

seek to subject us, and if we refuse to be subjected we are rebels.<sup>64</sup>

This declarative sentence is both true and false at the same time. It is true because it understands the authoritative claim of Scripture but it is false because it depicts this claim as an alien, totalitarian threat to man. It is exactly this Ricoeurian notion of appropriation that Auerbach, unlike Frye, failed to take into consideration. Frye, quoting Milton, can therefore assert that by the end of the Bible the ultimate authority is not the 'external Bible', but the Word of God in the human heart.<sup>65</sup> Only when the book is indeed 'swallowed up' can we speak about the disappearance of the ego. Paraphrasing Frye's notion about the purpose of studying Shakespeare, we can say that the end of reading the Bible is not to admire it but to possess it so that its verbal energy can filter into us and shape our way of thinking. Such an 'interpenetration' is the true purpose of reading the Bible.

However, Frye does not only speak about a 'moment' of dis-possession like Ricoeur, but about an eventual final vision that is conveyed to us by the language of love, in which there is no ego, no argument, nor 'Old', nor 'New' Testament, in which life is not opaque but becomes transparent. It is the appropriation of the surprising final vision of the Seer of Patmos: namely, that the strong, victorious Lion of the tribe of Judah and the weak Lamb pitifully slain, are one.

# 3

## Reading Scripture

### THE UNITY OF SCRIPTURE

In Chapter 2 we have seen that typology as a linguistic phenomenon has to be completed in reading. Our conclusion was that every reading is both a rewriting and an interpretation of the text. We have also seen that the text itself was interpretation and that interpretation was an act 'of' the text rather than an act 'on' the text. The text is in action if it is inspired, and inspiration is not the result of authorial intention but a quality of the text. If the text is inspired by God, it also inspires God, it inspires a reading in tune with its writing: if the ultimate 'author' was God, then the ultimate 'reader' of the text is God as well.

In this Chapter the reader is invited to join my reading of Scripture. By 'Scripture' I mean the 'Christian Bible' as it has been a major informing and inspiring book of Western culture. As a student of English literature I have chosen to refer to the translation of the Bible which has had greatest influence on English writers and poets to date. This version is the King James Bible (1611), or Authorized Version.

However, the following reading is based on some assumptions. First of all, this is going to be a layman's reading and not a professional theologian's. I am reading Scripture by following the canonical rather than the chronological-historical order of books. I consciously adopt this naive or unscholarly attitude for two reasons. First, I wish to demonstrate that the Bible definitely has a beginning and an end and, despite the obstacles, a linear-sequential reading is possible. Secondly, poets and writers read Scripture also in an unscholarly manner and they have made sense of it. The purpose of my reading is to help my readers envisage typological patterns emerging from the texts. Being a literary critic rather than a biblical scholar I shall draw on the works of such excellent

theologians as Gerhard von Rad and Oscar Cullmann and I shall rely heavily on the classic work of Leonard Goppelt.

If the claim to read Scripture instead of concentrating on one or two certain books of Scripture seems too ambitious, my reason is that I wish to keep the totality or unity of Scripture in mind as the Bible is a typologically constructed book itself. It is worth considering Northrop Frye's notion of the 'sevenfold phases of revelation': Creation - Exodus - Law - Wisdom - Prophecy - Gospel - Apocalypse. His suggestion is that each 'phase' is the type of the one following it and the antitype of the one preceeding it. But while keeping this totality in mind, I shall have to be selective to some extent while trying to explore some rhetorical patterns or the frequently occurring figures that constitute the typological structure of Scripture. Before we begin our reading, some words must be said about the unity of Scripture.

#### Typology and Salvation History: Principles of Unity

The Bible is undoubtedly a collection of diverse books written within a span of more than 1000 years in various genres and styles, by authors of different social rank, education, temper, and piety. Nevertheless these writings have been moulded into 'one book' through the centuries. Nowadays the dominant historical and analytical approach emphasizes the diversity, complexity and idiosyncrasy of each book. However, if one is endowed with some artistic sensitivity then it is impossible not to notice a striking unity within the diversity. It is somewhat ironic that today, in the age of an extremely departmentalized academic biblical scholarship, it is the task of the literary critic to call attention to the intrinsic and imaginative unity of the Bible, an idea that has been neglected by the majority of biblical scholars.

Whercin, then, lies the 'unity of the Bible'? According to Frye the unity of the Bible consists 'in its ordering of words under the rubrics of typological, metaphorical and stylistic unity which comprehends an encyclopaedic and imaginative vision of the world from creation to apocalypse'.<sup>1</sup> For Frye then, the Bible is a great 'archetypal structure' and an 'encyclopaedic form'; the most obvious indication of its unity is its typological formation and construction. However, there is perhaps another agent, of equal significance, which plays a major role in the intrinsic and the imaginative unity of the Bible. This is the notion of *Heilsgeschichte* (salvation history) which implies

a progressive understanding of revelation. The term was first used by some German theologians in the last century and revived in a different theological context by the Swiss Protestant theologian, Oscar Cullmann. He notes that typology and salvation history are two principles that are interrelated and interdependent, each of them conditioning the other.

every presentation of the history of salvation . . . offers just one excerpt of the whole and draws out just certain lines of salvation history. Thus far, hardly any distinction exists between salvation-historical exposition and typology. Conversely, typology presupposes a wider salvation-historical framework and connects two points of this background. In typology, however, the connection is limited to two points being dealt with. Those parts and members of the salvation history which fall in between the points are either passed over or are not considered in this manner of confrontation.<sup>2</sup>

Cullmann also contended that though salvation history and typology are linked with the pattern of 'promise and fulfilment', typology nevertheless 'lacks the element of development'.<sup>3</sup> But we may challenge this view by appealing to Goppelt's idea of *Steigerung* ('heightening') which does imply the notion of 'development': a simultaneous leap forward and upward. *Steigerung* is 'like a shift of music into a new key as it crescendoes to a climax'.<sup>4</sup>

#### TYPOLOGY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Typology gained recognition in Old Testament studies when Gerhard von Rad published his programmatic essay in 1952: 'Typological Interpretation in the Old Testament'<sup>5</sup> which led to the revival of typology in biblical studies. He gave an even fuller treatment of this subject in his *Theology of the Old Testament*.<sup>6</sup> In von Rad's view typology is not a theological device but 'typological thinking is an elementary function of all human thought and interpretation'<sup>7</sup> and without this analogical way of thinking there would be no poetry. But typology in the Old Testament is totally different from the analogical thinking of the ancient Orient because in the Bible it is determined by the eschatological significance of the correspondence between the beginning and the end (*Urzeit - Endzeit*) and therefore von Rad doubts Bultmann's view that typology is based on the

repetition deriving from a cyclic view of time. He prefers to use the term 'correspondence' (either temporal or spatial) instead of 'repetition'. As he says, the Old Testament is not a static book of facts but it is a book of prophetic faith with a radical openness and expectation towards the future. It is a book in which history becomes prophetic and all events are viewed in relation to the redemptive act of God: 'history becomes word and word becomes history'.<sup>8</sup> For von Rad typological interpretation should be concerned with the *keygma* and it should interpret events as being in preparation: the whole Old Testament is a witness to Christ.<sup>9</sup> Contrary to the former practice of typology which saw the types (persons, events, institutions) as being static and objective, von Rad revived a typology which has a 'keener eye for history' and has more affinity with the modern theological tradition. He worked with the idea of a dynamic typology of events: typological correspondences can be discerned only by faith; it is an interpretation based on faith's witness to past events. If God's dealings with his people are witnessed to, 'the possibility exists of seeing in this a shadow of the New Testament revelation of Christ'.<sup>10</sup> Von Rad does not assert naively that certain Old Testament characters or events 'foreshadowed' something of the future but maintains that in retrospect, in the light of faith, these things can indeed be seen to have foreshadowed something of the future. While for some nineteenth century theologians such as Fairbairn, typology was a part of the divine revelation which is analogous to an educational process 'leading mankind progressively to the fullness of time',<sup>11</sup> in von Rad's view, typology is not a part of the divine revelation any more but is a kind of theology, or, at least, a common mode of human thought employed by the theologians of Israel and by the early Christians. Thus for him typology does not belong to the *historia revelationis* but to the *historia theologiae*. For him it was a useful theological method by which he understood and proclaimed God's self-revelation in history.<sup>12</sup>

Typology has also been revived by Jewish scholars. In his thorough book on *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*<sup>13</sup> Michael Fishbane justified the 'inner-biblical typologies', the 'homological' likeness of events or persons in the Hebrew Bible. He envisaged four kinds of typologies within the Hebrew Bible: (1) Typologies of Cosmological - Historical Nature: ('New heaven and New earth'); (2) Typologies of Historical Nature: (Exodus - Conquest) (3) Typologies of Spatial Nature: (Eden, Temple); (4) Typologies of Biographical Nature (Adam, Noah, Moses, Joshua and so on).<sup>14</sup> He

pointed out that some fixed rhetorical terms, like 'just as . . . so' are used to establish a typological relationship between two persons, for example:

The Lord said unto Joshua . . . 'as I was with Moses, so I will be with thee.' (Joshua 3:7)

Though typology becomes manifest especially in the prophetic books of the Old Testament, we can also detect the origins of this mode of thought in the historical narratives of the Pentateuch. Typology in Genesis is, of course, far from the sophisticated typology in Pauline theology but the idea of the 'new' being interpreted in terms of the 'old', the sense of an advance by repetition is definitely present on the first pages of the Bible. For the Jewish mind the future is inseparable from the past as progress can take place only in terms of remembering.

#### Recurring Patterns of Blessing in Genesis

If one reads the Bible straight from the very beginning, one soon becomes aware of certain repeated patterns. One example of such a pattern is the blessing of God, given to those with whom he initiates a partnership.

#### Adam - Noah

Verbal features establish a direct typological link between Adam and Noah. Thus Noah is a 'new Adam' who is asked to preside over a restored world after the flood. God blessed Adam after his creation with the following words:

Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. (1:28)

After the flood, when God 'recreates' the world, he gives the blessing to Noah with the same pattern of words:

'Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth. And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth,

and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hand they are delivered.' (Genesis 9:1-2)

#### Adam - Abraham

The New Testament is particularly concerned with the typological significance of Abraham as the 'father' of all believers (Romans 4:11), who was also called the 'Friend of God' (James 2:23). But in Genesis itself he appears to be much more than a 'hero' of a historical narrative. Through Noah, God was able to renew his covenant with man following the flood. After another cataclysm, that is, the fall of Babel, Abram is chosen to be God's human partner in his unfolding plan of redemption. So the partnership, or covenant, is restored and renewed again. The pattern of blessing is again repeated, God promises Abram the gifts of land, seed and earthly blessing (12:1-3):

'Get thee out of thy country . . . unto a land that I will shew thee: And I will make thee a great nation, and make thy name great and thou shalt be a blessing . . . in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.'

Fishbane noted: 'In this typological context, it cannot fail to strike one that these three blessings are, in fact, a typological reversal of the primordial curses in Eden: directed against the earth, human generativity, and human labour.'<sup>15</sup>

#### 'Type-Scenes' in Genesis

Besides the typological parallels between individuals, there is also an interesting repetition of some patterns and themes already within the patriarchal narratives. Robert Alter calls such recurring patterns 'biblical type-scenes' borrowing the term from Homer-scholarship. The notion is that

there are fixed situations which the poet is expected to include in his narrative and which he must perform according to a set order of motifs - situations like the arrival, the message, the voyage, the assembly, the oracle, the arming of the hero, and some half-dozen others.<sup>16</sup>

Such descriptive devices cannot always be found in the Bible therefore reference of this term in the Bible is somewhat different. We are going to discuss two 'type-scenes'. These are recurring narrative patterns within *Genesis*, but the first pattern especially has a significance extending far beyond *Genesis* itself.

#### The Recurring Pattern of 'Primogeniture'

One of the most significant recurring patterns in the Bible is the pattern of 'Primogeniture', the question of the first-born. The pattern begins in *Genesis* but runs through the whole Bible. *Primogeniture* originally involved the passing of the rights of inheritance to the firstborn son. In the Bible this pattern works in a special way. There is a peculiar emphasis on the passing over of the rights and the status of the firstborn son in favour of a younger one. Adam's firstborn son, Cain becomes a murderer. Abraham's eldest son Ishmael is passed over in favour of Isaac; Isaac's eldest son Esau is passed over in favour of Jacob; Jacob's eldest son, Reuben is passed over in favour of Judah; Joseph's eldest son Manasseh is passed over in favour of Ephraim. But the pattern is at work far beyond the book of *Genesis*. Moses and the entire first generation of Israel are denied entry to the Promised Land and the leadership is transferred to Joshua. The pattern proceeds into the history of Israel: though Saul was chosen by God to be the first king, God nevertheless passes over Saul and his heirs in favour of David.

St Paul perceived the expansion of this pattern in the history of the chosen people and in Galatians 4 he claimed that the Jews had been passed over in the same way in favour of the Christians. Hagar and Ishmael stand for the law, bondage, Mount Sinai and the 'flesh'. Thus 'allegorically' (or typically) they represent Judaism while Sarah and Isaac are figuring the gospel, freedom, Jerusalem, the promise, and thus they represent Christianity.

What is the significance of the typological symbolism of primogeniture in the Bible? Northrop Frye, who devoted an illuminating lecture to this subject said<sup>17</sup> that the Bible's emphasis on the passing over of the status of the firstborn in favour of a younger son represents a direct intervention of the divine breaking in upon the human sense of continuity. Jesus fills in the role of the firstborn and represents also the continuity of the line of David. The divine breaking in 'subverts' the continuity, and Jesus is shown not to be the natural son of Joseph, the descendant of David. Nevertheless

he fulfilled this continuity through the direct divine intervention of the Virgin Birth. This involves the whole paradoxical conception of Christ, because Christ, as Frye says, 'is born after flesh like Ishmael but also after the promise of Isaac. So that his birth in the line of David . . . fulfils the law of primogeniture, but his actual birth represents a divine entry into history'.<sup>18</sup>

### A Recurring Episode

There is an interesting, if bizarre, pattern that crops up three times in Genesis. This pattern is a unique manifestation of intertextuality within Genesis. In Genesis 12:10-20 we read that Abram travelled to Egypt to avoid famine and that while he was there he asked his wife Sarai to pretend that she was his sister and not his wife. He did this as he was afraid that he would be killed because of the beauty of his wife. When the men of Pharaoh catch sight of Sarai, she is taken to Pharaoh's house. Abram, in return, is treated well. Then, we are told, the Lord sent plague to Pharaoh and his house because of Sarai. When Pharaoh learns of Sarai's true identity, he asks Abram: 'Why didst thou not tell me that she was thy wife?' Then Abraham is sent away with Sarai and with all their goods.

The same situation recurs in another setting: in Genesis 20 we read that Abraham and Sarah travelled to Gerar and once again Abraham says that Sarah is his sister. The King of Gerar, Abimelech, takes Sarah to his house but Sarah's identity is revealed to him in a dream. Abimelech who had not touched Sarah, returns her to Abraham the following morning. But whilst in the previous incident Pharaoh's question was apparently a rhetorical one to which Abram did not reply, here Abimelech's question seems genuinely concerned with the motivation of Abraham's deed and Abraham defends his integrity: he says he had thought he would be killed because of his wife and he argues that Sarah was indeed his sister on his father's side. Due presumably to this sincere confession, there is a mutual reconciliation: Abraham is entertained in the land of Abimelech. He even prays to God for Abimelech's wife and maidservants and as a result of his prayer, their barrenness, imposed on them because of Sarah, is taken away.

The situation recurs for the third time in Genesis 26: 1-11. This time it is Isaac and his wife Rebekah who also settle down in Gerar. Similarly, out of fear, Isaac pretends that the fair-faced Rebekah is

his sister and not his wife. In this version there is no hint that she is taken away to entertain the host of the place, but it is said that Abimelech, the king of the Philistines looked out of a window and saw Isaac and Rebekah involved in an embrace that was clearly more than fraternal! Abimelech therefore calls Isaac and asks him 'how saidst thou, She is my sister?' Isaac admits that he was afraid that he would die because of her. Abimelech is horrified because, as he says, 'one of the people might lightly have lien with thy wife' - which, he believes, would have brought guiltiness to the people. Then Abimelech commands that nobody should touch either Isaac or his wife.

So we have here what is substantially the same episode recurring three times in somewhat different settings. It makes sense to see these, not as historical episodes recorded in Genesis but as three versions of a 'proto'-story and for the literary critic the repetition of patterns or episodes is significant. We perceive an accelerating rhythm in the narration: the recurring 'old' pattern or formula tends to generate 'new' insights and meanings. The logic of typology is at work here: we understand the new in terms of the old.

### Typology beyond the Pentateuch: Moses - Joshua

Typology points not only beyond Genesis but even beyond the Pentateuch. We might even ask whether the whole concept of 'Deuteronomy' as 'second law' or the 'repetition of the law' could also be conceived as a typological notion. And further on, could we perhaps conceive the relationship between the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua as again a typological relationship and thereby justify the claim for the 'Hexateuch'? There is one level where typology is undoubtedly at work within the Hexateuch: this is the personal level. Therefore we now turn to the Moses-Joshua typology. Michael Fishbane has shown that salvific moments of Israelite history put on prototypical patterns which were then reiterated in the presentation of other or later events - the new was shown in terms of the old. So an historical event or a person could serve as 'the prototype for the descriptive shaping of the other'.<sup>19</sup> This is quite evident in the typological parallels between the Exodus and the Conquest or between Moses and Joshua.

Joshua is not just a new leader of the people but also a 'new Moses'. 'The Just . . . as . . . so' rhetorical formula is frequently applied to Joshua: 'as I was with Moses, so I will be with thee' (3:7);

'all Israel . . . feared him, as they feared Moses' (4:14). Before the destruction of Jericho, Joshua came face to face with a man holding his sword drawn against him. When Joshua inquired whether he was a friend or an enemy, and the man replied that he was 'a captain of the host of the Lord' and commanded Joshua in exactly the same words as the 'I am what I am' commanded Moses in the burning bush:

Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy. (5:15)

The crossing of the Jordan is also a typological reiteration of the crossing of the Red Sea. The 'just as . . . so' formula is applied also for the parallel between the Exodus and the Conquest: 'For the Lord your God dried up the waters of Jordan from before you, until ye were passed over, as the Lord your God did to the Red sea, which he dried up from before us, until we were gone over' (4:23).

Thus the crossing of the Jordan is virtually a replay of the crossing of the Red Sea. For the writer this event again testifies to the greatness of God. The people of Israel were interested in the depth of the meaning of the event and not in the descriptive logic of 'wie es eigentlich gewesen ist' (as it really happened). This is illustrated by the fact that these two crossings (and the two 'waters': the Red Sea and the Jordan) are being *fused* in the mind of the Psalmist when he praises the mighty things of God.

When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob from a people of strange language; Judah was his sanctuary, and Israel his dominion. The sea saw it, and fled: Jordan (!) was driven back. (Psalm 114:1-3)

#### Typology in the Prophetic Texts

So far our concern has been to show that typology was already at work in the historical narratives at the beginning of the Bible. We have dwelt on this at some length as scholars have tended to overlook typology within the Pentateuch and the historical books. Von Rad and his followers emphasize that typology becomes manifest within the prophetic books. When the prophets announced that a

new saving act was taking place in history they used the language of the old traditions in which they found some predictive character: 'new David', 'new Exodus' and the like. They saw the new in terms of the old and interpreted the old in the light of the new. The 'recitals of the old confessions' meant the 'reactualizing' of old events. To give some examples: Isaiah uses the Garden of Eden as a new paradise (9:1-2; 11:6-9); Hosea predicts another period in the wilderness (2:14-15; 12:9-10). Second Isaiah expects a new Exodus (43:16-21; 48:20-21; 51:9-11). David is often seen as typical of the King who is to come in the future (Isaiah 11:1; 51:3-4; Jeremiah 23:5; Ezekiel 34:23-24; Amos 9:11).

A literary critic, A. C. Charity, has convincingly demonstrated that the core of the Old Testament typology is the dialectic tension between the 'new' and the 'steadfast': God does not change but nevertheless he always creates something new. He encounters his people only in history, in the 'saving events'. Therefore Israel's confessions are always purely historical. God reveals himself primarily in history and not in nature (as in the pagan cults), nor in metaphysics (as in Greek philosophy). Playing with words we can, perhaps, say that while the pagan religions 'naturalized history', Israel, on the contrary, 'historicized' even nature. This radical historicity is the basis of the Old Testament typology. For Israel the continuous reciting of the past was both a contemporization and an actualization. The function of typology, as Charity asserts, has always been to confront man with God, to summon him for new decisions because the past provides analogical patterns for the future. For Charity typology is not a 'system' but a category of 'existentialist' concern, as in it the past is 'applied' to the needs of the present. God's mighty acts in the past are meant to summon God's people in the present for a new 'decision' and therefore typology is more 'imperative' than 'indicative':

Only by living up to the imperative could each man affirm the indicative as applying to him, and to become what, by virtue of the act of God, he already was: a member of God's chosen people, living in the new history which God had given him, according to the way which God had shown him.<sup>20</sup>

It is interesting to note that typology is more evident in the 'weal'-prophecies than in the 'woe'-prophecies. Typology in the Old Testament already works within the framework of the 'promise and

fulfilment' structure. Historical events are presented by the prophets 'in such relation to one another that they may be perceived to be purposive acts of God, tending towards fulfilment'.<sup>21</sup>

Some of the prophecies were already fulfilled within the Old Testament but due to Israel's disobedience, God's plan will not be accomplished with them. As this becomes more and more of a threatening possibility, the prophets are beginning to talk about a 'righteous remnant'. From the time of the Elijah stories (1 Kings 19:18) there is a growing belief that a small eschatological community will be the foundation-stone of God's new building (Isaiah 28:16). The remnant live in a provisional form of existence, their function is to point 'towards something still to come and still veiled'.<sup>22</sup> They prefer a future, eschatological reality, when the covenant with God, hitherto only half-lived, will be lived wholly and will be accomplished. A representative of this remnant is the 'righteous sufferer' or the 'suffering servant' of Deutero-Isaiah. The focus, we can see, is gradually narrowing down, first to the remnant and then to a single person. There is a sense of growing expectation and the Old Testament remains radically open. There is no attempt yet to remove the tension this created. The destiny of Israel will be, as Irenaeus used to say, 'recapitulated' by one person eagerly awaited but unrecognized and in the event, rejected. The message of old, its completion long awaited, will, similarly unnoticed, be fulfilled.

It has been suggested that typology in the Old Testament reaches its culmination in Deutero-Isaiah. Here we can observe both a cosmological and a historical typology. For the first – cosmological typology – we can say that the author promises a creation anew: 'For, behold, I create new heavens and new earth' (65:17). Then the present state of the world, which is 'wilderness' will become like Eden (51:3). Deutero-Isaiah envisages a divine healing that will take place in the heart of creation. Therefore there is a strong parallel between 'primordial time' (*Urzeit*) and eschatological time (*Endzeit*). Fishbane observes that the central historical events of Israel are also perceived as 'the reiteration of foundational cosmic patterns from a prehistorical period',<sup>23</sup> and his interesting conclusion is that the 'reiteration of cosmic prototypes in historical time results in the historicization of myth'.<sup>24</sup> Deutero-Isaiah frequently used the terms 'first things', 'new things' or 'things to come'. For him the *Endzeit* is like the *Urzeit* as he is 'the first and the last' (44:6), and that is the reason why he can declare the end from the beginning (46:10):

I have declared the former things from the beginning; and they went forth out of my mouth, and I shewed them I did them suddenly, and they came to pass. (48:3)

This eschatological-cosmological typology illustrates the way in which the 'word' is at work in fulfilment-language: the word is 'loosed off' and it is in motion until it reaches its goal and destination. When it reaches whom it was sent to, the word is fulfilled.

Turning now to the historical-eschatological typology in Deutero-Isaiah, we can see how much of this is related to the Exodus-experience. B. W. Anderson shows that there are numerous linguistic echoes of the Exodus tradition in Deutero-Isaiah. He has reinterpreted the following motifs eschatologically: (a) the promises to the fathers (49:19–21; 54:1–3; cf. Genesis 28:11); (b) the deliverance from Egypt (52:12; cf. Exodus 13:21–2); (c) the journey through the wilderness (48:21; cf. Exodus 17–2–7) including the promise for the renewal of the covenant (55:3; cf. Exodus 24:11); (d) the re-entry into the Promised Land (49:8, 52:1).<sup>25</sup>

H. Hummel's ideas on 'typical thinking' in the Old Testament allow us to summarize various aspects of typology.<sup>26</sup> He writes that typical thinking is a dominant concern of the Old Testament, especially in its historiography, cultus and prophecy. Hummel distinguishes various elements of typical thinking. The first is the typical selection of the historical events. The Exodus and the twelve tribes, for example, are theological types. Secondly, there are typical individuals such as Abraham or Moses, the prophet *par excellence*. Aaron is the type of the priest and David is that of king. Thirdly, there are typical groups, for example 'the righteous versus the wicked' in the Psalms. A subdivision of 'the righteous' is 'the righteous sufferer'. Fourthly, there are typical nations: the very name of Israel has had an eschatological quality from the very beginning; Babylon and Edom have become transhistorical symbols of eschatological judgement. Fifthly, there are some typical individuals who stand for foreign nations, for example Gog and Magog. Sixthly, there are typical places such as Jerusalem and Zion. Some passages in Ezekiel (40–48) also suggest that the earthly temple is a 'type', a prophecy of the eschatological restoration of the entire cosmos.

Seventhly, those events that are not understood as being historical in modern terms but in the Bible they are seen as real or historical (for example the creation, the Garden of Eden, the

Flood, the story of Jonah), should be interpreted also as typical. The eighth element is very significant: Israel's cult is the best evidence of her typical thinking. In this cult 'the great redemptive acts of God were re-enacted or represented in a great theophany of renewed contemporization and confrontation, climaxing in covenant renewal'.<sup>27</sup> It meant always a recapitulation and actualization of God's never changing divine purpose. The cult signified not only a vertical unity of man and God but also a 'horizontal homology' of the past, the present and the future. Leviticus 16, as other writers maintain, can also be seen as a typological prefiguration of Christ's redemptive activity.<sup>28</sup> The New Testament, especially the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, will take up the theme of this typological relationship.

#### TYPOLGY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

##### 'The Scripture Fulfilled'

According to Frye's 'sevenfold phases of revelation' the whole Old Testament is 'summed up' in the discourse of prophecy and so it is the antitype of all the previous phases. But each antitype, we have seen, becomes a type of the following phase. It is then the claim of the Christian Bible that prophecy is fulfilled in the Gospel.

We read more than once in the New Testament that 'Scripture is fulfilled: *peplerotai he graphē* (Luke 4:21; Mark 15:28). It means that the text of the Old Testament was seen as being 'filled up' with power, that it was in the light of the gospel relevant and creative yet again. The logic of typology did not simply imply that the past was interpreted or reinterpreted but that this past was actually generating a new meaning again. The new eschatological event in history, that is, the 'Christ-event' sums up and fulfils previous history. Therefore the New Testament is the fulfilment or the antitype of the Old. Christ is the great 'recapitulator' who fulfils both the vocation of Israel and the will of God. However, the vocation of Israel was seen by St Paul as the vocation of mankind and therefore Christ fulfils not only Israel's history but all human history as well (Ephesians 1:10). The mystery of the Incarnation is that Christ identifies himself with the whole of mankind which, according to Charity, means that the history of mankind is implicit in the history of Christ.<sup>29</sup>

##### Christ Fulfilling the Figures in the Synoptic Gospels

We begin our reading of the New Testament with a look at how the authors of the synoptic gospels saw Jesus as fulfilling various typological figures.

##### The 'Prophet'

Within the pages of the synoptic gospels Jesus appears to his contemporaries first of all as a 'prophet'. Since he did not teach as the scribes did (Mark 1:22, 27) he was seen by the people as an Elijah or a John the Baptist *redivivus* (Mark 8:28; 6:14). The present *kairos* announced by Jesus (Mark 1:15) is also the fulfilment of the past. Jesus himself is the antitype of the Old Testament prophets. He is in the line of the prophetic tradition but he is nonetheless greater than they are. This is the motif of *Steigerung* which involves not only comparison but frequently an antithesis as well. Jesus has consciously fulfilled the figure of the prophet by preaching repentance: his words echo Jeremiah (Mark 11:17; cf. Jeremiah 7:11) or Isaiah (Mark 7:6; cf. Isaiah 7:11). 'Jesus, like the prophets, smashes the human ordinances and restores God's commandment.'<sup>30</sup> The Sermon on the Mount is a good example of typological logic. Jesus interprets the old by giving it new significance: he has not come to destroy but to fulfil the law. He is indeed portrayed as a new Moses but his phrase 'but I tell you' signifies the arrival of a new divine order.<sup>31</sup> He speaks with the voice of divine authority. Like the prophets in the Old Testament he did not simply castigate the sins of the people but proclaimed salvation both in word and in deed. He frequently borrowed expressions from the Old Testament to demonstrate that he was fulfilling it. Several of his miracles have parallels in the Old Testament: for example the cleansing of the lepers (Mark 1:40-45; cf. Numbers 12:10ff.; 2 Kings 5:1 ff.) or the raising of the dead (Luke 7:11-17; cf. 1 Kings 17:17ff.; 2 Kings 4:18ff); or the story of the miraculous feeding (Mark 6:35-43 par.; cf. Exodus 16:4, 1 Kings 17:8-16; 2 Kings 4:1-7, 42-44). Of course, not all the parallels are typological ones. There is frequently an Old Testament precedent for the manner in which Jesus exercises his authority. Jesus' encounter with the Canaanite woman (Mark 7:24-30 par.) for example is similar to Elijah's encounter with the widow of Zarephath (1 Kings 17:8-24; cf. 2 Kings 4:18-37).



Clearly, Jesus's death too is conceived within a typological framework by the synoptic writers. Jesus did not fall victim to his enemies. He taught about the necessity of his death during his ministry. Jesus fulfils the destiny of the prophets just as his enemies also 'fill up the measure of their fathers' (Matthew 23:32). This is well illustrated by the parable of the wicked tenants (Mark 12:1-12). Other Old Testament metaphors such as for example the 'rejected stone' (Psalm 118:22ff.; cf. Mark 12:10) or the 'vineyard' (Isaiah 5:1ff.) in the mouth of Jesus indicate that he was consciously evoking well-known images when he alluded to his death. Jesus was consciously expecting that he would die in Jerusalem (Matthew 23:37-39 par.; Luke 13:33; cf. 9:31, 51, 53; 18:31, Matthew 16:21). When the Jews demanded a sign from him, he referred them to the sign of Jonah: 'For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth' (Matthew 12:39-40 par.). In Matthew 16:4 Jesus explicitly speaks about the 'sign' (*semeion*) of Jonah.

### The 'King'

Perhaps we may say that in the synoptic gospels Jesus viewed his whole life also as a fulfilment of the promises concerning the 'Son of David' and therefore that he 'fills up' the figure of the 'King'. This is most evident in the Gospel of Matthew which stresses the fact that Jesus was the descendant of David. But the genealogy shows that he is more than David because he is also the son of Abraham. Jesus the Messiah comes as David *redivivus*. That is implied in the allusion to David in the Sabbath controversy in Mark 2:23-28. If David the righteous king could eat the sacred bread on the Sabbath-day then he, the 'Lord also of the sabbath' (v. 28) may permit his disciples to pick grain on the Sabbath-day. It is reported by all four evangelists that Jesus so ordered his last entrance to Jerusalem that all people should recognize that the promise in Zechariah 9:9 was being fulfilled (Matthew 21:2ff. par.). Moreover, his anointing at Bethany (Mark 14:3-9 par.) was similarly the symbolic anointing of a King. Goppelt finds that even the shepherd metaphor from the Zechariah prophecy: 'smite the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered' (13:7) falls also within the scope of royal typology because the shepherd is only a figurative title of the king.<sup>32</sup> Jesus had been at work on building the 'kingdom' from the very beginning of his

ministry. The overall royal typology suggests that Jesus fulfilled both the figures of the Davidic kingdom and of the vocation of Israel.

### The 'Son of Man'

Another figure that Jesus seems to be consciously fulfilling is that of the Son of Man. This expression is used as a title for Jesus about seventy times in the synoptic gospels and twelve times in the Gospel of John.<sup>33</sup> The title may simply mean 'human being' but when used by Jesus it has a special messianic flavour. The expression *bar-neshah* is mentioned in the Book of Daniel (7:13) which, according to Josephus, was much quoted by the Jews in New Testament times.<sup>34</sup> Though the figure of the 'Son of Man' in Daniel is sketched only very briefly, he is given unequalled authority and power over men and women at that future time when he is to make his appearance. This figure can also be found in the apocryphal Book of Enoch (1:37-71) and also in 4 Ezra. In Daniel the figure of the Son of Man is very close to that of the 'Ancient of Days' (7:9) sitting on a throne and pronouncing judgement. This activity in the Gospels is attributed to the Son of Man (Matthew 25:31; 16:27 and so on). The title may both conceal and reveal that Jesus himself is God in human form (cf. Matthew 16:13, 17). And it implies that he is seen to be also one of us - he is our brother. He is not just an ordinary man, but he is *the* 'Man'.<sup>35</sup> Jesus emphasized throughout his ministry that the Son of Man had to suffer and die. By his allusion to the suffering, however, Jesus combined, or fused, the Messianic figure of the Son of Man with the figure of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.

### The 'Suffering Servant'

In Deutero-Isaiah there are four *Ebed Yahweh* songs (42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12) which present the figure of the 'Suffering Servant' (sometimes called the 'Righteous Sufferer' or the 'Servant of God'). This is another figure fulfilled by Jesus in the New Testament. It is uncertain whether the shadowy figure in Deutero-Isaiah refers to one man or a pious remnant or perhaps even to a whole nation. Scholars are still debating whether it stands for an historical personality (perhaps the author himself?) or for a corporate personality (Israel?). To demonstrate that Jesus fulfilled this image, Goppelt

reads the passion narratives in the context of their Old Testament quotations. The story of the passion is constantly being interpreted by the writers of the Gospels as fulfilment of Old Testament passages. There are dozens of passages from the Psalms (especially Psalm 22!) or from Jeremiah apart from those passages that identify the suffering Christ with the Suffering Servant. Describing how Jesus is mocked and ill-treated after the trial before the Sanhedrin in Mark 14:65 the author seems to have had Isaiah 50:6 in mind: 'I gave my back to the smiters and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting.' And Isaiah 53:12 is seen to have been fulfilled by the fact that Christ is crucified between two criminals.

Matthew, however, identifies Jesus directly with the suffering servant using a quotation from Isaiah 42-1 to describe his earthly ministry:

That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet saying, Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgement to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgement unto victory. And in his name shall the Gentiles trust. (Matthew 12:17-21)

Whilst the servant is weak, despised and rejected, he is at the same time and paradoxically a mighty and a victorious conqueror who is taking vengeance on the nations and restoring Israel. In Isaiah's prophecy it is clear that the ministry of the servant is directed first towards Israel and only afterwards towards the Gentiles.

It is clear from these few verses that for the first Christians the figure of the 'Servant of God' was 'filled in' by Christ. Isaiah 53:11b has special significance: 'by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities.' The idea of the 'one for the many' is echoed throughout the Gospels (Mark 10:45, 14:24 par.). This is the key to the idea of the forgiveness of sins.<sup>36</sup> Goppelt writes: 'Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection on behalf of 'many', that is, on behalf of all, accomplished what the self-surrender of all the martyrs of the Old Covenant could not do - the creation of a new people that has been sanctified by God and that will live forever.'<sup>37</sup>

In his brilliant phenomenological analysis of the *Ebed Jahve* figure, Paul Ricoeur shows that Christ's uniqueness consisted in his combination (or 'fusion') of the glorious figure of the 'Son of Man' with the pitiful figure of the 'Suffering Servant'. It implies that the way to a theology of glory leads through a theology of the cross. The image of the 'Judge', associated with the 'Son of Man' figure, is now connected with the sufferings of the servant. Hereafter the Son of Man is not only a 'Judge' but also a 'Paraclete' (Comforter, Advocate) and also a 'Witness'. Above all, and perhaps most unexpectedly, he also fulfils the role of the substitute 'Victim' in this cosmic trial. Satan remains alone, the 'Accuser' of the trial, his enemy Christ uniting the figures of the judge, the paraclete, the witness and even the victim. The Son of Man (who is also a King) is now identical with the suffering servant who is carrying the iniquities of many. The King had to become the victim: this is the mystery of Jesus.<sup>38</sup>

#### 'Twelve Tribes - Twelve Disciples'

The church of Jesus can be interpreted typologically as well. Jesus appointed twelve disciples (Mark 3:14 cf. Luke 6:13; Matthew 10:1) clearly making an allusion to the twelve tribes of Israel. In the same way as God, Jesus also calls twelve followers who would represent the nucleus of a growing community. But the twelve disciples are not merely antitypes of the twelve tribes of Israel, they are themselves the types of an eschatological reality. Jesus is the corner-stone, the apostles the foundation-stones (Ephesians 2:20). In New Jerusalem the twelve gates bear the names of the twelve tribes of Israel (Revelations 21:12-24). Christ promises the twelve to share in his glory (Matthew 19:28).

#### The 'Passover' - The 'Last Supper'

The next important typological antitype in the Synoptic Gospels is the institution of the Lord's Supper. It is the Passover Feast in which the people of God celebrated their deliverance from Egypt. In Luke the Last Supper is referred to explicitly as the Passover meal (22:15). According to the writers of the Synoptic Gospels the Last Supper takes place during the night which corresponds to the eve of the Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt when they were given particular instructions as to what and how to eat. (Exodus 12:8).

The reasons for sharing the bread and passing the cup also have their antecedents. The significance of the cup is that it refers to a covenant sealed with blood. It is unclear whether this is the blood of the Passover-lamb or the sprinkling of blood to seal the covenant at Sinai. However, the phrase: *haima tes diathekes* (Luke 22:20) is in verbal agreement with the Septuagint version of Exodus 24:8<sup>39</sup> suggesting more the analogy with the covenant at Sinai. From the interpretation in Hebrews, we can infer that as the old covenant was sealed with blood at Sinai, the covenant is also established with the blood of Christ. (Hebrews 9:18ff). Although if we were to take 1 Corinthians 5:7 into consideration we may perhaps conclude that the allusion is to the Passover lamb. Once again, the Old Testament types are 'fused' in the antitype of Christ's blood. Goppelt writes, 'that these two are inseparable and pulsate together in the words of institution, but, of course, without this clear conceptual definition of terms.'<sup>40</sup>

But we should bear in mind that the Last Supper is not only the antitype of the Passover; it is also a type in itself as well: the type of the great eschatological banquet (Luke 22:15-18 par.). Therefore the Lord's Supper always points to the eschaton, the consummation of time and history (Revelations 21:2 ff). Here we have to do again with the same kind of *Steigerung* as in the case of the twelve tribes and the twelve disciples. Jesus not only fulfils the types but lifts them up to a higher plane of reality.

#### The 'Lamb' and the New Creation (Typology in St John's Gospel)

Typology is also evident in the fourth gospel but it is very different from that in the synoptic gospels. Here Jesus is not simply compared to the Old Testament persons or figures but, as Goppelt argues, 'the basic orientation of this Gospel accounts for the fact that Jesus' work moves exclusively on the level of creation-typology'.<sup>41</sup> Accordingly, typology appears in two categories: firstly, Jesus is the Perfector of Creation, and secondly Jesus is the Perfect Gift of God.

The prologue (1:1-18) is a unique example of creation-typology. Only the Word was in the beginning and everything was created by the Word. The prologue announces that a new age has begun. 'In Jesus the redemptive gifts of the former salvation time come in perfected form, and this signifies that the first creation is being

perfected in a new one.'<sup>42</sup> Even the idea of the 'new birth' (3:1-21) is basically a typological one as it can be understood on the basis of creation-typology: the new birth is, in fact, the renewing of the creation. But in order to make this new birth possible for the believer, the Son must be lifted up to the Father just as Moses lifted up the snake in the wilderness (3:14). Jesus can create everything anew because he perfectly fulfils the redemptive history of God.

Jesus as the perfect gift of God fulfils both the gifts of the first age of salvation and also the institutions of the Old Testament. The manna or the water pouring out from the rock were the gifts of God of the first age but Jesus gives the true bread from heaven. He is the bread of life (6:35; 6:48). And instead of mere water he offers 'living water': 'he that believes in me shall never thirst' (6:35b; 7:37-38).

The most perfect gift of creation is the Lamb itself, as it is the Lamb, this innocent animal, which perfects creation. John the Baptist's metaphor evokes the Old Testament institution of the sacrifice. Where does the symbol of the 'Lamb' ultimately derive from? Three suggestions are usually offered: (1) it may refer to sin-offerings in general. Two lambs were offered in the temple as part of the daily ritual-sacrifice (cf. Numbers 28:3ff); (2) the servant of the Lord in Isaiah 53:7 is compared to a lamb; (3) Paul explicitly identifies Jesus with the passover-lamb in 1 Corinthians 5:7. John seems to imply that Jesus 'took up' the sins of many on himself and then he 'took it away'. In Goppelt's opinion, John has either the daily sacrifices or the passover lamb in mind. But it is likely that John's Gospel was written at a period when daily sacrifices had ceased to be performed, in which case the author would most probably have had a comparison of Jesus with the passover lamb in mind. And indeed this lamb was seen as delivering from death and destruction by the atoning power of its death (Exodus 12:7; 13:22). Whilst according to the synoptics Jesus celebrated this meal with his disciples on the evening before the Passover, in John it was celebrated 'at the hour specified by the law for the slaughtering of the Passover - lamb' (18:28; 19:14, 31).<sup>43</sup> This is reinforced in verses 19:33 and 36 when John records that Jesus' legs were not broken 'that the scripture should be fulfilled'. What John saw to have been fulfilled concerned the regulations of the preparation of the passover lamb ('neither shall ye break a bone thereof') in Exodus 12:46. This conception is in complete accordance with Paul's

notion that 'Christ our passover is sacrificed for us' (1 Corinthians 5:7). From all this evidence it can be inferred that John viewed the Lord's Supper as the antitype of the Passover.<sup>44</sup>

#### Typology in Stephen's Narrative: Acts 7: 2-60.

Explicit typological structure is most strikingly illustrated in the speech of Stephen, the first Christian martyr, in Acts 7:2-60. This piece is a wonderful combination of salvation history and typology. Stephen begins the story of Israel by reciting the story how Abraham as the Patriarch was given the covenant of circumcision (7:8). Then he briefly mentions Isaac, Jacob and the twelve patriarchs, dwelling at length on Joseph (9-19). The longest section deals with Moses (20-44), and then Joshua (45), David (46) and Solomon are mentioned. So far the the audience can see no 'scandalous' element in this speech as up to this point Stephen evokes only their own history.

The reversal or the *peripeteia* of this monologue begins in verse 48 where Stephen quotes the prophet Isaiah (66:1ff.) and immediately applies this prophecy to his audience. In verse 51 he is already directly castigating the 'stiffnecked' (Deuteronomy 9:6) people who are 'uncircumcised in heart and ears' and 'resist the Holy Ghost'. This is a clear example of direct typology. By suggesting that their 'fathers' (this relationship is to be understood 'spiritually' rather than a 'carnally') persecuted the prophets, Stephen identifies his audience with the enemies of God and of the Just One of whom they 'have been now the betrayers and murderers' (52b). Stephen clearly implies that as Christ fulfilled the figure of the prophet, his audience, the enemies of Christ, 'subfill' (Charity's phrase) the figures of the prophets' murderers. When the high priests and the members of the council have heard this, the author of the Acts tells us, they were not simply offended but 'they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth' (54) taking and stoning him there and then. In this they were re-enacting the role of the mob at the crucifixion, thus fulfilling both the figures of the enemies of the prophets and the enemies of Christ. Stephen, on the other hand, becomes identified with Christ; his last words: 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge' (60) so reminiscent of the words of the crucified Christ: 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.' (Luke 23:34). Significantly, these words are recorded only in the gospel of Luke which together

with the book of Acts is usually accepted as the work of a single author.

There are, of course, a great many other elements of both vertical and horizontal typology in this speech. There is a reference to Moses who was to make the 'tabernacle of witness' according to the 'fashion' (or 'pattern') that is *typos* of what he had seen on the mountain (7:44; cf. Exodus 25:40). Horizontal typology is evident in references in verse 45 to Joshua (in Greek *Iesu*) who led Israel to the promised land which has been seen as a prefiguration of Jesus' redemptive activity. Even Joseph, one of the Patriarchs, can be seen as a type of Jesus. As he was sold by his brothers so was Jesus sold by one of his disciples. The allusion to the circumcision, first in the literal sense (7:8) and then by transference to a figurative sense (7:52), is also a sign of typological thinking in the context of prophecy and fulfilment. M. D. Goulder finds that even the Genesis-passages of Stephen's apology tell the story 'not just of Jewish hard-heartedness and perfidy, and of divine interdependence, but of the life of Christ, incarnate and in his church, foreshadowed in the scriptures of old'.<sup>45</sup> We can conclude that Stephen's apology is pervaded by typological thinking; it is indeed a miniature representative sample of an overall spirit of typology and salvation history that permeates the whole Bible and, indeed, is like a 'Bible condensed'.

#### The 'Old' and the 'New' (Typology in St Paul)

The American Old Testament scholar, E. Earle Ellis maintains that Pauline typology derives chiefly from three Old Testament periods: the Creation, the Age of the Patriarchs, and the Exodus.<sup>46</sup> Ellis distinguishes two basic patterns: 'the adamic or creation-typology' and 'the covenant typology'.

#### 'Adam' (The Old and the New)

The Adamic or creation-typology is undoubtedly the most significant in St Paul's epistles. It is unparalleled in the New Testament because Adam is never mentioned in the Gospels. The most famous passage is at Romans 5:14 where Adam is described as a 'figure of him that was to come' (*typos tu mellontos*). Christ is not simply a 'Second Adam' or a 'New Adam', he is *the man*. He 'fills in' the figure of man, by his obedience he perfects the status of man.

It is important to see the whole context (5:12–21) because Paul's comparison of Adam and Christ involves both parallelism (5:12; 18ff.) and antithesis (15–17). Goppelt writes:

In their acts and in the effects they have on others, Adam and Christ are related to one-another as a photographic negative to its positive print or as a mould to the plastic shaped by it. As the mould determines the shape of the casting, so from Adam's power over the human race comes Christ's mission and work, his death and his resurrection.<sup>47</sup>

The significance of this typology is that in Christ the Christian becomes a new creation. In chapter 6 Paul describes how by our baptismal immersion we die with Christ: our old self is crucified with him (6:6) and as we emerge from water in unity with Christ we become one with him in his resurrection (6:5, 9). Thus in our baptism we gain new life (6:4). Therefore, as he puts it in: 'if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature' (2 Corinthians 5:17). Christ fulfills the figure of 'Man' (Adam), therefore whoever is in Christ is also conformed with the God-designed model of 'Man'. The term 'to be in Christ' corresponds to the notion of 'to put on Christ' (Galatians 3:27), an image evoking a 'clothing-metaphor' so prominent throughout the Bible. Mankind that was 'in Adam' is now recreated 'in Christ' (1 Corinthians 15:22). 'The first and the second Adam are the progenitors of two races of men. Each implies a whole world, an order of life and death. Each includes his adherence in and under himself'.<sup>48</sup> Thus the Church is also a new creation and whoever is in Christ, belongs to the 'body of Christ' (1 Corinthians 12:27).

#### The 'Covenants' (The Old and the New)

Paul distinguishes two kinds of 'covenants' in his typology: the Patriarchal Covenant and the Exodus Covenant. Both are seen as types of the 'New Covenant', but the Abraham-covenant rather parallels, whilst the one at Sinai is as antithetical to, the new covenant.

#### Abraham and His Sons

We have seen that 'Abraham' was already the symbol of faithful obedience in the Old Testament. Jesus considered him also symbolically: Abraham is the father of all believers. Jesus chided those

who regarded themselves the children of Abraham only on the basis of descent, without reference to faith. Their 'father', Jesus said, was the devil (John 8:44). This suggests that in biblical language, 'sonship' or 'fathership' is to be understood in typological or spiritual terms, rather than in literal or 'carnal' terms.

Romans 4 is the *classicus locus* of Abraham-typology. Abraham believed only on the basis of God's given word and therefore, those who believe in Christ are the children of Abraham. Justification is not dependent on circumcision as this is only a seal received from God. Abraham was already a believer (and thus justified) while being uncircumcised (4:12). The promise given to Abraham in Genesis 15:5 is fulfilled in his 'seed', that is, Christ (Galatians 3:16). Goppelt wrote:

In the Bible, the terms – 'father' and 'children' (seed) – which describe a natural relationship defined by blood and by law become expressions for the interrelationship of type and antitype in redemptive history. In this relationship to God, Abraham is, in the fullest sense of the word, a type of all Christians in their relationship to God; consequently the promise of innumerable descendants that was made to Abraham is fulfilled in the gathering of the church.<sup>49</sup>

The other kind of covenant-typology perceives an antithesis between the covenant at Sinai and the covenant with Christ. In Galatians 4:21–31 they are related typologically to Abraham's two sons, Ishmael and Isaac, as we have seen it in the section on 'Primogeniture':

HAGAR + ISHMAEL	SARAH + ISAAC
SINAI (Moses)	JERUSALEM (Christ)
OLD COVENANT	NEW COVENANT

#### 'Israel' (The Old and the New)

In our discussion of the Gospels we have seen that Jesus was seen to be the great recapitulator, the fulfilment of the history of Israel. Paul too has this presupposition in his mind. Typologically it is true that the 'believing Israel' is a type of Christ and the Church is the 'Israel of God'. Thus whatever happened to the Israelites, happened as 'examples' or 'warnings' (*typikos*) for the Church of

Christ which is now the people of God (1 Corinthians 10:6). If Christ was the 'perfected man', then the church is the 'perfected Israel'. When Paul says that 'they were all baptised unto Moses in cloud and in the sea' (1 Corinthians 10:2) he means that they were 'protected', 'enveloped' and saved by God just as we are protected, enveloped and saved by our baptism. The eating of the manna (Exodus 16:4:14-18) and the drinking from the Rock (Exodus 17:6; Numbers 20:7-13) are seen as types of the Lord's Supper (1 Corinthians 10:3ff.). These were gifts that preserved Israel in the wilderness just as the gifts of the sacraments are believed to preserve Christians today. The 'Rock' is also identified with Christ (1 Corinthians 10:4).<sup>50</sup> It is important to underline once again that the words *typos-typikos* have preserved an element of 'warning': these events or gifts are not only prefigurations but they are providential signs for the future, signposts of how, or how not, to behave in future analogous situations.

For Goppelt typology was the 'heart of Paul's theology':

with Paul, typology is not a hermeneutical method to be used in a technical way to interpret the OT. It is a spiritual approach (*pneumatische Betrachtungsweise*) that reveals the connection ordained in God's redemptive plan between the relationship of God and man in the OT and that relationship in the NT.<sup>51</sup>

#### The 'High-Priest' (Epistle to the Hebrews)

It is not my intention to explore the depth and difficulty of the all-permeating typological theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. I have chosen to concentrate on the central figure of the letter. In this epistle Christ is shown to have fulfilled another significant figure, almost as comprehensive as the figure of the 'Son of Man' in the synoptic gospels: the figure of the High Priest. Like the figure of the Son of Man, it involves humiliation and exaltation. This office was originally conferred upon the anointed one by God. As Aaron was called by God to be a high priest (5:4) so Christ was similarly chosen by God. The Psalmist's saying 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek (110:4) is applied to him (5:6). This mysterious figure 'without father, without mother, without descent' (7:3) was seen to be greater than even Abraham since the father of all believers received blessings from him and even paid tithes to him (Genesis 14:20). Jesus' priesthood is thus superior

to the Aaronic one partly because Jesus was not a descendent of the tribe of Levi, partly because his priesthood, unlike Levi's, is everlasting (7:23-25).

What then is the significance of Jesus' ministry as a high priest? Paul briefly alluded to Christ's atoning sacrifice in Romans 3:25. The theme is fully developed in this epistle. The Day of the Atonement is more explicitly evoked here. The Levitical high priest interceding for the people had to be both human and holy. He could attain holiness only by his daily sacrifices for his own sins. Christ is the perfect priest as he is both our brother and yet without sin (4:15). He does not need to bring any sacrifice for his own sin. In contrast to the Levitical priesthood, Christ does not need the earthly sanctuary as he has gone through the curtain which, according to the epistle, is his body (10:20) and thus opened for us a direct way to God. Matthew records that at the moment of Christ's death 'the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom' (Matthew 27:51). Thus the curtain separating the holy place from the holy of holies is taken away and a new way is opened for all believers. From now on, apart from Christ's intercession, no sacrifice or priesthood is necessary any more. Christ, the high priest, 'by his own blood . . . entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us' (9:12) and since then he has been performing the service in the original heavenly tabernacle (9:11). It is the original *typos* of the earthly tabernacle that Moses was instructed to build (Exodus 25:40). In this case there is a hint of a vertical typology but it does not challenge the dominance of the horizontal typology, namely, that Christ is acting already in the advanced stage of salvation history.

Christ, the crucified one, performs his priestly service in the presence of God with his own blood. It means that Christ united the priestly and the prophetic concepts of the sacrifice ('fusion', again!): the former requires the shedding of blood and the latter the dedication of one's heart. By 'fusing' these traditions (just as he 'fused' the concepts of the Son of Man and the Suffering Servant) Jesus perfects the sacrifice. Fulfilling the type of his own sacrifice on the great Day of Atonement in Leviticus 16, Jesus too suffered 'outside the city-gate', that is by his crucifixion outside the city of Jerusalem. And Christians are, therefore, encouraged to go their own way 'outside the city' and separate themselves from the old Jewish dispensation. 'For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come' (13:14).

The tone of exhortation and warning permeates the whole epistle. As he unveils the new mysteries of redemption, the author addresses the believer and the church with passion, warning them not to fall into the Old Testament types (*hypodeigma*) of disobedience, by hardening their heart or losing their belief. At the same time he beseeches them to follow the figures or types of the true believers that are described in the celebrated eleventh chapter of the epistle.

#### The 'Stone' (1 Peter)

It seems entirely appropriate that an epistle which employs the stone-typology found throughout the Bible in such a concentrated form, should be attributed to Peter, whose name (*petros*, cf. Matthew 16:18) means 'little stone' and is closely related to *petra*, a 'rock'.

Turning then to the text of the epistle, we note that in the passage 2:4-8, the author speaks about the 'living stones' of the church. He quotes Isaiah 28:16: 'Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste.' Paul, as we have seen, has identified the foundation-stone with Christ (1 Corinthians 3:11). Peter's words - 'the stone which the builders disallowed the same is made the head of the corner' (2:7) - echoes those of the psalmist: 'the stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner' (118:22). And perhaps there is too an allusion to the prophecy in the Book of Daniel concerning a stone that 'was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet . . . and brake them to pieces' (2:34). In Matthew 21, Jesus evokes both the image of the rejected stone and the stone-image from Daniel and, once again, he is 'fusing' the two images. He applies them to himself and to the Jews thus announcing the advent of a new age in salvation history (Matthew 21:42-44). In Acts, Peter identifies the rejected stone with the head of the corner (4:11). For Paul, on the other hand, the smitten rock in the desert (Exodus 17:6) is identical with Christ (1 Corinthians 10:4). Thus 1 Peter combines various images of the 'rejected stone', the 'foundation stone', the 'stone of building', the 'stumbling stone', the 'rock of offence' and even the 'crushing stone'. This passage fuses various aspects of the stone as a symbol in salvation history and all the images are united in the one person of Christ.

#### Judgement - Typology (2 Peter and Jude)

Whilst in the Old Testament typology was characteristic rather of the 'weal'-prophecies than the 'woe'-prophecies, we can observe an opposite tendency towards the end of the New Testament: a new kind of typology is emerging in 2 Peter and Jude, and this is called 'judgement-typology'.

Judgement-typology is used to evoke the images of the fallen angels (2:4), the flood (2:5), Sodom and Gomorrah (2:6). There are two significant points here. First, all the Old Testament types refer to the future as not yet being fulfilled; second, the judgement always entails the salvation of the true believers who are saved in the midst of destruction.

In the Epistle of Jude (which is very similar in imagery and argument to second Peter) the author speaks of ungodly men who have crept into the congregations. They were 'before of old ordained to this condemnation' (4). The fallen angels (6), Sodom and Gomorrah (7), the 'way of Cain' (11), the 'error of Balaam' (11), the 'gainsaying of Core' (11) are all types of those who will be judged in the future. Balaam also appears in 2 Peter 2:15 as the type of false teachers. He is the type of those who seduce others to idolatry because of greed. Sionce, in Numbers 16, Core rebelled against Moses and Aaron, Core is the type of those who rebel against the divine order. The non-canonical prophecy of Enoch is quoted to demonstrate that God will execute judgement upon the ungodly ones (14). These are said to be warning examples or patterns (*hypodeigma* in Peter 2:6 and *deigma* in Jude 7).

We can say that typology in 2 Peter and Jude is not directly applied to Christ (therefore the element of *Steigerung* is missing) but typology in these epistles refers to the future, to the judgement that is to come, the signs of which are already being felt and experienced in the present. This insight will be fully developed in the grandiose vision of the *Book of Revelation*.

#### THE LION AND THE LAMB (THE APOCALYPSE)

And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. And I wept much

because no man was found worthy to open and to read the book, neither to look thereon.

And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.

And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth.

And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. (5:2-7)

We have come to the Book of Revelation in our reading of Scripture. We seem to enter another world: the images, the sounds, the 'smells and the tastes' of this world are different. The experience is both surprising and shocking. The colours of this book are unusually strong and dense, its music ranges in key and pitch. Our eyes are dazzled, our ears assaulted, our minds unsettled. Whence is this difference? Why is it that this book attracts the artists rather than the theologians? Why is it neglected in many Christian traditions and a closed book even for many who read their Bibles?

First of all, this book is a dense mosaic of allusion to the books of the Old Testament. Its text echoes Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah and Isaiah. If it is true to say that the language of the Bible is metaphorical rather than descriptive or argumentative then this claim is even more valid in the case of the Book of Revelation. There is even a *Steigerung* of this metaphorical language, if this German word really means a 'leap forward', 'like a shift of music into a new key as it crescendoes to a climax'. If earlier we have noticed frequent 'fusions' of motifs, here, we have arrived at a 'fusion of fusions'. Whilst we have become used to the metaphorical 'this is that' language in the Gospels: 'I am the vine, ye are the branches', we are perplexed by the innumerable floating metaphors in the last book of the Bible. In the Gospels the metaphors were relatively easy to understand: both the *tenor* ('I') and the *vehicle* ('vine') was stated. In the Apocalypse, however, we enter the world of 'implicit' metaphors, where the tenor is not stated. Similarly, this is the language of implicit types. We meet here metaphors of metaphors and types of types, metaphors, images, symbols, types 'floating', without 'legs', merging or fusing with one another. In this language there is no distinction between 'this' and 'that': this is a

transparent language of identities without any argument. I use the word transparent in the sense of the *Oxford Dictionary*: 'Having the property of transmitting light, so as to render bodies lying beyond completely visible; that can be seen through.'<sup>52</sup>

One of the symbols around which this book revolves, is the 'book'. John of Patmos is told to 'write in a book' what he sees (1:11). In the text already quoted at length we have just read about the 'opening of the book', and in due course we shall discuss the meaning of the 'eating of the book' (10:9). Undoubtedly, the book's central concern is the 'Lamb's book of life' (21:27).

The passage (5:2-7) we have quoted above illustrates very well the nature and function of typology not only in this book but in the whole Bible. The Seer of Patmos has a vision of heaven. First he hears a resounding angelic voice asking: 'Who is worthy to open the book?' The mood is one of great solemnity and even dread. The question is not answered. There is only silence. The prophet is so distressed that there is no one worthy to open and read the book that he begins to weep. Then, suddenly, he hears the comforting words of one of the elders: 'Weep not . . . the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book.'

There is twofold sense of surprize here. First, we are surprized and perhaps relieved that there is someone, still considered 'worthy' to open the book. Then, instead of the expected Lion of Juda, we are shocked by the prophet's vision of a Lamb 'as it had been slain' who comes, sits on the throne and opens the book, accompanied by the singing of the angels: 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power.'

In this condensed, poetic language there no logic or argument. It is intensive, paradoxical: the strong is the weak, the weak is the strong; whoever is dead might be alive and whoever thinks he is alive, might be dead. Those who consider themselves to be 'rich' are revealed to be 'miserable and poor' (3:17). The divine reality of the Apocalypse subverts all human sense of reality.

Within this divine vision the 'logical' human world becomes transparent and metaphorical. In this extremely dense, apocalyptic phase, language is highly revealing. It comes to us as a revelation that the Lion and the Lamb are one. The 'Lion', the powerful text of the Old Testament merges into the 'Lamb', the weaker text of the New Testament. But this 'interpenetration' of texts means that the Lamb becomes as powerful as the Lion, because *he* is the Lion. He is the reader, the recapitulator of the text, who identifies himself with



the text and therefore, he is the text. The 'new' was concealed in the 'old', and now the 'old' reveals the 'new'. The seed has grown into a plant and the time of harvest has come.

We have seen the Lamb's reading of the book. Now, how does our 'reading' work in this specially intensified phase of language? To answer this question we turn to the intriguing image in 10:9, an echo, or 'intertext' of a passage in Ezekiel (3:1-3). The prophet is instructed to go to the angel who stands with a little book, open in his hand. The voice tells him: 'take it, eat it up; it shall make thy belly bitter, but it shall be in thy mouth as sweet as honey.' We have understood figure of 'swallowing up the book' as a metonym of appropriation, of how fulfilment is taking place. 'To swallow something up' is to absorb, assimilate, interpret, or, fulfill. Swallowing is incorporation or 'appropriation' in Ricoeur's sense of the word.

In the Bible each type is swallowed up or absorbed by its antitype but this does not mean that the type thereby loses its significance as happens in the case of allegory. Following Frye, we have described the Bible as a progress of types into antitypes within a scheme of the seven phases of revelation: creation is fulfilled (perfected) in the redemption of Israel in the Exodus. Exodus (or revolution) points towards an intensified sense of law and the law is individualised (fulfilled) in wisdom. Wisdom looks for continuity and stability and therefore it widens out into to prophecy. For the Christian, the whole Old Testament is a prophecy, thus prophecy swallows up the whole Old Testament. In turn, the prophecy is swallowed up by the Gospel and the Gospel is eventually fulfilled in the Apocalypse. Is this the end? Does not the Apocalypse point beyond itself? Surely, it does. Does the Apocalypse also become an antitype? If so, of what is it the type?

If prophecy swallows up the Old Testament, we can say the Apocalypse sums up, fulfills or swallows up, the whole Bible. But if so, it must also become a type that points to something beyond it. Apocalypse is the type of the new creation, of a new heaven and a new earth. The Apocalypse lifts the Bible up into a new sense of reality, as it were into a higher key. 'The new Creation will actually incorporate the whole sequence; it would start certainly as a revolution in the reader's mind and would also encapsulate the whole sequence down to the apocalypse itself.'<sup>53</sup>

At the end of this reading we have arrived at the 'reader's mind'. But what happens to the reader, at the end of the day, when he

has finished his reading of the Bible? We may say that the book is recreated in his mind: 'every text is a type of its on reading. Its antitype starts in the reader's mind . . .'<sup>54</sup> And the ultimate authority, according to Milton, is not the Book of the Bible but the Word of God in the human heart.<sup>55</sup> The purpose of reading is, indeed, to digest or 'eat up the book' and to be recreated by it. Here the Ricoeurian idea of 'appropriation' is indeed at work: if I 'eat' the book and 'swallow' the word, my ego will be extinguished, and I will become transparent. The reader is absorbed by the vision and recreated by it. 'The apocalypse', in Frye's words, 'is the way the world looks after the ego has disappeared.'<sup>56</sup>