

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1949

The Typological Method of Biblical Interpretation: An Investigation

Willard Burce

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Burce, Willard, "The Typological Method of Biblical Interpretation: An Investigation" (1949). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 216.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/216>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

52301

THE TYPOLOGICAL METHOD OF BIBLICAL
INTERPRETATION: AN INVESTIGATION

A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of New Testament Theology

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Sacred Theology

by
Willard Lewis Burce

May 1948

41, 274

Approved by: W. Burce

Saul D. Greuter

BV
4070
C69
M3
1948
no.4
c.2

THE TYPOLOGICAL METHOD OF BIBLICAL
INTERPRETATION: AN INVESTIGATION

(outline)

Introduction (1-8)

I. 100-500 A.D. (9-31)

- A. The Epistle of Barnabas (10)
- B. Justin Martyr (14)
- C. Origen (17)
- D. The School of Antioch (27)
- E. Junilius (29)

II. 500-1500 A.D. (32-41)

- A. The Manifold Sense (36)
- B. Abelard (38)
- C. Nicolas of Lyra (40)

III. Luther (42-56)

IV. From Luther to 1700 A.D. (57-94)

- A. The Lutheran Confessions (57)
- B. Flacius (59)
- C. Hyperius (61)
- D. Aretius (63)
- E. The Authorized Version (65)
- F. John Gerhard (65)
- G. Observations (66)
- H. Glass (69)
- I. Pascal (80)
- J. Cocceius and his Followers (83)
- K. Grotius and his Followers (88)

V. The Eighteenth Century (95-112)

- 1. Rambach (95)
- 2. Bengel (101)
- 3. Ernesti, Semler, and Michaelis (103)

VI. The Nineteenth Century (113-160)

- A. Schleiermacher (117)
- B. De Wette (119)
- C. Olshausen (120)
- D. Stier (122)
- E. Hofmann (128)
- F. Hengstenberg (132)
- G. Dörner (135)
- H. Tholuck (138)
- I. Klausen (141)
- J. Westcott (142)
- K. Kurtz (145)
- L. Fairbairn (147)
- M. Orelli (155)
- N. Terry (156)
- O. Briggs and Smith (159)

VII. The Twentieth Century (161-183)

- 1. Torm (161)
- 2. Schodde (164)
- 3. Fritsch (169)
- 4. Mystical Interpretation in England (171)
- 5. The Theology of Crisis (176)
- 6. The Roman Catholic Church (177)
- 7. The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod (179)

Conclusion (184-186)

Bibliography (187-192)

THE TYPOLOGICAL METHOD OF BIBLICAL
INTERPRETATION: AN INVESTIGATION

Introduction

De sensu literarum sacrarum mystico varia sunt hominum judicia. In the early eighteenth century Johann Jacob Rambach used these words as the opening statement of a book he wrote about the mystical sense of the Scriptures.¹ They contain the summary of this essay, too. In the following pages we shall examine many of the varia judicia.

From earliest times students of the Scriptures saw in them mystical meaning. Someone advanced the definition that while the literal sense of the Scriptures deals with words, the mystical sense has to do with the things that the words talk about. The mystical sense was supposed to have many possibilities and ramifications. Much that exegetes produced by way of expounding it was nonsense. But there was some truth hidden amongst it all.

Today we do not usually speak both of a literal and of

1. Johann Jacob Rambach, De Sensus Mystici Criteriis, 3rd. ed., bound with his Institutiones Hermeneuticae Sacrae, 2nd ed., p. 1.

a mystical sense. Sensus literalis unus est has become a well-known hermeneutical principle. The rule has come to mean that each statement of the Scriptures has but one intended meaning.

But we learn from the Scriptures themselves that some of the objects and events and institutions and persons which the Old Testament describes did, indeed, have a further significance than appears outwardly. Note well. Not the records about objects and events and persons and institutions, but these historical phenomena themselves, apart from the records, had a further significance. This further significance was that, according to God's purpose, they symbolized Christ and the things that had to do with Him and His kingdom.

The New Testament tells us of this:

Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ (Col. 2, 16-17).

For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect (Heb. 10, 1).

Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come (Rom. 5, 14).

Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like

figure whereunto (ἀντίτυπον) baptism doth also now save us (1 Pet. 3, 20-21).

Because Rom. 5, 14 calls Adam a τύπος of Christ, it has come about that whatever in the Old Testament prefigures something in the New is called a "type." The study of types is typology. In accord with 1 Pet. 3, 19, the things of the New Testament which are prefigured are called "antitypes."

It was not an innovation when New Testament writers said that things in the Old Testament represented things in the New. Moses had told the people of Israel: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me" (Deut. 18, 15). David had written of Christ: "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (Ps. 110,4). Ezekiel said of Christ: "I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd" (Ezek. 34, 23; cf. also Ezek. 37, 25 ff.). Malachi wrote: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord" (Mal. 4, 5). By Christ's word, this prophecy was fulfilled in John the Baptist.

These Old Testament writers show us how God shaped the history of the Old Testament in such a way that in some manner it pictured and foreshadowed what would come in

Christ. On this basis another vista opens up in the New Testament. Christ at times takes episodes of Old Testament history and applies them freely to Himself. Of the brazen serpent He said: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up" (John 3,14). After talking about the manna in the wilderness, Christ said: "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world . . . I am the bread of life" (John 6,32-35). In words which point back to Jacob's ladder, He said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man" (John 1,51). St. Paul writes: "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. 5,7). Scholars have concluded, and not without good reason, that God intended these Old Testament phenomena, when He gave them, to be prefigurative, to be types of Christ.

In some of the citations from the Old Testament in the New Testament, the question arises again. An example is Hos. 11,1. From all immediate indications, it looks like the words in Hos. 11,1, "I have called my son out of Egypt," apply to the nation Israel. Yet St. Matthew applies this statement to Christ (Matt. 2,15). Is it possible that the solution lies in Israel's being a type of Christ, and that the words are applied to Christ because He is the

antitype of Israel?

This is but a small fraction of the evidence that might be presented to show that there are ample grounds for studying what Scripture has to say about types. On the basis of the evidence many careful scholars have come to conclusions like that of R. V. G. Tasker, who wrote in a very recent book:

To them (the New Testament writers) the whole story of the People of Israel, their divine call, their redemption from Egypt, the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, the triumphant establishment of the worship of Jehovah in the Holy Land, the building of the Temple, the tragedy of the exile, and the subsequent resurrection and return of the remnant to Zion, are all fore-shadowings of the greater and final salvation given in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, apart from which they have in themselves no abiding significance and are not fully comprehensible.¹

Many have shrunk from this conclusion, saying that, if put into practice in the interpretation of the Old Testament, it would make the Scriptures an unclear book and open flood gates to exegetical abuse.

With regard to the first objection, that it would make of Scripture an unclear book, we must remember that we are here not dealing with the meaning of the words of Scripture, but with the meaning of historical events which the Scriptures tell us about. The deluge is one thing. The written record about the deluge is another. Scripture itself indicates that the written record has but one intended sense. But it has also indicated that God intended the

1. R. V. G. Tasker, The Old Testament in the New Testament, p. 16.

flood as an historical event to have a deeper significance.

With regard to the latter objection, that the treatment of many Old Testament phenomena as types of Christ and His kingdom will evoke floods of abuse, a number of things are to be said. The old Latin saw has it thus: Abusus non tollit usum. Scripture itself has indicated the direction we are to take in coming to a full understanding of Old Testament events in their relation to the New Testament of our Lord. The New Testament nowhere implies that it has expounded and exhausted all the types that existed in the history of Israel. In fact, the incidental way in which the New Testament writers refer to types would lead us to think that there is a large store from which the writers have drawn with freedom. Such statements as Col. 2,14-15 definitely show that there are more types in the Old Testament than the New Testament explains in detail. It would be an assumption for which there is no New Testament evidence were one to say that the only types in the Old Testament are those which the New Testament specifically mentions.

Far from drawing such a conclusion, a person might, if he wished to speculate for a moment, have reason to think that there were more types than even the Old Testament recorded. For types are historical phenomena. And there is no reason to believe that all the facts of Israel's history are recorded in the Old Testament. Not all the utterances of the prophets found a place in the sacred books. Why

should everything that stood in a typical relation to Christ be entered therein?

With regard to both these aforementioned objections, we must enunciate that within the proper bounds of typology we are dealing with what God Himself has set before us. We are not forsaking, but following, the principle that Scripture interprets itself. Scripture has directed our attention to types and has pointed many of them out. The interpreter may well follow this line of investigation, for God neither makes His own Scriptures unclear nor does He invent occasions for exegetical romancing.

There are many types in the Old Testament. That much we know. The New Testament has showed us some. The rules of procedure for dealing with the typological problem must come from Scripture itself--that, too, is clear. But three questions present themselves to the student. 1) Intensively and definitively, what is a type? What makes one thing typical of another? In what respect does anything in the Old Testament typify, prefigure, anything in the New Testament? 2) Extensively, and by way of application, what are the things in the Old Testament that are typical, and of what are they the types, and wherein do their individual typical characteristics consist? 3) What are the guiding hermeneutical principles for treating the types of Scripture?

Opinions throughout the centuries have differed widely on all three points. A great deal of effort has been

PRITZLAFF MEMORIAL LIBRARY
CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

expended and some progress made in finding answers to the second and third. Much less has been done about the first. The satisfactory solution of the second and third depends on the understanding of the first. Hermeneutical rules for handling types must not only stand the test of being put to practice, but must presuppose an understanding of what types really are.

It was the original object of this study to investigate these three questions. The subject is very large, however. It seems more salutary to deal for the first with the history of typology and to see how exegetes of the Church down through the years have faced the problems of understanding and discussing types.

Accepted by the use of the allegorical method of exegesis in the Old Testament with the proliferation of types of the New. This method found its way into the writings of the Church fathers,¹ along with the methods of the Jewish Rabbis—the Haggadists, Halakists, and Sederists.² These elements, intermingled and blended with actual treatment of the literal, historical sense, make a reconstruction of the hermeneutical principles of the fathers a difficult matter. Defining principles of interpretation and exegesis are by far not the most pressing task of the fathers. They

1. Patrick Peabody, *The Exegesis of Scripture*, p. 10.
 2. Frederick H. Parker, *History of the Bible in the Church*, p. 104.
 3. For a discussion of this, see the allegorical method, and the influence of, *ibid.* pp. 111-120.
 4. *ibid.*, pp. 97-107.

I. 100-500 A.D.

We begin our survey with the early fathers of the Church. Fairbairn says: "Their typological views were of a somewhat indeterminate kind, and are rather to be inferred from the use of occasional examples, than to be found in any systematic principles of interpretation."¹ Farrar writes: "Their exegesis--novel in application only--is a chaos of elements unconsciously borrowed on the one hand from Philo, and on the other from Rabbis and Kabbalists."² Philo (a contemporary of our Lord) and his fellow-Alexandrians attempted by the use of the allegorical method to reconcile the Old Testament with the philosophies of Plato and the Stoa. This method found its way into the writings of the Church fathers,³ along with the methods of the Jewish Rabbis--the Haggadists, Halakhists, and Kabbalists.⁴ These elements, intermingled ad libitum with actual treatment of the literal, historical sense, make a reconstruction of the hermeneutical principles of the fathers a difficult matter.

Defining principles of interpretation and typology was by far not the most pressing task of the fathers. They

-
1. Patrick Fairbairn, The Typology of Scripture, I, p. 1.
 2. Frederick W. Farrar, History of Interpretation, p. 165.
 3. For a discussion of Philo, the allegorical method, and its influence, cf. ibid. pp. 111-158.
 4. Ibid., pp. 47-107.

were embattled for survival against the forces of heathendom, Jewry, and heresy. They used whatever resources were at hand, and they won. Farrar says:

The only Bible used by the Apostolic Fathers was the Septuagint, and they rely on its supposed inspiration even when it differs widely from the original Hebrew. But while they proclaim the words of the Bible to be the very words of the Holy Spirit, they treat them with the strangest freedom. They alter; they misquote; they combine widely different passages of different authors; they introduce incidents borrowed from Jewish ritual and Jewish legend; they make more use of the Old Testament than of the New; they not only appeal to apocryphal writings as of inspired authority, but build arguments upon them.¹

A. The Epistle of Barnabas

We take as an example the Epistle of Barnabas, written very likely around the end of the first or the beginning of the second century.² This early letter made such an impression on the Church of the time that it was read as Scripture in public services.³

The author is anti-Judaistic. He is trying to take the Old Testament away from the Jews and claim it for Christianity.⁴ Farrar writes: "The only glimmer of an exegetic principle which he discloses is to find throughout the Old Testament something which can be referred to Christ

1. Ibid., p. 165.

2. Cf. The Apostolic Fathers, Loeb Classical Library, pp. 337-409.

3. Farrar, op. cit., p. 170.

4. Ibid., p. 167; The Apostolic Fathers, p. 337.

or to Christianity."¹ If the literal sense would not serve this purpose, the author used allegory, typology, cabbalism, or even more subjective opinion.²

The eighth chapter of the Epistle of Barnabas is a classic example of the author's strained use of typology.

But what do you think that it typifies, that the commandment has been given to Israel that the men in whom sin is complete offer a heifer and slay it and burn it, and that boys then take the ashes and put them into vessels and bind scarlet wool on sticks (see again the type of the cross and the scarlet wool), and hyssop, and that the boys all sprinkle the people thus one by one in order that they all be purified from their sins? Observe how plainly he speaks to you. The calf is Jesus; the sinful men offering it are those who brought him to be slain. Then there are no longer men, no longer the glory of sinners. The boys who sprinkle are they who preached to us the forgiveness of sins and the purification of the heart, to whom he gave the power of the Gospel to preach, and there are twelve as a testimony of the tribes, because there are twelve tribes of Israel. But why are there three boys who sprinkle? As a testimony to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, for these are great before God. And why was the wool put on the wood? Because the kingdom of Jesus is on the wood, and because those who hope in him shall live for ever. But why the wool and the hyssop together? Because in his kingdom there shall be evil and foul days, in which we shall be saved, for he also who has pain in his flesh is cured by the foulness of the hyssop. And for this reason the things which were thus done are plain to us, but obscure to them, because they did not hear the Lord's voice.³

In the seventh chapter the author of the epistle discusses a certain ritual of the Old Testament in which, he says, the people were all to fast, with the exception of

1. Farrar. *op. cit.*, p. 168.

2. Cf. W. R. Inge, "Alexandrian Theology," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, I, 312.

3. The Apostolic Fathers, Loeb Classical Series, pp. 369-371.

the priests, who were to eat the entrails of the sacrificial victim unwashed with vinegar. This was typical, he says, of the crucifixion, when Christ was giving His flesh for His new people and the priests (not the people) were giving Him gall and vinegar to drink.¹

In chapter nine he introduces a great piece of cabalism by way of interpreting this very factual statement of Moses: "Abraham circumcized from his household eighteen men and three hundred." The numeral eighteen is written IH in Greek. This indicates the name of Jesus, says our author. And three hundred is a T, which shows the cross. The author is very serious about this. He says: "Learn fully, then, children of love, concerning all things, for Abraham, who first circumcized, did so looking forward in the spirit to Jesus, and had received the doctrine of three letters."² It is interesting to see that the letters from which Chaldaic Abraham was supposed to have derived comfort were Greek letters. "No man has heard a more excellent lesson from me, but I know that you are worthy," the author confides to his readers.³

Barnabas' eleventh chapter is a discussion of Old Testament passages in which "the Lord took pains to foretell the water of baptism and the cross."⁴ He plies allegory to

1. Ibid., p. 367.

2. Ibid., p. 375.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 379.

the limit. An example: "Again he says in another prophet, 'And he who does these things shall be like the tree which is planted at the partings of the waters, which shall give its fruit in its season, and its leaf shall not fade, and all things, whatsoever he doeth, shall prosper' . . . Mark how he described the water and the cross together. For he means this: Blessed are those who hoped on the cross, and descended into the water."¹ To our author almost all the water in the Old Testament means baptism and every piece of wood the cross.

In chapter thirteen he makes Jacob's precedence over Esau indicate that the Jewish church is not the true Church, while the New Testament Church is. Jacob reversing the blessings of Ephraim and Manasseh indicates the same thing, for Jacob "saw in the spirit a type of the people of the future."²

Certainly, the Epistle of Barnabas "is marked by no coherent and intelligible theory."³ He makes use of the literal sense of Scripture when it suits him; he allegorizes; he invokes cabbalism; he discusses Old Testament types with utter abandon. One sentence, perhaps, gives us a clue to his views of typology. "But let us inquire if the Lord took pains to foretell the water of baptism and the cross."⁴

1. Ibid., p. 381.

2. Ibid., p. 389.

3. Farrar, op. cit., p. 167.

4. The Apostolic Fathers, Loeb Classical Series, p. 379.

Types were things which the Lord placed into Scripture for the purpose of foretelling (in a hidden way) facts about Christ and His Church.

B. Justin Martyr

Let us go on to Justin Martyr (d. ca. 165). Fritsch says: "Justin Martyr . . . is guilty of some of the most fanciful exegetical interpretations in the early Church."¹

Farrar writes:

For the New Testament Justin Martyr not only offers no exegesis, but seems uneasy unless he can base its simplest statements upon prophecies in the Old Testament . . . He speaks of the Law and circumcision as proofs of peculiar evil in the Jews, and regards God's approval of them as nothing but an "accommodation" to their sins . . . Following in the footsteps of the Rabbis he denies the plainest historical facts . . . Like Barnabas, he thinks that the Old Testament was meant mainly for Christians . . . In every Old Testament theophany he sees a certain Christophany . . . Justin's whole system of interpretation depends on the assumption that the Old Testament always spoke in mysteries, types, and symbols. When we read the passage in which Jacob and Noah are treated as types of Christ, we sympathize with the complaints of Trypho, that while God's Words were sacred, Justin's exegesis of them was purely artificial (Dial. 79).²

Justin learned much of his exegetic method from Philo, whom he admired. He called Philo and Josephus ὁ ἐβραῖος (Cohort. ad Graec. 9).³

We submit specimens of his exegesis from his Dialog with Trypho:

1. Charles T. Fritsch, "Biblical Typology," Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1947, p. 216.

2. Op. cit., p. 172.

3. Ibid., p. 174.

The true spiritual Israel, and descendants of Judah, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham (who in uncircumcision was approved of and blessed by God on account of his faith, and called the father of many nations), are we who have been led to God through this crucified Christ, as shall be demonstrated as we proceed (ch. 11).¹

That lamb which was commanded to be wholly roasted was a symbol of the suffering of the cross which Christ would undergo. For the lamb, which is roasted, is roasted and dressed up in the form of the cross. For one spit is transfixed right through from the lower parts up to the head, and one across the back, to which are attached the legs of the lamb (ch. 40).²

And the offering of fine flour . . . which was prescribed to be presented on behalf of those purified from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, the celebration of which our Lord Jesus Christ prescribed in remembrance of the suffering which He endured on behalf of those who are purified in soul from all iniquity . . . The command of circumcision, again, bidding them always circumcise the children on the eighth day, was a type of the true circumcision, by which we are circumcised from deceit and iniquity through Him who rose from the dead on the first day after the Sabbath, our Lord Jesus Christ (ch. 41).³

Moreover, the prescription that twelve bells be attached to the robe of the high priest, which hung down to the feet, was a symbol of the twelve apostles, who depend on the power of Christ, the eternal Priest; and through their voice it is that all the earth has been filled with the glory and grace of God and of His Christ (ch. 42).⁴

And in short . . . by enumerating all the other appointments of Moses, I can demonstrate that they were types and symbols and declarations of those things which would happen to Christ, and of those who it was foreknown were to believe in Him, and of those things which would also be done by Christ Himself (ch. 42).⁵

1. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, I, 200.

2. Ibid., I, 215.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., I, 216.

You know . . . that what the prophets said and did they veiled by parables and types, as you admitted to us; so that it was not easy for all to understand the most of what they said, since they concealed the truth by these means, that those who are eager to find out and learn it might do so with much labour (ch. 90).¹

(The stretched-out hands of Moses signified beforehand the cross, in battle with Amalek.) For if he gave up any part of this sign, which was an imitation of the cross, the people were beaten, as is recorded in the writings of Moses; but if he remained in this form, Amalek was proportionally defeated, and he who prevailed prevailed by the cross. For it was not because Moses so prayed that the people were stronger, but because, while one who bore the name of Jesus (Joshua) was in the forefront of the battle, he himself made the sign of the cross (ch. 90).²

I affirm that He announced beforehand the future salvation for the human race through the blood of Christ. For the sign of the scarlet thread, which the spies, sent to Jericho by Joshua, the son of Nave, gave to Rahab the harlot, telling her to bind it to the window through which she let them down to escape from their enemies, also manifested the symbol of the blood of Christ, by which those who were at one time harlots and unrighteous persons out of all nations are saved, receiving remission of sins, and continuing no longer in sin (ch. 111).³

As I said before, certain dispensations of weighty mysteries were accomplished in each act of this sort (Jacob's marrying two sisters) . . . The marriages of Jacob were types of that which Christ was about to accomplish. For it was not lawful for Jacob to marry two sisters at once. And he serves Laban for one of the daughters; and being deceived in the obtaining of the younger, he again serves seven years. Now Leah is your people and synagogue; but Rachel is our Church. And for these, and for the servants in both, Christ even now serves . . . Jacob served Laban for speckled

-
1. Ibid., p. 244.
 2. Ibid., p. 244-245.
 3. Ibid., p. 254.

and many-spotted sheep; and Christ served, even to the slavery of the cross, for the various and many-formed races of mankind, acquiring them by the blood and mystery of the cross. Leah was weak-eyed; for the eyes of your souls are excessively weak. Rachel stole the gods of Laban, and has hid them to this day; and we have lost our paternal and material gods (ch. 134).¹

The fanciful nature of much of Justin's exegesis makes one wonder that his books were received with approval. Yet the fact is that his books were approved, read, and quoted as authoritative for centuries. It is little wonder that the Scriptures were looked upon as a dark book, the interpretation of which required special divine illumination through the fathers. The task of the prophets, as Justin handled them, was not to reveal what they were told of Christ. They rather played a sort of game. They tantalizingly concealed Him for the sake of those persons who had the knowledge and the zeal to hunt for Him. And one of the prophets' methods of hiding Christ in the Scripture was to forecast His life and His acts and His Church under the guise of types.

C. Origen

Origen (ca. 185-254) shaped and stimulated the thinking of the Church as few men have ever done.² Bishop Lightfoot said: "In spite of his very patent faults, which it

1. Ibid., I, 267.

2. Cf. Johann Kurtz, Church History, I, 154-156; Farrar, op. cit., pp. 187-203; Inge, op. cit., I, 308-319.

costs nothing to denounce, a very considerable part of what is valuable in subsequent commentaries, whether ancient or modern, is due to him. A deep thinker, an accurate grammarian, a most laborious worker, and a most earnest Christian, he not only laid the foundation, but to a very great extent built up the fabric of Biblical interpretation."¹ Farrar declares:

By his Tetrapla and Hexapla he became the founder of all textual criticism; by his Homilies he fixed the type of a popular exposition; his Scholia were the earliest specimens of marginal explanations; his Commentaries furnished the Church with her first continuous exegesis; his book on "First Principles" (De Principiis) was "the earliest attempt at a systematic view of the Christian faith;" his knowledge of the Bible, and his contributions to its interpretation were absolutely unrivalled. His labours mark an epoch.²

Origen systematized, expanded mightily, and added to the principles which had already been at work in the exegesis of the Church.³ With such genius and industry did he approach this task, that his influence on the history of interpretation and exegesis is nothing short of phenomenal. The fruits of his brilliant mind and prodigious labors found their way in some shape or form, in a greater or lesser degree, into almost every commentary that was written for more than a thousand years. "His commentaries were the common mine in which all his successors dug."⁴ Theologians cursed his

1. Quoted by Farrar, op. cit., p. 188.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 201.

4. Ibid., pp. 189 and 201.

name but copied his writings, execrated his memory but promulgated his thoughts far and wide.¹ His work was a watershed, from which flowed many streams of thought. His impulse gave rise to the school of Antioch no less than to the later Alexandrian school.² "He was the father of grammatical as well as allegoric exegesis."³ But it was the allegoric which thrived.

Sad it is that often as not it was his weakest thoughts, his most dubious speculations, his most fantastic allegories, which were perpetuated. Heretic and orthodox alike quoted Origen. Many of his soundest principles were forgotten or abandoned. "His errors were canonised, his name condemned."⁴

The locus classicus of Origen's hermeneutical views is the fourth book of his De Principiis, on the inspiration of the Scriptures. We shall attempt here to summarize these views, as of great importance to our present study of the history of typological interpretation, using so far as possible the words of Origen himself.

The Jews, he begins, did not receive and accept Christ, but crucified Him, because they did not understand more than the letter of what was written about Him, and He thus did not meet their deceived expectations. Heretics read such anthropomorphic statements as Jer. 15,14; Ex. 20,5;

1. Ibid., pp. 187-198.

2. "Antiochene School," New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, I.

3. Farrar, op. cit., p. 189.

4. Ibid.

1 Sam. 15, 11; Is. 45, 7; Amos 3, 6; Mic. 1, 12; 1 Sam. 16, 14 and used them to bolster their argument for a "Demurge" who is an imperfect and unbenevolent God.⁵

Now the cause in all the points previously enumerated, of the false opinions, and of the impious statements or ignorant assertions about God, appears to be nothing else than the not understanding the Scripture according to its spiritual meaning, but the interpretation of it agreeably to the mere letter.²

That there are certain mystical economies made known by the holy Scripture, all have believed. But what these are, candid and modest individuals confess that they know not. If, then, one were to be perplexed about the intercourse of Lot with his daughters, and about the two wives of Abraham, and the two sisters married to Jacob, and the two handmaids who bore him children, they can return no other answer than this, that these are mysteries not understood by us. Nay, also, when the description of the fitting out of the tabernacle is read, believing that what is written is a type, they seek to adapt what they can to each particular related about the tabernacle. They are not wrong in their belief that the tabernacle is a type of something, but they err sometimes in adapting the description of that of which the tabernacle is a type to some special thing in a manner worthy of Scripture.³

The way, then, as it appears to us, in which we ought to deal with the Scriptures, and extract from them their meaning, is the following, which has been ascertained from the Scriptures themselves.⁴

As man consists of body and soul and spirit, so in the same way does Scripture, which has been arranged to be given by God for the salvation of men.⁵

The individual ought, then, to portray the ideas of holy Scripture in a threefold manner upon his own soul, in order that the simple man may be edified by the "flesh," as it were, of the Scrip-

1. Ante-Nicene Fathers, IV, 356-357.

2. Ibid., p. 357.

3. Ibid., p. 358.

4. Ibid., p. 359.

5. Ibid.

ture, for so we name the obvious sense; while he who has ascended a certain way may be edified by the "soul" as it were. The perfect man, again, may receive edification from the spiritual law, which has a shadow of good things to come.¹

As proof of this three-fold division of all Scripture, Origen cites Prov. 22,20: "Have I not written unto thee excellent things ($\text{דְּבָרֵי לֵב וְדְבָרֵי יָד}$) in words and knowledge?" For $\text{דְּבָרֵי לֵב וְדְבָרֵי יָד}$ the Septuagint has τρίβλις, and the Vulgate translates the passage "Ecce descripsi tibi tripliciter." This, for Origen, is adequate proof that Scripture has a three-fold sense--somatic, psychic, and pneumatic.²

There are certain passages of Scripture which do not at all contain the "corporeal" sense, as we shall show in the following paragraphs. There are places where we must seek only for the "soul," as it were, and "spirit" of Scripture.³

Origen proves this by the fact that at the wedding of Cana the water pots contained two or three firkins apiece.⁴

That the first "sense," then, is profitable in this respect, that it is capable of imparting edification, is testified by the multitudes of genuine and simple believers. Of that interpretation which is referred back to the "soul," there is an illustration in Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians. The expression is, "Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn;" to which he adds, "Doth God take care of oxen? or saith He it altogether for our sakes?" But the interpretation is "spiritual" when one is able to show of what heavenly things the Jews "according to the flesh" served as an example and shadow, and of what future blessings

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 361.

4. Ibid.

the law contains a shadow. We must investigate, according to the Apostolic promise, "the wisdom in a mystery, the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory, which one of the princes of this world knew," 1 Cor. 2,6-8.¹

To substantiate the existence of this "spiritual" sense, Origen now cites: "These things happened to them figuratively, but they were written for our sakes, upon whom the ends of the world are come" (1 Cor. 10,11); "For they drank of the spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ" (1 Cor. 10,4); "Thou shalt make everything according to the pattern showed thee in the mount" (Heb. 8,5); "Which things are an allegory" (Gal. 4,21-24); "Which things are a shadow of things to come" (Col. 2,16); "Who serve for an example and shadow of heavenly things" (Heb. 8,5).²

Do you wish to know with regard to the rest of the history, if it also happened as a pattern? We must note, then, the expression in the Epistle to the Romans, "I have left to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to Baal," quoted from the third book of Kings, which Paul has understood as equivalent in meaning to those who are Israelites according to election, because not only were the Gentiles benefited by the advent of Christ, but also certain of the race of God.³

The object of the Spirit which illuminated the prophets and apostles was especially the communication of ineffable mysteries regarding the affairs of men, in order that he who is capable of instruction may by investigation, and by devoting himself to the study of the profundities of meaning contained in the words, become a participator of all the doctrines of His counsel . . . There was a second object, for the sake of those who were unable to endure the fatigue

1. Ibid., pp. 361-363.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

of investigating matters so important, viz., to conceal the doctrines relating to the previously mentioned subjects in expressions containing a narrative regarding the things of the visible creation . . . describing in a connected series, with a power which is truly in keeping with the wisdom of God. For it was intended that the covering also of the spiritual truths--I mean the "bodily" part of Scripture--should not be without profit in many cases, but should be capable of improving the multitude, according to their capacity.¹

But since, if the usefulness of the legislation, and the sequence and beauty of the history, were universally evident of itself, we should not believe that any other thing could be understood in the Scripture save that which was obvious, the Word of God has arranged that certain stumbling-blocks, as it were, and offences, and impossibilities, should be introduced into the midst of the law and the history, in order that we may not, through being drawn away in all directions by the merely attractive nature of the language, either altogether fall away from the true doctrines, as learning nothing worthy of God, or, by not departing from the letter, come to the knowledge of nothing more divine . . . The Scripture sometimes interwove in the history the account of some event that did not take place, sometimes what could not have happened; sometimes what could, but did not. And sometimes a few words are interpolated which are not true in their literal acceptance, and sometimes a larger number . . . and at other times impossibilities are recorded for the sake of the more skilful and inquisitive, in order that they may give themselves to the toil of investigating what is written, and thus attain to a becoming conviction of the manner in which a meaning worthy of God must be sought out in such subjects.²

Here Origen mentions as manifest absurdities which could not have a literal truth: the first, second, and third days of creation being without sun, moon, and stars; God, like a farmer, planting a garden; God walking in the garden

1. Ibid., pp. 362-363.

2. Ibid., p. 364.

in the evening; Cain going forth from the presence of God; the devil taking Jesus upon a high mountain where He could see all the world. Among the laws these are absurd: Moses forbidding the eating of vultures (nobody would eat them, anyway); "Ye shall sit each one in your dwellings on the Sabbath" (How could one remain in a sitting posture all day?); "Salute no man by the way;" "If a man smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other" (Ordinarily men smite on the left cheek with the right hand.); "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out."¹

But that no one may suppose that we assert respecting the whole that no history is real, because a certain one is not . . . we have to answer that, with regard to certain things, it is perfectly clear to us that the historical account is true; as that Abraham was buried in the double cave at Hebron . . . For the passages that are true in their historical meaning are much more numerous than those which are inter-²persed with a purely spiritual signification.

For with respect to the holy Scripture, our opinion is that the whole of it has a "spiritual," but not the whole a "bodily" meaning, because the bodily meaning is in many places proved to be impossible.³

Such, then, being the state of the case, the apostle, elevating our power of discernment above the letter, says somewhere, "Behold Israel after the flesh," as if there were an Israel "according to the Spirit." And in another place he says, "For they who are the children of the flesh are not the children of God;" nor are "they all Israel who are of Israel;" nor is he a Jew who is one outwardly,

1. Ibid., pp. 366-367.

2. Ibid., p. 368.

3. Ibid., p. 369.

nor is that "circumcision" which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew who is one "inwardly," and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter. For if the judgment respecting the "Jew inwardly" be adopted, we must understand that, as there is a "bodily" race of Jews, so also is there a race of "Jews inwardly," the soul having acquired this nobility for certain mysterious reasons . . . The "spiritual" Israelites, of whom the "corporeal" Israelites were the type, sprang from families, and the families from tribes, and the tribes from some one individual whose descent is not of a "corporeal," but of a better kind . . . all going back to Adam, whom the apostle declares to be Christ . . . And if Eve also is intended by the apostle to refer to the Church, it is not surprising that Cain, who was born of Eve, and all after him, whose descent goes back to Eve, should be types of the Church, inasmuch as in a pre-eminent sense they are all descended from the Church.¹

If, therefore, the prophecies relating to Judea, and Jerusalem, and Israel, and Judah, and Jacob, not being understood by us in a "carnal" sense, indicate some such mysteries as already mentioned, it will follow also that the predictions concerning Egypt and the Egyptians, Babylon and the Babylonians, Tyre and the Tyrians, Sidon and the Sidonians, or the other nations, are spoken not only of these "bodily" Egyptians, Babylonians, Tyrians, and Sidonians, but also of their "spiritual" counterparts. For if there be "spiritual" Israelites, it follows that there are also "spiritual" Egyptians and Babylonians.²

For however far a man may advance in his investigations, and how great soever the progress that he may make by unremitting study, assisted even by the grace of God, and with his mind enlightened, he will not be able to attain to the end of those things which are the object of his inquiries . . . Therefore also it is to be desired that every one, according to his strength, should ever stretch out to those things that are before, "forgetting the things that

-
1. Ibid., pp. 370-371.
 2. Ibid., pp. 371-372.
 3. Ibid., p. 376.

are behind," both to better works and to a clearer apprehension and understanding, through Jesus Christ our Savior, to whom be glory forever!¹

If Origen had clearly separated his second and third senses, the psychic and pneumatic, his third sense would have dealt, seemingly, at least, with the material of the typology of Scripture. There was, in his view, a two-fold aspect of typology. The Jews according to the flesh, in all their doings, good or bad, as well as their enemies, were forms and shadows of things in the heavenly, spiritual, invisible, immaterial, Platonic sphere. At the same time history and law were shadows of future blessings.

One of Origen's fatal errors was to construe St. Paul's "spiritual Israel" in a Platonic sense and to make the deduction, "If there be 'spiritual' Israelites, it follows that there are also 'spiritual' Egyptians and Babylonians." Origen makes the whole purpose of Scripture to be the revealing in a hidden way facts concerning this invisible sphere. He is proverbial for the subjective and uninhibited extremes to which he went in finding parallels between the carnal and spiritual worlds. As we saw, he looked condescendingly upon the value of the literal sense and often denied its reality. Thus he became an allegorist, for allegory does not require reality, much less significance, in that which is allegorized. In pointing out and understanding an anti-

1. Ibid., p. 376.

type, on the other hand, it is essential that the type have a real existence.

Origen, moreover, does not in practice carefully keep his second and third senses separate. His second sense seems to be the moral application to life of the Scripture. Holding that to be an independent sense, and mixing it at random with the third, spiritual, sense, the results are, to say the least, an unsatisfactory treatment of the Sacred Records, as well as of the typology to which those records bear witness. Farrar summarizes:

With the highest admiration, and even the deepest reverence for Origen, whose spiritual teaching is often full of beauty and depth, and whose isolated comments are often valuable, we can only come to the conclusion that the foundations of his exegetic system are built upon the sand.¹

D. The School of Antioch

We have already mentioned that Origen's contribution to critical, grammatical, historical exegesis gave impulse to the school of Antioch, with its group of great scholars of the ancient Church. "The 'school' of Antioch was not like that of Alexandria, a succession of connected teachers. It was rather a theological tendency which continued at Nisibis and Edessa after the condemnation of Nestorius."²

"Diodorus of Tarsus (d. 393) must be regarded as the true founder of the School of Antioch."³ To this school

1. Op. cit., p. 201.
 2. Ibid., p. 212.
 3. Ibid.

belong Eusebius of Emesa (d. 360), Ephraem Syrus (d. 378), Chrysostom (d. 407), Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 429), and Theodoret (d. 457).

The school of Antioch protested vehemently against the allegorical treatment of Scripture and expounded a grammatical, historical method of interpretation. Farrar writes:

Their system of Biblical interpretation approached more nearly than any other to that which is adopted by the Reformed Churches throughout the world, and . . . if they had not been too uncharitably anathematised by the angry tongue, and crushed by the iron hand of a dominant orthodoxy, the study of their commentaries, and the adoption of their exegetic system, might have saved Church commentaries from centuries of futility and error.¹

The Antiochians distinguished allegory and type, rejecting the former, utilizing the latter.

The Syrian (Antiochian) school held that the Scriptures are the basis of knowledge, and not either the esoteric gnosis to which the Alexandrians had attached so much importance, nor the ecclesiastical tradition to which Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian had appealed. They were the Reformers, the Protestants, the Puritans, of the Ancient Church.²

Joseph H. Srawley writes regarding the school of Antioch:

The typical character of the Old Testament narratives is fully recognized. The incidents, persons, and objects mentioned are types of realities found in the New Testament (Theodore, Prooem. in Jon.). This harmony between type and antitype was foreseen and foreordained by the Divine purpose in order to assist men in recognizing the truth (Theodore in Ose 1,1; Prooem. in Am., Migne, lxvi, 125, 141.). Hence the obscurity of the Old Testament is due to the fact that it contains shadows and imperfect

1. Ibid., p. 211.

2. Ibid., p. 216.

images of the truth, but is not the truth itself (Chrys., Hom. 61 in Genes.). The language of the Old Testament is often hyperbolic and figurative, if referred to its original object, and finds its full content only in the higher realities of the Gospel (Theodore in Joel 2,28).¹

Joh. Geffcken has this to say:

These men (the Antiochians), of course, did not think of bluntly rejecting the pneumatical exegesis as unjustified; they only sought, by calling in question the sole supremacy of the allegorical interpretation, to restore the historical basis which had been destroyed by the allegorists. This they did by attempting to disclose the typical meaning after having ascertained the verbal significance.²

Srawley says again:

Theodore distinguishes three classes of prophecies-- 1) Those which have a primary application to Christ, and no other historical reference. These were few in number, e.g., Theodore recognized only four psalms (2,8,45,110) as directly Messianic. 2) Prophecies which have a primary reference to the Old Testament events, and refer only typically to the New Testament, i.e., such prophecies as are quoted in the New Testament. 3) Prophecies which have no Messianic reference, but refer only to the Old Testament (e.g., Mic. 4,1-12; Zech. 11,4 ff.; Hag. 2,1-9; Mal. 1,1-11 and 3,2-5) . . . Theodore has a profound realization of the significance of the idea of the kingdom of God as set forth in the Old Testament. The whole course of Old Testament history was intended to prepare the way for the coming of Christ.³

E. Junilius

Of very much interest for our subject, both because it reflects the work of the school of Antioch and because it deals directly with typology, is an extant work bearing the

1. Joseph H. Srawley, "Antiochene Theology," The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, I, 585.

2. Joh. Geffcken, "Allegory," ibid., I, 330.

3. Op. cit., p. 585-586.

name of Junilius (fl. ca. 550). Junilius was an African and a prominent courtier at Constantinople. His work is entitled De Partibus Divinarum Litterarum and is "the first attempt at a scientific introduction to biblical study."¹ The work is a translation which Junilius made of a treatise originally written in Syriac by Paul the Persian, teacher of the Nestorian seminary at Nisibis. Paul probably composed the work from selections which he gathered from the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia.² The writing contains one of the earliest, if not the earliest, systematic discussions of the problem of types.³

Types, we learn, can represent things past, present, or future. An example of a type of things past is the humility of the catechumens. It is a type of Adam excluded from paradise. The twelve stones on the breastplate of Aaron, representing the twelve tribes, was an example of a type of present things. The two sons of Isaac, showing the Old and the New Testament, is a type of future events.

Junilius' definition of a type: "Est ergo typus, sive figura, praesentium, aut praeteritarum, aut futurarum rerum ignotarum, per opera, secundum id quod opera sunt, manifestatio."

1. Cf. Kurtz, op. cit., I, 48, 1.

2. Ibid.

3. Flacius reprints the work in his Clavis Scripturae Sacrae, II, 206-227. See chap. 25, "De Typis," and chap. 26, "De Differentiis Typorum," pp. 220-221.

Type and prophecy are distinguished thus: Prophecy is a type in words; a type is a prophecy in actual things or events.

There are four principal kinds of types.

a) Pleasing things are signified by pleasing things, e.g., Christ's resurrection is a type of our resurrection.

b) Unpleasing things are prefigured by unpleasing things, e.g., the rejection of the evil angels prefigures the final rejection of evil men.

c) Pleasing things are signified by unpleasing things, e.g., Adam's transgression was a type of the righteousness of our Savior.

d) Unpleasing things are signified by pleasing things, e.g., baptism is a figure of the death of our Lord.

Junilius distinguishes the times of types. Some are before the Law, some under the Law, some under grace.

All these things, he says, pertain not to normative doctrine, but to the exposition of the text.¹

1. Ibid.

II. 500-1500 A.D.

The influence of the excellent principles of the School of Antioch perished for the most part in the Church, however; and allegorical interpretation, with its incredibly fanciful ramifications was victorious and held sway, being considered an entirely valid source of divine knowledge for a thousand years or more. While theologians paid lip service to the infallibility of all Scriptures, the allegorical method in fact made the Scriptures subject to the caprice of any and every interpreter.

In pursuing typical interpretation through the years, we need not pause long with the Latin fathers, with Jerome (d. 420), with Augustine (d. 430), with Ambrose (d. 397).¹ Great as were these men, learned, able, bringers of great contributions, and though they were the oracles of the Church for centuries, they can teach us little here. All three used Origen's commentaries freely and adopted his allegorical method, beside or within which a sound understanding of the typology of Scripture could hardly exist.²

1. For a discussion of their interpretation, cf. Farrar, *op. cit.*, pp. 205-206; 222-239.

2. For examples of their fanciful confusion of type and allegory, see Augustine, "Contra Faustum" (Book XII), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, IV, 183-199; and Jerome, "Epistle 53 to Paulinus," *ibid.* (2nd series), VI, 99-101.

A contribution which Augustine made is well worth noting, however. Oehler considers the fifteenth to the seventeenth books of the De Civitate Dei as "in a certain sense the first treatment of the theology of the Old Testament."¹ According to Augustine's discussion in these three books, "the history of the divine kingdom is comprised in seven periods, of which the week of creation forms the type. The first five periods fall in the Old Testament times, and are bounded by Noah, Abraham, David, the Babylonian captivity, and the appearing of Christ; the sixth is the present age of the Church; and the Sabbath of the world follows as the seventh."² There were and are typical and prefigurative relationships between the various historical periods. We shall see how this thought of Biblical history as a series of periods will recur in the theology of the post-Reformation period.

But now to trace the use of typology in detail through the maze of beclouded exegesis from the days of the fathers to the days of Luther would be a task of tedious proportions. Type and allegory are confused and hopelessly mingled. The use of typology is almost lost among a maze of abuses. Let it suffice to insert here the following statements:

1. Gustav Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament, pp. 22-23.

2. Ibid.

Farrar asserts:

The Alexandrian theory furnished the pretext for allegory--that is, for making the writers say something other than what they did say. The better Jewish theory, purified in Christianity, takes the teachings of the Old Dispensation literally, but sees in them, as St. Paul did, the shadow and germ of future developments. Allegory, though once used by St. Paul by way of passing illustration, is unknown to the other Apostles, and is never sanctioned by Christ. But Christ Himself, as in the case of Jonah, and of the brazen serpent, sanctioned the use of types. The allegoric method triumphed from the days of Origen onwards. The true grasp of typology ceased from the fifth to the seventeenth century--from the days of Theodore to those of Cocceius.¹

Regarding allegory, John. Geffcken writes:

We must keep in view that allegory is a form of representation which a reader believes himself to find in a piece of writing which is more or less in need of interpretation. As such an interpretation, however, is in reality justified only where the author of the writing, as, for instance, Horace, or Goethe in the second part of Faust, had a secret meaning in mind, the rule comes to be that in allegorical interpretation an entirely foreign subjective meaning is read into the passage which has to be explained. In this way allegory is almost always a relative, not an absolute, conception, which has nothing to do with the actual truth of the matter, and for the most part springs from the natural desire to conserve some idea which, owing to its age, has come to be regarded as sacred.²

W. R. Inge, in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, testifies of the debt which the allegorical bent of the early Church owed to the writings of the famous Jew of Alexandria whom we mentioned previously, Philo.

1. Op. cit., p. 218.

2. Op. cit., p. 327.

Christianity was well-acquainted with Philo, and seems to borrow from him not only many fanciful applications of the allegorical method, but several characteristic theological and philosophical terms; though these latter may be part of the common stock of ideas of Alexandria. The same may be said of Origen, between whom and Philo many correspondences are discovered by Siegfried . . . Jerome is also much influenced by Philo's interpretation of the Old Testament.¹

Farrar writes:

In the days of Justin Martyr and of Origen Christians had been driven to allegory by an imperious necessity. It was the only means known to them by which to meet the shock which wrenched the Gospel free from the fetters of Judaism. They used it to defeat the crude literalism of fanatical heresies; or to reconcile the teachings of philosophy with the truths of the Gospel. But in the days of Augustine the method had degenerated into an artistic method of displaying ingenuity and supporting ecclesiasticism. It had become the resource of a faithlessness which declined to admit, of an ignorance which failed to appreciate, and of an indolence which refused to solve the real difficulties in which the sacred book abounds. It enabled would-be teachers to fill whole volumes with the semblance of teaching. With others it became the ready means for establishing Church dogmas and priestly traditions, and so of making Scripture an oracle which answered them according to their idols, and an echo which returned to them the disguised utterance of their own imaginations.²

Once more Farrar declares:

Gregory the Great died in the year 604. With him the age of theological originality ceased for five centuries; and for four centuries more the study of the Bible was fettered by narrow restrictions, and misdirected in unprofitable efforts. We approach the subject of mediaeval exegesis with every desire to judge it in the kindest spirit; but we are compelled to say that during the Dark Ages, from the seventh to the twelfth century,

1. *Op. cit.*, p. 312.
2. *Op. cit.*, p. 239.

and during the scholastic epoch, from the twelfth to the sixteenth, there are but a few of the many who toiled in this field who added a single essential principle, or furnished a single original contribution to the explanation of the Word of God. During these nine centuries we find very little except the "glimmerings and decays" of patristic exposition. Much of the learning which still continued to exist was devoted to something which was meant for exegesis, yet not one writer in hundreds showed any true conception of what exegesis really implies. Sometimes, indeed, they repeat correct principles borrowed from Jerome and Augustine, but in practice they abandon these principles as soon as they are enunciated, and give us folio volumes of dogma, morality, and system, which profess to be based on Scripture, but have for the most part no real connection with the passages to which they are attached.¹

A. The Manifold Sense

Scripture had more than one sense--that was admitted almost universally in mediaeval times. Just how many senses it could have, and what sense was involved in a particular passage was a matter on which there was wide divergency of thought. Origen, as we heard, taught that there is a somatic, a psychic, and a pneumatic sense, corresponding to the three-fold function of man. Some parts of Scripture have all three, some only two, some only one. Augustine said the Old Testament has a four-fold division--history, etiology, analogy, and allegory. Others divided it into literal (or historical), allegorical, tropological (or moral), and anagogical. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) undertakes to harmonize these latter two views

1. Ibid., p. 245.

by asserting that history, etiology, and analogy are divisions of the literal sense, while allegory, tropology (or the moral sense), and anagogy are the three spiritual senses.¹ Hugo of St. Victor (1097-1141) included the anagogical with the allegorical and allowed a three-fold sense--historical, allegorical, tropological.²

Aquinas' explanation of the four-fold sense gives us a good and valuable insight into the state of the study of typology at his time. His distinction between the meaning of words and the meaning of things signified by words is one that we have heard before and shall hear again often.

The author of Holy Writ is God, in whose power it is to signify His meaning, not by words only (as man also can do), but also by things themselves. So, whereas in every other science things are signified by words, this science has the property, that the things signified by the words have themselves also a signification. Therefore that first signification whereby words signify things belongs to the first sense, the historical or literal. That signification whereby things signified by words have themselves also a signification is called the spiritual sense, which is based on the literal, and presupposes it. Now this spiritual sense has a three-fold division. For as the Apostle says (Heb. 10,1), the Old Law is a figure of the New Law, and Dionysius says (Cael. Haer. 1), the New Law itself is a figure of future glory. Again, in the New Law, whatever our Head has done is a type of what we ought to do. Therefore, so far as the things of the Old Law signify the things of the New Law, there is the allegorical sense; so far as the things done in

1. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica (Eng. transl., London, 1920), I, p. 17.

2. Ibid.

Christ, or so far as the things which signify Christ, are types of what we ought to do, there is the moral sense. But so far as they signify what relates to eternal glory, there is the anagogical sense. Since the literal sense is that which the author intends, and since the author of Holy Writ is God, Who by one act comprehends all things by His intellect, it is not unfitting, as Augustine says (Confess. 12), if, even according to the literal sense, one word in Holy Writ should have several senses.¹

B. Abelard

We note in passing the name of Peter Abelard (1079-1142), a great man of genius in the Middle Ages. Abelard may be regarded as one of those who contributed most to the rise of scholasticism.² Living in advance of his age, Abelard was condemned by the Church as a heretic. His importance to our study rests not in his heresies, however, but in his valiant, though not too successful, attack upon one of the great obstacles existing in the Middle Ages not only to a sound typology, but to any sound interpretation of the Scriptures. This obstacle was the slavish reverence which the writings of the fathers claimed. To the medieval theologian the writings of the fathers were inspired and held an authority which was, practically speaking, of as much value as the Scriptures themselves. (There was a saying: "Si Augustinus adest, sufficit ipse tibi."³) Abelard protested against this, and his contribution to

1. Ibid.

2. Farrar, op. cit., p. 258.

3. Ibid., p. 261.

interpretation is "his demand for reverent, though thorough, inquiry into matters of religion."¹ The spirit of Protestantism and an insight exceptional in his age is found in the following citation from the prolog to Abelard's Sic et Non, which prolog is the best reference for Abelard's views on interpretation.

Lest there be no room left for this "liberty to judge" and lest later scholars be denied the salutary work of discussing and reflecting on difficult questions of language and style, a distinction has been made between the excellency of the canonical authority of the Old and the New Testaments and the books of later writers. If anything in the Scriptures disturbs us and strikes us as absurd, we cannot say, "The author of this book did not stay by the truth." We either have to say that the codex is inaccurate or the translator has made a mistake or that we just do not understand. But with the works of later writers, which fill innumerable books, it is different. If the reader or hearer thinks that certain statements in them do not agree with the truth, perhaps because he does not understand what the author meant, he has freedom of judgment. He can approve of what pleases him or disapprove of what offends him. This applies to everything in the writings of the later fathers, unless they show by indisputable reason or by canonical authority that what they say either is true or could be true. Otherwise if what they say displeases anyone and he does not want to believe it, he cannot be blamed.²

Abelard sums up his call for careful, inquiring scholarship thus:

Constant or frequent questioning is called the first key of wisdom . . . By doubting we come to inquiring. And by inquiring we learn the truth, as Truth Himself says, "Seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you."³

1. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, I, 17.

2. Peter Abelard, Sic et Non, in Patrologiae Cursus Completus (Migne Edition), 2nd Series, Vol. 178, pp. 1339-1350.

3. Ibid.

Abelard's prolog contains at least one crass example of allegory and type confused:

In the same vein there is another passage which speaks typically of the hidden mysteries of Christ. Of the paschal lamb it says, "If any residue shall be left, let it be burned with fire" (Ex. 10). That means, if there are any divine mysteries which we cannot understand, we should leave them for teaching to the Spirit through whom they have been written, and not rashly attempt to define them.¹

C. Nicolas of Lyra

Karl Holl asserts that the four-fold method of interpretation was not altogether a scientific hindrance. For there was in it a healthy compulsion to look at the text from all angles. The four senses were distinguished, so that there was an opportunity to treat the literal sense, and no one acquainted with the field can say that no progress was made in the study of the literal sense in the Middle Ages. There was a recognized principle that in scientific argument the literal meaning alone had proof value. Besides, it was by no means assumed that every chapter and verse had to be expounded in all four ways.²

Evidence of this is found by looking at the accomplishments of Nicolas of Lyra (d. 1340), whom Farrar characterizes as "one green island among the tideless waves of exegetic commonplace."³ Lyra devoted himself, far more than his

1. Ibid.

2. Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, I, p. 545.

3. Op. cit., p. 274.

contemporaries, to that without which there can be no proper exegesis or typology--the study of the literal, historical sense of Scripture. "Practically . . . he admits only two possible senses--the literal and the mystic, and he founds the latter exclusively upon the former."¹ He "follows Thomas Aquinas in the remark that the literal sense develops the meaning of the words, and the mystic sense the meaning of the things which the words signify."² He insisted, too, on the principle of referring to the original languages, a rare thing in the Middle Ages.³ Luther wrote in his

Commentary on Genesis:

So habe ich euch oft gesagt, was fuer eine Theologie war, da ich erstlich anfieng Theologiam zu studieren. "Der Buchstabe," sageten sie, "toedtet," 2 Cor. 3,6. Darum war ich vor allen Lehrern sonderlich dem Lyra feind, dasz er so fleiszig dem Text nachgeheth, und gern darbei bleibet. Nun aber ziehe ich ihn im deswillen allen andern Auslegern der Schrift vor.⁴

Again Luther wrote of Lyra:

Ego Lyranum ideo amo et inter optimos pono quod ubique diligenter retinet et persequitur historiam, quamquam auctoritate Patrum se vinctum patitur et nonnumquam eorum exemplo deflectit . . . ad ineptas allegorias.⁵

-
1. Ibid., pp. 276-277.
 2. Ibid., p. 276.
 3. Ibid., p. 275.
 4. Walch Edition, I, 945.
 5. Quoted by Farrar, op. cit., p. 277.

III. Luther

Martin Luther (1483-1546) set down no explicit list of principles for the understanding of Scriptural typology, nor did he devote any of his hundreds of writings to the subject. Yet a consideration of his work is indispensable to our present topic. He marks the dawn of a new day in the entire field of interpretation.¹

1. He discarded the four-fold sense which had so long done so much damage, and he enunciated the principle of the singleness of sense of the Scriptures. If Scripture is intended to proclaim God's will, it must have a certain, clear, constant meaning.²

1. A valuable, well-documented study of Luther's contribution to hermeneutics is Karl Holl's essay, "Luthers Bedeutung fuer den Fortschritt der Auslegungskunst," in Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, I, pp. 544-582.

2. "Cum autem scripturae et verbi Dei oporteat esse unum, simplicem constantemque sensum, ne (ut dicunt) sacris literis caereum nasum faciamus" (Weimar Edition, V, 280, 36, quoted by Holl, op. cit., p. 551.

"A multis saeculis coepit hoc mysterium iniquitatis operari, ut simplicissimae scripturae simplicissimus sensus in multos divideretur, quod malum Origeni, deinde eius sectatori Hieronymo . . . acceptum referri debet" (Weimar Ed., V, 644, 2, quoted ibid.).

"Quomodo enim fidem certam doceas, quando sensum incertum facis?" (Weimar Ed., V, 647, 2, quoted ibid., p. 552.).

"Hoc effecerunt insulsi illi et inepti somniatores, ludentes in sensu literalis, allegorico, morali, anagogico, et vocantur doctores scholastici, et hoc propitiissimo veroque nomine: scholastici enim sunt, i. e., ludicri et lutores" (Weimar Ed., I, 507, 35, quoted ibid.).

2. The sense which for Luther became decisive was the literal, or, as he often said, the grammatical sense. Hence developed his love for Lyra which we noted previously.¹

3. Determining the literal sense, Luther saw, necessarily involved the study of grammar, lexical research, the study of the original languages. Luther gave impetus to these studies and turned to them himself with diligence.²

4. Luther pointed out the absolute necessity of contextual study for understanding the sense of Scripture. The good interpreter, he said, has to know not only the immediate context, but finally, all Scripture.³

5. Luther's insistence on the sensus literalis afforded the historical portion of the Old Testament its rightful regard as serious history, thing which the allegorists had often denied.

1. See above, p. 41. Cf. also Holl, op. cit., p. 552.

2. Ibid.

3. "Ideo verbi intelligentia ex tota scriptura et circumstantia rerum gestarum petenda est" (Weimar Ed., II, 302, 1, quoted by Holl, op. cit., p. 553.).

"Non est iste modus scripturas divinas feliciter intelligendi vel interpretandi, si ex diversis locis diversa decerpantur dicta nulla habita ratione vel consequentiae vel collationis: immo iste est canon errandi vulgatissimus in sacris literis. Oportet ergo theologum, si nolit errare, universam scripturam ob oculos ponere, et contraria contrariis conferre et sicut duo Cherubim adversis vultibus utriusque diversitatis consensum in medio propiciatorii invenire" (Weimar Ed., II, 360, 16, quoted ibid.).

4. "Thus Origen was repudiated in olden times because he despised the grammatical sense and turned the trees, and all things else written concerning Paradise into allegories; for it might therefrom be concluded that God did not create trees" (Holman Ed., II, 190).

6. A very important corollary of his grammatical, contextual, historical approach was that Luther saw clearly a relation between the Old and the New Testament and perceived the unity of the Scriptures.¹ Moses and his law had this purpose: to drive everyone to Christ. What the people were to learn from Moses was "to recognize sin and to sigh for Christ, and this is the true work of Moses and the true purpose of the law."² The latter prophets are "nothing else than what Moses is." They are "nothing else than administrators and witnesses of Moses and his work, to bring everyone to Christ through the law."³ Luther presented the purpose of the Old Testament and its unity with the New in his prefaces to the Old Testament. This relation is very important in typology. It will be worth while to note here some of Luther's remarks on the subject.

These pupils fall away from all works and presumption and learn from the law nothing else except to recognize sin and to sigh for Christ; and this is the true work of Moses and the true purpose of the law.

So Moses himself has told us that his work and teaching should last until Christ, and then cease, when he says in Deut. 18, "A prophet shall the Lord thy God raise up unto thee from among thy brethren, like unto me; him shalt thou hear, etc." This is the noblest saying in all of Moses; indeed it is the very pith of him; and the apostles appealed to it and made great use of it to strengthen the Gospel and abolish the law; all the prophets, too, drew heavily upon it. For since God here promises another Moses, whom they are to hear, it follows of necessity that he would teach something different from Moses; and Moses gives up his power to him, and yields to him, so that he may be heard. This

1. See Holl, *op. cit.*, pp. 560-563.

2. Holman Ed., VI, p. 377.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 378-379.

prophet cannot, then, teach law, for Moses has done that to the uttermost, and for the law's sake there would be no need to raise up another prophet. Therefore this word was certainly spoken concerning the teaching of grace and concerning Christ.

For this reason also, St. Paul calls the law of Moses "the Old Testament," and Christ does the same when He institutes "the New Testament." Thus it is a testament, because in it God promises and bequeathes to the people of Israel the land of Canaan, if they keep it. He gave it to them, also, and it was confirmed by the death and blood of sheep and goats. But since this testament rested not upon God's grace, but upon man's works, it had to grow old and cease, and the promised land had to be lost again, because the law cannot be fulfilled by works. And another testament had to come, which would not grow old, and would not rest upon our deeds, but upon God's words and works, so that it might last forever. Therefore it is confirmed by the death and blood of an eternal Person, and an everlasting land is promised and given.

Let this be enough about the books and works of Moses. What, then, are the other books, the prophets and the histories? I answer: They are nothing else than what Moses is; for all of them do the work that Moses does, and guard against the false prophets, that they may not lead the people to works, but allow them to stay in the work of Moses and the knowledge of sin. They hold fast to this purpose, in order to keep the people conscious of their own impotence through a right understanding of the law, and thus drive them to Christ, as Moses does. Therefore they enlarge upon what Moses says of Christ, and furnish two kinds of examples--examples of those who understand Moses and those who do not understand him rightly--together with examples of the punishments and rewards that come to both. Thus the prophets are nothing else than administrators and witnesses of Moses and his work, to bring everyone to Christ through the law.¹

7. Luther's views on allegory have frequently been over-simplified. In his recent article on typology, Charles

1. Ibid., pp. 377-379.

Fritsch follows Fairbairn¹ in saying: "The Reformers had little or nothing to do with allegorical interpretation. Luther denounced it as 'trifling and foolish fables, with which the Scriptures were rent into so many and diverse senses that silly, poor consciences could receive no certain doctrine of any thing' (Gal. 4,26)."² It is not altogether as simple as this, however. In the passage cited by Fritsch, Luther is denouncing the principle of the four-fold sense and the abuses that accompanied it. Luther used strong words against allegory of the kind that glutted the commentaries in his day.³ When allegorical interpretations were used as a source of doctrine and promulgated as a basis of faith, Luther had nothing but scorn for them. When theologians sought in allegory proof for theological propositions and opinions, they, too, encountered Luther's wrath. In his discussion of Ordination in The Babylonian Captivity of the Church he writes:

And in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, what does this Dionysius do but describe certain churchly rites and play round them with his allegories without proving them? Just as among us the author of the book entitled Rationale Divinorum. Such allegorical studies are the work of idle men. Think you I should find it difficult to play with allegories round anything in creation? Did not Bonaventure by allegory draw the liberal arts into theology? And Gerson even converted the smaller Donatus into a mystic theologian. It would not be a difficult task for me to compose a better hierarchy than that of Dionysius, for he knew nothing of pope, cardinals, and

-
1. Op. cit., I, p. 9.
 2. Op. cit., April-June, 1947, p. 217.
 3. Cf. Farrar, op. cit., p. 328.

archbishops, and put the bishop at the top.
 Nay, who has so weak a mind as not to be able
 to launch into allegories?¹

Yet to say that Luther discarded allegory altogether is not true. What he did was very strictly to define its purpose and limit its use. Allegory for him had no proof value. It can, however, at times serve as an illustration or as an adornment and garnishment of an argument that is already established. He recognized that allegory is a medium of artistic speech, and that it can have a certain use as such.² On Gal. 4,24 Luther writes:

Allegories do not strongly persuade in divinity, but, as certain pictures, they beautify and set out the matter. For if Paul had not proved the righteousness of faith against the righteousness of works by strong and pithy arguments, he should have little prevailed by this allegory. But, because he had fortified his cause before with invincible arguments, taken of experience, of the example of Abraham, the testimonies of the Scripture, and similitudes; now, in the end of his disputations, he adds an allegory, to give a beauty to all the rest. For it is a seemly thing sometimes to add an allegory, when the foundation is well laid, and the matter thoroughly proved; for as painting is an ornament to set forth and garnish a house already builded, so is an allegory the light of a matter which is already otherwise proved and confirmed.³

In a lengthy excursus on allegory in his Commentary on Genesis Luther roundly trounces the Anabaptists as well as the papists for using allegory to support their false teachings and denounces the insipid moralizing into which their allegorizing had degenerated. Yet he does

1. Holman Ed., II, 276.

2. See Holl, op. cit., pp. 553-555.

3. Eng. translation by S. S. Miles, p. 498.

not condemn allegory altogether, but says:

Darum soll man dieselben (die Allegorien) entweder gar umgehen, oder soll sie mit dem höchsten Verstand und Bedencken vornehmen, und auf die Regel ziehen und lencken, welcher die Apostel gebrauchen, davon ich hernach sagen will: auf dasz wir nicht, wie die Theologisten und Canonisten, oder vielmehr Asinisten, in haeszliche und schaedliche Absurditaeten gerathen; wie die Decretales und Decreta des allerabscheulichsten Jungherrn Pabstes zeugen.

Doch soll man bis also verstehen, dasz wir gleichwol nicht alle Allegorien insgemein verwerfen. Denn wir sehen, dasz auch Christus selbst und die Apostel zu Zeiten Allegorien gebrauchet haben. Dieselben aber seyn also, dasz sie dem Glauben gemaez seyn; nach der Regel St. Pauli, Roem. 12,7, da er vermahnet und heisset, dasz die Prophezeyung oder Lehre dem Glauben soll gemaez seyn.

Wenn ich ferner die Allegorien verwerfe, so rede ich von denen, die einer aus eigenem Geist und Verstand, ohne Grund der heiligen Schrift, erdichtet. Denn die andern, die man auf die Analogie und Richtschnur des Glaubens zeucht, zieren und schmuecken nicht allein die Lehre, sondern troesten auch die Gewissen.¹

He sums up his rule for the use of allegories in these words: "Darum soll man die Allegorien auf die Verheissungen Gottes und Lehre des Glaubens ziehen, dasz sie die Hertzen troesten und staercken."²

What Luther had in mind by proper allegories includes partly what we recognize as types. He cites, for example, as edifying allegories, Peter's reference to the flood in connection with baptism (1 Pet. 3,21-22); and St. Paul's statement, 1 Cor. 10,14, "Our Fathers all drank of the spiritual rock."³ As a case in which our Lord allegorized,

1. Walch Ed., I, 923-924.

2. Ibid., 932.

3. Ibid., 924.

he cites the reference to the brazen serpent, John 3,14.¹ But that Luther did not restrict "proper" allegory to typology is shown by the example he gives of what an edifying allegorical treatment of the story of the flood might be.² He adds, however, at the conclusion of it: "Dieses seyn von dieser Allegorie meine Gedancken, die ich kuerzlich habe wollen anzeigen. Denn man solche Dinge nicht nach der Laenge und so weitlaeuftig handeln soll, wie die Historien und Artickel des Glaubens."³

He states another practical admonition in The Babylonian Captivity of the Church: "I would not have a theologian give himself to allegorizing until he has perfected himself in the grammatical and literal interpretation of the Scriptures: otherwise his theology will bring him into danger, as Origen discovered."⁴

B. Another striking characteristic of Luther as an interpreter of Scripture is his grasp of the principle which was expressed in the old rabbinic saying, "The Law speaks in the tongue of the sons of men."⁵ He saw that at times the interpreter is obliged to forsake the letter of Scripture, namely, when the letter yields an absurdity or when the context indicates the use of figura-

-
1. Ibid.
 2. Ibid., 928-944.
 3. Ibid., 944.
 4. Holman Ed., II, 276.
 5. Farrar, op. cit., p. 4.

tive language.¹ Luther recognized with a singular clarity the expressive beauty of the language of Scripture. He appreciated the picturesque speech of the Old Testament and of the parables of the Lord. We noted before how he evaluated the allegory as a means of artistic speech. Luther was able to put himself into the position of the writers of Scripture and view the language from their viewpoint. They had as much right and ability and inclination to adorn their writings and use picturesque speech as any other writers of literature. To live himself into the pictures, parables, and tropes of the Scripture, said Luther, is an important task of the interpreter.² Luther had a keen artistic sense himself. Holl says: "Luther differed from his contemporaries in that he not only read his text, but listened to it."³

9. Luther was able to recognize figurative language and give it its due without abandoning his principle of the singleness of sense. When the context makes it evident that certain language is figurative, that does not mean that there are two meanings to the passage. There is still

1. "In nulla enim scriptura, nedum divina, figuras captare licet pro mera libidine, sed vitari debent et simplici purae primariaeque verborum significationi nitendum est, donec ipsa circumstantia aut evidens absurditas cogat figuram agnoscere" (Weimar Ed., VIII, 63, 27, quoted by Holl, op. cit., p. 554.

2. "Haec latius dixi, quia magna pars intelligentiae sita est in tropis locutionis, praesertim in sacris literis, quae suos habent idiotismos, quorum ignorantia grandes nebulas suscitatur, quandoque in claro die" (Weimar Ed., VIII, 63, 27, quoted by Holl, ibid.).

3. Op. cit., p. 569.

only one sense intended by the writer.¹

10. Having proclaimed the right of the sensus literalis to hold first place in the interpreter's attention, Luther defended his own right and the right of every Christian to read and comment on the Scriptures at all by teaching the clarity of the Scriptures--die Allgemeinverstaendlichkeit der Bibel.² He did not contend that there are no particular difficulties in Scripture, but raised the point, as more important, that whatever men need to know for their lives about their relation to God is written plainly in the Scripture so that they can and should read it and be edified by it.³

11. As a complement to the preceding, Luther taught the classic rule that Scripture is its own interpreter.⁴

1. "Non autem allegoricum dico more recentiorum, quasi alius sensus historialis sub eo sit quaerendum, quam qui dictus est, sed quod verum et proprium sensum figurata locutione expresserit" (quoted by Holl, op. cit., p. 555).

2. "Es ist auf Erden kein klarer Buch geschrieben denn die heilige Schrift, die ist gegen alle ander Buecher gleich wie die Sonne gegen alle Licht" (Weimar Ed., VIII, 236, 9, quoted ibid., p. 559.).

3. "Seid nur gewisz und ohn Zweifel, dasz nichts heller ist denn die Sonne, das ist, die Schrift. Ist aber ein Wolk davor getreten, so ist doch nichts anders dahinten denn dieselben helle Sonne. Also, ist ein dunkel Spruch in der Schrift, so zweifelt nur nicht, es ist gewiszlich dieselbe Wahrheit dahinten, die am andern Ort klar ist, und wer das dunkel nicht verstehen kann, der bleib bei dem lichten" (Weimar Ed., VIII, 239, 16, quoted ibid.).

4. "Fieri non potest (i.e., the solution of the controversy) nisi scripturae dederimus principem locum in omnibus quae tribuuntur patribus, hoc est, ut sit ipsa per sese rectissima, facillima, apertissima sui ipsius interpres" (Weimar Ed., VII, 97, 21 ff., quoted ibid.).

Thus he freed himself, once and for all, so far as the interpretation of Scripture is concerned, from the authority of the fathers, the popes, and the councils, which authority had tyrannously hampered and ruined exegesis for so many centuries. Positively, it was an assertion of the right of Scripture to speak for itself and to set forth the principles of interpretation which are to be applied to it.

12. We can but note in passing the impetus that this view of the Scripture as its own interpreter gave to study and criticism of the text and the canon, both by Luther and his followers.¹

13. Luther was the first teacher of the Church after Augustine to deal with the problem of the relation of the Spirit and the letter.² Arriving at the literal sense of Scripture is not yet the end for Luther. True understanding comes with the spiritual understanding of the matters expressed in words--the spiritual understanding in terms of Christ and His Gospel of the forgiveness of sins. It is, as it were, the reexperiencing in one's self of those things which moved the people who speak in the text. This is a gift from above. The Spirit of God works it.

On the one hand, Luther saw, natural man does not receive the Word of God; the Holy Spirit is required to

1. Cf. Holl, op. cit., pp. 560-562; 574-575. Cf. also Martin Reu, Luther and the Scriptures, pp. 103-108.

2. Cf. Holl, op. cit., p. 566.

interpret it to him. On the other hand, the Spirit comes upon a man only through the Word. Only through the Word can a man look into the depths of God.¹

This Spiritual understanding of a text is something altogether different from allegorical interpretation. Allegory seeks a meaning besides the literal. Spiritual understanding penetrates into the letter and through it to that which is contained in it, and to Him who speaks it, God Himself. A person can allegorize without being changed; even the devil can allegorize. But spiritualis intelligentia is the content of the Word itself become alive in a man.²

When Luther expressed in words his Spiritual understanding of historical sections of the Old Testament, the result is often like a living discussion of the typology

1. For a discussion of Luther's view on Word and Spirit, see ibid., pp. 555-558 and 565-568.

2. "Et hic notandum, quod, quando lex dicitur spiritualis, intelligitur non quod sit mystice intelligenda, sicut intelliguntur figurae et mysteria. Aliud enim mysticum et aliud spirituale . . . omne spirituale est mysticum, sed non contra" (Weimar Ed., I, 461-2, quoted ibid., p. 557).

"Unde spiritualis intelligentia non dicitur, quae est mystica vel anagogica, qua et impii praestant, sed ipsa propriae vita et experimentalis lex in anima per gratiam digito dei scripta" (Weimar Ed., VIII, 648, 14, quoted ibid.).

For discussions by Luther of "der geistliche Verstand" see "Die Zehn Gebote dem Volk zu Wittenberg Gepredigt," St. Louis Ed. III, 1246-1249; "Kuerzere Auslegung des Galaterbriefs," St. Louis Ed. VIII, 1541-1546.

For the views of Schwenckfeld on the same subject, see Joachim Wach, "Caspar Schwenckfeld, a Pupil and a Teacher in the School of Christ," The Journal of Religion, Jan., 1946, pp. 94 and 101.

of the Old Testament. In his Prefaces to the Old Testament, for example, he says:

In conclusion, I ought also indicate the spiritual meaning presented to us by the Levitical law and the Mosaic priesthood. But there is too much of this to write; it needs space and time, and should be expounded with the living voice. For Moses is, indeed, a well of all wisdom and understanding, out of which has sprung all that the prophets knew and said. Moreover, even the New Testament flows out of it and is founded in it, as we have heard. Let it be my service to give a little hint to those who have the grace and understanding to search for it.

If, then, you would interpret well and surely, set Christ before you; for He is the man to whom it all applies. Make nothing else of the high priest Aaron than Christ alone, as is done by the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is almost enough, all by itself, to interpret all the figures of Moses. Likewise it is certain that Christ Himself is both the sacrifice and the altar, for He sacrificed Himself, with His own blood, as the same Epistle announces. Now, as the Levitical high priest, by his sacrifice, took away only the artificial sins, which were in their nature no sins, so our high priest, Christ, by His own sacrifice and blood, has taken away the true sin, which is in its nature sin, and He has gone in once through the veil to God to make atonement for us. Thus you should apply to Christ personally and to no one else, all that is written about the high priest.

But the high priest's sons, who are engaged in the daily sacrifice, you should interpret to mean ourselves, who, in the presence of our father Christ, sitting in heaven, live here on earth in the body, and have not passed through to Him except by faith, spiritually. Their office of slaughter and sacrifice signifies nothing else than the preaching of the Gospel, by which the old man is slain and offered to God, burned and consumed by the fire of love, in the Holy Ghost; and this sacrifice is a sweet savour to God, that is, it produces a conscience that is good, pure, and secure before God. This is the interpretation that St. Paul makes, in Romans xii, when he teaches that we are to offer our bodies to God, a living, holy, and acceptable sacrifice; and

this we do (as has been said) by the constant practice of the Gospel, by preaching it and believing it.

Let this suffice for the present as a brief suggestion for seeking Christ and the Gospel in the Old Testament.¹

14. The final point we wish to note here is Luther's view of the Gospel.² The Gospel is "a good story and report, sounded forth into all the world by the apostles."³ It is "nothing but the preaching about Christ, Son of God and of David, true God and man, who by His death and resurrection has overcome all men's sin, death and hell, for us who believe in Him."⁴ "The idea must be given up that there are four Gospels and only four Evangelists."⁵ All proclaim the Gospel and are Evangelists who indicate how by his death and resurrection Christ overcame sin, death and hell for those who believe in Him, as do St. Peter and St. Paul. The Gospel is proclamation, preaching, testi- fyng, of the good news of Christ's victory on behalf of men. The Gospel is not confined within the writings of the New Testament. It was before them.⁶ That the Gospel

1. Holman Ed., VI, pp. 379-380.

2. Cf. Holl, op. cit., p. 562.

3. Holman Ed., VI, p. 440.

4. Ibid., p. 441.

5. Ibid., p. 439.

6. "Evangelion aber heisst nichts anders, denn ein Predigt und Geschrei von der Gnad und Barmherzigkeit Gottes, durch den Herrn Christum mit seinem Tod verdienet und erworben, und ist eigentlich nicht das, das in Buechern stehet und in Buchstaben verfasset wird, sondern mehr ein muendliche Predigt und lebendig Wort, und ein Stimm, die da in die ganz Welt erschallet und oeffentlich wird ausgeschrieen, das mans ueberall hoeret" (Weimar Ed., XII, 259, 8 ff., quoted by Holl, op. cit., p. 562.

had to be written down was an unfortunate result of error in the early Church.¹ Luther's preference for John over the other three Gospels was because John writes so much about Christ's preaching, and "His words give life, as He Himself says."²

A number of factors are basic to a study of types and antitypes in the Scriptures. One of them is a clear view of the redemptive purposes of God as the Scriptures reveal them. Another is a willingness to let the Scriptures speak for themselves, and meek and sympathetic ears to listen to them. The contribution which Luther made by bringing these points into focus is invaluable to our study.

1. "Das man aber hat muessen Buecher schreiben, ist schon ein grosser Abbruch und ein Gebrechen des Geistes, das es die Not erzwungen hatt, und nicht die Art ist des neuen Testaments; denn da anstatt der frommen Prediger aufstanden Ketzter, falsche Lehrer und mancherlei Irrtum, die den Schafen Christi Gift fuer Weide gaben. Da muszte man das Letzt versuchen, das zu tun und Not war, auf dasz doch etlich Schaf vor den Wolfen errettet wurden: da fing man an zu schreiben" (Weimar Ed., XI, 1; 627, lff., quoted ibid.).

2. Holman Ed., VI, p. 443.

IV. From Luther to 1700 A. D.

A. The Lutheran Confessions

The following statements from Article 24 of the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, De Missa, give evidence of an understanding and use of the typology of Scripture by Luther's co-workers.

Therefore let this remain established in the case, namely, that the death of Christ alone is truly a propitiatory sacrifice. For the Levitical propitiatory sacrifices were so called only to signify a future expiation. On account of a certain resemblance, therefore, they were satisfactions redeeming the righteousness of the Law, lest those persons who sinned should be excluded from the commonwealth.¹

In the Law the slaying of victims signified both the death of Christ and the preaching of the Gospel, by which this oldness of flesh should be mortified, and the new and eternal life be begun in us.²

They cite also the daily sacrifice (cf. Ex. 29, 38 f.; Dan. 8, 11 f.; 12, 11), that just as in the Law there was a daily sacrifice, so the Mass ought to be a daily sacrifice of the New Testament. The adversaries have managed well if we permit ourselves to be overcome by allegories. It is evident, however, that allegories do not produce firm proofs. Although we indeed readily suffer the Mass to be understood as a daily sacrifice, provided that the entire Mass be understood, i.e., the ceremony with the preaching of the Gospel, faith, invocation, and thanksgiving. For these joined together are a daily sacrifice of the New Testament, because the ceremony (of the Mass) was instituted on account of these things; neither is it to be separated from these.

1. Concordia Triglotta, 391, 24. Cf. also 389, 21.
2. Ibid., 395, 34.

Paul says accordingly, 1 Cor. 11,26: "As often as ye do eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." But it in no way follows from this Levitical type that a ceremony justifying ex opere operato is necessary, or ought to be applied on behalf of others, that it may merit for them the remission of sins.

And the type aptly represents not only the ceremony, but also the preaching of the Gospel. In Num. 28, 4 f. three parts of that daily sacrifice are represented, the burning of the lamb, the libation, and the oblation of wheat flour. The Law had pictures or shadows of future things. Accordingly, in this spectacle Christ and the entire worship of the New Testament are portrayed. The burning of the lamb signifies the death of Christ. The libation signifies that everywhere in the entire world, by the preaching of the Gospel, believers are sprinkled with the blood of that Lamb, i.e., sanctified, as Peter says, 1 Ep. 1, 2: "Through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." The oblation of wheat flour signifies faith, prayer, and thanksgiving in hearts. As, therefore, in the Old Testament, the shadow is perceived, so in the New the thing signified should be sought, and not another type, as sufficient for a sacrifice.¹

The adversaries distort against us mutilated passages from this Epistle, as in this very passage, where it is said that every "high priest is ordained to offer sacrifices for sins." Scripture itself immediately adds that Christ is High Priest, Heb. 5: 5,6,10. The preceding words speak of the Levitical priesthood, and signify that the Levitical priesthood was an image of the priesthood of Christ. For the Levitical sacrifices for sins did not merit the remission of sins before God; they were only an image of the sacrifice of Christ, which was to be the one propitiatory sacrifice, as we have said above. Therefore the Epistle is occupied to a great extent with the topic that the ancient priesthood and the ancient sacrifices were instituted not for the purpose of meriting the remission of sins before God or reconciliation, but only to signify the

1. Ibid., 397, 35-37.

future sacrifice of Christ alone. For in the Old Testament it was necessary for saints to be justified by faith derived from the promise of the remission of sins that was to be granted for Christ's sake, just as saints are also justified in the New Testament. From the beginning of the world it was necessary for all saints to believe that Christ would be the promised offering and satisfaction for sins, as Isaiah teaches, 53,10: "When Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin."

Since therefore in the Old Testament sacrifices did not merit reconciliation, unless by a figure (for they merited civil reconciliation), but signified the coming sacrifice, it follows that Christ is the only sacrifice applied on behalf of the sins of others. Therefore, in the New Testament no sacrifice is left to be applied for the sins of others, except the one sacrifice of Christ upon the cross.¹

B. Flacius

Matthias Flacius (1520-1575) in his Clavis Scripturae Sacrae (published 1567), which "governed the hermeneutics of the seventeenth century,"² used and to some extent systematized Luther's principles of interpretation. Holl says: "Klar hat Flacius die beiden Punkte erfaßt, auf die es Luther bei der Auslegung ankam: ein grammatisches Verstehen, das zur Anschauung wird, und ein damit zusammengreifendes Nacherleben des Inhalts."³

In his Clavis the great Flacius devotes due attention to the types of Scripture. In his first volume he includes articles on the words typus,⁴ umbra,⁵ and tabernaculum,⁶ all

1. Ibid., 403, 53-56.

2. Wach, Das Verstehen, I, p. 14.

3. Op. cit., p. 528. Cf. Holl's entire section on Flacius, pp. 578-582.

4. Flacius, Clavis Scripturae Sacrae, I, 1263.

5. Ibid., I, 1324.

6. Ibid., I, 1215.

of which indicate his views. In the article on typus he cites the Vulgate version of 1 Cor. 10,6, "Haec autem in figura facta sunt nostri" and Erasmus' rendition "Haec autem figurae nostrae fuerunt" and adds:

Quae expositiones aditum potefaciunt phreneticis quibusdam, ex hoc loco colligentibus, in veteri populo omnia fuisse umbratilia: quasi scilicet Israel non fuerit vera Ecclesia: sed verae duntaxat Ecclesiae umbra et figura: unde infiniti postea errores sunt exorti. Cum tamen Paulus haec dicat typos fuisse, non Israelitarum; sed nostri respectu. Quanquam etiam Israelitis fatear, sacramenta, caeremoniasque ceteras, ipsaque adeo Dei beneficia, ac poenas inflictas, fuisse rerum spiritualium typos; sed ita, ut rei veritatem simul haberent.¹

In his second volume he cites typos as one of the difficulties confronting the interpreter.² He says that sometimes the Scriptures speak of Christ openly, but at other times through types--e.g., the Paschal lamb, Melchisedek, the sacrifice of Isaac, the Rock in the desert, the leading out of the people from Egypt, the Manna, the whole tabernacle with all its ceremonies, the brazen serpent, Joshua, David, Jonah, the image of the tabernacle on the mountain, the good Samaritan.³ He adds the warning: "Quae tamen caute, ac ex collatione Scripturae, investiganda sunt."⁴ He says of the difference between Law and Gospel that, among other things, the Law sets forth the shadows and types, leading to Christ; but the Gospel shows body and truth, and

1. Ibid., I, 1263.

2. Ibid., II, 3.

3. Ibid., II, 48.

4. Ibid.

Christ Himself can be plainly seen.¹ In another place he says:

In historiis Patrum, observentur etiam typi et allegoriae, futura ac meliora significantes. Ut, historia Isaaci sacrificandi, et postea redivivi, unigeniti Dei Filii passionem et resurrectionem significavit. Sic Paulus, 1 Cor. 10, 6, dicit, omnia illa Patrum facta, et varios casus, fuisse nostros typos. Et Petrus ac Paulus dicunt, diluvium, et maris rubri transitum, significasse nostrum Baptismum, 1 Cor. 10, 1.2 et 1 Pet. 3, 20.21. Christus quoque securitatem ac exitum primi Mundi, et Sodomitarum, indicat fuisse typum ultimorum temporum, ac extremi iudicii, Matt. 24, 38; Luc. 17, 26 seqq."²

C. Hyperius

Most interesting of all, however, is Flacius' lengthy citation from Hyperius on the distinction of type and allegory. Andrew Hyperius (d. 1564) was a contemporary of Flacius and was prominent among the German Reformed theologians as an exegete, dogmatician, and homilist.³ Flacius does not identify the writing of Hyperius from which he quotes, but gives his approval to the cited words of Hyperius by saying, "Cuius iudicium ad verbum ascribam."⁴ Hyperius writes:

Moreover it is proper carefully to distinguish type and allegory. For we see many who confuse them; and where Scripture sets forth a type, they falsely assume an allegory. For example, when they read in 1 Cor. 10, "Our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the

1. Ibid., II, 50.

2. Ibid., II, 86.

3. Kurtz, op. cit., II, p. 378.

4. Flacius, op. cit., II, 75.

sea, and all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, etc.," they opine that that is an allegory. But they are wrong, since a type is set forth there, or, more properly, an example. For Paul, by setting these examples before their eyes, convicts those who fall back into their former sins after they have used the sacraments which Christ instituted for our salvation. Hence the following distinction between type and allegory should be observed:

A type, or figure (for the translators have rendered the word τύπος in this way), is when some fact is produced from the Old Testament and is shown to have presignified or foreshadowed something which was done or will be done in the New Testament. But an allegory is when something from either the Old or the New Testament is expounded with a new meaning and is accommodated to spiritual teaching or to edification of life. A type consists in a comparison of facts, and is altogether historical. Allegory busies itself not so much with facts as with their applications and produces from them material for teaching and much that is of a didactic nature. Type never discusses other things than Christ and the Church, Law and Gospel, neither is it ever accommodated to our persons. But allegory sermonizes about all sorts of things, and for the most part is accommodated to our persons so that, as is right, we can be instructed by it and incited to the practice of piety. In short: types are confined strictly to certain statements about the person of Christ, the Church, the Law, and the Gospel. But allegories can be found almost anywhere and are diffused throughout all sorts of material. Thus it can be that in one and the same history, from different standpoints, both type and allegory can be expounded, even though they are interpretations of widely divergent natures. For if I say that the history of David's fight with Goliath prefigured the struggle of Christ with the devil, I am expounding the narrative by means of a type. But if I transfer the meaning to us, and say that it signified the fight of the spirit with the flesh, which everyone of us experiences within himself, that will be an allegorical interpretation.

It would not be difficult to enumerate other similar examples. Expositions or proofs by means

of types are easily found here and there in the New Testament. Matt. 12 describes Jonah, devoured by the fish and then ejected again, as a type of Christ, who lay buried for three days and then rose from the dead. John 3 declares the brazen serpent to be a type of Christ crucified and John 19 makes it plain that the Paschal lamb, whose bones were not broken, constituted a type and image of Christ. In Gal. 4 the two sons of Abraham yield a type of the two testaments. In that passage, even though the apostle says that these things were spoken as an allegory, we rightly add that it was not as an allegory, but as a type that these things were spoken. Long before our day Chrysostom wisely made the note in his commentaries on that epistle that "The word allegory is there used in place of the word type." Chrysostom, a very learned interpreter of the Scriptures, discriminates meticulously between type and allegory . . . 1

D. Aretius

Benedict Aretius (1505-1574) was an early Reformed theologian and professor at Bern.² His opus magnum was Theologiae Problemata (1573). According to Solomon Glass, Aretius divided types into historical types (typi historiae), types of deed (typi facti), and sacramental types (typi sacramentae).³ An historical type is Jonah's three-day stay in the belly of the fish, which typified Christ's lying three days in the grave. Other historical types are: the humility of the catechumens, which was a type of Adam expelled from Paradise; the continuous prayer of Elias, which typified the continuous prayer of the Church. A type of deed, or fact, is Samson's taking a strange wife and overcoming his enemies

-
1. Ibid., II, 75-77 (translated from the Latin).
 2. See Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, I, 522.
 3. Solomon Glass, Philologia Sacra, pp. 318-319.

through his own death. This is said to be a type of Christ, who by a similar act (but spiritually) took the Church of the Gentiles as His bride and overcame His enemies by dying. A sacramental type is defined thus: "Typum sacramenti vocant, quando sub sensibilibus res occultae, mysticae, et futurae, tanquam sub typis et figuris, proponuntur." Thus circumcision made by hands is a type of the internal circumcision by the Spirit. Human marriage is a type of the spiritual union of Christ and the Church. The visions of the prophets and apostles come under this class of sacramental types. And, in the interest of the Reformed doctrine, Aretius proposes that the bread in the Lord's supper is a type of the body of Christ; and that baptism is a type of the submersion of the Old Adam and a figure of the emersion of the new man.

Glass (1593-1656) criticizes this division of types on the following counts: 1) it confuses type and allegory; 2) it confuses type and tropology (Glass defines tropology as "accommodatio dictorum vel exemplorum Scripturae, ad vitam et mores Christianorum informandos."); 3) it confuses typi ἑμπροσθεν with typis ἑμπροσθεν; 4) historical types and types of fact, which Aretius distinguishes, seem to be the same.¹

1. Ibid.

E. The Authorized Version

The translators of the Authorized Version (1611) took cognizance of typology in many of their chapter headings, of which we note:

- Ps. 109: "The afflictions of David, a type of Christ's sufferings at the hands of His people."
 Ps. 118: "Under the type of the psalmist the coming of Christ in His kingdom is expressed."
 Is. 20: "A type prefiguring the shameful captivity of Egypt and Ethiopia."
 Is. 22: "He prophesieth Shebna's deprivation and Eliakim, prefiguring the kingdom of Christ, His substitution."

F. John Gerhard

Among Lutheran dogmaticians of the seventeenth century we find John Gerhard (d. 1637) including a discussion of Old Testament types of Christ in his Loci Theologici. Under the heading De Συμυμμία in his chapter on the person and office of Christ, Gerhard lists as Old Testament types of the Savior Adam, Abel, Noah, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Melchisedek, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Jonah, David, Solomon and other kings; the tree of life, the rivers of paradise, the skin garments of Adam and Eve, Noah's ark, Jacob's ladder, the burning bush, the manna in the wilderness, the brazen serpent, and Aaron's rod.

After quoting a statement of Augustine, "Antiquorum

non solum lingua, sed etiam vita fuit prophetica," Gerhard adds:

Veteris Testamenti historiae non tantum praestant usum in sensu literali, sed etiam mystico, sunt enim quasi quaedam fasciae, quibus Christus involutus. Digna igitur pie erudito est diligentia, tales typos Christi ex Vetere Testamento colligere, membra applicationis juxta fidei analogiam prudenter instituere, cum primis vero illos typos, qui in Novo Testamento ab apostolis vel ipso etiam Christo ad salvatorem nostrum applicantur, observare.¹

He adds the warning:

Tamen notandum, quod in allegoriis tractandis singularis requiratur circumspectio, ne quid contra fidei analogiam proferatur ac infirmis scandalum, adversariis deridendi materia exhibeatur, quod in iisdem debeamus esse parci, γδύματα sint, non autem εδζεματα, quod maximam allegoriis conciliet gratiam, si fontes eius in ipsis Scripturis monstrantur.¹

G. Observations

We pause at this point to make a few observations concerning the method of procedure followed by some of the writers we have been considering in this period. We find that theologians are aware of the types in Scripture and that they make use of them freely in their writings. But they are also aware that a problem, a difficult problem confronts the interpreter in dealing with them. They see that the Old Testament Scriptures abound in types. They see also that vast numbers of errors have abounded and can abound in interpreting them. One must proceed cautiously; circumspection is required. Hyperius says, and Flacius

1. John Gerhard, Loci Theologici, I, IV, III, 28.

agrees, that we must carefully distinguish type and allegory. Flacius warns that we must not make shadows of everything among the ancient people and deny the historical reality and significance of events in the Old Testament. Gerhard says our discussion of types must be according to the analogy of faith lest we offend the weak and give the adversaries occasion to scoff. Those types are best which are based on New Testament statements.

But in spite of their demand for caution, they do not seem to exercise it at all times themselves. The majority of the types they adduced are firmly based on New Testament evidence. Now and then one can look askance at the adequacy of the evidence offered (for example, when Gerhard declares Noah to be a type of Christ on the basis of Matt. 24,37, "As were the days of Noah, so will be the coming of the Son of man"); but at least an attempt is made to supply evidence. But when Flacius makes the Good Samaritan a type of Christ; when Hyperius cites David's battle with Goliath as a possible example of a type; when Gerhard cites Enos and the skin garments of the first parents as types of Christ; when Aretius makes Samson and his wife prefigure Christ and the Church and follows Junilius in declaring the humility of the catechumens a type of Adam ejected from paradise; for such as these, no evidence is given. If they believe that evidence exists, they do not state it. If they feel that there are hermen-

etical principles which justify their conclusions, they do not produce them. If they feel that no evidence is required beyond their own intuition, they do not state that, either.

There is simply a lack of definite, clearly delineated principle for establishing their interpretations. The principles they have are no less vague than were those of the author of the Epistle of Barnabas. Types are simply Old Testament phenomena "*futura ac meliora significantes*" (Flacius). Gerhard speaks of a "mystical" sense in which Christ is to be found, rolled up as in a bandage. And Hyperius writes almost as though the mere adducing of an example from the Old Testament makes it a type: "A type is when some fact is produced from the Old Testament and is shown to have presignified or prefigured something that has been done or will be done in the New Testament." Aretius' distinctions are altogether subjective, without Scriptural evidence, lacking in principle, smacking of dogmatic bias; and Glass's four-fold criticism of them is hardly more elucidating.

These writers did not feel that they could limit their discussions of types to those which are specifically substantiated by the New Testament. But in going beyond the New Testament without a clear understanding of what is involved in a type, in going beyond the New Testament without positive, well-established, guiding principles

more specific than that interpretation must be according to the analogy of faith, they are marching through unknown terrain, and fall into exegetical pitfalls. And their most strenuous warnings that "typi caute investigandi sunt" cannot prevent their followers from falling into the same pits and from drawing this lack of principle out into more and more extravagant abuses and speculative excursions. That this is what actually took place we shall see when we come to Cocceius and his followers.

H. Glass

But now we must look at a full and systematic presentation of typology which comes to us from this same period. Solomon Glass (1593-1656), to whom we have already had occasion to refer, was a teacher at Jena and a leading Lutheran theologian of this day. Glass was widely acclaimed for his Philologia Sacra, first published in 1623. It ranked as a classical work for almost two centuries.¹ Dedicated to John Gerhard and replete with the glowing endorsements of many of the most learned men of the day, the work went through numerous editions.

It concerns our purposes because of its lengthy, analytical treatment of typology. It can be said to reflect in a systematic way some of the best thinking on our subject in the seventeenth century.

1. Kurtz, op. cit., 159, 4.

After treating the sensus literalis,¹ Glass launches into the subject of the sensus mysticus. He defines the sensus mysticus as that meaning of certain Scripture passages which is not signified in the words of Holy Writ, but which the Holy Spirit wishes to convey through the things which are expressed in the literal sense of the words. This sensus mysticus he subdivides into allegory, type, and parable. (Glass has a notable propensity for making subdivisions, as will appear presently.) The Scriptural evidence he cites for his use of the term mystical and for his assumption of the existence of such a sense is Eph. 5,32 and Rev. 17,7. In the following pages we shall indicate the salient points and the most interesting arguments in Glass's lengthy chapter.²

The mystical sense is allegorical when historical facts of Scripture are referred by the intention of the Holy Spirit to some mystery or spiritual teaching. It is typical when hidden things, either present or future, are signified under outward facts or prophetic visions, and especially when historical events of the Old Testament prefigure or foreshadow historical events of the New Testament. It is parabolic when something is narrated as though it had occurred and is used for pointing out some spiritual truth.³

1. Solomon Glass, Philologia Sacra (5th ed., 1686), pp. 259-288.

2. Ibid., pp. 289-336.

3. Ibid., pp. 289-290.

The basis of the mystical sense is God's ὑποκατάβασις, which is also called ὑπερωπία. Since God deals with wretched men in the Scripture, He often ὑποκατάβασις, or condescends to their level, and, accommodating Himself to their power of comprehension, sets forth His celestial mysteries under the cover of human things.¹

The literal sense precedes the mystical by nature and by order, but the mystical comes first in dignity. For the mystical sense, as being more noble and more sacred, is more intended by the Holy Spirit than the other. Thus Paul shows that there is a mystical sense in Deut. 25,4, "You shall not muzzle the ox that treads the corn," 1 Cor. 9,9. And he points out that in that passage God is speaking more about ministers of the word than He is about oxen. Under the figure of oxen He is showing that ministers should be provided for. Paul says, "Is God concerned about oxen?" (that is, principally, so that He would set forth for their sake a special law in which nothing more sublime lay hidden). "Or was it not altogether for our sakes that He said this?" continues Paul, implying that this mystic sense was intentionally placed there by God. "For our sakes, no doubt, this is written," says Paul, "that he that ploweth should plow in hope, and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope." Here Paul moves from allegory of the thing to allegory of

1. Ibid.

the word. So also John 3, 14-15 shows that the serpent lifted up in the wilderness was a type of Christ. And there is certainly no doubt that the typical sense, that is, the antitype, namely, Christ's passion and crucifixion, is greater than the mere lifting up of the serpent. With regard to parables it is similarly a certain fact that the mystical sense, or the thing which is pointed out by the parable, is greater and more worthy than the parabolic narration itself.¹

Accurately speaking, the typical and parabolical senses belong under the allegorical sense, as the species belongs under the genus. For by reason of its etymology an allegory is when anything is said and under the statement something else is understood, and it is apparent that that is what happens in the case of parables and types.²

It must be understood, says Glass, that when we deal here with the mystical sense, we understand only that which Scripture, as its own interpreter, plainly points out. With regard to other allegorical, typical, or parabolical interpretations, which depend upon the judgment of the interpreter, the statement of Jerome holds true: "Plus hic sensus; sed nunquam parabola aut dubia aenigmatum intelligentia potest ad auctoritatem dogmatum quicquam proficere." This should be carefully and constantly noted in the following discussion. For if the doctrine concerning allegories,

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.

types, and parables is to be whole and complete and properly understood, we must observe this necessary distinction between the mystical sense ἑρμηνεύον and between mystical accommodations ἀναφορῶν.¹

On allegories Glass takes much the same position that we saw in Luther. He distinguishes innate and illate allegories--the former being those which have the sanction of the New Testament, the latter those which are inferred by the interpreter. Innate allegories (of which he mentions 1 Cor. 9,9; 2 Cor. 3,7 and 13,14; Rom. 10,18; Eph. 5,31-32; Luke 17,32; 1 Cor. 4,7-8; Gal. 4,22) can be used as proof of dogmas, since they have the sanction of the Holy Spirit. Illate allegories are not valid proof for doctrine, but, properly used, are useful as ornaments and illustration in preaching and teaching. Glass writes:

*Illis utamur non in adversariis veritatis convincendis, sed in populo de suggestu erudiendo, seu in concionibus, in quibus decenter ac moderate adhibitae delectant, excitant, taedium auferunt, unde etiam exordiis maxime conveniunt.*²

We have already seen Glass's definition of the typical sense. "The mystical sense is typical when hidden things, either present or future, are signified under outward facts or prophetic visions, and especially when historical events of the Old Testament prefigure or foreshadow historical events of the New Testament."³ He thus divides

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid., p. 294.

3. Ibid., p. 289. See above, p. 70.

types into two classes, historical and prophetic.

Prophetic types, he says, were partly for admonition and partly to forecast the future. He subdivides prophetic types into actions and visions. The actions of the prophets were prophetic when something mystical or occult was indicated by outward acts which they performed by divine command. He includes the symbolic actions of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, and the prophet of 1 Kings 20,35. He also includes in this class Christ's cursing of the fig tree.¹

In treating prophetic visions and dreams as typical, Glass experiences a bit of difficulty. He is obliged to exclude the dreams of Joseph, the Lord's foster-father, as well as the dreams of the magi, from his discussion, because they are not clothed in symbolic form. Among those that are typical he includes Jacob's dream of the ladder; the dreams of the patriarch Joseph, of Daniel, of Pharaoh, and of Nebuchadnezzar; the visions of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Amos, Zechariah, and St. John the Divine.²

Coming to historical types, he again distinguishes those which are innate, having Scriptural basis, and those that are illate, being inferred without Scriptural endorsement by exegetes.³

He subdivides innate types into those which Scripture expressly and explicitly declares to have foreshadowed

-
1. Op. cit., pp. 320-321.
 2. Ibid., pp. 321-322.
 3. Ibid., p. 325.

New Testament matters, and those which it tacitly and implicitly insinuates to have been types. In the former class he includes Jonah's being swallowed (on the basis of Matt. 12,40 and 16,4 and Luke 11,29-30); the brazen serpent elevated in the wilderness (Jo. 3,14-15); and the Levitic priesthood and the sacrifices of the Old Testament (Heb. 5). Examples of the latter, insinuated, types are the mercy seat (Rom. 3,25); Joshua leading the people into the Promised Land (Heb. 4,8); the manna (Jo. 6,32-33); the slaying and eating of the paschal lamb (1 Cor. 5,7); the scape goat (Jo. 1,29; 1 Pet. 2,24); the sacrifice of Isaac (Heb. 11,19); Samson (Matt. 2,23); Solomon (Heb. 1,5; Acts 2,30 and 13,12); the children of Israel going out of Egypt (Matt. 2,15).¹

An illate type is one which Scripture does not point out, but which is inferred by interpreters. Here he again distinguishes:

Est vel oblatus, vel extortus et contortus. Ille probabili cum analogia conjunctus est, cumque fidei analogia et re ipsa consentit. Hic vero omni fundamento destituitur, et a sensu literali nimis discrepat, et ad ψευδαιτυνία refertur.²

In the oblatus class he includes Samson's taking a strange wife and defeating his enemies by his own death; Joseph bound and sold by his brothers and raised again to sublime glory; Aaron making propitiation for the people in

1. Ibid., pp. 325-326.

2. Ibid., p. 326.

the midst of the living and the dead (Num. 16,47); Adam rising from sleep; Daniel emerging from the lions' den; Samson rising at night and making off with the gates of Gaza; David slaying Goliath; David taking into his care men who were in distress and debt and who were bitter of soul.¹

Glass declares that while not all things in the Old Testament have a typical application in specie, they have nevertheless a typical meaning in genere et impliciti, since Christ says "Search the Scriptures . . . they testify of Me," and since Rev. 13,8 speaks of "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." The latter phrase, he says, does not refer only to the divine decrees concerning the passion of Christ, or only to its merit and efficacy, nor to single predictions in the Old Testament of Christ's death, but to types, "qui idcirco sedula Scripturae Veteris Testamenti meditatione, et cum Christo nucleo collatione, eruendi et salutariter proponenda sunt."²

In the class of typi historici illati extorti et contorti Glass concludes Papal statements saying that the Son of David is a type of the pontiff; that the Levites typified the monastic life; that the rebellion of Israel from Judah is a type of heretics causing schisms and separating themselves from the Church.³

1. Ibid., pp. 326-327.

2. Ibid., p. 327.

3. Ibid. For other Roman abuses, such as the claim that the two rods of Zechariah (11,7) are types of the Dominicans and Franciscans, see Farrar, op. cit., p. 297.

He discusses other possible classifications of historical types.

1) Those which refer directly to Christ, and those which refer to things connected with Christ. In the latter class he mentions the flood and circumcision as types of baptism. He mentions types of the Eucharist which have been expounded by "theologis nostris": the tree of life; the bread and wine in the story of Melchisedek; the paschal lamb in remembrance of the deliverance from Egypt; the manna; the water from the Rock in the desert; the blood of the covenant; the shewbread; the coal of fire which touched Isaiah's tongue. Types of the Church: Paradise; Noah's ark; the calling of Abraham; the tabernacle; Rahab's home; Jerusalem. Types of the New Testament ministry: the lesser priests and Levites.¹

2) Types can be divided into res gestae and caeremoniae.²

3) Types can be divided into those which were repeated, as the daily sacrifices, and those which occurred only once, as the lifting up of the brazen serpent.³

4) Types can be classified as either total or partial. It is doubtful, he says, if there are any types which in every respect are typical of Christ, unless, perhaps, it is the Levitic priesthood with its attendant rites. Most types are typical only in certain respects. Thus Jonah

1. Op. cit., p. 328.

2. Ibid., pp. 328-329.

3. Ibid., p. 329.

was not a type of Christ in all he did, but only in so far as he was in the belly of the fish three days. On the other hand, too, Jonah was not a type of everything which pertains to Christ, but only of His passion and death.¹

Glass concludes by listing nine canons for exploring types.

1) In exploring prophetic types, one must carefully note where Christ manifests Himself, His work and merit, and where He points out other divine benefits and judgments.

2) There is often more in the type than in the anti-type.

3) There is often more in the antitype than is prefigured in the type.

4) The application of the type is made in accord with the antitype, and not vice versa. (This was against Belarmine, who sought to prove that the mass is a sacrifice on the basis of the story of Melchisedek's bread and wine.)

5) When there are many partial types of one thing, then one must judge the antitype not on the basis of one partial type, but on the basis of all of them taken together.

6) In employing Old Testament types, one must accurately note whether a shadow, or whether the truth itself is set itself is set forth in the passage under consideration, i.e., whether the prophets are speaking of Christ under the

1. Ibid.

cover of types, or in express words (e.g., such passages as "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," Ps. 2,7; and "Thou Bethlehem Ephratah, etc.," Mic. 5,2).

7) Ungodly men in their ungodly acts can never be considered types or figures of Christ.

8) One thing may be a type or figure of two things, even of two contrary things, but in different respects (e.g., the flood, saving Noah, was a type of baptism; but drowning the ungodly, it was typical of the condemnation of the unjust at the last judgment.).

9) There is sometimes an interchange of names between type and antitype, so that the thing adumbrated is called by the name of the shade (thus Christ is called David, Ezek. 34,23).¹

"Tantum de typorum doctrina," says Glass.

And looking back, we find that he has not been very helpful in enabling us to get to the bottom of the problem of finding and interpreting types.

His "prophetic types" are a bit confusing. We cannot tell whether a thing is typical because it foreshadows something else, or whether it is typical because it is cloaked in some symbolic form. His classifications are well and good; but the problem remains of doing the classifying in particular cases. We wonder why he included the brazen serpent and Jonah in the innate explicit class. His canons

1. Ibid., pp. 330-336.

with the exception of the sixth and seventh, hardly help us at all in deciding if a particular person or event in the Old Testament is typical of something.

In fact, he leaves us to do almost as we please. If we are not content with the innate types of Scripture, we can begin to look for illate ones. All that we need to watch is that there be some analogy, some resemblance, between what we call type and antitype; and that what we say does not conflict with the analogies of faith and Scripture; and that we do not go to the absurd extremes of the papists. With these principles, or rather, with this freedom from principle, we can do almost anything with the Old Testament.

I. Pascal

It is somewhat of a digression, but an interesting one, that takes us now into the writings of a French philosopher, scientist, and theologian of this same period.

Blaise Pascal (1623-1662) left a chapter on typology among his famous *Pensées*.¹ It is fragmentary, but includes many stimulating thoughts. We quote some of his statements:

Isaiah 51. The Red Sea an image of the Redemption . . . God, wishing to show that He could form a people holy with an invisible holiness, and fill them with an eternal glory, made visible things. As nature is an image of grace, He has done in the bounties of nature what

1. Blaise Pascal, *Pensées*, Modern Library Edition, pp. 215-233.

He would do in those of grace, in order that we might judge that He could make the invisible, since He made the visible excellently.

Therefore He saved this people from the deluge; He has raised them up from Abraham, redeemed them from their enemies, and set them at rest.

The object of God was not to save them from the deluge, and raise up a whole people from Abraham, only in order to bring them into a rich land.

And even grace is only the type of glory, for it is not the ultimate end. It has been symbolized by the law, and itself symbolizes glory. But it is the type of it, and the origin or cause.¹

Types.--The Jewish and Egyptian people were plainly foretold by the two individuals whom Moses met; the Egyptian beating the Jew, Moses avenging him and killing the Egyptian, and the Jew being ungrateful.²

Types.--The Jews had grown old in these earthly thoughts, that God loved their father Abraham, his flesh and what sprang from it; that on account of this He had multiplied them, and distinguished them from all other nations, without allowing them to intermingle; that when they were languishing in Egypt, He brought them out with all these great signs in their favour; that He fed them with manna in the desert, and led them into a very rich land; that He gave them kings and a well-built temple, in order to offer up beasts before Him, by the shedding of whose blood they should be purified; and that at last He was to send them the Messiah to make them masters of all the world, and foretold the time of His coming.

The world having grown old in these carnal errors, Jesus Christ came at the time foretold, but not with the expected glory; and thus men did not think it was He. After His death, Saint Paul came to teach men that all these things had happened in allegory; that the kingdom of God did not consist in the flesh, but in the spirit; that the enemies of men were not the Babylonians, but the passions; that God delighted not in temples made by hands, but in a pure and contrite

1. Ibid., p. 216.

2. Ibid., p. 219.

heart; that the circumcision of the body was unprofitable, but that of the heart was needed; that Moses had not given them the bread from heaven, etc.

But God, not having desired to reveal these things to this people who were unworthy of them, and having nevertheless desired to foretell them, in order that they might be believed, foretold the time clearly, and expressed the things sometimes clearly, but very often in figures, in order that those who love symbols might consider them, and those who loved what was symbolised might see it therein.

All that tends not to charity is figurative.

The sole aim of Scripture is charity.

All which tends not to the sole end is the type of it. For since there is only one end, all which does not lead to it in express terms is figurative.¹

The Jews have so much loved the shadows, and have so strictly expected them, that they have misunderstood the reality, when it came in the time and manner foretold.

The Rabois take the breasts of the Spouse for types, and all that does not express the only end they have, namely, temporal good.

And Christians take even the Eucharist as a type of the glory at which they aim.²

"Fac secundum exemplar quod tibi ostensum est in monte."--The Jewish religion then has been formed on its likeness to the truth of the Messiah; and the truth of the Messiah has been recognised by the Jewish religion, which was the type of it.

Among the Jews the truth was only typified; in heaven it is revealed.

In the Church it is hidden, and recognised by its resemblance to the type.

The type has been made according to the truth, and the truth has been recognised according to the type.³

And yet this covenant, made to blind some and enlighten others, indicated in those very persons, whom it blinded, the truth which should

1. Ibid., pp. 223-224.

2. Ibid., p. 224.

3. Ibid., p. 225.

be recognized by others. For the visible blessings which they received from God were so great and so divine, that He indeed appeared able to give them those that are invisible, and a Messiah . . .

God has then shown by the deliverance from Egypt, and from the sea, by the defeat of the kings, by the manna, by the whole genealogy of Abraham, that He was able to save, to send down bread from heaven, etc.; so that the people hostile to Him are the type and the representation of the very Messiah whom they know not, etc.

He has then taught us at last that all these things were only types, and what is "true freedom," a "true Israelite," "true circumcision," "true bread from heaven," etc.

In these promises each one finds what he has most at heart, temporal benefits or spiritual, God or the creatures; but with this difference, that those who therein seek the creatures find them, but with many contradictions, with a prohibition against loving them, with the command to worship God only, and to love Him only, which is the same thing, and, finally, that the Messiah came not for them; whereas those who therein seek God find Him, without any contradiction, with the command to love Him only, and that the Messiah came in the time foretold, to give them the blessings which they ask."¹

The veil, which is upon these books for the Jews, is there also for evil Christians, and for all who do not hate themselves.

But how well disposed men are to understand and to know Jesus Christ, when they truly hate themselves.²

J. Cocceius and his Followers

A renowned Reformed theologian of the seventeenth century was John Koch (1603-1669). Known as Cocceius, he was professor at Leyden from 1650 to the time of his death.³

1. Ibid., pp. 225-226.

2. Ibid., p. 226.

3. On Cocceius and his work, see Oehler, op. cit., pp. 28-29; Fairbairn, op. cit., I, 9-16; Kurtz, op. cit., III, 54-55; Henrik Klausen, Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments, pp. 282-285.

His contribution was in Biblical theology, a study which he pursued singularly untrammelled by the tradition and dogmatic controversy of his day.

He developed an independent view of "federal theology." He conceived of a two-fold covenant between God and man. The first was a covenant of nature and works, made with Adam in the state of innocence. The second was the covenant of grace and faith which came in after the fall. This latter consists in three dispensation--before the law, under the law, and under the Gospel.¹ (We saw this distinction of the three dispensations already in Junilius.)

"Christ is the center of all history, spiritual, ecclesiastical, and civil; and so everything in Scripture, history, doctrine, and prophecy, necessarily and immediately stands related to Him."² For this reason the three dispensations of Scripture are parallel and analogous. Hence the Scripture contains an outline of ecclesiastical and civil history down to the end of time.

Gocceius' principle of interpretation was: "The literal meaning must be given as exactly as possible, though with careful attention to the immediate context. But since the Scripture is an organism, the whole Scripture must always be kept in mind in the theological explanation of each passage."³

1. His book on this subject is Summa Doctrina de Foedere et Testamento Dei, 2nd ed., 1654.

2. Kurtz, op. cit., III, 55.

3. Oehler, op. cit., p. 28.

Cocceius rejected allegory as much as his contemporaries did. But using typology as it was treated in his day, operating with the rules then in vogue, he developed vast numbers of parallels between the three dispensations. Typology was the key to understanding Scripture. An analogy was about all that was required to declare two things type and antitype.

What was said of Asshur going out and building Nineveh, for example, became a type of the Mohammedan power, which at once sprang from the kingdom and shook the dominion of antichrist.¹ "Passages in Isaiah became actual prophecies of the dispute between the successors of Constantine, the history of Karl the Great, and the death of Gustavus Adolphus."²

Many of Cocceius' followers went to even more extravagant extremes in constructing artificial parallels and calling them types. Farrar writes: "The movement begun by Cocceius, like almost every other movement during this epoch, seems by some fatality to have been cursed by the falsehood of extremes."³ Guertler, for example, subdivides each of the three dispensations into seven periods and finds hosts of corresponding characteristics in the corresponding periods.⁴ Cramer, likewise, who was another of the followers of Cocceius, considered the altar of holocausts a type of Christ, then posed the question, "Quadratus quomodo Christus

1. Fairbairn, op. cit., I, 10.

2. Farrar, op. cit., p. 386.

3. Ibid.

4. Uehler, op. cit., p. 28.

fuerit?" Van Til presented the snuffers of the sacred candlestick as a type of sanctified reason preventing many daily errors.¹

Among the pupils of Cocceius were Hermann Witsius (1636-1708) and Campegius Vitringa (1659-1722). They were men of much learning and trod more prudently than their teacher.² There is still much that is very arbitrary in their typology, however. By way of example, in their writings the name of Abel (emptiness) is viewed as prefiguring Christ's humiliation; the withdrawal of Isaac from his father's house to the land of Moriah, Christ's being led out of the temple to Calvary; Samson's meeting a young lion by the way, Christ's meeting Saul on the Damascus road.³

Fairbairn discusses English writers of the late seventeenth century who belonged to this same school of interpretation. Their principle, he says, was: "Where the analogy was evident and manifest between things under the Law and things under the Gospel, the one were to be concluded (on the ground simply of that analogy) to be types of the other."⁴ Fairbairn proceeds:

How far this warrant from analogy was thought capable of leading may be learned from Taylor and Guild, especially from the latter, who has no fewer than forty-nine typical resemblances be-

1. A. J. Maas, "Types in Scripture," Catholic Encyclopedia, XV, 107.

2. Oehler, op. cit., pp. 28-29; Farrar, op. cit., p. 396.

3. Fairbairn, op. cit., I, 11-12.

4. Ibid., I, 12.

tween Joseph and Christ, and seventeen between Jacob and Christ, not scrupling to swell the number by occasionally taking in acts of sin, as well as circumstances of an altogether trivial nature. Thus Jacob's being a supplanter of his brother, is made to represent Christ's supplanting death, sin, and Satan; his being obedient to his parents in all things, Christ's subjection to His heavenly Father and His earthly parents; his purchasing his birthright by red pottage, and obtaining the blessing by presenting savory venison to his father, clothed in Esau's garment, Christ's purchasing the heavenly inheritance to us by His red blood, and obtaining the blessing by offering up the savory meat of His obedience, in the borrowed garment of our nature, etc.¹

By way of criticism of the Cocceian mode of operation,

Fairbairn writes:

Now, we may affirm of these, and many similar examples occurring in writers of the same class, that the analogy they found upon was a merely superficial resemblance appearing between certain things in Old and certain things in New Testament Scripture If such weight was fitly attached to mere resemblances between the Old and the New, even when they were altogether of a slight and superficial kind, why should not profane as well as sacred history be ransacked for them . . . seeing that God is in all history By pushing the matter beyond its just limits, we reduce the sacred to a level with the profane, and, at the same time, throw an air of uncertainty over the whole aspect of its typical character.

That the Cocceian mode of handling the typical matter of ancient Scripture so readily admitted of the introduction of trifling, far-fetched, and even altogether false analogies, was one of its capital defects. It had no essential principles or fixed rules by which to guide its interpretations--set up no proper landmarks along the field of inquiry--left room on every hand for arbitrariness and caprice to enter. It was this, perhaps, more

1. Ibid., I, 12-13.

than any thing else, which tended to bring typical interpretations into disrepute, and disposed men, in proportion as the exact and critical study of Scripture came to be cultivated, to regard the subject of its typology as hopelessly involved in conjecture and uncertainty. Yet this was not the only fault inherent in the typological system now under consideration. It failed, more fundamentally still, in the idea it had formed of the connection between the Old and the New in God's dispensations--between the type and the thing typified--which came to be thrown mainly upon the mere forms and accidents of things, to the comparative neglect of the great fundamental principles which are common alike to all dispensations, and in which the more vital part of the connection must be sought.¹

K. Grotius and his Followers

While the Cocceians were abusing typology in one direction, another movement was under foot in the opposite way. This latter centered among the Arminian theologians.

Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) was one of the greatest minds of the seventeenth century. A man of vast interests, he was famed as a jurist and statesman and founder of international law; as a classical scholar; as a historian; as a philosopher; and as a theologian.² In theology he contributed the "governmental theory" of the atonement.³ Many regard him as the greatest exegete of his day. Farrar says: "His classical learning, his masterly good sense, his brevity, independence, and incomparable lucidity make his annotations more valuable than those of any of his

1. Ibid., pp. 13-14.

2. Cf. Henry Ruoff, Masters of Achievement, pp. 443-449.

3. See J. L. Neve, History of Christian Thought, II, 23-24.

immediate contemporaries."¹

Joachim Wach writes:

Besonders die Bedeutung des Grotius ist hervorzuheben. Dieser "feiste Interpret seit Calvin" (Dilthey) war schon durch seine Sektenangehörigkeit zu einer freieren Stellung gegenüber der kirchlichen Auslegung befähigt. Mit dem klassischen Altertum wohl vertraut hat er vor allem dazu beigetragen, die Schranken zwischen profaner und Sakralhermeneutik niederzulegen, hierin wie in seinen Ansätzen zu grammatischer und historischer Auslegung ein Vorläufer der Semler-Ernestischen Interpretationstheorie.²

The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia declares:

He declared the Bible had nothing to do with dogmatism, and dealt with the books of the Bible as with literary writings according to grammatical rules, and explained the words of Jesus by quoting passages from Greek and Latin authors . . . To him belongs the honor of first having applied the historical-philological method to the explanation of Scripture. He was the precursor of Ernesti.³

On dogmatic grounds as well as for reasons of scholarship Grotius rejected the typology that was in vogue among Lutheran and Reformed theologians. He rejected it to such an extent that the saying, not altogether accurate, became current, "Grotius nusquam in sacris litteris invenit Christum, Cocceius ubique."⁴

Rambach (1693-1735), by way of refutation, describes Grotius' views on Christ in the Old Testament thus:

Ex Hugonis Grotii sententia prophetae nullibi de Christo Jesu et regno eius directe, proprie, diserte vaticinati sunt. Si quae autem sint,

1. Op. cit., pp. 379-380. See also Ruoff, op. cit., p. 449; Kurtz, op. cit., III, 57.

2. Das Verstehen, I, 15.

3. V, 86.

4. Cf. Farrar, op. cit., note, p. 380.

quae dominus ipse et apostoli, in sermonibus atque epistolis suis, illuc transtulerint, quaerenda ea sunt in prophetis, secundum sensum illarum sublimiorem, quem Christus solus, eiusque apostoli perspexerunt.¹

If anyone claimed that there was a mystical sense in other passages than those which the New Testament writers point out, that person, Grotius maintained, would have to show that he possessed the same extraordinary Spirit as the apostles and prophets had.² Grotius was very likely the first one in the post-Reformation era, but by no means the last, to come forward with the view that the only types in Scripture are those which the New Testament expressly expounds.

Rambach discusses this view at length in his booklet De Sensu Mystici Criteriis.³ He attributes its origin to the "Socinian exegetes," and cites a number of cases of men who had adopted it.

Thus Philip Limborch (1633-1712), an Arminian, said:

Quum in allegoria non tam explicetur sensus verborum sacrae scripturae; sed illa sit sensus literalis extensio ad aliud quippiam, quod Deus scripturae auctor, sub eventu per sensum literalem expresso ac designato, tamquam sub typo adumbrare voluit; si sine erroris periculo hic versari velimus, non est allegoria quaerenda, nisi illis in locis, quod N. T. scriptores sensu mystico Domino Jesu applicuerunt (Praef. ad Comm. in Acta Apost. p. 2).⁴

1. Johann Jacob Rambach, Institutiones Hermeneuticae Sacrae, 2nd ed., p. 156.

2. Ibid., p. 73.

3. Bound in the same volume with his Institutiones Herm. Sac., 2nd ed.

4. Ibid., p. 25.

Guilielmus Saldenus (1627-1694), a Dutch Reformed theologian who wrote a book De Typorum Veteris Testamenti Usu et Abusu, in Otis Theologicis, declared:

Ad typum genuinum constituendum necesse est, ut ipsissimum Dei verbum rem vel personam, quae typum faciet, ad Christum in novo testamento repraesentandum ordinatam esse dicet (p. 251).¹

Rambach also cites a Lutheran theologian of his day, a certain Val. Velthemius, who, in a dissertation entitled De Scripturae Sensu Literali et Mystico, had tied the case up in this neat bundle:

Nulla interpretatio scripturae sacrae canonicae pro sensu mystico venditari potest, nisi spiritus sanctus hunc sensum mysticum esse a se intentum, in scripturis sacris canonicis expresse revelaverit.²

But already in the seventeenth century Hermann Witsius, the pupil of Cocceius whom we have already mentioned, rebutted this view of Grotius with the following argument, to which an adequate answer has never been found:

Non existimandum est infallibili auctoritate ad expositionem typorum opus esse, vel omnes Veteris Testamenti typos in novo esse expositos. Non prius. Cur enim magis infallibilis auctoritas in typorum, quam in prophetiarum, aliorumque scripturae aenigmatum, interpretatione exigitur? Quum constet Deum etiam per typos ecclesiam docere voluisse, et typorum explicatio saepe nunc longe facilius sit ob distinctam cognitionem antitypi, quam multarum prophetiarum. Non posterius. Cur enim malum credere, omnes typos Christi explicatos esse, quam omnes prophetias de Christo. Tenendum igitur, doctores θεοτιμωτοῦς viam nobis methodumque demonstrasse, qua in

1. Ibid., pp. 25-26.

2. Ibid., p. 26.

typorum elucidatione procedere debeamus, et
clavem tradidisse ad abdita illa referenda.¹

John Spencer (1630-1693) and Johann Clericus (1657-1736), the first British, the second Dutch, both of the Arminian camp, pursued the work of Grotius further.²

Both men studied the Old Testament and tried to dispense with revelation by explaining the Old Testament and Jewish institutions on prudential grounds and by grouping the practices of the Jews with those of sundry heathen nations.³ A crass example: Clericus said the incense at the sacrifices was designed to drive away impertinent flies from the flesh of the victims.⁴

As a complement to this, they proposed a theory of accommodation for the New Testament writers. The Jews at the time of Christ and the apostles, they said, were not aware of the altogether unsupernatural origin of their religion. In their ignorance they were accustomed to believe arguments based on the presupposition of the validity of prophecy, allegory, and type. It became part of their nature to view the Old Testament in this mystic manner. To achieve their purposes, Christ and the apostles availed themselves of this widespread ignorance. They accommodated their arguments to it. They defeated the Jews with their

1. De Oeconomia Foederum Dei cum Hominibus, IV, VI, p. 638, quoted by Rambach, Institut. Herm. Sac., pp. 73-74.

2. Clericus wrote Ars Critica in three volumes, 1696; Dissertatio de Optimo Genere Interpretum, 1693. Spencer wrote a learned book De Legibus Hebraeorum Ritualibus earumque Rationibus, 1686.

3. Cf. Farrar, op. cit., pp. 379-380; Oehler, op. cit., p. 31.

4. Oehler, op. cit., p. 247.

own weapons. They based arguments on type and prophecy, knowing full well that these arguments were, in fact, invalid.¹

Fairbairn writes:

It was the redeeming point of the earlier typology, which should be allowed to go far in extenuating the occasional errors connected with it, that it kept the work and kingdom of Christ ever prominently in view, as the grand scope and end of all God's dispensations. It felt, if we may so speak, correctly, whatever it may have wanted in the requisite depth and precision of thought. But towards the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, a general coldness very commonly discovered itself, both in the writings and the lives of even the more orthodox sections of the Church . . . Christ was not allowed to maintain His proper place in the New Testament; and it is not to be wondered at if He should have been nearly banished from the Old.

Vitringa, who lived when this degeneracy from better times had made considerable progress, attributed to it much of that distaste which was then beginning to prevail in regard to typical interpretations of the Scripture. With special reference to the work of Spencer on the Laws of the Hebrews--a work not less remarkable for its low-toned, semi-heathenish spirit, than for its varied and well-digested learning--he lamented the inclination that appeared to seek for the grounds and reasons of the Mosaic institutions in the mazes of Egyptian idolatry, instead of endeavoring to discover in them the mysteries of the gospel. These, he believed, the Holy Spirit had plainly intimated to be couched there; and they shone, indeed, so manifestly through the institutions themselves, that it seemed impossible for any one not to perceive the type, who recognized the antitype. Nor could he conceal his fear, that the talent, authority, and learning of such men as Spencer would gain extensive credit for their opinions,

1. Cf. Rambach's refutation, on ethical grounds, of Clericus' position, Institut. Herm. Sac., pp. 156-159.

and soon bring the typology of Scripture, as he understood it, into general contempt (Observationes Sacrae, II, pp. 460-461). In this apprehension he was certainly not mistaken. Another generation had scarcely passed away when Dathe published an edition of the Sacred Philology of Glass, in which the section on types, to which we have already referred, was wholly omitted, as relating to a subject no longer thought worthy of a recognized place in the science of an enlightened theology.¹

1. Op. cit., pp. 15-16.

V. The Eighteenth Century

1. Rambach

Pietism was another movement of this same period. Pietism marks its beginnings with Philip Spener (1635-1705), and had its center in the University of Halle, founded by Frederick III of Brandenburg. Students flocked there and "Halle now won the position which Wittenberg and Geneva had held during the Reformation period."¹ A mark of Pietism was its ardent study of the Scriptures, and Biblical typology received due attention.²

Johann Jacob Rambach (1693-1735) was one of the last of the Halle Pietists.³ He wrote at length on the mystical sense of Scripture, both in his Institutiones Hermeneuticae Sacrae and in a separate booklet De Sensu Mystici Criteriis.

We have already heard much of the sensus mysticus. Theologians from ancient days had distinguished it by saying that the sensus literalis is that sense which is conveyed by the words, while the sensus mysticus is the meaning which the Holy Ghost intended to convey through the things

1. Kurtz, Op. cit., III, 42.

2. On Pietism, see ibid., III, 41-42; 105-108.

3. See Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, IV, 1695.

which the words describe. Rambach concurs in this definition.¹ Glass and others had divided the mystic sense into allegorical, typical, and parabolic. Rambach discards this distinction as supervacaneum.²

Calov and Pfeiffer had protested against calling the mystical sense a sensus of Scripture. Glass, Bechmann, Baier, and Carpzov had not hesitated to call it a sensus. Rambach concludes that the first group used the word sensus in a narrow, the latter in a wider signification, and that the difference between them is not in fact, but only in manner of speaking.³

The sensus mysticus is not an arbitrary human fiction, or a Scriptural accommodation to men's ignorance, as the Arminians teach, but a true sense, says Rambach, having ample foundation in the writings of Christ and the apostles.⁴ Both Old and New Testaments contain the mystic sense, though the latter more infrequently (parables, miracles, apocalyptic writings).⁵

Of the two senses, literal and mystic, the literal is prior in nature and by order of importance, but the mystic sense is prior in respect to dignity.⁶

The mystic sense has argumentative value if it has clear Scriptural foundation.⁷

1. Inst. Herm. Sac., pp. 55, 67-68.

2. Ibid., p. 68.

3. Ibid., pp. 68-70.

4. Ibid., p. 71.

5. De Sens. Myst. Crit., p. 11.

6. Inst. Herm. Sac., p. 72.

7. Ibid.

The sedes classici, as it were, of the mystical sense are 1) the rules concerning the rites of the Mosaic Law; 2) the histories of the most notable persons in the Old Testament, among whom, in the kingdom of light, are Adam, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Melchisedek, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Job, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Gideon, Samson, David, Solomon, Elijah, Jonah, Eliakim, Daniel, and others; in the kingdom of darkness, Cain, Ishmael, Esau, Balaam, Ahitophel, Jezebel, Antiochus Epiphanes, and others; 3) the accounts of the singular events that befell ancient Israel; 4) the deliverances of Israel from the hands of their enemies; 5) the singular judgments which God executed under the Old Covenant; 6) the more excellent benefits which God bestowed on the Church of the Old Testament; 7) many statements of the prophets--chiefly statements concerning Judah, Jerusalem, Babel, Egypt, Edom, etc., which have a double signification, one signification being an emblem of the other; 8) most psalms and songs; 9) the main events of the life of Christ; 10) the parables of our Lord; 11) the miracles of the Savior.¹

The mystical sense is not to be found everywhere in Scripture.² Two extremes are to be avoided: trying to find mystical content everywhere, and setting the limits too narrowly, as do those who will accept a mystical sense only where Scripture expressly points it out.³ As not all

1. De Sens. Myst. Crit., pp. 11-24.

2. Ibid., p. 8.

3. Ibid., pp. 8-10, 24-26.

prophecies of the Old Testament are expressly explained in the New Testament, so we need not expect all types to be. It is sufficient that the New Testament writers have showed us the mode of procedure in finding the mystic meaning.¹

On the basis of the New Testament writings we can frame canons and certain criteria on the basis of which we can decide with the highest probability that in this or that passage a mystic sense lies hidden.²

Such criteria are internal and external.³

Internal criteria: There is good evidence of a mystical sense if the things described contain nothing worthy of God (as the laws about the washing of lepers); if they contain things unworthy of holy men (as the polygamy of the patriarchs); if the things described in the Old Testament are surrounded with such miraculous circumstances that they strike the reader and inspire his mind with the higher, mystical, significance; if the circumstances of a portion of the Old Testament have such a conspicuous, evident reference to an event of the New Testament that the reader cannot fail to notice it unless he is blind or prejudiced. More than a mere resemblance, indeed, is required to constitute one thing the type of another. But there is a difference between simply any kind of a resemblance, and an adequate similarity which is manifest to all eyes--such as that

1. Ibid., pp. 26-27.

2. Ibid., p. 29.

3. Ibid., pp. 29-70.

between Joseph and Christ. Other internal criteria which can cause one to suspect a mystical sense are: when the things predicated of the subject are clothed with such magnificent and illustrious words that, if taken literally, they do not square with facts (things that are said about Jerusalem, for example) or cannot be true, except in a diluted and weak sense.

External criteria: When Scripture says expressly and explicitly that this or that thing in the Old Testament is a type of something in the New.

Sometimes the New Testament says this implicitly-- e.g., when the antitype is called by Old Testament names, as Christ is called a lamb; when Scripture refers one thing to another by plain allusions, as Jerusalem and the Church; when the New Testament says that a certain genus is typical, thereby implying that all the species within it are typical, e.g., the Mosaic ceremonies; when legitimate deduction under the guidance of Scripture indicates that a certain thing is typical of another. Such legitimate deductions which indicate what is typical are: from the whole to the part (the temple, hence, its parts); from the part to the whole (the mercy seat, hence the whole ark); from the container to the content (the holy place, hence its furniture); from content to container (the shewbread, hence the table of shewbread); from like to like (the new moons and the sabbath, hence the feasts of Pentecost and Tabernacles); from the cause to

the effect (the ark of the covenant, hence the opening of the Jordan, caused by it); from effect to cause (the effects of the manifestation of God on Sinai, hence the manifestation itself); from the lesser to the greater (the Sabbath day, hence the sabbatical year).

Finally, Rambach adds a number of cautions. One should not suppose, he says, that all these criteria are of equal value. An explicit statement of the New Testament about a type is the surest criterion. The criteria based on deductions must be handled most carefully. One must be careful not to mix certain and uncertain things and attempt to pass off affected human notions as the meaning of the Holy Spirit. One must be careful not to devour this honey immoderately, and fall into a contempt of the literal sense. On the other hand one has to watch out that he does not adhere so closely to the mere forms of words that he despises the genuine mystical meaning. One must be careful not to affect omniscience in these matters, and not rush into the treatment of the mystical sense by blind impulse. One must not set such things before all people indiscriminately. Finally, one ought not to go about investigating the mystical sense only for idle delight, but for strengthening of the soul.¹

Rambach offers much valuable material and is widely acquainted with the literature of the subject. He tries

1. Ibid., pp. 70-79.

not only to aid the student in avoiding pitfalls, but offers positive principles of procedure. Yet his discussion is deficient. He does not become lucid on the relation between type and antitype. Simply to call a type a mystical sense answers no questions about it. What God reveals is merely labeled as something that is hidden. And his criteria, if not negated by his cautions, allow all manner of free play to subjective caprice.¹

2. Bengel

John Bengel (d. 1752), author of the famous and scholarly Gnomon, left no extensive discussion of the typology of Scripture. There are only occasional statements here and there throughout the Gnomon that indicate that he is well aware of the typical content of the Old Testament.²

Bengel gave voice to a view concerning the close connection of the Old Testament and the New Testament, however, which is of great importance to the historical study of typology. It was not an altogether new view. We have seen something of it before in Origen, in Luther, in Cocceius, in all who regarded the entire Old Testament as a preparation for and a foreshadowing of the New. Bengel presented history as a whole--as a gloriously connected, integrated unit, developing gradually under God's omniscient care toward its

1. Cf. Klausen, op. cit., pp. 272-276.

2. Cf. his remarks on Matt. 1,22; 2,15,18; Jo. 6,31 ff.; Rom. 6,14 ff.; 1 Cor. 5,7; Col. 2,16-17; Heb. 7.

climax, the second coming of Christ.¹ He set forth his views on sacred history in his book Ordo Temporum. (In this book Bengel, by chronological calculation, predicted the millenium would begin in 1836.) He regarded not only history as a unit, but he held the Scriptures, too, to be an organic whole. All its books constitute one body. It is a marvelous narrative which presents God's dealings with the human race from the beginning to the end of things as a wondrously connected system.² In the preface to the Gnomon Bengel wrote: "In the works of God, even to the smallest plant, there is the most entire symmetry; in the Word of God there is the most finished harmony, even to a letter."³ These pregnant thoughts were to recur in many forms in the work of nineteenth century theologians.

Bengel wrote in Ordo Temporum:

Tempora, quae in historia V. T. occurrunt, per se sunt quiddam incompletum in fine: N. T. tempora, initio quiddam incompletum habent. Se mutuo complent. Una catena aurea consistit, in qua omnes articuli cohaerent ac respondent. V. T. non sine N. T. et N. T. non sine V. T. summam temporum mundi conficit. Altera pars alteram egregie confirmat: et tota confirmatio omnes infideles, confirmatio temporum ex N. T. Iudaeos convincit. Unum Scriptura instrumentum, omnes libri eius unum corpus constituunt. Singuli libri totum quiddam sunt, et particularis scopi quisque sui rationes exhaustiunt: conjunctim, unus liber est, ex partibus illis resultans, scopum universum habens multo ampliorem. Tempora, quae Moses primus in eremo, novissimus Johannes in Patmo, inter utrumque alii

-
1. Ordo Temporum, 2nd ed., p. 262.
 2. Fritsch, op. cit., Dec., 1946, pp. 418-419.
 3. Gnomon of the New Testament, p. xxiii (Eng. tr., 1862).

homines sancti, tot seculorum intervallo, sparsim et paulatim notarunt, non potuere consilio humano adornari: unus est Intellectus, omnia comprehendens, infinitus, divinus, a quo proficiscuntur, qui praeterita, praesentia et futura exacte in numerato habet. Scriptura, Dei Liber Est.¹

3. Ernesti, Semler, and Michaelis

It was in the period of the "Enlightenment" in the middle and latter half of the eighteenth century that rationalism began to set in strongly in German theology.²

Farrar writes:

The tendency to crude infidelity . . . was only influential through the feebleness of the opposition which was offered to it. The work of Spener and Francke had spent its beneficent force. Of the clergy, some shut themselves up in a sullen dogmatic obstinacy. Others in alarm were willing to reduce religion to a system of utilitarianism and sentimentality, and acted, says Tholuck, like a man who, crying that his house is on fire, throws his best mirrors out of the window in order to save them.³

Kurtz declares:

German rationalism is essentially distinguished from Deism and Naturalism by not breaking completely with the Bible and the Church, but eviscerating both by its theories of accommodation and by its exaggerated representations of the limitations of the age in which the books of Scripture were written and the doctrines of Christianity were formulated.⁴

John August Ernesti (1707-1781), John Salomo Semler (1725-1791), and John David Michaelis (1717-1791) were

-
1. Ordo Temporum, p. 334.
 2. See Kurtz, op. cit., III, 139-156; Farrar, op. cit., pp. 400-402; Oehler, op. cit., pp. 30-31.
 3. Op. cit., p. 401.
 4. Op. cit., III, 140.

three tall figures in the transition period from decadent Pietism to flourishing rationalism. They did perhaps more than others in laying the groundwork for the rise of rationalism in the theology of their country. Yet the impetus they gave to historical, grammatical, philological interpretation marked a new day in exegesis. Their position was in many ways a reassertion, expansion, and development of the hermeneutical methods and principles of Hugo Grotius, who lived a century and a half earlier.¹

Joachim Wach writes of Ernesti and Semler:

Die Namen der beiden Maenner bezeichnen den Anbruch einer neuen Epoche in der Geschichte der hermeneutischen Theorie, die gekennzeichnet wird vor allem durch die Loesung der Auslegungslehre vom Dogma, die Verlegung des Schwerpunkts nach der Seite der grammatisch-historischen Interpretation und spezialhermeneutisch-theologisch durch die Sonderung der fuer das A.T. und der fuer das N.T. geltenden Auslegungsprinzipien. In Ernesti und Semler schafft die neue Richtung der Exegese ihre Theorie. War der erstere der groeszere Philolog, der exaktere Systematiker, so wirkte Semler vor allem durch den Reichtum der Ideen und die Kombination der Gedanken. Beide waren kritische Koepfe. Vor allem Semler ist durch seine historisch-kritischen Analysen das Vorbild der Schulen des 19. Jahrhunderts (Schleiermacher--Ferd. Chr. Baur) geworden. Ernestis Bemuehungen galten vor allem dem N.T., Semler arbeitete auf beiden Gebieten. Beide Maenner waren hervorragend philologisch und juristisch interessiert. Waehrend aber Semlers reicher Geist in alle seine zahlreichen Schriften ausgegossen erscheint (schon in seiner Vorbereitung zur theol. Herm., 1760, S. 160 ff., deutete er die Grundsuetze seiner

1. See above, pp. 88-89. See also Klausen, Op. cit., p. 298: "Die Vorgaenger, an welche sich die Semlersche Auslegungstheorie anschlieszt, sind Hugo Grotius als Exeget, Wetstein als Hermeneut."

Verstehenslehre an, die er dann vor allem in seinem apparatus ad liberalem Nl. Ti. interpretationem, 1767--Vet. Test. 1773--, entwickelte), schuf Ernesti in seiner berühmten Institutio Interpretis Nl. Ti. (²1765, ⁴1792) das hermeneutische Lehrbuch, an dem noch Schleiermacher sich bebildete. Der scharfsinnige Mann hatte vor allem an dem Studium der Antike sich die Grundsätze einer echten grammatischen Interpretation entwickeln gelernt, die er jetzt auf die Auslegung des N.T.s uebertrug. Der Literalsinn wird wieder streng betont: ihn gilt es -- man spuert den Gegensatz zur pietistischen Theorie der Hermeneutik -- auf streng grammatischem Wege zu eruieren, die Erforschung des Sprachgebrauchs musz maßgebend sein. Nur hilfweise soll die Analogie des Glaubens herbeigezogen werden; weil sie allein niemals den Sinn finden kann, erscheint es ausgeschlossen, sie als Kanon fuer die Auslegung gelten zu lassen. Die historische oder generische Interpretation wird nur schwach beruecksichtigt. Hier leistete Semler als echter Schueler Baumgartens Bedeutendes. Nicht nur grammatisch sollen wir, nach ihm, verstehen, sondern Zeit und Art der Abfassung der Schriften, Veranlassung, Zweck, Publikum und Lehrart beruecksichtigen.¹

Ernesti, in his Institutio Interpretis Novi Testamenti, laid down these three principles: 1) Every passage of Scripture has but a single meaning--the literal, grammatical, historical meaning.² 2) The Scriptures are to be interpreted in the same way as any other book.³ 3) The meaning which words have is determined by custom. To learn the meaning of words, one has to learn the usus loquendi of those who wrote the words. If the interpreter knows the latter, he can know the former. The usus loquendi of a word is determined by many factors: time, place, religious and

-
1. Das Verstehen, I, 17-18, note.
 2. Inst. Int. Nl. Ti., I, I, I, 6 and 15.
 3. Ibid., I, I, I, 16.

moral conditions, community and state life.¹

Ernesti easily pushed aside the problem of types, giving it a single paragraph and adopting the view which the Arminian followers of Grotius taught.² He repeats the old position on Allegory: It is not a sense of Scripture; it can have a certain use as illustration of doctrine if it is apt and moderate; it is easily abused and made ridiculous. What has been called the typical sense, he said, is not properly a sense, for it rests not in words, but in certain things which God wished to be signs of future things. Seeking what is typical in Scripture does not require a great deal of ingenuity on the part of the interpreter, for the testimony of the Holy Spirit has plainly indicated what is typical and we ought not to go beyond what He has pointed out in express words, e.g., Adam, Rom. 5,14; Jonah, Matt. 12,39; Melchisedek, Heb. 5,7. Those who point out types on the basis alone of what they believe to be the "intention" of the Holy Ghost are dealing with the unknown and are opening the way to caprice and to finding types everywhere. For one can impossibly know the plan of the Holy Spirit unless He Himself has given a plain indication of it. A type differs from an allegory in that the latter involves a comparison with a universal principle, the former with a singular thing. Types are comparisons drawn from outstanding persons and rites of Old

1. Ibid., I, I, I, 12-13, 20. Cf. also Klausen, op. cit., pp. 291-294.

2. Inst. Int. Ni. Ti., I, I, I, 10.

Testament history. Types were very familiar to the Jews. The more the New Testament writers used the Jewish manner of writing (e.g., Matthew and Paul), the more frequently they heaped up types. The less they followed the Jewish manner, the scarcer are the types found in their writings (e.g., John). Types should not be extended beyond the point of comparison. They should be explained in such a way that it is plain that they do not pertain to the essence of the Christian religion, but to its external dress only.¹

While Ernesti pressed the claims of grammatical interpretation, Semler, writing brilliantly and voluminously (171 books), proceeded in historical criticism of the Scriptures. Typology suffered at his hands.

Kurtz writes:

In a far greater measure than either Ernesti or Michaelis did J. Sol. Semler . . . help on the cause of rationalism. He had grown up under the influence of Halle Pietism in the profession of a customary Christianity, which he called his private religion, which contributed to his life a basis of genuine personal piety. But with a rare subtlety of reasoning as a man of science, endowed with rich scholarship, and without any wish to sever himself from Christianity, he undermined almost all the supports of the theology of the Church . . . This he did by casting doubt on the genuineness of the biblical writings, by setting up a theory of inspiration and accommodation which admitted the presence of error, misunderstanding, and pious fraud in the Scriptures, by a style of exposition which put aside everything unattractive in the New Testament as "remnants of Judaism," . . . He sowed the wind, and reaped the whirlwind, by which he himself was driven along . . . He applied himself eagerly to refute the "Wolfen-

1. Ibid., I, I, I, 10.

buettel Fragments" of Reimarus, edited by Lessing in 1774-1778, which represented Christianity as founded upon pure deceit and fraud But the current was not thus to be stemmed, and Semler died broken-hearted at the sight of the heavy crop from his own sowing.¹

To quote Semler himself:

Die Auslegung des N. Test. ist vornaeemlich geschichtlich, und beschreibt die Thaten oder Bestrebungen und Veranstaltungen jener Zeit, darauf berechnet, die Christen damaliger Zeit zu sammeln und zu befestigen.²

Bei dem aelteren juedischen Volke war eine gewisse symbolische, man koennte sagen mythologische Beschreibung der uebersinnlichen Dinge allgemein, wovon sich hin und wieder in den heiligen Buechern Spuren finden: so vom Staate und der Gemeinschaft der Todten, vom Tode als Herrscher und Tyrann, von den Stroemen und Schlingen des Todes, vom Paradiese als einem lieblichen Garten. Diese Bilder kommen nicht selten in den alten Gedichten vor; sie verrathen den Geist der alten Morgenlaender und uralte Ueberlieferung, nicht aber goettlichen Ursprung und Offenbarung. Dieser Art zu sprechen und zu beschreiben konnten sich die heiligen Verfasser nicht enthalten; sie haetten sonst die Gesetze der wahren Geschichte verletzt, von welcher die vollkommnere, metaphysische Kenntnisz, die sich fuer Menschen zu einer andern Zeit und an einem anderen Orte schickte, als weit entfernt zu denken war. Also reden Christus und die Apostel, weil sie es mit den Menschen damaliger Zeit zu thun hatten, sowie diese zu reden pflegten; sie reden davon, auf zwoelf Stuehlen im Gericht zu sitzen, mit Abraham im Himmelreich zu sitzen, ins Paradies einzugehen; die Daemonischen werden so gesund gemacht, wie es die Anwesenden erwarteten. Kurz: das Word ward ihnen so verkuendigt, sie sie es zu empfangen im Stande waren, nicht aber so, wie es die voellige Wahrheit zu jeder Zeit forderte. Auch die Juenger bedurften der Schonung, da sie sich noch nicht in den geistigen Lehrer finden konnten.³

1. Op. cit., III, 146-147.

2. Institutio Brevior ad Liberalem Eruditionem Theologicam (1765), I, 1, 57 (quoted by Klausen, op. cit., p. 299).

3. Quoted ibid., p. 301.

The same was true of the use of the Old Testament by Jesus and the apostles:

Um die Juden zu ueberzeugen, haben sie Unterstuetzung und Beweisgruende aus den Buechern derselben entlehnt, nicht aber in der Absicht, dasz alle Anderen sich streng an alle die unter den Juden geltenden Meinungen halten sollten, durch welche die ganze Geschichte dieses Volks, nicht ohne Aberglauben, geheiligt zu werden pflegte, so dasz die Religion des Geistes und der Wahrheit durch die Ehrfurcht gegen die duerftigen Grundelemente gehindert wurde.¹

Michaelis was professor at Goettingen and a learned scholar in oriental and Old Testament studies. In his Commentaries on the Laws of Moses (1770-1775) he took up the theme which John Spencer and Clericus had played long before his time and "pressed the theory of utility to the utmost."² He "reduces Moses to a clever statesman who gave to utility a religious sanction."³

Praiseworthy in the influential work of these three men is the stress they laid on careful grammatical, philological, and historical research in determining the meaning of Scripture. Tragically faulty was the rationalistic assumption drawn from their work that the laws of grammar and history govern all that is said in Scripture and that Scripture stands or falls on whether it complies with these laws.

If one says that Scripture is governed by the laws of

-
1. Ibid.
 2. Uehler, op. cit., p. 31. Cf. also Kurtz, op. cit., III, 146.
 3. Farrar, op. cit., p. 402.

human language and the laws of human history, what is that but to say that it is governed by human concepts, by human reason? For what are laws of language and laws of history and historical procedure but concepts at which men have arrived on the basis of human observations and experience? If one asserts that Scripture can say nothing that contradicts natural laws of language and history, what is that but to exclude, a priori, the possibility of Scripture saying anything or recording any fact which is supernatural? It must be said that Ernesti and Semler did not draw these conclusions. But many of their followers drew them avidly. Among them were such men as Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752-1827) and H. E. G. Paulus (1761-1851), "who, with all their learning, could find no better explanation for the supernatural element in both dispensations than a theory of mistake, hyperbole, and ignorance."¹ It soon became apparent that crude rationalism would either have to be provided with a sounder philosophical basis and a more scholarly development, or be abandoned.

Dorner writes of the period immediately following Ernesti and Semler:

Theology, now that it had thrown off the authority of the symbolical books, and of the "regula" or "analogia" fidei previously found therein, instead of explaining Scripture by Scripture, and placing full trust in its power and right to interpret itself, brought to its work another canon, to wit,

1. Farrar, op. cit., p. 402.

the rational ideas, the pretended wisdom of Illuminism, and all sorts of elements which it fancied to have constituted primitive Christianity.¹

Luther had stressed the need for grammatical and historical studies in understanding Scripture, but he conjoined the principle that Scripture is its own interpreter. It owes obeisance to no human traditions and laws. It has the right to speak for itself and pronounce the rules according to which it is to be interpreted. Luther moreover noted the place which God has in the understanding of Scripture. The full understanding of Scripture only begins with the intellectual grasp of the grammatical sense. The Holy Spirit alone can give one a full understanding of the meaning which the words convey.

It is true, as Ernesti says, that "the verbal sense of Scripture must be determined in the same way in which we ascertain that of other books."² But it is not Scripture's subservience to natural laws that gives truth to that statement. Laws of language and laws of what history ought to be are generalizations at which men have arrived inductively, through natural experience. But introduce the supernatural into history or into the production of literature, let God have a hand in it, and anything can happen. Laws of interpretation based on natural experience go by the board as no longer adequate to cope with the situation. We cannot pass judgment

1. Isaac Dorner, The Doctrine of the Person of Christ, Div. II, Vol. III, p. 25.

2. Inst. Int. Ni. Ti., I, I, I, 16.

on the basis of them. We find ourselves beyond their realm of jurisdiction.

Scripture, as literature given by God, is in a class by itself and lays down its own rules of interpretation. Even such rules as the literal sense being one, and that a person has to study grammar to determine the literal sense, are true not because they are true everywhere else, but only because Scripture itself indicates them to be true in its case. Ordinarily, Scripture concurs with natural laws of interpretation. But it always reserves the right to do otherwise. The validity of the grammatical sense of Scripture rests not on a natural, rational principle, but upon what Scripture says about itself, and in particular, upon the way in which the latter parts of the Old Testament make use of the earlier parts and upon the way in which the New Testament writers make use of the Old Testament.

When Scripture states that by divine intervention certain historical phenomena are, in a special sense, images and types of other phenomena, we are in a realm where natural laws of history and language are useless for judging. We can say nothing on the basis of them. We can only look in the Scriptures themselves for criteria on the basis of which to interpret and understand these types. We cannot say that only those things are types which Scripture itself declares to be types. That statement would be valid only if Scripture itself made it. But Scripture does not.

VI. The Nineteenth Century

The nineteenth century, so productive in all branches of theology, made great attempts to understand the typology of Scripture.

Bishop Herbert Marsh (1757-1839), in his Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible (1828) reasserted the principle that we have a right to regard as prefigurative only those things which the New Testament in express words declares to be so.¹ He wrote:

There is no other rule by which we can distinguish a real from a pretended type than that of Scripture itself. There are no other possible means by which we can know that a previous design and a pre-ordained connection existed. Whatever persons or things, therefore, recorded in the Old Testament, were expressly declared by Christ or by His apostles to have been designed as prefigurations of persons or things relating to the New Testament, such persons or things so recorded in the former are types of the persons or things with which they are compared in the latter. But if we assert that a person or thing was designed to prefigure another person or thing, where no such prefiguration has been declared by divine authority, we make an assertion for which we neither have, nor can have, the slightest foundation.²

Fairbairn records the names of many nineteenth century British scholars who followed Marsh in this view. In his criticism of it, Fairbairn writes:

-
1. Cf. Fairbairn, op. cit., I, 14-24.
 2. Ibid., I, 19.

While the field, as to its extent, was greatly circumscribed, and in its boundaries ruled as with square and compass, nothing was done in the way of investigating it internally or unfolding the grounds of connection between type and anti-type. Fewer points of resemblance are usually presented to us between the one and the other by the writers of this school than are found in works of an older date; but the resemblances themselves are quite as much of a superficial and outward kind. The real harmony and connection between the Old and the New in the divine dispensations stood precisely where it was . . . It drops a golden principle for the sake of avoiding a few lawless aberrations. With such narrow limits as it sets to our inquiries, we cannot indeed wander far into the regions of extravagance. But in the very prescription of these limits, it wrongfully shuts us up to errors scarcely less to be deprecated than those it seeks to correct. For it destroys to a large extent the bond of connection between the Old and the New Testament Scriptures, and thus deprives the Christian Church of much of the instruction in divine things which they were designed to impart. Were men accustomed, as they should be, to search for the germs of Christian truth in the earliest Scriptures, and to regard the inspired records of both covenants as having for their leading object "the testimony of Jesus," they would know how much they were losers by such an undue contraction of the typical element in Old Testament Scriptures.¹

In Germany, however, generally speaking, leading scholars took one of two courses. Either they said that the Old Testament in its entirety was typical of the New, or they said that the Old Testament was typical of nothing.

It is not, of course, within the scope of this sketch to deal in any detail with the latter group, who rigorously assaulted and discarded as sources of revelation both Old and New Testament, to the glorification of man and his

1. Ibid., I, 20.

reason; who replayed the old tunes of accommodation and pagan influence and added to them the variant themes of myth, fraud, and redaction. The views of such writers as Georg Friedrich Creuzer (1771-1858); David Friedrich Straus (1808-1874); Bruno Bauer (1809-1882); Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860) and his school of Tuebingen; Ernest Renan (1823-1892); as well as Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918)--the views of these men and their followers, interesting as they may be, do not concern us here, since typology is of little or no importance once one has disallowed, altogether or in large part, the historical value or supernatural content of either Testament.

Among scholars who ranged in their views anywhere to the right of extreme left, Bengel's proposals regarding the relation of Old and New Testament were extremely popular and were developed in sundry ways,¹ Bengel, as we have already seen, had been struck by God's unified and purposeful development of history and by the unity of the Scriptures, recording, as they do, God's revelation of the secrets of His kingdom, purposefully, step by step, down through the ages, till Christ comes in glory.² Cocceius' idea of the dispensations in history had been somewhat similar, and Luther's treatment of Old Testament times as the period in which Moses was leading to Christ came not a whit behind

1. Cf. Fritsch, *op. cit.*, Oct.-Dec., 1946, p. 419.
 2. See above, pp. 101-103.

in showing a teleological factor in history.

Before the end of the eighteenth century, in the very midst of the scoffing Enlightenment, the Romanticist Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803)¹ had raised his voice in behalf of the Scriptures and said:

The whole Old Testament rests on an ever fuller development of certain primitive promises, images, results, and their whole combined sense--their ever wider and more spiritual purpose: the New Testament was therefore a fulfilling of the Old, as the kernel appears when all the shells and husks that hid it are stripped off. They were stripped off gradually, and with ever increasing delicacy, till Christ appeared; and they shall yet be universally recognized as having one divine end, when He shall come with His kingdom.²

This approach was to recur again and again in the works of nineteenth century writers. We cannot hope to discuss here all who wrote on the relation of Old and New Testaments, and particularly on the special subject of typology. Nor can we present an extensive criticism of each view. As we shall see, certain faults and abuses occur and recur in treating typology in this manner. We mention a few of them in advance. Theologians were inclined to look at types solely from God's viewpoint. The attempt to reach this outlook resulted in much speculation. It frequently resulted, moreover, in a poor evaluation of what types meant to the people of the Old Testament and of what they should mean to

1. Cf. Wach, op. cit., I, 19. See also Farrar, op. cit., pp. 405-406.

2. The eighteenth of Herder's Letters on the Study of Theology, cited by Oehler, op. cit., p. 35.

us in the New Testament age. Other pitfalls of this sort of typology were inclinations to eliminate the supernatural from Biblical typology and to place it on a natural, secular basis; or to exalt typology at the expense now of verbal prophecy, now of the clarity of God's revelation.

A. Schleiermacher

Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768-1834) came upon the scene as "the founder of what may be called the psychological school of exegesis."¹ Schleiermacher does not discuss typology in his posthumous Hermeneutik und Kritik. But in Der Christliche Glaube he lays down an historical rationale of types.

In Schleiermacher's view, Christ, the founder of the Church, is at once historical and archetypal. His archetypal character consists "in the purity and vigour of His consciousness of God."² This character He communicates to the collective life of the Church. And "as the new collective life becomes an historical, natural thing, it follows that the old collective life of sin also in itself . . . stands in connection with the new; and if we look at history as a whole, we must treat it as a natural course, in which the appearance even of the Redeemer is no longer a supernatural thing, but the coming forth of a new stage of development, conditioned by that which went before."³ Christ, then, is

1. Farrar, op. cit., p. 409.
 2. Dorner, op. cit., II, III, 179.
 3. Ibid., p. 184.

the completion of creation, which before Him was incomplete. He is the beginner of the completed creation, which could not be attained without Him. The creation of man is thus divided into two momenta. God ordered the first momentum only in relation to the second. All who lived in the first momentum of history bore a relation to and possessed a part in Him who would be the completion of creation.¹ This is the basis of typology. But let us hear Schleiermacher himself:

Wie nun nicht nur der Mensch Jesus der zweite Adam heisst, welches doch nur sagen kann der zweite Gottgeschaffene, sondern auch alle Wiedergeborenen die neue Kreatur heissen, und also auch das noch als Schoepfung aufgestellt wird, was wir mit vollem Recht urspruenglich als Erhaltung darstellen, naemlich als Erhaltung der sich immer weiter bewachrenden Kraeftigkeit Christi zur Erloesung und Beseligung; so ist auch umgekehrt die Erscheinung Christi selbst anzusehen als Erhaltung naemlich der von Anbeginn der menschlichen Natur eingepflanzten und sich fortwachrend entwickelnden Empfaenglichkeit der menschlichen Natur eine solche schlechthinige Kraeftigkeit des Gottesbewusstseins in sich aufzunehmen. Denn kam gleich bei der ersten Schoepfung des Menschengeschlechtes nur der unvollkommene Zustand der menschlichen Natur zur Erscheinung: so war doch das Erscheinen des Erloesers ihr auf unzeitliche Weise schon eingepflanzt . . . Auch schlieszt sich von hier aus, was doch immer eine wichtige Frage fuer die christliche Betrachtung gewesen ist, die Beziehung Christi auf diejenigen, welche vor seinem Erscheinen gelebt haben, oder raemlich von dem durch ihn beseelten Gesamtleben getrennt sind, deutlicher auf. Wenn naemlich der erste Schoepfungsmoment von Gott nur mit Beziehung auf den zweiten geordnet ist: so musz offenbar das naemliche auch gelten von allem, was mit ihm einen

1. Friedrich Schleiermacher, Der Christliche Glaube (2nd ed.), II, pp. 20-21.

und denselben Naturzusammenhang bildet. Dem zufolge musz in der goettlichen ordnenden Anschauung alles der ersten Weltzeit angehoerige einen Antheil haben an der Beziehung auf den Erloeser. Zugleich erscheint dann um so natuerlicher, dasz diese sonst verborgene Beziehung auch an einzelnen Punkten besonders herab strete, welche Voraussetzung eben das Aufsuchen von Vorbildern und Weissagungen motivirt.¹

B. De Wette

The thoughts which Wilhelm Martin De Wette (1780-1849) expressed about history remind us a little of Origen. G. Frank, summarizing De Wette's position, writes:

Knowledge has to do only with finite things; while the infinite must be grasped by faith under the form of feeling. The infinite is revealed by the finite in a symbolical manner. The whole historical revelation is a symbol in which eternal and supersensuous ideas have found their expression.²

In an article which De Wette wrote late in life, entitled Contribution to the Characteristic Features of Hebraism, he said:

Christianity sprang out of Judaism. Long before Christ appeared, the world was prepared for His appearance: the entire Old Testament is a great prophecy, a great type of Him who was to come, and has come. Who can deny that the holy seers of the Old Testament saw in spirit the advent of Christ long before He came, and in prophetic anticipations, sometimes more, sometimes less clear, described the new doctrine? The typological comparison, also, of the Old Testament with the New, was by no means a mere play of fancy; nor can it be regarded as altogether the result of accident, that the evangelical history, in the most important particulars, runs parallel with the Mosaic. Christianity lay in Judaism as leaves

1. Ibid.

2. New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, XII, 332.

and fruit do in the seed, though certainly it needed the divine sun to bring them forth.¹

Of this latter statement of De Wette, Oehler writes:

It appears from his essay on The Exposition of the Psalms for Edification . . . that De Wette regarded the development of the views expressed in these essays as belonging not to scientific theology, but to the practical treatment of the Old Testament for ends of edification.²

C. Olshausen

Hermann Olshausen (1796-1839) wrote a small booklet in 1824 entitled Ein Wort Ueber Tiefern Schriftsinn. He sought to distinguish false and genuine allegorical interpretation. The fundamental error of the old allegorists, he said, from which all their arbitrary conclusions arose, was that they attributed to Scripture a double sense, the second of which was entirely different from the meaning indicated by the words. But there is a genuine sort of allegorizing which is employed frequently by New Testament writers. This method recognizes no sense but the literal sense. But it does recognize a deeper sense, which is internally and essentially connected with the literal meaning and is necessarily given along with it and in it. This deeper sense can be ascertained by certain fixed rules. It is based on the principle of general harmony in the world. All individuals, both in the natural and spiritual world, form an organic system. All phenomena, whether

1. Quoted in Fairbairn, op. cit., p. 34.

2. Op. cit., p. 35.

of the higher or the lower sphere, appear as copies of that which is the essence of their respective ideas. Thus the whole is pictured in the individual and the individual in the whole.

This fact, which has universal application, said Olshausen, is shown in the way in which the New Testament interprets the Old. Hence from the New Testament one can learn the rules for all interpretation of the Word, nature, and history. In the relation of Israel to Jehovah there is the picture of humanity and of every individual in their relation to God. In the relation of Israel to other nations there is the picture of the contrast which is found everywhere and in all ages between piety and its persecutors. Israel, as the chosen, priestly nation, is the prefiguration of Jesus as the Anointed of the Lord, the eternal High Priest. And all holy contenders for the truth and all men who are engaged in the quest for holiness are, on the other hand, a picture of the nation Israel and hence, also, of Christ.¹

It appears, however, that Olshausen's discussion does not do justice to, much less solve, the problem of types in Scripture. Klausen remarks that whether it is called a second sense or a deeper sense, it is still a sort of allegorizing which permits of all subjectivity.² Olshausen takes the types of Scripture out of the realm of the extraordinary and says that not only everything in the Old Testament, but

1. Klausen, op. cit., pp. 333-335; Fairbairn, op. cit., pp. 35-37.

2. Op. cit., p. 335.

everything in life, is typical. This does not at all give due weight to what is said in Scripture of types. Olshausen makes the typical quality of things an essential feature of them which follows inevitably from the constitution of the world. It could not be otherwise. Yet were not the Mosaic institutions, which are a large part of the problem of types, instituted according to a certain design by a special, extraordinary plan and command of God? Did not the men whom Scripture points out as typical--Adam, David, Elijah--achieve their typical quality because of extraordinary divine intervention in their lives? Moreover, it hardly follows from Olshausen's premise of an organic system in the world that one cannot speak of isolated phenomena without at the same time speaking of the "whole show." The whole purpose of language is to enable people to make clear to what particular things they are referring.

D. Stier

Rudolph Stier (1800-1862) had an unusual theory of interpretation. He placed typology in as high a place of importance as Cocceius had given it, and developed it in a way which was all his own. In his reaction against the one-sidedness of the grammatical-historical interpretation of his day, he went much farther than Olshausen.¹

1. Wach, op. cit., II, p. 186.

In his book Die Stufen und das Ziel der Bibelauslegung he pointed out three steps, or degrees, in interpretation.

The first step in interpreting Scripture is grammatical-historical. It must determine the immediate sense of the words according to the connection in which they stand. To understand a dead language, one has to place himself into the viewpoint of the people who used that language and understand the circumstances of their times. The same holds true for understanding a language which speaks of higher, spiritual things. One has to have the viewpoint of the higher world to understand them.¹ "Stier laeszt solches Wissen von Hoeheren dem Menschen durch 'Eroeffnung von oben', durch Offenbarung zuteil werden und darum fordert er fuer das Verstaendnis ihrer Sprache ein Eingehen in das besondere Leben dieses Gebietes . . . Die Mitteilung dieser Offenbarung hat eine besondere Sprache werden lassen, fuer deren Verstaendnis also nicht die Kenntnis des natuerlichen Idioms des Offenbarungsvolkes genuegt."² The profane Oriental philology can no more suffice for understanding the special content of the Hebrew of the Old Testament than a knowledge of classical Greek can suffice for penetrating the New Testament. "Die heilige Schrift braucht ihre eigentuemliche Philologie, wie Stier sagt, 'aus dem goettlichen Logos, dessen Sinn sich von Anfang in sie gesenkt hat,' dessen 'Pneuma', so

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

fahrt er fort, 'in stufenweiser Fortschreitung das nur von
Menschensprachen entlehnte ἁγίασμα sich dienstbar
macht."¹ The organic nature of the concepts basic to the
holy language has to be understood in its essence and in its
full manifestation. Only in this way is a true grammatical-
historical interpretation conceivable.² Step one, therefore,
is to understand the idiom of the Holy Spirit.

The Word can be understood only through the Spirit which
works in it; the Scripture bears within it the Spirit by
which it is understood. The interpreter must let himself be
guided by that Spirit, otherwise "kommt ein eigenwilligen
System heraus statt der biblischen Grundbegriffe."³ In
approaching the Scriptures there is more need of reverence
than of criticism.

The fact that the Scripture is the language of the Spirit
gives it not only unity and simplicity, but a deeper, fuller
meaning. "Die Ueberzeugung von der Tiefe und Fuelle des
Inhalts der Schrift aber ist eine der entscheidenden Ueber-
zeugungen, die der hermeneutischen Theorie Stiers zugrunde
liegen. Alle Worte der Schrift haben einen tiefen Grundsinn,
dessen letzt Wurzel stets eine grosse Anschauung des Geistes
ist."⁴ It is not as correct to speak of a multiple sense
in the words of Scripture as to speak of a deeper or fuller

-
1. Ibid.
 2. Ibid., pp. 186-187.
 3. Ibid., p. 187.
 4. Ibid., p. 188.

signification. The hidden, deep signification is always the inner side of the same word.¹ Still Stier is not altogether averse to speaking of a double sense. He writes:

Und hier ist denn dem so sehr verketzerten Doppelsinn, oder richtiger Vollsin--dem alsbald ein ganzer Abschnitt gewidmet werden soll--durchaus nicht zu entgehen, und es bleibt fuer ein Geistesbuch bei v. Meyers Worte: 'So lange die Interpreten nicht an den mystischen Doppelsinn glauben, werden sie weder vernuenftig noch uebervernuenftig, weder irdisch noch geistlich interpretiren koennen.' Denn auch das Irdische ist ja nichts ohne seinen geistlichen Hintergrund.²

The second step in interpretation, according to Stier, is to grasp the symbolic language of Scripture. All Scripture is symbolic language. "Die Ausdrucksweise der heiligen Schrift ist das Gleichnis; alle Religionsprache ist 'maschal.'"³ This symbolic quality of language has its cause in the difference between the higher and the lower world.

Das Schriftwort hat zwar die Form der Menschenordnung, aber da es der Geist Gottes ist, der in ihm spricht, sagt es natuerlich mehr als dieses je tun kann. Die Beziehungen zwischen hoeherer und niederer Welt tun sich in ihm ganz anders als in den menschlichen Werken. Es ist eine "verklaerte" Sprache, in welcher der im Geiste Redende spricht; so entsteht eine "heilige Symbolik," der eine Unerschöpflichkeit des Sinnes eignet, und diese ist keineswegs auf die sog. Gleichnisse der Schrift beschraenkt. Vor allem im A. T. ist, nach Stier, alles immer zugleich "Weissagung und gottweiser Maschal fuer Forscher." Das System der Symbolik, das sich so ergibt, ist die eigentliche Grammatik der Bibel vom inneren Standpunkt aus. Anfang und Ende der uns vertrauten

1. Ibid., pp. 188 and 190.

2. Rudolph Stier, Andeutungen fuer Glaebiges Schriftverstaendnis im Ganzen und Einzelnen, p. 49.

3. Wach, op. cit., p. 189.

Geschichte sind verhüllt: von der Urvergangenheit kann Moses am Anfang nur symbolisch reden, und von der letzten Zukunft Johannes nur symbolisch.¹

In his Andeutungen fuer Glaebiges Schriftverstaendnisz im Ganzen und Einzelnen Stier, in a Platonic manner, treats all nature as symbolic of things in the higher world. He writes:

Wenn der heilige Johannes sein erstes Kapitel, von der geistlichen Schoepfung durch Christum, sichtbar genau dem ersten Kapitel Moses von der leiblichen Schoepfung nachbildet, so will er uns damit lehren, was schon am Anfange dieser Blaetter betrachtet worden, nemlich, die Bildlichkeit der ganzen leiblichen Schoepfung fuer die geistige. So dasz, wenn Origenes die mosaische Schoepfungsgeschichte geistlich uebersetzt, er zwar in einzelnen Spielereien Unrecht haben kann und hat, darum aber nicht auch im allgemeinen Gedanken. Und ist es nicht unser Herr und Meister selber, der in seinen Gleichnissen uns an den Bildern der leiblichen Schoepfung den geheimen Ursinn der geistlichen aufdeckt? Und ist hiefuer nicht die ganze Bildsprache der heiligen Schrift im A. und N. T. unsre Lehrerin? Ja, schon die ganze Natur an sich ist ein Typensystem, von dem, in ihr das geistige Urverhaeltnisz abschattenden Urverhaeltnisz zwischen Licht und Finsterniss--bis zu den kleinsten, einzelsten Beziehungen der zeugenden Kraefte und Gestalten. Alles Leibliche ist eben Leib, d.h., Physiognomie einer Seele, und wer die grosze Physiognomik der Welten versteht, blickt in den Spiegel des Angesichtes Gottes. Alles Koerperliche steht und beruht ja nur im Geistlichen, hat nur darin seines Daseins Sinn und Moeglichkeit, denn Gott schafft keine Schale ohne Kern, nicht einmal im Microcosmus der Pflanzenwelt buchstaeblich--es sei denn etwa Miszgeburt. Wer moechte aber die ganze Welt zur groszen Miszgeburt machen? Wie die thun, welche "die waechserne Frucht selber verschlingen anstatt zu kaufen, was sie vorstellt." Es koennte z.B. gar kein Wachsen im Reich der Dinge da sein, wenn es nicht erstlich und vor Allem

1. Ibid.

ein geistliches Wachsen gäbe, als dessen Bild dann nur das körperliche sich herausbildet, kein leibliches Sehen, wenn nicht vorher ein, dies erst belebendes, geistliches.¹

So wie die Rabbinen von einem himmlischen Tempelurbilde sprachen, nach der Schrift 2 Mos. 25,40; Hebr. 12,22, nelmlich symbolisch ausgedrueckt, fuers Hoehere die Sprachhieroglyphe vom Niedern nehmend; also ist die ganze Natur solch ein Tempel nach hoeherem Urbild, das wir im Nachbild erkennen und also nach ihm bezeichnen. Man denke an Platons Ideen.²

There is yet a third step in interpretation, namely, grasping the "Geschichts- oder Anstaltssymbolik." By this Stier meant much the same as Cocceius had set forth in his discussions of the separate divine dispensations in history and the typical-antitypical relation existing between them.³ In the relation of the Old Testament and New Testament Stier sees, as it were, a microcosm, a creation in miniature. The same relation exists between the Old and New Testaments as between the physical and the spiritual worlds. The Old Testament is a symbol, a picture, a type, of the New.⁴ Of types Stier wrote:

Der Typus ist das geschichtliche Wunder, und hat daher, des Aufmerkens wegen, oft noch ein natuerliches zur Grundlage. Wie alle Natur wunderbar ist, und doch fuer uns hie und da das Wunder mehr heraustritt, eben so ist alle Geschichte typisch, und der sie geschicht hat, weisz es, aber fuer uns tritt das Typische hie und da mehr heraus. Nur darum handelt sichs also, und das heiszt uns denn im engern Sinne Typus, wie wir von Wundern im engern Sinne reden. Und wie du die Natur aus den Wundern erklaren sollst, und nicht umgekehrt, denn

-
1. Ibid., p. 154.
 2. Ibid., p. 151.
 3. Wach, op. cit., II, 190.
 4. Ibid.

Gott gibt dir in den Wundern ein Licht fuer die Natur: so sollst du auch nicht die Bibelgeschichte auf die weltliche zurueckfuehren, sondern umgekehrt, denn Gott hat uns hier Sein Wort besonders hervortreten lassen, zum Richtmaasz und Licht fuer Alles Andere.¹

Israel ist Lehrbild in Allem, in Verfassung, Gesetz, Geschichte. Nicht nur seine Geschichte ist ganz besonders ein Spiegel der lehrenden und leitenden Hand Gottes, nicht nur sein Gesetz macht es zum Abbild der ganzen natuerlichen Menschheit unter dem Gesetze; sondern wie jede niedere Stufe in der Entwicklung schon die Ahnung der folgenden hoehern bedingt, ja voellig ihr Bild wird aus dem Verstaendnisz der hoeheren herab, wie also die natuerliche Menschheit Vorbild der wiedergeborenen, und das Gesetz des erstern eine Weissagung vom Evangelio der letztern--so ist nun ueber dem allen das irdische Israel auch noch Vorbild des geistlichen, wenn der Messias gekommen ist; die sichtbare Theokratie schattet in all ihrem Organismus schon die unsichtbare ab. Und so hat Gott im ganzen Israel vom Reiche des Messias geweissaget; und gerade das ist eine sehr wuerdige Sprache des lebendigen Gottes, der es allein konnte. Wer es also glaubt, traemt nicht unvernuenftig, sondern weisz und redet, was goettliche, mithin wahrlich aecht vernuenftige Wahrheit und Weisheit ist.²

E. Hofmann

The totally typical character of the Old Testament is described within still another rationale by Johann Christian Konrad von Hofmann (1810-1877). Hofmann found the germs of the future realities of the Gospel not in the prophetic announcements in the Old Testament, but in the typical character of its history. His best-known works are Weissagung und Erfuellung (1841-45) and Der Schriftbeweis (1852-56).

1. Andeutungen, p. 156.

2. Ibid., p. 159.

1. Hofmann presents four factors which the interpreter has to bear in mind as he approaches Scripture.

- a. The Scripture is a presently-valid supernatural document, supernatural in its origin and in its content, presenting to the reader the will of God and His plan of redemption.
- b. The Scriptures are Israelitic in origin, content, language, and in the history it presents of the people chosen to play a meaningful part in the history of redemption.
- c. The Scriptures are documents from the past which find their unity in the uniform testimony they bear to the saving truth.
- d. The interpreter must approach Scripture as a member of the Church.¹

2. Hofmann's purpose in Weissagung und Erfuellung was to replace "the mechanical concept of prophecy as a forecasting of particular facts" with the deeper concept of prophetic history, or history as prophecy.²

3. The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia writes:

He brought prophecy into closest connection with history, and treated it as an organic whole. History itself is prophecy; and each period contains the germs of the future, and prefigures it. The entire Scriptural history is a prophecy of the final and eternal relation between God and man. The incarnation marks the beginning of the essential fulfillment; for Christ is the new man, the antitype of the old; but it marks only the beginning of this fulfillment; for the head is only the realization of the intended perfect communion with God when it is joined with the body of believers. Prophecy in the Old Testament becomes ever richer and richer in its forms, but points only to one goal--the Godman. He is then,

1. Wach, op. cit., II, pp. 371-374.

2. Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, II, 1983-1984.

in turn, the starting-point for new prophecy and hope; his appearance being the prefigurement of the final glorification of the church of believers.¹

4. Joachim Wach, analyzing Hofmann's position, says:

Dem theologischen Verstaendnis der Geschichtserzaehlung und der Heilsverkueundigung im AT sind zwei Abschnitte in Hofmanns Hermeneutik gewidmet. Es gilt die alttestamentliche Geschichte in ihren Grundzuegen, d.h., typisch zu verstehen. Haben wir die typische Bedeutung des Ganzen einer Tatsache verstanden, dann koennen wir auch die einzelnen Zuege richtig deuten. Jedenfalls ist die gesamte Geschichte als durch einen Zielpunkt bestimmt zu denken, so dasz, wie Hofmann sagt, in allen wesentlichen Punkten ihres Fortschritts ihr Zielpunkt vorstufig, also auch vorbildlich zu denken ist . . . Die Garantien gegen eine Willkuer in der Auffassung sieht Hofmann . . . in der Anwendung der Oben genannten vierfachen Ruecksicht.²

5. Hofmann gives an illustration of what he means by the prophetic or typical quality of history in Weissagung und Erfuellung:

Every triumphal procession which passed through the streets of Rome was a prophecy of Augustus Caesar; for what he displayed through the whole of his career, was here displayed by the triumphant general on his day of honor, namely, the god in the man, Jupiter in the Roman citizen. In the fact that Rome paid such honors to its victorious commanders, it pointed to the future, when it should rule the world through the great emperor, to whom divine honors should be paid.³

He compares this with a Scriptural type, the passover lamb:

The meaning of the triumph was not fully realized in the constantly recurring triumphal processions; and so also the meaning of the passover was not fully realized in the yearly passover meals; but the essential meaning of both was to be fully developed at some future period, when the prophecy contained in them should also be fully confirmed.³

1. V, 312.

2. Op. cit., II, pp. 376-377.

3. I, p. 15 (translation from Fairbairn, op. cit., I, 38).

6. Hengstenberg writes:

This is the plan proposed by Hofmann. A truly prophetic character he attributes to history alone. In his opinion the prophets do not reveal secrets which the Lord has communicated to them, his servants . . . On the contrary they are nothing but interpreters of history, and they proclaim nothing more than is put within the reach of an acute and far-seeing mind by the circumstances of any age. They do not stand above history to mark out its course with the eagle glance of a seer absorbed in God; in reality, they are nothing but what the rationalists thought them . . . far-seeing politicians, who could discern in the present the germs of future times. Prophecy is not a light shining in a dark place (2 Pet. 1,19), but is simply raised a few inches above the ordinary standpoint, the distinction between the two being nothing more than that between genius and the common understanding.¹

7. History, and history alone, is prophecy. In Hofmann's view, God's activity among men was his revelation to men. The incarnation could not be told until it was a fact. Hence the fact that the Messiah would be God is not, according to Hofmann, foretold in the Old Testament. The Old Testament contains only the movement toward the union of God and man, but does not contain an anticipation of the knowledge of it.²

8. Hofmann did, indeed, admit some genuine forecastings in the Old Testament, e.g., the prophecy in Genesis of the sojourn of 400 years in Egypt, Jeremiah's prophecy of the return from Babylon after seventy years, and numerous prophecies in Daniel.³

1. Ernst Hengstenberg, Christology of the Old Testament, Eng. tr., 1865, IV, pp. 389-390.
 2. Ibid., IV, p. 393; Oehler, op. cit., p. 38.
 3. Hengstenberg, op. cit., IV, p. 394.

9. Fairbairn writes, by way of criticism:

It is only as contemplated from the divine point of view that the triumphal procession could with any propriety be said to foreshadow the imperial dignity--a point of view which the event alone rendered it possible for men to apprehend; and the so-called prophecy, therefore, when closely considered and designated by its proper name, was merely the divine purpose secretly moulding the events which were in progress, and, through these, marching on to its accomplishment. This, and nothing more (since Zion is put on a footing with Rome), is the kind of prophecy which Hofmann would find, and find exclusively, in the facts and circumstances Israelitish history.¹

10. In refutation of Hofmann's manner of limiting prophecy to history, Franz Delitzsch (1813-1890) wrote:

History is the occasion of prophecy, not its measure. History prophesies, because God is in it; prophecy does so, because God is superior to history. Prophecy soars above history, not history above prophecy . . . Prophecy receives those wings which carry it far above the present, not from history, but from the omniscient God, who reveals to every particular time so much as He pleases, and as corresponds to its necessities. Though history may ever carry under its heart that which is to be the operating force in the next development, God carries the beginning, middle, and end of all history in His heart; and prophecy beholds as much of this as He opens to its spiritual eye.²

F. Hengstenberg

Of Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg (1802-1869) Kurtz writes: "He deserves the credit of having given a great impulse to Old Testament studies and a powerful defence of

1. Op. cit., p. 39.

2. Quoted by Karl F. Keil, Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, Eng. tr., 1869, p. 274.

Old Testament books."¹ He wrote vehemently against the rationalism of his day and in defence of orthodoxy.

While he held the Old Testament economy to be eminently typical, he did not base his understanding of the Old Testament on typology, as did Stier and Hofmann. Nor did the typical quality of the Old Testament consist only in its historical precedence of the New. He held the types of Scripture to be prophecies enacted in life, the meaning of which was made clear through the oral or written verbal communications of the prophets.

In his extensive work, The Christology of the Old Testament, he wrote: "The Mosaic economy was arranged with distinct reference to the economy to be founded by Christ, and was at the same time typical of it."² And again:

In general, it must be admitted that Tholuck is correct when he says, "The typical view of the Old Testament has far greater predominance in the discourses of the Redeemer than is generally admitted. He regards the Old Testament with its institutions and history and in certain of its utterances, as pre-eminently typical."³

Hengstenberg severely criticizes von Hofmann for elevating types at the expense of verbal prophecy, maintaining that such a procedure destroys the effectiveness of typical prophecy, too. Hengstenberg says:

It has always been admitted by orthodox teachers that even history possesses a prophetic importance. By the side of the prophecies, strictly

1. Op. cit., III, 196.

2. IV, pp. 427-428.

3. Ibid., IV, p. 334.

so called, they have recognized acted prophecies, or types. It is undeniable that "history is also prophecy. The past enfolds the present in the germ, and in particular points, which are discernible by the eyes of the mind; the greater may be seen in the less, the inward in the outward, and the present or the future in the past." But it is perfectly obvious that verbal prophecy is the pre-requisite and condition of the acted prophecy, and that the type is "a subordinate kind of divine testimony, which serves merely to complete the Word of the Spirit, from which at the same time light is thrown in return." Without the light which it receives from prophecy, the type by itself cannot possibly be understood; and hence, for the whole of the long ages preceding the fulfillment, it would be entirely useless. Its reality must therefore be questionable, if the necessary condition of its efficiency could not be proved to exist. If the evident proof is not to be found in prophecy, that there is a God, who rules above the world, and moves all events towards their ultimate destiny according to a preconcerted plan, then in the place of type, or the acted prophecy, we have nothing but a vague impulse, which cannot rest till that which exists already in the design has been worked out in history. Hence if prophecy in the strict sense of the word be overthrown, the acted prophecy, which is undoubtedly worthy of its name, must fall with it, and it is nothing but an illusion to attempt to elevate types at the expense of prophecy.¹

With regard to many of the messianic prophecies of the Old Testament which are cited in the New, Hengstenberg does not claim that they have only a single reference, namely, to the particular incident in connection with which the New Testament writer cites them. Hengstenberg, according to Tholuck, joined most of the contemporary scholars in assigning to Old Testament passages not a double, but a deeper and

1. Ibid., pp. 388-389.

wider sense than appears on the surface. Tholuck writes:

Durch die sogenannte organische Auslegungsweise ist das, was der aelteren Annahme eines Doppelsinnes, einer Uttveid, bei ihr dem historischen Zusammenhange des alttestamentlichen Textes sein Recht, als auf der andern Seite die neutestamentlichen Anfuhrungen von dem Vorwurfe rein subjektiver spielerischer Willkuehrlichkeit sicher gestellt werden . . . Auch die kirchliche orthodoxe Theologie ist allmaehlig auf diesen Standpunkt uebergetreten. Die veraenderte Ansicht von Hengstenberg sprach sich zuerst aus in einem Aufsatze der Ev. Kirchenzeitung 1833. No. 23.24., wo der Grundsatz aufgestellt wird, dasz die in einer Weissagung enthaltene Grundidee von ihrer zeitlichen Verwuertlichung abzuloesen sei. Auf befriedigende Weise wird von diesem Kanon im 3 Bände der Christologie Gebrauch gemacht. Der in Mal. 3, 1.23. verkuendete Prophet Elias ist nicht direkterweise Johannes der Taeufer, es ist die Personifikation der Buszpredigt, welche dem Heile vorangehen musz (Christol. III, S. 441.). Hagg. 2,6. bezieht sich nicht direkt auf die Periode des N.T's., sondern spricht die Idee aus (nach welcher dann Hengstenberg auch Hebr. 12,26. erkluert), dasz die Heiden durch ein zerstoerendes Gottesgericht ueber die Heidenwelt zur Bekehrung gefuehrt werden (a.a.O. S. 337.). Die Auffassung, nach welcher Apg. 2,16. der Ausspruch Joel 3,1.2. allein eben in jenem Faktum erfuehlt seyn soll, wird S. 190. "grob, hoelzern, ledern" genannt; die Erfuellung gehe so weit wie die Sache, die Ausgiesung des Geistes selbst. Nach Hengstenbergs neuerer Auslegung der Psalmen beruht die neutestamentliche Anwendung der Psalmen auf den Messias in solchen Stellen, wo der Saenger in der ersten Person spricht, darauf, das dieselben, indem sie den Gerechten seiner Idee nach schildern, im Messias erfuehlt werden.¹

G. Dorner

Isaak August Dorner (1809-1884) "was a great speculative genius striving at a close synthesis between philosophy and

1. Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament, pp. 9-10.

theology, faith and knowledge."¹ Laboring in systematic theology, Dorner is famed for his History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ and his System of Christian Doctrine.

Dorner adopted the view (which we have seen before in Schleiermacher) of the necessity of the incarnation apart from sin and the notion of the archetypal Christ, the union of God and man, as the perfecting of religion and the ultimate goal of the divine world order.² His position on typology is shaped in accord with this view.

Dorner treats typology in his System of Christian Doctrine. We submit the following statements as indicative of his thoughts on the subject:

In a broader sense, the entire history of ancient religion generally may be called a prediction of the perfecting of religion, i.e., of the unity of God and man. Just as the lower stages in the life of nature are as it were predictive of the higher, and give intimations of a type after which nature strives, so the same law is seen in religion.³

Its scientific thought (typology's) is, that the divine idea of the world and humanity is from the first so pervaded by the idea of completeness, that rightly understood, in harmony with the world's unity, everything must needs carry in itself its relation to the consummation of the kingdom of God, through the consummation of revelation and religion. Nature itself may be used as a symbol of higher spiritual truth, as is seen in so many of Christ's parables. Scripture itself describes this application of nature as an utterance of what was hidden in the world from its foundation, so to speak, its

-
1. J. L. Neve, The History of Christian Thought, II, p. 143.
 2. Cf. ibid. Cf. also Kurtz, op. cit., III, 200.
 3. Isaak Dorner, A System of Christian Doctrine, II, 267.

secret meaning (Matt. 13,35). According to the theory of typology, the laws in the higher and lower fields are identical, the higher being viewed as the true, perfect manifestation of the same law or relation that was announced at a lower stage. (Dorner here quotes "I am the true Vine," John 15,1; 6,32; 10,11; 4,14.) Thus typology addresses itself to that which before the advent of the absolute was in sympathy with it in the world of nature, and thus forms the right counterpoise to an absolutely supernatural notion of miracle, maintaining, as it does, the continuity of revelation and the unity of the world.¹

Undoubtedly it would be erroneous to suppose that the exposition of the typical element as a substantive prediction may form, or is meant to form, a proof of the absolute religion in the proper sense. On the contrary, this shadowy outline can only be rightly understood by means of the archetype. Still it is part of the prerogative of the absolute religion, which carries its proof within itself, and of its vocation, to demonstrate its right of property in the entire foretime. Just so, typology would make a mistake were it so to handle its material as if something took place for the mere purpose of pre-signifying the future. This would be a false hunting for teleology, and would imperil the historic apprehension. Rather, a type is only such by its not being merely a type--not merely a means of intimating something than itself--but having a signification of its own in its historic place. Typology is only possible on the basis of history. But all significant history points forward, and has relation to the consummation.²

Typology and prediction are mutually opposed. The former searches after the similarity of the stages, and assumes continuity; the latter, different new stages. It is therefore not correct, or requisite for the knowledge of historical progress, to resolve all prediction into types. A certain inclination to this is shown in von Hofmann's Weissagung und Erfuellung, as formerly in the Cocceian School.³

-
1. Ibid., II, pp. 267-268.
 2. Ibid., II, pp. 269-270.
 3. Ibid., II, p. 270.

H. Tholuck

Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck (1799-1877) published in 1860 the fifth edition of his small but rich, scholarly, and enjoyable work, Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament. After a historical discussion of the most popular views that have been held regarding the use of the Old Testament in the New, Tholuck treats in separate chapters the use of the Old Testament by Jewish writers, by Christ, by Paul, by the evangelists, and by the author of Hebrews.

He said that nearly all the theologians of his day had come to the position that the Old Testament writings have a deeper potential significance than appears on the surface, and that the cause of this is the inner organic unity of the Old and New Testaments. Tholuck adopts this view himself.

He states the problem, as he sees it, which confronts the student of the Old Testament in the New:

So lange bei den Exegeten, vermoege der Annahme einer inspiratio litteralis, die absolute Irrthumslosigkeit der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller als zweifellose Voraussetzung feststand, musste die im N. T. gegebene Auslegung und Anwendung des A. T. maaszgebend fuer die christliche Auslegungsweise des Alten T. seyn. Es ergab sich also die Aufgabe, den dem Anscheine nach von den neutestamentlichen Schriftstellern in den alttestamentlichen Stellen gefundenen specifisch christlichen Sinn auf irgend eine Art in denselben nachzuweisen. Ein zwiefacher Weg wurde hiebei eingeschlagen. Ohne Ruecksicht auf den Zusammenhang sucht der eine Theil der selteren Ausleger den specifisch christlichen Sinn als den im A. T. historisch gegebenen darzuthun; der andere, welcher die alttestamentlichen Stellen zunaechst aus dem Zusammenhange verstehen

zu messen glaubt, nimmt einen Doppelsinn, eine OnoVaid, an. Einige folgen bald der einen, bald der andern Erklärungsweise, wie in der alten Kirche die zwischen den Alexandrinern und den älteren Antiochenern die Mitte haltenden Ausleger Chrysostomus und Theodoret.¹

The following, says Tholuck, is the prevalent view:

Eine gewisse Verwandtschaft der apostolischen Hermeneutik mit der juedischen konnte hinfort nicht mehr gelaugnet werden. Die ueberwiegende Mehrzahl der Exegeten in den letzten zwanzig Jahren, einer mehr oder weniger vermittelnden Orthodoxie zugethan, ist auf die Betrachtungsweise der altantiochenischen Schule zurueckgegangen. Einerseits wird zugestanden, dass die angefuehrten alttest. Aussprueche im Zusammenhange eine andere historische Beziehung haben, andererseits wird bestritten, dass gegen die Anfuehrungen im N. T. der Vorwurf bodenloser Willkuehr erhoben werden koenne. Es wird auf den organischen Parallelismus der alt- und neutestamentlichen Oekonomie hingewiesen, vermoege dessen auch den einzelnen Beziehungen auf alttestamentliche Stellen eine gewisse Wahrheit zukomme. Wie die einzelnen bedeutungsvollen Aussprueche eines geistreichen Schriftstellers zusammenhangslos dazustehen scheinen und dennoch wie die Wasserlilien auf dem Wasserspiegel unter sich einen gemeinsamen Boden haben, in dem sie Wurzel treiben, so wurzelt auch die einzelne Beziehung auf das A. T. und die zufaellig scheinende Parallele in dem tieferen Boden des einheitlichen Principis beider Testamente.²

He adds:

So darf denn diese organisch biblische Auffassung der alttest. Citate im N. T. als die gegenwaertig unter den biblischen und kirchlichen Theologen zur Alleinherrschaft gekommene angesehen werden.³

Tholuck believes that the Savior's treatment of the Old Testament substantiates this view:

Die typische Anschauung vom A. T. hat ueberhaupt bei dem Erloeser eine weitere Herrschaft als

-
1. Friedrich Tholuck, Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testa-
ment, p. 2.
 2. Ibid., pp. 8-9.
 3. Ibid., p. 11.

gewoehnlich anerkannt wird. Er betrachtet das A. T. mit seinen Anstalten, in seiner Geschichte und in einzelnen seiner Aussprueche ueberwiegend vorbildlich. Gerade diejenige organisch-typische Betrachtungsweise des A. T., nach welcher die neuere Theologie von entgegengesetzten theologischen Standpunkten aus ein weissagendes Element in der alttestamentlichen Stiftung anzuerkennen bereit ist, ist nachweislich auch die des Erloesers gewesen.¹

He expands a bit on this view:

"Dasz es Vorbilder in Natur und Geschichte gebe, folgt schon aus dem allgemeinen Verhaeltnisse des Werdens zum Seyn und der Geschichte zum Geiste." Nicht das durch einen Hohlspiegel aus der von Gott intendirten Zukunft in die Vergangenheit zurueckgeworfene Bild ist das Vorbild, sondern die aus der Vergangenheit heraufkeimende Zukunft, wie in der Natur jede niedrigere, organische Stufe die hoehere praeformirt und in den Spielen des Kindes die Thaetigkeit des Mannes. Die Wahrheit aber der typischen Parallele tritt insbesondere da hervor, wo aus der aeuszerlich sinnbildlichen Stufe einer geschichtlichen Sphaere eine innerlich geistige Gestaltung dieses Organismus hervorgeht, wie das christliche Gottesreich aus dem juedischen: hier wird es, auch ohne alle christlich-dogmatische Voraussetzung in seiner tiefen Berechtigung anerkannt werden muessen. Nach dem merkwuerdigen Spruche 1 Petr. 1,11. ist es der schon in den Propheten vorwuerkende Geist Christi gewesen, welcher in ihnen von Christo geweissagt hat.²

Insofern diese Auslegung auf einer Geschichtsanschauung beruht, welche nur den auf verschiedenen Stufen der Geschichte in immer hoeherer Potenz sich offenbarenden Geist, das Gesetz der Geschichte, sieht, darf sie mit Beck die pneumatische genannt werden und ist schon in der alten Kirche so genannt worden.³

1. Ibid., p. 129.

2. Ibid., pp. 31-32.

3. Ibid., p. 32. The Beck referred to is Johann Tobias Beck (1804-1878), author of Versuch einer Pneumatisch-hermeneutischen Entwicklung des 9. Kapitels im Br. an die Roemer, 1833; Einleitung in das System der Christlichen Lehre, 1838, etc. Cf. Fritsch, op. cit., Oct. Dec., 1946, pp. 425-426.

I. Klausen

Henrik Nikolai Klausen was a Danish theologian who lived 1793-1877. "Als Theologe vertrat Klausen einen durch Schleiermacher stark beeinflussten Rationalismus."¹ Although in his Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments (which he dedicated to Schleiermacher) Klausen gives no room to a formal discussion of typology, discarding it along with allegory, nevertheless we treat him at this point with those who regard the entire Old Testament as typical of the New because of the position he took on the use of Old Testament references in the New.

He points out that there are quotations of the Old Testament in the New for which neither grammatical nor historical interpretation find a satisfactory explanation. These, he says, are to be judged on the basis of the religious relationship in which the Jewish nation and its Scriptures stood to Christianity. This organic relation of the Old Covenant, with its historical revelation, its law, doctrine, and cultus, to the New, is described by the New Testament writers as a promise, a prefiguring, a preparation (Heb. 9,24; Luke 24,37; Jo. 5,39; Rom. 15,4; 1 Cor. 10,11).

In this total relationship lies the principle and the rule according to which the Old Testament finds a use in the New. But while the Law and the prophets, considered as

1. Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, I, 1686.

a whole, is held to be a forecast and a prefiguration of the revelation of God which was completed in Christ, this is not true of all details. The interpreter has to remember this in treating such passages as Matt. 2,15 and Rom. 10,18, when the point of connection between the content of the passage and the Messianic idea seem to be far-fetched. It is not the concrete content of the passage which is the chief consideration, else the citation will not stand critical examination. Such passages as these have been cited only incidentally and by way of example, to indicate the total relation of the two covenants. The exegete must not deal with the meaning of the passage itself as much as with the general tone which sounds throughout the Old Testament.¹

J. Westcott

The eminent British scholar and critic, Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) dealt with the typology of Scripture in an able and in a beautiful way. By the will and working of Providence, he points out, the history and the Scripture of ancient Judaism are for our learning. They found the fulfillment to which they were proceeding in the Messiah and His Kingdom, and it is only from the standpoint of the New Testament that we are able to see their true inner meaning and their full glory and wisdom.

1. Henrik Klausen, Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments, pp. 446-452.

In his Introduction to the Study of the Gospels he says:

Again, we are taught to recognise the working of Providence, not only in the outer world of nature, but also in the inner world of action; while experience shows that the control of the general result is reconciled with individual freedom. To this end the reality and depth of prophecy is set before us in the records of Judaism of which Christianity is in the highest sense the proof and fulfilment. In the various events detailed in the Old Testament Scriptures which were written for our learning the Jews became figures of us. The private fortunes of their monarchs, and the national revolutions of their race; the general import of their history and the wider significance of their Prophecies, as well as the more explicit predictions; all receive their complete accomplishment in the Messiah and His Kingdom. It is then through the Evangelists that the Holy Spirit has afforded us a true insight into the inner meaning of the Prophets who were the historians of the elder dispensation, as in the Epistles He has set forth the antitypes of the ancient Law. That is surely a meagre theology and unscholarlike criticism which finds nothing more than a fanciful adaptation in the Scripture quoted in the opening chapter of St. Matthew, and nothing deeper than an arbitrary variation in the different words by which each passage is introduced. On the contrary, it seems as if from verse to verse the full glory and wisdom of the past were being gradually disclosed to us, as we are directed to observe the types of the Messiah in the crises of personal or national history; and then to acknowledge the fulness of the more distant Christian analogies in the outward fortunes of the Jews; and lastly to accept the reality of the minuter deductions from their Prophetic teaching.¹

Westcott speaks of a literal sense and a spiritual sense in Scripture. The spiritual sense, the deeper sense, lies in the religious lessons which the words contain, in the truth they impart concerning God's purposeful working

1. Brooke Foss Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, pp. 28-29.

in history. He writes:

Two great objects appear to be included in the work of the interpreter: the strict investigation of the simple meaning of the text, and the development of the religious teaching which lies beneath it. The first regards the form and the second the spirit of Scripture. The one rests on the acknowledged permanence of the essential relations between thought and language; the other on the Providential purpose which is seen to exist in the successive records of the Divine history of the world . . . The literal sense is but the source from which the spiritual sense is to be derived; but exactly in proportion as a clear view is gained of all that is special in the immediate object and position of each writer, it will be found that the simple record appears to be instinct with Divine life . . . The existence of an abiding spiritual sense underlying the literal text of the Old Testament is sufficiently attested by the quotations in the New. Unless it be recognized, many of the interpretations of the Evangelists and Apostles must appear forced and arbitrary; but if we assume that it exists, their usage appears to furnish an adequate clue to the investigation of its most intricate mazes. It must always be a difficult task to appreciate rightly the spiritual lessons of history, to detect the real analogy between past and present, to understand the fleeting symptoms of good and evil, to compare the several sides of truth and error; but the task is one which is ever assigned to men.¹

Westcott deals in workmanlike fashion with the problem of typology in the book of Hebrews in his commentary on that book, concluding that the author of Hebrews views the entire Old Testament as prefigurative of the New. He declares:

It has been already observed in the course of the notes that the writer of the Epistle everywhere assumes that there is a spiritual meaning in the whole record of the Old Testament . . . Christ and the Christian dispensation are regarded as the one end to which the Old Testament points

1. Ibid., pp. 36-37; 40-41.

and in which it finds its complete accomplishment . . . The historical truth of the Scriptural records is everywhere guarded, but the recorded facts are treated as "signs," and the believer is led to see in them a fuller meaning as the course of life is unfolded . . . The use which the author makes of Holy Scripture is, in other words, not dialectic, or rhetorical, but interpretative. The quotations are not brought forward in order to prove anything, but to indicate the correspondence which exists between the several stages in the fulfillment of the divine purpose from age to age. The Christian faith is assumed, and on this assumption the Hebrews are taught to recognise in the Old Testament the foreshadowings of that growing purpose which the Gospel completes and crowns . . . The object of the writer . . . is to make clear the relation in which the Gospel stands to the Mosaic system, as part of one divine whole.¹

K. Kurtz

Johann Heinrich Kurtz (1809-1890), the author of the history we have frequently cited, sought to combine prophecy and typology so as to make them complement each other in the production of a common result. Sacred history in the Old Covenant was prophetic not only because it was an organic part of the development toward Christ, but because it actually foreshadowed the realities of the plan of salvation. It foreshadowed these realities in a manner discernible to later posterity, but, by the assistance of prophecy, to contemporaries also in proportion to their spiritual capacity to receive it.²

In his Lehrbuch der heiligen Geschichte Kurtz wrote:

1. The Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 480. See also his treatment of the typical character of Melchisedek, ibid., pp. 200-201.

2. Fairbairn, op. cit., I, 40.

Eine jede Geschichte, die, von lebenskraeftigen Anfaengen ausgehend, von einem inneren Lebenstrieb getragen, durch alle Entwicklungen und Hemmnisse hindurch zu ihrem Ziele gelangt, wird typischen Charakter an sich tragen, so naemlich, dass in jedem weitem Fortschritt der Geschichte sich das Ziel derselben immer bestimmter und klarer prognostizieren laeszt. Der Lebenstrieb, der sie beseelt, ringt immerdar nach Gestaltung, und wenn er energisch genug ist, durch alle Schwierigkeiten hindurch das Ziel zu erreichen, so wird es ihm auch in der Mitte der Entwicklung gelingen, Hoehepunkte seiner Taetigkeit darzustellen, welche fuer die Stufe der Entwicklung, der sie angehoren, entsprechende Verleiblichungen derselben Idee sind, die auf der hoechsten Entwicklungsstufe zur vollen Darstellung gelangt, und welche somit Vorausdarstellungen oder Vorbilder zukuenftiger Vollendung sind. Zum Charakter der heiligen Geschichte wird also auch vorzugsweise die typische Gestaltung ihrer (normalen) Entwicklungen gehoeren.¹

Kurtz points out the difference between the typical character of sacred and the typical character of profane history:

In der Profangeschichte wird dieser typische Charakter zwar keineswegs fehlen (und um so weniger, je lebenskraeftiger sie ist), aber er wird mehr oder minder verwaschen erscheinen, weil die Entwicklung eine bloss kreatuerliche ist. In der heiligen Geschichte hingegen wird er unvergleichlich kraeftiger, stetiger, markierter und in schaefer gezeichneten Umrissen hervortreten muessen, so dass er nicht nur fuer die Nachwelt durch Vergleichung mit der Erfuellung, sondern auch fuer die Mitwelt durch Hilfe der Weissagung nach dem jedesmaligen Masse ihrer Fassungsfaehigkeit erkennbar sein wird. Denn es ist ja ein und derselbe goettliche Ratschluss, durch welchen ihre ganze Entwicklung getragen und beseelt wird, der bildend und gestaltend auf allen Punkten der Entwicklung eingreift und auf jeder Stufe derselben ist, soweit sie es zu fassen vermag, auspraegt. Wo daher z.B. irgendein Mann Gottes, im Boden des Reiches Gottes wurzelnd, die Entwicklung desselben weiterfuehrt, da ist er fuer seine Zeit, auf seinem Standpunkt und nach seinen

1. 4th ed., p. 10, quoted by William Arndt, "Typisch messianische Weissagungen," Lehre und Wehre, Dec., 1921, 361.

Kraefte ein Bild dessen, der alles der hoechsten Vollendung zufuehrt. In derselben Weise sind auch alle historischen Begebenheiten, Einrichtungen und Anstalten, die von entscheidender Wichtigkeit fuer die Foerderung des Reiches Gottes sind, Vorbilder zukuenftiger Tatsachen des Heils in seiner Vollendung.¹

L. Fairbairn

It was for Patrick Fairbairn (1805-1874), professor at Free Church College in Glasgow, Scotland, to write the classic work on types in Scripture. His work, The Typology of Scripture, in two volumes, which first appeared in 1845-1847, is analytical and exhaustive. He not only draws up principles, but applies them, and deals with the material of typology in a thorough manner. The work, moreover, is written from an evangelical and conservative point of view. (A disadvantage of the work, after a hundred years, is that its style now seems heavy, cumbersome, and tedious.)

In laying down a theological definition of a typical relationship, Fairbairn restricts his field to the relationship of things in the Old Covenant to things in the New. Two factors are necessary to constitute the relation of type and antitype: "In the character, action, or institution which is denominated the type, there must be a resemblance in form or spirit to what answers to it under the Gospel; and secondly, it must not be any character, action, or institution occurring in the Old Testament Scripture, but such

1. Ibid.

only as had their ordination of God, and were designed by Him to foreshadow and prepare for the better things of the Gospel."¹

The previous design and pre-ordained connection implies two facts, says Fairbairn. It implies that the realities of the Gospel are the ultimate objects which God had in mind when He planned the Old and New dispensations. It implies, moreover, that to prepare for the introduction of the realities of the Gospel, He placed the Church under a course of training which included instruction by means of types, or resemblances, of what was to come.²

The resemblance between type and antitype implies two things, also. It implies that "there must have been in the Old the same great elements of truth as in the things they represented under the New." Moreover, "in the Old, these must have been exhibited in a form more level to the comprehension, more easily and distinctly cognizable by the minds of men."³

When we view the institutions of the Mosaic covenant as prophetic symbols of the better things to come in the Gospel, we are viewing them in their secondary aspect, says Fairbairn. To understand their significance aright, we must understand them first of all "as parts of an existing dispensation, and as such, expressive of certain great and

-
1. Typology of the Scriptures, I, 46.
 2. Ibid., I, 47 ff.
 3. Ibid., I, 50 ff.

fundamental truths, which could even then be distinctly understood and embraced."¹ This was their immediate purpose. The expiatory sacrifices, for example, were prophetically symbolic of Christ's death. But this was secondary. Independent of this fact, the sacrifice had a meaning of its own which the ancient worshipper could understand. Independently of its typical character, it taught him certain principles and truths. It taught him that as a sinner, his life was forfeit to God; that his life must be surrendered to divine justice; and that being surrendered in the appointed way, it was given back by God to the offerer, who was thereby reestablished in the divine favor and fellowship. These were the same principles as were involved in that of which the sacrifice was a type--the death of Christ. The difference was this: what the first symbolically represented, the second actually accomplished.²

The same applies to historical types. The flood, which is a type of baptism, had an immediate significance, and it taught certain immediately discernible truths apart from its prefigurative quality. The flood, sent by God, destroyed the corrupt race of the old world and saved the seed of a better race. But what the flood did in an outward and ineffective way, baptism does in a higher manner, for it destroys the corruption of the flesh and causes the seed of the divine life to take root and grow in the new life.³

1. Ibid., I, 53.

2. Ibid., I, 54 ff.

3. Ibid., I, 64 ff.

We see, therefore, that the resemblance to be looked for between type and antitype is not a mere external resemblance, but "a coincidence of principle and economical design."¹ There are superficial likenesses, for example, between Abel and Christ. Abel was a shepherd, Christ the Good Shepherd. Abel's blood was shed, so was that of Christ. But what principle was at work in Abel's death which would throw light on the manner of Christ's death? There is nothing to be found of real unity and agreement. "Christ certainly died as the spiritual shepherd of souls, but Abel was not murdered on account of having been a keeper of sheep; nor had his death any necessary connection with his having followed such an employment. For what purpose, then, press points of resemblance so loosely associated, and dignify them with the name of typical prefigurations?"²

Historical types were necessary in considerable number and variety to render the earlier dispensations thoroughly preparative for the coming dispensation of the Gospel. In a sense it is true that the Old Testament, rightly understood, is one great prophecy of the New.³ This is true even of those parts of Scripture which in their direct bearing partake least of the prophetic. Scripture's records of the past "are at the same time pregnant with the germs of a corresponding but more exalted future."⁴ The

-
1. Ibid., I, 69.
 2. Ibid., I, 68.
 3. Ibid., I, 70-71.
 4. Ibid., I, 72.

relations, activities, deliverances, and chastisements of its characters were "parts of an unfinished and progressive plan, which finds its destined completion in the person and kingdom of Christ; and only when seen in this prospective reference do they appear in their proper magnitude and full significance."¹ "In so far as God spoke in the transactions, and gave discoveries by them of His truth and character, they pointed onward to the one 'Pattern Man,' and the terminal kingdom of righteousness and blessing of which He was to be the head and centre."²

It has been questioned whether we ought to take up the explanation of types in the Old Testament which the New Testament does not specifically mention and explain. Fairbairn answers that the New Testament does not profess to illustrate the whole field of typical matter in the Old Testament, but only takes it up in detached portions, by way of occasional example. To refrain from going into more detail than the New Testament does would be to exclude from the character of types many of the very institutions and services which are all "shadows of good things to come, whereof the body is Christ." The fact that so much of what was given to Moses as "a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after" in Christ has no explanation in Scripture justifies us in expecting that there is much that

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

is typical, though not expressly declared to be so, in the historical matter of the Old Testament.¹ "In the Epistle to the Hebrews a sharp reproof is administered for the imperfect acquaintance believers among them had with the typical character of Melchisedek, and subjects of a like nature-- thus placing it beyond all doubt that it is both the duty and the privilege of the Church, with that measure of the Spirit's grace which it is the part even of private Christians to possess, to search into the types of ancient Scripture and come to a correct understanding of them. To deny this is plainly to withhold an important privilege from the Church of Christ; to dissuade from it, is to encourage the neglect of an incumbent duty."²

It has been questioned whether the same truths and principles are to be found in the Old Testament as are operative in the New. Testimony that they are is the Book of Psalms, which, though composed in Old Testament days, "are still incomparably the most perfect expression of the religious sentiment, and the best directory to the soul in its meditations and communings about divine things, which is to be found anywhere."³ The existence of the Book of Psalms can be explained in no other way than that the Old and New dispensations, however they may have differed in form, were founded on the same principles and pervaded by the same

1. Ibid., I, 61.

2. Ibid., I, 21.

3. Ibid., I, 73-76.

essential truths and principles.¹

Fairbairn rejects the view upheld by Dorner that the incarnation was necessary even though man had not sinned, and that on that account the events of creation were typical of Christ.²

Fairbairn points out that there are four manners in which type and prophecy are combined or run into each other.

1. A typical action might be mentioned in the prophetic word; hence the word would come to be prophetic of that which the typical action prefigured, e.g., "Out of Egypt have I called my son," Hos. 11,1.³

2. Something typical in the past or present might be represented in a prophetic announcement as going to appear again in the future, thus combining typical act and prophetic word, e.g., "My servant David," Ezek. 34,23.⁴

3. The typical, not expressly and formally, but in its essential relations and principles, might be embodied in an accompanying prediction which foretold things corresponding in nature, but far higher and greater in importance, e.g., Psalm 2 as Messianic.⁵

4. The typical might itself be still future, and in a prophetic word might be partly described or presupposed as a vantage-ground for the delineation of other things still

-
1. Ibid.
 2. Ibid., I, 86-105.
 3. Ibid., I, 108 ff.
 4. Ibid., I, 111 ff.
 5. Ibid., I, 115 ff.

more distant to which, when it occurred, it was to stand in the relation of type to antitype, e.g., Isaiah's prediction of the deliverance from Babylon as a stepping-stone to the subject of the deliverance through God's Son.¹

Fairbairn lists a number of principles for interpreting particular types. The lack of clear principles has been, he says, the cause of much indiscretion and caprice in interpreting types in the past, and has given typology an evil name. Rules were given, such as those of Glass, but they were too vague and general to be of service. "The rules could not be precise or definite when the system on which they were founded was altogether loose and indeterminate."² Even now, says Fairbairn, on the supposition that a more stable foundation has been laid, "we can not hold out the prospect that no room shall be left for dubiety, and that all may be reduced to a kind of dogmatical precision and certainty."³ The rules that follow, however, will be sufficient to guard against material error, if they are used with ordinary care and discretion.⁴

1. "Nothing is to be regarded as typical of the good things under the Gospel which was itself of a forbidden and sinful nature," because the type, to be intended to foreshadow and prepare for the Gospel, must have had divine approval.⁵

-
1. Ibid., I, 126 ff.
 2. Ibid., I, 140.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Ibid., I, 141.
 5. Ibid., I, 141 ff.

2. "In determining the existence and import of particular types, we must be guided not so much by any knowledge possessed or supposed to be possessed by the ancient worshippers concerning their prospective fulfillment, as from the light furnished by their realization in the great facts and revelations of the Gospel."¹

3. "We must always, in the first instance, be careful to make ourselves acquainted with the truths or ideas exhibited in the types, considered merely as providential transactions or religious institutions. In other words, we are to find in what they were, in their immediate relation to the patriarchal or Jewish worshippers, the foundation and substance of what they present to the Christian Church."²

4. "While the symbol or institution constituting the type has properly but one radical meaning, yet the fundamental idea or principle exhibited in it may often be capable of more than one application to the realities of the Gospel; that is, it may bear respect to, and be developed in, more than one department of the affairs of Christ's kingdom."³

5. "Due regard must be had to the essential difference between the nature of type and antitype. For as the typical is divine truth on a lower stage, exhibited by means of outward relations and terrestrial interests, so, when making the transition from this to the antitypical, we must

1. Ibid., I, 145 ff.

2. Ibid., I, 150 ff.

3. Ibid., I, 154 ff.

expect the truth to appear on a loftier stage, and, if we may so speak, with a more heavenly aspect. What in the one bore immediate respect to the bodily life, must in the other be found to bear immediate respect to the spiritual life. While in the one it is seen and temporal objects that ostensibly present themselves, their proper counterpart in the other are the unseen and eternal--there, the outward, the present, the worldly; here, the inward, the future, the heavenly."¹

M. Orelli

Hans Conrad Orelli (1846-1912) held a position similar to that of Kurtz. He believed types to be God's shaping history with reference to the future. The people who lived at the time of the types did not recognize their future signification except in connection with verbal prophecy. Types were intended to render familiar certain ideas imperfectly expressed in them, which were to be perfectly expressed in the New Testament.

Orelli wrote:

The Son of God not only reveals Himself in definite words, which He suggests to consecrated seers. He also rules in history, shaping it with significant reference to the future.²

The profounder contrast (between type and prophecy) lies in this, that the type is still unrecognized

1. Ibid., I, 158 ff.

2. The Old Testament Prophecy of the Consummation of God's Kingdom, Eng. tr. by J. S. Banks, p. 38.

by contemporaries in its reference to the future, the necessity of a more perfect embodiment of the idea it contains not being declared.¹

Such types (ritual, historical, personal) are meant first of all in their imperfection to render familiar the idea expressed in them, and then to prepare for their adequate manifestation.²

But when a mediate stage between the beginning and completion is found when these types are seen in their prefigurative significance, and pass over into prophecy. Thus Is. 53, 10 speaks of a sin-offering, and (v.7) of a lamb atoning for guilt by voluntary suffering. Here the idea of this sacrificial lamb is transferred to a more perfect bearer--the Servant of God. Just so prophecy often applied the departure from Egypt to the future, promising a final deliverance of the Church from bondage, and setting forth this divine act with the well-known features taken from the Egyptian days. Cf. the antitype of the Egyptian plagues, Rev. 8, 9. Finally, David was so well-known as a type of the Messiah καὶ ἑσχατῶν, that the prophets expressly call the king of the final perfect age David, Hos. 3, 5; Jer. 33, 9. Here therefore, the type, lending a voice to the prophetic word, enters into our proper province. And as the express prophetic word had led the way in applying the past to the future, the thought of the Church felt itself called upon to understand the historic form of the God-anointed king in general typically, and to interpret his experiences as mirroring future experiences, turning his songs and words into prophecies.³

N. Terry

Milton Terry (b. 1840) includes a lengthy, analytical discussion of types and their interpretation in his book Biblical Hermeneutics.⁴

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid., p. 40.

3. Ibid.

4. Milton Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics, pp. 244-256.

Terry condemns as a view adopted under pressure the position that nothing in the Old Testament is to be regarded as typical but what the New Testament affirms to be so.

"We admit a divine purpose in every real type, but it does not therefore follow that every such purpose must be formally affirmed in the Scripture."¹ "The persons and events which are expressly declared by the sacred writers to be typical are rather to be taken as specimens and examples for the interpretation of all types."² If Moses and Jonah were typical characters, certainly Samuel and Elisha were, also, says Terry. "Our Lord rebuked the two disciples for having a heart so dull and slow to believe in all the things which the prophets spoke (Luke 24,25), clearly implying the duty of seeking to apprehend the sense of all the prophetic Scriptures."³

Old Testament persons and events cited for typical lessons should always, however, possess some notably exceptional importance, Terry holds.⁴

Terry lists the following hermeneutical rules to be grasped and applied in interpreting types:

1. Apprehend the real point of resemblance between type and antitype, and all far-fetched and recondite analogies should be as carefully avoided.

1. Ibid., p. 248.

2. Ibid., p. 256.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

2. Note the points of difference and contrast between type and antitype.

3. Old Testament types are susceptible of complete interpretation only by the light of the Gospel. We must not suppose that the ancient prophets and holy men and a full knowledge of the mysteries of Christ and vividly apprehended the profound meaning of all sacred types and symbols.¹

O. Briggs and Smith

The attitude of American liberalism toward Biblical typology is indicated to some extent in the unhelpful views of Charles Augustus Briggs (1841-1913) and Henry Preserved Smith (1847-1927).

Briggs did not take seriously what the New Testament has to say about the historical nature of types. He held that types were merely a higher sort of illustration which the Hebrew prophets invoked to symbolize the ideal things of the future. Certain things were merely called types.²

Smith wrote the following non-committal summary for A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics:

A type is a person or a thing which pre-figures another person or thing still future.

According to the theory of the Church, the Old Testament and the New Testament form a single revelation and teach the same lessons. The chief interest of early expositors therefore was to discover

1. Ibid., pp. 250-254.

2. Messianic Prophecy, p. 46 f.

predictions of Christ and His Church in the Old Testament. Many things, however, in the earlier revelation seem to have no direct bearing on the Christian life. These were interpreted allegorically--precedent was found in the Greek expositions of Homer--or else viewed as types. The New Testament itself sees a type of Christ in the brazen serpent made by Moses. Many expositors have discovered a type in almost every person or thing mentioned in the Hebrew Bible. But a more sober exegesis now prevails.¹

1. A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics (edited by Shailer Matthews and Gerald Birney Smith), p. 457.

VII. The Twentieth Century

1. Torm

Frederich Torm (1870-) included a thought-provoking discussion of typology in his comparatively recent Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments (1931).

The New Testament, says Torm, opened new vistas by its typological use of the Old Testament. This usage has been called typological interpretation. In many cases, however, the writer is not attempting an interpretation of the Old Testament text. Rather, he finds in the literal meaning of the Old Testament statement a reference to something in the future which is similar but of much greater significance. The person, or action, or experience, or institution, or relationship which is mentioned in the text is treated as "typical" of something in the future.¹

The "typological interpretation" is thus not as much an interpretation as a historical method, a manner of judging historical experiences and relationships, a kind of philosophy of history, if you will.²

Torm writes:

Besonders von der Anwendung des AT im Munde
Jesu gilt, dass sie mehr in einer typologischen

1. Frederick Torm, Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments, p. 223.

2. Ibid.

Betrachtungswise als in einer typologischen Auslegung besteht, vgl. besonders Tholuck: Das AT im NT, S. 29 ff. Jesu Benutzung von Jes. 29,13 (Matt. 15,7 ff.; Mark 7,16 ff.) zeugt von typologischer Betrachtungsweise selbst dort, so der Ausdruck ἐπιροφῆτε ὑμᾶς verwendet wird; denn Jesus kann kaum behaupten wollen, dass Jesaja bewusst an die Pharisaeer gedacht habe. Auch ist keineswegs ausgemacht, dass Jesus Matt. 22,43 mit dem Ausdruck ἐν πνεύματι sagen will, dass der Verfasser des Psalms sich des vollen Inhalts der Worte bewusst gewesen sei. Es ist möglich, dass er im Gegenteil nur sagen will, dass die Worte--gerade weil sie ἐν πνεύματι ausgesprochen sind--die Vorstellung von einer so erhabenen Persönlichkeit enthielten, dass sie ihre Erfuellung nur in ihm finden koennen, der sich nicht blosz mehr als Salomo, sondern auch mehr als David zu sein weisz. In solchen Fall hat Jesus auch hier keine Auslegung in dem Sinne gegeben, dass er hat sagen wollen, wie viel dem Autor selber klar bewusst gewesen ist, sondern er hat darauf hinweisen wollen, dass in den Worten ein tieferer Inhalt liege, als es dem Verfasser bewusst gewesen ist.¹

This typologische Betrachtungsweise appears at times in cases where the spiritual relation of type to antitype is outwardly small, e.g., when the waters of the deluge are presented as a type of the water of baptism (1 Pet. 3,21). (This case indicates surely that the writer did not have in mind an interpretation of the Old Testament words.) Usually, however, a deeper connection is easily discernible. The connection is based upon the fact that history repeats itself and that in religious history there is often a great spiritual relationship between persons and experiences of different times. The same basic religious forces are at work. There is the same continual conflict between good and

1. Ibid., p. 226, note.

evil. According to the basic view of the New Testament writers, history shows a progressive development in the revelation of God, a constantly richer self-revelation of God in connection with the progressively stronger outbreaks of evil powers among mankind. The importance of the typological method is that it gives us an insight into the unity in the revelation of God and shows us the lasting importance that each small portion of the revelation has for the whole.¹

More important is the question whether there is truth in the typological manner of handling history--whether in any case a Realprophetic actually exists, i.e., a fact through which God pointed to something in the future. The answer to this question, however, lies in the realm of religious conviction and is on that account not to be decided by hermeneutic theories about the proper method of interpretation.²

In general, where an instance of the typological method is at hand in the New Testament, it is the duty of the exegete to uncover the spiritual-historical connection to which the New Testament writer wishes to draw attention.³

If the distinction shown above between typological interpretation of the New Testament and a typological method of handling the Old Testament is true, then it is

1. Ibid., p. 224.

2. Ibid., p. 227.

3. Ibid.

false to establish typological interpretation as a hermeneutical principle.¹

Whether the typological method is a satisfactory historical method is quite another question. For this reason, Form believes, the efforts of Cocceius and von Hofmann, from an exegetical point of view, overshot the mark.²

Exegetically, the typological method has only this significance, that it reminds the exegete that prophetic utterances can have a deeper content than the original writer himself was aware of. It gives a hint in what direction one's thoughts must move if one wants to determine whether such a deeper content is present. But it adds nothing new to the rules and methods to be followed in determining the content of the text.³

2. Schodde

Within the American Lutheran Church George Schodde, in his Outlines of Biblical Hermeneutics (1917) follows the view of the Grotians and Herbert Marsh in excluding from the category of types all those things which are not expressly named as such in the New Testament. One is painfully aware of the inadequacy of this position in solving the problem of types which Scripture sets before us.

Schodde writes:

By types are to be understood all those persons and things in the Old Testament which according

-
1. Ibid.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid.

to the purpose of the Holy Ghost as expressed in the New Testament were intended to and did prefigure and foreshadow certain persons and things, all factors in the development of the Kingdom of God, in the New Testament, these latter being called antitypes. Types can thus be called prophetic persons and things, and the Typology of the Scriptures is thus closely related to prophecy, and perhaps more closely associated with the symbolical actions of some of the prophets. The New Testament declares that the entire Old Testament economy and its institutions are a "shadow" of which the substance and the reality is in the New Testament (Col. 2,16-17; Heb. 8,5); but this relationship is said to have existed specifically in certain individual cases.¹

In the interpretation of types care must be taken to regard as types only those persons and things which are declared to be such by the New Testament, and often termed typi innati. Not imaginings or even similarities, or typi illati, must decide this matter, but only the actual statements of the New Testament.²

The inconsistency of this position is patent. How can these statements be harmonized: "The New Testament declares that the entire Old Testament economy and its institutions are a 'shadow' of which the substance and the reality is in the New Testament," and "Care must be taken to regard as types only those persons and things which are declared to be such by the New Testament?" A possible justification would be a distinction between the words "shadow" and "type," but this distinction is extremely dubious, if not purely arbitrary. The fundamental principle of Lutheran hermeneutics, as Schodde himself states, is "Scriptura ex Scriptura

-
1. George Schodde, Outlines of Biblical Hermeneutics, p.219.
 2. Ibid., p. 220.

explicanda est." But where in Scripture, or by what deduction from the words of Holy Writ comes the rule that "Care must be taken to regard as types only those persons and things which are declared to be such by the New Testament?" Schodde offers no proof. The second rule of Lutheran hermeneutics, according to Schodde, is that exegesis should be according to the analogy of faith. But is it in accord with the analogy of faith to prescribe a rule which directly opposes such a clear statement as Col. 2,16-17 or such a one as Heb. 8,5?

"Care must be taken to regard as types only those persons and things which are declared to be such by the New Testament, and often termed typi illati." The inadequacy of this view to solve the problem or to prevent abuse is shown further by Schodde himself in the list of Scriptural types he offers. Among typical persons of the Old Testament he includes Joseph.¹ But what statement of the New Testament declares him to be a type? Among typical events and actions he includes the uplifting of the brazen serpent and Jonah's stay in the belly of the great fish.² Again, there is lack of express New Testament declaration to the explicit effect that these are types. It could easily be inferred that they are types; but an inference is necessary. With perhaps equal ease it could be assumed that the Savior refers to the brazen serpent and to Jonah's stay in the fish merely

1. Ibid., p. 219.

2. Ibid., p. 220.

as passing illustrations of the points He is making. The problem is not solved. The rule breaks down almost as soon as it is put to use.

Schodde adds a further rule: "Then these types are to be taken as such only in so far as the tertium comparationis goes and is shown by the Scriptures."¹ This, too, seems quite inadequate, since Scripture by no means always analyzes for us the typical relationship and defines the limit of the tertium comparationis, e.g., in the case of the various Levitic rites; the water from the rock; the conquest of Canaan, etc.

Schodde concludes:

The practical benefit of types for exegesis is slight, although the subject itself invites speculation and even phantasy. Yet a type can have no meaning beyond that which the antitype clearly teaches, and thus adds nothing to the latter. The study of types rather serves to illustrate the unity of the two Testaments and the fact that in these there is only one harmonious plan of salvation; and, secondly, goes to show that there has been growth and development in the revelation of God in the Scriptures.¹

With every desire to be just and fair, it must be said that this is the sort of study which has kept Scriptural typology shrouded in darkness and surrounded by misunderstanding. The statement, "A type can have no meaning beyond that which the antitype clearly teaches, and thus adds nothing to the latter," is not only inexact and obscure, but, if analyzed,

1. Ibid., p. 221.

is both rationalistic and illogical. It is inexact and obscure, insofar as every type must have a meaning of its own, apart from the antitype, else it would be no type. The water which poured from the rock in the wilderness had a meaning of its own in the thirst which it quenched and in the Israelitish lives it saved and the indication it gave to Israel of the favor and the omnipotence of God. The statement is rationalistic because it assumes without Scriptural evidence that the New Testament fully explains the significance of all types. It is illogical; for if we were to grant for argument's sake that the New Testament fully explains the total significance of a type, it would by no means follow that the type added nothing to the latter. Else, why should the type have been mentioned in the first place? The adducing of the type showed that the New Testament antitype had an ancient history and that it had long before been planned in the counsels of God. The type, moreover, served as an illustration, making the truth contained in the antitype more clear to the hearers and readers. "Whatever was written aforetime was written for our learning." Schodde says nothing about the value that comes from understanding the Old Testament and its relation to Christ, which in itself should be a strong incentive for pursuing the study of typology to a more satisfactory conclusion.

3. Fritsch

Among most recent writings in the field of Biblical typology is a series of four articles written by Charles Fritsch, entitled "Biblical Typology," and printed in Bibliotheca Sacra from July, 1946 to June, 1947. The articles were originally delivered as lectures at Dallas Theological Seminary. Fritsch devotes the first article to "New Trends in Old Testament Theology," the second to "The Bible as Redemptive History," the third to "Typological Interpretation in the New Testament," and the fourth to "Principles of Biblical Typology."

Fritsch follows the principles of the Heilsgeschichtlichen schule, which received its impetus from von Hofmann and Adolph Schlatter (1852-1938). Fritsch writes:

We have seen how this view of the Bible as redemptive history has made it a living organism, revealing God's activity in history and in the human soul to the end that He may have unbroken fellowship with the crown of His creation. All Scripture points to this end, the Old Testament to Christ and the New Testament to the final consummation of God's plan of redemption. Thus prophecy and eschatology are delivered from the shackles of a deadening, mechanical systematization whereby the system becomes the all-important factor, and are set in the correct perspective of God's eternal redemptive purpose as it relates to you and me as individuals . . . One evidence of the teleological character of the Scripture in general and of the organic connection between the Old and New Testaments in particular is the relation between type and antitype.¹

Typology, i.e., the study of types and their relation to the antitype, is fundamentally

1. Charles Fritsch, "Biblical Typology," Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan.-March, 1947, p. 87.

based upon the organic unity of the Bible. There is a divine purpose and plan unfolded in Scripture which has two goals in view, namely, the revelation of God to man and the redemption of man by God . . . the redemptive principle lies at the heart of typology, and no type can be understood or determined apart from that idea.¹

Fritsch defines "type" as follows:

A type is an institution, historical event, or person, ordained by God, which effectively prefigures some truth connected with Christianity.²

Typology differs from prophecy in the strict sense of the term only in the means of prediction. Prophecy predicts mainly by means of the word, whereas typology predicts by institution, act, or person.³

Typology is not a matter of collecting all of the resemblances between the Old and the New Testament, but rather of understanding the underlying redemptive and revelational process which begins in the Old Testament and finds its fulfillment in the New . . . In the light of this divinely ordained, organic principle uniting both Testaments we can now see the fallacy of limiting typology simply to the study of those types which the writers of the Scriptures happened to have used. This would be seriously limiting a divine process to a mere handful of examples . . . Rather should the few examples in Scripture be taken as indicative of the general prophetic or teleological character of the Old Testament.⁴

Another point to remember in determining the nature and characteristic of a type is that that which makes the institution, event, or person typical is the redemptive truth which it teaches and prefigures. . . . Wherein does the typological character of the tabernacle lie? Is it in the material out of which it was constructed, or is it in the prophetic, parabolic purpose which is

-
1. Ibid., Apr.-June, 1947, pp. 218-219.
 2. Ibid., p. 214.
 3. Ibid., p. 215.
 4. Ibid., p. 220.

carried out in the disposition of the furniture and the ministrations of the priesthood within its courts? We should certainly say the latter.¹

4. Mystical Interpretation in England

The "mystical" sense of Scripture has become the subject of a good deal of discussion among a group of prominent British scholars in the last two decades. The type of exegesis which followed in the wake of Wellhausen has showed its futility. Something more is needed if the Scriptures are to be meaningful in the life of the Church. While somewhat unclear about what the "mystical" sense of Scripture is, these scholars feel that there is more in the Old Testament than mere letters.

In 1928 Dr. Darwell Stone contributed an article to the one-volume A New Commentary, entitled "The Mystical Interpretation of the Old Testament." We cite the following statements by Dr. Stone:

Mystical interpretation explains the additional or allegorical or spiritual sense which is held to underlie the literal significance of persons or events or things or sayings. The principle of it was recognized by St. Paul in his phrase "which things have a further meaning" (Gal. 4,24); and such an interpretation of the Old Testament was used with some freedom in the New Testament.²

As examples, Stone cites Matt. 1,22-23; Matt. 2,15; Matt. 2,17-18; 1 Cor. 9,9-11; Gal. 4,21-31; Heb. 9.

1. Ibid., pp. 220-221.
 2. Darwell Stone, "The Mystical Interpretation of the Old Testament," A New Commentary, p. 688.

After giving a history of the use of mystical interpretation in the Church, Dr. Stone continues:

This interpretation is closely bound up with the permanent value of the Old Testament. If the Old Testament is to fulfil its purpose as "written for our admonition" (1 Cor. 10,11), something much more than its merely literal and historical meaning is needed. Many difficulties about Holy Scripture have been in part due to an effect produced by retaining the theory of verbal inspiration which the fathers held, and rejecting the co-ordinate theory of mystical interpretation by which it was lightened. The interpretation is suggested also by the authority of the New Testament; for there is nothing in the more moderate use of it which goes beyond the methods used by St. Paul and the First Gospel. It is in harmony with the analogy of nature and grace. It recognizes that it is the same God who spoke in the Old Testament as in the New Testament and in Christian times. It sees in our Lord One who sums up in Himself all that is best in human life wherever presented, and in the Christian Church that supernatural people of God to which the divinely chosen nation of Israel led.

Moreover, it affords justification for the reading of the Old Testament and the recitation of the psalter in Christian worship. If the Old Testament histories are regarded as histories only, they lose their interest for those who worship, and in some cases may even be repellent. The act of Jael or the slaughter of the Amalekites or the massacre of the prophets of Baal may easily be uninteresting or disconcerting in themselves. But, if in such incidents we may see with St. Augustine (c. Faust. xii, 32) the Church conquering the devil by the Cross of Christ, or with St. Ambrose (de vid., 46-49) the victory over sin through faith and prayer, they have not only interest but also spiritual value. The Psalm viewed on the surface may seem dull or unmeaning or unchristian. For instance, the imprecatory psalm may be and have been a stumbling block to many. But, if the denunciations in these psalms are understood, as in the ancient Church, to be expressions of God's judgement upon sin, and of the Christian's resolve to exterminate what is wrong in himself, they will be seen in a different light. And it

is not only for the imprecatory psalms that the mystical interpretation has its use. There are, indeed, some psalms which can be said devotionally in their simple obvious sense; but there are many of which the merely historical meaning can make but little appeal. "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture" (Ps. 22, 18) can have little meaning for many unless mystically understood of our Lord. Even when the simple obvious sense affords material for devotion, there may be a far fuller meaning for those reciting them if the mystical interpretation is realized. "Then said I, Lo I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me: I delight to do thy will" (Ps. 40, 7-8) may mean much as uttering the personal devotion of the Christian worshipper: it will mean more if by the mystical interpretation the supreme dedication of Christ also is in mind. Without such an aid to appreciation, few worshippers are likely to find any appropriateness in, for instance, the use of the proper psalms for Christmas Day (19, 45, 85, 89, 110, 132) in the services for that festival. In the judgement of the present writer, the Church is not likely to be able to retain the reading of the Old Testament and the recitation of the psalter in public worship unless the use of mystical interpretation is to some extent recognized. Those who in recent years have assailed the public use of particular lessons and particular psalms have failed to see what the problem in reality is.

This is not to say that the use of the mystical interpretation has never passed into an abuse, that there have ^{never} been exaggerations. Certainly Origen in the ancient Church, and not a few in later times, have gone beyond what right reason could approve. But here, as so often, the abuse does not destroy the possibility of rightful use. If such interpretation may run wild and be unreasonable when not held in due restraint, it possesses when properly handled such real spiritual value as might be expected from the use of it in the New Testament and its place in the tradition of the Church.

It is probable that different minds will always differ as to the extent to which the mystical interpretation may rightly be used, and as to the particular passages to which it may be applied. The recognition of deep spiritual principles expressed in the law of worship, or in the denunciations of God's enemies, or in the providential guidance of nations and individuals is obviously distinct

from such explanations as that the thorns mentioned in Gen. 3,18 signify the crown of thorns which was placed in mockery on the head of our Lord, and that the tree spoken of in Jer. 11,19 signifies the wood of the Cross (e.g. Rufinus, In Symp. Apost. 22). The broader and more general lines may well afford instruction to many, while some specific interpretations may be for the devotional enjoyment and edification of the few.¹

Charles Fritsch discusses this group of British scholars, saying:

The most prolific writer of this group is Dr. W. J. T. Phythian-Adams, editor of the Church Quarterly Review. His most important works include The Call of Israel (London, 1934), The Fulness of Israel (London, 1938), The People and the Presence (Oxford, 1942), and The Way of At-one-ment (London, 1944), besides numerous articles. In all of these works Phythian-Adams insists upon the unity of the Bible. He has coined the word "homology" which he uses to express the oneness of thought and the vital correspondence between the Testaments. The New Testament writers, he maintains, discerned a real "economic" relation between the events of the Old Testament and those of the New. History is summed up in our Lord; the church is the true people of God; and our forgetfulness of this has led to many divisions in the body of Christ. The way to reunion as well as to revival lies through a return to Scripture as Scripture interprets itself, i.e., by allowing each Testament to explain and interpret the other. Even though his exegesis at times is inaccurate, and his arguments hard to follow, he is fundamentally right in laying so much stress upon the unity and significance of the Bible as a necessary element in the life of the church.

Another representative of this group is A. G. Hebert, whose book, The Throne of David (N.Y., 1941), has caused considerable comment on both sides of the Atlantic. It is a study of the fulfillment of the Old Testament in Jesus Christ and His church. His approach is critical, yet he feels that the mystical or spiritual interpretation of the Old Testament is necessary in

1. Ibid., pp. 695-696.

order to understand its theological connection with the New. No one, he claims, can hope to interpret the Old Testament correctly until he takes seriously the two dogmas or grounds of faith in the Old Testament, namely, the reality of God, and the fact that He has chosen Israel to be His people. To accept these dogmas does not mean the disregarding of the fruits of Old Testament scholarship, but only the rejection of what is too often a humanistic point of view. Messianism, the law, the Sabbath, sacrifice and the church are some of the themes he discusses in order to show the organic connection between the Old and New Testaments. Although the book has not been well-received in Great Britain for obvious reasons--he is an Anglo-Catholic and his emphasis on mystical interpretation is viewed with serious alarm--it is full of new insights and refreshing ideas for the Biblical student.¹

The Old Testament in the New Testament by R. V. G.

Tasker, 1947, is another recent book which pursues a similar treatment of the Old Testament. Its author writes:

We cannot, however, understand the writers of the New Testament unless we realize that their attitude to the Old Testament was something very different from this. They did not confine their interest to those passages in which the revelation of God's nature most approximated to that given in the teaching of Jesus, or to those moral precepts which could be most easily taken over as part of a Christian ethic. To them the whole story of the People of Israel, their divine call, their redemption from Egypt, the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, the triumphant establishment of the worship of Jehovah in the Holy Land, the building of the temple, the tragedy of the exile, and the subsequent resurrection and return of the remnant to Zion, are all foreshadowings of the greater and final salvation given in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, apart from which they have in themselves no abiding significance and are not fully comprehensible. And the same may be said with reference to the attitude of Jesus Himself. As Maize Spens has written:

1. Charles Fritsch, op. cit., July-Sept., 1946, 300-301.

"The historical events recorded in the Scriptures were never to Him mere historical happenings in the past; each yielded to Him an eternal and abiding truth and significance, upon which He drew in the present circumstances and difficulties of His own life. His knowledge of the Scriptures was so intimate and profound that He was always able at will to interconnect from quite different contexts passages of life matter and spirit. By meditation He penetrated the Scriptures as a unity rather than a compilation," Concerning Himself, p. 65.¹

We must also realize that the literal meaning of a particular passage does not always contain the whole meaning; but that, as St. Paul clearly assumed, there is often a further or allegorical sense to be discovered in the light of the truth revealed elsewhere in passages where the meaning is unmistakable. The fact that the allegorical interpretation of Scripture has often been fanciful and far-fetched ought not to blind us to its legitimate use, of which the New Testament itself contains many examples.²

5. The Theology of Crisis

A discussion of the place and meaning that typology has in the Theology of Crisis would take us far afield, nor are we prepared to undertake such a discussion at this point. Its concepts of Offenbarung, Geschichte, and Urgeschichte all involve issues vital to typology. Suffice it to say that a good deal of pertinent material has already been written.³

1. R. V. G. Tasker, The Old Testament in the New Testament, p. 16.

2. Ibid., p. 17.

3. See Karl Barth, Roemerbrief, on Rom. 5, 14 and 6, 14; Die Kirchliche Dogmatik, I(1), pp. 148-168; II(1), pp. 408 ff. and 463-470; II(2), pp. 109 ff.; 215-336; 391-453 (!); 464-465. See also Emil Brunner, The Mediator, pp. 303-308; 563-566; The Word and the World, pp. 54-55; F. W. Canfield, Revelation and the Holy Spirit, pp. 212-223.

6. The Roman Catholic Church

Roman Catholic teaching on the types of Scripture today is virtually the same as described by Thomas Aquinas. Catholic writers speak of two senses of Scripture--the literal and the typical. "The typical sense is that meaning by which the things, signified by words, signify according to the intention of the Holy Spirit yet other things, and which is founded upon and supposes the literal sense."¹ Other designations for the typical sense are: real, spiritual, mystical, allegorical, mediate, indirect.²

The old divisions of sense are still in vogue. "By reason of the objects foreshadowed the typical sense is divided into messianic, prophetic, or allegorical types (because they refer to the messianic kingdom); anagogical types (because they prefigure the things of the world to come); and tropological types (because they convey lessons for our moral guidance."³

A. J. Maas repeats the natural basis for types: In the state of nature, history repeats itself. This is true also under the Mosaic Law, which superseded and surpassed in perfection the state of nature. It is true likewise in the Christian dispensation, to which the Mosaic Law yielded.⁴

Three elements are necessary for a type; it must have true and historical existence independent of the antitype;

1. Steinmueller, A Companion To Scripture Studies, I, 229.

2. Ibid., I, 228.

3. Ibid., I, 229; A. J. Maas, "Exegesis," Catholic Encyclopedia, V, 695.

4. "Types in Scripture," Catholic Encyclopedia, XV, 107.

there must be a similarity but not an essential connection between type and antitype; it must be God's intention to prefigure, and this intention must be manifested in some manner.¹

The problem of whether the entire Old Testament is typical or certain phenomena only is dispensed with by reference to wider and narrower sense. In the wider sense, the entire Old Testament is a type of the New.² "But Origen," says Steinmueller, "the Alexandrian School, and the Protestant Symbolists of the seventeenth century transgressed the proper limits when they tried to find types everywhere in the Old Testament and neglected the literal meaning of the Bible."³

"Authors are not in agreement whether types are also found in the New Testament. It may be conceded that no Messianic types will be found in the New Testament, but it is also possible that anagogical types may be found, especially in the Apocalypse."⁴

The criteria which serve for the interpretation of profane literature will not be sufficient to detect the typical sense. The latter is a supernatural fact depending entirely on the free will of God; nothing but revelation can make it known to us, so that Scripture and tradition must be regarded as the source of any solid argument in favor of the existence of the typical sense in any particular passage.⁵

1. Steinmueller, *op. cit.*, I, 229; A. J. Maas, "Exegesis," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, V, 695.

2. Steinmueller, *op. cit.*, I, 230; Maas, "Exegesis," *Cath. Ency.*, V, 695.

3. *Op. cit.*, I, 230.

4. *Ibid.*

5. Maas, "Exegesis," *Cath. Ency.*, V, 695.

If it is asked whether the Jews understood that all these things (paschal ceremonies, etc.) were of themselves of no value, but were prophecies of future salvation, it should be said that all Jews were able and ought to have understood that there was no salvation for them except through the Messiah and that the Law was a preparation for the Messiah (John 1,17 ff.; 4,19 ff.; 5,39.45 ff.; Luke 24,44). Concerning particular types, however, it can rightly be doubted whether the Jews understood what was signified through them.¹

The Church of the Old Testament was a figure of the Church of the New Testament; sacrifices of animals were figures of the sacrifice of Christ; rites, by which legal righteousness was obtained, were figures of the sacraments, by which internal righteousness is conferred.²

6. The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod

A.

Literature published within the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod on the subject of Biblical typology includes first of all an article published in 1921 by Dr. William Arndt and entitled Typisch messianische Weissagungen.

The Old and New Testaments fully agree, says Dr. Arndt, yet there is a great difference between them. All the saving facts and truths of the New Testament were proclaimed already in the Old; but the full content and glory of this proclamation is first made known in the New Testament.³

1. Christian Pesch, Praelectiones Dogmaticae, V, 300.

2. Ibid., p. 301.

3. William Arndt, "Typisch messianische Weissagungen," Lehre und Wehre, Dec., 1921, p. 359.

Typical messianic prophecies are those which set forth by means of a type, a Vorbild (the type being either a person, a thing, or an act), what would come to pass in the future through the Messiah for the salvation of the human race, e.g., the annual slaying of the paschal lamb (1 Cor. 5,7).¹

That there are such Tatweissagungen in the Old Testament is plainly indicated in Scripture. Scripture indeed presents no formal essay on the different kinds of prophecy. It rather treats the matter concretely in such places as Heb. 8,5-6; Rom. 5,14; 1 Pet. 3,20-21.²

There is a single divine plan guiding the sacred history of the Old and New Testaments. The entire sacred history is shaped by God. By giving to Old Testament historical characters a typical character, God used them to make known His loving plan to redeem mankind. A typical character is ascribed to the entire Old Testament (1 Cor. 10; 1 Pet. 1,11; Ezek. 34,23-24; cf. Is. 40, 3-5 with Matt. 3, Mark 1, Luke 3. Note the many references in the book of Hebrews. Cf. Col. 2,16-17.).³

Did the children of the Old Covenant recognize that they were living among types? Yes, by the help of verbal proclamations of the prophets (Deut. 18,15; Ps. 110; Mal. 3,1).⁴

1. Ibid., p. 360.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., pp. 361-363.

4. Ibid., pp. 363-364.

An understanding of the typical character of the Old Testament is indispensable not only for understanding the Old Testament itself, but also for solving exegetical difficulties connected with the citations of the Old Testament in the New. Such a passage as Matt. 2,15, "Out of Egypt have I called my son," which was originally applied to Israel (Hos. 11,1), does not simply show caprice on the part of Matthew when he applies it to our Lord. It is based on the fact that Israel was a type of Christ. God's marvelous dealings with Israel were typical messianic prophecies of His dealings with His Son. The discussion of Sarah and Hagar in Gal. 4 bespeaks a similar solution. The story of Sarah and Hagar in Genesis was not merely history, but possessed a typical character.¹

Dr. Arndt presents the following canons for treating typical messianic prophecies:

1. The entire Old Testament has a typical character.
2. Where the Scripture itself points out a type, that, of course, is an absolutely correct interpretation.
3. When the New Testament points out that there are types in the Old Testament, the interpreter's task is carefully to search the Scriptures themselves for an authoritative interpretation of these types.
4. The rule that one can consider only those to be types which Scripture clearly indicates to be such, goes too far. It does not properly evaluate the fact that the entire Old Testament is typical.

1. Ibid., pp. 363-365.

5. One must not claim a typical meaning where text, context, and New Testament indicate a verbal prophecy, e.g., in Ps. 22.
6. One should carefully observe how Christ and the New Testament writers point out Old Testament types, and proceed according to the analogy of their interpretation.
7. For a typical interpretation which is not clearly attested by Scripture, one cannot claim unconditional acceptance. One must be satisfied to point it out as a possible interpretation.¹

Dr. Arndt's position allows the statements of Scripture regarding its typical character to have full value. It recognizes the interpreter's right to investigate the typical things of Scripture and to use them to explain exegetical difficulties. His last canon points out a critically important consideration: that typical investigations into places to which Scripture has not specifically directed attention always have a conditional status. There is a principle here which no interpreter with proper humility should forget as he approaches Scripture: that there are problems in the interpretation of Scripture which he can and ought to investigate, but to which he will never be able to give a dogmatically expressed answer.

B.

In his Theological Hermeneutics Dr. Ludwig Fuerbringer makes only one reference to typology. He held that such passages as "I . . . called my son out of Egypt" (Hos. 11,1)

1. Ibid., pp. 366-367.

183

have reference alone to the New Testament fulfillment. He rejects the view that the passage referred originally to Israel, and that, since Israel was typical of Christ, the passage could properly be applied to Christ, too.¹

C.

Victor Mennicke, in The Abiding Word (1947) writes:

The "spiritual interpretation" by the Holy Spirit is to be carefully distinguished from that attempted by human interpreters. Peter declares the flood of Noah to be a type of Baptism (1 Pet. 3, 20-21). This interpretation is correct, for it is given by the Holy Spirit Himself. But when human interpreters would continue the picture and say that the ark represents the Church, the door stands for the Word of God through which the people enter the Church, this interpretation may be according to the analogy of faith; yet it cannot be proved, and no one should build his faith upon such interpretations or demand Scriptural authority for it.²

D.

Three sermons published in The Concordia Pulpit, 1946, show how typology can be used for purposes of edification. The sermons, an Advent series by Richard C. Jahn, are together entitled: "Nazarites as Types of Christ." In separate sermons Pastor Jahn treats Samson, Samuel, and John the Baptist as typical of the Savior. It is interesting to note that none of these is expressly declared by the New Testament to be typical.³

-
1. Ludwig Fuerbringer, Theological Hermeneutics, p. 18.
 2. Victor Mennicke, "Bible Interpretation," The Abiding Word, II, 55-56.
 3. The Concordia Pulpit, 1946, pp. 367-374.

CONCLUSION

We have reached the end of our study. We have seen theologians down through the centuries dealing with what is typical in the Scriptures. We have experienced what we set at the head of our study: "De sensu literarum sacrarum mystico varia sunt hominum iudicia." We draw no conclusions. That was not our objective, and we leave it to other investigations.

These things, though, we can say. Certain sentiments occurred again and again in the works into which we looked, and were expressed time after time by men who plowed in this field.

One of them is that there is more of a typical quality in the Old Testament than is apparent at first sight. Christ is well-represented in the Old Testament, not only in the utterances of its prophets, but in the very structure and composition of its history. The very actions of the Old Testament testify of Christ.

Another sentiment is that if we can find types in the Old Testament, we can learn from them. They are priceless discoveries. For the existence of a type means that God has acted. He has stepped into history and revealed Himself. And when God reveals Himself, let every man take off his spiritual shoes from off his feet, and keep silence before Him with open eyes and ears, if perchance He may utter a word of grace, and we may learn to know Him better.

The Church, too, as the bearer of Christ's Word of reconciliation to the world, needs the knowledge of the types of Scripture. Christ Himself and His prophets and apostles and evangelists used them. They counted an intimate knowledge of the Old Testament a thing to be esteemed, and types were a part and an instrument in their preaching, their "Kerygma," by which they formed the body of Christ and turned the world upside down. Shall the Church today, then, disdain the types in the Scriptures and count them a thing of little avail?

But scholars have seen, too, that it is difficult to dig types out of the Scriptures. Men have failed so often and have brought forth monstrous things which subverted the Scriptures and served neither for truth nor edification. But if ignorant men have dug in the earth and brought up fool's gold, should we cease on that account to dig there for the true metal?

Another sentiment is this: How can we get at the types in the Scriptures if the New Testament has not displayed them before our eyes? If one has no Scriptural evidence, one cannot be sure he has found a type, because Scripture is its own interpreter. One must have evidence.

Well and good. If all these things are true: if there are more types in the Old Testament than meet the first glance; if we could profit and learn by finding them out; if we need the evidence of Scripture to substan-

tiate our finds: what is the conclusion? The conclusion
 is, let us search the Scriptures. Let us see if they
 will not show us more clearly what types are. Let us
 delve into their mines and see if they will not show us
 more than we have found before. Let us search them
 diligently, to see if they will not lead us to a better
 understanding of the history of ancient days, that we may
 learn and be edified. Let us ransack the Scriptures and
 find more of the testimony they bear to Him who came in
 the fulness of time and became our Light and Life and
 Salvation.

Bibliography

- Abelard, Peter, "Sic et Non," in Petri Abaelardi Abbatis Rugensis Opera Omnia (Patrologiae Cursus Completus, second series, Vol. 178), J. -P. Migne, ed., Paris, 1855, pp. 1330-1610.
- Aquinas, Thomas, Summa Theologica, translated by fathers of the English Dominican Province, second and revised edition, London, Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd., 1920.
- Arndt, William, "Typisch messianische Weissagungen," Lehre und Wehre, LXVII (December, 1921), 359-367.
- Augustine, "Contra Faustum," Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887, IV, 183-199.
- Anonymous, "The Epistle of Barnabas," The Apostolic Fathers, Loeb Classical Library, translated by Kirsopp Lake, London, Wm. Heinemann, 1925, pp. 337-409.
- Barth, Karl, Die Kirchliche Dogmatik, Zuerich, A. G. Zollikon, 1942-1944.
- _____, Roemerbrief, third printing, new edition, Muenchen, Chr. Kaiser, 1924.
- Beck, J. T., Einleitung in das System der Christlichen Lehre, Stuttgart, Chr. Belser'schen Buchhandlung, 1838.
- Bengel, John A., Gnomon of the New Testament, translated by Charlton Lewis and Marvin Vincent, Philadelphia, Perkinpine and Higgins, 1862.
- _____, Ordo Temporum, second edition, Stuttgart, John Mezler, 1770.
- Briggs, Charles Augustus, Messianic Prophecy, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891.
- Brunner, Emil, The Mediator, translated by Olive Wyon, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1947.
- _____, The Word and the World, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931.
- Camfield, F. W., Revelation and the Holy Spirit, An Essay in Barthian Theology, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

- Darbyshire, J. R., "Typology," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, James Hastings, ed., New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928, XI, 500-504.
- Dorner, Isaac A., A System of Christian Doctrine, translated by Alfred Cave and J. S. Banks, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1881.
- _____, History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, translated by William L. Alexander, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1878.
- Ernesti, John A., Institutio Interpretis Novi Testamenti, fifth edition, Leipzig, Weidmann Library, 1809.
- Fairbairn, Patrick, The Typology of Scripture, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1900.
- Farrar, F. W., History of Interpretation, London, Macmillan and Co., 1886.
- Flacius, Matthias, Clavis Scripturae Sacrae, new edition by Theodore Sulzer, Leipzig, Christianus Goezius, 1695.
- Fritsch, Charles, "Biblical Typology," Bibliotheca Sacra, CIII (July-September and October-December, 1946), 293-305, 418-430, CIV (January-March and April-June, 1947), 87-100, 214-222.
- Fritsch, Robert, "Isaac, a Type of Christ," Our Hope, November, 1933, 281-288.
- Fuerbringer, Ludwig, Theological Hermeneutics, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1924.
- Geffcken, Joh., "Allegory," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, James Hastings, ed., New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928, I, 327-331.
- Gerhard, John, Loca Theologica, edited by Ed. Preuss, Berlin, Gust. Schlawitz, 1863.
- Glass, Solomon, Philologia Sacra, fifth edition, Frankfurt, John Fleischer, 1686.
- Harnack, Adolph, "Antiochene School," New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Samuel M. Jackson, ed., New York, Funk and Wagnalls, n.d., I, 201-202.
- Hebert, A. G., The Throne of David, A Study of the Fulfilment of the Old Testament in Jesus Christ and His Church, London, Faber and Faber Limited, 1941.

- Hengstenberg, Ernst, The Christology of the Old Testament, second edition, translated by James Martin, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1865.
- Hofmann, J. Chr. K., Weissagung und Erfuellung im Alten und im Neuen Testamente, Noerdlingen, C. H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung, 1841-1844.
- Holl, Karl, "Luthers Bedeutung fuer den Fortschritt der Auslegungskunst," in Gesammelte Aufsaeetze zur Kirchengeschichte, sixth edition, Tuebingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Vol. I, 544-582.
- Hoppe, P., "Grundzuege der lutherischen Hermeneutik, zusammengestellt aus Luthers Schriften," Lehre und Wehre, XXVIII (February-April, 1882), 57-72, 108-111, 148-157.
- Hoyer, D. A., "Exegesis," The Encyclopedia Americana, 1936 edition, X, 628-636.
- Inge, W. R., "Alexandrian Theology," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, James Hastings, ed., New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928, I, 308-319.
- Jahn, Richard C., "Nazaries as Types of Christ," Concordia Pulpit for 1946, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1945, pp. 367-374.
- Jerome, "Epistle 53 to Paulinus," Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912, VI, 99-101.
- Justin Martyr, "Dialog with Trypho, a Jew," The Ante-Nicene Fathers, American reprint, Buffalo, The Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1885, I, 194-270.
- Keil, Karl Friedrich, Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, translated from the second edition by George Douglas, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1869.
- Klausen, H. N., Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments, aus dem Daenischen uebersetzt von C. O. Schmidt-Phiseldok, Leipzig, Karl Franz Koehler, 1841.
- Kurtz, Johann, Church History, translated from latest revised edition by John Macpherson, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, n.d.
- Luther, Martin, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, translator and place of printing not given, Salmon S. Miles, 1840.

Luther, Martin, Auslegung des Ersten Buch Mosis (Walch Ed., Vols. I and II), Magdeburg, Johann Gebauer, 1739.

_____, Die Zehn Gebote dem Volk zu Wittenberg Gepredigt, St. Louis Edition, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1894, III, 1132-1353.

_____, Kuerzere Auslegung der Epistel St. Pauli an die Galater, St. Louis Edition, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1892, VIII, 1352-1661.

_____, Prefaces to the Books of the Bible, Philadelphia (Holman) Edition, Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1932, VI, 363-491.

_____, The Babylonian Captivity of the Church, Philadelphia (Holman) Edition, Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1943, II, 167-293.

Maas, A. J., "Exegesis," Catholic Encyclopedia, New York, Robert Appleton Co., 1909, V, 695-697.

_____, "Types in Scripture," Catholic Encyclopedia, New York, Robert Appleton Co., 1912, XV, 107-108.

McClintock, John, and Strong, James, "Type," Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1894, X, 608-611.

Mennicke, Victor, "Bible Interpretation," The Abiding Word, Theodore Laetsch, ed., St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1947, II, 35-58.

Nash, Henry S., "Exegesis or Hermeneutics," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Samuel M. Jackson, ed., New York, Funk and Wagnalls, n.d., IV, 237-248.

Neve, J. L., A History of Christian Thought, Philadelphia, The Muhlenberg Press, 1946.

Oehler, Gustav F., Theology of the Old Testament, revised translation by George E. Day, third edition, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1885.

Orelli, Hans Conrad von, The Old Testament Prophecy of the Consummation of God's Kingdom, translated by J. S. Banks, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1885.

Origen, "De Principiis," The Ante-Nicene Fathers, American Reprint, Buffalo, Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1885, IV, 239-382.

- Pascal, Blaise, Pensées and The Provincial Letters, Modern Library series, New York, Random House, 1941.
- Pesch, Christian, Praelectiones Dogmaticae, fourth edition, Freiburg-Bresgau, B. Herder, 1916.
- Rambach, Johann Jacob, De Sensus Mystici Criteriis, third edition, Jena, J. W. Hartung, 1738.
- _____, Institutiones Hermeneuticae Sacrae, second edition, Jena, J. W. Hartung, 1743.
- Reu, Martin, Luther and the Scriptures, Columbus, Ohio, The Wartburg Press, 1944.
- Ruoff, Henry W., Masters of Achievement, The World's Greatest Leaders in Literature, Art, Religion, Philosophy, Science, Politics, and Industry, Buffalo, The Frontier Press, 1913.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich, Der Christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche, second revised edition, Berlin, G. Reimer, 1831.
- Smith, Henry Preserved, "Types," A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics, Shailer Mathews and Gerald Birney Smith, eds., New York, The Macmillan Company, 1921.
- Srawley, J. H., "Antiochene Theology," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, James Hastings, ed., New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928, I, 584-593.
- Steinmueller, J. E., A Companion to Scripture Studies, second edition, New York, Joseph P. Wagner, Inc., 1943.
- Stier, Rudolph, Andeutungen fuer Glaebiges Schriftverstaendnisz im Ganzen und Einzelnen, Koenigsberg, August Wilhelm Unzer, 1824.
- Stone, Darwell, "The Mystical Interpretation of the Old Testament," in A New Commentary on Holy Scripture Including the Apocrypha, Charles Gore, Henry Goudge, and Alfred Guillaume, eds., New York, The Macmillan Company, 1928, pp. 688-697.
- Tasker, R. V. G., The Old Testament in the New Testament, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1947.
- Terry, Milton S., Biblical Hermeneutics, A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments, new edition, New York, Eaton and Mains, 1890.

Tholuck, A., Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament, fifth improved edition, Gotha, Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1861.

Torn, Fr., Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1930.

Triglot Concordia, The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1921.

Wach, Joachim, Das Verstehen, Grundzuege einer Geschichte der hermeneutischen Theorie im 19. Jahrhundert, Tuebingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926-1933.

_____, "Caspar Schwenkfeld, A Pupil and a Teacher in the School of Christ," The Journal of Religion, XXVI, January, 1946.

Weidner, Revere F., Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology, second edition, Chicago, Fleming H. Revell, 1898.

Westcott, Brooke Foss, An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, seventh edition, London, Macmillan and Company, 1880.

_____, The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays, second edition, London, Macmillan and Company, 1892.