

*Piotr Labuda*

The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Cracow, Poland

## **Typological Usage of the Old Testament in the New Testament**

### **Abstract**

The typological reading and application of Hebrew texts deserve the greatest attention among the numerous ways of reading and applying the Old Covenant ideas, traditions and texts. Through the typological reading and application of the text, the text is given broad latitude for its typological application. Treating the Bible from the typological point of view is not only restricted to quoting the books of the Old Testament. Instead, numerous allusions and references to events, characters, places and descriptions are made. The interpretation of these analogies leads to the understanding of the whole truth of the Old and New Testament. "Christians therefore read the Old Testament in the light of Christ who died and rose from the dead. Such typological reading reveals an inexhaustible part of the Old Testament" (CCC 129). Therefore typological thinking is necessary in order to interpret the Bible messages appropriately.

### **Keywords**

Typology, type, antitype, Old Testament, New Testament.

One of the most frequently recurring problems one encounters in New Testament studies is the use of the Old Testament text and of Jewish traditions<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> See J. Kudasiewicz, *Biblia – Historia – Nauka. Rozważania i dyskusje Biblijne*, Kraków 1986, Znak, p. 384-394; K.R. Snodgrass, *Matthew and the Law*, in: D.J. Lull (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1988 Seminar Papers, One Hundred Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting, 19-22 November 1988: Chicago*, Atlanta, Georgia 1988, Scholars Press, p. 536-554; A. Kowalczyk, *Wpływ typologii oraz tekstów Starego Testamentu na redakcję Ewangelii Mateusza*, Gdańsk 1993, Bernardinum; J. Klinkowski, *Zużytkowanie Starego Testamentu w Nowym*, Legnica 2000, Alta 2; E.J. Jezierska, *Duch Święty w Kościele po Pięćdziesiątnicy. Nauka Dziejów Apostolskich o Duchu Świętym*, in: W. Chrostowski (ed.), *„Stworzył Bóg człowieka na Swój obraz”. Księga pamiątkowa dla Biskupa*

Although it was obvious to the people of the early Church that the events of the Old Covenant were long passed, its pages have always constituted God's Word both for Christ and the Church. The Old Testament text and the Jewish traditions were crucial in the teaching and shaping of the New Testament texts<sup>2</sup>.

The New Testament authors were extremely creative in their presentation of the life and works of Jesus. Their creative aspect allowed them to adapt and make use of not only of the works and ideas of the Chosen People, but also of the literary forms and ideas of other cultures in which they found themselves and where they worked. The way they employed the Old Testament text deserves the greatest attention in this regard. One of the various ways they used the Old Testament text, ideas and traditions was in their use of these as typological readings and in doing so they used the Hebrew texts in a broadest sense.

## 1. *Typology as a means of interpretation*

In discussing the spiritual meaning of the Bible, the document of the Pontifical Biblical Commission<sup>3</sup>, states that *typology* is a crucial principle in interpreting of the Old Testament in the New.

Typological thinking is a fundamental function of human thinking and interpretation<sup>4</sup>. The origins of typological interpretation as an interpretative principle in relation to the Bible can be traced back to the Church of the first

---

*Profesora Mariana Gołębiowskiego w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, Warsaw 2002, Vocatio, p. 157; R. Banks, *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition*, Cambridge-New York 2005<sup>2</sup>, Cambridge University Press, p. 90-236; M.S. Wróbel, *Chrześcijańska lektura Biblii Hebrajskiej*, in: S. Szymik (ed.), *Słowo Boże w życiu i misji Kościoła*, Lublin 2009, KUL.

<sup>2</sup> When discussing the usage of Judaic works and traditions in New Testament writings we should bear in mind the fact that a threefold relationship exists between the Old and the New Testament: continuity, lack of continuity and progress. This appears to be a regular characteristic and a confirmation of the truthfulness of the New Revelation. See R. Rubinkiewicz (tr.), *Naród Żydowski i jego Święte Pismo w Biblii chrześcijańskiej*, Kielce 2002, Jedność, p. 124-127. On the interpretation and application of the New Testament books in early Church see M. Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, Edinburgh 1994, T&T Clark; R.M. Grant, D. Tracy, *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*, Philadelphia 1996<sup>2</sup>, Fortress Press.

<sup>3</sup> See R. Rubinkiewicz (tr. and ed.), *Interpretacja Biblii w Kościele. Dokument Papieskiej Komisji Biblijnej z komentarzem biblistów polskich*, Warsaw 1999, Jedność; see also CCC 130.

<sup>4</sup> See G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, „Evangelische Theologie“ 12 (1952-53), p. 17.

centuries when it was relatively systematized<sup>5</sup>. Typological insight, especially into the Old Testament pages, developed dynamically in the works of medieval reformers<sup>6</sup>. The last few decades have witnessed a revival of interest in biblical scholars on this topic. As a point of reference one can find such interest in the works of the following authors: A. B. Davidson<sup>7</sup>, E. W. Hengstenberg<sup>8</sup>, M.S. Terry<sup>9</sup>, F. Delitzsch<sup>10</sup>, B. F. Westcott<sup>11</sup>, and especially P. Fairbairn<sup>12</sup>.

The first complete historical treatment on the use of typology by the New Testament authors is found in a publication by Leonard Goppelt, published in 1939<sup>13</sup>. It is crucial to recognize that the above-mentioned works, written during 1800-1920, remained basically unnoticed. Such ignorance may have stemmed from the fact that the problem of relationship between the Testaments and hermeneutical studies in general were on principle disregarded by biblical commentators<sup>14</sup>. According to L. Goppelt, *typology* is the prevailing and characteristic hermeneutical principle in order to interpret the New Testament, which makes understating of the Scriptures possible; it is the basis for understanding Jesus, the Gospel and

<sup>5</sup> See H. de Lubac, *Typologie et allégorisme*, „Recherches de science religieuse” 34 (1947), p. 180-226; J. Daniélou, *Qu'est-ce que la typologie?*, in: P. Auvray (ed.), *L'Ancien Testament et les Chrétiens*, Paris 1951, Éditions du Cerf, p. 199-205; Orygenes, *O zasadach*, Kraków 1996, WAM, p. 339ff.; S. Wielgus, *Badania nad Biblią w starożytności i w średniowieczu*, Lublin 1990, TNKUL; G. Łopatka, *Zasady interpretacji Biblii w „De doctrina Christiana” św. Augustyna a współczesna hermeneutyka biblijna*, Kraków 2000, WNPAT; P.W. Martens, *Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction: The Case of Origen*, „Journal of Early Christian Studies” 16 (2008) 3, p. 283-317.

<sup>6</sup> See G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, p. 21.

<sup>7</sup> A.B. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, Edinburgh 1904, T&T Clark (work published after the author's death).

<sup>8</sup> E.W. Hengstenberg, *Christology of the Old Testament*, 2 vols., Edinburgh 1836-39, T&T Clark.

<sup>9</sup> M.S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics*, New York 1883, p. 244-303.

<sup>10</sup> His views concerning theology were included in the Book of Genesis commentary. See F. Delitzsch, *Neuer Commentar über die Genesis*, Giessen 1999, Brunnen Verlag, (original edition 1878), as well as in the whole series of commentaries by Keil and Delitzsch. See G.P. Hugenberger, *Introductory Notes on Typology*, in: G.K. Beale (ed.), *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text?*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House 1994, p. 331.

<sup>11</sup> B.F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London 1892, Macmillan.

<sup>12</sup> P. Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture*, 2 vols., Philadelphia 1854, Daniels&Smith, (first edition 1845-1847).

<sup>13</sup> See L. Goppelt, *Typos: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen*, Gütersloh 1939, reprint Dammstadt 1966, WBG: *Typos. The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, Grand Rapids 1982, W.B. Eerdmans.

<sup>14</sup> See L. Goppelt, *Typos*, p. 14ff.

the Church<sup>15</sup>. From this interpretative perspective both the *type* and *typology* are fundamental in understanding the Gospel with respect to theology<sup>16</sup>. When trying to describe the role and meaning of *typology*, other commentators related to and often repeated L. Goppelt's opinion, they introduce only minor modifications<sup>17</sup>. The following years brought only renewed discredit to the typological principle, as an important element in the theological sciences<sup>18</sup>. The situation changed at the end of the 20th century, when a renewed interest in Biblical *typology* became widely revived<sup>19</sup>. Over the last few decades numerous works and studies have presented the history of the use of *typology* as well as contemporary attempts to conceive and describe the use of *typology*<sup>20</sup>. These works led to the dynamic

<sup>15</sup> Typology „is the central and distinctive New Testament way of understanding Scripture”. See L. Goppelt, *Τύπος, ἀντίτυπος, τύπικος, ὑποτύποις*, TDNT VIII, p. 255.

<sup>16</sup> „Typology is theologically constitutive for an understanding of the Gospel”. Ibidem, p. 256.

<sup>17</sup> According to G.E. Wright and R.M. Grant, the term „typology” best reflects the method of interpreting and understanding the Old Testament in the primary Church community. See G.E. Wright, *God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital*, London 1952, SCM Press, p. 61; R.M. Grant, *A short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*, New York-London 1963, Wyn Grant, p. 54-55. For E.E. Ellis, as well as W.G. Kümmel, typological interpretation best expresses the basic attitude of the primary Christianity towards the Old Testament. See E.E. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity*, Tübingen 1978, J.C.B. Mohr, p. 165; W.G. Kümmel, *Schriftauslegung*, “Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart” V, p. 1519.

<sup>18</sup> See G.W.H. Lampe, *The Reasonableness of Typology*, in: G.W.H. Lampe, K.J. Woollcombe (eds.), *Essays on Typology*, London 1957, SCM Press, p. 16.

<sup>19</sup> Even though a greater number of adversaries of the relevance of typological considerations should be presented, the group includes, among others, R. Bultmann, F. Baumgärtel, R.L. Lucas, R.E. Murphy, G. Fohrer, H. Haag. Should you like to learn more about them see R.M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical TYPOS Structures*, Michigan 1981, Andrews Univ. Press, p. 2-3. 59. 65. 88-92.

<sup>20</sup> See E.E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids, MI 1957, W.B. Eerdmans; G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, p. 17-33; W. Eichrodt, *Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?*, in: C. Westermann (ed.), *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation*, London 1963, SCM Press; and H.W. Wolff, *The Hermeneutics of the Old Testament*, in: C. Westermann (ed.), *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*, Atlanta 1960; J. Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, London 1961, University Microfilms; R.M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical ΤΥΠΟΣ Structures*; D.L. Baker, *Two Testaments: One Bible*; S.L. Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New. An Argument for Biblical Inspiration*, Grand Rapids MI 1980, W.B. Eerdmans, in particular p. 53-79; J.A. Meek, *Toward a Biblical Typology*, Westminster 1981, Westminster Theological Seminary; M. Silva, *The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority*, in: D.A. Carson, J.D. Woodbridge (eds.), *Scripture and Truth*, Grand Rapids, MI 1983, W.B. Eerdmans, p. 147-65; G.W.H. Lampe, K.J. Woollcombe (eds.), *Essays on Typology*; M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, Oxford 1988, Clarendon Press; D.K. McKim (ed.), *A Guide to Contemporary Hermeneutics. Major Trends in Biblical Interpretation*; Grand Rapids, MI 1986, W.B. Eerdmans; G.R. Osborne, *Type, Typology*, in: G.W. Bromiley (ed.), *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. IV, Grand Rapids, MI 1988, W.B. Eerdmans, p. 930-932; E.P. Clowney, *The Unfolding Mystery. Discovering*

development and improvement of typological methodologies. The growing interest in *typology* gave birth to a variety of approaches and conceptions concerning the issue in question, which since.

L. Goppelt's times has been viewed as "a doctrine according to which all of the New Testament events were predicted symbolically in the Old Testament," or as a specific type of symbolism - "a prophetic symbol"<sup>21</sup>. It seems that such revival and deepening of the traditional view of the "type" - "typology" perceived so far as "fulfillment of promises" in particular or in between both Testaments<sup>22</sup>, has been enriching the understanding and application of these terms. In Jean Daniélou's view, *typology* has always been an element of the common Church tradition. It can be spotted everywhere in the modern church, in the West and the East, in Antioch and Alexandria. It is the type of exegesis that should always be of a normative nature to Biblical scholars. Thanks to *typology*, the complete view of the unity of God's plan - salvation history - is exposed in subsequent layers of history<sup>23</sup>.

The interest in *typology* was triggered by a few basic factors. One of the fundamental factors was, coming to the conclusion, that *typology* is a specific method of examination of relationships between events, characters or institutions present in the Scriptures. The question of the typological relationship of both Testaments, according to certain scholars, was often ignored in the exegetic milieu<sup>24</sup>. Meanwhile, E.E. Ellis believes that it is impossible to miss the application and usage of *typology* in relation to Old Testament texts in the works of Saint Paul<sup>25</sup>. *Typology*, therefore, became a useful tool of hermeneutical studies. These studies touched upon the usage of the Old Testament's own *typology*, visible in its proctology, patriarchal narratives, the particular patriarchal and prophetic characters, or other historical and salvation events, as well as in the events

---

*Christ in the Old Testament*, Colorado Springs, CO 1988, NavPress; J.M. Kee, *Typology and Tradition: Refiguring the Bible in Milton's Paradise Lost*, "Semeia" 51 (1990), p. 155-75.

<sup>21</sup> See F. Young, *Typology*, in: S.E. Porter, P. Joyce, D.E. Orton (eds.), *Crossing the Boundaries. Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1994, Brill, p. 29; W. Croft, *Typology and Universals*, Cambridge 2003<sup>2</sup>, Cambridge Univ. Press, p. 1-6.

<sup>22</sup> See D.L. Baker, *Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament*, in: G.K. Beale (ed.), *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text?*, p. 313.

<sup>23</sup> See J. Daniélou, *Qu'est-ce que la typologie?*, p. 200-203.

<sup>24</sup> In this way see L. Goppelt, *τύπος*, p. 246.

<sup>25</sup> See E.E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, similar conclusions concerning Jesus' teachings were also drawn by R.T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, London 1971, Tyndale Press.

of its own eschatology in a singular manner<sup>26</sup>. Another reason which induced researchers to return to studies on the problem of *typology* was the desire to make theology of the Old Testament more important to modern Christians<sup>27</sup>.

When discussing the reasons for revived interest in *typology* it must be observed that in contrast to the historic and traditional view, more and more modern commentators, taking into account the rules of *typology*, somehow did not take into consideration the Christian history of philosophy, in which it is God who administers and shapes all analogies and relations, which exist between people, objects and events in the whole of salvation history. Obviously, such a statement does mean the denial of inspiration in any of its elements. However, what is highlighted is the idea according to which the *type* is a certain literary or theological genre<sup>28</sup>. When one analyzes e.g. the Lucan description of the activity of the primitive Church, the most radical commentators<sup>29</sup> emphasize the fact that the Acts of the Apostles' author described the events presented in them on the basis of a typological view of Jesus' life, which became a model for Luke and which he used to create and depict not strictly historical events. In such a view, the Acts of the Apostles' *typology* was created as an intentional modeling of histories upon each other. It is noteworthy that in such a notion and view of *typology* may infringe and question the veracity and historicity of the events it is related to<sup>30</sup>.

---

<sup>26</sup> Therefore some commentators believe that when speaking about redemption or eschatological notions, Biblical authors related to e.g. exodus of the chosen people from captivity or used them as a specific basis. See e.g. J.J. Enz, *The Book of Exodus as a Literary Type for the Gospel of John*, "Journal of Biblical Literature" 76 (1957), p. 208-15. See also G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, p. 18-19; G.W.H. Lampe, *The Reasonableness of Typology*, p. 26.

<sup>27</sup> Such a message can be also observed in the following works: G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*; the same author, *Old Testament Theology*, p. 319-429; W. Eichrodt, *Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?*, p. 224-45; H.W. Wolff, *The Hermeneutics of the Old Testament*, p. 160-199.

<sup>28</sup> See G.P. Hugenberger, *Introductory Notes on Typology*, p. 333.

<sup>29</sup> These researchers include among others M.D. Goudler, for whom typology is mainly a literary tool. See M.D. Goudler, *Type and History in Acts*, London 1964, p. 187; F. Young, *Typology*, p. 29-30.

<sup>30</sup> It is crucial that such a view of the historicity of the events that form the salvation history and the preference of theological ideas history expressed in the context of types and antitypes are characterized by the amalgam of typology and traditional-historical method, which are partly defended by Gerhard von Rad. See G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, p. 19-21; the same author, *Old Testament Theology*, p. 319-429. G. von Rad emphasizes that: „Die neutestamentlichen Erzähler gehen oft ausgesprochenmaßen, oft aber auch stillschweigend an alttestamentlichen Geschehnissen entlang und sie setzen beim Leser voraus, daß er um dieses – wie gesagt: oft verborgene - Entsprechungsverhältnis weiß und es von sich aus bedenkt“. G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, p. 19-20.

## 2. The *type* and *antitype*

The terms “*type*” and “*typology*” refer to the Biblical designation τύπος, as well as its derivatives: τυπικός (*typical*), ἀντίτυπος (*antitype*) and ὑποτύπωσις (*type*)<sup>31</sup>. However, there is no linguistic Biblical term, which is equivalent of the word “*typology*.” Biblical authors did not analyze or systematize *types*. The term τύπος and its derivatives appear in the Bible as a print, a mark, an imprint, an image, an impression, a representation, a statue, a form, a character type, a model, an example, a type, a symbol<sup>32</sup>. In the LXX and in the New Testament texts the term τύπος appears seventeen times<sup>33</sup>. The remaining terms occur only on the pages of the New Testament: τυπικός appears once<sup>34</sup>, ἀντίτυπος<sup>35</sup> and ὑποτύπωσις<sup>36</sup> and each of these terms appears twice. The meaning of the following terms used in the Bible is close to τύπος and its derivatives: δείγμα<sup>37</sup>, δειγματίζω<sup>38</sup>, παράδειγμα<sup>39</sup>, παραδειγματίζω<sup>40</sup>, υπόδειγμα<sup>41</sup>, which denote in every case<sup>42</sup> “an example”, “a model”<sup>43</sup>. It is crucial that both in the LXX and in the New Testament texts the term τύπος is not used as a technical term<sup>44</sup>. It means basically “an example,” “a model,” “an analogy.” This term allows us to determine the relationship between realities - it determines the various examples, models and analogies.

<sup>31</sup> The term τύπος is also used by the author of the apocryphal Epistle of Barnabas. See F. Young, *Typology*, p. 38.

<sup>32</sup> See R. Popowski, *Wielki słownik grecko-polski Nowego Testamentu. Wydanie z pełną lokalizacją greckich hasel, kluczem polsko-greckim oraz indeksem form czasownikowych*, Warsaw 1997<sup>3</sup>, Vocatio, p. 613.

<sup>33</sup> See Exod 25:40; Amos 5:26; John 20:25; Acta 7:43; 7:44; 23:25; Rom 5:14; 6:17; 1Cor 10:6; Phil 3:17; 1Thess 1:7; 2Thes 3:9; 1Tim 4:12; Titus 2:7; Heb 8:5; 1Pet 5:3.

<sup>34</sup> See 1Cor 10:11.

<sup>35</sup> See Heb 9:24; 1Pet 3:21.

<sup>36</sup> See 1Tim 1:16; 2Tim 1:13.

<sup>37</sup> See Jude 7.

<sup>38</sup> See Col 2:15.

<sup>39</sup> Exod 25:9; 1Chr 28:11.12.18.19.

<sup>40</sup> See Matt 1:19; Heb 6:6.

<sup>41</sup> See John 13:15; Heb 4:11; 8:5; 9:23; Jas 5:10; 2Pet 2:6.

<sup>42</sup> The only exception is Heb 6:6, where παραδειγματίζω means „to despise”.

<sup>43</sup> See R. Popowski, *Wielki słownik grecko-polski*, p. 119-120. 462. 628.

<sup>44</sup> Only a few believe that the term τύπος in 1Cor 10:6 (10:11) and in Rom 5:14 was used by Paul as a technical term and not as “a harbinger”, “model”, „example”. See L. Goppelt, *Τύπος*, p. 251-253.

According to a number of authors, *typology* has its roots in the Old Testament, especially in the prophetic writings<sup>45</sup>. These commentators, having various options at their disposal, point to the writings of the prophet Isaiah who used the image of the Garden of Eden as a type for the new paradise (see Isa 9:1(2); 11:6-9)<sup>46</sup>, or expects a new Exodus (see Isa 43:16-21; 48:20-21; 51:9-11; 52:11-12). Hosea predicted another Exodus into the desert (see Hos 2:16-17; 12:10; Jer 31:2)<sup>47</sup>. Many prophets point to David as a *royal type* who will come in the future (Isa 11:1; 55:3-4; Jer 23:5; Ezek 34:23-4; Am 9:11).

The character of Samuel is a *type* for prophets, Levites, judges (see 1Sam 9:11ff.)<sup>48</sup>. Some commentators also point to Abraham who is the faithful type (see Gen 15:6)<sup>49</sup> and Moses who stands as a type for the prophet type (Deut 18:15.18)<sup>50</sup>. Some commentators believe that even the story of the manna is a typological sign of God's caring for all who trust in Him according to the person's needs (Exod 16:9-27)<sup>51</sup>. According to Gerhard von Rad a considerable majority of events in the whole Old Testament opus are of a typological nature. One might have the impression that the new events, characters and institutions are constantly created or forecasted on basis of what had already taken place<sup>52</sup>.

One can encounter remarkable typological images in the night visions of the prophet Zechariah (see Zech 1-6). The inspired author presents the prophet as one who sees the final events of salvation history at nighttime. As one reads these texts, it becomes clear that all of the eschatological hopes for the promised blessings of salvation preexist in heaven, while the fulfillment of salvation itself is still awaited for here on earth<sup>53</sup>. Israel therefore expected a specific *type* of divine

<sup>45</sup> See F. Foulkes, *The Acts of God: A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament*, London 1958, p. 7; D.L. Baker, *Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament*, p. 315.

<sup>46</sup> See T. Brzegowy, *Księga Izajasza. Rozdziały 1-12. Wstęp - przekład z oryginału - komentarz*, t. XXII, part 1, Częstochowa 2010, Ed. Św. Pawła, p. 511. 620.

<sup>47</sup> See A.A. Macintosh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea*, Edinburgh 1997, T&T Clark, p. 69-76; B.E. Kelle, *Hosea 2: Metaphor and rhetoric in historical perspective*, Atlanta, Georgia 2005, Society of Biblical Literature, p. 266-272.

<sup>48</sup> See G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, p. 28-29.

<sup>49</sup> See W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, vol. II, London 1967, SCM Press, p. 227-228.

<sup>50</sup> See G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions*, vol. I, Louisville, Kentucky 2001<sup>2</sup>, W.J.K. Press, p. 289-296; J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri. Les figures du Christ dans Ancien Testament. Études sur les origines de la typologie biblique*, Paryż 1950, Éditions Beauchesne, p. 204.

<sup>51</sup> See G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. I, p. 282.

<sup>52</sup> See the same autor, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, p. 28-29.

<sup>53</sup> See *ibidem*, p. 18-19.

action, namely, the re-enactment of God's actions in history. However, such re-enactment assumed and expected a nuanced divine action in the new historical context, which divine action would connect the present divine action to past events. Thus the divine revelatory activity would find its fruition in future events, which would be identified as a new covenant, a new creation, a new temple)<sup>54</sup>. Horacy Hummel states<sup>55</sup>, that typology is based on the Old Testament to a large extent. "Typicality", for Hummel, is the fundamental characteristic, which connects one to the Old Testament historiography, cult, prophets and prophecies<sup>56</sup>. The role and application of a typological approach can be seen, especially in the influence of the Old Testament text and message on the pages of the New Testament. The New Testament authors' typological use of the Old Testament is not limited only to citing books of the Ancient Law. Frequently they used the Old Testament text in numerous allusions and in the numerous references they made to events, persons, places and descriptions of events. What is particular about such references is to align the growth and development of the New Testament text. Thus in using typology as a connecting element, the New Testament authors evoke and connect Old Testament events and in so doing they become parallels of the divine revelatory activity in Jesus and in salvation history which is thus fulfilled through Him and in Him. We are therefore dealing with a certain continuation in the divine revelatory activity, which broadens its Old Testament prediction in the New Covenant events. However, it must be remembered that typology is not an interpretation method but rather a way of thinking. Typology is a connective historical link directed more at understanding certain theological fragments, events and ideas of the New Testament in relationship to the events of the Old Testament. Typology is a kind of conjunction, which connects the divine revelatory events of the Old Testament with the expanded revelatory divine events. Typology is a literary form which has as an objective to bring out the unity of the whole of salvation history. The New Testament books are a typological fulfillment of the theological expression of the salvation history theologically expressed in the Old Testament, as well as an eschatological typological announcement of the events that are still to come<sup>57</sup>.

---

<sup>54</sup> See F. Foulkes, *The Acts of God*, p. 7.

<sup>55</sup> H. D. Hummel, *The Old Testament Basis of Typological Interpretation*, "Biblical Research" 9 (1964), p. 37-50.

<sup>56</sup> „Israel's fundamental concern behind all the personages, events, and scenes of her history was typical, and intended to point to the basic realities of all existence". H.D. Hummel, *The Old Testament*, p. 47.

<sup>57</sup> See more R.T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, p. 38-80; G.W.H. Lampe, *The Reasonableness of Typology*, p. 39-69.

In speaking about biblical typology one should not confuse it with analogy, which is an aspect employed in the field of Comparative Study of Religion. Typology makes an historical correlative connection and it is an expression of continuity and fulfillment; while the analogical comparative method tries to derive a possible connection or similarity between two different realities. One may speak of the Church of Christ typologically as God's eschatological Israel or the New Israel; such expressions are typological, insofar as Israel and the Church are not spoken of as two distinct different realities, but as one reality, as a community of Faith in two different historical moments. The Church as a community of Faith is in continuity with the Faith community of Israel. The Church is brought forth from the other and thus the relationship is not analogical but typological. The New Testament is derived from the Old Testament and the derivation is expressed typologically and not analogically. In comparative activities one would engage in certain analogies which are not identical to any particular typological connections made between events and persons of the Old and the New Testament, in particular, where Christ's Church is typologically spoken of as God's eschatological Israel<sup>58</sup>.

On the other hand one would use analogous language in order to bring out similarities between the Old Testament text with other Near Eastern texts or any other religious texts in order to identify possible similarities of expression which are rooted in culture and not a sharing of the same belief<sup>59</sup>. In this regard one may speak of similarities between the religions of the Near East and the Old Testament. However, when one engages in comparative examination of the Old Testament and Near Eastern religious texts one discovers some similarities between the religions of the Near East and the Old Testament. These similarities are about certain elements in relation to analogy of places, objects, events,

---

<sup>58</sup> Therefore Hans W. Wolff would say that the New Testament announces God's actions while the Old Testament events resemble and are somehow imitated by the character of Jesus Christ who becomes the sacrificed Paschal Lamb; the New King who renews the covenant with God through his death, or finally becomes the New Priest of Israel who redeems people's sin through his own sacrifice. See H.W. Wolff, *The Hermeneutics of the Old Testament*, p. 174-175.

<sup>59</sup> For this exact reason Rudolf Bultmann rejected the typology which, to his mind, is based on the repetition principle. According to him, the idea of typology originates from the cyclical view of history in the Near East and in the classical Greece. Therefore the typological presentation of history of the chosen nation is improper. See R. Bultmann, *Ursprung und Sinn der Typologie als hermeneutische Methode*, "Theologische Literaturzeitung" 75 (1950), p. 205-212. Straightforward criticism of such an opinion was presented by G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, p. 17-19.

institutions or actions<sup>60</sup>. However, studies of the ancient Near East are not a key to understanding and recognizing the individuality of the Old Testament. Moreover, not even Judaism and synagogue teaching reveal the full meaning of the Old Testament<sup>61</sup>. It is the Christian understanding that the Old Testament gains its full meaning only when read in the light of Jesus Christ's Good News. Numerous typological connecting references exist between these two Testaments. These references are not always exact quotations of the Old Testament text but the New Testament writer alludes to them and in so doing the typological always remains the same. The historical reality remains the same and thus it becomes the basis - the model for the new one. Based on this principle of continuity between the two testaments, Hans Walter Wolff believes that typology is to be understood as an analogy between the Old and the New Testament, where starting point is the Old Testament which is completely fulfilled only on the pages of the New Covenant<sup>62</sup>. Decoding these analogies leads to discovering the full truth of the Old and the New Testaments. It is with this understanding that Gerhard von Rad's firmly states that typological thinking is necessary approach in order to correctly interpret the Biblical message<sup>63</sup>.

### 3. Various Perspectives on typology

According to commentators<sup>64</sup>, typological thinking is based on the assumed existence of an analogous model and its counterpart - the *type* will connect with an event or a person. Thus, the given *type* typologizes (an antitype). Typological

---

<sup>60</sup> Analogy is quite different than genealogy. When speaking about similarities between religions and culture of the Near East and the Old Testament society basic differences should - noticing some similarities, be observed, which include first and foremost the concept of God, salvation, time. See P. Łabuda, *Śmierć i życie po śmierci wg Ewangelii św. Łukasza*, Tarnów 2007, Biblos, p. 19-25.

<sup>61</sup> „There are two sequels to the Old Testament: the New Testament and the Talmud. Neither Jews nor Christians alone are Israel but together they form one congregation of God”. K.H. Miskotte, *When the Gods Are Silent*, London 1967, Harper and Row, p. 77-78; I. Ledwoń, *Stary Testament a religie*, Lublin 2009, RW KUL.

<sup>62</sup> „The New Testament offers the analogy of a fitness of faith to the covenant will of God - a fitness founded on historical facts - who chooses out of the world a people for himself and calls it to freedom under his Lordship”. H.W. Wolff, *The Hermeneutics of the Old Testament*, p. 180.

<sup>63</sup> See G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, p. 31-33.

<sup>64</sup> See C.T. Fritsch, *Biblical Typology I: New Trends in Old Testament Theology*, “Bibliotheca sanctorum” 103 (1946), p. 293; G.W.H. Lampe, *Typological Exegesis*, “Theology” 56 (1953), p. 201; R.A. Marcus, *Presuppositions of the Typological Approach to Scripture*, “The Church Quarterly Review” 158 (1957), p. 448.

thinking was a thinking characteristic of people living in Biblical times, an event was not just an even, it was future oriented. They believed that there was a relationship between e.g. events in Israel's history and those that would take place in the future community of Christ's disciples (Cf. 1 Cor 10:6.11; Gen 5:14; 1 Pet 3:21).

The ancient Hebrews believed that there an affinity between the *type* and the *antitype*, that perceived realities referred to the *type*, because all experiences of reality were part of God's plan. The presence of the divine plan was the presupposed interpretational factor which was presumed by the Biblical authors and commentators. It is this interpretative approach that formed the ideological basis for any form of *typology*<sup>65</sup>.

According to the commentators, it is correct to say that *typology* is based on the fundamental notion that the history of God's people and their relations with God is a continuous process in which certain models, rules and similarities can be recognized and identified<sup>66</sup>.

Therefore, it can be assumed that when the "type", is recognized as a theological notion, and that it refers to a Biblical event, person, or institution, then the "type", can serve as an example or pattern for other biblical events, persons or institutions which are designated as the "antitype". *Typology* is the study of *types* and the historical and theological correlation between them. This theological correlation found in *typology* is based in God's faithful and consistent active presence, in the history of his Chosen People<sup>67</sup>.

Commentators refer to the above description as the historical - salvation definition<sup>68</sup>.

According to Charles T. Fritsch, "a *type* is an institution, a historical event or a person that is designated by God to herald a certain Christian truth"<sup>69</sup>. A similar opinion, though more insistent upon relations between the Old and the New Testament, is given by G.W.H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcomb's description

<sup>65</sup> See D.L. Baker, *Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament*, p. 322.

<sup>66</sup> See G.W.H. Lampe, *Typological Exegesis*, p. 201. According to some commentators such resemblances can be found in the vertical relation - type and antitype, i.e. the relationship between the heaven and earth realities, as well as in the horizontal relation - prototype and antitype, where we speak of the relationship between previous and later historical facts. See more in C. T. Fritsch, TO 'ANTITYPION, in: T.C. Vriezen (ed.), *Studia Biblica et Semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen Quie Munere Professoris Theologiae per XXV Annos Functus Est, ab Amicis, Collegis, Discipulis Dedicata*, Wageningen 1966, H.Veenman&Zonen, p. 100-107.

<sup>67</sup> See D.L. Baker, *Two Testaments: One Bible*, p. 267.

<sup>68</sup> See G.P. Hugenberger, *Introductory Notes on Typology*, p. 337.

<sup>69</sup> C.T. Fritsch, *Biblical Typology*, p. 214.

in which states that *typology* is an exegetical method that “can be defined as establishing a historical relationship between events, people or objects from the New Testament. Recognized as a literary method, *typology* may be defined as a description of the event, person or an object from the New Testament in a context borrowed from the description of its *prototypical* equivalent in the Old Testament”<sup>70</sup>. In their view, *typology* allows us to “discover and reveal the true links with historical events which took place in the spiral rhythm of God’s actions”<sup>71</sup>.

*Typology*, therefore, allows us to find historical models as part of historical revelation in order to reveal God’s saving actions in the Old and the New Israel<sup>72</sup>. A similar understanding of *typology* was expressed by Jean Daniélou who, when disputing with H. de Lubac, claimed that the object of *typology* is the examination of similarities between events, institutions or characters of the Old and the New Testament<sup>73</sup>. In his opinion, the whole outlook of Old Testament symbolism is merged in the character of Christ. Therefore, the various aspects of Christ reveal various kinds of *typology*. We can therefore distinguish between Christological, ecclesiastic and eschatological *typology*, thus correlating Christ in his historical existence, as well as Christ in his current eschatological life and in his sacramental presence in the Church. If typological exegesis was perceptible in the Old Testament itself, it gained a completely new emphasis in the New Testament as the fulfillment of the Old Testament in Jesus Christ who is the new Adam, Noah, Moses, Joshua etc.<sup>74</sup>. The perspective of those commentators who do not share in the history of salvation approach to *typology* should be mentioned as well. These are of the opinion that the *type* should be a Biblical character, an event or an institution on the basis of which an author intentionally creates his text. In such a point of view one can therefore identify a *typology* that consists of purposeful modeling of histories upon each other. Such a point of view is shared by various authors among whom we find M.D. Goudler who write about *typology*, as a literal *typology*. Such authors associate *typology* with the literary form of which myths are an expression. Myths were created by authors on basis of *types*. *Typology* is therefore a literary tool helpful in myth creation<sup>75</sup>.

<sup>70</sup> G.W.H. Lampe, K.J. Woollcombe, *Essays on Typology*, p. 39-40.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 29.

<sup>72</sup> These views are questioned by F. Young. See F. Young, *Typology*, p. 32-33.

<sup>73</sup> See J. Daniélou, *Qu’est-ce que la typologie?*, p. 199.

<sup>74</sup> See P.W. Martens, *Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction*, p. 286.

<sup>75</sup> See M.D. Goudler, *Type and History in Acts*, p. 187.

For other authors among which G. von Rad is found, a *type* is an event in the Scriptures which is recognized by the modern commentator as corresponding to a later event. These commentators speak about “the fulfillment of promises”<sup>76</sup>.

Other than researchers who have been trying to investigate the place of *typology* in the Christian understanding of both the Old and the New Testament, there is a group of exegetes who either completely reject the legitimacy of *typology*<sup>77</sup> or being aware of the extremely wide range of connotation of this term, deem it necessary to substitute the term “*typology*” with another term. In their view, preserving and using the term “*typology*” results in numerous problems and incessant incorrect interpretations. They propose a variety of alternative names, including the following terms: “homology/analogy”, “model”<sup>78</sup> or “parallel situations”<sup>79</sup>. However, it seems that the rejection or any alternation of the name “*typology*” is not the right choice as this term is deeply rooted in the Bible and theological language<sup>80</sup>. Those who hold the history of salvation *typology* point of view may be distinguished for the three features they share in common concerning the *type-antitype* correlation.

The first characteristic of the *typology* point of view is that there must be a real point of similarity between the *type* and the *antitype*. Such similarity, regardless of the seeming differences, should consist as the primary element in the *type*, namely, it should be a true image of the latter, at least in one specific element<sup>81</sup>. Moreover, the *type* should resemble the *antitype*, in accordance with God’s plan. The similarity of characters, events or institutions of the Old and

<sup>76</sup> See G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, p. 29; J.A. Meek, *Toward a Biblical Typology*, p. 100; D.L. Baker, *Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament*, p. 313.

<sup>77</sup> See works by W.A. Irwin, *The Interpretation of the Old Testament*, “Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft” 62 (1949-1950), p. 1-10; the same author, *A Still Small Voice... Said, What are You Doing Here?*, “Journal of Biblical Literature” 78 (1959), p. 1-12; F. Baumgärtel, *Verheissung: Zur Frage des evangelischen Verständnisses des Alten Testaments*, Gütersloh 1952, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, p. 138-43; the same author, *The Hermeneutical Problem of the Old Testament*, in: C. Westermann (ed.), *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation*, p. 143-44; J.D. Smart, *The Interpretation of Scripture*, London 1961, SCM Press, p. 129-33; J. Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments*, London 1966, SCM Press, p. 103-48; G. Fohrer, *Das Alte Testament und das Thema ‘Christologie’*, “Evangelische Theologie” 30 (1970), p. 293-94.

<sup>78</sup> See H.H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible*, London 1953, Westminster Press, p. 19-20.

<sup>79</sup> See A.T. Hanson, *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament*, London 1965, p. 162.

<sup>80</sup> See H.W. Wolff, *The Hermeneutics of the Old Testament*, p. 181; G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, p. 17-33.

<sup>81</sup> The typical is not properly a different or higher sense, but a different or higher application of the same sense”. See P. Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture*, part I, p. 19.

the New Testaments should be reflected both in the *type* and the *antitype*. These similarities cannot appear to be accidental. The similarity must be based on Biblical evidence, proving that such was God's intention<sup>82</sup>. Finally, as Louis Berkhof stresses that, "the *type* is always a foreshadowing of future event. A Biblical *type* or prophecy is basically the same notion, differing only in their form"<sup>83</sup>.

\* \* \*

The task of *typology* is an activity, which seeks a deeper and deeper understanding of the saving events as found in the New Testament and therefore it seeks to recognize itself in the Old Covenant books. The Old Testament *types* are discovered through finding *antitypes* in the New Testament. Such research seeks the meaning of words, which may allow the researcher to reach the deeper prophetic meaning of salvation history. The Catechism of the Catholic Church reminds us of this old hermeneutical principle when it states. "Christians therefore read the Old Testament in the light of Christ who died and rose from the dead. Such typological reading reveals an inexhaustible part of the Old Testament. It does not allow us to forget that the Old Testament maintains its own value of Revelation, confirmed anew by our Lord Himself (Mk 12:29-31). In any case the New Testament requires the New Testament be read in the light of the Old Testament. This was done in the earliest Christian catechesis (1Cor 5:6-8; 10:1-11.). According to an ancient proverb "the New Testament is hidden within the Old, while the Old finds its explanation in the New". (Novum in Vetere latet et in Novo Vetus patet; s. Augustine, *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*, 2,73: PL 34, 623; com. Second Vatican Council II, const. Dei verbum, 16)" (CCC 129).

---

<sup>82</sup> See S. Lewis Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New: An Argument for Biblical Inspiration*, Grand Rapids 1980, Zondervan Pub. House, p. 37. It must be, however, remembered that not all researchers see the need to foreshadow the antitype. As long as types must be fulfilled by their antitypes (assuming that the type provides the model or a certain pattern, example for the antitype), not all types foreshadow the future antitype. See J.W. Wenham, *Christ and the Bible*, Downers Grove IL 1977, InterVarsity, p. 99.

<sup>83</sup> See L. Berkhof, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation*, Grand Rapids 1950, Evangelical Press, p. 145.

**Bibliography**

- Beale G.K. (ed.), *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House 1994.
- Buchan G.W., *Typology and the Gospel*, Lanham-Maryland 1987, Univ. Press of America.
- Klinkowski J., *Zużytkowanie Starego Testamentu w Nowym*, Legnica 2000, Alta 2.
- Kowalczyk A., *Wpływ typologii oraz tekstów Starego Testamentu na redakcję Ewangelii Mateusza*, Gdańsk 1993, Bernardinum.
- Kuntzmann R., et al. (eds.), *Typologie biblique: de quelques figures vives*, Paris 2002, Éditions du Cerf.
- Lampe G.W.H., Woollcombe K.J. (eds.), *Essays on Typology*, London 1957, SCM Press.
- Rad von G., *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, „Evangelische Theologie“ 12 (1952-53), p. 17-33.
- Szymik S. (ed.), *Słowo Boże w życiu i misji Kościoła*, Lublin 2009, KUL.