Typology and Allegory: Is There a Distinction? A Brief Examination of Figural Reading

Brent E. Parker

Brent E. Parker is a recent PhD graduate in systematic theology from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. He is assistant editor of *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* and is the co-editor of and a contributor in *Progressive Covenantalism: Charting a Course between Dispensational and Covenant Theologies* (B&H Academic, 2016). He is also a co-editor for a forthcoming four views book on systems of theology (InterVarsity Press, forthcoming 2018). Dr. Parker is married to Kandace and they have two boys and are members at Clifton Baptist Church, Louisville, Kentucky.

Any study of typology in recent days must account for allegory and elucidate if any distinction should be maintained between the two. In this brief article, I will sketch out the recent emphasis on *figural reading*[1] before critiquing this nomenclature and approach in the process of advancing four reasons that interpreters of Scripture should understand typology and allegory as separate literary phenomena. Scholars also need to take greater care with the terminology that is employed in the task of hermeneutics and interpretation in regard to typology and allegory.

The Case for Figural Reading: Blurring the Typology and Allegory Distinction

A current scholarly movement known as the Theological Interpretation of Scripture (TIS) classifies typology and allegory under the general heading of

figural reading.[2] For most advocates of TIS, the distinction between typology and allegory is a modern convention and is not detectable in the writings of the early church fathers. John O'Keefe and R. R. Reno explain, "Allegory and typology are part of the same family of reading strategies, often referred to by the fathers as 'spiritual,' that seek to interpret the scriptures in terms of the divine economy."[3] In addition, fueled by recent patristic research, most notably by Frances Young, the once common hermeneutical distinctive between the Antiochene and Alexandrian schools in the fourth century—the latter school thought to exemplify allegorical interpretation and the former as champions of typology and the historical context of interpretation—has been demonstrated to be anachronistic and reductionistic.[4] Young argues,

> In practice drawing a line between typology and allegory in early Christian literature is impossible, not just in Origen's work, where prophetic and symbolic types are fully integrated into his unitive understanding of what the Bible is about, but also, for example, in the tradition of Paschal Homilies beginning with the *Peri Pascha* of Melito.[5]

Her study of early patristic writings concludes,

> [The] differing results [between Alexandrian and Antiochene treatment of the biblical texts] were not the outcome of literal reading opposed to spiritual sense, for both knew, unlike modernists but perhaps not postmodernists, that the wording of the Bible carried deeper meanings and that the immediate sense or reference pointed beyond itself.[6]

The real difference in their methodology had more to do with the rhetorical and philosophical schools from which they preferred with the Alexandrians exhibiting "symbolic" *mimēsis* and the Antiochenes viewing the biblical text more along the lines of "ikonic" *mimēsis*.[7] Young writes,

> The modern affirmation of typology as distinct from allegory, an affirmation which requires the historical reality of an event as a foreshadowing of another event, its "antitype," is born of modern historical consciousness, and has no basis in the patristic material.[8]

Therefore, with a renewed emphasis on patristic exegesis and with studies showing that the early church fathers applied allegorical and typological interpretative techniques in figural readings without ever distinguishing them, TIS advocates urge that modern exegetes should follow suit.[9] For example, Benjamin Ribbens, depending on Young, argues that the modern understanding of typology should be replaced with the broader definition of ikonic *mimesis*, having three subcategories of Christological, tropological, and homological typological patterns.[10] This broader understanding can then be correlated or equated with figural reading. Thus, Daniel Treier explains, with "the label 'figural reading,' perhaps we can make space for some of the ambiguity over typology while nevertheless suggesting that certain forms of allegorizing are inappropriate."[11]

Beside the resurgence of patristic studies and the question of the allegorical and typological distinction in early Christian interpreters, a second reason is offered for why modern interpreters should be more receptive to figural reading that includes certain forms of allegorical interpretation. The claim is that allegorical interpretation or figural reading is present within Scripture itself. Robert Louis Wilken avers that three Pauline texts (Eph 5:28-32 with the citation of Gen 2:24; 1 Cor 10:1-11; and Gal 4:21-31)

> provide a biblical foundation for the practice of allegory, i.e. that for Christians the Old Testament is to be read on more than one level ... It was St. Paul who taught the earliest Christian to use allegory. By giving us "some examples of interpretation," writes Origen, Paul showed us how to use allegory so that we "might note similar things in other passages."[12]

Galatians 4:21-31 is the most frequently cited text supporting allegorical interpretations since it is the one passage in the Bible where the word *allegory* (ἀλληγορούμενα) appears as Paul links Sarah and Hagar to two covenants. Another passage that is purported to contain an allegorical interpretation is 1 Corinthians 9:9-10.[13] Wilken writes, "Used in the Scriptures as an interpretative device to discern a meaning that is not plainly given by the text," allegory pertains to the "Christological" dimension of the OT, also called the *spiritual sense*, and is important for the life of the church, for "context needs to be understood to embrace the Church, its liturgy, its way of life, its practices and institutions, its ideas and beliefs."[14] Accordingly, the spiritual

sense, which comprises of allegorical interpretations, would appear to possess scriptural warrant then since even the apostle Paul invoked OT texts in a manner that extended beyond the plain, literal meaning, resituating texts to meet his paraenetical or polemical purposes. Wilkin clarifies, "St. Paul gives an allegorical interpretation of passages from the Old Testament whose meaning is *not* on the face of it allegorical."[15]

Reaffirming the Typology and Allegory Distinction

The TIS movement has helpfully emphasized that exegesis is always spiritual and theological in contrast to the rationalistic, historical-critical procedures that have dominated the academy the past two centuries.[16] Drawing more attention to pre-critical interpreters and seeking to address the gap between biblical studies and theology are also efforts to be lauded, but the TIS stress on "figural reading" and diminishing the distinction between typology and allegory, even if such interpretative approaches were blurry in the first few centuries of the church, is problematic and leads to confusion.[17] Many salient points may be offered for rejecting the notion of "figural reading" and the merging of typology with allegorical interpretation.

1. Allegory and typology are distinct literary features.

Before addressing the hermeneutical and interpretative issues associated with allegorizing or allegorical interpretation and typological interpretation, of critical importance is observing that the literary characteristics of allegory and typology differ in the Bible. Just as there are many figures of speech and nonliteral language—metaphors, hyperboles, sarcasm, synecdoche, and metonymy—so there are also parables, symbols, analogies, prophecies, allegories, and typologies in Scripture as well.[18] Allegory and typology are distinguishable literary entities. Observed by many scholars, including some TIS advocates, an allegory is "to mean something other than what one says."[19] Allegory as a literary form is an extended metaphor or a trope that functions to illustrate and tell a story or convey a truth by personifying abstract concepts.[20] More generally, according to Anthony Thiselton, allegory "is grounded in a linguistic system of signs or semiotic codes and presupposes resonances or parallels between ideas or semiotic meanings."[21] The most common example cited of a literary composition representing an

allegory is John Bunyan's *The Pilgrim Progress*.[22] However, allegory is also present in the Bible. Instructive examples in both the OT and NT are Ezekiel 17:1-10, Ecclesiastes 12:3-7, Psalm 80:8-15, John 10:1-16, Ephesians 6:1-11, and arguably Matthew 22:1-14.[23] In each of these biblical passages the literary features consist of extended metaphors or figures that represent or symbolize certain truths or concepts. An allegory, to summarize, describes a larger narrative episode that has features laden with symbolic function.

On the other hand, typology in Scripture is a special and unique phenomenon of divine, redemptive-historical discourse manifesting in two distinct but related forms based on the directional orientation of the typological patterns. The first and most commonly recognized form of typology, known as "horizontal typology," signifies where God has providentially intended certain OT persons, events, institutions, and actions to correspond to, foreshadow, and prefigure escalated and intensified NT realities in and through the person of Jesus Christ.[24] This form receives the primary focus in this study given how common these typological patterns appear in Scripture. The second and more rare form of typology, called "vertical typology," is directionally oriented to the correspondences between the heavenly and earthly realms (e.g., the heavenly and earthly tabernacle, the priesthood; see Exod 25:40; Acts 7:44; Heb 8:5, 9:22-25). Charles Fritsch notes that horizontal typology "is deeply rooted in redemptive history which finds its goal and meaning in Christ; [*vertical* typology is rooted] in the view that God's redemptive purpose is realized on earth through material and temporal forms which are copies of heavenly patterns."[25] Vertical typology also involves historical realities and God's providential design as correspondences between heavenly and earthly orders involve intensification and escalation from "copy and shadow" (Heb 8:5) to the "true" (Heb 9:24).[26] The heavenly prototype or archetype (*Urbild*) has its "antitype" in the earthly, OT copy and shadow, which in turn serves as the OT type or mold (*Vorbild*) for its antitypical fulfillment in the NT (*Nachbild*).[27] In this way, vertical typology intersects with horizontal typology.

Unlike allegory, which features an episode having many elements of metaphor and imagery to convey a truth or idea, typological patterns in Scripture are more discrete as real phenomena—persons and events—correspond and anticipate future fulfillment in similar, yet different persons and events—primarily Jesus Christ and the redemption he accomplishes. OT types have their

own independent meaning and justification that is a significant departure from most forms of allegory where the thing signified is bound-up with the imagery. Moreover, there is a principle of analogy in typology just as there is in allegory, but not of surface imagery, which is wrapped in metaphor and encoded to resonate or parallel some other idea or concept. In addition, typology, unlike compositional allegory, has development and takes shape as later biblical authors build upon earlier written texts with the typological connections progressing along the stages of redemptive history. The typological patterns, then, are primarily discerned or detected through the progress of revelation (epochal and canonical horizons, though not excluding the textual horizon). Typology, then, is grounded textually.[28] Typology actually shows more affinity with prophecy than it does with allegory. In fact, many scholars classify typology as a form of indirect prophecy. G. K. Beale, to cite just one example, observes how typology "indicates fulfillment of the indirect prophetic adumbrations of events, people and institutions from the Old Testament in Christ who now is the final, climatic expression of all God ideally intended through these things in the Old Testament."[29] These characteristics of allegory and typology clearly differ and such observations should not be obliterated by confusingly lumping allegory and typology into a general category of *figural*.

The nature and characteristics of typology outlined are further elucidated next, but it is important at this juncture to address the relationship of typology to the τύπος word-group in Scripture. Frances Young does find the term "typology" to have value; however, much of her research of the early church shows how typology and allegory shade into each other in an almost indistinguishable way:

> The word "typology" is a modern coinage. Nevertheless, it is a useful term, and may be employed as a heuristic tool for discerning and describing an interpretative device whereby texts (usually narrative but … not exclusively so) are shaped or read, consciously or unconsciously, so that they are invested with meaning by correspondence with other texts of a "mimetic" or representational kind. Typology, then, is not an exegetical method, but a hermeneutical key, and, taking our cue from places where the word "type" is explicitly used, we may be able justifiably to identify other examples of the procedure where the terminology is not explicit.[30]

In his recent study, Richard Ounsworth notes Young's research on Antiochene and Alexandrian exegetical schools and cites her quote above. In response, he follows,

> The strategy suggested by Young, allowing a definition to emerge from the New Testament's use of the τύπος word-group which has given its name to "typology," so that we can be confident that it is a definition that would have been recognizable to the first addressees of NT texts, even if in fact it was not offered.[31]

From this point, Ounsworth canvasses the uses of τύπος within the NT as many others, particularly Richard Davidson and Leonhard Goppelt, have in more or less detail.[32] From these lexical studies, τύπος is acknowledged to denote an image, model, pattern, example, form, and imprint, but more broadly, "τύπος is understood to signify either the molding pattern (*Vorbild*) or the resulting pattern of another mold (*Nachbild*)," or in some instances both simultaneously.[33]

Conducting a focused study on the τύπος word group is an important consideration, after all, as highlighted, allegory (ἀλληγορέω) says one thing and means another. Having a terminological control is important and Davidson has convincingly demonstrated the essential characteristics of typology from his study of key passages (Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 10:6, 11; 1 Pet 3:21; Heb 8:5; and Heb 9:24). However, this is because τύπος in these contexts overlaps with what is commonly associated with typology. Young, Ounsworth, and Davidson run into trouble because they are attempting, in the words of H. Wayne Johnson,

> to answer hermeneutical questions about the nature of typology based on the lexicography of one word. This is asking too much for a number of reasons. First, it is questionable whether or not there is 'one basic meaning' for τύπος. The word is used to denote a mark (John 20:25), an idol or image (Acts 7:43), a pattern or model (Acts 7:44), an example (Phil 3:17 etc.) or type (Rom 5:14, clearly not an example). The diversity of English words used to render τύπος is not evidence of sloppiness in translation but an appreciation of the range of its meaning in various contexts. . . . Simply put, τύπος is not a technical term for 'type.' Neither is it a *sine qua non* for typology. Consequently, any attempt to establish the biblical definition of typology based purely on semasiological or

> lexical analysis is filled with problems.[34]

In other words, as Johnson has helpfully articulated,[35] typology has less to do with the lexicography of a Greek term and should be understood as a hermeneutical term or category that describes a unique feature that is the property of certain persons, events, and institutions that are recorded in Scripture. A proper understanding of typology in Scripture should examine critical passages where τύπος is employed to correspond to OT persons, events, and institutions (precisely the six passages where Davidson has already provided an excellent exegetical analysis), but there is a host of other passages that should be considered as well (e.g., Matt 2:15, 4:1-11, 12:39-42; John 6:32, 12:37-43, 15:1; 1 Cor 5:7b, 15:21-22, 45-49; Col 2:16-17; Heb 3-4, 7, 10; 1 Pet 2:4-10).[36] Therefore, the rendering of *typology* as a technical term is to describe a unique literary phenomenon of Scripture that is divergent from allegory because it accounts for the organic relationships between persons, events, institutions, and actions that occur at different stages in Scripture. Types possess a divine design in that they predictively prefigure corresponding intensified realities (antitypes) in the new age inaugurated by Jesus Christ. Although different, both allegory and typology are revelatory in nature, divinely authorized, and they are embedded in Scripture by the biblical authors rather than created by literary genius of later writers of Scripture or subsequent interpreters.[37]

2. Complications arise with the notions of "figural reading," "allegorical interpretation" or "typological interpretation."

As argued, allegory and typology are distinct literary entities that a reader should recognize in Scripture and hence there is reason for rejecting figural reading or any other attempt to merge typology with allegory. Another rationale for avoiding the confusion, however, is that the move from identifying and recognizing the allegories or typologies already intended as such in Scripture to the position of crafting figural, allegorical, or typological interpretations, much as Christian interpreters have freely fashioned in the past, results in unwarranted and arbitrary readings. Allegories and typologies are in Scripture, but, as Hans LaRondelle succinctly observes,

> It is a different story if an interpreter would *allegorize* a plainly historical narrative

> in the Bible. Such allegorizing transforms the narrative into a springboard for teaching an idea which is different from that intended by the Bible writer. Whenever an allegorical interpretation arbitrarily converts a historical narrative into teaching a spiritual or theological truth, such a speculative allegorizing is negatively called an "*allegorism*." It imposes a meaning on the Bible text that is not really there. It is added to the text by the interpreter only for the purpose of edification and finding spiritual truths and deep meanings.[38]

An allegorical interpretation requires an extra-textual grid or key, which is used to warrant an explanation.[39] With such an approach, a deeper spiritual or mystical sense or foreign aspect is introduced into the meaning of the text.[40] Kevin Vanhoozer writes, "Allegorizing becomes problematic ... insofar as it resembles a general hermeneutical strategy by which later readers find new meanings in texts *unrelated* to the human authorial discourse."[41] The problem of allegorical interpretation then is not so much that the historicity of a certain passage is denied, though the historical features are often diminished, but that the interpretative moves are arbitrary as there is no possible way to detect the relationship between the text and the meaning ascribed to it.[42]

A plethora of allegorical interpretations in the early church fathers could be recalled, but perhaps a few will suffice. Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem, and John Chrysostom all connect the dove that Noah sent out from the ark with the descending of the Holy Spirit in the synoptic Gospels since the Spirit came down upon Jesus in the form of a dove when Jesus arose from his baptism. Origen finds symbolic significance in the dimensions of Noah's ark and he also resorts to mystical and moral allegorizing when he compares the animals of the ark with those who are saved in the church. Moses praying with his arms outstretched during the battle with Amalek (Exod 17:8-13) was interpreted by Tertullian as a type of Christ on the cross since his arms were outstretched during the crucifixion.[43] Philo's philosophical interpretative approach seems to be appropriated by Origen and Clement leading to allegorical readings. Symbolism is employed to interpret Pharaoh's daughter as a type of the church, the "life of Moses as an allegory of the soul's journey to spiritual perfection," and the waters of Marah refer to the "strictness of the virtuous life for beginners, which is gradually tempered by hope."[44] Justin and Irenaeus are just two of many church fathers with the exception, surprisingly, of the Alexandrian School for the most part, who view Rahab's

scarlet cord as an illustrative resemblance of the blood of Christ since it recalls the Passover lamb.[45] The church fathers should be rightly esteemed for their high view of Scripture and defense of doctrinal truths, but clearly at times they applied mystical and foreign interpretive schemes in their readings of Scripture. For them, deeper religious truths or hidden meanings were to be unearthed as a principle of similitude and likeness was made, and the etymological significance of words led to allegorical readings based off lexical links and associative strategies.[46] However, such allegorisms, even if containing elements of truth, are unwarranted because the literal sense is obscured or distorted given the random symbolical associations or cleverly created correspondences at the level of semiotic code.

The danger is not just with "allegorical interpretations" however. Often scholars present the case for "typological interpretations." Clarification and caution are needed though, for Ardel Caneday convincingly argues,

> *Typological interpretation*, using the adjective to modify *interpretation*, creates confusion by focusing upon the *act of interpretation* rather than upon the *act of revelation* ... [T]ypology and allegory are fundamentally categories that belong to the *act of revelation*, not the *act of interpretation*. The reader discovers types and allegories that are already present in the text.[47]

The typological patterns are part of revelation because God casts and invests the types with foreshadowing significance in Scripture. The notion of "typological" and "allegorical" interpretations subtly expresses a form of reader-response hermeneutics, but the task of the reader is to explicate the meaning of sentences by attending to the authorial intent and their usage of literary forms, i.e., faithfully reading the text according to its genre—reading historical narratives historically, poetry poetically, and law passages should be read legally.[48] G. H. Schodde rightly stresses that Protestant biblical interpretation rejected

> allegorizing and adhered to the safe and sane principle, practiced by Christ and the entire NT, of *Sensum ne inferas, sed efferas* ("Do not carry a meaning into [the Scriptures] but draw it out of [the Scriptures]"). It is true that the older Protestant theology still adheres to a *sensus mysticus* in the Scriptures, but by this it means those passages in which the sense is conveyed not *per verba* (through words),

> but *per res verbis descriptas* ("through things described by means of words"), as, e.g., in the parable and the type.[49]

Thus, the role of the reader is to identify types, symbols, and allegories that are in Scripture and not creatively invent them as the phrase "typological interpretation" suggests. Similarly, Ounsworth rightly affirms that typology appeals to Scripture "*as a record*, and therefore retains and relies upon the literal sense of scripture ... [T]he role of the literary record is not to encode the theological meaning but to reveal to the reader (or hearer) the mimetic correspondences that exist in reality."[50] The connection between two persons or events as mimetic correspondences is not established by the "creative act on the part of the interpreter so much as a discovery, a discernment of what intended (sc. by God) to be understood."[51] The same concern regarding "allegorical" and "typological" interpretation is also applicable to the *figural reading*. The nomenclature is illegitimate because it suggests an accent on the reader's role of constructing figural correspondences from the text. While figural reading is sometimes used as a synonym for typology (e.g., Vanhoozer, Ribbens), the terminology indicates that it is the reader who crafts the figural connections.[52] The attention is diverted once again to the act of interpretation rather than the act of revelation. This leads to hermeneutical confusion and, depending on the one doing the figural reading, to treating the Scripture as a wax nose, carving and shaping out an array of superficial analogies and correspondences. Instead, reading the Bible faithfully means seeking to demonstrate the textual warrant and indicators for typological patterns. Such a constraint is necessary since there are "some interpreters ('hyper-typers') who see typology on almost every page of Scripture."[53]

3. Allegorical interpretations are not exemplified in the NT as some scholars claim.

While some may claim Galatians 4:21-31 and 1 Corinthians 9:9-11 as exemplars of "allegorical" interpretation, careful reading and analysis of the OT passages that are invoked in these Pauline passages provide a definitive conclusion that Paul did not devise figural readings. A brief discussion of each of these passages shows that Paul did not engage in "allegorical" interpretation, and therefore refutes the argument by Wilken and others that modern readers have the license to allegorize.

The use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:9-10 seems puzzling as Paul appears to be lifting an ancient OT law about oxen and applying it to justify material benefits that ministers of the gospel, like Paul and Barnabas, should reap. While Deuteronomy 24-25 may appear to list a group of disconnected and unstructured laws, viable interpretations have been offered to explain why a command about oxen would appear in the context of Deuteronomy 25. Jan Verbruggen argues that "all these laws seem to deal with situations that show how one should deal with one's fellow man" and particularly, the law about oxen (Deut 25:4) should be understood about how to care for a neighbor's ox.[54] God is concerned for the welfare of oxen, but the law is originally for humans, particularly the economic responsibility of using someone's property. On the other hand, Caneday finds that Deuteronomy 25:4 in its original context is a proverbial saying that is attached to Deuteronomy 25:1-3, "a fitting aphoristic conclusion to reinforce the commandment that prohibits inhumane and abusive threshing of another human with excessive lashes."[55] If this is the case, Paul's use of Deuteronomy 25:4 reflects its original proverbial nature as he reprimands the Corinthians for their mistreatment of him in prohibiting him from benefitting from his own labors. Another interpretation is that Paul is using a *qal wahomer* argument (from lesser to greater; *a fortiori*) characteristic of rabbinic exegesis.[56] Accordingly, Paul argues that if the law permits animals to eat crops in fields where they work, how much more may human laborers, such as ministers, be worthy to share in the benefits of the harvest. With these three interpretative options, the use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:9 is far from being an allegorical interpretation as postulated by TIS advocates or Pauline commentators, such as Richard Longenecker.[57] 1 Corinthians 9:9-11 is best categorized as an analogical use of Scripture. Paul applies a principle from an agricultural case with ethical import or Paul's use of the muzzled ox reflects its original proverbial nature which fittingly applies to his situation.[58]

The question of the legitimacy of allegorical interpretation has received by far the most attention with Galatians 4:21-31. Paul writes with reference to Sarah and Hagar that "these things are spoken/written allegorically: for these women are two covenants" (Gal 4:24).[59] When instructing the Galatians to not live under the Law, Paul connects Hagar to the Mosaic covenant, the present Jerusalem, and slavery on the one hand, while implicitly associating Sarah with the Abrahamic covenant, the heavenly Jerusalem, and freedom

through promise. Paul weaves together themes of Abrahamic sonship, barrenness, flesh versus Spirit, and slavery versus freedom, in affirming that the Galatians are sons of the free woman (Sarah) and not of the slave woman, Hagar. The notoriously difficult passage has attracted a variety of explanations for Paul's hermeneutic. Some believe that what Paul is doing is typology, even though he uses the word "allegorically," but others think that Paul is employing an allegorical interpretation, and still others make the case for the presence of both typological and allegorical elements in Galatians 4:21-31.[60]

The best treatment of Galatians 4:21-31 in my view is offered by Caneday. Individualized items of typology are present in Galatians 4:22-23 and 28-30, but in the main the passage is an allegory, but not an allegorical interpretation on the part of Paul. Caneday explains that it is

> unreasonable to think that Paul expects to convince his converts by grounding his argument in Gal 4:21-31 in nothing more than his adeptness to spin an impressive allegory from the Genesis narrative on the authority of a Christophany, his reception of the 'revelation of Jesus Christ' (1:12ff).[61]

While Paul makes the metaphorical connection between Hagar and Sarah to the two covenants, he finds grounding from the OT itself as Genesis 16-21 present Abraham, Sarah, Hagar, Isaac, and Ishmael as historical figures that are divinely invested with symbolism and point beyond themselves to the salvation to come in the latter days.[62] Isaiah also notices these features in the Genesis account (see Isa 51:2 and 54:1, the latter explicitly cited by Paul in Gal 4:27) as the Isaianic intertextual development of the barren woman (Sarah) with Jerusalem provides Paul with the redemptive historical context and lens that sharpens the focus of the allegory already present in Genesis.[63] Furthermore, as Caneday helpfully observes, Paul expects his readers to recognize the allegory already there in the Pentateuch by bracketing his appeal at the beginning: "Do you not hear the Law [i.e., Scripture]?" (4:21) with a reprise, "But what does the Scripture say?" (4:30).[64] Caneday writes, "The Scriptures—Genesis and Isaiah—authorize his dual concluding appeal to the Galatians: (1) to cast out the Sinai covenant and its descendants, the Judaizers and those who preach 'another gospel,' and (2) to affirm that Gentile believers are children of promise."[65]

Therefore, while typology involves discrete historical persons, places, events and institutions, Paul chooses the term "allegory" in Galatians 4:21-31 probably because he is not meditating exclusively upon discrete figures and subjects from the Genesis accounts. Instead, his attention is upon the entire narrative of the Pentateuch concerning God's promises to Abraham and a complex set of themes regarding the obstacles to his promises (the episode of Hagar; themes of barrenness, slavery) and how those promises are ultimately fulfilled in Abraham's true offspring, Jesus Christ, and not through reliance on the Law-covenant at Sinai.[66] Paul does not forge the allegory or conjure an allegorical interpretation in the manner of Philo or Origen; rather, his argument is rooted in Scripture, which can be traced.[67] As Karen Jobes rightly concludes, "Far from being an arbitrary allegorical assignment, the association of Hagar with the 'now' Jerusalem and Sarah with the 'above' Jerusalem follows logically from Paul's understanding of Isa 54:1 in light of Christ's resurrection."[68] The interpretative moves Paul makes may seem arbitrary, but Paul's warrant for this allegory, like the typological connections he finds elsewhere, are grounded in the Scriptures and integral to the mystery theme (μυστήριον) where concealed and enigmatic features in the OT are now revealed in light of further revelation as the progress of Scripture unfolds.[69]

4. Appealing to the Patristics is not definitive in how to understand biblical typology and interpretation.

The early church fathers have made a comeback in scholarly circles with more stress on how they interpreted Scripture and defended orthodox teachings.[70] Surely drawing attention to the Patristics and their reading of Scripture is a welcome development. The understanding of typology, and more generally, the hermeneutical approach to Scripture, should be informed by earlier interpreters, but their approach is not ultimately authoritative, nor are they as significant as the NT authors. Ribbens, for example, wishes to arrive at a definition of typology that embraces "the varied τύπος interpretations of the NT and Greek fathers and not, like prefiguration typology, exclude τύπος interpretations that do not fit a preconceived definition of typology."[71] This suggestion is wrongheaded because it elevates the early fathers to the same level as the NT authors, and secondly, seeks to define typology from the τύπος-word group when the nature of typology should be derived from

broader considerations from Scripture than just the use of τύπος. In this way, *typology* as a term should be defined in such a way to characterize unique biblical phenomena, drawn from, but not limited to, the τύπος-word group, whereby persons, events, and institutions serve as indirect prophecies or adumbrations of future realities. Moreover, even if the Patristic Fathers did not distinguish between allegory or typology, that does not mean that such a distinction is necessary, legitimate, and of critical hermeneutical importance. In fact, it is this point that later interpreters, the Protestant Reformers, provide a helpful corrective to the early church figurative approach.[72]

Against the Roman Catholic abuses in allegorizing Scripture, Calvin and the Reformed scholastics rejected the multiple and various senses and championed the *sensus literalis*—the literal sense that is derived from the intention of the divine and human authors, seeking to do justice to the grammatical, historical, rhetorical/literary elements of the text including figures of speech. In this way, rather than advocating multiple senses as imposed by the exegete, the distinct and separate senses of the *quadriga* had to be grafted on to the text itself as "valid applications of or conclusions drawn from the literal sense."[73] More narrowly on the subject of allegorical interpretation, the "Reformed made a strict distinction between allegories and figures that were intrinsic to the text and therefore its literal sense and allegories imposed from without by the imaginative expositor."[74] Figurative or typological meanings should be indicated by the text and identified through the analogy of Scripture. The Reformer's hermeneutic and understanding of typology serve as a guide since these principles derive from the nature of the Bible—a divine and human unified discourse that progressively unfolds—and its role as having sole authority for matters of faith. Vanhoozer rightly states:

> The typology the Protestant Reformers practiced ultimately presupposes neither *linear* nor *sacramental* but rather *redemptive* history, where type is related to antitype as anticipation is related to its realization, promise to fulfillment. The rule, then, is never to dislodge the spiritual sense given to persons, things, and events from the biblical narratives in which they are emplotted. In the words of Hans Frei: "figuration or typology was a natural extension of literal interpretation. It was literalism at the level of the whole biblical story and thus of the depiction of the whole historical reality." To be sure, not every piece of wood figures the cross. It is the redemptive-historical context that both enables and constrains

> the spiritual sense. *What spiritual significance things have is not a function of their sheer createdness but rather their role in the ongoing drama of redemption*.[75]

In summary, the distinction between allegory and typology is crucial as blending the two and deriving allegorical or typological interpretations as the terminology of figural reading suggests, leads to theological confusion and faulty interpretative moves. Faithful readers of Scripture treat Scripture as a unified revelation, discovering God's intent by explicating what biblical authors say and interpret Scripture with Scripture. In this manner, rather than the focus being in front of the text, the reader discovers and draws out the typologies and allegories that are in the text. This brief survey of allegory and typology indicates that K. J. Woollcombe is correct when he asserts that the similarities between allegories, typology, and prophecy "are not so close as to justify ignoring the differences between them, and using one of the terms to cover them all."[76] Maintaining these distinctions, and more importantly, comprehending biblical typology and elucidating the nature of the legitimate typological patterns, makes significant headway in understanding the relationship between the OT and NT, and in turn, rightfully putting together the canon of Scripture as a whole.

---

1 For an overview of "figural reading" see Daniel J. Treier, *Introducing Theological Interpretation of Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 46-51; Daniel Treier, "Typology," in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible* (ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 824-26. The discussion of "figural reading" is complicated and confusing because scholars do not use the term consistently. According to John David Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California, 2002), 15, "Auerbach and Frei present their formulations of allegorical reading in direct opposition to their presentation of Christian figural reading. Both argue that figural reading preserves and extends the literal meaning of the text ... Figurative interpretation is based on a conception of language as a series of tropes in which nonliteral meanings replace literal meanings; in contrast, figural reading generates a figurativeness that is not nonliteral." Note also Dawson's discussion on pp. 84-97 and 143-49. See further, Hans W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermenutics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1974), 7, 28-30; Erich Auerbach, "Figura," in *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (ed. Wlad Godzich and Jochen Schulte-Sasse, trans. Ralph Manheim; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1984), 50-55. For other scholars, the typological and allegorical interpretation or "figural reading" would be classified as nonliteral exegesis, see Peter W. Martens, "Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction: The Case of Origen," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 16 (2008): 296-310. For yet another scholar of the TIS persuasion, "figural reading" has to do with making analogous, atemporal connections between various realities. Jonathan T. Pennington, *Reading the Gospels Wisely: A Narrative and Theological Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 115. On the other hand, for Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "figural reading" is synonymous with typology and definitely incorporates history and how one understands how the parts fit within the whole canon: typology or figural reading "is the mainspring of theo-dramatic unity, the principle that accounts for

the continuity in God's words and acts, the connecting link between the history of Israel and the history of the church, the glue that unifies the Old and New Testaments." Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical-Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005), 223. Note also Richard B. Hays, *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2014), 1-3, 104-5.

2 Theological Interpretation of Scripture defies definition since it is not a monolithic movement; nevertheless, the movement generally is a negative response to modern critical and ideological approaches to biblical interpretation and instead seeks, in light of post-Enlightenment developments, to read and interpret the Bible with multiple lenses, which generally involves taking account of traditional pre-critical interpretations, especially patristic interpretations, reading within the Rule of Faith (early church creeds) and within one's ecclesial location (reading in the community), engaging the entire narrative of Scripture (canonical approach), and emphasizing the role of the reader including the need for the formation and virtue of the reader. For treatments of TIS, see Treier, *Introducing Theological Interpretation of Scripture*; Daniel J. Treier, "What Is Theological Interpretation? An Ecclesiologial Reduction," *IJST* 12 (2010): 144-61; Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "'Exegesis I Know, and Theology I Know, but Who are You?' Acts 19 and the Theological Interpretation of Scripture," in *Theological Theology: Essays in Honour of John Webster* (ed. R. David Nelson, Darren Sarisky, and Justin Stratis; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 289-306; Kevin J. Vanhoozer and Daniel J. Treier, *Theology and the Mirror of Scripture* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2015), 158-91, 244-53; Joel B. Green, *Seized by Truth: Reading the Bible as Scripture* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2007); John J. O'Keefe and R. R. Reno, *Sanctified Vision: An Introduction to Early Christian Interpretation of the Bible* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 2005); Stephen E. Fowl, ed., *The Theological Interpretation of Scripture: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1997); Peter J. Leithart, *Deep Exegesis: The Mystery of Reading Scripture* (Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2009); R. W. L. Moberly, "What Is Theological Interpretation of Scripture?" *JTI* 3 (2009): 161-78.

3 O'Keefe and Reno, *Sanctified Vision*, 90; cf. Christopher R. Seitz, *Figured Out: Typology and Providence in Christian Scripture* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 8-9; and Christopher R. Seitz, "History, Figural History, and Providence," in *Go Figure! Figuration in Biblical Interpretation* (ed. Stanley D. Walters; Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2008), 1-6.

4 For example, David S. Dockery, *Biblical Interpretation Then and Now: Contemporary Hermeneutics in the Light of the Early Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992) has a chap. entitled "The Alexandrian School: Allegorical Hermeneutics" and another labeled "The Antiochene School: Literal-Historical and Typological Hermeneutics"; cf. Andreas J. Köstenberger and Richard D. Patterson, *Invitation to Biblical Interpretation: Exploring the Hermeneutical Triad of History, Literature, and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2011), 70-71; Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., and Moisés Silva, *Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 264-67; Gerald Bray, *Biblical Interpretation: Past and Present* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996), 104-7. Others who maintain a strong distinction between allegory and typology in the early church include Jean Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, trans. Wulstan Hibberd (London: Burns and Oates, 1960), who proposed that both typology and allegory were nonliteral exegetical practices but the former was native to Christianity while the latter was foreign; G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe, *Essays in Typology* (Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 22; Naperville, IL: A. R. Allenson, 1957); and John E. Alsup, "Typology," in *ABD* (ed. David Noel Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 682-85, esp. 684. Some evangelicals are more cautious of the distinction between the exegetical approaches of the Alexandrian and Antiochene schools, see Moisés Silva, "Has the Church Misread the Bible?" in *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation* (ed. Moisés Silva; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 47-61, esp. 48; Graeme Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics: Foundations and Principles of Evangelical Interpretation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2006), 94-99, esp. 97; Douglas J. Moo, "The Problem of *Sensus Plenior*," in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon* (ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 181-82. For a more exhaustive discussion on why the distinction is misleading for the case of Origen, and for a more comprehensive bibliography, see Martens, "Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction," 283-317.

5 Frances Young, "Alexandrian and Antiochene Exegesis," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation*, vol. 1, *The Ancient Period* (ed. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 337. For a defense of Origen and challenge to the critique that early Christian allegorical interpretation was not historical, see Peter W. Martens, "Origen against History? Reconsidering the Critique of Allegory," *Modern Theology* 28 (2012): 635-56. James Barr, *Old and New Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments* (London: SCM, 1966), 107, asserts, "Allegory cannot be described categorically as anti-historical in character, and we cannot make

this into an ultimate distinction from typology."

6 Young, "Alexandrian and Antiochene Exegesis," 352. Frances Young has many studies of the patristics and the question of allegory and typology in their writings. Ultimately her thesis regarding what really separated the Antiochene and Alexandrian schools was not specifically typology versus allegory but *ikonic mimēsis* (Antiochene) and *symbolic mimēsis* (Alexandrian): "The difference lay in the Antiochene desire to find a genuine connection between what the text said and the spiritual meaning discerned through contemplation of the text. I use the terms 'ikonic' and 'symbolic' to distinguish that difference ... [The] representation (*mimēsis*) may be through genuine likeness, an analogy, 'ikon' or image, or it may be by a symbol, something unlike which stands for reality. The 'ikon' will resemble the person or event which it represents, but symbols are not representations in that sense; symbols are 'tokens' or 'signs' whose analogous relationship with what is symbolized is less clear." Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1997), 210; cf. 162-67, 175-76, 182-85. See also Frances M. Young, "Typology," in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder* (ed. Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce, and David E. Orton; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 29-48; Frances M. Young, "Allegory and the Ethics of Reading," in *The Open Text: New Directions for Biblical Study?* (ed. Francis Watson; London: SCM, 1993), 103-20, esp. 114-16. In this latter treatment, after having "disposed of the mirage of typology," she offers seven categories of allegory (some Hellenistic, others ancient or biblical and rabbinic): rhetorical, parabolic, prophetic, moral, natural or psychological, philosophical, and theological. Young, "Allegory and the Ethics of Reading," 111. For other works germane to the subject of allegory and the early church, see Andrew Louth's essay "Return to Allegory" in his book *Discerning the Mystery: An Essay on the Nature of Theology* (New York: Oxford University, 1983), 96-131; Henri De Lubac, *Theological Fragments*, trans. Rebecca Howell Balinski (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1989), 129-96; Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth Century Trinitarian Theology* (New York: Oxford University, 2004); Glenn W. Olsen, "Allegory, Typology, and Symbol: The *Sensus Spiritalis*, Part I: Definitions and Earliest History," *Communio: International Catholic Review* 4 (1977): 161-89; and "Allegory, Typology, and Symbol: The *Sensus Spiritalis*, Part II: Early Church through Origen," *Communio: International Catholic Review* 4 (1977): 357-84.

7 Young, "Alexandrian and Antiochene Exegesis," 344; Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 210-12. It is important to note that ikonic *mimēsis* still includes forms of allegorical interpretation, the Antiochenes rejected only the type of allegory that "destroyed the textual coherence," according to Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 176.

8 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 152-53.

9 See e.g., Mark Gignilliat, "Paul, Allegory, and the Plain Sense of Scripture: Galatians 4:21-33," *JTI* 2 (2008): 135-46, follows Louth and Young, arguing that typology "is a form of allegorical reading or a subset of allegorical reading and is still a useful term but is not to be opposed to allegory. Typology *is* allegorical or figural reading." Ibid., 140, emphasis original.

10 Benjamin J. Ribbens, "Typology of Types: Typology in Dialogue," *JTI* 5 (2011): 81-95. Ribbens writes, "If ikonic *mimēsis*, consequently, forms the boundaries of typology, then symbolic *mimēsis* is not typology, because it derives correspondence entirely from outside the text—interpreting a word or phrase as a symbol of something outside of the narrative." Ibid., 88. For Ribbens, ikonic *mimēsis* includes a diverse group of types: Christological types—certain OT persons, actions, or institutions that prefigure Christ and his redemptive work; Tropological types—certain figures and actions are examples exemplifying moral or immoral activity; and Homological types—a catch all subcategory of persons or events that correspond to similar persons and events, thus fitting a general pattern. Also appealing to ikonic and symbolic *mimēsis* in the discussion of typology is Daniel J. Treier, "The Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis? *Sic et Non*," *TrinJ* 24 (2003): 95-97. Gignilliat seems to go in this direction as well since he finds that "Paul's figural reading of the Sarah/Hagar story is not like a certain type of Alexandrian exegesis that tears apart the narrative coherence of the text. Rather, Paul respects the textual coherence of the story, or the way the words go, while recognizing that is has the potential within the divine economy to function figurally as an eschatological indicator of God's future action in Christ." Gignilliat, "Paul, Allegory, and the Plain Sense," 141.

11 Daniel J. Treier, "Pursuing Wisdom: (Back) toward Evangelical Spiritual Exegesis," *Crux* 48 (2012): 19. As to what forms of allegorizing would be inappropriate, Treier never explains.

12 Robert Louis Wilken, "In Defense of Allegory," *Modern Theology* 14 (1998): 200. Note also Martens, "Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction," 297, 301-3. Mark W. Elliot, "Allegory," in *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 1 (Nashville: Abingdon, 2006), 101, seems to agree with Wilken as he writes, "Paul's narrative examples and his use of the word ["allegorical" (Gal 4:24)] gave the green light to future Christian allegorical interpreters of the Bible."

13 Barr, *Old and New*, 109, states that in this passage where a legal text is invoked regarding the muzzling of

the ox, "the literal and original sense is explicitly repudiated by the apostle." Olsen, "Allegory, Typology, and Symbol, Part II," 360-64, also views allegory present in 1 Cor 9 and Gal 4. With reference to Gal 4:24, Richard Hays argues that the distinction between allegory and typology is not one that Paul himself recognizes. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1989), 116. Hays still maintains a distinction: "*Typology* is a particular species of the genus *allegorical interpretation*, a species distinguished by its propensity for representing the latent sense of a text as *temporally posterior* to its manifest sense. In typology, the allegorical sense latent in the text's figures is discovered not by a reading that ascends from the material to the spiritual but by a reading that grasps the preliminary in relation to the ultimate." Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 215n87, emphasis original.

14 Wilken, "In Defense of Allegory," 199, 201, 209. For an appeal to the spiritual sense that builds off the literal sense but still incorporates allegorical interpretation, see R. R. Reno, "From Letter to Spirit," *IJST* 13 (2011): 463-74. Note also Glenn W. Olsen, "The Spiritual Sense(s) Today," in *The Bible and the University* (vol. 8 of Scripture and Hermeneutics Series; ed. David Lyle Jeffrey and C. Stephen Evans; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 116-35. The *quadriga*, the four-fold mode of reading the Bible—historical or literal, allegorical, anagogical, and tropological—is receiving revived interest and acceptance as multiple scriptural readings or senses are viewed as valid. For examples, confer Richard N. Soulen, *Sacred Scripture: A Short History of Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009), 97-112; Kevin Storer, "Theological Interpretation and the Spiritual Sense of Scripture: Henri de Lubac's Retrieval of a Christological Hermeneutic of Presence," *JTI* 7 (2013): 79-96; and Leithart, *Deep Exegesis*, 207. De Lubac is particularly recognized for drawing attention to the medieval *quadriga* and postulating a sacramental hermeneutic which did have a historical foundation, but he was convinced that spiritual or allegorical interpretation preserved the historicity of biblical accounts. For a helpful discussion of the hermeneutic of de Lubac and Jean Daniélou, see chap. 5, "A Wheel within a Wheel: Spiritual Interpretation in de Lubac and Daniélou," in Hans Boersma, *Nouvelle Théologie and Sacramental Ontology: A Return to Mystery* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2009), 149-90. For an evangelical reception of the spiritual sense conjoined to the theme of wisdom, see Treier, "Pursuing Wisdom," 17-26.

15 Wilken, "In Defense of Allegory," 202. For yet another rationale for the acceptance of allegorical interpretation, see Paul K. Jewett, "Concerning the Allegorical Interpretation of Scripture," *WTJ* 17 (1954): 1-20. Jewett, thinks that the difference between typology and allegory comes down to semantics, for interpreting "the acts and institutions of the history of Israel as types of spiritual truths under the gospel dispensation is a form of allegorizing" (p. 7). In the end, for Jewett, the broader principle of avoiding arbitrary and fanciful interpretations that go beyond the strict grammatical exegesis rests on having a genuine organic relationship or analogy between the original text and that in terms of which one is interpreting it. Jewett, "Concerning the Allegorical Interpretation," 13, 18.

16 Treier, "Pursuing Wisdom," 24; Treier, *Theological Interpretation of Scripture*, 14.

17 It would go too far afield to address the positives but also the pitfalls of the TIS movement. For helpful surveys and critiques, see D. A. Carson, "Theological Interpretation of Scripture: Yes, But ...," in *Theological Commentary: Evangelical Perspectives* (ed. R. Michael Allen; London: T & T Clark, 2011), 187-207; Stanley E. Porter, "What Is Theological Interpretation of Scripture, and Is It Hermeneutically Robust Enough for the Task to Which It Has Been Appointed?" in *Horizons in Hermeneutics: A Festschrift in Honor of Anthony C. Thiselton* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Matthew R. Malcom; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 234-67; Gregg R. Allison, "Theological Interpretation of Scripture: An Introduction and Preliminary Evaluation," *SBJT* 14 (2010): 28-36; Charlie Trimm, "Evangelicals, Theology, and Biblical Interpretation: Reflections on the Theological Interpretation of Scripture," *BBR* 20 (2010): 311-30; John C. Poirer, "'Theological Interpretation' and its Contradistinctions," *TynBul* 61 (2010): 105-18; Robert L. Plummer, *40 Questions about Interpreting the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2010), 313-19.

18 The list provided is by no means exhaustive. The subject of literary forms and features is common fare in standard hermeneutics textbooks, see Dan McCartney and Charles Clayton, *Let the Reader Understand: A Guide to Interpreting and Applying the Bible*, 2nd ed. (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2002), 127-37; Köstenberger and Patterson, *Invitation to Biblical Interpretation*, 663-82; Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*, rev. ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006), 121-30; Kaiser and Silva, *Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics*, 139-64; Louis Berkhof, *Principles of Interpretation*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1952), 67-112; Bernard Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation: A Textbook of Hermeneutics*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1970), 143-44.

19 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 176-77, 189-90; cf. O'Keefe and Reno, *Sanctified Vision*, 89; Wilken, "In Defense of Allegory," 198; Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality*

of Literary Knowledge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998), 113-14; see also G. H. Schodde, "Allegory," in *ISBE* (vol. 1; ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 95. Elliot, "Allegory," 100-103, problematically discusses allegory only as a method of interpretation.

20 Jon Whitman, *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 3-5; Rita Copeland and Peter T. Struck, Introduction to *The Cambridge Companion to Allegory* (ed. Rita Copeland and Peter T. Struck; New York: Cambridge University, 2010), 1-5; Anthony C. Thiselton, *Hermeneutics: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 72; LaRondelle, *The Israel of God*, 26; Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, 24, 143-44, 217, esp. 223-25; Schodde, "Allegory," 95; Friedbert Ninow, *Indicators of Typology within the Old Testament: The Exodus Motif*, Friedensauer Schriftenreihe: Reihe I, Theologie, Band 4 (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2001), 24n34; Paul M. Hoskins, *That Scripture Might Be Fulfilled: Typology and the Death of Christ* (LaVergne, TN: Xulon, 2009), 30-31; Patrick Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture*, 2 vols. in 1 (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1900; repr., Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1989), 1:2. Anthony Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 63, finds that "allegory represents an extension of meaning in terms of parallels, analogies, or correspondence between two or more *ideas*" (emphasis original). For a rationale as to why parables are not allegories, see Thiselton, *Hermeneutics*, 35-39.

21 Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 730, emphasis original. Similarly, Moo, "The Problem of *Sensus Plenior*," 181. Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Donald H. Madrid, trans.; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 13, describes an allegory as "a narrative that was composed originally for the single purpose of presenting certain higher truths that are found in the literal sense, or when facts are reported for that same reason." Northrop Frye, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982), 85, asserts, "Typology is not allegory: allegory is normally a story-myth that finds its 'true' meaning in a conceptual or argumentative translation, and both testaments of the Bible, however oblique their approach to history, deal with real people and real events." Note also Frye, *The Great Code*, 10. Stephen Fowl, "Who Can Read Abraham's Story? Allegory and Interpretative Power in Galatians," *JSNT* 55 (1994): 77-95, advances a looser notion of allegory that is unlike the common view of allegory, which typically treats words, phrases, or stories as ciphers for something else. Instead he follows John David Dawson in finding that "while allegory may rely on metaphor, etymology or personification in order to generate its counterconventional account, such substitutions are not in themselves an allegory (or allegorical interpretation) until they are extended into the narrative account." Fowl, "Who Can Read Abraham's Story?," 80. With such a broadened view, Fowl and Dawson wrongly understand typology as a species of allegory.

22 Gerald Bray, "Allegory," in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, 34; Thiselton, *Hermeneutics*, 38; Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, 24; Schodde, "Allegory," 95; S. Lewis Johnson, "A Response to Patrick Fairbairn and Biblical Hermeneutics as Related to the Quotations of the Old Testament in the New," in *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible* (ed. Earl D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 795.

23 Schodde, "Allegory," 95; LaRondelle, *The Israel of God*, 26-27; Thiselton, *Hermeneutics*, 73; S. Lewis Johnson, Jr., "Throw Out Those Legalists! An Exposition of Galatians 4:21-31," *EmJ* 15 (2006): 68.

24 Many different definitions of biblical typology are offered and many do not agree as will be discussed when the characteristics of typology are described later in this chapter. Richard Davidson defines typology, based from his semasiological analysis of τύπος and six passages where τύπος is hermeneutically significant in terms of the NT author's interpretation of the OT (Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 10:6, 11; 1 Pet 3:21; Heb 8:5; and Heb 9:24), "as the study of certain OT salvation historical realities (persons, events, or institutions), which God has specifically designed to correspond to, and be prospective/predictive prefigurations of, their ineluctable (*devoir-etre*) and absolutely escalated eschatological fulfillment aspects (Christological/ecclesiological/apocalyptic) in NT salvation history." Richard Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical* ΤΥΠΟΣ *Structures* (Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 2; Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1981), 405-6); cf. Richard Davidson, "The Nature [and Identity] of Biblical Typology—Crucial Issues" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Evangelical Theological Society, St. Paul, MN, March 14, 2003), 39. Graham A. Cole, *He Who Gives Life: The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2007), 289, defines typology this way: "The idea that persons (e.g., Moses), events (e.g., the exodus), and institutions (e.g., the temple) can—in the plan of God—prefigure a later stage in that plan and provide the conceptuality necessary for understanding the divine intent (e.g., the coming of Christ to be the new Moses, to effect the new exodus, and to be the new temple)." Similarly, for Goppelt, the concept of typology has many components: "Only historical facts—persons, actions,

events, and institutions—are material for typological interpretation; words and narratives can be utilized only insofar as they deal with such matters. These things are to be interpreted typologically only if they are considered to be divinely ordained representations or types of future realities that be even greater and more complete. If the antitype does not represent a heightening of the type, if it is merely a repetition of the type, then it can be called typology only in certain instances and in a limited way." Goppelt, *Typos*, 17-18. Walther Eichrodt, "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?" in *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics* (trans. James Luther Mays; ed. Claus Westermann; Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1963), 225, defines typology as "persons, institutions, and events of the Old Testament which are regarded as divinely established models or prerepresentations of corresponding realities in the New Testament salvation history." Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics: A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments*, rev. ed. (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1911), 246, over a hundred years ago stated, "In the technical and theological sense a type is a figure or adumbration of that which is to come. It is a person, institution, office, action, or event, by means of which some truth of the Gospel was divinely foreshadowed under the Old Testament dispensations. Whatever was thus prefigured is called the antitype."

25 Charles T. Fritsch, "To 'Antitypon," in *Studia Biblica et Semitica* (Wageningen, The Netherlands: H Veenman, 1966), 106. Richard Ounsworth, *Joshua Typology in the New Testament*, WUNT 2/328 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 37-38, helpfully comments, "What makes the vertical typology in Hebrews 9 distinctive is that (a) it is directed to an eschatological purpose and (b) that it combines the vertical aspect with a two-fold horizontal one embracing both time and space, *Heilgeschichte* and *Heilsgeographie*, as it were" (emphasis original).

26 Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, 352-58; Richard Davidson, "Typology in the Book of Hebrews," in *Issues in the Book of Hebrews* (vol. 4 of *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*; ed. Frank B. Holbrook; Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), 121-86, esp. 146-50. See also, Fritsch, "To 'Antitypon," 100-107; Geerhardus Vos, *The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (ed. Johannes Vos; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 55-65; La Rondelle, *The Israel of God*, 41-44; Ounsworth, *Joshua Typology*, 37-39, 53.

27 Unless otherwise noted, my terminology follows that of Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, 420, who clarifies, "Since in Hebrews the functional movement (from OT reality to NT fulfillment) is the same as in other hermeneutical τύπος passages—even though the referents of τύπος and ἀντίτυπος are reversed—it seems proper for the sake of convenience and consistency to employ the term 'type' in its most common hermeneutical usage to refer to the OT prefiguration (whether person, event, or institution) and 'antitype' to denote the NT fulfillment."

28 Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "Ascending the Mountain, Singing the Rock: Biblical Interpretation Earthed, Typed, and Transfigured," *Modern Theology* 28 (2012): 788, rightly identifies "typology to be a form of theological interpretation that responds to something unique to the biblical text, a special rather than general hermeneutic that is particularly attentive to the divine authorial discourse and its organic unity." For helpful discussion on intertextuality, see Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 154-92, and G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 39-40. The version of intertextuality appealed to in this analysis with respect to typology refers "to the procedure by which a later biblical text refers to an earlier text, how that earlier text enhances the meaning of the later one, and how the later one creatively develops the earlier meaning." Beale, *Handbook*, 40. Intertextuality is taken here to refer to inner-biblical or intrabiblical exegesis. For intertextuality as understood by postmodern literary critics, see Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning?*, 121, 125-26, 132-35.

29 G. K. Beale, "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? An Examination of the Presuppositions of Jesus' and the Apostles' Exegetical Method," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?* (ed. G. K. Beale; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 396. See also Beale, *Handbook*, 17-18, 57-66. There are two types of prophecy: "one as direct prophecy by word, the other as indirect prophecy by foreshadowing event." Beale, *Handbook*, 18. For others who would classify typology as an indirect or implicit form of prophecy, see Palmer Robertson, "The Outlook for Biblical Theology," in *Toward a Theology for the Future* (ed. David F. Wells and Clark H. Pinnock; Carol Stream, IL: Creation House, 1971), 75, who specifically says that typology "may be regarded as one aspect of prophecy – prophecy enacted." Likewise, Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., *The Messiah in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 34; Peter J. Gentry and Stephen J. Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2012), 103-4; Charles T. Fritsch, "Biblical Typology," *BibSac* 104 (1947): 215; Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture*, 1:106-39. Dennis E. Johnson, *Him We Proclaim: Preaching Christ from All the Scripture* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2007), 207, differentiates between verbal prophecy and embodied prophecy, the latter referring to typology which is promise through event and closely related to promise through word

(prophecy). Walter R. Roehrs, "The Typological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *CJ* 10 (1984): 214-15, rejects the "direct" and "indirect" modes of prophecy but situates typology as a form of prophecy. For critical scholars who also link typology to prophecy, see Eichrodt, "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?," 229, 234, and Horace D. Hummel, "The Old Testament Basis of Typological Interpretation," *BR* 9 (1964): 48-49. Ounsworth, *Joshua Typology*, 51, concludes his survey of the τύπος word-group in the NT with these thoughts: "It is not necessary to emphasise historical *event* to justify typology and distinguish it from allegory. What is necessary, rather, is an emphasis on divine causation or providence."

30 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 193. Near verbatim remarks may be found in Young, "Typology," 35. For the term "typology" as a modern word, A. C. Charity, *Events and their Afterlife: The Dialetics of Christian Typology in the Bible and Dante* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1966), 171n2, cites J. Gerhard (1582-1637) as one of the first theologians to distinguish allegory from typology. Later in the nineteenth century "comes the first word 'typologia' (Latin, *c.* 1840), 'typology' (English, 1844)." For a translation of J. Gerhard's distinction between typology and allegory, see Goppelt, *Typos*, 7. Interestingly enough, while TIS advocates appeal to Young in advocating figural reading, she still values a notion of typology, which she links to ikonic *mimesis*, and as such a distinction from allegory is maintained, for what she calls "ikonic exegesis requires a mirroring of the supposed deeper meaning in the text taken as a coherent whole, whereas allegory involves using words as symbols or tokens, arbitrarily referring to other realities by application of a code, and so destroying the narrative, or surface, coherence of the text." Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 162. Martens, "Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction," 291-92, summarizes Young: "Allegorists interpret violently because of their myopic fascination with individual words that are allowed to serve only as tokens and that are made to refer arbitrarily to other, unrelated realities. Young's distinction between typology and allegory brings with it something new to Origenian scholarship . . . the claim that texts alone and not events are being interpreted, and her emphasis upon whether the coherence of a passage was discerned or dismantled by the reader."

31 Ounsworth, *Joshua Typology*, 33; cf. 4. It should be noted that one of the significant problems of Ounsworth's work is his audience-centered hermeneutic. The true referent of a term can be found only by attending to what the author meant and not speculating about what the original audience understood.

32 Ibid., 34-40, 51; Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, 115-90; Leonhard Goppelt, "τύπος," in *TDNT*, 8:246-59; Fritsch, "Biblical Typology," 87-91; David L. Baker, "Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament," *SJT* 29 (1976): 144-46; K. J. Woollcombe, "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology," in *Essays on Typology* (Studies in Biblical Theology 22; Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1957), 60-62; John D. Currid, "Recognition and Use of Typology in Preaching," *RTR* 53 (1994): 115-16; E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), 126.

33 H. Wayne Johnson, "The Pauline Typology of Abraham in Galatians 3" (Ph.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1993), 21; cf. Woollcombe, "Biblical Origins and Development," 61; Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, 128-32; Ounsworth, *Joshua Typology*, 34-35.

34 Johnson, "The Pauline Typology," 23, 25. Johnson rightly observes that τύπος is used in a variety of passages that have absolutely nothing to do with typology (Acts 20:25; Rom 6:17; Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:7; 2 Thess 3:9; 1 Tim 4:12). The range of τύπος is also nicely organized in Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, ed. and trans. William F. Arndt, F. Wilber Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker [BDAG], 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), s.v. "τύπος."

35 Johnson, "The Pauline Typology," 25. Johnson, points out, "Even if there were 'one basic meaning' for τύπος, it would be unclear what relationship that meaning would have to a biblical definition of 'typology.' Vern Poythress has warned that 'no term in the Bible is equal to a technical term of systematic theology.'" Johnson cites Vern Poythress, *Symphonic Theology: The Validity of Multiple Perspectives in Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987), 74-79. Rightly, C. A. Evans and Lidija Novakovic, "Typology," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, 2nd ed. (ed. Joel B. Green, Jeannine K. Brown, and Nicholas Perrin; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2013), 986, assert that the use of typology "is not limited to the presence of the term *typos* and its cognates. As a hermeneutical category, typology establishes a parallel or correspondence between a person, event or institution in the OT (the type), and another person, event or institution in the NT (the antitype), regardless of whether an author uses the *typos* terminology or provides an explicit link between the type and its antitype."

36 The list is by no means exhaustive. Hoskins, *That Scripture Might Be Fulfilled*, 27-30, points out other NT Greek terms related to typology, such as σκια (e.g., Col 2:17; shadow), παραβολή (e.g., Heb 9:9; symbol, figure), and ἀληθινός (e.g., John 6:32; true). Other scholars also mention ὑπόδειγμα (e.g., Heb 8:5; illustration,

pattern, copy). Other terms associated with typology in the book of Hebrews are provided by Jeffrey R. Sharp, "Typology and the Message of Hebrews," *EAJT* 4 (1986): 97. For a list of Hebrew terms and phrases in the OT, see Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 352-53.

37 I owe this insight to A. B. Caneday through personal correspondence.

38 Hans K. LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy: Principles of Interpretation* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1983), 27, emphasis original. For a helpful discussion of the difference between typology and other forms of first-century interpretative approaches such as allegorization, pesher, and midrash, see C. A. Evans, "Typology," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (ed. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshal; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992), 862-63; and James M. Hamilton, Jr., "The Typology of David's Rise to Power: Messianic Patterns in the Book of Samuel," *SBJT* 16 (2012): 8-9.

39 D. A. Carson, "Mystery and Fulfillment: Toward a More Comprehensive Paradigm of Paul's Understanding of the Old and the New," in *The Paradoxes of Paul*, vol. 2 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism* (ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 404; Carson, "Theological Interpretation of Scripture," 199; Gentry and Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant*, 102; Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning?*, 119, states, "In locating meaning in an intelligible conceptual realm, allegorical interpretation gives stability to the 'spiritual sense': '*This* (word) means *that* (concept).' Allegorical interpretation sees the meaning of a text as constituted outside the text in another framework: the conceptual." Daniel Boyarin, "Origen as Theorist of Allegory: Alexandrian Contexts," in *The Cambridge Companion to Allegory*, 45, observes that for the allegorist, "The role of the interpreter ... is to perceive and then describe this clear and determinate message, to somehow divine the invisible 'magic language' that underlies or lies behind the visible language and then to translate it in the form of allegorical commentary. The allegorist reaches this level of interpretation through a process of contemplation."

40 On this point, see Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, 223; Beale, "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach?," 395; Currid, "Recognition and Use of Typology," 119; Evans, "Typology," 862; Moo, "The Problem of *Sensus Plenior*," 181; David L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible*, 3rd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2010), 180-81; Donald A. Hagner, "When the Time had Fully Come," in *A Guide to Biblical Prophecy* (ed. Carl Edwin Armerding and W. Ward Gasque; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989), 94-95; Grant R. Osborne, "Type; Typology," in *ISBE* (ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 4:931. Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology: A Prolegomenon to Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1999), 304n17, avers that "allegory involves a relationship stemming from some accidental or peripheral aspect of the original event, person, or institution." Woollcombe, "Biblical Origins and Development," 40, also asserts that "allegorism is the search for a secondary and hidden meaning underlying the primary and obvious meaning of a narrative. This secondary sense ... does not necessarily have any connexion at all with the historical framework of revelation."

41 Vanhoozer, "Ascending the Mountain," 788; cf. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, 82. R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1998), 40, writes that allegorical interpretation "has little concern with the historical character of the Old Testament text. Words, names, events, etc. are used, with little regard for their context, and invested with a significance drawn more from the allegorist's own ideas than from the intended sense of the Old Testament. No real correspondence, historical or theological, between the Old Testament history and the application is required." Silva, "Has the Church Misread the Bible?," 58, agrees, and he mentions other problems with allegorical interpretation, namely its attachment with a philosophical system which could be an alien framework, the issue of arbitrariness, and the problem of elitism as certain interpreters happen to have the spiritual acumen and maturity in possessing the key to unlock the allegorical and hidden connections from the text (59-60).

42 Vanhoozer, "Ascending the Mountain," 787, citing Anthony C. Thiselton, *First Corinthians: A Shorter Exegetical and Pastoral Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 150, notes, "Absent the original context, there are no constraints—no air traffic control—with which to rein in flights of exegetical fancy: 'allegory (in general) rests on parallels between *ideas* and can become too often self-generated and arbitrary.'" Clearly Vanhoozer flies against the thoughts of Frances Young who seeks to do away with the distinction between compositional allegory and allegorical interpretation. Young, "Allegory and the Ethics of Reading," 112. Contra Young, preserving the authorial intent and detecting an "undersense" from textual indicators in the text must be maintained to arrive at proper meanings tied to human authorial discourse and avoiding subjective readings without hermeneutical control.

43 For the examples cited, see Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality*, 97-101, 104-10, 168-72.

[44] Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality*, 220, 224-25. Carson, "Theological Interpretation," 199, rightly says, "When Philo tells us that the respective meanings of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are the three fundamental principles of a Greek education, with the best will in the world it is difficult to see how this conclusion derives from the text of Genesis."

[45] Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality*, 247-49. Irenaeus also links the three spies that Rahab receives with the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Despite the fact that the text indicates that only two spies were sent by Joshua (Josh 6:22), the link to the Trinity is imaginative and depends on Greek philosophy. Ibid., 249. Other examples are briefly summarized in Johnson, "A Response to Patrick Fairbairn," 794.

[46] O'Keefe and Reno, *Sanctified Vision*, 48-56, 66-67; cf. Martens, "Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction," 310-12. Unfortunately, using lexemes as a springboard to other passages of Scripture just because the same word or imagery is present is certain to exemplify the word fallacies of the kinds catalogued in D. A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996). In fairness, the propensity to allegorize is not just found in the early Church Fathers, for more modern examples of allegorical readings, see W. L. Wilson, *Wilson's Dictionary of Biblical Types* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957).

[47] A. B. Caneday, "Covenant Lineage Allegorically Prefigured: 'Which Things Are Written Allegorically' (Galatians 4:21-31)," *SBJT* 14 (2010): 68n5, emphasis original. See also A. B. Caneday, "Can You Discuss the Significance of Typology to Biblical Theology?" in "The *SBJT* Forum: Biblical Theology for the Church," *SBJT* 10 (2006): 96-98 and A. B. Caneday, "The Muzzled Ox and the Abused Apostle: Deut 25:4 in 1 Cor 9:9," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, St. Paul, MN, March 31, 2006), 20-21. Examples of scholars who speak of "typological interpretation" include LaRondelle, *The Israel of God*, 35; Hamilton, "The Typology of David's Rise to Power;" and Goppelt, *Typos*. For additional discussions on the relation of typology to exegesis or hermeneutics, see Davidson, "The Nature [and Identity]," 12-17; Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2006), 23-25; Currid, "Recognition and Use of Typology," 121.

[48] Caneday, "Can You Discuss the Significance?," 96. The point is an important one as O'Keefe and Reno, *Sanctified Vision*, have a whole chapter dedicated to "typological interpretation" that concentrates on "typological exegesis" as an interpretative strategy in the early church. When typological interpretation is used to associate the civil rights movement of Martin Luther King to Israel's exodus or in terms of how patristic interpreters developed certain typologies retrospectively from the OT, then theologians have clearly departed from the identification of genuine typological patterns in Scripture to imaginatively and fancifully creating typologies (or really analogies) that have absolutely nothing to do with what the text actually says. Others in the TIS movement paddle in the same stream as O'Keefe and Reno. Young, "Typology," 48, describes typology as "a 'figure of speech' that configures or reads texts to bring out significant correspondences so as to invest them with meaning beyond themselves." Leithart, *Deep Exegesis*, 44-52, 74, also describes typology as a reading strategy that is particularly susceptible to reader-response propensities given his understanding of how the meaning of texts change over time and how typological interpretation can be applied as a general hermeneutic. For an overview of his approach and the suggestion that Leithart's answer to avoiding false typological interpretations requires the judgment of the Church's Magisterium (as a liturgically and theologically attuned community of believers), see Matthew Levering, "Readings on the Rock: Typological Exegesis in Contemporary Scholarship," *Modern Theology* 28 (2012): 707-31, esp. 722-27.

[49] Schodde, "Allegory," 95. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning?*, 311, very helpfully states, "Interpreters err either when they allegorize discourse that is intended to be taken literally or when they 'literalize' discourse that is intended to be taken figuratively." There is an important distinction between literal and literalistic interpretation. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning?*, 312, writes, "Literal, that is to say, *literate*, interpretation grasps the communicative context and is thus able to identify the communicative act. We grasp the literal meaning of an utterance when we discern its propositional matter and its illocutionary force—that is to say, when we recognize what it is: a command, assertion, joke, irony, parable, etc. . . . Taking the Bible literally means reading for its literary sense, the sense of its communicative act. This entails, first, doing justice to the propositional, poetic, and purposive aspects of each text as a communicative act and, second, relating these to the Bible considered as a unified divine communicative act: the Word of God." See also Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, 119-26.

[50] Ounsworth, *Joshua Typology*, 52.

[51] Ibid., 53. So also, Stanley N. Gundry, "Typology as a Means of Interpretation: Past and Present," *JETS* 12 (1969): 235, who finds that there is a danger "whenever typology is used to show the Christocentric

unity of the Bible, it is all too easy to impose an artificial unity (even assuming that there is a valid use of the basic method). Types come to be created rather than discovered, and the drift into allegorism comes all too easily."

52 To be fair, while Vanhoozer, "Ascending the Mountain," 792, cf. 791, unhelpfully uses the language of figural reading he does claim that typological exegesis "discovers the plain sense of the author. . . . It is only when we read the plain sense of the human author in canonical context that we discern the divinely intended 'plain canonical sense,' together with its 'plain canonical referent:' Jesus Christ."

53 Currid, "Recognition and Use of Typology," 121.

54 Jan L. Verbruggen, "Of Muzzles and Oxen: Deuteronomy 25:5 and 1 Corinthians 9:9," *JETS* 49 (2006): 706. Note also S. Lewis Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New: An Argument for Biblical Inspiration* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), 44-46, who highlights the context of Deut 24-25. Johnson concludes that the literal sense was not excluded, but Paul used the passage analogically, giving it a further spiritual or moral sense even as the proverbial or figurative notion should not be excluded as the command about oxen may have been related to human interactions in the original context.

55 Caneday, "The Muzzled Ox and the Abused Apostle," 23.

56 See David Instone-Brewer, "Paul's Literal Interpretation of 'Do Not Muzzle the Ox,'" in *The Trustworthiness of God: Perspectives on the Nature of Scripture* (ed. Paul Helm and Carl R. Trueman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 139-53. The *qal wahomer* position is also advocated in the analysis of Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, "I Corinthians," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 718-22. See also David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 409-12.

57 Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 109-10.

58 See Verbruggen, "Of Muzzles and Oxen," 710-11; Caneday, "The Muzzled Ox and the Abused Apostle," 22-24. Note also Beale, *Handbook*, 67-69; Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "Single Meaning, Unified Referents: Accurate and Authoritative Citations of the Old Testament by the New Testament," in *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Kenneth Berding and Jonathan Lunde; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 81-87.

59 For discussion of the only use of verb form ἀλληγορέω in the NT and LXX along with helpful elucidation of Paul's phrase, ***ἅτινά ἐστιν*** ἀλληγορούμενα, see Steven Di Mattei, "Paul's Allegory of the Two Covenants (Gal 4.21-31) in Light of First-Century Hellenistic Rhetoric and Jewish Hermeneutics," *NTS* 52 (2006): 104-9; Caneday, "Covenant Lineage Allegorically Prefigured," 53-55. While the verb can mean to "to speak allegorically" or "to interpret allegorically," Di Mattei, "Paul's Allegory," 106, finds in his survey of the ancient sources that "ἀλληγορέω is predominantly used by these authors in the sense 'to speak allegorically', in which case it is usually the author or the personified text itself which speaks allegorically." This assessment is crucial as it undermines the notion that Paul constructed or cleverly devised the allegorical connection. Further, Caneday, "Covenant Lineage Allegorically Prefigured," 55, makes a good case for translating the clause as "these things are written allegorically" since the clause is bracketed by two explicit OT citations on either side.

60 The lack of a clear delineation and agreed upon definition of allegory complicates the matter of Gal 4:21-31, but generally, those in favor of viewing the passage in terms of typology include Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old*, 51-53, 130; Goppelt, *Typos*, 139-40; Moisés Silva, "Galatians," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 808; and also leaning in this direction is F. F. Bruce, "'Abraham had Two Sons' A Study in Pauline Hermeneutics," in *New Testament Studies: Essays in Honor of Ray Summers in His Sixty-Fifth Year* (ed. Huber L. Drumwright and Curtis Vaughan; Waco, TX: Markham, 1975), 71-84, esp. 83. Those in favor of some form of an allegorical interpretation include Fowl, "Who Can Read Abraham's Story?," 82, 87-90; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 110-13; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC, vol. 41; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990), 199-200, 208-10; Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 116; R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event* (Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1959), 89; Jason C. Meyer, *The End of the Law: Mosaic Covenant in Pauline Theology* (NACSBT; Nashville: B&H, 2009), 116-19. Many others promote that both elements of allegory and typology are present: Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians* (ZECNT; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 293-300, identifies 4:21-23 and 4:28-30 as typology and 4:24-27 as allegory; Douglas J. Moo, *Galatians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013), 294-96; Martinus C. De Boer, "Paul's Quotation of Isaiah 54.1 in Galatians," *NTS* 50 (2004): 370-89; Charles H. Cosgrove, "The Law Has Given Sarah No Children (Gal. 4:21-30)," *NovT* 29 (1987): 221; Matthew S. Harmon, "Allegory, Typology, or Something Else? Revisiting Galatians 4:21-5:1," in *Studies in Paul's Letters: A Festschrift for Douglas J. Moo* (ed. Jay E. Smith and Matthew

Harmon; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 154-58. Di Mattei, "Paul's Allegory," 102-22, argues that Paul's hermeneutic uses the rhetorical this-for-that, the hallmark of allegorical principle, but the *historia* of Hagar and Sarah is not removed as Paul exemplifies a *haftarah* liturgical reading practice, a Jewish reading technique, which makes use of prophetic texts (Isa 54:1 in this case) to read the Torah (Gen 16-17, 21:10 in this case) eschatologically.

61 Caneday, "Covenant Lineage Allegorically Prefigured," 54; cf. 51.

62 Ibid., 55. The Genesis narrative features "historical persons divinely invested with symbolic significances that transcend their own experiences and times, converging together within an allegorical story, bearing significance that reconfirms the promise and engenders hope that the promise will be fulfilled in the latter days when Messiah, Abraham's true seed, is to be revealed. Thus, by quoting Isa 54:1 (in Gal 4:27), Paul is drawing the Galatians' attention to the fact that what they are now experiencing at the hands of those who trouble them with a different gospel was allegorically written long ago *in nuce* in the Genesis narrative that entails Abraham, Sarah (the desolate woman), Hagar (the woman with the husband), and the contrasting conceptions and births of two boys." Ibid., 60. Caneday's assertions have been further buttressed by Emerson's study of the lexical and thematic connections between Hagar/Sarah and the Sinai episodes within the Pentateuch itself, particularly how Gen 16-17, 21 link to the narratives concerning the Fall, Cain, and to wilderness/wandering narratives in the book of Exodus and Numbers, see Matthew Y. Emerson, "Arbitrary Allegory, Typical Typology, or Intertextual Interpretation? Paul's Use of the Pentateuch in Galatians 4:21-31," *BTB* 43 (2013): 14-22. Emerson notices how the identification of Hagar as an Egyptian slave and how both she and Israel receive their promises from God in the wilderness lead to thematic connections between them. Further, Hagar's and Ishmael's wandering can be linked to Israel's wandering in the wilderness. Another connection may be based on wordplay of Hagar's name. Di Mattei, "Paul's Allegory," 119, suggests, "Paul ... sees an elaborate allegory here in the Abrahamic narrative. Genesis' angel of God, who reveals himself to Hagar [Gen 16:9] to establish a 'covenant', allegorically speaks of the revelation at Hagra (i.e. Sinai at Arabia), whereupon the angels of God mediate a covenant, the Law, to Moses (Gal. 3:20). But as Hagar's 'covenant', allegorically is but temporarily established and does not alter God's predestined promise to a make a covenant with Sarah's future and promised son, so too the giving of the Law at Sinai; it does not abrogate the covenant promises made beforehand to Abraham (Gal 3.17)."

63 Caneday, "Covenant Lineage Allegorically Prefigured," 60; Harmon, "Allegory, Typology, or Something Else?, 152-53, 156. Harmon, though very similar, differs from Caneday in finding the allegory not so much in the Genesis narrative itself, but the allegory is through the correspondences "more fully revealed through the use of a theological and textual framework provided by Isaiah 54:1 and its surrounding context." Harmon, "Allegory, Typology, or Something Else?," 156. He ultimately concludes that typology and allegory are present, but the allegory is based on the external framework provided by the "extra-textual" lens of Isa 54:1. The problem with this view is that it suggests that Paul or Isaiah make an allegorical interpretation which is problematic for the reasons laid out above and as discussed in Caneday's article. For a helpful discussion of Isa 54:1 and Paul's use of this text, see Karen H. Jobes, "Jerusalem, Our Mother: Metalepsis and Intertextuality in Galatians 4:21-31," *WTJ* 55 (1993): 299-320. According to Jobes, "Jerusalem, Our Mother," 309, "Isaiah's transformation of the story of Israel's childless matriarchs, beginning with Abraham and Sarah, provides a canonical basis for at least three points with which Paul later resonates. Isaiah's proclamation (1) provides an interpretation of Sarah's motherhood that can be taken to have wider reference than to the nation of Israel; (2) merges the concept of matriarchal barrenness and the feminine personification of capital cities to produce female images of two Jerusalems, a barren cursed Jerusalem and a rejoicing Jerusalem; and (3) introduces the concept of a miraculous birth to a barren woman as a demonstration of God's power to deliver a nation of people from death."

64 Caneday, "Covenant Lineage Allegorically Prefigured," 55-56. A chiasm is present, for between the initial (Gal 4:21) and reprising (Gal 4:30) interrogatives (A, A'), Paul twice affirms, "for it is written" (Gal 4:22 and 27; B, B'), with these authoritative appeals to Scripture enclosing the assertion (C), "These things are written allegorically" (Gal 4:24). Ibid., 56.

65 Caneday, "Covenant Lineage Allegorically Prefigured," 56. Like Caneday, Emerson, "Arbitrary Allegory?," 20, finds that Paul reads the Pentateuch carefully and when "he uses the term 'allegory,' it is not to indicate that he is moving from a textual reading to one that ignores the Pentateuch's plain sense, but only to note that he is expounding on the full sense and interconnectedness of these related passages." Concurring is Harmon, "Allegory, Typology, or Something Else?," 155-56, as he also notes how Gen 16-21 has patterns that point forward to greater realities.

66 I owe this insight to A. B. Caneday through personal correspondence. In this way, the allegory that Paul

appeals to has a similarity to typology but has a crucial difference. The similarities include the assumption of the historicity of the figures and inner-textual development that can be discovered within the OT itself. Paul's use of Isa 54:1 in discussing the Hagar-Sarah allegory is instructive in the same way the writer of Hebrews uses Psalm 110:4 in the discussion of Melchizedekian typology (Heb 7:1-10). As a discrete individual, Melchizedek is a type (Gen 14:18-20), but the difference between typology and the allegory of Gal 4:21-31 is that Paul is noticing in a broader way the allegory present in the entire narrative as he deals with Hagar, Sarah, and the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants. Paul is not concentrating on individual elements in the Genesis narrative as *types* in Gal 4:24-27.

67 Contra, Moo, *Galatians*, 294, who implies that Paul commits eisegesis when he writes that "Paul's interpretation of the Sarah/Hagar story seems to go further in the direction of an imposition of a preconceived scheme onto a text than is typical of NT interpretation of the OT." Joel Willitts wrongly asserts that Paul creates the allegory. Joel Willitts, "Isa 54,1 in Gal 4,24b: Reading Genesis in Light of Isaiah," *ZNW* 96 (2005): 198, 202.

68 Jobes, "Jerusalem, Our Mother," 317.

69 Caneday, "Covenant Lineage Allegorically Prefigured," 51-53; Harmon, "Allegory, Typology, or Something Else?," 158n51. Also arguing for a warranted allegory is David I. Starling, "Justified Allegory: Scripture, Rhetoric, and Reason in Galatians 4:21-5:1," *JTI* 9 (2015): 227-45.

70 Besides the works of Frances Young cited earlier, see also Bradley G. Green, ed., *Shapers of Christian Orthodoxy: Engaging Early and Medieval Theologians* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2010); Michael A. G. Haykin, *Rediscovering the Church Fathers: Who They Were and How They Shaped the Church* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2011); Donald Fairbairn, *Grace and Christology in the Early Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

71 Ribbens, "Typology of Types," 85.

72 Vanhoozer, "Ascending the Mountain," 789-90, aptly writes, "I am less inclined to take descriptions of Patristic exegesis as normative for biblical interpretation today. [Ayres] may be right historically about the difficulty of distinguishing allegory and typology, but I believe some such distinction is both necessary and legitimate. I therefore propose to 'reform' (not reject!) Patristic figural interpretation ... The way forward—call it 'good type'—is to recover not modern historicist assumptions but rather the Protestant Reformers' habit of following typological *trajectories* (i.e., the broad sweep of redemptive history), as opposed to compiling allegorical *inventories* (i.e., a list of detailed correspondences). Note that the focus in making inventories is on the multiple referents of individual words; by contrast, what comes to the fore in following trajectories is the importance of following the whole discourse." In his critique of the TIS movement, Carson, "Theological Interpretation," 199-200, is in a similar orbit as Vanhoozer on this point: "Speaking of learning from past thinkers of pre-critical eras, one begins to grow in respect for the Reformers who thought their way clear of fuzzy notions of allegory to a greater dependence on 'literal' interpretation (without losing a sophisticated grasp of metaphorical language), and less of TIS support for unspecified allegory."

73 Richard A. Muller, *Holy Scripture: The Cognitive Foundation of Theology*, vol. 2 of *Post Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker 2003), 479, cf. 472-78, 480-82. For further discussion, see Richard A. Muller, "Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: The View from the Middle Ages," in *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: Essays Presented to David C. Steinmetz in Honor of His Sixtieth Birthday* (ed. Richard A. Muller and John L. Thompson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 12-14.

74 Muller, *Holy Scripture*, 474; cf. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning?*, 118-19. For analysis of Calvin's rejection of allegorical interpretations even as he did fashion allegories in practice, and his appeal to typology, see David L. Puckett, *John Calvin's Exegesis of the Old Testament* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 105-24. For an historical overview of the *sensus literalis*, see Brevard S. Childs, "The Sensus Literalis of Scripture: An Ancient and Modern Problem," in *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift für Walther Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1977), 80-93.

75 Vanhoozer, "Ascending the Mountain," 793, emphasis original. Cf. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning?*, 119. For Vanhoozer's citations Frei, see Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, 2.

76 Woollcombe, "Biblical Origins and Development," 42.