

Covenants and Typology: An Extended Review of Mitchell L. Chase, *40 Questions about Typology and Allegory*¹

BRENT E. PARKER

Brent E. Parker is the Assistant Editor of the *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*. He earned his PhD in Systematic Theology from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. He is the co-editor of *Covenantal and Dispensational Theologies: Four Views on the Continuity of Scripture* (IVP, 2022) and *Progressive Covenantalism: Charting a Course Between Dispensational and Covenantal Theologies* (B&H, 2016).

The *40 Questions Series* list of books, edited by Benjamin Merkle, continues to grow—now past several—with this latest volume by Mitchell Chase. In the introduction, Chase, who is preaching pastor of Kosmosdale Baptist Church and assistant professor of Boyce College and Southern Seminary, lays down his desire for rightly understanding the big story of the Bible and that his work would aid people to be more faithful readers of Scripture. Accordingly, typology and allegory are vital “tools” for reading Scripture (12). Chase is right about the significance of this topic, typology and allegory are important not just for biblical hermeneutics, but rightly understanding typological patterns is crucial for doing biblical theology and formulating theological conclusions properly while understanding allegory is important for rightly interpreting those passages of Scripture that feature that genre. To address the topic of typology and allegory, Chase divides his work into four parts. Part 1 revolves around biblical theology by answering the questions of what story the Bible tells and secondly, how it does so. Parts 2 and 3 on typology

and allegory, respectively, represent the bulk of the book and each is divided into three parts: understanding the nature of typology/allegory, their place in the history of interpretation, and identifying them in Scripture. Part 4 rounds out the work by answering the fortieth question on why interpreters should care about typology and allegory. For the purposes of this review, I will summarize each part of the book and then make observations and critiques before proceeding to the next part of the book. Naturally, the emphasis will be placed on part 2 (Questioning Typology) and part 3 (Questioning Allegory) since this is the critical material for Chase’s presentation of typology and allegory. Afterwards, I will offer a brief overall assessment.

In part 1, Chase provides a brief overview of the storyline of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. The Bible centers on the person of Jesus. In the next question on how the story is told, Chase helpfully lays out that the authors of Scripture do not just record the acts of God in history but also interpret them and further, there is an organic development through the storyline (progressive revelation). In succinct fashion Chase tackles the difficult topic of Scripture using Scripture, presenting his understanding of quotations, allusions, echoes while not neglecting other important aspects such as metalepsis, cluster of texts, and narrative recapitulation. Finally, a good overview is provided of figures of speech such as metaphor, hyperbole, metonymy, and symbolism. Given what Chase addresses in these two chapters, it is disappointing that his treatment of the organic development of the storyline omits the covenants. The covenants are briefly mentioned in regard to narrative recapitulation (29), but even in a concise discussion of the progress of revelation, the covenants from creation to the new covenant are critical for how we understand the larger storyline and should have had at least a brief explanation. Also, in regard to literary devices and figures of speech, it is interesting that no mention of the genres of Scripture is made, and particularly, parable or allegory are omitted in his list of literary devices/figures of speech (30–31).

Part 2 of the book is concentrated on typology. Section A focuses on defining typology, explaining its nature and characteristics, and how interpreters recognize types in Scripture. Chase defines typology as “a person, office, place, institution, event, or thing in salvation history that anticipates, shares correspondences with, escalates toward, and resolves in its antitype” (38, emphasis removed; cf. 65). This definition is fairly representative of

how evangelical scholars define typology but there is much debate regarding what it means that the type “anticipates” the antitype. Chase picks up on this in a later question. He rightly views typology as having a prophetic quality (61–62). Types are anticipatory in the sense that “[f]rom the divine perspective, all types are prospective because God has inspired the story that takes us to Christ, and thus these types are prefigurements designed to be fulfilled in Christ” (62). Like G.K. Beale, Richard Davidson, and many others, Chase posits that types are indirect prophecies. Tied to Chase’s understanding of typology are the theological assumptions, which Chase rightly explains in view of the providence of God, the unity of Scripture, the progress of revelation, the claims of Jesus, etc. (Question 4, p. 41–45). Chase also helpfully points out the importance of history for typology and how they are inseparable (Question 8, p. 65–69), though this could have been brought up earlier in Question 4 or moved up earlier as a main question.

In regard to recognizing types, Chase argues that even though types are by nature prospective, some types are identified as such only in hindsight (retrospective) (see Question 7, p. 59–63). In addition, we should recognize types in addition to the ones the NT authors explicitly highlight (Question 5, p. 47–52). Also of significance is how Chase speaks of typology as an exegetical method (Question 9, p. 71–75). Throughout, Chase refers to “typological interpretation” (e.g., 43) or “typological reading” (e.g., 75) as he states that typology is “canonical exegesis” (75, cf. 73) and is an “interpretative method” (71). On this last point, see also Question 16 (p. 119–22).

Section B of Part 2 is about typology and church history. “How was typology practiced” through the eras of church history is the question, and Chase seeks answers in the following eras: early church, Middle Ages, early modern, enlightenment, late modern, and postmodern. Naturally, given the limitations of space for these questions, the overview is quite selective. But Chase does offer helpful examples of the typological patterns that key figures in church history observed, and in a succinct fashion, he does cover important issues such as the Alexandria/Antiochene schools (82), the Quadriga (88), the shift to a more literal sense, and the loss of typology in biblical studies with the rise of higher-criticism before its recovery in more recent times (107–16).

The last section of Part 2 demonstrates Chase’s identifications of types from Genesis to Malachi (Questions 16–24 cover Section C; p. 119–89). Chase seeks to do this through prayerful, whole-Bible reading, in dialogue with the

church community, and input from history with the saints of old (121–22). In pointing out types in each OT book, it is important to emphasize again that for Chase, “[t]ypological exegesis is an act of diagnosing types through a deliberate (not arbitrary) and careful (not reckless) evaluation of correspondences, escalation, and redemptive or covenantal significant” (121). With this understanding of typology, Chase not only describes well-known types such as Adam, Moses, the exodus, David, the temple, the sacrificial system, and the offices of prophet, priest, king, but more specifically characters like Enoch, Gideon, Samson, Mordecai, and Esther are typological of Christ, and events like the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the opening up of the earth on the tribe of Korah (149), the capture and return of the ark (160), the suffering city of Lamentations (183), and instances such as Rahab’s scarlet cord (154), Moses’ outstretched hands (140), the zeal of Phinehas (150), Daniel’s friends in the fire (185), and Daniel’s rescue in the lion’s den (186) are all elucidated as types as well.

Overall, for Part 2, while there is much to appreciate here from Chase’s treatment of the nature and characteristics of typology, and his discussions of typology in church history (albeit very brief at points), there are a number of concerns I have with this presentation of typology.

First, in Chase’s discussion of how all types lead to Christ, he brings up the biblical covenants and highlights how the biblical types flow in the covenantal stream. Chase cites Matthew Barrett and David Schrock approvingly, with the understanding that types appear and are embedded in the context of covenants (54–55). The problem here is that this idea does not originate with Barrett or Schrock. The notion of types unfolding through the covenants is a significant contribution from Stephen Wellum (with Peter Gentry) in *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants*, 2nd ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2019), 135–36. Not only does Chase fail to credit this idea to Wellum, but in Part C where he identifies the types, he rarely, if at all, discusses the covenantal stream or how the type progresses and develops through the biblical covenants to their antitype in Christ. So, Chase seems to acknowledge the importance of the covenantal backdrop of types, but then he fails to tie or connect many of the types he identifies to the covenants in any way. In other words, given how important covenants are to the doing of biblical theology and the recognition of types, it is surprising and disappointing to see the covenantal stream mentioned

but not in any way worked out or demonstrated with how the typological patterns unfold.

Second, it is fascinating that there is so little treatment on the vertical dimension of biblical types (see p. 56). Chase focuses nearly exclusively on the horizontal dimension of types, and granted, it is much easier to explicate types along the horizontal, temporal axis of the biblical storyline. But types are designed by God and much more attention is needed on the forward-looking function based on the types' spatial relationship to heavenly realities. For a recent attempt at organically linking the horizontal and vertical dimensions of biblical types or at least showing their complementarity, see Ardel Caneday's article entitled, "God's Parabolic Design for Israel's Tabernacle: A Cluster of Earthly Shadows of Heavenly Realities," *SBJT* 24 (2020): 103–24.

Thirdly, a variety of types identified as such in section C of Part 2 is less than convincing. Of these, what I observe are examples of loose theological associations or connections that are posited as types. The problem goes back to Chase's approach to typology that involves only correspondences and escalation (see p. 121). With the coming of Christ and the new covenant era, there will always be an escalation, and so this really leaves only correspondence as the essential feature for identifying types per Chase's portrayal of typology. Not only does one need to show the correspondence and escalation, but there has to be textual warrant or some indication of the prophetic element that is characteristic of biblical types (e.g., see the writings of Richard Davidson). Chase recognizes types as being indirect prophecies, but does not this prophetic quality need to be demonstrated? This prophetic element may or may not be in the immediate context of a person, event, or institution in the biblical storyline, but if not, we know we are dealing with a typological pattern if a later biblical author picks up an earlier person, event, or institution and casts or projects it with a prophetic or eschatological overtone. For example, if all one had was Genesis 14 regarding Melchizedek, it may be difficult to discern him as a type, but given how David, in lieu of the Davidic covenant, discusses Melchizedek later in Psalm 110, there can be no doubt Melchizedek is typological of Jesus Christ. But for Chase, many of the types he identifies as such have no indication that they indirectly point ahead to Christ in the immediate or later context.

For some of the types that Chase identifies as such, he commits the very thing he wishes to avoid: arbitrary and clever associations that he,

the interpreter has cast or forged as a type. For example, Chase argues that Rahab's scarlet cord, which he claims is reminiscent of the Passover, is a forward-looking type of the cross (154). But this is dubious, as Graeme Goldsworthy has pointed out: "The redness of Rahab's cord is not a type of Jesus' blood. Such is the use of fanciful, non-contextual associations that avoid the real theology behind these things" (*Christ-Centered Biblical Theology: Hermeneutical Foundations and Principles* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2012], 187). Something similar can be said of Moses' raised hands with the defeat of the Amalekites (140). There may be an analogy to Christ's victory on the cross, but it is doubtful that Moses' raised hands function as a biblical type of Christ on the cross. The zeal of Phinehas, when he speared a transgressing Israelite for committing sexual morality, is offered as a type of the "true, and greater Phineas," Jesus, since only Jesus could make final propitiation for sin. "Rather than pursuing sinners with a spear, Jesus received the spear into his own body" (150). That may have appeal, but is not Chase engaged in allegorical interpretation of the text, or "hyper-typing" at this point, to use the language of John Currid? Nowhere is the indication in the immediate context or within later biblical authors that Phinehas' zeal in carrying out capital punishment with a spear is designed by God to foreshadow and point forward to Christ and his being speared on the cross. Other examples could be provided, but the discerning reader of this work will properly ask, "How is this a type given the textual evidence that Chase has provided?" Or, "How do I know that this is a type and not just an analogy with some loose textual or theological association?" There are types that the NT authors do not identify, but types are more than analogies and incidental correspondences, the prophetic and covenantal aspects of types must be maintained to properly identify a person, event, institution, place, as a biblical type.

Part 3 of the book is organized the same way as Part 2, but now concentrating on the topic of allegory. Section A covers what allegory and allegorical interpretation are and discusses the theological assumptions of allegory (Question 25 and 26). According to Chase, allegory is a literary device where a passage says one thing in order to communicate something deeper beneath the surface (193–94). On the other hand, allegorical interpretation is distinguished from allegory as it is a way of reading an allegory, treating the passage as it contains "deeper meaning(s)." Chase rightly notes the abuses

and concerns with allegorical interpretation (195-96); nevertheless, he signals that these excesses do not mean that allegorical interpretations should be ruled out entirely when the practice of allegorical interpretation can be warranted through the canonical revelation (197). Typology and allegory are examples of “figural reading” even as they are distinguishable, but both encompass significance that goes beyond the text itself (197). In terms of assumptions, allegorizing the biblical text is fitting. The unity of the OT and NT, the deeper meanings tied to Christ and Christian doctrine that are present through verbal associations, and the fact that all of Scripture is by one divine author provide the key assumptions for allegorical interpretation (199–200). In the early church, interpreting passages allegorically was viewed as imitating Paul (Gal 4:24; 1 Cor 10:1–4), but not in a manner that disregarded the literal sense as the foundation (201). Pursuing deeper meanings is important, because “Scripture has a literal sense as well as nonliteral senses” (201). Drawing on Hans Boersma, John O’Keefe, and R. R. Reno throughout, Chase advances the notion that allegorical interpretation is desirable for edifying the reader and for forming virtue in readers of Scripture (202–3).

Section B covers the practice of allegory through the same six stages of church history discussed before (Questions 27–32). These chapters highlight the approach to allegorical interpretation and more broadly, the understanding of the literal sense or multiple senses, but very few actual examples of allegorical interpretation are provided here. Chase unpacks the move from premodern hermeneutics through the Reformation and the rise of the historical-critical method with the Enlightenment and does offer some helpful insights into their approach to allegory.

In the last section (C), Chase asks the important question, “How should we practice allegorical interpretation?” (Question 33), before identifying what he views as allegorical from Genesis to Revelation (Questions 34–39). In terms of the former question, Chase does not want to abandon allegorical interpretation but instead bridle it by searching for textual controls to ground it in the literal sense and establishing it through a canonical lens (250–51). Per Chase, allegorical reading needs to be grounded in the plain sense of a text, should not contradict clearer passages of Scripture, honor the rule of faith, and be controlled by the unity of the Testaments, thus the interpretation must fit the whole canon (252–53).

What does an “allegorical reading” yield? For Chase, such an interpretation

may be established all through the OT and the NT. Moreover, there is much overlap with typology. Many of the same figures and events that Chase identified as typological in Part 2 reappear as allegorical in Part 3. Adam and Eve, Abel, Abraham, Joseph, the exodus, the manna, the sacrificial system, Rahab’s scarlet cord, David versus Goliath, exile, the rebuilding of the walls (in Ezra-Nehemiah), the defeat of Haman, Job, wisdom (Proverbs), the husband and bride of the Song of Solomon, and the vine of Isaiah 5 were all treated as typological to some degree but these persons, events, and institutions have double duty in being allegorical as well. Take for example David and Goliath. In the typology section, David’s defeat of Goliath is typological of Jesus, the seed of the woman, in defeating his enemies as the victory of the cross surpasses the defeat of Goliath (161). In Part 3 on allegory, David’s triumph over Goliath is allegorical of the defeat of God’s enemies and more, for “the stone is the cross, and the wound on Goliath’s forehead is the serpent’s head finally crushed (Gen 3:15; 1 Sam. 17:49). When read within the whole canon, the victory of David over Goliath has messianic tones for those with ears to hear. And in our union with Christ, the victory of David is ours as well. . . . [W]e overcome temptations and persevere through trials” (263). Many other allegories are offered such as the tabernacle furniture, Nathan’s rebuke of David, the vine of Psalm 80, Jeremiah’s loincloth, the dry bones in the valley (Ezekiel), Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, the names of Hosea’s children, and many others. In addition, there are allegories in the NT, like the gifts of the Magi (279), John the Baptist’s diet (280), and Jesus’ calming of the storm means that “through all the storms we face, he calls us to be people of faith rather than people debilitated by fear” (281). The parables, Jesus as the Good Shepherd, the bread and cup of the last supper, Peter’s vision of a great sheet (Acts 10:9–15), to Pauls’ allegorical interpretation in Galatians 4:24–31 to joining Christ outside the camp (Heb 13:13) to the woman and the dragon in Revelation 12, these are some of the other NT allegories that Chase identifies.

Assessing Part 3 on allegory is no easy task given that so much needs to be unraveled. This part is more complicated than Part 2, but it is also less convincing. A variety of challenges may be offered.

First, Chase does not adequately define what an allegory is. Generally, an allegory is a literary form or literary genre featuring an extended metaphor or a trope that functions to illustrate and tell a story or convey truth by personifying

abstract concepts. One can think of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. John Bunyan's story is an allegory of a Christian's life and walk toward the Holy City. Chase is correct that an allegory involves speaking one thing in order to say something else, but he does not properly discuss allegory as a literary device and genre that is grounded in human authorial intent. Indeed, there are allegories in Scripture and parables are akin to allegories, but the allegories are crafted and designed by the authors of Scripture. Chase is right to distinguish allegory from allegorical interpretation (194). But the problem is that Chase legitimizes allegorical interpretation as a reading strategy, thus placing the focus and emphasis on the *act* of interpretation instead of concentrating on allegories as part of revelation (more on this later). The role of the reader is to identify the allegories that are there in the text, intended by the author, but not force new meanings that are unrelated to the authorial discourse. Kevin Vanhoozer is correct when he 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" (*Is There a Meaning Meaning in This Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998], 311). Notice Vanhoozer's emphasis on "intended." As faithful readers, we need to follow authorial intent and not read a passage as an allegory when it is not so intended.

Second, while Chase claims that allegorical reading is legitimate by basing it in the literal sense, by not contradicting clearer passages, by honoring the rule of faith, and by creating space for Christ within the canonical sweep of Scripture, but in actual practice (see Section C of Part 3), he cannot make good on his claim. In many places, the canonical horizon runs roughshod over the immediate context. The three horizons of biblical interpretation, the textual, epochal, and canonical horizons (as described by Richard Lints and advanced by Stephen Wellum) are not functioning properly in Chase's interpretative scheme and it does not appear that the epochal horizon even exists in his approach. One can provide an allegorical interpretation that does not contradict another passage of Scripture, emphasizes Christ, and is in keeping with the rule of faith but nevertheless, still does violence to the original context and the textual horizon of that passage. The doctrine of inspiration is the driving force for why faithful readers of Scripture must maintain the original human authorial intent because God speaks through human authors (i.e., the concursive theory of inspiration) and the divine intent is bound up with the

human authorial intent. There are developments and sometimes human authors do speak beyond what they know (*sensus plenior*), but the original contextual meaning has to be maintained even as there is development along the axis of the covenantal unfolding of revelation. It is not legitimate to read NT realities back into OT texts, making massive jumps with an allegorical scheme.

Third, many examples that Chase offers as allegories throughout the Bible (Section C of Part 3) are largely unconvincing in my view. Some of the examples, such as the exodus (257–58) or his treatment of Psalm 72 (268) I would classify as typology. Other examples he lists do involve metaphors and symbols, but is this really allegory? Still other examples Chase seems to allegorize the text or cast features of the text as illustrations of Christ (e.g., Jesus is Abel, p. 256) or the Christians' call to follow him (e.g., the fisherman laying down their nets, p. 280; Jesus calming of the storm, p. 281). In some of these cases, what I observe are loose theological associations or parallels or analogies based on some detail of the text being made by the interpreter, but not flowing out of the text itself. These associations may not be outright wrong, there are applications, implications, and significance to be drawn from the biblical text, but they should be called that, and not labeled "allegories."

For my last critique of Part 3, it should be noted that Chase's interpretation of Galatians 4:21–31 is fraught with many difficulties (288–89; cf. 256–57). Is it really Paul who is doing an "allegorical reading" here and interpreting the family of Abraham in an allegorical fashion? Unfortunately, at no point does Chase engage with Ardel Caneday's significant treatment of this passage ("Covenant Lineage Allegorically Prefigured: 'Which Things are Written Allegorically' [Galatians 4:21–13]," *SBJT* 14 [2010], 50–77). Caneday argues, convincingly to my mind, that Paul does not spin or create the allegory here as he expects his readers to recognize the figurative aspects already there in the Pentateuch (see Gal 4:21, 30). Instead of typology, which is focused more on discrete persons, events, and institutions (and typological elements are pointed out by Paul in Gal 4:21–23, 28–30), Paul may have used the term "allegory" in this passage because the focus is on the entire narrative concerning the promises to Abraham and the complex set of themes regarding the obstacles to those promises. Isaiah also notices the features of the Genesis account (see Isa 51:2 and 54:1, the latter cited by Paul in Gal 4:27) and Isaiah's development of the barren woman (Sarah) with Jerusalem provides Paul with the redemptive-historical context that sharpens what may be observed as the allegorical, larger

than life, features already present in Genesis.

Finally, Chase rounds out the book with a question on why interpreters should care about typology and allegory (Part 4, Question 40). The testimony of Jesus means that “typological and allegorical interpretation are ways to read that earlier Scripture in light of his claim” (295). These “reading strategies” are needed to show how the OT points to Christ and they take seriously how Jesus used the OT and taught his disciples to interpret it. Moreover, the “reading strategies of typology and allegory” are needed “because they clarify what a biblical author is doing with an earlier passage and what the meaning of that passage is in its canonical context” (296). Thirdly, Chase argues we need a return to typological and allegorical interpretation in view of the Great Tradition and how their reading of the Word of God was in faith even if we don’t agree with all of their interpretative moves. In addition, typological and allegorical interpretations are needed for the task of preaching and for blessing the reader of Scripture (298–299).

Tackling the subject of typology and allegory is no simple task and Chase has labored not just to define typology and allegory, but to review church history and to apply his hand in looking throughout the grand sweep of Scripture to identify types and allegories. Chase should be applauded for taking on such an ambitious endeavor. Nevertheless, my overall assessment of his book is that it poses more problems and questions than it actually solves. There are at least three important points to be made.

First, throughout the entire work, Chase speaks of *typological* interpretation and *allegorical* interpretation along with using the terms “typology” and “allegory.” As mentioned above regarding the last question of the book in Part 4, Chase refers to typology and allegory as “reading strategies.” What is confusing about all this is that types and allegories belong, first and foremost, in the category of revelation. By accenting typological interpretation and allegorical interpretation in his treatment and discussion the locus is placed primarily in the realm of hermeneutics. But types and allegories are latent to the text of Scripture, a species of divine revelation, and the role of the reader is to identify them as such. When we read portions of Scripture that feature poetry, we don’t say that one needs to apply a *poetic* interpretation, or when we come across texts of Scripture on the law, we don’t say we must apply a *legal* interpretation. No, we read poetry according to its *nature*, we read legal portions of Scripture according to its *nature*. Ardel Caneday has been pointing

this out in a variety of articles and essays but Chase is either not aware of this important distinction or ignores it. For example, Caneday, argues that “to identify typology as a hermeneutical term or key locates the discussion within the interpretation of Scripture rather than principally within the nature of Scripture where it belongs. To categorize typology as the NT writers’ [or biblical interpreters’] ‘hermeneutical endeavor’ and to identify biblical typology with nomenclature such as ‘typological interpretation’ or ‘exegetical method’ seems to subvert the claim that biblical types are prophetic foreshadowings or prefiguring clues of things to come which are recognizable within the OT before they reach fulfillment in their NT antitypes.” What is more, the language of “[a]llegorical interpretation means something different from *interpretation of an allegory*. John Bunyan wrote *The Pilgrim’s Progress* as an allegory, but his allegory does not call for *allegorical interpretation*. We do not interpret it allegorically. Rather, we acknowledge that it is an allegory and read it in keeping with its allegorical nature” (“Biblical Types: Revelation Concealed in Plain Sight to be Disclosed—‘These Things Occurred Typologically to Them and Were Written Down for Our Admonition,’ in *God’s Glory Revealed in Christ: Essays on Biblical Theology in Honor of Thomas R. Schreiner*, ed. Denny Burk, James M. Hamilton, Jr., and Brian Vickers [Nashville: B&H, 2019], 142, 143 [emphasis original]). This is important, because Chase’s discussion of typology and allegory is muddled by his nomenclature and in his focus of each as interpretative practices, instead of concentrating on the redemptive-historical and literary features latent to the text of Scripture. At points Chase talks about identifying types and he distinguishes between allegory and allegorical interpretation, but these distinctions are not sustained throughout his presentation. Hermeneutical principles are certainly at stake with biblical typology and allegory (e.g., how is the reader to identify a type and understand an allegory?), but with the emphasis on interpretative practices and the canonical horizon, even though the conclusions Chase draws may be within the rule of faith, I find that what is applied is an extratextual grid forced upon the text of Scripture for some of the allegories and types he claims as such.

Second, it is interesting that while Chase has a helpful discussion on how Scripture uses Scripture (27–29), it is by no means as thorough as it could be. I think that some of the types and many of the allegories that Chase identifies as such belong in a different category altogether. For example, in G.K. Beale’s *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*

(Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 67–71, Beale presents the category of analogical or illustrative uses of the OT in the NT. An example he provides is 1 Corinthians 9:9-10 with the citation of Deuteronomy 25:4. For Chase, however, he describes this passage as an allegorical reading by Paul (see 287–88). It seems that the categories of typology and allegory have become too all-encompassing in Chase’s framework. I think readers of Scripture should follow Beale though, given his careful and nuanced classifications of how the NT uses the OT.

Third, and finally, the general sense from reading *40 Questions about Typology and Allegory*, with its emphasis on the great tradition and premodern hermeneutics, and the significant dependence on Peter Leithart, Keith Stanglin, and Craig Carter, is that this is a work moving in the direction of going beyond the *sensus literalis*. Chase seems to advocate for a spiritual sense in addition to the literal sense. There are a variety of elements in the book that may be correlated with the theological interpretation of Scripture (TIS) movement. As Richard Muller reminds us though, 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” (*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], 474). While Chase at points recognizes in his history and theological assumption sections the single, literal sense of the Reformers, still, the tenor of the book, as well as Chase’s typological and allegorical interpretations suggest that we should move beyond the literal sense.

Properly understanding the types, allegories, symbols, imagery, metaphors, and so on of the Biblical text is crucial for readers of Scripture even as there are many complications in interpreting them, especially for those wanting to rightly handle the word of truth (2 Tim 2:15). Mitchell Chase’s *40 Questions about Typology and Allegory* seeks to provide answers on these issues. While I remain unconvinced by his analysis, especially with regard to allegory, this book will be a resource that scholars will need to engage with for years to come.

¹ Mitchell L. Chase, *40 Questions about Typology and Allegory* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2020).