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FOREWORD

I regard it as an honor to recommend the publication of Richard M. Davidson's dissertation, which has earned him the Doctor of Theology degree from the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary of Andrews University. In my opinion this work, Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Tissue Structures, constitutes a step forward, even a milestone, in the discipline of biblical hermeneutics.

Dr. Davidson's identification of the characteristics and structures of biblical types and antitypes provides a better understanding of the intrinsic unity of both the Old and the New Testaments while recognizing the progressive revelation of God's plan in salvation history. This study fills a gap in the biblical studies regarding typology by letting the inherent theological structures emerge from Scripture itself. It further serves as a worthy reply to the claims of the hermeneutic of liberal in the area of prophetic interpretations. It avoids the pitfalls of the extremes in both allegorism and literalism by conscientiously digging out the genuine literal interpretation centered in Christ Jesus.

May its light benefit the students of biblical prophecy in better discerning the divinely ordained structures which connect God's works in the ancient past, in Christ Jesus, and in the promised apocalyptic future.

Hans K. La Fontelle
Professor of Theology
Andrews University
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INTRODUCTION

In 1938, Leonard Goppelt published the first comprehensive survey of NT typology from a modern historical perspective. Recent articles by this NT scholar emphasize the same basic contention as his pioneering dissertation: typology is "the central and distinctive NT way of understanding Scripture." Properly understood, "it is the decisive interpretation of Jesus, the Gospel, and the Church... According to its NT core... typology is theologically constitutive for an understanding of the Gospel." Other prominent scholars from various branches of biblical studies and biblically-related disciplines concur with Goppelt's assessment. G. E. Wright asserts that "the one word which perhaps better than any other describes the early Church's method of interpreting the Old Testament is 'typology'." Robert M. Grant concludes similarly: "The New Testament method of interpreting the

---


2. Idem, "Wiens, Stutens, Tucht, und Eintiefung," NTJ, 8:255.

3. Ibid., p. 256.

Old was generally that of typology. E. Earle Ellis (following Werner G. Kümmel) maintains that "typological interpretation expresses most clearly 'the basic attitude of primitive Christianity toward the Old Testament'."  

These recent affirmations of the centrality and importance of biblical typology appear remarkable in view of the prevailing negative evaluation among critical scholars in previous decades. Just before World War I, John R. Darbyshire could write that "typology, as a branch of serious theological study, is now generally discredited and practically obsolete." The triumph of historical criticism within liberal scholarship had spelled the demise of typological study throughout the latter nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Except in certain conservative circles, typology was merely "an historical curiosity, of little importance or significance for the modern reader."  

But recent decades have witnessed an amazing instauration of interest in the subject. Particularly after World War II strong advocates of the historical-critical method—which had dealt the death-blow to nineteenth-century traditional typology—exuberantly

---


---

embraced a "post-critical neo-typology." Once quasi-incompatible bedfellows were enthusiastically united.

Since the first detailed study of NT typology from a modern historical perspective was published by Goppelt, a host of scholars have participated in the discussion. The resurgence of interest in biblical typology has occurred not only within the OT and NT fields of biblical studies but also among such related disciplines as dogmatic and systematic theology, church history, art and architecture, and literary criticism.

The revival of typology has also met strong resistance within critical scholarship. For instance, William A. Irwin, in his presidential address delivered at the ninety-fourth annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, articulates his surprise and disdain that the Biblical Theology Movement "in the interest of relevance exhumes old errors we had supposed long since deep buried." He refers particularly to the "astonishing . . . reversal to typology," which he insists involves "clever devices of ingenuity" to establish the unity of the Bible rather than "sound literary and historical methods." Since 1950 a number of

---

1. This phrase is coined by Gilbert F. Cope, Symbolism in the Bible and the Church (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953), p. 20.

2. The major participants, views, and issues in this discussion are surveyed in the first chapter of the present study.


4. Ibid.
bibilical scholars have joined the debate in opposition to the modern revival of typology.¹

Despite the proliferation of literature on the topic in recent decades, there has heretofore been no comprehensive survey of significant participants, views, and issues in the twentieth-century discussion of biblical typology. This we attempt to provide in the review of literature. Brief attention is also given to the understanding of biblical typology in preceding centuries in order to allow the issues in the recent debate to stand out more clearly.

It becomes evident from the literature survey that virtually the entire range of issues connected with biblical typology still remains unsettled. This includes such aspects as terminology, definition, characteristics, origin, scope, and contemporary relevance. To be sure, various trends in the modern discussion will emerge—the traditional understanding of typology (with three main strands), a “post-critical neo-typology” (with two major traditions), and a historical-critical repudiation of typological interpretation. But even among the representatives of these different viewpoints, there is far from unanimity on many of the crucial questions regarding biblical typology.

The fundamental unresolved issues concern the nature of biblical typology. Its inherent conceptual structures. It is generally agreed that biblical typology is a hermeneutical approach of the biblical writers—an attempt to interpret OT Scripture. But does this hermeneutical approach involve the interpretation of specific, divinely-designed, predictive prefigurations, as in the traditional understanding? Or is it part of a common human way of analogical thinking which in Scripture involves the recognition of the “recurring rhythm” or “structural analogies”² within God’s saving activity, as maintained in many recent studies? Is biblical typology basically prospective or retrospective? Does it extend to minute details or is it limited to general parallels between type and antitype? Does biblical typology require the historicity of the type, or is it based on a theologically informed history that is not necessarily exact and objective?

Does Scripture contain both horizontal and vertical typology? If so, what is the relation between the two? Is biblical typology necessarily Christocentric or soteriological or historical? Is there always an eschatological intensification or escalation between type and antitype? Can a given type find fulfillment in more than one antitype or in more than one aspect of the same antitype? Is biblical typology a systematic hermeneutical method, or is it an unstructured intuitive (pneumatic) approach to Scripture?

Only as these and other questions dealing with the precise nature of biblical typology are settled can steps be taken

¹Lampe, “The Reasonableness of Typology,” p. 29.

toward resolution of other related issues. The almost bewildering disparity of views regarding the nature of biblical typology is symptomatic, however, of an underlying problem in the history of research on the topic. As is demonstrated in the literature survey, previous studies of the biblical use of typology suffer from a serious methodological deficiency. There is a repeated failure to allow the structures of typology to emerge from within the biblical text. Instead, an a priori understanding of typology—based on little or no exegetical evidence—is projected upon Scripture, and the biblical material then is examined from the perspective of the preconceived understanding.

This indictment of methodology applies as much to the longer monographs and dissertations on typology as to the shorter survey articles and essays and treatments of specific typological passages and motifs. Even Patrick Fairbairn's classic nineteenth-century study of Scriptural typology, while providing biblical illustrations, makes no attempt to work out his definitions and principles from thorough biblical exegesis. Goppelt's 1939 dissertation, though widely recognized as the "standard work" on the NT use of typology, likewise begins with a pre-understanding of the main characteristic of typology, stated at the outset of his study, which he then employs in discovering NT typological passages that conform to his proposed definition. Our survey of literature reveals that the "classic" statements and "standard" works on typology—not to mention the more cursory treatments—have failed to lay a solid exegetical foundation. The nature of biblical typology remains ambiguous as long as an a priori understanding of its conceptual structures is brought to the biblical text instead of allowing these structures to emerge from careful exegetical analysis.

The situation just described appears to call for a fresh attempt to come to grips with the nature of biblical typology, an attempt which seeks to rectify the methodological deficiency of previous studies. This is the thrust of the present dissertation.

Before we discuss an adequate methodology, however, certain key terms that are repeatedly employed in the present study must be defined. By "Scripture" is meant the OT and NT, but particularly the OT as the object of interpretation. "Hermeneutical" means "of or pertaining to the interpretation of Scripture." A "hermeneutical approach" refers to a way or method of interpreting Scripture. A "hermeneutical term" is a word used in a specialized or technical sense with reference to this approach of the biblical writers.

"Hermeneutical passages" refers to biblical texts or pericopes which involve the interpretation of OT Scripture.

---

1 A clear conception of the nature of typology would make possible an accurate definition and list of characteristics. The scope of typology within Scripture could then be examined, and its origin could be explored. Attention could be focused upon the function and purpose of typology within Scripture. With ambiguities over the nature of typology removed, the issue of contemporary relevance might be properly addressed.


---

1 This is similar to the usage of *ενσώρευσα* in Luke 24:27.
"τύποι passages" are those biblical texts or pericopes which employ the Greek term τύποι or cognate. "Hermeneutical τύποι passages" are those biblical passages which involve the interpretation of OT Scripture and employ the term τύποι or cognate. "τύποι structures" are the inherent conceptual elements that emerge from analysis of τύποι passages.

By "semasiological" is meant "of or pertaining to the study of the meaning of words." "Semasiological investigation" refers to an analysis of the overall semantic range of a word (or words) and its breadth of signification in specific occurrences. "Typological structures" are the inherent conceptual elements that comprise biblical typology. The definition of "biblical typology" must be deliberately postponed until its inherent structures have been allowed to emerge from Scripture.

We may now direct our attention toward methodology. As has already been noted, an adequate methodology for ascertaining the nature of biblical typology requires more than the projecting of an a priori definition of typology upon Scripture. The structures of biblical typology must be allowed to emerge from a thorough exegetical analysis of biblical passages. But which passages should be analyzed? Are there criteria whereby one may identify from the outset at least some representative passages that are clearly typological, so that exegesis of these passages can expose the basic structural elements involved in biblical typology?

A broad conceptual distinction may be recognized which allows us to focus upon the topic at hand. The term "typology" in modern English is employed by a number of scientific disciplines in a variety of contexts. The recent debate over biblical typology is not concerned with these scientific usages of the term. As we have already pointed out, it is rather concerned with typology as a hermeneutical approach of the biblical writers—a way of interpreting Scripture. This primarily involves the NT writers' interpretation of the OT. In the present dissertation we are interested in understanding the nature of this hermeneutical approach to the OT. Accordingly, it appears that at least the initial search for passages which employ typology should concentrate upon explicit hermeneutical passages, i.e., those which clearly involve the interpretation of the OT.

Typology, however, is not necessarily the only hermeneutical scheme of the biblical writers. How then can one pinpoint in advance a representative sample of hermeneutical passages which are clearly typological, out of which typological structures may be allowed to emerge, without imposing a pre-understanding of his hermeneutical scheme upon Scripture?

1 This is not to be confused with the biblical author's unconscious "deep structures" which are the primary concern of modern structural exegesis. For an introduction to structuralism and how it differs from traditional exegetical methods, see especially Daniel Patte, What is Structural Exegesis? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976); note in particular pp. 9-34. Our concern is with the conceptual elements intended by the biblical writer and not with the "unconscious elements which impose significations upon man" (ibid., p. 17).

1 See the discussion of these modern scientific usages in Akira Takegami, "Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments? Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung" (Th.D. dissertation, University of Zurich, 1966), pp. 100-5.

2 Even this broad conceptual limitation can be confirmed from within Scripture later in this study as we apply the terminological control which is discussed below.
A decisive preliminary control appears to be available which has never before been adequately utilized. Since this study concerns biblical typology—the study of biblical "types"—it would seem to follow that a crucial initial criterion is the appearance of the word "type," i.e., τὸνος (or cognate) as a hermeneutical term in a hermeneutical passage. The presence of τὸνος (or cognate) in a hermeneutical passage does not in itself guarantee the existence of typology in that passage, inasmuch as the term may only incidentally appear without actually referring to the hermeneutical approach of the biblical writer. But in those passages where the biblical writer does use the term in a specialized way with reference to his hermeneutical endeavor, such usage of τὸνος (or cognate) appears to provide an initial terminological control for the existence of typology.

The use of such a terminological control would obviously be too restrictive in an examination of a given theological topic. For instance, a study limited to the NT occurrences of τὸνος would not provide an adequate portrayal of NT Christology. But a significant difference must be recognized in the present study. This dissertation is primarily a structural, not a theological, study. It seeks to ascertain the structural components of a particular hermeneutical approach, not the theological content of a particular theological topic. If biblical typology is at all a distinct and coherent hermeneutical approach of the biblical writers, then the τὸνος structures emerging from the various hermeneutical τὸνος passages should indicate the basic structures of biblical typology.

Since τὸνος and its NT cognates serve such a crucial function in identifying typological passages, particular attention should be given to the significations of these terms. The semantic range of τὸνος and cognates in the hermeneutical τὸνος passages may be expected to provide important insights into the nature of typology. It therefore seems imperative to undertake what has never before been adequately carried out—an intensive semasiological investigation of these terms. That is to say, the biblical usage of τὸνος and cognates must be carefully analyzed in their literary contexts and against the background of their possible para-biblical and extra-biblical significance.

In the process of analyzing the biblical usage of τὸνος and cognates, it becomes apparent which τὸνος passages involve a hermeneutical context. A meticulous analysis of these hermeneutical τὸνος passages may be expected to reveal, first, in which passages τὸνος (or cognate) is employed as a hermeneutical term. The analysis of these passages in which τὸνος (or cognate) is so employed should lay bare the inherent conceptual structures in the biblical writers' typological approach to OT Scripture.

This is by no means to imply that typology occurs only in hermeneutical passages which contain the word τὸνος (or cognate) as a hermeneutical term. Once the basic τὸνος structures have

---

1But, we reiterate, not in the same sense as in modern structural exegesis. See p. 8, n. 1 above.

1Of course, if the τὸνος structures of the various τὸνος passages should prove to be conflicting and incompatible, we would be forced to abandon this methodology and conclude that there is no general uniformity and solidarity in the biblical writers' understanding of typology.
emerged from analysis of passages where the terminological control assures us that typology exists, it will then be possible in future studies to examine other areas of Scripture for the existence of these same structures. Thus the presence of typology can be recognized even where the word ἔδοξος (or cognate) does not occur.

This dissertation, however, focuses primarily upon hermeneutical ἔδοξος passages. In the haste to "get on" with the search for typological correspondences in Scripture, previous studies have neglected the painstaking but unavoidable task of laying a solid semasiological-exegetical foundation for understanding what biblical typology really is. The present study attempts to lay this essential foundation upon which, it is hoped, future studies of additional typological passages can build.

In harmony with the methodology and limitations which have just been outlined, the specific steps of this dissertation may now be briefly described. The first chapter, the review of literature, attempts the first comprehensive survey of the major protagonists, views, and issues in the recent debate over biblical typology, set against the backdrop of typological study in previous centuries. It can be seen that the structures of biblical typology have never been allowed to emerge from within Scripture by means of thorough semasiological and exegetical analysis of key biblical terms and passages.

A second chapter consists of a semasiological investigation of the word ἔδοξος and NT cognates with the aim of ascertaining the overall semantic range of these terms and their meanings in each biblical occurrence. It becomes evident that previous lexical studies have failed to grasp the full breadth of signification represented by these terms in a number of significant NT passages. In the process of examining seriatim the biblical occurrences of ἔδοξος and cognates in their contexts we single out for more detailed study the hermeneutical ἔδοξος passages, i.e., those passages in which the biblical writer is engaged in the interpretation of OT Scripture.

A third chapter is devoted to exegetical-structural analysis of the NT hermeneutical ἔδοξος passages. From the analysis of those passages in which ἔδοξος (or cognate) is employed hermeneutically emerges the basic typological structures inherent in the biblical writers' interpretation of OT Scripture. Such an inductive approach, applied only where the word ἔδοξος (or cognate) occurs as a hermeneutical term, provides a terminological control, and thus minimizes the risk of imposing an a priori conception of typology upon Scripture. Having executed representative typological "deep-cuts" into Scripture at points where ἔδοξος (or cognate) is used hermeneutically, we compare these with each other for possible further elucidation of structural relationships within typology. It is then possible to suggest a tentative definition of typology as a hermeneutical approach of the biblical writers.

The conclusion attempts to synthesize the data of previous chapters and explore the implications of the study with reference to the unresolved issues within recent typological research. Avenues for further investigation are also suggested.

In summary, this dissertation seeks to ascertain the nature of biblical typology—its inherent conceptual structures—by
allowing the typological structures to emerge from within Scripture by means of a semasiological investigation of the term τόξον (and NT cognates) and an exegetical analysis of hermeneutical τόξον passages in the NT.

This study is not intended to provide a definitive statement on the hermeneutics of typology. Though it aims to provide a semasiological and exegetical foundation for understanding the nature of biblical typology, the conclusions must remain tentative until the full scope of typological references can be examined in depth, and the phenomena of typological structures can be examined in relationship to other structural modalities in Scripture.

CHAPTER I
SURVEY OF LITERATURE

No comprehensive survey of the significant participants, views, and issues in the twentieth-century discussion of biblical typology has heretofore been conducted. In view of the proliferation of literature on typology since 1900, and the great disparity of views on a host of issues related to the topic, such a survey appears to be necessary as a preliminary step to any further investigation. In the present chapter we attempt to respond to this need.

The issues in the twentieth-century debate over biblical typology can only be properly understood against the background of typological interpretation in previous centuries. Numerous studies in recent decades have given attention to the understanding and use of typology by specific individuals or in specific periods of church history. However, this research has never been synthesized so as to provide a synopsis of the major views on biblical typology throughout the Christian era. Hence we must first seek

1 These sources are listed in connection with the particular historical period(s) upon which they focus.

to delineate concisely the path of typological interpretation in preceding centuries. Our chronological overview draws on primary sources to elucidate representative views held by exponents of typology before 1900, and at the same time we attempt to summarize the results of recent research on the history of typological interpretation.¹

The main emphasis in the present chapter is placed upon

Grant, A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible (New York: Macmillan, 1963), but the only serious attempt to trace the history of typological interpretation is found in the introductory chapter of Fairbairn’s Typology of Scripture. Written over a century ago, Fairbairn’s work obviously does not reflect the present state of research on the history of views on typology. Fairbairn also omits discussion of important periods in church history before 1800. Takamori’s 1966 dissertation does provide an etymological (wortgeschichtliche) examination of the terms type, figures, and types of the Bible, both in religious and non-religious settings, but this study focuses mainly upon the semantic history of terms and omits major historical periods of typological interpretation. A 1970 dissertation by Douglas W. Friederichsen, The Hermeneutics of Typology (Th.D., Dallas Theological Seminary), contains a chapter on the history of typology, but it appears to consist largely of a rewriting of Fairbairn’s material. Little or no account is taken of more recent historical studies. Attention should be called, however, to the very helpful bibliography on the history of typology by S. Van Bohemen, “Annotated Bibliography,” in Typology and Early American Literature, ed. S. Van Bohemen (Boston: University Press, 1924), pp. 245-337 (published in a more compact form as “Selective Checklist on Typology,” EAL 5 [1970]: 1-76).

¹ It is obviously beyond the scope of this concise historical survey to treat each exponent of typology as an original source. It must be emphasized that our concern is to set forth the general historical sweep of typological interpretation before 1900, so that the major views on biblical typology may become apparent. It can be seen that such an overview is an indispensable prerequisite for understanding the recent debate. We have sought to make use of primary source material, especially to illuminate the major representative views. We have also attempted to synthesize the major results of recent research on the history of typological interpretation. Where there is considerable difference of opinion, this is summarized in the footnotes. It is intended that this historical survey, though brief, will serve both to provide the needed background for the recent debate and also to review recent historical investigation on typology.

The discussion of biblical typology since 1900. The views of the major protagonists in the recent debate are set forth in considerable detail. We also indicate the general content of less significant studies and note in particular any unique positions that are advanced. Special attention is given to the evaluation of methodology in the various studies.

In the final section of this literature review an attempt is made to synthesize the host of issues concerning biblical typology that have emerged from the historical-chronological survey. Certain conclusions are drawn from the literature survey that further clarify what appears to be the most appropriate method to be employed in the present dissertation.

Historical-Chronological Survey

Before the Reformation

Beginnings. It is difficult to assess the starting-point of a historical survey on biblical typology until the precise nature of typology is determined.¹ Some modern studies would trace its usage back to ancient Near Eastern cyclical, mythical thinking.² A growing number of scholars find the origin of biblical typology in

¹ It should be noted that the term “typology” (German Typologie) was not employed before the rise of the Enlightenment. See the discussion by Takamori, pp. 90-105, summarized below, p. 38, n. 1. We are following the now commonly accepted usage of “typology” to denote the study of biblical “types” (and their “antitypical” fulfillments). The exact nature of typology or the “typical sense” of Scripture is the focus of this dissertation.

² See especially Rudolf Bultmann, “Ursprung und Sinn der Typologie als hermeneutische Methode,” TLZ 75 (1950): 206-12; see the discussion below, p. 59.
OT prophetic eschatology. The use of typology in the Hellenistic and Palestinian literature of late Judaism has been the focus of significant scholarly discussion. It is generally agreed that as a hermeneutical approach typology does not occur at all in the non-biblical sphere of the Graeco-Roman world.

Early Church Fathers. Numerous recent studies have examined

1 See, e.g., Goppelt, TDNT, 8:254. For further discussion and bibliography on OT typology, see below, pp. 82-83.

2 For a general survey of the typological understanding of Scripture in the literature of late Judaism, see especially Goppelt, Typos, pp. 23-69. Goppelt concludes that in these sources typology is relatively unimportant, generally superficial, and exclusively future-oriented. On Rabbinical typology, see in particular Sofia Cavalletti, "La Tipologia dei Rabbini," MSRH 37 (1960): 223-51. For a discussion of the use of typology in the apocalyptic literature of late Judaism, see, e.g., Daniel Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutics in Palestine, SBL Dissertation Series, no. 22 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), pp. 150-67. Patte, pp. 167, 293, suggests that the origin of such typology is to be found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Numerous recent studies have examined the use of typology in the literature of Qumran. See, in particular, Ellis, Prophecy and Hermeneutics, pp. 150-62, 172-81; Richard Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), pp. 41-45; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," NTG 1 (1960): 297-333; idem, Essays on the Semitic Bible and the New Testament (London: E. Chapman, 1971), pp. 27-33, 53-58, 234-37. These authors equate the ras pesher ("mystery interpretation") charismic exegesis of Qumran with typology. On the other hand, Goppelt, TDNT, 8:254, argues that the Qumran exegesis is basically a hermeneutic identification of the text of Scripture, not typology. See also Geoffrey W. H. Lampe, "The Exposition and Exegesis of Scripture," 1. To Gregory the Great, CGB, 2:158, and William H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," BA 14 (1951): 54-76, for similar conclusions. Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutics, pp. 209-314, also analyzes Qumran exegesis and offers a mediating suggestion: a two-fold hermeneutic is present, "a typology and an interpretation of Scripture as dream, a pesher." (p. 312, italics his). In a postscript (written in May 1975) Patte, ibid., pp. 321-24, proposes that the term "typology" be used as a cornerstone of the basic terminology to describe the apocalyptic uses of Scripture, encompassing both "typically hermeneutic" and "pesher hermeneutic."

3 See e.g., Goppelt, TDNT, 8:253.

4 While in the extant works of the Apostolic Fathers typology often seems to be "surprisingly unimportant," it does appear in 1 Clement and particularly in the Epistle of Barnabas. Barnabas' typology is consistently Christocentric. But the NT eschatological

perspective seems lacking, and his typological correspondences frequently appear to be based upon incidental and superficial resemblances.  

The Apologists of the second and early third centuries—especially Justin Martyr (d. 165), Tertullian (ca. 160-ca. 220), and Irenaeus (ca. 140-ca. 202)—made copious use of typology. In defending Christianity (primarily against the Jews and the Gnostics) they often employed typology to establish that the OT had value (contra the Gnostics) but was fulfilled or succeeded by the NT (contra the Jews). In their desire to make Christianity appealing to their contemporaries, however, the Apologists sometimes allowed typology to become blurred with Hellenistic allegory.  

1Geppel, TDNT, 8:236 (cf. Typos, pp. 245-49) contends that already in Gnosticism the eschatological self-understanding of the apostles is lost, and the similarity is found not in the essential features of God's action but in the outward form of OT events or their description. The types are viewed as "concealed descriptions" of OT realities, and thus are "basically an allegorizing of events and institutions." Danieau, in his Shadows to Reality, while recognizing a strand of allegorization already in the Apostolic Fathers and the early Apologists, nevertheless contends that the biblical perspective on typology was also maintained in the early church even in numerous instances where only ostensibly surface resemblances are drawn between type and antitype. See, e.g., Danieau's elucidation of patriarchal Bahab typology (ibid., pp. 244-50), in which the superficial resemblance between the red cord and the blood of Christ often implies an underlying correspondence of essential underlying truths, and therefore, according to Danieau, constitutes "authentic biblical typology" (ibid., p. 248).

2We are here employing the distinction that is commonly drawn in modern discussion of allegory and typology. In typology the literal, historical meaning of the passage is taken seriously, and the typological correspondence is built upon—not unrelated or opposed to—the original meaning. Allegory, on the other hand, is not primarily concerned about the literal meaning, but assigns to the words and phrases of the text meanings that are foreign to the original meaning. For bibliography and further discussion on this distinction, see below, pp. 61-100. Irenaeus was somewhat more cautious than other early Apologists in his application of typology.

The Alexandrian school. It was in the exegetical school of Alexandria that Christian typology became thoroughly fused with Hellenistic allegorism. In Clement of Alexandria (150-215) the allegorical method of Philo was "baptized into Christ," and in Origen (185-254) the method was systematically developed and clearly explained. Origen's typological-allegorical exegesis tended to

1Grant, History of Interpretation, p. 81. Jean Daniélou, in his Origen, trans. Walter Mitchell (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955), especially pp. 179-91, also summarizes the various elements of Philo's exegesis which molded Alexandrian allegorism. For Philo, Scripture cannot contain anything unworthy of God or useless to man, and therefore insignificant details, accounts of patriarchal misdeeds, and so on, must have a non-literal, hidden meaning. Furthermore, everything in Scripture is declared to have a figurative meaning. The literal meaning, as the husk, must be peeled off in order to get at the deeper, more important, allegorical sense, in harmony with Platonic dualism. Philo sees the inferior, transitory world in the light of the superior eternal ideas. Thus the narrative accounts and (creation, patriarchs, Moses, etc.) are hidden allegories of the moral states and progress of the soul, to be unlocked by the initiated interpreter. This involves the assigning of allegorical meaning to details of the narrative (by means of gematria, number symbolism, etymology, etc.). For example, in his De Opificiis Mundii, Philo shows how the account of creation in Gen 2 is not to be taken literally. Heaven and earth refer to Mind and Sense-perception. The garden is Virtue. The four rivers are the four particular virtues: Prudence, Courage, Self-Mastery, and Justice. The man is a symbol of Mind, and the creation of Eve signifies the origin of Sense-perception, which becomes active when Mind sleeps. For further discussion and bibliography see Philo, see below, pp. 30-39, 339-42.

depreciate the historical value of biblical accounts. The purpose of Scripture was primarily the presentation of intellectual truths and not the account of God's action in history. Utilizing concepts and means employed by Philo—such as rabbinic gematria, numerical/geographical/etymological symbolism, and the Platonic dualism of eternal ideas versus the inferior sense perception—Origen assigned to everything in Scripture spiritual-allegorical meanings as well as (or often instead of) literal meanings. Since every text of Scripture was thought to contain the spiritual sense, where this was not readily discernible the fault was considered to lie solely in the interpreter's lack of spiritual insight. In theory, if not always in practice, Origen actually propounded a threefold sense of Scripture, corresponding to the body, soul, and spirit of man. The "bodily" (or literal) meaning was least important and readily discernible even to neophytes. More advanced insight could grasp the "psychical" (or moral) sense. But only those with a mature faculty of spiritual wisdom could apprehend the highest, i.e., the spiritual (or allegorical) sense.

In the West, such Latin Fathers as Hilary of Poitiers (315-67), Ambrose (339-97), the early Jerome (329-419), and especially Augustine (354-430) made liberal use of the Alexandrian mode of allegorical exegesis. The Antiochene school, the exegetical school at Antioch, founded by Lucian of Samosata (c. 312) reacted strongly against Alexandrian allegorism. Adherents to the Antiochene school— notably Diodorus of Tarsus (d. ca. 393) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428)—wrote treatises denouncing Origen and his allegorical method. The exegetical principles of this school were also propounded in these works and popularized in the writings of John Chrysostom (344-407). Antiochene exegesis, in contradistinction to that of Alexandria, was firmly anchored to history and to the literal meaning of Scripture. The Antiochene concept of "theory has been arranged to be given by God for the salvation of man." In practice, however, Origen often makes use of only two senses, the literal and the spiritual.


2 De Principiis 4.1.20 (ANF, 4:369): "For, with respect to holy Scripture, our opinion is that the whole of it has a 'spiritual,' but not the whole a 'bodily' meaning, because the bodily meaning is in many places proved to be impossible."

3 De Principiis 4.1.11 (ANF, 4:359): "For as man consists of body, and soul, and spirit, so in the same way does Scripture, which
The Medieval Quadriga. Origen's threefold sense of Scripture was soon expanded into the "Fourfold Sense," or Quadriga. The formalization of this fourfold distinction can be traced back at least as far as John Cassian (d. 435). In his Conferences, he refers to the literal sense and three spiritual senses—the allegorical, tropological, and the anagogical—and gives an example which became a classic in the Middle Ages:

And so these four previously mentioned figures coalesce, if we desire, in one subject, so that one and the same Jerusalem can be taken in four senses: historically as the city of the Jews, allegorically as the Church of Christ, analogically as the heavenly city of God which is the mother of us all, tropologically as the soul of man, which is frequently subject to praise or blame from the Lord under this title. 


1 Literally, "four-horse chariot."
2 i.e., the mystical or Christological. Sometimes in medieval exegesis the term "allegory" stands collectively for all the three spiritual senses.
3 i.e., the heavenly or eschatological, from ἀγαθόν, "to lead up." Cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, p. 102.
5 i.e., the heavenly or eschatological, from ἀγαθός, "to lead up." Cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, p. 102.
6 At least according to the analysis of Daniilou, Origen, p. 164. He concludes that in both Antioch and Alexandria, true Biblical, historical typology was conducted, though in Alexandria the typology became blurred by elements of non-Christian exegesis (Ibid., pp. 174-90). Jacques Guillet, "Les exégèses d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche; conflit ou malentendu?" RechSR 34 (1947): 257-302, finds in Alexandria symbolic, and in Antioch prophetic, typology, but seems to go too far in his conclusion that the differences between the two schools were caused by a fundamental misunderstanding of each other.
This four-fold division was eventually expressed in the popular Medieval couplet:

Littera gesta docet; quid credas allegoria;
moralis quid agas; quo tendas anagogia.

The Quadrages became the standard theoretical principle of medieval exegesis. All four senses were to be sought in every text of Scripture.

Many medieval expositors considered each of the senses of Scripture as of equal importance, but especially in Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) the literal sense is stressed as the necessary basis for, and presupposition of, the threefold spiritual sense. Aquinas insists that “nothing necessary for faith is contained under the spiritual sense that is not openly conveyed through the literal sense elsewhere.”

According to Aquinas, the literal sense refers to the meaning

1 Translated into English verse:
The letter shows us what God and our Fathers did;
The allegory shows us where our faith is hid;
The moral meaning gives us rules of daily life;
The anagogy shows us where we end our strife.
See Grant, History of Interpretation, p. 119; Brown, "Hermeneutics," p. 612.

2 Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica 1.1.10 (trans. the Blackfriars, 1:38-39): "the spiritual sense... is based on and presupposes the literal sense." Similarly, Aquinas writes (ibid.) that "holy Scripture sets up no confusion, since all meanings are based on one, namely the literal sense." Though he speaks of a single spiritual sense, Aquinas clarifies (ibid.) that "this spiritual sense is divided into three." These three divisions are defined in harmony with the common medieval understanding: "the allegorical sense is brought into play when the things of the Old Law signify the things of the New Law; the moral [tropological] sense when the things done in Christ and in those who prefigured him are signs of what we should carry out; and the anagogical sense when the things that lie ahead in eternal glory are signified" (ibid.).

3 Ibid.

of the words of Scripture and the spiritual sense to the meaning of the things of Scripture. Note his line of reasoning:

That God is the author of holy Scripture should be acknowledged, and he has the power, not only of adapting words to convey meanings (which men also can do), but also of adapting things themselves. In every branch of knowledge words have meaning, but what is special here is that the things meant by the words also themselves mean something. That first meaning whereby the words signify things belong to the sense first-mentioned, namely the historical or literal. That meaning, however, whereby the things signified by the words in their turn also signify other things is called the spiritual sense... .

This Thomistic distinction between the meaning of the words and the meaning of the things of Scripture has been generally followed by Catholic exegetes in later centuries.

From the Reformation to the Twentieth Century

The Reformers. The Protestant Reformers of the sixteenth century gradually broke with the Fourfold Sense. Martin Luther

1 Ibid. (trans. the Blackfriars, 1:37-39).

In modern times the spiritual sense of the things of Scripture has often been referred to by Catholic scholars as the "typical sense." In recent decades Catholic discussion has not, however, generally focused upon this "typical sense" of Scripture. Instead, attention has centered upon a further distinction in the meaning of the words of Scripture—one that may already be implied by Aquinas. The meaning of the words of Scripture intended by the human author is called the literal sense, and the deeper meaning of the words of Scripture intended by the divine author is termed the sensus plenior. For discussion of the modern Catholic understanding of the "typical sense" and the recent emphasis upon the sensus plenior, see below, p. 86, n. 1, and p. 103.

(1483-1546) was still driving the "four-horse team" in his first lecture series on the Psalms (1513-15). But already in his 1519 commentary on Gal 4:24 he calls the exercise of finding four senses in Scriptural texts a "kind of game" which may be permitted to add extra ornamentation, so to speak, to the main and legitimate sense for those less well-instructed who need "milky teaching." Yet he insists that "that four-horse team (even though I do not disapprove of it) is not sufficiently supported by the authority of Scripture, by the custom of the Fathers, or by grammatical principles," and should not be used "with a view to establishing a doctrine of faith." In his 1535 commentary on Gal 4, Luther launches a frontal attack against the use of the Quaestio by the "idle and unlettered monks and scholastic doctors".


1See, e.g., his introduction to Ps 77 in LW 11:10-19. Note particularly how he interprets the "works of God" (Ps 77:12). "First, literally, as done personally in Christ; second, tropologically, the same works in the soul against the flesh; third, allegorically, in the world against the evil; fourth, analogically, in heaven and hell." (Ibid., p. 12.)


3Ibid.

They taught that there are four senses of Scripture—the literal, the tropological, the allegorical, and the anagogical—and by means of these they misinterpreted almost every word of Scripture. With these awkward and foolish fables they tore Scripture apart into many meanings and robbed themselves of the ability to give sure instruction to human consciences.

Hilmar Bornkamm maintains that "Luther's greatest achievement in the history of biblical interpretation is his mistrust of this shem [the allegorization of Origen and medieval exegesis]." Luther insists on taking seriously the literal meaning of Scripture as discovered by grammatico-historical exegesis. But the literal sense is identified with the Christological interpretation. The principle of sola Scriptura is wedded to the Christocentric principle "was zu Christo triftet." With regard to the OT, this necessarily involves a typological understanding. As Luther expresses it, "The Old Testament pointed toward Christ. The New, however, now gives us what was previously promised and signified.

1Lectures on Galatians, 1519. LW, 27:440. Luther's complete break with allegory begins to have come shortly after his struggle with Thomas Müntzer and the spiritualizers in 1524. See Bornkamm, p. 94, n. 57.

2Bornkamm, p. 249. It seems that Luther did, however, continue to make limited use of allegory for the sake of illustration. Note, e.g., in his Lectures on Isaiah, 1522-1530, WA 31, 97:15-17 (quoted in Bornkamm, p. 90): "One should think much, and magnificently, about history, but little about allegory. You should use allegory like a flower, for it illustrates the word rather than strengthens it. . . . In history you have complete as well as incomplete promises. Allegory does not establish doctrine, but like color, can only add to it. The painter's colors do not build the house. The human body does not consist of a wreath of flowers, or a beautiful garment, etc. This proves that faith is not grounded in allegories." See Bornkamm, pp. 92-95 for illustrations of Luther's continued use of allegory, despite his statement in 1530-31, "I leave allegories alone" (A Brief, Yet Clear Exposition of the Song of Songs, 1530-1531, WA 31, 592:16, quoted in Bornkamm, p. 92). It should also be noted that Luther recognized the existence of allegory in Scripture, but only where obviously intended by the inspired authors.
through figures in the Old Testament. Luther often places the OT figures (or types) in antithetical relation to their NT fulfillment, in harmony with his distinction between Law and Gospel (letter and spirit). His typology is thoroughly Christocentric, and firmly rooted to history, though inasmuch as he never formally investigated the principles of typology, he does occasionally lapse into allegory.

John Calvin (1509-64) likewise castigates the "licentious system" of Origen and the medieval allegorists as "undoubtedly a

1WA 12:275 (Althaus, p. 96). It is difficult to understand how Bornkamm can assert (p. 297) that Luther "refused to look for types of Christ and New Testament events in sacrifices, rites, and persons of the Old Testament." Bornkamm contends that Luther was interested in OT passages "in which he thought he actually found Christ" (ibid., p. 290), and not in those containing types of Christ in the sense that typology annuls the historical presence of Christ in the Old Testament" (ibid.). But typology and the pre-existent Christ are not for Luther mutually exclusive as Bornkamm intimates. Luther indeed was absorbed in finding was zu Christo treiben in the OT (as in the NT), but he did not eliminate typology. See, e.g., his presentation of the Passover as a type of Easter (WA 13:363; WA 31:393). See also the discussion by Grant, History of Interpretation, p. 129, and Althaus, pp. 96-102, for persuasive evidence pace Bornkamm.

2Takamori, pp. 75-81, attempts to demonstrate that Luther's understanding of figures (or types) is controlled by his strong antithesis between Law and Gospel. The OT figures are antithetically related to the NT fulfillment, contrary to the medieval view of a continuity between OT and NT. According to Takamori, Luther's insight into the antithesis of Law and Gospel (letter and spirit) is a decisive contribution to the understanding of typology. Takamori is convinced (p. 163) that in the modern discussion of typology, which follows the view of Protestant Orthodoxy, there has been a move away from the insight of Luther and a return to the medieval homoeumatic tradition. Thus, he concludes, there has been a great weakening of the Reformation position. The major difficulty with Takamori's argument appears to be that he makes Luther the norm for a proper understanding of typology, and nowhere substantiates Luther's position from Scripture. Furthermore, he presents Luther's emphasis upon the Law/Gospel antithesis as the decisive point in Luther's homoeumatic, and as the Reformation tradition. The position of John Calvin is completely ignored, and the views of Zwingli and Melanchthon are categorized under "Protestant Orthodoxy."

contrivance of Satan to undermine the authority of Scripture, and to take away from the reading of it the true advantage. He maintained with Luther that "the true meaning of Scripture is the natural and obvious meaning by which we ought resolutely to abide." In his Institutes Calvin indicates that this "true meaning involves the types of the OT: The Gospel points with the finger to what the Law shadowed under types." In the next section he elaborates:

Another distinction between the Old and New Testament is in the types, the former exhibiting only the image of truth, while the reality was absent, the shadow instead of the substance, the latter exhibiting both the full truth and the entire body.

Arguing from Heb 7-10, the Reformer follows this statement with a clarification of the nature of the ritual (legal) types as temporary, ineffectual "formal symbols" which foreshadowed their fulfillment in the Gospel. Throughout his writings Calvin frequently refers to typical institutions, persons, and events of the OT. In fact, Thomas M. Davis concludes that while for Luther "typology is only one of numerous exegetical methods and is ordinarily incidental to the main point at issue," for Calvin "typology occupies a central and significant role in his theology."

2Ibid., p. 135. 3Institutes 2.9.3. 4Ibid., 2.10.4.
5See Bates, pp. 45-57, for a survey of Calvin's use of typology, with special emphasis upon the typology of Adam and Christ. See also J. McNeill, pp. 135-38, 145.
6Davis, p. 38. See Davis, pp. 33-42, for discussion and illustrations of typology in the two Reformers.
The other Protestant Reformers also made frequent use of typology, though like Luther and Calvin they undertook no formal consideration of the Scriptural types.

**Protestant Orthodoxy.** With the rise of Protestant Orthodoxy in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the penchant for systematization and theological formulation manifested itself manifest with regard to typology. Johannes Gerhard in his *Loci Theologicae* (1610-22) articulates what has become a classical statement on the distinction between allegory and typology:


Other scholars within Protestant Orthodoxy generally concurred with Gerhard's definition of *typus*, though a thorough exegetical basis was never worked out. Types were regarded as OT facts (characters, actions, institutions) which were ordained by God to adumbrate or foreshadow aspects of Christ or the Gospel in the NT. This view has in succeeding centuries been commonly

1 See Bercovitch, 'Selected Bibliography,' pp. 271-86, for works of other Reformers employing typology.


accepted as the traditional understanding of biblical typology. Within this basic perspective, however, several divergent schools of thought have arisen. We turn our attention first to the Cocceian school.

**The Cocceian school.** One of the leading exponents of typology in the seventeenth century was Johannes Cocceius (1603-69). A noted Hebrew scholar and founder of the theological system known as Fideistheologie, this Franeker professor engaged in exegesis that was "impregnated with typology." Cocceius and the adherents of this school of thought distinguished between two kinds of types. The innate types were those that had been explicitly pointed out in Scripture. The inferred types were those whose typical nature had not been explicitly indicated in Scripture but whose existence was nonetheless just as real because they were "conformable to the analog of faith and the practice of the inspired writers in regard to similar examples." Though not reviving the view of Origen that everything in the OT had a figurative meaning, nonetheless it

1 Brown, "Hermeneutics," p. 613. See Fairbairn, 1:27-32, for a more complete discussion of Cocceius' views. The major primary sources for Cocceius' typology are his *Summa doctrinarum de foedore et testamento Dei* (Leiden, n.d., 1648) and *Summa theologicae ex scripturis repetita* (Geneva: sumptibus I. H. Widerhold, 1662).

2 Notably, Herman Witius, *De occasionis foedorum Dei cum hominibus* (Leuwardiae, n.p., 1677), and Danbergius Vitrina, *Sacrarum observationum* (Franeker: n.p., 1689). Actually, Glassius seems to have developed foundational principles of typology upon which Cocceius built, but Cocceius' scholarly stature as a commentator resulted in the Cocceian school of interpretation receiving his name.

3 Fairbairn, 1:29; see Glassius, 2.1.2.4; Vitrina, 2.6.20; and Witsius, 4.6.
appears that the Cocceian school viewed as atypical every of events which bore resemblance to NT history or even to certain contemporary political events. For example, the going out of Asshur to build Nineveh (Gen 10:11) was considered a type of the Moslem power which shook the dominion of Antichrist. Again, Adam's awakening out of sleep typified Christ's resurrection; Samson's meeting of a lion on the way prefigured Christ's meeting of Saul on the road to Damascus. The Cocceian school attempted to revitalize the cold formalism which had crept into Protestant orthodoxy and succeeded in planting the roots of Pietism. But in the process its typological interpretations seem to have revived the "caprice and irregularity of the ancient allegorists..."

In the latter seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, a host of writers (especially in Britain and Puritan New England) followed methods of typological interpretation similar to those of the Cocceian school. Some were more cautious than others in their identification of inferred types. The Cocceian mode of .

See Fairbairn, p. 29, for these and other examples of Cocceian typology.

1See Fairbairn, 1:27.

2Fairbairn, 1:27.

3Noted British representatives of the Cocceian mode of typology include such authors as William Gwill, Joseph Hall, Benjamin Keach, and Thomas Taylor. Typology especially flourished in seventeenth and eighteenth century Puritan New England. Seventeenth-century typology is represented by such authors as John Cotton, Cotton Mather, Increase Mather, and Edward Taylor. In the eighteenth century representative authors include such individuals as David Austin, Thomas Combe, Samuel Davies, and Jonathan Edwards. In Puritan New England typology was often employed in order to eliminate the political significance of the "New English Israel"-- the Puritan colonies. For an extensive bibliography of this whole period, see Percival, "Annotated Bibliography," pp. 271-300. For special studies of Puritan Typology, see Bercovitch, Typology and Early American Literature, Joseph A. Baildon, Typology and Seventeenth-Century Literature (The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1975); and Karen E. Kow, "Puritan Typology and Allegory as Metaphor and Conceit in Edward Taylor's Preparatory Meditations" (Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1971).

typology continued to be employed in numerous works throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.\(^1\) particularly among such groups as the Hutchinsonian School and the Plymouth Brethren.\(^2\)

The Marthian school. The extravagant use of typology led to a strong reaction within Protestant Orthodoxy. Herbert Marsh (1757-1839), Bishop of Peterborough,\(^3\) was probably the ablest defender of a much more constrictive view. He argued that the only Unveiled; or The Gospel Priest Out of the Legal Ceremonies (London: n.p., 1864).


\(^2\) For a discussion of the Hutchinsonian school and the Plymouth Brethren, see Friederichsen, pp. 41-50; cf. the bibliographical in GDB, s.v. "Hutchinson, John" (p. 679) and "Plymouth Brethren" (p. 1104). One of the theological canons of John Hutchinson (1674-1737) was that "every passage of the Old Testament looks back and forward, and every way, like light from the sun; not only to the state before and under the Law, but under the gospel, and nothing is hid from the light thereof" (The Philosophical and Theological Works of the Late Truly Learned John Hutchinson, ed. Robert Spearman and Julius Bate, 12 vols. [London: J. Hodges, 1748-49], 1:202, cited in Fairbairn, 1:37). An example of Brethren typology is Andrew J. Jukes, The Types of Genesis Briefly Considered as Revealing the Development of Human Nature, 16th ed. (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1888). See also the books on sanctity typology by Jukes and Henry Wardle (listed below p. 42, n. 5) and the discussion in F. Roy Coad, A History of the Brethren Movement: Its Origins, Its Worldwide Development and Its Significance for the Present Day (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1968), p. 79.

\(^3\) OCDC, s.v. "Marsh, Herbert" (p. 578) describes Marsh as "the foremost Bishop of his age."

Legitimate types are those identified as such in the NT:

There is no other rule by which we can distinguish a real from a pretended type, than that of Scripture itself. There are no other possible means by which we can know that a previous design and a pre-ordained connection existed. Whatever persons or things, therefore, recorded in the Old Testament, were expressly declared by Christ or by His apostles to have been designed as prefigurations of persons or things relating to the New Testament, such persons or things so recorded in the Old Testament, are types of the persons or things with which they are compared in the latter. But if we assert that a person or thing was designed to prefigure another person or thing, where no such prefiguration has been declared by divine authority, we make an assertion for which we neither have, nor can have, the slightest foundation.\(^1\)

A number of scholars in the period before 1900 shared Marsh's view of biblical typology,\(^2\) though this school of thought was never as popular as the Covenants.

Historical-critical repudiation. While the Marthian school was restricting the scope of typology exclusively to innate types, the rise of rationalism was dealing a decisive blow against the basic unity of the OT and NT, thus precluding the existence of both innate and inferred types.\(^3\) Johann S. Semler (1721-91), who apparently coined the word "typologie," was at the same time one of the leading forces in discrediting the validity of typological


\(^2\) Other representatives of Marsh's position include, e.g., John J. Conyers, Robert Nares, Robert L. Otterley, William Venn, Milberg, and Isaac Stuart. See the discussion and bibliographical information on the Marsh school in Fairbairn, 1:32-44, and Bercovitch, "Annotate Bibliography," pp. 306-07.

interpretation. These passages in the NT which had previously been regarded as indicating a typological correspondence were explained by critical scholars as a first-century cultural accommodation which no longer had validity in the modern worldview. From the rise of the Age of Enlightenment through the nineteenth century, traditional views of biblical typology were largely disregarded within critical scholarship.

Mediating positions. In the mid-nineteenth century a number of biblical scholars who had not rejected the unity of the Old and New Testaments sought to place the typological method upon a sound footing. They attempted to avoid either extreme of the Coccelian or Marshian positions by the identification and application of basic principles of typological hermeneutics gleaned from the biblical use of types. It was Patrick Fairbairn (1805-74) who published what was to become the classic nineteenth-century mediating statement on biblical typology.

Fairbairn criticizes the Alexandrian/Coccelian mode of interpretation for introducing "trifling, far-fetched and even false analogies" through a lack of "essential principles or fixed rules by which to guide its interpretations." The Marshian school is also faulted for its failure to recognize that the NT use of types is not exhaustive, but rather paradigmatic of the principles on which others of a like description are to be discovered and explained.

There are two constituent elements of a type which Fairbairn accepts as held by general consent:

First, that in the character, action, or institution which is denominated the type, there must be a resemblance in form or spirit to what answers to it under the Gospel; and secondly, that it must not be any character, action, or institution in Old Testament Scripture, but such only as had their ordination.


2Fairbairn, 1:33. See Fairbairn's comment on the rules of interpretation in the Coccelian mode, above, p. 34, n. 1.

3Ibid., 1:42. Fairbairn, 1:38-43 advances NT evidence and arguments against the arbitrary limitation of types exclusively to those mentioned in the NT.
of God, and use designed by Him to foreshadow and prepare
for the better things of the Gospel. 1

Building upon this generally accepted understanding of the
nature of typology, Fairbairn sets forth and illustrates five
principles for the proper identification and interpretation of
Scriptural types. 2 First, "nothing is to be regarded as typical
of the good things under the gospel which was itself of a forbidden
and sinful nature." 3 Secondly,
in determining the existence and import of particular types,
we must be guided, not so much by any knowledge possessed,
by the ancient worshippers concerning their prospective ful-
filment, as from the light furnished by their realization in
the great facts and revelations of the Gospel. 4
The OT authors and their contemporary readers may not have realized
the typical nature of a given type.

The third principle is "that we must always, in the first
instance, be careful to make ourselves acquainted with the truths
or ideas exhibited in the types, considered merely as providential
transactions or religious institutions." 5 Only when there is a
common principle, and not just an outward similarity uniting
the type with the antitype, does a true typological correspondence exist.

Fourthly,
while the symbol or institution has properly but one radical

1 ibid., 1:191. Italics his. 2 ibid., 1:194
3 ibid., 1:195. Italics his. 4 ibid., 1:181. Italics his.
5 ibid., 1:186. Italics his.

meaning, yet the fundamental idea or principle exhibited in
it may often be capable of more than one application to the
realities of the Gospel; that is, it may bear respect to, and
be developed in, more than one department of the affairs of
Christ's kingdom. 1
This is because "not only is there an organic connection between
the Old and the New dispensations, giving rise to the relation
of type and antitype, but also an organic connection between one
part and another of the Gospel dispensation." 2 Finally, "due
regard must be had to the essential difference between the nature
of type and antitype." 3 This involves a movement from a lower,
external/bodily stage (the type) to the loftier internal/spiritual
stage (the antitype). 4
Fairbairn provides some Scriptural illustrations of his
hermeneutical principles but never attempts to ground his under-
standing of typology with thorough biblical exegesis or semasiological
analysis. In the remainder of his two volumes, he applies his
principles in a systematic treatment of the Scriptural types. A
number of nineteenth-century authors approximating Fairbairn's
mediating position applied similar hermeneutical principles in
their study of biblical--and in particular, sanctuary--typology. 5

1 ibid., 1:191. Italics his. 2 ibid., 1:194
3 ibid., 1:195. Italics his. 4 ibid., 1:181. Italics his.
5 ibid., 1:186. Italics his.
...possible to distinguish the authors representing the position of Fairbairn from those who follow the Cocceian or Marshian mode, a sharp differentiation is not always possible. The works dealing specifically with sanctuary typology are especially difficult to classify. They conform to the restrictions of Marsh in that they deal exclusively with an institution which is identified in the NT as typological. Yet they appear to go beyond Marsh's dictum in their interpretation of minute sancturary details which are not mentioned in the NT. A number of the authors seem to be cognizant of the hermeneutical principles of Fairbairn, yet in actual practice they frequently draw typological correspondences that appear forced and arbitrary--more in harmony with the Cocceian mode. Among the representative nineteenth-century works on sanctuary typology, we note the following: Andrew J. Jukes, The Law of Offerings in Lev. I-VII (London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1846); reprinted ed., London: The Lamp Press, 1866); Henry W. Saltz, The Holy Vessels and Furniture of the Tabernacle of Israel on a Uniform Scale (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1850); Idem, The Tabernacle, the Priesthood, and the Offerings (London: Morgan & Scott, n.d.); Forster G. Simpson, Lectures on the Typical Character of the Jewish Tabernacle, Priesthood and Sacrifices (London: W. Thompson, 1882); George Jункер, Die Tabernacle (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Pub., 1863); Joseph A. Seiss, Holy Types; or, The Gospel in Leviticus: A Series of Lectures (Philadelphia, 1866; reprinted ed., Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, n.d.); Frank H. White, Christ in the Tabernacle (London: S. K. Porter, 1871); Edward E. Alwater, Christ in the Tabernacle and Sacrifice of the Sacred Tabernacle of the Hebrews (New York: Dodd & Mead, 1875); Frederick Whitfield, The Tabernacle, Priesthood, and Sacrifice of Israel (London: Seeley, Jackson and Halliday, 1875); Charles H. Mackintosh, Notes on the Book of Leviticus (New York: Locke Bible Truth Dept., 1889); William G. Ross, Studies in the Mosaic Institutions: The Tabernacle, the Priesthood, the Sacrifices, the Feasts of Ancient Israel (Dayton, Ohio: N. J. Shuey, 1895).

Roman history: "Every triumphal procession which went through the streets of Rome was a prophecy of Caesar Augustus. For what Augustus constantly represented, the triumphant general did on his day of honor--the god in man--Jupiter in the citizen of Rome."¹

This he compares with John's statement (John 19:36) that Jesus' unbroken bones on the cross fulfilled the prophecy of the Passover lamb in Exod 12:46 ("You shall not break a bone of it"). Then he adds:

The meaning of the triumph is not fulfilled in the many recurrent triumphal processions, nor of the Passover in the Passover meals taking place every year, but the real content of one and the other, in which the truth of each consists, is not to appear till a future time, and so only then to confirm for itself the prophecy contained in it.²

In his book on biblical hermeneutics, von Hofmann provides a number of further examples of what he views as the typological relationship between OT prefigurative history (or prophecy) and NT history.³ However, von Hofmann's understanding of typology is never substantiated by means of thorough exegetical-structural analysis of biblical passages.⁴

²Ibid.
⁴Numerous other criticisms of von Hofmann's views on typology (or prefigurative/prophetic history) have been offered from different perspectives. Fairbairn, 1:61, is convinced that von Hofmann's scheme is ultimately rationalistically based. Hengstenberg, 4:389, concludes "that by overthrowing prophecy, in the strict sense, it necessarily involves acted prophecy (or type) in the same fate; and that it is nothing but an illusion to attempt to elevate types at the expense of prophecy." Bultmann, "Prophecy and Fulfillment," p. 38, while agreeing with von Hofmann that prophecy involves history and not individual words of the OT, finds his position "theologically irrelevant" and based on an erroneous developmental philosophy of history. For further discussion of von Hofmann's view, see, e.g., David L. Baker, Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of Some Modern Solutions to the Theological Problem of the Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1971), pp. 58, 67, 173. See also the treatment by Charles T. Fritsch, as summarized below, p. 57, n. 2.
Friederichsen applies the Marshian principle that a true type must have a definite NT confirmation, and he also gives three additional criteria: "divine pre-ordination," "OT Saint recognition," and "Christo-soteriological concentration." These principles lead him to two major restrictions beyond that maintained by Marsh. First, true types are only found in the Levitical institutions. As Friederichsen expresses it, "the New Testament writers make it obvious that the Mosaic worship system should be the only area from which to seek true types." Other historical correspondences revealed by the NT, even those depicted as ἀνθρώπους (Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 10:6, 7; 1 Cor 7:23) are merely "analogous illustrations" and not genuine types. Second, moving from a dispensationalist perspective, Friederichsen forcefully denies that OT types ever point to NT ecclesiological antitypes--either the Christian Church or individual Christian experience. Christ and His work of salvation comprise the only true antitypes.

A summary of Friederichsen's understanding of typology is found in his definition of a genuine type:

A genuine type is defined as a religious place, person, practice or thing that was pre-intended by God to picture the antitype Christ in his soteriological aspect, and was recognized to be such in its historical setting by the Old Testament worshipper, and was affirmed to be such from a later vantage point by the New Testament writers.

Friederichsen fails to provide any substantial exegetical or

1See Friederichsen, pp. 220-230, for discussion of these criteria.
2Ibid., p. 461. 3Ibid. 4Ibid., p. 331.
semasiological foundation for his severely restrictive conclusions.

Advocates of a hermeneutically controlled typology (after the order of Fairbairn) include such authors as Geerhardus Vos, Louis Berkhof, and J. Barten Payne. The suggested hermeneutical principles are essentially those given by Fairbairn, but one principle of typological interpretation is uniquely applied by Payne and calls for special attention. Payne expresses what he considers "perhaps the most important single principle in the delimiting of typology, namely, that a given item must be sym-\[\Rightarrow\]

bolic to its contemporaries before it can be considered typical for the future." This principle for him focuses primary attention upon the ceremonial worship of Israel and eliminates typical


2For instance, the list of five hermeneutical principles given by Berkhof, pp. 146-47, is almost identical with the five given by Fairbairn: (1) a thing evil in itself cannot typify something good; (2) types are limited to those with a symbolic meaning for their contemporaries; (3) types can only be fully understood in the light of their NT fulfillment; (4) types have only one radical meaning, but may have more than one fulfillment in the NT economy of salvation; and (5) from type to antitype there is a movement from preponderantly carnal to purely spiritual, external to internal, present to future, earthly to heavenly. Payne, Biblical Prophecy, p. 23, defines a type as "a divine enactment of future redemption." From this definition, which is based primarily on Heb 8:5, he draws four corollaries (ibid., pp. 23-25): a type must be (1) divinely-originated, (2) redemptive, (3) a pictorial enactment, and (4) anticipatory.

3Ibid., p. 53. Payne here is following (and quoting) the conclusion of Vos, p. 162: "a type can never be a type independently of its being first a symbol."

4See his list of Scriptural types, Biblical Prophecy, pp. 671-72.

significance for most OT individuals. Only Adam and Melchizedek seem to qualify as typical persons.

Several trends may be noted in the twentieth-century studies which deal with typology from a traditional perspective.

First, much of the literature is devoted to sanctuary typology.

1Ibid., p. 53: "The persons that are often proposed, other than Adam and Melchizedek, do not appear to be inherently redemptive in respect to mankind and should not, in consequence, be considered typical."


Most of these works are popularized portrayals of sanctuary typology incorporating material from earlier studies. Typological correspondences are often drawn in connection with the most minute details of the sanctuary and its services, and little attention is given to hermeneutical principles of interpretation.

Many of these sanctuary studies are popularized treatments of the subject incorporating material from works written before 1900. Second, with the resurgence of typological studies among critical scholarship in recent decades, it is often difficult to distinguish between the traditional views of typology and the new historical-critical understanding (which is examined below). Even though the major proponents of the new typological approach generally reject the traditional views, yet some recent studies—particularly among Evangelical scholarship—tend to adopt the newer definitions of typology while at the same time retaining elements peculiar to the traditional perspective. Finally, it must be noted that the


For a discussion of recent vocal opposition to traditional typology (by e.g., James D. Smart and John W. Drake), see below, p. 81, n. 1 and p. 77, n. 9. See also our discussion of the major proponents of typological interpretation within critical scholarship, many of whom explicitly disavow the traditional views of typology (e.g., Bernard von Rad and Lampe, below, pp. 63-64, 68-69).

The studies with this tendency are reviewed in succeeding sections of the literature survey.

various twentieth-century typological studies conducted from a traditional perspective all fail to provide a solid semasiological and exegetical foundation for understanding the nature of biblical typology.

Historical-critical instauration. Modern literary criticism yielded a "most definite and conclusive result," namely, the breaking down of the old conception of the unity of Scripture and the consequent discrediting of the typological and prophetic exegesis familiar to so many generations of Christians. Within critical scholarship throughout the latter nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, typology was merely "an historical curiosity, of little importance or significance for the modern reader.

But already in the years following the trauma of World War I, the emergence of Neo-Orthodoxy and the Biblical Theology Movement brought a renewed emphasis upon the significance of the OT, a fresh search for ways to express the unity of the two Testaments while maintaining the method and results of historical criticism. This

1There have been, to be sure, cursory treatments of key biblical terms and passages in several of the works we have already listed. But none of these has adequately grounded conclusions by means of thorough semasiological and exegetical analysis.


3Ibid., p. 16.

involved, among other considerations, a limited revival of the almost forgotten typological outlook of the New Testament.\(^1\)

The rise of anti-Semitic National Socialism in Germany (1933) called forth particularly vigorous attempts to defend the value of the OT as a witness to Christ.\(^2\) No detailed study of War I as a major catalyst for this resurgence on the Continent. As Childs portrays the situation (p. 26): "The defeat and disillusionment following the First World War had shaken the assumptions of liberal theology to the roots, and had given birth to an agonizing reappraisal of the Bible and theology which had begun to take a definite shape in the middle twenties." Childs focuses particularly upon what he sees as a distinctly American Biblical Theology Movement, which after World War II broke the statements of the earlier Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy. James Barr however (IBBsup, p. 105) argues that in America, Britain, and on the Continent "the same broad tendencies existed, although the setting was different."

1. Walther Eichrodt, "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?" trans. by James Barr, in EDET, p. 223. Eichrodt, ibid., attributes the initial revival of typology to "the exegetes of the dialectical school of theology." The typological approach is evident, e.g., in the Church Dogmatics of Karl Barth, as analyzed by Leroy A. Davis, "Typology in Barth's Doctrine of Scripture," AIR 47 (1965): 33-49. Along with the more general causative climate of Neo-orthodoxy and the Biblical Theology Movement, Smart, pp. 94-96, isolates these specific factors in the modern revival of typology. First, a reassertion of the NT used the OT pointed up the extensive use of typology within the NT. Second, the presence of typology was recognized in the OT itself. Third, the necessity of some kind of Christological interpretation of the OT was increasingly recognized. Finally, there was a renewed interest in the works of the Reformers, especially the commentaries of Luther and Calvin.


V. VISCHER contended that since Jesus is the Word and the OT testifies to the Word of God throughout, one should be able to find an abundance of direct references to Christ (and the church) in the OT. Thus "by a liberal use of allegorical and typological interpretations he was able to find such foreshadowing almost everywhere"

bibilcal typology from the modern historical perspective was undertaken, however, until 1939, when Goppelt published his dissertation, Typus: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen. In the introduction to his dissertation, Goppelt acknowledges his special indebtedness to Walther Eichrodt\(^1\) and Wilhelm Vischer.\(^2\) He briefly refers to the history of typological interpretation and reviews certain works on biblical hermeneutics.\(^3\) Goppelt then discusses typology in contrast with allegory, utilizing the classical distinction made by Gerhard in seventeenth-century Protestant Orthodoxy. Without any exegetical foundation Goppelt proceeds to define typology in terms of its dual characteristics. It involves, first, divinely ordained correspondences between OT and NT historical facts. Second, there is an intensification or escalation (Steigerung) from the OT type to the greater reality, the NT antitype.\(^4\)

(Smart, p. 76). As an example of his Christological exegesis, note how Vischer, The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ, pp. 74-76, takes the mark put by God upon Cain as a sign of the cross of Christ. Vischer's work raised a storm of debate among critical scholarship. See Baker, Two Testaments: One Bible, pp. 207-35 for bibliography and further discussion of Vischer's approach.


3. This includes, of course, the works of Fairbairn and von Hofmann. Goppelt also reviews the brief treatment of typology by Frederick Tom, Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments (Göttingen: Vandenhoek and Ruprecht, 1950), pp. 213-23. Tom follows the classical distinction between typology and allegory pronounced within Protestant orthodoxy, but prefers to speak (p. 224) of a typological way of understanding (Betrachtungweise) rather than typological Interpretation (Auslegung) of the OT.
The main body of Goppelt's work is divided into three parts. The first section sets forth the typological understanding of the OT within Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism. In these sources, typology is shown to be relatively unimportant, often superficial, and exclusively future-oriented.

In the second section Goppelt attempts to examine all the typological references throughout the NT canonical literature. In four sub-sections he traces the typology of Jesus and the Church in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, the Pauline Epistles, the Epistle of Hebrews, and the Gospel of John, respectively, with excursus on the typology in the General Epistles and Revelation.

The third section attempts a summary of the main features of OT typology in the NT. From his survey of NT usage, Goppelt concludes that typology is the dominant and characteristic approach of the NT writers to the OT. It is present not only in the isolated NT citations of OT passages but also in numerous allusions to OT types. Despite differences of emphasis among various NT writers, there is a uniformity and solidarity of typological usage within the NT. Typology usually moves within the context of salvation history. It is, in fact, the normal means used by the NT writers to set the present salvation event in relation to past salvation history. It is not, however, a fixed hermeneutical method with technical terminology, but rather a pneumatic way of thinking which recognizes OT types in the light of the salvation-historical fulfillment. The specific function of typology in individual texts can only be understood in the context of the ground concern of each text. But all typology goes through Christ and has its foundation in Him. The point of departure and goal of typology is present eschatological salvation. This is in stark contrast to the Epistle of Barnabas, where the eschatological perspective has already been lost.

As we have already noted, Goppelt's work has been widely recognized as the "standard work" on the NT use of typology. Ellis describes the study as "a brilliant and highly significant contribution to New Testament hermeneutics." Despite these acclamations, however, a fundamental weakness of Goppelt's work must be pointed out. He attempts to uncover the main features of NT typology, but these are largely pre-determined by the a priori definition of typology which he brings to the NT text. Goppelt borrows his definition of typology from Protestant Orthodoxy—in particular, Gerhard—and fails to provide solid exegetical foundation for this definition. Until this preconceived understanding is substantiated by means of thorough semasiological and exegetical analysis, the results of Goppelt's work must remain in question.

A second dissertation dealing with biblical typology appeared in 1939. Willi Wiebe's study, "Die Wüstenzeit als Typus der messianischen Heilzeit," traces the extensive use of wilderness (Exodus) typology in biblical and para-biblical literature. This
dissertation must be faulted along similar lines as Goppelt's. Though Wiebe does briefly allude to 1 Cor 10 and other NT passages employing ἑνδοτικός or cognates, he never really allows the structures of typology to emerge from within Scripture. Because his definition -which constitutes his criterion for determining the presence of typological passages-is externally derived, it remains uncertain whether or not those passages which Wiebe includes are actually typological according to the biblical perspective.

During the decade of the 1940s, several significant studies dealing with biblical typology were undertaken. In Britain, William J. T. P. Phyffan-Adams and Arthur G. Hebert made a pioneering attempt to elucidating the nature of biblical "homologies,"

Entsprechendes aus der neustamentlichen Geschichte zur vermitteilen, die also von Neuen Testament als geschichtliche Präterformation des messianischen Heilsgeschehens.'

Wiebe attempts to show how the typology of the wilderness time of salvation-which played a significant role in contemporary Judaism-was taken up and molded by Jesus and the early church. In contrast to the vague and often fantastic use of wilderness typology in Jewish eschatology, in the NT typology receives a new controlling midpoint in the shape and work of the Messiah Jesus. From this midpoint on in the early church the traditional eschatological presentations are filled with new contents.

According to Wiebe's analysis, the wilderness typology has a profound influence in the NT. First, it forms a significant part in Christology: Christ is portrayed as the New Moses and His death is prefigured by the salvation event of Moses' time. Second, the Church existing between the death and parousia of Christ sees itself in the situation of wilderness-wandering Israel after the Exodus deliverance but before entering the promised land. Third, wilderness typology serves a paraenetic function, pointing out the destructive consequences of religious and moral mistakes and providing support in the battle against weariness of faith and hope. Finally, the wilderness typology has a particularly determinative role in NT eschatology. In the book of Revelation, it influences the entire sketch of the completion of salvation, and elsewhere it provides key terminology and concepts.


while Austin M. Farrer sought to establish a philosophical basis for the typological method and explored possible typological schema in the Apocalypse of John.1 In the United States, Charles T. Fritsch delivered a series of well-informed and lucidly presented lectures on biblical typology.2 On the Continent, Samuel Anselm's

followed by Arthur G. Hebert, The Authority of the Old Testament (London: Faber & Faber, 1947), pp. 230-22, employs the term "homologies" for the parallels drawn between God's working in the Old and New dispensations. Hebert had earlier drawn attention to these patterns between the OT and NT in his The Throne of David: A Study of the Fulfillment of the Old Testament in Jesus Christ and His Church (London: Faber & Faber, 1941). While maintaining the results of biblical criticism, he wishes to revive the "mystical interpretation" of the OT "in so far as it expresses the theological fulfillment of the Old Testament in the Messiah and the church" (Hebert, The Throne of David, p. 9). Smart, p. 77, is convinced that "Hebert and Vischer together have been responsible for the widespread impression that recognition of the unity of the Testaments leads inevitably to a revival of typology."


2Charles T. Fritsch gave the W. H. Griffith Thomas Memorial Lectures at Dallas Theological Seminary, April 23-26, 1946, which were later published under the title Biblical Typology: Its Scope 103 (1946): 235-105, 18-30, 104 (1947): 87-109, 214-22. He first describes the rise of the Biblical Theology Movement and its roots in the nineteenth-century Heilsgeschichtliche Schule (especially Johann T. Beck and Johann C. K. von Hofmann). He then moves to a brief word study of ἑνδοτικος and delineation of the three classes of NT types, namely, institutional, historical events, and persons. A type is defined as an institution, historical event, or person, ordained by God, which effectively prefigures some truth connected with Christianity" (ibid., p. 214). Fritsch provides a brief history of the interpretation of types, and concludes with hermeutical principles that
dissertation examined the use of typology in the Pauline corpus. These studies represent various attempts to embrace both biblical typology and the results of historical criticism. They still tend, however, to define typology in traditional terms, and as with previous studies, they do not provide an adequate exegetical-semasiological foundation for understanding the nature of attempt to "steer between the Scylla of an undisciplined and fanciful typology and the Charybdis of an unwarranted prejudice against typology" [ibid., p. 218]. Typology is based on "a divinely ordained, organic principle, uniting both Testaments" (ibid., p. 220). This principle involves the gradual unfolding of God's plan and purpose to reveal Himself and redeem man. Thus for Fritsch, "typology is not a matter of collecting all of the analogies between the Old and New Testaments, but rather of understanding the underlying redemptive and revelational process which begins in the Old Testament and finds its fulfillment in the New" (ibid.). From this follows another principle: "namely, that the type becomes more clear and understandable as the time for its fulfillment in the antitype draws near" (ibid.). Again, Fritsch asserts (ibid.) that "the things which the institution, event, or person typical is the the antitype which it teaches and prefigurates." A final principle is that the type must be significantly redemptive not only for its own day, but for the days to come until it is fulfilled in the antitype* (ibid., p. 221).

1Samuel Ansler's 1949 Th.D. dissertation, "La typologie de l'Ancien Testament chez Saint Paul" (University of Lausanne, 1949), is summarized in an article of the same title, RTP ser. 2, 37 (1949): 113-28. We hereafter refer to Ansler's dissertation as "La typologie," and to his RTP article as "La typologie chez Saint Paul." In his dissertation Ansler examines the various typological motifs in the Pauline corpus, and further elucidates Paul's use of typology in a detailed study of 1 Cor 10:1-13. He finds the characteristics of the typological relationship to be fourfold: (1) theological (the divine design); (2) historical/temporal (versus Philonic abstract, eternal ideas); (3) Christocentric (including the person of Christ, the church, the sacraments, and the eschatological); and (4) progressive (Goppelt's Stel lungserung). Ansler offers the following definition of typology: "La typologie est la méthode herméneutique qui interprète les événements, les personnes, les institutions et les paroles (prononcées à leur sujet) dont témoigne l'Ancien Testament comme des faits historiques que Dieu a prédit non seulement dans le détail mais aussi dans l'anticipation prefigurative (types) de réalités futures et nouvelles (antitypes) qui devraient se accomplir en Jésus-Christ" (Ansler, "La typologie" [italics his], p. 163; cf. "La typologie chez Saint Paul," pp. 123-24).

typology. Aside from these works and a few cursory treatments of the subject, by the end of the 1940s typology was still largely ignored within critical biblical scholarship.

Major protagonists in the recent debate. It was during the decade of the 1950s that the lines of the recent debate over typology were clearly drawn. In 1950, Rudolf Bultmann published his essay, "Ursprung und Sinn der Typologie als hermeneutische Methode." In his view, "a capital defect [ein Hauptfehler]" of Goppelt's research was his failure to properly distinguish between typology and prophecy. Bultmann asserts that NT typology is based on an ancient Near Eastern mythological/cosmological/cyclical view of time. This, he says, is in opposition to the genuine linear understanding of history as found in the OT prophets.

Gerhard von Rad, on the other hand, speaks approvingly of

1This indictment of methodology applies also to Ansler's dissertation, even though he does analyze one passage (1 Cor 10) in some detail. Ansler begins his dissertation with an a priori understanding of typology which enables him to set forth at the outset the full range of passages in the Pauline corpus that are typological. His analysis of 1 Cor 10 is helpful, but methodologically ill-conceived. Instead of providing the structures by which to determine the presence of typology elsewhere, it is simply an example to further elucidate the criteria which Ansler has already presupposed at the beginning of his study.

2Various review articles appeared during this period (see below, p. 75, n. 2) focusing particularly upon the research of Goppelt, Rhythm-Abadi, and Herder. These survey articles also mention other works that touch on the subject of typology.

3Bultmann, "Ursprung und Sinn," col. 205.

4Ibid., col. 205-12. Bultmann was not the first to criticize Goppelt on this point. Already nine years earlier, A. M. Brouwer, "Typologie," NTS 24 (1941) 98-115, reviewed Goppelt's Typo2, rejects typology for present-day critical theology, and finds the basis of typology in oriental root-thinking.
Goppelt's research and contests Rütmann's conclusion regarding the cyclical nature of biblical typology. In a programmatic essay of 1952, and later in his *Old Testament Theology*, von Rad sets forth an understanding of typology which has become one of the most determinative factors in precipitating such wide instauration of the typological method. While few, if any, have precisely followed his typological approach, yet his formative influence in the contemporary debate calls for a somewhat more detailed analysis of his position.

Von Rad's basic premise is that the OT is a history book. But his view of history is conditioned by a *traditionsgeschichtliche* perspective. The major elements of von Rad's view of history as it relates to his understanding of typology may be summarized as follows:

First, there is a radical separation of historical facts and biblical kerygma. The traditions as recorded in Scripture are largely constructs of faith and not historical occurrences. As von Rad describes it,

---


---

The narrators are so captivated by the doxa of the event that once happened, they see and point out in the event the splendor of the divine gift in such exclusive a way, that they thereby manifestly misdraw the historical picture. ... doxa is heaped on the event which reaches far beyond what actually occurred.

Second, though facts of the actual occurrences were in stark discontinuity, faith found continuity through typology. This typology is not at all a supernatural form of proof. It is merely a special use of a common way of thinking—man's universal effort to understand the phenomena about him on the basis of concrete analogies. Von Rad clarifies this with regard to Scripture:

This renewed recognition of types in the Old Testament is no peddling of secret lore, no diggling up of miracles, but the simply correspondent to the belief that the same God who revealed himself in Christ has also left his footprints in the history of the Old Testament covenant people—that we have to do with one divine discourse, here to the fathers through the prophets, there to us through Christ. (Heb. 1:1).

Let us note briefly how this concept of history operates in von Rad's theology. In his *Old Testament Theology* he describes how Yahwism was preceded by a phase (during the patriarchal period) called the religion of the gods of the ancestors. The traditions of this polytheistic religion were adopted by Yahwism that followed. But the adopting of the old traditions was not a merging or coalescing, for it remembered that it began with a fresh start (Exod 3). The stories of the patriarchs were rather seen in a new light by the eyes of faith. The promise of land, for instance, was recognized as the

---

1Von Rad, *EOTH*, pp. 24-35.

2Idem, *OT*, 2:364. Von Rad refers to Schiller's "Song of the Bell" as a good example of typological structures.

voice of Yahweh, but the promise was transferred to a horizon of more distant fulfillment in Canaan under Joshua. The patriarchs' stay in Canaan was now looked upon as a temporary thing. And as for the dissimilarities of the previous traditions, in von Rad's words, Yahwism "quietly discarded what was incompatible with itself."¹

This same pattern ran through the whole history of Israel. The prophets, according to von Rad, were the first to use typology in the fullest sense. They saw Israel disobeying and heading for judgment, but they did not want to throw away the old traditions in their efforts to point Israel to new saving acts in the future. So they used the language of the Old Testament and gave it a prefigurative character, thus converting old language into types and figures of the future. "They looked for a new David, a new Exodus, a new covenant, a new city of God: the old had become a type of the new and important as pointing forward to it."²

Von Rad sees this pattern of the prophets also taken up by the NT writers. Christ came as the last great act of God and everything was again on a new footing. Now again (and for the last time) the pattern of religious and theological transformation which had repeated itself so often before, unfolded. The NT writers recognized the newness of the Christ-event, but did not want to discard the old. So they used the language of the Old Testament to give expression to the New, re-interpreting and re-adapting it as types to establish correspondence and quietly discarding what was not applicable.

¹Ibid., p. 323. ²Ibid., EOTH, p. 36.

By asserting an existential "structural analogy" among the parts of the OT traditions and between the constructs of faith in the Old and New Testaments, von Rad thus establishes a continuity, a unity, and a significance of the OT for the Christian faith. The structural analogy he perceives is not just in a few places. In von Rad's words, "We see everywhere in this history brought to pass by God's Word...the prefiguration of the Christ-event of the New Testament...The number of Old Testament types is unlimited."³

This conception of typological structures within biblical history is clearly opposed to the contention of Bultmann. While von Rad does acknowledge⁴ that the analogical thinking of the ancient Orient involved a form of "mythological-speculative typology," he insists (pace Bultmann) that such thinking "remained almost entirely foreign to ancient Israel."⁵ Except for "certain reminiscences" in later OT sources (e.g., Exod 25:9, 40), the OT "is dominated by an essentially different form of typological thinking, namely, that of the eschatological correspondence between beginning and end (Urzzeit und Endzeit)."⁶

Von Rad also clearly recognizes that his view of typology is irreconcilable with the traditional understanding. He flatly asserts:

³Von Rad, EOTH, pp. 18-19. ⁴Ibid., p. 19. ⁵Ibid. While Bultmann and von Rad differ as to whether biblical typology is predominantly cyclical repetition or historical correspondence, yet there seems to be in von Rad an "existentialist interpretation of the biblical evidence" (Eichrodt, TOT, 1:515) that in many ways parallels Bultmann's existentialist approach to the NT.
Typological exposition of the kind practiced in Protestantism from the time of the Reformation down to that of Delitzsch can never be revived. Too much of what it took for granted, not least its underlying philosophy of history, has proved untenable, and the gulf between it and ourselves has become so wide that no great profit could be expected from any discussion of it.\(^1\)

Contrary to the earlier understanding of typology, in von Rad’s position “we, however, can no longer say that the David or Joshua of history, or the Tabernacle, or the Passover lamb, are types of Christ.”\(^2\) Typological interpretation “does not fix upon historical or biographical details, but confines itself to the credenda.”\(^3\) It “has to do only with the witness to the divine event, not with such correspondences in historical, cultural, or archaeological details as the Old Testament and the New may have in common.”\(^4\) In the typological interpretation of specific texts, von Rad insists—again contrary to the traditional attempts to develop rigorous hermeneutical principles—“no pedagogical norm can or may be set up; it cannot be further regulated hermeneutically, but takes place in the freedom of the Holy Spirit.”\(^5\)

Von Rad is confident that the two “seemingly mutually exclusive forms of analogical thinking”\(^6\)—typological interpretation (or “structural analogies”) and the historico-critical exegesis (with its “almightiness of analogy”)\(^7\)—“should actually interlock in the modern attempt to understand the OT from the perspective of Christian faith.”\(^8\)

Numerous negative critiques of von Rad’s view of history and his typological approach have appeared since 1950.\(^1\) One of the leading disputants in the early debate with von Rad over the revival of typology is Friedrich Baumgärtel. Baumgärtel’s 1952 monograph\(^2\) denounces any attempt (specifically von Rad’s) to legitimize the typological approach toward Scripture. This is because (1) typology is incompatible with modern historical thinking,\(^3\) and (2) the this-worldly nationalistic view of salvation in the OT is irreconcilable with the NT understanding of the gospel.

p. 357: “We must accept that meaning of the text which is revealed by using all available exegetical tools and critical criteria . . . However . . . we do not confine ourselves only to the Old Testament’s own understanding of the texts, because we see them as part of a logical progression whose end lies in the future. When they are considered simply as they were understood by ancient Israel, their forward-looking character is not apparent; but to the man who is aware of the New Testament’s salvation event, the Old Testament texts speak in a new way of the events which overtook Israel during its journey through history. For these events can now be recognized as prefigurations of Christ’s coming, and at the same time they keep their preliminary incomplete character.”

\(^1\) The more significant reviews are listed in Baker, Two Testaments: One Bible, pp. 276-77; cf. p. 292 for disceptators focusing specifically upon his typology. See also the discussion of recent opposition to the typological method, below, pp. 88-90.


\(^3\) Baumgärtel, ETH, p. 157, expresses this idea pointedly: “To desire to build theological bridges here by renewing typological and Christological ways of understanding, which stem from times when the Old Testament (for removed from any penetration by means of history of religion or any historical thinking at all) was understood in the sense of verbal inspiration, means basically to exclude modern historical-critical thinking from the process of understanding.”
In 1957 Walther Eichrodt published an essay in which he seeks to counter the objections of Bultmann and Baungärtel with regard to typology. Against Bultmann he forcefully argues that in typology "the basic view of history is the same as that involved in the proof from prophecy, in that history is definitely understood as teleologically determined, as salvation history striving toward its end or completion." Against Baungärtel Eichrodt asserts that if typology is to be rejected because the OT narration of events is a distortion of historical facts (as Baungärtel contends), then the basic promise "I am the Lord thy God" (which Baungärtel would retain) can likewise "be no more than an imaginary reality, a treacherous and disastrous guide." Furthermore, insists Eichrodt, the view of salvation involved in OT typology is not merely this-worldly but has "an inner relatedness to the New Testament faith in salvation," while the NT view of salvation also includes a this-worldly aspect.

Eichrodt's essay is not confined to answering objections. To the question raised in the title of his article, "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?" he responds with a clear affirmative. He defines the "so-called typoi" in basically traditional terms, 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." Various characteristics of the typological approach of the NT are discussed. According to Eichrodt, correspondence is in "central elements in the realization of salvation" and not in artificial links between external similarities. It is possible to have a correspondence by contrast as well as by comparison. An intensification occurs between the preliminary stage of the type and the completeness of the antitypical salvation in Christ. Eichrodt sharply distinguishes between typology, which is rooted in history, and allegory, which consistently deprecates history. He elucidates the relationships between typology on one hand, and paraenesis and prophecy on the other, and clarifies that in the NT typology is not systematized into a scholastic methodology.

In the final section of his essay, Eichrodt shows how the typological approach of the NT can take at least an 'ancillary position' within appropriate modern exegesis. This is because first, the basic conviction of NT typology—an essential unity of the OT with the NT in the history of salvation—lies also the presupposition of modern scientific exegesis. This is true despite the fact that the NT typological interpretation in some specific instances must be rejected. Secondly, typology can be viewed as part of exegesis because exegesis, as Eichrodt defines it, not only seeks to discover the literal sense but also "has to determine

---

1 Walther Eichrodt, "Ist die typologische Exegese sächsgemäße Exegese?" VTsup 4 (1957): 161-60; ET "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?" in EOTH, pp. 224-45.
2 Eichrodt, EOTH, p. 234.
3 Ibid., p. 233.
4 Ibid., p. 240.
5 Ibid., p. 225.
6 Ibid., p. 226.
7 In Eichrodt's view, it is inappropriate to find types, e.g., "in such inaccessible realities as the scapegoat of the Day of Atonement or the ashes of the red cow" (ibid., p. 230).
8 Ibid., p. 245.
the significance of a passage in its wider setting in the history of thought, and has to assess its influence in later times.\(^1\)

While Eichrodt does not deal with the details of von Rad's typological approach, he expresses his conviction that von Rad probably means "something rather different from typology"\(^2\) as he has defined it. In Eichrodt's estimation, von Rad's typology means "the working out of the structural relatedness in the experience of God in the Old and New Testaments, by virtue of which God's action in his community pursues the same goal in each case and illuminates the one covenant through the other."\(^3\)

In the same year as Eichrodt's contribution to the dialogue on biblical typology appeared, Lampe and Kenneth J. Woollcombe published their Essays on Typology.\(^4\) In his essay, "The Reasonableness of Typology," Lampe shows how the traditional view of typology met its demise when modern critical study ruptured the unity of the two Testaments. He argues, however, that one can retain the approach of biblical criticism and still find a rationale for typology, based on a proper understanding of the basic unity of Scripture (in spite of its diversity) and Jesus' own use of typology. He summarizes his rationale for and definition of typology:

> If we admit the unity of Scripture in the sense that it is the literature of people whose thought was controlled by a single series of images, and that it is a body of writings whose explicit or implicit there is the people and the Covenant, and if, further, we hold that Christ is the unifying

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 242.  \(^2\)Ibid., p. 244.  \(^3\)Ibid., p. 245.

\(^4\)Lampe and Woollcombe, Essays on Typology.

centre-point of Biblical history, deliberately fulfilling the various images presented by that literature and bringing together different threads within it to form a consistent pattern, then we have no objection to a typology which seeks to discover and make explicit the real correspondences in historical events which have been brought about by the recurring rhythm of the divine activity.\(^1\)

In the last section of his essay, Lampe distinguishes between legitimate historical typology that involves historical correspondences between past and future, and illegitimate allegorical exegesis and vertical typology which are "wholly unhistorical."\(^2\)

"In the essay by Woollcombe,\(^3\) typological exegesis is defined as "the search for linkages between events, persons, or things within the historical framework of revelation." In contradistinction to allegorism, "the search for a secondary and hidden meaning underlying the primary and obvious meaning of a narrative."\(^4\) At the heart of biblical typology, as well as in the fulfillment of prophecy, is "the recapitulative nature of the saving acts of God in Christ."\(^5\) The essay proceeds to provide brief lexical and theological studies in regard to biblical typology, followed by a summary of the development of typology by the Church Fathers. Four major conclusions are offered as "principles which determine the use of historical typology in the Bible, and in the writings of

\(^1\)Lampe, "The Reasonableness of Typology," p. 29.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 23; cf. pp. 30-38. The vertical correspondences, e.g., in Hebrews, are legitimized in Lampe's view if they also involve horizontal dimensions.
\(^3\)Woollcombe, pp. 39-75.  \(^4\)Ibid., p. 40. Italic his.
\(^5\)Ibid., p. 49.
those Fathers who followed the Biblical rather than the Hellenistic
tradition of typological exegesis. First, typology is confined to "the search for historical patterns within the historical
framework of revelation." Second, "spurious exegesis and Hellen-
istic allegorism" is rejected as a legitimate way to establish the patterns. Third, "the identity of the type and the antitype
must be real and intelligible." And finally, typology is used
solely to express "the consistency of God's redemptive activity
in the Old and the New Israel." Another significant proponent of typological interpretation
within critical scholarship is Hans Walter Wolff. According to
Wolff, neither Judaism nor other ancient Near Eastern religions,
but only the NT "offers the analogy of a witness of faith to the
covenant will of God—a witness founded on historical facts—who
chooses out of the world a people for himself and calls it to free-
don under his lordship." This analogy of the Old and New Testaments
—in a historically unique relation, which is not without a decisive
moment of intensification toward the eschaton—Wolff calls typology.
Such an understanding of typological interpretation involves three
main aspects: it is: (1) historical interpretation (in distinction
from allegorical), (2) interpretation based on comparison to New
Testament analogies (in distinction from targumic paraphrase and
rabbinical casuistic), (3) interpretation for proclamation (in
distinction from mere historical interpretation). For Wolff,
typology does not merely occupy "an ancillary position" in OT
study, as for Eichrodt. Rather, "the typological approach is
indispensable for an exegetical methodology that seeks to under-
stand the historical context of the Old Testament texts and is
concerned to eliminate arbitrary interpretations." The most recent major attempt at synthesis and critique of
typology is made by David L. Baker in his analysis of various modern
solutions to the problem of the relationship of the Old and New Testa-
ments. Baker first briefly discusses typology in recent study and
in a second section seeks to provide "A New Look at Typology:
Based upon various English translations of biblical μορφοί passages,
and the meaning of the word "type" in modern English. He concludes
that the μορφοί has only one basic meaning in Scripture, namely,
"example, pattern" and is never used in a technical sense by the
biblical writers. Typological thinking is seen to be a common human
way of viewing the world in terms of concrete analogies. In the
Bible it is concerned with drawing analogies or correspondences
within the uniform pattern of God's created order—in particular,
his saving history.

---

1Ibid., p. 75.  
2Ibid.  
5Ibid., pp. 180-91.  
6Baker, Two Testaments: One Bible, p. 237-70. This book is essentially his 1975 Ph.D. dissertation for the University of Sheffield; the section on typology is virtually the same as the article in SSCI, pp. 137-57, cited above, p. 6, n. 3.
In a third section Baker criticizes what he considers false ideas of typology and summarizes his own understanding of its nature. He contends that typology is not exegesis, prophecy, allegory, symbolism, or a system. He furthermore rejects the suggestions that divine design, specific limits, connection with Christ and redemption, prefiguration of the future and progression from type to antitype are necessary characteristics of typology. Only two basic principles are regarded as essential to typology. First, typology is historical, though the historicity of the type is not necessary. Second, typology involves a real correspondence in fundamental principles and structure (not details).

For Baker, "the essence of a type is that it is exemplary." This he illustrates from the use of the English word "type" in chemistry. He defines a type within Scripture as "a biblical event, person or institution which serves as an example or pattern for other events, persons or institutions." The basis for typology is "God's consistent activity in the history of his chosen people." Since the whole Bible is an expression of the consistency of divine activity, the number of types is unlimited. All the biblical accounts which have exemplary value for the Christian are "types." This understanding of typology leads Baker to a rather surprising conclusion: "Perhaps the concern of typology is less to look for types of Christ than to present Christ himself as the supreme type for Christians and the world."

A serious methodological weakness is apparent in Baker's study—a weakness which persists in all the literature of the recent debate over typology. A solid semasiological and exegetical foundation for understanding the nature of typology is never laid. Baker limits his biblical analysis to a comparison of English translations of textual-passage. The other major proponents in the recent discussion of typology likewise give little or no biblical basis for their conclusions. Despite the numerous clearly articulated and often elegantly crafted statements on the nature of typology, there is no adequate attempt to allow the structures of typology to emerge from within Scripture by means of thorough analysis of key biblical terms and passages.

Among the proponents of typology in the recent debate there appear to be two main trends or traditions. An English tradition, represented especially by Lamp and Woolcombe, emphasizes the "recurring rhythm" of divine activity: typology is the recognition of correspondences within the consistent pattern of God's "revelation in history." A German trend, represented particularly by von Rad, also accepts the primacy of "revelation in history" but associates it with a traditionsgeschichtliche perspective: typology consists of "structural analogies" by which the Biblical writers are able to reactualize earlier traditions in new situations.

---

1 Baker, Two Testaments: One Bible, p. 266.
2 Ibid., p. 262.
3 Ibid., p. 267.
4 Ibid., p. 270. Italics his.

These two trends or traditions are correctly pointed out by, e.g., James Barr, "Biblical Theology," TDJSupp, p. 109.

See James Barr, "Revelation in History," TDJSupp, pp. 746-49, for a concise discussion of the use of this formula in the Biblical Theology Movement. Proponents of the primacy of "revelation in history" argue that God's revelation is not in ideas, conceptions, statements or propositions, but in historical acts.
Despite these differences of perspective, and numerous other differences of detail, the major advocates of typological exegesis within critical scholarship seem to agree on certain essentials which stand in opposition to the traditional views of biblical typology. At the bottom is a different understanding of history and revelation. The historical-critical emphasis upon the primacy of "revelation in history" leaves little room for the predictive element. Rather, typology is seen as a common human way of analogical thinking which in Scripture (and in the modern typological approach) involves the recognition of correspondences within God's consistent activity in salvation history. Typology is regarded as basically retrospective and not prospective as in the traditional views. It focuses upon the general correspondences within God's salvific activity and does not extend to minute details. It is based upon theologically informed history, not exact and objective history, and therefore does not necessarily require the historicity of the type, as in traditional typology.

Advocates of the new understanding claim to revive the basic biblical perspective on typology, but at the same time readily point out that not all typology employed by the biblical writers is acceptable within the modern world-view. The only legitimate typology for contemporary critical scholarship is that which involves horizontal or historical correspondences. Symbolic

The Bible is a history book in that it witnesses to these divine acts. But the history presented in Scripture is theologically informed and not intended to be historically accurate or objective.

1 See the synthesis of issues, below, pp. 93-110.

and vertical typology—as seen occasionally in Scripture and as exploited in traditional typological studies of the sanctuary—are no longer tenable.

Finally, typology is seen to be a theological way of viewing history, not a fixed hermeneutical method. It is carried out pneumatically—in the freedom of the Spirit—not in accordance with systematic and rigorous principles of interpretation, as some traditional studies have attempted to formulate.

Reviews and surveys. Besides the pivotal studies already referred to, numerous review articles on typology have appeared in the periodical literature, the majority written in the decade of the 1950s. Each reviewer briefly discusses the nature of biblical typology, in the light of its modern resurgence within

1 It should be noted that the original articles dealing with typology by von Rad, Baumgärtel, Eichrodt, and Wolff, which we reviewed in the previous section of this survey, yielded even greater influence by virtue of their inclusion in the German compilation Probleme Alttestamentlicher Hermeneutik (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960) and its ET, ETHE. The core of the collection of essays in ETHE (by von Rad, Wolff, Martin Roth, Theodor C. Vriezen, Johann J. Steym, and Walther Zimmerli) was first published in two issues of EVT (12 [July/August 1952] and 16 [August/September 1956]) along with other programmatic essays by the group of collaborators in the Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament project. Noth's discussion of "textual presentation" (EvT 12 [1952/53]: 6-17; ET in ETHE, pp. 76-88) and Zimmerli's treatment of the "expression/fulfillment" theme (EvT 12 [1952/53]: 34-50; ET in ETHE, pp. 89-102) are closely related to the subject of typology, though the term 'typology' is not employed. For bibliography on the Biblischer Kommentar group, a discussion of their methodology, and summary of the views of Noth and Noth, see especially Baker, Two Testaments: One Bible, pp. 307-11; cf. Takamori, pp. 131-37 on Zimmerli. Note also Goppelt, Typos, p. v., where strong approval is given to efforts of the Biblischer Kommentar group.

2 Note the following chronological spectrum: Brouwer (1941), pp. 98-115; Bernardus J. Alfrink, Over 'typologische' Exegese van het O. T. (Hillegom: Dekker en van de Vegt, 1946), reviewed by P. J. van der Groen, Bijdragen 3 (1946): 43-44; Fritsch, 'Biblical
contemporary scholarship. These articles provide little substantive advance to the modern debate, though there are occasional fresh insights. The reviewers are generally favorable to the revival of typology, yet several caution against falling into allegory—into "a world of fantasy and intellectual will-o'-the-wisps." During the same period, but concentrated in the 1960s, other survey discussions of typology were published in theological and Bible dictionaries as well as in sections of works dealing with biblical hermeneutics and the relations of the Testaments. These Matt 6:5-13, and Mark 6:13) and asserts that the number of possible biblical types is unlimited. Riddersbos provides a rich bibliography of studies related to typology up to 1960. Gundry, Blackman, and Stek give particularly helpful analyses of stages in the history of typological interpretation. Gundry, pp. 239-40, asks some penetrating questions about the possibility of any real revival of typology by adherents to the same historical method which discredited typology.

Dranes, p. 208, contends that what is called "typology" in recent scholarly literature should be called the "promise-fulfillment motif," "salvation history," or "correspondences," and the term "typology" should be reserved for the mystical interpretation of the Church Fathers (the attempt to see direct, detailed, predictive correspondences between OT and NT). Drane concludes (p. 210) that "if the O.T. is ever to mean anything to twentieth-century men and women it will not be by means of any kind of mystical explication, whether allegorical or typological."

1For example, Greliet, "Biblical Figures," asserts that the criterion of what constitutes a figure is the analogy of participation or experience. Since the basic structure of the life of faith is the same in the OT and the NT (p. 12), one can say that "the authenticity of a figure is determined by the role played by the figures and the things figured in the experience of faith to which they are joined" (p. 9). He further (p. 11) notes three successive stages in the realization of the eschatological Event of Salvation: the first advent of Christ, the Church, and the second coming of Christ. This allows for three possible applications of the OT figures, to the inauguration, extension, and consummation of the Kingdom of God. Markus, pp. 448-50, relates the OT event and those three eschatological stages of fulfillment to the Four-fold Sense of scripture. In other reviews, Prier provides examples of the early analyses of Goppelt's Typen und further suggests (p. 113) that typology is based on oriental root-thinking. Sailer sets forth four unusual examples of NT typology (Matt 3:11; Luke 6:6-8;
treatments touch upon such areas as the history of typological interpretation, definitions and characteristics of typology, lexical analyses, classification and listings of biblical types.

Van Ruler, pp. 63-67; Frör, pp. 87-88; Brown, "Hermeneutics," pp. 616-19; Murdoch, pp. 213-17; de la Fuente, Old Testament Theology, pp. 112-13; Idem, New Testament Theology, pp. 170-79; and Ramm, p. 92. Several points call for special mention. McCullum (pp. 40-44) is quite helpful in elucidating the concept of the people of God shared by the early church, the idea of one Israel, and the understanding of typology. (P. 242).

Richardson, pp. 335-36, focuses upon the distinction between the understanding of typology entertained within modern historical-critical scholarship and the traditional argument from prophecy. The latter is based on a "mechanistic conception of the predictive element in the Old Testament, which goes hand in hand with the notion that revelation is written down in the propositional statements of Scripture." In the modern view of typology, the "great images of the Old Testament ... although they include literary and even artistic figures, part history and part inspiration, (along with "the great type-situations" which become "images of salvation") are "moulded in the crucible of Israel's history" and become "a kind of analogical rehearsal of the New Testament drama of incarnation and redemption." These images the NT authors employ in their theological-theological typological interpretations of the divine saving events. (p. 93). Coppen (pp. 63-67) suggests that in the "new typology" (technique nouvelle) the historical-critical method must be used to test the typological interpretations of the OT that are found in the NT. In order to determine which ones are still acceptable to modern understanding of the correspondence of the OT to the NT, contends that the "NT too can be interpreted in typological fashion, as the first fruits of that which will come." Kummel, col. 1519, is persuaded that "in the typological Deutung des AT zeigt sich darum am klarsten die Spannung im Sinne der Urchristenzeit in der christlichen Zeitgeschichte." (p. 503), makes the interesting observation that there is a "very close association of typology with aesthetics." For a summary of the many characteristics of typology suggested in the literature see below, pp. 95-100.

1See especially the word studies by Goppelt and Müller, which are repeatedly cited later in this dissertation. Cf. Fuchs, pp. 192-94; Frör, pp. 413-58; McCullum, p. 289; Baker, Two Testaments: One Bible, pp. 251-53.

2Rumm, pp. 231-32, classifies six different kinds of types: persons, institutions, offices, events, actions, and things. Often the types are categorized in terms of only three groups: persons, events, and institutions. For examples of the various biblical types see especially Fuchs, pp. 135-201 (Pauline examples); Frör, pp. 405-18 (emphasis on Exod typology); McCullum, pp. 164-67 (emphasis upon the point[s] of correspondence in each example). Cf. Rumm, pp. 231-32; Murdoch, pp. 214-16; and Achtehmeier, p. 927.

---


1See especially Coppen, pp. 78-84; Kraus, pp. 424-40; Wilkinson, pp. 33-36; Nakagawa, cols. 1095-98; and Ramm, pp. 218-21.

2E.g., Brown, "Hermeneutics," p. 518: "The typical sense is the deeper meaning that the things (persons, places, events) of Scripture possess because, according to the intention of the divine author, they foreshadow future things." Roman Catholic scholars (such as Brown) tend to perpetuate the Thomistic distinction between the deeper meaning of the "things" of Scripture and the deeper meaning of the "words" of Scripture. The former is the "typical sense," and the latter is in recent Catholic discourse termed the sensus plenior. For further discussion and bibliography on the sensus plenior, see below, pp. 103-4. For other definitions of typology, see Mickele, pp. 227-28; and Damm, pp. 227-28, who cite numerous (mostly) traditional definitions from various sources. Cf. also Coppen, p. 82; Fuchs, p. 192; Blaser, col. 422; Lys, pp. 64; Nakagawa, col. 1095; Achtemeier, p. 926. Though with different wording, these definitions coincide with ones we have noted in our previous discussion.

3See especially Coppen, pp. 84-91; Charlif, pp. 260-70; Verhoef, pp. 62-63; Mickele, pp. 237-42, 245-46; Ramm, pp. 286-289;
principles of typological interpretation,1 and various caution in

1In most of these studies, the procedures of typological interpretation are implied in the presentation of the characteristics of typology: proper procedure is obviously to discover where in Scripture these characteristics are present. Several authors, however, also give a set of procedures for typological investigation. Ramm, pp. 229-31, suggests four rules of interpretation: (1) "Note the typology of the New Testament and see how it treats the subject" (italics his). It is not concerned with minutiae or incidentals but with "the great facts of Christ and redemption; with the great moral and spiritual truths of Christian experience" (ibid., pp. 229-30). (2) The two major areas of typology are the tabernacle and wilderness wanderings, which typical wholes have typical parts. For other proposed areas, check to see if the NT uses them typologically. (3) "Locate in any given type the typical and the accidental" (ibid., p. 230, italics his). (4) "Do not groove a passage from typological theses of the New Testament authority" (ibid., p. 231, italics his). For a similar set of guidelines, cf. Murdoch, pp. 216-17. Mickelsen, p. 262, provides three general procedures for interpreting typology: (1) "Note the specific point or points of correspondence between the type and the antitype." (2) "Note also the points of difference and contrast in order to remove the 'artificialities that are fatal to all true typology.'" (3) "The New Testament picture of the unity of the people of God should be grasped in its full significance. He then proceeds (p. 263) to give "some rigorous procedures for recognizing inferred typologies" (procedures "the interpreter must discipline himself severely.") (1) A potential type must show a similarity in some basic quality or element." (2) "The basic quality or element of this potential type should exhibit God's purpose in the historical context of the type. (3) "The type does not exist within the historical context at the time the antitype." God's purpose may not be the same, but the point of correspondence will have the same meaning."). (3) "That which is taught by typological correspondence must also be taught by direct assertion" (italics his). Mickelsen concludes with a directive to carefully analyze all NT examples of typology before looking for additional types. The hermeneutical principles of Ramm and Murdoch tend to follow traditional lines, while Mickelsen's principles appear to incorporate much of the historical-critical understanding. Brown, "Hermeneutics," pp. 618-19, in delineating the two criteria for recognizing the typical sense, also seems to combine aspects of the traditional understanding of typology with the new historical-critical perspective. On one hand, in a Catholic version of the Marsh dictum, Brown maintains (ibid., p. 619) that the safest guide for the presence of the typical sense in Scripture is the recognition of such by revelation, i.e., "by the NT or by a consensus of the Fathers, of liturgical usages, and of Church documents" (italics his). On the other hand, he refuses to accept as typical the foreshadowings pointed out by the NT or the Fathers unless the type is related to the antitype through "an organic development in revelation" regard to the employment of typology.1 None of these surveys (ibid.), and he speaks approvingly of the attempts by modern authors (Lopes, Woollcombe, von Rad, and Eichrodt are among those recommended in the bibliography, ibid.) to elucidate this organic development. The unresolved tensions in Brown's mind over the issue of typology seem to surface in the final paragraphs of his treatment of the typical sense (ibid.). In which he verbalized difficulties involved in relating typology to modern exegesis and concludes that the typical sense must be "somehow revamped" if it is to serve as a useful hermeneutical category.

1A number of these authors caution against falling into allegory. For distinctions drawn between typology and allegory, see Charlier, pp. 288-89; Wilkinson, pp. 36-38; Richardson, pp. 336-37; Larcher, pp. 507-8; Lyd., pp. 50-74; Ramm, pp. 221-27; Murdoch, pp. 217-18; Hasel, Old Testament Theology, pp. 166-67. See also the discussions and bibliography, above, p. 20 and below, pp. 100-1. Several warnings are expressed that typology not be allowed to eclipse the primary significance of a passage within its historical context (see Wilkinson, p. 36; Larcher, p. 504; Verhoef, p. 62). Larcher, p. 513, warns against placing the investigations of types to result in "that's ignoring the reality in Christ. There are also admonitions against elevating typology as the only method of seeing the relationship between the Testaments (Verhoef, p. 63; Mickelsen, p. 244; van Ruler, p. 72; Hasel, Old Testament Theology, pp. 113-14; idem, New Testament Theology, pp. 191-92).

Van Ruler offers several rather unique cautions. Since according to him the "OT is the true Bible and the NT its explanatory gloss" (p. 74), one must continually start afresh with the OT text. For van Ruler, "What is to be typologically related to Jesus Christ is the historical event in the Old Testament in the historical sense" (p. 72). One must also "seek typological light for the eschaton, for Israel, the world, and God himself" (ibid.). As van Ruler puts it, "briefly and sharply, Jesus Christ is an emergency measure that God postponed as long as possible" and thus "we must not try to find him fully in the Old Testament" (ibid., p. 69). The fulfillment of the OT in Jesus Christ he takes to mean "that the Old Testament is put into effect in him and on the other hand that it speaks about him because it is fulfilled in him, and not vice versa. Hence we no longer look for intimations of Jesus Christ and his work in the Old Testament" (ibid., p. 71). In other words, "the a posteriori character of typical connections should be much more strongly recognized" (ibid., p. 70).

Smart provides a review (pp. 115-22) of various OT theologians (esp. Eichrodt, von Rad, and Wolff) who have dealt with the promise-fulfillment correspondences within the OT and between the two testaments. He is favorable to their study of such correspondences but insists that this should not be called typology. He suggests (p. 113) that the term "typology" be reserved for the "deliberate practice of finding and establishing correspondences,
provide from Scripture a solid exegetical or semasiological foundation for understanding the nature of typology.

OT studies. Along with the discussions of biblical typology in general, several studies have focused upon the OT basis for typology and/or its employment within the OT corpus. In a particularly significant work, Francis Foulkes emphasizes two fundamental OT convictions upon which typology is based: (1) the conviction of the unchanging nature of God and His unchanging covenant and principles dealing with men; and (2) the conviction that in the future the past acts of God will be repeated on a scale greater and more wonderful than that of the past. Many of the OT typological passages are given brief consideration in Foulkes' penetrating monograph. A later article by Horace D. Hummel even more emphatically than Foulkes asserts that "the typical is a dominant concern of the OT, its historiography, its cultus, its prophecy, etc." Hummel further clarifies that OT typology has a vertical as well as the horizontal dimension. In other treatments of OT typology, Bernhard W. Anderson focuses particularly on the Exodus typology of Second Isaiah; Norbert Lohfink seeks to establish the typological character of the Song of the Sea in Exod 15; and Gwilym H. Jones examines Abraham-Cyrus typology. All of these OT studies propound particular views of typology but fail to provide thorough exegetical-semasiological basis for them.

NT studies. In NT scholarship, a steady but small stream of research since World War II has been carried out, dealing with specific passages, authors, or motifs. Some of the more significant studies deal with typology in the Synoptic Gospels, the Fourth Gospel, Jesus' own teaching, the death of Jesus, and the book of

1 Ibid., pp. 38-30.


of Acts.\(^1\) There are also treatments of the typological use of the OT in the Pauline corpus\(^2\) and the Epistle to the Hebrews.\(^3\) Some attention has been given to the employment of typology in the book of Revelation.\(^4\) Other NT research has focused upon such areas as Adam-Chist typology,\(^5\) Exodus typology,\(^6\) Isaac typology,\(^7\) and Babylon typology.\(^8\) As in OT studies, these NT treatments presuppose views of typology that are not undergirded with thorough analysis of typological structures.


**Other studies.** The instauration of research on biblical typology in recent decades has by no means been limited to fields in biblical studies. Diametric and systematic theology,\(^1\) church history,\(^2\) literary criticism,\(^3\) arts and architecture\(^4\) - all have vigorously explored the meaning and significance of typology for their particular discipline. In fact, some of the most provocative analyses of typology have come from these sources. For instance, the patristic scholar Jean Daniélou, whose works we have already alluded to, has sought to re-establish the long-abandoned continuity between modern typology and a strand of biblical typology.

\(^{1}\)E.g., Davis, pp. 31-49; cf. Paul S. Minear’s examination of Christology and ecclesiology in the Light of Jerusalem Typology in Revelation and Hebrews, in Horizon of Christian Community (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1959), pp. 61-79.

\(^{2}\)Refer to the footnotes of our chronological survey for contributors to this discipline, above, pp. 18-45.


in the Church Fathers (which he separates from a co-existing strand of allegorizing). He has also attempted to distinguish among five classes of NT typology involving eschatological applications of the same type to the various parts of the Christus totus. Though his research has often been brushed aside as peripheral to the current debate, his insights demand more serious consideration. The literary critic Alan C. Charity has also provided scintillating insights in OT and NT typology, albeit in non-traditional terminology. He defines typology in the wider sense as:

- either the broad study, or any particular presentation, of the quasi-symbolic relations which one event may appear to bear to another—especially, but not exclusively, when these relations are the analogical ones existing between events which are taken to be one another's "prefiguration" and "fulfillment."

In a narrower sense, Christian typology is "the science of history's relations to its fulfillment in Christ." Charity compares the specific typology of the OT and NT with "the element of representativeness in literature" to confirm the hypothesis that it is

---

1. Jean Daniélou, "The Fathers and the Scriptures," Th 67 (1954): 87, defines five forms of typology: matthean (focusing on biographical details of Christ's life), Johannine (theological analogies of the Incarnation mystery), churchly (mainly sacramental), mystical (individual), and eschatological (OT declarations, the foundation of the others). In his book Origen, pp. 161, 166, 189-91, etc., Daniélou illustrates how "the Christological meaning can...be subdivided into as many sections as there are aspects in Christ himself" (p. 161). This involves the "Christus totus" (p. 191): historical Christ (divided into matthean and johannine forms), the mystical Christ (corporately—as the church and sacraments—and individually—as those "in Christ"), and the eschatological Christ (at his second coming).


3. Ibid., p. 1.

4. Ibid., p. 4.

5. Ibid., p. 1.

---

Exactly with the locating of an absolute existential norm in the idea of an event of historical fulfillment—and subsequently with faith's affirmation that it has discovered such an event—that biblical typology is concerned.

Joseph A. Galdon's recent Typology and Seventeenth-Century Literature sets forth a theory of biblical typology in a non-technical but highly illuminating manner. Typology is defined as "the method of interpreting Scripture in which the persons and events, incidents and narratives of the Old Testament, the Old Testament res ipsae, are viewed as realities which are also at one and the same time prophetic signs and forewarning of the persons and events in God's redemptive plan as it is fulfilled and revealed in the New Testament." Galdon analyzes four essential elements of typology:

The historical realism of both terms of the typological relationship, the type and the antitype; the basic and essential correspondence between the two terms, the similarity between the two; the relationship of shadow to reality, the notion that one pole of the typological reference must be a fulfillment, a forma perfectionis, of the other; and finally, the divine resonance and Christic correspondence of the type and antitype within the biblical theology of history.

Particular attention is given to the biblical view of history which according to Galdon forms the basis of genuine typology.

We must allow such studies to have their full force in the contemporary discussion of typology. It must be noted, however, that these treatments of typology have not grounded their

---

1. Ibid., p. 5.
2. See Galdon, pp. 19-59.
3. Ibid., p. 23.
5. Ibid., pp. 54-69.
conclusions in thorough exegetical-semasiological analysis of biblical terms and passages.

**Major opponents.** There have also been significant opponents of recent attempts within critical scholarship to revive typological interpretation. As we have already noted, Balamman rejects a modern use of typology because he is convinced it rests upon a cyclical rather than a linear view of time, while Baumgarten insists that typology is opposed to present historical thinking and must therefore be discarded as a distortion of real (factual) history. William A. Irwin, Richard L. Lucas, and Roland E. Murphy concur that the post-critical framework today has no room

3Above, pp. 59, 65.

2See William A. Irwin, "The Interpretation of the Old Testament," ZAW 62 (1969-70): 1-10; idem, "A Still Small Voice Said, What Are You Doing Here?" JBL 78 (1959): 1-12. In his presidential address delivered at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, Dec. 30, 1958, Irwin articulates this surprise and disal in that one of the Biblical Theology Movement "in the interest of relevance and modern errors we have supposed long since dead buried. Unquestionably, one of its distinguishing features, "Irwin continues, "has been a reversal to typology... That the thing [typology, as advocated, e.g., by Walter Eichrodt] is wrong in genesis and being there cannot be the least doubt" (Irwin, "A Still Small Voice," p. 5). He goes on to say that typology involves "a reversal of the order of things" to establish the unity of the Bible rather than "sound literary and historical methods" (ibid.).

3See Richard L. Lucas, "Considerations of Method in Old Testament Hermeneutics," JBL 64 (1965): 32-33: "An essential requisite of modern hermeneutics... is a certain consistency in method provided through the use of a criterion or principle. Typological interpretation does not fulfill this requirement. And for what reason? Precisely because it is the method of another age, an age which did not know scientific thinking and therefore scientific methods. Typology is more appropriate in a pre-critical mentality, and as such, is not readily employed in a post-critical framework."

4See Roland E. Murphy, "Christian Understanding of the Old Testament," TD 15 (1979): 320: "The typological approach is not

for typology. Lucas adds that typology (1) tends to minimize the significance of the OT witness in itself, (2) constitutes a theology of history rather than an interpretation of biblical texts, and (3) adds more to the OT events than is really there. James Barr hints at the unchronostrophic and impractical nature of typology, but his major contention is that it is not possible to distinguish typology from allusion on the basis of a typology-relatedness, as is commonly attempted in modern discussion of typology. He also criticizes the conceptions of typology (held especially by von Rad and Martin Noth) that relate only to the divine event and do not include persons and details.

suited to our present needs in articulating the relationship between the testaments; it is not creative enough for the possibilities of theology. It was the manner in which the early church interpreted history, and it is simply less appealing to the modern temper."

3Lucas, pp. 33-35.

2James Barr, Old and New in Interpretation (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 105-48. Note, e.g., his comment on p. 132: "An attempt to rehabilitate typology which carries with it also a very explicit and conscious repudiation of allegory, may be like a bridge which reaches neither side of the river. It may fail either to meet with modern historical requirements or to relate itself to the exegetical practice of the early church."

3Martin Noth, "The Re-Presentation of the Old Testament in Proclamation," in LOTH, pp. 85-87: "A legitimate 're-presentation' [Vergangenheitszueignung] cannot use the individual human figures of biblical history as its subject... A legitimate 're-presentation' cannot use specific historical situations which emerged in the Old Testament as its subject... According to the Old Testament, the subject of a legitimate 're-presentation' can be only the saving acts of God himself, to which saving acts belong also the proroguing and demanding word of God, and the punitive judgments of God."

4Barr, Old and New, especially pp. 111-12, shows how the OT does not separate the divine event from its 'circumstantial' (p. 112), and how in the OT 'very many typological references are to details of the Old Testament text' (ibid.).
Georg Fohrer\(^1\) rejects typology as a modern approach for the following reasons: (1) it makes the OT superfluous; (2) there is no typology in the OT, just a correspondence notion; (3) the NT has many other influences than the OT; (4) it is senseless to have hidden meanings arrogantly read into the OT; and (5) OT theology cannot be instructed by the NT. Hartmut Gese\(^2\) adds that the NT quotations from the OT are not a question of typology (vague and external analogies) but of theological agreement; it is the tradition history in the revelation process that provides the significance, not typology.

Herbert Haag\(^3\) summarizes the arguments of Fohrer and Gese and adds several of his own. First, the NT in its polemic against the Jews used typology and allegory as common ground with their opponents; but this cultural milieu is no longer present, and thus the typological method of the NT authors is not binding on us today. Second, the proper contemporary model for God's plan is not typology but organic evolution—the gradual development of Scripture (Motifgeschichte) finding its evolutionary apex in Christ. Third, the OT events are not fulfilled in that the NT events are read back into the OT (as in typology), but the reverse: the OT events are fulfilled because they have been (not had to be) fulfilled by Christ.


\(^3\) Haag, pp. 254-57.

None of these opponents of typological interpretation have based their criticism upon thorough analysis of biblical passages or terms. Besides the vocal opposition to the instauration of typology, there appears to be a widespread reticence within critical scholarship to accept the contemporary validity of the typological method. In 1970 John Stek assessed the climate within OT scholarship, and his judgment seems to be yet valid: typological exegesis "is still in disrepute among the majority of Old Testament scholars."\(^1\) Goppelt's remonstrance with NT scholars in 1966 for failing to give proper attention to NT typology\(^2\) may reveal the same state of affairs within NT biblical studies.

Furthermore, the most recent attacks upon the modern validity of biblical typology may indicate a mounting counterreaction among biblical scholars in line with the impending collapse of the Biblical Theology Movement.\(^3\) The Biblical Theology Movement placed great emphasis upon an inner unity of the Bible—and especially the OT with the NT—based upon the primacy of a consistent divine revelation in history. It was the acceptance of this essential unity that allowed historical-critical scholars to draw typological correspondences between the OT and NT. But since about 1960 the theme of "revelation in history" has undergone

\(^1\) Stek, p. 141.

\(^2\) Goppelt, *Typos*, pp. v-vi.

\(^3\) For the documentation of the "cracking of the walls" of the Biblical Theology Movement, see Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis*, esp. pp. 61-67. See also Barr, *IBESUP*, pp. 704-17.
severe criticism. Also since about 1960, particularly with the rise of redaction criticism, there has been an increasing tendency to emphasize the diversity of the Bible and question the existence of an internal unity or coherence. These developments have weakened the foundation for historical-critical acceptance of the typological approach. Since the vigorous discussion of typology in the decade of the 1960s, studies of the biblical use of typology have continued to appear, but less interest has been shown in defending its contemporary validity.

The most recent detailed studies of biblical typology appear to be concentrated within Evangelical circles. Evangelical Scholarship seems to have generally accepted the understanding of typology elucidated by advocates of historical criticism in the 1950s. Few voices of objection have been raised against the presuppositional shifts from the traditional understanding of typology. The recent attempt at synthesis and critique made by Baker seems to most clearly reflect the new understanding of typology. Baker’s position

1 See Barr, IDBSup, pp. 108, 716-49, for a summary of this recent criticism.

2 See ibid., pp. 108-9, for a summary analysis of this trend.

3 Gundry, p. 240, expresses deep concern over the presuppositional shifts. He writes: “Proponents of the new typology use such terms as ‘analogy’, ‘correspondence’, ‘prefiguration’, ‘pre-presentation’, ‘foreshadowing’, and ‘corresponding reality’. But what meaning can such terms have in a system of interpretation that repudiates predictive prophecy and verbal inspiration?” Payne, p. 24, quotes Gundry approvingly, and adds: “Little appeal to the advocates of this approach [Lampe, von Rad, Eichardt, and Wolff are mentioned specifically by Payne] can therefore be made in this book.”


is cited frequently in the elucidation of major issues in typology, to which we now turn our attention.

**Fundamental Issues in Biblical Typology**

This section does not give an exhaustive list of proponents and opponents of the various viewpoints, but cites at least one representative example of each.

**Terminology**

1. Modern language apppellations. In recent years many have expressed hesitation to employ the term "typology" because of undesirable overtones that it often carries. Among other suggested terms are: "homology," "patterns," "analogy," "protection," "parallel situation," and "correspondences." The majority still use "typology" in spite of possible negative connotations.

2. Scriptural apppellations. Debate centers on whether "typology" is ever used in Scripture as a hermeneutical term, or whether it everywhere has its common non-technical meaning of "pattern" or "example." A further point of discussion, for those accepting


4 Von Rad, OTT, 2:363-54; Wolff, EOTH, pp. 167-81.


6 Drane, p. 208; Smart, p. 123.

7 See Goppelt, TDNT, 8:252. 8 See Baker, "Typology," p. 145.
the Rom 5 usage as a terminus technicus, is whether or not the occurrences in 1 Cor 10 should be likewise conceived.\footnote{See the bibliographical references in Goppelt, TDNT, 8:251-52; cf. the discussion of this issue, below, pp. 372-73. Goppelt, "Apokalypse und Typologie bei Paulus," pp. 271-72, is a leading exponent of the passage as typological, while Brant, \textit{Life and Spirit}, p. 137, is an example of those for whom the use of \textit{to logos} in 1 Cor 10 is in the sense of mere example.}

A final point under consideration with regard to Scriptural apppellations for typology is whether any other words in Scripture are synonymous with \textit{to logos}. The following words come especially into view: \textit{σχῆμα}, \textit{παράλληλα}, \textit{αναλογία}, and \textit{προέξις} in the OT; \textit{πρόγνωσις} in the NT.\footnote{Goppelt, TDNT, 8:251-52, briefly discusses the terminological relationship; cf. Moorehead, p. 3029.} In what ways are these word synonyms describing the phenomenon of typology, and in what ways do they present different hermeneutical perspectives in Scripture?

\textbf{Definition}

Almost every discussion of typology offers its own unique definition of typology. But basically, as recognized by Baker,\footnote{Baker, "Typology," p. 138-39.} there are two views. The older conception (mostly represented by authors before the 1950s) views typology in terms of divinely preordained and predictive prefigurations.\footnote{E.g., Goppelt, \textit{Typos}, pp. 16-18; Ansler, "La typologie chez Saint Paul," p. 120; Blackburn, p. 57; Brown, \textit{Hermeneutics}, p. 618; Fritsch, "Biblical Typology," pp. 214-15; Galdon, p. 29; Michelsen, pp. 242-43; Moorehead, p. 3029.} The more recent consensus describes typology in terms of historical correspondences retrospectively recognized within the consistent redemptive activity of God.\footnote{E.g., Anderson, p. 180; Baker, "Typology," p. 152; Foulkes, p. 35; von Rad, \textit{OTT}, 2:363-64.}

\textbf{Characteristics}

A number of diverging conclusions are maintained regarding the essential characteristics of typology as employed in Scripture.

\textbf{Divine intent.} Is typology a mere human analogy\footnote{E.g., von Rad, \textit{OTT}, 2:363-64; cf. Andrew B. Davidson, \textit{Old Testament Prophecy}, ed. J. Paterson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905), p. 237.} or does it involve a divinely ordained prefiguration?\footnote{Ansler, "Où en est la typologie," p. 79; idem, "La typologie chez Saint Paul," p. 118; Berkof, p. 145; Davis, p. 39; Ellis, Paul's use of the OT, pp. 127-28; Fairbairn, 1:46; Georges Florovsky, \textit{Revelation and Inspiration}, in Biblical Authority for Today, ed. Alan Richardson and W. Schweizer (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951), p. 175; Joseph S. C. F. Frey, \textit{Course of Lectures on the Scripture Types}, 2 vols. (New York: B. Fanshaw, 1841), 1:173; Galdon, pp. 46-52; Goppelt, \textit{Typos}, pp. 16-19; Terry, p. 337.} The lines of demarcation in this area are not clear-cut. Most recent scholars discuss typology in terms of a consistent, divine activity in historical events so that earlier events "anticipate" later ones in salvation history. This is far different from the traditional understanding of typology in which God not only acts consistently but also has ordained and superintended specific persons/events/institutions to mutually predict the coming of Christ. In typology there is only the consistency of God's actions involved, or is there specific and predictive foreshadowing of one event (especially the Christ-event) by another (especially the OT type)?

\textbf{Historical correspondence.} Most scholars would agree that typology involves a historical correspondence between type and antitype,\footnote{Ansler, "Où en est la typologie," p. 80; idem, "La typologie chez Saint Paul," pp. 119-20; Eichholtz, \textit{EINT}, pp. 225-26; Lampe, \textit{The Reasonableness of Typology}, pp. 29-30; Minear, p. 66.} but Barr and others contend that one cannot really
distinguish between allegory and typology;\textsuperscript{1} i.e., even in allegory there is a kind of historical correspondence, while in typology the correspondence is not always clearly defined. The traditional typologists of the Cocceian mode would agree to the necessity of historical correspondence, but then would proceed to draw external, superficial parallels or resemblances in the most minute details. Where are the controls and limitations here? A. Berker, Nickelsen and Galdon perhaps provide the most thorough and rigorous set of biblical guidelines and illustrations for recognizing real ("essential, metaphysical") typological correspondences.\textsuperscript{2}

Another debated aspect of the historical correspondence regards the historicity of the corresponding events. While traditional typologists would insist on the facticity of both type and antitype, modern proponents within the historical-critical framework no longer require the actual historicity of the single scenes, as long as the truth of the self-revelation of God is manifest.\textsuperscript{3}

**Intensification.** Gottend and others claim that biblical typology involves a steigerung or escalation from the type to the antitype. Baker, however, sees no such necessity in typology.\textsuperscript{4} For Baker, it may simply be exemplary on the same plane, or theoretically the antitype could even be on a lesser plane than the type.

---


\textsuperscript{2} Nickelsen, pp. 236-64; Galdon, pp. 30-32, 36-41. Cf. Fairbairn, 1:175-205.

\textsuperscript{3} E.g., Gottend, "Apokalyptik und Typologie bei Paulus," p. 292.


**Direction of movement.** Gottend and the traditional views of typology characterize typology as prospective, while Baker and most recent proponents insist that it is only retrospective.\textsuperscript{1} Is the typical element already to be found within the context of the historical root event, or is an event, person, or institution only seen to be typical in retrospect after the appearance of the antitype?

**Christocentricity.** The Christocentric character of typology is often emphasized in the literature; but again Baker denies that this aspect is necessary for a true typological correspondence.\textsuperscript{2} Among those who do maintain the essential Christocentric thrust of typology, there is wide disagreement as to what this means. Note, for example, the application of the mark on Cain as a type of the cross in the work of Vischer.\textsuperscript{3} Daniëlou and others point out the many subdivisions of fulfillment in the "total Christ."\textsuperscript{4}

**Salvation history.** Many have noted the heilsgeschichtliche framework of typology,\textsuperscript{5} but few have worked at all with any detailed application of this element to typology. Baker again refuses

---

\textsuperscript{1} Gottend, TONT, B:252; Moorehead, p. 102; Wolff, EORTH, p. 184; contrast Baker, "Typology," p. 149, Coopans, pp. 86-89, and van Ruler, p. 122.

\textsuperscript{2} Amsler, "Où est la typologie," pp. 79-80; Davis, pp. 39, 49; Galdon, pp. 49-52; Lys, pp. 64; contrast Baker, "Typology," p. 151.

\textsuperscript{3} Vischer, pp. 74-76.

\textsuperscript{4} Daniëlou, Origen, pp. 161, 156, 191; cf. Charity, pp. 87, 153; Galdon, pp. 46-50.

\textsuperscript{5} Ellis, p. 128; Idem, Prophecy and Hermeneutic, p. 165; Galdon, pp. 65-69; Gottend, Typos, pp. 25-48; Idem, "Apokalyptik und Typologie bei Paulus," pp. 270, 280, 287; Verhoef, p. 69; Woolcombe, p. 75.
to see the necessity of salvation-historical roots in typology.

System and structure. To what extent is typology a systematic methodology within Scripture? We have on one extreme the full-blown methodology of the medieval Four-fold Sense of Scripture (Quadragesima) applied like a divining rod to all of Scripture to uncover its spiritual meaning. On the other hand, von Rad is convinced that there is not a systematic method at all in biblical typology, but that the various writers carry on their Christo-centric interpretation intuitively, intentionally, and almost randomly: "They rely only on the Spirit of the resurrected One, who interprets the Scripture for them with sovereign power." Only a few modern scholars are willing to speak of some kind of method or structure in Scriptural typology.

To what degree is there an order and consistency behind (or underlying) biblical typology? Do the applications of the same OT type to various stages in salvation history follow any orderly structural pattern? If so, is this pattern properly explained by such attempts as the apologetic, or flowering.


2See above, pp. 25-27.


4Feuken, p. 40; Wolff, ETH, pp. 281-91; Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 228; cf. Charles H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures: the Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology (London: Nisbet, 1952), p. 126 (though Dodd does not use the word 'typology').

principle of multiple applications within typology—must we go elsewhere for the solution?

Horizontal and vertical. The issue of the relationship between horizontal (or historical) and vertical (earthly, heavenly) typology in Scripture calls for further attention. Modern studies of biblical typology have concentrated on horizontal typology and completely ignored the vertical typological patterns. Only a few notes concerning vertical typology can be found scattered throughout the literature, with the exception of specific studies on the book of Hebrews, where discussion of vertical typology is rarely avoided.

What is the relationship of vertical and horizontal typology? Goppelt downplays the significance of vertical typology in Hebrews, regarding it only as an aid to the better expounding of horizontal typology. Since for Goppelt vertical typology is a vestige of ancient Near Eastern mythical thinking, it could not


3Goppelt, TDNT, 8:258-59.
have been given any substantial place in Judeo-Christian thinking without swallowing up the salvation-historical perspective. But does Goppelt's analysis do justice to the witness of Scripture? And does the contention of noted commentators on Hebrews—that the vertical typology is borrowed from Philonic speculations—hold any weight? Several recent studies on Hebrews have concluded that vertical typology plays an integral, if not predominant, role in the typology of Hebrews and is not a foreign, Philonic influence imported into Christianity.

Relations to Other Modes of Expression

Prophecy. Fairbairn, Ellis, and many others view typology as a mute species of prophecy, while Ansler, Baker and others draw a sharp distinction. Daniélou seems to subsume prophecy under typology when he writes that “prophecy is the typological interpretation of history.”

Allegory. There is considerable debate whether allegory is ever used in Scripture, and much literature attempting to

1 For a summary of the debate, including major proponents of Philonic speculation in Hebrews, see especially Ronald William, Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970); cf. the discussion below, pp. 338-42.


4 Daniélou, Shadous, p. 157.

define the differences between allegory and typology (or denying the possibility of such distinctions, in the case of Barr and others). 2

Symbolism. Milton S. Terry and Bernard Ramm distinguish between a symbol—a “timeless figurative representation,” and a type—a “figure or adumbration of that which is to come.” Symbols are objects expressing general truth, while types express relationships between historical facts. However, this distinction is blurred in the religionswissenschaftliche investigation of Mircea Eliade, and even traditional typologists tend to visualize

1 By those who make a distinction between allegory and typology (and this is the majority of modern scholars), allegory involves an arbitrary assigning of externally imposed meaning to the words of Scripture, which meaning is foreign to the ideas conveyed by the words, and often disregards the historical sense of the passage. For further discussion, see Ansler, L'Ancien Testament, pp. 184-72 (portions translated in Lyc., pp. 62-69); Anderson, pp. 178-80; Cope, pp. 18-19; Oscar Cullmann, Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History, 3rd ed., trans. Floyd Filson (London: SCM Press, 1962); passim; Daniélou, “The Fathers and the Scriptures,” pp. 84-85; Dentan, pp. 15-17; Downey, p. 15; Eichrodt, pp. 227-28; Foulkes, pp. 35-38; France, Jesus and the OT, p. 40; Fritsch, “Typology,” pp. 216-17; Galdon, pp. 32-38; J. Gerhard (classical distinction in 1782, quoted in Goppelt, Typos, p. 8; von Rad, EOTH, p. 21; Ellis, Paul's Use of the OT, p. 127; and Lucas, p. 29); Goppelt, Typos, p. 19; Hanson, Allegory and Event, p. 22; Lampe, “The Reusability of Typology,” pp. 33-35; Lyc., pp. 59, 74; Mckie, pp. 251-271; Ramm, pp. 221-27; Rex, p. 18; Richardson, “The Rise of Modern Scholarship,” p. 336; Wolff, EOTH, pp. 188-89; Woollcombe, p. 41.

2 Barr, pp. 103-48; cf. the hesitancy to distinguish between the two in de Lubac, 1:180-225; Haag, pp. 245-47; Grant, The Letter and Spirit, p. 136; Jewett, pp. 1-29; Lucas, p. 29.

3 Terry, p. 266; Ramm, p. 233.

symbols and types together as virtually synonymous. J. Barton Payne and Geerhardus Vos insist that a genuine type must have originally been symbolic. Can a symbol, even if essentially different from a type, ever become also typical if used in a pre-figuration context?

Paraenesis. Eichrodt makes a distinction between typology, which involves an intensification from type to antitype, and paraenesis, which is advice or warning using some example as a model of behavior with no higher correspondence. Baker, who defines typology in terms of "pattern" or "example" to start with, would apparently reject such differentiation.

Metaphors and/or other literary allusions. Goppelt remarks that the typological way of thinking in the NT involves "hidden allusions" as well as explicit citations or references. Others would like to restrict typology to a much smaller compass within Scripture.

---

2. Payne, Biblical Prophecy, p. 52, following Vos, p. 162.
3. Eichrodt, EUTH, pp. 228-29.
4. Baker, Typology, p. 152. For Baker, since typology is essentially exemplary, the supreme "type" is not of Christ, but in Jesus Christ Himself (ibid., p. 157).
5. Goppelt, TUNT, 8:255. Cf. the various studies on typological motifs in the OT and NT, most of which illustrate the "hidden" typological allusions in Scripture.
6. See A. T. Hanson, Jesus Christ in the OT, p. 53: the adherents to the view of Bishop Marsh would also tend to reject "hidden allusions" to typology. See also the extremely narrow limitations of Friederichsen, discussed above, p. 47.

---

Prometh/fulfillment. This category is related to that of prophecy, which we mentioned above, depending upon how broadly prophecy is defined (as only prediction/promise, or as all of divine revelation proclaimed by the prophet). Gerhard F. Hasel portrays typology and promise/fulfillment as two of several links between the OT and the NT. What is the relationship between these two links—parallel but separate, one subordinate to the other, mutual identification, interdependence, or no connection?

Salvation history. We have discussed this briefly above as a possible integral part (or framework) for typology. Oscar Cullmann and others have defined the relationship of Heilsgeschichte to typology, but detailed analysis of the interconnection between the two appears to be lacking in the literature.

Sensus plenior. The literature continues to expand on the senses plenier (fuller, or deeper sense) of Scripture, particularly in Roman Catholic circles, and much remains to be clarified how this

---

3. See above, pp. 97-98.
fuller sense relates to typology. Raymond E. Brown, a dominant
voice in the discussion, distinguishes between the deeper meaning
(i.e., the meaning intended by God that transcends the human
author’s intent) of the words of Scripture (sensus plenior) and
the deeper meaning of the things of Scripture (typology), while
others refuse to recognize such a distinction.1

Relations to Modern Hermeneutical Methods

Grammatical-historical exegesis. Lampe, Woolcombe,
Eichrodt, and a few others insist that typology is a legitimate
part of exegesis,2 while Baker, Goppelt, von Rad, and a host of
others call typology an application of Scripture but not exegesis
proper.3

“Literary patternism” and “typological criticism” (early
Redaktionsgeschichte). Farrer’s monographs on the Gospel of
Mark1 and the Apocalypse2 employ a literary-critical method that
is sometimes described as “literary patternism.”3 Farrer himself
seems to make no distinction between this and prefiguration or
typology,4 but Peter R. Jones points to a basic difference be-
tween the two: “Literary patternism deals with the fact of
literary recurrences while typological exegesis concerns the
recurring rhythms of divine activity.”5 Jones seeks to popular-
ize this term “patternism” as a terminus technicus within NT
scholarship, distinct from theological-historical typology.

Michael D. Goulder illustrates literary patternism (which
he terms “typological criticism”)6 in his interpretation of the
book of Acts. He contends that the author of Acts creativ-
ately (i.e., not necessarily according to the way it actually happened)
formulated the account in Acts to fit a literary schema borrowed
from the OT. We must ask to what extent there exists in Scripture
this kind of typology involving a departure from factual data (on
the part of the redactor) in order to erect a structure of liter-
ary recurrences.

1Austin M. Farrer, A Study in St. Mark (New York: Oxford
University Press, 1952).


3This is a term Farrer himself uses, St. Mark, pp. 31-35;
see below, n. 5, for Peter R. Jones’ specialized employment of
this term.

4Farrer, St. Mark, pp. 31-35, 149-52.

5Peter R. Jones, “A Critique of Patternism as a Homemoeutical
Method” (Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,

Traditions geschichte. von Rad skillfully combines his tradition-historical perspective with a description of typology, as detailed above. Several NT typological studies have also been conducted from a traditiongeschichtliche stance. To what extent are these analyses of typology faithful to the intention of the biblical text?

Structuralism. We have not yet seen an explicit mention of typology within biblical studies conducted according to the principles of structuralism. Yet the possibility of typology as an inherent deep-structure may eventually be argued. von Rad, though by no means a modern structuralist, may point in this direction when he discusses typology in terms of 'man's universal effort to understand the phenomena about him on the basis of concrete...

1 See above, pp. 60-64.

Is typological thinking part of a universal deep-structure in man's mind?

Origin

Several possible origins have been defended. Bultmann sees all typology as part of ancient Near Eastern cyclical or mythical thinking, while Goppelt agrees with the mythical origin for vertical typology but denies it for historical (horizontal) typology. Goppelt argues that horizontal typology can only be found in the biblical sphere of literature—that it is unknown elsewhere. He and many others find its first use in the OT, with the first usage of ῥυθμός as a hermeneutical term in Paul. Daniel Patte suggests that "the origin of any typological interpretation of Scripture is to be found in the Dead Sea Scrolls." von Rad argues that the...

1 Von Rad, OT, 2:364.
3 Goppelt, TNT, 8:253-59. 4 Ibid.
5 Goppelt, TNT, 8:253-59. 6 Ibid.
6 Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutics, p. 293. Patte, ibid., pp. 67-74; 293, does allow for an embryonic form of typology in the Synagogal use of Scripture (the "telescoping of elements of Scripture around a limited number of events of sacred history), but he emphasizes that "this is not a typological interpretation" (ibid., p. 73, italics his). He also points out (ibid., pp. 76-81) a "more" (but not actual) typology in the targumic literature. For further discussion of Patte's view, see above, p. 18, n. 2.
origin is in the universal human way of thinking in terms of concrete analogies, as we have just noted above. Did typology therefore originate in a universal deep-structure? Or is it something unique to Israel, but still on a human plane? Or is it a divinely given prefiguration impossible for man to devise without direct revelation?

**Scope**

Von Rad, Baker, and Johannes Sailer represent those who maintain that an unlimited number of types exist in Scripture. Typology is said to exist everywhere that a correspondence can be discovered within the divine revelation in history.

Coccuelus represents a different school of interpretation, the "allegorical" typologists, who find types almost everywhere by drawing multitudinous parallels between superficial and often trivial details. The scope of typology seems as broad as the imagination is fertile and the imagery is suggestive.

Goppelt does not insist on an unlimited number of NT types, yet he maintains that typology is the dominant NT way of understanding Scripture. Likewise for Daniélou, typology provides the fundamental perspective of the NT, and Grant concurs that the

1 Von Rad, *God*, pp. 36-37; Baker, "Typology," p. 151; Sailer, pp. 490-95; Sehlin, p. 94.

2 Above, pp. 33-36; Origen, Ambrose, Jerome, and most of the early Church and medieval interpreters would fall into this category, with the possible exception of the Antiochene school of exegesis. See above, p. 46, for examples of twelfth-century proponents of this mode.


"NT method of interpreting the OT was generally typology." At the other extreme, Anthony T. Hanson believes that "the real presence of the pre-existent Jesus" best explains most of what has usually been regarded as typology. Thus there are a very limited number of types in Scripture. Bishop Marsh's school of interpretation, as we have already noted, holds that only those types are legitimate which are explicitly pointed out in the NT record. Friederichsen goes even further and limits genuine types to the Mosaic worship system and antitypes to Christ in his soteriological aspect.

In the middle of the spectrum stands the view represented by Fairbairn: more types exist in Scripture than are explicitly cited as such, but those additional typological passages must be identified via sound hermeneutical principles set forth in Scripture.

**Contemporary Relevance**

Again we have the varying shades of opinion represented. Bultmann, Lucas, Baungärtel, Murphy, and Haag are among those who see no relevance for typology in modern attempts to define the relationship between the OT and NT. Goulder, on the other hand,
finds typology to be "the golden key that unlocks many a problem
door" of Scripture.¹ Goppelt, Wright, Ellis, and Wolff represent
those who view typology as crucial to an understanding of the
biblical perspective, and therefore of clear contemporary relevance
to OT and NT scholarship.²

There are a host of authors who recognize the importance
of typology as one of several ways of viewing the relation of OT
and NT. Gerhard F. Hasel, for example, regards typology as "in-
dispensable for an adequate methodology that attempts to come to
grips with the historical context of the OT and its relationship
to the NT," but he cautions against making it the central or
dominant category.³ Instead it is seen as an integral part of a
multiplex approach (along with such links as salvation history,
promise/fulfillment, common theological key terms and major
themes, Scripture quotations) in dealing with the interrelationship
between the Testaments.⁴ In a similar vein, Eichrodt describes
typology as playing "only an ancillary part" in exegesis, but still
within this ancillary position it is not to be considered "unworthy
of appropriate exegesis."⁵

Summary and Conclusions
Several leading twentieth-century trends have emerged from
our literature survey. Within certain conservative circles the
traditional views of biblical typology developed in previous
centuries still continue to be advocated. According to the
traditional understanding, biblical typology refers to the study
of divinely ordained, detailed OT predictive prefigurations of
Jesus Christ and Gospel realities brought about by him. Three
main traditional modes may be distinguished. The Cessian mode
operates with little or no hermeneutical controls and tends to
posit typological correspondences where there is even the slightest
resemblance between OT and NT realities. At the other extre-
me, the Marshian mode maintains that the only true types are
those explicitly confirmed in the NT. A mediating position, re-
presented in the classical nineteenth-century work of Fairbairn,
espouses a hermeneutically controlled typology.

The traditional views of typology have been generally dis-
credited within modern critical scholarship. Throughout the latter
nineteenth and early twentieth centuries typology was considered
by most critical scholars as a relic of the past, no longer
acceptable or relevant within the modern world view. But in
recent decades an amazing instauration of interest in typology has
occurred among noted advocates of the historical-critical method
within the Biblical Theology Movement. The "post-critical neo-
typology" is not, however, a return to the traditional views. It
is based upon a different understanding of history and revelation
which has little room for the predictive element. Typology is

¹Gould, p. 1.
²Goppelt, TDNT, 8:255-56; Wright, p. 51; Ellis, Prophecy
and Hermeneutics, p. 155; Wolff, EOTH, p. 181.
³Hasel, Old Testament Theology, p. 126.
⁴Ibid., pp. 117-27.
⁵Ibid., EOTH, p. 245.
viewed as a common human way of thinking in terms of concrete analogies which in Scripture (and in modern typological interpretation) involves the retrospective recognition of God's consistent
"revelation in history." Two main emphases may be distinguished. An English tradition, represented by Lampe and Woolcombe, stresses the "recurring rhythm" of God's saving activity, while a German tradition, represented by von Rad, points to an unlimited number of "structural analogies" within tradition history.

The revival of typological interpretation within critical scholarship has sparked a host of review articles and numerous biblical studies dealing with aspects of typology in the OT and NT. Interest in the subject has also been generated in such disciplines as systematic and dogmatic theology, church history, art and architecture, and literary criticism. At the same time, the modern use of typology has raised a wave of protest among a number of critical scholars. Especially since about 1960 a growing number of reservations have been expressed concerning the unity of Scripture and the primacy of "revelation in history"—which concepts form the basis for the modern understanding of typology. Although studies have continued to focus upon the use of typology in Scripture, much less interest has been shown in validating contemporary typological interpretation.

Despite the prodigious amount of literature on the subject of biblical typology that has appeared in previous centuries, and particularly in recent decades, still almost every area of typological interpretation is as yet unsettled. Even among the representatives of the various trends that have just been outlined,

there is an almost bewildering disparity of opinions on many of the crucial issues. These include such aspects as terminology, definition, characteristics, relation to other modes of expression in Scripture, origin, scope, and contemporary relevance.

The primary question concerns the nature of biblical typology. Only as the inherent structures of biblical typology are ascertained can other issues be addressed. Many proposed definitions and lists of characteristics have been forthcoming in the literature, but none of these studies has really allowed the structures of typology to emerge from within Scripture. A solid semasiological and exegetical foundation for understanding the nature of typology has never been laid.

Our review of literature points to the necessity of a method which analyzes the structures of typology within Scripture rather than imposing an a priori definition of typology upon Scripture from the outside. The methodology set forth in the introduction of the present study appears to be the most adequate procedure to meet this need.

Since the subject is biblical typology—the study of biblical "types" or τύποι—a preliminary terminological control appears to be available in the word τύπος (or cognate). A semasiological investigation of τύπος and NT cognates is required to reveal the overall semantic range of these terms and their breadth of significatio in the various biblical occurrences. In order to understand the nature of typology as a hermeneutical approach of the biblical writers, special attention must be focused upon hermeneutical τύπος passages, i.e., passages in which
rōmos (or cognate) occurs and which involve the interpretation of the OT. Analysis of the passages in which rōmos (or cognate) is used as a hermeneutical term may be expected to reveal the fundamental conceptual structures involved in the typological interpretation of the OT.

On the basis of these emergent structures the fundamental characteristics of biblical typology may be enumerated and a tentative definition formulated. The validity of the various views of typology surveyed in this literature review may then be assessed. We are then also prepared to point the way toward possible future study of typological structures in other Scripture passages where rōmos (or cognate) does not occur.

In harmony with the methodology that has been outlined, we turn our attention in the next chapter to a semasiological investigation of the word rōmos and biblical cognates. The third chapter is devoted to analysis of NT homoeotematic rōmos passages in order to ascertain the basic conceptual structures of biblical typology and frame a tentative definition. The conclusion seeks to synthesize the data of previous chapters, explore the implications in regard to issues in the recent debate over typology, and suggest areas for further study.

CHAPTER II

A SEMASIOLIGICAL INVESTIGATION OF RŌMOS AND BIBLICAL COGNATES

Although significant lexical and etymological studies of rōmos and biblical cognates have been conducted in recent decades, a number of crucial areas call for further attention. Of particular concern for the present study, we note that no thorough semasiological analysis of rōmos and cognates in NT passages has yet appeared. We must therefore examine the biblical usages of these terms in considerable detail. As explained in our statement


2 Even the more complete studies of Göppelt and Müller (in TDNT and NIJDNT, respectively) make only passing reference to many NT occurrences of rōmos and cognates. Semasiological conclusions are often set forth without substantiation.
of methodology in the introduction of this dissertation, hermeneutical rókos passages are first singled out for further investigation later in the study.

The semasiological analysis of the biblical occurrences of rókos and cognates must be undertaken in the light of the origin and history of these terms up to and including NT times. We then provide a summary of this semasiological data, entering into dialogue and advancing our own considerations based upon independent study.

Special contributions are made in several key areas. It is noted that previous studies have generally failed to elucidate the semantic range of rókos and biblical cognates by means of adequate illustrations from Greek literature. Furthermore, it is seen that no attempt has been made to place the semantic range of rókos in the larger perspective of other Greek terms whose semantic ranges overlap that of rókos and biblical cognates. In the present chapter we attempt to remedy these deficiencies of previous investigations. We also suggest the necessity of positing an additional basic meaning for the term rókos. This meaning, which has been largely disregarded in recent literature, proves to be of crucial importance in delineating the breadth of significance of rókos and cognates in many NT occurrences.

**Etymology**

**Derivation and Semantic Development**

The general consensus of lexicographers is that rókos derives from the verb ró pou "to strike." At least one time in early secular Greek usage, the word rókos seems to retain the sense of "blow." But apparently at a very early stage rókos already

---


Müller, NICNT, 3:903, agrees that this can be the original derivation but does not commit himself.

Blumenthal, pp. 391-410, advances the alternative hypothesis that rókos and its denominative tókos comprise a separate word-group, unrelated to rókos. However, other words in the tókos word-group seem to strongly support the tie with tókos because of meanings closely related to "strike":

- tókos, tókastos, õtopos -- malice, hammer
- tókastos, õtopos -- blow, wound
- stókastos, õtopos -- striker
- tókos, õtopos -- beating of the breast
- tókos, õtopos -- beating of the breast
- tókos, õtopos -- hampered, wrought
- tókos, õtopos -- to strike against
- tókastos, õtopos -- counterblow

Blumenthal has not presented a convincing case for a separate word-group.

2Herodotus 1. 67. 4 (LCL, 1:80-81) quotes an ancient retrospective formula. The oracle states that Orestes' bones would be found where rókos àúreukos, õtopos àúreukos "shock makes answer to shock, and anguish is laid upon anguish." Since the bones were found in the courtyard of a blacksmith, Herodotus concludes that the rókos àúreukos refers to the anvil and hammer, and the anguish laid upon anguish is the forged iron (Herodotus 1. 68. 4). Most lexicographers concur that rókos here preserves the significance of "blow" or "shock" (so the lexicoographers mentioned in the previous footnote, along with Stephanus, 7:2556, and Moulton and Milligan, p. 645).

Blumenthal, pp. 391-93 [followed by DeBoer, pp. 17-18], on the contrary, contends that even here the signification is "form," and that the original Greek text must have been rókos àúreukos, not rókos àúreukos. But it does not appear necessary for one to reject any connection between rókos and tókos, nor to posit a corruption of the Greek text, in order to maintain the general signification and order of development that Blumenthal suggests. It seems much
emphasized the basic idea of "form" (i.e., the result of the blow or pressure and/or that which gives the blow or impression), while the feminine ῥόανθος emphasized the signification of "blow." Albrecht von Blumenthal provides evidence that the earliest kind of "form" in view was a "hollow form" or "mold." This meaning is consonant with that of the verb ῥάῳδα ("to impress a form") and other denominatives of ῥόανθος. Blumenthal has traced the etymology of ῥόανθος from "hollow mold" through various stages of development. Akira Takamori similarly analyzes the development of semantic richness in ῥόανθος, from its pre-Septuagintic orientation toward the physical, graphic aspects related to "form," on to wider, more abstract connotations beginning especially with Plato. These studies show how more consonant with the immediate context of this oracle, and with the cognates in the ῥόανθος word-group, to grant an archaic signification of "blow" for ῥόανθος, but also recognize that very early the specialized development related to the denominative ῥάῳδα ("to impress a form") occurred, eclipsing the signification "blow."

Blumenthal, p. 395, concludes that the "ursprüngliche Bedeutung" is ῥίππος (hollow mold), probably first as a ῥίπτος (bread mold). As we have already seen, Blumenthal does not allow for an earlier meaning connected with ῥάῳδα. We are persuaded, however, that the meaning "blow" can be accepted, while at the same time following Blumenthal's basic order of etymological development from the idea of "hollow form" or "mold." Müller, p. 390-4, e.g., accepts the possibility of "blow" in Hesiodus, but otherwise the "original meaning of form, and in particular, a (hollow) mold."

2 See below, pp. 132-33.

3 Blumenthal, pp. 391-410 (cf. the English summary in De Boer, pp. 17-19), suggests the following progression of development: (1) "hollow mold [Hohlform]" = (2) "relic [Relikto]" = (3) "impression [Abdruck]" = (4) "copy, image [Abbildung]" = (5) "deformity, [Verformung]." Coarse shape (ungeschlossene Gestalt) = "relic outline [plastische Skizze] used as a pattern or model" = (6) "typical [Typisch]," "inexact [unscharf]," "general form, type [allgemeine form, typus]."

4 Takamori, pp. 3-8. It is pointed out by Takamori that a

rício is a term that seemed ever to increase its potential for expressiveness, without discarding its earlier semantic possibilities.

It is not essential for our purposes to chronicle the debate over the precise order of etymological development for rício, inasmuch as the various significations, once developed, apparently remained in current usage throughout the time of the LXX translation and the production of the NT.

Semantic Range

Goppelt has correctly spoken of the "astonishing number" of meanings represented by the Greek term rício. Some ten different major categories of signification may be listed, with a crucial contribution of Plato lies in his expanding of the nuance of rício as "sketch, outline" to a significantly larger semantic range. From the concrete concept of sketch or outline, Plato, followed by Aristotle, came to view rício as signifying an unfinished, preparatory, or preliminary (i.e., still only a sketch or outline) disclosure of a thing. See the examples, below, p. 126, n. 2. Takamori is convinced that this usage inaugurated an important aspect of the etymology of rício and prepared the way for a specialized usage in the literature of late Judaism and Christianity.

The archaic meaning "blow," as noted at the beginning of our discussion (above, p. 117), is the one exception to the general continuance of earlier meanings. The various lexicographers listed above, p. 117, n. 1, show how the earlier meanings continued.

Because of our interest in determining the usage of rício in the biblical material, we should clarify at this point that certain developments in the etymology of the word do not seem to have taken place until the second century A.D. Takamori (p. 7) lists the following meanings that arose following the first century A.D., and therefore would not be likely to occur within the spectrum of biblical usage: (1) "general grundsätzliche Abdruck des Schriftstückes, 2. Grundzüge des Verfahrens, 3. Entscheidung über grundlegende Bedeutung, a) kaiserliches Verfahren und b) Schiedsspruch."

3 Goppelt, TDNT, 8:247.
host of further subdivisions within these general headings. Many lexicographers have noted this breadth of semantic range, but they have generally failed to adequately elucidate the various meanings from secular Greek literature. Illustrations of the overall semantic range of τόκος, even where provided, have not usually been cited with sufficient context so that the various significations may become evident from the quotation. Nor has there been any effort to provide a larger perspective by revealing how the different meanings of τόκος overlap with the semantic range of other Greek words. These deficiencies we attempt to remedy in connection with the discussion that follows.

We have already referred to the archaic meaning of τόκος, i.e., "blow." A second class of significations can be grouped together under the heading "the effect of a blow or of pressure." This involves such meanings as "impression" (of a seal), "stamp." 2

1 Liddell-Scott-Jones, p. 1036, appear to provide the most comprehensive and accurate listing. The general outline of Liddell-Scott-Jones is employed in the discussion that follows.

2 This material is placed in the footnotes so as not to interrupt the flow of thought in the text.

3 Herodotus (ca. 464-425 B.C.) I, 67. 4. (see above, p. 117, n. 2). Note the following words with overlapping semantic range at this point: σαρκός, ἡ "blow, stroke, stripe," τόκος, ἄτοκος, τὸ ("blow, stroke, stripe"); σαρκός, ἡ ("blow"). In the following illustrations from secular Greek literature, italics are supplied to highlight the various significations.

4 Eratosthenes (390-346 B.C.) Hippolytus 862 (LCL, 4:239-31): "Lo, how the impress [τόκος] of the carbary gold, of her that is no more smiles up at me!"

Plato Theaetetus 192a (LCL, 2, 186-87): "It is impossible for anyone to think that one thing which he knows and which he has received a memorial imprint [τόκος] in his soul, but which he does not perceive, is another thing which he knows and which also he has an impress [τόκος], and which he does not perceive.

(on a coin, branding-iron, etc.), and "impress" (of foot, arm, teeth, etc.). 2 Tόκος is also used in a more technical sense

Plato Theaetetus 194b (LCL, 2:194-95): "... it is precisely in relation to things which we know and perceive that opinion burns and twists, becoming false and true-true when it puts the proper impress [τόκος] and seal [τόκος], fairly and squarely upon one another, and false when it applies them sideways and aslant."

Plato Republica 378b (LCL, pp. 176-7): "Do you not know, then, that the beginning in every task is the chief thing, especially for any creature that is young and tender? For it is then that it is most modelled [ἀφήνεται] and takes the impression [τόκος] that one wishes to stamp upon it."

Note the following Greek words whose semantic ranges overlap that of τόκος at this point: (1) ἅρματος, ἱδ-, seal-impression; (from ἀρματός); (2) ἁρματος, τόκος, a mark, sign, or token by which something is known; a trace, track; a seal. Related to ἁρματος "to mark": (3) ἄρματος, ἱδ- (a) impress, stamp, reproduction (that which is cut in or marked); (b) characteristic, distinctive mark, character; (c) likeness, image, exact representation. Derived from ἁρματος "to cut to a point, notch, indent.

Lucianus (120-180 A.D.) Ouromode historia conscribenda sit 10 (LCL, 56:16-17): "... they test each expression as a money-changer, rejecting at once what is false but accepting current coin that is legal tender and correctly minted [καὶ ἀρμάτως, τόκος]; 16cm. Panoptum 46 (LCL, 170-68): "... let him bear his mantle, cut off his beard close to the skin with goate-shears, and stamp or brand a mark on his forehead, between the eyebrows; let the pattern [τόκος] of the brand be a fox or an ape. Cf. Hero (2nd cent. B.C.) Menamouth 56.

Note the following substantives whose semantic ranges overlap that of τόκος at this point: (1) ἁρματος, ἱδ- (that which is struck or cut, the stamp or impression of a coin. Derived from ἁρματος "to smile, cut (off), stamp, coin, etc."); (2) ἁρματος, τόκος -brand. Cf. ἁρματος "to brand": (3) ἄρματος, ἱδ- -brand. Cf. ἁρματος "so burn or beat in.

Plutarch (50-128 A.D.) Vita Peripileae 7/2c (LCL, 9:166-67): "... not to love the mark [τόκος] of a pot in the ashes where they are boiled, but to stir them up; ibid., 92b (LCL, 12:456-59): "When she [the female tortoise] has buried and concealed them [her eggs] securely, some say that she scratches and scribbles the place with her feet, making it easy for her to recognize; others affirm that it is because she has been turned on her back by the male that she leaves peculiar marks [τόκος] and impressions [ἀρματος]."

within Epicurean philosophy for the impression that visible objects make upon the air. Further meanings fall under this general heading as effects of a blow or of pressure: "hollow mold or matrix" (used for making images of metal, clay, wax, etc., or for shaping fruit while growing on the tree); "die" (for casting).

Hector's goodly arm / Safe; shine heroic warder hast thou lost! / How dear his imprint [tē拱] on thine handle lies!" Aeneas (2nd-3rd cent. A.D.) Epitome 11. 586c [LCL 6:154-55]. "It being summer, he [a man who had been flogged] lay down stripped so that she [cellistion, the gym woman] saw the marks [tē拱 tīloc] of flogging, and asked, "How did you get these, you poor wretch?"

Note the following Greek words whose semantic ranges coincide with that of tē拱 at this point: (1) αυχετήραι, α- (αι 2a above); (2) δειμαρχηρία, α- (a) a subscription, signature: an indictment; (b) an impression, mark, print, (c) sketch, design, outline. Cf. αυχετήρια; (3) αυχετικόν, αως, α- any mark impressed; (4) αψίδη, α- any arch, mark, token, omen, portent.

1Epicurus (340-270 B.C.) quoted in Diogenes Laertius 10. 45 (LCL 2:574-75): "Again, there are outlines or films [tē拱], which are of the same shape as solid bodies, but of a thinness far exceeding that of any object that we see. For it is not possible that there should be found in the surrounding air combinations of this kind, materials adapted for expressing the hollowness and thinness of surfaces, and effluxes preserving the same relative position and motion which they had in the solid objects from which they came. To these films [tē拱] we give the name of 'images' or 'shadows.'" Ibid. 10. 49 (LCL 2:578-79): "...external things... stamp on us their own nature of colour and form... by the entrance into our eyes or minds, to whatever their size is, of certain films [τιχλοι] coming from the things themselves, these films or outlines [English words supplied] being of the same colour and shape as the external things themselves.

2Dion Chrysostomus (c. 40-120 A.D.) Orations 12. 44 (LCL 2:48-49): "... by the casting of bronze and the like precious metals, which are heated and then either beaten out or poured into moulds [τηροις]." Ibid. 60. 9 (LCL 4:459-61): "...for those craftsmen produce a mould [τηρος], and whatever clay they put into this they render like to the mould [τηρειν γράφειν] in form." Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) De partibus animalium 4. 1. 676-b 10: "...the space of them [the viscera of snakes] is fashioned, as though in a mould [τηρος], on account of the space available for them.

3Herodotus 2. 85 (LCL 1:370-71): "These [the embalmers] make a hollow wooden figure like a man [τήρον τοιούτου δάστριασκα] in which they inclose the corpse, shut it up, and preserve it safe in a coffin-chamber, placed erect against a wall." For the fruit-growers' "mold" see Georgic 10. 9. 3.

A third general signification of τήρος is that of a "cast or replica made in a mold." Related to this is a fourth meaning, "figure worked in relief" (made by molding, modelling, or sculpture). A fifth denotation of τήρος is "carved figure, coffin-chamber, placed erect against a wall." For the fruit-growers' "mold" see Georgic 10. 9. 3.

Compare the following words whose semantic ranges overlap with τήρος at this point: (1) καλλιστος, τή- (a) a subscription, signature: an indictment; (b) an impression, mark, print, (c) sketch, design, outline. Cf. καλλιστήρια; (2) καλλιστος, δ- (a) a subscription, signature: an indictment; (b) an impression, mark, print, (c) sketch, design, outline. Cf. καλλιστήρια; (3) καλλιστικόν, καλλί- (a) a subscription, signature: an indictment; (b) an impression, mark, print, (c) sketch, design, outline. Cf. καλλιστικήρια; (4) καλλιστηρία, καλλί- any arch, mark, token, omen, portent.

3Plutarch [Vitae parallelae] Alexander 17. 2 (LCL 7:270-71): "Now, there is in Lycaea, near the city of Xanthus, a spring, which at this time, as we are told, was of its own motion upheaved from its depths, and overflowed, and cast forth a bronze tablet bearing the signs of ancient letters, in which it was made known that the empire of the Persians would one day be destroyed by the Greeks and come to an end.

Plato Phaedrus 275a (LCL 1:562-63): "Their trust in writing, produced by the external characters [τεταμενον επιγραμμα] which are no part of themselves, will discourage the use of their own memory within them.

An example of another Greek word coinciding with this meaning of τήρος is καλλιστος, a- "engraving," from καλλίς "to hollow out, engrave, or carve."

3Inscriptions Graecae (ed. J. Kirchner, 1913) 1. 534. 64: τήρος σφαιρας. Ibid. 1. 534. 87: τήρος γραμματος. Note the overlapping semantic range in τήρος, σφαιρας, σφαιρας, το- "anything moulded or modelled (in clay, wax): an image, figure.

4Herodotus 2. 105 (LCL 1:399-95): "... else there are in Ionia two figures [τηρος] of this man carved in rock." Ibid. 2:148 (LCL 1:396-97): "... the walls are covered with carved figures [τηρος], ibid. 2:153 (LCL 1:464-65): "... this court has an inner colonnade all around it and many carved figures [τηρος]." For words with overlapping semantic ranges. See p. 124, n. 1.
A sixth category of τόσος significations revolves around the idea of form or shape. Various subdivisions include the following: "form, shape, features;" "thing having a shape;" "form of expression, style;" and "(grammatical) mode of formation, form." A seventh category involves the following meanings: "archetype, pattern, model, capable of exact repetition in numerous instances;" "character recognizable in a number of instances, general character, type;" "to see;" "to compare;" "to liken, make like;" "to copy;" "to portray, copy;" "to imitate, copy;" "to give a style of writing (on waxen tablets) and ἀναγγελλων "a way of speaking, diction, style;" "patterns or models (τούς συγγράμματα) of right speech about the gods."

Note the following Greek words whose semantic ranges overlap that of τόσος: (1) εἰκόνα, ἴδιον, ὁ- (a) form, outward appearance; (b) form, particular; (c) particular state or plan of action. For example, εἰκόνα refers to a representation or imitation of something, while ἴδιον denotes a characteristic or distinctive feature.

"to see;" "to compare;" "to liken, make like;" "to copy;" "to portray, copy;" "to imitate, copy;" "to give a style of writing (on waxen tablets) and ἀναγγελλων "a way of speaking, diction, style;" "patterns or models (τούς συγγράμματα) of right speech about the gods."

Note the following Greek words whose semantic ranges overlap that of τόσος: (1) εἰκόνα, ἴδιον, ὁ- (a) form, outward appearance; (b) form, particular; (c) particular state or plan of action. For example, εἰκόνα refers to a representation or imitation of something, while ἴδιον denotes a characteristic or distinctive feature.
A ninth category of ἔνσεις significations encompasses the following meanings: "prescribed form, model to be imitated:"

"general instruction, general principle (or law), rule of life or religion;"2 "rough draft (of a book), draft (of an official letter),"

Plato _Leges_ 7, 803e (LCL, 10:54-55): "By means of what kinds of song and dance both those aims may be affected—this has been, in part, stated in outline [ἐν ἔνσειν]." _Ibid_. _Philolaus_ 32b (LCL, 3:272-73): "Let us accept that; for it seems to me to be true in its general lines." _Ibid_. _Protagoras_ 346d (LCL, 4:200-1): "There are many points in the various expressions of the poem which might be insinuated to show its fine composition, for it is a work of very elegant and elaborate art; but it would take too long to detail all its beauty. However, let us go over its general outline [ἐν ἔνσειν] and intention, which is assuredly to refute Pittacus' saying, throughout the ode."

Aristotle _Politics_ 1341b32 (LCL, pp. 688-69): "We will abandon the precise discussion as to each of these matters for any who wish to seek it from us, while for the present let us lay down general principles, merely stating the outlines [ἔνσεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων] of the subjects." _Ibid_. _1323a10_ (LCL, pp. 530-31): "We have now therefore spoken in outline [ἐν ἔνσειν] about almost all the offices of state."

Note the following Greek substantives whose semantic ranges overlap that of ἔνσεις at this point: (a) ἐπότης, ἀ-—a marking round: sketch, outline, impression, print; (b) ἰδεία, ἀ—(see above, p. 120, n. 4); (c) ἀ-—sketch, outline, form, figure. Cr. _Ibid_. _120, n. 4_.

For words with overlapping semantic ranges, see above, p. 120, n. 4, and p. 124, n. 3.

Plato _Respublica_ 403e (LCL, 1:264-5): "Then if we should sufficiently state the mind and turn over to it the minutiae of the care of the body, and content ourselves with merely indicating the norms or patterns [outline, τῶν ἔνσεις], not to make a long story of it, we should be acting rightly?" _Ibid_. _41c_ (LCL, 2:326-32): "Furthermore, said I, all the so-called goods corrupt and divert, beauty and wealth and strength of body and powerful family connections in the city and all things akin to them—you get my general meaning [ἐν ἔνσεις]?" _Ibid_. _414a_ (LCL, 1:300-1): "Such, I said, appears to me, Glaucn, the general notion of our selection and appointment of rulers and guardians as sketched in outline [ἐν ἔνσεις], but not drawn out in detail."

Plato _Leges_ 803c (LCL, 10:55-6): "These dances the laws—every should describe in outline [ἐν ἔνσεις]. . . ." _Ibid_. _718c_ (LCL, 9:300-1): "It is by no means easy to embrace them all in a single model [ἐν ἔνσεις] of statement (so to speak); but let us conceive of them in some such way as this, in case we may succeed in affirming something definite about them."

1. _Polybius_ _The Histories_ 21, 24. 9 (LCL, pp. 284-85):
model of a letter; \(1\) "form" (of a document); \(2\) and "text" (of a document). A post-Hil meaning under this heading is "written decision" (e.g., imperial rescript). \(3\) A tenth category of \(\tau\)σος significations also relates to a later etymological development, in which \(\tau\)σος becomes a legal term for 'summons, writ.'

Basic Meanings

Underlying the multiplicity of meanings represented by

"Having laid down these general principles [τα τοιούτα] for the government of Asia, they dispatched the ten legates there to join Onoeus Muniusculus, the proconsul."

Note the following words whose semantic range approaches that of τοιούτα at this point: (1) ἐδόθος, ἀλ-α (a) 'a placing under, groundwork, foundation;' (b) "hypothesis, supposition;' (c) "that laid down as a rule of action, a principle;' (2) ὑπαίθριος, δια- (a) 'a boundary, limit, frontier;' (b) "rule, standard, limit, measure;' (c) "definition [of a word];' (3) τέκνα, δο- 'model, standard, law, rule, ordinance.' Cf. τέκνα. (4) ὑπαίθριος, δια- (a) "straight rod or bar;' (b) "rule or standard, model.'


For parallels in semantic range, see above, p. 126, n. 2.


4 See e.g., Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVI. 1911. 145 A.D.: και δείκτις τοιούτα εἰς τὴν συγχαρίαν: Cf. ibid., 1829. 2: οἱ τοιούτα τῆς παγοδρίας ("The dispositions of the pagodary").

5 See e.g., Philostratus (2nd-3rd cent. A.D.) Vitae Sophistorum 1. 25. 9: οἱ τοιούτα γραφέντες ἑαυτὸν ἀγάπης, ἔπαινον ὑπερτιμάτων τῷ ὑπερδοκοῦντι.
possibility when he suggests that such meanings as "form," "shape," "general impression," and "outline" may have reference "either to the matrix or to the impression or to both."  

But it seems that neither Woolcombe nor other lexicographers have recognized the scope and significance of this phenomenon. In the case of the significations of "mold" or "die," as we have already noted, both concepts (Nachbild and Vorbild) are implied and could easily be simultaneously emphasized. The same seems likely with other meanings listed by Woolcombe under the category of "matrix," such as "model to be imitated," "pattern," and "model capable of exact repetition in numerous instances."

Epicurus provides us with a lucid example of the Nachbild-Vorbild duality that can be involved in the significations of τόξον. As we have already noted, Epicurus uses τόξον to denote the "outlines or films" which come from solid, external objects, and are of the same color, shape, position, and motion as the solid bodies. Yet they enter into human eyes and minds and "stamp...their own nature." In other words, the τόξον function as Nachbilder of the original bodies, and at the same time perform a vorbildliche function upon the human senses.

Perhaps the clearest instance of this two-fold significations in τόξον is found in Philo. In his exposition of Exod. 25:40, 45

---

1Woolcombe, p. 51. Italics supplied.
2See above, pp. 122-23. 3Woolcombe, p. 51.
4See above, p. 122, n. 1, for full text of this example.
5Cf. Philo Legum allegoriae 3. 102; De vita Mois 2. 74ff., 141; De somnis 1. 205.

(in which passage the LXX uses τόξον to denote the τὸν τόξον shown to Moses on the mount) Philo explicitly draws out the "copy-model" duality of τόξον. The τόξον, according to Philo, is a Vorbild of the μορφή (copy) or oμί (shadow) made by Moses. But it is not itself the original. Rather it is a Nachbild of the ἀρχαῖον (archetype) in the mind of God. Of course, for Philo, the τόξον (which he also calls the ἀρχαῖον elsewhere) is not a tangible model, but an idea transferred by God to the spirit of Moses. But the point I would emphasize here is that for Philo, the word τόξον extends both upward and downward. It partakes both of the quality of Nachbild and Vorbild-Nachbild of the original archetype, Vorbild of the copy made by Moses. As Hermann Müller summarizes regarding this usage of τόξον in Philo, "It [τόξον] is not a special term for model or copy (for which Philo has a sufficient number of other terms), but is rather capable of denoting both at the same time."

Although this dual signification of τόξον is recognized by lexicographers in Philo, it has been generally overlooked as even a possibility in other occurrences of τόξον. In order to rectify this oversight in future analysis, we would posit the necessity of not just two, but three categories of basic meanings for the term τόξον: (1) the matrix or Vorbild, i.e., what leaves its impress; (2) the impression or Nachbild, i.e., the result of the impress or blow, or what is produced by the matrix; and (3) the matrix or Vorbild which is at the same time an impression or Nachbild. As

---

1Müller, NJWNT, 3:904.
we analyze the usage of τυτω in the literature of late Judaism and in the NT, we must be particularly aware of the possible presence of the third basic meaning which has been so widely disregarded in the lexicographical literature. To ascertain the existence of both Hebrew and Verbal dynamics in a given occurrence of τυτω would significantly expand our estimation of the breadth of signification of the term in that occurrence.

Biblical Cognates

Liddell-Scott-Jones examines at least seventy different cognates of τυτω.1 As we have already pointed out, some cognates retain a significance closely related to τυτω "to strike."2 Many of the cognates are grammatical variations of τυτω (verbal denominatives, adjectives, adverbs, substantives) and reflect its multiplexity of significations.3 τυτω and its grammatical variations occur with a number of different prefixed prepositions,4 sometimes for emphasis, but often yielding quite distinct meanings.5

1 Liddell-Scott-Jones, passim. 2See above, p. 117, n. 1.

3 Note the following examples: (verbal denominatives) τυτω to impress, stamp; to form, mold, model; to ordain, decree; to execute in due form; τυτω to form an impression, as in footprints; (adjectives) τυτω to form (see below, p. 134); τυτω, -ς like an outline; general or superficial; τυτω, -ς, -ες "fashioned, molded;" (adverbs) τυτω to form (see above, p. 134); τυτω summarily; (diminutive substantives) τυτω to small figure, image; τυτω to little model; τυτω to small model; (other substantives) τυτω, -ς, -ες to that which is formed or molded; figure, outline; seal impression received in perception; τυτω to form, molding, impression; modelling (as of the fetus); (2) delination, sketching in outline; τυτω, -ς, -ες "one who forms or molds."

4 Note particularly the following examples of distinctive

Our interest is focused particularly upon the three cognates that occur in the NT: ἀντιπω, τυτω (both -56), and ἰδωνω.

In the word ἀντιπω, the force of the etymological derivation from τυτω "to strike" is prominent in both adjective and substantive. The most common usage is related to the basic sense of "strike back"—from the oldest occurrence as part of a refractive formula,1 interpreted by Herodotus as the striking back of the hammer (on the anvil),2 to the throwing back of sound (echo).3 light (reflection),4 sending back (or resisting) of hard objects,5 and finally to the metaphorical meanings "contrary, imical:"

meanings resulting from the prefixed preposition: ἀντιπω "to form over again; to alter the form, transform to figure, or represent to oneself; to imagine;" ἀντιπω to form, frame, figure, or portray; to renew; to represent one's self; to imagine, conceive or project; τυτω, -ς "sculptured or carved in raised work; molded, imprinted, embossed;" τυτω, -ς, -ες receiving impressions, impressed; τυτω, -ς, -ες "to transform;" τυτω, -ς, -ες "counterfeit;" spurious; τυτω, -ς, -ες "made in half-raised work [not so prominent as τυτω]" τυτω, -ς, -ες "formed beforehand, as a model, specimen or prototype."

1 Herodotus 1. 57. 4. See discussion above, p. 117, n. 2.
2 Herodotus 1. 58. 4. See discussion above, p. 117, n. 2.

3 E.g., Sophocles (496-406 B.C.) Philoctetes 1460 (Jebb, 4:226): "... where oft the Hercean mount sent an echo [ἀντιπω] to my mournful cries."

4 E.g., Tryphiodorus Carmen 519 (LCL, pp. 618-19): ἄντιπων ἀντικινεῖ ἐν ἄντικειαν ἀντιμένοις "she draws to herself the reflected rays of the Sun."

5 E.g., Xenophon (430-354 B.C.) Agesilaus 6. 2. (LCL, Scripta Minora, pp. 103-9) ὁ ρήμα τυτω αἰνεῖ ἔτοικος, ὁ λογίαν τυτω τούτων τόκωσσιν τοῦτον ἐπιβάλλει. "... it was not by their panic flight that he won victory, but it was after overcoming them in stubborn fighting that he set up a trophy." Sophocles Antigone 156a (Jebb, 3:54-56): ἄντιπων δ' ἐμνε ἐπὶ τοὺς τυτων ὄνεος τυτω ἱπτομένω "Swung down, he fell on the earth with a crash, torch in hand."
adversary. The second basic meaning is "corresponding, antitypical," under which head we note the more specific meaning of "reproduction, copy" (i.e., that which corresponds to the original). This latter meaning takes on a technical sense in Neo-Platonism (but not in Plato himself) for the "sensual world of appearance" as contrasted with the "authentic" (ἀληθικόν) heavenly world of ideas.

The rare adjective τούτως (and the corresponding adverb τούτων) also has two basic meanings: (1) "open to impressions;" and (2) "corresponding to a type." Since τούτως is used in parallelism with τούτος in its single occurrence in Scripture

1. E.g., Aeschylus Septem contra Thebas 521 (LCL 1:334-66): "Full sure an I that the antagonist (ἀντίπαθος) of Zeus... will lay low his head before our part."
2. E.g., Polybius (210-120 B.C.) 6. 31. 8 (LCL 3:338-39): τούτως ἐπάνω τούτως ἀντίτυπον πέτουσιν κάθεν ἐν οἷς οὐ μειράς ἑβάλλεις τόν ἀνακούφισαν καὶ τὴν δικοῦσαν ἐπιθύμησιν τῆς δύνας. προστατεύοντας "Back to back with these cavalry and fronting the agger and the rearward face of the whole camp are placed the rest of the peltastae extraordinary."
3. E.g., Dyerchynus Papyri XII. 1476. 6 (336 A.D.): "Aurelius Theodore having presented a petition of which the copy (ἀντίτυπον) is appended."
4. E.g., Plotinus (204-270 A.D.) Enneads 2. 9. 6 (LCL 2:242-43): "And what ought one to say of the other things they introduce, their 'Exiles' and 'Impressions' (ἀντιδεής) and 'Reportings'"
5. E.g., Plutarch De viris illustribus 9 (LCL, moralia, 6:26-28): "οἱ σκέπτοντες σὲ ἀντίπαθος ὁμολογοῦν, ἀλλὰ τεθύνει "not by harsh and inflexible methods, but by flexible ones."
6. Claudius Galenus (129-199 A.D.) De typis 4 (Kina, 7:471) uses τούτως medically to denote what is "corresponding to a type" of disease.

(I Cor 10:6; cf. vs. 11), its precise biblical meaning is probably largely determined by the use of τούτος in the immediate context.

The noun ὄρθομαχος is analyzed by Liddell-Scott-Jones and Goppel to have the basic senses of (1) "model" or (2) "sketch." E. Kenneth Lee cites numerous clarifying examples from classical Greek literature to show that often the prefixed ὀρόπ had can give the compound "the special meaning of a form outlined as the basis of further work." But Lee fails to emphasize that here we have an extension of the potential dual perspective inherent in τούτος. The ὄρθομαχος in this special meaning of "outline to be filled up" can, as we have found to be true with τούτος, simultaneously be a Nachbild of a prior reality and a Vorbild for a forthcoming one. In our analysis of biblical usage we must be alert to the possibility of this twofold perspective.

1. Goppel, TDNT, 8:248; Liddell-Scott-Jones, p. 1500.
3. E.g., Strabo Geography 2. 5. 18 (LCL 1:460-67): "I now resume my first sketch [ὑπόγραμμα] of the inhabited world..."
4. E. Kenneth Lee, "Words Denoting 'Pattern' in the New Testament," NTS 8 (1961-62):117. (Italics his.) Note especially the following examples: Aristotle Nicomachean Ethics 1. 7. 17 (LCL, pp. 34-35): Περιγράφων δὴ ὁ ἐν τῷ ἔνλεκτῳ πρὸς ὅτι ἕκτο τοῦ ἐν τῷ ἔνλεκτῳ πρὸς. 1. ὑπογράφων ὑπέρ. ἐκαίνητον ὑπόγραφος. "Let this account then serve to describe the good in outline—for no doubt the proper procedure is to begin by making a rough sketch, and to fill it in afterwards."
Tūnos and Biblical Cognates in Late-Judaism

The Septuagint

The LXX contains four occurrences of τοῦνος, of which two represent Greek translations of the Hebrew OT.¹

In the first occurrence, Exod 25:40, Moses is instructed by the Lord regarding the building of the earthly sanctuary:

μετὰ τοῦ καίρου τήν τοῦνον τήν ἁγιασμον οὐ εὖ ἔν τῇ οἴκῳ.

See that you make [them] after the τοῦνον [for them] which is being shown you on the mountain.

Tūnos here translates the Hebrew נֵסֶס. The context seems to point to a meaning such as "pattern," "model." Since this is a crucial text quoted in a hermeneutical setting in Heb 8:5, we further analyze this occurrence in connection with the Heb 8 passage.²

A second occurrence of τοῦνος is found in Amos 5:26:

καὶ ἀνέλαβε τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ τοῦνος καὶ τὸ ἄρθρον τοῦ θουρίου Παρνα, τὸς τοῦνος αὐτῶν, αὐτὸ ἐπέτρεψεν ηλικίας.

You have taken up the tabernacle of Moloch and the star of your god Rayphan, their τοῦνος [MT סְבָרָה], which you made for yourselves.

In this passage τοῦνος, as well as בָּשָׂר, which it translates, undoubtedly means "idol," "graven image,"³ and refers to the idols of foreign gods made by Israel, on account of which (idolatry) God sent them into Babylonian exile (vs. 27).

¹See the discussion of the LXX use of τοῦνος in b.g., Goppelt, TENT, 1:246; Müller, KHD, 3:904; Takamori, pp. 9-12. ἀντικείμενον, τυπὲς (τυπεῖς), and ἑτεροποιήματε do not appear in the LXX.

²See below, pp. 367-88. ³See above, p. 124, n. 1.

A third usage of τοῦνος is found in 3 Macc 3:30:

καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τοῦνος οὗτος ἐγγέγραμμον.

And thus the τοῦνος of the letter had been written.

This verse comes after the word-for-word rendering (vss. 12-24) of a decree/letter by Ptolemy IV (Philopater) to his generals concerning vengeance upon Alexandrian Jews (c. 217 B.C.). Τοῦνος here seems to refer to the "wording" or "text" of Philopater's letter.¹

A fourth occurrence of τοῦνος is found in 4 Macc 6:19:

καὶ ψυχήν τὸν Ἱεροσολύμου τοῦ νῦν διδόμενον τοῖς ἔθεσις τοῦνος, ἵνα παραδώσῃ χειρὶς τῆς μισθοφορίας.

And become in our own persons a τοῦνος to the young of iniquity, to the end that we should encourage them to eat unclean meat.

The context of this passage is the account of seven Jewish brothers and their mother who defy Antiochus Epiphanes and are martyred for their faith. Immediately preceding this verse is recorded how the courtiers of the king seek to persuade Eleazar (one of the brothers) to avoid more torture by pretending to eat pork. Eleazar answers that he and his brothers would not thus "become in our own persons a τοῦνος to the young of iniquity, to the end that we should encourage them to eat unclean meat." Here τοῦνος seems to denote a determinative "model" or "pattern" of behavior.²

Philo

Tūnos is found frequently in Philo's writings,³ often with

¹See above, p. 128, nn. 1 and 3.
²See above, p. 121, n. 1, and p. 125, n. 4.
³At least 70 times, according to the count of Hans Leisegang, ed., Indices ad Philonis Alexandrini opera, Philonis Alexandrini
the common classical meanings such as "mark," "impression," "form," "outline," "pattern," and "model." Philo also employed ῥῆος in a more specialized sense in connection with his Platonic philosophical-allegorical interpretations of the OT. We have already seen how, in his treatment of Exod 25:40, ῥῆος is both Vorbild (of the μαρμονα) and Nachbild (of the ἀκτιχυρος). The same usage is apparent in Philo's exegesis of Gen 1.3 In his account of Creation, Philo likens God's work to that of an architect. The architect conceives of a city first in terms of mental impressions stamped upon his mind (like a seal-impression stamped upon wax), and then he builds the city according to that mental pattern. In like manner, God conceived beforehand the patterns/models (ῥῆος) as ideas stamped upon his mind, and then fashioned the world of perception according to the (heavenly, mental) pattern. Thus the ῥῆος (the eternal, divine idea) is a Nachbild in that it is stamped upon God's mind. And it is the mental Vorbild for the sensual copy.

opera quae supersunt, vol. 8 (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1930, pp. 786-87. For a discussion of Philo's use of the word ῥῆος, see especially Takamori, pp. 10-23; Woollcombe, pp. 62-65; Seppelt, Typos, pp. 5-6, 48-62; Idem, Text, 8:239; Liesegang, 8:32; lists only three occurrences of ῥῆος: De plantatione 133 (LCL, 3:200-81), De confusione lingvarum 102 (LCL, 4:54-65), and Quis rerum divinarum heres sit TBT (LCL, 4:372-73). In each case ῥῆος conforms to the Greek usage and refers to a "resistant" or "resisting" hard object (see above, p. 133, n. 5). The cognates ῥῆος and ῥῆος do not appear in Liesegang's Index.

1Seppelt (Typos, pp. 5-6) has analyzed the various common meanings of ῥῆος in Philo. These meanings are summarized by Takamori, p. 18, n. 22: "1. (Eindruck formai), a) Spur, b) Empfange, Eigentum, Merkmal, c) Form, Umrisse; 2. (Eindruck inhaltlich) Abdruck, Abbild, plastisches Bild, 3. (Eindruck nach Art des Zustandekommens) der geringere, wiederholbare, auslöscharbe Abdruck."

2See above, pp. 130-31.

Philo does not always consistently carry out this dual perspective of ῥῆος in his philosophical use of the term. Sometimes ῥῆος is more or less equivalent to the ἀκτιχυρος, the Vorbild.4 At other times Philo focuses solely on the nachbildliche quality of ῥῆος and it is virtually identified with the μαρμονα.5

Josephus

Compared to Philo, Josephus makes sparing use of ῥῆος and always in accordance with common secular Greek meanings. ῥῆος can signify an "impression,"4 "handwriting,"5 and "form [of names]."6

1E.g., Philo De Opificio Mundi 16-19, 29, 36, 129.

2E.g., Philo Qua Artetarii Potiori insulati soleat B3 (LCL, 2:258-69): "To the faculty which we have in common with the irrational creatures, God has given..." Moreover, it was through that did bring out of obscurity into distinctness the original patterns of our education. . . .


4Josephus Bellum Judaeicum 3. 420 (LCL, 2:694-95): "... here are still shown the Impressions [ῥῆος] of Andromeda's chains." 

5Idem, Antiquitates 16. 319 (LCL, 8:335-37): "Alexander, however, said that the scribè Diophantus had imitated his manner of writing [τὸ ῥῆος]." . . .

6Idem., 1. 129 (LCL, 4:62-63): "With a view to euphony and my readers' pleasure these names have been Hellenized. The form [ὁ ῥῆος] in which they here appear is not that used in our country..."
The most frequent signification of ἑκοτος for Josephus is the sense of "sculptured idols of pagan gods." This usage follows that of ἑκοτος in Amos 5:26 (LXX).

Rabbinic Literature

Although, of course, the Greek form of ἑκοτος does not occur in Rabbinic literature, yet it should be noted that ἑκοτος is occasionally employed as a loan word. We find the Hebrew nouns为什么不 and为什么不, and the Aramaic noun为什么不, with the following meanings: (1) "form, frame, mold, cast;" and (2) "formula; blank [of a document]."

1. E.g., Antiquitates 1. 310 (LCL, 4:156-51): "Rachel, taking with her even the images [τὰ ἑκοτοτα] of the gods which the religion of her fathers made it customary to venerate, escaped." Ibid. 15. 328-29 (LCL, 8:156-57): "We [Jews] are forbidden such things, including the honouring of statues and sculptured forms [ἐκοτοτα] in the manner of the Greeks."


3. E.g., Bem. 5: 3: "If a man bought from a baker, he may give tithe from hot bread for cold or from cold bread for hot bread, even when they are of various moulds [בַּחוֹז מֵעָשִׁים]; Kelim 15. 7: "a tephillin [phylactery] mould" [בַּחוֹז מֵעָשִׁים]."

4. Y. Ber. 1. 3b: "such is the formula [בַּחוֹז מֵעָשִׁים] of the benedictions"; y. Gitt. 3. 44c: "... if the writer filled out a blank [בַּחוֹז מֵעָשִׁים]..." b. Nig. 7b: "R. Eleazar says: The division [takes place] when both [claimants] clings either to the form [בַּחוֹז מֵעָשִׁים] of the bill, the general part, which may be written out in advance and does not contain the names of the contracting parties or the particulars [of date, place, sum involved, etc.] or to the operative part [thereof], but if one [claimant] clings to the form [בַּחוֹז מֵעָשִׁים], and the other clings to the operative part, one takes the form [בַּחוֹז מֵעָשִׁים] and the other takes the operative part."

The noun ἑκοτος appears a total of fifteen times in the NT. It is found most frequently in the Pauline corpus (Rom 5:14; 6:17; 1 Cor 10:6; Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:7; 2 Thess 3:6; 1 Tim 4:12; Titus 2:7). It appears three times in the book of Acts (7:43, 44; 23:25) and twice in the Gospel of John (20:25, 27). In Hebrews and 1 Peter it is employed one time each (Heb 8:5; 1 Pet 5:3).

The noun adjective ἑκοτος appears in the letter to the Hebrews (9:23) and in 1 Peter (3:21). The adverb ἑκοτος is a NT hapax legomenon found only in 1 Corinthians (10:11). The noun ἑκοτος is employed one time in each of Paul's letters to Timothy (1 Tim 1:16 and 2 Tim 1:13).

Semantic Analysis

As we have already indicated, no thorough, systematic semasiological investigation of the biblical usages of ἑκοτος and cognates has heretofore appeared. Even the most complete studies make only passing reference to a number of NT occurrences of these terms, and semasiological conclusions are often drawn with no supportive evidence. In the present section of this chapter, we attempt to remedy these deficiencies. The biblical occurrences

1. See Moulton and Geden, pp. 80, 962-63, 982 for statistical data on ἑκοτος and cognates in the NT. The total is only fourteen if John 20:25 contains only one occurrence, as many MSS attest. See discussion below, p. 142-44.

2. We refer in particular to Köppel, TONT, 8:246-59; and Müller, MDNTT, 3:803-7.
of τόκος and biblical cognates are examined seriatim in their literary contexts and against the background of the semasiological data gathered thus far, in order to determine the breadth of significance in each occurrence. In harmony with the methodology outlined in the introduction to the present study, all the hermeneutical τόκος passages are grouped together at the end of this section and reserved for closer scrutiny in the following chapter.

The Gospels. The two occurrences of τόκος in the Gospels are found in John 20:25:

ἐκάστου αυτοῦ ὃς ἦλθεν μαθηταὶ, ἔκρηκαν τὸν κηρύσσον. ὁ δὲ τὸν τόκον ἀποκρινεῖται, ἐξαντλοῦσαν τοὺς μυστήρια τοῦ τόκου, καὶ τὸν πίνακα τοῦ διακόνου, εἰς τὸν τόκον τὸν ἔλεγεν καὶ ἔφυγεν. καὶ τὴν λείψανον τοῦ τόκου, ἐξαντλοῦσαν τοὺς μυστήρια τοῦ τόκου, καὶ τὸν πίνακα τοῦ διακόνου, εἰς τὸν τόκον τὸν ἔλεγεν καὶ ἔφυγεν.

So the other disciples told him, 'We have seen the Lord'. But he said to them, 'Unless I see in his hands the τόκος of his nails, and place my finger in the τόκος of the nails, and place my hand in his side, I will not believe'.

A textual matter calls for immediate consideration. The MS evidence exhibits a confusion between τόκος and τόκος ("place") in both occurrences of this passage. In the first occurrence, textual evidence strongly favors the reading τὸν τόκον.3 We concur with the major critical editions of the Greek NT in retaining this as the original reading.4

1 The Greek text cited in this dissertation, unless otherwise noted, is that of UBS3.
2 The ET of these τόκος passages, unless otherwise noted, is mine. The ET of other biblical passages is from the RV.
3 Only the minor witnesses N, f, and q give τόκος; p56 and 566 have τόκος τόκου.
4 See WH; UBS; Augustinus Herk, ed., Novum Testamentum

In the second occurrence, however, the matter is not easy to decide because the MS evidence seems so evenly divided. Should the reading be τὸν τόκον or τῶν τόκων? Raymond E. Brown contends that the confusion among the variants is more easily explained on the basis of two different words in the original. This is entirely possible. On the other hand, J. H. Bernard is convinced that a scribal substitution of τῶν τόκων for the original τὸν τόκον occurred as "a very natural mistake." It is possible that a later scribe might expect the original employment of two parallel (but not identical) expressions in the progression of two clauses of a single sentence, consonant with Semitic patterns of poetic parallelism. Accordingly, he would be led to corrupt an original repetition of τῶν τόκων into a parallelism of a similarly orthotrophized τῶν τόκων with a preceding τὸν τόκον.

Though the matter cannot be decided with certainty, we

---

1 As in the texts of WH, SD, UBS, and ABS, after B, the koine tradition and D.
2 As in the texts of Nestle-Aland and Merk, after A, B, SG, and SYL.
concur with Bernhard and the UBS text that the reading τοῦ τύπου is probably to be preferred. In Thomas' resolve declaration, the intensification of action from "see" to "put my fingers" with a constant reference to the identical τοῦ τύπου would seem to highlight his mounting doubts. Furthermore, as this phrase would then be identical in the first and second clauses of the sentence, so ἐκεῖνος is repeated in the second and third clauses—forming a kind of "staircase" parallelism.¹

In this passage, it seems clear that τύπος contains the concrete meaning 'mark,' 'print.'² It refers to Jesus' wounds—prints or scars received from the nails that were driven through His hands when He was crucified.³ This meaning is reflective of the second basic meaning of τύπος: "the effect of a blow or pressure." Here the Nachbildung character of τύπος figures prominently.

The Book of Acts. We now turn our attention to two usages of the term τύπος in Acts 7:43-44:

καὶ ἐξέδειξεν τὰς ὑπαύλις τοῦ μακρύς καὶ τὸ στέφανον τοῦ θεοῦ (ἡμᾶς) Μωάμεθ, τὸν τύπος τοῦ εἰδώλου ἀνετράπη τὴν τειχικὴν τῶν ισραηλίτων. Αἱ σκέπαι τοῦ μακρύθρου ἂν τοὺς πατέρας ἦν ἐν τῇ ἑρῴδῃ, καθὼς ἔπεσαν ὁ ἀλόγον τὸ ἱερό τοῦ κοιλοῦ κατὰ τὸν τύπον τοῦ ἰεροῦ.

And you took up the tent of Moloch, and the star of the god Rephaim, the τύπος which you made to worship; and I will remove you beyond Babylon. Our fathers had the tent of witness in the wilderness, even as he who spoke to Moses directed him to make it, according to the τύπον which he had seen.

¹See, e.g., Brown, John, 1: 132, for a discussion of "staircase" parallelism in John's gospel.

²See above, p. 121, n. 2.

³This verse is the only scriptural mention of Jesus' nailprints, though it is implied in John 20:20, 27 and Luke 24:39.

Here in two succeeding verses of Stephen's speech, we have reference to the only occurrences of τύπος in the (canonical) LXX.¹ As we have indicated in our section on the LXX,² the meaning of τύπος in Amos 5:26 (= Acts 7:43) is "idol, graven image." In Exodus 25:40 (= Acts 7:44) we have tentatively suggested the English translation "model" or "pattern" for τύπος.³

It is revealing to note here that together these two occurrences demonstrate the Nachbildung and Verbild connotations of τύπος. The Verbild concept is apparent in vs. 43 where the τύπος, or "idols, graven images," are formed as the representations of the pagan gods. In vs. 44, the Verbild perspective is certainly present in that Moses is directed to make the earthly tabernacle according to the τύπος, or "model, pattern," which he had seen. The τύπος seen by Moses served as a Verbild for the earthly tabernacle.

Whether there is also a neubildliche semantic value functioning in Exodus 25:40, as Philo has interpreted it, Stephen does not appear to indicate.⁴ Nor does Stephen seem to draw from this quotation any hermeneutical implications for a NT fulfillment, such as we find in the Heb 8:5 citation of Exodus 25:40.

¹ τύπος is employed in the LXX of Exodus 25:40 and Amos 5:26 (see above, p. 136) and its presence in Acts 7:43-44 has the almost unanimous support of ancient MSS. But it should be noted that D reads μακρύθρος instead of τύπος.

² Above, p. 138.

³ See below, pp. 367-80 for a more detailed discussion of Exodus 25:40.

The third usage of ἔπεσεν in the book of Acts appears in Acts 23:25:

> ἔπεσεν εἰς τὸν στήθος τοῦ παρθένου τοῦ ὄνομα τοῦ γενέτορος

He wrote a letter having this τὸνος.

The historical context of this passage is made clear in Acts 23:12-23. The Jews make a plot on Paul's life. Hearing of the ambush plans, Paul's nephew tells Paul, who arranges with one of the centurions that his nephew report the plot to the tribune, Claudius Lysias. Claudius orders that Paul be removed by night and taken under military escort to Felix the governor in Caesarea.

Then, according to v. 25, Claudius Lysias writes an explanatory letter, to be delivered by the soldiers accompanying Paul, to Felix. Verses 26-30 record the wording of the letter.

Here we find a common secular Greek usage of τὸνος, paralleling the usage in 3 Macc 3:30 which we have already discussed.¹ In both passages, τὸνος refers to the specific contents of a document. The only difference is that here τὸνος precedes the wording of the letter, whereas in 3 Macc 3 it follows the text. As indicated in our discussion of 3 Macc 3:30, τὸνος seems to have the signification "[to be] written," and/or "form of expression" (of a document).² The meaning derives from the second of the basic meanings we have suggested for τὸνος: "the impression or Nachbildung: the impress left by a blow or pressure."³


²See discussion of this meaning above, p. 128, n. 3.

³See discussion of this meaning above p. 128, n. 2.
have been delivered over to it. The aorist passive denotes a past definite action, probably at the time of baptism (in the light of the context, Rom 6:1-4). The use of ἀνάρρητος here is common in secular Greek for describing the transfer of persons from one owner (or custodian) to another, where there is no hint of transmission of tradition. The Christians, then, are not masters of the teaching, but themselves are mastered and possessed by it.

This use of ἀνάρρητος safeguards Paul's concept of "under grace." The believers have no credit for accepting a ἀνάρρητος transmitted to them. Rather they are possessed by it. A divine miracle is involved. The fact they have obeyed from the heart the ἀνάρρητος (cf. Rom 10:17), the originator of the miracle, not to praise the Roman believers. Though heartfelt obedience to the ἀνάρρητος flows forth inevitably from the transfer of lordship, it is all of grace, not of works of law.

But what is the ἀνάρρητος? Various suggestions have been advanced. Rudolf Bultmann and Franz J. Henardt posit an early Paulinist interpolation, in which the ἀνάρρητος is synonymous with "Paulinism." Beare objects that "the difficulties are not really so great as to require us to resort to surgery in the complete absence of variation in the manuscript tradition." He also points out that (before F. C. Baur) it is highly unlikely that post-apostolic Christianity of the early centuries conceived of a plurality of ἀνάρρητος in the NT.

Bernhard Weiss and others, while accepting Pauline authorship, assert that Paul is speaking of his own particular form of Christian doctrine. But this does not appear to be the emphasis of the passage. Paul's letter is addressed to the Roman Christians whom he has never met personally. The church at Rome is "not of his own planting." It does not therefore seem likely for him to indicate that his readers had been delivered over (at baptism) to a particular Pauline form of doctrine.

Hans Lietzmann finds in this passage an antithesis, not of Pauline versus other Christian forms of doctrine, but of the Christian form of teaching versus the Jewish δόξαν of the Law. In parallel with the usage of δόξαν in Rom 16:17, it appears correct that the content of the δόξαν in Rom 6:17 is the basic message of

1See Beare, "Rom 6:17," p. 207.


But pace Lietzmann, we must note that the contrast in this passage is not between the new master of τούτος διδασκόν and the old master of the Law of Moses. Rather the contrast seems to be between the τούτος διδασκόν and the old master of Sin.

Josef Kürringer finds the τούτος διδασκόν to be a specific "Grundriss, Grundformel der Lehre," i.e., the baptismal confession to which the Romans were appropriate at their baptism. In the light of the baptismal context in Rom 6:1-4 and the aorist passive of μαθησιαω in vs. 17, it is not improbable that Paul was referring to the specific body of Christian teaching to which the baptismal candidate was delivered. However, the stress here is upon the confession of an outline of teaching by believers, but upon the possession of the believers by the power of the τούτος διδασκόν. In other words, the τούτος διδασκόν is not just a form of teaching. It is an active power which possesses the convert at baptism (μαθησιαω, vs. 17) and molds his conduct (vs. 18-19). It is not only a "form" but a "forming form."

This brings us to what seems to be the best interpretation of τούτος διδασκόν. Several scholars have concluded that τούτος should

---

1 Müller, TDNT, 3:905.
2 See Beare, "Rom 6:17," p. 208, for other persuasive arguments pace Lietzmann's interpretation.
3 Kürringer, pp. 170-72.
5 Frederick F. Bruce, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, TNBC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), p. 142, discusses the nature of the early catechetical material.
7 Lee, p. 170. Cf. Crenshaw, p. 324: "... the persons addressed have obeyed from the heart that teaching ... which is a mould by which their lives are to be shaped."
8 Goppelt, TDNT, 8:250.
content, the expression of the doctrine," but also "the original meaning of the form which stamps can still be strongly felt. As previously sin, so now the new teaching, i.e., the message of Christ, is the factor which stamps and determines the life of the Christian.\footnote{Müller, NIDNTT, 3:904-5.}

The sources just cited appear to have correctly observed the breadth of signification involved in the use of τοῦτο in this passage. Aside from these few references in the literature, however, this semantic richness of τοῦτο has been largely overlooked in lexical studies and commentaries.

The semantic range of this occurrence of τοῦτο may be summarized in the following points. In the context of Rom 6:17, τοῦτο is both Nachbild and Vorbild. Under the Nachbild aspect, at least two semantic indications may be isolated: (1) The Christian teaching is a concrete, molded entity having a specific (though not necessarily rigid) form; and (2) its form is a derived one, shaped by God via Christ and the apostles. The Vorbild aspect brings to the fore two further semantic contributions: (1) The form of doctrine is an authoritative norm or standard, teleologically orientated beyond itself to those whom it norms; and (2) its teleological purpose can be fulfilled because it is also a possessive power that stamps and molds the ethical conduct of those who are committed to it.

In the Pauline corpus there are five additional usages of τοῦτο and two of ἓν τὸ τοῦτο which are all employed in similar ethical contexts. Willis P. De Boer has conducted an extensive exegesis of these passages.\footnote{De Boer, The Imitation of Paul. See especially pp. 169-88 (discussion of Phil 3:17), 92-126 (1 Thess 1:6; 7), 127-39 (2 Thess 3:7-9), 87 (1 Tim 4:12), 196-99 (1 Tim 1:16; 2 Tim 1:13).}

Inasmuch as De Boer places special emphasis upon the "imitation of Paul" motif, however, he is not always able to stress the rich semantic contours of τοῦτο and ἓν τὸ τοῦτο. Thus we must give further attention to these passages, building upon his investigation.

The first of these seven usages is found in Phil 3:17:

Εὐαγγέλσατε τούς γονέας, ἀδελφε, καὶ ἕν τὸ τοῦτο ἐπιτηδεύετε, καθὼς ἔχει τοῦτο ἄρα.

Join in imitating me, brothers, and observe those who so walk [conduct themselves] as you have a τοῦτο in us.

In Phil 3 Paul warns against the false teachings (legalism \footnote{There have been numerous recent attempts to identify the opponents of Paul to whom he refers in Phil 3. See especially the discussions by Walter Schmithals, "Die Irrlehren des Philippusbriefes," ZTK 54 (1957):297-341; De Boer, pp. 171-73; H. Köster, "The Purpose of the Politic of a Pauline Fragment (Php 3)," NovT 7 (1965):279-84; K. Jewett, "The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation," NTS 17 (1970-71):98-212; and Ralph P. Martin, Philippians, NCB (London: Oliphants, 1976), pp. 22-34. See also the extensive bibliography in Martin, pp. 35-36. Several major views have been advanced. Schmithals argues that Paul is contending against a Jewish-Christian libertine gnosticism. Klijn is convinced that the opposition is from legalistic Judaizers. Köster views the opponents as pneumatic Jewish-Christians who attached a gnostic spiritualizing of the resurrection to a Pharisaic legalism. Numerous commentators (e.g., Francis Howard Bear, The Epistle to the Philippians, HTMC [New York: Harper, 1959], pp. 133-36; cf. Lightfoot, Vincent-Kennedy, Moule, Dibelius, Baumbach, and others mentioned in Martin, p. 28) maintain that these two groups of opponents in view in Phil 3 Judeaizing legalists and gnostic libertines. Martin, pp. 33-34, suggests that these two}\footnote{De Boer, The Imitation of Paul. See especially pp. 169-88 (discussion of Phil 3:17), 92-126 (1 Thess 1:6; 7), 127-39 (2 Thess 3:7-9), 87 (1 Tim 4:12), 196-99 (1 Tim 1:16; 2 Tim 1:13).}
couched in a statement of his personal experience. His own life had once been one of legalistic perfectionism (vss. 4-6). But he had come to know Jesus and his righteousness and to reject any confidence in his own merits. He is still aware of his own imperfections, but in "the righteousness from God that depends on faith" (3:9) he confidently and resolutely presses on toward the goal "for the prize of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus" (3:14). In vs. 16, Paul exhorts his readers to be "thus minded."

Phil 3:17 contains a certain awkwardness of phraseology, but the main point seems clear. In vs. 17b Paul asks his brothers in Philippi to be "imitators" of himself, i.e., to join together in imitating him. Clause (b) of vs. 17 indicates that there are others in Philippi (perhaps the various leaders of the congregation) whose conduct should be observed or marked.

sets of false teaching have common concerns: the "promise of perfection" (whether through circumcision or exalted spiritual self-consciousness) and the stance of "triumphalism and present glory" (which eliminates "commitment to lowliness and suffering"). Whether there are one or two groups of opponents, Phil 3:2-11 seems to indicate a strain of legalism, vss. 12-14 a stance of perfectionism, and vss. 18-19 a trend of libertinism. See in particular the evidence presented by De Boer, pp. 171-73 and Martin, pp. 23-34.

1De Boer, pp. 177-79, discusses various interpretations (and major proponents). Most modern commentators recognize the full force of the code-prefix in unnecessary and underscore the issue of a unified action among the Philippians. De Boer cautions against "becoming more precise than Paul meant to be" (p. 179); and suggests that Paul's intentional ambiguity was a subtle call for unity applicable to the various situations in the Philippian church. The straying ones in particular were called to unite with the more faithful ones, as vs. 17b makes apparent. See also the discussion in Marvin R. Vincent, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon, ITC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), pp. 115-16.

2See the discussion in De Boer, pp. 181-82. He suggests that this counsel to the congregation to observe their leaders is the counterpart to those passages (1 Tim 4:12; Titus 2:7) where Paul exhorts the leaders to be a tyros to the congregation.

because they already are imitating Paul. Verse 17c makes explicit the manner in which these exemplary men have been walking. They have lived in harmony with the tyros in Paul and his associates. Here tyros seems to signify a Vorbild. Paul, along with those of his associates in the proclamation of the Gospel that behavior and attitude--of "walking." He calls for the church at Philippi to conform themselves to the pattern as they see it demonstrated in those who conform to it in their midst.

De Boer p. 180, and Vincent, pp. 115-16 demonstrate how the causal interpretation is grammatically possible, but not as likely. The use of oikos with oikoumenia in its "natural and normal function" expresses correlation, not cause (ibid.: cf. Vincent, p. 116 for elaboration of this and other considerations). Paul is thus counseling his readers to mark those who walk "in the way that," "as," or "according as" they possess a tyros. Most modern translations and commentators have followed this correlative interpretation.

2Paul at times employs the first person plural as a designation for himself (e.g., 2 Cor 1:23, 24; 11:21; see the discussion and bibliography in De Boer, p. 179). But here it is less likely that Paul has already employed the singular in vs. 17a to refer to himself, the switch to the plural in vs. 17c seems to indicate a broadening of the scope to include Paul's missionary colleagues, Timothy, Epaphroditus, and others known to the Philippian readers. Martin p. 142 (following Wilhelm Michaelis, Philippiens, vol. 2, SNTW, 4:66-68), may provide a helpful explanation for the shift from singular to plural. He argues (pace De Boer, pp. 184-87) that oikoumenia is a call to obedience to apostolic authority and not just "to summon to imitate the apostle's way of life" (p. 142). But when Paul refers to those in Philippi who conduct themselves according to the tyros they have received, he includes in the tyros...
The content of the Vorbild in this passage appears to be a fairly broad one, as clarified in Phil 4:9: "What you have learned and received and heard and seen in me, do." But it seems to be concentrated upon a relationship to the cross of Christ. Paul is appealing to his friends and spiritual children to live totally with reference to the cross of Christ. This appears confirmed by the negative characterization in the following verse (Phil 3:18) of those who "walk" (περιπατόμενοι, the same verb as in the preceding verse), not according to Paul's τόπος, but "as enemies of the cross of Christ."

The context makes clear, furthermore, that Paul's Vorbild is not the original, i.e., the Urbild. It is rather derived from the original, Christ Jesus. Only after presenting Christ as the model in chapter 2 does Paul delineate his own experience as a Vorbild to be followed in chapter 3. And Phil 3:7-10 (cf. 4:13, 19, etc.) reveals the Christological source of his existence as a Vorbild. Paul's "model" is one that has been "modeled" after the ultimate Model. His Vorbild is also a Nachbild of the divine Urbild. This is in accordance with the third basic meaning of τόπος, which has been so widely disregarded in the lexicographical literature: the matrix or Vorbild that is at the same time an impression or Nachbild.

It may prove helpful to diagram the semantic contours of his missionary associates who, though not apostles by divine appointment, provide an ethical "model" for the Philippians.

Cf. DeBoer, p. 183: "This passage in the letter to the Philippian probably contains the broadest and most general call to imitation that we find in Paul's letters."

In the context of this passage, in order that the Nachbild-Vorbild dynamics may be elucidated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christ</th>
<th>Paul</th>
<th>Leaders and Congregation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urbild</td>
<td>Nachbild -- Vorbild</td>
<td>Nachbild</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breadth of signification in this usage of τόπος has generally been overlooked in modern discussions of the passage. Most lexical studies and commentaries on Phil 3:17 are content to translate the word τόπος as "example" or "pattern," without any indication of the semantological dynamics that are involved. It is apparent that such single word-substitutions, unless accompanied by a discussion of the dynamic contours of meaning, fail to provide an adequate representation of the semantic richness that is contained in this occurrence of τόπος.

The second Pauline usage of τόπος in the series of similar ethical contexts is found in 1 Thes 1:7:

Σας γιόντες ὑμᾶς τόπος τοῦ τόπους; ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐκτελεσθέντας εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰάκωβους.

So that you became a τόπος [or τόπος?] to all the believers in Macedonia and in Achaia.

1See, e.g., Baker, Two Testaments: One Bible, pp. 256-53; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, p. 637; Bolden, p. 20; Larcher, pp. 491-92; Michelsen, p. 239; Mo终极, p. 62; Vincent, p. 116; Beare, Philippians, p. 138; Martin, pp. 142-43; Goppelt, TDNT, 8:245; and Müller, NIDNTT, 3:605, are two exceptions to this general trend. Though they do not examine this passage individually, they do briefly comment on the seven τόπος passages which occur in similar ethical contexts. See below, pp. 160 and 178 for citation of their brief remarks. Even Goppelt and Müller, however, fail to adequately elucidate the Nachbild-Vorbild dynamics that are involved.
A textual matter calls for immediate attention. Is the original reading the singular τίσιος or the plural τίσιοι? Both readings have considerable MS support. The former reading is accepted as the original in most modern critical Greek texts, ETs, and commentaries. The choice seems to be influenced (at least in part) by the lingering influence of WH’s preference for B. In formal criteria, however, may favor the singular τίσιος. If τίσιοι were later changed to τίσιος because of the accompanying plural πολίες (as is often argued), then it must be asked why the change was not made in Phil 3:17 and 2 Thes 3:9 where the plural also occurs. It seems more likely that this one occurrence of the plural τίσιοι (among the five passages with similar ethical contexts) was later changed to the singular τίσιος to conform with the other usages. Regardless of which reading is accepted as original,

However, the basic sense remains unchanged. The Thessalonian church is a "pattern" or "model" to other believers—either as one corporate τίσίοι or as individual τίσιοι.

It will be helpful to quote 1 Thess 1:5-7 in order to catch the flow of Paul’s thought at this point:

for our gospel came to you not only in word, but in power and in the Holy Spirit and with full conviction. You know what kind of men we proved to be among you for your sake. And you became imitators of us and of the Lord, for you received the word in much affliction, with joy inspired by the Holy Spirit, so that you became a τίσιοι to all the believers in Macedonia and in Achaia.

Whereas Paul employs the word τίσιοι in the Philippians correspondence to describe only himself and his associates, he now applies the term to the Thessalonians themselves. Apparently Paul does not use τίσιοι with reference to himself in this context, because to his delight, those who have imitated him (and the Lord, vs. 6) have themselves become τίσιοι. The Thessalonians have allowed their lives to be molded by the ministry of Paul and his colleagues. In particular through Paul’s missionary team they have received the word in the face of much affliction (vs. 6).

We have already noted (above, p. 155, n. 2) how Paul can use the first person plural pronoun to refer only to himself. However, in the light of the introduction to 1 Thessalonians—"Paul, Silvanus, Timothy" (1:1)—followed by the succession of first person plural pronouns, it appears that Paul is here in some way including his missionary comrades who with him had brought the gospel to them. Yet, as later sections of the epistle seem to verify (e.g., 3:1-5; see the discussion and bibliography in De Boer, pp. 118-19), the primary stress of the "we," "us," and "our" is upon "Paul himself, the leader and dominating figure" of the missionary team (De Boer, p. 119).

In contrast to Paul’s general call to imitation in Phil 3:17, De Boer, pp. 114-15, argues that "Paul is not here [1 Thess 1:6] thinking of a general overall imitation. Rather, in their joyful facing and enduring affliction on account of their faith in..."
In 1 Thess 1:3, 8-9, Paul further details the content of their ministry as τόπος: their "work of faith"; "labour of love"; "steadfastness of hope" in Christ; their cordial welcome of Paul; their turning "to God from idols"; their serving of the true and living God; their expectant waiting for Christ's return. The news of the Thessalonians' experience has "gone forth everywhere" (vv. 8). The character of these τόποι or Vorbilder is not just a moral example. There is a power that is at work in the lives of the Thessalonians (2:13). As Goppelt describes that nature of the τόπος in 1 Thess 1:7, "The more a life is moulded by the word, the more it becomes a τόπος, a model or mold [= prägenden Vorbild in German original]." This recalls the connotation of a dynamic power that we encountered in Rom 6:17.

As we discovered in the use of τόπος in Phil 3:17, so in this passage there is not only a Vorbild but also a Nachbild perspective. This has been just alluded to in the quotation from Goppelt. It is by virtue of their being molded that they become molds. Thus the τόποι are Nachbilder of the word received by Paul (who is likewise a Nachbild of Christ as well as a Vorbild of the Thessalonians!) and Vorbilder for all the believers in Macedonia and Achaia (1:7) and everywhere (1:8).

The breadth of signification of τόπος in 1 Thess 1:7 has been largely disregarded in recent treatments of the passage. The word-substitution "example," employed in most modern English versions, is particularly misleading. As we have already noted, τόπος denotes far more than a moral example. It refers to a shaping, molding power. The word "example" tends to shift the metaphor away from the dynamic basic meanings of τόπος—a forming, shaping matrix and/or what is formed or shaped by the matrix. The translation "example" also fails to express the dual aspects of Nachbild and Vorbild which are present in this usage of τόπος.

No single English word-substitution seems capable of encompassing the various semantic nuances of τόπος in this passage. The words "mold," "stamp," or "die" capture the dynamic, formative nature of the τόπος, as well as representing both the Nachbild and Vorbild aspects. But as substantives these terms do not seem to lend themselves to an ethical setting. The terms "pattern" or "model" are able to connote both the Nachbild and Vorbild aspects involved and are well-suited to an ethical context. These latter terms are perhaps the best available, though they fail to stress the molding, stamping aspects of τόπος.

The next usage of τόπος in an ethical setting is found in 2 Thess 3:9:

τόπος τῶν ἔφορων ἐξαντλεῖται, ἄλλ' ζηλωταὶ τῶν σάμων ὃν ἐμὲ τοῖς μετατάσσομεν ἀπειροταρμονεῖται.

1See, e.g., KJV, RSV, NEB, JB, NASB, TEV, and NKJV, all of which translate τόπος as "example" (KJV "ensample").

2See the more complete discussion of this translation problem, below, p. 178, n. 1.
... not because we do not have the right, but in order that we may offer ourselves as a pattern for you, that you might imitate us.

Verses 5-9 provide the immediate context of this verse.\(^1\)

Now we commend you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you keep away from any brother who is living in idleness and not in accord with the tradition that you received from us. For you yourselves know how you ought to imitate us; we were not idle when we were with you, we did not eat any one's bread without paying, but with toil and labor we worked night and day, that we might not burden any of you, not because we do not have the right, but in order that we may offer ourselves as a pattern for you, that you might imitate us.

Paul and his associates are again the model as in Phil 3:17. We may well translate διάδοσις as Vorbild, i.e., "pattern" or "model," in this passage as we did in Phil 3. But in the passage at hand, the nature of διάδοσις as an authoritative norm comes particularly to the fore.

In this second epistle to the Thessalonians, Paul has to face the problems of disorderliness, idleness, and insubordination.\(^2\) There had been brief mention in the first epistle of those who were walking disorderly (I Thess 4:11; 5:14), but now in the second letter the problem still exists and apparently there is need for more drastic action. Whereas the counsel in the first letter was


\(^2\) De Boer, pp. 128-39, summarizes the scholarly discussion up to 1969 on the nature of this problem in Thessalonica. See also Leon Morris, The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), p. 84; Arthur L. Moore, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, NCB (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1966), pp. 114-21; Ernest Best, A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, NHTC (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), pp. 16-22. There may be some connection between tendency toward idleness and the eschatological perversions of the Thessalorian Church (as many scholars suggest), though Paul does not explicitly relate the two.

... to "exhort" (4:10-11) the idlers, how Paul commands his readers to "keep away from any brother who is living in idleness" (2 Thess 3:6). In order further to emphasize the authoritative nature of his instruction, Paul adds in vs. 14, "If any one refuses to obey what we say in this letter, note that man, and have nothing to do with him, that he may be ashamed." Also in vs. 6, Paul's command is linked with the normative tradition among the Thessalonians that the Thessalonians had previously received from Paul.\(^1\) Verse 7 further emphasizes the divine imperative with the use of ἐνεργεῖσθαι.\(^2\)

Because of the authoritative dimension to διάδοσις in this passage, it must be viewed as a normative Vorbild, teleologically oriented beyond itself to those whom it norms.\(^3\) Paul's "pattern" (διάδοσις) of industry and financial independence were in harmony with his verbal commands. This "pattern" Paul holds up for the Thessalonians to follow.\(^4\) Whereas in Phil 3:17 the διάδοσις was very broad in its scope, the usage in 2 Thess 3:9 shows how the divine

\(^1\) De Boer, pp. 128-39, points out that Paul also employs the personal fatherly appeal as well as asserting apostolic authority.
pattern impinges on the specific practical affairs of everyday life. The Vorbild has a form with concrete contents. In this case, the Vorbild directs its stamp or mold to the sins of idleness, meddling, and "drinking" or "sponging" off others.

It is the Vorbild perspective of ῥόκος that is highlighted in this occurrence. Nevertheless, it must be noted that Paul implicitly acknowledges (3:1, 6) that his molding, authoritative "pattern" is derived (i.e., is a Nachbild) from the Lord.

We now turn our attention to the first use of ἔξορθοντος in Scripture, which occurs in 1 Tim 1:16:

διδάξας ἐμεῖς ἐκείνου, ἐν ἑνώ έστω τρόπῳ ἐνυπνούειν κρατῆς πάντων τοὺς άγαθον καρδιῶν, ποὺς ουκ ἔστω οὐκέτι ἐπὶ γλῶσσας ἃς ἔρχονται,

But I received mercy for this reason, in order that in me, the foremost of sinners, Christ Jesus might display his unlimited patience, for a ἔξορθοντος off/for the ones who are to believe on him for eternal life.

This passage is the fourth in the series of ethical contexts. In his letters to Timothy, Paul writes as a father to his "child",

1. Many of the commentators translate ῥόκος as "example" in this passage (e.g., Moore, p. 117; Frame, p. 304). See also KJV, RSV, NEB, NASB, TEV, JB and NKJV. But De Boer, p. 137, who himself also translates ῥόκος by "example," recognizes that more than "example" is involved. He recognizes the "strange power of attraction" that is present. Earlier in the same page he writes (in relation to this passage to 1 Thess 4:6, 7): "A ῥόκος draws others to itself by way of calling forth imitation..." (italics supplied). De Boer has rightly pointed out the dynamic element in ῥόκος, but it appears that he could have better described this in terms indigenous to the semantic range of ῥόκος—i.e., as "stamps" or "mold"—rather than in terms of "attraction." The ῥόκος is a "pattern" which "stamps" or "molds" those who are willing to be changed.

2. Calvin, Thessalonians, p. 364, effectively employs the analogy of the drone bee.

3. It is not our purpose to enter into the complex question of the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. Donald Guthrie,

in the faith" (1 Tim 1:2), his "beloved child" (2 Tim 1:2). 1 Tim 1:3-10 summarizes the false teachings that occasioned Timothy's stay as pastor in Ephesus. In vs. 11, Paul mentions the "glorious gospel of the blessed God with which I have been entrusted." This leads Paul into a personal digression to recount his experience in the gospel. He describes the mission of Jesus coming into the world to save sinners (vs. 15), and in particular how he (Paul), "the foremost of sinners" (vs. 15), received mercy. Then he gives the reason (vs. 16): "in order that in me, the foremost, Christ Jesus might display his unlimited patience, for a ἔξορθοντος off/for the ones who are to believe on him for eternal life."

While ἔξορθοντος can sometimes be employed synonymously with ῥόκος in secular Greek literature, 1 Paul's shift to the compound in this instance does not seem to be without significance. There are several important differences between the use of ἔξορθοντος in this passage and the use of ῥόκος in the ethical passages we have just examined. Here it is not Paul (as in Phil 3:17 and 2 Thess 3:9), nor the other believers (as in 1 Thess 1:7), but Christ at work in Paul, that is in view. This passage is the closest that Scripture comes to applying a term from the ῥόκος word-group to Christ himself. Christ's work of mercy for Paul,

New Testament Introduction: The Pauline Epistles, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1963), pp. 198-238, provides an extensive review of the various theories and concludes that the acceptance of Pauline authorship poses fewer problems than alternate theories. Our investigation proceeds on the assumption that the Pastoral Epistles are essentially Pauline, with perhaps the literary assistance of an amanuensis such as Luke (cf. Harrison, p. 363, for this conclusion).

1 See above, p. 135.
His display of unlimited patience in the foremost of sinners, Paul terms a ὑστερόκεφαλός.

We must also recognize that in this passage the ὑστερόκεφαλός is not just one among many, but a radically unique, one-of-a-kind experience happening to the "foremost of sinners." As such an experience, we further note that Paul does not hold up this ὑστερόκεφαλός for imitation, as he has the τέρον in ethical contexts.

In the light of these unique aspects in the usage of ὑστερόκεφαλός, it seems probable that Paul had a special reason for using the compound instead of τέρον. It will be recalled that the particular meaning of ὑστερόκεφαλός acquired from the prefixed preposition is a "form outlined as the basis for further work." This meaning has been noted by some commentators on this passage.

1. The usage of τέρον in vs. 16 seems to continue the same signification as in the previous verse, i.e., Paul classing himself as the "foremost" of sinners. His experience is not held up as "one instance plucked at random among many," but as a radical instance clearly illustrating the potentials and limits of what Christ could do (De Boer, p. 197). It appears, however, that Paul may also intend a further meaning. He is not only the "foremost" in quality, but a πρώτος or "first" in time. As William Hendriksen, Commentary on I and II Timothy and Titus (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1969), p. 82, expresses it, "Paul is, in theence, as an example of what Christ's longsuffering can accomplish. He is at the same time 'foremost' as the head of a procession of persons to whom that longsuffering is shown." As we shall see below, ὑστερόκεφαλός is able to encompass this dual meaning.

2. It is significant that De Boer, in his work devoted to the examination of the 'imitation of Paul' notion, recognizes (p. 198) that in this passage Paul's example "must not be thought of in the sense of an example which others are to strive to follow or imitate."

3. Above, p. 135.

4. So, e.g., Walter Lock, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (I and II Timothy and Titus), ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924), p. 16, defines ὑστερόκεφαλός as "an incomplete ... sketch in contrast to the complete picture." John N.

Paul's radical conversion provided a dramatic outline sketch of the saving power of Christ. This outline functions as a Vorbild—it is "the basis for further work." But the precise nature of the vorbildliche outline depends on the interpretation of the genitive that follows.

It is difficult to decide with certainty whether Paul's experience is a ὑστερόκεφαλός of or to/for the ones who are to believe on Jesus for eternal life. The genitive more naturally calls to mind the translation "of," which would imply that Paul's experience is paradigmatic of the way Christ's work would proceed in the future. Paul's experience would be presented as a radical ('down to the roots') outline, to be filled in by the succession of conversions in the future who would also display Christ's unlimited longsuffering. On the other hand, I Tim 4:12 and 1 Pet 5:3 employ the genitive, where the meaning "to (or for)" seems intended. By analogy it has been argued that ὑστερόκεφαλός with


The Nachbild element also seems implied, in that Paul receives grace from Christ. The stress is upon Christ's work of grace in Paul as a Vorbild.


See the discussion below, pp. 170-71, 180-81.
the genitive in 1 Tim 1:16 can be similarly treated. This latter translation would place emphasis upon the function of Paul's experience as a source of encouragement and hope for future generations. Paul's radical conversion very early in the history of Christianity would be set forth as a dramatic illustration of the saving power of Christ, given for the benefit of later converts.

If the unique signification of ἀποκάλυπτε γενετήριον is allowed to have its full force—as we have argued that Paul probably intended—the former suggestion would seem to be what is stressed. Christ's work of grace in Paul is a "form outlined as the basis for further work," i.e., a "prototype" of Christ's further work in future believers. It is the "rough sketch" that sets forth the contours of Christ's work in bold relief, which contours would be filled in by His work of grace in those who would later believe in Him for eternal life.

At the same time, the context of this occurrence of ἀποκαλύπτε γενετήριον appears at least to imply nuances contained in the latter suggestion. Christ's work in Paul seems presented in some sense "for" the sake of those future believers. While Paul's unique experience as the apostle is not for future imitation, nevertheless the apostle apparently recounts it "for" the benefit of those who were to believe in Christ. His digression and his own experience in vs. 15b-16 is in support of the saying proclaimed in vs. 15a—"that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners"—which saying is "sure and worthy of full acceptance." Paul argues that if Christ's grace can avail for him, the "foremost of sinners," it can certainly avail for future believers. This line of argument seems to imply that Christ's work in Paul is a διά τοῦ γενετήριον (the encouragement of) succeeding generations of Christians.

Those two suggestions for the translation of the genitive are not necessarily mutually exclusive. It is perhaps best to consider this construction as an instance of what Robertson describes as "genitives of 'looser relation'."

Christ's work of grace in Paul may be viewed as a διά τοῦ γενετήριον both of Christ's future work in other believers and for the benefit of those believers. It is an outline formed as a "prototype" of what Christ's grace is able to accomplish in future believers and for the encouragement of those by whom the contours of the outline would be filled in. The former suggestion ("of") would appear to be the primary signification, in order to indicate the referents of the "prototype." But the context would seem to at least imply

---

1 De Boer, p. 199, sees the "point of the whole passage" as illustrating that "salvation in Christ is for sinners, even the worst of them." (Italics supplied.) While not making a final decision on the proper translation of the genitive he argues that "the grammatical construction of the passage does not preclude its being understood as 'an example to (or for) those who are to believe.'" (Italics his.) Various modern versions (e.g., RSV, NASB, TEV, NIV) opt for this translation.

2 As we have noted above, Paul is not holding up his experience as the "foremost of sinners" as an "example" for others to imitate. The translation of ὁ διά τοῦ γενετήριον as "example" seems to confuse the issue at this point. If the translation "of/for" is accepted, it is not "of/for" future believers that they might imitate or conform to Paul's experience, but apparently "for" their encouragement that Christ's grace can avail for them, too.

3 Robertson, Grammar, p. 500. De Boer, p. 198, recommends this choice, although his discussion of the problem seems to be weighted toward the ideas involved in the translation "of/for."
appears to contrast two possible stances of Timothy vis-à-vis the same group of believers in each case. Timothy is to let no one (of the believers) despise him for his youth, but on the contrary, he is to be looked up to as a Vorbild for those same believers. The constant element in the two clauses seems to be the believers (μαθηταὶ τοῦ μάρτυρος). Only in this way can the contrast of attitude toward Timothy come to the fore. Instead of despising Timothy, the believers are to esteem him as their Vorbild. Thus μαθηταί is probably not an abstraction denoting the ideal faithful ones (of whom Timothy is to be a Vorbild), but a concrete reference to the believing community (for whom Timothy is a Vorbild). This seems confirmed by the repeated stress in the epistle upon Timothy being a Vorbild for the community at Ephesus.¹

But it is not just an upstanding exemplary life that is in view here. Timothy's τίτος is to have a salvific, drawing (or "stamping") power upon his hearers (4:16).² He is not only a "pattern" or "model," but a "mold" or "stamp" exercising a formative influence upon those who respond. Furthermore, the τίτος is of divine origin (6:25) and thus also a Nachbild.³ It is also an

¹See, e.g., 1:18, 19; 4:6, 12-16; 6:11-15.

²Miller, NIDNTT, 3:805 (German, TNBT, 3:1332), forcefully points out that in some of these ethical πεποίθηται passages are there "simply admonitions to a morally exemplary life [moralisch beispielhaften Leben]." Rather for Paul the τίτος also involves a "shaping power"; it is a "formative example [prägenden Vorbild]." See below, p. 170, n. 1 for a more complete citation of Miller's view. Cf. the recognition by Dibelius/Conzelmann, p. 70, that the edifying character of secular Greek inscriptions employing τίτος as "example" is "quite distinct from the paradoxical way in which Paul uses the concept 'example'."

³Howard Moeller, in 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus and
authoritative norm (1:18; 4:11, 14) directed beyond itself to those it normalizes. It has an all-encompassing, practical content (6:2, 3) involving the various aspects of Timothy's charge. He is to be a ἁρμονιος in "speech and conduct, in love, in faith, in purity." The ἁρμονιος seems to encompass the various themes of Paul's counsel in the epistle: prayer, position of women, church officers, false doctrine, widows, servants, wealth, and so on. It appears that Paul, who has referred to himself as a ἁρμονιος for believers (Phil 3:17; 2 Thess 3:9), instructs Timothy in his responsibilities as a divinely called (1:18; 4:14) minister/teacher/preacher (1:18; 3:14: 4:6, 11) and declares that Timothy is also to be a ἁρμονιος to the Christian community under his charge at Ephesus.

This ἁρμονιος Paul indicates has the significance of a "prägendes, bestimmendes Vorbild"—a stamping, determinative pattern—that is at the same time a Nachbild. Except for the few brief references in recent literature that we have cited in connection with our discussion, studies dealing with 1 Tim 4:13 have generally overlooked the semantic nuances that are involved in this usage of ἁρμονιος.

Here, as in other ethical ἁρμονιος passages, it is difficult to find a single English word-substitution that encompasses the dynamic semantic elements of ἁρμονιος. We may perhaps best translate Philemon, by Howard A. Moeller and Victor A. Bartling, CC (St. Louis: Concordia, 1970), p. 91, recognizes the dual Nachbild-Vorbild nature of this passage: "In order to impress the likeness to Christ on others, one [specifically Timothy] must first have received the impression himself."

Goppelt, THNT, 8:249-50. For a discussion of the problems in the ET of the German original at this point (THNT, 8:249), see below, p. 170, n. 1.

"pattern" or "model," but recognize that it is a pattern or model that is at once derived and determinative, i.e., a Nachbild and also a prägendes, bestimmendes Vorbild.

We now turn our attention to 2 Tim 1:13, in which passage appears the second of two occurrences of ὑπότασσως in Scripture. ὑπότασσως ἢ ὑποτάσσομαι λέγει ὂς "ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμῶν ἐν κοσμῷ καὶ ἐν καθεμιᾷ τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἔργοις.

Hold fast the ὑπότασσως of sound words which you have heard from me, in faith and love which are in Christ Jesus.

This passage is the sixth in the series of ethical contexts.

The usage of ὑπότασσως here appears to parallel the basic meaning of ὑπότασσως, "outline to be filled up," as found in 1 Tim 1:16. Here perhaps Paul employs the term ὑπότασσως instead of ἁρμονιος because the primary referent is "sound words" and not Paul or the Christian community. An "outline" would be especially appropriate with regard to words. But the special meaning of ὑπότασσως also seems particularly capable of encompassing, and emphasizing, the breadth of semantic contribution involved in the immediate context.

Various elements discussed in previous verses of the chapter

1 See the discussion of this basic meaning of ὑπότασσως above, p. 135. This significance is emphasized by numerous commentators on 2 Tim 1:13. Thus, e.g., for Scott, p. 97, ὑπότασσως in this context "does not mean so much a pattern as a sketch or ground-plan." Guthrie, p. 132, suggests the meaning of "an outline sketch such as an architect might make before getting down to the detailed plans of a building." Morgan P. Noyes, "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and The Epistle to Titus," 13, vol. 11 (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955), points out that ὑπότασσως, "used in sculpture and painting, meant an outline sketch or rough draft; in literature, a summary account giving a general idea of a subject but not a complete exposition."

2 Although the "sound words" are the primary referent, obviously Paul as a person is related to his words, and thus De Boer, pp. 199-200, briefly discusses this passage in relation to the "imitation of Paul" motif.
focus in vs. 13: Jesus Christ, Paul, his "sound words," Timothy, Timothy's hearing and following. As we have already noted, it is neither Timothy nor Paul, but Paul's "advice" that constitute the *grundidee*. By using the word "grundidee" Paul seems to indicate that it is the general outline of his words that Timothy is to hold fast, not the verbatim presentation.

At the same time, *grundidee* can connote the twofold perspective that is latent in *roto* and its cognates. Paul’s "sound words," derived from Christ (1:17; 2:9), the *Vorbild*, are received by Paul as a Nachbild, and passed on as a Vorbild to Timothy and others who were to hear and teach then (2:2). As the *roto* can be a "model" of something and simultaneously for something, so the compound "grundidee" can be aptly employed for the Nachbildliches.

1 Kelly, p. 166, recognizes this aspect of the semantic range: "Paul is not saying that Timothy should reproduce his teaching word for word, still less has he in mind some fixed creedal formula which he wants him to recite without deviation. The word translated 'model' (Gr. *hupotyposis*; cf. 1 Tim 1:16) denotes an outline sketch or ground-plan used by an artist, or in literature, a rough draft forming the basis for a fuller exposition. The suggestion contained in it, therefore, is that while Timothy should be unwaveringly loyal to Paul’s message, regarding it as his pattern, he should be free to interpret or expand it in his own way." See also Guthrie, p. 132: "... the apostle claims his own teaching to be no more than a starting point... Timothy is not told merely to repeat what Paul taught, but to follow that teaching as a basis." Cf. Scott, p. 97: "Timothy is not told to repeat just the things which Paul has said. All that is required of him is to keep Paul’s teaching before his mind, as an architect designs a building on the general plan of some other which has proved suitable for its purpose." This is contra the position represented by John Calvin, Commentaries on the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, trans. William Pringle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948), p. 201, who maintains that Paul commands Timothy to hold fast the doctrine which he had learned, not only as to substance, but as to the very form of expression. He supports this conclusion by affirming (ibid., pp. 201-2) that "grundidee" "denotes a lively picture of objects, as if they were actually placed before the eyes." But this signification of "grundidee" does not seem to be tenable.

Vorbild of Paul’s divinely derived words. However, in this verse the stress is on the *Vorbildliche* function. This is in harmony with the emphasis implied in the special meaning of *grundidee*:

"a form outlined as the basis for further work." As with *roto* and *grundidee* in Rom 6:17, Paul here especially emphasizes the normative function of the *Vorbild*. The *grundidee* is ultimately directed beyond itself to those it norms.

Again, it is difficult to find an adequate English word-substitution for *grundidee* in this verse. "Rough sketch" and "preliminary outline," while closest to the basic meaning involved, appear rather awkward in an ethical context. "Pattern" and "model" are both able to convey the Nachbild-Vorbild ambivalence of *grundidee* in this context, and at the same time connote the normative aspect. Inasmuch as the major emphasis in this passage appears to be the nature of Paul’s words as a normative Vorbild, the translation "pattern" or "model" seems preferred. We express this preference, however, with the caveat that commentators on this passage have generally chosen one of these word substitutions but failed to recognize the rich complex of semantic nuances that is present.

1 So emphasizes Moeller, p. 134: "What Jesus witnessed concerning Himself Paul also taught, and it is this healthy norm that Timothy is to follow in his life and teaching." Paul insists upon the normative character of his message, though (as we have noted above, p. 174, n. 1) he does not insist that Timothy restrict himself to a slavish word-for-word recitation of his message. Paul here, as elsewhere in the Pastoral Epistles—1 Tim 1:10; 4:9; 6:3; 2 Tim 4:3; Tit 1:9, 13; 2:1, 2:2 is particularly concerned that sound doctrine be upheld. But 2 Tim 1:13 clarifies that orthodox teaching is not enough. It must be conducted "in the faith and love which are in Christ Jesus."
We now turn to Titus 2:7, the final "ethical" τὸ ὁσίος passage in the Pauline corpus:

We now turn to Titus 2:7, the final "ethical" τὸ ὁσίος passage in the Pauline corpus:

What has been said about Timothy as a τὸ ὁσίος (1 Tim 4:12) is generally applicable in the similar context of this epistle to Titus, who is for Paul another "true child in a common faith" (Titus 1:4). Titus is to show himself "in all things" a Vorbild ("model, pattern") of good deeds, to accompany his instruction in sound doctrine. But not only is the τὸ ὁσίος for the benefit of believers, as stressed in the counsel to Timothy. In the correspondence to Titus Paul clarifies that Titus is to be a model or "pattern" also so that any opponents may have nothing to gainsay regarding his behavior (vs. 6).

Furthermore, whereas to Timothy Paul first presents the Christocentric roots and source of power for being a Vorbild (1 Tim 1:1-16; 2 Tim 1:9-13), in his letter to Titus he reverses the order. Titus is exhorted to be a Vorbild (2:1-10), and then (introduced by γάρ, vs. 11) the soteriological motivating content

1 Thus various commentators on the Pastoral Epistles refer to their discussion of τὸ ὁσίος in 1 Tim 4:12 at this point. See, e.g., Dibelius/Conzelmann, p. 141. Cf. Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 195; Scott, p. 165. See also above, pp. 170-73, for a discussion of 1 Tim 4:12.

2 Scotts, p. 165, recognizes that Titus "pattern" of good deeds serves to "Illustrate his teaching by his life." Other commentators generally recognize the nature of τὸ ὁσίος as a "pattern" or "model" in this passage. See, e.g., Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 195; Neyes, p. 535; Calvin, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, pp. 313-314; Moellering, p. 200.

and potency are clarified (2:11-15). Finally, Paul's role as τὸ ὁσίος (Nachbild of Christ and Vorbild for the believers) is not as pronounced here as in some other passages we have noted. But the implication of such a role seems clear from the fact that it is Paul doing the exhorting and commanding (2:15, 3:8).

In this passage we would translate τὸ ὁσίος as "pattern" or "model," with the reminder that the pattern or model is at once derived and determinative, a nachbildliches, prägenden, bestimmendes Vorbild.

In the preceding seven Pauline usages of τὸ ὁσίος and ὄρθος, respectively, which occur in similar ethical contexts, we have found a breadth of signification for these Greek terms that has not been generally recognized. Lexical studies, commentaries, and modern English versions of the NT tend to overlook the semantic richness that τὸ ὁσίος and ὄρθος contain in these passages. Goppelt and Müller are the only major exceptions to this trend, but their studies make only passing reference to the individual τὸ ὁσίος passages with ethical contexts and provide no substantiating evidence to support their semasiological conclusions.

Our analysis of these passages has confirmed the brief assertions made by Goppelt and Müller and has also provided further elucidation of the broad semantic contours of τὸ ὁσίος and ὄρθος.

We have found that these terms do not indicate a mere moral example, and thus we have avoided the potentially misleading

1 The same order is maintained in Titus 3:1-2, 3-7.

2 Thus De Boer does not examine this passage in his analysis of the "Imitation of Paul" motif.
word-substitution "example" which is employed in many modern versions of the NT (and even in the ET of Goppelt's discussion of these passages in TDNT).

The German term Vorbild has proved helpful in clarifying the stress of τόκος and ἑνδοτικός in these passages. Yet even the term Vorbild is not able to encompass the meaning of the Greek terms. In these ethical contexts τόκος is not just a Vorbild but has the significance of a "prägenden, bestimmenden"

1 The word-substitution of "example" ("Example of the Obedience of Faith") for τόκος in the ET heading of Goppelt's discussion of these passages in TDNT 8:249, struck us as out of place. In view of the fact that, e.g., Liddell-Scott-Jones never define τόκος in terms of "example." The ET of the discussion by Goppelt under this heading adds to the confusion. Not only "example" but also "model," "mould," and "pattern" are employed as word-substitutions for τόκος.

A comparison with the German original of Goppelt's analysis (TDNT, 8:249-50), however, reveals that the variation is in the English translation. In Goppelt's (original) German of this section, he consistently employs the term Vorbild to describe τόκος (TDNT, 8:249). It seems unfortunate that the translator chose "example" to translate Vorbild in the heading and most often throughout the discussion. The term "example" is also a common translation of the more general German term Beispiel, which is avoided by Goppelt in defining τόκος (cf. Bauer-Arndt-Schöttler-Dankel, p. 630, and Müller, TDNT, 3:905, where the ET "example" consistently represents the German original Vorbild, not Beispiel [Bauer, col. 1642: Müller, TDNT, 3:1332]).

In fact, Müller (TDNT, 3:905 = TDNT, 3:1332) expressly repudiates the notion of mere Beispiel in all the "ethical" τόκος passages: "Diese Anderungen sind nicht nur Anmuthungen an eine moralisch-beispielhaftes Leben die für obergabe an den Bekenndien Vorbild werden surfen (2 Thes 3:5). Es sind diejenigen, die es erklären, und gibt ihm Autorität. Die Schaffung eines moralischen Lebens erfordert durch die Worte in einem neuen Kontext (1 Thes 1:6) an die für einen moralischen Ausdruck in der Gemeinde (1 Thes 1:6) erfordert die Verwendung des Wortes "Vorbild.""

It is not only to avoid the possible association with the German term Beispiel that we have avoided using the term "example." The word "example" tends to shift the metaphor away from the basic meanings involved in τόκος, i.e., a forming, shaping matrix and/or what is formed or shaped by the matrix. These ideas are more clearly prescribed by such word-substitutions as "pattern," "model," and "mold." It should further be noted that the term "example," like the German Vorbild, fails to express the ambivalent semantic value of τόκος, whereas the terms "model," "mold," or "pattern" retain the potential ambiguity.

Vorbild. And besides this dynamic "stamping, determining" nature of the Vorbild, several passages emphasize its normative character, in which the τόκος is teleologically oriented toward that which it normes. Furthermore, τόκος is usually presented as a Nachbild as well as a Vorbild. It is the Vorbild "which makes an impress because it is molded by God." These same semantic contours are present in ἑνδοτικός.

The English word-substitutions "pattern" or "model" are able to approximate the twofold perspective of τόκος and ἑνδοτικός— the Nachbild and the Vorbild—since they are also ambivalent in meaning, suggesting either the matrix or the effect of the matrix or both. These English terms are also well-suited to an ethical setting. But neither "pattern" nor "model" can convey the dynamic "stamping" or "molding" quality of the τόκος that we have discerned in several of the passages. This aspect is best expressed by such terms as "mold," "stamp," or "die." These latter terms are also able to convey the two-fold Nachbild-Vorbild perspective, but as substantives appear awkward in an ethical context. Likewise, ἑνδοτικός is most accurately translated as "rough sketch" or "preliminary outline," but these word-substitutions are not suited to an ethical context. It must be concluded that any single English or German word-substitution is inadequate to express the rich semantic range of τόκος and ἑνδοτικός in these passages.

A final feature of these ethical τόκος passages may be

1 Goppelt, TDNT, 8:249. Italics his.
2 Goppelt, TDNT, 8:249. Italics supplied.
3 Ibid.
pointed out. There is a wide spectrum of Nachbildung-Vorbild sequences operating in Paul's usage of these terms. The word tōgos is applied successively to Paul himself and his associates (Phil 3:17; 2 Thess 3:9), local church leaders (1 Tim 4:12; Titus 2:7), and the local congregation (1 Thess 1:7). Even the local congregation does not complete the sequence but is a tōgos for all other Christians (1 Thess 1:7). The Nachbildung-Vorbild relationships in successive Pauline usages of tōgos (and tōgoσων) may be diagrammed as follows:

![Diagram of Nachbildung-Vorbild relationships]

The use of tōgos and tōgoσων must be seen within the total spectrum of Nachbildung-Vorbild sequences. Only thus can the contextual contribution and semantic nuances of these terms be grasped in all their expressiveness.

General Epistles. The only occurrence of the term tōgos in the General Epistles appears in 1 Pet 5:3:

ἐγγέλτω κατατόμοντές τοι τόγον ἀλλὰ τόγον γνώσην τοῦ πάπτου.

[Tend the flock (vs. 2)] not as domineering over those in your charge but being tōgos to the flock.

Peter's use of tōgos here closely parallels that of Paul's. The elders are called "models" or "patterns" for the flock to follow. The shepherd imagery employed by Peter, though in a sense mixing the metaphors of seal-impressions (or molds) with sheep, is entirely appropriate for the usage of tōgos. The sheep need a concrete Vorbild placed before them, i.e., the shepherd, which they will willingly follow. Peter addresses the elders as fellow elders (5:1). He calls the fellow-shepherds of the flock (as he had been appointed by Jesus as shepherd, John 21:15-17) to the chief Shepherd (1 Pet 5:4). He speaks of the sufferings of Christ, as a witness of those sufferings, in the attempt to brace the believers to endure suffering for Christ's sake.

We have here the same Nachbildung-Vorbild sequence operating as in many of the Pauline ethical tōgos passages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christ</th>
<th>Apostle</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>&quot;Sheep&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vorbild</td>
<td>Nachbildung-Vorbild</td>
<td>Nachbildung-Vorbild</td>
<td>Nachbildung</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hermeneutical Tōgos Passages

In addition to the tōgos passages which we have analyzed thus far, there are six usages of tōgos (or cognate) which occur in hermeneutical passages. In harmony with the methodology stated

1See above, pp. 147-80.

2Go, e.g., Alan M. Stibbs, The First Epistle General of Peter, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), p. 188, rightly notes that the force of tōgos γνώσην is "becoming models", i.e., showing yourselves as patterns to be copied by the flock."
In the introduction of the present study, we reserve these passages for more detailed analysis in the following chapter. At this point, however, we may list the hermeneutical τός σε passages and briefly indicate the hermeneutical context of each.

In Rom 5:14 we find the following sentence employing the term τόσος:

\[ \textit{αλλ' ερασκόμενοι ο} \textit{άνωτας ήσ} \textit{όδοι μηνών καθώς κατα} \textit{τούς μη τεωστάς τος ἀπὸ τῆς δύναμιν τῆς χαράς, ἃς ἐστιν τόσον τοῦ ἔκλοντος}. \]

Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who is a τόσος of Him who was to come.

This passage reveals that we are dealing with a τόσος occurrence in a hermeneutical context. Paul is interpreting the significance of an OT personage, Adam, in the light of the NT reality, "Him who was to come." The surrounding verses (Rom 5:12-21) draw out the significance of this relationship between Adam and Christ.

A very pregnant usage of τόσος together with the appearance of the cognate τυπος is found in 1 Cor 10:6, 11:

\[ \textit{ταῦτα δὲ τόσον ἡμῶν ἐκείνων, εἰς τὸ μὴ εὔνοιαν ἡμᾶς ἐπιστολᾶς κατὰ, κατὰ δὲ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν, ἐκ τῆς τῷ ἐκ τῶν αἰῶνων μαρτυρίας}. \]

Now these things happened as τόσον of us, that we should not crave evil things, as they craved. . . . Now these things happened to them τυπος, and they were written for our warning, upon whom the end of the ages has come.

These τόσον passages are specifically dealing with Paul's interpretation of events recorded in OT Scripture from the perspective of the eschatological Christ-event, and therefore involve a hermeneutical context. In the light of our analysis in the following chapter, we are able to confirm (or disaffirm) the apparent parallelism of meaning between τόσον in vs. 6 and τυπος in vs. 11.

Significant usages of τόσον and τυπος occur in the epistle to the Hebrews. In Heb 8:5, the word τόσον occurs in a quotation from Exod 25:40 (LXX):

\[ \textit{οἵτως ὑποδείκνυται καὶ παρὰ λατρείᾳ τῶν ἔποιησιν, καὶ λατρεῖα λατρεῖως ἢκτορος τῶν σώματος, ἵνα γὰρ, γραφεῖς, ποιεῖται πάντα κατὰ τὸν τόσον τῶν σώματος τοῦ ἐν πάση ρήμα}. \]

They [the earthly priests] serve a copy and shadow of the heavenly sanctuary; for when Moses was about to erect the tent, he was instructed by God, saying, 'See that you make everything according to the τόσον which was shown you on the mountain.'

In Heb 9:24 the author of Hebrews employs the term τυπος:

\[ \textit{οἵτως ἐκτιμηθεῖται ἐκείνης ἡμῶν κατοίκες, τυποῖς τῶν ἵλησιν, ἀλλ' εἰς ἀυτὸν τὸν υἱὸν, τὸν εἰρημέναν τῷ πατρὶ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸν Ἰησοῦ}. \]

For Christ has entered, not into holy places made with hands, τυπος of the true one, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf.

These passages in the epistle to the Hebrews present us with a hermeneutical context. The OT reality (the sanctuary), as recorded in OT Scripture, is interpreted in the light of the eschatological Christ-event and the NT reality (the heavenly sanctuary).

In 1 Pet 3:21 we find the second of two occurrences of τυπος in the NT:

\[ \textit{δὲ μὴ ὡς τυποὶ τῶν σώματος βαπτισμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἡμέρας ἀνέκαθεν ἡμᾶς ἑκατοντάκισιν εἰς δεόν, καὶ τυποὶς ἔκκαθοράντων}. \]

Which also, as an τυπος, baptism now saves you, not as a removal of dirt from the flesh but the pledge of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ.
This passage again reveals a clear hermeneutical context. The apostle is interpreting the significance of the salvation of Noah and his family in the Flood, as recorded in OT Scripture, in the light of the NT reality, Christian baptism.

The following chapter is devoted to the analysis of these hermeneutical passages. It is expected that such analysis, compared with the semasiological data presented in the present chapter, will elucidate the signification of ἔτος and cognates in these passages.

Summary and Conclusions

The word ἔτος appears to be derived from the verb ἔταν, "to strike." From an early emphasis upon the basic idea of "form" (i.e., the result of a blow or pressure and/or that which gives the blow or impression), probably originally a "hollow form" or "mold," ἔτος passed through various stages of development, accumulating an amazing breadth of semantic range. The wealth of significations can be organized under ten different categories, and include such diverse meanings as "impression," "stamp," "mold," "die," "cast," "relief," "graven image," "form/shape/features," "archetype/pattern/model," "outline/sketch," and "rough draft/text." Beginning especially with Plato, more abstract (or metaphysical) semantic contributions accrued to ἔτος, though the concrete meanings also continued. In particular the concrete meaning of "sketch" or "outline" came to signify in Plato and Aristotle an "unfinished/preparatory/preliminary disclosure of a thing." This development may have had an influence on the specialized usage of ἔτος in late Judaism and in the NT.

Underlying the numerous significations of ἔτος, there seem to be three basic meanings: (1) the matrix, or Vorbild, i.e., what leaves its impress; (2) the impression and Nachbild, i.e., the result of the impress or blow; and (3) the matrix or Vorbild which is at the same time an impression or Nachbild. The third basic meaning, involving a dual perspective, is alluded to by a few researchers, but has not been given sufficient attention in view of its significance within NT usage.

Of the some seventy different cognates of ἔτος found in secular Greek sources, only three occur in the NT: ῦαρτῦντος, τιτλός, and ὕσσεως. The various significations of the noun adjective ῦαρτῦντος within secular Greek literature are related either to the basic sense of "strike back" or to the second basic meaning, "corresponding, antitypical." The infrequently used adverb τιτλός (closely related to the adjective τιτλός) also has two basic meanings: (1) "open to impressions"; and (2) "corresponding to a type." The basic meanings of the noun ἀρτατοῦντος are (1) "model" and (2) "sketch." The prefixed ἀρτο- often gives the compound the special meaning of "a form outlined as the basis of further work," which meaning involves the same twofold (Nachbild-Vorbild) perspective which may be found in ἔτος.

The word ἔτος is employed four times in the LXX, while the other NT cognates do not occur. In Exod 25:40 ἔτος translates the Hebrew וְהָבָשָׁן. The context appears to point to a meaning such as "pattern, model," but the citation of this passage in Heb 8:5 calls for further analysis of Exod 25:40 later.
Amos 6:26 ὰνὸς translates the Hebrew כִּיפָּ֣ס and signifies an "idol" or "graven image." In 1 Macc 3:30 ἄνωθεν refers to the "wording" or "text" of a letter, while in 4 Macc 6:19 it seems to denote a determinative "model" or "pattern" of behavior.

In Philo ὰνὸς is frequently employed in accordance with classical Greek usage. However, Philo can also make a specialized use of the term in his allegorical interpretation of the OT, which usage often reflects the dual perspective of ὰνὸς as a nachbildlicher Vorbild. Josephus employs ὰνὸς sparingly and according to common secular Greek usage. The term ὰνὸς also occurs as a loan word in Rabbinic literature. Biblical cognates of ὰνὸς appear infrequently in the literature of late Judaism and conform to secular Greek usage.

The substantive ὰνὸς occurs fifteen times in the NT, while the cognates ἄνωθεν and ἀνωτέρωξ each appear twice, and τὴν ὀνομασίαν is found only once. A semantic analysis of these occurrences reveals that ὰνὸς and its NT cognates exhibit a surprising breadth of semantic range.

All of the basic meanings of ὰνὸς are represented in the NT: Vorbild (Acts 7:44; Nachbild (e.g., John 20:25; Acts 7:43; 23:25); and the simultaneous nachbildlicher Vorbild (e.g., Rom 6:17; 1 Thess 1:7). The semantic range involves such significations as "mark, print" (John 20:25; 26); "idol" (Acts 7:43); "pattern, mold" (e.g., Acts 7:44); "text, form of expression" (Acts 23:25). In Rom 6:17 ὰνὸς is probably best translated "mold" and involves a rather complex combination of semantic contributions. In this passage ὰνὸς as a Nachbild is (1) derived and (2) concretely formed, and as a Vorbild is (1) a teleologically oriented norm and (2) a possessive power.

In the eight passages (seven Pauline and one Petrine) where ὰνὸς or ἀνωτέρωξ is employed in an ethical context, there is exhibited a breadth of signification similar to that in Rom 6:17. To a greater or lesser degree, depending on the emphasis of the particular context of ὰνὸς and ἀνωτέρωξ, the following semantic contributions of these Greek terms are in view: (1) a Vorbild (matrix) which functions as (a) an authoritative norm, teleologically oriented beyond itself to that which it norms, and (b) a dynamic, shaping power; (2) a Nachbild (impression of matrix) which is (a) a form with specific content and (b) a form shaped by God via Christ and the apostles. Furthermore, within the various ethical passages, we have seen how ὰνὸς and ἀνωτέρωξ present a spectrum of Nachbild-Vorbild sequences as applied successively to the apostle and his associates (Phil 3:17; 2 Thess 3:9; 1 Tim 1:16; 2 Tim 1:13), to the elders or leaders of the local congregation (1 Tim 4:12; Titus 2:7; 1 Pet 5:3), and to the other members of a local congregation (1 Thess 1:7). Ultimately this ὰνὸς (and ἀνωτέρωξ) directs its stamp or mold to the Christian church at large (cf. 1 Thess 1:7; 1 Tim 1:16) and even affects non-Christians (Titus 2:7-8).

The breadth of signification involved in the usage of ὰνὸς and ἀνωτέρωξ in these ethical passages is difficult to encompass by a single modern-language word-substitution. The substantives "mold" or "stamp" most adequately capture the dynamic semantic contours but are ill-suited to a setting of ethical exhortation. It has been suggested that perhaps the best ET of
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des continues in these ethical passages is "pattern" or "model" (except in 1 Tim 1:15, where the word-substitution "prototype" appears preferred). But the caveat must be added that it is not merely an exemplary pattern or model of behavior that is in view. In most instances ἱδρύμακι and ἁγιεμένοι consist of a stamping, determinative pattern or model (prügendes, bestimmendes Vorbild) that is simultaneously a copy (Nachbild) of the divine original (Urbild). These broad semantic dimensions have been largely overlooked in recent literature dealing with the usage of ἱδρύμακι and biblical cognates.

In the course of our semasiological investigation of ἱδρύμακι and cognates in the NT, we encountered six occurrences in a hermeneutical context, i.e., in a setting where the NT author is engaged in the interpretation of the OT. The term ἱδρύμακι is found in three passages (Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 10:6; Heb 8:5; Exod 25:40), ὁσιόμετωκος occurs twice (Heb 9:24 and 1 Pet 3:21), and ἱδρύμακι appears once (1 Cor 10:11). These passages are analyzed in more detail in the next chapter.

As we complete the summary of semasiological data in regard to ἱδρύμακι and biblical cognates, let us note some of the special contributions made by the present study.

First, previous lexicographical studies have failed to adequately elucidate the semantic range of ἱδρύμακι and biblical cognates. This we have sought to remedy by citing illustrations of the various significations from secular Greek literature with sufficient context so that the meanings may become evident from the quotations.

Second, there has never been an attempt to place the semantic range of ἱδρύμακι in a broader perspective by indicating how the various meanings of ἱδρύμακι overlap with the semantic ranges of other Greek words. This we have provided in the footnotes for each of the numerous significations.

Third, we have demonstrated the necessity of positing an additional basic meaning of ἱδρύμακι that has heretofore been largely overlooked. ἱδρύμακι can carry not only the basic meanings of Vorbild (matrix) and Nachbild (impression produced by the matrix) but can also indicate both Vorbild and Nachbild simultaneously. Although this dual Nachbild-Vorbild perspective of ἱδρύμακι is noted by lexicographers in reference to Philonic usage, it has been generally disregarded as a possibility in other occurrences of ἱδρύμακι.

Fourth, no detailed semasiological analysis of the NT occurrences of ἱδρύμακι and cognates has heretofore been conducted. The studies of Goppelt and Müller—the two most complete treatments—make only passing reference to a number of NT occurrences and often set forth their semasiological conclusions without substantiating analysis. Hence, perhaps the most important contribution of the present chapter is that it attempts for the first time to systematically examine the semantic contours of ἱδρύμακι and cognates in the NT.

Several aspects of this investigation may be listed as additional contributions. As part of our semasiological analysis of ἱδρύμακι and cognates in the NT, we have confirmed the statements of Goppelt and Müller regarding the rich semantic contours of these terms, particularly in Rom 6:17 and the eight ἱδρύμακι...
passages with ethical contexts. Aside from the cursory assertions of Goppelt and Müller, this breadth of signification has been generally disregarded in recent literature dealing with these passages.

Our analysis has taken us beyond the brief treatments of Goppelt and Müller and has provided further elucidation of the semantic richness of τόνος and biblical cognates. In Rom 6:17 and the eight ethical τόνος passages, we have seen how a whole cluster of semantic nuances is encompassed by τόνος and ὡς τόνος, and how, within the various ethical passages, these terms provide a full spectrum of Nachbildung-Vorbild sequences.

Finally, we have isolated six occurrences of τόνος (or cognate) which occur in hermeneutical passages. In harmony with our methodology stated in the introduction of the present study, these hermeneutical τόνος passages are examined in considerable detail in the following chapter. It is expected that the semasiological data regarding τόνος and biblical cognates gathered thus far will prove helpful in explicating the conceptual structures of the hermeneutical τόνος passages. It will be determined in which passages τόνος or cognate is employed as a specialized hermeneutical term. The passages in which this is the case are expected to reveal the essential structural components involved in biblical typology. To this analysis of hermeneutical τόνος passages we now turn our attention in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III
HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL TYNOΣ STRUCTURES
IN HERMENEUTICAL TYNOΣ PASSAGES

The semasiological study in the preceding chapter has revealed six NT occurrences of τόνος or cognate which are found in a hermeneutical setting: 1 Cor 10:6, 11; Rom 5:14; 1 Pet 3:21; Heb 8:5 (= Exod 25:40); and Heb 9:24. As noted in our survey of literature, no thorough analysis of these NT hermeneutical τόνος passages has heretofore been undertaken with a view toward exposing the inherent τόνος structures. This we attempt to accomplish in the present chapter.

In our investigation the various hermeneutical τόνος passages are grouped together under two major subdivisions. First, we examine the τόνος passages in 1 Cor 10:1-13, Rom 5:12-21, and 1 Pet 3:18-21, all of which are seen to involve horizontal (earthly/historical) τόνος structures. Within this subdivision, the passages are treated in what is determined to be the probable chronological order of composition—1 Cor 10, Rom 5, and 1 Pet 3—so that any possible shifts or development of usage may be ascertained. In the second subdivision, we examine the τόνος passages in Heb 8:5 and 9:24, which are seen to involve vertical (earth/heaven) as well as horizontal structures. Since Heb 8:5 cites the OT (LXX) τόνος
passage, Exod 25:40, to support the vertical dimension, we examine the latter in an excursus under the second subdivision.

An exhaustive exegesis of each hermeneutical τὸνος passage would take us beyond the limitations of this study. We conduct the most extensive investigation of 1 Cor 10:1-13, since it is seen to be (most probably) the earliest of the hermeneutical τὸνος passages and the only one in which the existence of typology has been seriously questioned. The presence of typology is generally recognized by scholars in the other hermeneutical τὸνος passages, and we can build upon the significant exegetical studies that have already been undertaken, even though these studies have not focused specifically upon τὸνος structures.

We augment this previous research by fresh analysis of crucial unresolved structural issues. In dealing with each of the hermeneutical τὸνος passages, we attempt to set forth the conceptual τὸνος structures as they emerge from the various strands of exegesis. Attention is also given to the semasiological contours of the word τὸνος (or cognate) in each of its immediate contexts, and it is determined in which passages τὸνος (or cognate) is employed as a specific hermeneutical term. In the excursus on Exod 25:40 (LXX) our primary concern is to ascertain whether or not vertical (earth/heaven) structures are present.

Following our investigation of these τὸνος passages, we attempt to synthesize the data and suggest conclusions regarding the basic hermeneutical τὸνος structures in Scripture. It is seen that these τὸνος structures are closely related to the structures of salvation history. On the basis of the hermeneutical τὸνος structures, viewed within the framework of salvation-historical structures, we are able to formulate a tentative definition of biblical typology. In light of the typological structures that emerge from our investigation, it is also possible to assess the validity of the various modern views of biblical typology.

Horizontal τὸνος Structures

Horizontal τὸνος Structures in 1 Cor 10:1-13

Preliminary Considerations

Modern studies dealing with 1 Cor 10:1-13 have been sharply divided over the existence of typology in this passage. A number of scholars assert that 1 Cor 10:1-13 constitutes paroemeis but not typology. On the other hand, it is widely affirmed that in this passage the author not only employs paroemeis but engages in a

---

typological interpretation of the OT. 1

Are the terms *idea* and *material* in this passage (vv. 6, 11) employed as specific homiletical terms to describe a typological approach to the OT? If so, what is the nature of this typological


interpretation? As we have noted in the literature survey, there has been no adequate attempt to resolve these questions by means of a thorough analysis which allows the rôles structures to emerge from the passage. This we seek to provide in the present study.

Attention is first given to certain essential contextual considerations, including (1) crucial questions of introduction, (2) special aspects of literary structure, and (3) the immediate context of the passage (i.e., 1 Cor 8:1-11:1). Exegetical considerations build upon the contextual foundation and attempt to deal with matters of textual criticism, word, thought, and progression of the argument, as these are pertinent to the elucidation of the inherent rôles structures. The exegetical analysis is not confined only to the verses in which rôles and cognate appear. Since the author's hermeneutical approach to the OT is sustained throughout the entire pericope, we must painstakingly examine every verse for indications of the constituent rôles structures. We then seek to synthesize these structures and ascertain the usage of rôles and rôles in the author's hermeneutical endeavor. Finally, we are able to draw preliminary conclusions and indicate implications for the recent debate over typology.

Contextual considerations

It is not essential for our purposes to consider the whole range of introductory and background materials that make up the historical/literary/theological context of 1 Cor 10:1-13. But we must deal with certain important contextual considerations prior to the
exegetical analysis. Attention is first given to several crucial questions of introduction.

Questions of introduction. The authorship and approximate date of composition of the first epistle to the Corinthians are particularly significant for our concerns. Only as these data are determined for each hermeneutical passage is it possible to ascertain any shifts or development that may occur in later usages of ἦν (or cognate) by the same or a different author. Evidence clearly points to a Pauline authorship of 1 Corinthians.2 Regarding the time of writing of the epistle, various Spring dates from A.D. 53-57 have been recently proposed.3 It appears possible to conclude

1These data are also of special concern in regard to 1 Cor 10, since it becomes evident in the present chapter of this dissertation that 1 Cor 10 most probably comprises the earliest extant usage of ἦν (or cognate) in a hermeneutical setting. It is of interest to determine when, and by whom, this first usage is employed.

2The Pauline authorship of 1 Corinthians (including chap. 10) has never been seriously questioned. See e.g., the discussion in Feine-Behn-Kummel, p. 202; and Johannes Behn, p. 202; Harrison, pp. 287-88. As early as c. A.D. 95—earlier than attestation for any other Pauline epistle—Clément of Rome quotes from 1 Corinthians and specifically refers to the letter as from Paul. See 1 Clement 37:5; 41:1-3; 42:5; cf. the early attestation in Ign. Eph 16:1; 18:1; Rom 5:1; and Phil 4:3. Pauline authorship is universally acknowledged by the early Church. The personal character and concerns of Paul are consonant with that presented in his other extant letters.


1The major chronological benchmark for dating 1 Corinthians is the Galileo inscription found at Delphi (see Charles K. Barrett, ed., The New Testament Background: Selected Documents [New York: Harper and Row, 1961], pp. 48-49, for the inscription, and uge, pp. 104-111 for historical interpretation), which provides a chronological link with data for Acts. According to Acts 18:21, Paul was brought before Galileo, proconsul of Achaea, sometime during his stay in Corinth on his second missionary journey. Corinth, the capital city of Achaea, was the residence of the proconsul, who was appointed by the Roman Senate, usually for one year. The Galileo inscription mentions (1) Galileo as proconsul of Achaea, and (2) the Emperor Claudius acclamed emperor for the 26th time. From other insessional evidence (see Conze, 1 Corinthians, pp. 12-13 for references) this can be fairly certainly fixed as occurring during the first half of his 12th year, A.D. 52. It is also clear from other sources that proconsuls normally took office in late Spring or early Summer (approximately April or May). Therefore Galileo probably presided in Corinth from May 1- May 52 A.D.

Acts 8:11 informs us that Paul remained in Corinth for at least six months. Following the uprising of Jews and his appearance before Galileo, Paul stayed on "many days longer" (18:18), then traveled to Syria/Antioch and stayed "some time" (18:23). He then began his Third Missionary Journey, traveling through Galatia/Prygia to Ephesus, where he remained three years (20:31). The letter of Paul to Corinth under question was written not long after he left for India, according to 1 Cor 16:8 he was planning to stay until Pentecost. Perhaps this intended short interval was even reduced by the riot in Ephesus stirred up by Demetrius (Acts 19:23-41) after which he departed (20:1).

This puts the date probably in the Spring of a year following 52 A.D. that allows for the activities of Paul in the meantime to have transpired. If one takes the chronological data of the book of Acts as accurate, then the date of Corinthians would be closer to 57 A.D., to make time for Paul's return to Syria, his travels through Galatia/Prygia, and his three years in Ephesus. While recent chronological works have taken Acts more seriously than classical 19th century liberalism, there is still a tendency to minimize the historical reliability of the book of Acts in comparison to the historical data found in Paul's letters. Those who advocate a date early in the 50s A.D. must juggle the order of events in Acts somehow, so that 1 Corinthians is dated only a year or two following
We have thus far referred to 1 Corinthians as a whole. Yet it must be recognized that numerous modern attempts have been made to subject the epistle to source analysis, resulting in proposals of its composite nature. Though the unity of 1 Cor 10:1-13 has never been seriously questioned, its immediate context (8:1-11:1) is often considered as one of the major composite sections. Since the immediate context of 1 Cor 10:1-13 is crucial to the interpretation of the passage, the question of unity is of special concern to our study. Various arguments have been set forth in favor of a composite

Paul's stay in Corinth. While admittedly there are problems in reconciling the data of the Pauline corpus and the book of Acts (see, e.g., R. Jewett, pp. 7-24), we are convinced the difficulties are not insurmountable (see, e.g., DJB, 97-107 and Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 354-63), and would put out a date that seeks to do justice both to Lukan Acts and Pauline data, i.e., ca. A.D. 57.

John C. Hurd, Jr., The Origin of 1 Corinthians (New York: Seabury Press, 1968), pp. 43-47, provides a schematic overview of the various source-analyses that have been proposed since 1875, when Hegge proposed the first theory of a composite epistle. Johannes Weiss, for instance, finds three parts of 1 Corinthians, representing three developmental stages in Paul's relation to Corinth, with an elaborate theory of editing. Weiss gives a summary of his view in his book, The History of Primitive Christianity. 2 vols., ed. Frederick C. Grant, trans. Frederick C. Grant et al. (New York: Wilson-Erickson, 1937), 1:350-57: Letter A involves 1 Cor 10: 1-23; 8:1-20; 11:2-34; 16:7, 9, 20-21; 2 Cor 5:14-7:1. Part B1 includes 1 Cor 7:24-8:1; 10:1-14; 11:1-19; 16:1-23; 11:2; 14:40-58; 16:1-15. Part B2 is comprised of 1 Cor 11:1-9; 1:10-11 (11:22-24). Letter A was written before Paul's receipt of the letter from Corinth (1 Cor 7:1); B1 answers the questions of the Corinthian letter. B2 is written after Paul receives word about the Macedonian readiness to share in giving to the collection, and after the reports from the household of Chloe. B2 is either sent at the same time as B1 or separately.

For the statement of the argument in favor of considering 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 a composite section, see below, p. 195, n. 1, point no. 4. In defense of the unity of this section, see below, p. 200, n. 2, point no. 3.

The major reasons set forth by various scholars in favor of the composite nature of 1 Corinthians are summarized by Herrin, pp. 117-24 as follows: (1) Paul mentions at least three letters to Corinth (1 Cor 5:9-11) and possibly a fourth (2 Cor 2:13-9:7:8). It is tempting to look for the preservation of all of these letters in the two surviving epistles. (2) The difference in tone between Paul's vigorous treatment of the orel information he received unfavorable to Corinth, and his more calm treatment of the correspondence from Corinth starting with 7:1, points to two different times of writing. Hurd, p. 43, sees this argument as the primary difference upon which all source theories are based. (3) Paul's statement in 4:19 that he will soon come to Corinth is in contradiction to his statement of delayed coming in 10:5-9. (4) In 10:1-22 Paul strongly opposes eating food sacrificed to idols, which contradicts his prescription merely out of deference for the weak in other passages (8:1-13; 10:23-11:1). This argument strikes at the immediate context of our two passages. (5) There is an abrupt resumption of discussion of apostleship in chap. 9 which was apparently already settled in chap. 8:1-4.

With Barrett we would agree that the reconstructions of Weiss and Herrin, for example, when read in the sequences suggested by their proponents, make quite good sense (Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 14). But Barrett raises the question whether this very fact constitutes an argument against them both, since both are not right and the sense that they make may be as a result of scholarly reconstruction, not originally separate sources.

Various recent studies have come to the defense of the unity of 1 Corinthians. See especially Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 14-17; Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 435-47; and Hurd, pp. 115-43. Among the arguments in favor of the integrity of the epistle, the following are the most cogent:

First, Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 15 points out that 1 Corinthians, p. 15, argues that one must note two different perspectives out of which the supposedly contradicting passages come. Chap. 4 is the context of warning—they should be aware that he will certainly return in person soon. Chap. 16 is a more objective statement of plans, with the commitment that he will come as soon as possible. Third, and perhaps most important in regard to 1 Cor 10, the question of food offered to idols (8:1-11:1) must be seen as a complex problem. Those who have posited a contradiction, argues Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 15, have failed to recognize Paul's distinction
of several Pauline documents, or (3) any apparent inconsistencies that cannot be accounted for by means of reasonable explanations, it seems "extremely improbable" that 1 Corinthians is of composite nature. In our exegesis of chap. 10, therefore, we treat 1 Corinthians as a unity.

**Literary structure.** It is not essential for our concerns to examine the overall literary structure of 1 Corinthians or its place within the epistolary genre common to the rest of the Pauline corpus. There is, however, one element in the literary structure of this epistle that calls for particular attention with regard to 1 Cor 10:1-13. This relates to the use of Corinthian slogans by Paul. In 1 Cor 8:1 there seems to be a definite clue to the existence of a Corinthian slogan cited by Paul. The double "we" is in this verse grammatically awkward. The first appears to refer to Paul.


3 W. P. W. D. C., p. 68, lists some twenty-five scholars who recognize three or more passages in 1 Corinthians as quotations by Paul of slogans from the letter sent by the Corinthians. The more commonly recognized Corinthian slogans quoted by Paul include the following: "all things are lawful" (6:12; 10:23); "Food is meant for the stomach and the stomach for food" (6:13); "It is well for a man not to touch a woman" (7:1); "All of us possess knowledge" (8:1); "An idol has no real existence" (8:4); "There is no God but one" (8:4); "For although there may be so-called gods in heaven or on earth ... indeed there are many gods!" (10:1); "And many lords—yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom all things are and through whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom all things and through whom we exist" (8:6, 6); "Food will not commend us to God. We are no worse off if we do not eat, and no better off if we do" (8:8).
and the second to the Corinthians: "We know that we all have knowledge." Furthermore, it has been correctly pointed out that in this verse "the formula ἦν ἀληθεῖα is frequently used to introduce a well-known fact that is generally accepted." Thus in this verse the ἦν has a function similar to the ἦν recitativum and frees the material which it introduces from its grammatical context. It would appear, therefore, that 8:1 as well as the two statements in 8:4 (where "we know that... and that" [οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ τὰς ἄγνοιαν] also occurs) are most probably slogans quoted by Paul from the Corinthian letter.

A second indication of the existence of quotations is that Paul immediately adds a counterstatement to qualify or modify certain statements he makes. In connection with the immediate context of 1 Cor 10, we note the following passages: 1 Cor 8:1, 4, 5, 6, 8; and 10:23. The very force of Paul's immediate modification of the original statements in these passages appears to be a literary apologetic device for recognizing the Corinthians' position by quotation of their argument, by partially agreeing with it, but then immediately introducing the counterstatement to circumscribe and delimit its application. We therefore concur with various scholars that these passages are among those in the epistle which probably involve a quotation utilized by Paul. The recognition that Paul is citing various Corinthian slogans in chaps. 8 and 10 clarifies the immediate context of 1 Cor 10:1-13. To this immediate context we now turn our attention.

Immediate context (1 Cor 8:1-11:1). The argument of Paul in the immediate context of 1 Cor 10 (i.e., in 1 Cor 8:1-11:1) calls for brief consideration. In 1 Cor 8:1 the words μὴδὲ do indicate the beginning of a new topic. Having dealt with the Corinthians queries concerning marriage and celibacy (chap. 7), Paul in chap. 8:1-11:1 turns his attention to the matter of σκόρπεια "food offered to idols." Is it proper for Christians to eat food that has been offered in sacrifice to an idol? There were apparently two extreme positions taken by the Corinthians with regard to this question. The first group, the "strong," believed they possessed γνῶσις which gave them liberty to eat food offered to idols even in idol temple feasts. The second group was composed of the "weak" who, being

---

1For discussion and bibliography on 1 Cor 8:1-11:1, see especially Orn and Walther, pp. 220-57; Bruce, 1 Corinthians, pp. 78-102; Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, pp. 137-80; and Charles K. Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols," NTQ 11 (1965): 38-53. This is the second of the sections in 1 Corinthians arising from the letter of inquiry the Corinthians wrote to Paul.

2Hurd, pp. 117-25, contends for only one position, that of the strong, with the "weak" group only a hypothetical allusion. But one cannot so easily slough over the explicit statements (especially 1 Cor 8:7-8) that if taken seriously would explode Hurd's hypothesis.

accustomed to idols," could not eat 
\[\text{Food offered to idols.}
\]
without violating their consciences.

In dealing with whether it was lawful for a Christian to eat food offered to idols, Paul places the issue in a larger framework. The whole section (1 Cor 8:1-11:1) becomes an explication of the nature of Christian freedom. In chap. 8 Paul agrees with the slogans of Corinthian yúnoq: "an idol has no real existence" and "there is no God but one" (vs. 4). It indeed logically follows from these statements that Christians are free to eat ekłądóma. But Paul hastens to point out the ruling principle of love which may on occasion limit Christian freedom. He counsels those with "liberated" consciences not to let their personal liberty be a stumbling block to the weak, but rather to surrender their rights out of love for them.

Were the Corinthians?" NTS 19 (1973-74): 65-74, persuasively argue that it is anachronistic to call "gnostic" those ideas and concepts held by the Corinthians "which may have been taken over by Gnosticism but were of earlier origin and arose in a totally different speculative context" (Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 15). Barrett, "Things Offered to Idols," pp. 150-53, provides a helpful summary of the position represented by these liberated Corinthians and seems to employ the term "gnostic" in an appropriate non-technical sense referring to people who made much of the term yūnoq" (ibid., p. 150).

1 Cor 8:7. This phrase either refers to Jewish Christians who are accustomed to thinking of idolatry as real and forbidden or it has reference to converted Gentiles who cannot rid themselves of the long held notion that an idol has real existence and food offered to it as having religious meaning. See Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 158, n. 8, for bibliography of proponents for each of these views. If Gentile Christians are the ones in view as those "weak" in conscience, as is most frequently maintained in recent literature, it is nonetheless possible that these converts are under the influence of Judaizing Christians. Note Barrett's comment ("Things Offered to Idols," p. 152): Paul had to walk the tightrope between the legalism of Jewish Christianity and the false liberalism of gnostic rationalism.

In chap. 9 Paul shows that his appeal for the Corinthians to limit their freedom and surrender their rights is not something he himself has not done. Not only has he for the sake of the gospel surrendered what any Christian could claim; he has also forgiven what he could claim as an apostle. In the final verses of chap. 9 (vss. 24-27) Paul illustrates the general principle of self-control by referring to the stigmata games and provides a transition to the next phase of his argument regarding food offered to idols. It appears that liberating yūnoq of the Corinthians involved a mechanical, magical view of the sacraments derived from the Hellenistic mystery cults. The Corinthians apparently felt that their participation in baptism and the Lord's Supper automatically guaranteed their salvation. Thus they were free-from the possibility of disqualification and free to behave as they chose.

The pericope of 1 Cor 10:1-13 must be seen in the light of the leading motifs in Paul's argument that we have surveyed thus far: (1) the original question of eating food sacrificed to idols, which Paul broadens into (2) an explication of Christian freedom; (3) the controlling principle of love which may call for the restricting of one's personal freedom and surrender of one's rights for the sake of others; (4) the surrender of personal rights broadened into a

principle of self-control or curbing of self-indulgence; (5) the possibility of disqualification as opposed to (6) the Corinthian view of a sacramental opus operatum which produced a false sense of freedom and security.

As is revealed below in our exegetical analysis, Paul is able to address himself to all of these issues by means of an illustration from the experience of ancient Israel (1 Cor 10:1-13). In so doing he at the same time gives further warning in regard to other issues brought up earlier in the letter, notable those of factions (cf. 1:10-4:21) and immorality (cf. 5:1-6:20). He likewise can bridge into the final stage of his argumentation concerning food offered to idols. In 1 Cor 10:14-11:1 Paul distinguishes between the mere eating of κοιμεπτα and the eating of κοιμεπτα in the context of actual participation in idolatrous feasts. Arguing from the nature of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as a participation in the blood and body of Christ, Paul warns that taking part in idolatrous feasts means becoming worshipers of and partners with demons.

In the final paragraph of this section (10:23-11:1), Paul summarizes the basic principles of his argument. These major points of Paul's argumentation in 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 must be kept in mind in the

---

1. The former he has already (chap. 8) argued is permissible if it does not violate the conscience of a weak brother, but the latter he now asserts gives the eating the significance of idolatry. See especially Barrett, "Things Offered to Idols," p. 16.

2. For a discussion of Paul's doctrine of the Lord's Supper expounded at this point, see especially Kásemann, Essays, pp. 108-35. See also Neugebauer, pp. 45-55; and G. Grün, "Eucharistia nella prima lettera ai Corinzi (10,1-18; 1,17-34)," RBR 12 (1977):35-55. Cf. the discussion and bibliography in the sources listed above, p. 205, n. 1.

---

Exegetical considerations

It is generally recognized that 1 Cor 10:1-13 belongs together as a unit. Paul has spoken of the possibility of being disqualified in 9:27, and then in vs. 1-11 he illustrates this possibility from the history of Israel in the wilderness. Then he repeats (vs. 12) the same principle of possible disqualification in terms of the Corinthians as it was for him personally (9:27). In vs. 13 Paul provides a positive promise to soften the warning and to assure his readers that what he has warned of as a possibility need not in fact happen. In vs. 14 he clearly starts a new progression in the argument with 6. Am. "therefore," and the admonitions against idolatry.

The pericope of 1 Cor 10:1-13 may be divided into the following thematic sections:

Israel's baptism in the cloud and sea (vs. 1-2)

Israel's spiritual food and spiritual drink from the spiritual rock (vs. 3-4)

---

1. There is no question regarding the integrity of this section (and in fact of vs. 1-22). See Bandstra, "Interpretation," p. 5 n. 1. The difference of opinion concerns which verse concludes the pericope. Most studies suggest a division after vs. 13. See, e.g., T. Baard, "1 Corinthians 10, 1-13. Een Schets," GTT 76 (1976):1-14; Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 218; Breeze, 1 Corinthians, p. 96; Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 164; Neugebauer, p. 45; and Robinson-Plummer, p. 198. Mertz, p. 322, and Bandstra, "Interpretation," p. 5, treat vs. 1-11 as a unit. See also Dahl, p. 244, consider vs. 1-15 together, and de Ru, p. 349, deals with vs. 1-12 as a single section. The question is not critical, but as argued below (and by most commentators) the best division appears to come after vs. 13.

2. Though, as we have already noted, vs. 14-33 are related to vs. 1-13.
Divine retribution on the wilderness generation (vs. 5)

Paraenetic warnings from Israel's experience (vss. 6-11)

Concluding exhortation (vss. 12-13)

We take up each section in turn.

In this pericope there are numerous background materials to be considered. The history of tradition which involved the Exodus and wilderness experiences of Israel spans a wide range of Biblical and para-Biblical literature, from Pentateuchal narrative to various OT references, Jewish midrashim, and NT allusions by Jesus and the apostles. Those references directly relevant to the interpretation of this passage are discussed in connection with the particular section to which they apply.

Israel's baptism in the cloud and sea (vss. 1-2). The historical situation is introduced in vs. 1:

οὐκ εἷλα γὰρ ὡς ἄρατος, ἄλογος, ἢ ς. οἱ ἀνθρώποι λοι καὶ κατά τινας θυράς οὐκ ἔσται καταγείρειται.

For I do not want you to be ignorant, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea.

By means of the introductory particle γάρ, Paul reveals that vss. 1-11 are to serve as a justification for the previous counsel he has given (9:24-27) to exercise self-control and be aware of the possibility of falling away. Paul is adding a weighty explanation of why his admonition is so important, in view of the experience of Israel. He is proving the danger of idolatry and self-indulgence, because it happened to ancient Israel, with dire results.

The introductory formula "I do not want you to be ignorant" is used by Paul as a special introduction for a critical item (e.g., in 12:1; Rom 1:13; 11:25; 2 Cor 1:8; 1 Thess 4:13). By the use of this introduction, Paul urges his readers to sit up and take special note of what is to follow.

Paul is hardly addressing only the Jews of the Corinthian congregation by the phrase "our fathers." For there is no hint of thus limiting its application. The word "brethren," immediately proceeding, appears to indicate that he is addressing both Jew and Gentile converts. Because this seems the case, the reference to ancient Israel as "our fathers" is particularly significant. It implies that both Jews and Gentiles are considered descendants of Israel. Both are inaugurated into the people of God. It further indicates that the Christian church is viewed as existing in continuity with Israel. Indeed, it is the new (eschatological, vs. 11) Israel. Paul makes this more explicit elsewhere (Gal 6:16; Phil 3:3; and Rom 2:26-29).

See Bandstra, "Interpretation," p. 5.

See Orr and Walker, p. 245. Cf. the positive statement "I want you to know" in such passages as 1 Cor 11:3 and Col 2:1.

See Bandstra, "Interpretation," p. 6.

The phrase "our Fathers" provides the basis upon which the correspondences drawn in succeeding verses can be made. There is a spiritual relation which binds the people of the old covenant with the people of the new covenant. By means of the phrase "our fathers," Paul announces this relationship between ancient Israel and the eschatological Christian community.

The pronoun "all" (οὖν τῶν) is emphasized by its fivefold repetition in vss. 1-4. This is the means by which Paul is able to show the contrast with vs. 5: all shared the gifts of grace, but not all a majority retained the blessing. Their "baptism" and eating and drinking of spiritual bread and drink did not preserve them ex opere operato. As noted above, the Corinthians seemed to have held a magical view of the sacraments in which participation guaranteed salvation. Because of this false sense of security that threatened the Corinthians, Paul provides the strong perorating warning in vss. 6-12, built upon the correspondences established in vss. 1-5.

Paul writes that all Israel were "under the cloud" (ἐν τῷ σκόντι), and all passed "through the sea" (ἐν τῷ θαλασσαῖ) The abrupt introduction of "the cloud" and "the sea" with definite article appears to indicate that the events Paul describes are assumed to be known by his readers. It seems clear that Paul has reference to

---


2. For discussion and bibliography on the elements of Jewish midrash, see, e.g., Longenecker, pp. 32-45; Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutics, pp. 117-27; Brown, John, 1:277-78; and Ellis, Prophecy and Hermeneutics, p. 136. Whether or not Paul's hermeneutical endeavor should be viewed as a Christian midrash utilizing the elements of Jewish midrash (as suggested, e.g., by Ellis, Prophecy and Hermeneutics, p. 136), need not be decided in the present study. The idiosyncrasies in Paul's hermeneutical endeavor which emerge from our analysis can in later studies be compared with the constituent structures of Jewish midrash to determine possible structural relationships. Relevant Scriptural passages dealing with the cloud include especially Exod 13:19-14:30; Ps 78:14; and Ps 105 (104 LXX):39.

3. Location is indeed involved. Exod 14:19-20 apparently implies this in describing the cloud passing from in front of Israel to the rear, and the locative idea is clearly presented in Ps 105:39. But the locative only provides the basis for other motifs.

4. Exod 13:21. It should be noted that the preposition ἐν with the accusative is frequently employed by Paul with regard to rule, power, sovereignty, and leadership (see Bauer-Arndt-Schmid-Danker, p. 851; cf. especially 1 Cor 9:20). In this motif ἐν signified "under the authority of..."


6. Ps 105:39 seems to clearly imply the notion of protection. In this motif ἐν would signify "under the shelter of..."

7. Exod 14:19-20; cf. Exod 14:13. The cloud came between Israel and the Egyptians to prevent the latter from attacking and to give the former light that they might pass safely through the Red Sea.
And all underwent baptism into Moses in the cloud and in the sea.

Upon what basis does Paul say that Israel "underwent baptism"? Some studies of Rabbinic parallels have sought to demonstrate that the baptism of Jewish proselytes is described by the Rabbis in relation to the Exodus event as a baptism. However, we need to first recognize that "the Rabbinic tradition is in fact at a loss to find

(Stuttgart: Württemberg Bible Society for United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 559; Hering, p. 86. Furthermore, the Jewish practice of proselytes baptizing themselves, as opposed to the Christian baptism performed by another, would provide a strong motivation for a later copyist replacing the middle (taken as reflexive) by the passive.

If we accept the middle voice as the original, this does not necessarily mean that Paul envisaged the Israelites baptizing themselves in the cloud and the sea, as opposed to the Christian procedure. To the contrary, Paul is attempting to draw historical correspondences between the Church and ancient Israel, not denote distinctions. Blass-Debrunner-Funk (p. 166) point out that the middle can often be translated in the sense of "to let oneself be." See, e.g., 1 Cor. 11:6; 2 Cor. 1:5 (LXX); Acts 2:16. If such is the case here, Paul would be indicating that Israel's "baptism" was not compulsory, but a result of their own free-will choice. However, Christian baptism involves free choice also, and thus there would seem to be no need for a middle voice here used in contradistinction to Paul's usual passive voice (for Christian baptism).

Another related possibility is that both the middle and passive voice are used in connection with baptism, should be taken as an insinuation active, i.e., "underwent baptism." See, e.g., Nigel Turner, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, ed. James H. Moulton, vol. 3: Syntax (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1983), sect. 57; Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 22; Orr and Walter, p. 265. This suggestion seems the most likely, in that a change of voice allows Paul to draw a general correspondence between Israel and the church, without implying absolute identity between the two experiences.

The use of an aorist tense here points to a punctiliar event, and in the context of the cloud and the sea it can be concluded that the reference is to the deliverance from the Egyptians at the Red Sea.

a Scripture proof for proselyte baptism." Furthermore, it has been persuasively shown by Gustave Mertellet, André Feuillet, and George R. Beasley-Murray that the rabbinic passages in question do not relate proselyte baptism to the Red Sea experience, but to the ritual purification at Sinai.

That Paul does not have a Jewish proselyte model in mind seems further evident from the phrase which precedes Ephes 2:11-20: "those who were..." There are simply no Jewish parallels to this expression. There can be little doubt that Paul's expression "into Moses" is based on the analogous phrase "into Christ" used by Paul with reference to Christian baptism. It appears, then, that one should approach Paul's phrase "baptized into Moses" by way of Paul's understanding of being "baptized into Christ" which he sets forth elsewhere.

It is beyond the purview of this analysis to attempt a full-blown synthesis of Paul's theology of baptism. Yet from a brief

1 Conzelmann, I Corinthians, p. 166.
3 Schnackenburg, p. 93.
4 Rom 6:3; Gal 3:27; cf. the use of the phrase in 1 Cor 1:13, 15, 12:13, etc.
5 1 Cor 12:13; Gal 3:27; Rom 6.
6 For discussions of Paul's theology of baptism, see especially Markus Barth, Die Taufe—Ein Sakrament? Ein exegetischer Beitrag zum Gespräch über die Kirchliche Taufe (Z11 1951: Europäischer Verlag, 1961), pp. 186-377; idem, "Baptism," IDB, pp. 88-89; Beasley-Murray, pp. 127-216; Lundberg, pp. 135-45; and Schnackenburg, Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul. See also the works on NT baptism listed below, p. 330, n. 2.

 glance at Paul's discussions of "baptism into Christ," we may infer something of what Paul may have intended to signify in the expression "baptized into Moses."

As in Christian baptism the believer is assigned to, and incorporated into, obedient fellowship with Christ, so Israel was united with Moses their leader in the Exodus event. "Into Moses," as "into Christ," means into his possession and under his authority, into his ownership, leadership, and even, "corporate existence." Consonant with the Christian experience of baptism, the Israelites had experienced redemption from the old order (Egypt) by God. They had made a commitment to the redemptive act when they crossed the Red Sea. They had accepted Moses as their leader and mediator. They had, in short, experienced "initiation into the redemptive program of which Moses was the dominant personal figure." As with Christians, they had experienced a transfer of lordships. Their "baptism" had sealed and signified them as the new community of redemption, under the lordship of Yahweh.

The historical correspondence between ancient Israel and the

1 Bendit, "Interpretation," p. 7; Schnackenburg, Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul, pp. 21-28; 31-35.
3 De Ru, pp. 354-55.
4 Bruce, I Corinthians, p. 90.
5 Grosheide, p. 220.
6 Ellis, Prophecy and Hellenistic, pp. 170-72.
7 Lewis B. Sneden, All Things Made New: A Theology of Man's Union with Christ (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), p. 143.
Christian church, already implied in the expression "our fathers" in vs. 1, is in vs. 2a significantly developed. Israel's baptism "into Moses" is viewed in historical correspondence with the Christian's baptism "into Christ." Moreover, the implied correspondence between the Christian church/Christian baptism/"into Christ" on one hand and ancient Israel/Exodus baptism/"into Moses" on the other hand appears to indicate ecclesiological, sacramental, and Christological structures in Paul's hermeneutical endeavor. These structures are more explicitly developed in succeeding verses of this hermeneutical passage.

Paul further expands the historical correspondence in vs. 2b when he writes that Israel underwent baptism in the cloud and in the sea: It is crucial at this point that we attempt to determine the nature and extent of the historical correspondence which is drawn between Christian baptism and ancient Israel's baptism. In what sense was ancient Israel baptized "in the cloud and in the sea?" Various suggestions have been proposed as to what Paul intended to signify.

1. A literal baptism denoting the mode of immersion. Though they did not actually go in, presumably the cloud moved from in front of the Israelites through their camp to rest behind them so that they were in or under (vs. 1) it as it passed.1 "With the cloud above them and the sea on both sides, the Israelites were enveloped by water when they passed through the sea, and in this sense they were baptized."2

---

2 Strack and Billerbeck, 3:405-308; Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 165.
3 Hansen, Jesus Christ and the OT, pp. 11-16.
4 Goppelt, TNT, 8:251; Goppelt also allows for the correspondence of "basic passage through water." Schackenberg, p. 93.
5 Meredith Kline, By Oath Consigned: A Reinterpretation of the Covenant Signs of Circumcision and Baptism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), pp. 55, 57-58, 67-70. On p. 70, Kline summarizes his understanding of the passage.
of Israel's baptism any more narrowly than Paul himself does in his theology of Christian baptism. If we examine the various elements in Paul's concept of baptism into Christ, and find historical parallels in the "baptism" of Israel at the Red Sea, we cannot easily limit the range of his intention any further than is called for in the text.

In regard to view No. 1 above, many scholars are opposed to the correspondence of any literal details and insist that in vs. 2 there is no allusion to the mode of baptism. But the description of "under the cloud" and "through the sea" (vs. 1) appear clearly local (even if δύναται in vs. 2 is instrumental), and such details would seem likely to connote to the Corinthian readers the parallel in the mode of Christian baptism, i.e., immersion.

This, however, need not mean that Paul was following the fanciful Rabbinic legends of tunnels and vaults in the sea that we referred to above.

In regard to view No. 2 above, we cannot agree with Hanson that Paul was referring solely to the presence of the pre-existent Christ. Andrew J. Bandstra rightly argues that such an interpretation would not do justice to the phrase "into Moses" which parallels "into Christ" nor to the phrase "in the sea," in which Christ did not "pre-exist."


Gappelt and Rudolf Schnackenburg (view No. 3 above) appear to be correct that the essential correspondence drawn by Paul is a soteriological one. It is the correspondence of God's saving acts of grace that form the basis of Paul's paraenesis involving acts of judgment in vss. 5-10. Furthermore, in the light of Paul's own concept of baptism as involving the forensic judgment motif, it seems possible to recognize the essential validity of Kline's argument (view No. 4 above) for the meaning of "Judgment ordeal."

Likewise, Martelet's argumentation (view No. 5 above) appears sound—especially in view of Isa 63:11-14—in support of the thesis that the cloud and the sea are to the baptism into Moses as the Spirit and water are to the baptism into Christ.

It does not seem possible to limit Paul's intention to a single nuance of meaning at this point. With his use of a sweeping generalization ("into Moses" modeled on "into Christ") coupled with the specific details ("in the cloud and in the sea") the

---


2 Kline has grounded his case in the biblical evidence and appears supportable even if his ancient Near Eastern examples of water and fire ordeals should not all prove relevant.

3 Plummer and Robinson, p. 200, find this suggestion "forced and illogical." In that both sea and cloud are watery elements, referring to the one material element (water) in baptism, just as Paul (vss. 3-4) refers to the material elements in the Eucharist. While Plummer and Robinson rightly point out that the cloud is a watery element and is thus part of the water baptism imagery, it appears that they fail to recognize that the cloud also involved the element of fire (Exod 14:20, MT) and the divine presence (Exod 14:24).

---

The apostle seems to envision the "whole mystery of redemption" and "whole pattern of images" consonant with both the experience of Israel and Christian baptism. Paul paints the scene before his readers with a few swift brush strokes. He provides the outline ("into Moses," "into Christ") and enough detail (cloud and sea) to inculcate upon their minds the rich complex of imagery involved in the historical scene and its correspondence with Christian baptism. We may conclude that the nature of Paul's correspondence is essentially soteriological and Christological, but the extent of the correspondence includes specific detailed historical parallels that are involved in the salvation events.

A number of structural elements have already begun to emerge in vss. 1 and 2. We have noted the historical correspondence that is implied by the phrases "our fathers" and "into Moses." Paul's account vividly portrays his view of the historical reality of the Exodus experience at the Red Sea. At the same time, a Christological/soteriological structure appears to be coming into view as an essential element in the apostle's description. An ecclesiological/sacramental structure also seems to be involved in the implied correspondence between ancient Israel's baptism and Christian baptism.

There are several additional conceptual aspects implied in vss. 1 and 2 which may perhaps be best viewed as different elements of a single prophetic structure. First, inasmuch as Paul has

---


2 By the use of the term "prophetic" we seek to encompass...
described Israel's Red Sea experience in direct continuity with Christian baptism, to the point of even employing Christocentric terminology to delineate Israel's ordeal, we can conclude that Paul conceived of Israel's "baptism" as an advance presentation of Christian baptism. If the OT event is a baptism, a baptism experientially and terminologically identified with Christian baptism, it then presents in advance that Christian baptism. The events of ancient Israel are for Paul a pre-presentation of what is repeated by eschatological (vs. 11) Israel.

Second, it can be asserted that for Paul, God caused this advance presentation to happen. Divine intent lay at the foundation of the pre-presentation. Israel did not deliver itself from bondage or plan its own route through the Red Sea. God, in fulfillment of His promise to Abraham centuries before (Gen 15), brought Israel out of slavery, led them to the Red Sea, parted the waters, provided the protecting, enveloping cloud, and brought them safely through the Sea. All were His mighty acts of deliverance.

At the same time, God did not interfere with Israel's freedom of choice. While He led, they were free to follow or not. The choice of each individual Israelite determined whether God's action would be for him one of deliverance or, as with the Egyptians, one of retributive judgment. Thus the advance presentation presented by Paul expresses a balance between the causative action the elements of advance-presentation, divine design, and devoir-être that are discussed below.

1 As recognized, e.g., by Goppelt, IONT, 8:231-52.

of God and responding freedom of Israel.

Finally, we can conclude that for Paul the relationship of the OT baptism of Israel and Christian baptism has an aspect which Martelet calls devoir-être ("must-needs-be"). If the OT event is indeed an advance-presentation of the NT event, then the OT "pre-presentation" implies that the NT "presentation" will occur, and further, that it will occur after the order of the OT "pre-presentation." This ineluctable devoir-être connection between the saving events of God in the Exodus and Christian baptism is essential to Paul's line of argument. Only if there is a devoir-être connection between these saving events of God, can Paul convince the Corinthians in vss. 5-10 of the devoir-être nature of the judgments of God, i.e., that if the Corinthians disobey like ancient Israel, it "must-needs-be" that the judgments of God will fall upon them too.

Israel's spiritual food and drink from the spiritual rock (vss. 3-4). We note first the parallel clauses in vss. 3-4:

καὶ κατέχεσθε τὸν πνευματικὸν ρύπον, καὶ εἰσίτω τὸν πνευματικὸν ζύλον ἐν κρίσιν.

And all ate the same spiritual food and all drank the same spiritual drink.

There is little question that the bread to which Paul refers is the manna miraculously supplied to the Israelites during their wilderness wanderings, and that the drink is the water miraculously

1 Martelet, pp. 527-31.
2 Exod 16:4, 35; Num 11:6-9, 21:5; Deut 8:3, 16; Josh 5:12; Ps 78:24; 105:40; Neh 9:15, 20.
provided from the rock.\(^1\) It is also *generally agreed*\(^2\) that by the expressions "spiritual food" and "spiritual drink" Paul is making allusion to the Lord's Supper, and that this would have been so recognized by his readers in Corinth. The covert reference to the Eucharist becomes evident from the explicit discussion of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor 10:16-22, a discussion obviously following from Paul's hermeneutical endeavor.\(^3\) This may be seen, e.g., by the combination of εὐχαριστεῖν "all" and τὸ αὐτὸ "the same" in vss. 3 and 4a. In vs. 17, Paul draws a correspondence between Israel's experience of all eating the same manna and the concept of sacramental communion "communion" (vs. 16) in the Lord's Supper, where also "all partake of the one bread."

The manna (and drink?) had already been used to refer to the Eucharist by Jesus himself.\(^4\) The phrase "spiritual food and drink" very well could have been a common current expression for the Eucharist in Corinth at the time of Paul's writing,\(^5\) as it was when the Didache was composed.\(^6\)

Though there is a scholarly *commnis opinio* that Paul is in some way alluding to the Lord's Supper in his reference to the

---

5. Coppelt, TUNT, 6:146.
6. Didache 10.1 employs the phrase "spiritual food and drink" in an Eucharistic prayer.

---

experience of Israel with the "spiritual food" and "spiritual drink." A wide variety of interpretations have been suggested for the precise meaning of τευχαριστεῖν. It is vital for our concerns that we seek to determine the signification of τευχαριστεῖν in this context. In fact, τευχαριστεῖν may be said to rank with τὸ αὐτὸ and τὸ δοκεῖν as one of the key terms of 1 Cor 10:1-13 in connection with Paul's hermeneutical endeavor. Paul uses this term specifically to indicate his interpretation of OT realities in Israel's experience. Some scholars have actually translated τευχαριστεῖν as "figurative" or "typological."\(^7\) Are these accurate translations? What meaning does Paul intend to convey when he describes the bread and drink as τευχαριστεῖν? What does the signification of τευχαριστεῖν imply with regard to the structures of the apostle's hermeneutical endeavor? These questions require careful attention.

Most of the suggested translations of τευχαριστεῖν take cognizance of the basic meaning of a Greek adjective ending in -λογος, "belonging to, pertaining to, with the characteristic of,"\(^2\) but they apply it in different (though often closely related) ways. Note the following suggested significations:

1. "Sacramental." Tertullian, followed in modern times by a few scholars, treats τευχαριστεῖν as synonymous with "sacramental."\(^3\)

---

1. See below, p. 227, n. 6, p. 228, nn. 2 and 5.
3. Tertullian De Baptismo 9 (see Danielou, Shadows to Reality,)
2. "Intended for the (human) spirit." Some older commentaries relate συνευκορενσίς to the human spirit. The food and drink was "spiritual" because of its effect on the spirit, or inner life, of those who partook. It was intended for their spirit, i.e., it strengthened their faith. ¹

3. "Wonderful." Another possibility proposed less recently is to understand συνευκορενσίς as a refined ethical quality, an epithet of excellence ("wonderful!"), similar to one English meaning of "celestial," "heavenly," or "divine" and comparable to Josephus' description of the manna as a 'divine and wonderful food.' ²

4. "Supernatural." Many scholars prefer a word-substitution of "supernatural" for συνευκορενσίς in this context. ³ This suggestion has several variations all related to the basic idea of supernatural: (a) "Miraculous." The manna and water were supernatural in origin, i.e., supplied (by the Spirit) miraculously. ⁴ (b) "Heavenly." Related to the preceding suggestion, some would translate συνευκορενσίς as "heavenly," in harmony with the statements that the bread came... pp. 177-78). Henri de Lubac, Corpus mysticum: L'Eucharistie et L'Eglise au Moyen Age, 2nd ed. (Paris: Aubier, 1949), pp. 139-54 (see Martelet, p. 340); Selwyn, St. Peter, p. 203.

² Josephus Antiquitates 3.16; cf. Hodge, p. 172.
⁴ SDAGC, 6.740; Ansler, "La typologie," p. 107. Ansler also concurs with suggestion no. 6 below.

5. "With a spiritual background." Bandstra argues that Paul does not explain the significance of the word συνευκορενσίς, but employs it to indicate that there was a "spiritual background" behind everything Israel received, a spiritual character to the food and drink. ⁶ While close to previous suggestions, this position emphasizes the overall spiritual background to the miraculous provision of sustenance because Christ was always present as the Giver.

6. "Figurative." Various interpreters find in the word συνευκορενσίς a reference to the figurative nature of the food and drink. Not denying the literal historical event, Paul is seen to emphasize a further figurative or "spiritual" significance. ⁷ In...
which the food and drink become a 'visible prophecy' of the sacraments.

Many of the modern commentators have not limited themselves to only one of the above options. A common approach recognizes two main aspects of τυπολογίας: (1) it is supplied supernaturally and (2) it has a spiritual/figurative ('typological') significance. For Eduard Schweizer, the bread and drink are 'spiritual' in that they (1) come directly from God's sphere and (2) give divine power. For Bandstra, they are (1) gifts of God that are (2) vehicles of the saving work of Christ. For Barrett, they are 'spiritual' because they are bearers of the Spirit in a two-fold way: (1) they have a further significance in addition to their material function as food and drink for the body'; and (2) they are 'symbolical, or typical, of the Christian sacrament.'

It is not easy to decide among the numerous possibilities presented above. A word study of Paul's use of τυπολογίας, especially in 1 Corinthians, provides some help. Within the NT

3:708-7, finds the meaning of τυπολογίας here "almost equivalent to 'allegorical,'" i.e., 'spiritual' in the sense of denoting a spiritual reality or conveying a spiritual meaning rather than in the sense of actually conveying the Spirit itself." (Italics his.)

1Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 222.
2E.g., Orr and Walther, p. 245.
4Bandstra, "Interpretation," p. 10.
5Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 222.

the word τυπολογίας appears twenty-six times, and all but two usages are in 1 Corinthians, where it seems that Paul is at crucial points taking over--and re-interpreting--the terminology of his Corinthian opponents. The term τυπολογίας is used by Paul in three grammatical forms: (1) adjective ('spiritual something'); (2) masculine noun ('spiritual man'), and (3) a neuter noun ('the spirite'). The various significations of τυπολογίας in the Pauline corpus (outside 1 Cor 10) provide parallels and support for a number of the aforementioned suggested meanings of the term in 1 Cor 10.

The concept of heavenly or supernatural origin (views No. 4a-3b) has much to commend it, in the light of both OT statements (especially Exod 16:14) and the parallels in 1 Cor 15. In the latter passage, the "spiritual" τυπολογίας body is the heavenly, glorified body, and is placed in antithetical parallelism with the earthly ματαιότητα body (vs. 44). The heavenly connotation is further revealed in the synonymous parallelism between Christ as a "life-giving Spirit" (vs. 45) and as the "man of heaven" (vs. 48).

At the same time, in that Christ as τύπος is "life-giving" we can also see support in 1 Cor 15 for the additional connotation of "conveying the Spirit" (view No. 4c). Also 1 Cor 2:14, 16


1See Moulan and Gedia, p. 824, for frequency and distribution of occurrence.
3See the analysis of these three forms in Dunn, 3:706-7.
provides an analogy for this usage. The ἀνέπτυχος is one who is possessed by the divine Spirit which enables him to understand and manifest the things of the Spirit. Along the same lines, 1 Cor 14:37 refers to "spiritual men," i.e., those possessed by and manifesting Spirit. These two latter passages have a further salvific connotation (view No. 4d above): "the ἀνέπτυξος is the man who knows God's saving work by virtue of the Spirit of God."¹

Numerous occurrences of ἀνέπτυξος can be seen to support view No. 5, that of a deeper spiritual background behind the material food and drink (especially because of the presence of Christ). Several aspects of Christianity seem to be called ἀνέπτυξος in view of the deeper "spiritual" significance that pervades them: the law (Rom 7:14), blessings (Eph 1:3; Rom 15:27), gifts (Rom 1:11; 1 Cor 12:1; 14:1), songs (Eph 3:19; Col 3:16), understanding and wisdom (Col 1:9). These are "the things of the Spirit," things "which ultimately depend on and derive from the Spirit and which draw their significance from the Spirit—in contrast to the merely material, or to those activities, attitudes, etc., which derive from the flesh and draw their significance from the merely physical, human, worldly."²

In harmony with view No. 6 above, ἀνέπτυξος is also employed by Paul in a figurative context. In the chapter immediately preceding 1 Cor 10, Paul uses the figure of the sower and reaper: "If we have sown spiritual seed [ἀνέπτυξος] among you, is it too much if we reap a material harvest [μορφή] from you?" (9:11, NIV). Peter also employs ἀνέπτυξος figuratively in terms of the church as a "spiritual house" offering "spiritual sacrifices" (1 Pet 2:5). The words "house" and "sacrifices" point to an ultimate reality beyond their normal meaning because of the attributive adjective ἀνέπτυξος. The figurative connotation is also apparent in the adverb ἀνέπτυξος in Rev 11:8.

There appears to be no parallel NT example where ἀνέπτυξος should be translated "sacramental" (view No. 1, above). View No. 2 also seems to lack any Scriptural support outside of 1 Cor 10. While in non-biblical literature ἀνέπτυξος can be used exclusively as "pertaining to the [human] spirit," all of the biblical occurrences (at least outside of 1 Cor 10) seem to pertain in some way to the divine Spirit. Likewise, ἀνέπτυξος is not used as an epithet of excellence (view No. 3, above) elsewhere in the NT.

Of course it may be possible that in 1 Cor 10 Paul is using ἀνέπτυξος in a way totally different from elsewhere in his epistles of the NT. Our brief survey of the usages of ἀνέπτυξος in the NT has demonstrated the wide range of connotations available and employed in particular by Paul apart from 1 Cor 10.

However, our ultimate decision of meaning in 1 Cor 10

¹Bauer-Arndt-Griechisch-Danker, pp. 678-79. Even Selwyn, St. Peter, pp. 282-83, who maintains that a subjective use of ἀνέπτυξος (i.e., referring to the human spirit) is present in Scripture, considers this usage "very rare" (ibid., p. 282), and he furthermore admits (ibid., p. 283) that two of the three examples he cites for a subjective usage (1 Cor 15:44 and 1 Cor 2:14) involve the objective sense of the indwelling Spirit of God. As we have argued above, 1 Cor 15:46—Selwyn's third example of a subjective usage—also appears to include a reference to the Spirit of God.

²Dunn, 3:707.
cannot be based on a word study. It must come from the final
determiner of meaning, the immediate context of the passage
(I Cor 10:4) itself. And this leads us to the second part of
vs. 4, where ἐκεῖνος reappears:

ἐὰν δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἐξ εὐαγγελισμοῦ ἀκολουθοῦσας ἔπειτα ἔως ἔν τῇ Ῥημίᾳ.

... for they were drinking from a spiritual rock which
accompanied them; and the rock was Christ.

The causal co-ordinating conjunctive γὰρ (“for”) which
introduces this clause is crucial to the interpretation. Paul
himself explains why the drink is spiritual. It is spiritual be-
cause they were drinking from a spiritual rock that was accompa-
nying them, and the rock was Christ. But before we can lay bare the
nature of this causal relationship and ascertain the significance
of ἐκεῖνος, other elements of the clause must first be con-
sidered.

Paul uses the imperfect tense ἔπονο ὄντος “were drinking” in
contrast to the aorist ἔδραυ “drank” of vs. 4a. This is a
“splendid example” of the distinction between imperfect and aorist,
in which the aorist “states the fact in the history of Israel,”
and the imperfect “describes a continuous custom.”1 Israel
habitually drank; the source was always at hand. Paul later
builds upon the universality (“all” vs. 4a) and the continuality
(“were drinking”) of Israel’s participation in the divine gifts
of grace in order to show that there was nothing magically in-
herent in the gifts that kept them from falling, which truth the

1Corinthians should likewise recognize regarding the Christian
sacraments.

Paul asserts that the Israelites were drinking from the
rock that “followed” or “accompanied” (ἀκολουθοῦσας) them in
the wilderness. Upon what basis can he say that the rock
“accompanied” or “followed” Israel? In the Pentateuchal narrative,
water from the rock is only mentioned twice, once near the be-
ginning of their journey, at Residebar.2 and once near the end, at
Kadesh.3 Many commentators insist that Paul is here working, not
from Scripture, but from the Rabbinic legend of a rocky well that
followed Israel throughout their wilderness journeys.4 This issue
is crucial to our concern for ἰσχυρος structures, since in I Cor 10:11,
Paul indicates that the events he has been describing are recorded
in Scripture.4 Does Paul’s statement in vs. 11 apply to his
description in vs. 4? Is there necessarily a Scriptural deter-
mination of these historical events, or can they be based upon
para-biblical or even extra-biblical traditions? In order to
answer these questions we must give attention to (1) the Rabbinic
legend upon which Paul is allegedly dependent, (2) the pertinent
OT material, and (3) Paul’s own description.

1Exod 17.
3E.g., Henry St. John Thackery, The Relation of St. Paul to
p. 208-11, is sure that Paul derives his midrash from the Rabbinic
legend: cf. also discussions by S. R. Driver, “Notes on Three
Passages in St. Paul’s Epistles,” The Expositor, 3rd ser. 9 (1889):
15-23; Oscar Cullmann, “Ischa,” TDOT 6:97; E. Earle Ellis, “A Note
on First Corinthians 10:4,” JBL 75 (1956):53-56; Strack and Biller-
beck, 3:490-8.
4See discussion below, pp. 270-71.
The most explicit Rabbinic references to a rocky well or stream following/accompanying Israel in the wilderness include the following:

Even so it was with the fountain which was with Israel in the wilderness; it resembled a rock full of holes like a sieve, and the water trickled through and rose up as from the opening of a flask. It went up the mountains with them and descended with them to the valleys.

Behold, then sang Israel this song of praise: Spring up, O well! they sang to it and it sprang up...

... And from thence the well was given to them at Mattana, turning it became strong overflows streams, and again it ascended to the top of the mountains, and went down with them to the ancient valleys; but the well was hidden from them when on the borders of Moab, on the head of the height which overlooketh toward Beth Jeshimmon.

They had the well through the merit of Miriam, as it is written, "And Miriam died, and was buried there." And what immediately after? "And the congregation here had no water." And how was the well formed? It was a clog [םולא] like a bee-hive, and it used to roll along [דלונא], and accompany them on their journeys. And when the standards were pitched, and the tabernacle rested, the clog came and settled in the court of the Tent of Meeting, and the princes came and stood beside it, and said, "Spring up, O well," and then it would spring up.

Did not a brook follow them in the wilderness and provide them with fat fish more than they needed? 

... well of water following them, brought He forth for them.

---

1. T. Sukk. 3:1 ff.
11. Num. Rab. 5:6: "Ten things were created on the eve of the Sabbath at twilight, and these are they: (1) the mouth of the earth, (2) the mouth of the well... "; Pesah 64a: "Ten things were created on the eve of the Sabbath at twilight. These are they: the well, the manna, the rainbow, the writing and the
of the merit of Miriam. She was like a beehive and functioning like a sieve, with water flowing as from the many openings as from a flask, the water occasionally delivered to the door of each individual tent. It rolled along with the Israelites over hill and dale. It effected remarkable healings and caused various writing instruments, the Tables, the sepulchre of Moses, the cave in which Moses and Elijah stood, the opening of the ass's mouth, and opening of the earth's mouth to swallow up the wicked.

'Taan 9a: "Three good leaders had arisen for Israel, namely, Moses, Aaron, and Miriam, and for their sake three good things were conferred upon Israel, namely, the Water, the Pillar of Cloud and the Manna; the Well, for the merit of Miriam; the Pillar of Cloud for the merit of Aaron; the Manna for the merit of Moses. When Miriam died the well disappeared, as is said, 'And Miriam died there,' and immediately follows the verse, 'And there was no water for the congregation;' and it returned for the merit of the [latter] two.' Cf. Num. Rab. 1:2 (p. 234 above); Cant. Rab. 4:5; Lev. Rab. 27:6.

1Tg. Onq. Num. 21 (Etheridge, p. 113): "And from thence it [the well] was given to them in Mattane; turning, it went up with them to the high mountains, and from the high mountains it went down with them to the hills surrounding all the camp of Israel, and giving them drink, every one at the door of his tent. And from the high mountains it descended with them to the lover hills, but was hidden from them on the borders of Moab, at the summit of the hill looking toward Beth-heshimmon, because there they neglected the words of the Law."

2Num. Rab. 1:2 (see p. 234 above).

3T. Sukk. 3:11ff. (see p. 234 above).

kinds of herbs, vegetables, fruits, and other trees to grow. Its verdure provided wine for the drink-offerings, perfume for the women, an effective deodorant, and "most of their enjoyments." The well once flooded a valley, destroying the armies of Israel's enemies and gathering the limbs of all the carcasses. It sent forth a river to the sea and brought back all the delights of the world. And it is still visible in the Sea of Tiberias (or the Mediterranean Sea)." 8

1Num. Rab. 19:26: "The water [from the well] flowed on outside the camp and encircled a large tract of land; as it says, 'He guideth me in straight paths [lit. 'circles'] for his name's sake' (Ps 23:3). It caused numerous varieties of grass and trees to spring forth, as it says, 'He maketh me lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters' (Ps 23:2)." 9

2Cant. Rab. 4:12: "What did the Israelites procure wine for drink-offerings all the forty years that they spent in the wilderness? R. Johanan said: From the well. From it came most of their enjoyments."

3Cant. Rab. 4:12: "Now whence did the daughters of Israel obtain wherewith to deck themselves and gladden their husbands all the forty years that they were in the wilderness? R. Johanan said: from the well." Cf. Cant. Rab. 12:3; 14:1.

4Deut. Rab. 7:11: "He asked: 'Did they not emit an evil odour because of the perspiration?' He replied: 'They used to play with the sweet-scented grass around the well, the fragrance of which permeated the world.'"

5Cant. Rab. 4:12 (see above n. 2).

6Num. Rab. 19:26: "The well descended into the valley and there it swelled and destroyed all the armies in the same manner as the Red Sea destroyed those [of the Egyptians].... The well descended into the caves and brought out skulls, arms, and legs innumerable. Israel returned in search of the well and saw it coming from the valley full, carrying limbs upon limbs."

7T. Sukk. 3:11ff.

8Num. Rab. 19:26: "Which can be seen in the desert [Num. 21:20]'. This alludes to the well, which accompanied them until it entered the sea of Tiberias. One who stands in the desert observes
to the Rabbinic legend, there are those who contend that Paul need not have borrowed anything from Rabbinic sources to have written 1 Cor 10:4. It is demonstrated that the OT material implicitly provides all the information for the concept of a following rock. Already in the Pentateuchal account, the mention of the smitten rock at Horeb—coming immediately after the narrative of the giving of the manna and followed by no record of any problem with water again until God directed Israel northward to a well-watered land (Deut 2:3-6) at the end of the forty years of wilderness wandering—could imply that the Exod 17 account was in some way paradigmatic for what occurred other times when water was needed.

1 E.g., Ellis, "1 Cor. 10:4," p. 56, suggests that "Paul and the Targum are related more directly to a particular interpretation of the passages by the prophets than to each other."

2 Bandstra, "Interpretation," p. 11.

3 Various commentators have taken this view; e.g., Marcus Dodd, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, The Expositor's Bible (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1916), p. 252, writes: "The fact is that the Israelites did not die of thirst in the wilderness. It was quite likely they should, and but for the providential supply of water, so large a company could not have been sustained. And no doubt not only in the rock at the beginning of their journey and the rock of Kadesh, but in many most unlikely places during the intervening years, water was found. So that in looking back on the entire journey, it might very naturally be said that the rock had followed them, not meaning that wherever they went they had the same source to draw from, but that throughout their journeys they were supplied with water in places and ways as unexpected and unlikely.

Ellen G. White, The Story of Patriarchs and Prophets: The Conflict of the Ages Illustrated in the Lives of Holy Men of Old (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1958 [1890]), p. 411, expresses it thus: "From the smitten rock in Horeb first flowed the living stream that refreshed Israel in the desert. During all their wanderings, wherever the need existed, they were supplied with water by a miracle of God's mercy. The water did not, however, continue to flow from Horeb. Wherever in their journeys they wanted water, there from the crevasses of the rock it gushed out beside their encampment." Cf. also John Calvin.
It seems that Deut 8:15, 16 places the water from the rock in a linear setting in parallelism with Israel's being fed with manna:

... the Lord your God who led you through the great and terrible wilderness, with its fiery serpents and scorpions and thirsty ground where there was no water, who brought you water out of the flinty rock, who fed you in the wilderness with manna which your fathers did not know.

The same is true in Neh 9:15:

Thou didst give them bread from heaven for their hunger and bring forth water for them from the rock for their thirst...

The Psalms and Isaiah contain references that also seem to point in the direction of a habitual, customary application:

He clave rocks in the wilderness, and gave them water abundantly as from the deep. He made streams come out of the rock, and caused waters to flow down like rivers. (Ps 78 [LXX 77]:16)

He smote the rock so that water gushed out and streams overflowed (vs. 20).
He opened the rock, and water gushed forth; it flowed through the desert like a river. (Ps 114 [LXX 113]:8)

... [the God of Jacob] who turns the rock into a pool of water, the flint into a spring of water. (Ps 114 [LXX 113]:8)

They thirsted not when he led them through the deserts; he made water flow for them from the rock. (Ps 114 [LXX 113]:8)


...Then he [Deshurim] forsook God who made him, and scoffed at the Rock of his salvation. (vs. 15)

You were unfaithful to the Rock that begot you, and you forgot the God who gave you birth. (vs. 18)

How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight, unless their Rock had sold them, and the Lord had given them up? (vs. 30)

For their rock is not as our Rock. (vs. 31)

Then there are many references elsewhere in the OT to the Lord as the Rock, employing both מָרָץ (as in the account in Num 20) and בֹּקֶר (as Exod 17).¹

In connection with this OT metaphorical usage of the word "rock" as an appellation of the deity, the question naturally arises concerning Paul's messianic (christological) application of the same term ("The Rock was Christ"). There is no evidence that the rock of Num 20 or Exod 17 was ever interpreted messianically within Rabbinic Judaism.² Recent literature on the subject usually pinpoints the bridge between rock and Messiah (for Paul) in the allegorization of Philo.³ Philo designates the rock as an allegory

¹The use of מָרָץ as an appellation for God includes the following references: 2 Sam 22:3; 32, 47; 23:1; Ps 18:2, 4b, 31; 19:14; 28:1; 31:2; 62:2, 7; 78:35; 89:26; 92:15; 94:22; 95:1, 144:1; Isa 17:10; 26:4. For the use of בֹּקֶר to refer to God, note the following texts: 2 Sam 22:2; Ps 18:2; 31:3; 42:9, 71:3.

²Wright, 1 Corinthians, p. 130.

³See Orr and Walther, p. 245; Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 22; Bandstra, "Interpretation," p. 12; Bruce, 1 Corinthians, p. 91; and Woolf, p. 66.
of Wisdom or the Word. Since Paul has in the beginning of his letter to Corinth identified Christ as the true Wisdom of God (1:24, 30), it is contended that Paul sees Christ in the OT account of the rock (Exod 17 and Num 20) via Philo's allegorical interpretation. On the other hand, it can be argued that the background of Paul's messianic application may be found in the identification of the angel of the Lord—who accompanied Israel in the wilderness—with Christ, or of δομος (LXX) with Christ.

From the survey of possible OT and Jewish background materials for Paul's statements in 1 Cor 10:3-4, a number of options have emerged. How shall the evidence be evaluated? We can begin with that which seems most perspicuous. There can be little doubt from the grammatical construction of vs. 4b that Paul is referring to the pre-existent Christ. He does not say that the rock is Christ, but that it was Christ. In his later correspondence, Paul makes other explicit statements about Christ's pre-existence. And there is strong MS support for reference to Christ in vs. 9 of 1 Cor 10. If vs. 9 does refer to the pre-existent Christ, this would weaken the case for maintaining that

1 Philo Leg. alleg. 2.86; 3.169-70; The Worse Attacks the Better 115.
3 Exod 13:21; 14:30; 15:26; etc.
4 2 Cor 8:9; Gal 4:4; Rom 8:3; Phil 2:5-6; cf. numerous references in Ephesians and Colossians.
5 See the discussion, below, pp. 259-60.

Paul's messianic interpretation of the rock originates with Philo. His identification of the pre-existent Christ would not just be tied to the Rock (= Wisdom for Philo) but would encompass a wider scope than Philo's allegory provides. Another argument in favor of Paul's derivation of the Rock as Christ immediately from the OT context stems from Paul's quotation of Deut 32:17 in 1 Cor 10:20. If Paul can directly quote from Deut 32 only a few verses later than vs. 4, it is not at all unlikely that the "Rock passages" of Deut 32 (vs. 4, 15, 16, 30, 31) are in his mind as he identifies Christ with the Rock of the OT. It appears that for Paul, Jesus is the Rock because he is the Yahweh of the OT, and not because Philo has allegorically equated the rock with wisdom and Paul sees Jesus as the true Wisdom.

Yet we cannot conclude that the location "spiritual rock" in 1 Cor 10:4 is referring exclusively to Christ as the over-present "Rock" of Israel. Some commentators, in order to "rescue" Paul from saying that a literal rock accompanied Israel, have interpreted the "spiritual rock" totally with reference to a figurative meaning, i.e., to Christ. But this interpretation jumps from a reference to literal food and drink to a figurative rock, though all three substantives are modified by the same adjective, πνευματικος. The parallelism that is operative here in the triple use of πνευματικος does not seem to indicate a shift from two occurrences which include

1 Godet, pp. 56-58.
2 E.g., Plummer and Robinson, p. 202; Dodds, p. 233.
the literal to a third which involves only the figurative— as has sometimes been argued.\(^1\)

As Paul is speaking of the real, concrete experience of eating bread and drinking drink, so in some sense the rock seems also to be viewed as a material rock "accompanying" Israel and not just a figurative reference to the ever-present pre-existent Christ. As we have seen above, there appears to be sufficient evidence in the OT for considering the water from the rock as more than an isolated event, so that Paul could envision Israel customarily (Exod. vs. 4) drinking water divinely provided from a rock (just as they continually were supplied with manna) wherever they needed it. The anathropical πέτρα (vs. 4), contrasted with the articular τὸ πέτρα τοῦ σώματος (vss. 3-4), could indicate the lack of individual identity with a certain (single) material rock in Paul's mind (vs. 4a), which becomes specific in regard to the Rock (ἐρατός) Christ (vs. 4b).\(^2\)

The word "accompanying" (ἀνακολουθοῦν) in vs. 4 could possibly reveal Paul's acquaintance with some stage— most likely the earlier "following stream" stage— of the parallel Rabbinic well legend. But it is also feasible that Paul is developing an independent interpretation based on the OT materials (and via direct revelation). We conclude that Paul, if he is aware of the

---

\(^1\)Contra Hodge, pp. 175; and Edersheim, pp. 56-7, who find the first two instances referring to "spiritual" in origin, and the third occurrence to "spiritual" in nature. This interpretation seems to violate the synonymous parallelism of the three occurrences.

\(^2\)See, e.g., Ellis, "1 Cor. 10:4," pp. 55-55.

---

Rabbinic legend, does not follow it beyond what could have been deduced from Scripture. His own testimony in vs. 11 about the "inscription" of the events he has been describing, seems to support this conclusion.\(^1\)

But the material rock is not all that is in view. There is also a Christological determination. This is not to say that Christ is immanent in the rock, as some scholars have maintained.\(^2\) Christ is no more immanent in the rock than in the bread or the drink. The rock, the manna, the water—all were material aspects of the historical narrative. Yet as material objects they also pointed beyond themselves to spiritual realities. This is already apparent in the case of the manna, which is pictured in its heavenly origin in Exod 16:4. And Deut 8:3 points to the word of the Lord as the ultimate source of man's sustenance. Perhaps because of such explicit references in the historical narrative to a deeper meaning in regard to the manna, Paul does not add a ἀληθεία clause in explanation of the τὸ πέτρα."\(^3\)

The spiritual background is not so explicitly mentioned in regard to the drink, and thus Paul tells the Corinthians why it was

---

\(^1\)See the discussion below, pp. 279-71.


\(^3\)Contra Banister, "Interpretation," pp. 12-13, who attempts to make the rock the source of both food and drink, in view of Deut 32:13, Ps 81:16, etc., where honey and oil (the constituents of the manna, Exod 16:8; Num 11:8) come from the rock. But despite the parallels to which he alludes, this is not what Paul says. They only drank from the rock, not also ate.
We have now returned full circle to the meaning of the word πνευματικός: "spiritual" in 1 Cor 10:1-4. As in vs. 2 Paul employed the catch-phrase "baptized into Christ" to denote a cluster of ideas, so here he seems to use πνευματικότητας as a catchword for a whole complex of concepts involved in ancient Israel's wilderness sustenance that corresponds to the Christian Lord's Supper.²

In both the nourishment of wilderness Israel and the Christian Lord's Supper, the material elements point beyond themselves to a deeper figurative meaning.² Behind both experiences is a supernatural, spiritual background referring ultimately to Christ.³ Both are sacraments, charged with eucatastrophic and salvific.⁴ We may say, in sum, that for Paul the bread, drink, and rock are πνευματικά in that they point beyond themselves (for those with spiritual eyesight to see)⁵ to Christ, the true Rock and Provider of both bread and water as gifts of grace which are supernatural/salvific/sacramental and at the same time advance-presentations of the NT Lord's Supper.

The same πνευματικός structures implied in regard to Israel's

---

¹See Martelet, p. 346.
²See above, p. 224.
³See especially Köstenbrey, Essays, p. 113.
⁴Views 1, 4e and 4d, discussed above, pp. 225, 227. See Köstenbrey, Essays, pp. 133-35.
⁵See Deut 8:1-2; Exod 17:6; 16:4.
baptism in vss. 1-2 have become evident from Paul's discussion of the spiritual bread and drink in vss. 3-4. Israel's sustenance in the wilderness is treated by Paul as a historical reality recorded in the OT which corresponds to the Lord's Supper in the NT. Both the OT and NT realities are Christologically-soteriologically determined as they find their ultimate significance in Christ's saving work. An ecclesiastical-sacramental determination is also apparent in the implied correspondence between ancient Israel's spiritual sustenance and the Christian Lord's Supper.

The three aspects of a prophetic structure are also implied as in vss. 1-2. First, using Lord's Supper terminology to identify Israel's experience, Paul intimates that Israel's spiritual food and drink are advance-presentations or prefigurations of the Christian Lord's Supper. Second, God intended and caused the events to happen as salvific acts of grace, while at the same time respecting Israel's freedom to respond or rebel, to accept or reject His gifts. Third, the aspect of devoir-ètre inheres in the relationship of OT and NT events as essential to Paul's paralectic thrust. The OT advance-presentation reveals how it "must-needs-be" in the NT situation at Corinth. As the line or argument in vss. 5-11 makes clear, just as the OT sacraments did not provide an automatic immunity from divine judgment, so it "must-needs-be" with the sacraments of the Christian Church which are prefigures in the OT.

The condemnation of the wilderness generation (vs. 5). In vs. 5 Paul introduces the nasty side of Israel's experience:

1Paul employs an understatement when he says God was not pleased with "most" of Israel. The fact is that only two of the adults survived the forty years in the wilderness (Num 14:30-32).

2καταιπνοάν does not primarily indicate an emotion on God's part but is tantamount to expressing his election, or in the negative, as here, his rejection. See Martens, pp. 116-17; Conzelmann, p. 167; and particularly, Gottlob Schirnke, 'Ευδοκέναι, Ευδοκέα, "

3The children of Israel were καταιπνοάν in the wilderness. Derived from καταιπνόω, this is a hapax legomenon in the NT. From its use in Num 14:16 and from the immediate context in 1 Cor 10, the word seems clearly to indicate the idea of "to kill," whether one follows the translation "lay low" (NASB) or "overthrow" (RSV), or whether one accepts the alternative meaning "spread out, scatter [their bodies across the desert]" (NIV); See Arndt-Gingrich-Danker, p. 420.

4The γάρ clause provides the justification for Paul's statement that God was not pleased. His "displeasure" or rejection is demonstrated in the acts of judgment upon the disobedient wilderness generation (Num 14:2-35).
no natural phenomenon. It was as much the action of God in judge- 
ment as were the gifts (vss. 1-4) God's acts of salvation. Paul 
provides detailed examples of these divine retributive judgments 
in the verses that follow.

Paranetic warnings from Israel's experience (vss. 6-11).

In vs. 6 we read:

τοῦτο εἰς τούτο ἵνα ἐγκυμοσύνην, ἵνα τὰ ζημία ἔκπληκτως κακῶς, 
καθὼς κακῶς ἐπέτευμαν.

Now these things happened as τῶν αὐτῶν, that we should not 
chase evil things, as they also chased.

This verse and vs. 11 are particularly crucial for an under-
standing of τῶν αὐτῶν and Pauline τῶν αὐτῶν hermeneutics in 1 Cor 10. 
Inasmuch as vs. 11 enlarges on the points introduced in vs. 6, we 
will defer detailed discussion of the terms τῶν αὐτῶν until we 
complete our analysis of vss. 7-10, which continue the theme of 
God's acts of judgment begun in vs. 5.

But though we reserve comment on the precise signification 
of τῶν αὐτῶν until later, we can note several important contextual 
indicators apparent in vs. 6. The plural τὸ τίτων introducing vs. 6 is 
particularly important.1 Commentators have widely recognized that the 

1Ellis, Prophecy and Hermeneutics, pp. 159-61, attempts to 
establish a parallel between Paul's use of τὰ τίτων "these" and the 
pazpesher formulation "the interpretation is" or "this is" of Qumran 
Hermeneutics. Pauling passages other than 1 Cor 10:5, to which 
Ellis refers (Rom 9:7-8; 10:5-6; Eph 5:31-32) may indeed provide 
possibilities for a correspondence with Qumran formulae, but 
such factors mitigate against such in 1 Cor 10. First, τῶν αὐτῶν 
is plural, not singular as in the other Pauline examples and as the 
singulars of the Qumran formulae. More significantly, the verb 
employed in 1 Cor 10 is not ἔγκυμον, as in the other Pauline examples 
Ellis cites, but ἐγκυμοσύνην, which in parallelism with the ἔγκυμον 
"happened" of vs. 11, most likely means "happened, occurred," not 
"were" (a substitute for ἐγέλθωϲ). Finally, the tense of ἐγκυμοσύνην 
is aorist, here denoting an event (of punctiliar Aktionsart) in the 
plural "these things" must refer to all the events mentioned in 
vss. 1-5, and not just to the retributive judgment of God intro-
duced in vs. 5.1 As Goppelt puts it, the "manifestations of grace 
and judgments on sin form an indivisible material nexus."2

The significance of this grammatical construction cannot 
be overestimated. It reveals that more than mere paraenesis is 
involved in the use of τῶν αὐτῶν. Paul does not have only the 
paraenetic warning of judgment in mind, for the food, drink, and 
baptism are also termed τῶν αὐτῶν. And the manifestations of grace 
are not presented just in order to contrast with the sins. Rather, 
they involve an advance-presentation of the NT sacraments. Only 
on the basis of this prefigurative, devoir-être relationship between 
the OT and NT sacramental gifts can Paul build his paraenetic 
warning.

The aspect of historical correspondence involved in the 
term τῶν αὐτῶν is also emphasized in vs. 6. By means of the verb 
ἐγκυμοσύνην Paul underscores his acceptance of the historical nature 
of the τῶν αὐτῶν. With the aorist tense in the indicative mood, this 
verb should not be translated "are" (as in the RSV) for it expresses 
past, in harmony with the current usage of Paul (1 Thess 1:5, 6; 
2:5, 8, 10, 14) and the parallelism of vs. 11. This would not co-
incide with the present interpretation emphasized in the Qumran 
pazpesher.

1E.g., Orr and Walther, p. 245; Bar; Barostro, "Interpretation," p. 16; Amsler, "La typologie," p. 126. Alternate explanations 
of a plural τῶν αὐτῶν by attraction to τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, or a plural referring to the 
various instances of judgment (vss. 1-10) are not satisfactory. 
Neither the grammatical construction nor the flow of Paul's argu-
ment allow us to separate the events of vss. 1-4 from vs. 5 and 
vss. 7-10. As we see below, pp. 253-66, the force of Paul's 
paraenetic warning of judgment is predicated upon the fact that 
the saving events are also τῶν αὐτῶν.

2Goppelt, IONT. 8:251.
past time. The word should most probably be translated as "occurred" (NIV) or "happened" (NASB) and not taken as a substitute for ἐγένετο (RSV). This seems apparent from the parallelism with ἐγένετο "happened" in vs. 11. This use of γένεθλος is in harmony with the usage current with Paul to denote a past event. Thus Paul stresses in vs. 6, as he reiterates in vs. 11, that for him the γένεθλος are historical events which happened to Israel in the wilderness, which events include both salvific and redemptive acts of God.

These events happened as γένεθλος Ἰσραήλ. Most modern versions translate this genitive with "for us." This translation is possible if one conceives of Ἰσραήλ as a genitive of reference, "with reference to us." It is interesting to note that in the occurrence of γένεθλος in Rom 5:14, the only other Pauline usage in a hermeneutical context, Paul uses the same genitive construction, and the various modern English versions invariably translate "of the one to come" (subjective genitive), not "for the one to come" (genitive of reference). The former is apparently the more natural rendering in Rom 5. Adon is a γένεθλος of Christ, not for Christ. The only contextual difference, at least grammatically, in 1 Cor 10:6 is that the object in view is "us" and not "the one to come," as in Rom 5.

Two major arguments have been advanced in opposition to the Ἰσραήλ as subjective genitive in 1 Cor 10:6. First, it is claimed that a subjective genitive would imply that "most" of the Corinthians would fall, just as "most" of ancient Israel in the wilderness did. But this objection cannot have validity in light of Rom 5, where the γένεθλος is conceived of almost totally in terms of contrast. It also does not do justice to the context of 1 Cor 10, in which the devoir-ètre is bound up with the freedom of choice of the Corinthians as it was to the Israelites. The devoir-ètre will be either salvation or judgment, depending upon the personal response of the individual.

A second argument advanced against the translation of Ἰσραήλ as a subjective genitive stems from the common notion that the γένεθλος refers to "warning examples" to be followed. In harmony with the translation of γένεθλος as "[warning] examples," the natural translation of Ἰσραήλ would be "for us" (genitive of reference). But we have already seen how the text precludes the restriction of γένεθλος to only paranastic warning of divine judgments. It also calls for the inclusion of God's acts of salvation as "pre-presentations" of the NT Christocentric/sacramental/salvific realities. We are thus led to turn the above arguments on their heads. The inclusive nature of the plural γένεθλος and Ἰσραήλ, involving an advance-presentation of salvation (the manifestations of grace) as well as the possibility of judgment demands a devoir-ètre aspect in

---

1 Similar usage prior to 1 Corinthians in Paul includes such passages as 1 Thess 1:5, 6; 2:5, 8, 10, 14.

2 Ibid., pp. 234-4; Bruca, 1 Corinthians, p. 92; Moffatt, p. 131; Barrett, 1 Corinthians, pp. 223-14.

3 See Bandstra, "Interpretation," p. 16; Amster, "La typologie," p. 286.
the relationship between the τῶν and their NT referents.\(^1\) This "must-needs-be" factor can be represented by the translation of ἀνώτατον as "of us," which denotes an ineluctable link between the τῶν and "us." But the translation "for us" seems to imply a loose, optional tie between the τῶν and "us," and simply cannot reproduce the semantic range that Paul intends. Therefore, in the light of the preceding arguments, and in parallel with the Rom 5:14 usage, it seems preferable to take the ἀνώτατον as a subjective genitive translated "of us."\(^2\)

In vs. 6b, the preposition εἰς with the accusative of the articular infinitive denotes purpose or result.\(^3\) It has been claimed that this phrase confirms the view in which τῶν means "examples for guidance."\(^4\) But it seems that this assertion confuses the paraenetic purpose of Paul with the nature of the τῶν. It would hardly be denied that Paul's ultimate purpose in 1 Cor 10 is a paraenetic warning against the evil practices in which some Corinthians were engaged (see vs. 6b and vss. 7-10). But this must not be allowed to obscure the nature of the τῶν (as clarified in vss. 1-5 and especially vs. 6a). Paul's warning can only be effective if it is tied to the concept of a pre-presentation or prefiguration that he has developed in vss. 1-5. Only on the basis of the ineluctable relationship between Israel and the "us" of the Christian church (vs. 6a)\(^1\) can he put "tooth" into his paraenesis by showing that what happened to Israel, depending on their (positive or negative) response to God's acts of salvation, "must-needs-be" what will happen to "us," depending on the individual response. Thus while keeping in view the expressed paraenetic purpose of this passage, we must not lose sight of the prefigurative nature of the τῶν which goes beyond paraenesis.

Other τῶν structures that were implied in vss. 1-4 become explicit in the paraenetic warning beginning in vs. 6. The ecclesiastical structure comes clearly into view as vs. 6a reveals the devoir-être relationship between ancient Israel and the "us" of the Christian church. While in vss. 1-4 the sacramental aspect of this structure was implied, in vs. 6 the focus is upon the individual response to God's salvific acts. Such a focus involves a soteriological structure, which by divine design has a positive or negative side—salvation or judgment—depending upon the individual response.

The substantive συνάμα "one who desires, craves" (vs. 6b) is a NT ἅμα ἐγκαίνωμεν, probably deriving from its LXX use in Num 11:34. But Paul here refers to a more general situation than the craving for meat in Num 11. He is describing a general class of evil things (ἐρωτάτον), of which in vss. 7-10 he provides specific instances pertinent to the Corinthian situation.\(^2\) Inasmuch

---

\(^1\) See above, pp. 223, 243.

\(^2\) Cf. Bohnst underrated, "Interpretation," p. 17, for this translation, though he also wants to safeguard the paraenetic idea and thus translates vs. 11 in such a way that obscures the pre-presentation and devoir-être aspects in the verse ("these things happened as warnings to them, and were recorded for our admonition").

\(^3\) Blasi Esteban, "Die Füllmotive," p. 15 (par. 402).

\(^4\) Plummer and Robinson, p. 203.
as vs. 7-10 elaborate upon the same basic theme and reveal the same basic structural elements as introduced in vs. 6, we need not be detained by details in these verses except as they serve uniquely to elucidate the τηρεῖν structures in Paul’s argument. In vs. 7 we find the specific warning against idolatry:

μὴ εὐλογεῖτε γάρ νόμον, ἡπέω τινες σάλον ἐννεδρέω, ἐκβάλλειν ἐγὼ ᾧδες φαγεῖν καὶ τελέ, καὶ ἐνδυναμίαν ταξεῦ. Ὁ 

Do not continue to be idolaters as some of them; as it is written, "The people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play."  

It is understandable that Paul would focus first upon idolatry in view of the question of food sacrificed to idols that constituted a burning issue in Corinth and forms the immediate context of this passage (1 Cor 8:1-11:1). Building upon this paraenesis, Paul will press the point home in more detail in 10:14-22. The present imperative prohibition implies that Paul is warning them to quit continuing to be idolaters.  

1The verb ταξεύω "to play," from the context in Exod 32:19, includes at least ἀλωδία "dancing." The dancing would be in honor of the golden calf as was that of David in honor of the Ark (2 Sam 6:14). But μετατιθέμενον (Heb. περίπτωσις) can also have sexual implications (as in Gen 32:13; 39:17) and may imply (in 1 Cor 10:7) sexual orgies as well as the idolatrous feasting and dancing. Cf. Exod 32:25.  

2Calvin, I Corinthians, pp. 323-24, has probably correctly assessed why Paul only alludes to the feasting and revelry recorded in Exod 32 and not to the actual adoration of the golden calf. The Corinthians with their "enlightened view" did not consider that the idolatrous feasts and partaking of the "accessories" of pagan idolatry necessarily entailed idolatry. Paul holds up these very "accessories" - feasting and revelry - as part and parcel of Israel's idolatry. 

3Dana and Mantey, p. 301 (par. 290).
In vs. 8 Paul moves from the topic of idolatry to that of immorality:

1 μηδε χαριστητε αχαϊς και δεινους ααχαιοινων, και εφευρημεν οι νεκροις τους θεούς.

Nor let us commit sexual immorality, as some of them committed sexual immorality, and 23,000 fell in a single day. 2

Here is given a second illustration of "craving evil things." Paul has already given the Corinthians strong counsel regarding immorality (see above). 3 But since immorality was concomitant with idolatry—both generally and specifically at Corinth— 4 the subject is brought forward again in this section of Paul's Letter. The apostle calls attention to the apostasy of Israel at Peor, as recorded in Num 25:1-9, where "the people began to play the harlot with the daughters of Moab" (vs. 1), joined in sacrifices to heathen gods (vs. 2), and died as a result of the divine plague.

1 It is instructive to note that whereas Paul used the 2nd person plural imperative γνωτε to introduce vs. 7, here he switches to ahortative (1st person plural) subjunctive γνωσθείν. This is possibly a stylistic device, in which vs. 7-10 have an ABBA pattern, the outer members with imperatives and the middle members with subjunctives. There may also be contextual reasons for the alterations. With his strong Rabbinic background that forbade any connection with idolatrous feasts (cf. Barret, "Things Sacrificed to Idols," pp. 138-51), Paul directs the parenthesis to his readers alone. But, as is perhaps indicated in other Pauline passages (e.g., 1 Cor 2:31; Rom 7), the apostle may have had personal moral struggles and thus included himself in the admonition regarding immorality.

2 There have been numerous attempts to harmonize Paul's reference to 23,000 with the unanimous testimony of 24,000 in the MT, LXX, Philo, the Targumim and the Midrashim. See the discussion of this problem in Plummer and Robinson, p. 205; Bruce, 1 Corinthians, p. 92; Hering, p. 70; and ZWTH, 1:914.

3 1 Cor 5:1, 9-11; 6:9, 13-20. 4 Num 25; Wis 14:12.

That broke out. Thus the Scriptural determination of the rōsa' is reiterated, and their historical reality reaffirmed. The historical correspondence is continued between OT and NT realities. The ecclesiological structure is apparent in that the referents in the correspondence are ancient Israel and the Christian church. The soteriological structure—in its negative aspect of retributive judgment—forms an integral part of the apostle's devoir-être argument. As ancient Israel experienced divine judgment because of sexual immorality, so it "must-needs-be" with Israel's counterpart, the Christian church, if they indulge in the same sin.

In vs. 9 Paul moves to another sin of the wilderness generation that brought divine retribution:

1 μηδε ενυπηρητε τον αυτον, καθες τενοες αποκτενων, και υπο του αυτου ιδρυστος.

Nor let us put Christ to the test, as some of them put (him) to the test, and were destroyed by serpents.

There is a textual matter that calls for some attention inasmuch as it involves the possibility of a Christological determination of the OT rōsa'. The MSS evidence is divided over who was put to the test by Israel: xραστον, 1 χραστῶν, 2 or οἰκῶν. 3 While Nestle-Aland and UBS 2 favor χραστῶν because of better MS support, UBS 3 has adopted xραστον because it is regarded as the lectio difficillior and the one that best explains the others. The difficulty of explaining how Christ was tempted in the wilderness would more likely explain why later copyists changed

1 BCP (and others; cf. the apparatus of UBS 3).

2 DGKR Byzantine lect. (and others; cf. UBS 3).

3 A (and others; cf. UBS 3).
it to the ambiguous κίνδυνον or the unobjectionable αἰθεῦν,¹ rather than seeing κίνδυνον as a gloss to explain κίνδυνον or οἰκον.² In the light of the recent trend toward an eclectic text, based more on internal criteria than on MS support,³ we find the reasoning of the UBS³ translators persuasive in favor of κίνδυνον as original.

As further evidence for the reading κίνδυνον, it is noted that "the interpretive move [of vs. 9] is analogous to that of vs. 4" where there is definitely a Christological identification. This would easily account for κίνδυνον in vs. 9 whereas the one occurrence in vs. 4 would not so readily cause a change in κίνδυνον (or οἰκον) here, but no change in vss. 13, 20, and 22. If our decision is correct, vs. 9 provides a Christological determination for the judgments of God as vs. 4 does for the manifestations of divine grace.

Because of the Scriptural determination of the κίνδυνον—which principle we have already noted above and which becomes explicit in vs. 11—it is important that we give brief attention to the OT narratives that form the basis of Paul's discussion at this point. From the reference to the serpents in vs. 9, it appears that Paul has in mind the experience of Israel with the fiery serpents recorded in Num 21:4-9. However, the word ἁμαρτήσαν (Hebrew נָאָדָא) is used in the Pentateuch, not for this experience, but rather with regard to the Massah (Exod 17:2, 7; Deut 6:16) and the "ten times" of testing in connection with the ten spies (Num 14:22). Nonetheless, the experience of Num 21 would doubtless be one of those occasions referred to by the Psalmist when he writes that in the desert "they tested [LXX ἐκατακρίνον] him again and provoked the Holy One of Israel."¹ Israel continually tried the patience of the Lord, questioning if He meant what He said—that He would provide for their needs, and that He would punish their transgressions. In his paraphrase Paulparticularly has the retributive judgments in mind, and points to the occasion of destruction by fiery serpents as a warning of the certain chastisement of God for habitual or continual (present subjunctive) putting the Lord to the test. Paul adds vividness to the nature of the destruction by the use of the imperfect (past linear) ἀποκτένων "were being destroyed," which perhaps depicts the prolonged agony.² It could also refer to the fact that here the process of destruction was arrested, while the aorist ἀποκτενοῦν in vs. 10 has in view "the general effect of the grumbling."³

In what way had the Corinthians been putting the Lord to the test? Many suggestions have been offered, of which the major alternatives fall: (1) misuse of the gift of tongues;⁴ (2) craving for miracles;⁵ (3) criticizing the authorities, as Korah and

¹Metzger, Textual Commentary, p. 560.
²As Plummer and Robinson, p. 206.
⁴Orr and Walther, p. 246.
⁵Chrysostom (see Plummer and Robinson, p. 205) and Weiss, pp. 180-89, in view of Ps 78 (77 LXX):18.
Dathan had done,¹ (4) abuse of Christian liberty by those with over-confidence in themselves, the “strong,” thus putting themselves in difficult situations;² (5) despondency;³ or (6) general weakness and sins.⁴

The first two suggestions do not seem to fit the context of 1 Cor 10. These problems have not yet been raised in the epistle. Though it is conceivable that Paul could anticipate himself, it is more probable that he is still concentrating on the major issues at hand in the context of chaps. 8-10. The third suggestion appears to be in view in vs. 10, not here, and would also likely be ruled out by Paul’s use of the first person plural to include himself. The fifth suggestion, “despondency,” though compatible with Paul’s conclusion of encouragement in vs. 13, does not seem to be congruous with the persistent resistance portrayed in the OT account, nor with the bold warnings of Paul in vs. 5-10.

The suggestion of general weakness (number 6) appears too vague in the polemical context out of which Paul is arguing. The most likely suggestion appears to be number 4 which maintains that Paul has not lost his perspective on the main issues he is meeting in this section of the letter. He is countering the abuse of Christian liberty by those who have been engaging idiosyncrasies and engaging in immorality with the mistaken notion that they cannot fall away. Paul appears to continue dealing with this same fundamental problem, but brings to light another aspect of their misunderstanding. The Corinthians were putting themselves in spiritually precarious situations involving (in this context, primarily) idolatry and immorality. In their arrogance (1 Cor 5:2) they disbelieved that the judgment of God could come upon them. Paul warns them that judgment will come just as severely as to Israel in the wilderness if they persist in putting the Lord to the test.

Still another occasion of divine retribution is brought to light in vs. 10:

μὴ γογγυστείτε, καθότι τινι αὐτῶν ἐγγυσεν, καὶ ἄλλῳ ὅπως τῷ ἀποστόλοι.

Nor continue to murmur, as some of them murmured, and were destroyed by the Destroyer.¹

¹In none of the instances involving ancient Israel’s murmuring do we have reference to ἐλοθρευτὴς “the Destroyer.” This substantive is a hapax legomenon in the NT, though the verb ἐλοθρευεῖται occurs in Heb 11:28 as a nominal participle (ἐλοθρευεῖται) to describe the destroyer of the first-born of Egypt in the tenth plague. Cf. the occurrences of the cognate λοθρευεῖν in 1 Cor 5:5; 1 Thess 1:9; 1 Thm 6:9. Heb 11:28 employs the same word as that used in the (LXX) Exodus account of the tenth plague. See also Wis 18:20-25. In Exod 12:23, “the Destroyer” appears to be used interchangeably with “the Lord” (vss. 23, 29), and may either express identity or point to “the destroyer” as the agent of Yahweh who carries out the divine sentence of punishment. In the account of the pestilence that came upon Israel because of David’s consubtaining (1 Chron 21), the agent in the destruction is called śēqarō šēkō-rēšā; (Hebrew סֵכֹהֶרָא סֶכֹרָאי) “the destroying angel” in vss. 12 and 15. The rabbis conceived of “the destroyer” as the name of a specific angel of divine judgment. Strack and Billerbeck, 4:12-13; Johannes Schneider, “λοθρευτῆς, λοθρευεῖται, ἐλοθρευτῆς, ἐλοθρευεῖται,” TDNT, 5:170.

It appears from the OT sphere out of which Paul is working that “the Destroyer” is an agent of divine judgment. It would not be inappropriate for Paul to envision the plagues, which broke out among the Israelite congregation because of murmuring, to be a direct act of the destroying angel. In the light of the parallel in 1 Chron 21. Paul may have utilized this term “the Destroyer” to encompass the various accounts of murmuring by Israel which resulted
Paul returns to the second person plural (as in vs. 7) γυγάματος, thus warning the Corinthians specifically; whereas in vss. 8 and 9 (by the hortatory subjunctive) he had included himself in the exhortation. He is also using the present imperative prohibition again, which implies that the Corinthians were engaged in the murmuring and Paul is telling them to cease. The linear present perhaps also implies a habitual grumbling, against which Paul warns.

Paul's principle of Scriptural determination of the rith (i.e., the fact that they are events recorded in Scripture) leads us to consider the OT source underlying the apostle's discussion at this point. When we turn to the various possible OT narratives upon which Paul may be building we encounter a recurrent practice of "murmuring" (Heb. ננה, ננה; Gk. γυγάματος [LXX] -γυγάματος, γυγάματος throughout the record of Israel's wilderness wandering.²

While this larger picture may provide the backdrop for Paul's drawing of potential historical correspondences, it seems likely that the incident involving the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram (recorded in Num 16) is particularly in view.³

What is the murmuring in Corinth? Barrett suggests that in 1 Cor 10:10 Paul is "driven forward by the momentum of his OT material" and is not thinking of any particular failing of Corinth with reference to murmuring.

However, if we are correct in our suggestion that the murmuring of the congregation in connection with the rebellion of Korah (Num 16) is that to which Paul particularly refers, then a forceful parallel to the situation at Corinth presents itself. The account in Num 16 concerns the rebellion of the congregation against God's appointed authorities, Moses and Aaron. The Corinthians, in their smug sense of sacramental security, arrogantly flouted their "Christian liberty" in defiance of Paul's authority (cf. 1 Cor 4:18-21). Possibly it is for this reason that Paul switches back to second person plural imperative to direct the warning squarely at the Corinthian offenders. By

be primarily in view in 1 Cor 10:10. In the account of Num 11, as a result of murmuring about general misfortunes, "the fire of the Lord burned among them, and consumed some outlying parts of the camp" (vs. 1). Num 14 describes the murmuring of the people following the report of the ten spies, and records how the ten spies, who "marched all the congregation to murmur" (vs. 26), "died by plague before the Lord" (vs. 37). The people themselves (above twenty years of age) who murmured, while not suffering from immediate retributive capital punishment like the spies, were sentenced to die in the wilderness during the ensuing thirty-eight years because of their grumblings (vss. 26-35; cf. Ps 106:105, LX3:25; Deut 1:27).

The incident involving the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram (Num 16) appears to be the closest parallel to what Paul described in 1 Cor 10. The leaders of the revolt, who grumbled against God's appointed leadership, were "swallowed" alive by the earth (vss. 31-34). The 250 princes who offered incense were consumed by "fire ... from the Lord" (vs. 35). And the congregation which continued to murmur against Moses and Aaron the next day, were struck by a plague from the Lord, in which 14,700 died before Aaron's intercession became effective (vss. 41-50). Here we have the only account of widespread divine destruction upon the congregation for murmuring, and thus this experience appears to be the one particularly in the mind of Paul.

Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 226.
means of the OT parallels, Paul indicates to the Corinthians that 
devoir-être (it must needs be) they can expect no more exemption from judgment than in the case of grumbling Israel in the wilderness.

In this verse Paul again reveals the significant structural elements in his ἔρχομαι hermeneutic that he introduced in vs. 6 with regard to the divine judgments because of sin. He indicates the historical reality of the OT ἔρχομαι, their Scriptural determination, the historical correspondence between OT and NT ecclesiological and soteriological realities, and elements of the prophetic structure (divine design and 
devoir-être).

In vs. 11, we come to the climax of this section and a recapitulation and expansion of vs. 6:

Now [all] these things happened to them ἐν τούτῳ, and they were written for our warning, upon whom the end of the ages has come.

Whether or not the ὑμῖν is original in this verse, it seems clear from Paul’s use of ἑν τούτῳ here as in vs. 6 that he is referring back to the entire sequence of events in the experience of Israel which forms the substance of his argument in vss. 1-10—both salvific and retributive. In vs. 11 Paul recapitulates the points made in vs. 6 regarding the ἐν τούτῳ and advances the argument with additional conceptual declarations.

According to Paul, "all these things"—the events in Israel’s Exodus—ἐν τούτῳ "happened" or "were happening (imperfect)." Paul has in view the whole process of events he has described. Again here, as we concluded for vs. 6, the historical nature of the events is tacitly affirmed by Paul. The apostle is not dealing with abstract ideas or meta-historical descriptions. The force of Paul’s whole argument rests on the historicality of the events under consideration. For Paul it is essential that the events really happened. Only thus can he draw out the significance from Israel’s real history for the concrete experience of his readers. If the events of salvation/retribution did not for Paul actually occur, he would not have been able to utilize Israel’s experience as a 
devoir-être argument in his paralanguage warning to the Corinthians. We therefore cannot underscore too heavily that for Paul the historical nature of the event is an integral element in the structure of the ἐν τούτῳ.

1 Most modern commentators and major editions of the Greek NT concur that ἐν τούτῳ (ABCP) omits (BCL) is to be preferred to τούτῳ (DEFL) omits (ABEF), since the latter appears to be an assimilation to vs. 6. See, e.g., WH, Nestle and Aland, UBS, Merk; cf. Robertson and Plummer, p. 269.

2 Textual evidence is divided on whether to include the word ὑμῖν "all" in the introduction to this verse. Even though the inclusion of ὑμῖν is well supported (e.g., CPK vs syr and most later MSS) because of its varying positions in the different MSS (either before or after τούτῳ), it is usually regarded as a scribal gloss inserted to heighten the narrative (see, e.g., Metzger, Textual Commentary, p. 560). But from its presence in so many important MSS it can just as forcefully be defended as original via the following argument: (1) τούτῳ is original, either before or after the μᾶθει. but (2) the word order was switched by a later copyist, and (3) still later copyists, noting the varying word order, interpreted it as a gloss. Admittedly this latter explanation is the more complicated and thus may be regarded by textual critics as having the lesser degree of probability.

1 See Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Dankel, pp. 784-85, for analysis of omits as denoting "meet, happen, come about" with reference to the actual occurrence of concrete events. See also Mark 10:32; Lk 24:14; Acts 3:10; 20:19; 21:35; 1 Pet 4:12; 2 Pet 2:22.
We hasten to add, however, that Paul's main emphasis here is not in upholding the historicity of the OT events. That is assumed to be essential. In vs. 11 Paul reveals in what sense these particular events, within the context of his argument, are significant in their occurrence. The historical events in the experience of ancient Israel in the wilderness are significant in that they were happening to them υἱοῖς τῶν ἁρματικῶν.

Paul is not saying that the events can now be seen to be τυχαίς—as if they became τὸνος as a result of some later occurrence or factor. Rather, Paul insists that in their very happening, they were happening τυχαίς. The τὸνος-quality of the events was inherent in their occurrence, not invented by the Pentateuchal historiographer or artificially given "typical" significance by Paul the exegete. The divine intent of the events clearly includes the τὸνος-theme of the event. A providential design was operative, causing the events to happen τυχαίς. The OT events enumerated by Paul are not presented as τὸνος just because of the continuity of God's actions and purpose at all times, as true and fundamental as that is. There is involved also the Lordship of Yahweh, molding unique details of history.

The tendency of modern English versions is to translate τυχαίς as related to "warning" or "[way of] example." Conzelmann baldly asserts that the 'paraenetic sense' of τὸνος (vs. 6) is in

1See Amsler, "La typologie," p. 118.
3See Ellis, Paul's Use of the OT, p. 123.
4Blass-Debrunner-Funk, p. 229 (par. 442).
5Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Bender, p. 170.
verse are not ἔκχωμα "for them," but ὑμῶν "of us."

We suggest that the solution to the problem lies in recognizing the differing functions of the two clauses in vs. 11.

Τοῖς δὲ καὶ ὁ πρώτος κλάμα, as we argued for τάξια and the first clause in vs. 6, describe the nature of the events, including such aspects as appearance and divine intent. The term νοοῦσα and the whole second clause of vs. 11, as we argued for the second clause in vs. 6, denote the purpose of the events as parastic warnings "for us."1 The relationship between the first two clauses of vss. 6 and 11 can thus be structurally diagramed in an ARAB pattern:

(vs. 6):
A (nature) ταῦτα ἡ ὑποῆκη ἐκείνους.
B (purpose) εἰς τὸ ἀπεισοῦν ἢ ἑξήγησέ τε καὶ τὸν

(vs. 11):
A (nature) ταῦτα ἡ πλῆθος συνεδρίας ἐκείνους.
B (purpose) ἔργα ἀπὸ τοῦ κατάσχοντος νῦν...

Our analysis of the two clauses in vs. 11 by no means indicates that vs. 11b provides no information regarding the structures of τάξια. Though vs. 11b describes the purpose of the τάξια, it is still referring to the same τάξια that comprise the τάξια of vss. 6 and 11. Both these verses make clear that for Paul the τάξια are historical events. But in vs. 11b Paul specifies the source of his information regarding the events. They were ἔργα. From Paul's similar usage of the verb ἔργα elsewhere,2 it is clear that he is referring to the recording of events in OT Scripture. Thus Paul intimates that the τάξια, though events, are "inscripturated" events. The τάξια, which Paul has been describing in vss. 1-10, were written down in Scripture, not merely deduced from oral tradition, speculation, or other written sources.

A major component in the structural framework of the text is revealed in vs. 11c. The 'us' of vs. 11b (and vs. 6) are they "upon whom the end of the ages has come." In the Greek both τῶν ἡκούσων and τῶν ἀλήθεων are plural (literally, "the ends of the ages." ἔργα means "to come to, arrive, reach one's destination." In what sense are we to understand that the "ends of the ages have arrived"?1

Various suggestions have been propounded to explain the statement, and in particular, the occurrences of the two plurals. Regarding τῶν ἰδιῶν we have the following major hypotheses: (1) the "ages" are the summary of previous successive periods which have reached their destination in the New Age already;2 (2) the "ages" are the summary of parallel ages,3 such as the ages of Greek

---

1See Rom 15:4; 4:23-24, for similar usage.
2Flinders and Robinson, p. 207; Hermann Sasse, "ἡμῶν, ἀλήθεων," TDNT, 1:203; Bachmann, p. 335; Bandstra, Elements, p. 89.
paganism and of Israel;\(^1\) (3) the "ages" are *dual* in number, and
denote the "New Age" and the "old age" which have met end to end,
so that the close of the old age coincides with the beginning of
the New;\(^2\) (4) the "ages" are ages past in totality (plural of
totality),\(^3\) designating "simply the world-epoch, from the point
of view of its limitation."\(^4\)

Regarding τά ἀλάνοι we have the following major options:
(1) τά ἀλάνοι is in the plural because its number has been attracted
to that of ψωμίων;\(^5\) (2) τά ἀλάνοι is in the singular sense of "the end
of a unity" and so implies no epochal pattern;\(^6\) (3) τά ἀλάνοι is in the
dual, referring to the coinciding ends of the old and New ages;\(^7\)
(4) τά ἀλάνοι has the secondary meaning of "revenues."\(^8\)

Apart from the fact that it is impossible to prove a dual
for ψωμίων or τά ἀλάνοι, we must dismiss suggestion No. 3 in each of
the above on the ground that τά ἀλάνοι does not refer to the "beginning"
of something, but to the end or goal, and therefore cannot denote
the terminal point of a previous age touching the beginning of the
New Age.

There are several Jewish apocalyptic references that parallel

\(^1\) Grosheide, p. 226.
\(^2\) Weiss, p. 254; Hering, pp. 88-89.
\(^3\) Bruce, 1 Corinthians, p. 93.
\(^4\) Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 168.
\(^5\) Bruce, 1 Corinthians, p. 93; Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 227.
\(^6\) Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, p. 168.\(^7\) Cf. above, n. 3.
\(^8\) R. Macpherson, "τά ἀλάνοι τῶν αἰῶνων, 1 Corinthians 10:11,"
world. The eschaton has dawned. The kingdom of God has been inaugurated, to be consummated with the perousia of Christ at his second advent. By virtue of the Christians' connection with Christ, they are the eschatological inheritors of all that has gone before.

All of the suggestions mentioned above for the significance of τά καινά and αἰώνιον would agree with the basic conclusion that Paul is here underscoring the eschatological character of the Christian church (the "us" of vss. 6, 11). The Corinthian church is living in the time of fulfillment ("in Christ") of all that the prophets had spoken. The eschatologically determined structure of the τόνων is strongly emphasized by Paul. The τόνων are advance-presentations of eschatological realities.

The eschatological focus of vs. 11c is an additional indication that τόνων/τά καινά refers to more than a universally applicable "warning example." The τόνων is linked specifically to the eschatological "us" in vs. 11, just as the τόνων are related to the "us" in vs. 6. The OT events in the history of Israel happened "typically" with specific reference to the people of a particular period—the eschatological age of fulfillment ushered in by Christ. And these OT events are bound up with the eschatological "us" whether the latter want them to be or not.

1 With the possible exception of view No. 4 for τά καινά—"revenues"—which sidesteps the eschatological perspective. This view has not been generally accepted as a possibility.


3 See especially Amsler, "La typologie," pp. 133-35, for a cogent presentation of the argument that follows.

The wilderness events are thus not merely general examples—to be followed or ignored by the Corinthians—but pre-presentations or prefigurations involving a devoir-etre connection with a specific fulfillment in eschatological "Israel," the Christian church. It must be emphasized, however, that Paul is not circumscribing the Corinthians' freedom of choice and action. He is not implying that because "most" in Israel experienced the divine retribution, therefore it "must needs be that the Corinthian church cannot escape judgment regardless of what they do. To the contrary, his paraenesis is directed at persuading his opponents to change their course of action so that they might avert the divine punishment. But Paul is insisting that any who continue in the same sins as ancient Israel will ineluctably experience God's retributive judgment. The devoir-etre character of the relationship between ancient Israel and the Corinth church remains unchanged. If the Corinthians persist in idolatry, immorality, testing the Lord, and grumbling, they can expect the certain consequences of divine retribution. But just as some individuals in Israel remained faithful to God and escaped punishment, so it may be with the Corinthians.

Because of the possibility that the Corinthians can avert judgment, it has been suggested that the wilderness experiences of Israel involving divine retribution are "hypothetical" τόνων.

1 This does not, however, exclude the "exemplary" interpretation. In vss. 6-11, the argument of Paul seems clearly to have a paraenetic thrust. But at the same time it moves beyond paraenesis to pre-presentation or prefiguration.

2See Köring, p. 188, followed by Bärdna, "Interpretation," p. 16.
The potential/conditional nature of divine judgment does appear to be present, but perhaps this can be best explained in terms of the Christological determination of the τάξις. The τάξις are Christologically structured not only as they refer directly to Christ as the Rock (vs. 4) and as the One put to the test (vs. 9)—but also as Christ is the ultimate orientation point of the τάξις. Each Israelite in the wilderness stood in either a negative or positive relationship to the Lord, the Rock, the pre-existent Christ. Those who persisted in a relationship against Christ suffered divine retribution. Such individuals and the punitive judgments that befell them are τάξις of what will happen to those in eschatological “Israel” who persist in a similar negative relationship with Christ. Thus the devoir-être character of the correspondence between ancient Israel and the Christian Church is upheld, but it remains with each individual Christian whether he will take a negative stand against Christ—and receive the divine chastisements—or relate positively to Christ—and continue to receive the blessings of salvation. The importance of this “Christocentric” aspect of the Christological τάξις-structure should not be overlooked.

Finally, it must be noted that the eschatological perspective of the τάξις involves a Steigerung or escalation from the OT τάξις to their fulfillment in the Christian community. This has already been noted with regard to the implications of vss. 1-4. Israel was baptized “into Moses” while Christians are baptized “into Christ.” Israel partook of the manna and water from the Rock, while Christians participate in the Lord’s Supper. Of course, in vss. 1-4 Paul emphasizes the continuity/correspondence and not the escalation: all Israel was truly baptized and partook of “spiritual” food and drink, just as did the Corinthians, the new Israel.

In vs. 11c, Paul more explicitly refers to the escalation between the τάξις and the “us” of the Christian community. In contrast to ancient Israel, upon “us” the end of the ages has come. The time of eschatological fulfillment has dawned in Christ. The events which God willed in their very historical unfolding to be for “us,”—and had consigned to Scripture in order that they might find their final destination in Christians at the end of time—have now indeed arrived at that climactic eschatological destination.

With the use of this phrase “upon when the end of the ages has come,” Paul reaches the climax of his hermeneutical endeavor. He is now ready to restate the original principle that had launched his OT hermeneutical expedition, and at the same time make a transition to a fuller explication of the Lord’s Supper.

The concluding exhortation (vss. 12-13). In vs. 12 Paul reiterates his basic paraenetic concern:


Therefore let the one who thinks he stands take heed lest he fall.

There is nothing of particular difficulty in this verse.

1 In vs. 11, as in vss. 1-4, the paraenetic concern necessitates that Paul emphasize the correspondences and not the contrasts. The fact that vs. 11c is included at all seems to reveal the importance Paul attaches to the escalation from τάξις to eschatological fulfillment, although he cannot in this paraenetic context develop the concept more fully.
The word ἔστω denotes the reasoned result of what has gone before. By means of this restatement of 1 Cor 9:27 in a more general way, Paul completes his exhortation construction. The final note of his parenthesis draws the conclusion from the experience of Israel. Just as with the τύχη, a fall was possible (even inevitable) to those who did not "take heed"—so the same is true for the eschatological counterpart of ancient Israel.

In vs. 13 Paul's concluding exhortation embraces a more positive dimension:

περισσότερος ἢ αὐτός εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἀπόστολος: πάσης εἰς τὸ δέον ἢ χάπης ὑμᾶς ἐξερρήνευσα ὡς θυσίας, ἐὰν ποιήσῃς τὰν ἐν τῇ περισσότερον τὰν ἐν τῇ δύνασίν τε δικαίαν ἐπικεφαλεῖν.

No temptation has overtaken you but such as is common to man; and God is faithful, who will not allow you to be tempted beyond what you are able; but with the temptation will also provide the way out, so that you can stand up under it.

Paul's paratactic warnings in vs. 5-12 have had no let up, no note of encouragement to the arrogant and self-secure. But Paul appears to have hope that his warnings will reach home to the Corinthians and show them their precarious position. Perhaps he also has in mind the "Weaker" element in Corinth as he adds the concluding verse of this pericope. It seems that though Paul still has the problems of idolatry, immorality, boasting, and arrogance in mind, he wishes his comfort to include all temptations that the Corinthians might face.

Just as the temptations in the wilderness were means by which God "tested" Israel (Deut 8:2), "to bring out their true character," 1 so the temptations the Corinthians faced in Corinth could serve a similar purpose. The word ἀντίδευτος is ambiguous, denoting either "testing" or "temptation." Perhaps Paul makes use of this ambiguity, pointing back to the "testing" of Israel by God, but including overtones of "temptation" in that there was a possibility of sinning involved.

Paul gives assurance to the Corinthians, first, from the past. The temptations they have faced have not been some exceptional, superhuman tests, but of the sort which commonly come to humanity. Secondly, Paul gives assurance for the future. God can be counted on to mitigate the temptation so that it is within their power to endure. And he will also provide an "escape route" 2 so that 3 they can endure. 4

Thus Paul concludes his hermeneutical treatment of the OT accounts of Israel's Exodus from Egypt. 5 From our analysis of this

1Orr and Walther, p. 247. 2ἐκβολή. 3στέφω + infinitive, expressing purpose or result. Cf. Gal 3:10; Phil 3:10; Rom 1:24; 6:5; 7:13; 8:12; 11:3, 10.
4ἀπεγνάω, "bear up, endure."
5We may here summarize how Paul has radically departed from traditional Jewish thought-structures at decisive points in his hermeneutical endeavor. In particular, we have seen that for Paul, in contrast to the literature of late Judaism, the eschaton has already dawned. In Christ the powers of the New Age have trampled into the world, the kingdom of God has been inaugurated. Furthermore, for Paul the Christian church constitutes eschatological Israel. In Christian believers are fulfilled the OT τάγμα relating to ancient Israel's Exodus from Egypt. Again, Paul breaks from traditional Jewish thought-structures by interpreting Israel's crossing of the Red Sea and their sustenance in the wilderness as sacraments. And what is more, these sacraments are prefigurations of Christian baptism and the Lord's Supper, respectively. We have also seen that Paul does not follow the often fantastic Rabbinic legends regarding the "following rock" beyond what could have been deduced from Scripture. Finally, we have noted that for Paul, in contrast to traditional Jewish midrash, the rock which accompanied Israel in the
passage a number of ἱστορικά structures have become evident. We now attempt a synthesis of these structures.

**Structures**

In our synthesis of the ἱστορικά structures that have emerged from the study of 1 Cor 10:1-13, the structures are organized under two major headings. First we delineate the elements of the historical structure, and then we summarize the aspects of the various theological structures.

**Historical structure**

The ἱστορικά of 1 Cor 10:1-13 are historically determined. This includes several aspects. First, the ἱστορικά are not just conceived of as ideas or general truths, but events—OT historical realities. In 1 Cor 10:1-13 are included the "baptism" of Israel in the sea and cloud (vss. 1-2), the partaking of spiritual food and of spiritual drink from the spiritual rock (vss. 3-4), and examples of Israel's apostasy—idolatry (vss. 7), immorality (vss. 8), testing the Lord (vss. 9), and grumbling (vss. 10)—which brought divine retributive judgment. These events are seen to have actually occurred in the past (vss. 5 and 11) and to have been recorded in OT Scripture just as they happened (vss. 11).

Second, there is a historical correspondence between the OT events and the NT realities. Ancient Israel corresponds with eschatological Israel (vss. 1, 11). Baptism "into Moses" corresponds to baptism "into Christ" (vs. 2). The spiritual food and wilderness is interpreted Messianically. The pre-existent Christ is seen to have been personally present with ancient Israel.

drink correspond to the Christian sacraments (vss. 3-4). And the sins of ancient Israel correspond to the conduct of the Corinthian congregation (vss. 7-10). The points of correspondence are either implicit (as in vss. 1-4) or explicit (vss. 5-11), actual (the sacraments and sins of vss. 1-4 and vss. 5-11, respectively) or potential (the judgments of vss. 5-11). Furthermore, the correspondences consist of specific parallel details as well as more general "similar situations." Thus, for instance, the baptism of ancient Israel corresponds with Christian baptism not only in terms of "basic deliverance" but in the wetery element (and perhaps also the fire/cloud = the Holy Spirit). Likewise, the bread and drink correspond to the elements in the Christian Eucharist.

Third, the NT realities correspond to, but are not identical with, the OT events. The horizontal movement from OT events to NT realities involves an historical progression or Steigerung ("escalation") because the NT realities constitute the climactic, eschatological destination toward which the OT events point. This aspect of the historical structure is not highlighted in 1 Cor 10 because Paul is here emphasizing the continuity and not the contrast.

**Theological structure**

Theological structures are closely related to the historical structure and may be summarized under several subheadings: eschatological, Christological/soteriological, ecclesiological, and prophetic.

**Eschatological structure.** The OT ἱστορικά are eschatologically
determined that they find specific fulfillment in the community "upon whom the end of the ages has come" (vs. 11). The first advent of Christ has inaugurated the eschatological kingdom of God, and thus the NT realities involve an absolute escalation (Steigerung) of the OT events in the end-time community.

Christological-soteriological structure. The OT realities are Christologically determined in that the OT events as well as the NT realities receive their ultimate significance in the light of the person and work of Christ (both in his pre-existent and incarnational states). Israel's Baptism "into Moses" is Christologically determined by the location "into Christ" (vs. 2). Likewise the spiritual bread and drink are Christologically structured by the Christian Eucharist (vs. 3-4) and the pre-existent Christ (vs. 4). The retributive judgments are also determined by the Christological reference in vs. 9.

The Christological structure not only involves the NT fulfillment of OT realities in the person of Christ (as in vs. 2) but also--and particularly so in 1 Cor 10--the fulfillment in various realities of the new covenant related to and brought about by Christ. Furthermore, Christ must be seen as the ultimate

---

1 We say "fulfillment" and not just "correspondence" because of the predictive-figurative (devoir-être) elements of the prophetic structure that are operative (as described below, pp. 284-85).

2 As we have noted above, pp. 276-77, this eschatological escalation aspect is not fully exploited in 1 Cor 10 apparently because of Paul's primarily paraenetic concerns.

3 In vs. 2 Paul seems to imply that Moses corresponds to Christ. See above, pp. 214-16.

4 The NT realities alluded to in 1 Cor 10 include the orientation point of the τὰ ἔργα and their NT fulfillments. The τὰ ἔργα and NT correspondents carry either a positive or negative moral "charge" depending upon their relationship to Christ. The Christological and soteriological components of this structure are inextricably bound together. The OT τὰ ἔργα find their fulfillment in the soteriological work of Christ and/or in the new covenant soteriological realities issuing from Christ. The OT τὰ ἔργα and their NT correspondents are not "bare" or "neutral" events, but soteriologically "charged." This involves both the salvific (for those who respond positively to Christ's grace) and the retributive (for those who spurn the manifestations of salvation) dimensions of soteriology.

Ecclesiological structure. This structure is closely related to the Christological-soteriological τὰ ἔργα structure in that ancient Israel and its counterpart, the Christian church, are the recipients of the salvific benefits bestowed by Christ.

Paul's argument in 1 Cor 10:1-13 centers around this correspondence between the experience of ancient Israel in the wilderness and the situation in the Christian church (particularly at Corinth). The Christian church is the new, eschatological Israel (vs. 1, 11). The events of salvation (and retribution) happened to ancient Israel τὰ ἔργα (vs. 11) or τὰ ἔργα (vs. 6) of the end-time congregation.

We include under this ecclesiological structure the individual

Christian church (especially vs. 1 and 11), baptism (vs. 2), and the Lord's Supper (vs. 3-4). These we have combined under a separate ecclesiological structure. See below, pp. 283-84.

1 See the discussion above, pp. 275-76.
("anthropological") dimension of the historical correspondence. As in ancient Israel, each individual at Corinth is free to choose whether he will stand in a negative relationship to divine grace—or receive the salvific gifts—or persist in disobedience and rebellion—or stand under the retributive judgment of God.

It is perhaps most appropriate also to include the sacraments of the church under the ecclesiological structure. The sacramental determination of the ὁδός appears especially in vss. 1-4, but also forms a basis for vv. 7-10. Israel's "sacraments" are advance-presentations of Christian baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Corinthians thus have no more automatic guarantee of salvation by participation in the sacraments than did ancient Israel.

Prophetic structure. The "prophetic" determination of the ὁδός involves three major aspects. First, Paul states that in their very occurrence the ὁδός were advance-presentations or prefigurations of the NT realities. The sacraments of ancient Israel (baptism in the Red Sea and partaking of manna and water from the rock) prefigured the Christian sacraments (baptism and the Lord's Supper), and the judgments upon ancient Israel for their sins of indulgence prefigured the judgments to fall upon eschatological Israel if they persist in those sins.

Second, it was by divine design that the events occurred as ὁδός. God is seen to have specifically ordained and superintended Israel's Exodus salvation—the baptism at the Red Sea (vss. 1-2) and

1Prior to the recent debate over the nature of typology, it would probably have been sufficient to use the term "prefiguration" without the accompanying adjectives "prospective/predictive" since in the traditional views such words as "prefiguration," "adumbration," "foreshadowing" include the prospective/predictive element. But proponents of the recent post-critical neo-typology have tended to employ traditional terminology in a way that minimizes or eliminates any real prospective/predictive thrust in the ὁδός. See the discussion above, p. 74.
Besides the theological structures that have been mentioned, we should also note the paraenetic determination of the τῶνος in this passage. We have not considered this as an actual τῶνος structure since it has become apparent that the paraenesis provides a determination which is primarily one of function and not of nature. At the same time it should be acknowledged that the paraenetic function is inextricably bound up with the structural composition of the τῶνος in this passage.

Τῶνος and τῶνοι as hermeneutical terms

According to the methodology set forth in the introduction of the present study, our exegesis of each NT τῶνος passage must not only lay bare the inherent τῶνος structures. It must also ascertain whether τῶνος (or cognate) occurs only incidentally in the hermeneutical passage or whether it is specifically employed to characterize the author's hermeneutical approach. Only if the latter is true, i.e., if τῶνος (or cognate) is used hermeneutically, can it be considered as a terminological indicator of the presence of typology in that passage.

In our investigation of 1 Cor 10:1-13, it has become evident that the terms τῶνος and τῶναι occur more than incidentally. Paul specifically describes the events as τῶνος in order to show hermeneutically that they point to the present eschatological salvation event. 1 Israel's baptism in the Red Sea, their sacramental sustenance in the wilderness, and the retributive judgments upon them for their sins of indulgence—all are interpreted by Paul as occurring τῶνοι, as τῶνος, of eschatological Israel, the Christian church. These Greek words are thus employed as specific hermeneutical terms by the apostle in his hermeneutical endeavor. We may therefore allow them to function as terminological indicators of the presence of typology in 1 Cor 10:1-13, and the τῶνος structures that have emerged from our exegesis of this passage may be recognized as typological structures.

Several lines of evidence from the use of τῶνος and τῶναι as hermeneutical terms in this passage confirm, contrary to frequent assertions, that these terms refer to more than paraenetic warning examples. We have seen first that the τῶνος of vs. 6 and the τῶνοι of vs. 11 involve the sacraments of vs. 1-4 as well as the divine judgments of vs. 5-11—and that Paul's discussion of the sacraments in vs. 1-4 clearly goes beyond paraenetic warning example to include divinely designed, predictive prefigurations.

Second, we have noted that if τῶναι in vs. 11a signified merely "warning example," the phrase in vs. 11b would constitute a tautology. A final confirmatory evidence is the direct linkage of τῶναι in vs. 11a with the eschatological "us" of vs. 11c. This specific devoir-être linkage seems clearly to indicate something beyond a general warning example. We may conclude that the terms τῶνος and τῶναι in 1 Cor 10 have reference to more than paraenesis. They are hermeneutical terms which function as terminological indicators of the presence of typology in this passage.

It may be asked at this point whether there is any continuity between the non-hermeneutical usage of τῶνος and cognates and
their usage as hermeneutical terms. To what extent does the
semantic range of ἔκαστος and biblical cognates as analyzed in the
preceding chapter of this dissertation encompass the historical
and theological structures that have emerged from our analysis of
1 Cor 10? Klaus Galley suggests that ἔκαστος is only a cipher for
the totality of the dynamic relationships involved in this
hermeneutical passage and cannot in itself signify those relation-
ships. 1 Goppelt, on the other hand, believes that ἔκαστος in its
meaning of "holding original" is particularly suited to represent
the "linear, dynamic interconnection" between the OT and NT events. 2

When the ἔκαστος structures of 1 Cor 10:1-13 are viewed in
the light of the semasiological investigation of ἔκαστος and biblical
cognates as conducted in the preceding chapter of this dissertation,
it becomes apparent that the semantic breadth of ἔκαστος is surpris-
ingly well-suited—even more so than Goppelt has recognized—to
encapsulate the dynamics found in Paul's hermeneutical endeavor. In
our semasiological investigation we found that the majority of
occurrences of ἔκαστος in the NT involved the semantic dynamics of a
Nachbild that is also a shaping, determinative Vorbild. This was
shown to be consonant with a basic sense of ἔκαστος as "[hollow] mold."
The mold (as a Nachbild) is formed from some prototype that exists
either concretely or in the mind of the designer. At the same time
the mold (as a Vorbild) functions as a matrix for shaping the end
product (an image, figure, or the like) which invariably conforms
to the contours of the mold, and "surpasses" it by reason of its
fulfilling the purpose for which the mold was designed.

This description of "hollow mold," a ἔκαστος, amazingly
encompasses the various linear dynamics of Paul's hermeneutical
approach in 1 Cor 10. The ἔκαστος (OT historical events) are "shaped"
from a "prototype" (the divine intent) in the mind of the Designer.
At the same time these ἔκαστος in their function as a hollow mold
shape the end (eschatological!) product (the NT events) which
ineluctably (devoir-être) corresponds to the (historical) contours
of the ἔκαστος (the OT events) but transcends them by virtue of the
(eschatological) fulfillment of the ultimate (Christological/
soteriological/ecclesiological) purpose for which the ἔκαστος were
intended. Thus the OT events are a Nachbild (of the divine design)
which serves as a dynamic, shaping, determinative Vorbild (of the
NT eschatological realities).

Though the signification of "hollow mold" strikingly coincides
with the linear dynamics of ἔκαστος in 1 Cor 10, yet it must
be recognized that this word-substitution for ἔκαστος cannot encompass
the actual conceptual structures conveyed by ἔκαστος as a hermeneutical
term. In 1 Cor 10 Paul seems to go beyond secular Greek usage of
ἔκαστος and ἔκαστος. No extant extra-biblical Greek source up to
and including NT times employs ἔκαστος (or biblical cognate) in a
sense which approximates Paul's hermeneutical usage, i.e., in interpret-
ing the significance of historical events. Likewise within
Scripture Paul's usage of ἔκαστος in the hermeneutical passage of
1 Cor 10:1-13 goes beyond his usage of the term in non-hermeneutical
passages. Although we have noted a similar twofold perspective

---
1 Klaus Galley, Altes und neues Heilsgeschehen des Paulus
2 Goppelt, TUNT, 8:252-53.
(Nachbild and Vorbild) in Rom 5:17 and the ethical τόνος passages as
is found in 1 Cor 10, yet the historical and theological τόνος
structures of the latter passage differ significantly from the
conceptual elements in the non-hermeneutical Pauline passages.
The τόνος of 1 Cor 10 are not simply a doctrinal mold which
possesses the believers (as in Rom 6:17) nor ethical models to be
imitated (as in the ethical τόνος passages), but are divinely de-
signed prefigurations of NT Christological/soteriological/
ecclcsiological realities. In contrast to the non-hermeneutical
usage of τόνος and cognates, the hermeneutical τόνος involve a
deyvoir-être relationship and an historical, eschatological
Steigerung between OT events and their NT fulfillments. In short,
τόνος and τόνος in 1 Cor 10 seem to approach a specialized,
technical meaning as hermeneutical terms.1

There are no English word-substitutions that are able ade-
quately to capture the nuances of this unique Pauline usage. It
seems, therefore, that the Christian church has taken the best course
of action by generally retaining τόνος in its transliterated form.
Thus in modern English the hermeneutical τόνος of 1 Cor 10 appear
best rendered as "types," and their interpretation can accordingly
be appropriately termed "typology."

1 Since we have determined above, pp. 196-97, that 1 Corin-
thians was written by Paul ca. A.D. 55, and since it is seen below in
our discussion of other hermeneutical τόνος passages that these
passages were probably written later than A.D. 55, it is therefore
appears that 1 Cor 10 constitutes the first known occurrence of τόνος
as a hermeneutical term. For a discussion of the alleged advance in
technicality in the Pauline use of τόνος in Rom 5:14 over that of
1 Cor 10, see below, pp. 312-13.

Summary and implications

The τόνος of 1 Cor 10 are soteriologically-Christologically
determined events in the history of ancient Israel—at the Red Sea
and in the wilderness—which according to Paul occurred as divinely-
ordained advance-presentations, ineluctably prefiguring the ex-
perience of eschatological Israel, the Christian church.

Ancient Israel had their sacraments—the baptism in the Red
Sea and partaking of the spiritual food and drink—which correspond
to and prefigure Christian baptism and the Lord's Supper. But
these sacraments did not provide them insurance against apostasy
and divine retribution. Just as most of ancient Israel were re-
jected by God because of their disobedience—idolatry, immorality,
testing the Lord, and murmuring—so, Paul warns, it "must needs be"
with those Christians in Corinth who persist in sin. But there is
a way of escape provided by God.

The τόνος in this passage are structured historically in
terms of their OT historical reality, their detailed historical
 correspondence with NT realities, and the historical progression
from OT τόνος to NT fulfillments. The theological τόνος structures
in 1 Cor 10 may be categorized as (1) eschatological, (2) Christo-
llogical—soteriological, (3) ecclesiological, and (4) prophetic.
The τόνος are eschatologically structured as they find absolute
intensification (or Steigerung) in their fulfillment at the "end of
the ages" inaugurated by Christ and appropriated by the Church.
The τόνος are Christologically—soteriologically structured as they
find fulfillment in Christ their ultimate orientation point and in
the New Covenant salvation realities issuing from Christ. The
ecclesiological τόκος structure involves the corporate, individual, and sacramental dimensions of ancient Israel and its counterpart, the Christian church. The prophetic τόκος structure includes the conceptual elements of advance-presentation or prefiguration, divine design, and devoir-être ("must-needs-be"). A fifth theological structure, involving the parenetic determination of the τόκος, may also be mentioned, though it is not primarily one of nature but of function.

The words τόκος and ἐπίτοκος do not appear only incidentally in 1 Cor 10. They function as specific hermeneutical terms in Paul's hermeneutical endeavor and therefore may be taken as terminological indicators of the presence of typology in this passage. The twofold (Nachbild-Vorbild) perspective of these terms makes them amazingly well-suited to encompass the linear dynamics involved in the typological structures of 1 Cor 10. At the same time the semantic contours of τόκος (and cognate) as hermeneutical terms transcend the non-hermeneutical usage of the terms up to and including NT times. Since there is no adequate English word-substitution for what approaches a specialized, technical usage in 1 Cor 10, it appears best simply to transliterate the hermeneutical term τόκος as "types" and label its interpretation as "typology."

The major contribution of our treatment of 1 Cor 10:1-13 is that it constitutes the first attempt to allow the structures of typology to emerge from within Scripture by means of a thorough analysis of a hermeneutical τόκος passage.

From our investigation of the τόκος structures in 1 Cor 10, a number of implications may be drawn with regard to the modern debate over the nature of typology. First, according to Paul the OT τόκοι are events which occurred as historical realities. Though he does not explicitly argue that these events actually happened as recorded in Scripture, this is assumed by the apostle to be the case and forms an indispensable foundation for his hermeneutical approach. The force and legitimacy of Paul's whole discussion in this passage rests on his acceptance of the historicality of the events under consideration. Only if the OT events of salvation and retribution were considered to have really happened to ancient Israel could Paul utilize Israel's experience as a devoir-être argument in his parenetic warning to the Corinthians. This aspect of the historical structure in Paul's hermeneutical endeavor is part of the traditional understanding of typology, but it appears to stand in tension with recent assertions among proponents of the post-critical neo-typology that the historicity of the τόκος is not essential for typology.¹

A second implication also proceeds from the historical structure in 1 Cor 10. The τόκοι are not only historical realities but OT historical realities. They are events which "happened" and "were written down" (1 Cor 10:11). Paul is not interpreting the significance of historical events as such, but events that have been recorded in Scripture. This aspect of the historical structure of typology appears to have been often overlooked in the recent discussion of the subject. Typology has been described as an

¹For a survey of this issue and listing of representative participants in the discussion, see above, p. 96.
interpretation of events and not an interpretation of Scriptural passages. It is often seen to derive from extra-biblical and para-biblical traditions as well as Scriptural accounts. But according to our analysis of 1 Cor 10, typology is the interpretation of Scriptural passages—passages which narrate the experience of ancient Israel. It is apparently based upon Scripture and not extra-biblical or para-biblical tradition.

A third implication again stems from the historical milieu structure of 1 Cor 10. According to major advocates of typological exegesis within modern-critical scholarship, typology focuses upon the general continuity within God's revelation in history and does not extend to detailed historical correspondences. But this understanding does not appear to be substantiated from our analysis of 1 Cor 10. To the contrary, we have found that the typological correspondences between OT and NT realities involve specific historical details. The sacramental baptism of Israel in the Red Sea corresponds with Christian baptism not only in terms of "basic deliverance" but seems to imply the watery element (and perhaps also the fire - the Holy Spirit). The sacramental bread and drink supplied to Israel in the wilderness likewise correspond to the elements in the Christian sacrament of the Lord's Supper. And the various sins of ancient Israel (idolatry, immorality, testing the Lord, murmuring) which called for divine retribution have their typological counterparts in eschatological Israel.

1 See above, pp. 74-75. 2 See above, pp. 106-7.

It must be added as a fourth implication, however, that the detailed correspondences do not involve trivial, insignificant details. Contrary to much of the Cocceian mode of typological interpretation, in 1 Cor 10 the historical structure is seen to occur in close conjunction with the Christological-soteriological structure. The corresponding typological details are not extraneous or trivial, but relate directly to the divine acts of salvation/retribution and find their ultimate reference point in Christ and the salvific realities brought about by Him.

A fifth implication also involves the conjunction of the historical structure with a theological structure and stands in tension with much of the Cocceian mode of typology. Whereas in Cocceian typology correspondences are often drawn between two realities which occur on the same plane, in 1 Cor 10 there is a historical, eschatological Steigerung in the movement from OT to NT fulfillment. This absolute eschatological escalation has been rightly emphasized in many recent descriptions of typology but frequently overlooked in the explication of traditional views.

A sixth implication stems from the fact that the OT types in 1 Cor 10 are historical events. Advocates of post-critical neo-typology and most exponents of the traditional views have rightly recognized that typology involves historical events. However, the recent dissertation of Friederichsen propounds a modified version of the Marshian mode of typology in which true types are found only

1 See above, pp. 33-35. 2 See above, pp. 33-35.

3 For a survey of this issue and listing of representative participants in the discussion, see above, p. 96.
in the Levitical institutions. This view appears to be disaffirmed in 1 Cor 10.

The final implications stem from the prophetic tóhos structure in 1 Cor 10. In contrast to recent assertions within historical-critical scholarship, our analysis of 1 Cor 10 reveals that (at least in this passage) typology is not only retrospective, analogical, and exemplary, but prospective, divinely designed, and prefigurative. According to Paul the OT events dealt with in 1 Cor 10 are not just retrospectively interpreted to be tóhos by the Pentateuchal historiographer in the light of inspiration or even by the NT exegete in the light of the Christ-event. Though indeed the events are recorded in OT Scripture and the precise nature of the fulfillment is clarified by the Christ-event, yet, insists Paul, the tóhos-quality is inherent in the events themselves. In their very occurrence they were happening tóhos. Furthermore, the OT tóhos are not merely exemplary in character or part of the structural analogy within God’s consistent revelation in history. Rather, according to 1 Cor 10, they consist of specific, divinely designed, predictive prefigurations. There is a devorêté linkage between the OT tóhos and their NT eschatological fulfillments. These aspects of the prophetic structure have been generally assumed in traditional views of typology, but the devorêté linkage has not been sufficiently emphasized.

The implications which we have just delineated appear to pose serious problems for the recent post-critical neo-typology:

1 For a summary of these major points of difference, see above, pp. 73-75.
3 Lengsfeld, p. 30. Corroborates our personal survey by
In our literature survey in the first chapter, there has been no
substantive analysis of this hermeneutical ἐνεργος passage conducted
with a view toward laying bare the inherent ἐνεργος structures. This
we seek to provide in the study that follows. Our investigation
builds upon previous studies augmented by fresh analysis of sig-
nificant unresolved structural issues and attempts to synthesize
the ἐνεργος structures that emerge from the passage.

Preliminary considerations:

Certain introductory and contextual considerations serve to
place this hermeneutical ἐνεργος passage in proper perspective within
the apostle and among the other NT hermeneutical ἐνεργος passages.

The epistle to the Romans was written by Paul most probably
within a year or two after the Corinthian correspondence, and thus
the usage of ἐνεργος in Rom 5:14 constitutes a later--but chronologi-
cally not far removed--Pauline usage than 1 Cor 10:8, 11. The
fifth chapter of Romans may be seen as the beginning of a new
section (Rom 5-8), one which builds upon the previous explication
of justification by faith (Rom 1-4) and elucidates its results with

a description of the new life. The chapter presents an affirmation
of the Christian’s confident hope and assurance of ultimate salvation.
In vv. 1-11 the apostle delineates the personal experience of the
life which follows justification. Then in 5:12-21, the passage
in which ἐνεργος appears, Paul grounds the personal experience by
focusing upon Christ the Justifier, the Representative Man. To the
conceptual structures of this hermeneutical ἐνεργος passage we now
turn our attention.

Enneuro structures

Historical structure

As a foundation to the historical correspondences of Rom 5,
we must recognize that Paul is “undoubtedly thinking of Adam as an
historical individual.” But seeing his insights ultimately upon the
biblical account of Adam’s fall in Gen 3, the apostle takes for
granted the historical reality of this event as recorded in Scrip-
ture. His entire argument is bound up with his acceptance of the
Fall as a literal event in history.

1 For a discussion of the central theme of Romans and the
divisions of the epistle which flow from it, see in particular
Anders Nygren, Commentary on Romans, trans. Carl C. Rasmussen
2 Matthew Black, Romans, NCB (London: Oliphants, 1973),
p. 86.
3 John Murray, The Epistle to the Romans, NICNT (Grand
Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), p. 181, characterizes as “exegetically
monstrous” the view of Charles H. Dodd, The Epistle to the Romans,
MTG (London: Collins Press, 1959), p. 80, that Paul’s argument
is not bound up with the Fall as a literal event. Murray appears
correct in his estimation of the importance of what Paul takes for
granted: “So basic to Paul’s doctrine is the one trespass of the
one man Adam that any interference with this datum wrecks Paul’s
whole argument.”
A syntactical survey of Rom 5:12-21 immediately reveals the preponderance of comparative conjunctions which introduce Paul's historical description. The following three pairs are involved:

1. ὁ δὲ ... ὁ δὲ ... (vss. 12, 18, 19, 21).
2. πρὸς ἀδικίαν ... ἀδικίας (vss. 15, 16).
3. εἰ δὲ ταλαγόν (vss. 15, 17).

These three pairs of conjunctions highlight different aspects of Paul's historical structure in this passage.

Our first attention will be directed to the pair ὁ δὲ (ὅτε) ... ὁ δὲ. This first pair involves a correspondence of similarities between Adam and Christ. Paul begins the positive comparison in vs. 12, but his apodosis breaks off in an anacolusion. The comparison is not resumed until vs. 18, and then continues to the end of the chapter. As in the parallel passage of 1 Cor 15:22, 45-49, Adam (like the New Adam, Christ) is the "head and inclusive representative of the human race." There is a "solidarity" between Adam and the rest of humanity.1

What is true of Adam, the representative man, says Paul, is true of Christ the (new) Representative Man. From the relationship of "Adam-and-all-men" Paul argues to the relational structure of "Christ-and-all-men." As (ὅτα σαρᾶν) Adam's trespass/disobedience led to condemnation for all men (vs. 18) and constituted "the many" sinners (vs. 17), ushering in the lordship of death, so (ὅτα σαρᾶν) Christ's righteousness/obedience issues in acquittal and life for all, makes "the many" (ὅτα σαρᾶν) righteous, ushering in the lordship of grace/righteousness/life/Christ.3


Whether or not Paul makes use of (and/or corrects) a gnostic cosmic redeemer myth, as advocated by Rudolf Bultmann, "Adam and Christ According to Romans 5," in Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Pfeiffer, ed. William Klassen and Raymond F. Snyder (New York: Harper & Bros. 1962), pp. 154, and Brandenburg, pp. 168-89, or relies on extra-biblical Jewish speculations, as traced, e.g., by Lengsfeld, pp. 37-46, and Brandenburg, pp. 16-64 (which possibilities appear doubtful), the GT conception of solidarity underlies all later myths and makes them possible.

1Cranfield, Romans, p. 295.
2ὅτα σαρᾶν. This expression is apparently equivalent to the "all" of vs. 18, with which it is in parallelism. Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966 [German, 1960]), pp. 179-82, shows that this phrase means "the whole, comprising many individuals" (p. 179). With regard to Adam's sin, the condemnation was universal. With Christ's obedience, the grace was available universally but depended upon the individual reception (vs. 17). "And they were all "those who received:" cf. the parallel usage in 1 Cor 15:22.

3This opens up the whole question of "original sin," especially focused in vs. 12, which topic has generated a deluge of literature. See the bibliographies in Cranfield, pp. 270-71 and A. J. M. Wedderburn, "The Theological Structure of Romans 5:12," RTS 19 (1972-73): 339-54. Cranfield perhaps provides the best.
The second pair of conjunctions is καὶ ὡς ... κόρος (vss. 15, 16). We have seen how Adam and Christ are in positive correspondence by virtue of their respective positions as inclusive representatives of humanity. But in terms of their actions, the correspondence is a negative one, a correspondence of opposites. This is signified by the introductory καὶ in vss. 15 and 16. The same antithesis appears in vss. 17 and 18 without the καὶ. The antithetical correspondence between Adam's act of disobedience and God's act of grace in Christ may be schematized as follows:

Adam's Act of Disobedience
1. "all" men died (vs. 15a)
2. judgment/condemnation (vss. 16a and 16b)
3. sin/death reigns (vss. 17a, 21a)
4. "all" made sinners (vs. 19a)

God's Act of Grace in Christ
1. 'all' have grace available (vs. 15b)
2. acquittal/justification (vss. 16c, 18b)
3. believers/Christ/Jesus Christ/life reigns (vss. 17b, 21b)
4. 'all' (who will receive) made righteous (vs. 19b)

It should be noted that this series of antitheses begins immediately after the mention of Adam as "Lyme" (τὸν ἄνθρωπον) of the one who was to come [τὸν ὑπότοιχον] in vs. 14. Goppelt has correctly noted that the antithetical correspondence is consonant with the basic meaning of τὸν ἄνθρωπον as "hollow mold." A hollow mold makes an opposite impression on the image/copy that is produced by the mold.

synthesis of the debate. Regardless of the conclusion concerning original sin in this passage, it seems clear, as shown especially by Wedderburn, that both the cosmic inevitability of, and individual responsibility for, sinning are upheld in this chapter.

1Goppelt, THT, 8:252.
in regard to the effectiveness of Christ's work. If it is certain that "the many" died through Adam's trespass, as evidenced even in the period of time before Sinai (vss. 13-14a), then it is "much more" certain that God's grace in Christ has overflowed to "the many."

We have so far seen the thorough-going historical structure--OT historical reality, historical comparison/antithesis/intensification--that is present in this passage. This structure functions concomitantly with several other conceptual structures throughout the passage, to which we now address ourselves.

Theological structures

Eschatological structure. Anders Nygren is convinced that Rom 5:12-21 provides the clearest picture of Paul's eschatological framework for the gospel. The doctrine of the two aeons, as elucidated in this passage, is for Nygren "the high point of the epistle, in the light of which the whole is best to be understood." It is said to give "the key to the whole epistle." It is understood to be "the presupposition on which all that has preceded rests." It may be debatable whether Rom 5:12-21 is the high point of the epistle. Nevertheless recent scholarship would agree that the eschatological framework set forth in this pericope is vital for understanding Paul's gospel. As Charles K. Barrett has pointed out, the groundwork of Paul's justification is eschatological inasmuch as the concept of justification is related to the divine judgment or sentence that was expected by first-century apocalyptic Judaism to come at the last day.

What is the eschatological structure of Rom 5:12-21? The two inclusive (representative) men, Adam and Christ, according to this passage, embody in themselves and in their acts the old and new aeons, respectively. In Adam came the old aeon—the realm of the hostile powers, sin and death. In Christ the powers have shifted; the new aeon of acquittal and life has come. Hans J. Schoeps and others have clarified that Paul was working within the framework of traditional Jewish expectations, but introduced one major difference: "The Messiah who should come at the end of the age has in fact come, though the end of history is still delayed. This mingling of the two ages [the olam hazeh and the olam habba] constitutes the distinctive eschatological standpoint of Pauline theology." Barrett in particular has shown that in Rom 5 there is a present and future "eschatological process."

\[1\] The multiple usage of this phrase provides a clue to the basic theme of the whole chapter. Ivan T. Blazer, "Death to Sin According to Rom 6:1-14 and Related Texts: An Exegetical-Theological Study with a Critique of Views" (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1979), p. 13, n. 15, argues forcefully for a united theme in Rom 5, namely "the Christian's confident assurance of final salvation."

\[2\] Nygren, p. 20.

\[3\] Ibid., p. 27.

\[4\] Ibid., p. 32. See pp. 16-26, 210-12, for Nygren's penetrating analysis of the eschatological perspective.


\[3\] Schoeps, p. 99.

\[4\] Barrett, Adam, p. 94.
extending from and completing the historic work of Jesus. For example, the "life" mentioned in Rom 5 is an eschatological gift of God, worked out in Christ, projected to us now, and to be consummated in the future.\(^1\)

By means of the eschatological motif of the ages, Paul gives Christ's work a cosmic and universal significance. Sin/Death are personified cosmic powers that were reigning, and which Christ has overcome. In Christ the powers of the Age to Come have already become operative, although the consummation is still future.

**Christological-soteriological structure.** Parallel to the eschatological structure of this passage is the overarching soteriological framework. In Rom 5:12-21 Paul works his doctrine of redemption (or justification) in terms of this Adam-Christ typology.\(^2\) Salvation is grounded in the death of the Representative Man and thus is given a universal significance. Weighty concepts of soteriology are focused in Rom 5:12-21: grace (vss. 15, 17, 20, 21), "free gift" (vss. 15, 18), life or eternal life (vss. 17, 18, 21), justification (vs. 16) or acquittal (vs. 19), righteousness (vss. 17, 19, 21). Paul's soteriology as represented by these key words indicates that it is essential to the entire theology of the epistle.

It has already become apparent throughout our discussion that Rom 5 is Christocentric in its thrust. In vs. 12, the predicate concerning the one man Adam calls for the apodosis of the one man Jesus Christ, which finally appears formally in vss. 18ff. after two explicit mentions of the "one man Jesus Christ" in vss. 15 and 17. And the τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ in vss. 14b seems clearly to refer to Christ\(^1\) as a Pauline equivalent to ὁ ἡγούμενος "the Coming One" (the Messiah) in Matt 11:3 - Luke 7:20.\(^2\)

We further note that there is a temporal ambivalence about the term τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. It points to a time in the future, as viewed from Adam's perspective, but does not provide exact clarification with regard to the time of Paul's writing. It has been perceptively observed that τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ "may, and probably does, include also the Christ who is yet to come."\(^3\) Certainly the historic deed of Christ is central and foundational, indicated by the past terms describing his work in vss. 15 and 20. But vss. 17 and 19 seem to indicate that the "full attainment of actual righteousness lies in the future."\(^4\) The intensified Christocentric focus of Rom 5 seems to involve three foci: past (the inauguration, vss. 15, 20), to be appropriated in the present (vs. 17), and consummated in the future (vs. 21). This parallels the discussion of Christ's work as the second Adam in 1 Cor 15.

**Ecclesiological structure.** In Rom 5:14 we find a substantial difference in the primary references of the οῖς αὐτοῖς as compared to 1 Cor 10:11-13. Though in both instances Christologically

---

\(^1\)Rom 5:17, 18, 21; cf. 6:18-23.  
\(^2\)Black, Romans, p. 84.  
\(^1\)Not to Moses, or "man under law" as argued by John A. T. Robinson, The Body, A Study in Pauline Theology (Chicago: H. Regnery Co., 1952), p. 35, followed by Scrivens, p. 81; cf. the persuasive counterarguments presented by Cranfield, Romans, 1:283-84.  
\(^3\)Barrett, Adam, p. 92.  
\(^4\)Dodd, Romans, p. 83.
determined, in 1 Cor 10 the OT rōmōs correspond primarily to the NT ecclesiological realities—the new eschatological Israel (vss. 1, 11), the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper (vss. 2-4), and the divine retributive judgment for disobedience (vss. 4, 7-10)—while in Rom 5 the rōmōs correspondence is primarily between Adam and Christ.

In the immediate context of Rom 5:14, however, there are at least implications of ecclesiological determination. In vss. 15-19 not only Adam and Christ, but also “the many” are involved in the correspondence (see especially vss. 15, 18, 19). As the condemnation in Adam was universal, so “in Christ” grace is made universally available. The anthropological status of “the many” in Adam is condemnation as sinners—leading to death. But “those who receive” (vs. 17) the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness attain a status of acquittal and righteousness (vss. 18-19) and “reign in life” (vs. 17) through the one man Jesus Christ. In Rom 6, which forms a unity with Rom 5, Paul clarifies how the effect of one act of one man flows to “the many.” By the sacrament of baptism, the believer is incorporated into the historical death and resurrection of Christ.

Prophetic structure. Several aspects of the prophetic structure come into view which need attention.

1. Advance-presentation. It seems clear in Rom 5 that the person Adam as representative man provides an advance-presentation or prefiguration of the Representative Man Jesus Christ worked out

1 Black, Romans, p. 84.
2 Gnilka, “La typologie chez Saint Paul,” p. 115 uses the phrase “dépendance formelle.”
4 Cranfield, Romans, p. 295.
6 Cf. “age [σόφος] to come” (Matt 12:32; Eph 1:21); “world [οἰκουμένη] to come” (Heb 2:5); “judgment [σοφία] to come” (Acts 24:25).
in parallel with the devoir-être Messianic structures of Matt 11:3 and Luke 7:20 (among other passages), rules out the "vague sense" of mere "future" and stresses the divinely destined certainty of the correspondence between Adam and Christ.1

Another indication of the correctness of this conclusion is the use of the most closely parallel phrase (to Rom 5:14a) in Col 2:17: ὁ λόγος τοῦ κελευθήρου. The imagery of "shadow" clearly calls for the inevitable, necessary relationship to the reality—the body—Christ.

3. Divine design. The argument for the devoir-être quality of the τῶν ἀνθρώπων (as just noted) as a concomitant emphasis upon the divinely destined certainty of the τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Besides the evidence from the employment of terminology in vs. 14 (and parallels elsewhere in Scripture), the divine design seems clearly indicated with the mention of (1) a judicial sentence following Adam's sin and (2) a negating, "abounding-to-the-opposite" bestowal of God's grace in Jesus Christ (vss. 16, 18).

This is not to say that Paul is denying the freedom of Adam (or of Christ) or suggesting the inevitability of sin (or of eternal life). Adam need not have sinned, and Christ could have failed, but this is not the point at issue in Paul's argument. It is rather that in the ordering of God, Adam was the representative of the whole human race. And since Adam fell, it "must needs be" that another Representative Man go over the same ground where Adam fell and conquer. This Christ did, thereby providing grace "super-

1Martelet, pp. 527-29.

abundantly" to reverse, rectify, and resolve the problem Adam's sin brought about.

Τῶν ἀνθρώπων as a hermeneutical term

It has become evident from our investigation of Rom 5:12-21 that Paul does not employ the term τῶν ἀνθρώπων only incidentally in this passage. As with τῶν ἀνθρώπων and τῶν ἀνθρώπων in 1 Cor 10, τῶν ἀνθρώπων in Rom 5 clearly occurs as a hermeneutical term in the apostle's hermeneutical endeavor. Adam as representative man is portrayed as a divinely designed predictive prefiguration—a τῶν ἀνθρώπων—of Christ, the eschatological Representative Man. Since τῶν ἀνθρώπων is specifically employed to characterize the author's hermeneutical approach, it may be allowed to function as a terminological indicator of the presence of typology in this passage, and the τῶν ἀνθρώπων structures which have emerged from our analysis of the passage may appropriately be termed "typological structures."

As we noted in our discussion of 1 Cor 10, the semantic range of τῶν ἀνθρώπων—particularly in its dual perspective (Nachbild-Vorbild) as a "hollow mold"—appears amazingly well-suited to encompass the linear dynamics that are involved in Paul's hermeneutical approach to the OT. Like a hollow mold, the OT representative man Adam is a Nachbild (of the divine design) which functions as a dynamic Vorbild, shaping the end (eschatological) product (Christ) so that it ineluctably (devoir-être) conforms to the (historical) contours of the Vorbild and surpasses it by fulfilling the (Christological-soteriological) purpose for which the Vorbild was designed. The element of antithesis emphasized in Rom 5 makes the
use of ἁλαθύς as a homoeautical term even more appropriate than in 1 Cor 10. As the hollow mold makes an opposite impression on what is produced by the mold, so there is an antithetical correspondence between the action of Adam and that of Christ.

Although ἁλαθύς in its signification of "hollow mold" does capture the linear dynamics of Paul's homoeautical approach in a striking way, yet it must be recognized that in Romans 5, as in 1 Corinthians 10, Paul goes beyond common non-homoeautical Greek usage. As a homoeautical term ἁλαθύς approaches a specialized, technical usage referring to a divinely designed OT historical reality which ineluctably (δεικτικόν) prefigures and finds fulfillment in a corresponding but absolutely intensified eschatological NT reality.

At this point we may inquire whether the usage of ἁλαθύς as a specialized homoeautical term constitutes an advance in technicality over Paul's first extant homoeautical usage (1 Corinthians 10). Because paraenesis is dominant in 1 Corinthians 10 and absent in Romans 5, many scholars have been led to posit a less technical, paraenetic usage of ἁλαθύς in the former passage. This conclusion, however, appears to be unwarranted. In our discussion of 1 Corinthians 10 we noted how ἁλαθύς in that passage goes beyond the signification of "paraenetic warning example" and refers to divinely designed

predictive prefigurations. We further pointed out that the paraenetic determination of the ἁλαθύς in 1 Corinthians 10 is one of function and not of nature. What at first glance may seem to be an advance in technicality in the usage of ἁλαθύς from Romans 5 to 1 Corinthians 10 is in reality a shift in primary referents from one passage to the other. The Christo-centric conceptual framework in Romans 5 has as its primary referent of the ἁλαθύς Christ himself, while in 1 Corinthians 10 the ἁλαθύς refer primarily to the church of Christ (its sacraments and chastisements for disobedience). This difference in the referent of the ἁλαθύς is consonant with the dominant paraenetic flavor of 1 Corinthians 10. It is only natural to expect that typology dealing primarily with the Church—especially with correspondences of imminent retributive divine judgment for persistent disobedience—will be found in a paraenetic context, admonishing the hearers to fulfill the salvific and not the retributive aspects of the ἁλαθύς. It is therefore the referent, not the technicality of the ἁλαθύς usage, that has changed between the two passages.

Summary and Implications

Our analysis of the conceptual structures in Romans 5 has revealed the same basic ἁλαθύς structures in this passage as present in 1 Corinthians 10. There is an historical structure which involves (1) an OT historical reality, (2) a detailed historical correspondence with a NT reality, and (3) an historical Steigerung between OT and NT realities. There are also theological structures which may be categorized as (1) eschatological (including the past, present, and

1 See above, p. 287.
2 See above, pp. 258-55.
future dimensions), (2) Christological-soteriological, (3) the ecclesiological, and (4) prophetic (including the elements of prefiguration, divine design, and devoir-être). In Rom 5, as in 1 Cor 10, ἄνθρωπος functions as a hermeneutical term and thus may be seen as a terminological indicator of the presence of typology in this passage.

Although the ἄνθρωπος structures of Rom 5:12-21 are basically the same as those in 1 Cor 10:1-13, there are certain shifts of emphasis. First, in regard to the historical correspondence, the bulk of the discussion in Rom 5 involves antithetical correspondence, while in 1 Cor 10 the emphasis is upon the similarities. Second, the ἄνθρωπος of Rom 5 is a person (though events are certainly involved), while in 1 Cor 10 it is events that are primarily in view (though this obviously involves persons). A third difference between the two passages involves the paraenetic determination. The paraenesis which is so dominant in 1 Cor 10 is not found in Rom 5. This does not indicate an advance in technicality in the usage of ἄνθρωπος between the two passages, but rather reflects the shift in primary referents from the ecclesiological in 1 Cor 10 to the christological in Rom 5. Those differences, along with those that are observed in connection with the study of the remaining ἄνθρωπος passages, are taken into account in our final synthesis of the structural components of biblical typology.

Various implications for the modern debate over the nature of biblical typology appear to follow from our analysis of Rom 5:12-21. These implications generally coincide with those drawn from our investigation of 1 Cor 10:1-13. First, the historical reality of the OT ἄνθρωπος (Adam) is not only assumed by Paul but forms an indispensable foundation for his devoir-être argument. This necessity for the historical reality of the ἄνθρωπος is recognized in the traditional views of typology but appears to stand in tension with the post-critical understanding in which the historicity of the type is not considered essential.

Second, the ἄνθρωπος is an OT historical reality. Adam is not only a historical personage but one whose existence and experience are recorded in Scripture. Paul’s hermeneutical endeavor is not only a theology of history (as suggested in recent critical views of typology) but also an interpretation of Scriptural passages. In Rom 5 the apostle’s discussion is ultimately based on the Scriptural account of Adam’s fall in Gen 3.

Third, the typology of Rom 5 is not limited to the general continuity within God’s revelation in history (as suggested by major advocates of post-critical neo-typology) but extends to detailed historical correspondences between Adam and Christ. Fourth, these correspondences do not involve insignificant or trivial details (as in much of the Cocceian mode of traditional typology) but are directly related to christological-soteriological realities.

Fifth, the correspondence between the OT ἄνθρωπος and the NT fulfillment does not occur on the same plane (as in much of the Cocceian mode) but involves an absolute eschatological fulfillment from type to fulfillment. In Rom 5 the eschatological perspective is more clearly elucidated than in 1 Cor 10. It is shown to have past, present, and future dimensions corresponding to what may be termed inaugurated, appropriated, and consummated,
oschatology. This perspective has received greater recognition in recent critical affirmations of typology than in the traditional views, although even in the former the ramifications of this perspective for typology have not been fully explored.

A sixth implication stems from the fact that the typology in Rom 5 involves historical personages. This appears to disaffirm Friederichsen's assertion that true typos are found only in Levitical institutions. Finally, the typology in Rom 5 involves elements of a prophetic τόκος structure that appear to stand in tension with recent post-critical neo-typology. In Rom 5 typology is basically prospective, divinely designed, and ineluctably prefigurative, and not merely retrospective, analogical, and exemplary. It remains to determine whether the structures in other NT hermeneutical τόκος passages corroborate these conclusions and implications drawn from Pauline typology.

τόκος Structures in 1 Pet 3:18-22

There is a scholarly consensus that 1 Pet 3:18-22 presents a typological interpretation of the OT Flood story. Yet

1 See above, pp. 97, 103, and below, pp. 99-96.
2 See above, p. 47.
3 See above, p. 296, for more complete discussion of this point.

while the "typological motif" in this passage is "pointed out nearly everywhere in the exegetical literature of 1 Peter," there has been no detailed analysis of 1 Pet 3:18-22 conducted with a view toward exposing the inherent τόκος structures in the passage. This we seek to provide in the study that follows. Our investigation builds upon previous studies, augments them by fresh analysis of pertinent structural problems, and attempts to synthesize the τόκος structures that emerge from the various strands of exegesis on the passage.

Preliminary considerations

It is not crucial to our concerns to address all of the exegetical problems in what has been viewed as the most difficult pericope in the epistle and one of the thorrist passages in the


See, e.g., Peake, p. 1029.

Only those issues affecting the elucidation of ἅγιος structures receive our attention. Fortunately, the hermeneutical endeavor does not deal directly with the major unsettled issue which relates to the “spirits in prison” (vs. 19), and an understanding of the ἅγιος structures in this passage does not appear to hinge upon the conclusions regarding this debated issue.

Nor does our analysis of ἅγιος structures in 1 Pet 3:18-22 depend upon a final settlement of all questions of introduction with regard to the epistle. The evidence does seem to indicate that the epistle was written by an author other than Paul (probably Peter with the help of Silvanus) at a time later than Paul's epistles to the Corinthians and Romans (probably in the early sixties of the first century A.D.). Thus 1 Pet 3:18-22 may be viewed as a non-Pauline hermeneutical ἅγιος passage written subsequent to 1 Cor 10:1-13 and Rom 5:12-21.

The first epistle of Peter is comprised largely of paraenetic material and no simple organization of contents seems possible. After the introductory greeting (1:1-2), the author begins an exposition of the nature of Christian salvation (1:3-2:10), followed by a discussion of Christian relationships (2:11-3:12). The “major theme” of the epistle is “suffering (i.e., suffering as Christians) and how to bear it triumphantly.” This theme, introduced at several points in other sections of the epistle (1:6-7; 2:19-21; 5:9-10), becomes the center of attention in 3:13-4:19.

In 3:13 the author takes the last phrase of the quotation from Ps 34:12-16—ῥακάδιδωσιν ψυχήν—as a point of departure for the theme of Christian suffering. He assures his readers that they have no fear of ultimate harm in their suffering for righteousness' sake (vs. 13-14) if they keep their consciences clear (vs. 16). They may in fact make a defense of their hope (vs. 15) and put their abusers to shame (vs. 17).

In 3:18-22, the passage in which ἀνέκδοτος appears, two central points of previous verses are further developed—undeserved suffering and a clear conscience. In vs. 18, Peter reminds his readers that Christ also suffered undeservingly. Then the apostle shows how Christ's sufferings unto death (vs. 18) and resurrection...
(vs. 21) bring salvation and a clear conscience. Christ's passion is thus not only a pattern of suffering but also the means whereby Christians may find assurance of final salvation in their suffering, i.e., access to God and a clear conscience.

Baptism seems to be salvific for Peter (as it was for Paul in Rom 5) in that it sacramentally incorporates the believer into Christ's death and resurrection. Peter finds support for the salvific function of the sacrament in the account of the Flood. As Noah and his family were 'saved' through water at the time of the Flood, so the readers may be assured that baptism now saves.

Before we attempt to grasp the ntos sisthms structures of this pericope, there are certain text-critical and syntactical difficulties that directly affect the use of ντόσιον and thus call for special attention.

The MS evidence is divided over the first word of vs. 21. The preponderance of MSS (and majority of commentators) support the neuter nominative relative pronoun ος, while a few cursive (and a few commentators)2 support the dative relative ὅς. The relative is omitted entirely by K, Coptic, Ethiopian and p.22. Since there is MS support from every major text-type for the ος, evidence that τάσιον ("suffered") is required in this context. See, e.g., Beare, Peter, p. 144; Dalton, pp. 119-21; cf. Keilke, Peter, p. 186.

1See Beare, Peter, p. 144; cf. Danielou, Shadows to Reality, pp. 50-51.


it is difficult to see how it could have received such universal attestation if ος were the original. On the other hand, it is perhaps possible that the similarity of sounds between ος and ω in first-century Koine Greek could explain an early scribal interchange of letters, which then was corrected in the later cursive. The least likely possibility is the complete omission of the relative. We are content to conclude that a relative pronoun of some kind was original, more probably the ος. But whether the verse begins with "which" or "to which," the nature of the hermeneutical relationship between the Flood and Christian baptism is not appreciably affected.

A more pressing question arises over what constitutes the antecedent of the relative. Is it δόμησιον "water" or the whole clause ἄλλης, τοιούτης ἐπετέλεσε ὡς υἱὸς, συμπληρών ὅποιον δόμησιον "a few, i.e., eight souls, were brought safely through water"?3 A deciding factor seems to be the threefold parallelism between vss. 20 and 21. This parallelism may be schematically set forth in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vs. 20</th>
<th>Vs. 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ἄλλης ὡς (eight persons)</td>
<td>δόμησιον (you)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. συμπληρών (were brought (safely through)</td>
<td>ἄλλης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. δόμησιον (through water)</td>
<td>συμπληρών (baptism)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Houlton and Howard, p. 44.
3Bigg, p. 164; Best, 1 Peter, p. 147; Fitzmyer, 'First Peter,' p. 367; Beare, Peter, p. 148; von Soden, p. 149.
In view of this point-for-point parallelism with the entire phrase in vs. 20, we agree with the majority of commentators who see the whole action of Noah and family passing safely through the water as the antecedent.

This brings us to the relation of ἀντίτυπον to the rest of the clause. It is almost universally agreed that the ἀντίτυπον refers to baptism, the Christian counterpart of the Flood experience.\footnote{The one major exception is Bo Reicke, who argues at length in Disobedient Spirits, pp. 149-72, and Peter, p. 113, for ἀντίτυπον to refer to the experience of Noah, and not to the Christian baptism. He construes ἀντίτυπον as an adjectival attributive to ἔθνος and ἀντίτυπον as the antecedent to the relative οὗ, in opposition to the previous sentence. Thus he translates "which antitypical baptism [i.e., the Flood] now saves you." According to Reicke, the Christian baptism is not termed antitypical, although it looks so from the form of the sentence [Disobedient Spirits, p. 148]." Reicke demonstrates from other Greek sources that his proposed translation is theoretically possible. But his very admission that it looks otherwise from the form of the sentence, and that it is a "somewhat illogical abridgment of a thought," which should have really been expressed in another way (ibid.), mitigates against his argument. Dalton and others have brought forward further weighty arguments against Reicke's position (Dalton, p. 213; George R. Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the New Testament [London: Macmillan, 1962], p. 240), and we add additional data against Reicke's hypothesis.}

First, it must be noted that Reicke is interpreting 1 Pet 3 by means of the use of ἀντίτυπον in Heb 9:24, where he finds the antitype (the earthly sanctuary) a copy of the original (the heavenly sanctuary). Therefore Reicke (mistakenly) concludes that ἀντίτυπον must always refer to something "secondary" (Disobedient Spirits, p. 144) or on a level inferior to the original. Applying this conclusion to 1 Pet 3, the secondary ἀντίτυπον would have to refer to the Flood. What Reicke does not recognize is that ἀντίτυπον is "what corresponds to," and is thus determined by, the τόκος. If, for example, the τόκος is a hollow mold, then the ἀντίτυπον would be the primary reality for which the τόκος was intended. It is just such a model of a hollow mold that we have seen functioning in the case of OT historical prefigurations of the NT realities in 1 Cor 10 and Rom 5.

Second, if Reicke were correct, it would be the Flood (as the ἀντίτυπον) which has the salvific effect for the (NT) Church. This would be considered heresy according to the author of Hebrews (Heb 6:2) and would make no sense for the argument of Peter. For Peter it is clearly Christian baptism (made effective by the resurrection of Christ) that plays the salvific function in the church, not the Flood.

Not so clear, however, is whether ἀντίτυπον is a noun in opposition to οὗ,\footnote{And water now saves you, too, who are the antitype of Noah and his company, namely the water of baptism.} or whether, as a noun or adjective, it goes with subject οὗ. The former cannot be ruled out, especially in view of the word order highlighting ὑμᾶς. This interpretation would also alleviate the rather awkward construction in which both ἀντίτυπον and ἔθνος are in opposition to the subject. If this former suggestion is accepted, then the emphasis would be placed on the correspondence between the persons not the events. So Edward Selwyn translates: \footnote{Dalton, p. 212; cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker, p. 75.}

But William J. Dalton has pointed out that the common element emphasized in the passage is the waters of salvation, and the correspondence of persons is only hinted at, not exploited.\footnote{Selwyn, St. Peter, p. 203. Italics supplied.} Dalton argues for ἀντίτυπον to be taken as an adjective, translated "by way of antitype," (or possibly a noun with the similar meaning "as an antitype"), and connected with the subject οὗ.\footnote{Selwyn, St. Peter, p. 203. Dalton, p. 212.} It seems more probable that ἀντίτυπον is an adjective, since this would be the least awkward reading, avoiding a second explanatory nominative (besides ἔθνος).

We agree with C. G. S. Cranfield that it is difficult to decide for sure whether ἀντίτυπον goes with οὗ or ὑμᾶς, but that whichever alternative is accepted, the "general sense will be the
same anyway.1 Whether it is the οὗτος that is emphasized, or the whole experience of passing safely through water, still all three elements of the parallelism noted above are involved in the correspondence—people, salvation, and water.

One more syntactical point in vs. 20 calls for brief examination. The οὗτος with the genitive (ἀπό), “through [the water],” can be construed as either instrumental2 or local.3 If the meaning is instrumental, “by means of [water],” then, as Ernest Best points out, this would not be strictly true of Noah—who was saved from the water, not (at least primarily) by means of it—but apparently forced by a reference to baptism.4

The local sense of “through” would be parallel to the στίχωσις prefix in the preceding verb σάραγαν. We find this verb used in other Jewish sources5 to describe the safe passage of Noah and his family (in the ark) through the waters of the Flood.

There is also the possibility that the author of 1 Peter makes deliberate use of the “convenient vagueness”6 that exists in οὗτος as is true with the English “through.” By means of the ambiguity involved, “the double quality of water, as saving in a spiritual sense, but as reminding of the hostile forces in another,”7 could be encompassed for the OT and NT realities. While the water of the Flood was destructive, i.e., to be saved from, yet on the other hand, it was a part of God’s salvific plan for Noah and his family to pass through it to safety.1

Regardless how one construes the meaning of the οὗτος, from the explanation of the δυνάμεις of the Flood experience in vs. 21, it appears that both the instrumental and local senses are involved in the historical correspondence. For baptism (“plunging under, immersion”) is in parallelism with the eight souls being “brought through” (σώζονται, local sense) the waters of the Flood. At the same time the instrumental sense is clearly elucidated in the last phrase of the verse, “through [by means of] the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” This is in parallel to the divine agent of salvation obviously implied by the aorist passive σώζονται “were brought through to safety.” Thus the author of 1 Peter is able to show the importance of the water in the salvation process, but safeguard against any sacramental automatism by eschewing the ultimate efficacy to the instrumentality of Christ’s work of salvation.

Text structures.

In the process of our discussion of syntactical and text-critical issues in 1 Pet 3, we have already touched upon various conceptual structures inherent in the apostle’s hermeneutical approach to the Scriptural account of the Flood. To these structures we now turn our full attention.

1 See Selwyn, St. Peter, pp. 202-3, who favors a combination of local and instrumental emphases.
Historical structure

Although there is no explicit citation of Scripture in 1 Pet 3:18-22, it seems clear that the apostle's discussion is at this point based upon the OT narrative of the Flood. The Flood is viewed as a scripturally determined reality. Furthermore, it seems clear from the author's treatment of the Flood narrative that he takes it as a historical happening. Though it is not explicitly argued that the Flood actually occurred as recorded in Scripture, this is assumed to be the case and it forms an indispensable foundation for the author's hermeneutical approach. The devoir-être argument for the saving significance of Christian baptism depends upon the actual occurrence of the Flood.

The historical correspondence between OT event and NT reality has become readily apparent from our discussion of syntactical problems. This correspondence includes specific detailed parallels. The salvation of the NT believers via the passage through the waters of baptism, made effective by means of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, is the counterpart of Noah's salvation by passage through the waters of the Flood, brought about by divine means. Moving from the reality of Noah's salvation through water, the author can assure the readers of the salvific reality in baptism.

The historical correspondence between the Flood and Christian baptism is not identical but involves an escalation or intensification. There is an escalation from Flood waters to baptism, from temporal safe passage to eternal salvation, from the time of the Flood to the eschatological "Now" (vs. 21). This historical Steigerung is further clarified in connection with our discussion of the theological structures inherent in this passage.

Theological structures

Eschatological structure. The entire background of the first epistle of Peter is "persecution from an eschatological perspective." Selwyn states that "there is no book in the New Testament where the eschatology is more closely integrated with the teaching of the document as a whole." We note in particular how the eschatological outlook of 1 Peter coincides with that of Rom 5 and 1 Cor 10, in that the "end of times" has already arrived with the manifestation of Christ in His first advent. The epistle is explicit on this point: "He was destined before the foundation of the world but was made manifest at the end of times (ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἐποίημι) for your sake (1 Pet 1:20)."

This eschatology which Christ inaugurated may be appropriated by the church, the eschatological Israel (2:4-10). In the passage under consideration (3:18-22), salvation is portrayed as a present reality: "You ... now saves you (vs. 21). The "now," perhaps once part of a baptismal liturgy pointing the candidate to the time of baptism, in its present setting seems (also) to refer to the eschatological "Now" ushered in by the coming

---

1 See below, p. 332.

of Christ. The readers of the epistle had once been a non-people who had not received mercy. It is announced to them that “now [vov] you are God’s people ... now [vov] you have received mercy.” Baptism is a present anticipation of the last judgment, as are the testing persecutions.

But as was true in the letters of 1 Corinthians and Romans, all is not yet accomplished. There is still the impending eschatological consummation (4:7) in the revelation of Christ’s glory (4:13; 5:1, 4) and ultimate salvation (1:5, 13) at the last judgment (4:5, 6, 17-19).

In summary, we may say that ἀνεμέτρουσις involves a climactic eschatological counterpart of the OT reality. The eschatological structure of 1 Peter includes (1) the past “once-for-all” (3:18) work of Christ, (2) into which the believer is incorporated (via baptism) in the eschatological “now,” which issues (3) in the future consummation at the revelation of Christ. Within this eschatological structure of 1 Peter, the ἀνεμέτρουσις in 3:18-22, though intimating the existence of past and future, focuses primarily on the present eschatological reality of baptism within the eschatological community.

Christological-soteriological structure. The Christological-

1 Cranfield, 1 Peter, p. 106; Selwyn, “Eschatology in 1 Peter,” pp. 394-95. For discussion of possible liturgical setting, see below, p. 389.

2 Pet 2:10; cf. the similar usage of vov in 1:6, 8, 12; 2:25.


4 Selwyn, “Eschatology in 1 Peter,” p. 396.

soteriological structure in 1 Pet 3:18-22 is manifestly evident. The passage is introduced in vs. 18 with the statement that “Christ also suffered for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God ...” And then Christ’s work is further spelled out with regard to the preaching to the “spirits in prison.” Further, according to vs. 21, the baptism is made efficacious to salvation (οἰκείος) by means of Christ’s resurrection. And the section concludes [vs. 22] with a picture of him “gone into heaven ... the right hand of God, with angels, authorities and powers subject to him.” Thus a cosmic Christus Victor dimension of salvation also comes into focus.

It seems apparent in this passage that the presence of water, or the bare historical fact of an ark floating safely through water, is not alone sufficient to provide a correspondence in the author’s hermeneutical endeavor. It is only as these elements are part of a divine saving event—soteriologically and Christologically determined—that they can function hermeneutically in relation to the NT ἀνεμέτρους.

Ecclesiological structure. This structure, as we have indicated with regard to 1 Cor 10 and Rom 5, involves the people of God (individually and corporately) and their sacraments. It has already been noted how the ὅλος of vs. 21, corresponding to the ἄνεμος of vs. 20, introduces an ecclesiological dimension to the

1 See above, p. 318, n. 2, for literature on this difficult passage. In any of the five major interpretations [see especially the concise summary of these views in Fitzmyer, “First Peter,” pp. 366-69] the Christological structure is clearly strengthened.
The relationship between Noah and his family (the eight souls) and the Christian community (corporately and individually) cannot be underestimated. At the same time, the sacramental aspect of this structure receives a major emphasis in the hermeneutical endeavor of this passage. Some scholars have suggested that the entire section of 1 Pet 1:3-4:11 is a baptismal liturgy or homily. Others have cautioned that comprehensive liturgical theories can only be supported by means of major textual reconstructions. It is generally agreed, however, that certain sections of the epistle, and in particular 3:18-22, may contain adaptations of a creoidal statement.

1 Solovyn, St. Peter, p. 203, stresses that in this passage "Noah and his company were as much a type of the Christian community as the Flood-water was of the water of baptism." It may be that Peter also intended the ark to be viewed as a type of the Christian Church (see, e.g., Reicke, 1 Peter, pp. 112-13; Solovyn, St. Peter, pp. 202, 204; Danilow, Shadows to Reality, p. 81), but this correspondence is not explicitly drawn.


baptismal hymn, homily, or some other baptismal liturgy. 
Baptism, according to 1 Peter, is not merely an outward cleansing of the body--as perhaps contrasted with the tendency in the ceremonial ablutions of first-century Judaism and paganism--but involves a deep spiritual experience. It is an exodeus. It has been demonstrated that exodeus, literally meaning "question, inquiry," has a technical usage in first-century papyri for the oral pledge made in agreeing to formal contracts. If there is a technical usage in view in 1 Pet 3:21, then the term appears to have reference to a pledge made to God by the baptismal candidate, either "to maintain a clear conscience" (objective genitive, i.e., promise of obedience) or "proceeding from a clear conscience" (subjective genitive, i.e., accepting forgiveness of sins). In the final phrase of vs. 21 the apostle hastens to add, however, that the pledge is made effective only by the redeeming work of the risen Lord.

Prophetic structure. The experience of the Flood is cited by Peter as an advance-presentation, a prefiguration of Christian baptism. As Noah and his family were "saved" (σώζοντας) through the water of the Flood (by divine means in the ark), so Christian


2 See Reicke, 1 Peter, p. 114; Best, 1 Peter, p. 147; cf. Matt 15:13-20; Col 2:13; Titus 1:14-16.

3 G. F. Richards, "1 Pet 3:21," JTS 22 (1931):77; Tooke, Obidient Spirits, pp. 181-85; Dalton, pp. 242-251. Though no complete unanimity has been reached within Petrine scholarship regarding the meaning of this NT hapax legomenon, most recent commentators accept the evidence presented by these scholars.
believers are "saved" (σωτήριον) through the water of baptism (by means of the resurrection of Christ). Baptism is the NT fulfillment--the ἀντίτυπον--of the OT salvation event.

From the context of 1 Pet 3:13-21, it seems apparent that the apostle recognizes a devoir-être (prospective/predictive) relationship between the OT event and its "antitype." In vss. 13-17 he tells the Christian believers that no ultimate harm will come to them in their suffering. In vss. 18-21 he appears to engage in his interpretation of the Flood narrative to show that the Christians may be sure of their ultimate salvation in spite of persecution. As the faithful remnant at the time of the Flood were "saved" through water, so it "must-needs-be" that baptism "saves" the eschatological congregation. God's salvific act for Noah and his family in the pre-presentation is an assurance that in the "antitypical" fulfillment (baptism) salvation is certain.

It is the divine design that makes possible both the prefigurative and devoir-être (prospective/predictive) character of the typological correspondence. The passive ὀνομάζεσθαι in vs. 20 seems clearly to imply the divine agency in the salvation of Noah and his family. Baptism is likewise conditioned by the divine salvific work (of God and Christ, vs. 21). God brought about the deliverance of Noah as an advance-presentation which prefigures the salvation that "must-needs-be" in the divinely ordained, eschatological ἀντίτυπον, Christian baptism.

1 As we have already noted, the connection between these two sections of the pericope appears confirmed by the repeated reference of the "clear conscience," and by the comparison of Christian suffering to the suffering of Christ.

"Ἀντίτυπον as a hermeneutical term

It has become apparent from our analysis of 1 Pet 3:18-22 that the term ἀντίτυπον does not appear only incidentally. Like its cognates in 1 Cor 10 and Rom 5, the word is employed as a specific hermeneutical term in connection with the author's hermeneutical endeavor and thus serves as a terminological indicator of the presence of typology in this passage. Whereas Paul uses a hermeneutical term, τοῖς ἐπίτομοι, to designate OT prefigurative realities, the author of 1 Peter uses a hermeneutical term, ἀντίτυπον, to denote the NT realities which fulfill OT prefigurations. Geppelt may be correct when he suggests that "under Paul's influence τοῖς became a hermeneutical term in the whole Church" and "is so familiar in 1 Pet. that this [1 Peter] uses ἀντίτυπον in a corresponding sense."1

In chapter 2 of this dissertation, we noted how ἀντίτυπον has a basic meaning of "corresponding" or "the corresponding thing," such as die to the stamp, or (molded-) figure to the mold.2 Our exegesis of 1 Cor 10 further revealed how the signification of [hollow] "mold" for τοῖς captures the dynamic linear connection between the DT and NT realities. Likewise, it appears that in 1 Pet 3:21 ἀντίτυπον may best be viewed in terms of "that which corresponds to the mold," i.e., the molded reality that results from the molding process. The DT events of the Flood are "shaped"

1Geppelt, TDNT, B:253. This would be in harmony with the many parallels to Paul's writings in 1 Peter (see, e.g., Harrison, pp. 405-6; Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 804-5.
2See above, pp. 133-34.
according to the divine intent to function as a "mold," so that the end (eschatological) product (Christian baptism) ineluctably (devoir-être) corresponds (avtômatos) to the (historical) contours of the OT reality, but transcends it by virtue of its (eschatological) fulfillment of the ultimate (Christological-soteriological-ecclesiological) purpose for which the OT event was intended. The avtômatos is thus the NT Nachbild of the OT nachbildliches Vorbild (the Flood salvation).

Summary and implications

The same basic tómos structures appear to be present in 1 Pet 3 as in 1 Cor 10 and Rom 5. There is an historical structure which involves historical correspondence and progression between OT and NT historical realities (the Flood and Christian baptism). Theological structures include (1) the eschatological (with past, present, and future dimensions), (2) the Christological-soteriological, (3) the ecclesiological (with individual, corporate, and sacramental dimensions), and (4) the prophetic (with the elements of prefiguration, divine design, and devoir-être). As with tómos in 1 Cor 10 and Rom 5, so avtômatos in 1 Pet 3 functions as a specific hermeneutical term in the author's hermeneutical endeavor and may therefore be regarded as a terminological indicator of the presence of typology in this passage. The usage of avtômatos as a specialized hermeneutical term in 1 Pet 3 goes beyond the ordinary (non-hermeneutical) Greek usage in its representation of typological structures, and yet the semantic range of the term in its signification "that which corresponds to a tómos [hollow mold]" coincides well with the linear dynamics of the baptismal typology in the passage. The major difference between 1 Pet 3 and the Pauline hermeneutical tómos passages is that whereas Paul employs a hermeneutical term (tómos/tómatos) to denote the OT prefigurations of NT realities, in 1 Pet 3 a hermeneutical term (avtômatos) is used to refer to the NT fulfillment of the OT prefiguration.

The implications of this study of 1 Pet 3 for the modern debate over the nature of typology generally coincide with those drawn from our analyses of 1 Cor 10 and Rom 5. In major areas where the recent critical understanding of typology diverges from traditional views, the structures in 1 Pet 3:18-22 appear to stand in tension with the former and corroborate the latter. The typology in 1 Pet 3 necessarily presupposes and builds upon the historical reality of the OT events as recorded in Scripture. The typological relationship between OT and NT realities (Flood and Christian baptism) involves not only a general correspondence but extends to specific parallel details. The typology in this passage is not merely a retrospective recognition of an exemplary structural analogy in God's revelation in history but consists of divinely designed, prospective/predictive (devoir-être) prefigurations.

In other crucial areas our analysis of 1 Pet 3 reveals that the post-critical neo-typology appears rightly to have emphasized certain structural elements which have generally been overlooked in traditional views of typology. The typological correspondences in 1 Pet 3 are directly related to Christological-soteriological realities and do not consist of trivial and extraneous details as in much of the Coccian mode. They involve an absolute
eschatological Stellung from OT prefiguration to NT fulfillment—which structure is often ignored in Cocceian typological interpretation. They consist of historical persons and events—as opposed to Friederichen's limitation of typology to Levitical institutions. Finally, the typology in 1 Pet 3 involves the NT perspective of inaugurated, appropriated, and consummated eschatology. This eschatological perspective has been generally overlooked in traditional typological interpretation and recognized in postcritical neo-typology, although even in the latter it has not received a great deal of attention.

It remains for us to ascertain whether or not these implications arising from horizontal σκοίας structures are affirmed in our analysis of σκοίας passages containing vertical as well as horizontal structures. To these latter passages we now turn our attention.

**Horizontal and Vertical σκοίας Structures**

Among the numerous recent exegetical studies dealing with the epistle to the Hebrews there is "very wide agreement that Hebrews contains typology," and this applies also to Heb 8:5 and 9:24. However, there has been no substantive analysis of these

1. J. Smith, p. 10; cf. p. 30: "It is agreed by all commentators there are types."


hermeneutical σκοίας passages conducted with a view toward laying bare the inherent σκοίας structures. This we attempt to provide in the study that follows. Building upon previous studies augmented by further analysis of significant unresolved structural issues, our investigation seeks to synthesize the horizontal and vertical σκοίας structures that emerge from these passages.

**Preliminary Considerations**

The various questions of introduction for the epistle to the Hebrews have been widely discussed, but as William G. Johnson has aptly observed, "Despite the torrents of ink that have flowed regarding the writer and his readers, the 'assured results' are practically nil." Fortunately, our analysis of inherent σκοίας structures in Heb 8:5 and 9:24 does not demand a determination of the precise identity of the author or his readers or the date of writing. There are, however, certain philosophical-hermeneutical and contextual issues that call for special consideration. To these we now turn our attention.


1. Johnson, "Defilement and Purgation," p. 23. For the host of suggestions regarding these questions, see especially Feina-Bein-Kümmel, pp. 273-82; Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 685-735; and Harrison, pp. 367-81.

2. A clear determination of the date and author of the epistle would naturally be helpful, especially for the purpose of placing
Philosophical-hermeneutical considerations. Though it is generally agreed that typology exists in Heb 8:6 and 9:24, there is a vigorous debate over the origin and nature of the concepts and terminology used by the author of Hebrews. It has often been asserted (and sometimes vigorously defended) that Platonic-Philonic philosophical ideas and expressions lie behind the earth-heaven correspondence presented in Hebrews. On the other hand, various

Heb 8:6 and 9:24 in proper historical sequence with other hermeneutical passages by the same or different author so that possible shifts or development in usage might become apparent. Certain evidence appears to favor a date in the period of imminent crisis just prior to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 (see, e.g., Harrison, p. 380). The traditional view of the essential Pauline authorship of the epistle (with perhaps a literary transcription who strongly colored the final literary form) does not appear to be as untenable as is usually argued in recent literature (cf., e.g., SNGER, 7:392-93). But regardless of the date and author of this epistle, since we are considering Heb 8:6 and 9:24 under a separate subheading (because of their vertical as well as horizontal thematic structures), the order of treatment of hermeneutical ideas in these passages in this chapter of our dissertation remains unchanged.


A careful treatment of the Platonic-Philonic issue has already been undertaken by Ronald Williamson.2 We are in agreement with the essentials of his prodigious research that has "pronounced a negative verdict on the Philonic school.3

Williamson deals extensively with the linguistic evidence.


2Williamson's monograph was originally his Ph.D. thesis presented to the University of Leeds. It is difficult to understand how major proponents since 1970 of a Philonic-Platonic model for the epistle to the Hebrews—notably Day and Thompson—take no mention at all of Williamson's study. The works produced since 1970 appear to have set forth no evidence nor argumentation that has not already been anticipated and effectively dealt with by Williamson.

themes and ideas and the use of Scripture in Philo and Hebrews. He demonstrates major divergences of thought between Philo and the auctor ad Hebraeos. We list the points most crucial to an understanding of ἰδέας/ἀρχής in Heb 8 and 9:

1. The auctor ad Hebraeos does not use the allegedly Platonic terminology in true Platonic fashion.

2. The heavenly world of ideas in Plato and Philo—which could not be entered except by pure intellect—has no room at all for the historical person of Jesus as described by the auctor ad Hebraeos.

3. The temporal-historical sequence of movement in Hebrews is totally incompatible with Platonic eternal/timeless principles of ethics and metaphysics.

4. There is allegory, not typology, in Philo, and typology, not allegory, in Hebrews.

5. There is no appreciable Messianism in Philo's works, as opposed to the Christological leit-motif of Hebrews.

Williamson analyzes Heb 8:5 in detail for Platonic-Philoic

---

1 See Barrett, "Eschatology of Hebrews," for the distinction in regard to eschatology. For a summary of these first three arguments with particular attention to Heb 8:1-5, see Ron Williamson's earlier article, "Platonism and Hebrews," SJT 16 (1963): 418-19; cf. the similar arguments in Buchanan, p. 384, 394-395.

2 So Barrett, "Eschatology of Hebrews," p. 396: "The heavenly tabernacle in Hebrews is not the product of Platonic idealism, but the eschatological temple of apocalyptic Judaism." F. F. Bruce, "To the Hebrews or To the Essenes?" NTS 9 (1963): 223-30, concurs: "His [the author of Hebrews] portrayal...and he develops this idea in much the same way as apocalyptic writers do, including the NT Apocalypists, who has not generally been regarded as influenced by Plato.

More recently, Nash, pp. 105-15, has shown that the nature of Christ and his mediatorial work in Hebrews is totally different from the Logos christology/heavenly mediator conceptions of Philo. In Hebrews, as opposed to Philo, there is (1) not a metaphysical abstraction but a historical person, (2) not plerotic dualism, but incarnation, (3) not disparagement of emotions, but expression of emotion, and (4) the ability in Christ to suffer, be tempted, and die, as Philo could never allow.
Hebrews contains certain Philonicism. But whatever quasi-Philonic vocabulary may be found, such terms appear to have been modified by the author. The fundamental conceptual structures of Platonic-Philonic idealism seem to have been replaced by thought-forms from Judeo-Christian apocalyptic theology. In the course of our analysis of conceptual structures in Heb 8:5 and 9:24 (and contexts), we will have further occasion to elucidate the difference in thought-forms between Platonic-Philonic philosophy and the book of Hebrews.

An analysis of the use of τοίχος and the underlying Hebrew term נְכַבֵּד (nakhbed) in Exod 25:40 (LXX and MT)—the passage cited in Heb 8:5 as proof of an earthly-heavenly sanctuary correspondence—appears to support the conclusion that "the writer of Hebrews derived this mode of thinking [earthly-heavenly sanctuary correspondence] from the OT itself, and not from Alexandrian philosophy." We conduct this analysis in an excursus which follows our study of Heb 8:5 and 9:24. It becomes apparent that the Hebrew term נְכַבֵּד as well as the Greek word τοίχος can denote both the Vorbild and Nachbild simultaneously. In Exod 25:40 it seems probable that נְכַבֵּד (τοίχος LXX) probably refers to a miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary and/or the heavenly sanctuary itself (with an implied

mediating miniature model) which functions as a pattern for the construction of the earthly sanctuary. The נְכַבֵּד/τοίχος is thus a Nachbild of an original Vorbild (or perhaps the Urbild itself) that serves as a Vorbild for the construction of an earthly Nachbild.

The presence of an implied earthly-heavenly sanctuary correspondence in Exod 25:40 is found to be supported by (1) linguistic and syntactical analyses, (2) the immediate theological context, (3) numerous other OT references to a vertical (earthly-heavenly) sanctuary correspondence, (4) ancient Near Eastern parallels, and (5) the literature of late Judaism. This conclusion regarding the use of נְכַבֵּד/τοίχος in Exod 25:40 has significant implications for the citation of this passage by the author of Hebrews. These are set forth in the process of our analysis of vertical τοίχος structures and the use of τοίχος as a hermeneutical term in Heb 8:5.

Contextual considerations. The literary structure of Hebrews has been recently analyzed in detail by Albert Vanhoye. As Johnson has rightly observed, Vanhoye has shown that the section 7:1 through 10:18, which deals with the cultus, "is not only central in location but one which is almost certainly central to the over-all plan of the work." Inasmuch as chapters 8 and 9 belong together as part of the same cultic argument (7:1 through 10:18) for the efficacious

---

1Williamson, Philo and Hebrews, p. 579.
2Fritsch, "Re Ausdruck," p. 103. That is to say, the earthly-heavenly sanctuary correspondence was already at home in the OT and need not have been borrowed from Platonic-Philonic thought. This of course does not rule out the possibility that the author of Hebrews recognizes the OT vertical Nachbild-VorBild dynamics of τοίχος (נְכַבֵּד) as it is made explicit by Philo, even though for the latter it is transcendent ideas and not material heavenly realities (as in Exod 25:40 and parallel OT passages) that are in view.
3See below, pp. 367-88.
and adequate sacrifice of the High Priest Jesus Christ in contrast with the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of the old worship, we will deal with 8:3 and 9:24 together in the elucidation of conceptual structures.

Let us note briefly the context of these passages. The first seven chapters of the hostility to the Hebrews reveal Christ's superiority to angels (1:4-2:18), Moses and Joshua (3:1-4:13), and the Aaronic Priesthood (4:14-7:28).

In Heb 8:1-2, the author summarizes the main point of his preceding discussion: "We have such a high priest, one who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, a minister in the sanctuary and the true tabernacle which is set up not by man but by the Lord." In vss. 3-6 it is shown how Jesus Christ is High Priest of a "better sanctuary," the true "heavenly sanctuary" (vs. 5). This is supported by the citation from Exod 25:40. In vs. 6 the author underscores the superior ministry of Christ and launches into a discussion of the better promises and superiority of the new covenant over the old covenant (vss. 7-13).

The "better sacrifice" of the new covenant is the focus of Heb 9:1-10:18; and Heb 9:1-5 briefly describes the earthly (OT) sanctuary. Then the author points out the limitations of the OT

---

1See Michel Gourgue, "Remarques sur la 'structure centrale' de l'épître aux Hébreux. A l'occasion d'une réédition," RB 94 (1977): 31-32, where chap. 8 in Gourgue's structure, states the main point regarding Christ as High Priest (vss. 1-5) and Mediator of the new covenant (vss. 6-13), and chap. 9 forms the first development of this mainpoint. Similarly with Vashoye (Le structure, pp. 137-73; A Structured Translation, pp. 17-25), where 8:1 through 9:10 points up the inadequacy of the old worship, and 9:11-28 shows the efficacy and adequacy of Christ's sacrifice.

sanctuary services (vss. 6-10) in comparison with the eternal heavenly sacrifice of Christ (vss. 11-15). In vss. 15-22 Christ is presented as the Mediator of the New Covenant, offering "better blood" (vss. 12-14).

The culminating axiom presented in vs. 22—"without the shedding of blood there is no atonement"—is in vs. 23 applied to the cleansing of the "heavenly things themselves." In vs. 24 the relationship between the earthly and heavenly sanctuary is reiterated. The earthly tabernacle widgets constitute copies of the true. Christ entered into the true sanctuary, "into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf." He does not offer Himself repeatedly as in the OT yearly Day of Atonement Services, but he appeared "once-for-all, at the end of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (vss. 25-26). And he will appear a second time, not to deal again with sin, but to bring salvation to those who expect Him (vs. 27). The superiority, efficacy, and finality of Christ's sacrifice in contrast to the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of the OT animal sacrifices is the emphasis of Heb 10:1-18.

Tidos structures

In the hermeneutical tidos passages under consideration horizontal tidos structures intersect with vertical structures. In order to clarify these structures, however, we examine the horizontal and vertical dimensions separately, and then attempt to ascertain the relationship between the two. We turn our attention first to the horizontal structures.
Horizontal structures

Historical structure. We have already seen how the arguments and descriptions of the *auctor ad Hebraeos* are structured in a temporal-historical sequence of movement. The author takes for granted the historical reality of the OT persons, events, and institutions mentioned in the epistle. The same is true with regard to the NT counterparts. As Johnsson expresses it, "His [the auctor ad Hebraeos] concern throughout the sermon is to ground Christian confidence in objective facts.... Real deity, real humanity, real priesthood—and we may add, a real ministry in a real sanctuary."

In Heb 8 the overriding historical correspondence is between the old and new covenants. In Heb 9 this motif continues, but the focus shifts to the historical correspondence between the temporary Levitical sacrifices and the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ. Both chapters continue the previous correspondence between the Levitical priesthood and Christ's Melchizedek (high-) priesthood, established in earlier sections of the epistle.

The correspondence between the OT and NT cultus involves specific crucial details. For example, as the earthly priests offered sacrifices, so must Jesus (8:3). Again, as the carcasses of those sacrifices whose blood was brought into the sanctuary were burned "outside the camp," so Jesus "suffered outside the gate" (13:11-13).

The historical correspondence involves an absolute

---


Steigerung or intensification from the OT to the NT reality. There is an escalation from the inadequate, ineffective, temporary OT cultus to a superior and permanent priesthood (4:11-7:28) with a "more excellent ministry (8:6), a "better covenant" based on "better promises" (i.e., the effective dealing with the sin problem, 8:6-13), "better sacrifices" (9:23) with better blood (9:13, 14)—in fact, a once-for-all, all-sufficient and efficacious Sacrifice (9:25-10:18).

Theological structures. Various theological structures function horizontally in the context of Heb 8 and 9:

1. The eschatological structure figures prominently in the epistle to the Hebrews. Charles K. Barrett's analysis of the epistle (including the section containing 8:5 and 9:24) convinces him "that the thought of Hebrews is consistent, and that in it the eschatological is the determining element." Or to express it differently, he asserts that "... the framework of thought in Hebrews is eschatological."

For Barrett the eschatology of Hebrews is essentially the same as that which is characteristic of NT Christianity in general: "The common pattern of NT eschatology is in Hebrews made uncommonly clear. God has begun to fulfill his ancient promises; the dawn of the new age has broken, though the full day has not yet come. The

---


Church lives in the last days, but before the last day." 1 The characteristically Christian conviction ... that eschatological events have already taken place (though others remain in the future as objects of hope) is found as clearly in Hebrews as in any part of the NT. 2

Others have recognized this strong eschatological tension between the "already" and the "not yet" in Hebrews. Core Brady demonstrates the movement in Hebrews along a "temporal ascending line" 3 from yesterday (the once-for-all act of Christ in the past, 10:10), through today (Christ reigns [1:3; 2:9] but victory is not complete [2:8; 10:13]), and to the future (the future hope, centered in the second coming [9:28; 10:25, 37] and involving forever [13:8]). Bertold Klappert lays bare the structure of the "schon-jetzt" and the "noch-nicht." 4 Jerome Smith speaks of the "thoroughgoing eschatology of the structure of thought in Hebrews." 5 Floyd Filson's work rests on the recognition of a temporal eschatological structure throughout Hebrews. 6

Especially in regard to the non-cultic parts of the book has this eschatological time-continuum been emphasized. For instance Johnsson schematically illustrates how the pilgrimage motif has three stages parallel to the eschatological pattern of the book: 7

---

1 Ibid., p. 397. 2 Ibid., p. 364.
5 J. Smith, p. 172. 6 Filson, "Yesterday."


the defilement-purgation motif is the dominant one, not the legal guilt-forgiveness theme. Johnson has clearly summarized the cultic issues in his review of modern investigation on the cultus of Hebrews and carried out careful exegesis of Heb 9 and 10, utilizing structures borrowed from the phenomenology of religions. His conclusions highlight the central structures of Christology and soteriology (the solution to man's problem of "defilement" by "purgation" via the once-for-all application of the one [Christ's] blood) in the argument of the epistle.

The ecclesiological structure has already become evident in our reference to the pilgrim motif which parallels the eschatological tension of the epistle. The pilgrim motif may actually be viewed as "the organizing idea of Hebrews." Johnson especially provides a persuasive analysis of how the author "uses Christianity as a pilgrimage for his ruling conception. The elements of pilgrimage-separation, journey to a sacred place, fixed purpose, and hardship--converge in the epistle. The eschatological people of God have left him, separated from the world (e.g., 11:16-19; 13:14). The way is beset with hardship (3:12-13; 5:11-6:12;

---

2 Ibid., pp. 27-96; cf. his synthesis and update in "the Cultus of Hebrews," pp. 104-5.
4 See his summary of conclusions in chap. 6 of "Defilement and Purgation," especially pp. 429-35.
5 Johnson, Absolute Confidence, p. 152.

---

10:23-26, 12:4), but the pilgrims are journeying with a fixed purpose to the heavenly city of God (e.g., 11:10, 16; 13:14).

The ecclesiological structure is basic to the cultic argument of 7:1-10:18. While the "defilement-purgation" motif concerns Christology and soteriology, it also obviously involves those who are defiled and purified. Though the dominant horizontal correspondence is drawn between the old and new cultic institution, yet the underlying reason and purpose for the cultus must not be overlooked. Man is defiled by sin, and the sin problem needs to be dealt with. The sacrifice of Christ "perfects" or "purifies" the conscience (9:9, 14; 10:2, 14, 22) of the individual worshiper. Furthermore, under the new covenant the believers are also united into an eschatological community (10:8-13; cf. 10:21; 12:22-24). Thus the ecclesiological structure in its individual and corporate dimensions emerges from the immediate context of Heb 8:5 and 9:24. It should be noted, however, that there is apparently no allusion to the sacraments of the Christian church in the context of Heb 8:5 and 9:24.

The prophetic structure seems clearly evident within the argument of Hebrews. In fact, as George G. Caired rightly observes, the author ad Hebræos "regarded the whole of the O.T. as a prophetic work, both because God spoke in it to his people and because in it he everywhere directed their attention to the eschatological future." Caired persuasively shows how the whole argument of Hebrews hinges

---

on the "self-confessed inadequacy of the old order,"\(^1\) illustrated in Hebrews by exegesis of Pss 8, 95, 110, and Jer 31.\(^2\) The OT pointed forward toward an eschatological Steigerung. As the old revealed its own ineffectiveness and provisional nature, it also provided an advance-presentation of the essential contours of the eschatological fulfillment.

Of particular interest to us (in the context of Heb 8 and 9) are the OT cultic institutions (priesthood, sanctuary service, sacrifices, etc.). In their very ineffectiveness they presented an anticipation of the realities in Jesus and his work. For example, in Heb 8:3-4, the author argues from the sacrifices of the high priests in the old covenant to the necessity of a sacrifice offered by Christ. The prophetic devoir-etre nature of the historical correspondence is thus revealed. Furthermore, it is by divine design that the sacrificial law of the old covenant constitutes a "shadow of the good things to come" (10:1). The institution of the old covenant was ordained by God (9:1), served its temporary function (9:10), but pointed forward as a shadow (10:1) to the realities of the New Covenant to be effected by Jesus.

Vertical structures

We have surveyed the horizontal structures inherent in this passage. But along with the historical-temporal sequence of movement, there is also a strong vertical (earthly-heavenly) dimension involved. As Johnsson describes it, "The time-continuum of Hebrews is crossed by a vertical, earthly-heavenly mode."\(^1\) Thus Heb 8:5 marshals Exod 25:40 as evidence that the earthly sanctuary is a copy (\(\gamma\omega\pi\epsilon\alpha\gamma\eta\sigma\beta\) – \(\gamma\omega\alpha\) – \(\alpha\varsigma\omega\delta\)) of the heavenly sanctuary.\(^2\)

Throughout chaps. 7-10, the historical correspondences are interwoven with crucial complexes of earth-heaven correspondences. There are the correspondences between the earthly priests and the heavenly High Priest; between the earthly sanctuary and the heavenly sanctuary; and between the earthly ritual and its heavenly counterpart. This vertical dimension involves the same structures that have emerged from our survey of the horizontal dimension.

Historical structure. The earthly sanctuary and its services are assumed to be a historical reality. Likewise, in the description of the heavenly sanctuary and liturgy, the author ad Hebrewos "holds to their reality."\(^3\) The correspondence between earthly and heavenly sanctuary involves an absolute Steigerung, an escalation from "copy and shadow" (8:5) to the "true" (9:23).

Theological structures. Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary is conditioned by the eschatological structure involving the tension of the "already" and "not yet." Christ has already inaugurated the eschaton by his once-for-all sacrifice of himself and entry upon his high-priestly ministry (9:26-26). He now continues his intercession in the heavenly sanctuary (7:25). He will

---

2. For further discussion, see below, pp. 358-60.
soon consummate his dealing with sin and appear a second time to save those waiting for him (9:27-28).

The vertical sanctuary typology is inexorably bound up with a Christological-soteriological structure. Even his sacrifice may be inferred as taking place on an altar that is in the (earthly) court of the heavenly sanctuary.‡ Christ's high-priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary is clearly soteriological (Heb 7:25; 9:12-14, 24-28), and his appearing the "second time" is also "to save those who are eagerly waiting for him" (9:28).

Likewise, the ecclasiological structure is constitutive for the vertical dimension. The beneficiaries of Christ's sacrifice and heavenly mediation are the individual worshipers who under the new covenant form an eschatological community.

Finally, the prophetic structure functions in the vertical as well as the horizontal dimension. In Heb 9:23, for example, the author argues from the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary to the necessity (devoir-être) of a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. By divine design, the earthly sanctuary, modeled after the heavenly original, with all its cultic functions becomes a prefiguration or advance-presentation of the realities connected with Christ's

—

†This seems to be implied already in Heb 8:1-5. As the priests of the earthly sanctuary offered sacrifices, so Jesus the High Priest of the heavenly sanctuary must also offer a sacrifice. This he did in the offering up of himself (Heb 7:27; 9:14; 10:12; etc.). But it was on earth that the antitypical sacrifice was slain. This corresponds to the court of the Levitical sanctuary—the place where the priests slew the victims whose blood was to be taken into the holy or most holy place. Heb 13:10 seems to make clear that the auctor ad Hebraeos considers the cross of Calvary to be the antitypical altar (in the court of the heavenly sanctuary). For further discussion, see, e.g., Edwin W. Rehm, The Atonement (Nashville, TN: Southern Pub. Assn., 1971), pp. 88-92; SDABC, 7.492.

ministry in the heavenly sanctuary (8:5).

The existence of two modes of thought in the book of Hebrews—the horizontal and vertical—has been well recognized. But the usual interpretation by modern commentators, based on the tendency to equate the vertical thinking with Platonic-Philoic dualism, has been to posit a theological dichotomy between the two. James Moffatt, for example, is convinced that in Hebrews the Platonic idea of two worlds (eternal and material) which comprised the author's "deeper thought" cannot be reconciled with his eschatological thought-forms.‡ Other scholars believe the author of Hebrews has reinterpreted one mode of thought so as to make it serve the other. Thus J. Cambier argues that the horizontal ["eschatological"] thought-forms are reinterpreted by the auctor ad Hebraeos into an Alexandrian-Hellenistic mode.‡ Klappert, on the other hand, concludes that the function of the vertical (Alexandrian-Hellenistic) correspondence is to provide a basis for the radical grounding of the horizontal future-apocalyptic hope.

Even Goppelt, who does not find in Hebrews a direct dependence upon Philonic vocabulary or development, still relegates vertical thinking to "the mythic cosmic analogy of antiquity," which in Hebrews "merely an aid to the presentation and characterization of the horizontal."‡

‡Moffatt, Hebrews, pp. liv, xxiii, xxxiv.
‡Klappert, pp. 50, 59.
‡Goppelt, TDNT, 8:250.
‡Ibid., p. 258.
However, Williamson's study has indicated¹ that the source of the vertical thinking is not Plato or Philo. Our study of the vertical correspondence in Exod 25:40 and throughout the OT² leads to the conclusion that it is not a foreign vestige of "mythic cosmic analogy" but an integral part of Israel's understanding of the relationship between earthly and heavenly sanctuaries within the unfolding linear-historical plan of God. Thus there appears to be no inconsistency between the vertical and horizontal correspondences. They are a description of the same reality from two perspectives: "The heavenly tabernacle and its ministration are from one point of view eternal archetypes, from another they are eschatological events."³

A holistic approach to the book of Hebrews—in line with that recently called for by Johnsson in regard to the cult and the pilgrimage motif⁴—must recognize that the horizontal and vertical harmonize and blend with each other in the book of Hebrews. Both are essential to the understanding of eschatology. The horizontal correspondence provides the linear dimension of God's saving activity, which reaches its basic eschatological fulfillment in the historical work of Christ, extends ecclesiologically as the Church appropriates Christ's work, and reaches its consummation at the Parousia.⁵

¹See above, pp. 338-42; cf. below, pp. 357-58.
²See the excursion below, pp. 367-88.
⁵As discussed above, pp. 347-49.

The horizontal is inextricably tied to the vertical dimension in eschatology, Christology-soteriology, and ecclesiology. The vertical dimension provides an understanding of the link between heaven and earth in the unfolding of God's plan of salvation. Throughout the OT this verticality is maintained, and the heavenly is presented as the ultimate source of meaning for the earthly. In Hebrews the vertical "makes the typological intensification unmistakably plain both materially and linguistically."¹ The sacrifice of Christ on earth is viewed as taking place on an altar that is in the (earthly) court of the heavenly sanctuary. Christian worshipers have salvation in Christ as they by faith relate to him in the heavenly sanctuary (10:19-22), where he intercedes continually on their behalf (7:25). From the heavenly sanctuary Christ will come the second time, having dealt fully with sin, to bring the consummation of salvation (9:28).

Within this indivisible material nexus between horizontal and vertical correspondences, it is true, as Klaappt⁰ and Goppelt³ maintain, that the horizontal seems to take the precedence in terms of the ultimate emphasis by the author. But this does not involve the subordinating of an alien 'Alexandrian-Hellenistic' (Klaappt) or 'mythic-cosmic' (Goppelt) vertical dimension to an indigenous Judeo-Christian, eschatological-historical dimension. Rather, the vertical dimension, already at home in the Christian tradition, is employed in a uniquely cultic argument to explain the nature of the

¹Goppelt, TDNT, 8:256.
²Klaappt, p. 50.
³Goppelt, TDNT, 8:258.
historical fulfillment of salvation, inaugurated by Christ in His once-for-all sacrifice of Himself, available to the Church by a spiritual-heavenly relationship to their High Priest, and soon to be consummated at the completion of His high-priestly ministry.

The importance of grasping the relationship between the vertical and horizontal structures in the argument of Heb 8 and 9, becomes more apparent as we investigate the use of ῥυσος and ἀντίτύπος in 8:5 and 9:24, respectively. To this we now turn our attention.

Tρυγος and ἀντίτύπος as hermeneutical terms

In Heb 8:5, the author affirms that the earthly sanctuary was "a copy (ἀντίτύπος) and shadow (σκιά) of the heavenly sanctuary," and he supports this assertion by citing Exod 25:40 (LXX).

In our excursus on Exod 25:40, we conclude that ῥυγος/ρύξαντα in that passage refers either to the heavenly sanctuary itself (with a mediating miniature model assumed), or to a miniature representation of the heavenly sanctuary, or to both.

If our analysis of Exod 25:40 is correct, then the author ad Hebreos seems justified in marshaling this OT passage as evidence for the existence of a heavenly sanctuary of which the earthly was a copy and shadow. But just as Exod 25:40 could refer either primarily to the heavenly sanctuary itself or its mediating miniature model, so Heb 8:5 is equivocal at this point. The author affirms the earthly/heavenly sanctuary correspondence on the basis of Exod 25:40, but he does not explicitly state that the ῥυγος is the heavenly sanctuary.

It is possible that he conceives of the ῥυγος as a miniature-model of the heavenly sanctuary but not primarily the heavenly sanctuary itself.¹ This possibility finds further support if ῥυγος (along with ἀντίτύπος and σκιά) is seen to be part of the Philonic vocabulary employed by the author, as is often suggested.

We have already noted in our Semasiological study of ῥυγος that Philo conceived of the ῥυγος in Exod 25:40 as simultaneously a Nachbildung of the archetype and a Vorbild of the earthly sanctuary. If the author ad Hebreos utilizes Philonisms here, even though the terminology is filled with new apocalyptic content, the same vertical dynamics could still be seen to function.

It is not certain, however, that the author of Hebrews employs ῥυγος with the same vertical dynamics as Philo. He does not introduce the accompanying characteristic Philonic terms ἀντίτύπος and σκιά to describe the archetype and earthly copy, respectively. Moreover, it seems that the primary concern of this passage is to establish the correspondence between the earthly and heavenly sanctuary, not to deal with a mediating miniature model.

We must tentatively conclude, therefore, that any of the three options we suggested with regard to ῥυγος in Exod 25:40 (LXX) is possible in this passage. ῥυγος may apply to the miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary for the earthly sanctuary. It may refer directly to the heavenly sanctuary, as most modern commentators

suggest. Or there is the possibility that both the miniature model and the heavenly sanctuary are in the mind of the author. There does not appear to be sufficient evidence in the passage to decide among these three possibilities. But regardless of which option is correct, it seems clear that a vertical (earthly-heavenly) sanctuary correspondence is affirmed.

The term ῥόδος in this passage follows the same linear sequence as we have seen in previous ῥόδος passages. The ῥόδος is a Vorbild (and/or Urbild) of a later Nachbild. If ῥόδος refers primarily to the miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary, then the same qualitative dynamics are also retained. As with a "hollow mold," which is secondary to the final product that it holds, so the ῥόδος (miniature model) derives from the Urbild (the heavenly sanctuary) and serves a secondary role to "shape" a reality of a higher order, the earthly sanctuary. If, however, ῥόδος refers primarily to the heavenly sanctuary itself (which may be more in harmony with the author's argument), then the qualitative dynamics are reversed. The ῥόδος is the original (Urbild) and functions as the Vorbild of a "Tower," secondary order (the earthly sanctuary).  

The use of ἀντίκλησις in Heb 9:24 appears to be controlled by the meaning of ῥόδος in 8:25. The word ἀντίκλησις, as Moffatt correctly notes, is "literally 'answering to the type' which was shown to Moses in the mount." Selwyn rightly points out that the term ἀντίκλησις "is itself a neutral word which may either... 'deprecate relatively,' or 'extol relatively.' The meaning, therefore, must be determined by the context: in itself it means 'corresponding' or 'the corresponding thing.' In Heb 8:5, the citation of Exod 25:40 has committed the auctor ad Hebraeos to a usage of ῥόδος that (directly and/or indirectly) refers to the heavenly sanctuary. Thus in Heb 9:24 he remains consistent to that usage and allows ἀντίκλησις to have the meaning "counterpart, corresponding to" with the connotation of "copy." The term ἀντίκλησις thereby becomes a virtual synonym of other words such as and 'shadow' and ὑμετέρος "copy" to point the reader from the earthly copy/shadow to the heavenly reality. In so doing, the author maintains the same linear sequence as we have seen in other

1 It is significant to note at this juncture that Philo never employs this word in his hermeneutical endeavors. If the auctor ad Hebraeos does employ Philonisms in his epistle, he departs from Philonic vocabulary at this crucial point.

2 Moffatt, Hebrews, p. 132.

3 Selwyn, St. Peter, p. 229.

4 If the ῥόδος (8:5) refers primarily to the miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary, then the ἀντίκλησις would be that which corresponds to (is a copy of) the miniature model (of the heavenly sanctuary). This is the way Lowrie, p. 323, interprets it: 'The Apostle calls it [the earthly sanctuary] an antitype of the true, the copy of the type, the image of the holy, the representation of heaven.' Selwyn, St. Peter, p. 258, interprets it as a copy of the heavenly sanctuary, a duplicate which is to be compared with the heavenly sanctuary. If on the other hand, the ῥόδος refers also or primarily to the heavenly sanctuary—which may be more consonant with the context of 8:5 and 9:24—then the ἀντίκλησις would be that which corresponds to (is a copy of) the heavenly sanctuary. In this case, the ἀντίκλησις would "deprecate relatively" in contrast to its usage in 1 Pet 3:21 (where it is employed to "extol relatively").
usage they are not always employed uniformly throughout the early church.

Summary and implications

The structural components of ἱεροί/ἱερεῖα in connection with Heb 8:5 and 9:24 may be summarized in a similar way as we have already done for the other hermeneutical ἱεροί passages with certain significant differences. We note, first, the historical structure. This involves an historical correspondence between the OT realities and the NT eschatological fulfillment. But in Hebrews it is cultic institutions, not primarily specific historical events or persons, which form the content of the OT realities. The correspondence, as in other hermeneutical ἱεροί passages, is seen in crucial details as well as general contours. And the correspondence involves an absolute Steigerung in its eschatological fulfillment. In the epistle to the Hebrews, the eschatological Steigerung is highlighted by a vertical correspondence that intersects the horizontal correspondence and overarches all historical salvific activity.

Theological structures include the eschatological, Christological-soteriological, ecclesiological, and prophetic. These structures are intersected by intertwining horizontal and vertical typological correspondences. The eschatology of Hebrews reveals what we have found in other passages: a tension between what is already fulfilled in Jesus Christ and what is not yet consummated. But in Hebrews the Christian's certainty of the future consummation is more radically grounded in the vertical earth-heaven correspondence. The immediate context of Heb 8:5
and 9:24 moves more freely in the realm of cultic soteriology and Christology than in other hermeneutical τοιχοι passages. The ecclesiologias likewise cultically determined in 7:1-10:18. The sacramental aspect of this ecclesiologias structure does not appear. The argument of this section, and in particular the τοιχοι themselves, clearly reveal the prophetic aspects of advance-presentation/prefiguration, devoir-être, and divine design.

Both τοιχοι and αὐτάτομα are seen to function as specific hermeneutical terms in the author's hermeneutical endeavor and thus may be regarded as terminological indicators of the presence of typology in these passages.

The use of τοιχοι/αὐτάτομα follows the linear sequence (Vorbild → Nachbild) as in other τοιχοι passages, but since τοιχοι (in the citation of Exod 25:40) refers (directly and/or indirectly) to the heavenly sanctuary, the αὐτάτομα denotes what "corresponds" to the preceding τοιχοι, i.e., the OT earthly sanctuary. Thus the usual application of the terms in other τοιχοι passages is reversed in Hebrews. The αὐτάτομα is the OT earthly reality and the τοιχοι is (directly and/or indirectly) the NT heavenly sanctuary (which pre-dated the earthly in existence but began to officially function only after the ratification of the new covenant with the death of Jesus).

Similar implications appear to follow from our analysis of the horizontal τοιχοι structures in Heb 8 and 9 as we have drawn from the other hermeneutical τοιχοι passages. In certain crucial areas the traditional understanding of typology—and not the post-critical view—appears to be confirmed: (1) typology in Heb 8 and 9 necessarily presupposes and builds upon the historical reality of the cultic institutions as recorded in Scripture; (2) it involves detailed correspondences between OT and NT realities as well as general "similar situations"; and (3) it consists of divinely designed prospective/predictive prefigurations and not merely the retrospective recognition of a recurring rhythm or structural analogy in the divine revelation in history. In other significant areas the post-critical understanding of typology—and not certain traditional views—seems to have been confirmed: (1) typology in Heb 8 and 9 is directly related to Christological-soteriological realities (and does not consist of trivial and extraneous details as much of the Cocceian mode); (2) it involves an absolute eschatological Steigerung from OT reality to NT fulfillment (which is often ignored in the Cocceian mode); and (3) it maintains the perspective of inaugurated, appropriated, and consummated eschatology (which perspective is often missing or blurred in traditional explications of typology).

In addition to these implications which coincide with the ones drawn from the τοιχοι structures in 1 Cor 10, Rom 5, and 1 Pet 3, we may note two further implications that appear to follow from the τοιχοι structures in the Hebrews passages. First, on the basis of our analysis of Heb 8:5 and 9:24 in their contexts, it does not seem appropriate to consider vertical typology as a vestige of ancient Near Eastern mythical thinking (pace, e.g., Goppelt) or a component of Platonic/Philonic dualism (pace, e.g., Klappert) which is essentially alien to the eschatological-historical dimension of Judeo-Christian thought. Rather, we have found that
the vertical (earthly-heavenly) sanctuary correspondence, already at home in the OT (cf. Exod 25:40 and many other passages) in the epistle to the Hebrews harmonizes and blends with the intersecting horizontal structures. Thus vertical as well as hori-

zontal ἱστος structures appear to be indigenous to biblical
typology, even though both are not employed in every hermeneutical ἱστος passage. This implication appears to stand in tension with the views of major advocates of post-critical neo-typology who
depreciate vertical typology and accept only horizontal typology as truly representing the biblical perspective.¹

A second implication stems from the apologetic use of
Scripture in the context of Heb 8 and 9. The auctor ad Hebraeos
does not simply assert the existence of a vertical (earthly-
heavenly) correspondence without Scriptural support. To the
contrary, he insists that the vertical correspondence is already affirmed in Exod 25:40. He also argues that the OT itself contains
indications of the provisional, inadequate nature of the Hebrew
cultus and points forward to future eschatological realities that
are eternal, effectual fulfillments of the old order. The OT
institutions are thus typological in their very existence and
recognized as such already in the OT.

We have noted how in 1 Cor 10 Paul similarly affirms that
certain OT events in Israel's history were in their very occurrence
"types" of the eschatological fulfillment. But unlike the epistle
to the Hebrews, in 1 Cor 10 there is no citation of OT evidence to

¹ For a discussion of the post-critical depreciation of vertical typology, see above, pp. 99-100.

support the assertion. Likewise in Rom 5 and 1 Pet 3 certain OT
realities are presented as predictive prefigurations of correspond-
ing NT realities, but no direct evidence is provided that the OT
already recognized the typical (i.e., typological) nature of these
OT realities. Does this mean that Paul and Peter were not aware of
any OT indicators of the typical nature of these persons and events
—that they carried on their Christocentric typological interpre-
tation intuitively, pneumatically, without OT controls for the
existence of typology—as is frequently maintained? Or is it
possible that the apostles were cognizant of Scriptural indicators
that these particular OT realities were typical but did not need
to elaborate the OT evidence (as in the epistle to the Hebrews)
because they were already commonly accepted as typological by their
readers? Inasmuch as the epistle to the Hebrews provides OT
indications of the presence of typology, it does not appear ad-
visable to dismiss too hastily the possibility of OT indications
of the typological nature of events and persons in the other
hermeneutical ἱστος passages even though the passages do not refer
to such indications. Investigation of these possible OT typolog-
ical controls appear to be called for in a future study.

Excursus: ἱστος Structures
in Exod 25:40

It has been noted above that Exod 25:40 is not strictly
a hermeneutical ἱστος passage. However, inasmuch as Heb 8:5 cites
Exod 25:40 (LXX) as proof that the earthly sanctuary was a copy

¹ For discussion and list of proponents see above, pp. 98-99.
and shadow of the heavenly sanctuary, it is important that we investigate the use of הֵבֶל and the underlying Hebrew term in Exod 25:40 (and Hebrew twice in the parallel vs. 9) to determine whether or not the original significance implies a vertical (earth-heaven) correspondence.

In the MT (and ET) Exod 25:9, 40 reads thus:

בְּכֵלָה אֲרוֹרֵת אֲדֹנָי אֶת הָאָרֶץ אֶת הַבָּרָד אִשָּׁהְךָ אֶת הַבַּרְכוֹת אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְ�הוּ הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָعַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו לְךָ אֶת הָעַצְמָיו L

According to all that I show you concerning the הֵבֶל or the tabernacle, and the שֶׁרֻקָּת of all its furniture, so you shall make it.... And see that you make them after the הֵבֶל for them, which is being shown you on the mountain.

Preliminary considerations

The twenty-fifth chapter of Exodus begins the section of the book which records the Lord's instructions to Moses regarding the construction of the sanctuary. The Lord first lists the various materials that will be necessary for the people to give (Exod 25:1-7) and in vs. 7 expresses the divine purpose: 'And let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them.' Then in vs. 9, Moses is cautioned to make the sanctuary according to what he is shown, the הֵבֶל of the tabernacle and its furniture. After a description of the specifications for the ark (vs. 10-22), the table (vs. 23-30), and the lampstand (vs. 31-40), the chapter ends in vs. 40 with a repeated admonition to Moses to "make them after the הֵבֶל for them, which is being shown you on the mountain."

Does this section of Scripture refer to the heavenly sanctuary (as Heb 8:5 asserts)? The answer to this question depends on the meaning of the Hebrew term הֵבֶל in this context. This Hebrew word is used three times in vss. 9 and 40, and is translated by most English versions as "pattern." We must examine the word lexicographically and contextually in order to ascertain its semantic range in Scripture.

The substantive הֵבֶל is a nominal derivative of כָּלָה, "to build." The verb כָּלָה appears in the OT at least 370 times, and the substantive כָּלָה occurs twenty times. There are some twenty-nine different substantive constructions from the same verbal root, with several words specifically denoting building: כָּלָה "structure, building," כָּלָה "building, temple," and כָּלָה "the work [of building, only in Ezekiel]."

The basic meaning given for כָּלָה by BDB is "pattern, figure, construction." The various usages of the word indicate the semantic range within this basic meaning.

We note that BDB divides the usages of כָּלָה very neatly into three categories: 1. Original usage, as "construction, structure"—Josh 22:28—Koheleth and Gad made an altar that is an actual construction (though a copy of the original)

1 This is correctly pointed out by, e.g., Cody, p. 16.

2 Siegfried Wagner, "בָּנָה," TDOT, 2:179.

3 BDB, p. 124, notes 373 times. A. R. Halit, THAT, 1:325, has 376 times. HAL, p. 133, lists 379 times. Our own count from Solomon Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, 3rd ed. (Tel Aviv: Schocken, 1978), pp. 204-9, is 373 times.

4 Mandelkern, p. 225. 5 BDB, p. 125. 6 Ibid.
Ps 144:12—The daughters are compared to pillars cut for the
“structure” of a palace
2. "Pattern" according to which anything is to be con-
structed—

Exod 25:9—The tabernacle built according to the "pattern"
Exod 25:9, 40—the utensils made according to the "pattern"
2 Kgs 16:10—Ahaz sends a "pattern" of an altar he has seen
at Damascus back to Israel to be copied
1 Chr 28:11, 12, 19—the "pattern" of the temple and its
furnishings are given by David to Solomon
1 Chr 28:18—the "pattern" of the golden chariot of the
cherubim is given by David to Solomon
3. "Figure, image, form"—
Deut 4:16, 17 (2x), 18 (2x)—Idols made in the "form, image"
of animals
Ps 106:20—they exchanged their glory for the "image" of an
ox

Isa 44:13—Idol shaped into the "figure" of a man
Eze 8:3—Put forth the "form" of a hand
Eze 8:10—Every "form" of creeping thing portrayed on the
wall
Eze 10:8—the cherubim appeared to have the "form" of a
human hand.

Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner divide the usages
somewhat differently:

1. Exod 25:9, 40 are in a separate category as Vorbild
("original, prototype")
2. Deut 4:10-18 and Josh 22:28 are described as Nachbild
("copy, duplicate")
3. 2 Kgs 16:10, Ps 144:12, and 1 Chr 28:11, 12, 19 are
Modell ("model")
4. Under Bild ("image") are listed Isa 44:13, Eze 8:10,
and Ps 106:20
5. Eze 8:3 and 10:8 are etwas wie ("something like")
6. 1 Chr 28:19 is a Bauplan ("architect’s plan")

An analysis of the above usages reveals a similar phenomenon
with מִרְכָּבָה as with the word image used by the LXX to translate it
in Exod 25:40. As we have noted with images, מִרְכָּבָה can also
assume three basic significations: Vorbild, Nachbild, or both
Nachbild and Vorbild at the same time. In at least twelve of the
twenty uses there is an explicit reference to the מִרְכָּבָה as a
Nachbild of an original. We find copies of an altar (Josh 22:28),
images of animals (Deut 4:16, 17, 18; Ps 106:20), or of
humans (Isa 44:13), "forms" of animals (Eze 8:10), or of human hands
(Eze 8:3; 10:8).

At least eight times מִרְכָּבָה has the character of a Vorbild,
or a norma normans, to use Franz Delitzsch’s term. We find

1See above, pp. 129-32.
2Franz Delitzsch, Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews,
"patterns/models" of the sanctuary and utensils (Exod 25:9, 10, 40), the Solomonic temple and furnishings (1 Chr 28:11, 12, 19) and the golden chariot of the cherubim (1 Chr 28:18).

In at least one of the twenty references, הבנה signifies both Vorbild and Nachbild, simultaneously. In 2 Kgs 16:10-11, it is recorded that Ahaz saw an original altar in Damascus, sent back the הבנה, the Nachbild, of the original, which then also became a Vorbild for the copy to be made by Uriah the priest. What is explicitly stated in 2 Kgs 16:10-11 regarding a Vorbild also being a Nachbild of an original may also be implied in some (or all) of the 21 references to הבנה as Vorbild, if it can be ascertained that they are also patterned after a heavenly original.

Thus we have in the term הבנה a wide semantic range, focusing on three basic meanings and including various nuances of semantic indication.

Tomos structures:

Scholars have applied different combinations of basic meanings and semantic nuances to the three appearances of the term in Exod 25:9, 10, with some six resultant possibilities. We may schematically diagram the various concepts suggested in the following way:

1. A Vorbild of the earthly sanctuary (in the form of a miniature model):¹

2. A Vorbild of the earthly sanctuary (in the form of architect's plans):¹

3. A Nachbild of the heavenly sanctuary which functions as a Vorbild of the earthly sanctuary (in the form of a miniature model):²

4. A Nachbild of the heavenly sanctuary which functions as


Since there are proponents for each of these suggestions within the scholarly community, how does one decide which is correct? William G. Moorehead flatly answers, "We cannot tell." We acknowledge that there is some ambiguity involved as regards the term תּוֹרֶבֶן, but a number of considerations seem to point toward probable conclusions.

It is generally agreed that the prepositional prefix ב "according to" before ל in Exod 25:9, and the prefixed preposition ב "by" [used with a standard of measurement of computation] preceding הָבָנִים, indicates that the תּוֹרֶבֶנָה is (at least) a norma normans, or Vorbild, of the earthly sanctuary. But what is the nature of this תּוֹרֶבֶנָה? Is it a miniature model (Nos. 1 or 3 above), or an architect's plan (Nos. 2 or 4), heaven itself (No. 5), or further reflections after a subjective "divine encounter" (No. 6)?

Position No. 5 seems to stand in tension with the text of Exod 25:9, where it is affirmed that Moses was "caused to see" (הָבָנִים) the God of Israel. The text suggests that there was a visible reality made known to Moses. And Num 8:4 uses the word for "appearance, view, vision" (מִצְרָא) in describing the same experience of Moses. Other parallel

1E.g., Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament; with a Critically Revised Text, a Digest of Various Readings, Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage, Prolegomena, and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 4 vols. (London: Rivingtons, 1864-66), 4:150; cf. earlier commentators (Faber Stapelus, Bleek, Schlichting, and Storr) mentioned and/or quoted by Alford (Ibid.) as pronouncing a similar position. Cf. also the discussion of these commentators (plus Rivet) by Ebrard, pp. 249-50, n. 1.


5DBB, p. 90 (IV,8).
passages support the conclusion that Moses beheld a visible reality.\(^1\)

Does the מָצַיָּב involve a solid construction or architect's blueprint? In twelve of the twenty usages of מָצַיָּב in the OT, as we have already noted, there is explicit reference to a solid structure or form. Leaving Exod 25 out of consideration, we have seen how Kohler and Baumgartner categorize the remainder of the twenty references under the meaning "model,"\(^2\) which seems to imply a solid structure. Numerous scholars have argued forcefully for this same meaning of "model" in Exod 25:9, 40.\(^3\) If Moses had been shown merely architect's plans, it would seem likely that these plans would have been made available to take down from the mountain so that the builders could follow them. But the record maintains that he brought down only the two tables of stone (Exod 32:15). It would seem more consonant with the context that Moses was provided in vision with a view of something constructed, relating in vivid reality how the sanctuary was going to look. In the light of a quantitative analysis of the uses of מָצַיָּב and the sense of the immediate context of Exod 25:9, 40, the conclusion as stated by David N. Freedman seems preferable: "Moses was shown something constructed, rather than a blueprint."\(^4\)

If the מָצַיָּב refers to something constructed, what is the nature of this construction? Is it a miniature model of the earthly sanctuary (i.e., a Vorbild), or a miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary for the earthly (i.e., both a Nachbild and a Vorbild)? Or is it the heavenly sanctuary itself (i.e., the Urbild)? Or did Moses perhaps first see the heavenly sanctuary itself and then a miniature model of the heavenly after which to pattern the construction of the earthly?

The basic question that must first be addressed is whether or not a vertical earthly-heavenly sanctuary correspondence emerges from this passage. It must be acknowledged that Exod 25:9, 40 does not explicitly state that Moses saw the heavenly sanctuary and/or a miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary.\(^7\) Yet there appears to be evidence for an implied earthly-heavenly sanctuary correspondence in the passage and its context.

First, we have already seen how the semantic range of the word מָצַיָּב allows for and even leans toward a heavenly original and/or miniature model of a heavenly original. In Ps 144:12 מָצַיָּב seems to refer to an original temple structure. This usage would tend to support the idea of a heavenly original in Exod 25:9, 40. In 2 Kgs 15:10-11, מָצַיָּב refers to a Nachbild of an original (Urbild) which serves as a Vorbild for the construction of another Nachbild. In at least eleven other OT occurrences, מָצַיָּב is likewise a Nachbild founded on some previously existing idea or

\(^{1}\)See, e.g., Exod 26:30; 27:8.

\(^{2}\)See above, p. 371.


\(^{7}\)So argues Cody, pp. 17, 20, and is content to leave it at that. He finds in Wis 9:8 the explicit reference that he believes to be the ultimate source of Heb 8:5.
object. These Nachbild usages would seem to support the idea of a miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary in view in Exod 25:9, 40.

Second, the immediate theophanic, visionary context of this passage appears to suggest heavenly sanctuary connotations. In Exod 24:10 it is stated that Moses and the other representatives of Israel "saw the God of Israel, and there was under his feet as it were a pavement of sapphire stone." This is suggestive of the throne vision in Ezek I—in the context of the heavenly temple—where the throne was "in appearance like sapphire" (vs. 26). It seems likely that in the narrative of Exod 24 Moses and the elders glimpsed the heavenly sanctuary itself as God's heavenly dwelling place. If then in the very next chapter Moses is told to build an earthly dwelling-place for God (Exod 25:8), it would appear probable that the earthly dwelling-place is in some sense a replica of God's heavenly dwelling-place.

This contextual probability is strengthened by a third consideration, namely, the common ancient Near Eastern belief that


2See Wagner, TDOT, 2:179.

3Bruce, Hebrews, p. 156, effectively argues that since the idea of the earthly tabernacle as a dwelling-place of God is emphasized in Exod 25:8, in Exod 25:9, 40 "it would be completely in keeping with current practice that such earthly dwelling-place should be a replica of God's heavenly dwelling-place." This argument combines the contextual indicators that we have just considered with the current ancient Near Eastern parallels, which are discussed in our next point.

An earthly temple is built as a copy of a heavenly original. A few examples of this widespread notion as revealed in the ancient Near Eastern texts may be noted. In the Babylonian Enuma elish we find a heavenly court of assembly (Ubshukkinne) corresponding to an earthly temple. According to the Code of Hamurabi the Ebla temple in Sippar was "like the heavenly dwelling." The famous neo-Sumerian cylinder texts portraying the exploits of Nanna of Lagash provide probably the oldest and clearest example and is

cited most often in the modern literature. King Gudea tells how he was guided in the building of his temples by divine visions. In constructing his temple, Gudea recounts his vision of the goddess Nintu, her brother Ningirsu, and her sister Ninlil. Ningirsu shows him the temple he is to copy, and Ninlil guides him in the planning (gis-har) of the temple.

The Sumerian parallels must not be taken as a final determinant for the Israelite conception. Nevertheless, we may allow the...


3 According to the analysis of, e.g., Hamilton-Kelly, p. 7. The text at this point (A. 3.6-8) is not clear (Thureau-Dangin, p. 95, does not attempt a complete translation). But elsewhere in Cylinder A it appears evident that the earthly temple was to be fashioned after a heavenly original. See, e.g., 11.18 (Barton, p. 227), "Like the great temple in heaven, the temple rose." Note also 27.13 (Barton, p. 233): "Its side, as the lofty temple of heaven filled with abundance." Cf. Cylinder B. 24.14 (Barton, p. 255): "At Eninnu, constructed in heaven and on earth."

4 Cylinders A. 3.4. Anton Daiml, ed., Sumersches Lexikon, 3 vols. (Rome: Verlag des Rössli, Bibel-Institut, 1920-34; reprint ed., Graz, Austria: Akademischen Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1962), 2:797 (and 3:123) defines gis-bar as "Zeichnung; Bild; Bildnis; Bestimmung; Plan." In the specific context of Cylinder A. 3.4, the Sumerian gis-bar is translated as a "Temple Plan." According to A. 3.4 (Barton, p. 208), this "temple plan" was contained on a tablet of lapis lazuli.

parallel to have its full comparative weight and serve as one of several indicators that the people of Israel also knew of a heavenly-earthly correspondence.

A fourth strand of evidence in support of an earthly-heavenly sanctuary correspondence in Exod 25:9, 40, is found in the various OT parallels. Allan J. McNicol correctly points out that...
out that the idea of a vertical (earthly-heavenly) sanctuary correspondence is at home in the OT and not, as von Rad claims, "almost entirely foreign to ancient Israel." Helpful parallels are found already in the book of Genesis. With regard to Gen 28:10-22, F. Jeremias argues effectively that Jacob saw "das Geschicht des himmlischen Heiligtums." The idea of an heavenly original/earthly counterpart is expressed by calling the earthly site of the vision the "House of God." Trygve N. D. Nettinger sees a further illustration in the analogy between הָרְבִּיקָם and the ἱμαγο concept of Gen 1:27. Both are according to heavenly originals.

In the Psalms and Prophets are found numerous explicit references to the heavenly sanctuary or temple in close parallelism or juxtaposition with the earthly sanctuary. The thought of the

1 McNicoll, pp. 55-56.
2 von Rad, EUTH, p. 19. Even von Rad points to a number of what he calls "vestiges" of the vertical correspondence in the OT (see von Rad, TDNT, 5:508). But he has not accounted for numerous examples of the earthly-heavenly sanctuary correspondences (especially in the Psalms and Prophets) nor the ease with which the thinking of the biblical writers moves from the earthly sanctuary to the heavenly.
4 Ibid., p. 56, 61-63.
6 Note particularly the following passages: Pss 11:4; 18:6 (7 MT); 50:5 (6): = 106:7 (8); 51:2 (3); 68:35 (36); 96:6; 102:19 (20); 150:3; Is 6:1ff.; Jonah 2:7 (8); Mic 1:2; Nah 2:19. For discussion of these and other texts, see our unpublished paper, "The Heavenly Sanctuary in the Old Testament" (Andrews University Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1976).

bibilical writers often moves easily from the earthly to the heavenly sanctuary, and liturgical aspects of the earthly sanctuary are frequently presented in vertical correspondence with heavenly sanctuary liturgy.

Further strands of evidence for a vertical sanctuary correspondence in Exod 25:9, 40 come from the literature of late Judaism. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha give several indications of an earthly-heavenly correspondence of sanctuary/temple and liturgy. Rabbinic sources frequently assert the existence of a full-blown original heavenly sanctuary corresponding to minute details of the Levitical sanctuary appointments and liturgy. Many of the elaborations of the heavenly original are based on Exod 25:9, 40 as a proof text. The LXX use of the terms στεφάνος and 

2 See Wis 9:8; T. Lev. 3:5-8; 5:1; 2 Apoc. Bar., 4:3-6; cf. the discussion in Cody, pp. 17-22.
3 For summaries of the evidence, see especially Pelai, pp. 130-33, 138-39; Streck and Billerbeck, 3:700-4; Bieterhard, pp. 125, 130, and passim; Cody, pp. 22-25; Buchanan, p. 158.
4 See discussion above, pp. 387-88.
5 See discussion above, pp. 130-31.
Moses as a "mirror of the heavenly original for the earthly. Though Philo interprets the heavenly original in terms of transcendent, eternal ideas and not as material heavenly realities, nonetheless the same vertical (earth-heaven) dynamics appear to be functioning as in the OT.

The following point emerges from our discussion thus far: The syntactical analysis of Exod 25:40 allows for and seems to lean toward the implication of a vertical (earthly-heavenly) sanctuary correspondence. This is supported by (1) the immediate theophanic context, combined with the stated function of the sanctuary as a dwelling-place for God; (2) ancient Near Eastern parallels; (3) OT parallels; (4) apocalyptic and pseudepigraphical literature; (5) Rabbinic sources; (6) the LXX translation; and (7) the interpretation of Philo. With Frank M. Cross, we would assert that "Probably the conception of the tabernacle, the 'model' (Exod 25:9), also goes back ultimately to the idea that the earthly sanctuary is the counterpart of the heavenly dwelling of a deity." If Exod 25:9, 40 does indeed imply a vertical (earthly-heavenly) correspondence with regard to the sanctuary, it still must be determined precisely what Moses saw shown.

We have already noted how the theophanic context of Exod 24 seems to imply that Moses saw the heavenly sanctuary. But it does not appear likely that the הֶרְבִּךְ refers exclusively to the heavenly sanctuary. If the heavenly sanctuary itself (unmediated by some miniature-model presentation) were solely in view, this would not seem to coincide with other OT portrayals of the heavenly sanctuary. Elsewhere in Scripture, the heavenly sanctuary is described as a vast, majestic temple, accommodating countless angels. If Moses had been able to take in such a display of majesty and had seen only the heavenly sanctuary itself (unmediated by some kind of miniature model), it does not appear possible that he could be repeatedly told to build it according to what he was shown (Exod 25:9, 40; 26:30; 27:3; Num 8:4). The emphasis of these latter passages seems to rule out the possibility that Moses saw only the heavenly reality as it was and then was told to translate it into earthly proportions. Rather, it seems probable that Moses was given a vision of the heavenly sanctuary and then provided with a miniature model of the heavenly as a pattern to copy in constructing the earthly. If this be the case, there are still several possibilities as to what הֶרְבִּךְ has primarily in view in Exod 25:9, 40.

The הֶרְבִּךְ may refer primarily to the miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary (though not excluding an ultimate orientation to the heavenly sanctuary itself). This suggestion is in harmony

---


2 Note, e.g., Dan 7:9, 10.

3 See Delitzsch, Hebrews, 2:34.

4 Gray, p. 156, reminds us that it was not mutually exclusive in the minds of the ancient Semitic people to believe in an earthly-heavenly correspondence and at the same time have the concept of a model of the earthly. Habel, pp. 85-86, against this blended background of earthly/heavenly and heavenly/earthly, sees Exod 25:9, 40 as pointing ultimately to a heavenly original.

Suggestion No. 3 above, p. 373.
with the majority of usages of the term elsewhere in the OT where הָרוֹם refers to a meaning other than original. It particularly corresponds with the semantic range of הָרוֹם made explicit in 2 Kgs 16:10, where the term refers to a Nachbild of the original Urbild which is employed as a Vorbild for another Nachbild. According to this suggestion, in Exod 25:9, 40, the הָרוֹם would refer to the miniature model (Nachbild) of the original heavenly sanctuary (Urbild) which God instructed Moses to employ as a "pattern" (Vorbild) for the earthly sanctuary (Nachbild).

On the other hand, in Exod 25 הָרוֹם may point primarily to the heavenly sanctuary itself (though not excluding the necessity for a mediating miniature representation for Moses to follow). This is in harmony with the usage of הָרוֹם in Ps 144:12. In this case the הָרוֹם would signify the Urbild (as suggested by Koehler), which serves as a Vorbild for the earthly Nachbild.

A third possibility is that both heavenly sanctuary and miniature model are in view. The הָרוֹם would then involve the whole of what Moses was shown on the mountain--heavenly sanctuary original and miniature-model--that was to serve as a pattern for the earthly sanctuary. This does not seem possible to decide with certainty from the available evidence whether the primary reference of הָרוּם is to the miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary, to the heavenly sanctuary itself (with a miniature model assumed), or to both.

But whichever is primarily in view, both the heavenly sanctuary (Urbild) and miniature model (nachbildliches Vorbild) appear still to be ultimately bound up with the term.

Drawing together the various strands of argument and evidence that have emerged from our analysis of the nature of הָרוּם in Exod 25:9, 40, we seem to be in a position to conclude in favor of a vertical (earth-heaven) structure implied in this passage. The הָרוֹם in vss. 9 and 40 probably signifies a miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary and/or the heavenly sanctuary itself (with an implied mediating miniature model). This הָרוּם functions as a norma romans or Vorbild for the construction of the earthly sanctuary.

What we have concluded concerning הָרוּם in Exod 25:9, 40 (MT) appears also to be inherent in the LXX translation of this passage. The words ὀρατός and τόκος, which are used to translate in Exod 25:9, 40, occur in Plato, Aristotle, and Greek thought of the third-second centuries B.C. to indicate an earthly-heavenly correspondence. The term τόκος, which like הָרוּם has the potential for denoting both Nachbild and Vorbild simultaneously, is particularly appropriate as a word-substitution for הָרוּם. Like the original Hebrew term, τόκος can imply that what Moses saw is a Nachbild (i.e., a miniature model) of the heavenly sanctuary (or perhaps an Urbild, the heavenly sanctuary itself) that serves as a pattern.

1 See Hamerton-Kelly, p. 6. In Greek dualism, of course, this correspondence functions at a different level than in OT Scripture. It is transcendent ideas and not material heavenly realities that correspond to the earthly. Nevertheless similar vertical dynamics are functioning.

---

1 Suggestion No. 5 above, p. 374.
2 This view would encompass both suggestion Nos. 3 and 5 above.
as a Vorbild for the earthly sanctuary. 1

Summary and implications

The Hebrew term הֵיכָל appears to involve dynamics similar to those of the Greek τιτανός. It can denote the Vorbild (Urbild), the Nachbild, or both together simultaneously. In Exod 25:9, 40, it appears probable that הֵיכָל (and τιτανός in vs. 40, LXX) refers to a Nachbild of an original Urbild (or perhaps the Urbild itself) that serves as a Vorbild. It has in view the "pattern" for the earthly sanctuary that is simultaneously a miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary and ultimately encompasses a vision of the heavenly sanctuary itself. Such a meaning is suggested by the use of הֵיכָל elsewhere in the OT and supported by the immediate context and biblical/para-biblical/extra-biblical parallels. A vertical (earth-heaven) sanctuary correspondence therefore seems to be implicit in Exod 25:9, 40.

τιτανός Structures and Salvation History

Preliminary considerations

In each NT hermeneutical τιτανός-passage we have examined, the same historical and theological structures have emerged. We have refrained from combining these structures together until our

1 Since τιτανός and μανίταρα were already employed in connection with a vertical correspondence in contemporary literature and earlier, the LXX translators may well have chosen these Greek terms to indicate that they interpreted the Hebrew הֵיכָל in terms of an earthly-heavenly correspondence (either in the OT sense of a material heavenly reality or in the Platonic sense of transcendental ideas). But regardless of their intentions, the word-substitutions they chose for הֵיכָל—and in particular the word-substitution τιτανός—strikingly encompass the semantic dynamics inherent in the original.

analysis of all the τιτανός-passages was completed. Now that we have reached that point, we may begin to see possible common denominators that tie various structural elements together.

We note immediately that aspects of τιτανός structures have in recent literature been linked with constitutive conceptual structures of what is termed Heilsgeschichte, salvation history. For example, various studies on the Epistle to the Hebrews have referred to salvation history as "basic to Heb.'s understanding of Scripture." 2 Salvation history has been viewed as the connection between the horizontal and vertical, 2 and as the determining factor that safeguarded the auctor ad Hebrews from Philonic allegory. 3 Is it possible that salvation history, comprised of aspects of the basic structures inherent in typology, provides a kind of "sub-structure" or schema within which the NT writers carried on their typological interpretation of the Bible?

A number of recent authors have pointed out the relationship between typology and salvation history. 4 Oscar Cullmann perhaps draws the connection most precisely when he states that "typology presupposes a wider salvation-historical framework and connects two points on this background." 5 According to Robert A.

1 Swers, p. 92. 2 Fritsch, "Τὸ Αὐτόρούγοσ," p. 107. 3 Swers, p. 36.
5 Cullmann, Salvation in History, p. 132.
Markus, *Heilgeschichte* provides the "biblical time-scheme," or time-grid, as it were, for the correct mode of application from type to antitype. Galdon deals at some length with the theory of salvation history as the "framework" of typology.  

The NT salvation-historical perspective  

We refer the reader to such detailed studies as George E. Ladd's *The Presence of the Future* for a clear substantiation and working out of the eschatological structure underlying the Christ-event and subsequent aspects of salvation history. An "emerging consensus" can be recognized within biblical scholarship that refuses to flatten out the eschatology of the NT into the totally present ("realized") eschatology of the earlier C. H. Dodd, nor into the totally future ("consistent") eschatology of Albert Schweitzer, but rather maintains a present tension between the "already fulfilled" and the "not yet consummated."

The salvation-historical perspective of the NT may be summarized briefly. Christ's first advent brought a basic fulfillment of the OT eschatological expectations of the New Age. The cross is the midpoint of salvation history. In Christ the powers of the Coming Age have irrupted into the Old Age. For the church living between the two advents of Christ, it is already true that upon them "the end of the ages has come" (1 Cor 10:11). They are living in the "last days" (Hab 2:3; Acts 2:16, 17). The powers of the Age to Come are already at work through the first-fruits of the Holy Spirit poured out from the time of Christ's inauguration in heaven. The time between the two conings of Christ is thus a period with an overlapping of the two Ages. The full consummation of the OT expectations is still future, to be experienced with the glorious ultimate dawn of the Age to Come.

Expressed in terms of the kingdom or rule of God, the history of the OT period involved a limited, patriarchal-nationalistic rule of God, but incomplete and open-ended toward the future in its eschatological expectations. The coming of Christ fulfilled those messianic/eschatological expectations. Christ inaugurated the kingdom of God in his person, his words, and deeds. But it was a kingdom of grace, not glory, that his first advent ushered in. This kingdom of grace, already experienced (proleptically) in OT times by the promise of God, was established in actuality by the death of Christ.

Following his ascension and heavenly inauguration at the right hand of the Father, Christ has continued his rule over all...
things. But it is a hidden rule as far as men are concerned, for
the kingdom is essentially a heavenly one and manifests itself on
earth in a spiritual way, i.e., effected by the Holy Spirit.
Christians participate in that kingdom as they are incorporated
into Christ's death and resurrection, and as they by faith are
seated with Christ "in the heavens" (Eph 1:3; 2:6). Because
Israel as a nation rejected the Messiah and forfeited its national
role in the kingdom of grace, there are no geographical nor ethnic
restrictions as there were in the kingdom of OT Israel. The church,
Christ's body, is universal. The rule of Christ is active in each
individual believer through the agency of the Holy Spirit.

The kingdom of God still awaits the final consummation. At
the consummation, the kingdom of grace will become the kingdom of
glory; the powers of the present, evil age will be annihilated.
God's tabernacle will be with men—the tension between the heavenly
and earthly rule of Christ will be resolved by the transference of
the very throne of God and of the Lamb to this earth. This kingdom
of glory will therefore consist of a final, literal, universal reign,
completely consummating the OT eschatological expectations.

The picture of salvation history we have cursorily pre-
sented is not found only in isolated sections of the NT. The over-
all time-scheme--historical OT realities; a primary eschatological
fulfillment in the Christ-event; the present tension of the "already"
and the "not yet"; and the final consummation—is found consistently
throughout the NT witness. It is not a matter of leveling out the
NT, forcibly harmonizing divergent views. "Salvation history is
the common basis of the whole New Testament." The tension arising
out of Christ's basic fulfillment but still-fortcoming final con-
summation qualifies the whole theology of the NT. Ladd has amply
demonstrated this fact in his Theology of the New Testament.

Our discussion thus far has pointed to a fourfold
salvation-historical substructure for the NT writers: (1) The
historical rule of God in the period of the patriarchs and national
Israel; (2) the basic fulfillment of the OT eschatological hopes
centered in the first advent of Jesus Christ; (3) the (derived)
spiritual fulfillment by the church in the time of tension between
the "already" and the "not yet"; and (4) the apocalyptic consummation
and complete ushering in of the Age to Come.

For the sake of concision, the three eschatological-
fulfillment aspects of the kingdom of God in the NT might be termed
(1) "inaugurated" eschatology—in the person of Jesus at his first
advent; (2) "appropriated" eschatology—in the church (corporately
and individually) and its sacraments in the time of the tension be-
tween the "already" and "not yet" as believers are connected
spiritually to the heavenly Christ via the Holy Spirit; and (3) "con-
summated" eschatology—in connection with the establishment of the
kingdom of glory at the second coming of Christ and beyond. Or to
put it in another way, the three fulfillment aspects of NT salvation

1Gillmann, Salvation in History, p. 173.
2Ibid., p. 172.
3George E. Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament (Grand
Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974). See his analysis of this tension in
connection with every section of the NT corpus.
history we can label (again for purposes of succinctness and convenience) the "Christological," the "ecclesiological," and the "apocalyptic," corresponding to inaugurated, appropriated, and consummated eschatology, respectively. We use these three terms advisedly, because all three terms could be construed to apply to all three aspects. But with a view to their obvious point of emphasis, we believe these "shorthand" distinctions of the aspects in the salvation-historical eschatological fulfillment will be helpful in further discussion.

It should be again emphasized, as alluded to in previous paragraphs, that the temporal salvation-historical perspective is overlaid by a vertical-heavenly dimension. Throughout OT history, throughout the "tabernacling" of Christ on earth and the existence of the Christian church, we must take into account the cosmic reality of God's rule. There is a vertical tension throughout salvation history till the final climax. Only when God's throne is transported to this earth at the apocalyptic consummation will the tension between earthly and heavenly find complete resolution.

**Tmolos structures within salvation history**

We have summarized the perspective of salvation history because of its apparent significance in the understanding of the way NT writers employed typology. From what we have seen already from the *Tmolos* passages analyzed, it seems that Woollcombe is correct in asserting that *Heilsgeschichte* is like the weaving of a pattern behind the typology of the NT.¹ We have found that the

¹Woollcombe, p. 66.
theological structures of eschatology, Christology-soteriology, and ecclesiology (church, individual believer, and sacraments) within typology can be encompassed by the use of the single term *heilsgeschichte* or salvation history. That is to say, salvation history appears to present the historical, eschatological, Christological-soteriological framework for typology. This framework seems to provide a threefold temporal "substructure" that indicates the modality of the eschatological fulfillment of the OT types.

**Summary and implications**

The salvation-historical perspective of the NT involves three aspects in the eschatological fulfillment of the OT expectations: (1) "inaugurated" eschatology at the first advent of Christ; (2) "appropriated" eschatology in the church (corporately, individually, and sacramentally); and (3) "consummated" eschatology in conjunction with the Parousia. These three aspects we have labeled the "Christological," "ecclesiological," and "apocalyptic," respectively.

This salvation-historical framework appears to involve four of the structures that have emerged from NT "hermeneutical" *tômos* passages: (1) historical (historical); (2) eschatological; (3) Christological-soteriological; and (4) ecclesiological (including individual, corporate, and sacramental aspects). It seems that salvation history provides a wider temporal "substructure" which subsumes these *tômos* structures.

This does not imply that salvation history is equivalent to the sum of all the "hermeneutical" *tômos* structures. Salvation history provides the suprastructure of historicality, eschatology, Christology-soteriology, and ecclesiology (including the corporate, individual, and sacramental dimensions). But along with these structures, in the hermeneutical *tômos* passages we find the prophetic structure and additional aspects of the historical structure, namely, historical correspondence and progression.

There is an historical correspondence between certain OT and NT persons, events, and institutions. By divine design the OT realities are advance-presentations of corresponding (but absolutely "escalated") NT realities, and there is a *devoir-âtre* relationship between the OT realities and the NT fulfillments. Salvation history seems to provide the framework, as it were, within which these additional *tômos* structures are worked out.

**Summary and Conclusions**

There are six NT occurrences of *tômos* and cognates which appear in a hermeneutical setting (i.e., a setting in which the NT writers are interpreting OT Scripture): 1 Cor 10:6, 11; Rom 5:14; 1 Pet 3:21; Heb 8:5 (= Exod 25:40 Lxx), and Hab 9:24. From our analysis of these passages, five *tômos* structures have consistently emerged. The first is the historical structure. The remaining four structures are theological: (1) the eschatological structure; (2) the Christological-soteriological structure; (3) the ecclesiastical structure; and (4) the prophetic structure. In all of the hermeneutical *tômos* passages, these structures function on a horizontal plane. In Heb 8:5 and 9:24 the structures also
function vertically. This vertical (earth-heaven) function is probably already implicit in Exod 25:40, the OT passage cited in Heb 8:5.

The historical structure consists of several aspects. First, the OT πᾶνος (cultic ἄνδρας) is assumed to be a historical reality as it is set forth in Scripture. As a second aspect, the NT author points out a historical correspondence between the OT πᾶνος (cultic ἄνδρας) and the NT reality or realities. Such a correspondence involves persons (e.g., Rom 5), events (e.g., 1 Cor 10 and 1 Pet 3), and/or institutions (e.g., Heb 8 and 9). The content of the correspondence extends even to details connected with the πᾶνος (cultic ἄνδρας), but apparently always to such details as are already salvifically significant in the OT. The correspondence can be either in terms of antithesis (Rom 5) or comparison (1 Cor 10 and 1 Pet 3). But even when there is a comparison of similarities, a third aspect of the historical structure appears to be present. The NT reality invariably involves an absolute Steigerung or escalation of the OT πᾶνος (cultic ἄνδρας).

The eschatological structure clarifies the nature of the historical correspondence and Steigerung. It is not to just any similar realities that the OT πᾶνος (cultic ἄνδρας) are linked. Rather the OT persons/events/institutions find their fulfillment—we use the word "fulfillment" because of the prophetic structure described below—in the eschatological realities of the NT. In 1 Cor 10, the experience of Israel in the wilderness are πᾶνος of the eschatological "us"—"upon whom the end of the ages has come" (vs. 11). In Rom 5, the first representative man Adam is a πᾶνος of "the One to come"—the Second Adam—whose coming brought about the eschatological New Aeon. In 1 Pet 3, the salvation of Noah and his family through the Flood finds its πᾶνος in the sacramental salvation of the eschatological "now" (vs. 21). And in Heb 8 and 9, the correspondence is drawn between the OT sacrifices and the once-for-all Sacrifice "at the end of the age" (9:26).

It should be noted that the eschatological fulfillment of the hermeneutical πᾶνος passages involves three aspects. The first advent of Christ brought an inauguration of the eschatological kingdom of God. This will not be consummated until the Parousia. The church now lives in the time of eschatological tension between the "already" and the "not yet." The various πᾶνος passages focus upon one or more of these aspects of eschatological fulfillment.

The Christological-soteriological structure is significant in its determination of the content of the πᾶνος/ἄνδρας. The OT πᾶνος (cultic ἄνδρας) find their fulfillment in Christ. Sometimes there is a direct correspondence between an OT reality and the person of Christ. As in Rom 5 (Adam + Christ) and Heb 8 and 9 (priesthood/sacrifices + High Priest and Sacrifice). At other times the primary fulfillment of the OT πᾶνος (cultic ἄνδρας) is viewed as occurring in various realities of the new covenant related to and brought about by Christ, as especially in 1 Cor 10 and 1 Pet 3 (ancient Israel and Noah and his family + the Christian church—individually, corporately, sacramentally). Likewise in Heb 8 and 9, the sanctuary of the old covenant is related to the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant, where Christ is the ministering High Priest and once-for-all Sacrifice.

In 1 Cor 10 a further aspect of the Christological
determination is brought to the fore. Christ is presented as the ultimate orientation point of the OT rōsōq and their NT fulfillments. The rōsōq and their NT correspondents are Christocentrically determined, i.e., they carry a positive or negative moral "charge" depending on whether they are for or against Christ. Thus in 1 Cor 10 the "most" of ancient Israel who persisted in disobedience are viewed as those in the Christian church who similarly orient themselves with reference to Christ.

Inextricably bound up with the Christological is the soteriological component of this structure. The correspondence of the rōsōq/soteriology is not between "bare" or "neutral" historical events, persons, or institutions, but ones that are soteriologically "charged." The OT rōsōq (cultic soteriology) are salvific realities, and they find their fulfillment in the soteriological work of Christ and/or in the new covenant soteriological realities issuing from Christ. This soteriological dimension is thoroughly Christocentric, i.e., either positive (salvific for those responding to Christ's grace) or negative (retributive for those who spurn the manifestation of salvation).

The ecclesiological structure includes three aspects: the individual worshipers, the corporate community, and/or the sacraments of the church. In 1 Cor 10, all of these aspects are emphasized. The experiences of ancient Israel in the wilderness happened as rōsōq of the end-time congregation (vss. 6, 11), the Christian church. This involved the sacraments (vss. 2-4) and a personal decision whether to be faithful or disobedient (vss. 5-10). In Rom 5, there is a correspondence between "the many" in Adam (vs. 15) and "the many" [= "those who receive," vs. 17] in Christ. This theme is developed in terms of baptism in the following chapter. In 1 Pet 3 the salvation of Noah and his family "through water" (vs. 20) has its eschatological soteriological, in which the sacrament of baptism saves the Christian congregation (the ἐκκλησία who have been baptized, vs. 21) through the resurrection of Jesus Christ. In Heb 8 and 9 (as in Rom 5) the emphasis is upon the Christological-soteriological structure, and not the ecclesiological. Yet the ecclesiological determination of rōsōq/soteriology is nonetheless shown to be present as that which issues from the Christological-soteriological. The sacrifice of Christ "perfects" or "purifies" the conscience (9:9, 14; 10:2, 14, 22) of the individual worshipers, and they are the beneficiaries of his heavenly mediation and second coming (7:25; 8:1; 9:14, 26-28). The new covenant unites these believers into an eschatological community (10:8-13, 21; 12:22-24). It should be noted that the sacramental aspect of the ecclesiological structure does not appear in Heb 8 and 9.

The prophetic structure also involves three aspects. First, the OT rōsōq (cultic soteriology) is an advance-presentation or prefiguration of the corresponding NT reality or realities. In 1 Cor 10 the experience of ancient Israel in the wilderness is shown to be an advance-presentation of the experience of the Christian church. In Rom 5 the representative man Adam is seen to prefigure the Second Adam, Jesus Christ. In 1 Pet 3, the divine salvation of Noah and his family through water is revealed as pre-presenting the salvation of Christians in the sacrament of baptism (through the resurrection of Jesus Christ). In Heb 8 and 9 the earthly sanctuary is described
as a "copy" and "shadow" of the heavenly reality.

Second, in each of these instances there is revealed a divine design, in which the OT realities were superintended by God so as to be advance-presentations of the NT realities. The divine design included specific details as well as the general soteriological contours, but did not interfere with the freedom of the individuals involved nor detract from the historical salvific significance of the OT realities in themselves.

Finally, the divinely designed advance-presentations involve a devoir-être ("must-needs-be") quality giving them the force of prospective-predictive foreshadowings of their NT fulfillments. In 1 Cor 10, Paul builds upon the devoir-être relationship between ancient and eschatological Israel in order to show that what happened to disobedient Israel in the wilderness "must-needs-be" what will come upon the Corinthians who persist in disobedience. In Rom 5, the devoir-être quality seems to be emphasized by the use of τοῦ μέλλοντος (vs. 14). Paul is able to argue from the Adan-all-men solidarity to the Christ-all-men solidarity because he posits a "must-needs-be" relationship between them. In 1 Pet 3, the apostle assures the readers that as Noah and his family experienced divine salvation through water, so it "must-needs-be" that the antitypical baptism now saves them through the resurrection of Jesus Christ. And in Heb 8 and 9, the author argues from the existence of priestly sacrifices and cleansing of the earthly sanctuary to the ineluctable necessity of Christ's high-priestly Sacrifice (8:3-4) and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary.

The term τόμος in its signification of "hollow mold" is strikingly suited to encompass the linear, dynamic interconnection between the OT and NT realities that is involved in these five structures. A hollow mold is a Nachbild that is also a preliminary, determinative Vorbild. It is formed from some prototype that exists previously (either concretely or in the mind of the designer), and it functions as a matrix for shaping the end product which invariably conforms to the contours of the mold and transcends it in that it fulfills the purpose for which the mold was designed. So the τόμος (1 Cor 10, Rom 5) are "shaped" according to the previous divine design and function as a "mold" to "shape" the end (eschatological) product (the OT events), which invariably (devoir-être) corresponds to the (historical) contours of the OT τόμος but transcends them in that it fulfills the ultimate (Christological-soteriological/ecclesiological) purpose for which the OT τόμος were intended. The (NT) transcendantal reality or (eschatological) end product, is likewise appropriately termed ἄντιτύπωμα (1 Pet 3), "that which corresponds to the τόμος."

In Hebrews the use of these terms is apparently reversed because the transcendantal reality existed prior to and itself was (directly or indirectly) the τόμος (8:5, following Exod 25:40), and therefore the ἄντιτύπωμα (9:24), "that which corresponded to the τόμος," was the earthly advance-presentation of the prior-existing but later-functioning heavenly reality.

It must be recognized, however, that the NT hermeneutical usage of τόμος/ἀντιτύπωμα goes beyond common Greek usage. Apparently beginning with Paul, the word τόμος (along with ἄντιτύπωμα) seems to approach the status of a hermeneutical terminus technicus, used
in interpreting the significance of past historical realities (1 Cor 10). Since in all of the NT hermeneutical ἔννοας passages ἔννοας and cognates function as specific hermeneutic terms in the biblical author's hermeneutic endeavors, they may therefore be taken as terminological indicators of the presence of typology in these passages, and the emergent ἔννοας structures may be viewed as typological structures.

The specialized hermeneutical use of ἔννοας may have become a familiar one in the early church, and the author of 1 Peter appears to have employed ἄντι-ἔννοας in a corresponding sense. But the infrequency of occurrences of these terms in the NT, and the apparent reversal of referents in Heb 8 and 9, may indicate that the words have not yet become fixed or exclusive technical terms to describe the phenomena of typology.

There appears to be no word-substitution in modern languages that adequately represent the semantic contours of ἐννοομένον/ἔννοας as hermeneutical terms. The Christian church seems to have taken the proper course in simply transliterating the Greek words. Thus in English the ἔννοας is a "type" and ἄντι-ἔννοας an "antitype."

There appears to be a relationship between the five ἔννοας structures and Heilsgegeschichte, salvation history. The salvation-historical perspective includes the historicality of the OT and NT realities. It has in view the same three aspects of eschatological fulfillment that occur in the eschatological structure, aspects which also involve the Christological-soteriological and ecclesiological structures. These aspects include inaugurated eschatology (fulfillment with the first advent of Christ), appropriated eschatology (fulfillment in the church of Christ--corporately, individually, and/or sacramentally), and consummated eschatology (fulfillment in connection with the second advent of Christ). These three aspects of the eschatological fulfillment may be termed (respectively) the "Christological," "ecclesiological," and "apocalyptic."

It appears that the historicality of the historical ἔννοας structure, and three theological ἔννοας structures--eschatological, Christological-soteriological, and ecclesiological--may be identified with constituent elements of salvation history and may be subsumed under that heading (as "salvation-historical" ἔννοας structures). Within the broad sweep of salvation history, certain individual persons, events, or institutions are further conditioned by the other elements of the historical ἔννοας structure--historical correspondence and Steigerung--and by the prophetic ἔννοας structure (advance-presentation/profiguration, divine design, and prospective/predictive devir-eatra). Salvation history provides the framework within which these additional structural elements operate.

Based upon our analysis of the constituent ἔννοας structures consistently emerging from the hermeneutical ἔννοας passages, and following from our subsumption of certain structures (or structural elements) under the heading of salvation history, we conclude this chapter with a tentative definition of typology. It is difficult to incorporate all of the data that we have examined in a single definition, but the following is a preliminary suggestion. Typology as a hermeneutical endeavor on the part of the biblical writers may be viewed 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-être) and absolutely eschatological fulfillment aspects (Christological/ecclesiological/apocalyptic) in NT salvation history. It must be recognized that in horizontal ἀντιτύπος passages (1 Cor 10. Rom 5, 1 Pet 3), the word ἀντιτύπος refers to the OT reality and ἀντιὑποτήτος to the NT fulfillment, while in the vertical/horizontal typology of Hebrews, the reverse is true. The difference in Hebrews, as we have seen, apparently arises because the NT reality (the heavenly sanctuary) existed prior to the OT reality and so the earthly is in Hebrews the (ontological) ἀντιὑποτήτος for the heavenly. However, since the functional movement of the typology in Hebrews (from OT reality to the NT fulfillment) is the same as that in other ἀντιτύπος passages, it does not appear to violate the basic thrust of Hebrews if--for the sake of convenience and consistency--in future study we employ the term "type" (τύπος) functionally in its most common 'hermeneutical' usage to refer to the OT reality, and "antitype" (ἀντιὑποτήτος) to denote the NT fulfillment.

From our analysis of NT hermeneutical ἀντιτύπος passages a number of implications for the recent debate over the nature of typology have become apparent. The emergent ἀντιτύπος structures appear to confirm certain essential features of the traditional understanding of typology which stand in tension with post-critical neo-typological views. First, the historical reality of the OT "types" seems to form an indispensable (and not optional) part of the author's devoir-être argument in the typological interpretation. Second, typology in these hermeneutical passages is not only a theology of history but an interpretation of Scriptural passages, not only an interpretation of persons, events, and institutions per se but an interpretation of these realities as recorded in Scripture. Third, the typological relationship between OT and NT realities in these passages is not limited to general "parallel situations" but extends to specific correspondences of significant details. Fourth, the typology of these hermeneutical ἀντιτύπος passages is not only retrospective but also prospective. It is not merely the recognition of a recurring rhythm or structural analogy within God's revelation in history but consists of divinely designed, predictive (devoir-être) prefigurations. Finally, the typological structures of Heb 8 and 9 (viewed in the light of Exod 25 and numerous other OT passages) appear to indicate that vertical as well as horizontal typology is indigenous to the biblical perspective and is not to be depreciated as an "Alexandrian-Hellenistic" or "myth-cosmic" dimension alien to the eschatological-historical dimension.

The ἀντιτύπος structures that have emerged from our analysis of hermeneutical ἀντιτύπος passages also appear to support certain emphases within post-critical neo-typology which have been largely overlooked in major traditional views of typology. First, typology in the NT hermeneutical ἀντιτύπος passages is invariably directly related to Christological-soteriological realities and does not consist of trivial and extraneous details (as in much of the Cocceian mode). Second, the typological correspondence between OT and NT realities does not occur on the same plane (as frequently in the
Cocceian mode) but there is an absolutely intensified eschatological
Steigerung between OT type and NT antitype. Third, typology is not
limited to Levitical institutions (as Friederichsen asserts) but
(also) involves various persons and events in salvation history.
Finally, the typology of the NT hermeneutical τύπος passages in-
volves the NT perspective of inaugurated, appropriated, and con-
summated eschatology (which perspective is often unrecognized or
not clearly elucidated by exponents of traditional views).

Several aspects of the nature of typology which have emerged
from our analysis of hermeneutical τύπος structures have not re-
ceived sufficient attention in either the traditional or post-
critical explications of biblical typology. First, though the
threefold eschatological perspective of the NT has been recognized
(as pointed out above), the ramifications of this perspective for
typology have not been explored in depth. Second, the devoir-être
linkage between OT types and their NT fulfillments has not received
adequate articulation or sufficient emphasis in the literature on
typology. Finally, the OT indications of the existence of typology
as explicitly pointed out by the auctor ad Hebraeos (and possibly
implied in 1 Cor 10:11 and other hermeneutical τύπος passages)
have not been thoroughly investigated. These elements of typology
have surfaced in the present chapter but call for further treat-
ment in a later study.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has sought to ascertain the nature of
biblical typology by allowing its conceptual structures to emerge
from within the biblical text through a semasiological analysis of
the term τύπος and NT cognates and on exegetical investigation of
the hermeneutical τύπος passages in the NT.

In the first chapter the stage was set for our study with
a review of pertinent literature. We attempted to provide the
first comprehensive survey of significant participants, views and
issues in the twentieth-century discussion of biblical typology.
This was placed against the backdrop of a concise overview of
typological interpretation in preceding centuries.

Several leading twentieth-century trends emerged from this
literature survey. We found that the traditional understanding—as
articulated in previous centuries and still advocated in certain
conservative circles—views biblical typology as the study of
specific OT realities which were divinely ordained to be prescriptive/
predictive prefigurations of Jesus Christ and/or the Gospel
realities brought about by him. Three main traditional modes
were distinguished. The Coccein mode operates with little or no
hermeneutical controls and often posits typological correspondences
where there is only the slightest resemblance between OT and NT
(or contemporary political) realities. The Marshian mode, on the
other hand, maintains that the only legitimate types are those explicitly confirmed in the NT. A mediating position represented by Fairbairn's classic nineteenth-century study espouses a typology controlled by carefully delineated hermeneutical principles.

It became apparent from our literature review that the traditional views of biblical typology have been generally discredited within modern critical scholarship. Throughout the latter nineteenth and early twentieth centuries typology was widely considered a relic of the past, no longer acceptable or relevant within the modern worldview. But we also found that in recent decades an amazing resurgence of interest in biblical typology has taken place among noted advocates of the historical-critical method within the Biblical Theology Movement. This "post-critical neo-typology" is not, however, a return to the traditional understanding. It is founded upon a different view of history and revelation which has little room for the predictive element. Typology is viewed as a common human way of analogical thinking which in Scripture and in modern typological interpretation involves the retrospective recognition of general correspondences within the consistent divine "revelation in history."

Two main traditions or emphases within post-critical neo-typology were distinguished. An English tradition, represented by Lampe and Woolcombe, stresses the "recurring rhythm" of God's saving activity, while a German emphasis, represented by von Rad, conceives of an unlimited number of "structural analogies" within tradition history.

In our review of literature we found that the instauration of typological interpretation within modern biblical scholarship has resulted in numerous review articles and biblical studies on typology as well as treatments of the subject within such disciplines as systematic and dogmatic theology, church history, art and architecture, and literary criticism. The modern use of typology has also called forth vigorous protest from a number of biblical scholars.

Despite the vast amount of literature on the subject of biblical typology that has appeared in previous centuries and particularly in recent decades, our survey of literature revealed that almost every area of typological interpretation is as yet unsettled. Even among the representatives of the various trends that have just been outlined, there is an almost bewildering disparity of opinions on many crucial issues.

We found that the primary question concerns the nature of biblical typology. Underlying this fundamental question we discovered a serious methodological deficiency that characterizes previous studies of the biblical use of typology. To a greater or lesser degree it was noted that an a priori understanding of typology--based on little or no exegetical analysis--has been projected upon Scripture, and the biblical material has then been examined from the perspective of the preconceived understanding.

In an attempt to remedy this methodological weakness we formulated what appears to be the most adequate procedure to follow in allowing the structures of typology to emerge from within the biblical text. Since our subject is biblical typology--the study of biblical "types" or "analogs"--it was argued that the usage of the
Greek word τόνος as a hermeneutical term in Scripture provides a preliminary terminological control for the presence of typology. Two major steps were outlined in order to utilize this terminological control. First, a semasiological investigation of τόνος and NT cognates could be expected to reveal the overall semantic range of these terms and their breadth of signification in the various biblical occurrences, and also make apparent which NT passages are hermeneutical passages. Second, a careful analysis of the NT hermeneutical passages could be expected to reveal in which passages τόνος or cognate is used as a hermeneutical term—and in these latter passages could also be expected to lay bare the inherent conceptual structures of biblical typology. These two procedural steps have been attempted in our second and third chapters respectively.

In the second chapter we conducted a semasiological investigation of τόνος and NT cognates up to and including NT times. It was found that the Greek term τόνος (and its cognates) appears to be derived from the verb τόνω "to strike." From an early emphasis upon the basic idea of "form" (i.e., the result of a blow or pressure and/or that which gives the blow or impression), probably originally a "hollow form" or "hold," τόνος was seen to pass through a number of stages of semantic development, while at the same time retaining earlier significations.

In our examination of the semantic range of τόνος and cognates in secular Greek literature and the literature of late Judaism, we found that previous lexicographical studies had neglected to adequately substantiate the various significations of these terms by providing illustrations with sufficient context so that the meanings might become evident from the citations. Previous studies had also failed to place the semantic range of τόνος and biblical cognates in a broader perspective by indicating how the various significations of these terms overlap with the semantic ranges of other Greek words. These deficiencies we sought to remedy for each significiation.

Our analysis of the non-biblical usage of τόνος revealed an astonishing wealth of significations which we classified under ten major categories and numerous sub-categories. Underlying this breadth of semantic range three basic meanings were isolated: (1) the matrix, or Vorbild, i.e., what leaves its impress; (2) the impression or Nachbildung, i.e., the result of the impress or blow; and (3) the matrix or Vorbild which is simultaneously an impression or Nachbildung. The third basic meaning, involving a dual (Nachbildung-Vorbild) perspective, was found to be largely overlooked by lexicographers.

Out of some seventy different cognates of τόνος appearing in extant non-biblical sources only three occur in the NT: ὑποτύπωσις, τυπικός, and ὑποτυπώσις. Our semasiological analysis revealed that the various significations of the noun/adjective ὑποτύπωσις outside the NT are related either to the basic sense of "strike back" or to the second basic meaning, "corresponding, antitypical." The infrequently used adverb τυπικός (closely related to the adjective τυπικός) also has two basic meanings: (1) "open to impressions"; and (2) "corresponding to a type." The basic meanings of the noun ὑποτυπώσις are "model" and "sketch." The prefixed ὑπο- often gives this compound the special meaning of "a form outlined as the basis of further work,"
which meaning involves the same two-fold (Nachbild-Vorbild) perspective that may be found in τόμος.

The substantive τόμος occurs fifteen times in the NT, while the cognates όριον and ύποτασσω each appear twice and τόμας is found only once. We discovered that no detailed semasiological analysis of these NT occurrences in their contexts had yet been conducted. Even the studies of Goppelt and Müller (the most complete treatments) make only passing reference to a number of NT occurrences and often set forth their conclusions without substantiating analysis. Hence our study attempted to systematically examine the semantic contours of τόμος and cognates in the NT.

All of the basic meanings of τόμος were found to be represented in the NT: Vorbild, Nachbild, and nachbildliches Vorbild. The semantic range involves such significations as "mark, print" (John 20:25); "idol" (Acts 7:43); "pattern, mold" (Acts 7:44); and "text, form of expression" (Acts 23:25).

In Rom 6:17 and the eight NT passages (seven Pauline and one Petrine) where τόμος or τόμας is employed in an ethical context, we encountered a rich complex of semantic contributions. To a greater or lesser degree, depending upon the emphasis of the particular context, the following semantic contributions were found to be present: (1) a Vorbild (matrix), which functions as (a) a dynamic shaping power and (b) an authoritative norm, telologically oriented beyond itself to that which it norms; (2) a Nachbild (impression of matrix) which is (a) a form with specific content and (b) divinely derived. Furthermore, within the ethical passages we noted how τόμος and τόμας present a spectrum of Nachbild-

Vorbild sequences as applied successively to the apostle and his associates, to the elders or leaders of the local congregation, to the other members of the congregation, and ultimately directing its stamp or mold to the Christian church at large and non-believers.

These broad semantic dimensions were seen to have been largely overlooked in recent literature dealing with the usage of τόμος and biblical cognates.

In the course of our semasiological investigation of NT τόμος passages we encountered six occurrences of τόμος and cognates which occur in a hermeneutical context: 1 Cor 10:6, 11; Rom 5:14; 1 Pet 3:21; Heb 8:5 (= Exod 25:40 LXX) and 9:24.

In the third chapter we attempted to provide the first detailed analysis of these NT hermeneutical τόμος passages undertaken with a view toward exposing the inherent τόμος structures. We began with an examination—in their contexts and in probable order of composition—of the τόμος passages which were seen to involve horizontal structures, namely, 1 Cor 10:1-13; Rom 5:12-21; and 1 Pet 3:18-21. Then we focused upon the passages which were seen to involve vertical (earth/heaven) as well as horizontal structures, namely Heb 8:5 and 9:24 in their contexts. This was followed by an excursion dealing with the possible vertical structures in Exod 25:40—the OT passage cited in Heb 8:5.

We conducted the most extensive investigation of 1 Cor 10:1-13 since it was seen to be (most probably) the earliest of the hermeneutical τόμος passages and the only one in which the existence of typology has been seriously questioned. In connection with this first passage we were also able to develop the basic terminology to
describe various structural elements which did not require an extensive elaboration in connection with succeeding passages where similar structural elements were found.

In the study of Rom 5, 1 Pet 3, and the Hebrews passages, where typology has been generally recognized, it was possible to build upon the significant exegetical studies that had already been undertaken even though these studies did not focus specifically upon τόνος structures. We augmented this previous research by fresh analysis of crucial unresolved structural issues.

From our analysis of the NT hermeneutical τόνος passages, five τόνος structures consistently emerged. The first is the historical structure. The remaining four structures are theological: (1) the eschatological structure; (2) the Christological-soteriological structure; (3) the ecclesiological structure; and (4) the prophetic structure. In all of the hermeneutical τόνος passages these structures function on a horizontal plane. In Heb 8:5 and 9:24 the structures also function vertically. In our excursus on Exod 25:40, we also found a vertical (earth-heaven) sanctuary correspondence apparently already implicit.

The historical structure consists of several aspects. First, the OT τόνος (cultic ἀντίκειμενος) is assumed to be a historical reality occurring or existing as recorded in Scripture. Second, building upon this historicality and Scriptural determination the NT author points out an historical correspondence between the OT τόνος (cultic ἀντίκειμενος) and their NT counterparts. The historical correspondence involves persons, events or institutions. It extends even to details connected with the OT and NT realities but apparently only to such details as are salvifically significant already in the OT. The correspondence can be either antithetical or synergetic. But even when there is a comparison of similarities, a third aspect of the historical structure appears to be present. The NT reality seems invariably to involve an absolute Steigerung or escalation of the OT τόνος (cultic ἀντίκειμενος).

The eschatological structure clarifies the nature of the historical correspondence and Steigerung. The OT τόνος (cultic ἀντίκειμενος) are not just linked to any similar realities. They find their fulfillment—we use the word fulfillment because of the prophetic structure explained below—in the eschatological realities of the NT. The eschatological fulfillment of the OT τόνος (cultic ἀντίκειμενος) involves three possible aspects: the past inauguration of the eschatological Kingdom at Christ's first advent; the present spiritual appropriation of the kingdom by the Church; and the future consummation at the Parousia. The various hermeneutical τόνος passages focus upon one or more of these aspects of the eschatological fulfillment.

The Christological-soteriological structure is crucial in its determination of the content of the τόνος/ἀντίκειμενος. The OT τόνος (cultic ἀντίκειμενος) find their fulfillment in Christ or in the realities of the new covenant related to and brought about by Christ. Christ is presented as the ultimate orientation point of the τόνος (cultic ἀντίκειμενος) and their NT fulfillments. The precise nature of the NT fulfillment is also clarified in the light of the Christ-event. Intrinsically bound up with the Christological is the soteriological component of this structure. The correspondence of
the ἀντίγραφος is not between "bare" or "neutral" historical events, persons, or institutions, but between those that are soteriologically "charged." The OT τόκος (cultic ἀντίγραφος) are salvific realities, and they find their fulfillment in the soteriological work of Christ and/or in the new covenant soteriological realities issuing from Christ. This soteriological dimension is thoroughly Christocentric, i.e., either positive (salvific for those responding to Christ's grace) or negative (retributive for those who spurn the manifestation of salvation).

The ecclesiological structure includes three possible aspects: the individual worshiper, the corporate Christian community, and/or the sacraments of the church. In 1 Cor 10, for instance, all of these aspects are emphasized. The experiences of ancient Israel in the wilderness happened τόκος, as τόκος of the end-time congregation (vss. 6, 11), the Christian church. This involves a correspondence between the sacraments of ancient Israel and Christian baptism and the Lord’s Supper (vss. 1-4), and it further calls for a personal decision whether to be faithful or disobedient (vss. 5-10).

The prophetic structure also involves three aspects. First, the OT τόκος (cultic ἀντίγραφος) are an advance-presentation or prefiguration of the corresponding NT reality or realities. Second, there is revealed a divine design in which the OT realities were superintended by God so as to be prefigurative even in specific soteriologically related details. Finally, the divinely designed prefigurations involve a devoir-être ("must-needs-be") quality that gives them the force of ineluctable, prospective/predictive foreshadowings of their intended NT fulfillments.

The term τόκος in its signification of "hollow mold" was seen to be amazingly well-suited to encompass the linear Nachbild-Vorbild dynamics involved in the nature of the OT τόκος (1 Cor 10; Rom 6). Likewise, the NT eschatological fulfillment is fittingly termed ἀντίγραφος "that which corresponds to the τόκος" (1 Pet 3).

In Hebrews the same Nachbild-Vorbild dynamics are present as in the other hermeneutical τόκος passages, but the use of the terms τόκος and ἀντίγραφος is reversed. This is apparently because in Heb 8:5 the author ad Hebraeos commits himself to the usage of τόκος as it is found in Exod 25:40 LXX (where τόκος probably refers to the heavenly sanctuary and/or the miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary), and in Heb 9:24 he remains consistent with the usage of τόκος in Heb 8:5 (= Exod 25:40 LXX) and employs ἀντίγραφος in the sense of "that which corresponds to the τόκος," i.e., the earthly sanctuary. Although the same linear Nachbild-Vorbild dynamics are present in these hermeneutical τόκος passages as we found in certain non-hermeneutical τόκος passages, at the same time our study revealed (pace Beker) that the semantic contours of τόκος and cognates in the hermeneutical τόκος passages transcend the non-hermeneutical usage of these terms and approach a technical status. Furthermore, because in all of the NT hermeneutical τόκος passages τόκος and cognates do function as specific hermeneutical terms in the biblical authors' hermeneutical endeavors, we concluded that they may therefore be taken as terminological indicators of the presence of typology in these passages.
We found no word-substitution in modern languages that adequately represents the semantic contours of τύπος and cognates as hermeneutical terms. It appears that the Christian church has taken the proper course in generally transliterating the Greek words. Thus in English the τύπος is a "type" and υπότυπος an "antitype." The τύπος structures may be termed "typological structures" and their study may appropriately be called "typology." 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 υπότυπος 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.

Following our analysis of NT hermeneutical τύπος passages and their emergent τύπος structures, we posited a relationship between the structures of typology and those of salvation history. It was noted that the historicity of the historical structures and three theological structures—the eschatological, Christological-soteriological, and ecclesiological—appear to be identical to constituent elements of salvation history and may therefore be subsumed under that heading as "salvation-historical structures." Within the sweep of salvation history certain persons, events, or institutions are further conditioned by the other elements of the historical structure (historical correspondence and Steigerung) and by the prophetic structure (prefiguration, divine design, and prospective/predictive devoir-être). Salvation history thus appears to provide the suprastructure within which these additional structural elements are worked out.

Based upon our analysis of typological structures and their apparent relationship to salvation history, we concluded the third chapter with a tentative definition of biblical typology. Typology as a hermeneutical endeavor on the part of the biblical writers was defined as the study of certain OT salvation-historical realities (persons, events, or institutions) which God specifically designed to correspond to, and be prospective-predictive prefigurations of, their elucubrations (devoir-être) and absolutely escalated eschatological fulfillment aspects (inaugurated/appropriate/consummated) within NT salvation history.

From our analysis of typological structures in NT hermeneutical τύπος passages a number of implications for the recent debate over the nature of biblical typology have become apparent. The emergent τύπος structures appear to confirm certain significant features of the traditional understanding of typology which stand in tension with post-critical neo-typological views. First, the historical reality of the OT types does not appear to be optional (pace, e.g., Goppelt) but seems to form an indispensable part of the biblical authors' devoir-être argument in the typological interpretation. Second, typology in the hermeneutical τύπος passages is not only a theology of history (pace, e.g., Becket, Goppelt, and von Rad) but an interpretation of Scriptural passages. Third, the typological relationship between OT and NT realities involves not only a general correspondence (pace, e.g., Becket and Goppelt) but extends to specific parallel details. Fourth, this typological
correspondence is not only retrospective but also prospective. Typology is not merely a recognition of the "recurring rhythm" (pace, e.g., Lempé and Woolcombe) or "structural analogy" (pace, e.g., von Rad) within God's revelation in history, but consists of divinely designed, predictive (devoir-être) prefigurations of specific NT fulfillments. Finally, the typological structures of Heb 8 and 9 (viewed in the light of Exod 25 and numerous other OT passages) appear to indicate that vertical typology is not to be depreciated as an "Alexandrian-Hellenistic" (pace, e.g., Klaapert) or a "myth-cosmic" (pace, e.g., Goppelt) dimension alien to the eschatological-historical dimension, but is (along with horizontal typology) indigenous to the biblical perspective.

In other crucial areas our analysis of hermeneutical rōmos structures has revealed that post-critical neo-typology has rightly recognized structural elements which have often been overlooked in traditional explications of the nature of typology. First, typology does not appear to consist of trivial and extraneous details (as in much of the Cocceian mode) but is invariably directly related to Christological-soteriological realities. Second, there is an absolutely intensified eschatological Steigerung between OT type and NT antitype which is often ignored in Cocceian typological interpretation. Third, typology is not limited to Levitical institutions (pace Friederichen) but includes various persons and events in salvation history. Finally, the typological structures emerging from our analysis of NT hermeneutical rōmos passages involves the NT perspective of three possible eschatological fulfillment aspects--inaugurated, appropriated, and consummated--which is often unrecognized or not clearly elucidated by exponents of traditional views.

Several points which have emerged from our analysis of typological structures have not received sufficient attention in either the traditional or post-critical explications of biblical typology. First, although the relationship of typology to salvation history has been recognized, the ramifications of this interconnection have not been explored in depth. Second, the literature on typology has not adequately articulated or sufficiently emphasized the devoir-être linkage between OT types and their NT fulfillments. Finally, there has not been a thorough investigation of the indications in the OT itself of the presence of typology. These points have been touched upon in connection with our analysis of representative typological passages, but they require further study in greater depth.

This dissertation by no means constitutes the "final word" on the nature of biblical typology. Our conclusions must remain tentative until case studies of various typological motifs have examined the whole of Scripture for the existence of typology. The larger perspective, the examination of rōmos structures in passages where the terminological control is not present, may further elucidate--or perhaps even suggest additions to or modifications of--the typological structures that have emerged from our foundational study. It is hoped that this dissertation has also provided incentive for future studies to go beyond the fundamental question of the nature of biblical typology and re-examine other issues in the recent debate--such as the origin and scope of
biblical typology, its function and purpose in Scripture, its relation to other hermeneutical approaches (in Scripture, in the literature of late Judaism, and in contemporary exegesis), and its contemporary relevance. It may then be ultimately possible to articulate a definitive, comprehensive statement on the hermeneutics of biblical typology.
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