

FINDING CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

G. K. BEALE*

Abstract: *The Old Testament anticipates the coming Christ in a number of discernible ways, not least of which is that of typology. In the present study, an approach will be set forth which justifies “seeing Christ in all of Scripture.” This approach does not read in Christological ideas where they are not present but develops the original meaning of the Old Testament. Various criteria for discerning types of Christ in the Old Testament will be discussed, along with certain presuppositions of New Testament writers in interpreting the Old Testament. Additionally, attention will be given to the question of Christophanies in the Old Testament, and the incomplete nature of the Old Testament as anticipating the New Testament.*

Key words: *use of the Old Testament in the New Testament, typology, prophecy, Christotelic, Christocentric, Christophany*

The relation of the OT to the NT not only has been an area of debate between evangelicals and non-evangelicals but also among evangelicals themselves. The issue is whether or not Jesus and the NT writers interpreted OT passages in line with their original OT meaning. Some scholars, including some evangelical scholars, argue that Jesus and the NT writers found Christ in OT passages where the OT writer never intended any reference to Christ. Thus, they were reading their Christological lens into OT passages that originally had nothing to do with Christ.

There are numerous examples where scholars view the NT writers to be “reading in Christ” to OT passages that originally had nothing to do with Christ. Though other passages could be cited, a classic example is Matthew’s use of Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15. Matthew’s use of Hos 11:1 is a well-known, notoriously difficult and debated text: Joseph “was there [Egypt] until the death of Herod in order that what had been spoken by the Lord through the prophet should be fulfilled, ‘*Out of Egypt I called my son.*’”¹ There are three problems with how Matthew uses the OT passage from Hosea. The first is that the verse in Hosea is a mere historical reflection, but Matthew clearly understands it as a direct prophecy that is fulfilled in Christ. The second problem is that what Hosea attributes to the nation Israel, Matthew attributes to the individual Jesus. Third, the Hos 11:1 reference to Israel com-

* G. K. Beale is J. Gresham Machen chair of NT and research professor of NT and biblical interpretation at Westminster Theological Seminary, 2960 Church Road, Glenside, PA 19038. This essay is a minor revision of a plenary address titled “Finding Christ in the Old Testament” delivered at the annual meeting of the ETS on November 20, 2019 in San Diego, CA. Much of the essay has been previously published elsewhere, and has been footnoted accordingly, though the present organization of the material is revised and different.

¹ It is clear that Matthew has quoted the Hebrew of Hos 11:1 (which reads “my son”) and not the Greek OT (which reads “his children”), on which see, e.g., D. A. Carson, *Matthew* (EBC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 91.

ing out of Egypt first introduces the holy family with Jesus entering into Egypt, and it is only later in Matt 2:21 that Jesus and his parents come out of Egypt.

In view of these problems, there have been a variety of responses. One evangelical Reformed commentator has said that this passage is “a parade example of the manner in which the NT uses the OT,” especially in not being “interested in reproducing the meaning” of the OT texts but in reading into the OT foreign Christological presuppositions.² Another evangelical commentator has said that this is “the most troubling case” of “NT exegesis of the OT” for many people.³

Others have viewed the use of Hosea 11 as a mere mistaken interpretation by Matthew, somehow viewing Hos 11:1 as a prophecy when it was only a historical reflection on the original exodus.⁴ For example, M. Eugene Boring has said that “Matthew’s use of Scripture” in Matthew 1 and 2, including the Hosea 11 quotation, is “in contrast with their obvious original [OT] meaning,” and “the changes he makes in the text itself . . . make him subject to the charge of manipulating the evidence in a way that would be unconvincing to outsiders.”⁵

Still other evangelical commentators have attributed to Matthew a Qumran-like special revelatory insight into the “full meaning” (*sensus plenior*) of Hos 11:1, a revelatory stance no longer available to subsequent church interpreters.⁶ Moreover, other evangelical interpreters have understood Matthew to be employing a faulty hermeneutic used elsewhere in Judaism, which Christian interpreters should not emulate, but that nonetheless the interpretative conclusion is purportedly inspired by God.⁷

² Peter Enns, “Biblical Interpretation, Jewish,” *DNTB* 164 (for the Enns reference, I am thankful to James W. Scott, “The Inspiration and Interpretation of God’s Word with Special Reference to Peter Enns, Part II: The Interpretation of Representative Passages,” *WTJ* 71 [2009]: 264).

³ Martin Pickup, “New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament: The Theological Rationale of Midrashic Exegesis,” *JETS* 51 (2008): 371, who says “it is futile to try to defend Matthew’s messianic interpretation of Hos 11:1 on grammatical-historical grounds” (372; see also 373) and “[t]o put it bluntly, Matthew appears to be reading Hos 11:1 out of context” (374).

⁴ E.g., D. M. Beegle, *Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), 236–38. See also David L. Turner, *Matthew* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 90, who, while not in agreement, gives a sampling of scholars holding this view. Cf. G. E. Ladd, “Historic Premillennialism,” in *The Meaning of the Millennium* (ed. R. G. Clouse; Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 1977), 20–21, who says that Matthew’s interpretation of Hos 11:1 as a prophecy was not intended by Hosea as a prophecy but only a description of a past event (Israel’s exodus out of Egypt).

⁵ Boring, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NIB 8; Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), 153. Similarly, S. V. McCasland, “Matthew Twists the Scriptures,” *JBL* 80 (1961): 144–46, says that Matthew “misunderstood Hosea 11:1” and “found a meaning entirely foreign to the original” of that in the Hosea passage. So also William Barclay, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956), 35–36, and likewise Theodore H. Robinson, *The Gospel of Matthew* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928), 9.

⁶ See, e.g., G. D. Fee and D. Stuart, *How to Read the Bible for All Its Worth* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 166–67; see again Turner, *Matthew*, 90, for examples for this among other commentators.

⁷ See, e.g., Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 124–25, especially when seen together with Longenecker’s general hermeneutical approach to the OT in the NT in “Who Is the Prophet Talking About? Some Reflections on the New Testament’s Use of the Old,” *Them* 13 (1987): 4–8; and “Can We Reproduce the Exegesis of the New Testament?” *TynBul* 21 (1970): 3–38. The view of Beegle cited directly above also comes close to this perspective.

Somewhat similarly, but with a new wrinkle, others have concluded that Matthew's interpretation of Hos 11:1 is not to be considered correct according to our modern standards of interpretation but was part of an acceptable Jewish hermeneutic in the first-century world, which modern scholars have no right to judge as wrong.⁸ According to this view, the interpretative procedure, while strange, is to be seen as Spirit-inspired and even as a pattern for the contemporary church to follow.

From another perspective, some see the interpretative procedure not to be wrong but so unique that Christians today should not dare to practice the same procedure in approaching other similar OT passages that merely narrate a historical event. Usually such conclusions are made because Matthew (and other NT writers) is being judged by what is often called a "grammatical-historical" interpretative method and by a particular understanding of that method.

Finally, there are scholars who understand Matthew to be viewing Israel's past exodus out of Egypt in Hos 11:1 as generally typological of Jesus coming out of Egypt in the light of the broader OT canonical context.⁹ This last approach is the one I will take in this paper, not only in relation to Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15 but also with respect to other passages narrating historical events which NT writers viewed as prophetic of Christ or the church.

Outside of the Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15 passage, there are many others that exhibit the same kind of problem, that is, OT historical events taken as prophecies by Jesus and the apostles. As far back as 1724, the deist Anthony Collins, a disciple of John Locke, said that "typological interpretation is absurd"¹⁰ and the OT passages identified as messianic prophecies by Jews and NT writers were not intended as messianic by the OT writers.¹¹ He went on to say that "the Apostles ... argued, not by scholastic [hermeneutical] rules, and did not interpret the passages they cited out of the Old Testament according to the obvious and literal sense they bore."¹² Note the various comments about such passages by more modern scholars: S. V. McCasland in his article "Matthew Twists the Scriptures," says that Matthew's use of "Isaiah 7:14 ... shows ... how a misinterpreted passage might become ... influential" in the early Christian community.¹³

⁸ This is the general approach to the OT in the NT by Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 113–63, who includes the use of Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15 among his examples (p. 134); Enns wants to classify this as an "odd use," on which see further his subsequent article "Response to Professor Beale," *Them* 32 (2007): 9–11; and Dan McCartney and Peter Enns, "Matthew and Hosea: A Response to John Sailhamer," *WTJ* 63 (2001): 97–105. Nevertheless, Enns's actual explanation is what I would consider to be a biblical-theological one that is not contrary to the standards of doing biblical theology today and which biblical theologians would accept and understand (see my further analysis in *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism: Responding to New Challenges to Biblical Authority* [Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2008], 88–89).

⁹ Among many, see R. T. France, *Matthew* (NIVTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 40, 86; Carson, *Matthew*, 91–93; and Turner, *Matthew*, 90–91.

¹⁰ This is the assessment of James O'Higgins, *Anthony Collins: The Man and His Works* (International Archives of the History of Ideas 35; The Hague: Martinus Nijhof, 1970), 166.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 169.

¹² *Ibid.*, 168.

¹³ McCasland, "Matthew Twists the Scriptures," 149.

Professor Morna Hooker, former holder of the Lady Margaret Chair of Divinity at the University of Cambridge, summarized the NT writers' use of the OT in the following way:

Any New Testament scholar who is in any way interested in the problem of hermeneutics is well aware of the dichotomy between the approach of New Testament authors to "Scripture" and our own. A study of their methods of exegesis must surely make any twentieth-century preacher uncomfortable, for they tear passages out of context, use allegory or typology to give old stories new meanings, contradict the plain meaning of the text, find references to Christ in passages where the original authors certainly never intended any, and adapt or even alter the wording in order to make it yield the meaning they require. Often one is left exclaiming: whatever the passage from the Old Testament originally meant, it certainly was not this! Yet we cannot simply dismiss their interpretation as false, for they were certainly being true to the exegetical methods of their day. Moreover, although the biblical scholar's primary concern will always be with the original meaning of his material, the present tendency in hermeneutics is to emphasize that "meaning" can never be limited to the intentions of an author. We may consider that the meaning which Paul gave to the prohibition to muzzle an ox in Deuteronomy 25:4 would have seemed as foreign to the original author as it seems far-fetched to us; but it is at least worth asking *why* Paul interprets Scripture in this kind of way. What was his underlying hermeneutical principle?—If, indeed, he had one ...

Although he [Paul] may frequently quote from Scripture, the interpretation he gives it often lies beyond the obvious meaning of the text. His somewhat artificial exegesis leaves one wondering whether there is anything which it would not be possible for him to argue on the basis of Scripture.¹⁴

James Barr has said similarly,

Our Lord's remarks in interpretation of Old Testament passages have authority for us because he spoke them, but it is often difficult for us to say that they can count as right interpretations of the text or, in other words, it is difficult or impossible for us to universalize them and draw from them a principle or method which we could affirm as our own ... it is doubtful whether there is any current in modern scholarship which feels able to make the principles and procedures of pre-critical exegesis [like that of Jesus] its own.¹⁵

Finally, there is an "in-house" evangelical debate about whether or not Christ can be found in every verse of Scripture, especially revolving around Luke 24:27, 44. We shall discuss this debate later in this paper.

The purpose of this address is to present an approach which justifies "seeing Christ in all of Scripture" in a way that develops the original meaning of the OT and does not read in Christological ideas where they are not present.

¹⁴ Morna Hooker, "Beyond the Things That Are Written? Saint Paul's Use of Scripture," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. G. K. Beale; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 279–80.

¹⁵ James Barr, *Holy Scripture: Canon, Authority, Criticism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983), 116.

I. HERMENEUTICAL APPROACHES VIEWING CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT¹⁶

1. *Direct prophecies of Christ from the Old Testament in the New Testament.* Here a direct prediction is made of the Messiah in the OT and the NT cites it as being fulfilled in Christ. Examples include Matt 2:5; 3:2–3; Acts 2:30–35; 8:32; 13:33–34, 47 (applied to the apostles); Rom 15:12; and 1 Pet 2:22. Note also Gen 3:15 in Rom 16:20; Gen 49:9–10 in Rev 5:5.

2. *Types of Christ in the Old Testament.*¹⁷ One major question at issue here is whether or not typology essentially indicates an analogy between the OT and NT¹⁸ or whether it also includes some kind of prophetic foreshadowing.¹⁹ And, even among those who may include the notion of the forward-looking element, most hold that it is so only from the NT writer's viewpoint and *not from the OT vantage point*.²⁰ Many would qualify this further by saying that while the OT author has no awareness of any foreshadowing sense, the fuller divine intention did include it. Some who also hold to a retrospective prophetic view from the NT writer's viewpoint, however, may not see this as even part of the fuller divine intention in the OT but a completely new meaning given under inspiration.²¹ The last two positions, especially the last, would view the NT typological interpretation not to be in line with the meaning of the OT passage. Of course, there are other scholars who do not hold to any form of divine inspiration of Scripture and who would view the NT's typological interpretation of the OT to be a distortion of the OT intention.

A definition of typology that includes both analogy and a prophetic element is the following: *Typology is the study of analogical correspondences between persons, events, institutions, and other things within the historical framework of God's special revelation, which, from a retrospective view, are of a prophetic nature. According to this definition, the essential characteristics of a type are: (1) analogical correspondence; (2) historicity; (3) forward-pointing; (4) escalation; (5) retrospection.*

The latter two elements need some explanation. By "escalation" is meant that the antitype (the NT correspondence) is heightened in some way in relation to the OT type. For example, John 19:36 views the requirement of not breaking the bones of the Passover lamb in the OT epoch to point to the greater reality of the bones of Jesus not being broken at his crucifixion (for this prophetic nuance note the phrase "that the Scripture might be fulfilled"). By "retrospection" is meant the idea that it

¹⁶ This section and the following one (I and II) are a revision of a section in my *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 13–25.

¹⁷ This paragraph and the following two reproduce material nearly verbatim from Beale, *Handbook*, 13–15.

¹⁸ So David L. Baker, "Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament," in Beale, *Right Doctrine from Wrong Texts?*, 313–330.

¹⁹ E.g., see Leonard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); Francis Foulkes, "The Acts of God: A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament," in *Right Doctrine from Wrong Texts?*, 342–371; R. M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*.

²⁰ R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982), 38–43.

²¹ E.g., see apparently Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), e.g., 124–134.

was only after Christ's resurrection under the direction of the Spirit that the apostolic writers understood certain OT historical narratives about persons, events, or institutions to be indirect prophecies of Christ or the church. A qualification, however, needs to be made about how the retrospective view is understood. Recent ongoing research is finding that in the context of some of these OT passages viewed as types by the NT, there is evidence of the foreshadowing nature of the OT narrative, which then is better understood after the coming of Christ.²²

II. CRITERIA FOR DISCERNING TYPES OF CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. *Presence of five elements of typology.* Some hold that the above five elements of typology must be present in order for something to be typological.

2. *Presence of the word *typos* or fulfillment formula in immediate context.* Does the NT reference contain the word *typos* (or its other forms: Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 10:6) or does its immediate context contain a fulfillment formula ("that it might be fulfilled") or some textual feature that indicates a sense of fulfillment ("it is necessary that the Son of Man must be lifted up"; John 12:34)?

The following four points show that types in the NT were already seen to be foreshadowing types in the OT, which show that typology in the NT is not completely retrospective or created by the NT writer, who then imposes it onto the OT. These four points are further criteria for discerning types of Christ in the OT.

3. *Evidence of typological anticipation in immediate context.*²³ Another criterion for discerning types in the NT is to determine if there is evidence of typological anticipation in the immediate context of some OT passages. One example of this is when Matthew understands that Joseph's taking of Jesus into Egypt and back out again is a "fulfillment" of Israel's past journey into Egypt and their exodus back out again, which was narrated by Hos 11:1 in its context: "So Joseph got up and took the Child and His mother while it was still night, and left for Egypt. He remained there until the death of Herod. This was to fulfill what had been spoken by the Lord through the prophet: 'OUT OF EGYPT I CALLED MY SON.'" (Matt 2:14–15)

To explain this use of Hosea more thoroughly would take us far beyond the bounds of our task here, but some explanation may prove helpful.²⁴ Some have thought that Matthew wrongly read Hosea's description of Israel's past exodus as a prophecy. But Matthew's interpretation fits into the same typological pattern as the others above.

The main point or goal of Hos 11:1–11 itself is the accomplishment of Israel's future restoration from the nations, including "Egypt." The overall meaning of

²² See, e.g., G. K. Beale and Sean M. McDonough, "Revelation," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 1096–97, with respect to the use of Isa 22:22 in Rev 3:7, which is expanded upon in chapter 8 of my *Handbook*.

²³ This section (3) reproduces material nearly verbatim from Beale, *Handbook*, 60–64.

²⁴ For an expansion of the following section on Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15, see G. K. Beale, "The Use of Hosea 11:1 in Matthew 2:15: One More Time," *JETS* 55 (2012): 697–715.

chapter 11 is to indicate that God's deliverance of Israel from Egypt, which led to their ungrateful unbelief, is not the final word about God's deliverance of them; though they will be judged, God will deliver them again, even from "Egypt." The chapter begins with the exodus out of Egypt and ends with the same exodus out of Egypt, the former referring to the past event and the latter to a yet future event. According to Hosea 11, the pattern of the first exodus at the beginning of Israel's history will be repeated again at the end of Israel's history in the end time. It is unlikely that Hosea saw these two exoduses to be accidental or coincidental or unconnected similar events. Hosea appears to understand that Israel's first exodus (Hos 11:1) was to be recapitulated at the time of the nation's latter-day exodus.

This mention of a first exodus from Egypt outside of Hos 11:1 occurs elsewhere in Hosea, and a future return from Egypt would appear to be implied by repeated prophecies of Israel returning to Egypt in the future, while Hos 1:10–11 and 11:11 are the only texts in Hosea explicitly affirming a future return from Egypt:

First Exodus Out of Egypt	Future Return to Egypt (implying a future return from Egypt)
<p>Hos 2:15b: And she will sing there as in the days of her youth, As in the day when she came up from the land of Egypt [though this passage compares the first exodus with a future exodus].</p> <p>Hos 12:13: But by a prophet the Lord brought Israel from Egypt, And by a prophet he was kept.</p> <p>Cf. Hos 12:9: But I have been the Lord your God since the land of Egypt.</p> <p>Cf. Hos 13:4: Yet I have been the Lord your God since the land of Egypt, and you were not to know any god except me, for there is no savior besides me.</p>	<p>Hos 7:11: So Ephraim has become like a silly dove, without sense; 'They call to Egypt, they go to Assyria.</p> <p>Hos 7:16b: Their princes will fall by the sword Because of the insolence of their tongue. 'This <i>will be</i> their derision in the land of Egypt.</p> <p>Hos 8:13b: Now he will remember their iniquity, And punish <i>them</i> for their sins; 'They will return to Egypt.</p> <p>Hos 9:3: They will not remain in the Lord's land, But Ephraim will return to Egypt, And in Assyria they will eat unclean <i>food</i>.</p> <p>Hos 9:6: For behold, they will go because of destruction; Egypt will gather them up, Memphis will bury them. Weeds will take over their treasures of silver; 'Thorns <i>will be</i> in their tents.</p> <p>Cf. Hos 1:11: And they [Israel] will go up from the land [of Egypt]²⁵</p> <p>Hos 11:5 He [Israel] assuredly will return to the land of Egypt.²⁶</p> <p>[Note the implication of a future exodus from Egypt in Hos 2:15 above.]</p>

If one had asked Hosea if he believed that God was sovereign over history and that God had designed that the first exodus from Egypt was a historical pattern that foreshadowed a second exodus from Egypt, would he not likely have answered “yes”? At least, this appears to be the way Matthew understood Hosea, especially using the language of the first exodus from Hos 11:1 in the light of the broader and particularly the immediate context, especially of Hosea 11,²⁷ where a “return to

²⁵ On which see the discussion below.

²⁶ Several commentaries and English translations render Hos 11:5 as “He will not return to the land of Egypt.” Several commentaries and English translations, however, have “He will assuredly return to the land of Egypt”; others render verse 5 as a question, “Will he not return to the land of Egypt?” I understand the expression to be a positive one.

²⁷ And in light of the hopes of the first exodus and implied second exodus elsewhere in the book.

Egypt” is predicted (Hos 11:5), and whose main point and goal is the end-time exodus back out from Egypt (Hos 11:11). What better language to use for Hosea’s prophecy of the second exodus and the beginning of its fulfillment in Jesus than the language already at hand describing the first exodus? This is a short step away from saying that the first exodus was seen by Hosea and, more clearly, by Matthew as a historical pattern pointing to the recurrence of the same pattern later in Israel’s history. In this respect, Matthew’s use of Hos 11:1 may also be called “typological” in that he understood, in the light of the entire chapter 11 of Hosea, that the first exodus in Hos 11:1 initiated a historical process of sin and judgment to be culminated in another final exodus (Hos 11:10–11). Duane Garrett has also said in this regard,

We need look no further than Hosea 11 to understand that Hosea, too, believed that God followed patterns in working with his people. Here the slavery in Egypt is the pattern for a second period of enslavement in an alien land (v. 5), and the exodus from Egypt is the type for a new exodus (vv. 10–11). Thus the application of typological principles to Hos 11:1 [by Matthew] is in keeping with the nature of prophecy itself and with Hosea’s own method.²⁸

Many commentators have observed that the placement of the quotation of Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15 appears to be out of order, since the quotation is appended directly only to the report of Joseph, Mary, and Jesus going *into* Egypt and *not coming out* of Egypt. Rather, they are said to come out of Egypt only later in 2:21. In this connection, the repeated OT pattern of Israel or Israelites reentering Egypt and then coming back out of Egypt stand in the background of Matthew’s reference to Hos 11:1 and have a bearing on the apparent odd placement of the quotation. The reference to Hos 11:1 we have argued is to be seen within the repeated references throughout the book to a past exodus *and* Israel’s future *reentering and subsequent return out* of Egypt. In particular, this pattern is fully found within Hosea 11 itself: Hos 11:5, only four verses after Hos 11:1, says that “he [Israel] indeed will return to the land of Egypt,” and this is followed by the main narrational point of the entire chapter that “his sons ... will come trembling like birds from Egypt” (Hos 11:11). Thus, the eleventh chapter of Hosea begins with Israel’s past exodus from Egypt (Hos 11:1), is punctuated in the middle with reference to Israel reentering Egypt and concludes with a promise of their future return from Egypt (Hos 11:11).

Some have seen it to be problematic that what was spoken of the nation in Hos 11:1 is applied by Matthew not to the nation but to an individual messianic figure. Accordingly, Matthew is seen by some as distorting the original corporate meaning of Hos 11:1. However, the application of what was applied to the nation in Hos 11:1 to the one person, Jesus, also may have been sparked by the prophecy at the end of Hos 1:11, where “and they will go up from the land” is a reference to going up from the “land” of Egypt,²⁹ especially since it is an allusion to Exod 1:10

²⁸ Garrett, *Hosea*, 222.

²⁹ On which see further Beale, “Hos. 11:1 in Matt. 2:15,” 708 n. 37.

and Isa 11:16.³⁰ After all, what sense does it make that this refers to the land of Israel, since at the end time, Israel was to be restored *back to her land*, and to describe this as Israel “going up from her own land” would be exceedingly odd at best? If this is a reference to Israel’s future return from Egypt, it fits admirably with the hope expressed in Hos 11:10–11 (and other such implied references noted above), and it would specifically affirm that such a future Exodus would be led by an individual leader: “And they will appoint for themselves one leader (literally the Hebrew reads “one head”), and they will go up from the land.” Such a return led by an individual leader appears to be further described in Hos 3:5 as a latter-day Davidic king: “Afterward the sons of Israel will return and seek the Lord their God and David their king, and they will come trembling to the Lord ... in the last days.” This image of “trembling” in Hos 3:5 to describe the manner in which Israel approaches God when they are restored is parallel to the description of the manner of their restoration in Hos 11:10–11, where also “they will come trembling from Egypt” (“trembling” is repeated twice, though a different Hebrew verb is used). This may point further to Hosea’s biblical-theological understanding that when Israel would come out of Egypt in the future (according to Hos 1:11 and 11:10–11), they would indeed be led by an individual king, which enhances further why Matthew could apply the corporate national language of Hos 11:1 and apply it to an individual king, Jesus. Could Matthew not have engaged in such a biblical-theological reading of Hosea?

There is one last rationale for understanding how Matthew can take what applied to the nation in Hos 11:1 and apply it to the individual Messiah. Duane Garrett has analyzed the use of Genesis in Hosea and has found that repeatedly the prophet alludes to descriptions in Genesis of the individual patriarchs and to other significant individuals in Israel’s history. Sometimes these are good portrayals and sometimes bad. The prophet Hosea applies these descriptions to the nation of his day. For example, the iniquity of Israel in the present involves her following the same pattern of disobedience as that of Adam (Hos 6:7) or Jacob (Hos 12:2–5), and the promise made to the individual Jacob to “make your seed as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered because of multitude” (Gen 32:12; cf. Gen 15:5 and 22:17 addressed to Abraham) is now reapplied and addressed directly to the nation Israel: “Yet the number of the sons of Israel will be like the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured or numbered” (Hos 1:10). Similarly, the valley of Achor, where Achan and his family were taken to be executed for his sin (Josh 7:24–26), is taken by Hosea and reversed to indicate that God would reverse Israel’s judgment of defeat and exile, and would not be exterminated for her sin but would have a hope of redemption (Hos 2:15). Instead of going from the one to the many, Matthew goes from the many (Israel) to the one (Jesus), but utilizes the same kind of “one

³⁰ On which see further *ibid.*, n. 38.

and many” corporate hermeneutical approach to interpreting and applying prior Scripture as did Hosea.³¹

I have elaborated on this typological use of Hos 11:1 since it is an example of a type that is not purely retrospective from the NT vantage point. That is, this was not a perspective understood by Matthew *only after* the events of Jesus’s coming. Rather, there are substantial indications *already in Hosea 11 itself and its immediate context* that Israel’s past exodus out of Egypt was an event that would be recapitulated again typologically in the eschatological future.

4. *Indications of typology in the wider canonical Old Testament context.* Another criterion for discerning types in the NT may be used: even when the immediate context of an OT passage does not indicate that something is being viewed typologically from the OT author’s conscious vantage point, the wider canonical context of the OT book or of the OT itself usually provides hints or indications that the passage is typological for something in the NT.

The portrayal of Eliakim as a ruler in Isa 22:22, viewed typologically in Rev 3:7, may be one such example.³² Christ is the one “who has the key of David, who opens and no one will shut, and who shuts and no one opens.” The immediate context of Isaiah 22 provides clues that this OT passage was intended originally by Isaiah as a type that points forward. The description of placing “the key of the house of David [i.e., administrative responsibility for the kingdom of Judah] on his [Eliakim’s] shoulder,” the mention of him being a “father” to those in “Jerusalem and to the house of Judah,” and the reference to him as “becoming a throne of glory” would all have facilitated such a prophetic understanding of Isa 22:22, since this language is so strikingly parallel to that of the prophecy of the future Israelite ruler of Isa 9:6–7 (“the government will be on *his shoulders* ... and his name will be called ... eternal *Father*,” who sits “on the *throne of David*”). In fact, as mentioned earlier, it is likely that Isa 22:22 intentionally applies the language of the coming messianic king to Eliakim to show him to be a figure who might potentially fulfill the Isaiah 9 prophecy. God did not deem that Eliakim be that figure and so his decreive word caused Eliakim to fall and not to achieve what Isaiah 9 predicted. In contrast, God promised that at some point in the future he would finally accomplish the fulfillment in one who would realize the prophetic description: “The zeal of the Lord of hosts will accomplish this.”

If the connection drawn between Isa 9:6–7 and 22:22 is correct, then it is probable that Isaiah himself would have been aware to some degree of the link and seen Eliakim as one who failed to fulfill the earlier prophecy but also as one whose failure pointed to the eventual success of another who would fulfill it. Accordingly, Rev 3:7 would see that the Isaiah 9 pattern, partially and temporarily reflected in

³¹ See Duane Garrett, “The Ways of God: Reenactment and Reversal in Hosea” (unpublished inaugural address for Duane Garrett’s installation as Professor of OT at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA, Fall 1996). See also Bass, “Hosea’s Use of Scripture,” which was written under the supervision of Duane Garrett.

³² The material on Eliakim in this paragraph and the following one reproduce material nearly verbatim from Beale, *Handbook*, 15, 143–44.

Eliakim and which Isaiah understood pointed still forward to another, was finally fulfilled in Jesus.

In addition, the reference to Eliakim as “My servant” in Isa 22:20 would have been easily associated with Isaiah’s messianic servant prophecies of chapters 40–53, since the phrase occurs there five times in this respect.³³ There are other indications from the immediate context of Rev 3:7 indicates that Eliakim was a foreshadowing of Christ.³⁴

But even if there were no such contextual intimations within the book of Isaiah itself, one can plausibly say that Isaiah had generally understood the prior biblical revelation about Israel’s coming eschatological ruler and David’s heir, so that even if messianic nuances were not in his mind when he wrote that verse, he would not have disapproved of the use made of his words in Rev 3:7.³⁵ Thus, Isaiah supplied a little part of the revelation unfolded in the course of salvation history about kingship, but he himself perceived that part to be a pictorial representation of the essence of Davidic kingship.³⁶ In this regard, D. A. Carson affirms with respect to the NT writers’ use of typology,

The NT writers insist that the OT can be rightly interpreted only if the entire revelation is kept in perspective as it is historically unfolded (e.g., Gal. 3:6–14). Hermeneutically this is not an innovation. OT writers drew lessons out of earlier salvation history, lessons difficult to [completely] perceive while that history was being lived, but lessons that retrospect would clarify (e.g., Asaph in Ps 78; cf. on Matt 13:35). Matthew [for example] does the same in the context of the fulfillment of OT hopes in Jesus Christ. We may therefore legitimately speak of a “fuller meaning” than any one text provides. But the appeal should be made, not to some hidden divine knowledge, but to the pattern of revelation up to that time—a pattern not yet adequately [or fully] discerned. The new revelation may therefore be truly new, yet at the same time capable of being checked against the old [and thus clarifying the older revelation].³⁷

Thus, is there evidence outside the immediate context of the focus OT passage itself that the reference was already conceived to be part of a foreshadowing pattern? If so, then there would be some grounds in the OT context itself that would lead a NT writer to understand such a reference to be a typological fulfill-

³³ The same phrase occurs nine times in Isaiah 41–45 with reference to the unfaithful nation of Israel, with which the faithful messianic servant is contrasted yet also sums up and represents; outside of Isa 22:22, the phrase occurs only twice elsewhere in Isaiah in reference to the prophet himself (Isa 20:3) and to David (Isa 37:35).

³⁴ On which see Beale, *Handbook*, 143–44.

³⁵ This paragraph is reproduced nearly verbatim from Beale, *Handbook*, 15.

³⁶ In these last two sentences, I have adopted the wording applied to another typological passage, the use of Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15, by D. A. Carson, *Matthew*, vol. 1: *Chapters 1 through 12* (Expositor’s Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 92.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 92–93.

ment, even if there is not a fulfillment formula or some clear indication of fulfillment in the nearby NT context.³⁸

Another example of this is Gen 12:10–20 in conjunction with Gen 15:13–16. In Gen 12:10–20, Abraham seeks refuge in Egypt because of a famine in the land outside, where there is a threat of being killed but his wife is spared, yet subsequently Abraham is treated well and increases his wealth while there. Then Pharaoh is struck with “plagues,” so that the Egyptians “sent away” Abraham and all that belonged to him. Then in Gen 15:13–16 God prophesies to Abraham that his “seed will be strangers in a land that is not theirs, where they will be enslaved and oppressed four hundred years. But I will also judge the nation whom they will serve, and afterward they will come out with many possessions. As for you, you shall go to your fathers in peace; you will be buried at a good old age. Then in the fourth generation they will return here, for the iniquity of the Amorite is not yet complete.”

Abraham was a corporate representative whose life in Egypt was a prophetic pattern for his descendants and the basis for the prediction in Genesis 15: both went into Egypt due to a famine (Gen 12:10; 47:4); there is a threat of males being killed but females being spared (Gen 12:12–13; Exod 1:15–22); there was good treatment (Gen 12:16; Exod 1:1–7), followed by “plagues” on Pharaoh (Gen 12:17; Exod 9:14), there is an increase of wealth (Gen 12:16; Exod 11:2–3), and then Pharaoh “sending out” (Gen 12:20; Exod 5:1) Israel as a result of the plagues.

In the light of these parallels, Gordon Wenham says,

this story [of Abraham in Egypt], foreshadowing as it does the later bondage of Egypt and the exodus, is an example of the typology that patterns many OT narratives. This typological paralleling of Abraham with the exodus from Egypt is especially clear in Isa 40–55. Here the return from Babylonian exile is repeatedly compared with the exodus on the one hand and with the call of Abram on the other (Isa 41:8–9, 18–19; 43:1–2, 14–16; 48:20–21; 49:8–12; 51:2–3, 9–11; 52:3–12). Similar typological thinking is found in the NT by Matthew, who explicitly compares Israel’s exodus from Egypt with Jesus’ return to Palestine from there (Matt. 2:15). Paul compares the Exodus to the church’s experience in Christ (1 Cor 10:1–12), and since Abram was also in Egypt, the believer is thus invited to look back to the life of Abraham and see in it ... an adumbration of his Lord’s experiences (Rom 4, Heb. 11:8–19).³⁹

³⁸ See also Foulkes, “Acts of God,” 370, who likewise says that a NT writer’s recognition of a type does not mean “that the writer was conscious of presenting a type or foreshadowing of the Christ, although we have seen that there was sometimes in the OT the consciousness that the acts of God in the past pointed forward to similar but much more glorious acts in the future.” Similarly, Douglas J. Moo, “The Problem of Sensus Plenior,” in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon* (ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1986), 96–107, who says the “‘anticipatory’ element in these typological experiences may sometimes have been more or less dimly perceived by the participants and human authors” but at other times it could be seen only retrospectively after Christ’s death, resurrection, and coming of the Spirit. Cf. J. E. Alsup, “Typology,” *ABD* 6:684.

³⁹ Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC 1; Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 291–92.

Another example is Noah being patterned after the first Adam, which we will discuss below.

Therefore, NT writers may interpret historical portions of the OT to have a forward-looking sense in the light of the whole OT canonical context.⁴⁰ For example, the portrayal by various eschatological prophecies about a coming king, priest, and prophet throughout OT revelation were so intrinsically similar to the historical descriptions of other kings, priests, and prophets elsewhere in the OT that the latter were seen to contain the same pattern of the former (except for the historical failure) and thus to point forward to the ideal end-time figures who would perfectly carry out these roles. The following point bears out this assertion about kings, priests, and prophets being typological.

5. *Literary clustering of commissions to prophets, priests, and kings.*⁴¹ Another criterion for discerning types in the NT is literary clustering of repeated commissions to prophets, priests, and kings. Gerhard von Rad observed that in certain sections of the OT are repeated narrations of Yahweh's commissioning people to fill certain offices (like that of the judges, prophets, priests, or kings). In these clustering of narrations are the repeated descriptions of a commission, the failure of the one commissioned, and judgment—and then the same cycle is repeated.⁴² Von Rad proceeds to draw the following typological significance of these narratives:

[The] range of OT saving utterances is that which tells of the calls of charismatic persons and of people summoned to great offices. ... In the case of certain descriptions of the call and the failure of charismatic leaders (Gideon, Samson, and Saul), we are dealing with literary compositions which already show a typological trend, in that the narrators are only concerned with the phenomenon of the rise and speeding failure of the man thus called. Here, too, in each case there is a fulfillment, the proof of the charisma and victory. Suddenly, however, these men are removed, Jahweh can no longer consider them, and the story ends with the reader feeling that, since Jahweh has so far been unable to find a really suitable instrument, the commission remains unfulfilled. Can we not say of each of these stories that Jahweh's designs far transcend their historical contexts? What happened to the ascriptions of a universal rule made by Jahweh to the kings of Judah (Pss. 2, 72, 110)? It is impossible that the post-exilic readers and transmitters of these Messianic texts saw them only as venerable monuments of a glorious but vanished past. ... These men [the judges, Saul, David, etc.] all passed away; but the tasks, the titles and the divine promises connected with them, were handed on. The Shebna-Eliakim pericope [Isa. 22:15–25] is a fine example of such transmission. ... The almost Messianic full powers of the unworthy Shebna will fail. Thus, the office of "the key of David" remained unprovided for until finally it could be laid down at the feet of Christ (Rev. 3:7). It is in this sense—*i.e.*, in the light of a final fulfillment and of the ceaseless movement towards such a fulfillment—that we can speak of a prophetic power resident in

⁴⁰ This paragraph is reproduced nearly verbatim from Beale, *Handbook*, 16.

⁴¹ This section (5) is reproduced nearly verbatim from Beale, *Handbook*, 20–21.

⁴² E.g., note the book of Judges and Isa 22:15–25, as well as the rise and fall of the many kings in the northern and southern kingdoms narrated in Kings and Chronicles.

the OT prototypes. ... No special hermeneutic method is necessary to see the whole diversified movement of the OT saving events, made up of God's promises and their temporary fulfillments, as pointing to their future fulfillment in Jesus Christ. This can be said quite categorically. The coming of Jesus Christ as a historical reality leaves the exegete no choice at all; he must interpret the OT as pointing to Christ, whom he must understand in this light.⁴³

Thus, von Rad contends that the literary clustering of repeated commissions and failures is evidence of a type within the OT itself. Furthermore, the forward-looking nature of these cyclic narratives of people and events can be discerned within the OT itself and often within each of the narratives themselves. Accordingly, if von Rad is correct, and I believe he is, this would mean that we can recognize OT types as having a prophetic element even before the fuller revelation of their fulfillment in the NT.

6. *Old Testament characters styled according to pattern of earlier Old Testament characters.* Another criterion for discerning types in the NT entails OT characters styled according to the pattern of earlier OT characters who are viewed as types of Christ in the NT.⁴⁴ If it can be shown in the OT itself that a later person is seen as an anti-type of an earlier person who is clearly viewed as a type of Christ by the NT, then this later OT person is also likely a good candidate to be considered to be a type of Christ. For example, there is abundant evidence that Noah is patterned after the first Adam and that the intention for this patterning is to indicate that Noah is a typological fulfillment of Adam. Noah, for example, is given the same commission as the first Adam (cf. Gen 1:28 with Gen 9:1–2, 7). It becomes quite apparent, however, that Noah as a second Adam figure does not accomplish the commission given to the first Adam (Gen 1:26–28; 2:15–17), just as the first Adam failed in the same way.⁴⁵ Note the many parallels between the first Adam and Noah:⁴⁶

The World That Was (Genesis 1–7)

Creation	Adam	Fall	Seed Conflict	Judgment
1. Waters of Chaos cover the earth (Gen 1:1–2)	1. Man commissioned in God's image (Gen 1:26)	1. Adam sins in a garden (Gen 3:2)	1. Cain, condemned to wander, founds the wicked city of Enoch (Gen 4:17)	1. Days of Noah are upon the earth (Gen 6:13)

⁴³ *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 2 (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 372–374; see also pp. 384–385.

⁴⁴ Gordon Hugenberg alerted me in conversation to this criterion for discerning typology.

⁴⁵ Portions of this paragraph and the following one are drawn verbatim from Beale, *Handbook*, 16.

⁴⁶ The following chart, with minimal alterations, is taken from W. A. Gage, *The Gospel of Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001), 16.

2. The Spirit hovers upon the face of the waters (Gen 1:2)	2. Man commanded to fill the earth (Gen 1:28)	2. Adam partakes of the fruit of knowledge (Gen 3:6)	2. Seth, with son Enosh, begins to call upon the Name of the Lord (Gen 4:26)	2. God brings a cloud upon the earth to destroy the wicked with a flood (Gen 7:23)
3. Dry land emerges, vegetation is brought forth (Gen 1:12)	3. God brings animals for Adam to name (Gen 2:19)	3. Adam is shamefully naked (Gen 3:7)	3. Daughters of man are taken to wife by the sons of God (Gen 6:2)	3. The old heavens and earth pass away before the present heavens and earth (2 Pet 3:5–7)
4. The old world is finished; God rests (Gen 2:2)		4. Adam's nakedness covered by God (Gen 3:21)		
		5. Adam's sin brings curse upon seed (Gen 3:15)		

The World That Now Is (Genesis 8–Revelation 22)

The New Creation	Noah: The New Adam	The Fall: Renewed	Seed Conflict: Renewed	The New Judgment
1. Waters of Noah cover the earth (Gen 7:18–19)	1. Man is recommissioned in God's image (Gen 9:6)	1. Noah sins in a vineyard (Gen 9:20)	1. Noah's sons, to avoid wandering, found wicked city of Babel (Gen 11:4)	1. "Days of Noah" are again upon the earth (Matt 24:37–39)
2. Dove "hovers" upon the face of the waters (Gen 8:9)	2. Man again commanded to fill the earth (Gen 9:7)	2. Noah partakes of the fruit of the vine (Gen 9:20)	2. Shem's descendant Abram begins to call upon the Name of the Lord (Gen 12:8)	2. God comes in clouds to destroy wicked with a fire (Matt 24:30 cf. 2 Pet 3:7)
3. Olive leaf betokens emergence of dry land (Gen 8:11)	3. God brings animals for Noah to deliver (Gen 7:15)	3. Noah is shamefully naked (Gen 9:21)	3. The harlot Babel seduces the sons of Zion throughout the ages (cf. Dan 1:1; Isa 47:1–15; Rev 17–18)	3. The present heavens and earth pass away before the new heavens and earth (2 Pet 3:13)
4. Present world finished; God receives a sacrifice of rest (Gen 8:21)		4. Noah's nakedness is covered by sons (Gen 9:23)		
		5. Noah's sin brings curse upon seed (Gen 9:24–25)		

Thus, the completion of fulfilling God's commission to Adam remained unfulfilled even in the semi-typological fulfillment in Noah, so that both the first Adam and Noah, as a secondary Adamic figure, pointed to another Adam to come,

who would finally fulfill the commission. That a prophetic element is present in the two parallel is apparent from two observations: first, Noah's name ("Rest") is explained as "this one shall give us rest from our work and from the toil of our hands arising from the ground which the Lord has cursed" (Gen 5:29). The second prophetic pointer lies in observing that Christ and Peter both refer to the idea that the days of Noah will be on the earth again before a coming universal judgment. Why did they say this? Because all the parallels between the first Adam and Noah as another Adam are all completed within Genesis 1–9 except for the last panel: the first Adamic world ends in judgment but this judgment panel has no fulfillment in the NT. Christ and Peter likely realized all the patterns of the first Adam had been completed in Noah, the "second" Adam, except for the universal judgment panel. Thus, they knew that the first world was the pattern for the second world and that the final panel of universal judgment had to occur at some point to complete the second world's modelling on the first.

Another example would be the case of Joshua in renewing the covenant and leading the people of God into the promised land.⁴⁷ "Since the original reader/observer would have been justified in interpreting Joshua as a second Moses figure (cf. Deuteronomy 31, Joshua 1; 3:7), and since Jesus may also be viewed as a second Moses, it is possible to correlate the significance of Joshua's acts of salvation and conquest of the promised land to the work of Christ."⁴⁸ Or consider the relation of Adam, Noah, and Christ, an example discussed briefly earlier in this essay. Significant OT commentators view Adam to be a type of Noah in the Genesis narrative itself. Nowhere in the NT, however, does it say that Noah is a type of Christ.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, if Noah is a partial antitype of the first Adam but does not fulfill all to which the typological first Adam points, then Noah also can plausibly be considered a part of the Adamic type⁵⁰ of Christ in the OT.

7. *Partially fulfilled Old Testament prophecies pointing to more complete New Testament fulfillment.* Yet another criterion for discerning types in the NT is this: events of partially fulfilled OT prophecies within the OT itself point to a more complete fulfillment in the NT.⁵¹ A similar kind of typology involves OT prophets who issued prophecies that were to be fulfilled in the short term, at least at some point within the OT epoch itself. When the prophecy is fulfilled, it is clear that the full

⁴⁷ This paragraph is largely drawn verbatim from Beale, *Handbook*, 21.

⁴⁸ G. P. Hugenberger, "Introductory Notes on Typology," in Beale, *Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, 341.

⁴⁹ There are NT passages saying that the climax of the age will resemble the apostate days of Noah (see Matt 24:37–39), that baptism is an antitype of Noah's flood (1 Pet 3:20–21), or that the flood is a precursor of the universal destruction of the world by fire (2 Pet 3:5–7), though none of these passages say that Noah himself is a type of Christ; nevertheless, these passages further point to the above observation being made about Adam and Noah in relation to Christ. Noah is called "a preacher of righteousness" in 2 Pet. 2:5. While it is possible to see Noah as a type here, it is more probable that he is to be viewed only as an analogy for the present time.

⁵⁰ See E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 44–67, for explanation of a "willed type," which helps to explain the idea that we have in mind here between Adam, Noah, and Christ, yet it also goes beyond the concept of typology discussed so far in this article.

⁵¹ This paragraph is largely drawn verbatim from Beale, *Handbook*, 16.

contours of the prophecy have not been consummately fulfilled. Then the partial historical fulfillment itself becomes a foreshadowing of or points to a later complete fulfillment in the latter days. Good examples of this are prophecies of the “Day of the Lord,” which predict judgment on a catastrophic scale. Although these “Day of the Lord” prophecies are fulfilled in various events of judgment within the OT period itself (such as parts of the prophecy of Joel where the phrase occurs five times), all the details of the predicted destruction are not fulfilled. Consequently, the nature of the fulfillment within the OT itself contains a pattern that points yet forward to the climactic period of such fulfillment when the pattern is fully filled out⁵² (the “Day of the Lord” *par excellence*).⁵³

Another example here are the prophecies of Israel’s restoration from Babylon, which were partially but not completely fulfilled when a remnant of Israel returned from Babylon after seventy years in captivity (e.g. 2 Chr 36:20–23 citing Jer 25:12–13; 29:10–14). Note what was to be fulfilled at Israel’s restoration which was not fulfilled at the time of Israel’s physical return from Babylonian captivity:

1. resurrection of Israelite saints
2. new creation
3. kingdom established over entire world
4. coming of the Messiah
5. the nations would stream into Israel and be converted
6. God will make a new covenant with Israel
7. foreign powers will no longer rule over Israel
8. God will bestow the Spirit on Israel
9. a huge temple will be rebuilt
10. miracles would happen (the deaf would hear and the blind will see)
11. definitive forgiveness

⁵² Note that the “Day of the Lord” occurs seventeen times in the OT with reference to some historical destruction coming within the OT era and five times in the NT with respect to the final end-time day, two of which specify eschatological destruction.

⁵³ I am following here an example given by Bock, “Scripture Citing Scripture,” 272. It is possible to categorize some of these kinds of typological uses as examples of a “first fulfillment and second fulfillment” or a “double fulfillment” or a “semi-fulfillment and complete fulfillment” of direct verbal prophecy. For example, the prophecy of a young woman (or virgin) giving birth to a child named “Immanuel” in Isa 7:13–14 finds its first provisional fulfillment in the birth of Isaiah’s son (Isa 8:3–4; cf. 8:8, 10, 18). Yet the greater fulfillment is predicted in Isa 9:1–7, where the prophesied Davidic king is called “Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace,” and Matt 1:22–23 shows this is fulfilled climactically in Jesus. I think this is best explained as fulfillment of prophecy within the OT itself that contains a typological pattern that points yet forward to the climactic period of such fulfillment when the pattern is fully filled out in Jesus. That Isaiah himself was aware that Isaiah’s child was a typological pointer to Jesus is evident in his prophecy in 9:1–7. However, it is possible to see this also as an example of “first fulfillment and second fulfillment” or a “semi-fulfillment and complete fulfillment” or a “double fulfillment” of direct verbal prophecy (the latter terminology is preferred in this case by Craig Blomberg, “Matthew,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 3–5). Throughout the church’s tradition, there have also been those who have seen Isa 7:13–14 as a direct verbal prophecy of Jesus and fulfilled only in him (which is less likely in light of the above discussion), while many modern commentators see no predictive element at all in Isa 7:13–14, which denies the authority of the text (for sources of both of these last two views, see Blomberg, “Matthew,” 3–5).

Yet none of these promises was fulfilled when the remnant of Israel returned from Babylon after seventy years of captivity. Thus the full prophecy remained to be completely fulfilled at some future time (which the Gospels and Paul see as beginning to be fulfilled at Christ's first coming and consummated at Christ's final coming; see, e.g., Isa 35:5–6 and 61:1 in Matt 11:5; Isa 61:1–2 in Luke 17–21; Isa 1:9 in Rom 9:29; Isa 52:11 and 43:6 in 2 Cor 6:17–7:1). Alternatively, it is also possible to see the event of the partial fulfillment of Israel returning from Babylon as a typological foreshadowing of the yet greater to come end-time restoration in Christ.

8. *Repeated major redemptive-historical events.*⁵⁴ Candidates for types may also be those major redemptive-historical events that in some fashion are repeated throughout the OT and share such unique characteristics that they are clearly to be identified with one another long before the era of the NT. For example, OT commentators have noticed the following: (1) The emergence of the earth out of the water of Noah's flood has a number of affinities with the emergence of the first earth from the chaos waters described in Genesis 1. (2) In several ways the redemption of Israel from Egypt is patterned after the creation in Genesis 1. (3) Israel's return from Babylonian exile is pictured as a new creation, modeled on the first creation. Likewise, it is commonly recognized that second-generation Israel's crossing of the Jordan is depicted like the first generation's crossing through the Red Sea, as likewise is Israel's restoration from Babylonian exile portrayed as another exodus like the first out of Egypt. Israel's tabernacle, the Solomonic temple, and Israel's second temple are all uniquely patterned in many ways after essential features in the garden of Eden. In each of the three above examples of creation, exodus, and temple repetitions, the earlier events may not only correspond uniquely to the later events but within the OT itself may also be designed to point forward to these later events. Accordingly, these earlier OT references that are linked together also typologically point to these same escalated realities in the NT's reference to Christ and the church as the beginning of the new creation, the end-time exodus, and the latter-day temple. But even when key redemptive-historical events are not repeated, a candidate for a type can still be discerned. It should, however, not be found among the minute details of a passage but in the central theological message of the literary unit, and it should concern God's acts to redeem a people or in his acts to judge those who are faithless and disobedient.

9. *Other instances of typology.* There are other interpretative ways to discern OT types from the OT itself—thus Christ is the antitypical new Joseph, Moses, Joshua, David, Melchizedek, Adam, and Jonah; he is also the antitypical brazen serpent, manna, temple, and sacrifice—but those already indicated must suffice for the purposes of the present discussion.

⁵⁴ This section (8) is reproduced verbatim from Beale, *Handbook*, 21.

III. THE PRESUPPOSITIONS OF NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS IN INTERPRETING THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THEIR BEARING ON TYPOLOGY

In my *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, I have a chapter on the presuppositions that underlay the NT writers' interpretation of the OT. They are the following:⁵⁵

1. There is the apparent assumption of *corporate solidarity* or *representation*.
2. In the light of corporate solidarity or representation, Christ as the Messiah is viewed as representing the *true Israel* of the OT and true Israel, the church, in the NT.
3. *History is unified* by a wise and sovereign plan, so that the earlier parts are designed to correspond and point to the latter parts (cf., e.g., Matt 5:17; 11:13; 13:16–17).
4. The age of *eschatological fulfillment* has come in Christ.
5. As a consequence of the preceding presupposition, it follows that the latter parts of biblical history function as the broader context to interpret earlier parts because they all have the same, ultimate divine author who inspires the various human authors. One deduction from this premise is that Christ is the goal toward which the OT pointed and the end-time center of redemptive history, which is the *key to interpreting the earlier portions of the OT and its promises*.

Presuppositions 3 and 5 bear most directly on typology. The very definition of presupposition 3 is a rationale for the NT writer's belief that the OT was typological of the new age, especially of Christ. The first half of the definition is the basis for the second part. Presuppositions 1–3 solve three kinds of "fulfillment" problems in the NT: (1) corporate solidarity in Christ as true Israel shows how the predominantly Gentile church can fulfill prophecies about Israel or about the Messiah; (2) the same presuppositions show how Christ can be seen as fulfilling prophecies about Israel; (3) OT events quoted in the NT as prophetic fulfillments is explainable from the third presupposition that the earlier parts of the OT are designed to correspond and point to the latter parts in the NT.

Presupposition 5 is the basis for a Christotelic or Christocentric view of the OT. Examples of passages which support such a view are Num 12:6–8; Matt 5:17; 13:11, 16–17; Luke 24:25–27, 32, 44–45; John 5:39; 20:9; Rom 10:4; and 2 Cor 1:20. Two of these passages will be examined in more detail.

1. *Luke 24*. Luke 24 is a passage supportive of this presupposition of the NT writers' Christological focus on the OT. Christ says in Luke 24:27, "And beginning with Moses and with all the prophets, He explained to them the things concerning Himself *in all the Scriptures*"; and in Luke 24:44 he says, "Now He said to them, 'These are My words which I spoke to you while I was still with you, that *all things which are written about Me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms* must be fulfilled.'"

⁵⁵ For further discussion of these presuppositions, see Beale, *Handbook*, 95–102.

Evangelical scholars debate whether or not Luke 24:27 indicates that Christ can be found in every verse of the OT—“all the Scriptures”—or whether this phrase refers only to the three broad sections of the OT (“the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms”). But the question still must be answered how much of “the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms” refers to Christ. Does “all the Scriptures” refer only to broad segments of the OT or to every verse?

Both Graeme Goldsworthy and Iain Duguid believe that every OT passage is in mind in Luke 24:27, and therefore every OT text should be approached from a Christocentric and Christotelic perspective. However, Walter Kaiser disagrees, arguing that Luke 24:27 refers only to the three broad segments of the OT and not every single verse.⁵⁶ Accordingly, Kaiser says, some scholars like R. Albert Mohler⁵⁷ have

championed a Christocentric interpretation (also known to some as the “Redemptive-Historical” [RH] method of interpreting), in which the interpretation of all Biblical texts should be done in such a way that the main theme of the preached Old Testament text should always be explicitly and directly related in every text from the Bible exclusively to the person of Jesus Christ. But in this method the emphasis, which stressed a whole-Bible-focus on God’s work in redemption across the whole canon, often resulted in the interpreter’s “discovering” that every passage ended up saying exactly what was found in the New Testament, regardless of the content of the chosen text ... [and] what was taught in the older text.⁵⁸

Luke 24:27’s “all Scriptures” is a bit ambiguous, but that it refers to every verse of Scripture is apparent from the following considerations:

First, the real question of Luke 24:27 is whether it refers only to explicit messianic prophecies throughout the OT, so that the Lukan passage does not refer to every verse of Scripture. But observe that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John see narrated “events” of the OT as having a prophetic sense. In this light, one has to ask if there are more OT events than seen by the NT writers, and, if so, where do we limit which events are typological and which are not.

Second, although the Greek word “scripture” (γραφή) is used about 50 times in the NT, the only other place where it occurs with “all” (πάς) is 2 Tim 3:16: “All [or every] scripture is God-breathed and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness.” It is highly probable that here “all scripture” refers to every verse (indeed the translation of “every” would highlight this). This suggests that we should take virtually the same phrase in Luke 24:27 to be referring to every OT verse or paragraph.

Third, in this respect, apparently insignificant events in the OT that do not appear at first glance to point to Christ are part of and are inextricably linked to

⁵⁶ Kaiser, “Preaching Christ from the Old Testament: Jesus in Every Scripture,” *Christianity Today* (online; Leadership Magazine; The Exchange; February 27, 2014).

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Kaiser, “Preaching Christ from the Old Testament: Ignoring the Old Testament,” *Christianity Today* (online; Leadership Magazine; the Exchange; February 11, 2014).

larger narratives that do point more clearly to Christ. So to whatever degree these apparently insignificant events or persons are inextricably linked thematically to the larger narratives, to that degree they have Christological significance.

The notion in nineteenth-century England that “all roads lead to London” is a good illustration of Christotelic interpretation and preaching. At that time, if you wanted to go to London but lived in a little hamlet a few hundred miles from London, you might take a footpath from your hamlet to the next larger settlement, a village. That footpath might in fact be in the opposite direction of London, but it is the only way conveniently to get to the next major village. When you reach that village, you take a road to a town. That road might not head in the direction of London but may merely be horizontal to it. Then when you reach the town, you take a highway to the next major city necessary to go to in order to reach London. This highway may not head straight to London, but it heads roughly in that direction. When you reach the city, you take a major highway, which does go straight in the direction of London. And then you finally reach London.

Likewise, when interpreting an OT passage (and preaching it), you want to ask, as insignificant as it may appear redemptive-historically, how is this a “path” that leads to a “road” that leads to a “highway,” which leads to the major highway to Christ. Charles Spurgeon has quoted an old minister who said that “from every text of Scripture there is a road to ... Christ. ... I have never yet found a text that had not got a road to Christ in it. ... [P]reach a sermon, running along the road towards ... Christ.”⁵⁹ Does this mean that every verse in the OT has to do with Christ? Well, yes and no. Graeme Goldsworthy has summarized this well:

While some texts may be more peripheral to the main message, no text is totally irrelevant. Thus, an event or person in the historical narratives of the Old Testament may never be specifically mentioned again. But it functions theologically within its own epoch, even if only to be one of the less prominent events or people in the outworking of God’s plan. It will always be part of a larger whole whose theological significance can be determined.⁶⁰

Likewise, Iain Duguid puts it this way:

When we interpret the Old Testament correctly, without allegory or artificial manipulation but in accordance with Jesus’ own teaching, the central message on every page is Christ. That does not mean that every verse taken by itself contains a hidden allusion to Christ, but that the central thrust of every passage leads us in some way to the central message of the gospel.⁶¹

⁵⁹ This “road to London” illustration has been adapted from a sermon illustration by Charles Spurgeon, “Christ Precious to Believers,” a sermon on 1 Pet 2:7 (1859). Text taken from *Sermons Preached and Revised by the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, Sixth Series* (New York: Sheldon and Company, 1860), 357.

⁶⁰ Graeme Goldsworthy, *Preaching the Whole Bible as Christian Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 256.

⁶¹ Iain Duguid, “Old Testament Hermeneutics,” in *Seeing Christ in All of Scripture* (ed. P. A. Lillback; Philadelphia: Westminster Seminary Press, 2016), 19.

Indeed, if we do not see every verse and paragraph ultimately related to Christ in our sermons, then we can ask: How do our sermons on OT passages, which are based on good historical-grammatical exegesis, differ from a rabbinic sermon, which is also based on good exegesis but not seeing the OT passage as related to Christ? I would like to hear how Walter Kaiser would answer that question.

2. *Numbers 12:6–8*. Numbers 12:6–8 says that prophecy by nature is often dark and obscure in contrast to God’s clear words through Moses. Thus, parts of the OT’s testimony to Christ appeared dim and unclear in the OT, only to be clarified by Christ’s coming. A way to think about this is to visualize a “prophecy conference” in the year 15 BC. At that point, the attendees would have had all of the OT, in addition to hundreds of years of reflection on it during the intertestamental era. Robust debate would have broken out if a speaker gave an address arguing that Psalm 22 predicted the Messiah’s death or contending that Psalm 16 was about the Messiah’s resurrection or that the Passover ordinance not to break any bone of the sacrificial animal was a prophecy of the Roman guards not breaking any of Jesus’s bones at the cross. That these passages were prophetic and would be fulfilled in this way was not at all clear. But with the benefit of hindsight and without eisegesis, these passages were confidently identified to find their fulfillment in Christ’s death and resurrection. In this respect, again, Luke 24:27, 44 represents Christ’s teaching in justifying such a hermeneutical approach to these OT passages.

We could compare the present church to help understand the pre-Christ perspective on some of the unclear OT prophecies of Christ. First Corinthians 13:9, 12 says that “we know in part, and ... we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then I shall know fully just as I also have been fully known.” This includes NT Scripture. The NT predicts that Christ will come a final time and raise the dead (e.g. 1 Cor 15:20–23; 1 Thess 4:14–17); he will establish an eternal kingdom (Rev 11:15–17), and there will be a final consummation, including final judgment, destruction of the earth (2 Pet 3:10–12), and new creation (2 Pet 3:13). But we do not fully understand all of these prophecies. For example, is the millennium of Revelation 20 to be understood in a premillennial, amillennial, or postmillennial sense? How does the final new creation relate precisely to the end of the present cosmos—will there only be an ethical renewal or will there be a complete destruction of the present cosmos, followed by the creation of a new cosmos? Some of our expectations will be proven wrong because we do not understand these prophecies as fully as we will with hindsight, after Christ’s final coming. Fulfillment always fleshes out prophetic expectation in some unexpected ways, which do not necessarily contradict our prior understanding but expand it.⁶² And it is like that with OT passages that look forward to Christ.

Warfield gave the following illustration of OT revelation in comparison to NT revelation:

⁶² Duguid, “Hermeneutics of the OT,” 20, 23, reminded me of the significance of the Numbers 12 and of 1 Corinthians 13 passages and drew my attention to the “prophecy conference” illustration.

The Old Testament may be likened to a chamber richly furnished but dimly lighted; the introduction of light brings into it nothing which was not in it before; but it brings out into clearer view much of what is in it but was only dimly or even not at all perceived before. The mystery of the Trinity is not revealed in the Old Testament; but the mystery of the Trinity underlies the Old Testament revelation, and here and there almost comes into view. Thus the Old Testament revelation of God is not corrected by the fuller revelation which follows it, but only perfected, extended and enlarged.⁶³

IV. CONCLUSION TO TYPOLOGY: RULES FOR USING TYPOLOGY

1. Start with a literary-historical interpretation.
2. Look for the meaning of the person, thing, institution, or event (e.g. the OT manna indicated God's provision for Israel).
3. Carry forward the meaning of the symbol even as it escalates and see how it finds its typological fulfillment (e.g. the OT manna indicating God's provision for Israel is fulfilled not in Jesus creating bread but in him being the end-time manna, on which see John 6).
4. Look for a type in the central message of the overall text and not in the details of the passage.
5. Note the points of both correspondence and contrast between the type and antitype.⁶⁴

V. THE QUESTION OF CHRISTOPHANIES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Many conservative commentators identify the theophanies of the OT with an appearance of Christ, sometimes referred to as Christophanies.⁶⁵ Others are skeptical,⁶⁶ contending that the appearances are of the triune God. The latter argue that Christ's incarnation is a further revelation of this triune God. It is sometimes assumed that since the NT identifies Christ as being present in the OT, this supports the notion that he must be the only one appearing in the theophanies (e.g. Christ was the rock in 1 Cor 10:4; Moses "bore the reproach of Christ," Heb 11:26; etc.). And there are specific passages where Christ is identified with the one who appeared in these theophanies (Isaiah 6 in John 12:40–41; Rev 10:1). However, these references to Christ in the OT and appearances do not mean that Christ was the only one who appeared in these theophanies but that he is identified with the triune God who appeared, so that he must be viewed as being included in these theophanies. But there is ongoing debate about this issue. Scott Oliphint in a forthcoming book argues that when God appears in the OT (e.g. as the "angel of the Lord"),

⁶³ Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, *Biblical Doctrines* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1929), 141–42.

⁶⁴ This discussion is based on Sidney Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 257–59.

⁶⁵ James A. Borland, *Christ in the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody, 1978).

⁶⁶ A. Malone, *Knowing Jesus in the Old Testament* (Nottingham, UK: InterVarsity, 2015) and Vern S. Poythress, *Theophany* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018).

this is a preincarnate appearance of Christ. He gives an extensive list of many commentators in favor of this, both older and more recent ones.⁶⁷

VI. THE INCOMPLETE NATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT POINTS FORWARD TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

The OT appears incomplete in itself. The Hebrew canon ends with 1 and 2 Chronicles, the conclusion of which narrates that a small group of Israelites have been restored to their homeland and face external and internal problems. Can this be the end of the redemptive-historical story, since it does not fulfill the great promises of the OT (e.g. Gen 3:15; the Abrahamic promises; all the various messianic promises such as Gen 49:9–10; Num 24:14–19; Psalm 2; Isaiah 11; 49; 53)? The canonical order of the Septuagint (the present English order) also presents an unfinished scenario. Malachi is the last book, which ends with a prophecy that God will send “Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord, and he will restore the hearts of the fathers to the children” (Mal 4:5–6). This prophecy is never fulfilled in the OT epoch, so the OT ends with a forward-looking note announcing a prophecy that is not yet fulfilled.

The NT also has the perspective that the OT was incomplete. Accordingly, the NT presents Jesus as the one who completes what was begun but not finished in the OT (the following overlaps with the above typological discussion). Hebrews 1:1–2 says, “God, after He spoke long ago to the fathers in the prophets in many portions and in many ways, in these last days has spoken to us in *His* Son.” The writer sees Christ as the climactic, eschatological prophetic voice of his in-scripturated word. In the context of Hebrews, this means that he is the new, eschatological Adam (Heb 2:6–9), better than Moses (Heb 3:1–6), better than the priests of the OT (Heb 5:6–11; 7:1–10:22). He is a sacrifice better than the OT sacrifices (Heb. 10:1–22) who executes a covenant better than the old covenant (Heb. 8:6–13). The reason why what Jesus does is better than the OT is that what he does is irreversible and eternal, not temporary and passing away.⁶⁸ Thus:

1. Jesus is the new end-time Adam.
2. Jesus is the new end-time Israel.
3. Jesus is the new end-time Davidic King.
4. Jesus is the new end-time Priest.
5. Jesus is the new end-time Prophet.
6. Jesus is the new end-time Teacher of the Law.

⁶⁷ Oliphint, *God With Us* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham, forthcoming in 2020), 418–74. Meredith Kline, “The Feast of Cover-Over,” *JETS* 37 (1994): 499, cites Exod 12:23, which says “the Lord will pass through to smite the Egyptians” and “the Lord will pass over the door and will not allow the destroyer to come into your houses to smite you,” thus identifying both the angelic “destroyer” and “the one who passes over the door” as “the Lord” but also clearly distinguishing them. Though not a typical theophany, this would appear to be a case in which the pre-incarnate Christ could be identified with one of the two characters.

⁶⁸ I am thankful to Iain Duguid, *Jesus in the Old Testament* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2013), 16–21, who has reminded me of the significance of the two OT canonical orders and of the significance of Hebrews.

7. Jesus is the new end-time Temple.
8. The church is all these things in its union with Christ.

VII. CONCLUSION

This address has attempted to explain the various ways, especially through typology, that one can discern that the OT anticipates Christ who was to come.