

INTRODUCTION TO TYPOLOGY

I. Desirability of studying Typology. t

A. The Vocabulary of the NT indicates that there is a typical element in the OT. ~~tu~~pos means an imprint which may serve as a mold or pattern ~~of~~ ^{and} that which is typical in the OT serves as a mold or pattern of that which is antitypical in the NT. Translated ensample, 1 Cor 10:11, 6 and clearly refers to OT events. Example Heb 8:5; figure, Rom 5:14. People, things, events are given NT sanction in these references and the word type is used.

hupodeigma means specimen or example and the hupo indicates that which is shown plainly under the eyes. Example in Heb 4:11 (event); 8:5 (institution-tabernacle); 9:23 same; James 5:10-persons.

B. X's example of use of OT invites us to use types. Lk 24:25-44. He began at Moses and included prophets and psalms, v 44, which included the 3 parts of the Jewish canon and makes the reference as wide as the whole OT. All the Script, vs 27. This gives warrant for finding types of X at least in OT which are not specifically designat@d as types by the NT. Jn 5:39-47 X invites men to search OT for they testify of Him.

C. Emphasize the analogy of faith and the unity of the two testaments. Esp pertinent if see types as symbolic prophecies (Ramm); then since the prophetic element clearly establishes the principle that the New is latent in the Old and the Old is patent in the New the value of types is readily seen. "Typology is justified, then, in that it is part of prophecy which forms the nexus (tie) between the Testaments." Ramm 139.

D. Neglect of study would mean neglect of large portions of the Word. These portions are not ~~any~~ portions which don't belong to this age wither but which clearly do illustrate truth that does belong to this dispensation. whole counsel of God. LSC says 100 types. 50 of X, I, xxx.

E. The general neglect of types ought to make us want to study them. Fairbairn, I, 1 "The Typology of Scripture has been one of the most neglected departments of theological science. It has never altogether escaped from the region of doubt and uncertainty; and some still regard it as a field incapable, from its very nature, of being satisfactorily explored, or cultivated so as to yield any sure and appreciable results." Why this neglect? Scroggie, Ruling Lines of Progressive Rev, 119-20 "The real secret of the neglect of the types, one cannot but think, is in part traceable to the fact that they require more spiritual intelligence than many Xns bring to them. To apprehend them requires a certain measure of spiritual capacity, and habitual exercise in the things of God which all do not possess for want of abiding fellowship with the Lord Jesus. The types are indeed pictures but to understand the pictures it is necessary that we should know something of the reality." DTS men who claim such qualifications ought to give this study its proper place.

F. The abuse of typological interpretation ought to make a study of it desirable. Ada R. Habershon, e.g., finds 131 comparisons between Joseph and X. Fact that both visited Shechem is significant. Walter Wilson, 199 "Swelling Jer. 12:5 (b) This is a picture of the predicament of one who is weary and disgusted with the Xnty that surrounds him. . . One who is made miserable by the Xns on earth would be far more miserable if he were in heaven where the highest form of Xnty prevails." (b) seem to be types bec of their use and bec of the evident meaning they convey. To whom??

"Typology, like Prophecy, has often suffered more from its friends than its foes. The fact that extremists have failed to distinguish between that which is typical and that which is merely allegorical, analogous, parallel, happy illustration, or resemblance, may have driven conservative theologians from the field. When truth is tortured by fadists and extremists, an added obligation is thereby imposed upon conservative scholarship to declare it in its right proportions." ⁴SC Bib Sac XCI,274.

- G. Desirable to study types bec they speak of X. We ought to be eager to know all we can about Him. If 50 types of Him, then think of the poverty if we do not see them as well as the substance. If you say, why need types when we have the record of Him, I answer, why need illustrations or cartoons in a lecture or sermon after you've made absolutely clear the truth?

II. Definition of a type

"Webster " A figure or representation of something to come."

Terry " In the science of theology it properly signifies the preordained representative relation which certain persons, events, and institutions of the OT bear to corresponding persons, events, and institutions in the New."

Moorehead " pictures, object lessons, by which God taught His people concng His grace and saving power."

A divinely purposed illustration which ^{fulfills} illustrates its ^{corresponding} antitype. *reality*

III. Classification of types.

- A. Person, Adam clearly stated as so.
- B. Event, children of Israel in wilderness, 1 Cor 10
- C. Thing, Tabernacle *Myat ?*
- D. Institution, Priesthood ^{of} Sabbath } *combine*
- E. Ceremonies, Offerings. *Consecration of priests* }

IV. Interpretation of types.

A. Determine what is a type.

1. Some are specifically designated so by NT. Marsh said that a type is only a type if the NT calls it so. Those given more or less direct Divine sanction in NT are

Adam, Rom 5:11, 1 Cor 15:22

Melchizedek, Heb 7

Sarah and Hagar, Ishmael and Isaac, Gal 4:22

Abraham by implication in same passage

Moses, Gal 3:19; Acts 3:22-26

Jonah, Matt 12:40

David, Ezek 37:24; Lk 1:32

(Solomon, 2 Sam 7

Zerubbabel and Joshua, Zech 3,4, Hag 2:23)

Preservation of Noah, 1 Pet 3:20

Redemption from Egypt and exodus, Mt 2:15, 1

Thru wilderness, 1 Cor 10, Jn 3:14, 5:33, Rev 2:18.

2. Some can be inferred to be so bec stated in OT or implied by NT.

The 2 above. "Must not, therefore, the silence of the NT in the case of any supposed type, be an argument against the existence of that type?" Undoubtedly, we reply, if the Scriptures of the NT professed to illustrate the whole field of typical matter in God's ancient dispensations; but by no means if...they only take it up in detached portions, by way of occasional example..."Fairbairn 61

Joseph never strictly called type of X yet he certainly is one. How can one avoid extremes in this matter? What Ramm calls "genuine resemblance" in form, idea, or spirit between the OT point of reference and the NT counterpart, 144. Not sure can follow and say as he does that it must be designated resemblance. Seems he contradicts himself. Perhaps Fairbairn states it better "there must have been in the Old the same great elements of truth as in the things they represented under the New; and then, in the Old, these must have been exhibited in a form more level to the comprehension, more easily and distinctly cognizable by the minds of men." 50. Since we bel in unity of Scriptures we may infer from that that certain types will be only implied.

"As we do not wait for the fulfilment of a prophecy to declare it to be a prophecy, so we do not need the NT to declare everything to be a type that is a type." Terry. 248. Avoid Marsh's principle on one hand and PB extreme on other bec the one is to meager a principle and the other is tending to be allegorical. Fairbairn is middle ground.

B. Determine the area of resemblance. There is no one-to-one correspondence bet type and antitype. There are points of similiarity bet Moses and X and points of dissimilarity. It is at the point of similiarity that the typical truth is found. "and the surrounding area of dissimilarity is the natural, historical, or geographic background of the type necessary for its very existence." Ramm 145. Eliminate those factors, yet remember that generally if the whole is typical then the parts are, e.g. the Tabernacle, but this isn't true of a person as Ramm's generalization would include. Just bec Joseph is type doesn't mean everything he did is. What is typical, what is accidental, what is historical, etc all need to be distinguished.

C. Differentiate bet typical and allegorical interpretation. "Allegorism is the method of interpreting a literary text that regards the literal sense as the vehicle for a secondary more spiritual and more profound sense." Ramm 21. Literal sense milk, allegorical, meat acc to Alexandrian school. Typical inter regards the literal sense as literal, is aware of the historical, geographical, temporary component parts of the story, but sees in them a resemblance to literal truth as revealed in the NT. Do not let allegorical swallow up typical tho really even the PB's don't. Their error is creating far-fetched types, really, as a sort of pseudo-spirituality.

D. Do not prove doctrine from a type unless there is clear NT authority.
To say that something proves is quite diff from something illustrates.
Do not get principles from types unless they are also NT principles.
This is PB error too. Arriving at principles of Xn conduct from OT stories.
OK if principle is also in NT.

ADAM

Adam is a type in twofold sense; (1) of X in relation to headship primarily and (2) of the Church in his relationship to Eve.

I. Type of the Christ, Rom 5:12-21.

A. The type is declared, vs 14. No supposition in this case. Adam called Τύπος του μέλλοντος Brubacher makes a lot of Adam's being a type by contrast, but I'm not sure that's legitimate. Adam innocent, X sinless, Adam grown when created, X grew. Walvoord Bib Sac 105(Vol) p 288 makes similarities--A and X both entered world by special act of ~~xxxxxx~~ God; both sinless. But the point of the type in this case is the representative character of each. Both acted on behalf of others. This pointed up perhaps better in 1 Cor 15:21,22, 45-50. First Adam and last Adam point to the type and the similarity is that a group called "all" are affected by both. Differences in the effect, but the similarity consists in the headship. In Adam all sinned, in X all made alive (take it as not referring to res of all but to the res of believers only). In Rom the contrast developed --

Adam	Christ	Verse
Trespass	Gift	15
Condemnation	Justification	16
Death	Life	17
Trespass	Righteousness	18
Disobedience	Obedience	19
Abounding trespass	Abounding grace	20
Reign of sin	Reign of grace	21

II. Type of the Church. Gen 2:18,21-24, Eph 5:25-32.

Relationship established, Gen 2

Relationship used, Eph 5. Type of X and Church is in all marriage but this harks back to Adam and Eve.

Relationship explained.

1. Adam, Eve, Church partake of creation.

Adam said Eve bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. Eph 5:30 same of us and Christ. Jews said God didn't take woman out of head lest she be proud; of eye, lest lustful; of ear lest curious; of mouth lest talkative; of heart lest jealous; of hand lest covetous; of foot lest busybody; of rib bec it is always covered and woman is to be modest. Modesty was therefore the prime quality Edersheim, 146. Whether press that of not (and isn't the Church to be modest and not take any glory from the Bridegroom?) the act of creation (@ Cor 5:17) is evident.

2. Adam, Eve, Church partook of cleansing.

Gen 3:21, Eph 5:26. "The painful sense of nakedness that oppressed them after their transgression, was the natural offspring of a consciousness of sin--an instinctive fear lest the unveiled body should give indication of the evil thots and dispositions which now lodged within." Fairbairn, 249. But their covering still left them exposed to condemnation of God. God had to provide if it would be sufficient. "But clothing so obtained argued the sacrifice of life in the animal that furnished them; and thus, through the death of an inferior yet innocent living creature, was the needed relief brought to their disquieted and fearful bosoms." Ibid

STANDARD B & P "NOTEAR"

ARD B & P "NOTEAR"

"If viewed apart from this higher symbolical aim (covering of conscience too) the outward act will naturally appear small and unworthy of God; but so to view it were to dissever it from the very reason of its performance." Perhaps Adam and Eve reasoned that provision would be by sacrifice but perhaps not, altho true that "it was simply the divine procedure in these cases which formed the ground of man's obligation; bec that prodedure was essentially a revelation of the mind and will of Godhead for the guidanced the rati nal beings who, being made in God's image, were to find their glory and their well-being in appropriating His acts, and copying His example." Fairbairn, 250-51.

3. Adam, Eve, church cleave.

Relationship is one of union. It is one of communion; it is one of separation to the one to whom joined alone. Eph passage is shot thru with idea of sanctification built on this relationship.

MELCHIZEDEK

Gen 14; Psa 110; Heb 5-7

I. What He was

A. King of Righteousness. $\text{מֶלֶךְ} + \text{צְדָקָה}$ combined with לְיָדוֹ of possession means my king is righteous or $\text{צְדָקָה} - \text{מֶלֶךְ}$

B. King of Salem. Derived from שָׁלוֹם meaning peace. Part of his title and city over which he ruled. Place is uncertain. Most take it to be Jerusalem. Jerome, Alford take it as town 8 miles from Scythopolis and same as Salim of Jn 3:23. Jerusalem view better. Jews claimed Zedek as a name of Jerusalem. In Tel el-Amarna letters there are some written by Ebed-Tob, who was priest and king in Jerus, to Pharaoh Amenhotep IV. Speaks of Uru-salim, or Jerus, and was capital of a large district which extended southward as far as Karmel of Judah. Says "It was not my father nor mother who installed me in this place, but the arm of the Mighty King gave it to me." Written in 1500 B.C. So city in existence then and had a priest king.

2. Psa 76:2 calls Jerus Salem.

3. Josh 10:1--name of ruler of Jerus at time of conquest was Adonizedek which sounds like a legitimate successor of Mel.

4. Psa 110:4 Zion is Jerus.

C. A Man.

Various theories.

1. Shem. Possible that Shem as survivor of the deluge was alive when these events occurred, but Mel was without descent. Wouldn't have been a diff order of priesthood bec Levi would have been in loins of Shem and Abr. Shem would be reigning in country of descendants of Ham.

2. Son of God. Mostly arose from Heb 7:3 without father etc. $\alpha\phi\omega\mu\omega\lambda\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ means made a type of and how could X be a type of Himself. Without recorded genealogy. "It is simply of the omissions of the narrative that the apostle is speaking; these omissions being necessary to the perfection of the type." Grant, Gen, 89.

3. Origen said he was an angel.

4. Melchizedekians of 4-50 thot he was a Power, Virtue, Influence of God.

5. Canaanitish prince, pious and rel man. Some of facts veiled that he might be a more perfect type of X. God might have used any of the king-priests but Mel was ruling at time of Abr. He was a man who was a monotheist. Even if want to consider Mel merely a title and not a name, then still OK, it is his position what is important.

D. Without certain things. Not eternal but simply no evidence that would link his line of descent to Aaron. He had father, mother, etc, but no revelation of them. In respect to priestly office he did not depend on parents. In these respects he was made like unto Son of God, i.e. in no recorded earthly origin or genealogy.

E. Priest of Most High God. When Mel lived there were only Gentiles on earth. Jews not yet singled out. There was evidently a knowledge of God in Canaan and a way of priestly worship. Delitzsch says "Mel is like the setting sun of the primitive rev made to men before their separation into nations, the last rays of which shine on the patriarch from whom the true light of the world is in process of coming. The sun sets to rise again in the antitype in JC, when the preparatory epoch of Israel shall have passed." Gen I,412. He was a Gentile king. Priest of all men bec he was priest of El Elyon.

II. What He did.

Eastern confederation of Kings under Chedorlaomer were victorious over cities of plain where Lot dwelt. Abr and 318 servants battle and rescue Lot. As returned Mel meets.

- A. He brot forth bread and wine. No special significance in this. It was simply a refreshing repast, Ruth 2:14; Jud 19:19. Not in itself a priestly act tho performed by a priest. Hospitality for weary travellers.
- B. Blessed Abr. Indicates his superiority to Abr. And Arb recognized him as his spiritual superior. Obviously God's rev of Himself not yet confined to one line of people. This blessing "is not any mere courtesy of private persons. It was done in the presence of various parties of jealousy watchful retainers. Men of rank and office and position consider how they should act to one another and who should take precedence--and Abram did deliberately and with a perfect perception of what he was doing, whatever he now did." Dods, Gen 129.
- C. Recd tithes from Abraham. From the spoils of the victory over the kings.

III. What He means.

Priest hood is point of the type & superiority is point of priesthood.

Psa 110:4--priest forever after order of Mel. Begins actually with ascension. Full fulfillment awaits M when Messiah would be priest, Zech 6:13. Will est kdom in righteousness and peace. X is priest now after order but doesn't fully enter into Mel type until M. Primary purpose of the type is to emphasize the order of X's priesthood. And Heb 5-7 makes primary point that Mel priesthood is superior.

Superior bec 1. King priest. Aaronic line only priests. Mel both and so X. Heb 7:2. Righteousness before peace. Reigns from Jerus. Bread and wine not bec he was a priest (as RC Church teaches) but and he was a priest (waw is connective). *pp 14, 17*
~~2. Priest of Most High God.~~ Mel didn't offer any sacrifice tho plenty of animals around in spoils they won. If see anything more than simple refreshment in this then see the memorial aspect of it as Friesen does and apply it to priestly work in resurrection where Mel presents memorials of sacrifice, bread and wine.

2. Priest of Most High God. So X priest for all nations. No national distinctions now. If said priest of Jehovah then have covenant people idea. Note Lk 1:32--son of Highest. Links X with this type. Aaronic priests only for Israel.

3. Bec of dignity attached to Mel priesthood. Proved by paying tithes and being blessed. Levites recd bec law commanded it, Numb 18:26 Payment by Abr a greater act of submission bec Levites not actually superior as Mel was to Abr. Abr did it voluntarily and did it to one who did not belong to his race of family. Levites were brethren. The tithe here was a gift of a tenth. Whenever we give to X (not pay) then acknowledge His superiority. Mel blessed Abr.

4. Bec of its covenant, Heb 8:6. Levitical priesthood based on conditional cov. Mel based on God's oath, Heb 6:13 and is better covenant bec it does what priesthood is supposed to do, i.e bring men to God. If X's priesthood on Mosaic cov alone then of wrong tribe (Judah) and no guarantee he could save.

5. Bec of duration. Heb 7:3,8,16,17,19,25. No record of birth, death of Mel interpreted by writer of Heb as being type of eternal priesthood. Heb 5:6 uses εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα and 7:3 uses εἰς τὸ διακρίεσθαι so no doubt.

6. Bec of its administration. Aaronic--many priest. Mel, one. Argument from silence in type bec just no record of Mel's having recd priesthood from someone or passed it on. X's administration is ἀπαράβατον inviolable, absolute. Unchangeable in that it isn't liable to pass to a successor.

ISAAC

I. As a type of X.

A. In his person and character.

1. Miraculous birth, Gen 17:15-21; 18:10; 21:12. Lk 1:28-38. It had been delayed in coming--25 years since God promised Abr he would have a seed. Both were children of promise, Isa 9:6. As Sarah did an unusual thing in having a child at that age, so X's birth new, Jer 31:22.

2. An only son. Heb 11:17; Jn 3:16 even tho Abr had other children, Isaac only one of promise. The we are children of God, X only begotten.

3. Father of many, Heb 2:13

B. In his offering, Gen. 22. Trial

Type of X's offering as a burnt-offering, vs 2, not sin-offering. Therefore not exactly right to say that the type breaks down since as a willing sacrifice Isaac went all the way. The ram represents the sin offering and substitution, but chief emphasis is on Isaac's willingness. Many ways it's a type of Rom 12:1 --living sacrifice--for the believer.

- 1. Offering was to be a sacrifice.
- 2. Offering was at the sovereign pleasure of God.
- 3. Offering demonstrated the love of the father.
- 4. Father was the priest in both cases, Isa 53:10.
- 5. Sons were obedient unto death in both cases.
- 6. Father pleased, 16ff.

*Isaac willing bec he loved & trusted Father
-Par 22
#4:5:7*

C. In his deliverance. 11,12, Heb 11:19. Triumph

D. In his love life, Gen 24.

Even CHM prefers to call this an illustration rather than a type. Be careful to remember that Church not taught until NT but types allowed for by P's as in Eph 3:5.

- 1. The Purpose of the Father. Based on an oath, 9, of which Rebekah knew nothing until afterward. Yet servant wasn't to coerce anyone, vs 8. Still whosoever will.
- 2. The Paramount position of the Son. Chiefly the purpose of the Father is to glorify his son, vs 36. Eph 1:20-22. At all costs the Son is to be the chief concern. No daughter of Canaanites would do nor is Isaac to be taken back to Ur. Better he not have a bride than the wrong one. Point is that God's purposes are Christocentric not soteriological.
- 3. The Proclamation of the Servant. One object was to announce what Abr had told him. Proclaimed vast resources of Father, 35 and glory of the son, 36. Jn/6: 14,15. J
- 4. The Power of the Message. 58. She consented to marry a stranger whom she had never seen. She is espoused as we are to X.

- 10
5. The Provision of gifts, 53. Guille says silver speaks of redemption bec Ex 30,38, 1 Pet 1:19; gold of glory bec Heb 9 golden cherubim were gold and were of glory and raiment of robes of righteousness which is provided not by Rebekah but by Father.
 6. The Progress to the Bridegroom, 61. Whole journey passed over in silence. So our is lost sight of, troubles fade away, in light of the significant thing, ie. we're on the way Home to meet Him. All time Isaac watching.
 7. The Perfection of Home. Permanent, perfect, centers around a Person. No doubt He will love us.

II Type of the Ch.

Gal 4: 28 - Those composed of spiritual children of Ab.

III Type of X's life

Gal 4: 29 - New nature as of Ishmael - old nature.

Bea These are allegorized, does it mean it is not a type?

JOSEPH

scripture about him.

Joseph nowhere called a type of X. Only in NT in Jn 4:5; Acts 7; Heb 11: Rev 7. But if type is a Divinely purposed illustration then Joseph is a type. All would admit that his remarkable life is direct result of Divine intervention and guidance so why not admit him as a type? NT is not a textbook on typology. God expects us to recognize some obvious things like this for ourselves. However, just bec he is a type doesn't make everything in his life typical. Habershon has about 150 typical things. 2 of Pharaoh's officers in prison, Gen 40:2,3 type of 2 thieves on cross. Peace be unto you, Gen 43:23. Stick to broad lines and best to follow Phil 2, Humiliation and exaltation.

I. Type of X in Humiliation.

- A. Birth by God's special intervention, Gen 30:22-24, Lk 1:35.
- B. Both were special objects of their Father's love, Men 37:3; Mt 3:17.
- C. Both were hated by brethren, Gen 37:4; Jn 15:24-5.
- D. Both were rejected by brethren, Ge 37:8; Mt 21:37-9; Jn 15:24-25. *Mt 11:16,17,20.*
Joseph's dreams indicated he was to rule over brethren. X came to do that too. Brethren failed to understand or benefit by the dreams. Indeed they conspired against him as he went seeking them.
- E. Both delivered to the place of death, Gen 37:18,24; Mt 26:3-4; 27:35-37.
Sold for silver, Gen 37:28; Mt 26:14-5. Condemned tho innocent, Gen 39:11-20; Isa 53:9; Mt 27:19-24. Joseph became a servant in Egypt, Gen 39:1-6 Phil 2:7. When tempted both resisted, Gen 39:9; Jn 14:30. Innocent suffering in both cases which led to the exaltation.

→ Back

*Habershon Th. M. makes
E. Rejection of his
Person, not type of death.*

II. Type of X in Exaltation.

- A. Both delivered by power of God, Gen 41:38. - *Exalted to place of power. 41:40-44. Heb 1:3*
- B. Both took a Gentile bride during time of rejection, Gen 41:45. Zaphnath-paaneah means saviour of the world or the one who furnishes the nourishment of life. Wife's name was Asenath which means belonging to or dedicated to Neit, an Egyptian goddess. Bride of X is dedicated to X. Gentile bride is Acts 15:14-18. →
- C. Both finally recognized and received by brethren as saviour. Gen 45:1-15; Rom 11:1-26. Note how Joseph has to convince brethren that it is really he and that he is really alive from the dead. Zech 12:10-12; 13:6. Dealt with his brethren not acc to their iniquities.
- D. Both exalted their brethren to places of honor and safety, Gen 45:16-18
Isa 65:17-25. *Psa 47:2-4* *Even during exaltation, broken dependent*
on Joseph for sustenance, 50:21

Both see. servants - Gen 39:1,2 Dan 4:1 Phil 2

Mediator servants Phil 39:4,6 Lk 2:52 Mk 5:8

Tempted 39:7-12 Mt 4:1-11

Falsely condemned 39:19,20a Lk 23:23,24

Suffered punishment That belonged to another (Mr Potyha) - Dan 3:6

Lk 23:15

of brother are type of earthly L. in rejection while Joseph has spiritual bride, then their acceptance not till after tribulation & judgment.

Parable 41:54,56-42:2 - world wide Rev 3:10. Not kept from family but

When recognized Joseph ^{maintained them in} they did otherwise, 43:21. Mt 24:21,22

AARON

Hebrews gives license to bel that Aaron type of priesthood of X.

1. Both appointed to the office, Heb 5:4, 5-6.
2. Time of appointment. Aaron set apart before the sacrifices were slain and so was X before need of priesthood even became a reality. Then Aaron's sons anointed after sacrifice was slain and blood applied; so believers become priests after Calvary.
3. Manner of anointing. Only Aaron with oil, Psa 133:2; Lev 8:10; Heb 1:9.
4. Function of priesthood. Represent the people before God. He was both Advocate and Intercessor for the people. Numb 16:46-50.
5. Nature of priesthood. Aaron remained part of the people while ministering so X is true humanity and continues so even in glory.
6. Basis of priesthood. Covenant. Mosaic vs new, Heb 8:6.

Many contrasts but these are similarities which are typical foreshadowings.

ABEL

A type in (1) his sacrifice and (2) slaying.

- I. His sacrifice. Type of true Shepherd, X, who offered Himself as bloody sacrifice. Heb 11:4. Gen 4:2-7. Based on obedience to what God must have revealed to Adam and Eve. Must have known that God was to be worshipped, by sacrifice, and with end view of receiving His salvation. Offered by righteous person, Heb 11 Mt 22:35
Involved blood. This is the reason why accepted, of course. Not life as Cain's but death nec. Bloodless no good.
- II. His slaying. By wicked hands.
Result of it. Blood cries out meaning that the fact of his death cannot be escaped. So with X. Savor of life or death.
That's why he being dead yet speaketh.

Note that sacrifice itself may be a type of finished work of X apart from Abel since whole idea of sacrifice in OT is a type of X's death. But consideration above esp looks at the Person as a type of X.

BENJAMIN

Youngest of Jacob's sons and in naming he is type of X. Gen 35:18. Son of my sorrows was name given by Rachel and Benjamin given by father Jacob meaning son of my right hand. Man of sorrows to his mother, Lk 2:35 and exalted conqueror to Father. 2 advents in view.

DAVID

Prophetic significance of him recognized but included in prophecy is typology. Type of X the Shepherd *Eph 37:14*
Type of X the King. After anointed David was in exile while Saul usurped the throne and illus X calling men today, 1 Sam 22:2. During this time he married Abigail, 1 Sam 25:39-42--church as bride.

JOSHUA

1. Name. Jehovah saves. OT equivalent of Jesus
2. Place in history. Successor to Moses, Jn 1:17.
3. Activity as intercessor, Josh 7:5-9; Lk 22:32; 1 Jn 2:1.
4. Position as one who apportioned Israel, Josh 13.

KINSMAN-REDEEMER זר

Redemption of the land in Lev 25; redemption of marriage, Deut 25. Became connected by tradition.

Redeemer had to be

1. Near kinsman. Lev 25:48-9; Ruth 3:12-13; Heb 2:14-5.
~~Ruth~~ Boaz related to Elimelech by blood and tho not 1st goel (bec the barefoot kinsman was) he was 2nd in line. Boaz near kinsman by blood relationship and by exclusion of the other kinsman bec of presence of Ruth who had to be redeemed in the transaction. Prob already married and therefore couldn't redeem Ruth in the affair. So X stands as near kinsman bec of being made of woman and bec no one else could redeem a Gentile sinner like me. Not ashamed to call us brethren. Hood thicker than water and always assures a more intimate and deep relationship. Assures of His interest and love.
2. Willing to redeem.
 Barefoot kinsman didn't exert any initiative but Boaz did. Lev 25:48 did not put any compulsion on a man to redeem. Only constraint was blood tie. If love didn't prompt him no law could. Love for Ruth did prompt Boaz and he became more than willing but as McGee says eager. So X, Jn 10:18; Heb 12:2; Mt 20:28
3. Able to redeem.
 Barefoot kinsman for some reason could not redeem. Reason not stated. Perhaps as suggested above he was already married. Boaz being unmarried would be unaffected even tho Ruth not an Hebrew bec when he married her she got all the privileges. Boaz evidently a rich man.
4. Must be free himself.
 Redeemer must not be under the curse of bondage which makes the redemption essential for the other involved. Boaz couldn't have redeemed if he himself had been under slavery or a Moabite. Racially Boaz qualified. Wealthy also. Boaz free to do the job. So X, Jn 14:30; Matt 5:17. Heb 7:26.
5. Must have the price of redemption, Lev 25:27; Rom 3:24-26; 1 Pet 1:18-9; Gal 3:13
 Value of any currency measured in what it can accomplish. Turkey 2.8 $\frac{1}{2}$
 Only thing that could buy our salvation was blood of X. Redemption for Ruth cost nothing, so for us, but did cost someone something.

MOSES

Type based on Deut 18:15-19--prophet like himself. So we may expect that the events of his life would foreshadow X's.

In the events of this time.

Delivered--deliverer.

1. Both as children were born in period when Israel persecuted and in danger of death, Ex 1:22; Mt 2:13-16.
2. Both chosen to be deliverers by Sovereign choice, Ex 3:7-10. Acts 7:25.

Rejected-~~5~~Received.

3. Both rejected by their brethren, Ex 2:11-15; Jn 1:11; Acts 7:23-28; 18:5-6. During this period of rejection both minister to Gentiles and secure a Gentile bride, typical of the Church, Ex 2:16; 2 Cor 11:2; Eph 5:25-32.
4. Both received by Israel at their second comings. Ex 4:19-31; Rom 11:24-26; Acts 15:14-17.

In their Persons

1. Prophet. Numb 34:1-2; Jn 12:29; Mt 13,57; 21:11; Acts 3:22-23.
2. Priest. As advocate, Ex 32:31-35; 1 Jn 2:1-2.
As intercessor, Ex 17:1-6; Heb 7:25.
3. As king or ruler, Deut 33:4-5; Jn 1:49.

Both died before promised land received by their people.