

## 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. ~~typo~~ <sup>ant</sup> ~~typo~~ means an imprint which may serve as a mold or pattern ~~of~~ 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. Ngglect 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, 1, xxx.
- E. The general neglect of types ought to make us want to study them. Fairbairn, 1,1 "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 capactiy, 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 ogght 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." <sup>4</sup>SC 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 <sup>subsumes</sup> illustrates its <sup>corresponding</sup> 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 *Egypt?*
- D. Institution, Priesthood <sup>of priests</sup> or 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.