

## Typology and Reformed Exegesis

We should begin with a definition. Typology is a biblical author's intentional comparison of two (or more) persons, institutions, or events. These comparisons are observed between the type (the original) and the antitype (the after copy). Authorial intent behind such comparisons is suggested by the presence of verbal concordance and shared thematic patterns, a literary phenomenon extensively seen throughout the Scripture.<sup>1</sup> Admittedly our confidence in the validity of biblical types is more secure the more extensive the verbal concordance and the more elaborate the thematic patterning.<sup>2</sup>

Today, however, there is an unfortunate hesitance on the part of many reformed exegetes to recognize and work with biblical types.<sup>3</sup> This is in spite of the overwhelming evidence that the exegetical method of the evangelists and apostles was robustly typological.<sup>4</sup> Such reluctance, it seems, stems from several misunderstandings. First, there is a lack of appreciation for the typological framework that undergirds the entire apostolic understanding of Jesus. Second, there is a striking under appreciation of the necessity of typology to sustain reformed (especially Pauline) covenantal theology as well as an unwarranted fear of the loss of the historicity of the Bible to allegorical fancy, a fear which fundamentally misunderstands Paul's own use of allegory in Galatians 4. And finally, there has not yet developed a consensus on the precise method by which legitimate types may be recognized. This short paper is intended to speak to these misunderstandings and, hopefully, to help to correct them.

First, typology is crucial to the entire apostolic enterprise. As practiced by the authors of the New Testament, typology is the method used to show the excellence of Jesus, who surpasses all of the Old Testament prophets, priests, and kings who came before Him. The evidence for these typological comparisons is as pervasive as it is indisputable in the New Testament. How do we demonstrate this? We begin by noting that the comparison between the Old Testament type and Jesus as the antitype always

---

<sup>1</sup> One of the best studies of the biblical words associated with typological exegesis is given by Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Typos Structures*, (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Seminary Dissertation Series, 1981) 115-190. The classic modern treatment is Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: Die Typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen* (Gutersloh: Bertelsmann, 1939).

<sup>2</sup> This admission is not to concede that typology differs from more propositional biblical statements in being more subjective and thus more uncertain. Propositions must likewise be interpreted, and some interpretations are more persuasive than others, as any cursory glance at commentary on James 2:24 demonstrates.

<sup>3</sup> Such hesitance is not warranted by the Westminster Confession. WCF VII.5 specifically references the relationship between the old and new covenants as containing: "promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the paschal lamb, and other types and ordinances delivered to the people of the Jews, all foreshadowing Christ to come..." In short, the WCF mandates the discipline of typology as fundamental to a confessional understanding of the Scriptural testaments, both old and new.

<sup>4</sup> F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982) 217-218.

involves something better.<sup>5</sup> Consequently, with respect to Jesus as the antitype, Christ always excels His Old Testament type. This juxtaposition creates a pattern of comparisons, a relationship between type and antitype that appears to be two-fold. Where the Old Testament typical figure is sinful, Jesus, by comparison, is shown to be sinless. Likewise, where the Old Testament type is heroic, Jesus, by comparison, is shown to be *more* heroic. In short, Jesus is *greater*, His ministry is *better*, and His triumph is filled with *more* glory.

Examples of this typology are manifold in the New Testament, as we have said. We are explicitly told that Jesus brings **more** grace than Adam (Rom 5:17),<sup>6</sup> that He has a **greater** dignity than Abraham (John 8:53). Jesus has a **greater** love than Jacob (John 4:12). He has a **greater** wisdom than Solomon (Luke 11:31), by which He builds a **greater** temple (Matt 12:6). He has a **greater** testimony than Jonah (Luke 11:32). Moreover, Jesus has **more** glory than Moses (Heb 3:3), for He has a **greater** tabernacle (Heb 9:11), offering a **better** sacrifice (Heb 9:14). Jesus has a **more** excellent priesthood than Aaron (Heb 8:6), and administers a **better** covenant with **better** promises (Heb 8:6). And He comes even with a **mightier** ministry than John the Baptist (Matt 3:11, Mark 1:17, Luke 3:16), for He has a **higher** rank of being (John 1:30). If such are several of the exceeding excellencies of Jesus and His ministry, how otherwise could we measure their surpassing excellence but by a typological method that compares the antitype to the type?

Moreover, there is an entire topic of implied comparisons that is likewise typological in character. Death came to all through Adam's disobedience, but Jesus' obedience brought many to life (Rom 5:17). The law came by Moses, but grace and truth by Jesus Christ (John 1:17). Moses and Elijah were worthy of honor, but Jesus alone is to be worshipped (Luke 9:30, 35). Joshua gave the people rest, but a greater rest comes through Jesus (Heb 4:8). Moreover, David's kingdom was great, but David's Son was to have a greater throne (Mark 12:35-37).

A further aspect of the comparisons underlying New Testament typology is the new/old contrast between the covenants of works and grace. Hebrews states explicitly that the old covenant had "faults" necessitating a new or better covenant (Heb 8:7-8). Similarly, Paul argues that the old covenant was of the "letter," and so brought death. The new covenant, however, is of the "Spirit," and so brings life (2 Cor 3:6). Consequently we see that the new covenant is shown to be superior to the old by the redemptive use of the word "new," implying a better contrast with the old.

It is against this background that the typological insufficiencies of the old covenant are juxtaposed to the redemptive excellence of the new.<sup>7</sup> Jesus compares His

---

<sup>5</sup> Leonhard Goppelt called this phenomenon a "hightening" (*G. Steigerung*). *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, trans. Donald H. Madvig (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982) 18.

<sup>6</sup> The words in bold reflect the use of the comparative in the cited NT Greek text.

<sup>7</sup> The words in bold font which follow reflect the use of the word "new" in Greek.

ministry with that of John the Baptist by contrasting **new** wine and **new** wineskins with old wine and old wineskins (Matt 9:17, Luke 5:37-38). Jesus comes as the Mediator of a **new** covenant (2 Cor 3:6; Heb 8:7, 13), which speaks with a better blood than Abel (Heb 12:24). The New Testament Christian is a **new** creation, the old having passed away (2 Cor 5:7). He is a **new** man (Eph 4:22-24; Col 3:9-10), wears **new** garments (Luke 5:36), has a **new** name (Rev 2:17, 3:12), is given a **new** song (Rev 5:9), obeys a **new** commandment (John 13:34, 1 John 2:8), has the hope of a **new** Jerusalem (Rev 3:12, 21:2) and a **new** heavens and a **new** earth (2 Pet 3:13; Rev 21:1). And in all these things we see that the antitype excels the type, and that the new is better, having a greater ministry, and filled with more glory. In sum, these examples affirm that no approach to understanding the Old Testament offers greater reward in setting forth the all excelling excellencies of Jesus than the typological method of the evangelists and apostles themselves!<sup>8</sup>

Second, the necessity of typology to the maintenance of reformed covenant theology is often overlooked. Two of the most fundamental doctrines of the Protestant faith are federalism, a doctrine wholly dependent upon the typology of Adam and Christ, as Paul develops it (Rom 5:12-21 and 1 Cor 15:20-22), and justification by faith alone, which Paul defends by means of an allegory (Gal. 4:21-31).<sup>9</sup>

While much attention has been devoted to the doctrine of federalism in Romans, although it is often not recognized as typology, little attention has been devoted to Paul's appeal to allegory to defend the doctrine of justification by grace alone.<sup>10</sup> Let's consider this apostolic allegory and its theological significance, seeing whether we can defend Paul's exegesis with a historical-grammatical method of interpretation.

---

<sup>8</sup> There is a large and respected contingent of reformed exegetes who have pursued typology as a part of biblical theology. Among the more notable are Geerhardus Vos, E.J. Young, Meredith Kline, Herman and Ridderbos. Occasionally critics have tried to restrain the discipline of typology altogether, alleging its abuses outweigh its contributions. Generally an appeal is made to "Marsh's dictum," an extra-biblical (and thus contra-Confessional, WCF I.9) hermeneutical standard which states that we must "not set forth any typology except that which is explicit in the Scriptures." Responding to such a view, Edmund P. Clowney, former president of Westminster Theological Seminary, said, "To conclude that we can never see a type where the New Testament does not identify it is to confess hermeneutical bankruptcy." *Preaching Christ in All the Scriptures* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 2003) 31.

<sup>9</sup> This is not to overlook Paul's typological view of the sacraments previewed in the "spiritual food and drink" that sustained Israel in the wilderness, or the foreshadowing of baptism as Israel went through the sea (1 Cor 10:1-4). In what sense, apart from typology, are we to understand that the rock in the wilderness was Christ (1 Cor 10:4)? We can appreciate, perhaps, the statement that Christ is the Paschal Lamb (1 Cor 5:17), but in what sense is Christ the serpent in the wilderness as well (John 3:14)? Until the arguments undergirding these claims can be reasonably and persuasively set forth, our typology is not commensurate with an apostolic hermeneutic.

<sup>10</sup> Modern critics often forget that allegory in modernity is a fancy that is not based on historical reality. Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* is a case in point of a modern allegory. Paul's use of the term is clearly not the same. His reasoning about the two covenants is founded upon the *history* of the patriarchal narratives, specifically, upon the histories of Sarah and Hagar. But Paul understands that there was a redemptive significance to these historical accounts. Once again, until it is evident that Sarah and Hagar represent the two covenants of grace and works, a point so obvious to Paul, our typology cannot claim to be commensurate to the apostolic hermeneutic.

## The Apostle Paul's Use of Allegory

The greatest crisis in the early life of the apostolic church was clearly the challenge to the gospel of free grace represented by the Judaizers, the controversy which necessitated the first ecumenical council at Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-3). Paul's epistle to the Galatians represents the most urgent and passionate defense of the gospel of grace in all the New Testament. Indeed, the stakes could not have been higher for the infant church in that controversy. Paul is so sobered by the threat of the Judaized gospel, which he calls no gospel (Gal 1:7), that he pronounces a curse (Gal 1:8) and an imprecation upon his opponents (Gal 5:12).

Now it is instructive that when the issue was so decisively drawn with his legalist opponents, Paul, at the climax of his argument, appealed to an *allegory* to refute the gainsayers of grace (Gal 4:24). It seems a fair question to ask our fellow Protestants whether, without the sanction of Holy Scripture, we would ever find the claim that Sarah and Hagar "are two covenants" persuasive. Would it be self-evident to us, as it apparently was to Paul and the Galatians, that these two women appearing in early Genesis dispositively anticipated<sup>11</sup> the covenants of promise and works?<sup>12</sup> Would

---

<sup>11</sup> Rather than understanding the bicovenantalism of Hagar and Sarah as merely *anticipating* the covenants of works and promise, it seems probable that in the providence of redemptive history Hagar and Sarah are likewise *explicating* the covenants of works and promise first announced to Adam in the garden (Gen 2:16-17 and 3:15). This argument, although inescapably typological, appears to complete Paul's understanding of the twin axes of works and promise (law and grace) that run right through the Scriptures. Paul's syncritical juxtaposition of works and promise in the figures of the two women Hagar and Sarah, who represent the Jerusalem below and the Jerusalem above, is echoed in the Johannine syncritical comparison of Lady Babylon and Lady Jerusalem. There should be no doubt that Lady Babylon is a figure for the Jerusalem below, even as Lady Jerusalem is a figure of the Jerusalem above. See Warren A. Gage, *St John's Vision of the Heavenly City* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Dallas, 2001) 50. John has already identified Jerusalem as a "spiritual" Egypt and Sodom (Rev 11:8). Babylon is the city made infamous in the Bible for having destroyed the temple of God in Jerusalem. Similarly, Jerusalem is the city made infamous for having destroyed the Temple of God in Christ Jesus (John 2:21). In all of this Jerusalem is justly charged with having become a "spiritual" Babylon, the proper contrast as the earthly "Old" Jerusalem to John's depiction of the heavenly New Jerusalem. Thus understood, both Paul and John are setting forth a syncritical juxtaposition of both a heavenly and earthly Jerusalem. Through a paranetic figure of speech, two women are set forth by both apostles to contrast the apostolic and the Judaistic gospel.

<sup>12</sup> Similarly, we might also ask how it is that Paul could see so clear a contrast between the covenant of Moses and the covenant of Christ in the account of the veil Moses wore after coming down from Mount Sinai, namely the fading glory of the one covenant contrasting with the perpetual glory of the other (2 Cor 3:7-4:6 and Exod 34:29-35)? We may justly inquire whether a normative Protestant hermeneutic today is capable of making and defending such identification apart from an appeal to Paul's apostolic authority alone. Moreover, how are we to demonstrate the truth so evident to the apostle that the Rock in the wilderness was Christ (1 Cor 10:4), that the waters of the Red Sea were baptismal (1 Cor 10:2) and that the "spiritual" bread and drink in the wilderness were communal (1 Cor 10:3-4)? If the Apostle Paul had not announced these truths, which should be self-evident from the Old Testament alone, would a pastor today setting forth such assertions not be scorned for wild speculation and eisegetical excess? And what of a pastor who would imagine that somehow the flood of Noah was likewise baptismal (1 Pet 3:20-21), or that the blessing of Melchizedek, who gave Abraham bread and wine (Gen 14:18) represented a greater priesthood and a greater covenant than the priesthood and covenant of Aaron (Heb 7:1-28). Would such a

Protestant scholarship today be capable of demonstrating, apart from Paul, the biblical theological bicovenantal theme of flesh and promise as represented by Hagar and Sarah (Gen 16:5 and 21:2, cf. Gal 4:24), Sinai and Zion (Exod 19:8 and Psa 48:2, cf. Gal 4:24-27), barren Jerusalem and fertile Zion (Isa 49:20-21 and 54:1, cf. Gal 4:27), and the Jerusalem of the second temple and the Jerusalem above (Gal 4:25-26)?<sup>13</sup>

Let's consider the first and most critical part of the question we have raised as to how Paul would have made the identification of Hagar with Sinai, and how such a comparison is defensible within the bounds of the historical-grammatical method. Perhaps the most striking grammatical similarity between the accounts of Hagar and Israel at Sinai is the use of the rare word *tsachaq* (to mock),<sup>14</sup> found in both accounts (Gen 21:6 and Exod 32:6). The identifying gesture of Ishmael, the son of the bondwoman, was to "mock" Isaac, the son of Sarah who had received the promise.<sup>15</sup> This "mocking" of Ishmael (Gen 21:6) is what makes Moses' use of the same word so significant when he describes the idolatry of the sons of Israel at Sinai who, like Ishmael, rose up to "mock" (Exod 32:6). Just as Paul would afterwards announce the doctrine that not all Israel is Israel (Rom 9:6), so Moses anticipates the same remnant doctrine when he charges the rebels at Sinai with rehearsing the action of Ishmael (Exod 32:6).

Now with respect to the Mosaic account of the similarity of Ishmael to Israel at Sinai, both Ishmael and disobedient Israel can boast in Abrahamic paternity. Both are circumcised (Gen 17:23; Josh 5:4-5). Yet idolatrous Israel is in jeopardy of not inheriting the blessing due to unbelief *like that of* Ishmael. By the use of a highly significant and rare word, Moses is inviting us to compare the two narratives that juxtapose faithless Israel and Ishmael.<sup>16</sup> This Mosaic equation of Ishmael and idolatrous Israel at Sinai makes Paul's argument against the Judaizers so probative, for like Ishmael, they too claimed both Abrahamic paternity and covenant circumcision. So with respect to the correspondence between the son of Hagar and Israel at Sinai, we observe a case of verbal

---

pastor even pass his ordination exams, much less hold his pulpit? Without a robust typology, is our modern Protestant hermeneutic sufficient for these things?

<sup>13</sup> Paul's entire federal theology depends on the *type* of Adam and Christ (Rom 5:12-14; 1 Cor 15:21-22, 45-49). Arguably the entire doctrine of justification by faith alone depends on biblical bicovenantalism, which is based on the *allegory* of Hagar and Sarah (Gal 4:24-27). Protestant dogmatics and poetry are thus inseparably bound together.

<sup>14</sup> S.V. *tsachaq*, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, F. Brown, S.R. Driver, C.A. Briggs (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1972) 850.

<sup>15</sup> The name Isaac is likewise derived from *tsachaq*, a point which emphasizes the literary and theological significance of the root within the text.

<sup>16</sup> There can be no doubt that such is Paul's point. He explicitly states that the Galatian church is *like* Isaac, children of promise (Gal 4:28) and that the "present" Jerusalem is like the children of the bondwoman, that is, they are *like* Ishmael (Gal 4:29).

concordance and structured similarity that suggests an intentional mirroring (or poetic comparison) of the two accounts by the sacred writer.<sup>17</sup>

A further clue to the interpretive framework of the Apostle Paul is the syncritical juxtaposition of two women, a common trope both in the biblical texts<sup>18</sup> and the literature of both the Jewish and the Hellenistic Galatians.<sup>19</sup> This figure of speech presents two women in order to contrast two ethical possibilities. The book of Proverbs, for example, which is highly exhortative, opens with a warning about the immoral woman (Prov 2:16-19) and ends with an admonition to marry the woman of virtue (Prov 31:10-31). The same admonitory charge is evident in Paul's instruction to cast out the bondswoman of legalism (Gal 4:30) and adhere to the woman of promise (Gal 4:31) as well as the Johannine charge to exercise wisdom in discerning the different destinies presented by Lady Babylon (Rev 17:5-9) and Lady Zion (Rev 21:1-2). To understand Paul's allegory fully requires a familiarity not only with the Bible but with the literature of the original recipients, at least if we are to take seriously the historical component of historical-grammatical exegesis. It is in this area especially that we see great hope as Protestants become increasingly attuned to the contribution of classical<sup>20</sup> and Septuagintal<sup>21</sup> study to New Testament exegesis, along with the already quite well established recognition of the value of the study of second temple Judaism.

In sum, the poetics of a Protestant biblical theology requires a rigorous historical as well as grammatical exegetical approach and a disciplined typological method. The method of biblical exegesis we are advocating is wholly consistent with the historical grammatical method of Protestant biblical interpretation. It begins with the Scriptures in their original languages of Hebrew and Greek. We insist that no serious demonstration of biblical theology (or systematic theology, for that matter) is possible apart from the original expression of the texts of Scripture, where many subtleties of lexical and grammatical form are preserved. Structural analysis, such as chiastic patterning, often

---

<sup>17</sup> Moses uses the same word (*tsachaq*) in the account of the Sodomites falsely charging Lot with mocking (Gen 19:14) and Potiphar's wife falsely charging Joseph with folly (Gen 39:17). The incipient disobedience of Israel, which is likened to Sodom and Egypt, is anticipated in Exodus 2:14 and 14:11-12 and finds full expression in Revelation 11:8 (cf. Isa 1:10, Ezek 16:26, 48-49).

<sup>18</sup> There are several juxtapositions of this kind in Scripture, especially in the patriarchal narratives. Abraham is developed between Hagar and Sarah. Jacob negotiates between Leah and Rachel. Joseph's character is seen between Potiphar's wife and the daughter of Potiphara. Elkanah veers between Hannah and Peninnah.

<sup>19</sup> An excellent discussion of the *topos* of the two-women in classical and Hellenistic literature is given by Barbara R. Rossing, *The Choice Between Two Women: Whore, Bride, and Empire in the Apocalypse*, Harvard Theological Studies 48 (Harrisburg, PA.: Trinity Press International, 1999) 17-59.

<sup>20</sup> See for example the use of classical drama to approach the Bible as suggested by a number of scholars and J. Cheryl Exum, ed., *Semeia* 32, Society of Biblical Literature, 1985. Also, J. William Whedbee, *The Bible and the Comic Vision* (Minneapolis, Mn.: Fortress Press, 2002).

<sup>21</sup> See Karen H. Jobes, "When God Spoke Greek: The Place of the Greek Bible in Evangelical Scholarship" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 16.2 (2006) 219-236.

turns on words that are rendered too inconsistently in translations to be recognized for their literary significance. We must recover the respect for the original languages that has eroded so seriously in Protestant theological training in the last decades of the twentieth century.

Once the original text of Scripture is in hand, we proceed with a method that first, establishes the text to be interpreted through textual and literary criticism. Second, we identify and study the theologically rich lexical words in the text. Third, we examine the passage grammatically to identify syntactical and interpretive ambiguity. Fourth, we interpret the text, considering structural and chiasmic form, narrational context, and authorial and historical background, where present. Historical as well as grammatical issues must be considered in exegetical statements. This implies a serious familiarity with the literature and history of the ancient Near East as well as a deep familiarity with Hellenistic literature. Fifth, we consider textual interpretation in light of our confessional or systematic theology. Sixth, we consider the textual interpretation in light of our biblical theology, that is, how it proclaims the suffering and the glory of Christ Jesus. The end of the exegetical method is the practical proclamation, by preaching and teaching, of the person and work of the Savior of the world as set forth in the Scriptures.

Moreover, the standards for identifying the probability of authorial intention with respect to typological allusions have been announced by competent students of the Bible, all of them consistent with traditional standards used by literary scholars in general. Dale Allison, for example, provides criteria of certainty beginning with explicit statement (cf. John 3:14), inexplicit citation or borrowing (LXX 2 Kgs 1:8 and Mark 1:6), similar circumstances (cf. Joshua's parting of the Jordan and Moses' parting of the sea), key words or phrases (cf. 2 Kgs 4:42-44 and the gospel accounts of the feeding of the five thousand), similar narrative structure (cf. 1 Kgs 19 and Mark 1), and word order, syllabic sequence, poetic resonance (cf. Gen 1 and John 1). Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis, Mn.: Fortress Press, 1993) 19-20. Greg Beale similarly announces criteria for distinguishing clear allusions from probable allusions and possible allusions. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999) 78.

J.I. Packer has clearly defined the approach we are advocating:

Biblical theology is the umbrella-name for those disciplines that explore the unity of the Bible, delving into the contents of the books, showing the links between them, and pointing to the ongoing flow of the revelatory and redemptive process that reached its climax in Jesus Christ. Historical exegesis, which explores what the text meant and implied for its original readership, is one of these disciplines. Typology, which looks into the Old Testament patterns of divine action, agency, and instruction that found final fulfillment in Christ, is another.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> J. I. Packer, from the Forward, Edmund P. Clowney, *The Unfolding Mystery: Discovering Christ in the Old Testament* (Colorado Springs, Colo.: Navpress, 1988) 8.

We have said that the purpose of a biblical typology is to articulate the unity of the biblical canon centered in the person of Jesus Christ. Such a project is not an abstract enterprise for theological scholars. Rather, it is intended to set forth the biblical *kerygma*, or the proclamation of Jesus' suffering and glory. This is so because the people of God, illumined by the Spirit of God, will recognize the Christ of the Holy Scriptures. These claims are based upon several presuppositions that should be clearly stated, namely, the truth of divine revelation, the inspiration of the biblical authors, the unity of the canon of Scripture, the coherence of the canon centered in Jesus Christ, and the recognition of Christ in the canon of the Scriptures by the people of God.

First of all, we affirm the truth of a verbal, plenary divine revelation in Holy Scripture. God, who spoke the creation into being in the beginning (Gen 1:3), likewise spoke through the office of the prophets as well, and spoke at last through his Son, whom He has made the heir of all things and through whom He made the world (Heb 1:1-2).<sup>23</sup>

Second, in order to accomplish the revelation of His word for His people, the Spirit of God moved the biblical writers in such a manner that they faithfully reported all that God intended (2 Pet 1:21). It is this affirmation of divine inspiration that makes the disciplines of biblical typology and biblical theology possible in spite of the many human authors who contributed to the sacred writings that the church has called canonical Scriptures.<sup>24</sup>

Third, the doctrine of inspiration implies that there must be an authorial unity of purpose in the Scriptures that can be discovered and displayed (John 5:39).<sup>25</sup> This makes necessary the Christian affirmation of the theological unity in the Bible, the coherence in the canon that can be expressed both systematically and biblically.<sup>26</sup>

Fourth, all the Scriptures find their organic center in Jesus Christ (Luke 24:27, Eph 1:17, Col 1:26-28). This center accounts for the narrative unity of the canon, which has its beginning in the creation of the world through Christ (John 1:3), its middle in the

---

<sup>23</sup> Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology*, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1948)11-14.

<sup>24</sup> D. A. Carson, "Current Issues in Biblical Theology," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* (1995) 27; Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Philadelphia, PA.: Westminster Press, 1970) 99-107. See also Edmund P. Clowney, *Preaching and Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1961)13.

<sup>25</sup> This affirmation makes possible the thematic continuity of the Scriptures. For example, Melchizedek's Salem is the same as that of Asaph (Psalm 76:2) and the New Testament apostle (Heb 7:1-2). This continuity in Scripture is the *sine qua non* of a true typology. It makes possible a poetics that explores the divine intent of the entire canon of the Holy Scriptures. It affirms an understanding that God, as the Lord of history, providentially ordained the historical events and persons whose accounts were superintended by the Spirit of God in order to be faithfully preserved by the sacred writers, all written in such a manner as to glorify the Son of God (John 5:39).

<sup>26</sup> Sidney Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament: A Contemporary Hermeneutical Method* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999) 48-50.

earthly ministry of Christ (Luke 24:26, 1 Pet 1:11) , and its ending in the redemption of all things in Christ (2 Cor 5:19).<sup>27</sup>

Fifth, the people of God, who under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth originally identified the canon of sacred Scriptures, are competent to understand the Christ of Scriptures as they themselves are moved in their hearts by the Spirit of God within them, consistent with the rational faculties revealed through the divine Logos (Luke 24:32, John 16:13, 1 Pet 1:12).<sup>28</sup>

*Sola Scriptura! Solus Christus! Soli Deo Gloria!*

*Semper Reformanda!*  
September 25, 2007  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

---

<sup>27</sup> Willem Van Gemen, *The Progress of Redemption: The Story of Salvation from Creation to the New Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1988) 25-27.

<sup>28</sup> That is, by the *analogia scripturae* and the *analogia fidei*, the church will recognize legitimate types and resist infelicitous comparisons.