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ABSTRACT
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The Topic

This dissertation seeks to ascertain whether there are indicators of Exodus typology within the Old Testament.

The Purpose

Based on R. M. Davidson's definition of biblical typology, various elements that comprise biblical typology such as the historical aspect, divine design, prophetic aspect, Steigerung (intensification), and eschatology are traced in a number of texts that deal with the Exodus motif. This examination seems to be crucial for establishing the exegetical and hermeneutical basis for the use of Exodus typology by the New Testament writers.
Chapter 1 surveys the perception and use of typology throughout the centuries up to the present. The traditional approach considers persons, events or actions, and institutions as being divinely ordained or designed types to foreshadow aspects of Christ and his ministry. After the historical-critical repudiation new interest into typology arose. While most scholars tend to favor either the “Pattern of God’s Acts” approach or the “Historical Hermeneutics” approach, R. M. Davidson points out the need for a controlled hermeneutics, thus calling for indicators of typology already within the Old Testament.

Chapter 2 seeks to establish the basic elements that are part of a biblical typology suggested by Davidson’s definition. Various passages that are directly linked to or describe the Exodus in the Pentateuch are discussed. Particular emphasis is given to the eschatological context.

Chapter 3 seeks to trace the elements of biblical typology throughout the prophetic writings that deal with the Exodus motif. While the passages of the Pentateuch stand in direct connection to the historical event of the Exodus, the prophetic writings function as hinges that connect the past redemption with the future redemption.

Conclusions

This dissertation concludes that there is in relation to the Exodus a type/anti-type relation that connects the Old Testament with the New Testament. This type/anti-type relation is based on a historical structure. It includes a divine design and the element of Steigerung. The announcement of the anti-type is always a prophecy and thereby hermeneutically controlled. The anti-type has no multiple fulfillments—but only one. The anti-type finds its fulfillment only in the eschaton, i.e., in Christ or in the realities of the new covenant related to and brought about by Christ.
Viele Töchter haben sich als tüchtig erwiesen,
du aber übertrifft sie alle!

Sprüche 31:9
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INTRODUCTION

One of the major problems in biblical research of this century concerns the relation between the Old Testament and the New Testament. Among the many issues related to the question of the unity of Scripture and biblical interpretation throughout the centuries—from the early Church Fathers until modern times—is the significance of the New Testament typological interpretation of the Old Testament. Christian expositors used typology from the beginning as a means of relating the Old with the New Testament. The New Testament writers understood the “Christ-Event” as the fulfillment of Old Testament expectation and the Old Testament as pointing to Jesus. The events, persons, and institutions prior to the advent of Jesus not only had their meaning and value in the history of the Israelite people, but ultimately pointed to a future salvation which had its dawn in the arrival of the Messiah Jesus. Upon what exegetical and hermeneutical basis did the New Testament writers have to apply certain Old Testament passages typologically?

Statement of the Problem and Justification for the Study

It is generally agreed that for the New Testament writers typology was a prominent hermeneutical approach. Goppelt insisted that typology "is the method of interpreting Scripture that is predominant in the New Testament and characteristic of it."¹ And Werner G. Kümmel asserted: "Typological interpretation of the Old Testament expresses most clearly the basic attitude of primitive Christianity toward the Old Testament."² The question is, does this hermeneutical approach involve the interpretation of specific Old Testament passages that deal with events, institutions, or persons which were considered divinely designed, predictive prefigurations, or is it part of a common human way of analogical thinking? Did the writers of the gospels—as one writer put it—"twist" Old Testament Scripture?³ If Jesus and the NT writers were inspired, did they have the right and authority to reinterpret and reapply to Jesus what originally in the Hebrew Bible—as it has been suggested—did not refer to Him? Neale Pryor, for example, maintained that the writers of the New Testament could make changes that uninspired men would dare not attempt. If they saw fulfillment in a passage, whether or not it was originally intended, the truth was still there. If they saw fit to change the wording


in order to make their point, they took that liberty. The truth they spoke was still
to be accepted, whether or not the prophet they cited knew it.1

Is typology merely a homiletic study of the Bible, or is it a concept based on
sound hermeneutical principles? G. W. H. Lampe has called for criteria for a legitimate
use of working with typological relations;2 others call for sound methods instead of
depending on "clever devices of ingenuity."3

Throughout the centuries typology has been a punching bag hammered by
excessive literal and historical approaches.4 In the twentieth century, and especially in the
decades since 1940, renewed interest in biblical typology bloomed. The first
comprehensive survey of New Testament typology from a modern historical perspective
was undertaken by Leonard Goppelt.5 While Goppelt and others—following the
traditional view of typology—characterized typology as prospective, the historical-critical
school initially rejected typology as "unscientific." Especially the results of literary

1N. Pryor, "Use of the Old Testament in the New," in Biblical Interpretation:
(Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1986), 286.

2"If the appeal to Scripture is to be maintained in its proper sense, and Christian
Doctrine is to be set on a less unstable foundation than the private judgment of ingenious
riddle-solvers, some attempt is urgently needed to establish a workable criterion for the
legitimate use of the typological method" (G. W. H. Lampe, "Typological Exegesis,"
Theology 56 [1953]: 208).

3W. A. Irwin, "A Still Small Voice Said, What Are You Doing Here?" Journal of

4See R. M. Davidson, Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical τύπος
Structures, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 2 (Berrien

5Goppelt, Typos.
criticism contributed to the "breaking down of the old conception of the unity of Scripture and the consequent discrediting of the typological and prophetical exegesis familiar to so many generations of Christians."¹

In the decades after World War II an astounding revival of interest in biblical typology took place among critical scholars, especially within the Biblical Theology Movement. However, this 'post-critical neo-typology' was not a return to the traditional understanding. It was founded upon a different view of history and revelation which had little room for the predictive element. Typology was viewed as a common human way of analogical thinking which in Scripture and in modern typological interpretation involved the retrospective recognition of general correspondences within the consistent divine 'revelation in history.'² David Baker stands as an example for this position when he states that

typology is not a method of exegesis or interpretation, but the study of historical and theological correspondences between different parts of God's activity among his people in order to find what is typical there. . . . The contribution of typology to understanding the relationship between the Testaments is to point to the fundamental analogy between different parts of the Bible.³


²Davidson, Typology in Scripture, 410.

Characteristic of much research in typology was the fact that each scholar seemed to work with his/her own definition of typology. As a result, scholars operated with a disparity of views regarding the nature of biblical typology.

This lack of inductive methodology in previous studies led Richard M. Davidson to write a dissertation on typology in order to determine the nature of biblical typology "by allowing its conceptual structures to emerge from within the biblical text through a semasiological analysis of the term τύπος and NT cognates and an exegetical investigation of the hermeneutical τύπος passages in the NT." He defines biblical typology as the study of certain OT salvation-historical realities (persons, events, or institutions) which God has specifically designed to correspond to, and be prospective/predictive prefigurations of, their ineluctable (devoir-être) and absolutely escalated eschatological fulfillment aspects (Christological/ ecclesiological/apocalyptic) in NT salvation history.

From his study of the New Testament τύπος passages, five structures emerged:

1. the "historical structure,”
2. the "eschatological structure,”
3. the "Christological-soteriological structure,”
4. the "ecclesiological structure,” and
5. the "prophetic structure.” With regard to the latter Davidson underlines that the Old Testament τύπος are divinely designed, advance presentations of the corresponding New Testament realities. This seems to imply that already within the Old Testament there are prophetic

---

1Davidson, Typology in Scripture.
2Ibid., 409.
3Ibid., 405-406.
4Ibid., 416-419.
5Ibid., 418.
elements which indicate that a certain person, event, or institution is a τύπος. An examination of these Old Testament τύποι seems crucial for establishing the exegetical and hermeneutical basis of New Testament typology. However, until now no one has thoroughly studied these indications of typology within the Old Testament.

Since the 1980s interest in typology has become somewhat sporadic. It appears that post-critical neo-typology prevailed over the traditional view of typology. Studies in typology during the last twenty years have been focusing mainly on single typological motifs or certain biblical passages.¹ No detailed study of the Old Testament indicators of biblical typology has been undertaken.

**Purpose and Scope of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to fill this gap by examining Old Testament passages to ascertain whether there are indicators of typology within the Old Testament itself that would provide a basis (or rationale) for the hermeneutical endeavor of the New Testament writers.

As a case study, I have chosen the motif of the Exodus and investigated Old Testament passages related to the historical Exodus events as well as other passages

pertaining to the Exodus motif in an attempt to detect Old Testament indicators of the
typological nature of the Exodus already within the Old Testament.

Studies in Exodus typology have focused predominantly on particular books or
chapters.¹ These studies have demonstrated the eschatological connotations of the
Exodus motif and have provided some partial and preliminary investigations of Old
Testament indicators of Exodus typology;² but no systematic and thorough study has been
undertaken.³

¹See e.g., M. L. Barré and J. S. Kselman, "New Exodus, Covenant, and
Restoration in Psalms 23," in The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of
David Noel Freedman, ed. C. L. Meyers and M. O'Connor, American Schools of Oriental
Research Special Volume Series 1 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 97-127; J. S.
Casey, "Exodus Typology in the Book of Revelation" (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist
Theological Seminary, 1981); L. H. Hill, Jr., "Reading Isaiah as a Theological Unity Based
on an Exegetical Investigation of the Exodus Motif" (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist

²See e.g., E. Zenger, "The God of Exodus in the Message of the Prophets as
Seen in Isaiah," in Exodus—A Lasting Paradigm, Concilium 189, ed. B. van Iersel and A.

³For further studies on Exodus typology see, e.g., F. Foulkes, The Acts of God:
A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament (London: Tyndale, 1958); B. W.
Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," in Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays
in Honor of James Muilenberg, ed. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York:
Harper & Brothers, 1962), 177-195; H. M. Barstad, A Way in the Wilderness: The
Second Exodus in the Message of Second Isaiah (Manchester: University of Manchester,
1989); N. Lohfink, "The Song of Victory at the Red Sea," in The Christian Meaning of
Research Methodology

This study involves the following steps: a survey of the issues involved, and a statement of the problem; a review of literature, a dia-canonical examination of a major typological motif (the Exodus motif); and an exegesis of Old Testament passages which contain possible verbal indicators of Exodus typology. The exegetical methodology includes the assessment of textual problems, historical context, literary context/analysis, grammatical/syntactical and theological analysis, and in particular an investigation of the constitutive structural components of the Old Testament indicators of Exodus typology.

Delimitations of the Study

I will focus on the main Old Testament passages which contain potential indicators of Exodus typology. It is not possible to do an exhaustive exegesis of the passages under discussion. The exegesis is limited primarily to those aspects that lay bare the Old Testament indicators of Exodus typology. I also limit myself to a single typological motif—the overall Exodus motif—and to a single typological trajectory—i.e., horizontal/historical typology.² The biblical text is accepted in its present canonical form without attempting to analyze its "sources" or trace its development.

---

¹I limit myself to the overall motif (which includes the Exodus and the time of the wandering in the wilderness), not to single aspects of this motif (e.g., Moses-typology).

²As opposed to vertical ("earth-heaven") typology (e.g., Sanctuary); see further on vertical typology, Davidson, Typology in Scripture, 336-367.

This conceptual distinction between vertical and horizontal typology does not deny the presence of various elements within horizontal typological structures that point to a vertical dimension.
CHAPTER I

APPROACHES TO TYPOLOGY

To properly understand the various approaches to typology and the issues involved it is critical to be aware of the "history" of typology throughout the centuries, and especially of the current debate. Until recently, no comprehensive survey of the major players, their views, and their concepts of typology had been undertaken. Only in 1981, Richard M. Davidson, in his dissertation Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical τύπος Structures,1 presented a thorough overview from the time of the early church until about 1980.2 Subsequently, other scholars such as Henning Graf Reventlow,3 George W. Buchanan,4 and David L. Baker5 followed with similar surveys

1See especially pp. 15-114; also in 1981, J. A. Meek surveyed the historical development of the typological approach in an M.Th. thesis, "Toward a Biblical Typology" (Westminster Theological Seminary), 12-102.

2For a bibliography of surveys on a smaller scale, see Davidson, Typology in Scripture, 75, ns. 1, 2; 77, n. 2.


5Baker, Two Testaments, One Bible, 179-202. See further surveys in T. M. Davis, "The Traditions of Puritan Typology" (Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri, 1968);
and evaluations. Davidson’s work remains the most comprehensive study of the
development and use of typology in biblical studies, especially of the twentieth century.
Although I do not want to reproduce the thorough investigations of the aforementioned
scholars, nor do I want to reassess the historical development, I consider it crucial to the
overall framework and understanding of my dissertation to summarize the various
approaches to typology. Since the discussion up to about 1980 has been widely covered, I
also focus on more recent developments.

For my survey of the history of the various approaches to typology I use three
labels that characterize the respective approaches: (1) the traditional approach, (2) the
historical-critical repudiation of typology, and (3) the post-critical neo-typology.¹

The Traditional Approach

In this “traditional approach,” persons, events or actions, and institutions are
considered as being divinely ordained or designed types to foreshadow aspects of Christ
and His ministry in the Gospels and New Testament dispensation.

Since the term “typology” as a hermeneutical concept did not appear prior to the
second half of the eighteenth century,² it is difficult to decide on a starting point for

¹These labels are used by Johnson, “Pauline Typology.”

²It was apparently J. S. Semler (1721-91) who coined the term “typology”
(“Typologie” in German); see A. Takamori, “Typologische Auslegung des Alten
Testaments? Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung” (Th.D. diss., University of Zurich,
Bright, in Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics, ed. Claus Westermann; English edition
ed. J. L. Mays (Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1963), 23; cf. Davidson, Typologie in
typology as a hermeneutical approach. Yet, it is clear that the Church Fathers immediately following the Apostolic period already heavily utilized the concept of “types” fueled by a “tremendous feeling for the living unity of all Scripture” which is “manifest on every page of the writings of the Fathers.” Various studies on patristic typology show that “types” were perceived of as divinely designed prefigurations of Christ or New Testament realities. Especially the Apologists—among them Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Irenaeus—employed the typological approach in their defense against Judaism and Scripture, 38, n. 1.


Gnosticism. During this period typology often took on allegorical shape. The exegetical tradition of Alexandria was marked by considerable excess fusing Hellenistic allegorism with Christian typology. These early Church Fathers—notably Origen—found types in many minor and insignificant details of incidents and events. This typological-allegorical approach tended to depreciate the historicity of facts and events transmitted in the biblical account.

The Alexandrian school of exegesis had its opponent in the Antiochene school of exegesis. Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose five volumes of Concerning Allegory and History against Origen were ordered to be burnt at the Second Council of Constantinople, held the view that the most exalted sense of Scripture was the sense

1 I differentiate between typology and allegory as follows: Allegory is a continuous metaphor which already includes in itself the intention of having more than one point. Allegorization assigns externally imposed meaning to Scripture, which meaning is foreign to the ideas conveyed by the words; often the historical aspect of the passage is disregarded (see D. S. Dockery, Biblical Interpretation Then and Now: Contemporary Hermeneutics in the Light of the Early Church [Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1992], 40).

J. E. Alsup remarks that "much of what was later used to discredit typology was based on the misperception of typology as allegory stemming from developments within this patristic period" ("Typology," The Anchor Bible Dictionary [1992], 6:684a).


3 See, e.g., Barn 7:3, 6-11; 8:1-7; 12:2-7; 13:5; 1 Clem 12:7; Shep Herm Vis IV:1.1; 2.5; 3.6; Irenaeus Haer I:5.6; Justin Apol 60.3.


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
revealed by typology. In contrast to the Alexandrian school, Antiochene exegesis
adhered to a literal meaning of Scripture and upheld the historicity of the biblical events.
The prophetic messianic meaning of certain passages was grounded upon the historical
meaning of a given text. The relationship between type and antitype was not veiled in
spiritualizing allegory but was seen to be real and discernible. The Antiochene school of
exegesis lost its influence, thus leaving the field to the allegorical approach of Alexandria,
which dominated with few exceptions for the following centuries until the Reformation.

1See, e.g., “ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ ΙΩΗΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΟΥ,” in Patrologia Graeca 66:
211-240; “ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ ΙΩΝΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΟΥ,” in Patrologia Graeca 66: 317-346;
cf. J. Breck, “Theoria and Orthodox Hermeneutics,” St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly

2John Breck comments: “It would be a mistake, however, to stereotype
Alexandrian exegesis as purely allegorical and Antiochene as purely historical, as though
the former were uniquely concerned with the spiritual sense of the text, while the latter
sought only the historical or literal sense. . . . Although the schools of Alexandria and
Antioch favored two very different methods of exegesis, their concern was the same: to
define and explain the relationship between the Scriptures of the Old Testament and the
apostolic writings of the early Church. . . . The second major hermeneutic principle
recognized by both schools held that since Jesus as Christ had fulfilled the prophecies of
the Old Covenant, the true meaning of prophecy could only be discerned by means of
typology. . . . Typological interpretation of the OT was thus normative from the very
beginnings of Church tradition. What distinguished and separated the schools . . . were
their respective methods of developing typology into two very different hermeneutic
systems: the Alexandrians sought to uncover allegorical symbolism, whereas the
Antiochenes insisted on preserving the historical meaning revealed in and through the
prophetic image or type” (“Theoria and Orthodox Hermeneutics,” 200-202); for a
comparison of Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis, see further J. Guillet, “Les exégèses
d’Alexandrie et d’Antioche; conflit ou malentendu?” Recherches de science religieuse 35
Review 12 (1964): 10-23; F. Young, “The Rhetorical Schools and Their Influence on
Patristic Exegesis,” in The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick,
ed. R. Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1989), 182-199.
The great scholar Augustine viewed himself as a reconciler between the Antiochene and Alexandrian positions. However, "his exegetical principles predisposed him to the Origenistic approach and his actual practice demonstrates his commitment to it."\(^1\) Curtis Freeman indicates that in the classic *De doctrina christiana* Augustine proposes a set of guidelines to regulate the practice of figural exegesis. For Augustine the two Testaments are typologically united.\(^2\) Although Augustine insisted that allegorical interpretations should be based on the literal sense, he was still a child of his times, "almost to the point of panallegorism."\(^3\)

The two great theologians of the twelfth century, Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure, basically continued to apply the interpretative methods set forth by Origen and especially Augustine. Aquinas made no distinction between typology and allegory. He did not utilize typological terminology, and it appears as if Aquinas had discarded typology, or it had been absorbed in the allegorical sense. Bonaventure, on the other hand, focused more on the "illuminative" aspect of Scripture. Apart from allegory, he identified types which he worked into his framework for a "mysticism of illumination."\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Davis, "The Traditions of Puritan Typology," 126.

\(^2\) C. W. Freeman, "Figure and History: A Contemporary Reassessment of Augustine's Hermeneutic," in *Augustine: Presbyter Factus Sum*, ed. Joseph T. Lienhard et al. (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), 319-329; see particularly 320-321.


\(^4\) Davis, "The Traditions of Puritan Typology," 139-146.
In the Reformation of the sixteenth century, Reformers such as Martin Luther and John Calvin turned away from allegory and especially from the Quadriga, the fourfold sense of Scripture developed in the Middle Ages out of Origen’s threefold approach to a Scripture passage. They rejected the search for multiple meanings and explored the literal and historical meaning of the text. Luther, trained in the traditional fourfold approach to Scriptures, later condemned the allegorical approach of the Alexandrian School, Jerome, Origen, and Augustine.

Luther did not equate the literal with the spiritual meaning but considered the biblical text as having a twofold sense, the literal and the spiritual. Because of his assumption that “every bit” of the Old Testament applies to Christ, he made many typological identifications. Typology is only one of numerous exegetical methods used by Luther; its use is ordinarily incidental to the main point at issue.

---

1The literal sense and three spiritual senses (the allegorical [i.e., the mystical or Christological], the tropological [i.e., the moral or anthropological], and the anagogical [i.e., the heavenly or eschatological]); all four senses were to be sought in every text of Scripture; see, e.g., H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de l’Écriture*, 2 vols. (Paris: Aubier, 1959-1964); R. E. Brown, “Hermeneutics,” in *The Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1968), 612-613.

2The “bodily” sense (i.e., the literal); the “psychical sense (i.e., the moral), and the spiritual sense (i.e., the allegorical); see e.g., M. F. Wiles, “Origen as Biblical Scholar,” in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1970), 1:454-489; Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, 21-2; Dockery, *Biblical Interpretation*, 88-89.


4Davis, “The Traditions of Puritan Typology,” 270.

---
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Calvin was anxious “to maintain the historical integrity of the text and its literal meaning, and only when those had been firmly fixed did he venture to examine the events or persons in question from the standpoint of their possible typological significance.”¹ For Calvin, the “true meaning” comprised the foreshadowing types of the Old Testament.² The Old Testament pointed forward to Christ, who fulfilled the anticipating types in the New Testament. Although the Reformers engaged in typology, they never formulated a systematic approach to typology.³

During the following years of Protestant Orthodoxy, scholars tried to formulate a more systematized approach. Johannes Gerhard’s classical statement in regard to the distinction between typology and allegory⁴ became the basis for a safeguard against an excessively spiritual approach. While it was commonly agreed upon that types


²“The Gospel points with the finger to what the Law shadowed under types” (*Institutes* 2.9.3); “Another distinction between the Old and New Testament is in the types, the former exhibiting only the image of truth, while the reality was absent, the shadow instead of the substance, the latter exhibiting both the full truth and the entire body” (ibid., 2.10.4); quoted in Davidson, *Typology and Scripture*, 31; on Calvin, see further A. G. Baxter, “John Calvin’s Use and Hermeneutics of the Old Testament” (Ph.D. diss., University of Sheffield, 1987).


foreshadowed New Testament realities, there developed differences in regard to identifying Old Testament types.

Johannes Cocceius distinguished two kinds of types: those that are explicitly pointed out in Scripture ("innate" types) and those that are not explicitly identified but are just as real because they are analogous to faith and practice ("inferred" types). With this approach—especially in regard to the "inferred" types—the door was opened to a large number of types found in the Old Testament. There were no real hermeneutical controls to establish the identity of a type. The "introduction of trifling, far-fetched, and even altogether false analogies, was one of its capital defects. It had no essential principles or fixed rules by which to guide its interpretations."1 The Cocceian school flourished especially in Britain and in the writings of the Puritans in New England, which they used to define their identity.2

The lavish identification of Old Testament types elicited a strong reaction on the part of Bishop Herbert Marsh, who supported a much more constrictive approach. He argued that there is no other sure means by which one could identify a type, than by Scripture itself. Only those are legitimate types, that are declared as such by Christ or by


His apostles in the New Testament. Although Marsh tried to check the flood of inferred types everywhere, many thought of his approach as too restrictive; it never gained wide acceptance. With the offensive of rationalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the unity of the Old and New Testaments was called into question—especially by Johann S. Semler and Johann D. Michaelis—thus precluding the existence of types. Semler apparently was the first one to use the term Typologie (typology). The traditional view of typology was by and large discarded among critical scholars.

Those who maintained a traditional perspective tried to find a mediating position between the view of Cocceius on the one hand and the conviction of Marsh on the other hand. Patrick Fairbairn’s The Typology of Scripture became the classic statement. He questioned Cocceius’s approach of identifying countless inferred types for its lack of proper controls which “left ample scope for the indulgence of a luxuriant fancy.”

---

1 H. Marsh, Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible (Cambridge: C. &. J. Rivington, 1828), 373.


4 Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, 1:29.
Marsh’s approach was considered by Fairbairn as being too restrictive in assuming that Scripture itself points out each typical relationship between the Old and the New Testament: “... as if there were no way for Scripture to furnish a sufficient direction on the subject, except by specifying every particular case.”

1 The use of typology within the New Testament is not exhaustive, but rather paradigmatic. Inferred typological relations should be found subject to certain controls and requirements.

In defining these requirements Fairbairn built on the traditional understanding of typology. In a type (i.e., a character, action, or institution) there must be a resemblance to the antitype in the New Testament. And not only a mere resemblance; the type “must have been designed to resemble the latter.”

2 With this traditional presupposition, Fairbairn formulated the following principles for the proper identification and interpretation of biblical types:

1. Types cannot be something forbidden or sinful.

2. OT authors may not have known about the prophetic-prospective nature of a type. The Gospel, however, brings this nature to light.

---

1 Ibid., 1:43.

2 Ibid., 1:69 (italics his).

3 The following principles are paraphrased in Johnson, “The Pauline Typology of Abraham,” 30; cf. Davidson, Typology in Scripture, 40-41.

4 Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, 1:176-181.

5 Ibid., 1:181-186.
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3. Types are based on more than outward similarity but on similar truths and ideas. This precludes typology based on "trifling" correspondences.1

4. Types have only one meaning but are capable of more than one application to the realities of the Gospel.2

5. There is a movement from a lower, external/bodily stage (the type) to the loftier internal/spiritual stage (the antitype).3

While the Cocceian approach and the school of Marsh had some followers,4 Fairbairn's work has become the foundation for many subsequent treatises on typology, especially within the Evangelical camp.5

1Ibid., 1:186-190.
2Ibid., 1:191-195.
3Ibid., 1:195-203.
4For the Cocceian approach, see, e.g., A. R. Habershon, The Study of the Types (London: Pickering and Inglis, 1915); C. C. Harwood, Handbook of Bible Types and Symbols (Los Angeles: Brooks, 1933); I. M. Brubacher, "Old Testament Types of Christ" (Th.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1938).

In the latter nineteenth and early twentieth centuries critical scholarship had gained an increasing influence on biblical scholarship. This did not exclude the perception of typology. It became "an historical curiosity, of very little importance or significance for the modern reader." The objection in regard to the historicity of Old Testament facts made it impossible to maintain a relationship between the Testaments, especially on the historical level. But with the emergence of Neo-Orthodoxy and the Biblical Theology movement, scholars looked again to typology trying to find ways to insist on a relationship between Old and New Testament while working within the method and results of historical criticism.


1 Lampe, "The Reasonableness of Typology," 16.

New upheld the traditional approach. It was the first comprehensive survey of biblical typology from a modern historical perspective. He affirmed that the basic characteristics of typology include the historical correspondence between type and antitype, that types are divinely designed to be predictive prefigurations, and that there is an intensification or escalation (Steigerung) from the Old Testament to the greater reality, the New Testament antitype. Goppelt clearly distinguished typology from allegory, since the historicity and the literal meaning of a text are foundational for typology. In his summary he concluded that “typology is the method of interpreting Scripture that is predominant in the New Testament and characteristic of it.” Goppelt considered typology as a framework for the proper understanding of the relationship between the Old and the New Testament. Although written in the first half of this century, his work became and remained one of the classical and standard statements on typology for the twentieth century. Yet, it has to be


2Ibid., 17-18, 226-227.

3Ibid., 198.


pointed out that Goppelt, whose work was influenced by scholars such as W. Eichrodt and Wilhelm Vischer, did not work with a definition of typology which was arrived at by means of an exegetical analysis of biblical text or a semasiological analysis of the term τύπος and its cognates. His definition of typology was primarily based on Protestant Orthodoxy and specifically on Gerhard’s distinction between typology and allegory.

Although Goppelt worked within the confines of critical scholarship he still affirmed the basic elements of typology as viewed by the traditional approach: (1) the correspondence of historical facts, (2) the divinely ordained prophetic role of types, and

---


(3) the element of intensification through salvation history. He thus “placed himself squarely in the traditional camp.”¹

The Historical-Critical Repudiation of Typology

With the rise of the enlightenment the Scriptures were approached under new presuppositions. With the skepticism of rationalism everything that appeared miraculous was explained apart from any supernaturalism. No longer was the Bible considered as the irrefutable and divine revelation. It was an ancient literary document that could be studied as any other ancient piece of literature.

A fresh interest in the original languages of the Bible in the context of pietism and subsequent text-critical investigations as well as considerations of the purpose of the books in the Old and New Testaments by such scholars as August Hermann Francke, Johann Albrecht Bengel, or Johann Jakob Wettstein were met with suspicion and resistance by the official church. As a consequence, this new approach to biblical studies made a stand against traditional views and dogmas. With Johann Salomo Semler² historical critical studies were established within the world of Protestantism. The goal was to free the biblical canon from spiritual censorship and to study the text unaffected by traditional thinking.³

¹H. W. Johnson, “Pauline Typology,” 32.


Until the rise of biblical criticism the Bible was viewed as a homogenous body inspired by the Holy Spirit. Now, Scripture was considered to be a collection of various strands of traditions and origins that had no connection whatsoever with each other. The "unhistorical" approach of the pre-critical era had accepted the events of the Bible as "historical"; now, the critical "historical" approach regarded them as "unhistorical."

Prophecy was no longer accepted as predictive and as a direct foretelling. Rather, texts were written *vaticinia ex eventu* to give them the outward look of a prophecy that had been fulfilled.¹

This development influenced, of course, the perception of typology. Typology was no longer viewed as a legitimate approach to Scripture. Since the historicity of the Bible events and fact were no longer considered to be tenable, there were no historical correspondences between the type and the antitype. Types that were understood within the traditional approach as a form of historical prophecy no longer spoke to the future.

Thus the typological method of interpretation became but an odd relic with little or no significance.

One of the major voices raised against the typological method belonged to Rudolf Bultmann. Being an heir to thinkers, philosophers, and theologians such as Schleiermacher, Semler, Feuerbach, von Harnack, and Wellhausen, he rejected the authority of the Old Testament. Being especially influenced by the literary-critical school of Wellhausen, he declared that the Old Testament is of no more value to the Christian than a pagan document.\(^1\) He rejected Goppelt's notion that typology was imbedded in salvation history and charged Goppelt for not properly distinguishing between typology and prophecy. For him, typology is not related to a "real" understanding of time. Typology is governed by the principle of repetition. Its origin is to be found in a cyclical-repetitive view of history which is in opposition to the linear understanding of history reflected in the prophetic writings.\(^2\)

He repudiated the concept that the Old Testament in its entirety is to be regarded as a book of predictions, which in Christ are partly already fulfilled, and partly proceeding toward fulfillment. He stated that this "method of interpreting the Old Testament . . . is


not specifically Christian, but was taken over from Judaism, especially from its Hellenistic branch, which in turn had taken it over from Greek Hellenism.”

Friedrich Baumgärtel criticized the typological approach along similar lines. He argued that “to desire to build theological bridges . . . by renewing typological and Christological ways of understanding . . . means basically to exclude modern historical-critical thinking from the process of understanding.” Since historical critical research has argued that the Old Testament events and facts are a complete distortion and deprived of their factual nature, they cannot play any part in a biblical typology that requires historical correspondences in history.

This radical stand against biblical typology has continued, especially in the wake of renewed interest in typology of the “Post-critical Neo-Typology” era.

The Post-critical Neo-Typology

Although the historical-critical approach had potent forces in Bultmann and Baumgärtel, biblical typology did not die. Several factors played a role in the revival of


3See for a reaction against Baumgärtel in Eichrodt, “Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?” 224-245.
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interest in typology:\(^1\) 1. The need to take into account the New Testament writer’s use of the Old Testament. As L. Goppelt noted, critical scholarship had largely abandoned the area of hermeneutics in general and in particular the study of New Testament hermeneutics. Similarly, there was little interest in the problem of the Old Testament in the New Testament.\(^2\) 2. Old Testament Theologians—especially in Germany\(^3\)—sought to make Old Testament theology more relevant to modern “Gentile” readers to whom the Old Testament cult with its offering of animal sacrifices at the temple of Jerusalem did not apply. 3. There was an increasing awareness of the Old Testament’s own use of typology as it related one event in salvation history with another as well as with future, eschatological events.\(^4\)

One of the advocates of typology and a supporter of this newfound interest in typology was Gerhard von Rad.\(^5\) He considered typology as a legitimate means of relating

---


\(^3\)See, e.g., G. von Rad, W. Eichrodt, and H. W. Wolff.


the Old with the New Testament. His approach was basically conditioned by

*Traditionsgeschichte*. He was concerned to trace the social and historical development of

Israel’s theological traditions.

Von Rad distinguished between “historical” facts and “believed” facts, the

*Kerygma*. Both are history: the “actual” history and the “believed” history. He emphatically proclaimed that “the Old Testament is a history book.”¹ While others like G. E. Wright and the Biblical Theology movement tried to obtain the nucleus of the actual events, von Rad sought to discover the content of the *kerygmatic* history and to trace its *traditionsgeschichtliche* development within *Heilsgeschichte*. Thus, Old Testament history became for him a testimony of appropriated faith of “believed” history that is again and again reinterpreted throughout the transmission of the various traditions.

Von Rad formulated eight characteristics of typological interpretation:²

1. Typological interpretation goes beyond the self-understanding of the Old Testament itself, because it sees the Old Testament as something preparatory for something beyond the Old Testament.

---


Typological interpretation considers the entire Old Testament, not just special parts. Wherever God’s dealings with man are witnessed to, the possibility exists of identifying in this a shadow of the New Testament revelation of Christ. The number of types is unlimited.

Typological interpretation, both in the Old and New Testament, goes beyond the historical self-understanding; it concerns only the *kerygma*, the witness to the divine event. It does not deal with correspondences in historical, cultural, or archaeological details which both Testaments might have in common.

Typological interpretation recognizes the imperfections and limitations of the redemptive benefits of the old covenant. It sees in God’s granted benefits (such as land, rest, long life, etc.) foreshadowings of God’s care and blessings extended to those who are in Christ.

Although typological interpretation surpasses the self-understanding of the Old Testament, it should not be separated from the process of exegesis. While it cannot function as a tool for solving historical or philological issues, both processes—historical-critical exegesis and typological interpretation—should interlock in the attempt to understand the Old Testament from the perspective of Christian faith.

Typological interpretation frees Old Testament exegesis from the compulsion to become theologically relevant by importing some meaning to the Old Testament that is not existent in the text.

Typological interpretation cannot be further regulated hermeneutically; no norm can be set up. It takes place in the freedom of the Holy Spirit.
8. Such typological interpretation thus outlined faces a more difficult task than formerly due to the more fine theological distinctions that must be made. Though the term "typology" is burdened with dated connotations and must be radically revamped in this new way, the term must be retained because it establishes a link with a hermeneutical tradition that provides a superior understanding of the Old Testament.

In regard to the prophetic aspect as part of typology within the traditional approach, von Rad redefined typology apart from any prospective prophecy. He states that

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

Although von Rad speaks of typology as prefiguration2 he does not consider any historical event, person, or fact a forecast of Christ. It is rather a retrospective appropriation of Heilsgeschichte so that it comes to be understood as a prefiguration of the Christ event. Typology has nothing supernatural. It is a mere human and common way of thinking; it is "man's universal effort to understand the phenomena about him on the basis of concrete analogies."3 Thus, von Rad's typology does not reckon with divine

1Von Rad, "Typological Interpretation," 36 (italics his).

2"Rather we see everywhere in this history brought to pass by God's work, in acts of judgment and acts of redemption alike, the prefiguration of the Christ-event of the New Testament" (ibid.; italics mine).

3Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2:364.
revelation or design and revealing of anything prae eventu. It is a retrospective view through the eye of faith, a humanly derived synthesis.¹

Von Rad’s approach made biblical typology acceptable within historical-critical scholarship. He demonstrated how one could appropriate the phenomenon of biblical typology without giving up the foundational presuppositions that govern the critical approach.

In the following period of revived interest in typology within the critical tradition other approaches are evident: (1) the “Pattern of God’s Acts” approach, and (2) “Historical Hermeneutics” approach.²


²I am aware that scholars might fit in either one of the suggested categories; there might be a lot of overlapping. On the other hand, different categories, other than mine, could be chosen. Often, any categorization might do injustice to the scholar under discussion. Yet, for the sake of the discussion, the following schematic presentation is offered.
The "Pattern of God's Acts" Approach

Von Rad was driven by the existential question, "What part have I in the Old Testament as a Christian believer, and what part has the church, if it cannot be that I identify myself, at least partly . . . with the religion of ancient Israel?" The answer to this question, for von Rad, was typology. Typology is based on the understanding that the same God who has revealed himself in Christ "has also left his footprints in the history of the Old Testament covenant people." Typology is a means within Heilsgeschichte to bring out structural analogies between the two Testaments.

---

1Von Rad, "Typological Interpretation," 35.
2Ibid., 36.
3Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2:363. There were other scholars who prepared or anticipated the view von Rad and others held on the relationship between typology and Heilsgeschichte:

Johann C. K. von Hofmann’s view on typology involved a concept of Heilsgeschichte and a basic acceptance of historical criticism. Important for his view is his understanding of prophecy. It is not so much verbal prediction of coming events, but Heilsgeschichte as it moves toward a goal. In its fulfillment the history is recognized as prophecy: "The events of the New Testament are not new as contrasted with the old, which dissolved and vanished as they came to pass, but are rather anti-types which bring a preliminary history to its conclusion and fulfill a prophecy" (J. C. K. von Hofmann, Interpreting the Bible, trans. C. Preus [Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1959], 169, cited by Davidson, Typology in Scripture, 43; see also von Hoffmann, Weissagung und Erfüllung im Alten und im Neuen Testamente, 2 vols. in 1 [Nördlingen: C. H. Beck, 1841-1844]).

For Leonhard Goppelt typology moves within the context of Heilsgeschichte. It is a means to set the New Testament Heilsereignis in relation to past Heilsgeschichte. He stated: "Typology demonstrates not only the nature of the new in comparison with the old, but it also shows that the new is founded directly and solely on redemptive history. . . . The things that are compared are related to each other in redemptive history; therefore, this is not the same as the parallels that are observed in the history of religions. The relationship in redemptive history is taken for granted by the evangelists and the rest of the New Testament because they are convinced that there is a continuity between Old Testament history and Jesus Christ in the sense of preparation and fulfillment" (Typos, 152, 199; see also idem, "Apokalyptik und Typologie bei Paulus," 270, 280, 297).
H. W. Wolff followed in the footsteps of von Rad. He understands typology as the analogy of the Old and New Testaments “in a historically unique relation, which is not without a decisive moment of intensification toward the eschaton.”

His basic understanding of typology was based on the presuppositions that the story of Jesus of Nazareth cannot be understood apart from the Old Testament, which as a whole is turned toward the future. But it is not just prediction. It is a witness to “what God has already done in Israel, to the coming activity of God in Israel in judgment and salvation, to the life of God’s people.”

Wolff stated several principles that involve a typological interpretation:

1. Typological interpretation is *historical* interpretation in contrast to an allegorical interpretation. The historical meaning of an Old Testament text must be exegetically examined.


Walter Eichrodt considered typology “as the designation for a peculiar way of looking at history. . . . The so-called *tupoi* . . . are persons, institutions, and events of the Old Testament which are regarded as divinely established models or prererepresentations of corresponding realities in the New Testament salvation history” (“Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?” 225). See also Fritsch, “Biblical Typology,” 97, 218-219.


3. Typological interpretation is a means for proclamation; it is not a mere historical interpretation.\(^1\)

Parallel to these studies, Charles H. Dodd published his investigations on the relationship between the two Testaments,\(^2\) which proved to be fruitful in stimulating research.\(^3\) He rejected James R. Harris’s hypothesis that the Early Church treasured a book or books of Old Testament quotations, *Testimonia*, which were used as apologetics against Jewish objections to the Christian faith. Harris presumed that these quotations

---

\(^1\)Ibid., 283.


were used with little reference to their Old Testament contexts and often quite arbitrarily. Dodd observed that the quotations from the Old Testament in the New are taken from the same few Old Testament contexts, and concluded that the New Testament authors were aware of the wider contexts of the texts they used. In many instances, a quotation was intended to function as signposts to evoke for the reader of the New Testament the specific context of the cited passage.

The New Testament writers interpreted and applied the prophecies of the Old Testament based on the same understanding of history as did the prophets. Dodd perceives Old Testament history, i.e., the history of the people of God, as

built upon a certain pattern corresponding to God's design for man His creature. It is a pattern, not in the sense of a pre-ordained sequence of inevitable events, but in the sense of a kind of master-plan imposed upon the order of human life by the Creator himself. . . .

. . . the prophets deny that history moves under its own stream, that man has in himself power to direct it. . . . There is a mysterious factor, praeter-human and praeter-natural, which is real and powerful, and without the recognition of this factor history remains unintelligible. This supra-historical factor in history is the living God Himself.2

He concluded that the early Christian interpretation of Scripture was not atomistic, unhistorical, or extracting arbitrary meanings by using typology, symbolism, and


2Dodd, According to Scriptures, 128-129.
allegory. The New Testament displays a unique method of interpreting the Old which considered the cited passage as a pointer to the whole context.¹

During the following years the heilsgeschichtliche component remained a firm ingredient in typological approaches.²

Similar to the approaches of von Rad and Wolff was the concept of Geoffrey W. H. Lampe and Kenneth J. Woollcombe. Both agreed that typology moves within the historical framework of God's revelation. Typological exegesis is defined as “the search for linkages between events, persons, or things within the historical framework of revelation.”³ Both Lampe and Woollcombe considered biblical typology as a


hermeneutical method. Lampe saw himself confronted with the same dilemma that faced
the Church of the second century: a choice between the typological and the allegorical
method of dealing with the Old Testament, so as to make it readable as a Christian book,
or the more drastic solution advocated by Marcion; either follow such rules of exegesis
that allow the Gospel to be read out of the Hebrew Scriptures, or throw away the Old
Testament as irrelevant to those who live under the New Covenant.¹

Lampe maintained that one can retain the historical-critical approach while still
finding a “reasonableness of typology,” based on a proper understanding of the basic unity
of Scripture. Typology “seeks to discover and make explicit the real correspondences in
historical events which have been brought about by the recurring rhythm of the divine
activity.”²

Woollcombe underlined four principles that determine the use of typology in the
Bible:

1. Typology is confined to the search for historical patterns within the historical
   framework of revelation.

2. Hellenistic allegorism is rejected as a legitimate way to establish the pattern of
   God's actions.

3. Biblical typology demands that the identity of the type and the antitype must
   be real and intelligible.

²Ibid., 29; see also idem, “Typological Exegesis,” 201.
4. Typology is used solely to express the consistency of God's redemptive activity in the Old and the New Israel.¹

Francis Foulkes, focusing on Old Testament typology, also based his typological approach on the basic assumptions that in the future the past acts of God "will be repeated on a scale greater and more wonderful than that of the past"² and that the nature of God in regard to the covenant and the principles of dealing with man are unchanging.³ Thus, typology is a theological and eschatological interpretation of history. The future hope of the prophets is based on their understanding that God would not only "act on the principles of His past action, but that He would do so on an unprecedented scale."⁴ This perception found expression in the prophecies and motifs of a "new David," a "new Temple," or a "new Exodus."

Foulkes made a careful distinction between exegesis and typology:

Typological interpretation involves a reading into the text of a meaning extrinsic to it. It takes more than the literal sense of a passage.

... Typology reads into Scripture a meaning which is not there in that it reads in the light of the fulfillment of the history. This is not exegesis, drawing out from a passage what the human author understood and intended as he wrote.⁵

---


³Ibid., 40.

⁴Ibid., 23.

⁵Ibid., 38-39.
Similarly, Richard T. France distinguished between typology and exegesis. For him, strict exegesis was a necessary prerequisite of typology. Only by a correct exegesis of the Old Testament text can a real correspondence of later events be established with those recorded in the text. This recognition by the New Testament writers of a correspondence between events of the new dispensation and the old is based on the conviction of the unchanging character of the principles of God's working.¹

Thus, typology itself is not a method of exegesis; it goes beyond: it is application. The writers of the New Testament manifested their theological conviction in their use of the Old Testament. They applied their belief that “God worked in a consistent manner, and that in the coming of Christ his Old Testament acts are repeated and consummated.”² Yet, one should “never introduce into the Old Testament text a principle which was not already present and intelligible to its Old Testament readers. Sound exegesis, and a respect for the sense of the Old Testament text thus discovered, will prevent typology from degenerating into allegory.”³ In contrast to a prediction, which looks forward to its fulfillment, typology consisted essentially in a looking back and discerning in the Old Testament examples of a pattern which reaches its culmination in the Christ event.

---

²Ibid., 43.
³Ibid., 41.
One of the more recent and comprehensive approaches to typology is David L. Baker's 1975 Ph.D. dissertation *Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of Some Modern Solutions to the Theological Problem of the Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments* which he presented to the University of Sheffield. He examined the use of the word τύπος and its cognates in the Septuagint and the Greek New Testament. Based on various English translations of the biblical passages, in which τύπος or its cognates appear, and on its modern use he concluded that the word τύπος has the general meaning "example" or "pattern."1 With this definition in mind he stated two principles that underlie typography:

1. Typology is historical. Since typology is a particular understanding of history,2 its concern is with historical events, people, and institutions. He asserted:

   The fundamental conviction which underlies typology is that God is consistently active in the history of this world—especially in the history of his chosen people—and that as a consequence the events in this history tend to follow a consistent pattern. One event may therefore be chosen as typical of another, or of many others.3

2. Typology implies a real correspondence. This correspondence does not focus on parallels of details but on fundamental principles and structures on the historical as well as the theological level.

---

1Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible*, 185.


3Ibid., 195.
With these principles in mind, Baker formulated a “working definition” for typology:

* a type is a biblical event, person or institution which serves as an example or pattern for other events, persons or institutions;
* typology is the study of types and the historical and theological correspondence between them;
* the basis of typology is God’s consistent activity in the history of his chosen people.¹

On the basis of the consistency in the working of God in both the Old and the New Testaments, typology therefore is a means to contribute to the understanding of the relationship between the testaments. Every part of the Bible affirms the consistency of God’s acts. How God acts in the Old Testament illuminates the way God acts in the New. “There is . . . a fundamental analogy between the Old and New Testaments as witnesses to God’s activity in history.”² And since all the Scriptures are a testimony to this consistency of divine activity, the number of types is unlimited.

As Foulkes, France, and others before him, Baker contended that typology is not exegesis. The meaning of a given text is to be found by grammatical-historical study. This is the one meaning of the text. If the author intended a typological significance in his writings it has to become clear in the text. “Typology is not an exegesis or interpretation of a text, but the study of relationships between events, persons and institutions recorded in biblical texts.”³ It is also not a method or a system. The biblical writers used the

¹Ibid., italics his.
²Ibid., 198.
³Ibid., 190.
typological approach so unsystematically that it does not even have a fixed terminology. Baker furthermore rejected the concept of divine design, the connection with Christ and redemption, or any prospective, prefigurative trajectories as part of typology. Persons, events, and institutions of the biblical account are typical of God’s saving activity. Jesus Christ is the supreme type for Christians and the world.

Herbert Haag explained the correspondences and patterns between the persons, events, and institutions within the Old Testament and between the Old and New Testament with the concept of Motifgeschichte. Given similar conditions and circumstances God and man will act according to a similar pattern. Later writers of the biblical material took earlier material as a model to craft their stories into a corresponding form. Later figures of the biblical history consciously followed in their lives the example of earlier figures whom they knew from Scriptures.

This is, above all, true for Jesus and his relationship to the Old Testament. Jesus, for example, identified himself with the נביא יהוה and recognized his mission to “re-live” the image of the divine servant. In this way one could say that the events of the Old Testament are fulfilled in the New Testament. The events of the Old Testament were not designed by God because they were supposed to foreshadow the Christ event, but rather they were fulfilled in Christ because they were divinely designed in the Old Testament. Christ “re-lived” the divine pattern of the Old Testament and thus fulfilled it.1

1H. Haag, “Typologisches Verständnis des Pentateuch?” 257. As others before him he contended that typology has nothing to do with exegesis because it cannot add anything to the meaning of the text as intended by the author (see ibid., 256).
In 1981, James Allison Meek in his M.Th. Thesis “Toward a Biblical Typology” surveyed the history of typological interpretation from the Early Church, through the Reformation period, down to the twentieth century. He observed various approaches to typology:

1. The “Literary View” considers a type in Scripture to be a person or event in terms of which a later writer of Scripture presents his account. This position holds that typology is a matter of literary dependence. The Gospel writer presented the life and work of Jesus modeled on Old Testament stories. Thus, the Gospel material does not say so much about Jesus and his followers but rather about the evangelists’ understanding of the Old Testament.

2. The “Historical Interpretation View” considers a type as being an event in terms of which later events are interpreted and to which later events are perceived by the interpreter to correspond. This view gives meaning to events that are not inherent in the events themselves. In order to come to grips with an existential self-understanding, Israel “confessed” a typological perception of her history. Thus, with each event the Tradition grew richer.

---


3. "The Allegorical View" understands Scripture being written "in code." Types may be symbols or tokens for some other thing or idea to which it may or may not be integrally related.

4. "The Educational View" was advanced by Fairbairn and other nineteenth-century scholars. The divinely ordained events, persons, and institutions are means to teach unchanging biblical truths in a way that each new generation was able to comprehend them. While earlier revelations were wrapped in a rather rudimentary form, they later became more fully disclosed in the Gospels.

5. "The Prophetic View" defines a type as being a divinely ordained event, person, or institution which prefigures future acts of God. Types reveal what is to come, thus being part of prophecy.

6. "The Redemptive-Historical View" is favored by Meek. Biblical types can be persons (e.g., David), places (e.g., Jerusalem), nations (e.g., Babylon), things (e.g., the tabernacle), events (e.g., the Exodus), ceremonies (e.g., the Passover), institutions (e.g., the priesthood), or experiences (e.g., the betrayal).¹ These types serve "as a model, pattern or example for persons, events, etc., in a subsequent era or eras."² The redemptive history of God's work is both consistent and progressive; there is continuity and discontinuity. The factor of continuity makes the recognition of a type possible;


²Ibid., 116.
discontinuity allows only in retrospective the recognition of a type. Thus, "the predictive power of types is limited."\(^1\)

Hans K. LaRondelle stressed the fact that the typological approach of the New Testament writers was motivated by the concept that the Christ event is the fulfillment of salvation history which began in the Old Testament. "Typology is a theology of the progression of God's acts of salvation through Jesus Christ. It is based on the biblical assumption that God always acts in accordance with the unchangeable principles of His holy nature and will."\(^2\) This salvation history culminates in the first as well as in the second advent of Jesus. This christological focus safeguards biblical typology against any accidental or trivial analogies. The antitype is not only a more developed or perfected form of the type but a new and unique work by God through the Messiah.

LaRondelle maintained that the correct understanding and use of the Old Testament depends on the New Testament. The New Testament writers looked back to Israel's history and tried—in the light of the Christ event—to figure out how God's saving acts in the past can be related to the salvation and redemption brought about in Jesus. They discovered many correspondences between past and present acts of God.

LaRondelle further underlined that "true typological interpretation of the Old Testament

---

\(^1\) Ibid., 131.

does not create a second meaning or allegorization beyond the literal sense\textsuperscript{1} but considers how the historical meaning of the Old Testament text continues to speak within the New Testament setting.

In an article in 1983,\textsuperscript{2} Keith Poysti tried to evaluate the typological interpretation. His major concern was the question: What function does typology serve in the Bible? Was the basic function of typology to prove that Jesus was the Christ? Or is typology simply a means to make connections between Old and New Testament events? Poysti supported Allan C. Charity's criticism of the "contemporary defenders of typology" for emphasizing the historical and factual aspects of typology to the neglect of its kerygmatic and practical nature.\textsuperscript{3} The function of typology was "to confront the hearer anew with God's past actions in the midst of his people. . . . Typology is what allows Israel's history to apply to our history, and also what allows Jesus' words to live in the twentieth century."\textsuperscript{4}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{2}K. Poysti, "The Typological Interpretation of Scripture," \textit{Direction} 12, no. 3 (July 1983): 3-11.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{4}Poysti, "The Typological Interpretation of Scripture," 5. Poysti made reference to Walter Brueggemann's work on the Psalms and their "typology of function." Based on Ricoeur's understanding of the dynamics of life as a movement, dialectic but not regular or patterned, of disorientation and reorientation (P. Ricoeur, \textit{Freud and Philosophy} [New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1970]; idem, "Biblical Hermeneutics," \textit{Semeia} 4 (1975): 29-148; idem, \textit{Interpretation Theory} [Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University, 1976]),
\end{flushright}
because they were convinced of God's unchanging character and what He "did in the past was a pattern of or a basis for what would happen in the future." Since God's words and actions are timeless they apply to all ages. Thus, the whole Bible becomes "typical," the number of types one can discover is unlimited.

In 1987, George Wesley Buchanan published his concept of biblical typology in connection with the problem regarding the nature of the gospel genre. He showed the widespread use of typology in Scripture and surveyed recent research. His main thesis in regard to typology was that typology is based upon an ancient cyclical understanding of time. Old Testament writers, for example, understood events in the light of God's acts in the Exodus and interpreted the contemporary situation accordingly. Similarly, the New Testament writers interpreted the life of Jesus in the light of cyclical Exodus typology. These Christians were convinced that their era conformed to the earlier pattern of the Hexateuch and the Exodus narrative in particular; accordingly, they gave the Christ event the same pattern and sequence as the "typical original."

Brueggemann maintained that although the Sitz im Leben of the Psalms is not the same as today, its function will forever remain the same. He wrote: "We may anticipate a commonality of function even when other matters diverge... The hermeneutical possibility of moving back and forth between ancient function and contemporary intentionality exists because the use of the Psalms in every day is for times when the most elemental and raw human issues are in play" (W. Brueggemann, "Psalms and the Life of Faith: A Suggested Typology of Function," Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 17 [1980]: 5.

1Poysti, "The Typological Interpretation of Scripture," 8.

2Buchanan, Typology and the Gospel; see also idem, Jesus: The King and His Kingdom (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1984).
With this cyclical understanding of time, Buchanan left the historical framework of typology. The narrator of the Gospel stories “invented” stories to fit the original pattern depicted in the Old Testament. As Buchanan readily admitted, his conclusions are “conjectural and speculative” and “more suggestive than convincing.”

John D. Currid sensed a need for recognition and use of typology in the homiletic endeavor. He noted two principal reasons as to why there is an absence of typology in preaching today: (1) There is a basic ignorance not only among the laymen but also among pastors and seminary faculty who are “typologically illiterate,” and (2) many church leaders are not convinced of the importance of typology in preaching.

Similar to others, his definition of typology worked in the framework of salvation history. He attributes four characteristics to a type/typology:

1. Typology must be firmly grounded in history, which means that both type and antitype must be historical events, persons, or institutions.

2. There must be a notable resemblance or similarity between the type and the antitype on the historical as well as the theological level.

3. There must be an intensification on the part of the antitype.

---

1 Buchanan, *Typology and the Gospel*, 122.

2 Ibid., 43.

4. There must be evidence that the type is divinely ordained to foreshadow the antitype.¹

Currid stressed especially the last point. Typology underscores the sovereignty of God. He has

planned history with a unified purpose so that what God has done in the past becomes the measure of the future. He has simply designed history in such a way that certain patterns repeat themselves. In other words, God has directed history so that foreshadowings occur.²

Typology demonstrates that God is unchanging. And because he is the same in the past, he is the same in the present, and he will be the same in the future. God acts according to a certain pattern within salvation history. Currid concluded his appeal for typology in preaching, pointing out that “the Christian congregation can take great solace in those patterns because God will treat his people today in a similar fashion.” Thus, “understanding and recognition of typology is absolutely essential for Biblical preaching.”³

¹Ibid., 118-121.

²Ibid., 128.

In a 1996 article, Father John Breck outlined principles of Orthodox biblical hermeneutics. In regard to the relationship between the Old and the New Testaments, he maintained that the unity between the two Testaments is based on the historical links that exist between both. Their relationship is expressed in terms of “Promise” and “Fulfillment.” There is an “inner, organic unity” that exists between the two. Key persons and events of the Old Testament find their ultimate meaning in those of the New. “This relationship of Promise to Fulfillment, inherent in the historical process itself, can be described as a relation of ‘type’ to ‘antitype’. . . . To interpret the Old Testament in the light of the Gospel, then, the Orthodox exegete will have recourse to ‘typology’.”

Based on the example of Antiochene exegesis, which combined allegorical elements with typology, Breck emphasized that “insofar as that combination [typology and allegory] is properly understood and applied, Orthodox exegetes would insist that it [the typological method] remains useful for the work of interpretation even in our own day.”

This concept of typology is based on the understanding of the relationship between biblical types and their antitypes as being founded on examples and patterns of man’s encounters with God. God’s saving acts thus form the paradigm for subsequent saving acts of God.

---


2 Ibid., 90.

3 “It may be that along with these ‘prophetic’ and ‘allegorical’ interpretations of the Old Testament should be set a third, the typological. This may be distinguished from the other two in that it seeks correspondences between persons and events not (as allegory does) in meanings hidden in language but actually in the course of history, and looks not to fulfillment of a prediction, but to the recurrence of a pattern” (C. K. Barrett, “The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New,” in *Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 1).
Closely related to the "Pattern of God's Acts"-approach is the study of literary patterns. Northrop Frye analyzed typology from this angle. Being a literary critic he did not study the Bible as literature but the Bible and literature. He attempted to investigate the symbolism and the mythological framework used and created by the biblical writers. Every event of the Bible is traced back to an earlier mythological source that triggered the typological processing of subsequent literature. One of the major agents of unity is this typological formation and construction of the Bible. "The two testaments form a double mirror, each reflecting the other but neither the world outside."

For Frye, typology is a form of rhetoric, a mode of thought and a figure of speech. He viewed "revelation" as being "a sequence or dialectical progression . . . as the Christian Bible proceeds from the beginning to the end of its story." There is a "sequence of phases" of biblical typology, each phase being a type of the one following it and an antitype of the one preceding it. These phases are: creation, revolution (exodus), law, wisdom, prophecy, gospel, apocalypse. Frye discovered a unity of imagery and narrative throughout the biblical writings. Types and antitypes are combined into a spiraling and continuous process in


2Ibid., 106.
which each type is absorbed into a subsequent antitype including and heightening its predecessor. Typology starts with the text, for "every text is the type of its own reading. Its antitype starts in the reader's mind, where it is not a simple reception but the unfolding of a long and complex dialectical process, the winding of the end of a string into a ball."\(^1\)

One of the issues related to the discussion of typology working within a framework of repeating patterns of divine intervention, which has been stressed in the more recent debate, had been emphasized already by von Rad. He had pointed out that typology is by no means a theological concern or a specific Oriental instrument. Rather, "typological thinking is an elementary function of all human thought and interpretation."\(^2\) It is the endeavor to understand one's existence in terms of analogies and which is most vividly displayed.\(^3\) This quest is what we see in the Bible in terms of typology. God's saving acts become the structural pattern of future salvific interventions.\(^4\)

This view was challenged by Bultmann, who did not consider the principle of repetition as part of a realistic understanding of history but as a cosmological axiom of the cyclical movement of the world's course, which does not strive towards completion but repetition. Thus, the idea of typology contradicts the principle of the linear progression of


\(^{2}\)Von Rad, "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," 17.

\(^{3}\)Von Rad refers to Schiller's poem *Die Glocke*.
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earth’s history.¹ Von Rad rejected this categorization of typology. It is not repetition which is the moving spirit of typology; rather, “the Old Testament . . . is dominated by an essentially different form of typological thinking, namely, that of the eschatological correspondence between beginning and end (Urzeit und Endzeit).”²

Uwe Steffen took up again von Rad’s argument and underscored that “thinking in types” is by no means a preliminary stage of indifferent thinking but is a basic structure of the human experience. He based his understanding on insights of C. G. Jung’s thesis of the archetypes.³ The sum of archetypes corresponds to the possibility of typical experiences. When a human being experiences a situation which corresponds in regard to its content to a original situation the archetype is enlivened. In a description of such a situation the concrete historical experience is easily becoming mixed with the archetypical experience.⁴

Although not many commentators based their understanding on psychological insights, this strand of reasoning remained part of the discussion. D. S. Ferguson noted

¹Bultmann, “Ursprung und Sinn der Typologie als hermeneutische Methode,” 205-206.


that “typological thinking arises out of the human effort to understand the world on the basis of analogy, symbol, and picture-image.”\textsuperscript{1} When it comes to the Bible “this understanding of typology has less to do with the specific events of saving history and more to do with understanding human existence in its relationship to salvation.”\textsuperscript{2} Recently, C. J. H. Wright described typology as “a normal and common way of knowing and understanding things.”\textsuperscript{3} Our daily life experience is filled with “typical” things, situations, facts, experiences, etc. It is a human phenomenon. And that is evident in Scriptures. Already the Old Testament displays a kind of internal typology. Events, persons, things, institutions are “picked out and seen as ‘typical.’” That is, they illustrate something characteristic about the way God does things.”\textsuperscript{4} And Wright concluded that “typology is a matter of analogy.”\textsuperscript{5}

The “Historical Hermeneutics” Approach

Besides the “Pattern of God’s Acts” approach, a second starting point in the quest to come to grips with the New Testament’s use of the Old Testament—and typology in particular—was determined by the conviction that the key was to be found in

\textsuperscript{1}D. S. Ferguson, \textit{Biblical Hermeneutics: An Introduction} (Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1986), 86.
\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{3}C. J. H. Wright, \textit{Knowing Jesus Through the Old Testament} (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995), 111.
\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., 112.
\textsuperscript{5}Ibid., 113.
hermeneutical principles displayed by contemporaries of the New Testament's writers and rabbinical Judaism. While various scholars such as Harris and Dodd were looking for the original sources of the Gospels, others turned their focus to an analysis of the methods by which the New Testament writers selected and applied Old Testament passages. In 1954 Krister Stendahl published a book in which he tried to understand the origin of the Gospel of Matthew. He argued that the formula-quotations are too much part of their contexts and too striking a feature of the Gospel as a whole to have originated from a special source. He identified a "Matthean school" in which the Gospel had its origin as a manual of instruction and administration. Its final form was due to a Christian rabbi, a member of this particular school. Its exegetical technique is not a halakic or haggadic type, which was favored by the contemporary rabbinic schools, "but it closely approaches what has been called the *midrash pesher* of the Qumran Sect, in which the Old Testament texts were not primarily the source of rules, but the prophecy which was shown to be fulfilled."2


Albert C. Sundberg questioned both Harris's and Dodd's proposals. He considered Dodd's theory of testimonia as being only a variation in form of Harris's hypothesis of testimonies. He went on to ask, "If the early church made such a collection of Old Testament passages and used it as the basic Old Testament reference for its preaching of the gospel, how could it have been omitted from the canon?" Sundberg pointed out divergent uses of the same text in the New Testament and argued against any theory of a common exegetical method. "The effect of Sundberg's contribution,” observed Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "tended to move biblical research away from Harris' search for an exact source for most, if not all, of the Old Testament quotations in the New in favor of a new focus on the manner and purpose of appropriating the Old Testament.”

Lindars also saw in the exegetical *pesher* method practiced at Qumran a model for understanding the development of Old Testament interpretation and application within the early church. The *pesher* method applied the meaning of the Old Testament text to a contemporary situation or event. Old Testament texts were sometimes modified to fit the

---


*W. C. Kaiser, The Uses of the Old Testament in the New, 12 (italics his).*
historical and theological needs of the community, and a shift in the application of texts in accordance with the developing thought and interest of the early church was observable. These "modifications" of the text and "shifts" of application owe their origin to the apologetic preaching tradition which employed scriptural proofs against opponents. The primary concern was to demonstrate the nature of Jesus’ messiahship.

Lindars noted further that "the Church inherited from the eschatological tradition the great typological themes of redemption, which greatly assisted the development of christology." He distinguished the typological exploitation of Old Testament passages from the apologetic. The primitive church, for example, did not show any interest in the Levitical priesthood; only in the letter to the Hebrews did the Levitical element enter as a typological development.

Influenced by Dodd and Stendahl, E. Earle Ellis sought to understand in particular Paul’s use of the Old Testament in his letters. He underlined Paul’s indebtedness to contemporary Jewish exegesis but pointed out that “one must look to the apostolic Church and to Christ Himself to find the primary source of the apostle’s understanding and use of the Old Testament.”

---


the viewpoint of the “End-time” in which history and prophecy become fulfilled in Christ.

What had been foretold to happen to Israel has happened to Jesus.

Following Stendahl, Ellis associated the quotation technique of the New Testament writers with the pesher midrash at Qumran and with other kinds of midrash found in rabbinic expositions. One of the main characteristics of the Qumran pesher is that it uses or creates variant Old Testament textforms which have the purpose of adapting the text to the interpretation in the commentary. It is also both charismatic and eschatological.

In his discussion of typology, Ellis stressed the fact that typology is first of all—and here he followed Goppelt—the basic means in relating the Old with the New.

---

1 Matthew Black defined the New Testament writer’s approach as “applied exegesis” or “actualisation midrashique” (M. Black, “The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament,” New Testament Studies 18 [1971]: 1-17). See also D. Juel who states that “the New Testament is very different from the rabbinic and the Qumran literature.” But the “exegetical activity belongs clearly to the larger world inhabited by the Qumran sectarians and the later rabbis. . . . Overall, New Testament scriptural interpretation is more like the ‘sectarian’ exegesis at Qumran than the ‘scholastic’ exegesis in rabbinic literature. . . . The greatest difference between early Christian exegesis and other forms of Jewish scriptural interpretation is the impact made by Jesus” (D. Juel, Messianic Exegesis, 56-57); see also idem, “Social Dimensions of Exegesis: The Use of Psalm 16 in Acts 2,” Catholic Biblical Quarterly 43 (1981): 543-556. Juel argued that Christians applied the Old Testament to Jesus because he was already confessed as the crucified-and-risen Messiah and because the passages in question had either already been interpreted by Jews as messianic, or could be so construed on the basis of Jewish exegetical principles (Messianic Exegesis, 171). Contrary to Lindars he argued that early Christian exegesis of the Old Testament did not primarily serve an apologetic purpose, but rather was the chief mode of Christian reflection on the question of Jesus’ identity.

2 E.E. Ellis, Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity, 151-162.
Further, typology is "thoroughly christological in its focus."¹ Jesus is the "prophet like Moses." The relationship between type and antitype is not a "one to one" equation, in which the type is just repeated in the antitype, but rather is governed by two principles: historical correspondence and escalation.² For Paul and the other New Testament writers there was more to a type than just "typicalness" or similarity. They viewed Israel's history within the framework of *Heilsgeschichte*. "When Paul speaks of the Exodus events happening τυπικῶς and written 'for our admonition', there can be no doubt that, in the apostle's mind, Divine intent is of the essence both in their occurrence and in their inscripturation."³ Ellis maintained that although the type has its own historical value, its real significance typologically is revealed only in the antitype or fulfillment.⁴

Robert H. Gundry challenged Stendahl's hypothesis of a special Matthean school as the origin of the allegedly unique Old Testament quotations Matthew used. He spoke of "Matthew the Targumist." Since the original milieu of the early Church was Jewish it "must have passed through a state of Targumism, if it emerges from the synagogue in which Targumism prevails."⁵ Gundry held that the New Testament preachers freely

---

¹Ibid., 166.

²E. E. Ellis, Foreword to *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, by L. Goppelt (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), x.


translated and rendered—while interpreting—the Hebrew text, of which various forms circulated as attested in the Qumran material, into Aramaic and Greek. Matthew focused especially on the "messianic hope," on Jesus, the royal Messiah, the Servant in Isaiah, or the Son of Man in Daniel. By means of these Old Testament quotations and allusions, Matthew showed his audience that this wide spectrum of messianic images and types finds its fulfillment in Jesus.

The association of the pesher-type method of exegesis with the New Testament writer's use of the Old Testament has been challenged. William D. Davies asked whether the method of interpretation revealed in the formula quotation is to be so sharply distinguished from that found in the rest of the New Testament as to constitute a special peculiarity of Matthew. And secondly, whether there is not considerable difference between the formula quotations and the pesher in use at Qumran. In the former, the 'historical event seems to determine the incidence and nature of the quotation, which serves as a closure to a pericope, that is, the scriptural quotation subserves the event. In the latter, the opposite is the case: the scriptural text is normative for the event, not a commentary upon this, but its ground.

---

1See also W. Rotfuchs, Die Erfüllungszeiten des Matthäus-Evangeliums, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, no. 88 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1969), 105-107.


It has been pointed out that the almost stereotyped formula which, for example, Matthew uses to introduce his fulfillment quotations from the Old Testament has no real parallel either at Qumran or in the Mishnah. Joseph A. Fitzmyer found only two examples of a formula that comes close to what we find in the New Testament, and even these differ from the New Testament material in referring to a future event. Furthermore, it has been observed that in 1QpHab, which is the clearest example of pesher exegesis, the Old Testament prophetic pronouncements of Habakkuk are exclusively interpreted in terms of the “fulfillments” to which they are related to, thus making their original context meaningless.

When studying the instances where Matthew quoted the Old Testament it becomes clear that the Old Testament passage and situation is not at all meaningless. For example, Mathew’s reference to the Exodus events in Matt 2:15 citing Hos 11:1 would have made no sense if the Israelites had not literally come out of Egypt.

---


Ulrich Luz remarked: “It is noteworthy that the interpretations of the prophets in the Qumran community which refer to the present time are introduced by the catchword תובנ (interpretation) which is missing from Matthew. This probably not by accident; between these two basic words מ施工现场 and πληροθεω there is an essential difference. תובנ begins with the text and interprets it; πληροθεω begins with the historical events and understands it as the fulfillment of predictions. מ施工现场 starts with the Bible and tries to understand it; πληροθεω begins with the present and reflects on it in light of the Bible” (U. Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, trans. W. C. Linss [Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1989], 158).

Richard N. Longenecker asked whether we could reproduce the exegesis of the New Testament writers. He identified three methods of interpreting sacred texts among first century Judaism: (1) the “Midrash Exegesis,” (2) the “Pesher Exegesis,” and (3) the “Allegorical Exegesis.”¹ The New Testament writers were not consciously following one or the other mode of interpretation. They employed a variety of means (e.g., historical-grammatical exegesis, illustration by way of analogy, midrash exegesis, pesher interpretation, etc.), all blended and interwoven. Yet, they were conscious of “interpreting the Old Testament (1) from a Christocentric perspective, (2) in conformity with a Christian tradition, and (3) along Christological lines. And in their exegesis there is the interplay of Jewish presupposition and practices, on the one hand, with Christian commitment and perspective, on the other; which joined to produce a distinctive interpretation of the Old Testament.”²

Especially Paul and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews used a midrashic type of biblical interpretation which starts with the Old Testament text “and seeks to demonstrate Christological relevance by means of a controlled atomistic exegesis.”³ This


²Longenecker, “Can We Reproduce,” 16-17; see also idem, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975), 206-209.

³Longenecker, “‘Who Is the Prophet Talking About?’,” 7.
interplay of Jewish exegetical means with Christian presuppositions has thus created a distinctive interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures.¹

When Jesus pointed out correspondences between earlier events of salvation history and circumstances which were connected with his person and ministry he “viewed these Old Testament events as typological, pointing forward to their fulfillment in his person and ministry—not just as analogies that could be employed for purposes of illustration.”² Jesus reinterpreted and used terms such as “Son of Man,” “Servant of YHWH,” and “Day of YHWH.” He viewed the Old Testament from his consciousness of being the promised Messiah, thus often treating selected quotations from the Old Testament in a pesher-type fashion. Longenecker concluded:

As students of history we can appreciate something of what was involved in their exegetical procedures, and as Christians we commit ourselves to their conclusions. But apart from a revelatory stance on our part, I suggest that we cannot reproduce their pesher exegesis. . . . Likewise, I suggest that we should not attempt to reproduce their midrashic handling of the text, their allegorical explications, or much of their Jewish manner of argumentation.³

. . . Christians today are committed to the apostolic faith and doctrine of the New Testament, but not necessarily to the apostolic exegetical practices as detailed for us in the New Testament.⁴


²Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period, 74.

³Ibid., 218.

⁴Longenecker, “‘Who Is the Prophet Talking About?’,” 8.
James H. Charlesworth proposed a reconceptualization of typology in light of its varied use in the writings of the Intertestamental period. First, one has to refine his understanding of the relationship between the Old and the New Testaments. After a thorough assessment of how the two relate to each other, typology should be brought into the discussion.

Charlesworth pointed out that various typological motifs which portrayed Jesus and his mission are both grounded in the Old Testament narratives as well as in early Jewish literature. The New Testament writers “inherited” this kind of typology which was developed by their Jewish ancestors and contemporaries. They used typology as a


3E.g., “the lamb symbolism at Passover time is enriched by the sign of the lamb’s salvific blood developed in Jubilees 49; the wise king typology is deepened by the messianic interpretation supplied by the author of the Psalms of Solomon 17 and 18; the shepherd imagery is employed to explain the history of God’s people from the flood to the messianic kingdom after the Maccabean wars by the author of 1 Enoch 89 to 90; and the Joseph typology is expanded in diverse and complex ways by the authors of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and Joseph and Aseneth” (ibid., 71-72).
means to relate the Old Testament to their experience. This relation "is often brought into clear focus by the theologies and technical terms of intertestamental Judaism. This dimension of the New Testament is obvious in Hebrews, whose author mastered the Jewish use of typology."¹

The Recent Evangelical Debate

With the rise of the Biblical Theology Movement in America as well as in Europe, scholars reacted against a liberal theology that had atomized the biblical text into different sources by means of source criticism and the historical-critical method. Scholars of this "counter-movement" who shared similarly liberal and critical presumptions focused on the theological dimension of the Bible which previous generations of scholars had almost completely neglected in favor of literal, linguistical, and historical studies. With this focus on the theological aspect of the biblical text came the attempt to deal with both testaments in a unified way. Great emphasis was placed upon the inner unity of the Bible as a whole but also upon the unity in terms of the relationship between the Old and the New Testaments. As Brevard S. Childs pointed out, "the most frequently used rubric by which to describe in a positive way the unity of the Bible was 'unity in diversity.' This approach appeared to allow the Biblical theologian to affirm the detailed analytical work

of his predecessors, while at the same time maintaining a unity." 1 To achieve this unity the allegorical method was rejected and eschewed as invalid. There was disagreement as to whether the typological method should be included in the disavowal of inappropriate means to relate both testaments. "While the term 'typology' was often avoided, one began to hear of 'finding the same pattern of revelation in the Old Testament and the New Testament.'" 2

The Biblical Theology Movement had its "high day" from about 1945 to 1965. 3 With its demise in the latter part of the sixties and beginning seventies there seemed to go hand in hand a decline of interest in typology within the camp of critical scholarship. Especially with the rise of redaction criticism in the sixties, the focus shifted from the question of an internal unity to emphasizing the diversity of the scriptural record. 4 Thus, the foundation for the acceptance of the typological approach amongst critical scholarship had been weakened, if not taken away. In the following period until now, less and less


2 Rowley, The Unity of the Bible, 98, quoted in Childs, Biblical Theology in Crisis, 37.


4 See Davidson, Typology in Scripture, 91-92.
attention has been paid to typology and its bearing upon the relationship between the
testaments. Yet, among evangelical scholarship the topic has never been abandoned, and
it seems as if the discussion has gained significant momentum. Evangelical scholars are
following S. Lewis Johnson's advice:

We must not succumb to the biting ridicule of those who denigrate typology. We
may then be guilty of ignoring what God has stressed. One of the happier results
of twentieth-century scholarship has been the rediscovery of the importance of
typology for the understanding of the Bible. I am hopeful that evangelicals, who
so often follow rather than lead in biblical scholarship, will follow once again, for
in this case modern scholarship is surely right.1

It appears—while most of the “leaders” have abandoned the stage—the
“followers” have remained and are engaged in a lively debate. Yet, as W. Edward Glenny
underlines there is no consensus of opinion is emerging on the many issues involved.2 In
one of the plenary sessions of the 1994 National Evangelical Theology Society Meeting,
D. A. Carson suggested that one of the solutions to the debate over authorial intent and a
text having a fuller meaning would be an agreement on what typology is.3 Similarly, Mark
W. Karlberg suggested that the “resolution of lingering differences of interpretation

1S. L. Johnson, “A Response to Patrick Fairbairn and Biblical Hermeneutics as
Related to the Quotations of the Old Testament in the New,” in Hermeneutics, Inerrancy,
and the Bible, ed. E. D. Radmacher and R. D. Preus (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan,
1984), 794-795.

2W. E. Glenny, “Typology: A Summary of the Present Evangelical Discussion,”
Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 40 (1997): 627-638. The following is
based on this article.

3D. A. Carson, “Two Turning Points in Contemporary Hermeneutical Debate,”
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among evangelicals depends, to a large extent, on a proper assessment of the nature and function of Old Testament typology.\textsuperscript{1}

The debate rages between—what Glenny called—"covenant theologians" and dispensationalists over three fundamental issues that need to be addressed: (1) "the relation of the progress of revelation to the priority of one Testament over the other," (2) "the understanding and implications of New Testament use of the Old Testament," and (3) "the understanding and implications of typology."\textsuperscript{2} While some feel that the typological approach of understanding the relationship between the Old and the New Testaments is not consistent with grammatico-historical exegesis,\textsuperscript{3} others appear distrustful of typology because of its apparent subjectivism and its sometimes contradictory results and interpretive excess. At times, typology tended to be confused with allegory which led to the result that typology was charged with the deficiencies of allegory.\textsuperscript{4}


\textsuperscript{4}Hugenberger, "Introductory Notes on Typology," 335-336.
valid typological approach are basically two groups: "Covenant theologians" and Dispensationalists.¹

Covenant Theologians

The basic concept of the "covenant" tradition is the understanding that biblical history is viewed in the framework of *Heilsgeschichte*. God's intervening acts in all of biblical history are directed forward toward Jesus and his redemptive acts. All epochs of biblical history are related to one another and come together in the Christ event. Typology is a means to relate these different epochs to one another as well as pointing to the fulfillment in Christ.

Again and again the call for a controlled typology has been heard. Gerhard F. Hasel asked for "a guarded and circumspect use of typology [which] is indispensable for an adequate methodology that attempts to come to grips with the historical context of the Old Testament and its relationship to the New Testament."² And J. D. Currid warned that

¹Glenny divided the dispensational camp into the "Revised Dispensational View" and the "Progressive Dispensational View." C. A. Blaising also broke down the development of dispensationalism into three stages: classical dispensationalism, revised dispensationalism, and progressive dispensationalism. For the characteristics and differences of these various stages, see C. A. Blaising and D. L. Bock, *Progressive Dispensationalism* (Wheaton, IL: BridgePoint Book, 1993), 9-56. See also idem, "Dispensationalism, Israel, and the Church: Assessment and Dialogue," in *Dispensationalism, Israel, and the Church: The Search for Definitions*, ed. C. A. Blaising and D. L. Bock (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992), 377-394; R. L. Saucy, *The Case for Progressive Dispensationalism: The Interface Between Dispensational and Non-Dispensational Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1993). In my discussion on typology I focus on the recent discussion among dispensationalists. Furthermore, Glenny added another Group in his survey, "the view of Richard M. Davidson."

“danger lurks at every bend.” He demanded that “the interpreter needs to be armed with clear-cut distinctives of the nature of typology.” One evangelical scholar who has attempted to work with a model of a controlled typology is Edmund P. Clowney. His understanding of typology is greatly influenced by his *heilsgeschichtlichen Ansatz*. For him, the redemptive history of the Old Testament carried along a rich paradigm of figures with the focus on God’s dwelling among mankind. All these figures lead to the New Testament revelation in which God in Christ dwelled among men. Thus, *Heilgeschichte* is “more than a carrier for the symbolism of the cultus. It furnishes in its occurrences metaphors that point to the fulfillment of God’s promises.” These metaphors, figures, and symbols are taken, for example, by the Old Testament prophets as “typical” of God’s future acts of deliverance. And in this way the New Testament writers interpreted the Old Testament. “The Old Testament history is not complete in itself, but provides analogies that anticipate the greater realization of the New.” Typology begins with a person, institution, or event which is considered in the context of *Heilgeschichte*. The symbolism or significance of the original fact is to be correlated with the later fact with which it shares an analogous meaning (not merely a superficial resemblance). The later fact fulfills or is modeled on the pattern of the first. With this diagram Clowney pointed out that only


3 Ibid.
something which is symbolic can be typical. Only when one has gained a clear understanding of the symbolism of Scripture can one construct the line of typology and work with confidence.¹ The number of types are not limited to the ones that are explicitly mentioned by the New Testament.

Another aspect of covenant theology is the issue of horizontal (or historical) and vertical (earthly, heavenly) typology. Although most of the studies on typology have virtually ignored the vertical typological pattern, some have considered it. For Goppelt, vertical typology is only a vestige of ancient Near Eastern mythical thinking which could not fit into a *heilsgeschichtliches* scheme, and others contended that the vertical typology which is foremostly displayed in the epistle to the Hebrews is borrowed from Philonic speculations.² On the other hand, a number of scholars take the two trajectories of typology into consideration. Bruce K. Waltke pointed out that “typology is analogical on


both its vertical, cosmological axis and on its horizontal, temporal axis.”

Especially Adventist theologians have emphasized that “in all biblical typology, both horizontal and vertical, the historical reality of both type and antitype is indispensable to the typological argument.”

The understanding of Sanctuary typology played a vital part in the formative phase of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and her understanding of a pre-Advent judgment. In refuting the notion that vertical typology is something “crypto-pagan” or


“Platonic” various scholars have pointed out that the concept of a heavenly order imprinted on the earthly order, found, for example, in the epistle to the Hebrews, is deeply rooted within Old Testament thinking. This becomes obvious when one studies the remarkable parallelism between the ordinances regarding the earthly sanctuary and the heavenly liturgy in the Psalms.1 Unfortunately, with the focus on the vertical, heaven-earth-related typology, some scholars have depreciated the value of the Old Testament types and emphasized the temporary and inferior nature of the Old Testament economy.

Other scholars, while maintaining the value of the Old Testament economy, pointed to the “ultimate” fulfillment of the Old Testament types. R. M. Davidson underscored that the eschatological element plays a major part in understanding New Testament typological applications. All Old Testament types have one eschatological fulfillment with three aspects: (1) the basic fulfillment in Christ’s earthly ministry—“inaugurated” eschatology, (2) the derived spiritual fulfillment by the


church—"appropriated" eschatology, and (3) the apocalyptic fulfillment at the second
coming of Christ and beyond—"consummated" eschatology.1

The eschatological trajectory of typology within "Covenant-Theology" brings
with it that the Old Testament Israel (the type) is fulfilled and "replaced"2 by the "kingdom
of the heavens" that has come into this world with Christ's first advent and which is
represented by the Church (antitype). Since Israel has rejected the covenant "the
legitimate heirs of the Mosaic and Abrahamic covenants are not the unbelieving natural
descendants of Abraham . . . but exclusively the spiritual children of Abraham, those who
belong to Christ. . . . The Church now occupies the place of Christ-rejecting ethnic
Israel."3 It is now God's intention to bring Israel back into a covenant relationship by
means of the Church. Only by confessing that Jesus is the risen savior (Rom 10:9, 10) can
Israel be saved. Thus, there is no room for any future restoration of national Israel
subsequent to or alongside the messianic fulfillment.4

1Davidson, Typology in Scripture, 398-401; idem, "Sanctuary Typology," 106-
108, see especially the chart on p. 129.

2There is a growing awareness that Israel has not been "replaced" by the Church
but is still the olive tree to which the new branches of the New Testament Church were
grafted (Rom 11). "Paul did not speak of another tree which would replace the old one.
For him the Church was to prolong the tree, not to replace it" (J. Doukhan, "The Two

3LaRondelle, The Israel of God in Prophecy, 130-131.

4For further reading on this controversy, see ibid., passim; W. VanGemeren,
"Israel as the Hermeneutical Crux in the Interpretation of Prophecy," Westminster
State of Israel Have Theological Significance?" Conrad Grebel Review 2, no. 1 (Winter
Hermeneutical Issues," Grace Theological Journal 6 (1985): 275-287; M. W. Karlberg,
Dispensationalists

Dispensational theologians, on the other hand, maintain that the Old Testament Israel has a prophetic and a typological significance. The prophetic component refers to the future, literal millennial reign of Christ on earth, the typological refers to the messianic, semi-eschatological realization of the promise in the age of the Church. Salvation history is defined by God’s activity to establish his rule on earth. It is “the gradual implementation and outworking of the kingdom of God.” Since the age of the Church is but a parenthetical period of this establishing of God’s kingdom, the promises given to Israel in the Old Testament are not fulfilled in the Church. The Church is not the antitypical fulfillment of “typical” Israel. Promises given to Israel are only literally fulfilled in a literal, political Israel of the future (i.e., during the thousand years of God’s reign which He will have established on this earth). Typological parallels drawn between Old Testament Israel and the New Testament Church are based only on analogies. Yet, “the Church participates in the blessings of the Abrahamic covenant by inheriting the promise of justification by faith (Gal 3:6-9, 29) and in the blessings of the New Covenant of Jeremiah 31 by experiencing regeneration, [and] the indwelling Spirit.”

---
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Because the Church is not seen as the heir to the promises given once to Israel, dispensationalist scholarship tends to find fewer types in the Old Testament. John F. Walvoord outlined the following control with regard to what is considered a type:

The only secure authority for the application of a type is to be found in Scripture. The mere perception of analogy will not suffice. Expositors have often imagined correspondence where none in fact exists, and where, even if it did, there is nothing to prove a special Divine intent. . . . It is this previous design and this preordained connexion which constitute the relation of type and antitype.

In this context Craig A. Blaising even spoke of a “gradual withdrawal from ‘typology’.” Roy B. Zuck applied the Marshian principle that perceived only those Old Testament persons, events, or things as legitimate types that are identified as such in the New Testament.

While “Covenant-Theology” seems to depreciate—at least in dispensationalist scholars’ opinion—the value and the meaning of the Old Testament type in favor of its antitypical “real” meaning, dispensationalists have pointed out that types are concrete historical entities, real events and persons. They “demand that both type and antitype be given their due meanings in their own contexts, while maintaining a typological relation to

---


3Blaising and Bock, Progressive Dispensationalism, 35.

The meaning of Old Testament types is neither to be ignored nor canceled by typological interpretation. Only if the New Testament explicitly rejects an Old Testament institution does it become obsolete. Thus, predictions that are spoken to Israel could not be fulfilled in the age of the Church since this would neglect the Old Testament meaning. Prophecies and predictions in regard to literal Israel can only be fulfilled to literal Israel in the future. There are, though, predictions that find their fulfillment in the New Testament, and there are also types in the Old Testament that find their antitype in the New Testament. But “type/antitype is a much different method of communicating truth than prediction/fulfillment.”

P. D. Feinberg counted the typological relationship between the Old and the New Testaments among other analogies that exist between the two. He stated that “while types and analogies are appropriate ways of understanding the relationship between the two Testaments, typical and analogical hermeneutics are not.”

Types and analogies are means that can be justified in relating both testaments since the Bible does make these kind of relationships itself. Both types and analogies are appropriate forms of communication within historical-grammatical hermeneutics. But, “advocating typological or analogical hermeneutical principles in interpreting the Old Testament . . . comes close to spiritualizing the Old Testament.” Because there are typological relationships and analogies between the Old and New Testaments does not


2P. D. Feinberg, “Hermeneutics of Discontinuity,” 120.

3Ibid., 122-123.

4Ibid., 123.
mean that the appropriate hermeneutical method for interpreting the Old Testament is typological or analogical.

In contrast to former generations of dispensationalists, "progressive dispensationalists" do not view the age of the Church as a parenthesis, but as an initial stage in the establishment of Christ's kingdom. The promises that are given for the ultimate establishment of Christ's kingdom are "initially" fulfilled during the age of the Church, the invisible reign of Christ. The New Testament believer takes part in these promises on the basis of his relationship with Christ, thus extending God's intended meaning in the Old Testament beyond the literal meaning of its Old Testament context and beyond the Old Testament author's intention. This concept has led to a reevaluation of typical relationships. Whereas, for example, the use of Hos 11:1 in the New Testament (Matt 2:15) was viewed as an "analogy" by "revised dispensationalists,"1 "progressive dispensationalists" consider this kind of "typical" relations as "typological-prophetic."

"Progressive dispensationalists" underscored, though, that this concept of an "initial" fulfillment in the age of the Church does not mean that the promises given to Israel in the Old Testament will not eventually be fulfilled to national Israel. Since the context in which these promises are given is clearly literal Israel, the promise also has to be fulfilled to a literal Israel in the future.

1Ibid., 122.
Richard M. Davidson’s “Biblical Typology”

In his 1981 dissertation *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical τύπος Structures*, Davidson observed that, although a lively debate over typology had occurred, the fundamental issues concerning terminology, characteristics, origin, and contemporary relevance of biblical typology had not been resolved. He pointed out that there is an almost bewildering disparity of views regarding the nature of biblical typology [which] is symptomatic, however, of an underlying problem in the history of research on the topic. . . . Previous studies of the biblical use of typology suffer from a serious methodological deficiency. There is a repeated failure to allow the structures of typology to emerge from within the biblical text. Instead, an a priori understanding of typology—based on little or no exegetical evidence—is projected upon Scripture, and the biblical material then is examined from the perspective of the preconceived understanding. . . . The nature of biblical typology remains ambiguous as long as an a priori understanding of its conceptual structures is brought to the biblical text instead of allowing these structures to emerge from careful exegetical analysis.1

After a review of literature from the early Church Fathers up until the present discussion, Davidson sought to ascertain the nature of biblical typology through a semasiological2 analysis of the term τύπος and its New Testament cognates up to and

---

1Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, 6-7.

2By “semasiological study” Davidson referred to an analysis of the overall semantic range of a word (or words) and its breadth of significance in specific contexts. He pointed out that “this is not to be confused with the biblical author’s unconscious ‘deep structures’ which are the primary concern of modern structural exegesis. . . . Our concern is with the conceptual elements intended by the biblical writer and not with the ‘unconscious elements which impose significations upon man’” (*Typology in Scripture*, 8, n. 1); see further D. Patte, *What Is Structural Exegesis?* (Philadephia, PA: Fortress, 1976); idem, *Structural Exegesis for New Testament Critics*, Guides to Biblical Scholarship (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990); J. Calloud, “A Few Comments on Structural Semiotics: Brief Review of a Method and Some Explanations of Procedures,” in *Beyond Form Criticism: Essays in Old Testament Literary Criticism*, ed. P. R. House, Sources for Biblical and Theological Study, vol. 2 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 118-142.
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This investigation of the term τύπος yielded three basic meanings: "(1) the matrix, or Vorbild, i.e., what leaves its impress; (2) the impression and [sic] Nachbild, i.e., the result of the impress or blow; and (3) the matrix or Vorbild which is at the same time an impression or Nachbild." 1 Especially this third basic meaning had been largely overlooked or not given proper attention in past studies. This meaning is found in ethical passages of the New Testament such as Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 12:7; 2 Thess 3:9; 2 Tim 1:13; and others. In these texts Christ is presented as the Urbild which is the model for Paul. Paul is a Nachbild of the divine Urbild. After Paul had pointed to Christ as the model, he outlined his own experience as a Vorbild to be followed. Thus, Paul's Nachbild of the divine Urbild is at the same time a Vorbild for the leaders of the church and the congregation.2 All of these basic meanings (Vorbild, Nachbild, and nachbildliches Vorbild) were found to be represented in the New Testament.

From the study of the hermeneutical τύπος passages, five τύπος structures emerged, one historical structure and four theological (the eschatological structure, the Christological-soteriological structure, the ecclesiological structure, and the prophetic structure).

The historical structure assumes that the Old Testament type is a historical reality. Persons, events, or institutions actually lived, happened, and existed as recorded in

1Davidson, Typology in Scripture, 185.

2Ibid., 156-157.
the scriptural account. There is a historical correspondence between the Old Testament type and its New Testament antitype which extends even to details which are important in regard to their salvific significance. This correspondence can be either synonymous or antithetical. Although there is a significant component of similarities, the historical structure seems to involve a *Steigerung* or intensification of the Old Testament type.

The eschatological structure clarifies the nature of the historical structure, especially the *Steigerung*, for the Old Testament types are not just linked to a New Testament entity based on a mere similarity or analogy. They point toward their antitypes within the eschatological realities of the New Testament which have three dimensions: (1) Inaugurated Eschatology (Christ’s first advent and his ministry here on earth); (2) Appropriated Eschatology (the spiritual appropriation of the kingdom of heavens by the Church); and (3) Consummated Eschatology (Christ’s second advent and the final, ultimate establishment of His kingdom).

The Christological-soteriological structure determines the content of the New Testament antitypes. The Old Testament types “find their fulfillment in Christ or in the realities of the new covenant related to and brought about by Christ. Christ is presented as the ultimate orientation point of the τύποι (cultic ἀντίτυπος) and their New Testament fulfillments.”¹ Thus, the relation between type and antitype is not between “neutral” entities, but between events, persons, and institutions that have salvific implications. New Testament antitypes center around Christ’s ministry and/or the salvation brought about by him.

¹Ibid., 417.
The ecclesiological structure has three different aspects: (1) the individual worshiper, (2) the corporate Christian community, and (3) the sacraments of the church. The salvific implications of Christ's ministry are appropriated either by the individual believer or by the corporate body, the church, through the sacraments.

The prophetic structure establishes the prospective character of biblical typology. Old Testament types are an advance presentation or prefiguration of their corresponding New Testament antitypes. The Old Testament types are divinely designed to "foreshadow" even specific soteriologically related details. Israel was led by God out of Egypt through the Red Sea into the Sinai wilderness. This was not planned by Israel; God "designed" it. This divine design involves "a devoir-être (must-needs-be) quality that gives them the force of ineluctable, prospective/predictive foreshadowings of their intended New Testament fulfillment."¹ "If the Old Testament event is indeed an advance-presentation of the New Testament event, then the Old Testament 'pre-presentation' implies that the New Testament 'presentation' will occur, and further, that it will occur after the order of the Old Testament 'pre-presentation'."² This element, for example, is crucial to Paul's argument in 1 Cor 10. "Only if there is a devoir-être connection between these saving events of God, can Paul convince the Corinthians in vss. 5-10 of the devoir-être connection between..."³


²Davidson, Typology in Scripture, 223.
être nature of the judgments of God, i.e., that if the Corinthians disobey like ancient Israel, it 'must-need-be' that the judgments of God will fall upon them."¹

Putting these definitions and structures together Davidson defines biblical typology as a New Testament study of the Old Testament salvation historical realities, or types (persons, events, institutions), that God designed to correspond to, and predictively prefigure, their intensified antitypical fulfillment aspects (inaugurated, appropriated, consummated) in New Testament salvation history.²

With this definition Davidson clearly distanced himself from the postcritical position and put himself in line with the traditional approach to typology whose major elements he saw affirmed by the biblical data: typology is rooted in historical realities; divinely designed prefiguration; there is a prospective or predictive thrust within the Old Testament type; prefigurations extend even to specific details in regard to salvific qualities; the structural elements of biblical typology encompass horizontal as well as vertical typology; and biblical typology involves consistent principles of interpretation.³

**Typology—A Hermeneutical Method?**

There is no doubt that typology has been a part of the hermeneutical endeavor to relate the Old Testament with the New since the earliest stages of the Church. For the Church Fathers and early expounders of Scripture, typology was one of the main means to relate the "old dispensation" with the "new"; in our age, the question has been raised

¹Ibid.

²Davidson, "Sanctuary Typology," 102.

³Cf. ibid., 127.
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whether typology is a hermeneutical method at all, whether it is part of the exegetical process, or only a homiletical application, a technique of expressing theological truth.

Due to the uncontrolled excessive (mis-)use in the early centuries and also thereafter, and the lack of a proper definition and procedure, typology has been regarded by many as "unscientific" and no longer applicable in our modern thinking. According to this view, since there is no consistency in method, typology cannot be considered a suitable Old Testament hermeneutic. It has been argued that it is "the method of another age, an age which did not know scientific thinking and therefore scientific method." Therefore, typology is improper to a post-critical age. It "is not suited to our present needs in articulating the relationship between the Testaments." In their effort to defend their identity, Christians employed typology against Gnostic heretics to confirm that the Old Testament had still value; yet it was fulfilled by the New Testament (against Jews). They "desperately . . . searched the Scriptures to find proof for the things happening among them . . . [and] felt free in changing and distorting the Scriptures." Old Testament quotations were used arbitrarily with little reference to their context. Thus, typology can

---

1See, e.g., Breck, "Theoria and Orthodox Hermeneutics," 203.


4McCasland, "Matthew Twists the Scripture," 146.
no longer be a binding device for studying the Scriptures. From the historical standpoint we can appreciate the methods used by the early Church, and as Christians we are committed to their conclusions, but we cannot reproduce their exegesis. Since many of such comparisons—such as Jonah/Jesus—are "intolerably bizarre" it is tempting to dismiss all typologies; "typology is a difficult and hazardous kind of thought." Others have contended that typology is not an exegetical method but "application." R. T. France notes:

But while strict exegesis is a prerequisite of typology, it is not correct to describe typology itself as a method of exegesis. Exegesis is the establishment of the true meaning and intention of the original text... As such it is distinct from interpretation or application, which are concerned with what is seen in the text, and what use is made of it, by later readers.

---

1 See Eichrodt, "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?" 231; Haag, "Typologisches Verständnis des Pentateuch?" 256.

2 Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period, 218; cf. Eldridge, "Typology—The Key to Understanding Matthew’s Formula Quotations?" 49.

3 P. S. Minear, Horizons of Christian Community (St. Louis, MO: Bethany, 1959), 64, 78.


Walter Baumgartner also considered typology as going beyond what one might consider proper exegesis. Typological interpretation is not derived from the original meaning of the Old Testament text; it is "applicatio," rather than "interpretatio."\(^1\) Robert B. Sloan urged that it is "historically necessary for us to think of the New Testament writers as having interpreted the Old Testament in ways unanticipated by the original author."\(^2\) The Old Testament writer cannot have the last word as to the final application of the text. Typology is one means among others to reinterpret a past tradition in light of a new experience so that it is relevant to the contemporary situation.\(^3\)

There are scholars who strongly emphasize that since the Old Testament text has only one meaning—its literal meaning—typology is not exegesis. Typology cannot add anything to the endeavor of finding out the Old Testament writer's intended meaning.\(^4\)

Hans K. LaRondelle underlines that "if one defines exegesis strictly as establishing the true

---

\(^1\)W. Baumgartner, "Die Auslegung des Alten Testaments im Streit der Gegenwart," Schweizerische Theologische Umschau 11, no. 3 (June 1941): 36. W. Eichrodt added: "Moreover, this position could be strengthened by pointing out that typological interpretation is not in fact concerned with the establishment of the literal sense of a passage, but rather presupposes the literal sense" ("Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?" 242).


meaning of the original text as the human author intended it, by means of the grammatico-historical method, then typology is not a method of exegesis of the Old Testament.”¹

John S. Feinberg pointed out that the New Testament writers did not understand the meaning of the Old Testament passages being canceled. They just offered a different application of an Old Testament passage than the writer of this passage might have foreseen. It is a double fulfillment which is necessitated by the New Testament’s application of the passage to the church and by maintaining the integrity of the Old Testament’s meaning. “If the New Testament antitype cancels the meaning of the Old Testament type, the New Testament must tell us so.”²

The general tenor of those who consider typology as not being part of the exegetical endeavor is that it is not an exegetical method but rather an attitude,³ the result of a certain conviction,⁴ or an effort to “impress men with the mysterious connection between Old Testament words and New Testament happenings.”⁵ It is not so much an

¹LaRondelle, “The Sensus Plenior of Israel’s Restoration Promises.” See also J. Bright, The Authority of the Old Testament (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1967), 92: “Whatever our zeal to find a Christian significance in the OT, we are on no account permitted to foist meanings upon the text not deducible by grammatico-historical principles, or to expound them as to convey the impression that they actually contain such meaning. To expound the Old Testament in this way is not to expound the Old Testament” (italics his).


⁴Cahill, “Hermeneutical Implications of Typology,” 274.

⁵Smart, The Interpretation of Scripture, 113.
application of a specific hermeneutical rule or heuristic methodology but rather a calling attention to events and establishing their relationship to one another.¹

On the other side, Jean Daniélou advertised a return to typology. He sought to re-establish the long-abandoned continuity between modern typology and the typology practiced by the Church Fathers. He argued that this typology has even today its right place within biblical studies. It is not only a fundamental part of the inner-biblical structure but also a possibility to preach and read the Old Testament as a Christian.² “It seems that typology may help us to a recovery of the Kerygma of primitive Christianity.”³ Especially among Catholic scholars the typological approach has been used to read the Bible spiritually. Daniélou called typology “spiritual” or “figurative” exegesis.⁴ This approach has a long tradition. Already Thomas Aquinas distinguished between sensus verbum and sensus rerum. God speaks not only through words but also through things.⁵


²J. Daniélou, “La typologie d’Isaac dans le Christianisme primitif,” Biblica 28 (1947): 363-393; idem, Origen; idem, From Shadows to Reality.


⁵“Illa ergo prima significatio, qua voces significant res, pertinet ad primum sensum, qui est sensus historicus, vel literalis. Illa vero significatio, qua res significatae per voces, iterum res alias significant, dicitur sensus spiritualis, qui super literalem fundatur, et eum supponit” (Summa Theologica, vol. 1, quaestio 1, articulus 10); cf. Haag, “Typologisches Verständnis des Pentateuch?” 248; see also J. Gribomont, “Le lien
To find a spiritual meaning along with a literal one has found support even by the papal authority.¹

In the decades after World War II the discussion over the "other-than-literal" sense had centered around the so-called "sensus plenior."² The sensus plenior is defined as the "fuller or more profound meaning conveyed by God through the words of Scripture, but not known (or, at least, not clearly known) to the sacred writer."³

Raymond Brown, in his basic work on this concept, described sensus plenior as des deux testaments selon la théologie des S. Thomas." Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 22 (1946): 70-89.

¹See the encyclica "Divino afflante spiritu," by Pope Pius XII (Acta apostolicae sedis 35 [1943]: 297-325).


that additional deeper meaning, intended by God but not clearly intended by the human author, which is seen to exist in the words of a biblical text (or group of texts, or even a whole book) when they are studied in the light of further revelation or development in the understanding of revelation.¹

This concept of a “fuller sense” has been connected with typology. Dan McCartney and Charles Clayton spoke of an “increase” of meaning that can be looked at in two ways: First, the historical standpoint sees later and more important events, persons, and institutions foreshadowed by earlier ones. Second, from the standpoint of language, the meaning of a text “grows,” it takes on a “fuller sense.” “Sensus plenior is thus simply another way of looking at the way later revelation relates to earlier. By showing how the later revelation reflects and completes the earlier (typology), the earlier revelation itself can be seen to take on an expanded meaning (sensus plenior), evident to us but not to its first readers.”² For D. A. Hagner, the tracing of typological correspondences is “a special instance of detecting the sensus plenior of the Old Testament material.”³ This “fuller” meaning is discernible only in the light of the New Testament. While these scholars considered typology and sensus plenior along the same

¹Brown, The Sensus Plenior of Sacred Scripture, 92. He noted further that the biblical author could have dimly perceived the “fuller” meaning at times; the writer’s awareness could range “from absolute ignorance to near clarity” (113).


lines, R. E. Brown distinguished between them. *Sensus plenior* had to do with the deeper meaning of *words*, typology with the extended meaning of *things.*

In the Protestant realm it was Gerhard von Rad who emphasized the spiritual element inherent to typology. He was convinced that there is not a systematic or methodological approach to typology. No pedagogical norm could be set up; typology is not to be regulated hermeneutically. The New Testament writers were convinced that the Old Testament is a testimony of God's acts in history. The "kerygmatic" intention of these acts is also relevant for the "new" era because God is the father of Jesus Christ. The various writers viewed and interpreted the Old Testament freely and almost randomly. Typological interpretation "takes place in the freedom of the Holy Spirit." Goppelt expressed this concept similarly when he states that "typology is not a hermeneutical method with specific rules of interpretation. It is a spiritual approach that looks forward to the consummation of salvation and recognizes the individual types of that consummation in redemptive history."
Others described the New Testament writer's use of the Old Testament a "more or less charismatic expression. . . . Their appeal to the Old Testament was intuitive rather than exegetical."\(^1\) The New Testament writers found types in the Old Testament because they saw a new significance in Israel's history in the light of the Christ event. This type of "charismatic" exegesis has its example in the hermeneutical endeavor of the Qumran community. The Old Testament text was a mystery which could not be interpreted by human reason but only revealed by the Holy Spirit.\(^2\) Still others considered typology as a key for "grasping imaginatively unity of the Bible,"\(^3\) or as a "naive" interpretation.\(^4\) Typology depends upon the "ingenuity of the the individual interpreter" and is thus more

\(^{1}\)Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, 92.


appropriate in a pre-critical mentality. It is a kind of “poetic insight” or a “creative poetic vision” rather than a scientific method. “What typology proclaims cannot be demonstrated by some logical process of reasoning; it can only be believed.” Since Jesus and the New Testament writers were inspired, they had the right to make changes under the guidance and authority of the Holy Spirit that uninspired men would not dare to attempt. Thus, inspiration gave the licence to find fulfillments in passages that had a different intention, and even change the wording in order to fit their purpose.

Out of these approaches the question arises: Where do we have a control as to what legitimate typology is? Is typology only a subjective, creative device that is dependent on our “poetic vision” or “ingenuity”? Is typology a “literary device”? Are there any exegetical controls that govern typology? Is typology after all part of a

1Lucas, "Considerations of Method in Old Testament Hermeneutics," 33.


4Roehrs, “The Typological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament,” 212; N. Frye too observed that typology comes from “faith, hope and vision” (Creation and Recreation [Toronto: University of Toronto, 1980], 60).

legitimate exegetical endeavor? Can we talk of a “typological method”? Geoffrey W. H. Lampe pointed out that it is hard “to find any criterion which is more than purely subjective. . . . What to one reader will seem a plausible and valid piece of historical typology will strike another as fantastic.” And Paul S. Minear cautioned that typology is very difficult to control. Without some kind of control, interpreters with an “active imagination” could see types everywhere or regard the entire Scriptures as a “bundle of oracles from which any and every exposition can quarry pieces at random to fashion into a mosaic of his own design.” In regard to the relationship of the Old and the New Testaments and the role of typology, Gerhard F. Hasel stated that “a guarded and circumspect use of typology is indispensable for an adequate methodology that attempts to come to grips with the historical context of the Old Testament and its relationship to the New Testament.” An unguarded typology without any controls has led to an extreme use of typology in the past. The Church Fathers in particular are here an ignominious example. But the uncontrolled and excessive utilization of typology is not only a device of the past. There are scholars and preachers who, like the Church Fathers, see typological connections almost everywhere in the Old Testament. Benjamin Keach, for example, saw in Noah a type of Christ. As Noah took many trees to build the ark, so Christ took many

---


2Minear, Horizons of Christian Community, 63.


believers, called trees of righteousness, to build the Church. Moses, who married a Gentile Black Ethiopian woman, was a type of Christ. Christ, like Moses, espoused the Gentiles. The Gentiles, like Moses' Ethiopian wife, were strangers to God. Through their sins they were "as black as hell could make them." Others claim that the rams' skin dyed red in the tabernacle were types of Peter and Paul in their converted state, or that the wooden boards of the tabernacle set in sockets of silver are types of the Christian grounded in his faith. The three stories of the ark are a type of the threefold salvation in Christ that makes provision for the redemption of our spirit, soul, and body.

If typology is to be regarded as a valid part of the exegetical procedure, i.e., based on sound exegesis, it has to be guarded by a controlled procedure. Scholars have

---

1 B. Keach, *Preaching from the Types and Metaphors of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1972), 972.

2 Ibid., 976.


Typology played a role in forming new religious movements. According to the theology of the "Unification Church" under the leadership of the Reverend Sun Myung Moon, God intended Adam and Eve to be a perfect family, having perfect children. But with the Fall and the subsequent union of the first human pair the impurity was passed on to their children. Jesus, the second Adam, was sent to earth to redeem man. Yet, he died before he could marry and procreate. Therefore, a third Adam needed to come. Supporters of the "Unification Church" see in Moon the "Lord of the Second Advent" who comes to accomplish what Jesus could not. Moon's union with his wife is called the "marriage of the Lamb" (see Sun Myung Moon, *Divine Principle*, 2d ed. [New York, NY: The Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity, 1973], passim.)
demanded that "only in concert with, and not in repudiation of, the checks and balances of historical-critical methodology can typology serve with integrity today." It has been pointed out that to make typological connections is justifiable in that such relationships are made by Scripture itself. It appears that typology is the way the New Testament writers viewed history, *Heilsgeschichte*; typology is therefore a legitimate means of interpreting the unity between the "type"-passages in the Old Testament and the anti-typical fulfillment in Christ.²

The question as to whether typology is based on sound exegesis is linked to the question of whether or not typology is prophetic. G. K. Beale expressed the notion that "if typology is classified as partially prophetic, then it can be viewed as an exegetical method since the New Testament correspondence would be drawing out retrospectively the fuller prophetic meaning of the Old Testament type which was originally included by the divine author."³ This concept does not equate the meaning of a text exhaustively with the author's intention.⁴ The argument from prophecy would attach a great measure of authority to the typological interpretation. The New Testament authors used prophecy to prove that Jesus was the Messiah: He was to be born in Bethlehem (Mic 5:2; Matt 2:1-6)

---

¹Alsup, "Typology," 685.
³Beale, "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?" 93.
of a virgin (Isa 7:14; Matt 1:18, 22-23). His life (Isa 9:1.2; Matt 4:12-16) and suffering (Isa 53:12; Luke 22:37) were read out of the Old Testament prophecies. Their proof from prophecy gave their claim of Jesus as being the Messiah the authoritative evidence that the Jewish believers needed to convince them that Jesus was, indeed, the Messiah. Can the same be claimed for typological connections? Is typological exegesis supported by prophetic authority?

In today’s age of the historical-critical evaluation of Scripture and the emphasis on the primacy of “revelation in history” there is little room for the prospective, predictive element. Thus, every notion of a predictive element in connection with typology is discarded. Others have struggled over the question as to the precise relationship of typology to prophecy. While Goppelt defended typology as divinely ordained and predictive prefiguration, R. Bultmann called Goppelt’s failure to properly distinguish between typology and prophecy a Hauptfehler.¹ He asserted that New Testament typology is based on a mythological cyclical view of time which is in opposition to the genuine linear understanding of history as found in the Old Testament prophets. David L. Baker stated that

typology is not prophecy. Typology and prophecy are related, since both presuppose continuity and correspondence in history; but typology is retrospective whereas prophecy is prospective. Of course, recognition of the fulfilment of prophecy is retrospective, but this is concerned with the fulfilment of

words in the Old Testament, whereas typology discerns a relationship between the events, persons and institutions recorded in the Bible.¹

A. Goff added that “fulfillment isn’t a necessary feature of typology.”² For the “Full Human Intent School,”³ whose basic premise is only that which is asserted in an Old Testament passage must have been a part of the human author’s intended meaning, typology is not prophetic nor does it deal with issues of meaning at all; rather, it is applicational. Walter C. Kaiser appealed to one of Willis J. Beecher’s definitions of “generic prophecy” which he gave in his book The Prophets and the Promise. Beecher defined a “generic prophecy” as

one which regards an event as occurring in a series of parts, separated by intervals, and expresses itself in language that may apply indifferently to the nearest part, or to the remoter parts, or to the whole—in other words, a prediction which, in applying to the whole of a complex event, also applies to some of the parts.⁴

Working with this definition, Kaiser held that “it would be wrong to speak of a literal sense of the ancient historic word, which was contemporaneous with its announcement, and of a deeper, mystical, or double sense that became clear when the


A "generic prophecy" has only one meaning and the author is aware of all the stages in the sequence. Only the time when those events will be fulfilled does the writer not know. Thus, Kaiser rejected the sensus plenior together with dual sense, double fulfillment, or double meaning.\(^2\)

If typology is devoid of any prospective or prophetic thrust, one has to conclude that typology is merely a form of analogical thinking or retrospective analogy. And this notion of "retrospectivity" has been a vital aspect in many modern scholars' perception and evaluation of typology. Typological connections are only perceivable when one looks back from the New Testament platform and discovers "in retrospective" the particular analogies and patterns that are evident throughout the Old Testament and continue on in the New Testament dispensation. Douglas J. Moo was convinced that "typology is fundamentally retrospective; there is no attempt to assert that the original text had any forward-looking element at all."\(^3\) In a similar statement, G. W. Grogan distinguished between prophecy and typology in that the former can be usually identified by the fact that the prophet clearly intended a future reference. "However," he concluded in regard to the latter, a type "is usually recognized only in retrospect. We have to see its fulfilment first before we can recognize its typical quality."\(^4\)


\(^3\) Moo, The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives, 31.

\(^4\) Grogan, "The Relationship Between Prophecy and Typology," 10. "Die Typologie ist retrospektiv, die Weissagungsidee zukunftweisend" (Haag,
Others, who still wanted to maintain the prophetic character of typology, claimed that only from a retrospective viewpoint are types perceived to have a prophetic function. W. Eichrodt had asserted that typology belongs in principle to prophecy; there is a close relation between these two. "But while in prophecy the messenger of God proclaims the future . . . a type possesses its significance, pointing into the future, independently of any human medium and purely through its objective factual reality." Then he went on to say that "in many cases its function is still hidden for contemporary people and is disclosed only when the gaze is turned backward from the New Testament time of salvation."¹

Eichrodt called this approach "objectivized prophecy"² or, following Frederik Torm, "realistic prophecy."³ Thomas R. Valletta who perceived typology as a "peculiar genre of

"Typologisches Verständnis des Pentateuch?" 246);

¹Eichrodt, “Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method?” 229.
²Ibid.
³F. Torm, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930), 226-227. Torm distinguished between typologische Auslegung and typologische Betrachtungsweise. He counted Realprophetie among typologischer Betrachtungsweise. He concluded that “falls der oben nachgewiesene Unterschied zwischen einer typologischen Auslegung und einer typologischen Betrachtungsweise wirklich vorliegt, so ist damit gegeben, daß es ganz falsch sein würde, die typologische Auslegung als ein hermeneutisches Prinzip aufzustellen” (ibid., 227; italics his).
symbolism relating to the correspondence of history and truth," maintained it is "a form of prophetic history presupposing that history follows a divine pattern." There is a general agreement that the people of Old Testament times did not know that various things were types. As A. Berkeley Mickelsen put it, "Even though a person, event, or thing in the Old Testament is typical, it does not mean that the contemporaries of the particular person, event, or thing recognized it as typical." Darrell L. Bock confirmed that typology is often retrospective and that the pattern cannot be recognized until it is repeated, but he maintained that typology is still prophetic because at its foundation is the idea that God works in certain patterns in working out his salvation. This pattern is fulfillable and is recognized as a fulfillment in an event or person. Also many of the initial Old Testament texts found in the typological category are texts of promise tied to ideas of deliverance, kingship, or other key concepts that have eschatological overtones and suggest patterns of salvation in themselves. As a result of these factors, 'typological-prophetic' is an accurate description of this class of texts, although the nature of the prophetic connection often is different from purely prophetic texts.

---


2 Ibid.

3 A. B. Mickelsen, Interpreting the Bible (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1963), 246.

Thus, these scholars point out, the Old Testament people were not aware of the forward-pointing thrust of types or even the very existence of a type. They might have had some awareness that certain persons, events, or institutions were typical of forthcoming realities, but they were certainly not fully aware of the full potential of the relationship between type and antitype. "More likely these were prophetic from God's standpoint and when the antitypes were revealed, then it was evident that the predictive element was present. What God saw as prospective, man saw as retrospective."¹ Typical events, persons, or institutions are signposts that point toward their antitypical fulfillment.

If there is a prophetic aspect connected with typology, and if this prophetic element is only recognized in retrospect, this raises then the question as to what function prophecy has, or more specifically: What was the function of the prophetic element of typology when its prophetic characteristic becomes evident only when one looks back from the New Testament perspective and discovers "similar patterns"? There are prophecies that specifically are "sealed" and are not meant to be understood at the time the prophecy was given. Dan 12:4, for example, says: "But you, Daniel, close up and seal the words of the scroll until the time of the end." Yet other prophecies might have been put in words of which the meaning appeared to be "dark" or ambiguous rather than always completely clear.² But certainly the main corpus of prospective prophetic sayings was

¹Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation*, 173.

²See Num 12:6-8: "He [the Lord] said, Listen to my words: When a prophet of the Lord is among you, I reveal myself to him in visions, I speak to him in dreams. But this is not true of my servant Moses; he is faithful in all my house. With him I speak face to face, clearly and not in riddles."
aimed to "enlighten" in regard to what is in store for the future. Retrospective recognition of prophetic elements was certainly not the norm. "Retrospective analogy is not a means of predicting the future but of making sense of the past."  

Throughout the centuries of biblical interpretation beginning with the early Church Fathers down to the beginning of the "critical" era, biblical types were generally considered to consist of prefigurations of Christ or of salvific realities in connection with Christ that were divinely designed (i.e., they had prophetic character). God not only acts according to a certain pattern but also intended specific persons, events, or institutions to foretell the realities of Christ's salvation. A type is in the same sense predictive as is a verbal utterance of predictive prophecy. Both Alexandrian and Antiochene exegetes held that since Jesus had fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies, the true meaning of prophecy could be discerned only by means of typology. In typology a person, place, object, or event is defined as a prophetic image which points forward to and is fulfilled by a corresponding future reality. P. Fairbairn who had formulated the classical definition on typology for the nineteenth century held that a type "possesses something of a prophetical character, and differs in form rather in nature from what is usually designated prophecy. The one images or prefigures, while the other foretells, coming realities." Types are

2Breck, "Theoria and Orthodox Hermeneutics," 201.
3Fairbairn, The Typology of Scripture, 1:137.
"indirect and veiled" prophecies.\textsuperscript{1} Fairbairn followed Bishop Herbert Marsh who insisted that

to constitute one thing the type of another, something more is wanted than mere resemblance. The former must not only resemble the latter, but must have been \textit{designed} to resemble the latter... The type as well as the antitype must have been pre-ordained; and they must have been pre-ordained as constituent parts of the same general scheme of Divine Providence. It is this \textit{previous design} and this \textit{pre-ordained} connection [together, of course, with the resemblance], which constitute the relation of type and antitype.\textsuperscript{2}

In the same tradition as Fairbairn and others, L. Goppelt understood the prophets as constantly working out typological correspondences in their prophecies.\textsuperscript{3} He also considered typological persons, events, or institutions to be divinely intended prefigurations within the process of salvation history.\textsuperscript{4}

With the dawn of the "critical" age and its depreciation of the possibility of prediction the prophetic element of typology got more and more out of focus. Yet, mostly among evangelical scholars the prospective trajectory of typology is still being discussed. For some, typology is prophetic because the pattern of God's activity is divinely designed to be repetitive and the correspondences are identifiable.\textsuperscript{5} For those who belong to the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Ibid., 1:182.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Marsh, \textit{Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible}, 371 (italics his); quoted in Fairbairn, \textit{The Typology of Scripture}, 1:69.
\item \textsuperscript{3}Goppelt, \textit{Typos}, 17-18, 226-227.
\item \textsuperscript{5}See e.g., J. I. Packer, "Biblical Authority, Hermeneutics and Inerrancy," in \textit{Jerusalem and Athens: Critical Discussions on the Theology and Apologetics of
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group of the "Historical Hermeneutics" school this approach seems to lessen the concept of prophecy by setting its recognition largely in the fulfillment period, rather than at the time of the original revelation. Others affirm that "both direct verbal prophecy and typology are prophetic in nature, but they convey prophecy by different and distinct means. In other words, they differ in form but not in essence."2

Another approach to this question is emphasized by D. J. Moo. He suggests that typology is best viewed as part of the "promise-fulfillment" scheme which is the essential framework within which the relationship between the Old and the New Testaments is working. Jesus and the apostles were aware of this heilsgeschichtliche movement from the old to the new dispensation. They explained their situation from this awareness and proved from the Old Testament their standpoint. Both Testaments witness to the unfolding revelation of God's character, purpose, and plan. The salvation brought about by Christ is the climax of this developing revelation; it is the "fulfillment" of Old Testament history, law, and prophecy. "New Testament persons, events, and institutions


will sometimes ‘fill up’ Old Testament persons, events, and institutions by repeating at a deeper or more climactic level that which was true in the original situation.”

All these studies seemed to presuppose that there is some kind of prophetic quality inherent of typology. This presupposition has several reasons: (1) the term type itself suggests a counterpart (antitype) to the type; (2) the appeal to “prophetic fulfillment” by the New Testament writers; (3) the notion that certain things are “shadows” which “foreshadow” the “greater” reality Christ; (4) the concept that God’s salvific acts are worked according to a pattern that is repeated/“fulfilled” in the following ages; and (5) the concept that types have to be “divinely designed” to be “real” types.

There may be many more reasons why the prophetic aspect of typology is often introduced and presupposed. Yet, there has been hardly any exegetical endeavor to define the exact nature and indication of the predictive quality of Old Testament types. W. E. Glenny rightly points to the following questions: Do antitypes fulfill types? Does fulfillment of a type require an indication before the fulfillment (in the antitype) that the type was a prediction? Why do we need the types if we have direct prophecies which indicate the predictive quality of the types? Are the direct prophecies given to clarify the types, and is the New Testament a fulfillment of the type or of the direct prophecies about them, or of both?


A major step toward an answer of some of the afore-mentioned questions was R. M. Davidson's dissertation on typology. While many studies had worked with an a priori understanding of typology which was based on little or no exegetical evidence, Davidson tried to define biblical typology by studying the term τύπος as a hermeneutical term in Scripture. His definition of biblical typology based on New Testament texts using the term τύπος has implications for a study of relevant Old Testament passages. First, the historical structure assumes that Vorbild and Nachbild are both historical realities: persons, events, or institutions that actually lived, happened, and existed. The relation between Vorbild and Nachbild is reasonable, not built upon imagination or unfounded analogies. There is, however, a Steigerung that is characterizing the Nachbild in relation to the Vorbild. Second, the Old Testament Vorbilder do not happen and exist by chance; they are divinely designed. It is God's doing. Third, the Vorbild is a prophetic advance-presentation or prefiguration of its corresponding New Testament realities. The typological correspondence is based not only on retrospective recognition of a pattern, analogy, or "recurring rhythm" but also on a prospective, divinely designed, predictive prefiguration.¹ Fourth, the Steigerung that exists between Vorbild and Nachbild is

¹Philip E. Powers notes that "because of the diverse range of meaning found in τύπος, extreme caution should be exercised in defining typology and its hermeneutics on the basis of the meaning and use of the term" (P. E. Powers, "Prefigurement and the Hermeneutics of Prophetic Typology" [Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1995], 291). He distinguishes two major categories of typology: analogical/theological typology and prophetic typology; any of the categories may involve retrospective recognition. In regard to the latter he writes: "[Old Testament typology is] an account of a historical event, person, or institution recorded in such a way as to allude to an earlier promise. The relationship between the account and the promise indicates that the event is a partial fulfillment of the promise (a type of that which was promised) which by implication anticipates an ultimate, completed fulfillment (antitype). . . . The type is governed not just
expressed by the eschatological fulfillment of the *Nachbild*. Not only is the *Nachbild* announced to occur (sometime) in the future, it will find its fulfillment in the *eschaton*.

If the Old Testament type had a prospective, prophetic thrust, was it recognized as such within the Old Testament dispensation? Were there "prophetic indicators" that would classify certain persons, events, or institutions as types already within the Old Testament? Did the New Testament writers define typological connections because they were "inspired" or did they also get hints by means of prophetic indicators that certain persons, events, or institutions were meant to be types? In the chapters 2 and 3 I try to answer some of these questions by choosing one typological motif, the Exodus, and investigating whether there are already within the Old Testament itself indicators for the presence of typology. I focus on the basic concepts of biblical typology as suggested by Davidson’s research: the historical structure, divine design, the prophetic structure, *Steigerung*, and eschatology.¹

by the promise, but by the form it takes in the initial event. The interpreter must look not only to the promise for the meaning of the type, but also to the form that promise takes in its first historic fulfillment. . . . Although prophetic typology is distinct from prophecy, in that the type does not look *exclusively* to a future event or figure, it is prophetic because the text intentionally links the historical event or person to a promise from God. It ‘looks to a pattern within events that is to culminate in a final fulfillment in light of the passage’s and the OT’s context of hope and deliverance.’ Each type is prophetic in that it is intentionally related to a divine promise by the textual design of the Author. Its predictiveness is present only because of the promise” (ibid., 210, 212-213).

¹Davidson’s categories of “Inaugurated Eschatology,” “Appropriated Eschatology,” “Consummated Eschatology,” and his “Christological-soteriological structure” I subsume under “eschatology.”
Undoubtedly the most important event that shaped the understanding of the history of Israel and its identity and self-understanding was the Exodus. Israel traced back to the Exodus her deliverance from Egypt, the subsequent constituting of the nation, and her unique covenant-bond with God (Exod 19:3-7; Deut 7:7; 9:6; 8:3, 12-18). It formed the basis for the future relationship between Israel and God. This liberating and redeeming event became incorporated into Israel’s most ancient credo (Deut 26:5-10). Especially in the liturgy of certain religious festivals—i.e., the feasts of Unleavened Bread or Passover, Weeks, and Tabernacles—the event of the Exodus from Egypt was remembered and celebrated not only as God’s act of salvation in the past, but also as an event which was contemporized by celebrators of subsequent generations for the present situation: "YHWH, our God, made a covenant with us at Horeb. It was not with our fathers that the Lord made this covenant, but with us, with all of us who are alive here today. YHWH spoke to you face to face out of the fire on the mountain" (Deut 5:2-4).

The Exodus event influenced not only the liturgy of religious festivals and the content of Israel’s covenant code (see Exod 19:3-8; 24:1-18), but also Israel’s ethics and
legal prescriptions¹ (see, e.g., Exod 22:21; Deut 10:18-19; 15:15). This Exodus event that was to be remembered encompassed the ritual of Passover, the deliverance, the going out from Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea with the destruction of the Egyptian army, the giving of the Law at Mt. Sinai, the instruction of the people before they entered the land, and their discipline in the wilderness. This entire experience was used as a “paradigmatic teaching for present and future generations.”² “Both the revelational meaning of the Exodus and Israel’s existential response and decision continued to furnish a kind of pattern or structure for the subsequent revelational and redemptive events of Old Testament history.”³ R. E. Nixon stated that “in the Old Testament the Exodus has pride of place even over the Creation.”⁴ Various studies and surveys have called attention to the pre-eminent status of the Exodus not only within the Old Testament but also throughout the New Testament.⁵


In our study, we turn now to the Exodus passages of the Pentateuch where the historical event of the Exodus, the *Vorbild*, is recorded. Are there any prophetic indicators directly or indirectly connected with the description of the Exodus event or related passages that would signal to later readers or listeners that the Exodus was not only a historical event which was “to be remembered throughout the generations” but points forward to another, even greater (*Steigerung*), exodus that was in store for Israel in the future? Of course, I cannot deal with every text that displays an allusion or reference of some kind to the Exodus. I focus rather on those references that tentatively appear not only to be related to the historical Exodus event but also have a forward-pointing orientation indicating a broader horizon of concern than the immediate historical one.

Before I do so, however, I will look at the eschatological perspective of the Exodus in general. In his study of the New Testament writers’ understanding of typology, R. M. Davidson pointed to the eschatological structure within biblical typology. He writes that
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the eschatological structure clarifies the nature of the historical correspondence and Steigerung. It is not to just any similar realities that the OT τύποι . . . are linked. Rather the OT persons/events/institutions find their fulfillment . . . in the eschatological realities of the NT.¹

The Old Testament type is the Vorbild for the antitype, the Nachbild, which is an eschatological reality. Vorbild and Nachbild are linked together not only by mere historical correspondences; the relationship between type and anti-type is characterized by an "eschatological" Steigerung. The anti-type is an eschatological reality finding its "fulfillment in the soteriological work of Christ and/or in the new covenant soteriological realities issuing from Christ."² If there are any indicators for the concept of typology already within the Old Testament, could we expect to find them in an eschatological context? After I deal with the eschatological context of the Exodus I turn to the particular passages and determine their historical and prophetic structure in relation to typology, the aspects of divine design and Steigerung involved.

The Eschatological Context of the Exodus

There is a basic eschatological orientation evident in the Old Testament. While there is considerable debate as to when in Israel’s history the various eschatological concepts were written down and which parts were the most original, there is no doubt that the Old Testament hope was carried by various eschatological traditions. David L. Petersen pointed out four major strands and sources for the Old Testament eschatology:

(1) Patriarchal Promise Traditions; (2) Sinai Covenant Traditions; (3) David-Zion

¹Davidson, Typology in Scripture, 398.

²Ibid., 418.
Tradition; and (4) the Prophetic Eschatology.¹ The eschatological nature of the Old Testament becomes apparent immediately in the first pages of the Bible. God created man to be in perfect communion with Him. Yet, sin entered into the world right from the beginning. But God did not leave mankind alone with the prospect of despair and facing inevitable death. In the process of exiling the first couple from the Garden of Eden, God gave a promise that was to finally seal the fate of the serpent, the “deceiver”: “And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; and you will crush your head, and you will strike his heel” (Gen 3:15). The beginning of mankind, the first chapters of Genesis, is characterized by an eschatological thrust. John Bright points out that

the Old Testament in all its parts is supported by a deep sense of the rule of God over his covenant people. And because Israel believed her God to be the Lord of history who works his purpose in history and summons Israel to be the servant of that purpose, she could conceive of no other end for history than the victorious establishment of God’s people under that rule. The Old Testament faith by its

very nature pointed ahead and announced the coming Kingdom of God. It awaited its fulfillment.1

The Old Testament understanding of eschatology is thoroughly based on the perception that God holds the future in his hands. It is a “book with an open message” which looks forward.2

J. H. Sailhamer suggests that the very first word of the Pentateuch, וּלְפָתַח (ב), might have been intentionally chosen by the author of Genesis because of its close association with וְזָמַן “and thus had the ‘end’ in view when he wrote of the ‘beginning’.”3 וְזָמַן as an adverb of time with the meaning “beginning” or “first” occurs in the Pentateuch only here at the beginning of the book of Genesis. In all other instances where the author wants to convey the meaning of “first” he uses בְּרֵאשִׁית or בֵּית הָעָלָה.4 These two expressions mark a “beginning” of a series in opposition to the “second” or “next” of the series. בְּרֵאשִׁית, however, marks the “beginning” in opposition to the “end”

4Lit., “at the first”; four times within the Pentateuch, all in Genesis: 13:3; 41:21; 43:18, 20.
Sailhamer points out “that we should ask not simply why the author chose to open the book with a report of what happened ‘in the beginning’ but, more importantly, why he chose to use this word only one time. The answer may lie in the fact that throughout its usage in the Hebrew Bible `\text{תלדו גלוי} occurs regularly as an antonym of `\text{תלדו רורא}. Thus already the author’s choice of the first word in the Pentateuch strikes a note of anticipation of his last words, which turn the reader’s attention toward the ‘end of the days’ (`\text{циальнך ידכם})”.

W. A. Irwin’s assessment that “interpreted in their truest Israelite context, the Old Testament dreams of the end of history mean simply that human life is a progress to better things” cannot stand the test. Rather, “the basis for hope in the Old Testament is not faith in human progress, but the assurance of a coming divine intervention that will introduce a new thing that people have failed and will fail to accomplish.” Thus, the whole Old Testament beginning with the first chapters down to the last verses is

---

1 See, e.g., Job 8:7; 42:12; Eccl 7:8; Isa 46:10.
permeated with an eschatological force that opens the view to look and hope ahead to the future for an decisive change.

The main thrust which pushed the eschatological expectation in the Pentateuchal tradition was the "promise-chain" that started in Gen 3:5. Especially the Abrahamic promise/blessing with its basic ingredients—seed and land—formed the basic for the very existence of the Israelite people. These promises form the immediate context for the Exodus event. The liberation from the bondage in Egypt was a means on the way to fulfill this promise. More than that, the covenant that God "cut" with Abraham was an "eternal covenant," a covenant that incorporated all subsequent generations.

The Seed

The root of the first half of that promise/blessing—the seed—goes back to that first promise at the gate of Eden. God has promised a seed which would accomplish salvation.

The literary structure of Gen 3:15 is as follows:

1* And I will put enmity
2* between you and the woman
3* and between your offspring and her [offspring]
4* he will crush
5* your head
6* and you will strike his heel

This verse depicts two opposing parties: the enmity between the serpent and its seed, and between the woman and her seed.1 In 3* the Hebrew word for "seed" (יֵיתָן) in

1Sigmund Mowinckel, e.g., regarded this passage as "a quite general statement about mankind, and serpents, and the struggle between them which continues as long as
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both cases is a masculine noun in the singular with a collective or metaphorical idea behind it.\textsuperscript{1} There will be enmity not only between the serpent and the woman but also between their respective descendants. The \textit{crux interpretum} which now arises is the question as to how the subsequent personal pronoun (אִמְלָךְ) is to be translated. Since in the Hebrew a personal pronoun employs the grammatical gender agreeing with its antecedent (the English language in contrast employs neutral gender), a literal translation would read \textquotedblleft he\textquotedblright{} or \textquotedblleft it.\textquotedblright{} Yet, the meaning of the preceding \textquotedblleft seed\textquotedblright{} is a collective, i.e., a plural one. Is the pronoun in \textsuperscript{4}\* to be translated \textquotedblleft he/it\textquotedblright{} (individual) or \textquotedblleft they\textquotedblright{} (collective)?

A study of all the verses in which a personal pronoun referred to a \textquotedblleft collective\textquotedblright{} seed (נְדִיב) revealed that in most cases the personal pronoun had the plural form.\textsuperscript{2} The fact that in \textsuperscript{5}\* the Hebrew suffix which refers to the \textquotedblleft head\textquotedblright{} (נַּגְז) is second-person masculine

the earth exists. The poisonous serpent strikes as man's foot whenever he is unfortunate enough to come near to it; and always and everywhere man tries to crunch the serpent's head when he has a chance\textsuperscript{1} (\textit{He That Cometh}, trans. G. W. Anderson [New York, NY: Abingdon, 1954], 11; quoted in O. P. Robertson, \textit{The Christ of the Covenants} [Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1980], 94). Robertson challenged this generalization since \textquotedblleft the whole context makes it clear that the primary purpose of these words is not simply to explain why snakes crawl [or why mankind is afraid of snakes]. The entire framework of the narrative is set on a much more significant level\textsuperscript{(ibid., 95).}}


\textsuperscript{2See, e.g., Gen 15:13; 17:7-9; Lev 21:17; 2 Kgs 17:5; Neh 9:2; Ps 106:27; Isa 65:17; Jer 7:1; 23:5; 30:1; 46:27; Ezek 20:1. A singular personal pronoun—besides Gen 3:15—is found in Gen 22:12; 24:60, Isa 48:1.}
singular points in the direction of a singular unity of the collective group of descendants. The Septuagint understood this text as a messianic prophecy and translated the pronoun with αὐτός (masculine singular) instead of αὐτό (neuter singular), which would be the appropriate form in regard to its antecedent ἐπέρματος (genitive neuter singular of ἐπέρμα). R. A. Martin in a study on the Septuagint's rendering of Gen 3:15 pointed out that although the Septuagint's translation of Genesis “evidences a good deal of freedom in translating the Hebrew masculine personal pronoun נְּכָל . . . in none of the instances where the translator has translated literally does he do violence to agreement in Greek between the pronoun and its antecedent, except here in Gen 3:15.”

Did Eve understand what God had promised to her? A hint as to how she interpreted this promise is found in connection with her giving birth to their firstborn son. Gen 4:1 reads: “Adam lay with his wife Eve, and she conceived and gave birth to Cain. She said, *With the help of YHWH I have brought forth a man*.’” This crucial second part of vs. 1 is rendered, for example, by the *New Jerusalem Bible* as “I have acquired a man with the help of YHWH.” To translate the Hebrew particle נְכָל in this case as “with” is one option which is preferred by the majority of versions. Yet, there is another possibility: one could also legitimately consider this construction as an apposition without violating Hebrew grammar and translate: “I have acquired a man, namely YHWH.”

---


correct, we have here a witness to Eve’s false assumption that the promised seed who would crush the head of the serpent had already arrived in her lifetime.

The seed motif is important to Gen 1-11: the genealogies of Gen 5; 10; 11:10-32; the recurrence of God’s command “to be fruitful and multiply” (Gen 1:22, 28; 9:1, 7). When Abraham had settled in Haran God spoke to him and promised to make him a great nation (Gen 12:2). After he arrived at Shechem, God appeared to him a second time and specified: “To your offspring I will give this land” (Gen 12:7). The patriarchal stories unfold around the various threats that seem to annihilate this precious offspring: all three wives of the patriarchs are struggling with barrenness (Gen 16:1; 17:15-21; 25:21; 30:1); old age (Gen 17:17; 18:11-13); foreign rulers took the wives of the patriarchs away (Gen 12:10-20; 20:1-18; 26:1-11); famine (Gen 12:10); God’s command to sacrifice Isaac (Gen 22); inter-familial hostility (Gen 32:7-8); edict to kill all firstborn sons (Exod 1:15-16).

In the patriarchal stories a line of successive representative sons who matched the seminal idea already inherent in the first promise of Gen 3:15 is the center-focus. In the sequence of the various promises the “seed” becomes more and more defined: in Gen 3:15 it is “a seed” who would crush the head of the serpent; in Gen 9:27 the promised seed was to be a descendant of Shem, i.e., a Semite.1 In the promise to Abraham, then, 

---

1Gen 9:27 reads: “... יִשְׂרָאֵל לָעַל עַל עַמְיָה יִשְׂרָאֵל לָעַל עַל עַמְיָהוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל = qal impf. 3. m. sg. with Jussiv connotation, “he will/may dwell”). There is considerable debate as to whom the he is, Japheth or God. Most ancient Hebrew sources posit God as the subject. Targum Onqelos to Genesis reads: “May YHWH enlarge Japheth and may He cause His Divine Presence רְשָׁמָה יֵשָׁתִיו to rest in the tents of Shem.” The Babylonian Talmud states: “Although God has enlarged Japheth, the Divine Presence rests only in the
the seed acquires both corporate and representative aspects: descendants as many as the stars in the night sky of the desert and the sand on the seashore (corporate), and Isaac, the son of Abraham's age (representative). Yet, besides the multitudes that are to develop out of the seed of Isaac, there is another quality that is attached to the "seed." In the context of the Akedah God repeated His promise to Abraham: "I will surely bless you and make your descendants as numerous as the stars in the sky and as the sand on the seashore.

Your descendants will take possession of the cities of their enemies" (Gen 22:17). Here, we have a similar situation as in Gen 3:15. The term "seed" in the singular is used in the first half of the verse as a collective; the seed is to become a great multitude. The second part reads literally: "your seed [singular] shall possess the gate of his/its [singular] enemies." Similar to Gen 3:15 the personal pronoun suffix that refers back to seed is in the uncommon singular. It appears that God in his promise to Abraham points beyond the immediate realization of the many descendants to another ultimate "seed" who is to reign tents of Shem" (Yoma 10a); see also the Book of Jubilees, Philo, Maimonides, Rashi, Ibn Ezra.

Walter Kaiser, Jr., supported God as the subject as follows: "1) the subject of the previous clause is presumed to continue into the next clause where the subject is unexpressed; 2) the use of the indirect object of the previous line as subject ('Japhet') would require strong contextual reasons for doing so; 3) the context of the next several chapters designates Shem as the first in honor of blessings; and 4) ... 'and he will dwell in the tents of Shem,' hardly makes sense if attributed to Japhet, for Japhet had already been granted the blessing of expansion" (Toward an Old Testament Theology, 82; cf. V. P. Hamilton, The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1 -17, New International Commentary on the Old Testament [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990], 326); for a different view, see, e.g., U. Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis: Part II—From Noah to Abraham, trans. I. Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1964), 169; E. A. Speiser, Genesis, Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 1, 3d ed. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987), 62-63; G. J. Wenham, Genesis I -15, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 1 (Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 202-203. 
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over his enemies. Paul in the New Testament seems to interpret the promise in this way:

“The promises were spoken to Abraham and his seed. The Scripture does not say ‘and to seeds,’ meaning many people, but ‘and to your seed,’ meaning one person, who is Christ” (Gal 3:16). That Paul is aware of both the individual and collective meaning becomes clear in his use of “seed” in Gal 3:29: “If you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” While the superficial fulfillment of the promise of the seed had been accomplished in the growth of Abraham’s descendants, especially in the days of their sojourn in Egypt and in subsequent periods of their history, there was still the expectation of this ultimate seed who would “possess the gates of his enemies.”

The eschatological perspective of a messianic figure is further enhanced in the blessing and prophecy delivered by Jacob towards his sons. While in Gen 9:27 the future “seed” was to be a Semite, in Gen 49 it is further defined as a descendant of Judah. Passing the first three sons, Judah was promised the praise of his brothers, superiority over enemies, his brothers’ obeisance, and prosperity of his livestock (Gen 49:8-12). The *crux interpretum* of this passage is found in vs. 10: “The scepter will not depart from Judah, nor the ruler’s staff from between his feet, until he comes to whom it belongs [literally, “until Shiloh comes”] and the obedience of the nations is his.” How is the term “Shiloh” to be understood? Walter Kaiser believes that the best solution in explaining the meaning of “Shiloh” is found in a vowel-change. Thus, the Hebrew form נִלְיוֹן is split into three compounds: ש, a shortened form of the relative pronoun נָהֶן; ל, a preposition; and the personal pronoun suffix ל for ל. This form is, according to Kaiser, supported by thirty-
eight different Hebrew manuscripts. This reading would perfectly accord with Ezek 21:32 which has the longer form יַעֲשֶׂה לְאֶת־ם ("until he comes to whom it rightfully belongs"). The Septuagint rendered this verse in favor of the latter option: "until there come the things stored up for him," as well as Targum Onqelos which reads: "The ruler shall never depart from the House of Judah, nor the scribe from his children's children for evermore, until the Messiah comes, to whom belongs the kingdom, and him shall nations obey." Similarly, 4Q Patriarchal Blessings understood Gen 49:10 as messianic:

A ruler shall not depart from the tribe of Judah while Israel has dominion. There will not be cut off a king [lit., "enthroned one"] in it belonging to (the line) of David. For the staff is the covenant of the kingship; the thousands of Israel are the feet, until the coming of the Messiah of Righteousness, the branch of David, for to him and to his seed has been given the covenant of the kingship over his people for everlasting generations.4

---


3 See also the Jerusalem Targum ("until the time that King Messiah shall come").

The disadvantage of this solution is an emendation of the Hebrew text which is somewhat arbitrary. But there is another possible interpretation that leaves the original Hebrew unaltered. Vs. 11 of Gen 49 puts the whole passage into a specific frame: it is the picture of exuberant, intoxicating prosperity. The livestock have offspring, the vine is only of the choicest branch which is used as a hitching-post; in fact, the harvest is so abundant that garments are washed in wine!¹ “Tethering an ass to a vine (which the ass would readily consume) would be like lighting a cigarette with a dollar bill.”² Those who are treading the wine press will not only splash their garments but soak them. In this context the term “Shiloh” denotes prosperity, tranquillity, and restfulness. The name “Shiloh” goes back to the Hebrew root שִׁלְוָה, which means “to be at ease,” or “to give oneself up to rest,” and “to prosper”³ (see, e.g., 1 Chr 4:40; Job 12:6; Ps 122:6; Jer 12:1; Lam 1:5). Thus, “Shiloh” is the “Pacificator,”⁴ the one who gives prosperity and peace which makes it possible to enjoy this abundance. Interestingly, Zech 9:9-11 which describes the coming of the Messiah, the King of Zion, builds upon the passage of Gen 661.


²Hamilton, Genesis, 662.


The terms אֶלֶם ("ass") and זֶרֶם ("foal"); lit., "son of a she-ass") are found together only in Gen 49:11 and Zech 9:9, both in a poetic passage. Not only will the one who is to come extend his rule "from sea to sea and from the River to the ends of the earth" (Zech 9:10) so that "the obedience of the nations is his" (Gen 49:10), he also will come in peace that will be proclaimed to all nations. He does not enter the city in a chariot or on a war-horse as other conquerors did but on a foal, signaling peace and humility.

The element of the "seed" that has been first introduced in Gen 3:15 keeps reappearing throughout the patriarchal promises, both with an individual and collective connotation. With Isaac and his descendants the promise is appropriated; the consummation of the one "seed" who would crush the head of the serpent, who would inherit the gates of his enemies, who would govern not only the people of Israel but also all nations around was to remain in the future, a hope and eschatological perspective not yet fulfilled with the accomplishment of the Exodus from Egypt.

---

1The only other occurrence of these two terms together is found in Gen 32:15 listing the various animals Jacob sent to Esau to appease him.


The second major aspect contained in God’s promise to Abraham besides the “seed” is the aspect of “land.” Abraham and his descendants were to inherit the land in which they were sojourning. Not only was God leading his people out of Egypt to be his own people, but he was to give them their own land as their inheritance. People and inheritance—seed and land—go together. In Gen 15:18 God delineated the borders of this Promised Land: “from the river of Egypt to the great river, the Euphrates.” Although Abraham received this promise, he was not to experience the actual possession of the land, which was postponed after the “fourth generation” has come out from “a country not their own” (Gen 15:13, 16) because the “sin of the Amorites has not yet reached its full measure” (Gen 15:16).

The first step towards the fulfilment of this promise was Abraham’s purchase of a burial site for his wife Sarah, the cave of Machpelah (Gen 23). Not only was Sarah buried there but all the other patriarchs as well. As the Israelites arrive at the border of the Promised Land after their Exodus from Egypt they sent out spies to reconnoiter all the Abraham (Gen 25:7-10), Isaac (Gen 35:27-29), Jacob (Gen 50:12-13), and Joseph (Gen 50:24-26; Exod 13:19). Ernest Neufeld noted that “everything permanently attached, affixed to the land—growing or man-made—would devolve upon its sale to the purchaser. . . . Ownership of the cave, Abraham realized, would not give him incontestably permanent resident status. . . . Ownership of the cave limited to burial purposes, could be considered an easement, which could be extinguished, whereas ownership of the field also, would confer on the buyer all the rights pertaining to such ownership, including the right of inheritance by his children and descendants” (“Abraham Plants the Flag,” *Dor le-dor* 16 [1987-1988]: 87-88). That is why Abraham paid such a high price for this property. See also M. R. Lehmann, “Abraham’s Purchase of Machpelah and Hittite Law,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 129 (1953): 15-18; G. M. Tucker, “The Legal Background of Genesis 23,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85 (1966): 77-84.
land. From south to north they explored Canaan (Num 13:21) and finally focused on the area around Hebron, the location of the patriarchs’ burial site (Num 13:22). It was here that God had first promised Abraham that he would eventually inherit the whole land and where he had been ordered to “spy out” the land for himself (Gen 13:14-18); from here he set out to defeat the army of the Kings from the East (Gen 14:13-16). Yet, the spies caused the Israelites to despair upon their return. They would not enter the land, they would not accomplish the very reason for the Exodus, i.e., the conquest and inheritance of the land. After the rebellious and unfaithful generation had died off, the new generation became the carrier of the promise. This new generation is now ready to enter the land.

As with the seed-promise the assurance of land is put into jeopardy over and over again: Pharaoh’s pursuit and the confrontation at the Red Sea (Exod 13:17 - 14:31); the harsh conditions during the wilderness wanderings (Exod 16 - 17), the repeated murmurings of the people (Exod 15:24; 16:2; 17:3), the golden calf episode (Exod 32), the refusal to enter the land after the report of the spies (Num 13-14), Balak’s attempt to curse Israel by means of a hired fortune-teller (Num 22-24), and the crisis brought about by the two tribes of Reuben and Gad requesting territory in the area east of the Jordan (Num 32). Yet, while the generation who went out from Egypt died in the desert because of their rebellious character, God raised up a new generation. “The members of this new generation become the carriers of the promise as they are again brought to the border of

---

the land of Canaan.” Right after the story of the spies (Num 13-14), who came back from their reconnaissance of the land and made the people doubt, follows a section with legal material concerning sacrifices and offerings to be presented to YHWH in the time when Israel will inhabit the land (Num 15:1-21). It is as if God says to the new generation: “Your fathers wanted to return to Egypt; they rebelled against me—that is why they will not enter the land but die in the wilderness. But ‘I am YHWH, your God, who brought you out of Egypt to be your God’ [Num 15:41]. You will finally inherit the land.” Thus, the laws that are presented in this section apply for the time “when you come into the land you are to inhabit, which I give you” (Num 15:2, 18). There are, in fact, several verbal allusions to the story of the spies in Num 15. Later on, especially in the Book of Deuteronomy, God gave several provisions to the people pertaining to the living in the land, as if the land was already theirs (Num 32:30; Deut 6:10; 11:29; 15:7; 17:14; 19:8; 25:19). God declares the Promised Land as “holy”: “Do not defile the land where you live and where I dwell, for I, YHWH, dwell among the Israelites” (Num 35:34).

1 Olson, The Death of the Old and the Birth of the New, 187.

2 This function of Num 15—reconfirming God’s intention to give the land to Abraham’s descendants—was understood by the medieval Jewish commentators Ibn Ezra and Nachmonides: “The incident of the spies is immediately followed by the section containing laws which apply only to the Promised Land. This was intended to give confidence and assurance of the ultimate possession of the land to the next generation, who might have been skeptical about the fulfillment of a forty-year-old promise” (quoted in Olson, The Death of the Old and the Birth of the New, 172, from The Soncino Chumash—The Five Books of Moses with Haphtaroth, ed. A. Cohen [Hindhead: Soncino, 1947], 870); see also Wenham, Numbers, 126-127; J. Milgrom, Numbers, The Jewish Publication Society Commentary, vol. 4 (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 117.

3 See Wenham, Numbers, 126.
It is interesting to note that the two key elements in the patriarchal blessings and promises—seed and land—are the center focus of the two types of major lists we find in the traditions concerning the Exodus and the Conquest: the census in Num 1 and 26 and the territory lists in Josh 13:15-21. The enumeration of the census lists in Numbers placates the fulfillment of the promise to Abraham that his descendants would become as numerous as the stars in the sky. The listing of the territories which the various tribes inherited underlines the claim to possession of the land. Where once the field and a cave of a burial site were the token for a larger inheritance in the future, now the descendants of those buried in Machpelah claimed ownership of (almost) the whole land. Both lists, census and territorial allotment, “praise” the fulfillment of the promise that God gave to Abraham: “Look at the heavens and count the stars... So shall your offspring be... To your descendants I give this land” (Gen 15:5, 18).

The Book of Numbers contributes in many ways to the theology of worship. The order in worship is emphasized (see also 1 Cor 14:40): the procedure of the various rituals, festivals, and fastings; at what time a sacrifice was demanded; restrictions and blessings (see especially the Aaronic blessing in Num 6:22-27); provisions for the Nazirite vow. Did the writer/redactor of the Book of Numbers view the census lists as part of the worship service? As the census was read, each family represented would consider itself as the actual fulfillment of the promise given to the patriarchs while their names were read. Proudly they would realize that they were the “seed” of which God spoke to Abraham.

---

Similarly, as the various families from the different tribes would make their journey to Jerusalem during the prescribed pilgrim festivals and as their own little place would be read during a ceremony they could identify with the land promise made to their forefathers which materialized in their allotment.

The שֵׁרְרֵת עָלָם

Both promises—seed and land—“spill over”¹ beyond the superficial fulfillment in Isaac, Jacob, and the multitudes that left Egypt: there was an ultimate “seed” to come who would rule the nations. It would “spill over” beyond the Land of Canaan: God’s promise has the quality of entirety and eternity. In Gen 13:15 God promised to give “all the land that you see . . . to you and your offspring forever.”⁴ The covenant that He established with Abraham is explicitly a בְּרִית עָלָם (an “everlasting covenant”; Gen 17:7, 13, 19). The land of Canaan, the “land of sojourning,” the place were the patriarchs lived but did not belong to, the land possessed by another and not by the patriarchs—this “land of rootlessness, possessed by others, is Israel’s future.”² The בְּרִית עָלָם that God established first with Abraham leads into בְּרִית הָאָבוֹת (“an everlasting possession”). “The enduring covenant leads to enduring land.”³

³Ibid.
The term הבוראם נולא is used three times in Gen 17 attesting to the centrality of this concept. While other scholars have denied Gen 17 any literary structure\(^1\) Sean E. McEvenue has convincingly argued that five speeches comprise the backbone of this chapter’s literary structure. The third speech, with the introduction of circumcision as a sign of the covenant and the confirmation that this covenant is to be an everlasting covenant, is the center piece of chap. 17.\(^2\) It is interesting to note that the covenant not only was for the bodily descendants of Abraham, but included also “those born in your household or bought with money from a foreigner—those who are not your offspring” (Gen 17:12). The “sacrament of distinctiveness” was available to both the direct descendants of the patriarch and to those outside the blood line. They, too, were full members of the covenant community.\(^3\) This provision was the inauguration of God’s promise that all nations on the earth shall be blessed through Abraham’s offspring (Gen 22:18; 26:4). This promise was again repeated in the context of the coming of the Messiah King in Zech 8:13. The inclusion of all nations on earth lets the promise which is superficially limited to the border of Canaan “overspill” into an eschatological quality that goes far beyond the boundaries of the Promised Land. All this is spoken in the context of


with its forward-looking thrust. H. D. Preuβ pointed out that the special theological interest in the continuance of מִשְׁמַרְתָּה, which is predominantly interpreted as gift and promise, is even more underlined in the fact that the construct chain often gets additions that stress durability as, for example, in the case of בְּנֵינֵי or דָּרְכָה, which are further qualified by “after you” (see e.g., Gen 17: 7-9).

The term מִשְׁמַרְתָּה, which is qualifying the סֵלָה that God “cut” with Abraham, indicates that this bond goes beyond the ones that were usually made on a man-to-man basis. God who himself is the מִשְׁמַרְתָּה underlines that his covenants are there to last, permanently and perpetually. In the Pentateuch, there is a close relation between the covenants that are designated מִשְׁמַרְתָּה, i.e., the Noachic covenant (Gen 9:16), the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 17:7, 13, 19), and the Mosaic covenant (Exod 31:16; cf. Lev 24:8). All three covenants display strong linguistic ties with each other. Various key words appear in all three covenant narratives, as shown in table 1.

---

Table 1. Key Words that Appear in the Three Covenant Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Word</th>
<th>Genesis 9</th>
<th>Genesis 17</th>
<th>Exodus 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>תֵּיתָנָה</td>
<td>vs. 16</td>
<td>vss. 7, 13, 19</td>
<td>vs. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָהוֹת</td>
<td>vss. 12, 13, 17</td>
<td>vs. 11</td>
<td>vss. 13, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כְּדָה</td>
<td>vs. 11</td>
<td>vs. 14</td>
<td>vs. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רֹאָה</td>
<td>vs. 12</td>
<td>vss. 7, 9, 12</td>
<td>vss. 13, 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Especially the term תֵּיתָנָה ("generations") adds to the notion of perpetuity of the covenant. Accompanied by the expressions נָהוֹת תֵּיתָנָה ("all living creatures"; Gen 9:10, 12, 15, 16) and "all flesh"; Gen 9:11, 15, 16, 17) and by רֹאָה נָהוֹת ("the seed that comes after [you]"; Gen 9:9; 17:7, 8, 9, 10), תֵּיתָנָה is used to make the validity of the bond even more certain. Since תֵּיתָנָה is used in all three covenant narratives it also adds to the idea of universality of the covenant especially in view of the parallel term נָהוֹת which indicates exactly this idea. Thus, the underlying concept of the covenant that God made with Abraham was one of perpetuity and universality. Together with the notion that

all the nations on earth should be blessed through the descendants of Abraham (Gen 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; cf. Exod 19:6) the promise pointed to a greater future. With the Exodus from Egypt and the Conquest of the Promised Land and the establishment of Israel as a nation, the ancestral promises were inaugurally fulfilled. Yet, they did not exhaust the promise. The final fulfillment in regard to the “seed” and “land” in terms of quality, perpetuity, and universality still expected its consummation.

The “You-Were-There” Motif

In the directions for the observance of the Passover festival, which was the main reminder of the Exodus event, there are several indicators that point to an “open-ended” quality of the Exodus. In Exod 12:24 the Israelites are told that the instruction on how to keep the festival is a “lasting ordinance for you and your descendants.” The answer they should give to their children when they were asked what the significance of the Passover was: “It is the Passover sacrifice to YHWH, who passed over the houses of the Israelites in Egypt and spared our homes when he struck the Egyptians” (vs. 27). Years and centuries later the Israeliite father would tell his son during the Passover ceremony: “I do this because of what YHWH did for me when I came out of Egypt” (Exod 13:8). Once the Israelites had entered the Promised Land and settled down they were to consecrate every firstborn male offspring—man or animal. Fathers were supposed to explain to their sons they did it because

with a mighty hand YHWH brought us out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery.

When the Pharaoh stubbornly refused to let us go, YHWH killed every firstborn in Egypt, both man and animal. This is why I sacrifice to YHWH the first male offspring of every womb and redeem each of my firstborn sons. (Exod 13:14-15)

Over and over again the first-person pronoun is used to describe what after-generations would say to their children regarding the reason for the Passover and other regulations. Significantly, forty years later, as the second-generation Israelites were about to eventually enter the Promised Land, Moses again instructed the people. Although most of them had not personally witnessed or participated in the actual Exodus, the same first-person pronouns were applied:

In the future, when your son asks you, “What is the meaning of the stipulations, decrees and laws YHWH our God has commanded you?” tell him: “We were slaves of Pharaoh in Egypt, but YHWH brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand.

Before our eyes YHWH sent miraculous signs and wonders—great and terrible—upon Egypt and Pharaoh and his whole household.

But he brought us out from there to bring us in and give us the land that he promised an oath to our forefathers. YHWH commanded us to obey all these decrees and to fear YHWH, our God, so that we might always prosper and be kept alive, as is the case today.

And if we are careful to obey all this law before YHWH, our God, as he commanded us, that will be our righteousness. (Deut 6:20-25)

In Joshua’s last appeal to the people of Israel, he charged them to recommit themselves to the covenant. In his speech he deliberately alternated between “your fathers” and “you,” showing that Israel was to reckon that they personally came out of Egypt although literally the very generation that physically experienced the Exodus was already dead:

When I brought your forefathers our of Egypt, you came to the sea, and the Egyptians pursued them with chariots and horsemen as far as the Red Sea. But they cried to YHWH for help, and he put darkness between you and the
Egyptians; he brought the sea over them and covered them. You saw with your own eyes what I did to the Egyptians. Then you lived in the desert for a long time. (Josh 24:6-7)\(^1\)

In the Israelite credo this same identification with the Exodus is expressed. Upon entering the land of Canaan, in connection with the offering of the first-fruits, the offerer was to describe the Exodus in terms of his personal involvement:

My Father was a wandering Aramean, and he went down into Egypt with a few people and lived there and became a great nation, powerful and numerous. But the Egyptians mistreated us and made us suffer, putting us to hard labor. Then we cried out to YHWH, the God of our fathers, and YHWH heard our voice and saw our misery, toil and oppression. So YHWH brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, with great terror and with miraculous signs and wonders. He brought us to this place and gave us this land, a land flowing with milk and honey. (Deut 25:5b-9)

Sigmund Mowinckel interpreted this memory of the salvific events in the various festivals as an actualization of the fact of salvation. His mythical analysis equated Israel’s cultic actualization with that present in the mythopoeic traditions and cultic elements of the surrounding ancient Near Eastern cultures. In the cultus, by observing the various festivals and stipulation, the Israelite would re-enact/repeat the Exodus. “To the ancients

\(^1\)This phenomenon is also represented in the text of the “Passover Haggadah.” After the four questions posed by the youngest participant at the Seder, the master of the Seder and all the celebrants recite the Reply: “We were Pharaoh’s slaves in Egypt, and the Lord our God brought us forth from there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. And if the Holy One, blessed be he, had not brought our forefathers forth from Egypt, then we, our children, and our children’s children would still be Pharaoh’s slaves in Egypt” (The Passover Haggadah, ed. N. N. Glatzer [New York, NY: Schocken Books, 1989], 27; italics mine). In the portion of the “Four Sons” it reads: “What does the wicked child say, ‘What is this service to you?’ ‘To you,’ and not to him. Since he removes himself from the group, and so denies God, you in return must set his teeth on edge, and answer him: ‘It is because of that which the Lord did for me when I came forth from Egypt’ (Exod 13:8)” (ibid., 33; italics mine).
this renewed experience was still more real than it is to us; it was an actual repetition of
the event. In the cult, the creative and saving events took place again and again, in regular
recurrence.”¹ This view was challenged by Brevard Childs, who criticized Mowinckel for
not taking into account the various radical alterations in the cult of Israel. These
differences set Israel’s cult apart from the general Near Eastern pattern. “For Israel the
structure of reality was historical in character and not mythical. These historical events
could not be repeated; they were forever fixed in an historical sequence.”² In another
reaction and attempt to guard the historical character of biblical events against the timeless
quality of myth, Martin Noth³ and H.-J. Kraus⁴ perceived the festivals which remembered
the redemptive acts of God as a Vergegenwärtigung (“actualization”). Its purpose is to be
the recital in the cult of the great redemptive historical acts brought about by God which
established Israel’s existence. The worshiper experienced an identification with the
original events. He bridged the gap of historical time and participated in the original
history. H.-J. Kraus explained that Vergegenwärtigung does not mean that the initial
historical event of God’s encounter with Israel is brought to the worshiping people;


²B. S. Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel, Studies in Biblical Theology, no.
37 (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1962), 82; for a further discussion on the relation of
myth to history, see Perdue, The Collapse of History, 113-150.

³M. Noth, “Die Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments in der Verkündigung,”
Evangelische Theologie 12 (1952): 6-17.

⁴H.-J. Kraus, Gottesdienst in Israel: Grundriß einer Geschichte des
rather, the people are transported into the initial situation. The uniqueness of this
salvation-historical event does not dissolve into a kerygma. The word does not bring the
Heilsgeschichte to the one who listens; rather, the word transports the listener into the
Heilsgeschehen. Only the mythos is timeless and interchangeable.¹

Yet, as Childs cautioned, this approach tends to ignore the dynamic quality of the
historical Exodus event. The Exodus “enters the world of time and space, at a given
moment, yet causes a continued reverberation beyond its original entry. The biblical
events can never become static, lifeless beads which can be strung on a chronological
chain.”² Childs pointed out that the redemptive events of Israel’s history—in direct
analogy to the ‘history-creating’ Word of God—“do not come to rest, but continue to
meet and are contemporary with each new generation. Similarly, D. T. Olson underlined
the appropriation of the promises and blessing of the past:

The second generation of hope functioned as a model or paradigm for every
succeeding generation of the community of God’s people as they struggled to
appropriate the promises and warnings of theological traditions inherited from
the past. . . . God’s promise to the patriarchs is passed on to the generation of
the Exodus and Sinai and to every succeeding generation who receives the
challenge and commission to be God’s holy people.³

As Israel remembered the redemptive acts of God on their behalf in the Exodus
event while they were celebrating the Passover and other festivals and partaking in the
various cultic services, they encountered the salvific quality of those events in the past as a

¹Ibid., 61-159.

²Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel, 83.

³Olson, The Death of the Old and the Birth of the New, 198.
reality for them in the present. They appropriated the promises and blessings as if they
were spoken to them. This becomes clear in the covenant-renewal ceremony at Shechem.
In Joshua’s last charge he alternated between “your fathers” and “you” showing that Israel
was to reckon that they personally came out of Egypt although this generation did know
about the Exodus only through the traditions of their fathers:

Then I sent Moses and Aaron, and I afflicted the Egyptians by what I did
there, and I brought you out.
When I brought your forefathers out of Egypt, you came to the sea, and the
Egyptians pursued them with chariots and horsemen as far as the Red Sea.
But they cried to YHWH for help, and he put darkness between you and the
Egyptians; he brought the sea over them and covered them. You saw with your
own eyes what I did to the Egyptians. Then you lived in the desert for a long
time.
I brought you to the land of the Amorites who lived east of the Jordan. They
fought against you, but I gave them into your hands. I destroyed them from
before you, and you took possession of their land. (Josh 24:5-8)

Each new generation of Israel that took over from the old was called upon to
participate in the redemptive events of the Exodus. In the description of the Passover
festival in Exod 12-13 and the various references where the Israelites of subsequent
generations were invited to experience for themselves and to “reactualize” the Exodus,
there seems to be an indication that the original redemptive events are open-ended toward
the future, the salvific reality which each subsequent generation was to encounter as a
“new” Exodus in their obedient response to God in present redemptive time.

Conclusion

The Pentateuchal traditions are thoroughly intertwined with eschatological
connotations and expectations. Various elements of the covenant, such as “seed” or
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"land," and the notion that this covenant was not only for the immediate generation but for subsequent generations as well ("everlasting") form the basis for this eschatological orientation. The Vergegenwärtigung of the Exodus event, the actualization of the salvific acts of God by subsequent generations, indicates an intimate relation between the past and the future. With this eschatological context in mind, I now turn to specific Exodus passages within the Pentateuchal tradition.

Exod 15:1-18

The "Victory Song" of Moses at the shores of the Red Sea praises the superior power and supremacy of God over the Egyptian forces and the mighty delivery from Pharaoh's pursuit. It is one of the most analyzed, dissected, scanned compositions of the entire Old Testament. It has been compared with an array of supposed precedent and

---

counterpart works. Various dates have been suggested; it has been forced into a wide variety of forms and Sitze im Leben. While some parts have been determined as being early, others were dated late. Miscellaneous attempts to establish an evolution in terms of form and content have been presented in the past. “None of these attempts has been entirely successful. The best of them have amounted to no more than helpful suggestions, while the worst of them have been fiction bordering fantasy.”¹

Most scholars view the last two verses of chap. 14 as the concluding remarks of the account containing the miraculous parting of the Red Sea and the salvation from the advancing Egyptian cavalry which has been attributed to the Yahwist.² Vs. 1a of Exod 15 is considered to represent “a secondary narrative framework”³ which introduces and links together the following poetic passage with the preceding material.⁴ The text reads as follows:

¹Durham, Exodus, 202.


⁴H. Schmidt (“Das Meieried: Ex 15:2-19,” Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 49 [1931]: 59-60) considered vs. 2 as the beginning of this section.
At that time Moses and the sons of Israel sang this song to YHWH, and they sang:

“I will sing to YHWH, for He is exalted in triumph gloriously; horse and rider He has thrown into the sea.

YHWH is my strength and my song of praise, He has become my salvation; this is my God, and I will praise Him, the God of my father, and I will exalt Him.

YHWH is a man of war; YHWH is His name.

Pharaoh’s chariots and his force he cast into the sea; the elite of his officers were sunk in the Red Sea.

The deep waters covered them; they went down into the depths like a stone.

Your right hand, YHWH, glorious in power—Your right hand, YHWH, has shattered the enemy.

In the abundance of Your majesty You overthrew those who rose against You; You sent out Your fury, it consumed them like dry straw.

At the blast of Your nostrils the waters piled up, the floods stood up in a heap;
the deep waters became dense in the heart of the sea.

9 The enemy said, "I will pursue, I will overtake, I will divide the plunder, my desire shall have its fill of them. I will draw my sword, my hand shall destroy them."

10 You blew with Your breath, the sea covered them; they sank like lead in the majestic waters.

11 Who is like You, among the gods, YHWH? Who is like You, majestic in holiness, awesome in praiseworthy deeds, doing the wonderful?

12 You stretched out Your right hand, the earth swallowed them.

13 In Your faithfulness You led this people whom You redeemed; You guided them by Your strength to the dwelling-place of Your holiness.

14 The peoples heard, they trembled; anguish seized the inhabitants of Philistia.

15 Then the chiefs of Edom were alarmed; the leaders of Moab, trembling has seized them; all the inhabitants of Canaan have melted away.

16 Terror and dread fell upon them; against the greatness of Your arm, they became dumb as a stone until Your people have passed by, YHWH; until the people whom You created passed by.

17 You will bring them and plant them on the mountain of Your inheritance, the place, that you have made your dwelling-place, YHWH; the sanctuary, Lord, that Your hands have established.

18 YHWH does reign forever and ever!

Source critics have divided the "Song of Moses" mainly into two sources, J and E. Julius Wellhausen saw in this song the original "hand" of the Yahwist with traces of the Elohist source found in vs. 8. Other scholars like William F. Albright and Frank M.

1It is also called the "Song of Miriam"; see F. M. Cross, Jr., and D. N. Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 14 (1955): 237.

2J. Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuch und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1899), 77.

Cross\textsuperscript{1} followed the notion that 15:1-18 is basically a Yahwistic document. While Mowinckel considered the Yahwistic portion of 15:1-18 as being taken up into the Elohist source,\textsuperscript{2} Georg Fohrer classified it under "Passages Not Belonging to the Source-Layers."\textsuperscript{3} Martin Noth dated 15:1-19 "relatively late"\textsuperscript{4} and Otto Eissfeldt considered 15:1-18 as a secondary insertion and an elaboration of 15:21, which he attributed to his "Lay-Source."\textsuperscript{5}

Today's scholars are far from reaching any agreement as to what sources should be assigned to this passage. As to the genre, Albright proposed the category of "triumphal song" or "hymn,"\textsuperscript{6} followed by Cross and Freedman who called it "a sort of 'national anthem' of Israel, celebrating the crucial and central event of her history."\textsuperscript{7} Mowinckel considered it a "Thronbesteigungspsalm" which was celebrated at the New Year's


\textsuperscript{2} S. Mowinckel, \textit{Psalmenstudien} (Amsterdam: P. Schippers, 1966), 2:191.


\textsuperscript{4} Noth, \textit{Exodus}, 123.


\textsuperscript{6} Albright, \textit{Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan}, 10; see also U. Cassuto, \textit{A Commentary on the Book of Exodus} (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967), 173.

\textsuperscript{7} Cross and Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," 237, n. f.
festival. For John D. W. Watts who viewed 15:1-18 as a "hymn" which does fit the general type of "victory songs" (15:6-7; 11-12), this passage functions as a liturgy from the time of the amphictyony, which had been adapted to the worship liturgy in the temple at Jerusalem during the monarchical period. According to Watts, even later "toward the end of the Southern Kingdom changes in ritual form forced still another adaption to make it suitable to the mouth of Moses, and this has become the basis for our literary preservation (Exod 15) of this very old and much used hymn." For Noth, the great "Red Sea Hymn" is a "solo hymn" which also incorporated elements of thanksgiving. Frank Crüsemann saw in it a "hymnus" with an "ausführliche Geschichtserzählung". Others

1 Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien, 2:4. He clearly opposed the view that Exod 15 was a Päsachhymnus (p. 56, n. 1). In Johannes Pedersen’s view, the whole sequence of Exod 1-15 is to be understood as a narrative celebration dictated by the Passover festival, intended to historicize Yahweh’s struggle against and victory over the opposing power of Pharaoh (“Passahfest und Passahlegende,” Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 52 (1934): 161-175). On Exod 15 as an “enthronement hymn,” see recently J. D. Levenson, The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism: Jews and Christians in Biblical Studies (Louisville, KY: Westminster, 1993), 140-142; cf. idem, “The Exodus and Biblical Theology: A Rejoinder to John J. Collins,” Biblical Theology Bulletin 26 (1996): 8.


3 Watts, “The Song of the Sea,” 380. For others who suppose that this “song” was used liturgically on festal occasions, see P. Haupt, “Moses’ Song of Triumph,” American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature 20 (1904): 149-172; H. Schmidt, “Das Meerlied: Ex 15:2-19,” 59-66; Beer, Exodus, 84.

4 Noth, Exodus, 123.

have called it a "hymn," some view it as a "Song of Praise," "Song of the Sea," or just "song." Since this song appears to incorporate many of the aforementioned elements, I will give it the designation "song" acknowledging, however, that this song does not reflect only one particular genre.

In terms of the language and style, Albright found several "archaic elements" in 15:1-18 that could also be found in the literature discovered in the archives of Ugarit/Ras Shamrah while Cross and Freedman and David A. Robertson in his dissertation on Early Hebrew Poetry found evidence for old Canaanite patterns and elements of early Hebrew poetry. This view was challenged by Trent C. Butler. After examining orthography, grammar, style, and vocabulary of Exod 15:1-18, he concluded that "the Song is most similar to literature from the latest pre-exilic and exilic times. Every word and form

---


4Childs, Exodus, 243.


investigated is present in exilic literature."\(^1\) He further attributed archaic tendencies to the
time of the deuteronomistic revival of the seventh century such as is found in Deutero-
Isaiah.\(^2\) "However, the overall consistency of the linguistic phenomena would rather point
to genuine archaic elements."\(^3\) Analogous to the text-critical approach, the linguistic
approach has not yielded any consensus among scholars in the field. While Albright dated
the song to the thirteenth century,\(^4\) Cross and Freedman assigned it a date between 1200
and 1100 B.C. "in its present form,"\(^5\) and Robertson to the twelfth century B.C.\(^6\)

The strophic structure of this passage has been under considerable discussion.
M. Noth suggested that one cannot with certainty discern a series of strophes since the
present form of the song with its different rhythm changes, and it no longer is a unity.\(^7\)

\(^1\) T. C. Butler, ""The Song of the Sea': Exodus 15:1-18: A Study in the Exegesis
of Hebrew Poetry" (Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1971), 248.

\(^2\) Ibid., 293; see also D. W. Goodwin, *Text-Restoration Methods in
Contemporary U.S.A. Biblical Scholarship* (Naples: Istituto Orientale de Napoli, 1969),
27, 32.

\(^3\) Childs, *Exodus*, 246.


\(^5\) Cross and Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," 239; cf. B. S. Childs, "A Traditio-

\(^6\) D. A. Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*, Society
of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, no. 3 (Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical
Literature for the Seminar on Form Criticism, 1972), 155. These dates are based on the
assumption that the Exodus took place in the 13th or 12th century B.C. For a date in the
15th century, see Shea, "The Date of the Exodus," *The International Standard Bible

\(^7\) Noth, *Exodus*, 123.
Various attempts have been made to divide the poem into patterns of bicola or tricola, yet no consensus has been reached. Subsequently, the resulting division into different strophes displayed the differing opinions on the metrical structure of the poem. The majority, though, favor a general division into four major sections with 15:1b and 15:18 as an introduction and conclusion respectively. August Dillman and U. Cassuto divided the song into three strophes and an epilogue, while M. Howell considered a strophe division of two major stanzas with six and four subdivisions respectively.

The thematic focus of the song gives a clear outline as to the literary structure of the passage under consideration. The first part is concerned with the utter destruction of the pursuing Egyptian army by means of the water torrents flowing back to their natural bed. The second half of the song turns to the subsequent wilderness wanderings and the conquest. While the first two strophes of the song (vss. 1b-5 and vss. 6-10) concentrate on the historical event of the miracle, the following verses seem to shift the perspective.

---


2See, e.g., Coats, “The Song of the Sea,” 2, n. 9.


4Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Exodus, 173.

The song focuses now on events which are supposed to happen in the future, thus forming a prophecy:1 vs. 14 speaks of the "princes of the Philistines,"2 vs. 15 of the bulls of Edom, the rams of Moab, and of the "princes of Canaan," all of them people that the Israelites are about to encounter on their further journey to the Promised Land. Moses describes the future destiny of the Israelites in their endeavor to reach the Promised Land. In short, there is a retrospective and a prospective description that characterize the thematic structure of 15:1-18.

W. Kaiser points out a particular pattern that is characteristic for the two strophes that form the first thematic section, and for the two strophes that make up the second thematic portion. Each of the four strophes follows a basic three-partite pattern: Part A—an exordium which serves as an introit; Part B—a confession; and Part C—a narration (first two strophes) or an anticipation (last two strophes). At the end of the two middle strophes (Strophe 2 and 3), concluding similes parallel each other.

Thus, the following literary structure emerges as shown in table 2:

1 A later reader in the time of Jesus certainly accepted the time frame attributed to the song—namely shortly after the Egyptian army drowned in the Red Sea. Critical scholarship has, of course, denied any prophetic element in this song; see J. W. Watts, "Sound and the Ancient Reader," Perspectives in Religious Studies 22 (1995): 143.

2 The term נֹהֲרַיִם ("inhabitants of Philistia") has caused many commentators to date this part later than the first half, or considered this expression as an anachronism (cf. Childs, Exodus, 246; Durham, Exodus, 208).
Table 2. Literary Structure of Exod 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retrospective Description</th>
<th>1b - 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strophe 1</strong></td>
<td>1b - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part A: Introit</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part B: Confession</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C: Narration</td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Strophe 2**             | 6 - 10 |
| Part A: Introit           | 6      |
| Part B: Confession        | 7 - 8  |
| Part C: Narration         | 9 - 10 |
| Simile ("like lead")     | 10b    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prospective Description</th>
<th>11 - 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strophe 3</strong></td>
<td>11 - 16a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part A: Introit</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part B: Confession</td>
<td>12 - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C: Anticipation</td>
<td>14 - 16a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simile (&quot;as a stone&quot;)</td>
<td>16a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Strophe 4**             | 16b    |
| Part A: Introit           |        |
| Part B: Confession        | 17     |
| Part C: Anticipation      | 18     |


In spite of Noth’s negative assessment, the literary and strophic structure of Exod 15:1-18 reveals a deliberate and conscious organization of the material on the part of the poet. The author of Exod 15 employed this strophic arrangement to point out two major aspects that are inherent in the Red Sea experience of Israel: The past and the future are celebrated in the present.
Norbert Lohfink in his study on Exod 15 observes a certain “openness” toward the future. At the heart of the matter lies a significant omission and substitution in the poetic structure and description. Vss. 8-10 describe the eradication of Israel’s enemies. There is a fundamental imagery that becomes apparent: There is a narrow passage, danger threatens on both sides (here the congealed masses of water), the pursuers have to pass through the danger zone to the other side. The structure of the imagery that emerges is that of “passage through dangers threatening.” In this retrospective part of the poem the resolution of the structure is in the catastrophe that closes over the Egyptian army in which the victory of YHWH over his enemies is revealed. Conspicuously, the image of the safe passage of the Israelites through the same danger-threatening passage, so lively portrayed in Exod 14, is completely lacking in this section. However, it is not forgotten. The image of the “passage through dangers threatening” is taken up in the second major section of the song, the prospective description. The “threatening dangers” of vs. 8 (“By the blast from your nostrils the waters piled up. The surging waters stood firm like a wall, the deep waters congealed in the heart of the sea.”) have been taken up again in vs. 16 (“terror and dread will fall upon them. By the power of your arm they will be as still as stone—until your people pass by, YHWH, until the people you bought pass by.”)

While in the retrospective section the “surging waters” are the threatening dangers through which one has to make his passage, in the prospective section the water masses are substituted by people who block the way to Canaan. The motif of passing through the “walls of water,” which is implied in vs. 8, becomes a passing through the

1Lohfink, “The Song of Victory at the Red Sea,” 82.
various hostile nations who become as still as a “stone wall” while the Israelites are on the way to and into the Promised Land. It is a picture of the Israelites who, threatened by a hostile army behind them and congealed masses of water on the right and the left, seek to find their way to salvation through a narrow passage. The song now opens the view into the future and views the further destiny of the Israelites on their way into Canaan as entering a “new land as in a procession through the avenue of sphinxes. The nations, struck still by the terror of Yahweh, do not hinder Israel’s passage, and cannot hold it back.”1 The conclusion, however, is not one of utter annihilation of the one who passed through the danger zone. This time, Israel passes through the people, who are “turned to stone” by YHWH, and they do not flow back together upon Israel. The basic structure of a safe “passage through dangers threatening” is retained but the later passage through the hostile nations into the Promised Land takes the place of the passage through the Red Sea. While Israel had passed through the waters of the Red Sea pursued by the Egyptian army, the safe passage of the future contains the element of Steigerung. Not only will the natural element be restrained, but all the people and nations that will get in the way of the Israelites will be restrained like the raging waters. YHWH is not only the One who commands the natural forces; He also commands the human forces.

Based on this particular structure of the Moses-song, Lohfink argued that the narrative contained in this poem was purposefully made “incomplete and open-ended.”2 He concluded that the intention was

1Ibid., 83.

2Ibid., 81.
to provide a context of imagery in which differences in time are suppressed, and into which every act of God on behalf of his chosen people can be fitted. . . . This basic structure of a pathway which is threatened, but which is made safe by Yahweh and so leads to its goal, is also to be found in other saving acts of Yahweh. . . .

In its literal meaning, the song of Moses already was composed in such a way that later saving acts of Yahweh could be introduced and read into its account of history, reduced as it was to a few basic images. Its very structure already assumed its typological application.1

This second part, the prospective description of future events connected with the march in direction to and conquest of the Promised Land, seems to have a forward movement towards a new safe passage through the hostile but “petrified” nations and crossing the Jordan into Canaan. It is, thus, not surprising that Joshua described the miraculous crossing of the Jordan in reference to what had happened at the Red Sea:

For YHWH your God dried up the Jordan before you until you had crossed over. YHWH your God did to the Jordan just what he had done to the Red Sea when he dried it up before us until we had crossed over. (Josh 4:23)

By virtue of this transfer of a future redemptive act into the historical narrative of the original Exodus, the way seems open for fitting later saving acts of YHWH into the same structure. The author of this composition intended that coming generations of Israel would be able to identify their own personal experience of “passage through dangers to a successful goal”2 with that described in the song. Thus, this song contains a prophetic indicator pointing to the fact that the redemptive salvation just experienced with the drowning of the Egyptian forces is not only a single, isolated event but functions as an example—or as a type—for another safe “passage through danger.”

---

1Ibid., 84.

2Ibid., 84-85.
Exod 15:1-18 praises and celebrates the delivering power of YHWH. His name (יהוה) is mentioned ten times.\(^1\) YHWH is the one warrior who kept the army of Pharaoh in check. He exercises his omnipotence and supremacy described in terms that remind one of creation language. The author of this song even used the term בָּשָׂם in 15:16. בָּשָׂם can be translated "to acquire," "to purchase," or "to create." In the other song ascribed to Moses in the Pentateuch, Deut 32:1-43, the poet used בָּשָׂם parallel to בָּשָׂם to speak of YHWH who "created" his people.\(^2\) "It is God as creator who is fundamentally at work here. It is God the Creator who heaps up the waters and covers the Egyptians with floods, whose winds blow and whose earth... swallows them up, and who thereby creates a people."\(^3\) YHWH with his superior power destroyed the advancing Egyptian cavalry; he will do the same for the people on their further wandering towards the Promised Land.

In the context of the eschatological seams of the Pentateuch—land and seed—the second part of the Song of Moses (Exod 15:11-18) takes on an eschatological connotation. Whereas for Eve the eschatological fulfillment was her immediate seed, her son Cain, for Abraham the eschaton—the new creation—was fulfilled in the achievement

\(^1\) 9 x בָּשָׂם, 1 x the shortened form בָּשָׂם (vs. 2) which is missing in the Septuagint.


\(^3\) Fretheim, Exodus, 167.
of the land inherited by his seed. This new creation would manifest itself in the restoration of the productivity of the land, reproduction, and intimate relationship with God.¹ For Israel, coming out of slavery and bondage, the hope of a future focused on the return to the Promised Land. With the fulfillment of all the promises that God had given to Abraham, the eschaton would be fulfilled. It is a relative eschatology. The eschatological understanding and perception grow as time and revelation progress.

Thus, the description of the passage through the Red Sea and the subsequent promise of a future redemption not only has a prophetic element but also an eschatological one. With Israel’s entering the Promised Land the people will have achieved their eschatological destination. That was their goal: finding rest in the Promised Land. Once they were in the land, “God would gradually restore Canaan until it became like the garden of the Lord. . . . The end would come within history. Weeds and disease would be gradually overcome. Through their relationship with God, Paradise could be restored.”²

Another element which points to an (eschatological) future is found in vs. 17:

You will bring them in and plant them on the mountain of your inheritance—the place, YHWH, you made for your dwelling, the sanctuary, YHWH, your hands established.

Vs. 17 describes the final destination of the Israelite people, the ultimate goal of the redemptive Exodus event. God will bring them to the mountain where He dwells (i.e., the Sanctuary).

¹J. Paulien, What the Bible Says about the End-Time (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1994), 50.

²Ibid., 52.
Cross and Freedman see in this verse a reference to the building of a cosmic temple as attested in the Ugaritic Baal cycle. "The building of cosmic temples (the archetypes of earthly temples) as symbols of authority, and the reference to lands, mountains, or mythological abodes as heritages of the gods are motifs common in Canaan in the Late Bronze Age." Cross and Freedman reject any allusion to the Solomonic Temple. The actual shrine referred to is at once the "cosmic mountain of which the earthly sanctuary is the duplicate" and the earthly sanctuary at Gilgal. As time progressed, the term "sanctuary" in Exod 15:17 was assumed to apply to the temple in Jerusalem built on Mount Zion.

While Noth and others interpret vs. 17 as referring to the Land of Canaan into which YHWH was to bring the Israelites, other scholars—especially those who dated the poem to a later period—see in the "sanctuary on the mountain" a reference to the central shrine in Jerusalem; the song was adopted for the worship service at the temple.

---

1Cross and Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," 240.

2Cross, "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," 143.


The key terms of Exod 15:17 are "mountain," "place," and "sanctuary." All three terms and the phrases in which they occur are parallel to each other:

\[
\text{on the mountain of your inheritance}
\]

\[
\text{the place, YHWH, you made for your dwelling,}
\]

\[
\text{the sanctuary, YHWH, your hands established.}
\]

All three expressions describe YHWH's abode. Thus, vs. 17 is linked to vs. 13 where God's holy dwelling, "גֵּד", is mentioned.

The reason for building the sanctuary is given in Exod 25:8: God wants to dwell among his people. In Jer 31:23 the terms "גֵּד, נֶגֶד" appear together in parallelism and can be used interchangeably:

This is what YHWH Almighty, the God of Israel, says: "When I bring them back from captivity, the people in the land of Judah and in its towns will once again use these words: 'YHWH bless you, O righteous dwelling [גֵּד], O sacred mountain [גֵּד].'"

Thus, all four terms connected with God’s dwelling—"גֵּד, נֶגֶד, מַפְרָשָׁה, מַמְלֵאך"—contain strong connotations that imply a reference to the earthly sanctuary, the Temple in Jerusalem on Mount Zion.

There is, however, another quality behind Exod 15:17. A significant term is the Hebrew word "מַמְלֵאך". This term is used sixteen times in the Old Testament beside the occurrence in Exod 15:17. In fifteen instances "מַמְלֵאך" is used in a cultic context, only once
outside.\textsuperscript{1} Within the cultic context מְלֹאך refers one time to the site of the Jerusalem temple\textsuperscript{2} and one time to the site of Zion.\textsuperscript{3} Two times מְלֹאך is used metaphorically in connection with God's throne.\textsuperscript{4} In another two instances the term refers to YHWH's earthly dwelling place.\textsuperscript{5} However, a large number of occurrences of מְלֹאך in the Old Testament are in reference to God's dwelling in heaven!\textsuperscript{6}

Thus, the term מְלֹאך in the cultic context of Exod 15:17 may point to a quality of meaning that goes beyond the earthly sanctuary, i.e., the "tent of the meeting" in the desert, or the Temple in Jerusalem, and may refer to another "heavenly" fulfillment. This

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}Ps 104:5; here מְלֹאך refers to God's act of establishing the foundations of the earth.
  \item \textsuperscript{2}Ezra 2:68.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}Ps 4:5.
  \item \textsuperscript{4}Ps 89:14 (15); 97:2.
  \item \textsuperscript{5}1 Kgs 8:13; 2 Chr 6:2.
  \item \textsuperscript{6}1 Kgs 8:39, 43, 49; 2 Chr 6:30, 33, 39; Ps 33:13; Dan 8:11. In another passage, Isa 18:4, מְלֹאך could refer either to the heavenly or earthly sanctuary. In regard to Dan 8:11 and the cultic contexts of מְלֹאך, Gerhard F. Hasel wrote: "It is in God's heavenly dwelling place—His sanctuary in heaven—that He hears the prayers of His faithful, both Israelites and non-Israelites, and from which comes His forgiveness and from which He renders 'judgment' or 'justice.' Again, it is from His heavenly dwelling place—His sanctuary in heaven—that the Lord looks upon the inhabitants of the earth (Ps 33:13-4). This is where the throne is located, the 'foundation' (מְלֹאך) of which is established on principles of 'righteousness and justice' (Ps 89:14; 97:2)" (G. F. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the Time of the End: A Study of Daniel 8:9-14," in Symposium on Daniel, ed. F. B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 2 [Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986], 413-414.)
\end{itemize}
notion is supported by linguistic evidence. The two Hebrew terms מָכָּרָה and מְלֹאכֶת appear only in two passages together: in Exod 15:17 and in Dan 8:11 where they appear in the context of God's heavenly sanctuary. Obviously, Exod 15:17 has not only a fulfillment in view that is exclusively concerned with the gathering of God's people at the yearly pilgrim festivals at the Temple in Jerusalem, but the author of the song anticipated as well a fulfillment that is on a larger, cosmic level. Thus, we find here another element of Steigerung.

The Pentateuch in general radiates the basic conviction that the victory of YHWH over Pharaoh at the Red Sea was the foundation of the assurance that such a victory will be repeated in regard to the nations of Canaan:

You may say to yourselves, "These nations are stronger than we are; how can we drive them out?"
But do not be afraid of them; remember well what YHWH your God did to Pharaoh and to all Egypt.
You saw with your own eyes the great trials, the miraculous signs and wonders, the mighty hand and outstretched arm, with which YHWH your God brought you out. YHWH your God will do the same to all the peoples you now fear." (Deut 7:17-19)

Numerous references speak about the assurance of continued protection and deliverance by YHWH in the future. All of these passages support the concept of Exod 15 that there will be another walk through the hostile waters of the foreign nations but YHWH will deliver in the same way he did when he led the people out of Egypt. We thus have yet another prophetic indicator that the Exodus event is open-ended and that it does

---

not find its end and ultimate consummation in God's redemption of his people at the Red Sea. God has more in store.

**Num 23 and 24**

After having defeated Sihon and Og on their way toward the Promised Land (Num 21:21-35), the Israelites encountered another threat that consisted of the Moabite king Balak, who tried to defeat Israel by having them cursed by a hired seer from the East. In Num 22 the reader is informed how the king made contact with “Balaam son of Beor, who was at Pethor, near the River, in his native land,”¹ that God spoke to this heathen prophet who acknowledged him and his superiority; how Balaam finally went to Moab but was cautioned by the angel of YHWH and his speaking donkey only to speak the words that YHWH would speak to him.

This enigmatic story has intrigued scholars a great deal, resulting in a flow of publications.² The discovery of ancient inscriptions at Tell Deir Alla that relate to the sayings of the same Balaam has also fueled interest into this passage.³

¹Num 22:5.


The Masoretic text of the Balaam cycle has been considered as having many pitfalls: words that make no sense, phrases that appear gratuitously, many inconsistencies—in short, the text "presents a nightmare to those who would analyze it critically."¹

Most critical commentators agree that the Balaam cycle had been compiled from different sources and then inserted into the text of Numbers.² The oracles in Num 23 were attributed to E and the sayings in Num 24 to J.³ Richard E. Friedman assigns Num 22-24 solely to the E source except 22:1, which he attributes to a redactor R.⁴ John T. Greene concludes his discussion in regard to the text-critical analysis of the Balaam cycle with the notion that "source conflation is obvious, but whether that conflation is to be sought in various hypothesized P, J, and E documents or source strata remains to be cogently argued."⁵

¹Milgrom, "Balaam and the Deir 'Alla Inscription," 473-476.


⁵Greene, Balaam and His Interpreters, 21.
While many source critics considered the narrative and the oracle section to be independent compositions,1 J. Milgrom has argued for the unity between the “prose and poetry” in chaps. 22-24. He argues that “the poetry was composed for the sake of the prose. Without the narrative, the poetic oracles would make no sense, and all their allusions to personalities, nations, and events would be incomprehensible.”2 He points out that the oracles display many references to the narrative, especially to the prose section that immediately precedes the oracle. Furthermore, the oracles progress thematically in the same way as the narrative does, at least in the canonical form of the Masoretic text.3

The two sets of oracles in chaps. 23 and 24—one set of two oracles (Num 23:7-10, 18-24) and another set of three oracles (Num 24:3-9, 15-19, 20-24)4—are closely related. Both sets are separated by the introduction of each oracle: the oracles in chap. 23 are introduced with the simple statement, “Then Balaam/he uttered his oracle.”5 The two major oracles in chap. 24, however, are introduced with the additional statement, “The oracle of the one whose eye sees clearly, the oracle of one who hears the words of God, who sees a vision from the Almighty, who falls prostrate, and whose eyes are

---


2Milgrom, Numbers, 467.

3Ibid., 467-468.

4The third oracle set consists actually of three smaller oracle units against various nations.

5Num 23:7, 18.
opened.”\(^1\) It appears as if the seer put extra emphasis on his two major sayings in Num 24.

The oracles in chap. 24 make numerous allusions to the oracles recorded in chap. 23. John H. Sailhamer noted that “what is said about Israel’s past in Num 23 is repeated in Num 24, but here it describes the work of a future king.”\(^2\) It is remarkable that certain parts of the oracles in chap. 23 are repeated word by word in chap. 24, replacing, however, the plural personal pronoun with a singular personal pronoun. Some English translations render the singular form as plural.\(^3\) Table 3 compares Num 23:22 with Num 24:8:

Table 3. Comparison between Num 23:22 and Num 24:8a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 23:22</th>
<th>Num 24:8a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אֶלָּה מִצְרָיִם מַמְצַרְיָם כָּהִבֵּית מִּצְרָיִם לָא</td>
<td>אֶלָּה מִצְרָיִם מַמְצַרְיָם כָּהִבֵּית מִּצְרָיִם לָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God brings them out from Egypt; like the horns of a wild ox [they are] to Him.</td>
<td>God brings Him out from Egypt; like the horns of a wild ox [He is] to Him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 23:22 the seer Balaam refers to the people of Israel and their Exodus experience. God has brought them out of Egypt. The context makes it clear that the

\(^1\) Num 24:3-4, 15-16. The final short oracles against the nations are introduced by the simple, “Then Balaam/he . . . uttered his oracle” (Num 24:20, 21, 23).


\(^3\) See, e.g., *The Berkeley Version in Modern English*, and *The New International Version*. 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
plural personal pronoun refers to the Israelites. In 24:7, immediately preceding the parallel expression of 23:22, Balaam refers to a future king of Israel, therefore giving a different context for the succeeding verse. Thus, the singular personal pronoun in 24:8 refers to this future king, of whom Balaam speaks in 24:7. Since Balaam is quoting his saying of 23:22, he consciously changes the personal pronoun. The wider context of this chapter—especially the following oracle—makes it clear that an individual is in view. Especially the fourth oracle points to this individual: After the introduction, Balaam uttered these words: “I see Him, but not now. I behold Him, but not near. A star shall rise out of Israel.”

Thus, in light of Num 23:22 and Num 24:8 the experience of this future king of Israel is described in the same terms as the Exodus experience of the Israelites. The Exodus experience of Israel becomes the Vorbild—the type—of the “anti-typical” experience of the king. This future king will have an Exodus like that of the people.

Sailhamer having the overall purpose of the Balaam narrative in view comments that the writer’s purpose appears to be to view the reign of the future king in terms taken from God’s great acts of salvation in the past. The future is going to be like the past. What God did for Israel in the past is seen as a type of what he will do for them in the future when he sends his promised king.

1A few Hebrew manuscripts, the Syrian Peshitta, and various Targumim read “brought them out.” Targum Neofiti I to Numbers reads “God is he who brought them out of the land of Egypt; to him belong the power, the praise, and the majesty.” Targum Onqelos to Numbers reads “God, who brought them out of Egypt, power and exaltation belongs to Him.” In the Targum the singular personal pronoun of 23:22 seems to refer to God.
Not only do Balaam's final oracles allude to his own earlier ones, but also in speaking of the future king, Balaam alludes to and even quotes the earlier poetic sections in the Pentateuch.¹

The Balaam cycle is not only placed in the immediate Exodus context; its shape and purpose serve the function of highlighting major eschatological concerns of the Pentateuch that are immediately connected with the Exodus event. Originating in the Garden of Eden, God had promised a “seed” that would restore the blessing lost by a single act of disobedience. In his promise to Abraham, God expressed his purpose to bless Abraham and through him all the nations by means of this “seed.” Abraham was looking forward to a seed, land, and a blessing. That is what the Exodus was supposed to accomplish: God’s people living in the Promised Land, looking forward to the ultimate seed through which the world would be blessed.

Sailhamer observes in his treatment of the Balaam cycle that two powerful persons, one at the beginning and one towards the end of the Exodus event—the Egyptian Pharaoh and the Moabite king Balak—attempted to obstruct the blessings God had in store for Israel. Both were kings of their respective nations, who had power to prevent the people of Israel to return and enter the Promised Land.

The agenda behind Pharaoh’s actions was to stop Israel from leaving the country. The reason was that the Israelite people had become so numerous:

“Look,” he [Pharaoh] said to his people, “the Israelites have become much too numerous for us. Come, we must deal shrewdly with them or they will become even more numerous and, if war breaks out, will join our enemies, fight against us and leave the country.” (Exod 1:9-10)

¹Sailhamer, The Pentateuch as Narrative, 408.
Here, the major elements of the promise given to Abraham are at stake: seed and land and subsequent blessing to the nations. In order to accomplish his goal, Pharaoh made three attempts to counteract the blessing of the increase and hence to prevent Israel from leaving the country: (1) He appointed taskmasters over the Israelites to oppress them (Exod 1:11-14); (2) the Hebrew midwives were ordered to kill all male children of the Israelites (Exod 1:15-21); and (3) Pharaoh commanded that every male Hebrew boy should be thrown into the Nile River (Exod 1:22). Yet, surprisingly, all these threats were turned into blessings for Israel: the more the taskmasters oppressed the Hebrew slaves, the more they multiplied (Exod 1:12); the midwives did not carry out Pharaoh’s command, the Israelite women became vigorous (Exod 1:19); Pharaoh’s command to throw all male children into the Nile introduces the narrative of Israel’s deliverer, Moses (Exod 2).

In the Balaam cycle, king Balak played the “role” of the Pharaoh. He also staged three attempts to block Israel’s way to the Promised Land. The Israelites posed the same threat to Moab as they did to Egypt: they had become too numerous. Like Pharaoh, Balak intended to keep the Israelites out of the Promised Land:

Now come and put a curse on these people, because they are too powerful for me. Perhaps then I will be able to defeat them and drive them out of the country. (Num 22:6)

Balak tried three times—like Pharaoh—to have Israel cursed through Balaam, yet each attempt was turned into a blessing (Num 23:11-12, 25-26; 24:10-11). All three oracles are thematically linked to Pharaoh’s three threats. After Balak’s third attempt Balaam pronounced the prophecy of a future deliverer, the star, who would crush Israel’s
enemies. The words used remind one of the language of the first promise given in Gen 3:15.

There has been considerable debate as to whom the “king,” or “star” refers. Some take it as a reference to the reign of David,¹ others see here a reference to the Messiah.²

The last oracle to the foreign nations (Num 24:23-24) seems to point into a more distant future than the Davidic monarchy. The event described there includes the people of Kittim, Asshur, and Eber. Asshur and Eber have been equated with the Babylonians,³ “eastern and western Shemites,”⁴ or with the “people across the Euphrates.”⁵ Kittim has been identified with Cyprus⁶ or in Dan 11:30 and especially in intertestamental literature with the Romans.⁷ The reference to the fact that even the Kittim “will come to ruin”


³Sailhamer, The Pentateuch as Narrative, 409.

⁴Keil and Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, 199; Budd, Numbers, 271.


(Num 24:23) seems to go beyond a historical framework that would fit into the Davidic monarchy. Sailhamer points out that it is difficult in this context not to think of texts like Genesis 10:2-4, where the Kittim are associated with nations such as Magog, Tubal, Media, and Meshech, nations which figure prominently in the later prophetic books (e.g., Eze 38:2-3), and of Daniel 11:30, where the Kittim are again mentioned in reference to the last great battle. In any case, this last oracle of Balaam appears to place the scope of his oracles too far in the future to be a reference to the reign of David.¹

Thus, the future king of Israel who is described to bring deliverance to Israel in the same terms as the historical Exodus experience seems to be a greater figure than King David, whose reign does not match the characteristics of this “deliverer-king” of the future. Here, we find the element of Steigerung in the introduction of this future king of Israel.

To ensure the close relation between Exod 1-2 and Num 22-24, the author of the Pentateuch has used certain key words in both narratives. At the beginning of each event stood the king’s concern regarding the increased number of the Israelite people. Israel is described as a כוש (“mighty nation”; Exod 1:9; Num 22:3, 6) that is threatening the existence of the home-nation. In the account of Pharaoh oppressing the Israelites, the narrator repeatedly referred to the “hardening” (יַעֲבַר) of Pharaoh’s heart (Exod 7:14; 8:11, 28; 9:7, 34; 10:1). Balak promised Balaam to richly reward and “honor” (לְגַנֵּב) him (Num 22:17, 37; 24:11). The point is made: The two major roadblocks between Egypt

---

¹Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 409.
and Canaan, Pharaoh and Balak, are linked together structurally, thematically, and linguistically.¹

The description of another “deliverance” by a future (Messiah-)king has been consciously phrased by the author of the Pentateuch in terms of the Exodus experience from Egypt. The whole narrative and the poetic sections that are connected with this other, future Exodus deliverance have been positioned within the larger Exodus framework. Both the past and the future deliverance have the one goal in common to restore the blessing which has been lost in Eden and which had been promised to the first pair and the patriarchs. Thus, we find here a prophetic indicator for another Exodus experience which involves a future king who is greater than David.

Deut 18:15-19

Although it is beyond the scope of this study to deal in detail with the Moses typology, this passage has significance for the wider Exodus typology context. Deut 18:15-19 is one of the most widely recognized Pentateuchal passages in regard to the typological view of the Exodus in general and Moses in particular:

¹Cf. ibid., 41-44, 405-409.
15. A prophet like me, YHWH, your God, will raise up for you from your midst, from your brothers. You must listen to him.

16. According to everything you requested from YHWH, your God, at Horeb on the day of the assembly saying, “I can no longer listen to the voice of YHWH, our God, nor look at this great fire anymore, or I will die.”

17. YHWH said to me: “They are right.

18. A prophet like you I will raise up for them from among their brothers; I will put my words in his mouth, and he will tell them everything I command him.

19. And it will happen—the man does not listen to my words that he speaks in my name, I myself will call him to account.”

Richard A. Horsley maintains that there is little evidence for the time of Jesus that the expectation of a prophet such as Moses played an important role.\(^1\) Based on the literature that is available from Qumran, R. E. Brown concluded that “\textit{de facto} we know very little of the contemporary interpretation of this text [Deut 18:18].”\(^2\) The \textit{Community Rule} of Qumran speaks of a prophet who will be coming along with the messiahs of Aaron and Israel.\(^3\) The manuscript \textit{Testimonia}\(^4\) quotes Deut 18:18-19 together with Deut 5:28-29 in reference to the anticipated prophet like Moses. Nevertheless, there are very few references referring to this coming prophet so that “we cannot really conclude that the Qumran community itself focused much hope on an expectation of such a prophet—let

\(^{1}\text{R. A. Horsley, ‘‘Like One of the Prophets of Old’}: Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus,” \textit{Catholic Biblical Quarterly} 47 (1985): 441.\)


\(^{3}\text{1QS 9:11.}\)

\(^{4}\text{4Q175.}\)
alone use this as evidence for Jewish society in general. Later Jewish writings considered the revelation that Moses had received on Mt. Sinai as all-important. This revelation had been transmitted through either the written or oral Torah. Later prophetic writing was not revered on the same level as the Torah. The rabbis who considered themselves as the guardians and interpreters of the Mosaic tradition were not much interested in a “new” prophet. Rashi and Ibn Ezra thought that this prophet referred to in Deut 18 was speaking of Joshua.

There are indications, however, that the expectations of a new Moses were evident in the Samaritan eschatology. The Samaritans were expecting the Taheb who would gather the true believers at Mt. Gerizim. In the Samaritan Pentateuch the tenth commandment defined the Temple on Mt. Gerizim as the true place of worship and was closely associated with this new prophet. “The designation of the ‘prophet like Moses’ as Taheb which stems from the Aramaic speaking period assumes that this prophet is a ‘Returning One’.”

Traditional Christian exegesis has viewed Deut 18:15-19 as a clear messianic prediction. Recent scholarship, however, has tended to reject any messianic overtones

---

1Horsley, “‘Like One of the Prophets of Old’,” 441.
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and have come to see in this passage a reference to the prophets who were to be raised up in Israel.\footnote{See, e.g., L. Perlitt, "Moses als Prophet," Evangelische Theologie 31 (1971): 588-608; P. C. Craigie, The Book of Deuteronomy, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976), 262; A. D. H. Mayes, Deuteronomy, New Century Bible Commentary, repr. ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 282; E. S. Kalland, "Deuteronomy," The Expositor's Bible Commentary, ed. F. E. Gaebelein, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992), 121-122. Ernst W. Hengstenberg understood this passage as primarily a reference to Christ and secondarily to the prophets (Christology of the Old Testament, repr. ed. [Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1970], 53-60). Meredith G. Kline considered Deut 18:15-19 as having both a corporate (prophetic institution) and individual (Christ the Messiah) significance (Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy: Studies and Commentary [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1963], 101); cf. G. Van Groningen, Messianic Revelation in the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1990), 253.} The verses immediately following Deut 18:15-19 seem to point to the fact that at least part of the fulfillment involves the "prophetic institution," i.e., those prophets who would follow Moses including his immediate successor Joshua. However, by underlining a singular prophet in Deut 18:15 and 18 this passage appears to also have an individual in mind. It is clear that Moses' successor Joshua did not (completely) fulfill the prediction of Deut 18:15. In reference to Moses, Deuteronomy speaks of other prophets:

Since then no prophet has risen in Israel like Moses, whom YHWH knew face to face, who did all those miraculous signs and wonders YHWH sent him to do in Egypt—to Pharaoh and to all his officials and to his whole land. For no one has ever shown the mighty power or performed the awesome deeds that Moses did in the sight of all Israel. (Deut 34:10-12)

The uniqueness of Moses is also underlined in Num 12:6-8 where YHWH speaks:

When a prophet of YHWH is among you, I reveal myself to him in visions, I speak to him in dreams.
But this is not true of my servant Moses; he is faithful in all my house.
With him I speak face to face clearly and not in riddles; he sees the form of YHWH.

There is a distinction made between God's revelation to Moses and that to other prophets. Thus, Deut 18:15 and 18 seem to have an individual in view who transcends the level of an "ordinary" prophet. According to the conclusion of the Book of Deuteronomy (Deut 34:10-12) the promise of the coming of another prophet such as Moses remained to be realized. Samuel R. Driver who saw in Deut 18:15, 18 a reference to the line of prophets succeeding Moses also pointed out that the terms of the description are such that it may be reasonably understood as including a reference to the ideal prophet, Who should be "like" Moses in a pre-eminent degree in Whom the line of individual prophets should culminate, and Who should exhibit the characteristics of the prophet in their fullest perfection.¹

The New Testament Church certainly was convinced that Christ was the one who eventually fulfilled this promise. Philip introduced Nathaniel to Jesus with the words, "We have found the one Moses wrote about in the Law" (John 1:45). After Peter had healed the crippled man at the temple gate, he quoted Deut 18:15, 18-19 as referring to Jesus who was this expected prophet (Acts 3:11-26); so did Stephen in his speech to the Sanhedrin (Acts 7:37).

Although the reference to a "prophet like Moses" is not direct evidence for Exodus typography, it certainly is placed in the wider context of the Exodus event. Moses is

the leader of the Exodus. He is the one who challenged the Pharaoh and performed miracles. He is the one who led the people to the border of the Promised Land. The openness of this passage towards the future, its focus on an individual “new Moses,” who resembles the first Moses in his unique relationship with God, certainly supports the concept of a new and greater Exodus that is led by this “new” Moses.

Deut 28 and 30

Another section in the book of Deuteronomy presents to the Israelites the possibility of a new return to “Egypt” if the people do not remain faithful and loyal to the covenant and their covenant God. Moses and the elders give distinct regulations in regard to what to do when the people have entered the Promised Land: They are to go to the area of Shechem and set up an altar of large stones on Mt. Ebal and coat it with plaster and write on them all the statutes and laws that God had given them (Deut 27:2-3). While the tribes of Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Joseph, and Benjamin are to stand on Mt. Gerizim to bless the people, the tribes of Reuben, Gad, Asher, Zebulun, Dan, and Naphtali are to position themselves on Mt. Ebal to pronounce curses and threats (Deut 27:12-13).

Deut 28:1-14 describes in detail the blessings that will accrue to Israel conditional upon loving obedience. But should it turn out that Israel proved herself disloyal and disobedient, the curses spelled out in vss. 15-68 will befall her. It appears as if the curses are seen as a return to the conditions of sickness and captivity in Egypt. Deut 28:27 reads: “YHWH will afflict you with the boils of Egypt and with tumors, festering

1Note the if in vss. 1, 2, 9, 13, 14. Not just legalistic obedience, but obedience “with joyfulness and gladness of heart” (vs. 47) is presupposed.
sores and the itch, from which you cannot be cured.” In case the Israelites “do not carefully follow all the words of the law . . . YHWH will send fearful plagues on you and your descendants, harsh and prolonged disasters, and severe and lingering illnesses. He will bring upon you all the diseases of Egypt that you dreaded” (Deut 28:59-60).

As a kind of thematic climax, the threatened captivity in a strange land, mentioned throughout the passage on the curses, is summarized in vs. 68: “YHWH will send you back in ships to Egypt on a journey I said you should never make again. There you will offer yourselves for sale to your enemies as male and female slaves, but no one will buy you.” From other passages within this same context it seems obvious that this description does not indicate a literal captivity limited to Egypt, but rather portrays Israel’s captivity “among all the nations where YHWH, your God, has dispersed you” (Deut 30:1) in terms of a new captivity in Egypt. In Deut 30:1-10, Moses describes the “new Exodus” from those lands where Israel would be taken captive if disobedient. Israel will be gathered and brought again to the land of promise: “then YHWH, your God, will restore your fortunes and have compassion on you and gather you again from all the nations where He scattered you. Even if you have been banished to the most distant land under the heavens, from there YHWH, your God, will gather you and bring you back. He will bring you to the land that belonged to your fathers, and you will take possession of it. He will make you more prosperous and numerous than your fathers” (Deut 30:3-5).

1E.g., Deut 28: 33, 36, 49, 50; 30:1.
Joshua interprets the capture of the land as the beginning of this eschatological process that is outlined in Deut 28. Yet, in the same context he warns that this is not the final accomplishment of the eschaton:

... you know in your hearts and souls, all of you, that not one thing has failed of all the good things which YHWH your God promised concerning you; all have come to pass for you, not one of them has failed.

But just as all the good things which YHWH your God promised concerning you have been fulfilled for you, so YHWH will bring upon you all the evil things, until he has destroyed you from off this good land which YHWH your God has given you,

if you transgress the covenant of YHWH your God, which he commanded you, and go and serve other gods and bow down to them. Then the anger of YHWH will be kindled against you, and you shall perish quickly from off the good land which he has given to you.¹

As in Deut 28 the people are warned not to violate the covenant. In case they serve other gods, Israel will be driven out of the good land and the transformation into the eschaton will be aborted.

**Structural Relationships**

Yet another prophetic indicator becomes evident in the structural relationship that exists between the narrative and poetry sections in the overall composition of the Pentateuch. Throughout the Pentateuch one can find sequences consisting of a narrative portion concluded by a poetic speech with a short epilogue: e.g., the Creation account (narrative—Gen 1-2; poetry—Gen 2:23; epilogue—Gen 2:24); the Fall account (narrative—Gen 3; poetry—Gen 3:14-19; epilogue—Gen 3:20-24); the patriarchal history

¹Josh 23:14-16.
J. H. Sailhamer points out that especially at three major junctures of the narrative seam the author of the Pentateuch has interrupted the flow of the narrative and put in a poetic discourse with an epilogue (Gen 49; Num 24; Deut 31). These units are characterized by the recurrence of the same narrative motifs and terminology:

Table 4. Recurrence of Narrative Motifs and Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poetic Section</th>
<th>Gen 49</th>
<th>Num 24</th>
<th>Deut 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central figure</strong></td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Balaam</td>
<td>Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calls audience together (Imperative)</strong></td>
<td>49:1</td>
<td>24:14</td>
<td>31:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proclamation (Cohortative)</strong></td>
<td>49:1</td>
<td>24:14</td>
<td>31:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;What will happen ...&quot;</strong></td>
<td>49:1</td>
<td>24:14</td>
<td>31:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In &quot;the days to come&quot;</strong></td>
<td>49:1</td>
<td>24:14</td>
<td>31:29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unifying theme of all three poetic sections is "what will happen" at "the end of days." In Gen 49, Jacob called together his sons to tell them "what will happen" to

---


2Ibid., 36.
them “in days to come” (בְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים). Balaam warned king Balak of “what this people will do to your people in days to come” (בְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים). In Deut 31:28 Moses called together the elders of the various tribes of Israel to point out to them what disasters will come upon them “in days to come” (בְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים) if they do not listen to the voice of YHWH.

The expression הבְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים has been widely discussed. Some argue that the expression is eschatological in nature, while others refer to it as a time period in the immediate future. H. Seebaß concluded that in earlier texts the term הבְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים refers to “eine begrenzte Folgezeit,” but in late texts there appears to be an apparent

1Gen 49:1.
2Num 24:14.
3Deut 31:29.
4See the useful article by J. T. Willis, “The Expression be’ acharith hayyamin in the Old Testament,” Restoration Quarterly 22 (1979): 54-71. Willis points out that scholars use different definitions of eschatology to study the term הבְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים: Some scholars limit eschatology to a study of the last things before the end of the world (e.g., Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 261-279); others use this term to describe circumstances in which an old era is replaced by a new one (e.g., J. Lindblom, “Gibt es eine Eschatologie bei den alttestamentlichen Propheten?” Studia Theologica 6 [1952]: 79-114; T. C. Vriezen, “Prophecy and Eschatology,” in Congress Volume—Copenhagen 1953, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. 1 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953], 199-229); some argue that the new age is viewed as history on earth; others, that it lies beyond history (Willis, “The Expression be’ acharith hayyamin in the Old Testament,” 54, n.1). See also Sarna, Genesis, 332; Allen, Numbers, 908.

5See, e.g., Speiser, Genesis, 364. For the interpretation of this term in the Qumran manuscripts, see A. Steudel, “בְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים in the Texts from Qumran,” Revue de Qumran 16 (1993): 225-246.
development towards a *terminus technicus*. The connotation of “future” cannot be excluded; however, the term points to the result of this “future” history, not to *mere* future.¹

Since the context of Gen 49 and Num 24 points beyond the immediate future, even beyond the Davidic monarchy, we can conclude that the term בֵּית הָרָעָב in these passages already takes on the quality which it has in other prophetical writing where בֵּית אָבְרָהָם becomes a *terminus technicus* for the end-time (*eschaton*).² Thus, we find here the eschatological element within the typological structure of Num 23-24.

Based on the close structural, thematical, and linguistic connection between Num 24 and Exod 15, we can add another “narrative-poetry-epilogue” segment to the three crucial ones mentioned above: the initial Exodus event (narrative—Exod 1-14; poetry and epilogue—Exod 15. Although the expression בֵּית הָרָעָב is not used in this passage, it nevertheless contains the major elements shown in table 5.


²See Sarna, *Genesis*, 332. In regard to Gen 49:1, Sarna remarks that “because the later eschatological meaning of the term בֵּית תִּירְסָּים ... is not appropriate to the contents of the poem, rabbinic exegesis had the divine spirit (*Shekhinah*) departing from Jacob just as he was about to reveal to his sons the secrets of messianic times” (ibid.). See, e.g., *Targum Jonathan; Genesis Rabbah* 98:3; see also E. Lipiński, “রাবান dans les textes préexiliques,” *Vetus Testamentum* 20 (1970): 445-450.
Table 5. Narrative Motifs in Exod 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>central figure</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>calls audience together</td>
<td>“Do not be afraid. Stand firm and you will see the deliverance YHWH will bring you today” (Exod 14:13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proclamation</td>
<td>“I will sing to YHWH” (Exod 15:1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future events</td>
<td>Exod 15:13-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The poetic section of the “Song of Moses” is certainly placed at a crucial juncture in the progress of the history of the Israelite people. The defeat of the Egyptian army secures and concludes the first major stage in their journey towards the Promised Land. The close parallelism of Exod 15 with Num 24 suggests that this passage, too, has to be considered among those which speak to a future event that lies beyond the immediate historical horizon.

Summary

In this chapter various passages that deal with the Exodus motif within the Pentateuch have been discussed. These texts were directly or indirectly connected with the historical event of the Exodus as described especially in Exod 14-15, Num 23-24, and other passages.

The description of the Exodus from Egypt through the Red Sea, the forty years of wandering in the Sinai desert, and the final march toward the Promised Land take up
large portions of the Pentateuch. The events are presented as historical, and subsequent generations have based their identity and their concept of God on the belief that these events actually happened. Over and over again this conviction is confirmed in the various expressions of Israelite faith. New Testament writers certainly shared the common assumption that the holy writings of the ancestors relate historical events.

In the Song of Moses, the experience of the safe passage through the Red Sea is immediately connected with a future redemption, which is phrased in similar terms as the just-experienced redemption from the Egyptian army. The intentional positioning of the historical description of redemption on one side and a future redemption in similar terms on the other side puts both in a close relation to each other and lends weight to the assumption that the former serves as a \textit{Vorbild}—or type—for the latter. Thus, the description of the \textit{Nachbild}—or anti-type—becomes a prophecy. The inclusion of historical entities in the description of the future redemption (people such as the Philistines, Edom, Moab, etc.) underlines the notion that this “prophesied” salvation will be a historical event as well. God is going to intervene again on behalf of his people within time and space (i.e., within the historical reality of Israel). The emphasis on the different nature of Israel’s God YHWH in Exod 15:11 and the ability to “work wonders” (עשתה נפלאה) expresses the hope of a similar intervention as the one just experienced.

Even as the historical Exodus had happened and had led to a glorious redemption, so the future historical redemption will happen. Not only will this glorious event happen in similar terms as the \textit{Vorbild}, but even in greater terms. Whereas Israel in her Exodus from Egypt had to fight the Egyptian army and the raging waters, the future will bring
redemption from all their enemies, which are going to be subdued like the elements of nature. Thus, the Nachbild—or anti-type—is characterized by a Steigerung. The fulfillment of the Nachbild will be on a much broader level than the event of the Vorbild, or type; it takes on an eschatological connotation.

Similarly, in Num 23 and Num 24 the past is firmly connected with the future. In the context of the historical Exodus experience, a prophetic statement points to another Exodus. This is emphasized by the almost identical wording of the respective verses. This deliberate closeness underlines the expectation that the future is real and is going to happen in the future history of Israel. The overall thematic element, that God is in control, gives the impression of divine design: He determines whether Balaam curses or blesses. As God has led the Israelites out of Egypt, as the prophet Balaam has spoken only what God allows him to speak, so God will again deliver by bringing out the future king that brings salvation to his people. Here, we meet again the element of Steigerung that is involved in the motif of the future king.

One of the main characteristics of the passages that connects the past with the future is the prophetic indication. In each case, where the text reveals a Vorbild/Nachbild relation, it is the prophet (see Deut 34:10) who uses the historical context of the Vorbild to “create” a future vision of events molded after the Vorbild, using similar language and imagery. It appears as if the historical event serves as the paradigm according to which the future is phrased. The Nachbild is “prophesied.”

The future is not open in terms of possible fulfillments. The prophet does not have in mind a “recurring rhythm” or patterns of realization but a single horizon of
fulfillment. This is confirmed by the fact that the trajectory of the *Vorbild/Nachbild* relation has the *eschaton* as its goal. For the Israelites, the entrance into the land meant the fulfillment of the promises God gave to Abraham. Once they had settled in the land God's blessings would turn the land into a Garden of Eden. The curses that befell humanity after the fall would be reversed in this process; for the Israelites, this was the *eschaton*. This means that typological connections have their basis on (1) a prophetic indication; and (2) on a single, eschatological fulfillment horizon. The *Nachbild* is not a vague event, person, or institution in the future that might repeat itself, but is always related to salvific actions by God on behalf of his people in order to bring about the final "rest" (i.e., the *eschaton*). This is supported by Num 23-24 where the "anti-typical" fulfillment of the Exodus event is described in relation to the messianic king, who will conquer his enemies and lead the people to their "rest."

In the study of the Exodus passages of the Pentateuch it becomes clear that a *Vorbild/Nachbild* relation is introduced within the immediate context of the historical Exodus event. The historical event is the platform and the trigger for a reflection on the future destiny of God's people. A prophet envisions a future redemption in the terms of the just-experienced salvation using similar terminology and imagery to describe the future. This future concerns the eschatological redemption of God's people.

This chapter shows that the major elements that comprise the structure of biblical typology—as outlined by Davidson—are indeed part of the Exodus tradition within the Pentateuch. Figure 1 and table 6 summarize the findings.
The type, or *Vorbild*, is the historical Exodus event. Within the historical context we find the prophetic indicator which indicates that the Exodus from Egypt is the paradigm, or type, for yet another Exodus. This event will happen in similar terms as the just-experienced one. This prophetic indicator points to the fact that the fulfillment of the anti-type, or *Nachbild*, will include a *Steigerung*, or intensification in the *eschaton*: Greater things are to be expected. Thus, the major elements of biblical typology are found in the context of the historical Exodus within the Pentateuchal traditions.

These elements are summarized as shown in table 6.
Table 6. Typological Elements within the Context of the Exodus-Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Aspect</th>
<th>Divine Design</th>
<th>Prophetic Aspect</th>
<th>Steigerung</th>
<th>Eschatology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exod 15</strong></td>
<td>Exodus in progress</td>
<td>God/YHWH does it</td>
<td>Shift to prospective description</td>
<td>Water → nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Num 23 + 24</strong></td>
<td>Exodus in progress</td>
<td>God/YHWH does it</td>
<td>Shift to future king</td>
<td>Israel → king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deut 18:15-19</strong></td>
<td>Exodus in progress</td>
<td>God will raise</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>Greater than Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deut 28 + 30</strong></td>
<td>Exodus in progress</td>
<td>YHWH will restore</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>&quot;more prosperous and numerous than the fathers&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

EXODUS TYPOLOGY AND THE PROPHETS

The Exodus motif in the Hebrew Bible is not limited to the historical context of the event itself or to the literary horizon of the Pentateuch. In the prophetic writings of the Old Testament the picture of a new Exodus is frequently developed. Although the message of judgment plays a predominant role in the preaching of the prophets, the proclamation of an alternative, of salvation and preservation, of hope in a situation of distress, is offered to God’s people. The prophets, well acquainted with the Exodus tradition, take up this motif to describe the future destiny of God’s people. Their writings testify to the consciousness of the Israelite people that God’s actions in the past are the foundation of their belief and the pledge that God will again act on their behalf. As God redeemed his people in the past so he will in the future.

In this chapter major passages within the prophetic writings that deal with the Exodus motif are looked at. They are examined in light of the questions that were raised in the previous chapter: How do the prophetic writings use the Exodus motif? Do they develop an approach similar to that of the Pentateuch? Are there any indications that the historical Exodus functions as a type or Vorbild for the future, and if so, does it involve a
Steigerung? What about the divine design, and is there also an eschatological perspective on which the prophet focuses?

Isaiah

One of the greatest expositors of the new Exodus in the Old Testament is the prophet Isaiah. He describes God as the "Holy One of Israel" who is the Lord of history (e.g., Isa 10:5-15). He is the one who has led his people in the past, and he is the one who leads in the present situation. The destiny of Israel is in his hands. It is therefore not surprising that Isaiah remembers the history and how God has acted on behalf of his people throughout this history. The prophet develops a tension in his message: The people have reached a point where God must pronounce judgment and exile upon his people. This judgment appears to be inevitable. There is no way that Israel could escape the punishment. But in the midst of impending doom, there is this message of hope. Based on the redeeming acts of the past and the Mosaic tradition, God offers new hope through the prophet. This message of preservation is shaped after the redemption par excellence, i.e., the Exodus.

Isa 11:10-16

In this passage Isaiah speaks of YHWH who will again gather the remnants of his people from all the different foreign nations and countries. He will gather the people who are scattered throughout the four corners of the earth. When YHWH is doing this, Judah and Ephraim will be reunited and their enemies will be subdued. To accomplish this, YHWH will again dry up the River. The text reads:
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And it shall happen in that day that the Root of Jesse will be standing as a signal pole for the peoples; the nations will seek him, and his place of rest will be glorious.

In that day it will happen, that YHWH [will reach out] His hand a second time
to reclaim the remnant that is left of His people from Assyria, from Lower Egypt, from Upper Egypt, from Cush, from Elam, from Babylonia, from Hamath and from the islands of the sea.

He will raise a signal pole for the nations and gather the exiles of Israel;
He will assemble the scattered ones of Judah from the four corners of the earth.

Ephraim’s jealousy will depart, and those who oppress Judah will be cut off;
Ephraim will not be jealous of Judah, and Judah not oppress Ephraim.

They will swoop down on the slopes of Philistia toward the west; together they will plunder the people to the east.
On Edom and Moab they will lay hands, and the Ammonites will be subject to them.

YHWH will dry up the gulf of the sea of Egypt and wave His hand over the river with a scorching wind;
He will break it up into seven streams so that one can cross over in sandals.

There will be a highway for the remnant of His people that is left from Assyria,
as there was for Israel in the day of her coming up from the land of Egypt.

This event—God's acquisition of his people—resembles the crossing of the Red Sea when Israel left Egypt led by Moses. John Watts observes that “with overtones of redemption and creation, God will act to bring back the exiles in a way parallel to the Exodus, a way that is like his creation of a people for himself.”

The future deliverance is described in terms of a new Exodus. In fact, vs. 11 speaks of YHWH raising His hand מִפְנֵי, “a second time,” indicating that he is going to do the same as he did in the first Exodus from Egypt. “YHWH's hand”—a major force in the first Exodus—will again “acquire,” or “create” (נָבַל), his people from every direction of the compass. Not only did his people end up in Egypt, they had been scattered throughout all directions: from Elam in the far east to the islands of the Mediterranean Sea in the west; from Assyria in the northwest to Cush in the extreme south. As the foreign people became “hostile walls” through which the Israelites wandered towards the Promised Land, so God removes the obstacles, i.e., the enemies of Israel, once again. The waters that would have prevented the people from crossing over into freedom and, therefore, would have held Israel in the land of slavery, are dried up so that the people could cross over dry-shod. The future deliverance—the new Exodus—is clearly phrased and formed in terms of the historical Exodus. There will be another Exodus and YHWH will employ the same means as in the first one (divine design).

---


Vs. 10 of Isa 11 links the larger context with our passage. It talks about the Root of Jesse, his pre-eminence and worldwide status in that particular day. Isa 11 describes this entity with the dual title “shoot” (vs. 1) and “root” of Jesse (vs. 10). “The reference to Jesse indicates that the shoot is not just another king in David’s line but rather another David.”¹ In the writings covering the period of the monarchy, no king was called “David” or “son of Jesse.” David alone was the true “son of Jesse.” Motyer concludes that

the unexpected reference to Jesse here has tremendous force: when Jesse produces a shoot it must be David. But to call the expected king the Root of Jesse is altogether another matter for this means that Jesse sprang from him; he is the root support and origin of the Messianic family in which he would be born. According to Genesis 3:15 the human family is kept in being, notwithstanding the edict of death (Gn. 2:16f.), because within it the conquering seed will be born. In the same way, here, the Messiah is the root cause of his own family tree pending the day when, within that family, he will shoot forth.²

The future deliverance is a redemption brought about by the Messiah. The larger context of Isa 2-12 shows that Israel had rejected God’s offer of salvation and that the divine judgment was irrevocable. The future salvation was to come in a more remote future. “The theme of the salvation, now cast into the future, is evident throughout this section where [the] Messiah is seen as a Righteous King who will bring the entire history of redemption to completion and fulfillment.”³ Isa 4:2-6 speaks of the coming Messiah,


²Ibid.

³Hill, “Reading Isaiah as a Theological Unity,” 59.
the branch of YHWH”), who will make the land fruitful, make His people holy, and create over the inhabitants of Jerusalem “a cloud by day, and by night smoke with the brightness of a flaring fire.” All three promises are related in one way or another to the period of the Exodus, when Israel came out of Egypt. The term וֹתֶה in Isa 4:2 does not refer to luxuriant wild growth and a good harvest. The words “in that day” indicate that something new was about to happen. יֹסֶר attains here a messianic sense. It is closely associated with a message concerning the priestly washing away of sin. Isa 9:1-6 speaks of the coming messianic ruler who will sit on the throne of David and rule the whole earth.

The future deliverance is a new Exodus which is by far greater than the coming out from the slavery in Egypt. The fulfillment of this greater Exodus will not be limited to any Jewish national expectation alone. YHWH will gather believers—from within and outside his people—from every corner of the earth. Judah will not become merely a new Israel while the rest disappears. This remnant will be a restoration of the whole. Isaiah paints a picture of a deliverance of such a magnitude that it can be performed only by

1Isa 4:5.

2Hill, “Reading Isaiah as a Theological Unity,” 59.

YHWH. The prophet points into a more remote future where a new deliverance in the form of a new Exodus will take place, this time under the leadership of the Messiah.

With the introduction of the “Root of Jesse” in vs. 10 Isaiah sets the stage for his message of salvation: It is an eschatological one. The future redemption in the form of the new Exodus is a deliverance brought about by the Messiah. Through the means of linguistic connections and parallels in regard to motifs and movements, the prophet takes the historical Exodus as a Vorlage for his outline of the coming salvation. With the Hebrew term נָזִיר, he connects the historical event with the eschatological. As in the typological structure of the Pentateuchal passages of the Exodus, the historical event of the Exodus serves as the Vorlage for an eschatological Nachbildung and not for multiple redemptions in the near future. The prophet seems to work with the same typological paradigm as the writer of the Pentateuch.

A second part of the typological structure is found in the element of Steigerung. Due to the punishment that will meet God’s people because of their disloyalty towards the covenant, God will gather his people not only from one nation but from many foreign countries, i.e., from all over the world. The results of this deliverance will overshadow the accomplishments of the old one. The ultimate Steigerung is the eschatological context and the personal involvement of the Messiah. All the enemies around will be subject to

---

them and they will come home on a "raised highway" (םַלְאָה) not as a secretly fleeing
crowd but openly, proud, and reunited—Judah and Israel—as a whole nation.

Isa 35

Chaps. 34 and 35 form the conclusion of a larger unit comprising chaps. 13-33
with their main focus on the different foreign nations. This close association of both
chapters has been recognized by several scholars.¹ Chap. 34 shows that depending on and
trusting in the foreign nations has the only result: reducing the world to a desert. In this
chapter Edom once lush, fertile, and rich has turned into a desolate wilderness; wild
beasts dwell in the once-inhabited mansions. Chap. 35 reverses this general trend: What
has been a desert will become a place which bursts into flowers and the parched ground
will become an overflowing fruitfulness. The thirty-fifth chapter is a "bridge chapter":
The blindness of the people² is about to end; the various wastelands predicted³ are
replaced with blooming estates. "It is almost as if the author of Isa 35 cannot wait for the
prophecies in Isa 40-55."⁴ Edom serves only as an example, for the opening verses of Isa

¹W. Caspari, "Jesaja 34 und 35," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche
Wissenschaft 49 (1931): 67-86; M. Pope, "Isaiah 34 in Relation to Isaiah 35, 40-66,"
Journal of Biblical Literature 71 (1952): 235-243; E. J. Young, "Isaiah 34 and Its
Hill, "Reading Isaiah as a Theological Unity," 95.


⁴D. Carr, "Light in the Darkness: Rediscovering Advent Hope in the Lectionary
make it plain that it is actually the entire world, all nations, that are being addressed and not Edom alone.\(^1\) Isa 35 reads:

1. The desert and the dry land will exult; the desert plain will rejoice and blossom. Like the crocus,
2. it will surely burst into bloom; it will rejoice indeed a rejoicing and cry in joy. The glory of Lebanon will be given to it, the splendor of Carmel and Sharon; they will see the glory of YHWH, the majesty of our God.
3. Strengthen the feeble hands, steady the knees that shake;
4. say to those with racing hearts, “Be strong, do not fear; behold, Your God comes with vengeance; with divine retribution; He will come and save you.”
5. Then the eyes of the blind will be opened and the ears of the deaf unstopped.
6. Then the lame will leap like a deer, and the mute tongue shout for joy. Water will gush forth in the desert and streams in the desert plain.

The parched sand will become a pool, the thirsty ground springs of water. In the haunts where jackals once lay, grass and reeds and papyrus will grow.

And there will be a highway; it will be called the Way of Holiness. The unclean will pass over it; it will be for those who walk that Way; the one who despises wisdom will not wander about on it.

There will be no lion there, nor will any ferocious beast get up on it; they will not be found there. But the redeemed will walk there, the ransomed of YHWH will return. They will enter Zion with singing; everlasting gladness on their heads. Joy and gladness will overtake them, and sorrow and sighing will flee away.

Judah’s future will be one of unprecedented prosperity, security, and well-being.

This future redemption is described as a new Exodus.

But the new Exodus is not merely a repetition of the old; it is different in many ways from the old: The wasteland will rejoice and bloom, the eyes of the blind will be opened, the deaf will hear, the lame will leap like a deer, the speechless will sing for joy.

There will be no enemies blocking the way; it will be an absolute safe passage. “No nations or wild animals will threaten the people as they return from Zion. This is not just the same old thing, however amazing this was. This is an Exodus ‘squared’.”

God makes his people whole again. The notion that “the unclean will not be allowed to use it [the highway of the new Exodus]” implies that God’s people are not only made whole in a physical sense but also spiritually. All sins will be washed away. They are a clean people; they are a truly redeemed people. This has an eschatological connotation strengthened by the fact that the transformation of the nature represents a return to the Garden of Eden, where no “sorrow and sighing” but “everlasting joy” exists.

---


2 Isa 35:8.
This passage underlines the notion that this new Exodus will be a *Steigerung.*

While the first generation had to live and die in a desert—a hostile environment,—the new Exodus will take place in a transformed desert, a place that bursts into flowers and overflows with fruitfulness. The desert turns into a blooming estate. While God had to sustain his people in the first Exodus through many miracles—heavenly bread and water among others,—the new environment will support God’s people. In addition to that, not only the nature will be transformed: Those who are marred by blindness, deafness, and lameness will be transformed; health will be restored. And to make this *Steigerung* complete, God’s people will be spiritually transformed. Thus this new Exodus produces a truly redeemed people.

*Isa 40:3-5*

During the past one hundred years critical scholarship has argued for dividing the Book of Isaiah into two parts (Isaiah of Jerusalem: chaps. 1-39, and Deutero-Isaiah: chaps. 40-66), or three parts respectively (Isaiah of Jerusalem, Deutero-Isaiah: chaps. 40-55, and Trito-Isaiah: chaps. 56-66). Already Ibn Ezra, the Jewish commentator from the twelfth century, had expressed doubt regarding the unity of Isaiah. Johann C. Döderlein was the first scholar to publish in 1775 a systematic treatment in favor of an sixth-century date for the second part of the book, chaps. 40-66.¹ He reasoned that portions which exhibit an alleged foreknowledge of the future must have been written after

the fulfillment. Bernhard Duhm promoted the theory of three Isaiahs, Deutero-Isaiah written in Phoenicia or Syria around 540 B.C., and Trito-Isaiah in Jerusalem during the time of Ezra. All three Isaiahs have insertions from still later periods in Judah's history, as late as the first century B.C.1 Modern scholarship has basically accepted this view of a bi-part or tri-part division of the book of Isaiah.2

In recent years, however, more scholars have refocused their attention on the unity in the book of Isaiah. The literary corpus of Isaiah is more and more studied in its finalized form whereby careful attention is given to the entire material that comprises the


book. Various studies have shown that the various parts of the book are connected by thematic links to give the book a distinctive and definable flow.

With the beginning of chap. 40 a new section within the book of Isaiah begins. First of all, narrative style changes to poetry. Whereas chaps. 36-39 report on the invasion of the Assyrian king Sennacherib, his defeat, and Hezekiah’s illness, chap. 40 now turns the focus to another future deliverance. While some scholars have disputed the notion that the beginning of chap. 40 has been written in view of chap. 39, thus having no


immediate connection to the preceding chapters,1 others have cautioned that chaps. 40ff. might have been strategically placed after the preceding chapters "in order to demonstrate that an historical event can form the basis of the theological message."2 Edward J. Young maintains that "chapters 40ff. serve to answer the dark picture that the thirty-ninth chapter had created."3

Hill has pointed out that there is a close connection between the narrative portion of chaps. 36-39 and Isa 10:24-34. In the latter portion Israel is called upon to trust in God and not be afraid of Assyria, which will be struck by God. Chaps. 36-39 represent the fulfillment of this promise. Immediately following chap. 10, one is confronted with the description of a new Exodus deliverance under the messianic ruler. Due to this close relationship between chaps. 10 and 11, "it can be surmised that the fulfillment of that promise in chapters 36-39 forms the historical foundation to the second Exodus motif which occurs in chapters 40ff."4 Isa 10 announces the deliverance from the Assyrians, Isa 11 the coming of the Messiah; Isa 36-39 announces the deliverance from the Assyrians, Isa 40ff. the coming of YHWH.

---


2Hill, "Reading Isaiah as a Theological Unity," 100.


4Hill, "Reading Isaiah as a Theological Unity," 102.
Isa 40:3-5 is placed within the larger unit of 40:1-11. Franz Delitzsch regarded this unit “as the prologue to the whole [chaps. 40-66]. . . . The theme of the prophetic promise, and the irresistible certainty of its fulfillment, are here declared.”¹ The Masoretic Text divides Isa 40:1-11 into four sections: (A) vss. 1-2; (B) vss. 3-5; (C) vss. 6-8; and (D) vss. 9-11.

The whole unit (40:1-11) is introduced with the call to “comfort my people.”² Is God here commissioning the prophet to bring his message to his people Israel? Who is speaking? The text itself does not directly identify the speaker. While, for example, Knight envisions God speaking here and giving his commands to angelic agencies,³ Whybray remarks that the expression “says your God” in vs. 1 is not quite the usual messenger-formula “Thus says YHWH.” “The speaker is neither God nor the prophet but an unnamed spokesman telling others what God is saying.”⁴ Karl Elliger writes that it remains unclear who the speaker is. Due to the parallelism with the section of vss. 3-5 and 6-8, it seems that “a heavenly being talks to heavenly beings.”⁵

²Isa 40:1.
³Knight, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 20.
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Whatever the case may be, it appears as if YHWH has made a decision and sends out his emissaries with a message. To whom is this call to comfort YHWH's people addressed? At first sight it seems as if God is talking here to the prophet. However, the Hebrew reads יִשָּׁנֵה, "Comfort ye [Imperative second-person plural]!" This plural imperative is tied to the expression יְהוָהךָ, "your God," consisting of the noun and a second person plural personal pronoun suffix. Who are they to whom God is commissioning his message? The linguistic connection between the instruction יְהוָהךָ, "cry, call, shout" [Imperative pl.] in 40:2 and יִשָּׁנֵה, "the voice shouted," suggests that some unidentified heavenly beings who execute God's instructions are appointed to bring this message to Israel. But it is not only these heavenly beings whose voices are heard that are addressed. One of the voices approaches the prophet and includes him in the commission of bringing a message to God's people. The messenger instructs the prophet to יִשָּׁנֵה, "to shout." Thus it is not only a message for the prophet; YHWH commissioned—besides the prophet—other emissaries, such as the voices (heavenly messengers), to bring his word to the people. It appears that this commission goes beyond the immediate context of the prophet. The prophet is part of it, but there are apparently still others called upon to prepare the coming of YHWH.

The Septuagint addresses directly the priests: “Speak, ye priests, to the heart of Jerusalem.” (Isa 40:2); the Targum addresses the prophets: “Prophets, prophesy consolations to my people, says your God. Speak to the heart of Jerusalem and prophesy to her that she is about to be filled with people of her exiles.” (Isa 40:1-2).

Chap. 40 seems to put a hold on the oracles of judgment pronounced earlier over Israel. God in his mercy turns away from his anger and promises comfort to his scattered people. And Israel will find comfort in the coming and presence of YHWH. God’s call for comfort in 40:1-2 is succeeded by a voice calling for the preparation of the highway which will be used by YHWH to come to his people. As in the Exodus from Egypt, God will be the one who brings Israel into freedom. Isa 40:3-5 reads:

3 A voice calling:
In the desert clear the way of YHWH;
make straight in the desert plain a highway for our God.

4 Every valley shall be raised up, every mountain and hill made low;
the even ground shall become level, the impassable places a plain.

5 And the glory of YHWH will be revealed, and all mankind together will see it. For the mouth of YHWH has spoken.

This redeeming event is described in language and images that build on the Exodus experience. There will be a passage across the wastelands, and the glory of

---


2 Motyer does not see an Exodus motif in this passage: “The picture of the way for the Lord is not an exodus motif of the Lord’s people journeying home: they are not called to prepare that way, for it is ready for them (35:8; 42:16; 43:16-19; 48:17-21; 55:12). Rather, it combines the ancient picture of the Lord coming to his people’s aid (Dt. 33:2; Jdg. 5:4; Ps. 68:4[5], 7[8]) with the practice of constructing processional ways for visiting dignitaries or for use by the gods as they were carried in procession” (The Prophecy of Isaiah, 300); see also Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 38-39; C. Stuhlmueller, Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah, Analecta Biblica, vol. 43 (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970), 75-79; A. S. Herbert, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah: Chapters 40-66,

---
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YHWH (יהוה) will appear. The expression "in the desert," recalls the Exodus event in which God led his people towards the Promised Land. The appearance of the glory of God is tied to God’s leadership during the historical Exodus. God’s glory manifested itself in the pillar of cloud and fire that led the Israelites through the desert.

The leadership of Moses in the Exodus from Egypt is expressed in Exod 15:22 where the root נָּס in the hiphil imperfect is used ("and Moses caused Israel to move"). When the Psalmist recounted this event he attributed the leadership to God using the same Hebrew expression (דָּבָר in the hiphil imperfect). Wherever God is leading there also appears the glory of God which is a manifestation of his presence. In the Exodus from Egypt God’s glory and presence was manifested to both Israel and Egypt in his mighty acts: in the judgment of the plagues and at the Red Sea.

The Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 18. Based on the linguistic parallels and the imagery I still hold, against Mayer, that this passage is deliberately built on the Exodus.


2Isa 40:3b.

3The Hebrew name for the book of Numbers is הָלוֹם נִבְנֵי.


5Pss 78:52; 80:9.

6Exod 7:5, 17.

7Exod 14:4, 17-18.
glory became manifested at Mt. Sinai¹ and especially in the pillar of fire and cloud which appeared over the tent-tabernacle throughout the forty years in the wilderness.² Whenever the Israelites saw this manifestation of God's glory they were aware of the fact that God was present in their midst.³

Most commentators have seen in Isa 40:3-5 a reference to the new Exodus from Babylon, the return of the Israelites to Zion, as an event parallel to the Exodus from Egypt.⁴ However, the new Exodus is not an event that parallels the first one, it incorporates a Steigerung. This new Exodus surpasses the old one. While God delivered the Israelites in the old Exodus to manifest his glory to the Israelites as well as to the Egyptians, the scope of the revelation of God's glory in the new Exodus is much broader:

¹Exod 19:16-19.
²Num 9:15.
³Hill, "Reading Isaiah as a Theological Unity," 106-107.
⁵Isa 40:5.
in its double sense of observing and experiencing. God will manifest himself so overwhelmingly that the whole world will be a witness and be affected by this deliverance. This will be an event that will surpass the return of the exiles from Babylon. The transformation of the geography only underlines the significance of the event and indicates that this coming Exodus will be an event never before experienced, surpassing the deliverance from Egypt. The reference to the fact that ("all mankind") will be observing and experiencing this redemption points toward an eschatological perspective and expectation of this passage.

Isa 41:17-20

Commentators have considered the first part of Isa 41 as an example of the particular genre Gerichtsrede ("trial-speech") where YHWH made a speech in a lawsuit. This lawsuit is not a criminal case but one in which 'fact-finding' is the center. The question at issue is the identity of the true God. This ‘trial-speech’ leads into a Heilsorakel or Erhörungsorakel in which three portions of comfort and assurance are

1 Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah, 300 (italics mine).


3 Elliger, Deuterojesaja, 133.
presented. YHWH is depicted as one who intervenes in human hostility (vss. 8-13); in personal weakness (vss. 14-16); and in adverse circumstances (vss. 17-20).1

In Isa 41:17-20 the future destiny of Israel is described in terms of the Exodus experience:

17 The poor and needy search for water, but there is none; their tongue is parched with thirst.
I, YHWH, will answer them; the God of Israel, will not forsake them.

18 I will open up rivers on barren hills, and springs in the midst of the valleys.
I will turn the desert into pools of water, and the dry land into springs of water.

19 I will put in the desert the cedar and the acacia, the myrtle and the olive tree.
I will set pines in the desert plain, the fir and the cypress together,

20 so that they may see and know, may consider and understand together, that the hand of YHWH has done this, that the Holy One of Israel has created it.

The reference to the:testament:”oppressed” in vs. 17 points back to the time in Israel’s history when they were oppressed in the Land of Egypt. The Hebrew term הָעָבָדִים is prominent in the traditions dealing with Egypt and the Exodus experience of old.2 The


2See, e.g., Gen 41:52; Exod 3:7, 17; 4:31; Deut 16:3; 26:7.
preeminent need of water and shade in the desert will once again be met by the provisions of YHWH.¹ However, the various instances where the Israelites cried out for water in the wilderness and God met their needs point beyond the mere fact that God gave water to the thirsty Israelites. God demonstrates his presence and underlines his holiness.² With the need for water a larger issue is raised: “Is YHWH with us, or not?”³ The well-being of the people is intimately connected with the presence of God. Yet, YHWH’s presence is not automatically guaranteed. And it is dangerous to step into God’s presence. His presence is threatening and consuming, but also salvific and delivering. God’s presence is closely connected with Israel’s history. Where God removes his presence, the history of Israel is in jeopardy. This becomes acute in the context of the golden calf episode. Israel has turned to the “visible presence” of the golden calf. It has abandoned the covenant.⁴ Thus forfeiting the presence of YHWH, Israel puts its whole history in danger.⁵ At the beginning of chap. 33, everything is in question, the whole future of Israel’s history.⁶ Yet, Moses pleads with God. Moses explicitly refers to God’s presence:

If your presence does not go with us, do not send us up from here.

¹Compare Exod 15:27.
³Exod 17:7.
⁴Exod 32.
⁵See especially Exod 32:9-10; 33:1-5.
How will anyone know that you are pleased with me and with your people unless you go with us? What else will distinguish me and your people from all the other people on the face of the earth?¹

Thus chap. 33 forms the bridge "over the abyss between the forfeiture of [chap.] 32 and the 'second coming' of YHWH in 34, characterized by law, theophany and covenant, grounds for a continued history."² Moses recognized the vital importance of God's presence for the future existence of the Israelite people.

Isa 41 picks up this motif. The needs of the people will again be met. But this new "desert" experience will be different from the one several hundred years ago. This future deliverance from the rigors of a hostile environment will not be a march through the desert but through a transformed desert, transformed into a paradise. Dry and barren land will be turned into lush areas watered by overflowing rivers and abundant wells. God will again provide water to such an extent that former deserts turn into a paradise. Isa 41:19 describes how YHWH will plant the desert with various trees. J. D. Michaelis called attention to the fact that the species of trees mentioned in this passage have been selected because they do not naturally grow together.³ Whybray observes that this variety of trees would be created instantly displaying the inexhaustible power of the Creator God.⁴ This is a deliberate act of a new creation on the part of YHWH to provide for his people.

¹Exod 33:15-16.
⁴Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, 67.
element of creation and God's power over nature was also a vital part of the first Exodus from the land of Egypt: God revealed his creative power in the plagues, by dividing the Sea, by providing food and water in the desert (manna and quails); the bread of the presence represents the creator and provider.\(^1\) Vs. 20 with its use of נְָֽעָ֝יְ ("to create") underlines the fact that this "new" creation can only be accomplished by YHWH. It is a divine act, a divine creation, and everybody will "consider and understand that the hand of YHWH has done this."\(^2\) This theme of a "new creation" is prominent in the second part of the book of Isaiah. YHWH's power and wisdom, his capability to נְָֽעָ֝יְ triggers the proclamation of divine redemption. Not only will mankind benefit from this new creation, also the beasts who are included in God's covenant\(^3\) will be transformed.\(^4\) Prophetic eschatology moves toward the vision of the new heaven and the new earth.\(^5\) While the presence of God was challenged in the various water episodes during the first Exodus and specifically in Exod 17:7, the fact that everybody will "observe" and "understand" in the second Exodus underlines the presence of God in this second Exodus. During the first Exodus the presence of God was only evident to the Israelites; now his presence, his


\(^2\)Isa 41:20.

\(^3\)See Gen 9:8-17.

\(^4\)Isa 11:6-9; Hos 2:20.

\(^5\)Isa 66:22; Anderson, *From Creation to New Creation*, 37.
holiness, and his new creation will benefit and be apparent to all people, exiles and captors alike (Steigerung). The new Exodus will be a new creation.

As in the Exodus of old a song of victory is to be sung. In both songs YHWH is likened to a warrior who shows his might against the enemies of Israel. In the new Exodus it is not only Moses and the Israelites who praise YHWH but all the people from all ends of the world. This victory by YHWH is in close connection to the work of the servant in the succeeding verses (chap. 42). The works of the servant include presenting fair judgment, being a light to the nations, opening the eyes of the blind, and freeing the captives from prison. In the victory song of Isa 42, YHWH himself now is going to lead the blind. It appears as if the work of the servant and the ministry of YHWH are seen as being the same. YHWH’s ministry is concerned with personal incapacities (blindness), overcomes ignorance (he will lead them by paths they do not know), and he removes barriers and any cause to stumble (he turns the darkness into light and the rugged surface into smooth and solid ground). “It is hard to see how any can think Isaiah is referring to the return from Babylon. That was a way on which they needed no guide!” This new Exodus experience is something greater than just the return of the exiles from Babylon.

---

1Hill, “Reading Isaiah as a Theological Unity,” 119-120.

2Exod 15; Isa 42:10-17.

3Isa 42:3.


5Isa 42:7.

6Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah, 325.
back to Palestine. A messianic servant who is characterized as doing YHWH’s work is to guide the people. Here again, the future redemption is clearly put into an eschatological context. This is underlined by the miraculous transformation, the new creation, of land and mankind.

Isa 43:1-3, 16-21

In spite of Israel’s continued refusal, her deafness and blindness,1 YHWH does not give up Israel. Since Isa 40 started out with the anxious call to comfort, the following chapter provides an answer to how YHWH is going to comfort his people. The basis for God’s acts of redemption is the election of Israel as God’s people. This election had been realized in the events of the first Exodus from Egypt. With the reference to creation the prophet picks up the “new creation” motif of preceding chapters. Isa 43:1-3 reads:

1 But now, this is what YHWH says, your creator, O Jacob, He who formed you, O Israel:
   “Fear not, for I have redeemed you; I have called you by your name; you are mine.
2 When you pass through the waters, I will be with you; and through the streams, they will not sweep over you.
   When you walk through the fire, you will not be burned; the flames will not set you ablaze.
3 For I am YHWH, your God, the Holy One of Israel, your Savior;

---

1See Isa 42:18-25.
I give Egypt for your ransom, Cush and Seba in your stead.

The larger unit of Isa 43:1-7 has been labeled a *Heilsorakel*, or oracle of salvation.\(^1\) The *Heilsorakel* is the most characteristic form in which the prophet presents his message of comfort. Vs. 1 is introduced with יְנוּי (“and now”) which is not so much a temporal connection to the preceding verses but forms a contrast between the sad condition of Israel presented in Isa 42:18-25 and the redemption which Israel is going to experience in the future. Something new is going to happen. Although the people are in a miserable condition, YHWH identifies himself with them. Isaiah employs terminology borrowed from the creation account in Gen 1 and 2. YHWH is their creator (אֲנָּחַד); he formed (יָשֵׁב) Israel. While the former term (אֲנָחַד) points to the divine sovereignty and creative power of YHWH who speaks and the world comes into existence, the latter (יָשֵׁב) refers to the creation of man. YHWH put the same care and thought that he used to form man in the bringing up of Israel as a nation.\(^2\) Motyer has pointed out the sequence of terms which are used to describe the intimate relationship of YHWH with his people: from creating to forming, from redeeming to calling by name, to YHWH’s exclamation, “You are mine!”\(^3\) No matter what happens—water and fire stand as representatives for all

---


\(^2\)Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 3: 139.

\(^3\)Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 330-331.
dangers\(^1\)—God will stand by his people.\(^2\) While many commentators see in this verse a
description of the Israelites journeying home from the Babylonian exile, Motyer cautions
that “this is by no means obvious.”\(^3\) He views the calamities of water and fire as hardships
that are to be endured by those leaving home for exile\(^4\) or by captives enduring
deporation.\(^5\) God’s protection throughout these calamities has a broader range of events
in mind than just the return of the exiles from Babylon. D. Paul Volz remarked that Isa
43:2 does not talk exclusively or predominantly about the dangers that Israel has to endure
while travelling back home. This verse is much more universally applicable; the prophet
does not think only of the Jews returning from Babylon but of the whole people as a
nation, not only of the unique act of deliverance but of the general eschatological
condition.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\)Compare Ps 66:12.

\(^2\)Various commentators have seen in the reference to water and fire an allusion to
the Exodus event; see Herbert, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, 49; Whybray, Isaiah 40-
66, 82. J. Steinmann refers to the narrative of the “fiery” snakes in Num 21:4-9 as the
reference to fire in Isa 43:2 (Le livre de la consolation d’Israel et les Prophets du Retour

\(^3\)Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah, 331.

\(^4\)See Isa 47:2.

\(^5\)Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah, 331.

Deichertscbe Verlagbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1932), 36-37. H. Frey sees here a
reference to the eschatological judgment: “Auch dieses Gericht, das allem Irdischen in
Wasser und Feuer ein Ende macht, soll der Gemeinde Gottes nicht schaden, weil sie
erkaufund Gottes Besitz ist. Ihre Bewahrung ist in den Farben des Auszugs aus Ägypten
geschaut” (Das Buch des Weltpolitik Gottes: Kapitel 40-55 des Buches Jesaja, Die
The expression יְהוָ֑ה אֱלֹהִיֲךָ ("[I am] YHWH your God") again picks up the Exodus motif. It directly refers back to Mt. Sinai where God reveals himself as the one who led Israel out of Egypt. However, God's acts of deliverance are not only a redemption from Egypt. While during the first Exodus Egypt had to pay for its repeated refusal to let the people go, the redemption of which the prophet is talking about in Isa 43 affects not only Egypt but also Cush and Seba. The countries Egypt, Cush, and Seba stand for the known parts of Africa. God will gather his people from all the nations, from all directions of the compass. This event is by far more comprehensive than the Exodus from Egypt.

In the Heilsorakel of Isa 43:16-21 the past is connected with the future. The reader is reminded of God's mighty acts on behalf of his people during the first Exodus. He is the one who made a way through the waters and defeated the pursuing army of chariots and horses. Yet, one is not to linger on the past. YHWH is about to do something new. The passage reads:

16 וה אֵל חָיָ֛ה יְהוָ֖ה יְהוָ֑ה יִתְבָּקֵ֗שׁ בָּעִיתוֹת יְהָ֣וֶה
17 הַמֶּ֖שֶׁךְ לֹ֣א יִבָּלָ֑ה יְהוָ֖ה יִתְבָּקֵ֗שׁ בָּעִיתוֹת יְהָ֣וֶה
18 אֶלָּא-יְהוָ֖ה אֲשֶׁר רָאָשָׁ֑יו יֹפֵרָ֖ה אֲלָתָֽהְוָ֣ינָה

1Exod 20:2.
2See Isa 43:4-6.

16 This is what YHWH says—He who gave a way in the sea, a path through the mighty waters,
17 who brought out the chariot and horse, the army and reinforcement together,
and they lay there together, never to rise again, extinguished, snuffed out like a wick:
18 Do not remember the former things; do not concern yourself with the past.
19 Behold, I am doing something new! Now it springs up; do you not perceive it?
I am establishing a way in the desert and streams in the wastelands.
20 The beasts of the field honor me, the jackals and the ostriches,
because I provide water in the desert and streams in the wastelands, to give drink to my people, my chosen,
21 the people I formed for myself that they may declare my praise.

This oracle is divided into two sections: the first part (Isa 43:16-18) that is concerned with the past, the קְרֵםָנִי and the קְרֵמוּנִי (the “first” and “former” things), and the second part (Isa 43:19-21) that is concerned with the future, the רָדָם (something “new”). In the first part YHWH is described as the one “who made a way through the sea”\(^2\) and caused the army of Pharaoh to “lay down never to rise again.”\(^3\) As YHWH is

---

\(^1\)As I have already noted in the previous chapter, the Hebrew term קְרֵמָנִי, or קְרֵמָנוֹן, respectively, is closely associated with the term בָּרָא, thus having “beginning” and “end” in mind.

\(^2\)Isa 43:16.

\(^3\)Isa 43:17.
about to speak he is introduced by the prophet in terms referring to his past redeeming
acts on behalf of his people. The “former things” constitute the platform on which God’s
new redemptive acts are announced. It appears as if the prophet intentionally emphasizes
the contrast between the “former” and the “new” things by pointing out the “former”
things, yet stressing the fact that there is no need to linger on the past but to focus on the
“new” things. The contrast between the “former” and “new” things is common
throughout Isa 40-48.1 The prophet does not encourage the people to forget the past.
Rather, it is a rhetorical device of comparison2 stressing the fact that the “new” things are
of much greater significance (Steigerung). The “former” things are only the Vorbild, or
the “type,” of what is to come in the future. This future is not a mere repetition of what
God did in the past. The return from Babylon certainly was not the deliverance in view; it
was not far superior to the first deliverance from the Egyptian bondage. While the Exodus
from Egypt manifested YHWH’s superior power over the ruler and therefore over the
gods of Egypt, the return of the exiles from Babylon took place through the permission of
the Persian king Cyrus. Certainly, the return from the Babylonian exile meant the end of

1See, e.g., Isa 40:21; 41:4, 22-29; 42:8-9; 43:8-13, 18-19; 44:1-8; 45:20-25;
46:9-11; 48:1-16. For studies on this subject, see A. van Hoonacker, “L’Èbed Iahvé et la
Eduard Sachau zum Siebzigsten Geburtstag, ed. G. Weil (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1915),
162-169; C. Stuhlmueller, “‘First and Last’ and ‘Yahweh—Creator’ in Deutero-Isaiah,”
Catholic Biblical Quarterly 29 (1967): 495-511; Hill, “Reading Isaiah as a Theological

2Zillesen, “Der alte und der neue Exodus: Eine Studie zur israelitischen
Prophetie, speziell zu Jesaja 40 ff.” Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 6 (1903): 299.
bondage and disgrace; but it was only the beginning of the salvation that YHWH was about to bring.¹

This new redemption will bring the whole world into harmony. The hostile environment is redeemed, water will gush from the desert, the endless, wayless horizon of the glowing desert is interrupted by a highway which is created by YHWH. The hostile beasts are transformed into animals that honor and glorify YHWH. The whole creation seems to come into harmony, a condition that will be perfected in the messianic age.² This motif of a redeemed creation including the beasts of the field has been previously sounded in the message of the prophet. This messianic age is characterized by wolf and lamb, lion and calf lying peacefully together led by a little boy. Wild beasts will turn from predators into grazing animals. Little babies will play with vipers, and there will be no harm or hurt.³

This scenario is again taken up in chap. 65 describing the coming messianic age:

The wolf and the lamb will feed together, and the lion will eat straw like the ox, but dust will be the serpent's food. They will neither harm nor destroy on all my holy mountain, says YHWH. (Isa 65:25)

Thus while the past is a vital part in Israel's remembrance and existence, YHWH urges his people to expect even more than the expected. Not only will the future salvation be a redemption in terms of the old one, it will surpass the old one in terms of the messianic age, the focal point of the prophet's eschatological expectation.

²Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 337.
While chap. 48 focuses on the lament concerning the unfaithfulness of the people, chap. 49 starts out with the so-called “second servant song.” Melugin considers vss. 1-6 as a report of the commissioning of the servant.\(^1\) In this song the task of the “servant” is outlined: “to bring back to him [YHWH] and to re-unite Israel to him.”\(^2\) Not only was the servant to “restore the tribes of Jacob and bring back the survivors of Israel,” but YHWH would make the servant “a light to the nations so that my [YHWH’s] salvation may reach the remotest parts of the earth.”\(^3\) Here, the same motif is employed that was used by the prophet in the previous chapter where he speaks about the return from Babylon and that YHWH’s redemptive acts were to be declared throughout the remotest parts of the earth.\(^4\) It is noteworthy that the Hebrew expression כָּלָה ("to the end of the earth") is used both in Isa 48:20 and 49:6.\(^5\) The reference to YHWH hiding the


\(^{2}\) Isa 49:5.

\(^{3}\) Isa 49:6.

\(^{4}\) Isa 48:20. Harry M. Orlinsky denied any reference to other nations: “... all the data ... make it amply clear that nothing international was implied in them. These prophets, God’s spokesmen all, were not sent on any mission to any nation other than their own, to God’s covenanted partner, Israel” (*Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah: The So-Called ‘Servant of the Lord’ and ‘Suffering Servant’ in Second Isaiah*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 14 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967], 116).

\(^{5}\) Cf. Hill, *Reading Isaiah as a Theological Unity*, 143, n. 189.
servant has been considered as God protecting his servant and hiding him in secret until
the time appointed for his [the servant's] service.

A comparison of the description of the servant in chap. 48 with the description of
the servant in Isa 49 reveals some subtle differences: While in chap. 48 the servant Jacob
is described as a wholly passive recipient of God's redemptive acts the servant in chap.
49 is very much active. While the servant of chap. 48 suffered exile and despair because
he did not listen to YHWH's commandments the servant in chap. 49 suffered and toiled
in vain because of his obedience. While chaps. 47 and 48 make it clear that Israel is
redeemed through the destruction of Babylon Isa 49 points out the insignificance of
Israel's redemption in comparison with the deliverance of the nations as far as the
remotest parts of the earth. Thus the servant of chap. 49 is pictured in global rather than
nationalistic terms.

Is the prophet himself the servant? Is he the one who would be a light for all
gentiles and the one who would bring salvation to ? It appears that this
task goes beyond the horizon of the prophet. “Even supposing that it was an easy thing to

1 Isa 49:2: “... he hid me in the shadow of his hand.”

2 Young, The Book of Isaiah, 3: 269; J. Muilenburg, “The Book of Isaiah:
Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, 137.


accept the near-megalomania of a prophet thinking of himself as ‘Israel’, it would still be
too much to expect that he could himself be the light and salvation of the world.”
Motyer further points out that לֶהָיוֹת יְהוָה נַעֲרֵי נַעֲרֵי הָאָרֶץ (“to be my salvation to the ends
of the world”) parallels the first part of vs. 6 מְדוּיוֹתִי לְנֵבֶר (“[that you should] be my
servant”). The servant is not the one who communicates salvation but he is in his own
person God’s salvation and the light to the world. Applying the expression “you are my
salvation” to a human being is not attested in the Old Testament. The personalized use
(“God is my salvation”) is applied only to God himself. While the metaphor “light” is
used to signify hope, relief, a sense of meaning and purpose, the light of life and truth,
being coupled with salvation, Isaiah alone uses the term “light” of moral integrity and of
the Messianic hope. The task that is to be the servant’s goes beyond that of a mere
prophet—“indeed it runs beyond that of a mere human.” It describes the work of the
Messiah (Steigerung and eschatological context)!

Immediately following this description of the task that lies ahead for the servant
follows the description of the joyful homecoming of the exiles:

---

1 Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah, 388.
3 See, e.g., Exod 15:2; Ps 35:3; Isa 12:2 (2x); 33:2.
5 Isa 9:2; 42:6; 48:6; 60:1, 3.
6 Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah, 389.
8 This is what YHWH says:
   "In the time of favor I will answer you, and in the day of salvation I will help you;
   I will keep you and will make you to be a covenant for the people,
   to rise up the land and to give as a possession the desolate portions,
   to say to those who are imprisoned, 'Come out,' and to those in darkness, 'Show yourself.'
   Beside the roads they will feed and on every barren height they will find pasture.

9 They will neither hunger nor thirst, nor will the desert heat or the sun beat upon them.
   For He who has compassion on them will guide them and beside springs of water He will lead them.

10 I will transform my mountains into a road, and my highways will be raised up.

11 Behold, these will come from afar, behold, some from the north and some from the west, others from the region of Sinim."¹

¹The Masoretic Text reads סינים, while 1QIs reads סיניות, "Syenites," from modern Aswan at the southern border of Egypt, a reference to the Jewish colony at Syene known from the Elephantine papyri (see G. Lambert, "Le Livre d'Isaïe parle-t-il des Chinois?" Nouvelle Revue Théologique 75 [1953]: 965-972; E. J. Kissane, "'The Land of Sinim' (Is. 49: 12)," Irish Theological Quarterly 21 [1954]: 63-64; Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 216).
Isa 49:8-12 has been viewed as a continuation of the preceding servant song\(^1\) or as a new oracle with a messenger formula and fresh content.\(^2\) Again, YHWH speaks to the servant and reveals his plan and actions regarding the restoration of Israel. Words of comfort are to be spoken to Israel. The situation of Israel is described in terms of bondage, the land is laid waste, the people are in captivity, they experience hunger and thirst. But YHWH will reverse their fortune. He will restore his people and the land. He will lead his people so that they will never hunger or thirst again; their traveling will be easy.

This passage again stresses the fact that the servant is more than the prophet. The servant is more than the one who proclaims and instigates the covenant; God will make him “to be a covenant for the people.”\(^3\) With the realization of the servant becoming the covenant for his people the land will be restored and the desolate inheritances will be reassigned. In the process of this realization, all the good things described in terms of the first Exodus will happen to Israel. As in the first Exodus God will provide (“They will

\(^1\)See, e.g., Muilenburg who considered vss. 8-9ab as the fifth strophe of a larger poetic section (“Isaiah 40-66,” 571).


\(^3\)Isa 49:8.
feed beside the roads and find pasture on every barren hill”), he will protect (the desert heat nor the sun will beat upon them), and he will lead them (“He who has compassion on them will guide them and lead them . . .”). Not only will God deliver his people by means of provision and protection, but the creation itself will be transformed to be of service to God’s people (“I will turn my mountains into roads”).

If the identification of אָנָּן with Aswan in the south is correct, members of God’s people will come from afar, i.e., from the north, from the west, and from the south (Steigerung). There is no reference to the east. Could it be, as Motyer argues, “because Isaiah did not want this journey to be confused with the return from Babylon”? The characterization of the servant, who seems to be a person who has a far greater significance (i.e., messianic significance) than the person of the prophet, coupled with the description of the deliverance of God’s people in terms of a new and greater Exodus experience mediated by the servant in his function as being a covenant for the people, again points beyond the return from the Babylonian exile to the eschatological fulfillment.

---

1 Isa 49:9.

2 Isa 49:10a.

3 Isa 49:10b.

4 Isa 49:11.

5 Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah, 392.
After the account of Israel’s sins, which stand in contrast to the servant’s obedience in chap. 50, YHWH again promises to comfort. Israel is reminded to look back to Abraham and the promise of posterity that God had given him. They are in fact the fulfillment of this promise. As God fulfilled his promise that he had given to Abraham, so he will fulfill his promises to Abraham’s descendants: He will comfort Zion, he will make Zion’s deserts and wastelands like the Garden of Eden. The reference to the Garden of Eden elevates this future salvation onto an eschatological platform. ("like Eden") in vs. 3 "is not simply a figure of beauty and plenty but also one of the absence of the divine curse consequent upon sin." "The coming salvation will be like the original state before the fall." This transformation is described in terms that remind one of the Exodus: "My righteousness draws near speedily, my salvation is on the way, and my arm will bring justice to the nations." The reference to God’s arm, which indicates personal divine action during the first Exodus from Egypt, leads to vss. 9-11 where the arm of YHWH is invoked to bring about a new Exodus:

1 Isa 51:3.
4 Isa 51:5.
9 Awake, awake! Put on strength, arm of YHWH; 
awake, as in the days of old, generations of old.
Was it not You who cut Rahab to pieces, who pierced the sea monster?

10 Was it not you who dried up the sea, the waters of the great deep, 
who made a road in the depths of the sea so that the redeemed might cross over?

11 The ransomed of YHWH will return. They will enter Zion with 
proclamation; 
everlasting joy will be on their heads. Gladness and joy will take hold of 
them, and sorrow and sighing will flee away.

This section starts a string of three pericopae each beginning with the call:

"Awake, awake!" The double imperatives which call upon the redemption of Zion call 
to mind the introductory imperative of the larger unit in Isa 40:1: “Comfort, comfort my 
people!” The three pericopae that start with Isa 51:9, 17, and 52:2 have been considered 
individual literary units. Other commentators have pointed out that there is a coherence 

1Isa 51:9 and 52:1 use the Qal imperative, Isa 51:17 uses the Hithpolel imperative of the root עָשַׂר.

2K. Marti, in his commentary Das Buch Jesaja (Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum 
Alten Testament, vol. 10 [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Sieneck), 1900]), considered Isa 
51:1-16 and 51:17 - 52:12 as separate units (pp. 336-344; see also C. C. Torrey, The 
Muilenburg, “Isaiah 40-66,” 588-613 [Muilenburg saw a larger unit stretching from Isa 
49:1 - 55:13]; Herbert, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, 97-106); Whybray (Isaiah 40-66, 
158-170) sees units in Isa 51:9-16, 51:17-23, and five units in chap. 52; D. Paul Volz 
(Jesaja II, 109-127) divides the section into Isa 51:1-3, 6-8 and Isa 51:9-11, 17-23; 52:1- 
2, 7-12; for a similar division, see Stuhlmueller, Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah, 
86, n. 294); F. Holmgren (“Chiastic Structure in Isaiah LI 1-11,” Vetus Testamentum 19 
between these three pericopae which have been consciously designed to form a single unit.¹

In this first *Weckrfu* several incidents of Israel’s past—especially their past Exodus experience—are recalled to invoke a renewed action of God’s arm so that he might intervene on behalf of his people in the same way he did the first time:

1. “Rahab.” The term “Rahab” is a poetical description used for Egypt. The context of Ps 87.4 where “Rahab” is used together with Babylon makes it clear that “Rahab” is an epithet for Egypt. The two dominant powers at that time were Babylon and Egypt. In chap. 30:7 the prophet used the term “Rahab” for Egypt in a way that must have been in common use. The immediate context and the theme of the *Weckrfu* make it clear that the prophet does not primarily have in mind a Canaanite mythological monster—although he used imagery of the mythological *Chaoskampf*—but the country out of which the *YHWH* led the Israelites, Egypt.

2. “Dried up the the sea,” a reference to the Israelites walking on dry ground through the Red Sea.

3. “The redeemed” are those who came out of Egypt. These references to events in Israel’s past are described in terms that make it clear that they are historical:

They took place at certain dates (“days”) and in the experience of people (“generations”).²

---


²Isa 51:9.
Between the first and the second Weckruf YHWH speaks. He points to the fact that it is ultimately he who delivers and comforts because he is the one who caused everything into existence—He is the creator. His work of deliverance is described in terms of the work of the servant: “The cowering prisoners will soon be set free.”

The second Weckruf describes the state of calamity in which Israel exists. God has poured the cup of his wrath over his people. But God does not leave at this point. He describes himself as “your God, who defends his people.” Being true to his character he announces deliverance. The cup of wrath changes from the tormented to the tormentors. The judgment of vs. 17 has been reversed in vs. 22. Not only is the judgment reversed but Israel “will never drink again” from it.

The third Weckruf continues the vision of a delivered and redeemed people. Zion is called upon to clothe herself with “garments of splendor.” The expression מַעַלְחָתָה is found only here. The background, however, is Exod 28:2 where the garments of the high priest were for בְּרֵיחוֹ (“honor”) and מַעַלְחָתָה (“splendor”). “The Lord’s people are at last the priestly people of divine intention.” After the divine wrath has been diverted, true holiness enters the city of Jerusalem. This is seen not only outwardly by the wearing of “garments of splendor” but is also manifested in the fact that “the

---

1 Isa 51:14; see also Isa 42:7.
2 Isa 51:22.
3 Isa 52:1.
4 Exod 19:6; Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah, 416.
uncircumcised and defiled will not enter" the holy city. Only those who are part of the
covenant people will be dwelling in the city. The finality of what God has accomplished
for his people is underlined. The captive "Daughter of Zion" has risen from the dungeon
onto the throne.

How will this happen? With יְהֹוָה in Isa 52:3 YHWH himself begins to explain how
this deliverance will come about and what will be involved in this deliverance. YHWH
speaks with certainty about the coming redemption. He states: "You were sold for
nothing, and without money you will be redeemed." 1 Although the people will be in
captivity, the name of YHWH will be constantly blasphemed, and it seems that YHWH
has left his people, his name will once again be revealed. While in the Exodus experience
of old YHWH set up a mediator to reveal his name, 2 in the future redemption YHWH
"will speak in person and in such a way as to be able to say, 'Behold me!'" 3 The
messengers are to bring the good news. This is good news for Jerusalem and it is good
news for the nations and all the ends of the earth. The redeeming acts of YHWH are

1Isa 52:3; Motyer remarks: "The Old Testament makes redemption (ָּלָד; cf. Isa
35:10) an essentially 'price-paying' conception, therefore, to place together without money
and you will be redeemed provokes the question, 'With what, then?' For in context,
without money cannot mean 'without cost to yourselves', as this would destroy the
parallelism with sold for nothing. The thing sold is not the gainer in any transaction. The
meaning is: just as the seller in this case made no gain, so the redeemer will not pay
money. But what will he pay?—for pay he must!" (The Prophecy of Isaiah, 418-419;
italics his).


3Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah, 419.
targeting the whole earth.\(^1\) YHWH will comfort his people and redeem Jerusalem.\(^2\)

YHWH will lay bare his holy arm—the arm that has led the people out of Egypt—and reveal his salvation to all the nations and to all the ends of the earth. This appearance of YHWH is the last, eschatological appearance of the God of Israel; it is a universal theophany. The redemption of Israel is at the same time a redemption of the world—salvation from *Gottferne* and *Gottlosigkeit*.\(^3\) This new Exodus experience of redemption, therefore, surpasses the old one in that YHWH’s saving acts affect the whole earth (*Steigerung*).\(^4\) This call to come out from bondage is a call to a life in holiness before YHWH (Isa 52:11-12):

11 Depart, depart, go out from there! The unclean thing do not touch!
Come out from the midst of her and be clean, you who carry the vessels of YHWH.
12 For you will not leave in haste or go in flight;
for YHWH will go before you, the God of Israel will be your rear.

---


\(^2\) Isa 52:9.

\(^3\) H.-J. Kraus, *Das Evangelium der unbekannten Propheten: Jesaja 40-66*, Kleine Biblische Bibliothek (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 144.

\(^4\) See also Isa 51:4-6.
Many commentators consider this a call to leave Babylon. However, in the context of this new, greater Exodus experience which is hinted at in the preceding verses, it appears that a larger picture is in mind. Isaiah had already concluded his treatment of Babylon and King Cyrus in chap. 48:20-21. Thereafter neither Babylon nor Cyrus is mentioned again. Alexander comments that

the analogy of chap. xlviii. 20 seems to shew that the Prophet had the departure from Babylon in view; but the omission of the name here, and of any allusion to that subject in the context, forbids the restriction of the words any further than the author has himself restricted them. The idea that this high-wrought and impassioned composition has reference merely to the literal migration of the captive Jews, says but little for the taste of those who entertain it. The whole analogy of language and especially of poetical composition shews that Babylon is no more the exclusive object of the writer’s contemplation than the local Zion and the literal Jerusalem in many of the places where those names are mentioned.2

The summons to leave Babylon in 48:20-21 are in stark contrast to the call to depart in 52:11. In the former call Isaiah uses the same terminology employed to describe the departure of Israel from Egypt (עָנַה, “to flee”)3 while the latter call uses יִשְׁבָּה (“to

---


2Alexander, Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah, 2:281.

3Exod 14:5.
Although the captives of Babylon had been granted permission to return to their homeland they lost no time in leaving before the ruler changed his mind. The departure of the latter call is triggered by moral and spiritual inefficiencies, not by political necessities, hence the command not to touch an unclean thing.\(^1\) The objective of this redemption is not the re-establishment of the Israelites in their homeland but the re-establishment of the holiness and priesthood of God's people. To leave "from there" is not to leave from Babylon but to leave from a sinful life. As those who are clothed in "garments of splendor" they are to perform their duties, i.e., to carry the vessels of YHWH. This new Exodus is an Exodus of priests; God will finally accomplish the destiny of his people.\(^2\) While the first Exodus was a flight in hurry\(^3\) this new deliverance will not be made in haste. Motyer remarks,

> There will be no unwelcome pressure in the situation and nothing to distract the mind from calm commitment to walk with God in holiness. They will experience neither the panic flight of sinners under condemnation nor the opportunist escape of those whose master might change his mind, but rather every favourable circumstance.\(^4\)

YHWH will give all the necessary protection. As in the Exodus of old where the pillar of fire and cloud led the way and protected the rear so the presence of YHWH will guard his people in the new Exodus.

---

\(^1\) Isa 52:11.


\(^3\) Exod 12:11; Deut 16:3.

\(^4\) Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 422.
So as to explain how God will finally accomplish this Exodus, the work of the servant is described in the succeeding verses. The description of the work of the servant makes it clear that this figure cannot be Israel or the prophet. Neither by the people's nor the prophet's wounds was Israel healed;¹ neither bore the "iniquities of us all;"² Israel and the prophet were not made a guilt offering nor given a grave with the rich;³ they did not bear the "sin of many, and made [not] intercession for the transgressors."⁴ This could have been accomplished only by a messianic figure who was to be God's servant. Thus the description of a new and greater Exodus experience is connected with the future activity of God's messianic servant and is placed in an eschatological setting.

Summary

Although other prophets are using the Exodus motif as well, it is the prophet Isaiah who explicitly takes the historic event and fueled with it the eschatological hope. Based on the covenant and Israel's faithfulness, salvation was still available. The view of a relationship between YHWH and his people based on the stipulations of the covenant is the underlying message of Isaianic prophecy. It is reflected in the prophet's heavy dependence upon the past salvific actions of YHWH in depicting the future salvation that

¹Isa 53:5.
³Isa 53:9-10.
⁴Isa 53:12.
was yet to come. Whenever the prophet builds on the Exodus the historicity of the event is assumed. The factum of the past redemption is the pledge for the coming redemption. If there was no past redemption, the prophet could not have fostered the hope for a second one.

Isaiah emphasized the parallelism between the old and the new Exodus. The old Exodus, or the "former things," the "things of old," will be completely overshadowed by the "things to come," "the new things," the old is the basis for the new. B. W. Anderson states that it is erroneous to assume that the new exodus is the same as the old, as though the end-time were a return to primeval time. . . . In the new exodus, historical conditions will be marvelously transformed. . . . [Second Isaiah] transposes the whole sacred story into a higher key as he announces the good tidings of salvation. The new exodus will be a radically new event.

The new Exodus is not the completion of a cyclic movement; it is a new event, it is a new creation. Yet, it is not in contrast in principle to the former; it is a renewal that surpasses the old; it is a Steigerung of the old: Israel will be gathered from the four

---


5J. Marböck, "Exodus zum Zion."168.
corners of the world—not only Israel, YHWH will gather believers from every nation;¹ the people will be transformed physically (the eyes of the blind will be opened, the ears of the deaf unstopped, the lame will leap like deer, and the mute tongue shout for joy) and spiritually (they will be a "clean" people walking on the "Way of Holiness");² the people will not come out in haste.³ When the prophets—and especially Isaiah—deal with the coming of a new eschatological era they not only employ the tradition of the Exodus but also the creation tradition. The new Exodus will be a new creation!

The prophet connects the historical event of the Exodus—and there is no doubt that the event of the Exodus from Egypt is taken as a historical factum—with a future redemption. He functions as a prophetic connecting link between history and future. This future is an eschatological future. With the new Exodus and covenant a new messianic king will appear, "the shoot will come up from the stump of Jesse. . . . The Spirit of YHWH will rest on him. . . ."⁴ With him the presence of YHWH, God's dwelling among his people, will return into the midst of his people.⁵ This eschatological hope is extended beyond the limits of the people of Israel. All gentile nations are invited to join the messianic kingdom. Yet, this hope of a new deliverance, of a new Exodus to be accomplished under the direction of the Messiah, remained a hope. Nowhere did the

¹Isa 11:11-12.
²Isa 35:5-6, 8.
³Isa 52:12.
⁵Exod 19:18; 25:8; Isa 40:5, 9; Ezek 43:2, 4-7.
prophets assert that the hope they proclaimed, the new Exodus they anticipated, was ever fulfilled.1 Even those who returned after seventy years of captivity from Babylon did not eventually fulfill the promised new Exodus: The Messiah was yet to come. “The faith of the returned exiles therefore was constantly looking forward to the coming Consolation of Israel. When He would come, He would achieve the Messianic gathering and restore Israel to all her covenant blessings.”2 The redemption of the new Exodus does not focus on the future in general. The fulfillment was not to find in every positive turn of Israel’s destiny in the history of this people. The focus was the eschatological redemption.


Isaiah describes God's intervention in terms of a "second." "YHWH will reach out his hand a second time to reclaim." He clearly views this "second" redemption as the "follow-up" of the first Exodus from Egypt. The historic event is set in relation to the eschatological event, the Exodus from Egypt in relation to the eschatological Exodus. The historical event becomes the Vorbild, the type for the Nachbild, the anti-type. The historical event is not the Vorbild for multiple redeeming events that may affect Israel's future. It is a single and eschatological event defined after the Vorbild including a Steigerung.

**Jeremiah**

Jeremiah's visions of a new Covenant and a new Exodus were triggered by the failure of the deuteronomistic reform under King Josiah. This reform failed to bring back the life of the nation to the Mosaic faith. Especially the spiritual failure and the injustices towards the poor, disadvantaged, and handicapped demonstrated the need of a complete transformation of heart and life. This transformation of heart and life is based on a new Covenant which will not be like the one which YHWH made with Israel when he led his people out of Egypt and which the Israelites broke. Instead, God's law will be written upon their hearts, not on stone. This new Covenant will be part of a new Exodus

---

1 Isa 11:11.
2 Jer 31:32.
3 Jer 31:33.
experience. Not only will this new Exodus be a redemption from foreign oppression and captivity but also a salvation from sin, a return to YHWH.¹

Jer 23:5-8

With the beginning of chap. 21 the prophet begins a series of oracles concerning the political and spiritual leaders of Israel, kings and prophets. The unit encompassing Jer 21:1 - 23:8 has been called the Zyklus der Königstexte² while the following (23:9-40) addresses the prophets. Chap. 21 reports the embassy sent by King Zedekiah to the prophet and God’s subsequent rejection of the King’s request,³ and a call for justice.⁴ Chap. 22 continues with a message to the ruling king and his officials to practice justice, and an announcement of utter destruction.⁵ Two oracles concerning the kings Jehoahaz (Shallum) and Jehoiachin (Coniah) follow.⁶ This unit is concluded by promises for the future.⁷


³Jer 21:1-10.

⁴Jer 21:11-14.

⁵Jer 22:1-10.


Various commentators consider Jer 21:1 - 23:8 as a literary unit\(^1\) while others separate 21:1-10 from 21:11 - 23:8.\(^2\) The passage in 23:1-8 forms the conclusion of the Königtexte-Zyklus. This conclusion comprises three sections, vss. 1-4, 5-6, and 7-8.\(^3\) The first section continues to blast the leaders of the people—kings and nobles—who have misled and corrupted the “flock of God.” Therefore, God will punish those evil shepherds. The remnant of his people, however, he will gather from all the countries and bring them back to “their pasture, where they will be fruitful and increase in number.”\(^4\) This promise goes beyond a mere return and reinstatement of the people. This is the return to the Garden of Eden (Steigerung). Being fruitful (HIE) and multiplying (נֶפֶל) is that which God intended for mankind in the garden.\(^5\) Since the loss of the garden HIE

---


\(^3\)Vss. 7-8 are almost identically duplicated in Jer 16:14-15.

\(^4\)Jer 23:3.

\(^5\)See Gen 1:22, 28.
and have been part of God’s promise for the future of his people, especially in the context of the covenant and law-giving.\(^1\)

The restoration will include a provision of shepherds who would tend God’s flock faithfully.\(^2\) Then follows the announcement as to how YHWH will accomplish this restoration (Jer 23:5-8):

\(5\) Behold, days are coming—utterance of YHWH—when I will raise up to David a righteous branch, a King will reign wisely and do justice and right in the land.

\(6\) In his days Judah will be saved and Israel dwell live in safety. This is the name by which they will call Him: YHWH, Our Righteousness.

\(7\) So then, behold, days are coming—utterance of YHWH—when they will no longer say, ‘As YHWH lives, who brought the Israelites up from the land of Egypt,’

\(8\) but as YHWH lives, who brought up and who led the seed of the house of Israel from the land of the north and from of all the lands where He had banished them, so that they will live in their own land.

\(^1\)See, e.g., Gen 9:1, 7; Lev 26:9.

\(^2\)Jer 23:4.
The phrase "Behold, days are coming" is frequently used by Jeremiah and "refers to the transformation of present conditions by the events of a new era." Charles L. Feinberg considered it a "messianic formula." What is going to happen in the days to come? God will raise up a "righteous branch" coming up from the stump of Jesse took on a messianic connotation already in Isaiah's time, in postexilic times the term had become a terminus technicus for the expected ideal king. The Targum of Jeremiah renders 23:5 as follows: "Behold the days are coming, says YHWH, when I shall raise up for David an Anointed One [TPCD] of righteousness, and he shall reign as king and for righteousness, and he shall reign as king and

3C. L. Feinberg, Jeremiah: A Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982), 162.
4Isa 11:1.
prosper, and he shall perform true justice and righteousness in the land.” This coming king would rule as a real king, not as a puppet king such as Zedekiah, dependent on Babylon’s grace. He would administer justice (ממשה) and righteousness (צדק), the basis of God’s character (“the way of YHWH”),¹ and the qualities of the messianic figure who would reign on David’s throne.²

The name of this messianic figure is given as יְהֹוָה הָרִיָּשׁ, “YHWH (is) our righteousness.” This appears to be a play on the name of the king Zedekiah, “YHWH is righteousness,” or “YHWH is my righteousness.”³ Yet, the reversal of the two elements that comprise a royal name is known elsewhere, but without any implications as to a reversal of character or fortune.⁴ Since Jeremiah did not consider Zedekiah a righteous ruler,⁵ this new name would be carried by another king, whose name not only was a reversal of the two elements of Zedekiah’s name “but would, by the specificity of the first person plural suffix, force the hearer to take the name as theophoric, ‘YHWH is our righteousness’.”⁶ Holladay concludes that the first-person plural suffix in the name of this

---

¹Gen 18:19.


³The Septuagint considered this name as a reverse of the two elements of Zedekiah’s name (Ἰωσῆκ).

⁴See, e.g., Coniah—Jehoiachin (Jer 22:24); Jehoahaz—Ahaziah (2 Chr 21:17; 22:1).

⁵See Jer 24:8; 43:21.

⁶Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 619 (italics his).
new ruler "moves the attention of the hearer to the people; the future king will embody the faith of the whole people in the realization of righteousness that has its source only in YHWH."¹

This future salvific time period, during which the messianic figure will reign, is described in terms of the Exodus experience from Egypt.² But this new experience will exceed anything in the past. It will supersede the old Exodus in a way that it will no longer be remembered or spoken of. This wonderful new Exodus will displace even the memory of the old one. The old situation cannot be mended; judgment will be brought upon the people by God. "There will be no newness by the operation of the old apparatus. . . . Life will be lost—and then given again. Thus God presides over both loss and gift."³

The age of the messianic king, a descendant of David, who would administer הֶסְדָּע and הָנֶפָשָׁה would parallel and supersede the Exodus experience (Steigerung). The dispersed of Israel will be gathered from all the countries. The life in dispersion was only but an interim to a future where all of God’s people would return to their homeland. Thus the event of the new Exodus will be greater than the one from Egypt.⁴

¹Ibid., 619-620.

²Jer 23:7-8.


These chapters separate themselves from the surrounding material by their poetic material and their prose expansions. The literary development of these two chapters has been under considerable discussion; the various opinions range from Deutero-Isaianic authorship and late post-exilic development\(^1\) to authentic material that is considered to be from Jeremiah’s Frühzeit.\(^2\) Although much has been written, the discussion is far from a consensus.\(^3\)

The introduction to this whole unit describes the content and intention: “‘Days are coming,’ declares YHWH, ‘when I will reverse the judgment\(^4\) of my people Israel and


Judah."\(^1\) This indicates a restoration to a previous time of well-being. These two chapters have been called by scholars "The Book of Comfort," "the Book of Consolation,"\(^2\) or "The Book of the Restoration of the Fortunes."\(^3\) Although the promises and prospects given seem to "exposit in lyrical ways the foundational promises of 29:10-14"\(^4\) the whole range of the oracles appears to imply more than just the return of the exiles from Babylon after seventy years.\(^5\) Reference is made again to the future Davidic ruler who will be raised by YHWH: "Instead, they will serve YHWH their God and David their king, whom I will raise up for them."\(^6\) Here, Jeremiah resumes the motif of the "righteous branch," the messianic ruler on David’s throne, who would reign as king and perform true justice (מֶשֶׁךְ) and righteousness (צדק) in the land.\(^7\) Though a messianic ruler is not mentioned in Jer 30:21 the description of this wonderful restoration could well point to the era of the Davidic ruler and of a peaceful life. YHWH will bring this ruler near to him and only thus can he approach YHWH. Entering into the divine presence unbidden would

\(^1\) Jer 30:2.


\(^3\) Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 568.


\(^5\) See Jer 29:10.

\(^6\) Jer 30:9.

\(^7\) The Targum to Jer 30:9 reads: "And they shall worship before YHWH their God, and shall obey the Anointed [חפץ], the son of David, their king whom I will raise up for them."
mean immediate death.\(^1\) This ruler thus appears to be performing sacral or priestly
functions rather than one that is specifically political. "He would need to be one who was
utterly loyal to YHWH personally and who administered the nation in conformity with the
demands of the covenant."\(^2\)

Again, the redemption from captivity is painted in Exodus colors and put into
language that reminds one of the Exodus. YHWH promises to return them to the land
that he gave to their forefathers to possess.\(^3\) The land that played such a vital part in the
early Exodus traditions is again promised. After YHWH has led his people from the
captivity back to their land, after he has healed the wounds, there will be again a special
relationship between him and his people: "So you will be my people, and I will be your
God."\(^4\) These words echo God's voice from Mt. Sinai: "I will walk among you and be
your God, and you will be my people. I am YHWH your God, who brought you out of
Egypt."\(^5\) Once again, God will lead his people out of captivity in an Exodus towards a
special relationship with him. YHWH's creative power—the Hebrew term נְפָשׁ is used in
Jer 31:22—will bring about the new creation.

---

\(^1\) The two Hebrew terms בָּנָה ("to come near") and קְרָא ("to approach") which
are used in Jer 30:21 are also used in Lev 2:8 and 21:21 in the context of the ordinances
regarding the conduct of the priests.

\(^2\) J. A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah*, The International Commentary on the

\(^3\) Jer 30:3.

\(^4\) Jer 30:22.

\(^5\) Lev 26:12-13; see also Exod 6:7.
And in order to seal this new relationship—as he did at Mt. Sinai—YHWH makes a covenant with his people. This new covenant is not to be separated from the new Exodus experience; it is a vital part of it. The introductory formula of Jer 31:31, "םייח ובככ נגלה יככ יסחי," points to an eschatological future.

In conveying the concept of a new covenant the prophet also combines with it the hope of a new Exodus as well. W. D. Davies writes that there is a marked significance of the Exodus and of Moses not only in Israel’s history but also in its Messianic expectation. This was not merely homiletic, but also theological, in that the first redemption from Egypt became the prototype of the future redemption. Thus although Jeremiah contrasts the New Covenant with that ratified at the Exodus, nevertheless, it was that same Exodus which, were it only by contrast, supplied him with the very categories with which to describe the new redemption that he desired.¹

This new covenant will not be like the covenant YHWH made with their forefathers when he took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt.² The people broke the old covenant. The difference that characterizes the new covenant is that the law no longer rests in the ark of the covenant but in the minds of the people. It is written in their hearts. YHWH himself will write it.³ This will not be a new law which replaces the Mosaic one; rather, YHWH promises a new power and possibility of obedience to the


²Jer 31:32.

³Jer 31:33.
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law. There will be no further need of human teaching of God's law "because all who participate in the new covenant will 'know' YHWH; and they will share in this knowledge because the barrier to it, sin, has been forgiven by God." Man will know God firsthand, from personal experience. In this respect the new covenant goes beyond the old one. The new covenant will be a covenant for a re-united Israel. While at first YHWH speaks of a new covenant that he will make "with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah," speaking to both entities, he later addresses only a covenant that he will make with the "house of Israel" indicating that not only will this new covenant be an era where the barriers of sin will be broken but also the barriers of nationality and separation. Israel, as in the time of the first Exodus, will once again be united.

While the return from Babylon is of apparent concern to the prophet, the future salvation that is described in Exodus terms is perceived as a much larger event than the Exodus from Egypt (Steigerung). YHWH will return the exiles not only from Babylon but from all the "ends of the earth." This redemption will set the captives free; there will be no sorrow any more; the return to YHWH will be a redemption from sin. The core of


2Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age, 16.

3Jer 31:31.

4Jer 31:33.

5Jer 31:8.

6Jer 31:12.

7Jer 31:34.
the message of a new covenant is: It is the creator God who accomplishes this despite human stubbornness. YHWH who led the Israelites out of bondage and made a covenant with them will again take Israel by the hand and lead them to a personal relationship with him.

Summary

The prophet Jeremiah focuses on the new covenant which YHWH will “cut” with his people. YHWH will turn the destiny of Israel. He will bring them back from countries afar in which they had been exiled. The high point of the new return from exile to the homeland will be this new covenant. Not only will this new Exodus be a return to the garden (Jer 31:12) and to prosperity, it will also be a return of the people to an intimate relationship with their creator. YHWH will give his law into their hearts. The future is characterized by forgiveness, and their sins are no longer remembered. This Exodus goes far beyond the Exodus from Egypt (Steigerung)! Its goal is a holy relationship of YHWH with his people.

This new Exodus clearly distinguishes itself from the first one: It will be a gathering from all the nations, among those who return would be included weak people,

---

1 Jer 30:3.
2 Jer 30:10.
3 Jer 31:12.
4 Jer 31:33-34.
5 Jer 23:3; 31:8.
the blind and the lame among them, the pregnant and women in labor. The return of this 
“great company” (קָרָה רְאוֹם) is not a military activity. This great company “includes 
even the most vulnerable travelers, the persons needing the most assistance on the journey, 
who could never serve in any army. The blind and lame are not able to fight because they 
need help even to walk.” It is the expression of utter dependence on YHWH.

The different nature of this new Exodus is underlined by its eschatological nature. 
The “righteous branch” (צדקה צדוק) describes the ideal messianic king who is expected in 
the eschaton. He will truly administer justice (משמש) and righteousness (צדק), his 
name is “YHWH, our righteousness” (יהוה צדקנו). The promised future is described in 
terms that remind one of the Garden in Eden, thus implying a new creation for this new 
redemption. The new Exodus is in fact an Exodus into the eschaton. The prophet expects 
the beginning of the eschaton with the new Exodus-event rather than any political change 
that could serve as a fulfillment. Israel will understand in the “last days” (ימים 
וֹשָׁע).  

1Jer 31:8. 
2G. L. Keown, P. J. Scalise, and T. G. Smothers, Jeremiah 26-52, Word Biblical 
Commentary, vol. 27 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1995), 113. 
3Jer 23:5. 
4Jer 30:24.
This new Exodus is clearly described and thought of in terms of the historical one. Images and words connect this new experience of redemption with the old one. The Exodus from Egypt is the Vorbild for the eschatological Nachbild.

**Hosea**

Besides the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah, Hosea is another prophet who utilized the Exodus motif as a means to describe a future redemption. Israel was about to be led into captivity. The prophet addressed the nation, which had come politically and spiritually to the end of the road. Hosea saw nothing but certain punishment, destruction, and suffering for the people. He compared the moral state of the Israelites to a wife who is unfaithful to her husband. Therefore, God was about to punish them. The history of Israel will come to an end. In a sense, Israel had come back to the point of her beginning, the Exodus. This starting point is at the same time the beginning of the new era. Israel has sinned, and because of her sin she has to return to Egypt. Yet God will again lead his people out. The book of Hosea develops the concept of a new covenant in close association with the Sinaitic covenant. In fact, as Steve McKenzie put it, "the most important theme in Hosea is that of covenant." Hans K. LaRondelle stressed that

---

1 Hos 1-4; references according to the Hebrew text of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.


“we need to remind ourselves that it is of essential importance to view all the Old Testament gathering promises as the unfolding of the original covenant promise of Moses in Deut 30:1-10, because here the restoration or exodus promise spells out the spiritual conditions of the participants in unambiguous terms within the surety of its fulfillment.”

Thus the many references to the Exodus indicate that in order for Israel to become again God’s covenant people a new Exodus had to take place.

Hos 2:16-17

Most commentators agree that the book of Hosea is to be divided into three major sections: (1) chaps. 1-3; (2) chaps. 4-11; and (3) chaps. 12-14. While the second and third section contain Hosea’s messages to Israel and foreign nations denouncing Israel’s wicked condition caused by the people and especially by a corrupt and idolatrous

---

1LaRondelle, “The Sensus Plenior of Israel’s Restoration Promises.”


government and priesthood, chaps. 1-3 describe Hosea’s marital experience with an unfaithful wife, a prostitute.

Of primary importance as a key to understanding the whole message of Hosea is a proper interpretation of the first three chapters of the book. Hosea’s experience shaped his theology and his message to God’s people. In dealing with God’s commands regarding his personal life, the prophet learned firsthand God’s will for his people. The book opens with God’s command to marry “an adulterous wife” and to take “children of unfaithfulness.” Scholars are divided as to the nature of this marriage: Is this marriage to be considered symbolic or allegorical whose only reality is the meaning? Did the divine command simply contemplate a symbolical representation of the relation in which the idolatrous Israelites were then standing to YHWH? Maimonides, for example, suggested that this marriage took place in a vision or a dream and was never carried out in real life. Another possible interpretation considers the marriage of Hosea and Gomer as literal, but Gomer’s unfaithfulness as not-literal. Her unfaithfulness refers to spiritual apostasy.

Gomer followed other gods.

---

1Hos 1:2.


3The Guide of the Perplexed, II, 46.

The majority of commentators who adhere to a more literal interpretation have espoused the so-called “proleptic” view of Hosea’s marriage. This understanding views the statement in Hos 1:2 as being written from a later time projecting back into the account what then actually happened at a later time. When Hosea married Gomer she had not yet committed adultery. Only later would she become unfaithful. Thus the “children of unfaithfulness” in 1:2 are to be taken as later realities read back into the text. The children referred to in 1:2 and 1:3-9 are one and the same group of offspring. Another view of the literal interpretation views the statement in regard to Gomer’s unfaithfulness in 1:2 as a statement that describes Gomer as being already a prostitute when God commands Hosea to marry her. The text is referring to two groups of children—those born to Gomer before her marriage to Hosea while she lived as a prostitute, and the three born to her and Hosea after their marriage.

No matter how one decides which of the literal interpretations to choose, it appears that the marriage of Hosea to Gomer was a literal one (how can one take a wife


"figuratively"?\(^1\) The command of God to marry Gomer and the events that unfold in Hosea’s marriage—particularly the naming of the children—suggest that Hosea was "acting out" God’s message for his people.\(^2\) The word of God (תִּרְנַח, הָגֵל) which came to Hosea\(^3\) became at the same time "word" and "event." As H. D. Beeby explains:

> Actions, for the Hebrews, do not necessarily speak louder than words, but sometimes they are the essential word which must be uttered in a certain context. Hosea the prophet had to ‘speak’ in his marriage and in his children. . . . Hosea’s family was to know and to reflect the awful anguish that God experienced because his ‘wives’—the land and Israel—had been faithless. Hosea must therefore share both the personality and the pathos of God.\(^4\)

Not only did the prophet’s action speak to the Israelites but they also spoke to his own life. The marriage to Gomer and his experience with this unfaithful wife “stirred and shocked the life of Hosea regardless of its effect upon public opinion. It concerned him personally at the deepest level and had a meaning of the highest significance for his own life.”\(^5\) Thus it is no wonder that the message of Hosea is shaped and dependent on the experience of this marriage. The theology of the prophet is informed by the way his life unfolds.

---


\(^2\)D. A. Hubbard defines the account of Hosea’s marriage as “enacted prophecy” (*Hosea*, 52).

\(^3\)Hos 1:1.


\(^5\)Heschel, *The Prophets*, 56.
Hosea plays in this drama the role of God. The meaning of his name יְהֹוָּא is “salvation.” God is in the business of salvation. So he commands Hosea to take Gomer, a woman without merits and without a good reputation, as his wife. Gomer conceives and bears a son whose name is Jezreel (יהֹוָּוָּא) meaning “God will scatter.” As the farmer scatters the seed all over the field so Israel will be scattered. The name Jezreel was a symbol for murder and violence. Then, Gomer conceives a second time and gives birth to a girl to be named Lo-Ruhamah (לֹא רֻחָם) meaning “without mercy.” This time God will show no mercy and deliver Israel out of the hands of her enemies as he had done so many times before. The third child is to be called Lo-Ammi (לֹא אָמִי), “not my people.” Something must have happened between the birth of Lo-Ruhamah and the conception of Lo-Ammi. Perhaps Gomer had gone back to her old lovers. The child who is born to her is not Hosea’s. God makes a final statement. Israel is no longer God’s people. The people have violated the covenant. The punishment they receive is described in terms of a reversal of the Exodus, a return to captivity.

---

1 Hos 1:3-4.
2 See 2 Kgs 9-10.
3 Hos 1:6.
4 Hos 1:8-9.
major promises involved in the first Exodus, land and seed, was subsequently misused:

"Israel was a spreading vine; he brought forth fruit for himself. As his fruit increased, he
built more altars; as his land prospered, he adorned his sacred stones."\(^1\) Therefore,
YHWH intends to remove these blessings from his people: "I will drive them out of my
house"\(^2\) and "Ephraim’s glory will fly away like a bird—no birth, no pregnancy, no
conception."\(^3\)

But God is a God of the covenant. In Lev 26:44-45 he had declared:

Yet in spite of this, when they are in the land of their enemies, I will not
reject them or abhor them so as to destroy them completely, breaking my
covenant with them. I am YHWH their God.
But for their sake I will remember the covenant with their ancestors whom I
brought out of Egypt in the sight of the nations to be their God. I am YHWH.

God stands by his covenant. There will be a future salvation and redemption.
The Israelites will be “like the sand on the seashore.”\(^4\) The events of Jezreel—formerly a
reminder of murder and violence—will be turned into joy for the people of Judah and the
people of Israel will be reunited.\(^5\) God will lead Israel back into the desert. Hos 2:16-17
reads:

\(~\text{Eschatologie des Hoseabuches,\, in Hosea und Amos: Studien zu den Anfängen des}
\text{Dodekapropheton, Forschungen zum Alten Testament, vol. 13 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr}
\text{[Paul Siebeck], 1996), 67-85.}\)

\(^1\)Hos 10:1.
\(^2\)Hos 9:15
\(^3\)Hos 9:11.
\(^4\)Hos 2:1.
\(^5\)Hos 2:2.
16 Therefore, behold, I will allure her; I will lead her into the desert and speak to her heart.

17 And from there I will give her her vineyards, and the Valley of Achor as a door of hope. There she will answer as in the days of her youth, as in the day she came up from the land of Egypt.

The expression כוֹסֶת עֲלָהָה מְאֹרֶץ מַעֲרֵיָה, “as in the day she came up from the land of Egypt,” clearly connects linguistically the historical experience of the first Exodus with the future promised one. This new Exodus is about to happen in the same way as the old one. The historical redemption serves as a Vorbild, or type, for the announced redemption that is about to come.

Two previous “therefores” were succeeded by announcements of punishment;¹ this one surprises. It does not introduce punishment and utter destruction but abounding grace, a grace that is wholly unconditional. Israel needs to go back to the desert where she first learned to trust YHWH. She needs to return to the mountain where the foundations of the covenant were laid. Hos 2:16-17 describes the necessary steps God will take to make the new covenant possible.² This new Exodus experience will have as a result that Israel will again inherit the land,³ and the valley of Achor—a painful reminder

¹“Therefore I will block her path with thornbushes.” (Hos 2:8); “Therefore I will take away my grain when it ripens.” (Hos 2:11).


³“There I will give her back her vineyards” (Hos 2:17).
of the disobedience that followed the first Exodus from Egypt during the initial stage of
the Conquest\(^1\)—shall turn into a symbol of a new beginning. Thus the new Exodus
experience will surpass the earlier one \((\text{Steigerung})\): This new entry into the land will not
be blurred by another Achan-experience; there will be no disobedience and the "trouble"
which it brought. Instead, Israel will find hope, even in the inhospitable place of the
desert.\(^2\)

This new Exodus will be marked by a continually faithful response. God will
"remove the names of the Baals from her lips; no longer will their names be invoked."\(^3\)
The future relationship with God goes beyond all that Israel had experienced before, for
the Israelites are to be more than just "God's people"; they are going to be called "sons of
the living God."\(^4\) The united people will choose a leader who is identified in a parallel
passage as King David or the messianic ruler\(^5\) reminiscent of the promise given by the
prophet Nathan to David.\(^6\) This leader, then, will head the Israelites in their "coming up"
out of captivity. The Septuagint uses in Hos 2:2 \([\text{LXX} 1:11]\) the same Greek root,
\(\text{ἀναβαίνω}\), that is used to describe Israel's "going up" out of the Jordan into the

\(^{1}\) See Josh 7.
\(^{3}\) Hos 2:19.
\(^{4}\) Hos 2:1.
\(^{5}\) Hos 3:5.
\(^{6}\) 2 Sam 7.
Promised Land.¹ These events are to be taking shape in a time that is described as הָיוֹת
(“in the last days”), a designation that played an important role in our study of
the Pentateuch and points toward an eschatological future. Commenting on Hos 2:1-2
Beeby writes that “this is more than just reversal or restoration. This utterance looks
forward to the messianic age.”² In order to start all over again with Israel YHWH intends
to lead his people “back into the desert” where everything began. Only there where Israel
is stripped of everything she could rely on, where she has to depend completely on
YHWH to survive, where nothing is left—only there can YHWH start again a covenant
relationship with his people. Only then can the fulfillment of the covenant promises, land
and seed, be accomplished.

It appears, after Gomer had given birth to Lo-Ammi and Hosea had recognized
that this is not his son, that she again leaves Hosea and goes back to the old places. But
even now, God does not release Hosea from his marriage. Hosea (his name means
“salvation”!) plays the part of God. God commands Hosea to once again show his love to
his wife. He has to buy his wife on the market where the prostitutes are offered like
common meat.³ God pays a price to redeem his people. He invests to get his people
back. This salvation, this second Exodus from the bondage of sin and the power of

¹Josh 4:19. Similarly, in the Gospel of Mark Jesus’ baptism is described as a
“coming up” out of the water (Mark 1:10).

²Beeby, Grace Abounding, 19.

³Hos 3:1-3.
Sheol,\textsuperscript{1} surpasses by far the first Exodus experience (Steigerung) and leads into the eschatological redemption. Joseph Klausner concludes that “the ancient tradition about the exile in Egypt and the deliverance from this exile were the initial stimulus to the formation of the entire Messianic idea, which is fundamentally the idea of redemption from exile.”\textsuperscript{2}

\textbf{Hos 12:10}

This passage ties right into the theological message of the previous one (2:16-17). The motif of God leading his people back into the desert and sustaining her there is again employed. All through the book, Hosea describes how Israel has failed in her relationship with God: Their political activities at home and abroad have aimed to secure power by their own strength. They mingled with foreign nations and sought their future in alliances with them. By their wickedness “they made the king happy, and the officials with their lies.”\textsuperscript{3} In their “lust for success, they negelcted the one thing that would really have secured peace, blessing and hope: a return to Yahweh and obedience to his covenant.”\textsuperscript{4} Over and over again God would call his people but “they have refused to return to me.”\textsuperscript{5}

This is the reason why God is about to have them return to Egypt and Assyria: “Though

\textsuperscript{1}Hos 13:14.


\textsuperscript{3}Hos 7:3.

\textsuperscript{4}D. Stuart, \textit{Hosea—Jonah}, 125.

\textsuperscript{5}Hos 11:5.
they offer choice sacrifices, though they eat flesh, YHWH does not accept them; now He will remember their iniquity and punish their sins—they shall return to Egypt.”1 “They shall not remain in the land of YHWH, but Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and in Assyria they shall eat unclean food;”2 “They shall return to the land of Egypt, and Assyria shall be their king.”3 Here is the announcement of a new immigration into exile. While Assyria represents the immanent political threat, Hosea’s intentional context is the historical exile situation in Egypt to which he was already referring in the previous chapters. But this is not the end—YHWH cries out: “How can I give you up, O Ephraim! How can I deliver

1Hos 8:13.
2Hos 9:3.
3Hos 11:5. This verse poses a problem in regard to the translation; it reads “... לא בראה אלי המים.” T. E. McComiskey asserts that לא (not) seems anomalous in view of the statements in Hosea that affirm a return to Egypt. The problem is a difficult one, but the statement in the Masoretic Text makes sense, particularly in view of the presence of נו (it) in the apodosis. If נו (not) is read, נו relieves the resultant anomaly. We may paraphrase it, ‘He will not return to the land of Egypt, rather it is נו Assyria that will [really] be his king’” (“Hosea,” 188). Other commentators do not accept the apparent negation in vs. 5. Andersen and Freedman write: “The best solution is to recognize an asseverative נו” (Hosea, 583-584; see also R. Gordis, The Word and the Book: Studies in Biblical Language and Literature [New York: KTAV, 1976], 182; W. Kuhnigk, Nordwestsemantische Studien zum Hoseabuch, Biblica et Orientalia 27 [Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1974], 133-134); Mays (Hosea, 150) and D. Stuart (Hosea-Jonah, 174-175) read נו (to him) and place it at the end of vs. 4: “And I reached out to him and fed him.” Based on the recurring motif of Israel’s return to Egypt I prefer the “asseverative” reading.
you over, O Israel!”1 YHWH's intention to “allure her” back into the desert2 is again echoing in the following verse (Hos 12:10):


10 But I am YHWH your God, ever since the land of Egypt, I will again cause you to dwell in tents as in the days of the appointed time.

Although YHWH has to lead his people into exile because they have forsaken his covenant, love oppression, and think that “no offense has been found in me that would be sin”3 he is still their God. The expression אֲנִי יְהוָה יָהַב אֶלֶּהָ דָּבָרְךָ מַעֲרָה יִישָׁב (“I am YHWH, your God, from the land of Egypt”)4 associates YHWH with the events of the Exodus from Egypt and what he did for his people. The preposition מְלֹא underlines the fact that YHWH has remained the same God as in the Exodus.5 Because of their iniquity the people had to experience a similar destiny as the people of old: exile and subsequent salvation through a new Exodus. God’s message of judgment did not stop with the exile. He still loves Israel. He will not leave his people in their exile. Another Exodus is part of his message for his people. Thus he will lure Israel back into the desert; he will make them live in tents again as Israel did when YHWH first led them out of Egypt. Again, the

---

1Hos 11:8.
2Hos 2:16.
3Hos 12:8-9.
4Hos 12:10.
5McComiskey, “Hosea,” 206.
historical course of events as they unfolded in the first Exodus form the framework in which Hosea describes the future redemption.

Hos 12:10 seems to imply two messages. First, because Israel has forgotten her covenant responsibilities and behaves like an unjust merchant YHWH has to reduce their luxurious living in palaces and big houses within lush gardens and sweep away all symbols of grandeur. He is about to turn their well-being into living in tents surrounded by nothing else but desert. Second, in the context of Hos 2:16-17 the picture of God leading his people again into the desert is a vision of hope. Living in tents is the first step out of bondage and slavery. The reference to מזון (“appointed time”) refers most likely to the Feast of Booths. This festival was a time of remembrance and rejoicing before YHWH\(^1\) for God would provide for their spiritual needs as well as for their physical ones. In the statutes of this festival similar expressions to the one in Hosea are found: “so that your generations may know that I made the people of Israel live in booths (מִרְגָּמיִם) when I brought them out of the land of Egypt.”\(^2\) For Hosea the wilderness period is a symbol of the childlike trust that the people had when YHWH led them out of Egypt into the wilderness. The conditions that led to Israel’s restoration to fellowship with YHWH will be repeated.\(^3\) This is underlined by the introductory ימֵמִי (“as in the days”). In several instances Hosea uses יָמִים or ימֵמִי to introduce analogies drawn from Israel’s early

---

1See Lev 23:40.
2Lev 23:43.
history. The reference to the festival in relation to the historical event of the exodus underlines the positive aspect of God's judgment and his subsequent acts of mercy in bringing his people out into the desert.

In subsequent verses Hosea refers to the prophetic gift by which he tried to guide his people, especially in the Exodus. The reference to the prophet by which YHWH brought Israel up from the land of Egypt in Hos 12:14 immediately recalls the figure of Moses to the minds of the people. Moses was the prophet of the Exodus. With his reference to the prophet Moses who led the people in the first Exodus Hosea provokes the image of a new Moses, i.e., the image of the new prophet who would again lead the people out of bondage. Already in the context of the historical Exodus event this vision of a "new" prophet was given to God's people at the border of the Promised Land: "YHWH will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your own people; you shall heed such a prophet" and "Never since has there risen a prophet in Israel like Moses with whom YHWH dealt so intimately, face to face." Moses promised the people another great prophet who—in the same way as Moses did—would lead the people. The statement that "never since has there risen a prophet in Israel like Moses" seems to have been added to the end of the Pentateuch some time after the event (presumably by Ezra?). When Hosea referred to the prophet he provoked the hope for the new prophet who was yet to come.

---

1 See Hos 2:5, 17; 9:9; cf. 10:9.

2 Hos 12:11, 14.

3 Deut 18:15.

4 Deut 34:10.
In subsequent verses YHWH assures the people that he is the same God as in the Exodus from Egypt. He has not changed. His authority extends from the time of the Exodus to Hosea's day thus giving assurance that he was and will be the deliverer of his people:

"Yet I have been YHWH your God ever since the land of Egypt; you know no God but me, and besides me there is no savior. It was I who fed you in the wilderness, in the land of drought."

Summary

The message of the prophet Hosea announces the impending judgment because Israel has failed to adhere to the covenant requirements. Israel is about to go again into exile. But this is not the end. YHWH is going to lead his people out of the land of bondage, he will lead them in another Exodus. The people will come back to a state (in the desert) where they have to depend completely on YHWH's acts of mercy. There will be nothing that can sustain them except the gracious benefits and gifts of God. This will be a time when God reestablishes his intimate relationship with his people. The prophet stresses repeatedly the fact that this new Exodus will be like the first one (Hosea uses לבר or YHWH needs to lead his people back to the conditions of the first Exodus. The historical redemption serves as a Vorbild, or type, for the announced redemption that is about to come. Israel will again inherit the land, the symbols of disobedience shall turn into symbols of a new beginning. This new beginning will not be blurred by disobedience and trouble as the first one was. The reference in Hos 11:17,

1Hos 13:4-5.
There [in the desert] I will give her back her vineyards," suggests that even the desert will be part of the inheritance being miraculously transformed into a garden (Steigerung). The future relationship of Israel with her God will go beyond all that Israel had experienced before. The united people will choose a leader, the messianic ruler, who will lead the Exodus. Thus this new redemption is put by Hosea into an eschatological horizon.

**Micah**

The introduction to the book of Micah states that Micah prophesied during the reign of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah. This is roughly the same time during which the prophet Isaiah was active. The closeness and literary interdependence becomes evident, for example, in the oracle of the pilgrimage to Mt. Zion (Mic 4:1-5; Isa 2:2-5). Both passages appear almost word by word with several rearrangements; only the liturgical additions (Mic 4:5; Isa 2:5) differ. The discussion in regard to the unity of the book is shaped by approval or rejection of the basic assumptions put forth by Bernhard Stade at the turn of the century. According to Stade’s concept, only the first three

---

1 Mic 1:1.


chapters of the book can be traced back to the prophet Micah himself. Chaps. 6:1 - 7:6 belong to the last phase of the pre-exilic period, whereas chaps. 4-5 and the outer framework of 1:2-4 and 7:7 were connected with chaps. 1-3 in post-exilic times. Most scholars today suspect that the core of chaps. 1-3 was edited under deuteronomistic influence during the exile and later expanded by the oracles in chaps. 4-5 and 6-7 during post-exilic times.\(^1\) The assessment of the text quality turns out to be quite different: While L. P. Smith writes that “the text of Micah offers more difficulties than that of any other prophet except Hosea,”\(^2\) Rolland E. Wolfe concludes that “the text of Micah is in a good state of preservation . . . , the book of Micah is in the best condition of any of the eighth-century prophetic texts.”\(^3\)


The structure of the book is characterized by the arrangement of three cycles of oracles which all contain messages of doom and of hope respectively.¹ Thus, it displays an internal coherence. Each of the three cycles begins with a summons to hear, which is followed by an oracle of doom; they all end with a perspective of hope. "While this strikingly symmetrical pattern may have come about as the speeches of Micah were arranged after his death, the inner coherence, the logical sequence of argument, and the general prophetic propensity for symmetrical arrangement of thought support the originality of the literary pattern."² Usually, those passages that display a strong note of hope in the material of the pre-exilic prophets have been automatically assigned to a post-exilic editor. Yet, cultic material from pre-exilic Israel and the surrounding Ancient Near East culture has shown examples of a strong doom-hope motif.³ This is also applicable to the Exodus material. "The basic pattern of Israel’s holy history, the exodus-conquest motif, is that of suffering-salvation. Therefore, we should not expect a radical difference


between pre-exilic, exilic, and post-exilic materials as far as hope is concerned, since they are all grounded in the same covenant theology, transmitted largely through the cult."¹

Mic 4:9-10

This section is part of the hope utterances of the second cycle of oracles. While Mic 4:1-8 speaks of the establishment of the kingdom of peace, the restoration of Jerusalem's former dominion and the exaltation of the remnant, the following verses (4:9 - 5:5) proclaim the pardoning of God's people and the announcement of a messianic figure. This section (4:9 - 5:5) is organized into three prophecies (4:9-10; 4:11-13; 4:14 - 5:5) that share common features: Each of the three prophecies is introduced by an initial נַעֲה and a situation of present distress followed by an act of salvation initiated by God. Especially the first and the second of these three prophecies share similar features:²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9a</th>
<th>נַעֲה</th>
<th>11a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>situation of distress</td>
<td>11b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>appeal to daughter Zion</td>
<td>13a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(with two feminine imperatives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>situation of victory</td>
<td>13b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mic 4:9-10 reads as follows:


9 Now why do you sound alarming cries? Is there not a King among you? Or did your Counselor perish that agony seizes you like a woman in labor?

10 Writhe and burst forth, O daughter Zion, like a woman in labor; for now you will leave from the city, and you will camp in the field, and you will go to Babylon, there you will be delivered! There YHWH will redeem you from the hand of your enemies.

The temporal adverb in vs. 9 links this verse with the preceding vs. 7 where is also used. This verse describes YHWH’s ruling over his remnant people in Mount Zion from to (“from now to forever”). God’s people, who are in exile, will again be assembled and transformed into a strong nation. This will happen (“in that day”). refers back to 4:1 where the era of Jerusalem’s exaltation is introduced with the words (“in the last days”) and characterized with the expression in the adverbial phrase (“forever and ever”) indicates ‘unlimited and unforeseeable duration’ and is heightened to ‘unending perpetuity’ by the addition of (also meaning ‘perpetuity’).” The exaltation of Jerusalem is intertwined with the messianic kingdom. Vs. 7 speaks of YHWH’s rule over the remnant people, vs. 8 of the kingship that “will come to the Daughter of Jerusalem,” and 5:2 of the ONE who will rule over Israel, “whose origins are from of old.” Thus, Mic 4:9-10 is set in a messianic framework.

1Ibid., 683-684.
Israel has to go through a crisis. There will be a time when she thinks that there is no longer a king or a counselor in her midst; the exile will be her destiny. This prospect causes her to “shout a shout”¹ and to experience the pain of a woman in labor. The two questions ‘Is there not a King in your midst?’ and ‘Did your Counselors perish?’ are rhetorical questions. Although there will be a time where it seems as if Israel has lost her king and all her counselors, God will take up complete control, for He is actually Israel’s king and counselor. While vs. 9 uses the word הַכְּנֻלֵה ("counselor," derived from the word כְּנַל), vs. 12 uses the word הָעַלָּא ("to counsel," derived from the same root as כְּנַל). In vs. 12 it is clearly YHWH who counsels; based on the close parallelism of the two prophecies there is good reason to suppose that the counselor in vs. 9 is also YHWH himself. The second part of vs. 10 displays the following parallelism:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>and you will enter Babel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>there you will be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'</td>
<td>there YHWH will redeem you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td>from the hand of your enemies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is YHWH who will deliver his people from Babel and redeem them from the hands of their enemies. This is the duty and role of the king. The close parallelism of the counselor and the king in vs. 9 underlines the notion that YHWH acts in both capacities, as king and counselor. The answer to the two rhetorical questions is: Of course not; there is no reason to cry aloud! Israel might have lost her political leadership but God himself—the actual king and counselor of Israel—is still in control. While Israel cries in

¹The rare noun יִשְׁתִּיָּה is found elsewhere only in Job 36:33 and in the context of the Exodus from Egypt in Exod 32:17.
agonies over her situation like a woman in labor (vs. 9), the prophet now calls for Israel to cry out and bring forth like a woman during childbirth (vs. 10). From the agony and labor of a woman comes forth new life, a newborn child. In this sense, the pain that Israel has to live through is the birth of a new salvation. “Daughter Zion must understand her cry of pain as a cry of deliverance. The suffering of the present moment prepares for the liberation to come.”¹ The place where liberation takes place is the exile.²

This place of exile is Babel. Since Assyria was the dominating political and military power in Micah’s days, commentators have applied the term ‘Babel’ to Assyria³ or have dated this part to the period of the Babylonian hegemony.⁴ C. F. Keil points out that Micah never mentions the Assyrians or the Babylonians as those who execute judgment, nor does the prophet say anything in regard to the time when this predicted destruction of Jerusalem will take place. He writes that

the persons addressed are the scandalous leaders of the house of Israel, i.e. of the covenant nation, and primarily those living in his own time, though by no means those only, but all who share their character and ungodliness, so that the words apply to succeeding generations quite as much as to his contemporaries. The only thing that would warrant our restricting the prophecy to Micah’s own times, would be a precise definition by Micah himself of the period when Jerusalem would be destroyed, or his expressly distinguishing his own contemporaries from their sons and descendants. . . .

¹Waltke, “Micah,” 694.

²Two times the Hebrew word בֵּית (“there”) is used.


We must therefore not restrict his threats... even to the Chaldaean catastrophe, nor the promise of Israel's deliverance in Babel out of the hands of its foes to the liberation of the Jews from Babylon... but must also extend the threat of punishment to the dispersion of the Jews over all the world, and the redemption out of Babel... to that deliverance of Israel which, in the main, is in the future still.¹

 Introduced is the promise of the forthcoming exile by a view into the future, into the time that succeeds this painful event of the exile: “the former dominion will be restored to you; kingship will come to the Daughter of Jerusalem.”² The messianic dominion of God's rule over Israel is interpreted as the renovation of the Davidic monarchy. In his vision of the future, Micah brings together on the one hand the dominion (מָלָיָה) of YHWH who has “established his throne in heaven” and rules over everything that he has created; “all his works everywhere in his dominion”³ are to praise him. God as their ruler and King before the people of Israel demanded a wordly king. While God called his people out of Egypt and led them through the desert years he was considered to be their king. Moses exclaimed while he was contemplating the future of Israel in his victory song at the Red Sea: “YHWH will be King forever and ever.”⁴ In the constituting phase of the history of Israel, however, the people no longer wanted to be ruled by an invisible God, through a theocracy. They rejected God as their King and set a human

¹Keil, Minor Prophets, 1:467, 470.
²Mic 4:8.
³Ps 103:22.
⁴Exod 15:18.
being as a visible king over themselves. Yet, God did not reject his people. Far from it! He confirmed the Davidic line with the words: "I will make firm the throne of his kingdom forever." In the prophetic tradition the Davidic line becomes the means of bringing to the people of Israel the eschatological peace and well-being through the messianic figure who will be a descendant of King David. The prophet Micah in describing the eschatological future of Israel weaves together both threads—God's dominion over his people and the messianic heir of King David—into one picture.

Linguistically, there are strong ties of this passage with the Exodus tradition of the Pentateuch. Mic 4:10 uses two verbs—ָיָּלֶל ("to snatch away," "to deliver") and לָלֶל ("to redeem")—which occur together only here and in the context of the historical Exodus. The prophet purposely phrases the coming eschatological redemption in terms that are reminiscent of the historical Vorbild, the Exodus from Egypt. The literarische Vorlage of the Exodus description in the Pentateuchal tradition constitutes the basis of the formulation of the Nachbild, the future redemption.

Mic 7:14-15

Chaps. 6 and 7 form a unity. They form the third and last cycle of oracles within the prophecies of Micah. This third cycle starts with God summoning his people for a

---

1 Sam 8:7.

2 Sam 7:13.

3 Exod 6:6 and Num 35:25.
275

Rechtsstreit (יוּל, “lawsuit speech”; 6:1-8). He reminds his people of his saving acts when he first led them out from Egypt and redeemed them “from the land of slavery.” He asks them to “remember your crossing over from Shittim to Gilgal.” Then follow messages of doom: The punishment for Israel’s guilt is announced and the breakdown of the social structures of Jerusalem foretold. After Micah’s affirmation of his confidence in YHWH the last oracle of hope follows. Although the punishment is deserved, God will again execute justice for his people, the walls will be rebuilt, and the borders will become remote. The condition in the world around Israel will be reversed: Jerusalem, deserted

---


2Mic 6:5; cf. Josh 2:1; 4:19.

3Mic 6:9-16.

4Mic 7:1-6.

5Mic 7:7. Scholars have not reached an agreement whether vs. 7 belongs to vss. 1-6 (e.g., R. Oberforcher, Das Buch Micha, Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar Altes Testament, vol. 24/2 [Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995], 139-143; Freiherr von Ungern-Sternberg, Der Rechtsstreit Gottes, 153-162; Weiser, Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten I, 285-287) or to vss. 8-18 (T. Lescow, “Redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse von Micha 6-7,” Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 84 [1972]: 199-202; McComiskey, “Micah,” 441-443; R. L. Smith, Micah—Malachi, 55-60; for further literature, see Wolff, Dodekapropheton 4: Micha, 176; Waltke (“Micah,” 750-751) considers vs. 7 as a hinge between both sections.

6Mic 6:8-20.
and destroyed, will be rebuilt, the earth will become desolate. This is the context of the following two verses (14-15):

14 Shepherd Your people with your staff, the flock of your inheritance,
so that they may abide apart in a forest, in the midst of a garden-land,
may they graze in Bashan and in Gilead as in the days of old;
15 as in the days when you went out from the land of Egypt, I will show him wonderful deeds.

Vs. 14 begins with the petition to "shepherd" the people. YHWH is asked to care for his flock. Micah pleads with יז serão דרוי of Ps 23:1 to lead them to fresh pastures so that they may graze in plenty. The expressions יָшуֵם "Your people," עֶמֶר "your rod," and נֵחַת "your inheritance" implore YHWH using motifs that are repeatedly employed in psalms of prayer. The "rod" signifies an authoritative rule; the ruler will protect his people against all enemies.

The people are described as dwelling (לָבוֹד) apart (לָבֹד) in the midst of a garden (בַּהֲרֵי הָרֹם). here indicates a permanent dwelling in contrast to לָבוֹד in 4:10 where only a temporary abode is in view. Together with לָבוֹד it has the connotation of "free from danger." This ties in with the prophecy of Balaam who had oracled that he sees "a people who live apart [לָבוֹד] and do not consider themselves one of the

1E.g., Pss 28:9; 74:1; 80:2 [1].
nations.”1 Jer 49:31 describes “a nation at ease, which lives in confidence . . . a nation that has neither gates nor bars; its people live apart [הנדסה, חל Tâm].” The ruling of the ‘Good Shepherd’ is to bring a life free from danger for his people, a life of security, well-being, and ease. The Hebrew word חל Tâm has two other meanings—besides the proper name of a mountain range—that are used in the Hebrew Bible: “orchard” and newly ripened corn.”2 Based on the parallelism with עיר, “forest,” it appears plausible to apply the meaning “orchard” to חל Tâm.3 The picture of a lush, gardenlike forest is painted. This notion is underlined by the reference to “Bashan” and “Gilead.” Bashan is a fertile area to the east of the Sea of Galilee that is known for its fine trees and fattened animals. Gilead is the area south of the Jabbok River that had already during the time of the conquest appealed to the Israelites. The tribes of Reuben and Gad decided to settle this side of the Jordan because “the place was a place for the cattle.”4 Micah hopes for a renewal of the ancient conquest-situation. Israel once again should “graze in Bashan and in Gilead” as she had done the first time when she conquered the land. “The extended metaphor for the Lord’s beneficent rule in the messianic era emphasizes the petition for new Israel’s

1Num 23:9.


3Compare Isa 29:17 and 37:24.

4Num 32:1.
restoration to its original prosperity and security, 'as in the days of old,' when God chose his inheritance.”¹

With "as in the days of," YHWH takes up the כִּמְיוֹן עֹלֶם, "as in the days of old," and compares the coming age with the time when he led the Israelites out of their slavery in Egypt and displayed his power by showing many wonderful deeds. Again, YHWH will display this power on behalf of his people: "I will show him wonderful deeds" (vs. 15). While the Masoretic text has הָיָה יְדֵי, "I will show him," the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia suggests that one should read here הָיָהּ, "show us." H. W. Wolff points out that Wellhausen's suggestion to read הָיָהּ is in harmony with the context of this passage. The masoretic הָיָהּ is not only a mishap of the copyist but also a conscious alteration of a petition into an assurance of salvation.³ Yet, B. Waltke writes:

All the versions point to the same consonantal text as the MT. Wellhausen's commonly accepted emendation . . . to הָיָהּ (show us) cannot be right because the second-person masculine singular suffix "you" in vs. 12A refers to Israel, not God. The change to third-person masculine singular in vs. 12B is consistent with Micah's style (e.g., 1:11). The point is important, for if Wellhausen be right, then verse 15 continues the petition of verse 14. If the MT is right, then verse 14 is a salvation oracle.⁴

¹Waltke, "Micah," 759.
²J. Wellhausen, Die kleinen Propheten (Berlin: Reimer, 1898), 150.
³Wolff, Dodekapropheton 4: Micha, 189; see also R. L. Smith, Micah-Malachi, 58. The Septuagint reads ὑψεόθε, "you shall see."
⁴Waltke, "Micah," 758.
YHWH says through Micah that the days of the first Exodus are to be a paradigm for what is to come when he delivers them anew. The wonderful deeds and marvelous miracles are going to be performed again to save the people. By using the second-person personal pronoun in “your going out” YHWH refers to the corporate solidarity experience that is part of the Passover festival. Micah and the people of Israel are reminded that in the forefathers they have to come out of Egypt. The history of Israel is the token for the future history to come. It is a future history that has already outplayed itself in destiny of the old generation. The same destiny is in stock for the new generation; and this new salvation plays out in the same way as YHWH redeemed the fathers when they first came out from Egypt. When this happens the nations will be ashamed and display reverence and awe (“they clap hands over mouths”; vs. 16); they will be humbled for “they lick dust like a serpent” (vs. 17). Here, a motif that had been developed in the context of the serpent in the Garden of Eden is again taken up. The nations will suffer the same final consequences as the serpent in the garden.

Summary

God tells his people through the prophet Micah that the new Exodus experience will be similar to the one “they” have experienced through their fathers. The various linguistic connections make it clear that the historical experience of Israel’s coming out from Egypt form the framework in which the future redemption is put. The center of Micah’s message is the pardoning of a people who are shattered. The saving act of
deliverance (𝔭ָנָא) and redemption (>}' is linguistically tied with the historical Exodus experience thus forming a direct link between past and future.

The motif of Israel's return from the Babylonian exile is taken and expanded into an eschatological future. The coming period is an age of the messianic kingdom which is qualified by unlimited and unforseeable duration and perpetuity. This messianic ruler and shepherd will renew and reestablish the Davidic monarchy. This new Exodus experience will be a redemption under the direction of YHWH; it is God's doing.

Zechariah

For Martin Luther the prophetic book of Zechariah had a special place among the prophetic writings of the Old Testament; he called it the Quintessenz of the prophetic writing.¹ His special interest in this book was certainly driven by the many references to the coming messiah. George L. Robinson calls the book of Zechariah "the most Messianic, the most truly apocalyptic and eschatological, of all writings of the OT."² This accentuation of the messianic perspective might be an explanation why Zechariah is cited so many times in the New Testament.

Zechariah's ministry was roughly contemporaneous with Haggai's. The date given at the beginning of Zechariah's book is the "eighth month of the second year of

1"Ex superioribus prophetis et ex Aggeo intelligi potest, quid velit Zacharias, immo et omnes prophetae, qui a captivitate Babylonica prophetarunt populo Israelitico" (Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe - Weimarer Ausgabe 13:546).

Darius, the Persian king. This was towards the end of the year 520 B.C. The edict by Cyrus had permitted the Israelites to return from the captivity in Babylon and rebuild the temple in Jerusalem. While the Jews began the work of rebuilding, the project became stalled and lay fallow during the remainder of Cyrus's reign and that of his successor Cambyses II. Only with the accession of Darius Hystaspes in 522 B.C. could the completion of the rebuilding of the temple be accomplished in 516 B.C. Both Haggai and Zechariah played a vital part in arousing again the passion for this task.

The prophecies of Zechariah can be subdivided into five sections: (1) 1:1-6, introduction and call to repentance; (2) 1:7 - 6:8, eight night visions; (3) 6:9-15, the symbolic crowning of Joshua the high priest; (4) 7-8, fasting; and (5) 9-14, two prophetic oracles. One of the major issues surrounding the book of Zechariah is the relationship of the latter part of the book, chaps. 9-14, to the rest of the book. This latter part is called "Deutero-Zechariah" or, if divided again into two parts, "Deutero-" and "Trito-Zechariah." The attempts to date these portions range between the time of Jeremiah and

1Zech 1:1.


4It is still debated whether one has to distinguish between chaps. 9-11 as coming from Deutero-Zechariah, and chaps. 12-14 from Trito-Zechariah. B. Otzen, e.g., has dated chaps. 9-13 as late pre-exilic, and chap. 14 as late post-exilic (Studien über Deuterosacharja, Acta Theologica Danica, vol. 6 [Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1964], 11-34); others seek to understand the development of the text in the context of the genesis of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
the time of the Ptolemies, 350-200 B.C.¹ Others see the entire book of Zechariah as a unity.²

Although most of the commentators do not find any common ground as to the dating of the last section of the book, there is general agreement on the apocalyptic and eschatological nature of the last six chapters of Zechariah (chaps. 9-14). The first oracle (chaps. 9-11) contains the announcement of Zion’s king, that God will act on behalf of his people, and the work and destiny of the “good shepherd” which contrasts the actions of the “foolish shepherd.” The second oracle (chaps. 12-14) describes the destiny of the people of God. While studying the literary structure of the chapters under consideration, P. Lamarche concluded that the author of Zechariah constructed chaps. 9-14 according to the whole Dodekapropheton (e.g., O. H. Steck, Der Abschluß der Prophetie im Alten Testament: Ein Versuch zur Frage der Vorgeschichte des Kanons, Biblisch-Theologische Studien 17 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991]; E. Bosshard and R. G. Kratz, “Maleachi im Zwölfprophetenbuch,” Biblische Notizen 52 [1990]: 27-46).


a chiasm thus forming a larger literary unit.\textsuperscript{1} Already C. F. Keil had concluded that the two oracles are “two corresponding portions of a greater whole.”\textsuperscript{2}

\textbf{Zech 10:6-12}

This text is part of the first oracle (chaps. 9-11) whose theme is the announcement of Zion’s coming king. The preceding chap. 9 speaks of God’s divine intervention among various states neighboring Israel, the announcement of the arrival of the king, and the actions that God takes to defend and support his people. Chap. 10 again describes the triumphant intervention of God on behalf of his people. First, he laments the people’s confidence in false gods, diviners, and the lack of the one, good shepherd. The people do not turn to God for the necessary rain and the much needed vegetation in the fields.\textsuperscript{3} Zechariah calls out that God’s anger is kindled against those bad and false shepherds. YHWH himself will care for his flock.\textsuperscript{4} As a result of God’s presence the people gain confidence in the battle. They put to shame their enemies (vss. 4-5). In the following verses Zechariah describes in more detail how God will act on behalf of his people (vss. 6-12):

\begin{quote}
\textit{הִנֵּה הַגְּרוֹן אַחֲרֵי הָיוֹדִעַ יָתְבֵּית יִתְּקֹשׁ אַלּוּכָּת

יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי חָמָסְתָּם וּרְאֵי בְּמִרְדְּשָתָם
ci ḥeir yēhōveh ḥālōhêth

כִּי אֵלָה יָהְוֶה אֶלֹהֵי אֲבָנָם}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{2}Keil, \textit{Minor Prophets}, 2:320.

\textsuperscript{3}Zech 10:1-2.

\textsuperscript{4}Zech 10:3.
And I will strengthen the house of Judah and deliver the house of Joseph, and I will restore them because I have compassion on them, and they will be as though I had not rejected them, for I am YHWH, their God, and I will answer them.

Then Ephraim will be like a mighty man, and their heart will rejoice as with wine, and their children will see and rejoice—their heart will exult in YHWH.

I will whistle for them and gather them, for I shall have redeemed them, and they will multiply as they have multiplied,

Though I will scatter them among the nations, yet in distant lands they will remember me, they along with their children will live, and they will return.

And I will bring them out from the land of Egypt, and from Assyria I will gather them, and to the land of Gilead and Lebanon I will bring them, and not enough room will be found for them.

And He will pass through the sea of distress and smite the waves of the sea, and all the depths of the Nile will dry up. And the pride of Assyria will be brought low, and the scepter of Egypt will depart.

And I will strengthen them in YHWH, and in his name they will walk—utterance of YHWH.

With vs. 6 the oracle abruptly switches back to the divine “I will.” God underlines his decision to turn around the situation and save his people from the calamities and afflictions that had befallen Israel due to the lack of proper leadership. “The parallel structure of the clauses, in which the verbs יבר, “strengthening,” and נשא, “delivering,” appear, gives them a semantic range that extends the connotation of each beyond its
essential meaning, for the strengthening of the people is conceptually one with God’s deliverance, which does not occur apart from his impartation of strength to them.”

God’s mercy refers to both, “the house of Juda” and “the house of Joseph” which are designations for both, the southern and the northern part of the Israelite kingdom. Both shall again be united under one king. Here, the prophet takes up the theme of the coming ideal kingship which he was referring to in the preceding chapter: He will defend his house and keep watch; then, the righteous king will come and bring salvation.

The Hebrew form in vs. 6, הָדַּשְׁתִּים, is difficult to read since it is anomalous. The parallelism to vs. 10, though, allows the reading “I will return/restore them.” Then God gives the reason why he is going to return and restore his scattered and exiled people: נָא יְהוָה אלהֵיהֶם, “for I am YHWH, their God.” This is more than just the resettlement in the land. Here, God refers back to the promise given to Abraham and to

1McComiskey, “Zechariah,” 1180.
2Zech 9:8.
4There are basically two ways to read the form הָדַּשְׁתִּים: if the root is הָדַּשׁ the form should read הָדַּשְׁתִּים, “I will cause them to dwell”; this reading is supported by many Hebrew manuscripts and the LXX which has καὶ κατοίκησι αὐτοῦς, “and I will settle them.” If the root is הָדַּשְׁב the form should read הָדַּשְׁחבָה, “I will return/restore them.” Others suggest the possibility that the Hebrew deliberately has a conflate text in order to carry both meanings (e.g., Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, 175, n. 1). “It is impossible to be certain, but since the discourse calls for a restoration of the people to their original status (‘they will be as though I had not rejected them’), neither of these options greatly affects the direction of the discourse” (McComiskey, “Zechariah,” 1181). Since the prophet takes up the same line of thought in vs. 10—here using the root הָדַּשְׁב—I prefer the reading הָדַּשְׁחָבָה in vs. 6.
the appropriation of its benefits. Part of this promise was the close covenant relationship that the people were to enjoy with their God.\(^1\) This aspect of God's desire to be "their God" is often repeated.\(^2\) This points back directly to Mt. Sinai where the covenant between God and his people was "cut." Already the introduction to the decalogue expresses God's will to be "your God." God promises through Zechariah a future for his people that is characterized by the powerful presence of God in a close covenant relationship. Here, as in the book of Jeremiah, the "new covenant" stands for the eschatological new beginning. The effects of this new relationship will result in a forgetting of the former situation of misery and affliction. It will be as though the experience of exile and rejection by God had never happened.

In vs. 8 Zechariah describes what will happen once God has redeemed (יִבְרָא):

"and they will multiply as they have multiplied" (יִבְרָא נָתַנְתָּם). The second form of בְּרָא, a qal perfect form, refers back to a period in Israel's history when once the people had already experienced such an increase of population. There is only one other context in the history of Israel where the reader is informed that the people increased in great numbers: the Exodus experience! Within this context, the reference to immense population growth appears just before the Exodus\(^3\) and towards the end of their desert

---

\(^1\)Cf. Gen 17:7-8.

\(^2\)Cf. Exod 6:7; Jer 31:33.

\(^3\)Gen 47:27 and Exod 1:7, 12, 20.
journey when they were about to enter the Promised Land.\(^1\) With this reference to an increase of population here, too, a reference to the promise given to Abraham is made.\(^2\)

This retrospective view of Israel's history connects the events of the first Exodus with a future return. It appears as if certain elements that are characteristic of the first coming out from Egypt form a paradigm for the new eschatological Exodus.

Vs. 9 again describes the situation of a scattered nation, “sowed” (םש) among the nations, that is to return (גאש) home. “God will cause them to return [גאש] from the land of Egypt, and He will gather [גאש] them from the land of Assyria” (vs. 10). One would expect that the prophet Zechariah living in the postexilic period mentions Babylon and Persia; yet he talks about Egypt and Assyria. The prophet does not refer to the immediate past (i.e., the experience of exile under Babylonian or Persian dominance respectively). He connects here Assyria, the first land of exile, with Egypt from which the Israelites came out of bondage in their first Exodus. Assyria stands for the hopelessness of a people that has gone into exile but has never returned. Here, the promises of land and offspring that are given in vss. 8-10 gain their power. Although the history of the northern kingdom is one of seemingly failed divine promises, God nevertheless envisions a future for his people. The recent experience of the southern kingdom—their returning home from the Babylonian captivity—does not play any part in this context. It had not been the final goal of God's promises for his people. The reference to the “house of Judah” and to

\(^1\)Deut 1:10.

\(^2\)See Gen 17:2; 22:17.
the “house of Joseph” (vs. 6) envisions a fulfillment for both entities, for a united kingdom. Thus, the overall picture is still one of exile and unfulfilled promise; it is still a situation that awaits reversal.

The fulfillment of God’s promise will exceed the experience of Egypt and even the most recent one of the Babylonian exile (Steigerung). He will bring them back “to the land of Gilead and Lebanon.” “Gilead” and “Lebanon” are no metonomies for Israel or surrogates for the northern kingdom. Rather, they are to be understood as metaphors. Both entities, Gilead and Lebanon, were noted for their fertility, good soil, abundant crops, and splendor. In Jer 22:6 the two are mentioned together denoting power and pride. Although some have assumed that Gilead and Lebanon represent an idealized extension of the land that God had promised his people, the only one commonality that existed between Gilead and Lebanon is that “both are metaphors for the Restoration, the time when the blessings of the new covenant became a reality.” The reference to Gilead recalls God’s provisions promised through the prophet Jeremiah and the prophet Micah where the Shepherd-King is to lead his people to the fertile pasturelands of Gilead.

---


3 Jer 50:19-20.

4 Mic 7:14.
Lebanon, on the other hand, is connected to the restoration of Zion: “The splendor of Lebanon will come to you [Zion].”

The opening line of vs. 11 has been widely debated. The Hebrew reads הָרַו, "and he will pass through the sea of affliction." The Greek translators of the Septuagint were reluctant to view YHWH as passing through a "sea of affliction"; hence they translated καὶ διέλευσανται ("they will pass through") with 'the people' being the subject. The other option that stays in greater harmony with the Hebrew text is to consider YHWH who is the subject of the subsequent verse, or even the king-shepherd who is announced in 9:2 and badly missed in 10:2, as the subject of this sentence. The relationship of בֵּית and יִשְׂרָאֵל is not defined in the Hebrew text by a construct chain ("sea of affliction"), it is, however, an appositional relationship that defines the sea more properly.

1 Isa 60:13.

2 This reading is preferred, e.g., by Elliger (Zwölf kleine Propheten, 155), Barker ("Zechariah," 673), and Laubach (Der Prophet Sacharja), 120.

3 E.g., Keil, Minor Prophets, 2:352; McComiskey, "Zechariah," 1185. M. Sæbø considers Moses as the subject. He writes: "Hinter dem Geschehen steht als der eigentlich Handelnde natürlich Jahwe, der nun aber kaum aus diesem Grund direkt als Subjekt der Verben von V.11a unbedingt angenommen werden braucht. . . . Wenn aber die Überlieferung die Gestalt des Mose derart in die Machtsphäre Jahwes einbezogen hat, daß er auf Jahwes Geheiß durch seinen Stab das Meer 'spalten' kann, wie Gott selbst (etwa Ex 14:16; 14:21; Ps 78:13), dann befremdet wohl auch nicht das Element der (mächtigen) Wellen in diesem Bild. Aber bei alledem bleibt V.11a doch änigmatisch und schwerdeutig, sein 'Er' merkwürdig anonym; die Entscheidung, ob hier Jahwe oder sein Knecht gemeint sei, ist letzten Endes nicht leicht" (Sacharja 9-14, 225).

4 W. Rudolph wants to read this part as a status constructus, “das Meer der Enge . . . also Meerenge [strait]” (Sacharja 9-14, 194); similar the Septuagint: ἐν δαλάςση στενή.
as affliction. "He will pass through affliction as through the sea." Here, the prophet Zechariah declares in figurative language that those who are scattered throughout the foreign lands, who still live in captivity and bondage, "will follow along the way opened to them by the Lord as He goes ahead through all the barriers between them and their land."\(^1\) Egypt and Assyria are mentioned again here in this verse as symbols of oppression and bondage that are going to cease.

The last verse of this passage concludes this passage. It is structured according to a chiasm:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{A. } \text{"I will strengthen them"} \\
\text{B. } \text{"in YHWH"} \\
\text{B' } \text{"in his name"} \\
\text{A' } \text{"they will walk."}^2
\end{array}
\]

"and I will strengthen them," echoes the introduction to vs. 6, "and I will strengthen." The latter as well as the former have YHWH as the subject. YHWH wants to strengthen his people in YHWH. It appears as if the king-shepherd, whom the prophet Zechariah is announcing, is YHWH himself. When YHWH strengthens his people he is saving them (see vs. 6); they walk with him, in his name.

Summary

Zechariah underlines again that God's judgment is not the end. God is going to save his people from the dispersion among the foreign lands and will bring them out of the

---

\(^1\) Baldwin, Zechariah, 177.

\(^2\) Ibid.
land of exile. They will be reunited under the ideal, messianic king who will defend and watch over his people. Zechariah announces a future for Israel that is characterized by the powerful presence of God in a close covenant relationship. This new covenant stands for the eschatological new beginning. The motifs of this new Exodus have their basis in the historical Exodus from Egypt; the old Exodus is the Vorbild for the new one. This new Exodus will exceed the former experience (Steigerung).

Summary

The prophetic writers stand between the past and the future. They function as links that connect the historical event of the Exodus from Egypt with the future redemption that is yet to come. Whenever the prophet builds on the Exodus, the historicity of the event is assumed. The factum of the past redemption is the pledge for the coming redemption. If there was no past redemption, the prophet could not have fostered the hope for a second one. The pentateuchal traditions about the exile in Egypt and the deliverance from this exile were the mold for the formation of the entire messianic idea, which is envisioned as a new Exodus. The historical Exodus is the Vorbild for the new one! Images and words connect this new experience of redemption with the old deliverance. As in the Exodus from Egypt, God will again lead his people during the day and follow them through the night, he will lead them in the wilderness and through the sea, he will provide water in the desert. God’s deeds of deliverance will be praised in songs of celebration, God’s word that once was heard at Mt. Sinai will again be heard.
Yet, this new Exodus event not only is a repetition of events, it will be something unique, something new, something greater that transcends the old Exodus. The new redemption will be a *Steigerung!* Instead of leaving Egypt in haste, the new Exodus will not be one of flight; this new Exodus will cause the original one to be forgotten, there will be a new and greater covenant. Israel will be gathered from the four corners of the world—not only Israel, YHWH will gather believers from every nation; the people will be transformed physically (the eyes of the blind will be opened, the ears of the deaf unstopped, the lame will leap like deer, and the mute tongue shout for joy) and spiritually (they will be a “clean” people walking on the “Way of Holiness”). This whole new Exodus experience will be a greater and more magnificent event than the deliverance from Egypt. The old Exodus, or the “former things,” the “things of old,” will be completely overshadowed by the “things to come,” “the new things.” The new exodus will be a radically new event.

Indeed, this new Exodus introduces an age so radically new and transforming that its prophetic dimensions exceed the particular exile-event, and point to a new eschatological time. The historical event is not the *Vorbild* for multiple redeeming events that may affect Israel’s future. It is not a paradigm for any salvation or redemption that may happen to the people of God; it is a single eschatological event defined after the *Vorbild* and including a *Steigerung*. The whole trajectory of this Exodus-“Typology” finds its goal in the eschatological fulfillment. The redemption of the new Exodus does not focus on the future in general. The fulfillment is not just any positive turn of Israel’s history. The focus is the eschatological redemption. The relationship of type and anti-
type, *Vorbild* and *Nachbild*, is defined by the two ends: historical event and eschatological fulfillment.

With the new Exodus and covenant, a new messianic king, a shoot from the stump of Jesse, a Davidic ruler will appear. The Spirit of YHWH will rest on him. He will lead out on this new Exodus. With him the presence of YHWH, God's dwelling among his people, will return into the midst of his people. This eschatological hope is extended beyond the limits of the people of Israel. All gentile nations are invited to join the messianic kingdom. The future is characterized by forgiveness, and the sins of God’s people are no longer remembered. The "righteous branch" will truly administer justice (צדקתי) and righteousness (צדקתי); his name is “YHWH, our righteousness” (יְהוָה יְשׁוּעָתָנוּ) . The promised future is described in terms that remind one of the Garden in Eden, thus implying a new creation for this new redemption. The new Exodus is in fact an Exodus into an eschatological age. Yet, this hope of a new deliverance, of a new Exodus to be accomplished under the direction of the Messiah, remained a hope. It is true that there was a return from the Babylonian captivity. But this event did not mark the fulfillment of the expectations of the new Exodus as foretold by the prophets. *Relative Eschatology* let the people expect the *eschaton* after the captivity. They had the hope that similar to the inheritance of the Promised Land after the first Exodus from Egypt the return of Israel from the Babylonian exile was the fulfillment of the proclaimed “new Exodus.” Yet, this fulfillment of the *eschaton* remained preliminary. With the progress of history God revealed more detail to the eschatological picture which made clear that the
return of the Israelites from the Babylonian captivity was not the eschatological fulfillment that they expected.

This chapter shows that the major elements that comprise the structure of biblical typology—as outlined by Davidson—are also part of the Exodus tradition within the Prophetic Writings. Figure 2 and table 7 summarize the findings.

![Figure 2. Type/anti-type relationship within the context of the prophetic writings.](image)

The basis for what the prophets say about the new Exodus is the historical event of the first Exodus when Israel went out of Egypt and spent the following years in the wilderness. This event is either assumed as being factual history, or the prophet directly refers back to the first Exodus in their various oracles. In the prophetic writings the prophetic indicator is not directly connected with the event itself. The prophet stands in between. He relates past with the future underlining that both past and future are God's
doing (divine design). As in the Pentateuchal tradition, there is a *Steigerung* between the *Vorbild* and the *Nachbild*. The fulfillment of the *Nachbild* reaches into the *eschaton*.

Thus, the major elements of biblical typology are found in the context of the historical Exodus within the Pentateuchal traditions. These elements are summarized as shown in table 7:

Table 7. Typological Elements within the Context of the Prophetic Writings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Aspect</th>
<th>Divine Design</th>
<th>Prophetic Aspect</th>
<th>Steigerung</th>
<th>Eschatology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isa 11:10-16</td>
<td>Exodus assumed</td>
<td>YHWH will employ the same means</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>Not limited to Judah → all nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 35</td>
<td>Exodus assumed</td>
<td>YHWH will come and save</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>Transformation of man and nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 40:3-5</td>
<td>Exodus assumed</td>
<td>The glory of YHWH will be revealed</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>All humanity will see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 41:17-20</td>
<td>Exodus assumed</td>
<td>YHWH creates anew</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>New creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 43:1-3, 16-21</td>
<td>YHWH made a way through the sea</td>
<td>YHWH is doing a &quot;new&quot; thing</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>God's protection has a broader range in mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 49:8-12</td>
<td>Exodus assumed</td>
<td>YHWH is doing it</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>Global deliverance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 51:1-52:15</td>
<td>&quot;Was it not you who dried up the sea?&quot;</td>
<td>Personal divine action</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>YHWH's acts will affect the whole earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer 23:5-8</td>
<td>&quot;As surely as YHWH lives, who brought Israel up out of Egypt&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;As surely as YHWH lives, who brought Israel up out of all countries.&quot;</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>Return from all countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer 30-31</td>
<td>Exodus assumed</td>
<td>YHWH restores their fortunes</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>Return from all the ends of the earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos 2:16-17</td>
<td>&quot;As in the days Israel came up out of Egypt&quot;</td>
<td>YHWH's doing</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>New entry into the land will not be blurred by another Achan-experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Prophet</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos 12:10</td>
<td>“Ever since Egypt I will again cause you...”</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>Transformation of the wilderness</td>
<td>“New” prophet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic 4:9-10</td>
<td>Exodus assumed YHWH will redeem</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>Many nations will be beaten in pieces</td>
<td>Messianic kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic 7:14-15</td>
<td>“As in the days of your coming out of Egypt” YHWH will show wonderful deeds</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>Nations will be ashamed—judgment</td>
<td>Messianic context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zec 10:6-12</td>
<td>Exodus assumed YHWH will gather them</td>
<td>Prophecy</td>
<td>Exhaustive fertility</td>
<td>Ideal kingship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has sought to ascertain whether there are indicators of typology within the Old Testament by examining relevant Old Testament passages. This examination seems to be crucial for establishing the exegetical and hermeneutical basis for the use of typology by the New Testament writers.

Chapter 1 demonstrated how typology was viewed and used throughout the centuries. The traditional approach considers persons, events or actions, and institutions as being divinely ordained or designed types to foreshadow aspects of Christ and his ministry in the Gospels and New Testament dispensation. Immediately following the Apostolic period, the Church Fathers heavily utilized the concept of “types” fueled by a zeal for the living unity of the Scriptures. They also employed the typological approach in their defense against Judaism and Gnosticism. During this time and especially later in the medieval period typology often took on an allegorical shape.

In the Reformation of the sixteenth century, Reformers such as Martin Luther and John Calvin turned away from allegory, rejected the search for multiple meanings, and explored the literal and historical meaning of the text. Although the Reformers engaged in typology, they never formulated a systematic approach to typology. During the following years of Protestant Orthodoxy, scholars tried to formulate a more systematized approach.
With the offensive of rationalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the
unity of the Old and New Testaments was called into question, thus precluding the
existence of types. Those who maintained a traditional perspective tried to come to grips
with the question as to how to identify a type.

The first comprehensive survey of New Testament typology from a modern
historical perspective was done by Leonard Goppelt who, following the traditional view of
typology, characterized typology as prospective. Although the historical-critical approach
repudiated typology, there was, especially after World War II, an astounding revival of
interest in biblical typology. Two main approaches are to be distinguished: The “Pattern
of God’s Acts” approach and the “Historical Hermeneutics” approach. In the first
approach, typology is used to express the consistency of God’s redemptive activity in the
Old and the New Israel on the basis of a regular, repeating pattern (often in the framework
of cyclical time). Typology is not a method of exegesis or interpretation but the study of
historical and theological correspondences in regard to God’s saving activity. The second
approach is based on the conviction that the key is to be found in hermeneutical principles
displayed by contemporaries of the New Testament’s writers and rabbinical Judaism.

While these approaches tend to downplay an inherent relationship in terms of
typology between the two Testaments, the evangelical camp revived the debate. Yet, each
scholar seemed to work with her/his own definition of typology and worked with a
disparity of views regarding the nature of biblical typology. Therefore, various voices
demanded a hermeneutically controlled typology.
The first step to fill this vacuum was done by Richard M. Davidson who wrote a dissertation on typology in order to determine the nature of biblical typology. He analyzed hermeneutical τύπος passages in the New Testament. With his definition of biblical typology, Davidson clearly distanced himself from the postcritical position and put himself in line with the traditional approach to typology whose major elements he saw affirmed by the biblical data: Types are rooted in historical realities; divinely designed prefiguration; there is a prospective or predictive thrust within the Old Testament type. The question of the "prophetic" element stands at the core of the issue. If typology is devoid of any prospective or prophetic thrust, one has to conclude that typology is merely a form of analogical thinking or retrospective analogy. And this notion of "retrospectivity" has been a vital aspect in many modern scholars' perception and evaluation of typology. On the other hand, if there is a prophetic, prospective element within typology that could be exegeted from the Old Testament text, the New Testament writers would have a hermeneutical basis for their interpretation that was hermeneutically controlled.

Chapter 2 sought to establish the basic elements that are part of a biblical typology suggested by Davidson's definition (the historical structure which includes the element of Steigerung [escalation] on the part of the anti-type or Nachbild; the prophetic structure; and the eschatological structure) within the historical context of the Exodus (i.e. the Pentateuch). Various passages that are directly linked to or describe the event of the Exodus from Egypt—such as Exod 15 and Num 23-24—were discussed.

The Exodus from the land of bondage was the single most important event that shaped the understanding of the history of Israel and its identity and self-understanding.
At all times the incidents of this event were considered to be real events that actually happened. Subsequent generations based their identity on the belief that these events happened as recorded in Holy Scripture. They not only happened but were also initiated by YHWH who was the one who led Israel out of Egypt (divinely designed).

The study of the Song of Moses (Exod 15) revealed that the experience of the safe passage through the Sea is immediately connected with a future redemption that is phrased in similar terms as the experience the Israelites just went through. The intentional positioning of the historical description of redemption on one side and a future redemption put in parallel linguistics and motifs puts both in close relation to each other and lends weight to the assumption that the former serves as a type, or Vorbild, for the latter. In the same way as God led his people out of Egypt he will lead them eventually to their final destination.

Similarly in Num 23 and Num 24 a new “coming out” is expected on the basis of the historical Vorbild. The almost parallel wording points to an intended type/anti-type connection. The author of the Pentateuch intentionally emphasizes this close relationship of past and future. Not only will this nachbildliche event happen in the same way as the Vorbild; it will be a greater event, a Steigerung. Whereas Israel in her Exodus from Egypt had to fight the Egyptian army and the raging waters, the future will bring redemption from all her enemies which will be subdued like the elements of nature. The relation between type and anti-type is characterized by a Steigerung. The fulfillment of the Nachbild will be on a much broader level. Part of this Steigerung is the eschatological aspect of the fulfillment of the Nachbild (and connected with the eschatological aspect the
messianic element). The anti-type always describes an eschatological *Sachverhalt*. It is not a person, event, or institution that could play some kind of a role any time within the historical framework of Israel's history. The future is not open in terms of multiple possible fulfillments. The *Vorbild* does not relate to a "recurring rhythm or patterns" but to a single horizon of fulfillment. The anti-type is always eschatological. This is underlined by a strong messianic notion, especially in Num 23-24. The *Nachbild* is not a vague event, person, or institution in the future, but is always related to salvific actions by God on behalf of his people in order to accomplish the *eschaton*. One of the major characteristics of these passages that connect the past with the future is the prophetic indication. In each case, where the text reveals a *Vorbild—Nachbild* relation, it is the prophet who uses the historical context of the *Vorbild* to "create" a future vision of events molded after the *Vorbild* using similar language and imagery. Thus the *Nachbild* is a prophecy.

Chapter 3 sought to investigate passages within the prophetic writings that deal with the Exodus motif. While the passages of the Pentateuch stand in direct connection to the historical event of the Exodus, the prophets hold an intermediary place in relation to the type and anti-type. While detached from the *Vorbild* they point to the *Nachbild* that is yet to come. They function as links that connect the past redemption from the house of bondage with the future redemption. The prophets as well as all generations before and after them in biblical times assumed the historicity of the Exodus event. The pentateuchal tradition of the exile in Egypt and the subsequent deliverance from bondage and exile were the mold for the formation of the entire messianic idea. In their vision of the age to come
the prophets used the *Vorbild* of the historical Exodus from Egypt as their basis to
describe the *Nachbild*, the new Exodus, using the same language and imagery in a close
relation to each other.

The prophets take up the thread of prophetic indication that was discovered in
the context of the description of the *Vorbild*. With their prophetic authority they
proclaimed another Exodus that would happen not only in similar terms as the first one but
would include the element of *Steigerung* as well. This whole new Exodus experience will
be a greater and more magnificent event than the redemption from Egypt. The old
Exodus, the "former Things," the "things of old," will be completely overshadowed by the
"things to come," or the "new things." The new Exodus will be a radically new event.

This new Exodus introduces an age so radically new and transforming that its
prophetic dimensions exceed the immanent exile-return horizon (*Steigerung*); it points to
a new eschatological time under the leadership of the Messiah. While many texts at first
might refer to the Babylonian exile and the subsequent return, it becomes clear that the
intention of the prophet goes beyond this immanent fulfillment. The whole trajectory of
the *Vorbild—Nachbild* relation is the eschaton. Again, there are not multiple fulfillments
in view, but only one, the eschatological redemption.

On the basis of the above mentioned findings I would conclude the following in
regard to defining Exodus typology from an Old Testament perspective:

1. There is in fact a type/anti-type relation that connects the Old with the New
Testament.
2. This type/anti-type relation is based on a historical structure. It includes a divine design and the element of *Steigerung*.

3. The announcement of the anti-type, or *Nachbild*, is always a prophecy (and thereby hermeneutically controlled).

4. The anti-type has no multiple fulfillments but only one.

5. The anti-type finds its fulfillment only in the *eschaton*, i.e., in Christ, the Messiah, or in the realities of the new covenant related to and brought about by Christ.

These basic concepts—the historical structure, the prophetic indicator, divine design, and *Steigerung*—can function as hermeneutical controls when one investigates Old Testament persons, events, or institutions in order to establish possible typological significance. The notion that typology is a concept that cannot be established on the basis of exegesis does not stand the test. It appears that the New Testament writers had ample data, based on a hermeneutically controlled exegesis of the Old Testament, to interpret the Jesus event as a New Exodus!

Future research should focus on other typological themes and motifs (such as Adam, David, the sanctuary and its services, etc.) that are supposed to exist between the Old and the New Testaments to confirm further these connections with regard to typology in general. The specific nature of single traits of typology should be further explored and clarified.

---

1 See Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible*, 197-198.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Cooper, David L. The Eternal God Revealing Himself to Suffering Israel and to Lost Humanity. Harrisburg, PA: Evangelical Press, 1928.


317


Der Taheb: Ein 'messianischer' Heilsbringer der Samaritaner.


Döderlein, Johann C. Esaias: Ex recensione textus hebraei ad fidem codd. quorum MSS et versionum antiquarum latine vertit notasque varii argumenti. Altorfii: Venum prostat in officina Schupfeliana, 1775.


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


Hanson, Richard P. C. *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen’s Interpretation of Scripture.* Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1959.


Jarnes, David C. "Did Matthew Twist Scripture?" *Ministry*, July 1984, 4-6, 30.


_____. What the Bible Says about the End-Time. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1994.


______. “Passahfest und Passahlegende.” Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 52 (1934): 161-175.


Smith, Uriah. *Looking unto Jesus; or, Christ in Type and Antitype*. Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald, 1897.


