

Copyright © 2015 John Wesley Fowler

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for the purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

COMMUNICATING THE GOSPEL THROUGH CHRISTOLOGICAL
TYPOLOGY IN THE PENTATEUCH AT FIRST BAPTIST
CHURCH, MAYFIELD, KENTUCKY

A Project
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Ministry

by
John Wesley Fowler
December 2015

APPROVAL SHEET

COMMUNICATING THE GOSPEL THROUGH CHRISTOLOGICAL
TYPOLOGY IN THE PENTATEUCH AT FIRST BAPTIST
CHURCH, MAYFIELD, KENTUCKY

John Wesley Fowler

Read and Approved by:

Terry J. Betts (Faculty Supervisor)

Russell T. Fuller

Date _____

To Tara Brook,
my beautiful wife, a precious gift from God;
to Braxton and Bryley,
our blessings from the Lord;
to Barry and Debby Fowler,
my faithful, supportive, and loving parents;
to Dr. Phil West and Rev. Mac Weaver,
my mentors in life and ministry;
and to First Baptist Mayfield,
my family in Christ.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.....	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose.....	1
Goals.....	1
Ministry Context.....	2
Rationale.....	4
Definitions.....	7
Limitations and Delimitations.....	9
Research Methodology.....	10
2. BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL SUPPORT.....	13
Introduction.....	13
John 3:14-15: Bronze Serpent.....	14
John 19:31-37: Passover Lamb.....	17
Romans 5:12-19: Adam.....	22
Hebrews 2:17-10:31: High Priest.....	26
Hebrews 3:1-6: Moses.....	31
Hebrews 8:1-10:20: Tabernacle.....	35

Chapter	Page
Hebrews 9:11-10:14: Sin Sacrifice.....	38
Conclusion.....	42
3. THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL SUPPORT.....	44
Introduction.....	44
Christological Typology in the Patristic Period.....	44
Christological Typology in the Medieval Period.....	49
Christological Typology in the Reformation Period.....	55
Christological Typology in the Modern Period.....	59
Conclusion.....	64
4. IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT.....	65
Introduction.....	65
Project Schedule.....	65
Selection of Panel.....	66
Sermon Outline Development.....	67
Initial Assessment.....	68
Proclamation of Sermon Series.....	69
Sermon 1: John 3:1-15.....	70
Sermon 2: John 19:31-37.....	72
Sermon 3: Romans 5:12-21.....	73
Sermon 4: Hebrews 3:1-6.....	74
Sermon 5: Hebrews 4:14-5:10.....	76
Sermon 6: Hebrews 9:1-14.....	77

Chapter	Page
Sermon 7: Hebrews 9:11-14.....	79
Sermon 8: Hebrews 10:1-10.....	80
Final Assessment.....	82
5. EVALUATION OF PROJECT.....	84
Introduction.....	84
Evaluation of the Project’s Purpose.....	84
Evaluation of the Project’s Goals.....	86
Strengths of the Project.....	88
Weaknesses of the Project.....	90
What I Would Do Differently.....	92
Theological Reflections.....	93
Miscellaneous Reflections.....	94
Personal Reflections.....	95
Conclusion.....	98
Appendix.....	99
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	104

PREFACE

First, I would like to thank my family for allowing me to complete the Doctor of Ministry program. Degrees such as this require a significant amount of time and effort, and my wife and our two children have faithfully supported me throughout. I would also like to thank my family in the Lord, First Baptist Church of Mayfield, Kentucky. From the onset, First Baptist Mayfield has provided encouragement, additional time away from the church, and an immeasurable amount of prayer. I will always be grateful for the patience and support of my wife and children, and I will also be grateful for the generosity of First Baptist Mayfield.

Second, I would like to thank those who provided me with a solid foundation in life and ministry. My mom and dad instilled in me a strong work ethic, and they have been a bedrock of support through every stage of life. Phil West and Mac Weaver mentored me in ministry. While I was serving as the youth pastor at First Baptist Church in Valdosta, Georgia, these two men, along with the entire church body, invested in me and in my theological education. Any success that I have enjoyed in life is first by the grace of God, and second, because of those who provided me with a solid foundation.

Third, I would like to thank those who made this project possible. As my faculty supervisor, T. J. Betts has been a tremendous source of wisdom, guidance, and encouragement. His knowledge of the Scriptures, coupled with his passion for teaching, has greatly enhanced my theological education. As my proofreader, Mike

Baker assisted me through every chapter, and his input made a significant difference in the quality of my work. I am thankful for his scholarship, and more importantly, I am thankful for his friendship.

Last, I would like to thank The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. I was encouraged by every class and challenged by every professor. My understanding of the Bible, my appreciation for the sovereignty of God, my knowledge of expository preaching, and my love for Jesus have all been strengthened through the Doctor of Ministry program. I will forever be grateful for the theological education I received from Southern Seminary.

John Wesley Fowler

Mayfield, Kentucky
December 2015

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this project was to communicate the gospel through Christological typology in the Pentateuch at First Baptist Church, Mayfield, Kentucky.

Goals

The first goal of this project was to assess the congregation's current knowledge of the gospel as witnessed through Christological typology in the Pentateuch. I measured this goal by a questionnaire administered to a 10 person panel (see Research Instrument 1). In an effort to form a representative sampling of the church, this panel consisted of regularly attending youth, median-aged adults, and senior adults who were members of First Baptist Mayfield. The definition of "regularly attending" was considered at least 75 percent Sunday school attendance within the past year.

The second goal of this project was to develop sermon outlines for an eight-week expository sermon series that communicated the gospel through the proclamation of Christological typology in the Pentateuch. I measured this goal by using a predetermined rubric completed by the pastoral staff at First Baptist Mayfield (see Research Instrument 2). The pastoral staff evaluated each sermon outline separately for standard sermonic features such as introduction, body, conclusion, use of illustrations, and application, but primarily focused on evaluating the understandability of the specific Christological

typology being preached, and whether or not the gospel was being revealed and proclaimed.

The third goal of this project was to communicate the gospel through Christological typology in the Pentateuch by preaching the eight-week sermon series to the congregation at First Baptist Mayfield. After the sermon series was complete, I scheduled a second meeting with the representative panel of 10 regularly attending members, and administered a post-sermon series questionnaire. The post-sermon series questionnaire was identical to the pre-sermon series questionnaire. I compared the results of the post-sermon series questionnaire to the initial assessment in an effort to determine the effectiveness of the sermon series. The objective was to achieve a statistically significant increase in the panel's knowledge of the gospel as witnessed through Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

Ministry Context

First Baptist Mayfield is a faithful church. They love the Lord, they love the Bible, they are eager to serve, they enjoy worship, they have a heart for missions, and they give faithfully. However, despite their faithfulness, there was a genuine lack of knowledge and appreciation for the gospel as witnessed through Christological typology in the Pentateuch. They were certainly aware of both the Old and New Testaments. They knew of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Old Testament, and they knew of the disciples, Paul, and Jesus in the New Testament. They knew God's Word was inspired and inerrant, and they knew that salvation was through Jesus alone. What they failed to understand was the grand overarching plan of redemption revealed by God through typology in both the Old and New Testaments.

Through many previous difficulties and times of transition, there was a lack of focus on teaching the full council of God's Word. Although unintentional, the inconsistency in pulpit supply during interim periods, coupled with the strained and tumultuous relationship with a short-tenured pastor, resulted in a church focused primarily on specific stories and topics within the Bible, but with no real connection to the grand picture of God's Word. As a result, there was a genuine lack of understanding concerning how the very beginning of God's Word, the Pentateuch, points directly to the coming Messiah through typology. This lack of understanding may very well be a common struggle among churches, but the magnitude of the problem at First Baptist Mayfield was intensified due to a significant period of instability.

Recently, while preaching through portions of the Pentateuch, and specifically while speaking of the protoevangelium in Genesis 3:15, a discernable level of interest and curiosity was present within the congregation. Multiple members expressed a desire to learn more about discovering Jesus in the Old Testament. This interest was heightened even further as we approached Genesis 3:21 and made a parallel between God clothing and covering Adam and Eve, and Christ clothing and covering a believer's guilt and shame. Although I had been aware for some time of the prophecy of Genesis 3:15 and the Christological typology of Genesis 3:21, I could sense that for many it was very fresh.

As First Baptist Mayfield continued its journey through portions of the Pentateuch, many hints of Christ consistently surfaced. Whether it was Adam, Noah, Moses, Abraham, Joseph, the Passover lamb, or the high priest, God's grand story of redemption seemed to be woven throughout the fabric of the Pentateuch. Although our time of study was not devoted towards typology, through this initial journey, many began

to see a glimpse of the larger picture for the first time. The New Testament was not merely a collection of unconnected stories, and the Pentateuch was not outdated and useless. There was a grand story waiting to be revealed. There was a connection between Genesis and Jesus. God had orchestrated an overarching redemptive plan that could be consistently witnessed in both the Old and New Testaments through typology. For those who began to see this truth, a genuine sense of awe was expressed.

Generally speaking, the Pentateuch has been neglected, misused, and sometimes even abused. It has a reputation for being lengthy, intimidating, and difficult to read. It often speaks of people, places, and times that are so far removed from modern culture, that many people find it challenging to relate. As an unfortunate result, the gospel within the Pentateuch has gone unnoticed. The Bible has been viewed as a collection of individual and unconnected stories, rather than a seamlessly connected meta-narrative of God's redemptive plan. The Pentateuch has been labeled as God's ancient law with little, if any, relevance for the New Testament church. Typology, which brings significant unity to the Bible, has become all but a foreign concept within the church. Although I believe this oversight to be a common struggle among twenty-first century churches, it certainly was the case within the congregation of First Baptist Mayfield.

Rationale

Many within the membership of First Baptist Mayfield had the misperception that the Pentateuch was a collection of independent stories with no significant connection to the New Testament. Though unintentional, through multiple years of unorganized and sporadic preaching, the cohesiveness and unity of God's Word was missed, and the

gospel within the Pentateuch was ignored. As a result, there were at least three aspects of Christianity that, generally speaking, First Baptist Mayfield failed to fully appreciate: the sovereignty of God, the sufficiency of Jesus, and the harmony of God's Word.

God's sovereignty was misunderstood because he was portrayed as inconsistent. Many believed that God established one set of standards for those who lived during the Old Testament era, and then established a completely new standard for those in the New Testament age. In the Old Testament, God seemed to be focused on justice and wrath, while in the New Testament, grace, mercy, and love were emphasized. God seemed very exclusive in the Old Testament by selecting Israel as his chosen people, while in the New Testament all who called upon the name of Jesus were saved. As a whole, First Baptist Mayfield struggled to adequately appreciate the sovereignty and consistency of God because they were unaware of God's grand story revealed in part through typology. This oversight had the potential to result in a belief in two very different gods, or at the very least a belief in one God who was terribly inconsistent. Our study of Christological typology in the Pentateuch revealed *one* God, who had *one* story, with *one* overarching purpose, and *one* redeeming savior.

As a direct consequence of being unaware of Christological typology, First Baptist Mayfield necessarily misunderstood the sufficiency of God's one and only Son, Jesus Christ. Although I was relatively new as their pastor, it was clear that many within the congregation identified Jesus as a figure with relevance only in the New Testament. As a result, I had little doubt that the Pentateuch had been marginalized and seldom proclaimed from a Christological perspective. It was likely that the majority of messages preached from the Pentateuch focused primarily on the moral and ethical lessons to be

learned, with little, if any, attention focused towards the greater Christological significance. The common belief that “we are a New Testament church and therefore should preach exclusively from the New Testament” was promoted, while the truth of God’s overarching redemptive plan remained neglected. As a result, the sufficiency of Jesus to atone for all throughout history who have responded by faith was only partially recognized.

Lastly, as a result of Christological typology being overlooked, the very tool that God provided for proclamation was misunderstood. I feared that many within the congregation of First Baptist Mayfield viewed God’s Word as a confusing collection of unrelated, unconnected, and seemingly unimportant stories. As a tragic consequence, a great portion of the Bible had been deemed archaic and useless. If my fears were accurate, the full counsel of God’s Word had been disregarded, the overarching theme of God’s grace had been ignored, and the grand story of redemption had gone unnoticed. Therefore, it was vital for First Baptist Mayfield to understand that the gospel began not merely in the pages of the New Testament, but from the very beginning of God’s Word, in the characters and stories of the Pentateuch through typology.

Specifically for this project, First Baptist Mayfield needed to witness the cohesiveness of God’s Word through the proclamation of Christological typology in the Pentateuch. Although many aspects of the Bible promote unity, nothing communicates God’s overarching redemptive plan more clearly than Christological typology. God, in his great sovereignty, pointed directly to the coming Savior through passages written millenniums before his coming. With great purpose and overwhelmingly convincing proofs, Jesus was proclaimed throughout the pages of the Pentateuch. What was once

portrayed as a collection of independent stories becomes an interconnected grand story focused on the long awaited Messiah. This was the message of hope that First Baptist Mayfield needed to understand. This was the message of grace that many at First Baptist Mayfield were eager to hear. This is the message of sovereignty that the world needs to know.

Definitions

Seven terms in this project were potentially ambiguous if left undefined.

Therefore, the following definitions have been provided:

Gospel. The word “gospel” was defined as “the joyous proclamation of God’s redemptive activity in Christ Jesus on behalf of humans enslaved by sin.”¹

Typology. Two primary sources provided the foundation for the definition of typology. The first source was G. K. Beale’s definition that typology is “the study of analogical correspondences among revealed truths about persons, events, institutions, and other things within the historical framework of God’s special revelation, which, from a retrospective view, are of a prophetic nature and are escalated in their meaning.”² The second source was Graeme Goldsworthy’s definition that “typology is the recognition that within Scripture itself certain events, people, and institutions in biblical history bear a particular relationship to later events, people or institutions. The relationship is such

¹Walter A. Elwell, ed., *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 512-13.

²G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 14.

that the earlier foreshadows the later, and the later fills out or completes the earlier.”³

Expository preaching. Expository preaching was defined as “the communication of a biblical concept, derived from and transmitted through a historical, grammatical, and literary study of a passage in its context, which the Holy Spirit first applies to the personality and experience of the preacher, then through the preacher, applies to the hearers.”⁴

Meta-narrative. The term “meta-narrative” was used to describe the grand story of God’s plan for redemption revealed through both Old and New Testaments. As stated by Greidanus,

Redemptive history is the mighty river that runs from the old covenant to the new and holds the two together. It is true, of course, that there is progression in redemptive history, but it is one redemptive history. It is true that there is an old covenant and a new covenant, but it is one covenant of grace. It is true that the sacrifice of Christ brought an end to Old Testament temple worship with its blood sacrifices, but Christians are still required to bring sacrifices to the same God. Progression in redemptive history takes place within the continuity of a single redemptive history.⁵

Youth. The term “youth” was defined as a person no younger than thirteen years of age and no older than eighteen years of age.⁶

Median-aged. The term “median-aged” was defined as a person no younger

³Graeme Goldsworthy, *Preaching the Whole Bible as Christian Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 77.

⁴Haddon W. Robinson, *Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 31.

⁵Sidney Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament: Contemporary Hermeneutical Method* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 48.

⁶This age range is defined in the “Ministry and Committee Handbook” of First Baptist Mayfield.

than nineteen years of age and no older than forty-nine years of age.⁷

Senior. The term “senior,” when referencing a senior adult, was defined as a person no younger than fifty years of age.⁸

Limitations and Delimitations

The primary limitation of this project was the recommended fifteen-week implementation period. In an effort to satisfy this recommendation, the following schedule was proposed. I selected and surveyed the representative panel of 10 regularly attending members during week 1. I developed sermon outlines that communicated the gospel through Christological typology in the Pentateuch during weeks 2 through 5. After developing the initial outlines, I met regularly with the pastoral staff of First Baptist Mayfield to evaluate and finalize the sermon outlines. On week 6, I met with the representative panel of 10 regularly attending members to administer the pre-sermon series questionnaire. I then preached the eight-week expository sermon series during weeks 7 through 14. Lastly, I re-administered the questionnaire to the representative panel of 10 regularly attending members during week 15.

There were four delimitations for this project. First, only the representative panel of 10 regularly attending members of First Baptist Mayfield took the pre and post-sermon series questionnaires. Second, only the pastoral staff at First Baptist Mayfield evaluated each sermon outline by use of a predetermined rubric. Third, the eight-week sermon series was confined to First Baptist Mayfield. Fourth, the eight-week sermon

⁷This age range is defined in the “Ministry and Committee Handbook” of First Baptist Mayfield.

⁸Ibid.

series contained only select examples of Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

Research Methodology

I selected a representative panel of 10 regularly attending members from the congregation of First Baptist Mayfield. This panel consisted of 2 youth, 4 median-aged adults, and 4 senior adults. As previously stipulated, at least 75 percent Sunday school attendance within the past one-year period constituted “regularly attending.” I selected this panel in cooperation and consultation with the pastoral staff at First Baptist Mayfield. Once the panel was selected, and each member had agreed to participate, I scheduled a meeting to administer a pre-sermon series questionnaire.

Prior to meeting with the panel, I developed sermon outlines for an eight-week expository sermon series to communicate the gospel through the proclamation of Christological typology in the Pentateuch. I purposefully narrowed my typology selections to only those mentioned by New Testament authors. After developing the initial outlines, I asked the pastoral staff at First Baptist Mayfield to evaluate each outline by using a predetermined rubric. The rubric evaluated standard sermonic features such as introduction, body, and conclusion, as well as more specific features such as whether the gospel was clearly proclaimed, and whether Christological typology was clearly communicated. I took each evaluation into consideration and made the necessary adjustments before finalizing each outline.

At the initial meeting with the panel, I briefly introduced the project, and then I administered the predetermined questionnaire to evaluate the panel’s knowledge of the gospel as witnessed through Christological typology in the Pentateuch. The introduction of the project to the panel was purposefully vague, defining only the most necessary of

terms, in an effort to gain a truer understanding of their pre-sermon series knowledge. The questionnaire consisted of multiple statements about specific passages from within the Pentateuch that directly related to Christological typology, as well as statements about the meaning of typology in general. The questionnaire evaluated how strongly each participant agreed or disagreed that he or she *understood* and *could explain* how the selected person, place, event, or ceremony was a type of Christ. For the purpose of statistical analysis, I used a six-point Likert scale to evaluate each statement where “1” represented “Strongly Disagree,” “2” represented “Disagree,” “3” represented “Disagree Somewhat,” “4” represented “Agree Somewhat,” “5” represented “Agree,” and “6” represented “Strongly Agree.”

I preached an eight-week sermon series at First Baptist Mayfield to communicate the gospel through the proclamation of Christological typology in the Pentateuch. In an effort to reach the greatest number of people, I preached this series during the Sunday morning worship service. I encouraged the representative panel of 10 regularly attending members to attend each service throughout the series, reflect on each message, and maintain a journal of their thoughts, reactions, and questions. After each message, I allotted time throughout the week to meet individually with members of the panel to discuss the sermon and answer questions. In the event of an absence, I provided the panel with an audio or video recording of the sermon.

After the sermon series was complete, I scheduled a second meeting with the representative panel of 10 regularly attending members. At this meeting, I administered a questionnaire identical to the initial one, and then compared the results for assessment. I conducted a t-test to determine whether or not the difference in knowledge was

statistically significant. To conduct this test, I first added the numerical values provided for *each statement* by *each participant* from the pre-sermon series questionnaires, and then did likewise for the post-sermon series questionnaires. At the conclusion of this meeting, I thanked the panel for their time, effort, and dedication towards the successful completion of this project.

CHAPTER 2
BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL SUPPORT

Introduction

The Gospel of Luke records that after the resurrection, Jesus encountered two men who were contemplating the crucifixion. As the men were talking, Jesus drew near, accompanied them along the way, and asked, “What is this conversation that you are holding with each other as you walk?” (Luke 24:17).¹ Cleopas responded by asking, “Are you the only visitor to Jerusalem who does not know the things that have happened there in these days?” (Luke 24:18). The men began to share with Jesus how the chief priest and the rulers crucified a man who was “a prophet mighty in deed and word,” and how it had been reported that his tomb was found empty (Luke 24:19). They had hoped this man would redeem Israel, but since it was now the third day their hopes seemed futile. Jesus said to them, “O foolish ones, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken. Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?” (Luke 24:25-26). Then, with some of the most powerful words in Scripture, Luke writes, “And beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself” (Luke 24:27).

Jesus began with Moses in the Pentateuch as he revealed himself as the Messiah to these men. From the very beginning of God’s word, the Scriptures have

¹All Scripture quotations are taken from the English Standard Version of the Bible.

anticipated, foreshadowed, and prophesied about Jesus. Goldsworthy explains, “The history recorded in the Old Testament is the history of salvation as it proceeds towards its full realization.”² Although the ramifications of the Bible being a meta-narrative are many, in what follows, my primary concern is to show how God revealed Jesus as the Christ within the pages of the Pentateuch through typology. This belief in typology will not be based on personal speculation, but rather solely on the inspired words of the New Testament. For many of those who authored the New Testament, Christological typology in the Pentateuch was not merely a hermeneutical theory, it was a theological reality. This theological reality will be clearly shown as I expound upon the passages that form the foundation for Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

John 3:14-15: Bronze Serpent

John 3:14-15 states, “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whoever believes in him may have eternal life.” In anticipation of the cross, this passage serves as the first of three “lifted up” references in John, with the other two being found in John 8:28 and John 12:32. Within these two verses, Jesus directly compares himself to the bronze serpent of Numbers 21:4-9. Just as Moses lifted up the bronze serpent, Jesus would be lifted up and crucified. Just as the bronze serpent offered life to those who were dying, Jesus would offer eternal life to all who were willing to believe. It cannot be overstated that Jesus himself makes this direct comparison, and in doing so, reveals the bronze serpent to be an example of Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

²Graeme Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics: Foundations and Principles of Evangelical Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006), 243.

To appreciate the foundation of this passage, the context must be understood. Under the leadership of Moses, the Hebrews had been led out of Egyptian bondage through the miraculous crossing of the Red Sea. They had complained on numerous occasions and rebelled against the Lord, and as a consequence God forced them to wander in the wilderness for forty years before inhabiting the Promised Land. It was during this time of wandering that the people of Israel became impatient, and once again spoke against both Moses and God. The people exclaimed, “Why have you brought us up out of Egypt to die in the wilderness? For there is no food and no water, and we loathe this worthless food” (Num 21:5). They despised the very manna that God provided for their nourishment, manna that Jesus later spoke of as representative of himself (John 6:32-35). They took for granted the provision of God, and bitterly grumbled against the very one who was sustaining their lives.

Because of their sinful complaints, God sent fiery serpents among the people, and those who were bitten faced certain death. After the people realized the error of their way, they sought relief from Moses. They asked Moses to “pray to the Lord, that he take away the serpents from us” (Num 21:7). Moses prayed on behalf of the people and the Lord told him to make a fiery serpent, set it on a pole, and instruct the people to look at the serpent to live. Moses obeyed the word of the Lord, and all who looked upon the bronze serpent were healed. Effectively, those who looked upon the serpent *in faith*, though they had been bitten, were given miraculous life. As Jesus speaks the words of John 3:14-15, he is referring to this very passage.

What is the relationship between Jesus and the bronze serpent? To help explain the connection, Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown state, “The venom of the fiery

serpents, shooting through the veins of the rebellious Israelites, was spreading death through the camp—lively emblem of the perishing condition of men by reason of sin.”³ Therefore, the bite of the serpent, which resulted in death, was the judgment of God on sin. Likewise, just as the Israelites rebelled, mankind has rebelled. Just as the Israelites deserved condemnation, mankind deserves nothing more than eternal death. Sin shoots through the veins of humanity and spreads a dreadful condition that, unless cured, ends in certain tragedy.

How is this terrible circumstance remedied? Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown continue their explanation of the passage by stating, “Stung by serpents, by a serpent they are healed . . . the instrument of cure is a serpent of brass or copper, having at a distance *the same appearance*. So in redemption, as by man came death, by Man also comes life.”⁴ In what seems to be a case of extreme irony, the Israelites are told to look upon the very image of what was causing their demise. In the Gospels, however, what initially seems ironic in Numbers 21:4-9 is explained by the incarnation of the Savior. In redemption, mankind must look upon a man for salvation. As the first man, Adam, brought sin and death into the world, the second man, Jesus, brings forgiveness and life. Just as the Israelites had to look upon the bronze serpent in faith to be healed, mankind must respond in faith and believe in the Son of God for salvation.

Not only is there a distinct comparison between the effects of the bronze serpent and Jesus, there is an undeniable element of foreshadowing in the position of the

³Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown, *Matthew-Romans, Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1934), 131.

⁴Ibid.

bronze serpent and the cross. Jesus intentionally states that “as Moses lifted up the serpent . . . so must the Son of Man be lifted up” (John 3:14). Lange states, “Christ was from the beginning conscious of the necessity of His dying for the salvation of mankind, and of dying an ignominious death under the condemnation of men, and that He from the beginning spoke of it; but at first only in mysterious hints.”⁵ The text clearly identifies the uplifted bronze serpent as a foreshadowing of Jesus uplifted on the cross. Lange continues by explaining that just as a look at the uplifted serpent brought healing, a “look at the cross, is a look at the curse-laden One, who is not a sinner, but a divine token of evil and penalty, and of the suffering of penalty, which is holy and therefore transformed into deliverance.”⁶

In both form and function, the bronze serpent in Numbers 21 serves as a powerful example of Christological typology in the Pentateuch. God, in his great sovereignty, with an overarching plan of redemption in view, with a foundation based on an historical event, and with an abundance of escalation and fulfillment, used the bronze serpent as a type of the one who would be perfectly “lifted up,” and as a type of the one who could perfectly “be looked upon” for life.

John 19:31-37: Passover Lamb

Immediately following the crucifixion of Jesus, John records some of the most straightforward and convincing words to justify the acceptance of Christological typology in the Pentateuch. The day of preparation had arrived, and since bodies were not allowed

⁵John Peter Lange, *John, A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical*, trans. Dunlop Moore and Samuel Lowrie, ed. Philip Schaff, (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008), 132.

⁶Ibid., 133.

to remain crucified during the Sabbath, especially since it was a high day, the Jews requested an expedited death of the guilty. Pilate agreed and instructed his soldiers to break the legs of those who had been crucified. This brutal procedure was quite effective as it prevented the leg support necessary to continue breathing.⁷ The Roman soldiers fulfilled their responsibilities with the other two men crucified that day, but as they approached Jesus, he was already dead. There was obviously no reason to break his legs, but wanting to feel assured of his demise, one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear and watched as both blood and water poured down. John says this about the sequence of events: “For these things took place that the Scripture might be fulfilled: ‘Not one of his bones will be broken.’ And again another Scripture says, ‘They will look on him whom they have pierced’” (John 19:36-37).

John’s statements speak volumes about who he believes Jesus to be, and they also clearly communicate his hermeneutic in regards to Christological typology. Through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, John equates what took place on the cross with the institution of the Passover. In Exodus, as Moses instructs the people regarding the Passover lamb, he writes, “It shall be eaten in one house; you shall not take any of the flesh outside the house, and you shall not break any of its bones” (Exod 12:46). Within this very passage, John sees a picture of the Messiah. As Hull explains, “The decision not to break the legs of Jesus meant that in this respect he was like both the righteous sufferer and the Passover lambs of whom it could be said, ‘Not a bone of him shall be

⁷J. Julius Scott Jr., “Crucifixion,” in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 309-10.

broken' (cf. Exod 12:46; Num 9:12; Ps 34:20)."⁸ By claiming Jesus to be a fulfillment of Exodus 12:46, John demonstrates his belief that God, in his sovereignty, gave specific instructions concerning the unblemished lamb that was to be sacrificed, as a foreshadowing of the coming Messiah. In God's overarching plan of redemption, the Passover lamb was a type of Christ.

John has a noticeable theme of the Passover lamb being a type of Christ. In the Gospel of John, John the Baptist said the following upon seeing Jesus, "Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world!" (John 1:29). Then, as explained above, John clearly equates the Passover lamb as a type in John 19:36-37. Lastly, if there were any confusion at all regarding how John viewed the Passover lamb, he expresses his feelings rather vividly in Revelation 5-7. John asks, "Who is worthy to open the scroll and break its seals?," only to discover that "no one was found worthy to open the scroll or to look into it" (Rev 5:2-4). Then one of the elders said to him, "Weep no more; behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has conquered, so that he can open the scroll and its seven seals. And between the throne and the four living creatures and among the elders I saw a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain" (Rev 5:5-6). Then, in an awesome moment of crescendo, John writes, "After this I looked, and behold, a great multitude that no one could number, from every nation, from all tribes and peoples and languages, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes, with palm branches in their hands, and crying out with a loud voice, "Salvation belongs to our God who sits on the throne, and to the Lamb!" (Rev 7:9-10). The Lamb was worthy. The Lamb was able to open the scroll. And the Lamb was Jesus.

⁸William E. Hull, *John*, in vol. 9 of *The Broadman Bible Commentary*, ed. Clifton J. Allen (Nashville: Broadman, 1970), 362.

John is not alone in his belief that the Passover lamb is a type of Christ. For example, in 1 Corinthians 5:7 Paul states, “Your boasting is not good. Do you not know that a little leaven leavens the whole lump? Cleanse out the old leaven that you may be a new lump, as you really are unleavened. For Christ, our Passover lamb, has been sacrificed.” Paul clearly declares Jesus to be “our Passover lamb.” Likewise, Peter states,

And if you call on him as Father who judges impartially according to each one’s deeds, conduct yourselves with fear throughout the time of your exile, knowing that you were ransomed from the futile ways inherited from your forefathers, not with perishable things such as silver or gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, like that of a lamb without blemish or spot. (1 Pet 1:17-19)

Peter may very well be speaking of a sacrificial lamb in general, but the Passover lamb would certainly be in view as well. Schreiner states,

The text is too general to restrict ourselves to any one background, whether Passover, the Suffering Servant text, or the sacrificial cult. It probably is best to think of Peter as seeing the death of Christ as embracing all three ideas. Early Christians saw Passover, the Suffering Servant, and the sacrificial system as fulfilled in the sacrifice of Christ as God’s sinless lamb.⁹

Why would the Passover lamb be a type of Christ? If one reflects back to the inauguration of the Passover, the connection can be easily understood. When giving instructions, Moses said, “Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male a year old. You may take it from the sheep or from the goats” (Exod 12:5). Stuart explains that “the reason for demanding perfection rested not in the quality of the meal but in the symbolic purpose: the animal served as a reminder of the eventual deliverance that a perfect God perfectly provided for his people as part of the process of making them holy like himself.

⁹Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, The New American Commentary, vol. 37 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2003), 87.

Proper relating to God requires perfection.”¹⁰ Then, to explain the typological connection, Stuart continues by stating,

From the vantage point of the full overview of the plan of redemption designed by God before he even created human beings, Jesus of Nazareth was to be young at the time of his death, male of course, and perfect—free from defect before God. His sinlessness qualified him and him alone to be the lamb of God, a human lamb rather than an animal of the flock, and yet a lamb in the sense of one meeting the criteria for the Passover meal.¹¹

In form, Jesus fulfills John’s typological use, but what about in function?

After identifying a young unblemished male lamb, what were the people of Israel to do?

Moses instructs them to kill the lamb and “take some of the blood and put it on the two doorposts and the lintel of the houses in which they eat it” (Exod 12:7). God explains these instructions by saying,

For I will pass through the land of Egypt that night, and I will strike all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and on all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments: I am the LORD. The blood shall be a sign for you, on the houses where you are. And when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and no plague will befall you to destroy you, when I strike the land of Egypt. (Exod 12:12-13)

Why did they have to put blood on their doorposts? Did God not know the difference between the Israelites and the Egyptians? Stuart explains,

The blood on the doorposts showed acceptance of God’s plan for rescue and trust in his word. After all, the sight of dried blood by itself had no power to deter death; it was only as the dried blood painted on the top and sides of the door was a testimony to the faith of the inhabitants in Yahweh that it had its efficacy. Thus the statement, ‘When I see the blood, I will pass over you’—in other words, I will spare all those who show that they have placed their faith in me.¹²

¹⁰Douglas K. Stuart, *Exodus*, The New American Commentary, vol. 2 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2006), 275.

¹¹*Ibid.*

¹²*Ibid.*, 278.

As one reflects upon the cross, a clear connection between the Passover lamb and Jesus emerges. In both form and function, Jesus is the unblemished Lamb of God. As one places faith in him, and is covered in his blood, that believer shall be spared from certain death. Rooted in history, and overflowing with escalation and fulfillment, the Passover lamb of Exodus 12 is an awesome example of Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

Romans 5:12-19: Adam

Romans 5:14 unmistakably identifies Adam as a type of Christ, but Paul's usage of the word type (τύπος) is quite unique in this passage. Rather than demonstrating an escalation of similarities, which is commonplace with typology, Paul magnifies the intensity of the dissimilarities. Historically, scholars have even argued that "Paul dropped the comparison between Adam and Christ after enumerating the points of analogy, because their dissimilarity occurred to his mind."¹³ Nevertheless, Paul's emphasis is that just as in Adam all are condemned, in Christ all are justified and have life. Even though Paul accentuates the stark differences between Adam and Christ, he strongly considers Adam a type because of one important similarity; both Adam and Jesus are heads of their respective races. Adam is the head of the sinful and condemned race, whereas Jesus is the head of the forgiven and redeemed race.

Romans 5:12 states, "Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned." Paul

¹³John Peter Lange, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical*, trans. Dunlop Moore and Samuel Lowrie, ed. Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids: 1950), 174.

makes the argument that (1) “sin came into the world through one man,” (2) death is the result of sin, and (3) “death spread to all men because all sinned.” Because of Adam’s original disobedience, all of humanity has been disobedient. Mounce states, “Because Adam was the first created person, his sin had consequences for all who were to be born into the human race.”¹⁴ To further explain, Boa and Kruidenier state, “When Adam sinned, humanity (the basic meaning of Heb. ‘adam) sinned in him. This is confirmed by Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:22 where he says, ‘in Adam all die.’ . . . in Romans 5:18 Paul will say even more plainly that ‘the result of one trespass was condemnation for all men,’ period.”¹⁵ Therefore, not only have all sinned in Adam, but as a penalty for sin, all now experience both physical and spiritual death. Adam died spiritually through his willful disobedience in Genesis 3, and he died physically in Genesis 5:5.¹⁶ Likewise, unless a remedy is made available, all of humanity will follow suit and suffer these same dreadful consequences.

Paul continues by explaining that the stain of sin has been universal since the time of Adam, even though no Law existed to distinguish sin from righteousness. Romans 5:13-14 states, “For sin indeed was in the world before the law was given, but sin is not counted where there is no law. Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sinning was not like the transgression of Adam, who was a type of the one who was to come.” Since death is a consequence of sin, the physical death of those

¹⁴Robert H. Mounce, *Romans*, The New American Commentary, vol. 27 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 141.

¹⁵Kenneth Boa and William Kruidenier, *Romans*, Holman New Testament Commentary, vol. 6 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000), 168.

¹⁶*Ibid.*

who lived between the times of Adam and Moses serves as proof of their sinfulness. They died; therefore they must have sinned. As a result, Paul not only confirms the existence of sin prior to the Law, he demonstrates that God’s judgment on sin does not hinge on one’s personal knowledge of the truth.

To expound further upon the universality of sin and its consequences, Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown state, “In this case, the particle ‘even,’ instead of specifying one particular class of those who lived ‘from Adam to Moses’, merely explains what it was that made the case of those who died from Adam to Moses worthy of special notice—namely, that ‘though unlike Adam and all since Moses, those who lived between the two had no positive threatening of death for transgression, nevertheless, death reigned even over them.’”¹⁷ Therefore, regardless of whether sin is committed knowingly or unknowingly, God’s judgment towards sin remains the same. The consequences for sin remain universal, and the need for redemption remains paramount.

Paul makes a pivotal statement towards the end of Romans 5:14 that sparks great interest and demands attention. Speaking of Adam, he says, “Who was a type of the one who was to come” (Rom 5:14). Paul clearly identifies Adam as a *type* of Christ, but what exactly does he mean? Moo explains that “the word ‘type’ denotes those OT persons, institutions, or events that have a divinely intended function of prefiguring the eschatological age inaugurated by Christ . . . it is in this sense that Adam is a ‘type’ of

¹⁷Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, *Matthew-Romans*, 232.

Christ.”¹⁸ Therefore, in Adam, Paul sees a foreshadowing of the Messiah, an intentional act of God in the Pentateuch pointing directly towards Christ.

After a brief digression to explain the differences between Adam and Jesus, Paul writes, “Therefore, as one trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all men” (Rom 5:18). The differences between Adam and Jesus are vast. One brought sin into the world, the other brought life. One was willfully disobedient, the other was obedient unto death, even death on a cross. Mounce explains,

Redemption is the story of two men. The first man disobeyed God and led the entire human race in the wrong direction. The second man obeyed God and provides justification for all who will turn to him in faith. No matter how devastating the sin of the first, the redemptive work of the second reverses the consequences of that sin and restores people to the favor of God. Only by grasping the seriousness of the first is one able to appreciate the remarkable magnanimity of the second.¹⁹

Despite the obvious differences, Paul remains focused on what Adam and Jesus have in common; they both serve as heads of their respective races.

The passage concludes with these words, “For as by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man’s obedience the many will be made righteous” (Rom 5:19). Humans are not helplessly destined for eternal condemnation because of the sinful nature inherited in Adam. In Christ one can be justified, declared righteous, and offered eternal life. Though in terms of obedience, Adam and Jesus have nothing in common, in terms of their impact on mankind, they are

¹⁸Douglas Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 333-34.

¹⁹Mounce, *Romans*, 139-40.

strikingly similar. In Adam *all* will die, yet in Christ *all* will live. The universal stain of sin brought into the world through Adam's willful disobedience foreshadows the universal availability of God's grace and forgiveness brought into the world through the perfect obedience of Jesus. Though the sting of death in Adam is powerful, for those who respond in faith, the promise of eternal life in Jesus overcomes. Through God's overarching plan of redemption, a plan that spans both Old and New Testaments, Adam is revealed as a type of Christ in the Pentateuch.

Hebrews 2:17-10:31: High Priest

The author of Hebrews makes it abundantly clear that Jesus is the new and better high priest. Beginning in Hebrews 2:17 and continuing through Hebrews 10:31, the emphasis of Jesus' priestly role is dominant.²⁰ Eight of thirteen chapters are used to develop this high priest theme, communicating that something of significance is being revealed. The author sees in Jesus the fulfillment of a special priestly office established in Leviticus. Special because only the high priest was allowed to enter into the Holy of Holies, only the high priest was allowed to enter into the presence of God, and only the high priest was permitted to make atonement for the people. As the text will show, the high priest was not a coincidental office that merely resembled Jesus, it was a God ordained example of Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

The author of Hebrews frequently refers to Jesus as the high priest or great high priest. For example, Hebrews 2:17 states that "therefore he had to be made like his brothers in every respect, so that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in

²⁰Luke Timothy Johnson, *Hebrews*, The New Testament Library (Louisville: Westminster Jon Knox Press, 2006), 137.

the service of God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people.” Hebrews 3:1 states, “Therefore, holy brothers, you who share in a heavenly calling, consider Jesus, the apostle and high priest of our confession.” Hebrews 4:14-15 states, “Since then we have a great high priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession. For we do not have a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but one who in every respect has been tempted as we are, yet without sin.” From Hebrews 2:17 through Hebrews 10:31, the author speaks of Jesus as the high priest or great high priest at least fourteen times. Why does the author use this title so often? What is the significance of this title?

To understand how Jesus typologically fulfills the role of high priest, a basic understanding of the priestly function must be outlined. Under the old covenant, priests had very specific duties that were firmly established and broadly recognized. Johnson, when expounding upon Hebrews 5:1-4, describes these duties as follows:

In 5:1-4 the author presents, in a remarkably compressed fashion, a description of “every high priest” (5:1), enumerating twelve qualities that in one way or another will also be ascribed to Christ over the course of the composition. First, the job description: a high priest is (1) taken from among humans, (2) in behalf of humans, (3) in matters pertaining to God, (4) to offer gifts and sacrifices, (5) for sins. Next, the personal dispositions: (6) dealing gently with ignorant and wandering, (7) sharing their weakness, (8) offering gifts for himself (9) as well as for the people. Finally, the matter of vocation: (10) not chosen by oneself, (11) chosen by God, (12) in the manner that Aaron was.²¹

Scripture affirms that Jesus was fully human, he served on behalf of humanity in matters pertaining to God, he offered himself as a sacrifice for sins, he dealt gently with those who were ignorant and wandering, he was tempted in every way yet remained sinless, and he was appointed by God to fulfill his redemptive purpose. Every role of the

²¹Johnson, *Hebrews*, 137.

high priest finds not only its completion in Jesus but its perfection as well. This comparison alone, which is historically rooted and loaded with escalation and fulfillment, seems sufficient to understand the office of high priest as an example of Christological typology in the Pentateuch, but the author goes much further to solidify his argument.

Not only is Jesus the high priest for all believers, according to Hebrews 6:19-20, he is the high priest in the order of Melchizedek. The author states, “We have this as a sure and steadfast anchor of the soul, a hope that enters into the inner place behind the curtain, where Jesus has gone as a forerunner on our behalf, having become a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek” (Heb 6:19-20). Within these two verses, there are four truths being revealed by the author. First, in Christ, believers have an *anchored* hope. Morris explains, “While the metaphor of the anchor is widely used in antiquity, it occurs only here in the NT. The ship firmly anchored is safe from idle drifting. Its position and safety are sure. So hope is a stabilizing force for the Christian.”²² In Christ, one’s hope is firm and secure.

Second, this hope can enter into the inner place “behind the curtain” (Heb 6:19). Morris continues his explanation by stating, “The imagery takes us back to the tabernacle, with its ‘curtain’ shutting off the Most Holy Place. That little room symbolized the very presence of God, but people were not allowed to enter it. But hope can, says the author.”²³ Third, this hope, which the author now introduces as Jesus, has gone as a *forerunner*. Although Jesus entered into the Holy of Holies, humanity still

²²Leon Morris, *Hebrews*, in vol. 12 of *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 61.

²³*Ibid.*, 61.

awaited outside. Humanity still needed access to God. Therefore, Morris states, “To call Jesus our ‘forerunner’ implies that we will follow in due course.”²⁴ The word *forerunner*, according to Allen, “occurs only here in the New Testament with the meaning ‘running before,’ and is used of messengers, athletes, advance military scouts, and sailing. ‘The idea is not so much that of an onrushing warrior or an advance ship as of the one who has run the same course and whose successful running makes that of believers possible.’”²⁵ The hope that believers have in Christ is that he has provided access and availability to God.

Last, and certainly most mysteriously, Jesus will provide an anchored hope, behind the curtain, as a forerunner, in the order of Melchizedek. What does this mean? And why is this truth significant? Melchizedek is initially introduced in Genesis 14:17-20 after Abraham returned from defeating the four kings of the east. Referencing Hebrews 7:1-3, Allen explains, “We are told eight facts about the identity of Melchizedek. He was (1) king of Salem, (2) priest of God most high, (3) his name means ‘king of righteousness,’ (4) he is also ‘king of Salem,’ which means ‘king of peace,’ (5) he is ‘without father or mother,’ (6) he is ‘without genealogy,’ (7) he is ‘without beginning of days or end of life,’ and (8) like the Son of God he remains a priest forever.”²⁶ As the author emphasizes in Hebrews 7:4-10, he is also the only priest to receive a tithe from Abraham. This act of homage is a critical element within the story,

²⁴Morris, *Hebrews*, 61.

²⁵David L. Allen, *Hebrews*, The New American Commentary, vol. 35 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2010), 403.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 408.

that according to Allen, “establishes the superiority of Melchizedek to Abraham and prepares the way to argue for the superiority of the priestly order of Melchizedek (which according to Ps 110:4 is a type of Christ), over against the Levitical order.”²⁷

Psalm 110 was generally accepted as Messianic,²⁸ and here the author of Hebrews proclaims that fulfillment of a prophecy has taken place in Christ. Jesus is a “priest forever after the order of Melchizedek” (Ps 110:4). Dennis Johnson explains,

Christ, like Aaron, was appointed priest directly by God . . . in the citation of Psalm 110:4 in Hebrews 5:6: ‘You are a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek.’ Yet, the Son’s priesthood surpasses Aaron’s in its permanence, grounded in the Son’s eternal life and the Father’s unbreakable oath, both found in Psalm 110:4 (Heb. 6:20; 7:11-128).²⁹

Jesus is a new and better high priest. He is greater than Abraham, he is greater than Melchizedek, and he has fulfilled the prophecy of a high priest who would reign forever.

To understand the office of high priest as an example of Christological typology in the Pentateuch, several questions must be considered. Who is the genuine “king of righteousness?” Who is the true “king of peace?” Who is truly an eternal high priest? Who literally established a never ending Kingdom? Who is it that Melchizedek foreshadows, that Psalm 110 prophecies about, and that the author of Hebrews exalts? There is only one who completely and perfectly fulfills the abovementioned titles and

²⁷Allen, *Hebrews*, 411.

²⁸In his commentary on Psalms, Willem A. VanGemeren writes, “Though scholarship is greatly divided on the origin, date, and purpose of the psalm (Allen, pp. 83–84), apostolic usage reveals a strongly messianic motif (cf. Matt 22:44; 26:64; Mark 12:36; 14:62; 16:19; Luke 20:42–44; 22:69; Acts 2:34–35; Rom 8:34; 1 Cor 15:25; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3, 13; 5:6; 7:17, 21; 8:1; 10:12–13; 12:2).” Willem A. VanGemeren, *Psalms*, in vol. 5 of *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991), 696.

²⁹Dennis E. Johnson, *Him We Proclaim: Preaching Christ from All the Scriptures* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2007), 179.

designations, and his name is Jesus.

Melchizedek may have been a mighty priest and king, but he pales in comparison to the King of kings. Allen states that Jesus' "death on the cross, resurrection, ascension and enthronement at the right hand of God as both high priest and king open the door of access for us to the throne of grace."³⁰ This access that had previously been limited, has now been made available to the world through Christ. The author of Hebrews, through Christological typology in the Pentateuch, reveals Jesus not only as the high priest, but as the high priest in the order of Melchizedek who will reign forever.

Hebrews 3:1-6: Moses

Historically, Moses is one of the most important figures in all of the Old Testament. His calling from God at the burning bush, his leadership throughout the Exodus, his role in delivering the Decalogue, and his authorship of the Pentateuch, all serve to solidify Moses as a renowned figure. As a result, the prominence of Moses throughout the Old Testament, combined with the notoriety of Jesus as the Messiah, naturally led to a comparison between the two.³¹ Allen explains, "If the recipients were Jewish believers, as most scholars have concluded, then Moses' relationship to Jesus would have been a topic of interest."³² Who was greater? Who was worthy of more honor? To address these questions, the author of Hebrews explains in Hebrews 1 that

³⁰Allen, *Hebrews*, 405.

³¹Morris, *Hebrews*, 31.

³²Allen, *Hebrews*, 236.

Jesus is superior to the angels, and he further elaborates in Hebrews 3:1-6 that Jesus is superior to Moses. Throughout the explanation, however, there is never an intention to diminish the faithfulness and importance of Moses. As Morris states, “The writer does nothing to belittle Moses. Nor does he criticize him. He accepts Moses’ greatness but shows that as great as he was, Jesus was greater by far.”³³

In Hebrews 3:1-2, Jesus is referred to as “the apostle and high priest of our confession, who was faithful to him who appointed him, just as Moses also was faithful in all God’s house.” According to Morris, “‘Apostle’ is applied to Jesus only here in the NT, but the idea that God ‘sent’ him is more frequent, especially in the fourth Gospel. The basic idea is that of mission. Jesus was sent by the Father to accomplish his purpose.”³⁴ Allen explains that “the title ‘high priest’ is coordinated to ‘apostle’ by the conjunction *kai* (‘and’), with the definite article governing both nouns showing both refer to Jesus. The term ‘high priest’ was first introduced in 2:17 and indicates Jesus’ work of atonement and his ongoing representation of redeemed humanity to God in heaven.”³⁵ The intention of the author of Hebrews is to show the significant similarities between Moses and Jesus. Just as God sent Moses with a clear calling and purpose, God sent Jesus to fulfill a divine mission. Just as Moses redeemed the people of Israel from slavery and bondage in Egypt, Jesus has offered redemption to mankind from the slavery and bondage of sin. The author is striving to demonstrate a unique historical correspondence between Moses and Jesus. Although in many ways they seem identical,

³³Morris, *Hebrews*, 31.

³⁴*Ibid.*

³⁵Allen, *Hebrews*, 240.

it is about to become very clear that they are not equal.

Hebrews 3:3-4 goes beyond a mere comparison and begins to elevate Jesus to a position greater than that of Moses. This superior designation would have been surprising, if not alarming, to many hearing it for the first time. For most, it would have been impressive to prioritize Jesus above the angels, but almost incomprehensible to place him above Moses. Next to the Patriarchs, Moses was *the* foundational figure in all of the Old Testament. According to Crowson, “The superiority of Jesus over Moses is seen by showing the relation of each to the house of God. Moses is viewed as only dwelling in the house that someone else has built; whereas, Jesus is seen as the builder of the house.”³⁶ As stated by Eubanks and Shannon, “Any architect is entitled to more honor than the building that he designs. Moses was only a part of the house, one of God’s created beings, but Jesus was the Creator.”³⁷ Therefore, although the author readily wants to highlight their similarities, his primary purpose is to emphasize the superiority of one, to emphasize the uniqueness and worthiness of Jesus.

Likewise, in Hebrews 3:5-6, the author stresses that Moses was faithful as a servant, whereas Jesus was faithful as a son. Morris states, “The word for ‘servant’ (*therapōn*) is found only here in the NT. It denotes an honored servant, one who is far above a slave but still a servant.”³⁸ Lea contributes to the explanation by stating, “The term shows a certain tenderness in the service rendered without focusing on the low

³⁶Milton Crowson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Clear Study Series (Nashville: Randall House, 2000), 36.

³⁷David L. Eubanks and Robert C. Shannon, *Hebrews: Unlocking the Scriptures for You* (Cincinnati: Standard, 1986), 27.

³⁸Morris, *Hebrews*, 32.

position of the servant.”³⁹ By defining Moses in this manner the author shows no lack of respect, yet elevates Jesus to an even greater honor, that of a son. Taken together, Hebrews 3:3-6 makes an aggressive argument for the superiority of Jesus. A son is always more worthy than a servant, and the builder is always more worthy than the building itself. Jesus is above the angels, he is above Moses, and he is the very Son of God.

Why would the author of Hebrews go to such great lengths to show the relationship between Moses and Jesus? Was he merely interested in a comparison, or was there something more? Hamilton states that “Jesus is a new and better Moses who has offered a new and better sacrifice because he is the new and better priest mediating a new and better covenant as we progress toward the new and better land.”⁴⁰ The evidence from Scripture is overwhelming that Moses indeed serves as a type of Christ:

Pharaoh tried to kill the baby Moses; Herod tried to kill the baby Jesus. Moses and his parents were strangers in the land of Egypt; Jesus and his parents were strangers in the land of Egypt. God summoned Moses to lead Israel, his firstborn son (Ex 4:22), out of Egypt; God gave a dream to Mary’s husband, Joseph, in response to which he led Jesus, God’s beloved Son, out of Egypt (Matt. 2:15). Moses led the children of Israel through the waters of the Red Sea into the wilderness, where the people were tempted and sinned (Exodus 16-34); Jesus was baptized in the Jordan River by John, then went into the wilderness to be tempted by Satan, where he stood firm on God’s Word (Matt. 3:13-4:11). At Mount Sinai, Moses went up on the mountain and came down with the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 19-24, esp. 24:7); Jesus “went up on the mountain, and when he sat down, his disciples came to him” (Matt. 5:1); and Jesus taught his disciples the law of Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 9:21; Gal 6:2) in the sermon on the mount (Matthew 5-7).⁴¹

³⁹Thomas D. Lea, *Hebrews*, James, Holman New Testament Commentary, vol. 10 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 46.

⁴⁰James M. Hamilton, *What Is Biblical Theology?* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), 80.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 78-79.

The author of Hebrews strategically compares Moses to Jesus. Just as Moses was great, one greater has now come. Just as Moses led the people of Israel, Jesus will lead his people. Just as Moses served as a mediator between God and Israel, one has now come to mediate perfectly. The similarities are much too broad to be coincidental. Firmly founded on history, and overflowing with escalation and fulfillment, God sovereignly used the life and ministry of Moses as an example of Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

Hebrews 8:1-10:20: Tabernacle

In Hebrews 8:1-2 the author writes, “Now the point in what we are saying is this: we have such a high priest, one who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, a minister in the holy places, in the true tent that the Lord set up, not man.” Here, the author emphasizes the “true tent” and begins to reveal a dualistic view of the tabernacle. One “tent” has been established on earth by human hands, and the other “true tent” has been established by the Lord in heaven. To support this dualistic view, he explains that earthly priests “serve a copy and shadow of the heavenly things. For when Moses was about to erect the tent, he was instructed by God, saying, ‘See that you make everything according to the pattern that was shown you on the mountain’” (Heb 8:5). Therefore, the earthly tent is merely a copy of what is real. It is a shadow cast from the heavenly realities, but not God’s ultimate expression or manifestation of the true tabernacle.

Where does one find this pattern that has cast a shadow and formed this earthly copy? According to the Scriptures, God himself instructs Moses regarding how to construct the earthly tabernacle. God said, “And see that you make them after the pattern

for them, which is being shown you on the mountain” (Exod 25:40). Moses was shown the heavenly realities, and then told to construct an earthly copy based on the heavenly pattern. Johnson states that Moses “was shown the *typos* ‘according to which’ (*kata*) he was to make all things in the sanctuary.”⁴² The word “copy” in Hebrews 8:5 is defined as “models which point to these heavenly things.”⁴³ And the word “shadow” simply means a “reflection” or “copy.”⁴⁴ As a whole, the author’s message becomes exceptionally clear. The earthly tabernacle was constructed according to the exact pattern of the heavenly tabernacle shown to Moses by God. Therefore, the earthly tabernacle is a type of the “true tent” that exists in heaven.

In Hebrews 9:11-12 the author writes, “But when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and more perfect tent (not made with hands, that is, not of this creation) he entered once for all into the holy places, not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by means of his own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption.” Again, the “greater and more perfect tent” is being emphasized. Then, in Hebrews 9:23-24 he continues by stating, “Thus it was necessary for the copies of the heavenly things to be purified with these rites, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ has entered, not into holy places made with hands, which are copies of the true things, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf.” Lastly, Hebrews 10:1 states, “For since the

⁴²Johnson, *Hebrews*, 201.

⁴³Heinrich Schlier, “ὑπόδειγμα,” in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 2:33.

⁴⁴Seigfried Schulz, “σκιά,” in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 7:394-95.

law has but a shadow of the good things to come instead of the true form of these realities, it can never, by the same sacrifices that are continually offered every year, make perfect those who draw near.” These three passages, combined with the foundation of Hebrews 8:5, convincingly show that the earthly tabernacle is a type of the heavenly reality. The tabernacle is a copy, a mere shadow, fashioned after the exact pattern set forth by God. This being said, although the tabernacle is undoubtedly a copy of the heavenly type, one should push further and consider whether or not the tabernacle is a Christological type.

The most convincing passage to reveal the tabernacle as a type of Christ is found in Hebrews 10:19-20 where the author writes, “Therefore, brothers, since we have confidence to enter the holy places by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way that he opened for us through the curtain, that is, through his flesh.” Johnson states,

In Hebrews, *sarx* (‘flesh’) consistently refers to the realm of human existence characterized by mortality (2:14; 5:7; 9:10; 12:9). The image of passing through the veil of the flesh, then, suggests that Jesus himself is the ‘way’ that gives access to God. His mortal body is the ‘veil’ that must be passed through in order to find full access to the living God.⁴⁵

With this view of Jesus’ flesh as the veil, one must consider the location where the veil resided, the very veil that allowed access to the presence of God. The veil was located in the innermost portion of the tabernacle. A place restricted to all but the high priest. A place where sacrifices were offered and atonement was made. Therefore, not only is the tabernacle a type of the heavenly reality, more importantly it also serves as a type of Christ.

The flesh of Jesus is the veil that must be destroyed in order to have access to

⁴⁵Johnson, *Hebrews*, 257.

God. At Calvary, Jesus' flesh was destroyed, and according to Matthew 27:51 the "curtain of the temple was torn in two, from top to bottom," securing humanity's access to God. The purpose of the tabernacle is completely and perfectly fulfilled in Jesus. Just as the tabernacle housed the presence of God, Jesus is fully God. Just as the tabernacle was the place for sacrifice, Jesus is the perfect sacrifice. Just as the tabernacle provided an earthly means for reconciliation with God, Jesus provides reconciliation. Historically rooted and saturated with escalation and fulfillment, the tabernacle is a beautiful example of Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

Hebrews 9:11-10:14: Sin Sacrifice

After providing a detailed description of the Most Holy Place in Hebrews 9:1-5, and declaring the limitations of the Levitical sacrificial system in Hebrews 9:6-10, the author explains how the sacrifice of Christ perfectly fulfills what Leviticus 16:15-22 and Numbers 19:1-14 commanded, namely that a sin sacrifice be made for those who were unclean. The author of Hebrews writes,

But when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and more perfect tent (not made with hands, that is, not of this creation) he entered once for all into the holy places, not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by means of his own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the sprinkling of defiled persons with the ashes of a heifer, sanctify for the purification of the flesh, how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God, purify our conscience from dead works to serve the living God. (Heb 9:11-14)

The phrases "not by the means of the blood of goats and calves" and "for if the blood of goats and bulls, and the sprinkling of defiled persons with the ashes of a heifer" refer directly to Leviticus 16:15-22 and Numbers 19:1-14. First, instructions are given to

Aaron in Leviticus 16 regarding how to perform the ceremonial aspects of the Day of Atonement. Leviticus 16:15-16 states,

Then he shall kill the goat of the sin offering that is for the people and bring its blood inside the veil and do with its blood as he did with the blood of the bull, sprinkling it over the mercy seat and in front of the mercy seat. Thus he shall make atonement for the Holy Place, because of the uncleannesses of the people of Israel and because of their transgressions, all their sins. And so he shall do for the tent of meeting, which dwells with them in the midst of their uncleannesses.

Notice the strong linguistic connection with Hebrews 9:12-13, namely the specific use of goats for a sin sacrifice. Due to the sinfulness of the people, a sacrifice had to be made for atonement, a blood sacrifice sprinkled upon the mercy seat. Ross explains that “the central idea of this passage is God’s gracious provision to provide complete atonement.”⁴⁶

Second, a sin offering is commanded in Numbers 19:1-14 for anyone who becomes “unclean.” Morris elaborates on this ceremonial cleansing by explaining that,

A red heifer was killed, the carcass was burned (together with ‘cedar wood, hyssop and scarlet wool’), and the ashes used ‘in the water of cleansing; it is for purification from sin.’ When anyone was ceremonially unclean because of contact with a dead body or even by entering a tent where a dead body lay (Num 19:14), he was made clean by the use of these ashes.⁴⁷

The problem, therefore, was uncleanness, the remedy was a sacrifice, and the result was purification. When the author of Hebrews makes reference to “the sprinkling of defiled persons with the ashes of a heifer,” he is plainly referring to Numbers 19.

By referencing these two passages in the Pentateuch, the author is striving to communicate a unique relationship between the Levitical sin sacrifice and Jesus. In

⁴⁶Allen P. Ross, *Holiness to the Lord: A Guide to the Exposition of the Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 314.

⁴⁷Morris, *Hebrews*, 86.

Hebrews 9:9-10 he writes, “According to this arrangement, gifts and sacrifices are offered that cannot perfect the conscience of the worshiper, but deal only with food and drink and various washings, regulations for the body imposed until the time of reformation.” The sacrifices are deemed inadequate because they “cannot perfect the conscience of the worshiper.” Then in Hebrews 9:13-14 he states, “For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the sprinkling of defiled persons with the ashes of a heifer, sanctify for the purification of the flesh, how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God, purify our conscience from dead works to serve the living God.” The sacrificial system dealt only with the outward flesh, but Christ deals with the whole person. The sacrificial system was inadequate, but Christ is completely sufficient.

Why would the author of Hebrews care so deeply about the relationship between the sin sacrifice and Jesus? What is he trying to communicate regarding the nature of the Levitical sacrificial system? If one reflects back to the sin sacrifice of Leviticus 16:15-22, he learns that there were actually two goats associated with the offering; one goat was offered for atonement, and the other served as the scapegoat. Concerning this second goat, Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown state,

Besides the goat offered for the people the blood of which was sprinkled before the mercy seat, the high priest led forth a second goat, namely, the scapegoat; over it he confessed the people’s sins, putting them on the head of the goat, which was sent as the sin-bearer into the wilderness out of sight, implying that the atonement effected by the goat sin offering (of which the ceremony of the scapegoat is a part, and not distinct from the sin offering) consisted in the transfer of the people’s sins on the goat, and their consequent removal out of sight.⁴⁸

⁴⁸Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, *Matthew-Romans*, 462.

Likewise, Ross explains, “This latter goat was the one upon whom the Israelites laid their sins and led out into the wilderness to die.”⁴⁹ He further explains that “Aaron laid both hands on the goat in order to ensure the transference of sin to the goat. He then confessed all the wickedness and rebellion of Israel – all their sins. And these sins were placed on the goat to bear them away into the wilderness.”⁵⁰ Since the author of Hebrews has made it clear that these sacrifices were inadequate, why were they such a vital aspect of Israel’s faith and practice? They were vital because they served as a type of the perfect sacrifice that was yet to come. They were vital because they served as a type of the true sin-bearer who was yet to come. With the sin sacrifice in mind, there are several questions to consider. Whose blood can truly offer propitiation on the Mercy Seat? In fact, who *is* the Mercy Seat? Who can truly serve as a scapegoat, becoming the sin-bearer for all who believe, and remove sin? In the history of mankind, there is only one who can completely and perfectly fulfill what the Levitical sin sacrifice failed to accomplish. Jesus, humanity’s scapegoat, has borne a believer’s iniquities and atoned for a believer’s sin.

Concerning the sin sacrifice of Numbers 19:1-14, the red heifer had to be “without defect” with “no blemish” (Num 19:2). Then, the unblemished heifer was sacrificed, burned, and its ashes used with the “water for impurity” (Num 19:9). This water was routinely used for cleansing when someone became ceremonially unclean. Just as one considered with Leviticus 16, one needs to ask why this sin sacrifice was so vital to Israel’s faith and practice. Again, several questions should be considered. Who

⁴⁹Ross, *Holiness to the Lord*, 319.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, 320-21.

was truly without defect and without blemish? Though unblemished, who was sacrificed as a sin offering? Whose sacrifice can truly cleanse and render a sinner clean? Numbers 19:1-14 foreshadows something much greater, and serves as a type of the true sin offering that was yet to come.

When comparing the Levitical sin sacrifice to Jesus, the author of Hebrews states, “For since the law has but a shadow of the good things to come instead of the true form of these realities, it can never, by the same sacrifices that are continually offered every year, make perfect those who draw near” (Heb 10:1). He continues by explaining that “it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins” (Heb 10:4). Then, to show Jesus as the fulfillment of the sacrificial system, he states, “But when Christ had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God, waiting from that time until his enemies should be made a footstool for his feet. For by a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are being sanctified” (Heb 10:12-14). Although all of the previous sacrifices were insufficient, the sacrifice made by Jesus was completely and perfectly sufficient. Speaking of the Day of Atonement, Ross states, “Jesus Christ achieved once and for all everything that this holy day prescribed.”⁵¹ The Levitical sin sacrifice was a mere shadow of the good things to come, a historical foreshadowing of the coming Messiah, and a beautiful example of Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

Conclusion

As he and the men journeyed towards Emmaus, Jesus shared some of the most critical truths about his identity. He was the second Adam who brought life instead of

⁵¹Ross, *Holiness to the Lord*, 323.

death. He was the new and better Moses. He was the genuine Passover Lamb who offered protection through his blood. He was the Bronze Serpent who must be lifted up and looked upon for healing and life. He was the high priest, and it was his flesh in the tabernacle that had to be torn. He was the unblemished sin sacrifice who became a sin-bearer and atoned for the iniquities of those who would believe.

CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL SUPPORT

Introduction

According to Leonhard Goppelt, “Typology and the typological method have been part of the church’s exegesis and hermeneutic from the very beginning.”¹ Goppelt also asserts that typology “originated in biblical thought,” and that prior to Paul’s usage in the New Testament, the word *τύπος* conveyed a less significant meaning.² In agreement, Davidson states, “It is generally agreed that as a hermeneutical approach typology does not occur at all in the non-biblical sphere of the Graeco-Roman world.”³ Therefore, since a typological hermeneutic has been used since the first century, and since typology is firmly rooted in the Scriptures, it is beneficial to understand its usage throughout church history. This chapter presents a brief historical survey of the typological interpretation of Scripture, discusses key proponents of typology, and explains major hermeneutical movements.

Christological Typology in the Patristic Period

Throughout the patristic period, consistent hermeneutical tension existed

¹Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 4.

²Ibid., 5.

³Richard Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical *τύπος* Structures* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 18.

between the schools of Alexandria and Antioch. In Alexandria, with the influence of Clement (ca. A.D. 150-215) and Origen (ca. A.D. 185-254), theologians embraced an allegorical hermeneutic.⁴ In Antioch, with the influence of John Chrysostom (ca. A.D. 347-407) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. A.D. 350-428), theologians embraced a more literal, historical, grammatical, and typological hermeneutic. Although some overlap existed between the two schools, foundational approaches to biblical interpretation were on opposite ends of the hermeneutical spectrum.

The school of Alexandria became well known for its allegorical interpretation of Scripture. Goldsworthy explains that “Clement saw the literal meaning as the starting point for the mass of Christians. But, in Platonic thought, earthly things are inferior to the heavenly forms and only shadows of them. In the same way, the literal sense of the Bible is inferior to the spiritual sense.”⁵ Clement believed that a deeper and more significant meaning of Scripture could be found through allegory. According to Goldsworthy, Clement’s “first hermeneutic principle was that the text had both a literal sense, that could be observed, and an allegorical sense, that must be discovered.”⁶ Clement stated, “The Scriptures hide the sense. . . . Wherefore the holy mysteries of the prophecies are veiled in parables — preserved for chosen men, selected to knowledge in

⁴David S. Dockery, *New Testament Criticism & Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991), 43.

⁵Graeme Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics: Foundations and Principles of Evangelical Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006), 94-95.

⁶*Ibid.*, 95.

consequence of their faith; for the style of the Scriptures is parabolic.”⁷ For Clement, almost the entirety of Scripture was expressed in enigmas.⁸ In Alexandria, there was no malicious campaign to denigrate the literal meaning of the text, but the literal meaning always paled in comparison to the allegorical meaning.

Likewise, Goldsworthy continues to explain that Origen “accepted the literal sense, but not necessarily as the primary sense.”⁹ As a student of Clement, Origen followed closely in the footsteps of his mentor, but went further by developing a systematized approach to allegory. Goldsworthy states that Origen “developed a hermeneutical approach in which Scripture has three meanings: (i) literal or physical; (ii) moral or psychical; and (iii) allegorical or intellectual.”¹⁰ To Origen, all Scripture had a deeper meaning that required allegory to fully comprehend. In fact, according to Greidanus, “Origen is convinced that mere literal interpretation can lead people astray.”¹¹ Origen justified his hermeneutic by pointing to New Testament examples of allegory, namely Galatians 4:24, and according to Goldsworthy, “Origen thought that God had deliberately veiled the truth so that there is a secret meaning that is hidden from the

⁷Clement, *Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria, The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 2, ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Company, 1885), 509.

⁸Ibid., 452.

⁹Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics*, 95.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Sidney Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament: A Contemporary Hermeneutical Method* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 83.

majority.”¹² In Alexandria, both Clement and Origen, along with other theologians, aggressively promoted the use of allegory and saw very little need for typology.

On the complete opposite end of the hermeneutical spectrum, the Antiochenes affirmed the literal, historical, grammatical, and typological interpretation of the Bible, while vehemently rejecting allegory. Zuck states, “Sensing the rampant disregard for the literal meaning of the Scriptures in the Alexandrian Fathers, several church leaders in Antioch of Syria emphasized historical, literal interpretation.”¹³ In agreement with Zuck, Goldsworthy explains that Antioch “became the centre of opposition to the allegorical method of Alexandria. Lucian of Antioch (born c. 240) led this reaction, emphasized the literal meaning of the text and developed the method of typology.”¹⁴ Instead of promoting the belief in a “hidden meaning” that only a select few had access to, the school of Antioch taught that spiritual insight could be gained from the literal sense alone.¹⁵ In fact, according to Kaiser, “They contended that the spiritual sense was in no way separable from the literal sense, as it was in the Alexandrian school.”¹⁶

John Chrysostom, a renowned preacher in Antioch, said this concerning the use of allegory: “Not to believe in the contents of Sacred Scripture, and introduce instead other views from one’s own reasoning, is in my opinion to bring great peril to those rash

¹²Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics*, 96.

¹³Roy B. Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation: A Practical Guide to Discovering Biblical Truth* (Colorado Springs: David C. Cook, 1991), 37.

¹⁴Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics*, 98.

¹⁵*Ibid.*

¹⁶Walter Kaiser and Moises Silva, *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 221.

enough to attempt it.”¹⁷ Greidanus aptly states that Chrysostom’s aim was to “zero in on the intention of the original author.”¹⁸ Instead of allegory, Chrysostom relied upon prophecy and typology when preaching Christ from the Old Testament. Chrysostom explained his hermeneutic in the following statement:

I will give you an example of prophecy by means of things, and of prophecy in words, regarding the same object: “He was led like a lamb to the slaughter and as a sheep before his shearer” (Is 53:7); that is prophecy in words. But when Abraham took Isaac and saw a ram caught by his horns in a thicket, and actually offered the sacrifice (Gen 22:3-13), then he really proclaimed unto us, in a type, the salutary Passion.¹⁹

So, although he had very little room for allegory, Chrysostom did embrace typology as a legitimate hermeneutic.

Like Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia opposed the allegorical interpretation of Scripture and embraced a more literal, grammatical, historical, typological hermeneutic. Theodore very openly rejected Origen’s use of Galatians 4:24 as justification for allegorizing Scripture. In rebuttal, Theodore stated, “The apostle did not do away with history, nor did he strip away actions which had occurred long ago. Rather, Paul used the account of the past events to elucidate his own words.”²⁰ Theodore argued that Paul was not providing a guide for *interpretation*, but rather he was simply

¹⁷John Chrysostom, *Homily in Genesis*, quoted in *The Father’s of the Church: A New Translation* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1986), 175-76.

¹⁸Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*, 95.

¹⁹John Chrysostom, *De Poenitentia hom. 6*, quoted in Georges Barrois, *The Face of Christ in the Old Testament* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1974), 43.

²⁰Robert J. Kepple, “An Analysis of Antiochene Exegesis of Galatians 4:24-26,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 39, no. 2 (Spring 1977): 241.

providing an *illustration*. The past had not been “stripped away” and history had not been altered, Paul was simply illustrating his point.

Theodore strived so diligently to avoid allegorizing a text that he greatly limited the number of Old Testament passages that he believed foreshadowed the coming Christ. McCartney and Clayton state, “From his commentary on the minor prophets, his [Theodore’s] principle appears to be: unless the New Testament actually cites the text it is not messianic.”²¹ This philosophy was also employed in regards to typology. Being well aware of the liberal use of typology by Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, Theodore used great caution when identifying any aspect of Scripture as a type.

John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia are but two of the notable theologians in Antioch who rejected allegory and embraced typology. According to Dockery, Lucian of Antioch “developed a typological exegetical approach very similar to early Christian typology.”²² Diodore of Tarsus “contended that allegorizers abolish history and make one thing mean another.”²³ Almost without exception, the school of Antioch rejected allegorizing and embraced the literal, grammatical, historical, and typological interpretation of Scripture.

Christological Typology in the Medieval Period

Kaiser states that “the Middle Ages were not the most brilliant of times for the

²¹Dan McCartney and Charles Clayton, *Let the Reader Understand: A Guide to Interpreting and Applying the Bible* (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1994), 90.

²²David S. Dockery, *Biblical Interpretation Then and Now: Contemporary Hermeneutics in the Light of the Early Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 106.

²³*Ibid.*, 107.

church or biblical hermeneutics.”²⁴ Goldsworthy adds, “Biblical interpretation in the ‘middle’ period of the Middle Ages is difficult to define. Preus jumps seven hundred years from Augustine to Hugh of Saint Victor (died 1141). Beryl Smalley starts her investigations, apart from a brief introduction, at 1300.”²⁵ Agreeing with both Kaiser and Goldsworthy, Zuck states, “The Middle Ages was a vast desert so far as biblical interpretation is concerned. There was no fresh, creative thinking about the Scriptures themselves. Church tradition was prominent, along with the allegorizing of Scripture.”²⁶ Although the medieval period may lack brilliance and is difficult to define hermeneutically, it is clearly not marked by the literal, historical, grammatical, and typological interpretation of Scripture.

According to Greidanus, “The major hermeneutical principle that guided biblical interpretation from Augustine through the Middle Ages was the four senses of Scripture.”²⁷ Dockery concurs and states, “From the time of Augustine, the church, following the lead of John Cassian (d. ca. 433), subscribed to a theory of the fourfold Scripture. These four senses were 1) literal, 2) allegorical, 3) tropological or moral, and 4) anagogical.”²⁸ Although there is some debate as to whether Augustine or Cassian developed the fourfold method, it is widely accepted that the fourfold method was the

²⁴Kaiser and Silva, *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics*, 223.

²⁵Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics*, 104.

²⁶Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation*, 41.

²⁷Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*, 98.

²⁸Dockery, *New Testament Criticism & Interpretation*, 45-46.

dominant hermeneutic throughout the medieval period.²⁹

Since information is limited concerning the use of typology during the medieval period, the most crucial hermeneutical issue to consider is how the fourfold method of interpretation became the standard. With the significant influence of John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia in Antioch, the hermeneutical momentum was moving towards a more literal interpretation. What caused the momentum to shift? Who's influence laid the foundation for basically the entire medieval period? Two names quickly surface: Jerome and Augustine.

Concerning Jerome, Goldsworthy states, "In theory he developed some sound principles, especially because of the influences of the literal school of Antioch. These influences notwithstanding, in practice he was an allegorist."³⁰ Jerome was greatly influenced by Didymus the Blind, a follower of Origen who emphasized the spiritual sense of Scripture.³¹ Although allegorists influenced Jerome's early hermeneutic, later in life he shifted towards a more literal interpretation. As an example of this shift, Dockery states, "His first commentary was almost pure allegorization. At Antioch, however, he came under the influence of the literal-historical method, taught to him by Apollinaris of Laodicea. The influence of the school of Antioch, along with the Jewish influence, caused Jerome to devalue the allegorical method."³² Jerome may have "devalued" the allegorical method, but he never fully rejected it. He accepted the significance of the

²⁹Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics*, 103.

³⁰Ibid., 101.

³¹Dockery, *Biblical Interpretation Then and Now*, 132.

³²Ibid., 132-33.

literal meaning of the text because it served as the foundation for the deeper meaning.³³ Therefore, with Jerome, a “blended” hermeneutic is prominent.

According to Baker, “Augustine’s work has been called ‘the transition from the early Church to the Middle Ages: it is the culmination of several centuries of Christian thought and forms the foundation of theology in the West for the following centuries.’”³⁴ Like Jerome, Augustine embraced an allegorical interpretation, yet at times he incorporated typology as well. Greidanus explains,

Augustine has various means for preaching Christ from the Old Testament. The Old Testament not only contains clear promises of Christ, but it also reveals types of Christ. For example, Joshua is a type of Christ: as Joshua led Israel into earthly Canaan, so Christ leads his church into the heavenly Canaan; Solomon as the king of a kingdom of peace is also a type of Christ who will bring the true kingdom of peace. In addition to promise-fulfillment and typological interpretation, however, Augustine also uses allegorical interpretation.³⁵

Although Augustine utilized typology, his use of allegory was substantial. For example, he taught that paradise stood for the church, that the four rivers stood for the four Gospels, the fruit trees were the saints and the fruit was their achievements, the tree of life was the Holy of Holies, and the Holy of Holies was Christ himself.³⁶ Noah’s ark symbolized the City of God, the wood of the ark symbolized the cross, and the door in the ark symbolized the pierced side of Jesus.³⁷ Therefore, although Augustine had a great

³³Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics*, 101.

³⁴David L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of Some Modern Solutions to the Theological Problem of the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1976), 47.

³⁵Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*, 100.

³⁶*Ibid.*, 102.

³⁷*Ibid.*

level of appreciation for the text, whenever convenient he employed the use of allegory without hesitation. In fact, according to Zuck, Augustine believed that “if a literal interpretation makes for dissension, then the passage is to be allegorized.”³⁸ Just as with Jerome, Augustine’s hermeneutic was a “blend” of Alexandrian and Antiochen interpretation.

It is within this “blend” that Augustine, with the aid of John Cassian, developed and promoted the fourfold method of interpretation, a hermeneutic that dominated until the time of Thomas Aquinas. The fourfold method was not completely new and unique. Greidanus explains how “Origen had already taught the three senses of Scripture analogous to a human person: the body is the literal sense of the text, the soul is the moral sense, and the spirit is the spiritual sense.”³⁹ Augustine used the foundation provided by Origen and Ambrose, and simply added a fourth sense that focused on the eschatological meaning.⁴⁰

The long-tenured acceptance of the fourfold method can be attributed to its broad hermeneutical spectrum. The first sense was the literal meaning of the text, which satisfied those from the school of Antioch. The second sense was the allegorical, which satisfied those from the school of Alexandria. The third sense was tropological or moral, which dealt with how to live the Christian life. And the fourth sense was anagogical, which was focused towards eschatology. In many ways, there was something for everyone within the fourfold method of interpretation, which aided in its long-term

³⁸Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation*, 39.

³⁹Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*, 98.

⁴⁰Ibid.

acceptance.

Returning to the initial question, why did this shift in hermeneutical understanding take place? Both Jerome and Augustine had a passion for the literal meaning of the Bible. Jerome spent considerable time translating his most famous work, the Latin Vulgate⁴¹, and Augustine's fourfold method begins with a literal understanding of the text. Clearly, both men appreciated the literal and historical nature of the Scriptures; yet, both men embraced an eclectic approach to hermeneutics.⁴² The literal sense was not enough. They believed that there must be something more, something deeper, something hidden. Consequently, as the patristic period drew to an end and the medieval period began, Jerome and Augustine laid a liberal foundation for biblical interpretation that would endure for centuries. This foundation clearly included typology, but in no way was the literal, grammatical, historical, and typological hermeneutic prioritized.

Not until the arrival of Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), towards the end of the medieval period, does one find any type of return to a more literal, grammatical, and historical hermeneutic. Simply put, the influence of Aquinas cannot be overstated. According to Yarchin, Aquinas was "one of the most illuminating and celebrated constructors of Christian theology."⁴³ Although allegorical interpretation was prominent, Aquinas argued for a more literal hermeneutic. Yarchin states, "So, although he

⁴¹Dockery, *Biblical Interpretation Then and Now*, 131.

⁴²Dockery, *New Testament Criticism & Interpretation*, 45.

⁴³William Yarchin, *History of Biblical Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 93.

defended the legitimacy of discerning multiple meanings in a passage of Scripture, Thomas did not allow for abandonment of the literal sense. Indeed, the basis for theology is the literal sense, and derivative from the literal are the allegorical and moral senses, which God uses to signify deeper dimensions of divine truth.”⁴⁴ Dockery agrees by explaining how Aquinas was “able to demonstrate that the spiritual sense of Scripture was always based on the literal sense and derived from it. Also, he equated the literal sense as the meaning of the text intended by the author.”⁴⁵ Aquinas himself stated, “Nothing necessary to faith is contained under the spiritual sense which is not elsewhere put forward by the Scripture in its literal sense.”⁴⁶ Therefore, Aquinas’s convictions concerning the significance of the literal meaning of the text provided a foundation for his contemporaries to follow, which in turn provided a foundation where a typological hermeneutic could reemerge.⁴⁷

Christological Typology in the Reformation Period

After centuries of theological darkness, the Reformation brought new life into the hermeneutical conversation. Interest was renewed in the original languages, in authorial intent, and in proclaiming Christ from both the Old and New Testaments. According to Zuck, “The Reformation was a time of social and ecclesiastical upheaval. . .

⁴⁴Yarchin, *History of Biblical Interpretation*, 94.

⁴⁵Dockery, *New Testament Criticism & Interpretation*, 46.

⁴⁶Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae Prima Pars* 1.1.10, trans. Fr. Laurence Shapcote, ed. John Mortensen and Enrique Alarcon (Lander, WY: The Aquinas Institute for the Study of Sacred Doctrine, 2012), 15.

⁴⁷Yarchin, *History of Biblical Interpretation*, 94

it was basically a hermeneutical reformation, a reformation in reference to the approach to the Bible.”⁴⁸ Arguably, the two most influential voices of the Reformation were Martin Luther and John Calvin.⁴⁹ Therefore, to understand how the platform for typology reemerged in the sixteenth century, this section will consider the hermeneutical beliefs and practices of both men.

Although Luther did not heavily rely upon typology,⁵⁰ he nevertheless helped set the stage for the literal, grammatical, historical, and typological interpretation of Scripture. Greidanus states, “Luther was trained in the fourfold interpretation of the Middle Ages, as is evident in his early writings. But, according to James S. Preus, he abandoned it in 1517, when he opted for a single, literal sense.”⁵¹ Not only did Luther abandon the fourfold method, which embraced allegorical interpretation, he criticized it harshly. Luther stated, “It was very difficult for me to break away from my habitual zeal for allegory; and yet I was aware that allegories were empty speculations and the froth, as it were, of the Holy Scriptures. It is the historical sense alone which supplies the true and sound doctrine.”⁵² Luther also said, “For an allegory is like a beautiful harlot who fondles men in such a way that it is impossible for her not to be loved, especially by idle men who are free from trial. Men of this kind think that they are in the middle of

⁴⁸Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation*, 44.

⁴⁹Dockery, *New Testament Criticism & Interpretation*, 47.

⁵⁰Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*, 126.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, 112.

⁵²Martin Luther, *Lectures on Genesis*, in *Luther's Works*, vol. 1, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis: Concorida, 1958), 232-33.

Paradise and on God's lap whenever they indulge in such speculations."⁵³ Lastly, to clear any remaining confusion regarding his feelings towards allegory, Luther stated, "Consequently, I hate allegories."⁵⁴ Based on his own statements, it is fair to conclude that Luther experienced a drastic shift in hermeneutical thought and practice.

Throughout his life, Luther struggled to avoid allegorizing Scripture, but after his hermeneutical conversion, he consistently proclaimed the necessity of discovering the literal meaning of the text. Greidanus states, "Luther claimed that the literal sense alone 'holds the ground in trouble and trial, conquers the gates of hell [Matt 16:18] along with sin and death, and triumphs for the praise and glory of God.'"⁵⁵ Furthermore, Luther said, "We must everywhere stick to the simple, pure, and natural sense of the words that accords with the rules of grammar and the normal use of language as God has created it in man."⁵⁶ Therefore, although Luther never elaborated on his typological beliefs⁵⁷, his Antiochen style hermeneutic provided a platform that allowed typology to once again thrive.

Like Luther, Calvin adhered to a more literal, grammatical, historical hermeneutic. Speaking of Calvin, Dockery states, "He developed the grammatical-historical exegetical method as revived by Erasmus, focusing the place of meaning in the

⁵³Martin Luther, *Lectures on Genesis*, in *Luther's Works*, vol. 5, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis: Concordia, 1968), 347.

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*, 115.

⁵⁶Martin Luther, *On the Bondage of the Will*, in *Luther and Erasmus: Freewill and Salvation*, ed. E. Gordon Rupp and Philip S. Watson (Louisville: The Westminster Press, 1969), 221.

⁵⁷Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, 30.

historical interpretation and developing the spiritual message from the text.”⁵⁸ Also like Luther, “Calvin rejected allegorical interpretation and emphasized the necessity of examining the historical and literary context while comparing Scriptures which treated common subjects.”⁵⁹ Hermeneutically speaking, Luther and Calvin had many similarities, but they had notable differences as well.

Unlike Luther, Calvin openly embraced typology. Parker states that for Calvin “the history of the Jews was not only a preparation for the coming of Christ; it was also a deliberate pre-enactment of him and his work. Certain persons and institutions were types or figures or images (he uses the words interchangeably).”⁶⁰ According to Greidanus, “A type is not for Calvin an accidental resemblance between the two Covenants, but something deliberately set up by God’s providence to pre-enact the Incarnate Christ, and thus to stand for Christ and stand for him effectually.”⁶¹ As an example of his typological hermeneutic, in his commentary on Jeremiah, Calvin states,

Now we know that in David was promised a spiritual kingdom, for what was David but a type of Christ? As God then gave in David a living image of his only-begotten Son, we ought ever to pass from the temporal kingdom to the eternal, from the visible to the spiritual, from the earthly to the celestial. The same thing ought to be said of the priesthood; for no mortal can reconcile God to men, and make an atonement for sins; and further, the blood of bulls and of goats could not pacify the wrath of God, nor incense, nor the sprinkling of water, nor any of the things which belonged to the ceremonial laws; they could not give the hope of salvation, so as to quiet trembling consciences. It then follows that that priesthood was shadowy, and

⁵⁸Dockery, *New Testament Criticism & Interpretation*, 47.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, 48.

⁶⁰Thomas Henry Louis Parker, *Calvin’s Old Testament Commentaries* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 74.

⁶¹Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*, 144.

that the Levites represented Christ until he came.⁶²

As is clearly evidenced from this excerpt, Calvin believed David, the Levitical priesthood, and the Levitical sin sacrifice to be types of Christ.

Through typology, Calvin stressed the unity of the Old and New Testaments. Greidanus states, “Whereas Luther looked for unity only in the witness to Christ, Calvin sees the unity across a broad front: one God, one Savior, one redemptive history, one covenant of grace, and even one law.”⁶³ As a result, typology was easy for Calvin to embrace. Calvin states, “But the gospel has not succeeded the whole Law in such a sense as to introduce a different method of salvation. It rather confirms the Law, and proves that everything which it promised is fulfilled. What was shadow, it has made substance.”⁶⁴

Following centuries of darkness throughout the medieval period, the Reformation sparked a renewed interest in theology and hermeneutics. As interest in the original languages and authorial intent increased, the foundation for typology broadened. As the foundation broadened, and typology reemerged as a viable hermeneutic, the Gospel in the Old Testament was once again proclaimed with confidence.

Christological Typology in the Modern Period

Following the Reformation, many hermeneutical movements affected the use

⁶²John Calvin, *Jeremiah 20-47, Calvin’s Commentary*, vol. 10, trans. and ed. John Owen (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 257-58.

⁶³Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*, 132.

⁶⁴John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2.9.4, trans. Henry Beveridge (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, 2008), 271.

and acceptance of typology. Confessionalism sought to distinguish differences between the Roman Catholic church and Protestantism, Pietism emphasized living a holy life, Rationalism stressed the importance of reason over faith, and Liberalism focused on the human authors of Scripture rather than the divine.⁶⁵ Through each current of change, the use and acceptance of typology fluctuated, and in many instances typology was simply ignored.⁶⁶ This section will present a brief discussion of the major influences on typology in the seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries.

According to Davidson, “One of the leading exponents of typology in the seventeenth century was Johannes Cocceius (1603-69).”⁶⁷ Davidson explains,

Cocceius and the adherents of this school of thought distinguished between two kinds of types. The innate types were those that had been explicitly pointed out in Scripture. The inferred types were those whose typical nature had not been explicitly indicated in Scripture but whose existence was nonetheless just as real because they were “conformable to the analogy of faith and the practice of the inspired writers in regard to similar examples.”⁶⁸

The Cocceian hermeneutic had no intention to revive the allegorical hermeneutic of Origen; yet, in practice allowed for an expansive understanding of typology.

In reaction to Cocceianism, Herbert Marsh (1757-1839) put forth a much narrower view of typological interpretation. Davidson states that Marsh “argued that the only legitimate types are those identified as such in the NT.”⁶⁹ Many throughout the

⁶⁵Henry A. Virkler, *Hermeneutics: Principles and Processes of Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 67-69.

⁶⁶Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, 52.

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, 33.

⁶⁸*Ibid.*

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, 36-37.

nineteenth century shared this more conservative view, but the less restrictive practice of Cocceius was more widely accepted.⁷⁰ Interestingly, although not quite to the same degree, the debate between the schools of Alexandria and Antioch reemerged in the hermeneutical differences between Cocceius and Marsh.

The rising influence of rationalism in the post Reformation era had a negative affect on typological interpretation. Davidson explains, “Those passages in the NT which had previously been regarded as indicating a typological correspondence were explained by critical scholars as a first-century cultural accommodation which no longer had validity in the modern worldview.”⁷¹ In reaction to rationalism, Patrick Fairbairn (1805-74) published what Davidson labels “the classic nineteenth-century mediating statement on biblical typology.”⁷² Fairbairn critiques both Cocceius and Marsh, explaining that Cocceius did not use enough restraint with typology, and that Marsh used too much. Fairbairn argues for a balanced approach, and puts forth foundational principles to use when determining whether a person, place, event, or thing can be considered a type.⁷³ Fairbairn’s contribution to the study of typology was monumental for the nineteenth century, and it continues to be valuable in the twenty-first century.

In the mid to late nineteenth century, the dominant influence of Charles Spurgeon affected the use and acceptance of typology. John Talbert states, “Perhaps the one factor that has had more impact on the contemporary pulpit than any other is

⁷⁰Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, 37.

⁷¹Ibid., 38.

⁷²Ibid., 39.

⁷³Ibid., 40-41.

Spurgeon's christological approach to the sermon."⁷⁴ Whether preaching from the Old Testament or New, Spurgeon believed that Christ should be present in every sermon.

One example of this belief can be found in his famous words to a young preacher,

Don't you know young man that from every town, and every village, and every little hamlet in England, wherever it may be, there is a road to London? So from every text in Scripture, there is a road to the metropolis of the Scriptures, that is Christ. And my dear brother, your business is when you get to a text, to say, "Now, what is the road to Christ?" I have never yet found a text that had not got a road to Christ in it, and if ever I do find one that has not a road to Christ in it, I will make one; I will go over hedge and ditch but I would get at my Master, for the sermon cannot do any good unless there is a savour of Christ in it.⁷⁵

Likewise, to his students Spurgeon proclaimed, "Of all I would wish to say this is the sum; my brethren, preach CHRIST, always and evermore. He is the whole gospel. His person, offices, and work must be our one great, all-comprehending theme."⁷⁶ Clearly, from his words of wisdom to a young preacher, and from the lectures to his many students, Spurgeon's hermeneutic was firmly Christocentric.

How does Spurgeon preach Christ from every text? Specifically, when preaching from the Old Testament, what hermeneutic does Spurgeon rely upon to proclaim the savior? A reading of his sermons indicates a variety of approaches, ranging from historical grammatical to allegorical, but one hermeneutic he used often was typology. Greidanus states, "Among the legitimate uses of the spiritual sense, Spurgeon

⁷⁴John David Talbert, *Charles Haddon Spurgeon's Christological Homiletics: A Critical Evaluation of Selected Sermons from Old Testament Texts* (Fort Worth: Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989), 18-19.

⁷⁵Charles Haddon Spurgeon, "Christ Precious to Believers," in *The New Park Street Pulpit: Containing Sermons* (Pasadena, TX: Pilgrim Publication, 1975), 140.

⁷⁶Charles Spurgeon, *Lectures to My Students* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1954), 79.

lists first ‘the types.’”⁷⁷ Spurgeon himself states, “You have frequently been shown that *the types* yield ample scope for the exercise of a sanctified ingenuity.”⁷⁸ Spurgeon certainly did not restrict himself to typology alone, but his vast influence and notoriety helped revive the typological hermeneutic during the latter part of the nineteenth century.

Last, in the twentieth century, Leonhard Goppelt (1911-73) is noted for making significant contributions to the study of typology. Davidson states, “Goppelt’s work has been widely recognized as the ‘standard work’ on the NT use of typology. Ellis describes the study as ‘a brilliant and highly significant contribution to New Testament hermeneutics.’”⁷⁹ In *TYPOS: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, Goppelt discusses typology in late Judaism, in the New Testament, and in the Pauline epistles. His primary emphasis is to show typology as a standard hermeneutic of New Testament authors. According to Davidson, in *TYPOS*,

Goppelt concludes that typology is the dominant and characteristic approach of the NT writers to the OT. It is present not only in the isolated NT citations of OT passages but also in the numerous allusions to OT types. Despite differences of emphasis among various NT writers, there is a uniformity and solidarity of typological usage within the NT.⁸⁰

For its time, *TYPOS* was a detailed, foundational, and influential study on typology,⁸¹ and it continues to remain significant today.

Following the Reformation, the use and acceptance of typology fluctuated.

⁷⁷Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*, 154.

⁷⁸Spurgeon, *Lectures to My Students*, 102.

⁷⁹Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, 55.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 54.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, 52-53.

Rationalism was a hindrance to the typological hermeneutic, but the expansive typology of Cocceius, followed by the more restrictive typology of Marsh, kept the debate vibrant. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with Spurgeon's dominant influence combined with Goppelt's academia, typology was recognized not only as a viable hermeneutical option, but as a sovereignly ordained hermeneutic.

Conclusion

Beginning in the first century through the teachings of Jesus, typology has been used to interpret the Old Testament. In the Patristic Period a debate arose between the allegorical hermeneutic of the Alexandrians and the typological hermeneutic of the Antiochenes. Although the medieval period was somewhat theologically dark, Thomas Aquinas began to reemphasize the literal meaning of the text, which provided a foundation for typology. During the Reformation, both Luther and Calvin used typology, but Calvin relied upon it heavily and proclaimed his firm belief in a typological hermeneutic. Following the Reformation, in the modern era, Cocceius and Marsh debated to what extent typology should be used, Fairbairn argued for a balanced approach, Spurgeon used it often to proclaim Christ, and Goppelt provided a foundational and detailed guide for understanding typology. Through the hermeneutical peaks and valleys of history, typology has been used to reveal the sovereignty of God, the meta-narrative of the Bible, and the salvation available through Jesus.

CHAPTER 4

IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT

Introduction

The purpose of this project was to communicate the gospel through Christological typology in the Pentateuch at First Baptist Church, Mayfield, Kentucky. I accomplished this project by preaching an eight-week sermon series on Christological typology in the Pentateuch. I established three primary goals for this project: (1) assess the congregation's current knowledge of the gospel as witnessed through Christological typology in the Pentateuch, (2) develop sermon outlines for an eight-week expository sermon series that communicates the gospel through the proclamation of Christological typology in the Pentateuch, and (3) preach an eight-week sermon series to communicate the gospel through Christological typology in the Pentateuch. I determined the effectiveness of the ministry project by evaluating pre and post-sermon series questionnaires completed by a selected panel of 10 regularly attending members.

Project Schedule

During week 1 I consulted with the pastoral staff of First Baptist Mayfield to select a panel of 10 regularly attending members to participate in the ministry project. I scheduled this meeting for November 3, 2014. I then contacted each selection, verified each candidate's willingness to participate, and informed the panel of our initial meeting date.

Throughout weeks 2 through 5 I selected eight New Testament passages that reveal Christological typology in the Pentateuch, and developed basic sermon outlines for each text. I began the process of passage selection and sermon outline development on November 9, 2014, and concluded on December 6, 2014.

During week 6 I met with the panel of 10 regularly attending members to introduce the project and administer the initial questionnaire. I scheduled this meeting for December 7, 2014. During weeks 7 through 14, I preached an eight-week sermon series on Christological typology in the Pentateuch using expanded versions of the sermon outlines developed in weeks 2-5. I began this sermon series on December 14, 2014, and concluded on February 8, 2015.

At the beginning of week 15 I met with the panel of 10 regularly attending members to administer a questionnaire identical to the initial assessment. I scheduled this meeting for February 8, 2015. Then, to conclude week 15, I compared the results of the initial questionnaire to the results of the second questionnaire to determine the effectiveness of the sermon series. I began the process of comparison and assessment on February 9, 2015, and concluded on February 13, 2015.

Selection of Panel

The pastoral staff of First Baptist Mayfield met on November 3, 2014, to discuss the selection of 10 regularly attending members who would serve on a panel throughout the ministry project. I explained that “regularly attending” was defined as 75 percent Sunday school attendance, and each pastor was provided with a list of members who met that qualification. I also explained that in an effort to survey a broad spectrum of our membership, 2 members of the panel would be youth, 4 would be median aged,

and 4 would be senior adults. After discussing a range of potential candidates, 10 regularly attending members were selected to participate in the ministry project. Following our meeting, I contacted each potential participant, inquired of their willingness to participate, and informed them of our initial meeting on December 7, 2014.

Sermon Outline Development

I began the process of sermon outline development on November 9, 2015. To narrow the scope of the project, as well as to protect against unintended allegory, I selected only types of Christ mentioned by New Testament authors. To accomplish this, I read the New Testament in its entirety, listed each potential type of Christ in the Pentateuch, studied critical commentaries on each potential type, and consulted authors who specialize in typology. I then further narrowed the scope of the project by selecting what I deemed to be the eight strongest examples of Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

Following the selection process, I prepared sermon outlines for each type of Christ, relying upon the corresponding Old and New Testament passages. For example, when preparing the sermon outline to proclaim the bronze serpent as a type of Christ, I examined John 3:1-15 in the New Testament and Numbers 21:4-9 in the Old Testament. After a thorough examination of the passages associated with each type, I then determined the most effective expository pattern to deliver the sermon. For the bronze serpent, I briefly began in John 3:1-15, developed my main points based on Numbers 21:4-9, and then returned to John 3:1-15 to conclude. The expository pattern differed slightly with each sermon depending on the unique aspects of the passage, but in each instance I derived the main points directly from the text to maintain the integrity of the

message. I concluded the initial process of sermon outline development on December 6, 2015.

After developing the initial outlines, I began meeting weekly with the pastoral staff of First Baptist Mayfield for final sermon outline consultation. For consistency, I provided the pastoral staff with a rubric (see Research Instrument 2) to critique each sermon outline. The rubric analyzed the introduction, body, and conclusion of each sermon outline, but specifically focused on whether or not Christological typology was revealed. I scheduled these meetings prior to the delivery of each sermon so that, when necessary, I could incorporate suggestions. Following this time of consultation, I finalized each sermon outline and prepared for sermon delivery.

Initial Assessment

On December 7, 2014, I met with the panel of 10 regularly attending members to administer the initial questionnaire (see Research Instrument 1). I opened our meeting with prayer, briefly introduced the ministry project, explained the basic concept of typology, and discussed the overall purpose of the sermon series. The information provided was purposefully vague in an effort to accurately assess the panel's knowledge of Christological typology in the Pentateuch. Following the introduction, I administered the initial questionnaire and all answers were provided anonymously to promote honesty and protect privacy. Once all questionnaires were complete and submitted, I dismissed our time together in prayer.

Following our meeting, I created an Excel spreadsheet to analyze the data gathered through the initial questionnaire. For each statement, I added the responses to determine the panel's initial knowledge of Christological typology in the Pentateuch. For

example, the panel’s combined response to the first statement, “I understand and can explain the definition of Christological typology,” was 30. The panel consisted of 10 members and each statement was rated 1 through 6 on a Likert scale; therefore, a total score of 60 was possible. Each statement was evaluated in like fashion to determine the panel’s initial knowledge.

Proclamation of Sermon Series

I began a sermon series on Christological typology in the Pentateuch on December 14, 2014. The sermon series was entitled “God’s Grand Story,” and the primary objective was to reveal Christ in the Pentateuch through typology. I began the sermon series by asking the congregation to consider whether the Bible was a collection of independent and unconnected stories, or if it contained a grand overarching story known as a meta-narrative. I explained in detail the definition of a meta-narrative and used the *Chronicles of Narnia* as an example. Below is an excerpt from my sermon series introduction as I explained the meaning of “meta-narrative”:

In literature, it is not uncommon for authors to use seemingly independent stories to form a grand overarching theme or purpose. For example, in the *Chronicles of Narnia*, author C.S. Lewis uses seven unique stories to communicate one central message. He uses Peter, Susan, Edmund, and Lucy to save Narnia. Through a magic wardrobe and a lion named Aslan, evil is overcome and the throne is restored to its rightful line. Each of the seven books has its own plot and unique features, but they all focus on the righteousness and wisdom of Aslan, and the need to overcome evil. In literature, this is called a meta-narrative, a series of narratives with a larger overarching narrative, a narrative beyond the obvious narrative, a narrative above the obvious narrative.

I then returned to the initial inquiry and asked a series of questions: “Is the Bible a meta-narrative?” “Is the Bible a collection of sixty-six books that all point towards a central theme?” “Each book within the Bible certainly has its own plot, characters, and unique

features, but is there something that unifies the whole?” “Is there an ‘umbrella’ that covers all of the Bible?” After asking these questions, I expressed my conviction that the Bible is indeed a meta-narrative, and that the Bible does have an overarching story of redemption that begins in the Pentateuch and ends in the New Testament.

After establishing this foundation of the Bible as a meta-narrative, I asked the congregation to contemplate *how* God reveals this overarching story of redemption. If the Bible is indeed a meta-narrative, *how* does God make this known to humanity? I explained that prophecy, a concept most believers are at least vaguely familiar with, is beneficial when striving to connect the Old Testament to the New, and allows one to see a glimpse of the meta-narrative. Therefore, prophecy answers a portion of the question *how*. I then pressed further by explaining that typology, a hermeneutic that is predominately unknown, firmly establishes the connection between the Old Testament and New, and clearly demonstrates that all Scripture points towards the person of Christ. Typology answers the question *how* with great clarity and with the inerrant and inspired authority of New Testament authors.

After opening the sermon series with this introduction, I proceeded with the first of eight messages. What follows is an overview of the eight sermons I proclaimed at First Baptist Mayfield to communicate Christological typology in the Pentateuch, as well as to show the meta-narrative of God’s Word.

Sermon 1: John 3:1-15

On December 14, 2014, I preached a sermon entitled “The Cure of the Cross” from John 3:1-15. The primary question was how did Jesus explain being “born again” to Nicodemus? I argued that many believers are familiar with the story of Nicodemus,

but when pressed to describe precisely how Jesus shared the Gospel, most would answer inadequately. The “born again” language is familiar, but the typology in the passage is often overlooked. I also explained how nearly every believer has memorized John 3:16, but very few can quote John 3:14-15. The irony of this truth is that what Jesus states in John 3:14-15 reveals the bronze serpent as a type of Christ, and uses Numbers 21:4-9 to share the Gospel with Nicodemus. Understanding the nature of being “born again,” and fully appreciating John 3:16, hinges on knowing the significance of the bronze serpent.

Jesus told Nicodemus, “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whoever believes in him may have eternal life” (John 3:14-15). After reading this passage to the congregation, I explained that Jesus’ words were founded in the Pentateuch. We then turned to Numbers 21:4-9, I read the passage aloud, and we considered the historical context of Moses lifting up the bronze serpent. Based on Numbers 21:4-9, the four points of the sermon were: (1) man is sinful, (2) sin has consequences, (3) repentance is necessary, and (4) salvation is available. The people of Israel had sinfully spoken against God, their consequence was death, they admitted their sinfulness, and God provided a way to live. If those who were dying would look upon the bronze serpent in faith, they would live. Numbers 21:4-9 is the context that Jesus used to tell Nicodemus that he must be born again.

To conclude the sermon, I returned to John 3:1-15 and asked, “Why would Jesus compare himself to the bronze serpent?” I then explained how the bronze serpent was a type of Christ in the Pentateuch, foreshadowing the coming Messiah. Just as Israel had sinned, Nicodemus had sinned. Just as Israel’s sins demanded death, Nicodemus’ sins demanded death. Just as Israel needed to repent, Nicodemus needed to repent. Just

as life was given to all who looked upon the bronze serpent in faith, Nicodemus could have life if he looked upon the Savior in faith. I reminded the congregation that these truths not only applied to Nicodemus, but to all of humanity as well. All who look upon the uplifted Savior in faith will live.

Sermon 2: John 19:31-37

I preached a sermon entitled “Our Passover Lamb” from John 19:31-37 on December 21, 2014. I explained that prior to this passage Jesus had appeared before Pilate, he had been flogged and a crown of thorns had been placed upon his head. He had been crucified, his clothes had been divided among the soldiers, and Jesus had died upon the cross. I then asked the congregation to notice carefully what was emphasized in John 19:31-37. The emphasis was placed upon Jesus’ legs not being broken so “that the Scripture might be fulfilled: ‘Not one of his bones will be broken’” (John 19:36). I asked, “Why would John want his audience to know that Jesus’ legs were not broken?” “What Scripture is John referring to?” “What Scripture is being fulfilled?” I then read from Exodus 12:46, and explained that John was revealing the Passover lamb as a type of Christ in the Pentateuch.

To explain the Passover lamb as a type of Christ, my sermon body was based on Exodus 12:1-13, and had three primary points: (1) the Passover lamb was unblemished, (2) the Passover lamb was sacrificed, (3) the Passover lamb offered salvation. Exodus 12:5 makes it clear that the lamb had to be unblemished, Exodus 12:6 speaks of the need for sacrifice, and Exodus 12:13 explains how the blood of the lamb offered salvation. After expounding the details of Exodus 12:1-13, I then returned to John 19:36 and asked, “What does it mean that this Scripture has been *fulfilled*?” I

explained that John's purpose is to reveal Jesus as the true Passover Lamb. Jesus is unblemished, Jesus was sacrificed, and Jesus offers salvation to those who believe.

I concluded the sermon by reminding the congregation that the blood of the Passover lamb in Exodus 12 was not magical; it was simply dried blood on the doorposts. I explained that it was faith in the blood that offered salvation to the people of Israel. When God "passed over" and saw the blood, he saw households responding by faith. Likewise, today one must respond by faith in the blood of Jesus, the unblemished and sacrificial Lamb of God, to have eternal life.

Sermon 3: Romans 5:12-21

On January 4, 2015, I preached a sermon entitled "Death in Adam, Life in Christ" from Romans 5:12-21. The primary emphasis of the sermon was to show Adam as a type of Christ in the Pentateuch. I explained that Paul's typological use of Adam is unique since Adam and Christ are seemingly polar opposites. I also explained that the modern day use of the word "typology" is grounded in Scripture. Paul states that Adam was a "type of the one who was to come" (Rom 5:14).

To show Adam as a type of Christ, my sermon had four primary points: (1) in Adam, everyone sins, (2) in Adam, everyone dies, (3) in Christ, all are forgiven, (4) in Christ, all live. These four points were derived directly from the text. Paul said, "Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man . . . all sinned" (Rom 5:12). He also states that since all have sinned "death spread to all men" (Rom 5:12). Therefore, in Adam, all sin and all die. Later, Paul states, "Therefore, as one trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all men" (Rom 5:18). Therefore, all can be justified (or forgiven), and all can have life.

To conclude the sermon, I asked the congregation to consider why Paul labeled Adam as a type of Christ. As stated earlier, on the surface Adam seems to be the absolute opposite of Christ; one brought sin and death into the world while the other brought forgiveness and life. I explained that although the differences between the two are many, the primary emphasis of Paul is the impact of both on humanity. The first man, Adam, affected all of humanity by bringing sin and death. The second man, Jesus, affected all of humanity by bringing forgiveness and life. I explained that although all are born with a sin nature, and although all will physically die, Jesus can forgive every sin, and Jesus offers life to everyone.

Sermon 4: Hebrews 3:1-6

I preached a sermon entitled “Who’s Greater” from Hebrews 3:1-6 on January 11, 2015. In the introduction I explained that escalation is a major component of typology. The antitype found in the New Testament is always greater than the type promised in the Old Testament. As an example, I explained that Jesus is greater than the bronze serpent, he is greater than the Passover lamb, and he is greater than Adam. From the promised type in the Old Testament to the fulfillment in the New Testament, typology always includes escalation. I concluded the introduction by stating that Hebrews 3:1-6 demonstrates a clear sense of escalation and reveals Jesus as the new and better Moses.

The three primary points of the sermon were: (1) from faithful to faultless, (2) from building to builder, and (3) from servant to son. The first point focused on how the author of Hebrews celebrates the faithfulness of Moses, and then quickly reminds the reader of the faultlessness of Jesus. Speaking of Jesus the author states, “Who was faithful to him who appointed him, just as Moses also was faithful in all God’s house”

(Heb 3:2). Here, both Jesus and Moses are labeled as “faithful.” Then, in the next chapter, the author pushes further when speaking of Jesus by stating, “For we do not have a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but one who in every respect has been tempted as we are, yet without sin” (Heb 4:15). Jesus is not only faithful; he is faultless as well.

The second point elevates the worthiness of Jesus as the builder above the worthiness of Moses as the building. The author states, “For Jesus has been counted worthy of more glory than Moses—as much more glory as the builder of a house has more honor than the house itself. (For every house is built by someone, but the builder of all things is God)” (Heb 3:3-4). Last, the third point explained how a son is always more worthy than a servant. The author states, “Now Moses was faithful in all God’s house as a servant, to testify to the things that were to be spoken later, but Christ is faithful over God’s house as a son. And we are his house if indeed we hold fast our confidence and our boasting in our hope” (Heb 3:5-6). Throughout the passage, the author of Hebrews not only reveals the significance of Moses, but also consistently shows Jesus to be of greater worth.

To conclude the sermon I explained that escalation alone is not enough to label Moses a type of Christ. I then listed multiple similarities between Jesus and Moses to show how Moses foreshadowed the coming Christ. For example, I explained that (1) Moses was a stranger in the land of Egypt; Jesus was a stranger in the land of Egypt, (2) Pharaoh tried to kill the baby Moses; Herod tried to kill the baby Jesus, (3) Moses spoke on behalf of God; Jesus spoke the Words of God, (4) Moses was God’s mediator; Jesus is God’s mediator, (5) Moses was known as a savior; Jesus is the Savior, and (6) Moses

freed the people from slavery and bondage; Jesus frees believers from the slavery and bondage of sin. I explained that the escalation of Hebrews 3:1-6, combined with the vast historical similarities, makes it clear that Moses is a Christological type of Christ in the Pentateuch.

Sermon 5: Hebrews 4:14-5:10

On January 18, 2015, I preached a sermon entitled “Our Great High Priest” from Hebrews 4:14-5:10. The primary goal of the sermon was to reveal the Levitical high priest as a type of Christ. The sermon had four main points: (1) the qualifications of a high priest, (2) the responsibilities of a high priest, (3) the qualifications of the Messiah, and (4) the responsibilities of the Messiah.

The first point was expounded from Hebrews 5:1 and Hebrews 5:4. The author of Hebrews states, “For every high priest chosen from among men is appointed to act on behalf of men in relation to God, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins” (Heb 5:1). He also states, “And no one takes this honor for himself, but only when called by God, just as Aaron was” (Heb 5:4). From the text, I explained that the high priest had to be chosen, appointed, called, and have the correct genealogy. I also explained from Leviticus 21 that the high priest had to be deemed unblemished before he could serve. The second point, concerning the responsibilities of the high priest, was expounded from Hebrews 5:1 and Hebrews 5:3. The high priest was “appointed to act on behalf of men in relation to God” and “offer gifts and sacrifices for sins” (Heb 5:1). The high priest was a mediator between God and man, and he offered sacrifices on behalf of the people.

The third point explained how the qualifications of the Messiah, as with the high priest, required being chosen, appointed, called, and having the correct genealogy.

Just as the high priest was chosen, appointed, and called, the Messiah had to be chosen, appointed, and called by God. Just as the high priest had to have the correct genealogy (in the line of Aaron), the Messiah had to be in the line of David. Several passages were used to solidify that the Messiah had to be in the line of David: 2 Samuel 7:12-14, Isaiah 9:6-7, Isaiah 11:1-2, Psalm 132:11, Jeremiah 23:5-6, and Jeremiah 31:31-34. Also concerning qualifications, I explained how just as the high priest had to be without blemish, the Messiah had to be without sin. The purpose of the third point was to show the vast similarities between the qualifications of the high priest and the Messiah.

The fourth point, concerning the responsibilities of the Messiah, explained how Jesus served as a mediator between God and man, and how he offered the perfect sacrifice to God. The purpose was to show the similarities in responsibilities between the high priest and Jesus. The high priest was a mediator; Jesus was *the* mediator. The high priest offered sacrifices; Jesus offered *the* sacrifice. Every responsibility of the high priest finds not only its completion in Jesus, but its perfection as well. The sermon concluded with a brief summary to reinforce the intentional similarities in both qualifications and responsibilities of the high priest and the Messiah. I explained how these similarities were no mere coincidence. The high priest anticipated and foreshadowed the coming Messiah. To close, I made an appeal for the congregation to trust Jesus as their high priest.

Sermon 6: Hebrews 9:1-14

I preached a sermon entitled “Access is Available” from Hebrews 9:1-14 on January 25, 2015. The primary purpose of the sermon was to reveal the tabernacle as a type of Christ in the Pentateuch. In the introduction, I explained the construction,

arrangement, and significance of the tabernacle, and projected a full-scale replica (located in Timnah, Israel) for the congregation to observe. To segue into the body of the sermon, I stressed the central role of the tabernacle in the daily lives of the Israelites.

The sermon had two main points with each having three sub-points. The first point was simply titled “The tabernacle” and the sub-points were (1) a place of worship, (2) a place of sacrifice, and (3) a place where God dwelt. The second point was titled “Christ” and the sub-points were (1) the object of our worship, (2) the perfect sacrifice, and (3) God who dwelt among us. The intention was to show the vast similarities between the tabernacle and Jesus.

The focal passage was Hebrews 9:11-12, where the author states,

But when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and more perfect tent (not made with hands, that is, not of this creation) he entered once for all into the holy places, not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by means of his own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption.

Clearly, the author refers to Jesus as “the greater and more perfect tent” and explains how it is through this greater tent that humanity has true redemption.

I concluded the sermon by explaining the ramifications of Jesus being the tabernacle. Just as Israel worshipped in the tabernacle, Jesus is the object of one’s worship. Just as the priests offered sacrifices in the tabernacle, Jesus offered himself as the final and perfect sacrifice. Just as God dwelt in the Holy of Holies, Jesus became flesh and dwelt among humanity. Just as the tabernacle had only one entrance, Jesus is the only way to redemption and eternal life. I explained how the author of Hebrews did not believe these similarities to be coincidental. Jesus was the new and better tabernacle, and the Old Testament tent merely foreshadowed the New Testament greater tent.

Sermon 7: Hebrews 9:11-14

On February 1, 2015, I preached a sermon entitled “Our Sin Sacrifice” from Hebrews 9:11-14. The primary purpose of the sermon was to reveal the Levitical sin sacrifice as a type of Christ in the Pentateuch. In the introduction, I described how a youth once asked me why Jesus’ death was any different than a soldier’s death. The question was asked sincerely from a young man trying to understand the importance of Calvary. In the conversation, the youth explained how soldiers, and even police officers, take our place so that we do not have to go fight, and sometimes they die. They willingly sacrifice their lives for others. Sometimes their deaths are brutal, unfair, and violent. Therefore, this youth wanted to know how the sacrifice of a soldier or police officer differed from that of Jesus? He had no intention to downplay what Jesus did, but a very real desire to understand how Jesus’ death was different. I segued into the body of the sermon by explaining that Jesus did not merely die *for* humanity, as any soldier is willing to do; Jesus died *for the sins* of humanity, which only he could do. Jesus was humanity’s sin sacrifice.

The three main points of the sermon were (1) the sacrifice of Jesus is sufficient, (2) the sacrifice of Jesus is effective, and (3) the sacrifice of Jesus is complete. To emphasize the sufficiency and effectiveness of Jesus’ sacrifice I relied upon Hebrews 9:11-12 which states, “But when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and more perfect tent (not made with hands, that is, not of this creation) he entered once for all into the holy places, not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by means of his own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption.” I explained that Jesus did not have to enter the Holy of Holies once a year

to atone for sin, as the high priest was required to do; his sacrifice was sufficient for all times. Likewise, I explained that Jesus did not offer the blood of goats and calves, which were never effective (Heb 10:4); he offered his own blood, which was perfectly effective. Lastly, to emphasize the completeness of Jesus' sacrifice, I relied upon Hebrews 9:13-14. Here, I explained how this entire passage points back to Leviticus 16 and the Day of Atonement. On this day, the sin sacrifice atoned for the sins of the people and the scapegoat carried away their sins. I explained how Jesus typologically completes and fulfills Leviticus 16. The author of Hebrews states, "For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the sprinkling of defiled persons with the ashes of a heifer, sanctify for the purification of the flesh, how much more will the blood of Christ" (Heb 9:13-14a). The blood of Christ is not only effective; it is complete. For all who place their faith in him, the sacrifice of Jesus atones for and takes away their sins.

I concluded the message by reminding the congregation that any courageous man might be willing to die for another, but that only an unblemished man can die for another's sins. I reiterated the fact that Jesus did not merely die *for* humanity; he died *for the sins* of humanity.

Sermon 8: Hebrews 10:1-10

On February 8, 2015, I preached a sermon entitled "Made Clean" from Hebrews 10:1-10. The primary purpose of the sermon was to reveal the Mosaic Law as a type of Christ in the Pentateuch. As a foundation for the sermon, I used a message by

Ligon Duncan entitled *The Gospel by Numbers*.¹ In his sermon, Duncan used Numbers 5:1-4 to show the nature of the Mosaic Law. I incorporated Duncan's message into my own and relied upon Hebrews 10:1-10 to show how the Mosaic Law was merely a shadow of the Messiah.

Following Duncan's outline, my sermon had three main points: (1) the law was practical, (2) the law was theological, and (3) the law was Christological. All three points were derived from Numbers 5:1-4, which states,

The LORD spoke to Moses, saying, 'Command the people of Israel that they put out of the camp everyone who is leprous or has a discharge and everyone who is unclean through contact with the dead. You shall put out both male and female, putting them outside the camp, that they may not defile their camp, in the midst of which I dwell.' And the people of Israel did so, and put them outside the camp; as the LORD said to Moses, so the people of Israel did.

I explained that although putting someone outside of the camp might seem harsh, this aspect of the Law was very practical. One person had the potential to spread an epidemic that could have killed thousands. Likewise, I explained that although it seemed uncompassionate, expelling those who were sick clearly communicated a theological truth about God's holiness; anything blemished could not be in his presence. Last, I explained that by specifying the uncleanness of leprosy, discharges, and contact with the dead, the passage is clearly Christological.

In Luke 5:12-16 I explained how Jesus purposefully touched a man with leprosy. According to the law, Jesus should have become unclean. Yet, because the law was merely a shadow of Jesus (Heb 10:1-10), and because Jesus came to fulfill the law, Jesus not only remained clean himself, he made the leper clean. In Luke 8:40-56 I

¹Ligon Duncan, *The Gospel by Numbers* at Together for the Gospel 2014 (T4G), accessed on December 1, 2014, <http://t4g.org/media/2014/03/the-gospel-by-numbers-2>.

explained how Jesus purposefully touched a woman with a discharge. The woman did not make Jesus unclean; Jesus made her clean. In the same passage, I explained how Jesus purposefully touched a dead girl. The dead girl did not make Jesus unclean; Jesus made her alive. The author of Hebrews said, “For since the law has but a shadow of the good things to come instead of the true form of these realities, it can never, by the same sacrifices that are continually offered every year, make perfect those who draw near” (Heb 10:1). I finished the body of the sermon by explaining that the law is but a shadow of the reality and can never truly make someone clean. Jesus, however, is the reality of the shadow, the fulfillment, the antitype, and has the power to make even the most unclean clean.

I concluded the sermon and the series by asking whether or not anyone needed to be made clean. I reminded the congregation that Jesus was crucified outside of the city walls of Jerusalem. Jesus died outside of the camp. He died in the place of those who are blemished, where humanity belongs, so that all who believe can be made clean.

Final Assessment

On February 8, 2015, I met with the panel of 10 regularly attending members to administer the second questionnaire, which was identical to the initial questionnaire. I opened our meeting with prayer, briefly reviewed the purpose of the ministry project, allowed for a time of questions, and then administered the second questionnaire (see Research Instrument 1). All answers were provided anonymously to promote honesty and to protect privacy. Once all questionnaires were complete and submitted, I thanked the panel for their willingness to participate and dismissed our time together in prayer.

Following our meeting, I calculated the results of the second questionnaire in the same manner as the initial assessment, and entered the data into the Excel spreadsheet.

CHAPTER 5
EVALUATION OF PROJECT

Introduction

In this final chapter, I will reflect on the overall value and effectiveness of the ministry project entitled “Communicating the Gospel through Christological Typology in the Pentateuch at First Baptist Church, Mayfield, Kentucky.” To begin, I will evaluate the purpose, goals, strengths, and weaknesses of the project. I will continue by making suggestions on how best to improve the effectiveness of the project. Then I will reflect on the theological knowledge that has been gained, and discuss miscellaneous details that were noteworthy. Last, I will express my personal feelings about the process and aftermath of the project, and conclude by explaining the motivation behind my interest in typology.

Evaluation of the Project’s Purpose

The purpose of this project was to communicate the gospel through Christological typology in the Pentateuch at First Baptist Church, Mayfield, Kentucky. I achieved this purpose through an eight-week expository sermon series. Based on a statistical analysis of the data provided through pre and post-sermon series questionnaires, the sermon series effectively communicated Christological typology in the Pentateuch. The pre and post-sermon series questionnaires were identical and consisted of ten statements about Christological typology. I asked the panel to respond to

each statement using a six-point Likert scale where “1” represented “Strongly Disagree,” “2” represented “Disagree,” “3” represented “Disagree Somewhat,” “4” represented “Agree Somewhat,” “5” represented “Agree,” and “6” represented “Strongly Agree.” The panel consisted of 10 regularly attending members; therefore, the highest possible score for each statement was 60. Below, table 1 shows pre and post-sermon series questionnaire results.

Table 1. Pre and post-sermon series questionnaire results

Question:	Pre-sermon series results:	Post-sermon series results:
1. I understand and can explain the definition of Christological typology.	30	55
2. I understand and can explain the meaning of the word “meta-narrative” when used in reference to the Bible.	18	54
3. I understand and can explain how Adam in Genesis 1-3 is a type of Christ.	20	51
4. I understand and can explain how Moses is a type of Christ.	23	53
5. I understand and can explain how the bronze serpent in Numbers 21:4-9 is a type of Christ.	21	57
6. I understand and can explain how the Passover lamb is a type of Christ.	31	58
7. I understand and can explain how the Old Testament high priest is a type of Christ.	19	53
8. I understand and can explain how the Mosaic Law is a type of Christ.	21	52
9. I understand and can explain how the sin sacrifice in Leviticus is a type of Christ.	23	54
10. I understand and can explain how the tabernacle is a type of Christ.	20	53

After gathering data from both pre and post-sermon series questionnaires, I conducted a paired sample two-tailed t-test to determine whether or not the results were

statistically significant. I established the degree of risk with an alpha of .05, which provided a 95 percent level of confidence. The null hypothesis was that there would be no significant difference between the pre and post-sermon series questionnaires. Therefore, the research hypothesis was that there would be a significant difference between the pre and post-sermon series questionnaires. The t-test resulted in a p value of 4.81762E-10, which allowed me to reject the null hypothesis and accept the research hypothesis. Since the p value (4.81762E-10) is significantly less than the risk value (.05), the possibility that the difference is merely by chance is statistically unlikely. Thankfully, the sermon series I preached made a statistically significant difference in the panel's understanding of Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

Evaluation of the Project's Goals

I established three primary goals for this project: (1) assess the congregation's current knowledge of the gospel as witnessed through Christological typology in the Pentateuch, (2) develop sermon outlines for an eight-week expository sermon series that communicates the gospel through the proclamation of Christological typology in the Pentateuch, and (3) preach an eight-week sermon series to communicate the gospel through Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

I accomplished the first goal by administering a pre-sermon series questionnaire to a 10-member panel. To create a representative spectrum of the church, I comprised the panel with 2 youth, 4 median-aged adults, and 4 senior adults. This method had two primary strengths: (1) The panel represented most age groups within the church body, and (2) the panel was relatively small, allowing for greater interaction and discussion. The limited size of the panel also served as one of the primary disadvantages.

On average, First Baptist Mayfield has 325 in attendance for the Sunday morning worship service. Therefore, a panel of 10 represents approximately 3 percent of the church. Although the representation was small, the diversity of the panel, coupled with the interaction and discussion, provided a satisfactory platform for the first goal to be realized.

I accomplished the second goal, developing sermon outlines, in three stages. First, I selected the passages that best revealed Christological typology in the Pentateuch. Second, I developed basic sermon outlines during weeks 2 through 5 of the ministry project. Third, the pastoral staff critiqued each outline by using a predetermined rubric. The strength of this method was the use of multiple stages, as well as multiple opinions, to develop each sermon. I enjoyed consulting with the pastoral staff, and they enjoyed having a role as well. Although the pastoral staff enjoyed assisting, their involvement had its weaknesses. When completing the rubric on each sermon outline, rating each predetermined statement by using a six-point Likert scale, most of their responses were 4 and above. Therefore, either my sermon outlines were outstanding, or possibly the panel felt compelled to be generous since I am their direct supervisor. A lack of preaching experience, as well as a lack of homiletical knowledge, might also be contributing factors. In hindsight, a panel of unbiased tenured preachers would have been more beneficial. Despite the weaknesses, the sermon outlines were developed, critiqued, finalized, and then proclaimed. For these reasons, the second goal was realized in a satisfactory manner.

I accomplished the third goal by preaching an eight-week expository sermon series on Christological typology in the Pentateuch. I preached each sermon on a Sunday

morning in an effort to reach the greatest number of people, and I asked the panel of 10 regularly attending members to attend each service. If someone was unable to attend, I provided an audio or video recording of the service. The strength of this method was that the entire church benefitted from the sermon series. Rather than teaching the panel alone, I proclaimed Christological typology to the whole congregation. Many had never noticed God's grand overarching plan of redemption, and appreciated how the sermon series connected the Old and New Testaments. A minor weakness, based on casual conversation, was that some felt as though the subject matter was "too deep," or "too difficult" to grasp, but the vast majority enjoyed the series. To remain expository, I based each sermon strictly on the biblical text, and explained the historical grammatical context of each passage. For these reasons, the third goal of the project was realized in a satisfactory manner.

Strengths of the Project

The project introduced a subject matter that few were aware of, but that most were interested in. As has been previously stated, the majority of the congregation were at least vaguely aware of biblical prophecy, but very few were familiar with typology. Initially, the terminology sounded overly complex. When I announced that I would be preaching a series on Christological typology in the Pentateuch, I was greeted with multiple blank stares. As I explained the simplicity of what merely sounded complex, the reception was more positive. Once the initial intimidation was overcome, the project proceeded exceptionally well.

Second, the project communicated the overarching meta-narrative of God's Word. Despite decades of church attendance, most of the members at First Baptist

Mayfield were unaware of God's overarching plan of redemption. Many questioned the usefulness of the Old Testament and most struggled to see its relevance. Although the vast majority of the membership would acknowledge the inspiration and inerrancy of God's Word, very few could explain how it all points to the Messiah. Throughout the project, as typology connected the Old Testament to the New, a fresh appreciation for the sovereignty of God emerged.

Third, the project communicated the Gospel with clarity and intention. Within the context of each sermon, the text naturally allowed for a clear and concise Gospel presentation. For example, as Moses lifted up the serpent, Jesus was lifted up on the cross; as the blood of the Passover lamb brought protection and life, the blood of Jesus offers eternal protection and life; as the high priest offered atonement and was a mediator between God and man, Jesus offers atonement and mediates between God and man. In each of the eight types of Christ proclaimed, I shared the Gospel with great intention.

Finally, the congregation benefited from the redundant nature of Christological typology. For example, the high priest was the one who offered atonement, the tabernacle was the place of atonement, and the sin sacrifice was the object of atonement. By the end of the series, the congregation knew beyond any doubt that God demands atonement for sin. Likewise, the high priest was a mediator between God and man, Moses mediated between God and man, and Jesus is the mediator between God and man. By the end of the series, no one in attendance doubted humanity's need for a mediator. Although being redundant is sometimes negative, within the context of this sermon series it served as a positive source of reinforcement.

Weaknesses of the Project

While developing sermon outlines (weeks 2-5), I quickly discovered the difficulty of expositionally preaching Christological typology. The first weakness I encountered was that each type of Christ necessarily has two corresponding passages, an Old Testament (type) and a New Testament (antitype). While “normal” expository preaching remains focused on a singular passage within a singular context, preaching typologically requires expositing multiple passages from multiple contexts. The difficulty is encountered when trying to allot enough time to establish the historical setting of each text. For example, when proclaiming the Passover lamb as a type of Christ, I first established the New Testament context of John 19:31-37. Jesus had appeared before Pilate, he had been flogged, he had been crucified, his clothing had been divided, and Jesus had died. Only after the sacrifice on the cross did John mention the fulfillment of John 19:36, identifying Jesus as the Passover Lamb. Then, within a completely different context, the congregation needed to understand the origins of the Passover in Exodus 12. Knowing that Jesus is the true Passover Lamb is inconsequential if the history and context of the Passover itself is not understood. Time simply did not allow for a detailed explanation of each historical context. Therefore, with each example of Christological typology, I found it challenging to abbreviate the historical context while still communicating the necessary information.

A second weakness with communicating Christological typology in the Pentateuch was the temptation to preach topically. Rather than relying upon a specified text, it was tempting to surround each subject with multiple supporting texts. For example, when proclaiming Moses as a type of Christ, there were two main issues: (1)

No singular Old Testament text summarizes why Moses is considered a type of Christ, and (2) no New Testament text explicitly names Moses as a type of Christ. Therefore, in order to show Moses as a type of Christ, it was necessary to combine multiple texts in both the Old and New Testaments. Preaching topically, using multiple texts is of no concern. However, for expositional preaching this presented an obstacle to overcome. To remedy this concern with Moses, I expounded Hebrews 3:1-6 as an example of escalation, which is a key component of typology. With each type, I had to use caution and creativity to communicate effectively while remaining expository.

A third weakness with preaching Christological typology in the Pentateuch was the tendency of some in the congregation to allegorize. Most found it fascinating to witness Old Testament passages legitimately foreshadowing the coming Messiah. Unfortunately, some found it overly fascinating and began finding “types” of Christ everywhere. Midway through the project I explained the differences between typology and allegory in an effort to remedy the allegorical abuse, but some were still able to “find” Christ in places where he was never intended to be found. This weakness was not a significant distraction, but it was notable to witness how modern day believers can easily succumb to the same temptations as early church fathers.

Last, I spent a significant amount of time explaining the meaning and significance of the term “meta-narrative.” My aim was twofold: (1) convincingly demonstrate that the Bible is indeed a meta-narrative, and (2) explain how God uses typology to reveal the meta-narrative. The meta-narrative component is an essential feature of typology. Although it is possible to have a meta-narrative without typology, it is not possible to have typology without a meta-narrative. Therefore, to reinforce the

legitimacy of a typological hermeneutic, I wanted to clearly show the Bible to be a meta-narrative. Although the intention was good, I may have allocated an excessive amount of time towards developing the meta-narrative theme.

What I Would Do Differently

To protect privacy and promote honesty, I asked the panel of 10 regularly attending members to complete the pre and post-sermon series questionnaires anonymously. Therefore, when the post-sermon series questionnaires were complete, I was unable to compare a panel member's initial responses to his or her final responses. I could compare the group as a whole, and I could evaluate the difference in response to each statement, but I could not witness individual growth, or lack thereof. By administering the questionnaire in this manner, I limited the amount of comparable data, which consequently limited my knowledge on the overall effectiveness of the project. For example, had I known the difference in each panel member's responses, I could have conducted t-tests for each of the 10 statements. In doing so, I could have tracked each panel member's growth, or lack thereof, and possibly drawn conclusions based on age and gender. It would have been interesting to see if the increase in knowledge varied in any measurable way between the youth, median-aged, and senior adults, and whether my style of preaching was better received by men or women. Therefore, to gain additional useful information, I would not recommend administering the questionnaires anonymously.

To communicate the boundaries of typology and discuss the dangers of allegory, I would recommend adding a Wednesday evening study on the history of typological interpretation. This study would coincide with the sermon series and contain

four primary sections: (1) typology in the patristic period, (2) typology in the medieval period, (3) typology in the Reformation period, and (4) typology in the modern period. I would prepare for this study by consulting chapter three of this project, making additional preparation time minimal. The purpose would be to show the historical pitfalls of allegory and stress the importance of a literal historical interpretation. This addition would provide time to elaborate on the legitimate use of typology, and in doing so would limit the potential for typological abuse.

Theological Reflections

The theological foundation of this project is rooted primarily in the sovereignty of God. From before creation, God orchestrated an overarching plan of redemption spanning from Genesis to Revelation. The heart of this plan is significantly foreshadowed in the Old Testament through typology, and then ultimately realized in the New Testament. From the very beginning of God's Word, the Messiah has been anticipated. From the very law of the people of Israel, Jesus was being revealed. With great purpose, God connected the sixty-six books of the Bible through typology and revealed his seamless plan of redemption.

Therefore, theologically one can make at least three conclusions based on the reality of Christological typology. First, mankind has always been in need of redemption. From the fall of Adam, humanity has been separated from God and in need of reconciliation. Why did the people of Israel need to look upon the bronze serpent? Why was there a need for a high priest and a sin sacrifice? Humanity has always been sinful and in need of atonement. Second, God has always been willing to offer grace to those who respond to his plan of redemption in faith. From the Passover lamb to the bronze

serpent, from the law to the sin sacrifice, from the high priest to the tabernacle, from Adam to Moses, all who responded to God's plan of redemption in faith were shown grace. Third, God's ultimate plan of redemption has been realized through the Messiah, Jesus Christ. All of the previous types merely pointed towards the reality. God has always had a plan, God has always had a purpose, and God has always desired to redeem a fallen humanity through Jesus.

In addition, typology demonstrates how God sees the "big picture" when humanity can only see the moment. Millenniums passed from the time of Adam to Jesus, yet God had ordained from before creation how his plan of redemption would be made manifest. God had ordained from before creation that he would incorporate "shadows," "images," and "types" to foreshadow and anticipate the coming Messiah. Although humanity may not be able to fully comprehend, Peter reminds one "that with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slow to fulfill his promise as some count slowness, but is patient toward you, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should reach repentance" (2 Peter 3:8-9). In his great patience, God revealed the Messiah in the Pentateuch through typology, that all who respond in faith may have life.

Miscellaneous Reflections

This project focused exclusively on types of Christ in the Pentateuch that were mentioned by New Testament authors. I limited the scope of the project in this manner to provide a focused and concise examination on one specific area of typology. Although some scholars argue that a limited hermeneutic is the only legitimate approach to typology, I believe otherwise. Therefore, alongside this project, on Sunday evenings, I

preached a variety of expository sermons on Christological typology that were never mentioned by New Testament authors, and some that were outside of the Pentateuch. For example, I preached that the ram was a type of Christ in Genesis 22, that Joseph was type of Christ in Genesis 37-50, and that like Moses, Joshua served as a type of Christ. Adhering to a strict and limited view of typology provides hermeneutical safety, but it neglects the full picture of the Messiah in the Old Testament. Therefore, I have embraced a broader view of typology while striving to avoid allegory or forced and unnatural typology.

I also briefly addressed the types of Christ that were mentioned by New Testament authors, but that were not included in the project. For example, in Matthew 12:38-42 and Luke 11:29-32 Jesus directly compares himself to Jonah. Although Jonah was beyond the scope of the project (outside of the Pentateuch), I explained to the congregation that he was indeed a type of Christ. Likewise, I explained how the rock that provided water for the people of Israel was a type of Christ. Paul states, “For they drank from the spiritual Rock that followed them, and the Rock was Christ” (1 Cor 10:4). Paul directly compares Jesus to the rock that provided nourishment and life to Israel. Although I did not select this passage for the project, I nevertheless wanted the congregation to be aware of it. Therefore, the aim of the project was to communicate Christological typology in the Pentateuch, but my overarching desire was to show a broader view of typology.

Personal Reflections

I prefer things in life to be “black or white,” “yes or no,” or “good or bad.” Life seems to flow more smoothly when there is certainty. As I began the process of

researching Christological typology, I assumed that identifying types of Christ could be accomplished with precision, clarity, and certainty. I assumed that most scholars agreed on the definition, limitations, and examples of typology. However, within the first week of research it became apparent that my assumptions were incorrect. For example, Dennis Johnson uses a rather broad definition for typology,¹ Sidney Greidanus' view is much more restrictive,² and Graeme Goldsworthy's understanding is more balanced.³ Therefore, as with many theological matters, there is little agreement in regards to typology. At first, this lack of consensus was frustrating, but then I was compelled to compare and contrast the differences, and eventually form my own understanding of typology. Although I normally enjoy things being "black or white," I am thankful for the journey that this project has allowed me to enjoy.

Second, I was impressed with the typological conviction of New Testament authors. Prior to this project, I was aware of the most basic examples of typology, Genesis 22 for example, but had no grasp of the typological hermeneutic used so frequently by New Testament authors. For example, John clearly explains how Jesus compared himself to the bronze serpent (John 3:1-15), and how Jesus is the Passover Lamb (John 19:31-37). Paul obviously believed Jesus to be the second Adam (Rom 5:12-21). The author of Hebrews believed Jesus to be greater than Moses (Heb 3:1-6), the great high priest (Heb 4:14-5:10), the tabernacle (Heb 9:1-14), and the perfect

¹Dennis E. Johnson, *Him We Proclaim: Preaching Christ from All the Scriptures* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2007), 49-50, 103.

²Sidney Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament: Contemporary Hermeneutical Method* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 255-60.

³Graeme Goldsworthy, *Christ-Centered Biblical Theology: Hermeneutical Foundations and Principles* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012), 174-75.

fulfillment of the law (Heb 10:1-10). For me, all of these tremendous examples of typology were hidden in plain sight. I had read the passages many times in the past, but had failed to grasp the underlying meaning. As I continue to learn about the sovereignty of God, the meta-narrative of God's Word, and the typological hermeneutic of New Testament authors, I will always be grateful for the foundation this project has provided.

Third, I was encouraged by the eagerness of the congregation to understand the significance of Christological typology. Pastors often avoid complex subjects for fear that the congregation will not be able to comprehend. In truth, the burden is upon the pastor to communicate seemingly difficult topics in an understandable and applicable manner. Accomplishing this takes time and effort, but the results are worth the labor. I have learned to have greater faith in the church's ability to grasp intricate theological issues. This task is accomplished first through the guidance of the Holy Spirit (John 14:26), and secondly through the determination of the preacher to faithfully exposit God's Word.

Last, I will always be grateful for the patience and love of First Baptist Mayfield. Projects such as this demand a great deal of time and effort; time that could have been spent on visitation, sermon preparation, or missions, but out of necessity was spent instead on a ministry project. Not once did the membership make me feel guilty for pursuing a theological education. Not once did they question my devotion to the church or my passion for pastoring. Throughout the entire process they have been faithful, encouraging, patient, and supportive. I know that my church family will be excited for me and proud of me when this chapter of my theological journey is complete. I

appreciate the Kingdom mindset of First Baptist Mayfield, and look forward to serving them in the years to come.

Conclusion

My desire to pursue this project was in response to the Doctor of Ministry seminar entitled *Expository Preaching and the Old Testament*. The syllabus required students to read books from authors such as Graeme Goldsworthy, Sidney Greidanus, and Walter Kaiser. Through the influence of these authors, combined with the instruction of T. J. Betts, I developed a passion to learn more about typology. The subject intrigued me because it answered a question that I had pondered since adolescence. I had always wondered how those who lived in the Old Testament era were offered grace. How were they saved? How were their sins forgiven and atoned for? How were they reconciled to God? Although one may never fully comprehend the sovereignty of God, one can know that his plan for redeeming humanity has always been through the Messiah. One can know that the Messiah was foreshadowed through typology in the Pentateuch. One can know that all who responded to God's plan of redemption in faith were shown grace. Therefore, one can conclude that grace, redemption, atonement, and reconciliation have always been through the blood of Jesus, whether anticipated or remembered. I pray that this ministry project has been beneficial to the congregation of First Baptist Mayfield, and I pray that God has been honored through the proclamation of Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

APPENDIX
RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Research Instrument 1

Communicating the Gospel through Christological Typology in the Pentateuch at First Baptist Church, Mayfield, KY

- I. Pre and post-sermon series questionnaire for the panel of 10 regularly attending youth, median-aged, and senior adult members of First Baptist Mayfield

Agreement to Participate

The research in which you are about to participate is designed to measure your knowledge of Christological typology in the Pentateuch. This research is being conducted by John Wesley Fowler for the purpose of a ministry project at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, KY. In this research, you will be asked to provide your opinion on statements relating to Christological typology in the Pentateuch. Each participant will take this questionnaire twice: (1) The questionnaire will be taken prior to an eight-week sermon series on Christological typology, and (2) The questionnaire will be re-taken at the conclusion of the eight-week sermon series on Christological typology. Any information you provide will be held *strictly confidential*, and at no time will your name be reported, or your name identified with your responses. *Participation in this study is totally voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time.*

By your completion of this questionnaire, you are giving informed consent for the use of your responses in this research.

Instructions: Please indicate your opinions about the statements below by using the scale provided. Write the corresponding number in the blank provided to the left of each statement.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

1. _____ I understand and can explain the definition of Christological typology.
2. _____ I understand and can explain the meaning of the word “meta-narrative” when used in reference to the Bible.
3. _____ I understand and can explain how Adam in Genesis 1-3 is a type of Christ.
4. _____ I understand and can explain how Moses is a type of Christ.

5. _____ I understand and can explain how the bronze serpent in Numbers 21:4-9 is a type of Christ.
6. _____ I understand and can explain how the Passover lamb is a type of Christ.
7. _____ I understand and can explain how the Old Testament high priest is a type of Christ.
8. _____ I understand and can explain how the Mosaic Law is a type of Christ.
9. _____ I understand and can explain how the sin sacrifice in Leviticus is a type of Christ.
10. _____ I understand and can explain how the tabernacle is a type of Christ.

Research Instrument 2

Communicating the Gospel through Christological Typology in the Pentateuch at First Baptist Church, Mayfield, KY

Agreement to Participate

The research in which you are about to participate is designed to evaluate sermon outlines pertaining to Christological typology in the Pentateuch. This research is being conducted by John Wesley Fowler for the purpose of a ministry project at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, KY. In this research, you will be providing your opinion on sermon outlines. Any information you provide will be held *strictly confidential*, and at no time will your name be reported, or your name identified with your responses. *Participation in this study is totally voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time.*

By your completion of this questionnaire, you are giving informed consent for the use of your responses in this research.

Instructions: In the blanks provided to the left of each statement, please use the scale below to express your opinions on the sermon outline being reviewed. For example, if you strongly agree with a statement, place a “6” in the blank to the left of that statement.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

Sermon Outline: Introduction

1. _____ The introduction is interesting.
2. _____ The length of the introduction is appropriate.
3. _____ The introduction prepares the congregation for the body of the sermon.
4. _____ The introduction provides a natural segue into the body of the sermon.

Sermon Outline: Body

1. _____ The sermon outline explains the context of the passage.
2. _____ The sermon outline is rooted firmly on the biblical text.
3. _____ The sermon outline is organized effectively.
4. _____ The sermon outline includes illustrations.
5. _____ The sermon outline transitions and flows smoothly.

Sermon Outline: Conclusion

1. _____ The sermon outline segues naturally into a conclusion.
2. _____ The conclusion is interesting.
3. _____ The length of the conclusion is appropriate.
4. _____ The conclusion nicely summarizes and completes the sermon.

Sermon Outline: Christological typology

1. _____ The Christological type is founded in the OT.
2. _____ The Christological type is revealed in the NT.
3. _____ The Christological type is based on a historical event, person, or place.
4. _____ The Christological type involves escalation.
5. _____ The Christological type involves fulfillment.
6. _____ The Christological type is sufficiently revealed & explained.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Allen, David L. *Hebrews*. The New American Commentary, vol. 35. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2010.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae Prima Pars*. Translated by Fr. Laurence Shapcote. Edited by John Mortensen and Enrique Alarcon. Lander, WY: The Aquinas Institute for the Study of Sacred Doctrine, 2012.
- Baker, David L. *Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of Some Modern Solutions to the Theological Problem of the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1976.
- Beale, G. K. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012.
- Black, David Alan, and David S. Dockery, eds. *New Testament Criticism & Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991.
- Boa, Kenneth, and William Kruidenier. *Romans*. The Holman New Testament Commentary, vol. 6. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000.
- Bruce, F. F. *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Calvin, John. *Calvin's Commentary*. Vol. 10, *Jeremiah 20-47*. Translated and edited by John Owen. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.
- _____. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2008.
- Chrysostom, John. *De Poenitentia*. In *The Face of Christ in the Old Testament* by Georges Barrois. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974.
- _____. *Homily in Genesis*. In *The Father's of the Church: A New Translation*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1986.

- Clement. *Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria. The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 2. Edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Company, 1885.
- Crowson, Milton. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Clear Study Series. Nashville: Randall House, 2000.
- Dallimore, Arnold. *Spurgeon: A New Biography*. East Peoria, IL: Moody Press, 1985.
- Davidson, Richard M. *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical τύπος Structures*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981.
- Dockery, David S. *Biblical Interpretation Then and Now: Contemporary Hermeneutics in the Light of the Early Church*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.
- _____. *New Testament Criticism & Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991.
- Drummond, Lewis. *Spurgeon: Prince of Preachers*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1992.
- Ellis, E. E. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.
- Elwell, Walter A., ed. *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.
- Eubanks, David L., and Robert C. Shannon. *Hebrews: Unlocking the Scriptures for You*. Cincinnati: Standard, 1986.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Ferguson, Duncan S. *Biblical Hermeneutics: An Introduction*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1986.
- Goldsworthy, Graeme. *Christ-Centered Biblical Theology: Hermeneutical Foundations and Principles*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012.
- _____. *Gospel and Kingdom: A Christian Interpretation of the Old Testament*. Exeter, UK: Paternoster, 1981.
- _____. *The Gospel in Revelation*. Exeter, UK: Paternoster, 1984.
- _____. *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics: Foundations and Principles of Evangelical Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006.

- _____. *Preaching the Whole Bible as Christian Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Greidanus, Sidney. *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Hamilton, James. *God's Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010.
- _____. *What is Biblical Theology? A Guide to the Bible's Story, Symbolism, and Patterns*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014.
- Hull, William E. *John*. In vol. 9 of *The Broadman Bible Commentary*. Edited by Clifton J. Allen, 189-376. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1970.
- Hyde, Gordon M. *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*. Washington, DC: The Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1974.
- Jamieson, Robert, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown. *Matthew-Romans*. Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible, vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1934.
- Johnson, Dennis E. *Him We Proclaim: Preaching Christ from All the Scriptures*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2007.
- _____. *Triumph of the Lamb: A Commentary on Revelation*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2001.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Hebrews*. The New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster, 2006.
- Kaiser, Walter, Jr. *Recovering the Unity of the Bible: One Continuous Story, Plan, and Purpose*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.
- _____. *Toward an Exegetical Theology: Biblical Exegesis for Preaching & Teaching*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.
- Kaiser, Walter, Jr., and Moises Silva. *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003.

- Lane, William L. *Hebrews 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 47a. Dallas: Word Books, 1991.
- Lange, John Peter. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical*. Translated by Philip Schaff. Bellingham, WA: Logos, 2008.
- _____. *John: A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*. Translated by Philip Schaff. Bellingham, WA: Logos, 2008.
- Larsen, David L. *The Anatomy of Preaching: Identifying the Issues in Preaching Today*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989.
- Lea, Thomas D. *Hebrews, James*. Holman New Testament Commentary, vol. 10. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999.
- Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works*. Vol. 1. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia, 1958.
- _____. *Luther's Works*. Vol. 5. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia, 1968.
- _____. *On the Bondage of the Will*. In *Luther and Erasmus: Freewill and Salvation*, edited by E. Gordon Rupp and Philip S. Watson, 220-62. Louisville: The Westminster Press, 1969.
- McCartney, Dan, and Charles Clayton. *Let the Reader Understand: A Guide to Interpreting and Applying the Bible*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1994.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Morris, Leon. *Hebrews*. In vol. 12 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein, 1-158. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.
- Mounce, Robert H. *Romans*. The New American Commentary, vol. 27. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995.
- Mulder, Martin J. *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
- Parker, Thomas Henry Louis, ed. *Calvin's Old Testament Commentaries*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986.
- Reventlow, Henning Graf. *History of Biblical Interpretation*. Vol. 2. Translated by James O. Duke. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.

- _____. *History of Biblical Interpretation*. Vol. 4. Translated by Leo G. Perdue. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Robinson, Haddon W. *Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.
- Ross, Allen P. *Holiness to the Lord: A Guide to the Exposition of the Book of Leviticus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *1,2 Peter, Jude*. The New American Commentary, vol. 37. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2003.
- Spurgeon, Charles. *Lectures to My Students*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1954.
- Stuart, Douglas K. *Exodus*. The New American Commentary, vol. 2. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2006.
- VanGemenen, Willem A. *Psalms*. In vol. 5 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelien, 1-880. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991.
- Virkler, Henry A. *Hermeneutics: Principles and Processes of Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.
- Vos, Geerhardus. *The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956. Reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1999.
- Wood, A. Skevington. *The Principles of Biblical Interpretation: As Enunciated by Irenaeus, Origen, Augustine, Luther and Calvin*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967.
- Yarchin, William. *History of Biblical Interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004.
- Zuck, Roy B. *Basic Bible Interpretation: A Practical Guide to Discovering Biblical Truth*. Colorado Springs: David C. Cook, 1991.

Articles

- Barrett, C. K. "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1947): 155-69.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W. "The Church Fathers and Holy Scripture." In *Scripture and Truth*, edited by D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge, 195-220. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983.

Edwards, O. C., Jr. "History of Preaching." In *Concise Encyclopedia of Preaching*. Edited by William H. Willimon and Richard Lischer, 184-227. Louisville: Westminster, 1995.

Kepple, Robert J. "An Analysis of Antiochene Exegesis of Galatians 4:24-26." *Westminster Theological Journal* 39, no. 2 (Spring 1977): 239-49.

McCartney, D. G. "The New Testament's Use of the Pentateuch: Implications for the Theonomic Movement." In *Theonomy: A Reformed Critique*, edited by W. S. Barker and W. R. Godfrey, 129-49. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.

Reim, G. "Jesus as God in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Background." *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 158-60.

Schlier, Heinrich. "ὑπόδειγμα." In vol. 2 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Schulz, Seigfried. "σκιά." In vol. 7 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.

Spurgeon, Charles. "Christ Precious to Believers." In *The New Park Street Pulpit: Containing Sermons*. Pasadena, TX: Pilgrim Publication, 1975.

Dissertation

Talbert, John David. "Charles Haddon Spurgeon's Christological Homiletics: A Critical Evaluation of Selected Sermons from Old Testament Texts." Fort Worth: Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.

Website

Duncan, Ligon. *The Gospel by Numbers*. Together for the Gospel 2014 (T4G). Accessed on December 1, 2014, <http://t4g.org/media/2014/03/the-gospel-by-numbers-2>.

ABSTRACT

COMMUNICATING THE GOSPEL THROUGH CHRISTOLOGICAL TYPOLOGY IN THE PENTATEUCH AT FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, MAYFIELD, KENTUCKY

John Wesley Fowler, D.Min.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2015
Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Terry J. Betts

This project communicated the Gospel through Christological typology in the Pentateuch at First Baptist Church, Mayfield, Kentucky. I accomplished this project by preaching an eight-week sermon series and comparing pre and post-sermon series questionnaires administered to a representative panel of 10 regularly attending members. Three goals guided the project. The first goal was to assess the congregation's pre-sermon series knowledge of Christological typology in the Pentateuch. The second goal was to develop sermon outlines to communicate Christological typology in the Pentateuch. The third goal was to preach an eight-week sermon series to proclaim Christological typology in the Pentateuch. A paired sample two-tailed t-test on the data from the pre and post-sermon series questionnaires determined the effectiveness of the sermon series. Based on the panel's responses, the sermon series made a statistically significant difference in the congregation's understanding of Christological typology in the Pentateuch.

VITA

John Wesley Fowler

EDUCATIONAL

Diploma, Graves County High School, Mayfield, Kentucky, 1995
B. A., Valdosta State University, 2003
M.Div., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2007

MINISTERIAL

Interim Youth Pastor, First Baptist Church, Valdosta, Georgia, 2001-03
Youth Pastor, First Baptist Church, Valdosta, Georgia, 2003-09
Senior Pastor, First Baptist Church, Homerville, Georgia, 2009-11
Senior Pastor, First Baptist Church, Mayfield, Kentucky, 2011-