

The Typology of David’s Rise to Power: Messianic Patterns in the Book of Samuel

James M. Hamilton Jr.
Julius Brown Gay Lecture
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

This essay is dedicated to Professor E. Earle Ellis in gratitude for his many contributions to the study of the Bible, and especially for his clear statements on the subject of typology.

It has recently been suggested that “the issue of how we may read the Old Testament Christianly” is “the most acute tension with which academic biblical theology faces us.”¹ This recent statement reflects a long-standing question, as can be seen from the fact that the relationship between the Old and New Testaments is the major issue dealt with in Reventlow’s *Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century*.² I would suggest that progress on this question will only be made by those who embrace an interpretive method practiced by the biblical authors themselves as they interpreted earlier passages of Scripture: typology.³ As Francis Watson puts it, “What is proposed is not an anachronistic return to pre-critical exegesis but a radicalization of the modern theological and exegetical concern to identify ever more precisely those characteristics that are peculiar to the biblical texts.”⁴

After briefly stating the significance of typology and defining what it is, this presentation will consider whether we are limited to the examples of typological interpretation seen in

¹ Daniel J. Treier, “Biblical Theology and/or Theological Interpretation of Scripture?” *SJT* 61 (2008), 29 (16–31). Similarly Graeme Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics: Foundations and Principles of Evangelical Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2006), 234.

² Henning Graf Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986).

³ For “an investigation of the breakdown of realistic and figural interpretation of the biblical stories,” see Hans W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 9. For extensive bibliography on the subject of typology, see Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology*, 14–18, 20–23, and Paul Hoskins has updated the discussion of typology in the published version of his dissertation, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2006), 18–36.

⁴ Francis Watson, *Text and Truth: Redefining Biblical Theology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 205.

the Old and New Testaments,⁵ or whether, taking our cues from those examples, we can build upon them. The theory that we can learn to interpret the Bible typologically from the authors of the New Testament *and apply the method to passages they themselves do not specifically address* will then be tested against the narratives of David's rise to power in the book of Samuel.

Typology: Significance and Definition

Significance

Understanding typology is significant because without it we cannot understand the New Testament's interpretation of the Old. If we do not understand the New Testament's interpretation of the Old, we could be led to false conclusions about the legitimacy of the hermeneutical moves made by the authors of the New Testament.

Leonhard Goppelt referred to typology as "the principal form of the NT's interpretation of Scripture."⁶ Similarly, Earle Ellis writes that "The NT's understanding and exposition of the OT lies at the heart of its theology, and it is primarily expressed within the framework of a typological interpretation."⁷ And David Instone-Brewer states, "Typology dominates the New Testament and, if messianic movements are an indication of popular thought, it also dominated pre-70 CE Palestinian Judaism . . ."⁸ Goppelt, Ellis,

⁵ For examination of the use of typology in the Old Testament, see Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 350–79, and Francis Foulkes, *The Acts of God: A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale, 1955; reprinted in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts*, 342–71). For typology in extra-biblical Jewish literature, see Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, trans. Donald H. Madvig (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982; reprint Wipf and Stock, 2002), 23–58. For typology in the New Testament, see Goppelt, *Typos*, 61–237; E. Earle Ellis, "Biblical Interpretation in the New Testament Church," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, CRINT 2.1 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988; reprint Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004), 713–16; R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (Vancouver: Regent College, 1998 [1971]), 38–80; and Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple*.

⁶ Goppelt, *Typos*, xxiii, cf. also 198: "typology is the method of interpreting Scripture that is predominant in the NT and characteristic of it." This is of course disputed. Reventlow (*Problems of Biblical Theology*, 20) writes: "typology is just one, rather rare, way in which the Old Testament is used in the New."

⁷ E. Earle Ellis, "Foreword," in Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, trans. Donald H. Madvig (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982; reprint Wipf and Stock, 2002), xx.

⁸ David Instone-Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE*, *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 221.

Instone-Brewer, and others,⁹ thus indicate that typological interpretation is central to understanding the New Testament's appeal to the Old Testament. By contrast, there is almost no treatment of typological interpretation in Richard Longenecker's *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*.¹⁰

Typology is significant because it is used so often in the New Testament, and this means that understanding this interpretive practice can deliver us from wrong conclusions regarding what the New Testament claims about the Old Testament. As Earle Ellis has written, "Paul's usage [of the OT] . . . is not arbitrary or against the literal sense if the typological usage be granted."¹¹ I have argued elsewhere that a typological reading of the "fulfillment" passages in the first two chapters of Matthew alleviates the dissonance created when we try to read the passages Matthew quotes as predictive prophecies.¹² And this has implications not only for our understanding of the New Testament, but also for how we understand the Old. It seems significant that one of the major proponents of the view that apostolic interpretive methods are not to be practiced today, Richard Longenecker, does not recognize typology *as an interpretive method*. Longenecker does discuss typology as a factor in "the concept of fulfillment in the New Testament," which, he writes, "has more to do with ideas of 'corporate solidarity' and 'typological

⁹ Mark A. Seifrid ("The Gospel as the Revelation of the Mystery: The Witness of the Scriptures to Christ in Romans," *SBJT* 11.3 [2007], 92–103) writes, "Paul's understanding of Scripture is fundamentally 'typological'" (99). Cf. also Richard B. Hays, "Reading Scripture in Light of the Resurrection," in *The Art of Reading Scripture*, ed. Ellen F. Davis and Richard B. Hays (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 216–38: "the Jesus who taught the disciples on the Emmaus road that *all* the scriptures bore witness to him continues to teach us to discover figural senses of Scripture that are not developed in the New Testament" (234).

¹⁰ Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999). Longenecker classifies first century Jewish exegesis "under four headings: literalist, midrashic, peshet, and allegorical" (xxv, 6–35). Longenecker does discuss "Correspondences in History" and "Eschatological Fulfillment" as two of what he refers to as four major "Exegetical Presuppositions" (76–79), but he does not view "typology" as a distinct interpretive practice, and he classifies instances of typological interpretation as instances of peshet interpretation (58). He writes, "what appears to be most characteristic in the preaching of the earliest Jewish believers in Jesus were their peshet interpretations of Scripture" (82). While Goppelt's book on typology (with reference to the English translation) is on Longenecker's bibliography, Goppelt's name does not appear in Longenecker's author index.

¹¹ E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981 [1957]), 75. Citing J. Bonsirven, *Exégèse Rabinique et Exégèse Paulinienne* (Paris, 1939), 337f.

¹² See my essay, "'The Virgin Will Conceive': Typological Fulfillment in Matthew 1:18–23," in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 228–47.

correspondences in history' than with direct prediction."¹³ But when he comes to "Exegetical Procedures of Early Christians," he limits these to "literalist, midrashic, pesher, and allegorical."¹⁴ This seems to be a category mistake: since Longenecker does not recognize typology as a kind of biblical theological interpretive procedure, he wrongly labels typological interpretations as pesher interpretations (more on this shortly).¹⁵ This would seem to call into question his rejection of the abiding validity of the hermeneutical procedures employed by the authors of the New Testament.

If the task of typology is similar to the task of biblical theology¹⁶—reflecting on the results of exegesis, and thus exegeting the canon as opposed to exegeting a particular passage¹⁷—then it appears that when the biblical authors engage in typological interpretation they are in fact engaging in biblical theological reflection. What Frei says regarding the "controversy between certain Deists and their orthodox opponents about the veracity of the assertions made in the New Testament . . . that certain Old Testament prophecies had been fulfilled in the New Testament story" remains true today:

At stake [is] the correctness or incorrectness of a later interpretation of the words of earlier texts. Did the earlier texts actually mean what at a later stage they had been said to mean? . . . Were the New Testament writers correct or not when they used the Old Testament texts as evidence for the New Testament's own historical truth claims?¹⁸

Definition

Historical correspondence and escalation. Earle Ellis helpfully explains that "typology views the relationship of OT events to those in the new dispensation . . . in terms of two

¹³ Richard N. Longenecker, "Who is the Prophet Talking About? Some Reflections on the New Testament Use of the Old," *Them* 13 (1987), 4–8; reprinted in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 377 (375–86).

¹⁴ Longenecker, "Who is the Prophet Talking About?" 379–80.

¹⁵ See Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 58, 82.

¹⁶ Frei refers to biblical theology as the successor of typology, which was destroyed by the rise of higher criticism (*Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, 8).

¹⁷ So also G. K. Beale, "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? An Examination of the Presuppositions of Jesus' and the Apostles' Exegetical Method," *Them* 14 (1989): 89–96; reprinted in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts*, 387–404. Beale writes: "typology can be called contextual exegesis within the framework of the canon, since it primarily involves the interpretation and elucidation of the meaning of earlier parts of Scripture by latter parts" (401).

¹⁸ Frei, *Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, 41.

principles, historical correspondence and escalation.”¹⁹ Michael Fishbane writes that “inner-biblical typologies constitute a literary-historical phenomenon which isolates perceived correlations between specific events, persons, or places early in time with their later correspondents.”²⁰ This basic definition of typology is generally agreed upon, with some exceptions,²¹ but there are differences over whether types are predictive and whether typology is an interpretive method. Our main interest will be with the latter question, but we can briefly represent the concerns of the former.

Retrospective or prospective? There is a dispute among those who read the Bible typologically over whether types are *only* retrospective or whether they also function *prospectively*, that is, predictively. On one side, R. T. France writes: “There is no indication in a type, as such, of any forward reference; it is complete and intelligible in itself.”²² On the other side, G. K. Beale states that “the πληρω [fulfillment] formulas prefixed to citations from formally non-prophetic OT passages in the gospels decisively argue against this.”²³ In between these two options, Grant Osborne writes, “It is likely that the solution lies in the middle. The OT authors and participants did not necessarily recognize any typological force in the original, but in the divine plan the early event did anticipate the later reality.”²⁴ The fulfillment formulas do indicate that the NT authors understand the Old Testament types to be pointing forward, but Osborne is correct to point out that more needs to be said about *how* and *when* these types would have been understood as pointing forward. Engaging this debate further is beyond the scope of this

¹⁹ Ellis, “Foreword,” x.

²⁰ Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 351. See also John H. Stek, “Biblical Typology Yesterday and Today,” *CTJ* 5 (1970), 135: “A type [as opposed to an allegory] is not a narrative but some historical fact or circumstance which the Old Testament narratives report. Furthermore, the type embodies the same ‘truth principle’ which is embodied in the antitype.” Stek is summarizing Patrick Fairbairn’s view.

²¹ For instance, David Baker does not think that “escalation” is essential to typology (“Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament,” *SJT* 29 [1976]: 137–57; reprinted in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts*, ed. G. K. Beale [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994], 313–30—see p. 326).

²² France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 42.

²³ Beale, “Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text?” 396–97 n. 27. Beale cites Fairbairn, S. L. Johnson, Goppelt, Davidson, Moo, and Foulkes as being in general agreement with this conclusion. See also Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple*, 186–87. Frei (*Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, 36) indicates that Calvin saw “figures” (types) as prospective.

²⁴ G. R. Osborne, “Type; Typology,” in *ISBE* 4:931 (930–32).

essay.²⁵ What does concern us at present is whether typology should be understood as an exegetical method or only as, in Longenecker's terms, an "exegetical presupposition."²⁶

Method or presupposition? Reventlow states that "Typology is not the task of exegesis proper, but of biblical theology; the former examines the literary testimony to an event; the latter connects it with other events which are reported in the Bible."²⁷ This is not dissimilar from a recent observation of Stephen Dempster's that biblical theology is something along the lines of reflection upon exegesis.²⁸ I grant the point that we first interpret the near context—words, phrases, complete thoughts, etc.—in our exegesis. This close exegesis of particular passages then provides fodder for reflection on and correlation with other passages when we engage in biblical theology or typological thinking. What must be recognized, however, is that this correlation and reflection is still *interpretation*. We are still doing exegesis. The difference is that rather than exegeting a particular passage, we are exegeting the canon.²⁹ Biblical theology and typological interpretation, then, can be thought of as a form of exegesis that gives itself to the broader context, the canonical context, of the passage at hand.

One sometimes hears the suggestion that "biblical theology is 'an old man's game.'"³⁰ The idea seems to be that one will spend the greater part of one's life exegeting individual passages in isolation, and only when all that long work is done is one in a position to make accurate correlations. But if this is true, why not suggest that one should spend the greater part of one's life studying historical backgrounds, or textual criticism, or language, or lexicography, or syntax, or exegetical method, and only once these approaches have been mastered, begin the work of exegesis as an old man?

It seems better to grant that biblical theology and typological interpretation have a rightful place in the hermeneutical spiral. This hermeneutical spiral has so many torturous turns that all interpreters—old or young—must hold their conclusions with due humility. We not only can, we must engage in biblical theology and typological thinking as we do exegesis. Naturally we will, Lord willing, become better interpreters as we grow in wisdom and experience, but that does not mean that we should bracket off part of the

²⁵ It seems to me that it would be helpful to explore *when* in salvation history the type would have been seen to be prospective, and also to ask whether seeing the prospective aspects of a type would have been possible only once a later Old Testament account could be seen to stand in typological relationship with an earlier narrative.

²⁶ Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 76–79.

²⁷ Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology*, 31.

²⁸ Personal communication, January 2008.

²⁹ So also Beale, "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text?" 401.

³⁰ Eugene H. Merrill, *Everlasting Dominion: A Theology of the Old Testament* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2006), xv.

process until we reach a certain age or level of experience. Each spin through the whole of the hermeneutical spiral brings us closer, it is hoped, to understanding what is happening in a text. We cannot afford to endlessly defer the typological turn.³¹ We must attempt to navigate these curves. Just as skill is cultivated from practicing the other bends in the spiral, so continued reflection on typology and biblical theology—continually refined by prayerful reading and re-reading of the Bible—will by God’s grace produce scribes trained for the kingdom of heaven, able to bring out treasures old and new.

If we ask how the conclusions of such exegetical reflection might differ from the *sensus plenior*, we find help from Reventlow, who says regarding the *sensus plenior*: “The difference from the typical sense is seen to lie in the fact that it relates to the wording of the Old Testament texts themselves . . .”³² Thus, whereas typology focuses on patterns of events, *sensus plenior* refers to deeper or fuller meanings of words or statements.³³

As noted above, Longenecker treats some instances of typological interpretation under the rubric of “peshet” interpretation.³⁴ This unhelpfully confuses two very different methods of interpretation. Peshet and Typology differ in both form and content. The “peshetite form” of interpretation practiced at Qumran often involved the citation of “large blocks” of the Old Testament, followed by the Aramaic term פִּשְׁתָּא, “solution/interpretation,” followed by “the elucidation of the consecutive lemmata from the text at hand . . . with references to the present and future life of the community.”³⁵

³¹ When I was taught OT exegesis at an evangelical institution, one of my teachers regularly told us that once we had first done our OT exegesis without reference to the NT, we could then consider the relationships between the Testaments. The problem is that I cannot ever remember a time when we actually finished our OT exegesis and moved to the consideration of the relationship between the OT and the NT.

³² Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology*, 42. See also Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 352.

³³ So also Douglas J. Moo, “The Problem of *Sensus Plenior*,” in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon*, ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 179–211, esp. 202.

³⁴ Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 58. It seems that in “systematizing” the NT’s interpretation of the Old according to his four categories of Jewish exegesis, he has forced material that does not fit into his established categories, such as these typological interpretations. This appears to make his categories more prescriptive than descriptive. See also the discussion of “the great gulf which separates Paul’s use of the OT from that of the rabbis” in Ellis, *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament*, 73–76, here 74; similarly Moo, “The Problem of *Sensus Plenior*,” 193.

³⁵ Michael Fishbane, “Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, CRINT 2.1 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988; reprint Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004), 351. Cf. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 24–30.

Thus, on the formal level, *peshar* interpretations are usually marked by the use of the word “*peshar*.”

By contrast, Michael Fishbane lists several phrases that are characteristically used to signal typological interpretations in the Old Testament. He writes:

- “the clause כן . . . כאשר ‘just as . . . so’ and its variants are particularly frequent”
 - “Now and then כאשר is replaced by כִּי and variants”
- “juxtaposition of such terms as ראשונות [תֵּאַנ=װאַר I] and קדמוניות [תֵּאַיֶּאַן I םֹד > ך ;], which indicate ‘first’ or ‘former’ things, over against אחרונות or חדשות [sic this term takes a masc. pl. ending not a feminine, cf. Isa 41:4], which indicate ‘new’ or ‘latter’ things, recurs exclusively in [Isaiah]”
- “In a similar way, the prophet Jeremiah juxtaposes old and new events with a fixed rhetorical style, as can be seen by a comparison of his statement in 31:30-2 that the new covenant will ‘not be like’ (לֹא כִּי . . .) the older one ‘but rather’ (כִּי זֹאת [v.33]) of a different type”
- “Apart from these instances, there is another broad category wherein the typologies are indicated by non-technical idiosyncratic usages, employed by the speaker for the situation at hand. A good example of this technique may be found in Isa. 11:11, where YHWH states that ‘he will continue יוֹסֵף’ to redeem Israel in the future, a ‘second time שְׁנִיִּית’, just like the first. The language used here marks the typological correlation very well, and explicitly indicates its two vital features, the new moment *and* its reiteration.”
- “In addition, there are many other cases of inner-biblical typology which are not signaled by technical terms at all. To recognize the typologies at hand, the latter-day investigator must be alert to lexical co-ordinates that appear to correlate apparently disparate texts . . . or to various forms of paratactic juxtaposition. Sometimes, moreover, motifs are juxtaposed, sometimes pericopae, and sometimes recurrent scenarios.”³⁶

None of the occurrences of פֶּשֶׁר, “interpretation,” in the Old Testament introduce a typological interpretation (cf. Eccl 8:1; Dan 4:3; 5:15, 26). Thus, on the formal level, there appears to be no warrant for grouping typological interpretation under the umbrella of “*peshar* interpretation.”

As for differences in content, Craig Evans helpfully contrasts typology with other forms of first century interpretation:

Allegorization discovers morals and theological symbols and truths from various details of Scripture; *peshar* seeks to unlock the prophetic mysteries hidden in Scripture and *midrash* seeks to update Torah and clarify obscurities and problems

³⁶ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 352–53. Fishbane adds that these techniques do not provide the basis for “flexible and comprehensive categories” that the analysis of the “contents of the typologies” does.

in Scripture. But *typology* represents the effort to coordinate the past and present (and future) according to the major events, persons and institutions of Scripture.³⁷

Typology should be recognized as an interpretive method. Granted, it reads divinely intended patterns of events seen in multiple passages as opposed to reading single passages in isolation. But typology should not be classed under “*peshar*,” for as George J. Brooke has written,

it is important that modern commentators do not use the term *peshar* loosely, as if it could ever cover all that there is to understand and catalog in Qumran biblical interpretation. *Peshar* describes one distinctive kind of interpretation among others. . . . The warning about the careful use of the term *peshar* applies especially in relation to the various kinds of biblical interpretation found in the NT.³⁸

Brooke then states that the term *peshar* “can be applied only in cases where the NT author engages in the interpretation of unfulfilled or partially fulfilled blessings, curses, and other prophecies.”³⁹ *Peshar* is not typology, and neither interpretive method is clarified by subsuming it under the other.⁴⁰

If typology is not classified as *peshar*, which Craig Evans calls “the most distinctive genre among the Dead Sea Scrolls,”⁴¹ it immediately loses some of the stigma attached to certain discredited methods of interpretation practiced in the ancient world. This would

³⁷ C. A. Evans, “Typology,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, I. Howard Marshall (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992), 862 (862–66).

³⁸ G. J. Brooke, “Pesharim,” in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), 781 (778–82).

³⁹ Brooke, “Pesharim,” 782.

⁴⁰ See the older (1957) but still very helpful discussions in Ellis, *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament*. Ellis discusses both typology (126–35) and “midrash *peshar*” (139–47). Largely informed by Stendahl’s work on Matthew, Ellis defines “midrash *peshar*” as “an interpretative moulding of the text within an apocalyptic framework, *ad hoc* or with reference to appropriate textual or targumic traditions” (147), and he treats this “moulding” as a scholarly “interpretative selection from the various known texts” (139). For a more recent discussion, see E. Earle Ellis, *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*, Biblical Interpretation Series 54 (Atlanta: SBL, 2001), for “*peshar* midrash” see 109–11, for typology see 115–18.

⁴¹ Craig A. Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005), 146.

seem to call for a reconsideration of “the normativeness or exemplary status”⁴² of the method of typology.

The Limits of Typological Interpretation?

There is no small dispute over whether we are limited to the typological interpretations found in the New Testament. Can we apply the method to Old Testament passages that the New Testament does not directly address? Graeme Goldsworthy states the question plainly when he writes, “There are obvious typological interpretations in the New Testament, but are we confined to the texts that are specifically raised in the New Testament?”⁴³ This question arises because, as Reventlow notes, “The demand is . . . often made that typology should be limited to the examples explicitly mentioned in the New Testament.”⁴⁴

Stan Gundry describes “The rule of thumb that a type is a type only when the New Testament specifically designates it to be such” as being a reaction against those whose typology had become so extravagant that it was practically allegorical.⁴⁵ Gundry explains:

whenever typology is used to show the Christocentric unity of the Bible, it is all too easy to impose an artificial unity (even assuming that there is a valid use of the basic method). Types come to be created rather than discovered, and the drift into allegorism comes all too easily. . . . Properly speaking, typology is a mode of historical understanding. The historical value and understanding of the text to be interpreted forms the essential presupposition for the use of it. But in the search for types it was all too easy to look for secondary hidden meanings underlying the primary and obvious meaning. When that happened, typology began to shade into allegory.⁴⁶

It is important to stress that it is precisely the *historical* nature of a type that is essential to it being interpreted typologically. This is a universally acknowledged methodological control articulated by those who differentiate between typology and allegory. Thus, if the type becomes merely a cipher for its antitype, the interpreter has begun to lean in the direction of allegory. As Fishbane writes, “the concrete historicity of the correlated data means that no new event is ever merely a ‘type’ of another, but always retains its

⁴² Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, xxxvi.

⁴³ Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics*, 247.

⁴⁴ Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology*, 19.

⁴⁵ Stanley N. Gundry, “Typology as a Means of Interpretation: Past and Present,” *JETS* 12 (1969), 236.

⁴⁶ Gundry, “Typology as a Means of Interpretation,” 235.

historically unique character.”⁴⁷ But it is not only *history* that matters, there must also be a genuine *correspondence*. As R. T. France says, “the lack of a real historical correspondence reduces typology to allegory. . . .”⁴⁸

As to whether we can employ this method today, Beale observes that all interpretive methods are abused and that the abuse of typology does not invalidate it as a method. Rather, the abuse of typology in the past urges that we use it with “great caution.” Moreover, Beale contends, we need not be inspired by the Holy Spirit to read the Old Testament typologically. The fact that we are not inspired, as the biblical authors were, simply means that we will lack the epistemological certainty enjoyed by the apostles. As Beale says, all interpretive conclusions “are a matter of degrees of possibility and probability,” and this will be true of the typological interpretations put forward as we use the method today.⁴⁹

In spite of the danger of allegory, it is simply not possible to limit our typological interpretation of the Old Testament to those examples explicitly cited in the New Testament. The most obvious reason for this is that the New Testament does not cite *all* of the instances of the Old Testament’s typological interpretation of itself.⁵⁰ This means that we must read the Old Testament typologically—and find types not explicitly identified in the New Testament—if we are to understand the Old Testament’s interpretation of itself. Typology appears to be vital to a robust understanding of the unity of the Bible.⁵¹ Moreover, several passages in the New Testament invite readers to conclude that the Old Testament is fulfilled in Jesus and the church in more ways than are explicitly quoted in the New Testament (cf. Luke 24:25–27; John 5:39–46; Acts 3:24; 17:2–3; Rom 15:4; 1 Cor 10:11; 2 Cor 1:20; Heb 8:5; 10:1; 1 Pet 1:10–12).⁵² The text

⁴⁷ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 351.

⁴⁸ France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 41.

⁴⁹ Beale, “Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text?” 399–400.

⁵⁰ See the many examples cited in Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 350–79.

⁵¹ Stek quotes Patrick Fairbairn on the point that “The arbitrary restriction of typology [to those instances cited in the NT] ‘destroys to a large extent the bond of connection between the Old and the New Testament Scriptures’” (Stek, “Biblical Typology Yesterday and Today,” 135 n. 5).

⁵² See further Richard B. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel’s Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005). Hays states that one of his purposes in the book is to show that “we can learn from Paul’s example how to read Scripture faithfully” (viii), and he suggests that in 1 Cor 10:1–22 Paul is seeking to teach the Corinthians “that all the scriptural narratives and promises must be understood to point forward to the crucial eschatological moment in which he and his churches now

that is particularly relevant for the examination of Samuel below is Acts 3:24, “And all the prophets who have spoken, from Samuel and those who came after him, also proclaimed these days.”⁵³ Could the proclamation in view be typological?

As we turn to explore a typological reading of David’s rise to power in Samuel, Frei’s words will hopefully ring true: “the ‘method’ of figural procedure [is] better exhibited in application than stated in the abstract.”⁵⁴ As we proceed, we do so in agreement with Richard B. Hays, who has written of Luke 24:27,

Luke’s formulation suggests that testimony to Jesus is to be found ‘in all the scriptures’ (ἐν πᾶσι ταῖς γραφαῖς, *en pasais tais graphais*), not just in a few isolated proof texts. The whole story of Israel builds to its narrative climax in Jesus, the Messiah who had to suffer before entering into his glory. That is what Jesus tries to teach them on the road.⁵⁵

Messianic Patterns in Samuel

Before we look at possible historical correspondences between and escalations of divinely intended patterns of events in Samuel, we should briefly define how the term “messianic” is being understood here. The term “messianic” is used here

to refer to expectations focused on a future royal figure sent by God who will bring salvation to God’s people and the world and establish a kingdom characterized by features such as peace and justice. The phrase ‘the Messiah’ is used to refer to the figure at the heart of these expectations.⁵⁶

find themselves. . . . they are to see in their own experience the typological fulfillment of the biblical narrative” (11).

⁵³ Unless otherwise noted, all quotations from the Bible in this essay are from the ESV. In what follows I will cite several passages from the Synoptic Gospels and John, but I will usually not cite parallel passages. In citing the Synoptic Gospels, I do so representatively from each Gospel, not privileging one over another.

⁵⁴ Frei, *Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, 30. So also Douglas Moo, “Paul’s Universalizing Hermeneutic in Romans,” *SBJT* 11.3 (2007), 62–90: “To be sure, typology is easier to talk about than to describe” (81).

⁵⁵ Richard B. Hays, “Reading Scripture in Light of the Resurrection,” in *The Art of Reading Scripture*, ed. Ellen F. Davis and Richard B. Hays (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 229 (216–38).

⁵⁶ W. H. Rose, “Messiah,” in *Dictionary of the Old Testament Pentateuch*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and David W. Baker (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 566. For discussion of this and other definitions, see Andrew Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation: Jewish Messianic and Visionary Traditions and New Testament Christology*, WUNT 207 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 193–205.

With this definition in mind, we turn from the significance and definition of typology to test the theory that we can engage in “the method of exegesis that is the characteristic use of Scripture in the NT.”⁵⁷ As we examine the narrative of Samuel, it is important to stress that nothing is being taken away from the historicity of these narratives, nor is the human author’s intention in recording them being violated in any way. These narratives can only be understood typologically if they are taken precisely as narratives that have historical meaning.⁵⁸ In what follows, I seek to draw attention to the ways in which David’s experience was matched and exceeded in the experience of Jesus.

The Anointed, Saving Restrainer

Saul serves as a foil for David in the narrative of Samuel, and his experience as king of Israel prepares the ground for the foundation of Davidic kingship to be laid. When Yahweh instructs Samuel regarding the anointing of Saul, significant statements are made about the king’s role in Israel:

“Tomorrow about this time I will send to you a man from the land of Benjamin, and you shall anoint him to be prince over my people Israel. He shall save my people from the hand of the Philistines. For I have seen my people, because their cry has come to me.” When Samuel saw Saul, the LORD told him, “Here is the man of whom I spoke to you! He it is who shall restrain my people” (1 Sam 9:16–17, ESV).

We begin with three observations on what this text says about kingship in Israel: first, the king is to be *anointed* (9:16). The Pentateuch calls for the anointing of priests, but Deuteronomy 17 does not mention that Israel’s king should be anointed. Later, Jotham’s parable against Abimelech associates anointing with kingship (Judg 9:8, 15). But as we consider the anointing of a king in biblical theology, we cannot overstate the significance of the prophet Samuel receiving direct revelation (1 Sam 9:15) that Israel’s king is to be anointed. Second, Yahweh tells Samuel that the anointed king will *save* his people from the Philistines (9:16). This announcement establishes Israel’s king as Yahweh’s agent of deliverance. As the narrative progresses, Saul is anointed (10:1), saves Israel from the Ammonites (11:1–15, Jonathan defeats the Philistines, 14:1–31), and when the people eat meat with the blood, Saul restrains them by having them slaughter the meat as the law requires (14:33–34).

⁵⁷ Goppelt, *Typos*, 200.

⁵⁸ Note Frei’s account of the way that the loss of confidence in the historicity of the narratives destroyed the possibility of reading the narratives typologically (*Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, 1–85). And for one example, see Anthony T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul’s Technique and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), who states that “so much of it depends for its validity on assuming that to be history which we must view as legend or myth” (229), and, “The view of inspiration held by the writers of the New Testament is one which we cannot accept today” (234).

This pattern is matched and exceeded by David, who is anointed not once but three times: by Samuel in private (16:16), as king over Judah (2 Sam 2:2), and as king over Israel (5:3).⁵⁹ Similarly, whereas Saul fought the Philistines all his days, never altogether defeating them (cf. 1 Sam 14:47, 52), David struck down the Philistine champion (17:49–51), took two hundred Philistine foreskins (18:27), and Yahweh gave the Philistines into David’s hand (2 Sam 5:17–21, 22–25). In short, David subdued them (8:1). David was not only anointed and not only saved the people from the hand of the Philistines, he also restrained the evil of God’s people. The people who gathered around David while he was in the wilderness were those who were in distress, those who were in debt, and those who were bitter in soul (1 Sam 22:2). This band of malcontents is transformed to become the nucleus of David’s kingdom. Twice David’s men urged him to strike Saul (24:4; 26:8), and twice David restrained himself and his men. In addition to his respect for Saul as the Lord’s anointed, striking Saul would set a grisly precedent for dealing with an unwanted king. David might not want such a precedent once he became king. Similarly, whereas Saul had around him the kind of person who would strike down priests (22:9–19), David did not tolerate those who came to him thinking that they would benefit from the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam 1:1–16). Nor did David congratulate Joab for his murder of Abner, but made him mourn Abner’s death (3:26–31). And David punished the murderers of Ish-bosheth (4:5–12). David restrained evil by doing justice and refusing to endorse and cultivate murderous methods in Israel.

As this pattern of Saul being anointed, saving God’s people, and restraining their evil is matched and exceeded by David, so it is fulfilled in Jesus. Just as David was anointed with oil three times, Jesus was anointed *by the Spirit* at his baptism (Luke 3:21–22).⁶⁰ Just as David delivered God’s people from the Philistines, Jesus saved his people from their sins (Matt 1:21) by casting out the ruler of this world (John 12:31), and the New Testament promises that he will come again and defeat the enemies of his people (e.g., 2

⁵⁹ We can also observe that after Solomon, the only king anointed in Israel is Jehu (2 Kgs 9:3, 6, 12).

⁶⁰ Peter J. Leithart (*A Son to Me: An Exposition of 1 & 2 Samuel* [Moscow, ID: Canon, 2003], 167) suggests that David’s three experiences of being anointed are matched by Jesus’ three experiences of the Spirit: at his baptism (Luke 3:21–22), when he was declared the Son of God in power by the Spirit at his resurrection (Acts 13:32–33; Rom 1:4), and when he received the promised Spirit from the Father when exalted to the Father’s right hand (Acts 2:33). We might have warrant for seeing a parallel between the three times David was anointed and Jesus being anointed by the Spirit, raised by the Spirit, and receiving the Spirit to pour out at his ascension from the fact that Luke quotes Psalm 2:7 with reference to the resurrection in Acts 13:33 and at least alludes to Psalm 2:7 in his account of Jesus’ baptism. On Luke 3:22, I. Howard Marshall (“Acts,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007], 585) calls attention to “the variant reading in Codex Bezae and the Old Latin witnesses, which replicate Ps. 2:7 LXX exactly.” Marshall also notes that Jesus received the Spirit at both his baptism and his ascension and that these receptions of the Spirit at the baptism and the ascension are different events (542).

Thess 1:8; Rev 19:11–21). Just as David restrained his men and cultivated virtue in Israel (perhaps some of those in distress and bitter of soul became the mighty men?), so also Jesus restrained the wielder of the sword on the night he was betrayed (Matt 26:51–52), prayed for Peter before he was to be sifted (Luke 22:32), and announced that all who love him will obey his commands (John 14:15).

The Unexpected King

Evidently no one, not even Jesse, expected that David might be the one whom Samuel was sent to anoint. The Lord sent Samuel to anoint one of Jesse's sons as king (1 Sam 16:2), Jesse passed his sons before Samuel (16:10), and Samuel had to ask if all of Jesse's sons were present. The youngest, David, was not even summoned in from the flocks on this occasion (16:11). Considered in worldly terms, there are certain expected routes to the throne. Being the youngest son, and later, serving as a court minstrel—playing the harp for the sitting king, are not conventional features of a king's resume.⁶¹ Samuel seems to have been impressed with the stature and appearance of David's older brother Eliab (16:6–7), and Saul expected his son to succeed him (e.g., 1 Sam 20:31). Nor is it expected that the one who would be king would be chased through the hills of Israel with a band of unimpressive losers, as Nabal's reaction to David shows (1 Sam 25:10).

In the same way, the establishment is hardly impressed by the circumstances of Jesus' birth and the route he takes to the throne. John 7:27 indicates that Jesus was not perceived as matching what was expected about where the Messiah would be born and raised (cf. 7:41–42). The suggestion that Jesus was a Samaritan (John 8:48) may reflect speculation on the circumstances resulting in the birth of Jesus. Just as Jesse did not expect his youngest to be anointed by Samuel, so Jesus' family apparently did not expect him to be the Messiah—they thought he was out of his mind (Mark 3:21), taunted him about going to Jerusalem, and did not believe in him (John 7:1–9). Just as the boy playing the harp was not expected to be king, so the carpenter the people of Nazareth knew was not expected to be king (Mark 6:1–4). And just as David had his “bitter in soul” debtors, so Jesus had his “unlearned men” who did not keep the traditions of the elders (Acts 4:13; Mark 7:5).

Establishment Opposition

David was anointed as Israel's king by the prophet Samuel according to the word of the Lord (1 Sam 16:13). He played the harp for Saul when the evil spirit from God troubled him (16:23). He struck Goliath down and brought great victory to Israel (17:45–54). Then Saul started throwing spears at him (18:11; 19:10). Saul used his own daughters as traps against David (18:17, 21, 25). David was eventually forced to flee (19:11–12), and throughout his flight he avoided open conflict with Saul, trusting that God would deal

⁶¹ Cf. Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible*, NSBT (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 139.

with Saul at the appropriate time (26:10). While David fled, Jonathan, who as heir to the throne has to be regarded as an establishment insider, interceded with Saul on behalf of David (20:28–29, 32). Saul was so enraged by this that he threw his spear at his own son Jonathan! (20:33).

Like David, Jesus was anointed as Israel's king in the presence of the prophet John according to the word of the Lord (John 1:30–34). Just as David ministered to Saul when he was troubled by the evil spirit,⁶² Jesus ministered to those troubled by evil spirits by casting them out (e.g., Mark 1:21–27).⁶³ Just as Saul had more regard for setting a trap for David than for the good of his daughter, so the Pharisees had more regard for setting a trap for Jesus than for the welfare of the man with the withered hand (Mark 3:1–2). Just as David had success in the moments of crisis with Goliath and when he took the two hundred Philistine foreskins as the bride-price for Saul's daughter, so Jesus had success in the five controversies recounted in Mark 2:1–3:6. Just as David's mounting triumphs resulted in Saul fearing and opposing him, so also Jesus' triumphs resulted in the Pharisees and Herodians, the establishment, plotting his destruction (Mark 3:6).⁶⁴ Just as David fled to the wilderness, so Mark's five controversies are preceded by the note that "Jesus could no longer openly enter a town, but was out in desolate places, and people were coming to him from every quarter" (Mark 1:45). Then after the five controversies culminate in the plot to kill Jesus (Mark 2:1–3:6), we read that "Jesus withdrew with his disciples to the sea" (3:7).

Wandering about in Deserts and Mountains, and in Dens and Caves of the Earth

Just as David was driven from Israel's court and gathered a following in the wilderness (1 Sam 22:2), so the Synoptic Gospels present Jesus only entering Jerusalem when he went there to die. Even in the Gospel of John, which indicates that Jesus made several trips to Jerusalem, he eluded the clutches of his enemies just as David had eluded Saul (John 7:30, 44; 8:59; 10:39). "Saul sought [David] every day, but God did not give him into his

⁶² David's ability to minister to Saul when he was afflicted with the evil spirit from God could have influenced *The Testament of Solomon*, the Greek title of which reads as follows: "Testament of Solomon, Son of David, who reigned in Jerusalem, and subdued all the spirits of the air, of the earth, and under the earth . . ." Cf. *OTP* 1:960.

⁶³ James D. G. Dunn (*Jesus Remembered* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003], 667) writes regarding the Jewish expectation, "both David and Solomon had reputations as exorcists."

⁶⁴ Just as Saul's son Jonathan, an establishment insider, had interceded on David's behalf—asking what David had done that he should be put to death (1 Sam 20:32), so also Nicodemus, an establishment insider "who was one of them" (John 7:50), asked, "Does our law judge a man without first giving him a hearing and learning what he does?" (7:51). Just as Jonathan's intercession had drawn Saul's wrath, so Nicodemus met with the curt reply, "Are you from Galilee too?" (7:52).

hand” (1 Sam 23:14), and in the same way, in the Gospels, Jesus eluded his enemies until the hour had come (John 12:23).

Once driven out of his home, David went to Ahimelech, the priest at Nob, and ate the holy bread (1 Sam 21:1–10). David then went to the Philistines, who feared him, and he escaped to the cave of Adullam (21:10–15, 22:1). Saul reacted to Ahimelech assisting David by ordering the death of the priests (22:9–19). Abiathar escaped to David, and David took responsibility for the death of the priests (“I have occasioned the death of all the persons of your father’s house,” 22:22), even though he had avoided disclosing the circumstances of his flight to Ahimelech (21:1–9). David had probably avoided telling Ahimelech why he needed food and weapons to preserve Ahimelech’s innocence before Saul (see Ahimelech’s reply to Saul when called before him, 22:14–15).

Just as David fled from cave to cave ahead of Saul, so Jesus stated that he had no place to lay his head (Matt 8:20). Just as David went to the Philistines, so Jesus crossed into Gentile territory (Mark 5:1). Just as the Philistines rejected David, so the Gerasenes “began to beg Jesus to depart from their region” (5:17). Jesus complied and returned to Jewish territory (5:21–22).

As for David and the holy bread, Jesus appealed to this incident in his defense of his disciples when the Pharisees complained that they were doing what was not lawful on the Sabbath (Mark 2:24). Jesus reminded the Pharisees that David ate bread that “is not lawful for any but the priests to eat, and also gave it to those who were with him” (Mark 2:26). R. T. France helpfully discusses this passage in terms that appear to legitimate the typological perspective on the relationships between David and Jesus being set forth here. France writes:

Jesus’ defence of his disciples’ alleged violation of the Sabbath by citing the story of David and the showbread is not simply an appeal to precedent It is a question of authority. Mark 2:28 claims that Jesus has the right to regulate Sabbath observance. The appeal to the example of David therefore has the force: “If David had the right to set aside a legal requirement, I have much more.” The unexpressed premise is “a greater than David is here”: indeed the parallel argument in Matthew 12:5–6 introduces an equivalent formula.

This argument from the authority of David to the greater authority of Jesus is best explained by an underlying typology. If David, the type, had the authority to reinterpret the law, Jesus, the greater antitype, must have that authority in a higher degree.⁶⁵

France’s reference to “an underlying typology” suggests that there are more points of historical correspondence and escalation than the ones explicitly mentioned in Mark 2:23–28, and this seems to warrant the kinds of suggestions being put forward here. Goppelt’s comments on this passage are similar: “Christ-David typology is the

⁶⁵ France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 46–47. Cf. Goppelt, *Typos*, 87 n. 116, quoting Zahn.

background of the saying and the general presupposition that supports it.”⁶⁶ When we consider the first five chapters of Mark’s gospel,⁶⁷ we find the following historical correspondences between David and Jesus, in whom these significant messianic patterns find their fulfillment:

Typological Points of Contact between Samuel and Mark

Ref. in 1 Samuel	Point of Contact	Ref. in Mark
16:23	Power over unclean spirits	1:23–27, 34, etc.
18:7–30	Triumphs result in opposition	2:1–3:6
22:3	Disreputable associates	2:16
21:1–6	Above the law status	2:23–28
18:17, 21, 25	People who should be protected used as traps	3:1–2
19:1, etc.	Enemies counsel to kill	3:6, etc.
19:18; 20:1	Withdrawal and avoidance of open conflict	1:45; 3:7
16:6–11	No regard from family members	3:21, 31–32
21:10–15	Trip into Gentile territory	5:1–20

Considering the way that Jesus appeals to the Davidic type in Mark 2:23–28, Goppelt draws attention to the way that Jesus not only makes a connection between himself and David in Mark 2:25, he also links his disciples to “those who were with [David].”⁶⁸ This would seem to invite Mark’s audience to make other connections between those involved in these two events. Much discussion has been generated by the fact that Mark 2:26 portrays Jesus referring to “the time of Abiathar the high priest,” when it appears that at the time, Ahimelech would have been the high priest. Goppelt simply asserts: “Mark says Abiathar, but that is an error.”⁶⁹ But perhaps there are typological forces at work here, too. David did interact with Ahimelech in 1 Samuel 21:1–9, but Abiathar is the priest who escapes from Doeg’s slaughter (22:20). Could the reference to Abiathar be intentional? Could Mark be presenting Jesus as intentionally alluding to Abiathar’s escape from the slaughter of the priests ordered by Saul and carried out by Doeg the Edomite? Could this be a subtle way for Jesus to remind the Pharisees (“Have you never read,” Mark 2:25) that the opposition to David was wicked and murderous? If this is so, the typological connection suggested by the reference to Abiathar in Mark might be that

⁶⁶ Goppelt, *Typos*, 86.

⁶⁷ We are concerned here with the narratives of David’s rise to power in Samuel, but if we were to consider broader typologies in Mark we would note the way that John’s baptism in the Jordan seems to correspond to and fulfill the way the nation first entered the land to conquer it, and the way that John’s dress corresponds to and fulfills the promise of the return of Elijah.

⁶⁸ Goppelt, *Typos*, 84–86.

⁶⁹ Goppelt, *Typos*, 85 n. 106.

just as Saul and Doeg opposed David and Abiathar's household, so also the Pharisees are opposing Jesus and his followers.⁷⁰

He Shall Bear Their Iniquities

I noted above that David is presented as preserving Ahimelech's innocence by not divulging the true circumstances of his need for food and a weapon when, having fled from Saul, he arrives at Nob (1 Sam 21:1–9). This makes Saul's vengeance upon Ahimelech and his house all the more vicious, but more importantly for our purposes here, it has implications for David's response to Abiathar. As noted above, when Abiathar comes to David, David says to him, "I knew on that day, when Doeg the Edomite was there, that he would surely tell Saul. I have occasioned the death of all the persons of your father's house" (22:22). What Saul and Doeg did was wicked, and yet David takes responsibility for the death of Abiathar's kinsmen. David is not guilty, and yet he takes the sins of others upon himself.⁷¹

This pattern is matched and exceeded by Jesus, who though he was innocent, nevertheless identified with the sins of the people when he "fulfilled all righteousness" by undergoing John's baptism for repentance (Matt 3:13–17). Jesus, whom no one can convict of sin (John 8:46), was nevertheless "numbered with the transgressors" (Luke 22:37). Just as David was innocent regarding the slaughter of the priests, but nevertheless took responsibility for their deaths, so also Jesus was innocent of sin, but nevertheless came as "the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" (John 1:29). Just as David was innocent of wrongdoing but took responsibility, so also "He committed no sin, neither was deceit found in his mouth," and yet "He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness. By his wounds you have been healed" (1 Pet 2:22, 24). And the words of David to Abiathar, "Stay with me; do not be afraid, for he who seeks my life seeks your life. With me you shall be in safekeeping" (1

⁷⁰ Having come to this position, I was pleased to find a similar suggestion in Rikk E. Watts, "Mark," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 141: "If the point is to establish an authoritative precedent, then the actions of Abiathar, as Ahimelech's son, in taking the ephod to David to become his chief priest and subsequent blessing underscore God's affirmation of Ahimelech's decision, his presence with David, and his abandonment of David's opponent Saul. Not only are Jesus' disciples justified, but also to oppose them (and, of course, Jesus) is to oppose both 'David' and ultimately God, who vindicated him and will also vindicate Jesus."

⁷¹ In a similar way, later in the narrative, Abigail takes responsibility for the sin of Nabal when she says to David: "On me alone, my lord, be the guilt" (25:24). The narrative had earlier cleared Abigail of any culpability in this matter by showing that Abigail did not learn of the visit from David's men until after Nabal had answered them roughly (25:14–17). These two episodes connect David and Abigail as righteous Israelites, who though they are innocent, nevertheless take responsibility for sins committed by others.

Sam 22:23), typify the one who said to those who came for him, “if you seek me, let these men go” (John 18:8).

Betrayed by those he served

David delivered the city of Keilah from the Philistines, and yet the people of Keilah were ready to hand David over to Saul (1 Sam 23:1–12). Similarly, though David had delivered Israel from Goliath, and though he had more success against the Philistines than all the servants of Saul “so that his name was highly esteemed” (18:30), the people of Ziph readily report his presence to Saul (23:15–24). Later, the Philistines refused to allow David to go into battle with them (29:1–11), and when David and his men returned to Ziklag they found it burned and all the women and children taken captive (30:1–5). Remarkably, David’s own men, “bitter in soul” at this calamity, were ready to stone him (30:6).

Similarly, Jesus cast demons out of many, healed many, and even raised people from the dead (e.g., Matt 4:23–25; Mark 5; Luke 7:11–15; John 11). John indicates that Jesus also did signs in Jerusalem (John 2:23; 5:1–9; 9:1–12). Even if most of his mighty works were not done in Jerusalem, it is likely that many in the crowd shouting “Crucify!” had come to Jerusalem for the Passover from areas where Jesus had done mighty works. Just as the city that David delivered, Keilah, was ready to hand David over to Saul, so the crowds whom Jesus delivered from demons, disease, and death, were ready to hand him over to Rome. Just as David’s men were ready to stone him, Judas was ready to betray Jesus (e.g., Matt 26:14–16), and the rest of the disciples abandoned him in his hour of need (26:56).

Entrusting Himself to God

Saul’s pursuit of David was unjust, and when he consulted the witch of Endor (1 Sam 28:3–11), it moved in the direction of being demonic. In spite of the atrocity Saul ordered in the slaughter of the priests (22:6–19), in spite of the various opportunities David had when his men told him that the Lord had delivered Saul into his hand (24:4; 26:8), David refused to lift his hand against the Lord’s anointed, Saul. Instead, David trusted that “As the LORD lives, the LORD will strike him, or his day will come to die, or he will go down into battle and perish” (26:10). As David fled from one place to the next, it appears that he was intent upon avoiding open conflict with Saul. David seems to have been resolute that he would not occasion civil war in Israel, trusting that if the Lord had anointed him as king, the Lord would bring it to pass in his good time.

Similarly, Jesus did nothing to raise his hand against his opponents or exploit his appeal with the multitudes. When they wanted to make him king by force (John 6:15), he withdrew to a mountain by himself. He constantly urged people to tell no one of the mighty things he did (e.g., Mark 1:44; 3:12; 5:43; 7:36; 9:9, etc.). Jesus even urged people to do as the Pharisees say, “but not what they do” (Matt 23:3). When Jesus was

arrested, he did not resist. “When he was reviled, he did not revile in return; when he suffered, he did not threaten, but continued entrusting himself to him who judges justly” (1 Pet 2:23). Jesus was confident that God’s plan was being worked out, and he declared to Pilate that Pilate had no more power over him than what was given him from above (John 19:11).

Seed of the Woman, Seed of the Serpent

A significant concept that has only been briefly mentioned to this point in this study is the idea of “corporate personality.” Beale lists this idea as one of “five hermeneutical and theological presuppositions” employed by the authors of the New Testament.⁷² Earle Ellis explains, “Israel the patriarch, Israel the nation, the king of Israel, and Messiah stand in such relationship to each other that one may be viewed as the ‘embodiment’ of the other.”⁷³ This notion is perhaps introduced in Genesis 3:15, where in the judgment on the serpent the Lord promises to put enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent.⁷⁴ The term “seed” is a collective singular, and it refers to both singular individuals who are “seed of the woman” as well as groups of people who are “seed of the woman.”⁷⁵ There will be enmity between those who belong to God and those who follow the serpent, and this enmity will also exist between particular individuals who can be identified as the seed of the woman or the seed of the serpent.

This enmity between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman is expressed in several different ways in Samuel. The sons of Eli are referred to as “sons of Belial” (1 Sam 2:12), and in later texts Belial is clearly understood to be an evil spirit.⁷⁶ Identifying Eli’s sons as “sons of Belial” seems tantamount to declaring them “seed of the serpent,”

⁷² Beale, “Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?” 392. The other four are that Christ represents the true Israel in both OT and NT, that history is unified by a wise, sovereign plan, that the age of eschatological fulfillment has dawned in Christ, and that later writings in the canon interpret earlier writings.

⁷³ Ellis, *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament*, 136.

⁷⁴ For the influence of Genesis 3:15 on the rest of the Old Testament, see my essay, “The Skull Crushing Seed of the Woman: Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Genesis 3:15,” *SBJT* 10.2 (2006), 30–54. For the relationship between the curses of Genesis 3:14–19 and the blessings of Genesis 12:1–3, see my essay, “The Seed of the Woman and the Blessing of Abraham,” *TynBul* 58.2 (2007), 253–73.

⁷⁵ Cf. Jack Collins, “A Syntactical Note (Genesis 3:15): Is the Woman’s Seed Singular or Plural?” *TynBul* 48 (1997), 139–48; T. Desmond Alexander, “Further Observations on the Term ‘Seed’ in Genesis,” *TynBul* 48 (1997), 363–67.

⁷⁶ Pseudepigraphic texts (e.g., *Mart. Isa.* 1:8, 2:4; 4:2; *Jub.* 1:20; 15:33; 20:1) and texts from Qumran (CD 16:5; 1QM 13:11) understand Belial to be “the angel of wickedness.” Many more texts from Qumran and the Pseudepigrapha could be cited, see T. J. Lewis, “Belial,” *ABD* 1:655–56.

and they stand in contrast to the seed of the woman born to Hannah when the Lord “remembered her,” Samuel (1:19).

On a broader scale, opponents of the people of God seem to be regarded as seed of the serpent, and no opponent of Israel is more prominent in Samuel than the Philistines. The particular Philistine seed of the serpent who receives the most attention in Samuel is the giant Goliath. Goliath presents himself as the representative Philistine. He stands for his tribe. And he calls for Israel to send out a representative Israelite to settle the dispute between Philistia and Israel (1 Sam 17:4–11).

Israel does just that, but the representative Israelite they send out is a shepherd boy unarmed but for a sling and five stones. This particular shepherd boy comes from a particular line. This line has been carefully traced back to Judah’s son via the genealogy in Ruth 4:18–22. Judah descends from Abraham, whose line was carefully traced back to Noah’s son in Genesis 11:10–27. Noah descends from a line that is carefully traced back to the son of Adam in Genesis 5:6–29. This means that the representative Israelite who goes out to meet the representative Philistine is the seed of Judah, seed of Abraham, seed of Noah, seed of the woman.

In the conflict between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent, the seed of the woman crushes the head of the seed of the serpent, smiting Goliath with a stone from the sling (1 Sam 17:49).⁷⁷ Sending out a virtually unarmed shepherd boy to fight the mighty Philistine looks like certain defeat. But the shepherd boy knows and proclaims that “the LORD saves not with sword and spear. For the battle is the LORD’s” (17:47). The victory that comes through the seed of the woman is a victory snatched from the jaws of defeat.

In the same way, a seed of David, seed of Judah, seed of Abraham, seed of Noah, seed of the woman arose who cast out the ruler of this world (John 12:31). On the way to the great conflict, the seed of the woman was opposed by the seed of the serpent. Jesus tells those seeking to kill him that they are of their father, the devil (John 8:44).⁷⁸ That is, they are seed of the serpent. The seed of the serpent also sought to kill the seed of the woman when the child was born, and his parents had to take him and flee to Egypt (Matt 2:13–16). Jesus, the seed of the woman, then conquered the serpent by crushing his head. Through what looked like a satanic triumph—the crucifixion—Jesus snatched victory from the jaws of death.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 139–40.

⁷⁸ Cf. Andreas J. Köstenberger, “John,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 458.

⁷⁹ See also the conflict between the serpent and the individual and collective seed of the woman in Rev 12:1–17.

On the Third Day

The narrator of Samuel is clear about the sequence of events surrounding Saul's death. While David was living in Ziklag under the authority of Achish the Philistine king of Gath (1 Sam 27:6), the Philistines mustered their forces for battle against Israel (28:1). Saul panicked (28:5) and sought out a medium (28:7). When he went to the witch of Endor, he had an encounter with Samuel, whom the witch brought up for him (28:11–14). Among other things, Samuel told Saul, "Tomorrow you and your sons shall be with me" (28:19), that is, dead.

The morrow, the day on which Saul would join Samuel, appears to be the day that David was sent home by the Philistine lords who feared that David would turn on them in battle (29:1–11). Curiously, the narrator of Samuel then relates that David and his men found their home city of Ziklag raided when they arrived "on the third day" (1 Sam 30:1). This seems to be the third day after the Philistines mustered for battle against Israel (cf. 30:13). In this way, the narrator shows that David was not with the Philistines in battle when Saul met his end. The narrator then relates what happened on the day the Philistines dismissed David: they defeated Saul's army and Saul took his own life (31:1–7). This means that a death brought the reign of the king who opposed the Lord's anointed to an end. Three days later, David overcame the thought his men had of stoning him, "strengthened himself in the LORD his God" (30:6), and, rising from the near stoning, pursued his enemies, and re-captured his people—all of them. But this is not the only significant third day in this account. 2 Samuel 1 opens by relating that after David had struck the Amelakites who had raided Ziklag, he remained in Ziklag for two days, and then "on the third day" the messenger came with the news that Saul was dead (2 Sam 1:1–2). This means that "on the third day" David conquered his enemies, took captivity captive, and gave gifts to men when he sent spoil to the elders of Judah (1 Sam 30:26–31). And then "on the third day" he received news that the death of Saul meant that as the Lord's anointed he, David, was now to be king.

Nor are these the only two significant "third days" in the Old Testament: Abraham went to sacrifice Isaac "on the third day" (Gen 22:4). Yahweh came down on Mount Sinai to meet Israel "on the third day" (Exod 19:11, 16). The Lord raised up Hezekiah "on the third day" (2 Kgs 20:5). The second temple was completed "on the third day" (Ezra 6:15). Esther interceded on behalf of the Jewish people "on the third day" (Esth 5:1). And perhaps most significantly, Jonah was in the belly of the whale "three days and three nights" (Jon 2:1 [ET 1:17]), while Hosea prophesied that the people, having been torn by Yahweh as by a lion (Hos 5:14–6:1), would be raised up "on the third day" (6:2).⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Cf. also Lev 7:17, 18; 19:6, 7; Num 19:12, 19. And N. T. Wright notes that "The phrase 'after three days', looking back mainly to Hosea 6.2, is frequently referred to in rabbinic mentions of the resurrection" (N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God 3 [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003], 322, and cf. 322 n. 25).

These significant events in the Old Testament took place “on the third day,” and this pattern found its fulfillment when Jesus “was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures” (1 Cor 15:4). Perhaps the references in the Old Testament to the remarkable things that took place “on the third day” were themselves read typologically by Hosea, leading him to the conclusion that the restoration of the people after Yahweh’s judgment of the nation would take place “on the third day” (Hos 6:2, cf. 5:14–6:1). Perhaps the same typological reading of these instances led Jesus to the conclusion that he would be the suffering servant who would be torn by Yahweh’s judgment and then raised up “on the third day” (cf. Matt 16:21; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22).⁸¹

Just as David defeated the Amelakites on the third day (1 Sam 30:1), Jesus defeated death on the third day.⁸² As David took captives and gave gifts to men, Jesus did the same (cf. Eph 4:8–11). Just as David received word that Saul was no more on the third day (2 Sam 2:1), Acts 13:33 links the announcement of enthronement from Psalm 2:7, “You are my Son; today I have begotten you” to the resurrection: “this he has fulfilled to us their children by raising Jesus, as also it is written in the second Psalm, ‘You are my Son, today I have begotten you’” (Acts 13:33). The death of the reigning king brought the end of hostility, and the news of that death announced the beginning of the reign of the Lord’s anointed.

N. T. Wright’s comments on 1 Corinthians 15:3, “that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures,” are instructive:

Paul is not proof-texting; he does not envisage one or two, or even half a dozen, isolated passages about a death for sinners. He is referring to the entire biblical narrative as the story which has reached its climax in the Messiah, and has now given rise to the new phase of the same story . . .⁸³

In fact, when Wright comments on the phrase in 1 Corinthians 15:4, “that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures,” he says, “Like the scriptural narrative invoked as the world of meaning for ‘the Messiah died for our sins’, the qualifying phrase here looks back to the scriptural narrative as a whole, not simply to a handful of proof-

⁸¹ The remarkable events that took place “on the third day” in the OT, Paul’s deliberate reference to it in 1 Cor 15:4, and Jesus’ apparent conclusion that “the third day” was significant for his own death and resurrection, seem to demand a typological understanding of the “third day” as significant. This is so even if “the phrase ‘according to the Scriptures’ modifies ‘was raised’ rather than the temporal reference” on the basis of “similar syntax in 1 Macc. 7:16” (Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, “1 Corinthians,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007], 744).

⁸² My attention was first drawn to the significant events that take place “on the third day” in the OT by Peter Leithart, *A Son to Me*, 149–51. Leithart also reads the phrase typologically, but I find some of his conclusions less than convincing.

⁸³ Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 320.

texts.”⁸⁴ D. A. Carson’s conclusion regarding Jesus being raised from the dead on the third day “according to the Scriptures” is similar: “It is difficult to make sense of such claims unless some form of typology is recognized. . . . The cross and the resurrection of the Messiah were, in Paul’s view, anticipated by the patterns of Old Testament revelation.”⁸⁵

Temple Building

David was the anointed seed of the woman who crushed the serpent’s head. He was rejected and opposed by the reigning establishment, with whom he avoided open conflict, while gathering a new Israel to himself in the wilderness. David conquered his enemies on the third day, and on the third day the news of the death of the reigning king opened the way for him to be enthroned. Once established as king, the Lord gave David “rest from all his surrounding enemies” (2 Sam 7:1). This rest resonates with the rest Yahweh himself enjoyed when he finished his work of creation (Gen 2:4). Immediately after Yahweh’s rest is mentioned, Genesis 2 describes the garden of Eden in terms of a cosmic temple. It seems that Adam’s responsibility to subdue the earth (Gen 1:28) entailed expanding the borders of Eden, God’s habitable dwelling, such that the glory of the Lord might cover the dry land as the waters cover the sea.⁸⁶ Once David experienced rest from all his enemies, his temple building impulse seems to have arisen from an understanding of his responsibility to expand the borders of the new Eden, the land of Israel, such that the dominion of Yahweh might expand so that the glory of Yahweh might cover the dry land as the waters cover the sea. The temple David desired to build (2 Sam 7:1–5) was to be the focal point from which the glory of God would spread. This began to happen in the conquests that expanded the boundaries of the land in 2 Samuel 8–10, before there was something like another “fall” in 2 Samuel 11.

Similarly, Jesus is the anointed seed of the woman who crushed the serpent’s head. Rejected and opposed by the establishment, he avoided open conflict while gathering to himself a new Israel. Jesus conquered death on the third day, and once enthroned as king, he took up the task of temple building. But the temple that Jesus builds is not a building

⁸⁴ Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, 321.

⁸⁵ D. A. Carson, “Mystery and Fulfillment: Toward a More Comprehensive Paradigm of Paul’s Understanding of the Old and the New,” in *Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism*, vol. 2: *The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, WUNT (Tübingen/Grand Rapids: Mohr [Siebeck]/Baker, 2004), 409.

⁸⁶ Cf. G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, NSBT (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 81–87. And cf. Hamilton, “The Seed of the Woman and the Blessing of Abraham,” 267–68.

but a people.⁸⁷ Jesus charges this people to go make disciples (Matt 28:19–20). Beginning from Jerusalem, the making of disciples spread through all Judea and Samaria and to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:8). As those in whom the Spirit dwells, God’s temple (1 Cor 3:16), the followers of Jesus are to make disciples, and this will spread the temple, spreading the knowledge of the glory of God until it covers the dry land as the waters cover the sea. Once enthroned, Jesus made good on his promise to build his church (Matt 16:18), and from the foundation of the apostles and prophets the knowledge of the glory of God began to spread, as seen in the advance of the gospel recounted in Acts–Revelation. Unlike David, his greater Son will never experience a “fall.”

Conclusion

This survey of David’s rise to power does not exhaust the possible typological points of contact between David and Jesus.⁸⁸ The plausibility of the typological reading of these narratives will be disputed by some, accepted by some, and altogether ignored by others. For my part, I am most sure of the typological significance of the incident when David visited the priests at Nob and ate the show bread. I am most sure of this incident because it seems to me that the New Testament presents this as an instance of typological interpretation. I think this example warrants a typological reading of other aspects of the narratives that recount what David experienced, but of these others I am less sure because unlike the authors of the New Testament, I am not an infallible interpreter of the Old Testament.

Throughout this study the main hermeneutical controls employed in the examination of possible types of Jesus in the narratives of David’s rise to power have been *historical correspondence* and *escalation*. Grant Osborne has also cautioned against basing doctrinal conclusions on typological interpretations.⁸⁹ No specific doctrines are at stake in

⁸⁷ See James M. Hamilton Jr., *God’s Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old and New Testaments*, NACSBT (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2006).

⁸⁸ There might be typological significance in the following: Saul’s son Jonathan recognizes that David will be King and acknowledges him as such (1 Sam 20:3–4). Similarly, Jesus asks his opponents by what power their sons cast out demons (Matt 12:27). This might be taken to indicate that the children of the opponents of Jesus have followed Jesus, just as Jonathan sided with David. Just as Saul wants to kill Jonathan for siding with David (1 Sam 20:33), so the chief priests want to kill Lazarus “because on account of him many of the Jews were going away and believing in Jesus” (John 12:11). Just as David provided for his parents by entrusting them to the king of Moab (22:3–4), so also Jesus, on the cross, provided for Mary by entrusting her to the beloved disciple (John 19:26–27). There might also be significance to the pattern seen in Joseph, Moses, and David: all three experience rejection from their kinsmen, go away, and take gentile wives. Similarly, Jesus was on the whole rejected by Israel and has gone away and taken a predominantly gentile bride in the church.

⁸⁹ G. R. Osborne, “Type; Typology,” in *ISBE* 4:931 (930–32).

anything that I have proposed here. What is mainly at issue has to do with understanding how the New Testament authors understand the Old Testament. It seems to me that typological interpretation is a tool whose explanatory power can and should be put to use.⁹⁰

From what we see in these narratives of David's rise to power, it would be possible to suggest that in David we see a certain pattern. This pattern is of king who would be anointed, who would save God's people, and who would restrain their evil. This king would be something of a surprise—he would come in an unexpected way, and he would be opposed by the establishment. He would follow in the footsteps of those “of whom the world was not worthy—wandering about in deserts and mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth” (Heb 11:38). This coming king might be expected to take responsibility for wrongs done by others, be betrayed by those whom he had blessed, and refuse to lift his hand to defend himself but rather entrust himself to God, who judges justly. This king would almost certainly be expected to crush the head of the serpent, and in so doing he would have his heel struck. And something remarkable might be expected to happen “on the third day,” after which, like not only David but all the righteous kings of Israel, he would seek to build the temple.

Perhaps early audiences of Samuel might have reflected upon these features of the narratives recounting David's rise to power. And perhaps it was reflection upon these messianic patterns in David's life, as well as similar patterns of rejection, suffering, and then saving intervention for God's people in the lives of Joseph, Moses, and others that prompted Isaiah, informed by the promise to David in 2 Samuel 7, to expect a shoot of Jesse who would arise to rule in Spirit-filled edenic splendor (Isaiah 11), a young plant who would have no form or majesty (Isa 53:2), who would be despised and rejected (53:3), who would bear the griefs of his people (53:4), be cut off from the land of the living (53:8), and thereby make many to be accounted righteous (53:11).⁹¹

⁹⁰ Foulkes (*The Acts of God*, 370) writes, “This, in fact, is the way in which we as Christians must read the Old Testament, following the precedent of the New Testament interpretation of the Old, and supremely the use that our Lord himself made of the Old Testament.”

⁹¹ Cf. Antti Laato's (*The Servant of YHWH and Cyrus: A Reinterpretation of the Exilic Messianic Programme in Isaiah 40–55*, Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 35 [Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1992]) suggestion that “the death of Josiah forms an important part of the tradition-historical background for Isa 53” (231). Laato establishes the link between Josiah and Isa 53 partly through the similarities he documents between Isa 52:13–53:12 and Zech 12:9–13:1 (153–54, cf. 235–37). In his book *Josiah and David Redivivus* (Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 33 [Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1992]) Laato argues “that expectations for a David Redivivus were intimately connected with a favorable picture of the historical Josiah . . . Josiah was regarded as a typos for the coming Messiah of the post-Josianic times” (356). Those of us who hold that the whole book of Isaiah comes from the hand of Isaiah ben Amoz can easily adapt Laato's stimulating suggestions to our understanding of how this plays out: perhaps Isaiah's typological understanding of David and others led to the

Perhaps. But we must also bear in mind that Paul describes what God accomplished in Messiah Jesus as “a secret and hidden wisdom of God” (1 Cor 2:7).⁹² He writes that this mystery “was not made known to the sons of men in other generations as it has now been revealed” (Eph 3:3–5; cf. Rom 16:25–27), and yet Paul also maintains that “Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures” (1 Cor 15:3–4).

In light of Paul’s comments about the way the mystery was hidden, and in light of the fact that the disciples needed Jesus to open their minds to understand the Scriptures (Luke 24:45), it seems that those of us who read the whole Bible today are in a better position to understand the canonical and messianic implications of Old Testament narratives than even those prophets who “searched and inquired carefully, inquiring what person or time the Spirit of Christ in them was indicating when he predicted the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glories” (1 Pet 1:10–11). Indeed, “It was revealed to them that they were serving not themselves but [us], in the things that have now been announced to [us] through” the authors of the New Testament (1:12).⁹³

This essay began with the question of “how we may read the Old Testament Christianly.” It seems to me that typological interpretation is central to answering that question: precisely by assuring us of the unity of Scripture and the faithfulness of God—that as God has acted in the past, so he acts in the present, and so we can expect him to act in the future—we find the words of Paul true in our own lives:

For whatever was written in former days was written for our instruction, that through endurance and through the encouragement of the Scriptures we might

prophecy found in Isa 53, then Zechariah, reflecting on what took place with Josiah in combination with Isa 53 (and other factors) was led to prophecy what he records in Zech 12:9–13:1 (for Laato’s suggestion that this passage understands Josiah’s death typologically, see *Josiah*, 362). Andrew Chester’s fascinating summary of Laato’s views drew my attention to his work (cf. Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation*, 211–13).

⁹² Cf. Ellis, *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*, 15: “From the perspective of the biblical writers, and of Jesus as he is represented by them, the essential meaning of the Scriptures is revelation, also in their historical and literary dimension. As such, the meaning is understood to be either hidden or revealed to the reader at God’s discretion and is never viewed as truth available, like pebbles on a beach.”

⁹³ Richard B. Hays (“Reading Scripture in Light of the Resurrection,” 224) suggests that the description of how the disciples came to fuller understanding of what Jesus had done and “believed the Scripture” in John 2:13–22 provides “the key that unlocks the interpretation of Scripture. Retrospective reading of the Old Testament after the resurrection enables Jesus’ disciples to ‘believe’ in a new way both the Scripture and Jesus’ teaching and to see how each illuminates the other. Such retrospective reading neither denies nor invalidates the meaning that the Old Testament text might have had in its original historical setting.”

have hope. May the God of endurance and encouragement grant you to live in such harmony with one another, in accord with Christ Jesus, that together you may with one voice glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (Rom 15:4–6).⁹⁴

⁹⁴ I wish to express my gratitude to Professors Thomas R. Schreiner, Jay E. Smith and Jason G. Duesing, as well as to my brother, David Hamilton, who read this essay and offered helpful feedback.