TYPOLOGY: PROS AND CONS IN BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS AND LITERARY CRITICISM (FROM LEONHARD GOPPELT TO NORTHROP FRYE)

Tibor Fabiny
Department of Hermeneutics
Faculty of Arts
Karoli Gaspar University of the Reformed Church
1088 Budapest. Hungría

The following essay is a survey of various theories of biblical typology (figuralism) in 20th century biblical hermeneutics and literary criticism. The word *typology* in biblical studies is a relatively modern coinage, it was not used in patristic literature together with *tropologia, allegoria* or *anagogia.* Sometimes it is used as a synonym with figuralism. More than ten years ago (Fabiny 1-2), I suggested that typology may refer to at least nine things: (1) a way of reading the Bible; (2) a principle of unity of the "Old" and the "New" Testaments in the Christian Bible; (3) a principle of exegesis; (4) a figure of speech; (5) a mode of thought; (6) a form of rhetoric; (7) a vision of history; (8) a principle of artistic composition; (9) a manifestation of "intertextuality".

1. The Goppelt-Bultmann Controversy

The standard book on typology is still Leonard Goppelt's *Typos: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen* (1939).[1] Goppelt examined the significant New Testament passages against the background of the contemporary Jewish interpretation of Scripture (Philo) in Hellenistic Judaism. His conclusion was that typology was the dominant form of interpretation for the New Testament use of the Old. One of the most important terms Goppelt introduced was that of *Steigerung* (translated into English by various authors as "heightening", "escalation" or "enhancement"), which means that some persons, events or things in the New Testament are seen as both analogous and greater to the persons, events or things in the Old Testament. It implies that the ministry of Jesus corresponds to that of the prophets of the Old Testament but there is "something more" involved in it. Jesus points to his activity as something "greater than Jonah" (Matt 12:6); "greater than Solomon" (Matt 12:42); "greater than the temple" (Matt 12:6) etc. This

RECEPCIÓN: MAYO 2007 RILCE 25.1 (2009) 138-152 ACEPTACIÓN DEFINITIVA: JUNIO 2007

claim implies that his activity is neither simply a repetition nor a mere continuation of the prophets but it is a "fulfillment" of their mission.

Goppelt's thesis received an implicit criticism by Rudolf Bultmann in 1950. Bultmann tried to provide a hermeneutical ground for his own rejection of typology and he criticized Goppelt for having failed to distinguish between the "hermeneutic method" of "prophecy and fulfillment" on the one hand, and typology on the other hand. The former, says Bultmann, rests upon the biblical linear view of time and the latter on a cyclical view that can be found in Oriental and Greek thinking. He also criticized the idea of *Steigerung* because typology is not simply a repetition on a higher level but it may involve antithesis as well. Thirdly, Bultmann maintained that typology arose through the eschatologizing of the pagan recurrence-motif.

Goppelt answered Bultmann's critique in an article on "Apocalypticism and Typology in Paul" in 1964.[2] Goppelt's reply was that Bultmann's idea of typology was different from the concept of typology in the New Testament as Bultmann rejected the relationship between the two testaments by eliminating the New Testament's understanding of itself in redemptive history. Goppelt showed how the two very different phenomena: apocalypticism and typology are related to one-another: "Apocalypticism interprets history as a course of events leading to the consummation; typology interprets it as a prefiguration of the consummation" (217).[3] In discussing Paul's use of typology Goppelt emphasized that it is not a "hermeneutical method" (as Bultmann put it) but a "spiritual approach" ("*pneumatische Betrachtungsweise*") "that reveals the connection ordained in God's redemptive plan between the relationship of God and man in the OT and that relationship in the NT" (223). Replying to Bultmann's charge that typology in the New Testament was only a new dress for an old idea ("eschatologizing of the recurrence motif") Goppelt wrote: "Methodologically this [ie. Bultmann's] explanation is an abstract construction in religious phenomenology; it adds conceptual elements, but is does not explain the motivations for the rise for such a distinctively biblical approach" (226). Moreover, Bultmann deals with typology only historically and thus overlooks the basic difference between the typology of Paul and eg. the *Epistle of Barnabas*.

Writing about the origins of the typological approach Goppelt declared that three things were certain: "(1) Typology is unknown in the non-biblical Hellenistic environment of early Christianity. (2) It is found exclusively in the Jewish environment, but only as a principle of eschatology. (3) The Typology that is found in Judaism had a prior history in the eschatology of the OT. Where the historical and material roots of this approach lie is a debated issue" (225-26).

To sum it up: in the Bultmann-Goppelt debate Goppelt's argument has proved to be more convincing. Bultmann seems to have misunderstood typology by making a historical concept out of it and by unwilling to recognize redemptive history which is part and parcel of biblical typology.

In the preface to the American edition of Goppelt's book E. Earl Ellis welcomed the appearance of *Typos* after forty years of its first publication as "appropriate and significant for current biblical criticism" especially because the competing alternatives to typological exegesis that were present in the early church and the surrounding Judaism are also, under other names, present in the church today (Goppelt: x). As an example he mentions the revival of the Marcionite attitude toward the Old Testament which, he thinks, probably resulted from a distortion of the law/ gospel dialectic in Lutheranism. Reviews of the American edition have also acknowledged the relevance of Goppelt's classic on the subject.[4]

After the second world war Goppelt's discussion of biblical typology was extended into patristic literature by French Catholic scholars, Jean Danielou and Henri de Lubac. Danielou in his *Sacramentum futuri* (1950) deliberately proposed to distinguish between typology and allegory as the former is in fact the sense of Scripture while allegory is an alien philosophy imposed upon Scripture. De Lubac, however, found that these two related symbolic methods cannot be separated in the New Testament and especially not in the spiritual exegesis of the Fathers.

2. Von Rad and his critics

Typology soon gained recognition in Old Testament studies. In 1952 Gerhard von Rad published his programmatic essay: "Typological Interpretation in the Old Testament"[5] which lead to the revival of typology in biblical studies. He even gave a fuller treatment to this subject in his *Theology of the Old Testament*. In von Rad's view typology is not a theological device but "typological thinking is an elementary function of all human thought and interpretation" (1963: 17) and without this analogical way of thinking there would be no poetry. Typology in the Old Testament is totally different from the analogical thinking in the Orient because in the Bible it is determined by the eschatological correspondence between the beginning and the end (*Urzeit-Endzeit*). He disagrees with Bultmann that typology is based on repetition which derives from a cyclic view of time. He prefers to use the term "correspondence" (either temporal or spatial) instead of "repetition". The typological interpretation should be concerned with the *kerygma* intended by

the author, it should see the events as being in preparation and the whole Old Testament as a witness to Christ (1963: 39).

Von Rad, however, distances himself from the typological tradition of old Protestantism as its underlying philosophy (eg. Herder's organic view) which is now already out of date. In von Rad's modern theological system typological thinking is "one of the essential presuppositions of the origin of prophetic prediction" and "a characteristic of the road by which early Christianity came to terms with its Old Testament heritage" (1965: 367).

Contrary to the old-fashion practice of typology that considered the types (persons, events, institutions) as static, objective and embedded in a naïve understanding of history, von Rad revives a typology which has a "keener eye for history" and has more affinity with the modern theological tradition. Typological correspondences can be discerned only by faith; it is an interpretation based on faith's witness to past events. Von Rad's ultimate aim is to reconcile the historico-critical method with typology. He finds that the process of typological interpretation and the historico-critical process "interlock" (1965: 38). No wonder that this middle-of-the-road theological position will be the target of critique from both the position of theological "left" (neoliberalism) and theological "right" (neoconservativism).

The first party is represented by James Barr who, in his *Old and New in Interpretation* (1966) devotes much energy to refuting the traditionally held difference between typology as being "Hebraic" and "historical" while allegory being "Hellenic" and "antihistorical". He provides many examples to blur this distinction. Barr criticizes von Rad as having restricted typology to the correspondances of events and excluded the correspondences between institutions, objects or persons. Barr finds difficulty with von Rad's idea of typological interpretation as the "witness to the divine event" that holds itself to the intended *kerygma* and confines itself to the *credenda*. He finds that one cannot separate the "saving acts" or the "divine events" from their contexts in the biblical material.

Von Rad's views have also received criticism from concervative circles. In his inaugural address "Biblical Typology Yesterday and Today" at Calvin Theological Seminary in 1970, John H. Stek drew an interesting comparison between two representative achievements of two examples of biblical scholarship. The first is the 19th century Patrick Fairbairn's *The Typology of Scripture* (1845-47, republished in 1967) and the other is von Rad's recent interest in biblical typology especially as it is manifested in his *Old Testament Theology*. In this thorough and accurate comparison Stek demonstrates that though Fairbairn was also touched by the current philosophy of his age (Christian Platonism, organic view of history etc.), nevertheless typology with him is a

"particular mode of divine revelation" (Stek 151) which is analogous to an educational process "leading mankind progressively to the fullness of time" (Stek 152). In von Rad's view, however, typology is not a part of the divine revelation any more but it is a kind of theology, or, at least, a common mode of human thought employed by the theologians of Israel and by the early Christians. Thus for him typology does not belong to the *historia revelationis* but the *historia theologiae*. Stek criticizes von Rad because for him the biblical documents are only the products of faith's reflection, of "faith's struggling attempts to verbalize its mysterious experiences" (Stek 155). Stek finds that this view is dictated by von Rad's inherent existential philosophy and it rejects the Bible's own view of the word of God. He also dislikes von Rad's radical skepticism of the facticity of events in the biblical narrative and that he excludes the kind of typology (persons, institutions etc.) presupposed in the biblical documents. This is the point when the liberal Barr and the conservative Stek shake hands in their critique of von Rad. For Stek "typology is not an exegetical method of Old Testament text but a hermeneutic of old covenant historical realities" (160) based upon the unity of Scripture brought about by the advance of the saving purpose of God in salvation history. In denying that typology is a hermeneutical method Stek comes very close to what Goppelt meant by "*pneumatische Betrachtung*".

3. British and American views in the 1950s

In a short but a very sensitive article in 1952 Robert C. Dentan undertook to discuss the use and abuse of typology in biblical theology. Following Goppelt and Danielou he accepted the distinction between typology and allegory endorsing the former as a sense of Scripture and rejecting the latter which is alien from it. He made three points in favour of typology and three points of reservation about it. His arguments for typology: (1) There is typology in the Bible, it is "an integral part of it" and it is "part of the Biblical world-view" (Dentan 215). (2) It provides the key for grasping the imaginative unity of the Bible (recurrence of images, themes, etc.). (3) If it is our presupposition that God is the "ultimate author" then it is indispensable to understand the pattern he works by. His cautions are as follows: (1) While studying typology we should not be lead into a world of fantasy (as it can be seen in the fanciful interpretations of some of the Church Fathers). The New Testament is a "healthy, open, straightforward document" (216). (2) In the pursuit of types one should not lose sight of the "human freshness and (3) the Bible's chief concern is with the relationship and not with the example" (216).

In 1957 R.A. Markus demonstrated that the typological approach was as old as Christianity and typological exegesis (if disciplined) is the extention of old biblical scholarship, it is the expression of the educative process in redemptive history. Typology is based on the Christian view of time which always points to the *eschaton*. The idea of anticipation and fulfillment is inherent in typology, it is a basic category of the Christian understanding of history.

The most significant achievement on the British theological scene was the appearance of *Essays in Typology* by G.W.H. Lampe and K.J. Woolcombe in 1957. The essays originated in an Oxford conference on Biblical theology in 1955. Woolcombe's study is mainly a historical discussion of typology while Lampe's "The Reasonableness of Typology" is a general inquiry to establish a rationale for typology. He distinguishes three periods in biblical hermeneutics. The first is the "precritical" age when a typological reading was most natural for the believers. The Bible was seen as a coherent whole and the idea of "the unity of Scripture" was taken for granted. The liturgy also adopted a typology originating in the Bible (eg. in Baptism). However, the chain of continuity was broken with the advent of the modern critical period when the historical approach wanted to see Moses as Moses, the servant only as a servant in its original literal sense and not as a sign pointing to something else. In such a context typology degenerated into a historical curiosity. In the 1950s, however, Lampe has noticed a renewed emphasis on the unity and the continuity of the Bible. This was in fact the heyday of "biblical theology". In this new situation the question arises "whether the typological method may legitimately be employed in what is said to be a 'post-critical' age or it rests upon such pre-critical assumptions which the development of the historical and critical approach has rendered untenable.[6] How can we demonstrate that this revival of interest in typology is not a return to precritical fundamentalism? The solution for the problem is the distinction between a "legitimate" and a "fanciful" typology. Fanciful typology frequently rests upon superficial similarities and it is very close to allegorism. Legitimate typology, however, "must rest upon authentic history, interpreted in accordance with the biblical view of the divine economy and with due regard for the literal sense of Scripture and the findings of critical scholarship".[7]

An outspoken critic of Lampe and of the general revival of interest in typology is J. D. Smart. In his book on interpretation (1961)[8] he is wondering what made scholars, who are otherwise not keen on undoing the achievement of two centuries of biblical scholarship, turn to the study of typology. He finds difficulty in distinguishing between what is typological, what is allegorical and what is predictive. Instead of the idea of "foreshadowing" he prefers the notion of "confidence" in God's faithfulness to his own nature.

His conclusion is that in the New Testament there is no basis for validating either a typological or an allegorical approach (129).

It is unfortunate that Smart failed to make a distinction between typology and allegory. He is very much in the tradition of the respectful historical scholarship and finds that the ultimate task of exegesis is to bridge the cultural gap between the "then" and the "now" by means of a successive methodological exploitation. Thus instead of a return to allegory or typology Smart demands a

> faithful exegesis […] that will wrestle with the words of these ancient witnesses until the wall of centuries become thin and they tell us in *our* day what they knew so well in *their* day […] let each of them speak to us in his own way until through his words he becomes our elder brother in the faith. (133)

Noble and respectful as this historical and scholarly attitude is, one may be left to wonder whether a bit of artistic sensitivity or some disciplined imaginative criticism (as we saw in the case of Lampe) could not facilitate the otherwise almost hopelessly hard labour of removing the "wall" that has grown up throughout the centuries.

4. More creative approaches: Baker and Cahill

The interest in typology has not disappeared entirely in the 1970s and in the 1980s. D.L. Baker in his excellent book on some modern solutions to the theological problem on the relationship between the Old and the New Testaments devotes a chapter to the typological correspondences between the two testaments. Typology is offered as one of the eight solutions for theological problem of this relationship.[9] After providing a useful survey of recent studies in typology he shows how it works in the Old and New Testament and in the relationship between the two testaments. Before arriving at a precise definition he mentions some false ideas of typology. Thus typology is not exegesis, not prophecy, not allegory, not symbolism, not a method, not a system. He rejects the notion that types are divine designs with a necessary allusion to Christ or redemption. He also rejects the idea that types are necessarily prefigurations of some future events. On the positive side he acknowledges two basic principles: first, typology is historical, it is concerned with historical facts: events, people and institutions, and as such it is rather a way of understanding history than a method of textual study. The second principle is, that typology implies a real correspondence in history and theol-

ogy, it is not interested in parallels of detail. Baker's new definition of typology is as follows:

> a *type* is a biblical event, person or institution which serves as an example or pattern for other events, person or institutions; *typology* is the study of types and the historical and theological correspondences between them; the *basis* of typology is God's consistent activity in the history of his chosen people. (267)

A significant theological adaptation of typology in contemporary biblical scholarship is by the Canadian Catholic theologian, P. Joseph Cahill. His spectrum of reference embraces not only theologians but recent literary critics as eg. Northrop Frye, Frank Kermode or Friedrich Ohly. Moreover, he also alludes to the iconographic tradition of typology.

Cahill begins by noticing the typological innuendo inherent in Stephen's speech (Acts 7:2-60) and argues that the whole text is animated by the conviction that history is to be interpreted typologically. Cahill's definition is: "Typology […] is but one specific mode of the larger category of interpretation, one in which a present event, person, situation, or thing suggest a likeness to an event, person, situation, or thing of the past" (267).

Since the Bible is permeated by a series of reinterpretations of past history we can say with Frye that the Bible is a typologically structured hermeneutical book. Thus typology is not only a Christian view of history but also a principle that orders the Christian Bible. The writers of Scripture did not "invent" typology but rather discovered a pattern that was present in history by the creative will of God. However, new meanings were also generated by typology. For Cahill typology is "basically an imaginative vision of history and historical process ultimately grounded on the conviction of a creative power of God who speaks and acts" (275).

Though there is only a limited number of clear cases of typology, it is nevertheless both a view of history and an underlying principle of the structure of the Bible. Cahill speaks about four characteristics of typology. The first is the time-element, the temporally united sequence (ie. The historical continuity) of the type and the antitype. The second is the "heightening" (*Steigerung*), which Cahill compares to *prestissimo* or *fortissimo* in music. The third characteristic of typology is its christocentric dimension: "all figures coalesce into the one antitype, the person of Christ" (274) who, according to Frye, is the one God, the one man, the one Lamb, the one tree of life, the one temple. This idea of promise and fulfillment "reminds the reader that typology is not an exegetical method but rather the result of a conviction that salvation had taken place in the end-time through Jesus Christ" (265). The fourth characteristic feature of typology is, that it is located in the poetic

vision and exhibits the creativity we associate with poetry. Cahill shows also some of the implications of typology. The first is that "it sees random events as intelligible by a vertical connection to a creative God" (265). The second implication is that it takes tradition with an ultimate seriousness. Tradition operates by the activity of the interpreter and thus, as E. Ellis put it, "charismatic exegesis… becomes part of the divine revelation itself".[10] The third hermeneutical implication of typology has to do with the status of the New Testament and of the church. Here Cahill distinguishes two tendencies: the first confines typological interpretation to the New Testament only; the second one extends New Testament typology into the present. This is manifest in the prophetic or the reform-movements. An example is the case of Joachim who understood himself typologically as being embraced in the redemptive history of God. In such cases, as Eliade put it, history is transformed into "hierophany". Cahill's conclusion is that "the spiritual stance behind typology is an intrinsic element of the Christian tradition in all ages and times" (278).

5. The Literary Critics: Auerbach, Charity, Ohly, Galdon, Frye

Among the literary critics it was undoubtedly Erich Auerbach who first adopted the theological notion of typology in literary studies. His groundbreaking first work was his book-length article "Figura"[11] in which he used the terms "phenomenal prophecy" or "figural interpretation". Auerbach was so much fascinated by typology or figuralism that he made it the center of his lifework. He pointed out the difference between the figurative interpretation and the modern man's understanding of history. The latter sees historical events in their chronological succession while the figurative interpretation is able to connect two evens that are chronologically or causally distant from one-another by attributing to them a common characteristic meaning. For the figurative interpreter the ultimate end of history is not unknown as it has already been revealed. The idea of figuralism crops up almost as a *leitmotif* of his deservedly famous *Mimesis,* especially when he contrasts the representations of reality in classical and biblical or early Christian narratives. For example, his contrastive commentary on extracts from Tacitus and St Augustine can convincingly illustrate that in the classical narratives the evens are shown horizontally while in a Christian narrative the occurances are linked not temporally or causally but they are vertically connected to Divine Providence. Unlike the practice of classical antiquity, the Judeo–Christian tradition is not particularly keen on observing the *decorum,* it frequently articu-

lated in s definite mixture of styles. This constant *sub speciae aeternitatis* view is the basis of the apparently violent yoking of the temporally distant events. In figural interpretation:

> the two of a figure are separated in time, but both, being real events or persons, are within temporality. They are both contained in the flowing stream which is historical life, and only the comprehension, the intellectus spiritualis, of their interdependece is a spiritual act. (Auerbach 1971: 73)

Among German literary scholars the mediaevalist Friedrich Ohly has published extensively on typology. In his programmatic article "Vom geistigen Sinn des Wortes im Mittelalter" (1977: 1-31)[12] he alluded to typology as dependent on salvation history. Later he developed this aspect in his brilliant study "Synagoge und Ecclessia" (1977: 312-37) where he emphasized the creative aspect of typology: "Typologisches Denken ist schopferisch". He also showed how typology can incorporate unbiblical events (eg. how Plato was seen as a type of Christ). He discussed this question in his article on "half-biblical" and "extra-biblical" typology (1977: 361-99). Most recently he published a book on typology in Luther's exegesis and in the paintings of Cranach (Ohly 1985).

In English literary scholarship the publication of A.C. Charity's *Events and their Afterlife: The Dialectics of Christian Typology in the Bible and in Dante* in 1966 was a significant event. The two-third of the book is devoted to the discussion of typology in the Old and the New Testaments. Charity's evaluation of contemporary (mainly German) theology gives the book the flavour of modernity. The author rejects the traditional, dogmatic and analogical conceptions of typology, the "curious art" that was only hunting for correspondences of historical reality at different stages of sacred history. He called this "applied typology" because this typology "applies" the past in the present. He proposed a broad and not-committed definition of typology: "a study of quasi-symbolic relations which one event may appear to bear to another especially, but not exclusively, when these relations are analogical ones existing between events which are taken to be on another's 'prefiguration' and 'fulfillment'" (1).

Typology, he shows, is concerned with the "event" and not with the "idea". Namely, with "the locating of an *absolute* existential norm in the idea of an event of historical fulfillment – and subsequently with faith's affirmation that it has discovered such an event" (1).

Charity's choice of words betrays that he is a follower of Bultmann and von Rad, commited to the existential school. For him the task of the theologian and the literary critic is the same: "to assist the word to be heard. Still

today, existentially" (6). He maintains that the origins of typology are to be found in the Old Testament interpretation of man's relationship to God and history. Typology goes back to Deutero-Isaiah's image of God as being both "steadfast" and "new". He never changes, he remains always the same but also brings something "new". Charity draws on von Rad when he says that with the Israelites there has always been a confessional recital of the past and he calls it the process of "contemporization".

Furthermore Charity criticizes some of the traditional views of typology (Lampe, Danielou) that neglected the *function* of this phenomenon, namely that in the Bible it was used critically to confront man with the action of God and thereby compelling him for an existential decision. This implies that typology is not only "indicative" but also "imperative" insofar as it is applied to man to summon him to change his existence.

In the New Testament Christ appears to be the great antitype of the Old Testament. He always brings "new" by pointing to the "old". He consciously fulfils the figures of the "suffering servant", the "son of man" etc. and also the whole vocation of Israel. This demands an existential response from his disciples, who, understanding this, "subfulfil" the sufferings of Christ (Col 1:14; 1Peter 2:18-25). Thus Jesus is the "great recapitulator", fulfilling both the vocation of Israel and the will of God. The vocation of Israel is also the vocation of man. Thus in Israel's history all history is fulfilled in Christ as it was seen by Paul (Eph 1:10) and later emphasized by Luther. And this is the mystery of the Incarnacion. In John's Gospel, Charity affirms, the whole history of mankind is implicit in Christ (155). Charity's sensitive theological analysis did not aim to defend a system of typological exegesis; his main concern was to make the dialectics of typology understandable for modern man; to show that the claim of the New Testament typology is that all history is fulfilled in Christ and this recognition demands an existential decision for men to "subfulfil" the way of Christ".

Having drawn on mainly traditional views of typology a Jesuit professor of literature, Joseph Galdon, published a book on *Typology and Seventeenth-Century Literature* in 1975. His ideas on typology were mainly formed by the French patristic scholars, Jean Danielou and Henri de Lubac. For him the characteristic elements of typology are: (1). "Historical realism" which means that the signified, not like in the case of the allegory, does not destroy the historical reality of the signifier. Moses, Josuah, David were types of Christ as historical figures. (2) The basis of correspondence between the type and the antitype is similarity, there is a metaphysical connection brought about by a kind of "homology". (3) The relationship between the shadow and reality is that of prefiguration and fulfillment. The figures or types are only the imita-

tions of truth, the fulfillment is the truth itself (*veritas ipsa*). This is why the Church Fathers suggested that the figures are to be fulfilled (*figuram implere*). The fulfilled type is the antitype, which is a *forma perfectior* while the type is only a *forma inferior*. The antitype is a "recapitulation" but this recapitulation is not a mere "repetition" but rather a "completion", "consummation" or "fulfillment" of the original. (4) There should be divine resonance and christocentric correspondence of the type and the antitype within the Biblical theology of history. This notion involves the idea of the unity of the Bible, the idea of a progressive revelation in salvation history and the centrality of Christ: "just as the Old Testament is a shadow of the New, the New Testament is in turn shadow of the kingdom to come at the end of the world" (48). This means that the "radical openness towards the future" of the Old Testament also survives in the New.

All in all, Galdon's book is a useful reference for the students of 17th century literature and his detailed theoretical discussion of the problem is thorough and accurate even if it is based on a scholastic understanding of typology.

In our survey of the evaluation of typology in 20th century biblical and literary scholarship we have arrived at Northrop Frye whose unceasing interest in typology seems to be a *leitmotif* throughout his career. Frye is a literary critic of whom a theologian once said that he "in a paragraph can throw more light on the Christian Bible than one usually finds in several issues of technical journals".[13] His concern for typology was already evident in his book on Blake (1947). In 1956 he published the essay "The Typology of *Paradise Regained*". The central ideas of this essay, namely, the two "concentric quest-myths" in the Bible: the Genesis-Apocalypse and the Exodus-Milleneum myths, were incorporated in his *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957: 191-92). Though explicitly he is not concerned with typology too much,[14] in the Anatomy it is nevertheless a pillar of his overall methodology, or, as he calls it, a "heuristic principle" of his "genuine higher criticism of the Bible". He contrasts his idea with the "lower" or analytical-historical scholarship which sees in the Bible only conflations, redactions, insertions etc. His own higher criticism is, however, a "synthesizing process" that grasps the imaginative unity of the Bible. This unity is, in fact, a theological one and all the editorial, redactional works were only intended to construct this unity. "We cannot trace the Bible back, even historically, to a time when its materials were not being shaped into a typological unity, and if the Bible is to be regarded as inspired in any case, sacred, or secular, its editorial and redacting processes must be regarded as inspired too" (1957: 315). A literary or a cultural critic, he adds, can only deal with the Bible in this way "as a major informing influence on literary symbolism".

In his *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* out of eight chapters two bear the title of typology. It is discussed together with language, metaphor and myth both in "The order of words" (Part One) and in "The order of types" (Part two). He contends that typology is a "neglected subject, even in theology […] because it is assumed to be bound up with a doctrinaire adherence to Christianity" (80). For Frye typology is a "mode of thought", a "figure of speech" and a "form of rhetoric". As a figure of speech it has two parts: the type and the antitype. In the Bible the Old Testament is the type or the adumbration of the New and the New is the antitype of the Old. Thus the "two testaments form a double mirror each reflecting the other but neither the world outside" (78).

If compared with the metaphor, typology is not a simultaneous figure of speech but it is "a figure that moves in time: the type exists in the past and the antitype in the present or the type exist in the present and the antitype in the future" (80). Moreover, typology leads up to a theory of history, a *Heilsgeschichte* which, even if it was converted into the secular idea of "progress", is a particular vision of the Bible.

Frye's significant distinction (though, to a certain extent, it was already hinted at by Auerbach) is between causality and typology. Both are rhetorical forms moving in time but the former is past-oriented, based on reason, observation and knowledge and the latter is future-oriented, based on faith, hope and vision (82). Kierkegaard is said to have first noticed this difference in his book on *Repetition*. While causality trends to remain in the same dimension of time, in typology there is both a horizontal movement forward and also a vertical leap.

Typology is a view of sacred history, however, soon lost its appeal. It was, however, taken up by the progress-believers and of the 18th and 19th centuries as a "one-directional and irreversible conception of history" (86). Frye's original insight is the distinction between the phases of revelation: creation, revolution (exodus), law, wisdom, prophecy, gospel, apocalypse. He interprets them as "each phase being a type of the one following it and the antitype of the one preceding it" (106). Thus Frye helps us to perceive a "progress" of the antitypes that is a progress of intensification in which always newer and newer perspectives are opened up until it arrives at the revealing apocalypse. "At the end of the Book of Revelation, with such phrases as 'I make all things new' (21:5) and the promise of a new heaven and earth, we reach the antitype of all antitypes, the real beginning of light and sound of which the first word of the Bible is the type" (138).

Notes

1. The second enlarged edition was published in 1969. The English translation was published in 1982.
2. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 89 (1964): 321-44. The article was included as a third chapter in the new German edition of his book (1969) and also in the English translation (1982); I quote from the latter.
3. In German: "die Apokalyptik deutet Geschichte als Ablauf auf das Ende hin, die typologie als Vorausdarstellung des Endgeschehens" (see reference in note 2, p. 328).
4. See reviews by Craig Evans in *Biblica* 64 (1983): 580-81, or C.C.Ryrie in *Bibliotheca sacra* (July- September 1983): 274-75.
5. Gerhard von Rad. "Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments". *Evangelische Theologie* 12 (1952): 17-33. In English: von Rad 1963.
6. Lampe, in Lampe & Woolcombe 21.
7. Lampe, in Lampe & Woolcombe 38.
8. Chapter "Typology, Allegory and Analogy".
9. This chapter was previously published in *Scottish Journal of Theology* 29 (1976): 137-57.
10. Quoted in Cahill 278.
11. First published in German in *Archivum Romanicum,* 1938.
12. First published in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterturm und deutsche Literatur* 89 (1958-59): 1-23.
13. P. Joseph Cahill's review of *Creation and Recreation,* in *Studies in Religion/ Science religieuse* 10 (1981): 235-36.
14. See Frye 1957: 14, 139, 191, 315.

Works cited

Auerbach, Erich. "Figura". Trans. Ralph Mannheim. *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature*. New York: Meridian, 1959.

—. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971.

Baker, D. L. *Two Testaments One Bible: A Study of Some Modern Solutions to the Theological Problem of the Relationship Between the Old and the New Testaments*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976.

Barr, James. *Old and New in Interpretation*. London: SMC, 1966.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "Ursprung und Sinn der Typologie als hermeneutischer Methode". *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 75 (1950): 205-12.

Cahill, P. Joseph. "Hermeneutical Implications of Typology". *Catholic Biblical Quaterly* 44 (1982): 266-81.

Charity, A.C. *Events and their Afterlife: The Dialectics of Christian Typology in the Bible and Dante*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1966.

Danielou, Jean. *Sacramentum futuri: études sur les origines de la typologie biblique*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1950.
De Lubac, Henri. "'Typologie' et 'Allegorisme'". *Recherces de Science Religieuse* 34 (1947): 180-226.
Dentan, Robert C. "Typology: Its Use and Abuse". *Anglican Theological Review* 34 (1952): 210-17.
Fabiny, Tibor. *The Lion and the Lamb: Figuralism and Fulfilment in the Bible, Art and Literature*. London: Macmillan, 1992.
Fairbairn, Patrick. *The Typology of Scripture*. 1845-47. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967.
Frye, Northrop. "The Typology of Paradise Regained". *Modern Philology* 53 (1956): 227-38.
—. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1957.
—. *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*. London: Routledge, 1982.
Galdon, Joseph A. *Typology and Seventeenth Century Literature*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1975.
Goppelt, Leonard. *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Trans. D. Madvig. Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans, 1982.
Lampe, G.W.H. & K.J. Woolcombe. *Essays in Typology*. London: SMC, 1957.
Markus, R.A. "Presuppositions of the Typological Approach to Scripture". *Church Quarterly Review* 158 (1957): 442-51
Ohly, Friedrich. *Schriften zur mittelalterlichen Bedeutungsforschung*. Darmstadt: Wissentschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977.
—. *Gesetz und Evangelium: zur Typologie bei Luther und Lucas Cranach. Zum Blutstrahl der Gnade in der Kunst*. Münster: Aschendorf, 1985.
Smart, James D. *The Interpretation of Scripture*. London: SMC, 1961.
Stek, John H. "Biblical Typology Yesterday and Today". *Calvin Theological Journal* 5 (1970): 133-62.
Von Rad, Gerhard. "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament". *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*. Ed. Claus Westermann. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox, 1963. 17-39.
—. *Theologie des alten Testaments, II*. München: Kaiser, 1965.