

SOME MISAPPLICATIONS OF BIBLICAL
TYPOLOGY IN RECENT LITERARY
SCHOLARSHIP

By

Carolyn Sue Doyel

Bachelor of Arts

California Baptist College

1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
December, 1976

Thesis
1976
D753s
cop. 2



SOME MISAPPLICATIONS OF BIBLICAL
TYPOLOGY IN RECENT LITERARY
SCHOLARSHIP

Thesis Approved:

David S. Berkeley
Thesis Adviser

Clifton Keeler

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

967695

PREFACE

This study is concerned with setting forth an exact and limiting explanation of Biblical typology. The primary objective here is to demonstrate that when Biblical typology is misunderstood and misapplied to interpret literature, the interpretations may be incorrect. The Bible and some of the writings on the subject by the classical Bible exegetes are used to define and explain Biblical typology. Articles and books by authors who have used Biblical typology to interpret and comment on certain works of literature are used to demonstrate what I believe to be errors in the use of Biblical typology.

I wish to thank Dr. David S. Berkeley for his guidance, inspiration and assistance throughout this effort. Also gratitude is expressed to the other committee members who read and criticized this thesis, Dr. Clinton Keeler, Dr. Walter Scott and Dr. Edward Lawry.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	1
APPROVAL PAGE	11
PREFACE	111
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
SOME MISAPPLICATIONS OF BIBLICAL TYPOLOGY IN RECENT LITERARY SCHOLARSHIP	1
ENDNOTES	35
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	40

Typology has occasionally been studied and used by various scholars and writers since the New Testament was brought together with the Old Testament in the fourth century. During the past few years such study and use have occurred again; consequently, several books and articles in literary criticism dealing with the subject, types and typology, have resulted. Several errors made in dealing with Biblical typology have been observed in this criticism however, signifying not only an imperfect grasp of the application of typology but also of its very definition. It seems expedient, therefore, to explain and restrict the definition of Biblical typology, as well as to illustrate some of the examples of its inept usage in recent literary scholarship.

The errors observed in this study are of four varieties. As might be expected, some examples contain more than one of these four and all will be explained by pointing out the inept usage and error. The four varieties are these: 1. That of describing a non-Biblical person, event, or mythical being as a type. 2. That of combining and confusing archetypes, prototypes, symbols or allegory with types. 3. That of declaring a thing or person, although Biblical, as a type, when in fact there is not sufficient Biblical warrant to support the idea. 4. That of either

ignoring the precise definition of Biblical typology or not being aware of it.

Definitions of types and typology are plentiful, but before considering the definition it seems best to state certain tenets which establish a basis for the subject, at least for the purposes dealt with here.

First it should be realized that there is a God, one God who created all, who is omnipotent, omniscient and the generative influence of the universe; or it must be understood that the Biblical authors believed in God as such. Then it should be noted that they represent God as having a complete plan for man's redemption and that this plan is revealed and explained in the Bible. For it's from God through the Bible that we have learned how types and anti-types were used to reveal and fulfill God's plan of redemption for man.

Generally, in discussing types the Oxford English Dictionary definition is mentioned: "That by which something is symbolized or figured; anything having a symbolical signification, a symbol, emblem, spec. in Theol. a person or thing revealed in the new dispensation;." In addition to this explanation it is helpful to clarify the subject further through the use of some of the writings of Biblical scholars on types.

Samuel Mather, one of the New England Puritans, has left us a detailed exposition of types. ^{in which} Early in his book he makes four important points concerning types. They are

the following:

1. That God is the only Author of the Types They are not meer natural or arbitrary similitudes; but were instituted and set apart by God for that end. How may we know when a thing is a Type, and that the Lord did ordain and design it to that end and use? The answer is, we cannot safely judge of that but by the Scripture. . . .
2. The Types were not only Signs, but Seals The Types were visible Promises, and not only Signs, but Pledges and Assurances of the good they represented. They did represent those great mysteries not only by way of resemblance to the understandings but by way of assurance to the Faith of God's People
3. The Third thing propounded to be spoken to, was the Differences and Agreements between a Type and other things of like Nature: That so we may distinguish and discern the things that differ. I shall Instance here only in four things, that are partly of the same Nature with the Types, but yet not exactly the same. 1. The difference between a Type and a Simile. A Type doth belong indeed to that Argument or Notion in Logick; But with this distinction, which will shew you the difference between them; that there is *Typus arbitriarius* and *Typus fixus & institutus*. An arbitrary Type is a similitude or comparison. So Marriage is a similitude or comparison, by which the Apostle sets out the mystical Union between Christ and the Church, Ephes. 5. But yet Marriage is not a Type. . . .

There is a wide difference between the occasional use of a thing in the way of a similitude or comparison, and the Designment or Institution of it for that end and use. As if Christ be compared to a Feast of Bread and Wine, as in the Parable of the Marriage-Supper. This is a very true and fit comparison; But for Bread and Wine to be designed and set apart by the Command of God to represent Christ and his Benefits, this is a thing of an higher Nature, and puts them into a Sacramental Nature and relation to him.

2. The difference between a Type and a Parable. A Parable is nothing else but a Sacred Similitude: We commonly take it as the Scripture doth, for such a Similitude, wherein not only the Truth and Mind of God is the Scope and Matter of it; but whereof God himself is the Author. As in the Four

Evangelists we Read of the Parables of Christ A Parable there is the same with a Similitude, only it hath God himself for its Author. But in a Type the Lord doth not only occasionally use such or such a Simile; but sets such a thing apart, sets a Stamp of institution upon it, and so makes it an Ordinance to hold forth Christ and his Benefits.

3. What is the difference between a Type and a Ceremony? This is only that which is between the Genus and Species. For all the Ceremonies were Types; but all Types were not Ceremonies; The Pillar of Cloud and Fire was a Type, but not a Ceremony. A Ceremony was some Law, or external Observation prescribed unto them, to teach and shadow forth some Gospel-Mystery; So that a Type is more general, a Ceremony is one particular kind of Type.

4. What is the difference between a Type and a Sacrament? I answer, they differed in the number and multitude of them, they had many Types; we have but two Sacraments. But there was no difference in the Nature of them, further than this, that our Sacraments are Signs of Christ already come; but their Types were Signs of Christ that was to come; Our Sacraments are Signs Christi exhibit; their Types Christi exhibendi.

4. As to the Words and Phrases by which a Type is expressed. First, we have this very word Type used in the Scripture, not only in its Native and proper Signification, John 20.25, ΕΙΣ Τὸν Τύπον τῶν ἤλων . the print of the Nails; But it is used also in the borrowed and spiritual sense where of we are treating, in the Text, Rom. 5.14 and 1 Cor. 10.6. these were Types for us.

ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγένηθησαν

And 1 Cor. 10.11 all these things happened unto them in Types. So the word Τύπος answers the Hebrew חָזָן , exemplar, figura, forma, חָזָן , aedificavit.

They are called Shadows σκία . Col. 2.17. A Shadow of things to come, Heb. 8.5. which serve unto the Example and shadow of Heavenly things, Heb. 10.1. A Shadow of good things to come.

They are called Figures or Patterns, ὑποδείγματα Heb. 8.5. ὑποδείγματα καὶ σκία , the Example and Shadow, Heb. 9.23 Patterns. 1

Mather has hereby explained that the source for types is the Bible, what they are and that they should not be confused with those things which are similar.

Benjamin Keach, a Baptist theologian in England during the middle seventeenth century, wrote this concerning types:

Types are either of things or of ceremonies: the types of things done are, when some actions of holy men in the O.T. prefigured some things done in the New. . . . Ceremonial types are, when the ceremonies and whole constitution of the Levitical worship in the O.T. prefigured things in the New: an evident explication of which the epistle to the Hebrews V is.²

He has specified two sorts of types, the thing type and the ceremony type. However, it is in the following excerpt that he includes person types although he does not refer to them as such. He explains that,

. . . . we find many things in the type which are not to be applied to the Anti-type, which it typifies in some certain thing only, not in all, especially the failings and sins of the saints of the Old Testament, who did typify Christ, are by no means, neither ought they to be attributed to the most holy and unspotted Jesus.³

Thus he is clarifying the point that types are not exact duplicates of the antitype and that there are parallels only in those instances where God intended. No man's sin was ever disclosing of the coming Christ, to repeat Keach's instance.

John Calvin's works also shed some light on the subject of types. In his Institutes of the Christian Religion I he says:

Another distinction between the Old and New Testament is in the types, the former exhibiting only the image of truth, while the reality was absent, the shadow instead of the substance, the latter exhibiting both the full truth and the entire body. Mention is usually made of this, whenever the New Testament is contrasted with the old, but it nowhere is so fully treated as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, But if you prefer it, take it thus: the covenant of the Lord was old, because veiled by the shadowy and ineffectual observance of ceremonies; and it was therefore temporary, being, as it were, in suspense until it received a firm and substantial confirmation. Then only did it become new and eternal when it was consecrated and established in the blood of Christ.⁴

The main idea he expresses here is that God used minor entities in the Old Testament to represent portions of the truth concerning his forthcoming plan; that is, they were minor in comparison to the antitypes of Christ and the Holy Spirit. Nothing nor no one came near to the true significance and holiness which these possess in God's divine plan. Perhaps this is why the types are referred to as shadows. To understand this word being applied to a type it might be helpful to consider just how little can be known of a person by viewing his shadow.

Later, in the same book, Calvin makes another enlightening statement concerning Christ as antitype. As he explains John 1.29 which reads: "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world."⁵ he says, speaking of John, "For he contrasts Christ with all the sacrifices of the Law, showing that in him alone was fulfilled what these figures typified."⁶

Dr. John Brown, an early nineteenth-century English

Bible scholar also helps explain types. He says in his exposition of Hebrews:

But it is quite plain, that though many things may be predicted of persons who are types of Christ, yet nothing can be predicted of them as types of Christ which cannot be predicted personally. What is said of them as types of Christ may be true in a higher sense in reference to Christ, but it must be true of them in a lower sense; and, indeed, it is this that fits them for being types of Christ.⁷

This excerpt explains that types of Christ did not have miracle working power, that is, they did not perform certain superhuman feats in order to be qualified or known as types. God determined that they would perform physical acts as a representation of the sometimes physical but always spiritual acts of the antitypes. A case in point is observed in Moses' being used of God as the leader of the Israelites from Egyptian slavery. It is not a superhuman act to be a leader. Yet it seems that God determined that this leadership by Moses and the deliverance of the Israelites which resulted would prefigure Christ's being the spiritual leader of the elect and delivering them from the slavery of sin to the freedom of the Christian life. The idea is that through scriptural correspondences, we can sometimes deduce that God planned for certain physical acts of a type, however human, to represent some more important spiritual acts by the antitype to come later in time. But types did not perform miracles such as Christ did and the things they did typically they could have done without being types, the differ-

ence being that God would not have used them as prefigurations.

More help in understanding types is found in An Exposition of Hebrews by the late theologian and minister A. W. Pink. In the chapter, "The Typical Tabernacle," when speaking of the Mosaic economy, he says, "It is full of most blessed typical import. . . ." ⁸ He also states, in writing of the ceremonial law and sacrifices:

Because it was typical, it was only preparatory and transient, for once the antitype materialized its purpose was served. The shadows were no longer needed when the substance was manifested. The scaffolding is dispensed with, taken away, as the finished building appears. ⁹

He hereby compares a type to a scaffold to illustrate its relationship to the antitype and to express its temporary nature. Then in a subsequent chapter, "The Typical Sacrifice," when he speaks of the Old Testament animal sacrifices, he remarks:

. . . by means of these types and shadows God was pointing out to them the direction from which true salvation must come, namely in a sinless Victim enduring in their stead the righteous penalty which their sins called for. ¹⁰

This illustrates what was probably God's primary purpose for using types as revelations to the Old Testament people which was to continually remind them that one was coming, incarnate, who was to be their deliverer and perfect, eternal sacrifice.

Further light is shed on the subject of types in Dr. David S. Berkeley's recent book, Inwrought With

Figures Dim. In the first chapter he says,

Typology emphasizes the antitype so much that when revealed, types are noted merely as shadows of realities to come or as things of lower importance. . . . But that essence of things past is preserved by typological interpretation, the accidents being stripped away by the appearance of the antitype. . . . The Christian typological view of life thus removes human happiness and tragedy to a life beyond the earth where all things are completed and seen in their proper definition. Obviously Christian typology interprets history as a providential order with definitive views coming from above, from a God who is supratemporal and extrahistorical.¹¹

An important point concerning typology is made here in the phrase, "the accidents being stripped away by the appearance of the antitype": this is to say that the typological events in the life of a type have not been coincidental, but as is evidenced by the appearance of the antitype, were planned by God for some revelation. Also important to an understanding of typology is the point made here that God has determined history and though we may interpret it anyway we choose, there is one perfect explanation for everything which has happened and that explanation is based on our understanding, if we can, how each event fits into God's eternal plan. Of course, many things about this plan will not be understood until Christ's return.

S. B. again

Erich Auerbach in his "Figura" has also written some very meaningful explanations concerning typology. Speaking specifically of the typological interpretation he says,

. . . the figural interpretation changed the Old Testament from a book of laws and a history of the people of Israel into a series of figures of Christ and the redemption. . . .

Figural interpretation establishes a connection between two events or persons, the first of which signifies not only itself but also the second, while the second encompasses or fulfills the first. The two poles of the figure are separate in time, but both, being real events or figures are within time, within the stream of historical life. Only the understanding of the two persons or events is a spiritual act, but this spiritual act deals with concrete events whether past, present or future and not with concepts or abstractions.¹²

Most important to be noted here is that types are real, a point which distinguishes them from mythological beings who are unreal and existed only in the minds of men.

It is important also to realize that early in God's dealing with man he began his revelation of Christ, the most important antitype. For example in Genesis 3.15 we read this prophecy,

And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.¹³

And a German Bible scholar, E. W. Hengstenberg has explained the purpose of this early prophecy. He states, "As the mission of Christ was rendered necessary by the fall of man so the first dark intimation of Him was given immediately after the fall."¹⁴ In this verse God is speaking to Satan who, at this particular time, is in the form of a serpent, and the general Christian belief is that the seed of Eve's which will bruise Satan's head culminates in Christ since Eve and Mary are genetically related. And while this scripture is not speaking of any type it does reveal that God began early in his dealing with man,

to prophesy about the coming Christ. Then after the fulfillment of this promise we observe several places in the New Testament where the writer views God's binding of the old and new dispensations according to the plan of typological revelation. For instance the following comes from the ninth chapter of Hebrews:

8 The Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing; 9 Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; 11 But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; 24 For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us;

And there are several other such scriptures having typological importance.¹⁵

The central tenets of typological exegesis were established by the early Church Fathers,¹⁶ and since that time typology has been used by various writers, scholars, Biblical exegetes and Christian ministers at different times in history including the present.

In order to understand Biblical types it is important, also, to realize that their basic purpose is that of revelation, and this revelation had at least three purposes. The first purpose was to suggest aspects of the nature of the coming Messiah or some other aspect of the new covenant to the Old Testament people. A second

purpose is that of demonstrating to those after Christ many things about him that they might, otherwise, never have known (e.g. how God simplified, through Christ the attainment of forgiveness of sin; how it is only necessary to have faith in Christ, repent and ask forgiveness whereas the Old Testament people had to present to God burnt animal sacrifices and other kinds as well). A third purpose was to demonstrate to all Christians to come that God has had, since the fall, a plan for man's redemption which centered on Christ.

The apostle Paul indicates that he views types as revelatory when he says in I Corinthians 10.6, "Now these things were our examples," and he is speaking of several things enumerated in the previous verses, 1-5. The margin of the 1611 King James Version by this verse reads, "or types," referring to "examples." And there are other Biblical instances of this nature.¹⁷

Very important to understanding the limiting definition of types is to realize how they differ from symbols, allegories, prototypes, and archetypes. A symbol, according to the OED is,

something that stands for, represents, or denotes something else (not by exact resemblance, but by vague suggestion, or by some accidental and conventional relation), esp. a material object representing or taken to represent something immaterial or abstract, as a being, idea, quality, or condition. . . .

On the other hand types had a definite, present purpose for which God had designed them while at the same time

representing, in one or more aspects, Christ or something in the New Testament to come. Opposed to this, symbols are dependent on their referents for meaning; but types are complete within themselves in that God gave them contemporary meaning and purpose. Even the sacrificing of animals under the first covenant, a type of Christ as sacrifice, had a then present purpose, which was to continually remind the Old Testament people that their sin was so bad that it demanded death to be forgiven.

It can be further explained that, widely speaking, man can choose anything he wishes to symbolize anything else. But God chose specific, appropriate persons and things to be types in order to reveal aspects of the antitypes. And as one critic, Robert Reiter, has said:

Events happened by divine providence and although the full salvific meaning of an event or person may not be apparent to contemporaries, this meaning can be understood by later¹⁸ men because the meaning has been given by God.

The point here is that types and antitypes are divinely chosen, symbols used in literature are not.

Allegory also differs from a type. An allegory is a form of extended metaphor in which objects and persons in prose or verse are equated with meanings that lie outside the narrative itself. Thus it represents one thing in the guise of another. And an allegory attempts to evoke an interest in both the events and characters presented as well as in the ideas they are intended to convey as is explained in Thrall, Hibbard,

and Holman's A Handbook To Literature. A type is not a metaphor hence not an allegory and would have meaning without being a type. And while its typological importance is not to be undermined, it should be recognized that this is only one of its aspects as an entity. For example Moses is considered a type of Christ in that he too proclaimed God's covenant, he prayed for food and water during the Israelites' desert wanderings and God sent bread (manna), and water to drink. Christ provides these on the spiritual level. And too Moses was leader of the Israelites' deliverance from slavery as Christ is leader of the Christian's deliverance from the slavery of sin. But Moses was real and his contemporary purpose was important in God's plan as was his purpose as a type. On the other hand the characters of an allegory are not real and have no real meaning outside the allegory.

Repeat from

The difference between prototypes, archetypes and types should be acknowledged if types are to be rightly understood. Neither of these is the same thing as a type. *Awk*

A prototype is the original or model from which a thing is made; so to say a person is the prototype of Christ, for example, would place that prototype in a superior position to Christ which, of course would not be proper. The model, by definition, is superior to others made after it. The opposite is true for the type-antitype situation. The antitype, created last, is superior to its type, which was created first. The Bible reveals that this is so.¹⁹

Now the difference between an archetype and a type should be recognized. An archetype, for literary purposes, is defined as an image, a descriptive detail, a plot pattern or a character type that occurs frequently in literature, myth, religion or folklore. As persons, archetypes are fully realized characterizations that are endlessly realized in history. So by definition we can expect these to continue occurring and this can result in a cyclical view of history. Typology involves a horizontal view of history, excluding repetitions so we cannot expect continuing antitypes, at least there is no known knowledge of such at this time. Since Christ has come incarnate there is no longer a need for types to be created, and he has fulfilled his purpose as antitype. So it is obvious that a type and an archetype are not the same. Strictly speaking, a type is a thing, person or ceremony in the Old Testament which God used to represent and reveal some aspects of the entities of the new dispensation such as Christ, the Holy Spirit, the church, etc., which are the antitypes.

6 This confusing of types with symbols, allegory, prototypes, archetypes and other literary devices is possibly the result of scholars viewing the type as merely another vehicle for interpreting literature. This is a mistake. Certainly literary artists can conceive types and antitypes, they can use them in their own literature but only God can create types and antitypes. On the other hand the devices which are used to interpret and evaluate literature

have been created by man. So it must be recognized as the critic, Stephen Manning has said:

Typology, then, is not properly a literary technique, nor can it be reduced to one. But it is a mode of spiritual perception and can affect literary techniques and can resemble literary modes.²⁰

Partial proof of this may be seen in the fact that neither the word "type" nor "typology" appears in Thrall, Hibbard, and Holman's A Handbook to Literature which contains definitions of the standard devices used to interpret literature.

So since typology is a Biblical means of revelation and is presently being applied, by some critics, to interpret non-Biblical materials, naturally some mistakes are being made in these efforts. The first such mistake to be discussed here is found in Kathleen Swaim's article, "'Mighty Pan': Tradition and an Image." Herein she suggests that Pan, the pagan god of shepherds, as mentioned in John Milton's poem, "On the Morning of Christ's Nativity," is a type of Christ. This is the excerpt under consideration:

Full little thought they then,
That the mighty Pan
Was kindly come to live with them below;
Perhaps their loves, or else their sheep,
Was all that did their silly thoughts so busy keep.²¹

Early in the article Ms. Swaim quotes Rosemond Tuve, another critic who is, perhaps, the originator of the idea that Milton was using Pan typologically, "Rosemond Tuve links 'mighty Pan' with the 'Prince of Light' and 'the Light of 'a greater sun' "--the Sun being like Pan a type of

Christ and a great source of creative energy."²² This, it seems, is to provide strength for her similar position on Pan, since later she says, "Pan functions doubly here: he is the pagan pastoral deity, but he also prefigures Christ as spirit of love and flocks and 'all.'"²³ Her error is in saying that a non-Christian, non-Biblical image is a type of Christ. It is true that some critics would view this as a pagan-Christian type because they do not believe that a thing has to be Biblical to be a type of Christ or something else in the New Testament. However, pagan-Christian typology may be conjecture since it is very difficult, if not impossible, to Biblically validate this subject while the Bible contains proof for the types and antitypes which God has designed. So viewing Pan as a type of Christ here does not seem appropriate. There are other, perhaps, more valid, ways of viewing this image. The image does seem to suggest that the shepherds had a very crude idea of the real nature of the Messiah. In fact Pan, a figment of man's imagination, is so far removed from actually prefiguring Christ that one might suppose that the image was invoked to suggest how far amiss the perceptions of the shepherds were concerning Christ. This type reference, along with being non-Biblical, is also nonsubstantial since Pan was only an idea in the minds of the ancient Greeks. Of course, it is possible that even Milton believed Pan to have been real, but the fact remains that an imaginary being cannot be a

Biblical type. There is also another error, by intimation, in Ms. Swain's comments on this image. This error is in the idea set forth that one of the ramifications of a type was to perform duties of the antitype until he arrived on earth (e.g. Pan as god of shepherds, spirit of love, etc. until Christ's birth). This idea is false. For example, David, a type of Christ, particularly in his kingly office (I Sam. 16.13, II Sam. 5.12), was a real, historical king of Israel and was not being king for Christ in his absence, or until he arrived on earth. (Anyway David was king of the physical realm which, while prefiguring Christ's being king of the spiritual realm, was very different from it.)

In view of the fact that Milton has woven together, in much of his poetry, pagan images with Christian realities, it is understandable that some critics might view these images typologically as far as his poetry is concerned. However, there does not seem to be sufficient Biblical warrant for such syncretistic conceptions. In fact, there is evidence which indicates that such mixed conceptions of the spiritual and pagan are condemned. Romans 1.18-25 pertains to this subject, particularly verses 19, 22 and 23:

19 Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them; 22 Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; 23 And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and fourfooted beasts and creeping things.

The point here is that God has made himself known to man as he wants to be known and does not accept man's associating him with other beings. And while this passage does not deal with typology specifically it does reveal that if we look to the Bible to learn of typology, which is its source, we then should not be asserting that pagans and/or pagan gods are Biblical types. In this instance Pan involves two of the condemned categories: he was supposedly part man, part beast. John Calvin, in his book, The Epistles of Paul to the Romans and Thessalonians brings to light more of the meaning of verse 23 which bears on this subject:

Having imagined such a God as they could comprehend by their carnal sense, it was impossible for them to acknowledge the true God, but they invented a fictitious new God, or rather a phantom in His stead. What Paul is saying is that they "changed the glory of God". In the same way as one might substitute one child for another, they departed from the true God. Nor are they excused on the pretext that they believe, nevertheless, that God dwells in heaven, and that they regard the wood not as God but as His image (pro simulacro), for it is an insult to God to form so gross an idea of His Majesty as to dare to make an image of Him. None of them can be exempted from the blasphemy of such presumption, neither priests, politicians, nor philosophers.

The utter senselessness to which we therefore draw attention here is that all men have desired to make themselves a figure of God. This is a sure proof that their ideas of God are gross and illogical.²⁴

In short, God does not sanction any pagan ideas or images of him or Christ; and the reason for this is because since no one has ever seen God, no one can realistically picture how He looks, and, further, there is

nothing on the earth that, so far as man knows, can resemble Him. Thus, man is limited to the Bible to gain the proper conception of God which is why I believe pagan typology is invalid as a device to interpret literature which has a Christian emphasis. There are some scriptures which will help further explain this reasoning.²⁵

In her book, American Thought and Religious Typology, Ms. Ursula Brumm demonstrates, many times, an apt comprehension of her subject; but on occasion, she too is in error in her application of typology. On page 177 she says, "Typology abounds in Melville. Moby-Dick, Ahab, and Ishmael all have Biblical models. Billy Budd. . . is in his sacrificial death, the fulfillment of Christ."²⁶

Typology cannot abound in novels since they are not parts of the Bible. Melville probably was aware of the typological revelation of the Bible, but he could not create a type. What his novels are abounding in is proof of his own saturation of Biblical knowledge and influence which probably included his understanding of the typological revelation therein. Therefore, Ms. Brumm is guilty of asserting that non-Biblical persons are types. These characters from Melville's novels should, perhaps, be labeled parallels or analogies of certain Biblical persons. Another error is contained in her statement that Billy Budd is "the fulfillment of Christ." This is false since Christ is the fulfillment of many of the types, or the ultimate fulfillment. This statement places Billy Budd

higher on the scale of importance, in God's plan, than Christ; consequently, she hereby exhibits either inadequate knowledge of the strict definition of her subject or that she is ignoring it.

In a latter portion of the same book where she discusses Hawthorne's use of types, she says,

This Christ is not the type of any of his characters, and whenever Hawthorne uses the type concept it is without reference to Christ. Usually it has no connection to the theologically recognized types of the Old Testament either. Hawthorne sought his types in Puritanism and in New England.²⁷

She is using "type" here when "model," "parallel" or perhaps "archetype" is what is actually meant. There is also another error in this statement by her implication that there are different ways to use the type concept other than those found in the Bible, and that there can be a type concept without reference to Christ in some way. This violates the truth of the central aspect of Biblical typology.

Another critic, Nathalia Wright, has erred in her application of typology to some of Melville's work in that she also has interpreted some non-Biblical persons as types. Speaking of these characters she remarks, "Affected as they are by scriptural patterns, by literary and historical types, constituting, indeed, types themselves, each none the less achieves a life of his own."²⁸ It would be an improvement of this statement to use the word "parallels" instead of "types" in the first occurrence. The second use of the word actually appears

to refer to the commonly understood meaning of the word "type" which is a class or group distinguished by a particular characteristic. However, she should not write under the semblance of Christian typology and use "type" in this common vogue without clarifying the matter. As it is, one cannot be sure which is meant here.

Ms. Wright displays another error concerning typology in her book in the following passage where she is again speaking of Melville's characters, "For about half these patterns the Bible provided prototypes: the type of Ishmael, of Ahab, and of Jesus."²⁹ She hereby uses "type" and "prototype" synonymously and as previously explained, this is incorrect since they do not mean the same thing. This statement seems to be simply an effort, on her part, to say the obvious in an original way; that is, that Melville drew from the Bible in the creation of many of his characters.

Walter Meyers, in writing a book on the Medieval Wakefield Plays, makes an assertion which also demonstrates a misapprehension of Biblical typology. "The types are not confined to Hebrews and Christians since even pagans can be prophets of the Messiah."³⁰ He errs on two points in this statement, by saying, indirectly, that types can be non-Biblical and that pagans can be prophets of God. Mention of the meaning of "prophet" should help explain this error.

It is:

The word prophet comes from the Greek prophētēs from pro ("before" or "for") and phēmī ("to speak"). The prophet is thus the one who speaks before in the sense of proclaim, or the one who speaks for, i.e., in the name of (God).³¹

So if Mr. Meyers is referring to the pagan gods, as one is most likely to suppose, the truth concerning this idea is that something which never existed could not prophesy and there is nothing in the Bible which suggests that God ordained anyone as His prophet who was a pagan. Certainly an author may write a work wherein a pagan god repeats scriptural prophecy but this does not result in a reality. In other words, the author who has his character pagan or otherwise repeat scriptural prophecy is not the originator of such he is the copier.

The second variety of commonly made errors in the use of typology to interpret literature, the confusion of types with archetypes, prototypes, symbols and allegory is exemplified by another excerpt from Ms. Brumm's book:

Melville regards "phenomenal men"--exceptional men, in so far as they can be comprehended--as new fulfillments of prefigurations and types, not in mere imitation but in various transformations and combinations. . . . The modern reader who regards this typological conception as hopelessly obsolete would do well to remember that a similar conception is gaining ground today, when people and literary characters are taken as repetitions of mythical originals or archetypes.³²

By definition, she has erroneously intertwined the ideas of archetypes, mythical originals and cyclical history with types, as well as identifying non-Biblical men as antitypes.

In another statement she errs by using "type" when "symbol" is the appropriate term:

Hawthorne's notion of the type has a special reference to the heart; figures and appearances are outer manifestations of what takes place in the hidden regions of the heart. Above all it is the evil in the heart that projects itself outward. Or seen from the other direction, the pernicious phenomena of the terrestrial world are types of the power of evil that leads an invisible existence in the human heart.³³

Here Ms. Brumm is explaining the outer manifestations of man's inner evil as viewed by Hawthorne. Whether or not Hawthorne had such a typological notion as she explains, may remain to be seen. Nevertheless, in her interpretation what she is actually explaining is that Hawthorne often, aptly symbolized man's inner evil in his writing; and this, of course, is true; but her use of "type" here is incorrect since, strictly speaking, there is no Biblical proof that God created "the pernicious phenomena of the terrestrial world" as "types of the power of evil" in "the human heart."

Further confusion of this sort is observed in an essay by J. A. Mazzeo wherein he is obviously aiming to demonstrate that Andrew Marvell in his poem, "The First Anniversary of the Government Under His Highness the Lord Protector," seems to reflect a belief that Oliver Cromwell was divinely approved of as a leader of the English people. Consequently, he states, "What is most significant for our theme, however, is an explicit reference to the type of David as the humble monarch, as

the archetypal figura of which Cromwell was a contemporary fulfillment."³⁴ The poem does draw parallels between King David and Cromwell but this does not prove that Cromwell was the contemporary fulfillment of a type of divinely ordained leader which is what is implied by Mazzeo's interpretation. Cromwell is non-Biblical and cannot, therefore, be either a figura or a fulfillment. He errs further in placing the two terms, "archetypal" and "figura" together. Because of the nature of their separate definitions, they are not combinable. Perhaps Cromwell did possess character traits similar to those of both Christ and David but such a situation does not establish a typological relationship.

An example of the third kind of mistake currently being made in the use of typology occurs on page 52 in the previously mentioned book by Meyers. In the following excerpt he says some Biblical things are types when there is not Biblical evidence to validate them as such, either through direct scriptural mention or revelatory parallels:

The sea is the type of the baptismal font, the cloud of the Holy Spirit and Moses of Christ our Saviour; Pharaoh of the Devil and the Egyptians of the fallen angels.³⁵

For the first three types mentioned here, the sea (I Cor. 10.1-2), the cloud³⁶ and Moses³⁷ there is verification; he is correct thus far. However he is in error by saying that Pharaoh is a type of the Devil and that the Egyptians are types of the fallen angels. In order for Pharaoh to be a

type of Devil he would have to have existed before the Devil. Since the Devil was already active right after the creation of Adam and Eve and since the episode between the Devil, Adam and Eve occurred before the episode between Pharaoh and the Israelites, Pharaoh could not be a type of the Devil because Pharaoh was created after the Devil whom he would be pointing toward as a type of him. Certainly Pharaoh was a pagan and had no compassion on the Israelites but there does not seem to be enough evidence to establish him as a type of the Devil. God did create him and allow him to be king of Egypt for a purpose and we are told this in Rom. 9.17-18, but there is nothing here which indicates that he is a type of the Devil.

Meyers is at fault in the same fashion in another portion of his endeavor when he says:

As all was lost through Adam, Eve and the tree in the Garden, so shall all be saved through Christ, Mary and the tree of the cross. Christ is thus a new Adam, Mary the second Eve. The tree in Eden is seen as a type of the Cross.³⁸

Again he is partially correct. Christ is viewed as a new Adam (Rom. 5.15), but the tree in the Garden of Eden and Mary should not be called types. There is no Biblical evidence to substantiate this claim. Mary and Eve were linked genetically but not typologically in the Bible.

Ms. Barbara K. Lewalski provides an example of this same sort of error in her article which discusses Milton's play "Samson Agonistes". She says:

Accordingly, Israelite and elect Christian

are type and antitype with respect to their historical situations and with respect to the relative perfection of the two covenants, but not as regards the essence of their spiritual experience.³⁹

There is not substantial Biblical evidence to support the idea that God meant for the Israelites to typify Christians. After all, not all Jews are elected as Paul indicates in Romans 9.7-11. So it seems that an unchosen Jew could not be a type of Christian, that is one who has been chosen, elected by God to be one of his followers. Perhaps Ms. Lewalski is attempting to establish a typological relationship predicated on Biblical history alone and while this is a part of such a relationship more than this is required as has been explained before.

The fourth sort of misapplication of Biblical typology, where it seems that the writer either ignores its definition or is not fully aware of it, occurs in an article by Jonathan Goldberg. He says, ". . . typology is a means of praise."⁴⁰ Nowhere in the Bible, so far as is known, has such an idea been found concerning typology. While it is true that the types had been chosen by God to perform certain tasks and to partially reveal the Messiah or something else in the new covenant, the Bible does not indicate that they were chosen because God wanted to praise them.

Karl Keller demonstrates, likewise, inept comprehension or application of the definition of Biblical typology in this statement from his article concerning typology, "In any system of typology the type does not

really exist until there is an antitype."⁴¹ Then on the following page he says further, ". . . a type does not have any significance until matched with its antitype. . ."⁴² He reveals that he believes that there is more than one system of typology. In reality there is only one, so far as is known, which has been instituted by God. He is also mistaken in his assertion that a type has no significance apart from its antitype. Types are meaningful and have purpose irrespective of their antitypes. The antitype does, of course, add more divine dimension to the lives of the types and also reveals one more purpose in their lives. However, their typological import is borne through the revelatory aspects of their lives concerning Christ or some other aspect of the new covenant. But they had contemporary meaning and purpose and probably would have had even if they had not been types.

Meyers errs in the same way also when he says, "The typological outlook, seeing history as the repetition of patterns, brings together the secular material and unites it with the sacred."⁴³ By this statement it is obvious that he is not applying the proper definition of typology to his work, since the idea of the repetition of patterns is not a part of the proper definition of typology. In fact this idea is the opposite of the one embraced in typology which is that in God's plan each event occurs only once even though there are repetitive patterns. However, there was only one Moses, only one chosen people,

only one creation, only one flood, one crucifixion, etc.

Among other errors concerning typology discovered in this area is one by Ms. Lewalski. As she discusses lines 381-84 from Book IV of "Paradise Regained" she maintains, "The relation of these two mountains emphasizes again the Adam motif. Christ is another Adam seeing a world under the dominion of Sin and Death, though with its ugliness now fraudulently masked."⁴⁴ She is not at all mistaken in her recognition of the parallels of Adam and Christ, or in seeing Adam as a type of Christ. Her error lies in the use of the word "another." The anti-type, Christ is not another, additional Adam; he is, instead, the fulfillment, in person of what had been prophesied about him through Adam's life. Christ is not another of any being. In fact it is his uniqueness that renders Biblical typology credible.

In another section of her book she errs again by saying, "In some respects Elijah was a closer type than Moses of Christ's fast in the wilderness and prophetic office."⁴⁵ As far as is known now there are no degrees of one's being a type; hence she should not have used the word "closer" in a discussion of the parallels concerning these people. Perhaps she could present a credible case for Elijah's life revealing more aspects of the coming Messiah than Moses' life but this would not make him a closer type than Moses since one is either a type or not as God has chosen. There seem to be no degrees in this area.

One other situation explained in an article by Ms. Sadler which illustrates either a lack of knowledge of the Bible verses under discussion or of the precise nature of typology is this:

Milton, for example, speaks of the brazen serpent as a "type of Christ" in the "De Doctrina" (II,v), probably on the basis of Moses' casting his rod on the ground in Exodus 4 and having it become a serpent, whereas, taken up in faith, it becomes the rod of God.⁴⁶

She continues by explaining her awareness of the appropriate scripture, Numbers 21.8-9, which Christ refers to in John 3.14 to establish this typological relationship that she is discussing; but it is evident that she is confused either about typology or the scripture since she uses the wrong verse, (Ex. 4.2-4), to explain her point. In the proper scripture, Numbers 21.8-9, Moses made a serpent of brass, lifted it up on a pole and positioned it in the camp of the Israelites whereby those who had been bitten by serpents could look on it, demonstrating their faith in God's promise, and not die of their snake bite wounds. All this happened according to God's express direction. The typological relationship which Christ is establishing links the event with his impending crucifixion and this is obvious; he too will be lifted up on a cross and positioned in Israel in order to save his people. Exodus 4.2-4 was simply a case whereby God was demonstrating his miracle working power to Moses. There is nothing here alluding to Christ's life, work or crucifixion.

Biblical typology, though seeming simple to some, is actually an intricate subject. One Bible scholar, E. W. Hengstenberg has rightly said, ". . . the treatment of the Old Testament in the New is of a very refined and spiritual character."⁴⁷ This has certainly proven true as well as has Mr. Davis' remark on the subject,

Hence, typology is the single most important method for interpreting the Old Testament, for types provided New Testament authors-- and all Christians as well--with a "key" to understanding the promises of Christ in the Old Testament.⁴⁸

So in order for criticism using types to be exempt from errors, it is imperative that one go beyond a perusal of Erich Auerbach's "Figura" in order to understand typology. One must first have a basic knowledge of the Bible, whereby the relationship of the Old to the New Testament is understood, before he can rightly understand and use typology to criticize and evaluate literature. Also some exposure to the Church Fathers on the subject is helpful and so is reading some of the classical Protestant exegetes, John Calvin, Benjamin Keach, and others on types. There seems to be a basic notion among some critics that Biblical typology and its conflation with pagan deities and superimposition on some of the works of such authors as John Milton and Edmund Spenser, are the same. But an adequate exposure to the above-mentioned sources and a consideration of the errors mentioned here in this study should expel such an idea.

Of course, I recognize that now the word "type" is

used occasionally in interpreting non-Biblical literature. It seems to be used to mean a sort of character continually reoccurring in literature, created by various authors. Actually this is the partial definition of the literary use of "archetype" previously mentioned. An example of this sort of "type" might be the selfish, misplaced woman. This kind of woman appears in several works of literature and she is characterized by being self-centered, having a feeling that she is really special and has been placed in circumstances in life which are much less than she deserves. That is, she feels that she deserves to be in a better station in life than what she is. Some women who, perhaps, fit this definition are Gustave Flaubert's Emma Bovary, John Milton's Eve, and Thomas Hardy's Eustacia Vye. However the problem that I see that keeps these from being types, apart from the fact that they are non-Biblical and not real, is this: Who or which one of these is the antitype, the fulfillment of all those misplaced women created before her? Are we to wait on an author to create the antitype of the misplaced woman? And if this happens how will we know that this is the antitype? The point is, it seems, is that in a discussion of non-Biblical typology we are actually back to dealing in literary archetypes, models, parallels, symbols, similarities, etc., in spite of what we choose to call them.

10 { It should be realized that Biblical typology, however, does have a place in the field of literary criticism, but

it is worthwhile only when one realizes its restrictions and correct application. For example in the following opening lines of Milton's "Paradise Regained",

I who ere while the happy Garden sing,
By one man's disobedience lost now sing
Recovered Paradise to all mankind,
By one man's firm obedience fully tri'd. . . .⁴⁹

we know that Milton is referring first to Adam then to Christ and he is simply demonstrating, by placing Adam here, that he knew that he was a type of Christ and that he intended for his poem to be read typologically, or that he would demonstrate in poetry God's plan of salvation, revealed through types and antitypes. He did not, nor was he trying to create a type. He included the real, Biblical type and antitype in his poetry to make the poem bear the weight of the salvific content that he needed. So to a reader who understands typology, the poem immediately has more meaning than to one who does not understand it. So in interpreting any literature containing Biblical subject matter, especially that literature from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the critic should search for types and antitypes so that if they are present he might grasp the full significance of the author's work. In short, Biblical typology has a purpose in literary criticism in that it is necessary for interpreting and understanding the works of writers who themselves read the Bible typologically and included such ideas in their own work.⁵⁰

There are several aspects of Biblical typology hitherto

unexplored. But an effort must be made to apply properly those which are known in order for the criticism involving Biblical typology to be valid. If properly used and understood, typology enlightens; if not, it confuses. Thus as Samuel Mather has explained,

There was and is a double use of Types and parables, and of that whole way of Argument by Similitudes and Comparisons: They do both darken and illustrate; but if not explained they are like a Riddle, they cast a dark mist and cloud upon the thing.⁵¹

Likewise, inept application of typology in literary criticism casts "a dark mist" upon the subject of Biblical typology. It is evident that some critics should exercise more diligent and comprehensive study of types and the Bible as a whole, before attempting to use Biblical typology to explain any literary work, thus possibly eliminating many errors in this area of study.

ENDNOTES

¹The Figures or Types of the Old Testament (1705; rpt. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1969), pp. 53-60.

²Preaching from the Types and Metaphors of the Bible (1855; rpt. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1972), p. 233.

³Ibid., p. 234.

⁴(Grand Rapids: Assoc. Publishers and Authors Inc. n.d.), pp. 233-34.

⁵Bible. Authorized Version (London: 1611).

⁶Calvin, p. 275.

⁷A Commentary on Hebrews (1862; rpt. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1972). p. 333.

⁸(Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973), p. 461.

⁹Ibid., p. 460.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 531.

¹¹(The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1974), pp. 19-20.

¹²Scenes from the Drama in European Literature (New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1959). pp. 52-53.

¹³This and all subsequent Biblical quotations are from the Authorized Version with chapter and verse cited in text.

¹⁴Christology of the Old Testament (MacDill, Florida: MacDonald Publishing Co., n.d.), I, p. 4.

¹⁵Some other New Testament verses which may be interpreted typologically are: Rom. 5.14; I Cor. 15.45 & 47; Heb. 11.4; Heb. 12.24; Heb. 11.7; I Pet. 3.20-21; Heb. 6.20-7.17; Matt. 26.26-28; John 7.37-38; Matt. 12.39-40.

¹⁶St. Augustine, Origen and others.

¹⁷Col. 2.16-17; Heb. 8.5; 10.1 and perhaps others.

¹⁸"On Biblical Typology and the Interpretation of Literature," College English, 68 (1971), p. 563.

¹⁹Hebrews 9 explains the superiority of the new covenant over the old.

²⁰Stephen Manning, "Typology and the Literary Critic," Early American Literature, 5 (1970), p. 60.

²¹"On the Morning of Christ's Nativity," Complete Poems and Major Prose, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (New York: Odyssey, 1957), p. 42.

²²Studies in Philology, 68 (1971), p. 487.

²³Ibid., p. 491.

²⁴The Epistles of Paul to the Romans and Thessalonians, tr. R. Mackenzie (1969; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), p. 34.

²⁵Acts, chapter 17, verses 16, 17, 23, 28, 29, 30 and the following explanation on verses 28 and 29 from J. A. Alexander's book, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, vol. 2, pages 157-58, will further explain this point. Verses 28 and 29 read:

28 For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring. 29 Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device.

Alexander says about them:

Our being and activity are wholly dependent on our intimate relation and proximity to God our Maker. That this was no peculiar tenet either of the Jews or Christians, Paul evinces by a sentence from a heathen poet, his own countryman, Aratus of Cilicia, who had lived in the third century before Christ, and who, in his astronomical poem, the Phenomena, translated into Latin by at least two illustrious Romans (Cicero and Germanicus), has these very words as part of a hexameter. The same idea, but conveyed in a direct address to Zeus or Jupiter, is found in an old hymn of Cleanthes the Stoic. Hence the plural form, "some of your own poets," or "of the poets among you" (or belonging to you). . . . The

use here made of heathen testimony is not an abuse, or even an accommodation, of the language quoted, which although applied by Aratus and addressed by Cleanthes to a mythological divinity, could only be regarded, even by themselves, as true of the Supreme God, as distinguished from all others. The "for" belongs to the quotation, and refers to nothing in this context. "We also," as well as other orders of intelligences nearer to him. "Offspring," family or race. . . .

The relationship existing between God and man must be chiefly spiritual, not corporeal. To deify matter, therefore, is to make God inferior to man, the Creator to the creature. "Forasmuch then as we are," literally, "therefore being." "Ought not," are bound not, as a matter both of interest and moral obligation. "Graven," literally, "with carving, sculpture." "Art and man's device" disturbs both the order and the syntax, the first and last noun being equally dependent on the second, "art and device of man." The two ideas here combined are those of skill and genius, the power of execution and the power of invention or artistical creation, neither of which, nor both together can change matter into spirit, much less clothe it with divine perfections. "The Godhead," literally, "the divine," i.e. the divine nature or essence. The corresponding abstract term in English is "the Deity." The original order of this sentence, although scarcely reproducible in English, is peculiarly striking and expressive, the first word being "offspring", and the last, "the Godhead" to be like.

²⁶tr. John Hoaglund (New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1970), p. 177.

²⁷Ibid., p. 122.

²⁸Melville's Use of the Bible (New York: Duke, 1949), p. 76.

²⁹Ibid., p. 47.

³⁰A Figure Given: Typology in the Wakefield Plays (Pittsburgh: Duquesne, 1970), p. 17.

³¹Everett F. Harrison, ed., Baker's Dictionary of Theology (Grand Rapids, 1973), p. 423.

³²Brumm, p. 167.

³³Ibid., p. 124.

³⁴"Cromwell as Davidic King," Reason and the Imagination: Studies in the History of Ideas, ed. J. A. Mazzeo (New York: Columbia, 1969), p. 33.

³⁵Meyers, A Figure Given, p. 52.

³⁶The cloud (Num. 9.15-22), is established as a type of the Holy Spirit by the several characteristics which it had that seemed to prefigure the Holy Spirit. For example the cloud was a guide for the Israelites as they traveled in the wilderness as the Holy Spirit is the spiritual guide for Christians today. Some scriptures that mention this are: Luke 12.12; John 6.63; 14.16-17 & 26; & 26; 15.26; 16.13-14.

³⁷There are several revelatory parallels which indicate that Moses was a type of Christ some of which have already been mentioned. Others are that like Christ, he was a mediator between God and man, he was rejected by Israel the same number of times that Jesus was rejected while on earth, and he proclaimed a covenant between God and man, (Ex. 35.1-2), as Jesus did, (Matt. 5, 6 & 7 and 26. 26-28).

³⁸Meyers, p. 52.

³⁹" 'Samson Agonistes' and the "Tragedy" of the Apocalypse," Publications of the Modern Language Association, 51 (1970). p. 1055.

⁴⁰"The Typology of 'Musicks Empire'", Texas Studies in Language and Literature, 13 (1972), p. 427.

⁴¹" 'The World Slickt up in Types': Edward Taylor as a Version of Emerson," Early American Literature, 5 (1970), p. 133.

⁴²Ibid., p. 134.

⁴³Meyers, p. 19.

⁴⁴Milton's Brief Epic: The Genre, Meaning and Art of Paradise Regained (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1966), p. 266.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 207.

⁴⁶Lynn Veach Sadler, "Typological Imagery in 'Samson Agonistes': Noon and the Dragon," English Literary History, 37 (1970), p. 207.

⁴⁷Christology of the Old Testament, II, p. 1338.

⁴⁸Thomas M. Davis, "The Exegetical Traditions of Puritan Typology," Early American Literature, 5 (1970), p. 36.

⁴⁹Hughes, ed., Complete Poems and Major Prose, p. 483.

⁵⁰I am partially indebted to Robert Reiter in his article "On Biblical Typology and the Interpretation of Literature," for the points made in this explanation. This article is mentioned previously in endnote 18.

⁵¹The Figures or Types of the Old Testament, p. 15.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Joseph Addison. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. 1857; rpt. 2 vols. in 1, London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1963.
- Auerbach, Erich. "Figura." Scenes From the Drama in European Literature. New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1959.
- Augustine, Aurelius. The City of God. vols. 7, 8. trs. Gerald G. Walsh and Daniel J. Honan. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1954.
- Berkeley, David S. "Figurae Futurarum in Moby-Dick." Bucknell Review, 21 (1973), 108-23.
- Berkeley, David S. Inwrought With Figures Dim. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1974.
- The Holy Bible. Authorized Version. London: 1611.
- Brown, John. A Commentary on Hebrews. 1862; rpt. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1972.
- Brumm, Ursula. American Thought and Religious Typology. tr. John Hoaglund, New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1970.
- Calvin, John. The Epistles of Paul to the Romans and Thessalonians. tr. R. Mackenzie, 1960; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973.
- Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. 2 vols. in 1, Grand Rapids: Assoc. Publishers and Authors Inc. n.d.
- Daniélou, Jean. Origen. tr. Walter Mitchell. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955.
- Daniélou, Jean. "Symbolism and History." Modern Catholic Thinkers. Ed. A. R. Caponigri. New York: Harper and Bros., 1960. 420-26.
- Davis, Thomas M. "Edward Taylor and the Traditions of Puritan Typology." Early American Literature, 4 (1970), 27-47.
- Davis, Thomas M. "The Exegetical Traditions of Puritan

- Typology." Early American Literature. 5 (1970), 11-50.
- Edwards, Jonathan. Images or Shadows of Divine Things. Ed. Perry Miller, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.
- Fixler, Michael. Milton and the Kingdoms of God. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1964.
- Hengstenberg, E. W. Christology of the Old Testament. 2 vols. MacDill, Florida: MacDonald Publishing Company. n.d.
- Goldberg, Jonathan. "The Typology of 'Musicks Empire'." Texas Studies in Language and Literature. 13 (1972), 421-30.
- Keach, Benjamin. Preaching from the Types and Metaphors of the Bible. 1855; rpt. Grand Rapids, Kregel Publications, 1972.
- Keller, Karl. " 'The World Slickt up in Types': Edward Taylor as a Version of Emerson." Early American Literature, 5 (1970), 124-40.
- Lewalski, Barbara K. Milton's Brief Epic: The Genre, Meaning and Art of Paradise Regained. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1966.
- Lewalski, Barbara K. " 'Samson Agonistes' and the 'Tragedy' of the Apocalypse." Publications of the Modern Language Association. 51 (1970), 1050-62.
- Lowance, Mason I., Jr. "Images or Shadows of Divine Things: The Typology of Jonathan Edwards." Early American Literature, 5 (1970), 141-81.
- Lowance, Mason I., Jr. "Typology and the New England Way: Cotten Mather and the Exegesis of Biblical Types." Early American Literature, 4 (1969), 15-37.
- Madsen, William G. From Shadowy Types to Truth: Studies in Milton's Symbolism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Manning, Stephen. "Typology and the Literary Critic." Early American Literature, 5 (1970), 51-73.
- Mather, Samuel. The Figures or Types of the Old Testament. 2nd ed., 1705; rpt. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1969.
- Mazzeo, J. A. "Cromwell as Davidic King." Reason and the Imagination: Studies in the History of Ideas. Ed. J. A. Mazzeo. New York: Columbia University Press,

1969. 29-55.

- Meyers, Walter E. A Figure Given: Typology in the Wakefield Plays. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1970.
- Milton, John. Complete Poems and Major Prose. Ed. Merritt Hughes. New York: Odyssey, 1957.
- Morgan, G. Campbell. The Acts of the Apostles. Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1924.
- Pink, A. W. An Exposition of Hebrews. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973.
- Preus, James Samuel. From Shadow to Promise: Old Testament Interpretation from Augustine to the Young Luther. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Reiter, Robert E. "On Biblical Typology and the Interpretation of Literature." College English, 68 (1971), 562-71.
- Reiter, Robert E. "Poetry and Typology: Edward Taylor's Preparatory Meditations; Second Series, Numbers 1-30." Early American Literature, 5 (1970), 11-23.
- Rosenblatt, Jason P. "Structural Unity and Temporal Concordance: The War in Heaven in 'Paradise Lost'." Publications of the Modern Language Association, 87 (1972), 31-39.
- Sadler, Lynn Veach. "Typological Imagery in 'Samson Agonistes': Noon and the Dragon." English Literary History, 37 (1970), 195-210.
- Swaim, Kathleen M. "'Mighty Pan': Tradition and an Image in Milton's Nativity Hymn." Studies in Philology, 68 (1971), 484-95.
- Williams, Arnold. "Typology and the Cycle Plays: Some Criteria," Speculum, 43 (1968), 677-84.
- Wilson, Walter Lewis. Wilson's Dictionary of Bible Types. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Wright, Nathalia. Melville's Use of the Bible. New York: Duke University Press, 1949.

VITA

Carolyn Sue Doyel

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Thesis: SOME MISAPPLICATIONS OF BIBLICAL TYPOLOGY IN RECENT
LITERARY SCHOLARSHIP

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Pawnee, Oklahoma, September 1,
1944 the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Cloyd Cushman.

Education: Graduated from Newkirk High School, New-
kirk, Oklahoma, in May, 1962; received Bachelor
of Arts degree in English from California Bap-
tist College, Riverside, California in May 1968;
enrolled in master's program at Oklahoma State
University, 1970; completed requirements for
the Master of Arts degree at Oklahoma State
University, December 1976.

Professional Experience: Teacher of English and Journ-
alism at Fort Supply High School, Fort Supply,
Oklahoma, 1971-72. Teacher of Freshman English,
Dodge City Community College, Dodge City, Kansas,
1974-76.