

# Typology of the Bible

## **TYOLOGY OF THE BIBLE: Unger's Bible Handbook**

**Definition:** A type (from the Gr. *typos* “blow or mark left by a blow; a pattern or impress”) is a double representation in action, the literal being intended and planned to represent the spiritual. A type is thus the divine impress of spiritual truth upon a literal event, person or thing. Rightly understood and appreciated, typology offers a strong proof of divine inspiration. It is in reality the divine redemptive program of the ages deftly woven into the warp and woof of Scripture by God Himself.

**Extent:** All Scripture is not equally typical. The book of Hebrews is a NT witness to the concentrated typical quality of the Pentateuch and Joshua. Likewise, the book of Ruth, because of its illustration of the Kinsman-Redeemer and the truth of redemption, has a deeper typical meaning than a mere love story. [First Corinthians 10:11](#) offers a NT basis the rich typology of the Pentateuch. “Now all these things happened to them [that is Israel in the wilderness] for ensamples [ Gr. *tupikos*, typically or as types]: and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world [ages] are come.”

**Purpose:** **Typology as the divine inworking of God's purposes in Scripture is a means of making the Word of God relevant for every age and situation.** Since Jesus Christ is the constant subject of the Scripture. His person or work are divinely impressed upon it in type, symbol and prophecy.

Unger's Bible Handbook: An Essential Guide to Understanding the Bible, Merrill F. Unger, Moody Press, Chicago 1967, pp 7-8

## **Excerpt for Jonathan Edwards' “Typological Writings”: Images of Divine Things**

**TYPES.** Texts of Scripture that seem to justify our supposing the Old Testament state of things was a typical state of things, and that not only the ceremonies of the Law were typical, but that their history and Constitution of the nation and their state and circumstances were typical. It was, as it were, a typical world.

John 9:7, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation,

## Typology of the Bible

Sent)." There evidently weight is laid on the interpretation of the word "signified," that there was instruction in the signification of the word, and that teaching that the pool was typical of that fount of grace and mercy that is in Christ.

Gal. 4: 21-23, "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise." [V.] 24, "Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants· the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar." [V.] 25, "For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now IS, and IS in bondage with her children."

I Cor. 10:1-4, "I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; were baptized in the cloud and in the sea; And all eat. of the same spiritual meat; And all drank of the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." V. 6, "Now these things were our examples (or figures ). V. 11, "Now all these things happened to them for ensamples" (or types). When we are sufficiently instructed that these things were typical

and had their spiritual signification, it would be on some accounts as unreasonable to say that we must interpret no more of them than the Scripture has interpreted for us, and than we are told the meaning of in the New Testament, as it would be to say that we must interpret prophecy, or prophetic visions and types, no further than Scripture has interpreted it to our hand.

**Christ blames the Jews and disciples that they don't understand his parables, that were made up of types without explication. But why so, if it be very presumption and folly to pretend to interpret any parables without explication? Matt. 13:15, "Their ears are dull of hearing," compared with Heb. 5:10-12.**

**Yea, Christ blames the disciples· that- they did not understand the types of the Old Testament without his explaining of them, as particularly he blames 'em that they did not understand that leaven was a type of hypocrisy.**

Matt. 16:11-12, "How is it that ye do not understand that I spake not to you concerning bread, but concerning the doctrine

## Typology of the Bible

of the Pharisees and of the Saducees?"

These things that are called "types" used by them to be called "mysteries," and they were many of them. I Cor. 13:2, "And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all *mysteries*, and all knowledge."

I Cor. 9:9-10, "For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope." And so in I Tim. 5:18, "For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his reward." *This passage is a type from the 8<sup>th</sup> Commandment, "Do not Steal", specifically from Deut 25:4, typically shown from Deut 23:15 through 25:16.*

Heb. 4:3, "As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest"; [v.] 4, "For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise"; v. g, "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God"; [v.] 10, "For he that entered into his rest hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.

Of Melchizedec, ch. 5, vv. 6, 11, called "a priest forever after the order of Melchizedec. [ ... ] Of whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing." Heb. 7, throughout, concerning Melchizedec: the interpretation of his name, "King of righteousness"; the name of the city, which is by "peace"; that minute circumstance concerning him, of his having no account of his birth or death, "without beginning of or end of" That is declared to be typical, that Abraham paid the tenth of the spoils, and Levi in Abraham, and that Melchizedec blessed

First, to lay down that persons ought to be exceeding careful in !. interpreting of types, that they don't give way to a wild fancy; not to fix an interpretation unless warranted by some hint in the New Testament of its being the true interpretation, or a lively figure and representation contained or warranted by an analogy to other types that we interpret on sure grounds....

## Typology of the Bible

.."Types are a certain sort of language, as it were, in which God is wont to speak to us. And there is, as it were, a certain idiom in that language which is to be learnt the same that the idiom of any language viz. by good acquaintance with the language, either by being naturally trained in it by education (but that is not the way in which corrupt mankind learned divine language), or by much use and acquaintance together with a good taste or by comparing one thing with another and having our senses as it were exercised to discern it ([See Heb 5:12-14] which is the way that adult persons must come to any language, and in its true that is not their native tongue). Great care should be used, and we should endeavor to be well and thoroughly acquainted, or we shall never understand [or] have a right notion of the idiom of language. If we go to divine types without this, we shall be just like one that speak any language that han't thoroughly learnt it. We shall use many barbarous expressions that fail entirely of the proper beauty language, that are very harsh in the ears of those that are well versed in the language. God han't expressly explained all the types of Scriptures, but has done so much as is sufficient to teach us the language...

.... To say that we must not say that such things are types of these and , those things unless the Scripture has expressly taught us that they are so, is as unreasonable as to say that we are not to interpret any prophecies of Scripture or apply them to these and those events, except we find them interpreted to our hand, and must interpret no more of the prophecies of David, etc. For by the Scripture it is plain that innumerable other things are types that are not interpreted in Scripture (all the ordinances of the Law are all shadows of good things to come), in like manner as it is plain by Scripture that these and those passages that are not actually interpreted are yet predictions of future events.

**Ps. 78:2. There the rehearsal of the story of [the wonderful work God wrought for Israel, in redeeming out of Egypt](#), leading through wilderness to Canaan, instating them in possession of that land, and setting the kingdom of David, etc. is called "parables" and "dark sayings." See note on that place.<sup>5</sup>**

That Mount Zion and Jerusalem are types of the church of saints is evident by Ps. 125:1-2.

That many more particulars in the form of the sanctuary and its various parts, vessels and utensils, are explained is evident

## Typology of the Bible

Heb. 9:5, "And over it the cherubim of glory shadowing mercy seat; of which we cannot now speak particularly," plainly intimating there [are] particulars in those things representing heavenly things which he now thought it not expedient to explain

5. "Blank Bible" note on Ps. 78:2: "The rehearsal made of the wonderful things which God had done of old for Israel, in their redemption [out] of Egypt, settlement in Canaan, etc. are called 'a parable' and 'dark sayings,' because all these things are of gospel things, and with an eye to gospel things this psalm (as almost all the next) was indited by the Spirit of God." Cf. "Types of the Messiah," pp. 193-94, above.