"This book is an astonishingly rich exploration of the contours and textures of the overarching message of the whole Bible. Jim Hamilton painstakingly assembles a veritable mountain of evidence for the argument that the biblical writers, under God, knew exactly what they were doing, and that from the beginning, they were consciously paving the way for the Christ to come. Every page deserves careful study, for so much ground is covered in such stimulating (and sparkling) detail. Even where one disagrees with specific conclusions (and such is the scope of this book that this is almost inevitable), the depth of insight and nuance of the argument makes reading this book a delight."

GARY MILLAR, principal, Queensland Theological College

"Jim Hamilton has written a clear and theologically rich work on typology, demonstrating how the scriptural story of redemption is anchored in God's promises of the Messiah. *Typology: Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns* shows forth both the unity of Scripture and the beautiful layers of its truths, and best of all it provides fresh lenses for beholding the glories of our Savior. Here readers may feast on the Bible's teaching concerning the One who is the Last Adam, the Prophet like Moses, the Faithful High Priest whose work fulfills the Levitical Cult, the Royal Son of David, the Righteous Suffering Servant, and God With Us—read and rejoice!"

L. MICHAEL MORALES, professor of biblical studies,
Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary

"In his previous work, Jim Hamilton convinced me that we need biblical theology in order to help disciples learn to think and live, in terms of the Bible's symbolic universe. With *Typology*, Hamilton continues to help readers become biblically literate by sensitizing them to the micro-level clues as to the nature of what the Bible is all about. As God's declaratives ("let there be") shape the created order, so God's promises shape redemptive history. Discerning typological connections between these promises and their fulfillment in Christ, and the meaningful pattern they create, is part and parcel of coming to have a biblical worldview—seeing God, God's world, and God's people from the perspective of the biblical authors. If theology is faith seeking understanding, coming to grips with the unique scriptural imaginary that typology is and creates is an essential theological task."

KEVIN J. VANHOOZER, research professor of systematic theology,
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

TYPOLOGY

UNDERSTANDING THE BIBLE'S
PROMISE-SHAPED PATTERNS

TYPOLOGY

UNDERSTANDING THE BIBLE'S PROMISE-SHAPED PATTERNS

How Old Testament Expectations
Are Fulfilled in Christ

JAMES M. HAMILTON JR.

ZONDERVAN ACADEMIC

For Isaiah John Hamilton
May you follow in the footsteps
of the men whose names you bear
growing to be mighty in the Scriptures
knowing Yahweh as the saving God
and giver of every good gift
in Christ by the Spirit

CONTENTS

PART 3: INSTITUTIONS

DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS

Typology—Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns

How Old Testament Expectations Are Fulfilled in Christ

PART 1: PERSONS

PART 2: EVENTS

PART 3: INSTITUTIONS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Writing a book is an exhilarating and frustrating endeavor (Eccl 1:18; 12:12). The truth is so beautiful and majestic, mere words so meager and frail. The Bible brims with life and power, but to seek to communicate that experience of searching the Scriptures and seeing their interconnectedness is to chase the wind (Eccl 2:11), which blows where it pleases (John 3:8). But what a blessed joy and privilege to try.

The limitations of this book vexed me until I landed on a way to structure the book's contents, a structure that serves as a vehicle for the book's message and is at the same time a key component of that message. What bothered me was the way that the topical nature of the discussion of typology—dealing first with people, then events, and finally institutions—kept me from being able to exposit everything all at once. My preference would have been to take readers on a leisurely stroll that went verse by verse, chapter by chapter, book by book through the whole Bible from Genesis to Revelation. That being impractical and impossible (imagine what it would have done to word limit and deadline!), I resigned myself to the topical arrangement. But then over Thanksgiving Break 2020, as I stared at the table of contents, a breakthrough solution came to me in the form of a simple question: why not structure my book according to the form the biblical authors so often use in theirs? You'll find more on that, which I found immensely satisfying, in the Introduction and Conclusion to this volume.

Readers who want to take that verse by verse, chapter by chapter stroll through the Bible with me can avail themselves of the BibleTalk podcast from 9Marks, where I join my friends Alex Duke and Sam Emadi in a

conversational exposition of the Scriptures that gives a lot of attention to Typology and Biblical Theology. In addition, it is my privilege to pastor at Kenwood Baptist Church at Victory Memorial and to teach at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, KY. The expositional sermons I have preached at Kenwood are freely available on our website and through the church's podcast, and the seminary accepts applications. The best way to explore the Scriptures together is through live, in-person, face-to-face interaction, so I would invite those who want more to move to Louisville, join us at Kenwood and/or enroll at Southern Seminary, that we might explore the Bible together at church and/or in class.

How could I thank the Lord for all his goodness to me? (cf. Ps 116:12). For the gospel, for my family, for my teachers, for the Scriptures, and for so much more that I could never enumerate (Ps 40:5).

I dedicate this book to my beloved youngest son, who bears the names of two of my favorite teachers, with the prayer that his eyes will see *the* Teacher, and that his ears will hear a word behind him saying, "This is the way, walk in it" (Isa 30:20–21).

May this book increase your love for God and neighbor as you grow in zeal for and understanding of the Scriptures.

Jim Hamilton
Louisville, KY
Easter, 2021

ABBREVIATIONS

When I cite from the Greek Translations of the Hebrew Bible, I will preface the verse reference with LXX as follows: LXX Mal 3:1.

When I refer to the superscriptions of the Psalms, which are verse 1 in the Masoretic Text (MT) but are not numbered in English translations, I will cite the number of the psalm with "ss" for "superscription," so the superscription of Psalm 18 would be presented as 18:ss.

In the book's footnotes I have spelled out the names of journals and monograph series rather than abbreviate them.

BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*
ET	English Translation
Gen. Rab.	Genesis Rabba
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NA[28]	*Novum Testamentum Graece*, Nestle-Aland, 28th ed.
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament

INTRODUCTION TO PROMISE-SHAPED TYPOLOGY

Micro-Level Indicators for Determining Authorial Intent

> Typology is the method of interpreting Scripture that is predominant in the NT and characteristic of it.
>
> —LEONHARD GOPPELT[1]

The aged father, the death of whose wife has just been narrated (Gen 23:1–20), commands his servant (עֶבֶד), "put your hand under my thigh" (24:2) and makes him "swear by Yahweh, the God of heaven and the God of earth" not to "take a wife for my son from the daughters of the Canaanites" (24:3), but to return to his kindred for a wife for his son, his only son, whom he loves, Isaac (24:4; cf. 22:2).[2] When the servant asks if he should take Isaac back

---

1. Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 198.

2. Unless otherwise noted, translations of the biblical text in this book will be my own. These will typically be as literal as possible in an attempt both to preserve the interconnectedness of the texts and communicate in English the way the biblical authors conceptualize and describe the world, even if this makes for awkward English. In these very literal renderings, I am not trying to produce smooth English (whose primary concern would be the target audience). My overarching concern in these excessively literal renderings is to allow contemporary speakers of English to glimpse the way the biblical authors put things. If everyone reading this book primarily accessed the Bible through original language texts, this would not be necessary. Since I hope people who have not yet studied Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic will read this book, very literal translations will sometimes be presented.

to that land if the woman is not willing to follow him to the land of promise (24:5), father Abraham says he must certainly not take Isaac back there (24:6), and then Abraham references the way God called him to leave his country, his kindred, and his father's house and go to the land he would be shown (12:1), land God promised to give to the seed of Abraham (12:7), before promising the servant, "he will send his angel before you" (24:7, ESV).

Note the similarity between the phrases Moses used to tell the story:

Gen 12:1, "Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house to the land"

Gen 24:7, ". . . took me from my father's house and from the land of my kindred"

Gen 12:7, "To your offspring I will give this land."

Gen 24:7, "To your offspring I will give this land."

We fast-forward in the narrative to a time when the one whose years have no end (Ps 102:27) commands his servant, "Do not come near; take your sandals off your feet, for the place on which you are standing is holy ground" (Exod 3:5, ESV). He then identifies himself, "I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (3:6), and he commissions Moses, his servant (עֶבֶד),[3] to return to Egypt. Abraham sent his servant to find a wife for Isaac, and Yahweh sends Moses to bring the one with whom he himself will enter into a marital covenant out of Egypt that they might inhabit the land promised to Abraham. Yahweh intends to be a husband to this people (Jer 31:32). Eventually he makes a statement to Moses reminiscent of the one Abraham made to his servant in Genesis 24:7 ("he will send his angel before you," ESV): in Exodus 23:20 the Lord tells Moses, "Behold, I send an angel before you" (ESV).

---

3. Stephen G. Dempster observes, "The precise expression ['servant of Yahweh'] is used mainly of Moses (eighteen times). It is also used to describe Moses's successor, Joshua (Jos. 24:29; Judges 2:8), David (Pss. 18:1; 36:1) and Israel (Is. 42:19)." Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Biblical Theology of the Hebrew Bible*, New Studies in Biblical Theology 15 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 123 n. 25.

הוּא יִשְׁלַח מַלְאָכוֹ לְפָנֶיךָ Gen 24:7,

הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי שֹׁלֵחַ מַלְאָךְ לְפָנֶיךָ Exod 23:20,

By the reuse of this statement, it seems that Moses intends to prompt his audience to associate the mission on which Abraham sent his servant, to get a bride for Isaac, and the mission on which Yahweh sent Moses, his servant, to get a covenant partner for himself. This understanding of Moses's intention seems to be verified by the way the prophet Malachi employs the sentiment. In Malachi 3:1 the Lord promises another installment in the pattern, another occasion when the servant will be sent for a bride, and Malachi makes remarkable adjustments to the scenario:

הִנְנִי שֹׁלֵחַ מַלְאָכִי וּפִנָּה־דֶרֶךְ לְפָנָי Mal 3:1,
"Behold, I send my messenger, and he will prepare the way before me." (ESV)

The Lord again promises to send his "messenger," and the word rendered "messenger" is the same Hebrew term translated "angel" in Genesis 24:7 and Exodus 23:20 in the ESV, but this time the Lord promises to come himself: "he will prepare the way before me" (Mal 3:1, ESV). And then the sequence of events is repeated climactically: when the Father sends his servant on a mission to acquire a bride for the servant himself, who is also the beloved Son, and in preparation declares, "Behold, I send my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way" (Mark 1:2, ESV).

How are we to account for and understand these patterns of events, and what is the relationship between God's promises and such patterns? The rest of this introductory chapter will explore the relationship between God's promises and the patterns we find in the Scriptures, along with what I refer to in this chapter's title, "micro-level indicators for determining authorial intent." I have in view things like what we have just seen: the quotation of lines, the reuse of key terms, the repetitions in sequences of events, and the similarities in covenantal and salvation-historical import we find when we focus in on particular texts. These "micro-level" indicators stand in contrast with the "macro-level" indicators that will be discussed in the final chapter of this book, and by "macro-level" I refer to wide-angle literary structures. At the end of the

Conclusion to this book, in the final section of the final chapter, we return to Genesis 24, so that discussions of the central episode in the literary structure of Genesis form an inclusio around this treatise.[4]

The phrase "promise-shaped typology" attempts to capture what happens when God makes a promise that results in those who know him interpreting the world in the terms and categories either communicated in the promise or assumed by it. God's words shape the world in Genesis 1, and as the Bible unfolds, his promises shape the expectations and perceptions of his people. This is especially the case with biblical authors, who operate under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

I will be arguing in this book that God's promises shaped the way the biblical authors perceived, understood, and wrote. As this happens again and again across the Scriptures, from account to account, book to book, author to author, patterns begin to be discerned, patterns that have been shaped by promises: promise-shaped patterns.

To demonstrate understanding, we show that we have discerned what an author intended to communicate.[5] I am claiming that the biblical authors *intended* to communicate the types that will be discussed in this book. This stands in contrast with the approach of Richard B. Hays, who writes, "Figural reading of the Bible need not presume that the Old Testament authors—or the characters they narrate—were conscious of predicting or anticipating Christ."[6] Here I briefly attempt to set forth a step-by-step process whereby this seems to have worked, from creation to the composition of the biblical texts, acknowledging that for the biblical authors the logical progression of these steps could have been simultaneous, intuitive, and instinctive. That is, I am not claiming that the biblical authors themselves outline this process but that this process can explain what we find in their writings.[7]

---

4. Readers who turn to §5 of Chapter 11 at this point will not offend me. You have my permission to read the end from the beginning, that it might inform all in between.

5. See E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967); and Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998).

6. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 2. For a strong critique of figural interpretation, see Aubrey Sequeira and Samuel C. Emadi, "Biblical-Theological Exegesis and the Nature of Typology," *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 21, no. 1 (2017): 25–28.

7. My goal is similar to what Emadi and Sequeira set out to achieve (I would include OT authors) when they write: "we are endeavoring to uncover the exegetical logic that undergirds the NT authors' interpretation and that leads them to interpret typology as a feature of divine revelation. Understanding

First, God made the world by his word, which shapes everything about human experience and perception, and then God spoke expectation and perception-shaping promises. My contention is that the creating and promising word of God resulted in earlier biblical authors (beginning with Moses) discerning certain patterns in their material. The promises and the patterns then began to work together, and later biblical authors had not only the promises but the patterns they produced influencing their perception. These later authors, then, having discerned the author-intended and promise-shaped patterns in earlier Scripture, saw similar patterns, which they then included in their own material.

When the biblical authors composed their writings, they intended to signal to their audiences the presence of the promise-shaped patterns. Thus, even if they did not fully understand the significance of the pattern and/or how the promise would be fulfilled (and see Eph 3:5 and 1 Pet 1:10–12), the Old Testament authors intended to draw attention to the recurring sequences of events, and they did so with a view to the future.[8] Because these sequences of events had themselves been shaped by the promises, the promises were reinforced by each new installation in the pattern of events, and a growing sense of the significance of both promise and pattern developed.

In the opening pages of the Bible, Moses establishes this feature of biblical literature. The biblical authors who follow Moses learn it from him and imitate his use of the convention: their worldview has been shaped by his words.[9] For Moses himself, the word of God—the promises—shaped his worldview (his assumptions and presuppositions, perceptions and interpretations), resulting in the promise-shaped patterns that he introduced into the accounts. Perhaps some of these patterns came to Moses in oral traditions he learned from his parents or from Aaron and Miriam. He then would have been carried along by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet 1:20–21) as he interpreted material passed down to

---

that logic will reveal a great deal about how the NT authors conceived of the nature of types. Put simply, we are attempting to describe how typology in the NT 'works.'" Sequeira and Emadi, "Nature of Typology," 11–12.

8. Cf. Basil of Caesarea's (AD 330–ca. 379) definition of typology: "Typology points out what is to be expected, indicating through imitation what is to happen before it happens." Saint Basil, *On the Holy Spirit*, trans. David Anderson (Crestwood, N.Y: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980), 53.

9. I have in mind the kind of thing Gibson describes when he writes concerning Malachi, "The core of the prophet's imagination is shaped by his reflection on an authoritative collection of texts." Jonathan Gibson, *Covenant Continuity and Fidelity: A Study of Inner-Biblical Allusion and Exegesis in Malachi*, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 625 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2019), xiii. See also his first chapter, which is subtitled, "The Core of Malachi's Imagination," 1–23.

him and made decisions about what to include and how to arrange what he presented in the Torah (the Torah, or Pentateuch, always and everywhere attributed in Scripture to Moses).[10]

The shaping of patterns by promise can be seen in the opening chapters of the book of Genesis, which is a profoundly self-referential book. To illustrate what I mean by the phrase "promise-shaped patterns," we begin by considering the influence of Genesis 3:15. The impact of what God says in Genesis 3:15 can be seen in the way Moses presents what happens between Cain and Abel, then later in the cursing of Canaan, and again in the blessing of Abraham. The three sections of this chapter will proceed as follows:

§1 Genesis 3:15, A Pattern-Shaping Promise
§2 Author-Intended Typology
§3 A Preview of What Follows

§1 GENESIS 3:15, A PATTERN-SHAPING PROMISE

As the Lord speaks words of judgment to the serpent in Genesis 3:14–15, we read,

And Yahweh God said to the serpent,

"Because you have done this,
cursed are you from all [i.e., more than all, comparative מִן]
        the beasts
    and from all [comparative מִן again] the living creatures
        of the field.
On your belly you shall walk,
and dust you shall eat all the days of your life.

---

10. See Deut 31:9, 24; 33:4; Josh 8:31, 32; 22:5; 23:6; 1 Kgs 2:3; 2 Kgs 14:6; 21:8; 23:25; 2 Chr 23:18; 25:4; 30:16; 33:8; 34:14; Ezra 3:2; 7:6; Neh 8:1, 14; 10:29; Dan 9:11, 13; Mal 4:4. These references, and the fact that Jesus attributes the Torah to Moses (e.g., Mark 12:26; Luke 24:44; John 5:45–47), lead me to the position that Moses wrote the Torah. Those who hold different views on the authorship of the Pentateuch can attribute the correspondences to whoever was responsible for the text in its final canonical form. I am persuaded that the Torah of Moses is a literary masterpiece, a work of genius, and such literature is produced not by committee but by individuals, literary geniuses. This does not deny updating by those recognized as qualified to do so, but the evidence indicates this editorial updating was neither pervasive nor structural but minor and restrained.

> And enmity I will put between you and the woman,
>> and between your seed and her seed.
> He will bruise you head,
> and you will bruise him heel."

The shaping character of the promise contained in these words of judgment becomes apparent when we consider the pervasive self-referentiality of Moses's presentation in Genesis. To explore the significance of Genesis 3:15, we will begin and end this sub-section with consideration of the nature of the book of Genesis, starting with its self-referentiality, ending with its foundational character. In the mirrored construction of this section, the outworking of Adam's sin in the life of his sons stands across from the outworking of Noah's sin in the lives of his sons and theirs. We then consider the way that Moses meant Genesis 4 to be read in light of Genesis 3, juxtaposing that with consideration of the way types impress themselves on our thinking. At the center of this discussion we will consider the cursed seed of the serpent. The mirroring panels of this subsection fall out as follows:

§1.1 The Self-Referential Nature of Genesis
    §1.1.1 Working and Keeping, Killed and Cursed
        §1.1.2 Genesis 4 in Light of Genesis 3
            §1.1.3 The Cursed Seed of the Serpent
        §1.1.4 The Impress of the Type
    §1.1.5 The Cursing of Canaan and Those Who Dishonor Abraham
§2.1 The Foundational Nature of Genesis

§1.1 The Self-Referential Nature of Genesis

In Genesis 3:14–15 Moses refers his readers back to material he introduced in the previous two chapters of Genesis: in 3:14 we read of "all the beasts" (כָּל־הַבְּהֵמָה) and "all the living creatures of the field" (כֹּל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה). These are known to readers from both their introduction on the sixth day of creation in 1:24–25 ("beasts," בְּהֵמָה) and the expanded description of their origin in 2:18–20 ("all the living creatures of the field," כָּל־חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה, 2:19). Similarly, the statement that the serpent will eat dust in 3:14 refers back to the 1:30 grant of "every green herb for food," which the Lord takes from him in 3:14. An even nearer reference back can be seen in the way the serpent tempted the woman

and the man to eat forbidden food (3:1–5), so the punishment inflicted upon him touches what he himself is permitted to eat (3:14)—his punishment fits his crime.[11]

Seeing typological patterns requires thinking about an account in light of those earlier and later, and as we read narratives we instinctively apply this kind of reflection to near contexts: statements from earlier in the narrative inform statements made later, and later statements clarify and build upon the earlier.[12] Seeking to understand types and patterns, then, extends to broader contexts something we intuitively do with immediate contexts. The study of typology amounts to active reflection on one passage in light of others.[13]

Continuing with the self-referentiality of Genesis, note that Yahweh God warned in 2:17 that eating from the tree would result in death. That warning produces the fear of death that prompts the man and woman to hide after their transgression in 3:8 and refuse to confess in 3:9–13. Once Yahweh has called them out and exposed their sin, the man and woman have no reason to think they will live—until God speaks to the serpent.

God promises to put enmity between the serpent and the woman in Genesis 3:15, and enmity entails ongoing conflict. Ongoing conflict requires ongoing life. In this ongoing life the woman will not side with the serpent against Yahweh but with Yahweh against the serpent. God's statements say it will be so. The woman has not yet joined battle with the serpent at this point, but God announces they will be at enmity. That God mentions the "seed of the woman" means the conflict will not be limited to the woman and the serpent—the man too will be involved, as he is necessary for any "seed" to be born of the woman. God's words to the serpent indicate that the man and woman will join his side against the serpent.

Does this imply that the man and woman have evaded the consequence

---

11. Gage sees this as the first instance in a pattern of punishments meting out retributive irony by matching the crime. See Warren Austin Gage, *The Gospel of Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1984), 46.

12. See the discussion of how information is encoded by authors and interpreted by readers in Elizabeth Robar, *The Verb and the Paragraph in Biblical Hebrew: A Cognitive-Linguistic Approach*, Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics (Boston: Brill, 2015), 1–18.

13. I agree with David L. Baker that this involves "theological reflection on relationships between events, persons and institutions [*sic*] recorded in biblical texts," but I disagree with his assertion that this means "typology is not exegesis." *Two Testaments, One Bible: The Theological Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments*, 3rd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2010), 181.

articulated in Genesis 2:17? Not for a moment: when compared with their unashamed nakedness in 2:25, their hiding from one another in 3:7 and from God in 3:8 shows that their uninhibited purity is no more. The man and woman have experienced a ruinous spiritual calamity. They have sinned. As a result of their sin they are spiritually dead. Their spiritual unresponsiveness can be seen in their refusal to confess their sin and repent of it when God calls them out. A few lines later, in 3:19, God assures them that they will physically die.

The promise of seed in Genesis 3:15, however, means they will not die without hope (cf. Rom 8:20–21). The enmity between the serpent and the woman means that humanity has not altogether joined the serpent's cause. The woman and her seed (which, again, requires the man's participation) will resist the snake. Thus the enmity.

And that brings us to the last line of Genesis 3:15. I have rendered this tersely, "He will bruise you head, and you will bruise him heel," because in the original Hebrew the pronouns "you" and "him" do not modify the nouns "head" (as in, "your head") and "heel" ("his heel"). In each case the pronouns modify the repeated verb "bruise." The statements, thus, are "he will bruise you . . . and you will bruise him . . ." To bring across the Hebrew in smoother English, we might say, "he will bruise you *on* (or perhaps *with respect to*) the head, and you will bruise him *on* (or *with respect to*) the heel." Because a wound to the heel would not typically be life-threatening in the way a head wound might, Moses communicates to his audience that the man and woman have every reason to understand God's words to the serpent as a promise that their seed will triumph over him.

We should note that in Genesis 1 life began by the word of God, as God spoke the world into existence. Now in Genesis 3 life continues by the word of God. The Lord's word of judgment to the serpent declares ongoing life for mankind, as attested by the man's naming of the woman in 3:20, "And the man called the name of his wife 'Eve,' because she was the mother of all living."

The life and death struggle between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent is *the* plot conflict that informs the whole of the biblical narrative. The serpent has instigated sin and incurred a curse, and man has transgressed but heard words of God that indicate that the tempter will be defeated, suggesting that not only sin but also the consequences of sin (death

and banishment from God's presence, which are different ways of saying the same thing) will be overcome.[14]

Supporting the idea that Moses intends his audience to understand the narrative as pointing to an ultimate resolution of the plot's conflict, the words of Lamech at the birth of Noah in Genesis 5:29 reflect hope for relief from the results of God's judgment. In the near context, Moses presents Eve articulating hope for the serpent-crushing seed at the births of Cain and Seth (4:1, 25). He then presents a carefully recorded line of descent from Adam in the Genesis 5 genealogy, tracing the progress of the seed of the woman with "and he died" as its refrain. The death-escaping account of how Enoch walked with God gives hope (5:21–24), and then in 5:29 we meet the reuse of the words of judgment from 3:17–19, as Lamech articulates hope that his child (cf. 3:15), Noah, will bring comfort.

As we consider the way that God's promises shape patterns in biblical narratives, we observe that in the words of judgment in Genesis 3:14–19 the serpent is cursed, and the land is cursed, but neither the man nor the woman hears the words "cursed are you." God blessed the man and woman in 1:28 (self-referentiality again), and that blessing will not be reversed. The man and the woman will be at enmity with the serpent and his seed, but they are not cursed. Who, or what, are the seed of the serpent? The observation that God curses the serpent but neither Adam nor Eve helps us address the question of how the seed of the serpent are to be understood. The self-referentiality of the narrative teaches Moses's audience to allow the narrative to interpret itself as it proceeds. We read the cross-referencing statements in light of each other so that they clarify one another. The Genesis 3:15 statement about the serpent's seed does not refer to literal snakes, as becomes clear when we keep reading into Genesis 4.

§1.1.1 Working and Keeping, Killed and Cursed

The narrative continues in its pervasively self-referential way. The man and woman were commanded to be fruitful and multiply in Genesis 1:28, and they begin to do so in 4:1–2. Eve's response to the birth of Cain in 4:1 indicates that she is looking for the seed promised in 3:15, and as Abel "became a shepherd of a flock while Cain was working [עבד] the ground" in 4:2, readers are reminded of Adam's responsibility to "work [עבד] and keep [שמר]" the

---

14. See Mitchell L. Chase, "The Genesis of Resurrection Hope: Exploring Its Early Presence and Deep Roots," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 57 (2014): 467–80.

garden (2:15). Adam's "working and keeping" of the garden in 2:15 was itself another way to describe his responsibility to "subdue" the earth and "have dominion" over the animals from 1:28.[15] In Genesis 4:2 Adam's "working" of the ground (subdue the earth, 1:28) is carried forward as Cain does the same, and Adam's "keeping" the garden (have dominion over, 1:28) is realized in Abel's shepherding of the flock (cf. 2:15).

TABLE 1.1 Working and Keeping

Work the Ground	Have Dominion over the Animals
1:28, subdue the earth כָּבַשׁ	1:28, rule over the animals רָדָה
2:15, work עָבַד	2:15, keep שָׁמַר (i.e., protect from the animals) the garden
4:2, Cain was working (עָבַד) the ground	4:2, Abel was shepherding (רָעָה) the flock

The two Hebrew terms from Genesis 2:15, work (עָבַד) and keep (שָׁמַר), appear in both Genesis 3 and Genesis 4. In Genesis 3:23, Yahweh sent Adam "from the garden of Eden to work the ground," while in 3:24 the cherubim and flaming sword "keep the way to the tree of life." Then in Genesis 4, we read of Cain's "working" (עָבַד) of the ground in 4:2, and after he murders Abel he asks if he is his brother's "keeper" (שָׁמַר) in 4:9.[16] The Lord then tells Cain

---

15. Gage observes, "in the divine command man is commissioned to reproduce God's own activity in creation, that is, to subdue and to fill the earth." Gage, *Gospel of Genesis*, 28.

16. R. W. L. Moberly opts for "recontextualization" and suggests, "it is arguable that what interpreters present as an author-hermeneutic is in fact generally a plausible text- and reader-hermeneutic that is articulated in a disciplined, historically oriented mode, however it is formally presented." He then states that he adopts a "rule of faith," stating that his "preference is to use the term loosely to refer to 'a sense of how things go'—that is, as a set of interrelated moral and theological judgments as to the kind of sense that does, or does not, resonate within a biblical and Christian frame of reference." R. W. L. Moberly, *The God of the Old Testament: Encountering the Divine in Christian Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2020), 8–9. By embracing recontextualization, "rule of faith" (which Moberly describes in a very subjective way—"a sense of how things go" and "the kind of sense that does, or does not, resonate"), and relativizing authorial intent (suggesting that it is merely a rigorous version of reader-response), Moberly makes moves that characterize some practitioners of "theological interpretation of Scripture." This stands in contrast with the kind of biblical theology pursued here, which seeks the intent of the human author and practices grammatical-historical interpretation in canonical context, and the differences have significant ramifications on interpretive conclusions, as can be seen from comparison of Moberly's account of Cain and Esau (ibid., 125–64) with mine in this book and in James M. Hamilton Jr., *Work and Our Labor in the Lord*, Short Studies in Biblical Theology (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2017), 45–48.

in 4:12 that when he "works" (עָבַד) the ground it will not yield its strength to him, and this reminds readers of the way that the words of judgment spoken to Adam included a curse on the ground (3:17), thorns and thistles (3:18), and banishment from the garden (3:23). The re-use of this "work" and "keep" terminology calls 2:15 to mind, reminding the audience of God's purpose for Adam in the garden and highlighting how far Cain has fallen from it.

The repetitions, again, instruct the audience to read the narrative so that its statements inform each other. Moses intends the different scenes of his broader narrative to be read in light of one another, and he presents the narrative such that what God says shapes not only the creation but the events that take place within it.

No narrative can comprehensively present everything that needs to be communicated. Authors must fill in gaps in audience understanding as they continue to provide new information. A promise was introduced into the narrative in Genesis 3:15, and this promise has decisively shaped Moses's understanding. Moses passes on to his audience his Genesis 3:15 promise-shaped understanding in his Genesis 4 narration of Cain's sin.

§1.1.2 Genesis 4 in Light of Genesis 3

The whole story of Cain murdering Abel in Genesis 4 makes constant reference back to Genesis 3. We see this from the pervasive repetitions of words and phrases from Genesis 3 in Genesis 4. Yahweh was not pleased with Cain's offering in 4:5, and in response to Cain's anger (4:6) he warns him that "sin is crouching at the door; and for you is its desire, but you must rule over it" (4:7). This statement recalls the words of judgment God spoke to the woman in 3:16, "and for your husband is your desire, but he will rule over you."

וְאֶל־אִישֵׁךְ תְּשׁוּקָתֵךְ וְהוּא יִמְשָׁל־בָּךְ ,Gen 3:16

וְאֵלֶיךָ תְּשׁוּקָתוֹ וְאַתָּה תִּמְשָׁל־בּוֹ ,Gen 4:7

The paralleling of these statements helps us understand the nature of the "desire" and the "ruling" described in both cases. The woman's desire for her husband is like sin's desire for Cain—a desire to influence, even control, behavior. The man's ruling over the woman will likewise parallel what Cain's response to sin *should* be. In addition to the way the re-use of terms helps us

understand what they mean, the parallelism of the phrases suggests that we are to read Genesis 4 in light of Genesis 3.

Taking this interpretive hint from the text's author, we set Cain's murder of Abel (4:8) in parallel with the first couple's eating of the forbidden fruit (3:6). After Adam and Eve transgressed, Yahweh confronted Adam with a "where" question—"Where are you?" After Cain transgressed, Yahweh confronted Cain with a "where" question—"Where is Abel your brother?" The wording of the two questions is similar:

וַיִּקְרָא יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶל־הָאָדָם וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ אַיֶּכָּה ,Gen 3:9

"And Yahweh God called to the man, and he said, 'Where are you?'"

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־קַיִן אֵי הֶבֶל אָחִיךָ ,Gen 4:9

"And Yahweh said to Cain, 'Where is Abel your brother?'"

Adam's response to Yahweh's question in 3:10 revealed his guilt: he was afraid because he knew he had transgressed, and he knew he was naked because he had eaten of the tree. So also Cain's response to Yahweh's question in 4:9 reveals his guilt: the claim that he does not know Abel's location is a lie, and the indignant question about whether he is his brother's keeper reveals his lack of love for neighbor.

In Genesis 3:13, "Yahweh God said to the woman, what is this you have done?" And in Genesis 4:10 the Lord says to Cain, "What have you done?"

מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂית . . . וַיֹּאמֶר ,Gen 3:13

וַיֹּאמֶר מֶה עָשִׂיתָ ,Gen 4:10

Having confronted the transgressors in Genesis 3:9–13, Yahweh curses the serpent in 3:14 with the words, "Because you have done this, cursed are you from . . ." Having confronted Cain with his transgression in 4:9–10, Yahweh curses him in 4:11 with the words, "And now, cursed are you from . . ."

כִּי עָשִׂיתָ זֹּאת אָרוּר אַתָּה מִכָּל־הַבְּהֵמָה ,Gen 3:14

וְעַתָּה אָרוּר אָתָּה מִן־הָאֲדָמָה ,Gen 4:11

The similarities between Genesis 3 and 4 indicate that the two chapters inform one another, and so we must compare *and* contrast them. The similarity between Genesis 3:14 and 4:11 shocks because of the connection it forges between Cain and *the serpent*. When God spoke words of judgment over Adam and Eve in 3:16–19, he did not say the words "cursed are you" to either of them. The only person to hear those words in Genesis 3 was the serpent in 3:14. When Moses presents God speaking those words to Cain, he provides a narrative answer to a question arising from 3:15—who are the seed of the serpent? Answer: people like Cain, whose actions incur God's curse in the same way the serpent's did.

§1.1.3 The Cursed Seed of the Serpent

How do these connections between Genesis 3 and 4 inform our understanding of the unfolding plot of Genesis, the Bible, and the world? The promise in Genesis 3:15 came in words of judgment to the serpent that there would be enmity between himself and the woman, between her seed and his. Eve's responses to the births of her sons in 4:1 and 4:25 indicate that she expects a male descendent to arise as the seed of the woman who will bruise the serpent's head. The cursing of Cain in 4:11 identifies him with his *figurative* father, the devil (Gen 3:14; cf. John 8:44–47; 1 John 3:8–15).

God's promise in Genesis 3:15 creates a set of expectations, which includes ideas along the following lines:

- those who rebel against Yahweh and his purposes will be identified with the serpent;
- those who embrace Yahweh and his purposes will be identified with the woman and her seed;
- there will be ongoing conflict between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent;
- and whereas the seed of the woman will inflict a head wound on the seed of the serpent, he will himself incur only a heel wound.

This set of expectations has been created by God's word of judgment to the serpent, which becomes a word of promise to the woman and her seed. That word of promise, further, shapes the expectations of those who believe it. In Genesis 4, Moses intends to present Cain's murder of Abel as an event to

be understood in light of the sin and resulting words of judgment in Genesis 3, as attested by the repetition of so many phrases from Genesis 3 in Genesis 4. The words of God in Genesis 1–3 have shaped the way Moses perceives and narrates the events of Genesis 4 and following.[17]

§1.1.4 The Impress of the Type

On the basis of what we have seen so far, I would suggest a relationship between the literal and figurative meanings of the Greek word τύπος. We derive our English term "type" from the Greek term τύπος (see Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 10:6; and cf. τυπικῶς in 1 Cor 10:11). BDAG[18] seems to provide first the concrete meaning of τύπος, "a mark made as the result of a blow or pressure" (1019), and then metaphorical and figurative extensions of the concrete meaning, for example, "an archetype serving as a model" (1020).[19] It seems that the relationship between the concrete meaning and its metaphorical extensions is something along the following lines: a person sees something that *impresses* itself onto their consciousness, and other things are interpreted along the lines of that impression.[20]

I am suggesting that the word of God has been pressed into the consciousness of those who believe it, and that impress results in reality being

---

17. The shaping influence of Genesis 3 can also be seen in the way that God says to Adam in 3:17 (ESV), "Because you have listened to the voice of your wife . . ." Later when Sarai comes up with the faithless plan involving Hagar, "Abram listened to the voice of Sarai" (Gen 16:2, ESV). This pattern is broken, by contrast, when we read that Potiphar's wife "spoke to Joseph day after day, he would not listen to her" (39:10, ESV). The event in Genesis 16 is also connected to the sin in Genesis 3 by the wording in 3:6, ". . . she *took* of its fruit and ate, and she also *gave* some to her husband . . ." and 16:3, ". . . Sarai . . . *took* Hagar . . . and *gave* her to Abram . . ." (ESV). Moses intends the sin of Sarai and Abram in Genesis 16 to be understood along the lines of the sin of the man and woman in Genesis 3. The connection with Joseph refusing to listen to Potiphar's wife indicates that he overcame where Adam and Abram failed.

18. Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ed. Frederick William Danker, trans. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

19. See also the entries in Franco Montanari, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, ed. Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder (Boston: Brill, 2015) that begin with the verb τυπάζω (pages 2166–67), active "to beat," passive "to be stamped." Related terms refer to things like drums (τυπάνον), woodpeckers (τυπάνος), and hammers (τυπάς); then terms like τυπίδιον, "model," seem to extend the idea to "what is beaten out" or the "impression stamped." For a full lexical analysis, see Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Typos Structures* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 115–90.

20. Leonhard Goppelt writes of the term τύπος, "It derives etym[ologically] from τύπτω "to strike," but retains the sense of "blow" only in the ancient saying in Hdt [Herodotus] I, 67, 4[1] . . . Elsewhere the ref. is always to the impress made by the blow, what is formed, what leaves its impress, the form-giving form, hence form gen. as outline. . . . In virtue of its expressiveness it has made its way as a loan word into almost all European languages" (τύπος κτλ., in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 8:246–47).

interpreted in light of God's word. By this process the promises of God shape the interpretations that produce the patterns, and those patterns reflect the biblical authors' typological understanding of both what has happened and what it indicates about the future.

§1.1.5 The Cursing of Canaan and Those Who Dishonor Abraham

The shaping influence of Genesis 3:15 continues to be seen across the narrative of Genesis. After Ham sins against Noah, Noah curses his son's descendants in Genesis 9:25, אָרוּר כְּנָעַן ("cursed be Canaan"), with the same term God used to curse the serpent (Gen 3:14) and Cain (4:11). This identifies Ham's descendant Canaan with the serpent, marking him as seed of the serpent and laying groundwork for God's justice to be visited on the Canaanites when Israel, seed of the woman, conquers the land of Canaan, seed of the serpent, in Joshua (cf. Gen 15:16; 10:15–16).[21]

A few pages later Moses narrates that Yahweh promised Abraham, "I will bless those who bless you, and the one who makes light of you I will curse [אָאֹר]" (Gen 12:3). God declares that those who refuse to honor Abraham will be cursed the way he cursed the serpent, Cain, and Canaan. Moses hereby signals to his audience that, going forward, anyone opposed to Abraham is to be identified as the seed of the serpent, while anyone who aligns with Abraham will be identified as the seed of the woman.

When God promises at the end of 12:3 that all the families of the earth will be blessed in Abraham, the implication is that the serpent and his seed will be defeated through Abraham and his seed (cf. Gen 22:17–18), then all aligned with Abraham will experience the blessed peace that results from the triumph of the seed of Abraham, whose descent has been traced in Genesis 5 and 11 all the way back to Adam. The seed of the woman will bless the world through the defeat of the seed of the serpent (3:15; 12:1–3; 22:17–18).

§1.2 The Foundational Nature of Genesis

The beginning of Genesis sets the parameters and expectations for the rest of the book. And the story of God speaking the world into being, with all very good, of him making man in his image and placing him in the garden to work and keep it, with a prohibition on eating from the tree of life, of the making

---

21. This dynamic also explains why Abraham does not want Isaac to intermarry with Canaanites (Gen 24:3), and Isaac and Rebekah have the same concern for Jacob (28:1, 6–9; cf. 26:34–35).

of male and female and their cleaving to one another in marriage, and then of their transgression and God's word of hope-giving judgment—this story not only sets up the book of beginnings, Genesis, but the whole of the Torah of Moses (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy). Every subsequent biblical author embraced the Torah of Moses and continued the story begun in the book of Genesis.

The content of Genesis is necessary for understanding the rest of the Torah, and in Genesis Moses teaches the biblical authors who follow him how to interpret, how to communicate, how to structure material, how to symbolize, how to typify. In this first chapter we are looking at how Moses does this at the micro-level with words, sentences, sequences, and matters of significance. In the final chapter of this book we will examine how Moses does this at the macro-level with literary structures that encompass the whole book of Genesis. All the biblical authors, I contend, embraced the teaching of Moses, learning from him how to understand the world and how to structure their own presentations.

§2 AUTHOR-INTENDED TYPOLOGY

The promise in Genesis 3:15 begins the shaping of the patterns the book you are reading seeks to exposit. Before we plunge into the patterns, significant questions about typology deserve some attention: How do we define "typology," what are its features, and what are the interpretive controls by which we can evaluate and establish that the biblical authors intended to communicate the typological patterns we might see in the text? I will work backward through these questions, beginning with the interpretive control of authorial intent, then moving to the features of typology, before suggesting a definition of this key term and concluding with reflections on the intent of the divine author of Scripture. This subsection has a concentric structure:

§2.1 The Intent of the Human Author
    §2.2 Features of Typology
        §2.2.1 Historical Correspondence
        §2.2.2 Escalation in Significance
    §2.3 Defining the Term "Typology"
§2.4 The Intent of the Divine Author

§2.1 The Intent of the Human Author

The most important criterion for determining what a text means is determining the intent of its human author.[22] As Elizabeth Robar has written, "To the extent that the reader construes the text as the author intended, successful communication has taken place."[23] We determine an author's intent by means of historical-grammatical interpretation of the text the author wrote.[24] We want to understand the grammatical meaning of the words and phrases the author has employed, and we want to understand that grammatical meaning in historical context. This study will employ grammatical-historical interpretation in pursuit of the intent of the human authors of the biblical texts.[25]

All texts have contexts, and all authors have ideological contexts in which they intend their writings to be understood. My working hypothesis is that the earliest biblical author, Moses, presents the whole of the Torah as relevant context for the isolated statements within his five books.[26] Continuing this line of thought, later biblical authors assume earlier Scripture as the wider

---

22. See the nuanced discussion advocating authorial intent in Dale C. Allison Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 1–8. Ounsworth's replacement of authorial intent with "the concept of a plausible first audience" is unpersuasive. Richard Ounsworth, *Joshua Typology in the New Testament*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/328 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 3, cf. 19–28. Audiences can so easily misunderstand or reject what authors/speakers intend to communicate (see, e.g., Deut 31:29; Matt 13:10; 16:22).

23. Robar, *The Verb and the Paragraph in Biblical Hebrew*, 41. *Pace* Moberly, *The God of the Old Testament*, 9.

24. In this study I will be interpreting the sixty-six books of the Protestant canon of Scripture, starting with the standard original language texts of the Old and New Testaments and moving from them into English translations. I will primarily work from the *BHS* text of the OT, the NA[28] for the NT, the Rahlfs text of the Greek translation of the OT (LXX), and the ESV, though as noted above I will also present my own translation.

25. E. D. Hirsch writes, "the intentional fallacy is properly applicable *only* to artistic success and to other normative criteria like profundity, consistency, and so on. . . . the intentional fallacy has no proper application whatever to verbal meaning." Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation*, 12.

26. Moses seems to expect his audience to encounter his material repeatedly, so that after their first time through, they will know what he introduces early but only explains later. For instance, see the way that in Gen 13:10 Moses assumes the destruction of Sodom that will not be narrated until Gen 19 with the words, "This was before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah" (Gen 13:10, ESV). Similarly, clean and unclean animals will not be delineated until Leviticus, but the classification is already assumed in the instructions for Noah in Genesis 7. The clean/unclean distinction seems to inform the release of the raven and the dove in Genesis 8:6–12, and the facts that doves will be used for sacrifice (e.g., Gen 15:9; Lev 12:6) and olive oil will be used for both the anointing of the tabernacle and the fueling of the menorah (Exod 27:20; 30:24–25) seem to cast light back on the dove returning with a freshly plucked olive leaf (Gen 8:11). The more confident we become that Moses means for the whole Pentateuch to be read together, the more significant becomes the fact that the serpent, which will later be declared unclean (Lev 11:42–44), got past the one charged to keep the clean realm of life (Adam), into the Garden, to tempt the woman to sin. For other examples along these lines, see footnote 4 on page 66.

context against which they intended their writings to be understood. As Beale has written,

> typology can be called contextual exegesis within the framework of the canon, since it primarily involves the interpretation and elucidation of the meaning of earlier parts of Scripture by latter parts. . . . Rather than exegeting a text only in light of its immediate literary context within a book, we are now merely exegeting the passage in view of the wider canonical context.[27]

The features of typology to which we now turn our attention will help us to establish the intent of the human authors.

§2.2 Features of Typology

The two essential features of typology are *historical correspondence* between events, persons, and institutions in the Bible's salvation-historical unfolding and the consequent *escalation in significance* that accrues to recurring patterns.[28] The kind of typological interpretation the biblical authors practice affirms the historicity of both the initial instance of the pattern and its recurrences.[29] As Melito of Sardis asserted in the second century, "the type happened."[30] That is to say, the biblical authors are not engaging in literary contrivance that creates these parallels and patterns.[31] Melito also affirmed escalation when he spoke of the type being surpassed by its fulfillment, which would be "taller in height,

---

27. G. K. Beale, "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? An Examination of the Presuppositions of Jesus' and the Apostles' Exegetical Method," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 401.

28. E. Earle Ellis, "Foreword," in *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, by Leonhard Goppelt, trans. Donald H. Madvig (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), x.

29. Joshua Philpot persuasively applies this principle to demonstrate the historicity of Adam, otherwise the biblical authors would not have treated him as a type of the one to come, in "See the True and Better Adam: Typology and Human Origins," *Bulletin of Ecclesial Theology* 5, no. 2 (2018): 79–103. Bell's position that "Adam is a type of the one to come (5.14) but the passage has to be understood as mythical" eviscerates the connection of any saving import. Richard H. Bell, *The Irrevocable Call of God: An Inquiry into Paul's Theology of Israel*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 184 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 186 n. 139.

30. My translation, in consultation with M. A. G. Haykin, of the Greek line, ὁ μὲν γὰρ τύπος [ἐγένετο]. Melito, *Peri Pascha* 4. Hall renders, "For the model indeed existed." See Stuart George Hall, ed., *Melito of Sardis on Pascha and Fragments: Texts and Translations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 4–5.

31. As Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 2nd ed. (New York: Basic, 2011), 55–78, seems to suggest.

and stronger in power, and beautiful in form, and rich in its construction."[32] Historical correspondence and escalation work together, as we will see when considering each in turn.

§2.2.1 Historical Correspondence

How do we establish historical correspondence?[33] We have evidence that later biblical authors seek to establish historical correspondence with earlier passages of Scripture when they re-use significant terms, quote whole phrases or entire sentences, repeat sequences of events, and establish parallels in covenantal or salvation-historical significance. Rarely-used terms or peculiar expressions naturally attract notice and establish connections in the minds of readers, as do quotations of earlier material. We must sometimes reflect to notice repeated event-sequences, but once noticed they cannot be un-seen. As for salvation-historical significance, another way to describe this would be to speak of a *covenantal* connection.

Consider the following examples:

Significant Terms. The word for "ark" (תֵּבָה) occurs in only two narratives in the Old Testament: in Genesis 6–9, where it describes Noah's ark, and Exodus 2:3 and 2:5, where it describes the "basket" (ESV) into which Moses's mother put him. This linguistic point of contact is regularly noted. I will argue in Chapter 4 that it is one of the features of historical correspondence between Noah and Moses. Here it is enough to observe that virtually all readers (of the Hebrew or of literal translations that preserve the connection) naturally think of Noah's ark when they read of the ark-basket carrying baby Moses in the bullrushes. Further, I would suggest that Moses employed this term to describe the basket into which his mother put him because he intended his audience to see a connection between himself and Noah.[34]

As another example of re-used terminology, note that in Exodus 15:5 Pharaoh's chariots and host sank in the sea "like a stone" (ESV). Just a few

---

32. Melito, *Peri Pascha*, 36. Hall, *Melito on Pascha and Fragments*, 18–19.

33. For a thorough discussion of "Evaluating the Evidence for Correspondence Between Texts: Established Criteria," with which I am in broad agreement, see Gibson, *Covenant Continuity and Fidelity*, 33–44.

34. Rightly Duane A. Garrett, *A Commentary on Exodus*, Kregel Exegetical Library (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2014), 168: "Moses is a new Noah, who goes through water in his ark sealed with tar in order to save the people of God from a wicked generation."

verses later, in 15:16, the Song of the Sea sings that the inhabitants of Canaan will be still "as a stone" (ESV) as Israel passes over. Duane Garrett explains,

> The future conquest of Canaan, in this prayer, will see a repetition of God's actions. As the Egyptians sank to the bottom of the sea "like a stone" (15:5b), the prayer is that the Canaanites will be as immobile as a stone (15:16b) until Israel has "crossed over" into Canaan. The crossing over (עָבַר) into the Promised Land is a mirror of Israel's crossing of the *Yam Suph*; both are works of God (see also the description of Israel's crossing [עָבַר] of the Jordan in Josh. 3).[35]

On the basis of these kinds of uses and re-uses of language, I will argue in Chapter 8 that as Moses celebrates the crossing of the Red Sea in Exodus 15, he indicates that the conquest of Canaan will be a new exodus.

Quotations of Phrases or Lines. We have observed above the way the phrase "cursed are you" from Genesis 3:14 is quoted in 4:11, establishing a "kinship" between the serpent and his figurative seed, Cain. The biblical authors pervasively refer to and quote earlier Scripture. As another example, consider the way that Moses forges a connection between Abraham's experience and the exodus from Egypt by presenting the Lord saying the words, "I am Yahweh, the one who brought you out . . ." in both Genesis 15:7 and Exodus 20:2. Encountered in narrative sequence, Moses presents Yahweh quoting himself as he speaks the same words at the making of the Sinai covenant that he spoke when making covenant with Abraham:

אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאוּר כַּשְׂדִּים ,Gen 15:7

אָנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם ,Exod 20:2

As argued elsewhere,[36] and to be presented again in Chapter 8 below, Abraham experiences a sequence of events that serves as a kind of preview of

---

35. Ibid., 405.
36. See, for instance, L. Michael Morales, *Exodus Old and New: A Biblical Theology of Redemption*, Essential Studies in Biblical Theology 2 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2020), 19–36; and James M. Hamilton Jr., *With the Clouds of Heaven: The Book of Daniel in Biblical Theology*, New Studies in Biblical Theology 32 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2014), 225–26.

the exodus from Egypt. The re-use of the quotation joins a parallel sequence of events, to which we turn our attention.

Repeated Sequences of Events. Often a number of features work together, as in this instance. Consider the parallels between the exoduses from Egypt of both Abraham and Israel:

1. Both Abraham and Jacob (and his offspring) descend into Egypt
2. because of a famine in the land of promise.
3. In both instances, the Hebrews are oppressed by the Egyptians, with Sarah taken into Pharaoh's harem and the children of Israel (eventually) enslaved.
4. In both cases the captives are liberated
5. when the Lord visits plagues on Pharaoh and Egypt,
6. and in both cases the Hebrews are enriched by the Egyptians,
7. before making their way out of Egypt and through the wilderness
8. to enter into a covenant ceremony with Yahweh,
9. who appears to Abraham as the smoking fire pot and flaming torch passing between the pieces, and to Israel in thick darkness and fire at Mount Sinai.
10. That Moses included these repetitions, and drew attention to them by means of the quotation of Genesis 15:7 in Exodus 20:2, suggests that Moses discerned an increasing significance in this repeated pattern and took pains to make sure his audience would see it as well.

As noted above with the "stone" language from the Exodus 15 Song of the Sea, it seems that Moses expected the pattern of events that took place in Abraham's life and at the exodus from Egypt to recur in Israel's future when they conquered Canaan.

Salvation-Historical Significance (i.e., Covenantal Import). I noted above that Moses uses the term תֵּבָה "ark" to describe both Noah's boat and the basket into which his own mother put him. Moses has obvious *covenantal significance*: he was the human mediator through whom Yahweh entered into covenant with Israel at Mount Sinai. Noah likewise has covenantal significance. When we considered *quotations* above we could have looked at the way Genesis 1:28 is quoted in Genesis 9:1, and in Chapter 2 below we will also see a repetition of the *sequence of events* that pertains to Adam's transgression in

the episode of Noah's drunkenness. In the midst of the ways these features work together, having just considered the *covenantal import* of Moses, note that Yahweh declares himself to be *establishing his covenant* with Noah (Gen 9:9, 11, 12, 17). The (1) re-used term "ark" works with (2) quotations of phrases or whole lines, Genesis 1:28 in 9:1, and (3) repeated sequences of events (on which see in Chapter 2) all of which join with (4) similarity in salvation-historical and covenantal import to establish *historical correspondence* between Noah and Moses. As these elements of historical correspondence are established and then repeated, we begin to suspect that they point beyond themselves to the future, which sets us up for the discussion of the second essential feature of typology.

§2.2.2 Escalation in Significance

Against the idea that "prophecy is prospective whereas typology is retrospective,"[37] I would suggest that the patterns are noticed and recorded by the biblical authors for two reasons: first, they saw something significant in the patterns (repetitions of earlier patterns or similarities between events); and second, the significance they saw suggested to them that they should expect more of this kind of thing in the future. The repetitions of exodus-style deliverances portend future exodus-style deliverances, even if the patterns do not provide specific predictive details. The differences between, for instance, the preview of the exodus in Abraham's life, the exodus itself, and the conquest of Canaan, show us that while an Old Testament author could use exodus typology to point to the way God would save in the future, he was not necessarily detailing exactly what would take place.

The big ideas here are the following:

1. that the biblical authors themselves noticed these patterns;[38]
2. that they intend to signal the presence of the patterns to their audiences through the historical correspondences they build into their presentations;[39]

---

37. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible*, 181.

38. Against Walther Eichrodt's assertion, "a type possesses its significance, pointing into the future, independently of any human medium and purely through its objective factual reality." "Is Typological Exegesis an Appropriate Method," in *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation*, ed. Claus Westermann, trans. James Barr (London: SCM, 1963), 229.

39. Against Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 2. While I grant that the OT authors did not know specific details (cf. Eph 3:5; 1 Pet 1:10–12), I maintain that they were looking for the Genesis 3:15

3. and thus the repetitions were intended to cause a gathering expectation to increase with each new installment in the pattern of events.[40]

To summarize: the key features of typology are historical correspondence and escalation, and historical correspondence is established by: (1) the re-use of key terms, (2) the quotation of phrases or lines, (3) the repetition of sequences of events, and (4) similarity in salvation-historical significance or covenantal import. These means for establishing historical correspondence provide us with *criteria* that can be used to determine when later biblical authors mean to signal typological relationships with material in earlier passages of Scripture. If we can establish that a later author *meant* to draw attention to a typological pattern, we have warrant for regarding the historical correspondences, as well as the escalations in significance and the resulting typological development, as *intended by the human author of the passage*. These standards represent my attempt to develop methodological rigor that can be applied in an attempt to remedy a deficiency many perceive in earlier writing on typology. For instance, S. Lewis Johnson wrote,

> the weaknesses of Fairbairn's work is largely the weakness of biblical studies done without the benefits of the knowledge derived from technical development in the study of the biblical languages, and without the benefits of knowledge derived from the biblical research of the last century or so.[41]

The fact that we arm ourselves with criteria, however, does not mean that every question is answered. As Dale Allison concludes after a similar discussion, "All uncertainty . . . is not thereby exorcised."[42] There is no substitute for long, slow, patient reading of the texts in their original languages, supplemented by meditative reflection upon them. Thus Allison writes,

---

seed of the woman, whom they expected to bring about a climactic new-exodus style salvation that would overcome sin and all its consequences, and further that their understanding of the patterns to which they intentionally drew attention were shaped by the promises of God (e.g., John 5:39; 12:41, etc.).

40. *Pace* Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible*, 183.

41. S. Lewis Johnson, "A Response to Patrick Fairbairn and Biblical Hermeneutics as Related to the Quotations of the Old Testament in the New," in *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible: Papers from ICBI Summit II*, ed. Earl D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 796. Referencing Patrick Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture* (1845; repr., Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1989).

42. Allison, *The New Moses*, 21.

> Only a delicate and mature judgment bred of familiarity with a tradition will be able to feel whether a suggested allusion or typology is solid or insubstantial: the truth must be divined, groped for by "taste, tact, and intuition rather than a controlling method."[43]

I would propose that the biblical authors instinctively understood that typological development functions as follows: when patterns of historical correspondences are repeated across narratives, expectations accumulate and cause escalation in the perceived significance of the repeated similarities and patterns. What they instinctively understood and communicated, we can validate by means of these criteria.

The Key Features of Typology

Historical Correspondence	Escalation in Significance
Established by 1. key terms 2. quotations 3. repetitions of sequences of events 4. similarity in salvation-historical or covenantal import	*When key terms, quotations of earlier material, and similarities in salvation-historical and covenantal import draw our attention to repeated installments in patterns of events, our sense of the importance of those patterns increases.*

The point being validated by these key features of typology is that the Old Testament authors *intended* to create the typological points of historical correspondence and escalation for which the New Testament authors claim fulfillment. That is to say, the interpretation of earlier Scripture by later biblical authors is *valid*. But I want to go one step further than saying that later biblical authors have correctly interpreted earlier Scripture and affirm that not only are their readings *valid* they are also *normative*. That is, through their interpretation of earlier Scripture, later biblical authors instruct their audiences regarding how to interpret the Bible.[44] The *normative* hermeneutic is the one that the biblical authors themselves have employed. If we are to read the Scriptures

---

43. Ibid. Citing M. H. Abrams, "Rationality and Imagination in Cultural History," in *Critical Understanding*: *The Powers and Limits of Pluralism*, by Wayne C. Booth (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 176.

44. Against Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), xxxiv–ix.

such that our readings are *valid*, our readings must align with the *normative* interpretations provided by the biblical authors themselves.

With these ideas on the table, I am ready to hazard a definition of *typology*.

§2.3 Defining the Term "Typology"

Gathering together the features of typology discussed to this point, we can offer a working definition of the term:

> Typology is God-ordained, author-intended historical correspondence and escalation in significance between people, events, and institutions across the Bible's redemptive-historical story (i.e., in covenantal context).[45]

The only part of this definition not discussed above is the phrase "God-ordained." By this I refer to the way that the sovereign God of the Bible has orchestrated history such that the parallels noticed and highlighted by the biblical authors *actually happened*. As Earle Ellis has written, "Typological exegesis assumes a divine sovereignty over history."[46] Typology is not mere literary contrivance, nor is it a result of the imaginative creativity of either the biblical authors or those who interpret them. God ordained that the parallels would actually happen, and he also providentially ensured that the biblical authors would notice them. The Holy Spirit superintended the process so that the biblical authors rightly interpreted both the history they observed and the earlier Scripture to which they had access.

Having offered this working definition of typology, we can do the same for the phrase "typological interpretation."

---

45. Contra David Crump, who writes, "Typology in biblical interpretation involves the understanding of some characters and stories in the Old Testament as allegories foreshadowing events in the New Testament." David Crump, *Encountering Jesus, Encountering Scripture: Reading the Bible Critically in Faith* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 26 n. 36. Typology and allegory are not to be equated. Mitchell Chase explains, "An allegory is a passage that says one thing in order to say something else." Mitchell L. Chase, *40 Questions About Typology and Allegory* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2020), 193. Chase gives the example of Isaiah 5, where the vineyard represents Israel, as an allegory. Peter J. Gentry and Stephen J. Wellum offer a similar definition of typology, distinguishing it from allegory, in *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants*, Second Ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018), 129–30.

46. Ellis, "Foreword," xv.

> Typological Interpretation establishes historical correspondence on the basis of linguistic points of contact (i.e., the re-use of significant terms), quotations, repeated sequences of events, and similarities in salvation historical significance and covenantal context. As these features are discerned in the text, interpreters detect author-intended parallels between people, events, and institutions, and they have textual warrant to perceive a growing significance in the repeated patterns. The Holy Spirit's inspiration ensured that the biblical authors infallibly interpreted earlier Scripture and inerrantly presented it. Later interpreters, who are neither inspired by the Holy Spirit nor writing Scripture, are neither infallible nor inerrant, but they should nevertheless seek to think and read and interpret in accordance with what the biblical authors intend to teach.

To clarify what I mean by this last statement (that we should seek to think and read and interpret in accordance with what the biblical authors intend to teach), as later biblical authors interpret earlier Scripture, they teach their audiences to do so. Those who embrace what the biblical authors teach will also seek to embrace the habits of mind, patterns of thought, and interpretive practices that the biblical authors model in their writings. The first sentence of the first chapter of Vernard Eller's book reads,

> It was, I think, Karl Barth who once said something to the effect that Christians have an obligation to become competent in 'the language of Canaan' (i.e., biblical ways of thinking and speaking) rather than simply demanding that everything be translated into *our* language (i.e., contemporary forms of thought).[47]

In my view this is the task of biblical theology—that of understanding and embracing the interpretive perspective of the biblical authors.[48] All this

---

47. Vernard Eller, *The Language of Canaan and the Grammar of Feminism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 1.

48. For a brief introduction, see James M. Hamilton Jr., *What Is Biblical Theology?* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014).

follows from the idea that the interpretive perspective of the biblical authors is both *valid* and *normative*.

§2.4 The Intent of the Divine Author

What about the intent of the divine author of Scripture? Believing that the Bible is inspired by the Holy Spirit (2 Tim 3:16), that its human authors "spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet 1:21, ESV), we can determine the intent of the divine author of Scripture by determining the intent of the human author of Scripture. In addition, we can see from later Spirit-inspired interpretation what the divine author meant to communicate in earlier Scripture. That is to say, where later biblical authors have interpreted earlier biblical texts, we can see what the divine author—whom I take to have been consistent with himself—meant to communicate in earlier texts. This principle goes in the other direction as well, as we should assume that what the divine author means to communicate through later biblical authors will be consistent with what he communicated through the earlier.[49]

§3 A PREVIEW OF WHAT FOLLOWS

As has been seen to this point in this chapter, typology deals in repetitions. The contents of this book have been adumbrated in this introductory chapter in the same way that an archetype and its ectypes[50] point forward to their anti-type. The biblical authors used literary structures to guide readers to see these repetitions, and as a result, understanding the literary structure of a passage is necessary for understanding what an author intended to communicate. In imitation of the method employed by the biblical authors, this book is struc-tured as a chiasm, and the chiasm helps me communicate the significance of what I am saying.

This Introduction has focused on what typology is and how we can verify whether an author intended to communicate it. We have looked at criteria for establishing author-intended typology at the micro-level: reuse of terms and phrases, quotation of earlier material, repetitions of event sequences, and

---

49. See the excellent reflections on this topic in Sequeira and Emadi, "Nature of Typology," 15–18.

50. Dictonary.com defines "ectype" as "a reproduction; copy (opposed to prototype)." I use the term to refer to an installment in a typological pattern between the archetype (or prototype), the initial instance, and the antitype, or final fulfillment to which the archetype and ectype(s) pointed.

similarities in significance. Another major authorial cue to typological pat-terning can be found at the macro-level, in the literary structure of the wider narrative, which I will discuss in the Conclusion, the final chapter of this book. The book thus opens and closes with discussions that seek to enable readers to validate and verify what the biblical authors meant to communicate. As with any chiasm found in the biblical writings, it is helpful to allow the correspond-ing units to interpret one another, as they were intended to do. Readers may be helped by reading the Introduction and then the Conclusion, as arguments throughout the book will deal with the kinds of literary structures discussed in the Conclusion.

The second and second-to-last chapters deal with the beginning and end of the Bible, where we see the weddings of the first and last Adam. The second chapter focuses on the way the biblical authors set us up to see Adam as the archetypal man, with his creation and marriage in Genesis 1–2 followed by the ectypal installments in the Adamic role across the pages of Scripture. The second to last chapter deals with the institution of marriage and the way it culminates in that of the last Adam with the wedding feast of the Lamb.

The chapters not only correspond to one another in chiastic structure, they also develop in linear fashion. Adam was a priestly, prophetic, royal figure, and chapters three, four, and five develop these typological realities. In the chiastic structure of this book, moreover, the chapter on Priests stands across from the chapter on the Levitical cult (a happy typo produced the form "Leviticult," which I have chosen to call into service). Naturally, the fulfillment of the priesthood and the cult are related concepts, but Christ brings to fulfillment both what the priests signified *as people* and what the cult served to achieve *as an institution*.

Similarly, chapter four deals with Prophets, and it was a prophet, Moses, who led Israel up from Egypt. Christ fulfills the role of Moses as he accom-plishes the (*event of the*) new exodus and leads his people to the new and better land of promise. Thus the chapter on Prophets stands across from the chapter on the Exodus.

Chapter five on kings goes with chapter seven on Creation. God gave Adam dominion over the world that he made, and Christ will reign as king in the new creation.[51]

---

51. Christopher A. Beetham writes, "the theme of creation is inextricably interwoven with that of divine kingship and human vicegerency and . . . the divine program to renew creation is nothing less than

At the center of the chiastic structure of this book stands the Savior, the righteous sufferer, whose rejection and humiliation gave way to triumphant resurrection and enthronement, fulfilling typological patterns seen in the lives of (among others) Joseph, Moses, and David. God established his glory in the salvation through judgment accomplished through the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus, in fulfillment of the Scriptures. That fact is not only the center of biblical theology, it is the central moment in human history, and the Lamb standing as though slain will be the centerpiece of praise for the redeemed in the age to come.

The chiastic structure of this book can be depicted as follows:[52]

1. Introduction to Promise-Shaped Patterns: Micro-Level Indicators for Determining Authorial Intent
    2. Adam
        3. Priests
            4. Prophets
                5. Kings
                    6. The Righteous Sufferer
                7. Creation
            8. Exodus
        9. Leviticult
    10. Marriage
11. Conclusion to Promise-Shaped Patterns: Macro-Level Indicators for Determining Authorial Intent

Biblical theology is the attempt to understand and embrace the interpretive perspective of the biblical authors, and the attempt to understand *what* they communicate is facilitated by, and dependent upon, understanding *how* they communicate. Like many others, I have found the biblical authors to make

---

the reassertion of rightful divine rule through restored human vicegerency over the usurped kingdom of the world." "From Creation to New Creation: The Biblical Epic of King, Human Vicegerency, and Kingdom," in *From Creation to New Creation: Essays in Honor of G. K. Beale*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and Benjamin L. Gladd (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2013), 235.

52. At the risk of belaboring the obvious, readers are encouraged to notice the matching character of the first and last chapters, and then that the only other chapter title that is not a single word is the central one. Similarly, the chapters of this book are headed by epitaphs, and the only epitaph from Scripture is reserved for that central chapter.

pervasive use of chiastic structures,[53] and here I seek to imitate their approach to communication. I will have more to say on how chiasms work and what they accomplish in the final chapter.

This book also falls into three parts that correspond to the ways typology is often described as dealing with people, events, and institutions who prefigure what God will do when he saves his people:

Introduction: Chapter 1
Part 1: People, Chapters 2–6
Part 2: Events, Chapters 7–8
Part 3: Institutions, Chapters 9–10
Conclusion: Chapter 11

When we look at People in Part 1 (Chapters 2–6), we will see several ways, some of them overlapping, in which key figures typify those who will come later. We will begin in Chapter 2 by considering the first man, the archetype, Adam, "who was a type of the one to come" (Rom 5:14, ESV), and we will trace the story through a number of ectypes, repetitions of the pattern, to culminate in the last Adam, Christ (1 Cor 15:45). The discussion of Priests, Prophets, and Kings in Chapters 3–5 will also begin with Adam, as he is the first to fill those roles. We will then move to the Righteous Sufferer in Chapter 6.

In Part 2 (Chapters 7–8), we turn our attention to events, beginning with creation in Chapter 7, before turning to the exodus in Chapter 8. This whole sequence will find fulfillment in the new exodus, the new wilderness sojourn, the new conquest of the land, in which is the new Jerusalem, which is the new holy of holies in the new cosmic temple of the new heaven and new earth.

Part 3 (Chapters 9–10) examines the Leviticult (Chapter 9) and Marriage (Chapter 10). Here again we will have fulfillment in the Melchizedekian high

---

53. Cf. John W. Welch and Daniel B. McKinlay, eds., *Chiasmus Bibliography* (Provo: Research Press, 1999). L. Michael Morales proposes a chiastic structure for the whole of the Pentateuch in L. Michael Morales, *Who Shall Ascend the Mountain of the Lord? A Biblical Theology of the Book of Leviticus*, New Studies in Biblical Theology 37 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2015), 23–38. For chiastic structures that I see in Revelation, Daniel, John, and Psalms, see James M. Hamilton Jr., *Revelation: The Spirit Speaks to the Churches*, Preaching the Word (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012), 165; Hamilton, *With the Clouds of Heaven*, 83; James M. Hamilton Jr., "John," in *ESV Expository Commentary: John–Acts*, ed. Ian M. Duguid, James M. Hamilton Jr., and Jay Sklar (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2019), 28–29; and see the section on Literary Structure in the Psalms and the Context discussion of each psalm in James M. Hamilton Jr., *Psalms*, 2 vols., Evangelical Biblical Theology Commentary (Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2021).

priesthood of Christ, whose death on the cross fulfills the sacrificial system and inaugurates the new marital covenant that will be celebrated at the wedding feast of the Lamb.

The book's Conclusion, Chapter 11, considers what chiasms are and do, and the way they function in Genesis. Literary structure facilitates typological patterning, and when authors build these into their work, they operate on readers even when not consciously recognized. People have a sense of development, climacteric, and closure, as well as an awareness of building expectation, even if they cannot put their finger on why.

PART 1
PERSONS

On what basis does Paul assert that Adam was "a type of the one to come" (Rom 5:14)? Applying the key hermeneutical question to this issue: did Moses intend for his audience to think of Adam as typifying one who would come after? If so, how does Moses establish that reality? A related set of questions has to do with how Moses presents Adam, and whether he develops his presentation of Adam in relationship to the nation of Israel. Is there anything more than a genealogical relationship between Adam and the nation of Israel? If so, how is that developed? We can ask similar questions about the relationship between Adam and David. Is there more to the presentation of the relationship between Adam and David than the line of descent traced through the genealogies? Do the biblical authors mean to indicate that if the future king promised to David will be a son to God, he will be a new Adam?

The next five chapters of this book (Chs. 2–6) deal with "Persons," and the first four (Chs. 2–5) are closely related. Chapter 2 seeks to tease out the way that Moses intended his audience to understand Adam, and then Chapters 3–5 consider Priests, Prophets, and Kings. Because of the way Adam is granted dominion (Gen 1:26, 28), he is a royal figure, so kingship could easily be discussed in Chapter 2. The amount of material to be covered, however, results in discrete treatment of these topics, which in turn affords the structural possibilities pursued here (see §3 of Chapter 1). Priests, prophets, and kings will be

discussed in different chapters, but they are related to one another, not least for the fact that Adam embodied these offices in his prototypical person.

We now apply the discussion in Chapter 1 to Moses's presentation of Adam and the way that develops across the Torah into the Prophets and Writings to find fulfillment in the New Adam of the New Testament.

ADAM

> The NT's understanding and exposition of the OT lies at the
> heart of its theology, and it is primarily expressed within the
> framework of a typological interpretation.
>
> —E. EARLE ELLIS[1]

Did Moses intend to present Adam as a type, and if so, how does he establish and develop that reality? I will argue in this chapter that Moses presents Adam not only as a type of the one to come but of key figures who come after him, and that he does this by means of quoted lines, repeated phrases, repetitions in sequences of events, and key covenantal and salvation-historical similarities.[2]

Having shown how Moses ties later characters in his writings back to Adam, we will move to consider the ways that later biblical authors discerned Moses's intentions: they correctly interpreted him and developed his ideas in accordance with his expectations. I do not mean to suggest that Moses knew precisely *how* the expectations would be fulfilled, but expect fulfillment he did.

This chapter begins by looking at Noah as a new-Adam and ends with Christ as the new-Adam who succeeded where archetypal Adam and all his ectypes failed. The second and fourth sections of the chapter deal with the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob on the one hand and David on the other. The central third section of the chapter deals with the nation of Israel as a new-Adam. The chapter's paneled structure can be depicted as follows:

---

1. Ellis, "Foreword," xx.
2. For a discussion of "Adam and Christ in St Irenaeus," see Jean Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, trans. Wulstan Hibberd (London: Burns and Oates, 1960), 30–47.

§1 New-Adam Noah
 §2 New-Adams Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob
  §3 New-Adam Israel
 §4 New-Adam David
§5 New-Adam Christ

This chapter begins by exploring the ways that Moses ties first the patriarchs then the nation back to Adam. From there we turn to the way that the narrative of Samuel links David with Israel, Abraham, and Adam, an understanding also reflected in Psalm 8. We will then consider expectations for the "one like a son of man" in Daniel 7, who comes as a new Adam, king from the line of David, to exercise dominion over the beasts in an everlasting kingdom.[3] The chapter concludes with the way that both Luke and Paul compare and contrast Jesus and Adam.

To be clear: I am claiming that by tying later figures in the Pentateuch back to Adam, Moses intends to teach his audience that Adam is the prototypical man, with successive figures presented as ectypal installments in the Adamic pattern, in expectation of the antitypical fulfillment when *the* seed of the woman arises to conquer and redeem where Adam was defeated and subjected. From their presentation of David and the expected one like a son of man, later Old Testament authors can be seen to have learned this perspective from Moses, which we in turn find in the New Testament writings of Luke and Paul.

§1 NEW-ADAM NOAH

I sought to show in Chapter 1 that God's promises prompted the biblical authors to notice patterns. The Genesis 3:15 promise that there would be enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent shaped the interpreted presentation of Cain as seed of the serpent after his killing of Abel. Moses has interpreted the material, and his interpretation was guided by what God said. In this instance, according to Genesis 3:14 and 4:11, God spoke

---

3. The fact that God granted Adam dominion, effectively making him king of creation, reveals that both kingship and land are equally significant in God's program. Bell is therefore mistaken to assert, "The promise of land was, for example, more fundamental than say that of Israel having a king." Bell, *The Irrevocable Call of God*, 377 n. 3.

the words that identified Cain with the serpent. For Moses to identify them with one another, then, was for him to take his interpretive cues from the Lord—as the word of God came to Moses, God's own word taught Moses the perspective reflected in what he wrote. In his presentation of Noah, Moses gives his readers a new Adam in a new creation with a new covenant, who then experiences a new fall into sin.

The promise of the seed of the woman in Genesis 3:15 also provides the rationale for both the genealogy in Genesis 5 and the words of hope at Noah's birth in 5:29. That first promise prompts the genealogy because the genealogy reflects attention to the line of descent of the seed of the woman. It provides the rationale for Genesis 5:29 because the hopes of Noah's father Lamech are based on God's promise in Genesis 3:15. Note the similarity in wording from Genesis 3:17 to Genesis 5:29:

Gen 3:17, אֲרוּרָה הָאֲדָמָה בַּעֲבוּרֶךָ בְּעִצָּבוֹן תֹּאכֲלֶנָּה
"cursed is the ground because of you; in painful toil you will eat of it"

Gen 5:29, וּמֵעִצְּבוֹן יָדֵינוּ מִן־הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר אֵרְרָהּ יְהוָה
"'. . . and the painful toil of our hands from the ground which Yahweh cursed.'"[4]

When Moses recounts Lamech's words at Noah's birth, he depicts hope informed by God's word: Lamech desires a relief he has discerned in the words God spoke. Not only that, but the difficulties he hopes to see overcome were introduced by God's word of judgment. The word of God has shaped the world.

The ten-member genealogy in Genesis 5 traces the line of descent from Adam to Noah. Why trace such a line of descent so carefully? My own family history does not extend beyond living memory. Not having done genealogical research, my knowledge of my ancestry does not extend beyond the name of my father's father's father. Why then was this line of descent so assiduously preserved and passed down to Moses, who saw fit to include it in the first of his five books? The answer, it would seem, is that the promise regarding the seed of the woman prompted attention to the line of descent. If Genesis 5:29 shows that God's promise has shaped the *hopes and beliefs* of his people,

---

4. Note that עצבון "painful toil" also occurs in Gen 3:16, and ארור "cursed" in 3:14.

the genealogy shows that it also shaped the *action* they took in keeping record of the line of descent.

But is there more to it than the genealogical line of descent? Is there evidence that Moses intended to present Noah as a new Adam, as an ectype of the archetype?

Consider the similar description of the creation in which readers encounter both Adam and Noah. In Genesis 1:2 the Spirit of God (רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים) was hovering over the face of the waters, and then in 1:9 the waters are gathered together so that the dry land can appear. When God brings the flood, the waters are let loose to re-cover the dry land in 7:10–12. And then as in 1:2, God (אֱלֹהִים) made a wind (רוּחַ) pass over (עָבַר) the land in 8:1, and the waters abated. When the waters subside after the flood, just as the dry land had appeared in 1:9, so it does again in 8:5. By forging these connections between the setting in which his readers encounter the two men, Moses indicates that Noah should be understood as a new Adam. Beetham writes, "Just as the destruction by flood is depicted as de-creation, so the postdiluvian renewal is depicted as re-creation, as new creation."[5]

Even more significant than the placement of Adam and Noah in similar settings where similar things happen, Moses presents God *saying the same thing* to Noah that he had earlier said to Adam. Genesis 9:1 presents a restatement of Genesis 1:28, providing us with another feature of author-intended historical correspondence—the quotation of earlier material:

> Gen 1:28, וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ
> "And God blessed them, and God said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth.'"

> Gen 9:1, וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־נֹחַ וְאֶת־בָּנָיו וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ
> "And God blessed Noah and his sons and said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth.'" (ESV)

The "be fruitful and multiply" language will be significant across Genesis, and Moses presents the Lord speaking to Noah in these terms again in 9:7. Along with the quotation of earlier material pertaining to Adam (1:28 in 9:1),

---

5. Beetham, "From Creation to New Creation," 242.

Genesis 6:18 (מֵקִים אֶת־בְּרִיתִי) and 9:9 (וַהֲקִמֹתִי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי) arguably present Yahweh *establishing* with Noah the covenant he implicitly *cut* (כָּרַת) with Adam. On the basis of his exhaustive analysis of the term "covenant" in the Old Testament (בְּרִית), my colleague Peter Gentry maintains that the normal pattern is for a covenant to be "cut" (כָּרַת) when it is made, and then when that existing covenant is referred back to its terms are upheld or "established" (הֵקִים).[6] If this is correct, then when God says he will *establish* his covenant with Noah, the statement implies a covenant that has already been *cut*—presumably with Adam. If God establishes the Adamic covenant with Noah, then Noah stands in the same *covenantal relationship* with Yahweh that Adam had previously enjoyed. Even if this understanding of the relationship between the *cutting* and *establishing* of the same covenant is rejected, however, in narrative terms the focus moves from Adam standing as the main human agent to Noah doing so. The Bible's storyline moves forward from Adam to Noah.

Genesis has moved from Adam as a main character in the narrative, from his creation until his death is recorded in Genesis 5, to Noah taking center stage in Genesis 6–9. From a salvation-historical perspective, what God charged Adam to do in Genesis 1:28, he charges Noah to do in 9:1. With 1:28 quoted in 9:1, God's blessing of Adam in 1:28 has been communicated to Noah in 9:1. Adam and Noah's situations are not exactly the same (Adam in the garden prior to sin; Noah in the post-sin, post-flood world), but whether we call the relationship between God and Adam a covenant or not, God established a relationship with both Adam and Noah, blessed them both, and charged both to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth. The hope for the seed of the woman who would defeat the serpent and his seed begins with a child whom Adam fathered (Seth) and continues through one Noah fathered (Shem). Along with the quotation of earlier material, then, we have the similar salvation-historical and covenantal significance of Adam and Noah.

We also see significant terms re-used from the description of Adam in the description of Noah. Several Hebrew terms for "man/male" are used to describe Adam in Genesis 1–2. He is referred to as "man/adam" (אָדָם) in 1:26, "male" (זָכָר) in 1:27, and as "man" (אִישׁ) in 2:23. In Genesis 2:7 Yahweh forms the "adam" (אָדָם) from the dust of the ground (אֲדָמָה). The connection

---

6. Gentry and Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant*, 187–95. See the full annotated lexical analysis of *berit* (בְּרִית) in pages 841–904. I find Gentry compelling on this point, but my argument about Moses presenting Noah as an ectype in the Adamic pattern does not stand or fall with it.

between the "ground" (אֲדָמָה) and the "man" (אָדָם) might be reflected in English if we rendered "ground" with a form that included "man," perhaps something like "manland," or if instead of "man" we called him a "groundling" or some other expression that included "ground" or "earth" (earthling? grounder?). The point is that in Genesis 2 the man seems to be named by what he is made from, just as the woman will be (אִשָּׁה, "woman," made from the rib of the אִישׁ, "man" in 2:23). Not only does the man come from the ground, he is made to work the ground. Genesis 2:5 speaks of the time "when there was no man [אָדָם] to work the ground [אֲדָמָה]" (ESV). These realities make it so that Adam is again called to mind when we read in 9:20 that "Noah began to be a man of the ground [אִישׁ הָאֲדָמָה]," and that brings us to a parallel sequence of events between Adam and Noah.

Yahweh God planted (וַיִּטַּע) a garden in Eden in the east in 2:8, and in 9:20 Noah planted (וַיִּטַּע) a vineyard. Adam ate forbidden fruit (Gen 3:6), at which point his nakedness was exposed (3:7), and words of judgment followed (3:14–19). Just as Adam ate of the fruit of the forbidden tree in the garden, Noah drank himself drunk by the wine of his vineyard (9:21a). As Adam's nakedness was exposed, Noah lay uncovered, naked, in his tent (9:21b). As God cursed the serpent after Adam's sin, so Noah cursed Canaan (9:25), descendant of Ham, identifying both the Egyptians (Ham) and the Canaanites as seed of the serpent (3:15; cf. 10:6).

By means of the reuse of key terms, the quotation of whole lines, the repeated event-sequences, and the similar role in the covenantal outworking of redemptive-history, Moses presents Noah after the pattern of Adam. Adam is the archetypal man, and Noah is an ectypal installment in the Adamic pattern.[7]

§2 NEW-ADAMS ABRAHAM, ISAAC, AND JACOB

The covenantal and salvation-historical relationship established between Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob show them to be ectypal installments in the Adamic typological pattern. The genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11 trace a direct line of descent from Adam to Abraham, and just as God had blessed Adam in Genesis 1:28, he blesses Abraham in Genesis 12:1–3. The narrative reiterates

---

7. So also Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26*, New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 351.

the blessing of Abraham throughout the account of his life (Gen 12:7; 13:15–18; 14:19–20; 15:5, 18–20; 17:4–8; 18:18–19; 22:16–18; 24:1, 7, 35), and then the Lord passes the blessing of Abraham directly to Isaac (26:2–4, 24). Isaac in turn pronounces the blessing of Abraham over Jacob (28:3–4), before the Lord himself does the same (28:13–15).

§2.1 The Covenantal Significance of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob

The blessing of Abraham not only extends and elaborates upon God's blessing on Adam (Gen 1:28) and Noah (9:1), it also answers the judgment spoken after sin in 3:14–19 point for point. There are three categories of difficulties introduced in Genesis 3:14–19: first, the enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent; second, the reproductive pain and conflict between male and female; and third, the curse on the ground. God's promise to Abraham directly addresses these difficulties: first, the enmity between the cursed seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman (3:14–15) will be overcome as God curses all who dishonor Abraham and blesses all who bless him—thus all the families of the earth will be blessed in Abraham and in his seed (12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14). Second, though Sarah's barrenness (11:30) is an outworking of the pain in childbearing (3:16a), and though her plan to have seed by Hagar (16:2) is an example of her seeking to take the initiative in the relationship (3:16b), God promises to make a great nation of Abraham (12:2), a promise of seed fulfilled with the birth of Isaac (21:1–3). And third, even in the midst of famines that result from the 3:17–19 curse on the ground (e.g., 12:10), God's promise of the land to Abraham indicates that the curse on the land will be overcome through the gift of the land (implicit in 12:1–2, explicit in 12:7), pointing as it does to God's promise to bless his people in his place. Dempster is on the mark: "God's programme with and through Abram is to restore the original conditions of creation described in Genesis 1–2 (Gen. 14:19–20)."[8]

Within the book of Genesis, Joseph represents an initial fulfillment of these promises when all the earth comes to him to buy grain (41:57), being blessed by his wise and discerning management (41:33, 39). Joseph also typifies the seed of Abraham who will overcome the enmity with the seed of the serpent: though he is thought to be dead (37:33–35), he lives and reigns over gentiles (45:8) and overcomes enmity by forgiving those who sought his life (45:3–15; 50:15–21).

---

8. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 79.

In covenantal and salvation-historical terms, what God set out to achieve with Adam and carried forward with Noah is continued through Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. In addition to the significance of the roles these key figures play, we have abundant re-use of key terms, quotations of whole phrases and lines, and significant repetitions of sequences of events.

§2.2 Key Terms and Quotations
§2.2.1 And I Will Establish My Covenant

God blessed Adam (1:28) and then established his covenant with Noah (6:18; 9:9). Similarly, God blesses Abraham (12:1–3) and then cuts a covenant with him (15:7–20, esp. 15:18, כָּרַת יְהוָה אֶת־אַבְרָם בְּרִית, "Yahweh cut a covenant with Abram"). The very words spoken to Noah in 6:18 and 9:11 ("and I will establish my covenant") are spoken to Abraham in 17:7 and regarding Isaac in 17:19.

Gen 6:18, וַהֲקִמֹתִי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי

Gen 9:11, וַהֲקִמֹתִי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי

Gen 17:7, וַהֲקִמֹתִי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי

Gen 17:19, וַהֲקִמֹתִי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי

"and I will establish my covenant"

This is not to suggest that the covenants God makes with Abraham and Noah are coterminous, but through both these covenants God preserves life, continues the purposes he set out to achieve when he placed Adam in the garden, and mercifully blesses his people in a way that delivers them from his own just wrath.

Not only does Moses connect these figures by showing God *blessing* and *entering into covenant* with Adam, Noah, and Abraham, he also uses and reuses the language first seen in Genesis 1:28 when God commanded the first man and woman to "be fruitful and multiply." Like Adam, Noah was blessed and told to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth (9:1, 7). In all these instances (1:28; 9:1, 7) as well as in 1:22, the phrase is פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ (cf. also 8:17).

Excursus: Is Ishmael an Installment in a Typological Pattern?

As we consider the "be fruitful and multiply" language, we have reuse of significant language that does not alone, in itself, establish a typological relationship with Adam and the line of promise. The angel of the Lord tells Hagar, "multiplying I will multiply your seed, so that they cannot be counted for multitude [הַרְבָּה אַרְבֶּה אֶת־זַרְעֵךְ]" (16:10), and God even says to Abraham, "And as for Ishmael, I have heard you. Behold, I have blessed him, and I will make him fruitful and multiply him exceedingly . . ." (17:20). Yahweh, however, does not enter into a covenantal relationship with Ishmael. In fact, in the verses that precede and follow the 17:20 statement of the *blessing* and the *making fruitful and multiplying* of Ishmael, the Lord asserts that he will establish his covenant with Isaac not Ishmael (17:19, 21). Along with other features of the narrative, these realities indicate that Ishmael *is* an installment in a typological pattern but *not the one* that traces the seed of promise.

In the case of Ishmael, we have repeated language and phrases, but we do not have either covenantal/salvation-historical significance or repeated sequences of events with Adam and the seed of the woman. It seems that Ishmael was blessed and multiplied simply because he physically descended from Abraham. God blessed Ishmael because of his connection to Abraham, but God entered into covenant with Isaac not Ishmael (Gen 17:20–21). Ishmael does not participate in the typological patterns seen in the development from Adam through Noah to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

There are, however, other patterns in which the story of Ishmael does make installments: the passing over of the firstborn son; the problems stemming from polygamy; and the enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. Adam's firstborn Cain was passed over: God was pleased with Abel's offering (Gen 4:4–5), and then Seth called on the name of Yahweh (4:26). Abraham's firstborn Ishmael was passed over in favor of the child of promise born to Sarah, Isaac (17:15–21). Isaac's firstborn Esau was passed over in favor of Jacob, as Rebekah was told that the older would serve the younger (25:23). This happens again as Jacob's firstborn Reuben does not receive the blessing because the much younger Joseph is the favorite of his father (37:3), and the last instance of this in Genesis comes when Jacob crosses his hands to place his right hand on the head of the younger Ephraim rather than the firstborn son of Joseph, Manasseh (48:13–20). Again and again in Genesis the older son is passed over, and the younger receives the blessing. That Moses

includes this pattern in his narrative reveals that he understands Yahweh to be one who chooses not according to worldly and cultural expectations but according to his own secret counsels.

In contrast to those whom Yahweh chooses in his unexpected way, Moses presents a series of proud, strong characters who are boastful and impressive by worldly standards. The Lamech of Cain's line brags of his murders and promises extreme vengeance (Gen 4:23–24). Nimrod seed of Ham was a mighty hunter (10:8–11). And similarly, Ishmael will "be a wild donkey of a man, his hand against everyone and everyone's hand against him" (16:12, ESV). Later we read, "He lived in the wilderness and became an expert with the bow" (21:20, ESV), which is not unlike Esau: "a skillful hunter, a man of the field" (25:27, ESV). When Isaac commissions Esau to prepare the feast at which he means to bless him, the blessing Jacob steals, Isaac sends Esau out with Ishmael's weapon, the bow (27:3). Hagar acquired for Ishmael a wife from Egypt (21:21), and Esau first marries daughters of Heth, Hittites (26:34), then a daughter of Ishmael (28:9). These women all descend from Ham, whose son Canaan Noah cursed (9:25; 10:6–15).[9]

The story of Ishmael also makes a contribution to a pattern of events showing that problems stem from polygamy. Sarai thinks it will be a good idea for Abram to go into Hagar, but she failed to anticipate how Hagar would respond when she conceived (Gen 16:1–6). Jacob marries both Leah and Rachel and gets no shortage of domestic strife (see Gen 29–35). Later, in a story remarkably similar to that of Abram, Sarai, and Hagar, a man named Elkanah is married to Hannah and Peninnah.[10] Like Sarai, Hannah had no children (1 Sam 1:2). Like Sarai, however, God grants her a son (1:19–20). Surprisingly, Hannah gives her son a name that carries the same meaning as Ishmael's, "God hears." The names Samuel (שְׁמוּאֵל) and Ishmael (יִשְׁמָעֵאל) are both built from the words "hear" (שָׁמַע) and "God" (אֵל). The author of Samuel accomplishes several things by telling his story the way he does: he reinforces the idea that polygamy produces problems; he links the conception of formerly-barren Hannah to that of formerly-barren Sarah (meanwhile fertile Hagar is identified with fertile Peninnah); and

---

9. Moberly's failure to understand what Moses intended to communicate is reflected in his comment, "It is a pity that in the history of interpretation, Esau has generally received a bad press." R. W. L. Moberly, *The Theology of the Book of Genesis*, Old Testament Theology (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 98 n. 13. Esau has received bad press because he has generally been recognized as seed of the serpent, because though he sought blessing he found no place for repentance (Heb 12:17).

10. We will return to the births of Samuel and Ishmael in §4.2 of Chapter 4 below.

thereby he links the miraculous births of Samuel and Isaac. These instances become installments in a pattern of barren women giving birth (Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, Samson's mother, Hannah, the Shunammite, Elizabeth).

What we learn from Ishmael shows that understanding the Bible's typology is not like understanding a basic mathematical formula. If the application of these criteria were a simple numerical equation,[11] on the basis of Genesis 16:10 and 17:20 we might expect Ishmael to be one of the good guys. Like Adam, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the Lord promises to multiply Ishmael's offspring (Gen 16:10), blessing him and making him fruitful and multiplying him (17:20). The Lord even makes him father of twelve tribe-like princes (17:20; 25:12–17; cf. Nahor's twelve descendants in 22:20–24 and Jacob's twelve sons), and we later read of Ishmael, "God was with the boy" (21:20, ESV). Biblical interpretation, however, is more than merely following rules and applying criteria. We are dealing with literature, and we have to *read* it—preferably in its original language, in big chunks, repeatedly, sympathetically—as we seek to understand the intentions of its authors.

Ishmael's part of the story connects him with the seed of the serpent as he opposes the seed of the woman: Cain kills Abel; Ishmael mocks Isaac; Esau seeks to kill Jacob; and Joseph's brothers sell him into slavery. There is enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent (Gen 3:15), and Ishmael, the "wild donkey of a man," lives out that enmity with "his hand against everyone" and as he dwells "over against all his kinsmen" (16:12; 25:18).

To return to evidence that Moses means to make installments in the Adamic-seed-of-the-woman typological pattern, we continue to consider the use of the language first seen in Genesis 1:28 when, having blessed the man and woman, God commanded them to "be fruitful and multiply."

§2.2.2 Be Fruitful and Multiply

The Lord promised to make Abraham's offspring as innumerable as the dust of the earth (Gen 13:16) and the stars of the sky (15:5) before telling him that he would give him his covenant and multiply (רְבָה) him "to exceeding excess (בִּמְאֹד מְאֹד)" (17:2). Just a few verses later the Lord promised to make Abraham "fruitful (פָּרָה) . . . to exceeding excess (בִּמְאֹד מְאֹד)" (17:6). The Lord next tells Abraham, "blessing I will bless you, and multiplying I will multiply

---

11. I am thankful for my brother-in-law, mathematics professor Clint Armani, who brought mathematical paradoxes to my attention.

your seed" (22:17). Every time he re-uses the *be fruitful and multiply* language Moses reminds his audience of what God set out to achieve when he blessed the first man and woman and commanded them to do just that (1:28).

As those made in God's image and likeness, the first man and woman were the visible representatives of the invisible God in the cosmic temple the Lord made.[12] When God commanded them to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth, he indicated that he wanted the world to be filled with those who represent him, those responsible to bring his character, his authority, his presence, and his reign to bear on all creation. In short, God wanted the man and woman to be fruitful and multiply because he wanted the world filled with his glory. This aspect of God's creation-purpose is reinforced when we encounter references to God's people *multiplying* and *being fruitful*.

When Abraham's servant found Rebekah and she agreed to become Isaac's wife, Moses recounts how as Rebekah's family said goodbye to her, "they blessed Rebekah and said to her, 'Our sister, may you be thousands of multitudes [רְבָבָה], and may your seed possess the gate of those who hate him'" (Gen 24:60). The Lord then tells Isaac, ". . . I will bless you . . . and I will establish the oath that I swore to Abraham your father; and I will multiply [רָבָה] your seed as the stars of the heavens . . . and they shall be blessed in your seed—all the nations of the earth" (26:3–4). Upon his arrival in Rehoboth, Isaac states his confidence that he and his people will "be fruitful (פָּרָה)" in the land (26:22), and just a few lines later Yahweh appears to him and assures him that he will "bless" him and "multiply (רָבָה)" his "seed" (26:24).

As he blesses Jacob Isaac says, "El Shaddai bless you and make you fruitful and multiply you . . ." (Gen 28:3). Later God appeared to Jacob and said to him, "I am El Shaddai, be fruitful and multiply . . ." (35:11; cf. 48:4). When Joseph's second son is born in Egypt, he gives him a name etymologically related to the idea of "fruitfulness," Ephraim (אֶפְרַיִם), with the explanation, "God has made me fruitful (פָּרָה)" (41:52, ESV; cf. 49:22).

To this point we have looked at the covenantal significance of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and we have seen how the "be fruitful and multiply" language also connects them to Adam. The covenantal significance and the re-use of key phrases and quotations of earlier material, moreover, were intended by Moses

---

12. See further Chapters 3 and 7 on priests and creation below, and cf. John H. Walton, "Creation," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and David W. Baker (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 164–65.

to draw the attention of his audience to repeated installments in patterns of events. As Beetham puts it,

> The intentional use of the language of the original Gn 1 vicegerency mandate and its application to the patriarchal family further demonstrates that God's original creation intentions have been concentrated in and are being accomplished through the seed of Abraham.[13]

§2.3 Event Sequences
§2.3.1 A Promise of Life Overturning Expected Death

The God who consistently chooses the younger son over the firstborn is also the God who chooses to respond to death with a promise of seed—offspring. God had warned Adam in Genesis 2:17 that he would surely die in the day he ate forbidden fruit. The man and woman ate, and they fled from God expecting death. As God cursed the serpent, he declared that the man and woman would have seed, a child, who would bruise the head of the serpent (Gen 3:15). God threw the promise of seed right into death's face.

Abraham's case is similar: once the narrative has worked down to him through the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11, we read that his wife is barren (11:30). A barren wife is like the death of the family line. As Jon Levenson notes, "infertility and the loss of children serve as the functional equivalent of death."[14] Into that death, however, God spoke life, promising to make Abraham into a great nation (12:2), to multiply his seed (e.g., 13:16), and specifying that the child would come through barren Sarah (17:16). In both cases the expectation of death (3:8; 18:11) is overturned when God promises seed (3:15; 17:21; 18:10, 14).

The overturning of expected death through birth by a previously barren woman happens not only in Sarah's case (21:1–7) but also with Isaac's wife Rebekah (25:21) and Jacob's wife Rachel (29:31). The expectation of death being overturned by God giving life ties the Genesis 3:15 promised seed of the woman to the births by barren women in the line of descent, linking the pattern of events to the covenantal significance, the quotations, and the re-use of key terms. We considered above the "be fruitful and multiply" language across Genesis, which is obviously connected to the event sequence under consideration here.

---

13. Beetham, "From Creation to New Creation," 246.
14. Jon D. Levenson, *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel: The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 119.

These three interlinked features of the narrative (the command/promise that God would make fruitful and multiply, barren women giving birth, and the overthrow of expected death) show that in all these cases God brought new birth and new life where no one had a right to expect anything but death.

§2.3.2 A Deep Sleep in a Covenantal Context

In some cases the key term draws our attention to the event sequence, as happens when we notice that Moses uses the term rendered "deep sleep" (תַּרְדֵּמָה) only twice in all his writings, at Genesis 2:21 and 15:12. God caused a "deep sleep" to fall upon Adam when he took the rib from his side, made the woman, and brought her to the man for the two of them to enter into a covenantal union. When we encounter this rare[15] term for "deep sleep" again in Genesis 15:12, once again we have a covenantal context, as the Lord has caused a "deep sleep" to fall upon Abraham before prophesying to him of the exodus and conquest (15:13–16) and cutting the covenant by causing the smoking fire pot and flaming torch to pass between the pieces of the halved animals (15:17–18).[16]

While the Genesis 2 marital covenant between the man and woman is obviously distinct from the Genesis 15 covenant, the use of the rare term for "deep sleep" (תַּרְדֵּמָה) naturally forges an association between Genesis 2 and Genesis 15. Encountering this rare word in Genesis 15 causes readers to think back to the only other place they have seen it, in Genesis 2. The use of this term in only these places in the whole Pentateuch prompts readers to associate the covenants with which the Lord blessed Adam and Abraham. For both men, the Lord caused a "deep sleep" to fall upon them, as a result of which they were passive participants while the Lord prepared covenantal blessings for them. The same term is not used to describe Jacob's sleep in Genesis 28:11–12, but Sailhamer notes that in the cases of Adam, Abraham, and Jacob, "the recipient of God's provision sleeps while God acts. . . . the man's sleep in the face of the divine activity appears to be intended to portray a sense of passivity and acceptance of the divine provision (cf. Ps 127:2)."[17] The linkage of Genesis 2 and 15 also connects marriage, the covenant, the exodus, and the overturning of

---

15. The term is used only in these two places in all of Genesis, nowhere else in the Pentateuch, and only five more times in the rest of the Old Testament at 1 Sam 26:12; Isa 29:10; Job 4:13; 33:15; and Prov 19:15.

16. The exegetical connection I am highlighting here between Genesis 2:21 and 15:12 may explain the interest in Adam's sleep in patristic commentary, on which see Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality*, 48–56.

17. John H. Sailhamer, "Genesis," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990), 46.

death by the seed, related concepts each pregnant with meaning as the gospel gestates in the pages of Scripture.

§2.3.3 A Failure to Protect

Adam cannot accomplish what God has charged him to do—be fruitful and multiply (Gen 1:28)—apart from his wife.[18] Adam has further been charged to "guard" the garden, "guard" being another connotation of "keep" in the phrase "work and keep" (2:15). In a sense, then, Adam must protect the woman in order to do what God has charged him to do. Snakes are not designated as unclean until the book of Leviticus (Lev 11:42–44), but Moses probably intends that information to influence his audience's consideration of the presence of the snake in the garden in Genesis 3:1.[19]

Rather than confront the snake, though he was present the whole time the snake tempted the woman (Gen 3:6b), Adam stood idly by and allowed the snake to question God (3:1), contradict God (3:4), and call into question the character of God (3:5). The man whose responsibility it was to "keep" the garden should long ago have interrupted the father of lies, politely asked him to leave, and, if the snake refused to depart, informed him that he could only continue to poison the mind of the woman over his own dead body. That is to say, Adam should have protected the woman, and if necessary, he should have fought the snake to the death.[20] This, alas, he did not do.

We have seen how the narrative moves from Adam to Abraham by means of the genealogies, the covenants, the quotations, and the key terms, and Adam was not the only one to fail to protect a wife vital to God's purposes. Immediately after God promised Abraham land, seed, and blessing (Gen 12:1–3), Abraham put Sarah in position to be seized by Pharaoh and taken into his harem (12:10–16). Sarah is as necessary to God's purposes as Eve was. Through Sarah and Sarah alone God intended to give seed to Abraham, and as her husband, Abraham's responsibility was to lead her, provide for her, and protect her. He led her right into jeopardy and then not only did not protect her but used her for his own protection (12:12–13).

---

18. See further James M. Hamilton Jr., "A Biblical Theology of Motherhood," *Journal of Discipleship and Family Ministry* 2, no. 2 (2012): 6–13.

19. See footnote 26 on page 18 above, along with footnote 4 on page 66 below discussing the way Moses assume his audience will know material he presents later in his writings.

20. See Michael Barber, *Singing in the Reign: The Psalms and the Liturgy of God's Kingdom* (Steubenville, OH: Emmaus Road, 2001), 43–46.

The narrative does not explore Abraham's other options (go somewhere else, find some other way to protect his own life, etc.), but surely the course of action he took was not the only one open to him. Even if it were, he should have trusted Yahweh to preserve his life and protected Sarah come what may. Instead, he placed his own safety above hers and treated her as expendable. And he did this not once but twice! The second time (Gen 20:1–7) is arguably worse because by then God has explicitly promised to raise up Isaac through Sarah (17:16–21), and at that point (Gen 20) Sarah might even have been pregnant with Isaac (cf. 18:10, 14; 21:1–7).

Like Adam, Abraham failed to protect the wife God had given him, the wife necessary for the fulfillment of God's promises. When Isaac sins in the same way with Rebekah (Gen 26:6–11), we have a confirmed pattern of male abdication of the responsibility to protect as an expression of self-sacrificial love. Men will keep right on taking and using and lying and abdicating until one comes who will say: "If then you seek me, permit these to go" (John 18:8). This is not to imply that no men until Jesus protected the women under their care, but even the good examples, such as Boaz in the book of Ruth, point forward to the one who would do this perfectly. Jesus gave himself to protect those under his care the way Adam, Abraham, Isaac, David, and many others,[21] failed to do.

In spite of the fact that Adam would show himself unable to protect his wife (Gen 3:1–6), God blessed him (1:28) and, having put him into a deep sleep in a covenant making context (2:21), God promised that the seed of the woman would arise from his line to conquer (3:15). Surprisingly, the line of destiny descends not through the firstborn but through a younger son (4:25–26), as the Lord shapes the plot in which the hope of the world will be realized in an unexpected way.

In spite of the fact that Abraham would show himself repeatedly unable to protect his wife (Gen 12:10–16; 20:1–7), God blessed him (12:1–3) and, having put him into a deep sleep in a covenant making context (15:12), God promised that his barren wife would give birth to the seed of promise (17:16). Surprisingly, the line of destiny descends not through Ishmael, Abraham's firstborn, but through the younger Isaac (17:18–21), as the Lord creates patterns in his plotline, in which the hope of the world will be realized in an unexpected way.

---

21. Lot, for instance, despicably offered to use his daughters to protect his visitors (Gen 19:8; cf. Judg 19:24–25).

§2.4 Adamic Ectypes: Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob

Why does Moses include the episodes he does, and why does he word them the way that he does? In Genesis Moses intends to present Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as installments in an Adamic pattern. This thesis accounts for the event sequences that are repeated across the book, sequences established or highlighted by the re-use of key terms, the quotation of earlier material, and the similar roles these men play as God covenants with them to keep his promises. The key terms are re-used and the quotations repeated because the author intends to draw his audience's attention to repeated patterns of events. As we continue to make our way through the Bible, tracing the salvation-historical narrative across the covenants, which do comprise "the backbone" of the biblical story,[22] we will see that the developing patterns begin to function as both *interpretive schemas* and *predictive paradigms*.

§3 NEW-ADAM ISRAEL

Already in the earliest mention of "man" in Genesis 1:26–27 there is a sense in which to refer to Adam is to refer to humanity: "Let us make *man* [אָדָם] . . . and let *them* rule [וְיִרְדּוּ] . . . And God created *the man* [הָאָדָם] . . . male and female he created *them* . . ." What I am pointing to here is a dynamic between the singular and the plural, the one and the many. The first man is the representative human, and the descriptions of him move easily between describing him as an individual, on the one hand, and as a kind of representative "everyman" on the other.

The same dynamic can be detected in the Genesis 3:15 reference to the "seed" of the woman, the word "seed" being a collective singular that can refer to one individual descendant or to descendants as numerous as the stars of the heavens. The singular pronouns and verbs in Genesis 3:15 indicate that one particular seed is in view,[23] but on the other hand when the Lord tells Abraham that his "seed" will be like the dust of the earth (Gen 13:16) the collective seed is in view.

I draw attention to this reality here because of the way that it relates to

---

22. Gentry and Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant*, 31. On this the opening page of the first chapter of their book, the authors assert, "*the progression of the covenants* forms the backbone of Scripture's metanarrative" (emphasis theirs).

23. Jack Collins, "A Syntactical Note (Genesis 3:15): Is the Woman's Seed Singular or Plural?," *Tyndale Bulletin* 48 (1997): 139–48.

the fact that as we make our way through Genesis, the name "Israel" comes to refer to either the patriarch Jacob or the nation that descends from him. Jacob's name had been changed to Israel in Genesis 32:28 (MT 32:29), but by 34:7 the humiliation of Dinah is referred to as a disgraceful thing "in Israel." The move to referring to *the people* by the name of the *patriarch* is like the one by which *humanity* is referred to by the term that designates the first *man*.

§3.1 Corporate Personality

The dynamic relationship between first *man* and *mankind* and then between *Jacob-Israel* and *nation-Israel* can be captured by the phrase "corporate personality," and it is related to the way that across the Old Testament nations will be identified with their kings and/or personified as an individual human, whether male or female. This concept of "corporate personality" informs a text like Genesis 47:27, which reads, "And *Israel* dwelled in the land of Egypt, in the land of Goshen, and *they* took possession of it; and *they* were fruitful and multiplied exceedingly." Most references to "Israel" in Genesis continue to point to Jacob, as does the one that immediately precedes 47:27, when Israel, that is Jacob, speaks to Joseph in 46:30. We expect the Israel in 47:27, then, to be Jacob, until the plural forms later in the verse force us to recognize that the reference is to the *collective* Israel not the *individual* Israel.

§3.2 Be Fruitful and Multiply

That the people have been fruitful and multiplied in Genesis 47:27 ties them to Adam and what he was charged to do in Genesis 1:28. This connection between Adam and the *collective* Israel is reinforced in Exodus 1:7, "and the sons of Israel were fruitful and swarmed and multiplied and grew strong in excessive excess, and the earth was filled with them" (cf. Exod 1:12). The reference to the "earth" being "filled" with the sons of Israel adds to the "swarming" and the *fruitful* and *multiply* language to point back to Genesis 1:28. The story of Adam is carried forward by the collective Israel, or to put it another way, the nation of Israel is a new Adam.

§3.3 Israel Is My Firstborn Son

The genealogy of Genesis 5 implicitly presents Adam as God's son, an implication rightly recognized in Luke's genealogy of Jesus, when, working back from Jesus to the first man, Luke arrives at Adam and refers to him as

"the son of God" (Luke 3:38). The idea is communicated in Genesis 5 as Moses begins, "On the day that God created man [Adam], in the image of God he made him . . . and he called the name of them Man [Adam] in the day he created them" (Gen 5:1–2). The genealogy continues in verse 3: "And it came about, man [Adam] was 130 years, and he fathered in his likeness, according to his image, and he called his name Seth." To bring out the point, let me set the phrases of the verses in visual parallel:

5:1–2	5:3
"On the day that God created man [Adam],	"And it came about, man [Adam] was 130 years,
in the image of God he made him . . .	and he fathered in his likeness, according to his image,
and he called the name of them Man [Adam] in the day he created them."	and he called his name Seth."

If Seth, fathered according to Adam's image and likeness, is *Adam's son*, then it would seem that Adam, created in the image and likeness of God, is *God's son*. The text does not overtly state this, but it seems to be implied.[24] The implication, again, is reflected in the reference to Adam as God's son in Luke 3:38.

The idea that Adam is God's son factors into this discussion because of the way that Yahweh instructed Moses to speak of Israel in Exodus 4:22–23,

And you shall say to Pharaoh, "Thus says Yahweh: my son, my firstborn, is Israel. And I say to you: send my son that he may serve me. And if you refuse to send him, behold, I am going to kill your son, your firstborn."

Exodus 4:22–23 indicates that Israel, which has been fruitful and multiplied and filled the earth (Exod 1:7), is a new Adam. Adam, God's son, has his role carried forward by Israel, God's son. The identification of Israel with Adam also suggests that we should identify the land of promise with the garden of Eden, and Adam's banishment from the garden with Israel's exile

---

24. So also Beetham, who writes, "As Seth is the son of Adam, so Adam is the son of God." "From Creation to New Creation," 239.

from the land.[25] But Adam and Israel are not the only figures to be identified as God's son in the Old Testament.

§4 NEW-ADAM DAVID

Both Adamic sonship and corporate personality inform the promises God makes to David in 2 Samuel 7. These promises pertain to kingship, which will occupy our attention in Chapter 5 below. Here we are concerned with the way that what God says to David through the prophet Nathan connects David and the future king from his line to Adam.

The context of the passage includes a number of pointers back to Adam and Abraham. The "rest" in 2 Samuel 7:1 recalls God's rest in Genesis 2:2–3.[26] David's desire to build God a house also recalls the Lord's work at creation building his own cosmic temple (see Chapter 7). The Lord's promise to make David "a great name" in 2 Samuel 7:9 recalls his promise to make Abraham's name great in Genesis 12:2. When the Lord tells David he will raise up his "seed" in 2 Samuel 7:12, notes sound from the seed theme that stems from Genesis 3:15 and continues through God's promise to Abraham and his seed (e.g., Gen 22:17–18). The associations with Abraham are strengthened by the next phrase from 2 Samuel 7:12, "who will come from your body," the whole of which occurs in only one other place in the Old Testament, at Genesis 15:4.

Gen 15:4, אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֵּעֶיךָ

2 Sam 7:12, אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֵּעֶיךָ

"who will come from your body"

The seed God promised to raise up from David, then, is firmly linked to the seed God promised to raise up from Abraham, and thereby, to the promised seed of the woman. The Lord then promises in 2 Samuel 7:14, "I will be to him a father, and he will be to me a son." The *sonship* of the king from David's line means that this king will reign as God himself would, and this brings out the

---

25. Ibid., 246–47.

26. Genesis 2:2–3 use שָׁבַת to describe God's rest, but Exodus 20:11 employs the same verb in 2 Samuel 7:1, נוּחַ, when it says that God rested on the seventh day.

sonship of the Adamic vice-regency the Lord communicates about the seed of David. Not only will the king from David's line be a new Adam, he will also be the representative of the corporate son of God in the Old Testament, Israel.

As the king of Israel, the seed of David will be the representative Israelite and the new Adam. In his person he will stand for the people, as David did when he fought Israel's battle for her against Goliath (1 Sam 17).

Understanding the Davidic king as the representative Israelite and new-Adam son of God would make sense of what David says in Psalm 8.[27] He begins and ends by affirming that God achieved what he set out to accomplish in creating the world—making his name majestic in all the earth (Ps 8:1, 9). David then asserts that Yahweh has established his strength from the mouths of babies and infants, and that he has done this because of his foes, "to still the enemy and the avenger" (8:2, ESV). The reference to the singular "enemy" and "avenger" here seems to point to the archenemy behind all enemies, and the establishing of strength from babies would seem to point to the way that God promised that the seed of the woman would bruise the serpent's head (Gen 3:15) and then preserved the seed's line of descent though repeatedly mothers in the line were barren.

Psalm 8:3, with its references to creation, would add to the interaction between Psalm 8 and the early chapters of Genesis. This interaction seems to continue, subtly, in 8:4. I have noted above that the first man's name, Adam, also became a way of referring to humanity, so that when the Hebrew term (אָדָם) is encountered we rely on context to tell us whether we are reading of Adam or mankind. Something similar seems to have happened with Adam's son's son's name: Adam had Seth, and Seth had Enosh (אֱנוֹשׁ). We can see Enosh's name in the plural form of another Hebrew term: singular אִישׁ, man; plural אֲנָשִׁים, men. When we consider Psalm 8:4 in Hebrew, we see a subtle reference to Adam's genealogy:

Ps 8:5 in Hebrew: מָה־אֱנוֹשׁ . . . וּבֶן־אָדָם . . .

Ps 8:4 in English (ESV): "What is man . . . and the son of man . . ."

---

27. See further the discussion in Hamilton, *Psalms* ad loc. and James M. Hamilton Jr., "David's Biblical Theology and Typology in the Psalms: Authorial Intent and Patterns of the Seed of Promise," in *The Psalms: Exploring Theological Themes*, ed. David M. Howard and Andrew J. Schmutzer (Bellingham, WA: Lexham, forthcoming).

English translations cannot preserve the connection between these terms for "man" and the names of "Adam" and "Enosh." We can, however, present a rendering that transliterates the names rather than translating them as terms for "man" as follows:

Ps 8:4/5 (to preserve the names): "What is Enosh . . . the son of Adam . . ."

To draw out the import of what the names connote: the verse begins from the third generation, Enosh, then implicitly mentions Seth, "son of," before mentioning Adam. Heard in concert with the reference to the babies and infants of verse 2, these questions can be understood to allude to the line of descent from which the seed of the woman comes.[28]

The next verse speaks of how man was made a bit lower than heavenly beings and crowned with glory and honor (Ps 8:5), before the terms of Genesis 1:26 and 1:28 are trumpeted in Psalm 8:6–8. God gave man dominion over the animals in Genesis 1:26 and 1:28, the same dominion over the same animals named in Psalm 8:6–8.[29]

I would suggest that Psalm 8 attests to David's understanding of himself as a new Adam, king of Israel, vice-regent of Yahweh. Going forward, we see that the line of descent from Adam through Abraham, Judah, and David will culminate in *the* Son of God, the last Adam, the true Israel, the one who is the image of the invisible God.

§5 NEW-ADAM CHRIST

The first man, Adam, was granted dominion over the animals (Gen 1:28). That first man was further charged to work and keep the garden (2:15)—he

---

28. In his book *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, Joachim Schaper has argued that the Greek translation of the Psalms is messianic and eschatological. The approach to Psalm 8 proposed here understands the original Hebrew text of the Psalm to be messianic and eschatological, which could indicate that the connections Schaper argues the Greek translator made with Numbers 24:7, 17 were in keeping with the intentions of Moses and David. Cf. Joachim Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/76 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995), 76–78.

29. Note the citation of Psalm 8:6 (MT 8:7) in reference to all things being put under Christ's feet in 1 Cor 15:27 and Hebrews 2:8. Jamieson observes, "Paul concludes that death is numbered among 'all things' subjected to the risen Christ, and that God, the one who subjected all things to Christ, is not himself subject to Christ (15.27)." R. B. Jamieson, "1 Corinthians 15.28 and the Grammar of Paul's Christology," *New Testament Studies* 66 (2020): 189.

was to protect it. An animal later Scripture designates as unclean, the serpent, infiltrated the garden, tempted the woman, and led the man into sin.

§5.1 The Son of Man in Daniel 7

In the apocalyptic symbolism of Daniel 7, the worldly kingdoms that successively exercise dominion in the land of promise are identified as beasts (Dan 7:1–8). This imagery links these kingdoms not with God but with the serpent. It is as though these idolatrous powers are identified with their father the devil. The kingdom of God, by contrast, comes when the last beast is killed, the others have their dominion taken away, and everlasting dominion is granted to "one like a son of man" (7:11–14).[30]

Daniel 7 was composed in Aramaic rather than Hebrew, and the expression for "son of man" therefore lacks explicit reference to Adam (but not to Enosh!). The Aramaic expression for "son of man" employs the term that appears to derive from Enosh, name of the son of Seth, son of Adam: כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ. The "one like a son of man" who comes with the clouds of heaven and is presented before the Ancient of Days in Daniel 7:13 receives everlasting dominion and a kingdom never to be destroyed in 7:14.[31] There is only one kingdom in the Old Testament that lasts forever—the one God promised to David in 2 Samuel 7. As Andrew Chester notes, "There are also clear affinities in the Hebrew Bible between Ps. 110.1 and Dan. 7.9–14 . . ."[32]

This one like a son of man, then, should be identified as the future king from the line of David. Some interpreters of Daniel 7 have questioned that conclusion because of what, on their reading, seems to be left out of the rest of the chapter. Daniel's vision is recounted in 7:1–14, and then in 7:15–28 he relates the interpretation of the vision provided by a member of the heavenly host (7:16; cf. 7:10).[33]

---

30. Cf. Beetham, "From Creation to New Creation," 240.

31. Commenting on the way that on the Day of Atonement the high priest "entered the holy of holies, the cultic counterpart to the heavenly throne room of God," where he put incense on the fire "that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that is over the testimony, so that he does not die" (Lev 16:12–13), Morales writes, "the high priest indeed entered 'heaven' with the clouds. This being the case, when during the exile the prophet Daniel envisions an Adam-like figure approaching God's throne with the clouds of heaven we are probably to understand this as a priestly image." Morales, *Who Shall Ascend the Mountain of the Lord?*, 172.

32. Andrew Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation: Jewish Messianic and Visionary Traditions and New Testament Christology*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 207 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 37.

33. On the date and authorship of Daniel, see Hamilton, *With the Clouds of Heaven*, 30–40.

Whereas in the vision, the "one like a son of man" receives the kingdom in Daniel 7:13–14, in the interpretation of the vision the phrase "one like a son of man" does not recur and "the saints of the Most High" receive the kingdom (7:18, 22, 25, 27). This has led to a "collective interpretation of 7:13," as Ernest Lucas explains,

> The collective interpretation was very much a minority one until the nineteenth century. By the mid-twentieth century it had become the common view. Basic to it is the equation of the 'one like a son of man' with 'the holy ones of the Most High' (18, 22, 25) and 'the people of the holy ones of the Most High' (27), both of which are assumed to be the Jewish people.[34]

The collective interpretation, however, has not accounted for the use of two different terms that mean "Most High" in Daniel 7.[35] Throughout the Aramaic section of Daniel (Dan 2:4–7:28), the normal Aramaic term for "Most High" (עֶלְיָא) is used with reference to Israel's God (3:26, 32; 4:17, 24, 25, 32, 34 [MT 4:14, 21, 22, 29, 31]; 5:18, 21; 7:25), the Ancient of Days who takes his seat in 7:9. Every time the phrase "saints of the Most High" appears, however, another term for "Most High" is used (7:18, 22, 25, 27): the Hebrew plural עֶלְיוֹן, made doubly plural (so BDB and HALOT) by the addition of the Aramaic plural ending, resulting in the form עֶלְיוֹנִין (cf. BDB ad loc., 1106). The NASB recognizes the two different terms and renders the Aramaic term (עֶלְיָא) "Most High" and the Aramaicized Hebrew term (עֶלְיוֹנִין) "the Highest One."

These two terms for "Most High" occur together in the same verse in Daniel 7:25, "And words against the Most High (עֶלְיָא) he shall speak, and the saints of the Most High (עֶלְיוֹנִין) he shall wear out . . ." Why would Daniel distinguish between the Ancient of Days, to whom he refers with the Aramaic

---

34. Ernest C. Lucas, *Daniel*, Apollos Old Testament Commentary 20 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002), 186.

35. Commentators do not typically attempt to explain the two different terms for "Most High" in Daniel 7. See John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993); Lucas, *Daniel*; and Andrew E. Steinmann, *Daniel*, Concordia Commentary (Saint Louis: Concordia, 2008). For interpretations similar to the one offered here, see Chrys Caragounis, *The Son of Man: Vision and Interpretation*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 66–67, 75–81; Peter J. Gentry, "The Son of Man in Daniel 7: Individual or Corporate?," in *Acorns to Oaks: The Primacy and Practice of Biblical Theology*, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin (Toronto: Joshua Press, 2003), 59–75; and Hamilton, *With the Clouds of Heaven*, 147–53.

term, and this other figure with whom the saints are identified, to whom he refers with the Aramaicized Hebrew term?

We can make progress toward answering this question by comparing Daniel 7:14 and 7:27 (the **bold font**, *italics*, SMALL CAPS, and ALL CAPS denote matching phrases):

7:14	7:27
And to him *will be given* **dominion** and honor and a **kingdom**, and all the peoples, tribes and tongues to him WILL PAY REVERENCE.	And the **kingdom** and the **dominion** and the greatness of the kingdoms under all the heavens *will be given* to the people of the saints of the Most High (עֶלְיוֹנִין).
His dominion is a dominion OF THE AGE, which will not pass away, and **his kingdom** one that will not be destroyed.	**His kingdom** is a kingdom OF THE AGE, and all the dominions to him WILL PAY REVERENCE and be obedient.

Daniel 7:27 makes the same statements about the kingdom that will be received by "the saints of the Most High" that were made about the kingdom of the one like a son of man in 7:13–14. This suggests that Daniel refers to the *one like a son of man* as the Most High with the Aramaicized Hebrew term עֶלְיוֹנִין, to distinguish him from the Ancient of Days, to whom he refers as Most High with the Aramaic term עֶלְיָא. On this understanding, the "saints" would be understood as the citizens of the kingdom over which the Most High (עֶלְיוֹנִין) Son of Man will reign. It is worth pointing out here, too, that Daniel presents the angelic interpreter (7:16) as introducing this phrase in 7:18, then Daniel himself repeats it in 7:22, before again the angelic interpreter employs it in 7:25 and 7:27. It would seem that the angelic interpreter begins to refer to the one like a son of man as "Most High" (עֶלְיוֹנִין), and from him Daniel learned to do likewise.

To summarize Daniel's vision: he sees the kingdoms of the world as beastly, like their father the devil, overthrown, and then dominion is granted to one like a son of man, who is already present in the heavenly court at the time of Daniel's vision. This figure, moreover, travels on the clouds, as God does elsewhere in the Old Testament, and then like God this figure is referred to as Most High, but with an Aramaicized form of the Hebrew term rather

than the Aramaic term that has been used to refer to the Ancient of Days. It is as though the one like a son of man is granted equal status with the Ancient of Days, even as he is distinguished from him, with both being referred to by different terms that mean "Most High."

The son of man in Daniel is the son of Enosh, son of Adam, image and likeness of God, who will exercise Adamic dominion as the Davidic king over all the earth, including the beasts and their kingdoms.[36]

§5.2 The Son of Adam in Luke and Romans

For the purposes of this discussion I want to draw attention to two passages in the New Testament that seem to compare and contrast Adam and Jesus, presenting Jesus as the one who succeeded where Adam failed.[37] We will look first at Luke's account of Jesus being tempted by Satan, then at Paul's comparison and contrast of Adam and Jesus in Romans 5. Paul and Luke traveled and ministered together to make disciples and plant churches (Col 4:14; 2 Tim 4:11; Phlm. 24; and the "we" passages in Acts), and these passages reveal their fundamental agreement on the typological relationship between Adam and Christ.[38]

§5.2.1 Son of Adam, Son of God

Whereas Matthew's genealogy works down from Abraham to Jesus, Luke's genealogy works back from Jesus to Adam. The last verse of Luke 3 reads, "the son of Enos, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God" (Luke 3:38, ESV), and then Luke 4 goes immediately into the temptation narrative, in which the devil repeatedly says to Jesus, "If you are the Son of God" (4:3, 9, ESV).

Luke juxtaposes the genealogy that concludes, "Adam, son of God" (Luke 3:38), with the temptation narrative in which the devil challenges Jesus with the words, "If you are the son of God" (Luke 4:3, 9). By setting the

---

36. Several "son of man" statements in the New Testament present Jesus as the fulfillment of the figure from Daniel 7:13–14 (see, e.g., Matt 26:64; Mark 10:45; John 3:13–14).

37. For discussion of both where Adam is directly named in the New Testament (Luke 3:38; Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 15:22, 45; 1 Tim 2:13–14; Jude 14) and where he is implied, see Robert W. Yarbrough, "Adam in the New Testament," in *Adam, the Fall, and Original Sin: Theological, Biblical, and Scientific Perspectives*, ed. Hans Madueme and Michael Reeves (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014), 33–52.

38. Kavin Rowe writes, "in light of this reading of Luke's Christology, it becomes possible to situate Luke in closer proximity to Paul and John than is usual in modern NT scholarship." C. Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009), 28.

genealogy next to the temptation, Luke invites readers to compare and contrast Jesus and Adam.[39]

- Adam was in the lush garden of Eden. Jesus was in the wilderness.
- Adam was not alone but with his suitable help-meet. Jesus was alone.
- In the garden, Adam had been granted the right to eat freely from all trees save one (Gen 2:16). Jesus had eaten nothing for forty days.
- Adam was tempted and sinned. The devil challenged Jesus, and Jesus answered him with Scripture, remaining faithful to God's commandments.

Earle Ellis notes regarding Satan's offer to give Jesus the kingdoms of the world: "To accept the offer would not be to displace Satan's lordship but, like Adam, to fall into bondage to it."[40]

§5.2.2 A Type of the One to Come

In Romans 5 Paul asserts that Adam was "a type of the one to come" (5:14). He compares the way sin came into the world, spreading death to all men, through the one man, Adam (5:12), with the way that the free gift of righteousness came through the obedience of the one man, Jesus Christ (5:15). Whereas many died because of Adam's sin, many experienced abounding grace because of Jesus. The trespass of Adam resulted in condemnation and judgment for many, but after all the many sins that had been committed, the free gift of Jesus brings justification (5:16). Adam's sin made it so death reigned (5:17a, 14). The obedience of Jesus, however, made it so that those who receive abounding grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through him (5:17b). Through Adam came condemnation and death. Through Jesus comes justification and life (5:18), extending to the making righteous of those justified (5:19).[41]

In this instance Adam and Jesus function as representative heads of humanity. All people are affected by what Adam did (5:12), and in the same way what Christ did affects all who receive the abundant grace and the free gift of righteousness (5:17). Salvation hinges on the connection: because of the

---

39. E. Earle Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*, New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 93–94.

40. Ibid., 95.

41. See the interpretation in Thomas R. Schreiner, "Original Sin and Original Death: Romans 5:12–19," in *Adam, the Fall, and Original Sin*, 271–88.

typological fulfillment of Adam's role in Christ, those who receive grace and the gift of righteousness can be saved from the condemnation that results from what Adam did.

Paul puts this relationship more succinctly in 1 Corinthians 15:21–22, "For as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (ESV). In 1 Corinthians 15:45 Paul even compares the moment when God made Adam alive in Genesis 2:7 to the way that Christ gives life: "Thus it is written, 'The first man Adam became a living being'; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit" (ESV).

The goal of this chapter has been to show that the biblical authors who followed him grasped what Moses intended from the beginning. In Genesis Moses forges connections between Adam, the prototypical man, and the ectypal installments in the Adamic pattern who come after him: Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and then in Exodus, the nation of Israel. This Mosaic presentation of Adam influenced later biblical authors, as can be seen from the promise to David in Samuel, David's words in Psalm 8, and the Daniel 7 one like a son of man. Jean Daniélou has it right:

> It is particularly noticeable that the Son of Man of Daniel is represented as triumphant over the animals, which represent the idolatrous nations. This would certainly recall the first Adam and his dominion over the animal world. Psalm 8 is apparently the link between Genesis and Daniel, showing as it does, a son of man who should reign over creation and particularly the animal world.[42]

Luke and Paul, then, have learned from Moses himself, from later Old Testament authors, and from "those who heard" Jesus (Heb 2:3) how to interpret Moses, and their Spirit-inspired presentation of Jesus as the new and better Adam fits with broader claims that Christ is the fulfillment of everything written of him in the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings (e.g., Luke 24:44; John 5:39, 46; 2 Cor 1:20; Eph 1:10).

---

42. Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality*, 15.