

The Practice and Promise of Biblical Theology: A Response to Hamilton and Goldsworthy

Robert W. Yarbrough

Robert W. Yarbrough is Chair of the New Testament Department and Associate Professor of New Testament at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Deerfield, Illinois. He also serves as the Editor of *Trinity Journal* and as Chair of the theological and exegetical department at the Institutul Biblic Emanuel in Oradea, Romania. Dr. Yarbrough has written numerous scholarly articles and is the author of *The Salvation-Historical Fallacy? Reassessing the History of New Testament Theology* (Deo, 2004), *Encountering the New Testament: A Historical and Theological Survey* (Baker, 2005), and *1, 2, and 3 John in the Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament* (Baker, 2008).

Athletic coaches sometimes remind frustrated players, “If it was easy, *everybody* would be doing it.” Anyone responsible for interpreting the Bible, and then communicating their interpretation, needs to remember that adage. *Everybody* does not hit home runs, throw touchdown passes, dunk over opponents, or shoot below par. And *everybody* who interprets the Bible does not achieve notable success.

Of course, the goal in interpreting God’s word, the Bible, is not success in the normal sense; it is to glorify God and engage in a use of his word with which he will be pleased—perhaps to evangelize or edify, perhaps to correct or condemn. This is where the studies of Graeme Goldsworthy and James Hamilton elsewhere in this journal are of value.¹ The approaches they set forth are not guaranteed to make hermeneutical or homiletical superstars out of anyone. But I believe that carefully heeded and discerningly appropriated, they shed valuable light on the interpretive labors of *everybody* who reads, lives, and seeks to share Scripture.

Below I will comment rather briefly on James Hamilton’s study, before interacting more extensively with the lengthier remarks of Graeme Goldsworthy. Both have much to offer in commending the practice and promoting the promise of a neglected approach to Scripture: biblical theology.

The Hamilton Hypothesis: Perceiving Patterns

The great strength of Hamilton’s study is to have restated the case for a tried-and-true means of making connections between Scripture passages that might otherwise seem disjointed. “Typology,” in one form or another, is as ancient as biblical writers themselves, who pioneered this mode of understanding God’s word once it had come to the prophets, was written down, and as time passed came to be interpreted by subsequent generations. Thanks in part to their God who was so emphatic that his people should remember former times, godly Hebrew and eventually Jewish readers looking back began to note likenesses or patterns—in God’s faithfulness, in his judgments, in Israel’s fickleness, in sin’s costliness, in redemption’s gloriousness. Later writers of the Old Testament take up themes, mention figures, and extend lessons found in writings predating their times so as to shed light on their present situations. God, the inspired biblical writers were made to see, was not only at work vertically from above, injecting his presence into situations according to his aims and will. He was also at work along the horizontal continuum of circumstances and human affairs we call history. To detect that horizontal con-

nection, and to view God's word now, as biblical writers did, in organic and significant connection with God's word to and for former days, was the core of the typological impulse.

It is helpful that Hamilton works out his views in dialogue with a range of interpreters both from current and past generations. The old-timer anchoring matters² is Leonhard Goppelt, whose *Typos* first appeared in German in 1939.³ Senior scholars like E. Earle Ellis, Richard Longenecker, and the late Hans Frei also appear; they are certainly part of the hermeneutical mix in discussion of typology (or lack thereof) in the last couple of generations. Then a welter of newer thinkers and studies is cited: Michael Fishbane, Francis Watson, Mark Seifrid, G. K. Beale, Grant Osborne, Richard Hays, Rikk Watts, and others. Hamilton does not urge his case by ignoring rival views but by conceding their existence and considering their arguments, then attempting to see if he can more convincingly go beyond them. This platform of discussion furnishes a strong basis for his own proposal.

I agree with Hamilton that we can, with both confidence and caution, read the Old Testament alert to the kind of likenesses that we see established there, sometimes repeated already in the Old Testament corpus, and then recapitulated by various means and to varying degrees in the New Testament. When Jesus compares his raising up on the cross to the bronze serpent lifted up by Moses in the wilderness (John 3:14; cf. Num 21:9), we can be confident we are dealing with typology. Analogies can be multiplied across the sweep of New Testament writings. This is especially true when we encounter words actually

denoting "type," whether the word *typos* itself (see, e.g., Rom 5:14, referring to Adam) or other words that may express the same idea: *skia* (cf. Heb 10:1, referring to the law), *hypodeigma* (cf. 2 Pet 3:6, referring to Sodom and Gomorrah), or *parabole* (cf. Heb 11:19, referring to the tie between Isaac and Christ).⁴ And as seen above in the case of John 3:14, the thing denoted by "type" may be present when no technical term for it is employed.

Are there potential problems in Hamilton's proposal? While I don't see material flaws, his constructive section on Samuel and Mark is merely one analysis of a very narrow slice of biblical tradition. The essay does not furnish a wide-ranging defense or definition of the practice of "typology" in general.⁵ Nearly 100 years ago it was recognized that "how much of the OT is to be regarded as [typological] is a question not easily answered."⁶ About the only thing definite is that "two extremes . . . should be avoided."⁷ Accordingly, while Hamilton has given a rationale for and example of a reasonable typological reading, in the nature of the case (one short article) we cannot expect full justification of a method that is perennially disputed and whose precise definition is much debated.⁸

What Hamilton *has* reminded us of, surely, is that typology of some description, which even from a minimalist perspective counts as an interpretive approach central to biblical theology,⁹ has its place in our hermeneutical tool chest. But what is biblical theology, and why is it important? Those are questions at the core of this journal's articles by Graeme Goldsworthy, to which we now turn.

The Goldsworthy Goal: Universalizing Biblical Theology

Definition and Strengths

Herbert Hoover is remembered for (among much else) his 1928 presidential campaign slogan, “A chicken in every pot and a car in every garage.” Perhaps the outstanding feature of Goldsworthy’s lectures is his call for biblical theology in every church, seminary, home, and Christian life. Biblical theology deserves prominence everywhere. He starts and concludes his first lecture by insisting on the necessity of biblical theology as a corollary of the doctrine of Scripture. His second lecture urges a prominent role for biblical theology in Bible college, seminary, and ministerial training generally. He writes, “I believe we need biblical theology as one of the first courses in Bible for all seminary students.” He is “on a mission” to make biblical theology an introductory component in “every seminary and Bible college” and then for biblical theology to be the integrating vision of the whole of theological training in subsequent years.¹⁰ His third lecture extends the importance of biblical theology to the local church and the home, including child education. “The office of pastor is first and foremost the office of theologian,” and that means a biblical theologian. Much that is necessary for healthy Christian life and service has been lost in evangelical circles, Goldsworthy feels; he concludes his lectures by asserting, “I see biblical theology as a vital part” of a much-needed “return to a gospel-centered world view.”

What does Goldsworthy mean by “biblical theology”? Actually he offers a number of definitions, and they do not always neatly mesh. But the general sense

is expressed with this:

Biblical Theology ... involves us in the two-fold exercise of analysis or exegesis of individual texts, and the synthesis of the individual texts into a big picture or metanarrative. Once we accept the overall unity of the Bible we have to realize that every single text is in some way supported by every other text. No individual part of Scripture stands alone. The context of any text, which prevents its misuse, is the whole canon.

Interpretation that takes up this analytic-yet-holistic approach to Scripture with its focus on the unity of the Bible and the fulfillment of the whole in Christ is the essence of Goldsworthy’s “biblical theology.” Elsewhere he defines it a bit differently and more briefly: “We can define biblical theology at its simplest as theology as the Bible reveals it (that is, within its historical framework and, thus, as a process).”

I note three strengths in the approach to the Bible to which Goldsworthy calls readers. He is surely correct that an integrated vision of the whole sweep of God’s word, not just familiarity with cherished verses, spiritual principles, or a random collage of memorable stories, should be at the core of healthy Christian life and practice everywhere. The seminary in which I teach has embraced this conviction. As the result of curriculum revision a few years back, every first-year ministry student at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School takes “Biblical Theology and Interpretation,” a course which seeks to achieve pretty much what Goldsworthy calls for at the entry level. To keep this vision before our students during the three or four years of their M.Div. training, we try to recruit and retain professors who think and, therefore, teach in theologically integrative ways from a

solid basis in the substance of biblical revelation and with evidence of a gospel-fired sense of God's presence in their lives. This greatly increases the odds that students will grow in biblical theological awareness and interpretive skill throughout their course of study.

Another strong point is Goldsworthy's insight into the dangerously thin knowledge of the Bible that has come to characterize many churches, in part because for so long "the coherence of the canon, its inner unity," has been "left largely to chance." Related to this, he sees that "doctrine does not seem to be very highly regarded by a lot of evangelicals, which is not only a pity; it is perilous." Revivalist individualism has crowded out the overarching vision of Scripture that "places personal regeneration within the wider cosmic scope that leads from creation to new creation." Stated positively, Goldsworthy insists that "we don't move on *from* the gospel in Christian living, but *with* the gospel" (his emphasis). The gospel is not only the driving force in justification; "it is also the matrix for sanctification." Biblical theology that unfolds the gospel, funds Spirit-led life in God's people, and refuels zeal for doctrinal truth is desperately needed to revitalize the church. Biblical theology could be a means of re-centering God in the church. "The gospel is about the transcendent God of creation doing something to rectify the corrupted history of mankind, not about a self-centered technique of personal self-improvement," as it has come to be marketed in recent decades. Citing articles and books by Scott Hafemann and David Wells that point to the encroachment of pragmatism, consumerism, and narcissism on theological education and evangelical religion

in North America, Goldsworthy observes, "I do not really think we can avoid the disasters that Wells and Hafemann warn of without a return to serious exegesis of the biblical text." This means, of course, biblical-theological exegesis.

A final strength of Goldsworthy's call for biblical theology is its pastoral usefulness. This can be broken down into several components. (1) Biblical theology enhances preaching. "When we apply biblical theology to preaching, and do so with prayerful humility before God, we may expect that the power of the gospel to convert and to change people's lives will be most evident." (2) Biblical theology enhances discipleship in the church as it becomes a means for the light to go on, so to speak, in people's understanding of what the Bible is about. "My experience," Goldsworthy writes, "is that adults, many who have been Christians for a long time, express some amazement that they have never seen or been shown this macro-structure of revelation before." This is not only the case with adults. Youth and children too benefit from a conception of the Bible in which there is meaning to the whole. As Goldsworthy says with respect to youth, "To teach biblical theology is to teach [young] people to read the Bible intelligently." It is no longer an impenetrable thicket of complexities nor merely an infinitude of burdensome imperatives. (3) Biblical theology enhances pastoral integrity. It serves this noble end in at least five ways.

First, it promotes a high view of the Bible. Pastoral and congregational focus on Scripture is not in itself sufficient for God's fullest blessing, but it is undoubtedly necessary. Biblical theology gives a framework for teaching and understanding Scripture that can make it likely and

indeed inevitable that God's word and thereby the Lord himself, not human agendas or contrivances, will be exalted by God's people. We are witnessing a fresh wave of defection (there are some who drift in every generation) from the notion of God's inerrant word currently, led by scholars who used to affirm inerrancy but are now castigating the church for its narrowness and calling for relaxation of former convictions.¹¹ Goldsworthy writes, "One of the greatest antidotes to destructive critical views is the biblical-theological perspective on the coherence of the whole canon." In my own many years of academic study and teaching, it would often have been easy (and perhaps professionally advantageous) to abandon the Bible's own high view of its complete and utter veracity. But, in my young adult years before beginning technical study of Scripture, repeated readings of Scripture and the intuitive development of a covenantal, biblical theological view of the whole have always made the vast and deep indubitable truth of God's word written loom decisively larger than the questions raised by the Bible's detractors.

Second, biblical theology enhances pastoral integrity by promoting a high Christology. "God is the central character of the Bible [who] makes biblical theology viable," and God has shown himself to us ultimately in his Son. But "the only access to the Word incarnate," Jesus Christ, "is through the word in Scripture." Anything that renders Scripture more intelligible, memorable, and comprehensible as a whole (not just in bits) promotes the teaching of Christ, the knowledge of Christ, and finally the presence of Christ. In that sense, we could say that biblical theology, through its promotion of the Lord's living presence with his people,

promotes healthy ecclesiology, too.

Third, biblical theology promotes a high view of the gospel and of the ministerial task in administering that good news. Goldsworthy states, "I want to be bold here and claim that biblical theology can have real and observable effects in our lives and ministries." Not least among these effects is a sense of common labor and purpose, as minister and people deepen in the perspective that collectively as well as individually they are "heirs to the whole wonderful process of salvation-history that culminates in Jesus Christ. That is what makes the ministerial task worth doing." It is notoriously easy for pastor and sizable (or powerful) blocs in the congregation to become estranged. There is no sure-fire prevention of this. But one very good defense is the offensive strategy of joint pursuit, church instructional staff and congregational learners united, of ever deeper insight into the majestic sweep of God's saving work in Christ as Scripture witnesses to it, and growing forth from that worship and service as one body in his name. This is a significant potential positive effect of an effective biblical theological focus.

Fourth and last, biblical theology enhances pastoral integrity by "promoting a high view of the people of God." Steadfast seeking after God in his word, on the scale and in the form that biblical theology calls for, dignifies what can easily seem the marginalized and trifling activities of most congregations, which are not large and wildly successful but modest in size and typically working hard to maintain current attendance, offerings, and ministries. Goldsworthy explains that biblical theology, both its practice and its fruit, serves to remind that "the ordinary, small, unremarkable

congregations, as much as any other, are in the front line of God's action in this world to redeem and judge the whole universe." This is, in a sense, a manifestation of Jesus' promise to be with even two or three gathered in his name (Matt 18:20)—so, even a very small congregation. But what would that congregation be doing in Jesus' name? One priority would surely be worship, and at the heart of worship is Scripture proclamation, and in Goldsworthy's proposal the teaching of God's word in a biblical theological mode would be the primary *modus operandi* of the teaching pastor and those laboring under his oversight. Where even small numbers are gathered, dutifully hearing and learning the whole counsel of God as a means to know, worship, and serve him, Christ by his Spirit is there, and the eternal work of God's kingdom through the church is underway. Biblical theology reverently pursued may demonstrate a truth preached years ago by Francis Schaeffer: in the kingdom economy, there are "no little people."¹² This is not because we set out to exalt ourselves, but because in our disciplined attentiveness to God's word in its fullness, God orders the thinking, willing, and behavior of Christ's followers, uniting us with him and making us no longer subject to the law of sin and death (cf. Rom 8:2). God himself lifts up those who seek him where and as he may be found (cf. Isa 55:6; 66:2).

Tensions and Liabilities

No set of lectures or essays on so large a subject as biblical theology can say everything. As indicated above, on the whole I have no fundamental criticisms of Goldsworthy's call to the particular way of reading, living, and ministering Scripture that he describes, admittedly

in sparse outline. Yet there are always concerns that emerge, because no single approach to Scripture engineered by humans can possibly constitute the only perfect way, and any articulation of an approach will admit of improvement and profit from qualification. I would like to conclude by setting forth some tensions and liabilities of Goldsworthy's proposals that occurred to me as I pondered with great appreciation what he had to say.

(1) There may be a tension between strong insistence on the necessity of a biblical theological emphasis, on the one hand, and the indubitable truth that many believers, across the generations and around the world, come to a grounded, holistic, balanced, and theologically acute grasp of Scripture more or less on their own, by intuition and the work of the Spirit, as they read Scripture daily and serve Christ faithfully over the years. Yes, in many cases we may be able to speed up the process of synthetic grasp of Scripture by furnishing a big picture for people, helping them to see where the pieces fit. But if people are not reading Scripture avidly and internalizing it consistently "from below," we may actually be harming them by creating the impression that the most important thing is the synthesis we aim to teach "from above." Biblical theology ought never take the place of the hard work of mastering, and being mastered by, the details of the texts themselves. This is not to suggest that Goldsworthy thinks that it should. It is to remind ourselves that it would not be healthy for overarching synthesis to replace detailed analysis. Calls for biblical theology must avoid encouraging that effect. Scripture calls for full attention from both analytic and synthetic directions.

(2) A possible liability of biblical theology is that its systematic advocacy could encourage the rise of doctrinaire biblicists who are confident in their beliefs, not because they are grounded in a personal appropriation of Scripture, but because they have learned from “biblical theology” what everything in the Bible means, in the end. Call it biblical theological reductionism. It is not hard to imagine a new kind of anti-dogmatic dogmatism, a dogmatism dismissive of systematic theology or the theological heritages of, for instance, Lutheran or Baptist or Reformed or Anglican churches. What “the church teaches” or what is “traditional” (which are in fact often true and good things) are jettisoned for a new manifestation of the “back to the Bible” impulse which at its worst has worked much woe in the church repeatedly in its North American history. Clearly Goldsworthy intends nothing of the sort; he seems to envision a sort of trans-denominational approach to the Bible that will unpack biblical revelation in its own terms and render it into our current settings in ways that will not undermine healthy denominational distinctives but rather strengthen and renew them. But care might need to be taken to avoid nasty unintended consequences from this salutary biblical theological summons.

(3) There may be a tension between ebullience in knowing the explanatory power of our biblical theological synthesis, on the one hand, and sober consciousness that our systems and knowledge are nevertheless provisional. I am not succumbing here to the postmodern error of declaring everything unknowable because we can know nothing comprehensively.¹³ Much of what Scripture says and what biblical theology sets forth is eminently knowable and is no more

subject to doubt or change than is the God who did and spoke the things that Scripture records. I am rather noting the truth voiced by E. Earle Ellis with respect to God’s revelation in Christ and the gospel being “a secret and hidden wisdom” (1 Cor 2:7). Everything is not immediately clear and transparent, even with the considerable illuminating advantage of biblical theological synthesis:

From the perspective of the biblical writers, and of Jesus as he is represented by them, the essential meaning of the Scriptures is revelation, also in their historical and literary dimension. As such, the meaning is understood to be either hidden or revealed to the reader at God’s discretion and is never viewed as truth available, like pebbles on a beach.¹⁴

Practitioners zealous for biblical theology’s potential for making Holy Scripture clear and rendering God’s ways in this world explicable must at the same time employ measures to head off hermeneutical triumphalism in matters that remain the sacred province, for us in this life at any rate, of divine comprehension alone. Doxology pertains at least as much to what we predicate of God but cannot fathom as it does to what we are convinced he has made transparent to us.

(4) If I had one serious misgiving about the way “biblical theology” was described and summarized in Goldsworthy’s lectures, it was the way in which the cross seemed to receive short shrift. I have no doubt of Goldsworthy’s intention for it to be central. But repeatedly in various formulations throughout these lectures, other aspects of God’s redemptive work, or our study of it, occupy center stage: creation-new creation, incarnation, promise-fulfillment, Christology, unity of the Bible, coherence of the canon, relationship of Old Testament and New.

One could get the impression that to get all these things (and more) right is really what biblical theology is about. The seven-point taxonomy by Donald Robinson (presented at the beginning of lecture two) says nothing explicit about the cross. Robinson's structure may indeed be, as Goldsworthy declares, "the one that best lays bare the matrix of progressive revelation," but don't we want the central saving act of God to be explicit in the matrix? In the third lecture Goldsworthy states he wants "to emphasize that there is much, much more to Jesus than his being the Son of God who died on the cross for our sins." Well, yes and no. It will not do to make our functional biblical theology John 3:16 and an altar call. Yet there is that narrow gate through which all must have entered, and I thought repenting of our sins and coming to God through the one who died for us, to bring us to God (1 Pet 3:18), was the start of all new covenantal knowledge of God. Goldsworthy essentially affirms this in the first lecture, stressing "the need for regeneration and the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit if one is to grasp both the authority and the meaning of Scripture."

Once we know cross-mediated entrance to the kingdom, the panoramic sweep of God's redemptive work as biblical theology so wonderfully renders it becomes light and life. But any theological enterprise or interpretive method that claims to grasp the center, but centers something other than the cross,¹⁵ seems out of sync with Scripture itself seen as a whole. Given the sagacity, spiritual discernment, and scriptural heft of what Goldsworthy proposes overall, it would not require major adjustments to assure that Christ's saving death and its very explicit implications for

Christian life, mission, and yes theologizing today receive a more central role.

ENDNOTES

¹*Editor's note:* The article by James Hamilton to which Dr. Yarbrough refers is not the article published in this issue of *SBJT*. We have published another article by Dr. Hamilton, "Was Joseph a Type of the Messiah? Tracing the Typological Identification between Joseph, David, and Jesus." In the currently published article, Dr. Hamilton is doing something similar to the original article to which Dr. Yarbrough refers, except in this case Dr. Hamilton is applying a typological interpretation to Joseph. Thus, Dr. Yarbrough's comments are appropriate, even though the article is not the same. Dr. Hamilton's original article, "The Typology of David's Rise to Power: Messianic Patterns in the Book of Samuel," is available at http://www.sbts.edu/pdf/JBGay/the_typology_of_davids_rise_to_power2008-03-101.pdf.

²Apart from a couple of passing references to Patrick Fairbairn (1805-74), author of the classic *The Typology of Scripture: Viewed in Connection with the Whole Series of the Divine Dispensations* (5th ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1870).

³Subtitled *die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen* and later reprinted (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973).

⁴For a helpful compact survey of the data see John E. Alsup, "Typology," *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. David Noel Freedman; 6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 6:683f.

⁵The section in the essay called "Typology: Significance and Definition" cites characteristics of typology proposed by Ellis, Fishbane, Evans, and others but is

mainly concerned to establish that typology is a legitimate method and is not peshet. I did not find a clear and definite definition given.

Editor's note: The section to which Dr. Yarbrough refers is found in Dr. Hamilton's article, "The Typology of David's Rise to Power: Messianic Patterns in the Book of Samuel," under the subheading, "Typology: Significance and Definition." See http://www.sbts.edu/pdf/JBGay/the_typology_of_davids_rise_to_power2008-03-101.pdf.

⁶William G. Moorehead, "Typology," in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* (ed. James Orr; vol. 5 (Chicago: The Howard-Severance Company, 1915), 5:3029.

⁷One extreme is when almost everything found in the Old Testament is taken to point to Christ, a view that Moorehead attributes to certain church fathers and Andrew Jukes (in *The Law of the Offerings* [Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2004]). The other is that the only types in the Old Testament are the ones explicitly asserted somewhere in the New Testament, a view he attributes to Moses Stuart.

⁸E.g., in a very different vein from Hamilton, Seifrid says typology is not "a method by which [Paul] discovers . . . historical analogies to the narratives that appear in the biblical text" ("The Gospel as the Revelation of Mystery: The Witness of the Scriptures to Christ in Romans," *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 11, no. 3 [Fall 2007]: 99). Typology is rather "a theology of history" (ibid.). In the same issue of that journal, Douglas Moo

("Paul's Universalizing Hermeneutic in Romans") points out that "typology is easier to talk about than to describe" and notes that "those who have attempted definitions do not always agree" (81). On the whole, Moo's definition (cf. ibid., 81-82) seems closer to Seifrid's than to Hamilton's.

⁹C. A. Evans ("New Testament Use of the Old Testament," in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology* [ed. T. D. Alexander and B. Rosner; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000], 73) concedes the presence of typology in the New Testament, though he subsumes it under "analogical" interpretation. It is striking that in this magisterial volume overall, "typology" receives no separate treatment and in fact little attention.

¹⁰Throughout the rest of this article, quotations without footnotes refer to Goldsworthy's lectures.

¹¹Examples: Kenton L. Sparks, *God's Word in Human Words: An Evangelical Appropriation of Critical Biblical Scholarship* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008); Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008); A. T. B. McGowan, *The Divine Authenticity of the Scripture: Retrieving an Evangelical Heritage* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2007). Commenting on this shift, especially with respect to Peter Enns, is G. K. Beale, *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism: Responding to New Challenges to Biblical Authority* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2008).

¹²Cf. Francis Schaeffer, *No Little People* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1974).

¹³Cf. D. A. Carson, "Systematic and Biblical Theology," in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, 100; idem, *The Gagging of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), passim.

¹⁴E. Earle Ellis, *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective* (Atlanta: SBL, 2001), 15. Ellis speaks specifically of typology. For a similar observation see Alsup, "Typology," 6:685.

¹⁵With all due regard for other verities without which the cross remains a torso, like Christ's incarnation, his perfect life, the hypostatic union, his resurrection, his ascension, his return, and so forth.