Was Joseph a Type of the Messiah? Tracing the Typological Identification between Joseph, David, and Jesus

James M. Hamilton

James M. Hamilton serves as Associate Professor of Biblical Theology at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. He previously served as Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary's Houston campus and was the preaching pastor at Baptist Church of the Redeemer in Houston, Texas. Dr. Hamilton has written many scholarly articles and is the author of *God's Indwelling Presence: The Ministry of the Holy Spirit in the Old and New Testaments* (B&H, 2006).

This typological way of reading the Bible is indicated too often and explicitly in the New Testament itself for us to be in any doubt that this is the "right" way of reading it—"right" in the only sense that criticism can recognize, as the way that conforms to the intentionality of the book itself and to the conventions it assumes and requires. . . . Naturally, being the indicated and obvious way of reading the Bible, and scholars being what they are, typology is a neglected subject, even in theology, and it is neglected elsewhere because it is assumed to be bound up with a doctrinaire adherence to Christianity (Northrop Frye, *The Great Code*).[1]

Introduction

How do we interpret the world and the events we experience? The world and the events that take place within it are not, after all, self-interpreting. In this essay I will argue that earlier biblical narratives so impacted later biblical authors that their minds, their vocabulary, and their interpretive framework were all shaped by what they read in earlier biblical narratives, chiefly the Pentateuch.[2] I will seek to demonstrate this from the way that later biblical authors frame their accounts to correspond with earlier stories. This essay will focus on narratives devoted to Joseph, David, and Jesus.

In the story of Joseph we find a certain pattern of events. The way that key aspects of this pattern of events drew attention, were passed down, and later written up by Moses may have been influenced by the story of Cain and Abel.[3] The presence of these elements in the Joseph story then exercised influence on the selection of events included in the stories of Moses,[4] Daniel,[5] Esther,[6] and Nehemiah.[7] Each of these instances could be studied in their own right, but in this essay we will focus on the narrative correspondences between Joseph and David before looking to Jesus. My contention in the first part of this essay is that the story of Joseph in Genesis 37–50 was a formative influence on the account of David produced by the author(s) of Samuel.[8] I will seek to show that the Joseph story had a world-view shaping impact upon the author(s) of Samuel. The Genesis account was so deeply pressed in that the shape of the thing left its mark, its type.[9]

My proposal is as follows: as a result of the deep impression made by the Joseph story, the life of David was interpreted by people who read what happened to David through the lens of Joseph.[10] In this sense Joseph functioned as a type of David. There was precedent for this in the way that the Joseph story influenced key points in the account of Moses, so once the narratives of Moses and David were presented in the "Josephic" pattern, it is plausible that expectations for more of the same would be generated. Once these patterns began to be recognized, which would have been possible for readers

of the Pentateuch because it contained the repeated patterns in the stories of Joseph and Moses, the patterns might be associated with Cain's enmity for Abel, Ishmael's for Isaac, and Esau's for Jacob. These typological patterns, where the one favored by God is rejected by his kinsmen, could have been understood as *prospective* in that they generated the expectation that future individuals in the line of promise, who experienced God's favor and kindness, would be expected to experience similar treatment.

In my view the prophet like Moses in Deut 18:15–18 should be understood in precisely this way—as pointing to a succession of prophets (that according to Deut 34:10–12 would culminate in one uniquely like Moses) who would experience a pattern of events similar to what Moses underwent in being raised up by God, rejected by the people, declaring the word of God, and being vindicated by God.[11] That is to say, the recognizable pattern (along with specific texts like Deuteronomy 18 and 34) pointed forward to others who would have parallel experiences. It also seems that Luke presents Jesus making this kind of typological association between the righteous prophets and their wicked opponents when he speaks of "the blood of all the prophets . . . from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah" (Luke 11:50–51).[12] All the righteous prophets have received the same kind of treatment from their wicked kinsmen, and the pattern will culminate in the murder of Jesus himself, for which reason Jesus asserts that all the blood of the prophets, "shed from the foundation of the world, may be charged against this generation" (11:50). There is historical correspondence between the way wicked opponents have treated the righteous

prophets, and the pattern undergoes a heightening or escalation of significance when the Messiah himself experiences the fullest expression of this pattern of events and is crucified. The pattern is typologically fulfilled in Jesus.

In an earlier essay I attempted to trace out the ways that David functioned as a type of Jesus the Messiah.[13] This essay will examine the Joseph story's impact on the author(s) of Samuel, then seek to show how the Joseph story also shaped the interpretive framework reflected in the New Testament. If what is presented here proves to be convincing, there is a natural point of application that flows from it: if biblical language, imagery, and patterns of events provide the interpretive matrix or grid of meaning through which later biblical authors interpreted the events they recount, what should those of us who seek to learn from the biblical authors use to form our own interpretive framework?[14]

I would offer the following working definition of typological interpretation: typological interpretation is canonical exegesis that observes divinely intended patterns of historical correspondence and escalation in significance in the events, people, or institutions of Israel, and these types are in the redemptive historical stream that flows through the Bible.[15] Some exposition of aspects of this definition will perhaps be helpful, starting with the last part first: (1) the progress of revelation through salvation history as recorded in the Bible functions as banks of the stream for typological interpretation. Things that are outside the banks of this stream do not match the "type" of interpretations that qualify as valid typological readings. (2) Divine intention points to God's sovereign, providential work in the

drama of human history. (3) Typological interpretation of the Bible looks for the ways the human authors of the Bible have "read" God's work in history, and it seeks to discern cues the human authors give as to how they have interpreted that work. (4) Typological interpretation then shapes the worldview of those who have learned interpretation from the biblical authors, and we who would learn from the biblical authors seek to interpret the world and our experiences in it in the same way that the biblical authors have. We seek to have our symbolic universe shaped by the symbolic universe portrayed in the Bible. We seek to build our interpretive framework after the pattern of the interpretive framework employed by the biblical authors. Our world is, as it were, read through the lens given to us by the Bible.

Was Joseph a Type of David?

Peter Leithart has written, "Like great novelists, the biblical writers repeat a theme, word, or image throughout a book, and it accumulates significance as it goes."[16] My argument that the author(s) of Samuel intended the book's audience to see that Joseph was a type of David will be based on three observable sets of data: (1) *linguistic correspondences*: the reuse of key phrases from the Joseph story points readers of the David narratives back to Genesis 37–50; (2) *sequential event correspondences*: the pattern of events in the David narrative broadly corresponds to the Joseph story both in terms of the events themselves and in terms of the chronological sequence in which the events are presented; and (3) *redemptive historical import*: both Joseph and David are presented as agents of salvation for God's people in fulfillment of promises

he has made. We turn to the evidence for each of these.

Linguistic Correspondences

As we begin to survey this evidence, it is important to note that the argument being presented is based on the accumulation of all the pieces of data to be surveyed below. Taken individually, a point of correspondence may seem incidental or easily dismissed. Taken all together, however, these are the kinds of correspondences that allusively draw the mind of someone reading the narratives of David to the narratives of Joseph, with the result that Joseph and David come to be associated with one another, even if not in an explicit or conscious way.[17] The authors of the biblical narratives are not heavy handed, nor do they invent material or falsify history. They do, however, make significant choices about which events or aspects of events to record, and they make linguistic choices regarding how to describe those events. These choices can function as intentional, if subtle, allusions to earlier narratives, and they can point us to the ways in which the biblical authors frame their interpretation of history to match earlier biblical patterns.

It is also helpful to consider the way that allusions work in our own language and culture. We know from our own experience that a unique phrase made up of common words that only occurs in a few places inevitably causes readers to associate the passages where the unique phrase occurs. Often we know the first instance of such a phrase, and we recognize that the author who reuses the same phrase consciously points his readers back to its original instance. So, for instance, words like "whom," "for," "bell," and "tolls" are very common in English literature. But

when Hemingway entitles his novel "For Whom the Bell Tolls" the allusion to John Donne's meditation is unmistakable.[18]

As it happens, there are only three instances in the text of the Old Testament (as reflected in BHS) where we find the phrase "shepherding the flock" in the form of the participle רֹעֶה with both the bet preposition and the article prefixed to the noun "flock" בַּצֹּאן.[19]

> Gen 37:2, Joseph was "shepherding the flock with his brothers"
> רֹעֶה אֶת־אֶחָיו בַּצֹּאן
> 1 Sam 16:11, David was "shepherding the flock" רֹעֶה בַּצֹּאן
> 1 Sam 17:34, David was "shepherding the flock"
> רֹעֶה הָיָה עַבְדְּךָ לְאָבִיו בַּצֹּאן

Flocks and shepherds are common in the Old Testament, but this combination of the terms in these forms is unique to these three verses. The use of the unique phrase referring to Joseph in Gen 37:2 by the author of Samuel with reference to David establishes a connection between Joseph and David. Others described in similar terms include Abel, Jacob, and Moses:

> Gen 4:2, Abel was shepherding the flock וַיְהִי־הֶבֶל רֹעֵה צֹאן
> Gen 30:36, Jacob was shepherding the flock וְיַעֲקֹב רֹעֶה אֶת־צֹאן לָבָן
> Exod 3:1, Moses was shepherding the flock וּמֹשֶׁה הָיָה רֹעֶה אֶת־צֹאן יִתְרוֹ

Outside of the six passages listed above, there are no other instances of particular individuals being described with the masculine singular participle of the verb "shepherding" taking "flock" as its object,[20] and the only instances in which "flock" has the prefixed preposition *bet* and the article are those that refer to Joseph and David.

A similar linkage between rare phrases occurs with the phrase "to shepherd the flock of the father," where the verb "shepherd" is in the *qal* infinitive construct with the *lamed* preposition followed by the marker of the definite direct object *et* connected to "flock of his/their father." The only two instances of this phrase are in Gen 37:12 and 1 Sam 17:5.[21]

> Gen 37:12,
> וַיֵּלְכוּ אֶחָיו לִרְעוֹת אֶת־צֹאן אֲבִיהֶם בִּשְׁכֶם׃
> 1 Sam 17:15, וְדָוִד הֹלֵךְ וָשָׁב מֵעַל שָׁאוּל לִרְעוֹת אֶת־צֹאן אָבִיו בֵּית־לָחֶם׃

These two phrases differ only in the pronominal suffix modifying the word "father." In Genesis Joseph's brothers are doing this action, while in 1 Samuel David is doing the action. We should not discount this as evidence because David is not described in terms that describe Joseph, for the reuse of the phrase from the Joseph narrative serves as another link between the two narratives.

Even the use of a more common phrase might be significant if it fits into a similar sequence of events. In other words, though the phrase "and they went" (וַיֵּלְכוּ) is very common in the Hebrew Bible, it may nevertheless remind readers of the David narratives in Samuel of the Joseph story in Genesis, since both Joseph's and David's older brothers are described this way. Joseph's brothers went off to shepherd the flock of their father (Gen 37:12), then Jacob sent Joseph to check on his brothers, at which point Joseph's brothers opposed him. Similarly, David's brothers went off to battle with Saul (1 Sam 17:13), then Jesse sent David to check on his brothers, at which point David's brothers reacted harshly to him. Then a few phrases later, in 1 Sam 17:15, we meet another phrase from Gen 37:12, noted above, "to shepherd the flock of the father." At the head of this parallel sequence of events, the phrase "and they went," though common,

is nevertheless a linguistic point of contact between the two narratives.

There are other linguistic connections between the Joseph and David narratives that overlap with points of sequential event correspondence, strengthening what might otherwise be a tenuous linguistic connection. For instance, it is relatively common for people to inquire about the "peace" (שָׁלוֹם) of others (e.g., Gen 29:6; 43:27; 1 Sam 10:4; 25:5; 2 Sam 8:10). Thus, as above with the phrase "and they went" describing the departure of both Joseph's and David's older brothers, it is not significant *in itself* that Joseph's father sent him to inquire about the "peace" of his brothers, and David's father later did the same (Gen 37:13–14; 1 Sam 17:17–18). But this item becomes significant when taken with the other linguistic ties and event sequence matches between the narratives. In view of (1) the already mentioned sequential event correspondences and (2) the role that both Joseph and David play in redemptive history, the fact that Joseph and David were both sent to see about the "peace" of their brothers is another link between the two narratives.

Even small words attract attention if they are only used in a few contexts. Texts that use the same rare word come to be associated with one another, as readers puzzle over a word they do not recognize. From ancient times students of the Bible have gathered all the instances of rare words in order to examine the rare word in context in an effort to determine its meaning.[22] This process would naturally result in the association of Gen 37:19, where Joseph's brothers refer to "this dreamer" using the rare demonstrative pronoun הַלָּזֶה,[23] with 1 Sam 17:26, where David refers to "this Philistine" using the related demonstrative pronoun הַלָּז, which is likewise rare.[24] The use of a rare but relatively easy to understand term (because of its apparent relationship to the more common forms זֶה and הַזֶּה)[25] would be one more commonality between the contexts that would cause them to be associated in the minds of the audience. It seems likely that the author(s) of Samuel were aware that this would take place, and that they intended it.

Another connection between the Joseph narratives in Genesis and the David narratives in Samuel is the unique "coat of many colors." This expression, כְּתֹנֶת פַּסִּים, is only found in two places in the Old Testament: in the description of the coat Joseph's brothers stripped off of him (Gen 37:3, 23, 32),[26] and in description of the robe that Tamar tore after Amnon sexually abused her (2 Sam 13:18–19). Again, the use of an expression unique to these two accounts links them. We also note that the presence in both narratives of a sexually abused woman named Tamar provides yet another occasion for readers of the David story in Samuel to engage in comparative and contrastive analysis with the Joseph story in Genesis (Genesis 38; 2 Samuel 13).[27]

Another linguistic connection overlapping with a sequential event connection is seen in the way that a phrase used by Joseph's brothers, when they mean to do him harm, is placed on the lips of King Saul by the author(s) of Samuel when Saul means to do David harm:

Gen 37:27, Joseph's brother's say, "Let not our hand be upon him" וְיָדֵנוּ אַל־תְּהִי־בוֹ
1 Sam 18:17, Saul says, "Let not my hand be upon him" אַל־תְּהִי יָדִי בּוֹ

These are the only two instances of the phrase "Let not my/our hand be" using

the expression אַל־תְּהִי with יָד in the Old Testament.[28] The phrase is the same, save the natural adjustment to the new context in 1 Samuel, and the event sequence is also the same. Joseph's brothers say this as they set about their opposition to Joseph, which results in his removal to Egypt. Saul says this as he sets about his opposition to David, which results in David fleeing Saul's presence for Philistine territory. This produces an alignment not only between the protagonists, Joseph and David, but also between their antagonists, Saul and Joseph's brothers.[29] This reality establishes a connection at the level of redemptive historical import as well, for in both cases the one whom God has acknowledged is opposed by his kinsmen.

Rather than belabor the point by discussing each and every instance of linguistic connection between the Joseph story and the David narratives, at this point I will simply list some other linguistic points of contact between the two passages:

Taken individually, these linguistic correspondences might seem threads too weak to tie up the case that the Joseph story was a formative influence on the author(s) of the narratives concerning David in Samuel. But taken all together we have a cord of far more than three strands, and I submit that these sixteen points of linguistic contact form one not easily broken. There are other points of linguistic contact not noted above,[35] to say nothing of those I might not have noticed. Moreover, this interwoven cord is itself reinforced by the similarities in both the sequences of events and the redemptive historical import of both Joseph and David. To these we now turn.

Sequential Event Correspondences

Both Joseph and David are young sons of old fathers, and both have older brothers (Gen 37:2–3; 1 Sam 16:11; 17:12). Both Joseph and David are shepherding the flock (Gen 37:2; 1 Sam 16:11; 17:34). Both Joseph and David are designated as God's

Linguistic Points of Contact Not Discussed above

Genesis 37–50	Samuel
Gen 38:1, 12, 20 Adullamite	1 Sam 22:1 Cave of Adullam[31]
Gen 38:26 Judah says of Tamar, "she has been more righteous than I because . . ." וַיֹּאמֶר צָדְקָה מִמֶּנִּי כִּי־	1 Sam 24:17 Saul says to David, "you have been more righteous than I because . . . " וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־דָּוִד צַדִּיק אַתָּה מִמֶּנִּי כִּי
Gen 37:5, 9; 39:2, 3, 21, 23; 48:21 Yahweh was with Joseph[32]	1 Sam 16:18; 17:37; 18:12, 14, 28 Yahweh was with David[33]
Gen 39:3 Yahweh causes everything Joseph does to succeed	1 Sam 16:18; 18:5, 14–16, 30 Yahweh with David to make him successful[34]
Gen 39:4 Joseph found favor in Potiphar's sight וַיִּמְצָא יוֹסֵף חֵן בְּעֵינָיו	1 Sam 16:22 David found favor in Saul's sight כִּי־מָצָא חֵן בְּעֵינָי
Gen 39:6 Joseph's handsome appearance יְפֵה־תֹאַר וִיפֵה מַרְאֶה׃	1 Sam 16:12, 18 David's handsome appearance 1 Sam 16:12, יְפֵה עֵינַיִם וְטוֹב רֹאִי 1 Sam 16:18, וְאִישׁ תֹּאַר
Gen 41:26 Joseph "stood before" Pharaoh בְּעָמְדוֹ לִפְנֵי	1 Sam 16:21 David "stood before" Saul וַיַּעֲמֹד לְפָנָיו
Gen 41:38 Joseph has the Spirit	1 Sam 16:14 David has the Spirit

chosen—Joseph through his dreams, and David when Samuel anoints him. Both Joseph and David have a father who apparently does not expect greatness from them—Joseph's father responds with incredulity to his dreams (Gen 37:5–10), and when Samuel came to anoint one of his sons as king, Jesse only summoned David from the field after Samuel passed over all of David's brothers (1 Sam 16:8–13). Both Joseph and David are described as handsome (Gen 39:6; 1 Sam 16:12, 18). Both Joseph and David have older brothers who go away—Joseph's brothers to shepherd the flock (1 Sam 37:12), and David's brothers go with Saul (1 Sam 17:13). Both Joseph and David are sent by their fathers to see how their brothers are doing (Gen 37:13–14; 1 Sam 17:17–18).[36] Both Joseph and David meet with animosity from their older brothers—Joseph's brothers put him in a pit and sell him into slavery (Gen 37:18–36), and David's brother answers him harshly (1 Sam 17:28).

Both Joseph and David meet opposition from their brothers, succeed, face more affliction, and ultimately prevail as God's deliverer for his people. Once Joseph's brothers sell him into slavery in Egypt, Joseph succeeds in Potiphar's house and Potiphar entrusts everything to him (Gen 39:1–5). Once David has been answered harshly by his brother, he goes on to slay Goliath (1 Sam 17:49–51), having ministered to King Saul by playing the harp when the evil spirit troubled him (16:23). Then, just as Joseph was desired by Potiphar's wife and refused her (Gen 39:7–12), Saul offered his daughter Merab to David, and he refused her (1 Sam 18:17–19). David was then desired by Saul's daughter Michal, and Saul sought to use her as a snare against David (1 Sam

18:20–21). After Joseph fled, Potiphar's wife lied about him (Gen 39:17–18), and after David fled Michal told a lie about him (1 Sam 19:17). The lies of Potiphar's wife were the cause of more affliction for Joseph (Gen 39:13–20), and in David's flight he found no little affliction, including his wife Michal being given to another man (1 Sam 25:44). Saul planned to use his daughters as snares for David (1 Sam 18:17, 21). David retook Michal (2 Sam 3:13–16), but she eventually turned against him (2 Sam 6:16–23). The authors of the two narratives are explicit on the point that Yahweh was with Joseph and David and caused them to succeed in everything they did, in spite of all affliction and opposition (see the references in the chart above).

Joseph's brothers sold him into slavery, which took him out of the promised land. Saul hurled his spear at David, which forced him to flee the promised land (e.g., 1 Sam 19:10; 21:10; 27:1). Both Joseph and David were pleasing to Gentile kings and prospered among foreigners—Pharaoh was only greater than Joseph with respect to the throne (Gen 41:40), and Achish was ready to take David into battle until the other Philistine lords objected (1 Sam 29:1–11).

Both Joseph and David were thirty years old when they rose to power (Gen 41:46; 2 Sam 5:4). Exalted to power in Egypt, Joseph forgave his brothers and showed kindness to them (Gen 45:1–15; 46:31–34; 50:19–21). Anointed as king over Israel, David refused to lift his hand against Saul—though Saul sought to kill him (e.g., 1 Sam 26:8–11)—and David later forgave Mephibosheth, who prostrated himself before David much the way Joseph's brothers had prostrated themselves before him (cf. Gen 50:18; 2

Sam 9:6–8). Joseph married an Egyptian woman, daughter of a priest, and had sons by her (Gen 41:50–52, cf. Moses, who also married the daughter of a Gentile priest and had sons by her, Exod 2:16–22). David also married a Gentile, the daughter of the king of Geshur, and had a son by her (2 Sam 3:3).

Joseph interceded with Pharaoh on behalf of his family (Gen 46:31–47:12). David interceded with the king of Moab on behalf of his (1 Sam 22:3–4). Once Joseph made himself known to his brothers, he provided land and grain for his father's house, delivering them from the threat of the famine (Gen 47:27). Once David was acknowledged as king over all Israel, he provided rest for the land, delivering the people from all their enemies round about (2 Sam 7:1; 8:1–14).

As with the linguistic connections, so with the correspondences between the sequence of events in the narratives of Joseph and David: isolated examples taken alone might be easy to dismiss, but the accumulation of example after example, in my judgment, places the burden of proof on those who would deny that the author(s) of Samuel sought to establish a connection between Joseph and David. The events recorded and the language used to record them point in the direction of David being described with terms that describe events well known from the Joseph story. This conclusion is independently confirmed by Robert Alter's analysis, where he concludes (from a different perspective) regarding the use of the Genesis narratives in Samuel: "From such purposeful deployment of allusion, the inference is inevitable that the author of the David story was familiar at least with the J strand of the Joseph story in a textual version very like the one that has come down to us."[37]

Those of us who affirm that these events took place, of course, will see another hand at work in the shaping of history. A divine hand orchestrated what took place such that key patterns of events recurred in the lives of Joseph, David, and the others mentioned above in the introduction. That divine hand then guided the interpreters of those events, with the result that the descriptions of earlier instances of these patterns became the interpretive grid through which later describers of similar patterns interpreted the history they set down. Thus, the good guys are identified by the Lord himself, opposed by their kinsmen and driven away to Gentile territory, where they marry, have children, and are delivered from every affliction, vindicated by God, and then turn up triumphant to deliver their own people, who find forgiveness for their earlier evil opposition to God's chosen agent of salvation. This pattern can be seen in Joseph and David, as well as in Moses and others (such as Jephthah and Samson).

Redemptive Historical Import

Genesis 3:15 points to a seed of the woman who will crush the serpent's head.[38] Genesis 5:29 indicates that the godly line traced in the genealogies expected a seed of the woman who would reverse the curses (cf. Gen 5:29 with Gen 3:17–19). Genesis 12:1–3 announces that all the families of the earth will be blessed by Abraham, and 22:18 adds that the blessing will come through the seed of Abraham.[39] Genesis 17:6 and 16 say kings will come from Abraham, and a natural conclusion to draw is that the seed of Abraham through whom the nations will be blessed

will be a king. The blessing of Abraham is passed to Isaac (Gen 26:2–5), then to Jacob (28:3–4). Then Joseph becomes lord of all Egypt (45:9), and he provides food for all the peoples of the earth (Gen 41:56–57). With Joseph delivering the Gentiles from famine, then providing for his brothers, there is a sense in which all the families of the earth have been blessed through the seed of Abraham. Regarding Joseph's treatment of his brothers, it is interesting to observe that the guilty have their feet washed (Gen 44:24) and eat bread when Joseph comes (44:25).

One might expect from the Joseph narrative that the blessing of Abraham, having been passed through Isaac to Jacob, would be realized through a deliverer from the line of Joseph, especially since Jacob blesses Joseph's sons (Gen 48:14–20). This was not to be, however, and 1 Chron 5:1–2 (ESV) explains:

> The sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel (for he was the firstborn, but because he defiled his father's couch,[40] his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph the son of Israel, so that he could not be enrolled as the oldest son; though Judah became strong among his brothers and a chief came from him, yet the birthright belonged to Joseph).

This text clearly states that though the birthright went to Joseph, the blessing of Abraham was not realized through a leader from Joseph's line. Rather, the chief came from the line of Judah. This refers to the line of David, who descended from Judah, and even in the Joseph narrative there are ways in which Judah shines.[41] Joseph had told his brothers they would not see him again unless they brought Benjamin with them. Jacob was understandably reluctant to entrust Benjamin to the care of his sons. When Reuben offered

his own sons as surety for Benjamin's life, Jacob refused Reuben's offer (Gen 42:37–38). But when Judah offered his own life as surety for Benjamin's, Jacob sent his beloved son to Egypt with Judah (43:8–14). Then Jacob blessed Judah with the ruler's staff that would never depart from him (49:8–12).

In a sense the redemptive historical import of Joseph approximates the redemptive historical import of David. Joseph delivers his kinsmen, but he is not king in the promised land. The promise of a king to Abraham preceded the Joseph narrative in Genesis 17, and another indication of a king follows it in Gen 49:8–12. The Balaam oracles reiterate the expectation of a king who will lead Israel to peace and security (Num 23:21; 24:7, 17), and regulations for the king are stated in Deut 17:14–20.[42] Early students of the Pentateuch, then, who might have noticed the parallels between Joseph, Moses, and others, might have expected future deliverers of Israel to have similar experiences, but they might also have been hoping for a righteous king. These aspects of the Pentateuch could have fostered the hope for one like Joseph but greater than he, king in the land.

It may have been just such an expectation that resulted in what is being argued here, namely, that the author(s) of Samuel shaped the narratives concerning David such that readers were pointed back to the Joseph stories. More happened in David's life than is recorded in the narratives of Samuel. One instance of this will illustrate the point: when the author(s) of Samuel framed up the story of David killing Goliath, was it necessary to include the details recounted above that are so reminiscent of Joseph? Was it necessary to record that David, the young son of

an aged father, had older brothers who had gone off with Saul, and that Jesse sent David to his brothers to see how they were doing? Was it necessary to include the interchange between David and his brother Eliab? It would seem that there could have been other places in the narrative where the details of David's family could have been recorded. Since 1 Samuel 16 closes with David serving Saul by playing the harp for him, the material about Jesse sending David to check on his brothers could have been left out. Since David was designated as Saul's armor bearer in 1 Sam 16:21, it would have been natural for David to be at the front to hear the Philistine's taunts, and the narrative could have carried forward with David's response to and triumph over Goliath. If verses that tell of David's family and his going back and forth from his father to his brothers, such as 1 Sam 17:12–15, 17–20a, had been left out, the narrative would have proceeded without interruption from David as Saul's armor bearer to his confrontation with Goliath. I contend that the author(s) of Samuel included what they did not only because it happened that way (again, much else that happened was not included), but also in order to highlight the historical correspondences between Joseph and David. As Leithart puts it, "Through analogy, the writer guides his reader's responses and judgments about characters and events."[43] The fact that David goes on to be king in Israel provides the note of escalation, making David, in a sense, a typological fulfillment of Joseph. Between Joseph and David, there are points of historical correspondence, and there is an escalation of significance from Joseph to David. It seems to me that the author(s) of Samuel sought to establish these things, and succeeded.

While the redemptive historical import of David goes beyond that of Joseph, since David is king in the land of promise, still David cannot build the temple. His seed, however, will do so. The seed of David will see his throne established forever, be as a son to Yahweh his father, and the kingdom of David will be established through him (2 Sam 7:12–16). Like Joseph, who embodies aspects of the realization of the promise, but whom the narrative points beyond to one greater, so also the narratives of Samuel point beyond David to his greater descendant. Psalm 110 also points beyond David, and Luke presents Jesus pointing this out (Luke 20:41–44).

Before we move to the question of whether Joseph was a type of Christ, a summary of my argument in this first section is in order. I have pointed to linguistic points of contact between the narratives of Joseph and David, summarized correspondences between the two narratives at the level of historical event sequences, and described the roles played by Joseph and David in the outworking of God's promise to crush the head of the serpent and bless all the families of the earth as promised in the blessing of Abraham. The argument here is that history developed this way because God intended these patterns of events to be repeated in the lives of Joseph and David. Further, the author(s) of Samuel wrote what they wrote the way they wrote it in order to show that Joseph was a type of David, and having pointed readers of the narratives back to Joseph, they then pointed their audience beyond David to his seed. The next question to be considered is this: if Joseph was a type of David, was he also a type of the Messiah?

If Joseph Was a Type of David, Was He Also a Type of the Messiah?

In order to establish whether or not the early Christian perspectives reflected in the New Testament indicate that Joseph was a type of the Messiah, we will ask two questions: first, given David's role as a type of the Messiah,[44] and having argued for Joseph's role as a type of David, are there passages in the Gospels that reflect patterns that are closer to Genesis than to Samuel? And second, are there passages in the New Testament that make a connection between Joseph and Jesus? What follows below argues for an affirmative answer to both questions, and the argument is that the patterns in the Gospels are typological patterns, as are the connections between Joseph and Jesus made by Stephen in his speech in Acts 7. Because Acts 7 draws explicit connections between Joseph and Jesus, we will take it first, then move back to the connections seen in the Gospel narratives.

Stephen's Speech in Acts 7

Stephen "was doing great wonders and signs" (Acts 6:8) in Jerusalem when he was opposed by the Synagogue of the Freedmen and others (6:9). When they could not overcome his wisdom and the Spirit in which he spoke (6:10), they cooked up three charges against him: (1) "we heard him speaking blasphemous words against Moses and God" (6:11); (2) "this man does not cease speaking words against this holy place and the law" (6:13); and (3) "we heard him saying that this Jesus the Nazarene will destroy this place and change the customs which Moses handed over to us" (6:14). Stephen then addressed the high priest and the Sanhedrin (6:12; 7:1). He told them about Abraham and the Patriarchs (7:2–8); Joseph

and the sojourn in Egypt (7:9–16); Moses, the exodus, Sinai, and the wilderness rebellion (7:17–43); the tent of testimony and Solomon's temple (7:44–50). Then he indicted them (7:51–53). In response, they gnashed their teeth (7:54), threw him out of town, and stoned him (7:58). Evidently what Stephen said to them was more than the innocuous history lesson it seems to be at first glance.

Stephen answered the three charges leveled against him, but something in his words caused the Sanhedrin to set aside all concern for judicial proceeding. The highest council of the Jewish people was so enraged at what Stephen said (7:54) that they took immediate, deadly action. Perhaps the violent reaction to Stephen resulted from the way that his speech typologically identified his opponents with the wicked throughout Israel's history, while at the same time identifying the early Christians, and most especially Jesus, with the righteous in Israel who, like all the prophets, were opposed by their wicked kinsmen throughout Israel's history.

Typology is not all there is in Stephen's speech. He answers the charge of speaking "against this holy place" (6:13), for instance, by showing that God is not limited to the land of Israel, the city of Jerusalem, or temple mount. Yahweh appeared to Abraham in Mesopotamia (7:2), and Abraham had no foothold in the land (7:5). Similarly, Yahweh appeared to Moses at Sinai (7:30), and then even though Yahweh took up residence in the temple, Isaiah taught that Yahweh's footstool would be not merely the ark but the earth, which Yahweh created as his dwelling place (7:44–50). These statements seem to represent Stephen's efforts to place the temple mount in Jerusalem in

proper biblical-theological perspective.

We can see also that Stephen responded to the charge of speaking against God and Moses by endorsing what Moses wrote about God (7:2–40 all comes from the Pentateuch), and he was probably responding to the charge of teaching that Jesus would change the regulations of Moses when he alluded to Moses teaching that God would raise up a prophet like himself (7:37). The bit about Jesus destroying the temple may reflect Jesus' statements regarding the temple in John 2:19 (cf. 2:21)[45] and the false charges brought against Jesus in Mark 14:58, with the taunt as he was crucified in Mark 15:29. The early Christians saw believers as the replacement of the temple (cf. 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; 1 Pet 2:5),[46] so this charge against Stephen may even be a distortion of such teaching, to which Stephen's comments about God not being limited to the land of Israel also apply.[47]

Still, the Sanhedrin had kept its cool in the face of early Christian teaching in other cases, such as when Peter and John declared they would obey God rather than man (Acts 4:19). What Peter and John did not do was declare that their opponents had aligned themselves with those who had opposed and killed the prophets throughout Israel's history. This Stephen did, and it got him killed.

Stephen's indictment of his opponents in Acts 7:51–53 provides the key information for understanding why his remarks were so incendiary. Luke presents Stephen saying,

> You stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Spirit. As your fathers did, so do you. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? And they killed those who announced beforehand the coming of the Righteous One, whom you

have now betrayed and murdered, you who received the law as delivered by angels and did not keep it (Acts 7:51–53, ESV).

The statement "you always resist the Holy Spirit" is exposited by the words that follow, "As your fathers did, so do you" (Acts 7:51). In other words, the resisting of the Holy Spirit to which Stephen refers are the actions of the "fathers" he has enumerated to this point in his discourse. The "fathers" resisted Joseph and sold him into slavery in Egypt (7:9), and they are identified in that section of Stephen's speech as "the patriarchs" (7:9) and as the "fathers" (7:11, 12, 15). Similarly, the "fathers" resisted Moses (7:25–28), and with respect to Moses Stephen elaborates on the point: "This is the Moses who said to the Israelites, 'God will raise up for you a prophet like me from your brothers. . . . Our fathers refused to obey him, but thrust him aside, and in their hearts they returned to Egypt" (7:35, 39).[48] The formula in Stephen's words, as they did so you do, is the kind of comparative statement used when typological interpretations are being made. John Polhill puts it well: "The whole purpose of Stephen's speech now becomes clear. His historical survey had illustrated Israel's constant rejection of God's chosen leaders. Moses, Joseph, the prophets are all types of and pointers to Christ; and Stephen pointed out to his hearers that they had already killed him."[49] A possible implication of Stephen's theology and teaching might be that his opponents concern for present Jerusalem—rather than being concerned with the worship of God through his Messiah—is analogous to returning to Egypt.[50] Perhaps another part of what infuriated Stephen's opponents was their perception that he had identified

Jerusalem with Egypt (cf. Acts 7:39; Gal 4:25; Rev 11:8).

Stephen charged his opponents with "always" acting this way, just as their fathers did, and the examples he gave of those whom the fathers resisted are Joseph and Moses.[51] These two, however, Stephen treats as "typical." That is, the fathers' treatment of Joseph and Moses is paradigmatic. Thus, Stephen asks, "Which of the prophets did your fathers not persecute?" (Acts 7:52).[52] His statement in Acts 7:52, "they killed those who announced beforehand the coming of the Righteous One," is very similar to the words of Jesus quoted above, regarding the blood of all the prophets from Abel to Zechariah being charged to that generation (Luke 11:50–51). Stephen seems to be interpreting history the same way Jesus did, and just as Jesus could charge that generation with the blood of all the prophets because of the way they treated him, so Stephen asserts that "you have now betrayed and murdered" Jesus (Acts 7:52).[53]

Stephen apparently read his own situation and the recent events that had taken place with Jesus through the lens of the Old Testament, with particular reference in this instance to Joseph and Moses. He identified Jesus and the early Christians with those to whom God had shown favor, and he identified the Jewish opponents of Jesus and the early Christians with Joseph's brothers and Moses' kinsmen who opposed and rejected them.[54] Luke has read the events this way as well, for he links Stephen and Moses when he records Stephen saying that Moses did "wonders and signs" (7:36) having noted that Stephen himself was doing "wonders and signs" when the opposition rose up against him (6:8).[55] There are also clear parallels between the deaths of Stephen and Jesus (Acts 7:59–60; Luke 23:34, 46). This typological identification of Stephen's opponents with the wicked in Israel's history is the basis for Stephen's charge that his opponents are "stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears [who] always resist the Holy Spirit" (Acts 7:51). Polhill points out that Stephen has in essence turned the charges made against him back upon his opponents: "No, it was not he but his Jewish accusers who were the real lawbreakers (v. 53). They were the apostates and idolaters who had constantly transgressed the first Commandments."[56] And his opponents seem to understand precisely these implications of his words: they understand that he has identified them with Joseph's brothers and with the wicked Israelites who opposed Moses. They understand that he claims that Jesus is the prophet like Moses precisely because in Jesus is seen the fullest expression of this "typical" pattern of events—God's chosen and anointed, rejected by the people, vindicated by God. They understand, and they will not tolerate such assertions. Gnashing their teeth, they stone him.

What I have argued above regarding the narratives of Samuel, namely, that the author(s) of Samuel shaped their narratives so as to match their account of David to the Joseph story, also holds, in my view, with what Luke has done in his Gospel and in Acts. Luke Timothy Johnson writes regarding Luke's account of Stephen's speech in Acts 7:

> And in the case of both Joseph and Moses, Luke has edited his account in such fashion as to show how each fits into a pattern of twofold sending and rejection, so that these biblical *exempla* point forward to the twofold sending and rejection of the prophet Jesus. By this editing

of the biblical narrative, Luke not only reinforces the fundamentally *prophetic* character of Scripture and its heroes, but by doing this supports the ideological position of his community that Scripture is best understood when read as pointing toward the risen prophet Jesus. . . . And he does all this within the tight limits set by the text of the LXX itself, whose wording he consistently employs.[57]

Gospels Reflecting Genesis Rather Than Samuel

As we turn now to the narratives concerning Jesus in the Gospels, our concern is to show that the Joseph story has not only influenced the Gospel narratives by means of its influence on the narratives of David but has had a direct influence on the narratives concerning Jesus in the Gospels. To establish this I will highlight two points of linguistic contact between Luke's Gospel and the Joseph story as translated into Greek. From there we will consider event sequence correspondences between Joseph and Jesus, before considering the redemptive historical import of the two.

Linguistic Correspondences

The claim here is not that these are the only two points of linguistic correspondence between the Joseph narratives in Genesis and the Jesus narratives in the Gospels, but this discussion will focus on two from Luke's Gospel. Rather than take them in the order in which they appear in the Gospel, we will begin by looking at one that appears in the parable of the wicked tenants. The second appears in a comment Luke makes as the narrator of the Gospel. I take them in this order because I think it likely that Jesus interpreted his life through the lens given to him from the Joseph story, and from this his followers learned to do

likewise. Read this way, the comment made by Luke becomes an indication that he is interpreting the Old Testament the way that Jesus did, and at the same time interpreting Jesus the way that Jesus interpreted himself.

The parable of the wicked tenants (Luke 20:9–18) is in some ways an interpretation of the whole history of Israel.[58] The planting of the vineyard (Luke 20:9) is reminiscent of Isaiah's love song for Yahweh's vineyard (Isa 5:1–7), where the vineyard is explicitly identified as Israel and Judah (5:7).[59] When Jesus finishes the parable, Luke relates that "the scribes and the chief priests sought to lay hands on him at that very hour, for they perceived that he had told this parable against them" (Luke 20:19, ESV), so they clearly understood that Jesus was identifying them as the wicked tenants, who beat the servants sent to them by the owner of the vineyard (20:9–12). Israel's history of afflicting the prophets Yahweh sent to them, from Moses to Jeremiah, makes it easy to identify the prophets with the servants the wicked tenants reject.[60] Significant figures, such as Moses, Joshua, Samson, and David, are identified as the Lord's servant in the Old Testament.[61]

From this perspective, Stephen's speech in Acts 7 is simply a more explicit version of Jesus' parable of the wicked tenants in Luke 20, and the parable of the wicked tenants is a thinly veiled exposition of the statement about the blood of all the prophets from Abel to Zechariah (Luke 11:49–51). In the parable, the owner of the vineyard decides to send his beloved son (20:13). The audience of Luke's Gospel has had Jesus identified as the beloved son at his baptism (3:22), and some manuscripts have "beloved son" rather than "my son, the chosen one" at

the transfiguration (9:35, cf. KJV). Luke presents Jesus routinely referring to himself as the son of man, but Jesus' opponents may have been aware of the occasions when the demons confessed Jesus as "son of God" (4:41; 8:28), and they may have heard that Jesus said the kind of thing Luke records at 10:22. The audience of Luke's gospel has every indication that the beloved son in the parable of the wicked tenants is to be identified with Jesus, and it is likely that Jesus' audience would have understood him that way as well.

As with Joseph and David, the father in the parable sends the son to see about his own, and the son will meet with a harsh response from those to whom the father has sent him. Here we meet the linguistic connection to the Joseph story in Genesis, for the words that Jesus places on the lips of the wicked tenants are the very words of the Greek translation of Genesis 37:20: ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, "let us kill him" (Luke 20:14).[62] It seems likely that in telling this parable that summarizes the history of Israel's rejection of the prophets, Jesus has chosen the very language of a significant early instance in Israel's history when the patriarchs themselves rejected Joseph, the one whom God had designated as preeminent through his dreams.

The parallel accounts of the parable of the wicked tenants in Matthew 21 and Mark 12 strengthen the allusion by including the first word of the phrase in Gen 37:20—the patriarchs words are rendered, δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, "come, let us kill him" (Gen 37:20). This three word phrase occurs in Matthew 21:38 and Mark 12:7, and some manuscripts include δεῦτε ("come") in Luke 20:14. Genesis 37:20, Matt 21:38, and Mark 12:7 are the only three places in all of biblical Greek where this three word phrase occurs.[63]

Whatever language Jesus was speaking (Aramaic? Greek?) when he told this parable, the evangelists present him alluding to the Joseph narrative. It would seem that the evangelists present Jesus telling a parable that encapsulates the way that Israel treated the prophets God sent to her, and as he presents himself as the ultimate example of one who will receive this treatment,[64] as God's beloved son, he uses the very language of the Joseph story to depict the way that his opponents will respond to him. Luke presents the opponents understanding exactly what Jesus is saying and wanting to seize him in response. This parable, with its linguistic connection to the Joseph story, with the event sequence correspondence of the father sending the son, who is then rejected, and with the redemptive historical import of Jesus as the last of a long line of figures whom the owner of the vineyard has sent to his tenants, indicates that Jesus understood himself as the typological fulfillment of this pattern, which means that Jesus understood himself as the typological fulfillment of a pattern to which the Joseph story made a key contribution.

The other point of linguistic correspondence to examine here indicates that Luke the evangelist had learned this perspective and reflects it in a narratorial comment. After Joseph told his second dream to his father, his father rebuked him (Gen 37:10), his brothers envied him (37:11a), and then we read, "but his father kept the saying in mind" (37:11b, ESV). The Greek translation of this phrase in Gen 37:11b reads, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ διετήρησεν τὸ ῥῆμα. The point of contact with this in Luke comes when the parents of Jesus, having searched for him for three days, find him and his mother said, "Son,

66

why have you treated us so? Behold, your father and I have been searching for you in great distress" (Luke 2:48). The parents of Jesus were understandably worried, and we might not be mistaken to see a rebuke in the words of Mary. Jesus then responds (2:49). Luke relates that his parents did not understand (2:50), and that Jesus went home and was submissive (2:51a). Luke 2:51b then states, "And his mother treasured up all these things in her heart" (ESV). In order to see how similar the words Luke places on the lips of Mary are to the Greek translation of the words of Jacob, it will be helpful to set them one on top of another:

Gen 37:11, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ διετήρησεν τὸ ῥῆμα
Luke 2:51, καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ διετήρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αυτῆς

Luke's phrase matches the Greek of Genesis 37 lexically and syntactically, with the articular subject modified by the possessive pronoun, followed by the same verb, with the same object.[65] Like Joseph's father, who "kept the thing," Jesus' mother "was keeping all these things," and in both cases the narrator makes this comment after the parent has rebuked the child. Luke seems to want to remind his readers of Jacob's words to Joseph near the beginning of his account of Jesus, with the result that they will interpret other aspects of the life of Jesus through the lens of Joseph, just as Jesus interpreted his own life through the lens of Joseph.

Sequential Event Correspondences

The linguistic correspondences just discussed serve, in my view, as cues to the audience of Luke's gospel. The audience is to take these cues and follow them. Jesus is like Joseph, who was a key early figure in the pattern of Israel's treatment of those God raised up to deliver her. We will have more to say about the redemptive historical import of this in the next section, here we will highlight some sequential event correspondences between Joseph and Jesus.

Luke's notation that Jesus "was about thirty years of age" (Luke 3:23, ESV) is almost certainly included to draw the minds of his readers to the only other two figures the Bible says were thirty years old: Joseph (Gen 41:46) and David (2 Sam 5:4).[66] This instance is another one where event sequence overlaps with linguistic correspondence. The Greek translation of Gen 41:46 has the two word phrase, ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, to describe Joseph's thirty years, this same two word phrase is used to describe Jesus being "about" thirty years of age in Luke 3:23. The two words are transposed in 2 Samuel. The significance of this notice at the level of event sequence comes in the fact that in each case the age is noted at the beginning of the figure's public service: Joseph as he begins to serve Pharaoh, David as he begins to reign over Israel and Judah, and Jesus as he begins to bring in the kingdom.

The genealogy follows the notice that Jesus was thirty years old in Luke (3:23–38); then Jesus faces temptation in the wilderness (4:1–13). There is a woeful pattern of sexual misbehavior in the Old Testament seen in Judah with Tamar, Samson with Delilah, David with Bathsheba, and Solomon with his multiplied wives, but Joseph resisted the temptation of Potiphar's wife (Gen 37:7–9). Similarly, Jesus resisted Satan's temptations (Luke 4:1–13). Just as Joseph's righteous conduct was twisted by Potiphar's wife

and used against him (Gen 37:11–20), so also the righteous mighty deeds of Jesus were twisted and used against him (e.g., the charge that he drove out demons by Beelzebul, Luke 11:15). God was with Joseph (e.g., Gen 39:21), and Nicodemus knew that God was with Jesus (John 3:2).

Just as Joseph was sold for 20 shekels of silver (Gen 37:28), so also Jesus was sold for a sum of silver, 30 pieces (Matt 27:14–16). Just as Joseph's brothers, sons of Israel, sold Joseph into the hands of Ishmaelite-Midianite traders (Gen 37:28), so the nations gathered together against Jesus (Acts 4:25–27; cf. Ps 2:1–2). Joseph's brothers had stripped him of the special coat his father gave him (Gen 37:23), and Jesus too was stripped of his seamless robe (Matt 27:28; John 19:23).

Joseph was in the pit (sometimes translated "dungeon" Gen 40:15) with two other criminals (40:4), one of whom was delivered while the other was destroyed (40:12–15, 18–22), hanged on a tree (40:19, 22; 41:13). As for Joseph, he insisted that he had done nothing to deserve his punishment (40:15). Jesus, too, was with two criminals, one who mocked him while the other was told by Jesus that he would be with him in paradise (Luke 23:43).[67] As for Jesus, Luke's gospel insists that Jesus was innocent (Luke 23:4, 14–15, 20, 23, 41, 47).

Joseph's brothers treated him as a dead man, and they fooled Israel into believing he was dead as well (Gen 37:31).[68] Joseph was not dead, however, even though his brothers thought he was "no more" (42:13). He was living and ruling over Gentiles in Egypt. Similarly, the Jewish leadership was convinced that Jesus was dead, and they tried to fool others into believing he was dead as well (Matt 28:11–15). But just as Joseph was alive, Jesus is alive and reigns over a largely Gentile church. When Joseph's brothers later appeared before him, they became conscious of their own sin toward him (42:21). Not realizing who he was, they bowed down to him. Joseph's dreams came true. Joseph then made himself known to his brothers (45:1–3), and it was as though he was back from the dead. The New Testament maintains that, like Joseph's brothers, those who have rejected Jesus will see the one they pierced (Rev 1:7; cf. Zech 12:10). Paul's words in Rom 11:25–27 can be interpreted to mean that, like Joseph's brothers, Jesus' kinsmen will bow to him when they behold him back from the dead.[69]

Redemptive Historical Import

Jesus is not simply one more example in this pattern. He is its culmination. He is its fulfillment. Joseph told his brothers that God sent him to Egypt to preserve life (Gen 45:5), to bring about a great deliverance (45:7). But that deliverance was only from famine. Jesus delivered his people from their sins. He broke the curse. As David Wells put it, the last defense against evil held, and in his death and resurrection Jesus has broken the back of evil.[70]

It may be that it was this pattern of the way that Israel rejected those God sent to her that made Jesus so certain that as the Messiah "it was necessary" for him to suffer (cf. Luke 9:22, 44; 12:50; 13:32–33; 17:25; 18:31–33; 24:25–26). And when Jesus "interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (24:27), it seems that he highlighted the ways that he fulfilled these typological patterns. Attending to these typological patterns would also explain Paul's preaching of the same themes (e.g., Acts 17:2–3).

Jesus is the climactic rejected prophet, and he is the risen king in the land. In his

death the exile reaches its nadir, and his resurrection begins the new exodus. The followers of Jesus are now sojourning in the wilderness, making their way to the promised land. And one day the new Jerusalem will descend from heaven, and we will see his face.

Conclusion

I have argued that Joseph was a type of David. This claim is based on the ways that the author(s) of Samuel makes use of the linguistic stock of the Joseph story, the way event sequences in the David narratives are matched to those in the Joseph story, and the roles Joseph and David play in redemptive history. And I have argued that Joseph is also a type of the Messiah. This claim is based on the explicit connection between the rejection of Joseph, Moses, and Jesus made by Stephen in Acts 7, on the linguistic connections to the Joseph story in the parable of the wicked tenants and in the way Mary "was keeping all these things," and on the correspondences in the sequences of events experienced by Joseph and Jesus. The authors of the Gospels have shaped their narratives to highlight points of historical correspondence between Joseph and Jesus, and their claim is that the significance of these historical events has been fulfilled in Jesus.

The story of the Bible is the story of the world.[71] This has implications for us. We should not only read the Bible typologically, the types we find in the Bible should shape the way we view the world.[72] With whom do we identify? Do we identify with the people of Sodom, who sinned and were destroyed? Or do we identify with Joseph and Jesus, who resisted temptation and were vindicated by God? Do we identify with Judas, who made his peace with the opponents of Jesus and took their money? Or do we identify with Jesus, who told his followers,

> If the world hates you, know that it has hated me before it hated you. If you were of the world, the world would love you as its own; but because you are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the word hates you. Remember the word that I said to you: 'A servant is not greater than his master.' If they persecuted me, they will also persecute you. If they kept my word, they will also keep yours (John 15:18–20, ESV).

Stephen Wright states, "it is important to restate that the position towards which Frei has pointed, and which many others have now stated from one angle or another, is that a recovery of true biblical faith in our generation must first be a matter not of defence [as in defending the historicity of the narratives, which Wright holds Christians should take for granted] . . . but of *inhabiting the story*."[73] Similarly, Peter Leithart writes, "the types of Scripture provide us with a set of names and symbols by which we may evaluate our world and which provide a motivation for action."[74]

The kind of typological interpretation that informed the author(s) of Samuel, Jesus, and the evangelists, appears to be the kind of typological interpretation we see in 1 Clement. The letter addresses division in the church in Corinth, and this division has apparently been caused by jealousy directed at the legitimate leadership of the church. Accordingly, Clement identifies the usurpers in the church with the wicked throughout Israel's history, and he identifies the legitimate leadership in the church with Abel, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and David (1 Clem 4:1–13).[75]

Peter Leithart has described this kind

of interpretation in terms of the biblical text absorbing the world:

> If the world absorbs the text, as in allegorical or historical-critical interpretation, we can discover nothing in the text that we did not know before; the text can only illustrate truths we learned from other sources, and it will not challenge or rebuke us. If the text absorbs the world, as typological interpretation demands, it is useful for correction, reproof, and training in righteousness. Interpreted typologically, Scripture is unleashed to function as revelation.

> And that, after all, is what it is.[76]

The final word goes to the Apostle Paul: "Now these things happened to them typologically, but they were written down for our instruction, on whom the end of the ages has come" (1 Cor 10:11).[77]

ENDNOTES

[1]Northrop Frye, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (Harvest, 2002), 79–80.

[2]This statement assumes that what the Bible claims for itself regarding the formation of the Canon is true. Thus, as Deut 31:24 and the many references to "the law of Moses" indicate, Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Joshua later added to what Moses had written (Josh 24:25–26; cf. Deut 31:24–26), as did Samuel (1 Sam 10:25). See Roger Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985). These narratives, then, would have been available by the time of David, when prophets and seers such as Samuel, Nathan, and Gad would have studied them, along with the king, who was commanded to do so in Deut 17:18–20. The very Davidic book of Psalms indicates that King David took Deuteronomy 17

seriously (cf. e.g., Psalm 1 and 19:7–11). The alternative picture constructed by modern critical scholarship is a house with no foundation built on sands of scholarly speculation. See, for instance, Duane Garrett, "The Undead Hypothesis: Why the Documentary Hypothesis is the Frankenstein of Biblical Studies," *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 5, no. 3 (2001): 28–41. Hans Frei has shown how the loss of confidence in the historical reliability of the Bible ended typological interpretation in *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale, 1974). For a brief summary of Frei's argument and the conclusion that "its main shortcoming seems to be that in one sense, Frei did not go far enough," see Stephen I. Wright, "Inhabiting the Story: The Use of the Bible in the Interpretation of History," in *"Behind" the Text: History and Biblical Interpretation* (ed. Craig Bartholomew, C. Stephen Evans, Mary Healy, and Murray Rae; Scripture and Hermeneutics Series 4; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003), 496.

[3]Like Abel, Joseph was shepherding the flock. Like Abel, Joseph was acknowledged by God. Like Abel, Joseph's brothers hate him unto death because of God's favor to him. Like Abel, Joseph's brothers do violence to him in the field. The enmity from brothers rejected by God directed at brothers accepted by God reappears in the accounts of Isaac and Ishmael and Jacob and Esau.

[4]Like Joseph, Moses was shepherding the flock. Like Joseph, Moses received a revelation that identified him as the agent of salvation for God's people. Like Joseph, Moses was rejected by God's people when he sought to lead them. Like Joseph, Moses was then separated

from God's people, and while he was removed from them he married the daughter of a gentile priest and sons were born to him. Like Joseph, after these things Moses became the agent of deliverance for God's people.

[5]Like Joseph, Daniel is held by the captain of the guard. Like Joseph, Daniel is brought before the king to interpret a troubling dream, which the magicians are unable to do. Like Joseph, Daniel asserts that interpretations belong to God. Like Joseph, Daniel declares the interpretation of the dream, in which God has revealed what he will do. Like Joseph, Daniel is recognized by the foreign ruler as one in whom the Spirit of God resides. Like Joseph, Daniel is given a gold chain around his neck and exalted to power by the foreign king.

[6]Like Joseph, Esther is virtually a slave in a foreign land. Like Joseph, she is described as being "handsome in form and appearance." Like Joseph, she is cleaned up and presented to the king. Like Joseph, she finds favor in the king's sight. The wording of her resolution is reminiscent of Israel's words (cf. Esth 4:16 and Gen 43:14), and like Joseph she makes requests of the king that benefit, yea, deliver the Jewish people from wicked opposition. There are also ways in which Mordecai corresponds to Joseph: like Joseph, Mordecai is rewarded by the king with new raiment and honored to ride in royal style with a herald before him. Like Joseph, Mordecai is a Jew in a foreign land who rises to second in command

under the king. My thanks to Mark Sherid for drawing my attention to Mordecai, which also prompted me to consider Esther herself.

[7]Like Joseph, Nehemiah is a Jew in a foreign land who has access to the king. Nehemiah is concerned for the state of the land of promise, and he makes requests of the king that benefit the Jews and their land. As with the opposition to Joseph and the others named in the foregoing footnotes, the opposition to Nehemiah is wicked.

[8]We do not know who wrote the books of Samuel, nor do we know how many people might have been involved in the project. The tradition in Baba Bathra 14b that Samuel wrote the parts of 1 Samuel that precede his death, and that the rest was completed by Gad the seer and Nathan the prophet appears to derive from 1 Chron 29:29, "Now the acts of King David, from first to last, are written in the Chronicles of Samuel the seer, and in the Chronicles of Nathan the prophet, and in the Chronicles of Gad the seer" (ESV).

[9]Cf. the range of meaning and the glosses for the word τύπος, "type" given in Walter Bauer, *A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (ed. Frederick W. Danker; 3rd ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000), 1019–1020: "(1) a mark made as the result of a blow or pressure, *mark, trace* . . . . (2) embodiment of characteristics or function of a model, *copy, image* . . . . (3) an object formed to resemble some entity, *image, statue* . . . . (4) a kind, class,

or thing that suggests a model or pattern, *form, figure, pattern* . . . . (5) the content of a document, *text, content* . . . . (6) an archetype serving as a model, *type, pattern, model* . . . ." (bold text removed).

[10]Cf. the discussion of the relationship between "formative narratives" and "world-view" in David Lyle Jeffrey, "(Pre) Figuration: Masterplot and Meaning in Biblical History," in *"Behind" the Text*, 365.

[11]Cf. D. A. Carson, "Review of Kenneth Berding and Jonathan Lunde, eds., *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*," *Themelios* 33, no. 3 (2008): 78–80: "Even if we accept that (at least some kinds of) types in the Old Testament are clearly predictive, would the human author of the first entry in a series of events/institutions that become a repeated pattern (i.e., a type) have understood that he was laying the cornerstone for a type? Doubtless God would know, and presumably the more discerning of later human authors would sooner or later discern the pattern, but why is it necessary or even plausible to assert that the author of the first entry would be so discerning?" (80). What I have suggested above leaves open the possibility that in the material that Moses used as he wrote Genesis, he saw the pattern in Abel, Isaac, and Jacob in a sense culminating in Joseph. The influence this material had on Moses could have then prompted him to see significance in the elements in his own experience that corresponded to Joseph's, and then as he wrote Deut 18:15–18 he

could plausibly have had in mind future prophets who would have similar experiences. Assuming that the Deuteronomy 34 account of Moses' death and the observation that no one like Moses had yet arisen was written by someone other than Moses, perhaps Joshua, we might nevertheless see a hint of the Deut 18:15–18 prophecy culminating in a unique figure whose word Yahweh would enforce. In this case, the foreshadowing in the typological pattern might have been intended by the earliest of the biblical authors, Moses himself.

[12]Though he is mainly concerned with the order of the books in the OT canon, nevertheless Roger Beckwith's discussion of this text is stimulating for the light it sheds on what Jesus and the evangelists intended in the words of Matth 23:34–36, paralleled in Luke 11:49–51 (*The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church*, 212–34).

[13]See my Julius Brown Gay Lecture presented at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary on March 13, 2008, "The Typology of David's Rise to Power: Messianic Patterns in the Book of Samuel." Online in audio: http://www.sbts.edu/media/audio/JBGay/20080313hamilton.mp3 or text format: http://www.sbts.edu/pdf/JBGay/the_typology_of_davids_rise_to_power2008-03-101.pdf.

[14]In "The Typology of David's Rise to Power" the question was raised as to whether we today can identify a person, event, or institution in the OT as functioning typologically if the NT does not explicitly identify it as such. The framing of the question above indicates that I think we can and should learn to interpret the way the biblical authors do, and that we can and should apply their methods to questions they have not answered for us. What I am presenting here also impinges on the whole discussion of the genre of the gospels. While many classify the Gospels as a form of Greek Biography, it seems far more plausible to me that the Gospels should be classified as *biblical narrative* since they carry forward the story begun in Old Testament narrative and fulfill it.

[15]For an attempt to practice the theory articulated in this definition, in addition to the present study and the Julius Brown Gay Lecture cited above, see my essay, "The Virgin Will Conceive: Typological Fulfillment in Matthew 1:18–23," in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* (ed. John Nolland and Dan Gurtner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 228–47.

[16]Peter J. Leithart, *A House for My Name: A Survey of the Old Testament* (Moscow, ID: Canon, 2000), 32, and see his discussion of "innerbiblical interpretation," which he defines as, "the way biblical writers interpret their own times through the lenses of earlier events in Israel's history" (33).

[17]Thus, in my judgment, the biblical authors understood and wrote in a way that reflects what G. K. Chesterton (*Orthodoxy* [1908; repr., Colorado Springs: Waterbrook, 2001], 216–17, ch. 9) was getting at when he wrote, "the evidence in my case . . . is not really in this or that alleged demonstration; it is in an enormous accumulation of small but unanimous facts. The secularist is not to be blamed because his objections to Christianity are miscellaneous and even scrappy; it is precisely such scrappy evidence that does convince the mind. I mean that a man may well be less convinced of a philosophy from four books, than from one book, one battle, one landscape, and one old friend. The very fact that the things are of different kinds increases the importance of the fact that they all point to one conclusion. Now, the non-Christianity of the average educated man to-day is almost always, to do him justice, made up of these loose but living experiences. I can only say that my evidences for Christianity are of the same vivid but varied kind as his evidences against it. For when I look at these various anti-Christian truths, I simply discover that none of them are true. I discover that the tide and force of all the facts flows the other way."

[18]Cf. the discussion of criteria in Harm W. M. van Grol, "Exegesis of the Exile – Exegesis of Scripture? Ezra 9:6–9," in *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel*, Oudtestamentische Studiën (ed. Johannes C. de Moor; Boston: Brill, 1998), 40–42. He concludes, "All these criteria serve us, scholars, in our work and communication, but they do not necessarily match reality in full. If there is no real quotation, if there is no explicit marker, and if the connection between the two texts is not very broad, there still may be an allusion. Words go their

own way. Nevertheless, criteria are useful. They force us to present the supposed connections in detail."

[19]To establish these claims I have used A. Even-Shoshan, ed., *A New Concordance of the Old Testament* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1997) in comparison with the results of searches performed with Bible-Works 7.

[20]Related phrases that do not fit the criteria listed above appear in Gen 29:9; 46:34; 47:3; Num 27:17; 1 Kgs 22:17; 2 Chron 18:16; Ps 80:2; Ezek 34:8, 12, 23; Zech 10:2; 11:4.

[21]The only other instances of "to shepherd" in the *qal* infinitive construct with the *lamed* preposition are in 2 Sam 7:7; 1 Chron 17:6; Ps 78:71; and Song 6:2.

[22]See the discussion of "The Apparatus of the Masorah" in Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 73–74: "The . . . *Masorah gedolah* (*Masorah magna* . . .) written in the upper or lower margins. This apparatus is closely connected with the [*Masorah parva*] as its function is to list in detail the particulars mentioned by way of allusion in the [*Masorah Parva*], especially the verses referred to by that apparatus. For example, if the [*Masorah parva*] states that a certain word occurs eight times in the Bible, the [*Masorah magna*] lists the verses in detail." The brackets above are a result of my removal of Tov's abbreviations. These *Masorah* are marginal notes in the manuscripts of Hebrew Bibles. Some notes are even concerned with "defective spellings" of certain words, show-

ing that even the smallest details of rare words were known and their locations recorded.

[23]The three occurrences of this form are found in Gen 24:65; 37:19; and Isa 58:5. Even-Shoshan (*Concordance*, 295) seems to have missed Isa 58:5.

[24]This form occurs six times in the OT: Judg 6:20; 1 Sam 14:1; 17:26; 2 Kgs 4:25; 23:17; Zech 2:8.

[25]so Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, eds., *A Hebrew English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1952), 229 (henceforth BDB).

[26]It might also be relevant that the same verb, פשׁט, is used to describe Joseph's brothers stripping him of his robe and Jonathan stripping himself of his robe (Gen 37:23; 1 Sam 18:4). Different terms are used, however, to describe the "robe" in these two contexts, which decreases the likelihood that this is a relevant observation. The different language used to describe Tamar's removal of one set of garments for another (Gen 38:14, 19) does show that the author(s) of Samuel had other linguistic possibilities.

[27]Robert Alter (*The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel* [New York: Norton, 1999], 267) notes that the phrase pronounced by Amnon in 2 Sam 13:9, הוֹצִיאוּ כָל־אִישׁ מֵעָלַי "Clear out everyone around me!" is an exact reproduction of the words spoken by Joseph just before he revealed himself to his brothers in Gen 45:1. Alter goes on to compare and contrast elements of the Joseph story with the narrative in 2 Samuel 13.

[28]A search done with BibleWorks 7

indicates that the other instances of אל־תְּהִי in the OT are in Job 6:29; Prov 3:7; 22:6; 23:20; 24:28; Eccl 7:16; Jer 50:26; Ezek 2:8.

[29]See also the reminiscence between the two sons of Eli, whom the Lord desired to kill (1 Sam 2:25; 4:11), and the two wicked sons of Judah whom the Lord killed (Gen 38:7–10). Judah's attempt to admonish Onan to do right is as ineffectual as Eli's.

[30]These are the only instances of "Adullamite" in the OT.

[31]The other references to "Adullam" in the OT are in Josh 12:15; 15:35; 2 Sam 23:13; 1 Chron 11:15; 2 Chron 11:7; Neh 11:30; and Mic 1:15.

[32]See further my essay, "God with Men in the Torah," *Westminster Theological Journal* 65 (2003): 113–33.

[33]See further my essay, "God with Men in the Prophets and the Writings, *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 23 (2005): 166–93.

[34]The Hebrew terminology in these instances differs slightly, but the term used in Gen 39:3 with reference to Joseph "prospering," מַצְלִיחַ, is the same term used in Ps 1:3, יַצְלִיחַ, both deriving from צלח. The terminology used to describe David prospering varies somewhat. In both cases it is God's presence that causes everything Joseph and David do to succeed. See the similar analysis in Alter, *The David Story*, 114.

[35]See, for instance, the following: (1) the rare term in 1 Sam 17:18, עֲרֻבָּה "token," occurs only elsewhere in Prov 17:18, and it is related to the rare term used in Gen 38:17–18, 20, עֵרָבוֹן "pledge," which occurs

only in those three verses (see BDB 786). (2) Gen 37:2 describes Joseph as "young," נַעַר, and 37:3 describes him as the son of Jacob's old age. 1 Sam 16:11 uses the plural of נַעַר "young men" to describe Jesse's sons, and David is identified as the youngest. Jesse is described as old in 17:12. See also the other linguistic points of contact between the Joseph story and Samuel noted by Alter, *The David Story*, 72, 267–70.

[36]David Toshio Tsumara (*The First Book of Samuel* [New International Commentary Old Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007], 449) writes of Jesse's sending of David (1 Sam 17:17–19), "The present episode is sometimes compared with the Joseph story. For example, R. P. Gordon explains: '[David's] errand to the battle-front is a detail reminiscent of Joseph's fact-finding mission to Dothan (Gen. 37:12ff.); in both cases the errand leads to an unforeseen encounter with destiny.' However, since sending a messenger to find out about someone's welfare is such a common experience, the narrator probably was not particularly thinking of the Joseph story." As I have stated several times above, taken individually, a detail such as this one might be easily dismissed. Taken with all the other details discussed here, however, the burden of proof shifts to those who would agree with Tsumara.

[37]Alter, *The David Story*, 267.

[38]See further my essay, "The Skull Crushing Seed of the Woman: Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Genesis 3:15," *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 10, no. 2 (2006):

30–54.

[39]See further my essay, "The Seed of the Woman and the Blessing of Abraham," *Tyndale Bulletin* 58, no. 2 (2007): 253–73.

[40]By doing what Reuben did, Absalom became a new Reuben (cf. 2 Sam 16:21–22 and Gen 35:22). I should note that typological interpretation is similar to but not equivalent with the method of "homiletical identification" seen in rabbinical haggadah where "different characters from Scripture who are linked by similarity of name or of other characteristics are often said to be the same person, and this in the face of the plainest evidence to the contrary" (Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church*, 217, see the whole discussion, 217–20, with notes 86–93 on p. 232–33). Typological identification differs in that people retain their individual identity even if they fit the "type" of, for instance, the wicked who oppose the righteous.

[41]So also Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible* (New Studies in Biblical Theology; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 89–92.

[42]See ibid., 116–17, 120.

[43]Peter J. Leithart, *A Son to Me: An Exposition of 1 & 2 Samuel* (Moscow, ID: Canon, 2003), 13.

[44]As argued in "The Typology of David's Rise to Power: Messianic Patterns in the Book of Samuel."

[45]On which see the argument that John presents Jesus as the typological fulfillment of the temple in Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*

(Paternoster Biblical Monographs; Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2006).

[46]For an examination of this theme, see my study, *God's Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old and New Testaments* (NAC Studies in Biblical Theology; Nashville: B&H, 2006).

[47]Cf. George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 391.

[48]Having noted that Stephen has highlighted the similarity of Joseph to Moses, John B. Polhill, (*Acts* [New American Commentary; Nashville: Broadman, 1992], 199) writes, "Moses was a type of Christ. Both were sent by God to deliver Israel. Both were denied, rejected by those they were sent to save. But the likeness does not end there. Moses performed 'wonders and miraculous signs' in Egypt . . . . One cannot fail to remember how Jesus also performed signs and wonders" (the likening of Joseph to Moses is on p. 192, cited in note 69 below).

[49]Ibid., 206. Alternatively, cf. I. Howard Marshall ("Acts" in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* [ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007], 571): "It is possible for the reader to see where the characters in the story can be regarded as 'types' . . . but despite strong hints . . . the possibility is not followed up. . . . Bock (1987: 217–18) finds no use of a Joseph-typology here, since no 'deliverance' terminology is present; Wall (2002: 126) proposes that Joseph typifies the prophets and their fate, including Jesus and now,

in particular Stephen. However, in the case of Moses there is the specific prophecy that the Lord will raise up a prophet 'like me' (7:37), and this statement invites typological development . . ." Against Marshall's hesitancy, the key criteria for determining whether or not one is dealing with typology are *historical correspondence* and *escalation.* Thus, that "no 'deliverance' terminology is present" is not relevant. Even if we were to insist on its presence, however, it would not be difficult to make the case that Stephen/Luke are invoking the broader context of the Joseph story, in which Joseph does "deliver" his family and all the earth from famine. A fuller version of this argument, on which Marshall depends, is in Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987), 217–18. Bock's negative evaluation is controlled by the question of whether the "three elements" he finds often mentioned by commentators are present: (1) "Joseph's deliverance of the Patriarchs;" (2) his "innocent suffering;" and (3) "the Patriarchs' second coming to Joseph as a parallel of the time of deliverance" (217). The problem with this is that Stephen/Luke's point in Acts 7 has to do with Israel's rejection of those sent to deliver her, and these other items Bock mentions should only come into the discussion once we move from the issue at hand (the rejection of the prophets) to broader questions *not addressed by the text of Acts 7.* If these broader questions are not the

author's agenda in Acts 7, it does not seem fair to reject the possibility of typology because Acts 7 does not address these broader questions. If we stay with the question of what is addressed by Acts 7, Bock himself writes, "There can be little doubt that Joseph fits into the general pattern of this speech which seeks to show that the Jews, beginning as far back as the Patriarchs, rejected the very men through whom God was working or revealing himself. This point is acknowledged by virtually every exegete of this passage" (*Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 217).

[50]Cf. David Peterson, "The Worship of the New Community," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (ed. I. H. Marshall and David Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 377: "Jerusalem preferred to remain with the Temple and to regard that as the final mark of God's favour, rather than let it lead them to Jesus to whom it pointed" (Peterson is quoting Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* [S.P.C.K., 1975], 102–3).

[51]So also Frank Thielman, *Theology of the New Testament: A Canonical and Synthetic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 192–93: Luke "devotes the lengthy speech of Stephen to an historical review of Israel's rejection of those whom God sent to deliver his people from various desperate circumstances. The patriarchs were jealous of Joseph . . . Moses . . . . The speech ends with a ringing indictment of Israel for its most recent, and most serious,

rejection of a deliverer from God."

[52]Cf. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church*, 215: "Abel being a 'prophet' in the same sense probably as some of the other patriarchs, who are given the title in Gen. 20.7; Ps. 105.15; 1 Chron. 16.22; Tobit. 4.12; Ecclus. 49.9 . . . Acts 3.25; 7.52 (where special allusion is apparently made to Moses and *Joseph*). A 'prophet', according to this usage, is not necessarily God's mouthpiece in addressing others, but, like those prophets who are, he is privileged to stand in an exceptionally close relationship with God, in which he enjoys both direct knowledge of the mind of God and special access to God in prayer" (emphasis his).

[53]Confirming the argument that "New Testament theology began with the biblical expositions of Jesus" in E. Earle Ellis, "Jesus' Use of the Old Testament and the Genesis of New Testament Theology," in E. Earle Ellis, *Christ and the Future in New Testament History* (Boston: Brill, 2001), 20–37, quote on p. 29.

[54]Similarly Heinz-Werner Neudorfer, "The Speech of Stephen," in *Witness to the Gospel*, 284, 288: "Apparently this is typological exegesis with respect to the archetypal figures of Joseph and Moses."

[55]So also Polhill, *Acts*, 191.

[56]Ibid., 206.

[57]Luke Timothy Johnson, *Septuagintal Midrash in the Speeches of Acts* (The Père Marquette Lecture in Theology 2002; Milwaukee: Marquette University, 2002), 29. In my view what Johnson has described is better termed *typological interpretation*

than "septuagintal targum," which is what he labels "the rereading of Scripture in Stephen's speech." See John Nolland's comments on "Repetition and escalation in salvation-history" where he discusses the "pervasiveness" of the "typological element in Luke's presentation" which has been "increasingly recognized" (John Nolland, "Salvation History and Eschatology," in *Witness to the Gospel* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 70–71).

[58]So also N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 1; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 76.

[59]Arland J. Hultgren (*The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000], 357) grants this for Mark and Matthew but claims it is "all but lacking in Luke 20:9." This judgment seems to result from a focus on Luke's account as compared with Matthew and Mark rather than a focus on Luke's account in the context of Luke's Gospel read in light of the OT. Kenneth E. Bailey (*Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes: Cultural Studies in the Gospels* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2008], 413–14) has no difficulty seeing Isaiah 5 in his analysis of Luke 20:9–18, nor do David W. Pao and Eckhard J. Schnabel ("Luke," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 360–62).

[60]Hultgren, *Parables*, 359; and Klyne R. Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 288.

[61]Cf. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 123 and note 25.

[62]Snodgrass (*Stories with Intent*, 277) asks "Is Gen 37:20 relevant?" Absolutely.

[63]Aside from Gen 37:20, Matt 21:38, Mark 12:7, and Luke 20:14, the only other place in all of biblical Greek where the two word phrase ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν "let us kill him" occurs is in Judg 16:2.

[64]So also N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 2; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 497.

[65]Pao and Schnabel ("Luke," 268) note that the wording of Luke 2:51 "closely resembles that of Gen. 37:11" but do not interpret the similarity as I do here.

[66]The text of 1 Sam 13:1 is very difficult, but in spite of what the NIV and NET say, the Hebrew text does not say that Saul was thirty years old when he became king.

[67]Another conceptual link between Genesis and Luke is the way that Joseph urged the one who was delivered to "remember" him when he was restored to his position in attendance upon Pharaoh (40:14), and one of the thieves crucified with Jesus urged him to "remember" him (Luke 23:39–43).

[68]Israel concludes that an "evil beast" has torn Joseph (37:33). The references to the beasts that surround the Psalmist may have been influenced by the Joseph story.

[69]Commenting on Acts 7:12–13, Polhill (*Acts*, 192) writes, "What Stephen did emphasize, however, was the seemingly insignificant detail that the brothers made two visits and only recognized Joseph on the second. Why this emphasis? The

same would be true of Moses later on in Stephen's speech. . . . One is strongly tempted to see here a reference to the two 'visits' of Christ. The Jews had rejected him on his first coming. Would they now accept him when confronted by Christ through Stephen's preaching?" Cf. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 366 n. 16: "Lake and Cadbury, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, IV, p. 73, describe as 'possible' the inclusion of the detail of the second trip as pointing to the second coming."

[70]David F. Wells, *God in the Wasteland: The Reality of Truth in a World of Fading Dreams* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 171.

[71]Cf. Stephen Wright ("Inhabiting the Story," 506–507): "A renewed figural interpretation will, I suggest, be both cosmic and personal. That is, it will not confine itself to the application of Scripture to the course of individual lives; it will recognize the Bible as the key that unlocks understanding of the unfolding course of the universe. . . . We must distinguish the idea that Scripture interprets the cosmos from the idea that Scripture constitutes an independent source of knowledge concerning the cosmos. When Scripture is treated as having the latter function, it is mistreated and becomes hostage to every scientific advance."

[72]For excellent Bible Study curriculum that examines the Joseph story with a stimulating concluding chapter on typology, noting interesting connections with, among other books in the NT, Revelation,