LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

JOHN W. RAWLINGS SCHOOL OF DIVINITY

Authorial Intent of Typological Writing in Judges

A Dissertation Submitted to

the Faculty of the Rawlings School of Ministry

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Bible Exposition

by

Amber Danielle Haugen

Lynchburg, Virginia

August 2023

APPROVAL SHEET

Authorial Intent of Typological Writing in Judges

Amber D. Haugen

READ AND APPROVED BY:

Supervising Reader: _____
James Gifford, Ph.D

Second Reader: _____
Ashley E. Davis, Ph.D

Acknowledgements

Projects of this magnitude are never solo endeavors. I am grateful to all the people who have been a part of this journey and made it possible for me to achieve this dream.

Thank you to my bosses, pastors, and friends, Michael and Tamara Norman; your understanding during stressful seasons and permission to focus on school was vital in completing this research and writing. Your friendship is valued more than I can express.

To all the people at Glad Tidings Church who have prayed, provided practical support, spoken words of reassurance, or just asked questions, thank you for your patience as I finished this process. Your interest in this project has increased my passion to love and serve you with the full truth of God's gospel.

To my dissertation chair, Dr. James Gifford, this simply would not have been possible without you. Thank you for your willingness to take on a unique project. I am grateful for the countless hours you have invested in reading and editing as well as explaining and encouraging. Your challenges have made me better as an academic and as a follower of Jesus. Your approach to scripture has changed me as a reader and researcher of the Bible. I am indebted.

To my family, there are no words. Ashlee, my forever type-editor, you are smarter than you know. Mateo and Cy, the joys of my life, thank you for supporting mom in school. It has been incredible to watch you grow these past few years and I pray the Lord draws you closer to him as you study scripture. Adam, love of my life and greatest gift from God, you have rejoiced with me in the sunshine and sat with me in the darkness that no one else sees. Your belief in me and encouragement make me all the more honored to follow you as you follow Christ.

To Jesus, thank you for revealing the beauty of your word. May others find you in the dark and difficult passages.

Contents

CHAPTER 1: SEEING WHAT THE SCRIPTURES SAY

Introduction

The Bible is an incredibly complex corpus consisting of historical records, poetry, narratives, battle accounts, covenants, and more. The way of reading this multifaceted masterpiece has shifted over the centuries. For the majority of its canonized existence, the text was read, interpreted, and understood with the primary purpose to assign meaning and direction to adherents of those who worship Yahweh. However, more recent scholarship has shifted the focus from liturgical meaning to literary milieu, with the emphasis on cultural context.[1] Authorial intent of scriptural writing has become the subject of incalculable research throughout recent years. The prominence of the historical-critical approach in modernity has highlighted greater understanding of cultural considerations while simultaneously creating a disconnect in meaning of Old Testament scriptures for modern believers. To study the Hebrew Bible as relevant solely in regard to the original audience relegates the Holy Writ to that of a historical tome. Steven Moyise strongly states, "If the meaning of Scripture is reduced to its original authorial intention, it ceases to be Scripture."[2] While there is considerable value in understanding the historical context of the scriptures, as Moyise implies there is also the potential of missing the fullness of the intended meaning if the primary focus is on obtaining the motivations of the original human author. Perhaps more important than understanding *why* an author was penning their prose is studying *how* they attempted to convey their message. Particular passages may appear difficult to

[1] Mitchell L. Chase, *40 Questions about Typology and Allegory*, ed. Benjamin L. Merkle (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2020), 112–16.

[2] Steve Moyise, "Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament," *Verbum et Ecclesia* 26, no. 2 (2005), 457.

interpret; however, the *patterns* utilized by biblical authors present a clearer understanding of their purposes. Some of these literary patterns are known as typology. Therefore, in its simplest form, typology denotes the scriptural patterns which connect points of the salvific narrative to create a unified picture of God's redemptive plan.[3] This perspective necessitates a reading of scripture as a whole rather than analyzing each book as an individual literary unit.

The best way to ascertain typology as a legitimate lens through which to view scripture is to examine its usage by New Testament authors and figures through the explicit and implicit examples of scripture. These individuals interacted most closely with the Hebrew Bible, and examining their interpretations provides insights to modern scholars. Additionally, the conclusion of this chapter will present the purpose of the present study and the rationale for the paper based on these observations.

Typology in the New Testament

In order to understand how contemporary Christians should view scripture, especially the Old Testament, it is first essential to determine how the believers of the first century understood the Hebrew Bible. These believers studied the Hebrew scriptures on a regular basis and will provide the most useful understanding of interpretation. Regarding typological elucidations, there are explicit and implicit references by the New Testament authors. Some uses of the typological lens are overt while others may be considered more allusions; however, both provide useful information on understanding the Old Testament narratives. Both explicit and implicit usages demonstrate how the believers of Jesus' day understood and utilized the Hebrew scriptures in their understanding of Yahweh.

[3] A more detailed definition of typology will be presented at the conclusion of this chapter and will be utilized as the working definition throughout the rest of the paper.

Explicit Examples

There are limited but clear, direct examples of typological interpretation by New Testament authors and figures. Perhaps the most notable is Jesus' comparison of himself to Jonah, as recorded by Matthew (12:39–41). This example is distinctly significant, as it was spoken by Jesus himself. Additionally, Paul unmistakably employs types as a means of scriptural interpretation as he relates Adam and the desert rock to Christ (Rom 5:12–19 and 1 Cor 10:2–4, respectively). If Jesus and Paul take such an approach to scripture, modern scholars must seriously consider the validity of this lens.

Jesus and Jonah

In the gospel of Matthew, the Pharisees are recorded as demanding a sign from Jesus. However, instead of responding with a clarifying sign of his messiahship, Jesus censures their request and compares himself to the prophet Jonah, stating that "just as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the great fish, so will the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt 12:40 ESV).[4] Wilson specifically notes that this announcement uses "biblical typology" to clarify Jesus' vague mention of a sign in verse 39.[5] By making this direct correlation to Jonah, Jesus legitimizes himself as the fulfillment of more than just the law.[6] He

[4] Unless otherwise stated, all scriptural passages referenced are in the *English Standard Version* (Crossway Bibles, 2016 accessed through biblegateway.com).

[5] Walter T. Wilson, *The Gospel of Matthew: Volume 1* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2022), 437.

[6] In Matthew 5:17, Jesus declares that he has not come to abolish the law or prophets but rather to fulfill them. However, his statements to the Pharisees in this passage denotes a deeper connection than merely a fulfillment. By comparing himself to Jonah, Jesus endorses the concept that figures of the Hebrew Bible may be interpreted typologically and understood as representative of his character and mission.

identifies Jonah as an archetype of himself, the antitype.[7] In fact, this passage is most fully understood when read typologically, since the purpose of Jonah's sojourn into the fish was not a pleasure ride but for the salvific intention of seeing the pagan city of Nineveh repent and acknowledge Yahweh. Therefore, Jesus' sign is not merely his time in the tomb but also the creation of the church to the gentiles, a concept not welcomed by Jonah and likely equally detestable to the Pharisees.[8] This interpretation aligns with his subsequent declaration that "the men of Nineveh will rise up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here" (Matt 12:41).[9] Jesus' comment appears decisive if not divisive and aligns with the satirical nature of the book of Jonah, which promotes the idea that pagan Ninevites might be more righteous than the Jewish religious elite.[10] This tone ensures followers of Jesus that his understanding and application of Jonah's narrative to his own is accurate and in alignment with the original writing of the prophet. Jesus is declaring himself the typological fulfillment.

When considering Jesus' reference to Jonah typologically, the profoundness of his claim becomes more apparent, recognizing that his descent may have even begun in the Garden of

---

[7] Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 243–44. Gundry specifically points out Matthew's wordage as corresponding closely to the Hebrew text, thereby assimilating the words of Jesus to the Old Testament. He explains that this is Matthew's means of stressing Jesus' fulfillment of the "prophetic typology apparent in Jonah" (243).

[8] Chesung Justin Ryu, "Silence as Resistance: A Postcolonial Reading of the Silence of Jonah in Jonah 4:1–11," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 34, no. 2 (2009), 197.

[9] Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 367–68. Keener notes that being compared to pagan Ninevites would have horrified Jesus' audience. The accusation becomes more indicting when considering that the men of Nineveh did not actually witness Jonah's sojourn in the fish but repented solely on his testimony—something the Jewish leaders appeared utterly unprepared to do.

[10] Mark Allan Powell, "Echoes of Jonah in the New Testament," *Word and World* 27, no. 2 (2007), 163.

Gethsemane as he surrendered himself to God's divine plan.[11] Other scholars suggest a time even earlier, such as his entrance into Jerusalem and his last supper with his disciples when he was first betrayed by Judas.[12] This is important, as the timing of this sign (the three days and three nights) has been problematic for theologians, considering Jesus' death and resurrection would not constitute three technical nights. The typological lens puts the emphasis on the idea of the "heart of the earth" rather than the timing of the resurrection, allowing for Jerusalem to be an identifying point of reference.[13] These truths are only evident when reading the passage as Jesus conveys it: typologically.

Jesus and Adam

The Jonah example is listed first, as believers must prioritize Jesus' interpretation and interaction with Old Testament scriptures. However, there are other explicit typological connections made to Christ in the New Testament by Paul. The first is his comparison of Christ to Adam in Romans 5:12–14 (emphasis added):

> Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned—for sin indeed was in the world before the law was given, but sin is not counted where there is no law. Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sinning was not like the transgression of Adam, *who was a type of the one who was to come*.

---

[11] Michael W. Andrews, "The Sign of Jonah: Jesus in the Heart of the Earth," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 61, no. 1 (2018), 118.

[12] Kenneth L. Waters, "Jesus in the Heart of the Earth: Deciphering the Jonah Saying (Matthew 12:39–41)," *SAGE Open* 11, no. 2 (2021), 8. Waters considers his interpretation to be typological and Andrews' to be psychological. Jerusalem is more closely related to the heart of the earth in Waters' study while Andrews examines the sinking of Jonah as the point of suffering prior to his envelopment by the fish as comparative to Jesus' suffering beginning with his actual declaration of suffering in the Garden. For this study, the timing or locale is less significant than the fact that Jesus' interpretive parallel was his fulfillment as the Jonah antitype. For other interpreters, the timing of the two signs is less significant. Turner states that in "Jewish reckoning any part of a day could count as a day." David L. Turner, *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament: Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 327.

[13] Ibid., 4.

This overt example is consistently translated as "type" in most formal New Testament renditions and demonstrates the typological connection Paul intended. He makes a clear comparison between the two men, including the idea that both were individuals whose actions affected the rest of humanity.[14] This interpretation of scripture showcases a type at its most basic form: an Old Testament narrative highlighting a characteristic pattern of God which is fulfilled in a greater sense in a corresponding New Testament account. Talbert contends that "Paul presented Christ as the antitype of Adam. This means Paul saw both similarities and dissimilarities between the two."[15] Paul elaborates more in his letter to the church in Corinth when he declares, "Thus it is written, 'The first man Adam became a living being'; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit" (1 Cor 15:45).[16] Paul writes of Adam and Christ not merely as individuals but as representatives.[17] He continues by illustrating that these typological realities have implications for the believers, since humanity is born of the dust like Adam but can also bear the image of Christ.[18] Goppelt relates Paul's typology of Adam and Christ to "a photographic negative to its positive print."[19] These explicit typological connections between Adam and Christ are clearer

---

[14] John VanMaaren, "The Adam-Christ Typology in Paul and Its Development in the Early Church Fathers," *Tyndale Bulletin* 64, no. 2 (2013), 280.

[15] Charles H. Talbert, *Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary: Romans* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), 150. Talbert notes that Paul was employing an ancient rhetorical device known as *synkrisis* as a means of highlighting the differences between Adam and Christ, placing blame on the former while lauding the latter. The employment of such literary devices highlights Paul's typological bend while showcasing Adam as a foil to Christ.

[16] Thiselton notes that "the Adam-Christ typology has already been introduced in 15:21–22, where it closely anticipates the better-known typology of Rom 5:12–19." Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1281.

[17] David E. Garland, *Baker's Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament: 1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 737.

[18] Paul expounds on this point in verses 47–57, clearly demonstrating that this typological reality is the reason why believers are able to experience eternal life.

[19] Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 129.

when considering both were seen as sons of God having supernatural origin stories. Additionally, both men were perfect and sinless until Adam failed the test of obedience when he rebelled at the tree, a test Christ passed when he submitted his life on the tree of Calvary. Christ was the heightened and superior fulfillment, the colorful picture of the undeveloped negative.

Jesus as the Rock

Thus far, the typologies considered have been christological and restricted to Old Testament *people* and Christ. However, Paul makes a final explicit example of typology when he compares Jesus to the rock in the wilderness of the Exodus. "For they drank from the spiritual Rock that followed them, and the Rock was Christ. Nevertheless, with most of them God was not pleased, for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things took place as examples for us, that we might not desire evil as they did" (1 Cor 10:4–6). Here Paul compares Christ to the rock which provided water during the Israelites' wilderness wanderings (Exod 17; Num 20).[20] This coincides with Jesus' own invitation that he will provide living water (John 7:37), which itself appears to be a quote from the prophet Isaiah (Isa 48:21, 55:1). Thiselton states it more explicitly when he says that Paul "utilizes a typological context of historical parallels between events in the experience of Israel and events in the experience of the church at Corinth."[21] Origen takes this opportunity to highlight the methodology of the esteemed missionary, asking, "What

[20] Mather makes the connection to other examples of a rock being typological to Jesus in scripture. In Matthew, Jesus urges followers to build their house on the rock; the Psalms declare the righteous will find refuge in the shadow of the rock; Peter and Paul refer to Jesus as a rock of offence and a stumbling stone, referencing the prophet Isaiah. Samuel Mather, *The Figures of Types of the Old Testament* (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1969), 143.

[21] Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 730.

then shall we do, having received such training in interpretation form Paul, the Church's teacher? Does it not seem right to apply the principle we have been given to other cases?"[22]

Paul's interpretation takes this typological understanding farther by stating that the Rock "*followed* them." The Greek word Paul uses, *akoloutheō*, is utilized throughout the Septuagint to indicate an actual following of people to locations.[23] This indicates Paul understood the Hebrew scriptures to illustrate the character of Christ as provisionary but not salvific *through* that provision. He writes how God was angry at the idolatry despite the Israelites drinking from the Rock of Christ and compares that with the idolatry of the New Testament church, concluding that believers cannot accept Christ's eternal provision and remain in sin. This overt typology employed by Paul about the Exodus narrative reveals his understanding of the consistency of God's character throughout scripture.

These overt references to typological connections demonstrate the way Jesus, Paul, and other New Testament authors understood and interpreted the Hebrew scriptures.[24] However, there are other more subtle ways that New Testament authors demonstrate typological connections from the Hebrew scriptures.

Implicit Examples

The New Testament authors tacitly wove typological understanding throughout their accounts. From the way books were constructed to their scriptural sidebar comparisons, the

---

[22] Judith L. Kovacs, *1 Corinthians: Interpreted by Early Christian Commentators* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 161.

[23] Examples include Balaam (Num 22:20), Ruth (Ruth 1:14), Abigail (1 Sam 25:42), and Elisha (1 Kings 19:20).

[24] Other New Testament authors refer to the characteristics that other authors demonstrated in relating Jesus to Old Testament types. For example, the author of Hebrews likens Christ to Melchizedek 7:11–28. Jesus also compares himself to the manna from the wilderness (John 6:41).

writers did not conceal their intention to demonstrate Jesus as the fulfillment of the Hebrew scriptures. Davidson goes so far as to say that the "historical reality of OT types does not appear to be optional," adding that they "form an indispensable part of the biblical authors' devoir-être argument" and concluding that "typological relationship between OT and NT realities involves not only a general correspondence but extends to specific parallel details."[25] While these typological patterns are most easily discerned in the explicit examples, there are numerous implicit ways that denote typological intent as well. For example, the comparison of Jesus to Jonah may be the most *explicit* example of typological interpretation in the New Testament, yet even this comparison has deeper relationships than initially assessed. Before examining other embedded examples of typology, this connection will be reevaluated for the nuanced connotations it represents elsewhere in scripture.

Jesus and Jonah

As previously noted, Jesus compares himself to Jonah regarding the three days and nights that each had spent in the belly of death. However, there are additional implicit references between Jesus and Jonah in other New Testament writings. For example, in his first letter to the church at Corinth, Paul refers to Jesus being buried and raised on the third day "according to the Scriptures" (1 Cor 15:4), which reinforces Jesus' own reference to himself as the fulfillment of Jonah as a type of resurrected savior. Matthew and Mark also make an implicit connection between the cries of distress exclaimed by Jonah and Jesus.[26] Additionally, there are typological

[25] Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 421.

[26] Alistair I. Wilson, "In the Same Boat? Jonah and Jesus as Wave-Beaten Heralds," *In die Skriflig* 55, no. 1 (2021), 2. Wilson denotes Jonah's desire to die (Jnh 4:9) and Jesus' claim that his soul is overwhelmed to the point of death (Matt 26:38; Mark 14:34) have connecting similarities. However, congruent with the main point of his

correlations regarding Jonah's chaotic encounter on the sea and Jesus' calming of the storm in Mark 4. While there are plenty of similarities in this account, Mark draws on the familiarity with the Old Testament narrative as a means of typological *contrast*.[27] For example, Jonah fled from his commission, while Jesus submitted to it. Furthermore, Jonah must sacrifice himself to the sea, while Jesus stands in authority over it, indicating his superior nature compared to the prophet. This thematic inversion is also an indication of the narrative's typological standpoint.[28]

Jesus and Moses

Jesus does not make explicit references to himself as a type of Moses, but he does indicate that he is the fulfillment of the law (Matt 5:17). In this manner, Jesus attests to the ongoing usefulness of the Hebrew canon through his actualization of the shadows and types.[29] However, there are multiple associations between the two, and "it is unquestionable that early Christians regularly compared Jesus and Moses."[30] The gospels of Mark and Matthew appear to make clear comparisons between Moses and Christ. For example, Markan theology outlines Jesus as a shepherd, leading people in the desert and performing miraculous signs, all of which

---

article, these similarities actually serve as a point of contrast between the archetype and antitype. Here, for example, Jonah's cry is out of anger subsequent to his suffering which had resulted in the Ninevites' salvation, whereas Jesus' is preemptive of his suffering which will bring salvation. While Jonah ultimately submitted himself to God's plan, whether or not he comprehended God's compassion is ambiguous, as his cry is after his salvific work; conversely, Jesus submits himself prior to his salvific work, and no anger is recorded throughout his trial and death.

[27] Ibid., 3–4. In his article, Wilson makes connections regarding both men traveling in a boat, having a great storm arise, and sleeping through the storm, only to be awakened by fearful others. Both men give a command which results in the calming of the storm and great fear arising in the other people.

[28] Jonathan Rivett Robinson, "Markan Typology: Miracle, Scripture and Christology in Mark 4:35–6:45" (PhD diss., University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand, 2020), 116–18.

[29] Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Keener does not specifically note the fulfillment of types but focuses on Jesus' assertion that the scriptures are valuable and valid through him.

[30] Dale Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1993), 97.

invoke images of Mosaic typology.[31] Likewise, Matthew highlights Jesus' narrow escape as a child to survive the edict of an avaricious leader (Matt 2:16–18; Exod 1:22–2:4). Both individuals find safety in Egypt (Matt 2:13–15; Exod 2:5–10), both have significant wilderness experiences (Matt 4:1–17; Exod 3), and both become leaders who will offer miraculous provision and deliverance for their people (Matt 14:13–21, 27:51–54; Exod 16:1–8, 12:33–42).[32] Additionally, the Beatitudes in Matthew 5 have inherent connections to the blessing of Moses in Deuteronomy 33, promising a new Exodus for the new Israel, namely the church.[33] These examples comprise just a fragment of the typological connections the New Testament authors utilized as they recorded the life of Jesus as the fulfillment of Hebrew narratives. Added together, these implicit allusions demonstrate a typological interpretation of Jesus as the salvific antitype of Moses.

Jesus and Others

Jesus is subtly portrayed as an array of human characters from the Hebrew scriptures, including Jonah, David, and Moses.[34] Luke identifies parallels between Christ and both of the miracle-working prophets Elijah and Elisha.[35] Adam, Joseph, Solomon, Isaac, Melchizedek, and others are also compared as types of Christ. However, typological understanding is not limited to

---

[31] Robinson, "Markan Typology: Miracle, Scripture and Christology in Mark 4:35–6:45," 257–58.

[32] Michael P. Theophilos, *Jesus as New Moses in Matthew 8–9: Jewish Typology in First Century Greek Literature* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2013), 165 concludes that Matthew has constructed his gospel specifically to reference Moses including ten supernatural signs, stating, "The implication of this is that Matthew employs a paradigmatic typology, in which Jesus leads a new chapter in Yahweh's salvation history. This overarching pattern, which spans the Old and New Testaments, affirms both the continuity and consistency of Yahweh's saving acts."

[33] Charles Quarles, "The Blessings of the New Moses," *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 13 (2015), 327.

[34] Robinson, "Markan Typology," 280.

[35] Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1984), 44.

people but can also be seen through events, positions, and institutions. This is because, while types can be difficult to define, they all demonstrate the character of God. In fact, Daniélou describes types, saying, "All the outstanding persons and leading events of Scripture are both stages and rough outlines to prepare and prefigure the mystery which is one day to be fulfilled in Christ."[36] Therefore, Jesus is portrayed as high priest (1 Tim 2:5; Heb 7:23–27) and Passover lamb (John 1:29; 1 Pet 1:19). Jesus portrays himself as the ultimate judge (John 9:39) and the bronze serpent who removes the curse from his people (John 3:14). In fact, after Jesus' resurrection, he reconnects with his distraught disciples, and "beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke 24:27). This demonstrates Jesus' endorsement of seeing himself throughout the Hebrew scriptures as he simply begins with the writings of Moses implying that all the scriptures reference Jesus' character and mission. Jesus read the scriptures typologically with himself as the ultimate fulfillment.

Despite being born in the first century, Jesus is fully active and present throughout the Old Testament scriptures because these previous types are demonstrative of God's character and salvific plan which ultimately culminated in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. The explicit and implicit examples listed here are just a fraction of the depth of scriptures' revelation of Christ through typological connections. While the New Testament authors, as well as Jesus himself, utilized a typological perspective to interpret the Hebrew Bible, thereby acknowledging Christ as the antitype and fulfillment of previous Old Testament shadows, the utilization of this methodology did not stop with them; it continued throughout the majority of church history.

---

[36] Jean Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (Jackson, MI: *Ex Fontibus* Company, 2018), 11.

Rationale for Present Study

Necessity of Utilizing a Typological Approach

Typology has a rich history in biblical interpretation. A more thorough examination of the history of typological interpretation will be examined in chapter 2, but the reality that Jesus and the New Testament authors read Hebrew scripture typologically presents a foundation for continuing this practice. While the historical-critical method has done much to advance our understanding of the cultural context of the biblical narrative, it also creates the distinct possibility of diminishing theological truths in favor of historical suppositions and therefore cannot serve as a sufficient replacement for the typological interpretations as utilized by the authors of the New Testament and church patriarchs. Conversely, a shift back toward typological interpretation is not a *carte blanche* to descend into "parallelomania," but rather a swing of the pendulum toward a more balanced understanding of scripture.[37] Typology inherently necessitates parallels, but these must fit into the overall pattern of the *Heilsgeschichte*.[38] The guardrails to prevent descents into cultural context is vital, since all true typologies must be rooted in historical reality, and yet, biblical narrative provides for deeper levels of meaning which must be

[37] Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* (1962), 1. While Sandmel primarily addresses comparisons between ancient texts (Dead Sea Scrolls, Rabbinic literature, Pauline epistles, etc.) his concern more aptly focuses on the tendency to specify derivation. Additionally, he considers all these ancient texts of Judaic origin and notes that some parallels may be of no significance. His main concern in determining legitimate connections is that the passages remain in context when paralleled to other passages. This mentality is an unintended promotion of typology as true typology, always rooted in historical reality and which must be interpreted in context to the greater salvation narrative. Typology, therefore, is not parallels in "extravagance," as defined by Sandmel. Rather, it is a recognition of the patterns native to the text which were divinely implemented by the Old Testament authors and subsequently interpreted by the New Testament authors providing a means by which legitimate scriptural interpretation can be conducted. The conditions for these parallels are briefly noted in this chapter and will be fully detailed in chapter 3.

[38] *Heilsgeschichte* is a German theological term used to describe the salvation history, emphasizing God's salvific work throughout human history with Jesus Christ as the center of redemption.

considered simultaneously.[39] This means that a book's interpretation cannot be bound to the borders of the scroll but rather requires the reader to enter into the expansive world of the scriptures as the intertextuality of the canon constantly alludes to other biblical narratives which may provide additional context to a particular passage.[40]

At the heart of typological understanding is the core belief that God's character and subsequent acts are consistent, and therefore correspondences can be seen through different narratives.[41] These consistent patterns became expectations as well as interpretations of actual historical events conveyed by the scriptural authors. Therefore, typology is not merely a lens through which New Testament Christians *consider* the Hebrew scriptures but rather the means by which Old Testament authors *conveyed* the message of God. This is clear because typology is also prevalent throughout the Hebrew scriptures.[42] Based on the idea that typology was a means of communicating the narrative of God's redemption plan, this dissertation will focus on the book of Judges.

---

[39] Gary Edward Schnittjer, "The Narrative Multiverse Within the Universe of the Bible: The Question of 'Borderlines' and 'Intertextuality,'" *Westminster Theological Journal* 64 (2002), 250–51. These various levels of meaning do not constitute *new* meanings. Rather there is a clear meaning within the presenting narrative that simultaneously reveals a deeper truth typically regarding the character of God. Schnittjer contends that confining the biblical texts to their individual scrolls misses the polyphonic echoes of "retrospective intertextuality," leaving the reader with only a partial perspective of the Word's fullness (231).

[40] Ibid., 237. This may be one of the most detrimental paradigms of the historical-critical method, as Martin Noth's Deuteronomistic proposal in the 1940s shifted the focus of study away from the established christological approach toward an assumed author and his motivation. This new perspective became the lens through which scholars peered for decades. Rather than each narrative being studied and seen to provide christological meaning as part of an overarching divine redemptive narrative, the Old Testament scriptures were valued by their connection to the Deuteronomist's agenda.

[41] David L. Baker, "Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 29, no. 2 (1976), 147.

[42] J. D. Douglas and Merrill C. Tenney, *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, ed. Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2011), 1492.

Primary Purpose of the Current Study

The primary purpose of this dissertation is to demonstrate authorial intent of typological writing within the book of Judges. As a book, Judges may comprise the most complex literary challenges of the Hebrew Bible. It contains a cyclical view of history rather than the linear pattern highlighted in later books, denoting that it may be independent from the popular idea of Deuteronomistic composition, and yet it contains connections to other scrolls.[43] The account exhibits a double introduction, which complements as well as contradicts itself and other conquest accounts.[44] The ensuing narratives appear mismatched and overlapping, but there are literary seams that tie the book together and move the historical story forward. Despite these haphazard accounts, Way suggests the book appears to be constructed in a ring compositional pattern, denoting an intentionality of flow in the final form of the book.[45] These discrepancies make Judges the perfect, albeit most challenging, case study for authorial intent regarding

---

[43] Thomas Römer, "The Rejection of the Theory of a Deuteronomistic History," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Historical Books of the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Brad E. Kelle and Brent A. Strawn (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), 311. The "popular idea" being referenced is the proposed singular authorship by the Deuteronomist. Römer presents a mitigating viewpoint which allows for the diversity in the various books. However, even Römer admits that Judges stands as a "puzzling piece" in the Deuteronomistic History. Raymond F. Person Jr., "In Conversation with Thomas Römer, The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction," *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 9, no. 17 (2005), 41. In response to Römer's proposal, Yairah Amit reinforces the cyclical nature of the book of Judges clarifying that neither the idea nor phraseologies are native to the Deuteronomistic paradigm. Yairah Amit, *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 33–34. This cyclical perspective was also denoted by Greenspahn as a "pattern." Frederick E Greenspahn, "The Theology of the Framework of Judges," *Vetus Testamentum* 36 (1986), 387. Exum described it as an "increasingly negative" cycle. J. Cheryl Exum, "The Centre Cannot Hold: Thematic and Textual Instabilities in Judges," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52, no. 3 (1990), 413–14. Both authors showcase the perspective of cyclicity as distinctly different from linear Deuteronomictic History. To be clear, the cyclical view highlights the repetative nature of Yahweh's grace in the sin, punishment, repentance, deliverance cycle demonstrated through many of the judge narratives.

[44] Susan Niditch, *The Old Testament Library: Judges* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 6. Niditch notes the disparity between the Joshua and Judges accounts of the conquest, summarizing that Joshua concludes with a unified, unbeatable nation infiltrating the Promised Land while Judges portrays a more disjunctive incursion. The division of the double introductions and conclusions will be discussed in the chiastic section of chapter 4.

[45] Kenneth C. Way, *Judges and Ruth* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2016), 37. This idea will be considered in chapter 4 regarding the macro-level typological construction of the book.

typological writing; if literary patterns can be found in such a convoluted book, then the paradigm of intentional typology is strengthened exponentially. Therefore, a goal of this dissertation is to analyze the book of Judges in its entirety as well as the various narratives to demonstrate the authorial patterns which reveal the nature of God and his salvific plan.

Defining Definitions

While debates swirl around definitions of this elusive term, for this paper, *typology* will be defined as "God-ordained, author-intended historical correspondence and escalation in significance between people, events, and institutions across the Bible's redemptive-historical story."[46] This definition will be further reviewed in chapter 3. Additionally, at the risk of creating a "fixed system rather than a basic approach to the Bible," this paper sets four criteria to act as guiderails to refrain from veering off the narrow road of typological interpretation into allegorical subjectiveness.[47] These criteria include the usage of key terms, specifically recurrent quotations, repetitions in sequence of events, and an escalating connection to covenants in the salvation story.[48] These criteria will be detailed further in the methodology of chapter 3. While some scholars would debate or deny the importance of wordage in designating types, and while one cannot get stuck on minute details, the reality is that biblical authors used specific words to

[46] James Hamilton Jr., *Typology: Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2022), 26.

[47] Baker, "Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament," 151. Baker asserts that these limits may be merely reflective of the nature of God rather than actual examples of types. He lists more negative aspects of what types are not than definitions of what types actually are. However, his two criteria for types also align with the definition of typology and four criteria listed here: types are historical and contain real correspondence (152–53).

[48] Hamilton Jr., *Typology*, 25.

convey their message.[49] In an oral culture, these words would be significantly more important for linking types to previous narratives with which the original listeners would be immediately familiar.

It is important to define a few more key terms that will be utilized throughout the paper. *Archetype* is the original example of a specific pattern. In typology, this is the first person, instance, or occurrence which initiates a typological pattern. *Antitype* is the final fulfillment or conclusionary example of a typological pattern. The antitype demonstrates the finality initiated by the archetype. Between archetype and antitype are instances that reinforce and demonstrate the typological pattern on display. These intermediary examples are *ectypes*. Ectypes need not have all the characteristics of the archetype but must demonstrate the same connective typological pattern through the criteria of key terms, recurrent quotations, repetitions in sequence, and connection to the covenants. Finally, the idea of a *foil* highlights the typological pattern through a contrasting character or event. Despite their contrary nature, foils are no less significant in understanding the typological patterns of scripture and may serve as a way to mitigate the discord of sinful ectypes and a divine antitype.

Chapter Summaries

With these definitions and criteria in mind, the purpose of this paper is to demonstrate authorial intent of typological writing specifically within the book of Judges. Each section builds upon the previous to establish the use of author-intended typology in the final form of Judges.

---

[49] Baker, "Typology," 154. Baker contests that typology is not concerned with the text but only the events recorded in it. However, the biblical authors were astute at conveying their message with clarity and connectiveness through their word choice. It should be noted that ancient Hebrew had a limited number of words, therefore repetitive phrases cannot be easily dismissed as unintentional patterns. Rather, these phraseological patterns should be examined for the ways they connect the events, people, and institutions they convey.

Chapter 2 will begin with an overview of the Hebrew mindset and the effect of that paradigm on the writing by the scriptural authors. The chapter continues by providing a history of typology within the church throughout the centuries, highlighting key individuals who practiced and perpetuated this established perspective, culminating in a section examining the shift away from typological interpretation. This historical overview will substantiate the reality that for the vast majority of the church's existence, typology has been the primary and prevailing method for understanding scripture. This section will briefly highlight the current academic perspective of typological interpretation as well as its dearth within modern education and practicum, demonstrating the need for scriptures to be reexamined through this lens.[50]

Chapter 3 introduces the methodology of the study, including the aforementioned definition and an expansion on the four criteria for determining typology. Chapter 3 will briefly review the present theological conclusions being drawn from the non-typological approaches to the text. Additionally, this chapter will examine the primary proposals regarding authorship and their subsequent effect on the text. Finally, chapter 3 will define the concept of macro and micro levels of typology, which will be the foundation for the subsequent chapters.

Based on the outlined methodology, chapter 4 will take a broad look at the book of Judges by establishing the authorial intent in the book's overall structuring of the individual accounts. This and the subsequent chapter will comprise the bulk of the study. While the entire book of Judges will be considered, only key examples will be highlighted in this paper. These examples will be chosen based on their significance to the study and relevance in demonstrating the patterns specific to the covenantal promises of Judges. The final form of the book of Judges demonstrates a typological way of seeing God's character as the center of the chronicle despite

[50] Chase, *40 Questions*, 111.

his overt role diminishing throughout the microlevel narratives. The macrolevel structure is linked to the covenants in the Pentateuch as well as the journey of Abraham and demonstrates a chiastic pattern, all of which will be examined. Finally, this chapter will evaluate the narrative seams of Judges which are authorially intended to create a more coherent whole, but which also necessitate a typological consideration.

Chapter 5 will survey the microlevel examples of typology throughout the book of Judges. Microlevel examples are those comprised of smaller, more specific examples within the book of Judges which link backward to previous scripture and forward to Christ. This chapter will be partitioned into two primary sections: positions and people. Understanding the intentionality of how the author portrayed these categories and figures is essential to understanding and accepting the typological paradigm of the book.

The final chapter will summarize the deductions of the previous chapters and propose an overall conclusion regarding the authorial intent of writing utilized within the book of Judges. Additionally, these conclusions will be related to New Testament truths and applied to implications for the contemporary Church. This practical conclusion and analysis may be most beneficial for understanding the book of Judges in modern ministry.[51] Finally, limitations for the study as well as areas for future research will be listed.

Conclusion

For Christians, the purpose of reading the Bible is to understand and apply the words of God to daily life. This can be a challenge when some of the books were written several millennia ago, and today's society appears much removed from the cultures of the scriptures. Nowhere is

[51] Daniel Block, *The New American Commentary: Judges, Ruth*, ed. E. Ray Clendened (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 586.

this disconnect more apparent than in the narratives of Judges. However, recognizing that the scriptures were written typologically can illuminate the character of God within culturally different and disconcerting passages, making difficult scripture accessible to modern-day believers. This paper will reexamine the book of Judges to demonstrate the authorial intent of typological writing within the scroll. Hopefully this will serve as a first step in reexamining the overall understanding of Yahweh's character as portrayed in the accounts of the judges. However, it is essential to first establish the role typological interpretation has played throughout the history of the church and determine its legitimacy as a means by which to study the Old Testament writings.

CHAPTER 2: JUDGING JUDGES: TYPOLOGY IN HISTORY

This chapter is divided into two main sections: the Hebrew mindset and a history of typology. Both sections provide vital understanding for the present study; examining the Hebrew mindset will demonstrate that the Old Testament is typological in nature, and the history of typology will showcase its accepted usage in the vast majority of Christian and Jewish writings and interpretations.

The Hebrew Mindset

Before venturing into the history of typology, it is essential to recognize that this style of writing is a natural expression of the Hebrew perspective. Living in the western world in the twenty-first century can make it challenging to understand or accept an utterly different worldview and interpretation of such basic concepts as time, thought, and manifestation. However, to correctly understand the Hebrew scriptures, these differences must be distinguished and grasped. These distinctions can be ascertained through the writings; however, language can only attempt to capture thoughts. For example, the word *flower* can induce a multiplicity of thoughts from roses to lilies to orchids and more. Therefore, words are more ambiguous than thoughts and must be examined within the close context as well as the macro-perspective of the particular writing. The close context in the Hebrew Bible typically denotes the pericope of the narrative, while the macro-perspective is the overall Hebrew mindset; it is the perspective from which the narrative proceeds and this goes beyond context. Another illustration better exemplifies this point. The phrase *have a ball* will be interpreted differently when spoken by a bowling alley owner, the parent of a teen going to a party, or an eighteenth-century wife to her husband. Understanding how this sentence is meant to be read goes beyond the words to the mindset of the person conveying the words. The Hebrew language was limited in words but not

in thoughts. In comparison to the vastness of English lexicons, the Hebrew language appears simple and "unadorned," but this must not be mistaken as primitive, since deep and insightful truths are reflected throughout the Old Testament.[1] These truths are not merely an overflow of the cultural milieu of their day, however, as the Israelites exhibited adamant resistance to widely accepted social norms in order to platform the inimitability of their beliefs.[2] Indeed, despite its abundance of words, the English language is still ultimately incapable of accurately capturing the Hebrew languages' inseparable connection of its words to its thought.

Considering the Hebrew Bible as a divine text adds an extra layer of complexity to this issue, and while some would infer that theology and language can be systematically removed from one another, this philosophy works better in theory than practice.[3] Theology is inherently tied into the language of the scriptures. Therefore, accurate interpretation of the scriptures relies not merely on more detailed linguistic studies but on ascertaining the cultural mindset of the authors penning the narratives. Again, some would seek to surgically remove the language from the theology it expresses.[4] However, the Hebrew Bible is not merely an ancient text; it is a

---

[1] Thorleif Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (New York: Norton, 1960), 196.

[2] Ibid., 26.

[3] Tal Goldfajn, *Word Order and Time in Biblical Hebrew Narrative* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 11–12. Goldfajn discusses the domestication of language in the Hebrew Bible by asserting that scriptural grammars "'explain' a particular linguistic phenomenon by appealing to theological arguments." He purports that this connection dilutes the pure meaning of the language by explaining away incongruities in verb forms. However, the author continues by pointing out the various discrepancies within the Hebrew verb structure as relating to chronological time and modern ideas of tense (13).

[4] Carsten Ziegert, "Beyond Barr – Biblical Hebrew Semantics at Its Crossroads," *European Journal of Theology* 30, no. 1 (2021), 19–36. Ziegert traces the pendulum swings in the area of linguistic study of the scripture, noting three distinct phases: pre-Barr, after Barr, and beyond Barr. The original approach to biblical philology contended that the uniqueness of a language reflected the culture and mentalities of its people employing it. However, in the 1960s, Barr criticized the methodology which essentially linked the Hebrew mindset to their language, denoting that this was not "a linguistic but rather a cultural issue" (26). Barr introduced linguistic structuralism to the scripture, which regarded language as a system of autonomous symbols. Despite his thorough condemnations of the accepted perspective, Barr offered no alternative for discovering theological insights from the

divinely inspired text, and the philology cannot be separated from the theology; rather, they must inform one another. The following sections will attempt to describe ideological divergences between the Hebrew mindset and accepted western conceptualizations. These variances will showcase the typological tendencies of the Hebrew mindset.

Time in the Hebrew Mindset

Perhaps the most challenging shift in mentality is in regard to the concept of time. Time is an elusive notion, as all definitions are merely crafted conceptualizations. In the western world, time is treated in multiple ways: as a specific or undetermined interval (an hour of time or a bit of time); an opponent (time is against me or killing time); an occasion (game time or party time); and often as a commodity (saving or spending time). Despite the elusiveness of the construct, the modern western world unequivocally views time in a linear fashion, denoting a line in which the future is ahead and the past is behind, adamantly refusing to consider other interpretations. This determination makes it challenging to comprehend the Hebrew mindset and its subsequent outflow of writing. However, studies have demonstrated that spatial ordering of sequences is influenced by the directionality of writing within a language.[5] If such an arbitrary component of language influences temporal perspectives, consideration must be given for a distinctive perspective of time within the Hebrew mindset. The differences are most notable in God's sovereignty over time, the demarcation of linear chronology and rhythms, and the concept of contemporaneity.

---

text, nor did he provide a methodology for word study; a pattern his adherents would follow. However, Ziegert traces a new trend of frame semantics which represents the pendulum returning to an acknowledgement that language is "indeed interconnected with human cognition, and not an autonomous system that can be discretely investigated" (33).

[5] Orly Fuhrman and Lera Boroditsky, "Mental Time-Lines Follow Writing Direction: Comparing English and Hebrew Speakers," *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* 29 (2007), 1010.

In his classic monograph, *The Sabbath*, Abraham Heschel prefaces that "the Bible is more concerned with time than with space. It sees the world in the dimension of time. It pays more attention to generations, to events, than to countries, to things."[6] Time is an essential component of the Hebrew Bible, yet it is not the traditional linear notion of time as perceived by Westerners. The Hebrew concept of time might best be represented by the idea of rhythms.[7] These rhythms are inherent in every living thing as well as in the natural order of the world: the cycles of the moon, the duration of a pregnancy, the harvest seasons. These concrete processes denote a core understanding of temporal order, but the scriptural depiction of time essentially emphasizes *priorities* within the Hebrew mindset.[8] For example, the first chapter of Genesis sets the stage for these rhythms, where God creates, God names, God declares things good, and evening and morning come (Gen 1:1–25). These rhythms existed prior to the actual separation of the day and night on the fourth day of creation, denoting that in the Hebrew author's mindset, the rhythms of *Elohim* supersede what man would consider natural order. For the Hebrews, God's sovereignty dictated the rhythms through which they lived their lives. Therefore, in their mindset God was also able to supersede these natural rhythms of time for his divine plan. The classic example of this mentality is found in Joshua's battle at Gibeon when he commanded the sun to stand still, and God displaced the natural rhythm of the day for his divine plan (Josh 10:12–13). Believing in a deity who can overrule rhythms of time is essential for a typological mindset as it

---

[6] Abraham Joshua Heschel, *The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1951), 6.

[7] Boman, *Hebrew Thought*, 134, 145.

[8] Mette Bundvad, "Defending the Concept of Time in the Hebrew Bible," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 28, no. 2 (2014), 296. Bundvad denounces Sacha Stern's thesis that the Hebrews had no concept of modern time but rather only processes of natural phenomena. Rather than imposing a modern concept of time on ancient Hebrews, it is more advantageous to understand how they portrayed time through these processes which created ongoing rhythms.

acknowledges a God who is able to look down through the centuries of time and write the present days of history as "predictive paradigms."[9] However, a typological mindset requires more than the acknowledgement of an omnipotent God who exists outside of time. The idea of time rhythms themselves demonstrate a typological perspective.

For Hebrews, the concept of time was equated to rhythms of events and of their own lives, all of which are directed by God.[10] This sense of rhythm, rather than mere linear chronology, is found throughout the Hebrew scriptures. Using the example of creation, this rhythm was specifically implemented into the ancient Hebrews' lives through the practice of Sabbaths, which were time designations for God's people to dwell in his presence. This weekly rhythm was emblematic of the concrete process of creation, where God fashioned a place and people with whom he would dwell. However, beyond the weekly rhythms dictated by creation, this process is repeated throughout the Hebrew Bible. First in the form of Noah and the flood, as God designates a people to deliver from the chaotic waters to a renewed place where he will dwell with them (Gen 6–9). Then after the corruption ensuing from the tower of Babel, God chooses Abram and directs him to a specific land, perpetuating the pattern (Gen 11–12). New creation is also seen in the Exodus story as Moses leads God's chosen people once again through chaotic waters to a new land (Exod 14). Although reiterating the heart of the creation narrative, the Exodus additionally becomes its own rhythm of deliverance, a pattern repeated throughout the conquest and exile narratives. The distinctiveness of the Exodus event became a form of new creation. Therefore, in the Hebrew mindset, God's creative acts are not limited to the chronology

[9] James Hamilton Jr., *Typology: Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academics, 2022).

[10] Boman, *Hebrew Thought*, 139.

of the beginning of time but are seen in rhythms *throughout* his interaction with his people, as he repeatedly creates or manipulates space in order to dwell with his people. While modern Western thought can only conceptualize creation as a single event at the genesis of history, the Hebrew mindset views creation as "a collective concept which expresses all the positive saving actions of God at all times."[11] This concept of time exists within these rhythms which subsequently become prophetic patterns for understanding future interactions with Yahweh. These repetitive patterns are found throughout the Hebrew scriptures. As a final example from the creation narrative, the command to "be fruitful and multiply" is rhythmically repeated, denoting new epochs in the lives of the Hebrew nation:[12]

To Adam:	Be *fruitful and multiply* and fill the earth and subdue it. (Gen 1:28)
To Noah:	Be *fruitful and multiply* and fill the earth. (Gen 1:9)
To Abram:	I will make you exceedingly *fruitful* . . . and may *multiply* you greatly. (Gen 17:6, 2)
To Jacob:	Be *fruitful and multiply.* (Gen 35:11)
About Israel:	The people of Israel were *fruitful* and increased greatly; they *multiplied* and grew exceedingly strong, so that the land was filled with them. (Exod 1:7)

Each of these men, subsequent to Adam, are ectypes of the prototypical man and therefore a rhythmic renewal of God's creative process as he seeks to produce a place and people with whom he can partner in his creative quest of the earth. For Hebrews, these typological rhythms flowed naturally from a mindset in which time operates in rhythms—daily, weekly, yearly, and generationally—because "seeing typological patterns requires thinking about an account in light of those earlier and later."[13]

---

[11] Boman, *Hebrew Thought*, 173.

[12] Hamilton Jr., *Typology*, 45–46. I considered this particular pattern initially through Hamilton's work, although he does not list all the examples specified here.

[13] Ibid., 8.

A concluding thought on the difference of the Hebrew mindset in regard to time is exemplified in the concept of contemporaneity.[14] First, it should be noted that Hebrew verbs do not inherently designate tenses as they do in modern English, instead denoting whether actions are complete or incomplete.[15] However, this perspective can make it challenging for modern minds to appreciate contemporaneity as naturally as the Hebrews did, since the Western perspective is that historical events are complete and situated in the past. Conversely, Hebrews experience the past and future through a concept denoted by Sören Kierkgaard as "corporate personality."[16] In this perspective, the Hebrews existed contemporaneously with those who came before them. For example, the rhythmic celebration of the Exodus was not merely a remembrance of a historical event but was experienced as a contemporaneous deliverance:

> [Additionally] we can cite the ancient poem in Genesis 49, where Jacob-Israel and the names of the twelve sons are at one moment individual persons and at another nations and tribes, and we find ourselves at one moment in the presumptive present and at another in the distant future without a suggestion of any time specification or distinction between time spheres.[17]

Contemporaneity reveals a psychological element to the Hebrew mindset regarding time, a paradigm that is a naturally typological perspective, as it requires the connection of various people and events across chronological time to be understood within a simultaneously true context. This mentality is demonstrated in the yearly Hebrew feast celebrations which are

---

[14] The relation of a contemporaneous perspective to a typological mind will be explicated in this section. However, the basic definition of contemporaneity is a psychological rather than chronological view of time which allows the subject to understand and experience previous narratives as contemporary with their present experiences. This is hindered in Western thought by the mutually exclusive spheres of past, present, or future which prevent the subject from naturally engaging in contemporaneity through patterns.

[15] Boman, *Hebrew Thought,* 146.

[16] Ibid., 148.

[17] Ibid.

designed to connect the current celebrants with the original beneficiaries.[18] This uniting of people and events across chronological time through psychological time rhythms exemplifies the foundation of the typological mindset. If this then is how the Hebrews understood time, it is natural to acknowledge that the authors of scripture would have written from this mindset. Inherently, the author of Judges understood persons, events, and institutions as simultaneously historical and contemporaneous and would have written as such, necessitating a typological interpretation.

Thought in the Hebrew Mindset

Examining the concept of thought may initially appear redundant when attempting to analyze the Hebrew mindset. However, there are two important aspects of the thought life that are relevant for investigation: generalization of concepts and development of thought through education and exegesis.

Contrary to Western thought, Hebrews possessed a generalized mindset, meaning their classifications were conducted in collectivistic rather than individualistic terms.[19] For example, the idea of wood to Westerners is often thought of in terms of wooden things, which have the properties of wood in common. Conversely, Hebrews naturally consider wood as "the given and the real, and wooden things are concretizations of it."[20] Therefore, Hebrews more naturally and simultaneously considered the abstract concept of wood along with the actual manifestation of

---

[18] See Leviticus 23 for a list of the feasts and their intended celebratory instructions. The feasts are outlined in such a way as to reenact elements of the original narratives including unleavened bread, resting in God's sovereignty, and living in tabernacles. While many holidays include representations of previous events, these appear specifically structured to reunite the participants with the previous recipients, promoting the mindset of contemporaneity.

[19] Boman, *Hebrew Thought,* 70.

[20] Ibid., 70.

wooden things. This dual acceptance of the concrete and abstract carries throughout multiple concepts, such as *'adham* representing both the initial created man as well as humanity in general.[21] In this way, unique examples are merely individualized representations of the overall type of the generalized concept. It is readily apparent how this aspect of the Hebrew mindset promotes the typological perspective as the type is a real concretization of future ectypes which are all representations of the eventual antitype. Again, Adam is the quintessential example. He is both the first man as well as the prototypical representation of God's relationship with humanity.

Adam was the first son of God, formed after the taming of the chaotic waters, a pattern repeated in the postdiluvian world as Noah becomes the new first man to restart creation.[22] Like Adam, Noah partakes of sin-inducing fruit, exposes his nakedness, and invites a curse on future generations. Other patriarchs follow various aspects of the Adamic pattern, such as the deep sleep he encounters before being given a covenantal union with Eve (Gen 2:21) which parallels Abrahams's deep sleep prior to God's covenant with him (Gen 15:12). Adam also concurrently represents groups of people such as Israel, in general, and the priesthood, specifically. As previously stated, Adam represents the first-born son of God, a title which Israel would assume as noted in Exodus 4:22, "Thus says the Lord, Israel is my firstborn son," and which Jesus would eventually fulfill (Matt 3:17). Finally, Adam could be considered the first priest, as he was charged to work and keep the garden of Eden, a charge later given repeatedly to the priesthood and Levites (Num 3:7–8, 8:26, 18:7). The Hebrews generalized mindset allows for these concomitant realities to exist seamlessly, demonstrating a typological disposition. Additionally,

---

[21] Ibid., 71.

[22] Hamilton Jr., *Typology,* 36–173. The ideas regarding Adam's examples are summarizations of the detailed discussions from Hamilton's outlines.

these scriptures were not merely recorded by the Hebrews, but studied within the context of personal and corporate life, perpetuating this paradigm.

Israel was not merely the nation who wrote the sacred scriptures, but also the most avid students of the writings. In fact, exegesis in its most fundamental sense is "the one indigenous science which Israel has created and developed."[23] Yet this exegesis was primarily oral, requiring instruction, memorization of large sections of scripture, and discussion of the embodied narratives.[24] This education began early in the home as soon as a child "begins to speak" and eventually continued through more formal training for boys through school, all of which demonstrated the essentialness of memorization.[25] Literacy was still reserved for the more elite in Hebrew society, and despite the formalization of alphabetic Hebrew, the ancient texts were often not reader-friendly, requiring extensive knowledge and substantial memorization of the texts; any fluency derived from ongoing ruminations on the subjects.[26] The purpose of this style of instruction was to imprint the cultural perspective on the minds of each new generation. However, this was not merely rote memorization. Learning was more naturally accomplished through the utilization of words, rhymes, overarching themes, and even music.[27] This assessment provides a latent glimpse into the intentionality of typological writing, as Hebrew authors, due to their enculturation and intense memorization, would naturally utilize journalistic techniques

---

[23] Joseph Jacobs, *Jewish Encyclopedia: A Guide to Its Contents, an Aid to Its Use* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1906), 162, https://www.jewishencyclopedia.com.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Philip Suciadi Chia and Juanda Juanda, "Memorization in DSS, NT, Talmud and Patristic Documents," *Journal Kerugma* 4, no. 1 (2021), 45–47.

[26] David Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 4–5.

[27] Ibid., 7.

which tie present writings to past writing to aid in understanding the overarching theme of the current narrative. This typological writing technique would have been most natural to the Hebraic author of Judges.

Exegesis examines specific units of scripture to determine their message, while biblical theology seeks to understand the overall message of the Bible in its entirety.[28] Hebrews engaged in both of these disciplines. The purpose of the Hebrew transmission of written text through oral means was spiritual enculturation, which had a pervasive influence on the formation of the Hebrew mindset. Memorization of scripture facilitates the typological mindset, as repetitive reflections enable students to detect overarching patterns through the assorted accounts. It is not essential for the antitype to have been known to the original authors or audience of the scriptures, as the recognition of characteristic patterns does not necessitate knowing the actual fulfillment. Therefore, the modern retrospective understanding of a type does not denote the *creation* but merely the *revelation* of the type.[29] Through education and exegesis, original authors and audiences would have readily written and understood the typological patterns present within the manuscripts.

Manifestation in the Hebrew Mindset

A final area for examination when considering scripture through the Hebrew mindset is in the depiction of materials. Manifestations, in this sense, are revealed through the expression of the physical nature of life. There is one relevant distinction from modern contemplation in this regard: the Hebrew Bible rarely gives any commentary on actual physical descriptions of people,

---

[28] Elmer A Martens, "Tackling Old Testament Theology," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20, no. 2 (1977), 123.

[29] Aubrey Sequeira and Samuel Emandi, "Biblical-Theological Exegesis and the Nature of Typology," *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 21, no. 1 (2017), 21.

buildings, or objects. Conversely, Hebrew writing focuses on the construction and function of created things, leaving the reader with abstract impressions rather than actual images.[30] This is exemplified through the ark as well as the wilderness tabernacle, both of which have extensive directions on their construction but little to none on their final appearance (Gen 6:9–22 and Exod 25–28, respectively). This focus on the construction and function of objects and places most naturally lends itself to a typological mindset, where the historical person, place, or thing is valid and valuable, but also representative of a deeper meaning within the *Heilsgeschichte*.

Despite the historicity of the Old Testament accounts, the emphasis is not on the specific person, place, or event but on the role exemplified. An example might be beneficial at this juncture: the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and the tree of life play pivotal roles in the biblical narrative, yet neither is ever described (Gen 2:15–17). However, their functions are clear; they are to operate as a test for humanity and a giver of God's life, respectively. This same test is present in the staff of Moses, another example of a tree which provides either life (Exod 14:16, 17:6) or death (Exod 4:2–4, 7:20), depending on the command of God and the obedience of the agent (Num 20:2–12). Again, we see the specific description was less salient than its function in the divine/mortal relationship. Likewise, despite the prevalence of nature in the scriptures, there is a dearth of landscape depictions. Rather, nature is relayed in relation to its symbolic representation of God.[31] This emphasis on function superseding depiction inherently develops a typological mindset, as the purpose of people, events, and objects are interpreted through their meaning and not merely their materialization. In a similar vein, the Hebrew

[30] Boman, *Hebrew Thought*, 74.

[31] Edward Chauncey Baldwin, "The Hebrew and the Greek Ideas of Life," *The Biblical World* 36, no. 5 (1910), 340–41.

mindset equates beauty with usefulness, demonstrating a "covenant aesthetic" which showcases God's ongoing gracious interactions with humanity.[32] It is not how things look but how things work to bring about God's purpose that is vital in the Hebrew perspective.

A final thought on the Hebrew mindset necessitates including the prevailing sense of hope that dominated their perspective. The hope of the Hebrews sustained them during invasion, deportation, exile, and subjugation. Truly, "no people ancient or modern ever had more to dishearten them in their thought of their national future than had the Hebrews; and yet no people looked forward so exultantly."[33] This is because the Hebrew hope was not based on well wishes or fortune cookie predictions but rather on the consistently repetitive promise and fulfillment pattern of scripture, which revealed the character of their God and the fate of their people. This overwhelming focus on a hope for the future further demonstrates a typological mindset, where each new person, place, and event operates as a chapter in a grander story that is leading toward a culminative fulfillment. This hope would have been paramount in the mind of the author of Judges regardless of when his writings were composed.

This section considered the Hebrew mindset specifically in regard to the Old Testament texts being written from a typological perspective. The Hebrew mindset regarding time, thought, and physical manifestation are naturally inclined toward a typological perspective. Additionally, the Hebrew mentality was more inherently spiritual than the prevalent logicalness of modernity. However, this is not to endorse one perspective over the other but rather to acknowledge both and advocate for interpreting scripture within the paradigm in which it was written. The dual

---

[32] Luke Ferretter, "The Power and the Glory: The Aesthetics of the Hebrew Bible," *Literature and Theology* 18, no. 2 (2004), 137.

[33] Baldwin, "The Hebrew and the Greek Ideas of Life," 337.

perspectives operate like light, which exhibits properties of both waves and particles. When only one is used for analysis, the Hebrew Bible will remain half veiled in darkness.[34] Moreover, the typological perspective was considered, accepted, and incorporated into the community of faith for the majority of Jewish and Christian history. This perspective is chronicled in the following section along with a critical examination of divergences which began during the Reformation and have extended into modern biblical scholarship.

History of Typology

Typology was not invented by modern interpreters.[35] While the term *typology* was not coined until the eighteenth century, typology as a means of transmitting the nature of the divine has been present throughout the history of the scriptures and the church. As demonstrated in the previous section, typology was the natural means by which Hebrew authors understood and communicated the salvation story through their own national history. Unfortunately, the practice has lain primarily dormant in academic circles since the inception of the historical-critical approach in the last few centuries. However, a remnant of scholars throughout the years have preserved typology as a means of understanding scripture. This reality will be presented to demonstrate the primacy and predominance of typology throughout scriptural and church history.

Typology as Present in the Old Testament

As previously mentioned in chapter 1, the New Testament authors were clearly already intimately versed in the concept of typological interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. This was not a

---

[34] Boman, *Hebrew Thought,* 208. Boman uses this analogy with regard to the atom.

[35] Stanley N. Gundry, "Typology as a Means of Interpretation: Past and Present," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 12, no. 4 (1969), 234.

new understanding, as outlined by Jesus and his disciples, but rather was the natural understanding of how scripture had been constructed for millennia. The Hebrew mindset saw time, thought, and manifestations in cyclical patterns that emphasized contemporaneity and generalization of concepts which most naturally led to typological perspectives and writings. The New Testament authors employed scripture congruently with the means demonstrated in the Hebrew Bible's utilization of scriptures, that is, typologically.[36] Jewish rabbis continued to employ typological understanding to their messianic hopes well into the second century.[37] With Old and New Testament authors as well as Jewish rabbis utilizing typology as an exegetical lens, there is reason to reconsider typology as a legitimate means of appraising the Hebrew scriptures. Given that the community to whom those scriptures were originally written considered typology a valid means of interpretation, those of the Christian tradition would do well to engage the practice as well.

Perhaps the most obvious examples of typological writing in the Old Testament can be found in the Torah as Moses relates the accounts of Creation, Eden, Noah, and the patriarchs.[38] Due to the uniform authorship of the Pentateuch, there are clearly repetitive linguistic patterns utilized to remind audiences of God's covenantal promises.[39] The example of the command to

---

[36] Gary Edward Schnittjer, *Old Testament Use of Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2021), xli, 856.

[37] David Berger, "Three Typological Themes in Early Jewish Messianism: Messiah Son of Joseph, Rabbinic Calculations, and the Figure of Armilus," *AJS Review* 10, no. 2 (1985), 164.

[38] Because it is not within the purview of this dissertation to authenticate authorship, this paper will assume Mosaic authorship of the Torah.

[39] While this paper assumes Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, this is not necessary for the final conclusion. Any Hebraic author or redactor would be steeped in the Hebrew mindset, including the aforementioned dimensions of time, thought, and manifestation. As previously noted, this mindset most naturally lends to a typological perspective which would become evident in their writing; uniform or diverse authorship have equal relevancy, as the outcome is the same.

"be fruitful and multiply" (Gen 1:28 NASB) was detailed in the previous section on the Hebrew mindset regarding time. This repetitive phrase employs linguistic repetition to denote that God's original pattern to Adam was reinstituted with Noah, then designated to be fulfilled through the familial line of Abraham. There is a broadening of this covenantal promise to the nation of Israel (Exod 1:7) which becomes contingent on the peoples' obedience (Lev 26:9) and, in exile, is portrayed as a latent benefit of God's faithful restoration of the remnant of Israel by the prophets (Jer 23:3, Ezek 16:11). All these examples of the "fruitful and multiply" pattern find their origin in the person of Adam. Consequently, Moses designated Adam as a type, a man in whom the covenantal promises of God were meant to be fulfilled but who fell short and therefore necessitated a future fulfillment, an antitype:

> By tying later figures in the Pentateuch back to Adam, Moses intends to teach his audience that Adam is the prototypical man, with successive figures presented as ectypal installments in the Adamic pattern, in expectation of the antitypical fulfillment when the seed of the woman arises to conquer and redeem where Adam was defeated and subjected. From their presentation of David and the expected one like a son of man, later Old Testament authors can be seen to have learned this perspective from Moses, which we in turn find in the New Testament writings of Luke and Paul.[40]

In the Pentateuch, Moses sets forth numerous typological themes which can then be traced throughout the Hebrew Bible. These patterns are not merely authorially intended but internalized by his audience as paradigms through which to understand Yahweh and his covenantal faithfulness. A few examples include the faithful priest and the righteous sufferer.

The Faithful Priest

When God places Adam in the Garden of Eden he charges him "to work it and keep it" (Gen 2:15 ESV). However, Adam fails at this task when the serpent enters the sacred space and

[40] Hamilton Jr., *Typology*, 36.

deceives Eve into disobedience.[41] Here readers gain their first glimpse into a divinely appointed priest, as Adam was responsible for guarding the holiness of a space in which God met with man, thereby protecting the human/divine relationship. Despite his failure, Yahweh promises a future offspring who will faithfully fulfill the task by defeating the deceiver (Gen 3:15). While Adam's priestly characteristics are defined by his responsibilities, the first identification of a priest in the Hebrew Bible is Melchizedek (Gen 14:18). Identified as a king and priest, Melchizedek is denoted as the faithful priest and righteous king with the authority to convey a blessing on God's chosen people (Gen 14:19–20). With no specified lineage, Moses paints Melchizedek as a divine priest who faithfully fulfills the will of God, a perspective made more obvious by later biblical authors:[42] "You are a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek" (Ps 110:4); "[Melchizedek] is without father or mother or genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but resembling the Son of God he continues a priest forever" (Heb 7:3). David clearly identifies himself as a type of Melchizedek, a faithful priest who will live forever through a promised divine descendent. The author of Hebrews agrees with this interpretation, adding the fulfillment of Jesus as the antitype of the faithful priest. He specifically endorses the connection that David's tribal identification as a divinely appointed Judahite priest promotes the reality that Jesus was the fulfillment of both David and, therefore, Melchizedek.

However, just like Adam, there were other unfaithful priests as well. Israel itself was intended to be a kingdom of priests (Exod 19:6) but fell short of keeping the covenant. Early in the history of the nation, unfaithful priests were destroyed by the Lord (Lev 10:1–2). Even the sons of the penultimate, pre-monarchic priest were killed for their unfaithfulness:

---

[41] Ibid., 66.

[42] Ibid., 70.

> And this that shall come upon your two sons, Hophni and Phinehas, shall be the sign to you: both of them shall die on the same day. And *I will raise up for myself a faithful priest,* who shall do according to what is in my heart and in my mind. And I will build him a sure house, and he shall go in and out before my anointed forever. (1 Sam 2:34–35, emphasis added)

The theme of the faithful priest repeats itself and the author of Hebrews identifies Jesus as the fulfillment of this type, stating, "Therefore [Jesus] had to be made like his brothers in every respect, *so that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest* in the service of God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people" (Heb 2:17, emphasis added). Contrary to the faithful priest type, it was the faithlessness and overall degeneration of the Israelite priests which eventually repeated the pattern of Adam and lead to exile from God's Promised Land. This reemphasized the need for a priest who would remain faithful to God's command and guard against the deceiver (2 Chron 36:14–20).

The Righteous Sufferer

Another typological theme portrayed by Moses and throughout the Hebrew Bible is that of the righteous sufferer. As Jesus mentions in Luke 11:51, this theme is illustrated throughout the Old Testament, from Abel to Zechariah.[43] Abel is the prototypical example, as he is favored by the Lord before being killed by his brother, Cain (Gen 4). Similarly, Joseph is the favored son whose brothers turn on him with murderous hearts (Gen 37:12–36). Likewise, despite David's anointing by Samuel, he encounters intense persecution from King Saul (1 Sam 16–26). Each of these examples suffered an attempt on their life (whether successful or not) by an enemy who

[43] H. G. L. Peels, "The Blood from Abel to Zechariah (Matthew 23:35; Luke 11:50) and the Canon of the Old Testament," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 113, no. 4 (2001), 599. Peels contends that these names are not necessarily representative of the initial and concluding books of the Hebrew canon but rather demonstrative of the intensity with which the righteous sufferer paradigm is depicted throughout the Old Testament. For example, Abel was killed in secret in an unknown location, but by the time of Zechariah, God's messengers were being murdered publicly near the altar in Jerusalem.

had been a brother or friend. In like manner, Jesus would live a righteous life only to be betrayed by a close friend (Mark 14:43–46) and those of his own nation (Mark 15:9–15). Jesus actually quotes David's cry to God during his persecution, further associating himself with the line of David and identifying himself as a righteous sufferer: "My God, my God, why have You forsaken me?" (Ps 22:1); "And about the ninth hour Jesus cried out with a loud voice, saying, *'Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani?'* that is, 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?'" (Matt 27:46). Jesus' use of David's psalm portraying his persecution at the hands of Saul denotes Jesus' personal perspective of his life and ministry as a typological realization of the righteous sufferer. However, Jesus clearly saw his suffering as the antitypical fulfillment for all humanity whose sacrifice would justify all those who expressed faith in him (Matt 16:21–28).

The Old Testament is filled with examples of people who demonstrate the righteous sufferer type. Job is an entire book chronicling the life of a man who suffered terrible loss despite his righteous obedience to Yahweh. Yet, it was not just individuals who were depicted as righteous sufferers. Jeremiah claims that the entire nation of Israel had been ignoring the collective cry of the righteous poor.[44] The nation was not just allowing the righteous to suffer, but the leadership actually participated in the destruction of the upright, thereby fulfilling the opposite intention for which the Lord created the nation.[45] The prophet confirms that the suffering of the righteous was cause of exile when he explains that deportation occurred "because of the sins of her prophets and the wrongdoings of her priests, *who have shed* in her

[44] In Jeremiah 2:34 the Lord convicts the nation of shedding the "lifeblood of the guiltless poor" (ESV). This reprimand is in stark contradiction to his previous commands to care for such individuals.

[45] In Genesis 12:3 God covenants with Abraham that his offspring will be a blessing to all nations. Again, in Deuteronomy 30:16 Moses reminds the people to choose Yahweh in order to be a blessing to the land they will possess. Throughout the Hebrew Bible, laws are given to protect the justice of the poor and foreigners (Exod. 22:21–27, 23:6–9; Lev. 19:10, 25:35–39; Deut. 15:7–11).

midst *the blood of the righteous*" (Lam 4:13, emphasis added). Contrariwise to their actions, Israel had been commanded to promote righteousness in order to stay in the Promised Land:

> You shall appoint judges and officers in all your towns that the Lord your God is giving you, according to your tribes, and they shall *judge the people with righteous judgment.* You shall not pervert justice. You shall not show partiality, and you shall not accept a bribe, for a bribe blinds the eyes of the wise and subverts the cause of the righteous. *Justice, and only justice, you shall follow, that you may live and inherit the land* that the Lord your God is giving you. (Deut 16:18–20, emphasis added)

However, Israel had perverted the theme of righteousness, thus endorsing on a national level the theme of righteous sufferers and perpetuating the need for a righteous suffer who would be able to fulfill the will of God by overcoming injustice.

Similarly, the prophet Isaiah writes of a righteous sufferer who will bring a conclusion to God's demand for justice. The following statements from Isaiah 53 highlight this theme:

> He was despised and *rejected* by men, a man of *sorrows* and acquainted with *grief*; and as one from whom men hide their faces he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely, he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we esteemed him stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted. But he was *pierced for our transgressions*; he was *crushed for our iniquities*; upon him was the chastisement that brought us peace, and with his wounds we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned—every one—to his own way; and *the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all*. And they made his grave with the wicked and with a rich man in his death, although he had done no violence, and there was no deceit in his mouth. Out of the anguish of his soul he shall see and be satisfied; *by his knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous*, and he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore I will divide him a portion with the many, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, because *he poured out his soul to death* and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he *bore the sin of many*, and makes intercession for the transgressors. (vv. 3–6, 9, 11–12, emphasis added)

The theme of a righteous sufferer is interwoven throughout this prophecy, including the ideas of affliction despite virtue and the bearing of another's sins to the point of death. However, this prophecy adds the idea that this suffering servant will make others righteous by his sacrifice, which Paul described as being fulfilled through Christ when God "made Him who knew no sin to *be sin on our behalf*, so that we might become the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor 5:21 NASB, emphasis added). The prophecies of Jeremiah and Isaiah shift the type of righteous

sufferer from individual narratives to a national level and then predict a fulfillment for all humanity. This escalation in theme is a key factor of the typological perspective.

Another example of Isaiah's typological outlook is found in his final chapters, where the dominant theme is of a new exodus.[46] However, the prophet's writing is reflective of more than just the Exodus from Egypt; rather, he includes the antediluvian days of Eden as well as the eventual Noahic covenant.[47] This repetitive pattern of highlighting God's character through his redemptive acts in history denotes typological intentionality by the author of Isaiah; it is a looking back at events in the past in order to envisage Yahweh's future acts of complete fulfillment. Anderson concludes,

> Second Isaiah, however, does not merely heighten the traditions a few degrees more: he transposes, the whole sacred story into a higher key as he announces the good tidings of salvation. The new exodus will be a radically new event. It will surpass the old exodus not only in wonder but also in soteriological meaning, as evidenced by the theme of divine forgiveness which runs through the whole of his prophecy, or by the extension of salvation to include all nations.[48]

This "radically new event" was utilized later by New Testament authors as describing the life and death of Jesus.[49] Christ's suffering as the righteous servant and designation as the deliverer

---

[46] B. W. Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), 181.

[47] Ibid., 184. Anderson notes that Israel's birth is traced back to Abraham, the promise of the land is traced to Jacob, and the deliverance from Egypt has multiple references throughout the passages. Additionally, he finds connections in second Isaiah's writing to the journey through the wilderness and entry into the Promised Land. This usage of the Torah to highlight the redemptive works of Yahweh as a prophetic way of viewing his continued acts of the future is the very nature of typology. According to Hamilton's definition, these connections exemplify typology within the Hebrew canon, as they are "God-ordained, author-intended historical correspondence and escalation in significance between people, events, and institutions across the Bible's redemptive-historical story."

[48] Ibid., 191.

[49] The suffering servant poems of Isaiah are quoted extensively in the New Testament to identify Jesus as the new Moses, thereby denoting him as the new deliverer of this surpassing exodus. Examples of these quotations include Matthew 12:18, 21; Mark 15:28; Luke 2:32, 22:37; John 12:38; Acts 8:32, 13:34, 47. The epistles also highlight this theme of Jesus' fulfillment of the new Moses and exodus typology as outlined in the suffering servant poems of Isaiah.

of this new exodus establishes that the New Testament authors were not creating a new means of exegesis by thinking typologically but rather were continuing the pattern set forth by the authors of the Hebrew scriptures.

Indeed, there are themes throughout the Old Testament which attest to the typological intentionality not only of the divine author but of the human authors as well. These themes often begin with individual narratives that transition into national truths for Israel and eventually inspire prophetic insights to the antitype. The book of Judges continues this tradition, detailing individual and national concerns with typological references to the inevitable exile. New Testament authors proliferate the perspective of the Old Testament writers as they interpret the Hebrew scriptures typologically, setting Jesus as the center of both testaments.

Apostolic–Medieval Era

Examples of New Testament typology were presented in chapter 1; however, it is vital to reiterate that Jesus and the New Testament authors employed typology consistently as a means of interpreting the Hebrew scriptures in light of Christ and the church.[50] The believers who continued the faith tradition after the New Testament authors were known as the church fathers and "were prominent men of unimpeachable orthodoxy whose literary legacy shaped and defended the theological formations of the four great 'ecumenical' councils of antiquity."[51] However, these patristics never systematized their principles regarding their use of typology.[52] Contrary to the idea that this negates their approach to scripture, this lack of formalization

[50] See the explicit and implicit examples listed in chapter 1.

[51] Gerald Bray, *How the Church Fathers Read the Bible: A Short Introduction* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2022), 3.

[52] Patrick Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture, Vol. 1* (Altenmünster: Jazzybee Verlag, 2017), ch. 1.

implicitly indicates the patristics' sense that their way of viewing scripture was natural, even innate, and needed neither explanation nor formalization, since it was the tradition of the biblical authors and apostles themselves. While scholarly interest in the patristic fathers has varied over the years, today the "biblical interpretation of the early church period has returned to the forefront of academic research."[53] Modern scholars do well to consider the foundational interpretations of those nearest to Jesus' teaching and those of his apostles. The church fathers understood and taught Christ through the Hebrew scriptures.[54] While the entire history of typological interpretation will be beyond the scope of this paper, key individuals from the Apostolic era will be expounded upon.

Clement of Rome

Perhaps one of the earliest known apostolic fathers was Clement of Rome, who was likely in contact with Paul and Peter prior to their martyrdom.[55] In his letter to the church of Corinth, Clement extensively quotes from the suffering servant poem in Isaiah 53, specifically denoting Christ as the fulfillment of the text and expounding on other Old Testament people as patterns of the godly whose humility proved their obedience.[56] Despite Clement recognizing Jesus first, his subsequent examples demonstrate a typological perspective of how prior examples exhibit a design of individuals whose humble submission led them to their reverential, emulous status in scriptures. Read inversely, Clement's pattern is clearer, culminating in Jesus as

---

[53] Bray, *How the Church Fathers Read the Bible*, 6.

[54] Mitchell L. Chase, *40 Questions about Typology and Allegory*, ed. Benjamin L. Merkle (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2020), 79.

[55] Marcellion D'Ambrosio, *When the Church Was Young* (Cincinnati: Servant Books, 2014), ch 2.

[56] Clement, *First Epistle* 16, https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/1clement-lightfoot.html.

the antitype of the Hebrew scripture's suffering servant. Clement also typifies Noah's flood as a new creation, relating it to the Christian act of baptism.[57] He furthermore denotes the red saving cord in the story of Rahab as typifying the blood of Christ which would provide salvation.[58] In making these connections, this initial apostolic father endorses and continues the typological teachings of the New Testament authors.

Justin Martyr

The broad narratives of salvific history as well as spiritual minutia of the Hebrew scriptures were both essential to Justin's typology.[59] The typology of this second century patriarch demonstrated his ability to see connections in persons as well as events such as Noah and the Flood being types of Jesus and baptism.[60] Justin also found christological references in overt examples like the Passover lamb and the bronze serpent, as well as minor details like the Atonement goats and Rahab's scarlet cord.[61] Justin clearly interpreted Joshua as a type of Christ.[62] Additionally, Justin interpreted Joshua's circumcision of the Israelites as typological of heart circumcision required of Christians in separating themselves from idols.[63] Justin's

---

[57] Jean Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (Jackson, MI: *Ex Fontibus* Company, 2018), 82.

[58] John R. Franke and Thomas C. Oden, eds., *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–2 Samuel* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2005), 13.

[59] Cullen I. K. Story, "The Cross as Ultimate in the Writings of Justin Martyr," *Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 21, no. 1 (1998), 29.

[60] Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 138, quoted in Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality*, 91.

[61] Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 15*, Dialogue with Trypho* 111*, and First Apology 60*, quoted in Story, "The Cross," 29–32.

[62] Leszek Misiarczyk, "Influence of the Septuagint on the Typological Interpretation of Joshua and His Deeds in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew,'" *Verbum Vitae* 39, no. 3 (2021), 955.

[63] Franke and Oden, *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture*, 25.

interpretive observations were accepted as a means of understanding scripture and repudiating pagan ideals and philosophies.[64]

Irenaeus

Irenaeus provided the first known writing to explore the Adam-Christ typology, thereby becoming the first church father to systematically link the Old and New Testaments.[65] Within this epitomic typological example, Irenaeus forms his foundational idea of recapitulation and Jesus' purpose of recovering what the first Adam lost in the garden.[66] Osborn describes Irenaeus' writings as a "jungle," stating that the "rich complexity" of his works can leave readers "overwhelmed."[67] Some would attribute this complexity to the interpretive choices made by translators of Irenaeus and that reexamining word choice creates a clearer picture of his outline of the typological comparison between Eve and Mary.[68] Irenaeus denotes Mary as an antitype of Eve in the sense that her obedience and submission to God enabled salvation to enter the world.[69] This is a counterpoint to Eve whose disobedience paved the way for sin to prevail. This typology

[64] Story, "The Cross," 33.

[65] John VanMaaren, "The Adam-Christ Typology in Paul and Its Development in the Early Church Fathers," *Tyndale Bulletin* 64, no. 2 (2013), 281.

[66] VanMaaren, "The Adam-Christ Typology," 282.

[67] Eric Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 7–10.

[68] Christophe Guignard, "Untying Knots: A New Interpretation of Irenaeus' Adversus Haereses 3.22.4," *Harvard Theological Review* 114, no. 2 (2021), 218.

[69] Chase, *40 Questions*, 36–39. According to Mitchell Chase, an antitype is denoted as the fulfillment of the type. Antitypes do not need to correspond to every aspect of the initial type, as they represent the true fullness of form demonstrating a culmination in God's salvific narrative.

is rooted in Paul's doctrine in Romans 5:12 that Adam's disobedience brought spiritual death to all humanity and Jesus' sacrifice that reversed the curse.[70]

While Irenaeus expands on Paul's epistles, it is clear from his typological writings that understanding scripture as a unified whole was paramount to his theology. Indeed, even his acceptance of the four gospels was verified by his belief that they were reflective of the four-faced cherubim in Ezekiel and ultimately represented by the four living creatures of Revelation, each of which harmonized with the main emphasis of the various accounts.[71] Irenaeus' writings, a counterpoint to the gnostic philosophies prevalent in his day, demonstrate the basis of scriptural typology: successive stages of a unique, divine plan, in which the comparative analogies create a "unifying thread" signifying the work of God and authenticating the canon.[72] Irenaeus' perspective of scriptural unity based in the writings of Paul demonstrates the persistence of typological understanding in the second century church.

Tertullian

Another ante-Nicene father, Tertullian, has additional insight for the paradigm of typology in the apostolic church. One example of Tertullian's typological persuasion is found in his writings on baptism. Here, the patristic father finds types within the narratives of creation, the flood (including the dove released by Noah), and the crossing of the Red Sea.[73] Christologically, Tertullian outlines Isaac's journey on the mountain as well as the life of Joseph demarcating each

---

[70] Guignard, "Untying Knots," 216.

[71] Dustin G. Resch, "The Fittingness and Harmony of Scripture: Toward an Irenaean Hermeneutic," *Heythrop Journal – Quarterly Review of Philosophy and Theology* 50, no. 1 (2009), 77–78.

[72] Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality*, 30–31.

[73] Tertullian, *Treatise on Baptism*, concepts found in chapters 3, 8, and 9, https://www.tertullian.org/articles/souter_orat_bapt/souter_orat_bapt_04baptism.htm#39.

as type of Christ.[74] Daniélou comments that Tertullian's symbolism is "quite straightforward. Isaac, sacrificed by his father and carrying the wood, typifies Christ offered by the Father and carrying his cross."[75] Additionally, he notes that Moses' outstretched hands for the battle with the Amalekites in Exodus 17 was a prefiguration of Christ's outstretched arms on the cross.[76] Clearly, these early church fathers continued reading the Old Testament scriptures typologically, carrying on the tradition of the New Testament authors.

Origen

The writings of Origen have garnered praise and critique but have ultimately stood the test of time due to his powerful interpretations of scripture.[77] His exegetical methods employ typology as a means of understanding how the Hebrew scriptures are relevant for the Christian life.[78] In doing so, however, Origen often crossed theological and philosophical lines blurring the distinction of typology and allegory. Origen draws on the traditions of first-century theologian Clement of Rome as well as Justin Martyr and Irenaeus in formulating an interpretation of Rahab as a type of the church. Here his theme is built on "purely biblical data" and comprises a classic example of patristic typology.[79] Thus, although his methodologies were debated, Origen demonstrates the consistent pattern of the first and second century theologians to unify the

---

[74] Chase, *40 Questions*, 83–84.

[75] Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality,* 124.

[76] Chase, *40 Questions,* 83–84.

[77] Elizabeth Ann Dively Lauro, *Homilies on Judges: Fathers of the Church Patristic Series* (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 3–4. Lauro notes that theologians and church leaders recognize the influence Origen had as a "master of the spiritual life."

[78] Ibid., 24.

[79] Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality*, 252.

message of the biblical canon through typological interpretation that continued into third-century writings.

The overall fortitude of typological interpretation in the first few centuries of the church denotes a deeper truth than a mere means of exegesis. These individuals understood the scriptures to have been *written* in such a way as to reveal typological realities which consistently demonstrated the nature of God and his salvific plan. Indeed, typology runs through patristic literature, and the aforementioned examples are the minutest of samples.[80] In constructing their commentaries, correspondences, and sermons, the early church was tasked with defining Christianity's understanding of scripture in light of the revelation and resurrection of Christ. For this commission, the patristics took their cue from the New Testament authors themselves: "By reading the Old Testament as anticipating Christ, the fathers were trying to imitate the apostles."[81] In this way, the church leaders of the first centuries were emulating the disciples, who were imitating Christ. This practice was the accepted means by which the church interpreted and taught the scriptures for centuries, establishing typology as the faithful way of understanding God's redemptive history. Additionally, the typological perspective was useful in their apologetic arguments for refuting heresies of the day.[82] These interpretations would most naturally include the book of Judges, garnering a typological understanding of the historical narratives. This was not a new form of exegesis but rather the demonstrated way of understanding the Hebrew scriptures as designated by Jesus, utilized by the apostles and authors of the New Testament, and continued by the patristic fathers. Typology did not merely constitute

[80] Ibid., 40.

[81] Chase, *40 Questions*, 80.

[82] Ibid., 81.

their way of viewing scripture as New Testament Christians but rather revealed the way scripture had been originally, divinely designed and composed and, thus, must be studied.

Alexandrian and Antiochene Schools of Thought

Following the apostolic age, two schools of thought came into existence, Alexandrians and Antiochenes, designations which denote exegetical distinctions rather than geographical regions of the patristic fathers.[83] While some would demarcate a clear distinction, that the Antiochenes favored typology and the Alexandrians preferred allegory, reality is murkier.[84] Contemporary scholarship distinguishes between these two approaches to scripture; however, it is vital to remember these categories are modern descriptors of ancient deliberations and may provide only a cursory understanding of the depth of the debates. For example, while it appears that the Antiochenes rejected allegory and focused on a more literal interpretation, it is conceivable that their attempts overcompensated for the Alexandrians by promoting grammatical rules over theological insights and limited the divine power of scripture.[85] Additionally, although Antiochenes are often portrayed in modern scholarship as the more historical and typological, it was from this group that prominent heretics developed including Marcion, Paul of Samosata, Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorius, all of whom were condemned by the church for lacking a sufficient christological emphasis in their exegesis.[86] Nestorius, for example,

[83] Darren M. Slade, "Patristic Exegesis: The Myth of the Alexandrian-Antiochene Schools of Interpretation," *Socio-Historical Examination of Religion and Ministry* 1, no. 2 (2019), 155.

[84] Benjamin J Ribbens, "Typology of Types: Typology in Dialogue," *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 5, no. 1 (2011), 86.

[85] John J. O'Keefe, "'A Letter That Killeth': Toward a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8, no. 1 (2000), 104.

[86] Slade, "Patristic Exegesis," 160.

promoted the division of Christ's divinity from his humanity based on his belief in the absolute impassibility of God.[87] This perspective, however, does not align with the typological representations of the righteous sufferer in the Hebrew Bible. Therefore, even in the church's condemnation of these heretics, a christological, typological approach to interpreting the Old Testament was reinforced.

Attempting to comprehend the divine as captured by mortal manifestations is messy and does not allow for simple delineations. Even Origen, who is often seen as the quintessential allegorist, acknowledged the literal interpretation of the scriptures, accepted the unity of the testaments, and utilized messianic types.[88] Antiochenes employed the same techniques as Origen in their exegesis and differed more significantly in their hermeneutic.[89] Therefore, what is more important than the differences between these early theologians is the similarities shared between the Alexandrians and Antiochenes. For example, both schools "saw sketches and outlines of Christ and his work throughout the Old Testament."[90] Indeed, despite their differences, both sides of scholarship in this era prioritized the intertextuality of the testaments and saw Christ as the key to understanding both. The Alexandrians and Antiochenes were "united on the importance of the witness of all scripture to Christ, and typological exegesis of scripture was one means of seeing that unity and witness."[91]

---

[87] H. Chadwick, "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy," *The Journal of Theological Studie* 2, no. 2 (1951), 158.

[88] Frances Young, *A History of Biblical Interpretation: Volume 1 The Ancient Period*, ed. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 335–36.

[89] Ibid., 352.

[90] Chase, *40 Questions*, 82.

[91] Gundry, "Typology as a Means of Interpretation," 234.

Later Fathers

Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and John Chrysostom might be classified in a chronological category of early patristics, although they are technically post-Nicene. Basil, who despite his affinity for Origen was quite opposed to allegorical interpretations, nevertheless wrote that God's character is "very frequently represented by the rough and shadowy outlines of the types," adding that "the type is an exhibition of things expected, and an imitative anticipation of the future."[92] Gregory's typological approach is exemplified in his commentary on Joshua, as he states, "It is clear that Joshua also, who set up the twelve stones in the stream, was anticipating the coming of the twelve disciples, the ministers of baptism."[93] Chrysostom, likely the most famous preacher of his day was also a proponent of simplistic, literal interpretation.[94] However, he also employed typological interpretations in his ministry, such as his belief that Rahab was a "prefigurement of the church, which was at one time mixed up in the prostitution of the demons and which now accepts the spies of Christ, not the ones sent by Joshua the son of Nun, but the apostles who were sent by Jesus the true Savior."[95]

The practice of typological reading of the Scriptures did not diminish despite a shift toward a more literal reading of the texts, a trend that would continue during the ensuing centuries, when a broadening of ways to understand scripture would occur. In fact, a few final fathers worthy of noting include Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, most of whom operated in the late fourth to mid-fifth centuries and all of whom employed typological interpretations. Ambrose

---

[92] Chase, *40 Questions,* 83.

[93] Franke and Oden, *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture,* 20.

[94] Ibid., xxiv.

[95] Ibid., 12.

points out David's Christlikeness when he endured the insults of Shimei as well as Abigail's connection to the gentile church, who would eventually find their way to the King.[96] Jerome was "an outstanding interpreter of Scripture," who demonstrated through his homilies an overall typological paradigm.[97] Augustine was the "most influential figure in the history of the Western church," and his spiritual and typological interpretation of scripture would shape the perspective of the church for centuries.[98] For Augustine, understanding the Old Testament required studying the text through a christological lens.[99] Augustine expanded on Origen's three-fold interpretation of scripture, adding an eschatological perspective which would become known as the Quadriga.[100]

During the Middle Ages, the Quadriga became of utmost importance in interpreting Old Testament scriptures. This fourfold interpretation of scripture continued to focus on the unity of the testaments. Unfortunately, during this period the interpretation pendulum would swing again, creating a shift away from the literal sense of scripture. This fluctuation produced an imbalance in understanding, since typological interpretation necessitates a historical reality. Despite this change, two of the main theologians of the thirteen century, Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure,

---

[96] Ibid., 376, 312–13.

[97] Ibid., xxv. One example of Jerome's perspective is the salvific type he assigns to Joshua as a type of Jesus who leads the people into the Promised Land (8–9). He also saw the church within the stories of Noah and Rahab as God continued to rescue a remnant (40).

[98] Ibid., xxv.

[99] Chase, *40 Questions,* 87.

[100] Ibid.*,* 88–89. The Quadriga consists of a fourfold understanding of scripture—the literal sense and three spiritual senses: allegorical, tropological (moral application), and anagogical (eschatological meaning). In these headings, typological interpretations align with allegorical interpretation because the church fathers were not as cognizant of such semantic distinctions.

"continued to apply the interpretative methods" of earlier church fathers.[101] It should be noted that at this point in history the church had been utilizing typology as a paradigm from which to understand the scriptures for the first nearly 1,500 foundational years of its existence. This perspective would naturally include the interpretation of the book of Judges through a typological perspective.

One final noteworthy scholar is Nicholas of Lyra. A reputable Hebraist, Nicholas tended to focus on the literal sense of the scripture while still maintaining a christological approach.[102] Nicholas utilized the idea of double meaning, emphasizing the literal without denying the theological implication of the narratives. "When Nicholas argued that *the christological interpretation is the literal sense,* he had the added benefit of not having to choose between his religious faith and his exegetical method."[103] This mentality would be instrumental to future typology, grounding the typological perspective in the literal sense. However, despite the anomaly of Nicholas' unique, dual interpretation, Saperstein argues that typology had essentially served its purpose of proving the unity of the testaments and denouncing Jewish, pagan, and heretical philosophies during the age of the church fathers, such that interest in the paradigm began to eventually wane during the Middle Ages.[104]

---

[101] Friedbert Ninow, "Indicators of Typology Within the Old Testament: The Exodus Motif" (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1999), 28.

[102] Deeana Copeland Klepper, *The Insight of Unbelievers: Nicholas of Lyra and Christian Reading of Jewish Text in the Later Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 32.

[103] Ari Geiger, *Nicolas De Lyre Franciscain Du XIVe Siècle Exègète et Thèologien* (Paris: *Institut d'Études Augustiniennes*, 2011), 201 (emphasis added).

[104] Marc Saperstein, "Jewish Typological Exegesis after Nahmanides," *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (1993), 169.

Renaissance–Enlightenment Era

Philosophies that grew outside of the religious world during this era transformed the cultural landscape of Europe. Revolutions in the areas of art, humanities, and science during the Renaissance began a transition in the minds of people to consider concepts beyond the ideals of the established church. It is worthy to note that this was the era in which the first Bible was printed, beginning another slow shift in the locus of scriptural interpretation from centralized, church leadership to personal, layman elucidation of scriptural truths. Additionally, people were able to print new ideas and spread them much more quickly than in previous eras, a change that Martin Luther would take full advantage of during his reformation movement.[105] With the advent of the printing press came a market for devotional tracts, many of which reinvigorated interest in typology.[106] With all of this readily available information, there was also a shift toward a more pluralistic perspective that challenged the classic Christian worldview and opened the way for the secularization of traditional values within the Church.[107]

Martin Luther and John Calvin

The two most significant theologians of this era were Martin Luther and John Calvin. Both reformers called for a methodological return to a more literal reading of the Old Testament.[108] Luther believed that all of the Old Testament pertained to Christ and therefore

---

[105] Frederik van Niekerk, "Reformation and Scientific Revolution: Historical Coincidence or Continual Renewal?," *In die Skriflig* 54, no. 2 (2020), 6.

[106] Susan Hardman Moore, "For the Mind's Eye Only: Puritans, Images and 'The Golden Mines of Scripture,'" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 59, no. 3 (2006), 286.

[107] Harvey Chisick, "Between Heavenly and Earthly Cities: Religion and Humanity in Enlightenment Thought," *European Legacy* 26, no. 6 (2021), 562.

[108] Gundry, "Typology as a Means of Interpretation," 236. It should be noted that Luther was firmly against allegorical interpretation, condemning Origen's writing and preferring the simplistic literal reading of the scriptures.

utilized typology within his exegesis.[109] However, he made a break with the fourfold sense of studying scripture promoted by the Quadriga, focusing instead on the literal sense while maintaining a christological approach.[110] Here he argued contrary to Nicholas of Lyra, insisting that the psalms consistently referred to Christ, leading to his foundational tenet of faith over deeds.[111] This belief—that the Hebrew scriptures pointed to Christ—necessitated a typological perspective. However, Luther had begun a trend of lessening the importance and examination of Old Testament types, a trend that would continue for centuries to come.[112]

Conversely, Calvin leaned more prominently into the historicity of the Hebrew Bible before accepting typological realities.[113] Like Luther, he firmly denounced the allegorists, but unlike Luther, Calvin's view on typology was fundamental to his theological interpretations.[114] However, Calvin acknowledged only those types which were detailed in the New Testament. By approving typology only when explicitly outlined in scripture, Calvin acknowledged the divinity of the New Testament authors' message but not their methodology, setting a dangerous example for future theologians. Therefore, despite its continued usage, the limitations placed on typology during the Reformation and shift toward grammatical-historical approach would inevitably lead to the historical-critical methodology of the Enlightenment era.

---

[109] Ninow, "Indicators of Typology Within the Old Testament," 15.

[110] Richard Davidson, "Typological Structures in the Old and New Testaments" (doctoral dissertation, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1981), 27–29

[111] Gerhard Ebeling, "The New Hermeneutics and the Early Luther," *Theology Today* 21, no. 1 (1964), 41.

[112] Catherine Brown Tkacz, "Typology Today," *New Blackfriars* 88, no. 1017 (2007), 574.

[113] Ninow, "Indicators of Typology Within the Old Testament," 16.

[114] Davidson, "Typological Structures in the Old and New Testaments," 31.

As the world crept toward the Enlightenment era, not all of the development was strictly linear, as some research reveals that scientists were disproportionately Protestant.[115] Each of these movements had mutual effects on one another, but eventually the seemingly symbiotic relationship would turn parasitic, as culturally the ideologies of the Enlightenment would supersede scriptural truth. Building upon the cultural shift of the Renaissance and the religious transformation of the Reformation, the world was set for the era of Enlightenment, which would reciprocally issue a knockout blow to the practice of typology as a legitimate way to understand the scriptures. The history of typology to this point had one point of agreement throughout the various eras: the types of the Hebrew scriptures pointed forward in an oracular manner toward Christ and his salvific and ongoing work.[116] However, with the radical shift to rationalism and individualism, the traditional teachings of the Bible as well as the authenticity of scripture itself came into sharp question in the Enlightenment era. This growing skepticism inevitably brought Holy Writ into question, as the unity of the testaments diminished even in the eyes of adherents to Christianity.

Typology Debates

A revival of typology by Johannes Cocceius in the seventeenth century was allayed within a century by Herbert Marsh who advocated for an even stricter view, denoting that only types specifically identified in the New Testament were to be recognized as legitimate.[117] Typology needed a mitigating position to regain firm footing between those who openly decried

[115] Niekerk, "Reformation and Scientific Revolution," 3.

[116] Gundry, "Typology as a Means of Interpretation," 237.

[117] Davidson, "Typological Structures in the Old and New Testaments," 33–37.

the practice as heretical and those who strayed into allegorical appropriations. In the mid-nineteenth century, Patrick Fairbairn became that voice, as he criticized the dearth of attention the academic world placed on the tradition of typology, stating that the "typology of Scripture has been one of the most neglected departments of theological science."[118] Fairbairn created five principles for the proper interpretation of types within scripture.[119] Additionally, Fairbairn was careful to distinguish between typology and allegory, as he considered the intermingling of these two terms and practices to be a primary reason for the abuses and ensuing rejection of typology.[120]

In the mid- to late-nineteenth century the split between typological and literal reading became more defined, creating a distinction between the ardors of academia and the practices of the pulpit. Benjamin Jowett, a Greek professor at Oxford, published an essay on the interpretation of scripture that both captured the scholarly opinion of the day and catalyzed the study of the future. Jowett asserted that "Scripture has one meaning—the meaning which it had to the mind of the Prophet or Evangelist who first uttered or wrote, to the hearers or readers who first received it."[121] Here Jowett clearly disavows the deeper meaning of scripture, promoting the literal sense as the only truth within Holy Writ. However, his perspective becomes more evident in the ensuing explanation:

> Neither is there any ground for assuming design of any other kind in Scripture any more than in Plato or Homer. Wherever there is beauty and order, there is design; but there is

---

[118] Patrick Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture, Vol. 1* (Altenmünster: Jazzybee Verlag, 2017), ch 1.

[119] Davidson, "Typological Structures in the Old and New Testaments," 40.

[120] Joseph J. Shepley III, "'Trembling on the Verge of Allegory' Interpretive Modes of Late-Antique and Early Christian Exegesis: A Comparative Study" (doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, Divinity School, 2000), 14.

[121] Benjamin Jowett, "The Interpretation of Scripture," in *Essays and Reviews*, 7th ed. (London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1861), 378.

> no proof of any artificial design, such as is often traced by the Fathers, in the relation of the several parts of a book, or of the several books to each other. . . that greatness [of scripture] is of a simple kind; it is not increased by double senses, or systems of types, or elaborate structure, or design.[122]

Within a few short statements, Jowett compares scripture to mortal philosophers, renounces a divine design in scripture, and repudiates the traditions of the church fathers as well as types. While this trend toward a solo literal meaning had begun earlier, Jowett's formalization seemed to widen the gap between formal academia and familiar application of scriptural interpretation. Whereas a mere five centuries previous, scholar and theologian Nicholas of Lyra approached scripture with a double-literal sense—acknowledging the original narrative while allowing for a larger typological meaning—Jowett definitively declares this means of interpretation as defunct.[123]

In the same era that Jowett was defecting, prolific preacher Charles Spurgeon developed a typological interpretation which featured prominently in his speaking.[124] These divergences highlighted the ever-widening gap between colleges and clergy. Despite preachers like Spurgeon, mitigating measures could not prevent the rise of the historical-critical method of studying scripture, which mandated the disconnection of each scriptural book from others in the corpus under the guise of discovering a more accurate interpretation of the authorial motives.

Unfortunately, this detachment latently served to sever the unity of the scripture. Indeed, while historical-criticism took an up-close look at various aspects of the scriptural texts, it undoubtably created a loss of overarching themes which "contributed to a fragmented

---

[122] Ibid., 381–82.

[123] David C. Steinmetz, "The Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis," *Theology Today* 37, no. 1 (1980), 31.

[124] Kiseong Lee, "An Evaluation of Typology in the Sermons of Charles H. Spurgeon and Alexander Maclaren and Its Implications for Text-Driven Preaching" (doctoral dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2019), 129–64.

understanding of the text, so that any unity [became] an illusion."[125] The Bible was no longer a book of divine wisdom but an "ancient literary document that could be studied as any other ancient piece of literature."[126] With the historicity of the scriptures brought into question, the tenets of typology disintegrated as well, since true types must always be based in historical reality. And the church stumbled toward the modern era.

Modern Era

Just as World War II was beginning to break out in Europe, Leonhard Goppelt wrote his dissertation, titled *Typos*, promoting a return to the "method of biblical interpretation that is characteristic of the [New Testament]."[127] Goppelt highlighted a "uniformity and solidarity" amongst the authors of the New Testament in regard to their employment of typology.[128] Yet in the 1950s, Rudolf Bultmann denounced Goppelt in part and typology entirely, declaring that the New Testament authors had a different mentality regarding the interpretation of time and therefore the types present were insupportable.[129] Bultmann rejected the idea that all of the Old Testament is predictive of Jesus' fulfillment, believing the idea to be cyclical and not reflective of the linear pattern of scripture.[130] A response by Gerhard von Rad set the debate in full motion,

---

[125] Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible*, ed. D. A. Carson, (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 29.

[126] Ninow, "Indicators of Typology Within the Old Testament," 24.

[127] Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 4.

[128] Davidson, "Typological Structures in the Old and New Testaments," 54.

[129] Tkacz, "Typology Today," 576.

[130] Ninow, "Indicators of Typology within the Old Testament," 27. Here Bultmann seems unable to acknowledge the Hebraic mindset which could simultaneously operate in cyclical patterns and an overarching *Heilsgeschichte*.

as he reinforced Goppelt but set forth a non-traditional interpretation of typology that was more historical but less Christocentric.[131] Von Rad maintained that there was a spiritual element which could not be methodized or regulated and must remain in the realm of the spirit.[132] Yet he asserted that typological thinking was an "elementary function of all human thought and interpretation."[133] This same sentiment is reflected in Anderson's work, which claims that "typological thinking is not a peculiarity of the Biblical faith. It may be found in any historical community."[134] However, both perspectives presented a new interpretation of typology which espoused ideas contrary to many of the traditional perspectives of typological interpretation. These new opinions created more complexity in the field, and since that time there has been no consensus of the definition of typology, nor are there cohesive criteria for identifying biblical types. Thus, the modern debate often shifts to one of semantics and the power of interpreting Scripture through this historically prominent paradigm acquiesces to the extraneous discussions of methodology. However, this distraction has merely clouded the understanding of typology, not diminished its power in understanding scripture.

Another modern scholar of typology was Richard T. France, who reflected the ideas of Francis Foulkes in espousing that typology "consisted in a looking back and discerning in the Old Testament examples of a pattern which reaches its culmination in the Christ event."[135] David Baker built upon this understanding of typology, specifying that types are historical and involve

---

[131] Davidson, "Typological Structures in the Old and New Testaments," 59–64.

[132] Ninow, "Indicators of Typology Within the Old Testament," 92.

[133] Gerhard von Rad, "The Interpretation of the Old Testament," *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 15, no. 2 (1961), 174.

[134] Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," 180.

[135] Ninow, "Indicators of Typology Within the Old Testament," 40.

real correspondence.[136] His approach focused on the grammatical-historical method and emphasized that typology is not a form of exegesis but rather that proper exegesis is essential for true typological understanding, which is conveyed by author-initiated accounts typifying God's salvific activity.[137] Baker concludes,

> Typology is not exegesis. The biblical text has only one meaning, its literal meaning, and this is to be found by means of grammatical-historical study. If the author intended a typical significance it will be clear in the text. And if we see a typical significance not perceived by the original author it must be consistent with the literal meaning. Typology is not an exegesis or interpretation of a text but the study of relationship between events, persons and institutions recorded in biblical texts.[138]

In this way, typology shifted to a retrospective rather than prospective view of biblical history. In this definition, Baker aligned himself with von Rad by recognizing the human analogical side of typology.[139] G. K. Beale would challenge these retrospective definitions, citing "an aspect of foreshadowing or presignification" was an essential element of typology.[140] These debates led to the modern classifications of typology.

Typology as studied today might be categorized into two main groups: prefiguration and correspondence typology.[141] Prefiguration typology is the traditional form, consisting of

---

[136] Ibid., 41.

[137] Ibid., 42–43. Here we sense the early stages of what Hamilton will utilize for his formalized definition of typology that is utilized in this paper.

[138] David L. Baker, "Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 29, no. 2 (1976), 149.

[139] Ribbens, "Typology of Types," 85.

[140] G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 9.

[141] Ribbens, "Typology of Types," 84–85. Prefiguration defines typology narrowly by concentrating only on types which were preordained and highlight the salvific work of Christ. This definition avoids any overlap into allegory but may miss the broader picture of the scriptural narrative.

predictive and forward-focused types.[142] Correspondence typology, the broader of the two perspectives, is defined as literary correspondences between persons, events, or institutions that manifest in literary patterns.[143] Typologists in the correspondence paradigm utilize the grammatical-historical approach as their method of interpretation.[144] Yet, these two categories need not be mutually exclusive, as scriptural authors could intentionally describe types which are predictive of God's future fulfillment based on previous accounts of his redemptive acts. Indeed, individually, neither of these two counterparts can fully explain a divine being operating in a redemptive way and conveying his character through typological patterns. Scholars must be willing to reduce their ardency in defending a position in order to garner a fuller interpretation. It is arrogantly egregious to assume finite beings can classify the workings of an infinite divinity into such simplistic categories. However, biblical scholars generally approach hermeneutics with a sincerity of heart. With this perspective, grace might be given to biblical scholars of the various eras. Rather than focusing on differences, it is vital to note that throughout the history of the church, typology was continuously employed until the dawn of the Enlightenment, when the actual authority of the scriptures came under scrutiny. With the intention of discovering a more accurate interpretation of scripture, the Enlightenment era succeeded in accomplishing the opposite. Stanglin notes that "as the methods of scholarly biblical study became detached from and even hostile to the handling of scripture in the church, it reinforced the increasingly

---

[142] Davidson, "Typological Structures in the Old and New Testaments," 94.

[143] Ribbens, "Typology of Types," 85. Ribbens would contend that these two perspectives are, in fact, mutually exclusive; that prefiguration typology conveys only those types which are divinely preordained but solely christologically focused while correspondence typology represents retrospective analogical recognitions.

[144] John Byong-Hwan Choi, "A Comparative Examination of Typological and Allegorical Interpretation in Developing Christ-Centered Preaching" (doctoral dissertation, Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 2020), 125.

antagonistic relationship of the university (once a handmaid of the state) versus the church," which would create more "fragmentation among Christians."[145] However, typology did not die in the Enlightenment, nor in the years after Bultmann or other opponents. Therefore, armed with this vast cloud of ancient witnesses, as well as modern scholars championing the typological paradigm, contemporary academia must consider the legitimacy of this form of scriptural understanding.

Typology propels forward the overarching narrative of the Old Testament, necessitating "resolution, reapplication, or fulfillment."[146] Understanding this history of redemption is vital for Christ-centered preaching as well as Christ-centered living.[147] While it may not be possible to definitively determine the original author's intent, evaluating literary patterns which demonstrate a typological correspondence can provide insight to the central themes of individual books and subsequently to scripture as a whole.[148] As will be explicated in the following chapters, Judges provides numerous examples of these literary patterns which are connected to the overarching redemptive story. The typology utilized by the patristic fathers was not new to them nor to their predecessors, the New Testament authors. Rather, typology was employed throughout the Hebrew Bible as a means of conveying the character of God. This paper proposes a return to the typological understanding regarding the book of Judges by examining the literary patterns of the

---

[145] Keith D. Stanglin, *The Letter and Spirit of Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018), 58–59.

[146] Ribbens, "Typology of Types," 90.

[147] Choi, "A Comparative Examination of Typological and Allegorical Interpretation," 130.

[148] C. Jason White, "Is It Possible to Discover 'The One' Intended Meaning of the Biblical Authors?," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 67, no. 2 (2014), 194. White only explores the idea of discovering the intended meaning of scripture and does not evaluate literary typological patterns in his analysis. His conclusion is not that biblical authors lacked intention but rather that it is impossible for modern day scholars to discover the objective original meaning aside from the church's interpretation. White, therefore, proposes a return to Christian traditions and dependence on the Holy Spirit.

author. To further understand the necessity of this shift, it is essential to provide a brief overview of the potential authorship of Judges and their paradigms. These potential authors will be discussed in chapter 3.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined two major considerations that form the foundation for interpreting the book of Judges typologically. First, examining the Hebrew understanding of time, thought, and manifestations demonstrates that the Hebrew mindset is naturally typological. Additionally, the prevalent spiritual paradigm of the Hebrews allows for interpretations of the text that have been ignored by the more analytical scrutiny of historical-critical methodology. Second, the acceptance and utilization of typology as an appropriate means of understanding scripture has been practiced by the New Testament authors through the Reformation and has only in recent centuries been dismissed as antiquated. Therefore, the vast majority of church history has supported the community of faith's employment of typology as a legitimate means of gaining accurate scriptural interpretation. This interpretation has uniformly applied to the book of Judges. These typological patterns must therefore be identified and analyzed, which is the subject of the next chapter, along with an exploration of potential authorship.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY; MEASURING THE MADNESS

The complexity of the book of Judges as well as the current academic conclusions being ascertained from non-typological perspectives creates an environment for misinterpretation. This chapter will begin by highlighting some of these literary complexities, considering potential authorships, and scrutinizing current conclusions. However, the purpose of this chapter is to outline the methodology employed in analyzing the typological intentionality of the author of Judges. This will be done through an expounding of definitions from chapter 1 and an explication of examples selected for the macro- and micro-level illustrations.

Judges' Complexity

The literary background of Judges exhibits the complexity of the book, which includes summaries of conquests, hymns of victory, "prayers, prophecies, political speeches, a fable, geographic equations" and more.[1] While each of these literary forms are represented in ancient Near Eastern literature, nowhere is there such a "coherent portrayal of history incorporating the forms and contents of these documents as we find in Judges."[2] Therefore, the intricacy of Judges makes an ideal, although challenging, canvas for testing the consistency of typology in the Hebrew Bible. Finally, contemporary studies present theological conclusions currently being drawn from non-typological approaches to the text.

---

[1] John H. Walton and Craig S. Keener, eds., *NIV Cultural Backgrounds Study Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 402.

[2] Daniel Block, "Judges," in *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary*, ed. John Walton (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 96.

Literary Background

The book of Judges could be considered one of the most complex textual corpuses in the Hebrew Bible. Set in the era subsequent to the Exodus and initial conquest of the Promised Land, the judges are the penultimate form of leadership prior to the establishment of the Israelite monarchy. The interlude the book represents was regarded as a distinct era in the minds of ancient Israelites, as evidenced by the book of Ruth.[3] From its double introduction to its seemingly non-linear timeline, the book has also been considered a compilation of multiple tradition stories.[4] Edenburg summarizes the complexity of the book:

> The outlook and literary structure of the prologue and appendix of Judges (Judg 1:1–2:5; 17:1–21:25) differ from the savior stories in Judges (Judg 2:6–16:31), and from the account of the conquest in Joshua (Josh 1:1–12:24). Furthermore, since the prologue and appendix to Judges disrupt the chronology and narrative continuity of the Deuteronomistic History, Noth thought that they were late additions composed from non-Deuteronomistic sources.[5]

[3] Block, "Judges," 95.

[4] Serge Frolov, "Rethinking Judges," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71, no. 1 (2009), 24–25. Frolov recounts Martin Noth's 1943 Deuteronomistic Hypothesis which divided the book into two parts (Judg 2:6–12:15 and Judg 13:1–1 Sam 12:25) as well as Wolfgang Richter's suggestion of a Book of Saviors (Judg 3:12–9:57) comprising a majority of the major judges and composed of earlier traditions. Brian Peterson notes the potential oral origins of such narratives as well. Brian N. Peterson, "Could Abiathar the Priest Be the Author of Judges?," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 170, no. October (2013): 432–52. Furthermore, Gooding expounds on the well known division of the Judges introduction into two sections (Judg 1:1–2:5 and 2:6–3:4) stating that the second portion sets up the pattern for the central section of the book. D. W. Gooding, "The Composition of the Book of Judges," *Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies* 16 (1982), 72. Gooding also notes the two sections of the epilogue as Judg 17:1–18:31 and 19:1–21:25 (75).

[5] Cynthia Edenburg, "'Overwriting and Overriding,' or What Is Not Deuteronomistic," in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, ed. Martti Nissinen (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 445. Edenburg draws from Martin Noth for the definition of the Deuteronomistic History. Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, trans. Max Neimeyer Verlag (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981). Noth's proposal will be discussed shortly.

While the central stories of Judges do appear to have independent origins from the "interpretive framework" that unifies the whole account,[6] these narratives were not altered throughout the centuries, despite evidence of later redactions that created the unifying framework.[7]

Adding to the complexity of the book, the framework of Judges has been categorized as historical, polemical, allegorical, or a combination of these perspectives.[8] Furthermore, there is no consensus on the authorship of Judges and the debates regarding the writer's motivation revolve around two main ideas; either the book was written as a pro-monarchy polemic or as a Deuteronomistic call to return to the ways of Yahweh. This dichotomy centers the debate around the author existing in the pre-monarchy or post-exilic era. However, both these ideas are met with challenges. For example, if Judges promotes kingship, then it contradicts its own account of Gideon.[9] Conversely, if composed by a Deuteronomist, the complex stories do not fit the literary style.[10] The idea of a Deuteronomistic History, first proposed by Martin Noth in 1943,

---

[6] Frederick E. Greenspahn, "The Theology of the Framework of Judges," *Vetus Testamentum* 36 (1986), 385.

[7] Robert G. Boling, *Judges: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman (Garden City, NY: DoubleDay, 1975), 29.

[8] Marc Brettler, "The Book of Judges: Literature as Politics," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108, no. 3 (1989): 395–418. Brettler attempts to bring a literary-historical approach to his study to discover the authorial purpose of the final form of the book of Judges. Within this line of thinking, Brettler denies a Deuteronomistic editor positing instead that the author's motives were polemical toward a pro-Judean monarchy. For Brettler, Othniel is written allegorically which, he proposes, "sets the tone for reading the book of Judges as a whole" (404). Brettler concludes by remarking that Judges was written typologically, prefiguring the monarchical era.

[9] W. J. Dumbrell, "'In Those Days There Was No King in Israel; Every Man Did What Was Right in His Own Eyes.' The Purpose of the Book of Judges Reconsidered," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 25 (1983), 28. The inclusion of Abimelech is also difficult to reconcile with a pro-monarchial perspective. However, some would contend that the polemic is not merely pro-monarchy but pro-*Davidic* monarchy which would make the accounts of Gideon and Abimelech more tenable.

[10] Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 5. Noth states that the Deuteronomist's language is easy to identify as "straightforward and dispenses with any particular artistry or refinement" (5). While there is a simplistic, cyclical formulae, not all of the narratives would fit into this definition. Additionally, if this were the case, the inclusion of Deborah's song is to be questioned. Despite the Deuteronomist drawing from earlier sources, this song, if not utilized as a means of typologically connecting Deborah to Moses, has no historical or theological necessity in the narrative. This connection typological will be considered in chapter 5.

reinterpreted Judges in connection to the surrounding texts as written and redacted through the Deuteronomistic author.[11] Noth's proposition works backward, where a later author/editor included details in earlier books which were already known as historical fact, concluding that the Deuteronomistic History comprised Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings.[12] Additionally, Noth states that the work of the Deuteronomist, including the conquest of Judges, was "developed completely independently of the Pentateuch."[13] This widely accepted hypothesis reigned in academia for decades and was only somewhat dethroned in the mid-1980s, when scholarly works on Judges began again to see it as an independent book.[14] The Deuteronomistic History still holds a significant place in biblical study, but some scholars have continued to question Noth's conclusions, contending that the language of Judges does not fully support such a claim.[15] It should be noted that Martin Noth, the originator of the theory, recognized that

[11] Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 42–53. For the book of Judges, Noth proposes the Deuteronomist to have written Joshua 23 and linked it immediately to Judges 2:6. Utilizing two sources, he then wrote the remainder of Judges up to or including the account of Samson and then moved on to 1 Samuel. This relegates Judges 18–21 to a later addition.

[12] Ibid., 4. Noth did not believe Judges was an independent literary unit but had value only so far as the narrative linked to Joshua and Samuel with the intention of demonstrating where to place the blame for the exilic period. However, Noth himself states that the "unity of Dtr. becomes apparent only if we look at the material which he used from the old tradition; for this material is very diverse in every respect" (9). Therefore, Noth's theory requires him to speculate on source material as well as redaction styles and authorial composition. He does note that the Deuteronomist appeared to have made judgement calls on how he arranged the material (11). Here, Noth gets at the heart of a uniform writer; he is simply too fettered by the idea of the Deuteronomist's intentions that he cannot see the author's macro and micro level motifs. These will be discussed in chapters 4 and 5 respectively.

[13] Martin Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, trans. H. G. M. Williamson. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 141.

[14] Serge Frolov, "Rethinking Judges," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71, no. 1 (2009), 25.

[15] Lauren A. S. Monroe, "They Behaved Even Worse than Their Ancestors: Reconsidering the Deuteronomistic Origin of Judges 2:11–19," *Revue Biblique*, no. 3 (2012): 347–65. Monroe argues that the original introduction (2:11–19) cannot be classified as Deuteronomistic due to its lack of a fitting schema, appropriate vocabulary, and its composite nature. Additionally, Cynthia Edenberg and Frederick Greenspahn call Noth's conclusions into question. Greenspahn calls the approach "simplistic" and states that Judges lacks "centralization," a primary characteristic of the Deuteronomic proposal.

significant portions of Judges did not reflect Deuteronomistic language.[16] While a full examination of the authorship is beyond the scope of this paper, three prevailing proposals will be examined.

Authorship of Judges

The author of Judges is not identified within the text itself, necessitating authorial analysis based on the content and literary style of the writing. Judges presents an array of literary styles and genres, including historical narrative, conquest summaries, "a victory hymn, prayers, prophecies, political speeches, a fable," and more.[17] Additionally, there is evidence of some, if not multiple, redactions. However, these emendations are primarily confined to the connective seams between the original narratives, rarely invading their "essential contents."[18] There are literary similarities with other ancient Israelite narratives, such as Job and Ruth.[19] The Jewish Talmud suggests Samuel as the author of Judges.[20] Other scholars consider the elusive Deuteronomist as the writer of the tome, although Butler asserts that these claims are weak at best.[21] Brian Peterson makes a compelling argument for Abiathar the priest as the original

[16] Edenburg, "'Overwriting and Overriding,' or What Is Not Deuteronomistic," 443.

[17] Block, "Judges," 96.

[18] Boling, *Judges,* 29.

[19] Ibid., 34–35.

[20] Walter C. Kaiser Jr. and Duane Garrett, *Archaeological Study Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 342.

[21] Trent C. Butler, *Word Biblical Commentary 8: Judges*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard, and Glenn W. Barker (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), li.

composer.[22] These three main authorial suggestions will be examined together in regard to the potential paradigm of their work and the typological ramifications.

While this paper is interested simply with the final form of the book, the various suggestions of authorship are worth a brief examination. Samuel was the lattermost pre-monarchical prophet. He was raised in the temple and spoke into the affairs of Israel for decades during the transition from the judge's era to the establishment of the kingdom. Having been exposed to ministerial corruption at a young age, Samuel had an earnest desire to convey the words and intentions of God as predictable and patterned by his covenants (1 Sam 1–3).

Abiathar was a priest with a personal and lengthy connection to David. As a priest whose life was entwined with God's chosen representative king, it is realistic to consider Abiathar as a man who would be concerned with knowing the ways of the Lord and representing them well. He had the training, opportunity, and motivation to record this era of Israel's history.[23] Additionally, as a priest, Abiathar would have genuine concern for demonstrating the need for a nationalistic return to genuine worship of Yahweh. To do this, Yahweh's patterned interactions needed to be documented as well as the sinful patterns exhibited by his people when they chose to live outside of His covenants.

Deuteronomistic history was introduced as a theory by Martin Noth in the 1940s. This proposal was not merely a redaction but a reconstruction of the Israelite history, placing the covenants and land at the center of the narrative in a linear construction, culminating in an

---

[22] Brian N. Peterson, "Could Abiathar the Priest Be the Author of Judges?," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 170, no. October (2013): 432–52. Peterson notes the anti-Saul polemic and pro-Judahite monarchy as consistent sentiments by the author which fit in the chronology of a pre-Davidic kingship.

[23] Ibid., 452.

explanation of the nation's exile.[24] The perspective of the Deuteronomist was to demonstrate the covenantal relationship that existed between Israel and Yahweh. It therefore behooved the Deuteronomist to highlight the ways in which Yahweh's character was consistent with his covenants and the patterned ways in which Israel rejected their creator.

Each of these potential authors—prophet, priest, and Deuteronomist—were thoroughly Hebrew.[25] They would have been raised with the Hebraic mindset discussed in chapter 2, which most naturally trends toward cyclical patterns and typological interpretations. Additionally, each was concerned with conveying the true nature of Yahweh and his interactions with his people. To this end, repetitive demonstrations of God's responses to covenantal fidelity or unfaithfulness would be notable authorial patterns for any of these writers. The book of Judges, regardless of authorship or redactional history, was written by a Hebrew who was concerned with exhibiting the typological nature of Yahweh in regard to his covenants.[26] Therefore, the authorship of Judges becomes inconsequential when considering that any of the major contenders would have been steeped in the Hebraic mindset with the expressed intention of demonstrating the repetitive covenantal faithfulness of Yahweh and Israel's inability to maintain fidelity. Any Hebraic author

---

[24] Mark A. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz Vandenhoeck & Ruprect Göttingen, 1989), 4–5. Von Rad points out that the cyclical nature of Judges appears as a strange interruption in the otherwise linear nature of the overall narrative proposed by Noth. However, if the Deuteronomist utilized some original source material for Judges, it does not detract from the main objective of demonstrating the patterned consistency of Yahweh in his covenantal fidelity.

[25] K Lawson Younger Jr., *The NIV Application Commentary: Judges, Ruth*, ed. Terry Muck (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2002). Younger notes that the book of Judges is "the work of a real author, not simply a [sic] editor" and that the uncertainty surrounding its authorship "should hardly deter the reader from understanding the book's message," 26.

[26] Robert B Chisholm Jr., *A Commentary of Judges and Ruth* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2013), 57. Chisholm points out that viewing the book through "a synchronic approach takes seriously the text as it stands. It assumes the material within Judges reflects larger purposes, which are revealed in the book itself." To zoom in on individual stories at the neglect of considering the overall narrative is akin to focusing on one stone in a mosaic and analyzing its composition: it misses the grander picture that the artist designed.

of Judges would have employed typology as a means of revealing these patterns to their audience. These patterned covenantal fulfillments of previous interactions with humanity showcased Yahweh's faithfulness and Israel's increasing infidelity, both of which were escalating toward a necessary conclusion in the *Heilsgeschichte*. Therefore, whoever the author, the book of Judges must be approached as a unified, typological text.[27]

Contemporary Studies

Judges can be a challenging book to study, as the narratives are not ordered in a chronological manner.[28] Furthermore, the storyline jumps between individuals and public concerns. While some find the rotation of personal characterization and national narratives confounding, others have suggested that this alternation is a literary technique meant to demonstrate the depravity which "permeates all levels of society, personal, familial, and national" fidelity.[29] This literary technique would place the emphasis on theological rather than chronological concerns, which also lends itself more naturally to a typological mindset. The author is not writing a historical report but a theological treatise on the covenant in action.

It is possible that Judges, due to its intricacy, violence, and bizarre narratives, has garnered more debate than other books of the Old Testament canon. However, the convolution of the composition has led some modern scholars to analyze the minutia of Judges while ignoring

---

[27] Yairah Amit, *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 18.

[28] Brettler, "The Book of Judges," 396. This observation is often made as the individual narratives do not add up to the allotted time in the Promised Land from Exodus to monarchy. Additionally, O'Connell notes the reversal of chronological order in the prologue. Robert H. O'Connell, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 80. Beldman notes that many scholars put a "chronological problem" section in their writings to attempt to address the chronological issues apparent in Judges. David J. H. Beldman, *The Completion of Judges: Strategies of Ending in Judges 17–21* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2017), 127.

[29] Philip E. Satterthwaite, "'No King in Israel': Narrative Criticism and Judges 17–21," *Tyndale Bulletin* (1993), 77.

the overall meaning of the book. Cheryl Exum states that the book "exhibits an enigmatic complexity; so much transpires on different levels that multiple interpretations are inevitable, as the plurality of views in current scholarship illustrates."[30] From commentaries to articles, scholars continue expanding the study on Judges. While some still focus on the redactional history or comparison of the book to its Near Eastern counterparts,[31] other scholars have isolated individual judges to examine their story independently from the surrounding accounts.[32] Perhaps the areas that are currently expanding the most within the study of the Judges corpus are in the realm of gender studies and feminist theory.

Unfortunately, these two concentrations may be detracting from the original message of Judges by examining the writing through modern perceptions. For example, Stone's article on Achsah suggests a queer reading of the text as does Derks's examination of Samson while Guest provides a lesbian reading of Jael's story.[33] McKenzie takes feminist ideas so far as to suggest that "the tent peg Jael uses to kill Sisera may be seen as a phallic symbol and the penetration of his skull with it as having sexual overtones."[34] Based on examining the entirety of the Hebrew Bible rather than isolated pericopes, the reality that these studies have taken the narratives out of

---

[30] J. Cheryl Exum, "The Centre Cannot Hold Thematic and Textual Instabilities in Judges," *Reconsidering Israel and Judah* 16, no. 1982 (2021), 411.

[31] Kelly J. Murphy, "Judges in Recent Research," *Currents in Biblical Research* 15, no. 2 (2017), 180. Gross's 2009 commentary continues the redactional criticism, while Sasson's updated Anchor commentary focuses on background issues. Murphy also highlights other scholars, including Frolov's form-critical approach.

[32] Ibid., 181–93. Murphy breaks down recent scholarship as presented through the various chapters of Judges. However, her descriptions also differentiate between studies of individuals, ideas, and forms. She highlights such authors as Brenner, Chisholm, Beck, and Mayfield as focusing on individual judges. Additionally, scholars such as Wright and Edenburg focus on the political landscape, while others emphasize the archeological minutia of identifying the judges' hometowns. As reported by Murphy, only Herzberg's study denotes any element of typological examination as he compares Deborah to Moses.

[33] Ibid., 194.

[34] Steven L. McKenzie, *Introduction to the Historical Books* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 70.

the context becomes overtly apparent. The review of this Old Testament book reveals a multifaceted work which contemporary scholars have ignored in favor of hyper-analyzation of modern-day issues. Therefore, this paper proposes a return to the typological interpretation utilized for millennia in the Jewish and Christian traditions. If authorial intent of typological writing can be demonstrated within the complex book of Judges, it strengthens the argument for its usage in the rest of the Hebrew Bible. While some scholars focus on what is missing in Judges, it may be more beneficial to consider what the author did record.[35] For this endeavor there must be a clear definition of terms as well as an explication of macro- and micro-level focuses utilized within the study.

Methodology

Gerhard Von Rad claims that "no pedagogical norm" can be established regarding typological interpretation as its construction would limit the interpretive freedom of the Holy Spirit.[36] However, proper research requires some stipulatory definition of terms and approach. This may be exponentially essential in the field of typology, as there has been intermixing of typological interpretation with other methodologies throughout church history. Gundry points out that "typology is an effort to understand the unity of the Bible from the standpoint of history rather than allegory."[37] This is certainly true in that every genuine typology must be rooted in the

[35] Authors like Cheryl Exum focus on what is lacking in Judges such as the role of Yahweh, completion of judge cycles, and lack of Deuteronomistic language.

[36] Gerhard von Rad, "The Interpretation of the Old Testament," *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 15, no. 2 (1961), 191.

[37] Stanley N. Gundry, "Typology as a Means of Interpretation: Past and Present," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 12, no. 4 (1969), 234.

historicity of the Old Testament account. Therefore, in the analysis of the book of Judges and its individual accounts, this section will attempt to clarify the approach of this study.

Definitions

The key concepts of the present paper which need defining are *typology* and *authorial intent*. *Typology* itself can be an elusive term, as demonstrated throughout church history. However, to reiterate from chapter 1, this paper defines *typology* as "God-ordained, author-intended historical correspondence and escalation in significance between people, events, and institutions across the Bible's redemptive-historical story."[38] Additionally, Hamilton lists four criteria which aid in identifying these typological patterns: the usage of key terms, specifically recurrent quotations, repetitions in sequence of events, and an escalating connection to covenants in the salvation story.[39]

Key Terms

While the Hebrew language had a limited number of words, authorial word selection cannot be discounted. Even disregarding inspiration from the divine author, terminology chosen by the human author must be considered as intentional wordage meant to convey more than explicit narrative. An example can be sighted between the usage of the term *ark* to describe Noah's boat as well as the basket Moses floated in, linking the two accounts, and leading the audience to see Moses as a new Noah.[40]

---

[38] Hamilton Jr., *Typology*, 26.

[39] Ibid., 25.

[40] Ibid., 20. A phonological examination of the Hebrew language and the linking of these words is beyond the purview of this paper. However, for additional information see Joshua Blau, *Phonology and Morphology of Biblical Hebrew* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010), Arthur Keefer, "Phonological Patterns in the Hebrew Bible: A

Specifically Recurrent Quotations

In addition to individual key terms, repeated phraseology can be indicative of typological intent by the author. In a predominantly oral society, repetitive phrases would immediately signal listeners back to previous narratives, linking the events or protagonists together to demonstrate a divine pattern of operation. One such significant phrase is the command to "be fruitful and multiply," initially seen in Genesis 1:28, repeated to Noah in Genesis 9:1, spoken to Abraham in Genesis 17:2–6, and again to the children Israel in Genesis 47:27.[41] These repetitive sequencings are especially telling of the authorial intent to demonstrate the current subject as an ectype of a previous archetype. In the case of Judges, these examples should always lead back toward a previous narrative even as they point forward to the antitypical fulfillment in the New Testament.

Repetitions in Sequence of Events

Beyond word usage, authors may highlight specific aspects of a narrative to communicate a connection of the present story to previous events. These repetitions can convey typological realities in which the author is specifically linking the story to a previously known narrative, with the purpose of transmitting a deeper meaning, one which would have been more blatant to the original audience who was vastly more familiar with the sequencing of other such Pentateuchal accounts. It is not essential that these occurrences have a reiteration of terms from previous writings but rather a clear connection of the progression of events.

Century of Studies in Sound," *Currents in Biblical Research* 15, no. 1 (2016), and Eric D. Reymond, *Intermediate Biblical Hebrew Grammar: A Student's Guide to Phonology and Morphology* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018).

[41] Ibid., 38, 46, 52.

Escalating Connection to Covenants

One of the main ideas conveyed through the book of Judges is the possession of the Promised Land by the children of Israel. The land is representative of a covenant made by Yahweh with Abram: "On that day the Lord made a covenant with Abram and said, 'To your offspring I give this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates,'" (Gen 15:18). The narratives of Judges are therefore already connected to the covenantal promises; yet beyond the manifest association, there are typological implications that demonstrate a connection to the greater salvific-historical narrative. This specific example will be expounded upon in chapter 4.

As semantics are often the source of unnecessary debate, it must be clarified what is meant by *authorial intent*.[42] To be clear, this study proposes that these repetitions were intentional by the human author in an attempt to draw the reader's attention toward the *Heilsgeschichte*. Therefore, this study will examine the key terms, repetitive phraseology, and event sequences of the book of Judges in order to determine their covenantal connections and demonstrate an increasing significance in the patterns as it relates to God's plan for humanity's ultimate salvation. These typologies are exhibited on two echelons in the book of Judges: macro- and micro-levels.

Macro- and Micro-Levels

As the terms denote, the macro- and micro-level examination of the book of Judges will analyze the larger and smaller typologies of the book, respectively. The macrolevel approach

[42] Jon Paulien, "Dreading the Whirlwind: Intertexuality and the Use of the Old Testament in Revelation," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39, no. 1 (2001), 20. Paulien details the debate between Steve Moyise and G. K. Beale, concluding that the disconnect is centered on the semantics of authorial intent. Here he highlights that Beale prefers the idea that the author can include "divine superintendence," while Moyise sticks to the narrower interpretation of the "human writer" to determine authorial intent.

will consider the overall structure of Judges, including the land covenant, chiastic structuring, and literary seams that tie the book together. These seams include the ancillary introduction and conclusion. The final form of the book of Judges demonstrates numerous typological themes which reveal a way of recognizing Yahweh's central role in the chronicle despite his diminishing overt presence throughout the individual narratives. Microlevel typologies reflect the individual narratives which demonstrate typological significance. This includes an evaluation of the positions and people represented within the book of Judges. While examining each of these throughout Judges is beyond the scope of this paper, principal examples will be included to showcase the authorial intent of the typological patterns. These microlevel instances illustrate the overall proclivity of the Hebrew author toward utilizing typology as a means of conveying historical realities while centering both on Yahweh.

CHAPTER 4: MACRO-TYPOLOGY; THE BIG PICTURE

While many of the seemingly random stories within Judges demonstrate typological realities on their own, it is perhaps the overall structure of the book's final form that contains the clearest demonstrations of the author's typological intentionality.[1] Types, by definition, are meant to foreshadow a future fulfilled reality, and Judges exhibits connections to the Pentateuch as a forward-focused attempt at re-creation. This overall foreshadowing is missed when minutia of the narratives is elevated above the broad points of the book. As Dempster notes, "The rise of historical criticism, with its attention to the zoom-lens features of the text . . . has coincided with a loss of a wide-angle-lens perspective."[2] This loss of comprehensive consideration of the text in favor of current concerns has prevented an understanding of unity among the scripture.[3] In studying Judges, the authorial intent is obvious through the selection and organization of the material.[4] Therefore, this chapter will examine the macro-level typological implications of Judges, including the purpose of the land in connection to the Pentateuchal covenants, the major

[1] For a more detailed description in the recent shifts in scholarship toward a unified reading of Judges, see Trent C. Butler, *Word Biblical Commentary 8: Judges*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard, and Glenn W. Barker (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009). He notes that new interpretations have elevated the previously misunderstood editor of Judges into an accomplished author who is "able to take previous material and reshape it into new theological patterns" (lvii). The final form of Judges demonstrates the typological intentionality of the writer who penned it. Additionally, Butler presents a convincing comparison of the Joshua and Judges accounts where Judges demonstrates a complete undoing of all that Joshua has accomplished in his tenure of leadership succeeding Moses, further linking the overall structure to previous patterns, and paving the way for a typological structure and theological interpretation.

[2] Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible*, ed. D. A. Carson, (InterVarsity Press, 2003), 29.

[3] Tammi Schneider echoes this sentiment in her book, *Berit Olam*, that explores the overarching themes, most of which center around the question, "Who is going to lead Israel?" Tammi J. Schneider, *Berit Olam: Judges* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000).

[4] Daniel Block, *The New American Commentary: Judges, Ruth*, ed. E. Ray Clendened (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 145.

and minor chiastic structures, and the literary seams which draw the narratives into a collective whole.

Land Connection to the Pentateuchal Covenants

Scripture consistently demarks place as a vital aspect of God's truth and the believers' spiritual journey.[5] Walter Brueggemann asserts that "land is a central, if not *the central theme* of biblical faith."[6] The Bible begins and ends in a garden, and journeying from the exile of one to the eternal acceptance of the other is the essence of Christian life, to move from the exile of sin to the everlasting reception of the unseen kingdom which Jesus proclaimed on the earth. Therefore, a key factor in determining typological writing is an understanding of the covenantal connection of Yahweh's promises and peoples' responses in regard to place. In the case of Judges, place is reflected through the fortification and loss of the pledged land of Canaan. As the continuing account of the conquest outlined in the book of Joshua, Judges details the period of time following the initial incursions into the Promised Land but prior to the establishment of the monarchy.[7] The tome showcases the judges as the penultimate form of leadership preceding the

[5] Patrick Schreiner, "Space, Place and Biblical Studies: A Survey of Recent Research in Light of Developing Trends," *Currents in Biblical Research* 14, no. 3 (2016), 344–45. Schreiner summarizes the expansion of current research on the concepts of space and place across multiple disciplines, defining the difference between place and space as the former relating to a specific locale whereas the latter denotes socially-produced, humanistic connections. He acknowledges that recent research challenges the notion of space as a "passive participant" (344) and concludes that "the land is one of the major themes in scripture" (360).

[6] Walter Brueggemann, *The Land: Place as Gift, Promise, and Challenge in Biblical Faith* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 3. Brueggemann's text boldly showcases place as a paradigm through which scriptural theology should be assessed. He demonstrates that each covenant promise is tied to the land and how the Israelites manage to have a sense of being when essentially homeless due to these promises for a land of their own (4).

[7] It should be noted that the Levites were not given land during the conquest (Num 18:20) because the Lord was considered their portion. These were the priests of Israel and land was denied them because their spiritual inheritance was of greater value. Peter notes this sentiment for New Testament believers, "But you are a chosen race, *a royal priesthood*, a holy nation, a people for his own possession, that you may proclaim the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light. Once you were not a people, but now you are God's people; once you had not received mercy, but now you have received mercy. Beloved, *I urge you as sojourners and*

anointed kingship and highlights the territorial conquests of each leader. Even if the judge is merely retaking a previously held area, the land takes center stage and acts as a major player in the book of Judges. After all, for an agrarian society, land equated to life.[8] This overall picture of the land as a typological representation of God's favor and blessing is exhibited throughout the Pentateuch, highlighted in the covenant with Abraham, and reiterated through the exile and New Testament writings.

Land in the Pentateuch

In Eden, God creates the land. This land becomes the setting for all of the interaction between the divine and mortals.[9] It is from this land that man is created (Gen 2:7), that the first test of humanity springs (Gen 2:9, 16–17), and that humanity's first purpose is initiated (Gen 2:15). When people introduce evil to the land by covenanting with the serpent, it is the land that becomes cursed (Gen 3:17–19). This pattern of purpose, test, and curse which plays out in the land is repeated in the lives of Adam and Eve's sons, Cain and Abel. Cain finds his purpose in the ground (Gen 4:2), is tested in his faithfulness, and ultimately fails (Gen 4:3–8). However, this time, rather than the land being cursed, Cain is cursed *from* the land (Gen 4:11–12). This shift demonstrates that the land outside of the Edenic garden is already cursed from Adam's transgression and continues the pattern of being exiled for sin. These opening narratives of the

---

exiles to abstain from the passions of the flesh, which wage war against your soul" (1 Pet 2:9–11, emphasis added). Peter notes that just as Levites were not given land, New Testament believers have a spiritual homelessness that is rooted in the promise of a future new heavens and earth. It was in the sojourning and exilic periods that Israel most diligently cried out to the Lord.

[8] Isabelle M. Hamley, *God of Justice and Mercy* (London: SCM Press, 2021), 22. Hamley also notes that Israel's fate is "intimately tied to that of the land" (29).

[9] On this subject, Brueggemann notes that the interactions with the land are divided into a distinct dichotomy in Genesis: chapters 1–11, which display people as fully rooted in a land but heading toward expulsion for their impertinence, and chapters 12–50, which showcase God's chosen people as landless but anticipating the fulfillment of a Promised Land (Brueggemann, *The Land*, 15–16).

Pentateuch demonstrate a clear connection between God's people and the land, in which the land represents the favor and blessing of God. Indeed, the notion of land carries "spiritual connotations as God's blessing on the recipient of the land."[10] Curses on the land and exile of God's people result from disobedience; a failure to pass a test of faithfulness to Yahweh. This pattern continues throughout the narratives of the Pentateuch. The land is filled with sin, and only Noah passes the test (Gen 6:5–8); therefore, the Lord exiles the people from the land (Gen 7:17–22). The pattern of testing and exile continues in the book of Judges, where the author makes a clear note that the adversarial nations were to act as a test to Israel's faithfulness:

> Now these are the nations that the Lord left, to *test* Israel by them, that is, all in Israel who had not experienced all the wars in Canaan. It was only in order that the generations of the people of Israel might know war, to teach war to those who had not known it before. These are the nations: the five lords of the Philistines and all the Canaanites and the Sidonians and the Hivites who lived on Mount Lebanon, from Mount Baal-hermon as far as Lebo-hamath. They were for the *testing* of Israel, to know whether Israel would obey the commandments of the Lord, which he commanded their fathers by the hand of Moses. (Judg 3:1–4, emphasis added)

Throughout the remaining narratives, the author compiles a list of judges who have attempted to aid in the possession or recapture of the land. The repetitive cycle of sin and exile illustrates the inclusion of judges as typological in the reclamation of land and the eventual need for a divine judge to bring people into the ongoing favor of God.[11]

Returning to the Pentateuch, the Lord covenants with Noah not to destroy the land again, causing his recourse for exile to shift. When the faithfulness test is failed at Babel, the Lord utilizes confused languages to exile the people to other lands (Gen 11:6–8). After this, the narrative moves into the story of Abraham which creates a special land covenant that will be

---

[10] K. Lawson Younger Jr., *The NIV Application Commentary: Judges, Ruth*, ed. Terry Muck (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2002), 95.

[11] The theme of the judge's role as typological is addressed further in chapter 5.

covered in the next section. The land theme continues in the story of Joseph: Joseph's brothers sin against him (Gen 37:25–32), he tests his brothers (Gen 44:18–34), and because Judah passes the test, they are rewarded with land (Gen 45:10). This shift showcases land as illustrative of blessings as well as curses, reinforcing the theme of land as a representation of favor. The book of Exodus opens as a re-creation theme with the people dwelling in their given land and fulfilling the initial divine command to be fruitful and multiply (Exod 1:7). When God calls Moses, he reiterates his promise to bring the people into the land of Canaan (Exod 3:8–9). While Yahweh could have killed off the Egyptians and given the land of Goshen to the Israelites, he promises to fulfill his covenant with Abraham, indicating that it is not merely *land* which demonstrates favor but the *specific land* which was promised by God to the peoples' ancestors. Therefore, the Promised Land becomes representative of much more than a location for the fledgling nation of Israel to put down roots; it denotes a divine plan of favor.

For the early rabbinic community, the Exodus period was the superlative standard of God's action and therefore the epitomic example of an archetype.[12] Therefore, it is understandable that in this pivotal period there is an escalation of the land motif. The Exodus unveils a significant shift in the land-as-typological-of-favor pattern. In Noah's narrative, *God* wipes out the evil; in Egypt, *God* delivers from evil; but after the Exodus, God requires the participation of the *Israelites* in eradicating the evil mankind has allowed into the world. Prior to the conquest, any land reassignment came through the power of God with the leadership of a key individual such as Noah or Moses. Ultimately, until this point in the narrative, God has done all

[12] Jonathan Kaplan, *My Perfect One: Typology and Early Rabbinic Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 29. Additionally, McCann observes that both the messenger in Judges 2:1–5 and the prophet in 6:7–10 refer back to the Exodus and the idea of the land as a gift. J. Clinton McCann, *Interpretation: Judges* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 2002), 63.

the fighting to grant his people the favor of land.[13] However, as his people are about to enter the Promised Land, there is a requirement for all the people to participate in the conquest to procure the favor of God; partaking both through warfare and obedience to the Mosaic covenant.[14] This shift to personal ownership is a key factor in the escalation of the land type through the Hebrew Bible. As Martin notes, "The development of the land promise across the canon provides hermeneutical warrant to see its ultimate fulfilment in the new creation won by Christ."[15] To understand the depth of this New Testament fulfilment of the Old Testament land theme. it is essential to continue tracing this typological pattern through the book of Judges, in which the land is a fundamental component of the narrative. The Israelites are no longer nomads but residents of the land, which characterizes their economic stability.[16] This commercial strength of the land is linked to the spiritual steadfastness of the nation, as it is repeatedly conquered and lost through a cycle of sin, repentance, mercy, and judges. Understanding the land's link to

[13] Brueggemann, *The Land*, 32–33. Brueggemann presents the reality that until the Exodus, possession of land has been associated with fullness. The garden had provision as did Egypt, but the wilderness brought about a need for daily dependence. However, it is in the landless wandering that the Israelites learn the true meaning of divine provision, which will take another turn when the conquest grants them a land of their own. It is in their lack of land that Yahweh is most present and most provisional, choosing to sojourn with his people. The crossing of the Jordan, therefore, represents a significant change from transitory to settled existence (43). Perhaps this is why God commanded that the land "shall not be sold permanently, because the land is Mine; for you are only strangers and residents with Me" (Lev 25:23). Not only would the land need to be personally fought for, but it was not to be permanently given because it served as a constant reminder of the true Deliverer who had brought them out of Egypt and graciously gifted it to them by his favor and grace.

[14] Moses outlines the connection between the land and blessing best in Leviticus 26, which spells out the blessings for obedience and curses for disobedience. In verse 9 the Hebrew wordage reflects the Genesis 1:22 theme of being fruitful and multiplying. The Edenic image is echoed again in Lev 26:12 as Yahweh promises to walk with them (Gen 3:8). However, the curses for disobedience outweigh the blessings and become specific to the land with Yahweh going so far as to vow to devastate the land himself (Lev 26:32). Yet repentance brings a special remembrance of the land to the Lord's mind (Lev 26:42).

[15] Oren R. Martin, *Bound For the Promised Land*, ed. D. A. Carson (InterVarsity Press, 2015), 27.

[16] David J. H. Beldman, *Judges* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020), 22. Beldman also details the political importance of the land through examining the Fertile Crescent's importance to trade in the region between the world powers of the time.

spirituality also grants greater insight as to how this sin cycle may have continued, since Baal was considered a master god who controls the fertility of the land. For a nation new to land ownership, the seduction to keep it by any means possible may have led them into worship of these foreign deities, despite Yahweh's initial provision.[17] The judges therefore do not merely fight to regain land from their oppressors but also the peoples' hearts from foreign deities.[18]

This shift to warfare as a means of possessing land is also a shift in theme. Throughout the Pentateuch, the divinely provided land theme is intricately linked to chaotic waters, repeatedly demonstrating Yahweh's preeminence.[19] In Eden, God separates the chaotic waters to produce the land he will give to Adam (Gen 1:9–10). With Noah, the chaotic flood waters are abated before the land can be repopulated (Gen 8:3–13). Interestingly, the one time a land blessing is given for obedience occurs during a famine (Gen 43:1; 45:10). In the Exodus, the Lord separated the Red Sea for Moses (Exod 14:21–22), and during the initial entrance to the

---

[17] Beldman, *Judges*, 28.

[18] This fighting is done through obedience to Yahweh. Spronk characterizes this shift as he points out the change in the divine testing from warfare to obedience between 3:1 and 3:4, stating, "The test itself is formulated differently, it is no longer connected to learning the war. Instead, it is related to keeping the commandments." Klaas Spronk, *Historical Commentary on the Old Testament: Judges* (Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 96. Therefore, the test shifts to a fight for personal obedience to fulfill the covenant conditions of Yahweh. This testing of obedience and fighting for covenant faithfulness on a personal and national level permeates the entirety of the book of Judges. McCann follows this logic into the New Testament, attesting that the Israelites and Christians were not intended to be the aggressors but rather must learn to "'stand firm' (Eph. 6:1–3) against people like the Philistines and their ways." McCann, *Interpretation: Judges*, 113. Chisholm adds that Israel's failure to secure the land was not due to the military might of their enemies but rather their lack of obedience which would eventually cost them even the partial blessing they were initially granted. Robert B. Chisholm Jr., *A Commentary of Judges and Ruth* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2013), 141.

[19] For further discussion on the imagery of chaotic waters in the ancient Near East, see Daniel Schwemer, "The Storm-Gods of the Ancient Near East: Summary, Synthesis, Recent Studies. Part 2," *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions,* 8, no. 1, (2008); and Noga Ayali-Darshan, "The Other Version of the Story of the Storm-god's Combat with the Sea in the Light of Egyptian, Ugaritic, and Hurro-Hittite Texts," *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions,* 15, no. 1 (2015). Both of these articles delineate the ideologies regarding chaotic waters as controlled by storm deities. The differences in relation to Yahweh's means of operation are stark. Unlike other ANE gods, Yahweh does not struggle with the sea, but rather commands the heavens and the earth including the chaotic waters. Instead of being depicted as fighting mythical sea monsters, Genesis declares that Yahweh has created them (Gen 1:21).

Promised Land the Jordan River was stopped for Joshua (Josh 3:15–16). These water events represent a new creation.[20] However, there is a shift in the books of Joshua and Judges in which land (as typological of favor) is no longer simply given after passing through these chaotic waters but rather must be fought for and maintained through tribal warfare and individual obedience.[21] This new pattern is intentionally repeated throughout the book of Judges as tribes conquer land only to have a cycle of sin exile them from God's favor. The author of Judges is clearly linking the typological pattern of land as indicative of divine approval from the Pentateuch into the conquest narrative.

The book of Judges makes it clear that, unfortunately, the Israelites do not fully shift to this new pattern of taking possession of the land through warfare. The repetition of failing to drive out inhabitants suggests that the Israelites have formed an alliance with the people of the land, including their cultures and religions.[22] Within the first chapter, the phrase "did not drive out" recurs nine times as the author recounts the incompleteness of the conquest:[23]

> [Judah] could *not drive out* the inhabitants of the plain because they had chariots of iron. (vs 19)[24]

---

[20] Keith D. Stanglin, "'Baptism in the Sea': An Invitation to Typological Interpretation," *Leaven* 21, no. 2 (2013), 72.

[21] McCann, *Judges*, 12. It should also be noted that the Pentateuch, the Holy Law of Israel prior to the historical chronicles, ends with the people still living outside of the land. This reality demonstrates Yahweh's faithfulness which exists regardless of his favor (the land). Yahweh remains faithful to his people even when they do not remain faithful to their covenant and therefore forfeit the favor of God.

[22] Beldman, *Judges*, 58–59.

[23] Yairah Amit, *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 152. This lack of conquest also denotes a continually incomplete process of separation from the foreign peoples which "began with dispossession and continued to reconciliation, concluded with deprivation and preferring to receive tribute from the Canaanites." This highlights the progressive comfortability that the Israelites felt with the idolatry of the pagan nations they were sent to dispossess.

[24] Robert B. Chisholm Jr., *A Commentary of Judges and Ruth* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2013), 129–30. Chisholm notes that the comment about the chariots of iron is more literary commentary than actual reasoning. Since Yahweh was clearly able to defeat chariots as noted in the Exodus story, the author seems to be highlighting the beginnings of the Israelites' lack of trust in Yahweh's power of deliverance.

> Benjamin did *not drive out* the Jebusites. (vs 21)
> Manasseh did *not drive out* the inhabitants. (vs 27)
> They put the Canaanites to forced labor, but did *not drive them out* completely. (vs 28)
> Ephraim did *not drive out* the Canaanites. (vs 29)
> Zebulun did *not drive out* the inhabitants. (vs 30)
> Asher did *not drive out* the inhabitants. (vs 31)
> Asherites lived among the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land, for they did *not drive them out.* (vs 32)
> Naphtali did *not drive out* the inhabitants. (vs 33)

However, the repetitive nature of the phrase "did not drive out" (לֹא הוֹרִישׁ) denotes more about the author's perspective of the land than mere failure of geographical acquisition.[25] The Hebrew phraseology signifies a "driving out" as well as a "taking possession of."[26] It is the same term used for inheritance and innately links the concepts, as one cannot claim an inheritance before the life is driven out of the possessor. This phrase specifically recalls the heirs of Abraham. The phrase is utilized in Genesis 15:4 in regard to Abraham's belief that Eliezer would be his heir. The Lord proclaims that Eliezer will not be the heir but rather confirms a covenant linked to Abraham's seed. The pattern is repeated by Sarah when she demands that Ishmael be cast out so as not to be an heir with Isaac.[27] In the first instance, the phrase initiates a covenant regarding

[25] Reformation theologian Richard Rogers notes that the Israelites' failure to drive out the inhabitants of the land showcases a lack of faith in the God who had already promised the land. He contends that it was their unbelief and not the excuse of iron chariots that truly allowed the enemy to remain in the Promised Land. N. Scott Amos, ed., *Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament IV Joshua, Judges, Ruth* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2020), 213. Additionally, Spronk contends that the Israelites inability to drive out the inhabitants is where it "goes wrong time and again" and alludes to the dark ending of the book. Klaas Spronk, *Historical Commentary on the Old Testament: Judges* (Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 50–51. Frolov suggests that this individualized list foreshadows the reality that without unity, the tribes will inevitably fail at securely remaining in the land. Serge Frolov, *Judges: The Forms of the Old Testament Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 63. Furthermore, the mention of forced labor and living among them speaks more of their lack of "resolve" than their "means" (63). Finally, Van Pelt notes that this list acts as the indicting evidence of an ancient form of covenant lawsuit which is presented fully by the angel of the Lord in chapter 2:1–5. Miles V. Van Pelt, "Judges," in *ESV Expository Commentary Vol II*, ed. Iain M. Duguid, James M. Hamilton Jr., and Jay Sklar (Wheaton: Crossway, 2021), 534–35.

[26] Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, ed. Hendrickson Publishers, Thirteenth. (Peabody, 2010), 439.

[27] In Genesis 21:10 the Hebrew yāraš is reflective of the *inheritance* or *taking possession* aspect of the term. The idea of Ishmael being cast out utilizes a different Hebrew verb, gāraš.

descendants and future favor; it reconfirms the promise of Genesis 12:7 when the land is promised to Abraham's offspring. The second usage regarding Ishmael conveys the specific plan of God to grant blessing through Isaac. Although Yahweh graciously blesses Ishmael, the inheritance of the land specifically belongs to Isaac's posterity; it is not to be shared. Eliezer and Ishmael were not the rightful heirs of God's covenant and therefore could not take possession of the inheritance. Repeatedly utilizing this term, the author of Judges draws the reader back to the reality that the covenant promise of land must be accomplished according to Yahweh's directives or else they will be cast out. By repeating the idea that the Israelites did not drive their enemies out, the author dually highlights the tribes' inability to take possession of their inheritance, the land of Canaan, and likens them to the illegitimate heirs of Eliezer and Ishmael, thereby foreshadowing their eventual dismissal from the land. These specifically linked word connections demonstrate the typological intent of the author of Judges to showcase the covenantal patterns Yahweh will be repeating in the ensuing era of the judges.

Another repeated pattern in Judges that echoes from the Pentateuch relates the land and rest. After creation God rested and the land remained at rest. There was a sanctification that occurred when the divine rested at the conclusion of creation as God's presence was at rest in his creation. This pattern plays out in Judges through the repeated phrase "the land had rest," which occurs four times in six chapters (emphasis added):

> So the *land had rest* forty years. Then Othniel the son of Kenaz died. (Judg 3:11)
> So Moab was subdued that day under the hand of Israel. And *the land had rest* for eighty years. (Judg 3:30)
> "So may all your enemies perish, O Lord! But your friends be like the sun as he rises in his might." And *the land had rest* for forty years. (Judg 5:31)
> So Midian was subdued before the people of Israel, and they raised their heads no more. And *the land had rest* forty years in the days of Gideon. (Judg 8:28)

This phrase is declared after each of the exploits of the first four major judges in the book: Othniel, Ehud, Deborah, and Gideon. It is fitting that the pattern terminates at Gideon as he is a pivotal judge in the downward trajectory of the nation.[28] Therefore, it is the first half of Judges which continues the pattern of bringing rest and thereby divine favor to the land as the judges act in obedience to Yahweh. It is essential to note that it is the *land*, not the people, that is endowed with rest at the conclusion of each of these cycles.[29] Conversely, the Lord allows the Israelites to experience captivity within the land for their covenantal disobedience, foreshadowing their eventual exile from the land and His favor.[30] Deeper than the land not having rest (וַתִּשְׁקֹט found in 3:11, 3:30, 5:31, and 8:28), by the end of the book we find the people of God striking down the inhabitants of Laish, who are twice said to be *at rest* (שֹׁקֵט found in 18:7 and 18:27). They have not only lost the pattern of gaining rest, but purposefully broken the pattern by striking down those who are at rest in the land. The cessation of this phrase after the turning point of the book acts as an additional typological marker indicating the favor of the Lord is withdrawing from the people and emphasizing the need for deeper, more lasting change.

When the patterns within Judges are viewed in the broader narrative God constructed throughout the Pentateuch, it becomes evident that the author wrote to intentionally underscore

---

[28] J. Paul Tanner, "The Gideon Narrative as the Focal Point of Judges," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149, no. 594 (1992), 152. Tanner specifically identifies the role of Gideon as the pivot point of the book of Judges. Neil O'Hara demonstrates this same truth through exploring the doublets highlighted in the narrative of Gideon. Neil O'Hara, "Man Cannot Serve Two Masters: The Characterisation of Gideon and Doublets in Judges 6," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 35, no. 2 (2021). Kenneth Way expands on the ideas of Mary Douglas, demonstrating that the entire book of Judges is structured in a ring composition with the first half of Gideon's life echoing the prologue of the book and the last half paralleling the epilogue. Kenneth C. Way, *Judges and Ruth* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2016): 6–7. These authors all note a marked shift that happens between the first half of Gideon's judgeship and his final days as a reluctant but pseudo-king. This pattern and the role of Abimelech as the actual pivotal point of the Gideon narrative will be fully discussed in the upcoming section on Chiastic Structures.

[29] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 155.

[30] J. Alan Groves, "Judges," in *Theological Interpretation of the Old Testament: A Book-by-Book Survey*, ed. Kevin J VanHoozer (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 99.

these patterns. Current Bible scholars would do well to consider the macro-level themes of Judges, lest the minutia distract them from the message. There is a typological pattern that governs the entire text, as McCann states,

> The book of Judges should finally be heard in the context of the material that surrounds it—that is, both the Torah with its portrayal of a God who creates and claims the whole world, and the Latter Prophets with its congruent portrayal of an ultimate sovereign whose purposes encompass all nations. In short, nothing in the book of Judges should be construed as a contradiction of God's universal sovereignty and God's will for justice and righteousness among all the peoples of the earth.[31]

The theme of land as a deific provision as well as a testing place for mortal obedience through exodus and exile showcases the human heart more than geographic inheritance and highlights its covenantal relationship with the divine throughout the Hebrew scriptures. The typological representation of the land as divine favor is a central theme of the Pentateuch, which is intentionally highlighted throughout Judges by its author. The Pentateuch records another shift in the land theme in the life of Abraham.

Land Covenant with Abraham

While the theme of land as a typological representation of God's favor is present throughout the Old Testament, there are key points at which this motif is honed to a more explicit interpretation. God's covenant with Abraham highlights one of the most crucial specifications of the land theme. The Abrahamic covenant is modeled after the Edenic covenant which encompassed a blessing for Adam's descendants and dominion over the land.[32] This theme

[31] McCann, *Judges*, 13.

[32] Brian Collins, "The Land Promise in Scripture: An Evaluation of Progressive Covenantalism's View of the Land," *BJU Press* (Bible faculty summit, Maranatha Baptist University, 2016), 6.

was continued in God's covenant with Noah and culminates with the promise to Abraham regarding Canaan:

> The Abrahamic covenant, then, clarifies the way in which God will fulfill for humanity both the blessing promised to Noah for all creation and the promise of a victorious 'seed'. Through God's covenantal dealings with and through Abram, Adam's curse will be removed, dominion will be restored, and universal blessing will come to the nations.[33]

Therefore, the life of Abraham becomes paramount in the ongoing narrative of the land necessitating an examination of Abraham's interactions with the land. The life and journeys of Abraham would be well known to the author of Judges and create a unique aspect of the typological intentionality of the writer: the parallel of Abraham's expeditions with the enemy attacks in Canaan.

Abraham's unique connection to the land begins with the Lord's call to leave his own land of Ur and pursue Yahweh's plan for his future generations.[34] From there, he travels throughout the land, garnering a covenant with Yahweh regarding the land (Gen 12:7, 17:8) and a promise for his progeny (Gen 12:7, 15:5). Listed below is Abraham's journey through the Promised Land, which is eventually fought for in the time of the judges.

---

[33] Martin, *Bound Promised*, 48.

[34] Regarding Abram's call to follow Yahweh, Brueggemann highlights the necessary tearing from the land of Ur and his father's house, a vital step toward beginning the journey of faith in garnering the promise of a new future, which included land as well as prosperity for his posterity. Brueggemann, *The Land*, 6, 17.

Table 4.1: Abram's Promised Land Journey

Origin:	Destination:	Scripture:	Direction:	Notes:
Ur	Haran	Gen 11:31	North	Response to father, Tehran
Haran	Shechem	Gen 12:1–7	South	Response to promised blessing
Shechem	Bethel/Ai	Gen 12:8	Central	Calls on the Lord
Bethel/Ai	Egypt	Gen 12:10	Far South	Escaping a famine
Egypt	Bethel	Gen 13:1–4	Central	Conflict with relatives (Lot)
Bethel	Sodom	Gen 13:11–12	East	Lot settles in Sodom (enemy to east)
Bethel	Hebron	Gen 13:18	Central	Abram settles in Hebron
Hebron	Gerar	Gen 20:1 20:22 21:14 21:34	Southwest	No resolution to heir promise Repetition of offense Child sacrificed (Ishmael) Dwells with the Philistines

Abraham's journey takes him through the length and breadth of the land of Canaan that his descendants will eventually inherit. The directionality of this journey finds an interesting and corresponding parallel in the book of Judges.

While chronology is typically paramount in historical accounts, a simple reading through the book of Judges leaves no allusion of a linear narrative.[35] Throughout the years, many studies have attempted to surmise the redactor's purpose for the arrangement of Judges' final form. Brettler asserts the entire book exists as a polemic, "royal propaganda" to promote pro-Judean leadership and specifically the Davidic dynasty.[36] Others uphold the framework of Judges as a pattern not of "the simple reward-and-punishment scheme usually claimed, but rather punishment-and-grace, a view of Israelite history found elsewhere in the Bible."[37] This arrangement insinuates the structure of Judges as a spiral of moral decline, with each successive

[35] Chisholm, *Judges and Ruth*, 25. Chisholm states that the author has utilized a thematic presentation, putting in the epilogue the narratives which "epitomize the period." This again reiterates that, while detailing historical epics, the author's focus was on conveying theological truths specifically in typological patterns that characterized the divine redemptive plan.

[36] Marc Zvi Brettler, *How to Read the Bible* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 2005), 115.

[37] Frederick E. Greenspahn, "The Theology of the Framework of Judges," *Vetus Testamentum* 36 (1986): 385–96.

judge demonstrating a decrease of faithfulness toward Yahweh as the peoples' apostasy increases. Within this degeneration, the Israelite nation must fend off their land against foreign invaders acting as divine punishment from Yahweh. Interestingly, the accounts in the final form of Judges organize the enemy invasions in a corresponding directional pattern to Abraham's first forays into the land. The structural arrangement of the narratives to echo the pathway taken by their ancestor Abraham demonstrates a strategically intentional parallel by the author of Judges to showcase the land as more than Israel's territorial endowment.

Table 4.2: Judges and Accompanying Land Aftermath

Judge:	Scripture:	Opponent Land:	Direction:	Land:
Othniel	3:7–11	Mesopotamia	North[38]	Rest for forty years
Ehud	3:12–30	Moab	South[39]	Rest for eighty years
Deborah	4–5	Canaan	Central[40]	Rest for forty years
Gideon	6–8	Midian	Far South[41]	Rest for forty years
Abimelech[42]	9	Israel	Central[43]	Destruction of Shechem (conflict with relatives)
Jephthah	10–11 12	Ammon Ephraim	East Central[44]	Enemy to the east subdued Ephraimites killed; Child sacrificed
Samson	13–16	Philistine	Southwest[45]	No resolution to land promise Repetitive offenses Kills many Philistines

This geographical outline demonstrates an overarching design by the author to parallel a crucial connection in the Pentateuch, reiterating the typological nature of the land in the book of Judges.

[38] Klaas Spronk, *Historical Commentary on the Old Testament: Judges* (Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 101. Spronk notes that while the name of Cushan-Rishathaim may be manufactured, the region of Aram accurately denoted the northern part of Mesopotamia.

[39] Hillel I. Millgram, *Judges and Saviors, Deborah and Samson: Reflections of a World in Chaos* (Lanham: Hamilton Books, 2018), 72–73. Millgram maps Moab to the south and east of the Benjaminite territory from which Ehud derived.

[40] Ibid., 96–98. The action of this battle takes place in the Jezreel Valley. Deborah comes from the south near Ramah and Bethel (Judg 4:5), while Barak journeys from the north in Kedesh (Judge 4:6), but the actual battle takes place at Mount Tabor in the center of the Israelite territory (Judg 4:12).

[41] W. Ewing, "Midian," accessed April 4, 2023, https://bibleatlas.org/midian.htm. Despite the camp of the Midianites being near the Jezreel Valley (Judg 6:33), Midian territory is located far south of Israel to the east of the Red Sea. Additionally, Millgram notes that Gideon's battle routes them back to the south of Israel's territory. Millgram, *Judges and Saviors*, 175.

[42] Although the position of Abimelech as an actual judge of Israel is controversial, his leadership and resultant outcomes are integral to understanding the shift that occurs as the book of Judges recounts the ongoing degradation of the Israelite nation. Abimelech's role will be discussed further in the chiastic section of this chapter.

[43] The struggle in the Abimelech narrative is clearly internal, taking place primarily at Shechem. This is not only geographically a central point of Israel but a spiritual center as well (Josh 24:1–25).

[44] Millgram, *Judges and Saviors*, 269. The Ammonite camp and capitol lie east of the Jordan River and Dead Sea; centrally located from the Israel territory.

[45] The Philistine Pentapolis is well attested as being on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, to the southwest of Israelite territory.

Parallels to note include the timing of the internal conflicts which do not occur until halfway through both narratives (Gen 13; Judg 9). For Abraham the conflict was against familial relations with Lot over grazing land while the parallel account in Judges showcases Abimelech raising arms against his Israelite brethren in a power struggle and attempted monarchy. In this counterpart, Abraham separates from Lot to avoid bloodshed, but Abimelech murders his brothers and later attacks his brethren, acting in direct contrast to Abraham's godly deference. Additionally, the child sacrifice motif demonstrates the denigration of the leadership and the nation as a whole. Whereas in Abraham's life, God invites and then prevents the child sacrifice, in Judges Jephthah vows and then perpetrates the child sacrifice. The scenes parallel but ultimately demonstrate the denigration of the nation, thereby exemplifying the disintegration of the covenant and foreshadowing the eventual exile from the land.

Land in the Exile and New Testament

The land in Judges epitomizes the typological interpretation of God's favor on the Israelites by reiterating the cycle of occupation and exile in conjunction with the peoples' obedience and rejection to divine laws. This reality is particularly present in Judges, which acts as a microcosm of the pattern in the entirety of the Hebrew Bible of the land being given, God being rejected, and possession of the land being removed in repetitive cycles.[46] These sequences lead to an ever-diminishing role of the divine and eventual silence of the Almighty in Judges, which also reflects the conclusion of the Hebrew Bible. In Judges, this signifies the need for an eternal judge who will lead the people in perpetual obedience to Yahweh, whereas the

[46] Brueggemann, *The Land*, 101. Regarding the cycle, Brueggemann notes that "Israel's royal history in the land moved inexorably toward exile." I would add that while the Judges' cycles spiral toward monarchy, their time in leadership also moved the nation toward landlessness. Therefore, the Israelites barely gain the Promised Land before they begin to lose it again through their rebellion and faithlessness.

conclusion of the Hebrew Bible designates a need for a messianic king who will reign by keeping the Abrahamic covenant thereby returning people to the land (favor) of God. Pre-exilic and post-exilic prophets reiterate this theme of landlessness, abandonment, and the need for divine intervention to keep the covenant and therefore the land.[47] Beldman states this connection is most clear in the prophet Jeremiah, through whom Yahweh tells the people to settle in and get comfortable in exile.[48] In essence Yahweh says, "I will still give my blessing, because I am about to shift the notion of the land as favor." In this way the land is clearly a typological theme of favor that echoes throughout the Old Testament and begins the shift toward a new interpretation during the exilic period.

The fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant through Jesus continues the shift of understanding the purpose of the land from a geographical location to the promised new creation found in faithful believers. Peter writes of the new creation:

> Since all [the heavens and earth] are thus to be dissolved, what sort of people ought you to be in lives of holiness and godliness, waiting for and hastening the coming of the day of God, because of which the heavens will be set on fire and dissolved, and the heavenly bodies will melt as they burn! But according to his promise we are waiting for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells. (2 Peter 3:11–13)

John's vision from God agrees when he declares, "Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more" (Rev 21:1). Jesus himself appears to reappropriate the land covenants with Israel, not to a geographical fulfillment, but rather to a universal, eschatological inheritance that is available to all believers.[49] Martin says it best this way:

---

[47] Brueggemann, *The Land*, 91–107.

[48] Beldman, *Judges*, 237–38.

[49] Martin, *Bound Promised*, 125.

> Therefore, the promise of land to the nation of Israel is understood within the broader context of God's programmatic agenda that begins with Adam, progresses from Abraham to Israel, and culminates in an international community living in a new creation. In other words, the national dimension involving the geographical territory of Israel should be viewed as a transitional stage in the outworking of God's redemptive plan, a plan that spans from creation to new creation and ultimately includes people from every nation filling the entire earth.[50]

The land covenant to Abraham, therefore, was a historical event that was part of God's overall typological schema to recreate his Edenic paradise which will only reach culmination with the new heavens and earth inaugurated by Jesus' resurrection. Therefore, the Promised Land, just like Eden, became a literal testing ground for the peoples' covenant faithfulness.[51] The author of Judges highlights this typological pattern throughout his writing putting the land as centerstage in the varying epics.

The land covenant simultaneously looks backward to the garden of Eden and forward to the new creation.[52] The land as a typological representation of divine approval and presence cannot be selectively applied; rather it must be consistently interpreted as God's visual representation of favor. This theme transitions to the new covenant initiated by Christ, inaugurated with the church, and fulfilled by the new creation. While some argue for a literal resettlement of Israel by the Jewish nation, this need not be the case when considering the

---

[50] Ibid., 118.

[51] E. John Hamlin, "Structure and Meaning of the Theological Essay in Judges 2:6-3:6," *Proceedings* (1986), 116.

[52] Miles V. Van Pelt, "Judges," in *ESV Expository Commentary Vol II*, ed. Iain M. Duguid, James M. Hamilton Jr., and Jay Sklar (Wheaton: Crossway, 2021), 516. Van Pelt specifically declares, "Both the land and the nation of Israel pointed beyond themselves to a better inheritance and a different kind of people. The land of Canaan, like the garden of Eden before it, serves as a shadow, image, or type of the new heavens and the new earth."

typological realities present throughout the entirety of scripture.[53] McCann encourages that when readers of scripture consider the larger canonical story, they can "understand land symbolically," because in biblical terms, "land represented access to life."[54] The author of Judges was writing typologically, building on the previously demonstrated patterns of God and foreshadowing the divine work that was yet to come through the historical realities encountered by the Israelites in the settlement period. The typological interpretation of the land theme is not the only macro-level demonstration of Judges' authorial intent; the actual layout of the book is structured in a chiastic parallel.

Chiastic Structures

Chiasms as a literary device are well documented in ancient literature but are often limited solely to parallelism. However, chiastic structures move beyond parallelism, as they are always focused on a central theme; a specific idea that each side of the parallel reiterates.[55] In fairly illiterate societies, chiasms allowed people to more easily remember stories and sayings as well as retain the main purpose of the writing. Osborn insists that looking for such preliminary

---

[53] Collins, "The Land Promise in Scripture," 21. Collins argues for a mediating position for the Progressive Covenantalist stance that the land is typological by stating that there is a failure to recognize the biblical theme of nations. He asserts that recognizing the development of nations would allow for an interpretation that the land is typological and still to be true to the promises made to the nation of Israel. In this way, Collins separates the covenant from the type and attempts to address them separately. He states that "if eternity is lived on a new earth, and if nations exist on the new earth, and if Israel is one of these nations, why would God not fulfill his specific promise to give Israel land" (21). However, Collins does not address Paul's words in Galatians 3:28, which removes such cultural distinctions in the new covenant with Christ, thereby making the land promises available to all new believers in Christ, regardless of ethnic backgrounds. Additionally, it could be argued that Israel's ethnic distinction has been allocated to the gentile church in Christ. From this perspective, the Church might be considered the second born of the covenant. There is a repeated theme that is beyond the purview of this paper which demonstrates that it is the second born son who receives the blessing and inheritance (examples include: Abel/Seth, Isaac, Jacob, and Ephraim). Therefore, in typological patterning, it would be the gentile church who would receive the land inheritance if the distinction remained.

[54] McCann, *Interpretation: Judges*, 16.

[55] Brad McCoy, "Chiasmus: An Important Structural Device Commonly Found in Biblical Literature," *Chafer Theological Seminary* 9, no. 1 (2003): 18–34.

patterns in the entirety of a book, even a longer book, is invaluable to initial study.[56] Extended chiasms have been identified in other books and it stands to reason that the author of Judges may have structured his tome around a central theme as well.[57] Therefore this section explicates the structure of Judges as reflective of such an encompassing chiastic structure as well as exploring the central micro-chiasm found within the larger pattern. These intentional literary devices denote the author's main purpose for recording and ordering the book of Judges.

Macro-Chiastic Structure

Before considering the structure of Judges in its final form, there is a unique parallel to consider between the entire account and the book of Genesis. Both books have double introductions and recount the giving of land to a people who will ultimately reject the Lord and be exiled.[58] Interestingly, the era of the Judges appears to have been the divinely appointed reverse parallel to the failure of humanity in Genesis. Therefore, the conquest of the Promised land in Judges acts as the thematic inverse of the Edenic covenant in Genesis. When God creates the world, the structure of the narrative moves forward in this manner:

A The land is at rest (Gen 2:2–3)
  B Paradise is given to man (Gen 2:8–9)
    C The enemy introduces idolatry and people sin (Gen 3:1–6)
      D People are driven from the land of Paradise (Gen 3:23–24)

[56] Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006), 45.

[57] David G. Firth, *Including the Stranger: Foreigners in the Former Prophets* (London: Apollos, 2019), 129.

[58] The double introductions of Genesis recount two parallel stories of creation in 1:1–2:3 and 2:4–25. Likewise, Judges 1:1–2:5 and 2:6–3:4 express two variations of Israel's forays into the Promised Land including the practical and spiritual challenges encountered.

During the Judges era, the possession of the land as a completion of the Abrahamic covenant appears to be God's attempt to reverse the curse that people incurred in the Garden. His intentional plan which inversely parallels the Edenic interactions is recorded in Numbers. The following is an elucidation of God's strategy as detailed to Moses prior to the conquest:

D Enemies are driven out of the Promised Land (Num 33:51–52a)
C Idolatry is destroyed and sin avoided (Num 33:52b)
B Promised Land is given to Israel (Num 33:53)
A The land is at rest (Num 33:54)

This intended chiasm demonstrates that the land in Judges acts as more than a completion of the Abrahamic covenant, although it is clearly the fulfillment of that agreement, the land itself becomes a type of new Eden. Unfortunately, despite the divine intentionality of reversing the Edenic curse, this pattern is clearly not the one engendered by the Israelites during the Judges era. However, to be truly chiastic, these parallels need a central point.[59] The main theme that becomes obvious through both narratives is that man cannot possess and remain at rest in the land without the direct involvement of God. This central point is reiterated in the overarching chiasm of Judges and Genesis through the repeated failures of man to fulfill the divine covenants. Building on the work of Mary Douglas,[60] Kenneth Way suggests that analyzing the ring structure of Judges puts the story of Gideon at the center of the narrative.[61] However, Way

[59] McCoy, "Chiasmus," 21. McCoy emphasizes the necessity of a central point in a chiasm which distinguishes it from parallelism, going so far as to adopt the designation of ABXB'A' over the popular ABCB'A' designations. Either way it is represented, the emphasis is that chiasms necessitate a central point.

[60] Douglas enumerates seven characteristics of ring structures: a prologue, a clear midpoint, parallel sections, markers of sections, central loading, rings within rings, and two-level closure. Mary Douglas, *Thinking in Circles: An Essay on Ring Composition* (Yale University Press, 2007), 36–37.

[61] Kenneth C. Way, "The Literary Structure of Judges Revisited: Judges as a Ring Composition," in *Windows to the Ancient World of the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Bill T. Arnold, Nancy L. Erickson, and John Walton (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2014), 249. Way appears to use ring structures and chiasms somewhat interchangeably (256). This may be due to Douglas' statement that "a major ring is a triumph of chiastic ordering." Douglas, *Thinking in Circles*, 31. Douglas backs up this assertion with the idea that a well-formed ring will have a central

does not take the narratives of the prologue and epilogue into account but merely groups them together as sections of the book that assumedly mirror one another. Examination of the narrative content demonstrates a necessary shift to Way's proposal.[62] Additionally, while sharing many of the parallels with chiasms, there is no central point to a ring structure, which makes it difficult to discern the overarching message of the book. Frolov thoroughly dismantles Way's analysis but offers no alternative structural proposals.[63] Beldman suggests a paralleling between the prologue and epilogue of Judges, demonstrating clear thematic and linguistic connections which highlight the irony of the nation's degradation.[64] Although these parallels exist, Beldman also fails to organize them into the chiastic structure, thereby disregarding the central point of the book. The following adjustments reveal the chiastic structure of Judges, including the book's central theme:

---

section that is loaded with connections to the beginning (32). However, her analysis of Numbers demonstrates a central connection to the beginning and ending of the book (63) but showcases some deficiencies since the end chapter does not correspond to the mid-turn (68). This is what likely leads Way to analyze Judges with the central section of Gideon showcasing a persuasive connection to the intro and conclusion of Judges. Thus, the idea of ring structure necessitates a two-part central section which corresponds simultaneously with the prologue and epilogue of the narrative section to which it is the midpoint. Conversely a chiastic structure will have a clear central focus that highlights the central theme to which each side of the chiasm builds.

[62] Additionally, Way proposes that the Deborah/Barak and Abimelech narratives parallel each other based on their northern location, the highlight of a heroine, the omission of a "judge" reference, and the inclusion of poetic literature. Way, *Judges and Ruth*, 81. However, these are simple parallels that can be explained, such as the fact that Deborah operated much more in the center of Israelite territory than in the north (Jephthah and Gideon might be a better candidate for location comparisons). Also, fables and victory songs are very different genres and Deborah's comes after the narrative as a parallel account, whereas Jotham's fable serves as a turning point in Abimelech's story.

[63] Serge Frolov, "The Rings of the Lord: Assessing Symmetric Structuring in Numbers and Judges," *Vetus Testamentum* 66, no. 1 (2016), 42–44. Frolov concludes that only books which are self-contained may exhibit structural patterns such as espoused by Douglas or Way and therefore calls into question the autonomy of Judges as a whole. He cites the lack of scholarly articles reflecting symmetrical arrangements of entire Enneateuchal books aside from Judges as evidence of the lack of such structure within the canon. However, a lack of exegetes does not necessitate a lack of design; rather it is potentially merely a deficiency in discovery. He postulates that the intertextuality of such complex books is "far too rich and diverse" for such structural patterns (42) and that utilizing such organization is more likely to obscure the main themes declaring that by constraining the "delicate and intricate fabric of a biblical book to a rigid symmetric frame the exegetes can only stifle the search for meaning, not advance it" (44). However, to outright deny some of the potential literary patterns present within scripture appears far more constraining to the divine author through whom the entirety of both canons were composed.

[64] Beldman, *Judges*, 107.

A War against enemy nations (1:1–3:6)[65]
  B Othniel (3:7–11)
    C Ehud (3:12–30)
      D Deborah and Barak (4–5)
        E Gideon (6–8)
          F Abimelech (9)[66]
        E Jephthah (10:6–11:15)
      D Samson (13–16)
    C Micah (17–18)
  B Levite and his concubine (19)
A War against Israelite nation (20–21)

A full interpretation of this chiastic breakdown is beyond the purview of this paper, but the following highlights the parallels between the corresponding counterparts. In this structure, the idea that Israel enters the land by fighting against depraved enemy nations is inversely paralleled with the conclusion of Israel initiating a civil war against the tribe of Benjamin.[67] Both battles begin with the question, "Who shall go up . . . ?" and each time, Judah is the answer.[68] Both stories also include the weeping of the Israelites (Judg 2:4, 20:26). The preliminary story after

[65] While there is no universal agreement on the breakdown of Judges' introduction, many scholars acknowledge these division. Block notes that while there are sections within this segment, it is best to treat 1:1–3:6 as a "literary unit whose purpose is to provide a military and theological context to the 'Book of Deliverers' that follows." Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 77. In this sense it parallels well with the final two chapters which conclude with military action that reflects the theological context being summarized by the entirety of Judges.

[66] Although commentators often do not know where to place Abimelech due to the lack of formulae in his narrative, Amit demonstrates that he has his own cycle. Amit, *The Art of Editing*, 222. Despite being interlocked with the Midian cycle, Frolov's form-critical assessment concludes that since the Midianites are subdued by Judges 8:28, "the Abimelech narrative constitutes a story in its own right." Frolov, *Judges*, 175. Millgram notes that chapter 9, with its story of Abimelech, is by far the longest chapter in Judges, stating that the "anomaly is too outsized to be overlooked." Millgram, *Judges and Saviors*, 228.

[67] There are several ironies within this parallel denoting the author's intentionality in pairing them as opposites on the chiasm. For example, the "holy" nation of Israel who *failed* in their holy war against the Canaanites has itself become more Canaanized and now wages a *successful* holy war against their own brethren, and a morally questionable Levite unites the tribes, whereas divinely ordained judges could not. Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 568. Beldman describes the parallels of these wars, listing the rhetorical specifics. He calls these connections a strategy of circularity. Beldman, *Judges*, 223. Additionally, McCann points out the literary connection between the weeping in Judges 2:4 and that in 20:23, 26 and 21:2 as well as the irony that the Canaanites are meant to teach them war, which they learn but instigate against their brethren in the concluding chapters. McCann, *Interpretation: Judges*, 31, 38.

[68] Spronk, *Judges*, 5.

the initial war account includes Caleb's relative who demonstrates his willingness to fight *for* his country and is rewarded with a wife (Judg 1:12–15), whose antithesis is found in the concluding account wherein the depraved Benjamites are willing to fight *against* their Hebrew brethren and end up deprived of wives for their rebellion (Judg 20–21:1).[69] The agency of the women in the reports should also be noted as inverse parallels as Caleb's daughter is able to make a request for land which is granted (Judg 1:14–15) while the narrative ends with women divested of any autonomy and are taken from their land (Judg 21:10–23).[70]

While Othniel appears in the prologue, his main contribution is chronicled as the first judge of Israel, epitomized as the ideal leader. Raised up by the Lord and with the Spirit of God on him, Othniel judges, wages war, delivers, and provides rest to the land (Judg 3:10–11). Again, because Othniel's story overlaps in the prologue and judges accounts, it is crucial to consider that his deliverance provided him with a treasured wife. Othniel is portrayed as the ultimate Hebrew. In Othniel's overall story, husband, wife, and father-in-law work cooperatively to secure a desired future.[71] This contrasts sharply with the penultimate story of the Levite who devalues his concubine by tossing her to the wicked men of Gibeah (Judg 19:22–28).[72] The Levite, a man who should represent Yahweh, has become fully Canaanized—the reverse of Othniel. Additionally,

---

[69] Additionally, the phrase "all the sons of Israel" only occurs in two places in the book of Judges: 2:4 and 20:1. Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 549, demonstrating the further parallel of these sections. Initially this was a lament for their rebellion, but the latter references their willingness to go to war against their fellow tribesmen. Furthermore, the phrase "who shall go up first" from their initial forays into the land in 1:1 is repeated in 20:18, except this time, they are fighting their own countrymen rather than Canaanites.

[70] These connections are noted and greatly expanded by Gregory Wong as he discusses the parallels in the prologue and epilogue being composed by the same author as a means of highlighting the main points of the book, of which the central section characters are illustrative stories of the overall theme of denigration. Gregory Wong, *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges: An Inductive, Rhetorical Study* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

[71] Beldman, *Judges*, 209.

[72] Schneider, *Berit Olam*, 249. Schneider actually points out that Achsah and the concubine "stand as bookends" to the entire book.

this narrative was clearly written in a way to cast the reader back to the story of Lot in Genesis 19, where two other women are offered to satisfy the homosexual appetites of the angry townspeople.[73] Understanding this connection is crucial for ascertaining the typological intentions of the author as he attempts to demonstrate a pattern of Israel heading toward the destruction by Yahweh. In doing this terrible act, the Benjamites are cast in the same light as the Sodomites and deserve to be decimated.[74] Brettler fittingly notes,

> Establishing the dependence of Judges 19 on Genesis 19 is important for two reasons: it indicates how truly evil the residents of Gibeah were in the eyes of the author of Judges 19, since they are patterned after the Sodomites, and it establishes that the author of Judges 19 was a learned author who knew traditions that circulated in ancient Israel and enjoyed using these traditions to make a literary point.[75]

The author's point demonstrates, not only the parallel of wickedness between the Israelites and Sodomites, but the contrast between who they initially fought against in the Promised Land and who they had sadly become. Whether or not this has been intentional, the Israelites have become the enemies they once were able to conquer.[76]

---

[73] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 534. Spronk agrees that this was an intentional link by the author as the old man is "precisely in the same situation as Lot, who was also living as a foreigner in Sodom." Spronk, *Historical Commentary*, 513. Millgram states that the plot line and vocabulary is nearly identical, noting that one quarter of the words found in Genesis 19:4–8 occur in the same exact form in Judges 19:22–24. Millgram, *Judges and Saviors*, 420.

[74] Cynthia Edenburg, *Dismembering the Whole: Composition and Purpose of Judges 19–21* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 186. Edenburg notes that this comparison would serve to showcase Gibeah as the "spiritual 'sister' of Sodom." She also finds literary parallels between the ensuing war against the Benjamites and the war Joshua fought against Ai (Josh 7–8), further highlighting the typological nature of account by demonstrating again that the Israelites have become the people they once fought against (203–17). Furthermore, Edenburg traces this literary pattern forward to the rape of Tamar, noting the connections and the pattern continue into the monarchic period as might be expected until a divine King brings order and God's people remain faithful to their covenant (248–55).

[75] Marc Brettler, "The Book of Judges: Literature as Politics," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108, no. 3, (1989), 412.

[76] Serge Frolov, *Judges: The Forms of the Old Testament Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 318. Additionally, Van Pelt lists ten ways in which the stories parallel. Van Pelt, *Judges*, 664–65.

The next judge, Ehud, is depicted as deceptive, but for noble purposes. He uses his cunning abilities to betray and conquer the subjugating enemy king and lead the Israelites in redemptive revolt. Conversely, his counterpart, Micah, is deceptive against his own mother for personal gain, a double violation of the Torah.[77] Additionally, rather than retribution for his turpitude, his restitution creates idolatry, and he inaugurates his son as a priest (Judg 17:4–5).[78] He then hires a Levite who ultimately betrays him for personal gain, as he aids the Danites in capturing a peaceful city. Micah's account showcases the descendant of a prominent historical leader defying the commands and covenant of Yahweh as well as a Levite operating for selfish advancement (Judg 20:7–21:31).[79] Micah, in particular, is not concerned with the nation but with himself and is portrayed as a deceptive, idolatrous thief who is cursed by his own mother (Judg 17:1–3). Additionally, he has led his household in abandoning Yahweh.[80] The contradiction between Ehud, who is willing to use his deception for national freedom, and Micah, whose story is inundated with the theme of personal gain, easily sets them as opposites in the chiastic structure.

The accounts of Deborah and Barak, next in the parallel, are set in contrast to Samson's story and downfall. The length of these accounts as well as some of their thematic qualities easily connect them. While Deborah and Samson are significant figures in the book of Judges,

---

[77] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 479.

[78] McCann, "Interpretation: Judges," 17. This action denotes a deeper theme at work; as McCann notes, "The opposite of faithful relationship to Israel's God is idolatry."

[79] Beldman, *The Completion of Judges*, 133.

[80] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 391. Block parallels the account of Judges 18:2 with Joshua 2:1, demonstrating that the author considers Micah's house equivalent to that of a prostitute. The irony is that in the complementary ensuing invasions, Rahab (a foreigner but God-fearer) will be spared and rewarded while Micah (an Israelite) will be plundered and ruined.

their individual typological ramifications will be assessed in chapter 5; here only broad motifs will be briefly assessed. For example, both stories have halfhearted male heroes and are dominated by the women characters who alter the outcomes of each narrative. These women play significant roles in both cycles.[81] Deborah is directive, and Jael is victorious, ultimately winning freedom for the Israelites. Conversely, the women in Samson's story eventually create subjugation and defeat for him. Jael and Delilah ultimately gain victory while the men sleep.

Finally in the chiastic structure, the author parallels Gideon and Jephthah. Both of their stories begin formulaically with these phrases:

> The people of Israel did what was evil in the sight of the Lord. (6:1)
> The people of Israel again did what was evil in the sight of the Lord. (10:6)

While Butler designates Gideon as a "novella" that is brought to conclusion only through the Abimelech narrative, Gideon's cycle actually has a formulaic ending, signaling the completion of his story.[82] Therefore, Gideon stands as his own cycle, despite his paternal links, thereby paralleling with Jephthah with whom the connections become more obvious upon further examination.[83] Younger notes strong links between Jephthah and Gideon, such as the open confrontation from Yahweh (6:7–10, 10:6–10) and their journey from nobodies to "despots."[84] Additionally, both of these men are reluctant warriors (Judg 6:13, 11:7), with questionable

---

[81] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 392. Additionally, Chisholm notes that when Samson is captured by the Philistines with Delilah's help, it highlights that Israel has "come full circle from the earlier account of Jael and Sisera. . . . Samson is in the role of Sisera, and Delilah in the role of Jael." Chisholm, *Commentary*, 426.

[82] Trent C. Butler, *Word Biblical Commentary 8: Judges*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard, and Glenn W. Barker (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 192. Although Butler would pair Jephthah with Abimelech (281), he also notes a parallel in the transitional preparations of their stories; Jephthah in Judges 10 and Gideon in Judges 6:1–10 (279).

[83] McCann, *Interpretation: Judges*, 89. McCann notes that the "stories of Gideon and Jephthah have significant parallels" including that both "start out well, but each takes a decided turn for the worse, resulting in a violent legacy."

[84] Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth*, 53.

families of origin (Judg 6:15, 11:1), who the Spirit of God comes upon (Judg 6:34, 11:29), and both demand a sign/promise in order to fight (Judg 6:36–40, 11:9–10). Both leave legacies of slaughtered progeny (Judg 9:5, 11:39). Gideon and Jephthah's interactions with the Ephraimites also have clear correspondences in their accounts. Judges 8 and 12 begin in the same fashion with the Ephraimites angry at not being called to war:

> Then the men of Ephraim said to [Gideon], "What is this that you have done to us, not to call us when you went to fight against Midian?" And they accused him fiercely. (8:1)

> The Ephraimite forces were called out, and they crossed over to Zaphon. They said to Jephthah, "Why did you go to fight the Ammonites without calling us to go with you? We're going to burn down your house over your head." (12:1)

In the conclusion of Gideon's narrative, the Ephraimites are called out to fight against the Midianites and ultimately help bring the victory by guarding the waters of the Jordan (Judg 7:24–25) while Jephthah calls the men of Gilead to fight against the Ephraimites by controlling the fords of the Jordan, killing 42,000 in a stunning reversal of Gideon's inclusion (Judg 12:4–6). These responses are distinct, inverted parallels, where Gideon dispels the Ephraimites anger with humility and Jephthah incites it with hostility. These strong parallels encase the central story of the book: Abimelech.

It is the central point of a chiasm rather than the intro or outro which "holds the interpretive key."[85] Therefore, if the center of Judges' chiastic structure is Abimelech, then the message of his narrative must be considered the author's rhetorical purpose for the entire Judges account.[86] Exum claims that Abimelech is the point at which the framework breaks down;

---

[85] Wayne Brouwer, "Understanding Chiasm and Assessing Macro-Chiasm as a Tool of Biblical Interpretation," *Calvin Theological Journal* 53, no. 1 (2018), 108.

[86] Younger considers Abimelech as a "sequel" to the Gideon narrative which closes unanswered questions. However, his analysis demonstrates a clearly closed chiastic structure for Gideon (Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth*, 218–19). Additionally, Hamley states that Abimelech stands at the center of Judges. Hamley, *God of Justice*, 104.

however, it is not the fragmentation of a framework but rather the pivotal point of the chiasm.[87] Judges 9 details the rise and fall of Abimelech who acts as a judge and is the first to attempt kingship. While Gideon refused sovereign control for himself and his offspring, he did name one of his sons Abimelech, which means "my father is king" (Judg 8:22–23).[88] Perhaps it was this lapse in judgement with his concubine or his familial spiritual regression that caused his son to take an entirely different approach to leadership (Judg 8:24–27) when Abimelech reverses Gideon's narrative through fratricide and assumption of sovereignty (Judg 9:5–6). Whatever Abimelech's motivation, the author of Judges has intentionally placed this narrative at the central point of the book, thereby denoting its fundamental importance to the overall account.[89]

Prior to examining Abimelech's narrative and its subsequent significance, it is essential to determine whether this vital piece of literature should be considered independently. Most often, the account of Abimelech is grouped into the Gideon cycle since there is no new instigation of the cyclical indicators.[90] The story plays out like Canaanite history, denoting the full extent of Canaanization in which the Israelites are now engaged.[91]

---

[87] J. Cheryl Exum, "The Centre Cannot Hold," 415. Exum notes that it is after Gideon when the deliverers begin to "complicate Israel's problems rather than relieve them" (419). While not Exum's conclusion, this observation serves to further the parallelism of the overarching chiastic structure of Judges with Abimelech as the pivot point.

[88] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 304. Block lists several potential meanings of the name, most convincingly the idea that this name represents Gideon's self-perception of his status as ruling in Israel. While Gideon's motives are impossible to fully ascertain, his son will demonstrate a savagely lethal desire to inherit the royal title which Gideon refused prior to his apostasy.

[89] Interestingly, there is no mention of nor connection to Yahweh throughout the Abimelech narrative, yet the divine message is conveyed through the fable of Jotham.

[90] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 308. Block notes that the typical phrasing that begins a new sin-rescue cycle, "The Israelites did evil in the eyes of Lord," does not occur at the beginning of the Abimelech narrative. However, this marker is less obvious in the Jephthah cycle as well, coming in the chapter previous to the introduction of the deliverer (10:6), which might be considered paralleled with the indictment against Israel following the Gideon cycle (8:33–34).

[91] Ibid., 308–9.

Understanding this macrolevel chiasm assists in garnering the author's intention for the overall tome. There is a consistent reiteration at each level of the chiasm that man cannot possess and remain at rest in the land without the direct involvement of God. This theme is showcased through the possession and dispossession of the land which serves as a type of new covenant representing God's favor. The macro-chiastic structure places Abimelech at the central point, demonstrating the theme that each of the various narratives are reiterating: human leadership is insufficient for longevity of God's favor.[92] Block notes that the author clearly intends the Abimelech story as the climax of the Gideon narrative; however, I would propose it is not just the climax of the Gideon cycle, but of the book in its entirety.[93] Judgeship and kingship will both be refuted in the life of Abimelech, proving that neither are suitable solutions to the problem of the people's sin.[94] The author of Judges has intentionally placed Abimelech at the central point of the entire tome. This revelation necessitates a deeper look at the writing surrounding Abimelech's life, which can be seen through a microlevel chiasm.

Micro-Chiastic Structure

The extended chiasm of the book of Judges denotes an intentionality by the author to highlight a central theme. As explicated in the previous section, this fundamental motif is revealed in the life of Abimelech, who ultimately fails as both judge and king. Abimelech himself serves as a typological character who represents the fallacy of adequate human

---

[92] Placing the center of this chiasm at the story of Abimelech does showcase connection to the beginning and conclusion of the structure. Spronk points out that 8:33–35 repeats "almost verbatim what was told in 2:10–12." Spronk, *Historical Commentary*, 266. Additionally, the idea of kingship clearly links to the literary seam in the epilogue of Judges that "there was no king in Israel."

[93] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 308.

[94] In fact, it is in the Abimelech narrative that Yahweh is most clearly seen as Judge, King, and Deliverer of Israel as he works behind the scenes to eliminate the corrupt power that the Israelites so willingly accepted.

leadership through the irony of his name as well as his overall Canaanization.[95] The life of Abimelech demonstrates the central theme of Judges when analyzed through a chiastic structure that stretches beyond the boundary of chapter 9, as his birth is divulged at the conclusion of Gideon's life in chapter 8. Below is the micro-chiasm of the life of Abimelech:

A Rise of Abimelech (8:29–35)[96]
  B Abimelech's conspiracy (9:1–4)
    C Opposition Arises from Jotham (9:5–8)
      D Jotham's Fable and Interpretation (9:9–21)
    C Opposition Arises from Shechem (9:22–25)
  B Gaal's conspiracy (9:26–49)
A Fall of Abimelech (9:50–57)

In this scenario, the principal point of the central focus in the book of Judges is found in Jotham's fable. Often skimmed over as a mere anti-monarchial polemic, this fable expresses the core connotation through which the entirety of Judges can be understood. Brouwer presents numerous requirements for categorizing chiasms, the first of which is the idea that the text's interpretation is problematic when utilizing other conventional outlines.[97] Truly, this fable has created challenges for interpreters. While some consider Jotham's approach a normative

[95] Wong, *Compositional Strategy*, 226. Wong demonstrates a persuasive parallel between Abimelech and Adoni-Bezek, a Canaanite king who was conquered in the original conquest (Judg 1:5). Adoni-Bezek recounts his brutality against seventy kings who he deposed, which parallels the way in which Abimelech came to power by murdering his seventy brothers (Judg 1:7; 9:5). The matching savagery between Abimelech and Adoni-Bezek demonstrates the eventual Canaanization of human leadership apart from Yahweh's direction and empowerment as characterized by Abimelech, the first major judge who is not recorded as being chosen by God.

[96] Amit agrees that this portion of scripture serves as exposition for the Abimelech narrative. Amit, *Judges,* 100. Additionally, while verses 8:29–32 give background information, Chisholm notes that verse 8:33 begins with an introductory *wayyiqtol* meant to introduce an episode and that the *wayyiqtol* of 9:1 is an initiatory clause meant to set the narrative of Abimelech in motion. Chisholm, *Commentary*, 81–82. Boling states that this section acts as a theological introduction to the Abimelech narrative. Boling, *Judges*, 170.

[97] Brouwer, "Understanding Chiasm," 114. Indeed, even Spronk notes that the fable does not fit neatly into the surrounding context and must therefore be considered as having a separate origin. Spronk, *Historical Commentary*, 257. He concludes that the moral is kingship without Yahweh's blessing is ultimately doomed to failure, a theme that will play out in Israel's monarchy (258). This difficulty in fitting Jotham's fable into the structure acts as further proof of the author's intentionality of its placement.

confrontational style,[98] others write it off as irony.[99] Still others debate the connectedness of the fable to the actual events of Abimelech's coup[100] or simply discount the narrative in favor of the author's closing remarks.[101] Recognizing Jotham's fable as the center point of a chiastic structure that is ultimately concerned with conveying the typological patterns of Yahweh alleviates the dissonance of these conventional outlines. Butler states, "If one lets the Jotham fable set the tone for the entire narrative, then the responsibility for choosing and exercising leadership is much more at the center of the narrative."[102] It can even be noted that Jotham's fable is a "microcosm" of the entirety of the book of Judges in the way it parallels the search for a ruler and the unfortunate procurement of curses from the chosen leaders.[103] Additionally, for the author of Judges to place this fable as the *central* point of the *central* chiasm of the entire volume denotes its significance to the totality of the work. The narrative of Abimelech could continue unabated without the fable and even without Jotham's curse. When Story claims that the fable's inclusion is the "most crucial part of Judges," he may be thinking too small, as Jotham speaks to the

---

[98] Susan Niditch, *The Old Testament Library: Judges* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 116.

[99] George W. Coats, "Parable, Fable, and Anecdote," *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 35, no. 4 (1981), 374.

[100] Daniel Scott Diffey, "Gideon's Response and Jothams' Fable: Two Anti-Monarchial Texts in a Pro-Monarchial Book?" (Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013), 248–51.

[101] Yairah Amit, "Endings - Especially Reversal Endings," *Scriptura* 87 (2004), 219.

[102] Butler, *Judges*, 234.

[103] Robert H. O'Connell, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 270. O'Connell footnotes that Jotham's fable parallels the "strategy of entrapment" in the book of Judges as the people search for a leader only to be trapped by their choices burning them in the end. The hearers of Jotham's fable do not know the fated conclusion of the fable just as the readers of Judges do not know the author's ensuing repetitive theme that "there was no king in Israel" denouncing the previous judgeships. This literary seam will be discussed further in the following section.

entirety of human history and future in this typological proclamation.[104] Jotham himself addresses the people of his day who have been led astray, stating that only in heeding his words will God hear theirs.[105] Although clearly a fable, the inclusion of this passage is central to the typological understanding of the whole book, and therefore must be further examined.

As the center of the Abimelech chiasm as well as the center of the chiastic structure of Judges, Jotham's fable illustrates the misconception that mortal rulership can be successful apart from Yahweh's ultimate sovereignty. This theme is essentially the point of the entire Hebrew Bible.[106] The fable focuses on the plants who reject surrendering their productiveness to "hold sway over the trees" (a phrase repeated by each of the candidates in Judges 9:9, 11, and 13) and on the bramble who accepts the offer (Judg 9:15). The Hebrew phrase, מלוכה עָלֵינוּ, utilized in Jotham's fable, requesting the trees to "reign over them," is distinctly used two other places in the Old Testament:

> His brothers said to him, "Are you indeed to *reign over us*? Or are you indeed to rule over us?" So they hated him even more for his dreams and for his words. (Gen 37:8, emphasis added)
>
> And the Lord said to Samuel, "Obey the voice of the people in all that they say to you, for they have not rejected you, but they have rejected me from being *king over them*. (1 Sam 8:7, emphasis added)

Here the typological motif is on full display as it moves from the figure of Joseph to Jotham to Samuel. In Joseph's narrative, the words are spoken by his family members, who do not desire

---

[104] J Lyle Story, "Jotham's Fable: A People and Leadership Called to Serve (Judges 8:22-9:57)," *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership* 2, no. 2 (2009), 31.

[105] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 316.

[106] Reading throughout the Hebrew Bible, this idea of the need for divine leadership is clearly spelled out from Eden to exile. The people of God repeatedly demonstrate their inability to lead themselves and their need for God's leadership. This theme will be repeated throughout the monarchy and with the warnings of the prophets. This repetitive theme showcases the need for Jesus to come as the Savior and create a connection to God. Brouwer's 8th requirement of chiasms is that the central passage be "worthy of that position in the light of its theological or ethical significance." Brouwer, *Understanding Chiasm*," 115.

their divinely selected brother to reign over them. The end of the story showcases that Joseph's reign is actually salvific for his family and their progeny. Joseph acts as a type of Christ who suffers and ultimately reigns for the salvation of his brothers and nation. While the brothers tried to kill Joseph as the Jews will later kill Jesus, the ultimate rulership of both demonstrates the power of Yahweh's divine sovereignty. This contrasts with Jotham's fable in which the brothers are *slaughtered* rather than *saved* to ensure the reign of a man who will eventually bring destruction rather than salvation to his nation. Jotham's fable and prophecy comes to fruition for the entirety of the Israelite nation during the judgeship of Samuel as the people demand human leadership and reject Yahweh's divine sovereignty despite the impending consequences of eventual destruction and exile. This typological theme of rejecting divine authority and the ensuing consequences begins in the Garden, is highlighted in the life of Joseph, given a visual by Jotham, and ultimately succumbed to during Samuel's life. The Septuagint's Greek interpretation of this, βασιλεῦσαι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, is specifically utilized by Jesus in a parable which highlights God's *intended* target for this wrath and destruction:

> But as for these *enemies of mine*, who did not want me to *reign over them*, bring them here and slaughter them before me (Luke 19:27, emphasis added).[107]

It was not the servants of the King, even the one who buried his minas, who were intended to incur his fiery wrath but rather the *enemies* of the King who rejected his sovereignty. Additionally, the idea of fire coming out from the bramble in Jotham's prophetical interpretation

[107] See also Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 292. While Johnson does not make the specific reference to Judges, he does notes that Luke places this parable directly before Jesus ascent into Jerusalem denoting that he will be the rejected King. Johnson further connects this theme to the apologetic speech of Stephen in Acts 7 noting that the first martyr linked the Hebrews' rejection of Moses to the Jews rejection of Jesus. However, whereas the Hebrews eventually trusted Moses to their own salvation, the first century Jewish leaders were rejecting him, thus becoming his enemies.

of the fable is another theme, showcasing God's wrath for rejection of his authority (Lev 10:2, Num 16:35, Jer 4:4, Ezek 15:7).

Diffey urges readers not to press the details of the fable but to take the overall nature of the literature as the author's main point for inclusion.[108] While it is wise not to overanalyze, the specified plants should be considered in the greater story of the biblical canon to demonstrate their importance in Judges as typological ramifications of Jotham's prophecy. The three demurring plants include an olive tree, a fig tree, and a vine. This vegetative trio is specifically characteristic of the Promised Land: "a land of wheat and barley, of *vines and fig trees* and pomegranates, a land of *olive trees* and honey" (Deut 8:8, emphasis added).[109] These plants are connected to God's description of the Promised Land and thereby representative of God's favor. This notion is reinforced when the Lord strikes this trio, removing his favor when Israel turned from following his merciful ways: "I struck you with blight and mildew; your many gardens and *your vineyards, your fig trees and your olive trees* the locust devoured; yet you did not return to me," declares the LORD" (Amos 4:9, emphasis added). Again, this trio is prophesied as the return of God's favor through Habakkuk and Haggai:

> Though the *fig tree* should not blossom, nor *fruit be on the vines*, the *produce of the olive* fail and the fields yield no food, the flock be cut off from the fold and there be no herd in the stalls. (Hab 3:17, emphasis added)
>
> Is the seed yet in the barn? Indeed, *the vine, the fig tree*, the pomegranate, and the *olive tree* have yielded nothing. But from this day on I will bless you. (Hag 2:19, emphasis added)

[108] Diffey, "Gideon's Response and Jothams' Fable," 255.

[109] Karin Schöpflin, "Jotham's Speech and Fable as Prophetic Comment on Abimelech's Story: The Genesis of Judges 9," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 18, no. 1 (2004), 14.

This typological trio can be traced from the promise of land to the prophets after the exile and is found at the heart of Judges in Jotham's fable. The overarching timeline of this thematic trio observes the following pattern: denoted as representing God's favor through blessings in the Promised Land (Deut 8:8), struck down for rebellion (Amos 4:9), prophetically poetized as proclaiming the nation's trust in God regardless of blessing (Hab 3:17), and promised by Yahweh as favor for reinstituting the Temple (Hag 2:19). Here we see a similar cycle to that of the Judges: favor, rebellion, repentance, and deliverance. The author of Judges has intentionally woven this prevalent theme into the center point of his narrative structure demonstrating his understanding and advancement of the typological nature of the scriptures: "Indeed, one is able to find a metaphorical salvation-history through the lens of these horticultural images in a progressive work of reinterpretation through the history of both testaments."[110] While each candidate produces commodities that could be used at the coronation of a king,[111] the premise of the fable is that productive serving outweighs potential sovereignty.[112] It is the product of each plant in the vegetative trio that prevents them from assuming leadership. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the message of the fable is also God's ongoing desire for a productive, theocratic people rather than a monarchial settling. It is not necessarily the monarchy in general or even Abimelech specifically that Jotham is opposing but rather the universal ideal espousing the propitiousness of human leadership overall. Interestingly, the only place in the New

[110] Story, "Jotham's Fable," 32.

[111] Baruch Halpern, "The Rise of Abimelek Ben-Jerubbaal," *Hebrew Annual Review* 2 (1978), 95.

[112] Story, "Jotham's Fable," 46. Block agrees with this interpretation noting that Jotham's negative interpretation runs contrary to ancient Near East ideals about kingship. Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 321.

Testament where this trio is found together also discusses good leadership, teaching that one cannot fabricate another's produce.[113]

At the conclusion of the chiasm are the citizens of Shechem who find themselves in a catch 22; they will love Abimelech's exploits while he remains in leadership but will be consumed by his eventual exit.[114] They cannot, therefore, remove him without bringing ruin upon themselves. Typical of all human leadership, this theme will play out repetitively in the future monarchy. While Jotham's prophecy may have been directed specifically at Abimelech, the reality that the author of Judges placed this fable at the crux of the entire book demonstrates a broader application than one king or even a polemic on the monarchy in general. This fable demonstrates the typological reality that advantageous mortal leadership is impossible and can only be accomplished by a divine intervention, pointing again toward Christ's fulfillment. The inclusion of this fable at the heart of Judges denotes the author's intention to showcase a look back to the Pentateuch and forward to the coming Messiah. This cyclical pattern of establishing archetypes, highlighting ectypes, and looking forward to the antitype is the essence of typology; and the author of Judges has placed it at the center of his writing.

While most scholars agree that Jotham's fable is not an outright condemnation on the monarchy, many consider Abimelech the sole recipient of the proclamation. The fable is mocking not just the choice of Abimelech but also the way the people have attempted to choose

---

[113] James 3:12 is specifically referencing the subject of words, including believers using curses and blessings. However, the context of the entire chapter is warning against stepping hastily into leadership because of the inherent faults in every human. This sentiment does contain echoes of Jotham's fable and prophecy.

[114] Silviu Tatu, "Jotham's Fable and the 'Crux Interpretum' in Judges IX," *Vetus Testamentum* 56, no. 1 (2006), 124. Although Tatu focuses on identifying the type and genus of the tree within Jotham's fable, his ultimate conclusion is that the people of Shechem are in an "irony of dilemma" for their choice to ask Abimelech to rule over them, making their own death imminent.

a king.[115] The entire fable demonstrates the irony that a people living in the Promised Land miraculously provided by Yahweh would attempt to institute a monarchy in opposition to theocracy, which has already been fully demonstrated as necessary by previous judge narratives of rebellion and deliverance. The intentional inclusion of the fable underscores the truth that the overall theme Judges is addressing is not a political issue but a spiritual issue.[116] Therefore, neither political system, judgeship nor kingship, can fully deliver a people who have set their hearts against their true Deliverer. As a final note, the life of Abimelech is bookended by Gideon and Jephthah—the former who refused leadership by emphasizing the need for theocracy (Judg 8:23), while the latter assumed leadership through a manipulative vow which cuts off his progeny (Judg 11:30–31).

Chiastic structures serve as organizing arrangements throughout the Hebrew Bible, and Judges is no exception.[117] There are extensive as well as limited chiasms throughout the book. The focal point of needing the right king to rule over the people, therefore, need not be a polemic for a Davidic monarchy but rather a spiritual appeal to await a messianic king and judge. The design of Judges is more than a mere historical detailing of Israel's pre-monarchial leadership. If that were the case, the author would likely have included such individuals as Moses and Samuel,

---

[115] O'Connell, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, 165. O'Connell argues that the Hebrew wordage in chapter 9 portrays a Canaanite nobility in Shechem thereby mocking the foreign nobility for their choice of king as well as their method of selection. This theory ultimately glorifies Yahweh but also demonstrates the folly of those outside of faith, reemphasizing God's power as the omnipotent leader of the Israelites.

[116] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 321.

[117] Chiasms are literary structures utilized in Hebrew poetry and short story to aid in highlighting the point of the literature. The structure entails a mirroring of the first half of the literature with similar words, phrases or ideas in the second half of the text. Chiasms have a center point which is unparalleled and stands alone as the pivotal point and purpose of the writing.

who were both said to have judged Israel.[118] Rather Judges' chiastic structure is an intentionally designed typological reiteration of themes from the Garden: that exile is inevitable for those who persistently refuse Yahweh's sovereignty. The restatement of Israel's lack of kingship acts as one of the literary seams that stitch the darker parts of the narratives together.

Literary Seams

Much like the Pentateuch, it likely that the book of Judges was composed of multiple stories that were stitched together by a skillful author to tell a specific story.[119] In weaving together the various accounts, the author of Judges creates a narrative center by utilizing "verbal seams" to unite the book in telling the story.[120] These seams tie the narratives back to the Pentateuch as well as to the other reports within Judges and showcase the work of a divinely inspired, skillful author with a more extensive narrative in mind than merely cataloguing the intermittent period between conquest and kingdom. Indeed, the literary seams attest that Judges demonstrates a "deeper coherence than has been recognized by most historical-critical scholars."[121] The literary seams discussed in this section include the angel of the Lord, divine questioning, and the lack of kingship.

---

[118] Exodus 18:13 and 1 Samuel 7:15 record these leaders as acting judges of Israel, respectively. Moses could even be considered as a military and judicial leader through the Exodus. However, these leaders are not essential to the structure of Judges because it is not the actual leaders that the author is highlighting but rather the inevitable outcome of the nation sans Yahweh's sovereignty. This is best highlighted through the life of Abimelech.

[119] Brian N. Peterson, "Could Abiathar the Priest Be the Author of Judges?," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 170, no. October (2013), 445.

[120] John H. Sailhamer, *The Meaning of the Pentateuch* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2009), 23. Sailhamer discusses these verbal seams in regard to the Pentateuch.

[121] Barry G. Webb, *The Book of Judges: An Integrated Reading* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1987), 207. Additionally, Butler comments that "many recent studies continue to show the integrity of the entire book, including the epilogue, even when the scholars do not agree on the origin and purpose of the book." Butler, "Word Bible Commentary," 372.

The Angel of the Lord

There are key moments throughout the Hebrew Bible in which the storyline is moved forward through the messenger of Yahweh known as the "angel of the Lord."[122] Three of these encounters occur in the book of Judges, more than any other book of the Hebrew canon.[123] There is no scholarly consensus on the meaning of this phrase, and suggestions range from a particular angel to a theophany and more specifically to a Christophany.[124] Some consider this ambiguity a deliberate literary device employed to create tension thereby showcasing the transcendence of the Lord in a euphemistic way.[125] Others appreciate a more earthly approach, suggesting that at least the first appearance of the figure in Judges is a human prophet sent by Yahweh.[126] However, this abstruseness need not be resolved to ascertain the writer's purpose, as the vagueness serves to highlight the author's main intention: a focus on the *message* rather than the *messenger*.[127] Therefore examining the overall messages conveyed by these encounters throughout scripture

---

[122] The Reformation theologians had numerous interpretations to whom scripture is alluding in these passages. For example, the Targum pointed toward a prophet causing Hebrew exegetes to label the messenger as Phinehas whereas others considered him to be a heavenly being or even the Lord Jesus himself. This debate centered around the fact that the angel "came from Bochim to Gilgal" but also spoke as if he were divine in the rescue during the Exodus. Amos, *Reformation Commentary*, 217–18. Spronk contends that this would be better translated as "messenger" since angel is always the angel of Yahweh in the scripture and that the emphasis here is on their function. Spronk, *Historical Commentary*, 75.

[123] René A. López, "Identifying the 'Angel of the Lord' in the Book of Judges," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 20, no. 1 (2010), 1. López notes that the phrase מַלְאַךְ־יְהוָה occurs 19 times in the book of Judges "far more than any other book of the Bible" (2).

[124] Andrew S. Malone, "Distinguishing the Angel of the Lord," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 21, no. 3 (2011), 297. Malone specifically refutes the argument presented by López regarding the representation theory citing that, while he proves that messenger and master can be regarded as equivalent, he fails to convincingly prove the distinguishment of the angel from Yahweh.

[125] Stephen L. White, "Angel of the Lord: Messenger or Euphemism?," *Tyndale Bulletin* 50, no. 2 (1999), 305.

[126] Millgram, *Judges and Saviors*, 48.

[127] Mart-Jan Paul, "The Identity of the Angel of the LORD," *Hiphil* 4 (2007), 11.

can aid in understanding this seam in Judges. Additionally, the theme which arises from examining these various encounters demonstrates the typological bend of the author as the recurrent phrase points back to Pentateuch accounts as well as forward to monarchial encounters, all of which are encompassed in covenantal motifs.

The first occurrence of the angel of the Lord is recorded in Genesis 16:7 with a visit to Hagar after she has run away from Sarai. He instructs her to return to her mistress, and she will be blessed with a multiplying of her offspring. This covenant language from Yahweh is interesting, as the angel tells a foreigner to submit to his chosen people and consequently promised her a great nation of descendants, which is later fulfilled (Gen 25:12–15). Conversely to the Genesis account, the initial appearance of the angel of the Lord in Judges reflects an indictment against the Israelites for their disobedience and partial conquest, subsequently denoting a punishment in relation to the Promised Land covenant (Judg 2:1–4).[128] It is a notable reversal that a foreigner would submit and gain Yahweh's blessing, whereas his chosen people would reject him through their disobedience, ultimately forfeiting their covenantal rights to sole possession of the land.

The second encounter in Genesis occurs during the sacrifice of Isaac when Abraham is tested by Yahweh to ascertain his faithfulness. Here the angel of the Lord not only prevents Abraham from slaying his progeny (Gen 22:11–12) but also proclaims a blessing over his offspring in which they will "possess the gate of his enemies" (Gen 22:17). This blessing will stand as an ironic contrast to the stories in Judges in which the enemy repeatedly subdues Israel.

[128] This indictment includes a recalling of Yahweh's deliverance of the Israelites from foreign oppression in Egypt pointing out God was always the deliverer while they were always the beneficiary. Additionally, the messenger makes clear the dangers of tolerating the Canaanites. Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 112–14. The irony is not lost that a foreigner submitted to Yahweh's commands and found freedom while Israel rebelled and would now be subject to captivity.

One notable exception that fits within the blessing to Isaac's descendants is Samson, whose birth was also foretold by the angel of the Lord (Judg 13) and who literally possessed the gates of his enemy (Judg 16:3). However, this blessing was given in light of Abraham's utter trust in and obedience to the Lord, the reversal of which will be a cyclical theme of Judges, underscoring the nation's distrust and disobedience. The third appearance of the angel of the Lord is found in the pre-Exodus story of Moses' encounter with the burning bush (Exod 3:2). It is this confrontation which sets in motion the fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant through the eventual possession of the Promised Land.

The initial message of the angel of the Lord is that blessing can come to anyone, even foreigners, based on their submission and obedience. The second message demonstrates that the Lord will grant blessing for passing divine testing. The third message sets into motion the covenantal guarantee of possession of the Promised Land. Each of these messages correlate with messages from the angel of the Lord presented in Judges; however, each exists as an apparent reversal of the Pentateuchal messages. Additionally, each recorded occurrence in Judges doubles the amount of scroll space devoted to the encounter. The first happens prior to Joshua's death in the conquest, when the Israelites are reprimanded for their lack of obedience and disciplined by having enemies remain in the Promised Land. It is the first explicit commentary on the Israelite's behavior in Judges, and it is clearly not good.[129] The peoples' subsequent unfaithfulness leads to the raising up of judges (Judg 2:1–5). The second instance is an appearance by the angel of the Lord to commission Gideon as a judge and rescuer for Israel (Judg 6:11–21). It involves Gideon testing the Lord as a reversal to the Lord's testing of Abraham. The final appearance in Judges is to Samson's parents as a prophetic end to his mother's barrenness as well as a termination of the

[129] Beldman, *Judges*, 65.

Philistine enslavement (Judg 13:2–25). There are numerous connections between the Moses and Samson encounters, including the appearance/disappearance of the angel in fire (Exod 3:2, Judg 13:20), the requesting of the divine name (Exod 3:13–14, Judg 13:17–18), and the commission to national rescue from foreign oppression (Exod 3:10, Judg 13:5). However, in the encounter with Moses, Yahweh gives specific instructions, promises full deliverance, and calms fears through signs, assurances, and acquiescence in human partnership. In the encounter with Samson's parents, Yahweh gives specific instructions, promises partial deliverance, and accepts an offering but offers no reassurances of his ongoing presence. The following table outlines these contrasts:

Table 4.3 Comparative Messages from the Angel of the Lord

Pentateuchal Scripture	Narrative	Message	Judges Scripture	Narrative	Message
Genesis 16, 25:12–15 Hagar	Hagar the foreigner has run away from Sarai. The angel of the Lord instructs her to return and submit and she will be blessed with a great nation of offspring.	The blessings of Yahweh are available to anyone including foreigners and dependent on submission and obedience.	Judges 2:1–5 Correction at Bochim	The people entered the Promised Land, are reminded of God's covenant faithfulness in the wilderness, and reprimanded for their lack of faithfulness.	The blessings of Yahweh are removed from his chosen people while foreigners defeat them due to their lack of submission and their disobedience.
Genesis 22:1–19 Sacrifice of Isaac	The Lord tests Abraham by requiring a sacrifice of his son. Abraham builds an altar but is prevented from committing filicide by the angel of the Lord. He is extended divine blessing for passing the test.	Yahweh is willing to test his children in order to ascertain their level of faith and faithfulness. Salvation and blessings ensue for those who pass the test.	Judges 6:11–40 Gideon	Gideon tests the angel of the Lord by preparing a meal. He then tears down his father's altar of Baal and is saved from death by his father. This leads to another testing of the Lord by fleece and the salvation of Israel from Midian.	Yahweh was willing to be tested to demonstrate his level of covenant faithfulness to his children. Salvation and blessings ensue for followers who remain obedient.
Exodus 3:1–4:17 Moses and the burning bush	The angel of the Lord appears to Moses in a fiery burning bush and prophesies that he will rescue the nation from foreign oppression.	Yahweh's deliverance requires the empowerment of Yahweh and the action of man.	Judges 13 Samson's birth foretold	The angel of the Lord appears to Samson's parents, prophesies a son who will rescue the nation from foreign oppression, and disappears in fire.	Yahweh's deliverance requires the empowerment of Yahweh and the action of man.

The preconquest appearances of the angel of the Lord work together to present the message that anyone can receive Yahweh's blessing if they are submissively obedient and pass the test of faithfulness. The narrative changes after the conquest where the message of the angel of the Lord reveals that blessing can be removed from God's chosen people for disobedience despite

Yahweh's willingness to demonstrate his faithfulness.[130] However, in both scenarios, deliverance is determined by a partnering of Yahweh's empowerment with the peoples' obedience. The difference in the final pairing is that Moses ultimately submits to the Lord's leading, whereas Samson spends most of his life satisfying his own lusts and partnering with Yahweh only at the conclusion of his life.

The author of Judges has arranged these theophanies in a parallel order to those of the Pentateuch, demonstrating a typological escalation where the locus of control shifts from Yahweh's sovereign commands to man's choice of obedience. This nondeterministic perspective has been functioning since the Garden but is clearly demonstrated through the shift in narrative after the pronouncements from the angel of the Lord.[131] In the epic of the Exodus, the emphasis is clearly on the power of the Lord; but in Judges, the dynamic has swung to spotlight the choices of the people. In the greater salvation story, it is this shift, highlighted by the encounters with the angel of the Lord, that will narrate the need for a divine Savior.[132] Judges acts as the stopgap period between Yahweh's leading through the wilderness and the inauguration of the monarchy with its humanistic focus. McCann states that each deliverance in Judges can be seen as a "miniexodus," an opportunity to answer the question of whether Yahweh's covenant people will be loyal to him or not.[133] Of course, throughout the narrative, the answer is clear that they will not

[130] Beldman suggests that the placement of the encounters in Judges (chapters 2, 6, and 13) may be spaced in such a way as to remind the reader of the angel's first indictment and recall the overall story being told as a pattern of God's covenantal encounters. Beldman, *Judges*, 104.

[131] See the discussion on Land in the Pentateuch for ways in which Yahweh shifted from sovereign deliverance to required participation during the conquest of the Promised Land.

[132] Additionally, as Spronk notes, these encounters underscore Yahweh's continual interaction with and desire to connect to his people. Spronk, *Historical Commentary*, 33.

[133] McCann, *Interpretation: Judges*, 15.

remain faithful. In this way, the author of Judges moves the *Heilsgeschichte* forward by revealing the need for a divine human to partner with Yahweh in his salvific act of deliverance.

An additional note might be added from Butler in that Joshua encounters a similar divine being at the beginning of his conquest.[134] Joshua's encounter came specifically after a time of recommitment to the covenant through circumcision and the Passover celebration. This occurrence instigates the naming of Gilgal (Josh 5:9). Therefore, it is significant that the encounter in Judges comments on the angel of the Lord journeying from Gilgal to Bochim as a visual representation of how far the Israelites have moved from their covenantal beginnings.[135] Furthermore, whereas Joshua is assured victory by a cyclical march around Jericho, Judges' divine messenger sets the stage for the ensuing cyclical decline and defeat of the nation. These links show that the typological pattern of Judges will differ from and enhance the previous understanding of Yahweh's work among his people.

Divine Questioning

The introduction to Judges offers many clues to authorial intent. One phrase clearly links the time just prior to the establishment of judges with an encounter of Adam and Eve in the Garden. The seam is stitched throughout Genesis and draws the original audience back to the familiar stories, connecting the two and foreshadowing the eventual conclusion of the fledgling Israelite nation. To this point in the Hebrew narrative, the character of *God* has been revealed most clearly in his rescue during the Exodus, but the character of the *Israelites* was revealed

---

[134] Butler, *Judges,* 39. Butler notes that the movement of the angel in Judges highlights the shift of the people from worshipping to weeping (40).

[135] A further note from Chisholm cites that the two cities named in chapter 1 would echo this same conclusion: Hormah symbolizes Israel's successful conquering through Yahweh whereas Bochim symbolized the Israelites failure of total conquest. Chisholm, *Commentary*, 141.

most clearly in their disobedience to Yahweh's commands.[136] Therefore, the divine questioning in Judges 2 should come as no surprise to the people who repeatedly denied Yahweh in the wilderness. Rather it acts as another thread in the seam which repeatedly underlines humanity's faithlessness and deception.

Judges 2 begins with the angel of the Lord traveling from Gilgal to Bochim to deliver a message of judgement to the people of Israel. The locations are significant, as Gilgal is the first place of covenant after crossing the Jordan (Josh 5:10). The location of Bochim is considered by some to be Bethel, a significant place of encounter with God.[137] The angel's physical location reflects the people's spiritual condition of moving from a place of covenant to a place of "weeping." Within the angel's rebuke is a significant question:

> Now the angel of the Lord went up from Gilgal to Bochim. And he said, "I brought you up from Egypt and brought you into the land that I swore to give to your fathers. I said, 'I will never break my covenant with you, and you shall make no covenant with the inhabitants of this land; you shall break down their altars.' But you have not obeyed my voice. *What is this you have done?* (Judg 2:1–2, emphasis added)[138]

This question naturally draws the original hearers back to the story of Eden, as it is the final query asked by the Lord during the interrogation of Adam and Eve in the garden (Gen 3:13).

---

[136] Thorleif Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (New York: Norton, 1960), 47.

[137] Niditch, *The Old Testament Library: Judges*, 49. Niditch merely points out that Bochim is identified with Bethel by scholars including Amit. The spiritual significance goes beyond the mere name as Bethel is the place Abram first called on the Lord (Gen 12:8) and where he returned to after his deceptive blunder with Pharoah (Gen 13:3). Bethel is also the place Jacob received a dream from the Lord with the promise that the land would be given to his offspring (Gen 28:11–29). Additionally, it is where Jacob returned to after Simeon and Levi deceptively slaughter the Hivites on account of Dinah (Gen 35:1). Kaminsky points out the word associations between Genesis 34 and Judges 9, linking the stories of deceptive violence committed at Shechem (Joel S. Kaminsky, "Reflections on Associative Word Links in Judges," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 36, no. 4 (2012)). Most significantly, Bethel is the place where God changes Jacob's name to Israel and instigates a new creation as noted by the phrase, "be fruitful and multiply" (Gen 35:11). In this blessing, the Lord reconfirms the promise of land to his offspring (Gen 35:12). Therefore, although Bochim/Bethel is a place of weeping, it may also be considered a place of redemption if there is repentance and returning to the Lord.

[138] Additionally, Spronk points out that this question is at the center of a mini-chiasm surrounding this encounter. Spronk, *Historical Commentary*, 75.

However, beyond the garden, the question acts as a literary seam that stiches together narratives of deception across multiple characters and contexts.

Table 4.4 What is this you have done?

Scripture	Hebrew	Narrative
Genesis 3:13	מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂי	Asked by the Lord to Eve after a confrontation regarding their eating of the forbidden fruit.
Genesis 4:10	מֶה עָשִׂיתָ	Asked by the Lord to Cain after he murdered his brother, Abel and lied to the Lord about it.
Genesis 12:18	מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂיתָ	Asked by Pharoah to Abram after he deceived him regarding his wife Sarai by calling her his sister.
Genesis 20:9	מֶּה־עָשִׂיתָ	Asked by Abimelech, the king of the Philistines to Abraham after he deceived him regarding his wife Sarah by calling her his sister.
Genesis 26:10	מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂיתָ	Asked by Abimelech, the king of the Philistines to Isaac after he deceived him regarding his wife Rebekah by calling her his sister.
Genesis 29:25	מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂיתָ	Asked by Jacob to Laban after he deceived him by giving Leah as his wife rather than Rachel.
Genesis 42:28	מַה־זֹּאת עָשָׂה אֱלֹהִים	Asked by one of Joseph's brothers to God after the money was secretly returned to their sacks on their journey home.
Judges 2:2	מַה־זֹּאת עֲשִׂיתֶם	Asked by the angel of the Lord to the Israelites when they had broken covenant after entering the Promised Land.

The question is asked at pivotal moments throughout the narratives in Genesis, each involving a deception. The first two instances are asked by the Lord to Eve and her son Cain, after the deception of the fruit and the murder of Abel, respectively. When the Lord questions Eve, it is clear he already knows what she has done and is looking for her admittance (Gen 3:12). The ultimate result of their transgression is exile from the garden (Gen 3:24). Likewise, when Cain is questioned in the field it is clear the Lord knows what he has done (Gen 4:10), and his punishment is again exile (Gen 4:12, 16). Similarly, Abram's first incident of deceiving a foreign king ends in exile from the land (Gen 12:20).[139] This theme, especially when the questions are asked by the Lord as in the stories of Eve and Cain, exhibits exile as the natural result of people who have faithlessly deceived a faithful God. With this in mind, the question asked by the angel

[139] The remaining occurrences of the phrase in Genesis do not specifically result in exile but do all involve deception. Abimelech is deceived by Abraham and Isaac, and although he allows Abraham to remain, eventually he asks Isaac to leave (Gen 26:16). The final incident with Joseph's brothers demonstrates a feeling of being deceived by God and fear of divine retribution stemming from the selling of Joseph and the deception they created to placate their father's wrath (Gen 42:35).

of the Lord in Judges 2:2 carries the weight of inevitable banishment from the newly acquired Promised Land for the disingenuous Israelites. As in the narratives of Eve and Cain, they have not deceived the Lord with their idolatry but only themselves. This phraseology is authored intentionally as a look back to the narratives of the Pentateuch which forces the audience forward to the natural conclusion of exile. Here again, the pattern of engaging with previous material to underscore an eventual end demonstrates the author's typological predisposition and desire to convey the redemptive patterns of Yahweh and the rebellious patterns of Israel. The remainder of Judges is a slowly spiraling descent from this divine proclamation to the proposed solution of a monarchy, which itself will predictably lead to exile.

"In Those Days There Was No King in Israel"

Perhaps the most obvious literary seam in Judges is the fourfold repetition that there is "no king in Israel," found in the double epilogue of chapters 17–21. These chapters have long been considered a later addition to the Judges corpus and even presented as an anti-Saulide polemic.[140] Conversely, Niditch asserts that the phrase is not an "overt, zealous condemnation" of a nation without a monarchy, but rather a simple indication of the differences of earlier times.[141]

---

[140] Sara J. Milstein, "Saul the Levite and His Concubine: The 'Allusive' Quality of Judges 19," *Vetus Testamentum* 66, no. 1 (2016), 97, 115. Although Milstein considers these chapters to be fictional, she does a thorough job of connecting the anonymous characters in the stories with figurers in Saul's life. Her conclusion, therefore, is not one of authorial intent of typology but rather of political polemic against Saul's leadership. She asserts that this position can rectify the competing considerations for dating the epilogue citing that earlier writing was possible for the polemic with a continued interest that later reshaped the story. While Milstein's connection of characters is admirable, her conclusions are lacking. If Judges 17–21 is merely a fictional anti-Saul polemic, why are these character connections so elusive? A fictional account would surely be more specific if refuting specific leadership or at a minimum would provide a counterexample, such as David, for the ideal type of leadership. Is it possible that rather than a specific person, the chapters are condemning human leadership as a whole; rather than leading forward to a specific monarchy, the account is looking back to a time of theocracy. Her interpretation depends on the dating of the book and the need for a political polemic in the history of Israel. Rather than Milstein's conclusions, if there is any polemic in the book it is against the gods of Baal and Dagon from the Canaanites and Philistines, respectively. Chisholm, *Commentary*, 59–61.

[141] Niditch, *The Old Testament Library: Judges*, 182.

Kaminsky agrees with this assessment that the literary seam does not necessitate monarchial propaganda.[142] Block goes a step farther in connecting this literary seam as a variation of the formulaic words from each of the prior judge cycles, thus indicting the people, more than any monarchy, as inherently evil.[143] Younger also points out the dangers of interpreting the phrase as merely a "promonarchiacal redaction," stating that readers "miss the spiritual component that seems to be functioning to reinforce the proper theological understanding of the double conclusion."[144] Beldman agrees that the statement has spiritual implications, noting that the first instance comes after a spiritual, not a political, incident.[145] Additionally, Way connects this refrain with another refrain that the Israelites did "evil in the eyes of the Lord," which occurs seven times throughout the body of the book.[146] However, if these theological rather than

---

[142] Joel S. Kaminsky, "Reflections on Associative Word Links in Judges," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 36, no. 4 (2012), 415.

[143] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 476. Block notes the seven repetitive statements of: "in those days" denoting the lack of kingship, and "everyone did what was evil in the Lord's eyes" showcasing the peoples' willingness to live in their own selfishness and rebellion. Block also demonstrates that there is no need for a human king as the people have demonstrated their ability to rebel and that rebellion is rampant as no divine King is acknowledged (583). Furthermore, Block declares that Judges "is a prophetic book, not a political tractate. . . . The theme of the book is the Canaanization of Israelite society during the period of settlement" (58).

[144] Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth,* 39.

[145] Beldman, *Judges*, 190. Frolov contends that there is no "macrolevel value" to the placement of these phrases based on the lack of their pattern as opening or dividing formulae. Frolov, *The Forms*, 231. However, skilled authors need not utilize phraseology as merely formulaic division, but rather can employ such phrases to create inclusios so as to bracket their main point. This fourfold repetition is clearly intentional by the author. McCann agrees with this assessment by pointing out the overall canonical theme present throughout the era of the judges and the monarchy: Israel's "persistent unfaithfulness and disobedience." McCann, *Interpretation: Judges*, 118. Boling also agrees stating that the first instance of this phrase does not denote a previous ending of the book but rather a division of the problem with Micah and his Levite, showcasing the problem of spiritual denigration and contemplating how God will respond since there is no king. Boling, *Judges*, 256. Therefore, this overarching pattern must be considered in the theological interpretation of the phrase that there was no king in Israel as it is not a human king, but the divine King which will eventually deliver the people.

[146] Kenneth C. Way, *Judges and Ruth* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2016), 6–7. Way also suggests that the reader need not decide between the phrase leading to a monarchy or theocracy, but rather that a theocratic monarchy where the "human king helps the people to do what is *right* in God's eyes" is a fitting conclusion (8).

political suggestions are to be accepted, then what indeed is the author's intent in such paralleled repetition?

Table 4.5 No King in Israel[147]

Scripture	Hebrew	Narrative
Judges 17:6	בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם אֵין מֶלֶךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל אִישׁ הַיָּשָׁר בְּעֵינָיו יַעֲשֶׂה *In those days there was no king in Israel. Everyone did what was right in his own eyes.*	At the conclusion of Micah's account of returning his mother's stolen money, forming an idol, and anointing one of his sons as priest.
Judges 18:1	בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם אֵין מֶלֶךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל *In those days there was no king in Israel.*	Introducing when the tribe of Dan usurps Micah's Levite and idols, and then violently takes over Laish.
Judges 19:1	בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם וּמֶלֶךְ אֵין בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל *In those days, when there was no king in Israel*	Introducing the Levite and his concubine who ends up gang raped, murdered, then butchered and sent out to the tribes as a condemning proclamation about the Benjaminites.
Judges 21:25	בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם אֵין מֶלֶךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל אִישׁ הַיָּשָׁר בְּעֵינָיו יַעֲשֶׂה *In those days there was no king in Israel. Everyone did what was right in his own eyes.*	Conclusion after the civil war that almost annihilates the Benjaminites and the pilfering of brides for the preservation of their remnant.

If these counterpart declarations were broken into a chiastic structure, it would easily be designated as ABB'A'.[148] However, as previously stated, chiasms need a central point to which the refrains lead. It could be proposed that the center of this chiasm is found in the response by Micah's priest to the Danites: "And the priest's heart was glad. He took the ephod and the

[147] It should be noted that despite the English translation and chapter demarcations, Chisholm reports that each of these instances is a concluding phrase explaining the preceding episode. Chisholm, *Commentary*, 439–41, 486. However, because the inclusio extends throughout the entirety of the epilogue, a straightforward presentation of the current interpretation has been specified in the table.

[148] Amit would contend that the first two statements serve a functional purpose of separating the narrative into three critiques regarding the events and the future of the country with the foci leading to a central monarchy. Conversely, she sees the last two statements as lacking context, creating "artificiality in their inclusion." Amit, *Judges*, 346–47. However, this interpretation may lean heavily on Noth's conclusions and does not seem to take the entirety of the final form into consideration instead regarding the concluding three chapters as an appendix. While she considers the final form an edit through which the redactor created a clever chiastic structure, it seems odd that these two statements would be found solely where she suggests (17:6 and 18:1) which would form neither an inclusio nor a chiastic structure. We do not see this editorial commentary used to divide other narrative sections within the main body of Judges, therefore the suggested artificiality could be a shift in the focus of the final two episodes contained within the last five chapters of Judges. Again, for this paper, the concern is the book in its final form. Furthermore, Millgram notes this specific chiastic pattern is neither "artificial nor superimposed upon the underlying narrative but intrinsic to it," Millgram, *Judges and Saviors*, 383. He goes so far as to point out five connections between the ensuing narrative elements which demonstrate parallelism as well as inversion and denote the unity of the epilogue.

household gods and the carved image and went along with the people" (Judg 18:20).[149] Here the refrain that without a king the people do "what was right in their own eyes" reaches its ultimate conclusion, as even the Levitical priests have turned to selfish gain.[150] The nation of Israel was intended to be a kingdom of priests with Yahweh as the King (Exod 19:6), but instead the actual priests have turned away from Him.[151] The entire book of Judges is permeated with covenantal language linked to the idea of kingship, all of which finds its climax in the final chapters and the literary seam that "there is no king in Israel."[152] While the phrase "in those days" may lend to the belief of later emendation, one need not become overly concerned with the timing of authorship to ascertain his intentions: Israel has no king and even the priests have become corrupt.

The idea of the nation's priests becoming immoral is doubly dark when set against the backdrop of the narratives found in Judges 17–21. These chapters contain some of the most deplorable accounts of humanity in the entirety of scripture and Yahweh is noticeably absent. The cycles of sin, repentance, rescue, and rebellion that we have come to expect in Judges are also nonexistent in these chapters. However, rather than assuming a separate authorship, it is possible that the inconsistencies in the writing reflect the very dissolution of the nation which the

---

[149] While Younger notes this chiasm, he insists the significance is conveyed through Gideon's statement in 8:23, "I will not rule over you. . . . The Lord will rule over you." Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth*, 39. However, this sentiment, while accurate to the story, lies outside of the inclusio. It is therefore better to find the significance of the pattern from within the story it enfolds.

[150] Van Pelt agrees with this assessment stating that the refrain reflects "Israel's rejection of the Lord as her King during this time" and that led to people doing what they wanted, mostly signified through idolatry. Van Pelt, *Judges*, 511.

[151] Hamley aptly notes how the refrain indicates a fragmentation on every level, "the nation, the tribe, the clan, the town, the household, the couples. In a world where everyone does what is right in their own eyes, only individuals are left, amidst the ruins of community. Together with individualization comes the victimization of those with less power." Hamley, *God of Justice*, 275. And the King has been disavowed through this individualism, perhaps a relevant commentary for a contemporary world.

[152] Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth*, 58.

author is trying to portray.[153] Additionally, the anonymous nature of many of the characters employed by the author may also convey the disintegration of the nation.[154] The stories told, especially that of the Levite and his concubine, serve to reiterate the depths of the royal refrain: there is no King, and the priests have been corrupted. While one might simply blame the evil Gibeathites, the Levite's lack of communication and care demonstrates a deeper problem within the Israelite society. The concubine's dismemberment radically symbolizes the division of Israel; she is nameless, helpless, and dismembered—a fitting visual of Israel's inevitable exile.[155] There are clear connections between Lot and the Levite; however, in the former account, "God intervenes to save Lot's guests, but in the gruesome counterpart in Judges 19, Yhwh does not appear."[156] This again denotes not the evil of being without a political monarchy but the deprivation reached when the nation has rejected their divine King.[157] Satterthwaite uses narrative criticism to analyze these chapters, concluding that the author's literary artistry has an agenda: "Not any king will do, but only a king who will set to right wrongs such as these."[158]

The theme of kingship in the Old Testament can be complex. The idea of human kingship first appears in Genesis 14 and is portrayed as bloodthirsty and avaricious. However, this chapter also introduces the enigmatic figure Melchizedek, who is noted to be both king and priest of God

---

[153] Exum, "The Centre Cannot Hold," 412.

[154] Don Michael Hudson, "Living in a Land of Epithets: Anonymity in Judges 19–21," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 62 (1994), 53.

[155] Susan Niditch, "The 'Sodomite' Theme in Judges 19-20: Family, Community, and Social Disintegration," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly Washington, DC*, no. 3 (1982), 371.

[156] Exum, "The Centre Cannot Hold," 428.

[157] Millgram agrees with this conclusion stating, "Israel has lost its King . . . and the implications of living in a godless world are immediately spelled out." Millgram, *Judges and Saviors:* 494.

[158] Philip E. Satterthwaite, "'No King in Israel'': Narrative Criticism and Judges 17–21,'" *Tyndale Bulletin* (1993), 88.

(Gen 14:18). Esau's descendants were said to have kings when there were none in Israel (Gen 36:31). However, Esau was the unblessed, disinherited eldest son, and it is Jacob's offspring with whom Yahweh will ultimately form a covenant. It is also Jacob's progeny who next encounter human kingship as they come under the protection and eventual enslavement of the kings of Egypt. It is notable that the same Hebrew wordage is used during their enslavement as in the refrain in Judges:

> During those many days the king of Egypt died (Exod 2:23a ESV)[159]
> בַיָּמִים הָרַבִּים הָהֵם וַיָּמָת מֶלֶךְ מִצְרָיִם
>
> In those days there was no king in Israel (Judg 21:25a ESV)
> בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם אֵין מֶלֶךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל

However, the conclusions of these verses are markedly different:

> The people of Israel groaned because of their slavery and cried out for help. Their cry for rescue from slavery came up to God. (Exod 2:23b)
>
> Everyone did what was right in his own eyes. (Judg 21:25b)

Rather than turning to Yahweh for deliverance as they did when there was no king in Egypt, the people of the judges' era did what was right in their own eyes. The conclusion in Exodus is equally as indicting: "God saw the people of Israel—and God knew" (Exod 2:25). In Judges, Israel has ceased crying out to the Lord; therefore, rather than God *seeing* and *knowing*, the people use their limited vision and knowledge to do what *appeared* right to them.

The kingship motif takes on a new meaning after the Exodus. The song sung by Moses and the Israelites subsequent to their Red Sea crossing concludes with a declaration of Yahweh's rulership (Exod 15:18). While not utilizing the term מֶלֶךְ, the relationship between God and Israel clearly presents as one of suzerain-vassal, where the ruler (suzerain) protects the vassal based on

[159] Spronk notes this connection pointing out the authorial highlighted emotion in the Exodus version versus the simply stated facts by the author of Judges. Spronk, *Historical Commentary*, 102.

a covenant agreement of specific stipulations.[160] This treaty of God's sovereignty and Israel's dependence is shown most clearly in the book of Deuteronomy, which outlines the obligations of the new nation as well as consequences for breaking the covenant.[161] In Judges 2, the angel of the Lord declared that Israel had broken their end of the treaty, and therefore Yahweh was no longer obligated to protect them as their ruler (Judg 2:2–3). This declaration in the prologue is therefore mirrored by the refrain in the epilogue that there was no King in Israel. Therefore, the issue outlined by the author of Judges is not a political problem, but a spiritual struggle.[162] Wong suggests the author of Judges composed the prologue and epilogue to specifically highlight chosen hero stories in the central section so as to exemplify his authorial purpose in illustrating the need for a divine King.[163] This then demonstrates again the typological intent of the author. Judges is written not as a polemic for or against specific monarchial leaders but as an indictment against all of Israel that they have forsaken their divine King. After all, there is no real need for Judges to be written as pro-monarchial polemic, since the Torah already contained provisionary instructions for a future monarchy:

> When you come to the land that the Lord your God is giving you, and you possess it and dwell in it and then say, 'I will set a king over me, like all the nations that are around me,' *you may indeed set a king over you whom the Lord your God will choose*. One from among your brothers you shall set as king over you. You may not put a foreigner over you, who is not your brother. Only he must not acquire many horses for himself or cause the people to return to Egypt in order to acquire many horses, since the Lord has said to you, 'You shall never return that way again.' And he shall not acquire many wives for himself, lest his heart turn away, nor shall he acquire for himself excessive silver and

---

[160] Brettler, *How to Read the Bible*. 155.

[161] Frederick Greenspahn, ed., *The Hebrew Bible: New Insights and Scholarship* (New York: New York University Press), 49.

[162] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 37. Block demonstrates that even with political considerations, the author of Judges' primary concern was the spiritual state of the nation.

[163] Wong, *Compositional Strategy,* 230. It seems Boling would agree with this assessment as he states, "Yahweh was in fact the King. This will be the thrust of the final chapters." Boling, *Judges*, 273.

> gold. And when he sits on the throne of his kingdom, *he shall write for himself in a book a copy of this law, approved by the Levitical priests*. And it shall be with him, and he shall read in it all the days of his life, that he may learn to fear the Lord his God by keeping all the words of this law and these statutes, and doing them, that his heart may not be lifted up above his brothers, *and that he may not turn aside from the commandment*, either to the right hand or to the left, so that he may continue long in his kingdom, he and his children, in Israel. (Deut 17:14–20, emphasis added)

Apparently, Yahweh did not deem a human monarchy and divine theocracy as mutually exclusive if the king remained subject to the King by knowing his commands and obeying the priests. Perhaps this is because throughout the book of Deuteronomy God's divine kingship is implicit.[164] However, this will not be the case for Israel:

> Then all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel at Ramah and said to him, "Behold, you are old and your sons do not walk in your ways. Now appoint for us a king to judge us like all the nations." But the thing displeased Samuel when they said, "Give us a king to judge us." And Samuel prayed to the Lord. And the Lord said to Samuel, "Obey the voice of the people in all that they say to you, for they have not rejected you, but *they have rejected me from being king over them*. According to all the deeds that they have done, from the day I brought them up out of Egypt even to this day, *forsaking me and serving other gods*, so they are also doing to you. (1 Sam 8:4–8, emphasis added)

Yahweh was not willing to share his sovereignty and gave the people over to their desire for kingship, knowing the nation would follow the ways of their kings. The peoples' desires and degeneracy will challenge but never overrule Yahweh's sovereignty.[165] This theme of kingship takes centerstage in Judges 9 with the story of Abimelech and the sentiments of the Lord being conveyed through Jotham's fable. Abimelech may reign as king for three years, but God reigns supreme forever and chooses to oust the usurper in his timeframe. Butler reiterates in his conclusion that the entirety of Judges is summed up in its desire to showcase the necessary qualities of human leadership:

---

[164] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 476.

[165] Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth,* 26.

> The king must show true humility, unlike Gideon. The king must show true piety, unlike Jephthah. The king must show loyalty to a people, unlike Abimelech. The king must know that kingship is a function in Israel but not an exclusive office to meet selfish desires for power, riches, and a large family. The office belongs by rights to God. The human occupant must enter the office only as the people under God's leadership place him there, not through usurpation as had Abimelech.[166]

In listing the vital virtues of a victorious king, Butler unknowingly demonstrates the typological role of kingship which can only be accomplished through a divine human. This may be why Jesus was constantly trying to redefine the meaning of kingdom in his teachings. In Jesus' most famous sermon, his inclusio starts and ends with the kingdom of God including the poor and persecuted.[167] Jesus' redefined kingdom in the New Testament is extended not to the rich and royal but to the poor and persecuted (Luke 6:20–22, 14:13). This is because Jesus has a new definition of Kingship which he will fulfill through service and suffering rather than grasping and greed. In this way, Judges highlights the typological antithesis of Jesus, effectively demonstrating that no mere human king will suffice to draw God's people back into covenant relationship; only a divinely human King will lead them toward doing what is right in God's eyes. Indeed, teaching about this kingdom was at the very heart of Jesus' agenda and the way he taught his disciples to pray stands in direct opposition to the literary seam of Judges when he says, "Your kingdom come, your will be done, on earth as it is in Heaven" (Matt 6:10). Instead of having no king and everyone doing what is right in their own eyes, Jesus teaches his disciples to pray for a heavenly kingdom so that what is done is right in God's eyes. This is the truth that

---

[166] Butler, *Judges*, 476.

[167] George Wesley Buchanan, *Jesus: The King and His Kingdom* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1984), 28. Buchanan also notes the typological connection of Jesus' teaching to the teachings of Moses during the Exodus as he declares the children belong to the Kingdom of Heaven (30).

the author of Judges is intentionally pointing forward to when he highlights the consequences of not honoring the divine King.

The book of Judges showcases the hazards of human leadership, concluding with the refrain that in absence of a king people will follow their own desires. However, this literary seam is deeper than historical commentary on a pre-monarchical society. Rather, it is a typological preview of Christ as the messianic King, fulfilling what was lacking in human leadership during the conquest period.[168] Additionally, in John's revelation, his followers are again called a kingdom of priests (Rev 5:10) who serve the one who sits on the throne (Rev 5:13). Paul refers to Jesus as the "only Sovereign, the King of kings" (1 Tim 6:15). Jesus himself described his purpose as being a King of an other-worldly kingdom who came to proclaim the truth (John 18:36–37). The theme of a divine king who eternally rules in justice and truth is a literary seam throughout the entire scriptural canon of which the author of Judges purposely provides an additional thread.

Minor Judges

Finally, while not actually a literary seam, the role of the "minor" judges should be considered in the macro-structure of Judges.[169] Younger prefers to utilize the terms "cyclical" and "non-cyclical" in regard to the judges, citing that it is merely their role and length of narrative, not actual importance that separates their titles.[170] With such short accounts, the inclusion of

[168] Groves, "Judges," 101. Groves also points out that the monarchy will reveal it is not a political structure that was lacking but a spiritual foundation which is able to change peoples' hearts. Human kingship, and the peace it creates, will prove as tenuous as the judges' era. It is therefore the Divine King to which the tome is ultimately pointing.

[169] Shamgar, Tola, Jair, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon are considered minor judges.

[170] Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth,* 25.

these judges comes into question. Block asserts that the minor Judges represent the solar year as each of their tribes constitute a part of the calendar.[171] Way suggests that six minor judges are included to bring the total number of judges to twelve, thus indicating an indictment against all twelve tribes for the increasing Canaanization of the nation.[172] Additionally, Way cites the intentional structuring of the minor judges inclusions into a triad of interruptions, highlighting the deliverance judges (Shamgar with Othniel, Ehud and Deborah), the royal prerogative judges (Tola and Jair with Gideon/Abimelech), and the progeny judges (Ibzan, Elon, Abdon with Jephthah and Samson).[173] This structuring of the minor judges as specific literary interruptions and reiterations serves to further emphasize the authorial intent of a deeper narrative, as each judge grouping demonstrates a decreasing of dependence on Yahweh's sovereignty and an increasing dependence on human authority with self-promoting agendas. The author is indicating that the nation does not need better leadership so much as spiritual recalibration.

Conclusion

"Judges is not primarily an Israelite historiography as most interpreters have proposed."[174] Rather, an examination of the macrostructure of Judges demonstrates the author's typological intent to portray the greater story of God through his depiction of the land, his chiastic structuring putting Jotham's fable centerstage, and through the literary seams that further tie the

---

[171] Block, *Judges, Ruth,* 145.

[172] Kenneth C. Way, "The Meaning of the Minor Judges: Understanding the Bible's Shortest Stories," *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society* 61, no. 2 (2018), 284.

[173] Ibid., 276. Way refers to the third triad as a revisiting of the royal theme but proceeds to discuss each in terms of progeny.

[174] Don Michael Hudson, "Living in a Land of Epithets: Anonymity in Judges 19–21," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 62 (1994), 50.

book back to the Pentateuch and forward to the Messiah. The land acts as a major player in the book of Judges and the author builds on the previously demonstrated patterns of God thereby foreshadowing future realities through the conquest and loss of the land. Typologically, the land represented God's favor and access to life which visually plays out through the Judges era. Additionally, the chiastic structuring of the tome places an emphasis on the central point of Abimelech's usurpation of power and Jotham's fabled response. Placing these narratives at the center of the entire book, the author highlights his main purpose by declaring that humanity's attempts at rulership are inherently doomed to destruction when not guided by the anointing and favor of Yahweh. This theme will be echoed by the author's use of literary seams, including the four-fold statement that Israel had no king, which left the people to do whatever they saw as right. This typological patterning demonstrates the author's awareness that there is more going on than a mere cataloguing of the conquest period. Rather, the author of Judges has specifically chronicled and arranged these historical narratives in a way that connects the concepts to key figures and events in the Pentateuch as a way to showcase the characteristic patterns of Yahweh and the responses of his people. This is typology in its most basic form.

The Hebrew Bible as a whole has various authors who record diverse stories in multiple literary genres. However, throughout history it has been read by believing communities as a unified collection ultimately designed by a divine author.[175] This unity is possible because individual stories are part of larger books which are part of larger sections which are part of the whole.[176] Therefore, one must look at both the macrostructure as well as the individual stories to

[175] Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 22.

[176] Ibid., 23. Dempster demonstrates that the various judge stories work to create the message of the book of Judges which is included in the Prophets section of the Tanakh which in turn leads to the greater canonical story of the Hebrew Bible.

understand the fullness of the theological message. The typological ramifications of these individual, microlevel ideas within Judges will be discussed in chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5: MICRO-TYPOLOGY; SEEING THE BIG IN THE SMALL

The previous chapter demonstrated the author's typological intent through the overall structure of the final form of Judges. This macro-level establishes the author's purpose to connect all of the stories within Judges to the greater covenantal narrative of scripture. However, an examination of the micro-level accounts also reveals specific examples of this typological intent. This micro-level examination provides an additional layer of validation to the authorial intentions of showcasing the characteristic patterns of God. These deeper, thematic motifs of Judges can be most easily categorized by the positions and people chronicled by the author.

Positions

The book of Judges addresses the questions of leadership and loyalty in the Israelite nation. With previously strong leaders such as Moses and Joshua gone, a leadership vacuum ensues which Judges chronicles through selected accounts. The Israelites find themselves in a third generation which has not personally experienced the initial freedom of Moses' generation nor the intense fight of Joshua's generation.[1] At this time in the nation's history, there is a prevalent idea that competent leadership will lead to cultic loyalty to Yahweh. Unfortunately, this ideal is proven wrong over and over again as the judges become progressively more rebellious and disloyal; leadership is not the real issue. The Israelites have focused on the wrong problem, it is not a political but a spiritual problem that plagues the fledgling nation. However, it is through these leadership positions that the character and covenant of God is most clearly demonstrated. Throughout the book of Judges, Yahweh remains somewhat silent, necessitating an understanding of the overall picture of His presence among his covenant people to garner a

[1] David J. H. Beldman, *Judges* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020), 2.

true picture of his character.[2] The positions highlighted through human fulfillment (judges) and anticipatory realization (kings) illustrate aspects of God's overall personality and patterns of fulfillment in the *Heilsgeschichte*. The former is demonstrated through the activity of the primary characters in the book, while the latter is defined through a role *in absentia*. An examination of each of these positions in the book of Judges underscores the author's typological connections back to the Pentateuch and forward to the prophets and messianic fulfillment.

The Position of Judge

Before detailing the typology of the individuals throughout Judges, it is essential to catalogue the author's representation of the position in a general sense. First, the title "Judges" can be confusing to modern readers, as it carries a sense of litigation. Amit notes that the term *to judge* has two meanings in biblical literature: law/judgement and rulership.[3] However, none of the leaders in the book are actually given the title of *judge*, and the term is more aptly interpreted as governor.[4] Block agrees with this assessment, concluding that the Hebrew might be better translated as "deliverers," with their purpose being to "lead, govern."[5] Yet the search for a definitive definition may distract from the true role the judges played. Butler suggests that modern readers may be overly fixated on finding a definition for a word that is purposely

---

[2] Trent C. Butler, *Word Biblical Commentary 8: Judges*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard, and Glenn W. Barker (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), lxxxiii.

[3] Amit, *The Art of Editing*, 66. Ultimately, she connects the meanings as a part of the ancient Near Eastern tradition of kings being the supreme judge of the land with their "ministers" also serving as judges.

[4] Beldman, *Judges*., 3.

[5] Daniel Block, *The New American Commentary: Judges, Ruth*, ed. E. Ray Clendened (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 23–24.

ambiguous.[6] Perhaps the better approach is to analyze the actions of the judges to determine their role in the overall narrative in the book of Judges:

Table 5.1 Activity of the Judges

Judge	Scripture	Hebrew	Context
Othniel	3:9	יָשַׁע	Delivered from Mesopotamia through war
Ehud	3:15	יָשַׁע	Delivered from Moab through assassination and war
Shamgar	3:31	יָשַׁע	Delivered from Philistines through personal battle
Deborah	4:4 4:23	שָׁפַט כָּנַע	Unspecified governing, alludes to spiritual guidance Subdued the Canaanites, but truly through Jael
Gideon	6:14	יָשַׁע	Delivered from Midianites through strategic war
Abimelech[7]	9:22	שׂוּר	Reigned over fellow Israelites through massacre
Tola	10:1	יָשַׁע	Unspecified deliverance
Jair	10:3	שָׁפַט	Unspecified governing
Jephthah	11:3	כָּנַע	Subdued the Ammonites through war
Ibzan	12:8	שָׁפַט	Unspecified governing
Elon	12:11	שָׁפַט	Unspecified governing
Abdon	12:13	שָׁפַט	Unspecified governing
Samson	13:5 16:31	יָשַׁע שָׁפַט	Prophetic declaration to begin deliverance from Philistines Governing, comment made at the conclusion of his life

The author primarily utilizes two verbs to describe the actions of the judges: יָשַׁע and שׂוּר. These are split almost evenly; however, four of the major judges apply the more specific idea of deliverance (יָשַׁע), while a more generic idea of governance (שׂוּר) describes the minor judges. There are clearly exceptions to this. For example, Deborah is described as *governing* Israel, which is perhaps another reason for the ambiguity regarding whether she or Barak is the true judge. Additionally, Tola is said to have *delivered* Israel, which is the last time the term is used to describe the action of a judge.[8] The author may have employed this term one last time after the

[6] Butler, *Judges*, 46.

[7] Although Abimelech is often not considered a judge, this paper has noted his vital role in the macrolevel.

[8] The usage of the word in Judg 13:5 is a prophetic proclamation from a divine messenger to Samson's parents, not a description of the actions of Samson himself.

turmoil caused by the reign of Abimelech as a way of reminding the reader of the intended purpose of the judges.

Throughout each of the accounts, the primary role highlighted for each judge is not judicial but rather their ability to deliver Israel from their oppressors. Van Pelt says this can allow readers to think of judges as "God's instruments of judgement."[9] However, the foreign oppressors were also God's instruments of judgement against a faithless and rebellious Israel (Judg 2:14–5). Therefore, it is more accurate to view judges as filling a dual role of delivering the people from enemies and removing them from the influence of foreign deities.[10] In this sense, Moses could be considered an exemplary judge, delivering the Israelites from the foreign oppression of Egypt and instituting the law of Yahweh.[11] In fact, the term יָשַׁע is first utilized in Exodus 2:17 to describe Moses as he delivers the daughters of the Midianite priest from the shepherds. The next usage of the word is in Exodus 14:30, after the Egyptian army is destroyed in the sea. The deliverance is rightly attributed to the Lord but was accomplished through the faithful actions of Moses. This is notable, as the judges will eventually turn from the Lord and find their inability to deliver the people due to their lack of faithfulness and obedience. Despite the human position in Judges, the reality remains that "Yahweh is judge, the arbiter of covenant

[9] Miles V. Van Pelt, "Judges," in *ESV Expository Commentary Vol II*, ed. Iain M. Duguid, James M. Hamilton Jr., and Jay Sklar (Wheaton: Crossway, 2021), 521. McCann points out that the Hebrew word for judges can also be rendered as a "bringer of justice" (4). Butler translates the Hebrew terminology describing the judges as a "judicial or mediatorial position." Trent C. Butler, *Word Biblical Commentary 8: Judges*, xxxvii. However, this mediatorial position should be considered as one between God and the people rather than the people and their enemies. The judge acts as God's intermediary to the covenant people of Israel.

[10] Amit, *Judges*, 75.

[11] While Moses did occupy a limited judicial role (Exod 18:13) and establish judge mediators for internal disputes (Exod 18:25–26), his roles as deliverer and lawgiver were the true archetype for the leaders in the judge's era. Moses' job was less about getting the Israelites out of Egypt and more about getting Egypt out of the Israelites.

fidelity and executioner of divine justice."[12] God remains the true judge and deliverer whether he utilizes people to bring about his divine plan or not. This is true from Moses through the conquest but is seemingly forgotten by the latter judges.

The combination of *physical* and *spiritual* deliverance was the quintessential characteristic demonstrating the type of judge who obeyed and pleased Yahweh. This is seen again during the Israelites' trek through the wilderness, as the people fall into idolatry with the Midianites and Moses commanded the judges to deliver them by purging the sin from within the camp, requiring *physical* sacrifice to attain *spiritual* freedom (Num 25:1–5).[13] There is always a physical and spiritual element to the deliverance. This is an essential truth in the covenantal story of scripture, as judges physically deliver the Hebrews but fail to direct their spiritual faithfulness, as noted by the peoples' continual return to idolatry after the death of the judge.[14] Therefore, the position of judge occupies a strategic link in the typological building blocks by showcasing the type of divine fulfillment required. The faithfulness of the judges illustrated Israel's need for obedience, but their flaws (and inconsistency of the people) illuminated Israel's inability to attain it; even with the empowerment of Yahweh, they could not pass this faithfulness test and therefore required constant deliverance. The judges could remove the enemy from the land, but they could not remove the enemy from the peoples' hearts.[15] Therefore, peace and faithfulness

---

[12] Beldman, *Judges*, 257.

[13] Yahweh's approval of this pattern of judgeship can be seen in his offering of a peace covenant to Phinehas for his deliverance of the Israelites through the physical slaughter of the copulating offenders (Num 25:6–13).

[14] See Judges 3:12; 4:1; 6:1; 10:6; 13:1.

[15] Susanne Gillmayr-Bucher, "Framework and Discourse in the Book of Judges," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128, no. 4 (2009), 690. The author notes that there is a pessimistic outlook from the beginning of Judges as the introduction notes that there will be no lasting change as God has already been abandoned on a national level. The judges, therefore, act as temporary relief, but lasting change will take more than human components.

were always limited to the lifetime of the judge. The position of human judges, therefore, showcased the need for a *divine* deliverer who would physically bring deliverance and renew an everlasting covenantal faithfulness within the people which would extend beyond his lifetime. Jesus will fulfill both of the roles exemplified in the position of judge. Perhaps Dirk Phillips notes the typological implications of the position best:

> All of [the judge's roles are] spiritually repeated in Christ Jesus, for he is the glorious warrior and conqueror who delivers his people from all their enemies, has made peace in their consciences, and is now the righteous judge in his congregation, with his Word and Spirit. And at the last day he shall hold judgement over the living and the dead.[16]

The role of judge as portrayed by the author of Judges demonstrates the position was intended as a deliverer who would create covenantal faithfulness among the people. This pattern follows the role of Moses and predicts the role of the Messiah, again highlighting the typological intent reaching back to the Pentateuch and forward to the fulfillment. Additionally, the judges simultaneously acted as deliverer while submitting themselves to the ultimate judge, Yahweh.[17] When they proceeded as deliverer outside of their submission to Yahweh, there were inevitably disastrous results. This was as true for Moses as for Abimelech, Jephthah, and Samson. Therefore, the divine design necessitated a deliverer who would willingly and fully submit to Yahweh.

Lastly, the position of judge demonstrates the covenantal faithfulness of God despite the rebellion of the people. A clear example is found in Judges 10:10–16, where Israel's cry (זָעַק), while initially met with resistance, was answered by the Lord not for their piety but due to Yahweh's faithfulness. Utilizing this verb, the author calls back to mind Israel's cries prior to the

---

[16] N. Scott Amos, ed., *Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament IV Joshua, Judges, Ruth* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press Academic, 2020), 203–4.

[17] Timothy D. Lytton, "'Shall Not the Judge of the Earth Deal Justly?': Accountability, Compassion, and Judicial Authority in the Biblical Story of Sodom and Gomorrah," *Journal of Law and Religion* 18, no. 1 (2002), 55.

Exodus (Exod 2:23), reaffirming that it was not Israel's "religious fidelity" but its *need* that moved God to deliver them, a theme that will play out throughout Judges.[18] Therefore, it was not the peoples' repentance but the compassion of God that raised up deliverers. This reality denotes an important truth for the position: a judge is not provided on the merit of the people but on the faithfulness of God. Paul writes of this covenant faithfulness being fulfilled in Jesus when he says, "He who did not spare His own Son, but delivered Him over for us all, how will He not also with Him freely give us all things?" (Rom 8:32 NASB). The Greek term for "delivered," παραδίδωμι, is used throughout the Old Testament, but most prominently in Judges. This short book contains at least fourteen percent of the overall instances, more than any other book in the Hebrew scriptures. The author of Judges was intentionally conveying a message that the interpreters of the Septuagint picked up on: deliverance was not earned; rather the position of a judge was freely given because of Yahweh's covenant faithfulness. The repetitive pattern of this truth throughout the individual judge stories denotes an intention by the author to highlight the typological nature of the position. Deliverance was not dependent on the righteousness of the people nor even on the morality of the judge: "Although the judges themselves are sinful and in need of gospel grace and saving faith, their ministry ultimately points forward to the life and ministry of Christ, the ultimate Judge."[19] However, judges were not the only form of leadership discussed in Judges; the people believed a king could solve their national struggles.

---

[18] Frederick E. Greenspahn, "The Theology of the Framework of Judges," *Vetus Testamentum* 36 (1986): 393–94.

[19] Miles V. Van Pelt, "Judges," in *ESV Expository Commentary Vol II*, ed. Iain M. Duguid, James M. Hamilton Jr., and Jay Sklar (Wheaton: Crossway, 2021), 518.

The Position of King

The initial introductions to the position of king in Judges are prevalently negative. For the first half of the book, kings are only referred to in a foreign context as conquering and subjugating Israel.[20] Millgram asserts that the initial battle between Cushan and Othniel symbolically represents the battle between kingship and judgeship respectively, where kingship means "bloodshed and evil" and judgeship equates to "liberation and freedom."[21] The center point of the book recounts the story of Abimelech, who tragically demonstrates the downfalls of the kingship in a trial run that lasts a mere three years (Judg 9). However, the position of king takes a noticeable turn in the final four chapters as it becomes the *inclusio* refrain for the conclusionary narratives.[22] This four-fold repetition can be interpreted as an endorsement for establishing the ensuing monarchy. However, Wong notes that within the context of Judges, the phrase denotes the central problem highlighted in the book: "Israel's refusal to recognize YHWH's ultimate kingly authority."[23] Dempster disagrees with this interpretation, noting that the conclusion of the book implies a hope for the future that will create more stability than the leadership of the judges. Whether it is interpreted divinely or practically, the position of king gained clearer formalization in the judges' era.

---

[20] The first reference is to Cushan-Rishathaim the king of Mesopotamia (3:8), then Eglon the king of Moab (3:12), and finally Jabin, king of Canaan (4:2). Additionally, Jephthah recounts the lack of compassion by foreign kings (including the Ammonites, Edomites, Moabites, and Amorites) when Israel first entered the land (11:15–28).

[21] Hillel I. Millgram, *Judges and Saviors, Deborah and Samson: Reflections of a World in Chaos* (Lanham: Hamilton Books, 2018), 68.

[22] For a detailed breakdown of how this phrase reflects the typological intents of the author, see chapter 4.

[23] Wong, *Compositional Strategy*, 252. Wong notes that the literary connects between Abimelech and Adoni-Bezek in the prologue creates a link to the behavior of the Gibeathites in the epilogue preventing the interpretation of the refrain to be fulfilled by the position of a human king (230).

John Mayer points out a main difference between judges and kings was that "a judge ruled only by the laws of God, and made no other laws, or constitutions, but in weightier matters stood to the decrees of the great Sanhedrin or council of seventy-two."[24] Additionally, he states that whereas judges were raised up through the Spirit of the Lord, kings most often inherited the throne from their father.[25] These distinctions are vital, yet both positions will ultimately be filled by Christ as the Spirit empowers him (Luke 4:14) and he inherits authority from his father (Matt 3:17, John 5:26–7). Prior to the establishment of judges or a monarchy, God fulfilled the roles of deliverer and divine authority; after all, "God was conceived as Israel's King; the One Who sets the rules and makes the laws."[26] Jesus would reestablish these positions as central to divinity.

Reformer Peter Martyr Vermigli contends that the state of Israel was better under the judges than the kings because God's words were more easily shown.[27] Fittingly, because both of these positions, although practically executed by humans, are ultimately typological to God's sovereignty, the institution of kingship as endorsed at the conclusion of Judges will prove as ineffective as that of judgeship in the ensuing centuries. In an ironic twist to Judge's final declarations, the position of the king does not prevent the person of the kingship from "doing right in his own eyes." Therefore, both positions showcase the fallibility of man's leadership while simultaneously highlighting the necessity of divine sovereignty for followers. For this reason, it is important to examine the individual people highlighted by the author to understand how their amazing feats as well as their foibles showcase the divine design of God.

---

[24] N. Scott Amos, ed., *Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament IV Joshua, Judges, Ruth* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2020), 203.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Millgram, *Judges and Saviors,* 191.

[27] Amos, *Reformation Commentary*, 203.

People

Regarding the chronicles of individual judges, Butler pens the most obvious question: "Why write such a book featuring Israel's failed leaders and aberrant religious, social, and political worlds?"[28] However, it is through these distinct stories that the author's intention to typologically highlight the patterns of God's covenantal plan are most easily revealed. While there is clearly a pattern in effect for the judge narratives, not all of the linguistic elements show up in each account.[29] However, knowing the pattern allows for a "polyphonic" emphasis, revealing a *national* pattern through *individual* circumstances.[30] In this way the author of Judges again demonstrates his intention to present each of the stories as fitting within a pattern, first within the book itself and then within the greater Pentateuchal narrative. This is an imperative perspective in keeping the *Heilsgeschichte* from becoming muted in the madness of the eccentric epics.

When considering the individual narratives, it should be noted that the Spirit of the Lord does not change the personality of the person.[31] Gideon still doubts, Jephthah still negotiates, Samson still acts selfishly. Therefore, Younger cautions against merely moralizing the actions of individual judges essentially simplifying their message apart from the greater story that God is writing through the book.[32] The purpose of examining specific judges is not to remove them from their context but to discover their typological significance within the tome. Van Pelt underscores

---

[28] Butler, *Judges,* xxxviii.

[29] Gillmayr-Bucher, "Framework," 691–93.

[30] Ibid., 694.

[31] Klaas Spronk, *Historical Commentary on the Old Testament: Judges* (Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 220.

[32] Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth*, 64.

this perspective when he states that "the foil to the theme of the Lord's faithfulness in the Former Prophets is the ongoing and ever-increasing unfaithfulness of Israel to the Lord."[33] The author of Judges, therefore, is not accentuating the deliverers' faithfulness nearly so much as their foibles. In this way, many of the "saviors" of Israel are seen as foils to the true Savior of the world. With this in mind, four judges will be examined in this section: Othniel, Deborah, Gideon, and Samson.

Othniel

The first judge detailed by the author is Othniel, who is portrayed as the quintessential leader. There are many questions about Othniel left unanswered for the reader, indicating the author's intent to create a "paradigmatic model against which the rest must be interpreted."[34] In this way, Othniel's cycle is well aligned with the expectations the exposition has previously set forth in chapter 2.[35] His exemplary cycle has seven components, denoting completeness.[36] Boling simplifies this to four: election, judging, victory for Israel through the Spirit of Yahweh, and rest for the land.[37]

---

[33] Van Pelt, "Judges," 511.

[34] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 149. Spronk agrees with this assessment stating that "Othniel is the model with whom [the other judges] should be measured." Spronk, *Historical Commentary*, 99. Younger notes that Othniel is the "paragon" against which all other judges should be assessed. Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth,* 139. Additionally, Amit states that the "Othniel passage contains the largest concentration of formulaic phrases in the book." Amit, *The Art of Editing*, 163.

[35] Beldman, *Judges,* 71.

[36] Van Pelt, "Judges," 545. The seven steps include: Israel doing evil (3:7), the Lord selling His people (3:8), Israel crying out (3:9), the raising of a deliverer (3:9), the judge delivering (3:10), the land having rest (3:11a), and the judge dying (3:11b).

[37] Boling, *Judges*, 81.

Othniel is first introduced in Judges 1, where he proves his valor and skill in warfare by conquering Kiriath-sepher and acquiring Caleb's daughter as a wife (Judg 1:12–13). Thus, Othniel marries within the covenant, a "stark contrast" to those who had settled down and intermarried with the people of the land (Judg 3:6).[38] Additionally, Othniel's wife finds a parallel with a woman of rapport in the Pentateuch. Achsah's request for springs of water in Judges 1:14–15 parallels Rebekah when she meets with Isaac in Genesis 24:61–67. Younger notes that both meetings include "a female riding on an animal, decent from the animal, making a request, and receiving the desired result from the person who has authority or power in relationship to her."[39]

Beyond his exemplary marriage, Othniel also defeats a paradigmatic enemy. Using geopolitical reasoning, Block convincingly reveals that this first oppressor, Cushan-Rishathaim, the king of Aram, is the most formidable foe faced by the Israelites in the entirety of the book:[40]

> The battle is portrayed as between a God-appointed deliverer who judges Israel and a dark, doubly wicked villain who is king of a far-distant land. This is one of the many clues that the book is about leadership, and more precisely about kingship. Othniel, like Joshua, does things God's way. Doubly Wicked goes his own way and thus goes the way of all the earth.[41]

With his exemplary marriage as well as his defeat of a formulaic foe, Othniel may stand out as the most classically typological judge.

Younger notes that the pivotal phrase in the Othniel story, "and he saved them" (Judg 3:9), is centrally positioned to provide ambiguity as to whether it is Othniel or Yahweh who is

---

[38] Robert B Chisholm Jr., *A Commentary of Judges and Ruth* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2013), 171.

[39] K Lawson Younger Jr., *The NIV Application Commentary: Judges, Ruth*, ed. Terry Muck (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2002), 108.

[40] Block, *Judges, Ruth*., 152.

[41] Butler, *Judges,* 65.

actually accomplishing the salvation.[42] While there may be ambiguity in this singular phrasing, the rest of the narrative makes the author's intention clear. The account of Othniel sets the standard by establishing that Yahweh is the true hero who can defeat any enemy.[43] Othniel's voice is never heard in the narrative, leaving the reader with only the author's interpretation of who was responsible for the victory.[44] Yahweh is truly the central character, being mentioned seven times and directing all of the events.[45] Finally, Othniel's name appropriately means "God is my strength," which is an additional way that his paradigmatic narrative showcases Yahweh as the true deliverer.[46] Othniel has nothing to commend him to the job of deliverer, further highlighting the power of God. This ideal reverberates in Isaiah's later prophecy about the coming messiah that "he had no form or majesty that we should look at him, and no beauty that we should desire him" (Isa 53:2b). The English Annotations describe Othniel as "a type of our Savior Jesus Christ, who was sent of God to deliver us out of the hand of all our spiritual enemies."[47] Essentially, Othniel is the archetypal judge not because he delivers Israel but rather because he demonstrates the power of Yahweh to deliver Israel.

---

[42] Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth*, 136–37.

[43] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 150.

[44] Tammi J. Schneider, *Berit Olam: Judges* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), 42.

[45] Klaas Spronk, *Historical Commentary on the Old Testament: Judges* (Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 103.

[46] Kenneth C. Way, *Judges and Ruth* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2016), 30. This is not to imply that the author fabricated the name but rather that his placement of Othniel as the first judge is paired with his exemplary behavior and dependance on God as deliverer.

[47] Amos, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, 240.

Deborah

Another judge who exemplifies the authorial intent toward demonstrating typological patterns is Deborah. However, her narrative does not contain some of the formulaic introduction the reader has come to expect. For example, Deborah is not named as being "raised up" by the Lord but is said to be "judging Israel," which creates ambiguity as to whether Deborah is actually the salvific judge or not.[48] When we meet Deborah, she is already well established as a prophetic voice of Yahweh who directs leadership in the nation.[49] It is in Deborah's narrative that Butler divides the dichotomy of human leadership and salvific acts, stating that the story hinges on leadership since God as savior is assumed.[50] However, the idea of Deborah as a salvific figure is more complex than merely analyzing her leadership style. The author of Judges has created specific literary links from Deborah's account to others in the Pentateuch, which will subsequently link to the prophets and eventually the Messiah.

In relation to the Pentateuch, the account begins with Deborah sitting outside of town before becoming a deliverer, reminiscent of Moses living in Midian before returning to team up with Aaron to deliver the people. Herzberg notes the similarities between these figures, concluding that "there are no other matchups as extensive as this one between Deborah and Moses."[51] Deborah actually operates in a dual role of leader and prophet, offices filled by one

---

[48] Beldman, *Judges*, 84.

[49] Isabelle M. Hamley, *God of Justice and Mercy* (London: SCM, 2021), 41.

[50] Butler, *Judges*, 108.

[51] Bruce Herzberg, "Deborah and Moses," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38, no. 1 (2013), 16. Herzberg expounds on the following similarities: both actually operate as judges, both are prophets, both have a regular location for rendering judgements, both order military leaders into action while staying on a hilltop, both present as the voice of God, both oversea victories where chariots are disabled by water, and both sing victory songs.

individual only through the persons of Moses, Joshua, and Samuel.[52] Additionally, Deborah's celebratory song in Judges 5 associates her with Moses through Miriam's song in Exodus 15, as both mention "the chariots of the enemy, the panic and following flight of the enemy" as well as the absolute obliteration of the enemy and Yahweh's graphic deliverance.[53] The account in Exodus 14–15 is the only other instance of such parallel accounts in the Hebrew Bible.[54] Deborah's song has been the subject of much scholarly debate, as the prose and poetry versions appear to have discrepancies.[55] However, early Jews were unconcerned with these differences in light of the powerful allusions to previous acts of God. Furthermore, the ancient Midrash suggested that Deborah's song was powerful enough to wipe Israel's slate clean, which is why Gideon's narrative merely states that the people "did evil" rather than adding the word "again."[56] This is likely due to the song's correlation to the celebration of Miriam when God delivered the Israelites by utterly destroying the Egyptian army (Exod 15). Deborah's song also mentions the

---

[52] Millgram, *Judges and Saviors*, 100. While most of the analysis here will focus on Deborah's connection to Moses in order to show the ongoing patterns of the Pentateuch, Spronk also notes that she is connected to Samuel as they occupy the same dual positions and are both associated with Ramah and Bethel. Spronk, *Historical Commentary*, 17.

[53] Spronk, *Judges*, 138. Block agrees with this assessment stating that just the title of prophet places Deborah in the same category as Moses and Miriam. Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 192.

[54] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 176. The differences between Judges 4 and 5 diminish in light of their purposeful inclusion by the author and the reality that their juxtaposition echoes the account of the Red Sea and defeat of the Egyptians.

[55] J. Clinton McCann, *Interpretation: Judges* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 49. The general consensus states that the song of Deborah came into existence first as one of the older parts of written scripture, but McCann insists that the order is inconsequential. However, Schneider notes that Deborah's song focuses more on "the battle and praising the deity" which differs from the narrative and may affect its interpretation by being placed subsequent to chapter 4. Schneider, *Berit Olam: Judges*, 63–64. While both have valid points, for this paper, the emphasis is on the patterns established through the author of Judges which will focus on the relationship with Exodus 14–15. Since these chapters exist in a prose-poetry format as well, it is seen as an intentional literary connection by the author of Judges to create additional typological connections between Deborah and Moses.

[56] David M. Gunn, *Blackwell Bible Commentaries: Judges*, ed. John Sawyer, Christopher Rowland, and Judith Kovacs (Maldan, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 55.

אָהַב, *covenant faithfulness*, of Yahweh (Judg 5:31) which reflects back to the Ten Commandments given to Moses (Exod 20:5–6) and the Shema (Deut 6:4–5).[57] This concluding verse of the song underscores Boling's argument that "the point of the narrative is that neither Deborah nor Baraq [sic] subdued Sisera on that day—but God did!"[58]

Deborah is the book's only female judge, and it is very clear the author wanted to highlight her gender, as he utilized seven feminine nouns in her introduction.[59] In today's world, the recognition of women as a type of Christ has "provided a dynamic reminder that women are made in the image of God and called to fulfill that image in becoming holy."[60] However, the prominence of the female heroines, Deborah and Jael, actually underscores an underdog theme which runs throughout the book of Judges and can showcase the ability of Yahweh to use unlikely people for deliverance.[61] Like in Othniel's account, this reality again reflects what Isaiah will prophesy, that the divine deliverer would have "no form or majesty" that would cause the people to consider them as a savior (Isa 53:2). Butler contends that too much is often made of Deborah as a heroine when she acts more as a prophetic character and consistently points away from herself.[62] Martin Luther notes that, despite the willingness of Israel's army, Deborah ascribes the glory for the victory to God.[63] This may be why Block calls her the "most honorable

---

[57] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 244.

[58] Boling, *Judges*, 100.

[59] Schneider, *Berit Olam: Judges*, 63–64.

[60] Catherine Brown Tkacz, "Typology Today," *New Blackfriars* 88, no. 1017 (2007), 579.

[61] Victor H. Matthews, *New Cambridge Bible Commentary: Judges & Ruth*, ed. Ben Witherington III and Bill T. Arnold (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 78.

[62] Butler, *Judges*, 91.

[63] Amos, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, 269.

human figure in the Book of Judges," because she acts as an example of someone pointing back to the need to follow Yahweh.[64] Despite the plethora of feminist studies devoted to this block of scripture, the female protagonists of this account are not heroines because of their defiance of a patriarchal system but rather as "agents of the divine agenda," overthrowing the rulership of those oppressing Israel.[65] In this way, the author again is showcasing the faithful judges as types of saviors who recognized that real deliverance is only found through obedience to Yahweh. This is the true typological pattern that demonstrates God's covenant and will eventually exemplify the Messiah. Younger boldly asserts that the song of Deborah comprises one of the most difficult passages in the Old Testament but ultimately concludes its purpose is to declare, despite Israel's rebellion and apostasy, that Yahweh is a mighty and gracious deliverer.[66]

Finally, it is possible that Deborah acts as a type of Christ by including Barak. She speaks for God and directs the battle, but Barak must actually carry out the initiative—just as believers must listen to and obey the voice of the Lord in their individual battles.[67] The phrase utilized by Barak in securing Deborah's presence reflects the cry of Moses in securing the Lord's presence to continue leading the Israelites in the wilderness:

וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו אִם־אֵין פָּנֶיךָ הֹלְכִים אַל־תַּעֲלֵנוּ (Exod 33:15)
וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלֶיהָ בָּרָק אִם־תֵּלְכִי עִמִּי וְהָלָכְתִּי וְאִם־לֹא תֵלְכִי עִמִּי לֹא אֵלֵךְ (Judg 4:8)

[64] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 246.

[65] Ibid., 186.

[66] Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth*, 190–206.

[67] While Barak is the one hailed as a hero in the book of Hebrews, it is possible that his insistence on Deborah does not stem from fear but rather as an acknowledgement that victory does not come without the presence of God which was clearly on Deborah as a prophetess. It is possible that Barak did not care for recognition so much as triumph. In this way, he could be acknowledged as a hero for securing the defeat of Sisera without personal gain.

Both phrases show the speaker (Moses and Barak) declaring their desire for the deliverer (Yahweh and Deborah) to go with them, and if not, that they will not go.[68] This link to the account of Moses further demonstrates the author's intention to typologically connect the activities in the life of Deborah and Barak to that of Moses and highlight the ongoing deliverance of Yahweh:

> The account of Deborah and Barak provides assurance that the Lord is gracious to his people and sustains them, as he rehearses the patterns of redemption over and over again across the pages of Scripture. The Lord himself is the hero of this account, and the great deliverance testifies to the fact that he alone is the savior of his people.[69]

However, this pattern will take a different approach in the latter judges. While the pattern is still at work, the judges subsequent to Deborah become more self-reliant than God-fearing, thereby playing out their narratives more as foils to the true type of deliverer outlined in God's initial pattern. This shift from type to foil happens most clearly in the judgeship of Gideon.

Gideon

The Gideon cycle is separated into two blocks 6:11–7:23 and 7:24–8:27a, with a shifting of characterization moving Gideon from a fearful leader who needed multiple signs to a confident and courageous potential ruler.[70] Simultaneously, Yahweh's role transitions from the forefront as director and deliverer to the background as Gideon takes center stage in his own narrative. However, while the typological pattern plays out differently due to Gideon's later choices, it is still clearly active throughout his narrative. For example, the story of Gideon utilized the same Hebrew verb for "to be strong" in verse 2 as in Judges 3:10 when describing

---

[68] The verses utilize two separate verbs for "to go," but הָלַךְ and יָלַךְ are used interchangeably in the Hebrew (Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon).

[69] Van Pelt, "Judges," 566.

[70] Amit, *Judges*, 238.

Othniel, indicating that there is a significant, repeating pattern at work.[71] However, the irony is that the phrase from Othniel's victory is used in Gideon's narrative to describe the enemy that is subjugating Israel; the nation has gone from strongly conquering to being conquered by the strong Midianites.[72] In much the same way, Gideon's account demonstrates connections to the pattern but divergent outcomes due to the sinful self-reliance of Gideon.

The author clearly intends to pattern Gideon after Moses as a deliverer.[73] For example, "in none of the other call narratives in Hebrew Scripture is the call of the protagonist presented as a direct response to the distress of God's people under oppression."[74] The calling of Gideon noticeably follows the pattern by which God called Moses prior to the Exodus.[75] Younger notes that many commentators see similarities between Gideon's call in Judges 6, Moses' call in Exodus 3, and Joshua's call in Joshua 1.[76] Hava Shalom-Guy does not limit the literary comparisons to just Moses, but notes that Gideon requested a sign, which parallels Abraham's

---

[71] Spronk, *Judges*, 203.

[72] Chisholm Jr., *Judges and Ruth*, 270. The phrase "and his hand was strong against," found in 3:10 and indicating Othniel's subjugation of Cushan-Rishathaim, has a variation in 6:2, now appropriated to the Midianites who are oppressing Israel.

[73] Spronk, *Judges*, 211. The account recording Gideon's commissioning by Yahweh and his subsequent attempt to escape his call has clear parallels to the story of Moses. Both men are confronted by a divine messenger (Exod 3:4; Judg 6:11), both question their ability to deliver (Exod 3:11; Judg 6:15), both are given signs (Exod 4:3,6; Judg 6:21), both are required to complete an act of dedication to demonstrate their faithfulness to the covenant of Yahweh before they are able to deliver their people (Exod 4:24–26; Judg 6:24–27), and both initially caused anger among their people (Exod 5:21; Judg 6:30). Block agrees with this assessment stating that the author "intentionally presents Gideon as a sort of second Moses." Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 257. Block cites numerous reasons for this fulfillment based on form critical scholars' expectations of "call narratives." Milgram also supports this view stating that Gideon is presented as a type of second Moses specifically after his encounter with Yahweh (6:21–22). Milgram, *Judges and Saviors*, 151. Finally, Boling agrees with this perspective stating that the narrator clearly saw Gideon as a savior. Boling, *Judges*, 161.

[74] Gregory T. K. Wong, "Gideon: A New Moses?," in *Reflection and Refraction*, ed. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 563.

[75] For a detailed comparative breakdown of the calls, see Van Pelt "Judges," 574.

[76] Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth*, 227.

divine visitation, and he experienced a divine encounter like Jacob.[77] The plethora of signs in the Gideon narrative is intentionally highlighted by the author to showcase an additional connection.[78] While Yahweh's call may be the same highlighting his consistent character, each man's response is vastly different. In this way, Younger concludes that Gideon is an "anti-type" of Moses. Gideon, therefore, becomes the first of the latter judges to operate more as a foil to the actual deliverer type that God has been patterning.[79]

In addition to Gideon's call, the enemies he fights have noted patterns. Butler compares the plague of Midianites to the plague of locusts suffered by the Egyptians.[80] Gideon's slaughter of the Midianites at night with just three hundred soldiers is reminiscent of the conquering of Jericho under Joshua.[81] Matthews adds to this perspective, stating that the war against the Amalekites is clearly patterned after Exodus 17:8–16 and the battle with Jericho (Josh 6:1–23) by having divine messengers employ an "unorthodox military strategy."[82] Gideon echoes the

---

[77] Hava Shalom-Guy, "The Call Narratives of Gideon and Moses: Literary Convention or More?," *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11, no. 11 (2011), 18.

[78] Amit, *Judges*, 235. The spiritual value of the signs has been hotly debated and is beyond the purview of this paper. Ideas range from stating that "the request for signs is not a sign of faith, but of unbelief" to the belief that Gideon testing God is a positive, courageous reversal of God testing the people through the enemy nations. Butler, *Judges*, 272–73; Spronk, *Judges*, 222. Way believes that rather than an act of faith, Gideon's fleece might be considered a manipulative means of putting humans in control over God. Way, *Judges and Ruth*, 68. For the purposes of this paper, Gideon's fleece need not be condemned nor imitated but rather simply seen as a part of the pattern of God's deliverers even as Moses requested signs to convince the Israelites of his divine commission. One difference to note in Gideon's story is that the signs are given to assure Gideon of God's power and are not manifested *through* him but *to* him. This was not the pattern in Moses' life, as the signs given to assuage Moses' fears were utilized in the deliverance of the people, in addition to more signs as manifested through the plagues. Jesus will follow Moses' pattern of manifesting signs as a way of demonstrating his divine commission.

[79] In this sense, Jephthah could be considered an anti-Abraham for actually going through with a child sacrifice that Yahweh had not commanded.

[80] Butler, *Judges*, 197.

[81] Van Pelt, "Judges," 583. Van Pelt notes two specific similarities including the absolute absurdity from a human perspective that either of these plans could meet with success and the instruments utilized in the attacks.

[82] Victor H. Matthews, *New Cambridge Bible Commentary: Judges & Ruth*, 92.

same pattern wherein he does no fighting and Yahweh gains the victory.[83] In recounting these specific battles, "the author is confirming patterns of redemption first established in the book of Exodus that will continue on into the NT in the person and work of Jesus."[84]

Unfortunately, Gideon will not continue in this pattern of leadership, eventually shifting from the fearful Moses-like start to the doomed Aaron-like ending when he makes a request for gold and then fashions it into what will become an idol.[85] Gideon makes an "elaborate divinatory" ephod from the gold; however, there should have been only one of these in Israel which was connected to the "judicial breastplate."[86] The ephod was a sacred vestment utilized by the high priest.[87] Gideon was the first judge to "confront idolatry," tearing down an altar, but also the first to lead Israel towards apostacy by establishing a type of idol.[88] While Gideon's words declare God's might, his actions defend his own claim. "Gideon had been acting increasingly like a king, with summary punishment on those who defy him, taking glory for himself, addressing other kings as equals and taking their royal symbols."[89] Gideon's choice to execute Zebah and Zalmunna begins to expose his royal hypocrisy.[90] Therefore, despite his declination, the author has provided overwhelming evidence that Gideon did indeed have kingship on his

---

[83] Boling, *Judges*, 148.

[84] Van Pelt, "Judges," 571.

[85] McCann, *Interpretation: Judges*, 70. McCann shows the similarities of Judges 8 with Exodus 32:1–6.

[86] Boling, *Judges*, 161. Exodus 28:15–30.

[87] Way, *Judges and Ruth*, 74.

[88] Beldman, *Judges*, 128.

[89] Hamley, *God of Justice and Mercy*, 98.

[90] Serge Frolov, *Judges: The Forms of the Old Testament Literature* (Grand Rapids:Eerdmans, 2013), 184.

mind.[91] Complementary to his seemingly royal prerogative, Gideon amasses multiple wives and at least one concubine (Judg 8:30–1) in direct opposition to commands about this type of leadership (Deut 17:17). This further separates Gideon from the idealized version of deliverer:

> Reference to multiple wives, in violation of the original marriage-covenant standard, serves frequently as a harbinger of judgment and tragedy. For example, the marriages of the sons of God to the daughters of man in Genesis 6 mark the beginning of the flood judgment, while the sexual corruption of Sodom and Gomorrah precipitate their destruction by fire in Genesis 19. Additionally, in 1 Kings 11 Solomon's vast harem leads him into grievous idolatry, provoking the Lord to anger and resulting in the division of the kingdom, the beginning of the end of Israel's tenure in the land. As such, the reference to Gideon's many wives and sons hints at the tragic events that will befall his household in Judges 9.[92]

These deviations from the leadership pattern established by Moses underscore the point at which Gideon began to turn from a type into a foil; the pattern of God was still highlighted through his life, but so was the absolute inability of humanity to attain deliverance without direct divine intervention. Gideon's shift from acknowledging the True Deliverer to accepting tribute for "his" conquest marks a turning point not just for Gideon but for God's people. Boling notes that Gideon's inability to recognize Yahweh was a "foreshadowing" of the problem in all of Israel revealed in Judges 10.[93] Gideon may have wanted Yahweh at the center, but he ended up glorifying himself, because although he refused kingship, he requested compensation. By this point, Gideon is making comments *about* Yahweh but has no connection *with* Him.

---

[91] Beldman, *Judges*, 124.

[92] Van Pelt, "Judges," 587–88. Additionally, this assumption of multiple wives creates another tragic irony in the Gideon account; his progeny will eventually be killed off through finances provided by a Baal temple, demonstrating that his straying from Yahweh did eventually allow Baal to contend and win against Jerubbaal and his legacy. Chisholm Jr., *Judges and Ruth*, 101.

[93] Boling, *Judges*, 129.

People have considered Gideon a type of Christ for centuries.[94] However, the end of Gideon's life presents problems for seeing him as a type of Christ. Amit contends that the author of Judges specifically includes both names for the deliverer switching between Gideon (used four times) and Jerubbaal (used twice) in just eight verses.[95] The purpose of this might be to demonstrate the conflicting example of a deliverer who freed God's people with an idolater who also led them away from Yahweh. Gideon followed the typological pattern of deliverers—until he didn't! However, this individual deviation from the pattern through the sinful choices of Gideon in no way negates that the pattern was operational. Rather, it highlights the deficiencies of mortals to fulfill their own deliverance further revealing the need for divine deliverance:

> In the unfolding drama of God's involvement with Israel, God will be searching for a leader who will actually embody what Gideon had only articulated: 'the Lord will rule over you' (8:23). . . . From the Christian point of view, the search is completed only in King Jesus, who both proclaimed and embodied the good news that God alone rules over us.[96]

In the narrative of Gideon, the people praised the wrong deliverer, and the subsequent judges fail to redirect their attention toward Yahweh. This is the author's intention, as he showcases the pattern of judges which clearly spirals farther and farther away from Yahweh's intended pattern of deliverance and freedom for his people. However, God will continue to utilize individuals in an attempt to redirect his people back to right worship of him. While these attempts will

---

[94] Amos, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*. For example, Reformation theologian John Mayer contends that Gideon is a type of Christ for the following reasons: both are valiant men, comforted by angels before a trial, and both destroyed idolatry to set up true religion. Mayer goes a step farther like many commentators of the time by comparing Gideon's fleece test to the Jews and gentiles; but this extension aside, the other connections are clear. Amos, *Reformation Commentary*, 305. Other early commentators point out Gideon's triumph in battle as symbolizing Christ's triumph at Calvary (313). Even in medieval literature, Gideon was interpreted as a prefiguration of Christ. Spronk, *Historical Commentary*, 191.

[95] Amit, *Judges*, 102.

[96] McCann, *Interpretation: Judges*, 75.

ultimately fail, the pattern remains constant and the final judges will continue to demonstrate, through type or foil, the nature of God's redemptive plan. Perhaps no judge showcases both side of this typological paradigm more clearly than Samson.

Samson

While Samson's narrative does contain elements of folklore, the main character himself is clearly depicted as human, not mythic.[97] This makes Samson perhaps the most palatably interesting character in Judges which may explain the abundance of research devoted to his story. However, this research includes the entire gamut of the interpretive spectrum. Millgram suggests that the author of Judges began the entire tome with Samson in mind as a way of symbolically representing Israel through the narrative of its most reluctant and failed deliverer.[98] This perspective will be evaluated at the conclusion of this section. Gaining an overall perspective of Samson's life and reception can help deduce the author's intention for including this expansive narrative.

First, Samson's birth has "striking similarities to other theophanies or birth announcements in the OT."[99] Birth stories are utilized to identify "major redemptive-historical

---

[97] Butler, *Judges*, 374.

[98] Millgram, *Judges and Saviors*, 316. Millgram notes that Samson's announcement is similar to Abraham's encounter with the angelic beings in Genesis 18. This would parallel Samson with Isaac, a foundational father of the Israelite nation. Additionally, Millgram comments on the full integration of the Samson Saga, noting that it could not be merely a later appendage. Rather he contends that the author intended to present Samson as Israel, the chosen ones who constantly run from their divine destiny, get entangled with the lures of heathen cultures, and find themselves enslaved to their enemies (377–78). This thought will be addressed later in this section. However, if Millgram's assumption is correct, this would further explain the author's structure of placing Samson opposite Barak in the chiasm, another reluctant deliverer but one who ultimately showcases the power of God when submitted to his plan.

[99] J. Cheryl Exum, "Promise and Fulfillment: Narrative Art in Judges 13," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99, no. 1 (1980), 43. Amit agrees with this assessment, stating that the motifs are consistent with other biographical heroes of scripture. Amit, *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*, 290.

figures" and usually have a pattern of "a barren mother, announcement by the angel of the Lord, the child's commission, the parents' struggle to believe the news, the naming of the child, and the child's favor with the Lord."[100] In this way, Samson's birth can be likened to Isaac (Gen 18:9–15), Jacob (Gen 25:19–26), Joseph (Gen 30:1–24), Samuel (1 Sam 1:1–20), and later to John (Luke 1:5–27) and Jesus (Luke 1:26–2:21).[101] This typological pattern highlighted by the author reaches back to the Pentateuch and forward to the Messiah. Additionally, when Samson's father asks the name of the messenger, there is a parallel in the Hebrew to Jacob's wrestling with God at Jabbok, as both men are unaware they are dealing with divinity and therefore request his name. The "dim-wittedness and obtuseness" of Samson's father in his lack of spiritual perception regarding the angelic messenger will prove prophetic for his son who is also unable to discern the presence of Yahweh (Judg 16:20).[102] This inability to discern the divine begins to showcase itself in Samson's life as a young man; his behavior is shockingly disrespectful toward his parents and Yahweh, operating as "the worst kind of spoiled brat."[103] This makes it challenging to see him as a type of Christ, who from a young age was "filled with wisdom. And the favor of God was upon him" (Luke 2:40). However, God's covenantal pattern was still at work.

Throughout the years, the reception of Samson's story has varied, with many seeing the correspondences between Samson and Christ. Gunn notes there are "many and ingenious"

---

[100] Van Pelt, "Judges," 626.

[101] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 396. Additionally, Spronk points out that Samson has numerous connections with the final judge and prophet, Samuel, stating that the birth stories of the two men are prominent in both narratives. Furthermore, 1 Samuel and the story of Samson end in the same way with the leader being blinded and led away in shackles. Spronk, *Historical Commentary*, 377.

[102] Ibid., 419.

[103] Millgram, *Judges and Saviors*, 328.

typological parallels found in the life of Samson by early Christian interpreters.[104] Heinrich Bünting states that Samson was typologically what was meant to represent Christ as a mighty man, Nazirite, prince, and judge and that he traveled around exacting revenge on the enemies of God.[105] Examining some of these parallels demonstrates that the pairing is not unfounded. The birth similarities have already been noted, and Ludwig Lavater calls Samson a "brilliant type of Christ," noting especially the similarities in their birth and death stories.[106] Additionally, Lucas Osiander describes Samson's overtaking of the lion in a typological sense as Christ overcoming the roaring lion in the desert before going to get his bride, the church, and that his parents sharing in the victory when they subsequently ate the honey demonstrates believers' today union with Christ's sweet victory.[107] Martin Luther adds to this stating that as Samson was able to tear away something sweet from something dead, so was Christ able to bring sweetness out of his conquering of death.[108] Van Pelt points out that Samson dies in the posture of Jesus with his arms outstretched and his desire to die with the Philistines showcases Christ's death as being between those who truly deserved to die.[109] The English Annotations record the binding of Samson by the Judahites as a type of Christ's being bound by his Jewish brethren so that each victory might be

---

[104] Gunn, *Blackwell Bible Commentaries: Judges*, 175.

[105] Amos, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, 388. I take issue with the assessment of Samson's ministry being like Christ's regarding the revenge against enemies, as this position stands opposed to much of Jesus' teaching, unless considering Satan as his only enemy.

[106] Ibid., 395.

[107] Ibid., 402.

[108] Ibid., 404.

[109] Van Pelt, "Judges," 643. However, Samson is not sacrificing himself for his people but rather as personal vengeance for the loss of his eyes (Judg 16:28). This stands in stark contrast to Jesus, who granted forgiveness of those who had tortured and killed him (Luke 23:34). In the end, Samson does sacrifice his life, but rather than concern for divine agenda or even national deliverance, Samson's cry is for personal vengeance. It is far from the final cries of Christ: "Not my will, but yours, be done" (Luke 22:42).

more glorious.[110] Arthur Jackson sees Samson's thirst as typologically related to Christ's thirst on the cross, so that after each had won a great victory, they cried out in thirst.[111] Martin Bucer claims that Samson's love of foreign women foreshadowed Christ's love for the gentiles.[112] However narratively akin, these kinds of interpretations may contribute to the difficulty in ascertaining types because the overall character of Samson does not reflect that of Christ. Therefore, we must consider the narrative in its entirety rather than cherry-picking pieces to fit our theological interpretations. For example, Samson's eating of the honey breaks his Nazarite vow, something Christ would not do. In this way, Lavater concludes,

> Although Samson is not a type of Christ in every respect—for Christ was altogether free from every stain of sin—nevertheless, he was a prelude to Christ in that he wrenched up the gages. For Christ shattered the gates of hell and likewise the bolts of death when on the third day he rose again from the dead, though the soldiers sought to prevent it.[113]

In other words, Samson's story highlights what only Christ would be able to accomplish regarding the deliverance of people from oppression and rendering a means of eternal covenantal faithfulness for sinful humanity. So, the question remains: is Samson a type of Christ?

Samson has been portrayed as a type of Christ since early Christianity through today.[114] While there are many parallels, upon closer examination the discrepancies appear to outweigh the similarities. For example, while Samson and Jesus have parallels in their birth stories, Samson exemplifies the opposite of Christ in maturity. The narrative depicts a child who rebelliously and selfishly never quite outgrows his carnal nature and prankish ways, whereas

---

[110] Amos, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, 409.

[111] Ibid., 410. However, Christ's cry technically occurs before the actual victory of defeating death.

[112] Ibid., 421.

[113] Ibid., 414.

[114] Spronk, *Judges*, 379–82.

even at a young age, Jesus was astonishing the most revered teachers of the law (Luke 2:47).[115] Likewise, in their final victories, the dissimilarities carry more significance. Samson, like Christ, did more in death than in life, but this is a damning statement about Samson rather than an extolling of his final conquest. Younger declares, "Very simply, Samson is not a type of Christ."[116] Instead, Samson plays a foil to Christ, as they are "polar opposites in attitude and action."[117] This interpretation in no way negates the typological intention of the author; rather, it heightens the awareness of his objectives: to showcase the covenantal faithfulness and patterns of deliverance of Yahweh through the workings of a sinful and rebellious people. The book of Judges, and truly the entirety of the canon of scripture, describes the faithfulness of God in light of the unfaithfulness and disobedience of mankind. In this sense, Samson's story is the culmination of these patterns. As McCann puts it, Judges and the story of Samson

> unflinchingly document the human unfaithfulness that yields chaos and destruction; and yet they affirm God's abiding presence and commitment amid the messes that God's people make. The prophetic books—including the book of Judges (and especially the book of Judges at its lowest point with Samson and the aftermath in chaps. 17–21)—are powerful statements of hope; not hope in 'cultural heroes' like Samson, but rather hope in a God whose grace is greater than our ability to comprehend and whose commitment to justice, righteousness, and peace surpasses our understanding.[118]

John Calvin explains it this way: "Christ is the original model; Samson is the inferior antitype. When he assumed the character of a Redeemer, we ought to understand that none of the titles

---

[115] Butler points out that Samson's victory song contains eight references to himself, pointing toward his braggadocious and selfish nature. Butler, *Word Biblical Commentary 8: Judges*, 343. Boling calls Samson the "complete antithesis" of the heroic judges who are listed before him. Boling, *Judges*, 236.

[116] Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth*, 411. McCann goes a step farther in saying that Samson was neither a type of Christ nor a national hero. McCann, *Interpretation: Judges*, 110.

[117] Ibid., 411.

[118] McCann, *Interpretation: Judges*, 94.

bestowed on that illustrious and truly divine office apply so strictly to himself as to Christ."[119] Therefore, where the humanity of Samson fails, the triumph of Christ shines more brightly. But if Samson is not to be simply categorized as a type of Christ, how are we to interpret his narrative?

Butler concludes that "Samson leaves us without easy answers and without easy sermons, but he forces us to contemplate deeply the meaning of being God's chosen and participating in God's mission even in the depths of human weakness and even human addiction."[120] Way asks, "Is Samson a saint or a sinner? . . . Is it possible that both perspectives may be correct for different reasons? . . . Typology may imply both positive and negative comparison."[121] To fully appreciate typological implications, we must acknowledge and hold both of these realities simultaneously: all of scripture is *about* Christ, and not everything is a *type* of Christ. Samson's story highlights the need for Christ and the deficiencies of a person trying to accomplish the deliverance only possible through God, and yet Samson is not a type of Christ, he is a foil which demonstrates the patterns of God in delivering his people. The reason some struggle to accept the typological intentionality of the biblical authors is because they are not holding these two realities concurrently. However, while Samson's foibles are concentrated into just a few chapters, other leaders have made worse decisions.[122] One need not see Samson *as* Christ to see

---

[119] Amos, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, 422.

[120] Butler, *Judges*., 356.

[121] Way, *Judges and Ruth,* 141. Way acknowledges that the author of Judges did not intend to represent Samson in light of Christ. Yet he did showcase the patterns of God within his life and by such means demonstrates him as a foil to Christ's eventual fulfillment as divine Deliverer.

[122] Noah got drunk (Gen 9:21); Abraham lied about his wife twice (Gen 12:13, 20:2); Jacob lied and swindled (Gen 25:33, 27:19, 30:41); Joseph was braggadocious (Gen 37:6–9); Moses disobeyed (Num 20:11); Job declared himself righteous (Job 31); and the list goes on. The typological pattern is not merely a foreshadow of the

Christ at work *in* Samson's story. For example, Judges 14:4 is an invitation to consider a divine perspective. Yahweh is not directing this intermarriage nor condoning it but rather utilizing Samson's "misdirected desire" as a means of confronting Israel's oppressors.[123] Samson's interactions with Philistine women alert the reader to his attraction toward the life outside of the covenant rather than the life of holiness for which he was set apart.[124] While these desires differ from Christ, they resemble Israel specifically and the heart of humanity in general. He is not a type of Christ; Samson is a type of *Israel*.[125]

This category of typology is no less significant than a christological one. Remember that typology is "God-ordained, author-intended historical correspondence and escalation in significance between people, events, and institutions across the Bible's redemptive-historical story."[126] Samson's narrative is clearly God-ordained through his theophanic birth announcement; yet Samson does not fit neatly into the previous narrative pattern. He does not appear as a response to Israel's cry to God, nor does he deliver the nation from their

---

deliverance that Christ would eventually provide, but also the pattern that God would continue to use people despite their flaws to bring about his order in the world. Therefore, as McCann points out, Samson demonstrates that God honors human integrity and free will while remaining true to *His* word to oppose oppression and deliver his people from it. McCann, *Interpretation: Judges*, 110.

[123] Hamley, *God of Justice and Mercy*, 168.

[124] Ibid., 193.

[125] See Edward L. Greenstein, "The Riddle of Samson," *Indiana University Press* 1, no. 3 (1981), 247; and Wong, *Compositional Strategy*, 231. Block describes Samson as embodying all that is wrong in Israel, proceeding to note the typological comparisons. He includes how Samson, like Israel, is miraculously born, called to a higher life of devotion, acts rashly, is drawn to foreign women, experiences bondage and oppression, cries out to Yahweh, is blinded (1 Sam 3:1–3), and is ultimately abandoned by God without knowing it. While Block does not label this interpretation typological, the term clearly identifies his description of the characteristics of Israel. Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 392. Additionally, Younger notes literary and moral movements towards the Samson account which designate him as a parallel to Israel. Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth*, 45.

[126] Hamilton Jr., *Typology*, 26.

oppressors.[127] Yet, in Samson's first interaction the author uses phraseology to link his story to Israel: "But Samson said to his father, 'Get her for me, for she is *right in my eyes*'" (Judg 14:3b, emphasis added). This phrase connects Samson to the covenant recorded by Moses in Deuteronomy 12, which repeats the phrase three times (Deut 12:8, 25, 28) in variations, warning the people *not* to do what's right in their eyes but rather to do what is right in the eyes of the Lord. Samson's story has an ongoing emphasis on sight, pursuing what he sees as good but being blind to the true characteristics.[128] This showcases Samson as a type of Israel who is doing what is right in their own eyes but are blind to the impending consequences. Samson is born into covenant yet pursues the desires he sees outside of covenant.[129] This, too, echoes Moses' warning to Israel when he specifically told the people to circumcise their hearts to remain faithful to their covenant with the Lord (Deut 10:16), but Samson has chosen to pursue the uncircumcised Philistines as a covenant partner (Judg 14:3). The Deuteronomist goes on to list the covenantal blessings for obedience and curses for rebellion while the author of Judges records Samson's seemingly innocuous yet disobedient act of defiance against his Nazarite covenant—a harbinger of things to come (Judg 14:9). The ongoing back and forth with Samson and the Philistines reflects the Israelite's struggle with foreigner oppressors to this point of the tome. But it is Samson's infatuation with foreign women that most clearly parallels with Israel's idolatry and

[127] Erik Eynikel and Tobias Nicklas, eds., *Samson: Hero or Fool?* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 1.

[128] Pnina Galpaz-Feller, *Samson: The Hero and the Man* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006), 207. Millgram agrees with this conclusion stating that the emphasis is on sight and the eyes as opposed to "calling, which is based on the sense of hearing." Millgram *Saviors*, 373. This echoes the Lord's accusation against the nation through the prophet Isaiah, that they "keep on hearing but do not understand; keep on seeing but do not perceive" (Isa 6:9). Millgram further asserts that Samson, and by extension Israel, has become like the pagan Philistines, using the base sense of seeing and losing the ability to discern God's direction.

[129] Eynikel and Nicklas, *Samson*, 29.

creates the downfall of both. Prophetically narrated through Samson's life, this pattern will not continue forever.

Tantamount to Israel's forsaking of their covenant and their forays into idolatry, Samson is obsessed with forbidden women and refuses to step into his destiny. Throughout the narrative, God remains faithful to his word, working through Samson's misdirected passions to bring about his own purposes. However, Samson will eventually realize the "inescapable truth that his quest for freedom has ended in slavery and his following the lure of his eyes has ended in blindness."[130] This is prophetic for Israel. Furthermore, Samson's interactions with Delilah are masterfully written by the author to lead the reader to an insight which Israel itself has not gained.[131] In the end, Samson cannot be an effective deliverer, as he cannot even save himself, a truth Yahweh longs for Israel to understand.

The author again employs literary clues to link the Samson saga to the Israelite nation and humanity in general. In Judges 15, Samson's wife is given away, and he uses foxes to torch the Philistine harvest. In retribution, the Philistines burn his wife's family, to which Samson retaliates by slaughtering many of them. The Philistines then raid the town of Lehi, and to subdue them, three thousand Judahites travel to where Samson is staying and ask, "What then is this that you have done to us?" (Judg 15:11). This question instantly links the reader back to the beginning of the book, when the messenger of the Lord asks the same question to the Israelites who have forsaken their covenant. Yet, this phrase extends farther back to the Garden itself.

---

[130] Millgram, *Judges and Saviors*, 371.

[131] J. Cheryl Exum, "Harvesting the Biblical Narrator's Scanty Plot of Ground: A Holistic Approach to Judges 16:4–22," *Tehillah le-Moshe* (2021), 46. By Delilah's fourth request, the reader knows that Samson has irrevocably violated his covenant and dire consequences await. The reality that this will soon be the case for Israel demonstrates an additional layer of typological nuance from the author by showcasing the reality that eventually vows can be cut with detrimental consequences.

Table 5.2[132]

Narrative	Hebrew	Reference
Samson questioned by the men of Judah	וּמַה־ זֹּאת עָשִׂיתָ	Judges 15:11
Israelites questioned by the messenger of the Lord	מַה־זֹּאת עֲשִׂיתֶם	Judges 2:2
Eve questioned by the Lord in the garden	מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂי	Genesis 3:13

These literary connections demonstrate the authorial intent of linking Samson with Israel and with humanity at large in his unfaithful actions. Throughout the narrative, however, Samson still sees himself as an invincible strongman and deliverer, comparable to Moses. This is evidenced through the unusual verb utilized at the conclusion of the Delilah episode when Samson believes that he can *shake off* the Philistines as before. The unique Hebrew word נָעַר is utilized rarely in the Hebrew Bible and often with the idea of shaking out the wicked from the earth such as when Moses stretches his hand back out over the Red Sea and the Lord *shakes off* the Egyptians (Exod 14:27) and when God questions Job about His righteousness *shaking out* the wicked from the earth (Job 38:13) By employing this distinctive verb, the author pairs Samson with Moses, at least in his own eyes, but perhaps is more aptly connected to Job who could not see past his own righteousness. However, the reader already knows that this time will not be like before, and unlike Moses who trusted in the Lord, Samson will meet with defeat, showcasing once again that Samson is not a type of faithful Moses but of unfaithful Israel. Another unique feature of this verb is its association with the shaking off of a lion's mane. This visual makes the author's usage that much more apropos, as Samson's "mane" is now gone, making it impossible to shake the enemy off.[133] Samson thinks he does not need his vow (hair) to obtain victory, a mentality that epitomizes the Israelites throughout the book of Judges.

[132] See table 4.4 for a more detailed breakdown of this literary seam.

[133] Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, ed. Hendrickson Publishers, Thirteenth. (Peabody, 2010), 654.

Samson's cycle is well linked with the concluding chapters of Judges, as it demonstrates the limitations of judgeship and the need for a divine savior. However, beyond Judges, Samson illustrates the Hebrews' reality which awaits in a few centuries: eventual exile from the Promised Land. Dempster concurs with the idea of Samson as a type of Israel citing that he reflects how the Israelites "had a supernatural origin, were set apart from among the nations with a distinctive vocation, broke their vows and were enamored of foreign idols, until finally they lost their identity and spiritual power and became the blind slaves of their oppressors in exile."[134] Therefore, the story of Samson fits well into the escalating pattern of the *Heilsgeschichte*, reflecting back on Israel's unfaithfulness and predicting their eventual demise while continually highlighting the faithfulness of Yahweh. Truly, the more shocking reality of the Samson cycle is the Israelites' apathy toward spiritual matters and their foreign oppression.[135] This is a key irony in Samson's story: the people he is meant to deliver from the enemy actually end up delivering him to their oppressors.[136] Another irony intentionally detailed by the author of Judges is Samson's reversal of Deborah's victory. Whereas Jael, the Israelite woman, was able to best a foreign warrior, in Samson's narrative an Israelite warrior is bested by a foreign woman.[137] This inverse in the Samson saga shows how far Israel has drifted out of favor with Yahweh. However, more disturbing than the Israelites' indifference and submission to their enemies is the reality

---

[134] Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible*, ed. D. A. Carson, הארץ (InterVarsity Press, 2003), 132. Additionally, Block notes that just like Israel, Samson's interracial marriage leads to war. Block states that the authorial intent is to showcase the purposes of Yahweh which the individual players, much like Israel, seem oblivious to discerning. Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 438.

[135] Younger Jr., *Judges, Ruth*, 370. This willingness to be subdued by and appease their oppressors is something indicative of Israel during its actual messianic encounter; especially their paralleled willingness to hand over their own Savior to their enemies to maintain the status quo.

[136] Beldman, Judge, 169.

[137] Greenstein, "The Riddle of Samson," 244. It is notable that both of these deceptions happen while the man is asleep.

that they are becoming *like* their enemies. Israel will soon make the same mistake Samson did: God will leave, and they will not even realize it. When Samson fully breaks his covenant and his hair is cut, he does not recognize that the spirit of God has left him (Judg 16:20), which parallels the epilogue of Judges when the people, including the priests, abandon their covenant and are comfortable instigating a civil war and condoning mass rape (Judg 18–21).

Samson's ministry could be categorized as a "microcosm" of the Israelite people who continually fail to keep their covenant and yet are given God's empowerment to eliminate oppression temporarily.[138] Samson as a type of Israel as well as a foil to Christ most clearly showcases the author's typological intention: he demonstrates the character of Israel while simultaneously highlighting God's pattern of utilizing flawed people and staying true to his covenantal promises.

Conclusion

Types in scripture are neither arbitrary nor literary inventions, but rather real accounts that the biblical authors utilized to draw attention to God's divine nature.[139] On the microlevel of the book, the author of Judges used the positions of the judge and the king to demonstrate the typological patterns of God in delivering and leading his people. Showing how the judges rescued Israel from their enemies reiterated the pattern God had begun during the Exodus. However, the individual stories begin to complicate the imagery as various judges do not always fit the perfect, divine pattern. The judge narratives shift from types of Christ to types of Israel and foils of Christ. However, "the stories also clarify the prologue's simple prayer-divine

[138] Matthews, *Judges & Ruth*, 146.

[139] James M. Hamilton, *What Is Biblical Theology? A Guide to the Bible's Story, Symbolism, and Patterns*, (Wheaton: Crossway, 2013), ch 8.

response model by showing that God cannot be manipulated like some good luck charm and that he often operates outside the expected norms."[140] Yahweh utilizes unexpected characters such as Deborah, a woman, and Gideon, a reluctant deliverer. However, what Israel truly needed was an effective leader who upheld God's standards and values.[141] Unfortunately, each judge became more like the nations around them and less able to deliver or lead Israel. Beldmen describes this period aptly when he states, "As they were settling into Canaan, 'Canaan' was settling into them."[142] These patterns further highlighted the need for a divine judge, deliverer, and king to eventually rescue people forever. It is through these perpetual and repetitive patterns that the author of Judges typological intention is on full display. It is not merely the way he has structured the book, but the actual, micro-level narratives that effectively demonstrate the God-ordained and escalating patterns which show his redemptive plan.

[140] Chisholm Jr., *Judges and Ruth*, 23.

[141] Ibid., 67.

[142] Beldman, *Judges*, 2.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS IN THE CHAOS

The book of Judges contains diverse literary styles, disturbing narratives, and a non-linear chronology, all of which provide an ample breeding ground for misinterpretation.[1] However, these apparent dissonances are ameliorated when the book is read typologically. The typological lens is neither a foreign nor modern framework forced onto the text, but rather the original means by which the scripture was composed. This dissertation has proposed that there was authorial intent of typological writing within the book of Judges. This typological intentionality is apparent at the macro- and micro-levels of the writing. Unfortunately, recent focus on the minutia of some narratives has produced results that do not align with the overall message of the book. Therefore, "if we wish to understand Judges we will have to, first and foremost, read it *theologically*."[2]

Summary

When considering authorial intent, it is necessary to ascertain the author's identity. Three of the main candidates of authorship explored include Samuel, Abiathar, and the Deuteronomist. These men were respectively a prophet, priest, and scholar, and while the authorship of Judges remains unknown, there is one certainty: he was a Hebrew who was versed in scripture. This means that he was steeped in the cultural mindset of the Israelite nation, which would have shown itself in his writing of Judges. Therefore, the Hebraic mindset was considered in regard to time, manifestations, and thought. Hebrews understood time in rhythms, cycles, and repetitive

[1] Hillel I. Millgram, *Judges and Saviors, Deborah and Samson: Reflections of a World in Chaos* (Lanham: Hamilton Books, 2018), 487, proposes that "the author may be obliquely proposing the thesis that as far as God is concerned, He gives priority to moral processes and not chronological sequence. It is moral growth and decline in the human realm that matters to Him."

[2] Ibid., 480.

patterns which reflect the nature of God's character. These cycles are on full display in the book of Judges, where the narrative follows covenants more closely than chronology. The Hebrew mentality regarding time being patterned demonstrates that the author of Judges would have been predisposed to compose his account from a typological perspective, reiterating the patterns of God established in the Pentateuch in connection with his covenants. Additionally, Hebrews viewed individual stories as representative and contemporaneous with the nation as a whole. This generalization in the Hebrew author's mindset would naturally express each of the judge stories as more than mere folktales but as emblematic of past saviors, such as Moses, and indicative of the ultimate savior, Christ.[3]

In the psyche of Hebraic culture, the person was considered in his totality; the separate parts of mind, soul, and body were not thought of as individual pieces but one unified whole.[4] Therefore, when he repented, it was not for merely the acts he committed with his body but for what kind of person he was that would commit such acts.[5] This mentality extended to the Hebrew view of God; therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that their perspective would be the same for his Word. The Bible is not a record of random acts by a detached deity but the unified story of a wholly communicative Creator. The clearest picture of this unity is through the perspective of typology. However, for this view to be viable it is necessary to consider the scriptures beyond the scroll. The historical-critical approach of cutting scriptures apart from one another to ascertain a more accurate historical picture and thereby comprehend scripture better

[3] Conversely, this works typologically with the failed judges, such as Samson, as they showcase Israel's side of the covenant and the continuous rebellion of man against God's compassion.

[4] Glenn E. Whitlock, "The Structure of Personality in Hebrew Psychology," *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 14, no. 1 (1960), 9.

[5] Ibid., 10–11.

does not align with how the scriptural authors, including the author of Judges, would have written the text. The Hebraic mindset saw God in patterned covenants, reiterating the unity of scripture. If this was the natural, Hebraic perspective, it is also naturally conclusive that this is the perspective from which the author of Judges would have composed his book. Fittingly, this typological unity of scripture was recognized by the church for millennia.

Perhaps the most pertinent reasoning for utilizing a typological perspective to interpret scripture is that New Testament authors and Jesus himself did. They would have considered Judges not merely as the historical account of the conquest but as an interpretation of Yahweh and humanity's behavior at a specific point of the *Heilsgeschichte*. The practice of typological interpretation continued from the Patristics until the Reformation and persisted until today, despite the overt shift towards a historical-critical approach. That means that throughout the vast majority of church history, scripture was read, interpreted, and taught through a typological lens. To deny the typological intention of biblical authors is to deny their Hebraic enculturation, centuries of church exposition, and Jesus' interpretation. Therefore, rather than debating the number of sources or authors who wrote Judges, it is perhaps more spiritually profitable to hear the divine voice in the polyphonic tome which consistently conveys through typological means the need for a perfect Savior. Rather than assuming the political motivations of the author or compilers, it is more reasonable to consider the divine motive, which throughout the canon demonstrates Yahweh's covenantal patterns of faithfulness to his rebellious children.

Seeing the typological intention of the author on the macro-level of the book enables the reader to grasp the main purpose of the writing—that a divine King is necessary for humanity to remain in the covenantal promises of Yahweh. This theme is traced through the land covenants, the chiastic structure, and the literary seams of the book. Land, throughout scripture, is much

more than territorial conquest; it is life, prosperity, and divine favor. The author of Judges clearly uses literary connections to typologically continue the Pentateuchal theme of land as representative of each of these. The inability of the Israelites to fully capture or retain the Promised Land visually demonstrates God's wavering favor as he responds to his rebellious people. The land plays a key role from the Pentateuch through exile, acting as a moral meter of peoples' obedience to Yahweh, and the author of Judges has intentionally penned his tome as a continuation of the land narrative. He indicates that their inability to drive out the inhabitants marks the Israelites as illegitimate children, or at least a people not fully in covenant, who will eventually be driven out themselves. These cyclical patterns are heightened in their connection to Abraham. The author of Judges organizes the main judge narratives around the same geographic path that Abraham walked in the Promised Land clearly connecting the Pentateuchal promises to the conquest account. This land theme simultaneously looks back to the garden given in Eden and forward to the New Creation provided by Christ. Judges is authored in a way conducive to the typological patterns seen throughout the entirety of scripture.

The macrolevel typological intentionality is also shown through the chiastic structuring of the book.[6] First, the era of the conquest and judges was originally designed to be an inversed chiastic answer to the rebellion and fall in the Garden, where people obey, remove sin, worship God, and have rest. However, that is clearly not the pattern recorded by the author, and instead the entirety of the book is set as a foil to this divinely inspired idea. The author pairs the stories of the prologue, epilogue, and individual judges toward a central point of the life of Abimelech.

[6] James Hamilton Jr., *Typology: Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2022), 332. Hamilton outlines the chiastic structure of Genesis as well as its subunits, noting that chiasms provide beauty, structure, and memory aids to the readers and hearers of scripture and were therefore intentionally utilized by biblical authors throughout their narratives.

It is within this narrative that judgeship and kingship will both be tested. The central point of the Abimelech epic is Jotham's fable. This unique literary unit creates difficulties for traditional interpretation which are ameliorated when read through the typological perspective. As the center point of the chiasm, the fable highlights the need for a divine King to secure the promise of favor, a theme which is the fundamental message of the entire book and reiterated through a conclusionary literary seam.

Three literary seams were explored and shown to have significant ties to the Pentateuch, demonstrating connections backward to Hebraic origins and forward to the predictive exile during the monarchial period. The three instances of the angel of the Lord have connections to the first three appearances of the angel in the Pentateuch with the messages expounding upon the character of God. For example, the first appearance in the Pentateuch promised to Hagar that even a foreigner could obtain Yahweh's blessing based on submission, while the first appearance in Judges informed his chosen people that they could lose their blessing and inheritance for disobedience. These authorially intended connections showcase the typological mindset of an author who understands that he is capturing a mere chapter of a greater story. The divine questioning seam in Judges 2 links the rebellious Israelites to Eve at the fall, Cain after his fratricide, and Abraham in his self-preservative lies. Finally, the four-fold seam in the epilogue, that there was no king in Israel, reiterates the theme of Jotham's fable but also connects to the Exodus. The Israelites have rejected their divine King, and unlike the era prior to the Exodus when they cried out for help, they now do whatever is right in their eyes. All of these seams highlight again the necessity of a divine Savior, reiterating the messianic hope which was a mainstay of the Hebrew faith and a reiteration in their typological writing.

Throughout Judges, the author highlights two leadership positions, judge and king, and essentially demonstrates that they are unable to be successfully filled by humans because the peace of the land was tied to the life of the leader. The judge's success was based on a combination of physical and spiritual deliverance. It was not merely about delivering the people from their oppressive enemies but from their obstinate engagement in the inevitable idolatry that resulted from their subjugation. However, this deliverance could never last beyond the life of the leader, showcasing the need for a divine Savior and typologically pointing toward Christ. Likewise, the position of king will prove as futile as the judges themselves, something hinted at by the author of Judges through the accounts of Othneil and Abimelech as well as through his concluding literary seam. As previously stated through Jotham's fable, the author is highlighting the necessity of a divine King, who thus far in the *Heilsgeschichte* has been repeatedly rejected by the people.

The individual micro-level narratives also convey typological connections. Othneil opens the narrative cycle as a paradigmatic judge whose exemplary exploits will set the standard for the remaining judge cycles. However, the author is ambiguous when he writes the pivotal phrase "and he saved them" (Judg 3:9), intentionally forcing the reader to determine whether their salvific belief is in the man, Othniel, or the divine Yahweh. Deborah stands as an enigma to the judge stories as a woman, prophetess, and military leader. However, the author strategically created numerous literary connections to Moses, legitimizing Yahweh's choice of utilizing Deborah and further demonstrating his writing as typologically patterned. Deborah is not just a deliverer; she is a new Moses. This distinction denotes her as a type of Christ. While Othneil and Deborah operate as the more emblematic messianic type, the shift of Gideon and fulfillment of Samson as foils still convey typological realities. Gideon also has multiple typological links to

several Old Testament leaders. He is fearful and questioning like Moses, gains victory through unusual means like Joshua, and receives signs like Abraham. However, Gideon is the first judge to shift into the role of a typological foil, becoming the antithesis of those who went before him, ending his life as a pseudo-king, acknowledging God but assuming the role intended for Yahweh. Samson's divinely announced birth links him to figures such as Isaac and Jacob and later to John and Jesus. However, these typological beginnings are not the end of his story and eventually Samson presents himself not as a type of Christ but as a type of Israel. Here again the Hebraic mindset of generalization is on full display as Samson becomes synonymous with the rebellious Israelites who also do what is right in their eyes but will end up blinded and led away into foreign captivity when God's spirit eventually departs from them. Samson's illustration of Israel's selfish rebellion and obsession with foreign temptations is as informative to the pattern as Othniel's exemplary representation of Yahweh's deliverance. The author intends to portray all these individuals as part of the greater pattern of God and Israel's covenantal relationship. When considering the book of Judges, it is erroneous think of the judges as the main protagonists when the true hero of the book is Yahweh. This is reemphasized in the epilogue where a world without God as king is on clear display in the narratives. Judges "serves as eternal testimony to the grim reality that God's people are often their own worst enemy."[7]

Importance of a Typological Perspective

The return to a typological perspective is imperative in a world dominated by historical-critical ideology where scriptural meaning has succumbed to the interpretation of cultural history. Rather than understanding history through the eyes of its Creator, we have been

[7] Daniel Block, *The New American Commentary: Judges, Ruth*, ed. E. Ray Clendened (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 586.

interpreting the Creator through our understanding of history. This is not to disregard the cultural influences but rather to consider that scriptural authors wrote with the intention of displaying the covenantal patterns of God *through* the cultural context in which they found themselves. Hamilton brilliantly explores this perspective in the book of Genesis and throughout the Pentateuch, paving the way for such analysis in other Old Testament books. This study has examined how the author of Judges utilized the historical account of Israel's conquest of the Promised Land at the macro- and micro-levels to demonstrate the typological patterns of the divine Deliverer. This is shown through his connections backward to the Pentateuchal covenants as well as forward to the exilic and New Testament writings which eventually align with the themes portrayed in Judges. It is these typological themes, the patterns of God's interactions with his people, which unify the overall story of scripture. Therefore, upon closer examination, Judges' seemingly random narratives actually exemplify the unity of scripture. If we cannot consider the unity of scripture, then we begin to question the canonization of the Bible. These are not merely historical books written and revised by man to capture culture or history; they are the ongoing narrative of a divine author who is repeatedly reiterating that his supernatural love for his rebellious creation will eventually culminate in his own fulfillment so that he might be reunited with them. Without a typological perspective, these overt themes can become lost; and it is already happening. When the minutia of biblical narratives and the historical context of surrounding cultures are venerated above the covenantal patterns of God, the church becomes theologically anemic and cannot hope to imitate the image of Christ.[8]

[8] The term *theological anemia* is credited to Hiestand and Wilson. However, in their analysis the fault is focused on the theologically inept pastorate community, whereas I would argue there is fault on both sides of the dichotomy, with the result being two-fold: churches that lack deep, theological insights and universities that are out-of-touch with the concerns of modern believers due to their hyperfocus on historical-critical analysis.

Typology is theology as it recognizes the unity of the scriptures and grants an integrated approach toward studying them. Perhaps Loughlin says it best: "Christian truth has never been a matter of matching stories against reality. It has always been a matter of matching reality-stories against the truth: Jesus Christ."[9] All of the scriptures, not merely the New Testament, corroborate this truth; and typology is the means by which we discern it. That is why this study has sought to showcase this reality through the biblical book with arguably the most arbitrary accounts and convoluted chronology. The consistent and prevalent demonstrations of typological intent on both the macro and micro-levels of Judges establish the intent of the author to convey the covenantal patterns of God even through loosely associated narratives. Therefore, although the author of Judges may not have known the fulfillment, he wrote his work in a typological way, reiterating divine patterns and enabling later believers to recognize Jesus' messianic characteristics when he did appear. This typological mentality is crucial for pastors who might avoid teaching the fullness of the Old Testament due to difficult or violent passages. Reading the Hebrew canon with a typological mindset allows the fullness of scripture to be taught because challenging pericopes are exegeted within the broader *Heilsgeschichte*. This perspective is also vital for academia where non-typological interpretations can produce studies which stand in direct opposition to the overarching scriptural patterns. While this study serves as a first step, there is certainly more research that would be beneficial to the theological enrichment of all believers.

[9] Gerard Loughlin, *Telling God's Story: Bible, Church and Narrative Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 23.

Areas for Additional Research

Regarding the book of Judges, there is a considerable amount of research on individual narratives; however, more studies could be conducted on the overall story being conveyed. This dissertation only scratched the surface of the full analysis of the macro-level connections. The chiastic structuring of the final form of the book is certainly worthy of a deeper analysis, as most researchers either eliminate or merely pair the prologue and epilogue and are often ambiguous as the to the role of Abimelech. Additionally, the only micro-chiastic structure analyzed was that of Abimelech, but exploring other subunits could contribute structure and clarity to the narratives. Finally, this paper has focused on authorial intentionality of types within Judges, namely prospective types. However, it may also be advantageous to consider retrospective types in Judges to reiterate that there is a divine author who has supernaturally instituted and inspired all biblical types through the progressive revelation of Christ in scripture. As Mitchell Chase notes, "The Old Testament is full of Christ, and this is God's design."[10] However, most areas of academia are not tuned into this design.

To ascertain the potential damage done by non-typological perspectives, it might be beneficial to examine their conclusions in parallel with deductions derived from a typological lens and determine which suppositions align most congruently with the rest of scripture. Afterall, Judges is merely a chapter in the grander redemption story and narratives found within the book will not contradict the overall covenantal patterns.

Finally, while briefly addressed in chapter 4, there may be benefits to analyzing the book of Judges through the perspective of Jotham's fable. If this is truly the central point of the

[10] Mitchell L. Chase, *40 Questions about Typology and Allegory*, ed. Benjamin L. Merkle (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2020), 61.

chiastic structure, then the author is intentionally leading the reader to this passage as the fundamental conclusion of the book. Diffey does an exemplary job of analyzing the fable, but primarily focuses on the political/monarchial considerations of the fable's implications rather than taking a theological/typological approach.[11]

Conclusion

In a culture that sees scriptures as unreliable at worst to historical at best, the return to recognizing the author's intent to represent the typological patterns of an eternal God is imperative. This perspective changes everything. For example, it is interesting that in modern ideologies, Judges is the book often drawn from to question or even degrade God's personality, when in truth the book is a defense of his character against the sinfully rebellious and morally corrupt nature of humanity.[12] Considering the Hebraic mindset, the chiastic structure, the literary connections to the Pentateuchal covenants, and even the association of individual judges to previous biblical characters, it becomes clear that the author of Judges intentionally composed the book from a typological perspective as he conveyed the heightening patterns of the redemption narrative. When the book is not studied as intended by the author, misinterpretations are inevitable. Therefore, now more than ever, a return to the typological perspective is vital as "no book in the Old Testament offers the modern church as telling a mirror as [Judges]."[13]

---

[11] Daniel Scott Diffey, "Gideon's Response and Jothams' Fable: Two Anti-Monarchial Texts in a Pro-Monarchial Book?" (doctoral dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013).

[12] Robert B Chisholm Jr., *A Commentary of Judges and Ruth* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2013), 87.

[13] Block, *Judges, Ruth,* 586.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allison, Dale. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1993.

Amit, Yairah. "Endings – Especially Reversal Endings." *Scriptura* 87 (2004): 213–26.

———. *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Amos, N. Scott, ed. *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*. Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament 4. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2020.

Anderson, B. W. "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah." In *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, edited by Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson, 177–95. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

Andrews, Michael W. "The Sign of Jonah: Jesus in the Heart of the Earth." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 61, no. 1 (2018): 105–19.

Baker, David L. "Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 29, no. 2 (1976): 137–57.

Baldwin, Edward Chauncey. "The Hebrew and the Greek Ideas of Life." *The Biblical World* 36, no. 5 (1910): 334–44.

Beale, G. K. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

Beldman, David J. H. *Judges*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020.

———. *The Completion of Judges: Strategies of Ending in Judges 17–21*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2017.

Berger, David. "Three Typological Themes in Early Jewish Messianism: Messiah Son of Joseph, Rabbinic Calculations, and the Figure of Armilus." *AJS Review* 10, no. 2 (1985): 141–64.

Block, Daniel I. "Judges." In *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary*, edited by John Walton. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.

———. *Judges, Ruth*. New American Commentary 6. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999.

Boling, Robert G. *Judges: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Edited by William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.

Boman, Thorleif. *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*. New York: Norton, 1960.

Bray, Gerald. *How the Church Fathers Read the Bible: A Short Introduction*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2022.

Brettler, Marc. “The Book of Judges: Literature as Politics.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108, no. 3 (1989): 395–418.

Brettler, Marc Zvi. *How to Read the Bible*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 2005.

Brouwer, Wayne. “Understanding Chiasm and Assessing Macro-Chiasm as a Tool of Biblical Interpretation.” *Calvin Theological Journal* 53, no. 1 (2018): 99–127.

[1]

Brueggemann, Walter. *The Land: Place as Gift, Promise, and Challenge in Biblical Faith*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

Buchanan, George Wesley. *Jesus: The King and His Kingdom*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1984.

Bundvad, Mette. “Defending the Concept of Time in the Hebrew Bible.” *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 28, no. 2 (2014): 280–97.

Butler, Trent C. *Judges*. Word Biblical Commentary 8. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.

Carr, David. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Chadwick, H. “Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy.” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 2, no. 2 (1951): 145–64.

Chase, Mitchell L. *40 Questions about Typology and Allegory*. Edited by Benjamin L. Merkle. Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2020.

Chia, Philip Suciadi, and Juanda Juanda. “Memorization in DSS, NT, Talmud and Patristic Documents.” *Journal Kerugma* 4, no. 1 (2021): 43–48.

Chisholm Jr., Robert B. *A Commentary of Judges and Ruth*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2013.

Chisick, Harvey. “Between Heavenly and Earthly Cities: Religion and Humanity in Enlightenment Thought.” *European Legacy* 26, no. 6 (2021): 561–586. https://doi.org/10.1080/10848770.2021.1924446.

Choi, John Byong-Hwan. “A Comparative Examination of Typological and Allegorical Interpretation in Developing Christ-Centered Preaching.” PhD diss., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 2020.

[1] Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon, ed. Hendrickson Publishers, Thirteenth. (Peabody, 2010), 654.

Clement of Rome. “First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians,” n.d. https://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/1clement-lightfoot.html.

Coats, George W. “Parable, Fable, and Anecdote.” *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 35, no. 4 (1981): 368–82.

Collins, Brian. “The Land Promise in Scripture: An Evaluation of Progressive Covenantalism’s View of the Land.” *BJU Press*. Bible faculty summit, Maranatha Baptist University (2016).

Copeland Klepper, Deeana. *The Insight of Unbelievers: Nicholas of Lyra and Christian Reading of Jewish Text in the Later Middle Ages*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

D’Ambrosio, Marcellion. *When the Church Was Young*. Cincinnati: Servant Books, 2014.

Daniélou, Jean. *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*. Jackson, MI: *Ex Fontibus* Company, 2018.

Davidson, Richard. “Typological Structures in the Old and New Testaments.” PhD diss., Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1981.

Davidson, Richard M. *Typology in Scripture*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981.

Dempster, Stephen G. *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by D. A. Carson. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003.

Diffey, Daniel Scott. “Gideon’s Response and Jotham’s Fable: Two Anti-Monarchial Texts in a Pro-Monarchial Book?” PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013.

Dively Lauro, Elizabeth Ann. *Homilies on Judges: Fathers of the Church Patristic Series*. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

Douglas, J. D., and Merrill C. Tenney. *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Dictionary*. Edited by Moisés Silva. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2011.

Douglas, Mary. *Thinking in Circles: An Essay on Ring Composition.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Dumbrell, W. J. “‘In Those Days There Was No King in Israel; Every Man Did What Was Right in His Own Eyes.’ The Purpose of the Book of Judges Reconsidered.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 25 (1983): 23–33.

Ebeling, Gerhard. “The New Hermeneutics and the Early Luther.” *Theology Today* 21, no. 1 (1964): 34–46.

Edenburg, Cynthia. “‘Overwriting and Overriding,’ or What Is Not Deuteronomistic.” In *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, edited by Martti Nissinen, 443–460. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

———. *Dismembering the Whole: Composition and Purpose of Judges 19–21*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

Ewing, W. "Midian." Accessed April 4, 2023. https://bibleatlas.org/midian.htm.

Exum, J. Cheryl. "Harvesting the Biblical Narrator's Scanty Plot of Ground: A Holistic Approach to Judges 16:4–22." *Tehillah le-Moshe* (2021): 39–46.

———. "Promise and Fulfillment: Narrative Art in Judges 13." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99, no. 1 (1980): 43.

———. "The Centre Cannot Hold: Thematic and Textual Instabilities in Judges." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52, no. 3 (1990): 410–431.

Eynikel, Erik, and Tobias Nicklas, eds. *Samson: Hero or Fool?* Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Fairbairn, Patrick. *The Typology of Scripture*. Vol. 1. Altenmünster: Jazzybee Verlag, 2017.

Ferretter, Luke. "The Power and the Glory: The Aesthetics of the Hebrew Bible." *Literature and Theology* 18, no. 2 (2004): 123–38.

Firth, David G. *Including the Stranger: Foreigners in the Former Prophets*. London: Apollos, 2019.

Franke, John R., and Thomas C. Oden, eds. *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–2 Samuel*. Old Testam. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2005.

Frolov, Serge. *Judges: The Forms of the Old Testament Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

———. "Rethinking Judges." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71, no. 1 (2009): 24–41.

———. "The Rings of the Lord: Assessing Symmetric Structuring in Numbers and Judges." *Vetus Testamentum* 66, no. 1 (2016): 15–44.

Fuhrman, Orly, and Lera Boroditsky. "Mental Time-Lines Follow Writing Direction: Comparing English and Hebrew Speakers." *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* 29 (2007).

Galpaz-Feller, Pnina. *Samson: The Hero and the Man*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2006.

Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.

Geiger, Ari. *Nicolas De Lyre Franciscain Du XIVe Siècle Exègète et Thèologien*. Paris: *Institut d'Études Augustiniennes*, 2011.

Gillmayr-Bucher, Susanne. "Framework and Discourse in the Book of Judges." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128, no. 4 (2009).

Goldfajn, Tal. *Word Order and Time in Biblical Hebrew Narrative*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

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

Greenspahn, Frederick, ed. *The Hebrew Bible: New Insights and Scholarship*. New York: New York University Press, 2008.

Greenspahn, Frederick E. "The Theology of the Framework of Judges." *Vetus Testamentum* 36 (1986): 385–96.

Greenstein, Edward L. "The Riddle of Samson." *Indiana University Press* 1, no. 3 (1981): 237–60.

Groves, J. Alan. "Judges." In *Theological Interpretation of the Old Testament: A Book-by-Book Survey*, edited by Kevin J VanHoozer. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Guignard, Christophe. "Untying Knots: A New Interpretation of Irenaeus's *Adversus Haereses* 3.22.4." *Harvard Theological Review* 114, no. 2 (2021): 203–18.

Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church Under Persecution*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Gundry, Stanley N. "Typology as a Means of Interpretation: Past and Present." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 12, no. 4 (1969): 233–40.

Gunn, David M. *Blackwell Bible Commentaries: Judges*. Edited by John Sawyer, Christopher Rowland, and Judith Kovacs. Maldan, MA: Blackwell, 2005.

Halpern, Baruch. "The Rise of Abimelek Ben-Jerubbaal." *Hebrew Annual Review* 2 (1978): 79–100.

Hamilton Jr., James M. *What Is Biblical Theology? A Guide to the Bible's Story, Symbolism, and Patterns*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2013.

———. *Typology: Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2022.

Hamley, Isabelle M. *God of Justice and Mercy*. London: SCM Press, 2021.

Hamlin, E. John. "Structure and Meaning of the Theological Essay in Judges 2:6–3:6." *Proceedings* (1986).

Herzberg, Bruce. "Deborah and Moses." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38, no. 1 (2013): 15–33.

Heschel, Abraham Joshua. *The Sabbath: It's Meaning for Modern Man*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1951.

Hiestand, Gerald, and Todd Wilson. *The Pastor Theologian: Resurrecting an Ancient Vision*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015.

Hudson, Don Michael. "Living in a Land of Epithets: Anonymity in Judges 19–21." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 62 (1994): 49–66.

Jacobs, Joseph. *Jewish Encyclopedia; A Guide to Its Contents, an Aid to Its Use*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1906. https://www.jewishencyclopedia.com.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Gospel of Luke*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.

Jowett, Benjamin. "The Interpretation of Scripture." In *Essays and Reviews*, 330–433. 7th ed. London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1861.

Kaiser Jr., Walter C., and Duane Garrett, eds. *Archaeological Study Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

Kaminsky, Joel S. "Reflections on Associative Word Links in Judges." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 36, no. 4 (2012).

Kaplan, Jonathan. *My Perfect One: Typology and Early Rabbinic Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Kovacs, Judith L. *1 Corinthians: Interpreted by Early Christian Commentators*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Lee, Kiseong. "An Evaluation of Typology in the Sermons of Charles H. Spurgeon and Alexander Maclaren and Its Implications for Text-Driven Preaching." PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2019.

López, René A. "Identifying the 'Angel of the Lord' in the Book of Judges." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 20, no. 1 (2010): 1–18.

Loughlin, Gerard. *Telling God's Story: Bible, Church and Narrative Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Lytton, Timothy D. "'Shall Not the Judge of the Earth Deal Justly?': Accountability, Compassion, and Judicial Authority in the Biblical Story of Sodom and Gomorrah." *Journal of Law and Religion* 18, no. 1 (2002): 31–55.

Malone, Andrew S. "Distinguishing the Angel of the Lord." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 21, no. 3 (2011): 297–314.

Martens, Elmer A. "Tackling Old Testament Theology." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20, no. 2 (1977): 123–32.

Martin, Oren R. *Bound For the Promised Land*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 34. Edited by D. A. Carson. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2015.

Mather, Samuel. *The Figures of Types of the Old Testament*. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1969.

Matthews, Victor H. *New Cambridge Bible Commentary: Judges & Ruth*. Edited by Ben Witherington III and Bill T. Arnold. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

McCann, J. Clinton. *Interpretation: Judges*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.

McCoy, Brad. "Chiasmus: An Important Structural Device Commonly Found in Biblical Literature." *Chafer Theological Seminary* 9, no. 1 (2003): 18–34.

McKenzie, Steven L. *Introduction to the Historical Books*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Millgram, Hillel I. *Judges and Saviors, Deborah and Samson: Reflections of a World in Chaos*. Lanham: Hamilton Books, 2018.

Milstein, Sara J. "Saul the Levite and His Concubine: The 'Allusive' Quality of Judges 19." *Vetus Testamentum* 66, no. 1 (2016): 95–116.

Misiarczyk, Leszek. "Influence of the Septuagint on the Typological Interpretation of Joshua and His Deeds in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew.'" *Verbum Vitae* 39, no. 3 (2021): 941–58.

Monroe, Lauren A. S. "They Behaved Even Worse than Their Ancestors: Reconsidering the Deuteronomistic Origin of Judges 2:11-19." *Revue Biblique*, no. 3 (2012): 347–65.

Moore, Susan Hardman. "For the Mind's Eye Only: Puritans, Images and 'The Golden Mines of Scripture.'" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 59, no. 3 (2006): 281–96.

Moyise, Steve. "Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament." *Verbum et Ecclesia* 26, no. 2 (2005): 447–58.

Murphy, Kelly J. "Judges in Recent Research." *Currents in Biblical Research* 15, no. 2 (2017): 179–213.

Niditch, Susan. *The Old Testament Library: Judges*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.

———. "The 'Sodomite' Theme in Judges 19–20: Family, Community, and Social Disintegration." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44, no. 3 (1982): 365–78.

Niekerk, Frederik van. "Reformation and Scientific Revolution: Historical Coincidence or Continual Renewal?" *In die Skriflig* 54, no. 2 (2020).

Ninow, Friedbert. "Indicators of Typology Within the Old Testament: The Exodus Motif." PhD diss., Andrews University, 1999.

Noth, Martin. *The Chronicler's History*. Translated by H. G. M. Williamson. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

———. *The Deuteronomistic History*. Translated by Max Niemeyer Verlag. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.

O'Brien, Mark A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. *Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz Vandenhoeck & Ruprect*, Göttingen, 1989.

O'Connell, Robert H. *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

O'Keefe, John J. "'A Letter That Killeth': Toward a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8, no. 1 (2000): 83–103.

Osborn, Eric. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Osborne, Grant R. *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006.

Paul, Mart-Jan. "The Identity of the Angel of the LORD." *Hiphil* 4 (2007): 1–12.

Paulien, Jon. "Dreading the Whirlwind: Intertexuality and the Use of the Old Testament in Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39, no. 1 (2001): 5–22.

Peels, H. G. L. "The Blood from Abel to Zechariah (Matthew 23:35; Luke 11:50) and the Canon of the Old Testament." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 113, no. 4 (2001): 583–601.

Van Pelt, Miles V. "Judges." In *ESV Expository Commentary*, vol .2, edited by Iain M. Duguid, James M. Hamilton Jr., and Jay Sklar. Wheaton: Crossway, 2021.

Peterson, Brian N. "Could Abiathar the Priest Be the Author of Judges?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 170, no. October (2013): 432–52.

Powell, Mark Allan. "Echoes of Jonah in the New Testament." *Word and World* 27, no. 2 (2007): 157–65.

Quarles, Charles. "The Blessings of the New Moses." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 13 (2015): 307–27.

Rad, Gerhard von. "The Interpretation of the Old Testament." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 15, no. 2 (1961): 174–92.

Resch, Dustin G. "The Fittingness and Harmony of Scripture: Toward an Irenaean Hermeneutic." *Heythrop Journal – Quarterly Review of Philosophy and Theology* 50, no. 1 (2009): 74–84.

Ribbens, Benjamin J. "Typology of Types: Typology in Dialogue." *Journal of Theological*

Interpretation 5, no. 1 (2011): 81–96.

Robinson, Jonathan Rivett. “Markan Typology: Miracle, Scripture and Christology in Mark 4:35–6:45.” PhD diss.. University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand, 2020.

Römer, Thomas. “The Rejection of the Theory of a Deuteronomistic History.” In *The Oxford Handbook of the Historical Books of the Hebrew Bible*, edited by Brad E. Kelle and Brent A. Strawn. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Ryu, Chesung Justin. “Silence as Resistance: A Postcolonial Reading of the Silence of Jonah in Jonah 4:1-11.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 34, no. 2 (2009): 195–218.

Sailhamer, John H. *The Meaning of the Pentateuch*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2009.

Sandmel, Samuel. “Parallelomania.” *Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* (1962): 1–13.

Saperstein, Marc. “Jewish Typological Exegesis after Nahmanides.” *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (1993): 158–70.

Satterthwaite, Philip E. “‘No King in Israel’’: Narrative Criticism and Judges 17-21.’” *Tyndale Bulletin* (1993): 75–88.

Schneider, Tammi J. *Berit Olam: Judges*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.

Schnittjer, Gary Edward. *Old Testament Use of Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2021.

———. “The Narrative Multiverse Within the Universe of the Bible: The Question of ‘Borderlines’ and ‘Intertextuality.’” *Westminster Theological Journal* 64 (2002): 231–52.

Schöpflin, Karin. “Jotham’s Speech and Fable as Prophetic Comment on Abimelech’s Story: The Genesis of Judges 9.” *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 18, no. 1 (2004): 3–22.

Schreiner, Patrick. “Space, Place and Biblical Studies: A Survey of Recent Research in Light of Developing Trends.” *Currents in Biblical Research* 14, no. 3 (2016): 340–71.

Sequeira, Aubrey, and Samuel Emandi. “Biblical-Theological Exegesis and the Nature of Typology.” *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 21, no. 1 (2017): 11–34.

Shalom-Guy, Hava. “The Call Narratives of Gideon and Moses: Literary Convention or More?” *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11, no. 11 (2011): 2–19.

Shepley III, Joseph J. “‘Trembling on the Verge of Allegory’ Interpretive Modes of Late-Antique and Early Christian Exegesis: A Comparative Study.” PhD diss., University of Chicago, Divinity School, 2000.

Slade, Darren M. “Patristic Exegesis: The Myth of the Alexandrian-Antiochene Schools of Interpretation.” *Socio-Historical Examination of Religion and Ministry* 1, no. 2 (2019): 155–76.

Spronk, Klaas. *Historical Commentary on the Old Testament: Judges*. Leuven: Peeters, 2019.

Stanglin, Keith D. "'Baptism in the Sea': An Invitation to Typological Interpretation." *Leaven* 21, no. 2 (2013). https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/leaven/vol21/iss2/5.

———. *The Letter and Spirit of Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018.

Steinmetz, David C. "The Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis." *Theology Today* 37, no. 1 (1980): 27–38.

Story, Cullen I. K. "The Cross as Ultimate in the Writings of Justin Martyr." *Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 21, no. 1 (1998): 18–34.

Story, J. Lyle. "Jotham's Fable: A People and Leadership Called to Serve (Judges 8:22–9:57)." *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership* 2, no. 2 (2009): 29–50.

Stronstad, Roger. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984.

Talbert, Charles H. *Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary: Romans*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2002.

Tanner, J. Paul. "The Gideon Narrative as the Focal Point of Judges." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149, no. 594 (1992): 146–61.

Tatu, Silviu. "Jotham's Fable and the 'Crux Interpretum' in Judges IX." *Vetus Testamentum* 56, no. 1 (2006): 105–24.

Tertullian. *Treatise on Baptism*, n.d. https://www.tertullian.org/articles/souter_orat_bapt/souter_orat_bapt_04baptism.htm#39.

Theophilos, Michael P. *Jesus as New Moses in Matthew 8–9: Jewish Typology in First Century Greek Literature*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2013.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Tkacz, Catherine Brown. "Typology Today." *New Blackfriars* 88, no. 1017 (2007): 564–80.

VanHoozer, Kevin J., and Owen Strachan. *The Pastor as Public Theologian: Reclaiming a Lost Vision*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

VanMaaren, John. "The Adam-Christ Typology in Paul and Its Development in the Early Church Fathers." *Tyndale Bulletin* 64, no. 2 (2013): 275–97.

Walton, John H., and Craig S. Keener, eds. *NIV Cultural Backgrounds Study Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.

Waters, Kenneth L. "Jesus in the Heart of the Earth: Deciphering the Jonah Saying (Matthew 12:39–41)." *SAGE Open* 11, no. 2 (2021).

Way, Kenneth C. *Judges and Ruth*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2016.

———. "The Literary Structure of Judges Revisited: Judges as a Ring Composition." In *Windows to the Ancient World of the Hebrew Bible*, edited by Bill T. Arnold, Nancy L. Erickson, and John Walton, 247–60. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014.

———. "The Meaning of the Minor Judges: Understanding the Bible's Shortest Stories." *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society* 61, no. 2 (2018): 275–85.

Webb, Barry G. *The Book of Judges: An Integrated Reading*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1987.

White, C. Jason. "Is It Possible to Discover 'The One' Intended Meaning of the Biblical Authors?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 67, no. 2 (2014): 178–94.

White, Stephen L. "Angel of the Lord: Messenger or Euphemism?" *Tyndale Bulletin* 50, no. 2 (1999): 299–305.

Whitlock, Glenn E. "The Structure of Personality in Hebrew Psychology." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 14, no. 1 (1960): 3–13.

Wilson, Alistair I. "In the Same Boat? Jonah and Jesus as Wave-Beaten Heralds." *In Die Skriflig* (2021): 1–8.

Wilson, Walter T. *The Gospel of Matthew: Volume 1*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2022.

Wong, Gregory. *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges: An Inductive, Rhetorical Study*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Wong, Gregory T. K. "Gideon: A New Moses?" In *Reflection and Refraction*, edited by Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker, 529–45. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Young, Frances. *A History of Biblical Interpretation: Volume 1 The Ancient Period*. Edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Younger Jr., K. Lawson. *Judges, Ruth*. NIV Application Commentary, edited by Terry Muck. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2002.

Ziegert, Carsten. "Beyond Barr – Biblical Hebrew Semantics at Its Crossroads." *European Journal of Theology* 30, no. 1 (2021): 19–36.