

Everything...Was Typical of Gospel Things! A Reconsideration of Jonathan Edwards's Biblical Typology: A Study of His *Blank Bible*

CAMERON SCHWEITZER
cameronschweitzer@gs.edu
Gateway Seminary

Biblical typology enamored Jonathan Edwards (1703–1758).¹ He once opined, speaking of the Hebrew Bible, that nearly everything it recorded “was typical of gospel things. Persons were typical persons, their actions were typical actions, the cities were typical cities...nations were typical nations, the land was a typical land, God’s providences towards them were typical providences...and indeed the world was a typical world.”² Douglas Sweeney comments that this exegetical practice was Edwards’s lifelong, “all-pervasive interpretive passion,” which “permeates nearly all of his manuscripts and published treatises.” Furthermore, it serves as a “synecdoche for all his exegesis.”³

Given such sentiment, is it interesting that scholars have done little work to investigate Edwards’s exegetical synecdoche—especially given all that authors have written on his *ontological* typology.⁴ Though these two

1. For biographies of Edwards, see Samuel Hopkins, *The Life and Character of the Late Reverend, Learned, and Pious Mr. Jonathan Edwards, President of the College of New Jersey. Together with Extracts from his Private Writings & Diary* (Northampton, 1804); George Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

2. Jonathan Edwards, *The “Miscellanies”*: (Entry Nos. a–z, aa–zz, 1–500), vol. 13 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Thomas A. Schafer (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 434–35. When citing from Edwards’s work in *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, this article will provide the full bibliographic information in the first citation, while consequent citations will be abbreviated “WJE” along with the volume and page number.

3. Sweeney, *Edwards the Exegete: Biblical Interpretation and Anglo-Protestant Culture on the Edge of the Enlightenment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 71; Sweeney, “Jonathan Edwards, the Harmony of Scripture, and Canonical Exegesis,” *Trinity Journal* 34 (Fall 2013): 195. Robert Brown agrees with Sweeney. He comments that “Edwards’s predilection for typological interpretation permeates nearly all of his manuscripts and treatises.” Brown, *Jonathan Edwards and the Bible* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2002), 185.

4. For Edwards’s ontological typology, see Perry Miller, “Introduction,” in *Images or Shadows of Divine Things*, ed. Perry Miller (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948); Miller,

typologies are related, they ought not to be confused—as is a common oversight in the literature. Stephen Stein, for example, has made some of these less-than-accurate statements. In his introduction to *The Blank Bible*, he comments that “much has been written regarding Edwards’s use of typology as a way of linking the Old and New Testaments.” In the footnote to this comment, Stein tells the reader to look at his editorial introduction to *Notes on Scripture* where he provides a short bibliography on Edwards’s

“The Rhetoric of Sensation,” in *Errand into the Wilderness*, ed. Perry Miller (New York: Harper and Row, 1956); Robert Boss, *God-Haunted World: The Elemental Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Dallas: JESociety Press, 2015); Brian Fehler, “Jonathan Edwards on Nature as a Language of God: Symbolic Typology as Rhetorical Presence,” in *Religion in the Age of Reason: A Transatlantic Study of the Long Eighteenth Century*, ed. Kathryn Duncan (New York: AMS Press, 2009); Mason Lowance, *The Language of Canaan: Metaphor and Symbol in New England from the Puritans to the Transcendentalists* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980); Lowance, “Typology and Millennial Eschatology in Early New England,” in *Literary Uses of Typology: From the Late Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Earl Miner (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977); Lowance, “Images or Shadows of Divine Things: The Typology of Jonathan Edwards,” *Early American Literature* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1970): 141–81; Lowance, “Jonathan Edwards and the Platonists: Edwardsean Epistemology and the Influence of Malebranche and Norris,” *Studies in Puritan American Spirituality* II (Jan. 1992): 129–52; Thomas Davis, “The Traditions of Puritan Typology,” (PhD diss., University of Missouri, 1968); Barbara Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); *Typology and Early American Literature*, ed. Sacvan Bercovitch (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972); Janice Knight, “Learning the Language of God: Jonathan Edwards and the Typology of Nature,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 48 (October 1991), 531–51; Ursula Brumm, *American Thought and Religious Typology* (Rutgers University Press, 1970), 86–108; Jennifer Leader, *Knowing, Seeing, Being: Jonathan Edwards, Emily Dickinson, Marianne Moore, and the American Typological Tradition* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2016); Leader, “In Love with the Image: Transitive Being and Typological Desire in Jonathan Edwards,” *Early American Literature* 41, no. 2 (2006): 153–81; Rowena Revis-Jones, “Edwards, Dickinson, and the Sacramentality of Nature,” *Studies in Puritan American Spirituality*, 1 (Dec. 1990): 225–53; Conrad Cherry, *Nature and the Religious Imagination: From Edwards to Bushnell* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); Sang Hyun Lee, “Mental Activity and the Perception of Beauty in Jonathan Edwards,” *Harvard Theological Review* 69, no. 3/4 (1976): 369–96; Diana Butler, “God’s Visible Glory: The Beauty of Nature in the Thought of John Calvin and Jonathan Edwards,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 52 (1990): 13–26; Lisanne Winslow, *A Great and Remarkable Analogy: The Onto-Typology of Jonathan Edwards* (Göttingen: V&R Publishing, 2020); Stephen Daniels, *The Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards: A Study in Divine Semiotics* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), 41–65; John Gatta, *Making Nature Sacred: Literature, Religion, and Environment in America from the Puritans to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 55–70; Thomas Holbrook, “The Elaborated Labyrinth: The American Habit of Typology” (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 1984); Christopher Grasso, “Images and Shadows of Jonathan Edwards,” *American Literature History* 8 (December 1996): 683–98.

biblical typology.⁵ Problematically, though, the works Stein lists nearly all investigate Edwards's *ontological* typology, and rarely—if ever—discuss his *exegetical* typology. This inaccurate equation is common among works that mention Edwards's typology.⁶

Another common oversight is that works broadly devoted to Edwards's typology usually focus on his *ontological* typology while almost entirely neglecting his *biblical* typology.⁷ Consequently, there are only a handful of treatments that have *exclusively* investigated Edwards's employment of typology as a method of interpreting the Bible.⁸

5. Stein, "Editor's Introduction," in *The Blank Bible*, vol. 24 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Stephen Stein (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 30; idem., "Editor's Introduction," in *Notes on Scripture*, vol. 15 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Stephen Stein (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 2n7.

6. For example, Michael McClymond makes this oversight when he says "the literature on Edwards's typology is especially rich." He then provides a brief bibliography in which the authors he cites *exclusively* detail Edwards's *ontological* typology. McClymond, *Encounters with God: An Approach to the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 143n23. James Bryd makes this same, incorrect equation in his essay "Jonathan Edwards, War, and the Bible," in *Jonathan Edwards & Scripture: Biblical Exegesis in British North America*, ed. David Barshinger and Douglas Sweeney (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 206n45. Harry Stout also makes this same mistake in his "Preface to the Period," in *Sermons and Discourses: 1739–1742*, vol. 22 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Harry Stout (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 19n4.

7. For example, see Winslow, *A Great and Remarkable Analogy*; Winslow, "A Great and Remarkable Analogy: Edwards's Use of Natural Typology in Communicating Divine Excellencies," in *Regeneration, Revival, and Creation*, ed. Chris Chun and Kyle Strobel (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick Publications, 2020), 220–34. Her work, while incredibly important for clarifying our knowledge of Edwards's ontological typology, still exemplifies this point by *exclusively* investigating Edwards's "onto-types." One can also consult Margaret Batschelet's dissertation, "Jonathan Edwards' Use of Typology: A Historical and Theological Approach" (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1977). Her dissertation only devotes seven pages to Edwards's "Pauline typology" (117–23), while the rest examines his natural typology. The same thing occurs in Gerald McDermott and Michael McClymond's chapter "Typology: Scripture, Nature, and All of Reality," in their *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 116–29. See also William Schweitzer's dissertation, "Interpreting the Harmony of Reality: Jonathan Edwards' Theology of Revelation" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2008). Here, however, this omission of Edwards's biblical typology is particularly conspicuous, since Schweitzer treats his theology of *revelation*—with an emphasis on Scripture.

8. For works—or parts of them—which focus on Edwards's *biblical* typology, see Mason Lowance and David Watters, "Editor's Introduction," *Typological Writings*, vol. 11 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Mason Lowance and Wallace Anderson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 157–182; Sweeney, *Edwards the Exegete*, 53–136; Stephen R. C. Nichols, *Jonathan Edwards's Bible* (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick Publications, 2013), 58–107;

This lack of serious treatment of Edwards's exegetical typology has led a host of scholars to describe it inaccurately. Writers have usually made these statements in passing while discussing his ontological typology. This began with Perry Miller's Introduction to his publication of Edwards's "Images or Shadows of Divine Things." Miller argues that there was a competing dialectic in the pastor's thought. He asserts that, on one hand, "the new science and psychology" fueled Edwards's *ontological* typology, while, on the other hand, his *biblical* typology followed the Puritan tradition of viewing the Old Testament as a "series of prophetic adumbrations of Christ." This bifurcation leads Miller to conclude that Edwards's "originality is not that he led a typological revival in America; his readings of the types within the Bible seem to be quite traditional. What gives his undertaking a wider interest was his effort to extend the method into nature and history."⁹

Miller's supposition of a disjunction in Edwards's typological thinking and its relationship to his tradition set the scholarly trajectory for some time, as authors, following Miller, state or assume that Edwards's exegetical typology was "traditional" or "conservative" (i.e. cohering with "traditional" Puritan hermeneutics), while also claiming that his ontological typology

Nichols, "Jonathan Edwards' Principles of Interpreting Scripture," in *Jonathan Edwards & Scripture*, 32–50; Barshinger, *Jonathan Edwards and the Psalms: A Redemptive-Historical Vision of Scripture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 164–217; Brandon Withrow, *Becoming Divine: Jonathan Edwards's Incarnational Spirituality Within the Christian Tradition* (Eugene, Ore.: Cascade, 2011), 179–88; Benjamin Wayman, "Women as Types of the Church in the Blank Bible: The 'Feminine' Ecclesiology of Jonathan Edwards," *Jonathan Edwards Studies* vol. 2, no. 2 (2012): 56–78; Drew Hunter, "Hebrews and the Typology of Jonathan Edwards," *Themelios* 44.2 (2019): 339–52; Tibor Fabiny, "Edwards and Biblical Typology," in *Understanding Jonathan Edwards: An Introduction to America's Theologian*, ed. Gerald McDermott (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 91–108; and, in the same volume, Gerald McDermott, "Alternative Viewpoint: Edwards and Biblical Typology," 109–12; Nelson Kloosterman, "The Use of Typology in Post-Canonical Salvation History: An Orientation to Jonathan Edwards' *A History of the Work of Redemption*," *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 14 (January 2003): 59–96; Mark Noll, "Jonathan Edwards' Use of the Bible, A Case Study (Genesis 32:22–32) with Comparisons," in *Jonathan Edwards Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1 (2012): 30–46; James Detrich, "A Recital of Presence: Christological use of Scripture in *A History of the Work of Redemption*" (PhD diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2016), 176–267; Douglas Landrum, *Jonathan Edwards' Exegesis of Genesis: A Puritan Hermeneutic* (Mustang, Okla.: Tate Publishing, 2015), 81–120; Linda Munk, "Jonathan Edwards: Types of the Peaceable Kingdom," in *Millennial Thought in America: Historical and Intellectual Contexts, 1630–1860*, ed. Bernd Engler, Joerg Fichte, and Oliver Scheiding (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2002), 215–28; Munk, "His Dazzling Absence: The Shekinah in Jonathan Edwards," *Early American Literature* 27, no. 1 (1992): 1–30.

9. Miller, "Introduction," 6, 27.

was “untraditional” or “liberal” (i.e. neither his forbearers nor contemporaries interpreted nature or secular history in the same way).¹⁰

Mason Lowance rearticulated Miller’s framework for opposing Edwards’s “conservative” biblical typology with his “liberal” ontological typology. Lowance argued that Edwards applied typology’s nomenclature to both the “historical scheme established between the testaments” and “external representations and the ideas they shadow forth.” Lowance labels the former Edwards’s “conservative typology” and the latter his “liberal typology.” He notes that Edwards’s “conservative” method is clearest in his *A History of the Work of Redemption*, while he uses his “liberal” method in “Images of Divine Things.” In addition, there is a kind of “spectrum of conservative-to-liberal typology” in Edwards’s “Miscellanies.” Lowance argues that this shows the inconsistencies of Edwards’s attempts to reconcile his “orthodox typological correspondences with his liberal Platonic allegorizing.”¹¹

Other authors furthered this trend Lowance and Miller set by continuing to speak of Edwards’s “liberal” or “untraditional” typology and his “conservative” or “traditional” biblical schema of typological interpretation.¹² These authors of the “Miller–Lowance line” have rearticulated that

10. Interestingly, Miller recognized that Edwards’s ontological typology was not *entirely* without historical precedent. He points out the Puritans “were spiritualizing everyday life” by using “tropes” as “lively notion(s)” of the day-to-day for instruction, which illustrated spiritual things the mind already knows. But, Miller claims, Edwards went beyond this metaphorical, pedagogical practice by asserting that these natural “images” must “be that of which the spiritual reality consists in itself.” Miller concludes, therefore, that Edwards understood the “image [to be] truth,” rather than a helpful *illustration* of the truth. Miller, “Introduction,” 18–20, 32. Other authors argue that Edwards’s ontological typology did not lack the sort of historical precedent that Miller claims. See, Boss, *God-Haunted World*, 12, 23, 88; Batschelet, “Jonathan Edwards’ Use of Typology,” 89–90; McDermott, *Everyday Glory: The Revelation of God in all Reality* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018); Avihu Zakai, “The Theological Origins of Jonathan Edwards’s Philosophy of Nature,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 60 (2009): 708–24.

11. Lowance, “Images or Shadows of Divine Things’ in the Thought of Jonathan Edwards,” in *Typology and Early American Literature*, 219, 231, 233. For additional places in which Lowance argues similarly, see his “Typology and Millennial Eschatology in Early New England,” in *Literary Uses of Typology*, 228–73, 263–64; Lowance, “Typology, Millennial Eschatology, and Jonathan Edwards,” in *Critical Essays on Jonathan Edwards*, ed. William Scheick (Boston: Hall Publishing, 1980), 189–90; Lowance, *The Language of Canaan*, 251–52; Lowance, “Editor’s Introduction,” *WJE* 11:162–64, 173, 175; Lowance, “Jonathan Edwards and the Platonists: Edwardsean Epistemology and the Influence of Malebranche and Norris,” *Studies in Puritan American Spirituality* 2 (Jan. 1992): 130–31, 146.

12. Cherry, “Symbols of Spiritual Truth,” 268–69; Stephen Holmes, *God of Grace and*

the “liberal” and “conservative” strands of Edwards’s typology are two different typologies and do not relate to the Christian, interpretive tradition in the same way.

The key take-away from these scholars’ thesis is the oft-repeated—or assumed—point that Edwards’s *biblical* typology was “conservative” and fell in line with the Christian, interpretive tradition. Miller, Lowance, and the authors following them have typically defined “conservative” in one of two ways. Some define it more broadly as an interpreter’s exegetical connection of an Old Testament type with *any* New Testament antitype.¹³ Others in the Miller–Lowance line define this key phrase more narrowly as an exegete’s linkage of an Old Testament type with a *specifically* Christological antitype.¹⁴

God of Glory: An Account of the Theology of Jonathan Edwards (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 107; Stephen Yarbrough, “Jonathan Edwards on Rhetorical Authority,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 47.3 (1986): 403; Grasso, “Images and Shadows of Jonathan Edwards,” 684; Anna Svetlikova, “Jonathan Edwards on Typology as Language,” *Theologica Wratislaviensia* 7 (2012): 159; Stephen Stein, “The Quest for the Spiritual Sense: The Biblical Hermeneutics of Jonathan Edwards,” *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (January–April 1977): 111–12; William Wainwright, “Jonathan Edwards and the Language of God,” in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 48.4 (1980): 527; Sang Lee, “Edwards on God and Nature: Resources for Contemporary Theology,” in *Edwards in Our Time: Jonathan Edwards and the Shaping of American Religion*, ed. Sang Lee and Allen Guelzo (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 15; Wallace Anderson, “Editor’s Introduction,” *WJE* 11:6; Davis, “The Traditions of Puritan Typology,” 378, 381; Michael Clark, “The Eschatology of Signs in Cotton Mather’s ‘Biblia Americana’ and Jonathan Edwards’s Case for the Legibility of Providence,” in *Cotton Mather and Biblia Americana—America’s First Bible Commentary: Essays in Reappraisal*, ed. Reiner Smolinski and Jan Stievermann (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 432; Richard Hunt, “Refiguring an Angry God: The Nature of Jonathan Edwards,” *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies* 4 (Spring 2003): 24–25; Gatta, “Intimations of an Environmental Ethic,” 56, 63; Harold Simonson, “Typology, Imagination, and Jonathan Edwards,” in *Radical Discontinuities: American Romanticism and Christian Consciousness* (East Brunswick, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1983), 20–21; Zakai, *Jonathan Edwards’s Philosophy of History: The Reenchantment of the World in the Age of Enlightenment* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 37; Ji Hyuk Kim, “A Reappraisal of Religious Experience in Expository Preaching in Light of Jonathan Edwards’s Sense of the Heart” (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013), 135–40.

13. Lowance, “Jonathan Edwards and the Platonists,” 131; Lowance, “Typology, Millennial Eschatology, and Jonathan Edwards,” 189; Fehler, “Edwards on Nature as a Language of God,” 181; Ava Chamberlain, “A Fish Story: Jonathan Edwards and Cotton Mather on Jonah’s Whale,” in *Jonathan Edwards & Scripture*, 158; Winslow, “A Great and Remarkable Analogy,” 222; Thomas Davies, “The Traditions of Puritan Typology,” in *Typology and Early American Literature*, 12; Simonson, “Typology, Imagination, and Jonathan Edwards,” 20; Marc Lee, “A Literary Approach to Selected Writings of Jonathan Edwards” (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1973), 52.

14. Miller, “Introduction,” 4–6; Gatta, “Intimations of an Environmental Ethic,” 63;

The Miller–Lowance line’s thesis has not gone unchallenged.¹⁵ Stephen Nichols argues, for example, that “Edwards does not pursue [Samuel] Mather’s approach when interpreting Scripture and departs from it only in his exegesis of the natural world and history,” since, for Edwards, “types are not simply Old Testament prefigurations of the Messiah.”¹⁶ Robert Brown and Douglas Sweeney concur with Nichols’s sentiments. They highlight that Edwards’s antitypes do not always absolve in Christ or the New Testament, but can include fulfillments like the heavenly kingdom, the bifurcation between the hypocritical and true church, or an individual’s struggle with sin.¹⁷

Nichols, Brown, and Sweeney are not alone in their thoughts regarding the fecundity of Edwards’s biblical typology. Others have noted that Edwards’s typological exegesis uncovers various antitypes that burst the “conservative” definitional banks with which the Miller–Lowance line circumscribed it.¹⁸ To use the language of the Miller–Lowance line, authors

Holbrook, “The Elaborated Labyrinth,” 16; Lee, “Edwards on God and Nature,” 37; Grasso, “Images and Shadows of Jonathan Edwards,” 683.

15. Another group of authors have argued against Miller and Lowance’s thesis of Edwards’s “bifurcated” typological system via their work on the pastor’s ontological typology. These authors have shown the broad biblical, theological, philosophical, linguistic, and historical similarities inherent within Edwards’s system that indicate he both understood and intentionally held his ontological and biblical typologies in tandem. For treatment, see Paula Cooley, *Jonathan Edwards on Nature and Destiny: A Systematic Analysis*. Studies in American Religion 16 (New York: Edwin Mellen, 1985): 7–9, 12. Knight, “Learning the Language of God,” 549; Knight, “Typology,” in *The Princeton Companion to Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Sang Lee (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 194; Leader, “In Love with the Image,” 157–58; Leader, *Knowing, Seeing, Being*, 3–57; Daniels, *The Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards*, 64–65.

16. Nichols, *Jonathan Edwards’s Bible*, 92–93, 103.

17. Brown, *Edwards and the Bible*, 186; Brown, “The Bible,” in *The Princeton Companion*, 97. Sweeney, *Edwards the Exegete*, 70–74. For similar statements, see his “Edwards and the Bible,” in *Understanding Jonathan Edwards*, 74; Sweeney, “The Harmony of Scripture,” 201–3.

18. Barshinger, *Edwards and the Psalms*, 129–30, 142, 219–30, 313–17; Batschelt, “Jonathan Edwards’ Use of Typology,” 120–23; Noll, “Edwards’ Use of the Bible,” 43; McDermott, *Jonathan Edwards Confronts the Gods: Christian Theology, Enlightenment Religion and Non-Christian Faiths* (Oxford University Press, 2000), 120–21; Cooley, *Edwards on Nature and Destiny*, 7–8; Landrum, *Edwards’ Exegesis of Genesis*, 81–120; Karl Dieterich-Pfisterer, “The Prism of Scripture: Studies on History and Historicity in the Work of Jonathan Edwards” (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1973), 147–56; Holbrook, “The Elaborated Labyrinth,” 221ff; Corne Blaauw, “Redemptive History as a Paradigm for Jonathan Edwards’ Exposition of Miracles,” *Jonathan Edwards Studies* vol. 4, no. 1 (2014): 4–20; Mark Valeri and John Wilson, “Scripture and Society: From Reform in the Old World to Revival

like Nichols, Brown, and Sweeney could assert, therefore, that Edwards's exegetical typology is "novel." In other words, on the Miller–Lowance line's own terms, Edwards's ontological typology *and* biblical typology are both "liberal."

As these dissenting authors have tried to employ better terms to categorize Edwards's exegetical typology, authors like Glenn Krieder and Stephen Nichols have argued that "Christological" better characterizes Edwards's exegetical typology.¹⁹ Others have pointed out, though, that "Christological"—while better than the Miller–Lowance line's terms—still does not accurately portray Edwards's richly diverse, typological understanding of the Scriptures.²⁰

Scholars clearly disagree over the nature of Edwards's biblical typology and how to describe it best. There is a need, therefore, to consider additional evidence to adjudicate between these competing interpretations of Edwards's typological exegesis. This essay intends to do this through an inductive survey of Edwards's longest and most-beloved exegetical-notebook, *The Blank Bible*. His 5,500 entry, exegetical manuscript

in the New," in *The Bible in American Law, Politics, and Political Rhetoric*, ed. James Johnson (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 30.

19. Glenn Kreider, *Jonathan Edwards's Interpretation of Revelation 4:1–8:1* (Dallas: University Press of America, 2004), 287–89; Nichols, *Jonathan Edwards's Bible*, 103–4, 106; Nichols, "Jonathan Edwards and the Bible: Christ, the Scope of Scripture," in *Jonathan Edwards for the Church: The Ministry and the Means of Grace*, ed. William Schweitzer (Welwyn Garden City, United Kingdom: Evangelical Press, 2015), 183–204; McClymond, *Encounters with God*, 68; Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards*, 77; Holmes, *God of Grace*, 107; William Tooman, "Edwards's Ezekiel: The Interpretation of Ezekiel in *The Blank Bible* and *Notes on Scripture*," *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 3, no. 1 (2009): 17–39; Brown, "The Bible," 97; Knight, "Typology," 197; Knight, "Learning the Language of God," 539–40; Hunter, "Hebrews and the Typology of Jonathan Edwards," 344–45; Sean Lucas, *God's Grand Design: The Theological Vision of Jonathan Edwards* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2011), 49–50; Lucas, "A History of the Work of Redemption," in *A Reader's Guide to the Major Writings of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Nathan Finn and Jeremy Kimble (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2017), 175–92; Stephen Clark, "Jonathan Edwards: The History of Redemption" (PhD diss., Drew University, 1986), 144; Detrich, "A Recital of Presence," 340–41; Withrow, *Becoming Divine*, 185–86.

20. Sweeney, "Edwards and the Bible," 74; Sweeney, "The Harmony of Scripture," 184, 201–203; McDermott, *Edwards Confronts the Gods*, 120–21; Barshinger, "Making the Psalter One's Own Language: Jonathan Edwards Engages the Psalms," *Jonathan Edwards Studies* vol. 2, no. 1 (2012): 3–29; Noll, "Edwards' Use of the Bible," 34–35, 43; Stein, "The Spirit and the Word: Jonathan Edwards and Scriptural Exegesis," in *Jonathan Edwards and the American Experience*, ed. Nathan Hatch and Harry Stout (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988): 118–30.

outnumbers, in terms of published page count, the combined totals of his *Notes on Scripture*, his typological notebooks, and his commentary on Revelation in his *Apocalyptic Writings* (his next three largest exegetical notebooks). The *Blank Bible* is a fitting subject for this essay, therefore, because it best helps readers probe the inner workings of Edwards's interpretive mind by providing the clearest portrait of how he understood and interpreted the Bible—the entire canon over.²¹

This essay's thesis is two-fold. It will argue, first, that those in the Miller–Lowance line who have either stated or implied that Edwards's biblical typology is “conservative”—on either the “narrower” or “looser” definition of the term—have overlooked evidence that suggests otherwise.²² The *Blank Bible's* evidence will strongly suggest that Douglas Sweeney, Stephen Nichols, Robert Brown, and others may be correct in stating that

21. Edwards, *The “Blank Bible,”* vol. 24 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Stephen Stein (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006). Edwards's brother-in-law gave Edwards this Bible as a gift in the early 1730s. The *Blank Bible* is a small King James Version, which Edwards interspersed with blank pages to provide ample space for notations he would make on the adjacent biblical texts. Edwards also referred to the “Blank Bible” as his “Miscellaneous Observations on the Holy Scriptures” and “Interleaved Bible.” Each designation helps the reader understand something unique about the document. This volume is one of the most important and yet peculiar pieces in Edwards's corpus. Its importance lies in its centrality within his study. Namely, in the last three decades of his life, this private notebook became the logistical center of Edwards's various biblical/theological reflections. Its peculiarity also resides in its only ever being a private, exegetical manuscript that Edwards did not intend for outside eyes. Thus it lacks any overall structure. Further, its abbreviations, lack of punctuation, grammatically incomplete sentences, obscuring symbols and cross references make it an intimidating primary source. Even though it does not approach the polished thought of his public works, the *Blank Bible* is still an important document which allows the reader to dive deeply into Edwards's exegetical mind. Interestingly, many of its notations—especially the longer ones—served as the seed-bed of Edwards's public works. The modern reader can liken it to a kind of Jonathan Edwards study bible—one, though, that totals over 1,000 pages. Until its release in 2006, only a few of its entries ever appeared in print. For more on the *Blank Bible*, see Stein, “Editor's Introduction” WJE 24:1–117; Robert Caldwell, “The ‘blank Bible,’” *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 52, no. 2 (2010): 166–71; Richard Bailey, “The ‘blank Bible,’” *Fides Et Historia* 39, no. 2 (September 2007): 144–46; Francis White, *The Reformation Roots and Edwardsean Fruits of the Missiology of Jonathan Edwards' Interleaved Bible* (ThM Thesis, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1991); Wilson Kinnach and Kenneth Minkema, “The Material and Social Practices of Intellectual Work: Jonathan Edwards's Study,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 69 (Oct. 2012): 683–730.

22. The “looser” definition of biblical typology refers to those who define this interpretive practice as one's connecting an Old Testament type with a New Testament antitype, while the “tighter” definition of this exegetical practice defines it as an interpreter's connecting an Old Testament type with a *Christological* antitype.

Edwards's biblical typology is not "conservative." This article will argue, second, that the *Blank Bible's* typological notations underscore that one cannot accurately categorize his biblical typology as "Christological" either.

In other words, the forthcoming evidence will suggest that the "Interleaved Bible's" typological notes are too diverse in their assignment of antitypes, as well as the *manner* and *time* in which Edwards asserts types find fulfillment, for one to accurately refer to his exegetical typology as "conservative" or "Christological." This implies, therefore, to borrow the terms of the Miller–Lowance line, that Edwards "broadens" the "nomenclature" of "orthodox typology" not only when typologically interpreting nature, but also while engaging in biblical exegesis.²³ Thus a reconsideration and recategorization of his exegetical typology is in order.

The present essay will survey the 210 notations in the *Blank Bible* in which Edwards uses a word from the "type" family (type, types, typify, typifies etc.) to connect a redemptive–historical sign with its signification.²⁴ Within these 210 notations, Edwards speaks of thirteen distinct antitypes to which various types point. These categories include Christology, soteriology, the church, "intra"-Old Testament, "intra"-New Testament, eschatology, the world, Christian spirituality, the demonic, sin, Christian ministry/ministers, and the Holy Spirit, as well as redemption/redemptive history generally.

Granted the present essay's constraints, this paper will only provide a brief summary for each of these antitypical categories, in addition to citing and analyzing one notation from each. This will allow the reader, at minimum, to appreciate the diversity of Edwards's typological exegesis. Footnotes will provide the other notations from that antitypical category in the *Blank Bible*.²⁵ After surveying Edwards's typological exegesis in the *Blank Bible*, the essay will then summarize its findings, highlight the inadequacy

23. Lowance and Watters, "Editor's Introduction," WJE 11:178.

24. Edwards does not number his *Blank Bible* like he does *Notes on Scripture* or "Miscellanies." Rather, he appends each note, whether it be a few sentences or a few pages, to the scriptural text that gave rise to that particular reflection. Thus the easiest way to delineate one note from the next is to refer to it as the text to which it is connected; i.e. his note on Genesis 27:5, or his exegetical musings appended to Matthew 11:11. Many of the *Blank Bible's* 210 typological notes have more than one such connection within them.

25. For a full analysis of all these examples, see my "Towards a Clearer Understanding of Jonathan Edwards's Exegetical Typology: A Case Study in *The 'Blank Bible'*" (PhD diss., Gateway Seminary, 2022).

of the terms “conservative” and “Christological,” and suggest more accurate definitions for categorizing Edwards’s biblical typology.

Christological Types in the *Blank Bible*

When restricting oneself to Edwards’s specific use of words from the “type” family to connect the Old Testament to a New Testament truth regarding Christ’s person, one finds thirty such notations in the *Blank Bible*.²⁶ These notations occur in fourteen different biblical books: ten in the Old Testament and four in the New (in which Edwards looks back to the Old).²⁷ Edwards claims that the Old Testament anticipates various aspects of the New Testament’s Christology: simple statements about Jesus’s identity, His incarnation, His identity as prophet, priest, king, and shepherd, His divine nature, His suffering and exalted states, as well as His role as the church’s head. The various types Edwards locates in the Old Testament story are similarly diverse. They include important persons and institutions, significant words and phrases, as well as key objects and events—even *seemingly* insignificant details.

In one representative note, Edwards makes two connections between Christ and Jacob’s prophecy in his comments attached to Genesis 49:24 in the *Blank Bible*.²⁸ Edwards focuses on Jacob’s comment that Joseph’s “arms... were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob,” and the authorial aside that “thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel.”²⁹ Edwards states

26. For Edwards’s Christology, see Christian T. George, “Christology,” in *The Jonathan Edwards Encyclopedia*, ed. Harry Stout, Kenneth Minkema, and Adriaan Neele (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 89–92; Michael Bush, “Jesus Christ in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards,” (PhD diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 2003); McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 244–61; James Carse, “The Christology of Jonathan Edwards,” (PhD diss., Drew University, 1967); John Gerstner, *The Rational Biblical Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Powhatan, Va.: Berea, 1992), 2.368–423; Robert Jenson, “Christology,” in *The Princeton Companion*, 72–86.

27. These books include Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Judges, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, Esther, Psalms, Isaiah, Daniel, Matthew, Mark, Acts, and Revelation.

28. For Edwards’s other Christological types in the *Blank Bible*, see his notes on Gen. 24:14; Gen. 28:11–12; Ex. 3:2–3; Ex. 25:10; Deut. 9:5; Deut. 12:5; Deut. 18:15; Deut. 24:9; Deut. 33:8; Deut. 33:16; Judg. 5:10; Judg. 13:19; 1 Sam. 23:26–28; 1 Ki. 11:3; Est. 8:2; Ps. 59; Ps. 77:15; Ps. 78:69; Ps. 78:71; Ps. 80:1; Ps. 82:8; Isa. 29:2; Isa. 53:2; Dan. 9:25; Mt. 11:11; Mk. 9:33–34; Acts 7; Acts 7:25–27; Rev. 19:13.

29. All scriptural citations are from the Authorized Version of 1611, as it was the Bible Edwards “hid in his heart.” Douglas Sweeney reminds readers that Edwards “knew the Bible’s contents better than most.” And likely “knew the bulk of them by heart.” Sweeney, “Edwards and the Bible,” 71.

that this prophecy had remarkable verification in Joshua (Numbers 13:8) and Gideon (Judges 6:11), who, Edwards notes, were Joseph's progeny and had remarkable success in war.

Edwards contends that Joshua remarkably fulfills the parenthetical statement about "the shepherd," for he led Israel like a shepherd into Canaan where he swiftly defeated their enemies. It is notable, Edwards point out, that this "rock of Israel's salvation" bears Christ's name—*Yeshua*. For the latter, Joshua also defeated the spiritual enemies of God's people and leads them into the heavenly Canaan. For this reason, Joshua "was a remarkable type of Christ, who had Christ with him, and acted by his influence, and fought by his strength, and had his spirit to guide him."³⁰ For Edwards, therefore, Christ is the true Joshua.

Soteriological Types in the *Blank Bible*

When focusing on Edwards's employment of "type" and its derivatives to connect the Old Testament to a New Testament truth regarding Christ's saving work, one finds thirty-seven such notations in the *Blank Bible*.³¹

30. WJE 24:202–3. It is likely that Edwards is here obliquely referring to the *shekinah* glory that led Israel during their wilderness sojourn. For the best treatment of Edwards's Christological interpretation of the glory-cloud, see Munk, "His Dazzling Absence." Edwards ends his typological comments by vaguely referring to how "it"—though he does not specify that to which "it" refers—"may also have respect to the ark and tabernacle being kept at Shiloh, as it was till the days of Samuel....The ark was the type and symbol of Christ, the shepherd and rock of Israel; and the tabernacle and the mercy seat over the ark was the place of his presence." Though the "it" that causes Edwards to connect the prophecy to the tabernacle in Shiloh remains unclear, it is clear that Edwards typologically connects both the ark and Joshua to Christ, given their "rocky" and "pastoral" natures.

31. For Edwards's soteriology, see Michael J. Plato, "Atonement," in *The Jonathan Edwards Encyclopedia*: 51–55; Gerstner, *Jonathan Edwards: A Mini-Theology* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 1987), 51–60; McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 244–61; Craig Biehl, *The Infinite Merit of Christ: The Glory of Christ's Obedience in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Jackson, Miss.: Reformed Academic Press, 2009); Daniel Cooley and Douglas Sweeney, "The Edwardseans and the Atonement," in *A New Divinity: Transatlantic Reformed Evangelical Debates during the Long Eighteenth Century*, ed. Mark Jones and Michael A. G. Haykin (Göttingen, V&R Publishing, 2018), 109–25; Oliver Crisp, "The Moral Government of God: Jonathan Edwards and Joseph Bellamy on the Atonement," in *After Jonathan Edwards: The Courses of the New England Theology* (Oxford University Press, 2012), 78–90; Obbie Todd, "Purchasing the Spirit: A Trinitarian Hermeneutic for Jonathan Edwards's Doctrine of the Atonement," *Puritan Reformed Journal* 10.2 (2018): 146–67; Brandon Crawford, *Jonathan Edwards on the Atonement* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2017); S. M. Hamilton, "Re-Thinking Atonement in Jonathan Edwards and New England Theology," *Perichoresis* 15.1 (2017): 85–99.

These reflections occur in seventeen biblical books.³² Edwards asserts that the Old Testament does not only anticipate several aspects of Christ's saving work on the cross (like His role as salvific victor or penal sacrifice), but it also adumbrates His ascension into heaven and regal exaltation. He also believes that Old Testament types prefigured certain soteriological doctrines, like the Son's role in election. These soteriological types in the Old Testament include important events like the flood, persons such as David and Joseph, significant things like manna, and *apparently* insignificant minutia like the priestly means of procuring olive oil.

A representative note for this category is Edwards's brief note on the soteriological significance of God's provision of clothing in Genesis 3:21.³³ He notes that Adam and Eve were clothed only "at the expense of life." These beasts "were slain...to afford them clothing to cover their nakedness." The skin of these animals, Edwards believes, was a metonymy for their life. So that, just as Job speaks of "life" given "for life" (Job 2:4), these animals were killed as a substitute for Adam and Eve. Edwards concludes, therefore, that these "beasts slain in sacrifice"—whose skins God used as clothing—typified Jesus's substitutionary death.³⁴

Edwards clarifies the specificities of this typological connection in his *Blank Bible* note appended to Exodus 26:14. There, speaking of God's same interaction with Adam and Eve, he points out that the animals' skins signified "the righteousness of Christ" with which God clothes His people. For this righteousness is obtained only by Christ "laying down his life," because He could "give us that righteousness no otherwise than giving us his own life." Thus just as the skins of slain animals clothed Adam and Eve, so, too, Christ gives "his own skin for our covering" at the expense of His own life.³⁵

32. These biblical books include Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, Psalms, Ezekiel, Zechariah, Matthew, Romans, Hebrews, and 1 Peter.

33. The text says, "Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them." For Edwards's other soteriological types in the "Interleaved Bible," see Gen. 14:5–6; Gen. 19:20–22; Gen. 28:11–12; Gen. 29:20; Gen. 33:19; Gen. 37:31; Gen. 41:40–57; Gen. 47:12; Gen. 49:18; Ex. 16:25–27; Ex. 27:20; Num. 16:48; Deut. 4:21–22; Judg. 14:5–6; Judg. 15:15; Judg. 15:18; 1 Sam. 5:4; 2 Sam. 6:12–23; 2 Sam. 8:2; 1 Ki. 14:14–15; 1 Ki. 18:33–35; 2 Ki. 2:9–13; 2 Ki. 13:21; 1 Chr. 15–16; Ps. 30; Ps. 68; Eze. 22:30; Zech. 10:11; Mt. 2:15; Rom. 5:14; Heb. 9:19–22; 1 Pet. 3:19–21.

34. WJE 24:139. For further discussion of this passage, see Steven Borgman, "Jonathan Edwards (1703–1758) On the Book of Genesis" (ThM thesis, Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary, 2020), 85–86.

35. WJE 24:241–42.

Edwards implies, therefore, that this story adumbrates Christ's giving up His life in order to clothe His church with His righteousness.

The *Blank Bible's* Ecclesiological Typology

After Edwards's Christological/soteriological types, his notes that connect an Old Testament type to an ecclesiological antitype are his next largest grouping of notations in the "Interleaved Bible."³⁶ Edwards's ecclesiological typology accounts for forty-seven notations in his note-taking Bible.³⁷ There are four categories into which these notations broadly fall: general types of the church, types of the Gentile church, types of the Jewish church, and "functional" ecclesiological antitypes. This last group of notations are functional in the sense of what Edwards believes the church should do, what God has done with/in it, or what events may transpire in the church. The types Edwards locates in this category are quite diverse. He asserts that events like the infant Moses's preservation in the Nile, seemingly insignificant things like the Law's rules for leprous houses, and important women like Rebecca, Rachel, and Mary all typify the church.

An interesting example from this group is the note Edwards appends to Stephen's speech in Acts 7.³⁸ Edwards focuses on the part of Stephen's

36. Benjamin Wayman also addresses this topic in his "Women as Types of the Church." He argues that Edwards's ecclesiological typology in the *Blank Bible* overwhelmingly focuses on female types. This is why he refers to Edwards's typology as "feminine." This author believes, though, that Wayman's conclusions are over-stated and off-base since his research missed a significant amount of other notes in the *Blank Bible* that speak of non-feminine, ecclesiological types. For a full treatment of his work, see the fifth chapter of my dissertation.

37. For Edwards's ecclesiology, see Sweeney, "The Church," in *The Princeton Companion to Jonathan Edwards*, 167–89; Rhys S. Bezzant, *Jonathan Edwards and the Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014); Amy Plantinga-Pauw, "Jonathan Edwards' Ecclesiology," in *Jonathan Edwards as Contemporary: Essays in Honor of Sang Hyun Lee*, ed. Don Schweitzer (New York: Peter Lang, 2010), 175–86; Holmes, *God of Grace*, 169–97; Thomas Schafer, "Jonathan Edwards' Conception of the Church," *Church History* 24 (1955): 51–66; Krister Sairsingh, "Jonathan Edwards and the Idea of Divine Glory: His Foundational Trinitarianism and its Ecclesial Import" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1986), 214–81.

38. For Edwards's other ecclesiological-typological notes in the *Blank Bible*, see Gen. 2:22; Gen. 3:7–8; Gen. 4; Gen. 7:1; Gen. 11:14; Gen. 15:5; Gen. 16:4; Gen. 16:9; Gen. 19:20–22; Gen. 24; Gen. 28:11–12; Gen. 29:9–10; Ex. 2:10; Ex. 3:13; Ex. 4:22; Ex. 7:11; Ex. 14:22; Ex. 24:1–11; Ex. 25:10; Ex. 26:14; Lev. 14:34; Num. 10:10; Num. 21:18; Num. 24:17; Num. 24:23–24; Num. 35:11–15; Jos. 2:18–19; Judg. 14:20; 1 Ki. 4:34; 1 Ki. 10:1–14; 1 Ki. 11:3; 1 Chr. 4:9–10; 1 Chr. 21:18; 1 Chr. 25:9–31; Neh. 4:2; Neh. 8:16–17; Ps. 37:11; Cant. 1:9; Isa. 28:9–11; Isa. 61:8; Jer. 22:19; Eze. 5:1–14; Amos 6:6; Mk. 6:40; Lk. 1:35; Acts 7:16.

speech where he mentions Israel's placing the bodies of their deceased patriarchs in Abraham's burial plot (Acts 7:16). Edwards muses over the typological significance of the deceased patriarchs having been laid to rest in Canaan after first sojourning through the wilderness.³⁹

Edwards points out that this "was the only land [Abraham] owned in Canaan," since he was still a landless "stranger and sojourner," even after he purchased the field. This seemingly insignificant detail is the soil from which Edwards's typological thinking springs. He writes that "the patriarchs' being buried there, and being carried up out of Egypt to Canaan... [to] rest there, seems to typify that the saints, when they die, go to heaven, the true Canaan, and rest there." So Jacob's desire to be buried in Canaan was an "earnest to his posterity that they should have [it] for a possession."

Edwards then compares Jacob's actions to Jesus. He writes that Christ was also "an earnest" to His spiritual progeny "that they should have [heaven] for a possession," since He first entered into it on account of His death. In Edwards's mind, therefore, just as the Israelites entered into Canaan with their forefathers' bones, "so the spiritual Israel enters into heaven by Christ's death." Edwards thus argues that not only can one find general, ecclesial types buried in the Hebrew Scriptures, but one can unearth truths regarding the saints' ultimate resting place as well. Edwards's close reading of the Hebrew Scriptures allows the reader to appreciate that his "typological readings of Scripture were not detached from the literal" but were extensions of it.⁴⁰

Edwards's "Intra"-Old Testament Typology in the *Blank Bible*

In the "Interleaved Bible," Edwards states that not only do Old Testament types look forward to New Testament antitypes, but some have a shorter antitypical gaze. That is to say, Edwards composed fifteen notations in the *Blank Bible* in which he states that an earlier part of the Old Testament typified a later part of the Old Testament. He speaks of these Old Testament type/antitype pairs in eleven Hebrew books.⁴¹

39. The relevant verses read, "So Jacob went down into Egypt, and died, he, and our fathers. And were carried over into Sychem, and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor the father of Sychem."

40. WJE 24:973; Barshinger, "The Only Rule of Our Faith and Practice: Jonathan Edwards' Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah as a Case Study of His Exegetical Boundaries," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52 (December 2009): 823–24.

41. These are Exodus, Genesis, and Numbers, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, Psalms, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel, and Zechariah.

These notations fall into two broad categories. Eight notes speak of typical things/events that absolve in later antitypical things/events, while seven others speak of types that absolve in later prophecies. The types of the first group include, for example, Melchizedek's blessing, Jacob's injured thigh, and the infant Moses's preservation in the Nile. This section's antitypes include events like Abram's God-centered blessing, Jacob's afflicted life, and Israel's preservation in Egypt. In the latter seven examples, Edwards's types include events like the stricken rock of Exodus 17, Hannah's song in 1 Samuel, and the sun-filled day of Joshua 10. The antitypical prophecies to which they look include the writings of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, and Zechariah.

An interesting example from this set of notations is Edwards's compact, but significant, "intra"-Old Testament connection in his inter-textual treatment of Exodus 17:6.⁴² Edwards writes, "The rock was smitten in order to afford water; so Christ was smitten and suffered in order to afford us his blood and [the] Holy Spirit.... What we have an account of in this verse is also typical of what is prophesied of in Isaiah 35:6-7, and Isaiah 41:18, and Isaiah 43:19-20, and is also typical of 'rivers of living water' flowing out of the heart when it is smitten (Jn. 7:38-39)." He then notes that these waters are akin to the waters proceeding from Ezekiel's temple (Ezek. 47:1) and the "river of water of life" in Revelation 22, for in each of these places water pours forth from God's throne.⁴³

Edwards believes that Moses's smitten rock has enduring typological value, since, on his interpretation, the prophets and New Testament writers employ this story's language and imagery to convey the theological significance of the "new thing" God would do in the "latter days." Where modern authors might refer to this phenomenon of "textual development" as "intertextuality" or "inner-biblical exegesis," Edwards employs the word "typical" to describe this relationship of the Old Testament's earlier and later texts.⁴⁴

42. God says "I will stand before thee upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink." For Edwards's other "intra"-Old Testament types, see his notes on Gen. 15:1; Gen. 32:21; Gen. 39:4-6; Ex. 2:10; Ex. 34:1; Num. 10:35-36; Judg. 14:20; 1 Sam. 2:1-10; 2 Sam. 8:13; Ps. 51:18-19; Isa. 37:7; Eze. 46:15; Joel 3:2; Zech. 6:14-15.

43. WJE 24:229-30. For modern arguments concerning later biblical authors' typological interpretation of Exodus, see John Day, "Prophecy," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 39-55; Bernhard Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. Bernhard Anderson and Walter Harrelson (New York: Harper Brothers, 1962), 177-95.

44. It is not surprising to find Edwards describing intertextuality in this manner, since

Edwards “hypothesized a gradual typological unfolding through the Old Testament” which yet “typified future events of some magnitude.”⁴⁵

In the texts to which Edwards appeals (Isa. 35:6–7, 41:18, and 43:19–20), Isaiah employs language that recalls Exodus’s smitten rock, the wilderness wanderings, and divine visitation to describe the similar, yet distinct, way in which God will work in the “latter days.” Edwards believes, therefore, that Isaiah typologically interpreted Exodus’s events and borrowed its language to describe God’s future salvation.⁴⁶ In addition, Edwards states that *both* the smitten rock and Isaiah’s prophecies looked forward typologically and prophetically to God’s “new thing” in the eschatological era. This, on this interpretation, one best understands in view of God’s provision of flowing water from a smitten rock, since they both anticipate God’s eschatological throne from whence He will satisfy the souls of His saints with spiritual water.

Edwards’s “Intra”-New Testament Typology in the *Blank Bible*

The *Blank Bible* also unveils another peculiar aspect of Edwards’s biblical typology. That is, America’s theologian believes that types *are not* only the purview of the Old Testament, *nor* antitypes *exclusively* the New Testament’s purview either. In seventeen notes within the “Interleaved Bible,” Edwards speaks of type–antitype pairs that the New Testament strictly

the prophets’ “intensified” employment of Exodus 17’s language and imagery exemplifies their belief that God was working, or would work, in a way comparable to earlier stages of redemptive history. Seen from this perspective, “intertextuality” sounds like biblical typology, given its similar and dissimilar employment of “sacred history” to describe events or persons in later contexts. For treatments of typology and intertextuality, see Paul Koptak, “Intertextuality” in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. Kevin Vanhoozer, et. al (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 332–34; G. K. Beale, “Positive Answer to the Question: Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts,” in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 391–98; Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 14–33; Bryan Estelle, *Echoes of Exodus: Tracing a Biblical Motif* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2018), 8–60; D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, eds., *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

45. Batschelet, “Jonathan Edwards’ Use of Typology,” 121–22.

46. Isaiah prophecies, “In the wilderness shall waters break out... And the parched ground shall become a pool... I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the valleys; I will make... the dry land springs of water... I will do a new thing; now it shall spring forth... I will make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert... I give... rivers in the desert to give drink to my people.”

contains within itself. Edwards left two such notes in his notes on the Old Testament, which looked forward to New Testament events. The other fifteen are found in the latter Testament.⁴⁷ These notations situate into eight general categories. These include his principled statements about New Testament typology, New Testament types in Old Testament notes, types of Christ's preaching, the typological witness of Christ washing His disciples' feet, types of Christ's redemption, ecclesiological types, and types of heaven and sin.

A helpful example to consider is one of Edwards's notes that justifies his conception of New Testament typology by appealing to the New Testament authors' figurative interpretations of the events of their own era. His note on John 9:7 highlights his conviction.⁴⁸ In John 9:7, Christ commands a blind man to wash his eyes in the "pool of Siloam." The apostle John then parenthetically adds "which is by interpretation, Sent." Edwards focuses on the apostle's etymological interpretation of the pool's name, and draws two principles from this brief verse. First, he postulates that "the facts related in the history of Christ in the New Testament are typical or mystical, as well as the facts of the history of the Old Testament." Second, he states that "the Holy Spirit makes account of the signification of names in order to instruct the church in divine matters."⁴⁹ Much to the reader's consternation, though, Edwards does not clarify why John 9:7 confirms his observation about the New Testament's typological witness.

However, in his other exegetical notebook, "Types," Edwards provides a small window into his thinking.⁵⁰ Edwards begins by glossing the text. He renders it "which is by *signification*, Sent." He then states that "evidently

47. The Old Testament books are Psalms and Isaiah; the New Testament biblical books include Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and 1 Corinthians.

48. For a helpful treatment of Edwards's treatment of this verse, see Michael McClymond, "Of His Fullness Have All We Received': Johannine Themes in Jonathan Edwards' Interpretation of Scripture," in *Jonathan Edwards & Scripture*, 169. McClymond comments that this text shows that for Edwards "there is a fullness of meaning in the events of Jesus' life."

49. WJE 24:945. For Edwards's other type-antitype pairs in the New Testament, see Ps. 93:3; Isa. 7:14; his first note before Mt. 1:1; Mt. 11:5; Mt. 11:11; Mt. 27:7; Mt. 27:26; Mt. 27:35; Mk. 9:33-34; Mk. 14:3; Lk. 1:35; Lk. 22:50-51; Jn. 5:1-4; Jn. 13:4; Jn. 18:8; 1 Cor. 5:7.

50. One finds "Types" in WJE 11:146-54. For an introduction to this small notebook, see the "Editor's Introduction" in that same volume, WJE 11:3-33. For a treatment of this notebook's importance in discussions about Edwards's biblical typology, see my "How Scripture Justifies Jonathan Edwards's Typological View of the Old Testament," in *The Miscellanies Reader, Volume 2*, ed. Robert Boss (Dallas: JESociety Press, 2021).

weight is laid on the interpretation of the word 'signified.'" Edwards believes, therefore, that John *intended* for his readers to find typological significance in the pool's name, given his authorial insertion. Further, drawing on the context of John's ninth chapter in which he ironically contrasts physical and spiritual blindness/sight, Edwards deduces that this pool "was typical of that fount of grace and mercy that is in Christ." As Edwards says in the *Blank Bible* note he appends to Isaiah 8:6, Christ, like "the pool of Siloam," is "living water" who "restores sight to the blind."⁵¹

On Edwards's read, therefore, this story underscores, given how John tries to bring out the "spiritual significance" of the pool's name, that New Testament authors found typological significance in things of their own day. For this reason, Edwards believes it reasonable to "observe" that John 9:7 proves that the "history of Christ in the New Testament" is also "typical." Just as is "the history of the Old." So, for Edwards "the life of Christ in the New Testament also contains typological significance."⁵²

The Eschatological Typology of the "Interleaved Bible"

Jonathan Edwards's fascination with the eschatological is well documented.⁵³ It is not as well known that Edwards's eschatological curiosity extended to his typological understanding of the Jewish scriptures. The *Blank Bible* highlights that Edwards's Old Testament types did not only point forward to the New Testament's events and persons, but also to antitypes that will appear in the "last days" of the present era and in the heavenly age to come.

51. WJE 11:146; WJE 24:638. Edwards likely makes this connection between a cleansing pool and a spiritual "fount" in Christ because he finds that the blind man's physical ocular washing prefigured his spiritual ocular washing, since he was the only one in the chapter to believe in Jesus. For a treatment of Edwards's thoughts on Isaiah 8:6, see Yoo, "Edwards' Interpretation of the Major Prophets," 177–78.

52. Yoo, "Edwards' Interpretation of the Major Prophets," 174–75.

53. For Edwards's eschatology, see Stein, "Editor's Introduction," in *Apocalyptic Writings*, vol. 5 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Stephen Stein (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), 1–94; Stein, "Eschatology," in *The Princeton Companion*, 226–42; McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 566–79; C. C. Goen, "Jonathan Edwards: A New Departure in Eschatology," *Church History* 28 (1959): 25–40; John Wilson, "History, Redemption, and the Millennium," in *Jonathan Edwards and the American Experience*, 131–41; McDermott, *One Holy and Happy Society: The Public Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 37–92; Brandon Withrow, "A Future of Hope: Jonathan Edwards and Millennial Expectations," *Trinity Journal* 22 (Spring 2001): 75–98; Zakai, *Edwards's Philosophy of History*, 182–306; Mark Rogers, "A Missional Eschatology: Jonathan Edwards, Future Prophecy, and the Spread of the Gospel," *Fides et Historia* 41 (Winter 2009): 23–46.

When concentrating on Edwards's use of "type" and its derivatives to connect the Old Testament to the eschaton, one finds twenty-nine such notations in the *Blank Bible*. This makes eschatology Edwards's third-most favored antitype behind Christ's person and work (sixty-seven notes) and ecclesiology (forty-seven notations). These twenty-nine notations occur in nineteen biblical books.⁵⁴ Edwards's antitypes include events and persons in the "last days," eschatological judgment and hell, and heaven and its eternal rest. His types include events like the flood; places like Egypt, Mount Sinai, and Daniel's lions' den; and people such as Absalom. The space Edwards devotes to these types suggests that typology informed a critical "aspect" of his theology of the "millennial era" and the one to come.⁵⁵

One of Edwards's most interesting typological connections from this group is his four page note on the eschatological–typological significance of Absalom's usurpation of David's throne.⁵⁶ He extrapolates at length about the various ways in which "Absalom seems to be a type of [the] Antichrist." In all, Edwards draws fourteen comparisons between them. To ground these comparisons in the biblical text, Edwards quotes and/or cites Scripture fifty times.

Edwards connects several of the comparisons to Absalom and the Antichrist's shared personality traits. First, for example, Edwards notes that just as Absalom was a "son of David," so too will the "man of sin" be a "son of Christ," for he will have formally been "one of the ministers of the gospel."⁵⁷ Furthermore, just as Absalom was known for his distinguished beauty, so too others will admire the Antichrist for his extravagance, for he will appear

54. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Judges, 2 Samuel, 2 Chronicles, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, Romans, Hebrews, 2 Peter, Jude, and Revelation.

55. Munk, "Types of the Peaceable Kingdom," 218.

56. For Edwards's other eschatological types in the *Blank Bible*, see his notes on Gen. 7; Gen. 23; Gen. 41:40–57; Ex. 9:10; Ex. 24:10; Ex. 34; Lev. 9:22–23; Deut. 2:34; Deut. 4:36; Judg. 5:14; Judg. 5:20; 2 Sam. 23:39; 2 Chr. 5:12–14; Job 26:5; Isa. 11:10; Isa. 21:1; Isa. 34:5; Jer. 16:13; Dan. 3:1; Dan. 6:22; Zech. 14:4–5; Rom. 8:23; Heb. 9:24; 2 Pet. 3:6–7; Jude 4; Rev. 4:4; Rev. 15:3.

57. Edwards implies that the Antichrist will have once been a Protestant minister who eventually joins the Catholic Church. For Edwards and the Catholic Church, see Stein, "A Notebook on the Apocalypse by Jonathan Edwards," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 29 (1972): 623–34; Stein, "Jonathan Edwards' Reflections on the Virgin Mary," in *Jonathan Edwards & Scripture*; Clyde Holbrook, *Jonathan Edwards, the Valley and Nature: An Interpretive Essay* (Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press, 1987), 89–91; Helen P. Westra, "Confronting Antichrist: The Influence of Jonathan Edwards's Millennial Vision," in *The Stowe Debate: Rhetorical Strategies in Uncle Tom's Cabin*, ed. Mason Lowance (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), 141–58.

“in exceeding external pomp and glory, decked with gold and silver.” Even Absalom’s “exceeding fruitful” hair—in which he gloried—prefigured the Antichrist’s exceedingly subtle and mischievous dealings. This hair, however, proved to be “his destruction.” In much the same manner, the Antichrist, though he will glory in his craftiness, will “finally be ruined” by it.

Edwards also notes various points in Absalom’s story that typify the Antichrist’s actions in his era of sin. For example, just as Absalom was David’s son by a Gentile woman, so the Antichrist will mix Christianity with heathenism. Furthermore, the Antichrist—whom Edwards identifies as the pope—will try to usurp Christ’s authority in the “spiritual Jerusalem,” just as Absalom stole his father’s kingdom.⁵⁸ Edwards also points out that Absalom “cloaked” this rebellion “with a pretense of religion.” So, too, the Antichrist will pretend “service to God.”⁵⁹

Further, when Absalom rebelled against his father, he drove David and his followers from Jerusalem. In a similar manner, when the Antichrist rebels he will “cast out of the church all the true and faithful followers of Christ.” In so doing, Absalom drove his father and his men out into the wilderness. Edwards notes that the church is also “represented as flying away into the wilderness” to take shelter during the Antichrist’s reign (Rev. 12:14). After Absalom succeeded in this endeavor, Jerusalem was “given up to [him] and his multitude,” who trod it down. Edwards points out that this is “agreeable to the description of the time of Antichrist,” when Christ’s enemies “shall tread under foot” the “holy city” (Rev. 11:2).

Absalom slept with his father’s concubines. So too, will the Antichrist defile “the church that is bound to Christ as his spouse.” But, just as Absalom only slept with his father’s concubines—not his “true wives”—so, too, during the Antichrist’s reign, he will not defile Christ’s “true followers.” The Antichrist will successfully smite the church, though, with “great affliction and sorrow,” just as “the time of Absalom’s usurpation is represented as a time of great affliction.” Part of David’s intense affliction was the great

58. Stephen Stein points out that Edwards’s identification of the pope with the Antichrist was “traditional” for Protestant interpreters of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Stein, “Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards on the Number of the Beast: Eighteenth Century Speculation about the Antichrist,” *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 84 (October 1974): 293–315.

59. For Edwards’s understanding of the pope’s role in the “last days,” see Fred Beuttler, “Jonathan Edwards and the Critical Assaults on the Bible” (MA thesis, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1988), 143–44.

reproaches with which others maligned him. These, Edwards points out, aptly prefigure “the great blasphemies of [the] Antichrist.”

Absalom did not finally succeed, though, and was eventually killed and “cast into a great pit.” David’s men piled a great heap of stones over this pit as a lasting monument to his ruin. Edwards believes that this prefigured the bottomless pit into which God will cast the Antichrist, from which the smoke of its torment will ascend forever.⁶⁰

Edwards’s Ontological Typology in the *Blank Bible*

In his “Interleaved Bible,” Edwards left several notations which underscore that his ontological typology is not solely the purview of his other notebook, “Images of Divine Things.”⁶¹ In his *Blank Bible*, he left a large handful of notations that fuse his ontological and biblical typologies. Edwards scattered eighteen such notations across his note-taking Bible, placing them in twelve biblical books from Genesis to Revelation.⁶² The biblical–ontological types he locates include the stars, hair, the Nile, grapes, wheat, and the sun. He asserts that these types find their antitypical fulfillment in Christ’s person and work, institutions like the church, or places like hell. These eighteen notations fall into five categories: Edwards’s luminary types, the sun’s various antitypes, types of Christ’s person and work, natural types of the church and Christian life, and types of hell and final judgement.⁶³

Edwards’s thoughts on God’s promise to Abram in Genesis 15 are an important and representative notation from this group. In this note,

60. WJE 24:365–69. Edwards ends by noting how David’s “joyful triumphant song of praise” (2 Sam. 22) “agrees much better with the description of the great things God did for his church in the destruction of Antichrist” than anything of his own day.

61. WJE 11:50–142.

62. Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, 2 Kings, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Luke, and Revelation.

63. In “Images” no. 156, Edwards provides two additional categories into which the reader can group these reflections. He notes, on the one hand, there are “spiritual mysteries” that are “typified in the constitution of the natural world,” which rely on the interpreter’s eye with Scripture’s aid. Ten of these notations fall into this category. On the other hand, one finds “onto-types” when Scripture “makes application of the signs and types in the book of nature as representations of spiritual mysteries.” Six of his notations discuss such biblical application of “onto-types.” These categories highlight the different ways Edwards appropriated the Scriptures in his musings on natural typology, emphasizing Scripture’s critical role in his theology of ontological typology. Paul Helm comments similarly that Edwards “took seriously the Bible’s imagery,” and regarded “biblical language not as rhetorical embellishment, but as types intended to convey truth.” Helm, “Introduction,” in *Treatise on Grace and other Posthumously Published Writings*, ed. Paul Helm (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1971), 17.

Edwards reflects on God's "making application" of worldly types in His promise to Abraham in which He likens the patriarch's descendants to the stars (Gen. 15:5).⁶⁴ Edwards, writing of the luminaries' typological significance, states, "The stars were designed to be a type of the saints, the spiritual seed of Abraham. The seeming multitude of them, which is much greater than the real multitude of visible stars, was designed as a type of the multitude of the saints." Three things here are worthy of note. First is Edwards's comment that the stars typified Abraham's "spiritual seed" *in and of themselves*. Second is how Edwards implies that the stars suitably signify the saints. That is, just as the "real multitude" of stars outnumbers "the visible stars," so too, the "real multitude" of saints outnumbers Christians "visible" to the eye.⁶⁵

Third, Edwards states significantly that God *designed* the stars to communicate this truth. Edwards helps the reader understand what "designed" means in "Images" no. 130. Speaking of Paul's use of the human body to describe the church, Edwards asserts that Paul argues "from what is in the body to what should be in the mystical body...[to] show that something further than mere illustration is intended. It shows that [one] is a real type...of the other; otherwise his arguments can't be so forcible."⁶⁶ Edwards is thus claiming that Paul does not employ this metaphor *merely* because it corresponds with what he *already* had in mind about the church. Rather, Paul speaks this way about the "embodied" church because there is a divinely intended semantic connection between the human body and the church.

If one has the eyes to see, therefore, he will perceive in the "shadowy" human body a picture of the "true spiritual understanding" of the unity and diversity of God's ecclesial body.⁶⁷ Paul compares the church to a body,

64. Genesis states, "God brought Abram abroad, saying, 'Look toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them.' And he said unto him, 'So shall thy seed be.'" For Edwards's other ontological types in the *Blank Bible*, see his notes on Gen. 24:25; Gen. 32:24–30; Ex. 4:9; Ex. 20:25; Num. 6:5; Num. 10:10; Deut. 20:19; Deut. 21:23; Deut. 32:14; Josh. 3:16; Josh. 10:13; 2 Ki. 4:41; Job 38:13; Ps. 68:18; Prov. 30:15–16; Isa. 38:5–8; Lk. 23:43; Rev. 19:17.

65. WJE 24:157. A text like Revelation 7:9 likely informs Edwards's conviction of the type's biblical basis: "I beheld a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, people, and tongues, standing before the throne, and before the Lamb."

66. WJE 11:98.

67. Ryan Hoselton, "Jonathan Edwards, The Inner Witness of the Spirit, and Experiential Exegesis," *Jonathan Edwards Studies* 5, no. 2 (2015): 90–120. Hoselton helpfully argues that "Edwards' point was that the spiritual sense gave the interpreter new access to

therefore, because the body “is a real type” of the church. The Corinthians *ought* to live as a united, diversified whole, consequently, because in so doing they “actualize” their bodies’ “semantic,” typological destinies.⁶⁸

Returning to Edwards’s *Blank Bible*, this entails that Edwards believes God pointed Abram to the stars not *merely* because they helpfully analogized His promise, but because He *designed* the stars to communicate this truth about His spiritual progeny.⁶⁹ Then, as Abram believed God’s promise, God counted it to him as righteousness, which served as the means of his and the luminaries’ “actualization.” There was a kind of “sermon [written] in the stars,” therefore, regarding Abraham’s descendants.⁷⁰

Types of “Christian Spirituality” in the *Blank Bible*

Not all of Edwards’s Old Testament types looked forward to historical, concrete antitypes in the “Interleaved Bible.” In a few different places in his *Blank Bible*, Edwards details how the Hebrew Scriptures adumbrated trans-temporal, spiritual truths about the Christian life and experience. These are Edwards’s types for “Christian spirituality.” This grouping of notations underscores that just as “spirituality was central to [Edwards’s] life,” so, too, Christian spirituality played an important role in his biblical typology.⁷¹

the experience of Scripture’s divine moral and aesthetic qualities—not to understanding Scripture’s hidden spiritual meaning.”

68. Sang Lee, *The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards: Expanded Edition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 92–93. Lee argues that “only via human perception [do] all the relations to which a material entity itself tends become explicit. So when Edwards writes about...types of certain divine things, he is functioning as a medium through which material entities [actualize].”

69. Lisanne Winslow similarly says that for Edwards “types are not mere human assignments, but are ontologically real since they represent ideas in God’s mind, which are also real...they point to the divine things they foreshadow.” Winslow, “A Great and Remarkable Analogy,” 223.

70. Gerald McDermott, “Jonathan Edwards, John Henry Newman, and Non-Christian Religions,” in *Jonathan Edwards, Philosophical Theologian*, ed. Paul Helm and Oliver Crisp (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2003), 128.

71. William Van Vlastuin, “Spirituality,” in *The Jonathan Edwards Encyclopedia*, 543–45. For an introduction to Edwards’s spirituality and spiritual practices, see Jonathan Edwards, *Spiritual Writings: The Classics of Western Spirituality*, eds. Kyle Strobel, Adriaan Neele, and Kenneth Minkema (New York: Paulist Press, 2019); Kyle Strobel, *Formed for the Glory of God: Learning from the Spiritual Practices of Jonathan Edwards* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2013); C. J. Viscardi, “Signs of Authenticity: A Study in the Spirituality of Jonathan Edwards” (STD diss., Pontifical Gregorian University, 1979); David Weddle, “The Melancholy Saint: Jonathan Edwards’s Interpretation of David Brainerd as a Model of Evangelical Spirituality,” *Harvard Theological Review* 81 (July 1988): 297–318; Gerald McDermott,

When concentrating on Edwards's employment of a word from the "type" family to connect the Hebrew Scriptures to an aspect of Christian spirituality, one finds fourteen such notations. These exegetical notes occur in seven biblical books across the Jewish Canon, as well as one note in a Gospel that looks back to the Old Testament.⁷² There are four broad antitypical categories to which these types point: a Christian's experience of regeneration and conversion, the believer's practice of repentance, the Christian life's journey-like nature, and the place of faith in Christian practice. His types include events like Lot's wife becoming a salt pillar, the golden calf, and Elisha's miracles, as well as individuals such as Ittai the Philistine or Ruth the Moabite, and even the Rechabite Jonadab's abstinent command to his descendants.

One of Edwards's more detailed notes from this group is his thoughts on the typological significance of Moses's statement that the Israelites's clothing "waxed not old" during their wilderness journey (Deut. 8:4).⁷³ Edwards argues that this statement's peculiar nature, granted Israel's wilderness wanderings, makes it very likely that God's preservation of Israel's clothing and feet "was a type of the durability of the spiritual clothing of the spiritual Israel in their journey through the wilderness of this world towards the heavenly Canaan."

Edwards provides several lines of reasoning for this typological connection's legitimacy. First, he notes that "the saints' righteousness is often represented as their clothing."⁷⁴ Next, he highlights the peculiarity of the statement "neither did thy foot swell." He notes that if the peoples' feet had swollen "they would not have been able to go any further." But, he points out, "it seems no very remarkable thing that their foot did not swell," for a great lot of the time "they lay still" and did not set foot out of camp. And when they did set out with God at their head, "it is probable it was not by long journeys," but only as long as the "women and children could bear." So,

"Jonathan Edwards on Revival, Spiritual Discernment, and God's Beauty," *Reformation and Revival* 6 (Winter 1997): 103–14; and McClymond and McDermott, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 60–76.

72. These are Genesis, Deuteronomy, 2 Samuel, 2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Matthew.

73. For Edwards's other types of "Christian spirituality," see his notes on Gen. 3:16; Gen. 19:26; Gen. 28:11–12; Deut. 8:4; Deut. 9:21; Deut. 21:11–13; 2 Sam. 15:21; 2 Ki. 4:34; 2 Ki. 5:14; Isa. 30:2; Jer. 35:6–8; Jer. 50:8; Mt. 24:17–18.

74. Edwards did not provide any such citations, but it is not for lack of examples. There are several places in the New Testament in which the authors figuratively link clothing itself, or one's "putting on clothing," with the Christian life (Rom. 13:14; Gal. 3:27; Eph. 4:22–24; Col. 2:11, 3:12–14; 1 Thess. 5:8).

Edwards reasons, it is probable that the Israelites traveled such distances during those forty years “that is common for men of settled habitation to travel in such a space of time.”

Edwards deduces, therefore, that the “chief reason” Moses made this remark about God’s preservation is “because it was a type.” This preservation, given the nature of their journey, therefore, “was in itself remarkable on no other account” than its typological witness. So Moses highlights that God kept their feet from “swelling” in order to typify that Christians “shall be enabled to hold on his way.” For God will “keep the feet of his saints, and establish their goings.” Further, their journey was portrayed as “exceeding rough” in order to adumbrate the rough “way of the saints towards heaven,” for this path is “full of difficulties and obstacles.” But God will work in their spirits and wills such that He “will enable ’em to go through ’em all.”⁷⁵ For Edwards, therefore, “the entire scope of the Christian’s journey—from bondage in the hands of God’s enemies to the warm embrace of divine redemptive presence in Christ—is envisioned in [his] interpretation of Israel’s voyage.”⁷⁶

The Demonic and Satanic Types of the *Blank Bible*

One of Edwards’s more intriguing antitypical categories in his “Interleaved Bible” are his ten notes that typologically connect the Hebrew Bible with Satan and his demons.⁷⁷ Edwards’s typological eye focuses on a few Old Testament characters: the pharaohs, the leviathan, and the prince of Tyre. He highlights that the former testament does not only adumbrate Satan himself, but it even typifies his defeat at the cross and his kingdom’s final destruction. These notations therefore solidify Christopher Reaske’s thesis that the Bible is Edwards’s “most important source” for understanding Satan.⁷⁸

In an intriguing constellation of notations, Edwards typologically connects the leviathan with Satan. In his note summarizing the fortieth and forty-first chapters of Job, he asserts that the leviathan signifies “water monsters” which Job cannot subdue.⁷⁹ These great beasts of the deep, Edwards

75. WJE 24:291.

76. Detrich, “A Recital of Presence,” 235.

77. For Edwards on Satan, see Kamil Halambiec, “Satan,” in *The Jonathan Edwards Encyclopedia*, 509–10; Christopher Reaske, “The Devil and Jonathan Edwards,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33 (January 1972): 123–38; Amy Plantinga-Pauw, “Where Theologians Fear to Tread,” *Modern Theology* 16 (January 2000): 38–59.

78. Reaske, “The Devil and Jonathan Edwards,” 124.

79. For Edwards’s other devilish type–antitype pairs, see his notes on Gen. 14:5–6; Ex. 1:16, 22; Josh. 3:16; Dan. 6:22; Hos. 2:15; Mt. 18:10.

states, are “types of the Devil...the chief of God’s proud and haughty enemies,” who is “king over all the children of pride” (Job 41:34). Edwards notes that this is a peculiar moral description of an amoral animal.⁸⁰

Edwards states in his other note on that verse (Job 41:34) that one should therefore understand this phrase “mystically.” Namely, one should interpret it as a reference to “he whom the leviathan was a type of, Satan, [who] is king over all the children of pride.”⁸¹ This is reasonable given Edwards’s “depiction of the devil,” since he views him as the ultimate “confluence of pride and hatred.”⁸²

In another note on Job’s forty-first chapter, Edwards states explicitly why Job’s language makes this typological connection likely. He appends his thoughts to God’s statement about the leviathan that “who hath prevented me, that I should repay him” (Job 41:11). Edwards points out that this is a moral injunction spoken to a beastly animal. And “no leviathan was ever subject to God’s moral government, or ever rebelled against him that God should repay him.” Thus Edwards concludes that “these words are great evidence that leviathan is a type of the devil.”⁸³

Edwards then provides the scriptural scaffolding for these typological connections in his fourth note on the leviathan and Satan. He appends these thoughts to Psalm 74:13–14, focusing on the psalmist’s description of God as the one who, in the exodus, “brakest the heads of leviathan in pieces.”⁸⁴ Edwards asserts that the psalmist clarifies that God “obtained a signal victory over Satan, that old serpent, the leviathan, that crooked serpent, when he overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea.”⁸⁵

Edwards then ties these various serpentine characters together. He comments that the language of “breaking the head” of a serpent-like character partially “fulfilled that curse on the old serpent” (Gen. 3:15). For the “dragon is a serpent.”⁸⁶ He also points out that the “leviathan” — whose head God also “brakest” — is a serpent. Edwards appeals to Isaiah 27:1 for proof,

80. WJE 24:470.

81. WJE 24:471.

82. Plantinga-Pauw, “Where Theologians Fear to Tread,” 47.

83. WJE 24:472.

84. For more of Edwards’s further reflections on the typological connections of the leviathan/serpent with the Devil, see WJE 10:78; 11:212; 15:449; 18:56, 273, 303, 507; 20:183; 25:213.

85. WJE 24:511. For additional treatment of Edwards’s confluence of sea-creature imagery with the Devil, see Chamberlain, “A Fish Tale,” 159–161.

86. Edwards also appeals to Isaiah’s description of God as He who “cut Rahab, and wounded the dragon” (Isa. 51:9).

since here the prophet describes the leviathan as “the piercing, crooked serpent.” So, Edwards reasons, the cursed serpent in Genesis 3 is “the same serpent whose head God is said to have broken,” which “was the devil.” Thus, Edwards deduces, the “pharaoh of Egypt was typically that dragon and leviathan” whom God triumphed over while redeeming his people.⁸⁷

This is why, Edwards reasons, the psalmist likens Pharaoh to the leviathan and dragon. God did not merely triumph over the North-African king, but God actually triumphed over the Devil in the exodus—whom the pharaoh typified. Edwards asserts, therefore, that this incipiently fulfilled the “bruising of his head that was threatened” in Genesis 3. So, Edwards believes, the psalmist describes the type (Pharaoh) in the language metaphorically applied to the antitype (Satan), to further solidify the typological connection. In Edwards’s reading, consequently, he finds a constellation of similar language describing Satan and Pharaoh, who are typologically connected through the leviathan–dragon imagery. He believes that this is exemplified in Scripture’s employment of such imagery to describe Satan and the pharaohs in divers places. This entails that the leviathan, dragon, and the pharaohs are types of the devil.⁸⁸

Types for Sin in the *Blank Bible*

In five “Interleaved Bible” notes, Edwards speaks of various types for sin.⁸⁹ He twice appeals to leaven as an embodiment of sin’s multiplying, souring corruption. He also believes that blood, Egyptian task-slavers, and sexual intimacy are types of sin.

One of this group’s more detailed notes is Edwards’s reflection on the typological connection of leaven with sin.⁹⁰ Edwards details leaven and sin’s typological connections in his “Interleaved Bible” note appended to the prophet Hosea’s likening of Israel to a baker’s baking of bread (Hos. 7:4). Edwards points out that here, “as is common in Scripture,” the author compares sinful Israel to two things: “an oven heated,” and “the dough leavened, and kneaded, and so fitted to be cast into the hot oven.”

87. WJE 24:511.

88. WJE 24:511.

89. For an introduction to Edwards’s hamartiology, see his *Original Sin*, vol. 3 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed. Clyde Holbrook (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 102–437; Clyde Holbrook’s “Editor’s Introduction,” WJE 2:1–67; McClymond and McDermott, *Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 339–56; and Oliver Crisp, *Jonathan Edwards and the Metaphysics of Sin* (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate Publishing, 2005).

90. For Edwards’s other types for sin, see his notes on Ex. 4:9; Ex. 12:15; Hos. 2:15; Isa. 7:14.

Edwards then draws out the comparisons' appropriateness. First, Israelites are like a hot oven "because their hearts are heated with lust." Second, they are likened to "dough leavened" because Scripture uses it "as a type of wickedness." For just as dough is leavened and kneaded so as "to be cast into the oven," so, too, men "ripen in wickedness" throughout their souls and are "fitted for destruction." Edwards draws this point out by comparing Hosea's implied baker with Satan. He asserts that just as the baker mixes leaven into the lump and kneads it, waiting on the dough "to be thoroughly fermented" that he may cast it into the oven, so the devil casts "the leaven of wickedness into men's hearts" and thoroughly works it through their soul so as "to establish the heart in sin." Thus the baker of sinful souls "waits till the measure of their sin be filled" and casts them into hell's oven.⁹¹

Types of Christian Ministers and Ministry in the *Blank Bible*

In four *Blank Bible* notes Edwards typologically connects the Old Testament to Christian ministers/ministry and the sacraments.⁹² Edwards points out that the Hebrew Scriptures adumbrate Christian ministers themselves, as well as important aspects of their office like preaching, prayer, and the administration of the sacraments. He finds these types in a dug-out well, Moses's intermediation, and David's slinging smooth stones.

In one of his notes, Edwards comments on the Old Testament's witness to the Christian minister's intercession in his note on Jabez's prayer (1 Chr. 4:9–10).⁹³ Edwards points out that Jabez "was probably a scribe" of esteemed honor who excelled in "learning and piety"—which he deduces from these verses and 1 Chronicles 2:55.⁹⁴ Granted Jabez's profession and status, Edwards concludes that his prayer recorded here "especially [made him] a type of the ministry." God's responding to his request to "enlarge [his] coast," embodies "God's enlarging the church in answer to the prayers of gospel ministers." For it is through the prayers of faithful ministers,

91. WJE 24:782–783.

92. For Edwards and the ministry, see Schweitzer, *Jonathan Edwards for the Church*; and Douglas Sweeney, *Jonathan Edwards and the Ministry of the Word: A Model of Faith and Thought* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2009).

93. The text says "Jabez called on God, saying, 'Oh that thou wouldest bless me, and enlarge my coast, that thine hand might be with me, and that thou wouldest keep me from evil!' And God granted him [his] request." For Edwards's additional three notes on this type, see Gen. 24:13; Ex. 34:1; 1 Sam. 17:50.

94. This verse states that the "families of the scribes dwelt at Jabez." Edwards reasons that the city "likely took its name from him" given his esteemed excellence. For Edwards and prayer, see Noll, "A Case Study."

Edwards implies, that God expands His church's "coasts," as He did for Jabez,⁹⁵ since only through prayer will God "remarkably pour out" an "effusion of the Spirit."⁹⁶

Types of the Holy Spirit in the *Blank Bible*

Edwards typologically connects the Old Testament to the Holy Spirit in five *Blank Bible* notes.⁹⁷ Leaning on the New Testament's metaphorical depictions of the Spirit, Edwards finds types in the Old Testament's first-fruit offering as well as its connection of water with God's presence.

In one of his notes that he appends to Daniel's vision of "Messiah the prince" in the prophet's ninth chapter, Edwards typologically reflects on the Old Testament's use of anointing oil. Edwards believes this was a typological witness to the Holy Spirit.⁹⁸ He begins this page-long notation by pointing out that Gabriel refers to the prince as "the Messiah," for he "had been spoken of as to be anointed." In four "respects," Edwards then shows why Jesus is truly "the Messiah, or Christ, or the anointed"—all of which he ties to the Spirit,⁹⁹ since the Scripture typifies the Holy Spirit "by oil."¹⁰⁰

95. WJE 24:403–404. Edwards believed strongly in prayer's importance in the ministry. It was so important to him that he devoted an entire treatise to underscoring its importance in bringing Christ's kingdom to bear. See his *An Humble Attempt* (WJE 5:309–437).

96. Detrich, "A Recital of Presence," 208–209.

97. For Edwards and the Holy Spirit, see Caldwell, *Communion in the Spirit: The Holy Spirit as the Bond of Unity in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Eugene, Ore: Wipf & Stock, 2007); Benjamin Carver, "The Development of the Redemptive Role of the Holy Spirit in the Reformed Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards" (ThM thesis, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, 2010); Barshinger, *Edwards and the Psalms*, 218–72; R. A. Leo, "Holy Spirit," in *The Jonathan Edwards Encyclopedia*, 298–300; McClymond and McDermott, *Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, 262–72; Michael Haykin, *Jonathan Edwards: The Holy Spirit in Revival* (Darlington, U.K.: Evangelical Press, 2005).

98. He focuses on Dan. 9:25, which states, "Understand that from the going forth of the commandment to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks." For Edwards's other notes on types of the Spirit, see Lev. 23:17; Num. 21:18; Deut. 9:21; 1 Sam. 17:40.

99. Edwards ties Jesus's four-fold anointing by the Spirit to His divine and human natures, to His mediation, and to "every believing soul." Edwards asserts, first, that Jesus is anointed "in his divine nature... as the Father doth eternally pour forth the Spirit of love upon him." Second, He was anointed "in his human nature... as the Spirit [was] given not by measure to him... and dwelt in him from the first moment of his existence in union with the eternal *Logos* so as to be the same person." Third, God anointed Jesus by the Spirit at His baptism so as "to consecrate him for his [mediatorial] work." Fourth, Jesus is anointed "by every believing soul, by the exercise of the grace of the Holy Spirit towards him... pouring out his soul in divine love upon him."

100. For the Bible's connection of anointing oil with the Holy Spirit, see Isa. 61:1; Acts

In other words, the Old Testament's description of leaders being "anointed by oil" prefigured the Holy Spirit's anointing Jesus to fulfill His God-given, messianic role,¹⁰¹ as it is only through His Spirit that God anoints people for His sanctified purposes.¹⁰²

Types of "Gospel Things" in the *Blank Bible*

The last antitypical category is Edwards's most general in his "Interleaved Bible." In ten notations, Edwards makes general comments about the Old Testament's typological witness to "gospel things" or "redemption." These notations do not detail the specificities of these "gospel things" or these aspects of "redemption," nor do they detail the nature of the connection between type and antitype. Edwards uncovers these types in seven biblical books, finding them in the Old Testament's description of the patriarch's blessings, the exodus, the flood, the sacrificial system, and "rest."¹⁰³

In one of Edwards's more interesting notes in this category, he makes a brief comment about the Old Testament's typification of God's redemption through its description of covenant meals in his note on Genesis 27:4.¹⁰⁴ Here the aging Isaac asks Esau to kill a deer that they might enjoy a final meal together in which he will bless his son. Edwards comments that "in those days" when a parent "expected to die" they would likely "make a feast with their children" so as to give "them their dying charges." This "dying testament" was "something like a covenant." During the covenant ratification it was common for the parties "to eat together."

10:38; 1 Jn. 2:20, 27. This note strengthens Ryan Hoselton's assertion that for Edwards "simply reading passages that contained imagery of oil" thus excited ideas of the work of the Spirit.... Such readings were fully legitimate because God designed the mind to reflexively associate sensations with ideas." Hoselton, "Spiritually Discerned: Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and Experiential Exegesis in Early Evangelicalism" (PhD diss., Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, 2019), 205.

101. David Barshinger helpfully provides insight into Edwards's thinking on this matter. He notes that for Edwards "casting oil as a type of the Holy Spirit confirmed the description of the Spirit's nature, for oil comes from the olive tree and the olive branch signifies 'love, peace, and friendship.'" This is fitting for the Spirit since His nature is one of "excellency, joy, and love." Barshinger, *Edwards and the Psalms*, 221–22.

102. WJE 24:767–68.

103. These books are Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, and John.

104. Isaac says to Esau, "Make me savoury meat, as I love, and bring it to me, that I may eat; that my soul may bless thee before I die." For Edwards's other types of "gospel things," see his first entry in the *Blank Bible*—occurring before Gen. 1:1—as well his notes on Ex. 12:14; Deut. 4:32–34; Ps. 29:10; Ps. 78:2; Prov. 25:11; 25:25; Isa. 43:21–28; Jn. 5:17.

Edwards then connects these actions with God's covenant ratifications. He points out that when God "makes his covenant with us" He also "doeth as it were at a feast." For when Israel covenanted with God "they were wont to make a feast before the Lord." This leads Edwards to conclude that "the patriarchs' thus blessing their children before their death exhibits to us a type of the covenant of grace, which is as it were Christ's last testament to his people."¹⁰⁵ This brief notation strengthens Gilsun Ryu's thesis that through the biblical covenants Edwards solidified "a Christocentric relationship between the Old and New Testaments."¹⁰⁶

Conclusion

This essay has accomplished several things. First, it surveyed an important but little-known debate about the best way to describe Edwards's exegetical typology. This section underscored that there are significant differences as to whether scholars should define Edwards's biblical typology as "conservative" or "Christological." Second, this paper also provided a general overview of 210 notations in the *Blank Bible* wherein Edwards uses a word from the "type" word-family to connect a redemptive-historical sign with its signification. This essay noted that the types within these 210 notations find fulfillment in one of thirteen distinct antitypical categories: Christology, soteriology, the church, "intra"-Old Testament, "intra"-New Testament, eschatology, the world, Christian spirituality, the demonic, sin, Christian ministry/ministers, the Holy Spirit, and redemption/redemptive history generally. This essay then provided a representative notation from each of these categories that the reader might get a sense of Edwards's wide-ranging typological exegesis in the *Blank Bible*.

This survey of Edwards's biblical typology in his "Interleaved Bible" highlights five significant problems for authors like Perry Miller and Mason Lowance who describe this aspect of Edwards's exegesis as "conservative." Similarly, it presents a challenge to authors like Glenn Kreider and Stephen Nichols who categorize Edwards's typological exegesis as "Christological."¹⁰⁷ This notebook highlights, first, that Edwards does not

105. WJE 24:171. For Edwards's understanding of the covenants, see Gilsun Ryu, *The Federal Theology of Jonathan Edwards: An Exegetical Perspective* (Bellingham, Wash.: Lexham Press, 2021); Paul Hoehner, *The Covenant Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick, 2021); Reita Yazawa, *The Covenant of Redemption in the Trinitarian Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick, 2019).

106. Ryu, *Federal Theology*, 164.

107. Miller, "Introduction," 6, 27; Lowance, "Images or Shadows of Divine Things,"

connect only Old Testament types to Christological antitypes in the New Testament. Second, Edwards asserts that there are Old Testament types that point to Old Testament antitypes. Third, Edwards claims that there are strictly New Testament type/antitype pairs. Fourth, Edwards finds Old Testament types that adumbrate eschatological antitypes. Lastly, Edwards connects historical types to ahistorical antitypes that embody ahistorical theological/spiritual principles.

It seems, therefore, that the exegetical evidence of Edwards's *Blank Bible* strongly suggests that the authors of the Miller–Lowance line have inaccurately described Edwards's biblical typology as "conservative."¹⁰⁸ Likewise, this evidence underscores that it seems less than accurate for Krieder, Nichols, Michael McClymond, Stephen Holmes, and others to categorize his exegetical typology as "Christological,"¹⁰⁹ since Edwards's array of antitypes are too diverse to fit within such confining strictures. The manner and time in which Edwards asserts that types find fulfillment resist these restricting confines. It seems appropriate, therefore, to replace the imprecise and inaccurate words "conservative" and "Christological" with more accurate and less semantically-loaded terms to describe Edwards's biblical typology.

Granted that Edwards has both Christological and non-Christological antitypes, as well as type–antitype pairs that do not follow the Old to New Testament fulfillment schema, in addition to types that find fulfillment in the Christian's lived experience, one needs to suggest terms that are sufficiently broad to encapsulate all the evidence, but not too general so as to say nothing of significance. This essay would like to put forward the following framework to best make sense of Edwards's manifold way of typologically interpreting the Bible. That is, Edwards's interpretive practices in his "Interleaved Bible" suggest that he understands biblical typology as a kind of historiographical lens by which he interprets the world and redemptive history as a constant movement towards its God-ordained, eschatological, and teleological fulfillment.¹¹⁰

209–44; Kreider, *Edwards's Interpretation of Revelation*, 287–89; Nichols, *Jonathan Edwards's Bible*, 103–104, 106.

108. See footnote 12.

109. See footnote 19.

110. For those few authors who provide aspects of this definition, see Joseph Cochran, "Jonathan Edwards's Harmonic Interpretation of Hebrews 12:22–24," *Jonathan Edwards Studies* 10, no. 1 (2020): 25; Holbrook, "The Elaborated Labyrinth," 226–27; Leader, "In Love with the Image," 157; Clark, "The History of Redemption," 134–35, 138.

These three important concepts best encapsulate Edwards's biblical typology: spiritual, teleological, and eschatological. His typology can be called "spiritual" because he believes that God sovereignly unites types with their antitypes. For Edwards, "types" are God's intentionally designed historical harbingers of greater and/or future redemptive-historical realities (antitypes).¹¹¹ Types and antitypes, in Edwards's worldview, therefore, are "ontologically real" things that exist in explicit relationship because God intended for them to exist in relation.¹¹²

One can also call Edwards's biblical typology "teleological." As far as the present researcher has observed, in all of Edwards's type-antitype relationships, he always states that the antitype is the "greater" and more "significant" entity to which the "lesser" and less "significant" type points. One can also call Edwards's exegetical typology "eschatological." In *most* of Edwards's type-antitype relationships that this author has seen, he states that the type precedes its antitype in redemptive history.¹¹³ To summarize, Edwards's actual, exegetical practices preserved in the *Blank Bible* suggest that it is most accurate *not* to refer to the pastor's biblical typology as either "conservative" or "Christological," but as his spiritual, eschatological, and teleological framework for interpreting God's unified orchestration of redemptive history.

111. An example of a type-antitype relationship that is "future" and "greater," is David and Christ. Christ arrives later in history than David and is also Israel's "greater" King. An example of a type-antitype relationship that is simply "greater" is Edwards's connection of leaven with sin. Leaven does not precede sin in redemptive history, but its sour, spreading nature is eclipsed by sin's "greater," spiritually souring, infecting nature.

112. Winslow, *A Trinitarian Theology of Nature*, 55.

113. Those type-antitype pairs that cannot be considered both teleological and eschatological include some of his types of Christian spirituality in which the type does not precede the antitype in time (like leaven and sin), as well as some of his biblical-ontological types in which the type exists both before and after its antitype (i.e. the rising and setting sun, which typifies Jesus's death and resurrection).