

INTRODUCTION

On the day of his resurrection, Jesus' exposition to two of his disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:25–27, 32) and shortly afterwards to his eleven apostles and other disciples (Luke 24:44–47) included “all the scriptures” “beginning with Moses and all the prophets.” An idea implicit and underlying Jesus' expositions in these two episodes is that a unity of purpose exists throughout the many diverse sacred books of the Old Testament. Jesus discerned there a story line, an orderly plan—a *Divine economy*—unfolding throughout history and expressed in the inspired record that would culminate in his own saving work.

The idea of *Typology* is implicit and flows from this unified story—this *Divine economy*—that we find in the Bible. The scriptures encompass a single story, but it is composed of two parts: the Old Testament and the New. Typology is the literal sense in which the New Testament reads the Old. Indeed, typology refers precisely to those things that Christ revealed in his exegesis on the road to Emmaus—“the things concerning him” “in all the scriptures.”

By unveiling the “things concerning him” “in all the scriptures,” Christ established a normative approach to the work of New Testament exegesis and of biblical theology.

The other New Testament writers follow his example in applying “all the scriptures” to the doctrine on the church and Christian moral, ascetical, and sacramental life. It is not merely, or even primarily, a correspondence of prediction and fulfillment. It is, rather, a pattern of analogy. What began in the Old Testament is fulfilled partially even within the Old Testament, but definitively in the New, in a way that is both restorative and transformative.

Christ's life has fulfilled the types in a sacrifice that was “once for all” (Heb. 9:26). But the mysteries of his life—all that was hidden in his life—are now extended in time through the church's sacraments. After his resurrection, the ordinary way the disciples come to know the mysteries of his life is through the breaking of the bread. In the sacraments, he is made known to his disciples, but it is more than a knowledge of doctrine, more than wisdom about the world. In “the breaking of the bread,” what happens is something far more profound than mere learning, surpassing the mere conversation of wayfarers, no matter how exalted that may be. What happens is *Mystagogy*: the leading of the Christian not just into a deeper understanding of the sacraments, but to personal *restoration* and *transformation*, and indeed—mysteriously and supernaturally, to *replication*—of Christ himself in the life of the Christian. The end or goal of mystagogy is for the Christian to become an *alter Christus*, another Christ, living a life of Christ-like love, sacrifice, death, resurrection, and ultimate glorification.

But the *end* is dependent on the *means*. Jesus' interpretation of the Hebrew scriptures on the Emmaus Road functioned to effectively give his imprimatur to

the notion of a *Divine Economy*, from Genesis to Revelation, and to the legitimacy—indeed, to the *necessity*—of *Typological Exegesis*, both of which will then lead to the miracle of *Mystagogy*.

This issue of Letter & Spirit seeks to explain and demonstrate the propriety and necessity of interpreting the Bible using the hermeneutics of the divine economy and typology; hence the title for this issue: Promise and Fulfillment: The Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments.

In his article, “From Old to New: ‘Covenant’ or ‘Testament’ in Hebrews 9?” **Scott Hahn** investigates the meaning of “covenant” in Hebrews 9:15-18. “Covenant” (*διαθήκη*) occurs more frequently in Hebrews (17x) than in the rest of the NT (16x). For a majority of interpreters, the author’s use of *διαθήκη* in Hebrews 9:15–17 is based on an analogy of the contemporary Greco-Roman legal institution of “testament,” and thus represents a brief but radical departure from the ancient Israelite understanding of “covenant” which the author employs everywhere else in Hebrews (chaps. 7–13). In this article, Dr. Hahn takes a social-scientific approach to the *legal* and *liturgical* aspects of “covenant” (*διαθήκη*) in the Old Testament to demonstrate that in Hebrews 9:15-18 the author did not abandon the ancient Israelite understanding of “covenant”—with its close relationship between liturgy and law—but actually bases his argument on the deeper inner logic of the liturgical and legal aspects involved in Israel’s making—and breaking—of the covenant at Sinai (Exod. 24-34). In Hebrews 9:15–19, the author draws out the *legal* implications of the *liturgical* ritual of the old (Sinai) covenant: a covenant that is solemnly sworn—and then broken—requires the death of the covenant-maker (Heb. 9:16), which thus implies that it is not “in force” (that is, *enforced*) while the offending covenant-maker still lives (Heb. 9:17). Hebrews 9:16–17 is therefore not an abrupt, unannounced shift in context from 9:15, nor does the author argue for a tortuous analogy between “covenant” and “testament.” In Hebrews 9:16–17 the author simply restates a theological principle summarized just prior in 9:15: the first covenant entailed the curse-of-death for those who broke it, which Christ now takes upon himself as Israel’s redemptive representative, thus freeing those who, under the old (broken) covenant, had become subject to the curse-of-death.

In his article, “Jesus, the Messianic Wedding Banquet, and the Restoration of Israel,” **Brant Pitre** interprets the parable of the Royal Wedding Feast (Matt. 22:1-14) against the backdrop of Jewish Scripture and tradition. Jesus seems to be alluding to the Passover feast of King Hezekiah, to which all Israel was invited but many refused to come (2 Chron. 30; Josephus, *Antiquities* 9:263-67). Seen in this light, Jesus is using this parable to reveal the liturgical nature of the restoration of Israel. As Jesus’ parable reveals, the twelve tribes of Israel and the Gentile nations will not be restored and gathered by means of a geographical return to the land, but by accepting the invitation to the new Passover banquet of the heavenly Kingdom of God, inaugurated at the Last Supper.

In his article, “Matthew as Exegete: The Unity and Function of the Formula Citations in Matthew 1:1-4:16,” **Jeremy Holmes** takes up Matthew’s so-called “formula citations,” in which Matthew explicitly cites Old Testament texts with a formulaic “this happened to fulfill that” phrase. While New Testament scholars have often criticized the formula citations for supposedly twisting the Scriptures, Holmes argues that Matthew’s citations must be understood in relation to one another and against the background of Matthew’s more allusive use of Scripture. Seen in this light, the formula citations are not apologetic proof-texts in defense of Jesus but a network of contextually sensitive interpretations that build a positive, typological understanding of Jesus’ identity and mission. Matthew presents Jesus as reliving the past history of Israel and inaugurating the New Exodus.

Many modern readers of the Bible eschew allegory, believing it to be the illegitimate importation of one’s own wishes and desires into the text. But **Leroy Huizenga**, in his article, “The Tradition of Christian Allegory Yesterday and Today,” argues that reading the Scriptures using the spiritual sense commonly called “allegory” is a natural and normal way to read religious texts, is seen in the biblical texts themselves—as well as the pre-modern tradition—and is for Catholics affirmed by contemporary authorities from the Second Vatican Council to the present. Dr. Huizenga’s essay explores what “allegory” has meant in the Western ecclesial tradition from the New Testament to the present, how it finds its culmination in liturgical mystagogy, and how it calls biblical scholars and theologians to a disciplined and fruitful return to it.

In his article “The New Temple, the New Priesthood, and the New Cult in Luke-Acts,” **Michael Barber** demonstrates how Luke’s Gospel displays clear expectations for a new temple, a new priesthood, and a new cult. While contemporary scholars downplay the significance of cultic elements in Luke, his emphasis on such matters was not lost on the early Church fathers. Irenaeus, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine all identified his Gospel with the symbol of the “ox,” precisely because of the evangelist’s perceived focus on cultic imagery. Contemporary scholarship’s lack of interest in these features can be traced to a centuries-old methodological blunder pioneered by certain Protestant scholars which held that the priestly and cultic elements of the Old Testament represented the degeneration of Israel’s religion in the post-exilic era and thus embodied the very antithesis of the Gospel Jesus came to proclaim. Such biases have led scholars to overlook the role of the cult in Luke-Acts. Dr. Barber demonstrates how the threefold hope for a new temple, a new priesthood, and a new cult—proclaimed by the prophets and hoped for in Jesus’ day—finds its fulfillment in the New Covenant established by Christ. Barber shows how Luke describes Jesus and the Church as the new temple, Jesus and the apostles as the new priests, and the celebration of the Lord’s Supper as the new cult.

In his article, “New Approaches to Marian Typology in Luke 1: Mary as Daughter Zion and Queen Mother,” **Ted Sri** considers two Marian types that appear in the first chapter of Luke’s Gospel: Mary as “Daughter Zion” and Mary as “queen mother.” Dr. Sri’s methodological approach proceeds from using extra-Scriptural agents such as the Church Fathers, the liturgy, or magisterial teaching and focuses instead on an examination of Mary in the context of Old Testament Scripture and Luke’s presentation of Mary in Luke 1. While reference to “extra-Scriptural” agents could certainly and properly be made, Dr. Sri demonstrates that interpretations of Mary as Daughter Zion and Queen are not just the result of later theological reflection by the Church. These typological connections are firmly grounded in Luke’s own scripturally-based presentation of Mary in the first chapter of his Gospel. Thus the angel’s greeting to Mary in Luke 1:28 presents her in ways that recall the prophecies about lady Zion in the Old Testament. Likewise, Luke’s accounts of the annunciation to Mary and her visit to Elizabeth invite us to view Mary in light of the Davidic kingdom traditions which those passages evoke. Considering Mary against the Davidic kingdom backdrop sheds important Biblical light on why we should see Mary, the mother of the Davidic king, as the queen mother. Dr. Sri demonstrates that by considering Mary by using the methodology of what he terms “inter-Biblical typology,” the case for these and other typological connections involving Mary in the New Testament is strengthened.

In his article, “Qumran and the Concept of Pan-Israelite Restoration,” **John Bergsma** argues that although it is sometimes claimed otherwise, the members of the Qumran community practically never self-identify in their sectarian documents as “Jews,” “Judeans,” or “Judah.” Instead, the Qumran sectarians conceive of themselves as “Israel,” that is, as representatives of the twelve tribes of the LORD. This self-conception as the eschatological restoration of the pan-Israelite twelve-tribe union bears striking resemblance to certain motifs and images employed by the New Testament authors, showing that the Qumranites and the early Church had strong parallels in their self-identities.

The *General Directory for Catechesis* enjoins upon catechists the recital of *narratio* (the narration of salvation history) to accompany the explication of the mysteries of faith. After showing that the reason for the GDC’s call for revival of *narratio* is rooted in its insistence upon the primacy of God’s own pedagogy, **Sean Innerst**, in his article, “Divine Pedagogy and Covenant Memorial: The Catechetical *Narratio* and the New Evangelization,” examines the character of that pedagogy. He first examines *narratio* in the classic patristic source text, Augustine of Hippo’s *De catechizandis rudibus*. Then, by reflecting upon Old Testament covenant practices, he demonstrates that God’s pedagogy required the people of Israel to engage in haggadic recitals of His saving works to form and maintain their covenant identity. Dr. Innerst’s article concludes that a positive response to the GDC’s call is warranted by the biblical and post-biblical Jewish and Christian

practices of ritual/covenantal remembrance. A positive response to the GDC's call will constitute one important way of advancing the New Evangelization.

Historical criticism is often understood as a scientific exegesis that emphasizes the literal sense of Scripture and eschews recourse to the more imaginative allegorical interpretation of the church fathers. In his article, "Historical Criticism as Secular Allegorism: The Case of Spinoza," **Jeffrey Morrow** employs the example of Baruch Spinoza to demonstrate how some of what passes for historical criticism is little more than secular allegory, where the literal sense of the biblical text is ignored in favor of a hypothetical history behind it. Spinoza is key here as one of the earliest pioneers of modern historical criticism of the Bible. His method, inherited by later historical critical exegetes, fragments the biblical text in order to undermine traditional interpretations which he supplants with alternative histories. These historical-critical reconstructions often serve particular political ends, ends which are secular, anti-Jewish, and anti-Catholic.

Matthew's Gospel is packed with economic imagery, especially in passages dealing with sin, righteousness, and divine recompense. Sin incurs a debt with God, righteous deeds earn treasure in heaven, and the second coming of Jesus will be the great settling of accounts. New Testament scholars have tended to downplay or even ignore this material as a theological embarrassment. As a result, the theology of salvation in Matthew has remained opaque in contemporary scholarship. **Nathan Eubank**, in his article, "Purchasing the Rewards of Eternal Life: The Logic of Resurrection and Ransom in Matthew's Gospel," examines Matthew's portrayal of Jesus as an earner of treasure in heaven by analyzing three key passages occurring after the pivotal moment when Jesus begins predicting his death and resurrection (16:13-28; 19:16-29; 20:17-28) with a particular focus on the ransom saying in 20:28. Dr. Eubank argues that careful attention to Matthew's economic language illuminates how Jesus saves his people from their sins (1:21) and is enthroned in fulfillment of Daniel 7.