

# The Islamic Pilgrimage as Mirror and Realization of the Eschaton: Typology and Mimesis

By Ian Richard Netton

## Introduction

**T**ypology, allegory, intertextuality, mimesis! The approaches to the interpretation of Christian scripture, especially of the New Testament (NT) in the light of the Old Testament (OT), have been many and diverse. Sometimes they may appear to complement each other; at other times, scholars have asked, for example, whether “typology and allegory [are] to be sharply contrasted”.<sup>1</sup> Certainly, such approaches may be multivalent and applied to other religions. Thus this essay will pay particular attention to typology and mimetic analysis with special attention to the Islamic pilgrimage (the *hajj*),<sup>2</sup> the *wuquf* or ‘standing’ at ‘Arafat on the 9<sup>th</sup> day of the pilgrimage month of Dhu ‘l-Hijja, and the Islamic eschaton (Gk: *to eskhaton*). The latter word is defined in the *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* (COED) as “the final event in the divine plan; the end of the world”,<sup>3</sup> and thus as applicable in Islam to the Last Day and the Final Judgment by Allah (*Yawm al-Din*, *Yawm al-Qiyama*) as it is in the Christian tradition. And similarly, as in the latter tradition, the development of typological and mimetic

<sup>1</sup> Christopher R. Seitz, *Figured Out: Typology and Providence in Christian Scripture*, (Louisville/London/Leiden: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), p. V11, see also p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Numerous works exist on the *Hajj*, the Islamic Pilgrimage, which ranks as the fifth of the five pillars (*arkan*) of Islam. For a general orientation, see A.J. Wensinck-[J.Jomier] et al., art. “Hadjdj”, *EF*, Vol. 3, pp. 31-38. For a neat, brief summary, see Edward D.A. Hulmes, art. “Al-Hajj” in Ian Richard Netton (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Islamic Civilisation and Religion*, (London & New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 207-209.

<sup>3</sup> Catherine Soanes & Angus Stevenson (eds.), *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, [hereafter referred to as *COED*], 11<sup>th</sup> rev. edn., (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 486 *sv* eschaton.

approaches in Islamic Studies may illuminate, qualify, emphasize, enchant—and, even, terrify!

### Of Types and Antitypes

The word ‘typology’ has its origins in “the Greek word *tupto* (from *tupto*, to strike)”.<sup>4</sup> In Biblical exegesis it has either a moral connotation or a reference “to some person, event or institution of the Old Law related in some way to the new and definitive self-revelation of God in Christ. In this sense Adam is ‘a type of the one to come’ (Rom.5.14)... The MANNA in the desert points forward to the reality possessed by the antitype, the true Bread (*Jn.6.32*)”.<sup>5</sup>

Blenkinsop deploys the word ‘antitype’ to indicate “the correspondent in the New Testament to the Old Testament type as in 1 Pt 3.21 where Baptism is the *antitypos* of the Flood”.<sup>6</sup> The online *Theopedia* defines the term as follows: “Typology is a method of biblical interpretation whereby an element found in the Old Testament is seen to prefigure one found in the New Testament. The initial one is called the type and the fulfilment is designated the *antitype*”.<sup>7</sup>

The COED provides us with a dual sense of typology. Firstly, it is “a classification according to general type, especially in archaeology, psychology, or the social sciences”.<sup>8</sup> But it is the second definition which is more relevant to this essay: “The study and interpretation of

---

<sup>4</sup> J.Blenkinsopp, art. “Type and Antitype” in Berard L.Marthaler (Exec.Ed.) et al,(eds.), *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, [hereafter referred to as *NCE:14*], 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., (Detroit/New York/Farmington Hills,MI:Thomson Learning, Gale, 2003),Vol. 14 (Thi-Zwi), p. 254. For a general survey of typology, see, *inter alia*: *Theopedia: An Encyclopaedia of Biblical Christianity* {An online evangelical encyclopedia of Biblical Christianity}, [hereafter referred to as *Theopedia*], *sv* *Biblical typology*; Patrick Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1847; repr. 6<sup>th</sup> edn. in 2 vols., New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1876; repr. Memphis: General Books LLC<sup>TH</sup>, 2012). The latter is a much-reprinted but very old-fashioned and dated source; however, it is historically important in the history of typological exegesis. See also Richard M.Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical typus Structures*, [hereafter referred to as Davidson, *Typology*], Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, Vol. 2, (Berrien Springs, MI:Andrews University Press, 1981). For a more popular approach to typology, see Nancy Guthrie, *The Promised One: Seeing Jesus in Genesis*, (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2011).

<sup>5</sup> Blenkinsop, art. “Type and Antitype”, pp. 254-255.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 255.

<sup>7</sup> *Theopedia*, *sv* *Biblical typology*.

<sup>8</sup> *COED*, p. 1561 *sv* *typology*.

To read the balance of this article, please [subscribe](#) to this volume.



# SACRED WEB

A JOURNAL OF TRADITION AND MODERNITY

[www.sacredweb.com](http://www.sacredweb.com)