**Fundamentals of Types/Antitypes**

A basic, fundamental rule to remember about types is the rule of “first mention.” The first time a type is recorded in Scripture the pattern is set. Once the pattern is set, no change can ever occur. Later types will add information and cast additional light on the original type, but the original was set perfect at the beginning and remains unchanged throughout Scripture.

Another fundamental rule to remember about types is in the area of “doctrine.” It is often taught that types are given merely for illustrations, and doctrine cannot be taught from types. Suffice it to say, types are far more than mere illustrations, and in the area of doctrine it would be well to ask a question, followed by a statement: “Who said doctrine cannot be taught from types? Certainly not the Scriptures!”

(“Doctrine” and “teaching” are translations of noun and verb forms of the same word in the Greek text — didaskalia and didasko. “Teaching” is “doctrine”; “doctrine” is “teaching.” And if “teaching” cannot be drawn from the types, of what value are the types?

Doctrine/teaching can be drawn from either or from both together. Because of the very nature of the origin of both — through God’s sovereign control of all things — there can be absolutely no difference between the two in this respect. Both could only have been designed and put together with the same perfection that exists within the Godhead.

The types form a part of the Word that was made Flesh. To see imperfection in the types is to see imperfection in the Word made Flesh; to see perfection in the Word made Flesh is to see perfection in the types.)

One overall thought though should suffice to quell any ideology that doctrine/teaching cannot be drawn from the types: Who made [designed] the type? And who made [designed] the antitype?

Types and antitypes are exact replicas of one another. The antitype is an exact imprint or duplicate of the type. The tabernacle was formed in exact detail, in every respect, to an existing tabernacle in heaven, “according to the pattern [Gk. tupos]” given to Moses in the mount ([Hebrews 8:5](http://www.blueletterbible.org/search/preSearch.cfm?Criteria=Hebrews+8.5&t=NKJV)). The “print [Gk. tupos] of the nails” in the hands of Christ were exact imprints of the nails which had been driven into His hands ([John 20:25](http://www.blueletterbible.org/search/preSearch.cfm?Criteria=John+20.25&t=NKJV)). The truth about Biblical doctrine and types is that since the antitype is an exact imprint or duplicate of the type, doctrine can be taught from either. No distinction, one from the other, can be made in this realm.

Another fundamental rule to remember is that types, contrary to common belief, “DO NOT break down.” To say that types break down is to say that types are imperfect. God established types, and He established these types perfectly. Types break down only in the minds of finite man. If a man knew all there were to know about any particular type, that type could be followed to its nth degree and never break down.

NOTHING happened in a haphazard manner in the Old Testament. EVERYTHING occurred according to a Divine plan, established before the creation of the heavens and the earth ([Hebrews 1:3](http://www.blueletterbible.org/search/preSearch.cfm?Criteria=Hebrews+1.3&t=NKJV); [Ephesians 3:11](http://www.blueletterbible.org/search/preSearch.cfm?Criteria=Ephesians+3.11&t=NKJV)). And events throughout the Old Testament happened as “types” in order that God might have these events and experiences of individuals to draw upon, allowing the Spirit of God to use these events and experiences to instruct Christians in the deep things of God.

“Types are as accurate as mathematics.” — F. B. Meyer

[Leviticus](http://www.blueletterbible.org/search/preSearch.cfm?Criteria=Leviticus+23&t=NKJV) draws heavily from typology, which is a form of biblical structure and study not even accepted in some circles today, much less understood in other circles. It was Andrew Jukes who, over one hundred years ago, said:

“The real secret of the neglect of the **types**, I cannot but think may be in part traced to this, that they require more spiritual intelligence than many Christians can bring to them. To apprehend them requires a certain measure of spiritual capacity and habitual exercise in the things of God, which all do not possess…”