Typology and Adventist Eschatological Identity: Friend or Foe?

Erick Mendieta

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/aussj

Part of the Biblical Studies Commons, and the Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons

Recommended Citation
Available at: https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/aussj/vol1/iss1/5
TYPOLOGY AND
ADVENTIST ESCHATOLOGICAL IDENTITY:
FRIEND OR FOE?

Erick Mendieta
Ph.D. Candidate in Old Testament (Andrews University)
mendieta@andrews.edu

Abstract

For Seventh-day Adventists the significance of typology is not only a matter of historical research. Davidson has rightly argued that “the historic Adventist interpretation of the sanctuary … stands or falls depending upon the validity of its hermeneutic method.” This study tries to show that in Seventh-day Adventism typology has proven to be a defining force in theology, thinking, and at times even in practice. Since typology’s first appearance in early Adventism, it has provided assistance to the understanding of Scripture but has also been the source of much misunderstanding. The need to explore its nature, characteristics, and application has been an ongoing concern for Adventism and it must continue to be so.
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Typology in Christianity

Since the work of Leonard Goppelt, who produced the first comprehensive survey of New Testament typology from a modern historical perspective, the scholarly community and the Christian Church have studied typology with renewed interest from different angles, especially with regard to discussions on the use of the Hebrew Bible (HB) in the New Testament.¹

The importance of Biblical typology for the traditional and historical Christian understanding of the relationship of the HB and New Testament cannot be overstated.² However, the value of a typological approach, as the history of biblical interpretation shows, does not come without the possibility of misuse.

¹Leonhard Goppelt, Typos, The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982); idem, "τύπος, ἀντίτυπος, τυπικός, ὑποτύπωσις," TNDT, 8:246-259.

A survey of recent literature on the topic of Biblical typology gives evidence not only of the ongoing discussion about the role of typology in Biblical hermeneutics today, but of whether it even has a place in proper exegesis. Nonetheless, among the reasons for the continuous consideration of the use and value of typology in Christian biblical interpretation is the prevalence of its use by biblical writers and early Christian interpreters that suggests the contemplation of typology as a distinctive approach of Christian interpretation and understanding of the HB in light of the Messianic identity of Jesus. Also among scholars who discuss typology in connection with the relationship between the HB and New Testament, typology seems to describe this relationship between the two as operating mainly under the rubrics of promise/fulfillment, salvation history, and eschatological expectation.

Typology in Adventism

Today, Adventism also needs to discuss and reassess the use and value of typology for Adventist eschatological identity and hermeneutics. At first glance this seems unnecessary since Adventism is unique in its prolific use and appreciation of typology.

However, a brief survey on the history of typology in early Adventism, the development of Adventist typological hermeneutics, and the role that typology has played in theological controversies in Adventism emphasizes two needs:

---


4John E. Alsup, "Typology," ABD 6:682-685; G. R. Osborne, "Typology," The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible, Q-Z, ed. Moisés Silva and Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan 2009), 5:952, 953. Osborne also suggests that while typology can be placed within the framework of a “promise-fulfillment” relationship between the testaments that this concept is related to salvation history. He adds that behind this approach is the idea of corporate solidarity, in which a king or high priest represented the nation in his actions. See Carl E. DeVries, "Type, Typology," BEB 2:2110; G. R. Osborne, "Type; Typology," ISBE 4:930.
acknowledging the importance of typology in understanding Adventist eschatological identity, and at the same time, being aware of the risk of misguided understandings concerning typology throughout our denominational history.

Typology and the Historical Theological Identity of Early Adventism

The indicators that typology played an important role in the formation of the theological identity of early Adventism are indisputable. Adventist church historians recognize the role biblical typology had in defining the theological identity of early Adventism. The initial biblical understanding of Adventism was marked by eschatological expectations based on a historicist prophetic interpretation of the book of Daniel, as well as the typological interpretations of the sanctuary rituals. Historically, Seventh-day Adventism is not only a prophetic movement; it is also a typological movement.

While the foundations for such an approach could be traced to William Miller, it was through the influential writings of Samuel Snow and O. R. L. Crosier, that the basis for typological thinking and interpretation in Seventh-day Adventism was set.

---


6George R. Knight, William Miller and the Rise of Adventism (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2010), 159-163; idem, Lest We Forget: Daily Devotionals (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2008), 31f. Knight states that Miller, writing on October 6, the day he finally accepted the October 22 date, exclaimed in the headline article of the Midnight Cry of October 12, “I see a glory in the seventh month, one year and a half ago [the May 1843 article], yet I did not realize the force of the types. … Thank the Lord, O my soul. Let Brother Snow, Brother Storrs, and others be blessed for their instrumentality in opening my eyes.”

7Samuel S. Snow, True Midnight Cry, October 4, 1844, 1, 2.


Furthermore, this perspective, in general terms received clear support from Ellen White in her writings\textsuperscript{10}, and also from the writings of other SDA pioneers\textsuperscript{11} like J. N. Andrews\textsuperscript{12}, Uriah Smith,\textsuperscript{13} and Stephen N. Haskell\textsuperscript{14}. This array of support gives typology solid standing and recognition within early Adventist hermeneutics.

Typology in early Adventism was not only the key to better understanding and interpreting the prophecies in the book of Daniel in light of the sanctuary rituals, but it was also a means to discover the sanctuary doctrine itself. In addition, typology was a method used to evaluate, experience, and understand Adventism identity, role, and message in salvation history. Without typology early Adventists would not have been able to understand and interpret the first disappointment in the spring of 1844, and again, in the fall of the same year. The use of typology moved them closer to clarifying their position from Scripture, using it to advance their comprehension of the sanctuary. Consequently, it became the “key which unlocked the mystery of the disappointment of 1844. It opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious, showing that God’s hand had directed the great advent movement and revealing present duty as it brought to light the position and work of His people.”\textsuperscript{15} Therefore, typology in early

\textsuperscript{10}Ellen G. White, \textit{The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan} (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1911), 399f.

\textsuperscript{11}Paul A. Gordon, \textit{The Sanctuary, 1844, and the Pioneers} (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1983), 32. Gordon quotes Uriah Smith answering the charge that Seventh-day Adventists base their position on the sanctuary on one of E. G. White’s visions saying, “Works upon the sanctuary are among our standard publications. Hundreds of articles have been written upon the subject. But not in one of these are the visions referred to as any authority on this subject, or the source from whence any view we hold has been derived. Nor does any preacher ever refer to them on this question. The appeal is invariably to the Bible, where there is abundant evidence for the views we hold on this subject.” Gordon also argues that a search of many articles in the \textit{Review and Herald} supports this understanding. The writers do not quote Ellen White as the authority for the sanctuary teaching of the church.


\textsuperscript{13}Uriah Smith, \textit{Looking Unto Jesus or Christ in Type and Antitype} (Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald, 1898).

\textsuperscript{14}Stephen N. Haskell, \textit{The Cross and its Shadow} (South Lancaster, MA: Bible Training School, 1914).

\textsuperscript{15}White, \textit{The Great Controversy}, 423; Richard Rice, \textit{Reign of God: An Introduction to Christian Theology from a Seventh-day Adventist Perspective} (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1997), 331. Rice asserts that the doctrine of the sanctuary enabled early Adventists to affirm the validity of their “Adventist experience.” Their understanding gave them the
Adventism opened the way to discern the importance of the sanctuary in understanding the ministry of Jesus in heaven.

But for some, in the aftermath of 1844, typology became the foundation of their misunderstanding of the meaning of sanctuary rituals and date setting. Hans K. LaRondelle states that after 1844 the Millerite movements fractured into various factions where conflicting approaches to typology and to the prophetic time periods, gave rise to different apocalyptic movements that renewed the focus on the imminence of the Second Coming.16

This was also true for early Sabbatarians. For example, Joseph Bates, one of the founders of Seventh-day Adventism, would draw from his notions of typology that the Day of Atonement was perhaps the year of atonement. Hence, Bates suggested the possibility of Jesus coming on the fall of 1845. Later, he would also argue that the high priest’s work of sprinkling the blood “seven times” before the ark in the Most Holy Place on the Day of Atonement represented seven years, which meant that the Lord would come on the Day of Atonement in 1851.17

This incident, among other early interpretational controversies related to the sanctuary, demonstrated to early Sabbatarians the need to adopt a standard for explaining typology and its implications. Sabbatarians responded by combining common sense, biblical contextual evidences of the types and their antitype as it is explained in the NT, and pragmatic inferences.18 Two important insights concerning the types and their fulfillment are worth mentioning: First, the antitype commences on the day of the type, but may extend forward a great distance.19 Second, although there are many type-antitype relationships, this correspondence with the antitype does not apply in every detail. Caution has to be exercised against a too literalistic view of typology.20

Another important issue that has marked the use and abuse of typology in Adventism is the notion that early Seventh-day Adventists had about themselves.

conviction that God had been leading in the events preceding the Great Disappointment and that they were not merely victims of a prophetic miscalculation.

19Damsteegt, "Continued Clarification (1850-1863)," 83. Andrews argued that it was so with “the work in the holiest on the day of atonement [sic]. Its antitype must commence at that time, and of course must occupy a space corresponding to its magnitude and importance.” See Andrews, “The Sanctuary and its Cleansing,” 69.
20Damsteegt, "Continued Clarification (1850-1863)," 83.
As Paulien stated, “They thought of themselves as modern Israel making their way through the wilderness of this earth into the heavenly Promised Land.”

Typology and Adventist Hermeneutical Identity

As has been observed, typology played a significant role in early Adventist hermeneutics. Typology continued to be used in connection with the sanctuary doctrine and its hermeneutics. For example, in the seminal book Questions on Doctrine (QOD), the validity for using typology to discuss, explain and interpret the sanctuary rituals in connection with Adventist beliefs is taken for granted. Nonetheless, it offers some hermeneutical principles to work with typology and states that while the “types and shadows of the Levitical ritual do have a spiritual significance, it should not be expected that every detail in the sanctuary of old had a typical meaning.”

Also, it is stated that “it is better to see and study the great realities of the sacrifice and priestly ministry of Christ than to dwell too much upon the details of the typical service, which gave but an inadequate portrayal of the sacrifice and ministry of Christ.” Therefore it is suggested “that it is far better to interpret the earthly tabernacle in the light of the heavenly, rather than to circumscribe the antitypical realities by the limitations of too close an application of the type.”

Again, it is possible to see a rejection of an inordinate attention to the details and a concern about the danger of using a too literalistic view of typology.

As the theological interaction of Adventism grew, typology in Adventism began to be discussed not only in connection with the Sanctuary but also in connection with issues related to the greater debate of typology within Biblical hermeneutics in general. Afterwards, typology was explored in connection with the nature of Scripture, the unity of Scripture, and the interpretation of Scripture.

A leading voice during this period was Gerhard Hasel, who, in his discussion of the theology of the HB, would bring to Adventists’ attention the scholarly debate about the role, function, and value that typology has for biblical studies.

---

21Paulien, What the Bible Says About the End-Time, 21. A similar trajectory is found in Taylor G. Bunch, The Exodus and Advent Movement in Type and Antitype (n.p.: n.p., [1937]).
23Ibid. The book suggests that the book of Hebrews offers a clear example which presents the essence of these details in its antitypical significance.
24Ibid.
25Typology will be discussed among these topics in articles found in Gordon M. Hyde, ed., A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Committee, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1974).
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and Christian theology, and the concerns we should have about its use as well as some guiding principles for its use.\textsuperscript{26}

Hasel suggested the following ideas related to typology and its use:

a. Typology is a valid approach if it does not develop into a hermeneutical method that is applied to all texts like a divining-rod.\textsuperscript{27} Not all texts are typological.

b. Typological correspondence must be rigidly controlled on the basis of direct relationship between various OT elements and their NT counterpart in order to block the access to exegesis of arbitrary and fortuitous personal views.\textsuperscript{28} Typology has to have strict contextual controls, both in the OT and NT.

c. Typology is not primarily concerned with finding a unity of historical facts between the OT prefiguration and its NT counterpart. It is more concerned with recognizing the connection in terms of a structural similarity between type and antitype.\textsuperscript{29} Typology is not concerned with all the details.

d. While the OT context must be preserved in its prefiguration so that NT meanings are not read into the OT texts, it seems that a clear NT indication is necessary so that subjective imaginative and arbitrary typological analogies can be avoided. The \textit{a posteriori} character of the typological approach should not be suppressed.\textsuperscript{30} The safest movement in typological analysis is from the NT back to the OT.

Again, around the same time typology was discussed within the book \textit{A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics}. In it, typology was clearly identified as a general hermeneutical principle of biblical interpretation in the Advent Movement.\textsuperscript{31} Typology was also recognized as a valid hermeneutical principle used by NT writers for the OT,\textsuperscript{32} and was acknowledged as an illustrative example of the fuller import and deeper meaning of Scripture. That is to say, “God as the author of Scripture placed within the type a prefiguration of what is later identified as


\textsuperscript{27}Ibid., 179.

\textsuperscript{28}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., 180.

\textsuperscript{30}Ibid., 181.


antitype. The greater import and deeper meaning of the type is discerned most adequately through further inspired revelation.”

Particularly, W. G. C. Murdoch made an important treatment of typology in this book, in his article on the “Interpretation of Symbols, Types, Allegories and Parables.” The importance of this article is the attempt to define more clearly what a biblical type is from an Adventist perspective. Murdoch proposes the following definition of a biblical type:

A biblical type, by contrast, is like a shadow cast on the pages of earlier literature, which presents a limited account of a truth, the full embodiment of which is amplified in a later revelation. A type invariably points forward in time to its antitype. Types are rooted in history yet are prophetic in nature. Their basic ideas lie in their earthly and human correspondence to a heavenly and divine reality. Genuine OT types are not concerned with unessential similarities between type and antitype (counterpart). They are realities (persons, events, things) of the OT, which later are shown by inspired writers to have a corresponding spiritual reality superseding the historical fact.

However, later on, Murdoch clarifies that “care must be exercised to differentiate between type and prediction. Although a type has reference to the future, it is not in itself a prediction. Rather, it is recorded as a historical fact without evident reference to the future.” Essentially, Murdoch proposes that while biblical types are prophetic in nature, they are not predictive.

Murdoch also considers that in the interpretation of the OT types in the NT, “there is a great loss in attempts to separate the study of the NT from a careful exegetical and theological exposition of the OT.” Nonetheless, Murdoch thinks that typology can legitimately be used in the interpretation of the OT to bring out the correspondence between God’s methods of dealing with His people before and after the cross of Christ. Murdoch also indicates that not every type meets its complete counterpart in the NT. There often remains a further eschatological significance. Finally, Murdoch offers valuable criteria for the interpretation of

---


35Ibid., 214.

36Ibid.

37Ibid., 216.

38Ibid.
types. Here, an important dictum is worth mentioning: “Sound typology must rest on the guidance of inspired writers. When the interpreter moves out of the areas designated by inspiration to be types, he needs to acknowledge that he is moving into the realm of speculation.”

Another prominent figure in the development of the Adventist understanding of typology and its hermeneutical function was LaRondelle. He considered the typological structure an essential element in a multiplex approach to understanding the mysteries of the biblical apocalyptic. According to LaRondelle typology presupposes a redemptive history in the past, the present, and the future, culminating in the historical advent of Christ Jesus. He also recognizes that the typological structure is characterized both by its analogy and intensification of type and antitype. For him this type-antitype relationship is qualified by the Christological-eschatological understanding introduced by Christ Himself.

LaRondelle’s interest and study of typology enriched and expanded Adventist understanding of typology. A significant contribution of his hermeneutical assessment of typology is his study of the function and nature of typology within the framework of Covenant Theology, contrasted against Dispensationalist

39Ibid., 216, 217. Murdoch considers that a genuine application of typology contributes much to the understanding of the Bible by adding to the vertical aspect of revelation the horizontal aspect of salvation. According to Murdoch there are certain criteria that are necessary to sound interpretation of types: (a) The specific points of correspondence must be carefully noted between the types and the antitypes. (b) The points of difference and contrast between the types and the antitype should be also noted. (c) The points of correspondence and differences should be studied in the light of the historical context of each. (d) An attempt must not be made to discover meaning in the minutia of detail. Here the NT is a guide as it treats the broad themes of the plan of redemption rather than the incidentals of the type. (e) Sound typology must rest on the guidance of inspired writers. When the interpreter moves out of the areas designated by inspiration to be types, he needs to acknowledge that he is moving into the realm of speculation. (f) The interpreter should seek understanding of God’s purpose in giving both the type and the antitype. There should be an evident similarity of meaning between them, although the later usually represents a more vital and broader event or principle than the former.

40Ibid., 217.


42Ibid.

43Ibid., 233.

44Ibid.
eschatology, to understand and interpret the OT and Eschatology from a Christological perspective.\textsuperscript{45}

However, some of LaRondelle’s typological concepts are worth mentioning: In his view typological interpretation is distinct from both the grammatical-historical method and the allegorical approach.\textsuperscript{46} Typology is the theological-Christological interpretation of the history in the HB by the New Testament, which goes beyond mere exegesis.\textsuperscript{47} For LaRondelle the study of historical correspondences between God’s redemptive acts in the OT and the salvation that the NT writers had beheld in Jesus Christ is called Christian typology.\textsuperscript{48} Therefore he argued that a valid definition of a biblical type could be: “A type is an institution, historical event, or person, ordained by God, which effectively prefigures some truth connected with Christianity.”\textsuperscript{49} However, it is the authority of the NT which establishes the divinely \textit{pre-ordained} connection between a type and antitype and discloses the \textit{predictive} nature of the type.\textsuperscript{50} LaRondelle typology’s predictive nature is retrospective,\textsuperscript{51} while at the same time it is based on the historical exegesis of the

\textsuperscript{45}Hans K. LaRondelle, \textit{The Israel of God in Prophecy: Principles of Prophetic Interpretation} (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983), 35-55. LaRondelle considers that this Christological focus and eschatological perspective distinguishes typology from any accidental parallel situation. Wherever historical persons, events, or institutions are understood as foreshadowing some aspect of Christ’s ministry, a typological perspective becomes visible. The relation of type-antitype is not simply one of repetition but one of an eschatological completion. The antitype is therefore not a more developed form of the type, but a new and unique work of God, through the Messiah, so that the antitype in some respects can even stand in opposition to the type (e.g., the sacrificial cultus, Adam).

\textsuperscript{46}LaRondelle, \textit{The Israel of God in Prophecy}, 36. He argues that the grammatical-historical exegesis focuses exclusively on one period of time as the context of Scripture. It must be asked, however, whether the meaning of an event or prophecy in the OT can be determined fully by the original historical situation. The meaning of single events can often be fully understood only in the light of their consequences in later history.

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., 45.

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., 36.

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid. LaRondelle states that the New Testament writers, under divine inspiration, disclosed surprising correspondences between God’s redemptive acts in the HB and the salvation they had beheld in Jesus Christ.

\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., 37.

\textsuperscript{51}Ibid., 45, 46. Typology “takes more than the literal sense of a passage. The New Testament does this when it sees Christ as the theme and fulfillment of all the Old Testament, without limiting this to what is explicitly Messianic prophecy. .... Typological interpretation shows that the partial and fragmentary revelation in the Old Testament
OT in order to grasp a better understanding or greater sense (the *sensus pleniour*) of God’s redemptive-historical acts for the whole human race.\(^{52}\)

LaRondelle also offers the following characteristics of New Testament typology:

a. New Testament typology does not deal with the minutiae and incidentals, nor does it teach a one-to-one correspondence or complete identity between type and antitype. Consequently dissimilarity between type and antitype must be recognized.\(^{53}\) Again, a too literalistic typology should be avoided.

b. In order to discover the typological pattern between the two testaments and grasp the real essentials of the OT salvation history, and to distinguish them clearly from merely external similarities, more is needed than what a purely historical exegesis can offer. It requires the enlightenment and guidance of the Holy Spirit.\(^{54}\) Typology interpretation is not only an exegetical endeavor, but also a charismatic event.

c. The discovery of a new typological pattern in the Scriptures must be based on clear New Testament authority.\(^{55}\)

Furthermore, this period provided another enormous step forward in the development of our understanding of typology because for the first time Adventism focused their study on the why and how of typology without taking it for granted and tried to see what the Bible had to say about it. A major breakthrough in our understanding of typology came from the doctoral work of

pointed forward to Christ. ... Typology reads into Scripture a meaning which is not there in that it reads in the light of the fulfillment of the history. ... Nevertheless it does not read a new principle into the context; it interprets the dealings of God with men from the literal context, and then points to the way in which God has so dealt with men in Christ.” See Hans K. LaRondelle and Jon Paulien, *The Bible Jesus Interpreted: Seeing Jesus in the Old Testament*, (Loma Linda, CA: Jon Paulien, 2014), 61, 62. Christian typology is defined by this messianic progression of salvation history. Because the ancient types and prophecies were but dimly understood, Christian typology must start with Jesus as the true Interpreter of the Scriptures. He opens the mind to a deeper understanding that goes beyond a surface reading of Scripture (see Luke 24:45). This hermeneutical starting point offers a serious safeguard against unwarranted conclusions on the basis of an Old Testament type or prophecy alone. Although there is a circle of correspondences in type and antitype, the defining standard of this two-way relationship lies in the New Testament.

\(^{52}\)LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy*, 46. He declares, “We affirm that the genuine typological sense does not superimpose a different sense on the literal meaning of the words of Scripture, but pertains to the prophetic meaning of the things, or events, expressed by the words of Scripture. True typological interpretation of the HB does not create a second meaning or allegorization beyond the literal sense but listens ‘to how the historical meaning of the text continues to speak in the New Testament situation.’”

\(^{53}\)Ibid., 48.

\(^{54}\)Ibid.

\(^{55}\)Ibid.

As an objective of his study, Davidson proposed to “ascertain the nature of biblical typology by allowing its conceptual structures to emerge from within Scripture through a semasiological analysis of the term τύπος and NT cognates and an exegetical investigation of NT hermeneutical τύπος passages.” Davidson argued that as result of his exegetical analysis of the five NT hermeneutical τύπος passages, five τύπος structures consistently emerge.

There is an historical structure (including the elements of historicality, correspondence, and progression) and four theological structures—the eschatological (involving inaugurated/appropriated/consummated fulfillment aspects), the Christological-soteriological (in which Christ and his salvific work are the ultimate orientation point of the τύπος/ἀντίτυπος), the ecclesiological (comprised of individual, corporate, and sacramental dimensions), and the prophetic (consisting of the aspects of prefiguration, divine design, and prospective/predictive [devoir-être]).

Davidson proposes that “typology can be defined as the study of persons, events, or institutions in salvation history that God specifically designed to predictively prefigure their antitypical eschatological fulfillment in Christ and the gospel realities brought about by Christ.”

Davidson’s work on typology has refined and defined most of the ongoing scholarly discussion on typology within Adventism. But in addition to this, it

---


57 Ibid., 1.

58 Ibid., 2, 3.


also has made a significant contribution to the discussion of typology outside of Adventism by establishing a connection between the contextual relationship of the types and the antitypes, within a comprehensive framework of systematic theology.

Yet, according to Edward Glenny, “the most controversial and innovative aspect of Davidson’s theory of typology is his belief that types are predictive and there must be some indication of the existence and predictive quality of OT types


before their antitypical fulfillment—otherwise they cannot be predictive.”

However, Glenny misses the fact that Davidson is not the only one who argues for the predictive nature of typology. Furthermore, he does not take into account that the predictive element of typology is the logical outcome of the theological foundations of biblical typology. Likewise, this seems to be a logical

64 W. Edward Glenny, "Typology: A Summary of the Present Evangelical Discussion," JETS 40, no. 4 (1997): 637. While Glenny considers that Davidson is to be commended for his attempt to develop the structures of typology from the Biblical text. He considers that this element in particular needs further study and elaboration.

65 Ellis validated Davidson’s point when he declares that “for the NT writers a type has not merely the property of ‘typicalness’ or similarity; they view Israel’s history as Heilsgeschichte, and the significance of a type in the HB lies in its particular locus in the divine plan of redemption. When Paul speaks of the Exodus events happening typikōs and written ‘for our admonition,’ there can be no doubt that, in the apostle’s mind, Divine intent is of the essence both in the occurrence and in their inscripturation. The rationale of NT typological exegesis is not only ‘the continuity of God’s purpose throughout the history of his Covenant,’ but also His Lordship in molding and using history to reveal and illumine His purpose. God writes His parables in the sands of time.” See E. Earle Ellis, Paul’s Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957), 127, 128. Waltke states that “typology entails divine determination.” Since God divinely determined the type, it follows that the type is a divine prediction. See Bruce K. Waltke, "Kingdom Promises as Spiritual," in Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments: Essays in Honor of S. Lewis Johnson, Jr., ed. John S. Feinberg (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1988), 278; cf. Gerhard F. Hasel, "F fulfillments of Prophecy," in Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 3, The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy, ed. Frank B. Hollbrook (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 309. Davidson states that while he felt flattered by Glenny’s kind ascription to him for providing an “innovative” view of typology by emphasizing the predictive/prophetic element, he recognizes that his study has merely exegetically confirmed and drawn the logical consequences of the classical or traditional understanding of the subject as already set forth in previous centuries by Patrick Fairbairn, Milton Terry, Louis Berkhof, Leonhard Goppelt, and others who saw typology as a species of prophecy and essentially predictive. See Richard M. Davidson, "The Eschatological Hermeneutic of Biblical Typology," TheoRhema 6, no. 2 (2011): 13, 14.

66 S. Lewis Johnson, The Old Testament in the New: An Argument for Biblical Inspiration, Contemporary Evangelical Perspectives (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1980), 56. The fundamental basis of typology is theological. Biblical typology is built squarely on the sovereignty of God. It is He who controls history, and therefore guides events in such a way that types find their correspondence in antitypes. Glenny misses the notion that Davidson’s typological structures, four out five, are theological including the prophetic (consisting of the aspects of prefiguration, divine design, and prospective/predictive [devoir-être]).
outcome for the argument of a “fuller import and deeper meaning” of biblical typology already proposed in Adventism by Hasel.67

It is important to acknowledge that Adventist hermeneutics has experienced significant growth in its understanding of typology, its nature and characteristics.68 However, from a personal perspective, the application of such improvement is not proportionate to the growth in understanding for, the issue seems to be absent from Adventist scholarly work.69 This may be a sign that scholars have


68 The growth and influence of typology is perceived from its brief mention in “Methods of Bible Study” to its presence in the DARCOM series and his discussion in the Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology in the chapter “Biblical Interpretation.” See "Methods of Bible Study," (Washington, DC: General Conference Committee, 1986), 4. Under the discussion of interpreting prophecy item number 4 states: “The norms for interpreting prophecy are found within the Bible itself: The Bible notes times prophecies and their historical fulfillments; the New Testament cites specific fulfillments of Old Testament prophecies about the Messiah; and the Old Testament itself presents individuals and events as types of the Messiah.” See Davidson, "Biblical Interpretation," 83-85.

69 Frank B. Holbrook, Light in the Shadows: An Overview of the Doctrine of the Sanctuary (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1980), 12, 13. In this overview of the doctrine of the sanctuary Holbrook argues that the two keys are important in assisting us in correctly interpret the sanctuary symbolism: (a) The Israelite sanctuary is described as a parable; and (b) The Israelite sanctuary is described as a shadow-type. According to Holdbrook, we generally designate these ritual “shadows—as types.” A dictionary definition of type is “a person or thing regarded as the symbol of someone or something that is yet to appear.” Types are, therefore, like prophecies. Instead of being embodied in words, the sanctuary shadow-types were prophecies embodied in rituals which foreshadowed—“foretold”—the coming death of Jesus and His priestly ministry in heaven. Here again, shadow-types can be subject to a variety of interpretations, but we may be guarded from misapplications of both sanctuary symbols and types if we study them in the clear light of the plan of salvation as taught throughout the Scriptures. While Hardinge’s book mentions Davidson’s dissertation as one of the resources to understand typology it seems from his rules on how to interpret sanctuary typology that he does not incorporate it concepts into his analysis. Hardinge suggest some obvious rules for the study of Sanctuary symbology: (a) The student should constantly pray himself in that frame of mind which will allow the Spirit to “guide him into all truth.” (b) No meaning should be deduced which produces tensions with other portions or the Scriptures dealing with the topic. (c) No interpretation should be proposed which runs counter verified human
mixed feelings about the value and validity of typology in the exegetical task. It may also indicate that Adventist scholars have a limited understanding of the significance of biblical typology in helping us understand Scripture beyond the traditional use of typology in Adventism (e.g., Sanctuary and Revelation).  

knowledge and experience. (d) Every passage dealing with the concept should be brought to bear upon it with the help of good concordances. (e) The contexts of each passage, book, author and the Scriptures as a whole should be kept in mind. (f) Hebrew and Greek lexicons should be consulted to ensure that the meanings of the words are clearly understood. (g) Grammars should provide ideas as to the thrust of phrases and sentences. (h) Reliable histories and books on archaeology should be studied. (i) “The law of first mention” should be applied. This stresses that the context of the first time any idea is introduced in Scripture sets the tone for its use in the rest of the Bible. (j) “The law of last mention” rounds out this meaning. (k) “The law of full mention” looks for some passage in Scripture where the idea is discussed at length. (l) The writings of Ellen G. White should be compared with Scripture. See Leslie Hardinge, With Jesus in His Sanctuary: A Walk Through the Tabernacle Along His Way (Harrisburg, PA: American Cassette Ministries, 1991), 48. This is an excellent introductory book to biblical hermeneutics from an Adventist perspective that adopts fully Davidson typological analysis. A whole chapter is dedicated to discuss typology and offers worksheet to do typological analysis. See Lee J. Gugliotto, Handbook For Bible Study: A Guide to Understanding, Teaching, and Preaching the Word of God (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2000).

Roy Adams, The Sanctuary Doctrine: Three Approaches in the Seventh-day Adventist Church (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 278. Roy Adams considers that the “strict typological approach” only seems to deal with questions related to the theological significance of the immediate sanctuary and paraphernalia. There is a growing awareness of the typological nature of the OT within itself. Steiner mentions Sailhamer’s assessment that in the Pentateuch there is a rich use of “narrative typology,” by means of which “later events are written to remind the reader of past narratives” (e.g., Gen 41 – Exod 12 foreshadowed in Gen 12:10-20; or Exod 25-40 in Gen 1-3), Steiner states that Sailhamer also finds evidence in the strategy of the Pentateuch that the author worked “within a clearly defined hermeneutic,” namely, “an eschatological reading of his historical narratives” in which “the narrative texts of past events are presented as pointers to future events. See V. J. Steiner, "Literary Structure of the Pentateuch, Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch, eds. T. Desmond Alexander and David W. Baker (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 547. The traditional approach to figure out biblical connections was called “typology”—observing how the narrative patterns of the HB foreshadowed the Messiah. The basis of typology is the belief that stories of biblical persons or events point toward the Christ. Traditional typology made each connection singularly between particular narrative elements and Jesus the Messiah. Biblical readers were invited to consider the relationship, for example, between Jacob and Jesus, or Joseph and Jesus, or Judah and Jesus, or David and Jesus, and so forth. One of the problems with the exclusively “Jesus and x” approach to the relationship between the Testaments was that it flattened the biblical narratives into many small units that each said the same thing. It prevented readers from hearing the interconnected and dynamic story that culminated in the Messiah. Schnittjer, for example, proposes a Polyacoustic reading—hearing multiple and
Typology in Adventism is far from being exhausted. Nonetheless, we could claim that we have discovered more precise tools to help us explore the text in relation to typological themes. Yet, several enquiries remain to be explored and tested. For example: What is the extent of typology? Are types only those expressly mentioned in the Bible? Does this approach limit the legitimate use of types, for some types (traditionally understood) not mentioned in the NT (e.g., Abraham sacrificing Isaac)? Are the types given in the NT examples for finding others in the OT? There is also the question of how the concept of corporate personality relates to typology. How do intertextuality, allusion, and typology relate to each other? What parameters can be used to establish a clear distinction between symbol and type? How does typology express itself in the Writings, especially in books like Job and the hermeneutically challenging Song of Songs, which has a long history of allegorical interpretation?

In essence, what is indicative from analyzing the development of hermeneutical controls for typology in Adventism is the need to limit the inappropriate and harmful use of typology when interpreting the Scriptures.

———

71 "Interpretation of Prophecy," *Baker’s Dictionary of Practical Theology*, ed. Ralph G. Turnbull (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1967), 131. This article argues that according to some teachers, if a whole is typical, then the parts are also typical. On this basis, the details of the tabernacle and its furnishings are considered as types, and a significance is sought in each, with an antitype in Christ. This is considered strictly speaking, as an application of the allegorical method, rather than the typical.

72 DeVries, "Type, Typology," 2:2110; Osborne, "Typology," 5:954. Osborne argues that there are two kinds of typological figures: (a) an innate type that is specifically mentioned in the NT (e.g., 1 Cor 10:6; 1 Pet. 3:21); and (b) an inferred type that does not use the terminology but is based upon the principles (e.g., the uses of OT texts in Hebrews or Revelation). Both are valid uses of typology, but the latter are more open to fanciful and allegorical exegesis so must be studied carefully. See Patrick Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture: Viewed in Connection with the Whole Series of the Divine Dispensations* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1900); Osborne, "Type; Typology," 4:930.

73 Bruce Corley, Steve Lemke, and Grant Lovejoy, *Biblical Hermeneutics: A Comprehensive Introduction to Interpreting Scripture* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2002), 88. The history of salvation often appears in the New Testament as the history of individuals—Adam, Abraham, Moses, David, Jesus—yet they are individuals who also have a corporate dimension embracing the nation or the race.

Typology in Adventist Theological Controversies

It is unmistakable that typology is strongly affected by theology. But, on the other hand, it is not always obvious how typology has affected theology, particularly in Adventism. However, Adventist history has given us enough evidence to support the idea that, behind several theological controversies, typology and typological thinking (i.e. analogical thinking) have played a fundamental role.

a. Date Setting Controversies: John Paulien argues in his book What the Bible says about the End-Time in the chapter titled “The ‘When’ of the End” that “logical analogy and a Bible text” have been the basis behind the reasoning of several attempts at date setting controversies in Adventism. Interestingly, several of them could clearly be recognized as using typological thinking. For example, Bates’ arguments were based on sanctuary rituals on the Day of Atonement. Also, arguments have been made from the wilderness experience of Israel before entering Canaan (used more than once), Noah’s preaching before the flood, and from the Old Testament year of Jubilee (Predictive and prophetic elements of typology).

b. Atonement Concept Controversies: For example, Roy Adams considers that Uriah Smith’s position on the atonement in relation to the cross is based “on a rigid interpretation of the ancient typical system.” Adams argues that Smith saw in the Old Testament sacrificial system of atonement as something occurring within the sanctuary once a year. Accordingly, he believed that the locus of the antitypical atonement should likewise be within the sanctuary and in this case the heavenly.

Adams also proposes that Andreasen’s experiential understanding of the notion of defilement and cleansing of the sanctuary constituted a major thrust of his sanctuary theology (Ecclesiological typology). In this scheme, argues Adams, the sanctuary to be cleansed is not simply the heavenly, but the earthly sanctuary of the human heart. The so-called “Last Generation” theology is grounded in typology. It is not only argued on the basis of Sanctuary typology, but on a Job typology as well. Andreasen states “Job’s case is recorded for a purpose. While we grant its historicity, we believe that it has also a wider meaning. God’s people in the last days will pass through an experience similar to Job’s.” In more recent times, Herbert Douglass echoes this fact when he states “the characters of last-day

---

75 Paulien, What the Bible Says About the End-Time, 19-24.
76 Roy Adams, The Sanctuary: Understanding the Heart of Adventist Theology (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1993), 133.
77 Ibid.
78 Adams, The Sanctuary Doctrine, 190, 191.
Christians who ‘keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus’ are the same quality as those of Enoch, Daniel, and all the others in times past who became sanctified overcomers, in so doing vindicating the wisdom and power of God. Job’s experience will be reproduced” (Experiential and Ecclesiological elements of typology).80

c. Israelite Festival Controversy: The typological foundation of this controversy in Adventism is explicit. According to Bacchiocchi, it is a wrong assumption to consider that the annual Feast came to an end with the sacrifice of Christ simply because they were connected with the sacrificial system. The reason that Bacchiocchi gives to sustain his positions is “that the continuity or discontinuity of the Feast is determined not by their connection with the sacrificial system, but by the scope of their typology.”81 Bacchiocchi adds:

If the Feasts had typified only the redemptive accomplishments of Christ’s first Advent, then obviously their function would have terminated at the Cross. But, if the Feast foreshadow also the consummation of redemption to be accomplished by Christ at His second Advent, then their function continues in the Christian church, though with a new meaning and manner of observance.82

Interestingly, in his first book on the Israelite festivals, Bacchiochi establishes the foundation of his argument for typology without offering any clear definition of typology, its nature, or characteristics. Amazingly, also, he does not incorporate in his bibliography any previous material discussed on the issue from Adventist history either popular or scholarly, neither on typology or the Israelite feasts. In addition, he does not mention a single article, dictionary entry or book dedicated to biblical typology outside of Adventism!

However, in his second book Bacchiocchi corrected these deficiencies in his analysis and defined biblical typology and assents to Davidson’s definition and structures of typology.83 Nonetheless, while it seems that Bacchiochi’s intent is “not to point out some of the deficiencies in the typological interpretation of Adventist pioneers, but rather to build upon their foundation by expanding the understanding of the typical nature and antitypical fulfillment of the Fall Feast,”84 there is a significant gap between his stated intentions and his procedure.

82Ibid.
84Ibid., 17.
While Bacchiocchi's typological approach faced strong opposition in Adventist scholarly circles, his book, among others, has promoted a modified practice of the Israelite feasts within Adventism. However, this incident illustrates the tension that exists in Adventism between the theory of typology and its application. After all, typology in Adventism should not only have exegetical concerns but hermeneutical as well.

Typology in the Future of Adventism

According to G. R. Osborne in the post-Reformation period several distinct schools of thought developed in connection with typology. Among conservative scholars there were three major positions: (1) Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669) applied any OT event or person that resembled a NT parallel, thereby coming close to an allegorical approach; (2) John March (1757–1839) asserted that the only types were those explicitly stated to be types in the NT; and (3) Patrick Fairbairn (1805–1874) mediated between the two by accepting both innate (explicit) and inferred (implied) types, stating that many more correspondences existed in the NT period than happened to be enumerated in the texts themselves.

Today in Adventism similar proposals could be perceived suggesting three different approaches to typology:

a. Closed Typology: While Adventism has not clearly proposed a closed typology; it has certainly promoted it by suggesting the danger of exploring beyond the explicit stated types in the NT. Perhaps this is the safest form of typology in Adventism (exegetically grounded).

b. Controlled Typology: Adventism has always tried also to develop controls to typological interpretation by sometimes arguing from common sense, Christian tradition, as well as from biblical controls. However, as Adventism grew and interacted theologically, typology, through the contributions of scholars like Hasel, Murdoch, LaRondelle, and Davidson, experienced a significant hermeneutical advance in acquiring sound biblical parameters used to detect typological relationships in the Scriptures. The most detailed hermeneutical system for a


controlled typology within Adventism today is Davidson’s typological structures (exegetically and theologically grounded).

c. Quasi-Controlled Typology: Scholars within Adventism advance a more open view of typology. For example, Adams proposes “a quasi-typological approach” that, unlike “the strict typological approach,” attempts to draw out the possible theological or religious significance of certain incidental aspects of the “sanctuary complex.” Adams argues that the value of the quasi-typological approach is that it allows Adventists to say something theologically significant about the sanctuary independent of (though not unrelated) those “distinctive aspects that dominate the traditional presentation of the subject. It draws from the sanctuary something deeply theological and spiritual that could provide an intellectually and experiential ‘currency’ of various cultures and peoples.”

However, Adams himself considers that “in approaching the biblical text in this way, one needs to be constantly on guard against allegorical speculations, into which this method can easily degenerate.” It becomes evident, in Adams’s approach, that the motivation behind it is the use of typology with theological, homiletical and pastoral purposes (pastorally grounded).

---

88Adams, The Sanctuary Doctrine, 278.
89Ibid., 282.
90Ibid.; Roy Adams, The Nature of Christ: Help for a Church Divided over Perfection (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1994), 134. Here Adams discusses the danger that an uncontrolled view of analogical thinking could lead to dangerous conclusions. His advice is be “careful how you draw the parallels.”
91Adams, The Sanctuary Doctrine, 282. Another clear example is John S. Nixon, Redemption in Genesis: The Crossroads of Faith and Reason (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2011), 10-13. While Nixon calls his approach “faithful reasoning” the thrust of his book is typology he states “in the pages that follow, we will look for Jesus in the stories told in the first book of the Bible, beginning in places where His presence is hidden. We will search out hints of Him and His attributes in shadows and symbols, in metaphors and figures of speech, and, most of all, in the lives of men and women of yore—believers in the true God, who walked and talked and lived and died in the days before the Messiah came to earth” Nixon suggest that the effect of seeing “through the clarifying lens of Christ, we will see redemption anew as that which calls us to self-abandonment and deeper reliance on Him. Nixon proposes that Jesus is the ultimate meaning of Eden’s lamb, of Noah’s ark, of Sodom’s destruction, of Abraham’s ram in the thicket. See Ivor Myers, Operation Blueprint, Earth’s Final Movie: The Ultimate Search & Rescue Mission (Roseville, CA: Amazing Facts, 2013). This popular book offers an unexpected twist between traditional sanctuary typology with prophetic interpretation. It clearly follows the approach of “analogical logic and a Bible text.”
Conclusion

Typology arose in Adventism as a unifying force, and while somehow limited, was working together with these elements. Adventist typology needs to be continually developed and integrated with clear exegetical, theological and ecclesiological concerns.

Furthermore, in a church hermeneutically divided between literal or principle approaches, Adventist typology hermeneutics has always existed in tandem with these two approaches. It is also accepted by members in both groups. Adventist history has continually rejected a too literalistic approach to typology. At the same time, it has constantly discarded the over spiritualization of typology. It seems typology is showing Adventism a way toward hermeneutical unity.

For Seventh-day Adventists, the significance of typology is not only a matter of historical research. Davidson has rightly argued that “the historic Adventist interpretation of the sanctuary … stands or falls depending upon the validity of its hermeneutic method.”

This study has tried to show that typology in Adventism has proven to be a defining force in our theology, our thinking and even, at times, our practices. Since its first appearing in early Adventism, typology has provided assistance to our understanding of Scripture, but also has been the source of much misunderstanding. The need to explore its nature, characteristics, and application has been an ongoing concern for Adventism and it must continue to be so.

92For a more complete picture of the hermeneutical divisions within Adventism see Ján Barna, Ordination of Women in Seventh-day Adventist Theology: A Study in Biblical Interpretations (Belgrade, Serbia: Preporod, 2012).


95Representatives of the different hermeneutical perspectives within Adventism acknowledge the value and validity of typology as an acceptable exegetical method. See for example fns. 93 and 94.