

Heb. xi. 31; Jas. ii. 25.—“The harlot Rahab”: where πόρνη (*pornee*), a harlot, receives its true meaning from the Heb. זֹנָה (zōnah) which means a female hostess, or landlady, as well as harlot.

1 Pet. iii. 14.—δικαιοσύνη (*dikaiousunee*), righteousness, is used of ordinary piety, kindness, etc. So 2 Cor. ix. 9. Matt. vi. 1 according to one reading (see *Metonymy* and *Synecdoche*).

Rev. ii. 7; xxii. 2, 14.—“The tree of life.” In the Greek ξύλον (*xylon*) means wood; but receives its meaning of “tree” from the Heb. עֵץ (*eytz*), tree, which is frequently rendered ξύλον (*xylon*) in the LXX.

Rev. xiv. 8; xviii. 3.—“She hath made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.” Here, θυμός (*thumos*), wrath, means heat, as well as anger; like the Heb. חַיְמָה (*cheymah*), heat, venom, or poison. See Job vi. 4, where the LXX. renders it θυμός (*thumos*), evil or affliction, as Matt. vi. 34. So that the meaning is “the heating or poisonous wine of her fornication.”

METALLAGE; or, A CHANGING OVER.

A different subject of thought substituted for the original subject.

Me-tal'-la-gee. Greek μεταλλαγή, from μετά (*meta*), *beyond*, or *across*; and ἀλλαγή (*allagee*), a *change*, *exchange* (from ἀλλάσσω, *allasso*). Hence, *Metallage* means *a taking over in exchange*.

In this figure the word taken over is exchanged for a separate object of thought.

The Latins called it SUPPOSITIO, *substitution*, and MATERIALIS, *the mother stuff*: *i.e.*, one material out of which something else is made. The figure *Metallage* is used when a word is taken as the material, and out of it another object of thought is made and substituted.

Brydane exclaims, "O frightful and terrible *perhaps!*" Whitefield speaks of "Judas accosting his glorious Lord with a 'Hail, Master!'"

Hos. iv. 18.—"Their drink is sour: they have committed whoredom continually: her rulers with shame do love, 'Give ye.'"

ANTONOMASIA ; or, NAME-CHANGE.

Change of proper name for appellative ; or vice versa.

An -to-no-mā'-si-a. Greek, ἀντρονομασία, a different name, from ἀντρονομάζειν, to name instead ; and this from ἀντί (anti), instead, and ὀνομάζειν (onomazein), to name (from ὄνομα (onoma), a name).

This figure is so called because a proper name is put for a common or appellative noun ; or because, on the contrary, an appellation derived from some attribute is put for a proper name. As when a name of some office, dignity, profession, science, or trade, is used instead of the proper name of the person : e.g., when we speak of the Queen as *Her Majesty*, or of a nobleman as *his lordship* ; or when a wise man is called a *Solon*, or a *Solomon*, etc.

When we speak of David as "the Psalmist," or of Paul as "the Apostle," we use the figure *Antonomasia*.

Gen. xxxi. 21.—The Euphrates is called "the river" on account of its greatness. See also Josh. xxiv. 2. Ps. lxxii. 8 ; lxxx. 11 (12), where also "the sea" is put for "the Great Sea," which is another *Antonomasia* for the Mediterranean. See also Mic. vii. 12.

1 Sam. iv. 21.—"And she named the child 'In-glorious' (*i.e.*, *I-chabōd*), saying, 'The glory is departed,'" *I-chabōd* meaning *there is no glory*. The name occurs once more, in chap. xiv. 3.

Isa. lxii. 4.—

"Thou shalt no more be termed 'Forsaken' ;

Neither shall thy land any more be termed 'Desolate' :

But thou shalt be called 'Hephzi-bah' (*i.e.*, *my delight is in her*),
And thy land 'Beulah' (*i.e.*, *married*)."

Here note that the four lines are alternate : the subject of the first and third being the *People*, while that of the second and fourth is the *Land*.

Hos. i. 6.—"And He said unto him, Call her name 'Not-having-obtained-mercy' (*i.e.*, *Lo-ruhamah*)."

Hos. xii. 13 (14).—Moses is called "a Prophet," because he was *par excellence* the prophet. See Deut. xxxiv. 10, 11, 12.

Mark viii. 20.—"And when [*I brake*] the seven among four thousand" : *i.e.*, the seven loaves.

Acts iii. 14.—“ But ye denied the Holy One and the Just ”: *i.e.*, the Lord Jesus Christ. See *Hendiadys*.

Acts xxii. 14.—“ The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that Just (or Righteous) One ”: *i.e.*, the Lord Jesus. Thus was Paul led of the Spirit to avoid the use of any word which would excite and inflame them. By this means he obtained audience, until, in verse 21, he had to use the word “ Gentiles ” (“ I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles ”), when we read: “ And they gave him audience unto this word.”

Acts xxv. 26.—The Roman Emperor is called “ my lord.”

The Divine Names and Titles are sometimes the attributes of God used as proper names:—

God is called *the Strong One (El)*; or, *the Most High (Elyōn)*. Ps. v. 4 (5); xxii. 1 (2), etc.

Christ is in the same way called *the Lord*. Matt. xxi. 3. John xi. 3, 12, etc.

The Teacher or Master. Matt. xxvi. 18. John xi. 28.

The Son of man (see under *Synecdoche*). Matt. viii. 20; ix. 6; x. 23; xi. 19; xii. 8, etc.

The Angel. Gen. xlviii. 16. Ex. xxiii. 20.

The Angel of the Lord. Ex. iii. 2. Judges vi. 11

So also other appellatives are used: *e.g.*, “ The Seed of the woman,” “ The Messiah,” “ The Servant of Jehovah,” “ The Messenger of the Covenant,” “ The Prophet,” etc.

EUPHEMISMOS ; or, EUPHEMY.

Change of what is unpleasant for pleasant.

Eu'-phee-mis'-mos. Greek, εὐφημισμός, from εὐφημίζειν (*euphemizein*), to use words of good omen, from εὖ (*eu*), well, and φημί (*phemi*), to speak. Hence, Eng., *Euphemy*.

Euphemy is a figure by which a harsh or disagreeable expression is changed for a pleasant and agreeable one ; or, where an offensive word or expression is changed for a gentle one ; or an indelicate word for a modest word.

This figure is not, strange to say, generally used as with us of the ordinary functions of nature, which are often exaggerated by civilization and fashion into a false modesty. The Scriptures use very plain language on plain subjects : but there are beautiful *Euphemies* used where really delicate feelings or sentiments are affected.

Indeed, we may say that the contrast between the Hebrew and other languages in this respect is one of the greatest proofs of Inspiration. Other languages abound in terms of indecency and immorality, which are a corrupt reflex of the corrupt mind of fallen man. But "the words of Jehovah are pure words."

As to our "uncomely parts," as the Holy Spirit terms them, there is actually no word in the Hebrew for the female, and for the male a *Euphemy* is employed.

We may contrast with this the tendency of man, not only downward in this direction, but in his vain attempts to cover his sin and to make himself appear better than he is. Examples abound in every day life. "A love-child" covers illegitimacy ; "a free life" glosses a debauchee ; "a gentleman of the road" covered a highway robber. So the Romans called a thief "a man of three letters," because the Latin word for thief is "*fur*." On the other hand, among ourselves, "the hydraulic van" has superseded the water-cart ; the shop has become an "establishment" or "emporium" ; the butcher has blossomed into "a purveyor of meat" ; the hair-dresser is "an artist" or "professor," etc., etc.

But the *Euphemisms* of the Bible are not like these ! Sin is not glossed over or "wrapped up," but spoken of plainly in all its abomination. Man is not deceived by coloured and pretty ornaments of speech.

Compare, again, man's *Euphemies* of "life" and "death"; and note the false teaching conveyed by them, when compared with those used in the word of God. Man calls "death" a friend, and speaks of "joining the majority": but God speaks of it as a terrible calamity, and calls it "the enemy"; "the last enemy," "the king of terrors," etc., though, in the case of His own people, He speaks of their being "put to sleep by Jesus" (1 Thess. iv. 14). It is only a "sleep"; because the Lord Himself will come to wake them.

The change in *Euphemy* is necessarily obtained by using several words for one, and is therefore a special kind of *Periphrasis*: *i.e.*, a *Periphrasis* used with a special object.

Hence it was called also PERIPLOCE (*Per-i-plok'-ee*), from *περί* (*peri*), *around*, and *πλοκή* (*plokee*), *a folding*; a figure by which the unpleasantness of a thing is wrapped round and made to appear agreeable.

CHROMA (*Chro'-ma*) was another name given to the figure, from *χρῶμα* (*chrōma*), *a colouring, an ornament, or embellishment*.

The Latins called it also INVOLUTIO: *i.e.*, an *involution*.

In English we might call it "a smooth handle": *i.e.*, a polite expression for a rough or unpleasant one.

Gen. xv. 15.—"Thou shalt go to thy fathers": *i.e.*, shalt die.

Gen. xlii. 38.—"Then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave": *i.e.*, ye will kill me.

Judges iii. 24.—"Surely he covereth his feet in his summer chamber." When an Eastern stoops down, his garments fall over and cover his feet. Hence the *Euphemy*, the meaning of which is given in the margin. See also 1 Sam. xxiv. 3.

2 Sam. xviii. 32.—David enquired of Cush: "Is the young man Absalom safe? And Cush answered, The enemies of my lord the king, and all that rise against thee to do thee hurt, be as that young man is."

Thus, by two beautiful *Euphemisms*, Cush reminded David of Absalom's treason and its deserts, while he also intimated that he had been slain.

Ruth iii. 9.—"Spread . . . thy skirt over thine handmaid": *i.e.*, receive me in the way of marriage.

2 Kings xxii. 20.—"I will gather thee unto thy fathers (*i.e.*, thou shalt die), and thou shalt be gathered into thy grave (*i.e.*, be buried) in peace."

Neh. iv. 23 (17).—"None of us put off our clothes, *saving that every one put them off for washing.*" (Margin, *every one went with his weapon for water.*)

The R.V. is no clearer: "None of us put off our clothes, every one *went with his weapon to the water*"; and puts it in the margin: "The text is probably faulty"! This is like man; who always thinks the *fault* is in the Text instead of in himself. When he meets with a difficulty, it never dawns on him that the difficulty lies in his own head, or is of his own creating!

The Hebrew is literally: "None of us put off our clothes; each man went with his weapon (or tool) and water": *i.e., he discharged his water as he was (or as he stood): i.e., there was neither time nor opportunity for retiring and for that laborious arrangement of the clothes which an Eastern requires. And thus the simple Euphemy is most expressive, and explains, instead of needing an explanation (which after all does not explain)!*

Glassius would treat the word "water" as a *Synecdoche* by which "water," the most important part of a man's ration, is put for all of it. "This would require the translation: "Each one went with his sword *and water*": *i.e., one single weapon and one measured ration, "water" being used alone for a measured ration, as it was a very important part of the rations served out. Just as "salt" was served and measured out to the Roman soldiers, and afterwards was used by Synecdoche of the whole ration of which it was a part. Hence our term "salt-money"; and the Latin, salarium, and English, salary. When we say "a man is not worth his salt," we preserve this Synecdoche; and, putting a part for the whole, we mean that he is not worth his salary.*

So it may be here in Neh. iv. 23. The A.V. and R.V., with these marginal renderings, clearly show that something more is meant than what is said. But we believe that the figure of *Euphemy* sufficiently and satisfactorily explains it.

There is, however, something to be said for Glassius's suggestion as to *Synecdoche*.

One thing is clear, which makes either figure explain or express the one fact that is specially emphasized: *viz., that Nehemiah and his companions were building the wall with a trowel in one hand and a sword in the other (iv. 17 (11), etc).* So exigent were the circumstances that they worked all night, and could take with them no armour or supplies of food. A single weapon and a single ration were all they could take.

Or so exigent were the circumstances that there was not even the usual opportunity for performing the functions of nature in the ordinary way. In either case the figure read in the light of the context shows the urgency of the circumstances.

Job x. 21, 22.—Here, we have two beautiful *Periphrases*: “Before I go whence I shall not return (*i.e.*, before I die), even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death”: *i.e.*, the grave, etc. So xvi. 22.

Job xviii. 13. — “The first-born of death shall devour his strength”: *i.e.*, the cruellest and most calamitous death shall destroy him.

Job xviii. 14.—Death is called “the king of terrors”: *i.e.*, the terrible king who claims so many subjects.

Ps. xciv. 17.—“Unless the LORD had been my help, my soul had almost (*marg.*, *quickly*) dwelt in silence”: *i.e.*, I should soon have been dead and buried.

Isa. xxxviii. 10.—“I shall go to the gates of the grave (*Sheol*)”: *i.e.*, I shall die. This explains Matt. xvi. 18; where the corresponding word (*Hades*) is used, and in the same sense: *i.e.*, death shall not prevail against the accomplishment of God’s purposes.

Ecc. iii. 21.—See Appendix E, and *Erotesis*.

Ecc. xii. 1-7.—We have a series of connected *Periphrases* and *Euphemisms*.

One of them is worthy of a longer notice:—

Ecc. xii. 5. — “And desire shall fail.” We have already considered this under *Metalepsis* (*q.v.*), because there is a double *Metonymy*. But there is a beautiful latent *Euphemy* as well. The “*cap-er-berry*” is put for the *condiment* made from it, and then the *condiment* is put for the *appetite* or desire created by it.

But as this *condiment* was supposed specially to create sexual desire, the *Euphemy* is elegantly expressed in the A.V. (“and desire shall fail”). The sense is absurdly lost in the R.V.; while to make the obscurity caused by the literal translation still greater, it is suggested in the margin that “fail” may mean “burst.”

This is certainly one of the many passages in which the A.V. far exceeds the R.V. in beauty as well as accuracy, and shows that the A.V. is a *Version*, while the R.V. is a *Translation*.

Matt. viii. 11.—“Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.”

This was a beautiful *Euphemism*; to avoid giving offence (at that stage of Christ's ministry) to the Jews, who grudged the blessings being extended to Gentiles.

Matt. xi. 19 and Luke vii. 35.—“But wisdom is justified of (or on the part of) her children.” By this *Euphemy* the Lord Jesus condemns those who received Him not.

True wisdom was shown in submitting to the Son of God: “Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth.” These words were written (Ps. ii. 10) with special reference to the reception of the Messiah: and all who were truly wise submitted themselves. Those who did not are thus rebuked.

John ii. 25.—“He knew what was in man.” This is a solemn condemnation of man; and shows something of his true nature and character.

John xi. 11.—“Our friend Lazarus sleepeth (*i.e.*, is dead); but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep”: *i.e.*, raise him from the dead.

Acts ii. 39.—“For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off”: *i.e.*, to the Gentiles. Peter did not wish at that time to give unnecessary offence.

There are many other *Euphemisms* which require no explanation, and which the student will now readily note and mark for himself.

AMPLIATIO ; or, ADJOURNMENT : *i.e.*, AN OLD NAME FOR A NEW THING.

*A retaining of an old Name after the reason for it is
passed away.*

Am'pli-a'-ti-o is a figure discovered and named by the Latins. It is from *am'pli-o*, to fill out, extend; hence, its more special and technical sense, to adjourn: *i.e.*, to extend the time. So that *Ampliatio* means an adjournment: and the name is given to this figure, because a name or epithet is used of a subject either (1) before it has acquired the reason for giving the name, or (2) after the reason has ceased.

In the latter case "the wolf" is still spoken of as the wolf in Millennial days, when its wolf's nature has been changed (Isa. xi. 6): and in the former the Saviour is so called by the angels while still an infant (Luke ii. 11). This use of the figure is of the nature of *Prolepsis* (*q.v.*).

Ampliatio thus differs from *Amplificatio* (*q.v.*), though the two words are from the same root. The former has reference to a change which has taken place; while in *Amplificatio* the sense of a word or expression is made wider and expanded by a repetition of the words in another form, in order to enlarge a narrative, and to heighten or intensify what has already been said.

Ampliatio is thus a form of *Epitheton* (*q.v.*). The original meaning of the figure is what is called *permansive*: *i.e.*, the name lives through the change which has taken place, and is still used, though in a new sense.

There is a form of *Prolepsis* which is distinguished from *Ampliatio*, (as opposed to *Occupatio*), but only as to time. It is a statement of future things as though present, the real interpretation of them being adjourned.

See under *Prolepsis* § 4 and § 6 of the last subdivision of Figures involving Change.

Gen. ii. 23.—"This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh."

Though the bone and flesh of Adam were changed and made into Eve, yet the name of the original source, "bone," etc., is retained.

Ex. vii. 12.—The rod of Aaron, when changed into a serpent, is still called "a rod" by way of *Ampliatio*.

1 Sam. xxx. 5. 2 Sam. iii. 3.—Abigail is still called, by way of *Ampliatio*, “the wife of Nabal the Carmelite,” though Nabal was dead, and she was the wife of David. Compare Matt. i. 6.

Isa. xi. 6.—The term “wolf” is used, by *Ampliatio*, of the animal in Millennial days, though his nature will have then been so changed that he shall dwell with the lamb, which formerly he devoured, and be no more really a wolf.

Amos vi. 8.—“I abhor the excellency of Jacob”: *i.e.*, that which was once so called, but was no longer worthy of the name, if this were the Temple, it is so called by *Ampliatio*.

Matt. x. 3.—“Matthew the Publican” is still so called, though he had ceased to be a *publicanus*, or tax-farmer: *i.e.*, “Matthew, who had formerly been a publican.”

See *Epitheton*.

Matt. xi. 5.—The blind are said to see, and the lame to walk after they are restored. Thus, by the figure *Ampliatio*, the *Epithet* still clings to them.

Matt. xxvi. 6.—“Simon the leper” is so called after he was healed. The *Epithet* still clings to him.

Luke ii. 11.—“Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour.” He is so called proleptically, by way of *Ampliatio*. His saving work, which gives Him this title, had then yet to be accomplished.

John ix. 17.—The *Epithet* “blind man” is still used of the man after his sight was restored. Compare verses 13 and 24.

John x. 16.—“Other sheep I have.” They are so called, though they were not yet in existence, except in the purpose of the Father.

Rom. iv. 5.—“The ungodly” is so called after he is justified. The *Epithet* is still used by way of *Ampliatio*.

1 Cor. xv. 5.—“The twelve” are so-called after Judas’s death, by way of *Ampliatio*, because they were formerly twelve: although there were only eleven after, until Matthias was appointed.

So Acts i. 21, 22.

2 Cor. iv. 3.—“The perishing” are those who shall hereafter be destroyed, and who were then or are now on their way to destruction.

Heb. xi. 31 and Jas. ii. 25.—Rahab is still called “the harlot.” The term remains as an *Epithet*. But see under *Catachresis*.

ANTIPHRAISIS; or, PERMUTATION:
i.e., **A NEW NAME FOR THE OLD THING.**

*A new and opposite Name for a thing after the original Meaning
has ceased.*

An-tiph'-ra-sis. Greek, ἀντιφρασις, from ἀντιφράζειν (*antiphrazein*), to express by antithesis or negation; from ἀντί (*anti*), against, and φράζειν (*phrazein*). Hence, φράσις (*phrasis*), a way of speaking. The figure is so called, because a word or phrase is used in a sense opposite to its original and proper signification; the figure is thus one of change: the name of a thing or subject being changed to the opposite, in order to emphasize some important fact or circumstance, as when a court of justice was once called "a court of vengeance."

It thus partakes of, and is indeed a species of, *Irony* (*q.v.*). The difference is that *Antiphraisis* is used only of single words or phrases, while *Irony* is used of connected sentences. Another difference is that *Antiphraisis* affects rather the *meaning* of words, while *Irony* affects the *application* of words.

Hence *Antiphraisis* is called, by the Latins, PERMUTATIO, or *permutation*, because of this change of meaning.

Gen. iii. 22.—"Behold, the man is become as one of us": *i.e.*, he had become, not necessarily or really "a God," but what the tempter promised him; and now he will get the Tempter's doom and be cast out from God's presence.

Isa. xliv. 25.—"That turneth wise men backward": *i.e.*, those who are accounted wise by themselves or others. Not those who are truly and really wise in God's sight. So the word "knowledge" is used in the next sentence by *Antiphraisis*.

II. AFFECTING THE ARRANGEMENT AND ORDER OF WORDS.

1. SEPARATE WORDS.

HYPERBATON ; or, TRANSPOSITION.

The placing of a Word out of its usual order in a Sentence.

Hy-per'-ba-ton. Greek, ὑπέρβατον, from ὑπέρ (*hyper*), *over*, and βαίνειν (*bainein*), *to step*. Hence ὑπερβατός and *Hyperbaton*, a *stepping over*, *transposition*.

The figure is so called because the words of a sentence are put out of their natural and usual grammatical order.

All words are arranged in a sentence according to certain laws, which have been acquired by usage. These laws are not the same in all languages, but each language has its own peculiar laws, called *Syntax*, which merely means a *putting together in order*. Even in one language this order may vary in different stages of its history and development.

Hyperbaton is a putting together of words in a way contrary to or different from the usual order. Hence, what is *Hyperbaton* in one language may not be *Hyperbaton* in another.

In English, the arrangement of words in a sentence usually follows the order of thought. Hence, naturally, the *subject* (with all that pertains to it) comes first: *i.e.*, the thing spoken of; then follows the *copula*: *i.e.*, the verb, and all words connected with it; and then the *predicate*: *i.e.*, something said about the subject, called the object, with its adjuncts.

In an inflected language (like the Greek, for example) it is not so necessary to keep to the formal arrangement of the words in a sentence, the grammatical dependence of words being sufficiently indicated by the inflections. Consequently there is great room for a variety of arrangements, when a particular word has to be emphasized.

It is hopeless to attempt to give an adequate idea of the nature and extent of the beautiful and subtle shades of meaning and thought produced by these unusual collocation of words called *Hyperbaton*. So

delicate are they, at times, that it is scarcely possible to reproduce them in a translation.

In the Greek language, the object usually follows the governing verb; but it sometimes comes before it. The predicate usually comes after the object; but sometimes it stands first. The adjective usually follows the noun which it qualifies; but sometimes it stands before its noun: etc, etc.

The most emphatic position for these transposed words is at the beginning of a clause; but sometimes it is at the end; in which case the word is held back, and kept in suspense, while the attention is kept up, and the hearer or reader has nothing for it but to listen to the close for fear of losing the whole. When it is put out of its place, and stands out at the beginning, it thrusts itself upon our notice, and compels us to give all our attention, and see what it is that is going to be said about it.

In the old Hebrew Syntax, the subject usually precedes the predicate, the adjective the substantive, pronouns the nouns, the genitive the nominative, and the nominative the verb: *e.g.*, Judges i. 7: "seventy kings thumbs of their hands and feet cut off, were."

In more modern Hebrew Syntax, the adjective follows the substantive; pronouns follow nouns; while the genitive follows the nominative which has a special form called the "construct."

In Chaldee, the verb is placed after the subject, and the article after the noun.

It has been said that "proper words in proper places is the true definition of style." But an intentional deviation from the ordinary "style" for the purpose of attracting attention and expressing the emphasis is the definition of *Hyperbaton*.

We may illustrate its use in this way. A person has a particular chair in his room, which he wishes his friends to notice. They continue to call, but do not notice it. It is in the usual place where chairs ought to be, and so does not attract any special attention. But one day he places this chair upon the table. Who can then fail to observe it, the moment the room is entered?

This is exactly what takes place with words, in the figure *Hyperbaton*. Special attention is desired for some particular word. Placed in its ordinary and usual position, it may not be noticed. But, put out of its usual order and place at the beginning instead of at the end of a sentence, it is impossible for the reader not to be arrested by it.

If we say, for example, "The mystery of godliness is great," that is the natural order of the English words. But if we say, "Great is the mystery of godliness," we see at once that all the emphasis is to be placed on the word "great."

This figure has also been called **SYNCHYSIS**, *Syn'-chy-sis*: Greek, *σύγχυσις*, from *συχχεῖν* (*synchein*), to mix up, which is from *σύν* (*sun*), together, and *χεῖν* (*chein*), to pour. Hence, *χύσις* (*chysis*), a pouring, and *Synchysis*, a mixing up, as of words in a sentence.

We now give a few examples:—

Isa. xxxiv. 4.—"And the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll." Here, (in the Heb.) the word "heavens" is emphasized by being, by *Hyperbaton*, put last: "And they shall be rolled together as a scroll—the heavens."

Jer. xiv. 1.—"The word of the LORD that came to Jeremiah concerning the dearth." Here, by *Hyperbaton*, it is **That which was the Word of the LORD** came, etc.

Jer. xvii. 3.—"I will give thy substance and all thy treasures to the spoiler." Here, the verb is emphasized by being put last: "All thy substance and all thy treasures to the spoiler—will I give."

Matt. v. 3-11.—In these verses, called the "Beatitudes," the participle is put out of its usual place, and made to begin the sentences instead of ending them: thus calling attention to the emphasis placed upon it.

Matt. vii. 13.—"Enter ye in at the strait gate."

Here the adjective is placed before the noun to call attention to its narrowness. So with the adjectives "wide" and "broad," which are both to be emphasized.

Luke xvi. 11.—"Who will commit to your trust the true riches."

The *Hyperbaton* (in the Greek) shows where the emphasis is to be placed: "The true riches—who will entrust them to you."

John i. 1.—Here the subject, "the Word," being defined by the article which is prefixed to it, can be placed at the end of two of the clauses: "In the beginning was the Word, and God the Word was": i.e., in plain cold English, "The Word was in the beginning . . . and the Word was God."

The A.V. preserves the *Hyperbaton* in the first clause, but not in the last, because the English idiom will not bear it. But in each case we are to put the stress on "the Word."

See under *Climax*.

John iv. 19.—The order of the words is, "Saith to him, the woman, Sir, I perceive that a prophet art thou": thus emphasizing both the words "thou" and "prophet," which should be greatly emphasized in reading.

John iv. 24.—"A Spirit is God."

The true emphasis is to be placed on the word "Spirit," through its being placed (in the Greek) at the beginning of the sentence. In the ordinary order, it would be placed after the subject. The two words are transposed to call our attention to this great fact; as being the basis of the Great Rubric which emphasizes the absolute necessity of our worship being truly spiritual.

See under *Hendiadys*.

John vi. 60.—"Hard is this saying."

Here again the predicate is put first, and the object last, in order to emphasize both.

John vii. 4.—"For no one in secret doeth anything and [*at the same time*] seeketh for it in public to be."

John ix. 31.—"Now we know that sinners—God does not hear."

John xvii. 5.—"And now glorify me, Thou, Father, with Thyself, with the glory which I had, before the world was, with Thee." Here, the mysterious depths of the words are forced upon our attention by the *Hyperbaton*.

The force of it is weakened by the literalness of the A.V. and R.V.

Acts xvii. 23.—The true emphasis is here brought out by the *Hyperbaton*: "For passing through and beholding the objects of your worship, I found an altar also, on which stood inscribed, 'To an unknown God.' What therefore, unknowing, ye reverence, this I—even I, announce to you."

Rom. i. 3.—"Concerning His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord." Here, the A.V. entirely loses the emphasis of the *Hyperbaton*, by which the words "Jesus Christ our Lord" in sense follow the words "His Son," but are held back in suspense to the very end of the clause.

The R.V. restores it, but we give our own rendering of this difficult passage (verses 1-4):—

"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, by Divine calling an apostle (see *Ellipsis*), separated unto God's Gospel which He promised in former times through His prophets in Holy Scriptures: *viz.*, the Gospel concerning His Son, who was of David's seed according to the flesh,

but was powerfully (*ἐν δυνάμει*) demonstrated to be God's Son with respect to His holy spiritual nature, by His resurrection from the dead* (Ps. ii. Acts ii.), even Jesus Christ our Lord."

Rom. v. 8.—Here the words are out of the natural order to excite our attention. The Greek is: "But commends His own love to us—God." The nominative is put last, and the verb first, to emphasize both.

Rom. viii. 18.—"Not worthy are the sufferings of the present time [*compared with*] the coming glory, to be revealed."

Here, the emphasis is placed on the non-worthiness of the sufferings, and the nearness of the revelation of the glory.

Rom. xi. 13.—"For to you I speak, to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am of Gentiles the apostle."

Here the shades of emphasis can be traced in the unusual order of the words in which fleshly wisdom can discern only "bad grammar"! The first and last words are seen to be very emphatic.

Rom. xii. 19.—How unusual to commence like this: "Not yourselves avenging (or, be no self-avengers), beloved, but give place to [*Divine*] wrath," thus emphasizing "yourselves."

Rom. xiv. 1.—"Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not for disputings of doubts": *i.e.*, doubtful disputations, with emphasis on doubtful.

1 Cor. iii. 9.—"For God's fellow-workers, God's husbandry, God's building ye."

The emphasis is on "God's"; and it is to be noted that it is we who are fellow-workers with one another; not with God, as though He were one like ourselves. We are the fellow-workers with one another, and we belong to God and work for Him. We work, and He it is who giveth the increase.

1 Cor. xiii. 1.—"If with the tongues of men I speak and of angels."

Eph. vi. 8.—"Whatsoever thing each may have done that is good."

Here the adjective is held over to the last in order to emphasize it.

1 Tim. i. 15; iii. 1; iv. 9. 2 Tim. ii. 11. Tit. iii. 8.—"πιστὸς ὁ λόγος: Faithful the saying."

* Or "by a resurrection of dead persons": *viz.*, that referred to in Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. See under *Hysteresis* and *Heterosis*;

How much more emphatic than the ordinary coldness of the natural order: "The saying *is* faithful."

1 Tim. iii. 16.—"Great is, of godliness, the mystery."

How wonderful is the emphasis thus placed on the word "great," put as it is before the subject, which is kept back and put as the very last word in the sentence (in the Greek).

See under *Synecdoche*, *Hendiadys*, and *Synonymia*.

1 Tim. vi. 5.—"Supposing that gain is godliness."

Here the principal word is put out of its place, at the end, to call our attention to it. The emphasis is thus put on the word "godliness," "Supposing that godliness is gain."

1 Tim. vi. 12.—"Keep on struggling the fine good struggle of the Faith, lay hold on the life eternal, unto which life thou wast called also, and didst confess the fine confession before many witnesses."

Here the adjective "fine" (or "good") is greatly emphasized in each case.

Heb. vi. 16.—"For with men it is the Greater by whom they swear, and of all dispute they have a decisive settlement the oath."

Heb. vii. 4.—"To whom, even a tenth, Abraham gave out of the spoils, the patriarch."

Notice how the subject of the verse is kept back to the last, in order to call attention to the fact that, if Abraham—the patriarch himself—gave the tithe, He to whom he gave them must of necessity be greater, even than Abraham.

Heb. x. 30.—"To me vengeance belongeth, I (even I) will recompense, saith the Lord": emphasising the pronouns very strongly.

1 Pet. ii. 7.—"To you therefore is the preciousness—[unto you] who believe." The subject is put last in order to emphasize the fact that the Lord Jesus is precious only to believers and to none else.

1 Pet. iii. 21.—The order and emphasis of the Greek is:—

"Which [*water*]—in the antitype—now saves you also—namely, baptism: not a putting away of bodily defilement, but an appeal of a good conscience to God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ": *i.e.*, that while it was water which was the instrumentality through which Noah was brought safely through, it is the Holy Ghost who is now the antitype of this, which we have through the resurrection of Christ.

It was often declared that He should thus baptize: "I baptize with water: but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost."

1 John ii. 24.—Here again the peculiarity of the *Hyperbaton* attracts our attraction, and causes us to reflect on the words. "Ye, then, what ye heard from the beginning (or primitively), in you let it abide: if in you shall have abode what from the beginning ye heard, ye also, in the Son, and in the Father, shall abide."

So verse 27: "And you, the anointing, which ye received from Him, in you abideth; and no need have ye that anyone should teach you: but, as the same anointing teacheth you concerning all things, and is true, and is not a lie, and even as it [*first*] taught you, ye will abide in Him."

Rev. xiii. 8.—"Whose names are not written in the book of life, of the Lamb slain, from the foundation of the world."

The last sentence is put by *Hyperbaton* out of its place, at the end, so as to call our attention to it. It is a question whether it does not belong to the writing of the names and not to the slaying of the Lamb:—"Whose names are not written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb slain." As in xvii. 8. Compare Dan. xii. 1. Ps. lxxix. 28 and Isa. liii. 7.

ANASTROPHE ; or, ARRAIGNMENT.

The position of One word changed so as to be set over against the Other.

A-nas'-tro-phae. Greek, ἀναστροφή, from ἀνά (*ana*), *back again*, and στρέφειν (*strephein*), *to turn, a turning back*.

The figure is so-called because one word is turned, or turned back out of its proper or usual position in a sentence.

Hence it is a kind of *Hyperbaton* ; but affecting only one word, instead of several words, in a sentence.

It is called also *PARALLAGE*, *Par-al'-la-gee*. Greek, παραλλαγή, from παραλλάσσω (*parallasso*), *to make things alternate*. Hence *Parallage* means a *deviation, a turning aside, variation*. And *SYNCATEGOREMA*, *syn-cat'-ee-gor-ee'-ma*, from σύν (*syn*), *together with*, and κατηγορήμα, *an arraignment*. Hence the figure is so called because one word is set over against or arraigned against another. *Reversal* would be a good English name for this figure.

The Latins called it *TRAJECTIO* : *i.e., a crossing over, a transposition or trajection of words*. And *INVERSIO*, *a turning about, an inversion of words*.

The word thus put out of its usual place receives great emphasis.

We have many examples in English :—

The Verb before its Noun.

“ Burns Marmion’s swarthy cheek like fire.”—*Scott*.

Adjective after its Noun.

“ He ceased ; and death involved him dark around.”—*Cowper*.

Objective before the Verb.

“ Me didst thou constitute a priest of thine.”—*Wordsworth*.

Preposition before the Participle.

“ Into what pit thou seest, from what height fallen.”—*Milton*.

Preposition after the Noun.

“ It only stands our lives upon, to use
Our strongest hands.”—*Shakespeare*.

Noun at end of sentence.

“ Ape-born, not God-born, is what the atheists say of—man.”

Deut. xxii. 1.—“ Thou shalt not see thy brother’s ox or his sheep go astray, and hide thyself from them.”

Here, the *negative* is put with "see" instead of with "hide," in order to emphasize the command, which would otherwise tamely read:—"If thou shalt see . . . thou shalt not hide," etc. See under *Metonymy*.

Micah vi. 10.—"Are there yet the treasures of wickedness in the house of the wicked?" In the Hebrew, the verse begins with the adverb: "Still are there *in the* house of the wicked man treasures of wickedness?"

Acts vii. 48.—In the English, the negative is joined with the verb, with which it is to be read: but in the Greek, the negative is put at the beginning of the clause, and the verb at the end, which greatly intensifies the force of the word "not."

"But not the Most High in hand-made temples dwelleth."

SYLLEPSIS; or, CHANGE IN CONCORD.

Grammatical Syllepsis, by which there is a change in the Ideas rather than in actual words, so that the concord is logical rather than grammatical.

Syl-lep'-sis. Greek, σύλληψις, from σύν (*sun*), together with, and λήψις (*lepsis*), a taking.

It is a figure by which one word, or the meaning of one word, is taken with another; or, when one word is used, and another idea is meant. When involving addition of words, or sense, it has already been described in Div. II.

It is a kind of *Enallage*, or *Heterosis*; in that there is an exchange of genders, of numbers, or of both. But it differs from *Enallage*, in that the change takes place rather in the idea than in the actual words.

It is a kind of *Zeugma*, in that one adjective or verb belonging to two or more nouns of different genders, persons, or numbers, agrees with one rather than with another.

Syllepsis therefore depends on a change or disturbance in the concord of parts of speech; in making a *logical* rather than a *grammatical* concord.

John xvi. 13, 14.—“When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you unto all truth,” etc.

Here, though the word πνεῦμα (*pneuma*), *Spirit*, is neuter, the word ἐκεῖνος (*ekainos*), *He*, is masculine; agreeing with the Divine Person rather than with the actual word “Spirit.”

John xxi. 12.—“And none (*sing.*) of the disciples durst ask him Who art thou? knowing (*pl.*) that it was the Lord.”

The figure points out that *not one* asked; for *all* knew.

2 Cor. v. 19.—“God was in Christ, reconciling the world (*sing.*) unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them (*pl.*)”

Here, the figure *Metonymy*, by which the “world” is put for its *inhabitants*, is interpreted by the use of the plural, “them.”

TMESIS; or, MID-CUT.

A Change by which one Word is cut in two, and another Word put in between.

Tmē'-sis. Greek, τμήσις, *a cutting*, from τέμνειν (*temnein*), *to cut*.

It is a figure by which a compound word or connected phrase is separated, and the position of its syllables changed, by the intervention of one or more words.

Each of the syllables thus cut off is a separate and complete word. Thus in "to us ward," the word "toward" is, by the figure *Tmesis*, cut in two: and the word "us" is put in between the two separated words, "to us ward." So also we say "to heaven ward," or "what condition soever."

The figure is also called **DIACOPE**, *Di-ac'-o-pee*. Greek, διακοπή, *a cutting in two*.

DIÆRESIS, *Dī-æ'-re-sis*. Greek, διαίρεσις (*diairesis*), *a dividing through*.

DIASTOLE, *Di-as-to-lee*. Greek, διαστολή, *a separating through*.

ECTASIS, *Ec'-ta-sis*. Greek, ἔκτασις, *a stretching out*.

DIALYSIS, *Di-al'-y-sis*. Greek, διάλυσις, *a dissolving or parting asunder*.

DIVISIO, *Division*.

There is an example of it in Eph. vi. 8: ὅ τι ἐάν (*ho ti ean*), three words, which usually go together in this order, are divided: and the last is put in between the other two, so that it reads "what soever thing," instead of "what thing soever."

Our English *Tmesis* here better expresses the Greek, than the A.V. which neglects the Greek *Tmesis*.

Through not seeing the figure in this passage, there are several various readings created in order to explain it.

2. SENTENCES AND PHRASES.

HYSTERON-PROTERON ; or, LAST-FIRST.

The Second of two things put First.

Hys'te-ron - Prot'-e-ron, from ὕστερος (*hysteros*), *the latter*, and πρότερος (*proteros*), *the former*.

A figure in which the word that should be the latter of two words comes first.

It is, therefore, a kind of *Hyperbaton*: where 'the cart is put before the horse.' It occurs in most languages; but it is a question whether in this sense it occurs in the Bible, as the figure is considered rather a blemish than an ornament. If it is used, it is certainly for unusual emphasis.

Phil. iii. 19 has been cited: "Whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things."

Here, the "end" is put first: in order that the mind may dwell with the greater horror on the things which lead to it.

The structure of these verses (18, 19) throws more light on them, and shows that after the words "many walk" there is a parenthetical break, which is resumed at the end of verse 19, to show who these "walkers" are, *viz.*, "the earthly minded."

a | "For many are walking

b | Whom I often told you, and do tell you now—even weeping,
| *calling them* the enemies of the cross of Christ,

b | Whose end—destruction; whose god—the belly; and their
| glory—in shame.

a | Such [*namely*] as are minding earthly things."

Here, in "a" and "a" we have the walkers; while in "b" we have their walk, and in "b" their end. Hence their walk ends in destruction, their worship ends in their belly, and their glory ends in shame.

Heb. iii. 8.—"Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness."

The provocation of God followed the temptation in the wilderness; but is here put first to mark out the special temptation referred to.

Heb. iv. 2.—“For unto us was the Gospel preached, as well as unto them.” Here, the order of time is inverted, to agree with the order of thought, and for emphasis.

But, as we have said, it is a question whether we have any real examples of this figure in the Bible.

HYSTEROLOGIA ; or, THE FIRST, LAST.

The First of two things put Last : or, the opposite of Hysteron-Proteron.

Hys'ter-o-log'i-a. Greek, ὑστερολογία, from ὑστερος (*hysteros*), *last*, and λόγος (*logos*), *speech, discourse.*

A figure by which that which is put last, ought, according to the usual order, to come first.

It is the opposite of *Hysteron-Proteron*; except that it refers to a transposition of connected events, rather than of words.

It differs from *Hysteresis* (*q.v.*).

Gen. x. and xi.—In chapter x. the dispersion of the nations is put before the cause of it, which is recorded in chap. xi.

Gen. xii. 1.—Here, the call of Abraham is put, by *Hysterologia*, after the obedience to it (or to a previous call) in chap. xi. 31, 32.

Abraham and Terah came out of Haran in consequence of this call; which is not recorded till afterward.

The figure thus emphasizes the fact that God had called them out of "Ur of the Chaldees" (see chap. xv. 7) "into a land that I will show thee" (chap. xii. 1): while the history shows that the obedience, from some cause, was not complete, for "they came unto Haran, and dwelt there." The Divine comment in Acts vii. 2-4 reveals the secret to us: "From thence (*i.e.*, from Haran) when his father was dead, he removed him into this land," showing that Terah, his father, was the hindrance to Abrām's complete obedience.

The figure thus calls attention to the fact that in his day, as well as in our own, family ties often hinder full obedience to God.

The two calls are still further marked by the contrasted expressions in chaps. xi. 31 and xii. 5.

In chap. xi. 31, we read: "They went forth . . . from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land Canaan; and they came unto Haran, and dwelt there."

In chap. xii. 5, we read, as to Haran, that "they went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came."

Gen. xxx. 22-24.—The birth of Joseph is described by *Hysterologia*. For it happened, really, after the birth of the sixth son of Jacob (Naph-tali) and during the first seven years of his servitude. It was after the birth of Joseph that Jacob wished to go away and leave Laban. In the

first seven years were born Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Dan, Naphtali, and Joseph. Then he served seven more years (chap. xxxi. 41), and in these were born Gad, Asher, Issachar, Zebulun, and Dinah.

So Joseph's birth, which took place after Naphtali's, is recorded, by *Hysterologia* : after Dinah's.

Gen. xxxviii.—The history of Judah in this chapter is put by *Hysterologia*, for the greater part of it took place before the selling of Joseph, which is recorded in chap. xxxvii.

Judges xx. and xxi.—These chapters describe the Benjamite war; which must have taken place many years before; indeed soon after Joshua's death, though recorded here. For Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron, was high priest (chap. xx. 28): and Jonathan, the grandson of Moses, was the first idolatrous priest to the tribe of Dan!*

Moreover, Jebus or Jerusalem was still in the hands of strangers (chap. xix. 10-12), whereas chap. i. 8, 21 describes its capture and firing by the tribe of Judah.

1 Sam. xvi.-xviii.—Here, four events in the history of Saul and David are transposed, by *Hysterologia*, in order to bring together certain facts relating to each; and especially to the Spirit of God in relation to each. In chap. xvi. 1-13, David is anointed, and the Spirit of God comes upon him. Then, in order to contrast the Spirit of the Lord departing from Saul, a *later* fact is brought forward here (chap. xvi. 14-23), which, in the history, really follows chap. xviii. 9. So that chaps. xvii.-xviii. 9 record an earlier event in David's life, which is brought in here parenthetically, describing one of the illustrations of chap. xiv. 52, that, when Saul saw any strong man or any valiant man, he took him unto him. Chaps. xvii.-xviii. 9 go on to give an instance of this with David, and tell how Saul thus found David. Then (after chap. xviii. 9) we have to go back again to prior events (recorded in chap. xvi. 14-23); while, in chap. xviii. 10-30, we have further facts concerning Saul's "evil spirit" and other events of David's life.

The whole section is beautifully constructed; and the parentheses between the different members are clearly seen: each member being parenthetical to the other two, between which it is placed:—

* See pamphlet on *The Massorah*, by the same author and publisher.

A | xvi. 1-13. DAVID anointed. The Spirit of the Lord comes upon him.

B | 14-23. SAUL rejected. The Spirit of the Lord departs from Saul, and an evil spirit troubles him.

A | xvii. 1-xviii. 9. DAVID. An earlier incident in his life.

B | 10-30. SAUL. The Spirit departed, and evil spirit troubling him.

So that, while *Saul* and *David* alternate, we see why the special arrangement is made; so as to bring out into contrast the facts recorded in each pair of corresponding members, which are not recorded in their historical order, but in the order of the spiritual instruction which is to be conveyed. The *historical* order is obtained by reading on from A to A (treating B as being in a parenthesis); and then from B to B (treating A as though it were in a parenthesis); while the logical sequence of the *spiritual* order is obtained by reading straight on, as the history is written in the Text.

2 Sam. xxiii. and xxiv.—The latter chapter is put after chapters xxii. and xxiii., which contain David's "last song" and "last words," while the events really follow chap. xxi. The "song" and the "words" follow more appropriately, immediately after the record of David's mighty acts, instead of after David's sin in numbering the People.

Isa. xxxviii. 21, 22.—Here, the sign which Hezekiah had asked for, in verse 22, is described in verse 21, beautifully emphasizing the Divine over-ruling of the history.

Amos vi. 2.—The cities are put according to logical emphasis, rather than geographical sequence.

Matt. xxvii. 52, 53.—Here, the events which took place later, are recorded in their consequential order, rather than in the actual historical order.

At the moment when the Lord Jesus "yielded up His Spirit . . . the earth was shaken, and the rocks were rent, and the tombs were opened [and now comes, (by *Hysterologia*) "many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep, arose, and, coming forth out of the tombs after His resurrection, entered into the holy city, and appeared privately* to many]. Now the centurion, and those with him, keeping guard over Jesus—seeing the earthquake, and the things that were taking place—feared greatly, saying, 'Truly, God's Son this Man was.'"

* This seems to be the meaning of ἐμφανίζειν (*emphanizein*), see its only other occurrences: Heb. ix. 24 and xi. 14.

It is a question whether it be not this which is referred to in Rom. i. 4: where the Lord Jesus is said to have been marked out as "God's Son . . . as the result of raising (or rising) again of dead persons." For it is not ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *from among the dead*, but simply νεκρῶν, *of dead people*. That He was so marked out is described in the history by the exclamation of the Centurion. In both cases we have υἱὸς θεοῦ (without articles), "*God's Son.*"

Some have suggested that we have this figure in the record of the temptation (Luke iv. 5, 9), where the temptation which seems to come first in order of events is put last. Compare Matt. iv. 5, 8.

Rev. xii.—In this chapter, we have the prophetic record of events, which shall take place before chapter vi., and lead up to what is recorded in chapters vi.-xi.

Chapters vi.-xi. give the *exoteric* view of the future history, which ends with the judgment (chap. xi. 18). Chap. xi. 18 therefore brings us parallel to chap. xx. The Beast and false prophet are upon the earth during this period, and their actions are seen in chaps. ix. and xi., though they are not named, and their actual coming is not described, till chap. xiii.

But chapter xii. gives the *esoteric* view of the same period, and takes us back to a point prior to chap. vi., and shows us the causes which shall lead to the rising up of the Beast and the false prophet.

First, the war takes place in heaven, and the Devil is cast out into the earth.

Then "he" stands upon the sand of the sea (chap. xiii. 1, R.V.); and John sees these two awful beings coming up, the one from the sea and the other from the earth. There is no record of their doings, except what is recorded in chaps. vi.-xi., and in xiii.

See further under *Ellipsis*.

HYSTERESIS; or, SUBSEQUENT NARRATION.

A subsequent Narration of prior Events.

Hys'ter-ee-sis. Greek, ὑστέρησις, from ὑστερέω (*hysteredō*), to come later. Hence, a coming after or later.

This is a special form of *Hysterologia*, and does not refer to connected records or events, but gives, long afterwards, further details of some long prior events; or, gives events never before recorded.

When a record, written much later, gives supplemental or new particulars, quite *disconnected* from the original historical record, it is called *Hysteresis*: and hence has been called

HISTORICAL HYSTERESIS,

by which the Holy Spirit, in later and subsequent Scriptures, adds supplementary details which were not given in the history itself; and sometimes even historical facts, of which no mention had before been made.

Man often does, and is allowed to do, this in human literature: but God may not! and so man cavils at this beautiful figure, and sees in it only "discrepancy"; instead of delighting in these subsequent supplementary facts thus revealed to us by the Holy Spirit, and such as none but He could give.

Gen. xxxi. 7, 8.—Jacob mentions later, certain facts in his history which had taken place before.

1 Sam. xii. 12.—A prior event is here recorded, not mentioned in the earlier narration.

1 Sam. xxii. 9-16.—Certain supplementary details are given here which are not recorded in the account as narrated in chap. xxi. 1-9.

Ps. cv. 18.—"Whose feet they hurt with fetters." This, by *Hysteresis*, is mentioned here, though not recorded in the history of Joseph in Genesis.

Hos. xii. 3-5 gives further particulars supplementing the history in **Gen. xxxii. 24, etc.; xxviii. 12-19, and xxxv. 9-15.**

Amos i. 1.—A particular earthquake is here mentioned, of which no historical record is given. It is possibly the earthquake mentioned in **Zech. xiv. 5.** Amos is said to have prophesied "in the days of

Uzziah . . . and Jeroboam"; and it is added, "two years before the earthquake." Now, in Zechariah, we have no mention of Jeroboam. Hence it is very possible that, by the time the earthquake took place, he was dead. How Amos came to be "among the herdmen from Tekoa"; or, why these men migrated, as it may seem, into Israelite territory, we are not told. But if we take the mysterious "it,"* which the Lord, by Amos, says, He will not "avert," to be this very earthquake, we avoid a very puzzling *Ellipsis*, and shall very likely be correct.

Amos ii. 1.—Moab is here said to have "burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime," a fact of which we have no historical mention. Meshah, king of Moab, evidently was a cruel man. In his superstitions he offered his own son upon the wall, and turned the tide of battle.

See further information concerning this in the history of *The Moabite Stone*.

Amos v. 25, 26.—Here we learn the names of certain of the gods which the Children of Israel worshipped in the wilderness. See also Ezek. xx. 6, 7, 18, 22, etc.

Zech. xiv. 5.—See above under Amos i. 1.

Matt. ii. 23.—"And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene."

Through missing this *Hysteresis*, the commentators have created a difficulty of their own.

First, they cannot find such a prophecy in any of the prophets.

Then, they try and make a connection between *netzer*, a branch, and *Nazarene*; and, as there is none, the difficulty is only increased.

Even if the connection could be established, the difficulty would not be removed: for it says "prophets" (*plural*), and the word *netzer* is used of Christ in only one prophet, Isaiah. So the difficulty is further increased.

But there is really no difficulty at all. It is absolutely created. It is assumed from the outset that it says "which was *written*." But it does not say so! It says "which was **SPOKEN**." The fact is, some prophecies were written down and never spoken; some were both written and spoken; while others were spoken and never written. This is one of the latter class: and there is all the difference in the

* Which is *masc.* in all the eight occurrences: and *always* followed by the great pause.

world between τὸ ῥηθὲν (*to rheethen*), which was spoken, and ὁ γέγραπται (*ho gegraptai*), which standeth written!

Thus, this beautiful *Hysteresis* reveals to us the historical fact that several prophets had declared by the Holy Spirit that the Messiah should be called a Nazarene. But for this *Hysteresis* we should never have known it.

Matt. xxiii. 35, 36.—"That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar." etc.

Now, from failing to see the historical *Hysteresis* here, it has been hastily assumed that the reference is to 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, 21, where we read, "The Spirit of God came upon Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest . . . And they conspired against him, and stoned him with stones at the commandment of the king in the court of the house of the LORD."

By this inaccurate reference, the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is charged with making a serious mistake.

But note that when the Lord says that Zachariah was "the son of Barachias," He could not possibly have been speaking of "the son of Jehoiada" as the same man.

If He began with Abel, the first martyr, it is not probable He would end with a murder which took place 870 years before he spoke the words, when there were many more during those 870 years.

How much more probable that he referred to Zechariah the (last but one) prophet (and the one of whom he is speaking, verse 31), who lived only 450 years before the Lord spoke the words? Moreover, he is expressly called "the son of Berechiah" in Zech. i. 1, and i. 7.

It is remarkable that there was another Zechariah, the son of Baruch, who was martyred some 36 years afterward (A.D. 69), immediately before the destruction of Jerusalem, as recorded by Josephus (*Wars*, iv. 5, 4).

Matt. xxvii. 9, 10.—See under *Gnome*.

Acts ix. ; xxii. ; xxvi.—In the three accounts of the conversion of Saul, we have supplementary facts, disconnected from the historical event.

2 Tim. iii. 8.—"Jannes and Jambres" are named as two of the Egyptian wise men; whose names are not given in Exodus, but are supplied here by the Holy Spirit.

Heb. ix. 19.—The sprinkling of the book is supplementary information which is not given in Ex. xxiv.

Heb. xi. 21.—Here we have an additional fact, which at once explains and amplifies Gen. xlviii. 12, and is not in discrepancy with Gen. xlvii. 31, as is commonly supposed.

We must give the whole of this verse, because of the controversies which have raged around it: "By faith, Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph; and worshipped, *leaning* upon the top of his staff."

The marginal reference in the A.V. is Gen. xlvii. 31; but this, though followed by every one, is certainly not correct. The circumstance in Heb. xi. 21 is Jacob's blessing of the sons of Joseph, which is set in company with Isaac's blessing of his own sons. The two together giving the beautiful lesson that Isaac's blessing was given contrary to *the will of the flesh* (i.e., his own will), while Jacob's blessing was given contrary to *the will of man* (i.e., Joseph's will) (Heb. xi. 20, 21).

It is clear, therefore, that the whole emphasis of the reference is to the occasion of *the blessing*: of which there is not a word in Gen. xlvii. 31, and to which it does not refer.

In Gen. xlvii. 31, Jacob was causing Joseph to swear that he would bury him not in Egypt, but in the land of Canaan, and "Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head."

But it was "after these things" (Gen. xlviii. 1), that the blessing of Joseph and his sons took place. And, then, we have, in chap. xlviii. 12, the *worship* of Jacob who "bowed himself with his face to the earth." Jacob must, therefore, have been in a sitting posture; for, in verse 2, we read that when they told him that Joseph was approaching, "Israel strengthened himself, and sat upon the bed"; and, from verse 12, when he embraced Ephraim and Manasseh, he took them "between his knees." It was then, we gather that, in the blessing of his own sons (for chaps. xlviii. and xlix. are continuous), that he "leaned on the top of his staff." And this inspired addition to the information is given us in Heb. xi. 21, to enhance and emphasize his faith, and to indicate Israel's extreme infirmity, for it was his last dying act (chap. xlix. 33).

There is no necessity, therefore, for us to discuss the question of the various reading involved in the Hebrew מִטָּה (*mittah*), *the bed*, and the LXX. and Syriac rendering, *the staff*, which would require the Hebrew to be pointed מַטֵּה (*matteh*). Had the word been used in the

Hebrew of Gen. xlvi. 11, the true pointing would have been there decided.* But the point is decided for us in Heb. xi. 21; which clearly states that it was his "staff" that Israel leaned upon while worshipping God and blessing "by faith" the sons of Joseph. We must, however, point out "the incalculable quantity of idolatrous nonsense," to use the words of Dean Alford (*in loco*), which (he says) "has been written on these words by Roman Catholic commentators, taking as their starting point the rendering of the Vulgate: *et adoravit fastigium virgae ejus* [*and worshipped the top of his staff*], and thence deriving an argument for the worship of images"! This corruption of the Vulgate is perpetuated in all the Romish translations of it; and all therefore come under the Dean's vigorous condemnation.

Heb. xii. 21 gives a particular which we do not find recorded in Ex. xix. and xx.

Jas. v. 17.—The earnest prayer of Elijah is not recorded in 1 Kings xvii. 1.

Jude 9 mentions by the Holy Spirit the contention of Satan about the body of Moses; and, in verse 14, some words of a prophecy of Enoch. Trading on this reference, men have forged "the book of Enoch" evolving its fancies and trivialities out of this historical *Hysteresis*.

* Had a *staff* been intended in Gen. xlvii. 31, it would probably have been מַקְּסֵל (*makkail*), as in chaps. xxx. 37; xxxii. 10, etc.

SIMULTANEUM ; or, INSERTION.

A parenthetic Insertion between the record of two simultaneous Events.

Si'-mul-ta'-ne-um. Latin, from *simul*, at the same time, together.

This figure is used when, in a description of events, properly belonging to the same time, one is changed and put out of its historical place, and put in between two others, which is thus divided so as to take us by surprise.

It is, therefore, a kind of historical *parenthesis*, or logical *Tmesis* (*q.v.*).

Mark xv. 12, 13, 14.—Where Pilate's words (verses 12, 14) are interrupted by the shouts of the People (verse 13). The events took place literally in this order : but, instead of describing the two events separately, Pilate's words and the People's are described at one and the same time.

Rev. xvi. 13, 14, 15, 16.—Here the description (14, 16) of the work of the three unclean spirits in gathering together the kings of the earth to Armageddon is interrupted by verse 15 ; which is an injunction specially referring to that same time, and is therefore introduced there, by *Simultaneum*, for the sake of emphasis.

ANTITHESIS ; or, CONTRAST.

A setting of one Phrase in Contrast with another.

An-tith'-e-sis. Greek, ἀντίθεσις, from ἀντί (*anti*), *against*, and θέσις (*thesis*), *a setting*, from τίθειν (*tithenai*), *to set or place*.

It is a figure by which two thoughts, ideas, or phrases, are set over one against the other, in order to make the contrast more striking, and thus to emphasize it.*

The two parts so placed are hence called in Greek *antitheta*, and in Latin *opposita* and *contraposita*. For example :

“When our vices leave us, we flatter ourselves we leave them.”

“Curved is the line of beauty,
Straight is the line of duty.”

“The prodigal robs his heir, the miser robs himself.”

“God demands man’s homage; man offers Him his patronage.”†

Man often misuses this figure, for the mere fancy of balancing sentences; and thus often falsely exaggerates a contrast which lies more in the words than in the thoughts. When this is the case it is called *Antimetabole*, *Parison*, *Annominatio*, etc. (*q.v.*).

It is called also *CONTENTIO*: *i.e.*, *comparison*, or *contrast*.

When this contrast is made by affirmatives and negatives, it is called *Enantiosis*, see below.

The Book of Proverbs so abounds in such *Antitheses* that we have not given any examples from it.

Isa. i. 21.—Of Jerusalem it is said “Righteousness lodged in it; but now murderers [*lodge in it*].

Isa. lix. 9.—

“We wait for the light, but behold obscurity;
For brightness, but we walk in darkness.”

Isa. lxxv. 13, 14.—Where we have many beautiful *Antitheses*. See also under *Symploce*.

Lam. i. 1.—“How doth the city sit solitary that was full of people !”

* When this consists of *words* rather than of sentences, it is called *Epanodos*, and *Antimetabole* (*q.v.*).

† Dr. Robert Anderson in *The Silence of God*.

Luke ii. 14.—“Glory in the highest to God, and on earth peace.” And then, after these two *Antitheta*, a third fact is stated as resulting from them when coming together:—“Good will toward men.” *

See under *Ellipsis*.

Rom. v. 18.—“Therefore as through one offence judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so too, through the righteous act (*δικαλωμα*, not *δικαιοσύνη*) of one, the free gift came upon all men unto a justifying (*δικαιωσις*, spoken only of God’s activity in justifying us) of life” (or, a life-long justifying).†

Rom. v. 19.—“For as by one man’s disobedient *act* many were made sinners, so by the obedient *act* of one (*i.e.*, His death) shall many be made righteous.”

See also *Paronomasia* and *Paregmenon*.

Rom. vi. 7, 8.—“For he that died, has been justified from sin. Now, if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall live also with him.”

Rom. viii. 5.—“For they that are (or live) after (or according to) flesh (the Old nature) do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are (or live) after (according to) spirit (the New nature) [*do mind*] the things of the spirit”: *i.e.*, the things that belong to the New nature. See under *Metonymy*.

Rom. viii. 13.—“For if ye live according to flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through spirit (the New nature) do mortify the deeds of the body (*i.e.*, by reckoning that it died with Christ; Rom. vi. 11), ye will live.”

Rom. xv. 12.—“There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise [*and raise His banner*] to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust.” The reference is to Isa. xi. 10: where *ῥίζα* (*neys*), a banner, which is raised aloft, is put in contrast with the “root” which is the lowest point. So Messiah rises from the lowest to the highest.

2 Cor. iv. 17, 18 contains several beautiful *Antitheses*.

* Is it not clear that *εὐδοκία* (*eudokia*) refers to *Divine complacency*, and that we find the explanation in the *εὐδόκησα* (*eudokeusa*) of Matt. iii. 17; xii. 18; xvii. 5. Mark i. 11. Luke iii. 22. 2 Pet. i. 7? With these, contrast God’s side (Heb. x. 6, 8, 38); and on man’s side (2 Thess. ii. 12. How scholars can tolerate the Revisers’ reading *εὐδοκίας* (*eudokias*) is a marvel. Can a parallel be produced?

† See articles on Romans in *Things to Come*, Vol. V.

2 Cor. vi. 8-10 contains a series of beautiful *Antitheses*.

In verses 4 and 5-, we have a seven-fold *passive experience* :—

patience,
afflictions,
necessities,
distresses,
stripes,
imprisonments,
tumults.

In verses -5, 6-, we have a seven-fold *self-denial* :—

labours,
watchings,
fastings,
pureness,
knowledge,
longsuffering.
kindness.

In verses -6, 8-, we have a seven-fold means to *endure* :—

the Holy Ghost,
love unfeigned,
the word of truth,
the power of God,
the armour of righteousness,
honour and dishonour,
evil report and good report.

In verses -8-10, we have a seven-fold *result* in the following *Antitheses* :—

deceivers, and yet true ;
unknown, yet well-known ;
dying, yet living ;
chastened, yet not killed ;
sorrowful, yet always rejoicing ;
poor, yet enriching others ;
having nothing, yet possessing all things.

Phil. iii. 7.—“ But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ.”

Note that, by *Antithesis*, our attention is called to the fact that Paul is here speaking, by the Spirit, of his “gains,” not of his *sins*. Of his gains, as a man and an Israelite ; which included the hope of resurrection as well as righteousness, of course : but he was willing to

give them all up for that righteousness which he had in Christ, and for that "out-rising from among the dead," which he should have at Christ's appearing.

He does not, in verse 11, speak of something which he could attain to as a Christian more than other Christians ; but he is *contrast-
ing* his "gains," as a Jew, and putting them in *Antithesis* with his greater gains as a Christian.

2 Pet. ii. 19.—"While they promise them (*i.e* their dupes) liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption."

ENANTIOSIS ; or, CONTRARIES.

Affirmation or Negation by Contraries.

E-nan-ti-ō'-sis. Greek, ἐναντιώσις, from ἐναντίος (*enantios*), *opposite*. The figure *Antithesis* is called *Enantiosis* when the contrast is expressed by *affirmatives* and *negatives*. What is stated affirmatively is meant negatively, or *vice versa*. When it is stated both ways, it is a kind of *Pleonasm* (*q.v.*). The difference being that *Pleonasm* refers to any statement, while *Enantiosis* refers to affirmation by contraries.

Ps. i. 1.—We have here a beautiful series of affirmation by contraries.

Isa. xlv. 22.—“ I am God, and there is none else.”

Luke vii. 44-46.—The difference between reality and formality is beautifully shown by a series of contrasts which are affirmatives by contraries.

Rom. viii. 15.—“ For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear ; but ye have received the spirit of adoption (or a sonship-spirit), whereby we cry, “ Abba, Father.”

Phil. iii. 9.—“ And be found in him (Christ), not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that [*righteousness*] which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.” See under *Synecdoche*.

ANACOLUTHON ; or, NON-SEQUENCE.

A breaking off the sequence of Thought.

An'-a-co-lū'-ithon. Greek, ἀνακόλουθον, from ἀ or ἀν, *negative*, and ἀκόλουθος (*akolouthos*), *following* : *i.e.*, *not following*, want of sequence or connection in a sentence, the latter part of which does not follow on or correspond with the former part.

This figure is so-called, because the construction with which a proposition begins is abandoned ; and, either for the sake of perspicuity, emphasis, or elegance, the sentence proceeds in a manner, different from that in which it set out.

Human writings of deep thought or feeling or argument frequently have the figure *Anacoluthon*, which in these cases is mere irregularity attributable to inadvertence, arising from the negligence or carelessness of the writer.

But, in the case of the Scriptures, where the Holy Spirit is the Author, and all is perfect, the figure not only imparts grace, but strength and force to the language, and is intended to catch and fix the attention of the reader. In this case, of course, what is abandoned is not further necessary. It has served its purpose in arresting, and so the argument passes on to that to which the attention is to be given.

1. Sometimes the accusative stands alone at the beginning of a sentence.

This is not an "accusative absolute," but is to be rendered "as for" or "as to."

Luke xxi. 6.—Here, the Lord says : "These things which ye behold" : and then He turns off, and says : "There will come days." So that we must supply the words "*As to*" these things, etc.

Acts x. 36.—Here, again, the sentence begins with the accusative : "The word which He sent unto the children of Israel." Some MSS., not understanding the *Anacoluthon*, omit the relative pronoun "which." But the sense is "*As touching* the word which He hath sent," etc. Or it may depend on οἴδατε, ye *know*, in the next verse : "Ye know the word which He sent," etc.

Rom. viii. 3.—"For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh." Here, the argument breaks off to speak of what God has done : "God (by sending His own Son in the

likeness of sinful flesh and *as an offering* for sin) did: namely, "He condemned sin in the flesh in order that the righteous-requirement (*δικαίωμα, dikaiōma*) of the Law might be fulfilled in us who walk not according to flesh (*i.e.*, the Old nature), but according to spirit (*i.e.*, the New nature)."

The figure requires the conclusion—this thing was impossible for the Law *to do*, because it was weak through the flesh: *i.e.*, man, owing to the corruption of his nature, could not keep the Law; and the Law was powerless, because it could neither pardon the transgressor, nor alter his nature. This defect was overcome by God, Who condemned sin in the death of His Son (who was the sin-offering personified). His People, therefore, having died with Him, are discharged from the claims of the Law; and, being now "in Christ," fulfil in Him all its righteous requirements.

2. Sometimes the leading proposition is interrupted by a parenthesis, and, when the subject is resumed, the grammatical connection is changed.

John vi. 22-24.

Gal. ii. 6, 7.

3. Sometimes the construction suddenly changes (without a parenthesis) by a change of persons; or, from participles to finite verbs; or, from singular to plural, and *vice versa*.

Mark vi. 11.—"And whosoever shall not receive you . . . shake off the dust of your feet against them."

Here, the *Anacoluthon* is seen only when we take the Critical Text approved by T.Tr.A. WH., and R.V. *viz.*, *ὅς ἂν τόπος* (*hos an topos*), *whatsoever place* (singular), instead of *ὅσοι ἂν* (*hosoi an*) *whosoever* or *as many as* (plural). So that the *Anacoluthon* is: "And whatsoever place (sing.) will not receive you . . . shake off the dust of your feet against them."

Luke xi. 11.—"From which of you, the father, shall his son ask bread? Will he give him a stone?"

Here the plural "you" is broken off for the singular "he."

1 Cor. vii. 13.—"And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her," etc.

Here the break is from the feminine to the masculine.

2 Cor. v. 6, 8.—Here the change is from participles to finite verbs:

“Being confident then always, and conscious that being at home [here] in the body, we are from home, away from the Lord (for by faith we are walking, not by sight). We are confident, however, and are content rather to be from home [here] out of the body, and to be at home with the Lord [there].”

These words are usually misquoted “absent from the body, present with the Lord,” as though it meant that the moment we are absent from the body we are present with the Lord. But this is exactly what it does not say: and the *Anacoluthon* calls our attention to this.

The whole subject is resurrection, starting from iv. 14. Our two bodies are contrasted in v. 1-5: viz.: “the earthly house of this tabernacle (i.e., this mortal body)” is contrasted with “our οἰκητήριον (*oikeeteerion*), our *spiritual* or resurrection body” (see Jude 6): viz.: “our house which is from heaven,” the future body of glory being called a “house,” as compared with the present body in which we groan, which is called a “tabernacle” or tent.

The argument is that, while we are in this “tabernacle” we cannot have that “house”; and that while we are in this tent we are away from our real eternal home, which is with the Lord.

There is no thought (here or elsewhere) of our being at home, or “with the Lord,” apart from resurrection and our resurrection bodies.

Gal. vi. 1.—“Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.”

Here the abrupt transition from the plural to the singular, which is a kind of *Enallage* (*q.v.*), makes the general precept applicable to each individual, in order to emphasize the absolute necessity of the “spirit of meekness” which is enjoined.

The figure calls our attention also to the fact that *restoration* is the object, and not *judgment*. Experience would lead us to believe that the text read: “Ye which are spiritual *judge* such an one in the spirit of bitterness and harshness, not considering thyself!” Hence the use of this figure to arrest our attention, and correct our error.

Eph. i. 20.—“Having raised him . . . he set him.”

Col. i. 26.—“The secret which had been lying hid from the ages and from the generations, but lately was made manifest to his saints.”

Other examples may be found, *e.g.*:—

Change from *first* person to the *second*: Gal. iii. 25, 26; iv. 5, 6, 20.

Change from *second* person to the *first*: Eph. ii. 2, 3, 13, 14; iv. 31, 32; v. 2 (textual reading). Col. i. 10-13; iii. 3, 4. 1 Thess. v. 5.

Change from second person *plural* to *singular*: Rom. xii. 16-19, 20. 1 Cor. iv. 6, 7. Gal. iv. 6, 7.

Change from *third* person to *second*: Jas. ii. 16.

4. Sometimes the construction is broken off altogether, and is not completed at all.

Mark xi. 32.—“ But if we shall say, Of men;—they feared the people.”

Here, the reasonings of the rulers are broken off, and the sense must be supplied by *Ellipsis* (*q.v.*).

Rom. v. 12.—This is usually given as an example of what appears to be an *Anacoluthon*; because the sense seems broken off at the end of verse 12: but the structure of the passage shows us the connection, and where the sense or argument is resumed. Many suppose that this is verse 15; but the Correspondence of subjects shows that it must be verse 18.

The section to which verse 12 belongs is that from verse 12 to 21, and is as follows:—

THE STRUCTURE OF ROM. v. 12-21.

A	a	12. By one man, sin: then, death upon all.
	b	13. Sin not imputed where no Law exists.
	c	14. The reign of death.
	B	15. Not as the offence, so the gracious gift.
	B	16, 17. Not as by one person, so the gift.
A	a	18, 19. By one man's offence, all men under condemnation; by one man's disobedient act the many were constituted sinners; and the counterpart.
	b	20. The offence abounded when Law came—and the counterpart.
	c	21. The reign of sin—and the counterpart.

Here, we see that verse 12 corresponds with verses 18, 19, and consequently all between (*viz.*, verses 13-17) is practically in a parenthesis. Moreover, note that the three members of *A* are stated *with their counterparts*, and are thus distinguished from the three in *A*.

1 Tim. i. 3, 4.—Here, the A.V. supplies the sense by adding “*so do.*” The R.V. adds “*so do I now.*”

5. Sometimes the change consists of a sudden transition from the *indirect* to the *direct* form of speech.

Mark vi. 9.—“ But being shod with sandals ; and put not on two coats.

Luke v. 14.—“ He charged him to tell no man, but go and show thyself,” etc.

This may be explained by the *Ellipsis* of the verb “ say,” “ but [he said] go and show thyself,” etc.

John v. 44.—“ How can ye believe, receiving honour one from another ? and the honour that is only from God, ye seek not.”

Acts i. 4.—“ Wait for the Father’s promise which ye heard of me.” The A.V. and R.V. treat this as *Ellipsis*, supplying the words “ which [saith or said he] ye have heard of me.”

Acts xvii. 3.—“ Opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered and have risen from among the dead, and that this is the Christ whom I announce to you.” The R.V. (and A.V. margin) treat this as *Ellipsis*, “ whom [said he] I preach,” etc.

6. Sometimes the change is from the *direct* form, which passes into the *indirect*.

John xiii. 29.—“ Buy those things that we have need of against the feast ; or, that he should give something to the poor.”

Acts xiv. 22. — “ Establishing the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that through many tribulations must we enter into the Kingdom of God.”

See under *Ellipsis*.

Acts xxiii. 23.—“ Get ready two hundred soldiers that they may go to Cæsarea.” The natural sequence would have been “ and go.”

7. Sometimes two equivalent constructions are united in the same proposition.

It is scarcely necessary to present these in full. The student can readily search them out for himself.

See Mark vi. 7 ; xii. 38. Rom. xii. 4. 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Eph. v. 27, 33.

And in the Old Testament the following may be noticed :—

Gen. xxxv. 3. Josh. xxiii. 16. Judges xvi. 24. Neh. x. 30.

III. AFFECTING THE APPLICATION OF WORDS.

We now come to the last class of the three great divisions of figurative language, *viz.*, figures which involve the *Application* of words rather than their *Meaning* or *Order*.

These we propose to consider under those that have to do with *change*; not that there is any real or absolute change; but because there is a deviation or change from the *literal*, or from the more ordinary and usual *application* of words. This change is brought about and prompted by some internal action of the mind, which seeks to impress its intensity of feeling upon others. The *meaning* of the words themselves continues to be literal: the figure lies in the *application* of the words. This *application* arises from some actual resemblance between the words, or between two or more mental things which are before the mind.

When the literal application of the words is contrary to ordinary plain human experience, or to the nature of the things themselves, then we are compelled to regard the *application* as figurative, though the words themselves still retain their *literal meaning*; otherwise, the application would lose all its force and all its point.

The first three important figures in this class should be studied together: *viz.*: *Simile* (comparison by *Resemblance*), *Metaphor* (comparison by *Representation*), and *Hypocatastasis* (comparison by *Implication*), because they are like three degrees of comparison in the emphasis conveyed by the inter-relation of words and their application. They are the positive, comparative, and superlative degrees of relation between words and thoughts.

In conforming to the order in which we are presenting these Figures of language, we lose much that would elucidate and bring out the beauties of these three. They would each gain in force and emphasis if we were to combine them in one chapter and under one head.

Even if we could present the passages out of the order of the books of the Bible, one could be made to lead on and up to another, so as to enhance the general effect and force of the subject.

But we proceed on the lines we have laid down, and consider the *Application* of words:

1. AS TO SENSE.

SIMILE ; or, RESEMBLANCE.

A Declaration that one Thing resembles another ; or, Comparison by Resemblance.

Sim'-i-le. This is the Latin name of the figure; from *similis*, like, similar, resembling closely, or in many respects.

This figure has no corresponding Greek name. Indeed it can hardly be called a figure, or an unusual form of expression, seeing it is quite literal, and one of the commonest forms of expression in use. It is a cold, clear, plain statement as to a *resemblance* between words and things. The whole application of the figure lies in this *Resemblance*, and not in *Representation*, as in *Metonymy*; or in *Implication*, as in *Hypocatastasis*; or, in *Association*, as in *Synecdoche*.

Accordingly, when this resemblance is not apparent, or is counter to our ordinary perception of things, it jars upon the ear. Such *Similes* abound in human writings. Hence the pleasure of studying the use of them in the Word of God, where we have the Holy Spirit's own perfect work.

Many examples could be given of false, or incongruous *Similes* in human writings. Take, for example, Montgomery's poem on Satan : *

“ Lo ! the bright dew-bead on the bramble lies,
Like liquid rapture upon Beauty's eyes.”

We fail to see any resemblance between beauteous eyes and a bramble ; or, any meaning at all in “liquid rapture.”

So Mrs. Browning :

“ Then the bitter sea
Inexorably pushed between us both ;
And sweeping up the steep with my despair,
Threw us out as a pasture to the stars.”

We fail to see any resemblance between a ship and a pasture ; and why stars go out to grass ; or, when they do, why they should feed on ships and their passengers !

No such inexplicable similes as these can be found in the Scriptures.

* Quoted in Macbeth's *Might and Mirth of Literature*.

When one is used there, it is "for our learning;" and the more we study it the more we may learn.

They are usually marked by the *Caph* (כ) in Hebrew; and in the Greek by ὡς (*hōs*), *as*; καθὼς (*kathōs*), *like as*; or, by some seventeen other kindred words*; and the English: "*as*," "*like as*," "*even as*," "*like*," etc.

Simile differs from *Comparison*, in that comparison admits of dissimilitudes as well as resemblances.

Simile differs from *Allegory* (*q.v.*) in that allegory names only one of the two things and leaves us to find, and make the resemblance with the other, ourselves.

Simile differs from *Metaphor* (*q.v.*), in that it merely states resemblance, while *Metaphor* boldly transfers the *representation*.

Simile differs from *Hypocatastasis* (*q.v.*), in that the latter only *implies* the resemblance, while *Simile* states it.

Simile, therefore, is destitute of feeling. It is clear, beautiful, gentle, true to fact, but cold and too deliberate for passion.

All this will be seen as the *Similes* are studied. They require no explanation. They explain and are intended to explain themselves. It is scarcely necessary to give any examples. They abound throughout the Scripture, and impart to it much of its beauty and force.

Ps. i. 3.—"He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water." Here, the similitude tells us that the man who meditates in God's word is planted and protected, just as a tree in a garden is cared for as a "tree of the field" is not.

See under *Ellipsis*, page 97.

Ps. i. 4.—"The ungodly are not so: but are like the chaff which the wind driveth away." The contrast between the driven chaff and the "planted" tree is most striking and solemn.

The two comparisons are the great features of the Psalm, the structure of which is as follows:—

A	a 1. The godly blessed in not standing among the ungodly.
	b 2, 3. Comparison (כִּי כִּדָּם). "Like a tree."
	c -3. Prosperity.
A	c 4-. The Contrary: "not so."
	b -4. Comparison (כִּי כִּדָּם). "Like the chaff."
	a 5. The ungodly punished in not standing among the godly.

* See under the word "AS" in *A Critical Lexicon and Concordance*, by the same author. Longman and Co., 15s.

Then the last verse stands out alone in solemn grandeur as giving the reason for the whole.

Ps. v. 12 (13).—"With favour wilt thou compass him as with a shield." And why is His "favour" (*i.e.*, His grace, which is favour to the unworthy) like a shield? Because "in his favour is life," Ps. xxx. 5 (6); because in His favour there is mercy (Isa. lx. 10); because in His favour there is preservation (Ps. lxxxvi. 2, margin); because in His favour there is security, Ps. xli. 11 (12): and therefore the prayer of all such favoured ones will ever be Ps. cvi. 4.

Ps. xvii. 8.—"Keep me as the apple of the eye [*is kept*]."

Ps. cxxxi. 2.—"I have behaved and quieted myself, as a child that is weaned of his mother: my soul is even as a weaned child."

Matt. vii. 24-27.—Here we have a magnificent and extended *Simile*, almost amounting to a parable. It is too long to quote, and too plain to need elucidation. It explains to us very clearly and forcibly its own powerful lesson.

Matt. ix. 36.—"They . . . were scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd.

1 Pet. ii. 25.—"Ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls."

Here we have *Simile*, which stands in marked contrast to the *Proverb* in 2 Pet. ii. 22, as to the "sow." Both the stray sheep and the washed sow "return." But the one returns to the shepherd, and the other to the mire. We may note also that the verb "returned" as used of the "sheep" is the *passive* form; while, as used of the "sow," it is the *active* form. Showing that the "sheep" is made to return by a constraining power, while the "sow" returns of its own act and free-will. See under *Paræmia*.

Sometimes a *Simile* is really used as a figure, implying not merely a resemblance but the actual thing itself.

Gen. xxv. 31.—"Sell me as on this day (דַּיִם, *kayyôm*):" *i.e.*, on this very day. See, too, verse 33.

Num. xi. 1.—The Heb. reads: "And when the People was as murmurers, it was evil in the ears of Jehovah."

Here the resemblance was real: *i.e.*, they *were* murmurers.

Neh. vii. 2.—"I gave my brother Hanani . . . charge over Jerusalem: for he acted as a faithful man (שֵׁנִי, etc."): *i.e.*, he *was* a faithful man.

Isa. i. 7.—"It is desolate as the overthrow of strangers." See A.V. margin.

See under *Antimereia*, and compare Isa. xiii. 6.

Isa. i. 9.—"Except the LORD of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, and we should have been like unto Gomorrah."

Here the words of the godly remnant declare the resemblance; and in the next verse Jehovah endorses it as true; addressing the ungodly but most religious nation actually as "the rulers of Sodom" and "the people of Gomorrah."

Ps. cxxii. 3.—"Jerusalem is builded as a city that is compact together": *i.e.*, it *was* a city so built.

Hos. v. 10.—"The princes of Judah were like them that remove the bound": *i.e.*, they actually committed this sin, the greatness of which is seen from Deut. xix. 14; xxvii. 17.

Matt. xiv. 5.—"Because they counted him as a prophet": *i.e.*, as actually a prophet.

Luke xxii. 44.—"His sweat was as it were great drops of blood": *i.e.*, it was.

John i. 14.—"And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father": *i.e.*, the glory of Him who was really the only begotten Son of the Father.

Rom. ix. 32.—"Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were (*i.e.*, actually) by the works of the law."

2 Cor. ii. 17.—"We are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ": *i.e.*, we speak really and truly sincere, pure, and Divine words.

2 Cor. iii. 18.—"We are all with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror (*κατοπτριζόμενοι, katoptrizomenoi*) the glory of the Lord, are transfigured to the same image, from glory to glory, even as from the Lord—the Spirit": *i.e.*, really by the actual operation of the Holy Spirit. His office is to glorify Christ; and those who are led by the Spirit do occupy themselves with Christ—the heavenly object, and thus become like Him, heavenly, and that without an effort. Indeed, the measure in which we are "filled with the Spirit" is the measure in which we are thus occupied with Christ.

Sometimes the word "as" is followed by the word "so," to strengthen and heighten the comparison, and make it more clear: as in

Isa. xxiv. 2.—"And it shall be
 As with the people,
 So with the priest;
 As with the servant,
 So with his master;
 As with the maid,
 So with her mistress;
 As with the buyer,
 So with the seller;
 As with the lender,
 So with the borrower;
 As with the taker of usury,
 So with the giver of usury to him."

And all this to show the universality of the judgment which shall make the land empty and desolate.

This is a combination of *Syncretism* with this form of *Simile*.

Isa. lv. 10, 11.—

a | "As the rain cometh down, and the snow

b | From heaven,

c | And returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and
 maketh it bring forth and bud,

d | That it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the
 eater.

a | So shall my word be that goeth forth

b | Out of my mouth:

c | It shall not return unto me void,

d | But it shall accomplish that which I please, and it
 shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

Here, in this beautiful comparison, we have in a and a the two things compared, the Word resembling the rain and snow; in b and b we have their *source*; in c and c, their *destiny*, not returning void; and in d and d, their *end* prospering, and the accomplishment of their mission.

"AS" and "SO."

We have collected a number of these examples of the use of "as" and "so" together; and arranged them, not in the sequence of the

books of the Bible, or in full ; but we have numbered them and placed them so as to illustrate the ways of God in grace :—

- (1) Sin and death (Rom. v. 12). These words explain the mystery of the first and last Adam, and the first and second man : their temptation and its results as shown in Gen. iii., Matt. iv., and Rom. vi. 23. This explains
- (2) Offence and righteousness : judgment and free gift (Rom. v. 18) ; also
- (3) Disobedience and obedience : sinners and righteous (Rom. v. 19). Hence the eternal results of
- (4) Sin and death : grace and eternal life (Rom. v. 21).

Now we pass from sin and its entrance and consequences to

- (5) its remedy. The Serpent and the Son of Man (John iii. 14). Note the two "musts" (verses 7 and 14) ; and the parabolic miracle of Num. xxi. 5-9. Note the "lifting up" spoken of in John xii. 32. The "all" means all *without distinction* (no longer the *one* People of Israel) not "all" *without exception*.

In due time Christ came to be thus "lifted up," and

- (6) do the Father's will, and Commandment, and He did (John xiv. 31), and
- (7) suffered ; Lamb dumb, and so He ; etc. (Isa. liiii. 7). Hence
- (8) Once to die, and once offered (Heb. ix. 27, 28).

Then

- (9) they are sent, "Sent Me" and "sent them" (John xvii. 18)
- (10) to bear testimony of His grace : "Believed" and "done" (Matt. viii. 13),
- (11) yea, of His life-giving grace : Life (John v. 26).
- (12) God reveals *Himself* : Heaven and earth ; ways and thoughts (Isa. lv. 9), and
- (13) man, *morally* : Foolish as a beast (Ps. lxxiii. 22).
- (14) Fathers and sons, etc., ye (Acts vii. 51) ; and
- (15) *physically*, the Flower that flourisheth (Ps. ciii. 15).

Then He reveals

- (16) His *mercy* : Heaven high and mercy great (Ps. ciii. 11),
- (17) His *forgiveness* : East from west and transgressions removed (Ps. ciii. 12),

(18) His *pity*: A father and the Lord (Ps. ciii. 13), and

(19) His *love*: The Father and I (John xv. 9).

Then He reveals

(20) our relationships and duties: Many members and one body (Rom. xii. 4; see 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13).

(21) Mutual forgiveness: Christ forgave and do ye (Col. iii. 13),

(22) Christ-like walk: Received and walk ye (Col. ii. 6).

(23) Divine consolations: Sufferings and consolation (2 Cor. i. 5, 7).

(24) Missionary work: Received and minister (1 Pet. iv. 10); with

(25) the Divine promise, Rain and snow: the word of God (Isa. lv. 10, 11); and

(26) the Divine support, Thy days and thy strength (Deut. xxxiii. 25).

Oh may our desire to do His will be according to,

(27) The hart panting, and the soul longing (Ps. xlii. 1 (2)).

THE JEW.

(28) All blessing based on God's original covenant-promise; Stars and seed (Jer. xxxiii. 22), see especially Gen. xv. 5, and Rom. iv. 18. The covenant of works they brake, see Ex. xxiv. 3, 7 and Jer. xxxi. 32, and are now suffering the consequences.

(29) The future blessing of Israel will be under the original covenant of grace: as Mother comforteth, so will I comfort (Isa. lxvi. 13).

(30) Bridegroom and thy God (Isa. lxii. 5).

(31) The waters of Noah, and wrath (Isa. liv. 9, 10).

(32) Shepherd seeking and I will seek (Ezek. xxxiv. 12).

THE GENTILE. We must not separate what God has joined together, nor join together what God has separated (Matt. xix. 6). The Jew, the Gentile, and the Church of God, are distinct in their calling, standing, hope, and destiny (1 Cor. x. 32). The preaching of the Gospel is not to convert the world, but to take out a People (Acts xv. 14); while the world will get worse and worse until Christ suddenly comes.

(33) Lightning, and coming (Matt. xxiv. 27).

(34) The days of Noah, and the coming of the Son of Man (Matt. xxiv. 37-39).

THE CHURCH OF GOD. Christ's advent will wear a different aspect to the Church. Not like the lightning or a thief, but

- (35) "this same Jesus." As ye have seen Him go will so come (Acts i. 11). Christ's *resurrection* is the type and pledge of ours.
- (36) As all in Adam die, so all in Christ made alive (1 Cor. xv. 22). Note the "order" (verses 23 and 24).
-

SYNCRISIS ; or, REPEATED SIMILE.

Repetition of a number of Resemblances.

Syn'-cri-sis. Greek, σύγκρισις, from σύν (*sun*), *together with*, and κρίσις (*crisis*), *a judging or deciding*.

Hence, *Syncrisis* is *the judging or comparing* of one thing with another ; and is used of the figure which consists of a repeated *Simile*, or of more than one, or of a number of separate comparisons used together.

Another name for this figure is PARATHESIS (*Pa-rath'-e-sis*), Greek, παράθεσις, *a putting beside* ; from παρά (*para*), *beside*, and τιθέναι (*tithenai*), *to place*.

It was called by the Latins COMPARATIO : *i.e.*, *a bringing together and comparing*.

Isa. i. 18.—

“ Though your sins be as scarlet,
They shall be as white as snow ;
Though they be red like crimson,
They shall be as wool.”

Isa. xxxii. 2.—“ And a man shall be as an hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest ; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.”

Isa. lxvi. 12.—“ For thus saith the LORD, Behold, I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream.”

METAPHOR ; or, REPRESENTATION.

*A Declaration that one Thing is (or represents) another ;
or, Comparison by Representation.*

Met'-a-phor. Greek, μεταφορά (*metaphora*), a transference, or carrying over or across. From μετά (*meta*), beyond or over, and φέρειν (*pherein*), to carry. We may call the figure "Representation" or "Transference."

Hence, while the *Simile* gently states that one thing is like or resembles another, the *Metaphor* boldly and warmly declares that one thing IS the other.

While the *Simile* says "All flesh is AS grass" (1 Pet. i. 24), the *Metaphor* carries the figure across at once, and says "All flesh IS grass" (Isa. xl. 6). This is the distinction between the two.

The *Metaphor* is, therefore, not so true to *fact* as the *Simile*, but is much truer to *feeling*.

The *Simile* says "All we like sheep," while the *Metaphor* declares that "we are the sheep of His pasture."

While, therefore, the word "resembles" marks the *Simile* : "represents" is the word that marks the metaphor.

We have recourse to Metaphor when we say of a picture, "This is my father," or "This is my mother." The verb "is" means in this case *represents* ; there may not be the least *resemblance* ! The verb "is" always has this meaning and no other when used as a *metaphor*. No other verb will do.

Few figures are more misunderstood than the *Metaphor*. It is one of the few whose names are well known, and hence it has become a general term for any figure ; and any figurative language is commonly called "metaphorical."

Few figures have been more variously defined. But all the differences of opinion arise from not separating the figure *Hypocatastasis* (*q.v.*) on the one hand, or distinguishing *Simile* on the other. The same confusion is seen with reference to *Allegory* (*q.v.*).

Let it then be clearly understood that a *Metaphor* is confined to a distinct affirmation that *one thing is another thing*, owing to some association or connection in the uses or effects of anything expressed or understood. The two nouns themselves must both be mentioned, and are always to be taken in their absolutely literal sense, or else no one can tell what they mean. The figure lies wholly in the verb, or

copula, which, in English, must always be expressed, and never understood by *Ellipsis*.

For example, "All flesh is grass." Here "flesh" is to be taken literally as the subject spoken of, and "grass" is to be taken equally literally as that which *represents* "flesh." All the figure lies in the verb "is." This statement is made under strong feeling, the mind realising some point of association; but, instead of using the more measured verb "resembles," or "is like"; which would be truer to fact, though not so true to feeling; the verb "is" is used, and the meaning of one thing is *carried across* and *transferred* to the other. It is not, as some might think, a mere Hebrew idiom to use "is" for "represents"; but it is a necessity of language arising from the actual condition and character of the human mind.

We must, therefore, banish the common and loose way in which the words "metaphor" and "metaphorical" are used, and confine the figure strictly and exclusively to this, its one true and proper signification: that of *representation*.

The Representation referred to in the figure may not lie upon the surface, and may not be at all apparent in the language itself. It may be in the uses of the thing represented, or in the effects which it produces. In this case the *Metaphor* often comes as a surprise, by the discovery of a point in which two apparently unrelated objects have some point in which they really agree. Hence the same thing may be used, by a *Metaphor*, to represent two totally different objects by some different quality or character which may be referred to: *e.g.*, a lion is used both of Christ and of the devil. We are to "cease from man" as opposed to trust in God; we are exhorted to "quit" ourselves like men as opposed to all that is effeminate.

The Latins* called the figure *TRANSLATIO*: *i.e.*, *Translation*, thus denoting the same fact: *viz.*, *the translation* or *carrying across* of one thing and applying it to another which *represents* it, just as what is meant in one language is carried across and expressed or *translated* in the words of another language.

It should be observed that the Hebrew has no verb substantive or *copula* answering to the Greek and English verb "to be." Consequently the A.V. generally puts in italics the verbs "is," "are," "were," etc. The verb "to be," though it is not necessary to be expressed in Hebrew, is yet so really there that the R.V. has abandoned the use of italic type with regard to it in the Old Testament, and so the Revisers

* Cicero. *Orat.* xxvii.

state it in their preface. We prefer the practice of the translators of the A.V., and believe it is more correct.

In the Greek, as we shall see below, whenever a *Metaphor* is intended, the verb substantative must be used; otherwise it is often omitted according to the Hebrew usage (see the Beatitudes, etc.). It is, therefore, more easy to discern a *Metaphor* in the New Testament than in the Old. In the latter we have to be guided by what is true to *fact* and what is true only to *feeling*. If we distinguish between these, we shall not fail to see what is a statement of fact, and what is a *Metaphor*.

Ps. xxiii. 1.—"The LORD is my Shepherd." Here, we have a *Metaphor*; and in it a great and blessed truth is set forth by the representation of Jehovah as a Shepherd. It is He who tends his People, and does more for them than any earthly shepherd does for his sheep. All His titles and attributes are so bound up with this care that in this Psalm we have the illustration of all the Jehovah-titles:—

In verse 1. "I shall not want," because He is JEHOVAH-JIREH (Gen. xxii. 14), and will provide.

In verse 2. "He leadeth me beside the waters of quietness (margin), because He is JEHOVAH-SHALOM (Judges vi. 24), and will give peace.

In verse 3. "He restoreth my soul," for He is JEHOVAH-ROPHCHA (Ex. xv. 26), and will graciously heal.

In verse 3. He guides me "in the paths of righteousness," for He is JEHOVAH-TZIDKENU (Jer. xxiii. 6), and is Himself my righteousness, and I am righteous in Him (Jer. xxxiii. 16).

In verse 4. In death's dark valley "Thou art with me," for thou art JEHOVAH-SHAMMAH (Ezek. xlvi. 35); and the LORD is there.

In verse 5. "Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies," for Thou art JEHOVAH-NISSI (Ex. xvii. 15), my banner, and will fight for me, while I feast.

In verse 5. "Thou anointest my head with oil," for Thou art JEHOVAH-MEKADDESSEM (Ex. xxxi. 13, etc.), the LORD that sanctifieth me.

In verse 6. "Surely" all these blessings are mine for time and eternity, for He is JEHOVAH-ROHI (Ps. xxiii. 1), Jehovah my Shepherd, pledged to raise me up from the dead, and to preserve and bring me "through" the valley of death into His glorious kingdom (John vi. 39).

Ps. lxxxiv. 11 (12).—"The LORD God is a Sun and Shield." Here, the *Metaphor* is taken from the uses and effects of the two things mentioned. He is my light and my defence. See P.B.V.

Ps. xci. 4.—"His truth is a shield and a buckler" (R.V.). Here, we have the *Metaphor*, by which the one thing is *carried over* and *stated* as being the other. In Ps. v. 12, we have the same fact stated literally as a *Simile*. See page 728 above.

Metaphors are so numerous in the Old Testament, that it is impossible to give more than these few to serve as specimens and examples. We add a few from the New Testament.

Matt. v. 13.—"Ye are the salt of the earth": *i.e.*, ye are (or *represent*) with regard to the earth what salt is to other things, preserving it from total corruption and destruction; just as the few righteous in Sodom would have preserved that city.

When the Lord Jesus shall have returned and caught up His People (the salt) to meet Him in the air and to be for ever with Him, then the corruption will proceed apace, and the harvest of the earth speedily be ripened for judgment.

Matt. xxvi. 26.—"This is my body" (τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, *touto esti to soma mou*).

Few passages have been more perverted than these simple words. Rome has insisted on the literal or the figurative sense of words just as it suits her own purpose, and not at all according to the laws of philology and the true science of language.

Hence the Latin idiom, "*agere pœnitentiam*," *repent*, has been rendered literally in all her versions from the Vulgate, in various languages, "do penance," except when God is said to repent! Rome dared not translate *agere pœnitentiam* literally in these cases, which proves her design in thus systematically perverting the Word of God: and the false doctrine is thus *forced* into the words under a show or semblance of literal translation.* So the *Metaphor*, "This is my body," has been forced to teach false doctrine by being translated literally.

No perversion of language has been fraught with greater calamity to the human race. Tens of thousands have suffered martyrdom at the hands of Rome rather than believe the "blasphemous fable" forced

* Rome would not dare to translate the same Latin idiom "*agere vitam*," *to do life*, though the expression has passed into slang. It means simply *to live*, as the other idiom means *to repent*.

into these words. The exquisite tortures of the Inquisition were invented to coerce the consciences of men and compel them to accept this lie!

Luther himself was misled, through his ignorance of this simple law of figurative language. In his controversy with Zwingli, he obstinately persisted in maintaining the *literal* sense of the figure, and thus forced it to have a meaning which it never has. He thus led the whole of Germany into his error! For, while his common sense rejected the error of "Transubstantiation," he fell into another, and invented the figment of "Consubstantiation," and fastened it upon the Lutheran Church to this day.

What a solemn and instructive lesson as to the importance of a true understanding of the figures of language!

The whole figure, in a metaphor, lies, as we have said, in the verb substantive "IS"; and not in either of the two nouns; and it is a remarkable fact that, when a *pronoun* is used instead of one of the nouns (as it is here), and the two nouns are of different genders, the pronoun is always made to agree in gender with that noun to which the meaning is carried across, and not with the noun from which it is carried, and to which it properly belongs. This at once shows us that a figure is being employed; when a pronoun, which ought, according to the laws of language, to agree in gender with its own noun, is changed, and made to agree with the noun which, by *Metaphor*, represents it.

Here, for example, the pronoun, "this" (τοῦτό, *touto*), is *neuter*, and is thus made to agree with "body" (σῶμά, *sōma*), which is *neuter*, and not with bread (ἄρτος, *artos*), which is *masculine*.*

This is always the case in *Metaphors*, and a few examples may be cited here, instead of in their natural order and place.

In Zech. v. 8, "This is wickedness." Here, "this" (*fem.*) does not agree with "ephah" (to which it refers), which is *neuter* (LXX.), but with "wickedness," which is *feminine*.

In Zech. v. 3, "This is the curse." "This" (*fem.*) agrees with "curse," which is *feminine*, and not with "flying roll," which is *neuter*, (to which it refers), (δρέπανον, *drepanon*, LXX.).

In Matt. xiii. 38, "The good seed are the children of the kingdom." Here, "these" (*masc.*) (οὗτοι, *houtoi*),† agrees with "children of the kingdom" (*masc.*), and not with seed (σπέρμα, *sperma*), which is *neuter*.

* In violation of this law, a recent revision of the Marathi Prayer Book has deliberately changed the gender of the pronoun and made it to agree with the word for "bread"!

† This pronoun is omitted in the English of the A.V. and R.V.

Luke viii. 14, "These are they which having heard," etc. Here, "these" (*masc.*) (οὗτοι, houtoi) agrees with the participle (οἱ ἀκούσαντες, *hoi akousantes*), "they which having heard," which is *masculine*, and not with the seed, (to which it refers), which is *neuter*.

All this establishes our statement that, in a *Metaphor*, the two nouns (or pronoun and noun) are always literal, and that the figure lies only in the *verb*. Another remarkable fact is that in the vast number of cases where the language is literal, and there is no metaphor at all, the verb is omitted altogether.* Even when a *Metaphor* has been used, and the language passes suddenly from figurative to literal, the verb is *at once dropped*, by *Ellipsis*, as not being necessary for the literal sense, as it was for the previous figurative expression: *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. xii. 27, "Ye ARE the body of Christ." Here is a metaphor, and consequently the verb is used. But in verse 29, which is literal, the change is at once made, and the fact is marked by the omission of the verb, "[Are] all apostles? [are] all prophets? [are] all teachers? [are] all workers of miracles?"

Next compare other examples of *Metaphors* which are naturally used in the explanations of Parables. Note the Parables of the Sower, and of the Tares (Matt. xiii. 19-23, and 37-43).

"He that soweth the good seed is (*i.e.*, represents) the Son of man."

"The field is (*i.e.*, signifies) the world."

"The good seed are the children of the kingdom."

"But the tares are the children of the wicked one."

"The enemy that sowed them is the devil."

"The harvest is the end of the age."

"And the reapers are the angels."

In all these (as in every other *Metaphor*) the verb means, and might have been rendered, "*represents*," or "*signifies*."

The Apocalypse is full of metaphors, *e.g.* :

"The seven stars are (*i.e.*, represent) the angels of the seven churches."

"And the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches" (i. 20).

The odours "are the prayers of the saints" (v. 8).

"They are the spirits of demons" (xvi. 14).

"The seven heads are (*i.e.*, represent) seven mountains (xvii. 9) : etc., etc.

* This rule does not apply to the Hebrew, of course, as we have said above: because it has no verb "to be."

So in the very words that follow "this is (*i.e.*, represents or signifies) my body," we have an undoubted *Metaphor*. "He took the cup . . . saying . . . this is my blood." *Here*, thus, we have a *pair* of metaphors. In the former one, "this" refers to "bread," and it is claimed that "is" means *changed into* the "body" of Christ. In the latter, "this" refers to "the cup," but it is not claimed that the cup is changed into "blood." At least, we have never heard that such a claim has been put forward. The difference of treatment which the same figure meets with in these two verses is the proof that the former is wrong.

In 1 Cor. xi. 25 we read "this cup is the new covenant." Will Romanists, in and out of the Church of England, tell us how this "cup" becomes transubstantiated into a "covenant" ?

Is it not clear that the figure in the words, "This is my body," is *forced* into a literal statement with the set purpose and design of making it teach and support erroneous doctrine ?

Other examples of *Metaphor* in this immediate connection are :

1 Cor. x. 16.—"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not (*i.e.*, does it not represent) the communion of the blood of Christ." through which all blessing comes to us ?

"The bread which we break, is it not (*i.e.*, does it not represent) the communion of the body of Christ ?" *i.e.*, does it not signify the fellowship of all the members of Christ's mystical body, who, being many, are one body (1 Cor. xii. 12) ? "For we being many are one bread, and one body," as 1 Cor. x. 17 declares.

It is because those who eat of that bread do not "discern" or discriminate that "one body" (*i.e.*, Christ mystical) that they are said to eat to their own condemnation ; for they witness to the fact of that "great Mystery" and yet are ignorant of its truth ! And hence they condemn themselves.

Further, the verb, εἶμι (*eimi*), *I am*, or the infinitive of it, *to be*, means *to be* in the sense of *signifying, amounting to*. And that this is one of its primary senses may be seen from the following passages, where it is actually translated "*to mean*," and not merely *to be* :—

"But go ye and learn what that is" (*i.e.*, *meaneth*, as in A.V.),
Matt. ix. 13.

"But if ye had known what that is" (A.V., *meaneth*), Matt. xii. 7.

"He asked what these things *were*" (A.V., *meant*), Luke xv. 26.

"What is this ?" (A.V., "What *meaneth* this ?") Acts ii. 12.

"Now, while Peter doubted in himself what this vision was which he had seen" (A.V., "What this vision should mean"), Acts x. 17, etc., etc., etc.

On the other hand, if an *actual* change is meant, then there must be a verb which shall plainly and actually say so: for the verb "*to be*" never has or conveys any idea of such change.

The usual verb to express such a change is *γίνομαι* (*ginomai*), which means *to be* or *become*. Mark iv. 39, "There *was* (i.e., there became) a great calm," and the storm was changed (or turned into) into calm.

Luke iv. 3, "Command this stone that it *be made* (i.e., changed into) bread."

John ii. 9, "When the ruler of the feast tasted the water that *was made* (i.e., changed into) wine."

John xvi. 20, "Your sorrow *shall be turned* into joy." This was a real transubstantiation.

Acts xxvi. 28, Agrippa said, "Almost thou persuadest me *to be* (i.e., to become) a Christian."

Rev. viii. 8, "The third part of the sea *became* blood," and in verse 11, "Many men died of the waters, because they were *made* bitter."

In all these cases (but the last) the verb is *γίνομαι* (*ginomai*), *to become*: and, if the Lord had meant that the bread *became* His body, that is the verb He would have necessarily used. The fact that He did not use it, but used the simple verb, *εἶμι* (*eimi*), instead, i.e., "is," proves conclusively that no *change* was meant, and that only *representation* was intended.

Just as when we are looking over a map and say, "This is England," "This is America," "This is Palestine," etc., we do not mean that that piece of paper is England, but we mean that those marks upon it *represent* those respective countries.

From all this it is philologically, philosophically, and scientifically clear that the words, "This is my body," mean "This [*bread*] represents my body." And as Professor Macbeth has put it, "We trample on the laws of nature, and we trample on the laws of language when we force the verb 'is' to mean *what it never does mean*."

And, besides all this, to pass from the use made of this perversion, suppose for a moment that we grant the claim, and the words mean that the Lord Jesus then and there did transmute the bread into *His own body* (if we can imagine such an impossibility!), what then? Where is there a breath about His giving that power to any one else? Where is there one word about such gifts being conferred? And, if it be claimed, as it is by some traitors in the Church of England, that

the words, "Do this," convey that power and authority, it could have been conveyed only to the eleven that were present. Where is there a breath about not only giving them power, but delegating it to them to give to others, and these to others again indefinitely? There is not one single word expressed or implied that conveys the idea that one iota of such power was conferred or delegated. So that the whole fabric of transubstantiation rests on absolutely no foundation whatsoever! There is a "missing link" which is fatal to the whole position.

And this, on the assumption which we have only for the moment granted. But, when it is seen that not only is there this link missing, which can never be supplied: but that there is also this claim which can never be substantiated; we have an explanation of the *Metaphor* which sweeps the dogma out of the Scriptures, and proves it to be a fiction which is the outcome of ignorance, and this by arguments that cannot be overthrown, and facts that cannot be denied.

John vi. 35. "I am the bread of life": *i.e.*, what bread does in supporting natural life is a *representation* of what Christ does in supporting and nourishing the new, Divine, spiritual life.

John viii. 12.—"I am the light of the world."

John x. 9.—"I am the door": *i.e.*, I am what a door is. I am the entrance to the sheepfold, and to the Father. Yes, a door, and not a flight of steps. A door, through which we pass in one movement from one side to the other.

John xv. 5.—"I am the true vine."

Here the word *ἀληθινός* (*aleethinos*) helps the figure, for it means *true* as regards the reality in relation to shadows or representations. Not "true" as opposed to what is false, but the "very" vine: the vine all earthly vines represent, and to which they point in such Scriptures as Isa. v. and Ps. lxxx.*

Gal. iv. 24.—"Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants," etc.

* See an Article, by the same author, in *Things to Come* for July, 1899.

HYPOCATASTASIS ; or, IMPLICATION.

*A Declaration that implies the Resemblance or Representation ;
or Comparison by Implication.*

Hy'-po-cat-as'-ta-sis. Greek, ὑποκατάστασις, substitution or implication ; from ὑπό (*hypo*), underneath, κατά (*kata*), down, and στάσις (*stasis*), a stationing. Hence, a putting down underneath.

As a figure, it differs from *Metaphor*, because in a metaphor the two nouns are both named and given ; while, in *Hypocatastasis*, only one is named and the other is implied, or as it were, is put down underneath out of sight. Hence *Hypocatastasis* is implied resemblance or representation : *i.e.*, an implied *Simile* or *Metaphor*. If *Metaphor* is more forcible than *Simile*, then *Hypocatastasis* is more forcible than *Metaphor*, and expresses as it were the superlative degree of resemblance.

For example, one may say to another, "You are like a beast." This would be *Simile*, tamely stating a fact. If, however, he said, "You are a beast" that would be *Metaphor*. But, if he said simply, "Beast!" that would be *Hypocatastasis*, for the other part of the *Simile* or *Metaphor* ("you"), would be implied and not stated.

This figure, therefore, is calculated to arouse the mind and attract and excite the attention to the greatest extent.

So well known was it to the ancients, that it received this significant name. But it is, to-day, unmentioned by literary men, though it is often unconsciously used by them. Thus, their language is enriched by its use, while the figure is unknown, even by name !

What a proof of the sad neglect into which this great subject has fallen ; and what an example of the consequent loss which has ensued.

This beautiful and far-reaching figure frequently occurs in Scripture. The Lord Jesus Himself often used it, and that with wonderful effect.

Its beauty and force will be at once seen, if we compare one or two passages.

When, in Jer. xlix. 19, we read of the king of Babylon coming up against Edom, it says : "Behold, he shall come up like a lion . . . against the habitation of the strong" : etc. Here, we have a *Simile*, and the feelings are unmoved, as it is only against Edom that the assault is made.

But it is a very different case in Jer. iv. 7, where the same king of Babylon is spoken of as coming up against ZION. In the heat of excited feeling he is not named, but only *implied*.

“The lion is come up from his thicket.”

So, in all the other cases, it will be well to contrast every example of *Hypocatastasis* with both *Simile* and *Metaphor*, in order to gather the full force of its meaning and the reason for its use instead of either of the other two.

Ps. xxii. 16 (17).—“Dogs have compassed me about.”

Here He does not say that his enemies were like dogs, or that they were dogs; no: the word “*enemies*” is not mentioned. It is implied: and by a kind of *Prosopopoeia*, they are spoken of as “dogs.” It means of course, “mine enemies have compassed me about” as the next sentence goes on to explain. See also under *Paronomasia*.

Matt. xv. 13.—“Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.” This is *Hypocatastasis*, bordering on Allegory. Persons are implied, though only plants are named. The solemn lesson of this implication is, that unless the work in the heart be that of God Himself, all is vain. It is useless therefore to attempt to effect conversion or to impart a new nature by personal appeals, persuasions, or excitement. This is only to make the flesh religious, and “that which is born of the flesh is flesh.”

Matt. xvi. 6.—“Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the Sadducees.” There the word “*doctrine*” is implied. Had the Lord said, “the doctrine of the Pharisees is like leaven,” that would have been *Simile*, and a cold, bare statement of fact; but He did not say so. Had He said “the doctrine of the Pharisees is leaven,” that would have been *Metaphor*; much bolder, much more forcible, but not so true to fact though much truer to truth. But He did not say so. He took the word “*doctrine*” and *put it down underneath*, and did not mention it at all. He only *implied* it: and this was *Hypocatastasis*.

No wonder then that the attention of the disciples was excited and attracted. No wonder their interest was aroused: for this was the Lord's object.

“They reasoned among themselves, saying, It is because we have taken no bread. Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have brought no bread? Do ye not yet understand? . . . How is it that ye do not understand that I spake not to you concerning bread, that ye

should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Saducees ? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees" (verses 6-12). This example is remarkable when we compare it with another, in the previous chapter, which we give next ; and out of its textual order for the purpose of contrast.

Matt. xv. 26.—"It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs." Here, the Lord Jesus, did not say to the woman of Canaan, *Thou art a dog of the Gentiles* (which would have been *Metaphor*), but He left out all reference to her, and only referred to her by *implication*, substituting a "dog" for herself. The woman, unlike the disciples (in chap. xvi.), at once saw and understood what the Lord *implied, viz.*, that it was not meet to take that which belonged to Israel and give it to a Gentile (or a dog of a Gentile as they were called by the Jews), "And she said, Truth, Lord." What she felt is clear : "It is quite true ; Thou art perfectly right ; I called Thee 'the Son of David,' and deserved no answer ; I pleaded for 'help' and said : 'Lord, help me' ; but I made no confession as to who the 'me' was : no acknowledgment of my unworthiness and unmeetness as 'a dog of the Gentiles.'" "Truth, Lord : yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table. Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith."

So, it is "great faith" to understand what the Lord *implied* by the use of this beautiful figure, and it is "little faith" not to understand it! even though the former was spoken of a Gentile woman, and the latter of the apostles of the Lord. See also under *Synecdoche* and *Meiosis*.

John ii. 19.—"Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." The Lord Jesus did not say that His body was like the temple (that would have been *Simile*), or that it was His body (that would have been *Metaphor*). He merely *implied* the word *body*, as ver. 21 plainly declares : "He spake of the temple of his body."

Here was neither "great faith" nor "little faith," but wilful unbelief of His words. His disciples remembered them *after* He was raised from the dead, and believed. His enemies remembered them *before* and perverted them : "This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days" (Matt. xxvi. 61). He said no such thing. What He foretold was that they would destroy "this temple" of His body, and that He should raise it again from the dead in three days, and build it again. See also under *Heterosis*.

Other examples are:—

Matt. iii. 10.—Where, by the axe being laid to the root of the trees, etc., is *implied* the result of the ministry of John the Baptist.

The same is the case with ver. 12.

Matt. v. 29, 30.—May also be explained by this figure better than by *Hyperbole* (*q.v.*). The right eye, etc., is compared by *implication* to the most highly prized possession.

Matt. vii. 3-5.—The mote and beam refer by *implication* to anything that perverts the vision.

Matt. vii. 6.—Here “dogs” and “swine” are compared by *implication* to persons.

Mark i. 17.—“I will make you to become fishers of men.” The Lord does not say *like* fishers, nor does He use direct *metaphor*. The resemblance is only by *implication*.

Acts xx. 29.—“I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.”

Thus does the Holy Spirit inform us, by *Implication*, as to the true character of “apostolic succession,” in order to impress the solemn fact on our minds.

ALLEGORY ; or, CONTINUED METAPHOR AND HYPOCATASTASIS.

Continued Comparison by Representation or Implication.

Al'-le-go-ry. Greek, ἀλληγορία, from ἄλλος (*allos*), *another*, and ἀγορεύειν (*agoreuein*), *to speak or make a speech in the agora (i.e., assembly).*

Few figures have been the subject of greater controversy than *Allegory*; or, have been more variously defined. One class of Rhetoricians declare that it is a continued metaphor: and another class declare that it is not. But, as is often the case under such circumstances, neither is quite correct, because both have a part of the truth and put it for the whole. Neither of the contending parties takes into consideration the existence of *Hypocatastasis*. And this fact accounts for the confusion, not only with regard to *Allegory*, but also with regard to *Metaphor*.

All three figures are based on *comparison*. *Simile* is comparison by *resemblance*; *Metaphor* is comparison by *representation*; *Hypocatastasis* is comparison by *implication*.

In the first the comparison is *stated*; in the second it is *substituted*; in the third it is *implied*.

Thus *Allegory* is a continuation of the latter two, *Metaphor* or *Hypocatastasis*; while the *Parable (q.v.)* is a continuation of the *Simile*.

This definition clears the whole ground, and explains the whole of the difficulties, and reconciles the different schools.

The *Allegory*, therefore, is of two kinds; one in which it is *continued Metaphor* (as in Ps. xxiii.), where the two things are *both* mentioned (Jehovah, and the Shepherd's care), and what is asserted belongs to the principal object; the other, in which it is *continued Hypocatastasis* (Ps. lxxx. 8-15), where only one thing is mentioned (the vine), and what is asserted belongs properly to the secondary object; *viz.*, to *Israel*. Israel whom it really refers, is not mentioned, but only implied.

Isa. v. 1-6.—This is an *Allegory* which combines both forms. "Judah and Jerusalem" (concerning whom Isaiah prophecies i. 1) are again represented as a vine, and the *Allegory* commences by *implying* them, and afterwards proceeds to *substitute* them (vers. 3-7).

Allegory thus differs from *Parable*, for a *parable* is a *continued Simile*. It never departs from the simple statement that one thing resembles another. While the *allegory represents*, or *implies*, that the one

thing is the other. As in the allegory of the Pilgrim's Progress: What is spoken of one person refers to another person in similar circumstances and experiences. In Ps. lxxx. and Isa. v., what is spoken of a Vine refers to Israel: but, in Genesis, what is stated of Israel and Ishmael, Sarah and Hagar is all true history, yet in Gal. iv. it is made to speak of and set forth other truths, and hence *there* it is, and is called an "*Allegory*" (Gal. iv. 24).

No figure requires more careful discrimination than *Allegory*. And it would be safer to say that there are no allegories in Scripture than to follow one's own judgment as to what is allegory, and what is not.

At any rate, we have only one which is distinctly declared to be such; and that is Gal. iv. 22, 24. "It is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free-woman was by promise. Which things are an Allegory": or, which things teach or tell us something beyond what is said.

The modern and common usage of the word *allegoria* is thus quite different from this Scriptural definition. According to the modern sense it is taken to mean a fictitious narrative which has another and deeper meaning than that which is expressed.

An allegory *may* sometimes be fictitious, but Gal. iv. shows us that a true history may be allegorized (*i.e.*, be shown to have further teaching in that which actually took place) *without detracting from the truth of the history*. Here note this important fact: that, in either case, *Allegory* is always stated in the *past* tense, and *never in the future*. *Allegory* is thus distinguished from Prophecy. The *Allegory* brings other teaching out of past events, while the prophecy tells us events that are yet to come, and means exactly what is said.

Gen. xlix.—The prophetic blessing of Jacob is mixed. Part of it is *Simile* (verse 4). Some is *Metaphor* (verse 9). In some parts the *Metaphors* are repeated, in which case we have *Allegory*.

Judges ix. 7-15.—This is not a parable, as the A.V. chapter-heading calls it; because there is no similitude, by which one thing is likened to another. It is a continued *Hypocatastasis*, only one of the two things being plainly mentioned. Were it not for the interpretation given in verses 16-20, there would be nothing beyond what is implied.

It is interesting to note that the four trees referred to—the Fig-tree, the Olive, the vine, and the Bramble—are the four which are used to combine the whole of Israel's history.

The FIG-TREE represents the *National position* of Israel, from which we learn (in the Synoptic Gospels) that it withered away and has been cut down.

The OLIVE TREE represents the *Covenant privileges* of Israel (Rom. xi.): which are now in abeyance.

The VINE represents Israel's *Spiritual blessings*, which henceforth are to be found only in Christ, the True Vine (John xv.).

The BRAMBLE represents the Antichrist, in whose shadow they will yet trust, but who will be to Israel a consuming fire in the day of "Jacob's trouble"—"the great Tribulation."*

Isa. xxviii. 20 is *Allegory*: *i.e.*, repeated *Hypocatastasis*, only one part of the figure being mentioned: *viz.*, the bed and its covering, and not the people to whom it refers. The prophet is speaking of the great fear which ought to agitate the people of Judea at the speedy coming of Sennacherib; but they preferred to be left in their false security. By this beautiful allegorical illustration they are informed that their rest should be restless, and their sleep should be soon disturbed.

Matt. iii. 10, 12 is repeated *Hypocatastasis*, and therefore *Allegory*.

Matt. v. 13 is the same, following on "Ye are the salt of the earth," which is *Metaphor*.

Matt. vii. 3-5 is the same; only one thing, the mote and the beam, being named. What they mean is only implied.

Matt. ix. 15 is the same, the meaning being implied.

Matt. ix. 16, 17.—The "old piece" on the new implies the solemn lesson as to the impossibility of reforming the Old nature.

Matt. xii. 43-45.—"When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man," etc. This is an *Allegory*. It is to be interpreted of the Jewish nation, as verse 45 declares. By *application* also it teaches the unclean spirit's *going out* of his own accord, and not being "cast out" (verse 28, 29). When he is "cast out," he never returns; but when he "goes out," he comes back; and finds only a "reformed character," instead of the Holy Spirit indwelling in the one who is born again.

Luke ix. 62.—"No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." This is a brief allegory.

For other examples, see John iv. 35. Rom. xi. 16-18, etc.; xiii. 11, 12. 1 Cor. iii. 6-8, 12-15; v. 7, 8. 2 Cor. iii. 2, 3; v. 1, etc.; x. 3-5; xi. 2. Gal. vi. 8. Eph. vi. 11, etc.

* See *Things to Come* for July, 1899. A. Holness, 14 Paternoster Row.

PARABOLA ; or, PARABLE : i.e., CONTINUED SIMILE.

Comparison by continued Resemblance.

Par-ab'-o-la. Greek, παραβολή (*pa-rab'-o-lee*), a placing beside for the purpose of comparison, from παρά (*para*), beside, and βάλλειν (*ballein*), to throw or cast.

The classical use of the word was for one of the subdivisions of παράδειγμα (*paradeigma*), an example, viz., a presentation of an analogous case by way of illustration.

In the LXX. it occurs about thirty times as the translation of מַשְׁלָל (*mahshal*), and of no other word : and, if we look at some of the sayings to which the word "parable" is applied, the meaning which was attached to it will be clearly seen.

1 Sam. x. 12 : We read of "the proverb," "Is Saul also among the prophets?" So xxiv. 14 (13) : Of "the proverb of the ancients," "Wickedness proceedeth from the wicked." Compare Ezek. xii. 22 ; xvi. 44 ; xviii. 2. Deut. xxviii. 37. 2 Chron. vii. 20. Ps. xlv. 14 (15). Jer. xxiv. 9. But see below under *Paræmia*.

Growing out of this came a later meaning of מַשְׁלָל (*mahshal*) as used of any saying which required an explanation. We see this as early as in Ezek. xx. 47-49.

In the New Testament instances of the word, it is used of a story with a hidden meaning, without pressing, in every detail, the idea of a comparison.

As the name of a Figure of Speech, it is limited to what we may describe as repeated or *continued Simile*—an illustration by which one set of circumstances is likened to another. It consists in *likeness*, not in representation, and therefore is not a *continued Metaphor*, as some have said ; but a *repeated Simile*.

This likeness is generally only in some special point. One person may be like another in appearance, but not in character, and *vice versa* ; so that when resemblance or likeness is affirmed it is not to be concluded that the likeness may be pressed in all points, or extended to all particulars.

For example, a lion is used as a resemblance of Christ, on account of his strength and prowess. The Devil is likened to "a lion" because

of his violence and cruelty. Christ is compared to a thief, on account of his coming, being unexpected; not on account of dishonesty.

The resemblance is to be sought for in the scope of the context, and in the one great truth which is presented, and the one important lesson which is taught: and not in all the minute details with which these happen to be associated.

The *interpretation* of the parable must be further distinguished from any *application* which may be made of it. For example: in the Parable of the "Ten Virgins" (Matt. xxv. 1-12), the *interpretation* belongs to some special point of time immediately preceding the return of the Lord to the earth. This is indicated by the word "Then," with which it commences, and by its place in relation to the context. Any lesson for ourselves, as to watchfulness on our part, must come as an *application* of it to present circumstances.

So with the parable of the Great Supper (Luke xiv. 16-24). The *application* to the present time must not blot out the *interpretation* of it, which refers to the successive ministries connected with the invitations to "the great supper."

(1) "A certain man" sends "his servant" to those who had been previously "bidden." This was Peter's first ministry (Acts ii.-vii.). All excuse themselves.

(2) The "master of the house" sends him again to "the streets and lanes of the city." This is Peter's second ministry (Acts x.-xiii.).

(3) Then "the lord" sends out another servant to "the highways and hedges." This is Paul's ministry to the great Gentile world (Acts xiii.-xxviii.).

Parables are used from the resemblance of one thing to another. The thing, or history, or story may be true or imaginary; but the events must be possible, or likely to have happened; at any rate those who hear must believe that they are possible events, though it is not necessary that the speaker should believe them.

Where they are impossible, such as trees or animals speaking and reasoning, we have *Fable*; and if the *Fable* is explained, then we have *Allegory* (*q.v.*). See Judges ix. 8-15, where we should have *Fable*, but for the application of it, which we have in verse 16, which renders it *Allegory*.

We do not propose to give even a list of the parables of Scripture, as they can be so easily and readily found by the reader.

One word of caution, however, we must give: and that is concerning the object of parables. The common idea is that they are intended to make things clear and plain. Hence every young minister and

Sunday-school teacher turns to the parables as though they were the simplest things in the world. Whereas they were spoken that the truth might be veiled from those who "seeing, see not: and hearing, hear not." See Matt. xiii. 10-17. Hence they are among the most difficult portions of God's Word.

Without wearying the student with all the varying definitions and explanations which Rhetoricians and Divines have given, we add what is perhaps the best classification of Similitudes, *viz.*: that by P. Rutilius Lupus.

I. PARADEIGMA.

1. Persons without words.
2. Words without persons.
3. Both persons and words.

II. PARABOLA OR PARABLE.

1. *Icon.* Simile forming a complete image.
2. *Homæon.* Simile founded on certain points only.
3. *Epagoge.* Argument from induction.

APOLOGUE ; or, FABLE.

A Fictitious Narrative used for Illustration.

Ap'-o-logue. Greek, ἀπόλογος, from ἀπό (*apo*), *from*, and λόγος (*logos*), *speech* (from λέγειν, *to speak*), *a story, tale* ; and especially *a fable*. Latin, FABULA, *a fable*.

An *Apologue* (or *Fable*) differs from a *Parable*, in that the *Parable* describes what is likely or probable, or at any rate what is believed by the hearers as probable, while the *Fable* is not limited by such considerations, and is used of impossibilities, such as trees, or animals, and inanimate things talking and acting.

The *Fable*, therefore, is a fictitious narrative intended to illustrate some maxim or truth.

Judges ix. 8-15 would be a *Fable*, were it not explained in verse 16.

As it is, there are no examples of *Fable*, as such, in the Word of God.

PARÆMIA ; or, PROVERB.

A wayside-saying in common use.

Par-oi'-mi-a. παροιμία, a way-side; from παρά (*para*), beside, and οἶμος (*oimos*), a way or path. Hence *Paræmia* is a way side saying, a trite expression, or common remark, a proverb. As we say "a saw" or adage.

Like *Parable*, *Paræmia* is used in the Septuagint Version to translate the Hebrew word מִשְׁלָּה (*mahshal*). Now this noun מִשְׁלָּה (*mahshal*) belongs to the verb מִשַּׁל (*mahshal*), which means to rule, control, to have, or exercise control.

Hence it is plain that there must be a close connection between "a rule" and "a proverb." This connection may be illustrated by our phrase "a ruling principle"; and by the fact that we might term what we call 'the *Proverbs* of Solomon' 'Solomon's *Rules*'; since that is just what they are: rules for guiding life. Indeed, if we ask what is the derivation of the word "*Maxim*," we may find its history not unlike that of παροιμία in Greek. It would seem to mean 'a saying most widely used,' 'most in vogue,' in the market, by the roadside, and in ordinary life generally. By degrees, usage separated the words *Parable* and *Paræmia*; and *Parable* was limited to an illustration; while *Paræmia* was confined to what we now call a *proverb*.

The figure is used, therefore, of any *sententious saying*, because these are generally such as control and influence life.

The word *Paræmia* is used in the New Testament (John x. 6), where it is rendered "parable"; and in xvi. 25 (twice), 29, and 2 Pet. ii. 22, where it is rendered "Proverb."

The Latin name for the figure is PROVERBIUM, *Proverb*. Hence, the name given to the book of Proverbs,* which consists of collections of such brief sententious sayings which govern the life and control the walk.

Paræmiæ or Proverbs occurring in Scripture may be divided into three classes:—

- (1) Those that are quoted as being already in use as such.
- (2) Those which, though not quoted as such, were very probably already in use as proverbial expressions.

* See *The Names and Order of the Books of the Old Testament*, by the same author and publisher. Price fourpence.

(3) Those which appear for the first time in Scripture; but which, owing to their fulness of meaning and their wide application, have since passed into general use as proverbial sayings.

1. *Paræmia* which are quoted as being already in use as such.

Gen. x. 9.—“He was a mighty hunter before the LORD: wherefore it is said, ‘Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before the LORD’” (R.V.).

Num. xxi. 27.—“Wherefore they that speak in proverbs say, ‘Come into Heshbon, Let the city of Sihon be built and prepared,’” etc.

Three strophes are given from a popular poem, introduced by the word “wherefore.”

The *first* (-27, 28) is an ironical call to the Amorites to rebuild their city Heshbon, which Israel had destroyed (see verses 25, 26).

The *second* (verse 29) is a prophecy of Moab's ruin.

The *third* (verse 30) is the justification of the woe pronounced in verse 29.

Verse 30 is obscure, because of the reading of the letter ך in ךִּֿשָׁה which, according to Massorah, is one of the fifteen cases in which words, etc., are dotted. The letter (ך) ought, therefore, to be cancelled. In this case שָׁה (*ish*), *man*, is put for שִׁשָׁה (*ish*), *men*, and ךִּֿשָׁהג (ג *vannashsheem*), *we have laid them waste*, would then be the plural of ךִּֿשָׁהג (*issshah*): *women*.

The strophe would then read:—

“We have shot at them,
Heshbon is destroyed even unto Dibon,
The women also even unto Nopha,
And the men even unto Medeba.”*

1 Sam. x. 12.—“Therefore it became a proverb: ‘Is Saul also among the prophets?’”

1 Sam. xxiv. 13.—“As saith the proverb of the ancients, ‘Wickedness proceedeth from the wicked: but mine hand shall not be upon thee.’”

2 Sam. xx. 18.—“They were wont to speak in old time, saying, ‘They shall surely ask *counsel* at Abel’: and so they ended *the matter*.”

* See Ginsburg's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, pp. 326-328.

Jer. xxxi. 29.—“ In those days they shall say no more, ‘The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children’s teeth are set on edge.’ ”

This is what they did once say. See Ezek. xviii. 2, 3.

Ezek. xvi. 44.—“ Behold, every one that useth proverbs shall use this proverb against thee, saying: ‘As is the mother, so is her daughter.’ ” See xix. 2, 3.

Luke iv. 23.—“ Ye will surely say unto me this proverb: ‘Physician, heal thyself.’ ”

This was a well known proverb. It may be found in the Talmud, “Physician, heal thine own lameness.”*

John i. 46 (47).—“ Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth ? ”

This appears from vii. 41, 42, 52, to have been a proverb already in use.

John iv. 37.—“ And herein is that saying true; ‘One soweth, and another reapeth.’ ”

2 Pet. ii. 22.—“ But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb (Prov. xxvi. 11):

“ The dog is turned to his own vomit again ;
And the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.”

When we contrast this with 1 Pet. ii. 25, we see how forcible is the difference between the *saved sinner* and the “reformed character.” The saint may go astray, and the ungodly may reform; but they both turn again, the one to his Shepherd, and the other to his mire! There is all the difference in the world between a dirty sheep and a washed sow! It is not that which goeth into the mouth that defleth the man, but that which cometh out of the heart (Matt. xv. 17-20).

The mouth, dish, or sepulchre, may be cleansed or whitened without, but within it is all uncleanness (Matt. xxiii. 25-28).

“ Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the LORD looketh on the heart ” (1 Sam. xvi. 7).

Truly “ the Lord seeth not as man seeth.”

How many hirelings are there who are engaged in merely washing sows and amusing goats, instead of seeking out and feeding Christ’s harassed and scattered and famishing sheep, who are at their wits’ end

* Beresh. rab. sect. 23, and in Tanchuma, fol. 4. 2.

to know where to find a little green grass, or fresh water, which has not been trodden down with the feet of the goats, or defiled with the "vomit" of the dogs?

2. *Paræmia* which, though not quoted as such, were very probably already in use as proverbial expressions.

"Like to a grain of mustard seed" (Matt. xiii. 31, 32; xvii. 20. Luke xvii. 6). This was doubtless a proverbial saying among the Hebrews (not the Greeks), to indicate a very small thing; as we say, of rent, etc., "a peppercorn." See Buxtorf *Lex. Talmud*, under the word חֶרְדָּל, and above, under *Ellipsis* and *Synecdoche*.

"As the sand of the sea," or "as the sand." This was used proverbially, in order to express a vast multitude that could not be numbered.

See Gen. xxii. 17; xxxii. 12; xli. 49. Josh. xi. 4. Judges vii. 12. 1 Sam. xiii. 5. 2 Sam. xvii. 11. 1 Kings iv. 20, 29 (v. 9). Job xxix. 18. Ps. lxxviii. 27; cxxxix. 18. Isa. x. 22; xlvi. 19. Jer. xv. 8; xxxiii. 22. Hos. i. 10 (ii. 1). Hab. i. 9. And in the New Testament—Rom. ix. 27. Heb. xi. 12; and Rev. xx. 8. See under *Hyperbole*.

"As the dust of the earth," or "dust," is used proverbially, by *Metonymy* (*q.v.*), for an innumerable multitude.

See Gen. xiii. 16; xxviii. 14. Num. xxiii. 10.* 2 Chron. i. 9. Job xxii. 24; xxvii. 16. Ps. lxxviii. 27. Zeph. i. 17. Zech. ix. 3. See under *Hyperbole*.

"As the stars of heaven," or "as the stars," is used proverbially to indicate a vast number that could not be counted.

See Gen. xv. 5; xxii. 17; xxvi. 4. Ex. xxxii. 13. Deut. i. 10; x. 22; xxviii. 62. 1 Chron. xxvii. 23. Neh. ix. 23. Jer. xxxiii. 22. Nah. iii. 16.

"It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle" (Matt. xix. 24. Mark x. 25. Luke xviii. 25). This was a proverbial

* Num. xxiii. 10. The A.V. renders this "Who can count the dust of Jacob, and the number the fourth part of Israel." The R.V. renders the second line, "Or number the fourth part of Israel"; and in the margin says, "Heb., Or, by number." But Dr. Ginsburg points out in his *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (p. 168), that the word רִמְסָפָר (*umispahr*), rendered "and the number," is obscure, because the first two letters רִמ were originally a separate word, being the abbreviation of the first word of the first line, *viz.*: רִמ for רִמִּי, and *who*. Thus the two lines (dividing the word into two) are now seen to be a beautiful parallel:—

"Who can count the dust of Jacob?"

And who can number the fourth part of Israel?"

expression for a thing very unusual and very difficult. Lightfoot (*Horæ Hebraicæ*) quotes several examples: from the Talmud,* where, concerning dreams, it says "They do not show a man a palm-tree of gold, nor an elephant going through the eye of a needle." The gloss is, "A thing which he was not wont to see, nor concerning which he had ever thought." Another example is given,† where Rabbi Sheshith answered R. Amram, disputing with him, and asserting something that was incongruous of him, and said, "Perhaps thou art one of these Pombeditha, who can make an elephant pass through the eye of a needle": *i.e.*, as the *Aruch* interprets it, "Who speak things that are impossible."

"That strain out a gnat, and swallow a camel" (Matt. xxiii. 24). Not "straining at a gnat." See Buxtorf in *Lex. Talmud*, under סנן.

"With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again" (Matt. vii. 2). This was a very common proverb among the Jews. See Bab. *Sanhedrim*, fol. 100, 1, and the Tract *Sotah* cap. 1, quoted by Lightfoot.

"Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye," etc. (Matt. vii. 4). Lightfoot quotes from the *Baba Bathra*, fol. 15, 2, a well known proverb: "It is written in the days when they judged the judges (*i.e.*, in the generation which judged their judges), When any [*judge*] said to another 'Cast out the mote out of thine eye,' he answered, 'Cast you out the beam out of your own eye,'" etc.

"There shall not an hair of your head perish," etc. (Luke xxi. 18. Acts xxvii. 34; and, in the Old Testament, 1 Sam. xiv. 45. 2 Sam. xiv. 11. 1 Kings i. 52. Compare also Matt. x. 30.

"Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased: and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted" (Matt. xxiii. 12. Luke xiv. 11). Many similar sayings might be quoted from the Talmud. See *Erubim*, cap. i. Indeed, it was very ancient. See Job v. 11; xxii. 29. Ps. xviii. 27 (28); cxiii. 6 (7). Prov. xxix. 23, and the song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 6-8), and of Mary (Luke i. 52, 53).

"Shake off the dust of your feet" (Matt. x. 14. Mark vi. 11. Luke ix. 5. And Acts xiii. 51). The schools of the Scribes taught that the dust of heathen lands caused defilement.‡ The shaking off

* Babyl. *Berachoth*. fol. 55, 2.

† *Baba Mezia*, fol. 38, 2.

‡ *Tosaph. ad Kelim*, cap. 1. Bab. *Sanhedr.*, fol. 12. 1. Bab. *Shabb*, fol. 15. 2. Gloss in *Sanhedr.*, fol. 5. 2. *Tosaph. in Sanhedr.*, cap. 1, article 30, quoted by Lightfoot.

of the dust of the feet, therefore, was a sign that, though the place might be in the land of Israel, it was as though it were a heathen and profane and defiled place.

"It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord," etc. (Matt. x. 25. Luke vi. 40. John xiii. 16).*

"Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation," etc. (Matt. xii. 25. Mark iii. 24, 25. Luke xi. 17. (See Buxtorf. *Lex. Talmud*, under פָּרִיב).

"To remove mountains" (Matt. xxi. 21. 1 Cor. xiii. 2) was a Hebrew proverb, as may be seen in Buxtorf. *Lex. Talmud*, under עָקַר. It was common to say of a great teacher that he was "a rooter up of mountains." (See Bab. *Berachoth*, fol. 64. 1; *Erubim*, fol. 29. 1; *Sanhedrim*, fol. 24. 1; *Baba Bathra*, fol. 3. 2). And thus what they foolishly said of the learning of their wisest men, Christ said of His humblest disciple. In 1 Cor xiii. 2, knowledge and faith are combined by this *Paræmia*.

"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the Law and the Prophets" (Matt. vii. 12. Luke vi. 31. (See Talmud, Bab. *Sabbath*, fol. 31. 1, and Buxtorf. *Lex. Talmud*, under בָּנָה).

"To unloose the shoe-latchet" (Matt. iii. 11. Mark i. 7. Luke iii. 16) was a proverb connected with the buying of a servant: the loosening of the shoe being a token of purchase. See Ruth iv. 7, 8; and Bab. *Kiddushin*, fol. 22. 2, cap. 1.

"If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" (Luke xxiii. 31), or better (comparing Matt. iii. 10: "Now, also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees.")

"If to a green tree, these things they are doing;

To the dry tree, what shall happen?" †

I. e., if they deal thus with Me, a green and flourishing Tree, what shall happen to the nation—a dry and sapless trunk, when the Romans shall presently lay their axe to it? (See Ps. i., and Jer. xvii. 5-8).

"It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks" (Acts ix. 5; xxvi. 14).

This was a proverb common among the Greeks as well as the Hebrews.

* See the Talmud. *Berachoth*, cap. 9 and *Chusar*, cap. 20. Also Aben Ezra on Hos. i. 2.

† Talmud *Sanhedrim*, quoted by Drusius.

3. *Paræmiæ which appear for the first time in Scripture; but, which, owing to their fulness of meaning and their wide application, have since passed into general use as proverbial sayings.*

Gen. xxii. 14.—“As it is said to this day, ‘In the mount of the LORD it shall be seen.’”

Deut. xxv. 4 is a Scripture which afterward became a proverb, because it is a brief sententious saying with many applications. “Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn (margin, Heb. *thresheth*). See 1 Cor. ix. 9 and 1 Tim. v. 18.

1 Kings viii. 46. 2 Chron. vi. 36.—“For there is no man that sinneth not.” This became a proverb on account of its great truth, as may be seen from Prov. xx. 9. Ecc. vii. 20. Jas. iii. 2. 1 John i. 8, 10.

1 Kings xx. 11.—This also has come down to, and is used by posterity as a proverb, full of meaning, and with many applications :

“Let not him that girdeth on his harness
Boast himself as he that putteth it off.”

Job vi. 5.—“Doth the wild ass bray when he is at grass? or loweth the ox over his fodder?” (See A.V. margin).

Job xiv. 19.—“The waters wear the stones.”

Job xxviii. 18.—“The price of wisdom is above rubies.”

Ps. lxii. 9.—“Surely men of low degree are vanity, and men of high degree are a lie: to be laid in the balance they are altogether lighter than vanity.”

Ps. cxi. 10.—“The fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom.” So Deut. iv. 6. Job xxviii. 28. Prov. i. 7: ix. 10. Ecc. xii. 13. Probably the first use is in Job xxviii. 28, but it passed into a common proverb.

Prov. i. 17.—“Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird.”

Prov. i. 32.—“The prosperity of fools shall destroy them.”

Prov. iii. 12.—“For whom the LORD loveth He correcteth: even as a father the son in whom he delighteth.” Here we have a *Simile* as well. It is referred to in Heb. xii. 5, 6. See also Job v. 17. Ps. xciv. 12, and Rev. iii. 19.

Prov. vi. 6.—“Go to the ant, thou sluggard: consider her ways and be wise.” Compare Job xii. 7.

Prov. vi. 27.—“Can a man take fire in his bosom, and his clothes not be burned?” This is doubtless a saying arising from common observation of daily life.

Prov. x. 5.—“He that gathereth in summer is a wise son.”

Prov. x. 13.—“A rod is for the back of him who is void of understanding.” So xxvi. 3.

Verse 19: “In the multitude of words there wanteth not sin.”

Prov. xi. 15.—“He that is surety for a stranger shall smart for it.” Heb. *shall be sore broken* (so A.V. margin). The common experience of this fact has made this a common proverb; but they are blessed indeed who learn and know from a happy experience that when Christ became Surety for His People, who were “strangers,” He smarted for it, and was “sore broken” that they might be for ever blessed.

Prov. xxii. 6.—“Train up a child in the way he should go.”

Few proverbs have passed more into common use than this. Mr. C. H. Spurgeon once put it, “in the way you wish you had gone yourself.” See under *Pleonasm* and *Metonymy*.

Prov. xxvi. 11.—“As a dog returneth to his vomit, so a fool returneth to his folly.”

This is also a simile, which passed into a proverb. See 2 Pet. ii. 22, quoted and referred to above.

Prov. xxvii. 6.—“Faithful are the wounds of a friend.”

Verse 7: “The full soul loatheth the honeycomb.”

Verse 17: “As iron sharpeneth iron,” etc.

Prov. xxviii. 21.—“To have respect of persons is not good.”

See *Synecdoche*, and Prov. xviii. 5, and xxiv. 23.

Ecc. i. 15.—“That which is crooked cannot be made straight.” So vii. 13. Job. xii. 14. Isa. xiv. 27.

This perhaps gave rise to another expressive Hebrew proverb: “You cannot straighten a pig’s tail.”

Ecc. i. 18.—“For in much wisdom is much grief.” So xii. 12.

Ecc. ix. 4.—“For a living dog is better than a dead lion.”

Ecc. x. 1.—“Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour.”

See under *Ellipsis*.

Ecc. xi. 6.—"In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand."

Jer. xiii. 23.—"Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?"

Jer. xxiii. 28.—"What is the chaff (Heb., straw) to the wheat?"

Hab. ii. 6.—"Shall not all these take up a parable against him, and a taunting proverb against him, and say, 'Woe to him that increaseth that which is not his! How long? and to him that ladeth himself with thick clay?'" (see R.V.).

Mal. ii. 10.—"Have we not all one father?" The Jews used this proverb in their controversy with the Lord in John viii. 33, 39, etc.

Matt. v. 13.—"If the salt have lost his savour (or taste) wherewith shall it be salted?"

Matt. v. 14.—"A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid."

Matt. vi. 3.—"Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth."

Matt. vi. 21.—"Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." Greek, "there will your heart also be," with emphasis on "heart." (See *Metonymy*).

Matt. vi. 24.—"No man can serve two masters." See *Hermeneia*.

Verse 34: "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Matt. vii. 16.—"Ye shall know them by their fruits."

These words were first used by the Lord concerning *false teachers*. But to-day the saying has passed into general use, and is spoken (not so correctly) of every one.

Matt. ix. 12.—"They that be whole need not a physician."

Matt. x. 10.—"The workman is worthy of his meat." So Luke x. 7. 1 Cor. ix. 7, etc.

Verse 22: "He that endureth to the end shall be saved." This *Paræmia* is further used Dan. xii. 12. Matt. xxiv. 13. Mark xiii. 13, etc. and refers to the faithful remnant of Jews enduring to the end of the coming "great tribulation." The τέλος (*telos*), *end*, should be distinguished from the συντέλεια (*sunteleia*), which is also translated *end*.

The latter word is used of *the time of the end*, while the former (*telos*) is used of the end or crisis of the *sunteleia*. The *sunteleia* refers

to the consummation of all the ages and dispensations; a joining together of the ages, or ends, as it were, and is used of the whole time of the "great tribulation"; while the *telos* is the point of time at the end of it. It is of this point that this saying is used: "He that endureth to the end (*telos*) shall be saved (or delivered)."

The word *συντέλεια* (*sunteleia*) occurs only in Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20, and Heb. ix. 26. It will be easy, therefore, for the student to distinguish it from *τέλος* (*telos*), which is used in the other passages.

Matt. xii. 34.—"For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh."

Matt. xiii. 57.—"A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country and in his own house."

Matt. xv. 14.—"If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch."

Matt. xxiv. 28.—"For wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together." The word "for" introduces the *Paræmia*, which is from Job xxxix. 30. "Her young ones suck up blood: and where the slain are, there is she." Had this *Paræmia* been understood, and the title "Son of Man" noticed as referring to Christ's title as exercising dominion in the Earth,* these words would never have been interpreted of the church as the "Body" of Christ. Luke xvii. 37 clearly shows that it is a time of judgment (see verses 24-37); and that the *taking* and the *leaving* refer to judgment, and not to the Rapture of 1 Thess. iv. 17; which was a subsequent revelation, and ought not to be read into the Gospels, which are perfectly clear without it.

Mark ix. 50.—See Matt. v. 13.

Luke xvii. 37.—See Matt. xxiv. 28 above.

Acts ix. 5.—"It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks": *i.e.*, the goads.

Acts xx. 35.—"It is more blessed to give than to receive." This is one of the un-recorded *Paræmiæ* or *Logia* of Christ. But it does not follow that a papyrus which professes, some centuries later, to give other *Paræmiæ* is genuine and authentic.

* See *The Divine Names and Titles*, by the same author and publisher. One shilling.

1 Cor. v. 6.—“A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.” Leaven is always used in a bad sense. Even in the case of one of the two wave-loaves, leaven was to be used because that loaf represented human nature; while the other loaf which represented Christ's perfect nature had no leaven.

See other examples of such Proverbs in Prov. xi. 27; xii. 11, 15; xv. 2, 33; xvii. 1, 10, 19, 28; xix. 2, 24; xx. 4, 11, 14, 21, 25; xxii. 13; xxv. 11, 16, 27; xxvi. 4, 5 (see under *Ellipsis*), 14; xxvii. 8, 10, 22; xxx. 15, etc., etc. Ecc. iv. 5, 12; v. 2, 6, 8, 9, 10; vi. 9; ix. 18; x. 2, 8, 9, 15, 19, 20; xi. 3, 4, 7; xii. 12. Micah vii. 5, 6. Matt. v. 15; vii. 2, 5; ix. 16; x. 24, 26; xiii. 12. Luke ix. 62; xii. 48; xxiii. 31. 1 Cor. x. 12; xv. 33. 2 Cor. ix. 6, 7. 2 Thess. iii. 10. Tit. i. 15

NON-CANONICAL, or, SUPPOSED SCRIPTURE, PROVERBS.

There are many common sayings which are supposed to be in Scripture, even by those who should know better; and pass current among those who are ill-informed. For example—

“*God tempers the wind to the shorn lamb.*”

This is not in the Bible; but is taken from Laurence-Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*. And he took it probably from the French of Henri Etienne, *Dieu mesure le froid à la brebis tondue*. And both may have been acquainted with Isa. xxvii. 8: “He stayeth his rough wind in the day of his east wind.”

“*Spare the rod and spoil the child.*”

Many use this, thinking it is Scripture. Even Butler, in his *Hudibras*, says: “That may be heard ten times to one quotation of Solomon.” And yet Solomon said: “He that spareth the rod hateth his son” (Prov. xiii. 24).

“*A word to the wise is sufficient.*” (Sometimes “*for them*” is added, whereas it is singular, not plural).

This has been quoted as Scripture. But it is from the Latin of Terence*; who himself is misquoted; for he said: “*Dictum sapienti sat est,*” not *Verbum sat sapienti*.

It is said that the celebrated Robert Hall once planned a sermon on the words

“*In the midst of life we are in death,*”

But he abandoned it, we are told, when he found that it was not to be found in the Bible; but only in the Prayer-book.

* *Phormio*, Ac. iii. sc. 3. v. 8. In Parry's edition of Terence, he says in a note that the Proverb is found in Plautus *Pœrsa* iv. 7. 18.

It appears to have come from a monk of St. Gall, named Notker, in the tenth century, whose Latin hymn contained the line: "*Media vita in morte sumus.*"

MISQUOTED PROVERBIAL SAYINGS.

Even in quoting common sayings from Scripture and the Prayer Book, which have passed into Proverbs, there is an habitual misquotation which has become practically universal. It may not be out of place to give one or two examples by way of warning.

"*Man is prone to sin as the sparks fly upward.*" But Job v. 7 says: "Man is born unto trouble," etc.

"*A still small voice*" is generally quoted as "*the still small voice*" (1 Kings xix. 12).

"*A merciful man is merciful to his beast.*" But Prov. xii. 10 has it: "A righteous man regardeth the life of his beast."

"*The truth as it is in Jesus*" is almost invariably thus quoted. The Scripture says (Eph. iv. 21): "As the truth is in Jesus," which is a very different thing. The former implies that there is truth apart from Him. But the latter implies that the truth is in Jesus, and nowhere else.

"*A nation shall be born in a day.*" No concordance will give this passage. Isa. lxvi. 8 asks: "Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? or shall a nation be born at once?"

"*So plain that he who runs may read.*" On the contrary. So plain was to be the written vision that he who reads it may run, and flee from the coming judgments (Hab. ii. 2).

"*My time is in thy hand.*" Thank God, He said "times" (Psa. xxxi. 15 (16)). Yes, "My times are always in thy hand." All my times: my times of sorrow and of joy; of trouble and of danger. All are in the hand of my God.*

"*Let him cast the first stone.*" But John viii. 7 says: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone."

* Shakespeare is misquoted in the other direction. He said: "The time is out of joint," not *the times are out of joint*. The next line would set people right, for he says:—

"The time is out of joint;—O cursed spite!

That I was born to set it right."

(*Hamlet*, Act i. sc. 4, at the close).

So Cowper: "The cups that cheer," not *cup*. (See his *Task*, iv, 39, 40).

"How great a fire a little matter kindleth." But in Jas. iii. 5 it is written: "Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth."

The Apostolic benediction (2 Cor. xiii. 14) suffers from various changes: fellowship, instead of communion; or, in addition to it, as though they were two different things: rest upon and abide; be and abide: for ever; now, henceforth, and for ever; now and for ever. And these are supposed to improve the words of the Holy Spirit! That such attempted improvement of Scripture meets with no check is a sad sign of the low regard in which its accuracy is held.

TYPE.

A figure or ensample of something future and more or less prophetic, called the "Antitype."

Type. Greek, τύπος (*typos*). The verb τύπτειν (*tuptein*), to strike, make an impress. Hence *Type* means primarily a blow; then, the impress or mark left by a blow; then, a mark, print, or impress of any kind.

In the New Testament the word occurs in several of these senses. It is rendered:—

1. *A print or mark* (John xx. 25).*
2. *Figure* (Acts vii. 43. Rom. v. 14).
3. *Form* (Rom. vi. 17).
4. *Fashion* (Acts vii. 44).
5. *Manner* (Acts xxiii. 25).
6. *Pattern* (Tit. ii. 7. Heb. viii. 5).
7. *Ensample* (1 Cor. x. 11. Phil. iii. 17. 1 Thess. i. 7).†
2 Thess. iii. 9. 1 Pet. v. 3
8. *Example* (1 Cor. x. 6. 1 Tim. iv. 12).

The Greeks used it of the *symptoms* of a disease. Galen wrote a medical work entitled περὶ τῶν τύπων, concerning *symptoms*. In a Legal sense it was used of what we technically cite as a "*case*."

It will thus be seen that the special and technical sense which has been given to it by Theologians is not exactly equivalent to any of these usages: the nearest being Rom. v. 14, where Adam is spoken of as a *type* of the Coming One.

The theological use of the word agrees more with what in the New Testament is called σκιά (*skiu*), a *shadow* (Heb. x. i. Col. ii. 17).

There is, therefore, not much profit in following out what have been called types by men. Many are merely *illustrations*; and it would be better so to call them; inasmuch as they did not and do not of themselves *teach* the truths, but only *illustrate* those truths which are elsewhere clearly revealed. We should never have called them *types* but for such subsequent revelation; and therefore they are only illustrations so far as their teaching agrees with clear revelation afterward made.

* The second occurrence in this verse is read τόπος, *the place*, by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles (margin).

† According to the best texts, this is singular, as in R.V., not plural.

SYMBOL.

A material Object substituted for a moral or spiritual Truth.

Greek, σύμβολον (*symbolon*), from σύν (*syn*), *together*, and βάλλειν (*ballein*), *to cast*; hence a casting together. Used by the Greeks, much in the same way as we use the word "*coupon*," where one part corresponded with or represented another part. Hence, in language, the use of one thing to represent another; or, the use of a material object to represent a moral or spiritual truth.

The word does not occur in the New Testament, and nothing is said in Scripture as to one thing being so used. The assertion as to anything being a symbol of another rests entirely on human authority, and depends for its accuracy on its agreement with the teaching of Scripture.

The nearest word to symbol is *mystery*; and, by the Fathers, μυστήριον was used as being synonymous with σύμβολον.

Μυστήριον (*mysterion*) means *secret*;* and later it came to mean a *secret sign* or *symbol*. Justin Martyr (A.D. 148) says † that in all false religions the serpent was represented as "a great *symbol* and *mystery*."

Speaking of Isa. vii. 14, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son," he says, "since this refers to the house of David, Isaiah has explained how that which was spoken by God to David, ἐν μυστηρίῳ (*en mysterio*), *in a mystery*, would actually come to pass. Perhaps," he adds, "you are not aware, my friends, of this—that there were many sayings written ἐπικεκαλυμμένως (*epikekalummenōs*), *obscurely*; or, ἐν παραβολαῖς (*en parabolais*), *in parables*; or, μυστηρίοις (*mysteriois*), *in secret signs*; or, ἐν συμβόλοις (*en symbolois*), *in symbols*; which the prophets, who lived after the persons who said or did them, expounded." ‡

Thus it will be seen that *symbol* is practically synonymous with the latter use of *mystery* as meaning a *secret sign*. It is only two or three times so used in Scripture:—In Rev. i. 20, the stars which John saw were a *mystery*: *i.e.*, secret sign (or symbol); and in Rev. xvii. 5, 7, Babylon is said to be a *mysterion* (or symbol): *i.e.*, a secret sign of something spiritual and moral which it represented.

* See *The Mystery*, by the same author and publisher.

† *Apology*, i. 27.

‡ *Trypho*, c. 68.

Eph. v. 32 shows us that it was also synonymous with the Latin *sacramentum*, which is there used to represent the Greek *mysterion*. So that the *sacramentum* of the Latin Vulgate meant simply a symbol.

Sacramentum is said to have reference to a military oath, but it must have been only because of some *secret sign* used in connection with the administration of the oath. From this it is clear that "the sacrament" so called is only a secret sign or symbol of spiritual truths and acts or events which it is used to commemorate.

Doubtless there are many *symbols* in the Scriptures, but great care and caution must be exercised in their interpretation. The different interpretations which have been given to the same so-called symbol, are sufficient to serve as a warning.

All *Metonymies* (*q.v.*) are, in a certain sense, symbols. When, for example, "cup" is used, by *Metonymy*, for blessing (Ps. xvi. 5; cxvi. 13); or, "clay" for man (Isa. lxiv. 8(7)); or, "gate" for entrance, etc., the one is practically a symbol of the other: and when by repeated and constant use the one gets to be more and more closely associated with the other, it is then used as a symbol of it and is substituted for it. The transition stage is *Hypocatastasis* (*q.v.*) or *Implication*.

The stages by which a symbol is reached, therefore, are: (1) either by *Metonymy* or *Metaphor*, one thing is used to represent another; then (2) the one is used to *imply* the other; and finally (3) it becomes permanently *substituted* for it as a *symbol* of it.

Thus, with regard to "leaven," we have first the thing itself causing fermentation, and therefore forbidden to be used in connection with any sacrifice or offering to the Lord. Then it is used by *Metonymy* for that which is corrupt (1 Cor. v. 6-8). Then by *Implication* for corrupt or evil doctrine (Matt. xvi. 6). And finally it is used as the permanent *symbol* of it (Matt. xiii. 33). Indeed, "leaven" is always used in a bad sense, and of that which is corrupt. In the case of the two wave-loaves, where leaven was to be put into one and not into the other, the exception is significant, and proves the rule. For one represented Christ, and the other His People.

In the same way, "key" is used as a symbol of power and authority, and especially the power of opening and closing (Rev. i. 18; iii. 7. Isa. xxii. 22). In Matt. xvi. 19, the power and authority of opening the doors of the kingdom were committed to Peter, and he exercised that commission in making the final offer of the Messiah to the nation of Israel (Acts ii.-viii., and x.). Observe, that they were the keys of the *Kingdom*, not of the church; and that he was altogether

incompetent and unable to transfer that power and authority to others.

It is scarcely necessary for us to attempt to say more with regard to symbols. The subject would form a work by itself; and, indeed, many works have been written upon it. We can only repeat our caution as to their use.

ÆNIGMA ; or, DARK SAYING.

A. Truth expressed in obscure Language.

E-nig'-ma. Greek, αἰνύγμα (*ai-nig-ma*), from αἰνίσσασθαι (*ainissesthai*), to tell a strange tale, then to speak darkly or in riddles. Hence an *enigma* is a dark or obscure saying, a puzzling statement or action. A statement of which the meaning has to be searched for in order to be discovered.

Enigma thus differs from *Parable*, in that the latter is generally explained. When a *Parable* is without any explanation, it may be called an *Enigma*, *i.e.*, a dark or obscure saying.

See Ps. lxxviii. 2 quoted in Matt. xiii. 35. The "dark saying" of the Old Testament is צִדְדָה (*cheedah*); from צָדָה (*chood*), to tie in a knot, to twist : a knotty or intricate saying.

It is rendered *dark saying* three times (Ps. xlix. 4 (5) ; lxxviii. 2. Prov. i. 6) ; *dark sentence*, once (Dan. viii. 23) ; *dark speech*, once (Num. xii. 8) ; *hard question*, twice (1 Kings x. 1. 2 Chron. ix. 1) ; *proverb*, once (Hab. ii. 6) ; *riddle*, nine times (Judges xiv. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. Ezek. xvii. 2).

When the saying is very obscure indeed, it is called

HYPÆNIGMA, *i.e.*, the same word, with the preposition ὑπό (*hypo*) prefixed, meaning *under*, *i.e.*, a saying *deep* as well as *dark*.

Also **HYPÆNIXIS**, from ὑπό (*hypo*), *under*, and αἰνίσσομαι (*ainissomai*), to speak darkly. Hence, a *speaking beneath* : *i.e.*, having another meaning beneath what is actually said.

When the *Enigma* is connected with the names of persons or places, it is known by the name *Polyonymia*. (See the next Figure).

There are sayings dark and deep in the Scriptures beside those that are actually so designated.

Gen. xlix. 10 is in the form of *Enigma*. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." See under *Metonymy*.

Judges xiv. 14.—Samson's *Enigma* is well known.

"Out of the eater came forth meat,
And out of the strong came forth sweetness."

The answer is given in verse 18, in the form of another question (See *Anteisagoge*):

“What is sweeter than honey?
And what is stronger than a lion?”

This is a saying both “dark” and “deep”: for there is precious truth hidden in that darkness and those depths, which neither the Philistines nor the natural man can understand or receive.

The Living Word (Christ) is stronger than the strong man armed (Matt. xii. 29. Mark iii. 27. Luke xii. 21, 22). For the Lion means in Hebrew *the strong one*.

The Written Word (the Scriptures of truth) are sweeter than honey (Ps. cxix. 103; xix. 10 (11). Jer. xv. 16).

All who know this blessed deliverance which the great Deliverer brings, cry out in the words of Ps. xxxv. 10, “LORD, who is like unto thee, which deliverest the poor from him that is too strong for him, yea, the poor and needy from him that spoileth him?” (See *Erotesis* and *Prosopopeia*).

THE LAW was a strong Lion (Gal. iii. 10): but the honey is found in verse 13.

SIN is a strong Lion (Rom. v. 21): but the honey is found in Rom. vi. 6; vii. 18-25. And 1 Cor. xv. 56, 57.

THE WORLD is a strong Lion (Luke viii. 14. Gal. v. 21): but the honey is found in John xvi. 33.

AFFLICTION is a strong Lion (Job v. 6, 7; xiv. 1, 2. Acts xiv. 22): but the honey is found in Ps. cxix. 67, 71; xxxiv. 19 (20). Rom. viii. 35-39. Heb. xii. 11.

DEATH is a strong Lion (Rom. v. 12. Heb. ix. 27): but the honey is found in 2 Tim. i. 10. Hosea xiii. 14, and 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55.

The answer to these *Enigmas* is found in Ps. lxxiii. 16, 17, “When I thought to know this it was too painful for me; Until I went into the sanctuary of God. Then understood I.”

Isa. xi. 1 is a dark saying, and has to be interpreted by what follows.

Isa. xxi. 11, 12, is another dark saying.

Ezek. xvii. 2-10 gives a prophecy concerning the King of Babylon's coming to Jerusalem, and leading it into captivity, under the Enigma of two Eagles.

Dan. v. 25-28.—The handwriting on the wall is given in the form of an *Enigma*, in which the immediate fall of Babylon was announced.

Three words were written, the first twice (by *Epizeuxis*, q.v.), for emphasis.

מְנָה, *M'neh*. NUMBERED.

תִּקַּל, *T'kel*. WEIGHED.

פָּרַס, *P'res*. DIVIDED.

These three words are interpreted by Daniel in verses 26-28, and the fulfilment of them follows in verses 30, 31. See under *Paronomasia*.

POLYONYMIA; or, MANY NAMES.

An Application of Ænigma to the Names of Persons or Places.

Pol'-y-ō-nym'-i-a. Greek, πολωνυμία, *having many names, or more than one name*: from πολύς (*polys*), *many*, and ὄνομα (*onoma*), *a name*.

It is not uncommon for persons or places to be known by different names.

In Matt. xv. 39, for example, there is no Enigma, but merely a case of two names for the same place: "The coasts of Magdala." In Mark viii. 10, it is called "The parts of Dalmanutha," DALMANUTHA being the name of the region, and MAGDALA of the city. The former was general, the latter was special.

In Matt viii. 28, the people are called *Gergesenes*; and in Luke viii. 26, and Mark v. 1, *Gadarenes*. Some suppose that these were either different names of the same place, or two places forming one larger place. It is a question also as to whether precisely the same event is described in these places, or whether two similar events took place at two different times.

So with the names of Esau's wives, which have formed a great subject for the attention of infidels.

It is clear from a comparison of Gen. xxvi. 34 and xxviii. 9, that Esau's wives were three in number:

1. "The daughter of Elon the Hittite"; called ADAH (xxxvi. 2); but she also had another name, BASHMATH (xxvi. 34).

2. "The daughter of Anah the daughter of ZIBBON the Hivite"; called AHOLIBAMAH (xxxvi. 2); but not the Aholibamah of verse 25, who was her aunt (compare verses 2 and 25). She was called also JUDITH, and in xxvi. 34 this Judith is said to be the daughter of BEERI the Hittite. But there is no contradiction in this, for ANAH appears to have been called BEERI, or *the Spring-man*, because he discovered the "hot-springs" (see xxxvi. 24)*; not "mules," as in A.V.

* So the R.V., הַיְיֵמֶם (*Hay-ye-meem*), from הוּמָה (*Hoom*), to put in commotion, agitate (Deut. vii. 23. Micah ii. 12. Ps. lv. 3). The Syriac has "waters." "Mules" are always פְּרָחֵדִים (*Pharahdeem*), (2 Sam. xiii. 29; xviii. 9. 1 Kings x. 25. 2 Kings v. 17. Ps. xxxii. 9, etc.). The A.V. Translators followed an error of the Talmud. Moreover, מַצָּח (*matsah*), to find, means to happen on, not to invent.

It is true that in xxxvi. 2, Anah, alias Beeri, is called "the Hivite," while in xxvi. 34, he is called "the Hittite." The latter is *history*, and is therefore general; the former is *genealogy*, and is therefore more precise. "Hittite" is the general term; "Hivite" is the special and more particular term (compare Josh. i. 4. 1 Kings x. 29. 2 Kings vii. 6; and Gen. xxviii. 8, when Esau's Hittite wives are spoken of as "daughters of Canaan").

3. The third wife was "the daughter of Ishmael," and was called BASHMATH (xxxvi. 2), and MAHALATH (xxviii. 8).

When three persons are so carefully and minutely described, it is preposterous for anyone to create a difficulty about the similar names, when down to our own day precisely the same phenomenon constantly occurs.

But this feature of *Polyonymia* is not what we are describing and discussing here. There is no Enigma in these common *aliases*.

It is only when another name is given, because of some special meaning, "dark" or "deep" in it, that it becomes a Figure, being used in a figurative sense, having some important signification beyond what appears upon the surface.

Gen. x. 10; xi. 2.—"The Land of Shinar" is another name for Babel or Babylon. Babylon must be intended by "the land of Shinar" in the prophecy of the "Ephah" (Zech. v. 11). Had the name Babylon been used here it might have been urged that it was put by *Enigma* for some other place; but, when "the land of Shinar" is used for Babylon it can hardly be that, after this, Babylon can be used for some other name by a double use of the figure.

Deut. i. 2, 44; ii. 8, etc.—Edom is called Seir, and this was afterwards known in the Jerusalem Targum as גַּבְלָא, *Gabla* or *Gebal*.

We have the name in Psalm lxxxiii. 6 (7). "Gebal, and Ammon, and Amelek": *i.e.*, Edom, Ammon, and Amelek—three of Israel's greatest enemies at critical moments in the history of the Nation.

2 Kings xxiii. 13.—The Mount of Olives is called "the mount of corruption," because of the idolatries connected with it.

Ps. lxxxvii. 4; lxxxix. 10 (11). Isa. li. 9.—Egypt is called Rahab on account of its pride (רַחַב, *Rachab*, having this signification). This judgment of Egypt is in Isa. xxx. 1-14.

Isa. xiv. 4.—The Antichrist is called "the King of Babylon," because he is the end and final outcome of Babel.

Isa. xxix. 1.—Jerusalem is called Ariel, which means *the Lion of God*. It is so called to denote its greatness, glory, and strength (cf. 2 Sam. xxiii. 20. 1 Chron. xi. 22), and is thus put in contrast with the woe here pronounced against it. (See under *Ellipsis*, page 5).

Jer. xxv. 26.—“And the king of Sheshach shall drink after them.” Here Sheshach is put for Babylon.

The subject is the cup of the fury of the God of Israel (verse 15). Four classes of nations were to drink of it, and all at one time. (1) Jerusalem and the cities of Judah (18). (2) Egypt, etc. (19). (3) The mingled nations (20-22), and (4) the nations further off (23-25), and, finally, “the king of Sheshach.” In Jeremiah “the times of the Gentiles” are not within the scope of his prophecy. Nor in Ezekiel. Daniel, on the other hand, fills in these present times, and makes but little reference to what goes before or comes after, as in Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

The point is that the judgment of these nations takes place all at the same time with that of “the king of Sheshach,” and that time is veiled in the *Enigma* contained in this peculiar name. Babylon is meant; and, according to the ancient *Kabbalah*, the last letter of the alphabet was put for the first, and the penultimate for the second, and the antepenultimate for the third, and so on. By which Enigma the word “Sheshach” (ששח) spells *Babel* (בבל). So that the final judgment upon the nations is yet future, when Babylon shall have been restored, and when “Great Babylon” “comes into remembrance.” See further under *Paronomasia* and *Amphibologia*.

Ezek. xxiii. 4.—Jerusalem is called “AHOLIBAH”: *i.e.*, *my tabernacle is in her*. While Samaria (Israel) is called AHOLAH: *i.e.*, *his (own) tabernacle*. There is a depth of meaning, therefore, in each name.

Hos. iv. 15; x. 5.—Bethel (*the house of God*, Gen. xxviii. 19, 22) was made, by Jeroboam, a house of his idol (1 Kings xii. 29). Hence, God gives it another name, and calls it *Beth-Aven*: *i.e.*, *the house of vanity*.

GNOME ; or, QUOTATION.

Gnō'-mee. Greek, γνώμη, *knowledge, understanding*; also a means of knowing. From γνῶναι (*gnōnai*), to know.

Hence, the term *Gnome* is given to the citation of brief, sententious, profitable sayings expressive of a universal maxim or sentiment which appertains to human affairs, cited as well-known, or as being of general acceptance, but without quoting the author's name.

In Prov. i. 2, they are called "words of understanding." The Scriptures, as Bengel remarks, are so "full of the best things, that these constitute, as it were, certain continued sentiments openly set forth in the form of *gnomes*."

When these are applied to a certain person, time, or place; or to individual cases; or are clothed with circumstantial particulars, the figure is called *NOEMA*, νόημα (*no-ee-ma*), (plural, *NOEMATA*), *i.e.*, sense, thought, that which is thought, from νοεῖν, to perceive.

When the author's name is given, the figure is called *CHREIA*, χρεία, *chree'-a*, use, usage, or usance, (from χράομαι, *chraomai*, to use).

For the Greek name of the figure *Gnome* the Latins substituted *SENTENTIA* (*sen-ten'-ti-a*), sentiment, or a sententious saying; a philosophic aphorism, maxim, or axiom, which is quoted on account of its application to the subject in hand.

These are exactly what are referred to in Ecc. xii. 11.

"The words of the wise
Are as goads;
And as tent-pegs well fixed are
[*The words*] of the masters of assemblies.*

A *Gnome*, however, differs from a Proverb in this: that every Proverb is a *Gnome*, but every *Gnome* is not necessarily a Proverb. A *Gnome* is, properly speaking, a quotation: and therefore this figure opens up the whole question of the Quotations from the Old Testament in the New.

This is a large subject, many volumes having been written upon it, both in ancient and in recent times.

* See under *Ellipsis*, page 74.

It is also a difficult subject, owing to certain phenomena which lie upon its surface.

It is a fact that there are variations between the quotations and the Text quoted from.

Sometimes they agree with the Septuagint translation, and differ from the Hebrew, and *vice versa*; and sometimes they differ from both.

Sometimes they are direct quotations; at other times they are composite quotations of several passages joined in one; while others are mere allusions.

Consequently it is difficult for anyone to make a list or table of such quotations which shall agree with those made by others.

The general fact seems to be that there are 189 separate passages quoted* in the New Testament, according to Spearman's reckoning;† *i.e.*, counting a passage only once, though it may be quoted several times. Including the whole, there are, according to Bishop Wetenhall's method, 244: of which 147 agree with the LXX, and 97 differ from it.

Reckoning according to Spearman, we find, out of the 189 passages quoted, 105 that agree with the Septuagint, 21 that differ from it, 45 that differ from both it and the Hebrew, and 18 neutral.

These may be exhibited in the following table:—

* If it is merely a *reference* or *allusion*, as distinct from a *quotation*, then there are many more, of course. The Lord Jesus Himself referred to 22 out of our 39 Old Testament books.

In Matthew there are references to 88 passages in 10 Old Testament books. In Mark to 37 passages in 10 books. In Luke to 58 passages in 8 books. In John to 40 passages in 6 books.

Deuteronomy and Isaiah, the two books most assailed by the Higher Critics, are referred to more often than any other Old Testament books. While Revelation contains no less than 244 references to 25 Old Testament books.

In Romans there are 74 references. Corinthians, 54. Gal., 16. Eph., 10. Heb., 85.

In all, out of 260 chapters in the New Testament, there are 832 quotations, or references, or allusions to the Old Testament Scriptures.

Every Old Testament book is referred to with the exception of Ezra, Neh. Est., and Canticles.

The Apocryphal books are not referred to at all.

† *Letters to a friend*. Edinburgh, 1759.

No. of Quotations in	Total.	Acc. to LXX.	Differ from LXX.	Differ from both.	Neutral.
Matt.	38	25	4	8	1
Mark	3	1	—	2	—
Luke	5	—	—	3	2
John	11	3	2	5	1
Acts	19	11	1	7	—
Rom.	51	30	4	5	12
1 Cor.	11	4	2	5	—
2 Cor.	8	4	1	1	2
Gal.	4	3	1	—	—
Eph.	2	—	1	1	—
Hebrews	22	15	3	4	—
1 Peter	7	6	—	—	1
Jude	1	1	—	—	—
Rev.	7	2	2	3	—
	189	105	21	44	19

It will thus be seen that by far the larger number of quotations correspond with the Septuagint translation.

Now, all the difficulties have been caused by thinking and speaking only of the instrument or the agent employed: instead of having regard to the great and important fact that the Bible has only One Author, and that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. i. 21).

Our studies will certainly be incomplete if we do not observe the manner in which the Holy Spirit quotes in the New Testament those Scriptures which He had before inspired in the Old. Notice, then, the following examples:—

Mark xii. 36.—"David himself *said by the Holy Ghost.*" This was the introduction to a quotation from Psa. cx. 1.

Matt. xv. 4.—Referring to Ex. xx. 12, our Lord says, "*God commanded, saying,*" etc.

Heb. iii. 7.—Referring to Ps. xcv. 7-11. "*Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith,*" not "*as David saith,*" or "*as the Psalmist saith.*"

Heb. ix. 8.—Referring to Ex. xxv. xl. (concerning the Tabernacle and its teaching), "*The Holy Ghost this signifying,*" etc.