

Types  
and  
Metaphors

Adapted from Searching the Scriptures by Cecil N. Wright  
Permission is given to reproduce without change.  
The BibleWay Online - Randolph Dunn  
Write to us at [lessons@thebiblewayonline.com](mailto:lessons@thebiblewayonline.com)  
Or visit us at <http://www.thebiblewayonline.com>  
December—2005

## DEFINING TYPES AND METAPHORS

### INTRODUCTION

This is in response to a request from a respected preacher brother of many years, to "many a paper defining distinctly the variations [of] terms found on page, Contents, [which] seem to be all from the same family yet meaning something different in each word shown," in a book he owns. It is a massive volume of 1,007 pages plus xxviii preliminary and prefix pages, entitled Preaching from the Types and Metaphors of the Bible, by Benjamin Keach (1640-1704) of London, England.

He described on the inside back flap of the dust cover of the book as a "self-taught man" who "gained fame as a powerful preacher and defender of Baptist doctrine," who according to the Foreword (page vii), began preaching at 18 years of age and during his ministry of 46 years over 40 works came from his prolific pen.

Conspicuous among those works was the tome mentioned above, first published in London, but not till 1855, more than 150 years after the author's death, and under the title, Tropologia: A Key to Open Scripture Metaphors, together with Types of the Old Testament, prefixed by "Articles to prove the Divine Authority of the Holy Bible." But under its present title it was copyrighted and republished by Kregel Publishing of Grand Rapids, Michigan, U.S.A., in 1972 and reprinted in 1975, 1976, 1978, and 1980, whether more times since then I do not know.

On the "Contents" pages (v. and vi.) of the latter, two parts are listed: Part I, DEFINING AND INTERPRETING TYPES AND METAPHORS AS USED IN THE BIBLE, 240 pages, referred to in the above-mentioned request; and in Part II, SOURCE MATERIALS FOR PREACHING FROM THE TYPES AND METAPHORS OF THE BIBLE, the remaining 767 pages.

1. TROPES AND FIGURES: Metonymy, Metaphor, Synecdoche, Irony, Catachresis, Hyperbole, Allegory, Proverb, Enigma.
2. SHEMES AND FIGURES: Figures, Schemes
3. TYPES AND PARABLES: Types, Parables.

## II. DISCUSSION.

### 1. General Observations.

On Pages 1 and 2 of the text proper, is a duplication of the above table of contents, beginning under the heading of TROPHIES AND FIGURES, with the addition of occasional explanations before taking up individual types and metaphors. The first explanation is a by-line below the heading, as follows: "SCRIPTURE RHETORIC, or SACRED ELOCUTION, may be reduced to two principle heads or chapters" – "Trophies," and "Figures."

a. Of "*tropes*" it is stated that "they concern the sense of the words, viz. "when they are drawn from their proper and genuine signification to that which is different or contrary; Which the etymology of the word shows; for *tropos* is derived from *trepo* signifying *verto, muto*, to turn of change."

In the foregoing, the nouns *trope*, *trophe*, and *tropos* seem to be used interchangeably though they do not mean the same notwithstanding having a common derivation, namely, from the verb *terpo* to turn or change.

The word "*trope*" as a figure of speech is an anglicised form of the Greek word *trope*, occurring one time in the New Testament, in James 1:17, where it speaks of a "shadow of turning," referring to the shadow of night being cast by the turning or rotation of the earth on its axis. It is not there used as a figure of speech, but the figure of speech named from it does indicate a turn or change, that is, of language from its literal meaning to a figurative meaning, as the literal turning of the earth changes day to night in any given area of our globe.

*Trophe*, however, is not a synonym of *trope*, as represented above, but instead is used of nourishment or food, and of such it is used 16 times as follows (in the King James Version): "MEAT" 13 times (Matthew 3:4; 6:25; 10:10; 24:25; Luke 12:23; John 4:8; Acts 2:46; 9:19; 27:33,34; Hebrews 5:12,14; "FOOD" 3 times (Acts 14:17; 27:38(occurring in the phrase, *koreshentes trophe*, meaning having been satisfied of [or, with] food, but rendered in English idiom as "had eaten enough"); James 2:15).

b. Of "figures," it is likewise stated that "the Greeks call [them] {S}*chemata*, signifying the habit or ornament of speech, do not alter or vary the sense of the words, but embellish, beautify, or adorn them." For two reasons I have added the "S" at the beginning and not perceived as such by proofreaders.

One is that without it I could not find such a word in lexicons of either New Testament or secular Greek, leading me to believe it to be a typographical error, likely made by the typesetter and not perceived as such by proofreaders.

The other is that when later the subject of "Schemes and Figures" begins to be dealt with in the text (p.199), it is said: "The word *Schema*, principally and properly signifies a garb, habit, or ornament of the body; and by a metaphor is translated to signify the beauty or ornament of speech, as Aristotle and Cicero say [one a Greek, the other a Latin]. The Latin's render it figure (as some say) because stage-players, by the variation of shifting of their habit, represented divers figures of men: these figures are called rhetorical lights and ornaments, and do not change the sense of the words, as *tropes* do, but give embellishment or beauty to speech."

It is likely that Aristotle used the Greek word *schema*, and that Cicero used the Latin word *figura*, a form, shape, figure, from *ingere*, to form, shape, as per Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary, Unabridged (1959).

The latter also says of the Latin *figura*, that in rhetoric it is "a figure of speech: that in grammar it is a deviation from rules of analogy or syntax: an unusual construction"; and that the phrase "figure of speech," is "an expression using words in an unusual or non-literal sense to give beauty of vividness of style: metaphor, personification, simile, litotes, hyperbole, metonymy, synechdoche, etc.; trope."

The upshot seems to be that in general usage, "Tropes" (or tropical language) and "Figures" ("figures of speech," or figurative language) are in our day practically one and the same thing, whereas at an earlier time "figure" was considered as a species of "trope," confined largely (yet not exclusively) to tropical language that adorns but does not change the meaning.

c. The third category on the contents page, namely, "Types and Parables," is not mentioned again on pages 1 and 2 with the above, but is treated on pages 225-240. We shall, however, include in our effort at "defining distinctly the variation [of] terms found on page, "Contents." Moreover, a subhead on page 228, reads: "Prophetical Types, and Typical, and Symbolical Actions." Consequently, we shall include "Symbols" in our definition of terms.

Our "definitions" will aim at being as simple and summary in form as we can reasonably make them, with enough examples to be aptly illustrative and of practical value without beginning to be exhaustive.

## 2. Definitions of Terms.

Dictionary definitions will be used as seems appropriate. And so will any other source material readily available. But the one best source I have is a 400-page text book entitled Hermeneutics (1888), by D. R. Dungan, with three chapters on "Figurative Language." And by the aforementioned brother I have also been sent a copy of Types and Metaphors of the Bible, by J. W. Mosner, with an "Introduction" by "Chas. Louis Loos, President of Kentucky University" (a late if not the last president before it ceased to exist in 1908).

Mosner, in his "Preface," not dated, starts out by saying, "After the Lapse of a few years this work is put into the hands of the public." And, in May 1936, F. L. Rowe, on his "Preface to the Present Edition," stated: "To give this book to the brotherhood has involved much sacrifice on the part of the present publisher who has gone through with it because of the great blessing it will prove to the present and coming generations. No other book has ever been published quite like this." The edition published by Rowe was also reprinted by the Gospel Advocate Company, 1995, without any comment of its own, from which printing came the copy lent to me.

This book is mentioned because Mosner, in his "Preface," credits Keach with being one of the four authors to whom he himself was most indebted; also that both Mosner and Keach speak of "Types and Metaphors" as if umbrella terms under which all figurative language is covered – metaphors relating to words, and types to sentences (which is confusing without this intended distinction being understood).

And Monser, in some ways more logical than Keach, arranges his book on that pattern. Our assignment however, is not to deal with Monser, but with terms found on Keach's Contents" page. This we now begin to attempt, and will call attention to when finishing with his metaphors ("a" through "j" below) and beginning with his types ("k" through "n"), as umbrella terms.

a. *Metonymy*. It is from the Greek words *meta*, indicating a change, and *onoma*, name, hence a change of name; the employment of one name or word for another which have some relation to each other, "as when we say a man keeps a good table, instead of good provisions; we read Virgil – that is, his poems or writings; they have 'Moses and the prophets' – that is their books, or writings; a man has a clear head – that is, an understanding, or intellect; a warm heart, that is, affection." (Webster.)

Many times this figure bears a close resemblance to the metaphor and the allegory. In fact, all figures of speech are indeed related to each other, as mentioned in the request for this paper as seeming to be the case, which is because all are employed for the purpose of comparing one thing with another in some particular sense. *Metonymy* is one of the most definite, yet of different sorts itself, as follows:

(1.) Of Cause, with cause stated while effect is intended, as "whenever Moses is read" (2 Corinthians 3:15), meaning his writings, as in similar examples already mentioned without reference to different sorts of metaphors themselves:

(2.) Of Effect, with the effect put for the cause; the cause meant, but the effect named -- as in Matthew 13:37-38, where it is said that the "son of man" sowed "good seed" in the world, namely, "the sons of the kingdom," and the "devil" sowed "tares," "the sons of the evil one." Christ did not literally sow "sons of the kingdom," but the word of God by which they were produced. Likewise, the devil did not literally sow "sons of the evil one," but the falsehood by which they are produced.

(3.) Of Subject, with the subject named but as an adjunct – something pertaining or belonging to it be intended, as (a) Jesus saying to Saul, "Why persecutes thou me?" (Acts 9:4), referring to the persecution of his disciples; also (b) Jesus saying to his disciples of the "cup," "Drink ye all of it" (Matthew 26:27), the container being put for the contents;

(4.) Of Adjunct, with the adjunct put for the subject, as (a) "then shall ye bring down my gray hairs to the grave (Genesis 42:38), the language of Jacob to his sons. His gray hairs relating only to his age, but spoken of in place of himself; or as (b) "circumcision" and "uncircumcision" for Jews and Gentiles, since those characteristics distinguish each of them from the other.

b. Irony. This term is used from the Greek *eironeia*, from *eiro*, a dissembler in speech – who says one thing while meaning another. When used as a figure of speech, not intended to deceive, "dissemble implies an assumed of artfully feigned semblance or pretense." So, irony is "a sort of humor, ridicule, or light sarcasm, which adopts a mode of speech the intended implication of which is the opposite of the literal sense of the words, as when expressions of praise are used where blame is meant." (Webster).

Dungan (pages 316-318) says: "Irony can be detected (1) by a statement made by the author: he sometimes says that certain things were said in mockery. (2) It is sometimes apparent from the tone or accent, or the manner of the speaker. (3) Sometimes it will be recognized by the character of the address: if the speaker has been dealing in that kind of dissimulation for the purpose of ridicule, it will be the easier detected. (4) The extravagance of praise, when we both know the subject and the author, will enable us to note the intent. (5) When the language was used orally, and has been printed, there may be nothing in the form of words to denote that it was an ironical speech; but if we can get the opinion of those who were present, it will assist us; for they would be able to discover in the tone of the accent what has been lost to us by distance and time.

"The scriptures contain many examples of irony, but with the rules we have given already for its detection, we will cite but a few, for the real meaning in [most] any case is not difficult." Avers Dungan.

Then he cites and quotes, and in some instances briefly comments upon, the following passages, which we cite only: 1 Kings 18:27; 1 Kings 22:15-18; Job 12:2; Judges 10:14; 1 Corinthians 4:8-13; except for Acts 2:13, upon which he comments as follows: "Of course they meant to be understood as saying that they were drunk; but being full of sweet wine would not make them drunk. They meant what we would mean when we

say of a man that 'he is happy' or that "he is full of milk.' They say one thing, but mean another."

(It may be supposed that for want of any other more suitably named category, Keach (P.33) includes some things spoken feignedly, by way of trial of testing, as when God said unto Abraham: "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee unto the land of Moriah, and offer him there a burnt offering upon one of the mountains, which I will show thee" (Genesis 22:2). Similarly, when Lot invited angels, whom he then thought to be men, and they said, "Nay, but we will abide in the street all night," whereas they actually intended to stay with him, and deliver him and his family from the destruction of Sodom the next morning (Genesis 19:1-16). Also included by him was the incident in the ministry of our Lord in which he used insulting demeanor and language to test the sincerity and faith of a foreign mother beseeching him to heal her grievously afflicted daughter, and finally said to her, "O woman, great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt," and her daughter was made whole from that hour [Matthew 15:21-28].)

c. Metaphor. This is from two Greek words, *meta*, beyond, or over and *pherin*, to bring, or bear in the sense of carry. In rhetoric it is used of a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea in place of another by way of suggesting a likeness or analogy between them (the ship plows the sea; a volley of oaths). A metaphor may be regarded as a compressed simile, the comparison implied in the former (a marble brow) being explicit in the latter (a brow white like marble). (Webster).

(A further word needs to be stated about *meta*, since under "*Metonymy*" it was used as representing change, and now as beyond, or over. That is because it is a highly flexible term, with a variety of related meanings according to context. Webster, represented in the foregoing paragraph, states that it means between, with, after; and as a prefix means in general along with, after, denoting (a) posteriority, succession, and (b) change, transportation, transfer, beyond, transcending, higher.

Dungan observes: "the metaphor is briefer and far more pungent than a simile. On that account it was more frequently used by the ancients. It represents characteristics by means of a representative of the thought that is intended to be conveyed, by calling one thing by the name of another term which denotes the characteristics which is to be made prominent. The simile gently says that it is like it; the metaphor says it is it. 'I will

devour them like a lion' (Hosea 13:8), is simile; 'Judah is a lion's whelp' (Genesis 49:9), is a metaphor."

d. *Synechdoche*. According to Webster, this word is from the Greek *synekdoche*, from *synekdechesthai*, meaning to receive jointly – from *syn*, with, and *ekdechesthai*, from *ek*, out and *dechesthai*, to receive.

(In Greek, the first syllable is spelled with the letter upsilon (u), as given in the Greek-English lexicons. But in Latin and oftentimes in English it is translated as "Y," as above by Webster. Had I not been quoting Webster, however, I would have employed "u". This is being mentioned in case I may be found doing so elsewhere.)

In rhetoric, Webster states that the above word is a figure of speech in which the whole is out for a part or a part for the whole. "but," explains Dungan, "while this is the main feature of this trope, it by no means exhaust it." So he extends its application to six more related items that we shall include, giving samples of his examples of all eight, as follows.

(1.) The whole is put for the part. In Luke 2:1, it is affirmed that from Augustus there went out a decree that "all the world should be enrolled." This could not have embraced more than the Roman provinces, which were indeed extensive and expansive.

By this figure the kingdom of heaven is spoken of many times, when but a single feature of that kingdom is meant. The parables in Matthew 13 are inexplicable on any other hypothesis – the word "kingdom" being employed when only one aspect of it is meant in each instance – as "The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man that sowed seed in the field" (v.24); "The kingdom of heaven is like a grain of mustard seed" (v.31); "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till it was all leavened"; and so on.

Under this figure, Lazarus (Luke 16:23) is put for the spirit of Lazarus carried by angels to Abraham's bosom. And, in John 19:42 and 20:2, we have this figure used of Jesus and Lord for his body, laid in the tomb and later was absent from the tomb.

(2.) A part put for the whole. In Genesis 46:27, "all the souls of the house of Jacob which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten." The word "soul" here, as in many places in the Bible, stands for persons – one

entity named, but the whole person is intended. This is also many times the case with the salvation of sinners – the whole of conditions being intended by the use of one.

Most often it is "faith." Because without it nothing else could follow. So, the Philippian jailor was told, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house" (Acts 16:31); but then the word of the Lord was preached to him and his household, and they were all baptized, believing in God (vs.32-34).

When the apostle Peter, criticized by some of his Jewish brethren in Jerusalem for having gone "in to men uncircumcised" and eaten with them, had recounted the events leading up to and associated with the conversion of the household of Cornelius in Caesarea, his brethren in Jerusalem "held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life" (Acts 11:18), mentioning that alone – notwithstanding, according to Acts 10:48, they had been commanded to "be baptized in the name of the Lord" – but without the text of Acts 10 saying anything explicit about repentance, though it does imply it.

(It implies it because of stating that what was commanded was "water" baptism (10:47), "in the name of the Lord" (v.48) – "the Lord Jesus Christ" 11:17 – and both repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ were for the remissions of sins, according to Peter's previous preaching (Acts 2:38). But in some context each of these commands alone is mentioned without intending to exclude the other, or others.)

In the case of Saul of Tarsus, who was to go into the city of Damascus where he would be told what he "must do" (Acts 9:6), he was told to "be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Acts 22:16). But years later, as the apostle Paul, he wrote that "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Romans 10:13) – without mentioning baptism.

Also, similarly except in reverse, on Pentecost, that apostle Peter had explained that the coming of the Holy Spirit that day marked the time when "it shall come to pass, that whoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Acts 2:21) – mentioning nothing else. Yet, when his sermon had pricked the hearts of many who had either engineered or approved the crucifixion of Christ, and wanted to know of Peter and the

other apostles what to do, Peter told them to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38) – saying nothing about calling on the name of the Lord.

In each of the instances, one command or condition of salvation is made to stand for all that are associated with it.

(3.) Time is put for a part of time. All the way through the scriptures this Oriental form of expression is found.

For example, in Leviticus 25:46, "Of them shall ye take your bondmen for ever," was spoken to Israel in regard to the nations round about and to strangers sojourning among them, in contrast with their own brethren who might sell themselves to them due to poverty, whom they were to treat as hired servants (not slaves) until the year of jubilee, when they would have to be released, and not serve "for ever" – that is, throughout their lifetime – not meaning all time to come.

Also, in Jonah's prayer to God from the belly of the fish that had swallowed him (Jonah 2:1-9), he seemed to consider that being thus swallowed must be God's method of rescuing and preserving him, as indeed it was, for in v.6 the prophet described his experience after being cast overboard in the Mediterranean Sea, saying, "I went down to the bottoms of the mountains: the earth with her bars was about me for ever: Yet hast thou brought up my life from corruption, O Lord my God" (evidently said by way of grateful and confident anticipation while in the fish's belly).

Dungan. Although not using Jonah as an example, observes that forever exhaust the period to which it belongs," and continues thus: "If it was said to a king 'live forever,' it means a long life, and yet the life of a man. If it referred to a nation, it would extend till that nation would be scattered and the nationality be destroyed. If we could know it related to time [not eternity], we could be sure that it would exhaust the period. But if it reach beyond the precincts of time, there then being no limit, it must have all the meaning that can attach to the word. Hence, because the word is sometimes used in a figurative sense [of a limited duration], it does not follow that it is always to be so understood."

(4.) The plural is put for the singular. Dungan again: "The ark that carried Noah across the flood rested on mountains of Ararat (Genesis

8:4). It could not have rested on more than one. To one accustomed to this style of speech, there would be nothing strange in the expression. here were three ranges of hills, or mountains, and in one of these ranges the ark rested."

Again: "And it came to pass, when God destroyed the cities of the Plain, ... he overthrew the cities in which Lot dwelt" (Genesis 19:29) – yet Lot dwelt in only one city, Sodom" (19:1).

Also: "Who would have said unto Abraham, that Sarah should give children suck" (Genesis 46:7) – whereas she never had but one child, Isaac, and was never promised another.

Again: "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, wherein is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls" (Jeremiah 6:16).

Dungan: "This may account for the singular being used by one apostle and the plural by another, when describing the same thing. Matthew and Mark usually differ in this respect. Matthew has two men possessed of demons in Gadara; Mark has but one. Mark tells of one blind beggar in Jericho that wished to be healed; Matthew has two. Mark describes the ride into Jerusalem to be on a colt whereon man never sat; Matthew has an ass and a colt. Mark and Matthew both say that they who were crucified with Jesus reproached him; while Luke declares that one defended his claims by rebuking the other (Luke 23:39-43). To say that they reproached Him when only one did it, would not have been out of harmony with general custom at that time."

(5.) The singular put for the plural. (a) "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (Genesis 2:24) – meant for all men generally, marriage being instituted for the race. (b) "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the living creature that hath life, Which the waters brought forth abundantly, and fowl that they may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven (Genesis 1:21).

(6.) A definite is put for an indefinite number. (a) "Howbeit in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (I Corinthians 14:19) – meaning a very few words that would instruct versus a great

number that would not, rather than the precise numbers stated in either category, (b) "For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills" – obviously meaning on all the hills, however many. (c) The words hour, day, year, are often used with the same latitude. Jesus said to his disciples the night of his crucifixion, "could ye not watch with me one hour?" (Matthew 26:40) – meaning just a little while. Dungan also remarks: "All the antediluvian patriarchs seem to have died on their birthdays, for they were so many years old. The same is true of the men who lived this side of the flood. And yet we do not think but that they lived months and days, more or less, [in addition to or less than precisely so many years] just as people do now."

Similarly, the ordinals, first, second, third, and so on were used among the ancients in ways we would not. Jesus said he was to be in the heart of the earth "three days and three nights" (Matthew 12:40); "and the third day be raised up" (16:21); "and the third day rise again" Luke 24:7,46). "He was risen early on the first day of the week" (Mark 16:8), which was "the third day since these things came to pass" (Luke 24:21) – that is, since he had been "condemned to death, and crucified" (v.20).

Counting back from the first day of the week (Sunday), which was the third day, the second day would be Saturday (the Sabbath), and the day before Saturday (namely Friday) would have been the first day – the day of crucifixion itself. For, from the Gospels we learn that the burial was late on Friday ("Preparation" day). Before the beginning of the Sabbath after sunset. (See Matthew 27:57 - 28:6; Mark 15:42 - 16:11; Luke 23:50 - 24:7; John 19:31 - 20:18.) That made him in the grave a short part of the first "day and night" (the first 24-hour period), all of the second, and a few hours of the third – references to the beginning and ending periods being examples of putting the whole for a part, as mentioned above in (1). Hence, "after three days" in the above has to mean after the arrival of the third day, not after it was over.

(See 1 Kings 12:5, 12; Esther 4:16; 5:1, for "three days" and the "third day" before the end of it, being used as equivalents – the whole for the part – a long way back in Old Testament history.)

(7) A general name is put for a particular name. (a) "all flesh" referring to all of human beings, as follows: "And let all flesh bless his holy name for ever and ever" (Psalm 145:1). "Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight" (Romans 3:29). Animal "flesh" is not

intended in either instance. (b) Again, "preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15), does not mean every created thing, but the human race only.

(8) Sometimes a special name or word is put for a general one. (a) "Bread" is often used for "food" in general, as "Command that these stones become bread" (Matthew 4:3); "Give us this day our daily bread" (Matthew 6:11). (b) In Mark 16:16, "He that believeth" stands for all who believe, etc. And in Psalm 1:1, "Blessed is the man" means blessed are all who walk as being described.

e. Catachresis. This is from the Greek word *katachresis*, misuse, from *kata*, against, and *chresthai*, to use. In rhetoric, it is the wrong use of one word for another (mutual for common); also, a wresting of a word from its true signification, as in a forced trope, or mixed metaphor ("To take arms against a sea of troubles." Shak.). In philosophy, it is the use of a word in an improper form through mistake as to its origin, as *calcariferous* [having the form of a spur] for *calciferous* [bearing, producing, or having calcite, or carbonate of lime]. (Webster.)

*Catachresis*, Hyperbole, and Allegory, are spoken of by Keach as "affection" he seems to mean closely related and seemingly with heightened intensity, as usage I have not found in any of our current dictionaries of word study books. With him, *Catachresis* is especially an "affection" of the "metaphor" and "*metonymy*." That leads me to suspect that our current word-study books treat his "*catachrestical*" categories simply as a part of the category of which they are "affections."

He states that "by a *catachrestical, metonymy*" in 1 Corinthians 11:10, "the covering of a woman's head, is called *exousia*, 'power,' (because it is passively a sign of her being under command of the man)."

Also, "With respect to the acceptation and signification of words, Lev. 26:30, the fragments of idols are called carcasses, by a hard metaphor [emphasis added], alluding to the carcasses of men before mentioned, Deut.16:7."

(NOTE: I can see no relation of Deut.16:7 to "the carcasses of men afore mentioned," for they are "afore mentioned" in Leviticus 26:30 itself, whereas Deuteronomy 16:7 has reference to preparation of the lamb sacrificed in connection with observance of the Passover feast, which

Keach mentions next, and should have been placed at the beginning of that new sentence. The error may have been due to inadvertence either by the author, or those who prepared his work for the printer, or by the printer himself, and not known by the proofreaders to be such.)

Keach, in his introductory paragraph, states of *Catachresis*, that it "is called in Latin *abusio*, an abuse, not as if the sacred scriptures had abused any words, but because the things that are *catachrestical*, differ in some things from the custom of speaking tropically, and have a harder utterance and coherence. The style of scripture is most holy, and pure from blemish, or indecency, of which we take a few examples of a threefold kind."

That nearly has to mean that the scriptures did not use tropical or figurative language out of harmony with the language of the readers immediately addressed, but if literally translated into another language not having the same custom of speaking tropically, it would be more difficult to understand and therefore might lead to erroneous interpretations. This I shall later attempt to illustrate. But now we notice the three kinds of *Catachresis* as presented by Keach.

"1. With respect to the acceptation and signification of words." The examples of 1 Corinthians 11:10 ("power" on the woman's head) and Leviticus 26:30 ("carcases" of idols), already mentioned above, are of this kind: "*catachrestical metonymy*" and "hare metaphor." Another example by Keach is in Deuteronomy 16:7, already mentioned, where he says: "To boil *bashal* is put for roasting the paschal lamb, which was not to be boiled, but roasted, by command of God, Exodus 12:9, etc."

Both the King James Version of 1611 and the American Standard Version of 1901, read "roast." But in the margin, the latter reads, "or boil." And Young's Analytical Concordance gives its meaning as "boil, ripen, cook," and lists its translations in the Old Testament as "be ripe," 1 time; seethe, 1; bake, 2; boil, 6; roast, 2; seethe (sod), 11; be sodden, 4; bring forth ripe, 1. Also, Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible, says that *bashal*, pronounced bawshal' is a primitive root; properly to boil up; hence, to be done in cooking; figuratively, to ripen: -- bake, boil, bring forth, roast, seethe, sod (be sodden).

"2. With respect to the joining of the words when some words (in a metaphor especially) are joined together, which seem not well to

correspond, as Exod. 5:21, where it is said to stink in the eyes, which better agrees with the nostrils, which denote great adverseness."

(NOTE" The foregoing Hebrew idiom is rendered into the English idiom by the King James Version as "to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of his servants," which we English readers are comfortable with, though the abhorring is done with the psyche rather than the eyes.)

Also, "Exod. 20:18, 'And all the people saw the thunder and lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet," of which only lightning, is seen, the others are heard. So to see a voice, Rev. 1:12. See Matt.7:21, 22, and 10:15, 1 Tim. 6:19, 2 Cor. 5:7, 2 Tim. 2:19&c, for more examples.)

3. "With respect to the change of words. This belongs to the writings of the New Testament, and the Greek tongue, in which certain words are used to signify different things, because one and the same Hebrew word, (whence that speech was taken), may so signify. Thus Aiones, (aiones) secula ages, are put for the world, Hab.1:6, because the Hebrew *olam* signifies both ages and the world, Ecclesiastes 3:11."

(NOTE: The King James Version reads: "he hath set the world in their heart," whereas the American Standard Version renders it in the text as "he hath set eternity in their heart," but states in a marginal note, "or, the world.")

Continuing, *Dorean, gratis* 'freely' is put for *maten, frustra*, 'in vain,' Gal.2:21, from the Hebrew word *chinnam*, which signifies (in vain) as it is contradistinguished, from the hoped effect, or event, Psalm. 109:2,3."

(COMMENT: Examples of the Greek adverb *maten*, vainly, or in vain, are indeed found in Matthew 15:9 and Mark 7:7. On the other hand, the Hebrew word *chinnam* does not occur in Psalm 109:2-3, as one would think from the above; but according to Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible, it occurs 32 times in the Old Testament, translated "causeless," 1 time; "free," 1; "freely" 1; "innocent," 2; "for nothing," 1; "in vain," 2 (Proverbs 1:17; Ezekiel 6:10); "without cause," 15; "without cost," 1; and "without wages," 1. But according to Keach it is used in Psalm 109:2-3 in the sense of "in vain" inasmuch as what is there described as having been done and said against the writer was "contra-distinguished, from the hoped effect, or event" – evidently by being

contrary to what he had hoped for and believed to be deserved – not by the word *chinnam* itself being in the passage!)

Keach says further: "See more examples, Rev 14:8, and 18:3, compared with Job 6:4, Matt, 6:34. A word that signifies malice, is put for affliction because the Hebrew word *ra'ah* signifies both. See Amos 3:6, 1 Cor. 15:54, with Amos 1:11, Heb. 11:31, James 2:25, 1 Cor. 2:6, and 14:20, Col. 3:14, and 4:12, 1 John 4:18-20, with Judges 9:16, and Prov. 11:3, &c."

COMMENT: All the foregoing paragraphs are given by Keach as more examples of where the Greek New Testament uses a word in a sense not usual to the Greek language, but because the Old Testament Hebrew word which represents either directly or indirectly has that as one of its senses – with New Testament writers having to assume a familiarity with such fact on the part of their immediate readers, in order for its use to be "pure from any blemish." As stated, and I believe correctly by Keach. But I have to confess to utter inability to see any such connection between the old and New Testament passages cited above as "more examples." To me, they are more like what the writer of Ecclesiastes says in 2:21 of his works; "Then I looked on all the works my hands had wrought, and on the labor that I had labored to do; and, behold, all was vanity and a striving after wind; and there was no profit under the sun" (American Standard Version).

The last two sentences of mine, however, are in no wise to be interpreted as meaning that the scriptures may not be wrongly interpreted because of not properly distinguishing between various uses of certain key words. With my own ears I once heard a quite good man and sincere preacher, but with limited education, confidently use Matthew 7:13-14 as a proof text of the necessity of water baptism as a condition to salvation. Properly calling attention to the fact that the passage reads "strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life," and that strait is spelled s-t-r-a-i-t not "s-t-r-a-i-g-h-t," he gleefully added that if you consult a good dictionary you will find that "s-t-r-a-i-t" means a narrow neck of water connecting two larger bodies of water, and that this makes it refer to water baptism. That was notwithstanding the word "strait" in that text is next used as a synonym of "narrow," and does not have any reference to water than "narrow" does. Moreover, the reason that a narrow neck of water connecting two larger bodies of water is called a "strait" is that it is narrow – rather than because it is water! The good brother's use of "strait" was obviously a *Catcshresis*.

But nobody knows everything, and being highly skilled in one area is no guarantee of competence in another. An older preacher once told me of another older preacher highly skilled and masterful as a defender of the faith in regard to first principles, who, in preaching a sermon on the conversion of Cornelius, eloquently discoursed in his introduction about what a great musician he must have been – "a centurion of the band called the Italian band" (Acts 10:1)! But the word "band" in that translation had reference to a band of soldiers (*speira*, cohort), not of musicians, and is so indicated in the margin of the American Standard Version and incorporated into the text of later translations – or "Regiment," as in the New King James Version. So, another *Catachresis*.

But a much more serious *Catachresis* than either of the above, which had their humorous aspects and were strictly local, was involved in the historical Christological controversy of early Christian centuries that shook and even split the church world -wide, causing the Roman emperor Constantine to call the first ecumenical council at Nicea in Asia Minor, in A.D. 321, and resulting in lingering aspects of translation controversy even to our day over whether Christ as God's *monogenes* Son is to be described in translation as God's "only begotten Son" or "only Son," and with even Isaac being called Abraham's "only begotten son" in Hebrews 11:17 of the King James Version of 1611 and retained in the English Revised Version of 1881 and the American Standard Version of 1901, although he was neither his "only" nor his "only begotten" son – for Abraham had another son, Ishmael by Hagar, and six more by Katurah. That suggest that there is an aspect of the Greek adjective *monogenes* that neither of the above carry, which is "only one of a kind," and which both Jesus and Isaac were. It is also used of an only son or relative of the kind of his or her parent. Hugo McCord's New Testament Translation (1988), in recognition of that, accurately renders it of Christ and Isaac as "unique," each being the only example of his category.

(Clement of Rome, writing of the fabled Phoenix, called it a *monogenes* bird, there supposedly being only one of its species living at a given time. See Arndt & Gingrich, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature; also 1 Clement 25:2).

f. Hyperbole. This word is from the Greek word *huper*, above, over, beyond, and *bole*, from *bolein*, to throw. Webster says: "A figure of speech in which the expression is an exaggeration of the meaning intended to be conveyed, of or by which things are represented as much

greater or less, better or worse, than they really are; a statement which exaggerates through passion or intense excitement."

Dungan states: "There need be no rule for the interpretation of hyperbole, except to keep before the mind the purpose of the author, and the language will interpret itself. It is simply an intensification, and not used with any intent to misrepresent the facts in the case. Of course, to make these statements literal will find the Bible guilty of many falsehoods; but when we treat such figures in the Scriptures as we treat them elsewhere, there is no danger of failing to comprehend them."

A few examples: (a) Ten spies sent by Moses to view the Promised Land reporting: "the cities are great and fenced up to heaven" (Deuteronomy 1:28); conversely, of their inhabitants, "and were in our sight as grasshoppers. And so were we in their sight" (Numbers 13:33). (b) "God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding exceeding much, and largeness of heart, even as the sand that is on the seashore." (1 Kings 5:29). (c) The apostle Paul saying, "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given" (Ephesians 3:8). (d) Also John writing: "And there are so many other things that Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written" (John 21:21).

g. Allegory. The word comes from the Greek *allos*, other, and *agoreuo*, to speak, "and so means speaking something else than what the language actually means, what Philo, the past-master in use of allegory, calls the deeper spiritual sense." (A. T. Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament, in regard to Paul's allegory of the two women [Sarah and Hagar] in Galatians 4:21-31).

(According to The New Columbia Encyclopedia, 1975, Philo was born about 20 B.C. and died about A.D. 50. A noted Jewish philosopher and mystic of Alexandria, Egypt, he had enormous influence on Jewish and Christian thought, particularly among the Alexandrian theologians Clement (born about A.D. 150) and Origen (born about A.D. 185). He was the first to attempt to reconcile Biblical religion with Greek philosophy, hoping to impress favorably the Hellenistic philosophical world. In so doing he developed an allegorical method of interpreting the scripture, which enabled him to find many of the doctrines of Greek philosophy in the Pentateuch.)

Paul, speaking by divine inspiration and not under the influence of Philo, did not say what he was recounting was originally written as an allegory, but, literally, according to the Greek text, it was "being allegorized," that is, by himself – (a) making the two women, a bondmaid (Hagar, he mentions by name) and a freewoman (Sarah, he does not mention by name), by whom Abraham had two sons, to stand for two "covenants," the Old from Sinai in Arabia, and the New from Jerusalem which is from above and free: (b) making their sons to represent the "children" of the respective covenants: (1) Christians, free-born under Christ, and (2) earthly Israel, in bondage under the law of Moses; and (c) the scripture saying, "cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman."

Dungan's discussion of allegory extends almost to 12 pages, dealing with definition first and then giving a number of important examples: (a) A vine brought out of Egypt (Psalm 80:8-16); (b) Fasting inappropriate as mere ritual (Matthew 9:14-17); (c) Putting on the whole armor of God (Ephesians 6:11-18); (d) Good and wild olive trees (Romans 11:15-24) – the latter being given special attention over three pages because of having given more trouble to exegetes than any other in the Bible, with "many more things put into it than Paul ever thought of"; (e) The two covenants (2 Corinthians 3:6-16) – also given special attention in just over three pages, because next to the olive trees in respect to difficulty of interpretation, and having much the same object in view, so that Dungan does some recapitulating for comparison. He calls the last two "double allegories" – this sort having two lines of thought, one put over the other, making them more difficult of interpretation because of having twice as much in themselves for the mind of the interpreter to deal with, and then find the purpose of the comparison – except that in the allegories of Paul he lets us in on what he wishes to accomplish by them, and we need to guard against putting more into them than he intended.

Robertson, quoted earlier for definition, states that Paul was also familiar with allegory as a rabbinical method of exegesis (but which was not always without abuse, Rabbi Akiba, for instance, finding a mystical sense in every hook and crook of the Hebrew alphabet) – that Paul, however, makes skillful use of his knowledge of allegory in that of the two women in Galatians 4:21-31.

On the other hand, Robertson states: "Christian preachers in Alexandria early fell victims of Philo's allegorical method and carried it to excess with regard to the plain sense of the narrative [which Paul had not done]."

That startling style of preaching survives yet to the discredit of sound preaching. Please observe that Paul says here that he is using allegory, not ordinary interpretation. It is not necessary to say that Paul intended his readers to believe that this allegory was designed by the narrative. He [simply] illustrates his point of it."

h. Proverb. This word is from the Latin *proverbium*, from *pro*, before, and *verbu*., word – hence, etymologically, a sentence condensed into a word, or its smallest form, whereas a "parable" (yet to be considered) is usually a somewhat lengthy utterance, and so with "allegory" (discussed immediately above).

Webster's first definition of "proverb" is as follows: "A profound or oracular maxim; a sage sentence; often, in Scriptural use, an enigma; a parable; a truth couched obscurely. Chiefly Bib[l]ical. Now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb. John 16:29."

But in Old Testament usage it is also frequently used in a context expressive of astonishment, contempt, and taunt, though the etymology of the word does not mean, as in Deuteronomy 28:37: "Thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword, among all the peoples whither Jehovah shall lead thee away" American Standard Version; "You will become a thing of horror and an object of scorn and ridicule to all the nations where the Lord will drive you" (New International Version). (See also all the passages cited below.)

In both the Old and New Testaments it occurs no less than 29 times, as a translation of at least four Hebrew and Greek words, as follows:

Heb. *chidah*, a cute saying, hidden thing (Habakkuk 2:6); Heb. *Mashal*. As a noun, a ruling saying, proverb, similitude (Deuteronomy 28:37); 1 Samuel 10:12; 24:13; 1 Kings 4:32; 9:17; 2 Chronicles 7<sup>th</sup>10; Psalms 69:11; Proverbs 1:1-6; 25:1\*; Ecclesiastes 12:9; Isaiah 14:4; Jeremiah 24:9; Ezekiel 12:22,23; 14:8; 18:2,3; and as a verb, to use as a similitude or ruling saying, Numbers 21:27; Ezekiel 12:23; 16:44; Gr. *Parabole*, parable, comparison, similitude, Luke 4:23; Gr. *Paroimia*, proverb, obscure saying, John 10:6; 16:25, 29; 2 Peter 2:22.

\* The Book of Proverbs is an example of Webster's first definition of a proverb "in scriptural sense," as cited above at the outset.

\*\* Dungan calls attention to the fact that Matthew 24:32 the word "parable" is in reality a "proverb" in our mode of speaking, as it is translated above in Luke 4:23, which we shall also note under "Parables".

i. Enigma. This word is from the Greek *ainigma*, literally riddle, then indistinct image. (Arndt & Gingrich, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament).

In the Old Testament, "riddle" translates the Hebrew word *chidah* nine times: in Judges 14:12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19; and in Ezekiel 17:2, where it is also used as a synonym of "parable".

As used in the Septuagint (LXX), the earliest translation of the Old Testament Hebrew into Greek (approximately 250 B.C.), it occurs where the King James Version reads "dark speeches" (Numbers 12:8, "astonishment" (Deuteronomy 28:37), "hard questions" (1 Kings 10:1; 2 Chronicles 9:1), and "dark sayings" (Proverbs 1:6) – all from the Heb. *chidah*.

In the New Testament it occurs only once, in 1 Corinthians 11:12, "now we see through a glass darkly [*en ainiymati*] but then face to face" – contracting the difference before and after the Christian revelation in its totality had been given – before and after "the faith ... was once for all delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3), and inscripturated for preservation and intensive over-all study (cf. 2 Timothy 3:16-17) – after scriptural gifts had "ceased," or been "done away" (1 Corinthians 13:8-19) – after the childhood state of the church had ended and adulthood had been reached (v.11).

Keach concludes that not every parable or allegory is an enigma, but that every enigma is a parable or allegory. Dungan does not bother to treat "inigma" as a separate figure of speech.

j. Figures. The word "figures" is from the Latin *figura*, as already learned (see page 3 above) and in earlier times more than now was confined to graciousness in rhetoric, to language that gives embellishment or beauty to speech without changing the sense of the words employed. It applies to both words and sentences.

But when it applies to words, it is mostly to words within a sentence, as in Exodus 34:6, "The Lord, the Lord, a God merciful and gracious," etc.,

or in Isaiah 6:3 "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God of Host." Keach also cites the following passages as examples of similar structure, that is, "when the same word or sound is continued or repeated in the next sentence" (which is by no means exhaustive, Keach distinguishing seven more, though not all said structures are as obvious as the first one). The other passages are Jeremiah 22:29; Ezekiel 21:27; Matthew 23:37; Luke 28:10; 23:21; Acts 9:4; Revelation 18:2 2 Samuel 18:33; Isaiah 28:10; Hosea 2:21-23; Ezekiel 34:17.

(With reference to Isaiah 6:3, quoted above, Keach makes a comment that I have to challenge the certainty of, when he says that "this triple repetition denotes the mystery of the Trinity" (p. 200). Does, then the passage in Exodus 34:6, uttered by God, with only double repetition, mean that at that time there were only two members in the Godhead, including the Holy Spirit? Surely not! For under Keach's third type of structure, which he calls "climax," or climbing by steps, he has the following: "John 1:1, 'In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and God was the word' – this word, was in the beginning with God." He explains that "in the third proposition there was an inversion of terms, viz. A God was the word, for the word was God." Accordingly, reading from the King James Version, we have: "In the beginning was the word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" [with emphasis added to make the graduation or progression of thought all the more obvious] – the Word was, was with God, and was God – all this "in the beginning," so that the Trinity has existed from the beginning.)

In addition to "repetition" of words within a sentence, Keach adds five more, the first of which is "*paranomasia*," of which Webster says in rhetoric: "A play on words in which that same word is used in different senses or words similar in sound are set in opposition so as to give antithetical force; punning, a pun." A select few of the more obvious ones in scripture, either quoted or cited by Keach as examples are: Exodus 32:18, "And he said it is not the voice of them that shout for mastery, neither is it the voice of them that cry for being overcome: but the noise of them that sing do I hear"; Isaiah 5:7, "he looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry"; Matthew 16:18. "And I say unto thee, That thou art Peter [*petros*, masculine gender, stone, a fragment of rock], and upon this rock [*petra*, feminine gender, rock, but bed rock or a ledge of rock] I will build my church"; 2 Corinthians 10:3, "Though we walk in the flesh, yet we do not war after the flesh"; 2 Corinthians 6:9, "As unknown and yet known."

The second addition to repetition of words within a sentence that Keach makes is *antanaclais*, a Greek word that, when used in rhetoric, is defined by Webster as: a. Repetition of a word in a contrary or different sense (Learn some craft, that you may live without craft). b. Repetition of a previous word or phrase in resuming the thread of the discourse.)"

A few examples of the former cited by Keach are: 1 Samuel 1:24, "and the child was young (King James Version), where the same Hebrew word, *naar*, is used for both "child" and "young," so that Keach represents the Hebrew text as saying, "and the boy was a boy," but using the word "boy" in two different senses – that category, the third, of the word itself occurring in the Old Testament 233 times, and in the King James Version rendered "babe" (1 time), "boy" (1 time), "child" (51 times), "lad" (32), "servant" (54). "young man" (90), "youth" (4); Matthew 8:22, "follow me ; and let the dead bury the dead" – the spiritual dead bury the physical dead; John 1:10. "The world was made by him, and the world knew him not" – the former "world" meaning the universe; the latter, the unbelieving majority of persons in it; Romans 9:6, They are not all Israel which are of Israel" – that is, not all are Israel spiritually, who are of Israel according to the flesh.

The other three classes Keach calls:

(a) "Figures of a Sentence in Logism," by which he means what is said in conversation, or is addressed to others as if in conversation.

(b) "Interrogation, " the use of questions, (1) by way of denoting absurdity (real or supposed) and exploding it (John 3:4; 6:52); (2) by way of wonder and/or admiration (Genesis 17:17; Matthew 21:20); (3) by way of affirmation (1 Corinthians 9:1; 12:20-30; Hebrews 2:14; Job 11:7, which I took from Dungan); (4) by way of demonstration of a certain subject, of which something affirmed or predicted (Ezekiel 8:6; Matthew 11:7-9); (5) by way of expressing doubt (Genesis 18:12; Romans 10:6-7); (6) by way of exaltation and extenuation (Psalm 31:19; 8:4); and so on through nine more.

(c) "Figures of a Sentence in Dialogism." Which Keach lists as five in number, expressive of (1) doubt or deliberation; (2) communication of information; (3) anticipating or avoiding or answering an objection; (4) seriously granting the profession of another to be correct but inconsistent with his practice, or ironically granting or permitting a thing verbally

when indeed prohibiting it; (5) conceding a statement or professed belief to be correct, yet of no profit or advantage to be one making it, as, "Thou belivest that there is one God, thou doest well; the devils also believe and tremble" (James 2:19).

(THE END OF KEACH SOCALLED "TYPES," WITH HIS REMAINING FIGURES OF SPEECH BEING UNDER THE UMBRELLA OF "SCHEMES."

k. Schemes. This word, derived from the Greek *Schema*, has been used in contrast with Figures, derived from the Latin *Futura*, when using them as umbrella words to cover and distinguish two species of figurative language. All the foregoing figures of speech have been under the category of "Figures," and confined to the use of words within sentences, whereas now reference will be to the structures of sentences themselves.

It will be noted above that under the topic of "figures" there is a subtopic "Figures of a Word," which includes the sub-subtopics "Figures of a sentence in Logism" and "Figures of speech in Dialogism." Since "dialogism" obviously refers to conversation or communication on the part of two or more persons, whether formal or informal, "Figures of a Sentence in Logism" must refer to communication of one person only ("Monologism") – though I have no dictionary that gives the word "Logism." But that distinction does not apply except within sentences themselves in the category of "Schemes".

He latter word is derived from the Greek *schema*, plural *schemata*, to which we have been introduced on pages 2 and 3. There we learned that what the Greeks called *Schema*, the Latins' called *Futura*. But Webster says of the English word Scheme, that it is from the Latin *schema*, a rhetorical figure, a shape, figure, manner, from the Greek *schema*, form, outline plan (which means the Latins also adopted the word along side their *futura*). And it has been adopted into English as it was in Latin, as *schema*, defined by Webster as "Scheme, plan, outline, or diagram; specifi[cally]. In logic, a syllogistic figure." (Webster also states that in rhetoric it has been used as "a figure of speech," but "obsolete" – not so used now in English.)

The topic of "Themes" (the internal plan and structure of sentences) occupies almost ten pages in Keach's book. So all we can do is to list his subtopic headings: I. Schemes taken from Causes; II. Schemes taken

from Adjuncts and circumstances; III. Schemes taken from Disparates or different Things; IV. Schemes taken from Opposites, or contraries; V. Schemes taken from Comparates; VI. Schemes taken from Division; VII. Schemes taken from definition; VIII. Schemes taken from Testimony (occupying five full pages). One example of the latter: "Titus 1:12, 'The Cretans are always liars, evil beast, slow bellies,' verse 13, 'This witness is true.'" Keach says of this: "There is a most elegant Oxymoron, in these words of Paul; the Cretans are always liars; but the that said this is a Cretan, therefore (it may be concluded) he is a liar; yet Paul says his testimony is true: and hence perhaps he calls him a prophet; ... Hence Paul calls him a prophet, whether by way of irony, or because of the subject he treated on we will not determine."

It seems to me that "Parallelism" is an outstanding and highly important example of internal plan and structure of sentences, though from an approach different from the above. Yet if Keach includes it anywhere I have searched for it in vain. The word is from the Greek *parallelismos*, from *para*, beside, and *allelo*, each. As a figure of speech it is a placing beside each other two or more lines having the same or similar import, or else opposite import, and is characteristic especially of Hebrew poetry, found abundantly in the Psalms and in book of Proverbs, but not limited to them. See Exodus 15:1-18,21; 1 Samuel 18:7; Judges 5:1-31; Luke 1:41-55; etc.

Dungan makes the following classifications: (1) "Synonymous Parallelism" – when the lines contain the same thought, or nearly the same; (2) "Antithetic Parallelism" – in which lines or sentences are made to oppose each other; (3) "Synthetic Parallelism" – where words and sentences do not answer to each other, yet run parallel for the sake of greater strength, and may even run to several lines in cumulative fashion, either on the ascendent scale. (See Psalm 9:1-6 for an example ascendent scale, and again in vs.7-11; also Proverbs 9:13-17 for descendent scale).

1. Types. The word "type" is from the Greek *typos*, the mark of a blow, impression, form of character. And a correlative term is *antitypous*, or antitype, corresponding in some way to the type – the type being the original, and the antitype a copy in the sense we are considering.

Dungan gives this simple illustration: "We say we have seen a horse's foot in the clay, when we have seen only an impression of his foot, which would be the type. But when we take the track of the foot for the foot ,

we have just the opposite of the foot. So if a man should strike his fist into a ball of putty, he would leave there, not his fist, but the type of it. Though this is not the meaning it generally has in the Bible, yet to remember this original import will be of service in the interpretation of types."

Then he makes the following further observations, which we present in condensed form:

(a) We must not expect the type and the antitype to be the same, which would identity, not type and antitype. So they will not be the analogous in every respect, but in some particular one or ones. (b) Finding the purpose of a given type, its application in antitype will usually be easy. (c) It must foretell something, for if it is representative of a present truth or duty, it is a symbol (yet to be discussed), not a type. (d) It must not simply happen to represent something in the future, and therefore do as an illustration, but must have been intended to represent that thought or fact when it was given. Hence, it must be as old in design as its antitype. (e) The scriptures should be made to interpret types as far as possible, and with their definition we must be content. (f) Yet there may be analogies not demonstrated as types in the Bible, that are close enough to be type and antitype, whether so intended or not, and may therefore serve excellently as illustrations. (g) As in the interpretation of symbols (yet to be discussed), the similarities between type and antitype, will lead in most cases to the true meaning. (h) Anything, to be a type, must have been a real person, thing, event, or office (not true of symbols). (i) The antitype is always superior to the type in at least some respect, else there would be no reason in the type – which is always visible at the time it is given, because it is material; but the antitype contains divine or spiritual thought. And occasionally there may be more than one antitype, or fulfillment, the first antitype also being a type for a second antitype (as in the case of Moses, Joshua, and Christ (the fulfillment of both the proceeding) – this anticipating Dungan further along). (j) Sometimes figurative language is employed in giving a typical event, and should be treated as it would be in any other circumstances. (k) The rules for interpreting symbols (yet to be given) apply as well to types, as they have several things in common. And insofar as the type becomes a prophecy, history should also be carefully examined, that we may have all the facts on both sides.

Finally, Dungan presents "THE SEVERAL KINDS OF TYPES," as to sources from which they are drawn, as follows:

(1.) Typical persons. – (a) Types of Christ: Adam (Romans 5:12-19; 1 Corinthians 15:22,45); Moses (Acts 3:22-24; cf. Deuteronomy 18:15-19); Joshua (see Hebrews 4:8-9, and the fact Joshua was the immediate successor of Moses (Numbers 27:18-20; Deuteronomy 1:37-38; 31:1-3,22-23; 34:9 Joshua 1:1-7; Deut.34:8-9)); Melchisedek (Hebrews 5:5-10; 6:20; 7:1-17; cf. Genesis 14:18-20; Psalm 110:4); David (Acts 13:32-34; cf. Isaiah 9:6-7); Solomon, but more feebly (Romans 1:1-4; cf. 1 Samuel 7:13-15; 1 Kings 8:18-20); Zarubbalel (Haggai 1:1-12; Zechariah 4:1-10; 6:12-13); Cyrus, king of Persia (Isaiah 44:28; 45:1-4). (b) A type of Judas: Ahithophel (Acts 1:16-20; Psalm 109:1; cf. 2 Samuel 15:30-34; 17:23; Psalm 41:9; 55:12-13,20). (c) A type of John the Baptist: Elijah (Isaiah 40:3-4; Malachi 3:1; 4:5-6; cf. Matthew 3:1-3; 11:14; 17:10-12; Luke 1:17).

(2.) Typical things. – (a) The serpent in the wilderness (Numbers 21:9), a type of Christ lifted up on the cross (John 3:14). (b) Lambs slain from the foundation of the world (Genesis 4:4, etc., etc.) A type of Christ; "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29; cf. Hebrews 10:3).

(3.) Typical institutions. – (a) The Sabbath, a type of the Christian's rest in Christ (Matthew 11:28-29), especially the eternal rest in heaven (Hebrews 10:1-4); (b) The Passover lamb (Exodus 12), a type of Christ, "our passover" (1 Corinthians 5:7); (c) The year of Jubilee, a year of great deliverance from debt and bondage (Leviticus 25) was a type of savior's work (Luke 4:16-21); (d) The Tabernacle and all of its services and ritual, a type of the church and its functions and blessings on earth and ultimately in heaven (Hebrews 8:8-10, 12:18-29).

(4.) Typical offices. – (a) Of Prophet, to supply divinely communicated knowledge to other men; (b) Of Priest, to make offerings to God for removal of human sin; and (c) Of King, to exercise divinely authorized governmental rule and protection for his subjects. In the theocracy of ancient Israel, each of these came to his office by first being anointed by God – in Hebrew, messiah; in Greek, *christos*; in English anointed. All the foregoing were types of Jesus Christ, who combines all these offices in himself, and is preeminently "the Christ"; and citizens of his kingdom are "Christians." Christ is our great High Priest, and under him we are all priest (1 Peter 2:5; cf. Revelation 1:6; 5:10; 20:6), but make all our approaches to God through him (see John 16:23-24,27).\*{at the end of this paper}.

We are omitting (5.) Typical conduct; (6.) Typical events; and (7.) Typical places, for want of time and space. The foregoing have been condensed and somewhat otherwise adapted. And the remaining figures of speech will also have to be merely sketched.

m. Symbols. The word is from the Greek *symbolon*, from the sun, with and *ballein*, to throw, to throw with, or throw together. Dungan quotes a definition from Webster as fairly exhausting its meaning: as being "the sign of representation of something moral or intellectual, by the images or properties of natural things; an emblem, a representation; as the lion is a symbol of courage; the lamb is the symbol of meekness or patience." Dungan explains that, while a "type" always represents something yet to be, a "symbol" may represent the conditions existing at the time, or it may relate to something to occur in the future and thus become a typological prophecy.

Dungan classifies symbols as being (1) Miraculous, as the burning bush Moses saw at Horeb that did not consume, which made something of the dignity and glory of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to appear prior to his being commissioned for his tremendously important task ahead of leading Israel from Egypt to Canaan (Exodus 3:2); (2) Material, as bread and fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper are symbols of the body and blood of Christ (Matthew 26:26-28); (3) Visional, as the apostle Peter's vision on the housetop in Joppa to prepare him for going to Caesarea to preach the gospel to Gentiles for the first time (Acts 10). The greater part of the book of Revelation is also descriptive of visional symbols seen by the apostle John while banished on the Island of Patmos.

n. Parables. The word in the singular is from the Greek *para*, beside and *ballein*, to throw; hence a placing beside or together, a comparing, comparison: a story by which something in harmony with reality is used as a means of presenting a moral thought. The actors in a parable are real – in the sense of being human, and doing nothing which by nature they could not do or experience. In this respect it is the opposite of a "fable," as we use that term today, in which human qualities are attributed to animate and inanimate beings, as in Judges 9:6-21 and 2 Kings 14:8-10.

Among the ancients, however there were but few designations for figurative language. And in the scriptures we have only the parables, proverb, type, and allegory named, and the fable used but not named –

with parable containing all we put into parable, simile, similitude (prolonged simile) – and with parable and proverb sometimes used interchangeably, as noted above under "Parable," beginning on page 16.

The parable is said to be the oldest and most common of all figures of speech. The Old Testament contains many examples. And, coming to the New Testament, we find our Lord making almost constant use of it in teaching – to reveal truth about the unknown by a comparison with the known, and at the same time make it easily remembered. But it served other purposes also at times.

For example, according to Matthew 13:10-13, when asked by his disciples why he had preached his great sermon of the kingdom of heaven to the multitude in parables, he gave two reasons: in effect saying (a) that in addition to illustrating and embalming truth as it would do for his disciples who would ask for explanation if the meaning was not evident to them, it was (b) to conceal said truth from those not worthy of it – not interested in it enough to receive and follow it, if not hostile and listening for something to criticize and use against him, as was true of different ones by that time.

Also, in the parable of the vineyard (Matthew 21:33-46; Mark 12:1-12; Luke 20:9-19), spoken on Tuesday of crucifixion week against the chief priest and Pharisees who would be responsible for his death, he so framed it that he presented truth that they assented to before they saw it was meant for themselves – much as the prophet Nathan had done centuries earlier in regard to King David's so in with Bathsheba (2 Samuel 12) also as our Lord had already done in his account of the "Good Samaritan" to answer a lawyer (Luke 10:25-37).

### III. CONCLUSION.

It has been said that the Old Testament is the New Testament concealed, and that the New Testament is the Old Testament revealed, which becomes evident as both are carefully examined. That makes a study of Old Testament types and New Testament Antitypes especially important to an understanding of what the apostle Paul calls "the eternal purpose which [God] purposed in Jesus Christ our Lord" (Ephesians 3:11), and who speaks of himself as "declaring the end from the beginning" (Isaiah 46:10).

And, if we let the word "metaphors" stand for all related figures of speech as well, they greatly enrich and ornament it. and no other literature excels the Bible in this regard.

If this paper, for the most part sketchy of necessity, should contribute to a clearer insight of any reader into the matters covered, the writer will have been amply rewarded for his effort, besides having greatly enjoyed and benefited from the equivalent of a refresher course for himself. I am glad to have been introduced to Benjamin Keach and his monumental work of three centuries earlier.

\*By the same token, we are also "kings" (see 2 Timothy 2:12; Revelation 1:5-6; 5:10; 20:4-6; 22:5), under him who is "KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS" (Revelation 19:11-16). And the apostles, "in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory [the present Christian dispensation]," were told by Christ, "ye shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of [spiritual] Israel" (Matthew 19:28).