

quainted with the Oracles of God than any other cause. This mode of interpreting the Bible was introduced into the first theological school ever formed under Christian patronage! This was located in Alexandria in Egypt—their literature was imported from heathenism, and it soon caused a moral and pestiferous darkness to roll over the churches; which soon hid the sun of righteousness, and left the Christian Church groping at noonday. In proportion as men have come back to the word of God, and cleared themselves of these moral mists and fogs, by explaining the word of God as they do other books of the same antiquity, has the light of truth illuminated their path, and in the salvation of God have they been made to rejoice. The remark above made we repeat, that those who would apply the Scripture, with which we began, to this state of existence, or to Jews and Gentiles, can carry their point in no other way than that which every man acquainted with the principles of interpretation must in his heart reprobate. This may be considered strong language; but we hope the subsequent remarks will show its propriety.

If the account of the Rich man and Lazarus be considered a historical fact, which we are inclined to think is the case, comments are unnecessary. It is not called a parable, and it would, therefore, be rather difficult to prove that it is; but lest any should think that we would seek to inculcate an important point on the silence of Scripture, we will admit for the time being that it is a parable.

These questions then arise, on what does the Saviour predicate his instructions? On realities or non-entities? Shall we take those parables which are difficult to explain those that are perfectly plain? or shall we reverse the rule, and take those that are plain and obvious to illustrate the intricate? The parable of the Rich man and the Beggar is admitted, we believe, by all whom we oppose in this interpretation, to be one of the most difficult of solution.

This being conceded we now turn our attention to the other parables, with the inquiry, Are they not without an exception *founded on facts*? Unhesitatingly we answer, *Yes!* How then dare any man, with this truth before him, say of this parable what cannot be said of any other? Are all the other parabolic instructions of the Saviour based on facts, obvious to the most common capacity, and this which a common reader would at once consider one of infinite importance, based upon a bugbear—a non-entity! Who can indulge the thought! Yet this must be done or the opposite side of the question yielded without an argument to support it.

Some may call this declamation. Hear, then, the facts! Take the parables in order. There is the sower. The individual, the field, the seed, the way side, the thorns, the stony places, and the good ground, are all realities. The same may be said of all the others. Here they are—the tares; seed springing up imperceptibly; grain of mustard seed; Leaven; found treasure; precious pearl; net; two debtors; unmerciful servant; Samaritan; rich fool; servants who waited for their Lord; barren figtree; lost sheep; lost piece of money; prodigal son; dishonest steward; unjust judge; pharisee and publican; laborers in