

ARTICLE II.

EXPLANATION OF ΤΗΣ ΠΡΩΤΗΣ ΣΚΗΝΗΣ, HEB. 9: 8.

By Rev. Daniel Ladd, Missionary of the American Board in Smyrna.

IN order to understand the meaning of these words, it is necessary, first, to inquire what is the scope of the passage in which they are found ; and to ascertain the meaning of the phrase preceding them: *μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν.*

It is plain that the writer, from the commencement of the fifth chapter to the eighteenth verse of the tenth, compares the priesthood of Christ with that of the Levitical priests, in order to show the superiority of the former. He makes the comparison in respect to several particulars ; as, the manner of appointment, the duration of office, and others. At the commencement of chapter ninth, he comes to the last particular of his comparison, the most important one of all, *the efficacy of the two priesthoods in restoring men to communion and favor with God* ; and the consideration of this subject extends to the eighteenth verse of the tenth chapter, including a statement and illustration of the efficacy of death in procuring pardon, in chapter ninth, verses 15—22.

As the efficacy of a priesthood is determined by the efficacy of the sacrifices offered by it ; the writer compares, at some length, the sacrifice of Christ with those of the Levitical priests ; but it is in order to set clearly before his readers the grand result effected by those priesthoods, in making men holy and fitting them for God's service, that he compares them. This is the grand decisive point, to which all the others, previously considered, are subordinate. The quotation from Jeremiah, in the last part of chapter eighth, showing that a new covenant was promised, very naturally introduced this last particular of his comparison ; for a new covenant implies a more perfect one.

In order to have a clear view of the meaning of this pas-

sage, it is important to have a definite conception of the criterion to which the writer brings these two priesthoods in order to test their efficacy ; for this is entirely what may be called a Jewish conception of holiness ; that is, it is not holiness as manifested by a life of obedience and benevolence and devotedness to the service of God ; but holiness as consisting in a state of pardon and acceptance with God, fitting its possessor to go, like the high-priest, into the immediate presence of God, and offer acceptable worship. Probably no Jew ever conceived of a person in a holier state, in this world, than the high-priest when he entered the holy-of-holies, on the great day of atonement, and received tokens of the Divine favor there ; and we shall see in the sequel good evidence to believe, that the particular conception of moral purity which the writer has in treating of this subject, is derived from these services of the high-priest, in the tabernacle or temple.

We come now to the examination of the phrase immediately preceding the words under consideration, being persuaded that the right understanding of this will afford us indispensable aid in finding out the true meaning of these words. We render *μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν*, *that the way into the holy-of-holies has not yet been made manifest ; not, was not yet made manifest ;* for the writer makes use of the present tense here, from the sixth to the tenth verse inclusive ; and *πεφανερῶσθαι*, in connection with the present tense, cannot be properly translated by the imperfect. Prof. Stuart remarks on the ninth verse, that it shows very plainly that this epistle was written while the services of the temple were still practised ; as if there were something peculiar to this verse, in the use of the present tense ; but it is these five verses together, from the sixth to the tenth, which show that this epistle was written while the temple was still standing, and its services were still continued ; and we must translate just what is written, nothing more, nothing less.

But how could the writer affirm, at the time of writing this epistle, that the Holy Spirit then showed that the way

into the holy-of-holies had not yet been made manifest? This difficulty plainly belongs to the passage, whether a literal or a figurative meaning be given to *τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς*. If it can be obviated, however, it will facilitate our explanation of these words. In whatever way we endeavor to do this, we must not attempt it, as many commentators have done, by altering the tense of the text. There was a good reason, in the writer's mind, for using the present in these verses; and no one may presume to change it, any more than to change the words themselves. The following considerations, we think, sufficiently explain the matter:

1. By the use of the present tense, the writer does not mean to restrict his declarations respecting the temple services and the Spirit's instruction exclusively to the time then present; for this sense fairly implies that these declarations hold true also in regard to all the past time, in which those services and the Spirit's teaching had been the same.

2. The writer having looked back upon the construction of the tabernacle, regarding the whole as favorably as possible in reference to the Jewish side of the subject; he here discourses about the services of the temple, viewing them from this same side, and taking his stand, for the time being, with the Jews his opponents; both because the services of the temple were still continued in all their splendor at the time when he wrote, and therefore that which the Holy Spirit is said here to show did continue actually to be shown; and also because there was no danger of misleading his readers as to the facts by doing so; for he knew they would understand him as meaning, that the way into the holy-of-holies had not yet been made manifest, on the supposition that the temple services were still the true way of worshipping God. He had already shown them that Christ was superior to Moses and to their high-priest, and had exhorted them to come directly to the throne of grace (4: 16), implying that the way to it had been made manifest; and therefore they could not understand him to say here, that the Holy Spirit showed absolutely, that the way into the holy-of-holies had not yet been made manifest. It is one of those cases where the fa-

miliarity of the readers with all the circumstances of the subject of discourse, secures them effectually against being misled by an expression not strictly conformed to the historic facts. It is not the writer's object to give an accurate statement of facts, in their chronological order; and therefore he makes such a use of them as is best fitted to accomplish his purpose; while at the same time it leads no one into mistake. So in verses 6, 7, he says that the priests and high-priest at that time entered, as duty required, into their respective apartments of the *tabernacle*; although in fact the tabernacle had, long before that, been destroyed. In verse seven, he also says that the high-priest entered into the holy-of-holies *once a year* (ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ); whereas, he actually entered three times, at least, on the great day of atonement; but our author knew that his readers perfectly understood the circumstances, and could not mistake his meaning.

Many examples of this verbal inaccuracy, which the readers would not misunderstand, are found in other parts of the New Testament. In Acts 13: 29, the *Jews* are said to have laid Christ's body in the sepulchre; whereas Joseph and Nicodemus did it; and in 26: 7, *the twelve tribes* are said to be then earnestly serving God; whereas the twelve tribes had, long before that, ceased to exist as tribes. In all these instances, the readers well understood the circumstances, and would not be misled by the statements.

In the case under consideration, certainly the writer cannot be charged with making unguarded statements, for the additional reason that, by *μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπιτελεμένα*, which follows closely after his declaration that the Holy Spirit showed that the way into the holy-of-holies had not yet been made manifest, he made it evident to his readers, that the meaning of his entire discourse is, that, as long as the first tabernacle had a standing according to God's arrangement, the way into the holy-of-holies was not yet made manifest, and that the Holy Spirit continued to show this, up to the time when he wrote, through the continuance of the first tabernacle and its services.

It is evident that the phrase which we are examining is not to be taken in its literal sense; for the real way into the holy-of-holies was never to be trodden by any but the high-priest alone. What, then, is the figurative meaning of it? Commentators have usually explained τῶν ἁγίων as designating heaven; and have understood, by the whole phrase, merely that free access to God was obstructed. But this view of the figure employed here, we regard erroneous; and this meaning, though correct as far as it goes, still very defective. For, according to this view, the imagery here used to denote access to God is, itself, a metaphor; and then the sense, *access to God*, becomes a figurative meaning of a figurative meaning; for τὰ ἅγια means heaven only in a figurative sense; and this figure even, is in our view employed only twice (8: 2 and 9: 12) in this epistle, where the writer speaks of the entrance of Christ into heaven as our high-priest, in reference to the entrance of the Jewish high-priest into the holy-of-holies; although those who explain τῶν ἁγίων to mean heaven here, do the same also in 10: 19.

We think that *πεφανερωσθαι*, which means *to be exposed to view*, plainly indicates that the figure is taken directly from the holy-of-holies, being evidently used in reference to that apartment being always concealed from the view of the people. If, therefore, we take τῶν ἁγίων to mean *heaven*, we must imagine heaven as resembling the literal holy-of-holies, with the way into it concealed from view; all to represent that access to God was not free; for *πεφανερωσθαι* is not opposed to the way here mentioned being *obstructed*, as it is said truly that the way of access to God was obstructed, but to its being *concealed*.

The same figure is evidently used in 4: 16 and 10: 19; and a brief examination of these passages will assist us in understanding it. In the former, *προσερχόμεθα* is plainly used in reference to the people not being allowed to come to the holy-of-holies, nor even to approach the altar, except the offerer of a sacrifice; but they always, in time of worship, stood at a distance, in the court, with their faces towards the holy-of-holies, where God accepted intercessory services per-

formed on their behalf. τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος unquestionably means the mercy-seat in the holy-of-holies, before which the high-priest appeared in behalf of the people, and mercy and grace were bestowed in consequence. If the writer intends, in this passage, to represent heaven to the minds of his readers, and themselves as approaching near to a throne of grace there; then he makes use of an imaginary worship offered in heaven, in order to represent access to God. But if the imagery here employed, is taken directly from the services of the tabernacle or temple, then it is also, unquestionably, in the passage under consideration.

In 10: 19, an entrance with strong confidence into the holy-of-holies is mentioned, which seems quite too bold a figure to be used in respect to heaven, meaning only access to God on earth. And when we see the figure continued in the following *προσερχόμεθα, ἐγγαντισμένοι, and λελουμένοι*, verse 22; we cannot suppose that all this is said in reference to offering worship in heaven. But if it is not, then the nineteenth verse is not, unless we suppose the writer takes his figurative language here from two very different scenes of worship, one of which is imaginary. If it should be insisted that the imagery here is taken from heaven, not from the entrance of the high-priest into the holy-of-holies, we see not why it may not, with equal propriety, be insisted that the same is true also in respect to 7: 25 and 11: 6, where *προσερχομένους* and *προσερχόμενον* denote the same origin of imagery. But how much more natural, in an epistle to the Hebrews, to regard this as the Jews' throne of grace on earth, not that contemplated by the Christian in heaven.

We conclude, therefore, that the imagery in these four passages, and in the particular one under consideration, is taken directly from the entrance of the high-priest into the holy-of-holies; and that the meaning of the metaphorical expression *τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν* is, *access to God, in person, including the requisite moral fitness*. The literal entrance into the holy-of-holies implied, in a Jew's mind, the highest degree of moral purity in the high-priest; for he could not enter there without offering, at the same time, an atonement for

his sins, and performing other special rites of purification. Consequently, his personal appearance before the mercy-seat implied the forgiveness of his sins and acceptance with God. If then the writer uses the phrase τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν figuratively, to mean personal access to God, including that cleansing from sin which is requisite to acceptance with him, we see, at once, the simplicity and force of the metaphor. It is taken directly from the services of the high-priest on the great day of atonement; from actual, familiar occurrences in the worship of the temple; not from imaginary scenes in heaven; it is in all respects natural, and its meaning plain and striking. In Ps. 15: 1. 61: 4 and elsewhere, we find the figure of *dwelling in the tabernacle*, used to denote constant, intimate communion with God; which, like the figure under consideration, is derived from the holy-of-holies being regarded as God's earthly dwelling-place. And surely the figure of *entering into the holy-of-holies*, denoting personal access to God and the requisite purification from sin, is quite as natural as that of *dwelling in the tabernacle*, used to denote intimate communion with God.

This meaning of the figure also admirably suits the passage above mentioned (10: 19 seq.), in which it is again employed. The two important thoughts, which in our view this figurative language expresses, — personal access to God and purification from sin, — are very plainly brought to view in this passage, which seems to be the counterpart of the phrase under consideration, affirming the existence of the things under the Christian dispensation, which this asserts did not exist under the old; for ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ clearly denotes the requisite purification from sin, according to 9: 14; and ἔχοντες *** ἱερέα μέγαν brings to view distinctly the other thought, personal access to God; since no priest on earth is any more to come between men and God; and accordingly the writer adds προσερχόμεθα, *let us come near [to God]*.

We also see that this interpretation of τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν preserves a logical course of thought in verses 6—14, where commentators have usually found only independent declara-

tions respecting several distinct subjects. It makes the writer declare, that the Holy Spirit showed, that personal access to God with the purification from sin requisite for this, was not granted, while the Levitical priesthood ministered at the altar. The purification from sin is the more prominent thought; and is not, for a moment, relinquished in these verses. Amid the incidental subjects occurring here, sanctuary, blood offered in sacrifice, and officiating priest, both these points indeed are kept steadily in view in these verses, just as we should expect; for they involve the grand subject of discussion, the perfection and imperfection respectively of the two priesthoods. A mere inspection of the verses is sufficient to verify these remarks. It will be seen that these points being first considered in reference to the Levitical priesthood in verses 8, 9, are then again brought forward, in reference to the priesthood of Christ, in verses 11, 12, 14. The words, "Christ being come, a high-priest * * * entered in once into the holy place," show, by implication, that we are to come to God in person, if we come at all; there is no alternative; for our high-priest is not on earth, to come between us and God here.

We will only add, in support of our interpretation, when the writer says that the Holy Spirit showed that the thing denoted by *πεφανερωσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν*, whatever it was, remained unaccomplished under the old dispensation, he evidently mentions this as showing the grand imperfection of the Levitical priesthood. And certainly the circumstance of coming to God in person or through a priest was, in itself, of very small moment compared with the moral preparation requisite to approach God acceptably at all; and, by itself, could hardly deserve the prominence here attached to the meaning of this phrase by the writer. But if the meaning of it does not include the idea of purification from sin, so as to appear before God with acceptance without the intervention of a priest, then it does not bring to view the chief imperfection of the Levitical priesthood, and seems to have no intimate connection with the following verses.

We are now prepared to examine, more directly, the

meaning of *τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς*, *first tabernacle*, that is, the outer one. The figurative meaning, *former dispensation*, expressed in this or other phraseology, is the one most usually given to these words by the best commentators. But to us there seem to be insuperable difficulties in giving any figurative meaning to them; which we will mention briefly, before attempting to vindicate the literal one.

1. There is nothing in the context, nor in these words themselves, to show what particular figurative meaning should be given to them, on the supposition that some one must be given; and hence the variety of meanings which different commentators have ascribed to them. But when, in order to give a word or phrase a figurative meaning, we must resort to conjecture, with no fixed principles respecting the use of figurative language to sustain us in our interpretation, we cannot expect to convince others of its correctness. Take the meaning "former dispensation," and inquire what there is in these words, or the context, which points out this meaning. We can see nothing. The assumption that *παραβολή* following means *typé*, has doubtless led interpreters to seek for some meaning of *τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς* more fit to point out something belonging to the Christian dispensation than the first tabernacle; but this point will be considered below. These words mean, literally, "a definite object," and are used to denote that object, in the preceding context; and there seems to be no more appropriateness attached to them, to denote, figuratively, "former dispensation," than there is to the words *priests*, *altar*, *sacrifice*, and many others. By what law of figurative language, then, are they supposed to mean "former dispensation" here? We know of none, especially as this meaning implies that an entirely new and distinct metaphor is here used. The most plausible figurative meaning which could be given them would be one naturally arising from supposing the metaphor contained in the preceding phrase to be continued through the verse, thus becoming an allegory, and making these words mean the obstacles then existing to personal access to God; but there is no evidence that the writer uses an allegory here; and

we shall see, in the sequel, evidence that he does not. For aught that we can see, one has just as good reason for maintaining that τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς means *Levitical priesthood, or Jewish sacrifices*, as "former dispensation;" for we are without any guide furnished by the text in either case.

2. The ἦτις which follows these words, is, in our view, strong if not sufficient proof, that no figurative meaning is to be given to them. Those who give them a figurative meaning, make ἦτις refer to this meaning for its antecedent; but it cannot do this grammatically, unless it be considered as drawn by attraction into the gender of παραβολή following; and then we find here τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς standing as the true antecedent of ἦτις, according to the common rules of syntax, but by an uncommon rule, not being the true antecedent. Such obscurity as this must necessarily occasion, is a sufficient proof that there is no attraction here; and, consequently, ἦτις refers to τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς in its literal sense for an antecedent.

3. If we give these words a figurative meaning, we make the writer say, that this figurative meaning is a παραβολή, that is, a figurative representation of something else; thus building figure upon figure, and making his language more resemble an enigma, than earnest didactic discourse. The declaration that the thing to which ἦτις refers for its antecedent is a παραβολή, is, in our view, sufficient proof by itself that this antecedent is not an abstract idea, like *dispensation*, nor a figurative meaning, but a sensible object; for only something cognizable by the senses is appropriate to make a symbolical representation of any religious truth.

While a figurative meaning of these words is beset with such difficulties, the literal meaning seems to harmonize, entirely, both with the preceding and the following context; thus showing that the first necessity for resorting to a figurative meaning is here wanting. The whole sentence, ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιω, must be translated: *while the first tabernacle still has a standing*; and in order to understand the connection which it has with the preceding verses, we must recollect that the outer tabernacle, and the

part of the court connected with it, constituted together the place where the priests performed all their official duties, and were thus inseparably associated together as the place appropriated to their services. In Ps. 27: 6 we read: "Therefore will I offer *in his tabernacle* sacrifices of joy; as though to offer sacrifices in the court, near the tabernacle, were to offer them in the tabernacle; both being viewed as one place; just as, in John 2: 14, the sellers of oxen, sheep, and doves, and the money-changers, are said to be in the temple (*ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*), while they occupied a place outside the three courts, all being viewed as one place, the temple. The first tabernacle having a standing, implied its being used; and, consequently, the services connected with it. For the writer does not say that the Holy Spirit would have shown the truth mentioned, if the tabernacle had stood desolate and neglected; its mere standing, in opposition to its falling to ruin, is not what he means; but its standing and being employed, as always, in the worship of God. The fundamental idea, therefore, contained in this sentence, may be expressed more fully in other words thus: *while all these services, just mentioned, still continue to be practised*; for the first tabernacle seems to be mentioned particularly because, in connection with it, all these services were performed which hindered that personal approach to God, and moral qualification for it, which the writer is considering. We see, therefore, that the literal meaning of *τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς* is appropriate and in entire harmony with the meaning of the preceding phrase.

We shall see a still further harmony of the literal meaning of these words with the preceding context, if we consider in what particular way the Holy Spirit showed, that the way into the holy-of-holies was not yet made manifest, while the first tabernacle still had a standing. Plainly it was by teaching Moses how to construct the tabernacle with its two apartments and sacred utensils, how to institute its services, and what prohibitions and restrictions to make, in respect to the entrance of the priests and people into it. Most of these particulars the writer mentions in the preceding

context. How natural, then, was it for him to say that the Holy Spirit continued to show that personal access to God, with the requisite purification from sin, had not yet been granted, *while the first tabernacle, with all its services, still held its position*, the very thing by which the Holy Spirit showed this truth. With this symbolical manner of teaching religious truth, the Jews were familiar, and quick to understand any particular instance of it; and therefore needed not that the writer should give any further explanations respecting it in this case.

We think that what has now been said is sufficient to show that the literal meaning of *τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς* harmonizes with the preceding context. It remains to show how it also agrees with the succeeding context, *ἥτις παραβολή εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα*.

The important word here is *παραβολή*, the meaning of which we must now endeavor to determine. Commentators have generally assumed that it means *type*. We must consider this to be a groundless assumption; and we will proceed directly to give our reasons.

1. We begin with an examination of the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament. This word is used in the New Testament just forty-nine times, besides the instance under consideration; and forty-four times it means *parable*, as any one may see by examination. In the remaining five instances, its meaning is very closely allied to its common meaning, as a reference to the passages will show. In Matt. 15: 15. Luke 4: 23 and 5: 36, it unquestionably means *proverb*. The parable and proverb are both obscure forms of speech, expressing but a part of their meaning, and leaving a part to be understood; and here it is easy to see why *παραβολή* should be used to mean *proverb* also. In the remaining two passages, Mark 4: 30, and Heb. 11: 19, *similitude* seems plainly to be the meaning of *παραβολή*; and since in every parable there is contained the idea of similitude between the cases or objects brought to view, it is easy to see how, in these passages this should be the principal idea denoted by this word. If a single passage could be pointed out, in

which *παραβολή* as plainly means *type* as it means *proverb* and similitude in these, there would be some good ground for giving it this meaning in the passage before us ; but until this can be done, or an exegetical necessity can be shown for giving it this meaning here, we must consider the assumption that it means *type* as groundless.

2. If we give the meaning of *type* to *παραβολή* in this passage, we thereby disturb the logical course of thought in it. In the preceding context, the writer speaks of the grand imperfection of the Levitical priesthood ; and in that which follows, of the inefficacy of the sacrifices offered by them, since it was from this that the imperfection of the priesthood arose. Now if he has here introduced the idea, that anything under the former dispensation is a type of anything belonging to the new one ; it is plain that this is a new subject, which seems out of place here ; for there is no evidence besides what this single word contains, that the writer had this subject at all in his mind when writing this passage.

3. On the supposition that *παραβολή* means *type* here, we attribute to the writer all the obscurity of an enigma ; for he has given us no key-word, nor any intimation whatever, by which we may understand what this alleged type is a type of ; and hence commentators have found ample scope for exercising their ingenuity or fancy respecting it. Bishop Bloomfield considers it a type “ of the entrance of the more excellent High-priest into heaven ; ” Dr. Robinson, a “ type of spiritual things in Christ ; ” and Mr. Barnes refers it to “ things which were more fully to be revealed at a future period.” The two latter objects seem, however, rather too indefinite to be pointed out by a type. The truth is, the moment we give to *παραβολή* the meaning of *type*, we are at sea without compass, or chart, or stars, to guide us. Where else is figurative language used, whether parable, allegory, or symbol, without any key furnished for understanding it, either in the context, or in the language itself ?

We think that these considerations make it evident, that, to give the meaning *type* to *παραβολή*, is to give it an unwarranted meaning, which cannot without force be brought

into harmony with the context, and which must stand as a sign, without any indication of the thing signified, having no guide but conjecture to show what this alleged type is a type of. We feel constrained, therefore, to reject entirely this meaning of *παραβολή*, by whatever great names it has been advocated, and to seek one not encumbered with this kind of difficulties.

It is plain that *proverb* or *similitude* is not the meaning of this word here; nor can it have precisely the common meaning *parable*, inasmuch as *ἡ πρώτη σκηνή*, that is, an object presented to the eye, is here called a *παραβολή*. This circumstance, however, does not require us to give a meaning to the word here very much differing from *parable*; for a parable may as well be exhibited to the eye in a picture, or by symbolical objects and actions, as addressed to the ear. We believe that a *parable exhibited to the eye*, teaching important moral truth like one addressed to the ear, is the meaning of *παραβολή* in this passage. We are necessarily led to this meaning, when we observe that in the preceding context the writer, in speaking of the tabernacle and its services, says that the Holy Spirit showed that the way into the holy-of-holies had not yet been made manifest, and inquire how the Holy Spirit showed this; for we see at once that the writer is here expressly bringing to view instructions of the Holy Spirit, conveyed in a symbolical manner by means of the tabernacle and its services, inasmuch as they were arranged according to the dictations of the Holy Spirit. For it cannot be denied, that the instruction here mentioned was communicated quite as much by what was exhibited to the eye by means of the tabernacle and its services, as by the directions and prohibitions connected with these services. How natural, then, for the writer to continue to speak of this symbolical instruction given by the Holy Spirit, and say respecting the first tabernacle, that it is a *παραβολή*, being as it was the most prominent object standing in the place where the priests officiated, and, together with the services performed in it and in the court near it, forming the grand barrier to that personal access to God which he had

just mentioned; for in saying this he only presents the principal object, by means of which the instruction about which he is speaking was communicated. By calling it a *παραβολή*, he means to say, that in connection with its services it presented to the eye symbolically the truth, that personal access to God with the requisite purification from sin was not granted under the former dispensation; the preceding context plainly affording the key to this meaning of *παραβολή*, and showing of what it was a symbolical representation. *ἥτις παραβολή* may therefore be paraphrased: *which is a symbolical representation of the truth just mentioned*. This interpretation, making the first tabernacle a symbolical representation of the truth, that personal access to God with the requisite purification from sin had not been granted, shows the intimate connection of the latter part of verse 9, *καθ' ὃν.... λατρεύοντα*, with the preceding context; since it was through the offering of the gifts and sacrifices here mentioned, all which was performed in the first tabernacle and the court connected with it, that the Holy Spirit showed this truth. As the manifestation of important moral truth is inseparable from the parable, so we see it belongs to the meaning of *παραβολή* here; the only difference in its meaning here from its common meaning, parable, being that here the instruction is conveyed through the eye, and not as ordinarily through the ear.

The meaning which we have here given to this word well accords with the succeeding phrase, *εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα*, which must be translated, *to the present time*. That *εἰς* with words denoting time has this meaning, is evident from such examples as Mark 13: 13, and Acts 4: 3. Bishop Bloomfield and Prof. Stuart so translate it here. As the services of the temple were still continued at the time when this epistle was written; and as the writer, in mentioning the two apartments of the tabernacle and the sacred utensils contained in them, in vs. 2—5, had carried the minds of his readers back to ancient time; he here says *εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα*, in order to show that the Holy Spirit continued the instruction under consideration from that ancient

time to the time then present ; although the tabernacle, its sacred utensils, and the mercy-seat, and even the first temple, had perished, and the true Messiah had actually come ; and the declaration was peculiarly forcible to them, because this instruction was set before them by what their own eyes saw.

ARTICLE III.

THE MOSAIC SIX DAYS AND GEÖLOGY.

By Professor E. P. Barrows, Andover.

In pursuance of our plan, as indicated in a previous Article, we now proceed to consider the Mosaic narrative of the creation in its relations to the science of Geology. They who regard the narrative as a *religious myth* escape, at once, the whole difficulty ; but, in doing this, they destroy the historic basis of revealed religion, and involve themselves in infinitely graver difficulties. If the account of the six days' work of creation is a myth, then the ground upon which the decalogue places the rest of the Sabbath is mythical ; in other words, it is no ground at all ; whence the inference naturally follows, that the decalogue itself is of human origin, and the authority of the Pentateuch a nullity. But still further (since we cannot, upon any fair principle of interpretation, make part of the narrative contained in the first three chapters of Genesis mythical and part historic), if the record of the six days' work of creation is mythical, then the contents of the two following chapters are mythical also. Whence it follows, that our Saviour's argument for the perpetuity of the marriage relation,¹ rests upon the sandy foundation of a human myth, although he plainly appeals to the primitive

¹ Matt. 19: 3—6. Mark 10: 2—9.