

purposes of the people to whom they belong, and are only interesting as they show what those minds, and characters, and purposes were. In like manner, theological critics are throwing away valuable effort over the facts supposed to underlie the origin of Christianity. They forget the simile of the grain of mustard-seed to which the kingdom of heaven was compared by Christ himself; and they seek for the living in the dead. They sift the Gospel to separate the true from the false. They desire to ascertain precisely the events which occurred in Palestine eighteen or nineteen centuries ago; and such events as survive the process, and can be accepted after passing through the critical crucible, will be but ash or charred cinders. The truth, as it was, can never be discovered. The historical inquirer can look only through the eyes of the early Christian writers; and those writers neither saw as he sees, nor judged as he judges. The historical inquirer sees with the eye of reason; the early Christian saw with the eye of faith. The historical inquirer is impartial; the early Christian was enthusiastic and prepossessed. The historical inquirer demands evidence such as would satisfy a British jury in a criminal case; to the early Christian the life, and death, and resurrection of Christ were their own evidence, each detail of