

ries of experience? Has this world no lore of love, no stores of faith, no experience of joy unfolded from the original germs, which shall fit it to go back to the truths of the New Testament with a far larger understanding of their contents than *they* had who wrote them? Prophets do not always understand their own visions; Apostles deliver truths which are far deeper, and more glorious in their ulterior forms, than even their utterers suspect.

It is both a privilege and a duty of the Church of Christ to gather up, from time to time, these living commentaries upon divine truth,—these divine interpretations, by means of human experience, of the truth as it is in Jesus,—and carry back this light and knowledge to the primal forms and symbols. Our Lord himself declared that his kingdom of truth was as a seed. But what shall interpret a seed like its own growth and harvest? To us the narratives of the Gospel ought to mean far more than to the primitive disciple, or they have been germs without development, seed without a harvest.

All critics of the Gospels, though, in each group, differing by many shades among themselves, may be reduced to two classes:—

1. Those who believe that the writings of the Evangelists are authentic historical documents, that they were divinely inspired, and that the supernatural elements contained in them are real, and to be credited as much as any other parts of the history; and,—

2. Those who deny the inspiration of the Gospels, regarding them as unassisted human productions, filled with mistakes and inaccuracies; especially, as filled with superstitions and pretended miracles.