

ture of our Lord more in accordance with the habits and wants of men in our day.

This diversity of witnesses subserves other important ends. No single man could have represented all sides of the Saviour's teaching. A comparison of Matthew's Gospel with that of John will show how much would have been lost, had there been only a single collector and reporter of Christ's discourses.

It is not easy, even for one trained to investigation, to gather out of the four Evangelists a clear and consistent narrative of our Lord's ministry; and still less will unstudious men succeed in doing it.

No one will deny that every Christian man should seek a comprehensive, and not a fragmentary, knowledge of his Lord. In other words, every Christian reader seeks, for himself, out of the other four, to weave a fifth life of Christ. Why should not this indispensable work be performed for men, with all the aids of elaborate investigation?

2. The impression derived from this general view is greatly strengthened by a critical examination of the contents of the Gospels.

It is one of the striking facts in history, that One whose teachings were to revolutionize human ideas, and to create a new era in the world's affairs, did not commit a single syllable to paper, and did not organize a single institution. An unlimited power of acting upon the world without these subsidiary and, to men, indispensable instruments,—viz. writing and organization,—and only by the enunciation of absolute truths in their relation to human conduct, is one of the marks of Divinity.

There is no evidence that Jesus appointed any of his