

the second, yet the second contains sentences not included in the first. As one who has devoted his life to the task of summarizing speeches, and can speak with a practical experience not possessed by any critical scholar, who spends his time among books, I am entitled to the opinion that these are vivid and nervous accounts, of a real utterance, by a real Teacher—the very variations showing that we have here, not error or carelessness, but the corroboration of more than one witness. And when I am told by German critics that our Lord could not have uttered the discourses set out in the Fourth Gospel, I appeal once more to my own experience. I have been writing some anonymous articles which aroused curiosity. Not only have my friends decided, on internal evidence as it is called, that I did not write them, but I have heard already of one person, of high literary attainments, who does not deny that he is the author. If one considers how literature is actually produced, one becomes profoundly skeptical of what are called the results of modern research. The “proof” is often merely hypothesis, and the hypotheses vary, like the fashions.

Our Lord did not inscribe a Koran, to be learnt by rote and transcribed from parchment to parchment, like some Abracadabra. When He said that we must worship the Father in spirit and in truth, His only audience was an erring Samaritan woman, to whose good faith He trusted with an implicitness which was vindicated by one of the most dramatic and moving dialogues ever incorporated in biography. For this reason, we read the Gospels—not as Wordsworth is read, in selections, because all have been preserved—but as a whole, because all have been sifted, arranged,