

or what He did. It ~~produces~~ reduces the gospels actually to just a group of ancient legends from which very ~~little~~ little of true facts can ~~g~~ be gathered. This is utterly ~~contrary~~ to the attitude that Christians have taken all through the ~~sk~~ ages and it is something ~~sk~~ which is utterly contrary to the attitude which German scholarship has taken in all other fields , except the field of ~~Biblical~~ studies. It ~~is~~ is the taking o f the German Higher Criticism and presenting it to the American public ~~as~~ as if it were something new and something that true scholars accept. Even in ~~this~~ the course ~~of~~ of this article there is a statement on page 91 in the third column ~~that~~ --"the Christ myth had a considerable vogue ~~among the mid~~ during the mid-nineteenth century, especially in France. A Frenchman also supplied its most ~~sk~~ effective rebuttal by using the methods of ~~hy~~ historical criticism to prove that Napolion had never existed and was the product of a Napolion myth~~k~~. Yet what ~~this~~ article amounts to ~~princ~~ principally is ~~reduc~~ reducing Jesus Christ to a myth and ~~sk~~ saying ~~we~~ that we know ~~practi~~ practically nothing about him.

The actual evidences that are presented in which to do this thing are very slim indeed. It is denied ~~that~~ that Matt. wrote his gospel , but no real proof is given of it. It is denied ~~that~~ that John wrote the gospel ~~sk~~ because the tone of the gospel is so different from the gospels of Matt. Mark and Luke. Yet, when we consider that the gospels of Matt. , Mark, and Luke were written very early in the history of the Christian Church, and were written to present Jesus to the Greeks, the Romans, and the Jews, and the Gospel of John was written ~~for~~ ^{for} the Christians to give them the inner discourses that Jesus gave to His disciples, we naturally find a different tone in them. There is nothing in the Gospel ~~in~~ of