

second century requires to be accounted for if their genuineness is denied." If later writers palmed off their own compositions and forged apostolic names, why should one Gospel have been ascribed to the obscure Matthew, about all we know of whom is that he was a despised and hated publican? And why should Mark and Luke, neither of whom was an apostle, have been pitched upon as the authors of two of the narratives, if later writers were palming off their own works? John's authorship of the Fourth Gospel had never been questioned in the time of Eusebius the historian, except by an insignificant heretical sect. It bears the marks of being the autobiographic record of a profound and affectionate soul who had come to believe, and who desired others to believe in the supernatural nature of the Messiah. It is because John's testimony, if acknowledged to be his, is so powerful in establishing the Deity of his Master and the celestial authority of His mission, that the anti-supernaturalists have, in the last fifty years, so violently assailed the Fourth Gospel. But after such defences of its Johannine authorship as those of Weiss, Meyer, Godet, Lightfoot, Ezra Abbott, Westcott, and a score of others, there is every reason to believe that the author was a Christian of Jewish origin, that he was a Jew of Palestine, that he was a contemporary of Jesus, that he was an eye-witness of what he recorded, that he was the disciple whom Jesus loved—in other words, that he was John, the son of Zebedee.

3. Our faith in the Gospels is augmented by the fact that we have a *fourfold* record of the life of Jesus. Each Gospel is different from the others, Matthew apparently written for the Jews, to show that Christ is the Messiah of the Old Testament; Mark, written, as it would seem, for the Romans, and, as the ancient writers unanimously testify, under the direction of Peter, to show in a vivid way Christ in action as the strong Son of God; Luke, written, it would seem, for the Greeks, under the direction of Paul, to show the universality, the mercifulness, and the peculiar tenderness of the grace of Christ and of His teaching; and John, apparently written for all Christians, to show that Jesus is One with the Father. And yet, though different, the peculiarities of each are found in some measure in all the others. The divinity of Christ is not taught by John alone, nor the graciousness and universality of His Gospel by Luke alone. The discrepancies between them forbid the theory of collusion and fraud, and tend to strengthen the conviction of the candor and faithfulness of the men who wrote of what they saw and believed. With so many gaps in the Gospel record, it may not be possible, and it is certainly not necessary, to show a perfect agreement. The careful reading of the four narratives gives the feeling that the variations confirm, rather than weaken, the total impression of reality and of faithfulness to the essential truth.

4. The evidence of the four evangelists is further strengthened by the important testimony of the Apostle Paul. Besides the Gospels we have, in confirmation of the evangelic narratives, the four undisputed Pauline epistles, Galatians, Romans, and First and Second Corinthians. The