

tians began to look upon Jews as types of malignity and murderers of the Son of God.

So widely different in all respects is the portraiture of Jesus in this gospel from what it is in the other three, that it becomes necessary, even on this ground, to suppose a considerable intervening lapse of time before the writing of the Fourth Gospel, as well as a Gentile authorship. There is no doubt that the writer wishes us to think him the Apostle John, though he nowhere distinctly says that he is the Apostle. He avers that he is a witness of what he relates and that his testimony is true.\* But the evidence of a witness who withholds his name is not highly esteemed in court though he swear by all the gods. Especially if the witness does not personally appear, but submits his testimony in writing, is it essential to have his unmistakable signature. There are the strongest reasons for supposing this to be the work of a writer in the latter half of the second century, who desired to have it pass as by the Apostle John. Two important ends were to be gained by this transfer of authorship.

A high degree of authority would be at once secured to the book, and the reputation of the apostle would be saved from the imputation of Jewish narrowness which his only book, the Apocalypse, and the references to him in Paul's epistles were sure to fasten upon him. As for the moral obliquity of writing in the name of another and more famous person, as I have repeatedly said, the Bible writers do not appear to have recognised it. By

\* xix. 35 ; xxi. 24.