

occurrences at the sea.' This is, as I think, probable, as 'the disciple' had been specially mentioned before only in connection with the explanation respecting the rumor, and because the original document required no such sanction, it having been already accredited by the Church. If the facts were as supposed, 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' by necessary implication, is identified with the author of the Gospel, as fully as if the 'things' of verse 14 meant the original document together with the appendix. The style of the attestation, reminding of John 12, — used perhaps as an exemplar — is not opposed to my hypothesis of interpretation. As to who wrote the last verse of the last chapter, that is, as it seems to me a question of no importance, as the 30th verse of chap. xx had previously expressed, in substance, all that the redundant verse in question contains.

"The harmonious completeness that the whole document, apart from the supplement, presents, in respect of the introduction compared with the close, would strongly sway my mind to a belief of the Johannean authorship.

"The assumed author — John, and he *alone* of all the evangelists — wrote of Christ, in this Gospel, first, *that he was bound* before he was brought to ~~judge~~; second, *that he was made to bear his cross*, on the way to the place of crucifixion; and both, *without reference to any antecedents*. Read with this that part of our narrative which is found in Gen. xxii. 6, 9; asking, if the harmony — unnoticed by the writer — which is presented by a comparison of the old Scripture with the Gospel in question, suggests *forgery*, or genuineness, in relation to the latter.

"If you, pursuing a course of reasoning suggested by yourself, will gather and weigh all that history, contemporary and future, sacred and profane, tells us, bearing on what is related in the Christian documents concerning '*the resurrection of our Lord*,' including the report of what Christ's followers did and suffered on the faith of the doctrine; and will consider, also, the historical fact of the influence which the name of Christ has exercised, and is exercising, on the opinions, conduct and

be reached before the Fourth Gospel was written. It is impossible that the reference in verse 24 can be to the victim of Herod. Acts xii. 1, 2. Therefore, assuming the trifle alternative, the reference in v. v. 20, 24 must be to S. John. Cf. Matt. x. 2; John xix. 26, 27; Rev. i. 2.

John xix. 25

Caiaphas