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 supposed waut of accurate information with regard to the geography   
 and customs of Judea. But again, the passages cited to support this   
 involve only geographical and archzological dificulties, such as would   
 never have been raised by an impostor ;—and one in particular (ch. vii.   
 52: sce note there) is chargeable, not on the Evangelist, but on the   
 Sanhedrim, who were likely enough to have made the mistake, or pur-   
 posely overlooked the fact, in their proud spirit of contempt for Galilee.   
 The other objections derived from internal considerations are hardly   
 worth recounting. They are fully stated and answered by Liicke.   
 12. An hypothesis was advanced by Eckermann, Vigel, and Paulus,   
 and brought to completeness by Weisse, founded on a compromise   
 hetween the evidence for and against the Gospel: that it is partly   
 genuine, and principally in the didactie portions, which are veritable   
 notices from the Apostle John: but that a later hand has wrought   
 upon these, and added most of the narrative portions. But first, eccle-   
 siastical tradition gives no countenance to this, always citing the Gospel   
 as a whole,—and dropping no hint of any such distinction between its   
 parts ;—and secondly, it is quite impossible to draw any line in the   
 Gospel itself which shall separate the original matter from the supposed   
 additions. There certainly is a marked distinction in diction and style   
 between the rest of the Gospel and ch. xxi. (of ch. vii. 53—viii. 12, I do   
 not now speak ; see notes there):—which I believe to be accounted for   
 by that chapter being a later addition by the Author himself: but farther   
 than this, no such distinction can, even by the most fanciful analogies,   
 be established. The same spirit pervades the form of the narrative and   
 didactic parts: and so strongly, that the impugners of the Gospel have   
 made this very circumstance an argument against the authenticity of the   
 latter ;—how unjustly, I have shewn above in § ii.:—but the fact of the   
 objection having been made is important, as fatal to Weisse’s hypothesis.   
 13. The principal arguments, against the genuineness of the Gospel   
 have been repeated and elaborated by Baur, who tries to shew that the   
 whole is apocryphal,—and has arisen from a pious fraud of an author in   
 the latter part of the second century. I mention this attempt because   
 an admirable answer to it has appeared, by Ebrard. In this work he   
 has gone over carefully all the arguments treated in the preceding   
 sections, and shewn their entire untenableness. Luthardt also, in tho   
 work above referred to, has treated at length of the view of Baur and   
 his school.   
 14. Our conclusion then from internal as well as external evidence,   
 must be that the Gospel is what it has generally been believed to be,—   
 the genuine work of the Apostle John. And this result has been ob-   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 Apostles from the historic field view. It is very unlikely that John would have in-   
 troduced mention of him merely because he was his brother. He has not named   
 several others of the Apostles. See ch. xxi, 2, and note.   
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