The Accidental Finding of a Second Writer; Daniel E Bourque

Why the **New Revised COLLECTIVE GOSPEL OF JESUS** © 2010 and 2013 is so **Unique** and so **Forthright**. Believe it or not, there was more to the story.

(Section of Part I in <u>Preface</u> from second publication mentioned <u>above</u> and included in <u>Fabulous Discoveries About Jesus' Teachings</u>, © 2018.)

Since the first three are synoptic in nature, they were shuffled in together first. (Shuffled; the same way you would shuffle three decks of cards. You usually don't break up the cards, you keep them whole, but arrange them according to their combined evidence.) Duplicated episodes were also narrowed down, if or where possible. This effort enabled the use of all three synoptic Gospels without bumping over each other. Once that was accomplished, a profile of Jesus' style and focus became fairly visible, almost as though you could see him right in front of you. But now when the supposed shuffling of John's Gospel came into play, it kept insisting to upset that profile, as though John was portraying someone else. His work kept presenting a <u>dual</u> personality. However, a thought came to mind.

Hoping not to leave John's efforts out of the research, all parts that did not pervert the wholeness of the first three were included. When the sections that <u>could</u> be used were finally <u>exhausted</u>, was when the <u>3rd</u> discovery was realized. As the experiment was being conducted, it *innocently* unmasked two different writing styles, John's work and someone else's. The parts not used were noticeably damaging to his personal profile, (that of *glorifying himself*), of which the other writings illustrated the opposite, one of a *humbling* quality.

Not wanting to take this observation on assumption, research was done to find any credibility to this supposed find. It was learned that it was not <u>unknown</u> there was more than one writer involved in John's Gospel. It's been noted already by creditable theologians and scholars alike among the Bible's historical information regarding its own separate writings, as in the NAB and encyclopedic references as well under, 'John; Gospel According to'. This heading forces the records to <u>confirm</u> that the forth Gospel was indeed written by John. (If you go on line, you'll need to look it up in the Encyclopedias directly; otherwise you get 'Gospel according to John').

The second writer, (perhaps a follower of John, the most widely agreed theory), attempts to magnify who Jesus was, such as 'No one comes to the Father but through me', or 'Behold the Lamb of God'. (In the synoptics, the Baptism of Jesus is described in full detail. In John's gospel, a baptism isn't even

mentioned). Though these remarks themselves may be true, many were <u>not</u> fully realized until <u>after</u> his crucifixion. It wasn't until then that his real identity was truly understood. By inserting these declarations ahead of time in the story as personal claims, his <u>wise</u> and <u>subtle</u> approach <u>unfortunately</u> gets obscured or almost <u>erased</u>. The portions that <u>were</u> salvaged from John's work however, proved out to be most <u>invaluable</u>. Eventually a complete Collective Gospel compilation finally settled down with a profile that all four Gospels could jointly agree.

References of John's gospel *incorporating* two writers;

Excerpt of intro to John's Gospel in New American Bible © 1970-2010;

Critical analysis makes it difficult to accept the idea that the gospel as it now stands was written by one person. Jn 21 seems to have been added after the gospel was completed; it exhibits a Greek style somewhat different from that of the rest of the work. The prologue (Jn 1:1–18) apparently contains an independent hymn, subsequently adapted to serve as a preface to the gospel. Within the gospel itself there are also some inconsistencies, e.g., there are two endings of Jesus' discourse in the upper room (Jn 14:31; 18:1). To solve these problems, scholars have proposed various rearrangements that would produce a smoother order. However, most have come to the conclusion that the inconsistencies were probably produced by subsequent editing in which homogeneous materials were added to a shorter original.

John. Gospel according to; Vol 16, Encyclopedia Americana, ©1985

Certain inconsistencies in John cause many scholars to posit more than one writing hand_for example, an ending of the public ministry in 10:40-42 and another in 12:36-43; two endings of the farewell discourse in14:31 and 18:1; an ending of the Gospel in 20:30-31, followed, surprisingly, by the additional chapter 21. Plausibly, after the Evangelist had composed a substantial work, additions were made by a redactor whose theological view was somewhat different. Thus, the main Gospel, the Epistles of John, and the redaction of the Gospel (in that order) may represent 10 to 15 years of productivity by a Johannine school of writers_the "we" of John 21:24 (I John 1:1, 3).

John; Gospel according to; Encyclopedia Britannica; © 2012

fourth of the four New Testament narratives recounting the life and death of Jesus Christ; John's is the only one of the four not considered among the <u>Synoptic Gospels</u> (*i.e.*, those presenting a common view). Although the Gospel is ostensibly written by John, "the beloved disciple" of Jesus, there has been considerable discussion of the actual identity of the author. The language of the Gospel and its well-developed theology suggest that the author may have lived later than John and based his writing on John's teachings and testimonies. Moreover, the facts that several episodes in the life of Jesus are recounted out of sequence with the Synoptics and the final chapter appears to be a later addition suggest that the text may be a composite. The Gospel's place and date of composition are also uncertain; many scholars suggest that it was written at Ephesus, in Asia Minor, in about AD 100 for the purpose of communicating the truths about Christ to Christians of Hellenistic background.