

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

demands belief in doctrines rather than a good life, or teaches men to neglect the duties of this world in order to secure bliss in the world to come, and so makes selfishness rather than love its prime motive, or that it condemns the vast majority of men to an endless torment ; they shirk the real difficulties of the problem, evade the best and most advanced statement of the Christian hypothesis, and, in fine, behave themselves as foolishly as would the theologian or divine who should refute the scientific hypothesis in vogue a century ago, and pass by the science of to-day.

ALMONI PELONI.

---

*DOUBLE PICTURES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL  
AND THE APOCALYPSE.*

WE propose in this, and at least another paper of a similar kind, to speak of one of those peculiarities in their manner of thought which seem to distinguish the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse among all the other books of the New Testament. Our object is partly critical, for it will be found that our conclusions, if correct, exercise a most vital influence upon the interpretation of many important passages of both these books, especially of the latter of the two. But, while partly critical, it is mainly apologetic. The enquiry ought to throw at least some measure of light upon the great question, by no means as yet settled, whether the two books, notwithstanding all their differences, really proceeded from the same pen. This question is of the deepest interest, not merely in a Biblical, but also in a more strictly theological, point of view. While it has the closest possible bearing upon many difficult and delicate considerations relating to the principles upon which the canonicity of our New Testament books in general is to

be determined, it bears not less directly upon a still weightier question, the interpretation and construction of our whole Christian faith. Let it be established that the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse are the work of the same writer, and it will be impossible to resist the conclusion that the substance of those Christian doctrines which have been received in the Church of Christ through all ages of her history, is connected immediately with the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. The evidence for the Johannine origin of the Apocalypse is, as every one knows, so strong that very few indeed are able to resist it. Were the writer of the Apocalypse and the writer of the Gospel one, then the latter as well as the former proceeded from the most intimate, if not also the most attached, of the Apostles of our Lord. We shall have only further to combine with this the other characteristics of the Gospel in order to feel justified in the inference that it must express to us the mind of Christ. The Christianity which the Church professes—a Christianity so largely moulded by the writings of St. John—will be seen to be the Christianity of Him in whom we recognize a Divine Master, and not of any mystical manipulator of the simpler ideas of Jesus. This circumstance alone is enough to lend ever fresh interest to enquiries as to identity of authorship in the case of the two books of which we speak. No student, however often he may be tired of apologetics, will complain that his attention should be again and again called to an investigation involving such momentous issues.

Again, it will probably be admitted that, in comparing two books with such a purpose as that now before us, the *manner of thought* which marks the writer of each is worthy of peculiar regard. "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he." We may adopt these words to give expression to what all will readily allow, that what a man is will find unusually distinct utterance in the *mode* in which he

presents his thoughts. His mere language indeed, his mere *delectus verborum*, may frequently in no small degree guide us to a determination upon the point. Words are valuable as the expression of thought, and it may be expected that when a man is sincere, simple-minded, and straightforward, he will utter the same thought in the same language. The inference, therefore, is not unfair that, when two writings which we are comparing with one another exhibit great diversity in the choice of words, even when speaking of the same thing, they in all probability proceeded from different authors. No doubt such an inference may easily be too hasty. The same object does not always strike the same person in precisely the same light. The difference may require him to speak differently of it at different times. The object may grow upon him; he may be brought into new relations with it; his views of it may change; his vocabulary may become copious and more accurate by long familiarity with what has deeply interested him. All these considerations require to be kept in view when we would argue from the difference of many words in two treatises—say two Epistles of the New Testament or two passages of the same Gospel—that they cannot have been penned by the same writer. In the main, however, arguments of this kind drawn from the use of words are valid. Sameness in the use of words, especially characteristic words, is a proof of identity, difference is a proof of non-identity, of authorship. But the argument from the use of words, if valid when fairly conducted, seems to possess far greater validity when we turn from the words themselves to the form into which they are cast, or the manner which they display when uttered. A man may change his thoughts, and therefore the words in which he utters them; he is not so likely to change the mould or framework within which all his thinking is conducted. That becomes like his walk, or like the tones, as distinguished from the words, of his voice.

He may walk faster or slower ; he may speak more loudly or more softly ; it matters not ; we recognize him at once, and that even at a distance. However great his transition from one set of ideas to another, the fashion in which he presents them both to himself and others will most probably continue to be the same. In this sense we may put new wine into old bottles without the bottles perishing or the wine being spilled. It will be seen that the double pictures of which we are about to speak deal only in the first instance with *form*. Conclusions as to meaning are inferential.

One other preliminary remark may be made. There seems to have been something in the mode of thinking which characterized the Hebrew mind that may prepare us for the observations to be made in these papers. By "double pictures" is meant expressing the same thing, or nearly the same thing, twice over, the second expression being at the same time climactic to the first. The speaker or writer is not satisfied with one utterance of his thought. After he has spoken it for the first time, he brings it again before him, works upon it, enlarges it, deepens it, sets it forth in stronger and more vivid colours. Yet it is the same thought. It is only now the centre of a circle of still wider circumference, or it is spoken in a more impressive manner than before. The whole system of Hebrew parallelism may probably be regarded as an illustration of this principle, although the element of climax may not be always present. The simple repetition of the thought lends it force, and brings it home more powerfully to the mind. Instead, however, of dwelling upon this, let us rather look for a moment at a simple narrative from the earliest times of the Old Testament, in which it is impossible to mistake the operation of the principle to which we are referring. In Chap. xli. of the Book of Genesis the two dreams of Pharaoh are related, the one of the seven fat and the seven

lean kine, the other of the seven full and the seven blasted ears of corn. Joseph gives the interpretation; and then adds, "And for that the dream was doubled unto Pharaoh twice, it is because the thing is established by God, and God will shortly bring it to pass" (Gen. xli. 32). The doubling of the dream was felt to give it a force and certainty which it might not otherwise have possessed. The same observation, though not made in the sacred text, may without hesitation be applied to the two earlier dreams of Joseph himself in Chapter xxxvii. of the same book. Such then was the effect upon a Jew of the repetition of any act or thought; and hence the words of the Psalmist, "God hath spoken once, yea *twice* have I heard this, that power belongeth unto God" (Ps. lxii. 12).

If we now turn to the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse we shall find that, letting alone in the meantime passages marked by the repetition of the same thought in its double and climactic form, the writer of each of these books gives distinct indication of his sense of the importance attaching to a deed performed, or a word spoken, twice instead of only once. Thus in John iv. 54 we read in the Authorised Version, at the close of the narrative of the healing of the nobleman's son, "This is again the second miracle that Jesus did when He was come out of Judea into Galilee." The Revisers render in substantially the same way, only replacing the word "miracle" by the more correct translation "sign." It may be doubted if either of these two renderings gives the exact idea of the Evangelist. Let the reader turn to the original, and he will see that it ought to be translated, "This Jesus again did, as a second sign, having come out of Judea into Galilee." The order of the words is remarkable, and no student of the style of the Fourth Gospel will for a moment doubt that it is intentional. Nor is it difficult to explain the intention. It appears from various earlier passages of the Gospel, from

Chap. i. 44, the object of which is to make it clear that the three disciples mentioned were Galileans; from Chap. ii. 1, where Cana is said to be "of Galilee," not because these last words were a part of the name, but because it was desirable to give the province of "Galilee" a special prominence; and from Chap. iv. 43-45, where so much is said of this province and its inhabitants, that St. John regarded it as a point of peculiar importance to bring out the connexion of Jesus with Galilee. Historically Christ's "own country" was Judea, but from the first his mission was not to be confined to it. He might at the outset of his course be manifested there; but Judea was the land of "the Jews," the hard, stubborn, stiff-necked, and carnally-minded Jews, who steeled themselves against the revelation of the Saviour's glory. Not in it, therefore, was He to find his chosen followers, or to set forth the first great aspects of his kingdom in the "signs" which He performed, but in despised Galilee, that district of the country from which it was supposed that no prophet could proceed (Chap. vii. 52). Hence the first "sign" related of Jesus is that of turning water into wine in Cana of Galilee. Hence, still more, the confirmation of one at least of the great lessons which that sign conveyed by the relation of a second "sign" there performed in the healing of the nobleman's son. It is the fact that it is a "second sign" that lends it such peculiar weight for the Apostle's purpose; and therefore it is that he says, with an arrangement of his words hardly admitting of any other interpretation than that which we have given, "This Jesus again did, as a second sign." The whole clause is moulded by the thought of the great weight to be attached to the repetition of an act. An illustration of the same kind meets us in the Apocalypse, chap. xix. 3. The voice of much people in heaven has been heard in Verses i. 2, celebrating the fall of Babylon with a "Hallelujah" and

song of praise. At the close of the song it is added in the Authorised Version, "And again they said, Alleluia." The Revisers have here rendered much more correctly, "And a second time they say, Hallelujah." The thought of the cry being heard "a second time" is that which makes it so powerful to the mind of the seer. How must heaven have been stirred by emotions of the profoundest and most enthusiastic joy when not once only but "a second time" its inhabitants cried "Hallelujah"!

To the two illustrations now given of the point before us others might be added, but these are sufficient for our purpose. It will be observed that they are not instances of what may be properly termed "double pictures." There is no double presentation of the same thought, the second presentation being in climax to the first. What we chiefly mark is that sense of the importance of a "second" presentation which prepares the way for a further elucidation of the subject. We obtain admission in each case into the inner chamber of the writer's mind. We see a certain mould and fashion of things of which he feels the value.

We may now take a further step, and we shall find the writers of both the Gospel and the Apocalypse giving us illustrations in short passages, hardly to be called double pictures, of that style of thought of which we speak.

Thus in the very opening of the Gospel we read, "All things were made by Him." The thought is complete: nothing more need be said. But it is not enough for the Evangelist, who adds, as he looks at it again from another point of view, "And without Him was not anything made" (John i. 3). The second of these clauses also, it will be noticed, is even more exclusive than the first; or, if this be not allowed, it will at least be readily granted that the combination of the two lends peculiar vividness and emphasis to what the Evangelist intended to express. Coming



a little further down the same chapter we read, "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not." The thought is again complete. The sad rejection of Jesus by the world is too clear to need further dwelling on it. But the Evangelist is not satisfied. He looks therefore again at the relation of Jesus to man (whether the world or Israel we shall not enquire) in a deeper and tenderer light, and he adds, "He came unto the things that were his own, and they that were his own accepted Him not" (John i. 10, 11). There will probably be no hesitation in allowing that the thought of the two verses is substantially the same. Yet the rejection of Jesus in the second case is set before us in a much more pathetic light than in the first. Instead of "the world" we have now "his own;" instead of "was in" we have "came unto;" instead of "knew" we have "accepted." There is here, therefore, not only the same thought twice, but the repetition of it is climactic to its first utterance. The same general structure may be traced in such expressions as "He confessed and denied not;" "He answered and said;" "We speak that we do know, and bear witness of what we have seen," in all of which climax is observable. "Confession" may be made in any circumstances, amidst friends as well as foes, in times of ease as well as times of trouble; "denying not" belongs to the prophet's task when the world that rejects his message would fain close his mouth. To "answer" embodies the general idea of reply; to "say" gives the words that are used. Any one who knows may "speak;" he only who has a commission entrusted to him, and who is responsible for its discharge, "bears witness."

We take next an instance from the Apocalypse. In Chap. xi. 18 of that book we read, "And the nations were wroth, and Thy wrath came, and the time of the dead to be judged and *the time* to give their reward to thy

servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, the small and the great, and to destroy them that destroy the earth." It would lead us away from our present object were we to spend time in enquiring into the general relation of these clauses to one another. We deal only with the two "the saints" and "they that fear God." These do not seem to be two different classes; they are in reality one class, though they are beheld by the seer in two aspects, the one taken from the sphere of Jewish, the other from that of Gentile, thought. "Saints," or consecrated ones, was the name for all true Israelites, members of that community which the Almighty had separated to Himself as a "holy people." "They that fear God" was, as we see in the Acts of the Apostles, the appellation constantly applied to Gentile proselytes. No distinction is drawn here between a Jewish and a Gentile portion of the Church. Both classes are really one; but they may be, and they are, viewed under a double aspect. On the one hand they are God's true Israel; on the other hand they are those whom He has redeemed out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation. This latter circumstance also constitutes the climax in the words; and it will be found that, in the interpretation of the Apocalypse, there is constant occasion to make use of the idea of climax proceeding from one step to another of a similar kind. The failure, indeed, to notice the principle of structure illustrated by the words before us has lain at the root of not a few serious mistakes in the interpretation of that book. It seems to be a main explanation of the fact, that so many commentators have been led to regard it as a book pervaded by a narrow and Judaic spirit instead of a spirit of the freest and most generous universalism.

With these remarks, in a great measure preliminary, we may now turn to some of the double pictures presented to us in our two books; and, in doing so, we have only to

request our readers to take two general considerations along with them. In the first place, they will not suppose that historical facts are either invented or changed, in order that the Evangelist may obtain an opportunity of gratifying his own structural tastes. Some facts are only selected by him from a vast multitude of others left unnoticed, because they seem best adapted to the mode of grouping which he loves, —partly, it may be, from a kind of natural inclination to it ; partly, because it appears to him that he finds in it a more powerful expression than he could otherwise obtain for the conception that fills his mind. In the second place, the force of the argument depends upon the combination of all the particulars on which it rests, and not upon any one of them taken singly. A single passage would prove little or nothing. But if consistency and clearness are given to many passages by the application of the hypothesis with which we start, if difficulties are removed, and if the introduction of little particulars into a narrative receives an explanation which it would otherwise be hard to supply, then we shall surely be entitled to conclude that the hypothesis is sound.

We begin with the Fourth Gospel, and with an incident related in the first chapter.

Most readers of that chapter must have been struck with the facts related in Verses 29, 35, 36. In the first of these verses we are told that “on the morrow he (the Baptist) seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” In the last two we read, “Again on the morrow John was standing, and two of his disciples ; and he looked upon Jesus as he walked, and saith, Behold, the Lamb of God.” Why mention a circumstance of this kind twice? and that, too, when the Evangelist feels that he has so much to relate that, were he to tell it all, “even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written” (Chap. xxi. 25).

If there is no difference between the two statements, it seems like a waste of space ; if there is a difference, wherein does the difference lie ? We have here one of the double pictures of St. John. It is of peculiar importance to him to bring out that aspect of Jesus in which He appears as the Lamb of God. At the close of his earthly career He will be seen to be so (Chap. xix. 36, 37). But what He was at the close He was also at the beginning—beneath all the lowliness of his lot, the Divine Lord who changes not, “the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end” (Rev. i. 8 ; xxii. 13). The Baptist had, in all probability, often spoken of Him as the Lamb of God. The Evangelist fixes upon two occasions, one on each of two successive days, when he did so ; and the repetition lends emphasis and force to the declaration. More, however, is necessary in order to bring the incidents within the range of that principle of structure which we are considering. In the mention of the second incident when compared with the first there must be climax. Climax is at once traceable here. At Verse 29 the Baptist appears to have been alone, and his words have the form of a soliloquy. Nothing is said of any persons in his neighbourhood, and it is only when he passes, at Verse 32, to a different topic that we read of that “bearing witness” which most probably implies testifying to others. On the second occasion it is different. “Two of his disciples” stand beside him, and his words are intended for them : they “heard him speak.” Again, no effect is connected with the first utterance, we have to think of nothing but the emotions of the prophet’s own heart. Not so the second time, for the effect is distinctly noted : the two disciples “followed Jesus” (Verse 37). Yet again, the different attitude of our Lord on the two occasions is worthy of regard. On the first He is “coming unto” John, and we can easily imagine the latter overawed by the contemplation of his holiness and

gentleness and majesty. Under this powerful impression he is unable to withhold the exclamation that we hear from him. On the second occasion Jesus is not coming unto him. He simply sees Him "as he walked," as He passed to and fro at some little distance from him. But he now knows who He is. He does not need the glance of his eye or the approaching majesty of his person to produce the effect. Yet the old exclamation springs at once to his lips. Once more, let us look at the exclamation in itself. At first sight it may seem as if climax now failed us, as if the Baptist's words were richer and fuller the first time than the second. In reality the reverse is the case. Let us remember that the *paschal lamb* lies at the bottom of the figure. The words in Verse 29, therefore, "which taketh away the sin of the world," limit it to one aspect only of the benefits conferred by that great sacrifice in which all the other sacrifices of Israel met, and which contained not merely one idea but all the ideas of the sacrificial system as a whole. They bring out the pardon and removal of sin, but nothing further. Let us drop them, and dwell only on the shorter form, "Behold, the Lamb of God," and *everything* that was included in the thought of the paschal lamb comes into view. Above all, we have now the highest, the culminating, idea of the paschal sacrifice—that of nourishment, of food for the life, of the feast in communion and fellowship with God. The second of the two statements, brief as it is, is far wider and more comprehensive than the first. All these particulars make it impossible to mistake the climax in the two parts of the double picture before us. The end of the Evangelist is gained. He has made us dwell upon the one main thought, until it has risen in wider relations, in grander proportions, to our view.

We take another passage, Chap. xii. 1-19. In this passage a double picture of the reception given to Jesus, in the remarkable circumstances in which He was at the moment

placed, at once arrests our attention. It is of importance to observe that, when introduced to us at the beginning of the chapter, Jesus had not only been condemned to death by the highest religious authorities of the land (Chap. xi. 50, 53), but "they had given a commandment that, if any man knew where he was, he should shew it, that they might take him" (Chap. xi. 57). The virulence of his persecutors has thus been brought out with more than ordinary force; and the object of the first nineteen verses of Chap. xii. is to illustrate the fact that, although thus outwardly defeated, He is still the Conqueror; that in the lowest stage of his humiliation, in the midst of danger, under sentence of death, He nevertheless draws to Himself the affection and admiration of men. This object is attained by means of the two pictures, the Anointing in Bethany, and the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem. That these two scenes really form a double scene designed to illustrate the same thought is clear from different considerations. On the one hand, both are obviously an act of homage to Jesus. On the other, Jesus is brought before us in both with the doom of death resting upon Him. More than either of these is to be noticed the fact, that with the thought of the death of Jesus is distinctly combined in both the thought of his power over the grave. In both Lazarus is associated with Him. In the first, he is actually present, and that as one raised from the dead: "Jesus," it is said, "came to Bethany, where Lazarus was, whom Jesus raised from the dead;" "Lazarus was one of them that sat at meat with him" (Verses 1, 2). In the second, Lazarus raised is present to the minds of the people: "The multitude therefore that was with him when he called Lazarus out of the tomb, and raised him from the dead, bare witness;" "For this cause also the multitude went and met him, for that they heard that he had done this sign" (Verses 17, 18). We cannot doubt, then, that the

same leading conception lies at the bottom of the two pictures—homage to One who, at the very instant when He is under sentence of death, is victorious over death; who, while He is just about to die by the malice of his enemies, is able to exhibit the most illustrious trophy of that triumph in which death itself is led as a captive in his train. The sentence of death is upon Him in each of the two pictures: in each He is the Resurrection and the Life. The striking combination of these ideas in both, not less than the homage expressed in both, proves their unity.

While, however, the principles marking the two tributes of adoration are thus essentially one, and while the two may thus be regarded as parts of the same tableau, a little further consideration will shew us that the idea intended to be expressed comes before us in the second at a higher stage, in a much more decided form than in the first. At the opening of the first Jesus is indeed, as we have seen, the selected victim upon which sentence of death has been passed. Before the second opens He has been anointed for his burial (Verse 7). In the first Jesus is only at Bethany, in the quiet village, perhaps in the quiet house, where He had so often rested, and in which friendship and love ministered to Him consolation under his many trials. In the second He has bade farewell to rest, hospitality, or comfort, and has entered upon his last short journey to Jerusalem, where He is to die. Death is nearer now. In the first He is borne witness to by a number of Jews from Jerusalem who had "seen Lazarus" (Verse 9). In the second the witness is borne by a multitude brought together from all quarters who had only "heard" (Verse 18), and yet had believed; and we have but to look at Chap. xx. 29 to see how much more valuable is the latter than the former faith. In the first the tribute paid is a silent act of reverence and love. In the second it is a loud acclaim of

praise (Verse 13), while Jesus Himself comes before us not as a longed-for guest, but as Israel's eagerly expected King (Verse 15). In the first the hope of the chief priests and Pharisees, that they will be able to accomplish their end, has been high (Chap. xi. 57). In the second they begin to despair, and their plot threatens to be baffled: "The Pharisees therefore said among themselves, Behold, how ye prevail nothing" (Chap. xii. 19). In the first many Jews are led to faith (Verse 11). In the second, "Lo; the world is gone after him" (Verse 19). Finally, we are not told that the disciples had any difficulty in comprehending the first; but the second belongs to those higher incidents which can only be understood when light has been thrown upon them by time and the wonderful events of Providence (Verse 16). The climactic relation of the two pictures cannot be mistaken.

For the present we must pause. In another paper one or two other illustrations of the point before us will be taken from the Fourth Gospel before we pass to the Apocalypse.

WM. MILLIGAN.

---

## *THE SOURCES OF ST. PAUL'S TEACHING.*

### IV. RABBINICAL TRAINING.

"I AM a Jew, born in Tarsus of Cilicia, but brought up in this city, at the feet of Gamaliel, instructed according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers, being zealous for God" (Acts xxii. 3). "I advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of mine own age among my countrymen, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers" (Gal. i. 14). In terms such