

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/robbadshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

him that power of conscience which revealed his participation in the deathless nature of God. He felt the presence of a power that said to him "Thou shalt," "Thou shalt not." He could not explain its working by anything in himself; for it asserted its presence most powerfully at the very moment when he had willed to disobey it. Its mandates did not come from his own imperfect heart, and therefore they must be the voice of another heart. There was *in* him something which was not *of* him, a law which ruled him but was not made by him, a life which breathed through him but which was not his own. The law of God within him was his hope of glory. Heaven and earth might pass away, but this moral life would not pass away. It was the same in all times, and therefore it was independent of all changes, of the world, and life, and death. In the view of its imperishable glory, and in the sense of its Divine origin, the Psalmist might well close with the prayer "Lead me in the way everlasting."

GEORGE MATHESON.

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

SECOND PAPER.

RETURNING to the subject with which we were engaged last month, and still keeping by the Fourth Gospel, we turn to another illustration of the point before us taken from Chapters xv. and xvi. of that Gospel. We are thus introduced, it is true, not to a narrative of St. John himself, but to one of the last discourses of our Lord; and it may seem as if an illustration drawn from such a source tended to destroy the simple objectivity of the accounts given us by the Apostle of his Master's words, and to bring them too much

under the influence of his own mental habitudes. It must, however, be plain to every one that our first duty is to deal with the facts as we have them. It is further to be considered that the difficulty thus started is only part of a still wider one, affecting the whole character of the discourses of Jesus as recorded by the fourth Evangelist. And, finally, we can never forget that any peculiarities in St. John's manner of presenting these discourses is much more likely to have proceeded from the impression produced on him by the Speaker, than to have been transferred by him to One to whom he evidently felt that he was commissioned simply to "witness," and in whose presence his own individuality was to disappear. Nor can it for a moment be allowed that there would have been anything inappropriate or unnatural in the fact of our Lord's adopting such a *method* of discourse as that which we are now considering. He had been born of the "seed of David according to the flesh"; his education and training had been received among his own people; his associations were Jewish; and, so long as He pursued his work among men, He felt that his mission was to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." Whatever, therefore, marked the Hebrew tone of mind may be expected to appear in Him, and more especially when He speaks in a lofty and prophetic tone. In this last consideration, indeed, we should be disposed to seek, much more than is generally done, the explanation of the undeniable difference between the discourses of our Lord in the Fourth Gospel and those contained in its predecessors. Something is undoubtedly to be attributed to the different places in which these discourses were for the most part respectively delivered, in the one case in Judea, in the other in Galilee. More weight still is due to the difference between the audiences which heard them; there, the representatives of Judaism in its most degenerate form; here, simple minded men, less fettered by prejudice and

more willing to be taught. Neither of these considerations, however, seems so important as the fact that, much more than the earlier Evangelists, St. John deals with Jesus in the profounder, more solemn, more affecting moments of his life,—those moments when it was natural for Him to rise, in a greater than ordinary degree, to a prophetic and poetic strain. Whatever was most essentially national, most connected with the “seed of Abraham,” would then be likely to shew itself in Him, when the depths of his heart were most profoundly stirred either by indignation or by sorrow.

At the same time, while all this may be said, it is unnecessary to dwell upon it. We have to take the text of our Gospel simply as it stands, and to see how far, alike in narrative and discourse, it illustrates the subject with which we deal.

The passage then to which we now turn is contained in John xv. 18—xvi. 15; a passage, the two parts of which, Chapter xv. 18–27, and Chapter xvi. 1–15, are not to be separated from each other as if the second were “the introduction of a new thought.” The topic of the latter, on the contrary, is simply that of the former. There is no change either of circumstances or of lesson. The disciples are still viewed less in their private Christian life than in the bearing of their life and work upon that world in which they are to take the place of Him who was about “to go to the Father.” Their active work had been set before them in the earlier portion of Chapter xv., and we need not dwell upon it. The thought in the later portion, to which Jesus turns, is, that in executing their task his followers are sure to provoke the opposition of the world, but that even in that prospect there is for them sufficient encouragement and strength. To present this consolation in the prospect of the hard struggle that awaits them is the object of the whole passage that we are considering, in both its parts.

A simple glance at the two parts will prove that this is the case. The first part begins with speaking of the hatred and persecutions for which the disciples were to look, and which are traced to their true cause, that the world did not know that God who had sent the Son (Chapter xv. 21); after which it passes on to the promise of the Advocate who should be sent unto them from the Father, even "the Spirit of truth" which proceedeth from the Father, and through whom, as He dwelt in them, they should be enabled to continue that witnessing to which they had been called (Verses 26, 27). A precisely similar order of thought marks the second part. We have the same hatred and persecutions (Chapter xvi. 1, 2); they are traced to the same cause (Verse 3); and, finally, we have the same promise of the Advocate as "the Spirit of truth" (Verse 13) to guide them into all the truth. In both instances the particular truths mentioned, and even their sequence, are the same.

But, while this is the case, more careful consideration will also shew that there is a difference between the two parts of which we speak, and that this difference is one of climax, Chapter xvi. 1-6 standing in a climactic relation to Chapter xv. 18-25; and Chapter xvi. 7-15 in a similar relation to Chapter xv. 26, 27. The first pair of these two groups of passages is occupied with the hatred and opposition of the world to the preachers of the truth; but the second member of the pair is far more specific than the first. In the one we have hatred and persecution simply in their *general* form; in the other they assume shapes of the most definite and terrible kind. They rise to excommunication from the synagogue, nay, not merely to excommunication, but to death; nay more, not merely to death, but to death from the fiercest spirit of ungodly fanaticism, when the murderers of the disciples shall slay them, in no levity or sport, "to make a Greek or Roman holiday," but in the

stern belief that their very religion, such as they profess it, demands that they shall do so; and because, in doing so, they will think that they offer acceptable service to the Almighty,—“whosoever killeth you will think that he offereth service unto God” (Chapter xvi. 2). Similar remarks apply to the second pair of the two groups of passages noted by us, that containing the promise of the Advocate. In the first member of this pair the Advocate is said to “bear witness concerning Jesus,” and to do this by means of the disciples, for verse 27 of Chapter xv. is not to be so separated from verse 26 as to lead us to the thought of two separate witnessings. The witnessing is one, that of the disciples animated by the Spirit of truth. The second member of the pair takes us much further forward. It describes the work of the Advocate at greater length and in more definite terms. It makes prominent the thought of “all the truth” (verse 13). It brings out a closer relation than before between Him and such as are made partakers of his influences. And, finally, it speaks of the work of the Spirit in the world, not as one merely of “witness-bearing,” but as one of so convicting of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, that the consciousness of its guilt shall be awakened in the world’s heart and it shall be unable to reply. The conditions of a double picture are thus clearly fulfilled in this part of our Lord’s last discourse to his disciples.

We turn to a fourth and last illustration of the point before us, taken from the Fourth Gospel, Chapter xviii. 15–27, premising only that we speak with some hesitation in regard to it, and that the solution which, upon the principle of St. John’s love of double pictures, we offer of its difficulties is to be considered rather as tentative than as one proposed with confidence. It is possible, indeed, that enquirers who, by a large induction of passages shall satisfy themselves that we are dealing with a real and not an imaginary principle

of structure in the writings of the beloved disciple, may be disposed to allow that there is more probability in the solution than we ask them to admit now. But there can be no presumption in at least requesting them to try whether this key will not fit the lock upon which so many other keys have been tried in vain. The passage relates the trial of our Lord before the high priest, with the thrice repeated denial of the Apostle Peter at that time. To reconcile its statements with those of the Synoptic Gospels, to determine the order of events, whether there was a preliminary examination before the real trial in the presence of the high priest took place ; to fix the personality of the high priest ; and to arrange the denials of Peter without making them six or even nine in number ; these and similar points have reduced an innumerable succession of commentators to almost hopeless perplexity. Into all the details of difficulties, or into the solutions that have been offered, it is impossible to enter. Some of them will appear as we proceed. One or two points also must be taken for granted without argument. Thus the later reading of Verse 24, *οὐν* inserted after *ἀπέστειλεν*, admits of no reasonable doubt. The received reading has dropped *οὐν* from the text as an escape from difficulties. Verse 24, too, is neither spurious, nor is it inserted at a wrong place. All the evidence points at once to its genuineness, and to its standing where it ought to stand. Again, the verb *ἀπέστειλεν* of Verse 24 must be rendered “sent,” and not “had sent” as in the Authorised Version. No doubt the aorist may be used with a pluperfect sense, but not in a clause like this which is both a main and direct clause, and neither subordinate nor relative. To translate “had sent” is simply to cut the knot. Once more, the “high priest” mentioned in Verses 15, 16, 19, 22, cannot surely be any other than Caiaphas. We know both from Matthew xxvi. 3, 57, and from the very passage before us (see Verse 13), that Caiaphas was the

high priest of that year. It is hardly possible to think that in a continuous narrative like the present, where the word "high priest" repeatedly occurs, there should be a sudden transition at Verse 15 from one individual to another as the person to be designated by that title. And this improbability is rendered much greater when we consider the peculiar importance attached by the Evangelist to keeping the thought of Caiaphas and of the high priest's office in the closest connexion with one another (Chapter xviii. 13, comp. Chapter xi. 49, 51). But, if these things be so, the whole narrative becomes at first sight both unintelligible in itself and at variance with those of the earlier Evangelists. If Caiaphas be throughout the "high priest," what are we to make of Verse 24, "Annas therefore sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest"? Jesus had been before Caiaphas already, and these words ought to have come in at the close of Verse 14. If, on the other hand, Annas be the "high priest" the trial of Jesus and at least the first denial of Peter are said to have taken place before him, although we are distinctly told in Matthew xxvi. that these things happened before Caiaphas.

The only solution of all these difficulties worth considering is that which supposes the trial related by St. John to have been not so much a public trial as a preliminary examination, a kind of precognition instituted for the purpose of laying a foundation for the more formal trial to be afterwards held before the Sanhedrin. Annas and Caiaphas, being closely related to one another, are then thought to have occupied apartments in the same large house, the buildings of which surrounded the "court" in which Peter denied his Master. Though this precognition therefore took place before Annas (John xviii. 13), Caiaphas, as holding the position of chief authority, conducted it (John xviii. 15-23); and, when it was over, Jesus was sent formally to Caiaphas to be publicly tried (John xviii. 24).

The fact, again, that Peter's first denial is, upon this view, reported by St. John as having taken place at a point of time anterior to the public trial, while in the narrative of St. Matthew it is not spoken of until that trial is over, finds its explanation in the tendency of the first Evangelist to group particulars of the same kind together, without strict regard to chronological arrangement. Finally, all that we are told in the Fourth Gospel of the Saviour's public trial is contained in Verses 25 to 27 of Chapter xviii.

We shall not venture to say that this explanation is untenable; but it is certainly attended by many difficulties that can hardly be spoken of as satisfactorily overcome. It may therefore be worth while to ask whether the true solution is not to be found in that structural principle of the Fourth Gospel already illustrated in several other instances.

Let it be observed that the main object of the whole passage, Verses 12-27, is not so much to relate the particulars of the trial of Jesus as to set before us a picture of the continued sufferings inflicted upon Him by the cruel "Jews," more especially as these are aggravated by the faithlessness and cowardice of the boldest of all the Apostles; not only Simon, but "Simon, therefore, Peter" (Verse 10), Simon who is Peter, "the rock."¹ For this purpose a scene really one is divided into two parts, and is presented to us in one of the double pictures of St. John; the same idea predominating in each, but appearing in the second of the two in deepened colouring, in climactic form. The first picture extends from Verse 15 to Verse 18; the second from Verse 24 to Verse 27, the latter being

¹ The peculiar manner in which the name of Peter is introduced to us in the narrative of this passage is worthy of observation, and it is to be regretted that the force of the original words is lost in the Revised as well as in the Authorised Version. In Chapter xviii. verse 10 the Apostle does not say "Simon Peter therefore" but *Σιμων οὖν Ἰάκωπος*, "Simon therefore Peter," i.e. Simon whose name is Peter, the object being to bring out the nature of the man (comp. also Verses 15 and 25).

at the same time prefaced by an introduction extending from Verse 19 to Verse 23. Looked at in this light, Verse 24 neither intimates that at that particular moment Jesus was taken from Annas to Caiaphas, thus implying that the former is the high priest of Verses 15 to 23, nor that at a previous time Annas "had" sent Him to Caiaphas, a translation which we have seen cannot be accepted. Verse 24 is simply a restatement, at the opening of the second picture, of a fact that must be borne in mind if we would understand the scene. That Jesus was "bound" is a part of his sufferings rendering the sin of Peter peculiarly great; but, when the binding of the "officers of the Jews" (Verse 12) received the confirmation of one so eminent as Annas, it constituted such an aggravation of the sufferings of the innocent Redeemer that, only in an instant of more than ordinary callousness, could it have failed to melt the heart of the Apostle. This fact, therefore, of the binding of Jesus, the Evangelist will not allow us to forget; and, that it may be kept distinctly in our view, he recapitulates it when entering on the second section of his narrative, with the element of added force which springs from its association not with the "officers" merely but with Annas, the most influential person in the whole Jewish community at Jerusalem. It would almost seem as if some slight confirmation of what has been said were to be found in the insertion of the article before the name of Annas in Verse 24, although the same name had been anarthrous in Verse 13. The Evangelist would, as it were, say, "That same Annas, of whom I have already spoken as having received Jesus bound, sent Him bound to Caiaphas." But, without urging this, our simple contention is that Verse 24 belongs rather to the ideal grouping than to the historical succession of events. In this respect the word "therefore" in it has a certain resemblance to the same word when it occurs in the last clause of Chapter

xix. 24. It is at once a pause and the resumption of a thought, not the introduction to an event described as taking place at the particular moment in question.

It is probable enough that, up to the point now reached, our readers may have accompanied us with considerable hesitation. It may seem to them that the foundation of the argument is narrow. Let us therefore ask whether there are any traces to be discovered in the second picture of that deeper colouring which, if the theory now suggested be correct, it ought to possess in comparison with the first. It would seem that there are not a few, and some of them highly interesting and important. Thus the framework of the second picture, in comparison with that of the first, is heightened. We have already seen that it is so with the binding of Jesus, that binding being in the first connected only with "the band, and the chief captain, and the officers of the Jews" (Verse 12), and this although Annas, to whom Jesus was sent "first," must, *before we leave Verse 14*, have confirmed it; while in the second the part taken by Annas in the binding is specially mentioned.

Again, not only is this the case with the binding of Jesus, the same climax appears in the picture of his sufferings and submission. These are only silently implied in the first picture (Verses 12 to 14): they are brought out with peculiar emphasis in the introduction to the second (Verses 19 to 23). Above all, however, that heightening of effect of which we speak is perceptible in the denials of Peter. (1) In the first picture there is only one denial; in the second there are two. (2) The circumstances in which the second and third denials take place are much more calculated to wound the heart of Jesus than those of the first. The first took place in the porch. Let us bring the scene before us. When Peter, along with "another disciple," followed his Divine Master that night, he was not at first permitted to accompany Him closely; he

was stopped at "the door without" (Verse 16). It may have been only for a few seconds, but they are full of weight in our effort to realize the incidents of the hour. While Peter is stopped *Jesus passes through*, and we are justified in saying that, before that parley at the door is over which eventually leads to the admission of both disciples, Jesus will have been lost in the crowd, and will be out of sight. At that time the first denial takes place. Peter beholds only angry officers and servants; he does not *see* his Lord, and he denies Him. There is nothing of this kind connected with the second and third denials. They occur after Peter has been admitted into the "court," and when he has Jesus under his eye, bound and struck, yet patient and submissive. (3) The first denial is uttered while Peter is only with the other disciple, and in the cold. He has not yet in any way connected himself with the enemies of Jesus, has had no fellowship with them, and has so far been thinking only of his Master's cross, not of the comforts which the world can offer. But the second and third denials are uttered after he has taken his place in the midst of the circle gathered in the cold of that night around the charcoal fire. There he "was standing and warming himself" at the time (Verse 25).¹ (4) The first denial is introduced by the words, "Peter saith" (Verse 17); the second and third have emphasis attached to them, "he denied and said," "Peter therefore denied again" (Verses 25, 27).

So many circumstances, taken together, appear to warrant the conclusion that the whole passage which we have been discussing contains two pictures, both embodying the same idea, but in climax to one another; and we may

¹ The mention of this circumstance in Verse 25 in almost the same words as in Verse 18 is not only a proof of the importance attached to it by the Evangelist, but seems to afford a confirmation of the general view here taken, that in Verse 24 we have a resumption of the thought of the previous passage.

therefore present it at least for consideration in this light. If the application of the general principle of structure of which we have spoken be in this instance allowed, the gain will be unquestionable. We shall be able to explain those words of St. John's narrative in Verse 24 which have not yet received an explanation in full correspondence with the other parts of the same narrative, or with the earlier Evangelists.

It is unnecessary to produce further illustrations from the Fourth Gospel of the point before us; nor shall we say much at present of the importance of adverting to it. This will appear more clearly when the existence of this structural principle in St. John's writings has been more fully established. In the mean time it ought to be our effort to satisfy ourselves that we have been dealing with a real, and not an imaginary, characteristic of our Apostle. If well founded, it will obviously supply a rule of interpretation that we cannot afford to neglect. It will also yield an answer to the objection so often urged, that the style of the Fourth Gospel is marked by constant and wearisome reiterations of the same thing. In no single instance, we believe, is this the case. The general and fundamental thought may be the same, but there is always a difference either of aspect or of application. Nor do the reiterations, such as they are, proceed from any deficiency of skill on the part of the writer. They are distinctly designed by him; they are a part of that mould into which, probably for the sake of greater impressiveness, he casts his thoughts.

The Fourth Gospel has occupied more space than we expected. It may be well, therefore, to delay entering upon those illustrations of the principle we are discussing which are afforded by the Apocalypse.

Wm. MILLIGAN.