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 (Heb. viii. 2, ix. 24, x. 22): but nine times in the Gospel of St. John\*,   
 four times in the Epistle’, and ten times in the Apocalypse\*, Here   
 again, it is true, Liieke adduces this on the other side, alleging that   
 while the Evangelist uses the word only in the sense of genuine—   
 “the true God,” “the true light,” “the true bread,”—the Author of the   
 Apocalypse uses it of Christ as a synonym with “ fuith/ul,” “righteous,”   
 “holy,” and asa predicate of the “words,” “judgments,” “ways” of   
 God. This latter is true enough ; but the former assertion is singularly   
 untrue. For in four out of the nine places in the Gospel, the subjective   
 sense of the word must be taken: viz. in iv. 27, vii. 28, viii. 16, xix. 35:   
 and in the last of these, “his testimony is true,” the word is used exactly   
 as in Rev. xxii. 6, “ these sayings are faithful and true.”   
 114. The word lamb (literally, little lamb), which designates our   
 Lord 29 times in the Apocalypse, only elsewhere occurs in John xxi. 15,   
 not with reference to Him. But it is remarkable that John i, 29, 36 are   
 the only places where he is called by the name of a lamb, another Greek   
 word being used, in reference doubtless to Isa. liii. 7 (Acts viii. 32), as   
 in one other place where He is compared to a lamb, 1 Pet. i. 19, The   
 Apocalyptic writer, as Liicke observes, probably chooses the diminutive,   
 and attaches to it the epithet “slain,” for the purpose of contrast to the   
 majesty and power which he has also to predicate of Christ: but is it   
 not to be taken into account, that this personal name, the Lamb, whether   
 in one form or the other, whether with or without the adjunct “ of God,”   
 is common only to the two books ?   
 115, To these many minor examples might be added, and will be found   
 treated at length in Liicke, p. 669 ff., Davidson, p. 561 ff‘. Thelatter writer   
 has succeeded in many cases in shewing the unfairness of Liicke’s strong   
 partisanship, by which he makes every similarity into a dissimilarity :   
 but on the other hand he on his side has gone perhaps too far in   
 attempting to answer every objection of this kind. After all, while there   
 certainly are weighty indications of identity of authorship, there is also   
 a residuum of phenomena of diversity quite enough for the reasonable   
 support of the contrary hypothesis. If the book stood alone in the   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 1 John i. 9, iv. 37, vi. 32, vii. vill. 16, xv. 1, xvii. xix. 35.   
 2 1 John ii. 8 v. 20 thrice,   
 3 ch. iii. 14, vi. 10, xv. 8, xvi. xix. 2, 9, 11, xxi. 5, 6.   
 4 Ihave observed the following which I have not seen elsewhere noticed, oceurring   
 only in the three books, or only in the peculiar sense :—   
 1, “ Ye cannot bear them yet,” John xvi, 12.   
 “ Thou canst not bear wicked men,” Rev. ii. 2.   
 2. “« Weary from his journey,” John iv. 6.   
 “ Thou hast not (literally) grown weary,” Rev. ii. 3.   
 8. Lwo angels in white,” John xx. 12.   
 “ They shall walk me in white,” Rev. iii.   
 FS 18 with 1 Jobn ii. 20, 27, as to the anointing and its effects.   
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