

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 *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

GENERAL SECRETARY:
E. J. SEWELL.

LECTURE SECRETARY:
E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.

VOL. XLIX.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W. 1.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

591ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, MAY 21ST, 1917,

AT 4.30 P.M.

THE VERY REV. HENRY WACE, D.D., DEAN OF CANTERBURY,
VICE-PRESIDENT, TOOK THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the preceding Meeting were read and confirmed.

The SECRETARY announced the election of Mr. Andrew Miller as an Associate of the Institute.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon the Chairman of the Council, Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay, to read his paper.

THE EMPHASIS OF ST. LUKE.

A STUDY.

By Lieut.-Colonel G. MACKINLAY, late R.A.

CONSIDERED simply as literary productions, the writings of St. Luke in his Gospel, and in the Acts (Luke i, 3, Acts i, 1), are very attractive.

The charm of his language has long been recognized; even Renan pronounced the Third Gospel to be the most beautiful book that has ever been written. His historical groupings are realistic and harmonious; his style is classical, resembling that of Thucydides.

In recent years systematic and scientific archaeological research by Professor Sir William Ramsay and others has produced many long-buried evidences, which bear incontestable witness to our author's marvellous historical accuracy in the whole of the Acts and in part of his Gospel; his smallest details have been found to be true to life in all cases in which verification was possible.

The arrangement of the central chapters of his Gospel, however, has long been a puzzle to the historian, and the more so because of his special statement at the beginning that he writes "in order" (i, 3).

But in this study it will be shewn that these chapters are arranged in a most orderly and methodical manner, and that the chronology is accurate; and as a further and

more important result it will be demonstrated (it is trusted) that this inspired evangelist lays greater stress upon the glorious spiritual truths which he proclaims, than has previously been supposed to be the case.

St. Luke's two books are linked together in many ways; at the end of his Gospel he quotes the words of our Risen Lord: "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His Name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem" (xxiv, 46-47). The first half of this paragraph epitomises the climax to which all the Gospel of Luke leads up—the Death and Resurrection of our Lord; the second half of the paragraph sums up the purport of the Acts, in which Christ Crucified and Risen is the constant theme preached far and wide to the nations of the earth. Luke has thus happily chosen the subjects for his two books, which our Lord Himself had joined together in one sentence.

Luke uses many skilful devices to secure the attention of his reader. One of his chief methods is to employ triple iteration in order to give great emphasis to some important subject. We shall confine ourselves in this paper to the consideration of some examples of this habit.

Threefold repetition is occasionally employed in Scripture for this purpose; for instance, the three denials of Peter, told by all the Evangelists, emphasize the greatness of his fall; the three questions of our risen Lord to that Apostle, asking him if he loved his Master, shew a depth of faithful, yet gracious rebuke (John xxi, 15-17); and the thrice-repeated prayer of Paul for the removal of the thorn in the flesh (2 Corinthians, xii, 8), demonstrates the earnestness of his pleading. But it is in the writings of St. Luke that we find the greatest use of this method of giving emphasis. Each triplication is generally easy to recognize, and its object is generally evident at once; but in one case, at least, its existence is not apparent without some little study; we must not be astonished that it is so, because cryptic methods and omissions, without explanation or remark, were not uncommon among the ancients. For instance, hidden anagrams were at times embedded in the poems of antiquity, giving the name of the writer, and other information. They were probably employed in order to provide proof of the true authorship, in case it were disputed at some subsequent date, or to please a patron, to whom alone the secret may have been entrusted. A most striking example of such cryptic writing has recently been discovered by the patient skill of

Professor D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt., in the Iliad and in the Odyssey, which both contain two-letter anagrams in iambic verse, giving the name of Homer as author of each poem; they also contain a dedicatory prayer, and in one case a date.*

An interesting fact about the Homeric anagrams is the hint of their existence furnished by the inevitable presence of some words, which are not so appropriate as those used elsewhere by this poet; thus, the very first word in the Iliad *μῆνιν*, *anger*, is not nearly so suitable as *κῦδος*, *glory*, which has been suggested instead of it; but this inauspicious word *μῆνιν* has evidently been employed because it furnishes two of the letters required for Homer's name in the anagram.

Cryptic writings occur in Scripture, as for instance in the book of Revelation. Many puzzling omissions are to be found in other parts; the name of God does not appear in the book of Esther, except in acrostic form. There are omissions in all the synoptic Gospels, of the interval of time, about six months, between the end of the Temptation and our Lord's return to Galilee, when John was imprisoned; the account of the raising of Lazarus is also omitted by all the first three Evangelists; we should know nothing of these events, except for John (i, 29-iv, 54, xi, 1-44). The Gospel of Luke contains at least two other important omissions without remark, the most noticeable being the well-known "Great Omission," between verses 17 and 18 of Luke ix, of all the events related in Mark vi, 45-viii, 26, during a period of about six months.

This being so, we must not be surprised if every Lukan triplication cannot be discovered at once; we must not hastily deny its existence, because its components are not always close together, or even if there is a retrogression in narrative; and we must not expect our Evangelist to point out plainly what he has done. A good writer, especially among the ancients, not infrequently leaves his meaning in some obscurity, so that a little thought and trouble must be expended by the reader in finding out the meaning, which, when once grasped, is thus impressed upon the attention and memory. This is certainly true of the Scriptural writers, whose full meanings are not to be found by the casual reader, but only by him who ponders carefully and prayerfully.

Tripletions abound in the Gospel of Luke and in the Acts,

* "The Life and Work of Homer," *Trans. Victoria Institute*, vol. xlvii, 1915, p. 35.

but we shall only consider a few of those in the second book, which we may compare with those in the first.

The scope of the Acts may be said to comprise two main subjects :—

1. The proclamation of a Person of the Holy Trinity.

(a) The Risen Christ.

(b) The Holy Spirit.

2. The Work of witnessing to Christ Crucified and Risen, performed by Spirit-filled men.

1 (a). The proclamation of the Risen Christ is enforced by a triplication, and also by numerous statements.

1 (b). The proclamation of the Holy Spirit is emphasized by two important triplications, supported by other minor ones, and by many allusions.

2. The work of witnessing is brought prominently forward by two important triplications, supported by several others, and also by a mass of historical records.

The emphasis of the whole book is therefore divided.

Let us briefly consider these five principal triplications in the Acts ; see Table I (in which the necessary Scripture references will be found).

TABLE I.—PROMINENT TRIPPLICATIONS IN THE ACTS.

Subjects of triplications.	Ref. Nos.	Reference texts.	Where recorded.	
Proclamation of Two Persons of the Holy Trinity.	{ The Risen Christ ...	1	i, 11. ii, 32. ii, 36.	Introductory chapters.
	{ The Holy Spirit (before Pentecost).	2	i, 2. i, 4. i, 5, 8.	
	{ The Holy Spirit (on the day of Pentecost).	3	ii, 16-21. ii, 33. ii, 38, 39.	
The Work performed by two Spirit-filled men (witnessing).	{ Peter's commission and his obedience.	4	x, 1-48. xi, 1-18. xv, 1-29.	Central chapters.
	{ Paul's commission and his obedience.	5	ix, 1-22. xxii, 4-21. xxvi, 9-20.	Central and later chapters.

The first triplication (No. 1) which we investigate draws attention to the first of the above main subjects, and emphatically proclaims "This Jesus," crucified by the Jews, raised up

from the dead by God, received up into heaven, and coming again, as stated by the angelic messengers at the Ascension, and by Peter on the day of Pentecost. The parts of this triplication are connected with each other by the use of the Greek words *οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς* in each (the accusative case being used in the last two passages), an expression occurring nowhere else in the Acts. This triple iteration forms a fitting prelude to the Work of witnessing to Jew and Gentile, then about to begin.

In the Revised Version the same term "This Jesus" is used in each case; uniformity has also been observed in several, at least, of the other European translations, *e.g.*, in French, Spanish, German, and Dutch.

But the existence of this beautiful triplication is not apparent to those who only read the Authorized English Version, because uniformity has not been observed in it; the same Greek expression being differently translated each time; thus in the first passage it is rendered "This same Jesus," in the second it is "This Jesus," while in the last it is "That same Jesus."

The coming of the Holy Spirit is emphatically proclaimed by two principal triplications, the first of them (No. 2) is entirely contained in the very brief record of the deeds and words of our Risen Lord in the opening verses of the Acts. Luke thus takes the opportunity of the departure of One Person of the Holy Trinity to draw emphatic attention to the coming of the Third Person of the Godhead. Luke tells us, in this triplication, firstly, that in the past our Lord had given commandment unto His Apostles through the Holy Spirit; secondly, that our Risen Lord then ordered His disciples to wait at Jerusalem for the Promise of the Father; and, lastly, that He prophesied that in the near future they would be baptized in, and receive power from, the Holy Ghost.

Just after the gift of the Promise of the Father, on the very same day of Pentecost, Luke records a triplication (No. 3) emphatically announcing that the Holy Spirit had indeed come. We are told that Peter quoted at the time Joel ii, 28-32, given in the past, referring to the pouring out of the Spirit; then he appealed to the spiritual manifestation which the people saw and heard; and lastly he told his hearers to repent and be baptized, and "Ye shall receive," he said, "the gift of the Holy Ghost." Past, present, and future were again alluded to in this emphatic proclamation of the descent of the Holy Spirit. There are also other triplications in the Acts, still further emphasizing the influence of the Third Person of the Trinity, but we have not space to allude to them.

We now proceed to consider briefly the second main subject in the Acts: the Work of witnessing to Christ Crucified and Risen, by Spirit-filled men, chiefly by Peter and Paul.

A triplicate account is recorded of the Divine commission given to each of these selected agents. Emphatic attention is thus drawn to the subject which fills the greater part of the Acts.

The commission to St. Peter to preach the Gospel to the heathen Cornelius and his household, together with the Apostle's compliance, is emphasized by being told three times (No. 4), and the importance of this triplication is further reinforced by a minor one (twice recorded) of the sheet being let down three times from heaven (x, 11-16; xi, 5-10), which doubtless served to impress the command very deeply on Peter himself.

The commissioning of St. Paul to proclaim the Gospel, and his obedience to the command, are also emphasized by threefold repetition (No. 5). The importance of this triplication is also reinforced by a minor one, which Luke records, of the blindness of the Apostle for three days (ix, 9); this affliction doubtless served to impress the command very deeply on Paul himself.

It is true that the components of these important triplications are separated from each other, but that fact does not militate against the emphasis given by triple repetition. Some may think that each account of these two events comes naturally in the main narrative; but if Luke had only recorded the commission to Peter once and to Paul once, he would have had room in the Acts for further interesting historical information, which he must certainly have had at his disposal. This plan, however, he did not adopt, doubtless because he wished to concentrate attention on the commissioning of Peter and Paul and on their obedience.

There are several other triplications in the Acts emphasizing the Work of witnessing, but we shall not consider them.

Turning now to the Gospel of St. Luke, we find a general correspondence with the arrangement in the Acts; for in both of them there is one set of triplications which proclaims a Divine Person (or Persons) of the Holy Trinity, and another set, which emphasizes the performance of a grand Work.

In the Acts, as we have seen, both Christ and the Holy Spirit are proclaimed; in the Gospel we shall find that only our Saviour is emphatically announced.

In the Acts, the Work of witnessing by the Spirit-filled Peter and Paul, representatives of all preachers of the Gospel, is emphasized by the triple repetition of the stories of their com-

missioning; in the Gospel we shall find that only the Atoning Work of the Lord Jesus is enforced by similar means.

There is thus far greater unity of design in the arrangement of the triplications in the Gospel of Luke than in the Acts, the emphasis being all concentrated upon the Person and Work of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We now proceed to consider the triplications in the Gospel of Luke. See Table II (in which the necessary Scripture references will be found).

We begin with an important triplication (No. 1), in which our Evangelist records the satisfaction of God the Father with His Son, expressed at three striking epochs in the Ministry, widely separated from each other. On the first occasion, at our Lord's Baptism, Luke records that "A voice came out of heaven, Thou art My beloved Son; in Thee I am well pleased," the Holy Spirit descending in a bodily form as a dove upon Him at the time. Secondly, at the Transfiguration, "A voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is My Son, My Chosen." And, thirdly, at the very end of the Ministry, the Father, in the Parable of the wicked husbandmen, said, "I will send My beloved Son," words which undoubtedly indicated our Lord, as the One sent by the Father (Luke xx, 19).

It is noticeable that in each of these three instances the subject of Death is closely linked with the words of Divine approbation; for Baptism figures Death and Resurrection (Rom. vi, 4); the subject of converse at the Transfiguration was the coming decease of our Lord at Jerusalem (Luke ix, 31); and the wicked husbandmen, in the Parable, cast forth the Son out of the vineyard and killed Him (xx, 15).

We may notice a growing clearness in these references to Death as that great event draws nearer: in the first case it is only referred to in type in Baptism; in the second case it is called *exodus*, which means going out or departure. Hence decease or death is only indicated in a somewhat indirect manner; but in the last instance the Son is stated, in the plainest terms, to be killed.

The next triplication (No. 2), in which our Lord proclaimed Himself to the Jews as the Messiah, may be regarded as complementary to the first, though in fearful contrast to it; for the Jews as a body shewed the bitterest antagonism to recognizing our Lord as the Son of God.

This triplication is all contained in the first five and a half, or introductory chapters, of the Gospel. On the first occasion, at Nazareth, when our Lord quoted the prophecy of Isaiah lxi,

TABLE II.—TRIPPLICATIONS IN THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.

Subjects of Triplications.	Ref. Nos.	Reference texts.	Where recorded.	
Proclamation of our Lord as the Messiah.	{ By God the Father	1	iii, 22. ix, 35. xx, 13.	i, 1-xxi, 38. Introductory and central chapters.
	{ By Himself... ..	2	iv, 18-21. v, 18-26. vi, 1-11.	
The Work performed by our Lord. (His Atoning Death.)	Three long narratives.	3	vi, 20-x, 42. xi, 1-xiv, 24. xiv, 25-xxi, 38.	} Luke (A), Luke (B), Luke (C), vi, 20-xxi, 38. } } Luke (A), vi, 20-x, 42. } Central chapters. (Looking forward to the Work.) } } Luke (B), xi, 1-xiv, 24. } } Luke (C), xiv, 25-xxi, 38. } } Betrayal and Crucifixion, xxii, 1-xxiii, 56. } Later chapters. (The Work being accomplished.) } } Resurrection, xxiv, 1-53. } Last chapter. (Looking back on the finished Work.) }
	A triplication of triplications of our Lord's Death.	4	See No. 7. No. 9. No. 11.	
	A triplication of triplications (doctrinal).	5	No. 8. No. 10. No. 12.	
	Only ones	6	vii, 12, 15. viii, 42, 54, 55. ix, 38, 42.	
	Prophecies of our Lord's Death.	7	ix, 22. ix, 31. ix, 44.	
	Hesitating ones (doctrinal).	8	ix, 57, 58. ix, 59, 60. ix, 61, 62.	
	Prophecies of our Lord's Death.	9	xi, 29, 30. xii, 50. xiii, 32.	
	Years of unfruitfulness (doctrinal).	10	xiii, 6-9.	
	Prophecies of our Lord's Death.	11	xvii, 25. xviii, 31-35. xx, 15.	
	Lost ones (doctrinal) ...	12	xv, 5-7. xv, 8-10. xv, 11-32.	
	<i>οὐτος</i> (doctrinal) ...	13	xv, 24. xv, 30. xv, 32.	
	Peter's denials	14	xxii, 34, 56, 57. xxii, 58. xxii, 59-62.	
	Pilate's failure to release our Lord. Testimony to His faultlessness.	15	xxiii, 4. xxiii, 15, 16. xxiii, 22-24.	
	Similar testimony from others.	16	xxiii, 15. xxiii, 41. xxiii, 47.	
Reminders of prophecies of the Resurrection.	17	xxiv, 6, 7. xxiv, 26, 27. xxiv, 44-46.		
Full openings	18	xxiv, 31. xxiv, 32. xxiv, 45.		

1, 2, about Himself, and blessing to the Gentiles, His hearers endeavoured to kill Him. Our Lord's next demonstration of His Divine power in forgiving a man's sins was met by the impious protest of the Scribes and Pharisees that He was blaspheming. As they said, "Who can forgive sins, but God alone?" they evidently understood the greatness of His claim (Exodus xxxiv, 6, 7). On the third occasion our Saviour declared Himself to be the Lord of the Sabbath; His hearers well knew that this was an assertion of His Godhead, because the Sabbath belongs to Jehovah (Exodus xx, 10). Again he encountered intense opposition (Luke vi, 11).

It will be noticed that these two triplications, proclaiming the Lord Jesus, correspond to the three at the beginning of the Acts, which announce two of the Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity.

We now proceed to demonstrate the existence of the most important triplication (No. 3) in the Gospel of Luke, which powerfully emphasizes the grand Work which our Lord came to do—to die upon the Cross for our sins.

In reading through the synoptic Gospels we are struck by the fact that the arrival at Bethany (Luke x, 38, c. with John xii, 1), toward the close of the last journey to Jerusalem (Luke ix, 51), is told at less than half-way through the Gospel of Luke; but the same point is not reached in the other two Gospels until two-thirds of each have been read through. It is, however, evidently the *same* arrival at Bethany or its neighbourhood which is recorded, because the events which *preceded* it are told in the same order by all three Evangelists.

But in Luke xix, 29, an arrival at Bethphage and Bethany is mentioned; the context *after* this passage agrees exactly with the records after the corresponding accounts in the other synoptists. Hence we must conclude, in this case also, that the *same* arrival is referred to by all three Evangelists.

Consequently Luke x, 38, and xix, 29, must both tell of the *same* arrival. If we suppose the long intervening passage between these two texts to be cut out *pro tem.* we should find that the arrival at Bethany would then come at two-thirds of the way through this Gospel also. The thought at once occurs that a retrogression must have been made; this supposition is fully confirmed by further evidence.

Let us now consider the chapters between these two accounts of the same arrival. At first sight they look like historical confusion, and it is generally supposed that chronological order has been quite given up, some think for the sake

of teaching a spiritual truth, but what that truth may be is not generally agreed. Other explanations have been given, as, for instance, that Luke describes, throughout this long passage, nothing but the last journey; but this explanation will not bear investigation. The arrangement of these chapters has hitherto been an unsolved puzzle, all the greater because Luke distinctly states in his opening sentence that he writes "in order" (i, 3).

We noticed that the employment of the awkward word $\mu\eta\nu\nu$ at the beginning of the Iliad, so unlike Homer's usual diction, gave a clue to the discovery of his hidden anagram. Is it not likely, therefore, that the departure of Luke from his usual method of ordinary historical narrative may also furnish a clue to some cryptic plan which our Evangelist may have employed?

If we can find that these chapters contain *two* historical retrogressions, making, with the account given before the end of chapter x, *three* historical narratives, which all include a common period, then we shall find that orderly chronology is maintained, and that Luke has arranged his materials in his characteristic fashion, as in the Acts, to give great emphasis, by threefold repetition, to the prominent themes of his Gospel—the Death and Resurrection of our Lord.

We now proceed to adduce a few of the many evidences of the existence of the three parallel narratives.

We find when reading Luke xi and xii that the chapters contain very much of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew v-vii); Luke vi, 20-49, also contains many quotations from it. In fact, these two passages taken together contain practically the whole of the Lukan reproductions of the Matthæan discourse (91·5 p.c. of the verses); the remainder (8·5 p.c.) consists of several short sentences recorded by Luke as spoken at other times; these may well have been uttered, more than once, by our Lord. Hence it appears that Luke has split up the Matthæan Sermon into two parts; he has placed one fragment in chapters xi and xii, and the other in chapter vi. In other words, there appears to be a retrogression at Luke xi, 1, to the time of Luke vi. This supposition is supported by many considerations; for instance, Luke vi, 20-49, was spoken at summer time, because ears of corn had just been plucked (vi, 1); consistently with this fact we have references in this passage to the products of summer, to fruit, figs and grapes (vi, 43, 44). Luke xii also contains references to products of the same season, to fruits, corn, lilies, and grass (16-19, 24-28). Hence we conclude that the second Lukan account of the Sermon was spoken at the same season of the year. Now there was no summer in the Ministry

after the start for the *last* journey (ix, 51) in the last winter; hence any reference to a summer in a subsequent chapter must involve a retrogression, in this case to the time of the Sermon on the Mount.

We find this supposition of retrogression greatly strengthened by the records of the succeeding events and discourses, which come in the same chronological order after each Lukan part of the Sermon; for instance, a Parable on sowing (xiii, 19) comes after the second Lukan fragment, just as a Parable on sowing (viii, 4-15) came after the first Lukan part of the Sermon. These Parables were both spoken at the same time.*

Other events in the two Lukan narratives are also arranged in the same order, *e.g.*, the start for the last journey to Jerusalem (ix, 51, 52, and xiii, 22); and the discourse with the man who wished to know what to do to inherit eternal life (x, 25-37; xiii, 23-30; c. with Matthew xix, 16-30; Mark x, 17-31). The Parable of the great supper at the end of this second Lukan narrative (xiv, 16-24) contains our Lord's teaching about His coming judgments on the Jews, and also the call of the Gentiles; these truths are elsewhere only recorded as spoken at the very end of the Ministry, as, for instance, in the cognate Parables of the wicked husbandmen, and the marriage of the king's son (Matthew xxi, 33-45; Mark xii, 1-12; Luke xx, 9-19; Matthew xxii, 1-14). Hence we conclude that Luke has placed the Parable of the great supper in its correct chronological position, and that all the material in his second narrative is arranged in correct chronological sequence.

At Luke xiv, 25, we come to another retrogression, to a time about a week before the Transfiguration, not so far back as before. This second recommencement is indicated by the quotation of our Lord's saying about cross-bearing, in xiv, 27, which also occurs, in practically the same words (ix, 23), a few days before the account of the vision on the Holy Mount in the first Lukan narrative (ix, 28-36). We infer, therefore, that Luke xiv, 25 (the beginning of the sentence which contains xiv, 27), goes back to a time just before the Transfiguration. We are confirmed in this supposition, because, from thence onwards, this third narrative also progresses in regular chronological order. Soon afterwards comes a fragment of the discourse about a child and humility, etc. (xvii, 1-6); the remainder of our Lord's teaching on

* *The Greek Testament.* Notes on Matthew xiii, 1, and Mark iv, 35 (Dean Alford).

this subject is to be found in the first Lukan narrative (ix, 46-50), just after the Transfiguration. That these sentences really belong together is proved by the fact, that if both are combined, we have practically the full discourse on the same subject to be found in Matthew xvii, 20, 24, xviii, 1-7, 15, 21, 22, and Mark ix, 33-42, in the same chronological position. Thus we have another interesting example of a discourse divided into halves by Luke each part being placed in a distinct narrative. It may be that he has done this in order to let his readers know that he had made separate parallel narratives.

The start for the last journey is likewise recorded in the third narrative (xvii, 11), and also a considerable part of the discourse with the man who wished to know how to inherit eternal life (xviii, 18-30); this conversation is thus split up by Luke into no less than three parts, each narrative containing a fragment. Bethphage and Bethany are reached (xix, 29), and then Jerusalem (xix, 41, 45). All the material in this third narrative is also arranged in correct chronological order.

It is thus evident that Luke's history is perfectly accurate in the central chapters of his Gospel, and that they contain three parallel narratives, which constitute the longest and most important of all his triplications (No. 3), very emphatically pointing forward to the coming great work of our Lord's Atoning Death. We may conveniently call the three narratives Luke (A), (vi, 20-x, 42); Luke (B) (xi, 1-xiv, 24); and Luke (C) (xiv, 25-xxi, 38). The line indicating No. 3 triplication in Table II is printed in heavy type in order to draw special attention, on account of its great importance.

We may compare this long triplication in the Gospel, emphasizing the great Work of our Lord, with the two in the Acts which draw attention to the Apostles' Work of witnessing. A similar literary arrangement of triplications is thus adopted in each of Luke's books, to emphasize the chief Work described in each. The Work of Redemption was performed by the Son of God alone; the humbler but very honourable Work of publishing the good tidings was committed to Spirit-filled men: two were very probably selected, in order to avoid giving undue prominence to an individual.

In the Acts, witnessing continued for a long time: in fact, it still continues. In the Gospel, on the other hand, the Atoning Work of Christ was finished on the Cross, the long triplication Luke (A), Luke (B), Luke (C), emphatically leading up to that crisis. Although its components are close together, it has not been so easy to recognize the existence of this historical triplication

as it was to find those in the Acts, which emphasized the commissioning and the obedience of Peter and Paul. In the Gospel triplication, it is not stated that the story is retold, and comparatively few of the same events and discourses are repeated in such component.

One event, however, the start for the last journey—(ix, 51) in Luke (A), (xiii, 22) in Luke (B), and xvii, 11 in Luke (C)—is clearly told in each of the three Lukan narratives. Now a journey has a destination and an object; in this case the destination was Jerusalem, and the object was the Death of our Lord there (ix, 31; xviii, 31–33); consequently, the prominence given to the account of this journey is most appropriate, because it conducts to the climax of the Gospel.

In the Acts we noticed that the triplications, emphasizing the commissioning of Peter and Paul for their Work of evangelization, are supported by the minor ones of the sheet let down three times, and of the three days of blindness respectively; while the Work of St. Paul is further emphasized by several other threefold iterations.

It is natural, therefore, to expect that we may find triplications in the Gospel of Luke, supporting the long, thrice-repeated narrative, which emphasizes the Atoning Death of our Lord. This expectation is abundantly realized: Luke (A) contains a striking special triplication (No. 6) pointing to our Lord's Death, and especially to His Resurrection; it also points to God the Father's very great love for Him. In it loved "only" ones are raised up by Christ: the first, the *only* son of a widow; the second, an *only* daughter, these both from death; and the third, an *only* child, from a living death. A gradation is here apparent: with an only son taken, there might be daughters left; with an only daughter dead, there might be sons alive; with an only child practically dead, there might be the hope of another being born. This leads us to think of a further step, of the beloved only-begotten Son of God, Who could never be replaced, but Who was nevertheless given by God the Father to die for our sins. Our conclusion, that this triplication refers to our Lord, is strengthened by the fact that the Greek word for *only* son, daughter, and child in each of these three components is *μονογενής*, a word which is only applied elsewhere in the New Testament to our Lord (John i, 14, 18; iii, 16, 18; I John iv, 9), or to Isaac, who was a type of Christ (Hebrews xi, 17).

Luke (A), Luke (B), and Luke (C) resemble each other because each contains a similar triplication of prophecies by our Lord of

His coming Death, sometimes associated with the mention of His Resurrection.

Luke (A) contains the striking record of three such prophecies (No. 7); they were all uttered at about the time of the Transfiguration, some six months before the Crucifixion, and all at times of glory and success. The first was spoken at Cæsarea Philippi, when Peter confessed that Jesus was the Christ; our Lord then took the opportunity to tell His disciples that "The Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up." The next occasion was at the Transfiguration itself, when the subject of discourse with Moses and Elijah was the coming exodus of our Lord at Jerusalem. And lastly, on the next day, when our Saviour had successfully cured the demon-possessed boy after His disciples had failed to do so, He again foretold the same grand event, by stating that "The Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men."

Luke (B) also contains three prophecies by our Lord (No. 9) emphasizing His coming Death; they are in more veiled terms than the triplication to the same effect, which we have just noticed in Luke (A), and they were uttered at different and less striking times. The first, which Luke gives in this narrative, was spoken by our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount, nearly two years before the Crucifixion: "Even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation." Matthew (xii, 40) adds the reason for this similitude, but Luke does not do so. In the same Sermon Luke records our Lord's words: "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" Mark (x, 38, 39), assigning this utterance to a different time, implies that it refers to our Lord's approaching Death (see also Matthew xx, 22), but again Luke does not do so. Our Evangelist records a third prophetic utterance in Luke (B) by our Lord toward the end of His Ministry, which is also in veiled terms: "Behold, I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected." These words refer to Death, for they furnished a reply to Herod's threat to kill our Lord.

Luke (C) also contains a triplication of prophecies (No. 11) by our Lord of His coming Death. These were all spoken near the end of the Ministry, and they are impressive because they give plain details of the shortly impending event. Thus the first component tells of suffering and rejection; the second

of delivery up to the Gentiles, of mockery, shameful spitting, and scourging, of killing and rising again; and the third prophecy adds the detail that our Lord was to be cast out before He was killed.

It will thus be seen that we have no less than nine prophecies of the Death of our Lord in Luke (A), Luke (B), and Luke (C), three in each, no more and no less, or a triplication of triplications (No. 4). We have noticed that the first in Luke (A), and the third in Luke (C), are both more striking than that in Luke (B); this is to be expected under the circumstances, because the first triplication draws great attention, and the last one is emphatic, because it immediately heralds the climax; the intermediate one, in Luke (B), serving as a link between the two, is more suppressed.

Luke (A), Luke (B), and Luke (C) also each contain another triplication, emphasizing a main doctrine of the Christian faith. In Luke (A) man's failure is emphasized by the account of three men who, one after another, hesitated to obey our Lord's command to follow Him (No. 8); their action is in strong contrast with the spiritual teaching of this section of the Gospel, which may be summed up in the words contained in it: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself" (x, 27).

In Luke (B) God's certain judgment on sinners is emphasized by the sentence on the fig-tree unfruitful for three years (No. 10). This agrees with the doctrinal teaching of this section, which may be summed up by our Lord's words contained in it: "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (xiii, 5).

In Luke (C) Christ seeking to save the lost by His Atoning Death is emphasized by the three Parables of the lost sheep, the lost piece of silver, and the lost son (No. 12). This is a fuller doctrinal triplication than either of the others, and its force is increased by the fact that in each case only *one* lost one is sought for and found. In the Parable of the lost son, a very personal touch is given in the subsidiary triplication (No. 13) by the use of the Greek word *οὗτος*, translated by the word "this" in the passages, "this My son," "this Thy son," "this thy brother." These triplications emphasize the doctrinal teaching of this section of the Gospel, which may be summed up by the words of our Lord contained in it: "The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost" (xix, 10).

It is interesting to notice the resemblance between the verbal construction of this last triplication and the first one which

we considered in the Acts (see p. 4) proclaiming the Risen Lord. The word *σῦτος* is used in both: in the one case it points to the triumphant Saviour, and in the other to the saved sinner. A hint is thus given of the intimate personal relationship between the two, which is plainly stated by St. Paul, when he wrote of "the Son of God, Who loved me, and gave Himself for me" (Galatians ii, 20).

We now find that we have a triplication of doctrinal triplications (No. 5); the first (No. 8) shews man's failure and guilt, the second (No. 10) God's judgment on unpardoned sinners, and the third (No. 12) (reinforced by No. 13) demonstrates the salvation of God to anyone who trusts in the Atoning Work of Christ. We thus have a summary of the relationship between God and man.

As we have found so many triplications in the narratives leading up to the Death and Resurrection of our Lord, we may naturally expect to find others when those events themselves are described.

Let us first consider the section containing the Betrayal and Crucifixion of our Lord. The failure of human love to help Him in His time of trial, when He indeed suffered alone, is emphasized by the record of Peter's thrice-repeated denial of his Master (No. 14). St. Luke has arranged this triplication in a manner similar to his long one, Luke (A), Luke (B), Luke (C). In both cases, the crisis coming immediately afterwards, he makes the first and last components more striking than the intermediate one. In our present instance (No. 14) Luke records that the first questioner looked steadfastly on Peter and said: "This man also was with Him. But he denied, saying, woman, I know Him not." The last one "confidently affirmed" that the Apostle had been with our Lord, for he was a Galilæan, but Peter said: "Man, I know not what thou sayest." The intermediate questioner is recorded simply as saying: "Thou also art one of them," without any mention of steadfast looking or confident affirmation. Peter's reply on the second occasion is recorded in only three Greek words, while his first denial is in four, and his last in five words.

The powerlessness of human authority to rescue our Lord in His time of crisis is emphasized by the record of the failure of Pilate's thrice-repeated efforts (No. 15), though "he had determined to release Him" (Acts iii, 13). The proud Roman ruler sank deeper and deeper into shame at each attempt, while each time confessing our Lord's faultlessness. At first the Governor simply said: "I find no fault in this Man." This should have been

sufficient; Pilate's plain duty was then to release and protect, but instead of doing so he sent our Lord to Herod. When our Saviour came back, there was more reason for release than before, for Herod also vouched that no fault could be laid to the charge of the Divine Prisoner.

Nevertheless, Pilate, fearing the Jews, wickedly tried to compromise, and said he would chastise our Lord and then release Him. But the Jews then raised their bloodthirsty shout, and though Pilate still desired to release our Lord, he weakly descended to argue with his subjects, and at last, coward as he was, basely gave way to their evil desires.

Our Lord's obedience to human laws is still further emphasized by a triplication (No. 16) of testimony from Herod, from the penitent thief, and from the centurion at the Cross.

In the last section of St. Luke's Gospel, which contains the account of the Resurrection, we find a triplication (No. 17) which emphasizes that great event as well as the Death of Christ. The memory of former prophecies is brought before the disciples in an ascending scale: on the first occasion, the two men in dazzling apparel at the empty tomb reminded the women of our Lord's own predictions of His sufferings and Resurrection; afterwards the Risen Christ referred the two on the way to Emmaus to the prophecies of Moses and of all the Prophets about Himself, suffering and entering into His glory; while, later on, our Lord reminded the assembled believers of His own words, and He also referred to the prophecies in the Law of Moses, in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Himself, His Death, and His Resurrection.

Finally, comes a triplication (No. 18) complementary to the last; it demonstrates how fully the disciples received and understood the meaning of our Lord's Death and Resurrection in fulfilment of prophecy. We are told that their eyes were *opened*, and they knew the Lord; their heart burned within them when He *opened* to them the Scriptures, and again we read that our Lord *opened* their mind that they might understand the Scriptures. It is noteworthy that the Greek word *to open* in each component of this triplication is *διανοίγω*, a word seldom used in the New Testament, and only in one other place in the Gospel of Luke (ii, 23), where the meaning is evidently to open fully, which is the true meaning of the word. In both the Authorized and Revised Versions, however, this emphatic compound word and also the simple *ἀνοίγω*, from which it is derived, are always translated by the same English word

to open; the full emphasis of this triplication is therefore lost in both our English translations.

A glance at Table II informs us that the triplications in the Gospel of Luke have been arranged in a very systematic and orderly manner. No. 1 triplication, unlike the others, is distributed in different parts of the introductory and central chapters, doubtless because it emphasizes the continued approval which God the Father bestowed upon His Son during the whole period of the Ministry, for the grand work of His Atoning Death to be carried out at the close. No. 2 triplication, which is all contained in the introductory chapters, emphasizes the fact that the Jews early shewed the bitterest opposition to recognizing our Lord as the Messiah.

All the remaining triplications draw marked attention to the Atoning Work which our Lord came to do; they are in three groups in the Central, Crucifixion, and Resurrection chapters respectively. The first group looks forward to the Cross; the second group emphasizes the sinlessness and the isolation of our Lord when He suffered; and the Resurrection triplications look back triumphantly on Christ's finished Work.

As further evidence of the careful arrangement of details, it may be noted that all the simple triplications, Nos. 6-13, are each entirely contained in Luke (A), Luke (B), or Luke (C). There is no instance, for example, of any with one component in Luke (A) and another in Luke (B); and we may further notice the symmetrical arrangement by which the double triplications (Nos. 4 and 5) have a component in each of the three parallel narratives.

The deductions made in this paper enable us intelligently to accept Luke's claim that he writes his Gospel "in order" (i, 3); for we have seen that he is most methodical in both his historical and literary arrangements.

It is trusted that a threefold advantage may result from this study of St. Luke's writings: that the historian may recognize that the chronology of the central chapters of his Gospel is perfectly accurate; that the student of literature may appreciate the beauty of the variously constructed triplications with which both his books are enriched; and that the devout Christian may more fully grasp the intense emphasis which this Evangelist has laid upon the central facts of Redemption,—on the Atoning Death and the glorious Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN : I am sure we are very grateful to Col. Mackinlay for the immense labour he has had in preparing this paper and for his kindness in reading it.

Mr. M. L. ROUSE, B.A., B.L. : I have looked through Col. Mackinlay's instances, and he certainly has made out an exceedingly good case. But I would say that it is a mistake to suppose that the arrival of the Lord Jesus at Bethany in Luke x, 38, is the same as the arrival for His last Passover (Luke xix, 29, John xii, 1), because in the first place St. Luke states "A certain woman named Martha received Him into her house," language describing a first visit; secondly, Martha is gently chidden for making extensive preparations, whereas at His last visit He accepted the Supper at which Martha served; and lastly and more potently the Lord Jesus had, after the raising of Lazarus, retired to a city called Ephraim, in the wilderness of Judæa, therefore He would not have gone through Samaria to get to Jerusalem, as we find that He did from the closing words of Luke ix.

On the other hand, if you take three successive journeys during this period, you get the chronology you desire, for they correspond with Christ's three visits recorded in John, to keep the feast of Tabernacles, the feast of Dedication, and the last Passover.

Again, Col. Mackinlay speaks of a certain narrative of a man who sought the way of eternal life, but these are not all one, but three. First, in Luke x, 25-37, a lawyer asked, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" In Luke xiii, 23-30, there is no question of eternal life. The real story is found in Luke xviii, 18-30; this clearly corresponds with the parallel account in Mark.

Dr. A. T. SCHOFIELD : I should like to point out that in my opinion the order of St. Luke is anything but cryptic. It seems psychologically not unreasonable to present a thing three times over. I must join the last speaker in taking exception to the statement that Luke x, 38, is the same as xix, 29. It would appear that Luke x, 38, corresponds with John vii, 2, 10, which refers to the feast of Tabernacles, six months before the visit referred to in Luke xix.

I think exception must be taken to the statement that the order is historical or chronological, although it is moral and literary.

There is a remarkable instance, in Luke xiii, 31-34, on our Lord's journey to the feast of the Dedication, when Herod tried to drive Him out, and sought to kill Him, and our Lord replied, "Go, tell that fox," etc. Luke then proceeds to put in our Lord's words, spoken three months later, in the Mount of Olives, as if they were spoken here: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings." Of course, the conjunction of the two is remarkable, and you have a picture of the fox after the hen, and the hen protecting the chickens, which would be lost if you did not couple together events which are really separated by three months' time, but here you get the whole scene. Surely the order is not chronological.

In Luke xxii, 14, Judas is spoken of as being at the Lord's Supper, whereas earlier it is stated that he left before. These are some illustrations which show that the order to which Luke refers is literary rather than historical.

The Rev. A. H. FINN: Is it quite safe to conclude that the passage in Luke xii must have been spoken in summer, because it mentions fruits, corn, lilies and grass? The allusions are perfectly general, and I think could have been uttered at any season; and moreover, in Palestine, these things do not all belong to any particular season. Lilies and grass would belong to the Passover time, the corn to Pentecost, and the fruits to late summer or early autumn.

However, I think the main subject of the paper is triplications, which interested me specially, because in my studies in the Old Testament I have come across triplications of triplications in Genesis, in relation both to the Deluge and to the destruction of souls, and the decrease of the waters. We must not suppose that Luke chose three, just to emphasize the subject. Does it not suggest the idea that triplication is not a question of the author's arrangement, but lies further back in the Providence of God, in arranging history to enforce attention?

The CHAIRMAN: This is a paper rather to study than discuss, and it is very difficult indeed even to enter into any considerable argument about it offhand, at a meeting like this. Colonel Mackinlay has contributed such valuable investigations on other parts of the

Scriptures, and particularly the Gospels, that anything he writes like this deserves the most careful study, and I should not like to give any definite opinion upon it without more time than I can bestow just now.

I must quarrel with one statement in which he says that the style of St. Luke is like that of Thucydides, because I think St. Luke is so much more simple ; and I have a little quarrel with his statement about the word *μῆνιν*, and his suggestion that it should have been *κῶδος*, the glory instead of the wrath of Achilles, for the whole account of the *Iliad* depends on "wrath" and not on "glory." Therefore the word "wrath" appears to be correct.

I sympathise with Professor Stanton (who has sent a letter on the paper) in thinking that it is very difficult to suppose that St. Luke or any other writer composed a narrative on a system so very elaborate as that indicated to-day. It seems to me that if the retrogressions spoken of in the paper are accepted, the historic thread is broken in the Gospel of St. Luke. I join most cordially in the expression of thanks to Colonel Mackinlay for the infinite labour he has bestowed on the production of the paper, and I am sure it will be a benefit to us to study, at greater leisure, the truths laid before us.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

The following written communications were received :—

The Rev. Professor V. H. STANTON, D.D. : "All study of the Gospels is valuable, and theories as to the arrangement of the matter, even if greatly mistaken, may yet help to direct attention to the main themes. I do not doubt that the great *themes* on which you lay stress are the themes which most occupied the mind of St. Luke. But whether he intended to emphasize those themes by a system of triplications, extending through large portions of his two works, is far more questionable.

"When one looks into instances that are offered of some such cryptic plans, one often finds that there has been something arbitrary in the selection of cases, *e.g.*, in the very first of yours. I do not know by what right you omit Acts ii, 23, 24, ' τοῦτον . . . οὗ ὁ Θεός,' where then is the triplet ?

“Again, there are two mentions of the Holy Spirit in Peter’s sermon, and you take in one after it, but why not also that before it, the event of Pentecost itself, or others that occur soon after in the course of the narrative of the Acts? There is surely no triplet here of a kind to lend emphasis.

“I cannot follow your argument as to three parallel sections, A, B and C, in Luke vi, 20–xxi, 38. I can discover no indication of intentional retrogression at the points you indicate, and the fact that the narratives within the sections hang together fairly well does not make the treatments of his subject as a whole chronological, and prove the Evangelist’s chronology to be accurate, when they are thus pieced together.

“Cryptic arrangements such as that discovered in Homer by Margoliouth, or some of the ‘Baconians’ in Shakespeare’s works, do not appeal to me. It may be difficult sometimes to disprove them, but also they cannot be proved. But that a writer like St. Luke, who was composing a Gospel for the instruction of all and everyone, should employ cryptic methods for emphasizing his message is to me incredible.”

The Rev. H. E. GAUSSEN, M.A., wrote questioning whether the Greek word for “in order” (Luke i, 3) is necessarily chronological; he also adds: “There is a very special interest and originality in what is said on p. 13 as regards the word *μωρογενής*.”

The Rev. E. A. ABBOTT, D.D.: “I have read your paper with much interest, and feel sure that there is a great deal of truth in your theory of triplications.”

A large number of other communications were received expressing interest in the paper, but hardly any of them entered into the arguments brought forward. Among them were letters from Professor MARGOLIOUTH, Professor NAIRNE, Canon ROBINSON, Dr. A. C. DIXON, and Dr. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL. Also from Sir WILLIAM ARCHIBALD, the Rt. Hon. Sir EDWARD CLARKE, Professor FLINDERS PETRIE, and Professor TURNER.

LECTURER’S REPLY.

Mr. Rouse contends that the arrivals at Bethany (Luke x, 38, xix, 29, and John xii, 1) are not the same. But attention is directed to the following:—(1) John xii, 1, of course, tells of a visit at the end of the Ministry, and the journey whose ending is recorded in Luke x, 38, must have been the very last one, because at its

beginning "the days were well-nigh come that He should be received up" (Luke ix, 51). (2) In both accounts of the visit to the house of Martha and Mary, we have the statement that Martha served, and that Mary was at our Lord's feet, and was commended—very suggestive that both accounts refer to the *same* visit. (3) The last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem was taken on the eastern side of the Jordan (Matt. xix, 1, Mark x, 1). It is fully in accord with Luke ix, 51-56, that the journey there described was also on the eastern side of the river. Our Lord was not received in a village of the Samaritans, Samaria being on the direct route; consequently He went to another, most probably *not* to another Samaritan one. If so, a glance at the map assures us that he must have crossed the Jordan in order to reach Jerusalem.

Bearing in mind the literary methods of the Evangelists, who dwell vividly on separate events, but do not always connect them together, and remembering their frequent omissions without remark, it must be allowed that after the tarrying at Ephraim (John xi, 54) Jerusalem could have been reached by a circuitous route *via* Samaria, Galilee, the eastern side of the Jordan, and Jericho. This route *must* have been followed, in order to fulfil the three foregoing conditions.

It is to be remembered also that the synoptic Gospels record our Lord's Ministry in Galilee fully, while they omit the record of all visits to Jerusalem, except the last. St. John, on the other hand, writing in a supplementary manner, describes many visits to the Holy City, but he had no need to mention the last visit to Galilee, nor the last journey from thence to Jerusalem, because they had both been fully described by the synoptists. It is concluded, therefore, that Luke x, 38, xix, 29, and John xii, 1, all refer to the same visit to Bethany.

Mr. Rouse contends that three separate conversations are reported in Luke x, 25-37; xiii, 23-30; and xviii, 18-30. He maintains that only the last passage corresponds with Mark x, 17-31. But all refer to the same discourse, for in Luke x, 25-37, these subjects are discussed: (1) The question how to inherit eternal life. (2) The keeping of the Commandments in general. (3) The command to love our neighbour. In Luke xiii, 23-30, these subjects are considered: (1) The question about the number of the saved—of the inheritors of eternal life. (2) The command, "Strive

to enter in." (3) The striking closing statement, "The last shall be first."

These subjects are all referred to directly, or indirectly, in the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark. Hence we conclude that all the five records refer to one and the same conversation, made on the same final journey to Jerusalem.

Dr. Schofield states that Lukan triplications are apparent, but it is evident that the long one, Luke (A), Luke (B), Luke (C), is cryptic to him. Otherwise he would conclude that the sentence about the fox, the hen and her brood (Luke xiii, 31-35) was spoken on the very last journey, and most probably near to Jerusalem. For it came just after the conversation with the man about the saved—the inheritors of eternal life, which we judge from the reference to the Jerusalem-Jericho road in the parallel passage in Luke (A) (x, 25-37), containing the Parable of the Good Samaritan, was uttered on that route. The latter half of the sentence about the hen and her brood was repeated at Jerusalem, according to Matthew xxiii, 37, only a few days afterwards.

Now it was in accord with our Lord's practice to speak on the same subject on days near together, as for instance when He referred to Himself as the Bread of Life on the day after the miracle of feeding the five thousand (John vi, 11, 22, 51). Hence, if the long threefold narrative is accepted, we must judge that Luke is historical and accurate in the passage under consideration. But Dr. Schofield thinks that the sentence in question was spoken just before the feast of Dedication, more than three months before the Crucifixion; if so, all unity of time is lost and Luke's historicity must be given up; for it is most unlikely that our Lord would have repeated the same sentence about the hen and her brood at times so far separated from each other.

There are difficult questions connected with the presence of Judas at the Lord's Supper, but St. Luke's history of what took place is quite consistent with itself. We are told in chapter xxii, 4, 5, that the traitor was away plotting with the chief priests. But he was afterwards present at the eating of the Passover (xxii, 21). Later on he must have left, because he met our Lord in the garden, and guided the multitude to apprehend Him (xxii, 47).

In reply to the Rev. A. H. Finn, it is, of course, true that fruits, corn, lilies and grass ripen at different times, but all are growing

during early summer, and they can then appropriately be alluded to. Triplications are doubtless employed for purposes other than emphasis ; but we must keep to our subject in this paper.

Our Chairman says it is very difficult to suppose that Luke or any other writer composed a narrative on a system so very elaborate as that indicated in the paper. On the other hand, the Rev. Harrington Lees writes with regard to the paper : " The elaborateness of St. Luke's style makes the theory possible, though certainly startling." May we not expect methodical arrangement in St. Luke's Gospel, particularly when it is remembered that the Greek word *καθεξῆς* in Luke i, 3, probably refers to literary as well as to chronological order.

The Dean's criticism that if there are two retrogressions in the Gospel of St. Luke, the historic thread must be broken, merits attention. It may truly be said that there is a retrogression on each of the two occasions when St. Paul narrated his conversion and commissioning in Acts xxii and xxvi, but there was no break in the historic thread, because it is very evident that the Apostle referred to past events.

It is maintained that, when all the evidences have been carefully examined, and when it is fully recognized that St. Luke has made two retrogressions in his Gospel, then also the historic thread is unbroken. The arrangements in the Gospel and in the Acts are parallel to each other : in both it is clearly understood that an old story is being repeated. The plan adopted in the Gospel of St. Luke is not one with which we are familiar, but it is a reasonable one to adopt.

In reply to Professor Stanton's criticism (second paragraph) it should be remembered that it is stated, on p. 5 of the paper, that the connecting thread of No. 1 triplication in the Acts is the use of the *three* Greek words, *οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς*. By what right, therefore, should *τοῦτου*, etc., in Acts ii, 23, be admitted, as the Professor suggests ? *οὗτος*, alone, occurs frequently ; but the components of this triplication are defined by the combination of the *three* words, which do not occur elsewhere in the Acts, as pointed out in the paper.

With regard to the third paragraph of the Professor's letter, the triplication here referred to (No. 3 in Table I) is not simply a *mention* of the Holy Spirit, but it is a *proclamation* ; His actual arriva

is not included, because an *arrival* is not a *proclamation*. This triplication is confined to Peter's words on the *day* of Pentecost as stated in the paper. The next *mention* of the Holy Spirit (iv, 8) is on a later day (ii, 46 ; iv, 5), and cannot therefore be included. Professor Stanton writes about this triplication, "there are two mentions of the Holy Spirit in Peter's sermon, you take one after it." The simple inference from these words is that the third proclamation was not by Peter. But it was, according to Acts ii, 38, and on the same day. Where is the mistake in the paper ?

In his fourth paragraph, the Professor raises a general objection ; the evidences of retrogression in the paper are considerable, but all have not been given, as mentioned on p. 252. A book is now being written on *The Emphasis of St. Luke*, in which all the arguments will be fully set out.

Professor Stanton refers to the Homeric anagrams. The author of this paper examined them, and came to the conclusion, which he still holds, that they really exist. But he referred to them simply as illustrations of the well-known fact that ancient writers occasionally veiled some of their arrangements. It was not contended that Luke adopted the same method as did Homer ; but both wrote in a cryptic manner.

Whether Professor Margoliouth's discovery is true or not, makes no difference to the existence of the long-hidden triplication Luke (A), Luke (B), Luke (C), because attention was drawn to the latter in an article published in *The Interpreter* in 1911, and the Homeric anagrams were not heard of until 1915.

The Gospels contain instruction for all and everyone, but surely it is not incredible that diligent seekers may find that well-known facts and spiritual truths are emphasized in striking ways, hidden from the casual reader ?

The author thanks the Dean of Canterbury for his kindness in presiding, and for his encouraging remarks. He also thanks all who have contributed to the discussion, including the large number whose letters, it is regretted, are not published, for want of space.

It is trusted that the interest in this subject will be maintained, and that students and scholars will carefully examine the arguments adduced in favour of the very methodical and orderly arrangement of St. Luke's books.