

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

*ST. LUKE AND ST. PAUL:**AN INQUIRY INTO THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS.*

THE chief object of this paper is to illustrate the influence of the professional character of the "beloved physician" on the thoughts and language of the later Epistles of St. Paul. It is assumed that the long-continued and intimate companionship implied in the Acts, which are traditionally ascribed to St. Luke (Acts xvi. 10; xx. 5; xxviii. 16), and in the casual references in three of St. Paul's Epistles (Col. iv. 14; Philem. verse 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11), would render such an influence antecedently probable. In proportion as we are able to trace it in coincidences that are obviously undesigned, beyond the reach even of the most consummate art, the probability assumes more and more nearly the character of a certainty, and it imparts some measure of that certainty to the inference already drawn as to the companionship. That the coincidences are thus undesigned is patent from the fact that St. Luke (assuming for the present his authorship of the Acts and of the Gospel that bears his name) nowhere informs us, directly or indirectly, of his calling, and that we know it only from a casual mention of his name by the Apostle.

As a preliminary inquiry, however, it may be well to note the phenomena in the writings ascribed to the physician which, though they do not directly indicate his calling, at least fall in with it and are best explained by it. Assume such an one coming into contact with the cycle of events and the circle of persons connected with the ministry of Jesus,

and the early years of the Church which took its name from Him, and it is hardly conceivable that his way of looking on them should not have been, in some measure, determined by his technical culture, by the opportunities which his calling gave him, by the habit of observation which that culture and calling had formed and fashioned in him. Mr. Browning's wonderful poem, "An Epistle of Karshish the Arab physician,"¹ in which he represents one of the same calling suddenly, in the course of his travels, coming across the case of Lazarus as one transcending all his past experience, may

¹ The poem should be read as a whole ; but as it is probable that the volume containing it may not be in the hands of many readers of THE EXPOSITOR, I may, perhaps, be allowed to put together a few of its more striking passages:—

"Some elders of his tribe, I should premise,
Led in their friend, obedient as a sheep,
To bear my inquisition. While they spoke,
Now sharply, now with sorrow,—told the case,—
He listened not except I spoke to him,
But folded his two hands and let them talk.

* * * * *

And oft the man's soul springs into his face
As if he saw again and heard again
His sage that bade him 'Rise,' and he did rise.
Something, a word, a tick of the blood within
Admonishes: then back he sinks at once
To ashes, who was very fire before,
In sedulous recurrence to his trade
Whereby he earneth him the daily bread ;
And studiously the humbler for that pride,
Professedly the faultier that he knows
God's secret, while he holds the thread of life.
Indeed the especial marking of the man
Is pure submission to the heavenly will—
Seeing it, what it is, and why it is.

* * * * *

He will live, nay, it pleaseth him to live
So long as God please, and just how God please.

be allowed, in its dramatic truth and vividness, to illustrate the impression which analogous phenomena would make on the mind of the Italian freedman who bore the name of Luke.¹ Such a writer, more familiar with the form and substance of Greek literature than any other writer of the New Testament, must, from the nature of the case, at least be credited with a knowledge of the current phraseology of the medical schools of the time, and

He even seeketh not to please God more
(Which meaneth, otherwise) than as God please.

* * * * *

This man so cured regards the curer, then,
As—God forgive me!—who but God himself,
Creator and Sustainer of the world,
That came and dwelt in flesh on it awhile!
Sayeth that such an one was born and lived,
Taught, healed the sick, broke bread at his own house,
Then died, with Lazarus by, for aught I know,
And yet was . . . what I said, nor choose repeat,
And must have so avouched himself, in fact,
In hearing of this very Lazarus.

* * * * *

The very God! think, Abib; dost thou think?
So, the All-great were the All-loving too,—
So, through the thunder comes a human voice
Saying, 'O heart I made, a heart beats here!
Face, my hands fashioned, see in it myself,
Thou hast no power, nor may'st conceive of mine,
But love I gave thee, with myself to love,
And thou must love me who have died for thee!
The madman saith He said so: it is strange."

¹ Lucas is, beyond all doubt, a contraction of Lucanus, and this suggests Lucania in Southern Italy as his birthplace. The inference becomes more conclusive when we take into account the obvious familiarity with Italian topography seen in the mention of Appii Forum and the Three Taverns in Acts xxviii. That he was a freedman may be inferred from the fact that well-nigh every physician in Italy belonged to that class.

of the text-books, such as the writings of Hippocrates, upon which the education given in them was based. Some of the examples of this phraseology are familiar enough to most students, but for the sake of making the inquiry complete, it will be necessary to note them briefly here. Thus we find him noting specifically the special combination of fevers (*πυρετοὶ*, as in Hippoc. *Aph.* vii. 63, 64, the plural is obviously technical for "feverish symptoms") and a bloody flux¹ (*δυσεντερία*) from which the father of Publius suffered at Melita (Acts xxviii. 8), and using in relation to the generous gifts which it called forth the special word "honour" (*τιμὴ*), which, like our "honorarium," was applied to the payments made to those who practised a profession, and not a trade. So, again, in the healing of the cripple in the Temple (Acts iii. 7) he records with a technical precision which our English Version but partially represents that "his feet" (not the common *πόδες*, but *βάσεις*—a word used by Hippocrates, p. 637) "and ankle bones" (*σφυρὰ*) "were strengthened," the previous crippled state being due to the congenital imperfect development of the bones and tendons of the feet. So, in tracing the sequel of the miraculous healing, he twice dwells on the fact that the man leapt, not once only, but repeatedly, as if with a natural exultation and desire to test his newly-acquired power. (Acts iii. 8, 9.) So, again, as one who, as far as he could, made a point of inquiring into the history of each case of healing, he states that the paralysis of Æneas had lasted for eight years, and that for the whole of that period

¹ Hippocrates (*Aph.* vi. 3) speaks of this combination as specially severe and dangerous.

he had been bedridden. (Acts ix. 33.) Assuming, what I hope to prove more fully by and by, that his relation to St. Paul was one which involved constant personal application of his professional skill, we can understand how he would register the fact that when he recovered from his temporary blindness there fell from his eyes as it had been the "scales" (*ὡσεὶ λεπιδες*) of the incrustation incidental to ophthalmia or other forms of severe inflammation of the eye-balls. (Acts ix. 18.) So, while an unscientific writer, say like St. Matthew, would have been content with describing St. Peter's vision as a dream (*ὄναρ*), he more technically sees in it a trance (*ἔκστασις*), and connects that "ecstatic" state with its natural antecedents in St. Peter's long-continued fasting, and probably his exposure in the exhausted condition thus brought on to the burning mid-day sun, at the fourth hour of the day, as it blazed down on the house-top to which he had withdrawn for prayer. (Acts x. 9, 10.) A Jew using the common language of Palestine would have simply spoken of the damsel at Philippi as having an unclean spirit, as possessed with a demon. St. Luke, though in compiling the narrative of his Gospel from Palestine records he uses the language which he found in them, in dealing with a case which came under his own observation uses a term which more naturally suggested itself to a Greek physician, and speaks of her as having "a spirit of Python," or Apollo, presenting phenomena identical with the convulsive movements and wild cries of the Pythian priestess at Delphi. (Acts xvi. 16.) One whose previous studies had made him acquainted with the

recorded cases of phthiriasis, such as those of Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc. ix. 9), Pheretima (Herod. iv. 205), and Sylla, and perhaps Herod the Great (Josephus, Ant. xvii. 15), would note with a special interest the addition of another instance in the death of Herod Agrippa as "eaten by worms," *σκοληκόβρωτος*. (Acts xii. 23.)

So, turning to his Gospel, we find that while the other Evangelists use the word *δυνάμεις* in a vague way as a synonym for miracles, St. Luke only speaks with a professional precision of the *δύναμις*, the "virtue" of the old medical writers (Hippoc. *Ant. Med.* c. 22), which seemed to him to be the instrument of healing, drawn from the person of Christ by the touch of faith. (Luke viii. 16, 17.) He alone recalls the words which naturally would come home to him with a special force, "Ye will surely say unto me this parable, Physician, heal thyself" (Luke iv. 23). Lastly, whatever view we take of the precise nature of the fact described, it was quite in accordance with his character that he should note that in the agony at Gethsemane "our Lord's sweat was, as it were, great drops" (*θρόμβοι*, clots, a definitely medical term) "of blood falling down to the ground" (Luke xxii. 44).

We enter on a more conjectural region, yet one in which the conjectures have at least the merit of giving a reasonable explanation of phenomena, when we connect St. Luke's work as a physician with the opportunities which he manifestly possessed, in a higher degree than others, in his work as an historian. What characterizes his Gospel and the Acts is (1) the information which he supplies as to the several members of the Herodian family,

Antipas and the two Agrippas, Manaen, Drusilla, and Bernice; and (2) his access to letters and documents, on the one hand, and, on the other, (3) his acquaintance with the names of the company of devout women who accompanied our Lord at least in his later journeyings, and ministered to Him of their substance. (Luke viii. 1 ; xxiv. 10.) It is, at any rate, probable that a skilled Greek physician living at Jerusalem or Cesarea would be eagerly sought out and welcomed by the official class at the seat of Roman government, and hardly less so by those whose position and active work must have made them conspicuous among the members of the Church of the Holy City, and the centre of whose reverence must, in the nature of things, have been found in the mother of the Lord they loved. Thus we may think of him as gathering from their lips every anecdote, if we may so speak of the facts of the Gospel, which was likely to dwell in the memories of such women—the love and the tears of the woman that was a sinner, the seven devils that had been cast out of Mary Magdalene, the pitying words spoken to the daughters of Jerusalem, the cry of the woman who burst out into the adoring exclamation, “Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the paps which thou hast sucked;” the raising of the son of the widow of Nain. Thus, also, we may think of him as obtaining the record, manifestly originally Aramaic, in which he has given us the Gospel of the Nativity, the recollections which lingered in that company of the saintly wife of Zacharias and the prophetess Anna, the daughter of Phanuel. From them too, and therefore ultimately from the mother of the Lord,

he may well have derived the genealogy which he inserts at the end of that record, and which, whatever view we take of its relation to that given by St. Matthew, is manifestly one which, running, as it does, through the line of natural descent, may well have been cherished side by side with that which traced the succession of regal inheritance in the home of Nazareth. When we remember that the Emmaus in Judea had, like its namesake in Galilee, a reputation for medicinal springs,¹ which might well have attracted to it the footsteps of the travelling physician, and that there, as elsewhere, he would naturally utilize every visit as an inquiry into the facts of the history which he had already planned and for which he was gathering materials, it is no bold assumption to think that we owe to such a visit the record, peculiar to his Gospel, of that walk to Emmaus, when the two disciples (of whom the one whom he names Clopas was probably his informant) felt their hearts burn within them as the risen Lord talked with them by the way and opened to them the Scriptures. (Luke xxiv. 18.)

Lastly, under this head, I would venture to note as at least characteristic of the kind of culture which medical education gives, the accuracy which we find both in the Gospel and the Acts in the report of details seemingly insignificant, and sometimes even in instances where it has required careful research on the part of modern criticism to ascertain that it was accurate. Thus, for instance, his notice of the *στρατηγοὶ* at Philippi as a Roman

¹ The very name, indeed (connected, as it is, with Hammath, "hot springs," or the more familiar Hammam), implied the reputation.

κολωνία, of the Proconsuls of Cyprus and Achaia, of the *πολιτάρχαι* of Thessalonica, and the *ασιάρχαι* of Ephesus, of the taxing of Cyrenius, and the synchronism of those who bore rule in Palestine at the commencement of our Lord's ministry, of the two Agrippas, and Drusilla, and Bernice, and Felix, and Festus, and John, and Alexander, as members of the Pontifical family, are, one and all of them, as any student will recognize, confirmed either by contemporary historians or by recently discovered inscriptions on coins and monuments. It is not, I think, fanciful to trace here also, and hardly less in the narrative of the shipwreck in Acts xxvii., the effects of that training which, in proportion to its completeness, habituates the mind to carefulness in observing and precision in recording.

I pass from this preliminary inquiry to that with which we are more specially concerned,—St. Luke's companionship with St. Paul. When that companionship began we have no direct record. The writer of the Acts appears for the first time, as indicated by the change from the third person to the first, on St. Paul's arrival at Troas, in what we call his second missionary journey. (Acts xvi. 10.) But it is clear that that was not the beginning of their friendship. The naturalness with which the transition is made, the absence of any mention of the circumstances that brought them together, forbid that assumption. It is therefore all but certain that they must have met at some earlier stage of St. Paul's ministry, possibly at Antioch or Tarsus. Both these cities stood high in reputation as seats of learning. Either was likely to attract a traveller

seeking knowledge in his special art. Leaving as doubtful the question where they had met before, the circumstances under which they now meet again have, if I mistake not, a special interest. The Apostle had been detained in Galatia by an attack of severe illness, probably (from the strange form in which he expresses his sense of the ardent affection which would have led the Galatians, "if it had been possible, to have plucked out their own eyes and given them to him"—Gal. iv. 15) by a sharp attack of that affection of the eyes, at once painful and disfiguring (Gal. iv. 14), which very many of the profounder students of St. Paul's life have identified with the mysterious "thorn in the flesh," which has passed into a proverb: (2 Cor. xii. 7.) Is it too much to suppose that the physician may well have thought that one who had recently suffered so much needed his loving and skilful care as he entered on the labours of his European ministry?

That conclusion is at all events strengthened by the fact that when they meet again, and when, so far as we trace their companionship, it was renewed never again to be broken, it was under circumstances altogether analogous. Some years had passed, during which we trace at the outset the loving care of the friend in the help sent once and again to St. Paul at Thessalonica from Philippi (Phil. iv. 15), and again at Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 9), and then they were divided. In one instance, indeed, I would venture to suggest that St. Luke's influence may have helped the Apostle in his work at Ephesus. He taught there, we are told, daily "in the school," or lecture-room, "of one Tyrannus" (Acts xix. 9). That was not a

common name among either Greeks or Romans. It is found, however, in the well-known list of freedmen and others attached to the Imperial service, in the *Columbarium*, or burial-place, of the Empress Livia, the wife of Augustus, and there it appears as the name of a physician. (Gori. *Columb. Liv.* p. 120.) It was the commonest matter of course that such names and callings should descend from father to son, and it is, therefore, in a high degree probable that the teacher who thus placed his lecture-room at the disposal of the herald of a new and unpopular doctrine, may have done so because he and that teacher had a common friend in the physician of Philippi.

It is clear from the whole tenor of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians that, immediately before his next visit to Philippi, where it is equally clear that Luke remained, St. Paul had again suffered severely from his bodily infirmities. He "despaired of life," had been "delivered as from so great a death," was as one "always bearing in his body the dying of the Lord Jesus," groaning under the burden of his "earthly tabernacle," his "outward man perishing day by day" (2 Cor. i. 10; iv. 10, 15; v. 2). Can we interpret these expressions otherwise than as indicating that he had sunk into a state of feebleness and prostration, in which the help of his friend and adviser would once again be an urgent necessity for him? Must we not in part, at least, look on this as the reason that led St. Luke from that time forth to accompany him in all his journeyings? Other motives may, of course, have combined with this. If, as I believe, he was

“the brother whose praise was in the gospel” of 2 Cor. viii. 18, he was chosen by the Churches of Macedonia, in which he had been so active, to be their representative among the bearers of the great collection for the “saints” at Jerusalem. He may have welcomed the opportunity for going over the sacred ground of Galilee and Judea, and adding to the materials for that history to which, as St. Paul’s words imply, he had already devoted himself. These motives would account for his journey to Jerusalem; but we want something more to explain his abandonment of his former work, in order that he might be with St. Paul during his two years’ imprisonment at Cesarea and on his voyage to Italy: and that something I find in strong personal affection and the growing sense of his necessity to the Apostle’s well-being.

It will be, I am sure, within the experience of most of us that we cannot be thrown for any length of time, hardly perhaps even for a single consultation, into the society of a thoughtful and cultivated physician without learning something from him beyond our own immediate case, from the knowledge with which his studies have enriched him. His words dwell with us, and we reproduce them and apply them, with more or less freedom, as half parables of moral, or political, or social life. We talk of the *diagnosis* of national diseases, of the policy of *counter-irritation*, of the *delirium tremens* of political or ecclesiastical fanaticism, of the *hypertrophy* of this or that organ of the body politic. Such instances of phrases that were once professional and have become literary might be multiplied by

the score. It will hardly, I think, be questioned that a companionship such as that which we have traced between the physician and the Apostle would be likely to issue in like phenomena.

The influence of that companionship is what I now seek to trace, and I begin with that in which it is most conspicuous, the group of letters known as the Pastoral Epistles. Here, as the most prominent instance, I take (1) the remarkable use of the verb *ὑγιαίνειν* (to be healthy), in its figurative application to doctrine. The frequency of that application (1 Tim. 9; vi. 3; 2 Tim. i. 13; Titus i. 9) is concealed in the English Version by the needless variations of rendering, such as "sound doctrine," "wholesome words," "sound words," and the like; but the verb is in all such cases (eight in number) one and the same. That word, as might be expected, was one in frequent use by Hippocrates, e.g., *Aph.* ii. 15; *Vet. Med.* c. 10. It was likely to be found in the vocabulary of every Greek physician. It is noticeable that it is found three times in St. Luke's Gospel (Chaps. v. 31; vii. 10; xv. 2) and not in the other three. It does not occur in St. Paul's earlier writings. I say, then, to begin with, that this reference of all teaching to an ideal standard of healthiness is one which we may naturally connect with the influence exercised on St. Paul's thoughts and language by those of the "beloved physician." He had learnt to recognize there also, in the region of the spiritual life as in the natural, the importance of health, of the "*mens sana in corpore sano.*" And as the natural sequence of this, departures from the true faith present themselves to his mind as deflections in one direction or

another from that normal healthiness. Here, again, we must look to the Greek rather than the English. One who teaches another doctrine than that of the words of the Lord Jesus, in which he recognizes the highest type of health (1 Tim. vi. 3), is not "doting," as in the Authorized Version, but "*diseased*" (1 Tim. vi. 4) about disputes and logomachies. Of the most malignant form of that disease he predicts that it will spread and have its course, feeding on the organs of life, not (as in the Authorized Version) as a "canker," but as a gangrene, γάγγραινα (Galen's *Commentary on Aph.* vii. 50), as a *cancer*, in the full significance which that term has in modern pathology (2 Tim. ii. 17), eating into the inner life of the soul, and spreading its corruption. So, again, in that word τυφωθεῖς, τετυφωμένοι, and the cognate forms, which are rendered, "lifted up with pride," "proud," "high-minded" (1 Tim. iii. 6; vi. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 4), we trace, when we turn to the language of Hippocrates and Galen, not simply a moral defect, but a specific form of fever, as far as the word goes, identical with our familiar *typhus* (*Int. Aff.* c. xlii.) having as its characteristic symptoms the "*delirantium somnia*," to which St. Paul compares the insane, self-centred imaginations of the false teachers. Others, however, are in a yet more hopeless state. They have their very conscience seared as with a red-hot iron (1 Tim. iv. 2), *cauterized*, to use St. Paul's more technical term, by crimes which have left an ineffaceable brand upon their souls, and yet in doing so have numbed its sensitiveness, so that, as has been said of some, the very "nerve of pudicity" is dead in them. Of a lighter form of the same evil he

notes that they have "itching ears" (*κνηθόμενοι τήν ἀκοήν*; the word is strictly technical, Hippoc. p. 444-35), are affected as by a "*pruritus aurium*," which they cannot control or cure. (2 Tim. iv. 3.)

The influence of which I speak shews itself not less plainly, if I mistake not, in the singular moderation with which St. Paul deals with all questions that affect the relation between the health of the body and that of the spirit of man. Timothy, it would seem, conscious of some temptations from the youthful lusts that war against the soul, sought to check them by an overstrained asceticism. St. Paul saw the dangers incident to these practices as a physician's eye would see them, and twice warns his disciple against them. "Bodily exercise," he tells him (again a word from Hippocrates, *Aph.* vi. 5, *γυμνασία*), the *training* of the body, as the athlete or the ascetic trains it, as Timothy was training it, profits a little, but godliness, piety in the true sense of the word, is profitable for all things, in this life and in the life to come. (1 Tim. iv. 8.) The well-known advice, "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake" (*στόμαχος*, again from Hippocrates, *Isag. puls.* p. 72,) "and for thine often infirmities" (1 Tim. v. 23), supplies obviously another example. The position of that advice is, however, peculiar, and calls for a special notice. It comes in, it will be remembered, with a strange abruptness, in the midst of a series of rules for trying ecclesiastical offences: "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses. Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear. . . . Observe these things without preferring one before

another, doing nothing by partiality. Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins. Keep thyself pure." Then follows the counsel about a "little wine." Then the letter returns to the previous subject, and discusses the difference between open and secret sins. What account are we to give of this strange parenthesis? By what train of unexpressed thought was St. Paul led to interpose this precept here? I venture to think that the train of thought was precisely such as would be natural in one habitually under the guidance of the counsels of a wise physician. It lay in the nature of things, looking to the social condition of the Empire, that the most numerous offences that would come under the notice of an ecclesiastical judge would be sins against sexual purity. The mere inquiry into such things, in all their loathsome details, brought with it, to a young and sensitive nature, like that of St. Paul's true son in the faith, the risk of mental contamination. Timothy, it would seem, sought to guard against that risk by a more rigorous abstinence. St. Paul saw, as one under such guidance would be sure to see, that that rigour was certain to overshoot its mark, that the enfeebled and excited system was more likely to be the victim of unclean imaginations than one in an average state of healthy equilibrium; and, lest his injunction, "Keep thyself pure," should lead to fresh austerities, he throws in a plain practical rule of dietetics tending to that result. So, perhaps, in an ecclesiastical system where the practice of confession led the guide of souls to be often brought in contact with perils of a like kind, a wise physician would say to

him, "If you must listen to such things, at all events don't go into the confessional on an empty stomach."

What we have seen in the two passages just examined will prepare us for the right interpretation of another, which, from its singular difficulty, has been the *crux* of commentators. As it stands in the English Version it is not too much to say that it is simply unintelligible. "Which things" (he is speaking of ascetic rules) "touch not, taste not, handle not" (the first clause referring, by a well-understood euphemism, as in 1 Cor. vii. 1, to an enforced celibate life as essential to holiness),—"which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship and humility and neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh" (Col. ii. 23). The true explanation of the last clause is found, I am bold to say, in looking to the strictly medical sense of the word translated "satisfying." *Πλησμονή* appears in Hippocrates as satiety, the state that results from high feeding. (*Aph.* ii. 4, 22.) It is contrasted with hunger, it is associated with drunkenness (*De Itner. Affect.* lxxv. 39). Giving it this meaning, and assigning to *τιμὴ* its natural sense of "honour" or "repute," we find in the whole passage a line of thought identical with that which we have traced in the Epistle to Timothy. At Colosse, as at Ephesus, St. Paul met with those who, in their Manichean horror of the body, forbade to marry and commanded to abstain from meats. "Their negative rules," he says, "have a counterfeit show of wisdom in self-imposed ritual, and abject lowliness, and unsparing treatment of the body; yet, in relation to fulness of the flesh, to the lusts which

that fulness implies, they are absolutely valueless, *held in no honour* as remedies for that disease."

With less certainty, yet unwilling to pass over what seems to me to throw light upon another obscure passage, I refer to a precept of like character, bearing upon the weaknesses of the other sex. St. Paul is urging the right relation of the woman to the man as one of subordination. He suffers not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man. Adam had been created first, not Eve. Eve had been the first to yield to the tempter. And then, "Nevertheless, she shall be saved in [or rather *through*] child-bearing, if she continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety" (1 Tim. ii. 15). I seem to myself to hear in this the counsel of one who had studied the character and work of women from the stand-point both of a trained physician and of one who had been the guide and director of the guild or sisterhood at Philippi. To him, whatever tended to draw woman from the duties of home-life seemed full of danger. She would find her true salvation, her true deliverance from the temptations incident to her sex, through that child-bearing (note the characteristic use of a technical term, *διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας*) which was commonly regarded as the penalty of her transgression. Maternity, with all the affections and responsibilities which it involved, was the true discipline for her perfection.

These are the more prominent instances, but the case may be rendered yet more complete by noting other examples of a like phraseology used as by one familiar with it in daily conversation. St. Paul, over and above his direct argument against forcing cir-

cumcision as a condition of entrance into the Christian Church, speaks of it at times with a half-humorous Luther-like scorn and indignation. When the rite is retained after its purpose has been exhausted, and it has thus been emptied of its symbolism and sacramental character, it has no longer any title to its old time-honoured name, but is simply, so to speak, a surgical operation. It is no longer a true circumcision, but an incision, or, to use the strictly medical Greek, not a *περιτομή*, but a *κατατομή* (Phil. iii. 2). In a yet bolder passage, speaking of the same false teachers, he bursts out into the wish (I follow the consensus of all the best commentators in my paraphrase), "I would that they who trouble you would mutilate themselves after the manner of the eunuch-priests of Cybele" (Gal. v. 12). Not *circumcision*, nor *incision*, but *excision* was the natural outcome of this morbid dwelling on the fleshly rite. Is not this precisely the kind of language likely to be used by a Gentile physician resenting, with a natural scorn, the attempt of the Judaizing teachers to impose their yoke of bondage upon him and his brother converts?

So, in not a few passages where our English Version hides the technicality, when we read, "If a man strive for masteries he is not crowned, except he strive lawfully" (2 Tim. ii. 5), the Greek adverb (*νομίμως*) is a strictly technical word, half medical and half athletic, implying the observance of the normal system of diet and exercise which physicians and gymnasts alike prescribed for the training of the wrestler (Hippoc. *Aph. i.* 15). When we find, "they turned aside to vain jangling" (1 Tim. i. 6),

the word (*ἐκτρέπεσθαι*), though common enough, was used by Hippocrates in a special sense of a bodily state or organ turning off or degenerating into something lower than its actual state (*de temp. morb.*). When we read, "I count them but dung" (Phil: ii. 8), the word is not the common familiar one, but technical (*σκύβαλα*), such as a medical writer would use, and which has, I believe, passed into modern medical terminology.

In the word *ἀφορμή*, again, commonly rendered "occasion" in 1 Tim. v. 14, and elsewhere, we have a term used by St. Paul alone (Rom. vii. 8-11; 2 Cor. v. 12, xi. 11; Gal. v. 13) among the New Testament writers, that is found in Hippocrates as expressing the starting-point of the action of disease (*Aph.* vi. 14). In *ἀτενίζειν*, used only by St. Luke and St. Paul in the New Testament (2 Cor. ii. 7-13), and by the former to describe the look and expression of the latter (Luke iv. 20; xxii. 56; Acts iii. 21; x. 4; xiv. 9; xxiii. 1), we have a form technically used by Hippocrates for the fixed gaze of intense emotion, which soon passes into the glare of delirium (*Coac. Prem.* v. 1). Even the exceptional use of Scythian, to denote one great division of the human race (Col. iii. 11), has its counterpart in the medical arrangement of climates in their relation to health under the heads of Libya, Delos, Scythia, as representative instances (Hippoc. p. 166).

Here my induction for the present ends. It will be admitted, I think, that I have sufficiently proved the position which I sought to establish; but I am far from thinking that my inquiry has been complete or full, and the way in which each re-

ference to the Greek medical writers has brought fresh coincidences to light makes me feel that there is in them a mine, as yet unworked, for this purpose, to reward the search of more laborious or more leisurely scholars than myself.¹ What has been brought out has, I venture to think, a claim on our attention, if only as bearing on the personal relations of the two men of whom I have been speaking. It is no small matter to gain a fresh insight into the friendships of a great thinker or a great worker, to watch their birth and growth and the circumstances that drew the men nearer and nearer to each other, to trace the influence of mind on mind, to note how the familiar words and phrases of the one percolate into the language of the other. But the interest, I may add the importance, of the inquiry does not end here. We have been told, with a great parade of learning, by the author of "Supernatural Religion" that there is no evidence of the existence of any of the first

¹ I add a few instances as further illustrations:—1. St. Luke's use of the word *παροξυσμός* (Acts xv. 39), though not exclusively, is yet characteristically medical. (Hippoc. *Aph.* ii. 13.) 2. St. Paul's use of *παραγγελία* in the same way as that in which it is employed by Hippocrates in the document known as "The Oath." 3. St. Paul's arguments (1) as to the functions of the several parts of the body (1 Cor. xii. 14-27), and the nature of the sensuous and the spiritual bodies (1 Cor. xv. 36-44). These, though not technical, are yet, it will be admitted, such as would commend themselves to a mind familiar with a technical view of the matters they discuss. 4. The phrase in Ephes. iv. 16, "fitly joined together, and compacted by every joint of supply" (*συναρμολογούμενον και συμβιβαζόμενον δια πάσης άρθης της επιχορηγίας*), has, to say the least, the ring of a physiological illustration. 5. "Rightly dividing" (*ὀρθορομύνην*) "the word of truth" (2 Tim. ii. 15), which have been applied to the work of the ploughman, the sculptor, the carpenter, the sacrificing priest, the father of the family, may quite as legitimately be connected with the skill of the surgeon, operating with the precision which true insight gives.

three Gospels prior to the middle of the second century, that the traditions which ascribe them to St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke have no claim to historical credibility. Passing over other grounds on which that assertion may be disputed, I submit that it is indefinitely weakened, if not altogether refuted, by the conclusions to which we have been led. By a series of coincidences so absolutely undesigned and latent, that, so far as I know, they have never before been brought together as materials for an induction, we have seen (1) that St. Paul's casual mention of Luke as the "beloved physician" explains characteristic phenomena in the books commonly ascribed to him, which demand an explanation and do not easily admit of any other; (2) that these characteristics and the technical culture which they imply explain equally peculiar phenomena in the Pastoral and other Epistles of St. Paul. (3) We have shewn, to a degree of probability so high that it is scarcely less than certainty, that the Pastoral Epistles were written by the friend of Luke, that the Gospels and the Acts were written by the friend of Paul, and so we establish, as far as that probability goes, the date both of the Epistles and the Gospels. But then it follows that, leaving the other Gospels to stand or fall on their own evidence, there is at least one of which we can say that it brings before us contemporary, though not perhaps direct, testimony to the facts which it records. We need not go to Papias, or Irenæus, or Justin for scattered intimations of the existence of the Gospels. Here is one which the whole weight of circumstantial

evidence leads us to ascribe to the generation of St. Peter and St. Paul, and its opening words imply the evidence not only of a widely diffused oral knowledge, but of still earlier written records. And that Gospel is the work not of an illiterate publican or fisherman of Galilee (I use the common language, though I believe it to be in no small measure an exaggeration), but of a man of culture and learning, conversant with the works that were in highest repute in the medical schools of Greece. He comes across the facts, inquires into them minutely, tracks the reports to their sources, accepts, believes. Men may, if they will, look on him as credulous and superstitious, as some among us look on any physician or man of science who avows himself a Christian as credulous and superstitious now, and so reject his testimony; but they cannot do so on the ground that he lived long after the events, or took no pains to inquire into them, or had not received the training which qualified him to judge. The one ground on which they can consistently set aside his evidence is that they postulate the impossibility of miracles. In other words, they take the short and easy method of begging the question.

E. H. PLUMPTRE.
