

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

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

## PROFESSOR HARNACK ON LUKE.

### II.

AFTER stating in a general way the position which Professor Harnack takes up in this remarkable book,<sup>1</sup> it is only fair to give some specimens in detail of the arguments on which he relies. As we are in almost entire agreement with the main position of his book, it will conduce to clearness to say that most of the quotations which will be made at the outset are of points which seem to show his method at its best. In the concluding pages some remarks will be made on the method of proof which is employed in the book. As before, in order to avoid the frequent repetition of the personal name, we shall refer to him as the Author.

The Author's argument and inferences about the passages in which the first personal pronoun "We" is used are stated most definitely on pp. 37 f. After minutely examining Acts xvi. 10-17, and observing the identity in words, construction, tone and thought with the style of the rest of the *Acts* and the Third Gospel, he argues that, if the writer of the *Acts* took this passage from a "Source," he has left nothing in it unchanged except the first personal pronoun: everything else he has recast into his own characteristic vocabulary, syntax and style. Such a procedure is simply inconceivable, and therefore there remains only the position that the writer of the whole book is himself the original composer of these "We"-Passages: he is the man whose

<sup>1</sup> See EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1906, pp. 481 ff.

personal presence in Troas and Philippi with Paul obliges him to speak as a witness of and sharer in the action.

It is possible, the Author argues on p. 38, to go one step further. The writer did not take this passage, xvi. 10-17, from his own old notebook or diary, and insert it in his history. When he wrote the history twenty to thirty years after the events, he could not possibly have retained in all respects exactly the same style as he used in his old notebook. This passage was written when the book of the Acts was written; it was composed as part of the whole work, though this does not preclude the view that he had notes written down at the time, with which he could refresh his memory. This argument is absolutely conclusive to every person that has the power of comprehending and appreciating style and literary art; unfortunately many of the so-called "Higher Critics" seem to have become devoid of any such comprehension through fixing persistently their attention on words and details.

Luke was not merely a witness, he took part in the action: "Straightway we sought to go forth into Macedonia, concluding that God had called us for to preach the Gospel unto them," and "we sat down and spake unto the women" (xvi. 10, 13): here the narrator makes himself one of the missionaries to Macedonia. He was not a mere companion, he was an enthusiastic missionary to that country; and on my view (though not on the Author's view) he continued to be specially devoted to that country, except in so far as the still higher personal devotion to Paul called him away.

The Author, on the contrary, is disposed to connect Luke with Ephesus, with Asia, and with Achaia (as has been stated above, *EXPOSITOR*, Dec. 1906, p. 496 f.). He finds a sufficient proof that Luke was not a Macedonian in Acts xxvii. 2—"we put to sea, Aristarchus, a Macedonian of

Thessalonica, being with us" (p. 31). I cannot see any force in this reasoning. On the same principle it might be argued that Luke was not an Asian (which the Author is inclined to believe that he was), because in xx. 4, 5, he speaks of "Asians, Tychicus and Trophimus," who "were waiting for us at Troas."

The remarkable passage, Acts xvi. 9, must detain our attention for a moment, while we apply to it a principle which the Author lays down on p. 11, though he does not apply it to xvi. 9, and would deny the inferences which we shall draw. He points out that, throughout the "We"-Passages, Luke distinguishes carefully between "We" and Paul: wherever it is reasonably possible in view of historic and literary truth, he emphasizes Paul and keeps the "We" modestly in the background.<sup>1</sup> Now observe in xvi. 10 how the "We" is put forward. The vision was seen by Paul alone, the message was given to Paul alone, "Come over into Macedonia and help us." Yet the narrative continues, "And when he had seen the vision, straightway we sought to go forth into Macedonia, concluding that God had called us for to preach the Gospel unto them." Without any apparent necessity, even without any apparent justification, the writer assumes that, because Paul has been called into Macedonia, Luke shares in the call. There is no other passage in which the "We" is forced in without obvious justification; and on the view stated in *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 200-3, there is a justification hidden beneath the surface in this case also, for Luke had taken a part in the vision, and was therefore forced to conclude that he as well as Paul was called to Macedonia. Several reasons (which need not be repeated here) are there stated, which point to the idea that the man of Macedonia, whom Paul saw in the vision and recognized at sight as a Mace-

<sup>1</sup> See EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1906 p. 492.

donian, was Luke; and these are confirmed by the observation now stated.

Every time I read this remarkable passage, xvi. 6-10, I am more and more struck with the intense personal feeling that lies under the words, the hurry and rush of the narrative, and the quiet satisfaction of the conclusion "God had called us." Luke is here introducing himself, in the moment when he played so important a part in determining the course of Paul's work. The large space which is given to the Macedonian work in the *Acts* is out of proportion to its importance, and can only be explained by Luke's strong personal interest in it.

The Author gives as an example of the style of the "We"-Passages a similar analysis of xxviii. 1-16, a specimen of continuous sea-narrative; his treatment cannot be shortened, but must be studied in full. Only one criticism has to be made on this excellent piece of investigation. It is strange that on p. 44 the Author quotes, as if there were any strength in it, Professor Blass's unjustifiable objection to, and conjectural alteration of, the reading *παρασήμῳ Διοσκούροις*, "whose sign was the Twin Brothers," given by MSS. and all other editions in Acts xxviii. 11. Neither of them has observed that this dative absolute is the correct technical form, guaranteed by many examples in inscriptions. This has been pointed out, and some examples quoted in an article published long ago in the *EXPOSITOR*.<sup>1</sup> There is no detail in which the exact technical accuracy of Luke's expression is more clearly made out than this, and

<sup>1</sup> In *St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 346, it did not occur to me even to defend this common technical usage (dates by a consul's name, e.g., being always tacked on loosely by this absolute dative in Greek, ablative in Latin); the most perfect parallel occurs in a Latin inscription C.I.L. III. 3 (Smith, *Voyage, etc., of St. Paul*, p. 261), *gubernatore navis parasemo Isopharia*, "sailing-master of the ship whose sign was the Pharian Isis," where the Greek translation would be *παρασήμῳ Ἴσοφάρῃ*.

yet Professor Blass would change it into a commonplace relative clause, *ὃ ἦν παράσημον Διοσκούρων*.

The Author devotes considerable space to statistics about the occurrence of the same words in the "We"-Passages and in Luke generally, as contrasted with the rarity or total absence of many of those words in Matthew, Mark and John. It is impossible to abbreviate this argument : the reasoning must be taken as a whole, and seems conclusive, though opinion will always differ a good deal as to the value of such verbal arguments in proving identity of authorship. Personally, I have not as a rule much belief in such arguments, but it must be confessed that the statistics in this case are impressive.

The single sign of difference between the language of the "We"-Passages and the rest of Luke lies in the unusually large number of words in the former, which are used nowhere else by Luke. Words which an author uses only once and no more occur throughout the writings of Luke as well as in all the other books of the New Testament ; they are distributed in a fairly even way, and in proportion to the amount of the "We"-Passages there should be in them about thirty-eight words which occur nowhere else in the *Acts* and the Third Gospel ; whereas there actually occur 111 of that class. But this is due to the subject matter. Navigation and voyages play a large part in the "We"-Passages, because it was to a large extent on voyages that Luke accompanied Paul in the earlier years of their friendship ; and he was by nature interested as a Greek in seamanship. Three-fifths of the words which are peculiar to the "We"-Passages are technical terms relating to ships, parts of a ship, naval officers, sea-winds, management of a ship, and matters of navigation generally, and almost all of them are nouns, while the few verbs without exception denote

actions required in seamanship. Such words are forced on the writer by his subject; and, as the Author rightly remarks, it is a striking fact that in spite of the novelty of subject in chapter xxvii, describing the shipwreck, the ordinary style and vocabulary of Luke are traceable with perfect clearness even in that long passage (p. 60).

It is, of course, acknowledged by practically all scholars that Luke employed written Sources. These written Sources he has modified and recast so that they assume much of his own style. Now, if any one still continues, in spite of the above-stated proofs from style and vocabulary, to urge that Luke found the "We"-Passages in a written Source, and took them over into his book, transforming them into his own style and language, the Author replies by a careful study of the way in which Luke elsewhere uses his written Sources, from which he demonstrates that in spite of the freedom with which Luke handled and touched up his written Source, the original style, syntax and vocabulary still are clearly traceable in the transformed narrative. This is one of the most important and striking parts in the Author's work, and will reward the closest attention.

While every one admits freely as a starting point that Luke had access to written narratives about many events of which he had not been an eye-witness—for he himself mentions in the opening of his Gospel that there were many such written Sources, founded on information given by eye-witnesses, to which he could have recourse—there is not much agreement as to the extent to which, and the parts of his two books in which, he was indebted to these Sources. But there is at any rate one Source, the character of which is indubitable: for we possess the Source in practically its original form (or a form so near the original as to be equally useful for the immediate purpose of this investigation), and can thus tell exactly how far and in what way

Luke used it. Some Sources are more or less a matter of conjecture and inference, as they are lost in the original form and are merely supposed as the foundation of Luke's narrative. But it is practically universally admitted now that Luke employed the Second Gospel: he took a copy of Mark in much the same text and extent as we now possess, and he wrote out three-fourths of it in his own Gospel in much the same order as Mark wrote it. He improved the Greek, he touched it up with explanatory additions and "improvements" or "corrections," and he added greatly to it from other sources of information, oral or written; but the style, syntax and vocabulary of Mark are clearly discernible in the borrowed passages.

The Author exemplifies this in two passages, Mark i. 21-28 (i.e. Luke iv. 30-37) and Mark ii. 1-11 (i.e. Luke v. 17-24). A few verses may be quoted from the first as a specimen of this most luminous and instructive investigation, which ought to be studied by every one in the Author's own words.

Mark i. 21. And they go into Capernaum, and straightway on the Sabbath day he entered into the synagogue and taught.

Luke iv. 31. And he came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and he was teaching them on the Sabbath day.

Mark has used the plural "they went after him" in the previous verse, and continues his narrative accordingly. But Luke had the singular in iv. 30 (which belongs to a passage derived from a non-Markan source), "he passing through the midst of them went his way"; and was therefore obliged to change Mark's plural to the singular. Further, in the preceding verses Mark's scene was the shore of the Sea of Galilee, and therefore the simple verb "go" was suitable. But Luke's scene in the preceding passage was at Nazareth, and he marks the change of scene from the hill-country of Nazareth to the lower coast of the lake,

“he came down.” And, as the readers for whom he wrote did not know the topography of Palestine, he adds to the name Capernaum the explanation “a city of Galilee.”<sup>1</sup> Again, Mark was fond of the word “straightway,” and often employed it (as in verse 23); but Luke disliked the usage, and often omits the word. Mark allowed the verb “teach” without an object; but this also was not a usage that Luke approved, and he inserted “them” (not very lucidly). The process “was teaching” seemed to Luke to express the facts better than the simple “taught.” He found the expression “was teaching” in the following sentence of Mark, and brought it over to this place.

22. And they were astonished at his teaching; for he was teaching them as having authority and not as the scribes.<sup>2</sup>

32. And they were astonished at his teaching, for his word was with authority.

In the second half of the verse, the thought is entirely remodelled and transformed into Lukan Greek and Lukan language; the verb had been transferred to the preceding sentence, and change was therefore imperatively required.

23. And straightway there was in their synagogue a man in an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying—

33. And in the synagogue there was a man which had a spirit of an unclean demon, and he cried out with a loud voice—

Luke here cuts out the not very lucid “their,” and replaces the preposition “in” (perhaps a literal rendering by Mark from the original Semitic, not very satisfactory in Greek) by “which had”; he defines “unclean” more precisely; he substitutes the more vivid “with a loud

<sup>1</sup> Luke has already mentioned Capernaum in iv. 23; but there it occurs incidentally in a speech of Jesus, and explanation is unnecessary and would be out of place. Here the topographical explanation is useful and suitable.

<sup>2</sup> The quotations here follow the Authorized Version almost exactly, but occasional slight changes are made to follow the Greek more literally, as here “was teaching,” where both Authorized and Revised Versions give “taught” (which is better English in this case).

voice" for the simple "saying"; and omits "straightway" (v. 21).

Verses 24 and 25 are taken over unchanged, except that in 25 Luke changes "out of" into "from."

A comparison like this might be carried out over the whole of the matter common to Mark and Luke. In some places there is distinctly more change than here. But even where there is most change, enough remains to show the character of the Source. Slight alterations to improve the Greek are frequent. Complete refashioning of the thought and expression is rare. Words and phraseology which Luke rarely employs where he is writing freely are retained from the Source. Luke recognized that a certain type of narrative style had been established for the Gospel, and he allowed this to remain. Especially in the beginning of a borrowed paragraph he altered more freely to suit the preceding narrative. From some places it is clear that he did not translate verse by verse, but considered a paragraph or incident as a whole, and transferred touches from one point to another, where they seemed more effective.<sup>1</sup> He studied effect more, or rather, perhaps, he pictured the scene to himself more vividly than Mark did, and lit it up with more vivid forms of language, e.g.—

Mark ii. 3. And they came	Luke v. 18. And behold! men
carrying unto him.	carrying.

The changes which Luke made have in some rare cases almost the effect of misrepresenting the literal facts; but this is either for the sake of making the situation more intelligible to his readers, who were Western, not Oriental, or possibly because he doubted the accuracy of some detail in the Source. A good example is briefly noted by the Author, who, however, does not discuss it, but refers in a word to Wellhausen's explanation. This example is fully

<sup>1</sup> Compare Mark ii. 1 and 6 with Luke v. 17 and 21.

discussed in my Essay on the Credibility of Luke (*Was Christ Born at Bethlehem*, pp. 58-64). Mark ii. 4 describes how the bearers of the paralytic stripped off the covering of clay and soil from the (flat) roof of the house, broke a hole in the ceiling, and let down the bed through it. This description was true of the simple Palestinian hut, but was unintelligible to a person who knew only the houses of a Greek or a Roman city. Luke adapts his account of the incident (not to a Greek house, but) to a Roman house, and tells how the bearers of the man who was paralyzed went up on the tiled roof,<sup>1</sup> and let the sick man down through the hole (*impluvium*) which was in the roof of the public room (*atrium*) of every Roman house. There was not a hole of this kind in the roof of Greek houses, and Luke therefore wrote for an audience or a single reader (viz. Theophilus, a Roman official<sup>2</sup>) familiar with Roman houses, i.e. living either in Italy or in some Roman colony like Philippi.<sup>3</sup>

There is no question here that Mark states the actual facts, and Luke misrepresents what occurred. The question is whether Luke, familiar only with Greek or Roman houses, misunderstood the description of the incident on the roof of a rustic hut in Palestine, or intentionally stated the facts in this changed way in order to make the scene more easily intelligible to his readers (or his reader, Theophilus), preserving indeed the general character of the scene, but materially altering the details and surroundings from Palestinian to Italian. But, after all, how small even in this case is the change!—for though a good many sen-

<sup>1</sup> He imitates even the Latin usage, which used the term "the tiles" to indicate the roof.

<sup>2</sup> *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 388.

<sup>3</sup> If we may assume that the Roman style of house was common in this Roman colony. We could hardly make such an assumption about the Colony Corinth, where probably Greek fashion was dominant; but at Philippi the Roman soldiers were numerous.

tences are needed to explain it to the modern reader, it is completed in two or three words in the Greek.

What is most striking as the result of the Author's investigation is (1) the slightness of the changes as a whole that Luke makes in his authority, and the faithfulness with which on the whole he reports his authority, even preserving largely Mark's very simple method of connecting sentences by "and" (*καί*)—a kind of connection which is much rarer in the parts where Luke composes freely.

(2) His almost invariable practice of touching up descriptions of medical matters : on this there will be more to say in the latter part of the present paper.

(3) The way in which, even where he most freely alters, he preserves a certain style of expression, which he evidently considered to be an established and suitable form for the Gospel. This attributes to Luke a marked sense of style and great dramatic propriety in varying style to suit difference of scene and action. This has been the quality of Luke as a stylist that most impressed me during years of study. There is a certain modulation and freedom in his expression, which changes in obedience to the feeling of the moment and to the changes of scene ; and the Author is sensitive to this beyond any other of the German scholars whom I have read. Even Professor Blass, greatest of Lukan editors, has been so taken up with explanation, and attention to readings, and questions of verbal harmony, that he has not been sufficiently (if I may say so) alive to this highest quality of style. In the Author's hands this observation leads to very important results regarding the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel. But, before passing to this much controverted topic, I should like briefly to call attention once more to the paragraph Acts xvi. 6-11 as a specimen of this quality in Luke. It has long appeared to me that this is the most remarkable

paragraph, from a certain point of view, in the whole of Luke's writings : it is most full of himself and his whole view of history and life and his Pauline comprehension, most instinct with vibrating emotion (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 200) : " the sweep and rush of the narrative is unique in *Acts* : point after point, province after province, are hurried over " : Paul is driven on from country to country, Galatic Phrygia, Asian Phrygia, the Bithynian frontier, Mysia, the Troad, and he must have been in despair as to what was to be the outcome of this dark and perplexing journey, until at last the vision and the invitation explained the overruling purpose of all those wanderings. We cannot wonder that the commentators have been so perplexed and nonplussed by this paragraph, and that they have had recourse to such shifts to make their way through it ; perplexity is the fact or emotion which underlies the whole passage, and that is what the style brings out. The writer felt that breathless, panting eagerness, so to say ; and his style is modelled to suit the emotion. The style is here, and always, almost out of the writer's control : the subject and the emotion compel the style, or, rather, clothe themselves naturally in the suitable words. That is the perfection of style. But it puzzles the commentator. We must here and everywhere in *Acts* follow truth and life and geography.

And, if Paul is here driven on from country to country, if the historian has to hurry over the lands to keep pace with his subject, is not that the whole life of Paul the Christian ? Paul thinks imperially : " he talks of Provinces, and as he marches on in his victorious course, he plants his footsteps in their capitals." <sup>1</sup> It is hardly too much to say that all the rest of right Lukan study is an exposition of the meaning and spirit of that one paragraph

<sup>1</sup> *Pauline and other Studies*, p. 198.

where the mind of Luke and the influence of Paul are most perfectly expressed.

Regarding Luke i. and ii., the Author is of the opinion that the historian is dependent entirely on oral tradition, and used no written Source; he regards those chapters as purely legendary. He allows the possibility that the narrative part may depend on an Aramaic written Source translated by Luke himself; but he is not favourably disposed to this view, and he is absolutely convinced that the hymns of Mary, i. 46-55, and Zacharias, i. 68-79, are the free composition of Luke himself, that they were originated in the Greek form, and never had an Aramaic form. The proof lies in the fact that the language and style are so thoroughly Lukan, adapted with extraordinary skill from fragments of the Old Testament (the Septuagint).

Considerable part of this view seems to be highly probable. I have always felt and maintained that Luke regarded this part of his history as being a pure addition made by him to the Gospel as recorded by his predecessors: he had obtained it from oral, not literary sources.<sup>1</sup> He believed, however, that those sources were good, and he would not have been satisfied with mere oral tradition. The man who wrote i. 1-4 could never have gone on to give in i. 5 ff. a mere popular tale, or have invented without any authority such hymns as those of Mary and Zacharias. Exaggeration and overdoing of a view fundamentally correct is here the character of the Author's opinions.

The Author does not draw the following inferences, but they seem to follow from what he does say. The style of Luke's history is governed according to the gradual evolution of the Christian Church out of its Jewish cradle. It is most strongly Biblical (i.e. taken from the Septuagint Greek) and Hebraistic in describing the birth and early

<sup>1</sup> *Christ Born at Bethlehem*, chap. iv.

years of Jesus. In describing the life and death and words of Christ it is less Biblical, but still is deeply tinged with Hebraism, while in many parts it shows strong traces of non-Lukan style due to the use of written Sources. In describing the earliest stage of the Palestinian Church after the death of the Lord, it continued to be distinctly Hebraistic, and in parts the *Acts* even go beyond the later parts of the Gospel in the intensity of the Hebraistic tinge, as if marking the narrowed spirit of the early Church, which had hardly yet begun to understand the universality of Christ's message. In the second half of *Acts* (except in chap. xv. and in some of the scenes at Jerusalem, where the earlier Hebraistic tone is perceptible) it is most thoroughly Greek and Lukan. The preface to the whole history, Luke i. 1-4, is on the same level as the second half of *Acts*, in excellent and markedly individual Greek—here we have the true and natural Luke. As the Author says, the problem of the language and style of the Third Gospel taken by itself, would be insoluble, but by the aid of comparison with the *Acts*, everything is clear. It may be doubted, however, whether the Sources in the Third Gospel could be disentangled, were it not that we can recover the originals independently of Luke, through their survival in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew.

I do not mean that Luke was unconscious of the variation in style: such an assertion would be ridiculous. But he did not originate the variation—his subject originated it; and he did not employ it for mere literary and artistic effect, as the Author definitely maintains, but for historical reasons, as a means of conveying more clearly and effectively his meaning.

The use of the two forms, Hierosolyma and Jerusalem, which appear side by side in Luke's Gospel and *Acts*, shows both that Luke must have been conscious of the difference,

and that he did not originate the idea of using it for effective presentation of his subject. There is no trace of attention to this difference in the other Gospels<sup>1</sup>; but it is clearly present in the writings of Paul, who probably originated it. The form Jerusalem occurs twice in *Galatians*, Hierosolyma three times: the latter is in that Epistle clearly a geographical term, the former is hieratic and Judaistic, as it is in *Revelation* and *Hebrews*. A similar distinction can on the whole be traced in *Luke*, though it is partly obscured by various causes (notably by uncertainty, and sometimes perhaps by corruption, in the text).

I. Hierosolyma occurs only four times in the Third Gospel,<sup>2</sup> always very definitely in a geographical sense, while Jerusalem occurs twenty-six times: some of the latter cases are mainly geographical in sense, but the atmosphere of the passage, the spirit of the context, may be regarded as determining the form to be employed. Some of these cases are in passages common either to Mark or to Matthew; and Luke has deliberately altered the form used. But most are in passages or in clauses peculiar to Luke. The following list tells its own tale.

II. Passages peculiar to Luke: name Jerusalem occurs in Luke ii. five times; Luke x. 30; in xiii. three times; xvii. 11; xix. 11; xxiii. 28; xxiv., five times.

III. Passages common to Luke with Matthew or Mark, or both:—

Luke iv. 9.	Jerusalem.	Mt.		The holy city.
„ v. 17.	„	Mt., Mk.		omit.
„ vi. 17.	„	„	„	Hierosolyma.
„ ix. 31.	„	„	„	omit.

<sup>1</sup> They all use only the form Hierosolyma, except that Matthew once has Jerusalem. The latter form is almost confined to Paul and Luke in the New Testament; exceptions are noted above.

<sup>2</sup> Always in passages that have no parallel in Mark or Matthew. The statistics in the text are taken from Moulton and Geden.

Luke ix. 51.	Jerusalem.	Mt.	Mk.	omit.
„ ix. 53.	„	„	„	„
„ xviii. 31	„	„	„	Hierosolyma.
„ xxi. 20, 24	„	„	„	omit.

Thus, while Luke has frequently the form Jerusalem, he uses it only twice in places where Matthew or Mark actually employ the other form. It is a principle of verbal suitability which is peculiar to himself among the Evangelists, one which he almost certainly learned from Paul.<sup>1</sup>

IV. In Acts i.-xii., xv., Jerusalem occurs twenty-five times, Hierosolyma six times.

V. In Acts xiii., xiv., xvi. ff., Jerusalem occurs fourteen times, Hierosolyma nineteen times (but according to the text of WH., the numbers are twelve and twenty-one). Many of the places where the form Jerusalem is used are markedly Hieratic and Hebraizing.

While details in some cases are uncertain, the general result of these statistics is clear. Luke did, beyond doubt or question, attach some meaning to the distinction of form. He deliberately and intentionally chose sometimes one, sometimes the other. He was not guided by his Source, for in some few cases he changes the name used in his Source, and in other cases inserts the name where the Source did not use it. The distinction is clearest where he depends on eye-witness, and had no written Source. The distinction has no literary value, but only a historical and real value. It was used as a device to express meaning, not to give external and formal beauty. Professor Harnack, who maintains that Luke aimed at the latter kind of effect alone, without any thought of the former, cannot explain such a fact as this. Finally, Luke took the distinction from Paul, in whose case it would be ridiculous to

<sup>1</sup> The idea that Paul adopted it from Luke may be dismissed without hesitation. Their usage cannot be independent of one another, if they were friends and companions. Paul may have taken it from a predecessor.

think of a conscious striving after formal and artistic or rhetorical effect.

The case is similar to the distinction between the names Saul and Paul. Luke consciously and deliberately uses the former to indicate the Apostle in his character as a Hebrew, the latter in his character as a citizen of the Græco-Roman world. I have little to add to, and nothing to retract from, the exposition of the meaning of this distinction given in *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 81-8. Here again we have a distinction used by Luke, in regard to which no one can dream of any striving on his part for artistic or literary effect: it originates entirely in the delicate perception of real fact and historic truth.

In respect of Luke's style, I regret to find myself in one important respect holding a view diametrically opposed to that of the Author. The style appears to me natural, unforced, determined by the subject in hand. The Author, on the contrary, takes the view that Luke's style is extremely artificial and elaborated (pp. 80 f., 152), that he paid the most minute and careful attention to the form and external qualities of style, but was careless to the last degree of fact and truth and consistency. It has been pointed out in the first part of this review what is the fixed idea and motive that unconsciously induces the Author to exaggerate (as I venture to think) the inconsistencies and the artificiality, the contempt for facts and the devotion to verbal art, that he discovers in Luke. He seems to me to have often been misled by that fixed idea into complete misunderstanding of Luke's method of narration. For example, he thinks that Luke in Acts xvi. 27 describes the jailor as not having observed the earthquake, but only its consequence, the opened doors. It is quite evident that Professor Harnack has never had the misfortune (or, shall I say, the good fortune? for it is a good preparation for

appreciating this passage) to live in a country subject to earthquakes. If he had, he would never think it necessary for the historian to record that a person, who was wakened from sleep by an earthquake (as the jailor was wakened), was cognizant of the fact that an earthquake had occurred, for no person lives through an earthquake without perceiving it. Luke and his readers knew better about earthquakes; and when he described the earthquake and its consequences, and added that the jailor was wakened, he could reckon on every one of his readers understanding without formal mention that the jailor perceived the earthquake. He who reads Luke without applying practical sense and mother wit and experience will always misunderstand him; and one of the chief purposes of my *St. Paul the Traveller* was to illustrate the fact that these qualities must be constantly applied in studying Luke. When you think you find an "inconsistency" in Luke, you should look carefully whether you have been applying these qualities sufficiently, before you condemn the supposed fault.

The Author is not disposed to admit that any written Source was used by Luke in the first half of Acts. He rejects with contempt all the numerous speculations about Sources used in the Acts i.-xii. as empty, unmethodical and valueless, excepting only the attempt of Bernhard Weiss to prove that one such written Source can be traced here and there in Acts i.-xv.: Weiss detects numerous inconsistencies, and explains these by the hypothesis that Luke was here only a Redactor, who failed to harmonize his material thoroughly. But, so far as language and style go, the Author finds no part of Acts i.-xv. that can be separated from the rest as showing signs of a different hand and expression, whereas in the Third Gospel the parts common to Luke and Mark, and those common to Luke and Matthew, show such signs distinctly. On the ground of difficulties

regarding facts and the treatment of facts, the Author is disposed to consider that Luke used a written Source for the episodes in which Peter plays the chief part; but the Source was Aramaic and Luke translated it himself, so that his own style appears alone in the Greek form.<sup>1</sup> Even in this case, however, the hypothesis that oral information alone was used by Luke cannot (in his opinion) be convincingly disproved.

The Author rightly attaches great importance to the proof that the writer of the Third Gospel and the *Acts* was a physician. The same personality is felt throughout. The proofs are found in all parts of the work, both those written by Luke as an eye-witness and those which he has borrowed from Sources that are known to us. The Author enumerates six classes of proofs.

1. The presentation of the subject as a whole to the reader is determined to a certain degree by point of view, aims and ideals of a medical character.

2. Acts of healing are recorded in abundance and with especial interest.

3. The language of the history is coloured by the speech of physicians (in the way of technical medical terms, etc.).

These three proofs, however, are not sufficient. Jesus did much as the great physician and healer; and it must be the case that the four Gospels should vary in the attention which they pay to this side of his work and character, and that one must go beyond the others in this respect. This would not prove that the one who goes beyond the others was a physician. But these proofs are raised to a demonstration by the following reasons:—

4. The description of the several cases of sickness men-

<sup>1</sup> In the Third Gospel the parts common to Luke and Matthew rest ultimately on an Aramaic Source, but the Author considers that Luke used a Greek translation from the original Aramaic, and did not himself translate.

tioned shows the observation and knowledge that belong to a physician.

5. The language of Luke, even when he is not treating of medical matters and acts of healing, has a medical colour.

6. Where Luke is speaking as an eye-witness, the medical element is specially clearly visible.

The proof of these six propositions lies in the cumulative effect of a great number of small details scattered over the whole of *Acts* and the Gospel. It is, of course, impossible to give any analysis of such a demonstration. There are few striking cases to quote even as specimens; and one or two samples would give no conception of the strength of the cumulative proof. What is perhaps the most effective instance was quoted in the first part of this paper, *EXPOSITOR*, Dec. 1906, p. 492.

This topic leads up to a question, which I do not remember to have seen adequately discussed. Even in the passages that have been taken over by Luke from the Source which we still possess almost in its original form in the Gospel of Mark, wherever there occurs any reference to illness or medical treatment of sick persons, Luke almost invariably alters the expression more or less, as in v. 18 he changes the term "a paralytic" of Mark ii. 3<sup>1</sup> to "a man who was paralysed." He could hardly ever rest satisfied with the popular untrained language used about medical matters by Mark.<sup>2</sup>

In some cases the change does not imply really more than is contained in the original Source, and amounts only to a more scientific and medically accurate description of the fact related in the Source. But in other cases a real

<sup>1</sup> "A man sick of the palsy" in the Authorized Version.

<sup>2</sup> This is the second class of alterations on Mark, systematically introduced by Luke, as mentioned on p. 107.

addition to knowledge is involved, as appears, e.g., from the following examples :—

1. Mark iii. 1 speaks of a man with a withered hand ; Luke vi. 6 adds that it was the right hand : the medical mind demands such specification.

2. Luke viii. 27 adds to Mark v. 2 that the possessed man had for a long time worn no clothes : this was a symptom of the insanity that a physician would not willingly omit.

3. In Luke viii. 55 the physician mentions that Jairus' daughter called for food (cf. Mark v. 42). Various other examples occur.

In such cases are we to suppose that Luke simply made these additions without any authority, inventing them as natural and probable ? That is the Author's decided opinion (p. 130, n. 4) ; according to him, these are examples of Luke's carelessness about fact and truth. But why must we suppose that Luke, who in the Author's opinion had access to so many oral sources of information, and who so often used sources of this kind in both books of his history, never had access to any oral authority for any event narrated by Mark ? Is it not more natural to suppose that the authorities with whom he had conversed told him sometimes about incidents which Mark records ; and that, while he preferred to use Mark's account as his basis, he made additions in some cases from other authorities ? Those who reject wholly the possibility that Luke could have had access to any good oral authority, who possessed first-hand knowledge of the facts, are justified in regarding those additions as pure invention ; but it seems inconsistent in the Author to maintain that Luke's witnesses (whom he admits to be first-rate) confined their statements strictly to matters that Mark omitted.

The question inevitably arises, What effect will this book

have on general opinion? The interest and value of the book, as has been already said,<sup>1</sup> seems to lie rather in the evolution of the thought of a striking modern personality, viz., the distinguished Author, than in the study of Luke. It shows the Author on the threshold of the twentieth century thought, yet not able completely to shake off the fetters and emerge out of the narrow methods of the nineteenth century.

It may be doubted whether Professor Harnack's book, highly as we must estimate the ability and the clever ratiocination displayed in it, will change any one's opinion or convince any one who was not already convinced of the truth that Luke the companion of Paul wrote the Third Gospel and the Acts. Its method is too deeply infected with the vice of most modern investigations into questions of the kind: it is too purely verbal; it has too little hold on realities and facts. The history of literary criticism of ancient documents during the last fifty years has demonstrated that by such purely verbal criticism one can prove anything and nothing. Almost all the real progress that has been made comes from the discovery of new evidence, and not from verbal criticism of the old books. It is only by bringing the old books into comparison with facts and life that they can be profitably studied.

It is difficult to think that the author himself can attach value to the verbal proofs which he gathers together in his third Appendix, as showing that the letter of the Council in Jerusalem, Acts xv. 23-29, is the free composition of Luke without any written authority. I cannot imagine that the Author arrived at his opinion on the strength of the verbal evidence, which is singularly weak and conflicting; and, in fact, he confesses on p. 154 that the verbal arguments are perhaps less important than the reasons of

<sup>1</sup> EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1906, p. 488.

fact and history. One feels that his opinion was reached first on the latter ground, and the verbal reasons are mere buttresses added afterwards in the attempt to support the tottering pile. One notes with real regret the special pleading in the comments on xv. 23, where *κατά* in *οἱ κατά τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ Συρίαν* is proved to be a Lukan usage (as if anyone could doubt this) by comparison with the totally different sense of *κατά* in Acts ii. 10, *Διβόης τῆς κατά Κυρήνην*. It needs no demonstration that Luke could use the preposition with an accusative, but so could any other Greek speaker from the Danube to the Nile, and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf. And the attempt to make out, in defiance of the plain sense and linguistic usage, that *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοί* is the easy reading and *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί* the more difficult reading, and therefore more liable to alteration, mixes up argument and meaning in the style of a lawyer pleading for a bad case.

The same character attaches to much of the commentary on the following verses. What bearing has it on the question whether the Council or Luke composed the letter that *ἀπαγγέλλειν* (which is found in verse 27) is used by Luke twenty-five times, by Mark only twice, and John twice? <sup>1</sup> What reason does this give for thinking that the Apostles could not use the word? Paul uses it twice, the Epistle to the Hebrews has it, the Septuagint has it, Matthew uses it eight times.

Why point out that Matthew and Mark do not use the perfect of *ἀποστέλλω*; as if that had any, even the remotest bearing on the question? Both use the verb very frequently, and as a matter of fact Matthew has the perfect passive in xxiii. 37. John uses the verb and its perfect freely. Paul, Peter, and *Hebrews* have it (the first using even the perfect

<sup>1</sup> There are some textual differences on this point. Moulton and Geden give it five times in Mark, three times in John.

active). Similar remarks rise to one's lips in a good many other parts of this short commentary : many of the notes are absolutely irrelevant, and prove nothing, do not even point towards anything. Why heap them up ? They merely weaken the Author's argument, for they show that he has tried every way and found nothing to buttress his case.

But, while the Author spends several pages in this discussion, he does not explain his position on the really important questions that arise about this letter. His position is far more difficult in this instance than that of the more thoroughgoing "critics," who maintain that *Acts* was composed by a late writer : they find it quite natural that this late writer should have to make up this document from his own resources. But the Author considers that the historical Luke, the companion of Paul, wrote the *Acts*, and that Luke was in the closest relations with Paul on the very journey in which he describes Paul as delivering this letter to all his non-Jewish converts in the Galatian cities as an authoritative guide for their conduct in life. Luke certainly makes it clear and inevitable that this Decree of the Council at Jerusalem was the solution of the difficulty for himself and for all in his position. Now what every one asks from the Author, and what he is bound to furnish, is some explanation of the matter. How does it come that Luke was so entirely ignorant of the words of a Decree which he describes as of such immense importance, and which Paul had in his hands when he met Luke at Troas ? Or if Luke knew the words of the Decree, does the Author seriously believe, and wish to make us believe, that the historian threw aside the real Decree and composed a sham one in its place. Finally the Author must explain what he considers to be the relation between the sham Decree and the real one. Do they state the same thing, or different things ? If the same, why does Luke in this case rewrite a document

entirely, whereas in other cases (as the Author proves so carefully and so conclusively) he retains so much of his original Source? Or does the Author consider that the Council was a pure fiction, the Decree a mere invention, and the story that Paul carried it to Antioch and delivered it to his Galatian converts an elaborate lie? If that be so, how does he reconcile this with Lukan authorship? He declares that Luke is to the last degree careless of truth and consistency; but such elaborate falsification goes far beyond mere carelessness.

These are not questions that can be evaded. They must be answered, in order to make Professor Harnack's view intelligible and rational to us, who desire to understand him. It is not sufficient to waive them aside (as the Author does) as discussed by others; for these others think differently about essential points.

Here the argument is mainly of words; yet one does not feel that it was through these studies of words that the Author attained his present opinions. Where the verbal argument of this book possesses demonstrative value, it has more than words to rest on. Thus, in the study of the parts common to Mark and Luke, the reasoning rests on the firm foundation of the original written Source, and investigates the process by which Luke transformed this original into the words of the Third Gospel. In the study of the "We"-passages, it has a large extent of varied narrative to deal with, and it cannot wholly neglect the facts. But, when the Author takes small pieces like the song of Mary or the Decree of the Council of Jerusalem, and analyses the language and rests purely on verbal statistics, we fail to find strength in the reasoning.

Take as a specimen with which to finish off this paper, the passage Acts xxviii. 9 f., which is very fully discussed by the Author twice (pp. 11 f. and 123 f.). He argues that

the true meaning of the passage was not understood until medical language was compared, when it was shown that the word *καθῆψεν*, by which the act of the viper to Paul's hand is described, implies "bit," and not merely "fastened upon." But it is a well-assured fact that the viper, a poisonous snake, only strikes, fixes the poison-fangs in the flesh for a moment, and withdraws its head instantly. Its action could never be what is attributed by Luke the eye-witness to this Maltese viper; that it clung to Paul's hand, and had to be shaken off into the fire by him. On the other hand, constrictors, which have no poison fangs, cling in the way described, but as a rule do not bite. Are we then to understand, in spite of the medical style and the authority of Professor Blass (who translates "momordit" in his edition) that the viper "fastened upon" the Apostle's hand (*καθῆψεν*). Then, the very name "viper" is a difficulty. Was Luke mistaken about the kind of snake which he saw? A trained medical man in ancient times was usually a good authority about serpents, to which great respect was paid in ancient medicine and custom.

Mere verbal study is here utterly at fault. We can make no progress without turning to the realities and facts of Maltese natural history. A correspondent<sup>1</sup> obligingly informed me years ago that Mr. Bryan Hook, of Farnham, Surrey (who, my correspondent assures me, is a thoroughly good naturalist), had found in Malta a small snake, *Coronella Austriaca*, which is rare in England, but common in many parts of Europe. It is a constrictor, without poison-fangs, which would cling to the hand or arm as Luke describes. It is similar in size to the viper, and so like in markings and general appearance that Mr. Hook, when he caught his specimen, thought he was killing a viper.

My friend, Professor J. W. H. Trail, of Aberdeen, whom

<sup>1</sup> Mr. A. Sloman, Kingslee, Farndon, Chester.

I consulted, replied that *Coronella lævis*, or *Austriaca*, is known in Sicily and the adjoining islands ; but he can find no evidence of its existence in Malta. It is known to be rather irritable, and to fix its small teeth so firmly into the human skin as to hang on and need a little force to pull it off, though the teeth are too short to do any real injury to the skin. *Coronella* is at a glance very much like a viper ; and in the flames it would not be closely examined. While it is not reported as found in Malta except by Mr. Hook, two species are known there belonging to the same family and having similar habits, *leopardinus* and *zamenis* (or *coluber*) *gemonensis*. The colouring of *C. leopardinus* would be the most likely to suggest a viper.

These observations justify Luke entirely. We have here a snake so closely resembling a viper as to be taken for one by a good naturalist until he had caught and examined a specimen. It clings, and yet it also bites without doing harm. That the Maltese rustics should mistake this harmless snake for a venomous one is not strange. Many uneducated people have the idea that all snakes are poisonous in varying degrees, just as the vulgar often firmly believe that toads are poisonous. Every detail as related by Luke is natural, and in accordance with the facts of the country.

The Author quite fairly quotes this passage as an example of Luke's love for the marvellous. One cannot doubt that the reason for its appearance in Luke's history is that it seemed to the writer a proof of Paul's marvellous powers. We see now that, while it was bound to appear marvellous to Luke, the event was quite simple and natural. No one can doubt, probably hardly any scholar has ever doubted, that the incident is narrated by an eye-witness : it is so vivid and so direct, so evidently a transcript from life, that its character is self-evident. But of what value would mere verbal examination be in this case without investigation of

the real facts and surroundings in which the incident occurred? It is the same throughout Luke's history from beginning to end. One may refer to the incidents of the stoning and reviving of Paul at Lystra, and the recovery of Eutychus at Troas, which are not necessarily marvellous, but which both Luke and the public assuredly considered to be so; yet (as is shown in *St. Paul the Traveller*) Luke, while revealing what was the general belief and his own, describes the events simply and accurately, without intruding anything that forces on the reader his own marvellous interpretation.

W. M. RAMSAY.