

their fidelity to Scripture—as, for example, a truly majestic passage on the dignity and inspiration of God's Word, a truth which we meet with again in Hilary's letter to Constantine. It is also as interesting as it is pleasing, to learn, in his enumeration of the canonical books, that Hilary follows Melito of Sardis, and Origen, and antedates Jerome, in including only those of our own English Bible. Space alone forbids our further referring to those other doctrines of our Catholic and Evangelical faith maintained by him in a spirit of equal scriptural integrity. The object, however, of our brief considerations will be amply fulfilled should they conduce not only to a recognition of Hilary of Poitiers as one of the most Evangelical of all the earlier post-Nicene Fathers, but, what is of still greater importance, to a fresh revelation of the reality of the continuity of our own Church with that of the early centuries.



Barnack on "Luke the Physician."

BY THE REV. THOMAS J. PULVERTAFT, M.A.

NOTHING in the criticism of the New Testament has been more remarkable than the steady return by the leading theologians on the Continent to the traditional views of the authors and dates of the books contained therein. The day is past when the publication of startling paradoxes arrests attention, and constrains acceptance by reason of the eminent position of their propounders. It is becoming more and more recognised that the Church has not been wrong in the assignment of dates and authorship, and the detailed analysis of sources and language in order to determine the various documents that lie behind the writings as we receive them has taken the place of "tendency" discussion, and fantastic theorizing. This decisive change of attitude has received its last, and in many respects most important,

manifestation by the publication of Adolph Harnack's—now no longer Professor, but Councillor of the German Empire—brilliant monograph on the authorship and sources of the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles.¹ He crowds into 160 pages a masterly review of the most important works on the subject, and finds beyond a doubt that both books have a common author, who was in a position to know "the certainty of those things wherein Theophilus had been instructed."

He starts with the indisputable assertion that from 140 to 150 A.D. the third Gospel is acknowledged to have been the work of St. Luke, and arguing from the allusion in the Epistles of St. Paul, he shows that St. Luke was a born Greek, a physician, companion and fellow-labourer of St. Paul. The tradition of Eusebius that he was an Antiochian is worthy of all belief, for the writer shows peculiar acquaintance with the "group of Christians in that city," and dwells with special interest on the names of Antiochian Christians. Nicolas—one of the seven deacons—was a proselyte of Antioch. Antioch became a second Jerusalem after the dispersion of the Church (Acts xi. 19-21). Agabus dwelt in that city, and in Acts xiii. 2 he mentions by name, with details, the prophets and teachers in that city. The other allusions (Acts xiv. 19, 26, xv. 35, xviii. 22) all point in the same direction. The writer was not a native of Palestine and did not write for the inhabitants of that land; he did not keep in view the Macedonian. He had a sound knowledge of Antioch and the coasts of Asia, and when he visited Jerusalem with St. Paul he arrived as a stranger (Acts xxi. 15, 17).

Was this man the author of the two books assigned to him? The great names of Baur, de Wette, Zeller, Wendt, Schürer, Pfeiderer, and many others, are associated with the confident assertion that tradition is wrong, and no companion and fellow-labourer of St. Paul could have written the Acts. In spite of the writings of Zahn, Renan, and Blass on the Continent, and Hobart, Ramsay, Hawkins, and Plummer in this country, it is

¹ "Lukas der Arzt der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und des Apostelgeschichte," Leipzig, 1906.

generally believed by critics that the attribution of the Acts to St. Luke is a "vain wish," and it has become a critical dogma that the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles could not have had a common author. Criticism acknowledges that the "we" sections of the Acts were the work of a travel companion of St. Paul, and all hypotheses that Timothy, Titus, or Silas was their writer have been rejected. Still there is an unwillingness to assign them to St. Luke. Some anonymous scribe was the author, who suddenly, without any apparent reason, introduced "we" into his writing, forgetting that the real author was known to Theophilus, to whom the book was dedicated with an "I." Surely such carelessness is beyond the range of probability, as no anonymous writer who was not a companion of St. Paul would be guilty of such evident deception to a man he respected and to whom he dedicated his work. Two difficulties arise at once—viz., that the skilled writer took out of his sources long extracts containing "we" and inserted them uncorrected in his work, and thereby, *nolens volens*, gave rise to the opinion that he was an eye-witness. But in a few decades his name was lost to tradition, and in its place the name of the author of that source was inserted, although the true writer has never mentioned that name, and, as far as we know, no special authority attached to it. Well might Harnack exclaim: "Two literary historical paradoxes at once—that is rather too much." The task of our author is to make plain the fact that the author of the "we" sections is the writer of the whole work, and compel Higher Criticism to keep silent on this point, and to find some explanation for its problems on a wider and freer valuation of the facts. Dealing with the "we" sections, special emphasis is laid on the narrative of the story of the shipwrecked group in Malta, and it is shown that by its language it may be decided at once that St. Paul's companion was a physician. The description of the viper on St. Paul's hand, the expectation of his death, the illness of the father of Publius, all bear manifest signs of being the work of one familiar with medical phraseology. Harnack draws the conclusion that the phrase of Acts xxviii. 10 (*οὐ καὶ*

πολλαῖς τιμαῖς ἐτίμησαν ἡμᾶς) in connection with the case of many rich folk shows that St. Paul's fellow-traveller took part in the work of healing the sick. "If Paul were the only helper, he would not have written *ἐθεραπεύοντο* only, but would have inserted *ὑπὸ Παύλου*. The indeterminate *ἐθεραπεύοντο* prepares for the following *ἡμᾶς*." In connection with this passage he quotes the words of our Lord, "Physician, heal thyself," and comparing them with the words in Mark xv. 31 (quoted also in Luke xxiii. 35, Matt. xxvii. 42), "He saved others, Himself He cannot save," mentions a striking parallel from Galen, which says: "The physician should first cure his own symptoms, and then prepare to cure others."

Before going into linguistic and general questions the work of St. Luke is dated between 78 and 93 A.D.—before the Domitian persecution, the wide distribution of the Epistles of St. Paul, the establishment of the name "Christian" in ordinary Christian use, the canonization of the word "Church," the use of "martyr" as title of one who witnessed for the faith with his life, but some time after the destruction of Jerusalem. To place its date about 80 A.D. is probably the nearest approximation to fact that can be made.

Sixty-seven pages—more than one-third of the entire work—are devoted to a masterly analysis of the language and contents of the "we" sections and their comparison with the rest of the Acts, the Gospel of St. Luke, and the other Gospels. Their writer is in no way different in temperament from the author of the other Lukan documents. He is in no way averse to belief in miracles, for in a comparatively short series of passages he narrates an exorcism, the healing of fever by laying on of hands, a wonderful salvation from the effects of a viper bite, the summary account of many healings, a raising from the dead, prophecies by disciples, the prophet Agabus, the prophet-daughters of Philip and by St. Paul, the angel's appearance to St. Paul on his journey, and the vision of the Macedonian.¹

¹ Acts xvi. 16-18; xxviii. 8; xxviii. 5; xxviii. 9; xx. 10; xxi. 4, xxi. 11; xxi. 9; xxvii. 22; xxvii. 23; xvi. 9.

"More wonders in few verses cannot be desired. The writer also shows himself as keen on wonders—and as specially interested in wonderful healings, the 'Spirit' and angel appearances—as the writer of the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles." There can be no doubt on this point. The "we" sections are not one whit less full of miracles than the rest of the work of St. Luke, and it is specially noteworthy that in the Gospel (Luke viii. 28) the evil spirit cries out, "What have I to do with Thee, Jesus, Thou Son of God most high?" and in the Acts "we" section (xvi. 17) the evil spirit shouts, "These men are servants of the most high God." Harnack, as his wont, rejects miracles; but the fact that a physician, who by his writings shows himself a skilled historian and a trustworthy man, narrates those he has seen, and believes them to be such, constitutes a real difficulty for those who wish to proclaim a non-miraculous Christianity.

Harnack makes short work of the objections to the homogeneity of the Acts, and proves that the introduction of names in the "we" section—*e.g.*, Agabus and Philip—is a convincing testimony to the unity of the Acts. In fact, from a mere historical point of view, there is no escaping from the conviction that the Acts was written by the author of the "we" sections. This becomes even more certain by a closer examination of the language of the "we" sections, that of the Gospel and the rest of the Acts. Anyone who carefully compares the words and phrases must be impressed by the parallelisms which occur in every verse. The work is a whole, composed at one time. Gospel, Acts, and "we" sections all have the same peculiarities in syntax, style and medical language. All Irish scholars are delighted to find the use made by Harnack of the "Medical language of St. Luke," written by the late Dr. Hobart and published by the Dublin University Press; and we who have carefully gone over all the passages noted by Hobart are not surprised to find that his testimony to the technical colouring of the Lukan writings is fully accepted by the German critic.

The results of Harnack's linguistic investigations are briefly

summarized. In the "we" sections there are 97 verses, which constitute one-tenth of the entire contents of the Acts. They have in common with the first half of the Acts 67 words, and with the second half 88 words, of which 45 are identical with those employed in the first half, and are not found in the other Evangelists. The "we" sections have—

In common with

Luke and Acts,	43	words wanting in	Matthew, Mark, and John.
Luke ...	20	" "	Matthew, Mark, John, and Acts.
Acts and Matthew	3	" "	Mark, Luke and John.
Matthew ...	3	" "	Mark, Luke, John, and Acts.
Mark and Acts	2	" "	Matthew, Luke, and John.
Mark ...	1	" "	Matthew, Luke, John, and Acts.
Acts and John	2	" "	Matthew, Mark, and Luke.
John ...	2	" "	Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Acts.
Mark and John	1	" "	Luke, Matthew, and Acts.
Matthew and Mark	1	" "	Luke and Acts.
Acts, Matthew, Mark, and John,	1	word wanting in	Luke.

Of the 63 words used in the Gospel of St. Luke and in the "we" sections, 35 are verbs; and of the 110 words used in these sections and elsewhere in the Acts, 55 are verbs; whereas of the 16 words common to Matthew, Mark, and John, only 7 are verbs. These facts and the similarity of style and the use of particles prove that the Acts of the Apostles and the "we" sections proceed from the same hand. "Now," says Harnack triumphantly, "no one denies the identity of the writer of the third Gospel with the writer of the Acts; but the words and phrasings of the 'we' sections are twice as strongly related to the Gospel of St. Luke as the rest of the Acts are related to the Gospel. How can anyone, then, deny that the author of the 'we' sections and the author of the Acts of the Apostles are identical! In the 480 verses of Acts i.-xii. and xv., 132 words are common with St. Luke's Gospel which are not found in Matthew, Mark and John, and in the 527 verses Acts xiii., xiv., xvi.-xxviii., there are 141 words with a similar relationship. But in the 97 verses of the "we" sections there are 63 words, whereas only 26 would be expected." One more remark need only be made on the "word" question. It is said that in the "we" section there are a very large number of *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*. In fact,

III occur which are not found elsewhere in St. Luke's writings. Only 188 words in Acts i.-xii. and xv. are found which do not occur in the rest of Acts and the Gospel, and this would lead us to expect only 38 in the "we" sections. But all difficulty is removed when it is noted that three-fifths of the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* occur in the account of the shipwreck, and when these are eliminated the relation between unusual words in the "we" sections and the other writings is strictly observed. In fact, in the narrative of the shipwreck the accustomed style and vocabulary of the writer are strikingly manifest.

Harnack next discusses the sources of the Gospel and Acts. Quite three-fourths of St. Mark's Gospel is appropriated by St. Luke, who, however, removes roughnesses of style and makes the language more classical. He is especially careful in describing events which have a technical significance for him (*e.g.*, *cf.* Mark ii. 3 with Luke v. 18). He probably had before him also an earlier Gospel similar to that of St. Matthew, and uses this source with similar freedom. Behind these portions lies a written document, and in the third place he employed Jerusalem or Jewish traditions "whose trustworthiness is thoroughly questionable, and the greatest part must be described as legendary." These last sources bear a relationship to the Johannine Gospel, were probably received orally and were in no way committed to writing in narrative form. St. Luke derived them, it is conjectured, from Philip and his four prophesying daughters, who, according to the express statement of Papias, handed down histories. This accounts for the strong woman element in his Gospel, for we find in it, besides allusions to the Virgin Mary, the prophesying Elizabeth, the prophetess Hannah, the widow of Nain, the great sinner, the group of women in viii. 1 *et seq.*, Mary and Martha, the woman who praised the Lord's mother, the woman bound for eighteen years with a spirit of infirmity, the widow and the judge, the widow's mite, the wailing daughters of Jerusalem, the Galilean women at the foot of the cross, women as the first evangelists of the resurrection of the Lord, and the history of the woman

with seven husbands. He supports his view by the special interest shown by St. Luke for the Samaritan, which is shared, however, by the fourth Gospel, but is not found in the others. This is attributed to the fact that Philip was the Evangelist of Samaria (Acts viii. 14).

For the earlier portions of the Acts he doubtless used material supplied by St. Mark—whose household he knew intimately (Acts xii., Rhoda)—as well as narratives of Philip and his daughters, for he lodged with them in Cæsarea, where he probably met them for the first time, and it is possible that he afterwards consulted them in Asia. It is interesting to note that Dr. Sanday and other writers attribute the Lukan narrative of the Nativity to a female source, and it is obvious that for St. Luke there is a special attractiveness in the work of woman in the early Church.

In the opinion of Harnack the traditions concerning our Lord in St. Mark and St. Luke are older than is generally believed. St. Mark gives us the accounts that spring from Jerusalem, and uses an Aramaic source which is earlier than 70 A.D. He wrote not for Jewish Christians, but probably for Roman Christians—such as Alexander and Rufus, sons of Simon of Cyrene, and we know that a Christian Rufus and his believing mother lived in Rome. Luke followed him, and, like a miller, he uses all that comes to his hand in his own way. "He writes without any tendency, or rather he has only *one* tendency—viz., to present Jesus as the Divine Healer, and to prove His healing power by His history and by the effects of His Spirit (through the Apostles in the heathen world, in opposition to stubborn Judaism). Like St. Mark, he disdains theology; he makes good use of prophecy in all the Gospel and in the first half of the Acts. This history propagated Paulinism in Asia or Achaia, less than the work of Mark. Only in his general labours Paul lives in both; but his general work was his greatest."

St. Matthew's Gospel is a vindication against Jewish objections and slanders, which soon were also made by the heathen; it alone has for the teaching of Jesus a substantial interest. It

is furthest removed from the Greeks in its contents and tendency, and yet it sets itself in the position of St. Paul in the heathen world, for it deals with the universalism of the Church in Pauline manner. It is a great mistake to identify Pauline with heathen Christianity. St. Matthew, in the controversy between Jews and Jewish Christians, became the chief Gospel of the heathen Church. Two authors stand forth in the light of history—Mark, the companion of St. Paul, and St. Luke. That the name of the third writer is unknown is not strange, for the Gospel according to St. Matthew, in its earliest form, is at least a private work. As a book for the Churches it was compiled, and assuredly often rewritten. In its earliest form it is older than Luke, and as we have it is the youngest of the Synoptic Gospels. It can be considered the first liturgical book of the Christian Church, especially of the Palestinian Church, with a message not only to Jewish Christianity, but also to the heathen Church. The Church rapidly became a teaching Church, and preferred Matthew to Luke. The formation of the Canon saved Mark and Luke from being lost, for they were not doctrinal but narrative accounts of the life of Christ; and as the Gospel of the Saviour has its special place in the Church, so in the Catholic Church Paul lives more in the picture of the Acts of the Apostles than in his letters.

The entire book is an excellent piece of work—one of the ablest that has come to us from the Berlin thinker. It contains much that is not in accordance with the traditional belief of Christendom, and has the author's customary rejection of miraculous events. Nevertheless, it makes the position more precarious, for every year that is taken from the late dates of the books of the New Testament makes the account of the beginnings of Christianity more trustworthy; and it seems impossible to believe that the supernatural element, which forms a large and integral portion of St. Luke's writing, should be unhistorical, when the other parts may be received as a faithful chronicle of events—many of which are supported by the personal testimony which, as an eye-witness, was given at the same time to the miracles by St. Luke himself.