

# 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.

It has for some time been evident to all New Testament scholars who were not hide-bound in old prejudice that there must be a new departure in Lukan criticism. The method of dissection had failed. When a real piece of living literature has to be examined, it is false method to treat it as a corpse, and cut it in pieces: only a mess can result. The work is alive, and must be handled as such. Criticism for a time regarded the work attributed to Luke as dead, and the laborious autopsy was utterly fruitless. Nothing in the whole history of literary criticism has been so waste and dreary as great part of the modern critical study of Luke. As Professor Harnack says on p. 87 of his new book,<sup>1</sup> "All faults that have been made in New Testament criticism are gathered as it were to a focus in the criticism of the Acts of the Apostles."

The question "Shall we hear evidence or not?" presents itself at the threshold of every investigation into the New Testament.<sup>2</sup> Modern criticism for a time entered on its task with a decided negative. Its mind was made up, and it would not listen to evidence on a matter that was already decided. But the results of recent exploration made this attitude untenable. So long as the vivid accuracy of Acts xxvii., which no critic except the most incompetent

<sup>1</sup> *Lukas der Arzt der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte*. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1906.

<sup>2</sup> The bearing of this question is discussed in the opening paper of the writer's *Pauline Studies*, 1906.

failed to perceive and admit, was supposed to be confined to that one chapter, it was possible to explain this passage as an isolated and solitary fragment in the patchwork book. But when it was demonstrated that the same life-like accuracy characterized the whole of the travels, the theory became impossible. Evidence must be admitted. All minds that are sensitive to new impressions, all minds that are able to learn, have become aware of this. The result is visible in Professor Harnack's book. He is willing to hear evidence. The class of evidence that appeals to him is not geographical, not external, not even historical in the widest sense, but literary and linguistic; and this he finds clear enough to make him alter his former views, and come to the decided conclusion that the Third Gospel and the Acts are a historical work in two books,<sup>1</sup> written, as the tradition says, by Luke, a physician, companion in travel and associate in evangelistic work of Paul: this conclusion he regards as a demonstrated fact (*sicher nachgewiesene Tatsache*, p. 87). It does not, however, lead him to consider that Luke's history is true; and he argues very ingeniously against attaching any high degree of trustworthiness to it, and hardly even admits that the early date which he assigns to it compels the admission that it is more trustworthy than the champions of its later date would or could allow. That is the only impression which I can gather (see p. 504), from the Author's language. On the other hand, in his notice of his book (*Selbstanzeige*),<sup>2</sup> he speaks far more favourably of Luke's trustworthiness and credibility, as being generally in a position to transmit reliable information, and as having proved himself able

<sup>1</sup> He hints at the possibility that a third book may have been intended by Luke, but never written. See below, p. 499f.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (edited by himself and Professor Schürer), July 7, 1906, p. 404.

to take advantage of his position. I cannot but feel that there is a certain want of harmony here, due to the fact that the Author was gradually working his way to a new plane of thought.

Some years ago I reviewed in this magazine Professor McGiffert's arguments on the Acts.<sup>1</sup> The American Professor also had felt compelled by the geographical and historical evidence to abandon in part the older criticism. He also admitted that the Acts is more trustworthy than previous critics allowed; he also was of opinion that it was not thoroughly trustworthy, but was a mixture of truth and error; he also saw that it is a living piece of literature written by one author. But from the fact that Acts was not thoroughly trustworthy, he inferred that it could not be the work of a companion and friend of the Apostle Paul; and he has no pity for the erroneous idea that the Acts could have failed to be trustworthy if it had been written by the friend of Paul. I concluded with the words: "Dr. McGiffert has destroyed that error, if an error can be destroyed." But what is to Professor McGiffert inadmissible is the view that Professor Harnack champions.

In the following remarks Professor Harnack will generally be spoken of simply as "the Author," in order to avoid reiteration of the personal name.

The careful and methodical studies of the language of Luke by Mr. Hobart<sup>2</sup> and Mr. Hawkins<sup>3</sup> have been thoroughly used by the Author. He mentions that Mr. Hawkins seems to be almost unknown in Germany (p. 19), and expresses the opinion (p. 10) that Mr. Hobart's book would have produced more effect, if he had confined himself to

<sup>1</sup> The review is republished in revised form in *Pauline Studies*, 1906: the quotation here given is from p. 321 of that book.

<sup>2</sup> *Medical Language of St. Luke*, Dublin, 1882.

<sup>3</sup> *Horae Synopticae*, 1899.

the essential and had not overloaded his book with collections and comparisons that often prove nothing. I doubt if this is the reason that Mr. Hobart's admirable and conclusive demonstration has produced so little effect in Germany. The real reason is that the Germans, with a few exceptions, have not read it. That many of his examinations of words prove nothing, Mr. Hobart was quite aware; but he intentionally, and, as I venture to think, rightly, gave a very full statement of his comparison of Luke's language with the medical Greek writers. It is the completeness with which he has performed his task that produces such effect on those who read his book. He has pursued to the end almost every line of investigation, and shown what words do not afford any evidence as well as what words may be relied upon for evidence. The Author says that those who merely glance through the pages of Mr. Hobart's book are almost driven over to the opposite opinion (as they find so many investigations that prove nothing). This description of the common German "critical" way of glancing at or entirely neglecting English works which are the most progressive and conclusive investigations of modern times suggests much. These so-called "critics" do not read a book whose method and results they disapprove: the method of studying facts is not to their taste, when they see that it leads to a conclusion which they have definitely decided against beforehand.

The importance of this book lies in its convincing demonstration of the perfect unity of authorship throughout the whole of the Third Gospel and the Acts. These are a history in two books. All difference between parts like Luke i. 5-ii. 52 on the one hand, and the "We"-sections of Acts on the other hand—to take the most absolutely divergent parts—is a mere trifle in comparison with the complete identity in language, vocabulary, intentions, interests, and

method of narration. The writer is the same throughout. He was, of course, dependent on information gained from others : the Author is disposed to allow considerable scope to oral information in addition to the various certain or probable written sources ; but Luke treated his written authorities with considerable freedom as regards style and even choice of details, and impressed his own personality distinctly even on those parts in which he follows a written source most closely.

This alone carries Lukan criticism a long step forwards, and sets it on a new and higher plane. Never has the unity and character of the book been demonstrated so convincingly and conclusively. The step is made and the plane is reached by the method which is practised in other departments of literary criticism, viz., by dispassionate investigation of the work, and by discarding fashionable *a priori* theories.

Especially weighty is the evidence afforded by the medical interest and knowledge, which marks almost every part of the work alike. The writer of this history was a physician, and that fact is apparent throughout. The investigations of Mr. Hobart supply all the evidence—I think the word “all,” without “almost,” may be used in this case—on which the Author relies. Never was a case in which one book so completely exhausts the subject and presents itself as final, to be used and not to be supplemented even by Professor Harnack. It is doubtless only by a slip, but certainly a regrettable slip, that the Author, in his notice of his own book published in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, makes no reference to Mr. Hobart, though he mentions other scholars from whose work he has profited.

The Author has up to a certain point employed the plain, simple method of straightforward unprejudiced investigation into the historical work which forms the subject of his

study, a method which has not been favoured much by the so-called critical scholars of recent time. So far as he follows this simple method, which we who study principally other departments of literature are in the habit of employing, his study is most instructive and complete. But he does not follow it all through; if we read his book, we shall find many examples of the fashionable critical method of *a priori* rules and prepossessions as to what must be or must not be permitted. *Multa tamen suberunt priscae vestigia fraudis*. These are almost all of the one kind. Wherever anything occurs that savours of the marvellous in the estimation of the polished and courteous scholar, sitting in his well-ordered library and contemplating the world through its windows, it must be forthwith set aside as unworthy of attention and as mere delusion. That method of studying the first century was the method of the later nineteenth century. I venture to think that it will not be the method of the twentieth century. Professor Harnack stands on the border between the nineteenth and the twentieth century. His book shows that he is to a certain degree sensitive of and obedient to the new spirit; but he is only partially so. The nineteenth century critical method was false, and is already antiquated. A fine old crusty, musty, dusty specimen of it is appended to the Author's *Selbstanzeige* by Professor Schürer, who fills more than three columns of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, July 7, 1906, with a protest against the results of new methods and a declaration of his firm resolution to see nothing that he has not been accustomed to see: "These be thy gods, O Israel."

The first century could find nothing real and true which was not accompanied by the marvellous and the "supernatural." The nineteenth century could find nothing real and true which was. Which view was right, and

which wrong? Was either complete? Of these two questions, the second alone is profitable at the present. Both views were right—in a certain way of contemplating; both views were wrong—in a certain way. Neither was complete. At present, as we are struggling to throw off the fetters which impeded thought in the nineteenth century, it is most important to throw off its prejudices and narrowness. The age and the people, of whatever nationality they be, whose most perfect expression and greatest hero was Bismarck, are a dangerous guide for the twentieth century. In no age has brute force and mere power to kill been so exclusively regarded as the one great aim of a nation, and the one justification to a place in the Parliament of Man, as in Europe during the latter part of the nineteenth century; and in no age and country has the outlook upon the world been so narrow and so rigid among the students of history and ancient letters. We who study religion owe it to the progress of science that we can begin now to see how hard and lifeless our old outlook was; but we who were brought up in the nineteenth century can hardly shake off our prejudices or go out into the light. We can only get a distant view of the new hope. Professor Harnack is in that position. He is one of the first to force his way out into the light of day; but his eyes are still dazzled, and his sight imperfect. He sees that Luke always found the marvellous quite as much in his own immediate surroundings, where he was a witness and an actor, as in the earliest period of his history; but he only infers, to put it in coarse language, “how blind Luke was.”

What was the truth? How far was Luke right? I cannot say. Consult the men of the twentieth century. I was trained in the nineteenth, and cannot see clearly. But of one thing I am certain: in so far as Professor Harnack



condemns Luke's point of view and rules it out in this unheeding way, he is wrong. In so far as he is willing to hear evidence, he comes near being right.

Practically all the argument, in the sense of facts affording evidence, stated by the Author has long been familiar to us in England and Scotland. What is new and interesting and valuable is the ratiocination, the theorizing, and the personal point of view in the book under review. We study it to understand Professor Harnack, not to understand Luke : and the study is well worth the time and work. Personally, I feel specially interested in the question of Luke's nationality. On this the Author has some admirable and suggestive pages.

That Luke was a Hellene is quite clear to the Author. He repeats this often ; and if once or twice it looks as if he were leaving another possibility open, that is only from the scientific desire to keep well within the limits of what the evidence permits. He has no real doubt. The reasons on which he lays stress are utterly different from those which have been mentioned by myself in support of the same conclusion, but certainly quite as strong if not stronger ; it is a mere difference of idiosyncrasy which makes him lay stress on those that spring from the thought and the inner temperament of Luke, while I have spoken most of those which indicate his outlook on the world and his attitude towards external nature. . But just as I was quite conscious of the other class and merely emphasized those which seemed to have been omitted from previous discussions of the subject,<sup>1</sup> so the Author's silence about the class which I have mentioned need not be taken as proof that he is insensible to such reasons. But those reasons do not appeal much to the mind of one who has not lived long in the country and has not felt the sense impressions from

<sup>1</sup> *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 21, 205 ff.

whose sphere they are taken. Perhaps they are apt to seem fanciful to the scholar who has spent his life in the library and the study.

The sentimental tone and the frequent allusion to weeping, which is characteristic of Luke, is characteristic also of the Hellene: *dort und hier sind die Tränen hellenische* (p. 25). Mark and Matthew have hardly any weeping: there is more in John; but Luke far surpasses John. Such ideas and words as *ὑβρις*, *βάρβαροι*, are characteristically Greek. "Justice did not suffer him to live" is exactly the word of a Hellenic poet.<sup>1</sup> To Pindar or Aeschylus Justice and Zeus are almost equivalent ideas.

In an extremely interesting passage, p. 100 f., the Author sketches the character of Luke's religion. He recognizes with correct insight the fundamental Hellenism of Luke's Christianity. To put the matter from a different point of view, Luke had been a Hellenic pagan, and could not fully comprehend either Judaism or Christianity. As in Ignatius, so in Luke, we see the clear traces of his original pagan thought,<sup>2</sup> and we detect the early stage of the process which was destined to work itself out in the paganization of the Church. The world was not able to comprehend Paulinism, and the result of this inability to understand the spiritual power was the degrading of the spiritual into pagan personal deities as saints. It was not possible for even Luke to spring at once to the level of Paulinism; that would need at the best more than a single life, even supposing that there had been unbroken progress. As it happened, there was a degeneration in the level of thought and com-

<sup>1</sup> Acts xxviii. 4: the words are put in the mouth of the Maltese barbarians, but they are only the expression by Luke of their remarks and attitude to Paul; and they are the Hellenized thought of a Hellene.

<sup>2</sup> I do not mean to imply that the Author expresses such an opinion about Luke; he pictures Luke's idea as a definite hard fact; to me it always comes natural to regard a man's ideas as a process of growth, and to look before and after the moment. The Author isolates the moment.

prehension, after the first impulse communicated by Jesus had apparently exhausted itself, until the Christian idea had time slowly to mould the world into the position of comprehending it better.

I confess, however, that the Author, while he catches this undeniable fact about Luke's religious comprehension, seems to miss the elements in his view that were capable of higher development. These were only germs, and the weakness of the Author's view seems to be that he recognizes only the fully articulated opinion and is sometimes blind to ideas which were merely inchoate. Hence I cannot but regard the estimate (on p. 101) of Luke's Paulinism, i.e. of his failure to grasp Paulinism, as too hard and too thin. But, with this qualification, the passage on p. 100 f. appears to me to be most illuminative and remunerative. We are really trying to say the same thing, but expressing it through the colouring and transforming medium of our different personalities, and I too imperfectly: as regards the Hellenism of Luke the difference between us is one merely of degree. The really important matter is this: in the first place, we both see clearly and perfectly and finally the first century character of Luke's thought: "He has come into personal relations with the first Christians, with Paul" (p. 103). In the second place, the Author's view that Luke was so totally incapable of comprehending the spirit of Christianity—for that inevitably is implied in his exposition pp. 100–102—only brings out into clearer light his inability to have evolved from his inner consciousness the picture of Jesus which looks out in such exquisite outline from his historical work. The picture was given to him, not made by him; and the Author himself shows plainly how it was given him. He had intimate relations with some of those who had known Jesus, and from that, more than from the early written accounts to

which he also had access, he derived his conception. Where he altered this conception, it could only be to introduce his own ideas and his want of real comprehension. I do not at all deny that there are traces in his Gospel and the other Gospels of the age and the thoughts amid which they were respectively composed ; but these are recognized because they are inharmonious with the picture as a whole. They are stains, and not parts of the picture.

Accordingly, in spite of certain difference, so close does this part of the task bring us, starting from our widely opposed points of contemplation, that the conclusion of this brilliant passage is the first expression of Paul's general position in the Jewish and Hellenic world, as Harnack conceives it, that I am able to adopt and to use as my own. " Paul and Luke are counterparts.<sup>1</sup> As the former is only intelligible as a Jew, but a Jew who has come into the closest contact with Hellenism, so the latter is only intelligible as a Hellene, but a Hellene who has personally had touch with the original Jewish Christianity." Usually, in his characterization of Paul, the Author sees the Jew so clearly, that he sees nothing else. Here he recognizes the very close contact of Paul with Hellenism. Has that contact been so utterly devoid of effect on an extremely sensitive and sympathetic mind, as the Author often represents it to have been ? To me it seems that, while Luke was the Hellene, who could never understand or sympathize with the Jew,<sup>2</sup> Paul was the Jew who had sympathized with much that lay in Hellenism and had been powerfully modified and developed thereby, remaining however a Jew, but a developed Jew, " who had come into the closest contact with Hellenism."

In the familiar argument about the " We " - Passages of

<sup>1</sup> *Gegenbilder*, companion and contrasted pictures.

<sup>2</sup> *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 207.

Acts, the Author puts one point in a striking and impressive way. In these "We"-Passages, as he points out and as is universally recognized, 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. Now, take into account the narrative in Acts xxviii. 8-10, "And it was so that the father of Publius lay sick of fever and dysentery : unto whom Paul entered in and prayed, and laying his hands on him healed him. And when this was done, the rest also which had diseases in the island came and were cured [more correctly, 'received medical treatment'] : who also honoured us with many honours."

In this passage attention is concentrated on Paul, so long as historic truth allowed ; but Paul's healing power by prayer and faith could not be always exercised. Such power is efficacious only occasionally in suitable circumstances and on suitable persons. As soon as it begins to be exercised on all and sundry, it begins to fail, and a career of pretence deepening into imposture begins. When the invalids came in numbers, medical advice was employed to supplement the faith-cure, and the physician Luke became prominent. Hence the people honoured not "Paul," but "us."

Here the Author recognizes a probable objection, but considers it has not any serious weight : viz. that Luke, like Paul, may have cured by prayer and not by medical treatment. Against this he points to the precise definition of Publius's illness, which is paralleled often in Greek medical works, but never in Greek literature proper ; and argues that faith-healers do not trouble themselves, as a rule, about the precise nature of the disease which is submitted to them. He acknowledges that this is not a complete and conclusive answer. He has strangely missed the real

answer, which is complete and conclusive. Paul healed Publius (*ιάσατο*), but Luke is not said to have healed the invalids who came afterwards. They received medical treatment (*ἐθεραπεύοντο*). The latter verb is translated "cured" in the English Version; and Professor Harnack agrees. Now in the strict sense *ἐθεραπεύοντο*, as a medical term, means "received medical treatment"; and in the present case the context and the whole situation demand this translation (though Luke uses the word elsewhere sometimes in the sense of "cure"): the contrast to *ιάσατο*, the careful use of medical terms in the passage, and above all the implied contrast of Paul's healing power and Luke's modest description of his medical attention to his numerous patients from all parts of the island, all demand the latter sense. Professor Knowling is here right.

The Author states a careful argument that, since Luke and Aristarchus are twice mentioned together in the Epistles of Paul and Aristarchus is thrice mentioned in the Acts, the silence of Acts about Luke is to be explained by the fact that he wrote the book, and there is no other explanation possible. Aristarchus, an unimportant person, is mentioned in Acts solely because he was in relation with Luke. Luke did not name himself, though he frequently indicates his presence by using the first person. Luke and Aristarchus were Paul's two sole Christian companions on his voyage to Rome. These facts, the triple reference in Acts to a person so unimportant in history as Aristarchus, and the silence about Luke except in the editorial "we," point to Luke as the author.

This argument occurs or appeals to every one who approaches the book with a desire to understand it; it carries weight; but the weight is lessened by the enigmatic silence of Acts about Titus, a person of such importance and so closely alike in influence to Luke. He who solves that enigma

will throw a flood of light on the early history of Christianity in the Aegean lands. A conjecture is advanced in *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 390 ; and as yet I see no other way out of the difficulty, since the only other supposition that suggests itself—viz., that Titus Lucanus was the full name of the author, and that he was sometimes spoken of as Titus simply, sometimes as Lukas (an abbreviated form)—introduces apparently greater difficulties than it solves.

The attempt on pp. 15–17 to demonstrate that the writer of Acts was closely connected with Syrian Antioch, seems to me a distinct failure. That Luke had some family connexion with Syrian Antioch<sup>1</sup> is in perfect harmony with the evidence of his writings, and must be accepted on the evidence of Eusebius and others ; but the proof that this in any way influenced his selection and statement of details is anything but convincing. A false inference seems to be drawn in some cases. For example, it is pointed out (p. 16, note 1) that Syrian Antioch is only once alluded to in the Pauline letters (Gal. ii. 11), whereas it is often mentioned in a peculiar and emphatic way in Acts ; and the inference is drawn that the emphasis laid on Antioch in Acts cannot be explained purely from the facts and must be due to some special interest which Luke felt in it. This reasoning implies that the importance of different places in the early history of Christianity can be estimated according to the frequency with which they are mentioned in Paul's letters. Without that premise the Author's reasoning in the note just quoted has no validity ; but the premise needs only to be formally stated, and its falsity is at once evident.

In the view which I have tried to support, the reason why Syrian Antioch is often mentioned in Acts is simply and solely its critical and immense importance in the development of the early Church. In Antioch were taken

<sup>1</sup> On the character of this connexion, see Note<sup>2</sup> at the end.

the first important steps in the adaptation of the Church to the pagan world ; for the episode of Cornelius does not imply such a serious step, and would have been quite compatible with the maintenance of a Judaic Church of a free and generous fashion.

The reason why Antioch is rarely mentioned by Paul is that his letters are not intended to give a history of the development of the Church, but to warn or to encourage his correspondents. Only in Galatians i., ii. does Paul diverge into history, and there Antioch plays an extremely important part. It is the scene of action from Galatians i. 21 (where Syria means Antioch) down to ii. 1, and again ii. 11-14.

The Author's further suggestion that Mnason the Cypriote,<sup>1</sup> whom Paul and his companions found living at a town between Caesareia and Jerusalem, may have been the missionary from Cyprus that helped to found the Church in Antioch (p. 16, n. 2), has absolutely nothing in its favour, and is an example of the sort of vague "might have been" which annoys and irritates the plain matter-of-fact English scholar, but which is extremely popular among the so-called "Higher Critics" abroad and at home. Those suggestions of utterly unproved and improbable possibilities lead to nothing, and should never be made (as here) buttresses for an argument. It is founded on the observation that among the Antiochian leaders mentioned in xiii. 1, no Cypriote occurs.<sup>2</sup> Professor Harnack has forgotten that the first of the list, the outstanding leader of the Antiochian Church, Barnabas, was a Cypriote ; and, though he was not one of the missionaries who helped in the original foundation, he came to Antioch immediately after the foundation ; and there is no reason to assume that the five leaders mentioned in xiii. 1 must include all the original founders.

<sup>1</sup> At Jerusalem, as the Author thinks, assigning no value to Western readings.

<sup>2</sup> *Ein Cyprier wird nicht genannt.*



The imagined contrast between the importance attached to Syrian Antioch in Acts and Paul's comparative silence about it, is strengthened by the quotation of Acts xiv. 19 as a reference—a confusion of Syrian with Pisidian Antioch, evidently a mere slip, but a slip into which the Author has been betrayed by eagerness to find arguments for a theory.

Not much better seems to me the inference drawn from the first speech of Jesus (Luke iv. 21–27), which begins with “this parable, Physician, heal thyself,” and ends with a reference to Naaman, the Syrian. In this the Author finds conclusive proof that Luke was a physician, and that he was keenly interested in Antioch. What connexion has Damascus with Antioch? True, we now speak of them both as in Syria. But Syria was not a country. There was no unity between Damascus and Antioch from any point of view when that speech was delivered, and as little when Luke composed his history. The two cities were in different countries, under different rule, far distant from one another, and having no relation with one another. One was the capital of a Roman Province, the other was subject to the barbarian king of Arabia.

The cases in which I find myself obliged to disagree with the Author are generally of one class, and are due to the fact that he frequently regards as indicative of Luke's individual character details which are forced on the historian by his subject. Examples are numerous. We have some in the Author's attempt to prove that Antioch had a special interest for Luke as his birthplace. On p. 106 he attempts similarly to show that Ephesus had a special interest for him, and is specially marked out among the Churches by him; in this he finds a proof that Luke settled and wrote either at Ephesus or in a district for which Ephesus had a central significance, and he adds that this country may

have been Achaia. Why Ephesus should have a central significance for one who resided in Achaia is not easy to see,<sup>1</sup> except in the sense that it had a central significance for the Gentile Church in general. This special interest which Luke had in Ephesus is proved (1) by the heartfelt tone of affection in which Paul addresses the elders of Ephesus; (2) by the way in which Paul's address on that occasion is turned into a general farewell to the congregations of the Aegean district; (3) that he knows and takes notice of the later history of the Ephesian Church.

The facts seem to me only to illuminate Paul's feeling towards Ephesus and to mark out Luke's report as being a trustworthy account of an address which was really delivered; Luke sinks and Paul alone emerges in the report. The farewell to Ephesus was at some points expressed as a general farewell, because his audience included representatives of all the Churches, in Achaia, Macedonia, Asia and Galatia; and though these representatives were accompanying him to Jerusalem, yet, when he was explaining that he intended to come no more into those regions (having, as we know, Rome and the West now in view), it seems only natural that at this point he should begin to speak more generally, "Ye all, among whom I went about preaching, shall see my face no more." This is said to all the congregations, Corinth, etc., which were absent but represented by delegates, who would report his farewell. Considering Paul's past experience elsewhere, it is not strange that he should be able to foresee that dangers from without

<sup>1</sup> It is rather inconsistent with this that in a footnote on the same page the Author says that, while Acts shows clearly that the foundation of the congregation at Corinth was the principal achievement of Paul's second journey, yet Luke himself had no relation to this Church. How it could have been possible to settle in Achaia and yet not come into any relation to Corinth, but regard Ephesus as the point of central significance for his district, I cannot in the circumstances of the Roman period understand.

and dangers from within awaited Ephesus. The Author has just pointed out that the address had already become general; why, then, does he assume that this sentence 29-30 applies only to Ephesus, and shows such a knowledge of later Ephesian history as proves the subsequent acquaintance with, perhaps actual residence in, Ephesus of the historian who composed the address and put it into the mouth of Paul? It might equally plausibly be argued, on the contrary, that this sentence shows ignorance of subsequent Ephesian history, for both John and Ignatius agree that Ephesus was long the champion of truth and the rejecter of error.<sup>1</sup>

In general one feels that, where the Author is at his best, he is studying Luke in a straightforward way and drawing inferences from observed facts; where he is less satisfactory, he has got a theory in his head, and is straining the facts to support the theory.

The tendency to regard historical details which Luke narrates as indicative of his personal character often takes the form of blaming the historian for being inconsistent, where the inconsistency (if it be such) was the fault of the facts, not of the narrator. I quote just one example. In xvi. 37 Paul appeals to his Roman rights as a citizen: "one asks in astonishment why he does so only now." One may certainly be quite justified in asking the question, but one is not justified in blaming Luke because Paul did not do so sooner. There are some clear signs of the unfinished state in which this chapter was left by Luke; but some of the German scholar's criticisms show that he has not a right idea of the simplicity of life and equipment that evidently characterized the jailer's house and the prison.<sup>2</sup> The details which he blames as inexact and incon-

<sup>1</sup> *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 240 f.

<sup>2</sup> *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 220 ff.

sistent are sometimes most instructive about the circumstances of this provincial town and colonia.

The Author lays much stress on the fact that inconsistencies and inexactnesses occur all through Acts. Some of these are undeniable ; and I have argued that they are to be regarded in the same light as similar phenomena in Lucretius, for example, viz., as proofs that the work never received the final form which Luke intended to give it, but was still incomplete when he died. The evident need for a third book to complete the work, together with those blemishes in expression, form the proof. Below, p. 499 f.

But the Author finds inconsistencies and faults in Luke where I see none. He complains that Luke is not disturbed by the fact that Paul was driven on by the Spirit to Jerusalem, and yet the disciples in Tyre through this same Spirit seek to detain him from going to Jerusalem. I cannot feel disturbed any more than Luke ; and I can only marvel that the great German scholar thinks we ought to be disturbed by it. Still less can I blame Luke (as the Author does, p. 81) because Agabus's prophecy, xxi. 11, is not fulfilled exactly as it is uttered. Luke is merely the reporter of what he heard Agabus say ; and we can only feel profoundly grateful that he recorded the simple facts, and did not adapt the prophecy to the event.

But it is never safe to lay much stress on small points of inexactness or inconsistency. One finds such faults even in the works of modern scholarship, if one examines them in the microscopic fashion in which Luke is studied here. I think I can find them in the Author himself. His point of view sometimes varies in a puzzling way. On p. 92 the paragraph Acts xxviii. 17-31 is said to be clearly modelled for the conclusion of the whole work. On p. 96 the Author confesses his inability to solve the serious problem presented by the last two verses, and suggests the possibility that

Luke intended to write a third book. Again, on p. 20 he numerates xx. 5, 6 as part of the "We"-sections, but on p. 105 f. he declares that Luke first met Paul at Troas, accompanied him to Philippi, and there parted from him, to rejoin him after some years, and in fact the meeting took place once more at Troas. But if the reunion only took place at Troas, then xx. 5, 6 cannot be a genuine part of the "We"-sections.

I suspect that inexactness on the Author's part forms the foundation for a charge which he brings against me. He speaks of my theory that Luke was employed by Paul as a physician during his severe illness in Galatia. If I have so spoken it would be a clear example of inexactitude and inconsistency on my own part. I entirely agree with Professor Harnack that Paul first met Luke in Troas, and that Luke never travelled with Paul in Galatia; and I think this is put quite clearly and strongly in my book, *St. Paul the Traveller*. I may elsewhere have been guilty of this inexactitude and inconsistency; but I cannot remember to have made such a statement. I have doubtless spoken of Luke as being useful as a medical adviser to Paul in travelling, as e.g. I have said that Luke would have discouraged any proposal to walk sixty miles in two days (Acts xxi. 16),<sup>1</sup> more especially since Paul was liable to attacks of fever; but his fever was not confined to Galatia or to any one journey. Moreover, a traveller may be guided by his physician's advice, even though the physician does not accompany him.

There is an object in thus dwelling on the inconsistencies and inexactitudes of which Luke is guilty. Professor Harnack is here preparing to cope with the supreme difficulty in Acts, viz. the disagreement between the narrative of Acts xv. and that of Galatians ii. 1-11, if these are taken (as

<sup>1</sup> *Pauline and other Studies* (1906), p. 267.

the Author takes them) to be accounts of the same event, or series of events. These are so plainly and undeniably inconsistent with one another—for the denial which some scholars even yet express is one of the strange things in the history of learning—that, if they depict the same incident, one must be fatally inaccurate. Now, as Paul was present and took part in the incident, his evidence must rank higher, unless he be condemned as intentionally misrepresenting facts, a theory which few adopt and which need not be considered. Luke then must be wrong, where he is in disagreement with Paul. The disagreement can be readily explained by those who regard Acts as the work of a later period history, as they may reasonably say, had become dimmed by lapse of time, by the growth of prejudice, and by various other causes. But how can those explain it, who maintain (as the Author does) that Acts was written by the friend, coadjutor and personal attendant of Paul, the friend of many other persons closely concerned and certain to possess good information? The inconsistency is not in unimportant details, easily caught up differently by different persons: the inconsistency is fundamental and thorough.

To that question the Author has to prepare his answer; and his answer is that Luke was habitually inaccurate and inconsistent with himself. This answer is always a difficulty, against which the Author is struggling with extraordinary dialectic skill throughout his book, but the struggle is vain and success impossible. Luke is not, in the Author's exposition, a single character. He is a double personality, good and bad.

The truth is, as has frequently been pointed out, that the whole problem which governs so completely and so disastrously this and most modern books about Acts is a mere phantom, the creation of geographical ignorance, the

result of the irrational North Galatian view. Acts xv. describes a different scene from Galatians ii. 2-11.

On p. 106 f. the Author discusses the very evident relation between Luke and the Gospel of John, and points out that of all the Apostles Luke shows interest in none but Peter and John. That this greater frequency of reference to these two might be due to their greater importance in the development of Christianity as the religion of the Empire (which I hold to be the truth) is set aside without even a passing glance by the Author. The reason must lie in some accidental meeting of Luke with, or personal relation to, John. It is quietly assumed from first to last that the determining motive of Luke in his choice of events for record or omission lies in personal idiosyncrasy or caprice, never in the real importance or unimportance of the events. The Author says that, considering his predilection for John, it is remarkable that Luke does not mention him in Acts xv., when Paul shows in Galatians ii. that John was one of the three prominent figures in the incident; and the only inference which he draws is that Luke had not read the letter to the Galatians. But, even if that inference were true, it would not be a sufficient explanation, for Luke had abundant opportunity of learning the facts and the comparative authority of the various Apostles from other informants; and the Author fully grants that he made considerable use of oral information. The only justifiable inference which the mere commonplace historian would permit himself to draw is that, according to the information at Luke's disposal, John did not play a prominent part in the incident described in Acts xv., whereas he was prominent in the scene described by Paul (Gal. ii. 2-10).

The view which at present commends itself to me (but which might, of course, be altered by more systematic consideration) is that the writer of the Fourth Gospel knew the

Third, but that the writer of the Third did not know the Fourth and had little acquaintance with its author. The analogies which Professor Harnack points out are of subject, forced on both by external facts, and not caused by personal influence.

It sounds, at first hearing, strange to us that the Author feels himself as the first to observe that the female element is so much emphasized in Luke, whereas Mark and Matthew give women very small place in the history.<sup>1</sup> This seems such a commonplace in English study, that I felt obliged to be almost apologetic and very brief in referring to the subject in *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* (pp. 83-90). Yet when one's attention is called to the fact, it is not easy to refer to any formal and serious discussion of this extremely important side of the evidence about Luke's personality; and it may be that the Author is the first, at least in modern German scholarship, to treat the topic in a scholarly way. The truth seems to be that German scholars have been so entirely taken up with the preliminary questions, such as "Was there a Luke at all?" that they have never tried to discover what sort of man he was. Even those who championed his reality were so occupied in proving it by what are considered more weighty arguments, that they forgot the mode of proof which seems in my humble judgment to be far the strongest, viz., to hold up to the admiration of all thinking men this man Luke in his humanity and reality. Do his works reveal to us a real man? If so, they must be the genuine composition of a true person; no pseudonymous work ever succeeded or could succeed in exhibiting the supposititious writer as a real personality. Professor Harnack has only half essayed

<sup>1</sup> *Worauf, soviel ich mich erinnere, bisher noch nie aufmerksam gemacht worden ist. . . . Erst Lukas hat sie [i.e. Frauen] so stark in die evangelische Geschichte eingeführt.* But see above, p. 482 f.



the task. He has entered on it, but never heartily, for he is too much cumbered by prepossessions, by old theories only half discarded, and above all by the hopeless fetters of the North-Galatian prejudice, which inevitably distorts the whole history (above, p. 501 f.).

I have pointed out, in the passage above quoted (p. 90), that this attitude of Luke's mind is characteristic of Macedonia (implying thereby that it is not characteristic of Greece proper): I might and should have added Asia Minor. But there is much to say on this subject, and here I can only refer to the discussion of the place in subsequent Christian development filled by the Anatolian craving for some recognition of the female element in the Divine nature (*Pauline and other Studies*, 1906, pp. 135 ff.).

"The traditions of Jesus, which lie before us in the works of Mark and Luke, are older than is commonly supposed. That does not make them more trustworthy, but yet is not a matter of indifference for their criticism."<sup>1</sup> So says the Author on p. 113. These are not the words of a dispassionate historian; they are the words of one whose mind is made up *a priori*, and who strains the facts to suit his preconceived opinion. In no other department of historical criticism except Biblical would any scholar dream of saying, or dare to say, that accounts are not more trustworthy if they can be traced back to authors who were children at the time the events which form this subject occurred, and who were in year-long, confidential and intimate relations with actors in those events, than they would be if they were composed by writers one or two generations younger, who had personal acquaintance with few or none of the actors and contemporaries. But compare above, p. 482.

<sup>1</sup> *Die Ueberlieferungen von Jesus, die bei Markus und Lukas vorliegen, sind älter als man gewöhnlich annimmt. Das macht sie nicht glaubwürdiger, ist aber doch für ihre Kritik nicht gleichgültig.*

There is room, and great need, for a dispassionate and serious examination of the question how far there exist in the Gospels real traces of the period in which they were composed, and of the thought characteristic of that time. Such an examination cannot be conducted to a useful end by one who begins with his mind made up as to what must be later and what cannot be real, for such prejudices must inevitably be of nineteenth century character and hostile to any true comprehension of first century realities. I cannot but think and maintain that there are later elements in the Gospels, showing the influence of popular legend, and reminding us that after all the picture of Jesus which stands before us in the New Testament has always to be contemplated through glass that is not perfect and flawless, through a human and imperfect medium.<sup>1</sup> The flaws can be distinguished, but the marvel is that they are so few and so unimportant. The picture is so strong, so simple in outline, and so unique, that it shines with hardly diminished clearness through the medium.

NOTE.—A word must be added about the meaning of Eusebius's statements as to Luke's origin, τὸ μὲν γένος ἂν τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας. In *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 389, I expressed the opinion that this peculiar phrase, used in preference to one of the simple ways of saying that he was an Antiochian or resided at Antioch, amounted to an assertion that he did not live in Antioch, but belonged to an Antiochian family. Professor Harnack does not say anything that conflicts with my statement (so far as I have observed), though he does not formally agree with it, and, on the whole, rather neglects it; quite probably he may never have observed it. But several others have disputed

<sup>1</sup> Legend gathers quickly in the East. It is an interesting study to observe how the historic figure of Ibrahim Pasha has been hidden beneath a crust of legend in the districts of Asia Minor which he held from 1832-40. The name is famous, but the legends gather round it.

it, and asserted that Eusebius describes Luke as an Antiochian. Some parallel passages will show that I was right; had Luke been known to Eusebius as an Antiochian himself, the historian would not have said that "by family he was of those from Antioch." Arrian, *Ind.* 18, mentions Nearchos, son of Androtimos, τὸ γένος μὲν Κρής ὁ Νέαρχος, ᾧ κεε δὲ ἐν Ἀμφιπόλει τῇ ἐπὶ Στρώμονι (compare *Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1896, p. 471). Nearchos was by family a Cretan, but he resided in Amphipolis, where probably his father settled, and where the son could only be a resident stranger, not a citizen: <sup>1</sup> hence he continued to be "Cretan by family, settled in Amphipolis." Similarly we find in an epitaph of Olympos in Lycia Telesphoros, son of Trophimos, γένει Πρυμνησεῦς, <sup>2</sup> a resident in Olympos and married to an Olympian woman (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1892, p. 224). As resident strangers acquired no citizenship, it was necessary to have some method of designating them in the second or third generation: had Telesphorus himself migrated from Phrygian Prymnessios, he would have been called Πρυμνησεὺς οἰκῶν ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ (*Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. p. 471), or more formally, after the analogy of C.I.G. 2686, οἰκῆσει μὲν Μειλήσιος, φύσει δὲ Ἰασεύς. Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 7, 2, speaks of Simon resident in Caesareia Stratonis as Ἰουδαίου, Κύπριόν δὲ γένος.

The form ἀπὸ Ὄξυρύγχως, etc., is used in the Egyptian Papyri apparently in the sense of "belonging to Oxyrynchos, etc.," without any implication that the person was not resident there; but in this expression the critical word

<sup>1</sup> Unless an act of the Macedonian king forced the conferring of citizenship.

<sup>2</sup> Personally I should regard Πρυμνησεὺς as the better accentuation: the form is due to rough and coarse local pronunciation of Greek, often exemplified in inscriptions of Asia Minor: many examples of this are quoted in writings on Asia Minor of recent date, e.g., κατασκευάσαν for κατασκευάσαν, where *ων* must be regarded as a representation of the sound of *W*. In Πρυμνησεὺς it represents either *W* or the modern pronunciation *F*. See e.g. *Histor. Geogr. of As. Min.* p. 281; *Studies in Eastern Prov.* (1906), p. 360.

γένος is omitted: examples are numerous, e.g., 'Αλοίνης, Κώμονος, Διονυσίου, τῶν ἀπὸ Ὁξυρύγχων πόλεως, Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyr.* No. 48, 49.

The form τῶν ἀπὸ is also used in a way different from the last example, equivalent to ἐκ τῶν: e.g. ὑπὸ Νεφέριτος τῶν ἀπὸ Μέμφεως, *Greek Papyri Br. Mus.* p. 32 (Nepheris was resident in Memphis); compare also Κάστορος . . . τῶν ἀπὸ κόμης Ἀκώρεως καταγεινομέν[ου]<sup>1</sup> ἐν κόμῃ Μνάχει, *Amherst Papyri*, 88. In the second case Castor was not a resident in his proper village: in the former case it is possible that the formula is used in a papyrus of the Serapeum, because Nepheris was at the moment at the Serapeum outside of Memphis. But I do not venture to make any statement about Egyptian usage. Literary usage certainly has a distinguishing sense for τῶν ἀπὸ, e.g. Σεβήρος τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἄνωθεν Φρυγίας, Aristides, i. p. 505 (Dindorf): this Roman officer of high rank belonged to a Jewish family of Upper Phrygia and also of Ancyra, but he evidently was not a resident in Upper Phrygia, and at the period in question he was probably not even educated in Upper Phrygia, but in Italy, as he was able to enter the senatorial career when a youth.

The expression τῶν ἀπὸ is also used in the sense of 'descended from a person,' e.g. τῶν ἀπ' Ἀρδύου Ἡρακλειδῶν (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1892, p. 218), "of the Heracleids descended from Ardys," the Lydian king.

Fränkel, *Inscr. Perg.* i. p. 170, takes the phrase appended to a royal letter, Ἀθηναγόρας ἐκ Περγάμου, as meaning that Athenagoras the scribe was not a Pergamenian citizen, but a resident only. But the meaning is, "Athenagoras (was the scribe: the letter was written) from Pergamos."

W. M. RAMSAY.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ωι in pap.: corrected to [ου] by the editors.

<sup>2</sup> The Author dates Luke's History A.D. 80. For a different reason I argued that Luke iii. 1, was written under Titus, 79-81 (*St. Paul the Traveler*, p. 387).