

SWEET GOSPEL HARMONY, COM
Paton GQAG / SYNOPSIS GOSPELS

PART IV

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

LITERATURE.—The principal commentaries and dissertations on the Gospel of Luke are those of Schleiermacher, *Ueber die Schriften des Lukas kritischer Versuch* (Berlin, 1817), translated by Bishop Thirlwall, with a valuable introduction (London, 1825); Olshausen (1837, English translation, 1863); De Wette (3rd ed. Leipsic, 1846); Trollope, *Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel* (London, 1847); Ewald (Göttingen, 1850); Meyer (1st ed. Göttingen, 1860, 6th ed. by Weiss, 1878, translated by the Rev. Robert Wallis, Edinburgh, 1880); Grimm, *Die Einheit des Lukasevangelium* (Regensburg, 1863); Oosterzee in Lange's *Bibelwerk* (3rd ed. Bielefeld, 1877), translated by Dr. Schaff (New York, 1866); Van Doren, *Suggestive Commentary on St. Luke* (London, 1868); Godet (Neuchatel, 1871, translated Edinburgh, 1875); Bishop Jones in the *Speaker's Commentary* (London, 1875); Alford in his *Greek Testament*, last edition (London, 1894); Dean Plumptre in *Bishop Ellicott's Commentary* (1879); Farrar on Luke in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools* (London, 1882); Riddle in *International Commentary* (New York, 1882); Dean Spence in *Pulpit Commentary* (London, 1889); Dr. Colin Campbell, *Critical Studies in St. Luke's Gospel* (Edinburgh, 1890).

I. GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPEL.

The genuineness of the Gospel of Luke is sufficiently attested. It is true that we cannot here appeal to the Apostolic Fathers, as this Gospel was the latest written of the Synoptic Gospels, and as it is difficult to determine whether

the citations adduced are taken from it or from the Gospel of Matthew.¹ It has been affirmed that the Gospel of Luke is quoted by Paul in his First Epistle to Timothy: "For the scripture saith (λέγει ἡ γραφή), Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his hire" (1 Tim. v. 18). The last clause of the verse is only to be found in Luke's Gospel, where the very same words occur: ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ (Luke x. 7). There is nothing incredible in this supposition, considering the close connection between Luke and Paul, and the probability that the Gospel of Luke was written before the First Epistle to Timothy; but we hardly think that this Gospel at so early a period would be considered as scripture (ἡ γραφή). Marcion (A.D. 140) is perhaps the earliest witness to the Gospel of Luke. Marcion's Gospel, as we shall afterwards see, was merely a mutilated form of Luke's, and he was living when Justin Martyr wrote his Apologies. "There is," says Justin, "Marcion, a man of Pontus, who is even at this day alive, and teaching his disciples to believe in some other god greater than the Creator."² Allowing time for the diffusion of his opinions, the Gospel of Marcion cannot be placed later than ten years before the time of Justin. The distinct references of Justin Martyr himself (A.D. 150) to the Gospel of Luke are very numerous. He does not indeed mention the name of Luke, but his citations from the Gospel are unmistakable. The following are the principal quotations: "The Virgin Mary received faith and joy, when the angel Gabriel announced the good tidings to her that the Spirit of the Lord would come upon her."³ "On the occasion of the first census which was taken in Judæa under Cyrenius, Joseph went up from Nazareth, where he dwelt, to Bethlehem, to which he belonged, to be enrolled; for his family was of the tribe of Judah, which then inhabited that region."⁴ "Jesus said to His disciples, I give unto you power to tread on serpents, and

¹ In Charteris' *Canonicity*, testimonies are given from Barnabas, Ep. xiv. 1; Clement of Rome, 1 Ep. xiii. 2, xlv. 8, lix. 3; Hermas, *Mand.* v. 2. 7; these, however, cannot be depended on.

² Justin, *Apol.* i. 26.

³ *Dialog. c. Trypho*, ch. c.

⁴ *Ibid.* ch. lxxviii.

scorpions, and on all the might of the enemy" (Luke x. 19).¹ "In the Memoirs, which were composed by His apostles and those who followed them, it is recorded that His sweat fell down like drops of blood while He prayed, saying, If it be possible, let this cup pass" (Luke xxii. 42).² "When Christ was giving up His spirit on the cross, He said, 'Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit,' as I have learned from the Memoirs" (Luke xxiii. 46).³ Tatian (A.D. 160) included Luke's Gospel in his Diatessaron, a complete copy of which has recently been discovered. In the Muratorian canon (A.D. 170) the Gospel of Luke is thus mentioned: "The third Gospel is according to Luke. Luke, a physician, whom Paul after the ascension of Christ had chosen as a companion of his journey, wrote this in his own name and according to his own judgment; yet he had not himself seen the Lord in the flesh. Carrying his narrative as far back as he could obtain information, he began from the birth of John."⁴ In the Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons (A.D. 177) there is a reference to Luke's Gospel. "His (Vettius Epagathus) was so consistent a life, that although young he had obtained a reputation equal to that of the elder Zacharias, for he walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless" (Luke i. 6).⁵ Celsus, who is generally supposed to have lived about A.D. 178, refers to Luke's Gospel, when he adverts to the genealogy of Christ being traced up to Adam.⁶ The first Father who mentions Luke as the author of the third Gospel is Irenæus (A.D. 180). "Luke, the follower and the disciple of the apostles, referring to Zacharias and Elizabeth, from whom, according to promise, John was born, says: 'And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.'"⁷ And again, "Now, if any man set Luke aside, as one who did not know the truth, he will manifestly reject that Gospel of which he claims to be a disciple."⁸ Irenæus quotes the Gospel of Luke about eighty times. It is needless to pursue

¹ *Dialog. c. Trypho*, ch. lxxvi.

² *Ibid.* ch. cv.

³ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 1.

⁴ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 10. 1.

⁵ *Ibid.* ch. ciii.

⁶ Tregelles, *Codex Muratorius*.

⁷ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 32.

⁸ *Ibid.* iii. 14. 3.

the subject further, for after this there is no doubt or question about Luke's authorship of the third Gospel.¹

Another distinct line of argument is drawn from the relation of the third Gospel to the Acts of the Apostles. These writings profess to have the same author. In the Acts the writer alludes to his former treatise. Both works are addressed or dedicated to a certain Theophilus (Acts i. 1; Luke i. 3). This identity of authorship was never called in question by the early Church, and in modern times has been admitted by scholars of all shades of opinion. Dr. Davidson mentions no less than forty-seven terms which occur in both works, but nowhere else in the New Testament.² De Wette observes: "It is certain that the writer of the Acts is the author of the third Gospel, and his peculiarity of style remains the same in both works, and in the Acts of the Apostles from the beginning to the end."³ And so also Zeller remarks: "The identity of the author of the two writings is raised to such a height of probability that we have every reason to consider it as historically proved."⁴ Admitting this identity of authorship, it follows that the whole series of testimonies in favour of the Acts can also be adduced in favour of the genuineness of the third Gospel. Now the testimonies for the Acts are strong and numerous. It is quoted or referred to by Polycarp in his Epistle to the Philippians,⁵ in the Epistle to the Churches of Lyons and Vienne,⁶ by Irenæus,⁷ Clemens Alexandrinus,⁸ Tertullian,⁹ Origen,¹⁰ and subsequent Fathers. Eusebius places both the Gospel of Luke and the Acts among those books which are universally acknowledged.¹¹

¹ Luke's Gospel is also frequently quoted in the *Clementine Homilies* (A.D. 160-170).

² Davidson's *Introduction to the N.T.* vol. ii. 8. See also Davidson's *Introduction to the Study of the N.T.* vol. ii. p. 151, 3rd ed., and Zeller's *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 414-425.

³ De Wette's *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 10.

⁴ Zeller's *Acts of the Apostles*, translation, vol. ii. 213; *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 442.

⁵ *Ep. ad Philipp.* ch. i.

⁷ *Adv. Hær.* iii. 14. 1.

⁹ *De Jejuniis*, ch. x.

¹¹ *Ibid.* iii. 4.

⁶ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 1

⁸ *Stromata*, v. 12.

¹⁰ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 25.

Olshausen has good reason for the assertion : " In the primitive Church there was no opposition either to Luke's Gospel or to the Acts of the Apostles." ¹

In recent times the Gospel of Luke has been more or less disputed, especially by Eichhorn, who supposed it to be an enlargement of the Gospel of Marcion; by those critics belonging to the early Tübingen school who placed the time of its composition about the middle of the second century; and by many of those theologians who have adopted the so-called twofold documentary hypothesis concerning the origin of the Synoptic Gospels. There have also been special objections adduced against the genuineness of this Gospel, as, for example, the apparently mythical account of the birth of Christ and its supposed discrepancy with the account given by Matthew, a subject which has already been discussed; ² the apparent contradiction between the genealogies of Christ given by Matthew and Luke, which is reserved for a separate dissertation; and the supposed erroneous historical statement concerning the enrolment made by Cyrenius, governor of Syria (Luke ii. 1), which will be considered when we treat of the chronology of the Gospels.

The chief, or at least the most noteworthy, objection brought against the genuineness of Luke's Gospel is its relation to the Gospel of Marcion, of which several critics consider that it is merely an amplification. On account of its importance and the interest connected with it, we shall examine this subject in detail. ³

Marcion, one of the most notorious, and in several

¹ Olshausen, *On the Gospel and the Acts*, vol. i. p. xli.

² See *supra*, pp. 135 ff.

³ The chief works on the relation of Marcion's Gospel to that of Luke, are Hahn's *Evangelium Marcion*, contained in the *Codex Apocryphus N.T.* of Thilo, pp. 401-486 (Leipsic, 1833); Ritschl's *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium Lukas* (Tübingen, 1846); Volkmar, *Das Evangelium Marcions* (Leipsic, 1852); Rönseh, *Das Neue Testamentum Tertullian*, 1871; Baring Gould, *Lost and Hostile Gospels*, pp. 235-277 (London, 1874); Hill's *Marcion's Gospel* (Guernsey, 1893). The subject is also more or less discussed in Bleek's *Introduction to the N.T.* vol. i. pp. 138-154; in an elaborate article on Marcion, by Professor Salmon, in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*; in Professor Sanday's *Gospels of the Second Century*; in an article on Gnosis in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*,

respects one of the most interesting of the early heretics, was a contemporary of Justin Martyr, and wrote about A.D. 140. He was a native of Sinope, in the province of Pontus, of which town his father was bishop. A Christian by birth, he received a thorough Christian education, as is proved by his writings. Perplexed with the existence of evil under the government of a good and holy God of infinite power and wisdom, he fell into heresy, and became a disciple of the Syrian Gnostic Cerdo, whose system he developed. "Cerdo," says Irenæus, "taught that the God proclaimed by the law and the prophets was not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The former was known, the latter unknown; the one was righteous, the other benevolent. Marcion of Pontus succeeded him, and developed his doctrine."¹ About A.D. 140 he followed Cerdo to Rome, where he was excommunicated on account of his erroneous opinions, and in consequence formed a sect of his own. Irenæus informs us that he met with Polycarp at Rome, and, wishing to procure the recognition of that Father, asked him, Dost thou know me? to whom Polycarp replied, I recognise thee as the firstborn of Satan.² There does not appear to have been anything immoral in his teaching, nor, so far as appears, in his conduct.³ Unlike many of the early heretics, his doctrine was moral; he even carried asceticism to an unwarrantable extent, not only inculcating abstinence from the use of wine and animal food, except fish, but forbidding his disciples to marry. In the early centuries Marcionism was diffused throughout the Christian Church by reason of its plausibility and the high morality and self-denial which it inculcated. There was a regular Church formed, with its bishops and presbyters. Epiphanius tells us that besides Rome, where it was at first promulgated, it spread into Egypt, Palestine, Arabia, Syria, Cyprus, and Persia. It gradually disappeared in the fourth century, owing to the rise and growth of Manichæanism, a

2nd ed. vol. v. pp. 231-236, by Jacobi; and in Harnack's *Quellenkritik des Gnosticismus*.

¹ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* i. 27. 1.

² *Ibid.* iii. 3. 4.

³ The charge of youthful incontinence brought against him is not confirmed by Irenæus or Tertullian.

system which it closely resembled, and on account of the repressive measures of Constantine and his successors.

Marcion is generally reckoned among the earliest of the Gnostic heretics. And certainly many of his doctrines, such as the difference between the supreme God and the Creator, and the docetic nature of Christ, are tenets of Gnosticism. But in his system he does not recognise the Gnostic æons, as the connecting links between the supreme God and the world; nor is there any mixture of heathen philosophy and Oriental speculation, as is the case with all other Gnostic systems.¹ He contemplated religion from a Christian standpoint. He asserted that the evil which was in the world could not possibly have arisen under the government of a good God; and that consequently there was a difference between God the Creator of the world, the Demiurge (*δημιουργός*) of the Gnostics, and the supreme God. In short, he taught that there were two Gods. The Creator was an inferior being to the God of the Gospel, but not, as some of the Gnostics taught, an evil principle. His inferiority consisted in defect; He was limited in power and knowledge, and even goodness.² Hence there was a certain difference, often amounting to antagonism, between the Old Testament and the New. The God of the Old Testament was the Creator, whilst the God of the New Testament was the supreme God; the God of the Old Testament was the God of justice, the God of the New Testament was the God of love.³ The law was opposed to the Gospel; the prophets

¹ As Mansel observes: "Marcion is the least Gnostic of all the Gnostics." *The Gnostic Heresies*, p. 218. "Marcion," says Harnack, "put all emphasis on faith, not on Gnosis." *History of Dogma*, vol. i. p. 266.

² For these tenets of Marcion, see the account of Marcion and his doctrines in Mansel's *Gnostic Heresy*, lect. xiii.; Salmon's article on Marcion in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. "Marcion," says Irenæus, "advanced the most daring blasphemy against Him who is proclaimed as God by the law and the prophets, declaring Him to be the author of evils, to delight in war, to be infirm of purpose, and even to be contrary to Himself." *Adv. Hær.* i. 27. 2.

³ Thus he observes: "'Thou shall love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy,' was the command of the just God; 'Love thine enemies,' was the law of the good God. 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,' was the retributive law of the just God; 'If any smite thee on the right

of the Old Testament were not the inspired servants of the supreme God, but the servants of the Demiurge. The supreme God was unknown until Christ revealed Him: "No man has known the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him." And as there were two Gods, so, according to Marcion, there were two Messiahs—the Messiah of the prophets and the Messiah of the New Testament. The Jewish Messiah was to be a victorious King; the Christian Messiah was to be a suffering Saviour. The one was to rule the nations with a rod of iron, the other was to die as a sacrifice for sin. The one was to be the Deliverer of Israel, the other was to be the Saviour of the world. Jesus came not to fulfil, but to abolish the law and the prophets and the works of the Creator of the world.¹ In conformity with these views and his opposition to the Jewish religion, Marcion considered Paul, on account of his conflict with the Judaising Christians, as the only true apostle. Hence he accepted only ten Epistles of Paul, and rejected all the other books of the New Testament, with the exception of the Gospel of Luke, as infected with Judaism. Such a system, at once compact and consistent, was violently opposed by the early Fathers. Justin Martyr and Irenæus both wrote against it; but the chief opponents of Marcion were Tertullian² and Epiphanius.

But it is the Gospel of Marcion that we have especially to consider, and its relation to the Gospel of Luke. Besides a work termed *ἀντιθέσεις*, containing a series of antitheses between the Old Testament, the revelation of the Creator or the God of justice, and the New Testament, the revelation of the supreme God or the God of love, Marcion wrote a gospel. It is no longer extant, but we have numerous

check, turn to him the other also,' was the command of the good God."

¹ So Irenæus asserts that Marcion taught that "Jesus was manifested in the form of a man to those who were in Judæa, abolishing the prophets and the law and all the work of that God who made the world."—*Adv. Her.* i. 27. 2.

² Tertullian wrote a special work against Marcion, in which he employs all his vehemence and eloquence. In this he is followed by Epiphanius, who, however, wrote independently of Tertullian.

extracts from it in the writings of Tertullian and Epiphanius. From these extracts it appears that it bears a very close resemblance to our canonical Gospel of Luke. Marcion entitled it "the Gospel of the Lord" (*Τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Κυρίου*), being, as he supposed, the true Gospel of Christ—the Gospel of the God of love. It commences with the words: "In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, Jesus¹ came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and was teaching on the Sabbath day; and they were astonished at His doctrine, for His word was with authority" (comp. Luke iii. 1, iv. 31, 32). In this Gospel Jesus suddenly appears in the world.² There is no mention of His birth, for this is opposed to the Docetic views of Marcion; nor of His baptism, as the Baptist was regarded as a prophet of the Old Testament. The Gospel of Luke is strictly followed throughout; and, in general, the same order is preserved. There are no statements of incidents or discourses which are not found in Luke's Gospel; there are indeed numerous omissions, but two-thirds of Luke's Gospel are preserved, though in an altered form. The omissions are generally accounted for by Marcion's peculiar views; all those passages being omitted which would seem to recognise the divine origin of the Jewish religion.³ Sometimes, however, no reason can be assigned for the omission, as, for example, in the case of the parable of the Prodigal Son, which one would think to be rather in favour of Marcion's conception of the God of the New Testament as the God of love. There are also numerous verbal alterations, most of which can be explained by Marcion's peculiar views.⁴ Several attempts have been made at the reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel

¹ For Jesus, Hahn and Westcott read God, namely, the good God, as distinguished from the Creator.

² Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.* iv. 7.

³ The omissions of Marcion are the following: Luke i., ii., iii., iv. 1–15, xiii. 1–9, xiii. 29–35, xv. 11–32, xviii. 31–34, xix. 29–48, xx. 9–18, xxii. 35–38, xxii. 49–51, xxiv. 48–53.

⁴ There is in Marcion's Gospel a curious alteration in the Lord's Prayer. Marcion has, "Father, may Thy Holy Spirit come upon us," instead of, "Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name." Baring-Gould's *Lost and Hostile Gospels*, p. 252. Hill's *Marcion's Gospel*,

from the numerous quotations given from it by Tertullian and Epiphanius, and from their remarks, as both these Fathers criticise that Gospel passage by passage.¹ In this manner we can ascertain with tolerable certainty what passages of Luke's Gospel are omitted and what are retained, as well as in what parts the Gospel of Marcion differs from our third Gospel.

The question arises, What is the relation between the Gospel of Marcion and our canonical Gospel of Luke? Is Marcion's Gospel merely a mutilation of Luke's, made with the purpose of making it correspond with his heretical views? Or, Is the Gospel of Marcion the prior or original Gospel, of which our third Gospel is an expansion and recension? Is it the first edition, so to speak, of Luke's Gospel? On this point the Fathers are unanimous; they with one voice accuse Marcion of mutilating the Gospel of Luke. Thus Irenæus says: "Marcion mutilates the Gospel which is according to Luke, removing from it all that is written respecting the generation of the Lord, and setting aside a great deal of the teaching of the Lord, in which the Lord is recorded as most clearly confessing that the Maker of the universe is His Father."² And Tertullian observes: "It is certain that Marcion has erased everything that was contrary to his own opinion and in favour of the Creator, as if it had been interpolated, whilst anything that agreed with his own opinion he has retained."³ Some modern critics have, however, impugned these statements, and asserted that they proceeded from prejudice; and that Marcion's Gospel is an original work, and the chief source from which our Gospel of Luke was composed. The first who adopted this view was Semler, and he has been followed by Eichhorn and his school, as this opinion was favourable to their hypothesis of original documents. Afterwards this opinion was at one time maintained by Baur,⁴

p. 25. Hahn, however, gives the words as they are found in our Gospel. See Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.* iv. 26.

¹ This was done by Hahn, *Evangelium Marcionis ex auctoritate veterum monumentorum*; inserted in Thilo's *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, pp. 401-486. Hill's *Marcion's Gospel* is an English translation of the work of Hahn with some variations.

² *Adv. Hær.* i. 27. 2.

³ Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.* iv. 6.

⁴ *Marcusevangelium*, pp. 191 ff.

Ritschl,¹ Schwegler,² and other critics belonging to the early Tübingen school.³ But, on the other hand, strange to say, the strongest advocate in favour of the patristic opinion, that Marcion's Gospel was a mutilation of Luke's, was Volkmar,⁴ one of the most pronounced disciples of the Tübingen school; and he so convincingly vindicated this view, that most of his opponents were gained over and retracted their opinions. Thus Ritschl says: "The hypothesis propounded by me, that Marcion did not alter the Gospel of Luke, but that his Gospel is a step towards the canonical Luke, I regard as refuted by Volkmar and Hilgenfeld."⁵ So also Zeller, belonging to the Tübingen school, observes: "We may admit as proved and generally accepted, not only that Marcion made use of an older Gospel, but further, that he recomposed, modified, and often abridged it, and that this older Gospel was essentially none other than that of Luke."⁶ Professor Sanday, by a minute critical examination, has proved that the passages omitted by Marcion are written by the same author as those which are retained.⁷ In consequence of this examination the author of *Supernatural Religion* also acknowledged that he was in error in holding that Marcion's Gospel was the original.⁸ The only theologian, so far as we are aware, who still maintains the paradoxical opinion of the priority of Marcion's Gospel is Baring-Gould. "The Gospel of our Lord," he observes, "if not the original Luke Gospel,—and this is probable,—was the basis of Luke's compilation. But that it was Luke's first edition of his Gospel, drawn up when St. Paul was actively engaged in founding the Asiatic Churches, is the view I am disposed to take of it. . . . All these facts point to

¹ *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas.*

² *Nachapostol. Zeitalter*, vol. i. p. 260.

³ See Bleek's *Introduction to the N.T.* vol. i. pp. 143, 144, notes; and Meyer's *Commentary on Luke*, vol. i. p. 264, Remark 2, English translation.

⁴ *Das Evangelium Marcions.*

⁵ *Theolog. Jahrbuch*, 1851, pp. 528 f., quoted by Meyer.

⁶ Zeller's *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 11-26: translation, vol. i. pp. 99 ff.

⁷ Sanday's *Gospels of the Second Century*, pp. 204-237, and pp. 362-372.

⁸ Salmon's *Introduction to the N.T.* p. 245.

Marcion's Gospel as the original Luke, not, however, quite as it came to Marcion, but edited by the heretic."¹

It may now be considered as demonstrated that the Gospel of Marcion is a mutilation of the Gospel of Luke. He first formed his own opinions on the opposition between the Old and New Testaments,—the difference between the God of creation and the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ,—the antithesis between Judaism and Christianity, and selected the Gospel of Luke as the Gospel which appeared to him best suited for his purpose, and by omissions and alterations adapted it to his opinions. As Bleek observes: "He excludes all passages in which the Gospel history is brought into harmony with the Old Testament revelation, in which the New Testament is represented as the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies, in which Christ is described as springing from the Jewish nation and of human parentage and partaker of human weaknesses, in which Christ describes God, after the manner of the Old Testament, as an avenging Judge."² The following alterations will illustrate the method on which Marcion proceeded. The words, "When ye see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God" (xiii. 28), are changed into, "When you shall see all the righteous (πάντας τοὺς δικαίους) in the kingdom of God." The declaration of our Lord, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fail" (xvi. 17), is altered into, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, even as the law and the prophets have passed away, than for one tittle of My words to fail." And the address of our Lord to the disciples going to Emmaus, "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken" (xxiv. 25), is transformed into, "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that He spoke to you."³

Another objection brought against the Gospel of Luke is its alleged Ebionite tendency.⁴ It is asserted that this

¹ *Lost and Hostile Gospels*, pp. 275, 276.

² Bleek's *Introduction to the N.T.* vol. i. p. 149. See also Sanday, *Gospels of the Second Century*, p. 219.

³ See Hill's *Marcion's Gospel*. Hahn's *Evangelium Marcionis*.

⁴ See Dr. Colin Campbell's *Critical Studies in St. Luke*; also Renan's

Gospel, or at least a considerable portion of it, is the work of an Ebionite. By this is not meant, as the term Ebionite usually denotes,¹ the maintenance of a Jewish form of Christianity, the direct opposite of Marcionism, which is certainly not taught in Luke's Gospel, but the exaltation of poverty and the denunciation of riches. The reasons for this opinion are, that throughout this Gospel poverty is praised, whilst riches are denounced. Thus in the beatitudes the words are: "Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God" (vi. 20), without the restriction found in Matthew's Gospel: "Blessed are the poor in spirit." A woe is pronounced upon the rich: "Woe unto you that are rich: for ye have received your consolation" (vi. 24); in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the rich man is condemned apparently on account of his riches, and Lazarus is saved apparently on account of his poverty and wretchedness; the rich young ruler is told that in order to inherit eternal life he must sell all that he has and give it to the poor; and the widow woman is commended for casting in her mite into the treasury. Now it is true that this Gospel may, in a peculiar sense, be styled "the Gospel of the poor": its consolations are peculiarly addressed to them. But the passages adduced are too few to warrant the conclusion that the Gospel of Luke was composed with a special tendency to exalt poverty and to promote asceticism. Zacchæus, the rich publican, is commended: of him it is said that salvation has come into his house.

II. THE AUTHOR OF THE GOSPEL.

In the Greek manuscripts this Gospel is entitled, *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Λουκᾶν* or simply *κατὰ Λουκᾶν*. The earliest Fathers who quote this Gospel do not assign it to any particular person. The first assertion of the authorship

Introduction to the *Vie de Jesus*, and Davidson's *Introduction to the N.T.* 3rd ed. vol. i. pp. 404 ff.

¹ The Ebionites were a Jewish Christian sect who seceded from the Church about the middle of the second century. They considered the Jewish law still binding, and held low views of the nature of Christ.

of Luke which we meet with, is in the Muratorian canon and in the writings of Irenæus.

The name Lucas is a contraction of Lucanus, as Silas is of Silvanus. Luke is not to be confounded with Lucius, one of the teachers in the Church of Antioch (Acts xiii. 1), nor with Lucius, mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans (Rom. xvi. 21), as the names are entirely different. He is thrice mentioned by Paul in his Epistles (Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11). Some suppose that he is also alluded to in 2 Cor. viii. 18, where Paul says: "We have sent together with him (Titus) the brother whose praise in the Gospel *is spread* through all the Churches; and not only so, but who was also appointed by the Churches to travel with us in *the matter of this grace*": not because there is any allusion in the words, "whose praise is in the Gospel," to the Gospel of Luke, but because Luke was one of the deputies of the Churches who went with Paul to Jerusalem; and he might have been sent along with Titus to take charge of the contribution of the Church of Corinth. We are ignorant of the birthplace of Luke. Eusebius, Jerome, and Nicephorus inform us that this was Antioch;¹ but this may have arisen from confounding him with Lucius of Cyrene (Acts xiii. 1); others fix on Troas, because there he first joined the apostle; and others, as Greswell, conjecture that he was an inhabitant of Philippi, because, according to the narrative of the Acts, he appears to have resided there for several years. From a statement made by Paul (comp. Col. iv. 11 with ver. 14), he appears to have been a Gentile by birth. The purity of his Greek, and the comparative absence of Hebraisms, are in favour of his Gentile origin, though these may be accounted for on the supposition that he was a Hellenistic Jew. It is doubtful whether he was a proselyte to Judaism before his conversion to Christianity, as Jerome asserts, and as his acquaintance with Jewish rites and ordinances would seem to imply. Paul calls him "Luke, the beloved physician" (Col. iv. 14); and some think that there are proofs of his medical knowledge to be found in his writings from the precise and exact manner in which he

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 4.

speaks of diseases and miracles of healing:¹ as that Peter's mother-in-law was afflicted with a great fever (*πυρετῶ μεγάλῳ*), Elymas was struck with blindness (*ἀχλὺς*), a technical term (Acts xiii. 11), and the father of Publius lay sick of fevers and dysentery (*πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίῳ*, Acts xxviii. 8); but the argument from these and similar expressions is overdrawn. Grotius supposes that Luke was originally a slave, because the most eminent physicians mentioned in Roman history were of this class:² but there is no ground for this supposition, as among the Greeks the medical profession was highly esteemed and practised by men of liberal education.

We learn from the Acts that Luke was the companion of Paul. The author of the Acts joined Paul on his missionary journeys at Troas, when the style of narrative changes from the indirect to the direct form: instead of the third, the first person pronoun is employed (Acts xvi. 10). He passed with the apostle into Macedonia, and was with him at Philippi (Acts xvi. 11, 13). Here he appears to have remained behind, for the narrative again changes from the first to the third person; and it is not until Paul's return, seven years after, to Philippi that the direct form is resumed (Acts xx. 6). Hence it is with some probability assumed that Luke remained at Philippi. He was doubtless one of the messengers of the Churches who accompanied the apostle on his last momentous journey to Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 1, 15, 17). Probably he remained with Paul during his imprisonment of two years at Cæsarea, for he sailed with him from that city to Rome (Acts xxvii. 1–3, xxviii. 16). He was with the apostle during his first Roman imprisonment, when Paul wrote the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon (Col. iv. 11; Philem. 24), and was also with him during his second Roman imprisonment, remaining with him to the close of his life (2 Tim. iv. 11). "He was," says Irenæus, "always attached to and inseparable from Paul."³

¹ Hobart, *The Medical Language of St. Luke*.

² As Antestius the physician of Julius Cæsar, and Antoninus Musa the physician of Augustus.

³ *Adv. Hær.* iii. 14. 1.

We have few notices of Luke in the patristic writings and in the early ecclesiastical histories, and all of them are of a legendary character. Epiphanius informs us that he was one of the seventy disciples, probably because it is only in the Gospel of Luke that the mission of the seventy is recorded ; but this statement is refuted by Luke himself, who in the preface to his Gospel evidently implies that he was not one of our Lord's immediate followers (Luke i. 1-3). For the same reason the plausible assertion of Theophylact, that he was one of the disciples going to Emmaus to whom Jesus after His resurrection revealed Himself, is to be rejected. The tradition that he was a painter rests on the authority of Nicephorus of the fourteenth century, and is entitled to no credit.¹ It seems to have arisen from a rude picture of the Virgin being found in the Catacombs with the inscription that it was one of the seven painted by Luca. According to Epiphanius, he preached the gospel in Dalmatia, Gallia, Italy, and Macedonia. According to Jerome, he died a natural death in the eighty-fourth year of his age. Gregory Nazianzen reckons him among the martyrs ; and according to Nicephorus he returned to Greece, where he suffered martyrdom by being hanged on an olive tree in the eightieth year of his age. His remains were removed to Constantinople by the order of Constantine.²

As, according to the Fathers, there was a close connection between the Apostle Peter and the evangelist Mark, so they held that there was a similar connection between Paul and Luke. The Gospel of Luke was regarded by them in a certain sense as the Gospel of Paul. Thus Irenæus observes : " Luke, the companion of Paul, recorded in a book the gospel preached by him." ³ Tertullian says : " Men usually ascribe Luke's form of the Gospel to Paul." ⁴ And Origen writes : " Among the four Gospels which are the only indisputable ones in the Church of God, I have learned by

¹ Nicephorus, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 4.

² See Baring-Gould's *Lives of the Saints*, October 18 ; Winer's *Biblisches Realwörterbuch* ; Cave's *Lives of the Apostles*.

³ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 1. 1.

⁴ Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.* iv. 5.

tradition . . . that the third was written by Luke, the Gospel commended by Paul, and composed for Gentile converts.”¹ The Gospel of Luke was not, however, so closely dependent on Paul as that of Mark was on Peter. Paul was not himself a follower of Christ when He was in this world, and although he may have materially assisted Luke in the composition of his Gospel by suggestions and by information imparted, yet the evangelist must have derived his facts from other sources, and must have been in direct communication with those who were the immediate followers of the Lord. There is undoubtedly a closer connection with the Pauline phase of doctrine in this Gospel than in the other Gospels. The account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper, as given by Luke, bears a close resemblance to that given by Paul in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (compare Luke xxii. 19, 20 with 1 Cor. xi. 23–25). The Fathers in general supposed that when Paul speaks of “his Gospel” (Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 8), he means the Gospel of Luke, composed as they imagined under his superintendence. Thus Eusebius says: “They say (*φασί*) that Paul meant to refer to Luke’s Gospel whenever, as if speaking of some Gospel of his own, he used the words ‘according to my Gospel.’”² And the same remark is made by Jerome: “Some suppose that whenever Paul in his Epistles makes use of the expression ‘according to my Gospel,’ he means Luke’s writing.”³ All this is mere supposition, as these Fathers themselves seem to imply, and is unsupported by any evidence.

III. SOURCES OF LUKE’S GOSPEL.

On this point we have some solid ground to go. In his preface, Luke gives us information of the sources from which he derived his Gospel: “Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 25.

² *Ibid.* iii. 4.

³ Jerome, *De vir. illustr.* ch. vii.

witnesses and ministers of the word, it seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus; that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed" (Luke i. 1-4). From these words it is evident that the evangelist affirms that he himself was not an eye- and ear-witness of the works and discourses of the Lord, for he evidently distinguishes himself from those who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. At the same time, he asserts that he was fully qualified to write an account of the actions of Christ; that he possessed sufficient knowledge; that he had traced the course of all things accurately (*ἀκριβῶς*) from the beginning. He mentions two sources of information which he possessed. The first was the oral information which he received from his intercourse with those who had been with Christ—the apostles and disciples of the Lord. This he would carefully ascertain, and under the guidance of the Spirit of God commit to writing. And the second source of information was the narratives of those who were the followers of Christ, many of which had been committed to writing; there were not only oral traditions, but written documents, to which he could refer.

The first source of Luke's information was oral tradition. Here Luke had peculiar advantages. He appears to have been for a considerable period resident in Judæa, in all probability during Paul's two years' imprisonment at Cæsarea. He would thus come into direct contact with many who had been the actual followers of Christ; most probably with some of the apostles, and certainly with James the Lord's brother, the so-called bishop of Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 18), and with Philip the evangelist, whom he met at Cæsarea (Acts xxi. 8). He had also the advantage of the information which Paul could impart to him, for that apostle must have had frequent communication with the original apostles. The account which Luke gives of the birth of John the Baptist, of the visit of the angel to the Virgin, and of the circumstances attending the birth of the Lord and His presentation in the temple, might have been obtained by him, either from Mary herself, or from James and the other

brethren of our Lord. As he himself tells us, he used the greatest diligence in the collection of the facts and sayings of our Lord.

The other source of information consisted of written documents. These, he asserts, were numerous. "Many (*πολλοί*) have taken in hand to draw up a narrative." We have already had occasion to remark that such evangelical fragments would be abundant in the early Church. Of these Luke would make a careful selection, guided in doing so by a higher wisdom than his own. As we have already stated, he might have had access to a narrative, either oral or written, which does not appear to have been used by the other two evangelists, the so-called Peræan section (Luke ix. 51—xviii. 41).¹ These documents Luke would not employ slavishly, but freely, working them into his narrative. According to Schleiermacher: "Luke is from the beginning to end no more than a compiler and arranger of documents which he found in existence, and which he allows to pass unaltered through his hands." "His great merit consists in this, that he has admitted scarcely any pieces but what are peculiarly genuine and good."² But this is a most erroneous view of the formation of the Gospel of Luke, and is refuted by the uniformity of style and diction which pervades the whole book, as well as the Acts of the Apostles, proving the unity of authorship, and the freedom with which the author used his materials.

It is, however, a very difficult question to determine how far the Gospels of Matthew and Mark are to be classed among the documentary sources of Luke's Gospel. We have already discussed the subject when considering the sources of the Synoptic Gospels,³ and found it one of extreme difficulty, hardly admitting of a satisfactory solution. There is nothing incredible in the supposition that Luke made use of these Gospels, as we consider that they were previously written. But we found that there were reasons for calling

¹ See *supra*, pp. 34, 35.

² Schleiermacher's *Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke*, translated by Thirlwall, pp. 313, 314. See also Renan's *Life of Jesus*, p. xlviii, English translation.

³ See *supra*, pp. 48, 49.

in question his use of Matthew's Gospel, especially on account of the differences in the genealogies and in the narrations of the birth of Christ and of His resurrection in the two Gospels; and we are disposed to infer that Luke had not access to Matthew's Gospel. But it is otherwise with the Gospel of Mark. Considering the similarity of the incidents recorded and of the chronological order of the narrative, and the frequent identity of expression, the probability, amounting however by no means to certainty, is that the narrative of Luke is to a certain extent dependent on the Gospel of Mark.¹ There is nothing in the preface of Luke to forbid this; there is no condemnation in it, as some think, of the previous narratives that were undertaken. At the same time, it must be admitted that there are portions of Mark's Gospel wanting in Luke which we would not expect to have been omitted had Luke that Gospel before him; not only those few parts that are peculiar to Mark, but other portions which are inserted in Matthew's Gospel, but wanting in Luke. All these reasons for and against must leave the question under considerable uncertainty.

IV. DESIGN OF THE GOSPEL.

Both the Gospel of Luke and the Acts are addressed to a certain Theophilus (Luke i. 3; Acts i. 1). The epithet *κράτιστος*, *most noble*, prefixed in the Gospel to his name, seems to intimate that he was a person of rank, as this is an epithet which generally refers, not to character, but to station. It is the same epithet which is given by Claudius Lysias and Tertullus to Felix (Acts xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3), and by Paul to Festus (Acts xxvi. 25). Theophilus was evidently a Christian, as it is stated that he had been a catechumen, fully instructed (*κατηχήθης*) in the religion of Christ. Some of the Fathers (Origen, Ambrose, Epiphanius) suppose that

¹ Meyer observes: "One of his (Luke's) principal documentary sources was the Gospel of Mark. Assuming this, as in view of the priority of Mark among the three Synoptics it must of necessity be assumed, it may be matter of doubt whether Matthew also in his present form was made use of by him or not." *On Luke*, vol. i. p. 261.

the word is not a proper name, but an appellative, denoting a lover of God, and applicable to every Christian reader; but its occurrence in two historical works refutes this opinion. Others (Michaelis,¹ Theodore Hase), wishing to identify him with some historical character, suppose that he may have been the same as Theophilus, the son of Annas, the high priest, who was deposed by King Agrippa,² and that the third Gospel and the Acts were apologies for Christianity,—an extravagant opinion, at variance with the dedication of the Gospel, which implies that Theophilus was a Christian. Some think that he was a native of Alexandria, and others a native of Italy; in all probability he was a Greek Christian of some position and influence.

The immediate design of the Gospel was, according to the preface, that Theophilus might know the certainty of those things wherein he was instructed. But this address to Theophilus must be considered rather as a dedication of the work than a statement of its nature and contents. The Gospel was written for the purpose of giving an authoritative account of the ministry of Jesus for the instruction of Christians, and especially of Gentile Christians. "Luke," says Origen, "composed his Gospel for Gentile converts." This statement is seen to be correct from an examination of its contents. There are explanations of Jewish customs and localities which would have been unnecessary for Jews, but necessary for those who were ignorant of the religious customs of the Jews and of the geography of the Holy Land. Thus we are informed that the Feast of Unleavened Bread is called the Passover; that Nazareth and Capernaum are cities of Galilee; that the country of the Gadarenes lies over against Galilee; that Arimathea is a city of the Jews; and that the village of Emmaus is about threescore furlongs from Jerusalem.³ In his genealogy Luke traces the descent of Jesus not only to Abraham, at which point Matthew stops, but to Adam, the father of the human race. There are numerous references to the Gentiles and the non-Jewish

¹ Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. iv. p. 239, 2nd ed.

² Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 5. 3, xix. 6. 2.

³ Davidson's *Introduction to the N.T.* vol. i. p. 186.

racés; Christ was to be a light for revelation to the Gentiles (Luke ii. 32); it was a Samaritan who is represented as having had compassion on the man who fell among thieves; and the leper, who only among those who were cleansed returned to express his gratitude, was a Samaritan. As the Gospel of Matthew was addressed chiefly to Jewish readers, so the Gospel of Luke was addressed chiefly to Gentile readers. The one may be called the Gospel of the circumcision, and the other the Gospel of the uncircumcision.

V. THE LANGUAGE OF THE GOSPEL.

The Greek of Luke, both in his Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles, is comparatively pure. The evangelist has great mastery of the language, and is very copious in his use of words. It has often been remarked that the purity of the preface approaches classical Greek; and in the narrative itself, when he writes with freedom and independence, the style and diction are generally pure and correct. The Hebraisms are chiefly restricted to those passages where it would appear that the author uses oral tradition, or has recourse to written documents. Thus the first two chapters of the Gospel are full of Hebraic expressions. So also the second part of the Acts of the Apostles is purer than the first, because Luke there wrote from his own observation, and was less dependent on the writings of others.

There is a remarkable individuality in the style and diction of Luke. This has been carefully examined by several writers, especially by Credner and Dr. Samuel Davidson. Credner mentions sixty-five linguistic peculiarities in the writings of Luke, including both the Acts and the Gospel, whilst Dr. Davidson increases the number to 123.¹ The following are the most remarkable of these peculiarities mentioned by these critics. The frequent use of *καρδία*, answering to the Hebrew use of *לֵב*; *οἶκος* in the sense of household or family; *νομικοί* is used six times for the customary *γραμματεῖς* as being more familiar to the Greeks;

¹ Credner's *Einleitung in das N.T.* p. 130 ff.; Davidson's *Introduction to the Study of the N.T.* vol. i. pp. 438-447, 3rd ed.

for the same reason ἐπιστάτης is used six times instead of the Hebrew *ράββι*; the Sea of Galilee is called λίμνη instead of θάλασσα, as in the other Gospels; the preposition σύν is used in preference to μετά, employed by Matthew and Mark; Jerusalem is commonly written Ἱερουσαλήμ instead of Ἱερουσόλυμα, as in the other Gospels, except Matt. xxiii. 37; ἐνώπιον, *before*, occurs twenty times in Luke's Gospel, but never in Matthew or Mark; εὐαγγελίζομαι often occurs, but is only once used by Matthew, and never by Mark or John; χάρις is frequently used by Luke, but never by Matthew or Mark; when speaking of Christ, Luke often calls Him ὁ κύριος (vii. 13, 31, x. 1, xi. 39, xxii. 61),—a title which is not used by Matthew, and only twice by Mark in the disputed verses at the close of his Gospel (Mark xvi. 19, 20). A long list of words, extending over three and a half pages, is given by Dr. Davidson, used only by Luke among the Synoptists.¹ Dr. Schaff observes: "The vocabulary of Luke considerably exceeds that of the other evangelists; he has about 180 terms which occur in his Gospel alone, and nowhere else in the New Testament; while Matthew has only about 70, Mark 44, and John 50 peculiar words. Luke's Gospel has 55, and the Acts 135 ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, and among them many verbal compounds and rare technical terms."² All this shows the command which Luke had of the Greek language; thus confirming the opinion, that of all the writers of the New Testament he alone was not a Hebrew or Hellenistic Jew, but a Greek by birth.

VI. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GOSPEL.

Luke's Gospel has many peculiar characteristics. Among these may be mentioned its *completeness*. It begins with the birth of Christ, or rather with the Annunciation, follows Him through all the stages of life, and terminates with His Ascension. Luke alone gives us the account of the Annunciation, and narrates the birth of our Lord at Bethlehem

¹ Dr. Davidson's *Introduction to the Study of the N.T.* 3rd ed. vol. i. pp. 447-453.

² Schaff's *History of the Church*, vol. ii. p. 665.

differently in several respects from the narrative of Matthew. He alone tells us of the announcement of the birth of Christ to the shepherds; and he alone informs us of the presentation of the child Jesus in the temple. Whilst the other evangelists pass over in silence the thirty years of our Lord's life before the commencement of His public ministry, Luke relates an incident of His boyhood, when, at the age of twelve, He accompanied Joseph and Mary to Jerusalem, and was found among the doctors, hearing them and asking them questions (ii. 42). He alone adverts to the development of our Lord's youthful years, saying that He increased in wisdom and in stature (ii. 52). Whilst, like the other evangelists, he gives an account of our Lord's ministry in Galilee, and of His sufferings, death, and resurrection, Luke closes his Gospel with the account of the ascension (xxiv. 50).¹ And in the mention of the promise of the Father, for which the apostles were commanded to wait at Jerusalem (xxiv. 49), Luke unites his Gospel with the fulfilment of that promise as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

Another striking and more marked feature in Luke's Gospel is its *universality*: it is emphatically the Gospel of universal salvation, the Gospel of the Gentiles. It is not restricted to the Jews; there is a largeness, a fulness, and a breadth about this Gospel which are not so discernible in the other Gospels. The incorporation of the Gentiles into the Church of Christ is in a manner anticipated. There are many intimations that the wall of separation between Jews and Gentiles was to be broken down, and that the peculiar privileges of the Jews, as the people of God, were to be done away with; that the Gospel of Christ was to be a universal religion, and was to embrace the whole world; that in the language of St. Paul, God was the God of the Gentiles, and not of the Jews only (Rom. iii. 29, ix. 24). The angels who proclaimed the birth of the Lord to the shepherds on the plains of Bethlehem announced goodwill to men (ii. 14); the aged Simeon, in his song of thanksgiving, greeted the infant Saviour as a light for revelation to the Gentiles, as

¹ Matthew has no reference to the ascension; Mark alludes to it in the disputed passage at the close of his Gospel.

well as for the glory of the people of Israel (ii. 32). To the prediction of Isaiah announcing the preaching of the Baptist, the words are added: "And all flesh shall see the salvation of God" (iii. 6).¹ Whilst the other evangelists record the mission of the Twelve, as representing the nation of Israel, Luke alone relates the mission of the seventy disciples as representing the nations of the world (x. 1).² The distinction between the Jews and the Samaritans is abolished: no preference is given to the former; the disciples are rebuked for wishing to call down fire from heaven to destroy the inhospitable Samaritans (ix. 54); in the parable of the wounded Traveller, whilst the priest and the Levite pass by on the other side, it is a Samaritan who is represented as having compassion on him (x. 33); of the ten lepers who were cleansed, the only one who returned to give thanks was a Samaritan (xvii. 16). Our Lord Himself affirms, that "the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost" (xix. 10). And His commission to His disciples was, that repentance and remission of sins should be preached unto all nations, beginning at Jerusalem (xxiv. 47). The same universality is indeed exhibited in all the Gospels, but in the Gospel of Luke it is more fully and more frequently mentioned.³ Luke's Gospel is the gospel of free salvation: the freedom of the grace of God is here proclaimed; there are no restrictions; salvation is a matter, not of works bestowed as a reward, but of grace bestowed on the penitent: the Pauline doctrine of free justification is foreshadowed; Zacchæus, the publican, was accepted by the Lord; the woman that was a sinner was graciously pardoned on her repentance; and the penitent thief received the promise of admission into paradise.

The Gospel of Luke is pre-eminently the Gospel of the

¹ This addition to the prophecy in Isa. xl. 3, 4, is taken from Isa. lii. 10.

² Seventy was, by the Jews, supposed to be the number of the nations of the world.

³ Those statements in St. Matthew's Gospel, where the Twelve are forbidden to go to the Gentiles, but to restrict themselves to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. x. 5, xv. 24), are omitted in Luke's Gospel.

humanity of Christ, exhibiting His human tenderness and love. Whilst Matthew proclaims Jesus as the Messiah of the Jews, and Mark as the Son of God, the worker of miracles, Luke dwells specially on His manhood, as the Son of Man and the Saviour of the world.¹ The manhood of Christ is described in its growth and in its limitations; the doctrine of the *kenosis*, that our Lord emptied Himself (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, Phil. ii. 7),² is here distinctly taught. We are told that Jesus grew up as one of the children of men; He passed from infancy to youth, and from youth to manhood; there was a development of His human nature; He not only grew and waxed strong physically, but also mentally; He grew in wisdom, and in favour both with God and man (ii. 40, 52). Luke dwells upon the tender human sensibilities of His nature. He alone mentions the tears which in the hour of His triumph He shed over Jerusalem. He alone gives the account of His bloody sweat in Gethsemane, when an angel had to be sent from heaven to strengthen His human nature to endure the agony. In neither of the other two Synoptists have we such an insight into the tenderness and love of Christ; we see into His heart, a human heart which beats with love: in this respect the Gospel of Luke resembles that of John. The love, and tenderness, and mercy of our Saviour are disclosed to us. "He came to heal the broken-hearted." Most of the parables peculiar to Luke, as the Lost Piece of Money, the Prodigal Son, the Good Samaritan, exhibit the mercy and love of our God. God is represented as our Father, who rejoices in the recovery of His lost children, in the restoration of the erring, and in the deliverance of the wretched from their miseries. It is Luke alone who tells us of the penitent woman who lay at our Saviour's feet and bathed them with her tears, and who was so tenderly received by Him. It is Luke alone who relates the gracious reception of Zacchæus, who was looked down upon by his countrymen as an outcast and a sinner. And it is Luke

¹ "Das Evangelium des Menschensohnes, der Humanität Christi, der Verklärung aller Humanität," Lange.

² The doctrine of the *kenosis* is a great mystery, which has not as yet received sufficient consideration. On it we are not called upon to enter; it belongs to the sphere of dogmatics.

alone who mentions our Lord's prayer on the cross for the forgiveness of His enemies, and His gracious reply to the request of the dying thief: "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." In this Gospel especially we are taught in the language of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews that "we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. iv. 15). Jesus Himself is the Good Samaritan, the Shepherd who leaves the ninety and nine, and goes into the wilderness to seek the sheep that was lost.

In this Gospel *prominence is given to women*. It has not inappropriately been termed the "Gospel of womanhood." It opens with the mention of Elizabeth the mother of the Baptist, who with her husband Zacharias walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless (i. 6). Luke alone adverts to the pious character of the blessed Virgin, and records her song of thanksgiving. He alone mentions Anna, the aged widow of fourscore and four years, who departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day (ii. 36). He, with John, mentions the sisters of Bethany; Martha, careful and troubled about many things, and Mary, sitting at the Saviour's feet and listening to His words (x. 38-41). He alone tells us of the widow of Nain, and of the compassion of the Lord (vii. 11). It is in this Gospel that we read of the penitent woman, who anointed our Lord's feet, and bathed them with her tears (vii. 36-39). It is from Luke that we learn that many pious women followed our Lord in His missionary journeys through Galilee, ministering to Him of their substance (vii. 1-3), and accompanied Him on His last journey to Jerusalem, and who, when all His male disciples forsook Him and fled, remained faithful to the last (xxiii. 49). It is Luke who records our Lord's address to the women who followed Him to the cross bewailing and lamenting Him: "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for Me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children" (xxiii. 28).

There are in the Gospel of Luke numerous striking and instructive *contrasts*; lights and shadows are mingled

throughout the narrative. Thus, for example, the doubting Zacharias the father of the Baptist, and the humble and confiding Mary the mother of our Lord; the anxious and busy Martha, and the humble and devout Mary; the proud and self-righteous Pharisee, and the abased and penitent publican; the rich man clothed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day, and the beggar Lazarus, full of sores, and fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table; the priest and the Levite who passed by, and the Samaritan who had compassion on the wounded traveller; the ungrateful nine lepers, and the tenth, a Samaritan, who alone returned to render thanks; the elder son, who never left his father's house, and the younger son, who turned prodigal, and was restored to his father's love and confidence; Simon the self-righteous Pharisee who loved little, and gave the Lord no water to wash His feet, and the woman who was a sinner, who loved much and washed His feet with her tears; the penitent thief on the right hand, and the impenitent thief on the left.

It is from Luke's Gospel that those *spiritual songs* are taken which have been used in all ages in the worship of the Christian Church; as the Ave Maria, the song of the Annunciation (i. 28-31); the Magnificat, the song of Mary (i. 47-50); the Benedictus, the song of Zacharias (i. 68-79); the Gloria in Excelsis, the song of the Angels (ii. 14); and Nunc Dimittis, the song of Simeon (ii. 29-32). All these spiritual songs are contained in the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel; indeed, it is only in this Gospel and in the Apocalypse that spiritual songs are to be found. They are all Hebraic in their sentiment and diction, and have been rendered into Hebrew without any loss of their beauty. We have in the Gospel of Luke the last of the Hebrew Psalms and the first of the Christian hymns.

Such are the characteristics of the Gospel of Luke. It is, as Dean Farrar remarks, "the Gospel of the Greek and of the future; of catholicity of mind; the Gospel of hymns and of prayers; the Gospel of the Saviour; the Gospel of the universality and gratuitousness of salvation; the Gospel of holy toleration; the Gospel of those whom the religious world regards as heretics; the Gospel of the publican, and the

outcast, and the humble poor, and the weeping Magdalene, and the crucified malefactor; the Gospel of the lost piece of money and the lost sheep; the Gospel of the good Samaritan and of the prodigal son; the Gospel of the saintly life, of pity, of forgiveness obtained by faith, of pardon for all the world; the Gospel of grace and of the glad tidings of free salvation; the Gospel of Him who was, as we all are, the son of Adam, and who died that we all might be the sons of God."¹

VII. THE INTEGRITY OF THE GOSPEL.

As the first two chapters of the Gospel of Matthew, especially the account of the birth and infancy of Christ, have been disputed; so, in like manner, the narrative of the miraculous conception and of the infancy of Christ in the Gospel of Luke (i. 5—ii. 52) has been called in question. The first who cast doubts on this passage was Evanson, toward the close of last century (1792), in his *Dissonance of the four generally received Evangelists*.² In this he was followed by Eichhorn³ and Baur.⁴ On the other hand, the genuineness of the passage has been defended by such rationalistic critics as Ammon, Paulus, Credner, Kuinoel, Volkmar, and Köstlin. The chief objections were its omission in the Gospel of Marcion, and its supposed irreconcilability with the narrative of the birth and infancy of Christ as given by Matthew. These objections are of no force. The genuineness of the passage is demonstrated beyond dispute by its presence in all the Greek manuscripts and in all versions of the New Testament, and by the repeated references to it in the writings of the early Fathers. It is true that the section was wanting in Marcion's Gospel; but, as we have seen, Marcion mutilated and abbreviated the Gospel of Luke to suit his own pre-conceived dogmatic opinions. We have already discussed the differences between the accounts of the infancy given by

¹ Farrar's *Messages of the Books*, p. 86.

² This work was answered by Priestley, *Letters to a Young Man*, 1793, and by the Rev. Thomas Falconer in the *Bampton Lectures* for 1811.

³ *Einleitung in das N.T.* vol. i. p. 630.

⁴ Baur's *Markusevangelium*, p. 218.

Matthew and Luke, and shown that these differences are capable of reconciliation, and do not amount to a discrepancy in the accounts themselves.¹ As already remarked, Luke might have obtained his information, either from Mary herself, whom it is not improbable he may have met in Jerusalem, or from James the Lord's brother, whom he certainly did meet (Acts xxi. 18), or from the other brethren of the Lord.

An important difference in reading is found in the *Gloria in Excelsis* (Luke ii. 14): δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία (εὐδοκίας).² The difference arises from the addition of one letter—εὐδοκίας instead of εὐδοκία. The Revised Version adopts the reading εὐδοκίας, and translates: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom He is well pleased"; with the footnote: "Many ancient authorities read 'Peace, good pleasure among men'; and instead of 'Men in whom He is well pleased,' a footnote gives the alternative rendering, 'Men of good pleasure.'"

The reading εὐδοκίας of the Revised Version is supported by the principal ancient manuscripts \aleph A B D: C (the Codex Ephræm) is defective. The combined testimony of such valuable and independent manuscripts as the Vatican and the Alexandrian is very strong. Among the versions the old Latin and the Vulgate also have this reading; the Vulgate renders the clause *in hominibus bonæ voluntatis*. The Latin Fathers adopt the reading of their own version; whilst among the Greek Fathers, Origen alone is favourable, although he also uses εὐδοκία.

On the other hand, the rest of the uncials and all the cursives are in favour of εὐδοκία, the reading of the Authorised Version; such also is the reading of the Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions; the Greek Fathers may be considered as unanimous in their testimony; even Origen, in his work against Celsus, adopts this reading: "At the birth of Jesus a multitude of the heavenly host praised God, saying:

¹ See *supra*, pp. 115 ff.

² This hardly belongs to the discussion on the integrity of the Gospel, but is here given on account of the interest attached to this reading.

Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men.”¹

But whilst the external evidence, owing to the combined testimony of the most important of the uncial manuscripts, is in favour of the reading *εὐδοκίας*, the internal evidence is in favour of *εὐδοκία*. The expression *ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας* is certainly the more difficult reading, and this is so far in its favour; yet it is very obscure, and so difficult of translation, that a reasonable sense can hardly be made out of it; literally rendered it is “among men of good pleasure.” The Revisers render it “among men in whom He is well pleased”; others, “to the men of goodwill,”; others “to men who are the object of goodwill”; and others, “peace on earth to those who will have it.” Origen, in those places where he adopts the reading *εὐδοκίας*, unites the word with *εἰρήνη*, and renders the whole passage: “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth the peace of good pleasure to men,”—a meaning which, Dr. Hort says, “would deserve serious attention, if no better interpretation were available.”² In short, as Scrivener observes of these and such like interpretations, they “can be arrived at only through some process which would make any phrase bear almost any meaning which the translator might like to put upon it.”³ Such a reading also narrows the expression “goodwill” to a certain class of men, instead of making it embrace the whole human race, as is naturally suggested by the preceding words, “on earth peace.” On the other hand, the reading *εὐδοκία* gives a plain and intelligible sense—goodwill to men: the goodwill being the goodwill of God—His mercy and good pleasure. This also better preserves the parallelism of the passage, divided into three sentences: “Glory to God in the highest; on earth peace; goodwill toward men.” According to the other rendering, the parallelism consists of only two members: “Glory to God in the highest; on earth peace to men of goodwill.” Others render it: “Glory to God in the highest and on earth; peace to men of goodwill.”

¹ *Contra Celsum*, i. 60.

² Westcott and Hort's *Greek New Testament*, Select Readings, vol. ii. p. 56.

³ Scrivener's *Biblical Criticism*, vol. ii. 4th ed. p. 347.

The rendering *εὐδοκίας* is adopted by the principal biblical critics—Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Meyer, Westcott and Hort; whilst Scrivener, Burgon, and Cook give the preference to *εὐδοκία*.

Another important passage where there is a remarkable difference in the reading, is Luke's version of the Lord's Prayer (xi. 2-4). In many authorities the prayer is given in an abbreviated form, and this is the reading adopted in the Revised Version: "Father, Hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we ourselves also forgive everyone that is indebted to us. And bring us not into temptation." The reading of the Authorised Version is relegated to the footnotes.

The reading here adopted by the Revisers is that of the Vatican and the Sinaitic;¹ whilst the Alexandrian has the reading of the Authorised Version. The other manuscripts vary; some agree with the Vatican and others with the Alexandrian; and some, omitting one or two clauses, give the prayer in a partially abbreviated form. The same is the case with the different versions; for example, the Vulgate omits the words: "And deliver us from evil." It is argued that the internal evidence is in favour of the abbreviated form, because transcribers would be induced to supply the omitted petitions from the Gospel of Matthew. At the same time, in this form the prayer certainly appears to want completeness. The occasions when the prayer was delivered were, according to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, very different. In Matthew it occupies part of the Sermon on the Mount, and stands in close connection with what precedes, being attached to our Lord's injunction against hypocrisy in our prayers; whilst in Luke it is given in answer to the request of the disciples: "Lord, teach us to

¹ The following is the reading of the Vatican: Πατήρ, ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομα σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν· καὶ ἄφεσ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν· καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμον. With this the Sinaitic agrees, except that it has the clause: "Thy will be done as in heaven, so on earth."

pray, even as John also taught his disciples." There is no improbability in supposing that our Lord delivered this prayer to His disciples on two different occasions.

Perhaps a still more important passage is the incident of the bloody sweat in Gethsemane, omitted by the other evangelists and given only by Luke: "And there appeared unto Him an angel from heaven, strengthening Him. And, being in an agony, He prayed more earnestly: and His sweat became as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground" (xxii. 43, 44). We shall consider the evidence against and for its genuineness.

1. *Evidence against the genuineness of the passage.*—These verses are omitted in the two important manuscripts, the Alexandrian (A) and the Vatican (B), manuscripts not only among the oldest extant, but wholly independent of each other; in two other important uncial manuscripts (E T), and in three cursive manuscripts (13, 124, 561); whilst the important manuscript, the Codex Ephræm (C), is here defective. They are marked with an asterisk in four uncial and six cursive manuscripts, implying a doubt as to their genuineness. They are omitted in the important Codex Brixianus (f) of the Old Latin and in some of the codices of the Sahidic and Armenian versions, and in the lately discovered Sinaitic Syrian version. There is no reference to the words in the writings of Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, although these Fathers would naturally have quoted them in their controversies against Docetism. Hilary states: "In very many Greek and Latin copies,¹ nothing was written either about the appearance of an angel or the bloody sweat." And the same remark is made by Jerome.

2. *Evidence for the genuineness of the passage.*—One great argument in favour of these words is that they are contained in the Codex Sinaiticus (s), thus differing in this reading from the Codex Vaticanus, with which it in general agrees. They are also found in the celebrated Codex Bezae (D) of the fifth century, and in ten other important uncial manuscripts, and in almost all the cursive manuscripts. The Versions are almost unanimously in favour of their

¹ In Græcis et in Latinis codicibus complurimis.

genuineness. They are found in the Old Latin, with the exception of the Codex Brixianus (f); in the three Syriac versions, the Curetonian, the Peshito, and the Philoxenian; in the Vulgate and the Ethiopic and Armenian versions. But the chief argument in favour of their genuineness is that they are recognised in the writings of the early Fathers. Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, thus refers to the passage: "In the Memoirs which I have said were drawn up by His apostles and those who followed them, it is recorded that His sweat fell down like drops of blood while He was praying and saying, If it is possible let this cup pass."¹ Tatian incorporates it in his Diatessaron. Irenæus states that Jesus sweat great drops of blood, and declared that His soul was exceedingly sorrowful.² And Hippolytus, referring to the humanity of Christ, in opposition to Noetus, says: "Though God, He does not refuse the conditions proper to Him as man, since He hungers and toils and thirsts in weariness, and flies in fear, and prays in trouble. He who as God has a sleepless nature, slumbers on a pillow; He who (for our salvation) came into the world, begs off from the cup of suffering; and in an agony He sweats blood and is strengthened by an angel, who Himself strengthens those who believe on Him."³ The passage is also quoted by Gregory of Nazianzus, Epiphanius, Ephraem Syrus, Chrysostom, Augustine, and subsequent Fathers. It is also said to be found in Marcion's Gospel. Epiphanius accounts for its omission from some manuscripts by the indiscreet zeal of the orthodox, who omitted it because they thought that it might be perverted by heretics, and used by them in arguing against the divinity of our Lord: "orthodox persons removed it through fear, not understanding its bearing and its great force." But there does not appear to be any ground for this statement.

The passage has also been objected to on internal grounds. Thus Norton observes that the agony of Christ is represented as existing after the angel had been sent to strengthen Him; that we have no authority for believing

¹ Justin, *Dialog. cum Trypho*, ch. ciii.

² *Adv. Hær.* iii. 22. 2.

³ Hippolytus, *Adv. Hær. Noeti*, ch. xviii.

that the bloody sweat described was ever produced by mere distress of mind; and that as the disciples were asleep, it does not appear how anyone could have witnessed or become acquainted with the events related. He supposes that the passage was first written in the margin of some very early manuscript, and subsequently, through the mistake of transcribers, taken into the text of other copies.¹ To the above objection it has been replied that the angel was sent, not to remove the agony, but to strengthen our Lord to endure it; and although it is said that the disciples were asleep, yet they were not so profoundly asleep but that they heard our Lord praying that the cup might pass from Him, and might have seen the bloody sweat, or the marks of it might have been apparent after its termination. The question is entirely one of external authority, and cannot be decided by subjective impressions.

With regard to the nature of the bloody sweat, it is not said that our Lord actually sweat great drops of blood, but that His perspiration fell from Him as it were great drops of blood, bearing a resemblance to them (ὁ ἰδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὥσεί τι θρόμβοι αἵματος). The word *θρόμβος* is strikingly descriptive; it denotes, not simply a drop, but a great drop, such as a clot of blood. Probably Meyer gives the correct interpretation: "The sweat of Jesus was indeed no mass of blood (opposed to which is ὥσεί), but a profusion of bloody sweat, which was mingled with portions of blood, and as it flowed down appeared as clots of blood trickling down to the ground."² It is not correct to say, with Norton, that we have no authority for believing that a bloody sweat was ever produced by mere distress of mind. Instances of a bloody sweat, produced under circumstances of terror, have been recorded (Aristotle's *Hist. Anim.* iii. 19). "An interesting example," observes Alford, "of a sweat of blood under circumstances of strong terror, accompanied by loss of speech, is cited in the *Medical Gazette* for December 1848."³

Such are the arguments against and for the genuineness of the passage containing the account of "the agony and

¹ Norton, *The Genuineness of the Gospels*, pp. 228, 229.

² *Commentary on Luke*, *in loco*.

³ Alford's *Greek Testament*, *in loco*.

bloody sweat." It is difficult to balance these arguments, and to come to a correct decision. The evidence from the Greek manuscripts appears to be rather at variance with the idea of its genuineness, especially when we consider that the combined testimony of the Alexandrian and Vatican manuscripts is unfavourable, though the force of this is to a considerable extent weakened by the passages being found in the Codex Sinaiticus. Its insertion in the Codex Bezae is not conclusive, as it might be accounted for from the nature of that manuscript, which contains many unauthorised additions. But, on the other hand, this adverse testimony is counterbalanced by the distinct recognition of the passage by such early Fathers as Justin, Tatian, Irenæus, and Hippolytus. We judge then that the preponderance of evidence is in favour of the retention of the passage; still we cannot venture to say with Canon Cook, in words which are quoted with approval by Scrivener: "Supporting the whole passage we have an array of authorities which, whether we regard their antiquity or their character for sound judgment, veracity, and accuracy, are scarcely paralleled on any occasion."¹

The most eminent biblical critics are mostly in favour of the genuineness of the passage. It is accepted by Tischendorf, Alford, Tregelles, Meyer, and Scrivener; it is enclosed within brackets by Lachmann; whilst Westcott and Hort express their doubts by placing it within double brackets. The Revised Version inserts it in the text without any mark, but adds the footnote: "Many ancient authorities omit vv. 43, 44."

VIII. TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The time when this Gospel was written has been much disputed. Dates ranging from A.D. 58 to A.D. 130 have been assigned to it. Baur fixed on A.D. 130, a date now universally relinquished; Dr. Davidson, in his last edition of his *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, fixed on A.D. 110;

¹ Cook's *Revised Version of the first three Gospels*, p. 103; Scrivener's *Criticism of the New Testament*, 4th ed. vol. ii. p. 356.

Pfleiderer, on A.D. 100–120; Hilgenfeld, on A.D. 100–110; Volkmar, on A.D. 100; Keim and Abbott, on A.D. 80; Credner, De Wette, Bleek, Meyer, Holtzmann, Reuss, and Professor Sanday, after the destruction of Jerusalem; Michaelis, Lardner, Horne, Guericke, Ebrard, and Godet, on A.D. 63 or 64. Dr. Davidson, in his earlier *Introduction to the New Testament*, on A.D. 61; Alford, Archbishop Thomson, and Schaff, on A.D. 58–60.

Very little light is thrown on this subject from the writings of the early Fathers: their statements are at variance. But, on the other hand, an argument may be based on the probable date of the Acts of the Apostles. The Gospel of Luke is undoubtedly “the former treatise” to which the author of the Acts in his preface alludes: “The former treatise I made, O Theophilus, concerning all that Jesus began both to do and to teach.” The Gospel, then, must have been written before the Acts. Now, the date of the Acts may, with much probability, be ascertained. The history is carried on until the close of Paul’s two years’ imprisonment at Rome (A.D. 63), ending with the words: “And he abode two whole years in his own hired house” (Acts xxviii. 30). The most probable reason why Luke thus closes his history is, that he then completed it; otherwise the work would end most abruptly, without any statement of what happened after the termination of the two years. Nor is there any presumption against this opinion. Now, admitting this, we infer that the Gospel was composed before A.D. 63. In all probability, as already observed, Luke was with Paul during his two years’ imprisonment in Cæsarea (A.D. 58–60). Here he had ample opportunities for collecting the materials for his history: he met with those who had been the followers of the Lord; he could make a collection of the written Gospel fragments which were dispersed throughout the Churches; he could visit these parts of Galilee where our Lord’s ministry was chiefly spent; he could go up frequently to Jerusalem; he would have ample time at his disposal; and he had free access to Paul, who, although a prisoner, was not kept in strict confinement, for we are informed that Felix gave order to the centurion that

he should have indulgence, and that none of his friends should be forbidden to minister to him (Acts xxiv. 23). From all this we consider that the Gospel of Luke was written about A.D. 60, toward the conclusion of Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea.

It has been objected to this early date that there are, in the Gospel itself, statements which show that it must have been written after the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70).¹ In the Gospel of Matthew, it is affirmed, the destruction of Jerusalem is closely connected with the end of the world. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days" shall the final catastrophe take place (Matt. xxiv. 29); whereas, in the Gospel of Luke, a long period is interposed, termed "the times of the Gentiles": "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Luke xxi. 24); and it is stated that the end is not immediately (Luke xxi. 9). In Luke's Gospel the author takes a retrospect of the circumstances of the siege. "The days shall come upon thee, when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another, because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation" (Luke xix. 43, 44). But we cannot see the force of this objection. The slight variations in the accounts of our Lord's predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke are needlessly strained. In Matthew, as in Luke, there is an interval between the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world; the Gospel must first be diffused throughout the earth. "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all nations; and then shall the end come" (Matt. xxiv. 14). In Matthew the encompassing of Jerusalem with armies is as distinctly foretold as in Luke: the abomination of desolation was to be seen standing in the holy place (Matt. xxiv. 15). And in both Matthew and Luke the statement is made, that this generation shall not

¹ This opinion was held by Meyer, De Wette, Credner, Bleek, and Dr. Davidson.

pass away until all these things be accomplished (Matt. xxiv. 34: Luke xxi. 32). To suppose that Luke changed the prophecy of our Lord by inserting words which intimated that the prediction was fulfilled, and thus converted it into a *vaticinium post eventum*, is inconsistent with the honesty of the historian, and at variance with the supernatural foresight of our Lord.

If, then, the date of the Gospel was A.D. 60, or thereby, the place of writing was Cæsarea, an opinion adopted by Michaelis, Kuinoel, Schott, Thiersch, and others. Other places have been assigned. The title in the Peshito version is: "The Gospel of Luke the evangelist, which he published and preached in Greek in Alexandria the Great." Jerome fixes on Achæa and Bœotia; Godet on Greece; Hug, Ewald, Zeller, Keim, and Holtzmann on Rome.

IX. THE CONTENTS OF THE GOSPEL.

The general divisions of the Gospel are the Introduction, i. 1-4.

1. Narrative of the birth and childhood of the Baptist and of Jesus, i. 5-ii. 53.

2. Preparation for the ministry, iii., iv. 13.

3. Our Lord's ministry in Galilee, iv. 14-ix. 50.

4. Our Lord's ministry in Peræa and its neighbourhood, ix. 51-xviii. 14.

5. The journey to Jerusalem, xviii. 15-xix. 48.

6. The closing scenes and death, xx.-xxiii. 49.

7. The burial, resurrection, and ascension, xxiii. 50-xxiv.

The Gospel of Luke is rich in most important additions. We have already, in a former part of this Introduction, enumerated the incidents and discourses which are peculiar to it:¹ still we may recapitulate the most striking and remarkable: the annunciation and the song of the Virgin; the birth of John the Baptist and the prophecy of his father Zacharias: the angel's message to the shepherds; the presentation in the temple and the song of Simeon; the

¹ See *supra*, p. 33 f.

raising of the widow's son at Nain; the anointing of our Lord by the woman who was a sinner; the memorable and striking parables of the Good Samaritan, the Unjust Steward, the Prodigal Son and the Rich Man and Lazarus, our Lord's reception of Martha and Mary, our Lord's examination before Herod, and His appearance after the resurrection to the disciples going to Emmaus. All these passages enhance the value of the Gospel of Luke.

There are twelve important parables peculiar to Luke—

1. The Two Debtors, vii. 41–43.
2. The Good Samaritan, x. 25–37.
3. The Rich Man who boasted of his goods, xii. 13–21.
4. The Barren Fig Tree, xiii. 1–9.
5. The Marriage Feast, xiv. 7–24.
6. The Lost Piece of Money, xv. 8–10.
7. The Prodigal Son, xv. 11–32.
8. The Unjust Steward, xvi. 1–13.
9. The Rich Man and Lazarus, xvi. 19–31.
10. The Unjust Judge and the Importunate Widow, xviii. 1–8.
11. The Pharisee and the Publican, xviii. 9–14.
12. The Ten Pounds, xix. 12–27.

There are six miracles peculiar to Luke—

1. The miraculous draught of fishes, v. 1–11.
2. The raising of the widow's son at Nain, vii. 11–17.
3. The cure of the woman with the spirit of infirmity, xiii. 11–17.
4. The cure of the dropsical man on the Sabbath, xiv. 1–6.
5. The cleansing of the ten lepers, xvii. 11–19.
6. The healing of Malchus, xxii. 50, 51.