

CHAPTER XIII.

ST LUKE.—II.

THE testimony of Marcion carries us back considerably beyond his day, for the condition of the text shows that his Gospel, our Third Gospel, had been for a length of time in circulation. It is quite in accordance with this that we find undoubted references to it in JUSTIN MARTYR, the references, as already indicated, showing the influence of Matthew and Mark, perhaps because of an early harmony or because the 'Memoirs' (*Ἀπομνημονεύματα*) are themselves a harmony. There are references to St Luke in Justin's writings, more or less clearly marked, numbering over sixty. In his vindication of the Christians to the Emperor we find him quoting the words of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount:¹ "As to being patient of evil, and helpful to all, and free from anger, this is what He (*ὁ Χριστός*) said: To him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the

¹ *Apol.*, i, 16.

other; and him that taketh from thee the vest or the cloak, hinder not" (Luke vi. 29). St Luke is most in evidence, but St Matthew (v. 39, 40) seems also recalled in the mixed character of the passage. A similar mixture is found in another reference,¹ where St Luke (xii. 4, xviii. 27) and St Matthew (x. 28) are combined: "We know that our Lord Jesus Christ spoke as follows: The things which are impossible with men are possible with God. And, Fear ye not them that kill you and after that have nothing that they can do, He said, but fear ye Him Who is able after death to cast both soul and body into hell." In Justin's account of the Virgin Birth, St Luke (i. 35) and St Matthew (i. 21) are found in combination. There are passages, however, referred to which imply St Luke alone: "For in the Memoirs, which I say were composed by His Apostles and those that followed them, it is written,² sweat poured down from Him like clots of blood as He prayed and said, Let this cup pass, if it be possible" (Luke xxii. 44). "And when Herod, who succeeded Archelaus, had taken the power entrusted to him, to whom also, by way of doing him courtesy, Pilate sent Jesus bound, God foreseeing that this would happen, had spoken as follows" (Luke xxiii. 7, 8). A good illustration of a quotation made from memory, and not in the very words

¹ Apol., i. 19.

² Dial., c. 103.

of the Gospel, is the following:¹ "And again in other words He said, I give to you power to tread upon serpents and scorpions and adders, and upon all the power of the enemy" (Luke x. 19). Another quotation,² while by no means exact, too closely resembles the Third Gospel to be referred to any other source: "As also our Lord said, They shall neither marry nor be given in marriage, but shall be equal to the angels, being the children of the God of the resurrection" (Luke xx. 35, 36). But no one can read Justin's First Apology or the Dialogue without finding quotations or references to discourses of Jesus or incidents in His ministry, as well as to particulars associated with His Birth and with His Passion, Trial, Crucifixion, and Resurrection, as these are recorded by the Third Evangelist.

Another witness contemporary with Justin and Marcion whose testimony may be noticed is the apocryphal GOSPEL OF PETER, which is placed by Harnack and Sanday as early as the first quarter of the second century, but, as Zahn contends, may not be earlier than 140-150 A.D. It presupposes our Canonical Gospels, and there are a number of expressions which exhibit the influence of St Luke. It is only a fragment which has been preserved, containing the narrative of the Passion and the Resurrection. It is

¹ Dial., c. 76.

² Dial., c. 81.

accordingly only the concluding chapters of St Luke that it attests, but in attesting these it sufficiently attests the whole Gospel. The Gospel of Peter mentions, like Justin, the sending of Jesus by Pilate to Herod; calls the two malefactors *κακοῦργοι*; recalls the multitudes present at the last scenes of the Crucifixion beating their breasts; the two men in the sepulchre in shining vesture; the bringing of spices by the women for a memorial while it was yet early morning—all of which particulars belong to the Evangelic narrative, and are peculiar to St Luke. There are other coincidences of such an artless and natural character that they are inexplicable if we deny to the Docetic author of the fragment a knowledge of the Gospel according to Luke.¹

Reference might be made to CELSUS, who used St Matthew as his chief authority, but who has

¹ About the same date some scholars would find testimony in the 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.' The work seems to have been known to Irenæus, Hippolytus, and Tertullian. Origen expressly refers to it in his Homily on Joshua. Its value has been called in question by Schürer ('Geschichte des Volkes Israels,'³ iii. 252-262), who holds it to be a Jewish work interpolated in a Christian interest. Plummer ('St Luke,' p. lxxviii) has drawn up a table of verbal coincidences on the assumption that the book is from the middle of the second century of our era, and their testimony is confirmed by coincidences of thought pointing to the universality of the Christian redemption and the comprehensiveness of the Kingdom. Professor Charles, however ('The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs'), holds that the work was written in Hebrew before 100 B.C., and represents pre-Christian Judaism at its highest and best. He

references to incidents and precepts clearly traceable to St Luke. "He seems to allude to the sending of an angel to Mary; he scoffs at her royal descent, and at the carrying back of the genealogy of Christ to the first man. Either from St Luke or St John he has learned that Jesus, after His resurrection, showed His pierced hands to the disciples. He has read in St Luke the saying of Jesus about the ravens. The form in which he quotes the precept of Jesus with reference to not returning evil for evil suggests St Luke rather than St Matthew."¹

In the apocryphal *PROTEVANGELIUM JACOBI* and the *PSEUDO-MATTHÆUS*, which are Infancy Narratives, there are references to St Luke's Nativity history. These works are both comparatively early in the second century, and presuppose the Gospel history. They give a cave, just as Justin does, for the place of the birth of Jesus.

Of the early heretics, none has a more eminent place than *BASILIDES*, who used the New Testament books and quoted them as Scripture. There are those who are of opinion

admits slight Christian interpolations, but believes that our Lord knew it and used it in the Sermon on the Mount, and that St Paul also was acquainted with it. In this estimate Jewish scholars agree with him, but Schürer's view appears to strike the mean between Charles and Plummer.

¹ Patrick, 'Apology of Origen in reply to Celsus,' pp. 92, 93.

that St Luke was his Gospel. Eusebius¹ tells us of his 'Exegetica,' a work in twenty-four books, which is not a Gospel (although Origen speaks of a Gospel of Basilides) but an exposition of the Gospels. There is in this work an undoubted reference to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. According to Hippolytus,² he gave a mystical explanation of the Incarnation, quoting St Luke (i. 35). We may hold, therefore, that St Luke's Gospel was known and acknowledged by Basilides.

When we come to the APOSTOLIC FATHERS, we find still traces of the Third Gospel, although these are neither numerous nor explicit. We have already seen that HERMAS knew the Four Gospels, but the possible traces of St Luke's Gospel by itself are very slight. It is probable that IGNATIUS had St Luke's Gospel in his mind (xxiii. 7-9) when he referred to the crucifixion as having taken place in the time of Pontius Pilate and Herod the Tetrarch;³ and when he quotes the Risen Lord as saying to St Peter and those that were with him, "Take ye and feel me, and see that I am not a bodiless spirit" (*δαίμόνιον*) (Luke xxiv. 39). These two last words are found, however, in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and it might be held that Ignatius, though he has no other uncanonical

¹ H. E., IV. 7. 6, 7.

² Ref. Hær., vii. 26.

³ Smyr., i. 2.

allusion, may have obtained it from that source. In POLYCARP'S Epistle to the Philippians, which is saturated with the Synoptic tradition, there are passages which seem to exhibit a combination of St Matthew and St Luke. One of these passages is quoted also by Clement of Rome with an almost identical formula of quotation: "Especially remembering the words of the Lord Jesus which He spake teaching meekness and long-suffering. For thus He spake: Show mercy, that ye may receive mercy; forgive, that ye may be forgiven; as ye do, so shall it be done unto you; as ye give, so shall it be given to you; as ye judge, so shall ye be judged; as ye lend, so shall it be lent to you; with what measure ye mete, it shall be meted unto you again."¹ Clement of Alexandria also gives the passage with a few unimportant variations,² and the Didascalia and Macarius give portions more or less exactly. The Oxford Committee, who have sought out the traces of the New Testament books in the Apostolic Fathers,³ have subjected this reference to a careful analysis, and are of opinion that there is no one documentary source common to all these writers. "We incline to think," they say, "that we have in Clemens

¹ Clem., xiii. 1. Compare Polycarp ad Phil., ii.

² Strom., ii. 18. 91.

³ New Testament in Apostolic Fathers, pp. 58-61.

Romanus a citation from some written or unwritten form of 'Catechesis' as to our Lord's teaching, current in the Roman Church, perhaps a local form which may go back to a time before our Gospels existed." While BARNABAS may be regarded as a witness on behalf of St Matthew's Gospel, it is doubtful whether he had any acquaintance with St Luke. The Synoptic tradition was no doubt before him, but it is difficult to determine how far he was acquainted with our Third Gospel, since nothing peculiar to St Luke occurs in his citations. The search for traces of St Luke in the DIDACHE is not much more successful. In the opening chapter we have a mosaic of quotations from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 44, 46, 47; Luke vi. 29, 30), a perusal of which begets the feeling that the writer has been using St Luke as well as St Matthew. In another passage describing "the true prophet," the 'Didache' speaks of him as worthy of his meat, which is the exact expression of St Matthew and 1 Timothy v. 18, whereas St Luke has for meat (*τροφής*), hire (*μισθοῦ*) (Luke x. 7 = Matt. x. 10). In the eschatological chapter concluding the 'Didache' there is another of those mixed references made up of St Matthew and St Luke, where St Luke has the best of it: "Watch ye for your life. Let not your lamps be put out, and let not

your loins be loosed, but be ye ready. For ye know not the hour in which our Lord cometh.”¹ This is more distinctively St Luke’s language (Luke xii. 35): he uses *λύχνοι* (lamps) and *ὄσφρες* (loins) exactly as the author of the ‘Didache.’ The first and the last sentences are more suggestive of St Matthew (Matt. xxiv. 44). Upon the whole we may decide for the knowledge of St Luke, although St Matthew is the favourite source. Here, again, there may be the influence of oral instruction in Christian morality given to catechumens, which in Dr Sanday’s judgment accounts for combinations such as these.

We have thus traced the Third Gospel by means of references in the early Fathers more or less clear, up into the first century. It has to be borne in mind that down to the time of Irenæus it is never quoted or referred to as St Luke’s. It is in this respect not so much different from the other Gospels. The First and the Second Gospels are called by their authors’ names by Papias, but the Fourth Gospel is not quoted as St John’s till Theophilus of Antioch quotes it by name about 180 A.D. There is no indication that Irenæus was led by internal evidence to ascribe the Third Gospel to St Luke. The name of the Evangelist does not occur either in his Gospel or in the Acts of

¹ Did., c. xvi. 1.

the Apostles. Irenæus was no doubt guided, as the Church was in those days, by primitive tradition, which in the case of St Luke, as of the others, never varied. Marcion, though he mutilated the Gospel and did not call it by St Luke's name, seems nevertheless to have known it as his. The fact that he left out the reference to "the beloved physician" in the greeting of St Paul to the Colossians (iv. 10) may point to such knowledge. Tatian, though regarded as a heretic, acknowledged its authority, and included it in the Diatessaron. Justin ascribes the 'Memoirs' to the Apostles of Jesus and those who followed them (*παρακολουθησάντων*, Luke i. 3) when he is referring to incidents narrated by St Luke alone, being apparently aware of the Lucan authorship of the Gospel, though he does not ascribe it to him by name. Those who collected the Gospels into a quartette, as we have reason to believe, shortly after the appearance of the Fourth Gospel, no doubt gave the Third the title which it afterwards bore without challenge, *According to Luke* (*κατὰ Λουκᾶν*). And they did so because the prologue must have from the beginning pointed to the author. "Anonymous compilations," says Professor Harnack, "in the course of tradition easily acquire some determining name, and it is easy to imagine an

author writing under a pseudonym. But in the case of a writing determined by a prologue and a dedication, we require some very definite reasons for a substitution of names, especially when this is supposed to occur only one generation after the date of publication."¹ The tradition, so unvarying and so constant from the first, and becoming vocal and explicit by the time of Irenæus, is to be explained only by the fact that St Luke was the writer. The book was ascribed to him just as the 'Annals' are ascribed to Tacitus and 'Romeo and Juliet' to Shakespeare.

In the case of our Gospel, the internal evidence is so far from contradicting the ascription of it to St Luke by primitive tradition that it actually establishes it beyond dispute. Not only so, but the internal evidence here is of so marked and special a character that it furnishes us with a test of the intrinsic value of Christian tradition in its bearing upon the composition of the Gospels.

The tradition of Luke's authorship is fully confirmed and vindicated by the evidence of the Gospel itself. It is part and parcel of that tradition that the Luke whose name is associated with this two-volume Christian history, the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, is the Luke

¹ Lucas der Arzt, p. 2.

mentioned in St Paul's Epistles (Col. iv. 10; Phil. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11), and from that history can be shown to be a Greek by birth, a physician, a follower of St Paul, and a fellow-labourer of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. It is hardly necessary any longer to support the statement that the Third Gospel and the Acts are by the same hand. Dr Hobart of Dublin, in his work on the 'Medical Language of St Luke,' Sir John Hawkins in his 'Horæ Synopticæ,' and Dr Plummer in his 'Commentary on St Luke,' have adduced evidence of the common authorship which is irresistible, and have brought it home to St Luke by unassailable proofs. Firstly, the language, style, and literary arrangement are identical. Characteristic words and expressions are found in both. The writer of both books has skill in writing Greek, and the Septuagint was his Bible more than St Paul's. Secondly, assuming that the Gospel and the Acts are by one author, we learn from the We-sections of the Acts that he was a companion in travel and fellow-labourer of St Paul. It is not enough to say that these sections are interpolations, or portions of a diary of travel, belonging to some other person. The literary characteristics, the miraculous incidents, and other special phenomena, show them to be of exactly the same texture as the rest of the work. Thirdly, the crowning

proof of identity which fixes the authorship unmistakably upon Luke, the Beloved Physician, is the indication of medical interest and the employment of medical phraseology which run right through the Acts, and are found in the Acts and the Gospel equally. Professor Harnack has braved the risk of being called an apologist, and in his 'Luke the Physician' has adopted, and to some extent strengthened, the proofs furnished by the writers named above of the Lucan authorship of both works. We are, then, fully warranted in affirming that the evidence of the books themselves entirely coincides with the verdict of early Church history regarding the authorship, and there are few facts of literary history better established than this, that St Luke, the Beloved Physician, the companion and fellow-labourer of St Paul, is the author of our Third Gospel and the Acts.

Through the witness of the early Fathers, and the phenomena of the twofold history itself, we are brought right up within the Apostolic age to the composition of the Third Gospel somewhere between 60 and 80 A.D. We have a history eminently worthy of credit, whether we place it earlier or later within these limits. When, moreover, we reflect that St Luke avails himself largely of St Mark's materials, and that he draws from the same fountain-head as

St Matthew for other material, we see how fundamental is his position as a witness to the truth of the Gospel history. He not only enables us to vindicate the general truth of the literary traditions of the early Church regarding its sacred writings, but himself in his Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles guarantees the historical character of the earliest Christian records.