



THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME X.

JANUARY, 1912.

NUMBER I.

THE HYMNS OF THE FIRST CHAPTER OF LUKE

The outward form of Lk i. 5-ii. 52 invites investigation of sources. The prologue of the Gospel (Lk i. 1-4) is a genuine Greek period, clearly indicative of the literary culture of its author; yet it is followed by one of the most Hebraistic portions of the New Testament. Lk i.5-ii.52 exhibits throughout a marked affinity for the better portions of the Septuagint; while in the brief compass of the prologue there are no less than five words¹ that do not occur at all in the Septuagint, and six others that occur only rarely.² No greater contrast in style could be imagined than that which exists between Lk i. 1-4 and the passage which immediately follows. The contrast has usually been explained by supposing that the author of the Gospel is closely following a source in Lk i. 5-ii. 52. The prologue represents Luke's own style; the following passage represents the style of one of his sources.

In recent years this conclusion has been disputed by Holtzmann,³ by Dalman,⁴ and especially by Harnack.⁵ Harnack

¹ ἐπειδὴ περ, ἀνατάσσομαι, ἀντόπτῃς, καθέξῃς, κατηχέω.

² ἐπιχειρεῖν occurs about twelve times, of which seven fall in the literary Greek of 2, 3, 4 Maccabees; διήγησις occurs about twelve times, mostly in Sirach; πληροφορέω occurs only once; ὑπηρέτης, only four times; ἀκριβῶς, about five times; παρακολουθέω, only twice, in 2 Maccabees (the text doubtful in both places).

³ *Hand-Commentar*, I. i. p. 19.

⁴ *Worte Jesu*, i. pp. 31f., 150, 183, 226, 249.

⁵ *Das Magnificat der Elisabeth* (Luc. i, 46-55) nebst einigen Bemerk-

would explain the difference in style between the prologue and the passage that immediately follows by the conscious art of the author. In the prologue, Luke is writing according to his own natural style; in the following narrative, he is imitating the style of the Septuagint. At first sight the hypothesis seems very unlikely. It attributes to Luke a refinement of art which hardly seems natural in an ancient writer. But first impressions must be modified. For as a matter of fact imitations of the Septuagint in the Lucan writings cannot altogether be denied. For example, despite his literary affinities, Luke uses the Hebraistic *ἐγένετο* far more than it is used by any other New Testament writer. Evidently Luke had a keen appreciation for what might be called the "Bible style" of the Septuagint, and felt that it was peculiarly fitted to be the vehicle of his own sacred narrative. Harnack's contention amounts to this: In treating in a poetical manner the events connected with the Saviour's birth, Luke simply carried the imitation of the Septuagint style somewhat further than he did when he was narrating in a more matter of fact way the well-known events of the public ministry. In the latter case, the subject-matter did not lend itself so readily to artistic imitation of the Old Testament, and furthermore Luke was hindered by his sources from carrying out his plans with perfect freedom. The hypothesis of Harnack cannot therefore be regarded as inherently impossible.

In a very careful way, Harnack has gone through representative sections of Lk i. 5-ii. 52 pointing out Lucan peculiarities—that is, words or usages which occur only in Luke and Acts among the New Testament writings or else occur more frequently there than in the rest of the New Testament and especially in Matthew and Mark. The work of Harnack has received a valuable supplement from Zim-

ungen zu Luc. 1 und 2, in *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1900, pp. 537-556; *Lukas der Arzt*, 1906, pp. 69-75, 138-152; cf. *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, 1911, pp. 108-110.

mermann.⁶ Zimmermann examined in detail those portions of the passage in question which were left unexamined in Harnack's former discussion. In Harnack's more recent work he has carried the examination through part of the sections that had been covered by Zimmermann.⁷

Harnack and Zimmermann agree in excluding a Greek written source for Lk i. 5-ii. 52. The style of the passage,

**Evangelium des Lukas* Kap. 1 und 2, in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1903, pp. 247-290. Cf. also Plummer, in his commentary (in the *International Critical Commentary*), and Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii (1909), pp. 291-295. All of these recent investigators were anticipated by Gersdorf nearly one hundred years ago. In his *Beiträge zur Sprachcharacteristik der Schriftsteller des Neuen Testaments*, 1816, he defended the genuineness of the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke by an elaborate linguistic argument. The chapters in question were explored very much after the method that has been adopted by Harnack and Zimmermann. Lk i-ii, for example, was traversed from beginning to end in order to exhibit those linguistic features which connect it with the rest of Luke-Acts as the work of the same writer. In thoroughness, Gersdorf is not one whit inferior to the more recent investigators. In the following discussion it will be observed how very seldom Harnack or Zimmermann has detected a Lucan characteristic which Gersdorf had not already observed; and in a number of cases, Gersdorf observed what his successors have overlooked. Gersdorf labored with insufficient textual materials, and was too much inclined to emend the text in order to secure absolute uniformity of style; but such faults do not affect the permanent usefulness of his work. In recent years, however, the book has been altogether neglected even by scholars who have worked over exactly the same ground. Feine (*Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas*, 1891, p. 19) alone among recent investigators has recognized the value of Gersdorf's work.

⁷ The result is as follows:—i. 5-15 has been examined both by Harnack and by Zimmermann; i. 16-38, by Zimmermann; i. 39-56, by Harnack, supplemented by Zimmermann; i. 57-67, by Zimmermann; i. 68-79, by Harnack, supplemented by Zimmermann; i. 80-ii. 14, by Zimmermann; ii. 15-20, by Harnack, supplemented by Zimmermann; ii. 21-40, by Zimmermann; ii. 41-52, by Harnack, supplemented by Zimmermann. It will be observed that the essay of Zimmermann was written after Harnack's earlier work, but before the later work. In his later work, Harnack displays no acquaintance with Zimmermann's investigations. In i. 5-15, therefore, Harnack and Zimmermann have investigated the same material independently. In view of their independence, the agreement of the two investigators in many of the proofs urged in this passage becomes significant.

after making due allowance for peculiarity of the subject-matter and for imitation of the Septuagint, is found to be so totally Lucan, that Luke must have been something more than the mere editor. He must have been the first to treat the material in a Greek narrative. If he had used a Greek source, the style of the source would necessarily appear in the use of words that are not characteristically Lucan. So far Harnack and Zimmermann agree. But they differ in what they substitute for the hypothesis of a Greek source. Zimmermann supposes that Luke used an Aramaic written source which he translated himself; Harnack, while admitting the possibility of an Aramaic source, thinks it probable that Luke depended merely upon oral tradition.

Harnack began his investigation with the Magnificat (which he supposes to have been attributed by the author to Elisabeth, not to Mary) and the Benedictus. These hymns, despite first appearances, he maintains, are so totally Lucan in style that in the case of them even the hypothesis of an Aramaic source, possible for the rest of the narrative, is excluded. Luke himself composed the Magnificat and the Benedictus, and [after the manner of ancient historians] put them into the mouth of the characters of his narrative. Of course, Luke did not compose the poems in his own language; he pieced them together from the Septuagint. But subtract the Septuagint passages which he used, and the little that remains is sufficient to reveal quite clearly the hand of Luke. This argument, which has been elaborated in *Lukas der Arzt*, but appeared in essentials in 1900, was subjected to an acute criticism by Spitta.⁸ Spitta pointed out that the Septuagint materials out of which Harnack thought the Magnificat was composed were arbitrarily limit-

⁸ Das Magnifikat, ein Psalm der Maria und nicht der Elisabeth, in *Theologische Abhandlungen für Holtzmann*, 1902, pp. 61-94, especially pp. 79-84. Cf. also Hilgenfeld, Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu, in *Zeitschrift für die wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1901, pp. 211 ff., and Ladeuze, De l'origine du Magnificat et de son attribution dans le troisième Évangile à Marie ou à Elisabeth, in *Revue d' Histoire ecclésiastique*, 4, 1903, pp. 632 ff.

ed. The supposed Lucan words which Harnack detected, are really derived from the Septuagint just as truly as the rest of the poem—only they are derived from passages other than those which Harnack arbitrarily chose to regard as the basis of the composition. Thus Harnack claims as Lucan such characteristic Septuagint words and phrases as *μεγαλύνειν* (v. 46), *ἐπιβλέπειν ἐπὶ* (v. 48),⁹ *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* (v. 48), *ἐξαποστέλλειν* (v. 53). It is unfortunate that before writing his *Lukas der Arzt* Harnack did not notice the criticism of Spitta.¹⁰ For it is not too much to say that Spitta's criticism amounted to a complete refutation. Subtract the Septuagint words and phrases from the Magnificat, and really nothing remains to indicate Lucan authorship. It will not be necessary to go over the ground already traversed by Spitta; and in his subsequent discussion of the Magnificat Harnack has added nothing of real significance. It should only be remarked (1) that *τὸ ἔλεος* (v. 50)¹¹ can hardly be claimed as specifically Lucan, since it occurs not at all in Acts and only once in Luke outside of the first two chapters, while it is very strongly attested in Mt ix. 13 (citation), xii. 7 (same citation), and xxiii. 23,¹² and occurs very frequently in the Septuagint;¹³ (2) that *οἱ φοβούμενοι* (*τοῖς φοβουμένοις*) *τὸν θεόν* is simply an Old Testament phrase, common, for example, in the Psalms;¹⁴ (3) that *ἐνπλήρημι* (v. 53) occurs in one of the Septuagint passages which

⁹ *ἐπιβλεψα ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν* occurs 1 Sam ix. 16.

¹⁰ That Harnack has not read Spitta's criticism seems to be indicated by at least one obvious error that he has left uncorrected in *Lukas der Arzt*. He has overlooked *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* in 2 Cor v. 16, which was pointed out by Spitta.

¹¹ *Lukas der Arzt*, p. 141. Apparently Harnack intends the article merely as an indication of the gender (*ἔλεος, ἐλέους*, etc., as distinguished from *ἔλεος, ἐλέου*, etc.).

¹² Harnack has not mentioned the passages in Matthew!

¹³ Cf. Thackeray, *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, i. p. 158.

¹⁴ There is no reason whatever for conjecturing with Harnack (*loc. cit.*) that Luke wishes the phrase to be understood in a technical sense as in Acts.

Harnack himself¹⁵ cites as parallel, and is very frequent in the Septuagint in general; and (4) that ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι (v. 54)¹⁶ also occurs in one of Harnack's own parallels and elsewhere in the Septuagint.

With regard to the rest of Lk i. 5-ii. 52, a method of investigation somewhat similar to that of Spitta should be pursued. The words and phrases which Harnack, Zimmermann and other investigators regard as Lucan characteristics should be examined as to their occurrence in the Septuagint.¹⁷ If it be discovered that the supposed Lucan characteristics are also characteristic of the Septuagint, the argument for Lucan authorship will be decidedly weakened. Luke imitated the style of the Septuagint. But he need not have

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 142.

¹⁶ Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

¹⁷ Resch, *Das Kindheitsevangelium*, 1897, in *Texte und Untersuchungen* x. 5, pp. 30-43, 45-51, 55 f., has cited a great number of Old Testament parallels, giving the Hebrew text, as well as the Septuagint rendering. In the present investigation, Hatch-Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, will be used for the Old Testament; for the New Testament, Moulton and Geden, *Concordance to the Greek Testament*, second edition. In giving simply the number of cases where a word or phrase occurs, information provided by the concordances will be accepted without further acknowledgment; where definite passages are cited, the references will be verified. The names of those investigators who have called attention to the several real or supposed Lucan characteristics, will be mentioned in footnotes. In the case of Gersdorf, Harnack, and Zimmermann, references will not be given: their remarks about the usage in question can easily be found in their works as mentioned above, pp. 1, 2, 3. Where other writers are referred to, nothing is implied as to the inferences which they have drawn from the usage in question. Hawkins, for example, in his *Horae Synopticae* has constructed lists of Lucan characteristics, without attempting to determine their significance. In quoting statistics from Hawkins, the material will be arranged, without further remark, in the order that suits the present purpose of the discussion, and some details will be omitted. For instance the number of occurrences in Lk i-ii will be noted first, and the division between various parts of the rest of Luke and of Acts will not be reproduced. Finally, in the following discussion, no attempt at absolute completeness will be made. Some of the words and phrases which Harnack and others have regarded as signs of Lucan authorship will have to be passed over without remark.

been the only early Christian writer who imitated it.¹⁸ Even Harnack will admit that the similarity to the Septuagint is far more striking in Lk i-ii than in any other part of the Lucan writings. If this Septuagint element be subtracted, are there enough Lucan peculiarities left to prove anything more than Lucan editorship?¹⁹

¹⁸ Cf. Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 224 f.

¹⁹ Ladeuze (*op. cit.*, p. 638, note), in criticism of Spitta (with whom he agrees in many points), has defended Harnack against this mode of attack: "Dans l'examen détaillé qu'il fait de l'argument de M. Harnack, M. Spitta s'attache surtout à montrer que les expressions relevées par le professeur de Berlin se retrouvent fréquemment dans les LXX. Cette réponse n'a aucune valeur, s'il est établi d'autre part que les autres auteurs du N. T. n'emploient pas les mêmes expressions. Luc aura eu dans sa langue propre bien des termes et des formules que la *κοινή* avait en commun avec les LXX." This caution deserves to be borne well in mind. Common dependence of two writings upon the language of the Septuagint does not necessarily involve linguistic coincidence with each other. Coincidence of the two writings with each other, therefore, may establish common authorship, even though the criteria by which the coincidence is established are all derived from the common model. All the New Testament writers are dependent upon the Septuagint. If therefore Lk i-ii coincides with the rest of Luke in using certain Septuagint expressions, which the other New Testament writers do not use, even that may establish the Lucan authorship of the chapters in question. Why are those particular expressions not found in the rest of the New Testament, whereas they are found in Lk i-ii and in the rest of Luke? Because the other New Testament writers, though they used the Septuagint, made a different use of it; they made different selections from the vast store which it provided. The fact that Lk i-ii exhibits a similar selection from the Septuagint to that exhibited by the rest of Luke may indicate common authorship. But when it is observed that the similarity in language between Luke and the Septuagint, and particularly between Lk i-ii and the Septuagint, is far greater than that between the Septuagint and the other New Testament writers, then the coincidences in language between Lk i-ii and the rest of Luke become less significant. Where else in the New Testament can a section be found which approximates so closely as Lk i-ii to the narrative of the Old Testament? The exceptionally close affinity of Lk iii-Acts xxviii to Lk i-ii may be due simply to an exceptionally close affinity to the Septuagint in general. Other New Testament writers may be found to diverge more (than Luke does) from Lk i-ii simply because they diverge more from the Septuagint. However, the caution urged by Ladeuze is wholesome. When it is proved that the "Lucan character-

In the rest of the present article not all of Lk i-ii, but only the Benedictus (Lk i. 68-79) can be discussed.^{19a}

Verse 68. ἐπισκέπτομαι (ἐπεσκέψατο)²⁰ is used of the activity of God frequently in the Septuagint²¹ and in Ps. Sol. iii. 14.²² It is also sometimes used absolutely in the Septuagint. Neither of these uses of the word, therefore, is peculiarly Lucan.²³

Verse 69. That ἐγείρω is substituted for ἐξαναστέλλω (Ps cxxxii. 17) or ὑψόω (1 Sam ii. 10) or ἀνατέλλω (Ezek xxix. 21) in view of the resurrection of Christ²⁴ is an unproved assertion. Cf. Judg iii. 9 ἤγειρε κύριος σωτήρα τῷ Ἰσραήλ. In his earlier work Harnack himself cited this passage.

σωτηρία²⁵ can hardly be called a "favorite expression of Luke", since besides the three occurrences in Lk i-ii it occurs only once in Luke and six times in Acts (once in a Septuagint citation). It is true that it occurs only once in John and not at all in Matthew and Mark. But it occurs about nineteen times in Paul. In the Septuagint it is very frequent. See also Ps. Sol. x. 9; xii. 7.²⁶ Its use here in Lk i. 69 is clearly derived from the Septuagint.

Verse 70. διὰ στόματος²⁷ occurs elsewhere, it is true, only in Acts and probably in Mt iv. 4.²⁸ Furthermore the "istics" in Lk i-ii are also Septuagint characteristics, the significance of those characteristics in supporting Lucan authorship is not removed, but only diminished.

^{19a} See Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt*, pp. 143-146; Gersdorf, *op. cit.*, pp. 206-212.

²⁰ Gersdorf, Harnack.

²¹ Ruth i. 6 ἐπέσκεπται κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ is perhaps as worthy to be regarded as furnishing the basis for the present verse as is either of the passages cited by Harnack.

²² See Ryle and James, *ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΣΟΛΟΜΩΝΤΟΣ* *Psalms of the Pharisees commonly called Psalms of Solomon*, p. xcii.

²³ Cf. Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

²⁴ Harnack.

²⁵ Harnack, cf. Gersdorf, Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd. ed., 1909, p. 22.

²⁶ Ryle and James, *op. cit.*, p. xcii.

²⁷ Gersdorf, Harnack.

²⁸ Harnack eliminates the passage in Matthew by following without comment the Western text, which omits ἐκπορευομενω δια στοματος; Gersdorf dismisses it with the remark that it is a citation.

phrase is rare in the Septuagint. It should be noticed, however, that the occurrences in Acts fall without exception in speeches placed in the mouth of Jewish Christians. Very probably those passages were derived from Jewish Christian sources. At any rate, Luke must have felt the phrase to be Jewish in character—otherwise he would not have confined his use of it to the speeches. It must therefore have been in use in Jewish circles or in Jewish writings. This coincidence in usage, therefore, between Lk i and Acts does not necessarily prove unity of authorship. It may also be explained by a common adherence on the part of two authors to a Jewish Christian usage. However, the argument of Gersdorf and Harnack is not altogether without significance.

The addition of ἅγιος (ἁγίων)²⁹ can hardly be called specifically Lucan. The word is exceedingly common in the Septuagint.

The remarkable clause, καθὼς ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ³⁰ is strikingly similar to Acts xii. 21, ὃν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν. First, however, the question must be raised whether the coincidence is not due simply to a harmonistic correction of the text by a scribe. In Lk i. 70, ἀπ αἰωνος is certainly genuine; for, although its position varies, it is omitted by no witness.³¹ In Acts iii. 21, however, ἀπ αἰωνος is omitted by D etc. The various readings may be exhibited as follows:^{31a}

των αγιων αυτου των προφητων. D, supported at least in the omission of ἀπ αἰωνος by 19. [Souter cites 28, instead of 19] h gig p [these three are cited by Souter] arm Cosm⁵⁰³

²⁹ Harnack, *cf.* Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

³⁰ Gersdorf, Harnack.

³¹ **NB** etc. have των αγιων απ αιωνος προφητων αυτου (the great mass of the later witnesses insert των after αγιων); whereas D supported by many Old Latin manuscripts reads αγιων προφητων αυτου των απ αιωνος.

^{31a} For the most part, the evidence has simply been taken (with some omissions) from Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed. viii. maj. *Cf.* Souter, *Novum Testamentum Graece*.

[according to Souter, Cosmas places the phrase before *αυτου προφητων* as in $\aleph B$] Ir^{int} 194 Tert^{res carn} 23 Orig^{lat} [Souter].

των αγιων απ αιωνος αυτου προφητων. $\aleph^*AB^*C$ 6I. 69.
[Souter cites, instead of 6I. 69., 8I. 429. al]

(*παντων*) *των αγιων των απ αιωνος αυτου προφητων.*
 $\aleph^cB^3E$ al cat

των αγιων αυτου (4. 13. add *των*) *απ αιωνος προφητων.* 4.
13. Or^{3,221} (vg) (Or^{3,798})

(*παντων*) *των αγιων αυτου προφητων απ αιωνος.* P al
plu syr^{utr} cop (sah) aeth Chr^{9,86} (et^{9,81} *των αγιων αυτω*
προφητων των απ αιωνος).

If the short reading preserved by D were original, then the varying position of *απ αιωνος* in the other witnesses would be easily explained. The phrase was supplied from Lk i. 70, but different scribes inserted it in different places.³² The position of *αυτου* before *προφητων* both in $\aleph B$ and in P etc.³³ would be explained as a survival from the original reading, where *αυτου* was construed with the preceding *αγιων*.³⁴ Furthermore the designation of the Old Testament prophets as "saints", though unusual, is not impossible in New Testament usage. If *απ αιωνος* is thus not genuine in Acts iii. 21, then the striking similarity between this passage and Lk i. 70 disappears, and there is no longer any argument for unity of authorship. On the other hand, however, the textual phenomena in Acts iii. 21 may also be explained on the supposition that the reading of $\aleph B$ is correct. The phrase *απ αιωνος* naturally gave difficulty to ancient as well as to modern readers—hence its omission in D etc. The reading of P with the mass of later witnesses

³² See Souter's note.

³³ It stands after *προφητων* in Lk i. 70.

³⁴ 4. 13. and P etc. would preserve the original *των αγιων αυτου* intact.

may be due to re-insertion of *απ αἰωνος* into the D-text, or (more probably) represents an attempt at simplification of the *NB*-text, the heaping of three adjective expressions (*αἰωνων*, *απ αἰωνος*, and *αυτου*) between article and noun being felt to be cumbrous.³⁵ On the whole, there seems to be no sufficient reason for deserting *NB* at this point in favor of the inferior Western documents.³⁶ The coincidence, then, between Lk i. 70 and Acts iii. 21 probably remains.

This coincidence can hardly be due merely to an accident—the expression is too remarkable for that. The coincidence must be explained. But unity of authorship is by no means the only possible explanation. For example, why may not the author of the expression in Acts have been dependent upon the author of Lk i. 70? Suppose, for a moment, in opposition to Harnack, that the Benedictus (Lk i. 68-79) is a Jewish Christian hymn. It was well known to Luke, and if rightly or wrongly he supposed it to have been produced by Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, he must have regarded it highly. He may then have allowed it to color his language in Acts iii. 21. There is nothing at all improbable in such an hypothesis.³⁷ It should be observed further that Acts iii. 21 is part of a speech of Peter. The primitive, Jewish character of the speeches in the early part of Acts has often been noticed. Coincidence between one of these speeches, therefore, and Lk i does not prove the Lucan authorship of both. Luke was perhaps not the

³⁵ A similar remark may be made about the reading of 4.13., though this reading is perhaps more probably to be derived from the short reading of D and only indirectly from the reading of *NB*.

³⁶ The alternative hypothesis remains very attractive, however, on account of the easy explanation that it affords of the three variants attested by *NB*, P etc., and 4.13. respectively. Suspicion of the phrase *απ αἰωνος* cannot be altogether dissipated simply by the weight of external attestation.

³⁷ Such dependence of the author of Luke-Acts upon the songs of Lk i-ii is accepted in the case of the Gloria in excelsis by Holtzmann, B. Weiss, J. Weiss, and Gould.

author of Acts iii. 12-26 any more than of Lk i. 68-79. In both cases, he may have been merely the editor. But even if Acts iii. 12-26 is pre-Lucan—indeed even if it is an actual speech of Peter in its original form—the hypothesis of direct dependence upon Lk i. 70 remains possible. Why may not Peter himself have known the primitive hymn, the *Benedictus*, so that its language came naturally to his lips? It must be admitted that this hypothesis, though possible, is hardly probable. For there is no evidence that the narrative-cycle represented by Lk i-ii was known at the very earliest time by the Christian community in Jerusalem. Peter would hardly have had time to become so familiar with the *Benedictus* as to use its language spontaneously in a speech. If he did so, then it was probably because he was under the overpowering first impression made by the narrative of the infancy of John and Jesus. But such an hypothesis cannot here be argued. The problem of the speeches in Acts may fairly be left out of account. Even if Acts iii. 12-26 is genuinely Petrine, it hardly reproduces a verbatim report, or a literal translation of one. The wording, at any rate, is probably due either to Luke, or to his sources. But either Luke himself, or the earlier author of a Jewish Christian source may well have allowed the *Benedictus* to color his language, most of all, where, as in a speech of Peter, the Jewish Christian spirit was to be preserved.

No particular explanation of the coincidence between Lk i. 70 and Acts iii. 21 need here be defended. All that is insisted upon is that Lucan authorship of both passages is by no means the only possible explanation. A number of other explanations suggest themselves.

*ἀπ' αἰῶνος*³⁸ occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Lk i. 70, Acts iii. 21, xv. 18. But similar phrases³⁹ are not uncommon in the Septuagint.⁴⁰ It should be observed

³⁸ Harnack.

³⁹ ἐξ αἰῶνος, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος, etc.

⁴⁰ This very phrase occurs in Jer ii.20, xxv.5, Ezek xxxii.27, Da (LXX) viii. 11, 3 Macc v. 11.

that both occurrences in Acts are in the speeches of Jewish Christians.

Verse 71 (also verse 74). *ἐκ χειρός*,⁴¹ though it recurs in just the same sense as here only in Acts xii. 11,⁴² can hardly be regarded as specifically Lucan. It occurs in the passage (Ps cvi. 10) quoted by Harnack as the basis for this verse, and elsewhere in the Septuagint. The phrase in Acts is attributed to a Jewish Christian (Peter).

Verse 72. *ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετά*,⁴³ though it occurs again only at Lk x. 37 in the New Testament, is not specifically Lucan. It is a common Septuagint phrase, produced in imitation of Hebrew.⁴⁴

For the addition of *ἀγίας*⁴⁵ see above on verse 70.

Verse 73. *ὄρκον δὲ ὥμοσε*.⁴⁶ Cf. Acts ii. 30 *ὄρκῳ ὥμοσεν*, the only other passage in the New Testament where *ὁμνῶ* is used with *ὄρκος*. The usage occurs in the Septuagint: Gen xxvi. 3 *τὸν ὄρκον μου δὲ ὥμοσα Ἀβραάμ*—a close parallel to Lk i. 73, (Ex xiii. 19 *ὄρκῳ γὰρ ὤρκισε*), Nu xxx.3 *ἡ ὁμολογία ὄρκον*, Deut vii. 8 *τὸν ὄρκον δὲ ὥμοσεν τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν*,^{46a} Josh ix. 20 *διὰ τὸν ὄρκον δὲ ὥμώσαμεν*.⁴⁷ Such a use of accusative or dative is common in the New Testament; it is merely by chance that it occurs with *ὁμνῶ* only in this passage and in Acts.

The use of *πρός c. acc.*,⁴⁸ though unusually common in Luke and Acts, is hardly any sure test of Lucan style. The fact, which is not noticed by Harnack, that this usage occurs almost exactly as frequently in Lk i-ii in proportion to

⁴¹ Gersdorf.

⁴² *ἐκ τῆς χειρός* occurs in John x.28, 29, 39, and in Apoc x.8; *ἐκ χειρός* appears in Apoc viii.4 and xix.2, but not with the same meaning as in Lk i.71, 74.

⁴³ Gersdorf, Harnack.

⁴⁴ See also Ryle and James, *op. cit.*, p. xcii, where attention is called to the occurrence in Ps. Sol. vi. 9.

⁴⁵ Harnack.

⁴⁶ Gersdorf.

^{46a} Cited by Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

⁴⁷ Cf. also other passages cited by Resch (*loc. cit.*).

⁴⁸ Harnack.

the length of the passage as in the whole Gospel of Luke⁴⁹ may possibly be significant for determining the authorship of the infancy narrative as a whole; but the one occurrence in the Benedictus surely proves absolutely nothing about the authorship of the hymn. *πρός c. acc.* is nowhere rare. It is true that *ὁμνῶ* seems always to have the dative, never *πρός c. acc.*, in the Septuagint.⁵⁰ But *πρός c. acc.* in this connection cannot be proved to be specifically Lucan, for in the only other passage (Act ii. 30) where Luke uses *ὁμνῶ* he follows it with the dative.

Verse 74. For *δοῦναι c. infin.*⁵¹ compare, for example, Gen xxxi. 7 *καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς κακοποιῆσαί με* and Job xxii. 27.

τοῦ c. infin.,⁵² epexegetical or expressing purpose, which occurs three times in the Benedictus⁵³ and once besides in Lk i-ii,⁵⁴ is far more frequent in Luke and Acts than in the rest of the New Testament.⁵⁵ But this usage is very common in the Septuagint.⁵⁶ A Jewish Christian writer could hardly avoid it.

λατρεύειν,⁵⁷ which occurs twice in Lk i-iii, once in the rest of Luke (citation), once in Matthew (same citation), five times in Acts, four times in Paul,⁵⁸ six times in Hebrews, twice in the Apocalypse, is rather common in the Pentateuch, and in Joshua and Judges. It is certainly no clear indication of Lucan style.

⁴⁹ There are seventeen occurrences in the first two chapters, and (by Harnack's count) one hundred and sixty-six occurrences in the whole Gospel.

⁵⁰ Cf. Gen xxvi.3 *τὸν ὄρκον ὃν ὤμοσα τῷ Ἀβραάμ.*

⁵¹ Harnack.

⁵² Gersdorf.

⁵³ Here and i. 77, 79.

⁵⁴ Lk ii. 24.

⁵⁵ Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol i, Prolegomena, (second edition, 1906), pp. 216-218, gives statistics. The Lucan writings supply two-thirds of the total. Cf. Hawkins, *op cit.*, pp. 22, 48.

⁵⁶ See Thackeray, *op cit.*, i. p. 24.

⁵⁷ Harnack, Zimmermann, cf. Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

⁵⁸ Zimmermann overlooks the occurrences in Paul, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse.

Verse 75. *ἐνώπιον*⁵⁹ occurs five times in Lk i-ii (twice in the Benedictus), about eighteen times in the rest of Luke, thirteen times in Acts, not at all in Matthew and Mark, once in John, seventeen times in Paul, twice in Hebrews, four times in the Catholic Epistles, and about thirty-two times in the Apocalypse. The word is very common in the Septuagint, especially in Samuel-Kings and in the Psalms.⁶⁰ Its frequency is due to its adoption by the translators from vernacular Greek as a convenient translation of the Hebrew *בְּעֵינַי* and *לִפְנֵי*.⁶¹ Its relative frequency in Luke and Acts is due to Luke's imitation of the Septuagint. It is certainly no clear indication of Lucan style. Luke was probably not the only early Christian writer who imitated the Septuagint—witness the very common employment of *ἐνώπιον* in the Apocalypse. The word would very naturally be used by any Christian writer, but especially by a Jewish Christian. The entire absence of *ἐνώπιον* from Matthew and Mark and its very sparing use in John remain very surprising.⁶²

Verse 76. *ὕψιστου*.⁶³ *ὑψιστος* as a designation of God, occurs three times in Lk i-ii, twice in the rest of Luke, twice in Acts (one of these in the speech of a Jewish Christian, Stephen), once in Mark, (where, despite Harnack, it is scarcely doubtful), and once in Hebrews. It is rather common in the Septuagint, and is therefore no clear mark of Lucan style. Anarthrous *ὑψιστος* as a designation of God occurs in the New Testament three times in Lk i-ii, and once in the rest of Luke. That is surely insufficient to stamp the usage as Lucan; especially since it is exceedingly common in Sirach, and occurs a few times elsewhere in the Septuagint.

⁵⁹ Harnack, Zimmermann; cf. Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 291, 292, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

⁶⁰ Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 42, cites 1 Sam ii. 18, where the Septuagint has *καὶ Σαμουὴλ ἦν λειτουργῶν ἐνώπιον κυρίου*.

⁶¹ See Thackeray, *op. cit.*, pp. 42f., and compare Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, pp. 41f.

⁶² Cf. Thackeray, *loc. cit.*, footnote.

⁶³ Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt*, pp. 36, 145; Zimmermann, on Lk i. 32; cf. Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 23, Dalman, *op. cit.*, pp. 162f.

*προπορεύση*⁶⁴. *προπορεύεσθαι* occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Acts vii. 40 (in the speech of Stephen). But that passage is a citation from Exodus xxxii. 1, 2, 3, and the word occurs elsewhere in the Septuagint as well.⁶⁵ The argument has absolutely no weight.

*πρὸ προσώπου*⁶⁶ is probably not the correct reading. It is supported by D it and the mass of the Syrian documents. It was probably inserted by a scribe under the influence of the Septuagint of the well-known passage, Mal iii. 1. If, however, it is original, it is no mark of Lucan style. *πρὸ προσώπου* occurs elsewhere in the New Testament three times in the rest of Luke (once in the Malachi citation), once in Acts, once in Matthew (Malachi citation), once in Mark (Malachi citation); but it is frequent in the Septuagint, and Mal iii. 1 made its employment in Lk i. 76 very natural.

Verse 77. *γνώσις*⁶⁷ is not peculiarly Lucan. Though it occurs in the Gospels only here and in Lk xi. 52, it is frequent in Paul, and not infrequent in parts of the Septuagint.

*ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν*⁶⁸ occurs twice in the rest of Luke, five times in Acts, once in Matthew, once in Mark (Mk i. 4=Lk iii. 3), and once in Paul. It does not occur at all in the Septuagint. The argument for Lucan authorship is stronger here than in the cases which have been discussed before. But in view of Mk i. 4 (Lk iii. 3), the hypothesis suggests itself that the Greek expression is derived from a phrase current in the circles from which John the Baptist came. Compare *ἀφήσει ἁμαρτίας* in Ps. Sol. ix. 14.⁶⁹

Verse 78. *ἐξ ὕψους*⁷⁰ occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Lk xxiv. 49.⁷¹ But compare 2 Sam xxii. 17,

⁶⁴ Gersdorf, Harnack.

⁶⁵ For example, Deut xxxi. 3, cited by Harnack.

⁶⁶ Gersdorf, Zimmermann.

⁶⁷ Harnack.

⁶⁸ Gersdorf, Harnack.

⁶⁹ Cited by Ryle and James, *op. cit.*, p. xcii.

⁷⁰ Gersdorf, Harnack.

⁷¹ *δύναμις ἐξ ὕψους*

P^s xvii. 16, ci. 19, cxliii. 7, Si xvi. 17, La i. 13.

Verse 79. ἐπιφάναι.⁷³ ἐπιφαίνω occurs elsewhere in the New Testament once in Acts and twice in Titus. But it is not specifically Lucan. It occurs a number of times in the Septuagint, nearly always of the manifestations of God (often it is transitive). See especially the notable passage, Nu vi. 25 (the Benediction), and Ep Jer 60, where the word occurs in connection with ἀστραπή, which is somewhat related in idea to the ἀνατολή of the present passage.

ὁδὸν εἰρήνης.⁷⁴ The expressions ὁδὸν σωτηρίας (Acts xvi. 17) and ὁδοὺς ζωῆς (Acts ii. 28) are somewhat similar. But the latter passage is simply a citation from Ps xv. (xvi.) 11. Furthermore, ὁδὸν εἰρήνης itself occurs in Rom iii. 17, and a similar expression (ὁδὸν δικαιοσύνης) in 2 Pet 21. ὁδὸς εἰρήνης is a Septuagint expression. Rom iii. 17 is derived from Ps xiii. 3. For similar expressions, compare Gen xxiv. 48, Ps xv. 16, etc.

The word εἰρήνη itself occurs in Hawkins' list of Lucan characteristics.⁷⁴ But it is very common in the Septuagint.

It is now time to attempt to draw some conclusion with regard to the hymns. Of Hawkins' one hundred and fifty-one "Lucan" words and phrases,⁷⁵ no less than eighteen occur in the Magnificat or Benedictus, the total number of occurrences there being twenty-four.⁷⁶ In addition, Hawkins has placed in his "subsidiary lists"⁷⁷ two words one of which occurs once in the Benedictus, and the other once in

⁷³ Harnack.

⁷⁴ Harnack.

⁷⁵ Hawkins' figures are: Matthew, four occurrences; Mark, one; Luke, thirteen (three in Lk i-ii); Acts, seven; Paul, forty-two; John, six; the rest of the New Testament, seventeen.

⁷⁶ That is "words and phrases which occur at least four times in this Gospel, and which either (a) are not found at all in Matthew or Mark, or (b) are found in Luke at least twice as often as in Matthew and Mark together".

⁷⁷ Ten expressions, each occurring only once, in the Magnificat; nine expressions, occurring thirteen times in all, in the Benedictus.

⁷⁸ Which are at least as clearly indicative of Lucan style as is the principal list.

the Magnificat and twice in the Benedictus. At first sight, such statistics seem formidable. But the argument which might be drawn from them for Lucan authorship has been weakened by the investigations of Spitta, which have been supplemented for the Benedictus by the preceding discussion. The Lucan expressions are found to be also Old Testament expressions, which would occur naturally to any Jewish Christian. Whether he was translating Aramaic hymns or composing the hymns originally in Greek, he could hardly fail to be influenced profoundly by the Septuagint.⁷⁸

One argument of Harnack remains—an argument drawn not from details, but from the structure of the hymns.⁷⁹ The skilful management of the repeated *μου* and *αὐτός* in the Magnificat, and of *αὐτός* and *ἡμεῖς* in the Benedictus, and in general the elaborate character of the poetic compo-

⁷⁸ One or two of the expressions in the hymns which appear in Hawkins' lists have not been discussed either by Spitta or in the preceding pages. The one occurrence (Lk. i. 70) of *ὁ* "with words inserted between the art. and noun" (Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 50) is no sure sign of Lucan authorship. The usage is not rare even outside of Luke-Acts. *πρός* "used of speaking to" (compare above, pp. 13, 14, where the uses of *πρός* in general and of *πρός* after *ὁμνῶ* are discussed), which appears once in the Magnificat (Lk. i. 55) and once in the Benedictus (Lk. i. 73), occurs according to Hawkins (*op. cit.*, pp. 21, 45f.) twelve times in Lk. i.-ii., eighty-seven times in the rest of Luke, fifty-two times in Acts, not at all in Matthew, five times in Mark, twice in Paul, nineteen times in John, and four times in the rest of the New Testament. The preponderance of the usage in Luke and Acts is indeed very striking. But in the Septuagint of 1 Samuel and of 1 Chronicles, *πρός* after the leading verbs of saying (*εἶπον*, *ἔρω* etc., *λέγω*, and *λαλέω*) is even much more frequent in proportion to the dative than it is in Luke. Lk. iii.-Acts xxviii. has *πρός* about one hundred and seventeen times, and the dative about two hundred and thirty-two times; 1 Samuel has *πρός* one hundred and twenty-five times, and the dative ninety-one times; 1 Chronicles has *πρός* fifteen times and the dative nineteen times. Genesis has also been examined, and found to have *πρός* after these verbs seventy times and the dative two hundred and fifty-one times. The two occurrences of *πρός* "of speaking to" in the hymns are insufficient to support Lucan authorship.

⁷⁹ See *Sitzungsberichte der königl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1900, pp. 544 f., 552-556, and *Lukas der Arzt*, pp. 150-152.

sition is thought to indicate the hand of the artist Luke. With regard to the Benedictus, Harnack is particularly confident. "The first three strophes of the Benedictus (verses 68-75; in all, there are five strophes with four lines each) are only superficially put into the form of the Hebrew psalm; a closer examination reveals *a single, complicated, genuinely Greek period* which is altogether to the credit of the author of the prologue (Lk i. 1) and of numerous excellent Greek sentences. The period is merely forced into the Hebraising covering: the hands are Esau's hands, but the voice is the voice of Jacob."⁸⁰

How many of the niceties discovered by Harnack were intended by the authors of the hymns is a matter of doubt. At any rate, in order to prove Lucan authorship, Harnack should have exhibited by example (1) the likeness of these hymns to undisputed works of Luke and (2) their unlikeness to non-Lucan hymns. The former requirement is impossible of fulfilment. Luke has unfortunately left to posterity no certain examples of his poetry, if he ever wrote any. The most that could possibly be done would be to show that these hymns are Greek rather than Semitic in poetical form; that they are such as a native Greek must have produced, without a Semitic original, merely by moulding Hebrew materials into an imitation of a Hebrew poem. Obviously, examples in point are rather hard to find; at any rate, they have not yet been produced by Harnack. In the second place, if Harnack is unable to exhibit the likeness of the Magnificat and the Benedictus to undisputed Lucan works, he should have exhibited their unlikeness to non-Lucan and particularly Old Testament hymns. That could have been done only by examples. Until it is done, the proof remains incomplete. If some of the psalms of the Septuagint were to be examined by the same kind of minute scrutiny which Harnack has applied to the two hymns of Lk i, perhaps similar peculiarities of composition might be discovered.

⁸⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 152. The translation is independent of the English edition.

Harnack lays particular stress upon the first part of the Benedictus, Lk i. 68-75. But if he means to compare this sentence with the prologue, Lk i. 1-4, the comparison is particularly unfortunate. The two sentences are totally different. Lk i. 1-4 is one complete period; it could not grammatically be broken off until almost the very end. But Lk i. 68-75 could be broken off at the end of almost any one of the nine lines of which it is composed, and still make complete sense. The sentence is not planned as though the end were in view from the beginning, but is lengthened out by adding one exegetical phrase or clause after another, loosely and almost as an after-thought. Is that a characteristic Greek form of sentence? Does it not look more like the simplicity of Semitic poetry, forced into the restraints of Greek grammar? Compare for example such a passage as Ps. Sol. xviii. 7-9,⁸¹ which certainly is translated from a Semitic original:

μακάριοι οἱ γινόμενοι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις
 ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ κυρίου, ἃ ποιήσει γενεᾷ τῇ ἐρχομένῃ,
 ὑπὸ ράβδον παιδείας χριστοῦ κυρίου ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ,
 ἐν σοφίᾳ πνεύματος καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἰσχύος,
 κατευθῆναι ἄνδρα ἐν ἔργοις δικαιοσύνης φόβῳ θεοῦ,
 καταστήσαι πάντας αὐτοὺς ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου.

This passage is very much shorter than the passage from the Benedictus; but the sentence-structure, if "structure" it may be called, is very similar.

The Psalms of Solomon, from which this passage has been taken, afford material for other interesting comparisons with the hymns of Luke i.⁸² Of the parallels cited by Ryle and James a few are striking. Compare, for example, with Lk i. 50 (καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν) Ps. Sol. xiii. 11 (ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς ὁσίους τὸ ἔλεος κυρίου, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους αὐτὸν τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ), and with Lk i. 69 (Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι

⁸¹ Ryle and James, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

⁸² See Ryle and James, *op. cit.*, pp. lx, lxii, and especially xc f., where the parallels are cited in detail. Cf. also Hillmann *Die Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu nach Lukas*, in *Jahrbuch für prot. Theol.*, xvii., 1891, pp. 201f.

ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ) Ps. Sol. vi. 9 (εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ἔλεον τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ).

Although direct parallels are few, a certain similarity in spirit and in ideas can hardly be denied. This is one more indication of the Palestinian and Semitic origin of the Lucan hymns; since the Psalms of Solomon reflect the events of the Palestinian invasion of Pompey, and were produced in Palestine at about the middle of the first century before Christ.⁸³ The date of the Greek translation is placed by Ryle and James between 40 B.C. and 40 A.D. There can be no question of direct literary dependence one way or the other between the Psalms of Solomon and the hymns of Lk i. In order to explain the parallels, Chase⁸⁴ suggests the hypothesis of common dependence upon the "Greek Jewish prayers of the Hellenistic Synagogues," and to support this hypothesis constructs an extended list of parallels between the Jewish prayers and the Lucan hymns.⁸⁵ Even granting that the Jewish prayers in question, which in their present form are later products,⁸⁶ are in substance earlier than the

⁸³ See Ryle and James, *op. cit.*, pp. xxxvii-xliv.

⁸⁴ The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church, in *Texts and Studies* edited by J. Armitage Robinson, Vol. i (1891), No. 3, pp. 128, note 1, 147-151.

⁸⁵ Cf. Spitta, *op. cit.*, p. 71, who (for a slightly different purpose) cites Schmone Esre 15. This passage, which is included in Chase's list, contains the expression "horn of salvation," (see Hirsch, Art. She-moneh 'Esreh in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. xi. p. 271), like the κέρασ σωτηρίας of the Benedictus (Lk i. 69). But κέρασ σωτηρίας occurs in the Septuagint, 2 Sam xxii. 3, and the expression in the Benedictus may be derived directly from that passage. Chase (*op. cit.*, p. 128, note 1) has noted the occurrence in 1 Clem. 48 of the phrase ἐν δσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνη exactly as it appears in the Benedictus (Lk i. 75). The passage in Clement is thought by Chase to be "closely connected with Jewish Prayers." But the phrase is so natural that the correspondence between Lk i. 75 and 1 Clem. 48 is hardly significant. In Wisdom ix. 3 (cited by Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt*, p. 145) ἐν δσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνη occurs exactly as in Luke and Clement. Compare also Deut ix. 5 οὐχὶ διὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου οὐδὲ διὰ τὴν δσιότητα τῆς καρδίας σου (cited by Resch, *op. cit.*, pp. 108f.). Cf. Lightfoot's note on 2 Clem. i. 8, and the passages, sacred and profane, in Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, §lxxxviii. See also Resch, *loc. cit.*

⁸⁶ See Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, iii⁴, pp. 541 f.

Magnificat and Benedictus, the parallels are quite insufficient to establish direct dependence. The correspondence between the Lucan hymns and the Jewish Prayers, so far as it is verbal, is amply explained by common dependence upon the Old Testament.⁸⁷ However, although all thought of direct dependence must be dismissed, the similarity of thought and feeling between the hymns of Lk i-ii on the one hand, and the Palestinian Psalms of Solomon and certain Palestinian Jewish prayers on the other, furnishes subsidiary evidence for a primitive Jewish Christian origin of the Magnificat and the Benedictus.

The primary evidence is discovered simply by an examination of the two hymns themselves. It has already been observed that the Magnificat is made up altogether of Old Testament phrases. These phrases are derived from no one passage, but from the most various parts of the Jewish Scriptures. The Magnificat is no mere imitation, for example, of the song of Hannah in 1 Sam ii. 1-10. Yet the various elements are welded together into a song of perfect unity and great beauty, which preserves the parallelism of Hebrew poetry in its noblest form.⁸⁸ Harnack supposes that the result was accomplished by the conscious art

⁸⁷ This dependence upon the Old Testament is of course admitted by Chase; but he adds to this explanation of the parallels his suggestion "that the utterances of the Virgin Mary, Zacharias, and Simeon, at supreme crises of their lives were largely based on familiar forms of devotion." These familiar forms of devotion could only be Hebrew or Aramaic prayers (*op. cit.*, p. 150). Just below, however, Greek forms of the Jewish prayers are suggested as determining partly the wording of the Lucan hymns. Does Chase mean that the originals of the Lucan hymns were dependent upon Semitic prayers, and that the Greek translations of them are dependent upon Greek translations of the same or similar prayers? The hypothesis is not clearly defined; and indeed Chase himself has suggested it only with a query, and with great caution.

⁸⁸ Zorell (*Das Magnificat ein Kunstwerk hebräischer oder aramäischer Poesie?*, in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 29, 1905, pp. 754-758) has attempted to show that the poetic art of the Magnificat becomes fully clear only in a Semitic language. In a second note (*Zum Hymnus Magnificat, ibid.*, 30, 1906, pp. 360 f.), Zorell favors Hebrew over against Aramaic as the original language of the hymn.

of a Gentile. But it is no wonder that the vast majority of scholars and of simple readers are opposed to him. A single passage from the Old Testament might have been imitated; but that almost numberless passages should have been united without disclosing the joints, without making the slightest impression of artificiality, must always remain very improbable. The author of such a hymn must have lived in the atmosphere of the Old Testament, and must have been familiar from earliest childhood with its language. Only so could elements derived from so many sources have been incorporated without artificiality in a single poem. The synthesis must have been made in life, long before it was made in literary form.^{88a}

The Benedictus, it is true, is somewhat different in form—probably different enough to disprove at once Harnack's contention that the two hymns must have been composed by the same person. The parallelism is not quite so simple, there are more subordinate clauses and appositions and exegetical phrases.⁸⁹ The basic Old Testament passages are perhaps not quite so easily designated. But the Hebrew parallelism and the genuine Old Testament spirit are really almost as clear as in the case of the other hymn.⁹⁰

^{88a} T. D. Bernard (*The Songs of the Holy Nativity*, 1895, pp. 36 f.) aptly compares the modern use of Biblical phrases in prayer. That is not artificial imitation.

⁸⁹ Cf. Ladeuze, *op. cit.*, pp. 368 ff.

⁹⁰ Dalman (*op. cit.*, p. 183) regards ἐπισκέψατο . . . ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους (Benedictus, verse 78) as an argument against a Semitic original. The figure in ἀνατολή does not suit ἐπισκέψατο. A "rising" could, in Hebrew, be said to "visit," to "have regard to" men, only if "rising" had become a stereotyped term for a definite person. Now in Jer xxiii. 5, Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12 ἀνατολή is used in the Septuagint to translate שֶׁמֶץ = "shoot," "branch," which is a name of the Messiah. In Lk i. 78, starting from these passages, the Evangelist has used ἀνατολή simply as a designation of the Messiah. But as verse 79 shows, he has interpreted ἀνατολή as referring to light (helped by Is iv. 2, where הָיָה לְנֶפֶשׁ כִּשְׁמֶץ הַיָּהוֹי is translated by the Septuagint ἐπὶ λάμψει ὁ θεός)—which would have been impossible if he had had recourse to the Hebrew, rather than merely to the Septuagint, of Jer. xxiii. 5, Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12. For שֶׁמֶץ = "shoot" of course has nothing to do with light. The argument is ingenious, but breaks down upon closer ex-

The form of the hymns, then, is genuinely Semitic.⁹¹ The Greek translation, like some of the better parts of the Septuagint, has preserved the spirit of the original, though without doing unnecessary violence to the idiom of the Greek language. But an even stronger argument for a primitive Palestinian origin is to be derived from the content of the hymns. There is nothing which can by any possibility be stretched into an allusion to Christian dogma, or even to the later history of Jesus. In the Magnificat there is no clear allusion even to the person of the Messiah.⁹² In the Benedictus the allusion is merely to salvation in the house of David. The Messianic king has come at last; but nothing more is known about Him than what was contained in Old Testament prophecy. The child John is thought of as a forerunner, not particularly of the Messiah, but of Jehovah. The coming salvation is conceived as applying not to the world, but primarily at least, to Israel.

amination. It is valid only if the author of Lk i. 78 had Jer xxiii. 5, Zech iii. 8, vi. 12 in mind. But surely it is more natural to think of such passages as Is lx. 1, Mal iii. 20 (iv. 2), where the verb ἀνατέλλω (though not the noun ἀνατολή) is used in the Septuagint, and where the figure of the rising of a heavenly body really is used in the Hebrew text to designate the coming salvation. The ἐπεσκέψατο . . . ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους is not such a bad mixture of metaphors, if ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους be regarded as putting the rising of the heavenly body for the heavenly body itself (that is the interpretation of Plummer, *in loc.*).

⁹¹ Ladeuze (*op. cit.*), while opposing Harnack's contention for Lucan authorship, supposes that Luke retouched the Magnificat here and there. That is possible, but cannot be proved.

⁹² Völter, (*Die evangelischen Erzählungen von den Geburt und Kindheit Jesu*, 1911, p. 23) calls attention to the fact that the closing words of the song of Hannah, καὶ ὑψώσει κέρας χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, find no place in the Magnificat. If the Magnificat were composed to suit its present context on the basis of the song of Hannah, why should the author omit just those words in his Old Testament model, which would seem to apply most directly to the Christian Messiah? Hilgenfeld (*op. cit.*, p. 214, footnote) supposes that Lk. i. 55b is a Christian interpolation into an originally Jewish psalm. But at any rate it is entirely arbitrary to say that τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ "has a Pauline ring (Gal iii. 16)". Gen xiii. 15 and similar passages are the common source for the phrase here and in Paul.

Israel is to be delivered from its insolent oppressors.⁹³ That the salvation is to be not merely political, but also moral and religious (Lk i. 75ff.) certainly does not transcend the bounds of Old Testament prophecy.⁹⁴ If Lk. i. 79 (ἐπιφάναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις) contains a hint of universalism, it is the universalism of Isaiah.⁹⁵

⁹³ Verses 71, 74 were certainly written before 70 A. D. After the destruction of Jerusalem, no Christian could possibly have regarded the Messianic salvation as a liberation of the Jewish people from its political enemies. All such hopes were crushed. Indeed, even long before 70, the Christian hope had certainly assumed another, and less political form. It is exceedingly doubtful whether, even by a Jewish Christian, these verses could have been written after the crucifixion. Cf. Loisy, *Les évangiles synoptiques*, i. p. 312, "Cet idéal n'a rien de paulinien, et même un judéo-chrétien n'aurait pu s'exprimer de la sorte après la destruction de Jérusalem."

⁹⁴ Cf. Hilgenfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 219: "Wird dieses Heil auch nicht blos in politische Befreiung, sondern auch in Frömmigkeit und Gerechtigkeit gesetzt, so führt doch nichts hinaus über die Gefühle eines Juden, wie der Verfasser des Ps. Sol. xvii, nur dass hier wohl die Geburt des Messias in dem Hause David's bereits vorausgesetzt wird."

⁹⁵ How Hilgenfeld (*op. cit.*, p. 219, footnote) can detect in Lk i. 73a the striking parallel with Heb vi. 13 by which he identifies the line as a deutero-Pauline addition of the redactor (like the Pauline addition in the Magnificat, Lk i. 55b), it is difficult to see. According to Hilgenfeld the second part of the psalm (verses 76-79), in marked contrast with the former part, is altogether Pauline. In verses 68-75 the political salvation had the chief emphasis. In those verses, the goal set for the people of God is a righteousness of works (verse 75); in verses 76-79, salvation is represented as consisting in forgiveness of sins through the grace of God—just the Pauline doctrine of justification. But the Pauline doctrine of justification had its roots in the Old Testament. Certainly the idea of the mercy of God and His gracious forgiveness of His erring people was nothing new. For verses 77, 78, compare Jer xxxi. 34: "and they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know Jehovah; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith Jehovah: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more." Hilgenfeld thinks the comparison is quite far-fetched, but gives no reason for his view. With regard to the psalm as a whole, it is quite true that verses 68-75 emphasize the political salvation, whereas verses 76-79 refer rather to the inward, individualistic, and ethical results of the Lord's coming; but that observation, instead of giving rise to critical division of the psalm into a Jewish and a Christian part, should simply be regarded as an instance of that intimate union between material and spiritual which

Against this overwhelming *prima facie* evidence, Harnack can urge only his linguistic argument. And that has been examined in detail and found insufficient. Harnack is much more confident about the hymns than about the rest of Lk i-ii. In the case of the Magnificat and the Benedictus, he would exclude altogether the possibility, which he leaves open as regards the rest of the narrative, that Luke was merely the translator of an Aramaic source. This decision should certainly be reversed. The linguistic examination of the hymns, which has just been concluded, when compared with a thorough examination of the rest of Lk i-ii, will, it is believed, show clearly that the evidence for Lucan authorship is far less convincing in the case of the Magnificat and Benedictus than in that of the rest of the narrative.⁹⁶ That the hymns were found by Luke in a Greek form is perhaps most probable; that they were translated by him from Hebrew or Aramaic is perfectly possible, but is by no means proved by the linguistic phenomena; that they were composed by him is practically out of the question.

But if Luke was not the author of the hymns, who was? According to Hillmann,⁹⁷ Hilgenfeld,⁹⁸ Spitta,⁹⁹ and others, the author (at least of the Magnificat) was not a Christian but a Jew. The Magnificat originally had nothing to do with the situation in which it is now placed; but was perhaps

characterizes all Old Testament prophecy. The Benedictus, in this respect as in others, belongs to the Old Testament. The new dispensation is close at hand; but it is still enveloped in prophetic dimness. Where else could such a psalm have arisen except just where the author of Lk i-ii has placed it? For the unity of the hymn, Lagrange (*Le Récit de l'Enfance de Jésus dans S. Luc. in Revue Biblique Trimestrielle*, iv, 1895, p. 168, note) appeals to the τοῦ δοῦναι of verses 74, 77, which indicates the same author in both parts.

⁹⁶ Cf. Feine, *op. cit.*, p. 20 ("Ich bin der Ansicht, dass die Bearbeitung des Lukas in den beiden Kapiteln nicht eine gleichartige ist. Eine verhältnismässig geringe ist sie jedenfalls in den Lobgesängen"), and Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 223 ff. (where Harnack's argument about the hymns is singled out for particularly emphatic criticism).

⁹⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 197-213.

⁹⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 208-215, 217-221.

⁹⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 83-90.

intended merely to express an Israelitish woman's rejoicing over a happy turn in the history of the nation, for which her own sons had fought.¹⁰⁰ Some such view might seem to be suggested by what has been noticed above—the complete absence from the hymn of anything specifically Christian. In particular there is nothing in the Magnificat that points necessarily to the situation which is presupposed in the narrative. Indeed the *ταπείνωσις* of verse 48 (*ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ*) seems to introduce a discordant note. Wherein consisted the "lowly estate" of Mary?¹⁰¹ The *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* of the same verse has also caused difficulty. Why should the blessing, which all generations are to render to Mary, be dated just from her visit to Elisabeth rather than from the conception, or from some important event like the resurrection? Again, it does not seem to suit the character of Mary, that she should speak a hymn of praise at all. Elsewhere in Luke i-ii she is carefully represented as silent and passive. The manner of introducing the hymn has also provoked objection. Elsewhere in the narrative, when similar poetical effusions are introduced, the presence of the Spirit is noted; here there is nothing but the simple *καὶ εἶπεν Μαριάμ* (verse 48). And what follows upon the hymn is declared to be equally unnatural: *ἔμεινεν δὲ Μαριάμ σὺν αὐτῇ κ. τ. λ.* If Mary has just been speaking, her name might be omitted; but the name of Elisabeth, who has not been mentioned for some time, should certainly have been expected instead of the pronoun *αὐτῇ*.

¹⁰⁰ Spitta, *op. cit.*, p. 89; cf. Hillmann, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

¹⁰¹ The difficulty becomes even more serious if *ταπείνωσις* means not merely "low estate," but "humiliation," that is, the descent from a higher estate into a lower. (Cf. Völter, *op. cit.*, p. 24; "Erniedrigung nicht Niedrigkeit"). How had Mary suffered such a fall? But the suffix *-σις* cannot always be interpreted so strictly (Cf. Wilkinson, *A Johannine Document in the First Chapter of St. Luke's Gospel*, p. 36). Wilkinson says further (p. 37): "The quotation *ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ* quite naturally suits the feeling with which a native of Nazareth in Galilee would receive the news that she was destined to be the Mother of Messiah (Cf. St. John, i, 45)."

These difficulties have led a very considerable number of recent scholars (including Harnack) to suppose that the Magnificat was originally attributed not to Mary but to Elisabeth. This hypothesis is not quite devoid of textual support.¹⁰² And it apparently overcomes some of the difficulties. The *ταπείνωσις* of verse 38 now becomes intelligible. It is the humiliation (very acute to a Jewish woman) of childlessness, like the *ταπείνωσις* (1 Sam i. 11) of Hannah, whose prayer¹⁰³ offers such a close analogy to this very verse, and whose song¹⁰⁴ seems to have formed the chief model for the Magnificat itself. The *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* now dates the blessing rendered to Elisabeth from the first movement of the child in the womb. The reserve of Mary now remains unbroken. The presence of the Spirit in Elisabeth does not have to be mentioned in verse 46, because it has just been mentioned in verse 41. Finally the *σὺν αὐτῇ* of verse 56 now becomes natural, for Elisabeth has just been the speaker and does not need to be mentioned again by name.

Spitta,¹⁰⁵ while admitting the validity of some of the arguments which have been urged against supposing that the narrator intended Mary to be regarded as the author of the hymn, is on the other hand unable to satisfy himself with the Elisabeth hypothesis. The external evidence for the omission of the subject of *εἶπεν* or for reading *Ἐλεισάβητ* in verse 46 is insufficient. It remains more probable that *Μαριάμ* was first omitted by accident and then *Ἐλεισάβητ* wrongly supplied, than that an original *Ἐλεισάβητ* was changed to *Μαριάμ* in order to attribute the hymn to a more illustrious authoress. Furthermore, if the Magnificat as the song of the barren Elisabeth were an imitation of the song of the barren Hannah, the clear indication of the barrenness of the singer, which appears in the song of

¹⁰² See, for example, Harnack, in *Sitzungsberichte der königl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1900, pp. 538 f.

¹⁰³ *ἐὰν ἐπιβλέπων ἐπιβλέψῃς (ἐπὶ) τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης σου.*

¹⁰⁴ 1 Sam ii. 1-10.

¹⁰⁵ *Op. cit.*

Hannah (verse 5: ὅτι στεῖρα ἔτεκεν ἑπτά, καὶ ἡ πολλὴ ἐν τέκνοις ἡσθένησεν) would surely not have been omitted from the song of Elisabeth. The idea στεῖρα, being the very link which bound the two songs together, would not have been weakened into the general expression ταπείνωσις. Any other idea in Hannah's song would have been omitted more readily than that. Furthermore, the Elisabeth hypothesis explains no better than the Mary hypothesis the looseness with which the song is fitted into the narrative. If Elisabeth were regarded as the speaker, the hymn should have been inserted after Lk i. 25. At any rate, almost any place would have been more desirable for the insertion than the one which was actually chosen. In verses 42-45, Elisabeth has greeted Mary as the Mother of her Lord, Mary and her Son are here the all-important figures. Surely Elisabeth would not proceed at once to such an extravagant praise of her own son. And the σὺν αὐτῇ of verse 56 follows admirably upon verse 45; whereas according to Old Testament usage, if the psalm had intervened, the name Elisabeth must have been mentioned even if Elisabeth had been represented as the speaker. The phenomena can be explained only by the hypothesis that the hymn was foreign to the original story, and was inserted by the Evangelist redactor.¹⁰⁶

But what was the motive of the redactor in inserting the hymn? According to Spitta himself, the plan of the story requires Mary to keep silent. If that plan is so clear to modern scholars, even after it has been spoiled by the insertion of the Magnificat, it should have been still clearer to the Evangelist. He has respected it in other parts of the narrative; why should he upset it here? His action would be indeed conceivable if he accomplished anything by it. If the Magnificat contained Lucan or even Christian ideas which the Evangelist was anxious to impress upon his readers, then the insertion of the hymn might be explicable. But Spitta himself has insisted that this is not the case. Or if

¹⁰⁶ The Evangelist, according to Spitta, attributed the hymn not to Elisabeth but to Mary.

the Evangelist had chanced upon a Jewish hymn which suited the situation of Mary in some remarkable way, perhaps he might have seized the opportunity of embellishing his narrative. But that too is far from the fact.¹⁰⁷ The situation implied in the Magnificat itself can be defined only in general terms. How then came the hymn to be attributed to Mary? In general, it is unlikely that a Jewish hymn would be inserted in such a narrative by a Christian writer. Spitta points to similar cases in the Old Testament—for example, to the song of Hannah, which, he believes, was originally separate from its present context. But even granting the conclusions of criticism in the Old Testament passages cited by Spitta, the present case is somewhat different. There, Jewish writers are adopting Jewish hymns; here, a Christian writer is adopting a Jewish hymn, and adopting it, altogether without compulsion, for insertion in the most sacred part of his narrative. Would not the Christian consciousness of the newness of the Christian faith have prevented such disregard of the break between the old religion and the new?¹⁰⁸ If the Evangelist had revised the Jewish

¹⁰⁷ Spitta (*op. cit.*, p. 88) suggests that the Evangelist attributed the hymn to Mary and inserted it just at this point because of τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ (v. 48), which corresponds with ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου (v. 38); and because of μακαριοῦσίν με, which corresponds with μακαρία ἡ πιστεύουσα, immediately preceding in verse 45. Such correspondences are easy to detect after the hymn has already been inserted, but they would hardly have occurred to anyone in reading a Jewish song. The Evangelist would have to be imagined as searching through a collection of Jewish songs in order to discover the one least unsuited to his purpose. What was the necessity of such a painful search? The narrative would have done very well without the Magnificat. Hillmann (*op. cit.*, p. 206) considers it more probable that it was not the final redactor of the Gospel who inserted the Magnificat, but that the final redactor found it already inserted in the Jewish Christian narrative (Lk i-ii). That does not change the case essentially. In some respects, it would have been harder for a Jewish Christian writer to insert a purely Jewish, non-Christian hymn into his narrative, than for a Gentile Christian to have done so.

¹⁰⁸ What Hillmann (*op. cit.*, pp. 204-206) says about other such purely Jewish elements in the New Testament is problematical. Even if they are really Jewish, they are made serviceable to Christian ideas. In the case of the Magnificat that would not be the case.

song so as to make a Christian hymn of it, then his employment of it would perhaps be in accordance with the habits of certain early Christian writers, though not of the author of Luke and Acts. But that he should insert a simple Jewish song without redaction seems altogether beyond the bounds of probability. If the Evangelist were unscrupulous enough to put a simple Jewish hymn into the mouth of Mary, he would have been unscrupulous enough to make the hymn express his own ideas.

The insertion by the Evangelist of this Jewish hymn could be explicable only if, when the Evangelist wrote, it was already regarded as a hymn of Mary. But that only pushes the problem a step further back. How came it to be attributed to Mary in the first place? If it were a Jewish song, it would very probably have been known as such by the primitive Jewish Christian community. How came that community then to put it into the mouth of the Mother of the Lord, at a time when she had probably not long been dead?^{108a}

The hypothesis, then, that the Magnificat was originally just a Jewish song, a foreign element inserted into the nativity narrative, must be rejected. Is it then simply a part of that narrative? Was it composed by the author of the narrative?¹⁰⁹ This hypothesis cannot be altogether ex-

^{108a} In a renewed discussion of the hymns of Lk i-ii in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vii, 1906, pp. 303-317, Spitta suggests (pp. 316 f.) that the hymns came into the hands of the Evangelist under the titles; *τῆς Μαρίας, τοῦ Ζαχαρίου, τοῦ Σμεῶνος*, perhaps as parts of an ancient Christian collection. Possibly these names designated the persons that appear in Lk i-ii. In that case the hymns had been attributed to them by primitive Christianity without any real intention to represent them as the poets. But it is also possible that the hymns really belonged originally to persons whose names stand in the titles. In that case those persons had nothing to do with the characters of the Christian narrative, but the chance similarity of name led the Evangelist to insert the hymns in their present positions. The former hypothesis is liable to the objections urged above in the text; the latter is valuable chiefly as indicating some appreciation, on the part of its author, of the difficulties which beset all less adventurous suggestions.

¹⁰⁹ That is, the author of Luke's source in Lk i-ii. It has been shown

cluded. The author may well have exercised the freedom of an ancient historian by attributing to his characters not words which they actually spoke, but words which in view of the situation they might fittingly have spoken. The objection to such a view arises from the absence from the hymn of Christian ideas. The narrative of the infancy could not well have been written before the resurrection, for there would scarcely have been a motive for its composition before the origin of the Christian community. But after the resurrection, a Christian writer in composing a hymn for the Mother of the Lord could hardly have failed to insert in it some more definite prophecy of the life or death or resurrection of the Son.¹¹⁰ Unless, indeed, he were writ-

above that the composition of the Magnificat by Luke himself is unlikely.

¹¹⁰ The force of this argument may be avoided by supposing that the Magnificat and Benedictus, in company with other parts of Lk i, belonged originally to non-Christian tradition about John the Baptist, which has later been united with an independent tradition about Jesus. This hypothesis, favored by Wilkinson (*op. cit.*) and Völter (*op. cit.*), with their elaborate documentary theories, has recently received the weighty support of Harnack (*Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, 1911, pp. 108-110), who, however, postulates simply independent oral traditions about John and Jesus respectively, not independent documents. Of course, if the Magnificat and Benedictus were composed by non-Christian disciples of John the Baptist, then the absence from them of Christian ideas no longer requires explanation. But the documentary theories of Wilkinson and Völter are quite inadequately supported; and the more cautious theory of Harnack (more cautious because, since traditions are less easily studied than documents, assertions about them can be made with greater impunity) is also incapable of proof. Of course, the theory that both hymns were originally Johannine and non-Christian presupposes the view that the Magnificat belonged originally to Elisabeth rather than to Mary. But that view, as Spitta (compare, however, his later article, pp. 311f.) has shown, is beset with difficulties. It might be held in a form which would suppose the Magnificat to have been transferred by the Christian historian from Elisabeth to Mary. But in view of the absence of specifically Christian ideas in the hymn, all motive for such transference was lacking. The most that can be admitted is that if the Magnificat is a non-Christian hymn, then it is more probably Johannine than simply Jewish. But that is simply the lesser of two improbabilities. At any rate, Harnack and Wilkinson could not possibly

ing before the death of Mary, when such an anachronism would have provoked contradiction. But in that case he would scarcely have ventured to compose the hymn at all. One hypothesis alone is proof against such objections, the hypothesis that the Magnificat is actually derived from an Aramaic song of Mary herself. To many modern readers, that may seem to be an adventurous suggestion. But it seems so only because Joseph and Mary and Zacharias and Elisabeth as they appear in the infancy narrative are thought to be legendary figures. If the narrative is based upon fact, then why may not the mother of Jesus have been endowed with the gift of simple poetry; so that under the immediate impression of her wonderful experience, she may have moulded her store of Scripture imagery, made part of her life from childhood, into this beautiful hymn of praise? Why must the mother of Jesus of Nazareth have been a nonentity? Why may she not have possessed gifts that fitted her in some measure for her inestimable privilege?¹¹¹

The hypothesis becomes more acceptable, when one examines again the manner in which the hymn is introduced. Modern criticism is perfectly correct in observing that the Magnificat is inserted rather loosely in the narrative. Perhaps the first impression of the reader is that the hymn is intended as an immediate answer of Mary to the greeting of Elisabeth. But that is by no means certain. There is no clear indication of it either in the introductory words

use their theory of Johannine tradition to explain the absence of Christian ideas in the hymns, because Harnack is quite positive that the hymns were composed by the Christian Luke, and Wilkinson places the Magnificat not in the Johannine but in the Christian part of Lk i.

¹¹¹ Compare the significant admission of Harnack, *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, p. 109 (footnote): "Die Geschichten [i. e. the narrative of Jesus' birth and infancy that lies back of Lk i-ii] sind ihrem Charakter nach wesentlich einheitlich. Der Kreis, aus dem sie stammen, hatte für Maria hohe Verehrung und stellt sie bedeutungsvoll neben ihren Sohn. Von selbst hat sich das nicht gemacht, sondern das muss auf den Eindruck der Maria zurückgehen" Cf. also Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

καὶ εἶπεν Μαριάμ or in the hymn itself.¹¹² It looks rather as though the hymn had circulated separately, as a hymn of Mary produced during the visit to Elisabeth, but without any indication of the exact day and hour when it was first spoken. It was then inserted in the narrative of the infancy at the proper place, as an answer to the greeting of Elisabeth; but without any indication whatever that it was spoken extemporaneously. It could be an answer to Elisabeth's greeting without being an immediate answer. The ridicule that has sometimes been vented upon the Lucan narrative, for attributing to a simple Jewish maiden an improvised speech of such perfect artistic form, is therefore misplaced. The sense of the narrative is not violated if the Magnificat be regarded as the product of Mary's meditation, during the three months in the hill country of Judah.¹¹³

Much of what has been said about the Magnificat could be repeated for the Benedictus. In the Benedictus, there is somewhat clearer indication of the intended occasion. καὶ σὺ δέ, παιδίον, κ. τ. λ. (Lk i. 76) points to a child, already born, as forerunner of the Messianic age. The hypo-

¹¹² Spitta (in *Theologische Abhandlungen für Holtzmann*, pp. 89f.) can even, without downright absurdity, venture the suggestion that perhaps the Evangelist thought of the Magnificat as arising not from the situation in the house of Elisabeth, but from the situation to which the immediately preceding words point—namely from the *τελείωσις* of the promises made to Mary.

¹¹³ The ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν of verse 48 is no insuperable objection to this view of the origin of the hymn. Cf. Resch *op. cit.*, p. 105: "In dem ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν bezeichnet übrigens das νῦν nicht nothwendiger Weise den gegenwärtigen eng begrenzten Augenblick, sondern, wie man aus jedem Lexicon ersehen kann, auch den ganzen gegenwärtigen Zeitraum, kann also nicht als Beweis dafür gelten, als ob hier ursprünglich ein anderer Context vorauszusetzen sei." Compare, however, Hilgenfeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 209 f. Ladeuze (*op. cit.*, p. 630) refers ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (which on linguistic grounds he attributes to the Evangelist redactor) to verse 45. Mary sees in the μακαρία which Elisabeth has just pronounced the first of a long series of similar pronouncements. Resch (*op. cit.*, pp. 101 f.) suggests (what is perhaps less probable than the hypothesis suggested above in the text) that the hymn had gradually taken form in Mary's mind between the annunciation and the visit of Elisabeth, so that it could be spoken immediately as an answer to Elisabeth's greeting.

thesis of an originally non-Christian hymn, therefore, could here be made plausible at best only by regarding the hymn as having undergone Christian interpolation.¹¹⁴ But there is the same absence, as in the case of the Magnificat, of Christian ideas; and therefore the same difficulty of supposing that the hymn was composed for Zacharias by the author of the narrative. Moreover, the Benedictus is even more loosely inserted in the narrative than is the Magnificat. If the narrator had desired to put a hymn into the mouth of Zacharias he would surely have done so at Lk i. 64, when Zacharias regained his speech, and "spake, blessing God." Instead, the hymn is inserted in a general description (Lk i. 65-66, 80) of the growth of the child.¹¹⁵ Surely the most plausible explanation is that the hymn was circulated separately, and was delivered to the author of the narrative as a hymn of Zacharias, but without definite indication of the time when it was produced.¹¹⁶ Like the Magnificat, it may well have been the product of partly conscious, though inspired art.¹¹⁷

The absence, then, of Christian ideas in the Magnificat

¹¹⁴ As was done, for example, by Völter, obviously without sufficient evidence. Cf. also Hillmann (*op. cit.*, pp. 210-213) and Hilgenfeld (*op. cit.*, pp. 218-222), who suppose that the second part of the hymn is a Christian addition.

¹¹⁵ The suggestion of Wilkinson (*op. cit.*, pp. 17, 32) that the compiler of the narrative regarded the Benedictus as an answer to the question *Τί ἄρα τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο ἔσται;* (verse 66), is not plausible.

¹¹⁶ Cf. James Cooper, art. Benedictus in *Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*: "Zacharias may have had it [the psalm] ready for the long anticipated moment; may have recited it then and written it afterwards." That is possible, but there is no clear evidence in the narrative that the psalm was recited at the time of the circumcision of John.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Weiss, *Leben Jesu* i⁴. p. 222: "Auch dieser Lobgesang zeigt die Form der jüdischen Messiashoffnung noch in einer Ursprünglichkeit und Reinheit, die sie in der späteren christlichen Zeit nicht mehr bewahren, und die sie nur durch eine jener Zeit völlig fremde Kunstdichtung reproduziert werden konnte. Derselbe wird auch keineswegs von dem Erzähler zur Ausschmückung der Beschneidungsscene dem Zacharias in den Mund gelegt (i, 64), sondern nach dem Abschluss derselben als eine auf dem Gebirge Juda noch fortgepflanzte Erinnerung aus jener Zeit nachträglich mitgeteilt."

and Benedictus, the absence of reference to concrete facts in the life of Jesus, points to a time when the Messianic hope was still couched in the terms of Old Testament prophecy. On the other hand, the hymns are not simply Jewish hymns, composed in some unknown situation. If they were, they could not have found a place in Lk i-ii. They must, therefore, really have been produced by the persons to whom they are attributed in the narrative—and produced at a time when Old Testament prophecy had not yet been explained by its fulfilment. The fulfilment is at the door—it is no longer a thing of the dim future—but the fashion of it is still unknown. The promised King has arrived at last; but the manner of His reign must still be conjectured from the dim indications of prophecy. The Messiah is there; but He is still unknown. The hymns belong just where the Evangelist has placed them.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁸ Ladeuze (*op. cit.*, pp. 634 ff.) agrees with Spitta in supposing that the hymns were circulated separately before they found a place in their present context. But he rightly rejects the view that they were simply Jewish psalms. They were found by Luke as hymns in use in the Christian communities of Palestine. "Ne seraient ils pas simplement, l'un et l'autre, ce que détachés du contexte, ils semblent bien être, de véritables psaumes, des psaumes chrétiens prononcés, sous l'action de l'Esprit, dans les réunions des premières communautés de Palestine, et que S. Luc auraient trouvés, en même temps que son document judéo-chrétien sur l'Enfance du Christ?" (p. 643). Indeed, Ladeuze continues, Mary herself may have been the one who first sang the Magnificat among the believers. The concrete circumstances were already in the past. So she simply considered as a whole the work of which she had been the instrument. This view approaches rather closely the one which has been defended above. But it does not explain so well the absence from the hymn of definite reference to the later history. J. Weiss (in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* i^o. pp. 418 f.) suggests that the Magnificat is a Jewish Christian psalm in which the Christian community gives thanks for the blessing which God has given it, verse 48 being an addition made in order to suit the song to its present context. The aorists in verses 51-54, are referred by Weiss to experiences of the Jewish Christian Church. The mighty act which God has performed (verse 51) is the sending of Christ. The "lowly" of verse 52 are the members of the Christian community, who strangely enough were chosen from among the humbler classes of the people. The mighty ones who have been cast down from their thrones, are, perhaps, Pilate and Herod, or also the persecutor Herod Agrippa,

If the hymns really were composed by Mary and by Zacharias, then they were composed in Hebrew or in Aramaic. The former hypothesis would explain best of all the Old Testament spirit and coloring of this poetry, the Old Testament parallelism, etc. And that the priest Zacharias, at least, should have composed such a hymn in the sacred language, rather than in the language of every-day life, is by no means impossible *a priori*, indeed in view of the judgments of experts with regard to the language of Palestine at the time of Christ, it might almost be pronounced the more probable alternative. That a woman (Mary) should have composed a hymn in Hebrew is less natural.¹¹⁹ If the hymns were composed in Aramaic (and in the case of the Magnificat, that is more probable), then the task of the translator was harder. He would not be able to use Septuagint renderings which had already been coined for the very expressions which lay before him, but would be forced to

who died a sudden death in 44 A. D. But these aorists can be understood perfectly well as examples of the vivid past tense of prophecy. It is perfectly true, as Weiss insists, that even so there must have been some special occasion for praising these acts of God just at the particular time when the poet was writing. This occasion, however, was present to Mary, at the time described in Lk i, as well as to a writer of the Jewish Christian church. After the marvellous experience which Mary had undergone at the annunciation, the coming of the Messiah was to the eye of faith already accomplished, and also (in principle) all the acts of God's grace which are celebrated in verses 51-54. Wilkinson (*op. cit.*, pp. 14 f., footnote 2), like J. Weiss, regards the Magnificat as "a hymn of the early Christian Church at Jerusalem". Only, Wilkinson is not obliged to regard verse 48 as an interpolation into the original hymn, for he supposes that the term *δοῦλη* was originally applied to the Christian community. Wilkinson and J. Weiss have at least entered a wholesome protest against current misconceptions of the hymn. The Magnificat is neither purely Jewish, nor is it of late Gentile Christian origin (see, for example, Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 419: "es kann nicht verkannt werden, dass der Lobpreis dieses Psalms mehr einen judenchristlichen Standpunkt zeigt, als den eines heidenchristlichen Schriftstellers am Ende des ersten Jahrhunderts"). The former part of the Benedictus (verses 68-75) is also regarded by Weiss (*op. cit.*, p. 321) as the work of a Jewish Christian poet.

¹¹⁹ See Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* i⁸, p. 4: "Also auch in den gesetzeseifrigen Familien verstanden die Frauen kein Hebräisch."

consider first (of course naturally, and almost unconsciously) the Old Testament Hebrew expressions which were equivalent to the Aramaic expressions of the hymns. In view of the similarity between Hebrew and Aramaic, the task would not be over-difficult, especially for one who was at home in the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Scriptures. The Aramaic hymns would have been composed by one who was familiar with the Old Testament passages. The suffusion of the Aramaic hymns with the thought and language of the Old Testament would not be unnatural; for the Scriptures in an Aramaic form became familiar to all through the oral translations in the synagogues.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

