

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME X.

APRIL, 1912.

NUMBER 2.

THE LITURGICAL USE OF ENGLISH HYMNS.*

I.

THE DENOMINATIONAL DIVISIONS OF CHURCH SONG AT THE RESTORATION.

We have considered the development of the English Hymn from the metrical Psalm. As the metrical Psalm had been originally cast into the mould of the congregational Hymn, the change was in the subject matter rather than in the form. This change we have followed through its several phases, from a close translation of canonical Scripture, to a freer paraphrase first of Psalms then of other Scriptural songs, and up to the point where the purpose of turning Scriptural materials into metre met the impulse to give lyrical form to devotional poetry, and coincided in the production of Hymns, freely composed and yet more or less based upon Scripture.

The movement toward hymns was always a liturgical one. It had for its motive the enrichment of English worship rather than of English literature. The same thing was true of the Hymn movement in the period following the Restoration. But what gave it special significance was the weakened hold of the old Psalmody upon the people, the number of men who concerned themselves with the new movement, and the acceptable character of the new hymns themselves. Under such conditions hymn singing

* Being the second of the lectures upon "The Hymnody of the English-speaking Churches", delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary, in February, 1910.

THE ORIGIN OF THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF LUKE.

In the last number of the PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW,¹ the Magnificat (Lk. i. 46-55) and the Benedictus (Lk. i. 68-79) were investigated in order to determine whether these hymns were derived from a source or sources or whether they were composed by the Evangelist himself. The same method of investigation which was there employed will now be applied to the rest of Lk. i. 5-ii. 52. The words and phrases which Harnack, Zimmermann and others regard as Lucan characteristics will be examined as to their occurrence in the Septuagint. If the supposed Lucan characteristics are also Septuagint characteristics, the argument for Lucan authorship will be decidedly weakened.²

Chapter i. Verse 5. *ὀνόματι* ³, used to insert proper

¹ Vol. x (1912), pp. 1-38.

² The present investigation will not be fully intelligible apart from the previous article of which it is a continuation. See especially pp. 1-7 of that article, where the problem is defined, and the method of investigation outlined. As in the previous article, where Gersdorf, Harnack and Zimmermann are mentioned as having called attention to the several real or supposed Lucan characteristics, references will not be given. Their remarks will easily be found in the following works: Gersdorf, *Beiträge zur Sprachcharacteristik der Schriftsteller des Neuen Testaments*, 1816; Harnack, *Das Magnificat der Elisabeth (Luc. 1, 46-55) nebst einigen Bemerkungen 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; Zimmermann, *Evangelium des Lukas Kap. 1 und 2*, in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1903, pp. 247-290. Compare also Harnack, *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, 1911, pp. 108-110. The concordances (Hatch-Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, and Moulton and Geden, *Concordance to the Greek Testament*, second edition) will be used in the manner described on p. 6 (footnote 7) of the former article. The Septuagint text which has been used is Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*. Not all the evidences of Lucan authorship which have been adduced by Harnack and others will be discussed, but only so much as may be necessary to test their conclusions.

³ Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Harnack, Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii (1909). pp. 285, 292, Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd. ed., 1909, pp. 21, 44, Vogel, *Zur Charakteristik des Lukas*,

nouns, occurs once in Lk. i-ii, about six times in the rest of Luke, twenty-two times in Acts, and twice in the rest of the New Testament. Alternative uses (for example, *καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς* Lk. i. 5) occur four times in Lk. i-ii, four (or three) times in the rest of Luke⁴, once in Acts, once in Matthew (not of a person), three times in John, twice (or four times) in the Apocalypse. *τις* is used with *ὀνόματι* once (here) in Lk. i-ii, twice in the rest of Luke, fourteen times in Acts, and nowhere else in the New Testament. The Septuagint, in inserting proper nouns, uses regularly *ὄνομα αὐτῶ* or *ὃ ὄνομα*; there is perhaps not a single case of *ὀνόματι* where the text is perfectly certain. This use of *ὀνόματι* is therefore a pretty clear mark of Lucan style, and the addition of *τις* makes the matter even clearer. But the occurrence in Lk. i. 5 may well be due merely to Lucan editorship. Alternative uses occur about as often in Lk. i-ii as in the rest of Luke and Acts combined; whereas the Lucan *ὀνόματι* occurs only this once. Since *καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς* occurs in the latter part of Lk. i. 5, Luke may have substituted *ὀνόματι* in the first part of the verse in order to avoid monotonous repetition. However, for the style of the whole verse, Harnack compares Acts xviii. 2, *εὐρών τινα Ἰουδαῖον ὀνόματι Ἀκύλαν . . . καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ*.

Verse 6. *ἐναντίον* (or *ἐναντι*)⁵ occurs twice in Lk. i-ii, twice in the rest of Luke, three times in Acts, and nowhere else in the New Testament. But one of the passages in Acts takes the *ἐναντίον* directly from a passage in the Septuagint, and all three passages in Acts are in the speeches of Jewish Christians, where Luke was probably using sources. In the Septuagint the word is so very common that its employment in such a narrative as Lk. i-ii was almost inevitable.

2te Aufl., 1899, p. 24, Friedrich, *Das Lukasevangelium und die Apostelgeschichte, Werke desselben Verfassers*, 1890, pp. 38, 101.

⁴ In one of these cases, Lk. viii. 41, the Lucan *ὀνόματι* occurs in the parallel passage in Mark, while the non-Lucan *ὃ ὄνομα* is used by Luke.

⁵ Gersdorf, Harnack, Zimmermann; cf. Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 291f., Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

πορευόμενοι⁶. πορεύεσθαι is a favorite word with Luke; but it is so exceedingly common in the Septuagint that it is here entirely without significance as a mark of Lucan style. The figurative sense in which it is used is the well-known Hebraism.

πάσαις⁷. πᾶς is unusually frequent both in Lk. i-ii and in the rest of Luke and Acts. But in the Septuagint the word occupies no less than twenty-nine pages in the Hatch-Redpath concordance. Is not its great frequency both in the Septuagint and in Lk. i-ii due to the influence of Hebrew style?

Verse 7. καθότι⁸ occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, once in the rest of Luke, four times in Acts, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. It is not infrequent in the Septuagint. The argument is perhaps not altogether valueless.

Verse 8. ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἱερατεύειν αὐτόν.⁹ ἐγένετο followed by ἐν τῷ with the infinitive occurs twice in Lk. i-ii, often in the rest of Luke, once in Acts, elsewhere in the New Testament only at Mk. iv. 4. In the Septuagint, ἐγένετο is followed numberless times by some temporal phrase or clause; ἐν τῷ with the infinitive is apparently not uncommon. The occurrence of this usage in Lk. i-ii is therefore not to be wondered at; though it may perhaps be a mark of the hand of Luke.

ἐν τῷ with the infinitive in general¹⁰ is especially frequent in Luke. Hawkins gives the following figures: Lk. i-ii, 5; the rest of Luke, 27; Acts, 7; Matthew, 3; Mark, 2; John, 0; Paul, 4; and the rest of the New Testament, 4. According to Moulton,¹¹ the infinitive with the article in general

⁶ Harnack, Zimmermann; cf. Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 292, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 25, 42.

⁷ Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 5f., 86.

⁸ Gersdorf, Harnack, Zimmermann, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 292; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 18, 91.

⁹ Gersdorf; cf. Harnack, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 13, 90.

¹⁰ Gersdorf, on verse 21, Zimmermann, on verse 21, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 40, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 280, 282; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 36f., 101.

¹¹ *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol. I, Prolegomena (second edition, 1906), p. 216.

occurs as follows: James has 7 occurrences, or 1.08 per Westcott-and-Hort page; Hebrews, 23, or 1.09 per page; Luke, 71, or nearly .99 per page; Paul, 106, or .89 per page; Acts, 49, or .7 per page; 1 Peter, 4, or .59 per page; Matthew, 24, or .35 per page; Mark, 13, or .32 per page; John, 4, or .076 per page; the Apocalypse, 1, or .027 per page. Lk. i. 5-ii. 52 has eleven occurrences, or about 1.42 per Westcott-and-Hort page; so that the articular infinitive is considerably commoner here than in the rest of Luke and Acts.¹² In the Septuagint, ἐν τῷ with the infinitive occurs about 430 times.¹³ The New Testament figures for the use of ἐν τῷ with the infinitive are striking, but the extreme frequency of this usage in parts of the Septuagint diminishes somewhat its value as a mark of Lucan style.¹⁴

The familiar ἐγένετο in narrative¹⁵ is a well-known Lucan characteristic. Three types have been distinguished: (1) ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε, (2) ἐγένετο ἦλθε, (3) ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν. Hawkins' statistics for the New Testament are as follows: ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε occurs not at all in Lk. i-ii, eleven times in the rest of Luke, once (?) in Acts, once in Matthew, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament; ἐγένετο ἦλθε occurs eight times in Lk. i-ii, fourteen times in the rest of Luke, not at all in Acts, five times in Matthew, twice in Mark, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament; ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν occurs not at all in Lk. i-ii, five times in the rest of Luke, sixteen times in Acts, once in Mark, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. For the Septuagint, Thackeray¹⁶ has compiled the following

¹² Three of the occurrences are in the Benedictus.

¹³ For example, Pentateuch, 53; Job, 2; Psalms, 59; Proverbs, 1; Isaiah, 4; Jeremiah, 7; Ezekiel, 75. These figures have been obtained simply by counting the asterisks in Hatch-Redpath, which, under ἐν, indicate ἐν τῷ with the infinitive.

¹⁴ According to Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898, pp. 26f., this usage is a Hebraism (not an Aramaism), which has crept into the New Testament through the influence of the Septuagint. Cf. below, pp. 269 f.

¹⁵ Harnack and Zimmermann, on verse 5, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 37; cf. Vogel, *op. cit.*, pp. 33f.

¹⁶ *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, i. pp. 50-52.

statistics: ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε occurs 269 times (164 times in Judges-2 Kings); ἐγένετο ἦλθε, 145 times; and ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν once only. When it is observed that no less than 164 of the occurrences of ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε are in Judges-2 Kings, which for the most part lies linguistically far beneath the level of Lk. i-ii, the preference of Lk. i-ii for ἐγένετο ἦλθε is not to be wondered at. Certainly there is nothing in the use of ἐγένετο to suggest Lucan authorship. The characteristically Lucan ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν does not occur at all in Lk. i-ii; and of the other two types, which are almost equally divided in the rest of Luke, only one is used. This last fact might seem if anything to be an argument in favor of non-Lucan authorship.¹⁷

Verse 9. κατὰ τὸ ἔθος¹⁸ occurs twice in Lk. i-ii (here and Lk. ii. 42), once in the rest of Luke, and nowhere else in the New Testament. κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός occurs in the New Testament only once in Luke and once in Acts. κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον occurs only in Lk. ii. 27. The word ἔθος occurs in all twice in Lk. i-ii, once in the rest of Luke, seven times in Acts, once in John, not at all in Matthew and Mark, and once in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint the word ἔθος occurs only six times at most (all in the Apocrypha). κατὰ τὸ ἔθος αὐτῶν occurs in Dan. Th. Bel. 15. κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός occurs only twice in the Septuagint, and κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον not at all. κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, therefore, has some value as a mark of Lucan style.¹⁹

Verse 10. ἦν . . . προσευχόμενον.²⁰ εἶναι with the participle occurs, according to Zimmermann, forty-eight

¹⁷ On the use of ἐγένετο cf. Plummer, in his commentary on Luke, in *The International Critical Commentary*, 7th. ed., p. 45, and Moulton, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 17.

¹⁸ Gersdorf, Harnack; cf. Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 29, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 287, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 18f..

¹⁹ Cf. Resch, *Das Kindheitsevangelium*, 1897, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, x. 5, p. 31: "ἔθος wie in der LXX, so in den Logia-Übersetzungen ungebräuchlich, dagegen ein Lieblingswort des Lc, stammt hier wie Lc. 2, 42 aus der Feder des Lc."

²⁰ Harnack, Zimmermann; cf. Harnack on Lk. ii. 51, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 281.

times in Luke, thirty-nine times in Acts, eleven times in Matthew, twenty-eight times in Mark, and only once in John. Friedrich^{20a} has the same counting for ἦν or ἦσαν (or ἡμην) or ἔσομαι with the participle, except so far as John is concerned, where he counts twenty occurrences. This usage is thought (for example, by Zimmermann) to be an Aramaism. An examination of the Septuagint usage would be interesting.

πάν τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ.²¹ The word πλῆθος occurs twice in Lk. i-ii, six times in the rest of Luke, sixteen times in Acts, not at all in Matthew, twice in Mark, twice in John, and three times in the rest of the New Testament. πάν (or ἅπαν) τὸ πλῆθος occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, three times in the rest of Luke, three times in Acts, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament.²² τοῦ λαοῦ is added to πλῆθος once (here) in Lk. i-ii, twice in the rest of Luke, once in Acts, and nowhere else in the New Testament. The synonym ὄχλος, which is very much more common than πλῆθος in the New Testament (it is more common even in Acts), does not occur at all in Lk. i-ii. In the Septuagint, the use of the two synonyms is the reverse of the New Testament usage. πλῆθος is used more than five times as much as ὄχλος, and is very common. That looks as though Lk. i-ii had simply followed the Septuagint usage. πάν τὸ πλῆθος occurs, for example, in Ex. xii. 6. Nevertheless, the phenomena in the New Testament are so striking that πάν τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ affords genuine evidence of Lucan style.

Verse 11. ὥφθη²³, since it is apparently the regular Septuagint word for describing visions, etc., can hardly be regarded as a certain mark of Lucan style.

^{20a} *Op. cit.*, pp. 12, 89f, cf. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

²¹ Gersdorf, Harnack, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 21; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 40, 102.

²² Cf. Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

²³ Gersdorf, Harnack, (Zimmermann); cf. Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 292, 293.

ἑστώς for ἑστηκώς.²⁴ In Lk. i-ii, ἑστώς occurs once, ἑστηκώς not at all; in the rest of Luke and Acts, ἑστώς occurs fourteen times, ἑστηκώς once; in Matthew, ἑστώς occurs six times, ἑστηκώς once; in Mark, ἑστώς occurs not at all, ἑστηκώς four times; in John, ἑστώς occurs four times, ἑστηκώς three times; in the Apocalypse, ἑστώς occurs nine times, ἑστηκώς twice. So Matthew, John, and the Apocalypse, as well as Luke, prefer ἑστώς. And Stanton has called attention to παρεστηκώς in Lk. i-ii (in Lk. i. 19).²⁵ In the Septuagint, Thackeray gives as the proportion of ἑστηκώς to ἑστώς 95/51; the latter being "practically confined to late and literary books".²⁶ In the New Testament, ἑστώς is not particularly literary, as is indicated by the usage of the Apocalypse. Certainly ἑστώς in Lk. i. 10 is no sign of Lucan authorship. παρεστηκώς (Lk. i. 19) might with at least equal plausibility be claimed as distinctly non-Lucan.

ἑστώς ἐκ δεξιῶν.²⁷ ἐκ δεξιῶν ἰσθάναι occurs again in Acts vii. 55, 56. But that Jesus should be seen standing on the right hand of God is very natural. The similarity of expression may simply be due to the similarity of the facts.

Verse 12. ἐπέπεσεν.²⁸ ἐπιπίπτειν for the beginning of unusual states occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii., once in Acts,²⁹ and perhaps once in the Apocalypse.³⁰ In Acts xix. 17, as in Lk. i. 12, φόβος is the subject; but the same

²⁴ Zimmermann; cf. Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 292, 294, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 8, 88.

²⁵ Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 294. Stanton is in error, however, when he says that "in every other passage of Lk. and A. in which the perf. part. of ἵστημι, or one of its compounds, is used the form is ἑστώς"; for in Lk. ix. 27 ἑστηκοτων is in all probability the correct reading.

²⁶ But cf. Helbing, *Grammatik der Septuaginta*, Laut und Wortlehre, 1897, p. 103.

²⁷ Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

²⁸ Zimmermann; cf. Gersdorf, Harnack, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 292, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 41, 43.

²⁹ Acts xix. 17. In two other passages, Acts x. 10 and xiii. 11, ἐπεπεσεν is read by some manuscripts.

³⁰ Rev. xi. 11.

is true of Rev. xi. 11.³¹ In the Septuagint, this use of ἐπιπίπτειν is not uncommon, and the subject is almost always φόβος or some other word expressing fear. There is no argument whatever for Lucan authorship.

ἐπιπίπτειν ἐπί, according to Harnack, occurs only in the Lucan writings. But he has apparently overlooked Rom. xv. 3 (citation), and in Rev. xi. 11 and Jno. xiii. 25 ἐπεπεσεν ἐπὶ is strongly attested. In the Septuagint, ἐπί after ἐπιπίπτειν is quite the regular thing.

Verse 13. εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν.³² Statistics of the use of πρὸς with the accusative and of the dative after the chief verbs of saying are as follows:³³

In Lk. i-ii:

εἶπον πρὸς	7	εἶπον c. dat.	4
λέγω πρὸς	0	λέγω c. dat.	0
ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	0	ἐρῶ etc. c. dat.	0
λαλέω πρὸς	5	λαλέω c. dat.	5

In the rest of Luke:

	about		about
εἶπον πρὸς	65	εἶπον c. dat.	96
λέγω πρὸς	12	λέγω c. dat.	76
ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	0	ἐρῶ etc. c. dat.	11
λαλέω πρὸς	1	λαλέω c. dat.	3

In Acts:

	about		about
εἶπον πρὸς	24	εἶπον c. dat.	17
λέγω πρὸς	7	λέγω c. dat.	12
ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	0	ἐρῶ etc. c. dat.	0
λαλέω πρὸς	8	λαλέω c. dat.	17

³¹ Where ἐπεσεν is to be read if ἐπεπεσεν is wrong.

³² Gersdorf (also on Lk. i. 19), Harnack, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 21, 45ff.; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

³³ It will be remembered that here, as elsewhere in the present article, the figures have simply been compiled from the concordances. The following figures are approximate only. No attempt has been made, for example, to settle questions of text. Cf. PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, x (1912). p. 18, footnote 78, where the facts are stated in less detail.

In Matthew :

		about
εἶπον πρὸς	1 ?	98
λέγω πρὸς	0	130
ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	0	12
λαλέω πρὸς	0	13
εἶπον c. dat.		
λέγω c. dat.		
ἐρῶ etc. c. dat.		
λαλέω c. dat.		

In Mark :

		about
εἶπον πρὸς	1	58
λέγω πρὸς	3	109
ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	0	1
λαλέω πρὸς	0	4
εἶπον c. dat.		
λέγω c. dat.		
ἐρῶ etc. c. dat.		
λαλέω c. dat.		

In John :

		about
εἶπον πρὸς	9	114
λέγω πρὸς	7	149
ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	0	3
λαλέω πρὸς	0	19
εἶπον c. dat.		
λέγω c. dat.		
ἐρῶ etc. c. dat.		
λαλέω c. dat.		

In Paul :

		about
εἶπον πρὸς	0	5
λέγω πρὸς	1 ?	14
ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	0	5
λαλέω πρὸς	1	12
εἶπον c. dat.		
λέγω c. dat.		
ἐρῶ etc. c. dat.		
λαλέω c. dat.		

In Hebrews :

εἶπον πρὸς	0	0
λέγω πρὸς	2	0
ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	1	0
λαλέω πρὸς	2	3
εἶπον c. dat.		
λέγω c. dat.		
ἐρῶ etc. c. dat.		
λαλέω c. dat.		

In the Catholic Epistles :

εἶπον πρὸς	0	1
λέγω πρὸς	0	3
ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	0	0
λαλέω πρὸς	0	0
εἶπον c. dat.		
λέγω c. dat.		
ἐρῶ etc. c. dat.		
λαλέω c. dat.		

In the Apocalypse:

εἶπον πρὸς	0	εἶπον <i>c. dat.</i>	4
λέγω πρὸς	0	λέγω <i>c. dat.</i>	26
ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	0	ἐρῶ etc. <i>c. dat.</i>	4
λαλέω πρὸς	0	λαλέω <i>c. dat.</i>	0

In the Septuagint, Genesis, 1 Samuel, 1 Chronicles, and 2, 3, 4 Maccabees have been chosen for examination, as representative of different degrees of literary correctness. The statistics are as follows:³⁴

In Genesis:

εἶπον, ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	52	εἶπον, ἐρῶ etc. <i>c. dat.</i>	228
λέγω πρὸς	2	λέγω <i>c. dat.</i>	1
λαλέω πρὸς	16	λαλέω <i>c. dat.</i>	22

In 1 Samuel:

εἶπον, ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	115	εἶπον, ἐρῶ etc. <i>c. dat.</i>	79
λέγω πρὸς	0	λέγω <i>c. dat.</i>	7
λαλέω πρὸς	10	λαλέω <i>c. dat.</i>	5

In 1 Chronicles:

εἶπον, ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	10	εἶπον, ἐρῶ etc. <i>c. dat.</i>	19
λέγω πρὸς	0	λέγω <i>c. dat.</i>	0
λαλέω πρὸς	5	λαλέω <i>c. dat.</i>	0

In 2, 3 4 Maccabees:

εἶπον, ἐρῶ etc. πρὸς	0	εἶπον, ἐρῶ etc. <i>c. dat.</i>	1
λέγω πρὸς	1	λέγω <i>c. dat.</i>	1
λαλέω πρὸς	0	λαλέω <i>c. dat.</i>	1

If the New Testament alone be examined, *πρὸς* after verbs of saying appears to be very decidedly a Lucan characteristic. Indeed it is almost confined to the Lucan writings. But in 1 Samuel and in 1 Chronicles it is even much more frequent in proportion to the dative than it is in Luke-Acts; and in Genesis also it is common. The argument for Lucan style must be pronounced weighty; yet if the use of *πρὸς* in the body of the Gospel indicates only Lucan editorship, why should it indicate more than that in Lk. i-ii?

³⁴ The figures are approximate only.

μὴ φοβοῦ³⁵ is no clear mark of Lucan style. It is not uncommon in the Septuagint,³⁶ where the name of the person addressed³⁷ is sometimes added as here.³⁸

διότι³⁹ occurs twice in Lk. i-ii, once in the rest of Luke, five times in Acts, not at all in Matthew, Mark and John, about ten times in Paul, and about seven times in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, it is common enough (especially in a number of books which Thackeray classes with 1 Samuel under the head of "indifferent Greek") to prevent its occurrence in Lk. i-ii from being surprising.

γεννᾶν of the mother⁴⁰ occurs not only in Lk. i. 13, 57 and in Lk. xxiii. 29, but also in Jno. xvi. 21 and Gal. iv. 24.⁴¹ The usage occurs a few times in the Septuagint.

Verse 14. ἔσται . . . σοι.⁴² Hawkins gives the following statistics for the use of εἶναι with the dative: three times in Lk. i-ii, twelve times in the rest of Luke, ten times in Acts, three times in Matthew, twice in Mark, twice in John, three times in Paul, and three times in the rest of the New Testament. These facts perhaps furnish a slight argument for detecting Lucan style in Lk. i-ii. But an investigation of the Septuagint usage would be interesting.⁴³

³⁵ Gersdorf, Harnack, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

³⁶ Cf. especially Dan. x. 12, cited by Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

³⁷ Regarded by Harnack as an additional argument.

³⁸ Gersdorf compares Acts xviii. 9, 10, where διότι occurs as here after μὴ φοβοῦ. But ὅτι occurs after μὴ φοβοῦ a number of times in the Septuagint; and διότι is not an uncommon word. The similarity, therefore, is perhaps merely due to chance.

³⁹ Gersdorf, Harnack, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 28; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 91.

⁴⁰ Harnack.

⁴¹ Harnack has overlooked these two cases, which are both perfectly clear, γεννᾶν being used in the active voice.

⁴² Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 38f.

⁴³ Such an investigation cannot be carried on by means of the concordance, for Hatch-Redpath does not give the context of the occurrences of εἶναι.

For verse 14, Gersdorf compares Lk. xv. 7 *χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔσται*, as well as one or two less striking parallels.

Verse 15. *πνεύματος ἁγίου*.⁴⁴ The statistics of the New Testament use of *πνεῦμα* to designate the divine Spirit are approximately as follows:

	Total occurrences of <i>πνεῦμα</i> designating the divine Spirit	With <i>ἅγιον</i>	Of these with the article
Lk. i-ii	7	6	1
The rest of Luke	10	7	4
Acts	58	43	24
Matthew	12	5	2
Mark	6	4	3
John	15	4	1
Paul	112	17	4
Hebrews	7	5	3
The Catholic Epistles	15	0	0
The Apocalypse	8	0	0 ⁴⁵

In the Septuagint, the following phrases should be compared: *πνεῦμα θείου* (Ex. xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31, Jb. xxvii. 3, xxxiii. 4), *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν σου* (Ps. l. 13), *τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον* (Ps. cxlii. 10)⁴⁶, *ἅγιον . . . πνεῦμα παιδείας*⁴⁷ (Wi. i. 5), *τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα* (Wi. ix. 17), *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ* (Is. lxiii. 10), *πνεύματος αὐτοῦ (ἁγίου)*⁴⁸ (Si. xlviii. 12), *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* (Dan. Sept. v. 12, vi. 3).⁴⁹ Compare, besides, especially Ps. Sol. xvii. 42 (in the well-known description of the Messianic king). It will be remembered that the Psalms of Solomon are to be dated in the first century before Christ and the Greek translation of them in the

⁴⁴ Gersdorf, Harnack, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 27; cf. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 51, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 30f., 98f.

⁴⁵ The statistics of Hawkins differ slightly, but only slightly, from the above. In addition, Hawkins gives the following statistics for the use of *ἅγιος* in general: in Lk i-ii, 11; in the rest of Luke, 9; in Acts, 53; in Matthew, 10; in Mark, 7; in John, 5; in Paul, 77; in the rest of the New Testament, 62.

⁴⁶ Some authorities read *αγαθόν* instead of *αγιον*.

⁴⁷ Or *σοφίας*.

⁴⁸ *αγιον* is added by A.

⁴⁹ Cf. in Theodotion's translation of Daniel *πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἅγιον* (iv. 5, 6), *θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἅγιον* (iv. 15).

first century after Christ.⁵⁰ The statistics for the New Testament are very striking. But the frequent mention of the Spirit in Lk. i-ii is perhaps to be regarded as due partly to the subject-matter,⁵¹ and the addition of ἅγιον is of course not very infrequent even outside of the Lucan writings. A basis for the term πνεῦμα ἅγιον may be found in the Old Testament passages cited above; and the passage in the Psalms of Solomon shows that the "Holy Spirit" had a place in Palestinian Messianic expectations in the century just preceding the birth of Jesus. Nevertheless, the argument of Gersdorf and Harnack is not altogether without value.

πλησθήσεται and πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται.⁵² *πιμπλάναι* occurs eight times in Lk. i-ii, five times in the rest of Luke, nine times in Acts, twice in Matthew, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. *ἐπιμπλάναι* occurs once in Lk. i-ii,⁵³ once in the rest of Luke, once in Acts, once in John, once in Paul, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, however, both *πιμπλάναι* and *ἐπιμπλάναι* are very common; the very frequent use of the former word in Lk. i-ii and the single occurrence of the latter are therefore not surprising. *πιμπλάναι* with πνεύματος ἁγίου occurs three times in Lk. i-ii, not at all in the rest of Luke, five times in Acts, (including Acts iv. 31, where του ἁγίου πνεύματος is probably to be read instead of πνεύματος ἁγίου),⁵⁴ and not at all in the rest of the New Testament.⁵⁵ The following Septuagint passages should be compared: Ex. xxviii. 3 οὗς ἐνέπλησα πνεύματος αἰσθήσεως, xxxi. 3 καὶ ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα θείου σοφίας καὶ

⁵⁰ See PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, x (1912), p. 21.

⁵¹ Matthew uses πνεῦμα ἅγιον in speaking of the conception of Jesus, just as Luke does in Lk. i. 35.

⁵² Gersdorf, Harnack, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 21; cf. Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 40, 102.

⁵³ In the Magnificat, Lk. i. 53.

⁵⁴ Harnack has apparently overlooked Acts ii. 4.

⁵⁵ Compare πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου, which occurs once in Luke (Lk. iv. 1), four times in Acts, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament.

συνέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης, xxxv. 31 καὶ ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης πάντων, Deut. xxxiv. 9 ἐνεπλήσθη πνεύματος συνέσεως, Wi. i. 7 πνεῦμα κυρίου πεπλήρωκεν τὴν οἰκουμένην, Si. xlviii. 12 Ἐλειαίε ἐνεπλήσθη (επλήσθη Α) πνεύματος αὐτοῦ (αγίου Α), Is. xi. 3 ἐμπλήσει αὐτὸν πνεῦμα φόβου θεοῦ. These passages indicate an Old Testament basis for the idea of "filling" with the Spirit or with a spirit. Si. xlviii. 12, where Elisha is represented as being filled with the spirit of Elijah, is especially worthy of notice. However, the coincidence of Lk. i-ii with Acts in the use of this expression is very interesting. When it is observed that all but one⁵⁶ of the occurrences in Acts are in the former portion of the book, where Jewish Christian sources were probably used and Jewish Christian conditions are described, a suggestion may perhaps be made to the effect that Luke derived his use of the phrase from the primitive Jewish church—partly perhaps even from a document underlying Lk. i-ii.

ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός,⁵⁷ which occurs in the New Testament besides here only twice in Acts, once in Matthew, and once in Paul, has a number of parallels in the Septuagint. Compare especially Judg. xv. 17 ἅγιος θεοῦ ἐγὼ εἰμι ἀπὸ κοιλίας μητρός μου. In this passage, the speaker is Samson, whose manner of life was prescribed supernaturally as in the case of John the Baptist and in somewhat the same terms.

Verse 16. υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ⁵⁸ occurs not only⁵⁹ here and five times in Acts, but also once in Matthew, three times in Paul, once in Hebrews, and three times in the Apocalypse. It is the regular Septuagint phrase, for example in Exodus.

ἐπιστρέφει ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν.⁶⁰ ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ followed by τὸν θεόν or some other designation of God occurs in the New Testament only once (here) in Lk. i-ii,

⁵⁶ Acts xiii. 9.

⁵⁷ Harnack, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

⁵⁸ Zimmermann.

⁵⁹ As Zimmermann strangely says.

⁶⁰ Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

and five times in Acts. Zimmermann cites also 2 Cor. iii. 16, but there *πρός* stands instead of *ἐπί*.⁶¹ If this passage is in point, then surely 1 Thess. i. 9 *ἐπιστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεόν* should be cited also. Compare also 1 Pet. ii. 25 *ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν*. It should be noticed that *ἐπιστρέφειν* in Lk. i. 16 is transitive, whereas in all the five passages in Acts it is intransitive. This use of *ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ* in Lk. i. 16 could well be derived from such passages in the Septuagint as Deut. xxx. 2.⁶²

Verse 17. *καὶ αὐτός*⁶³ is used in this way⁶⁴ three times (including this passage) in Lk. i-ii, perhaps about twenty-two times in the rest of Luke, perhaps once in Acts,⁶⁵ perhaps three times in Mark, not at all in Matthew or John, three times in Paul, three times in Hebrews, four times in the Catholic Epistles, and five times in the Apocalypse. It is obviously very difficult to tell which passages are to be counted.⁶⁶ Zimmermann's counting differs considerably from the above. The coincidence between Lk. i-ii and the rest of Luke is striking. The argument of Gersdorf and Zimmermann must be allowed considerable weight, at least until the Septuagint usage has been investigated.

πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει.⁶⁷ *πνεῦμα* and *δύναμις* are joined besides here in the following passages in the New Testament: Lk. i. 35 *πνεῦμα ἁγίου ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιδέσει σοι*, iv. 14 *καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς Γαλιλαίαν*, Acts i. 8 *ἀλλὰ λήμψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*,

⁶¹It may be doubted whether this verse is a citation, as Zimmermann says, so far as the *ἐπιστρέψα πρὸς* is concerned. At any rate, *ἐπιστρέψα πρὸς* (or *ἐπὶ*) does not occur in Ex. xxxiv. 34.

⁶²Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 33, cites Joel ii. 13.

⁶³Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 41f.; cf. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 23, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 37, 101.

⁶⁴That is, cases where the *καὶ* is not copulative but intensive are not counted.

⁶⁵Acts xxii. 20.

⁶⁶See especially Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

⁶⁷Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

x. 38 ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει, Rom. i. 4 τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης, xv. 13 εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου, 19 ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου, 1 Cor. ii. 4 οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως, Eph. iii. 16 δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἕσω ἄνθρωπον, 2 Tim. i. 7 οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα δειλίας, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ.⁶⁸ In the Septuagint, Judg. vi. 34 καὶ πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐνεδυνάμωσεν τὸν Γεδεὼν should be compared. A most interesting parallel occurs in Ps. Sol. xvii. 42, δυνατὸν ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ,⁶⁹ in the description of the Messiah. The joining of the two ideas, Spirit and power, is natural enough, and need not be due only to Luke. The Spirit was conceived of in the Old Testament as the active agent of God in His mighty works.⁷⁰ If the activity of the Spirit of God is what it is represented as being in the Old and New Testaments then the conjunction of πνεῦμα and δύναμις was inevitable. And why may not Luke, in particular, have come to unite the two ideas closely, under the influence of the document underlying Lk. i-ii? Surely the passage Lk. i. 35 is noteworthy enough to have made a great impression upon his mind, if that passage lay before him.

Verse 19. εὐαγγελίσασθαι.⁷¹ This verb occurs twice in Lk. i-ii, eight times in the rest of Luke, fifteen times in Acts, once in Matthew, not at all in Mark and John, twenty-one times in Paul, twice in Hebrews, three times in the Catholic Epistles (all in 1 Peter), and twice in the Apocalypse (both times in the active voice).⁷² In the Septuagint, the word is

⁶⁸ The last two passages are not mentioned by Zimmermann.

⁶⁹ Cf. PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, x (1912), pp. 20f. Ryle and James, ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΣΟΛΟΜΩΝΤΟΣ *Psalms of the Pharisees, commonly called the Psalms of Solomon*, in loc., quote Is. xi. 2 πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως, πνεῦμα βουλῆς καὶ ἰσχύος, πνεῦμα γνώσεως καὶ εὐσεβείας.

⁷⁰ Compare, for example, Gen i. 2.

⁷¹ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 19; cf. Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 28of., 292.

⁷² The noun εὐαγγέλιον, on the other hand, occurs not at all in Luke

not common, but there is some basis for the New Testament usage. Compare also especially Ps. Sol. xi. 1 *φωνῇ εὐαγγελιζομένου*, with Ryle and James's note.⁷³ Stanton⁷⁴ remarks that in Lk. i. 19 and ii. 10 the meaning of *εὐαγγελίζομαι* "seems to be simply that of 'bringing good news' as in O. T., not specifically that of bringing the news of 'salvation', as in the rest of N. T."

Verse 20. *ἄχρι* (or *ἄχρις*)⁷⁵ occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, three times in the rest of Luke, fifteen times in Acts, once (possibly twice) in Matthew, not at all in Mark or John, fourteen times in Paul, three times in Hebrews, and eleven times in the Apocalypse. In the Septuagint, *ἄχρι* (or *ἄχρις*) occurs only seven times, *ἕως* being the common word.⁷⁶ The argument has some weight. But the frequency of *ἄχρι* in the Apocalypse as well as in Luke-Acts is worthy of note. For *ἄχρι ἥς ἡμέρας*, Gersdorf⁷⁷ compares Lk. xvii. 27, Acts i. 2, and one or two other less similar passages. These parallels strengthen somewhat the argument derived from *ἄχρι* alone. But Gersdorf was not justified in questioning the correctness of the text of Mt. xxiv. 38.

*ἀνθ' ὧν*⁷⁸ occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, twice in the rest of Luke, once in Acts, once in Paul, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. But it is not uncommon in the Septuagint, and therefore the occurrence in Lk. i. 20 is not at all surprising. Loisy⁷⁹ compares Gen. xxii. 18 *ἀνθ' ὧν ὑπήκουσας τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς*.⁸⁰

and only twice in Acts, whereas it occurs four times in Matthew, seven times in Mark, very often in Paul, and twice in the rest of the New Testament.

⁷³ On p. xcii of their edition, Ryle and James compare this passage with Lk. ii. 10.

⁷⁴ *Op. cit.*, ii. p. 292.

⁷⁵ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 16; *cf.* Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 292f., Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 91.

⁷⁶ In the New Testament also, *ἕως* is commoner than *ἄχρι* or *μέχρι*.

⁷⁷ *Cf.* Stanton, *loc. cit.*

⁷⁸ Gersdorf, Zimmermann; *cf.* Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 293, Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 24, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

⁷⁹ *Les Évangiles synoptiques*, i. p. 284, footnote 5.

⁸⁰ See also Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

Verse 21. *προσδοκᾶν*.⁸¹ *προσδοκᾶν* occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, five times in the rest of Luke, five times in Acts, twice in Matthew, three times in 2 Peter, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, it occurs only about ten times, of which about four are in 2 Maccabees and one in 3 Maccabees. The argument has some weight.

Verse 23, *ἐγένετο ὡς ἐπλήσθησαν*.⁸² *ὡς* meaning "when" occurs, according to Hawkins, five times in Lk. i-ii, fourteen times in the rest of Luke, twenty-nine times in Acts, not at all in Matthew,⁸³ once in Mark,⁸⁴ sixteen times in John, three times in Paul, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, it occurs about 222 times.⁸⁵ The Septuagint usage prevents the usage in Lk. i-ii from being any clear indication of Lucan style. The frequent occurrence in such a narrative as 1 Maccabees is particularly instructive. *ἐγένετο ὡς*, which accounts for three out of the five occurrences of *ὡς* temporal in Lk. i-ii, and occurs besides only in Lk. xix. 29 in the New Testament, far from being an additional indication of Lucan style,⁸⁶ is a Septuagint usage. It is customary in the Septuagint for the narrative *ἐγένετο* to be followed by some clause or phrase indicating time. Luke strongly prefers *ἐν τῷ* with the infinitive; Lk. i-ii is about equally divided between *ἐν τῷ* with the infinitive and a temporal clause introduced by *ὡς*.

Verse 29. *εἴη*.⁸⁷ The optative mood occurs three times

⁸¹ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 21; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 96.

⁸² Gersdorf, Harnack, on verse 41, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 23, 49.

⁸³ *ὡς* is not used as a conjunction at all in Matthew.

⁸⁴ Mk ix. 21 is not noticed by Harnack, though *ὡς* here has strong attestation and is probably to be read.

⁸⁵ For example, Pentateuch, 18; 1 Samuel, 19; 1 Kings, 22; Job, Psalms, Isaiah and Ezekiel, 0; 1 Maccabees, 26; 2,3,4 Maccabees, 17. The figures have been secured simply by counting the asterisks, which, in Hatch-Redpath, under *ὡς*, denote the temporal use.

⁸⁶ Cf. Gersdorf.

⁸⁷ Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 17, 22, 35, 38, 53; cf. Gersdorf and Zimmermann (on verse 62), Vogel, *op. cit.*, pp. 25f., Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 36, 100.

in Lk. i-ii, namely in Lk. i. 29, 38, 62. Of these occurrences, Lk. i. 38 *γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου* calls for no comment; the optative expressing a wish is fairly well distributed among the New Testament writers.⁸⁸ The other two passages, however, are interesting. They are as follows: Lk. i. 29 *διελογίζετο ποταπὸς εἶη ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος*, Lk. i. 62 *ἐνένευον δὲ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι καλεῖσθαι αὐτό*. The optative used otherwise than to express a wish occurs twice (as above) in Lk. i-ii, seven times in the rest of Luke, fifteen times in Acts, twice in Paul, twice in 1 Peter, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. The passages in Paul⁸⁹ and in 1 Peter⁹⁰ are totally unlike those in Lk. i-ii. In both of the passages in Lk. i-ii, the optative stands in a question—a usage which recurs seven times in the rest of Luke,⁹¹ six times in Acts,⁹² and nowhere else in the New Testament. Of these thirteen passages, seven have *ἄν*, like Lk. i. 62, six omit *ἄν* like Lk. i. 29, in eleven the question is indirect, as in both passages in Lk. i-ii, in ten the question is introduced by the pronoun *τίς*, as in Lk. i. 62, and in two⁹³ the pronoun is preceded by *τό* as in Lk. i. 62.⁹⁴ In the Septuagint, *ἄν* with the optative occurs thus a number of times in questions introduced by *τί* and *πῶς*, for example five times in Job.⁹⁵ But such cases are rather uncommon except in "literary" books like Job.⁹⁶ According to Thackeray,⁹⁷ the mood

⁸⁸ Moulton, *op. cit.*, pp. 194f.; cf. Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, 2nd. ed., 1906, p. 79.

⁸⁹ Namely 1 Cor. xiv. 10, xv. 37. These have merely the stereotyped phrase *εἰ τύχοι*.

⁹⁰ Namely 1 Pet. iii. 14, 17. In both of these passages, the optative stands in the protasis of a condition.

⁹¹ Lk. iii. 15, vi. 11, viii. 9, ix. 46, xv. 26, xviii. 36, xxii. 23.

⁹² Acts v. 24, viii. 31, x. 17, xvii. 11, 18, xxi. 33.

⁹³ Lk. ix. 46 and Acts xxii. 23.

⁹⁴ Cf. below, p. 237.

⁹⁵ These passages have been found by examining Hatch-Redpath under *ἄν*; no general investigation of the Septuagint use of the optative could be attempted.

⁹⁶ See Thackeray, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

⁹⁷ *Loc. cit.*

"appears still to show some signs of life in the vernacular of the Ptolemaic age, whereas in the N. T. writings it is always an index of a cultivated writer". In general, though the Septuagint needs investigation, the assertion may be ventured that a Jewish Christian writer of the first century after Christ would not be likely to use the optative in the way in which it appears in Lk. i-ii. The New Testament usage, as outlined above, tells an unmistakable story. The optative in Lk. i. 29, 62 is due to the hand of Luke.⁹⁸

Verse 30. *χάριν*.⁹⁹ For the use of *χάρις* in the New Testament, Hawkins¹⁰⁰ gives the following statistics: Lk. i-ii, 3; the rest of Luke, 5; Acts, 17; Matthew and Mark, 0; John, 4; Paul, 99; the rest of the New Testament, 27. The word is common in the Septuagint. *εὐρίσκειν χάριν* (so in Lk. i. 30) is a regular Septuagint phrase, and should not have been urged by Gersdorf and Zimmermann,¹⁰¹ because of its occurrence in Acts vii. 46,¹⁰² as an additional mark of Lucan style.

Verse 32. *ὑψίστου*.¹⁰³ *ὑψιστος*, though it occurs oftener in Luke and Acts than in the rest of the New Testament, and is used as a substantive to designate God by Luke only among New Testament writers, is hardly a sign of Lucan style.¹⁰⁴

Verse 35. *ἐπελεύσεται*.¹⁰⁵ *ἐπέρχεται* occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, twice in the rest of Luke, four times in

⁹⁸ On the use of the optative in New Testament times, see Moulton, *op. cit.*, pp. 194-199, Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*, 1911, pp. 128-133, Harsing, *De optativi in chartis Aegyptiis usu*, 1910.

⁹⁹ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, on verse 28, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 23; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 28, 96.

¹⁰⁰ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁰¹ On Lk. i. 30.

¹⁰² In the speech of a Jewish Christian, Stephen.

¹⁰³ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 23; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 24f.

¹⁰⁴ See PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, x (1912). p. 15. Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 35, cites Ps. lxxxii. 6.

¹⁰⁵ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 29, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293.

Acts, once in Paul, once in James, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, however, it is common.

διό ¹⁰⁶ occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, once in the rest of Luke, eight times in Acts, once in Matthew, twenty-seven times in Paul, nine times in Hebrews, six times in the Catholic Epistles, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. The word occurs only about thirty-three times in the Septuagint, of which twelve are in 2, 3, 4 Maccabees.¹⁰⁷ This use of διό, though not at all decisive, is as good an indication of the hand of Luke as are many of the phenomena which have been urged by Harnack; yet Harnack makes it perform an opposite service. He makes it help to prove not the Lucan, but the non-Lucan character of verses 34, 35, which he regards as an interpolation into the completed Gospel.¹⁰⁸ Arguments from style are apt to be colored by preconceived opinions. It may fairly be demanded that the search for Lucan characteristics should be as thorough in Lk. i. 34, 35 as in the rest of Lk. i-ii.

Verse 36. καὶ ἰδὼν Ἐλειςάβετ ἡ συγγενὴς σου καὶ αὐτὴ συνέλκυσεν υἱὸν ἐν γήρει αὐτῆς, καὶ οὗτος μὲν ἕκτος ἐστὶν αὐτῇ τῇ καλουμένῃ στείρα. Gersdorf compares Lk. viii. 41 and xix. 2. The sequence of καὶ ἰδοὺ . . . καὶ αὐτός in Lk. viii. 41, and of καὶ ἰδοὺ . . . καὶ αὐτός . . . καὶ οὗτος (?) in Lk. xix. 2 is similar to the καὶ ἰδοὺ . . . καὶ αὐτὴ . . . καὶ οὗτος of Lk. i. 36. But Gersdorf is exaggerating when he says that "without doubt the self-same author must have written this".¹⁰⁹ Perhaps a common adherence on the part of two authors to an extreme Semitic form of parataxis would help to explain the coincidence.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶ Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 91.

¹⁰⁷ 2, 3, 4 Maccabees are "literary" (Thackeray, *op. cit.*, p. 13) books, and had no Semitic original.

¹⁰⁸ Zu Lc 1, 34, 35, in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1901, pp. 53-57. In defence of the integrity of the passage, see PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, iv (1906), pp. 50-61.

¹⁰⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 196: "Unstreitig muss dieses ein und derselbe Schriftsteller geschrieben haben."

¹¹⁰ Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 19. (cf. p. 42), gives the following figures for

ῥῆμα = "thing",¹¹¹ which Harnack and Zimmermann cite as occurring, besides here and at Lk. ii. 15, only at Acts v. 32 and x. 37 in the New Testament,¹¹² is a Hebraism common in the Septuagint. Both of the passages in Acts are in speeches attributed to Jewish Christians. The use of ῥῆμα in Lk. i-ii is absolutely no indication of Lucan authorship.¹¹³

Verse 39. ἀναστᾶσα.¹¹⁴ This pleonastic aorist participle of ἀνιστάναι occurs, according to Hawkins, once in Lk. i-ii, fifteen times in the rest of Luke, eighteen times in Acts, twice in Matthew, six times in Mark, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. But it is so common in the Septuagint as a translation of the familiar קָם of the Hebrew that the single occurrence in a narrative like Lk. i-ii could hardly have been avoided.

ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις (compare μετὰ δὲ ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας in verse 24 and ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις in Lk. ii. 1)¹¹⁵ has perhaps some value as an indication of Lucan style.

Verse 41. ἐσκίρτησεν.¹¹⁶ σκιρτᾶν, which occurs in the New Testament, besides here and verse 44, only at Lk. vi. the use of καὶ οὗτος etc., nominative, in the New Testament: Lk. i-ii, 2; the rest of Luke, 6; Acts, 1; Matthew, 0; Mark, 1; Paul, 2; John, 1; the rest of the New Testament, 2. Cf. Gersdorf.

¹¹¹ Zimmermann; cf. Harnack, on Lk. ii. 15, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293.

¹¹² It may sometimes be a question whether ῥῆμα means "word" or "thing". In Lk. ii. 15, at any rate, there is no doubt whatever. In that passage, it certainly means "thing".

¹¹³ Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 21, places the word ῥῆμα itself in his list of Lucan characteristics. His figures for the use of it in the New Testament are as follows: Lk. i-ii, 9; the rest of Luke, 10; Acts, 14; Matthew, 5; Mark, 2; John, 12; Paul, 9; the rest of the New Testament, 8. The very frequent occurrence of the word in the Septuagint prevents its frequent use in Lk. i-ii from being at all surprising. A narrative like Lk. i-ii, with its similarity to the Old Testament, could hardly have avoided the word.

¹¹⁴ Gersdorf, Harnack, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 35f.; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 42, 102.

¹¹⁵ Gersdorf, Harnack, Zimmermann, on Lk. i. 24, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 40. With ἀναστᾶσα δὲ Μαριάμ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 45, compares Acts i. 15 καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἀναστὰς Πέτρος.

¹¹⁶ Gersdorf, Harnack, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293.

23, occurs seven times in the Septuagint in all, and once of the leaping of babes in the womb (Gen. xxv. 22).

*βρέφος*¹¹⁷ occurs four times in Lk. i-ii, once in the rest of Luke, once in Acts, once in 2 Timothy, once in 1 Peter, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. Though the word occurs only five times in the Septuagint, of which three are in 2, 3, 4 Maccabees,¹¹⁸ the argument for Lucan authorship has perhaps little weight.

Verse 42. *ἀνεφώνησεν κραυγῇ μεγάλῃ*.¹¹⁹ For *κραυγῇ μεγάλῃ* compare Septuagint, Ex. xi. 6, xii. 30, 1 Sam. iv. 6, Neh. v. 1, 1 Macc. v. 31. For *ἀνεφώνησεν κραυγῇ* compare Zeph. i. 10 *φωνῇ κραυγῆς*. If the parallels Lk. iv. 33 *ἀνέκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ* and Acts vii. 60 *ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ* be thought to indicate Lucan authorship of Lk. i-ii, compare 1 Sam. iv. 5 *ἀνέκραξεν πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*, Gen. xxxix. 14 *ἐβόησα φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*. Resch¹²⁰ compares Ezek. xi. 13, where the Septuagint has *ἀνεβόησα φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*.

Verse 44. For *ἰδοὺ γάρ*¹²¹ see Spitta, in *Theologische Abhandlungen für Holtzmann*, p. 80.¹²²

ἐγένετο ἡ φωνή.¹²³ *φωνή* used thus with *γίνεσθαι* occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, three times in the rest of Luke, four times in Acts, twice (?) in Mark,¹²⁴ once in

¹¹⁷ Gersdorf, Harnack, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 17; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 30, 98.

¹¹⁸ Cf. above, p. 232, footnote 107.

¹¹⁹ Gersdorf, Harnack; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

¹²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

¹²¹ Gersdorf, Harnack, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 41.

¹²² Cf. PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, x (1912). pp. 4ff.

¹²³ Gersdorf, Harnack, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 23, 49; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

¹²⁴ Harnack rejects the *ἐγενετο* in Mk. i. 11, perhaps rightly, as having been added by a scribe under the influence of Luke. But in Mk. ix. 7, which Harnack does not mention, the *ἐγενετο* is genuine. The omission is attested only by 1. k syr^{codd} (see Tischendorf). Probably both the omission in these witnesses and the substitution of *ἦλθεν* in AD etc. and the mass of the cursives (where the influence of Jno. xii. 28 may have assisted) may be explained by Tischendorf's remark: "offendit *ἐγενετο* paucis verbis interiectis repetitum".

John (compare also Jno. xii. 28 ἦλθεν οὖν φωνή),¹²⁵ six times in the Apocalypse, and nowhere else in the New Testament. In the Septuagint, compare Gen. xv. 4, Ex. xix. 16, 19, 2 Chron. v. 13, and Dan. Theod. iv. 28.

εἰς τὰ ὄτα¹²⁶ is a regular Septuagint phrase.

Verse 45. μακαρία.¹²⁷ μακάριος, which even on the showing of the New Testament occurrences,¹²⁸ is not peculiarly Lucan, is very common in the Psalms (Septuagint), where it is used in just the same way as here.

τοῖς λαλουμένοις.¹²⁹ The passive of λαλεῖν, which occurs five times in Lk. i-ii, not at all in the rest of Luke, seven times in Acts, once in Matthew, twice in Mark,¹³⁰ once in Paul, five times in Hebrews, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament, occurs only six or seven times in the Septuagint (where the active of λαλεῖν is exceedingly common). τὰ λαλούμενα recurs in the New Testament, besides in Lk. ii. 33, only in Acts xiii. 45, xvi. 14.¹³¹ The argument for Lucan authorship or editorship cannot altogether be denied.¹³²

Verse 56. ἔμεινεν . . . σύν.¹³³ μένειν σύν recurs in the

¹²⁵ The passage in John, namely Jno xii. 30 ἡ φωνὴ αὕτη γέγονεν, is ignored by Harnack. Here ἦλθεν is substituted for γεγονεν by D etc. But D substituted εγενετο for ἦλθεν in verse 28 (καὶ εγενετο φωνη instead of ἦλθεν ουν φωνη). Without doubt εγενετο is right in verse 30 and ἦλθεν in verse 28.

¹²⁶ Gersdorf, Harnack, Zimmermann; cf. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 24, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

¹²⁷ Harnack.

¹²⁸ Harnack has here compared simply the Gospel of Luke with Matthew and Mark. There are also two occurrences in Acts, but also two in John, and others in the rest of the New Testament.

¹²⁹ Harnack, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293.

¹³⁰ In Mk v. 36, Harnack has apparently adopted without comment the reading of D etc., τουτον τον λογον instead of τον λογον (τον) λαλουμενον.

¹³¹ The latter passage has been overlooked by Harnack. Cf. Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 285: "The formation of substantives out of the neut. of particles as in classical Greek is much commoner in Lk and A. than in the rest of N. T."

¹³² Cf. Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

¹³³ Gersdorf, Harnack.

New Testament only at Lk. xxiv. 29, and does not appear in the Septuagint; but a stronger argument, perhaps, is to be derived from the use of *σύν* in general. According to Hawkins,¹³⁴ *σύν* occurs three times in Lk. i-ii, twenty times in the rest of Luke, fifty-two times in Acts, four times in Matthew, six times in Mark, three times in John, thirty-eight times in Paul, and twice in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, *μετά* with the genitive is far commoner than *σύν* with the dative. However, *σύν* is not so rare in the Septuagint as to render surprising the occurrences in Lk. i-ii. It should be observed that *μετά* is commoner than *σύν* in Lk. i-ii. It is also commoner in the rest of Luke, but not in Acts.

ὑπέστρεψεν.¹³⁵ *ὑποστρέφειν* occurs four times in Lk. i-ii, seventeen times in the rest of Luke, eleven times in Acts, perhaps once in Mark,¹³⁶ once in 2 Peter, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, the word occurs perhaps twenty-four times, but in many of these cases the text is doubtful. These facts are decidedly significant. In all probability, the use of the word in Lk. i-ii is due to the hand of Luke.

Verse 57. *ὁ χρόνος τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν*. No argument for Lucan authorship can be drawn from this use of the genitive of the articular infinitive,¹³⁷ for Stanton¹³⁸ aptly cites Gen. xxv. 24 *καὶ ἐπληρώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν*.

Verse 58. *ἐμεγάλυνεν κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτῆς*.¹³⁹ This use of *μετ' αὐτῆς* is no sign of Lucan style, for *ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετὰ τινος* is a regular Septuagint phrase, formed in imitation of Hebrew.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 22. Cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 8, 88.

¹³⁵ Gersdorf, Harnack, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 285, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 23; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

¹³⁶ Mk. xiv. 40. The text is at least very doubtful. The reading *υποστρεψας* is opposed by $\times$ BL.

¹³⁷ See Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 280.

¹³⁸ *Op. cit.*, ii. p. 293. Also Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

¹³⁹ Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 25, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

¹⁴⁰ See PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, x (1912). p. 13. Cf. Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

Verse 62. $\tau\acute{o}$.¹⁴¹ $\tau\acute{o}$ before the interrogative $\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ or $\tau\acute{\iota}$ occurs, according to Hawkins,¹⁴² once in Lk. i-ii, four times in the rest of Luke, once in Acts, once in Paul, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. A similar use of $\tau\acute{o}$ before $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ occurs twice in Acts.¹⁴³ An investigation of the Septuagint usage would be interesting. Very probably, however, this use of $\tau\acute{o}$ is a genuine mark of Luke's hand. But Stanton should be given careful attention when he says:¹⁴⁴ "But all that was necessary in order to produce this 'Lucan' feature was that the neut. art. should be inserted, which we see to have been actually what has happened at Lk. ix. 46 = Mk. ix. 34."¹⁴⁵ Such features are just what a reviser could add with least derangement of his source; they indicate, therefore, Lucan editorship, but not necessarily Lucan authorship.

Verse 64. $\piαραχρῆμα$ ¹⁴⁶ occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, nine times in the rest of Luke, six times in Acts, twice in Matthew (in the same passage), and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. The word occurs only eighteen times at most in the Septuagint. The occurrence of it in Lk. i. 64 may indicate the hand of Luke.

Verse 65. $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota} \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma \phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\varsigma$.¹⁴⁷ $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ followed by $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$ with the accusative, and with $\phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\varsigma$ as the subject recurs in the New Testament only at Acts v. 5, 11.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴¹ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 22, 47, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293; cf. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 23, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

¹⁴² *Op. cit.*, p. 47. Some error seems to have crept into the figures on p. 22, which do not agree at all (except for the Gospel of Luke) either with Zimmermann or with p. 47 of Hawkins' own work.

¹⁴³ Hawkins, *loc. cit.*

¹⁴⁴ *Op. cit.*, ii. p. 310.

¹⁴⁵ Mk. ix. 34 $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma \alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \gamma\alpha\rho \delta\iota\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu \epsilon\nu \tau\eta \delta\delta\omega \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$, Lk ix. 46 $\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu \delta\epsilon \delta\iota\alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma, \tau\acute{o} \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \alpha\nu \epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta \mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$. It will be noticed that (supposing that Mark was the source of Luke) Luke has added not only the $\tau\acute{o}$ but also the optative $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$. May not the optatives in Lk. i-ii be similarly explained as due merely to revision of a source?

¹⁴⁶ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 280, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 21; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.* pp. 8, 88.

¹⁴⁷ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 36.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. also Lk. iv. 36 $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron \theta\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota} \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$, and Acts ii. 43 $\phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\varsigma \tau\epsilon \eta\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\varsigma \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota} \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$, where, however, the sentence is omitted by BDE etc.

Compare, however, Gen. xxxv. 5 καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος θεοῦ ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις, 2 Chron. xix. 7 καὶ νῦν γενέσθω φόβος κυρίου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς. According to Hawkins,¹⁴⁹ γίνεσθαι followed by ἐπὶ with the accusative in general occurs once in Lk. i-ii, five times in the rest of Luke, five times in Acts, once in Matthew, once in Mark, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, this usage occurs only about fifty times.¹⁵⁰ When it is observed that in Lk. iv. 64, (Acts ii. 43), and Acts v. 5, 11 the parallel with Lk. i. 64 appears in the ἐπὶ πάντας as well as in the particulars noted above, the indication of Lucan style becomes rather strong.

διαελαλεῖτο.¹⁵¹ The word, which recurs only at Lk. vi. 11 in the New Testament, does not appear in the Septuagint, but occurs a number of times in the translation of Symmachus (in the Psalms).

Verse 66. For ἔθεντο . . . ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν¹⁵² compare 1 Sam. xxi. 12 ἔθετο Δαυεὶδ τὰ ῥήματα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, xxix. 10, Hg. ii. 18.

πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες.¹⁵³ Of the passages cited by Zimmermann, Acts v. 5, 11, ix. 21, x. 44 are really parallel. Acts v. 5b καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας and Acts v. 11 καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας certainly display a remarkable similarity to Lk. i. 65, 66. In the Septuagint, parallels for πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες are apparently scarce. Compare Lev. xxiv. 14.

τί ἄρα (or τίς ἄρα)¹⁵⁴ occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii,

¹⁴⁹ Loc. cit.

¹⁵⁰ Some of the most frequent subjects of the verb are πνεῦμα κυρίου, χεὶρ κυρίου, and ὄργη. 2 Chron. xx. 29 καὶ ἐγένετο ἔκστασις κυρίου ἐπὶ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς γῆς ἐν τῷ ἀκούσαι αὐτοὺς ὅτι κ.τ.λ. and 2 Chron. xiv. 13 (cited by Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 40), with the two passages quoted above (where φόβος is the subject) offer a somewhat closer parallel to Lk. i. 64.

¹⁵¹ Gersdorf, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293.

¹⁵² Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293: cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

¹⁵³ Zimmermann; cf. Harnack, on Lk. ii. 17, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

¹⁵⁴ Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

three times in the rest of Luke, once in Acts, four times in Matthew, once in Mark, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. Though the occurrences of this usage in Matthew prevent it from being regarded as peculiarly Lucan, yet the extreme rarity or non-occurrence of it in the Septuagint¹⁵⁵ suggests the hypothesis of Lucan editing, if not Lucan authorship.

χεὶρ κυρίου ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.¹⁵⁶ This expression recurs in the New Testament only at Acts xi. 21 *καὶ ἦν χεὶρ κυρίου μετ' αὐτῶν*. Acts xiii. 11 *καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ χεὶρ κυρίου ἐπὶ σέ* is different.¹⁵⁷ In the Septuagint, the expression does not occur, though 1 Chron. iv. 10 *καὶ ἦν ἡ χεὶρ σου [referring to God] μετ' ἐμοῦ* is very similar.¹⁵⁸ Gersdorf has here perhaps detected a true indication of Lucan style which has been overlooked by many more recent investigators.

Verse 80. *ἡύξανε*.¹⁵⁹ *αὐξάνειν* occurs twice in Lk. i-ii, perhaps twice in the rest of Luke,¹⁶⁰ four times in Acts, twice in Matthew, once in Mark, once in John, nine times in Paul, twice in the Catholic Epistles, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. It is not the mere occurrence of the word in Acts which is interesting, but its occurrence in summaries which are somewhat similar to Lk. i. 80 and ii. 40. But for the *ἡύξησεν . . . καὶ ἐπληθύνθη* of Acts vii. 17 and the *ἡύξανεν καὶ ἐπληθύνετο* of Acts xii. 24, compare Gen. i. 22; and for Lk. i. 80 and ii. 40 compare Gen. xxi. 8 *καὶ ἡύξήθη τὸ παιδίον*.¹⁶¹

ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις.¹⁶² For the plural *αἱ ἔρημοι*, which re-

¹⁵⁵ A has *τινα ἀρα* in Job xv. 2.

¹⁵⁶ Gersdorf; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

¹⁵⁷ *ἐπὶ c. acc.* stands instead of *μετὰ c. gen.*, and the expression is used in a bad sense.

¹⁵⁸ There is some Old Testament basis for the conception of the hand of the Lord as the source of strength and prosperity; though sometimes, also, the conception is like that in Acts xiii. 11.

¹⁵⁹ Zimmermann.

¹⁶⁰ In Lk. xii. 27, the text is doubtful.

¹⁶¹ Which, it must be admitted, is not a very close parallel.

¹⁶² Gersdorf.

curs in the New Testament only at Lk. v. 16,¹⁶³ compare Ezek. xiii. 4 *ὡς ἀλώπεκες ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις οἱ προφήται σου, Ἰσραήλ.*

*ἀναδείξως.*¹⁶⁴ *ἀνάδειξις*, which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, occurs in the Septuagint only at Si. xliii. 6. *ἀναδεικνύναι*, which occurs in the New Testament only at Lk. x. 1 and Acts i. 24, occurs only about eighteen times in the Septuagint, of which half are in 2, 3, 4 Maccabees. However, the meaning "to exhibit publicly as a king or officer", which appears not only six times in 1 Esdras and once in Daniel, but also perhaps in Hab. iii. 2,¹⁶⁵ approaches far more closely to Lk. i. 80 than does the use of the word in Acts. *ὑποδεικνύναι* is fairly common in the Septuagint.

Chapter ii. Verse 1. *δόγμα*,¹⁶⁶ which occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only twice in Acts and twice in Paul, is rare in the Septuagint, but occurs frequently in the Daniel of Theodotion.¹⁶⁷ Holtzmann¹⁶⁸ compares Dan. ii. 13 *τὸ δόγμα ἐξήλθεν*. The occurrence of the word in a Jewish Christian work (supposing Lk. i-ii to be such) is not surprising. When a Jewish Christian wished to speak of things that had to do with the Empire, his vocabulary would naturally approach more closely than elsewhere to that of an historian like Luke.

*οἰκουμένην.*¹⁶⁹ The word *οἰκουμένη*, which occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, twice in the rest of Luke, five times in Acts, once in Matthew, once in Paul, twice in Hebrews, three times in the Apocalypse, and not at all in

¹⁶³ With the same preposition as in this passage: *αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις.*

¹⁶⁴ Gersdorf, Zimmermann.

¹⁶⁵ *ἐν τῷ παρῆναι τὸν καιρὸν ἀναδειχθήσῃ.* The Lord is here addressed.

¹⁶⁶ Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 31, 99.

¹⁶⁷ On this translation and its connection with the Septuagint, see Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, pp. 46ff.

¹⁶⁸ Die Synoptiker, in *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, 3te Aufl., 1901, in *loc.*

¹⁶⁹ Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 29; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 22, 92.

the rest of the New Testament, is rather frequent in the Septuagint, for example in the Psalms.

Verse 2. ἀπογραφή¹⁷⁰ is rare in the Septuagint. But the coincidence with Acts v. 37 is due of course to the similarity of what was to be designated.

ἡγεμονεύοντος. Gersdorf compares Lk. iii. 1.¹⁷¹ The comparison is interesting. ἡγεμονεύειν does not occur in the Septuagint, but ἡγεμονία occurs a number of times, and ἡγεμών is fairly common.

Verse 4. δὲ καί¹⁷² occurs, according to Hawkins, once in Lk. i-ii, twenty-four times in the rest of Luke, seven times in Acts, three times in Matthew, twice in Mark, eight times in John, twenty-two times in Paul, and five times in the rest of the New Testament. An investigation of the Septuagint usage would be interesting. But the single occurrence in Lk. i-ii is perhaps without special significance.

διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτόν.¹⁷³ διὰ τό with the infinitive occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, seven times in the rest of Luke, eight times in Acts, three times in Matthew, three times in Mark, once in John, once in Paul, three times in Hebrews, once in the Catholic Epistles, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint it is fairly common. The single occurrence in Lk. i-ii is of no great significance.

Verse 8. φυλάσσουντες.¹⁷⁴ This verb is exceedingly common in the Septuagint. For φυλάσσουντες φυλακάς¹⁷⁵ compare Num. iii. 7 φυλάξουσιν τὰς φυλακάς αὐτοῦ, etc. For the somewhat similar expression ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν in verse 9, compare Jonah i. 10 ἐφοβήθησαν οἱ ἄνδρες φόβον μέγαν (or φόβῳ μεγάλῳ).

¹⁷⁰ Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

¹⁷¹ In that passage, D has ἐπιτροπευοντος instead of ἡγεμονευοντος.

¹⁷² Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 37; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 15f., 91.

¹⁷³ Gersdorf.

¹⁷⁴ Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 23; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 32, 100.

¹⁷⁵ Zimmermann; cf. Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 290, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 284f.

Verse 9. ἐπέστη.¹⁷⁶ ἐφιστάναι occurs twice in Lk. i-ii, five times in the rest of Luke, eleven times in Acts,¹⁷⁷ three times in Paul, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. In the New Testament, the verb is always intransitive;¹⁷⁸ in the Septuagint, it is usually transitive, and when it is intransitive it is not often followed by the dative. The word looks like a genuine mark of the hand of Luke.

περιέλαμψεν.¹⁷⁹ περιλάμπειν, which appears elsewhere in the New Testament only at Acts xxvi. 13, does not occur at all in the Septuagint, and the simple verb λάμπειν is not common. The parallel is worthy of notice, but in view of the ease with which compound verbs could be formed it is perhaps of no great significance. Similarity in the event described might have produced the similarity in expression.

With verse 9 καὶ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς καὶ δόξα κυρίου περιέλαμψεν αὐτούς compare Acts xii. 7 ἰδὸν ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐπέστη, καὶ φῶς ἔλαμψεν ἐν τῷ οἰκήματι.¹⁸⁰

The parallel is interesting, but the connection between an angel of the Lord and "light" is natural enough, and does not necessarily indicate common authorship. And why may not the similarity of expression be due to dependence of the author of Acts xii. 7 upon the source of Lk. ii. 9?¹⁸¹

Verse 10. παντὶ τῷ λαῷ.¹⁸² πᾶς (or ἅπας) ὁ λαός occurs, according to Hawkins, once in Lk. i-ii, nine times in the rest of Luke, six times in Acts, once in Matthew, once in Hebrews, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament (once in *pericope de adultera*). It is a regular Septuagint phrase, occurring, for example, twenty times in Exodus.

¹⁷⁶ Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 19, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 280, 293.

¹⁷⁷ Compare especially Acts xii. 7 ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐπέστη.

¹⁷⁸ That is, the intransitive parts of the verb are used.

¹⁷⁹ Zimmermann, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 43.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Gersdorf, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

¹⁸¹ Cf. PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, x (1912). pp. 11f., and below, pp. 255f.

¹⁸² Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 21, 45.

Verse 13. *ἐξαίφνης*¹⁸³ occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, once in the rest of Luke, twice in Acts, once in Matthew, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. The word occurs only about ten times in the Septuagint. It is doubtful whether the occurrence in Lk. ii. 13 is of any special significance.¹⁸⁴

στρατιᾶς οὐρανόου (or *οὐρανοῦ*). Gersdorf^{184a} cites Acts vii. 42 *τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. But with Lk. ii. 13 compare 1 Kings xxii. 19, Neh. ix. 6, Hos. xiii. 4; and with Acts vii. 42 compare 2 Chron. xxxiii. 3, 5, Zeph. i. 5, Jer. vii. 18, viii. 2, xix. 13. *στρατιὰ οὐρανοῦ* or the like occurs in all these passages.

αἰνούντων.¹⁸⁵ *αἰνεῖν* occurs twice in Lk. i-ii, once (possibly twice) in the rest of Luke, three times in Acts, once in Paul (citation), once in the Apocalypse, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. The word is common in the Septuagint, and is very frequently used of the praise of God.

Verse 14. With this verse Gersdorf compares Lk. xix. 38, where the second part of the verse reads *ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις*. These words are not found in the other Gospels, but take the place in Luke of the *ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις* in Matthew and Mark. But what is the relation between this Lucan addition and the angelic song of Lk. ii. 14? The two have two things in common; the *δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις*, and the conjunction of this with *εἰρήνη ἐν*. With regard to the former point, Ryle and James¹⁸⁶ can cite an interesting parallel in Ps. Sol. xviii. 11 (xix. 1) *ἐνδοξος ἐν ὑψίστοις κατοικῶν*. This

¹⁸³ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293.

¹⁸⁴ The word occurs in Acts ix. 3 and xxii. 6, in corresponding passages in two of the accounts of Paul's conversion, in connection with the light that shone round about him. Cf. *δόξα κυρίου περιέλαμψεν αὐτούς* in Lk. ii. 9.

^{184a} Cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

¹⁸⁵ Zimmermann, Harnack, on verse 20, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 28, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 25, 94.

¹⁸⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. xcii; cf. Gould, in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, 1905, on Lk. ii. 14, Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

suggests the possibility that the *δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις* of Lk. ii. 14 and of Lk. xix. 38 may be quite independent. The idea was a natural one, and also the expression of it. The writer who first put the angelic song into Greek (supposing it to have existed first in Aramaic) may have written independently of him who performed a similar service for the original of Lk. xix. 38. In the latter passage, *ἐν ὑψίστοις*, at any rate, was already given. It stands in the *ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις* of Matthew and Mark. The conjunction of *εἰρήνη* and *δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις* might also be explained as due to mere coincidence, especially since the order is reversed, and since *εἰρήνη* goes with *ἐν οὐρανῷ* in the one case and with *ἐπὶ γῆς* and *ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας* in the other. However, in view of the rather striking parallel between the two passages, other solutions of the problem call for careful consideration. Wellhausen is quite confident that Lk. ii. 14 is dependent upon Lk. xix. 38¹⁸⁷. This hypothesis, however, is apparently connected with the untenable¹⁸⁸ view that Lk. i-ii is an addition to the completed Gospel. The reverse hypothesis, that Lk. xix. 38 is dependent upon Lk. ii. 14, is favored by Holtzmann,¹⁸⁹ B. Weiss,¹⁹⁰ J. Weiss,¹⁹¹ and Gould.¹⁹² In Lk. xix. 38, Holtzmann supposes, the wording of the triumphant cry was exchanged for a reminiscence of the Gloria (Lk. ii. 14), which had already become a hymn of the Christian congregation. There is nothing improbable in this hypothesis; though if a correct view be held with regard to the date of the Gospel, the Gloria must have become a hymn of the Church long before Holtzmann would suppose. If there is de-

¹⁸⁷ *Das Evangelium Lucae*, 1904, p. 109: "Dass Lc. 19, 39 das Muster für 2, 14 ist, unterliegt keinem Zweifel, obgleich Weiss das Verhältnis umkehrt."

¹⁸⁸ See PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, iii (1905), pp. 642-644, iv (1906), pp. 44-49.

¹⁸⁹ *Op. cit.*, on Lk. xix. 38.

¹⁹⁰ In Meyer's *Kommentar*, 9te Aufl., 1901, on Lk. xix. 38.

¹⁹¹ In *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2te Aufl., 1907, on Lk. xix. 38.

¹⁹² *Op. cit.*, 1905, on Lk. xix. 38.

pendence, may it not rather be dependence upon the source of Lk. i-ii, in which the Gloria was already inserted as it appears now. Such dependence would not be irreconcilable with the integrity of Luke as a historian. The cry of the multitude at the triumphal entry of Jesus was not recorded with verbal exactness. Indeed, it was probably not stereotyped in the first place. There were many persons; some said one thing, others another.¹⁹³ It is not surprising, therefore, that the tradition of what was said is not exactly uniform. The characteristic cry of the multitude—what was heard again and again during the descent into the city—might have impressed itself upon the hearer with greater or less fulness. The translation into Greek, moreover, necessarily brought greater divergence from the exact words that were spoken by any person among the multitude. One Aramaic word, Hosanna, has been preserved by three of the Evangelists. Luke, for the benefit of his Greek readers, has substituted Greek words for it. His *ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις* reproduces the spirit and general meaning of the *ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις* which has been preserved by Matthew and Mark. Surely that phrase is not altogether clear.¹⁹⁴ In order to bring out the meaning of the original cry—that is, its real significance in the feeling of the original speakers—literal translation was insufficient. There are cases when amplification is the truest translation.¹⁹⁵ However, to those who have not accepted without modification the current view of Luke's dependence solely upon Mark, it will seem more probable that Lk. xix. 38b is no mere amplification of *ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις*, but rather a reproduction of independent tradition. The decision with regard to that question does not affect essentially the problem involved in the parallel with Lk. ii. 14. For the tradition was not in the first place fixed in a

¹⁹³ Cf. James Cooper, art, "Hosanna" in *Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, i. p. 750.

¹⁹⁴ The modern commentators have experienced enough difficulty with it.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Cooper, *op. cit.*, pp. 750f.

Greek form; if it came to Luke in Greek, it came in a mere translation which might freely be modified. In any case, therefore, Luke may have made use of the words of the angelic doxology in determining the form, though not the content, of the triumphal cry. He may have done so consciously or unconsciously—more probably the latter. The song of the angels, as recorded in the infancy narrative, was familiar to him; the words of it came naturally from his pen when he was putting the similar praise of the multitude into a form which would be both intelligible and impressive for himself and for his Greek readers. Such a solution of the problem is a combination of two hypotheses—the hypothesis that Lk. xix. 38 and Lk. ii. 14 are completely independent of each other, and the hypothesis that the former is dependent upon the latter. The present form of Lk. xix. 38 is due partly to a real coincidence in the original praises rendered to God, and partly to Luke's familiarity with the wording of the angelic hymn. The similarity, therefore, between Lk. ii. 14 and Lk. xix. 38 does not prove that Luke was the author of the former as well as of the latter. He may have been the first to put the angels' song into Greek (that would perhaps help to explain his familiarity with its wording and his natural employment of it without artificial imitation), but such an hypothesis is not necessary.¹⁹⁶

Verse 15. *διέλθωμεν*.¹⁹⁷ *διέρχεσθαι* occurs twice in Lk.

¹⁹⁶ Of course, the above solution might be reversed. Luke might be supposed to have received Lk. xix. 38 in its present form and then conformed the wording of the angelic hymn to it. But that view is less probable. In view of what has been said above (p. 245), Luke must be pronounced less likely to have altered the wording of the angelic hymn than the wording of the cry of the multitude. At any rate, this view is improbable unless Luke was the first translator of Lk. ii. 14. In that case, he might have allowed himself more freedom. Finally, against the view that he actually composed the angelic hymn himself, various objections present themselves. For instance, the very bold Hebraism, *ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας* (in all probability the correct reading) would be inexplicable.

¹⁹⁷ Gersdorf, Harnack, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 17, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 283; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 7, 87.

i-ii, eight times in the rest of Luke, twenty times in Acts, once (in Mt. xix. 24 it is probably not to be read) in Matthew, twice in Mark, twice in John, five times in Paul, once in Hebrews, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, the word is not uncommon. For διέρχεσθαι ἕως¹⁹⁸ compare Gen. xxii. 5 διελευσόμεθα ἕως ὧδε. However, the remarkable preponderance of the word in Luke-Acts as compared with the other New Testament books renders the two occurrences in Lk. i-ii rather significant.

δὴ with the imperative (or hortatory subjunctive),¹⁹⁹ which occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only at Acts xiii. 2 and xv. 36 (in the latter passage with the hortatory subjunctive as in Lk. ii. 15),²⁰⁰ is common in the Septuagint. It occurs, for example, about twenty-four times in Judges, including, of course, the cases where it is used with the subjunctive in prohibitions. It translates the familiar Hebrew כִּי .

ἰδωμεν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο τὸ γεγονός.²⁰¹ τὸ γεγονός occurs, according to Hawkins, once in Lk. i-ii, three times in the rest of Luke (not counting Lk. xxiv. 12), three times in Acts, once in Mark, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. τὸ γεγονός as the object of εἶδον occurs, besides here, only in Lk. viii. 34 (where Mk. v. 14 has ἰδεῖν τί ἐστὶν τὸ γεγονός), 35, Acts xiii. 12. In the Septuagint, compare 1 Sam. iv. 16 τί τὸ γεγονός ῥῆμα²⁰², x. 11 τί τοῦτο τὸ γεγονός τῷ νιῷ Κεῖς²⁰³, Esth. iv. 4, 7,

¹⁹⁸ διέρχεσθαι ἕως occurs in the New Testament, besides here, only three, or possibly four, times in Acts. See Harnack. Cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 20.

¹⁹⁹ Harnack, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 14f.

²⁰⁰ A has it also in Acts vi. 3.

²⁰¹ Gersdorf, Harnack, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 36.

²⁰² ῥῆμα occurs with γεγονός only in Lk. ii. 15 in the New Testament (Gersdorf compares, however, Acts x. 37 τὸ γινόμενον ῥῆμα). This usage is strongly Hebraistic. Cf. above, p. 233.

²⁰³ This passage introduces τοῦτο like Lk. i. 15 (Harnack says, "Luk. liebt das pleonastische Demonstrativpronomen", but cites no passages outside of Lk. i-ii), but the γεγονός here retains more of its participial force.

Judith xv. 1, (Eccl. i. 9), 1 Macc. iv. 21. The significance of τὸ γεγονός as a Lucan characteristic cannot, perhaps, be altogether denied.

Verse 16. σπεύσαντες.²⁰⁴ σπεύδειν occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, twice (in the same context) in the rest of Luke, twice in Acts, once in 2 Peter, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. The participle "is used in a precisely similar manner" in Lk. xix. 5, 6.²⁰⁵ But so it is also in the Septuagint, where, moreover, the word itself is fairly common.

ἀνεῦραν.²⁰⁶ ἀνευρίσκειν, which recurs in the New Testament only at Acts xxi. 4, appears only once in the Septuagint, and that in 4 Maccabees. Possibly this word is an indication of Lucan editing of Lk. i-ii.

τε²⁰⁷ occurs, according to Hawkins, once (here) in Lk. i-ii, eight times in the rest of Luke, about one hundred and thirty-four times in Acts, three times in Matthew, not at all in Mark, three times in John, twenty-three times in Paul, and twenty-two times in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, it is fairly common, but especially in the "literary" parts. It is perhaps an indication of Luke's hand, but the significance of one occurrence must not be exaggerated.

Verse 19. συμβάλλουσα.²⁰⁸ συμβάλλειν occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, once in the rest of Luke, four times in Acts, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. But the meaning varies somewhat in these passages.²⁰⁹ In the Septuagint, the word occurs only twelve times at most. It is perhaps some indication of Lucan style.

²⁰⁴ Gersdorf, Harnack, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293; *cf.* Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 96.

²⁰⁵ Stanton, *loc. cit.*

²⁰⁶ Gersdorf, Harnack, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 293; *cf.* Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

²⁰⁷ Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 22; *cf.* Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 15, 90.

²⁰⁸ Gersdorf, Harnack, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 29, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 293f.; *cf.* Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

²⁰⁹ See Stanton, *loc. cit.*, and Gersdorf.

Verse 20. *δοξάζοντες τὸν θεόν.*²¹⁰ *δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν* occurs, according to Hawkins, once in Lk. i-ii, seven times in the rest of Luke, three times in Acts, twice in Matthew, once in Mark, twice in John, six times in Paul, and three times in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, it occurs only at Judg. ix. 9 (A has a different reading) and at Dan. iii. 51 (both Septuagint and Theodotion);²¹¹ though of course *δοξάζειν* is used of the praise of God in passages where the noun *θεός* does not appear as the object. The expression is perhaps some indication of Lucan style.

Verse 25. *εὐλαβής*²¹² occurs in the New Testament only here and three times in Acts. In the Septuagint, it occurs only three times at most. It is perhaps some indication of Lucan style.²¹³

*προσδεχόμενος.*²¹⁴ *προσδέχεσθαι* occurs twice in Lk. i-ii, three times in the rest of Luke, twice in Acts, once in Mark, three times in Paul, twice in Hebrews, once in Jude, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. It is not uncommon in the Septuagint. With the present passage and verse 38 may be compared Job. ii. 9a *προσδεχόμενος τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς σωτηρίας μου* and Wi. xviii. 7 *προσεδέχθη ὑπὸ λαοῦ σου σωτηρία μὲν δικαίων*. Neither of these passages, however, had a Semitic original.²¹⁵

*παράκλησιν.*²¹⁶ *παράκλησις*, which occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, once in the rest of Luke, four times in Acts, twenty times in Paul, three times in Hebrews, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament, occurs only about fifteen times in the Septuagint. Holtzmann²¹⁷ compares Is.

²¹⁰ Gersdorf, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

²¹¹ Also at Dan xi. 38 (Theodotion), with reference to a false god.

²¹² Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 294; cf. Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt*, pp. 73f., Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

²¹³ Cf. Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

²¹⁴ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

²¹⁵ With regard to the former, see Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

²¹⁶ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 29; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 32, 100.

²¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, in *loc.*

xl. 1. Compare also the passages from Jewish writings cited by Wettstein,²¹⁸ and Dalman.²¹⁹

Verse 27. *εἰσαγαγεῖν*.²²⁰ *εἰσάγειν*, which occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, twice in the rest of Luke, six times in Acts, once in John, once in Hebrews, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament, is very common in the Septuagint.

Verse 28. *ἐδέξατο*.²²¹ *δέχεσθαι* occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, sixteen²²² times in the rest of Luke, eight²²³ times in Acts, ten²²⁴ times in Matthew, six²²⁵ times in Mark, once in John, thirteen times in Paul, once in Hebrews, once in James, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, it is not uncommon.

Verse 29. *δέσποτα*.²²⁶ *δεσπότης* is fairly common in the Septuagint, being often used, as here and in Acts ii. 24, in addressing God.

It should be noticed that in the *Nunc dimittis* (verses 29-32) specifically Lucan features are absent.²²⁷ The Messianic hope is expressed entirely in Old Testament forms. The universalism is the universalism of the prophets. The nations of the earth are to do honor to Israel for the light that proceeds from her. Besides the Old Testament parallels, compare Ps. Sol. xvii. 32, 34f.²²⁸

Verse 33. *θαυμάζοντες ἐπὶ*.²²⁹ *θαυμάζειν ἐπὶ*, which

²¹⁸ *In loc.*

²¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 89f.

²²⁰ Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

²²¹ Zimmermann.

²²² Zimmermann says fifteen.

²²³ So Moulton and Geden. Zimmermann says nine.

²²⁴ Zimmermann says six. Seven of the occurrences, it is true, are in the same context.

²²⁵ Zimmermann says three. Four of the occurrences are in the same context.

²²⁶ Gersdorf, Zimmermann.

²²⁷ Compare the investigation of the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus* in the former article, *PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW*, x (1912). pp. 1-38.

²²⁸ Cited by Ryle and James, *op. cit.*, p. xcii.

²²⁹ Gersdorf, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 41; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

in the New Testament appears only in Luke-Acts (five times in all), occurs about eleven times in the Septuagint.

Verse 34. ἀντιλεγόμενον.²³⁰ ἀντιλέγειν, which occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, probably not at all in the rest of Luke (in Lk. xx. 27 it is probably not to be read), four times in Acts, once in John, once in Romans (citation), twice in 1 Timothy, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament, occurs about eight times in the Septuagint.

Verse 35. διαλογισμοί.²³¹ διαλογισμός is much more common in the Gospel of Luke than in any other New Testament book, and of the thirteen New Testament occurrences of διαλέγεσθαι, ten are in Acts. Both words occur in the Septuagint, though not with great frequency.

Verse 36. ἔτη.²³² ἔτος, which occurs, according to Hawkins, twenty-six times in Luke-Acts (four times in Lk. i-ii), as against twenty-three times in the rest of the New Testament, is exceedingly common in the Septuagint.

Verse 37. ἀφίστατο.²³³ ἀφιστάναι occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, three times in the rest of Luke, six times in Acts, three times in Paul, once in Hebrews, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. It is common in the Septuagint.

λατρεύουσα νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν.²³⁴ λατρεύειν νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν occurs in the New Testament only here and in Acts xxvi. 7, and in the Septuagint not at all. The parallel is interesting.

Verse 38. ἀντὶ τῆς ὥρας.²³⁵ The phrase (with or without ἐν) occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, five times in the rest of Luke, twice in Acts and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. It occurs only a few times in the Septuagint.²³⁶ The phrase may perhaps be regarded as a genuine mark of Lucan style.

²³⁰ Gersdorf, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 294.

²³¹ Gersdorf, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

²³² Zimmermann, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 19; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 23, 94.

²³³ Gersdorf, Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

²³⁴ Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 36, 100.

²³⁵ Gersdorf, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 294; cf. Hawkins, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

²³⁶ Perhaps because the word ὥρα itself is not common there.

Verse 40. σοφία, καὶ χάρις.²³⁷ Compare verse 52 ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ . . . καὶ χάριτι. A similar association of χάρις and σοφία occurs at Acts vii. 10 (in the speech of Stephen). In the Septuagint, Eccl. x. 12 λόγοι στόματος σοφοῦ χάρις may perhaps be compared.

Verse 43. ὑπέμεινεν.²³⁸ ὑπομένειν in the sense of "remain" occurs again in the New Testament only at Acts xvii. 14. But compare (in the Septuagint) Num. xx. 19, Judg. iii. 25.²³⁹

Verse 44. νομίσαντες.²⁴⁰ νομίζειν occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, once (Lk. iii. 23, in connection with the genealogy) in the rest of Luke, seven times in Acts, three times in Paul, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. With the infinitive,²⁴¹ it occurs only here and six times in Acts. In the Septuagint, the word is rare, occurring only once outside of Wisdom and 2, 3, 4 Maccabees. It seems to be a genuine mark of the hand of Luke.

ἀναζητοῦντες.²⁴² ἀναζητεῖν occurs in the New Testament, besides here and in the next verse, only at Acts xi. 25. In the Septuagint, it occurs only three times, and that in the "literary" books, Job and 2 Maccabees. The case is somewhat similar to that of νομίζειν.

Verse 46. ἐν μέσῳ²⁴³ is common in the Septuagint.

Verse 47. ἐξίσταντο.²⁴⁴ The word occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, twice in the rest of Luke, eight times in Acts, once in Matthew, four times in Mark, once in Paul, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. In the Septuagint, it is not uncommon. However, the exact parallel of

²³⁷ Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

²³⁸ Gersdorf, Harnack.

²³⁹ Of verses 42, 43 Harnack says: "Die ganze Periode ist echt lukanisch, auch in dem Wechsel des Tempus ἀναβαινόντων und τελειωσάντων."

²⁴⁰ Harnack; cf. Gersdorf, Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

²⁴¹ Gersdorf; cf. Friedrich, *loc. cit.*

²⁴² Harnack, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 294; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

²⁴³ Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 22, 92.

²⁴⁴ Harnack.

Lk. ii. 47 with Acts ix. 21 ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες²⁴⁵ is striking.

Verse 48. ὀδυνώμενοι.²⁴⁶ The verb occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only at Lk. xvi. 24, 25 and Acts xx. 38. In the Septuagint it occurs only ten times.²⁴⁷

The preceding investigation has by no means discredited the contention of Harnack and others that Lk. i-ii exhibits a remarkable linguistic affinity with the rest of the Gospel and Acts. The existence of the parallels must freely be admitted. The only question is how they shall be interpreted. Harnack interprets them as evidence that the author of Luke and Acts was also the author of the infancy narrative, and that for this narrative he was not dependent upon written sources. But is this the only possible interpretation? Other interpretations have suggested themselves in the course of the investigation.

In the first place, many of the parallels between Lk. i-ii and the rest of Luke and Acts have been explained as due

²⁴⁵ Harnack.

²⁴⁶ Harnack, Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 294; cf. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

²⁴⁷ In the course of Harnack's investigation, he notices a number of words and phrases, which, apparently according to his own admission, tell against, rather than for, his thesis. So, for example, ὁρεινή (Lk. i. 39, 65) occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, but is common enough in the Septuagint (Harnack says: "fehlt sonst im N. T., steht aber im Buch Judith". As a matter of fact, though it is commonest in Judith, it occurs also elsewhere in the Septuagint. It is frequent in Joshua). Again, for πῶθεν μοι τοῦτο (Lk. i. 43) Harnack can compare only Mt. xiii. 54, 56, xv. 33. Mk. vi. 2. Again, with regard to ἴνα κ.τ.λ. in the same verse, Harnack remarks, "dieser Gebrauch der Κοινή für den Infinit. ist bei Luk. sonst m. W. nicht zu belegen, im N. T. aber doch schon häufiger". Vogel, *op. cit.*, pp. 35f., detects in Lk. i-ii a certain general tone which connects this narrative with the rest of Luke—Acts: "Mit hellenischer Art zur schönen Einheit vermählt tritt uns aber bei L. noch ein Weiteres entgegen, was ich in die Worte: Feinfühligkeit, Innigkeit, Weitherzigkeit zusammenfassen möchte, um das missdeutbare Wort Humanität zu vermeiden". This unity of tone cannot be denied. But perhaps it is due partly to Luke's choice of materials, and not solely to his treatment of the materials which he had. Even if Luke found Lk. i-ii ready to hand, one can still admire in him the artist who had discernment enough not to spoil, but perhaps even, by sympathetic editing, to improve, the wonderful story.

simply to a common dependence upon the Septuagint—or rather, perhaps, in the case of Luke, dependence upon the Septuagint, and in the case of Lk. i-ii, in addition to dependence upon the Septuagint, an independent operation of the same forces which produced the style of the Septuagint.²⁴⁸ Harnack himself admits that the style of the infancy narrative is not entirely Lucan. “The narrative in Chapters i and ii”, he says, “is, regarded linguistically, a product of Bible (Septuagint) Greek with the Greek that belonged to the author himself.” The style of Lk. i-ii is “artistically and successfully imitated from the Greek of the Septuagint, but mingled with this the narrative exhibits in almost every verse the elements and the vocabulary of the author’s own style”.²⁴⁹ Harnack’s method of investigation, then, is essentially this: subtract from Lk. i-ii the elements that have been taken from the Septuagint, and what remains is purely Lucan. But the conclusion to be drawn depends upon the amount of the Lucan residuum. The Lucan element, after subtraction of what has been derived from the Septuagint, is so large, Harnack maintains, that nothing short of Lucan authorship will explain it. If the Lucan residuum were smaller, perhaps Harnack would be content with the hypothesis of Lucan editing, as in the body of the Gospel. But the preceding investigation has had just this result—the reduction of the Lucan residuum. The Septuagint element in Lk. i-ii is found to be much larger than Harnack supposed, and the purely Lucan element correspondingly smaller.

In the second place, some of the parallels between Lk. i-ii and the rest of Luke and Acts have been explained as due probably to dependence of Luke upon various sources of the same type. With what part of Luke-Acts is Lk. i-ii to be compared in order to exhibit its Lucan character? Obviously the comparison should be made with parts where

²⁴⁸ Even in the case of Luke, the dependence must not be represented as mechanical. The Septuagint was the Bible of the Christian Luke. Its phraseology became to some extent part and parcel of his life.

²⁴⁹ Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt*, pp. 74, 75.

Luke's own style appears in its purity. But this is not certainly the case, for example, in the former part of Acts, especially in the speeches which are there attributed to Jewish Christians. Very probably Luke is there using sources, and sources of a Jewish Christian character very much like the source that has been posited for Lk. i-ii. Therefore, affinity of Lk. i-ii for those early chapters in Acts does not necessarily prove Lucan authorship. It may prove nothing more than authorship by a Jewish Christian, whose linguistic and religious environment was the same as that of the authors who produced the sources of the Lucan account of the primitive Jewish church.

Finally, even if Lk. i-ii is found to coincide in a certain usage with the admittedly and purely Lucan parts of Luke and Acts, that does not necessarily prove dependence of Lk. i-ii upon the Lucan usage in question. For the dependence may be the other way. Such a possibility has usually been ignored. But quite unjustifiably. That Luke's style has been colored by phrases in the Benedictus and in the angelic doxology has already been shown to be probable;²⁵⁰ and there is no reason why the dependence should not be extended to the narrative portions of Lk. i-ii, if Luke was really using a written source in that section of his Gospel. Luke was attracted, not unnaturally, by the simple grandeur and poetic dignity of the "Bible style", and followed the Old Testament model in his own sacred narrative.²⁵¹ But why should such influence have been exerted by the Old Testament alone? If Lk. i-ii is what at first sight it seems to be, a poetic narrative produced on the very native soil of the Old Testament, at a time when the Old Testament type of poetry had not yet become a thing of the remote past, and if this narrative fell into the hands of Luke, what more natural than that it, as well as the Old Testament, should impress itself permanently upon his mind and fancy? Surely it is not inferior to the best of what the Old Testa-

²⁵⁰ See PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, x (1912). pp. 11f., and above, pp. 243-246.

²⁵¹ See PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, x (1912). p. 2.

ment can offer, and it is concerned with the events most stimulating to the Christian imagination. It may well have taken a place side by side with the Old Testament in moulding the literary gifts of the Greek historian for a sacred use.²⁵²

However, after all deductions have been made, the Lucan residuum in the style of Lk. i-ii remains amply sufficient to prove that the author of Luke-Acts certainly had a part in the production of the present form of the infancy narrative.²⁵³ Some of the "Lucan characteristics" that have been examined above are discovered not to be also characteristic of the Septuagint. Many of them are found not only in the former parts of Acts, but also in the latter, and more certainly and purely Lucan, part. Finally, some of them were certainly not taken by Luke from Lk. i-ii, for these belong not to Semitizing Greek or even to popular Greek, but rather to the literary form of the *Koinḗ*. Hence Luke was at least the editor of Lk. i-ii. These chapters

²⁵² Cf. Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 291: "Luke may have been led to use the expressions in question [ἐγένετο, etc.] partly from his own familiarity with the LXX., partly from his having become accustomed to them in copying this document at the beginning." Also Feine, *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas*, 1891, p. 20: "Die Quellschrift, die wir verfolgen, ist ja auch nur in diesem einen Evangelium verwendet worden, wir haben also für ihre Beurteilung keinen ausserhalb des dritten Evangeliums liegenden Massstab. Dazu kommt, dass wenn diese Quellschrift ein hebräischartiges Gepräge getragen hat, von Lukas selbst bekanntermassen auch hebraisierende Wendungen in seinen beiden Schriften herrühren, und dass Lukas es auch verstanden hat, sich das Sprachgut seiner Quellen anzueignen und selbständig wieder zu verwenden."

²⁵³ Köhler, Zu den kanonischen Geburts- und Jugendgeschichten Jesu, in *Schweizerische Theologische Zeitschrift*, xix (1902). p. 221, is guilty of exaggeration when he says, "An den lucanischen Stil von 1, 5-2, 52 glaubt niemand mehr", and of injustice when he dismisses the investigations of Harnack, "Die beiden Arbeiten Harnacks [in *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1900, and in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1901] sind Spreu, die neben den unzähligen goldenen Weizenkörnern eben auch auf dem Forschungsacker des grossen Theologen gereift sind". This harsh judgment may be correct so far as the latter of the two articles is concerned (see *PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW*, iv (1906), pp. 50-59), but certainly not with regard to the former.

belong to the Third Gospel in its original form. That fact was established beyond contradiction by Gersdorf nearly one hundred years ago. It has been confirmed, not disproved, by the preceding investigation.

Thus the first (and perhaps the most important) result of the above examination of the argument which Harnack and Zimmermann have developed for detecting Lucan style in Lk. i-ii has been a clear confirmation of that argument. In the birth narrative, the hand of Luke has certainly been at work. That conclusion, it is believed, has been strengthened rather than weakened by the criticism to which it has been subjected in the preceding pages. Some of the supposed indications of Lucan style have been eliminated; but the severity of the test has only exhibited all the more clearly the genuineness of the proofs that remain.

On the other hand, however, the investigation has resulted in a deepened impression of the affinity of Lk. i-ii for the Septuagint. Many of the supposed Lucan characteristics have been shown to be merely characteristics of the Septuagint. Of course Harnack himself admitted the presence of a large Septuagint element in Lk. i-ii. But the present investigation makes that element much larger than Harnack supposed. This remarkable affinity of Lk. i-ii for the language of the Septuagint, which has appeared even in the case of those words or phrases for which parallels have been cited in the rest of Luke and Acts, points to a Jewish Christian origin of the narrative. And of course these instances do not exhaust the list of the Hebraisms or Aramaisms²⁵⁴ which are to be found in Lk. i-ii.²⁵⁵ A complete

²⁵⁴ By "Hebraism" or "Aramaism" is to be understood not merely a word or phrase which is found in Greek only on account of the influence of Hebrew or Aramaic, but also a word or phrase the frequency of which, or the use of which in its present context, is fairly to be traced to the influence of Hebrew or Aramaic.

²⁵⁵ For the Semitic character of the language of Lk. i-ii, see especially Hillmann, *Die Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu nach Lukas*, in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, xvii (1891), pp. 193ff., Feine, *op. cit.*, pp. 17ff., Resch, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-43, 45-51, 55f.; and for a list of apparently non-Lucan expressions, see Stanton, *op. cit.*, ii. pp. 294f.

list of such characteristic Old Testament expressions would amount almost to a transcript of the whole narrative. Stronger still is the argument which is to be derived not from details but from the spirit and temper of the whole. The Semitic coloring has not been produced by such a merely artificial imitation as might have been possible for a Gentile.

Thus the form of the narrative furnishes evidence of Jewish Christian origin. Stronger yet is the evidence which is to be derived not from the form but from the content.

In the first place, the familiarity which Lk. i-ii exhibits with regard to Jewish customs and Palestinian conditions is a strong argument for placing the origin of the narrative in Palestine. The events are dated not by reference to world-rulers, as is partly the case in Lk. iii. 1, but simply by the phrase "in the days of Herod, king of Judea".²⁵⁶ The author is familiar with the courses of priests and with the name at least of one of them, yet enters into no explanations as a Gentile would naturally have done.²⁵⁷ Lk. i. 8-10, 21 display an intimate and detailed acquaintance with the procedure in the offering of incense. Lk. i. 39 seems to be written from a Judean point of view. "The hill country" without qualifying word or phrase means the hill country of Judea.²⁵⁸ The custom of circumcision and of the naming of the child is of course perfectly familiar to the narrator.²⁵⁹ Events which concern the Empire at large are referred to only in the vaguest way. Lk. ii. 1 loses its difficulty, perhaps, when it is understood as written by a provincial. The writer knows merely that the census in Judea is part of a great imperial measure. He does not know or care how or when or how completely the enrollment was carried out in other provinces. Just so, without perspective, would the events in the history of the Empire naturally appear in the

²⁵⁶ See Hillmann, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

²⁵⁷ See Hillmann, *loc. cit.*

²⁵⁸ See Hillmann, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

²⁵⁹ Lk. i. 59ff., ii. 21.

eyes of an inhabitant of Palestine.^{259a} The technical expressions *οἶκος* and *πατριά* and *φυλή* are incidentally used.²⁶⁰ The author knows the provisions of the law about purification after childbirth and consecration of the first-born.²⁶¹ He represents the parents of Jesus as choosing the alternative offering prescribed for the poor²⁶² which they would probably have chosen in actual fact. Yet he does not call attention to the alternative, as he would probably have done if his narrative had been the product of a learned study of the law.²⁶³ The pious custom of visiting the temple for worship and prayer, as illustrated by Simeon and Anna, is described in sympathetic terms. The author is not only familiar with the custom of visiting the temple at the feast of the Passover, but one of these journeys is described with a wealth of detail that makes an irresistible impression of intimate acquaintance. The scene formed by the doctors with the boy Jesus is also described in perfect harmony with what can be learned of the customs of the Jewish teachers.

Some objection, however, has been urged against the accuracy of the author's knowledge of Jewish customs so far as the passage Lk. ii. 22-24 is concerned.

In the first place, *τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν* in Lk. ii. 22 is thought to involve an error. According to the twelfth chapter of Leviticus, it was the mother who was regarded as ceremonially unclean, whereas Lk. ii. 22 apparently extends the impurity to the father also.²⁶⁴ For *αὐτῶν* refers most naturally to Joseph and Mary (the subject of *ἀνήγα-*

^{259a} This suggestion with regard to Lk. ii. 1 is ventured upon only with caution. No adequate discussion of the census could here be attempted.

²⁶⁰ Lk. ii. 4, 36. See Feine, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

²⁶¹ Lk. ii. 22-24.

²⁶² Lk. ii. 24.

²⁶³ Cf. Feine, *loc. cit.*

²⁶⁴ No doubt *αὐτῶν* is the correct reading. *αὐτῆς* is very weakly attested. *αὐτοῦ* is supported by D and a few other witnesses. Syr^{s1a} may go back either to *αὐτῆς* or to *αὐτοῦ* (see Merx, *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas*, 1905, p. 191). *αὐτῆς* is manifestly a correction; *αὐτοῦ* perhaps also, though, if so, the correction was certainly very unfortunate.

γον), rather than to Mary and the Child, as is maintained by De Wette and Alford. But the writer can hardly mean that the husband was regarded as ceremonially unclean like the wife. That would involve an ignorance greater than would be natural even in a Gentile, if he had studied the customs of the Jews enough to be so accurate in other particulars. Rather is the husband thought of as involved not in the uncleanness of the wife, but merely in the purification of the uncleanness. The ceremonial impurity belonged to the wife alone; but the purification, so far as it involved a journey to Jerusalem and the purchasing of the offering, belonged naturally to the husband as well.²⁶⁵

In the second place, it is objected that according to the law, the first-born son was to be redeemed²⁶⁶ rather than actually presented in the temple.²⁶⁷ But that only means that the presentation was not absolutely necessary. In order to make the ceremony of redemption more impressive, the presence of the child would be advisable. It is true that the redemption money is not mentioned in the narrative. But that does not prove that the author did not understand it to have been paid. No other evidence seems to be extant with regard to such a ceremony of presentation,²⁶⁸ but neither, apparently, has any evidence been cited to exclude it. In view of the accuracy which is displayed elsewhere in Lk. i-ii, this passage, of which the accuracy cannot be verified directly, may fairly be permitted to supplement the extant sources of information with regard to the customs of the Jews.

An even stronger argument for the primitive Jewish Christian origin of Lk. i-ii is to be found in the genuinely Jewish character of the religious ideal that runs through the whole narrative. There is no reference whatever to speci-

²⁶⁵ The suggestion of Feine, *loc. cit.*, that the inclusion of Joseph is an error due to the redactor of the source, is unnecessary.

²⁶⁶ Ex. xiii. 2, 12f., 15, Num. iii. 46ff., viii. 16, xviii. 15f.

²⁶⁷ Lk. ii. 22, 23. See J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, in *loc.*, and Merx, *op. cit.*, pp. 206f.

²⁶⁸ 1 Sam i. 28 is different.

fically Christian dogma, and no specific reference to the later events in the life of Jesus. This argument is difficult of presentation, because the Old Testament spirit of the section can be felt only when the narrative is taken as a whole. But a few examples may not be out of place.

In Lk. i. 6, the idea of righteousness is that of the Old Testament dispensation, and as far removed as possible from the teaching of Paul. "Righteous" is explained by "walking in the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless".²⁶⁹ In Lk. i. 15, the Old Testament form of asceticism is represented as required of John the Baptist. In Lk. i. 16f., the work of John is regarded as confined to the Jewish people, and as a preparation for the coming, not specifically of the Messiah, but of Jehovah. The need of ethical preparation for the Messianic age is implied throughout all the teaching of the Old Testament prophets; the special function of John is described in Lk. i in the terms of Mal. iii. 1, iv. 5, 6. The punishment of unbelief (Lk. i. 20) and the praise of faith (Lk. i. 45) are in accordance with Gen. xv. 6, etc. The characteristic Jewish feeling of shame on account of childlessness appears in Lk. i. 25. In Lk. i. 31f., nothing whatever is said about the ethical work of Jesus; the name Jesus is not explained, as in Mt. i. 21, of salvation from sin. The promised son appears simply and solely as the Messianic king of David's line—king of "the house of Jacob", not of the world. "Son of the Highest" (Lk. i. 32) is to be understood in a theocratic rather than in a metaphysical sense.²⁷⁰ Even the doctrine of the Holy Spirit (Lk. i. 35) hardly transcends the Old Testament conception. In Lk. i. 41, 67, the Spirit appears as the moving power in inspired utterance, as the Old Testament connected the Spirit with the prophets. In Lk. i. 43, it is true, Elisabeth recognizes Mary as the mother of her Lord.

²⁶⁹ Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu*, in *Zeitschrift für die wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1901, p. 194.

²⁷⁰ Even the term "Son of God" in Lk. i. 35 might plausibly be interpreted in a theocratic sense, though of course the implications of the verse go far beyond that interpretation.

For disbelievers in predictive prophecy, but for them only, that is a *vaticinium post eventum*. At any rate, it is quite indefinite. Of course, the narrator regarded John as the forerunner of Jesus—that much, however, was natural even in the primitive Jewish Christian church. In Lk. i. 27, ii. 4, the Davidic descent of Jesus is traced altogether through Joseph, although Joseph is not regarded in the narrative as in a physical sense the father. This apparent contradiction has sometimes been regarded as indicating that the virgin birth was not mentioned in the original form of the story. In reality, it indicates merely that the narrator is thoroughly imbued with Jewish ideas, which trace descent altogether through the male line and regard putative fatherhood as equivalent to actual begetting. In Lk. ii. 11, the Messiah is called *χριστὸς κύριος* as in the Palestinian Psalms of Solomon.²⁷¹ *τὸν χριστὸν κυρίου* in Lk. ii. 26 is of course even more clearly a Jewish expression. Lk. ii. 14, *ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας* does not mean that God is pleased with all men. In Lk. ii. 21-24, the fulfilment of all legal rites prescribed for the infant Jesus is described apparently with a sympathetic hand, and not merely as part of the humiliation of Christ.²⁷² In Lk. ii. 25, the piety of Simeon is described as an awaiting of “the consolation of Israel”—the Messianic hope still centres around the chosen people.²⁷³ The same is really true of Lk. ii. 30-32, for the universalism of these verses is simply that of universal honor paid to Israel. The nations are to be enlightened, but the light shines out from Israel. Exactly the same conception appears in Is. xlii. 6f., xlix. 6, xxv. 6ff., xlv. 13 (passages cited in the margin of Nestle’s text, published by the British and Foreign Bible Society).²⁷⁴ Lk. ii. 34-35 contains a prophecy. If pre-

²⁷¹ Ps. Sol. xvii. 36, xviii. 8 (and the title of this psalm). See Ryle and James’s note on the first of these passages, and *cf.* below, p. 271, footnote 293.

²⁷² *Cf.* Gal. iv. 4. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 82f., not very plausibly, connects Lk. ii. 21-24 etc. with a general tendency of the author of Luke-Acts to note the observance of the Mosaic law.

²⁷³ *Cf.* above, pp. 249f.

²⁷⁴ Holtzmann is therefore entirely unwarranted in saying, *op. cit.*,

dictive prophecy is impossible, then this is a *vaticinium post eventum*. But if there is such a thing as genuine prediction, then there never was a prophecy which bears the marks of genuineness more clearly than this. Everything is indefinite, like vague premonition rather than exact information. In the midst of the general rejoicing, the darker side of the Messiah's work is revealed. He is come to bring about a dread decision. He is come not to send peace on the earth but a sword. Surely so much may have been revealed; so much preparation may have been granted to Mary for the bitter disappointment of the coming years. Even the remarkable sentence *καὶ σοῦ δὲ αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν διελύσεται ῥομφαία* is thoroughly enigmatical. Later writers think of the scene at the cross, the *stabat mater dolorosa*; but that that was originally intended is by no means clear. Rather what is meant is that the division which the Messiah will cause is to be felt in its most poignant form in the heart of Mary herself. The cross was the culmination of the fulfilment, not the fulfilment itself.²⁷⁵ It must be remembered, furthermore, that the conception of the suffering Messiah was not really absent from the Old Testament, and perhaps not absent from the current Messianic beliefs at the time of the birth of Jesus.²⁷⁶ In Lk. ii. 38, the Messianic salvation is spoken of as the "redemption of Jerusalem".²⁷⁷ Surely the use of such a term points

in loc.: "Die ganze Weissagung ist vom Standpunkte des lucanischen Universalismus entworfen." B. Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i⁴. pp. 237f., and Feine, *op. cit.*, pp. 21f., have correctly observed that the attitude which Luke in the book of Acts assumes towards the Jewish people is different from the attitude assumed in this prophecy of Simeon.

²⁷⁵ Cf. Feine, *op. cit.*, p. 22; also Lagrange, *Le Récit de l'Enfance de Jésus dans S. Luc*, in *Revue Biblique Trimestrielle*, iv (1895).pp. 170f., who insists that the *mater dolorosa* appears here only in the "demi-obscurité prophétique": "N'y a-t-il dans cette sobriété l'empreinte d'un récit exact?" For the opposite view of the prophecy of Simeon, see Holtzmann, *op. cit.*, *in loc.*: "Seine [the Evangelist's] eigene Hand bemerkt man gleichwohl, wenn. . . . dem Simeon Worte in den Mund gelegt werden, wie sie erst auf Grund späterer Erfahrungen Jesu und der Gemeinde möglich und denkbar sind."

²⁷⁶ Cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, iv⁴, pp. 648-654.

²⁷⁷ Cf. Is. lii.9.

almost unmistakably to Palestine. In the following verse, the Mosaic law (and that too especially in its ceremonial aspect) is called simply "the law of the Lord". In Lk. ii. 41-52, Jesus is represented as sitting at the feet of the Jewish teachers. The interpretation of this passage has gone astray when it has represented Jesus as putting the rabbis to shame. That does not lie in the intention of the narrator. Jesus is a genuine pupil, though of remarkable understanding. What Gentile Christian, writing at a time when Judaism and Christianity had become two separate, hostile religions, could have produced such a picture? If a Gentile Christian had attempted it, he would have fallen into the error of which the exegesis of the passage has actually become guilty. The point of the scene would have been laid in the superiority of even the boy Jesus over the proud, self-sufficient rabbis. Instead, the Jewish teachers, so far as they are described at all, are described in sympathetic colors. In hearing them in their quarters within the temple area, Jesus was "in His Father's house" or "about His Father's business".

Finally, Lk. i-ii contains special indications of such familiarity with Palestinian persons as could have been derived only from Palestinian tradition. Feine²⁷⁸ argues with some plausibility that the very presence of the stories about the birth of John points to Palestine. "The forerunner of the Messiah as an historical person concerned also the Gentile Christians. But the stories of the wonderful events connected with his birth could have been preserved only in the nation in which the great forerunner of the Messiah was called forth. For to the believers from among that nation they were of special value, and only in that nation could the presuppositions of the narrative be understood. Furthermore, the traditions of the birth of John the Baptist and of Jesus are so closely related that a distinct derivation of them is improbable." The description of Anna (Lk. ii. 36-37) may also be regarded as indicating a Palestinian

²⁷⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

origin for the narrative. For such a surprising wealth of minute details, altogether without relation to any conceivable purpose of the narrative, can hardly be explained except by personal acquaintance of the narrator with the person so described, or at least with her friends or relatives.²⁷⁹

Two facts, then, have been established with regard to Lk. i-ii. In the first place, the narrative is of a primitive Jewish Christian and Palestinian type. And in the second place, it shows clearly the mark of Luke's hand. These two facts must be reckoned with in every hypothesis which may be proposed with regard to the genesis of the narrative. Three hypotheses have been proposed.

In the first place, there is the hypothesis that Lk. i-ii was composed by the author of Luke-Acts himself without the use of written sources. But how did the author compose it? If he is thought to have composed it simply by artificial imitation of the Septuagint and artificial adaptation of his narrative to Palestinian conditions of which he had no first-hand knowledge, then the hypothesis becomes impossible. Such a refinement of art is altogether inconceivable in an ancient writer. If the author of Luke-Acts actually composed the birth narrative himself, then he was himself in

²⁷⁹ For the Jewish Christian character of Lk. i-ii, see especially Hillmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 193-197, Feine, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-22. Cf. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, ii^a. p. 411: "Stücke wie Lc 1-2, welche in ihren erzählenden Teilen und den eingelegten Psalmen nur mit den schönsten Stücken der Samuelisbücher an poetischer Anmut und echt israelitischem Geist sich vergleichen lassen, konnte der Grieche Lc nicht schaffen. Nur auf dem Boden Palästinas, wo auch prophetisch begabte Männer und Frauen an den Anfängen und der Fortentwicklung des Christentums beteiligt waren . . . , können sie entstanden sein." Also Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, p. 67: ". . . man wird sich schwerlich davon überzeugen können, dass diese Erzählung nur eine geschickte Imitation des Stilkünstlers Lukas und nicht vielmehr ein echtes Dokument höchst archaischer, judenchristlicher Anschauungsweise sei, wie es denn sehr wahrscheinlich ist, dass sie auch sprachlich auf ein hebräisches Original zurückgeht, wenn die Überarbeitung des Lukas natürlich auch im einzelnen eingegriffen haben mag, und daher nicht mehr jeder einzelne Ausdruck ins Hebräische übersetzt werden kann".

close touch with Palestinian conditions. This supposition, however, is by no means unnatural. If the author was Luke, the companion of Paul, then he was certainly in Palestine at the time of Paul's last visit to Jerusalem. At that time, or on previous occasions of which nothing definite is known, he may have acquainted himself intimately with Palestinian conditions. But even so he could not have composed the birth narrative unless he possessed definite Palestinian tradition. If, however, he had himself been in Palestine, if he was in full possession of Palestinian tradition with regard to the birth of John and of Jesus, and if he put that tradition into written form without any long delay, then conceivably he might have composed the birth narrative without the aid of written sources. In this form, the hypothesis is perfectly possible. It has not been rejected categorically in the preceding pages. All that has been maintained is that it has not been proved. The non-Semitic Lucan element in Lk. i-ii is insufficient to exclude the possibility of written sources. The important thing to observe is that if Luke was the first to put the Lucan birth narrative into written form, even then the genuinely primitive Palestinian character of Lk. i-ii cannot be denied. If Harnack is right, if the linguistic phenomena show that Luke was the original author of Lk. i-ii, that proves not that Lk. i-ii is late, but that the whole of Luke-Acts is early. If it can be proved that Lk. i-ii was composed by the author of Luke-Acts, then Lk. i-ii furnishes simply one more weighty argument for the Lucan authorship and early date of the entire work. Indeed, it might almost be maintained specifically with some degree of confidence that the Gospel of Luke was written in Palestine during the time of the Palestinian imprisonment of Paul. The hypothesis that Luke composed Lk. i-ii on the basis of primitive Palestinian oral tradition, aided by first-hand acquaintance with Palestinian conditions, is very attractive. It explains admirably many of the facts. It may well be correct. But it has not been proved.²⁸⁰

²⁸⁰ It should be observed that Harnack (see especially *Neue Unter-*

The second hypothesis is that for Lk. i-ii Luke himself translated an Aramaic written source.²⁸¹ This hypothesis would explain on the one hand the thoroughly Palestinian character of the content of Lk. i-ii and on the other hand the undeniable Lucan elements in the style. That Luke should have known sufficient Aramaic to translate an Aramaic document is not at all impossible. Thus Harnack, who is inclined to reject the hypothesis of an Aramaic source for Lk. i-ii, supposes that Luke may have translated an Aramaic document in the early part of Acts, and adds that knowledge of Aramaic sufficient to translate a simple Aramaic text may well be attributed to a native of Antioch,^{281a} and a com-
suchungen zur Apostelgeschichte, 1911, pp. 108-110) himself supposes that the birth stories came to Luke from Palestinian tradition. What Harnack says about that Palestinian tradition, so far as it refers to Jesus (for Harnack's view—also very significant—about the Lucan tradition with regard to the birth of John, see below, pp. 275f.), is exceedingly significant: "The Lucan account of Jesus' birth and infancy is derived from circles other than those that produced the narrative in Matthew. The interest for Joseph is here almost entirely lacking; Mary, on the other hand, is in the foreground. . . . ; indeed it follows from Lk. ii. 19, 51 that the narratives present themselves ultimately as communications of Mary. For us, of course, it is impossible to test the matter; but that the stories have been freely worked up by an artist, namely Luke—about that there can be no doubt. But it is no less certain that Luke regarded them as having come from Mary [dass Lukas sie für Marianische gehalten hat]; the attitude as an historian which he preserves elsewhere shows that stories such as these could not have been invented by him. They came to him under this authority and therefore certainly from Palestine" (p.109). See also on the same page (footnote): "The stories are essentially unitary in character. The circle from which they came revered Mary highly, and placed her significantly by the side of her Son. That did not happen by chance, but must go back to the impression which Mary made; an artist, using his materials with freedom, seized this impression and transposed into the hour of conception and birth what can really have been only an inward development of the mother of Jesus in later years. During His lifetime, Jesus was not believed on by His family. That the artist did his work before the death of Mary seems to me almost impossible." (All translation from Harnack in the present article is independent of the English edition).

²⁸¹ This view is held by Zimmermann. Cf. Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

^{281a} Accepting the view which makes Luke a native of Antioch.

panion of Paul.^{281b} This hypothesis is perfectly possible. But like the first hypothesis it cannot be proved.

The third hypothesis is that Luke employed a Greek written source. The above examination of the linguistic phenomena has shown that this hypothesis, like the two others, is perfectly possible. After deducting from the style of Lk. i-ii what is characteristic of the Septuagint and what is natural in a primitive Jewish Christian document, the Lucan element that remains is insufficient to prove anything more than Lucan editing, though on the other hand it is sufficient to render actual Lucan authorship perfectly possible. The hypothesis of a Greek written source, like the other two hypotheses, is possible, but not certain.

If Luke was using in Lk. i-ii a Greek written source, then the source may have been composed originally in Greek, or the Greek form in which Luke used it may have been produced by previous translation from Hebrew or Aramaic.

According to Resch,²⁸² the source was originally composed in Hebrew. That would explain admirably the linguistic phenomena. For, as Dalman has pointed out, a number of the Semitisms in Lk. i-ii, for example the familiar narrative use of *ἐγένετο*, are Hebraisms, not Aramaisms.²⁸³ But is it likely that such a narrative should have been composed in Hebrew in the first century after Christ? At that time Hebrew had long ceased to be the ordinary language of Palestine.²⁸⁴ Yet Hebrew remained in use as the language of certain kinds of literature.²⁸⁵ If Lk. i-ii was originally written in Hebrew, then it was in-

^{281b} *Lukas der Arzt*, p. 32. Cf. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 14. For an opposite view of the Semitic attainments of Luke, see Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

²⁸² *Op. cit.*, *passim*. Cf. also Gunkel, *loc. cit.*

²⁸³ According to Resch, *op. cit.*, pp. 61f., there is not a single sign of an Aramaic, as distinguished from a Hebrew, original of Lk. i-ii. But cf. above, p. 217.

²⁸⁴ See Dalman, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-10, Zahn, *op. cit.*, i³. pp. 1-24, Schürer, *op. cit.*, ii⁴. pp. 23-36.

²⁸⁵ Dalman, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-13.

tended from the first to be a sacred narrative, for which the sacred language would be the fittest vehicle. In view of the lofty, poetical tone of the narrative, comparable to the best parts of the Old Testament, such a supposition is by no means impossible. The necessary knowledge of Hebrew would not have been lacking, for, despite linguistic changes, the Old Testament continued to be read and studied in its original language. However, the earliest Christian community, despite the presence of many priests (Acts vi. 7), was probably composed chiefly of persons who, in the sense that was true of the apostles (Acts iv. 3), were "unlearned and ignorant men". In such a community, the employment of the ordinary language of the country for such a work as the source of Lk. i-ii remains on the whole more natural.

The Hebraisms of Lk. i-ii cannot at once overbalance these *a priori* considerations. Indeed, they may conceivably be regarded as furnishing an argument not for, but positively against, any Semitic original for Lk. i-ii. For Hebraisms are not Aramaisms; they might establish a Hebrew original, but not certainly an Aramaic original. But if a Hebrew original is impossible in view of the linguistic conditions prevailing in Palestine in the first century after Christ, then the Hebraisms still require explanation. According to Dalman,²⁸⁶ they can be explained only as due to the Septuagint. In other words, they are not really Hebraisms, but "Septuagint Graecisms" or "Greek Biblicisms".²⁸⁷ Of course, the Hebraisms might conceivably be explained as due to an influence exerted upon the Aramaic of the source by the Hebrew Old Testament. The apparent Hebraisms would then be Aramaic Biblicisms. Thus, although the familiar Hebraistic ἐγένετο has no equivalent in the living Aramaic,²⁸⁸ yet in the (Aramaic) Targums the Hebrew וַיְהִי is imitated by וַיִּהְיֶה.^{288a} It might have

²⁸⁶ *Op cit.*, pp. 30f., etc.

²⁸⁸ Dalman, *op. cit.*, pp. 25f.

^{288a} Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

²⁸⁷ Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

been imitated also in the Aramaic source of Lk. i-ii. But this Dalman regards as improbable, because the imitation of a Targum is hardly to be attributed to Christian writers.²⁸⁹ In general, says Dalman,²⁹⁰ "the Jewish Aramaic, as it lived among the people, displayed much less tendency to adopt Hebrew expressions than did the Greek of the Synoptic Gospels." Hence Dalman can enunciate the principle for the literary criticism of the New Testament: "the more Hebraisms, so much the more activity of Hellenistic redactors".²⁹¹ The Hebraisms in Lk. i-ii are thus made to afford merely another support for the view of Dalman that the passage was composed originally in Greek.

The question certainly cannot be settled without first-hand knowledge of the dialects of Palestine. But even accepting most of what Dalman says with regard to these dialects, the possibility of an Aramaic source does not seem to be altogether excluded. Only, it would have to be admitted that the Aramaic source imitated the Hebrew of the Old Testament. That supposition, which certainly does not seem altogether unlikely, would explain some of the non-Aramaic Hebraisms of Lk. i-ii. Others would be laid to the charge of the Greek translator, who imitated the Septuagint.²⁹²

At any rate, even if Lk. i-ii was written originally in Greek, it was written by a Palestinian Jewish Christian, and written probably in the very early days of the Jerusalem church. So much has been established by what has been said above about the Jewish Christian character both of the form and of the content of the passage. That such a primitive Jewish Christian narrative should have been written in Greek is by no means impossible. The earliest Christian

²⁸⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

²⁹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

²⁹¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 33f.

²⁹² What has just been said about the possibility that Luke's source was written originally in Aramaic has an obvious importance for the hypothesis (mentioned above, pp. 267f.) that Luke himself translated an Aramaic document.

community at Jerusalem, which is described in the first chapters of Acts, was composed to a very considerable extent of Greek-speaking Jews.²⁹³

Many questions with regard to Lk. i-ii must be left undecided. It is uncertain whether the narrative was composed by Luke himself on the basis of oral tradition, or whether he himself translated an Aramaic document, or whether he used a Greek written source. It is also uncertain whether the source, if it came into Luke's hands in a Greek form, was composed originally in Greek, or in Hebrew, or in Aramaic. In the midst of so much uncertainty, however, two facts stand out clear. In the first place, the birth narrative formed an original part of the Third Gospel, and in the second place, it is genuinely primitive and Palestinian. These two facts are quite independent of the disputed questions. And they are the really important facts.

Throughout the investigation, the unity of the source (if there was a written source) has been provisionally assumed. That unity, however, has been challenged in va-

²⁹³ Some scholars have attempted to establish a Semitic original for Lk. i-ii by pointing out mistakes in translation in the extant Greek narrative. These attempts have been attended with no great measure of success. Gunkel, *loc. cit.*, regards *χριστός κύριος* (Lk. ii. 11) as the clearest indication of a Hebrew original. It looks like a mistranslation of *יהוה משיח*, which is certainly mistranslated thus in Lam. iv. 20 (Septuagint). *χριστός κύριος* is, to say the least, a very unusual phrase; whereas a Christian translator, to whom *κύριος* seemed natural as applied to Christ, would very naturally take *משיח* as absolute instead of construct state. But *χριστός κύριος* occurs also in Ps. Sol. xvii. 36. Of course, some scholars have regarded it there also as a mistranslation. Nevertheless, every additional occurrence of the phrase makes the theory of mistranslation less likely. See the defence of the correctness of the translation in Ps. Sol. xvii. 36 by Ryle and James, in *loc. cit.*, p. 249, who has been followed by Loisy, *op. cit.*, pp. 350f., footnote 3, supposes that *κύριος* was added by the Evangelist to explain *χριστός*, which is used here for the first time in the Gospel. The matter is problematical at best. *χριστός κύριος* may well be a correct translation of the source. That the tense of the verb in *ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω* (Lk. i. 34) is due to a mistranslation has also not been proved. Discussion of that passage would exceed the limits of the present article.

rious ways. Schmiedel²⁹⁴ supposes that Lk. ii was originally separate from Lk. i, because "in Lk. 2 the contents of Lk. i are not presupposed, except in 221b: which was so called by the angel before he was conceived in the womb". But since no contradiction between the two chapters has been established,²⁹⁵ this verse, Lk. ii. 21, is amply sufficient to link the chapters together. The style, as well as the entire spirit of the narrative, displays a marked uniformity throughout. What Holtzmann²⁹⁶ says about Lk. ii. 4, 5, as proving the "relative independence of the new passage"²⁹⁷ is unconvincing. In those verses, Nazareth, Joseph and Mary are not spoken of as though they had not been mentioned before. The Davidic descent of Joseph is mentioned again simply in order to explain the journey. Certainly the name Joseph appears abruptly enough, as though Joseph had been mentioned before and needed no further introduction.²⁹⁸ Nazareth need not have been mentioned, but probably a certain emphatic parallelism with εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν εἰς πόλιν Δαυείδ was desired.²⁹⁹ Of course, Holtzmann does not separate Lk. ii from Lk. i as a second document (for he attributes both chapters to the author of the Gospel), but apparently supposes merely that the two chapters are derived from different traditions. Even in that more cautious form, the theory is devoid of support.^{299a} Far more elaborate are the theories of Völter³⁰⁰ and Wilkinson.³⁰¹ Both of these writers, working independently,³⁰² detected within the first chapter of Luke a purely Johannine

²⁹⁴ Article "Mary" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, iii. col. 2960.

²⁹⁵ See PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, iii (1905), pp. 667ff.

²⁹⁶ *Op. cit.*, in loc.

²⁹⁷ "Beweis verhältnissmässiger Selbstständigkeit des neuen Stücks."

²⁹⁸ Contrast Lk. i. 27 ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωσήφ.

²⁹⁹ Cf. PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, iv (1906), p. 50.

^{299a} Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 7, suggests that in Lk. i-ii Luke is translating from a series of Aramaic documents, each with its own conclusion (Lk. i. 80, ii. 40, 52).

³⁰⁰ *Die evangelischen Erzählungen von der Geburt und Kindheit Jesu*, 1911.

³⁰¹ *A Johannine Document in the First Chapter of St. Luke's Gospel*.

³⁰² See Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

document³⁰³—that is, a document written by a non-Christian disciple of John the Baptist—which a Christian compiler used in order to show the inferiority of John to Jesus. It will be convenient to consider first the theory of Völter. Since Lk. i. 5-25 is purely Jewish in character, whereas Lk. i. 26-56 is distinctly Christian, Völter leaps to the conclusion that the second section was not originally the continuation of the first. The Christian writer of verses 26-56 has, however, adapted to his own use certain elements that stood in the original Johannine narrative. In the Johannine narrative, the angel Gabriel was represented as visiting Elisabeth (an appearance of the angel to the wife as well as to the husband is demanded by the parallelism with the story of Samson in Judg. xiii); the Christian writer has substituted for this a visit of the angel to Mary and of Mary herself to Elisabeth. The appearance of the angel to Elisabeth took place "in the sixth month". In the completed narrative, this note of time refers to the appearance to Mary. But that is very unnatural. It is unnatural to date an event that has nothing to do with Elisabeth by reference to the time of her pregnancy. Immediately after the appearance of the angel, according to the Johannine narrative, Elisabeth recited the Magnificat. In the latter part of Lk. i, verses 57-64, 68, 71-74, 80 belonged to the Johannine narrative; the other verses were interpolated by the Christian redactor. The narrative in the Protevangelium Jacobi of the persecution of Zacharias by Herod can be understood only as a continuation of the original Johannine narrative of the birth of John. Lk. ii. 1-40 was written by the Christian Evangelist with the intention of surpassing the Johannine narrative, which, however, he inserted without important changes. Whereas the Johannine document of Lk. i was perhaps written originally in Aramaic, the apparently Semitic character of Lk. ii is artificial. Finally, the birth narratives fell into the hands of a redactor, who

³⁰³ Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 6, 30f., speaks as though merely Johannine tradition, rather than a Johannine document, were posited; but that does not agree with the title of his book.

inserted i. 26-45 in its present form, 56, 65-67, 69, 70, 76-79, and retouched also the second chapter. The Lucan narrative in Lk. ii represented Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary; the miraculous conception was inserted by the final redactor.³⁰⁴

According to Wilkinson, the Johannine narrative in Lk. i consisted of Lk. i. 5-25, 57-66. By a Jewish Christian compiler this narrative was combined with a narrative of an annunciation of the birth of Jesus. The compiler joined the two stories together by inserting verses 39-45. Originally the Magnificat was represented as spoken by Mary immediately after the annunciation; it could be moved to its present position, because for the compiler, though not for the modern reader, the climax of the narrative lay in Elisabeth's homage, not in the annunciation to Mary.³⁰⁵ A second redactor inserted verses 34-37 (where the idea of the miraculous conception is introduced) and added *μετὰ σπουδῆς* (which does not really agree with *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις* in verse 39).³⁰⁶ By making Mary a kinswoman of Elisabeth (verse 36) this redactor secured a better motive for the journey of Mary. But he did not notice that Mary's question *πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο;* (verse 34) does not agree with the praise of Mary's faith in verse 45. The first compilation was undertaken by a Jewish Christian, who desired to refute the claims of the sect of John's disciples by showing the subordination of John to Jesus. "As in the account of the Baptism given in the first gospel St. John confesses himself unworthy to baptize our Lord, so here a passage [verse 39-45] is inserted which relates how Elizabeth his mother with the child yet unborn paid

³⁰⁴ Cf. PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, iv (1906), pp. 70ff., where the theory of Völter is presented in the form in which it appeared in *Die Apocalypse des Zacharias im Evangelium Lucas*, in *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1896, pp. 244-269.

³⁰⁵ Thus the *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* of verse 48 referred originally to "the moment of the annunciation"; whereas in the present narrative it refers to "the moment of Elisabeth's homage".

³⁰⁶ Apparently Wilkinson attributes the transference of the Magnificat from verse 38 to verse 46 also to the second redactor.

humble homage to St. Mary."³⁰⁷ The later redactor acted with a similar interest; though the insertion of the verses which speak of the miraculous conception was probably due simply "to the growing belief in the Virgin Birth".

Detailed refutation of these theories is unnecessary. The elaborate critical analysis proposed by Völter and Wilkinson can be accepted only by those who have extraordinary confidence in the methods of literary criticism. Wilkinson himself admits that "the first two chapters of St. Luke's gospel, omitting the preface 1, 1-4, bear upon the face of them many signs of unity of composition". What he says³⁰⁸ about the inferiority of the style of Lk. i. 39-45 to that of the rest of the narrative will not appeal very strongly to many readers. The attempt to exhibit the joints in the composition by pointing out inconsistencies and infelicities is in the case of Lk. i-ii even less convincing than such attempts usually are. Finally, the theories of Völter and Wilkinson depend upon the assumption that the absence of specifically Christian ideas in Lk. i. 5-25, etc. can be explained only by the origin of this narrative amid a non-Christian sect. That assumption, in turn, depends upon the further assumption that the narrative is unhistorical. For if the narrative is a true account of events that happened before the birth of Jesus, then the absence of specifically Christian ideas is only what is to be expected. This objection really applies also to the more cautious theory of Harnack. Harnack distinguishes in Lk. i-ii not different documents, but merely different traditions. The narrative is derived "not merely from two chief sources, but even ultimately from two religious camps; for the narrative of the birth of John the Baptist, which still shows that it was not originally composed as an introduction to the story of Jesus, but had independent value, must have arisen in the circle of John's disciples (Lk. i. 5-25, 46-55, 57-80), where also Lk. iii. 1 ff. (in so far as it goes beyond Mark and Q)

³⁰⁷ P. 31.

³⁰⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

together with the great chronological note evidently originated. The passage Lk. i. 39-45, 46 unites the two birth narratives, which were originally quite distinct. The former of these narratives originally celebrated the Baptist not as forerunner of Jesus the Messiah, but as preparing the way for the coming of Jehovah in redemption (Lk. i. 16, 17). The birth narrative of John is accordingly very old and presents the tradition of John's disciples in Lucan spirit and style."³⁰⁹ The hypothesis is exceedingly attractive, and can by no means be rejected categorically. But after all, it can be established with reasonable probability³¹⁰ only if Lk. i is unhistorical. For if Mary was really related to Elisabeth, as is asserted in Lk. i. 36, and if the two mothers really came into contact in the way described in i. 39 ff., then a family history of the birth of Jesus could hardly have been composed without including also the events connected with the birth of the forerunner. In Lk. i. 5-25, John appears as the forerunner not specifically of the Messiah, but of Jehovah. That fact would be explicable if the narrative were composed by a non-Christian disciple of John. But it is equally explicable if the description of the work of John in Lk. i. 13-17 is not a *vaticinium ex eventu*, but a genuine prophecy. For, in prophecy, definiteness is not to be demanded. The Old Testament, according to one

³⁰⁹ *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 108f. In a footnote (*ibid*), Harnack says: "It is not improbable that Luke, before he united himself with the Christian community, belonged to the disciples of John the Baptist [Anhänger des Täuferbewegung gewesen ist] and had already pursued historical investigations which he afterwards used for his Gospel. The attitude which he assumes in the Gospel (and also in Acts) towards the Johannine movement [Täuferbewegung] and towards the "Spirit" tends to support this hypothesis. Furthermore, in Lk. iii. 15 προσδοκῶντος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ διαλογιζομένων πάντων ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου, μή ποτε αὐτὸς εἴη ὁ χριστός, Luke has probably given expression to experiences of his own, which, after the narrative in Lk. i, seem altogether natural. This narrative can only have originated in the circle of the Baptist's disciples and could have been placed at the beginning of the history of Jesus only by one who was connected with that circle."

³¹⁰ That is, if it can be established with probability at all.

representation, connected the future redemption with a coming of Jehovah. In just what way Jehovah was to come had not yet been revealed with perfect definiteness, either in Old Testament times or at the time just preceding the birth of Jesus. The non-Christian character of Lk. i. 5-25, therefore, may prove, not its origin in a non-Christian sect, but merely its historicity. It could not have been composed by a Christian writer, but must have been composed by a Johannine writer—unless the Christian writer was telling the truth.

This hypothesis of Harnack, then, cannot be disproved. It is perfectly possible, whether Lk. i-ii be regarded as historical or unhistorical. But if Lk. i-ii is historical, then the hypothesis of non-Christian, Johannine tradition in Lk. i., cannot be proved any more than it can be disproved. The interest in the events connected with the birth of John would be present not merely in a sect of John's disciples, but also in the family of Jesus. The presence of Lk. i. 5-25 etc. in a history of the birth of Jesus would point merely to the origin of the narrative in Palestine and in circles connected intimately with the family of the Lord.

Princeton.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.