
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

you will find the "simple ritual" consist of an eloquent extempore prayer without one single audible *Amen* at the close of it, whilst real earnestness of worship is only found in those Episcopal and in those *Methodist Episcopal* churches where a liturgical form of worship is used. It is the Presbyterian form of worship which has turned the churches of America into lecture-halls and concert-rooms, with their fine extemporaneous effusions and their quartette choirs, and it is now the mission of the American Church to infuse into the worship of the country that spirit of earnest devotion which, thank God, so characterizes the Church of England at the present day. The Bishop of New York has said that the Advent Mission marked an era in the disintegration of parties. But it has done much more than this. It has shown our Nonconformist brethren that however divided a great historical Church must of necessity be, as regards ritual and even doctrine, she is one in the unity of the spirit in her mission to fallen souls, whether it be within the stately walls of Westminster, or on the sunny plains of India, or amongst the savages of Africa, or to those teeming millions of a new world which represent all that is worst as well as much that is best in the aspirations of the Anglo-Saxon race. "Criticize the past," indeed! Let American Puritanism scan the religious history of New England, and then, if it dare, first cast the stone! It must be the special mission of the Episcopal Church for years to come to establish in this great country those true principles of right which were so often lost sight of amidst the din of conflicting politics, the contentions of religious intolerance, and the sharp but sordid strife for commercial success, which have so characterized the American people during the marvellous and rapid growth of their great Republic.

A DISESTABLISHED CHURCHMAN.

ART. III.—ST. LUKE'S LITERARY PERSONALITY.[1]

THE Rev. Dr. Hobart and the Rev. H. H. Evans have lately taken up from opposite sides our Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. Each rests his argument chiefly on the language of the documents criticized, and each finds what seems exactly to confirm his own conclusion. But those

[1] *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, etc. But the Rev. W. K. HOBART. LL.D., etc. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Co. London: Longmans. 1882.
St. Paul the Author of the Acts of the Apostles, and of the Third Gospel. By HOWARD HEBER EVANS, B.A., etc. London: Wyman and Sons. First part, 1884, second part, 1886.

conclusions are mutually exclusive of one another, that of the former being that the medical profession of the writer is established by his style, that of the latter that the personality of St. Luke, and therefore of any physician, vanishes from the authorship of both treatises alike; that they had and could have had only one author, viz., St. Paul himself. He accordingly relegates "Luke the beloved physician" to the function of an amanuensis merely.

Dr. Hobart largely overdraws the bow. Much of the language used by physicians in all ages is non-technical, and would suit an unprofessional utterance equally well. Scores of words cited from Hippocrates and Galen by the critic are no more medical than the tunics and shoes of those ancient healers would be medical. Such are the words for "dawn," "noonday," "evening," "midnight," current on all lips, and the more so when machines to measure time were not yet in popular use. They have no more of medical stamp than "the watches of the night" have necessarily of military. The same applies to "sweat" and "drops of blood" in Greek. Indeed, the latter phrase almost exactly occurs three times in Æschylus, whose theme favoured such tragicaccessories.[1] The same common usage includes under θεραπεία the senses of "a household" (or rather, a train of domestics) and "medical treatment." Again, ἐπιχειρεῖν, in the sense of "to take in hand" a task or business, occurs in a long array of classic writers, prose and verse, Ionic and Attic alike, from Homer downwards. The same is applicable to various compounds of βάλλειν, πίπτειν, σπᾶν, κ.τ.λ. That such words have a large currency among medical writers does not perceptibly tend to fix a medical sense upon them, and is valueless as evidence of a medical proclivity in the author of a popular work. Homer, or at least the poet of the "Iliad," has been by some critics set down as a surgeon on account of his exact and often anatomical description of wounds in the battle-field; while some have been equally confident that he possessed military experience, and knew how to "set a squadron in the field."

If Dr. Hobart had relied less on these loose wisps of popular language floating in Galen or Aretæus, and studied by him until he saw medical lore in them, and more on the circumstantial features of fact on which the writer whom we still venture to call St. Luke preferentially dwells, he would have strengthened his argument. These salient features are, indeed, touched incidentally in the course of reviewing the language which conveys them—*e.g.*, the extent to which, in the case of the demoniac child in Luke ix. 38, 39, the quasi-

[1] Θρόμβον αἵματος σπάσαι, Choeph. 533; θρόμβῳ δ' ἔμιξαν αἵματος, *ib.* 546; θρόμβους . . . . φόνου, Eumen. 184.

epileptic symptoms are dwelt upon; the organic seat of the lameness noted in Acts iii. 7, as also the sudden starting of the parts into exercise when the cure was effected; and the complication of ailments in Publius's father in Acts xxviii. 8. Again, St. Luke alone gives the circumstance of the "bloody sweat" in the narrative of the Agony. These circumstantial details, apart wholly from language, if extracted from all the passages in which they occur, and viewed collectively, carry great weight. Then the language in which they are couched, if certainly or probably technical, strengthens the whole case.

Still, after every proper deduction has been made, there remains a vast accumulation of instances in the Third Gospel and the Acts confirming the view that the writer's mind had had a medical training, and establishing a presumption, therefore, that St. Luke, declared by the Apostle Paul to be a "physician," and not that Apostle himself, was their author. It is further important to show that special attention was early directed, chiefly by heretical writers, to the Third Gospel, in a way likely to draw attention to the personality of its author. Thus Marcion, contemporary with Justin who died probably 148 A.D., recognized only one Gospel, that of St. Luke (revised, of course, by himself), and one Apostle, viz., St. Paul. It seems so highly pertinent to his view to have verified, if true, the identity of the writer of the Gospel, which he took as his narrative basis, with the Apostle whom he regarded as his doctrinal standard, that that identity could hardly, if a fact, have been overlooked by him. That St. Luke, the reputed author, should have had no more really to do with the work than "I Tertius, who wrote this epistle," had to do with the letter to the Romans—which is virtually Mr. Evans's view—seems wholly inconsistent with the attitude of Marcion towards him. We may put Marcion's date of "flourishing" at 135 A.D. It seems impossible that evidence should within seventy years have perished, which it was so imperative upon him to have collected, if it existed, and turned to account. Valentinus, another heresiarch, received all the Catholic New Testament ("integrum instrumentum," Tertull. *de Præscr. Hær.*, 38), but professed to derive his doctrinal standard from Theonas, a disciple of St. Paul. Valentinus was at Rome when Polycarp visited Anicetus there, about 150 A.D. Again, Heracleon, familiar with Valentinus, wrote a commentary on St. Luke's Gospel, which Clement of Alexandria quotes. This shows concurrent evidence that, in the first half of the second century, attention was specially drawn to the documents which have exercised Mr. Evans's criticism, and increases the presumption that the view of St. Luke's authorship was accepted by heretical as by Catholic writers, *i.e.*, was univer-

sally accepted. The interesting Muratorian fragment on the Canon of the New Testament belongs, or rather its original, to the earlier part of the latter half of the same century. It expressly ascribes the Third Gospel to "that physician Luke whom Paul took with him," and adds that he wrote it "nomine suo"—a remarkable phrase, which seems almost designed to negative the precise proposition which Mr. Evans seeks to establish. The fragment is unquestionably from an Italian, if not Roman, source; and at Rome the Acts, at any rate, whether written by St. Luke or by St. Paul, would have been almost certainly finished and published. The Canon then, being drawn up about a century after the death of St. Paul, falls within the period to which the archetypal MSS. of the New Testament may easily have survived. It can hardly be doubted that *nomine suo* points to the fact that either the actual archetype, or some duly authenticated copy, bore the name of Luke as the writer. But without pressing the literal sense of the widely extended term *nomen*, its use, at any rate, establishes the personality of St. Luke as the recognized author, as a fact within the cognizance of the then living Church.

To turn to internal evidence, which Mr. Evans has most carefully compiled (enriching his repertory with quotations from Zeller, Bishop Lightfoot, and others), it seems only too plain that he is a most careful observer, but unable to apply the rules of evidence to the results of his observation. He notices with great emphasis the fact of a parallelism between both the miracles and sufferings ascribed to St. Peter and those ascribed to St. Paul in the Acts. He draws out at greater length a register of descriptive incidents and phrases common to the sufferings of our Lord in the third Gospel, and to the persecutions endured by St. Paul in the Acts. He infers at once that a strong presumption hence arises in favour of Pauline authorship of Gospel and Acts. Why? The presumption seems to lie wholly the opposite way. It is natural for the ardent admirer of a man of heroic character designedly to trace or tacitly to suggest by instances selected and grouped, and by phrases repeating themselves or slightly differenced, parallels which tend to give the measure of his hero as tallying with the loftiest standards known. It is *not* the way in which a true hero goes to work, even if he sits down to write his own memoirs. As far as one can judge from the indignant reluctance with which St. Paul in 2 Cor. xi. and xii. enters on his vindication of his authority by the appeal to his sufferings, he was about the last man on earth likely to have made such a studied comparison.

Another inference of Mr. Evans's is as follows: We know

that Nero was the Cæsar to whom St. Paul appealed, and when we find the writer of this history calling him (though not indeed in the direct narrative) ὁ Σεβαστός, this is surely an indication that the history was written and read while Nero was still the reigning Emperor, the one living representative of the august majesty of Rome.—(Letter VI., p. 62.)

The conclusion here is wholly unsustained by the premise. The title ὁ Σεβαστός="His Majesty," occurs merely in two speeches, both on occasions of state: one by the provincial *regulus* to the prefect, the other by the said prefect to the same *regulus;* and each is speaking of the Emperor at the time being. Supposing the *ipsissima verba* given, what so likely as this title? It was a conventional necessity on such an occasion. But it goes no more to prove "that this history was written and read while Nero was still the reigning Emperor," than the epithet κράτιστε, applied to Felix, proves that it was "written and read" during his procuratorship.

Again (*ib.*), we read, "This *unique work* must have had an *unique* author:" which reminds one of the Johnsonian parody:

> Who drives fat oxen should himself be fat.

Boswell's "Johnson" is of course suggested by the argument. Indeed, Mr. Evans himself adduces the parallel, where he repeats his argument on p. 207. That biography is, one may say, an "unique work;" but no one would say that Boswell was "unique" in the same sense. The subject and the opportunities are what made the Third Gospel and the Acts, taken as a whole, "unique," even as they did that biography. The question of the author is not mixed up at all with the unique character of the work. Indeed, the gossiping prominence of Boswell, and the way in which he plays sometimes clown, sometimes pantaloon, to Johnson's intellectual harlequinade, is the greatest possible contrast to the studied impersonality of St. Luke, save in his introductions. "We of Paul's company" and the like phrases are the only hints of his presence on the scene. And here we strike, in fact, one sure note of authorship. St. Luke's impersonality is an unequivocal confirmation of Lucan authorship. He is lost in his great study. The hero objective absorbs the subjectivity of the worshipper. Not only so, but all others are discussed as briefly as possible. Timothy, when introduced, is so merely for St. Paul to circumcise him. His errands on the Apostle's behalf are dismissed in single sentences. Titus is nowhere even mentioned, who in Galatians and 2 Corinthians is so prominent. If St. Paul had been the author, we may be sure some generous sentences of commendation would have been bestowed on the services of

both; nor would St. Mark have been left as it were "under a cloud," contrary to the express testimony given by St. Paul himself in 2 Tim. iv. 11; nor would St. Luke have been allowed to slip away like a mute under a mask, as we find him doing. It is when tried by the ethical standard, the best and surest in judging questions of personal identity, that Mr. Evans's theory most fatally collapses.

Equally fallacious are Mr. Evans's attempts to account for the changes of person; *e.g.*, in Acts xvi. 10, "After he had seen . . . we endeavoured." On which he urges, "The writer must have been the *alter ego* of St. Paul, to be able to place thus on public record those secret inner experiences of St. Paul—even the visions of the night." Here, again, there is no particle of proving power in the premise. We know from Acts xxii. 17 foll., that St. Paul publicly declared another such vision to the mob at Jerusalem, to say nothing of his double mention of the vision of his conversion in xxii. 6 foll., and xxvi. 12 foll., and that he "comes to visions and revelations of the Lord" as part of his defence, under compulsion, in 2 Cor. xii. 1. How much more would he reveal them to his trusted comrades, whose movements with his own they directly concerned! The suggestion that St. Luke was a special confidant of the vision, and thus an "*alter ego*," in xvi. 10, is utterly baseless. The very opposite is suggested by the passage itself. The parallels adduced of Cæsar, Josephus, etc., are no parallels at all, as will be seen by any who fairly examines those authorities. It seems as plain as words can make it, from xvi. 10 and xxi. 12-14, that if St. Paul *was* the author, he stooped to designed falsification of the features of narrative to conceal his identity.

Space unhappily forbids entering here upon the verbal question. Mr. Evans reckons that in the Third Gospel every *other* word, and in the Acts every *third* word, of the narrative is taken from the diction of the Pauline Epistles. Be it so—nay, assume, if you will, that cent. per cent. of Lucan diction is Pauline. This no more proves identity of author where styles differ *toto cœlo*, than identity of letters or words, where handwritings similarly differ, proves identity of penman. *Le style c'est l'homme;* and the clear, pellucid flow of Lucan narrative is to the involved, fervid, impetuous, disjointed style of St. Paul as South is to North. Further, as regards subject-matter, discrepancies hard to reconcile, if viewed from the assumed standpoint of personal identity of author, occur between some statements in the Epistles and in the narratives. If the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper offers in St. Luke and St. Paul remarkable coincidences, the post-resurrection notices in 1 Cor. xv. and in St. Luke xxiv. and

Acts i. offer no less remarkable deviations. The "Cephas" of five passages in the Epistles is a name unknown to St. Luke. The "James, the son of Alphæus," of Acts i. 13, and of the synoptic Gospels, is "James, the Lord's brother," of Gal i. 19. Other unlikenesses, obliquities, and differences of circumstance, which confirm substantial truth when distributed between two witnesses, become entanglements and paradoxes when we extinguish the difference of persons, and make their two standpoints coincide. What else, indeed, is the famous *Horæ Paulinæ* of Paley than a protest gone before against just such a theory as that of Mr. Evans—a protest the more forcible because impossible to be designed?

Mr. Evans is quite sure that the author must have been a Jew, and therefore not St. Luke. Tillemont asserted the same of Clement of Rome, and on the same ground—the copious knowledge of the LXX. and of Jewish custom manifested in his writings. But this view is now abandoned; see Hefele, *Patr. Apost. Opp. Prol.*, pp. xx., xxi.; and Hingelfeldt, *Prolog. ad Clem. Rom. epist.*, p. xxx. The LXX. was, in short, a Greek classic to religious souls, Jew or Gentile, at the Christian era and subsequently. Justin Martyr is another noteworthy witness to its influence over the Greek mind.

Yet Mr. Evans has done valuable work—more so than if he had incontestably proved his thesis of identity. He has made it impossible for any candid mind to doubt that the Third Gospel and Acts are documents of the Pauline age, and penetrated at first hand with the Pauline spirit. In "the foundation of Apostles and Prophets" upon which the Church is "built," he has brought out clearly the close relation of two master-stones to one another; he has shown that they belong to the same stratum, and contain largely the same fossils, each confirming the contemporary genesis of both, although not, as he is inclined to think, mere sundered members of one integral block.

A great deal of patient and laborious work must have gone into each of these studies of the subject which these two writers now before us have made. They in effect supplement one another. Dr. Hobart brings out that distinct repertory of terms which shows the separate individuality of him who uses them so largely among writers of the New Testament. Mr. Evans has shown a saturation of St. Luke's matter with Pauline and LXX. phraseology. Thus we have, as a resultant, a clearer view of St. Luke's personal entity, and, at the same time, an estimate of the large volume of his mental sphere which was modified and conditioned by his Pauline relations. Each commentator reflects light on the other, and is more valuable by reason of the company in which we have placed

them both. All who have ever heard of Philo Judæus will remember the proverb, "Aut Philo platonizat, aut Plato philonizat." If the study of Plato's works at the distance of three centuries in the Alexandrian Library produced such a pointed resemblance between him and Philo, how much more between contemporaries, between the only two superiorly educated writers of the New Testament, between master and disciple, between two who shared a gradually narrowing circle of comrades, which dwindled down at last to themselves (2 Tim. iv. 11). A probable ground for this constancy is to be sought in profound harmonies of personal character, while the pressure of persecution from without would force yet more closely together the impressive and the impressed mind. Mr. Evans has done well to bring this out. He seems to have been some years at work on his subject, as probably has Dr. Hobart. A few more years will doubtless bring the former that maturity of judgment which will lead him to see the limits of what can be proved by identity of phrase words and idiom, and perhaps to recognise duality in spite of seeming coincidence.

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

ART. IV.—A YEAR'S RESIDENCE AMONG THE SAVOYARD ALPS.

SAVOY is a part of Central Europe comparatively little known, and yet few countries on the Continent present a greater variety of interest, either for the tourist, the historian, the naturalist, or the sportsman. There are certain portions of it with which every traveller is familiar, such, for example, as Mont Blanc, and Aix-les-Bains; but those districts which lie more remote from the public route are seldom explored, and are therefore not very often visited, except by an adventurous Alpine climber, or by some settler who, either for amusement or for health, may have taken up his residence for a year or so in the interior.

The scenery is superb, the climate invigorating, and the people peaceful and inoffensive. Living is, at least was, very moderate, and the wines of the country wholesome, inexpensive, and exceedingly good. The winters are cold, but the air is dry, crisp, and bracing. From November to the end of March, mountain and plain are covered with a mantle of snow. The sun shines brightly every day, and it is very seldom that the weather prevents outdoor exercise, whether walking,