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

THE ORIGIN OF THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF LUKE.

In the last number of the Princeton Theological Review, 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 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.

Chapter i. Verse 5. δόνουμι, 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, Beitrdge zur Sprachcharakteristik der Schriftsteller des Neuen Testaments, 1816; Harnack, Das Magnificat der Elisabet (Luc. i, 46-55) nebst einigen Bemerkungen zu Luc. 1 und 2, in Sitzungsberichte der kndlich 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.

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 Luke\(^4\), once in Acts, once in Matthew (not of a person), three times in John, twice (or four times) in the Apocalypse. τῆς is used with ὄνόματι 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 αὐτῷ or ὁ ὄνομα; there is perhaps not a single case of ὄνόματι where the text is perfectly certain. This use of ὄνόματι is therefore a pretty clear mark of Lucan style, and the addition of τῆς 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 ὄνόματι occurs only this once. Since καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς occurs in the latter part of Lk. i. 5, Luke may have substituted ὄνόματι 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, εὐφῶν τίνα Ἰουδαῖον ὄνόματι Ἀκώλαν... καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.

Verse 6. ἐναντίον (or ἐναντὶ)\(^5\) 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.


\(^4\) In one of these cases, Lk viii. 41, the Lucan ὄνόματι occurs in the parallel passage in Mark, while the non-Lucan ὁ ὄνομα is used by Luke.

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 ιερατεύειν αὐτῶν.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

---

⁷Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, op. cit., pp. 5f., 86.
⁹Gerstorf; cf Harnack, Friedrich, op. cit., pp. 13, 90.
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; I 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. In the Septuagint, \( \epsilon\nu \tau\varphi \) with the infinitive occurs about 430 times. The New Testament figures for the use of \( \epsilon\nu \tau\varphi \) 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.

The familiar \( \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\eta \) is a well-known Lucan characteristic. Three types have been distinguished: (1) \( \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\eta \) \( \kappa\alpha\iota \) \( \tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon \), (2) \( \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\eta \) \( \tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon \), (3) \( \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\eta \) \( \epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\nu \). Hawkins' statistics for the New Testament are as follows: \( \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\eta \) \( \kappa\alpha\iota \) \( \tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon \) 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; \( \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\eta \) \( \tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon \) 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; \( \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\eta \) \( \epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\nu \) 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, Thackeray 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 \( \epsilon\nu \), indicate \( \epsilon\nu \tau\varphi \) 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.
statistics: ἐγένετο καὶ ἡλθε occurs 269 times (164 times in Judges-2 Kings); ἐγένετο ἡλθε, 145 times; and ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν once only. When it is observed that no less than 164 of the occurrences of ἐγένετο καὶ ἡλθε 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 ἡλθε 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.  

Verse 9. κατὰ τὸ ἔθος 18 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 εἰσωθός occurs in the New Testament only once in Luke and once in Acts. κατὰ τὸ εἰσιςμένου 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 εἰσωθός occurs only twice in the Septuagint, and κατὰ τὸ εἰσιςμένου not at all. κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, therefore, has some value as a mark of Lucan style.  

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

19 Cf. Resch, Das Kindheitsevangelium, 1897, in Texte und Untersuchungen, x. 5, p. 31: "ἔθος wie in der LXX, so in den Logia-Übersetzungen ungebrauchlich, dagegen ein Lieblingswort des Lc, stammt hier wie Lc. 2, 42 aus der Feder des Lc."
times in Luke, thirty-nine times in Acts, eleven times in Matthew, twenty-eight times in Mark, and only once in John. Friedrich\textsuperscript{20a} has the same counting for ἡν or ἴσαν (or ἴμην) or ἐσομαι 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.

\[\pi\acute{a}n \; \tau\omega \; \pi\lambda\acute{h}\acute{b}os \ldots \tau\omicron \; \lambda\alpha\omicron \nu.\textsuperscript{21}\] The word \(\pi\lambda\acute{h}\acute{b}os\) 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. \(\pi\acute{a}n\) (or ἴσαν) \(\tau\omega \; \pi\lambda\acute{h}\acute{b}os\) 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.\textsuperscript{22} \(\tau\omicron \; \lambda\alpha\omicron \nu\) is added to \(\pi\lambda\acute{h}\acute{b}os\) once (here) in Lk. i-ii, twice in the rest of Luke, once in Acts, and nowhere else in the New Testament. The synonym \(\dot{o}\chi\lambda\lambda os\), which is very much more common than \(\pi\lambda\acute{h}\acute{b}os\) 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. \(\pi\lambda\acute{h}\acute{b}os\) is used more than five times as much as \(\dot{o}\chi\lambda\lambda os\), and is very common. That looks as though Lk. i-ii had simply followed the Septuagint usage. \(\pi\acute{a}n \; \tau\omega \; \pi\lambda\acute{h}\acute{b}os\) occurs, for example, in Ex. xii. 6. Nevertheless, the phenomena in the New Testament are so striking that \(\pi\acute{a}n \; \tau\omega \; \pi\lambda\acute{h}\acute{b}os \ldots \tau\omicron \; \lambda\alpha\omicron \nu\) affords genuine evidence of Lucan style.

Verse 11. \(\ddot{o}\phi\theta\eta\textsuperscript{23}\), since it is apparently the regular Septuagint word for describing visions, etc., can hardly be regarded as a certain mark of Lucan style.

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. Hawkins, op. cit., p. 21.
\textsuperscript{23} Gersdorff, Harnack, (Zimmermann); cf. Stanton, op. cit, ii. pp. 292, 293.
In Lk. i-ii, ἐστὶς occurs once, ἐστηκὼς not at all; in the rest of Luke and Acts, ἐστὶς occurs fourteen times, ἐστηκὼς once; in Matthew, ἐστὶς occurs six times, ἐστηκὼς once; in Mark, ἐστὶς occurs not at all, ἐστηκὼς four times; in John, ἐστὶς occurs four times, ἐστηκὼς three times; in the Apocalypse, ἐστὶς occurs nine times, ἐστηκὼς twice. So Matthew, John, and the Apocalypse, as well as Luke, prefer ἐστὶς. And Stanton has called attention to παραστηκὼς in Lk. i-ii (in Lk. i. 19). In the Septuagint, Thackeray gives as the proportion of ἐστηκὼς to ἐστὶς 95/51; the latter being “practically confined to late and literary books”. In the New Testament, ἐστὶς is not particularly literary, as is indicated by the usage of the Apocalypse. Certainly ἐστὶς in Lk. i. 10 is no sign of Lucan authorship. παραστηκὼς (Lk. i. 19) might with at least equal plausibility be claimed as distinctly non-Lucan.

ἐστὶς ἐκ δεξιῶν ἰστάναι 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. for the beginning of unusual states occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii., once in Acts, and perhaps once in the Apocalypse. In Acts xix. 17, as in Lk. i. 12, φῶς is the subject; but the same

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 ἔστηκα, or one of its compounds, is used the form is ἐστὶς”; for in Lk. ix. 27 ἐστηκὼς is in all probability the correct reading.
27 Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 36.
29 Acts xix. 17. In two other passages, Acts x. 10 and xiii. 11, ἐπέπεσεν is read by some manuscripts.
30 Rev. xi. 11.
is true of Rev. xi. ii. 31 In the Septuagint, this use of επιπίπτειν is not uncommon, and the subject is almost always φόβος or some other word expressing fear. There is no argument whatever for Lucan authorship.

επιπίπτειν επί, 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 επέπεσεν επί is strongly attested. In the Septuagint, επί after επιπίπτειν is quite the regular thing.

Verse 13. εἰπεν .... πρὸς αὐτὸν. 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:

| εἴπον πρός | 7 | εἴπον c. dat. | 4 |
| λέγω πρός | 0 | λέγω c. dat. | 0 |
| ἔρω etc. πρός | 0 | ἔρω etc. c. dat. | 0 |
| λαλέω πρός | 5 | λαλέω c. dat. | 5 |

In the rest of Luke:

| εἴπον πρός | about 65 | εἴπον c. dat. | about 96 |
| λέγω πρός | 12 | λέγω c. dat. | 76 |
| ἔρω etc. πρός | 0 | ἔρω etc. c. dat. | 11 |
| λαλέω πρός | 1 | λαλέω c. dat. | 3 |

In Acts:

| εἴπον πρός | about 24 | εἴπον c. dat. | about 17 |
| λέγω πρός | 7 | λέγω c. dat. | 12 |
| ἔρω etc. πρός | 0 | ἔρω etc. c. dat. | 0 |
| λαλέω πρός | 8 | λαλέω c. dat. | 17 |

31 Where επέπεσεν is to be read if επέπεσεν 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰπον πρόσ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγω πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρώ etc. πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαλέω πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Mark:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰπον πρόσ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγω πρόσ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρώ etc. πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαλέω πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In John:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰπον πρόσ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγω πρόσ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρώ etc. πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαλέω πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Paul:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰπον πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγω πρόσ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρώ etc. πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαλέω πρόσ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Hebrews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰπον πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγω πρόσ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρώ etc. πρόσ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαλέω πρόσ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Catholic Epistles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰπον πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγω πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρώ etc. πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαλέω πρόσ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Apocalypse:

- εἰπον πρόσ ........................................... 0 | εἰπον c. dat. ........................................... 4
- λέγω πρόσ ........................................... 0 | λέγω c. dat. ........................................... 26
- ἐρω etc. πρόσ ........................................... 0 | ἐρω etc. c. dat. ........................................... 4
- λαλέω πρόσ ........................................... 0 | λαλέω c. dat. ........................................... 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:

**In Genesis:**

- εἰπον, ἐρω etc. πρόσ ........................................... 52 | εἰπον, ἐρω etc. c. dat. ........................................... 228
- λέγω πρόσ ........................................... 2 | λέγω c. dat. ........................................... 1
- λαλέω πρόσ ........................................... 16 | λαλέω c. dat. ........................................... 22

**In 1 Samuel:**

- εἰπον, ἐρω etc. πρόσ ........................................... 115 | εἰπον, ἐρω etc. c. dat. ........................................... 79
- λέγω πρόσ ........................................... 0 | λέγω c. dat. ........................................... 7
- λαλέω πρόσ ........................................... 10 | λαλέω c. dat. ........................................... 5

**In 1 Chronicles:**

- εἰπον, ἐρω etc. πρόσ ........................................... 10 | εἰπον, ἐρω etc. c. dat. ........................................... 19
- λέγω πρόσ ........................................... 0 | λέγω c. dat. ........................................... 0
- λαλέω πρόσ ........................................... 5 | λαλέω c. dat. ........................................... 0

**In 2, 3 4 Maccabees:**

- εἰπον, ἐρω etc. πρόσ ........................................... 0 | εἰπον, ἐρω etc. c. dat. ........................................... 1
- λέγω πρόσ ........................................... 1 | λέγω c. dat. ........................................... 1
- λαλέω πρόσ ........................................... 0 | λαλέω c. dat. ........................................... 1

If the New Testament alone be examined, πρόσ 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 πρόσ in the body of the Gospel indicates only Lucan editorship, why should it indicate more than that in Lk. i-ii?

---

54 The figures are approximate only.
μη φοβοῦειν is no clear mark of Lucan style. It is not uncommon in the Septuagint, where the name of the person addressed is sometimes added as here.

διότι 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.

γεννάω of the mother occurs not only in Lk. i. 13, 57 and in Lk. xxiii. 29, but also in Jno. xvi. 21 and Gal. iv. 24. The usage occurs a few times in the Septuagint.

Verse 14. ἐσταὶ . . . σοῦ. 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.

---

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 μη φοβοῦειν. But διότι occurs after μη φοβοῦειν a number of times in the Septuagint; and διότι is not an uncommon word. The similarity, therefore, is perhaps merely due to chance.
40 Harnack.
41 Harnack has overlooked these two cases, which are both perfectly clear, γεννάω 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.
THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF LUKE

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total occurrences of πνεῦμα designating the divine Spirit</th>
<th>With άγίου</th>
<th>Of these with the article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lk. i-ii</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rest of Luke</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Catholic Epistles</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Apocalypse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Septuagint, the following phrases should be compared: πνεῦμα θείου (Ex. xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31, Jb. xxvii. 3, xxxiii. 4), τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίου σου (Ps. l. 13), τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἁγίου (Ps. cxiii. 10) 46, ἁγίου . . . πνεῦμα παιδείας 47 (Wi. i. 5), τὸ ἁγίου σου πνεῦμα (Wi. ix. 17), τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίου αὐτοῦ (Is. lxiii. 10), πνεῦματος αὐτοῦ (ἁγίου) 48 (Si. xlviii. 12), πνεῦμα ἁγίου (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

45 The statistics of Hawkins differ slightly, but only slightly, from the above. In addition, Hawkins gives the following statistics for the use of ἁγίος 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 ἀγαθόν instead of ἁγίον.
47 Or σοφίας.
48 ἁγίον is added by A.
49 Cf. in Theodotion’s translation of Daniel πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἁγίου (iv. 5, 6), θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἁγίου (iv. 15).
first century after Christ. 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, and the addition of ἀγίου is of course not very infrequent even outside of the Lucan writings. A basis for the term πνεύμα ἀγίου 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 ἀγίου πλησθήσεται, πτιμπλάναι 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. ἐμπιμπλάναι occurs once in Lk. i-ii, 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 πτιμπλάναι and ἐμπιμπλάναι 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. πτιμπλάναι with πνεύματος ἀγίου occurs three times in Lk. i-ii, not at all in the rest of Luke, five times in Acts, (including Acts iv. 31, where τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος is probably to be read instead of πνεύματος ἀγίου ), and not at all in the rest of the New Testament. The following Septuagint passages should be compared: Ex. xxviii. 3 οὐς ἐνέπλησα πνεύματος αἰσθήσεως, xxxi.3 καὶ ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα θείον σοφίας καί

50 See Princeton Theological Review, x (1912), p. 21.
51 Matthew uses πνεύμα ἀγίου in speaking of the conception of Jesus, just as Luke does in Lk. i. 35.
53 In the Magnificat, Lk. i. 53.
54 Harnack has apparently overlooked Acts ii. 4.
55 Compare πλήρης πνεύματος ἀγίου, which occurs once in Luke (Lk. iv. 1), four times in Acts, and not at all in the rest of the New Testament.
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συνέσεως καὶ ἑπιστήμης, ΧΧΧΧV. 31 καὶ ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως καὶ ἑπιστήμης πάντων, Deut. xxxiv. 9 ἐνεπλήσθη πνεῦματός συνέσεως, Wi. i. 7 πνεῦμα κύριον πεπλήσκει τὴν οἰκουμένην, Si. xlviii. 12 Ἐλευσαίε πνεῦματος αὐτοῦ (ἐπων Λ), 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 one 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 μητρὸς,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 ἀγιὸς θεοῦ ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ἀπὸ κοιλίας μητρὸς 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. νιὸν Ἰσραήλ58 occurs not only 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.

ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεοῦ αὐτῶν.60 ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ ευκολαίνει followed by τὸν θεοῦ or some other designation of God occurs in the New Testament only once (here) in Lk. i-ii,
and five times in Acts. Zimmermann cites also 2 Cor. iii. 16, but there πρός stands instead of ἐπὶ. 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.

Verse 17. καὶ αὐτός is used in this way three times (including this passage) in Lk. i-ii, perhaps about twenty-two times in the rest of Luke, perhaps once in Acts, 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. 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.

πνεῦματι καὶ δύναμει. πνεῦμα and δύναμις are joined besides here in the following passages in the New Testament: Lk. i. 35 πνεῦμα ἀγίου ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ἐν θυσίαν ἐπισκέψει σοι, iv. 14 καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἱσοῖος ἐν τῇ δύναμι τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς Γαλιλαίαν, Acts i. 8 ἀλλὰ λήμψετε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.

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

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


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

Acts xxii. 20.

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

Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 35.
x. 38 ὃς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα ἁγίω καὶ δύναμιν, Rom. i. 4 τοῦ ὁρισθέντος νυώθεων ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, xv. 13 εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐκπίθῃ 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 κραταιοθήναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἐσώ ἀνθρώπον, 2 Tim. i. 7 οὐ γὰρ ἐδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα δειλίας, ἀλλ’ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ. 68 In the Septuagint, Judg. vi. 34 καὶ πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐνευδυνάμωσεν τὸν Γενεῶν should be compared. A most interesting parallel occurs in Ps. Sol. xvii. 42, δυνατον 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 ΣΟΛΟΜΟΝΤΟΣ Psalms of the Pharisees, commonly called the Psalms of Solomon, in loc., quote Is. xi. 2 πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ συνέτευς, πνεῦμα βουλῆς καὶ ἱσχύος, πνεῦμα γνώσεως καὶ εὐλογησιας.
70 Compare, for example, Gen i. 2.
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 φωνὴ 
εὐαγγελίζομενοι, with Ryle and James's note.\textsuperscript{73} Stanton\textsuperscript{74} 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. \(\ddelta \chiρ\) (or \(\ddeltachi\))\textsuperscript{75} occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, three times in the rest of Luke, fifteen times in Acts, 
onece (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, \(\ddelta \chiρ\) (or \(\ddeltachi\)) occurs only seven times, \(\varepsilon\omegaς\) being the common 
word.\textsuperscript{76} The argument has some weight. But the frequency 
of \(\ddelta \chiρ\) in the Apocalypse as well as in Luke-Acts is 
worthy of note. For \(\ddelta \chiρ\ \h\mu\epsilon\rho\alphaς\), Gersdorf\textsuperscript{77} compares 
Lk. xvii. 27, Acts i. 2, and one or two other less similar pas-
sages. These parallels strengthen somewhat the argument 
derived from \(\ddelta \chiρ\) alone. But Gersdorf was not justified in 
questioning the correctness of the text of Mt. xxiv. 38.

\(\alpha ν\theta\iota\nu\)\textsuperscript{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. Loisy\textsuperscript{79} compares Gen. xxii. 18 \(\alpha ν\theta\iota\nu\ \iota\pi\eta\kappa\omega\upsilon\alpha\tau\varsigma\ \h\epsilon\mu\h\iota\varsigma\ \phi\omega\nu\h\iota\varsigma\).\textsuperscript{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 

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


\textsuperscript{75} Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, op. cit., p. 16; cf. Stanton, op. 

\textsuperscript{76} In the New Testament also, \(\varepsilon\omegaς\) is commoner than \(\ddelta \chiρ\) or \(\mu\chiρ\).

\textsuperscript{77} Cf. Stanton, loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{78} Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Stanton, op. cit., p. 293. Vogel, op. 

\textsuperscript{79} Les Évangelies synoptiques, i. p. 284, footnote 5.

\textsuperscript{80} See also Resch, op. cit., p. 33.
Verse 21. \(\pi\rho\sigma\delta\omega\kappa\alpha\nu\).\(^{81}\) \(\pi\rho\sigma\delta\omega\kappa\alpha\nu\) 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, \(\epsilon\gamma\nu\varepsilon\tau\omicron\vartheta\omicron\omicron\nu\).\(^{82}\) \(\omega\varsigma\) 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. \(\epsilon\gamma\nu\varepsilon\tau\omicron\vartheta\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\), which accounts for three out of the five occurrences of \(\omega\varsigma\) 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 \(\epsilon\gamma\nu\varepsilon\tau\omicron\vartheta\omicron\omicron\nu\) to be followed by some clause or phrase indicating time. Luke strongly prefers \(\epsilon\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\) with the infinitive; Lk. i-ii is about equally divided between \(\epsilon\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\) with the infinitive and a temporal clause introduced by \(\omega\varsigma\).

Verse 29. \(\epsilon\nu\nu\).\(^{87}\) The optative mood occurs three times

---

\(^{81}\) Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 21; cf. Friedrich, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 27, 96.

\(^{82}\) Gersdorf, Harnack, on verse 41, Hawkins, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 23, 49.

\(^{83}\) \(\omega\varsigma\) is not used as a conjunction at all in Matthew.

\(^{84}\) Mk ix. 21 is not noticed by Harnack, though \(\omega\varsigma\) here has strong attestation and is probably to be read.

\(^{85}\) For example, Pentateuch, 18; 1 Samuel, 19; I 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 \(\omega\varsigma\), denote the temporal use.

\(^{86}\) Cf. Gersdorf.

in Lk. i-ii, namely in Lk. i. 29, 38, 62. Of these occurrences, Lk. i. 38 γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥήμα σου calls for no comment; the optative expressing a wish is fairly well distributed among the New Testament writers.\(^8\) The other two passages, however, are interesting. They are as follows: Lk. i. 29 διελογίζετο ποταμὸς εἰν ὁ ἀστασμὸς οὕτως, Lk. i. 62 ἐνένευνον δὲ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ τί ἄν θέλω καλείσθαι αὐτῷ. 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 Paul\(^8\) and in 1 Peter\(^9\) 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,\(^9\) six times in Acts,\(^9\) 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 two\(^9\) the pronoun is preceded by τὸ as in Lk. i. 62.\(^9\) 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.\(^9\) But such cases are rather uncommon except in "literary" books like Job.\(^9\) According to Thackeray,\(^9\) the mood

\(^9\)Namely 1 Cor. xiv. 10, xv. 37. These have merely the stereotyped phrase εἰ τίχοι.
\(^9\)Namely 1 Pet. iii. 14, 17. In both of these passages, the optative stands in the protasis of a condition.
\(^1\)Lk. iii. 15, vi. 11, viii. 9, ix. 46, xv. 26, xviii. 36, xxii. 23.
\(^2\)Acts v. 24, vii. 31, x. 17, xvii. 11, 18, xxii. 33.
\(^3\)Lk. ix. 46 and Acts xxii. 23.
\(^4\)Cf. below, p. 237.
\(^5\)These passages have been found by examining Hatch-Redpath under ἄν; no general investigation of the Septuagint use of the optative could be attempted.
\(^6\)See Thackeray, op. cit., p. 193.
\(^7\)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 χάριν 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. εὐφιλακεῖν 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. ἰνὐστού.103 ἰνὐστος, 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 ἐπερχεσθαι occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, twice in the rest of Luke, four times in

100 Loc. cit.
101 On Lk. i. 30.
102 In the speech of a Jewish Christian, Stephen.
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.

διὸ\[106\] 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 διὸ, 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 ἵδον 'Ἐλευσίδεστ ἡ συγγενὴς σοῦ καὶ αὐτὴ συνειληφεν υἱὸν ἐν γῆρει αὐτῆς, καὶ οὗτος μὴν ἐκτὸς ἐστὶν αὐτῇ τῇ καλουμένῃ στείρᾳ. Gersdorf compares Lk. viii. 41 and xix. 2. The sequence of καὶ ἵδον . . . καὶ αὐτὸς in Lk. viii. 41, and of καὶ ἵδον . . . καὶ αὐτὸς . . . καὶ οὗτος (?) in Lk. xix. 2 is similar to the καὶ ἵδον . . . καὶ αὐτή . . . 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.\[110\]


\[107\] 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.


\[110\] Hawkins, op. cit., p. 19. (cf. p. 42), gives the following figures for
\( \rho\eta\mu a = \text{"thing"}, \) 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 \( \rho\eta\mu a \) in Lk. i-ii is absolutely no indication of Lucan authorship.\(^{113}\)

Verse 39. \( \acute{\alpha}v\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}v\sigmaa. \)\(^{114}\) This pleonastic aorist participle of \( \acute{\alpha}v\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}va\) 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 \( \tau\rho\mu\eta \) of the Hebrew that the single occurrence in a narrative like Lk. i-ii could hardly have been avoided.

\( \epsilon\nu \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma (\text{compare } \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha \ \delta\epsilon \ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma \ \tau\alpha\varsigma \ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma \ \text{in verse 24} \) \( \text{and } \epsilon\nu \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma \ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma \ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\varsigma \text{in Lk. ii. 1} \)\(^{115}\) has perhaps some value as an indication of Lucan style.

Verse 41. \( \epsilon\sigma\kappa\iota\rho\tau\iota\varsigma\eta\varsigma\nu. \)\(^{116}\) \( \sigma\kappa\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}v, \) which occurs in the New Testament, besides here and verse 44, only at Lk. vi.

the use of \( \kappa\alpha\iota \ \omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \) 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 \( \rho\eta\mu a \) 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 \( \rho\eta\mu a \) 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.


\(^{115}\) Gersdorf, Harnack, Zimmermann, on Lk. i. 24. Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 18, 40. With \( \acute{\alpha}v\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}v\sigmaa \ \delta\epsilon \ \eta\mu\alpha\iota\varsigma \ \text{\epsilon\nu \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma \ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma \ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma \) Friedrich, op. cit., p. 45, compares Acts i. 15 \( \kappa\alpha \ \epsilon\nu \ \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma \ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma \ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma \ \acute{\alpha}v\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}v\sigmaa \ \Pi\epsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\) .

\(^{116}\) 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 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, the argument for Lucan authorship has perhaps little weight.

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

Verse 44. For ἰδοὺ γάρ see Spitta, in Theologische Abhandlungen für Holtzmann, p. 80. ἐγένετο ἡ φωνή. φωνῇ 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, once in

---

118 Cf. above, p. 232, footnote 107.
119 Gersdorf, Harnack; cf. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 41.
122 Cf. PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, x (1912). pp. 4ff.
124 Harnack rejects the εὑερέτο 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 εὑερέτο 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 ἡλθεν 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 εὑερέτο paucis verbis interiectis repetitum".
John (compare also Jno. xii. 28 ἡλθεν σὺν φωνῇ), 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.

eις τὰ ὁστα is a regular Septuagint phrase.

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

τοῖς λαλούμενοις. 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, 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 λαλοῦμενα recurs in the New Testament, besides in Lk. ii. 33, only in Acts xiii. 45, xvi. 14. The argument for Lucan authorship or editorship cannot altogether be denied.

Verse 56. ἐμείνεν . . . σὺν. μένειν σὺν recurs in the

125 The passage in John, namely Jno xii. 30 ἡ φωνὴ αὐτῆ γέγονεν, is ignored by Harnack. Here ἡλθεν is substituted for γέγονεν by D etc. But D substituted εγένετο for ἡλθεν in verse 28 (καὶ εγένετο φωνὴ instead of ἡλθεν ὅν ψαν θαν). Without doubt εγένετο is right in verse 30 and ἡλθεν 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., τοῦτον τοῦ λογοῦ instead of τοῦ λογοῦ (τοῦ) λαλοῦμενος.
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."
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 συν in general. According to Hawkins,134 συν 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 συν with the dative. However, συν 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 συν in Lk. i-ii. It is also commoner in the rest of Luke, but not in Acts.

υπεστρέψεν.135 υποστρέφειν 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. ο χρόνος τού τεκείν 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 τού τεκείν αὐτήν.

Verse 58. ἐμεγάλυνεν κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετὰ 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

136 Mk. xiv. 40. The text is at least very doubtful. The reading υποστρέφεις is opposed by Ρ BL.
137 See Stanton, op. cit., ii. p. 280.
Verse 62. τό.\textsuperscript{141} τό before the interrogative τίς or τι occurs, according to Hawkins,\textsuperscript{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 τό before πῶς occurs twice in Acts.\textsuperscript{143} An investigation of the Septuagint usage would be interesting. Very probably, however, this use of τό is a genuine mark of Luke’s hand. But Stanton should be given careful attention when he says:\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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. παραχρημα\textsuperscript{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. ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πάντας φόβος.\textsuperscript{147} γίνεσθαι followed by ἐπὶ with the accusative, and with φόβος as the subject recurs in the New Testament only at Acts v. 5, i.\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{143}Hawkins, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{145}Mk. ix. 34 πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν ἐν τῇ ὅδῷ τίς μείζων, Lk ix. 46 εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διὰ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτῶι, τό τίς ἢν εἶν αὐτῶι μείζων αὐτῶι. It will be noticed that (supposing that Mark was the source of Luke) Luke has added not only the τό but also the optative ἐν. May not the optatives in Lk. i-ii be similarly explained as due merely to revision of a source?
\textsuperscript{147}Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 17, 36.
\textsuperscript{148}Cf. also Lk. iv. 36 καὶ ἐγένετο ὃς μείζων ἐπὶ πάντας, and Acts ii. 43 φόβος τε ἢν μέγας ἐπὶ πάντας, where, however, the sentence is omitted by BDE etc.
Compare, however, Gen. xxxv. 5 καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς θεοῦ ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις, 2 Chron. xix. 7 καὶ νῦν γενέσθω φῶς κυρίου ἐφ' ὕμνος. According to Hawkins, 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. 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.

diaeικαιείτο. 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 αὐτῶν compare 1 Sam. xxi. 12 ἔθεντο Δανείδ τὰ ἰματα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, xxix. 10, Hg: ii. 18.

πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες. Of the passages cited by Zimmermann, Acts v. 5, 11, ix. 21, x. 44 are really parallel. Acts v. 5b καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς μέγας ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούσαντες and Acts v. 11 καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς μέγας ἐφ' θλην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούσαντες 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.

τι ἄρα (or τις ἄρα) occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii,

149 Loc. cit.
150 Some of the most frequent subjects of the verb are πνεύμα κυρίου, χειρ κυρίου, and ὄργη. 2 Chron. xx. 29 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐκστάσεις κυρίου ἐπὶ πᾶσας τᾶς βασιλείας τῆς γῆς ἐν τῷ ἀκούσαι αὐτοῦ στὶ κ.τ.λ. and 2 Chron xiv. 13 (cited by Resch, op. cit., p. 40), with the two passages quoted above (where φῶς is the subject) offer a somewhat closer parallel to Lk. i. 64.

151 Gersdorf, Stanton, op. cit., ii. p. 293.
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 Septuagint suggests the hypothesis of Lucan editing, if not Lucan authorship.

\[ \chiεิρ κυρίου Ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ \] 156 This expression recurs in the New Testament only at Acts xi. 21 καὶ Ἦν τοῦ χειρ κυρίου μετ' αὐτῶν. Acts xiii. 11 καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ χειρ κυρίου ἐπὶ σέ is different. 157 In the Septuagint, the expression does not occur, though I Chron. iv. 10 καὶ Ἦν τοῦ χειρ 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. \[ ηὔξανεν \] 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 ηὔξησεν . . . καὶ ἐπληθύνθη of Acts vii. 17 and the ηὔξανεν καὶ ἐπληθύνετο of Acts xii. 24, compare Gen. i. 22; and for Lk. i. 80 and ii. 40 compare Gen. xxi. 8 καὶ ηὔξηθη τὸ παιδίον. 161

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

---

155 A has τινα ἄρα in Job xv. 2.
156 Gersdorf; cf. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 44.
157 ἐστὶ c. acc. stands instead of μετά 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, compare Ezek. xiii. 4 ὃς ἀλώπεκες ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις οἱ προφήται σου, Ἰσραήλ.

ἀναδείξεως. ἀναδείξεως, which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, occurs in the Septuagint only at Si. xliii. 6. ἀναδεικνύει, 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, approaches far more closely to Lk. i. 80 than does the use of the word in Acts. ὑποδεικνύει is fairly common in the Septuagint.

Chapter ii. Verse 1. ὁγομ, 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. Holtzmann compares Dan. ii. 13 to ὁγομ 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.

οἰκομένην. The word οἰκομένη, 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: ἀρτὸς δὲ ἢ ν ὑποχώρων ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις.
164 Gersdorf, Zimmermann.
165 ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι τὸν καρδὶν ἀναδειχθῇση. The Lord is here addressed.
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.
the rest of the New Testament, is rather frequent in the Septuagint, for example in the Psalms.

Verse 2. \textit{ἀπογραφή} 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.

\textit{ἡγεμονεύωντος}. Gersdorf compares Lk. iii. i. The comparison is interesting: \textit{ἡγεμονεύων} does not occur in the Septuagint, but \textit{ἡγεμονία} occurs a number of times, and \textit{ἡγεμῶν} is fairly common.

Verse 4. \textit{δὲ καὶ} 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.

\textit{διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτῶν}. \textit{διὰ τὸ} 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. \textit{φυλάσσοντες}. This verb is exceedingly common in the Septuagint. For \textit{φυλάσσοντες φυλακᾶς} compare Num. iii. 7 \textit{φυλάξοντιν τὰς φυλακὰς αὐτοῦ}, etc. For the somewhat similar expression \textit{ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν} in verse 9, compare Jonah i. 10 \textit{ἐφοβήθησαν οἱ ἀνδρεὶς φόβον μέγαν} (or \textit{φόβῳ μεγάλῳ}).

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{170} Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{171} In that passage, D has \textit{επιτροπεύων} instead of \textit{ηγεμονεύων}.
\textsuperscript{172} Zimmermann, Hawkins, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 17, 37; cf. Friedrich, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 15ff., 91.
\textsuperscript{173} Gersdorf.
\textsuperscript{174} Zimmermann, Hawkins, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 23; cf. Friedrich, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 32, 100.
\textsuperscript{175} Zimmermann; cf. Stanton, \textit{op. cit.}, ii. p. 290, Friedrich, \textit{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 αὐτοῖς compare Acts xii. 7 ἔδω ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐπέστη, καὶ φῶς ἐλαμψεν ἐν τῷ οἴκήματι 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 ἀπας) ὁ λαὸς 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.

---

177 Compare especially Acts xii. 7 ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐπέστη.
178 That is, the intransitive parts of the verb are used.
180 Cf. Gersdorff, Friedrich, op. cit., p. 45.
182 Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 21, 45.
Verse 13. ἐξαίρεσις 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.

στρατιάς ὀφρανίου (or ὀφρανοῦ). Gersdorf cites Acts vii. 42 τῇ στρατιὰ τοῦ ὀφρανοῦ. 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 ὀφρανοῦ or the like occurs in all these passages.

αἰνοῦτον. aiveiv 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 ὀφρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις. These words are not found in the other Gospels, but take the place in Luke of the ὄσαννα 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 James can cite an interesting parallel in Ps. Sol. xviii. 11 (xix. 1) ἐνδόξα 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 περιελαμφευ ἀντοῖς in Lk. ii. 9.
184a Cf. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 44.
suggests the possibility that the δόξα ἐν ἰνθίστοις 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 ἰνθίστοις, at any rate, was already given. It stands in the ὡσαν-να ἐν τοῖς ἰνθίστοις of Matthew and Mark. The conjunction of εἰρήνη and δόξα ἐν ἰνθίστοις 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. 38. This hypothesis, however, is apparently connected with the untenable 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, B. Weiss, J. Weiss and Gould. 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-


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.

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. It is not surprising, therefore, that the tradition of what was said is not exactly uniform. The characteristic cry of the multitude—that 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 εὐαυτὴν καὶ δόξα ἐν υἱῶσίου reproduces the spirit and general meaning of the ὠσάνων ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖστοι which has been preserved by Matthew and Mark. Surely that phrase is not altogether clear. 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. 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 ὠσάνων ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖστοι, 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

---

194 The modern commentators have experienced enough difficulty with it.
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 εὐδοκις (in all probability the correct reading) would be inexplicable.
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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 \( \text{dierxesthai e\'os}^{108} \) compare Gen. xxii. 5 \( \text{dielevu'meta e\'os o\'de} \). 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.

\( \delta\eta \) 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 \( \text{shiy}. \)

\( \text{idomenv to h\'uma touto to yegovos}.^{201} \) \( \text{to yegovos 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. to yegovos as the object of } \text{eidov occurs, besides here, only in Lk. viii. 34 (where Mk. v. 14 has } \text{idev} \text{ t} \text{i } \text{estin to yegovos}), 35. \text{Acts xiii. 12. In the Septuagint, compare I Sam. iv. 16 } \text{ti to yegovos h\'uma}^{202}, \text{x. i} \text{i } \text{ti touto to yegovos to \text{vi}o Keli}^{203}, \text{Esth. iv. 4, 7,}

\( \text{dierxesthai e\'os occurs in the New Testament, besides here, only three, or possibly four, times in Acts. See Harnack. Cf. Friedrich, op. cit., pp. 17, 20.}^{100} \)

\( \text{Harnack, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, op. cit., pp. 14f.}^{108} \)

\( \text{A has it also in Acts vi. 3.}^{201} \)

\( \text{Gersdorf, Harnack, Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 17, 36.}^{202} \)

\( \text{h\'uma occurs with yegovos only in Lk. ii. 15 in the New Testament (Gersdorf compares, however, Acts x. 37 to yegovos h\'uma ). This usage is strongly Hebraistic. Cf. above, p. 233.}^{203} \)

\( \text{This passage introduces touto like Lk. i. 15 (Harnack says, “Luk. liet das pleonastische Demonstrativpronomen”, but cites no passages outside of Lk. i-ii), but the yegovos here retains more of its participial force.}^{100} \)
Judith xv. i, (Eccl. i. 9), 1 Macc. iv. 21. The significance of τὸ γεγονός as a Lucan characteristic cannot, perhaps, be altogether denied.

Verse 16. οὐσίαντες. οὐδὲν 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. But so it is also in the Septuagint, where, moreover, the word itself is fairly common.

ἀνεβαρεν, 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.

τε 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. οὐσίαντες. οὐδὲν 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. In the Septuagint, the word occurs only twelve times at most. It is perhaps some indication of Lucan style.

205 Stanton, loc. cit.
209 See Stanton, loc. cit., and Gersdorf.
Verse 20. "δοξάζοντες . . . 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); 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" 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.

"προσδέχόμενος." 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 "προσδέχόμενος τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς σωτηρίας μου" and Wi. xviii. 7 "προσδέχθη ὕπο λαοῦ σου σωτηρία μὲν δικαίων." Neither of these passages, however, had a Semitic original.

"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. Holtzmann compares Is. 216

---

211 Also at Dan xi. 38 (Theodotion), with reference to a false god.
213 Cf. Resch, op. cit., p. 131.
215 With regard to the former, see Swete, op. cit., p. 256.
xl. 1. Compare also the passages from Jewish writings cited by Wettstein,\textsuperscript{218} and Dalman.\textsuperscript{219}

Verse 27. *εἰδαργαίειν*,\textsuperscript{220} *εἰσάργειν*, 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*.\textsuperscript{221} *ἐδέξασθαι* occurs once (here) in Lk. i-ii, sixteen\textsuperscript{222} times in the rest of Luke, eight\textsuperscript{223} times in Acts, ten\textsuperscript{224} times in Matthew, six\textsuperscript{225} 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. *δεσπότης*.\textsuperscript{226} *δέσποτα* 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{228}

Verse 33. *θαυμάζουντες ἐπὶ*.\textsuperscript{229} *θαυμάζειν ἐπὶ*, which

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{218}In loc.
  \item \textsuperscript{219}Op. cit., pp. 89f.
  \item \textsuperscript{220}Gersdorf, Zimmermann, Hawkins, op. cit., p. 29.
  \item \textsuperscript{221}Zimmermann.
  \item \textsuperscript{222}Zimmermann says fifteen.
  \item \textsuperscript{223}So Moulton and Geden. Zimmermann says nine.
  \item \textsuperscript{224}Zimmermann says six. Seven of the occurrences, it is true, are in the same context.
  \item \textsuperscript{225}Zimmermann says three. Four of the occurrences are in the same context.
  \item \textsuperscript{226}Gersdorf, Zimmermann.
  \item \textsuperscript{227}Compare the investigation of the Magnificat and the Benedictus in the former article, Princeton Theological Review, x (1912). pp. 1-38.
  \item \textsuperscript{228}Cited by Ryle and James, op. cit., p. xcii.
  \item \textsuperscript{229}Gersdorf, Hawkins, op. cit., pp. 19, 41; cf. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 33.
\end{itemize}

Verse 34. \( \text{ἀντιλεγόμενον} \)\(^{230} \) \( \text{ἀντιλέγειν} \), 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. \( \text{διαλογισμός} \)\(^{231} \) \( \text{διαλογισμός} \) is much more common in the Gospel of Luke than in any other New Testament book, and of the thirteen New Testament occurrences of \( \text{διαλέγεσθαι} \), ten are in Acts. Both words occur in the Septuagint, though not with great frequency.

Verse 36. \( \text{ἐτος} \)\(^{232} \) \( \text{ἐτος} \), 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. \( \text{ἀπιστάναι} \)\(^{233} \) \( \text{ἀπιστάναν} \) 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.

\( \lambda ατρείονσα νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν \)\(^{234} \) \( \lambda ατρεῖεν νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν \) 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. \( \text{ἀυτὴ τῇ ὁρᾷ} \)\(^{235} \) The phrase (with or without \( \text{ἐν} \) ) 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.
\(^{233}\) Gersdorf, Hawkins, op. cit., p. 16.
\(^{234}\) Gersdorf, Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, op. cit., pp. 36, 100.
\(^{236}\) Perhaps because the word ὁρᾷ 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. ὑπέμενεν. \(^{238}\) ὑπομένειν in the sense of “remain” occurs again in the New Testament only at Acts xviii. 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.

ἀναξητοῦντες. \(^{242}\) ἀναξητείν 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 μέσῳ\(^{243}\) is common in the Septuagint.

Verse 47. εἴσισταντο. \(^{244}\) 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 ἀναβαίνουσιν und τελειομένων.”

\(^{240}\) Harnack; cf. Gersdorf, Friedrich, op. cit., p. 19.

\(^{241}\) Gersdorf; cf. Friedrich, loc. cit.


\(^{243}\) Zimmermann; cf. Friedrich, op. cit., pp. 22, 92.

\(^{244}\) Harnack.
Lk. ii. 47 with Acts ix. 21 ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες. 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.

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

243 Harnack.
245 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, ὀμφαλός (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 πόθεν μοι τοῦτο (Lk. i. 43) Harnack can compare only Mt. xiii. 54, 56, xv. 33. Mk. vi. 2. Again, with regard to ἡ εἰκόνισμα in the same verse, Harnack remarks, “dieser Gebrauch der Εἰκόνισμα für den Infinit. ist bei Luk. sonst m. W. nicht zu belegen, im N. T. aber doch schon häufiger”. Vogel, op. cit., pp. 35 f., 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 vermahlt 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. 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". 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 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; 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. 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 Testament

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.

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. 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 Kouvý. Hence Luke was at least the editor of Lk. i-ii. These chapters

Cf. Stanton, op. cit., ii. p. 291: "Luke may have been led to use the expressions in question [ἐκτίνερο, 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 Quellenschrift, 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 Quellenschrift 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."

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 Aramaisms which are to be found in Lk. i-ii. 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.

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

\(^{257}\) See Hillmann, *loc. cit.*
\(^{258}\) See Hillmann, *op. cit.*, p. 196.
\(^{259}\) Lk. i. 59ff., ii. 21.
eyes of an inhabitant of Palestine. The technical expressions ὀικος and πατριά and φυλή are incidentally used. The author knows the provisions of the law about purification after childbirth and consecration of the first-born. He represents the parents of Jesus as choosing the alternative offering prescribed for the poor 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. 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. 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. αὐτὴς is very weakly attested. αὐτὸν is supported by D and a few other witnesses. Syr may go back either to αὐτὴς or to αὐτὸν (see Merx, Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas, 1905, p. 191). αὐτὴς is manifestly a correction; αὐτὸν perhaps also, though, if so, the correction was certainly very unfortunate.
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.

In the second place, it is objected that according to the law, the first-born son was to be redeemed rather than actually presented in the temple. 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, 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.
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.

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 *Χριστός Κύριος* as in the Palestinian Psalms of Solomon. 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. 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. 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., xliv. 6, xlv. 6ff., xlvi. 13 (passages cited in the margin of Nestle's text, published by the British and Foreign Bible Society). Lk. ii. 34-35 contains a prophecy. 

---

2.1 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.


2.3 Cf. above, pp. 249f.

2.4 Holtzmann is therefore entirely unwarranted in saying, *op. cit.*,
predictive 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 διελέυσεται 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

---


277 Cf. Is. lli.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. Feine 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

\[278 \text{Op. cit., p. 13.}\]
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.  

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

---

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 firsthand 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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{281a} and a com-

\textit{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 reverenced 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).

\textsuperscript{280} This view is held by Zimmermann. Cf. Plummer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{281a} Accepting the view which makes Luke a native of Antioch.
panion of Paul. 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, 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 ἐγέρσος, are Hebraisms, not Aramaisms. 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. Yet Hebrew remained in use as the language of certain kinds of literature. If Lk. i-ii was originally written in Hebrew, then it was in-


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


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 Bibli-cisms".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 Bibli-cisms. Thus, although the familiar Hebraistic ἐγένετο has no equivalent in the living Aramaic,288 yet in the (Aramaic) Targums the Hebrew נִנְעָה is imitated by נַנְעָה 288. It might have

---

287 Dalman, op. cit., p. 33.  
288 Dalman, op. cit., pp. 25f.  
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.  

In general, says Dalman, "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." 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.

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

---

290 Op. cit., p. 34.
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.393

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-

393 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 לְוָיִית חֵשֵׁם, 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 חֵשֵׁם 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. Dalman, op. 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 ἐπελ θηρά ο ἄνωθεν (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. Schmiedel supposes that Lk. ii was originally separate from Lk. i, because "in Lk. 2 the contents of Lk. 1 are not presupposed, except in 21 b: 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, 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 Holtzmann says about Lk. ii. 4, 5, as proving the "relative independence of the new passage" 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. Nazareth need not have been mentioned, but probably a certain emphatic parallelism with εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν εἰς πόλιν Δαβίδ was desired. 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. Far more elaborate are the theories of Völter and Wilkinson. Both of these writers, working independently, detected within the first chapter of Luke a purely Johannine

294 Article "Mary" in Encyclopaedia Biblica, iii. col. 2960.
297 "Beweis verhältnissmässiger Selbständigkeit des neuen Stücks."
298 Contrast Lk. i. 27 ἀνδρὶ δυομα Ἰωσήφ.
300 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).
301 Die evangelischen Erzählungen von der Geburt und Kindheit Jesu, 1911.
303 See Wilkinson, op. cit., p. 34.
document—\textsuperscript{303}—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

\textsuperscript{303} Wilkinson, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 6, 30ff., 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 \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota \omicron \sigma \rho \omicron \upsilon \delta \varsigma \) (which does not really agree with \( \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha \iota \varsigma \ \eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \alpha \varsigma \ \tau \alpha \upsilon \tau \alpha \iota \varsigma \) 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 \( \pi \alpha \omega \varsigma \ \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \iota \ \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \) (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

---


305 Thus the \( \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha \iota \varsigma \ \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \ \nu \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \) of verse 48 referred originally to "the moment of the annunciation"; whereas in the present narrative it refers to "the moment of Elizabeth'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.” 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 says 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.
together with the great chronological note evidently ori-
genated. The passage Lk. i. 39-45, 46 unites the two birth
narratives, which were originally quite distinct. The for-
mer 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 probability 310 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 con-
nected with the birth of the forerunner. In Lk. i. 5-25,
John appears as the forerunner not specifically of the Mes-
siah, 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 foot-
note (ibid), Harnack says: “It is not improbable that Luke, before
he united himself with the Christian community, belonged to the dis-
ciples of John the Baptist [Anhänger des Täuferbewegung gewesend]
and had already pursued historical investigations which he after-
wards used for his Gospel. The attitude which he assumes in the
Gospel (and also in Acts) towards the Johannine movement [Täufer-
bewegung] and towards the “Spirit” tends to support this hypothesis.
Furthermore, in Lk. iii. 15 προςδοκώντος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ διαλογίζομενον πάντων
ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου, μὴ ποτὲ αὐτῶς εἴη ὁ χριστὸς, Luke
has probably given expression to experiences of his own, which, after the narrative in Lk. i, seem altogether natural. This nar-
rative 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 MACHEM.