I have put down Luke’s work for this lecture because, on the whole, I think that in the true chronological order of the Gospels Luke should follow Mark and precede Matthew and John. Both Matthew and Luke make use of the early collection of sayings of Jesus known as Q\(^1\); in the course of prolonged and detailed study of this source as preserved in Matthew and Luke, I have come to the conclusion that Luke used a more primitive rendering of the original Aramaic than Matthew. Similarly, both Matthew and Luke use Mark, but with a difference. Matthew produces a new, enlarged, and enriched edition of Mark, while Luke uses Mark as a quarry from which to extract such materials as he chooses to incorporate in a new work of his own. This suggests that by the time that Matthew wrote, the Gospel of Mark had attained a prestige (through its association with the name of Peter) which ruled out the possibility of cutting it about as Luke had done.

For the purposes of this lecture I shall assume as a working hypothesis that Luke and Acts are the work of the same writer, who is to be identified with one of the companions of St. Paul, covered by the ‘We’ in the ‘We-passages’ of Acts, and in all probability with the Luke who is referred to in Col. iv. 14;

\(^1\) I think it probable that Q was put together in Aramaic about the middle of the first century as a manual of instruction for Christian converts. The original order is best preserved in Luke. The following portions of Luke should probably be assigned to the source Q (brackets indicate doubt): Lk. iii. 7-9, 16, 17; iv. 1-13; vi. 20-49; vii. (1-6a), 6b-9 (10), 18-35; ix. 57-62; x. 2, 3, 8-16, 21-24; xi. 9-26, (27-28), 29-36, (37-41), 42-52; xii. (1), 2-12, 22-34, (35-38), 39-46, (47-50), 51-59; xiii. 18-30, 34, 35; xiv. 15-24, 26, 27, (34, 35); xvi. 13, 16-18; xvii. 1-6, 22-37. For an attempted reconstruction of Q with a commentary, see The Mission and Message of Jesus, pp. 331-440.
I begin with a short consideration of the early Church tradition regarding the work of Luke. Most of it is available in very convenient form for English readers in a contribution by H. J. Cadbury to the Beginnings of Christianity, ii. 209-264. The first thing that strikes one about this material is the absence of any considerable body of very early testimony of the sort that cannot be explained as inference from statements in the New Testament itself. This is in marked contrast to what we found in the case of Mark; and it calls for explanation. The facts are as follows:

There is nothing from Papias. Eusebius gives us traditions preserved by the Bishop of Hierapolis concerning Mark, and (as Papias supposed) Matthew. But there is no word about Luke; and it is reasonable to suppose that Eusebius would have reported it, had it been available.

The Muratorian Canon, which may be taken to give the views current in Rome in the second century, and may perhaps be the work of Hippolytus, says:  

‘The third book of the Gospel, according to Luke, Luke that physician, who after the ascension of Christ, when Paul had taken him with him as companion of his journey, composed in his own name on the basis of report. However, he did not himself see the Lord in the flesh and therefore as he could “trace the course of events” he set them down. So also he began his story with the birth of John.’

There is nothing here that could not be inferred from the New Testament (Luke, Acts, and Pauline Epistles) by an intelligent student of the text. This conclusion holds good in the case of Irenaeus, our other second century witness in Europe, who not only gives his conclusions but sets out the arguments by which they are derived from the New Testament.

The African and Egyptian Fathers add little or nothing.

1 On the identification of the Λουκᾶς of Col., Phm., and II Tim. with the Λουκᾶς of Rom., and of both with the author of the ‘We’-passages, see Deissmann, Licht vom Osten, pp. 372-377; H. J. Cadbury in Beginnings of Christianity, v. 489-492.

2 Trans. Cadbury, Beginnings, ii. 211.

3 Cadbury, ibid., ii. 212-221.
Tertullian lays great stress on the fact that Luke was one of Paul's followers. Clement of Alexandria mentions the theory that Luke translated the Epistle to the Hebrews into Greek. Origen tells us that Luke 'made for converts from the Gentiles the gospel praised by Paul'. This last statement is again an inference, and probably an illegitimate one, from the passage in II Cor. viii. 18 where Paul speaks to the Corinthian community of sending to them 'the brother whose praise in the Gospel is through all the churches'. The brother is not named and there have been many guesses at his identity; but they remain mere guesses. The description given is quite ambiguous. What it means is that the brother in question has a great and widespread reputation as an Evangelist; but whether 'Evangelist' means a preacher of the Gospel or the composer of a gospel, we have no means of determining. It seems that Origen was the first to interpret II Cor. viii. 18 of Luke and his Gospel: he has had many followers in ancient and modern times—Chrysostom, Ephrem Syrus, Eusebius, Jerome, Ambrose; and in more recent days Rendall, Plummer, Bachmann, and others. But the identification remains no more than a guess.

The only early document to give particulars apparently independent of the New Testament is the anti-Marcionite Prologue to the Gospel. The credit for showing the date and importance of the anti-Marcionite prologues belongs to Dom D. de Bruyne, whose conclusions were published in the *Revue Bénédictine* for July 1928 (pp. 193-214), and accepted by Harnack in a paper published in the same year. Three Prologues are extant, to Mark, Luke, and John. All three are in Latin; but for Luke the Greek original has also survived. They belong to the second century and most probably to the time before Irenaeus. The Greek prologue to Luke runs as follows:

1 Cadbury, *ibid.*, ii. 227.
2 For an excellent discussion of the problems raised by II. Cor. viii. 18, see E. B. Allo, *Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens* (*Études Bibliques*), pp. 224 ff.
3 It may be remarked in passing that Origen here gives the four gospels in the order Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, which he evidently regards as the chronological order of composition.
5 I translate De Bruyne's text as given by Harnack.
Luke was a Syrian of Antioch, a physician by profession. A former disciple of the Apostles who afterwards accompanied Paul until his (Paul's) martyrdom, who served the Lord continually, unmarried, childless, he fell asleep at the age of eighty-four in Boeotia, full of the Holy Spirit.

This man, when there were already Gospels in existence—that "according to Matthew", written down in Judaea, and that "according to Mark", in Italy—impelled by the Holy Spirit, composed this whole Gospel in Achaea, making clear by his Preface this very fact that before him other (Gospels) had been written, and also that it was necessary to set forth an accurate account of the (Christian) dispensation for the believers of Gentile origin, so that they should neither be disturbed by Jewish tales, nor, through the deceitful influence of heretical and empty imaginings, miss the truth. Accordingly at the very outset (of the Gospel) we have transmitted to us as being most essential (the account of) the birth of John, who is "the beginning of the Gospel". who was the forerunner of the Lord and shared in the preparation of the Gospel, in the baptismal instruction, and in the fellowship of the Spirit. Of this dispensation a prophet, one of "The Twelve", makes mention.

And then at a later date this same Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles, and afterwards John the Apostle, one of the Twelve, wrote the Apocalypse in the island of Patmos and after that the Gospel.

The strong anti-Marcionite polemic of this Prologue is evident at every turn. Against Marcion's reduction of the whole...
Bible to a mutilated edition of Luke and the Pauline Epistles. We have Luke himself brought in to testify to the existence of other Gospels. We have a strong insistence on the complete Gospel of Luke with all the things, the story of John the Baptist for example, that Marcion had deleted. We have the insistence on the Old Testament prophecy of the Forerunner. All this points to a time when the Marcionite dispute was a living issue, that is the second half of the second century.

Along with this obviously polemical matter we have a number of details about St. Luke, which do not serve in any way to grind the anti-Marcionite axe. We learn (1) that Luke was first a disciple of the Apostles; (2) that subsequently he became a companion of St. Paul and remained with him till his martyrdom; (3) that he wrote the Gospel in Achaea; (4) that he was unmarried and childless; (5) that he reached the age of 84; and (6) that he died in Boeotia. These details were not invented to help the case against Marcion. But equally they were not, for the most part, the product of arm-chair detective work on the text of the New Testament. The first two items might conceivably be guesses based on Luke's Preface, the narrative of Acts, and the references to Luke in the Pauline Epistles. The remainder could hardly have come in that way. Indeed anyone who made inferences from the New Testament would have had good reason to choose Macedonia or Caesarea or Rome as the place of writing of the Gospel and of the death of Luke, rather than Achaea or Boeotia. The fact that we have Achaea and Boeotia suggests that we have to do either with genuine tradition or pure invention. The same holds of the remaining details. The information that Luke was unmarried and childless could not possibly help the case against Marcion, who repudiated marriage and the procreation of children with horror and disgust. Nor could these points have been deduced from Scripture. They are here either because they were invented by the author of the Prologue—and what purpose could the invention serve?—or because they were believed to be true statements. Similarly, there was no point in giving Luke's age when he died unless there was some ground for believing that that was in fact his age. We

may conclude that there is at least a *prima facie* case for accepting the tradition as generally reliable.

As to its origin and date, De Bruyne has shown good reason for placing the composition of the Prologues in the second half of the second century and making their home at Rome. Harnack puts forward as alternative suggestions for the place of origin Achaea and Asia; but he admits that Rome is more probable than these. I venture to propose a compromise solution to the problem. Accepting De Bruyne's arguments in favour of Rome as the place of origin of the Prologues, we may ask whence the personalia regarding Luke were obtained. And to that question the most obvious answer is Achaea. If details of this kind were to be preserved at all, it would most probably be in the place to which they were native. Moreover the information could easily have been transmitted to Rome. To name only one possible way, we know that the episcopate of Dionysius of Corinth overlapped that of Soter of Rome (c. 166-174), that Dionysius was a strong anti-Marcionite, and that he wrote at least one letter to Rome.¹ I suggest, therefore, that the Prologue to Luke was composed in Rome in the latter half of the second century on the basis of information supplied from Achaea.

The tradition makes Luke a Syrian of Antioch. We are bound to consider the relation of this statement to the well-known variant reading in the text of Acts xi. 28. In the R.V. Acts xi. 27 f. reads as follows:—

'Now in those days there came down prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be a great famine over all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius.'

After 'Antioch' the Codex Bezae, with support from Latin MSS. and ecclesiastical writers, has:—

'And there was much rejoicing, and when we had been in conversation together, one of them named Agabus spoke signifying by the Spirit . . .'

¹ Eusebius *HE*, iv. 23.
If this reading is genuine, it is the first of the 'We-passages' in Acts, and the inference is that the author of these passages (whom I regard as the author of the whole book) was associated with the community at Antioch at the time of this incident (c. A.D. 45). Naturally there has been considerable discussion of the relation between the variant in Acts and the tradition connecting Luke with Antioch. This mostly takes the form of asking whether the reading is derived from the tradition or the tradition from the reading. The former view was apparently held by J. H. Ropes; the latter is regarded as more likely by Cadbury and accepted by A. C. Clark. There is, of course, a third possibility, which seems to me to be more credible than either of the other two. That is that the tradition and the reading are independent of one another, that the reading is genuine and the tradition true, and that both depend on the fact that Luke was an Antiochene Christian who was a member of the church in that city at the time in question. If Luke was an early member of the Antiochene community, he would naturally come under the influence of the leaders of the Palestinian Church before attaching himself to Paul.

The result of our examination of the early tradition is that what there is seems to originate in one locality—Achaea. Along with this result goes the fact that while the other Gospels seem to be fairly firmly attached to leading centres of early Church life—Mark to Rome, Matthew to Antioch, John to Asia and Ephesus—Luke's Gospel has no such traditional connexion. It seems to me that both facts may be explained in the same way, that Luke's work in its final form was not done at the request of any particular Christian community for lectionary use in its worship, but that it was done on his own initiative for publication to the outside world. That this was the case seems to be clearly implied in the author's own preface to the Gospel, where he tells Theophilus—and through him all the other readers of the work—how he came to the decision to add one more to the existing

1 See his note ad. loc. (Beginnings of Christianity, iii. 108).
2 Beginnings, ii. 248.
4 ἔδοξεν καίμεν: 'I also decided'. It is made quite plain that the job was not undertaken at the request of a Church or Christian group. There is nothing
accounts of the beginnings of Christianity. The statement of the Preface is corroborated (or interpreted) by the Muratorian Canon, which tells us that Luke 'composed' (the Gospel) 'in his own name on the basis of report'; and by the anti-Marcionite Prologue, which says that he wrote 'impelled by the Holy Spirit'. That is to say Luke's work was regarded by himself and by later Christians as a personal undertaking for which he took personal responsibility. Doubtless Luke himself, and certainly the author of the anti-Marcionite Prologue, believed that in taking this decision and carrying it out the Evangelist was guided by the Holy Spirit.

The upshot of the preceding discussion is that we should recognize in Luke-Acts the first conscious and deliberate attempt to write a History of Christianity, an attempt made by an individual on his own initiative, using materials collected by himself, intended for publication to the world outside the Church under the name and on the responsibility of the author. These conclusions are, in part at least, supported by the analysis of the documents themselves.

We may begin with the familiar and widely-accepted conclusions of synoptic criticism. First, that the Gospel of Luke incorporates a little over half of Mark; from which it at once follows that Luke, *in its present form*, is later than Mark. Second, that when the Marcan matter is removed from Luke, we are left with a body of teaching and narrative, some of which corresponds to and is often in close verbal agreement with non-Marcan sections in Matthew. This non-Marcan matter common to Matthew and Luke is assigned to a hypothetical source Q. It is clear that we can confidently claim acquaintance with Q only at those points where Matthew and Luke coincide in their borrowings. We might suggest that the Gospel and Acts were put together as a kind of brief for the defence of Paul in his trial at Rome. All that the preface says is that Luke, for reasons that seemed good to him, made up his mind to tell the world what he knew about the ministry of Jesus and the early years of the Church. Later in this lecture I suggest a possible reason why Luke made this decision.

*a nomine suo ex opinione conscriptis*. The translation is Cadbury's. (Beginnings, ii. 211.)

*a προταθῶς ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου*: Lat. sancto instigatus spiritu.
ings from it. Either may also have borrowed passages which the other has left untouched. In these cases we may suspect that a passage in Matthew or Luke is from Q; but we cannot be sure. Again there may well have been sections of Q which neither Matthew nor Luke chose to incorporate. Here our ignorance is total. There may have been such passages. If there were, we know nothing about them; and we do not even know whether such passages existed or not. My own attempts to reconstruct Q have led to the conclusion that there are in Luke some 222 verses, which I should assign confidently to that source, and another 24 which may have come from it.

If we remove the Q material as well as the Marcan, the remaining matter in Luke is peculiar to this gospel. It includes the stories of the birth of John the Baptist and Jesus, an account of an incident in the Temple when Jesus was twelve years old, a genealogy of Jesus different from that given in Matthew, and large body of stories and teachings from the Ministry and the Passion. The late Dr. Streeter formed a hypothesis to cover the data presented by the analysis of Luke into its components. He suggested that the first draft of the Gospel consisted of matter from Q and matter peculiar to Luke, without the Marcan extracts and without the Birth and Infancy narratives. This first draft, which Streeter called Proto-Luke, opened with the elaborate time-reference at the beginning of chapter iii. It consisted of narrative and teaching and made a document about the same size as Mark. It seems to me that Streeter was right in his main contention that the document Proto-Luke was a definite stage in the composition of our Luke and that the next step was the incorporation of extracts from Mark into Proto-Luke rather than the expansion of Mark by the insertion of Proto-Lukan material.

A question of some importance still remains. Granted that Proto-Luke had a separate existence, what was the manner of its existence? Was it a heap of notes; or a properly written account of the Ministry based on all the materials then available (viz. Q and L); or a definite first edition of the Gospel, not only written down but put into circulation? The question was raised
by Dr. Headlam,\textsuperscript{1} who, rejecting the idea of two editions, suggested that 'St. Luke had probably collected much material and planned his work before he came in contact with St. Mark's Gospel, which he would not do until he reached Rome'. Streeter, in reply to this,\textsuperscript{2} said:

'All I am concerned to argue is that Proto-Luke was, and was originally intended as, a complete Gospel; but it is quite likely that it was only meant for what in modern phrase would be called "private circulation".'

In considering this problem it is necessary to be clear about terms like 'edition', 'circulation', 'publication'. As I see it there were two kinds of Gospel-writing in the early Church. One sort of Gospel was produced primarily to meet the needs of the existing Christian community in a particular centre. It was composed for them and read to them or by them. If it later came to the knowledge of other Christian communities, that was something extra, which need not even have been foreseen when the work was done originally. I think that Q, Mark, Matthew (probably), and John (probably) were works of this sort. The second kind of Gospel, represented by Luke along with its continuation in Acts, was prepared for publication in our sense of the word, to instruct the outsider even more than to edify the Church member, though the latter aim is not excluded. As will appear later, I think that Luke-Acts was written and published by Luke to meet a particular emergency. But it is not necessary to suppose that Proto-Luke was either published in this sense (I don't believe it was) or even written with publication in this sense in view. It seems to me much more likely that Proto-Luke was written with the needs of the Christian communities in mind, though I do not think that it was written at the request of any particular congregation. The following hypothetical reconstruction of the history of Luke-Acts covers (I think) the data and contains (I hope) nothing incredible.

Credible tradition connects Luke with Antioch. It is probable, in my judgement, that the document Q and the earliest

\textsuperscript{1} Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ, p. 20, n. 1.

\textsuperscript{2} The Four Gospels, p. 221.
rendering of it into Greek also belong to Antioch. Luke may well have possessed one of the earliest copies of Q in Greek. Now Q was essentially a manual of instruction for Church members; and it seems to me that the process which produced Proto-Luke was first and foremost the effort of the working missionary Luke, the assistant of Paul, to make Q a still more comprehensive and effective manual of instruction. There were doubtless many opportunities for adding to Q, the greatest of all being the long stay in Caesarea when Paul was a prisoner there and Luke was in attendance on him. Later came the journey to Rome and a knowledge of the Roman Gospel of Mark. Mark had matter that was new to the author of Proto-Luke; but it was not immediately necessary to appropriate any of it in a work of edification seeing that it was already available for that purpose in the Church. The advisability of adding Marcan material to Proto-Luke would only become apparent when the decision was taken by Luke to present to the non-Christian world a full-dress account of the Life of Jesus and the Beginnings of the Church. I think that the most obvious occasion for such a public defence of Christianity comes with the savage attack on the Church made by Nero in A.D. 64 and the Jewish war of A.D. 66-70. The publication of Luke-Acts could be placed at any time in this period of crisis (64-70) or in the years immediately following. Thus the process which begins with the possession of a copy of Q and ends with the publication of Luke-Acts may have occupied anything from fifteen to twenty-five years of Luke's life.

The fact that Luke borrowed rather more than half of Mark for his published Gospel provides us with an excellent test of his reliability as a transmitter of material which he collected. We can compare Mark with Mark-according-to-Luke, note, classify, and count up the editorial alterations, and so reach conclusions which will be of help when we are dealing with other parts of the Gospel where the sources used have not survived in their original form. On the whole it may be said that the

---

1 On Q see The Mission and Message of Jesus, pp. 307-312.
2 This work has been admirably done by H. J. Cadbury, The Style and Literary Method of Luke, Pt. II, The Treatment of Sources in the Gospel.
examination tends to strengthen our confidence in Luke’s faithfulness to his sources.¹

Again the method by which he combines materials from different sources is helpful to the student. For he does not, as a rule, conflate different accounts of the same incident or saying. His way is to follow one source at a time; and the result is that his Gospel is in the form of successive layers of material drawn from the different sources. In some places, the Passion Narrative for example, the layers are thinner and more closely packed than elsewhere; but, generally speaking, the structure is the same throughout, and it is not difficult to split the layers apart. This means that we have, as Streeter saw, a reasonable probability that Luke preserves his sources in something like their original order. My own dealings with Q-according-to-Luke tend to raise that probability for me to something like certainty.

So much can be gathered about the Evangelist’s method of work from the study of his Gospel. Something can also be learned about his motives and purposes.

In the first place we have adequate reason for holding to the tradition that the author of the Gospel and Acts was Luke the companion and assistant of Paul. That being so, we may expect that the missionary motive will be strong. Nobody in whom the missionary motive was not strong was likely to remain long in Paul’s entourage. And it is the case that nowhere in the New Testament outside the Pauline Epistles, is the missionary interest so strong and obvious as it is in Luke and Acts. Mark depicts as objectively as possible the Messianic Ministry, letting the facts speak for themselves. Matthew shows us the Messiah as Founder of the Church, who by his life and teaching lays down the Rule of Faith and the Rule of Life for the community. The Gospel of John is written ‘that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ,

¹ See F. C. Burkitt in Beginnings, ii. 106-120; W. L. Knox, Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity, p. 9: ‘In general . . . he shows a remarkable fidelity to his sources . . . (It) seems . . . that Luke was often content to copy out his sources faithfully and was a very slovenly corrector. . . . On the other hand, from time to time we find alterations in which Luke betrays himself by a use of Greek which shines like a good deed in a naughty world both in the Gospel and in the Acts.’ My own impression is that Luke’s alterations are largely attempts to improve the language and style of his sources, and that this revising activity is least in evidence where the words of Jesus are concerned.
the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name":¹ its object is to lead Christians to a right theological interpretation of the fact of Jesus Christ. On Luke-Acts I think the just word was spoken by C. H. Turner:²

"The Gospel and Acts form two halves of a simple and connected scheme, and . . . in order to understand it we have only to attach to the two books some such labels as these: Λόγος α', "How Jesus the Christ preached the Good News to the Jews, and how after His Death and Resurrection He commissioned His Apostles to preach it to the Gentiles": Λόγος β', "How they brought the Good News from Jerusalem to Rome".

This intense missionary interest is reflected in some of the characteristic features of the Gospel particularly in its universalism and its interest in the despised and outcast. Sayings, parables, and incidents are reported showing that the Gospel is for all and that it is offered first where the need is greatest. True, universalism and interest in the outcast and needy are not missing in the other gospels. Indeed, we have excellent reason for believing that they are an integral part of the Gospel in the mind of Jesus himself. But nowhere else are the points stressed and the examples multiplied as they are in Luke's work.

It is in Luke that the genealogy of Jesus is carried back beyond Abraham the father of Israel to Adam the father of mankind. It is in Luke that the infant Jesus is hailed as 'a light to lighten the Gentiles'. It is in Luke that the first recorded sermon of the Galilean Ministry speaks of divine blessings conferred on a Sidonian widow and a Syrian soldier. The disciples are the light of the world:³ it is Luke who sees the function of the light as that of guiding people outside into the house, whereas Matthew sees it as that of giving illumination to those who are already in. In Luke's account of the Resurrection appearances of Jesus, a Christian mission to all nations starting from Jerusalem is declared to be part and parcel of the Divine purpose foreshadowed

¹ John, xx. 31.
³ Luke xi. 33, compared with Matt. v. 15.
in the Scriptures and brought to fulfilment in the Ministry of Jesus and his followers.¹

Again it is Luke who embodies in his Gospel a whole series of teachings, parables, and stories, which I have called 'The Gospel of the Outcast'. I venture to repeat here part of what I wrote about it in The Mission and Message of Jesus (p. 574):

'The L material in chapters xv-xix might be called in a special sense the Gospel of the Outcast. There is in this section a great concentration of teaching, chiefly in the form of parables, whose purpose is primarily to demonstrate God's care for those whom men despise and condemn. This appears very clearly in the three parables which together make up chap. xv, in the parables of the Poor Widow (xviii. 1-8) and the Pharisee and the Publican (xviii. 9-14), and in the story of Zacchaeus (xix. 1-10). This divine love for the unloved and unlovable is, indirectly, the condemnation of the harsh and censorious attitude taken towards these unfortunates by more righteous folk. That the righteous fail from lack of kindness and human sympathy, and spoil themselves by pride, is one of the lessons of such passages as Luke xvi. 1-8, 14 f., 19-31; xviii. 9-14. Again it is taught that even from the most unpromising people there can be a genuine response to kindness and understanding (xvii. 11-19; xix. 1-10). In Luke's arrangement this mass of material leads up to the account of Passion Week: it is as though the whole of Luke from chap. xv. onwards were written to illustrate the Pauline text, "God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us".

A third point which deserves to be noticed is the extent to which Luke's editorial activities serve the purpose of 'putting the Gospel across' to the Graeco-Roman world. In a most interesting and instructive study recently published Canon W. L. Knox makes a great deal of the missionary motive as a factor in the Hellenization of the Gospel. 'The Gospel must be preached to all the world; it had therefore to be translated into the Greek language and accommodated to the general theological

¹ Lk. xxiv. 47.
² Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity—the Schweich Lectures for 1942.
conceptions of the hellenistic world, and worked out into a coherent scheme of thought.'\(^1\)

Alongside the missionary motive and equal to it in importance is the apologetic interest. Luke-Acts is the first publication in defence of Christianity against suspicion, misunderstanding, and misrepresentation. The defence makes two principal points.

The first is that the Christian community is not to be associated with the contemporary Jewish community. All the Gospels have something to say about the incompatibility between Jesus and his people, between his Messianic hope and theirs. The opposition was a fact and Jesus himself was well aware of it and spoke of it. But none of the Evangelists gives it the prominence that Luke gives it: none produces so many instances of Jewish neglect, ingratitude, and hostility. It is Luke who, in his version of the parable of the servants left in charge of their master's property, provides the additional detail that the master was claiming a throne and that his prospective subjects rejected his claim.\(^2\) It is Luke who records the bitter saying that Jerusalem must not be deprived of her rights in the matter of murdering prophets.\(^3\) It is Luke who records the enigmatic conversation about the swords, which, whatever else it means, certainly presupposes bitter hostility between the Disciples and their fellow-countrymen. It is Luke who shows us Jesus weeping over a Jerusalem that would make no effective response to his appeals.\(^4\) It is Luke who records the healing of ten lepers of whom only one, and he a Samaritan, returned to say Thank you.\(^5\) In the story of the Passion it is Luke who tells us of the contemptuous dismissal of Jesus by Herod Antipas,\(^6\) and takes great pains to show that the condemnation by Pilate was forced from him by the violence and clamour of the Jewish mob.\(^7\) On the other side, it is Luke who gives us the picture of Jewish mourners as Jesus goes on the way to execution;\(^8\) but even here it is only the women who show sympathy. The story of hostility is continued in Acts in a long series of incidents both in Palestine and

---

2 Lk. xix. 12-15a, 27 (L).  
3 Lk. xiii. 31-33 (L), 34f. (Q).  
4 Lk. xxii. 35-38 (L).  
5 Lk. xix. 41-44 (L).  
6 Lk. xvii. 11-19 (L).  
7 Lk. xxiii. 6-12 (L).  
8 Lk. xxiii. 18-23 (L).  
9 Lk. xxiii. 27-31 (L).
in the synagogues of the Dispersion. From beginning to end Luke-Acts is out to show the width and depth of the breach between Jesus and his Jewish contemporaries, between the Synagogue and the Church.

There are two things to be said about this. The first is that it is reported because it was fact, and a very important fact in the story of the Ministry of Jesus and the Early Church. The second point is that we must ask ourselves why Luke not only reports the fact but underlines it, continually reminding the reader that the Church has nothing to do with contemporary Judaism for the simple and conclusive reason that contemporary Judaism will have nothing to do with the Church, rejecting the Gospel of Jesus the Messiah just as it had rejected Jesus the Messiah himself and compassed his death at the hands of Pilate. And it is to be noted that Luke is no Marcionite before Marcion. He sets forth Jesus as the fulfilment of all the Divine promises in the Old Testament. The breach is not between the Old Covenant and the New but between Jesus and His Church on the one side and first-century Judaism and the Jewish Community on the other. This breach was a fact. At what time or times was it important to impress the fact upon the Imperial Government and the Graeco-Roman public? To put this question in this way is to get a clue to the date of Luke-Acts.

The matter can be put in this way. In the early days of the Church there were strong inducements to maintain a connexion with official Judaism and indeed to incorporate all converts into the Jewish nation. For the Jewish nation occupied a privileged position in the Roman Empire so far as religion was concerned; and the privilege enjoyed by the nation as a whole could be claimed by any local Jewish community. It is probable that the strong desire of a large section of the Early Church to hold on to their Jewish affiliation was not unconnected with the wish to have the status of a relígio licita. At the same time there is a certain amount of evidence that some members of the early Church cherished the hope of the return of Jesus in glory in a form that differed little if at all from current Jewish Messianic hopes. It is likely enough that the two groups coincided or overlapped,

1 See Juster, Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain, i. 246, 422, n. 8; Tertullian Apol., xxi. 1.
that a desire to remain affiliated to Judaism and a cherishing of the hope of the Parousia in Jewish Messianic form went together. The position was never easy to maintain: it was assailed from both sides—by the orthodox Judaism of the Synagogue and the radical Christianity of Paul. But it seems to have survived until the Jewish War of A.D. 66-70 killed it.

I venture to think that it was that disastrous revolt against the Empire that made it important to say to the Roman Government and people: 'Not only have we no share in this enterprise; we are not a part of the Jewish community at all. Long ago the Jews rejected Jesus, and the synagogue has been doing its best ever since to be rid of his followers. Our Founder was accused of seditious activities against the Empire; but the Procurator declared the charge to be unfounded.¹ Our leading missionaries have been examined by Roman magistrates and whenever the hearing has been before a man of courage and independence of mind, it has been made clear that the Christians harbour no designs against the peace and security of the Empire. It is true that we speak of a 'kingdom of God' and a Messiah, just as the Jews do; but our Messiah is no rebel against Rome, and the kingdom of God that we preach is a spiritual kingdom. So far as the Empire is concerned, Christianity is politically innocuous.' Something like that Luke-Acts is trying to say.

In the seventies of the first century it might well have seemed an urgent task to clear the Church of any suspicion of being mixed up with the rebellious Jews. I doubt whether a like urgency would be felt again before the later years of Domitian's reign in the nineties. But by that time the collection of the Pauline letters was going ahead, as we can see from I Clement; and there is nothing in Acts to incline us to the belief that its author had access to those documents, all or any of them. I venture to think that this practically certain ignorance of the Pauline epistles is a stronger argument against the later date than a problematical acquaintance with the Antiquities of Josephus can be for it.²

¹ Lk. xxiii. 2-5.
² This paragraph and part of that which follows are taken from my Presidential Address to the Oxford Society for Historical Theology. The Address is printed in the Proceedings of the Society for 1941-42, and I am grateful for permission to make use of these paragraphs here.
Suppose then that Luke, in the seventies of the first century, sits down to write a history of the Christian movement. Suppose that the tradition is true and that the work is being done somewhere in the province of Achaea. What helps are available for the work and what hindrances stand in the way at this early date? For his account of the life and teaching of Jesus he has his own copy of Q enriched by all the additional material collected during a quarter of a century of Christian work. He has the Roman Gospel of Mark, which, if my dating is correct, was already in existence when Luke came to Rome with Paul. He has some other pieces of narrative dealing with the birth of John the Baptist and Jesus and the childhood of the latter, and a genealogy of Jesus. The materials are not very abundant, and, because of the way in which they were collected, there is no guarantee that they are in chronological order.

That brings us to a great handicap under which Luke had to labour. Not only were his materials scanty: it was also very difficult—indeed almost impossible—even at this relatively early date, to supplement them or to obtain clarification where the data were confused or inconsistent with one another. For example, Mark gave an account of the conversation between Jesus and the Jewish lawyer about the greatest commandment in the Law. Here Jesus himself gives the answer to the question. But Luke’s note-book contained an independent account of a conversation on this subject, only in this case the answer is supplied by the lawyer. What is the evangelist to do? Treat them as separate incidents and record both? Or take them as variant accounts of one and the same incident and then decide which is the more accurate? But in that case how is the decision to be made? The witnesses who might settle the point are no longer available. Some of the original Disciples are dead. Jerusalem is destroyed and the remnants of the Mother-Church of Primitive Christendom are beyond Jordan at Pella in the Decapolis. The only kind of research that could be of any use to the Evangelist would involve long journeys for himself or his messengers and inevitable delay in the completion of the work; and I think we have good reason to suppose that Luke thought his task urgent.

1 Mk. xii. 28-34.  
2 Lk. x. 25-28.
In the particular case we are considering he preferred the version of the Great Commandment conversation which he had in his own note-book to that offered by Mark. We don’t know on what grounds: we may suppose that he just relied on his own judgement. In some such way Luke’s Gospel and the Acts got written, the author doing his best with the materials at his disposal. And—this is the point—even as early as the seventies it is doubtful whether anything much better could have been done.

It seems to me that somewhere about A.D. 65 there is a dividing line. Before that date it was comparatively easy to pick up first-hand information about the Ministry of Jesus and the early history of the Church, particularly if the enquirer could go to Palestine and conduct his researches on the spot. Afterwards the difficulties increased very rapidly, and after A.D. 70 they were almost insuperable.

There are two matters bearing on the date of Luke’s work that ought to be considered before we leave the subject. They are the abrupt ending of Acts and the alleged dependence of Luke on the Antiquities of Josephus. If the latter point were established it would compel us to put the composition of Acts in the last years of the first century. The essential facts are stated clearly and fairly in The Beginnings of Christianity, ii. 355-358. The strongest statement of the case for Luke’s dependence on Josephus is that of F. C. Burkitt in his book The Gospel Histor’ and its Transmission, pp. 105-110. On the other side Eduard Meyer found the arguments completely unconvincing. The verdict of the editors of The Beginnings of Christianity and Professor Cadbury is that ‘the case (for dependence) will always rest on three passages, and it is safe to say that they can never be completely explained away, yet will never convince every one’. I must confess that they do not convince me.

1 Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, i. 47 ff.; ii. 404 f.; iii. 11.

2 Beginnings, ii. 356.

3 I give my reasons in barest outline. (1) Of the three cases of alleged dependence, only the first need be taken seriously. This is Acts v. 36 f., where Gamaliel is made to refer to the Jewish uprisings led by Theudas (during the procuratorship of Fadus, c. A.D. 44-46) and Judas the Galilean (in the days of the census under Quirinius, c. A.D. 6) in this order. (2) It is clear that, at the time
The ending of Acts has given rise to much debate. The essence of the matter is simply this, that the whole course of the narrative of Acts from the moment when Paul sets out on the last journey to Jerusalem seems to be leading up to the grand climax of the trial of Paul in the Imperial Court at Rome. The reader is prepared by full accounts of the proceedings in the courts below for the final scene in which Paul will give his testimony before the supreme tribunal of the Empire and achieve either a triumphant acquittal or a glorious martyrdom. But the climax never comes. We are left with a picture of Paul waiting for his when Gamaliel is supposed to have spoken, the revolt of Theudas was still in the future; I should say more than ten years in the future. It follows that this is a case where Luke has put into the mouth of the speaker sentiments which he considered suitable. He is therefore presenting cases of fruitless rebellion of which he had heard. (3) His first example, Theudas, is introduced by the words πρὸ γὰρ τοῦτος τῶν ἡμερῶν. This expression occurs again in xxi. 38, where it evidently refers to an event in the very recent past. It is arguable that that should be the meaning here, that Luke knew that the Theudas revolt had taken place somewhere in the period covered by Acts i.-xii, and mistakenly thought it came before the date of Gamaliel's 'speech' rather than afterwards. We should then take πρὸ τοῦτος τῶν ἡμερῶν to mean 'in the recent past'. That involves a reconsideration of the μέτα τοῦτον which introduces Judas the Galilean. If the argument so far is sound μετὰ cannot here mean 'after', for Luke must have known that the Judas who raised a revolt in the days of the census could not be 'after' the Theudas who revolted recently. But μετὰ c. acc. pers. can mean 'besides', 'in addition to' (Moulton and Milligan, *Vocab. s.v.*). I suggest that the μετὰ here means to say, 'my next example is . . . '. (4) But even if this be rejected, there are insuperable difficulties in supposing that Luke constructed Acts, v. 36 f. out of the data supplied by Josephus in *Ant.* xx. For (a) Josephus says that the revolt of Theudas took place when Fadus was procurator. (b) Josephus does not say that the revolt of Judas took place after that of Theudas; but that the execution of two sons of Judas occurred during the procuratorship of Tiberius Alexander the successor of Fadus. (c) Both Josephus and Luke state explicitly that the revolt of Judas took place at the time of the census. By that Josephus means the census of c. A.D. 6, made during the procuratorship of Coponius the first procurator of Judaea. Luke evidently thinks—rightly or wrongly—of an earlier census taken while Herod the Great was still on the throne. In either case there was no procurator before the procurator of the census of A.D. 6. And in either case it is incredible that Luke should have supposed that the Theudas revolt in the procuratorship of Fadus took place before the census, that is, before there was any procurator of Judaea at all. (d) In a word, the theory requires us to suppose that Acts v. 36 f., is based on Josephus: I cannot see how any intelligent person could possibly produce Acts, v. 36 f., as it is usually interpreted, out of the passage in Josephus. If that is so, we are driven back to the alternative suggested in (3).
case to be called, carrying on missionary work in Rome while he waits; and the story just peters out. Various explanations have been proposed: an excellent summary of them is given at the end of Lake and Cadbury’s commentary on Acts. In many ways the most attractive solution is that defended by Lake and Ramsay, that the trial itself petered out because no one appeared from Jerusalem to prosecute within the period—whatever it was: two years or eighteen months—during which an appearance could be put in. If this is the right answer, it explains why there is no triumphant acquittal or glorious martyrdom for Paul. It just did not happen in that way.

But if we accept this solution, certain consequences follow. The first is the release of Paul; and the question at once arises, what did Paul do next? To this question varied answers are supplied directly or indirectly by the Pastoral Epistles, the apocryphal Acts of Paul, the Muratorian Canon, the Vercelli Acts of Peter, and I Clement. The Pastorals imply activity in various parts of the Mediterranean area, the Acta Pauli seem to describe what might be called the ‘Fourth Missionary Journey’ covering the ground from Damascus to Rome and ending in martyrdom. The Muratorian Canon and the Vercelli Acts of Peter both send Paul off to Spain in fulfilment of the plan mentioned in Rom. xv. 22-29, and I Clement also is widely believed to imply the journey to Spain. This is not the place to enter into a discussion of the value of these different stories; and indeed, competent scholars differ widely in their estimates. The main point is that while the stories differ as to how the Apostle spent his time after the two years in Rome, with which Acts closes, they all assume that he had some time to spend. That is to say,

---

1 Beginnings, iv. 349 f. This should be supplemented by the further discussion by Cadbury, Beginnings, v. 326-338.
3 Expositor, March 1913, pp. 264-284; Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day, 346-382.
4 I cannot think that the Acta Pauli are meant to describe anything but the period between the end of Acts and the death of Paul.
5 The case against this interpretation of the τέρµα τῆς δύναµος in I Clem. v. is most strongly argued by P. N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, 107 f.
there was, by the end of the first century or early in the second a fairly widespread tradition that the Roman captivity of Acts did not end with an execution.

Luke is silent about all this, and we may make conjectures about the cause of the silence. They will be no more than guesses. I am not prepared to engage in conjecture on any large scale; but I will venture the surmise that Luke tells no more because he knew no more. It may be the case that at some time during the two years in Rome, or at the end of it, Luke was sent back to Greece and so lost sight of any subsequent activities of Paul. This would not be at all surprising when we consider how little Luke has to say about Paul's doings when they were separated at earlier times in the missionary career of the Apostle. If Paul was released and set out on new adventures, and Luke was where tradition says he was, in Achaea, it is quite possible that he did not hear what Paul was doing or where he went. And Luke does not use his imagination to fill up gaps in his information. There is, however, one event that would probably not have escaped the notice of Luke, wherever he might be: that is the martyrdom of Paul. The fact that Luke has nothing to say about it, supposing that it occurred anywhere near the dates usually given for it, is very difficult to explain; so difficult as to call for a reconsideration of the traditions which are held to testify to it. But this is not the place to begin that enquiry.

To conclude, the internal and external data seem to me to be satisfied if Luke-Acts was the work of Luke, the companion of Paul, written in Achaea round about A.D. 70 as a public defence of the Christian Church against the suspicion of being mixed up with the rebellious Jews, and a public assurance that the Christian Gospel was no seditious propaganda but a message of universal peace and goodwill.