

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## Linguistic Evidence for the Lucan Source L

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

NASHOTAH HOUSE

### PREFACE

THE incentive to the present study was supplied by the investigations of Bernhard Weiss, as published, in particular, in the three works, *Evangelium des Lukas* (Göttingen, 1901), *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums* (Stuttgart, 1907), and *Die Quellen der synoptischen Ueberlieferung* (Leipsic, 1908). In these three treatises, Dr. Weiss has set forth in the fullest detail his theory of the composition of the Synoptic Gospels, which, as far as it relates to St. Luke, asserts the existence of three written sources (Mc., Q, and L) as explaining practically the entire contents of the Third Gospel. This third written source, L, is a contribution of Dr. Weiss' own to the Synoptic Problem,—at least in so far as its length and completeness are concerned,—and he has supported his contention with a number of extremely cogent arguments, chief among which (probably) is the linguistic.

Briefly, his contention is this. It is admitted that a single hand can be found running through all parts of our Third Gospel. Certain characteristics of a rather peculiar and individual style can be seen almost everywhere. But from this it does not follow that the entire Gospel is the word of a single author writing freely. On the other hand, these stylistic touches in themselves need not establish anything more than unity of editorship, of a fairly thorough-going kind.

In two cases positive proof is possible that St. Luke's work was, in part, at least, that of an editor, for the use

by him of two documents, Mc. and Q, may be demonstrated. And in regard to Mc., we are in the fortunate situation of being able to compare the original source with Lc.'s treatment of it. In the case of Q the matter is not so simple, for the source must be reconstructed by a comparison of Lc. with Mt., but, within certain limits, this reconstruction can be performed with a very fair degree of certainty. Consequently, it is incumbent on the student of the Synoptic Problem to subject the other matter in Lc. to a close examination with a view to determining how much else may possibly belong to a source rather than to Lc.'s free composition.

An examination of this kind is always a very delicate matter and the results always more or less uncertain. But in the case of the Third Gospel, there are certain factors that simplify the problem somewhat. The author of the Third Gospel was palpably a Gentile, writing for Gentiles. This follows not only from the tradition regarding the author but from an examination of the Gospel itself (omission of matter of purely Jewish interest from Mc., etc.). The material, however, deals so often with purely Jewish matter in such an entirely familiar way as to establish a strong probability in favor of its being of Jewish origin. Again, it appears evident from many stylistic usages throughout the Gospel that the editor had a fairly keen feeling for a rather good Hellenistic style, so that evidences of a fondness for Jewish (especially Septuagint) vocabulary or constructions must be viewed rather with suspicion. Again, even apart from matters of Jewish or Gentile Greek, Lc.'s style is so characteristic that it can be tabulated to a rather considerable extent, so that differences from it may be noted and traced out.

These factors are of the very greatest assistance in literary-critical work of this kind, but they are not the only factors. Much can be done, for instance, by a study of the relation of the tradition in the individual portions of the Third Gospel to the traditions in the other New Testament writings. It is found, to a noteworthy degree, that certain passages ex-

hibit a strong affinity to the Johannine tradition. Again, the "ætiological motive" of the author in many parts points to his having written under not Gentile but Palestinian conditions of A.D. 40-60. Finally, there are the tests that are usually applied in literary-critical work,—the problems of "doublets," the interdependence of the various parts of what is suspected to be a single source, and (for Gospel problems) the furnishing of the proper material for the "Evangelic Tradition."

All of these factors in literary-critical work have been applied by Dr. Weiss in his studies, and he has claimed that their convergence has established his contention that there exists in the Third Gospel a source which he has named L, and he has effected a tentative reconstruction of the Greek text of this source. As yet, however, no critique has been published of his results and it is the purpose of the present study to supply this lack.<sup>1</sup>

The most important part of the evidence presented by Dr. Weiss is that which relates to the linguistic peculiarities of the source L. The data that he has collected make out a really strong *prima facie* case for an author of L whose style differed notably from that of Lc. Unfortunately, the manner in which Dr. Weiss has arranged this evidence is about as awkward as possible. A short table is drawn up on pp. 197-198 of the third of his books cited above, in which some of the material is collected, but this table is by no means complete and the figures quoted not always accurate. The rest of the material is scattered through the book in footnotes, in which the evidence as quoted often seems to be contradicted by that offered by a concordance (cf. especially p. 167 below). Consequently, if the value of the arguments offered is to be given any just appraisal, the first step needed is a collection and thorough sifting of the data.

This work has been undertaken in what follows, and on

<sup>1</sup> Stanton in *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part II (1909), p. 224, misstates Weiss' position. Nicolardot (*Les Procédés de Rédaction des trois premiers Évangélistes*, 1908) in a very obvious reference to Weiss (p. 182) appears also to miss Weiss' point.

it some elaboration has been made. For the present purposes there have been examined all the statistics of the words and phrases belonging to the following classes: (a) all of those used by Weiss (143 in number, by my count); (b) all of those classed as characteristic of Lc. by Hawkins (151 in number, but in part coinciding with those in Weiss,—*Horae Synopticae*, 2d edition, pp. 15–23); (c) all words classed by Hawkins as common in Lc., but not in A.; (d) all words belonging to Biblical Greek only; (e) a selected list of all words that might seem characteristic (particles in especial); (f) Dalman's "possible Hebraisms"; (g) every word in Moulton and Geden's Concordance, pp. 1–424 (through Zeta). This examination has yielded results of such a definite character that it has not seemed worth while to carry the Concordance study further at present, as it could yield only cumulative evidence.

In work of this sort, naturally, a mere mechanical count would have been worthless. It is necessary to know not only how often Lc. uses a given phrase, but the source from which he takes it,—a document or his own preference. When, for instance, a word from Mc. is taken over into Lc. in connection with the rest of the Marcan passage, no conclusion for Lc.'s fondness or otherwise for that word may be drawn, and it should be barred out of such lists as the present. The same is true for words in Q, where their existence in Q is guaranteed by their occurrence in the parallel passage in Mt. However, for completeness' sake I have invariably given such uses with a reference to their source or parallel (chapter and verse of Mc. or Mt.). On the other hand, the changes made in Mc. by Lc., where we may be reasonably sure that they are really Lucan changes and are not due to some parallel account, are of the very greatest service. When, as in the case of ἀρχω, we find Lc. systematically avoiding or altering a common Marcan phrase, we may decide with real certainty that Lc. objected to that particular word or phrase. Consequently, the present study has involved counting and comparing the words in Mc. as well as those in Lc., and I trust it has recorded every case

where a word that occurs in L has not been copied where it occurs in Mc. Again, the insertion by Lc. of words or phrases into the Marcan narrative is of great importance, as indicating a predilection on Lc.'s part for such words. Where, for instance, such a case occurs in a word of not many occurrences in all, the assignment of that word to L becomes less certain. For words of high number of occurrences this is not of so much importance, as frequent copying of the same word tends to introduce it into one's own vocabulary. All such cases have been recorded, with the reference given to the place in Mc. into which Lc. has made the insertion as well as to the place in Lc. Strictly speaking, each example should be accompanied by a discussion as to the appropriateness of the word in each context, but such a method is out of the question. Not only is the bulk of cases so great as to be prohibitive, but, in the vast majority of instances, the discussion would be so subjective as to destroy its value. Consequently, attention has been called to reasons other than purely stylistic only in certain very prominent cases.

All evidence offered by Acts has been duly tabulated. To my mind it is convincing as an additional proof that Lc. and A. have a common author. But it also points to the use of sources in the first twelve chapters of A. and in the speeches throughout the Book. Most notably does this appear to be true in the case of St. Stephen's speech, to which attention is usually directed.

In referring a word to Mc. rather than to Q, the possibility must always be borne in mind that Mc. and Lc. may be both quoting from Q. Weiss maintains this in a large number of cases (and in certain of these I feel that he has made out a case), but for the present purposes this is immaterial. In most places, however, I have used the reference "Mc. (or Q)," but not invariably. As to the matter of Q passages in Lc. only, I have simply followed Weiss, with a reference to the page of his discussion. Without committing myself as to whether or not these passages belong to Q, it is enough to say that the evidence collected at least seems to show that most of them do not belong to L.

For the limits of L, I have used simply the reconstruction given by Weiss. As his list of words differs somewhat from the one in the present work and as his proofs for L are only in part linguistic, his tests and those here are in large part independent. To judge from the tests I have made, Weiss has certainly included in his reconstruction of L all that properly belongs to it, with the exception, perhaps, of the Transfiguration narrative. On the other hand, it is possible that he has included a little too much; but these questions as to the precise extent of L must be left open for the present. My interest has lain in the proofs for the existence or otherwise of the document, and the precise determination of its limits (if the problem is capable of solution at all) can hardly be settled by linguistic considerations alone. In one respect, Weiss has consequently not been followed; namely, his elimination of small sections inside the L narrative. In other words, there has been studied not the text as reconstructed by Weiss, but the Lucan text of the passages that Weiss has attributed to L. Otherwise there would have been the danger of a *petitio principii*, especially where Weiss has discarded phrases for linguistic reasons. In a few cases, which are noted, Weiss seems to have assigned phrases to Lc. which in reality belong to his source.

It is proper to add that the three treatises of Weiss differ slightly from each other in the matter they assign to L. I have, of course, noted all these differences, but it has seemed needless to record them here. I have tried to adapt my own data to the limits as set forth in the last of the three books, but possibly I have not succeeded invariably. In one case (the first few words of Lc. 19 29) I have followed the book of 1907 (p. 211) for a matter that is not mentioned in the book of 1908. All references otherwise, unless specially designated, are to the book of 1908, in particular the page-numbers in parentheses that follow the words in my first four lists. Where matter in these first four lists is not in Weiss I have noted the fact. The matter in the other lists is independent of Weiss.

### A. WORDS AND PHRASES ESPECIALLY CHARACTERISTIC OF L

1. *ἀμαρτωλός* (not in Weiss). Occurs eighteen times in Lc., not at all in A. Two occurrences (5 30. 32) are from Mc. (2 16. 17). Once (7 34, Mt. 11 19) from Q. 15 7. 10 are probably from Q or from Lc.'s own hand. The remaining thirteen instances (5 8 6 32. 33. 34 (twice) 7 37. 39 13 2 15 1. 2 18 13 19 7 24 7) are all in L. In 5 29 the word is dropped from Mc. 2 15.

2. *ἀναπίπτω* (123, 137, 150). Occurs four times in Lc., not at all in A. The four occurrences (11 37 14 10 17 7 22 14) are all in L. In 9 15 the word is rejected from Mc. 6 40 and *κατακλίνω* substituted.

3. *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* (151, 157). Five times in Lc., once (18 6) in A, elsewhere only 2 Cor. 5 16 and [Jn. 8 11]. The five occurrences are all in L, — 1 48 5 10 12 52 22 18. 69.

4. *ἀπολαμβάνω* (125, 127). Four times (or five) in Lc., not at all in A. The four occurrences (6 34 15 27 16 25 23 41) are all in L. If the word is read in 18 30, it is there an insertion by Lc. into Mc. 10 30, but WH and Weiss read the simple verb there.

5. *ἄρχω*. Thirty-one times in Lc., ten times (1 1. 22 2 4 8 35 10 37 11 4. 15 18 28 24 2 27 35) in A. The distribution in Lc., however, seems very significant. The word is used twenty-five times by Mc. and sixteen of these occurrences are in passages copied directly by Lc. But only three (Mc. 11 15 12 1 14 19) of these sixteen are taken over by Lc. (19 45 20 9 22 23) and in the other thirteen cases (Mc. 1 45 2 23 5 17. 20 6 2. 7. 34 8 31 10 28. 32. 47 13 5 14 69) the word is omitted or modified into some other construction (imperfect, etc.). Twice the word is inserted by Lc. (5 21 9 12) into Mc.'s narrative (2 6 6 35), but in the second of these cases (at least), — *ἡ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν*, — the word has its proper force and cannot be regarded as a mere periphrasis. Twice the word is certainly due to Q (7 24, Mt. 11 7; 12 45, Mt. 24 49) and in 3 8 (cf. Mt. 3 9) it is altogether probable that the word belongs to Q and the alteration is due to Mt. The origin of the two cases in 13 25. 26 is not clear, — Weiss



(pp. 57-58) prints the second as part of Q and attributes the first to Lc. The case 11 29 is dubious, — it is in a Q context. But the remaining twenty cases (3 23 4 21 7 15. 38. 49 11 53 12 1 14 9. 18. 29. 30 15 14. 24 19 37 21 28 23 2. 8. 30 24 27. 47) are all L. The fact that so many cases occur in so small a part of the Gospel, especially when contrasted with the much thinner distribution elsewhere in the Gospel and in A. and when contrasted with the frequency with which the word is rejected from Mc., seems to me to be of particular significance. Weiss, as far as I have been able to discover, does not notice this word as a characteristic of L.

6. Ἐγένετο followed by *καί*. Eleven (or twelve) times in Lc., not at all in A. (the case A. 5 7 is quite different). Of these cases, eight (5 1 8 1 9 51 14 1 17 11 19 15 24 4. 15) are in L. The cases 5 12. 17 are to be referred to the influence of 5 1, — the three consecutive paragraphs begin alike. 8 22 may be explained in the same way from 8 1 or may be from Q. Also 9 28 may belong here (Q?, L?, — text? Cf. B 15).

7. ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ followed by infinitive. Twenty-one times in Lc., once (19 1) in A. (or twice, if 9 3 is counted, but it probably should not be included). The three cases 9 29. 33 11 1 are in a Q context, but there seems to be no evidence for the phrase in Q (it is not found in Mt.). In 3 21 and 9 18 it is probably from Lc.'s own hand (but in the former of these two passages I feel that there is something to be said for a source). 5 12 is due to 5 1, as above. The remaining fifteen occurrences (1 8 2 6 5 1 9 51 10 38 (but the text here is dubious) 11 27 14 1 17 11. 14 18 35 19 15 24 4. 15. 30. 51) are all L. It is also worthy of note that in the only occurrence of this phrase in Mc. (4 4), it is changed in Lc. (8 5). Weiss does not recognize this phrase as characteristic of L, — on the contrary (*Quellen des Lukasevangeliums*, p. 132), he treats it as a Lucan phrase, — but the statistics seem convincing.

NOTE. On combining the results of this section with those of the preceding, a particularly significant result is given for the very un-Greek combination “ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ with the infinitive followed by *καί*.” There are eight occurrences

in Lc. and no others in the New Testament. Of these eight cases, seven (5 1 9 51 14 1 17 11 19 15 24 4. 15) are in L and the only other case (5 12) seems to be due to 5 1.

8. ἐγγίζω (124, 143, 147, 153, 165). Eighteen times in Lc., six in A. (7 17 9 3 10 9 21 33 22 6 (identical with 9 3) 23 15). Of the eighteen occurrences, two (10 9. 11) are certainly from Q. In 18 40, Lc. inserts the word into Mc. 10 50 (influence of 18 35?). The remaining fifteen cases (7 12 12 33 15 1. 25 18 35 19 29. 37. 41 21 8. 20. 28 22 1. 47 24 15. 28) are all in L. The significance here lies in the large number of the cases. While the number of occurrences in A. shows that Lc. did not entirely disuse the word, yet the number is too small, especially when the character of the narrative (with its journeyings) is considered, to account for the enormously greater proportion in L.

Among special uses, Weiss (p. 147) calls attention to ὡς ἐγγίζω. The phrase is found four times (7 12 15 25 19 29. 41), not at all in A. (but 7 17 has καθὼς ἤγγιζεν, — in temporal, not local, sense, however, and in St. Stephen's speech besides) nor in the rest of the New Testament, — something not noted by Weiss. I may add ἐγγίζω εἰς, 18 35 19 29 24 28, — all L, — not found in A. (and poor Greek, — LXX).

9. ἐτοιμάζω (119). Fourteen times in Lc., once (23 23) in A. Of these fourteen occurrences that in 3 4 is from the Septuagint. 22 9. 12. 13 are from Mc. 14 12. 15. 16. 22 8 is almost certainly due to the following three cases, as Lc. seems to have formed this whole verse out of what follows. 12 20 Weiss (p. 48) prints as from Q. The remaining eight instances (1 17. 76 2 31 9 52 12 47 17 8 23 56 24 1) are all in L. Cf. ἐτοιμος, 14 17 22 33 (both L) and 12 40 (Q, Mt. 24 44).

10. εὐλογέω (113). Thirteen times in Lc. (omitting 1 28 and counting 24 53), twice in A. (3 25. (text?) 26), but both cases due to Septuagint. Consequently it should not be counted as occurring in A. Of the thirteen instances, 9 16 and 19 38 are from Mc. 6 41 and 11 9. One case (13 35, Mt. 23 39) is from Q. Of the remaining ten cases, nine (1 42. (twice) 64 2 28. 34 6 28 24 30. 50. 51) are certainly from L and 24 53 may be. Weiss attributes this verse to Lc., but in any case the use of

*εὐλογέω* (if the text is right) is due to vs. 30. Note also *εὐλογητός* in 1 68, — the only one of the cognates in the Lucan writings.

11. *καὶ αὐτός*, nominative, where *αὐτός* has no real intensive force and where *καί* is merely copulative. Thirty-six cases in Lc., none at all in A. Of these thirty-six cases no less than twenty-nine appear to be in L, — 1 17. 22 2 23. 37. 50 3 23 (a very awkward case) 5 1. 37 6 20 7 12 8 1 9 51 11 46 (?) 14 1 15 14 16 24 17 11. 13. 16 18 34 19 2 (twice, — the second especially un-Greek) 22 23. 41 24 14. 25. 28. 31. 35. The other cases, with one exception (4 15, — Lc.?), seem to be due to the influence of a preceding case in L; namely, 5 14. 17 due to 5 1; 8 23. 43 (text?) due to 8 1; 24 32 due to the other cases in cp. 24. There should be added 9 36 in a Q (?) passage (but the phrase in this sense is not found in Mt.). It is to be noted, moreover, that where Lc. (8 23 9 20 22 12) meets the phrase in Mc. (4 38 8 29 14 15) he either omits or modifies it, a fact telling against Lc.'s having any fondness for the combination.

A peculiarly un-Greek combination is found in *καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν*, followed by a participle. L has four instances, — 1 22 3 23 5 1 14 1. The only case in Lc. outside of L is in 5 17, apparently modeled on 5 1.

For the sake of completeness, the other occurrences of the phrase in the Synoptists, where there is a real intensive force, may be given. Mt. 20 10 21 27 25 44 27 57. The last of these is taken over from Mc. 15 43, which is avoided, despite the better sense, in Lc. 23 51. Lc. 1 36 14 12 16 28 19 9 24 15 (text uncertain). All of these examples (five) are likewise from L. In A. there are eight occurrences (8 12 15 32 21 24 22 20 24 15. 16 25 23 27 36), all of which are quite distinct from the first use quoted.

In Mc. 6 47 there is one further example of the first use, but the passage is not in a Lucan context.

Weiss does not class this phrase among those characteristic of L; indeed, he often removes *αὐτός* from the L narrative as a Lucan word. (*E.g.* on p. 125.) But he has not distinguished between the uses of the word.

12. *κατὰ τὸ ἔθος* (152). Three times in Lc., not in the rest of the New Testament. The Lucan cases (1 9 2 42 22 39) are all L. Despite seven occurrences of the word *ἔθος* in Acts the phrase does not recur, — in 15 1 21 21 the simple dative is used in the same sense.

13. *Κύριος*, of Christ, in the Evangelist's narrative (134, 137, 144, 156, 164). Fifteen times in Lc. (if 24 3 is included); no comparison with A. is possible. Of these occurrences, twelve are in L, — 7 13. 19 10 1. 39. 41 11 39 13 15 17 5. 6 19 8 22 61 (first occurrence) 24 3. The second occurrence in 22 61 may be from Lc., but it is of course due to the first occurrence. The two other cases are 12 42, — one of Lc.'s characteristic transition-questions, — and 18 6, possibly a Lucan insertion in Q. The title is never inserted by Lc. in Mc.

14. *λύτρωσις* and cognates (166). All in L: *λύτρωσις* in 1 68 2 38; *ἀπολύτρωσις* in 21 28; *λυτρόομαι* in 24 21. None of these words are in A. and the only cognate is *λυτρωτής* (7 35), which occurs, moreover, in St. Stephen's speech.

15. *οὐχί, ἀλλά* (133, 137). Five times in Lc., not at all in A. The five cases are all in L, — 1 60 12 61 13 3. 5 16 30. To these probably should be added *ἀλλ' οὐχί*, also in L and not in A. (Lc. 17 8).

16. *παρά* with accusative in sense of "beyond," "more than" (133). Four times in Lc., not at all in A. The four cases (3 13 13 2. 4 18 14) are all L. Contrast the use of *ὑπέρ* in same sense in 6 40 (Q, — Mt. 10 24), 16 8 (Q or Lc., probably), A. 26 13.

17. *ποιῶ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ* (122). In Lc. 1 72 10 37. Compare *ἐμεγάλυνεν τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτῆς* in 1 58. Besides, the word *ἔλεος* is 1 50. 54. 78 and not at all in A. All these passages in Lc. are in L.

18. *στροφίς* (136, 156, 161). Seven times in Lc., not at all in A. (Lc. 10 22 is not included.) Of these seven cases, five (7 44 9 55 14 25 22 61 23 28) are in L. Of the other two, 7 9 is in a mixture of Q and L, and 10 23 is either Lc. or Q.

B. WORDS AND PHRASES PROBABLY CHARACTERISTIC  
OF L

1. ἄγγελος as "messenger" (119). Three times in Lc., not at all in A. Of these cases, 7 27 is a Septuagint quotation (Mt. 11 10 Mc. 1 2). The other two (7 24 9 52) are L.

2. ἀδελφοὶ καὶ συγγενεῖς καὶ γείτονες (133). Lc. 14 12, — cf. ἀδελφοὶ καὶ συγγενεῖς καὶ φίλοι in 21 16, — both in L.

3. αἶνος, αἰνέω (143, 146). The verb occurs Lc. 2 13. 20 19 37, — all L, — and possibly 24 53 (Lc.), but εὐλογοῦντες is the much more probable reading. Also in A. 2 47 3 8. 9, — all in the very early part. The noun is found Lc. 18 43 (L), not in A.

4. ἀμήν (not in Weiss). Six times in Lc., not at all in A. Three of these cases (18 17. 29 21 32) are from Mc. (10 15. 29 13 30), the other three, all with λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι, are from L (4 24 12 37 23 43). Lc. 22 18 omits the word from Mc. 14 25 (used in part, at least, by Lc. here), and in 9 27 21 3 he substitutes ἀληθῶς for it in Mc. 9 1 12 43. Five times in Q passages the word stands in Mt. (Mt. 5 25 8 10 10 15 11 11 13 17), where the corresponding Lc. passage (12 59 7 9 10 12 7 28 10 24) omits it. For ἀμήν in Mt. 23 36 Lc. has ναί in 11 51 and ἀληθῶς 12 44 (Mt. 24 47). This relation between Mt. and Lc. would seem to denote that ἀμήν was fairly common in Q, and was retained by Mt. but either dropped or altered by Lc., as in the three cases in Mc. Hence the examples from L acquire still greater weight.

5. ἀνακλίνω (not in Weiss). Three times in Lc., not at all in A. Of these cases, Lc. 13 29 is from Q (Mt. 8 11), the other two (2 7 12 37) are in L. In Mc. 6 39, Lc. (9 14) alters to κατακλίνω.

6. ἀνακίπτω (134). Twice in Lc. (13 11 21 28), both in L. Elsewhere in New Testament only [J. 8 7. 10].

7. ἀντίκειμαι (133, 135). In Lc. 13 17 21 15, both L, and both times in the phrase οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ. Not in A.

8. ἀπέχω, in the sense "be distant from" (165). Three times in Lc. (7 6 15 20 24 13), all in L. The verb occurs A. 15 20. 29, but in both cases in the *middle* and not in a local

sense. Cf. also μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος (125) in 7 6 15 20 and (not in Weiss) ἀπέχω ἀπό 7 6 24 13.

9. ἀπορία, ἀπορέω (164). Neither in A. Noun 21 26, verb 24 4.

10. ἀρχιερεύς not used in the singular (154). Plural in L in 22 4. 52. 66 23 4. 10. 13 24 20. The only exceptions are 3 2, where the word means "highpriesthood" and 22 54, in the phrase εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως. Note that in the last case Mc. 14 53 (used in part by Lc.) has πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα.

11. ἀριστάω, ἄριστον (124). Verb 11 37, noun 11 38 14 12. All three in L, neither word in A.

12. ἀφαιρέω (120). Four times in Lc., not at all in A. Of the four cases 22 50 is from Mc. 14 47 ("cut off"). The other three cases have the meaning "take away." 16 3 (*middle*) Weiss (p. 53) prints as part of Q, the other two (1 25 10 42) are from L.

13. βασιλεύω ἐπί with accusative (145). In New Testament only Lc. 1 33 19 14. 27. The verb not elsewhere in Lc. or A.

14. ἐγένετο followed by a finite verb. Twenty-one (or twenty-two) cases in Lc., none in Acts. (Lc. 10 38 should probably not be counted.) Fifteen of these (1 8. 23. 41. 59 2 1. 6. 15. 46 7 11 11 27 17 14 18 35 19 29 24 30. 51) are in L. Of the other six (or seven), three (9 18. 28. (text? cf. A 6) 37) are printed by Weiss (pp. 64, 65, 66) as part of Q, but cf. Note 4, *infra*. 20 1 seems an insertion into Mc. 11 27, and 9 33 is perhaps another. 11 1 and 11 14 are in Q context, and the phrase here is possibly Q and possibly Lc. There is no *certain* case of the phrase in Q, but Mt. (7 28 11 1 13 53 19 1 26 1) uses it five times in a Q context and nowhere else. However, if the number of occurrences in L were not quite so large, the classification of the phrase here might seem unjustified. But the large number and the absence of the phrase from A. make a strong impression. Moreover, in the two cases (3 21 and 8 5) where Lc. meets the phrase in Mc. (1 9 4 4) he alters it. (Not in Weiss.)

NOTE 1. A combination of this phrase with ἐν τῷ and the infinitive appears in L seven times (1 8 2 6 11 27 17 14

18 35 24 30. 51), elsewhere only in 9 18. 33, as above. (Not in Weiss.)

NOTE 2. The phrase *ἐγένετο ὡς* is found only in this combination and only in the L section of Lc. (not at all in A.). The places are 1 23. 41 2 15 19 29, — four in all. (Not in Weiss.)

NOTE 3. An interesting contrast is afforded by the use of *ἐγένετο* followed by the infinitive, — five times (3 21 6 1. 6. 12 16 22) in Lc., sixteen times in A. Lc. 6 1 is from Mc. 2 23. 6 6 and 6 12 are clearly insertions by Lc. into Mc. 3 1 and 3 13. 3 21 is probably an insertion into Mc. 1 9. 16 22 is the only occurrence in an L passage. *ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ* with infinitive in this construction is found in 3 21, A. 19 1 only.

NOTE 4. If the special matter in the Transfiguration narrative be assigned to L (cf. p. 169, *infra*), then of the 21 (or 22) cases in Lc., 16 (or 17) are found in L, — a high proportion (adding 9 28 (text?) 33).

15. *γνωρίζω, γνωῶσις, γνωστοί* (197, — for the third of these). The first of these twice in Lc., — 2 15. 17, both L. Twice in A., but in 2 28 the word is from a Septuagint quotation; in 7 13 it is in St. Stephen's speech and the text is doubtful. The second in Lc. 1 77 (L), 11 52 (Lc.). The third in Lc. 2 44 23 49 (both L), not at all in A., despite ten occurrences of the word in the neuter (not found in Lc.).

16. *γογγύζω, διαγογγύζω* (110). Simple verb Lc. 5 30 (L), not at all in A. (noun in A. 6 1, not in Lc.). Compound verb (an exclusively Septuagint form) in 15 2 19 7, not elsewhere in New Testament. In all three cases *λέγοντες* follows.

17. *δέησις* (111). 1 13 2 37 5 33, — three cases in Lc., all L, not at all in A.

18. *διακονέω* (138). Eight times in Lc., twice (A. 6 2 19 22) in A. Of these cases in Lc., one (4 39) is from Mc. (1 31). Three times, in immediate conjunction and as noun (*ὁ διακονῶν*), the word is found in a Q passage (22 26. 27 (twice)), where the word may be Q and may be due to Lc. (Mc. 10 43, Mt. 20 26 has *διάκονος*). The other four instances (8 3 10 40 12 37 17 8) are in L. The construction with the

dative is found in 4 39 8 3 12 37 17 8 only, with the possible addition of A. 6 2 (*τραπέζαις*).

19. *δοκέω* (133, 144). The interrogative *δοκέετε* is found three times, all with *στι*, in Lc., — 12 51 13 2. 4, — all L, — and not at all in A. Otherwise, six times in Lc. and nine in A. Of these six times, 1 3 (preface) and 8 18 (insertion in Mc. 4 25) are certainly from Lc. 22 24 is Lc. or Q. 10 56 19 11 24 37 are L. The interrogative form alone can be classed as probably L. (On p. 197, Weiss states that the word occurs five times in L. This is a slip for *σιζ*, — cf. pp. 121, 131, 133 (twice), 144, 167 of his reconstructed text.)

20. *δόξα* (not noted by Weiss). Thirteen times in Lc., four times in A. Of these four times, however, two (7 2. 55) are in St. Stephen's speech. The other cases are A. 12 23 22 11. Of the thirteen cases in Lc., two (9 26 21 27) are from Mc. (8 38 13 26). Twice the word is from Q (12 27, Mt. 6 29; 4 6, Mt. 4 8). 9 38 is an insertion into Mc. 11 10, doubtless under the influence of 2 14. Twice (9 31. 32, — in conjunction) the word may be Q, Lc., or L. The remaining six cases (*i. e.* six out of the uncertain nine) are all L, — 2 9. 14. 32 14 10 17 18 24 26.

21. *έκλείπω* (152, 162). Three times in Lc., not at all in A. The three occurrences (16 9 22 32 23 45) are all L.

22. *έλεέω* (not noted by Weiss). Four times in Lc., not at all in A. Of these cases, two, in immediate conjunction (18 38. 39), are from Mc. (10 47. 48). The other two (16 24 17 13) are both L. The word is omitted by Lc. (8 39) in his reproduction of Mc. 5 19. Cf. also the statistics for *έλεος* in A 17.

23. *έλεημοσύνην* with *δίδομι* (139). Twice (11 41 12 33) in Lc., both L. Not at all in A., which uses *ποιέω έλεημοσύνην* (A. 9 38 10 2 24 17).

24. *έμπαίζω* (159, 162). Five times in Lc., not at all in A. Of these occurrences, one (18 32) is from Mc. (10 34). The other four (14 29 22 63 23 11. 36) are all in L.

25. *έμπροσθεν* (not noted by Weiss). Ten times in Lc., twice (10 4 18 17) in A. Of these ten cases, four (7 27,



Mt. 11 10; 10 21, Mt. 11 26; 12 8 (twice), Mt. 10 32 (twice)) are from Q. The case 5 19 may be Q but is much more probably Lc. (added to Mc. 2 4). The remaining five cases (14 2 19 4. 27. 28 21 36) are all L. It should be noted moreover that in 5 25 this word in Mc. 2 12 is changed to *ἐνώπιον*, and a similar change seems to have been made in Q, — cf. Mt. 10 33 with Lc. 12 9. The word occurs also in Mc. 9 2 but not in the parallel Lc. 9 29, but here the whole narrative is changed.

26. *ἐναντίον* (149, 165). Three times in Lc., twice in A. But of the occurrences in A., 7 10 is in St. Stephen's speech and has a textual uncertainty, 8 32 is a Septuagint quotation. Consequently, the word scarcely belongs to the vocabulary of A. The three occurrences in Lc. (1 6 20 26 24 19) are all L.

27. *ἐξουσία* with subjective genitive (159). Three times in Lc., once in A. (26 18). The three Lc. occurrences (20 20 22 53 23 7) are all L.

28. *ἐπαίρω* (127, 128, 168). Six times in Lc. (all L), five times in A. Of the A. occurrences, however, three (2 14 14 11 22 22) are in the phrase *ἐπαίρω τὴν φωνήν*, also in the Gospel 11 27. On the other hand, the phrase *ἐπαίρω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς* is three times (6 20 16 23 18 13) in Lc., not at all in A. The other Lucan occurrences are Lc. 21 28 24 50, A. 1 9 27 40. And note *ἐπαίρω εἰς*, 6 20 18 13.

Consequently, only *ἐπαίρω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς* can be classed as an L phrase.

29. *ἐπισκέπτομαι, ἐπισκοπή* (117, 147). Verb three times in Lc., four times in A. In Lc., however, it has uniformly the sense of "favor" (1 68. 78 7 16), a sense that in A. it has only 15 14, in St. Peter's speech. In A. 7 23 15 36 it has the sense "inspect"; in A. 6 3 that of "seek out." The three occurrences in Lc. are all L. The noun occurs Lc. 19 44 in the sense of "favorable visitation," in A. 1 20 (a Septuagint quotation) it means "office."

30. *εὐφραίνω* (not noted by Weiss). Six times in Lc., twice in A. Of the occurrences in A., however, 2 26 is in a Septuagint quotation, 7 41 is in St. Stephen's speech. The

Lc. occurrences (12 19 15 23. 24. 29. 32 16 19) are all L except 12 19 (Q ?). Only the clustering of the four cases in ep. 15 has made it seem unwise to place this word in class (A).

31. *ἐχθροί*, in the plural (147). Seven times in Lc., once in A. The occurrence in A. (2 35), however, is in a Septuagint quotation. Of the cases in Lc., one (20 43) is from Mc. (12 36) and is a Septuagint quotation. Once (6 27, Mt. 5 44) the word belongs to Q, and 6 33 is a repetition of 6 27. The other four cases (1 71. 74 19 27. 43) are all L. Particularly to be noted is the word in the sense "Gentiles" (1 71. 74 19 43), not elsewhere in the Gospels.

32. *ἡμέρα τοῦ σαββάτου* (134). Three times in Lc., not at all in A. The three cases (13 14. 16 14 5) are all L. Contrast *ἡμέρα τῶν σαββάτων* in A. 13 14 16 13 (also in Lc. 4 16, — L).

33. *θαυμάζω ἐπί* (not in Weiss). Four times in Lc., once (3 12, in St. Peter's speech) in A. Of the four occurrences, one (20 26) is from Mc. (12 17, — *ἐκθαυμάζω ἐπί*). The other three (2 33 4 22 9 43) are all in L.

34. *Ἱεροσαλήμ* (142). Twenty-six times in Lc., thirty-nine times in A. Of these cases in A, twenty-three are in the first twelve chapters. Of the occurrences in Lc., one (13 34, Mt. 23 37) is certainly Q. Two (4 9 13 33) are in Q passages, and of these 13 33 (at least) is almost certainly due to Q. In 6 17 the word is changed from Mc.'s *Ἱεροσόλυμα* (Mc. 3 8), and in 5 17 it is added to Mc. 2 2. 18 31 would seem to be a change from Mc. 10 33, but Weiss (p. 142) prints the word here as from L. 24 52 is from Lc., but is, of course, due to the four occurrences of the form earlier in the chapter. 9 31 is uncertain, — Q? Lc.? L? The remaining eighteen cases (2 25. 38. 41. 43. 45 9 51. 53 10 30 13 4 17 11 19 11 21 20. 24 23 28 24 13. 18. 33. 47) are all in L, with 18 31 as another possible case. The use of *Ἱεροσόλυμα* may be contrasted. In Lc. it occurs four times. 13 22 seems to be a transition verse from Lc.'s own hand. 19 28 is apparently a reminiscence of Mc. 10 32. 2 22 and 23 7 are in L. In A. the form occurs twenty-five times, but only five of these are in the first twelve chapters. *I.e.* where Lc. is most certainly writ-

ing without documents, the Greek form is more frequently used, as would be expected.

It is also perhaps worth noting that of the sixteen occurrences in the Hebrew form in A., outside of the first twelve chapters, all except 15 2. 4 20 16 21 12. 31 25 3, are in the speeches. And in these six residuary cases, 21 12 is due to 21 11 and the text of 15 4 and 20 16 is uncertain.

35. *καταφιλέω* (125). Three times in Lc., once in A. The three cases in Lc. (7 38. 45 15 20) are all L. The case in A. (20 37) is a virtual copy of that in Lc. 15 20.

36. *κλαίω ἐπί* (161). Three times in Lc., not at all in A. The occurrences in Lc. (19 41 23 28 (twice)) are all L. The whole use of *κλαίω* (not noted by Weiss) may be compared. Omitting the uses just cited, there are eight occurrences in Lc. and two (9 39 21 13, — omitting 8 24) in A. Three of the cases in Lc. (8 52 (twice) 22 52) are from Mc. (5 38. 39 14 72). Once (7 32) the word is either Lc. or Q, — cf. Mt. 11 17. The other four cases (a total of seven), namely 6 21. 28 7 13. 38, are all L.

37. *πᾶς ὁ λαός*, viewed as eager supporters of Christ (149). Four times in Lc., no comparison with A. possible. Of these cases, three (18 43 19 48 21 38) are L. The remaining case (7 29) is of dubious origin, — Weiss (p. 19, footnote) regards it as a Lucan insertion in Q.

38. *μμνήσκομαι*, aorist passive with active sense (127, 162, 164). Six times in Lc., once (A. 11 16) in A. The six cases (1 54. 72 16 25 28 42 24 6. 8) are all L. Contrast the same form in the passive sense in A. 10 31, the use of *ὑπομμνήσκομαι* in Lc. 22 61 (substituted for *ἀναμμνήσκομαι* in Mc. 14 72), and the use of *μνημονεύω* in 17 32 (Q?); A. 20 31. 35.

39. *ὁμοίως* (133). Eleven times in Lc., not at all in A. Of the occurrences in Lc., one (17 31) is probably from Lc., — an interpolation into Mc. 18 18. Possibly the same is true of 5 10, — an interpolation into a reminiscence of Mc. 1 19, but it is in an L context. In three cases (6 31 — cf. Mt. 7 12 — 17 28 22 36) the doubt seems to lie between Q and Lc., — noting, however, that there is no certain case of the

word in Q, and noting on the other hand that the case 6 31 is printed by Weiss (p. 113) in parentheses as being possibly from L, despite the parallel in Mt. The remaining six cases (3 11 5 33 10 32. 37 13 3 16 25) are all L, — *i.e.* certainly six and possibly eight cases. It is to be noted, besides, that Lc. 8 13 avoids the word in Mc. 4 18 and possibly Lc. 23 35 avoids it in Mc. 15 31, but in the second case the use of Mc. is not quite so certain. And note *ποιέω ὁμοίως*, 3 11 6 31 10 37.

40. *οὐς*, — *εἰς τὰ ὄτα* (119). The phrase is found Lc. (1 44 9 44), — cf. *ἐν τοῖς ὠσίν*, Lc. 4 21. All these passages are L. The phrase is found again in A. 11 23, however. But contrast the use of the singular in Q (Lc. 12 3, Mt. 10 27). The entirely different (literal) use of the phrase Mc. 7 33 has no Lucan context.

41. *περιζώννυμαι* (138). Three times in Lc., not at all in A. The three cases (12 35. 37 17 8) are all L. Contrast the simple verb in A. 12 8.

42. *πίμπλημι* in temporal sense (not in Weiss). Five times in Lc., not at all in A. The five cases (1 23. 57 2 6. 21. 22) are all L. Contrast the use of *πληρόω*, Lc. 21 24 (L), A. 7 23. 30 (St. Stephen's speech) 9 23 24 27, and *συμπληρόω*, Lc. 9 51 (L), A. 2 1. (The reference in Weiss, p. 141, to this verb I have put in class *D*.)

43. *πόρρω*, *πόρρωθεν* (166). The former Lc. 14 32 24 28. The latter 17 12. All three cases L. Neither word occurs in A.

44. *πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ* (119). Three times (or twice) in Lc., once (A. 13 24, in St. Paul's speech) in A. The cases in Lc. are 1 76 (with dubious text) 9 52 10 1, — all L. There should be added the case Lc. 7 27 (Mt. 11 10), — a Septuagint quotation in Q.

45. *προσδέχομαι* (138). Five times in Lc., twice (A. 23 21 24 15, — in St. Paul's speech) in A. Of the cases in Lc., one (23 51) is from Mc. (15 43). The other four (2 25. 38 12 38 15 2) are all L. The first three are present participles. It may be noted, however, that in the case 15 2 Weiss (p. 124) substitutes the simple verb for the compound on account of

the difference in meaning, — “receive” instead of “expect.”

46. *σκιρτάω* (113). Three times (1 41 1 44 6 23, — all L) in Lc., not at all in A.

47. *σπλαγχνίζομαι* (125). Three times in Lc., not at all in A. The three cases (7 13 10 33 15 20) are all L. Note, moreover, that in Lc. 5 13 the word is omitted from Mc. 1 41. The other occurrences in Mc. (6 34 8 2 9 22) have no proper Lucan reproduction of context.

48. *στηρίζω* (127, 152). Three times in Lc., once in A. The three cases (9 51 16 28 22 32) are all L. — The case in A is 18 23.

49. *συγγενεύς* and cognates (not in Weiss). *συγγενεις* in Lc. 2 44 only. *συγγενίς*, Lc. 1 36 only. *συγγενής* four (or three) times in Lc., once (10 24) in A. Of these four cases, one (21 16) is possibly due to Lc., — an insertion into Mc. 13 12, — but the context is L. The other three (or two) cases (1 58 2 44 (text dubious) 14 12) are all L. *συγγένεια* in Lc. 1 61, A. 7 3. (Septuagint) 14, — both in St. Stephen’s speech.

NOTE. — In Lc. 2 44 the readings vary between *συγγενεύσιν* and *συγγενέσιν*. Consequently in appraising the above data, both of these must not be counted.

50. *συμπορεύομαι* (136, 165). Three times in Lc., not at all in A. The three occurrences (7 11 14 28 24 15) are all L.

51. *τίθεσθαι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις*, etc. (133). Three times in Lc., namely: *ἔθεντο ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, 1 66; *θέσθε εἰς τὰ ὦτα*, 9 44; *θέτε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις*, 21 14. In A. only *ἔθου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, 5 4.

52. *τόπος* after *ἐπί* (152). Three times in Lc., not at all in A. The three cases (19 5 22 40 23 33) are all L. Cf. also *κατὰ τὸν τόπον* in 10 32 (L), not in A.

53. *ὥστε* with infinitive of purpose (119, 148). Three times in Lc., not at all in A. The three cases (4 29 9 52 20 20) are all L.

#### C. WORDS AND PHRASES CITED BY WEISS AS CHARACTERISTIC OF L, AND POSSIBLY CORROBORATIVE

1. *ἀναδείχνημι*, *ἀνάδειξις* (120). Verb 10 1 (L), A. 1 24, noun 1 80.

2. *ἀνθ’ ὧν*, meaning “because” (157). Lc. 1 20 19 44 (both

L), A. 12 23. In Lc. 12 3 the phrase is used differently (?), — due to Lc. in Q (cf. Mt. 10 27)?

3. ἀπολύω (123, 157). Thirteen times in Lc.; fifteen in A. (all parts). Of the cases in Lc., two (16 18 twice, Mt. 5 32 twice) are from Q. Three cases (9 12, Mc. 6 38 23 18. 25, Mc. 15 11. 15) are from Mc. Once (8 38) Lc. introduces the word in Mc. 5 19. Twice (23 20. 22) the word may be due to the case 23 18 (from Mc.). The remaining five cases (2 29 6 37 13 12 14 4 23 16) are in L, but there are too many cases in A. for any real conclusion to be drawn, and 23 16 and 23 22 are duplicates.

4. ἀπόστολοι (110, 137, 150). Six times in Lc. no comparison with A. possible. Of these six cases one (9 10) is from Mc. (6 30). One case (6 13) is either from Mc. or is an insertion into Mc. (3 14) by Lc.,— depending on the proper reading in Mc. 3 14. (There seems to be some L context, however, cf. Weiss, pp. 110–11.) Once (11 49, Mt. 23 34) we have almost certainly a Lucan insertion into Q. The other three cases (17 5 22 14 24 10) are in L. As nothing would have been easier than reading back this title of the Twelve, these data evidently must be taken cautiously.

5. ἄροτρον, ἀροτριᾶω (137). Noun 9 62, verb 17 7. Both L, neither word in A.

6. ἄρχοντες (162, 165). The phenomena for the plural are curious for it occurs four times in Lc. and seven in A. The A. cases are 3 17 4 5. 8. 26 (Septuagint) 13 27 14 5 16 19. The cases in Lc. are 14 1 23 13. 35 24 20, all of which are in L. The plural is not found in Mt. or Mc. (Mt. 20 25 is different). There are too many cases in A., however, to class the word as certain for L.

The singular is found Lc. 8 41 (Lc. in Mc. 5 22 or else from Q), 11 15 (Mt. 12 24, Mc. 3 22, from Q or Mc.) 12 58 (probably Lc. in Q, — cf. Mt. 5 25) 18 18 (Lc. in Mc. 10 17). Also A. 7 27. 35 (twice) (all three in St. Stephen's speech) 23 5 (Septuagint).

7. ἀρώματα (164). 23 58 24 1, — both L. Not in A.

8. φαρισαῖοι καὶ γραμματεῖς (110). In this order 5 30 15 2, — both L. Also Mt. 15 1, Mc. 7 1. 5 9 11 (dubious text). In

reverse order Lc. 5 21 (Lc. in Mc. 2 6) 6 7 (Lc. in Mc. 3 2) 11 53 (L), not at all in Mc., nine times in Mt. In A. the combination does not occur in either order.

9. *δαπάνη, δαπανάω* (136). Noun 14 28, verb 15 14, — both L. Verb also A. 21 24.

10. *διατάσσω*, passive participle (137). Three times in Lc. (3 13 17 8, 10,—all L), once (23 31) in A. The immediate conjunction of the two cases in cp. 17 tells against much significance here.

11. *διόστημι* (168). Twice (22 29 24 51, — both L) in Lc., once (27 28) in A.

12. *δυνατός*, masculine (165). Three times in Lc. (1 49 14 31 24 19,—all L), three times (7 22 18 24 25 5, plural) in A. Particularly alike are Lc. 24 19 and A. 7 22, but the latter is in St. Stephen's speech.

13. *ἐγείρω* in the sense "make effective" (117). Twice (1 69 7 16,—both L) in Lc., once (13 22) in A.

14. *εἰρήνη* of literal (military) peace (136, 147). Twice (12 51 14 32,—both L) in Lc., not at all in A. The phrase *τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην* is found Lc. 14 32 19 42 (both L), but the text of 14 32 is very uncertain. The phrase is not found in A.

15. *ἐκδίκησις*, "punishment" (141). In Lc. 21 22 only (L), not in A. Contrast the sense "vengeance" in 18 7. 8 (Q?), A. 7 24 (St. Stephen's speech).

16. *ἐκμυκτηρίζω* (162). Lc. 16 14 23 33 (both L) only in NT.

17. *ἐμπίμπλημι* (113). Twice in Lc. (1 53 6 25,—both L), once (14 17) in A.

18. *ἔντιμος* (123). Twice (7 2 14 8) in Lc. (both L), not in A.

19. *ἐξουθενέω* (159). Twice (18 9 23 11,—both L) in Lc., once (4 11) in A.

20. *ἐπανερχομαι* (121, 145). Twice (10 35 19 15, both L) in Lc., not elsewhere in NT.

21. *ἐπιστρέφω* (137, 152). Seven times in Lc., eleven times in A. (all parts). Of these occurrences in Lc., one (17 31) is from Mc. (13 16). One (8 55) is a Lucan addition

to Mc. (5 42). The other five cases (1 16. 17 2 39 17 4 22 32) are in L. Lc. (8 45) avoids the word in Mc. 5 30 (the occurrences in Mc. 4 12 (Septuagint) and 8 33 have no proper Lucan context).

22. *ἐπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας* (187). Only in Lc. 17 4, — quoted (?) from Ps. 119 164. (This seems to have little significance.)

23. *ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με*, metaphorical, of Christ (115). Lc. 6 47 14 28. Both L. No comparison with A. possible.

24. *ἔρωτάω*, "make request" (118, 127, 135, 136). Nine (or ten) times in Lc., six times (8 3 10 48 16 39 18 20 23 18. 20) in A. Of the cases in Lc. (8 37) is a Lucan insertion in Mc. 5 17. The other eight (or nine) (5 3 7 3. 4 (text dubious) 36 11 37 14 18. 19. 32 16 27) are all L. The value of this number is destroyed as evidence, however, by the fact that this use of the word is almost the uniform custom in A. — six out of seven cases, — A. 1 6 is the only example of the other use. Of special uses, though, *ἔρωτάω ἵνα* is found in Lc. 7 36 16 27 (not at all in A. — both Lc. cases are L), and *ἔρωτάω ὅπως* in Lc. 7 3 11 37 (both L) and A. 23 20.

25. *ζάω*, "become alive" (125). Lc. 15 32, cf. *ἀναζάω* in same sense 15 24. (This seems rather pointless.)

26. *ἡλικία*, "stature" (144). Lc. 2 52 19 3 (both L), not in A. Contrast Lc. 12 25 (Mt. 6 27 — in Q), "length of life."

27. *θεμελιον τίθημι* (136). Lc. 6 48 14 29 (both L). Not in A. (In A. is there any occasion for the phrase?)

28. *ἰκανός*, "much," "great," etc. (116). Six (or seven) times in Lc. seventeen times in A. (all parts). Of the cases in Lc., two (8 27. 32) are Lucan insertions in Mc. (5 2. 11, — the second a deliberate change). The other four (or five) (7 11, text dubious, 12 20 9 23 8. 9) are in L. Contrast the use of the word as "sufficient" in Lc. 3 16 (from Mc. 1 7 or from Q) 7 6 (Mt. 8 8, in Q) 22 38 (Q?). Also in A. 17 9 ("security"). The use of A. is almost uniformly (always, except 17 9) what Weiss has given as the L use.

29. *Ἰουδαία* as the province, not Palestine (117). Weiss' data here depend on very subtle exegesis, — too subtle to be very convincing.



30. *ἴστημι* in the aorist passive (165). The participle is found three times in Lc. and six times (2 14 5 20 11 13 17 22 25 18 27 21) in A. Of the cases in Lc., one (18 40) is a Lucan change in Mc. 10 49. The other two cases (18 11 19 8) are in L. These data obviously tell rather against an L use than for it. Other moods of the aorist passive are found in 21 36 (infinitive) 24 17 (indicative). Both cases are L. No other cases in A.

31. *ἰσχύω* (186, 149). Eight times in Lc., six times in A. The cases in Lc. all are negated and are followed by the infinitive. A. 6 10 15 10 25 7 are negated and have the infinitive; A. 27 16 has the infinitive, A. 19 16. 20 are used absolutely. Of the cases in Lc., one (8 43) is a Lucan change made in Mc. 5 26. Two cases (13 24, infinitive implied, 16 3) are classed by Weiss (pp. 57, 58) as from Q. The remaining five cases (6 48 14 6. 29. 30 20 26) are in L.

32. *καλούμενος*, of persons (150). Five times (6 15 8 2 10 39 19 2 22 3,—all L) in Lc., five times (1 23 7 58 13 1 15 22. 37) in A. To these may be added the same phrase of *places* in Lc. 7 11 (L) 9 10 (Lc.?,—cf. Mc. 6 32) 23 33 (L), A. 3 11 27 8. 18, and of a *wind* in A. 27 14. There may have been a correspondence between the usage of Lc. and L in this form, but certainly nothing can be proved; and cf. also No. 45, below.

33. *κοιλία*, "womb" (197). Seven times in Lc. (1 15. 41. 42. 44 2 21 11 27 23 29,—all L) in Lc., twice in A. (3 2 14 8). But the large number of cases in L is due to the character of the narrative. On p. 197 of Weiss for "8" read "7,"—Lc. 15 16 (even if the text is right) is a different (classical) use. It may be noted that the phrase *ἐκ κοιτίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ* occurs Lc. 1 15, A. 3 2 14 8.

34. *κόλπος*, "bosom" (127). Three times in Lc. (6 38 16 22. 23,—all L), not at all in A. (in 27 39 the word means "cove"). If the two cases 16 22. 23 had not been conjoined, this word would have belonged to class B.

35. *κρίμα* (165). Three times in Lc., once (24 25) in A. Of the three cases, one (20 47) is from Mc. (12 40). The other two (23 40 24 20) are both L.

36. *κρύπτω* (147). Three times in Lc. (omitting 11 32), not at all in A. The two cases 18 34 and 19 42 are L. In the Q passage 13 21, Mt. 13 33, Lc. has the simple verb while Mt. has *ἐγκρύπτω*, in the Q passage 10 22, Mt. 11 25, Mt. has the simple verb while Lc. has *ἀποκρύπτω*.

37. *λεγόμενος*, "called" (153). Twice in Lc. (22 1. 47, — both L), once (6 9) in A.

38. *λεπρός* (139). Three times in Lc., not at all in A. (no occasion). Of the three cases, one (7 23 Mt. 11 5) is from Q. The other two (4 27 17 12) are L. In 5 12 Lc. explains the word where he meets it in Mc. 1 40.

39. *λιμός ἐγένετο* (125). Twice (4 23 15 14, — both L) in Lc., not at all in A. Contrast with *ἔσται* in Lc. 21 11 (L), A. 11 28 and with *ἦλθεν* in A. 7 11 (St. Stephen's speech).

40. *οἱ μισοῦντες* (118). Twice (1 71 6 27, — both L) in Lc., not at all in A.

41. *ἤμελλον* (144). Four times in Lc., three times (12 6 16 27 27 33) in A. Of the cases in Lc., one (9 31) is of dubious origin, — Weiss (pp. 65-66) makes it a Lucan addition to Q and reads *ἔμελλεν*. The other three cases (7 2 10 1 19 4) are L. *ἔμελλον* only in A. 21 27, — possibly in A. 27 33.

42. *Ναζαρά* (106). Lc. 4 16 only, — *Ναζαρέτ* (= *ρέθ*) in 1 28 2 4. 39. 51 (all L). *I.e.*, Lc. omitted to change the one form?

43. *ὄπτασία* (166). Lc. 1 22 24 23 (both L), A. 26 19.

44. *ὄρθρος*, etc. (166). *ὄρθρος*, Lc. 24 1, A. 5 21. *ὄρθρίζω*, Lc. 21 38. *ὄρθρινός*, Lc. 24 22. All three cases in Lc. are L.

45. *τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν* (146, 149). Lc. 19 37 22 39. (So in Mc. 11 1, Mt. 21 1; Mc. 13 3, Mt. 24 3; Mc. 14 26, Mt. 26 30.) Contrast the use of *τὸ ὄρος καλούμενον ἐλαιῶν* (= *ὶών*) in Lc. 19 29 21 37, A. 1 12 (form?). But all *four* of these cases in Lc. are in L.

NOTE. Probably these examples of the use of *καλούμενος* should be added to those of No. 32, above.

46. *τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην* (127, 134). Five times with prospective use of *ταύτην* in Lc., no comparison with A. possible.

Of these five cases, one (20 9) is an insertion in Mc. (12 1). The other four (4 23 13 6 15 3 18 9) are all L. With retrospective use, twice, both from Lc. (12 41, a Lucan transition question, 20 19, an addition to Mc. 12 19). Of these cases, three (15 3 18 9 20 19) have *εἶπεν*. The same phrase is found in the nominative in 8 9 (added to Mc. 4 10) and 8 11 (from Mc. 4 13.). In both of these last cases the use is retrospective. The prospective use, to introduce a parable, may be characteristic of L, but it seems almost too accidental.

47. *παραγίνομαι* (135). Eight times in Lc., twenty (all parts) in A. Of the eight cases (8 19), one seems to be a Lucan change in Mc. (3 31). One (11 6) is probably from Q. The other six cases (7 4. 20 12 51 14 21 19 16 22 52) are L. But the great number in A. outweighs this evidence.

48. *παρατηρέω*, active (148). Lc. 20 20 only (L), but with doubtful text. Contrast the middle in 6 7 (change to middle of active in Mc. 3 2) 14 1 (L), A. 9 24.

49. *παρέρχομαι*, "come" (138). Lc. 12 37 17 7 only both L,—and aorist participle in both cases. In A. only in the spurious verse 24 7.

50. *πέμπω* (127). Ten times in Lc., eleven (all after cp. 9) in A. Of the cases in Lc., three (20 11. 12. 13) are Lucan insertions in Mc. (12 4. 5. 6) probably, but they may be due to Q (cf. Weiss, p. 59, for the third of these). Once (7 19, Mt. 11 2) the word is from Q or (possibly) L. The other cases (4 26 7 6. 10 15 15 16 24. 27) are in L. Avoided 8 33 in Mc. 5 12.

51. *πληγή* (138). Lc. 10 30 12 48,—both L. Also A. 16 23 (apparently copied from Lc. 10 30.) 33. (due to v. 23).

52. *πλήθος* (197). Eight times in Lc, sixteen (or seventeen, if A. 21 22 is read) in A. Of the cases in Lc., one (6 17) is from Mc. (3 7). Once (8 37) the word is inserted into Mc. 5 17. The other six cases (1 10 2 13 5 6 19 37 23 1. 27) are in L. In Weiss, p. 197, for "8" read "6."

53. *ποίει* (= *εἶτω*) *ὁμοίως* (122). Lc. 3 11 10 37,—both L. Also 6 31, L or Q (cf. Mt. 7 12). Not in A.

54. *πολίται* (145). Lc. 15 13 19 14,—both L. Also A. 21 39 in singular.

55. *πρέσβειαν ἀποστέλλω* (145). Lc. 14 32 19 14, — both L. No occasion in A.

56. *πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ* (157). Lc. 22 66 (L), — explained and (according to Weiss) misunderstood by Lc. The word *πρεσβυτέριον* again in A. 22 5.

57. *προέρχομαι* (153). Lc. 1 17 (text dubious) 22 47, — both L. Probably again in A. 20 13, with less likelihood in A. 20 5, and with still less likelihood in A. 12 13, — textual questions in all three of these cases in A. Avoided 22 41 in Mc. 14 33 (but text of Mc. dubious, and Weiss, p. 152, maintains that Lc. follows L here). The example in Mc. 6 33 has no proper Lucan context.

58. *προσέχετε (ἑαυτοῖς) without ἀπό* (137, 142). Lc. 17 3 21 34, — both L. Also A. 5 33 (with ἐπί) 20 23 (with infinitive).

59. *σιωπάω* (147). Lc. 1 20 19 40, — both L. Also A. 18 9. Omitted 6 9 8 24 9 46 from Mc. 3 4 4 39 9 34. Changed 18 39 in Mc. 10 48. (Mc. 14 61 has no Lucan context.) Contrast the use of *σιγάω* in 9 36 (cf. Mc. 9 9) 18 39 (changed in Mc. 10 48, as above) 20 28 (added to Mc. 12 17), A. 12 17 15 12. 13.

60. *σπεύσας* (144). The aorist active participle only in Lc. 2 16 19 5. 6, — all L. The verb otherwise only in A. 20 16 22 18.

61. *στρατεύματα*, "soldiers" (159). Lc. 23 11 (L) only. In A. 23 10. 27 the word (in the singular) means "troop." Contrast the use of *στρατιῶται* in Lc. 7 8 (Mt. 8 9, — Q) 23 36 (L), A. 12 4 (?) 18 21 32 (twice) 35 23 23. (?) 31 27 31. 32. 42.

62. *στρατηγοί*, as Temple officials (150). Lc. 22 4. 52, — both L. Also A. 4 1 5 24. 23, but in all three cases in the singular. The word in A. 16 (five times) means "praetors."

63. *συκοφαντέω* (144). Lc. 3 14 19 8, — both L. Not in A.

64. *συνζητέω* (165). Lc. 22 23 24 15, — both L. Also A. 6 9 9 29. Omitted 9 37 from Mc. 9 14, changed 4 36 from Mc. 1 27. Mc. 8 11 9 10. 16 12 23 have no proper Lucan context.

65. *τόπος ἐστίν*, "there is room" (135). Lc. 2 7 14 22, — both L. Not in A.

66. *τύπτω τὸ στήθος* (163). Lc. 18 13 23 48, — both L. Not in A.

67. *ὑποδέχομαι* (120, 144). Lc. 10 38 19 6, — both L, A. 17 7. In the cases in L the form both times is *ὑπεδέξατο αὐτόν*.

68. *ὑπολαμβάνω* (121). Meaning "imagine" in Lc. 7 43 (L), A. 2 15, "reply" Lc. 10 30 (L), "receive" A. 1 9.

69. *φάτιη* (134). Lc. 2 7. 12. 16 13 15. Not elsewhere (is there any occasion for its use?).

70. *φόβος* (197). The phrase *φόβος ἐπιπίπτει ἐπὶ* Lc. 1 12, A. 19 17. *φόβος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ* Lc. 1 63, A. 5 5. 11. *φόβος ἐγένετό τινι* in A. 2 43. *φόβος ἔλαβεν πάντας* Lc. 7 16. Otherwise the word is found in Lc. 5 26 8 37 (Lucan additions to Mc. 2 12 5 17) 2 9 21 26, A. 9 31. These examples do not seem to prove anything.

71. *φόρος* (197). Lc. 20 22 23 2, — both L. Not in A.

72. *φωνήν αἶρω* (139). Lc. 17 13 (L); A. 4 24. *φωνήν ἐπαίρω* Lc. 11 27 (L), A. 2 14 14 11 22 22.

73. *χάρις* (114). The distinctions in meaning that Weiss draws depend on very subtle exegesis.

74. *εἰς χώραν μακράν* (144). Lc. 15 13 19 12, — both L. Not in A.

75. *ἡ ὥρα* with genitive (154). Lc. 1 10 14 17, — both L. Also A. 3 1.

The following were omitted from their order by an oversight:—

76. *ἔρχομαι ἐπὶ* (164). Lc. 19 5 23 33 24 1, — all L. A. 8 36 12 10. 12. Verb in aorist in all six cases.

77. *ὀπίσω* with genitive (141) Lc. 9 23 (from Mc. 8 34) 14 27 19 14 21 8 (these three all L), A. 5 37 20 30.

78. *τελέω*, passive, aorist and future (143, 198). Lc. 12 50 18 31 (both L) 22 37 (Q?). Not in A.

The following are not very clear:—

79. Compare *πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων* in Lc. 19 37 with Lc. 9 43 (*ἐξεπλήσσοντο δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ μεγαλειότητι τοῦ θεοῦ*). (Weiss, p. 146.)

80. The "plastic" phrase *ἡ χεὶρ . . . ἐπὶ τ. τραπ.* (151). Unless the word in question here is *χεῖρ* (for which I can detect no significant use), I am unable to understand Weiss' point.

**D. WORDS AND PHRASES CLASSED BY WEISS AS CHARACTERISTIC OF L ON INSUFFICIENT (?) EVIDENCE**

1. γόνυ (152). Lc. 5 8 22 41, — both L, A. 7 60 9 40 20 36 21 5. The occurrence of the noun is of no importance and all cases in A., with Lc. 22 41, have it in the form *θεις τὰ γόνατα*.

2. ἔμφοβος γενόμενος (167). Lc. 24 5. 37, A. 10 4 24 25.

3. ἐπιγινώσκω (δτι) (159). With *δτι*, Lc. 1 22 7 37 23 7 (all L), A. 3 10 4 13 (these two have object of person also) 19 34 22 29 24 11 28 1. Not elsewhere in the Gospels except Mc. 2 8, and so highly probably due to Lc., not L. Otherwise the verb is found Lc. 5 22 (from Mc. 2 8, — Lc. drops Mc.'s *δτι*) and in 1 4 (Lc.'s preface), 24 16. 31 (both L). And seven times in A. (9 30 12 14 22 24 23 28 24 8 25 10 27 39) besides the six cases above.

4. ἐπιπίπτω ἐπί (125). Lc. 1 12 15 20, — both L. A. 8 16 10 44 11 15 19 17 20 37. Without *ἐπί* only 20 10 (with dative).

5. ἐσθής (159). Lc. 23 11 24 4, A. 10 30 12 21. *ἐσθης λαμπρά*, Lc. 23 11, A. 10 30. Cf. *ἔσθης*, A. 1 10.

6. ἐφίστημι (142, 164). Seven times in Lc., eleven in A. Of the seven cases, two (4 39 20 1) are additions of Lc. to Mc. (1 31 11 27). The other five cases (2 9. 38 10 40 21 34 24 4) are in L.

7. παρὰ τοὺς πόδας (139). Lc. 7 38 17 16 (in L), 8 35. 41 (Lucan alterations in Mc. 5 15. 22), A. 4 35. 37 (dubious text) 5 2 7 58 22 3.

8. πῖμπλημι, in general use (141). For this word in temporal sense cf. (B 42). Otherwise the word occurs eight times in Lc. and nine times in A. Of these cases, the following are of the form *πλησθῆναι πνεύματος ἀγίου*, — Lc. 1 15. 41. 67, A. 2 4 4 8. 31 9 17 13 9. Of the remaining five cases in Lc., two (5 28 6 11) are Lucan alterations of Mc. (2 12 3 6). There remain only three further cases to represent L (4 28 5 7 21 22) with a corresponding four in A. (3 10 5 17 13 45 19 29).

9. πληρόω in temporal sense (119). The data collected in (B 42) would prove this use characteristic of Lc. rather than L.

10. συνβάλλω (136). Lc. 2 19 14 31, A. 4 15 17 18 18 27 20 14.

## DISTRIBUTION OF THE CHARACTERISTIC WORDS

The distribution of the characteristic words and phrases within the various sections of L can be seen from the following tables. The first column contains the number of the most characteristic words and phrases in the verses as noted, *i.e.* those of Class A, and those of Notes 1 and 2 of No. 14, and those of No. 38 in Class B. The second column contains the numbers for the remaining words and phrases of Class B with the exception of Nos. 10, 34, 40, and 51. These last four are less clear than the others in the class, and they are not counted. The third column contains the percentage of the total frequency per verse of the words counted in the first two columns.

(a) Words found in L passages where admixture from Mc. or Q is not suspected :

1 5-25	8	6	.67	13 1-9	5	3	.89
1 26-45	3	5	.40	13 10-17	1	4	.63
1 46-56	4	0	.36	14 1-6	5	2	1.17
1 57-66	3	4	.70	14 7-14	2	4	.75
1 67-80	5	5	.71	14 25-28	2	2	.67
2 1-7	2	5	1.00	15 1-3	2	2	1.33
2 8-20	1	7	.62	15 11-23	6	7	.59
2 21-26	6	6	.67	16 14-15	0	0	.00
2 29-32	2	3	.36	16 19-21	4	5	.69
3 10-14	1	1	.40	17 2-4	0	0	.00
3 23	3	0	3.00	17 5-10	5	2	1.17
3 24-33	(Genealogy)			17 11-19	8	4	1.33
4 16-30	1	3	.27	18 9-14	2	1	.50
5 1-11	7	1	.73	19 1-10	4	3	.70
7 11-17	5	5	1.43	19 11-15	3	1	.80
7 25-50	5	3	.53	19 27	0	3	3.00
8 1-3	2	1	1.00	19 37-44	4	5	1.12
9 31-33	6	4	1.67	21 24-26	0	1	.33
9 31-43	0	0	.00	21 37-39	0	1	.50
10 1	1	1	2.00	22 21-24	0	2	.50
10 29-37	1	3	.44	23 4-12	1	2	.33
10 38-42	2	2	.80	23 27-32	2	2	.67
11 27-29	2	1	1.50	23 39-42	2	1	.60
11 53-54	1	0	.50	24 13-25	15	6	.91
12 1a	1	0	2.00	24 26-43	0	0	.00
12 25-28	0	6	1.25	24 44-51	5	1	.75

Total for these 408½ verses, omitting the Genealogy : 150  
139 .70.

NOTE. In almost all of the above cases, a reminiscence or a short quotation from Mc. is probable. If this were deleted in each case, the averages would be raised slightly.

In the above list the proportion is almost invariably higher than one characteristic word or phrase in every two verses. Where the proportion is less than this (omitting very short extracts) we have the following passages : 1 26-45 (The Annunciation and Visitation), 1 46-56 (The Magnificat), 2 39-52 (The Child in the Temple), 3 10-14 (The Baptist's Charge), 4 16-30 (Synagogue in Capernaum), 10 29-37 (Good Samaritan), 21 34-36 (Warnings of End), 23 4-12 (Christ and Herod), 24 36-48 (Appearance in Jerusalem).

The significance of these last figures, if they have any significance, must be left an open question here.

(b) Words found in L passages where there is evidence of admixture from other sources :

6 20-28	7	6	.68	21 28-28	3	2	1.25
7 1-10	1	1	.20	22 1-6	1	0	.17
7 16-22 a	1	0	.22	22 14-19a	2	0	.36
9 48-48	0	1	.33	22 21-28	1	0	.38
11 57-62	2	4	.38	22 39-42	2	1	.75
12 33-34	1	1	1.00	22 48-53	1	1	.22
12 49-53	2	1	.60	22 54-55	3	1	.33
14 16-24	1	0	.11	22 66-71	1	0	.17
14 26-27	1	1	.67	23 1-2	1	0	.50
18 31-34	1	0	.25	23 13-25	0	0	.00
20 20-28	0	3	.43	23 33-38	0	2	.33
20 34-38	0	0	.00	23 48-49	0	2	.40
21 12-19	0	3	.37	23 50-56	1	0	.14
21 20-24	1	0	.20	24 1-12	7	1	.67

As was to be expected, the proportions are lower in this case than in the last, as the introduction of extraneous matter naturally "dilutes" the L vocabulary.

(c) L words in non-L passages.

The occurrence of L words outside of L is so small as to be negligible, except in the passage 9 28-36 (the Transfiguration). The proportion here is (5 3 .89) with *Ἱεροσολήμη*, once. A comparison with Mt.-Mc. reveals the rather interesting fact that all of the eight cases are in matter peculiar to Lc. (or due



to the introduction of such matter, v. 33). Moreover, the matter peculiar to Lc. here does not consist of stylistic improvements, but in the addition of new details. Consequently, the supposition lies close at hand that L contained a Transfiguration account which Lc. here has combined with that in Mc. (or Q, — so Weiss).

The above tables give very strong evidence for the substantial unity of L as a source. Certain sections perhaps should be omitted, but, as a whole, Weiss' case seems to be made out.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF WORDS BELONGING ONLY TO ECCLESIASTICAL GREEK IN THE LUCAN WRITINGS

The following list contains those words marked by Moulton and Geden (1st edition) either with a simple dagger or a dagger and a double asterisk. Words belonging to a direct quotation from the Old Testament or copied by Lc. directly from Mc. are omitted. On the other hand, for the sake of the statistics, words plainly quoted by Lc. from Q are included.

##### (a) Words found only in L in the Lucan writings :

1. ἀγαθοποιέω. Lc. 6 33. 35.
2. ἀλλογενής. Lc. 17 18.
3. ἀναζάω. Lc. 15 24 (text slightly dubious).
4. ἀνταπόδομα. Lc. 14 12.
5. ἀνταποκρίνομαι. Lc. 14 8.
6. ἀντιπαρέρχομαι. Lc. 10 31. 31.
7. βδέλυγμα. Lc. 16 15.
8. διαγογγύζω. Lc. 15 2 19 7.
9. δυσβάστακτος. Lc. 11 46. (If read in Mt. 23 4,  
this word may be from Q.)
10. ἐκζητέω. Lc. 11 50. 51.
11. ἐκμυκτηρίζω. Lc. 16 14 23 35.
12. ἐκριζάω. Lc. 17 8.
13. ἐξουθενέω. Lc. 18 9 23 11.
14. ἐπισκοπή. Lc. 19 44.
15. ἐπιφάσκω. Lc. 23 54. (Mt. 28 1 not parallel.)

16. *ἐφημερία*. Lc. 1 5. 8.
17. *λαξευτός*. Lc. 23 53.
18. *λύτρωσις*. Lc. 1 68 2 38.
19. *ὀρθρίζω*. Lc. 21 38.
20. *πλήμυρα*. Lc. 6 48.
21. *προσρήγνυμι*. Lc. 6 48. 49.
22. *ρόμφαία*. Lc. 2 35.
23. *σίκερα*. Lc. 1 15.
24. *συγγενείς*. Lc. 2 44. (Probable reading.)
25. *συνανάκειμαι*. Lc. 7 49 (L?) 14 10. 15.
26. *ὑπερεκχύννομαι*. Lc. 6 38.
27. *χαριτώω*. Lc. 1 28.

## (b) Words found only in Q in the Lucan writings :

1. *περίσσευμα*. Lc. 6 45, Mt. 12 34.
2. *σάτον*. Lc. 13 21, Mt. 13 33.

## (c) Words found only in L and Q :

1. *εὐδοκία*. Lc. 2 14. Lc. 10 21, Mt. 11 28.
2. *θυσιαστήριον*. Lc. 1 11. Lc. 11 51, Mt. 23 35.
3. *οὐαί*. Lc. 6 24. 25. (twice) 26. For use in Q, cf. Lc. 11 42-52, Mt. 23 13-29. Also Lc. 10 13, Mt. 11 21 ; Lc. 17 1, Mt. 18 7.

## (d) Words of doubtful source found in the Gospel only :

1. *ἀγαπή*. Lc. 11 42, — Lc. or Q.
2. *βάτος*. 16 8, — Q?
3. *γένημα*. 12 18, — text very dubious, — Q?
4. *γογγύζω*. 5 30, — L?
5. *ἐκπειράζω*. 10 25, — Q?
6. *ἐξαστράπτω*. 9 29, — Q? L?
7. *καύσων*. 12 55, — Q?
8. *μακροθυμέω*. 18 7, — Q?
9. *σκάνδαλον*. 17 1, probably Q, — Mt. 18 7.
10. *χρεοφιλέτης*. 7 41 (L) 16 5, — Q?

## (e) Words certainly due to Lc. in the Gospel only :

1. *ἀφυπνώω*. 8 23, added to Mc. 4 38.
2. *πληροφορέω*. 1 1, — in the Preface.
3. *ὑστέρημα*. 21 4, for *ὑστέρησις* in Mc. 12 44.

## (f) Words in A., cpp. 1-12 only:

## i. In the speeches.

1. διαταγή. 7 53.
2. ἐνωτίζομαι. 2 14.
3. θεόμαχος. 5 39.
4. κατάσχεσις. 7 5. 45.
5. λυτρωτής. 7 35.
6. ὀλοκληρία. 3 16.
7. πατριαρχής. 2 29 7 8. 9.
8. πρόγνωσις. 2 23.
9. σκληροτραχέλος. 7 51.

## ii. In the narrative.

1. ἀκροβυστία. 11 3.
2. γογγυσμός. 6 1.
3. κατανύσσομαι. 2 37.
4. κράββατος. 5 15 9 33.
5. ὀπτάνομαι. 1 3.
6. συνοδεύω. 9 7.

(No significance attaches to περιτομή, 7 8 10 45 11 2.)

## (g) Words only in A., cpp. 13-28:

## i. In the speeches.

1. ἀπρόσκοπος. 24 16.
2. βίωσις. 26 4.
3. γνώστης. 26 3.
4. ἐκτένεια. 26 7.
5. κατακληρονομέω. 13 19.
6. παρεκτός. 26 29.
7. παροιμία. 13 17.
8. τροποφορέω (τροφ-). 13 18.
9. φυλακίζω. 22 19.

## ii. In the narrative.

1. ἀναθεματίζω. 23 12. 14. 21.
2. ἀναστατόω. 17 6 21 38.
3. ἀνετάζω. 22 24. 29.
4. εἰδωλόθυτος. 15 29 21 25 (technical term).
5. ἐξαρτίζω. 21 5, — "We."

6. *περικρατής*. 27 16, — "We."
7. *συμβούλιον*. 25 12.

(h) Words found in all parts of A. but not in the Gospel:

1. *ἐπαύριον*. 10 9. 23. 24 14 20 20 7 ("We") 21 8 ("We") 22 30 23 32 25 6. 23.
2. *περιαστράπτω*. 9 3 22 6, — identical passages.
3. *προσήλυτος*. 2 11 6 5 13 43 (technical term).

(i) Words in L and in A., cpp. 1-12:

1. *ἀγαλλίασις*. Lc. 1 14. 44, A. 2 46.
2. *δεκτός*. Lc. 4 24, A. 10 36 (speech).
3. *διερμηνεύω*. Lc. 24 2. 7, A. 9 36.
4. *ἐλαιών (-ῶν)*. Lc. 19 29 21 37, A. 1 12.
5. *ἐναντι*. Lc. 1 8, A. 7 10 (text dubious, — St. Stephen's speech) 8 21.

(j) Other words found in both Lc. and A:

1. *ἀγαλλιδῶ*. Lc. 1 47 (L) 10 21 (Q?), A. 16 34.
2. *γρηγορέω*. Lc. 12 37 (L) 12 39 (Q, but unlikely reading), A. 20 31 (speech).
3. *ἐκχύννομαι*. Lc. 5 37 (Lc., change in Mc. 2 22) 11 50 (L or Q., cf. Mt. 23 35), A. 1 18 10 45 22 20, — all three in speeches.
4. *ἐνώπιον*. Twenty-two times in Lc., thirteen times in A., in all parts of both.
5. *ἐξομολογέω*. Lc. 10 21 (Q, — Mt. 11 25) 22 6 (L), A. 19 18.
6. *θέλημα*. Lc. 12 47 (twice) 22 42 23 25 (all four L); A. 13 23 (speech) 21 14 22 14 (speech). (The longer form of the Lord's Prayer has influenced some of these cases.)
7. *καθαρίζω*. Lc. 4 27 (L) 7 22 (Q, — Mt. 11 5) 11 39 (Q, — Mt. 23 25) 17 14. 17 (both L), A. 10 15 11 9 (these two identical) 15 9 (last two in speeches).
8. *λιθοβολέω*. Lc. 13 34 (Q, — Mt. 23 37), A. 7 58. 59 14 5.
9. *ὄπτασία*. Lc. 1 22 24 23 (both L), A. 26 19 (speech).

10. *πρεσβυτέριον*. Lc. 22 66 (L), A. 22 5 (speech):
11. *πειρασμός*. Lc. 4 13 (Lc. in Q?) 8 13 (Lc. in Mc. 4 17) 11 4 (Q, — Mt. 6 13) 22 28 (Q?) 22 40 (probably due to quotation from Mc. 14 28 in 22 46), A. 20 19 (speech).
12. *προσευχή*. Lc. 6 12 (L?) 22 45 (L?); seven times in A. 1–12, otherwise only 16 13, 18, in the sense of a *place*.
13. *ψευδοπροφήτης*. Lc. 6 28 (L?), A. 13 6.

**SUMMARY.** In both Lucan writings, ninety-seven; in the Gospel only, forty-five; in A. only, thirty-four; in both, eighteen. In L only, twenty-seven; total number of cases certainly in L, forty-three.

In other words, almost half of the total number of cases are found in L, whose extent is only about one quarter of the two writings combined.

**NOTE.** In Deissmann's *Licht vom Osten* (3d edition, 1909), pp. 46–75, there is given a list of "ecclesiastical" words that have been discovered in non-Jewish sources. These data will delete from the lists above the following words: From list (a) *ἀναζάω*, Deissmann, p. 64 (the case is not so clear for *ἀλλογενής*, p. 51). From list (d) *ἀγάπή*, p. 48. From list (e) *πληροφορέω*, p. 56. From list (f) *διαταγή*, p. 59; *ὀπτάνομαι*, p. 54. From list (g) *ἀναστατώω*, p. 55 (the case for *ἀναθεματίζω*, p. 63, is not clear). From list (i) *ἐλαιών*, *ἐναντι*, p. 48. From list (j) *ἐνώπιον*, *καθαρίζω*, *προσευχή*, p. 48.

The summary will now read: In both Lucan writings, eighty-six; in the Gospel only, forty-two; in A. only, thirty-one; in both, thirteen. In L only, twenty-six; total number of cases certainly in L, thirty-eight. The average is about the same as it was before the deletions.

Of course, the purely "ecclesiastical" character of a word does not admit of precise enough proof to allow of accurate computation. But the figures, none the less, are not without significance.

POSSIBLE HEBRAISMS IN THE LUCAN WRITINGS, AS  
CLASSED BY DALMAN

A very interesting corroboration of the results reached, by a comparison of statistics drawn up from an entirely distinct standpoint, can be attained by using the lists drawn up by Dalman, in his *Words of Jesus*, English translation, pp. 20-36. (Cf. also Moulton's *Prolegomena*, pp. 14-17.) The following words are classed as possible Hebraisms.

1. *ἐλθών, ἐρχόμενος*, redundantly used with a finite verb. In collecting data of this sort, the question as to the redundancy or otherwise of each particular case naturally arises. I have allowed the presumption to lie on the side of redundancy, including *good* uses rather than excluding them, but have taken it as a general principle that where the participle has a modifier, it cannot properly be held redundant. However, in this and all following cases, I have quoted all of Dalman's examples.

There are twelve cases in Lc. and none at all in A.; A. 16 37. 39 approach most closely to the use, but the "coming" has especial emphasis there and the participle cannot be classed as redundant. Of the cases in Lc., three, 11 25 (Mt. 12 44) 12 43 (Mt. 24 46) 19 23 (Mt. 25 27) are certainly quoted by Lc. from Q. One case (18 5) is of dubious origin (Q?). The other eight cases (5 7 7 3 10 32 12 36 13 14 14 9 15 25 16 21) all are found in L.

For *πορευόμενος, πορευθείς* there are nine examples in Lc. and (again) none at all in A. One case (7 22, Mt. 11 4) is from Q. Twice (8 14 22 8) the use is certainly from Mc. (4 19 14 12); and in 9 13 the use is to be referred to the influence of Mc. 6 36-37, especially with the modifications in Lc. 9 12. The case 13 32 is of uncertain origin but probably from Q. The remaining four cases (9 52 14 10 15 15 17 14) are all in L.

2. *καθίσας, καθήμενος*. The two examples from chapter 5 cited by Dalman, 5 3. 27, hardly seem to be redundant in any proper sense (and the second is from Mc. 2 14), and it may be noted that an example (A. 16 13) is found in the "We"

sections of A. Really redundant cases seem to occur in Lc. 7 32 (Mt. 11 16, — Q) 16 6 (Q?) 14 23, 31, — the last two the best marked cases and both L.

3. *ἐντός, σταθός*. Seven times in Lc., six times in A. Of the Lucan passages, one (18 40) is a slight modification of Mc. (10 42, — *σταθός* for *στός*). One (9 27) is from Mc. (9 1). The other five cases (1 11 5 1 18 11 19 8 24 17) are in L. In A. the use is found 2 14 5 20 16 9 17 23 25 18 27 21, and consequently this cannot safely be classed as an L use. On the other hand, the very awkward phrases (Lc. 23 10. 35) quoted by Dalman both belong to L and seem to have no parallel in A. Cf. C 30, *supra*.

4. *ἀναστός, ἐγεθός*. The first of these words unmistakably belongs to Lc.'s (not L's) vocabulary, as it is found sixteen times in Lc. and eighteen times in A., and in all parts of each, except the "We" sections of A. The second word is found only in Lc. 11 8 (probably in Q and probably not redundant) and not at all in A.

5. *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν*. This phrase is so extremely common in all parts of the Gospels (Jn. included) and A. that no weight can be attached to it.

6. *λέγων* after a verb of speaking. Dalman's examples of Lucan use (24 6-7 14 3) are both in L. But note A. 8 28 26 31.

7. *ἤρξατο, ἤρξαντο*. That this word belongs to L and not to Lc. has been shown in (A 5).

8. *εὐθύς*, etc. As Dalman maintains that the excessive frequency of this word in Mc. "is due probably to Greek rather than Jewish-Aramaic influence," and as the word is cited for a demonstration of Aramaic rather than Hebrew (not Greek) influence, this use is of no importance for present purposes.

9. *πρόσωπον*. Only the cases cited by Dalman are of importance here. Lc. 7 27 (Mt. 11 10) is in an explicit Septuagint quotation (in Q). The other citations in Dalman are Lc. 1 76 (text?) 9 52 10 1 21 35 20 21 9 51, and these are all L. 9 53, by Dalman's reasoning, should be classed as a Lucan editing of L. The phrases in A. (3 19 5 41 7 45 13 24) are all very simple, and all but 5 41 are in speeches. Cf. B 44.

10. ἐνώπιον. Discarded by Dalman as evidence and referred to the Κοινή.

11. καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐγένετο δέ. These uses have been studied fully in (A 6, B 14; cf. A 7) and referred there to L.

12. ἐν τῷ with the infinitive. One special use of this phrase has been discussed in (A 7). There remain eleven cases in Lc. and six in A., all in the first twelve chapters (2 1 3 28 4 30 8 6 9 8 11 15). Of the cases in Lc., one (8 5) is from Mc. (4 4). 8 40. 42 are apparently Lucan insertions into Mc. 5 21. 24. 12 15 is of dubious origin (Q?). 9 34. 38 are also of dubious origin, but on p. 169 I have suggested that other evidence points to L for this passage. The remaining five cases (1 21 2 27. 43 10 35 11 37) are in L.

It may be questioned, however, how far this use of the infinitive is to be classed as a Semitism. Allen's *The Infinitive in Polybius* (Chicago, 1907) gives examples of both the temporal and the local use of the phrase in an author where there is no Semitic influence, and has counted twenty-four occurrences in all (pp. 37, 48). Cf. also Moulton, *Prolegomena*, pp. 14, 215.

13. The emphasizing of a verb by its cognate substantive. As a concordance is useless for checking up these instances, I have contented myself with the examples given by Dalman. The two cases in Lc. cited by him (2 9 22 15, — particularly characteristic) are both L. Of the occurrences in A., 23 14 is a technical term in the mouth of Jews; 4 17 has very uncertain text (but Weiss reads the word); 7 34 (Septuagint) is in St. Stephen's speech, and 5 28 is again in the mouth of Jews.

14. εἶναι with the participle. It seems impossible to draw up reliable statistics here; cf., for instance, Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, pp. 202 ff., and Moulton, *op. cit.*, pp. 225 ff., for the difficulty of deciding whether or not a given case is really periphrastic. Suffice it to say that in Lc. out of a total of forty-five cases (omitting 24 27) of the imperfect of εἶναι with the participle, twenty-eight are found in L. (Only two seem certainly due to Mc., — 5 17 8 32.) The most awkward cases seem to be 8 28 9 53 13 11 23 8 23 33, all L.



SUMMARY. Nos. 1, 2, 7, 11, 12 (the really Semitic uses), 13 are certainly L phrases, Nos. 3, 9, 14 are so in part. Nos. 5, 8, 10 are irrelevant. Only Nos. 4 and 3 (in part only) really belong to Lc.

### THE THIRD GOSPEL AND ACTS

On pp. 179-180 of Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae* (2d edition) are drawn up lists of words found frequently in the Third Gospel but not at all or very infrequently in A. Hawkins deduces from these lists, in conjunction with the three others given on pp. 177-178, that a considerable interval must have elapsed between the production of the two works, if they are to be ascribed to the same author. The force of this argument, however, as far as it is supported by the fourth and fifth lists, is considerably broken by the statistics as they have been discussed in the present tables.

Hawkins gives fourteen words in his last two lists. Exactly half of these have been shown to belong to L, not Lc., namely: *ἀμαρτωλός, ἐγένετο* with a finite verb, *ὁμοίως, στραφείς, ἐγένετο* with *καί* (this should have been in Hawkins' fourth list), *ἐν τῷ* with the infinitive (in the only cases that give Lc. much preponderance over A.,—cf. also No. 12, *supra*), *καί αὐτός*. Cf. A 1, B 14, B 39, A 18, A 6, A 7, A 11.

Of the other cases listed by Hawkins, certain words owe their frequency entirely to the character of the narrative in Lc. and not to questions of style. The frequency of *εἶπον δέ, εἶπεν δέ* is due to the great frequency of the short quotations of a speaker in Lc., something which has no parallel in A. Hawkins gives as the ratio 59:15, and the words of a speaker, surely, are introduced four times as frequently in Lc. as in A. Much the same is true of *ἐαυτοῦ*, as there is far more occasion for the accentuation of persons in the Gospel than in A.

*Πλούσιος* naturally affords no evidence for style in a comparison of Lc. and A., especially when it is observed that of the eleven occurrences in Lc., one (21 i) is from Mc. 12 41 and five cases (12 16 16 1. 19. 21. 22) are in parables.

*ἐξέρχομαι ἀπὸ* is found thirteen times in Lc. The number,

however, is due to the fact that it has been used as a technical term in exorcisms nine times:—4 35 (twice). 41 8 2. 29. (text?) 33. 35. 38 11 24 (Q, Mt. 12 43),—exactly as it is in A. 16 18 (a “We” passage). Moreover, in 4 35 (twice) 8 29 it is simply a correction of Mc.’s awkward ἐξέρχομαι ἐξ (Mc. 1 25. 26 5 8). Removing these exorcism uses there remain only four cases in Lc. (5 8 8 46 9 5 17 29) and two in A. (16 40 28 3), a disproportion that may be neglected.

There remain three words only in Hawkins’ list. The full statistics may be given.

ἀγαπάω. Thirteen times in Lc., not at all in A. Of these twelve cases, four are in the verse 6 32 (L) and twice in the immediate context (6 27. 35), also in L. Of the other six cases, one (10 27) is a Septuagint quotation (from Q?); 16 13 (Mt. 6 24) is from Q. The other five cases (7 5. 42. 47 (twice) 11 43) are in L. If it had not been for the suspicion of strong Q admixture in 6 27-35, I should have included this word in Class B, at least. Probably it belongs there.

αὐτός ὁ. This combination is found principally in the phrase, αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, — 2 38 10 21 12 12 13 31 20 19 24 33, A. 16 18 22 13, and may safely be set down to Lc. (20 19 is an insertion into Mc. 12 12). Of the same type are αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, 23 12 24 13, and αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ in 13 1. The other cases are 1 38 10 7. Here a predominance of numbers in Lc. over A. certainly exists that is not easily explicable by the character of the narrative. But the first uses cited may be due to attempts to give the sources a chronology.

πλήν. Of the fifteen cases in Lc., two (10 14, Mt. 11 22, 17 1 (text?), Mt. 18 7) are certainly from Q; 22 22 is an insertion into Mc. 14 21, but copied exactly after 17 1, still more closely after the form in Mt. 18 7. The four cases, 6 24. 35 19 27 23 28 are in L, as is 11 41 (probably), and 22 21 (possibly). The remaining five cases (10 11. 20 12 31 13 33 19 27) are all in passages that Weiss considers part of Q, and the word certainly is used in Q. Finally, in 22 42 (L?) the text is doubtful. The cases in A. (8 1 15 28 20 23 27 22) are all quite different, and the use of the word is rather that of a preposition than that of a conjunction. Consequently,

deductions are hard to draw. To me it seems as if there were here a fairly abundant source-use (both L and Q), copied by Lc. but dropped in A.

SUMMARY. — Of the fourteen examples given by Hawkins, only two, — the last two, — have much cogency. The others are explained either by the character of the narrative or are due to the fact that the word in question is copied by Lc. from a written source.