

LEXICAL NOTES ON LUKE-ACTS

II. RECENT ARGUMENTS FOR MEDICAL LANGUAGE

HENRY J. CADBURY
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

AT the meeting of the *Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* held in Washington in 1912 I offered a report upon an investigation, since published *in extenso*,¹ of the alleged medical language of Luke and Acts. After certain adumbrations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries W. K. Hobart² produced in 1882 a list of over 400 terms found in Luke's writings, many of them occurring nowhere besides in the New Testament, which from parallels in the writings of Hippocrates, Aretaeus, Dioscorides and Galen he regarded as technical terms of medicine. Many English scholars, notably Knowling and Moffatt, and in Germany Zahn and Harnack, had endorsed this thesis, though they selected independently more limited lists of examples. My reply was that these examples, even the more select ones, could not be called technical, since they were extensively used in writers who were not physicians. Their occurrence was not confined to Luke and the medical writings. In fact, the medical writings in Greek, unlike our own, apparently never had a restricted professional vocabulary.³ It was shown

¹ *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Harvard Theological Studies VI.) Part I, pp. 39 ff. Cambridge, Mass., 1919.

² *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, Dublin, 1882.

³ In modern languages medical language is a jargon derived from the Greek and Latin, whereas the Greek medicine used the native Greek words, sometimes imitating the dialect of Hippocrates. Galen's interest

further that by such proofs as good a case (which in reality is no case at all) could be made out for the medical training of Lucian and other Hellenistic writers or even for the evangelists Mark and Matthew in comparison with whom Hobart, Harnack and others were wont to find evidence of "Luke's medical degree."

The present paper is intended, without repeating the answers to these arguments, to carry the review of such arguments down to date. It will be obviously impossible to present such material to its fullest extent, but sufficient illustration will be offered, it is hoped, to give a suggestion of the fallacies still at work in the continued use of this most ingenious argument for the traditional authorship of the books *ad Theophilum*. At the beginning of his *Luke the Physician* (p. 7, note), the work in which Harnack espoused this thesis, occur the following sentences: "Even criticism has for generations its freaks and fancies. Very often one notices that when some comprehensive critical theory has been in fashion for a long time and then has been refuted, particular fragments thereof still cling obstinately to men's minds, although they have no intellectual basis." He was referring to the theory of Baur, but we may well apply his words to the probable history of the theory of technical medical vocabulary in Luke-Acts. It is sure to have a longer life than the data warrant.

in vocabulary is mainly in reference to the purist tastes of contemporary Atticism. He distinguishes terms as ancient or modern, accurate or inaccurate, Hellenistic or Attic, popular or literary, usual or unusual, but not as professional or unprofessional. See W. Herbst, *Galeni Pergamensi de Atticisantium Studis Testimonia*, 1911. He does not adopt a technical vocabulary but claims both for himself and for Hippocrates clear and customary words intelligible to *oi πολλοι* (*Style*, p. 64 note 91 and *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xiv, [1921] p. 106). His criticisms of language are directed against medical writers because they use vague or inaccurate terms (see below on "great fever") or because (as e. g. Archigenes) they used "the diction of sailors, merchants, bath-house men and tax collectors." The last is the complaint of a purist who prided himself on the style of his work while he often copied verbatim those whom he criticized. Even a Christian historian like Eusebius (in describing Jesus as a physician) may be quoting verbatim (*H. E.* x 4, 11) from an ancient medical treatise. See McGiffert, *ad loc.* and Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, I, p. 106, note 2.

The chief quarry for examples of medical language is still Hobart's industrious and, as far as quotation goes, generally accurate work. Few additional examples have been proposed in the decades that have followed. I have already alluded to some examples which Plummer attempted to add.⁴ I am able now to trace, I think, the origin of one of these:

Plummer writes (on Luke 8 23):

In *Anth. Pal.* 9. 517 ἀφυπνύω means "awaken *from* sleep."

Here it means "fall *off* to sleep," a use which seems to be medical and late (*Heliod.* ix. 12).

But he is merely misunderstanding Liddell and Scott, whose definition reads (Seventh Edition [1883], p. 265):

ἀφυπνύω, fut. -ώσω to wake from sleep, *Anth. P.* 9. 517.

II. to fall asleep, *Ev. Luc.* 8. 23: and so in *Med.*, *Heliod.* 9. 12.

But of course in Liddell and Scott 'Med.' means middle voice, not medical writers.⁵

Another example of more recent vintage seems to be entering the exegetical and lexical tradition. That is *πρηνής* meaning 'swollen' at the death of Judas (*Acts* 1 18), a meaning which we are told to substitute for the translation "falling headlong,"⁶

⁴ *Style*, p. 54, note 2. Plummer also recalls an earlier example not in Hobart, viz. ἐκκρήσσειν, *Luke* 1 41. He says: "Grotius states that the verb is a medical word for the movement of children in the womb, but he gives no instances." The passage to which he refers is apparently Grotius, *Annotaciones in libros evangeliorum* (1641), p. 612: "Solent quidem medici hoc verbo notare motum naturalem infantis in utero, quod ἀσκαπίσει est aliis."

⁵ For tracing Plummer's misunderstanding to its source I am indebted to my friend Professor Norman B. Nash, of Cambridge, Mass. A good early lay instance of the verb entirely parallel to Luke's use is at the beginning of *Hermas* (*Vis.* I. 1. 3). Is *Hermas* also among the doctors?

⁶ F. H. Chase, *Journal of Theological Studies*, XIII (1912), pp. 278 ff., followed by Harnack, *Theol. Literaturzeitung* (1912), col. 235 ff., Rendel Harris, *American Journal of Theology* XVIII (1914), pp. 127 ff. Wendt (*ad loc.*) gives examples of the translation of *πρηνής* as swollen, e. g. by the Armenian here and in *Wisdom* 4 19 and by the Old Latin in the latter passage. The idea of Judas' swelling is conspicuous in the later tradition and may be derived from such an understanding of this passage, for

and then to add it to the medical examples. But there is no case of *πρηνής* meaning swollen quoted from the medical or even the non-medical writers. If that is its meaning in Acts it is doubtless a popular meaning due to association with the verbs from a like root, *πιμπράσθαι* (Acts 28 6) and *πρήθω*, rather than a technical one.⁷

The originator of this example was F. H. Chase. I may mention next therefore another effort of his in the same direction. Believing as he does both in the accuracy of the speeches in Acts and in the medical education of its author he makes the following comment:

Galen (xix, p. 11, *ed.* Kühn) mentions the fact that the medical students who attended his lectures took them down. It is by no means impossible that St. Luke acquired the power of shorthand-writing in connexion with his training in medicine.⁸

This fancy however finds no support in the passage of Galen quoted, for it makes no reference to shorthand and does not indicate whether the books were dictated to his students for their own use, or were being multiplied for the trade in the usual way, by dictating them to copyists, for which purpose young 'medics' were doubtless convenient labor.⁹

Another new suggestion of medical terminology is to be credited to Rev. Thomas Walker, D. D. in his *Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age* (p. 336). He is referring to the complaint of Dives in Luke's parable (16 24), "I am in anguish in this flame." He objects to taking *φλογί* literally and calls attention to the absence of *πυρός* as in the phrase *φλόξ*

which intrinsically much may be said. But I must return to this at another time.

⁷ Of course we had been previously assured by Hobart and others that *πρηνής* in its usual sense of "prone" was technically medical.

⁸ *The Credibility of Acts* (1902), p. 112 note.

⁹ *ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν οὐδ' εἶχον ἀπάντων αὐτῶν ἀντίγραφα μισρακίους ὑπαγορευθέντων ἀρχομένους μαθήσασθαι, ἢ καὶ τισὶ φίλοις ἀξιώσασθαι διδόντων.* B. W. Bacon, *Story of St. Paul* (1904), p. 157 note, suggests without accepting the suggestion that "the mention of 'many lights' in Acts 20 8, as if connected with the drowsiness of Eutychus 20 9, betokens the observation of the physician."

πυρός. "Hence as there is here no explanatory genitive, the request for a drop of water to 'cool' the 'tongue' suggests that φλόξ on the lips of the rich man means 'fever,' a hitherto unobserved medical use of the term in Luke: 'Father Abraham, pity me and send Lazarus that he may dip his finger-tip in water and cool my tongue, for I am suffering acute pain in this fever.'" It is evident that the purpose of this translation is not to confirm Luke's medical knowledge but to acquit Jesus of the contemporary Jewish conception of literal hell fire. No medical parallels for φλόξ, fever, are offered.

Beside the discoveries of medical terms in Luke we have to chronicle the discovery of Lucan terms in the doctors. To the arguments that Luke's preface is influenced by the preface of Dioscorides¹⁰ an additional parallel is now found in the recently discovered letter of the physician Thessalus to Nero *πολλῶν ἐπιχειρησάντων . . . παραδοῦναι*.¹¹

But the most striking additional argument of recent years is connected with the phrase "great fever." This phrase has constituted one of the oldest and most effective arguments for medical terminology. Luke says that Peter's mother-in-law was afflicted with great fever, 4:38 *ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ*. Galen, *Different. Febr.* 1, 1 (Kühn vii, 275) states that it was customary for physicians with regard to this kind of difference [i. e., of heat] to name the great fever and small fever. Hobart does not continue the quotation in which Galen himself objects to that usage. Now in 1915 a Munich physician, Dr. Joseph Schuster, published two new passages in which the term 'great fevers' was used.¹² One is from Aulus Cornelius Celsus, a layman, who wrote in Latin in the first half of the first century.¹³

¹⁰ P. de Lagarde, *Psalterium juxta Hebr. Hieronymi* (1874), pp. 165 f.

¹¹ S[alomon] R[einach], "Encore Luc médecin," *Revue archéologique*, 5th series, Vol. X (1919), p. 235. Both the initial πολλοί and the use of ἐπιχειρέω are found in other writers. See Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. II, p. 490 note 4; pp. 492 ff.

¹² *Biblische Zeitschrift*, XIII (1915), pp. 338 ff.

¹³ Lib. iv, Cap. 14. *De viscerum morbis et primo de pulmone: "hunc eius casum subsequitur tussis, bilem vel pus trahens, praecordiorum totiusque pectoris gravitas, spiritus difficultas, magnae febres, continua vigilia, cibi fastidium, tabes."*

The second is Alexander of Aphrodisias in Caria who lived at nearly the same time as Galen. He speaks several times of the distinction between great and small fevers and one passage is almost verbatim the same, including the objection to the misuse of the term, as the passage of Galen.¹⁴ This shows that we are not dealing with really independent writings, but that both writers are merely, as is common in medical writers as well as gospel writers, excerpting from their predecessors. In this case Alexander continues: "But all these differences of fevers one of our predecessors accurately and clearly described." Students of medical literary history¹⁵ identify this common source with Archigenes and thus he and his two excerptors represent not independent witnesses to the terminology but only a single source multiplied.

Hobart's book remains therefore the chief source of medical illustrations and is still quoted often quite indiscriminately, though some writers criticize his method as a whole and hope by making selections to strengthen his thesis. This was the method of Zahn, Harnack and Moffatt, to whose examples I devoted my attention on an earlier occasion. None of these three writers has reversed his former views. Moffatt in republishing in 1918 his *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* left unchanged his discussion of "the 'medical' element" in the language of the third gospel and Acts.¹⁶ He has also come to the defense of the argument in an article in the *Expositor*¹⁷

¹⁴ The principal reference is *De febribus libellus* 31 (in J. L. Ideler, *Physici et medici Graeci minores*, I (1841), pp. 105f.) μικροῦς τε καὶ μεγάλους ὀνομάζομεν πυρετούς· οὐ κυρίως μὲν ἐπὶ πολλοῦ πράγματος ὄνομα ποσότητος ἐπιφέροντες, ὅμως δ' οὖν εἰθυσμένοι τοῦτο ποιεῖν οὐκ ἐπὶ πυρετῶν μόνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλων μυρίων, ἐν ποιότητι μὲν ἐχόντων τὴν ἕπαρξιν, ὀνομαζόμενων δὲ μεγάλων καὶ μικρῶν.

¹⁵ M. Wellmann, *Die pneumatische Schule bis auf Archigenes*, Berlin (1895), p. 87. C. Allbutt, *Greek Medicine in Rome*, London (1921), pp. 279f.

¹⁶ Third edition (1918), pp. 298ff. Moffatt endorses about one third of Hobart's medical terms. An unbiased student of general Hellenistic Greek would find practically all of these words and Luke's use of them familiar and untechnical.

¹⁷ "St. Luke and Literary Criticism," *Expositor*, Eighth Series, Vol. XXIV (July 1922), pp. 1ff.

to which I shall refer again. Zahn's commentaries on Luke¹⁸ and Acts¹⁹ continue to accept the medical evidence of Hobart, as occasional notes in them indicate. Harnack has not returned to this theme recently, though the reference to it in his introduction to his *Acts of the Apostles* remains in the subsequent editions of his *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* in which that whole introduction was incorporated.²⁰ About a year ago he wrote me in reply to an inquiry that without a fresh study of the matter he could take no assured position on it.²¹

Other writers who have selected and presented the same arguments may be mentioned. No one was more constant in advocating it than R. J. Knowling, who not only in his commentary on Acts but repeatedly thereafter argued for it.²² A more recent exposition is to be found in A. T. Robertson's *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research* (1920), pp. 9 ff., 90 ff. Both he and M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Luc* (1921),

¹⁸ *Kommentar zum N. T.*, III³ (1920).

¹⁹ *Kommentar zum N. T.*, V 1³ (1922), 2¹ (1921).

²⁰ *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1—20 = *The Acts of the Apostles*, xiii—xliii = *Die Mission und Ausbreitung*³, 83—99 = *Die Mission und Ausbreitung*⁴, 89—107. The omission in the latter work of the phrase "a physician probably already well stricken in years" is due to Harnack's change of date from "in der Zeit der flavischen Kaiser" to "in der mittleren Zeit der Regierung des Kaisers Nero," rather than to a changed view of authorship. Following Ramsay (*Luke the Physician*, pp. 16 f.) Harnack lays stress upon the fact that in Acts 28 s the word used of Paul's cure of Publius is *lazarus*, while in the next verse other treatments of disease (forsooth by Luke the diarist) are described by *θεραπεύω*. But the juxtaposition of these words in Luke's gospel (e. g. 5 16, 17; 6 17, 18, 19; 8 43, 47; 9 1, 2, 11; 14 3, 4) forbids our reading in the variation any fixed distinction of meaning. Cf. Robertson, *Luke the Historian*, pp. 10, 101 f.: "Luke employs one verb for the miraculous cure of Publius by Paul and another for the general practice of medicine in which he is engaged."

²¹ "Ohne ein neues *Studium* kann ich keine feste Stellung zu dem Problem nehmen. Meine Ansicht, daß Lukas der Verfasser des Evangeliums und der Acta sei, bleibt mir unerschüttert, auch wenn das von der Sprache genomene Argument wegfällt." Postcard 17 i. 1925.

²² *Expositor's Greek Testament*. II (1900), pp. 9 ff. and *passim*; *The Biblical World*, XX (1902), pp. 260 ff., 370 ff.; *Literary Criticism and the N. T.*² (1910), pp. 9 ff., 68 ff.; *Messianic Interpretation and Other Studies* (1910), pp. 113 ff.

pp. cxxv ff. wrote (or at least published) their arguments after reading my monograph, without becoming convinced of its contention.

Feine on the other hand in the third edition of his *Einleitung in das N. T.*, (1923), pp. 58 ff. has felt bound to change his earlier position and to admit that the technical medical expressions of the Lucan writings do not offer a proof that the author was a physician, though he thinks the same contention can be established on other grounds.²³

²³ Among other recent writers who have acknowledged the insufficiency of the argument from "medical language" may be named A. Thumb in Hastings *D. A. C. I* (1916) p. 555; K. Lake, *ibid.*, p. 720; M. Goguel, *Introduction au N. T.* III (1922), p. 146; G. W. Wade, *N. T. History* (1922), pp. 206 f.; B. S. Easton, *St. Luke*, 1926, p. xxxiv.

Meanwhile the validity of the medical evidence is taken for granted and enters the most elementary text books; e. g.:

W. F. Adeney, *Century Bible*, "Luke" (1922), see index s. v. "Medical."
H. Appel, *Einleitung in das N. T.* (1922), p. 166.

W. C. Allen in Allen and Grensted, *Introduction to the Books of the N. T.* (1913), pp. 50 f.

J. V. Bartlet, *Century Bible*, "Acts" (1901), see index s. v. "Medical." In *Encyclopaedia Britannica* ¹¹ (1910), XVII, pp. 117 f. Bartlet would make even the Canon of Muratori, the oldest external witness to the Lucan authorship, bear witness to him as a doctor by supposing 'iuris studiosum' to be based on an error of *ῥῆσιν* for *ῥῆσιν*.

A. W. F. Blunt, *Clarendon Bible*, "Acts" (1922), p. 21.

S. C. Carpenter, *Christianity according to S. Luke*, (1919), pp. 192 f.

G. Milligan, *The N. T. Documents* (1913), p. 56, "medical training which enriched his vocabulary with many scientific and quasiscientific terms."

J. H. Moulton, *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, II (1919—), 9 note: "the medical writers who so profoundly influenced his diction."

W. F. Burnside, *St. Luke* (1913), see index s. v. "Luke, Medical Language," and *The Acts* (1916), p. xii and index s. v. "Medical." At Acts 21:1 he notes on *τῆν Κῶν*: "famous as the birthplace of Hippocrates and therefore of special interest to S. Luke."

E. J. Goodspeed, *The Story of the N. T.* (1916), p. 68, "a few echoes of medical language."

G. H. Gilbert, *The Bible for Home and School*, "Acts" (1908), pp. 13, 50, 60, 103, etc.

L. Ragg, *St. Luke* (1922), (Westminster Commentaries), pp. xxx f. *et passim*.

A. T. Robertson, *A Translation of Luke's Gospel* (1923), *passim*.

The newer advocates repeat the defects of the older arguments. There is no apparent effort to test the extent of the occurrence of the examples outside Luke and the medical writings.²⁴ That a word occurs in both is of little significance unless it can be shown that it is not frequent in other contemporary Greek.²⁵ Rarely is the claim of such exclusively medical use advanced and for most of the words suggested as medical terms such a claim cannot be substantiated.

That the words in question occur nowhere else in the New Testament is no valid evidence that they are really rare in Greek literature or that they are characteristic of Luke. Even

A. Souther, Hastings *D. C. G.* II (1908), p. 84: "From the character of the language of his writings it is evident that he had a good education, both rhetorical and medical."

A. Wright, *ibid.*, p. 91: "Hobart's *Medical Language of St. Luke* needs some weeding out, but has never been refuted."

For older sponsors of the thesis, Roman Catholic and Protestant, see Knowing, *Biblical World* XX, p. 260 note.

²⁴ Knowing is an exception. After calling attention to the occurrence in ordinary Greek of his examples he regularly argues that nevertheless they may be regarded as medical because they are frequent in the doctors or are not used by other N. T. writers.

²⁵ Beside the examples of such claims cited in my *Style*, pp. 61 f. note 76, I may refer to the general exaggerated statement in the popular apologetic work, *The Truth of Christianity*, by W. H. Turton, 9th Edition (1919), p. 296: "There are 201 places in Acts, 252 in the Third Gospel where words and expressions occur which are specially, and many of them exclusively, used by Greek medical writers." The claim of Hobart, to which I previously referred, that ἐκψόχων, to die, "seems to be almost confined to the medical writers" is repeated by L. Pirot, *Les Actes des Apôtres et la Commission Biblique*, Paris (1919), p. 50, in the form: "un terme exclusivement réservé à la littérature médicale." Robertson who quotes Hobart on ἐκψόχων adds on the same page (99) a similar claim for βῆσος (Acts 3 7): "The word for feet is unusual in this sense outside of medical works." But according to Knowing *ad loc.* (who nevertheless thinks it has been justly held to point to a technical description of a medical man) it "is found in the same sense as here in Wisdom 13 18; cf. also Josephus, *Ant.* VII. 3, 1, so in Plato, *Timaeus*, 92 A." To which we may add at random Dion. Hal. V, 25; Philostrate. *Imag.* ed. Keyser, p. 418, 2 f.; Apollodorus I, 3, 5 *et al.*; Philostrate., *Apoll. Tyan.* 55, 11.; Philo., *De opif. mundi*, 40 § 118; Josephus, *Ant.* VII. 5. 5 § 113, *bis*; 11, 3 § 269; 12, 2 § 303; P. Lond. 121 line 518, etc.

limitation of a few words to Luke and Galen would prove little. It is natural that in our limited knowledge of Hellenistic Greek the voluminous medical writings of the early empire should show some points of contact with the rarer words of every contemporary writing. It is interesting how prominent is the citation of occurrence of words from the doctors, especially Galen, in such word lists as W. Schmid compiled for Dio Chrysostom, Lucian, Aristides, Aelian and Philostratus,²⁶ or P. N. Harrison for the Pastoral Epistles.²⁷ A list of the less common words in Luke would in like manner include some which the doctors along with a few other writers, or sometimes the doctors alone, attest. I have called attention before to two such words, *συγκυβία* and *ἀνωτερικός*, as words of Luke found also in medical literature but "except for later writers . . . cited from no other sources."²⁸ *ψάχω* also appears to be attested only in Luke 6 1 and (in the middle) Nicander, *Theriaca*, 619. Hobart and his followers failed to emphasize such cases. But such illustrations are quite illusory—statistical accidents, Deissmann would call them, and they might be spoiled by a new discovery. A good chance for a further example was overlooked when no parallel to the word *ὀροθεσίας* of Acts 17 26 was known except the form *ὀροθεσιῶν* in Galen, *Definitiones medicae* II (xix. 349). But now the word appears on an inscription and a papyrus.²⁹

I attempted before to indicate how frequently Luke's 'medical terms' occur in ordinary writings like the LXX, Josephus,

²⁶ *Der Atticismus*, 1887—1897, *passim*. Similar lists for Maximus of Tyre were prepared by K. Dürr in *Philologus*, Supplementband VIII (1899—1901), pp. 70 ff.

²⁷ *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (1921), pp. 161 ff. Other N. T. writings use words attested elsewhere only in the doctors, or well illustrated by them (see Wettstein *passim*) as Knowing, *Bibl. World*, XX. 263, grudgingly admitted for Mark. Hobart's collection of parallels to Luke and Acts may be quite useful as lexical materials if, like the similar *Observationes* from other writers, they are treated as merely illustrating Luke's meaning or his relation to current Greek idiom.

²⁸ *Style*, p. 62, note 76 at end. Attention may however be called to the occurrence of *συγκυβία* in Symmachus' translation of 1 Sam. 6 9. The nearest lay parallel I find to *ἀνωτερικός* is *ἀνωτέριος* in a papyrus of ii / B. C. (*Archiv für Papyrusforschung* I. 63 f., line 13).

²⁹ See *J. B. L.* XLIV (1925), pp. 219 f.

Plutarch and Lucian. All new evidence on Hellenistic Greek tends not to isolate Luke's diction but to connect it with contemporary writers. The forthcoming concordances to Josephus and Philo may be counted on to show that many of the so-called medical terms are used and used with frequency by these contemporary Jewish writers in Greek. I suppose objection will be taken to regarding Philo's use of such words as evidence of lay currency since his medical training has been sometimes suggested.³⁰ The papyri at least cannot be regarded as medically influenced in the main, and the newer conveniences for comparison of N. T. vocabulary with these writings give some excellent confutation of so-called medical examples. I quote a few illustrations of the rarer words in Luke from recent publications of these non-literary writings.

In the parable of the Good Samaritan the robbers are said to have left their victim "half dead" (*ἡμιθανής*). In spite of its obviously untechnical character this picturesque adjective has been claimed by Hobart, Harnack, Zahn and others as medical. But the frequent occurrence of this adjective in complaints of assault and battery suggests a very ordinary origin and show how fully Luke's phraseology agrees with the idiom appropriate to the occasion.³¹

In the description of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate (Acts 3 7), a passage often claimed among the irreducible minimum of medical terms, the author of Acts seems to have used for "ankles" the spelling *σφυδρά* rather than *σφυρά*. One other instance of this spelling before Hesychius is now available in a palmomantic papyrus of the third century.³² Probably

³⁰ Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon*² (1925), pp. 286 f.

³¹ Luke 10 30 *πληγὰς ἐπιθέντες ἀπήλθον ἀφέρντες ἡμιθανή*. Cf. P. Lips. I. 37, 21 (389 A. D.) *ἡμιθανῆ αὐτὸν ποιήσαντες*; P. Amh. II. 141, 13 (350 A. D.) *πληγὰς με κατέκταναν . . . ἡμιθανῆ καταστήσαντες*. The adjective *ἡμιθανής* occurs in 4 Macc. 4 11; Dion. Hal. viii. 67, 5; Diod. Sic. xii. 62, 5; Arrian, Strabo, etc. The adjective *ἡμιθνής* quoted by Hobart from the doctors is also commoner in earlier and contemporary Greek, being found in Aelian, Aeschines, Aeschylus, Alciphron, Apollodorus, Aristophanes, Dio Cassius, Dion. Hal., etc.

³² P. Flor. 391, 53 and 56.

neither the common nor the uncommon spelling is distinctively medical.

Among Luke's four words for bed or pallet the rarest is perhaps the diminutive κλινάριον (Acts 5 15). It occurs, to be sure, in Aristophanes, Arrian, Artemidorus, Marcus Aurelius and Pollux.³³ Its appearance in a Ptolemaic papyrus recently published³⁴ shows that it had been part of every day Greek in the interval between Aristophanes and the Christian evangelist.

The disease of Herod Agrippa I is described by one compound adjective σκωληκόβρωτος, "worm-eaten" (Acts 12 23). Previously this word was attested from Theophrastus who applies it to diseased plants, and it was inferred from this botanical use and "indirectly from the fact that non-medical writers express the disease differently" that it was a medical term. The papyri now show the word used by unscientific men.³⁵ In the examples cited from papyri iii / B. C. it is used of grain.

These are only four illustrations of Luke's "technical terms" among the papyri. They could be multiplied considerably. It is perhaps worth noting that not only are these words not limited to the medical writers; not one of the four words or spellings has yet been cited from the medical writers at all. Or—to take words which do occur in the doctors—would not any diligent reader of Hellenistic Greek rub his eyes to see the noun and adverb from φιλόανθρωπος (in Acts 27 3 φιλοανθρώπως τε ὁ Ἰούλιος τῷ Παύλῳ χρησάμενος, and 28 2 οἱ τε βάρβαροι παρείχον οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν φιλανθρωπίαν ἡμῶν) claimed as medical terms by Hobart, Moffatt and Knowling.³⁶ Why, a single handbook of inscriptions³⁷ contains over 40 instances of these words, including at least three instances of the use of

³³ Cf. *Style*, p. 56 note 32.

³⁴ PSI VI. 616, 14 (iii / B. C.) τὰ κλινάρια.

³⁵ PSI V. 490, 14 σκωληκόβρωτον. Cf. P. Grad. 7, 11 ἀσκωληκόβρωτος where, however, some letters are not certain.

³⁶ Hobart, pp. 296 f.; Moffatt, p. 299 and note; Knowling, *ad loc.* and *Biblical World*, XX, p. 376.

³⁷ W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum*³ IV (1924), p. 611, s. v. φιλανθρωπία, -ος. In the recently published letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians (P. Lond. 1912) the words occur four times in less than 100 lines.

the adverb *φιλανθρώπως* with the verb *χράσμαι* precisely as they are combined in Acts, and as indeed they are combined in Demosthenes, Polybius, Diodorus, Plutarch, Dio Cassius and other writers.³⁸ Thus it frequently turns out that instances intended to show Luke's diction as related to the doctors exhibit in striking fashion his concord with the less obvious idioms of contemporary Greek in general.³⁹

The more recent claimants of medical evidence in Luke-Acts profess not to rely on mere vocabulary. They admit the exaggeration in Hobart's contention and the ineffectiveness of merely verbal examples, yet in the end they must depend on the choice of words in this author as evidence of medical training. This is particularly the case in his descriptions of diseases which, whether in parallel passages or not, are always asserted to be "in medizinisch exakterer Weise" than the other evangelists. I cannot deal with all such arguments. It will be obvious from the following quotations how subjective such judgments are bound to be. The changes Luke makes in Mark can often be otherwise explained. I quote from Robertson:

The point to observe here is whether Luke made any changes that a physician would be likely to desire. We have already seen that in Luke 8 43 Mark's caustic comment that the poor woman 'had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse' (Mark 5 26) has been softened to 'she was not able to be healed by any' (a chronic case for which physicians were not to blame). But this striking case does not stand alone . . .

The healing of Simon's mother-in-law (Mark 1 30 f. = Luke 4 38 f. = Matt. 8 14 f.) has some striking touches. Luke alone notes that she 'was holden with a great fever.' Precisely this medical phrase of 'great fever' occurs in Galen and Hippocrates. Galen says that Greek physicians divided

³⁸ Josephus, *Contra Apion* I. 20, § 153; *Antiq.* XII, 2, 5 § 46; XIV 12, 3 § 313; Isocr. *Epist.* VII. 6; Demos. *De falsa legat.* 225; Aeschines, *Contr. Ctesiph.* 57; Diod. Sic. XX. 17; Plut. *Aemil.* 39, p. 276 B, *Alcib.* 4, p. 193 E; Dio Cass. 71, 14 and 27.

³⁹ Cf. Zahn on Acts 27 3: "klass. Begriffe durch deren Anwendung . . . Le sich als einen Griechen . . . kennzeichnet."

fevers into 'great' and 'small.' Luke, like a doctor, adds also two items concerning Christ's method of treatment. 'And he stood over her,' as if in careful contemplation of the symptoms of the patient by way of diagnosis . . . Luke adds 'and rebuked the fever,' showing that Jesus spoke words of authority and cheer like the wise physician. Jesus spoke not for mere psychological effect on the patient, but also to show his instant mastery of the disease. So Luke observes that the fever left her 'immediately.' It is not a matter of vocabulary here, but we note the physician's interest and insight that give these touches to the story not present in Mark and Luke . . .

In the story of the raising of Jairus' daughter (Luke 8 55 = Mark 5 41 f. = Matt. 9 25), Luke alone gives the detail that Jesus 'commanded that something be given her to eat.' Once more the physician's interest in the child's welfare appears."⁴⁰

Now the last item is simply a mistake. Mark also records Jesus' command that something be given her to eat.⁴¹ As to Peter's mother-in-law, the word "rebuke" sounds magical rather than medical. The other differences are quite difficult to judge. If Luke's "stood over her" is medical, what shall we say of the parallel in Mark omitted by Luke, "approaching her he raised her up taking her hand." I find no instance of "great fever" in Hippocrates nor am I sure that the references to unsuccessful doctors in Mark and Luke indicate respectively the layman and the physician.⁴² What shall we say of Matthew who leaves the comment out entirely?⁴³

⁴⁰ Robertson, *op. cit.*, pp. 92 ff.

⁴¹ This error had occurred in Ramsay and I had already called attention to it, *Style*, p. 61. Yet Robertson "after a careful study of Cadbury's arguments" (p. 12) repeats the error. The real motif of the eating is to prove the reality of the miraculous resuscitation as at Luke 24 43, etc.

⁴² For a high fever Hippocrates and the other medical writings use other adjectives very frequently. μέγας πυρετός is not common in them. I refrain from collecting cases where laymen (e. g. frequently in the papyri) use μέγας to describe a disease. Strictly speaking Luke's παραχρήμα does not go with the verb 'left her' (ἀφήκεν) but with the sentence that follows, while Mark used the synonymous εὐθὺς twice earlier in the pericope.

⁴³ It should be remembered that, except in *BD Syr sin Sah Arm.*, Luke 8 43 contains parallel to Mark ἥτις ἰατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ἔλον τὸν βίον

Even in their comparison of Luke's terms for diseases with those of doctors and laymen the medicalists' arguments need testing. Hobart (p. 43) inferred that *σκοληκόβρωτος* (Acts 12 23) may have been a medical term because non-medical writers express this disease differently. Similarly, it is argued that *παραλυτικός* in Mark must be a layman's word because the physicians do not use it, while Luke and the doctors use the familiar *παραλελυμένος*.⁴⁴ But another adjective in *-ικός*, *ύδρωπικός*, is claimed as a good medical term simply because the doctors use it. Hobart, Harnack and Moffatt regard "*θέρμη* (Acts 28 3) for *θερμότης* the usual medical term for heat." But the known distribution of these words does not justify the inference. *παραλυτικός* outside the gospels is rare. But the only early occurrences that I can find claimed for it appear to be precisely in the two first century doctors, Moschion and Dioscorides.⁴⁵ There is good MS evidence for supposing that Luke

as well as *οὐκ ἔρχυσεν ἀπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι*. And if the omission of this unfavorable reference to physicians bespeaks a professional apologetic on Luke's part how do the defenders of Luke's M. D. find evidence of the same viewpoint in Luke's introduction of the somewhat uncomplimentary challenge, "Physician, heal thyself" in Luke 4 23? They cannot have it both ways at once. In like manner they argue that "it is significant that Luke the physician should cite as almost the last words of his record a prophecy (Is. 6 9 f.) ending with *ἰσσομαι*" (Knowing on Acts 28 27, following Plummer). But they do not explain the fact that in the first speech in his record (Luke 4 18) the evangelist in quoting the same book of Isaiah (61 1 f.) omits precisely the same verb by omitting the clause *ἰσθαται τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν* (Plummer declares the MS evidence against the clause in Luke decisive).

⁴⁴ Moffatt, *Introduction* p. 298, "evidence of his early studies and professional training may be discovered . . . in the choice . . . of the correct medical term *παραλελυμένος* for the popular *παραλυτικός*." Similarly Zahn, *Intro.* III, p. 161; Knowling, *Biblical World* XX, pp. 262; Robertson, *Luke the Historian*, p. 94; Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, p. 185: "*παραλελυμένος* is linguistically an improvement, but it is also the technical word of the physicians who do not use *παραλυτικός*." Of Herod's death *σκοληκόβρωτος* Harnack in 1892 had said, "Die medicinische Wissenschaft kennt eine solche Krankheit nicht" ('Medicinisches aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte' in *T. U.* VIII., 4, p. 95).

⁴⁵ Moschion, *De pass. muliebr.*, ed Dewez, p. 69, 25. Dioscorides, *ed.* Sprengel, i, p. 30; ii, p. 213 *al.* Contrast Harnack's assertion quoted above. The word occurs also in the apocryphal gospels (Tischendorf,

followed a habit illustrated elsewhere in his use of Mark and after changing it to *παραλελυμένος* in 5 18 actually retained it himself in 5 24 (*παραλυτικῶ* Σ C D W Θ etc.). If he removed it entirely its rarity in general Greek would be sufficient reason. *ἰδρωπικός* for *ἰδρώψ* is well established in both technical and untechnical writers. Teles and Plutarch, for examples, use both words.⁴⁶ On the other hand the form *δυσεντερία* in Acts 28 8 is unparalleled in both medical and non-medical writings. Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, s. v. remark "Moeris p. 129 *δυσεντερία, θηλυκῶς, Ἀττικῶς. δυσεντέριον, Ἑλληνικῶς* settles the form in Acts 28 8, where all the uncials have the neuter. If Hobart's long list (pp. 52 f.) can be trusted for this detail "Luke's medical books all presented him with *δυσεντερία* (-ῆ Hippocrates) and his faithfulness to the spoken Hellenistic form is the more noteworthy." Like Luke's other terms for disease it would be known to laymen without consulting medical books.⁴⁷ *θερμότης* apparently is common among the doctors as *θέρμη* is common among the laymen.

The literary problem involved in determining medical influence is a delicate one, as Professor Moffatt in his *Expositor* article realizes, and it would require more space than is available for me to attempt to meet his arguments there given. However, Moffatt produces no new evidence and rests his argument on the alleged inaccuracy and inconsistency which he finds in my earlier essay. In a footnote I hope to show that in some instances he has not understood my meaning and that in others he has fallen into misstatement.⁴⁸

*Evangelia Apocrypha*² [1876], p. 215, 8; 436, 11 = 444, 9) and in Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 22, 6, but these occurrences referring to Jesus' cures may be due to the canonical gospels.

⁴⁶ Other writers who use *ἰδρωπικός* include Polybius and the author of the *περί ὕψους*. Both *hydropticus* and *paralyticus* are attested for first century Latin writers. This hardly suggests that one was technically medical and the other was not.

⁴⁷ The form *δυσεντέριον* occurs, besides the passages of the Atticists where it is condemned, in a definition of *κατάρπος* repeated in the lexicographical works of a much later date, *Δέξεις ἰητροῦ*. (Bekker, *Anecdota* I. 270, 13) and *Etym. Magn.* 494, 31.

⁴⁸ In his article (*Expositor*, July 1922, pp. 1 ff.) Professor Moffatt after discussing some features of the problem of medical language in

It is of course possible that while the words which Luke used are not in themselves technical, the way in which he used them

Luke-Acts and the validity of certain general considerations that I had urged (the discussion of which I may omit, leaving the reader to examine for himself my monograph and the replies of Moffatt) says (p. 7): "Without pressing such considerations, we may examine his specific pleas; it is when we pass from generalisations to definite data that we can test his theories"; and concludes (p. 14); "It would be superfluous to heap up further illustrations; what I have indicated is sufficient to show that this line of argument is far from being valid." He rests his case on the inaccuracy or inconsistency of my details. I will list the points briefly:

pp. 2f. "The next item of this kind of alteration, chronicled by Mr. Cadbury, is a mistake; he quotes Mark 14⁷¹ (Peter began to curse and swear) and contrasts Luke 22⁵⁹ ἄλλος τις (not Peter) διασχυρίζετο; but, of course, the latter passage refers not to a disciple but to a suspicious questioner in the group gathered beside the fire." In my heading, however, I indicated that this was exactly the kind of phenomenon I was listing. Luke had apparently transferred the strong asseveration from one speaker to another.

p. 3. "On p. 102 is it quite accurate to say that" in Luke 20⁴⁰ "we are told that the scribes no longer (οὐκέτι, so Mark 12³⁴) dared ask him any question" [and] "the οὐκέτι has no real meaning in Luke"? But it is certainly natural to understand οὐκέτι γὰρ ἐτόλμων of Luke as a reference to the scribes (the last persons mentioned) though Mark's question by a scribe has been omitted.

Several of Professor Moffatt's criticisms are directed against my argument that Matthew and Mark are sometimes as "medical" as Luke. This was perhaps a somewhat roundabout type of confutation and not to be taken quite seriously. My examples are of course intended to be as good but no better than those which are used to prove Luke more medical than Matthew and Mark. Thus:

p. 8. He objects to my quoting as "medical" words in Matthew and Mark where Luke offers no parallel (seven in a list of nineteen). But he had without hesitation and in much greater proportion listed as medical terms of Luke words found in Acts and in passages of the gospel where Luke has no parallels.

p. 9. He objects to my examples of αἰμορρέω or πυρέσσω as medical terms in Mark because they are only exchanged for an equally medical phrase in Luke. But Moffatt a few pages later forgets the equality. He says (p. 13): "Luke, for example, describes Peter's mother-in-law as συναχόμενη πυρετῶ μεγάλῳ instead of repeating the single term πυρέσσουσα used by Mark and Matthew. This may be fairly taken as a water-mark of his professional training."

p. 10 note. "Surely it is not serious criticism to argue that Luke is

shows a special likeness to the doctors. If this is so, evidence could be produced, and would certainly be easily found by any

not more 'medical' than the others because he 'does not mention (9 ε) as does Mark (6 13) that the twelve in their mission of preaching and practising anointed their patients with olive oil.'" But on the preceding page Moffatt regards it serious criticism to point out that the good Samaritan (10 34) poured oil and wine on the wounds. "This was a well-known salve in Jewish medicine; it is mentioned in the Mishna (*Sabbath* 19 2) as a liniment for wounds."

pp. 10 f. "As for the description of the epileptic boy (8 37 f.) and the lunatic it is inaccurate to say that Luke omits the serious symptoms chronicled by Mark and Matthew; e. g. in 9 39 he does include 'foaming.'" It was not said (*Style*, p. 48) that all "serious" symptoms were omitted but that in both cases "Luke omits or explicitly contradicts all reference to a self-destructive tendency on the part of the patient" and that in the former case "he also omits such symptoms as deafness, dumbness, foaming, grinding the teeth, pining away, falling and rolling, deathlike coma on the ground." That statement was correct and was supported by the evidence in the footnote where it was also duly indicated that the foaming is once mentioned by Luke as well as once omitted. Lagrange, although he is desirous of retaining as much as possible of Hobart's argument, admits that here Mark indicates the symptoms more clearly than Luke. He argues, however, that Mark's detail is not due to medical causes but to other qualities of his style.

Moffatt objects to my citing omissions or changes in Luke as evidence of comparative absence of medical interest, since the same features, as I myself have often noted elsewhere, are attributable to other motives. Of course if I had been trying to prove seriously that Luke was averse to medical information or that Mark was really a doctor his objection would be well founded. But Moffatt himself does not hesitate to ascribe to medical training and knowledge changes and additions easily explained on other grounds. Thus he says of μέγας in μέγας πυρετός "it might be stylistic, and yet also medical" (p. 4). On p. 6 he thinks it inconsistent for me to deny evidence of Luke's medical knowledge and to admit Luke's habit of including in his summaries of Jesus' work the element of healings. Surely medical *knowledge* is not evidenced by an interest in Jesus' cures or by a literary tendency to intersperse incidents with summaries in which healings are mentioned. Yet Moffatt confuses the two when he says that I spoke "once and quite correctly about Luke's medical knowledge (p. 112), observing that in 9 11 'Luke quite independently has added one of his characteristic notes of healing.'"

p. 14: "The similar plea against πλήρης λέπρας as a 'medical' phrase in 5 12 is equally unconvincing . . . indeed Mr. Cadbury later on (p. 58) admits with characteristic candour that 'πλήρης, in this connexion peculiar

one thoroughly familiar with the doctors in a reading of Luke and Acts. Such a person must however be familiar with other Hellenistic Greek or he will cite examples which other writers use as well. It will not be sufficient to salvage Hobart's theory merely to state without explicit examples that there is in Luke such a technical use of untechnical terms, or that his books give an impression of being written by a physician. It must be shown that the semasiology and idiom do not coincide with ordinary Greek as the vocabulary does.

If this is not done the case for internal evidence of authorship by a physician remains "not proven." The other arguments, such as the author's general interest in healing, whether in his changes of Mark,⁴⁹ in the "we" passages, or elsewhere, in so far as they do not rely upon the assumption of a technical language, are so vague or so easily explained in other ways as to be quite unconvincing. A series of lexical notes is not the place to deal with them. Besides it is difficult to reply to such general arguments or to the inference that because the language is consonant with the tradition of Lucan authorship it therefore

to St. Luke, is frequently thus used in medical writers." Yet Moffatt has entirely overlooked the fact that the sentence he quotes as mine is really Hobart's and that I had introduced it in quotation marks and with no endorsement, thus: "The argument for *πλήρης λέπρας* is stated thus by Hobart (p. 5): '*πλήρης* in this connexion,'" etc.

On p. 9 *note* he again fails to represent my position. He says, "Mr. Cadbury quotes (p. 64), with apparent approval, Clemen's assertion," etc. What I said in the note quoted was: "Some of Clemen's arguments are of interest." The sentence in the text to which the note refers was: "It is probably futile to try to carry the argument further, as Clemen does, and to argue from the language of Luke and Acts that a physician *could not* have written them."

As Professor Moffatt's general conclusion is based, as he says, on the definite data of my argument "after going carefully over Mr. Cadbury's pages," I think that I may now refrain from further illustration and from the rebuttal of his more complicated criticisms. Like him, I feel that "it would be superfluous to heap up further illustrations."

⁴⁹ It gives me pleasure to add one example of this sort which has not apparently been mentioned by the medicalists. Luke alone (8 2, contrast Mark 15 41, Matt. 27 55) tells that the ministering women had been healed.

supports the tradition (Moffatt), or to the complaint of Robertson that word lists do not answer the elaborate volume of Hobart. Obviously in many of the defenses of Luke's medical language there still inheres the fallacious "cumulative argument." I may perhaps appropriate to this debate the recent words of Lord Charnwood on another question: "This is not one of those many instances in which indications separately slight collectively amount to an impressive or conclusive argument. Every one of these pieces of evidence by itself must be evaluated at nothing. And nothing may be added to nothing forever and ever, but the sum will still be nothing."

Of course the other evidences concerning Luke's authorship—evidences either for it or against it—remain unaffected by this medical argument. They may be discussed and appraised without reference to "medical language." Superficially, however, the traditional view, which at first seemed so brilliantly confirmed by the medical argument, is in danger of suffering undeserved discrediting by reason of the continued effort to support it by fallacious and specious arguments.