INTRODUCTION. ] LUKE’S GOSPEL. [cu. rv.   
   
 itself, my conclusion with regard to its sources is the following :—that   
 Luke, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, drew up his Gospel inde-   
 pendently of, and without knowledge of, those of Matthew and Mark ;   
 —that he fell in with, in the main, the same cycle of apostolic teaching   
 as the writers of those Gospels placed on record, viz. that which em-   
 braced principally the Galilean life and ministry of our Lord, to the   
 exclusion of that part of it which passed at Jerusalem before the formal   
 call of the twelve Apostles ;—but that he possessed other sources of   
 information, not open to the compiler of Matthew’s Gospel, nor to Mark.   
 5. To this latter circumstance may be attributed his access to (I   
 \* believe, from its peculiar style and character) a documentary record of   
 the events preceding and accompanying the birth of the Lord, derived   
 probably from her who alone was competent to narrate several parti-   
 culars contained in it:—his preservation of the precious and most im-   
 portant cycle of our Lord’s discourses and parables contained in that   
 large section of his Gospel, ch. ix. 51—xviii. 15, which is mostly peculiar   
 to himself:—numerous other details scattered up and down in every   
 part of his narrative, shewing information from an eye-witness :—and,   
 lastly, his enlarged account of some events following the Resurrection, and   
 the narration, by him alone, of the circumstances accompanying the   
 Ascension.   
 6. A tradition was very early current, that Luke’s Gospel contained   
 the substance of the teaching of Paul. Irenwus states: “Luke, the   
 follower of Paul, set down in a book the Gospel preached by that   
 Apostle.” See also Tertullian, But this is contradicted by the   
 implicit assertion of the Evangelist himself in his preface, that the Gospel   
 ‘was compiled and arranged by himself from the testimony of those   
 who, ‘from the beginning of our Lord's ministry,’ were eye-witnesses or   
 ministers of the word. Among these it is not, of course, possible to   
 reckon Paul.   
 7. It is however an interesting enquiry, how far his continued inter-   
 course with the great Apostle of the Gentiles may have influenced his   
 diction, or even his selectiou of facts. It is a remarkable coincidence,   
 that the account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper should be nearly   
 verbatim the same in Luke xxii. 19, and in 1 Cor. xi. 23,—and that   
 Paul claims to have received this last from the Lord. For we know,   
 that to compensate to Paul in his apostolic office for the want of the   
 authority of an eye-witness, and to constitute him a witness to the truth   
 of the Gospel, a revelation was made to him,—to which he refers,   
 Gal. i. 12: Eph. iii. 83: 1 Cor. xi. 23; xv. 3,—embracing at least   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 7 Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome go so far as to understand the expression “my   
 Gospel,” Rom. ii. of the Gospel of Luke. But this is to the usage the   
 word “ Gospel” in the New Testament: see the true meaning in notes   
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