BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

Today, the discussion on the common authorship of [Luke] and Acts, which is to be distinguished from that on the identity of the author, is closed. Of course, “resolution of this basic issue does not determine that the same author could not have written in different genres, employed different theological constructs in the two volumes, or used different narrators” (Parsons-Pervo, Rethinking, p. 116). But it is a necessary condition to allow for a reflection on the way Luke has composed both writings [emphasis added].

Rarely do scholars make the startling and uncompromising declaration that a topic is closed to further investigation. Such a statement defies the search and research objectives of any systematic, critical inquiry. So universally held is the above opinion that few have opted to challenge


the hypothesis – and it is a hypothesis – that Luke and Acts were written and compiled by a unitary author-editor. Here “author-editor” denotes a writer who not only composed independently but also redacted and compiled inherited sources and traditions, be they written or oral.

Although few, challenges to the single authorship of Luke and Acts follow two trajectories. The first understands Luke and Acts as the fulfillment of different writers’ theological agendas, a proposition with little currency among scholars. On this trajectory, which is profiled later, are examples of two nineteenth-century exegetes, F. C. Baur and J. H. Scholten, whose complex theological interpretations of the early Christian religious milieux treat the possible extenuating historical circumstances from which conflicting theologies emerged.\(^3\) The second trajectory of challenges to single authorship differentiates compositional styles in Luke and Acts, primarily through word study analysis. On this trajectory, also summarized later, are the lone examples of Albert C. Clark and A. W. Argyle, two twentieth-century scholars, who base their authorship testing on literary-critical analysis without factoring in theological motivations.\(^4\) Tracing challenges to the single authorship hypothesis along the two trajectories shows none has so far persuaded scholars to abandon the common authorship hypothesis.

Why does the hypothesis enjoy such unequivocal agreement, as we shall see, in the face of some significant counter-evidence? One purpose of this book is to re-examine the evidence for single authorship and, by doing so, reveal certain problems in the research. The other purpose is to conduct a new authorial analysis based on ancient literary criticism in order to reconfirm or challenge the prevailing opinion – in short, it is a study of passages in Luke and Acts virtually certain to be authorial, that is, seams and summaries, and how they map the elements of ancient prose composition criticism such as euphony, rhythm, and sentence structure, documented by ancient literary critics. Said another way, this authorial analysis searches patterns of ancient compositional conventions in the

\(^3\) See pp. 24f. and pp. 25f., respectively.  
\(^4\) See pp. 26ff. and pp. 33ff., respectively.
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seams and summaries of Luke and Acts. The patterns – when identified, tabulated, and statistically compared – will reveal the prose compositional style in each book, an authorial handprint, as it were. The differences in compositional style when statistically compared will either verify or challenge the received opinion of single authorship.

State of the question

The single authorship hypothesis rests on three “pillars” of evidence, presented as standard fare in many commentaries. First, the preface of each book (Lk 1:1–4; Acts 1:1–5) dedicates it to one named Theophilus, and the Acts preface refers to “the first book” (Τὸν . . . πρῶτον λόγον, Acts 1:1), assumed to be the gospel of Luke. As a literary hinge, these connective devices fasten Acts to Luke. Hence, commentators and exegetes cite the prefaces as evidence for single authorship, as shown in the following examples. In The Beginnings of Christianity, F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake write:

On one point there is practical agreement – the author of the two works [Luke and Acts] is the same. This seems to be proved by the common address to Theophilus, by the description in Acts i. of a book corresponding to the Third Gospel, and by the identity of the two books in style and language, even in subtle details and mannerisms [emphasis added].


In any study of Luke and Acts, their unity is a fundamental and illuminating axiom. Among all the problems of New Testament authorship no answer is so universally agreed upon as is the common authorship of these two volumes. Each is addressed in its opening words to the same Theophilus, the second volume refers explicitly to the first, and in innumerable points of style the Greek diction of each shows close identity with the other. Whatever the difference in subject matter and sources, each

---
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volume is in its present form the work of the same ultimate editor [emphasis added].

While W. C. van Unnik believes there is no reason to doubt the correctness of Acts 1:1, F. F. Bruce sums up a conservative view of common authorship:

Suffice it to say that, from the late second century on, the consentient witness of all who write on the subject is that the author of the two volumes Ad Theophilum (anonymous as they are in the form in which they have come down to us, and the form in which those writers knew them) was one and the same person, and that his name was Luke [emphasis added].

Finally and most explicitly, in The Acts of the Apostles, Joseph A. Fitzmyer writes:

The authorship of Acts is related to that of the Third Gospel, because Acts begins, “In my first account, Theophilus, I dealt with all that Jesus did and taught from the beginning (1:1). It [Acts] is dedicated to the “Theophilus,” for whom the author wrote an account of Jesus’ words and deeds (Luke 1:3). The dedication to the same person implies a common authorship of both the Gospel and Acts [emphasis added].

So strong is the authority of prefatory evidence that virtually no one suggests the Luke and Acts prefaces come from other than one author-editor. Indeed, investigation of extra-biblical Hellenistic and Greco-Roman prefaces such as Josephus Contra Apionem I.1; II.1 and numerous others appear to support this view. Loveday Alexander’s extensive study of ancient preface conventions has convinced many that the Luke and Acts prefaces are more closely related to technical treatise or manual preface
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formulations than to those in historical texts, Hellenistic Jewish literature, or other Greek literary works. Whatever the generic implications, when analyzed without the presumption of common authorship, the Luke and Acts prefaces give rise to a nagging question. Why is the range of stylistic variation between them so enormous? One look at an analysis of the Josephus *Contra Apionem* prefaces as well as others suggests a stylistic variation much narrower than that in the prefaces to Luke and Acts. The structural and stylistic differences between sophisticated and basic Greek in the latter prefaces are so great as to make their attribution to one author-editor, well, problematic. Due to the entrenched nature of the single authorship hypothesis, however, never considered is the idea the Luke and Acts prefaces may have originated from different author-editors.

The second “pillar” on which the single authorship hypothesis rests is early Christian external evidence. Second- to fourth-century Christian writers attribute the authorship of “a” gospel and the book of Acts to one named “Luke,” variously identified as the “Luke” of tradition (Col 4:14; 2 Tim 4:11; Phlm 24), a physician (Col 4:14; *Muratorian Canon* fragment), a follower of Paul (Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III.1.1; 10.1; 14.1), or a combination of these. The two earliest pieces of extant external evidence date from the latter part of the second century, Irenaeus’ *Adv. haer.* (ca. 175–180 CE) and the *Muratorian Canon* fragment.

In the case of Irenaeus, scholars writing about the authorship of Luke and Acts often cite Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* III.1.1: “Καὶ Λουκᾶ δὲ, ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο. [Then, Luke, the follower of Paul, set down in a book the gospel proclaimed by him.]” Additionally, Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* III.13.3; III.14.1, 4 attribute to “Luke” a substantial amount of material corresponding to the contents of the book of Acts. The significance should not be missed: Irenaeus appears to differentiate the two texts; although he attributes both to “Luke,” their original unity is open to question. Irenaeus, it seems, did not consider Luke and Acts to be two parts of a one-volume work. In the case of the *Muratorian Canon* fragment, a difficult and error-filled Latin text, the “third book of the gospel” and “the Acts of all the apostles” are

---

14 The original Greek of a possible title for Acts (*Adv. haer.* III.13.3) is not extant; the Latin translation is *doctrina apostolorum.*
attributed to “Luke” the physician, a companion of Paul (10.2–8, 34–39). While a majority of scholars dates the Muratorian Canon ca. 170–210 CE, a minority argues for the fourth century. About Luke and Acts, the Muratorian Canon says:


After the ascension of Christ, Luke the physician, whom Paul had taken along with him as a companion [iuris studiosum], composed in his own name on the basis of report. He himself, however, did not see the Lord in the flesh and therefore, as far as he could follow, he wrote down [the story]. He began to tell it from the nativity of John (10.2–8).

. . . The Acts of all the apostles have been written in one volume. Compiled for the most excellent Theophilus, Luke includes in detail the things that were done in his own presence, as he shows plainly by omitting both the death of Peter and also Paul’s departure from the city when he was setting out for Spain (10.34–39).

Despite the fact that extant external evidence dates to the latter part of the second century, interpretation of the external evidence seems at best contradictory, at worst problematic. Adversus haereses, the Muratorian Canon fragment, and indeed all external evidence that identifies “Luke” as the author-editor of the third gospel and Acts notwithstanding, scholars today consider Luke, the other gospels, and Acts to be anonymous texts, author unknown. At the very same time, scholars do not question the early evidentiary attribution of Luke and Acts to one author-editor. Why do scholars doubt the external evidence for “Luke” as the author-editor of the gospel and Acts but readily accept the evidence for single authorship? Why do scholars declare Luke and Acts to be anonymously written texts but faithfully attribute them to that one author-editor? The answer may be that external evidence does not provide the whole story. Scholars rely on internal evidence in conjunction with external evidence.


Thus, the third and most impressive “pillar” on which the single authorship hypothesis rests is internal evidence, presented in summarized form below. Single authorship advocates point to the “remarkable similarities” between Luke and Acts in vocabulary, style, themes, and theology; and admittedly the two books do reveal a striking number of parallels and correspondences in structure, theme, style, and portrayal of key figures. For example, the two books frame large portions of text by means of a journey motif, the so-called travel narrative in Luke (Lk 9:51–19:27) and the travels of Paul and other missionaries in Acts (Acts 13:1–28:31). Similarly, numerous syntactic and lexical correspondences such as the εγένετο constructions, the definite article + infinitive, and the use of κυρίος to refer to Jesus have been extensively investigated. Most often noted are the apparently parallel portrayals of key figures in the two books, e.g., Jesus’ noble, dignified death (Lk 23:33–49) and Stephen’s heroic martyrdom (Acts 7:54–60), or Jesus’ miracle working (e.g., Lk 5:17–26; 7:11–17; 8:41–42, 49–56) and Peter’s and Paul’s miraculous accomplishments of healing and resuscitation (e.g., Peter: Acts 3:1–10; 9:36–42; Paul: 14:8–11; 20:7–12).

Although the undisputed acceptance of single authorship still obtains, scholars question the once-understood, inextricably linked theological, generic, and narrative unity of Luke and Acts, as J. Verheyden, editor of The Unity of Luke-Acts (1999), notes:

In their recent monograph Parsons and Pervo joined forces to “rethink” the unity of Lk and Acts. They feel uneasy about the way many scholars tend to speak of unity without sufficiently clarifying their model, their arguments for it, or its implications. They list five levels on which the relationship has to be studied: the author and the canon (two issues which do not need a lot of discussion), the genre, the narrative, and the theology of the work [emphasis added].

In Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts (1993), Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo suggest scholarly opinion on the tight integration of Luke and Acts is often based on insufficient or unclear supporting criteria. They ask us, for example, to re-examine the reasoning for an author-editor with one Weltanschauung to compose a “present” theology of salvation informing Luke but a “future” theology informing Acts. Theories about and problems with the literary and theological unity of

18 Ibid., pp. 5–6.  
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Luke and Acts are summarized below, but the overriding point is that scholars who distinguish features of theology, genre, or subject matter never suggest different authorship. In other words, the hypothesis that Luke and Acts come from the hand of one author-editor is a *sine qua non* in New Testament studies. Attested to by the prefaces and early church writers who reinforced the claim and by correspondences in language, style, and theology, the single authorship hypothesis enjoys an almost invulnerable position. Thus, the state of the question cannot be fully grasped until the external and internal evidence are evaluated.

External evidence for single authorship

The external evidence consists of authorial references in second- to fourth-century manuscripts. Note the extant fragments of Papias’ five-volume work (ca. early second century CE) contain no references to Luke or Acts. As mentioned, Irenaeus Adv. haer. (ca. 175–180 CE) contains the earliest extant references to a gospel and to apostolic teaching (Lat. *doctrina apostolorum*) written by “Luke,” while in nearly the same period, Clement of Alexandria’s *Stromata* 5.12.82.4 contains the earliest extant Greek titular reference to *Acts of the Apostles*, also given to “Luke.” As shown too, the Muratorian Canon fragment clearly links Luke and Acts to the same author-editor. Although some scholars find words and phrases from Acts in the works of earlier second-century writers such as Polycarp or Clement of Rome, they admit these so-called borrowings may simply reflect the language and spirit of the age.

In addition to Irenaeus and the Muratorian Canon fragment, the external evidence for single authorship of Luke and Acts includes: Clement

---


21 Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* II.15.2; III.39.1–7, 14–17 (III CE). The five fragments include: Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 18 (v CE); Philippus Sidetes, *Hist. eccl.* fragments in Codex Barocci 142 (v CE); Codex vaticanus Reg. Lat. 14 (IX CE); Georgius Monachus, *Chronicon*, Codex Coisl. 305 (IX CE); Catena on John, ed. Corderius (1630 CE).


24 For a list, although slightly expanded here, see Cadbury, “The Tradition,” pp. 209–264. The Greek texts have been taken from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, CD ROM.
of Alexandria Stromata 5.12.82.4;25 Tertullian Adversus Marcionem 4.2.4;26 Origen Contra Celsum 6.11;27 Commentarii in evangelium Ioannis 1.23.149,28 150;29 Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei 15.15;30 17.25;31 Selecta in Psalms 12.1632;32 In epistolam ad Hebraeos homiliae 14.1309;33 and Eusebius Historia ecclesiastica vol. E, University of California Irvine, 1999. Where the Greek edition is unavailable or Latin is the original language, I follow the Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum used by Cadbury. The exception is the Muratorian Canon fragment, where I use Hahneman, The Muratorian Fragment. 

25 leipetaiti δη θεο χάριτι και μόνω τῷ παρ᾿ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τό ἁγνοστόν οὐκ, καθά καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς εν ταῖς Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀπομενομένηι τὸν Παύλον λέγοντα· ἄνδρες θηνάγοι, κατα τάντα ϑρος διεθσανυνετήσας ϑύμας θεωροῦ [It is left then by God’s grace and only by the Word from him to consider the unknown, just as also Luke in the Acts of the Apostles recounts Paul saying: “Men of Athens, in all ways I observe that you are very religious”]

26 Nam ex iis commentatoribus, quos habemus, Lucam videtur Marcion elegisse quem caederet. Porro Lucas non apostolus, sed apostolicus, non magister, sed discipulus, utique magistro minor, certe tanto posterior quanto posteriores apostoli sector, Pauli sine dubio ... [For from the gospel writers whom we have Marcion is seen to have selected Luke for mutilation. Luke, not an apostle but a follower of the apostles, not a master but a disciple, at any rate inferior to a master and so far later than the others as he was the follower of a later apostle, of course, of Paul ...]; translation from Cadbury, “The Tradition,” p. 225.


28 Δηλοὶ δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ εν ταῖς Πράξεις ὁ Λουκᾶς, οὐκ ἄλλου ἢ τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι τὸν λίθον [Luke made the gospel clear also in the Acts; none other than Christ is the stone]

29 ἐν δὲ ταῖς Πράξεις ὁ Λουκᾶς γράφει· “Οὗτος ἦσστιν ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐξουθενεῖς υφ᾽ υμῶν τῶν οἰκείων, ὁ γενόμενος εἰς κεφαλὴν γυναικὸς” [In the Acts, Luke writes: “He is the stone rejected by you, the builders; he has become the cornerstone”]

30 ἀκούσατο τῶν ἱστοριαμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Λουκᾶ εν ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων Πράξεις περὶ τῶν προτραπέντων ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν ταῖς ἀποστόλως δυνάμεις πιστεύειν καὶ μισους τελείως κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦ λόγον [let one hear the narrations by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles about those encouraged by the power of the apostles to believe and live fully according to the word of Jesus]

31 καὶ ἰστήριται ὅτι Ἰούδας μὲν ὁ Γαλατεύς, οὐ μείναιται καὶ Λουκᾶς εν ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων Πράξεις [He recounted that Judas of Galilee, of whom Luke makes mention in the Acts of the Apostles]

32 ἔχει γάρ καὶ οὕτως ἑπιθυμεῖν τὸν ἀναλάλοις καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι, πολλὰ μέλλων κρείσσονα· τὸ δὲ ἐπιμενεῖ τῇ σαρκὶ ἀναγκαίοτερος διὰ τοὺς ὑφῆμενους, ἐπίτερ ὁ Δαυίδ κατὰ τῶν Λουκᾶν ἐν ταῖς Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἢ κατὰ Παύλου ἰδίας γενέως ύπερτέρας, ἐξαιτητάλη [For he had a “desire to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better; but remain in the flesh” is more necessary on account of the benefits, since according to Luke in the Acts of the Apostles or also according to Paul, David was sent “to provide for his own generation”]

33 Ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φύλαγμα ἱστορία, ὑπὸ τῶν μὲν λεγόντων, ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίκαιτος ὡς ὀρμώτων ἔγραψε ἐπιστολὴν ὑπὸ τῶν μὲν, ὅτι Λουκᾶς οὐχ ἔγραψε τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ τὰς Πράξεις [The story reached us, by means of some who said that Clement,
Internal evidence for single authorship

The internal evidence consists of an array of lexical, stylistic, thematic, and theological correspondences between Luke and Acts. Often vast in scope and vivid in acuity, centuries’ worth of critical analysis hardly fits into neat categories, but a cautious attempt to summarize the scholarship produces two rudimentary groupings: stylistic evidence and who was made bishop of Rome, wrote the Epistle, by others that Luke, who wrote the gospel and the Acts); see Eusebius Hist. eccl. 6.25.14.

34 ἄδεια καὶ παρ᾽ ἡμῖν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεις μνήμης ὡδὲ ποιοὺς πεποίηται . . [of our own Luke has also made mention here in the Acts saying . . .]

35 Τὸν δὲ κατὰ Κλαύδιον λιμῷ ἐπιστημονικὸν ἐν ταῖς Πράξεις ὁ Λουκᾶς ἱστορήσας τι [Luke in the Acts reports the famine in the time of Claudius]

36 Ἐπεὶ δὲ πάλιν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεις εἰσάγει τὸν Γαμαληλᾶ [Since again Luke in the Acts introduces Gamaliel]

37 Καὶ Λουκᾶς, δὲ καὶ τὰς Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφῇ παραδόσει, ἐν τούτοις κατέθεσε τὴν ἱστορίαν [Luke, who also committed to writing the Acts of the Apostles, stopped his narrative with this]

38 ἐδὲν εἰκότος τῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων Πράξεις ἐπ᾽ ἑκάσιν ὁ Λουκᾶς περιέγραψεν τοὺς χρόνους [wherefore in all likelihood Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles at that time]

39 Ὁτι μὲν οὖν τοῖς ἔθνος κηρύσσον ὁ Παύλος τοὺς ἀπὸ ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἱλλυρίκου τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καταβιβλητό θεμελίους, δήλον εἰ τῶν αὐτοῦ γένοις ὁ φωιτός καὶ ἀρ’ ὄν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεις ἱστορήσαν [Therefore, it is clear from Paul’s own words and from what Luke recounted in Acts that Paul, when preaching to the Gentiles, laid the foundations of the churches from Jerusalem and the area surrounding Illyricum].


40 οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεις τοῖς γνωρίμοις αὐτοῦ κατὰ λέγων ἐξ ἀνάμορφος αὐτῶν μνημεύει [moreover even Luke in the Acts records a list of those known to him and mentions them by name]

41 ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων τῶν Φιλίππου δυνατύτερον ἐν Καισαρείᾳ τῆς ᾿Αλόνασις ἐξαιτίας τῶν πατρί τὴν ἀγωνίαν συνικόσιον διατριβῶντών προφητικῶν τε χρησιμοτο ἡμιωνίων μνημονεύει [Luke in the Acts of the Apostles mentions the daughters of Philip living in Caesarea of Judea with their father and vouchsafed with the gift of prophecy]