

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-50974-9 - The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A
 Reassessment of the Evidence
 Patricia Walters
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

1

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].¹

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 opinion² that few have opted to challenge

¹ J. Verheyden, “The Unity of Luke-Acts” in J. Verheyden (ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, BETL 142 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), pp. 6–7 note 13. For the reference cited, see Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1993), p. 116.

² See, e.g., David E. Aune, *The New Testament and Its Literary Environment* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Westminster Press, 1987), p. 77; F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1990), pp. 1–9; Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 2nd edition (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1958; reprint, 1999), p. 8; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel, Hermeneia (Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1987), pp. xl–xlv; Frederick W. Danker, *Luke*, Proclamation Commentaries (Philadelphia, Pa., Fortress Press, 1987), p. 2; Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf from the 2nd edition (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1935), p. 3; originally published as *Die Formgeschichte des Evangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1919); “Style Criticism in the Book of Acts” in Heinrich Greevan (ed.), *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, trans. Mary Ling (London: SCM Press, 1956; reprint, Mifflintown, Penn.: Sigler Press, 1999), pp. 174f.; originally published as “Stilkritisches zur Apostelgeschichte” in H. Schmidt (ed.), *Eucharisterion: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Festschrift Hermann Gunkel, vol. II (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), pp. 27–49; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, AB 28 (New York: Doubleday, 1970), pp. 35–41; *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 31 (New York:

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-50974-9 - The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A
 Reassessment of the Evidence
 Patricia Walters
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

2 *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts*

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 milieu 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

Doubleday, 1998), pp. 49–51; Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, trans. Basil Blackwell (Philadelphia, Pa.: Westminster Press, 1971), pp. 90–112; John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*, 2nd edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909; reprint, 1968), p. 174; Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke*, 5th edition (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922; reprint 1969), pp. xi–xii; Gerhard Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas: Kapitel 1–10*, vol. I (Würzburg: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, Gütersloh und Echter Verlag, 1977), pp. 32–33; and W. C. van Unnik, “The ‘Book of Acts’ – The Confirmation of the Gospel” in David E. Orton (ed.), *The Composition of Luke’s Gospel: Selected Studies from “Novum Testamentum”* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 184f.

³ See pp. 24f. and pp. 25f., respectively. ⁴ See pp. 26ff. and pp. 33ff., respectively.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-50974-9 - The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence

Patricia Walters

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Background and Methodology*

3

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)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].*⁶

In *The Making of Luke-Acts*, Henry J. Cadbury suggests:

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*

⁵ The length of the Acts preface is a matter of dispute. In fact, all the following have been proposed: Acts 1:1; 1:1–2; 1:1–5; 1:1–8; 1:1–11; 1:1–14; 1:1–26; 1:1–2:41; 1:1–2:47. I have chosen Acts 1:1–5, so Aune, *Literary*, p. 117. See also Steve Walton, “Where Does the Beginning of Acts End?” in Verheyden, *Unity of Luke-Acts*, p. 447.

⁶ F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles: Prolegomena II*, vol. II (London: Macmillan and Co., 1922), p. 207.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-50974-9 - The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence

Patricia Walters

Excerpt

[More information](#)4 *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts*

volume is in its present form the work of the same ultimate editor [emphasis added].⁷

While W. C. van Unnik believes there is no reason to doubt the correctness of Acts 1:1,⁸ 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].⁹

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].¹⁰

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.¹¹ 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

⁷ Cadbury, *Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 8.

⁸ Van Unnik, “The ‘Book of Acts’ – The Confirmation of the Gospel,” p. 184.

⁹ Bruce, *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 2f.

¹⁰ Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 49. For an excursus on proems, see Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 4.

¹¹ E.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 288. For a comprehensive treatment of extra-biblical prefaces, see reference in note 12 as well as Loveday Alexander, “Formal Elements and Genre: Which Greco-Roman Prologues Most Closely Parallel the Lukan Prologues?” in David P. Moessner (ed.), *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke’s Narrative Claim upon Israel’s History* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1999).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-50974-9 - The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence

Patricia Walters

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Background and Methodology*

5

formulations than to those in historical texts, Hellenistic Jewish literature, or other Greek literary works.¹² 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 δέ, ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βίβλῳ κατέθετο. [Then, Luke, the follower of Paul, set down in a book the gospel proclaimed by him.]”¹³ 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.¹⁴ 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

¹² Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke’s Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1–4 and Acts 1.1*, SNTSMS 78 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 167.

¹³ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, trans. Kirsopp Lake, LCL 153 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926; reprint 1949, 1953, 1959, 1965), 5.8.3. Unless otherwise indicated, the English translations are my own.

¹⁴ The original Greek of a possible title for Acts (*Adv. haer.* III.13.3) is not extant; the Latin translation is *doctrina apostolorum*.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-50974-9 - The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence

Patricia Walters

Excerpt

[More information](#)6 *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts*

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.¹⁵ About Luke and Acts, the *Muratorian Canon* says:

The third book of the gospel: according to Luke.

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).¹⁶

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.

¹⁵ For the majority opinion, see Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 191–201. For the minority opinion, see Geoffrey Mark Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), pp. 215–218. See also A. C. Sundberg, Jr., “Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List,” *HTR* 66 (1973), 1–41.

¹⁶ The English translation comes from Henry J. Cadbury, “The Tradition,” in F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, vol. II. Prolegomena II: Criticism* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1922), pp. 210–211. For the Latin text, see Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment*, p. 6.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-50974-9 - The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence

Patricia Walters

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Background and Methodology*

7

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”¹⁷ 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 ἐγένετο constructions, the definite article+infinitive, and the use of κύριος 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].¹⁸

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.¹⁹ Theories about and problems with the literary and theological unity of

¹⁷ Verheyden, “The Unity of Luke-Acts,” p. 6 note 13. ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 5–6.

¹⁹ Parsons and Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*, pp. 88f.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-50974-9 - The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A
 Reassessment of the Evidence
 Patricia Walters
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

8 *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts*

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.²⁰ 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.²¹ 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."²² 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.²³

In addition to Irenaeus and the *Muratorian Canon* fragment, the external evidence for single authorship of Luke and Acts includes:²⁴ Clement

²⁰ For a comprehensive treatment of recent scholarly contributions to the issue of Luke and Acts unity, see Michael F. Bird, "The Unity of Luke-Acts in Recent Discussion," *JSNT* 29 (2007), pp. 425–448. Scholars focus on questions of whether Luke and Acts comprise a literary whole or whether reception-history studies have relevance. For the former, see Andrew Gregory, "The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts" *JSNT* 29 (2007), pp. 459–472; for the latter, see Luke Timothy Johnson, "Literary Criticism of Luke-Acts: Is Reception-History Pertinent?" *JSNT* 29 (2007), pp. 159–162.

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).

²² The Latin translation of Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* contains the earliest extant reference to the book of Acts: *doctrina apostolorum* (III.13.3).

²³ Haenchen, *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 9.

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

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-50974-9 - The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A
Reassessment of the Evidence

Patricia Walters
Excerpt

[More information](#)

Background and Methodology

9

of Alexandria *Stromata* 5.12.82.4;²⁵ Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 4.2.4;²⁶ Origen *Contra Celsum* 6.11;²⁷ *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 1.23.149,²⁸ 150;²⁹ *Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei* 15.15;³⁰ 17.25;³¹ *Selecta in Psalmos* 12.1632;³² *In epistulam 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 λείπεται δὴ θεῖα χάριτι καὶ μόνω τῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγῳ τὸ ἄγνωστον νοεῖν, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀπομνημονεύει τὸν Παῦλον λέγοντα· ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεσποδαίμονεστέροις ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ [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 posterioris apostoli sectator, 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.

²⁷ Καὶ "Ἰουδᾶς" δὲ "ὁ Γαλιλαῖος," ὡς ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔγραψεν, ἐβουλήθη ἑαυτὸν τινα εἰπεῖν μέγαν, καὶ πρὸ ἐκείνου "Θευδᾶς" ["Judas of Galilee," as Luke wrote in the Acts of the Apostles, wanted to call himself someone great, as did Theudas before him]

²⁸ Δηλοῖ δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσιν ὁ Λουκᾶς, οὐκ ἄλλον ἢ τὸν Χριστόν εἶναι τὸν λίθον [Luke made the gospel clear also in the Acts; none other than Christ is the stone]

²⁹ ἐν δὲ ταῖς Πράξεσιν ὁ Λουκᾶς γράφει· "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐξουδενωθεὶς ὑφ' ὑμῶν τῶν οἰκοδόμων, ὁ γενόμενος εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας" [In the Acts, Luke writes: "He is the stone rejected by you, the builders; he has become the cornerstone"]

³⁰ ἀκουσάτω τῶν ἱστορουμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Λουκᾶ ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων Πράξεσι περὶ τῶν προτραπέντων ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις δυνάμεως πιστεύειν καὶ βιοῦν 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 ἰστώρηται ὅτι Ἰουδᾶς μὲν ὁ Γαλιλαῖος, οὗ μένηται καὶ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων Πράξεσιν [He recounted that Judas of Galilee, of whom Luke makes mention in the Acts of the Apostles]

³² ἔχει γὰρ καὶ οὗτος "ἐπιθυμίαν τοῦ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι, πολλῶ μᾶλλον κρείσσονα· τὸ δὲ ἐπιμένειν τῇ σαρκί" ἀναγκαιότερους διὰ τοὺς ὠφελιμένους, εἴπερ ὁ Δαυὶδ κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ἢ καὶ κατὰ Παῦλον "ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ ὑπερέτησον" ἔξαπαστόλη [For he had a "desire to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better; but to 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 φθάσασα ἱστορία, ὑπὸ τινων μὲν λεγόντων, ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε Ἐπιστολήν· ὑπὸ τινων δὲ, ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ τὰς Πράξεις [The story reached us, by means of some who said that Clement,

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-50974-9 - The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence

Patricia Walters

Excerpt

[More information](#)10 *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts*

1.5.3;³⁴ 2.8.2;³⁵ 2.11.1;³⁶ 2.22.1,³⁷ 6;³⁸ 3.4.1,³⁹ 4;⁴⁰ 3.31.5.⁴¹ The so-called Anti-Marcionite prologue to the gospel of Luke appears to be of a later, though uncertain, date.⁴² To repeat, few scholars today question the *anonymity* of Luke and Acts authorship, but even fewer, remarkably, question the authorial unity of these two anonymous works. Thus external evidence will not suffice for “proof” of single authorship, so scholars rely on internal evidence.

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 ἤς καὶ παρ’ ἡμῖν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσιν μνήμη ἐὼς πῶς λέγων πεποιθῆται . . . [of this our own Luke has also made mention here in the Acts saying . . .]

³⁵ Τὸν δὲ κατὰ Κλαύδιον λιμὸν ἐπισημηνάμενος ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσιν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἱστορήσας τε [Luke in the Acts reports the famine in the time of Claudius]

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

³⁷ Καὶ Λουκᾶς, ὁ καὶ τὰς Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφῆ παραδοῦς, ἐν τούτοις κατέλυσε τὴν ἱστορίαν [Luke, who also committed to writing the Acts of the Apostles, stopped his narrative with this]

³⁸ ὅθεν εἰκότως τὰς τῶν ἀποστόλων Πράξεις ἐπ’ ἐκείνον ὁ Λουκᾶς περιέγραψε τὸν χρόνον [wherefore in all likelihood Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles at that time]

³⁹ Ὅτι μὲν οὖν τοῖς ἐξ ἔθνῶν κηρύσσων ὁ Παῦλος τοὺς ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ κύκλω μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καταβέβλητο θεμελίους, δῆλον ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ γένοιτ’ ἂν φωνῶν καὶ ἀφ’ ὧν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσιν ἱστόρησεν [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]. The English translation relies on Eusebius *Historia ecclesiastica*, trans. Kirsopp Lake, LCL 153 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926), p. 195.

⁴⁰ οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσιν τοὺς γνωρίμους αὐτοῦ κατὰ λέγων ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν μνημονεύει [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 Πράξεσιν τῶν ἀποστόλων τῶν Φιλίππου θυγατέρων ἐν Καισαρείᾳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἅμα τῷ πατρὶ τότε διατριβουσῶν προφητικοῦ τε χαρίσματος ἡξιομένων 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]

⁴² “And afterwards this same Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles”; see Haenchen, *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 10 note 1.