

AN ARGUMENT FOR THE LUKAN AUTHORSHIP OF HEBREWS

by

DAVID LEWIS ALLEN

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

December 1987

To Sherri, Jeremy, and Jared,
My beloved wife and children
without whose support and understanding
this dissertation could not have been completed

Soli Deo Gloria

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincerest appreciation to Paige Patterson, mentor and friend, who encouraged me as a sophomore in college to pursue the possibility of the Lukan authorship of Hebrews, and who has been a constant encouragement along the way. Also to Roy Metts, who instilled in me a love for the Greek New Testament and whose classes in the Greek language laid the foundation for this work, I offer special thanks.

David Witter, chairman of deacons at Audelia Road Baptist Church, provided invaluable help by virtue of his expertise in computer programming and by serving as a sounding board for ideas presented herein. For his many hours of help in preparing the manuscript on the computer, I am deeply grateful. Also, I wish to thank Dr. B. T. Johnson who read several drafts of this manuscript with critical eyes and made many helpful suggestions. Mrs. Janie Campbell also proofread my final draft and offered helpful corrections.

Finally, for his constant support and friendship throughout the writing of this dissertation, and for his encouragement during its preparation, I wish to thank my colleague in the ministry, Danny Akin.

November 16th, 1987

ABSTRACT

AN ARGUMENT FOR THE LUKAN AUTHORSHIP OF HEBREWS

Publication No. _____

David Lewis Allen, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 1987

Supervising Professor: Robert E. Longacre

The question of the authorship of the New Testament epistle to the Hebrews has provided scholars with fertile ground for speculation from the earliest days of Church history until the present time. The purpose of this dissertation is to propose and argue for the possibility of Luke the physician and traveling companion of the Apostle Paul as having been the independent author. After a survey of the major theories on authorship proposed from the times of the Church Fathers to the present, I briefly discuss the arguments pro and con for the possibility of the three leading candidates for authorship: Paul, Apollos, and Barnabas, as well as other matters of background in order to set the stage for the argument of Lukan authorship.

Chapter two furnishes linguistic evidence from three broad fronts to support the theory: (1) lexical similarity, (2) stylistic similarity, and (3) textlinguistic considerations. Under this third section, I evaluate

four lines of evidence: (1) a comparison of the prologues to Luke, Acts, and Hebrews, (2) a comparison of the two longest expositions of Old Testament history in the New Testament: Acts 7 and Hebrews 11, (3) a comparison of the use of chiasm as an over-arching framework for the entire discourse of Luke-Acts and Hebrews which tends to set them off against other New Testament books, especially the Pauline epistles, and (4) a comparison of Old Testament citation formulae found in the three works.

Chapter three evaluates the theological outlook characteristic of Luke-Acts and Hebrews and finds them to be closely related especially in matters of Christology and Eschatology. Chapter four proposes a Jewish background for Luke on the basis of a reading of his two-volume Luke-Acts which reveals extensive influence by and interest in matters of Jewish concern. Luke is shown to be capable of writing such a highly Jewish work as Hebrews. Finally, in chapter five I offer a theory of the authorship and background of Hebrews in which I suggest that Luke wrote it ca. A. D. 67 from Rome and addressed it to former Jewish Priests who are now Christians living in Antioch of Syria.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The uniqueness of Hebrews: genre and provenance	1
1.2 Summary of major theories of author- ship and provenance	4
1.2.1 Historical testimony	7
1.2.2 The argument for Paul	11
1.2.3 The argument for Barnabas	18
1.2.4 The argument for Apollos	20
1.3 Recipients of Hebrews	22
1.3.1 Jerusalem	23
1.3.2 Alexandria	24
1.3.3 Rome	25
1.4 Date	26
1.5 Purpose	26
1.6 Abstract of a new theory	28
2. LINGUISTIC ARGUMENTS	35
2.1 Lexical similarity	35
2.1.1 The Relationship between Luke-Acts, Paul and Hebrews.	40
2.1.2 Luke-Acts, Hebrews, and the Apocryphal books.	43
2.1.3 Other lexical similarities	44
2.2 Stylistic similarity	55

2.2.1	The importance of style in questions of authorship identification	56
2.2.2	Evidence of stylistic similarity between Luke-Acts and Hebrews	58
2.3	The argument from textlinguistic considerations	67
2.3.1	The prologues of Luke-Acts and Hebrews	67
2.3.2	Comparison between Acts 7 and Hebrews 11	72
2.3.3	Macrostructure and superstructure in Luke-Acts and Hebrews	79
2.3.4	Use of O. T. citation formulae in Luke-Acts and Hebrews	104
2.3.5	Luke, Hebrews and the Septuagint	112
2.4	Conclusion	115
3.	THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENTS	120
3.1	Christology	122
3.2	Eschatology	128
3.3	Angelology	133
3.4	Hebrews 6:1-2 and Acts	134
3.5	The theological significance of the 'house of Israel'	134
3.6	The use of the theological concept of <i>σημερον</i> 'today' in Luke-Acts and Hebrews	135
3.7	Additional arguments	137
3.8	Conclusion	144
4.	EVIDENCES OF A JEWISH BACKGROUND OF LUKE-ACTS	147
4.1	The identity of Luke	147
4.2	Jewish aspects of Luke-Acts	153

4.3 The Lukan conception of the relationship of Judaism to the church	165
4.4 Additional evidence	173
4.5 Excursus on Luke's intended reader Theophilus	179
5. HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION.	189
5.1 Authorship	189
5.2 Recipients	195
5.3 Date	202
5.4 Conclusion	205
REFERENCE LIST	209

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Chart summary of theories on authorship of Hebrews	4
2.1	Vocabulary unique to the writings of Luke and Hebrews in the New Testament	37
2.2.2	Positions of participial and adjectival phrases qualifying an articular noun in Hebrews and the we-sections of Acts	65
2.3.1	The prologues of Luke, Acts and Hebrews	67
2.3.2	Linguistic comparisons of Acts 7 and Hebrews 11.	77
2.3.3.1	The chiastic framework of Luke's travel narrative as given by Goulder	82
2.3.3.2	The chiastic structure of Acts 15:1-21:26	83
2.3.3.3	The chiastic structure of the five summary statements in Part I of Acts	86
2.3.3.4	Diagram of Luke's chiastic correlation of thematic participants	89
2.3.3.5	Vanhoye's chiastic structure of Hebrews	95
2.3.3.6	Parallels between 1:1-4:13; 11-13	98
2.3.3.7a	Parallel introductions--10:19-25; 4:14-16	99
2.3.3.7b	Parallel warnings--10:26-31; 6:4-8	99
2.3.3.7c	Parallel reminders--6:9-20; 10:32-39	100
2.3.3.8	Parallels between 7:1-28; 8:1-10:18	101
2.3.4.1	Old Testament citation formulae in Luke-Acts	105

2.3.4.2	Old Testament citation formulae in Hebrews . . .	107
2.3.4.3	Old Testament citation formulae in Romans . . .	108

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The uniqueness of Hebrews: genre and provenance

From the earliest days of Christian history, the epistle to the Hebrews has been shrouded in obscurity. It is the only truly anonymous letter in the New Testament. With regard to authorship, most modern scholars share the view expressed by Origen's dictum: 'as to who wrote the epistle, truly only God knows' (Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, VI. 14). Hebrews appears on the scene much like the Melchizedek of whom it speaks: 'without father, without mother, without descent.' Complicating the problem of authorship is the uncertainty regarding date, recipients, place of writing, etc. All of this converges upon the scholar with such force that perhaps it would not be in error to say that Hebrews must be reckoned as the most enigmatic book in the New Testament in terms of provenance.

Certainly much of its content is unique. It does not seem to fit readily into the scheme of the Pauline, the Johannine, or the Petrine writings, yet it constitutes one of the most majestic presentations of Christology in the entire New Testament. Its genre is mixed, sometimes being epistolary in nature, while at other times appearing to be sermonic in nature. Other terms used to describe its literary character are essay, treatise, oration, biblical exposition, and exhortation. The latter is especially

apropos because in 13:22 the author himself speaks of his work as a 'word of exhortation.' Though it is no doubt an epistle and a sermon of sorts, the designation of 'exhortation' is to be preferred because it more accurately describes the discourse genre of Hebrews. The frequent and well-placed imperatives and hortatory subjunctives illustrate this fact. From the linguistic perspective it is therefore best to describe Hebrews as an example of hortatory discourse with large sections of embedded expository discourse.²

Hebrews is unique in the New Testament in that it possesses no specific salutation but it does have a conclusion. Several suggestions have been offered in light of this fact. Some have suggested that the original introduction was lost accidentally. Yet this is not a likely solution since there are more than 14,000 extant letters from the ancient world, many of which are autographs, and not one single autograph lacks the usual introduction. There is no record at all of the prescript alone becoming lost from any papyrus roll (Wikenhauser 1958:346,349,359). The suggestion that the prescript was omitted for canonical reasons could possibly be true, but as Moffatt points out, some trace of the original would have probably survived (1918:429). It therefore seems unlikely that the prescript to Hebrews would have been lost or omitted for canonical reasons.

Others have suggested that the introduction was deliberately omitted by the author. This is also very doubtful, for those who suggest that Paul omitted any reference to his name because he was the apostle to the Gentiles and was now writing a letter to Jewish Christians overlook the fact that the letter itself makes it clear that the readers knew exactly who the author was. Furthermore, an alteration of the introduction by adding the name of Paul (for purposes of achieving canonicity) would seem more likely than a total excision.

E. J. Goodspeed suggested that Hebrews may have been originally pseudonymous rather than anonymous (1939:257). But D. Guthrie counters that had the letter originally borne any ascription to Paul, 'it is impossible to envisage any situation in which it would lose its ascription and still continue to be regarded with some favor. There are no parallels to this kind of thing among the pseudepigrapha' (1970:698).

The beautifully balanced and classical sentence with which Hebrews does begin has all the earmarks of the original introduction to the work. Unlike the Pauline epistles, there is no formal salutation naming author or readers. It is this fact coupled with the historical obscurity surrounding its provenance that has provided scholars with a fertile field for theorizing about authorship.

1.2 Summary of major theories of authorship and provenance

Most commentaries on Hebrews of recent vintage do not spend a great deal of time discussing matters of authorship and recipients. This is understandable in light of the multitude of theories available. In this introduction, an attempt will be made to present in a succinct manner most of the major theories relative to the authorship of Hebrews and then propose a new theory which seems to have considerable explanatory power.

I have presented in chart form below the major theories of authorship. It is not my intention to discuss thoroughly each theory, as one can find this information elsewhere.² The name of the scholar or scholars who have suggested each theory will appear in the far left hand column, followed by the headings 'author', 'recipients', and 'date.' This approach seems valuable in that it summarizes information for easy study.

Table 1.-- Chart summary of theories on authorship of Hebrews

SCHOLAR	AUTHOR	RECIPIENTS	DATE
Pantaenus (A.D.150)	Paul		
Clement of Alexandria	Paul (trans. by Luke)	Jewish Christians	

Table 1--Continued.

Origen ^a	unknown		
Tertullian	Barnabas		
Luther ^b	Apollos		
Calvin	Luke ^c		
Riggenbach	Barnabas	Jewish Christians in Cyprus	66-70
Windisch	Barnabas		81-96
A. Harnack	Priscilla & Aquila	Small group of believers in Rome (house church)	
Ruth Hoppin	Priscilla ^d	Ephesus	ca. 65
James Moffatt		Gentile Christians	
William Ramsay	Philip	Jerusalem church	57-59
B. F. Westcott		Jerusalem church	64-67
T. W. Manson	Apollos	Churches in Lycus valley	
W. F. Howard	Apollos	Jewish Christians in Ephesus	
William Manson	Barnabas	Jewish Christians in Rome	49
H. W. Montefiore	Apollos	Christians at Corinth	52-54
S. Brandon		Alexandria	post 70
A. Snell	Barnabas	Jewish Christians in Cyprus	66-70
A. Ehrhardt	Roman Church	Jerusalem Church	post 70
P. Spicq	Apollos	Priests of Acts 6:7 in Caeserea ^e or Antioch	

Table 1.--Continued.

J. W. Bowman		Hellenistic Jewish-Christ- ians of Palestin- ian Christianity in the region of Sychar	
F. Lo Bue	Apollos	Jewish-Christ- ian section of Corinthian church.	pre 70
W. Leonard Paul ^f			
F.C. Synge		Jews on verge of accepting Christianity	
T. Hewitt	Silvanus		
Welch	Peter		
A. M. Dubarle	Jude		

^aOrigen pointed out that the thoughts were Pauline but the style was un-Pauline.

^bLuther was the first to suggest Apollos as the author.

^cCalvin noted the stylistic similarities of Luke's writings and Hebrews, but he did not argue the case in depth. He did seem to posit Lukan authorship independent of Pauline influence, however.

^dHoppin provides the most elaborate and best argument available for Priscilla as the author.

^eSpicq's commentary on Hebrews is well respected for its scholarly depth, but few have followed his suggestion that the recipients were converted priests who were Essen-Christians including former members of Qumran.

^fLeonard's work constitutes the best modern presentation of the Pauline authorship theory.

Three conclusions emerge from the preceding table. First, it is obvious that from the Church Fathers until the present, there have been numerous theories as to the authorship of the book. Second, the suggestions made by the Church Fathers, Medieval, and Reformation scholars almost always involved persons who were well known apostles or who were associated with the apostles in some close fashion as was Barnabas. No one in the early church thought to suggest some obscure individual as the possible author. This may be accounted for on the supposition that canonization was a factor in the Fathers' suggestions. That is, they would propose someone like Paul as the author because such apostolicity was necessary to make Hebrews a part of the canon. Canonicity may have played a role in the theories of authorship among the Church Fathers. But it is still significant that names suggested for possible authorship always involved those of the apostolic band.

Third, not only is there no agreement as to authorship, but all other matters of background such as date, place of writing, recipients, etc., have been open to speculation from the Church Fathers until the present. This is due to the fact that nowhere does the book of Hebrews itself locate or name specifically its recipients.

1.2.1 Historical testimony

The historical testimony³ regarding the authorship of Hebrews begins in the middle of the second century with

statements attributed to Pantaenus, head of the Alexandrian school of catechetes. He attributed it to the apostle Paul, but observed that contrary to Paul's custom in his other epistles, there is no salutation identifying him as the author. At the end of the second century, Clement of Alexandria, student of Pantaenus, was quoted by Eusebius as saying that Paul wrote Hebrews originally in Hebrew and that Luke translated it into Greek for a Hellenistic Jewish audience. Clement stated that it was this fact (Luke's translation) which accounted for the stylistic similarities between Hebrews and Luke-Acts.

Και την προς Ἑβραίους δε ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου μὲν εἶναι φησὶ, γεγραπταὶ δὲ Ἑβραϊκῆ φωνῇ, Λουκᾶν δὲ φιλοτιμῶς αὐτὴν μεθερμηνεύσαντα ἐκδουναὶ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν ὅθεν τοῦ αὐτοῦ χρωτᾶ εὐρισκεσθῆναι κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ταύτης τε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν πράξεων μὴ προγεγραφθῆναι δὲ τὸ Παῦλος ἀποστολὸς, εἰκοτῶς. Ἑβραίοις γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐπιστελλῶν προλήψιν εἰληφοσὶ κατ' αὐτοῦ καὶ υποπτέουσιν αὐτὸν συνέτως πανυ οὐκ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἀπεστρέφεν αὐτοὺς τὸ ὄνομα θεοῦ.

The epistle to the Hebrews is the work of Paul, and that it was written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language; but that Luke translated it carefully and published it for the Greeks, and hence the same style of expression is found in this epistle and in the Acts. But he says that the words, Paul the Apostle, were probably not prefixed, because, in sending it to the Hebrews, who were prejudiced and suspicious of him, he wisely did not wish to repel them at the very beginning by giving his name.⁴

By the middle of the third century, Origen allowed for Pauline influence on the thoughts of the epistle to the Hebrews, but he ascribed the style and actual writing to someone else.

ἽΟτι ο χαρακτηρ της λεξεως της προς Ἐβραιους επιγεγραμμενη επιστολης ουκ εχει το εν λογω ιδιωτικον του αποστολου, ομολογησαντος εαυτον ιδιωτην ειναι τω λογω, τουτεστι τη φρασει, αλλα εστιν η επιστολη συνθεσει της λεξεως ελληνικωτερα, πας ο επισταμενος κρινειν φρασεων φιαφορας ομολογησαι αν παλιν τε αυ οτι τα νοηματα της επιστολης θαυμασια εστι και ου δευτερα των αποστολικων ομολογουμενων γραμματων, και τουτο αν συμφησαι ειναι αληθες πας ο προσεχων τη αναγνωσει τη αποστολικη. . .
 ἽΕγω δε αποφαινομενος ειποιμ' αν, οτι τα μεν νοηματα του αποστολου εστιν, η δε φρασις και η συνθεσις απομνημονευσαντος τινος τα αποστολικά και ωσπερει σχολιογραφησαντος τινος τα ειρημενα υπο του διδασκαλου. Ει τις ουν εκκλησια εχει ταυτην την επιστολην ως Παυλου, αυτη ευδοκιμειτω και επι ταυτω ου γαρ εικη οι αρχαιοι ανδρες ως Παυλου αυτην παραδεδωκασι τις δε ο γραφας την επιστολην, το μεν αληθες θεος οιδεν η δε εις ημας φθασασα ιστορια υπο τινων μεν λεγοντων, οτι Κλημης ο γενομενος επισκοπος Ρωμαιων εγραφε την επιστολην, υπο τινων δε, οτι Λουκας ο γραφας το ευαγγελιον και τας πραξεις.

That the verbal style of the epistle entitled 'To the Hebrews', is not rude like the language of the apostle, who acknowledged himself 'rude in speech,' that is, in expression; but that its diction is purer Greek, any one who has the power to discern differences of phraseology will acknowledge. Moreover, that the thoughts of the epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged apostolic writings, any one who carefully examines the apostolic text will admit . . . If I gave my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are those of the apostle, but the diction and phraseology are those of someone who remembered the apostolic teachings, and wrote them down at his leisure what had been said by his teacher. Therefore, if any church holds that this epistle is by Paul, let it be commended for this. . . . But who wrote the epistle, in truth, God knows. The statement of some who have gone before us is that Clement, bishop of the Romans, wrote the epistle, and of others that Luke, the author of the Gospel and the Acts, wrote it.

Several facts can be noted in Origen's statements. First, the style is unlike Paul. Second, the thoughts are attributed to Paul, and thus in this way Hebrews is linked to Paul. Third, Origen himself offered no theory of authorship. Fourth, he cited tradition as saying that Clement of Rome or Luke wrote it.

This Alexandrian tradition regarding authorship continued to grow with the result that by the fourth century Paul was regarded as the undisputed author of the epistle in the Alexandrian church. However, from the very beginning of this tradition, Hebrews was attributed to Paul only in a very tentative fashion.

In the ancient Syrian church, Ephraem (ca. 378) appears to link Romans 2:16, Ephesians 5:15, and Hebrews 10:31 as having all been written by Paul. In Western Syria the Antiochian Synod (ca. 264) issued a letter to Paul of Samosata in which were quoted statements by Paul in his Corinthian letters and Hebrews 11:26 as all having been written by the same apostle. By the middle of the fourth century, the Pauline authorship was well attested in the Eastern church, yet immediate Pauline composition was primarily asserted in the late third and fourth centuries.

Turning to the Western Church in North Africa, no tradition regarding Pauline authorship apparently existed. Rather, in the late second and early third centuries,

Tertullian made reference to the epistle as having been written by Barnabas.⁶ In the Roman Church, there was likewise no tradition of Pauline authorship until very late. Clement of Rome makes the first reference to the epistle in his letters to the Corinthians (ca. 96), but he does not posit Pauline authorship. The Muratorian Canon (ca. 170-210) refers to the thirteen epistles of Paul, but does not list Hebrews, thus giving evidence that the Roman church did not regard Paul as the author. It was only toward the end of the fourth century that the Pauline authorship began to be accepted in the Western Church.

Of all those who have been suggested as the possible author of Hebrews, three seem to have gained the most support: Paul, Barnabas, and Apollos. Evidence for and against each will be briefly considered.

1.2.2 The argument for Paul

Paul has been a candidate since the time of the Church Fathers. As shown above, there were three major traditions of authorship which circulated in the first four centuries. According to the Alexandrian tradition, the epistle was regarded at least in some sense as the work of Paul. Pantaenus, mentor of Clement, suggested that Paul did not use his name in this epistle out of reverence for the Lord and to avoid suspicion since he was known as the apostle to

the Gentiles. The Pauline tradition continued to grow in Alexandria with the result that by the fourth century, it was accepted without question.

The Pauline authorship of Hebrews is most ably defended in William Leonard's Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews (1939). Roman Catholic scholars seem to be the largest single group who still support the Pauline hypothesis, although departure from the traditional position of the Church has increased in recent years. The argument for Pauline authorship turns primarily upon three factors: (1) vocabulary similarity, (2) some theological similarity, and (3) the historical testimony from the Church Fathers.

The following problems have caused most scholars to reject this view. First, Paul's name does not appear in the prologue as is the custom with his other writings. There are thirteen epistles of Paul in the New Testament canon, and each one contains a salutation which identifies the writer as the great apostle. In fact, in all of the thirteen epistles of Paul, his name is the first word of the text. For example, in Romans he begins by writing 'Paul, a servant of Christ Jesus. . .'. This is the style in each of his epistles. Yet in the epistle to the Hebrews there is no mention of Paul's name anywhere, in spite of the fact that it is obvious that the readers knew who the author was.

Second, Hebrews lacks the characteristic salutation

which begins each of the Pauline letters. After identifying himself, it was Paul's custom to state the location of the recipients of his letter, as for example Romans 1:7, 'to all that be in Rome. . .'. Then would follow the Pauline greeting 'Grace and peace be to you from God our father and from the Lord Jesus Christ.' It is not without significance that Hebrews lacks all three of these salutary characteristics which mark the Pauline epistles. It is this fact which has caused many scholars to deny Pauline authorship to Hebrews.

Third, from a stylistic perspective, Hebrews is certainly divergent in many ways from the other letters of Paul. This fact has been noted from earliest times in the history of the church. As noted above, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Eusebius all mentioned the difference in style between the known writings of Paul and the epistle to the Hebrews.

There is a certain similarity of style between chapter 13 and the writings of Paul. This has led some scholars to make the unlikely suggestion that Paul may have added this chapter to the letter. Others have suggested that it is a fragment from an otherwise unknown Pauline epistle. However, chapter 13 gives no hint of having been added to Hebrews by Paul or anyone else. Floyd Filson (1967:15,16, et al.) has conclusively shown it to be an integral part of the text.

It must be stated at this juncture that stylistic comparisons cannot in and of themselves prove or disprove conclusively that Paul did or did not write Hebrews. The key word here is 'conclusively.' It can be demonstrated that an author may change his style deliberately to accommodate his subject matter. Furthermore, over the period of an author's life, his style may alter to such a degree that one could speak of an author's 'early' writings and his 'late' writings not only in terms of a change in thought patterns and content, but also in terms of style. Therefore, I feel that it would be overstating the case to suggest on the basis of stylistic comparisons, that Paul could not have written Hebrews.

But literary studies have shown that stylistic comparisons can furnish rather strong evidence in favor of or against a particular author if we remember that we are dealing within the realm of probability. Thus, I would suggest that the Pauline epistles do betray certain stylistic features which tend to corroborate the supposition that Paul is the author, and that the epistle to the Hebrews is stylistically so unlike the Paulines that we can say that Paul probably did not write Hebrews.

Fourth, much of the theology of the epistle is foreign to Paul's writings. As has been noted by many, there is a marked absence of characteristic Pauline thought, themes and motifs. Again, this should not be used to argue that Paul

could not have written Hebrews, only that it makes it less likely that he did.

Fifth, the writer of Hebrews seems to class himself with second generation Christians in 2:3, something which Paul would probably never do. 'How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him.' Paul elsewhere in his epistles identified himself as an 'apostle,' the prerequisite of which was to have been an eyewitness of the resurrected Christ. In Acts 9, Luke recounts the experience of Paul on the road to Damascus when he met Jesus Christ and became a Christian. Paul referred later to this experience of salvation in the context of his apostleship when he said that he was 'one born out of due time.' Nowhere in the thirteen epistles does Paul ever refer to himself as the writer of Hebrews does in 2:3. Thus, it is unlikely that Paul would have written such a statement.

Sixth, the unusual apologetic of Hebrews 13:22 which says 'Bear with this word of exhortation, for I have written to you briefly. . .' does not fit well with the acknowledged length of the thirteen Pauline letters. As a matter of fact, Hebrews is longer than eleven of the thirteen Pauline epistles and more than twice as long as the average length for a Pauline epistle. Unless Paul had addressed other

epistles of considerably greater length to this same readership, then it does not seem likely he would have written such a statement.

However, it must be noted that there are evidences of Pauline thought and perhaps even influence in Hebrews. The reference to 'our brother Timothy' in Hebrews 13:23 causes one to think immediately of Paul since Timothy is so closely associated with the Pauline circle. The benediction of 13:24,25 is reminiscent of the Pauline letters: 'Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you. Grace be with you all, Amen.'

Certain facets of the Christology of Hebrews are somewhat akin to Pauline thought in that both present Christ as being in the image of God (Hebrews 1:3; Colossians 1:15) and both present him as the agent and sustainer of all creation (Hebrews 1:2,3; Colossians 1:16-17).

Moses Stuart devoted more than 100 pages of his commentary on Hebrews to the defense of Pauline authorship. He noted several parallels in terms and phrases between Hebrews and the Pauline letters (1860:147-51). I list below some of the main parallels that he noted.

1. Hebrews 2:10: . . .for whom and by whom all things exist.
Colossians 1:16: All things were created through him and for him.
2. Hebrews 2:16: . . . the descendants of Abraham.
Galatians 3:29: . . . And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's seed.
Romans 4:16: . . . Abraham, for he is the father of us all.

3. Hebrews 4:12: For the word of God⁷ is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword.
Ephesians 6:17: . . . the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.
4. Hebrews 6:3: . . .if God permits.
I Corinthians 16:7: . . .if the Lord permits.
These are the only two occurrences of this phrase in the New Testament.

While there is some evidence both historical and internal that Paul could have written Hebrews, the many examples of dissimilarity coupled with the fact that the historical testimony does not strongly support the Pauline authorship allow us to say that it is probable that Paul did not write Hebrews. New Testament scholarship has been reluctant to distance completely the epistle to the Hebrews from Pauline influence, yet on the other hand it has been reluctant to identify the epistle as Paul's. It would seem that the best solution to the evidence of the epistle itself would be to deny Pauline authorship, but to acknowledge that it is likely that the writer was considerably influenced by Paul and/or associated with the Pauline circle. It is interesting to note that of the names suggested for authorship by the early Church Fathers, they all possessed the distinction of having at one time or another been a part of the Pauline circle.

D. Guthrie summarizes the state of affairs with reference to Pauline authorship when he pointed out that

it should be noted that differences from Paul do not amount to disagreements with Paul. . .Nor must it be

supposed that these doctrinal differences necessarily exclude Pauline authorship. Yet, if they do not require its rejection, it must be admitted that they appear to suggest it (1970:690).

1.2.3 The argument for Barnabas

The second suggested author which has found the support of scholars ancient and modern is Barnabas. Tertullian presents this hypothesis in his On Modesty, and he writes in such a fashion as to imply that he has no doubts about it.

For there is extant withal an Epistle to the Hebrews under the name of Barnabas--a man sufficiently accredited by God, as being one whom Paul has stationed next to himself in the uninterrupted observance of abstinence: Or else, I alone and Barnabas, have not we the power of working? And, of course, the Epistle of Barnabas is more generally received among the Churches than that apocryphal Shepherd of adulterers (The Ante-Nicene Fathers, 1979:97).

Additional support for Barnabas is found in the fourth century Tractatus Origenis by Gregory of Elvira who writes 'The most holy Barnabas says, Through him we offer to God the sacrifice of lips that acknowledge his name' (Hughes 1977:25). This is an allusion to Hebrews 13:15 and thus Gregory is attributing Hebrews to Barnabas. The fourth century bishop of Brescia in northern Italy, Filaster, also mentions Hebrews as having been written by Barnabas (De Haeresibus 89). Jerome (ca. 345-ca. 419) pointed out that Hebrews was received as Paul's, yet many considered it to be the work of either Barnabas, Luke or Clement (De Viris Illustribus 5).

While certainly not conclusive, there is Patristic evidence to suggest Barnabas as the author. This evidence is definitely identified with the Western (Latin) tradition, and we have already seen that it was in the West that the Pauline authorship met with its strongest denial.

Other evidence to support Barnabas adduced by scholars includes the following. (1) He was a Levite of Cyprus (Acts 4:36) and hence his interest in the Old Testament ritual and sacrificial system (as is found in Hebrews) would be natural. (2) Barnabas was a member of the Pauline circle and would probably have contact with Timothy since Timothy came from the area evangelized by both Barnabas and Paul (cf. Acts 16:1). (3) The Hellenistic outlook reflected in Hebrews is considered by some to suggest Barnabas as the author. When the Antiochene Hellenists are evangelized, it is Barnabas who is sent by the church at Jerusalem to coordinate this new thrust of the gospel (Acts 11:19-26). (4) Barnabas is called the 'son of exhortation' (Acts 4:36) and the epistle to the Hebrews is called by its author a 'word of exhortation' (Hebrews 13:22). (5) The Pauline flavor of the epistle could be accounted for on the supposition that Barnabas, as a traveling companion with Paul on his first missionary journey, would likely share the same outlook and conceptual framework as Paul.

Some scholars have adopted the suggestion of Barnabas, noting that since he was a Levite of Cyprus and of high

visibility in the early church, particularly at Jerusalem, he could have written a work of such nature as Hebrews.⁸ The major weakness of this suggestion is that we have no extant writings of Barnabas to compare with Hebrews since the so called Epistle of Barnabas is considered spurious. Of course, this does not mean that it is impossible that Barnabas wrote it, merely that we have no way to do any comparative studies.

Another argument against Barnabas may be the way in which the author of Hebrews has treated Levi and the tithe in Hebrews 7. The historical debates that existed in the first century between the priests and the Levites on this subject cannot be dealt with here (Horbury 1983), but it is clear that a Levite would hardly have treated the subject in so priestly a fashion as appears to be the case with Hebrews.

1.2.4 The argument for Apollos

The third suggestion which is perhaps the most popular in modern New Testament studies is that Apollos wrote Hebrews.⁹ Luther is the first to make this suggestion and it is therefore important to notice that none of the Church Fathers opted for Apollos, not even the Alexandrian school which claimed Apollos as its prime leader. I find it strange that his name would not be suggested as a possible author if the Fathers had any reason to think that he could

have written Hebrews. The fact that he is not mentioned in connection with Hebrews weakens the suggestion.

Those who argue for Apollos do so on the basis of his description given by Luke in the Acts and by Paul in the letter of First Corinthians. He was apparently a great orator and 'mighty in the scriptures' (Acts 18:24), two characteristics which appear to be true of the author of Hebrews. He was a member of the Pauline circle, thus accounting for the Pauline influences.

Apollos' connection with Alexandria would seem to explain the so-called Alexandrian coloring of the book. However, this point has been increasingly called into question by scholars. R. Williamson has brought the most serious challenge against the alleged Platonism of the author of Hebrews, as well as the so called influence of Philo, in his Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews (1970). He has shown that the Old Testament Levitical cultus and typological milieu furnishes a better explanation for the background of the thought of the author rather than any supposed Alexandrian influence. He further catalogues a host of differences between Alexandrian thought and the epistle. Consequently, what was once considered a strong argument in favor of Apollos has been severely weakened.

Two major reasons seem to militate against Apollos as having been the author. First, the lack of any support from early church tradition, and second, the fact that there are

no extant works of Apollos to which we may compare Hebrews.

Of course, many others have been suggested as possible authors, but space prohibits discussion of each individual theory. For the interested reader, the bibliography contains references for further detailed reading.

1.3 Recipients of Hebrews

With regard to the recipients of the letter, the traditional view regarded the readers as Jewish Christians who were in danger of relapsing into Judaism. The argument of the epistle supports such an interpretation in that the writer attempts to show how the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ fulfills the Old Testament, and from this exhorts the readers to hold fast their profession and to 'go on' to maturity. A slightly modified version of this traditional view was suggested by William Manson (1951). He argued that the readers of Hebrews were not in danger of abandoning Christianity for Judaism, but rather were attempting to remain as Christians under the cover of the Jewish religion. They were living too much in the Jewish part of their Christianity, and so missing the true horizon of their calling in Christ (1951:24).

As early as 1836, however, it was suggested that the addressees of Hebrews were not drifting back toward Judaism, but were pulled more in the direction of paganism. Moffatt followed this line of reasoning in the International

Critical Commentary series and suggested that the epistle was directed to Gentile readers rather than Jewish Christians (1924:xv-lv). However, this theory of a Gentile readership has not found favor with many scholars. There are too many overt references and covert allusions to Judaism in the epistle to make a Gentile audience likely (See Bruce 1964:xxv-xxvii). The vast majority of New Testament scholars have opted for a Jewish/Jewish-Christian audience.

1.3.1 Jerusalem

If the recipients were Jewish Christians, where were they located? Again, numerous suggestions have been made, and again, three seem to come to the fore: Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Rome. Traditionally scholars have supported a Jerusalem destination as best fitting the facts. Reasons for this are obvious in the epistle itself since the priesthood and the references to Jewish worship and history are replete throughout. Objections to this theory include the epistle's use of the Greek language and the use of the Septuagint as being unlikely in the event of a Palestinian destination. However, the Greek language was known and used all over the Roman world during the first century and the Septuagint was also used by Jesus, Paul and the early church even in Palestine.

1.3.2 Alexandria

Alexandria was noted as a possible location of the recipients of Hebrews for four reasons. First, the Muratorian Canon (A. D. 170-210) omits any reference to Hebrews but does include an Epistolos ad Alexandrinus. This has led some to suppose that the two were one and the same letter. Second, Alexandria is known to have had one of the largest resident Jewish populations in the world in the first century. Third, the temple at Leontopolis in Egypt is considered by many to be the one in the mind of the writer of Hebrews rather than the temple in Jerusalem. Finally, the supposed Alexandrian character of the argument of Hebrews coupled with the supposed affinity to the thought of Philo suggests Alexandria as a likely destination. However, the supposed Alexandrian destination of Hebrews has been weakened in recent years, and has not found wide acceptance among scholars. First, it is only an assumption, that the Epistolos ad Alexandrinus is to be identified with Hebrews. There is no extant evidence to make such a claim. Second, the extent of an Alexandrian influence in Hebrews cannot be determined with any certainty. Some have been prone to overemphasize Alexandrian influences due to a desire to locate the recipients in Alexandria or to identify the author with the Alexandrian church. Third, the suggestion that Hebrews refers to the temple at Leontopolis has been shown by many to be untenable (Milligan 1978:44).

Finally, the Alexandrian tradition consistently suggested a Palestinian provenance. If those in Alexandria considered it possible that Hebrews might have been addressed to readers there, might we not expect some reference to it, even as a possibility?

1.3.3 Rome

The theory that seems to have gained the most support from scholars in this century is the Roman destination (See, for example, Manson 1951, and Robinson, 1976:200-220). This is the most widely held view among scholars of the twentieth century, though there are a variety of options within the view itself. For example, some contend that Hebrews was written to the entire church at Rome while others argue that it was directed to a particular group within the Roman church. In this latter group are those who see Hebrews as written for Gentiles in the Roman church, those who see it as written for the Jewish segment of the church, and those who suggest that it was directed to a house church at Rome.

Among the arguments presented in favor of a Roman destination are first, the statement made in Hebrews 13:24 'they of Italy. . .' and secondly, the fact that Clement of Rome quotes the epistle in his letter to the Corinthians around A. D. 96. With reference to Hebrews 13:24 it should be noted that this phrase could mean either those who are away from Italy send greetings to you who are in Italy, or

it could mean those who are in Italy send greetings to you (who are away from Italy). More will be said on this question later. The fact that Clement of Rome makes use of the epistle does not establish a Roman destination. It merely shows that 96 a. d. is the terminus ad quem for Hebrews.

1.4 Date

With respect to the date of writing for Hebrews, again numerous theories have been forthcoming. For convenience sake, we may say that there are primarily two theories on this subject (Robinson 1976:200-220). The first suggests that Hebrews is to be dated before A. D. 70. and the second posits a post-70 dating usually ca. A. D. 85-90. Since I will deal with the dating question in conjunction with the presentation of an overall theory of authorship, suffice it to say now that the pre-A. D. 70 date for Hebrews seems preferable in light of the internal witness of the book itself.

1.5 Purpose

Determining the purpose which the writer had in mind when he wrote Hebrews is a most difficult task. Since there is very little agreement on the circumstances of the epistle itself, we must confine ourselves to the text in order to attempt to discern the author's purpose.

In keeping with the hortatory genre of the epistle, we will probably come closest to the truth of the matter if we study carefully the hortatory sections in an attempt to gain insight into the author's purpose. The following verses contain pertinent imperatives and hortatory subjunctives: 2:3; 3:12; 4:1,11,14; 5:12; 6:1; 10:22-24,36; and 12:1,12,13. These verses alternately warn and encourage the readers to hold fast their confession, to go on to maturity, to persevere in the face of adversity, etc. It would seem then that the most likely purpose of the epistle would be to encourage the readers to strive to attain spiritual maturity. In order to do this, they are encouraged to persevere in whatever difficult circumstances they were facing. Furthermore, the hint that the readers were considering relapsing into a former faith (Judaism) or were at least failing to carry their Christian faith beyond the realms of Judaism which we seem to see in the epistle is strengthened by a study of the hortatory passages. The primary purpose of Hebrews is to exhort the readers to go on to spiritual maturity. Aside from the fact that the internal textual evidence supports such a macrostructure for Hebrews, my theory as to the recipients of the letter harmonizes well with such a purpose (see chapter five below).

1.6 Abstract of a new theory

Before I suggest and argue for my theory of the authorship and background of Hebrews, I believe there are three things which must be kept in mind throughout the discussion. First, any theory which pretends to be able to answer all of the questions, and neatly categorize all of the data so that everything fits snugly into place is suspect immediately. As in the realm of scientific investigation, a new hypothesis need not be able to answer all of the questions in order to be considered a good theory. A good theory is one which accounts for most of the available data, but like the periodic chart of the elements, not everything fits neatly into the system, nor does it have to.

Second, although each major element in the theory such as date, recipients, etc. contributes to the overall strength of the argument, it should be noted that the theory of authorship is not contingent on these factors. My major proposal and the bulk of this study is given to an argument for the Lukan authorship of Hebrews. My suggestion regarding authorship may be correct while my theory on the recipients may be incorrect. In other words, the theory is not such that if one element breaks down, then the rest is ipso facto proven wrong.

Third, in light of the facts that (1) the text itself does not name the author, (2) the historical testimony

regarding authorship and background is not conclusive in and of itself, and (3) that the internal evidence of the epistle does not provide enough information to determine authorship apart from a comparison with other writings, therefore, the most fruitful efforts at reconstruction of authorship will be those theories which provide other textual data with which to compare Hebrews in terms of lexical choice, style, and conceptual framework. This is a weakness in the suggestions of both Barnabas and Apollos in that as far as we know, there are no extant texts written by these men to compare with Hebrews. Of course this does not mean that they could not have written it. Both James and Jude wrote only one book each in the New Testament. It merely means that as far as we are concerned, there is no way of making any comparative study.

With these things in mind, the following is an abstract of a theory of authorship which shall be argued in the remainder of this study. The author of Hebrews is none other than Luke, the beloved physician who traveled with the apostle Paul and who wrote the two-volume treatise Luke-Acts. (Luke's intended reader of his two-volume Luke-Acts was Theophilus, a former Jewish high priest. The recipients of Hebrews were the many former Jewish priests who had been converted to Christianity during the early days of the church at Jerusalem before the Stephanic persecution broke out (Acts 6:7). As a result of this persecution, they fled

to Antioch in Syria, where they lived in relative safety and were a part of the Antiochene church. Since both scripture and tradition link Luke with the church at Antioch, he probably had contact with this group of former priests on numerous occasions. The gospel of Luke is to be dated A.D. 61, Acts in A.D. 63 and Hebrews in ca. A.D. 66-69, probably in A.D. 67. Hebrews was written from Rome while Luke was shortly after the death of Paul.

Four lines of evidence will be adduced to support this thesis. First, the linguistic argument will evaluate lexical, stylistic, and textlinguistic similarities between the works of Luke and Hebrews. Second, the theological argument will assess the conceptual framework which undergirds the three works and point out areas of similarity over against the other New Testament writers. Third, evidence from the Jewish background of Luke-Acts will be adduced to suggest that Luke was himself Jewish and capable of writing a work such as Hebrews. Finally, I will seek to reconstruct historically the circumstances surrounding the writing of Hebrews presenting my theory of authorship, recipients, location of recipients, date, and other relevant background material.

In one sense, my proposal of Lukan authorship for Hebrews is not totally new. I have shown that early in church history, Origen mentioned that some had advocated the possibility of Lukan authorship, but beyond this brief

statement, no evidence was ever presented. A few scholars have held to the possibility of a dual authorship with Paul as the guiding mind of the epistle but Luke as the penman. Only a very few scholars have ever posited the possibility of independent Lukan authorship (e.g. Calvin, Grotius) and then they have marshalled only limited argumentation for such a theory.

In my estimation, the primary reason why Luke has not been considered seriously as the author of Hebrews is that he is generally considered to be of Greek origin while the author of Hebrews is apparently a Jew. The prevailing paradigm in New Testament studies is that Luke was a Gentile, as can be seen clearly by any cursory reading of commentaries on Luke-Acts. But what if this paradigm is faulty? What of the possibility that Luke may have been a Hellenistic Jew whose writings exhibit characteristics both Jewish and Greek?

Long ago, Aristotle described Rhetoric as an art that is both field specific and 'universal' in that it is not limited to any single discipline but applicable to all. The neo-Aristotelian scholar R. McKeon (1971) has stated that the essence of the rhetorical process is that it is an art characterized by an architectonic productive nature. By this McKeon means that rhetoric should and does function productively in the resolution of new problems and in the structuring of new communities of thought (Ibid.:45).

The value of Rhetoric as an architectonic productive art is further enhanced in that it is also epistemic in nature. This claim was made by Robert Scott in an important article in 1967 entitled 'On Viewing Rhetoric as Epistemic.' By 'epistemic' he meant that rhetoric is a way of knowing; or, as Croasmun and Cherwitz put it, it is a 'part of the process which strives toward testing and validating knowledge claims in a critical manner' (1982:14).

One of the fundamental tenets of Rhetoric is the notion that interpretative communities get locked into viewing the world from a particular grid with the result that often new ways of looking at things are dismissed or simply not even thought of. How true is the axiom that a way of seeing is also a way of not seeing. The practice of 'picking up the stick from the other end' often results in new solutions to old problems, i.e. the construction of a new paradigm, to put it in Kuhn's terms (1970). My theory on the authorship of Hebrews is the result of 'picking up the stick from the other end.' If Luke is Jewish (as some scholars are now willing to concede) then the possibility of his having written Hebrews, when supported by other corroborating factors, becomes more plausible. It is this attempt to approach the problem of the Lukan authorship of Hebrews and of the background of Luke himself from a somewhat different perspective that I hope will serve to elicit new insights and possibly lead to a new understanding of the problem.

The uniqueness (and I hope the value) of my theory is that I will present detailed argumentation supporting independent Lukan authorship of Hebrews as well as a proposal regarding the provenance, recipients, date and circumstances surrounding its writing. The result is a holistic theory undergirded by linguistic, theological, and historical evidence which provides a viable explanatory paradigm for Hebrews.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

¹Robert Longacre (1983:39) defines hortatory discourse as an attempt to convince or persuade hearers/readers to a certain course of action or to dissuade them from a course of conduct in which they have either already engaged in or are about to engage in. This is an accurate description of what takes place in Hebrews. See also Neeley, 1987:1-146, who has shown through discourse analysis that Hebrews is primarily hortatory discourse with embedded sections of expository discourse.

²The reader should consult the bibliography for scholars listed in this chart. See the excellent article by F. F. Bruce 1969:260-264, and for additional information on pertinent contributions to the understanding of Hebrews see George W. Buchanan 1975:299-330.

³For a complete discussion of these traditions see the excellent article by T. Rees 1939:1355-ff., and Alexander Nairne 1917:xix-ff.

⁴Clement of Alexandria, quoted by Eusebius, from Clement's Hypotyposes, in Ecclesiastical History, VI. 14.

⁵Origen, quoted by Eusebius, Ibid. VI. 25.

⁶Tertullian, De Pudicitia 20.

⁷Many scholars believe the phrase here refers not to the written scriptures, but to Christ as the Logos of God. If that is the meaning, then the phrase word of God in Hebrews 4:12 would not be truly equivalent with Ephesians 6:17 since the latter definitely refers to the written scriptures.

⁸Cf. Salmon, 1888:446-48; See also E. C. Wickham 1910; E. Riggenbach 1913; and K. Bornhauser 1932.

⁹See T. W. Manson 1949:1-17; also, C. Spicq 1958-9:365-90; and Montefiore 1964:9-28.

CHAPTER TWO

LINGUISTIC ARGUMENTS

2.1 Lexical similarity

When I first began a serious study of the letter to the Hebrews, I was immediately struck by the large number of Greek words unique to it and the Lukan writings. Of course lexical similarity is not the sine qua non of authorship, and must be considered in proper perspective, but after due allowance has been made, the number of words peculiar to the Lukan writings and Hebrews in the New Testament is significant. Bishop Westcott in his commentary on Hebrews (1955:xlvi) pointed out that 'no impartial student can fail to be struck by the frequent use [in Hebrews] of words characteristic of St. Luke among writers of the New Testament.' C. P. M Jones examined the lexical similarity between Luke-Acts and Hebrews and with balanced judgement noted the following:

Luke-Acts and Hebrews are both writings of considerable length, in which there would be plenty of scope for casual overlapping, as may well be the case with many words. . .which are used in different senses and contexts in the two writings; some words only occur in quotations from the Septuagint, and many of the words are compound verbs whose coining seems to be a common feature among later New Testament writers. Moreover, one can compile lists of words peculiar to Hebrews and the pastoral epistles, to Hebrews and I Peter and James, even to Hebrews and St. Paul, as well as those peculiar to Luke-Acts and the later non-Pauline epistles in general, which should be taken into account. But when all deductions have been made, the verbal correspondences are so numerous [between Luke-Acts and Hebrews] that a substantial area of common phraseology remains. . .which may well be indicative of a closer kinship in the

presence of other corroborating factors (1955:117-18).

Frederick Gardiner suggested in 1887 that there were 34 words unique to the writings of Luke and Hebrews (1887:1-37). Hawkins in his *Horae Synopticae* cited 38 words unique to Luke-Acts and Hebrews (1909:192). Plummer charted 40 words peculiar to Luke-Acts and Hebrews (1922:lix). However, there are actually no less than 51 words found in Hebrews which occur nowhere else but in the Lukan writings.

This number of lexical items common to Luke-Acts and Hebrews was determined by working through Moulton and Geden's Concordance to the Greek Testament (1899). I also worked through the lexical word lists in Morgenthalar's Statistik Des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes (1958). Table 2.1 below catalogues the lexical items unique to the Lukan writings and Hebrews. Each Greek word is listed, followed by its English translation and its location in the scripture. An 'H' stands for Hebrews while 'L' and 'A' represent Luke and Acts respectively.

To my knowledge, this is the largest number of shared vocabulary between the Lukan writings and Hebrews 'to be catalogued. Compare these findings with the number of words peculiar to Luke and Acts in the New Testament. This total, exclusive of proper names, is 58 (Hawkins 1909:175). In other words, Luke and Acts share 58 words which occur nowhere else in the New Testament, and this number is only a few more than the 51 words shared by the Lukan writings and

Hebrews. This fact coupled with the considerably shorter

Table 2.1--Vocabulary unique to the writings of Luke and Hebrews in the New Testament

GREEK WORD	ENGLISH TRANSLATION	SCRIPTURE REFERENCE
μετοχος	'partakers'	H. 1:9; 3:1,14; 6:4; 12:8; L. 5:7
παλαιω	'to become old'	H. 1:11; 8:13; L. 12:33
εκλειπω	'to cease, fail'	H. 1:12; L. 16:9; 22:32; 23:45
αρχηγος	'author'	H. 2:10; 12:2; A. 3:15; 5:31
απαλλησω	'to release'	H. 2:15; L. 12:58; A. 19:12
ιλασκομαι	'to propitiate'	H. 2:17; L. 18:13
καταπαυω	'to cease'	H. 4:4,8,10; A. 14:18
βοηθεια	'help'	H. 4:16; A. 27:17
ευθετος	'fit'	H. 6:7; L. 9:62; 14:35
καταφευγω	'to flee'	H. 6:18; A. 14:6
αγκυρα	'anchor'	H. 6:19; A.27:29, 30,40
εσωτερος	'inner'	H. 6:19; A. 16:24
συναντω	'to meet'	H. 7:1,10; L. 9:18, 37,22:10; A.10:25; 20:22
πατριαρχης	'patriarch'	H. 7:4; A. 2:29; 7:8,9
ιερατεια	'office of priesthood'	H. 7:5; L. 1:9

Table 2.1--Continued.

τελειωσις	'perfection'	H. 7:11; L. 1:45
παντewη	'complete, perfect'	H. 7:25; L. 13:11
κεφαλαιον	'main thing'	H. 8:1; A. 22:28
πολιτη	'citizen'	H. 8:11; L. 15:15; 19:14; A. 21:39
εισειμι	'go into'	H. 9:6; A. 3:3; 21:18, 26
λυτρωσις	'redemption'	H. 9:12; L. 1:68; 2:38
σχεδον	'almost'	H. 9:22; A. 13:44; 19: 26
ανωτερον	'above, higher'	H. 10:8; L. 14:10
παροξυσμος	'provoke'	H. 10:24; A. 15:39
υπαρξις	'possession'	H. 10:34; A. 2:45
παροικειω	'sojourn'	H. 11:9; L. 24:18
αστρον	'star'	H. 11:12; L. 21:25; A. 7:43; 27:20
πορρωθεν	'afar off'	H. 11:13; L. 17:12
αναδεχομαι	'to receive'	H. 11:17; A. 28:7
διαβαινω	'pass through'	H. 11:29; L. 16:26; A. 16:9.
ερυθρος	'red'	H. 11:29; A. 7:36
Αιγυπτοι	'Egypt'	H. 11:29; A. 7:22,24, 28; 21:38
παραλυομαι	'to be disabled'	H.12:12; L. 5:18,24; A. 8:7; 9:33
ανορθω	'to restore'	H. 12:12; L. 13:13; A. 15:16
'ορθος	'upright, straight'	H. 12:13; A. 14:10
φυω	'grow'	H. 12:15; L. 8:6,8

Table 2.1--Continued.

ενοχλεω	'trouble, annoy'	H. 12:15; L. 16:18
ηχος	'report, sound'	H. 12:19; L. 4:37; 21:25; A. 2:2
εντρομος	'trembling'	H. 12:21; A. 7:32; 16:29
απογραφομαι	'to enroll'	H. 12:23; L. 2:1,3,5
ασαλευτος	'unmoved'	H. 12:28; A. 27:41
αναθεωρεω	'to examine'	H. 13:7; A. 17:23
αιτιος	'cause'	H. 5:9; L. 23:4,14, 22; A. 19:40
διατιθεμαι	'make a covenant'	H. 8:10; 9:16,17; 10: 16; L. 22:29; A. 3:25
επιστελλω	'to write'	H. 13:22; A. 15:20; 21:25
Ιταλια	'Italy'	H. 13:24; A. 18:2; 27:1,6
καιτοι	'and yet'	H. 4:3; A. 14:17
καταπαυσις	'rest'	H. 3:11,18; 4:1,3,5, 10,11; A. 7:49
Σαμουηλ	'Samuel'	H. 11:32; A. 3:24; 13:20
αστειος	'well-pleasing'	H. 11:23; A. 7:20
Ααρων	'Aaron'	H. 5:4; 7:11; 9:4; L. 1:5; A. 7:40

length of Hebrews when compared to either Luke or Acts is remarkable and furnishes evidence to make a positive comparison between them in terms of authorship.

2.1.1 The Relationship between Luke-Acts, Paul, and Hebrews

In order to give a balanced lexical comparison, it should be noticed that there are 46 words which are unique to the Pauline epistles and Hebrews (Hawkins 1909:192). Those who have supported Pauline authorship have appealed to this lexical similarity as evidence for their case. One may ask at this point if this evidence weakens the argument for Lukan authorship. I do not believe that such is the case for the following reasons. First, in matters relative to theological outlook, there is a recognized dissimilarity between Paul and Hebrews in many areas. I do not consider this to be an impassable argument against Pauline authorship for the simple reason that an author can vary his theological vocabulary in addressing different themes and readerships. Such may have been the case with Paul if he wrote Hebrews. However, I do hope to show that Hebrews is much closer to Luke-Acts in theological outlook than Paul, a fact which has been noticed by numerous scholars both ancient and modern.

Second, the most forceful argument against the Pauline authorship theory (according to most scholars) is the stylistic dissimilarity between Hebrews and the Pauline corpus. Furthermore, I intend to demonstrate in my section on stylistic similarity that Hebrews is much closer to Luke-Acts stylistically than to the Pauline corpus, again a

fact which has been noticed by scholars both ancient and modern. Third, it has been known for some time now that there is a high lexical correlation between Luke, Paul and Hebrews in the New Testament. Both Gardiner and Plummer presented evidence to substantiate this fact (Gardiner 1887:1-27; Plummer 1922:lviii). There are 32 words unique to Luke, Paul, and Hebrews in addition to the 51 words unique to the Lukan corpus and Hebrews.

What are we to make of this evidence? We can safely say on the basis of stylistic and theological dissimilarity that it is unlikely that Paul wrote Hebrews. Yet it can also be safely assumed on the basis of the evidence that the writer was probably close to the Pauline circle. Since Luke was a close associate and traveling companion of Paul for many years, we could explain the lexical similarity between Luke, Paul, and Hebrews in this way. With such a relationship, it would not be at all unexpected; in fact we would be surprised if such were not the case, that their choice of vocabulary should overlap. How can two men share in the same experiences of travel, imprisonment, difficulties, and triumphs over a period of years without their being some affinity in vocabulary.

Therefore, in light of Luke's close association with Paul, especially during the latter years of his life; in light of the many lexical similarities between Luke and Paul which can probably be accounted for on this basis; and in

light of the fact that the Pauline epistles stand apart from Hebrews both theologically and stylistically, while Luke-Acts can be shown to be very similar in these respects, it does not seem unwarranted to suggest that Luke is more likely to be the author of Hebrews than Paul.¹

Hebrews contains 169 hapax legomena and 168 other words not found in Luke or Acts. It is interesting that in Hebrews and Luke's writings are found the highest ratio of hapax legomena to total vocabulary in the entire New Testament. Both are noted for their rich vocabulary. There are a total of 4942 words in Hebrews, with a total vocabulary of 1038, distributed as follows (Morganthalar 1958:162-64 and de Young 1973:10-12):

354 nouns	- 34.1% of vocabulary
361 verbs	- 34.8%
36 names	- 3.5%
133 adjectives	- 12.8%
66 adverbs	- 6.4%
88 other	- 8.4%

There are a total of 337 words found in Hebrews but not in Luke or Acts. 16.2% of the vocabulary of Hebrews consists of hapax legomena, while another 16.2% of the vocabulary does not occur in the Lukan writings. Thus two-thirds of the total vocabulary of Hebrews or 67.6% does occur in the Lukan writings. This figure represents a significant level of recurrence and supports the theory of Lukan authorship.

2.1.2 Luke-Acts, Hebrews and the Apocryphal books

Other interesting lexical data are derived from a comparison of the vocabulary of Luke, Acts, and Hebrews with that of some of the Apocryphal books, specifically the Maccabean writings. The following statistics were compiled by Clarke.

37%	of	vocabulary	in	2	Maccabees	recurs	in	Acts
35%	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Luke
30%	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Matthew
22%	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Hebrews
44%	of	vocabulary	in	3	Maccabees	recurs	in	Acts
43%	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Luke
34%	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Matthew
28%	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Hebrews
2	words	occur	only	in	2	and	3	Maccabees
0	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	and
9	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Matthew
27	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	and
								Mark
								Luke
								Acts

His conclusions are illuminating.

When allowance has been made on the one hand for the smaller extent of Hebrews, and on the other for the number of common words which must inevitably be found in every book, the degree of affinity evinced by Lk.-Acts and Hebrews towards 2 and 3 Maccabees seems substantially the same. . . These figures suggest that Luke may have read 2 and 3 Maccabees before writing Acts. . . It was no doubt known to the author of Hebrews who belonged to the same literary circles as Luke (Clarke, repr. 1979:74,75).

Ancient evidence seems to point to Antioch as the center of religious interest in the Maccabees (Burch 1936:130). We know from both scripture and tradition that Luke was associated with the church in Antioch (see chapter five). If the recipients of Hebrews were located in Antioch as I shall argue (chapter five), and if they were former

Jewish priests who would probably have some interest in the Maccabean writings, then this correlation of shared vocabulary between Luke-Acts and Hebrews can be seen as further evidence for a theory of Lukan authorship.

2.1.3 Other lexical similarities

In his article to which I have already referred, Gardiner concludes from his lexical comparison that the epistle to the Hebrews is linguistically most comparable with the writings of Luke and Paul. I will couple some of his findings to those of other sources and to some of my own to illustrate further the similarity between the Lukan corpus and Hebrews.²

The Greek word for 'star' has two forms in the New Testament, *αστρον* or *αστηρ*, and both are common in the LXX. However, the form *αστρον* is used exclusively by Luke and Hebrews, while *αστηρ* is used by all the other New Testament writers (3 times in Paul, 21 times elsewhere). This is a fact of particular interest to the question of authorship.

The verb *ερχομαι* 'to come,' more common in narrative discourse, along with its many compound forms, is found frequently in Luke's writings and in Hebrews, but relatively infrequently in Paul. This is all the more important to notice in that Luke-Acts are clearly narrative discourse, but Hebrews is not. Both Luke and Hebrews share a similarly proportionate use of *αλλος* 'another' as well.

The occurrences of the first person singular verbal endings and the personal pronoun *εγω* 'I' is markedly limited in both the Lukan corpus and Hebrews, reflecting a shared reluctance to personalize the message. On the contrary, Paul is quite fond of the first person singular personal pronoun. The proportionate use of the third person personal pronoun *αυτος*, the demonstrative pronoun *εκεινος*, and the reflexive pronoun *εαυτου* in Hebrews and Luke is about the same, while Paul and the other New Testament writers use them much less frequently.

Adverbs of space, such as *εκει*, *οπου*, *ου που*, and *ωδε* are proportionately about the same in both Luke and Hebrews, while they are very infrequently used by Paul. The adverb *ωσει*, and the conjunction *ωστε* are used in about the same proportion in both Luke and Hebrews. Both are much more rare in Paul and in the rest of the New Testament.

The lexical group *αγαπαω* 'to love,' *αγαπη*, and *αγαπητος* is very common in Paul's writings, but rare in both the Lukan corpus and Hebrews. The lexical group *αληθεια*, *αληθης*, and its cognates are less frequent in Luke and Hebrews than the rest of the New Testament, the proportions in their writings being about the same.

Of significant interest is the usage of the lexical item *ιερευς*, 'temple'. The noun occurs 14 times in Hebrews, 9 times in the Lukan corpus, not at all in Paul, and 9 times in the rest of the New Testament. The figures for

ἀρχιερεὺς, 'high priest', are equally interesting. It occurs 17 times in Hebrews, 37 times in Luke, and not once in Paul. Of course the subject matter of Hebrews requires these lexical items be used considerably. Yet the comparison is not without weight in that it will be shown below that the priests, the high priests, and the temple are accorded great importance in Luke's writings, and Hebrews presents the greatest exposition of the high-priesthood of Christ to be found in the New Testament. My point here is to show that compared to the other gospel writers and even the rest of the New Testament, Luke and Hebrews share a common interest in the priesthood evinced by the lexical counts.

Hebrews uses the term σκηνή, 'tabernacle,' 10 times; it occurs 5 times in Luke, never in Paul, and only 5 times in the rest of the New Testament.

Another very interesting lexical similarity is found in Luke 2:26 and Hebrews 11:5 where we find the exact phrase, 'shall not see death'. The only other place in the New Testament where this phrase occurs is in John 8:51, where John employs a different Greek word for 'see' and a stronger form of the negative.

In addition to these examples, the following are words and expressions which occur only rarely outside the writings of Luke and Hebrews in the New Testament.

exultation	to perceive, consider
departure (exodus)	to be made a partaker
calf (bullock)	to mark out, appoint
to take away	to go about, to wander
to harden	a standing, state
architect (craftsman)	to let down
laying on of hands	to be worthy

Other lexical links between the three books include the use of *οικουμενη*, 'inhabited world', and *πολις*, 'city'.

'Inhabited world' occurs once in Matthew, once in Paul, 3 times in Revelation, 3 times in Luke, 5 times in Acts, and twice in Hebrews. The words *μετανοια*, 'repentance,' and *αφεσις*, 'forgiveness', occur rarely outside the writings of Luke and Hebrews. 'Repentance' occurs once in Mark, twice in Matthew, 4 times in Paul, and once in 2 Peter. It is used 5 times in Luke, 6 times in Acts, and 3 times in Hebrews. 'Forgiveness' is used twice in Mark, once in Matthew, twice in Paul, but 5 times in Luke, 5 times in Acts, and twice in Hebrews (Cf. Jones 1955:119-20 and see my discussion on forgiveness in the jubiliary theology of Luke below).

The verb for 'cleansing' is used 6 times in Matthew, 4 times in Mark, 3 times in Paul, once in James, and twice in I John. it occurs 7 times in Luke, 3 in Acts, and 4 times in Hebrews. Interestingly, it is used of the cleansing of the heart and conscience only in Acts 15:9 and Hebrews 9:14 and 10:2.

The word *ηγουμενοι* 'leaders' or 'chief leaders,' occurs ten times in the New Testament: once in Matthew, once in

Paul, and once in II Peter, but four times in Luke-Acts and three times in Hebrews. Only in Acts and Hebrews is the word used to refer to the leaders or chief men of the church.

There is a similar phrase found in Luke 10:20 and Hebrews 12:23 which consists of a compounded form of the verb *γραφω*, 'to write,' and *ουρανοις*, 'in heaven.' In the Lukan passage, Jesus tells the disciples to rejoice that 'their names are written in heaven,' while in the Hebrews passage the reference is to the church of the firstborn which is 'written' or 'enrolled in heaven.' A similar concept is found in both the Pauline and Johannine writings with the idea of the names of believers being in 'the book of life.' But it is to be noticed that the precise phrase 'written in heaven' occurs only in Luke and Hebrews.

A comparison of Luke 16:2 with Hebrews 13:17 reveals another parallel occurring nowhere else in the New Testament. In the parable of the unjust steward in Luke 16, the owner commands the steward to 'give an account,' *αποδος τον λογον*. In Hebrews 13:17 the readers are exhorted to obey their leaders since they (the leaders) must one day *λογον αποδωσουντες*, 'give an account.'

In the next few pages, I list further examples of lexical similarity which may be used to aid in authorship identification. Since these examples have varying evidential weight for my theory, I will divide them in two

groups. Division one consists of examples which carry stronger weight because they illustrate lexical similarity in Luke-Acts and Hebrews in contrast to the rest of the New Testament. Division two consists of examples which carry lesser weight because they illustrate lexical similarity prominent for the most part in Luke-Acts and Hebrews, but which may also occur somewhere else in the New Testament.

Division One

αρχηγος 'captain' as a Christological title is found only in Heb. 2:10, 12:22, Acts 3:15, 5:31.

ιλασκεσθαι 'to make propitiation' (Heb. 2:17) has its only New Testament parallel in Luke 18:13.

πειρασθεις 'suffering' (Heb. 2:18) is used to describe the suffering of Christ as in Luke 22:28.

ευλαβεια, 'piety' *ευλαβεισθαι* (Heb. 5:7), and *ευλαβης* reflects the characteristic Lukan usage of these words. This cognate group occurs only in Luke-Acts and Hebrews in the New Testament.

The use of *σχεδον* 'almost' with *πας* 'all' occurs only in Heb. 9:22, Acts 13:34, 19:26. This adverb occurs nowhere else in the New Testament.

The use of *παν* 'all' with the phrase *εξ ενος* 'from one' occurs only in Acts 17:26 and Hebrews 2:11. The phrase 'from one' occurs only 5 times in the New Testament.

The phrase *εις τον καιρον* occurs only in Luke 1:20 and Hebrews 9:9.

The phrase *ουτοι παντες* 'these all' occurs twice in Acts and twice in Hebrews, but nowhere else in the New Testament.

The adverb *ετι* 'still, yet' occurs 93 times in the New Testament, but only three times with the infinitive (twice in Luke and once in Hebrews). Furthermore, the adverb *ετι* followed by the conjunction *δε* occurs 3 times in Luke, once in Acts and twice in Hebrews, but nowhere else in the New Testament.

The noun *δακρυον* 'tears' occurs 10 times in the New Testament (twice in Luke, twice in Acts, twice in Paul, twice in John, and twice in Hebrews). The genitive *δακρυων* preceded by the preposition *μετα*, 'with tears,' occurs only in Acts 20:19 and 31 and Hebrews 5:7 and 12:17. The conjunction *και* 'and' preceding the genitive *φακθυων* occurs only in Acts 20:19 and Hebrews 5:7.

Acts 15:33 and Hebrews 11:31 are the only two places in the New Testament where the phrase *μετ' ειρηνης*, 'with peace,' occurs.

The phrase *εις το παντελης* 'to the uttermost' occurs in Luke 13:11 and Hebrews 7:25. These are the only two occurrences of noun *παντελης* in the New Testament. In both instances the noun is preceded by *εις το*. Notice further that in each clause the verb *δυναμαι* 'to be able' is used. This is a rather remarkable similarity of not only vocabulary but also style as well.

The use of the passive infinitive *λεγεσθαι* 'it was said' occurs only 4 times in the New Testament: 3 times in Hebrews and once in Luke.

The use of the aorist passive *ελαληθη* 'it had been told' occurs only in Luke 2:20 and Hebrews 11:18.

The verb *εισαγαγω* 'to bring in' occurs only 5 times in the New Testament, 4 times in Luke-Acts and once in Hebrews.

Division Two

Both Luke and the writer of Hebrews avoid the use of *ευαγγελιον* for the gospel and instead employ a variety of periphrases. Luke uses it only twice and Hebrews never uses it.

διαμαρτυρεσθαι 'to testify' (Heb. 2:6) is frequent in Luke-Acts.

κατανοειν 'to repent' occurs most frequently in the New Testament in Luke-Acts and Hebrews. The concept of repentance is a dominant motif in Luke and Hebrews.

The phrase *ζων ο λογος του θεου* (Heb. 4:12) may be compared to its only similar counterparts I Peter 1:23 and Acts 7:38 where the phrase is *λογια ζωντα* 'living words'.

The verb *εμφανιζω* 'to appear, to make known' occurs ten times in the New Testament, once in Matthew, twice in John, five times in Acts, and twice in Hebrews. In Hebrews 11:14 and all five Acts occurrences it is used in the sense of 'to make known.'

The verb *διαμαρτυρομαι* 'to testify' occurs only four times in the New Testament: Acts 2:40; Acts 23:11; I Thessalonians 4:6; and Hebrews 2:6.

εισφερω 'to go into, to bring into' occurs eight times in the New Testament, once in Matthew, once in Paul, once in Hebrews, 5 times in Luke-Acts.

The pronominal adjective *βραχυ* 'short, small, little' occurs once in John, 4 times in Luke-Acts, and 3 times in Hebrews, but nowhere else in the New Testament.

The verb *διαλεγομαι* 'to converse, argue, or discuss' occurs 13 times in the New Testament; once in Mark, once in Jude, 10 times in Acts and once in Hebrews.

The verb *διηγεομαι* 'to recount' occurs twice in Mark, 7 times in Luke-Acts and once in Hebrews. It is followed by the preposition *περι* 'concerning, about' only in Luke 1:1 and Hebrews 11:32.

The noun *εθος* 'custom' occurs once in John, once in Hebrews, and 10 times in Luke-Acts.

The adverb *παντοθεν* 'from all sides' occurs only 3 times in the New Testament, in Mark, Luke, and Hebrews.

The proper noun *Αιγυπτος* 'Egypt' occurs 4 times in Matthew, once in Jude, once in Revelation, 19 times in Acts (16 in chapter 7), and 5 times in Hebrews (3 in chapter 11).

The noun *παρεμβολη* 'encampment' occurs once in Revelation, 6 times in Acts and 3 times in Hebrews.

The use of *και* with the feminine personal pronoun *αυτη*, translated 'and she,' occurs once in Paul, once in Revelation, 5 times in Luke and once in Hebrews.

The lexical item *ρημα* 'word' occurs 33 times in Luke-Acts, 5 times in Matthew, twice in Mark, 12 times in John, 8 times in Paul, 3 times in Peter, once in Jude and 4 times in Hebrews. It is used with the genitive *θεου* 7 times and is translated 'word of God' twice in Luke, twice in John, twice in Hebrews and once in Paul.

In only two of these seven occurrences of this phrase is the genitive noun *θεου* fronted before *ρημα*: Luke 1:37 and Hebrews 6:5.

The phrase *τις εξ υμων* 'which of you' occurs 3 times in Matthew, once in John, once in James, 5 times in Luke and twice in Hebrews. In eight of the twelve occurrences, the indefinite pronoun *tis* is separated from the preposition *εξ* by an intervening noun, verb, pronoun, or conjunction. Only Luke 11:5, John 8:46, Hebrews 3:13 and 4:1 use the phrase without any intervening words.

The use of the phrase *καθ' ημεραν* 'daily' occurs once in Matthew, once in Mark, five times in Luke, 6 times in Acts, twice in Paul and twice in Hebrews. It is thus very infrequent in Matthew, Mark, and Paul, but not so in Luke-Acts. This is all the more important for our discussion because the comparison of the Synoptic gospels supports the suggestion that this is a phrase particularly characteristic of Luke. The fact that it occurs twice in Hebrews is notable in that Hebrews is only about one-fourth the length of Luke-Acts or the Paulines.

The use of the present infinitive *λεγειν* 'to say or speak' occurs 5 times in Matthew, 8 times in Mark, once in John, 18 times in Luke-Acts, 4 times in Paul, 4 times in Hebrews, and once in James. Again, considering the relative lengths of these books, there is a strong correlation between Luke-Acts and Hebrews. Furthermore, only in Luke 11:27 and Hebrews 8:13 is the infinitive preceded by both the preposition *εν* and the article *τω*. This example along with the preceding two all involve the New Testament author's use of a form of the verb *λεγω*. The fact that in all three cases cited above Luke and Hebrews can be correlated against the rest of the New Testament writers lends strong support to the argument of Lukan authorship of Hebrews.

The lexical item *λαος* 'people' occurs twice in Mark, 4 times in Peter, 12 times in the Johannine epistles, 12 times in Paul, 84 times in Luke-Acts and 13 times in Hebrews. Again Luke-Acts and Hebrews show the most comparable proportion in terms of usage. Note further that the use of this noun with the adjective *πας* 'all' occurs once in Matthew, once in Paul, twice in Hebrews, and 16 times in Luke-Acts.

The adjective 'most high' *υψιστος* occurs once in Matthew, twice in Mark, 9 times in Luke-Acts and once in

Hebrews for a total of 13 occurrences in the New Testament. In four of these occurrences, Mark 5:7, Luke 8:28, Acts 16:17, and Hebrews 7:1, the adjective qualifies the noun *θεου* in the genitive case and the phrase is thus translated 'of the most high God.'

A rather striking lexical example of the agreement of Luke-Acts with Hebrews against Pauline usage is found in the use of the verb *εισερχομαι* 'to go into.' It occurs 36 times in Matthew, 30 times in Mark, 20 times in the Johannine epistles, 3 times in James, and only 4 times in the entire Pauline corpus. Yet it is used 82 times in Luke-Acts and 17 times in Hebrews. When it is remembered that Hebrews is only about one-fourth the length of Luke-Acts or the Paulines, the contrast with Paul's usage is evident. Furthermore, this is a compound verb formed by the preposition *εις* prefixed to the regular verb *ερχομαι*. On the whole, such compound verbs are found with greatest frequency in Luke-Acts, Paul, and Hebrews, but especially so in Luke-Acts and Hebrews. Four further examples of compound verbs and their frequencies are listed next.

εκφερω 'to go out' occurs once in Mark, once in Paul, but 5 times in Luke-Acts and once in Hebrews.

εισακουω, a strengthened form of 'to hear,' occurs once in Matthew, once in the Paulines, twice in Luke-Acts and once in Hebrews.

The lexical item *εκζητεω* 'to seek out' occurs once in Peter, twice in Paul, 3 times in Luke-Acts and twice in Hebrews.

The use of the nominative form *ετεροι* 'others' occurs once in Matthew, 4 times in Luke-Acts and once in Hebrews. In Luke 11:16, Acts 2:13 and Hebrews 11:36 it is followed by *δε* and a participle.

The use of the aorist active indicative third person singular form of *λαλεω* 'to say or speak' is found outside of the five narrative books in the New Testament (Matthew - Acts) only in Hebrews and Revelation. The aorist active indicative third person plural form of this verb occurs 3 times in Revelation, once in Jude, once in Peter, once in James, 4 times in Luke-Acts and once in Hebrews. There is a parallel between Acts 16:32 and Hebrews 13:7 in that the aorist active indicative third person plural form is followed by a dative personal pronoun, the articular accusative *τον λογον* and the genitive *θεου* (*κυριου* in the Acts passage): 'They

spoke to him (us) the word of the Lord (God).' Note that neither of the above two forms occurs in the Paulines.

Simcox (1902:50) noted that three times in Hebrews divine revelation is described by the use of this verb λαλεω with the subject θεος and that this same phrase occurs twice in Luke, 4 times in Acts, once in John and nowhere else in the New Testament.

The present active indicative third person singular μαρτυρει 'to bear witness' occurs 6 times in John, once in Acts and once in Hebrews. The structure of the clauses in Acts and Hebrews containing this verb are quite similar in that each verb is followed by the dative personal pronoun, the conjunction και 'and' and an articular proper noun. The clause in Acts 22:5 reads 'all the elders bear witness to me' while the clause in Hebrews 10:15 reads 'the Holy Spirit bears witness to us.' The lexical item μαρτυς and its cognates are found most frequently in the Johannine epistles in the New Testament, somewhat frequently in the writings of Luke-Acts and Hebrews, and relatively infrequently in the Paulines. The present passive participle nominative masculine singular μαρτυρουμενος, for example, is found only three times in the New Testament, twice in Acts and once in Hebrews.

The noun αναμνησις 'remembrance' occurs only 3 times in the New Testament, Luke 22:19 (the Lord's supper pericope), I Corinthians 11:24-5 (a passage parallel to Luke 22:19), and Hebrews 10:3. This comparison is given further weight in that neither Matthew nor Mark in their account of the Lord's supper include this word, yet both Luke and Paul do. This is a further example of the close connection between the writings of Luke and Paul, and of Luke, Paul and Hebrews.

There are 93 words found in Hebrews of which one half or more of their total occurrences in the New Testament are found in Luke-Acts.

No attempt has been made to discuss the vocabulary differences between the Lukan corpus and Hebrews. Two things in this regard should be kept in mind. First, theme and subject matter to a great extent determine lexical choice. Some vocabulary differences are undoubtedly to be accounted

for in this fashion. Second, there are some lexical differences between Luke and Acts, but their similarities outweigh their differences (Hawkins 1909:182). Furthermore, there are differences among the acknowledged Pauline epistles, but again, lexical similarity outweighs the minor differences. The same would appear to be the case when we compare the Lukan corpus with Hebrews. My purpose has been to illustrate the remarkable lexical similarities which characterize the three works and suggest that they are best explained by common authorship.

Simcox, after carefully sifting the evidence, while not positing Lukan authorship for Hebrews, concludes that Luke's language, both lexically and stylistically, has more in common with Hebrews than does any other New Testament writer (1903:52,53).

2.2 Stylistic similarity

A. T. Robertson, Nigel Turner, and other Greek scholars have pointed out that while there is a common substratum of ideas, expressions and religious terminology which undergirds all of the New Testament writers, it is nevertheless possible to examine the linguistic features which distinguish the work of one author from that of another (Robertson 1934:116-137; Turner 1976:1-4). Stylistic studies can furnish evidence which, when tempered with other matters of external and internal evidence, can

be used as a discriminating factor in questions of authorship.

2.2.1 The importance of style in questions of authorship identification

We may generally define an author's style of writing, following an Aristotelian line, as more the manner of writing as distinct from the matter or content. Yet we must make clear at the outset that a rigid distinction between form and content cannot be maintained. Different genres of literature demand different styles; that is, different contents demand different forms (Ellegard 1982:519).

Sometimes stylistic differences among texts written by different authors are to be viewed as trivial in that they are more or less automatic results of the subject-matter of the respective texts (Ibid.:521). Cases in point would include such things as the use of tense forms, the use of personal pronouns, and the proportion of verbs to nouns. In the latter case, clauses in scientific texts are considerably longer than those in popular writings, and this is primarily due to the genre of texts.

Even textual features of a more abstract nature, such as the frequency of articles and the use of prepositions are not necessarily indicators of individualistic linguistic style, but can sometimes be shown to be due to the nature of the text being considered. Yet in any study which attempts to evaluate an author's style of writing, there is the

generally agreed upon notion that the variability of some stylistic features within the writings of a single author are small when compared with the variability over different authors, especially in the same genre (Ibid.:528).

I am working under the assumption in this section on style that an author's use of non-content words is less variable than his use of content words, and hence a more helpful indicator in questions of authorship identification. However, an author's use of content words must never be excluded in attempts at author identification. Ellegard's explanation for this is worth noting:

Even if the subject-matter very largely determines the vocabulary used in a text, we must not forget that the author's choice of subject-matter, in its turn, is in quite a high degree due to his more or less permanent interest, or even to his temperament. Most writers have their pet subjects. And even when writing on a different subject, an author's main interest may break through in metaphors and illustrations (Ellegard 1962:101,102).

Stylistic studies are important in questions of authorship identification for at least two reasons. First, through comparative studies, attempts are made to find an author who could have written the text under consideration based upon his acknowledged style in previous writings. Second, through comparative studies, attempts are made to make it highly improbable that most others within the circle of suspected authors could have written the text in question.

All of the above considerations are important for my theory of Lukan authorship of Hebrews. If we arbitrarily narrow the field of possible candidates to those who are New Testament authors only (something which can never be done with certainty), then Luke and Paul are the most obvious likely candidates due to vocabulary, stylistic and conceptual similarities. I believe I have already shown that on the basis of lexical comparison alone, Luke is more likely than Paul to be the author. In this section on stylistic comparison, I hope to show again that such is the case.

2.2.2 Evidence of stylistic similarity between Luke-Acts and Hebrews

From very early in the history of the church, scholars studying the epistle to the Hebrews have commented on the remarkable stylistic parallels between it and the Lukan writings. The Church Fathers reveal a very early tradition favoring Lukan involvement in the authorship of Hebrews. Clement of Alexandria, for example, is quoted by Eusebius as saying that

. . . the Epistle to the Hebrews is the work of Paul,
. . . it was written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language; but . . . Luke translated it carefully and published it for the Greeks, and hence the same style of expression is found in this epistle and in the Acts (Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, VI. 14).

When one examines the New Testament literature, it is discovered that the writings of Luke and Hebrews alone

approach the standard of Classical Greek. Examples of a near-classical style observable in both Luke and Hebrews are frequent use of the genitive absolute, frequent insertion of material between adjective and noun and article and noun, the use of lengthy and balanced sentences, and comparatively fewer Hebraisms than the rest of the New Testament. These are all more distinctive of Luke and Hebrews than any other New Testament writer (Cf. Turner 1976).

Yet in spite of clear evidence of near-classical style, both Luke and Hebrews also, like other New Testament books, show evidence of Semitic style as well. This is particularly confusing in regard to Luke for he has long been considered to be of Greek origin, a supposition which I will challenge below. I have noticed that Luke, when compared to Matthew, shows evidence of being even more Semitic at times. For example, Luke is quite fond of beginning paragraphs and episodes with the Hebraistic *καὶ ἐγένετο* and *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις*, a somewhat odd stylistic device for a Greek supposedly writing to a Greek audience.

Franz Delitzsch in his commentary on Hebrews noticed the stylistic similarities between the Lukan corpus and Hebrews, and while he did not catalogue them, he did note them frequently (Delitzsch, repr. 1952). Lunemann, on the other hand, in his commentary on Hebrews has collated the stylistic similarities noted by Delitzsch and his list

fills six pages of text (Lunemann 1885:356-362). Lunemann criticized Delitzsch's interpretation of the stylistic data as having been carried out too uncritically. After having carefully sifted through both Delitzsch's evidence and Lunemann's critique of it, several things can be noted. First, Lunemann is correct that some of the stylistic data noted by Delitzsch are not unique to Luke-Acts and Hebrews, but may have occurred elsewhere in the New Testament. Second, when it is found to occur elsewhere, it is usually in the Pauline epistles, giving further evidence of a unique kinship between the writings of Luke, Paul and Hebrews. Third, even after allowance has been made for stylistic data which occur elsewhere in the New Testament, the sheer bulk of the similarity between Luke-Acts and Hebrews cannot be ignored. Fourth, Lunemann grants that there is an amazing amount of similarity between Luke-Acts and Hebrews, but he rejects Lukan authorship on the presupposition that Luke was a Gentile and the author of Hebrews was Jewish.

I shall list and in some cases briefly discuss the stylistic similarities between the Lukan corpus and the epistle to the Hebrews. Some of these examples were noted by Delitzsch in his commentary and catalogued by Lunemann. For these, please see the respective sources. Others I have discovered through comparative research in the texts themselves with the aid of the FIESTA computer program developed by John Alsop which contains the UBS Greek Text,

3rd edition, and the grammatical tags developed by Timothy Friberg (as seen also in the Analytical Greek New Testament published by Baker). As in the discussion on lexical similarity above, I shall divide these examples into two sections. Section one will include those examples which are unique to Luke-Acts and Hebrews in the New Testament. Section two will include those examples which, while not unique to Luke-Acts and Hebrews, do serve to illustrate the similarity among the three books.

Section One

The use of the particle *καιτοι* (Heb. 4:3) is found only in Acts 14:17.

δια with the genitive is used of time passed through in Luke 5:5, Heb. 2:15 and Acts 1:3.

παρα with the comparative (Heb. 1:4) corresponds to Luke 3:13.

The infinitive *προσεχειν* followed by the dative is found only in Heb. 2:1 and Acts 16:14.

ως with the infinitive is found only in Luke 9:52, Acts 20:24 and Hebrews 7:9

The future infinitive occurs only in Acts and Hebrews.

The use of the accusative participle with the dative pronoun is very classical and occurs in Heb. 2:10, Luke 1:74, Acts 11:12, 15:22 and 25:29.

The use of the future participle to express purpose is found only in Acts 8:27 and Heb. 13:17.

ευαγγελιζεσθαι 'to evangelize' (Heb. 4:2), a present passive infinitive, is used of people to whom the gospel is proclaimed in Luke 7:22 and 16:16.

ομοιωθηναι 'to be made like' (Heb. 2:17) is used in the same fashion as in Acts 14:11.

The comparative adjective followed by *υπερ* (Heb. 4:12, 'sharper than') has its counterpart in Luke 16:8 with the phrase 'wiser than.'

The infinitival *περικεισθαι* occurs only in Heb. 5:2 and Acts 28:20.

The preposition *απο* in Heb. 5:7 occurs in the same unusual construction in Luke 19:3, 24:41; Acts 12:14, 20:9, 22:11.

The use of *εχειν* 'to have' with a following infinitive (Heb. 6:13) is near-classical style and occurs four times in the Lukan writings.

The phrase *το ιδιον αιμα* 'his own blood' occurs only in Heb. 9:12; 13:12; and Acts 20:28. There are many occurrences of the phrase *αιμα αυτου* 'his blood' throughout the New Testament, but only in Acts and Hebrews is the particular construction above used.

The use of the preposition *δια* with *πνευματος* occurs only in Heb. 9:14, Acts 1:2, 11:28, and 21:4.

The use of *και αυτος* 'and this' with a proper name occurs in Heb. 11:11 and is found only in three other places in the New Testament, all in Luke-Acts (Lk. 20:42, 24:15, Acts 8:13).

The use of the preposition *δια* 'because' followed by *το μηδεμιαν* 'not one' occurs only in Acts 28:18 and Hebrews 10:2.

The juxtaposition of the indefinite relative *τι* 'some, something' with the preposition *παρα* occurs only in Acts 3:5, Hebrews 2:7 and 9 in the New Testament.

The use of the article *ο* followed by the untranslated *τε* and a noun or substantivized participle occurs once in Luke, 7 times in Acts, once in Hebrews and nowhere else in the New Testament.

The use of the present participle of the verb 'to be' *ων* followed by the negative *ουκ* occurs only twice in Luke, twice in Acts and twice in Hebrews.

The conjunction *και* followed by the preposition *προς* and a verb of speaking occurs only in Luke and Hebrews. Simcox (1902:49,50) noted that there is a 'real resemblance' to Luke in the way Hebrews uses *πασχειν* 'to suffer' without an object for the passion of Christ. Cf.

Luke 22:15, 24:46, Acts 1:3, 17:3, Hebrews 2:18, 9:26, 13:12. This is distinct from the Pauline usage of *πασχω* where it is used in an absolute sense 3 times, but never of Christ.

The use of the preposition *μετα* 'with' preceding *παρρησιας* 'boldness' occurs only in the Lukan writings and Hebrews.

Section Two

The conjunction *τε* (Heb. 1:3), is rarely found in the New Testament except in Luke, Paul and Hebrews, but it is used most frequently in Luke and Hebrews. (3 times in John, 25 times in the Pauline corpus, 159 times in Luke-Acts, and 20 times in Hebrews.) The proportions are especially striking when it is remembered that both the Lukan and Pauline corpora are approximately 4 times longer than the text of Hebrews.

The conjunction *δε* is found in the third position only in Hebrews 1:13, Luke 15:17, Acts 27:14, and Galatians 3:23.

οθεν, Heb. 2:17 et. al., is used frequently in Hebrews, but never by Paul, and it occurs also in Acts 26:19.

The use of *δυναται* with the aorist infinitive is most frequent in Luke and Hebrews.

The phrase how much more is common to Luke and Hebrews.

The phrase *τουτο το αιμα* 'This is the blood. . .' occurs five times in the New Testament, all in the context of the last supper and all with the noun *διαθηκη* 'covenant' present:

Mt. 26:28 *τουτο γαρ εστιν το αιμα μου της διαθηκης*
 Mk. 14:24 *τουτο εστιν το αιμα μου της διαθηκης*
 Lk. 22:20 *τουτο το ποτηριον η καινη διαθηκη εν τω αιματι μου*
 I Cor. 11:25 *τουτο το ποτηριον η καινη διαθηκη εστιν εν τω εμω αιματι*
 Heb. 9:20 *τουτο το αιμα της διαθηκας*

Note in the above examples that only Luke and Hebrews elide the equative verb while all the others employ it.

In the New Testament, the use of the preposition *μετα* followed by an articular infinitive occurs twice in Mark, once in Paul, once in Hebrews, and 7 times in Luke-Acts.

The use of the preposition *απ'* 'from' with the feminine relative pronoun *ης* 'which' occurs once in Peter, twice

in Paul, 5 times in Luke-Acts and twice in Hebrews.

The use of the conjunction *ουν* 'therefore' followed by the untranslated *μεν* occurs once in Mark, twice in John, 4 times in Paul, but 28 times in Luke-Acts and 3 times in Hebrews. Furthermore, on four occasions this phrase is preceded by the conditional *ει* 'if': twice in Acts and twice in Hebrews.

The preposition *προς* followed by the accusative relative pronoun *ον* translated 'to whom' occurs once in Peter, twice in Luke and twice in Hebrews, but nowhere else in the New Testament.

The juxtaposition of the preposition *δια* with the accusative indefinite relative *ην* 'for which' occurs once in Peter, 3 times in Paul, 4 times in Luke-Acts and once in Hebrews.

The use of the preposition *μετα* followed immediately by *δε* occurs 3 times in Matthew, 3 times in Mark, twice in John, 3 times in Luke, 8 times in Acts, and twice in Hebrews, but nowhere else in the New Testament.

The use of the adverb *εως* 'until' followed by the untranslated *αν* occurs once in Matthew, once in Mark, twice in Luke-Acts and once in Hebrews but nowhere else in the New Testament.

Both Luke and Hebrews show a marked stylistic similarity in their frequent employment of the participle. The ratio of participles to total verbs and verbals is virtually identical in Hebrews and in the last half of Acts. For example, Han's Parsing Guide (1971) lists 16 and a half pages of verbs and verbals from Hebrews. There are a total of 297 participles in Hebrews, an average of 18 per page in Han's guide. The last 16 and a half pages in the guide for Acts (a string of text equivalent in length to Hebrews) reveals a total of 308 participles, an average of 18 1/2 per page. This is a larger average than is found in either the

Pauline corpus or the rest of the New Testament.

Another very interesting stylistic parallel among the three writings concerns the position of participial and adjectival phrases qualifying an articular noun. In non-Biblical Greek, the participial and adjectival phrases normally occur between the article and its noun. In Jewish Greek, there is a tendency to place the adjectival phrase after the noun as is done in Semitic languages, with the article repeated. Turner (1976:110) notes the immediate parallel between Hebrews and the 'we' sections of Acts. The following table illustrates this correspondence.

Table 2.2.2--Positions of participial and adjectival phrases qualifying an articular noun in Hebrews and the we-sections of Acts

	Between-position	Post-position
Hebrews	6:4,7; 7:27; 9:6,11, 12,15; 10:1; 11:10, 29; 12:1,2; 13:12	2:5; 6:4,7; 8:2; 9:2,4,8,9 10:15; 13:20
We Sections	16:13; 27:34; 28:2,16	16:17; 21:11; 28:2,9

A final stylistic parallel between the Lukan corpus and Hebrews is found in the use of the first person plural personal pronouns 'we' and 'us.' In the so called 'we' sections of Acts, Luke employs 'we' to show that he was

present with Paul at the time of the events being narrated. It has been suggested that Luke's 'we' may have been a literary form employed for effect as well as to suggest the author's personal involvement in the events narrated. In studying the book of Hebrews, one is immediately impressed by the frequent use of 'we' and 'us.' Indeed, the first person plural personal pronoun or the corresponding verb ending appears 61 times in Hebrews and 50 times in Acts 16-28. When we consider that Paul is more fond of the first person personal pronoun 'I', and that of all the New Testament writers, only Luke and the author of Hebrews make such extensive use of 'we,' the parallel becomes even more striking.

There is beyond question an impressive array of evidence to link Luke with Hebrews. The fact that this association has been recognized since the days of the Church Fathers further supports my proposal that Luke was the independent author. No less an authority than B. F. Westcott has this to say concerning the stylistic resemblance between the Lukan corpus and Hebrews:

It has been already seen that the earliest scholars who speak of the Epistle notice its likeness in style to the writings of St. Luke; and when every allowance has been made for coincidences which consist in forms of expression which are found also in the LXX. or in other writers of the N. T., or in late Greek generally, the likeness is unquestionably remarkable (repr. 1955:lxxvi).

2.3 The argument from textlinguistic considerations

If Luke is the author of all three works, might there not be certain evidences of a textlinguistic nature to support the claim? Are there any structural similarities to be seen? I will evaluate four areas of similarity among the books: 1) the prologues to Luke, Acts and Hebrews, 2) the similarity between Acts 7 and Hebrews 11, 3) macrostructure and superstructure in Luke-Acts and Hebrews, and 4) the use of citation formulae.

2.3.1 The prologues to Luke, Acts and Hebrews

Table 2.3.1--The prologues of Luke, Acts, and Hebrews

Luke 1:1-4

Επειδηπερ πολλοι επεχειρησαν αναταξασθαι διηγσιν περι των πεπληροφορημενων εν ημιν πραγματων, καθως παρεδοσαν ημιν οι απαρχης αυτοπται και υπηρεται γενομενοι του λογου, εδοξε καμοι παρηκολουθηκοτι ανωθεν πασιν ακριβως καθεξης σοι γραφαι, κρατιστε θεοφιλε, ινα επιγνωσ περι ων κατηχηθησ λογων την ασφαλειαν.

Since many have taken in hand to write an orderly account of the things which have been fulfilled among us, just as they were delivered to us by those who were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, it seemed good to me also, having followed carefully all things from the beginning, to write to you, most excellent Theophilus, in order that you may know the things concerning which you have been instructed.

Acts 1:1-5

Τον μεν πρωτον λογον εποιησαμην περι παντων, ω θεοφιλε, ων ηρξατο ο Ιησους ποιειν τε και διδασκειν αχρι ης

Table 2.3.1--Continued.

ημερας εντειλαμενος τοις αποστολοις δια πνευματος αγιου ους εξελεξατο ανελημφθη οις και παρεστησεν εαυτον ζυτα μετα το παθειν αυτον εν πολλοις τεκμηριοις, δι_ημερων τεσσερακοντα οπτανομενος αυτοις και λεγων τα περι της βασιλειας του θεου. και συναλιζομενος παρηγγειλεν αυτοις απο Ιεροσολυμων μη χωριζεσθαι, αλλα περιμενειν την επαγγελιαν του πατρος ην ηκουσατε μου οτι Ιωαννης μεν εβαπτισεν υδατι, υμεις δε εν πνευματι βαπτισθησεσθε αγιω ου μετα πολλας ταυτας ημερας.

The former treatise I have made, O Theophilus, concerning all which Jesus began both to do and to teach, until the day in which he was received up [into heaven] after having given commandments to the apostles whom he had chosen by the Holy Spirit; to whom also he showed himself alive after his sufferings by many infallible proofs, being seen by them during forty days and speaking about the things concerning the kingdom of God. And being assembled together with them, he commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem, but rather to wait for the promise of the father, which [he said] you have heard from me; for John baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days from now.

Hebrews 1:1-4

πολυμερως και πολυτροπως παλαι ο θεος λαλησας τοις πατρασιν εν τοις προφηταις επ εσχατου των ημερων τουτων ελαλησεν ημιν εν υιω, ον εθηκεν κληρονομον παντων, δι ου και εποιησεν τους αιωνας ος ων απαυγασμα της δοξης και χαρακτηρ της υποστασεως αυτου, φερων τε τα παντα τω ρηματι της δυναμεως αυτου, καθαρισμον των αμαρτιων ποιησαμενος εκαθισεν εν δεξια της μεγαλωσυνης εν υψηλοις, τοσούτω κρειττων γενομενος των αγγελων οσω δια φωρωτερον παρ αυτους κεκληρονομηκεν ονομα.

God, who at different times and in different ways spoke in time past to our fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken to us by his Son, whom He has appointed heir of all things, through whom also He made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high, having become so much better than the angels, as He has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

The following comparative features between the prologues may be observed. First, the prologues share a relatively similar length. Second, they represent a literary skill that is unequalled in the rest of the New Testament. F. Blass described the prologue of Luke's gospel as 'a remarkable specimen of fine and well-balanced structure, and at the same time of well-chosen vocabulary' (1898:7). Luke's prologue is a single sentence of six balanced and symmetrical clauses. Both the protasis and the apodosis are of even balance. Without a doubt, the prologue of Luke stands in the tradition of classical Greek. The same could be said for the prologue to Hebrews. Both Luke and the author of Hebrews are described by most New Testament scholars as the most literary writers of the New Testament (Simcox 1902:16).

Third, all three prologues are retrospective and prospective. In Luke 1:1-4, Luke informs us that many have written and that he now intends to write an account as well. In Acts 1:1-5, reference is made to the former treatise (gospel of Luke) and the things which Jesus began to do and to teach. This is followed by a reference to future things to happen as the disciples are told to wait for the promise of the Holy Spirit in Jerusalem. Acts is a rehearsal of events from the coming of the Spirit in Jerusalem at Pentecost to the arrest of Paul in Rome, a period of approximately thirty years. The prologue in

Hebrews looks back to the fact that God 'has spoken' in times past to the fact that God now continues to speak in his Son. In all three prologues there is a retrospective and prospective aspect on the semantic level.

Fourth, there seems to be a propensity to alliterate with the Greek letter 'pi' in all three prologues. Five times in both Luke and Hebrews words beginning with the letter 'pi' occur, and in both cases all are preposed to the main verb in the sentence. This alliteration would seem to be used for stylistic effect. Fifth, there is an absence of *de* or *kai* in the opening prologue of Luke and Hebrews which illustrates the high classical Greek style characteristic of these flowing sentences. Sixth, a considerable length of text is sandwiched between the subject and verb of each prologue, and each nucleus contains an overt subject, verb, and indirect object, but no direct object. Seventh, the use of polys in both prologues to add to the rhetorical effect is an evidence of stylistic design.

These seven factors suggest that there is a high degree of similarity existent among the three prologues. All of these factors could be considered to be coincidental, but it seems they could also be interpreted as evidence for common authorship. It is easily established that none of the Pauline epistles contain introductory prologues that even approximate the classical structure found in Luke and

Hebrews.

The style of Luke's prologue can be compared with Josephus in his *Against Apion*, a two volume work like *Luke-Acts*. Josephus wrote in the latter quarter of the first century (approximately twenty years after *Luke-Acts*) and thus is roughly a contemporary of Luke. The English translation of the first sentence of each volume is given below for comparison with the style of the prologues in *Luke-Acts* (Josephus, *Against Apion*, 1966:163-5; 293-5).

In my history of Antiquities most excellent Epaphroditus, I have, I think, made sufficiently clear to any who may peruse that work the extreme antiquity of our Jewish race.

In the first volume of this work, my most esteemed Epaphroditus, I demonstrated the antiquity of our race . . . I shall now proceed to refute the rest of the authors who have attacked us.

The pertinence of comparing the Lukan prologue with that of Josephus' *Against Apion* is illustrated by the similarities which point out the fact that the near-classical style of Luke's prologue need not be an argument against his Jewishness and in favor of a Greek background as has been the case in the past. Josephus was a Jew of priestly descent who employed a similar style to that reflected in Luke's prologue. Since the Jewish Josephus could write in this fashion, then (the Jewish) Luke could as well. Once Luke concludes the Hellenistic prologue, he immediately shifts and writes more in the vein of Old Testament biblical history.

Second, this comparison reveals that Luke has introduced his two-volume work in a way that is in accord with the accepted norms of his day. Third, the prologue names Theophilus as the recipient or intended reader of Luke's work. The language of the prologue makes it likely that Theophilus is more than just the one to whom Luke is dedicating his two-volume work. Theophilus is an historical individual to whom Luke addressed the work in the same way that Epaphroditus was the intended reader of Josephus' *Against Apion*. Fourth, Luke's prologue informs us that he intended his work to be considered as an historical account in the same way that Josephus wrote of the history of the Jewish people.

2.3.2 Comparison between Acts 7 and Hebrews 11

Both Luke and Hebrews share a similar view of Old Testament history. The two longest summaries of Old Testament history in the New Testament occur in Acts 7 and Hebrews 11. There are a number of parallels between the two which I will summarize. First, a comparison of Acts 7 to the book of Hebrews generally will be made, and then Acts 7 and Hebrews 11 will be compared specifically.

Stephen's defense in Acts 7 totals 1022 words according to the Westcott and Hort text. Nearly 90% of these recur in Hebrews. Acts 7 has 301 vocabulary words and nearly 70% of these are also found in Hebrews (Brown 1923:514).

These proportions seem the more remarkable if we count the Seventh of Acts a transcript from the Aramaic, but Hebrews the best of Testament Greek; if we note that of the hundred (103) words lacking in the latter, some fifty (54) are found in Stephen's O. T. quotations; that of his three hundred, twenty-six are used by him alone in the N.T.: that fourteen are found elsewhere in Testament solely with Luke, his reporter; also that twenty-eight of his three hundred are proper names; and that perhaps a dozen of the earlier words might have been deliberately avoided by a later writer for reasons of tact in addressing the Christians of Hebrews. (Ibid.)

Both Acts 7 and Hebrews cite the Old Testament with quote formulae which are very similar. Both employ phrases like 'God says,' or 'David says,' or 'Moses says,' and 39 times out of 50 some form of the verb 'say' is used.

Abraham appears prominently in both Acts 7 and Hebrews. The phrase 'church in the wilderness' occurs in Acts 7 and may be directly compared to Hebrews 13:11-13. Acts 7:38 speaks of 'living oracles' as does Hebrews 4:12. Exodus 25:40 is quoted only in Acts 7:44 and Hebrews 8:5 in the New Testament. In both Acts 7:53 and Hebrews 2:2, the law is described as being mediated by angels.

Nils Dahl notes that Acts 7:44-50 and Hebrews 4:1-11 are parallel in thought and argument form. Hebrews 4:8,9 says: 'For if Joshua had given them rest, God would not have spoken later about another day. There remains, then, a Sabbath-rest for the people of God.' Dahl paraphrases Acts 7:47-50:

Solomon built a house for him. But had Solomon's temple been the fulfillment of David's prayer for a dwelling-place, and its cult the worship of which God spoke to Abraham, the prophet would not have said:

Heaven is my throne and earth my footstool. What house will you build for me, says the Lord, or what is the place of my rest? Did not my hands make all these things? (1976:75).

The Jews rejected Jesus in favor of a complex of hopes centering on the temple, thus imputing permanence to it. Stephen attacked the idea of temple permanence in Acts 7:48 when he used the term 'made with hands.' Hebrews 9:11,24 express the same theological concept using the same term. The immutability of Christ and the passing nature of the temple are subjects of interest for both Luke and the author of Hebrews.

Stephen argues in Acts 7:53 that to abide within a rigid legalism is tantamount to failing to interpret properly the law's own intention. This is precisely what the writer to Hebrews argues (Moule 1950:30). W. Manson has sought to find the key to Hebrews by examining the history of the world-mission of Christianity from its inception in the work of Stephen (1951:23-37). He finds numerous examples of similarity between Stephen's apologia and Hebrews as listed below (Ibid. 36).

(a) the attitude of Stephen to the Cultus and Law of Judaism;

(b) his declaration that Jesus means to change and supersede these things;

(c) his sense of the divine call to the people of God being a call to 'Go out;'

(d) his stress on the ever-shifting scene in Israel's life, and on the ever-renewed homelessness of the faithful;

(e) his thought of God's Word as 'living;'

(f) his incidental allusion to Joshua in connection with the promise of God's 'Rest;'

(g) his idea of the 'angels' being the ordainers of God's Law;

(h) his directing of his eyes to Heaven and to Jesus.

J. Bowman offers additional similarities between Acts 7 and Hebrews (1962:11). In Acts 7 there is emphasis placed upon the notion of God's revelation transcending national boundaries (Acts 7:2,9,30,31,36,38). In Hebrews 2:5-18, Jesus is the universal saviour who came in order that he might taste death for everyone. In Acts 7:17-29, God's revelation is independent of culture, while in Hebrews 7:4-10 the non-Jewish Melchizedek blesses Abraham and his descendents. In Acts 7:44-50, God's revelation is not bound to the temple, the temple cultus, or the tabernacle. In Hebrews, faith is said to be independent of the city of Jerusalem and the temple is apparently never mentioned (Hebrews 11:10,14-16,23-31; 13:12-14). The notion of the rejection of God's prophets is prominent in Acts 7:25,26,35,36,51-53; and in Hebrews 3:17-19, and the entire eleventh chapter, where national Israel persecuted God's prophets and rejected his message.

A specific comparison of Acts 7 and Hebrews 11 yields further parallels between the two pericopes. Luke seems to consider the history of Israel to be woven together with individual people such as Abraham, Moses, and David, who

constitute the backbone of the nation's history. Acts 7:2-8 and Hebrews 11:8-19 speak of Abraham, stressing his faith in God which enabled him to leave his native land for an unknown destination. For Luke, Abraham remains the 'father of the Jews' and is never said to be the father of Christians. In Luke's writings, it is only when he is addressing Jews that Abraham and his descendants are called 'our fathers' (Dahl 1976:48).

While it is true that the idea of God's promise to Abraham is discussed in Luke, the Pauline epistles, and Hebrews, it is Luke and Hebrews which are most alike in their perspectives. Both Luke and Hebrews stress God's oath and promise to Abraham, and both stress the fact of Abraham's sojourn as a foreigner in the land of promise (Cf. Heb. 11:11,12 and Acts 7:5-8). Both emphasize the fact that Abraham had no land of his own nor any children when God made the covenant with him to give him the land and children (Heb. 11:9-13 and Acts 7:5). In Hebrews 10:19-23, the central hortatory section of the epistle, the exhortation to 'hold fast the confession of our hope' involves a reference to the promise of Abraham. If the phrase 'he who has promised is faithful' be taken as an allusion to the argument in 6:13, then the readers were in danger of failing to rely on the promise of Abraham by failing to recognize the priestly office of Christ. In Acts 3:25-26 the notion of Christians as inheritors of the promise to Abraham was an

emphasis of Jewish Christianity in the early years of the church.

Of interest is the fact that Acts 7 speaks of the 120 years of Moses' life in three spans of 40 years each. That this was also of interest to the writer of Hebrews may be deduced from his quotation of Psalm 95 in Hebrews 3:7-4:13. Both Acts 7 and Hebrews 11 speak of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph in succession. Both speak of Moses' being hidden three months by his parents and describe his life in similar detail. Both avoid the word 'temple', making the rare substitution of the term 'house.' Both share the same concept of the tabernacle.

The following table presents the linguistic parallels from the Greek texts of Acts 7 and Hebrews 11.

Table 2.3.2--Linguistic comparision of Acts 7 and Hebrews 11

Acts 7	Hebrews 11
παροικον (6)	παρωκησεν (9)
εν γη αλλοτρια (6)	εις γην της επαγγελιας ως αλλοτριαν (9)
εξελθε (3)	εξελθειν, εξηλθεν (8)
και δευρο εις την γην ην αν σοι δειξω (3)	και εξηλθεν μη επισταμενος που ερχεται (8) (semantic equivalents)
κληρονομιαν (5)	συγκληρονομων (9)
επηγγειλατο (5)	επαγγελιας (9)

Table 2.3.2--Continued.

Ισαακ τον Ιακωβ (8)	Ισαακ και Ιακωβ (9) Ισαακ τον Ιακωβ (19)
σπερματι (5)	σπερματος (11)
το σπερμα αυτου (6)	σοι σπερμα (18)
ελαλησεν δε ουτως ο θεος (6)	προς ον ελαληγη (18)
Ιωσηφ (9)	Ιωσηφ (21,22)
death of Jacob and Joseph, burial in the promised land after departure from Egypt.	death of Joseph, mention of departure from Egypt and instructions concerning his bones being buried in the promised land.
και οξχ ηυρισκον (11)	και ουχ ηυρισκετω (3)
ετελευτησεν (15)	τελευτων (22)
επληθυνθη (17)	πληθει (12)
Egypt (17)	Egypt (26,27,29)
λαος (17)	λαω (25)
βασιλευς (18)	βασιλευς (23,27)
This man dealt treacherously with our people, and oppressed our forefathers, making them expose their babies, so that they might not live. (19)	Moses, when he was born, was hidden three months by his parents because. . .they were not afraid of the kings command. (23)
εγεννηθη Μωυσης (20)	Μωυσης γεννηθεις (23)
αστειος (20)	αστειον (23)
μηνας τρεις (20)	τριμηνον (23)
του πατρος αυτου (20)	υπο των πατερων (23)
θυγατηρ φαραω 21)	θυγατρος φαραω (24)
εις υιον (21)	υιος (24)

Table 2.3.2--Continued.

Moses, mighty in words and deeds (22)	Moses, becoming great. . . (24)
εφυγεν (29)	εφυγον (34)
Ερυθρα θαλασση (36)	Ερυθραν θαλασσαν (29)
πρωφητων (37,42)	πρωφητων (32)
προσκυνειν (43)	προσεκυνησεν (21)

2.3.3 Macrostructure and superstructure in Luke-Acts and Hebrews

Teun A. van Dijk has done extensive work on the subject of macrostructures and superstructures in discourse³ and has shown that the notion of discourse topic can be made explicit in semantic terms (1980:131). Distinguishing between sentential topics and discourse topics, he points out that the former determine the distribution of information along sequences of sentences (which van Dijk understands as paragraphs), while the latter reduce, organize, and categorize semantic information of sequences as wholes (Ibid.:132). // Simply put, the macrostructure of a discourse is the semantic notion of global meaning such as topic, theme, or gist. It is the abstract or summary which captures the theme or topic of the discourse.

A second term, 'superstructure,' is used by van Dijk to describe structures which have a global notion at the 'syntactic' level (1977:11). Whereas macrostructures are

semantic, superstructures are schematic or structural. Hence macrostructures describe overall structure at the notional (semantic) level while superstructures describe the information organization at the surface structure level. A third term, 'microstructures,' is used by van Dijk to describe the structure of information at the 'local' semantic level, such as the meaning of words, phrases, clauses, etc. (Ibid.:13). van Dijk points out that without the notion of microstructure, we cannot distinguish what macrostructures are.

Macrostructures are global semantic information only relative to the microstructures of discourse, cognition, and interaction. In other words, for different discourses or interaction sequences, the same type of information may function either as microstructure or as macrostructure, depending on its semantic role in the whole (Ibid.)

It should be pointed out that these three levels are not independent of one another in a text, but are systematically related in that macrostructures are derived from microstructures. Thus, the primary function of the macrostructure of a text is twofold: the organization and reduction of complex information (Ibid.:14).

Analyzing the macrostructures and superstructures of Luke-Acts and Hebrews may provide some insight into the argument for common authorship. I shall examine the structure of Luke-Acts first and then consider Hebrews. Finally, a comparison of the three texts will be made with a view to testing my proposal of Lukan authorship for Hebrews.

Macrostructure and superstructure in Luke-Acts

The last two decades have witnessed an upsurge of interest in the writings of Luke in the New Testament. The structure of Luke and Acts has been probed in great depth in recent years. As a result, Luke's gospel is now generally viewed as the most literary and structurally artistic gospel in the New Testament canon. Henry Cadbury in his seminal The Making of Luke-Acts (1927) has shown the Lukan fondness for parallelism in his accounts. More recently M. Goulder has shown the Lukan travel narrative (Luke 9:51-19:46) to be composed in chiastic fashion (1964:195-202). A chiasm, (from the Greek chiasmos, 'a placing crosswise'), comes from the Greek letter 'chi' 'χ' and refers to an inverted order of words, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, etc. which forms the pattern ABBA.

A	B
B	A

The A's and B's correspond lexically or semantically producing a chiasm. The Lukan travel narrative is a rather large section of embedded material in the overall discourse framework. The chiastic superstructure of this section as given by Goulder is presented in table 2.3.3.1 below.

Table 2.3.3.1--The chiastic framework of Luke's travel narrative as given by Goulder

Luke 10:31-13:30	Luke 14:1-18:30
10:21-24 The kingdom is revealed to babes. Blessed are the disciples for they see.	18:15-17 The kingdom is to be received as a child.
10:25-37 Jesus is confronted with the question: What shall I do to inherit eternal life? The answer elicits teaching by Jesus.	18:18-30 Jesus is confronted with the question What shall I do to inherit eternal life? The response elicits more teaching from him.
10:38-42 The story of Mary and Martha deemphasizes the importance of good works.	18:9-14 The parable of the Pharisee and hte publican deemphasizes the importance of good works.
11:1-13 God's willingness to answer prayer is seen.	18:1-8 God's willingness to answer prayer is seen.
11:14-36 A healing followed by a discussion of the signs of the kingdom of God and a warning about the last judgment.	17:11-37 A healing followed by a discussion of the signs of the kingdom of God and a warning about the last judgement.
11:37-54 At a meal, Jesus rebukes the Pharisees and lawyers for their sins.	17:1-10 An exhortation to rebuke one's brother when he sins followed by a parable about a meal.
12:1-48 Three themes are treated in the order: 1) hell, 2) riches, 3) faithful stewardship.	Chap. 16 Three themes are treated in the order: 1) unfaithful stewardship, 2) riches, 3) hell.
12:49-13:9 Four themes are present in the order: 1) transcendence of family loyalty, 2) prudent action taken ahead of time, 3) repentance, 4) the fruitless	14:25-15:32 Four themes are present in the order: 1) transcendence of family loyalty, 2) prudent action taken ahead of time, 3) tasteless salt thrown away, 4) repentance.

Table 2.3.3.1--Continued.

tree is cut down.

13:10-17 A woman is healed on the sabbath. Jesus says the Jews treat an ox and ass better than a person.

14:1-6 A man is healed on the sabbath. Jesus says the Jews treat an ox and ass better than a person.

13:18-30 Parables of the Kingdom of God are concluded by the theme of the exclusion of privileged ones from the Messianic banquet and the inclusion of the disadvantaged.

14:7-24 Parables relating to the Kingdom are concluded by the theme of the exclusion from the Messianic banquet of certain privileged people and the inclusion of the disadvantaged.

13:31-33 A prophet cannot perish away from Jerusalem.

13:34-35 Jerusalem is the city killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to her.

C. Talbert suggests that Paul's journey to Jerusalem in Acts 15:1-21:26 parallels the Lukan travel narrative and that Luke's literary design at this point is revealed by the chiastic framework of this section as well (1972:56-58). Table 2.3.3.2 illustrates the chiastic structure.

David and Doris Blood (1979:2) have suggested a chiastic framework for the first major section of Acts.

Table 2.3.3.2--The chiastic structure of Acts 15:1-21:26

Acts 15:1-18:11

15:1-29 Paul and others go to Jerusalem and on the way report on the Gentile mission. The report is well received

Acts 18:12-21:26

18:12-21:26 Paul and others go to Jerusalem and are received gladly. Their report on the Gentile mission is

Table 2.3.3.2--Continued

and they are welcomed on their arrival at Jerusalem. Jewish Christians raise the issue of the law and circumcision. There is a meeting involving Paul and James over the matter. The decision of James is sent in a letter to other churches.

15:30-16:15 Paul returns to the cities where he had earlier preached the gospel. He is forbidden by the Holy Spirit to speak in Asia. A vision calls him to Macedonia.

16:16-40 An exorcism by Paul, followed by a riot. The Philippian jailer is converted.

17:1-15 Synagogue debates.

17:16-34 The Athenians who are already religious are taught accurately about true religion by Paul.

18:1-11 Paul argues in the synagogue and reference is made to the ruler of the synagogue. God promises Paul that no harm will befall him in the city.

well received. The issue of Jewish Christian concern over the law and circumcision is raised. There is a meeting involving Paul and James over the matter. The earlier decision by James which was sent in a letter was upheld.

20:13-21:14 The Ephesian elders sorrow because they will see Paul no more. The Holy Spirit warns against going to Jerusalem. Bondage and suffering await Paul there.

19:11-20:12 Certain Jews try to imitate Paul's exorcisms. A riot insues, and Paul saves Eutychus' life.

19:8-10 Synagogue debates.

18:24-19:7 Apollos and twelve disciples who are already on the way to being Christians are taught accurately about true religion by Paul and his helpers.

18:12-23 Paul argues in the synagogue and reference is made to the ruler of the synagogue. God's promise to Paul that no harm will befall him in Corinth is fulfilled.

They analyze the entire book of Acts as follows:

Introductory Tie 1:1-11

Part I 1:12-19:20

Division 1	1:12-6:7
Division 2	6:8-9:31
Division 3	12:25-16:5
Division 4	13:25-16:5
Division 5	16:6-19:20
Part II	19:21-28:31
Introduction	19:21-22
Division 1	19:23-21:16
Division 2	21:17-23:11
Division 3	23:12-26:32
Division 4	27:1-28:16
Division 5	28:17-31

These divisions are all justified linguistically by Blood and Blood in their article and thus no effort will be made here to cover the same ground. The chiasmus in the first major section is formed by the five summary statements given at the end of each embedded section as in Table 2.3.3.3 below (Ibid.:11). The summary statements are found in 6:7, 9:31, 12:34, 16:5, and 19:20.

Blood and Blood note that this feature of the first section of Acts gives prominence and provides unity as the topics of each of the five summary statements are forefronted and chiastically arranged (Ibid.)

Table 2.3.3.3--Chiastic structure of the five summary statements in Part I of Acts

6:7	ο λογος
9:31	η εκκλησια
12:24	ο λογος
16:5	αι εκκλησιαι
19:20	ο λογος

They suggest the following as a theme statement or macrostructure for Acts: 'Against adversity, the Spirit-empowered witness about Jesus expands, through the disciples, from Jerusalem to the Aegean area and then extends, through Paul's trial, to Rome' (Ibid.:4). Acts 1:8 would appear to be the programmatic verse for the entire book in that it describes the geographical expansion of the witness given by the apostles. Thus, Luke begins his gospel in Jerusalem, he concludes it in Jerusalem with the ascension, he begins Acts with the ascension in Jerusalem, and concludes Acts with the witness to Christ having spread to Rome with Paul's imprisonment there. All of this is artistically brought together in the superstructure of the text by the use of a chiastic framework.

Not only are there large sections of Luke-Acts that bear the earmarks of chiastic arrangement, but it is now generally recognized that the entire two-volume work can be described as one large chiasm.

For example, Goulder has suggested that Luke-Acts is

structured upon one over-arching chiastic framework with the following sections: Galilee-Samaria-Judea-Jerusalem-Resurrection-Jerusalem-Judea-Samaria-the uttermost parts of the earth.⁴ Notice that for Goulder the resurrection is the central panel in the chiasm.

Kenneth Wolfe has argued that Goulder's analysis is essentially correct, but needs modification at one point. Rather than the resurrection being the central panel, Wolfe suggests that the ascension should be considered the central point.

Luke clearly places the resurrection in the Jerusalem panel. The statement at the beginning of the journey section (Luke 9:51) makes the ascension (analempsis) the end of his journey to Jerusalem. At the end of the Gospel Luke has Jesus leave the city and ascend (Luke 24:50-51). In the summary of the contents of his first volume Luke indicates that he had written about what Jesus had done until the day when he ascended (anelemphte [sic] Acts 1:2). The summary ends with a second narration of the ascension and a promise of the return (Acts 1:9-11). (1980:67)

Thus Wolfe argues for the structure of Luke-Acts as follows:

- A Galilee, Luke 4:14-9:50
- B 'Journey to Jerusalem' (through Samaria and Judea), Luke 9:51-19:40.
- C Jerusalem, Luke 19:41-24:49
- D Ascension, Luke 24:50,51.
- [D' Ascension, Acts 1:1-11]
- C' Jerusalem, Acts 1:12-8:1a
- B' Judea and Samaria, Acts 8:1b-11:18.
- A' To the end of the earth, Acts 11:19-28:31 (Ibid.)

In a similar vein, Ethel Wallis has suggested that Luke-Acts can be viewed from the standpoint of its thematic location and participants. When this is done, there is a resulting cyclic parallelism which forms a loose chiasmus (1979:3).

Wallis points out that Luke has grouped main events in his narrative around locations which are not only geographical but also areas of social space: 1) Jerusalem, Jewish officialdom; 2) Judea, Jewish population; 3) Samaria, Gentiles and 'hybrid' Jews; 4) Uttermost part of the earth, Gentile population (Ibid.:2). Events which result from the actions of thematic participants in thematic locations are organized into cycles along a spatiosequential story line. Thus, Luke's order is not simply chronological, but reflects progressive action related to defined space (Ibid.).

According to Wallis, each cycle of events is composed of discrete units of episodes designed by Luke to advance the plot one structural step toward the climax. In Table 2.3.3.4 these units of episodes are indicated by capital letters A, B, C, etc. and are joined by underlining to indicate cycles, as ABCD. The resulting parallelism between these episodes serves as a linking device to give coherence to the entire discourse and at the same time achieving dramatic unity (Ibid.). With regard to thematic participants, A, B, C, and D all have Jesus as their referent, while D', C', and B' all have Peter as their

referent and A^2 , B^2 , C^2 , D^2 , and B^3 all have Paul as their referent.

Table 2.3.3.4--Diagram of Luke's chiastic correlation of thematic participants

THEMATIC LOCATION (Spatiosequential)	A	B	C	D	D'	C'	B'	A^2	B^2	C^2	D^2	B^3
THEMATIC PARTICIPANT		Jesus			/		Peter		/			Paul
THEMATIC ROLE		Prophet			/							Apostle

Wallis' analysis of the text is quite similar to both Goulder and Wolfe and provides further linguistic confirmation for this particular approach to the structure of Luke-Acts. Thus, in the overall structure of Luke-Acts, we find that there is impressive evidence that Luke has chosen to use chiasm as a special stylistic device to convey his message.

The chiastic framework discussed above for the whole of Luke-Acts is seen to be superimposed over the constituent structure of the gospel. It does not always correspond exactly with the constituent structure, yet it overlies the constituent structure as a separate principle of cohesion and functions to achieve an overall sense of unity to the

two-volume work.

Charles Talbert is recognized as one of the leading Lukan scholars today. He has published numerous works on the subject as well as having served as chairman for the Luke-Acts Seminar of the Society of Biblical Literature. In his most recent work, Reading Luke (1982), Talbert suggests the following outline for Luke's gospel and offers substantial linguistic evidence to support it.

Prologue - 1:1-4

Life of Jesus prior to his Public Ministry - 1:5-4:15

Galilean Ministry of Jesus - 4:16-9:50

Journey to Jerusalem - 9:51-19:44

Last days in Jerusalem; Jesus' death, resurrection, and ascension - 19:45-24:53 (1982:vii,viii)

These major units correspond closely to the suggested structure posited by both Goulder and Wolfe. Using the foregoing structural evidence, the foundation is laid for extracting a suggested macrostructure for Luke-Acts.

Luke has addressed his two-volume work to a specific individual named Theophilus (Luke 1:1-4) with the intent of confirming his faith in the gospel account which he has already heard. Whether Theophilus was already a Christian or not at the time of Luke's composition cannot be known with certainty. If he were not, then Luke's purpose would have been to elicit faith in his reader. However, it seems to me that the most plausible reading of the prologue seems

to suggest that Luke's purpose was to confirm Theophilus' faith. Wallis notes that it is as if Luke were saying: 'Theophilus, consider the words and deeds of Jesus, the great and final Prophet. . . Be reassured--here is proof of his authenticity' (1983:9).

As shown above, Luke centers his two-volume work around the ascension of Christ. Furthermore, he presents Jesus as God's final prophet to the people. In the denouement of the gospel, the post-resurrection episode on the road to Emmaus, Wallis notes that Jesus functions in the role of prophet and that this fact is placed in high focus.

The bereft disciples declared that he [Jesus] was a prophet, powerful in word and deed (24:19). Perhaps, they had been mistaken. To them Jesus said, How foolish and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! (24:25) (Ibid.:10).

The prologue to Acts (1:1-5) can be viewed as providing a summary of the gospel, especially in the first two verses. The following is my own translation from the original Greek text.

The former book I have made, O Theophilus, concerning all things which Jesus began to do and to teach, until the day in which, after he had given commandment by the Holy Spirit to the apostles whom he had chosen, he was taken up.

I have deliberately placed the words he was taken up at the end of the sentence because they translate the Greek verb which Luke has placed at the end of the clause for special focus. This is further linguistic evidence that the ascension serves as the focal point of Luke's gospel. Thus,

according to Acts 1:1-2, there are three overarching categories found in the gospel: 1) the things Jesus did, 2) the things Jesus taught, and 3) the ascension of Jesus.

In their recent work, The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels? (1987), Orchard and Riley have suggested that Acts 1:1-2 forms a good summation of the gospel of Luke. They point out that after the introduction and infancy narratives in Luke 1:1-3:38, Luke concentrates on the things Jesus began to do (4:1-9:50), then on what Jesus began to teach (9:51-18:30). Finally, Luke centers on the events of the passion and resurrection, culminating his gospel with the ascension (1987:51). It would seem that we have good justification for accepting Acts 1:1-2 as a good macrostructure for the entire gospel of Luke.

From the above analysis, taking into account Luke's prologue in both the gospel and Acts, the thematic statements offered by Wallis and Blood and Blood, and the structural analysis of Talbert, Goulder, Wolfe, and Wallis, the macrostructure for Luke-Acts could be presented as follows:

Writing to Theophilus, Luke intends to inform him concerning the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ, God's final prophet. The life of Jesus prior to his public ministry includes the infancy narrative (Luke 1-2) and his pre-public ministry culminating in the statement about the beginning of his Galilean ministry (4:14-15). The deeds of Jesus are narrated in 4:16-9:50 with special emphasis on his healing. The journey to Jerusalem is a section primarily devoted to the teaching of Jesus, culminating in his arrival at Jerusalem. The final section (19:45-24:53)

narrates his conflict with the religious leaders, arrest, trial, death, resurrection and ascension.

The prologue to Acts announces the theme that what Jesus began to do on earth, he now continues to do in heaven. Beginning at Jerusalem, the spread of the gospel is recounted as moving to Judea and Samaria, and finally to the uttermost part of the earth, when Paul arrives in Rome. The growth of the gospel is accompanied by persecution, yet the word of God and the number of disciples continues to multiply.

Macrostructure and superstructure in Hebrews.

We turn now to a consideration of the letter to the Hebrews and its structure. The traditional way of looking at the structure of Hebrews was summed up well by John Brown more than a century and a quarter ago when he said:

The Epistle divides itself into two parts--the first Doctrinal, and the second Practical--though the division is not so accurately observed that there are no duties enjoined or urged in the first part, and no doctrines stated in the second (repr. 1961:10).

According to this analysis, Hebrews is analyzed as consisting of two main divisions: 1:5-10:18 and 10:19-13:17. A thematic introduction (1:1-4) precedes part one while a conclusion (13:18-21) and postscript (13:22-25) follow part two. Part one is described as 'doctrinal,' 'dogmatic' or 'kerygmatic' while part two is labelled 'practical,' 'parenetic,' or 'ethical.'

Although a number of scholars still accept this traditional bipartite structure of Hebrews, it is becoming increasingly more clear that this thesis must be modified. For example, Kummel in his well known Introduction to the New Testament has concluded that the hortatory passages

(2:1-4, 3:7-4:11, 5:11-6:12, 10:19-25, 12:1-2. . .) function as the goal and purpose of the entire discourse (1975:390). O. Michel in his influential commentary which appeared in 1975 concurs that the most salient sections of Hebrews must be the hortatory passages (1975:27). The text itself bears out this analysis for in 13:22 the author speaks of his text as 'a word of exhortation.' Thus, of the four major discourse types (narrative, procedural, expository and hortatory) Hebrews is best described by the latter category. The imperatives and hortatory subjunctives in the epistle will be ranked at the highest thematic level.

Perhaps no one has done any more detailed analysis of the structure of Hebrews than has the Jesuit scholar A. Vanhoye.⁵ He has presented evidence to show that Hebrews is structured chiastically. Table 2.3.3.5 illustrates Vanhoye's division of the text.

Vanhoye's analysis of Hebrews makes use of linguistic methodology to arrive at his conclusions. Yet in spite of the seminal nature of his work, few scholars have ever really interacted with him or even acknowledged his importance. David Black laments the fact that Vanhoye's work has been either neglected by many scholars or or has been subjected to temerarious opinion (1986:172). He lists a number of major commentaries since 1967 which 'register no

Table 2.3.3.5--Vanhoye's chiastic structure of Hebrews

1:1-4 Introduction			
	1:5-2:18 Eschatology		
		3:1-5:10 Ecclesiology	
			5:11-10:39 Sacrifice
		11:1-12:13 Ecclesiology	
	12:14-13:19 Eschatology		
13:20-21 Conclusion			

sign of Vanhoye's influence, though his work appeared in 1963' (Ibid.:173).

In 1976 Linda Lloyd Neeley completed her Masters thesis at The University of Texas at Arlington entitled 'A Discourse Analysis of Hebrews.'⁶ She interacted with Vanhoye's conclusions, and while she felt his structural breaks must be modified in light of her investigation of the text, she concurred fully with him that Hebrews was structured in an overall chiastic framework. Accepting Hebrews as an example of hortatory discourse with large sections of embedded exposition, she presented the following

outline of its discourse structure (Neeley, 1987:41):

Thematic Introduction	-	1:1-4
Point 1	-	1:1-4:13
Point 2	-	4:14-10:18
Peak (Point 3)	-	10:19-13:21
Conclusion	-	13:20,21
Finis	-	13:22-25

Neeley takes the theme statements from the three embedded discourses and produces the following macrostructure for Hebrews:

- ED1 God has spoken to us in his Son
- ED2 who as our high priest has offered a complete sacrifice for sins and by this obtained salvation for us.
- ED3 Therefore let us draw near to God with a true heart in full assurance of faith in Jesus and the sufficiency of his finished sacrifice; let us hold fast the confession of the hope in him without wavering, and let us consider each other to stir up to love and good works (Ibid.:61).

The fact that both Vanhoye and Neeley have proposed an overall chiastic structure for the book is of interest to us in our investigation of authorship. We have already shown that Luke has chosen this literary phenomenon to convey the superstructure of his two-volume work.

While Vanhoye's chiastic analysis certainly has merits, I believe that Neeley's analysis of the chiastic structure is, from a linguistic perspective, more structurally sound as she pays attention to both surface and semantic structure

features. Hebrews, like Luke-Acts, is shown to have both low level examples of chiasm (paragraphs, sections, etc.) as well as chiasm at the highest structural level. With reference to this phenomenon of chiasm in Hebrews she remarks:

A special feature of the lexico-semantic unity of Hebrews is a chiasmic ordering of major semantic divisions in the discourse as a whole. These divisions, not corresponding exactly with the organization of Hebrews into embedded discourses on different levels of embedding, form another system of organization which is superimposed on the constituent structure and is also distinct from the backbone of the book (Ibid.:61,62).

This is precisely what we have discovered to be the case with Luke's two-volume work. Luke-Acts is primarily narrative discourse with large sections of embedded exposition while Hebrews is primarily hortatory discourse with large sections of embedded exposition. If Luke is the author of all three works, he would appear to be quite taken with the cohesive literary device of chiasm.

The chiasm which Neeley suggests (Ibid.:62) may be displayed as follows:

A	1-4:13
B	4:14-6:20
C	7:1-28
C'	8:1-10:18
B'	10:19-10:39
A'	11-13

Table 2.3.3.6 illustrates the parallels which exist between sections A and A' of the chiasm (Neeley 1987:63).

The parallels that exist between the B's of the chiasm are given by Neeley in Tables 2.3.3.7a, 2.3.3.7b, and 2.3.3.7c. These tables show parallel introductions, parallel warnings, and parallel reminders respectively. I have shown these parallels in the three tables below using the English translation of each section.

Table 2.3.3.6--Parallels between 1:1-4:13; 11-13

1-2 expository embedded discourse	11 expository embedded discourse
3:1 the apostle and high priest of our confession, Jesus. . .	12:2,3 completer of faith, Jesus. . . for consider him who endured such slander. . .
3:6-8 Therefore, as the Holy Spirit says, Today if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts. . .	12:5 exhortation that speaks to you as a son, My son, do not despise the chastening of the Lord. . .
4:1 Let us therefore fear lest. . . any of you should seem to fall short (<i>υστερηκεναι</i>).	12:15 . . . watching lest anyone lack (<i>υστερω</i>) the grace of God . . .
4:11-13 Let us be diligent to enter that rest, lest anyone fall into the same example of un- belief, for the word of	12:25, 28-29 See that you refuse not him that speaks. . . let us have grace whereby we may serve God. . . for our God is a con- suming fire.

Table 2.3.3.6--Continued

God is living and powerful before him, but all things are naked and opened to the eyes of him to whom we must give account.

Table 2.3.3.7a--Parallel introductions --10:19-25;
4:14-16 (Ibid.:52,53)

10:19-25

Having therefore, brothers, boldness to enter the holy place by the blood of Jesus and having a great high priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith; let us hold firm the confession of hope without wavering, for faithful is the one who promises.

4:14-16

Having therefore a great high priest who has passed into heavens, Jesus the son of God, let us hold firm our confession. For we have not an high priest who is not able to sympathize with our weaknesses, but having been tempted in everything similarly, yet without sin. Let us draw near therefore with boldness to the throne of grace that we may receive mercy and find grace for well-timed help.

Table 2.3.3.7b--Parallel warnings -- 10:26-31; 6:4-8
(Ibid.:54)

10:26-31

For if we sin wilfully after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains any sacrifice for sins, but a fearful expectation of judge-

6:4-8

For it is impossible to renew again to repentance those who have been once enlightened and become sharers in the Holy Spirit and tasted the good word of God and the powers of

Table 2.3.3.7b-Continued

ment and a fire of jealousy which shall consume the enemies. He who disregarded the law of Moses died without mercy on the testimony of two or three witnesses; of how much greater punishment shall he be thought worthy who has trampled the Son of God underfoot and considered common the blood of the covenant by which he was sanctified and insulted the Spirit of Grace? For we know the one who said, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, and again, The Lord shall judge his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

the coming age, and fall away since they are recrucifying to themselves the Son of God and exposing Him to contempt. For the ground that drinks in the rain that often falls on it and brings forth useful vegetation for those for whom it is cultivated receives blessing from God, but that which bears thorns and thistles is worthless and close to being cursed, whose end is to be burned.

Table 2.3.3.7c--Parallel reminders -- 6:9-20; 10:32-39 (Ibid.:54,55).

10:32-33

But recall the former days, in which when you had been enlightened, you endured a great struggle of sufferings, sometimes being exposed publically to reproach and affliction, and sometimes being sharers with those so treated. For you sympathized with those in bonds, and accepted the seizing of your goods with joy, knowing that you have a better and more lasting possession.

6:9-10

But we are persuaded better things about you, beloved, and things accompanying salvation, though we speak thus. For God is not unrighteous that he would forget your work and the love which you have shown to to his name, in having ministered to the saints as you do now also.

Table 2.3.3.7c-Continued

10:35-39

Do not throw away therefore your confidence, which has great reward. For you have need of patience that when you have done the will of God you may receive the promise. For yet a little while and he that is coming will come and not delay, but my righteous one shall live by faith, and if he shrinks back, my soul will have no pleasure in him. But we are not of those who shrink back and are lost but of those who believe to the keeping of their souls.

6:11-20

But we desire that each one of show the same diligence toward the full assurance of hope to the end, that you be not sluggish, but imitators of those who through faith and patience inherit the promises. For when God promised Abraham, since he had no greater to swear by, he swore by himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless you and multiplying I will multiply you, and thus through patience he obtained the promise. . . . This hope we have as an anchor for the soul--secure and firm. . . .

The parallels between the C's of the chiasm are listed below in Table 2.3.3.8. I have marked some of the verbal parallels, but note the extensive semantic parallel between these two sections which contrast differing aspects of the old and new covenants.

Table 2.3.3.8--Parallels between 7:1-28; 8:1-10:18
(Ibid.:64,65)

7:11-12

If therefore perfection were through the Levitical priesthood, for under it the people received the law,

8:7-8

For if that first had been faultless then there would have been no occasion for a second. For finding fault

Table 2.3.3.8--Continued

what further need was there for another priest to arise after the order of Melchizedek and not called after the order of Aaron? For when there is a change of priesthood, there is of necessity also a change of the law.

7:19-19

For there is a setting aside of the former commandment because of its weakness and uselessness, for the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did, through which we draw nigh to God.

7:20-22

And inasmuch as not without an oath--for those on the one hand were made priests without oaths, but he with an oath through the one who said to him, The Lord swears and will not repent, You are a priest forever--to the same degree Jesus has become the pledge of a better covenant.

7:25-28

So then, he is able to save to the fullest those who come through him to God, living always to make intercession for them. For such a high priest was fitting for us--holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens, who had no need

with them he says, Behold, the days come, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Judah. . .

8:6

But now he has obtained a more excellent ministry to the degree that he is mediator of a better covenant which is established upon better promises.

9:15

And because of this he is the mediator of a new covenant, that by means of death to redeem from the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

9:24-28

For Christ entered not the holy place made with hands, the representation of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us, not that he might offer himself often, as those high priests every year entered the holy place with the blood of others, since it would then have been

Table 2.3.3.8--Continued.

every day, as those high priests, first to offer sacrifices for his own sins, then for those of the people, for this he did once for all when he offered up himself. For the law appointed men high priests who have weakness; but the word of the oath which came after the law, the Son, who is perfected forever.

necessary for him to have suffered often from the foundation of the world, but now once at the end of the ages has he appeared to put away sin through the sacrifice of himself. And just as it is appointed to men once to die, but after this the judgement, so also Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, the second time without sins, shall appear for salvation to those who eagerly await him.

10:11-14

And every priest stands daily ministering and offering often the same sacrifices which can never take away sins, but this one, when he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down at the right hand of God, then waiting until his enemies be made a footstool for his feet. For by one offering he has perfected forever those who are sanctified.

The above tables reveal the extensive parallelism and resulting chiastic organization which pervades Hebrews. The author has carefully constructed his text into one overarching chiasm. The question which we must ask relative to this study is does the use of parallelism, chiasm, and inclusio, which we have seen to be a part of Luke-Acts and Hebrews provide evidence for common authorship? The answer

would be yes if it can be shown that such phenomena are not characteristic of most of the other New Testament writings, particularly of the Pauline epistles. While we must grant the use of parallelism and chiasm on the lower levels of discourse throughout the New Testament, it has not been demonstrated that the structure of Luke-Acts or Hebrews is approximated by any other New Testament writer in terms of the use of parallelism and chiasmus at the discourse level.⁷ Of further importance for this inquiry is the fact that Paul rarely if ever used chiasm as an over-arching literary device for any of his epistles.⁸ He does use chiasm frequently on the lower discourse levels, but it has not been demonstrated that he uses it at the highest level, that of an entire discourse.

Thus, a further similarity is found to exist between Luke and Hebrews in the use of parallelism and chiasm, while it appears that Paul was not nearly as oriented toward these literary devices at the discourse level. The evidence merits a positive comparison between Luke-Acts and Hebrews and this provides a further argument for our theory of Lukan authorship of Hebrews.

2.3.4 Use of O. T. citation formulae in Luke-Acts and Hebrews

Perhaps one of the most graphic illustrations of stylistic similarity may be found in the employment of citation formulae by an author. Both Luke and the writer to

Hebrews have a marked preference for the use of *λεγει* (to say) in scripture citations. This can be contrasted with the Pauline writings where Paul alternatively employs *λεγει* and *γεγραπται* (it is written). The following tables illustrate the citation formulae as they appear in Luke, Acts, and Hebrews.

Table 2.3.4.1--Old Testament citation formulae in Luke-Acts

CITATION FORMULAE	REFERENCE
<i>γεγραπται</i>	L. 2:23
<i>εν βιβλω λεγων 'Ησαιου του προφητου</i>	L. 2:24
<i>γεγραπται</i>	L. 3:4
<i>γεγραπται</i>	L. 4:4,8,10,17
<i>γεγραπται</i>	L. 7:27
<i>ειπεν</i>	L. 10:27
<i>γεγραπται</i>	L. 20:17
<i>λεγει</i>	L. 20:37
<i>γαρ Δαυιδ λεγει εν βιβλω ψαλμων</i>	L. 20:42
<i>γεγραπται</i>	A. 1:20
<i>λεγει ο θεος</i>	A. 2:17
<i>Δαυιδ γαρ λεγει</i>	A. 2:25
<i>γαρ Δαυιδ. . . λεγει</i>	A. 2:34
<i>ΜωυσηS μεν ειπεν</i>	A. 3:22
<i>ο θεοS. . . λεγων προς Αβρααμ</i>	A. 3:25

Table 2.3.4.1--Continued.

ο του πατρος ημων δια πνευματος αγιου στοματος Δαυιδ παιδοσ σου ειπων	A. 4:25
ειπεν προς αυτον	A. 7:3
ελαλησεν δε ουτως ο θεοσ	A. 7:6
ο θεοσ ειπεν	A. 7:7
ειπων	A. 7:27
ειπεν δε ο κυριοσ	A. 7:33
ειποντες	A. 7:35
ο Μωυσης ο ειπασ	A. 7:37
ειποντες τω Ααρων	A. 7:40
γεγραπται εν βιβλω των προφητων	A. 7:42
ο προφητης λεγει	A. 7:48
ειπεν μαρτυρησασ	A. 13:22
εν τω ψαλμω γεγραπται τω δευτερω	A. 13:33
ειρηκεν	A. 13:34
εν ετερω λεγει	A. 13:35
το ειρημενον εν τοισ προφηταισ	A. 13:40
εντεταλται ημιν ο κυριοσ	A. 13:47
και τουτω συμφωνουσιν οι λογοι των προφητων καθωσ γεγραπται	A. 15:15
γεγραπται	A. 23:5
το πνευμα το αγιον ελαλησεν δια Ησαιου του προφητου προς τουσ πατερασ υμων λεγων	A. 28:25,26

Table 2.3.4.2--Old Testament citation formulae in Hebrews

CITATION FORMULAE	REFERENCE
λεγει	1:6
λεγει	1:7
ειρηκεν	1:13
διεμαρτυρατο δε που λεγων	2:6
λεγων	2:12
λεγει το πνευμα το αγιον	3:7
εν τω λεγεσθαι	3:15
ειρηκεν γαρ που	4:4
εν Δαυιδ λεγον. . . προειρηται	4:7
ο λαλησας προς αυτον	5:5
εν ετερω λεγει	5:6
ο θεος . . . λεγων	6:14
μαρτυρειται	7:17
δια του λεγοντος προς αυτον	7:21
λεγει	8:8
λεγων	9:20
λεγει	10:5
ανωτερον λεγων	10:8
μαρτυρει δε ημιν και το πνευμα το αγιον μετα γαρ το ειρηκεναι	10:15
τον ειποντα	10:30
προς ον ελαληθη	11:18

Table 2.3.4.2--Continued.

Μωυσης ειπεν	12:5
λεγων	12:26
ειρηκεν	13:5
λεγειν	13:6

For comparative purposes, I list below all of the citation formulae which occur in Paul's epistle to the Romans. This will give a broader base of data from which to draw conclusions regarding similarities and differences among the authors.

Table 2.3.4.3--Old Testament citation formulae in Romans

CITATION FORMULAE	REFERENCE
γεγραπται	1:17
γεγραπται	2:24
γεγραπται	3:4
γεγραπται	3:10
τι γαρ η γραφη λεγει	4:3
Δαυιδ λεγει	4:6
λεγομεν γαρ	4:9
γεγραπται	4:17
κατα το ειρημενον	4:18
ο νομος ελεγεν	7:7

Table 2.3.4.3--Continued.

γεγραπται	8:36
[]	9:7
επαγγελιας γαρ ο λογος ουτος	9:9
ερρεθη αυτη	9:12
γεγραπται	9:13
τω Μωυσει γαρ λεγει	9:15
λεγει γαρ η γραφη	9:17
ως και εν τω Ωσηε λεγει	9:25
'Ησαιας δε κραζει	9:27
και καθως προειρηκεν 'Ησαιας	9:29
γεγραπται	9:33
αλλα τι λεγει	10:8
λεγει γαρ η γραφη	10:11
[]	10:13
γεγραπται	10:15
'Ησαιας γαρ λεγει	10:16
[]	10:18
Μωυσης λεγει	10:19
'Ησαιας . . . λεγει	10:20
προς δε τον 'Ισραηλ λεγει	10:21
εν 'Ηλια τι λεγει η γραφη	11:2
γεγραπται	11:8
και Δαυιδ λεγει	11:9
γεγραπται	11:26

Table 2.3.4.3--Continued.

[]	11:34
γεγραπται	12:19
το γαρ	13:9
γεγραπται	14:11
γεγραπται	15:3
γεγραπται	15:9
και παλιν λεγει	15:10
και παλιν	15:11
και παλιν 'Ησαιας λεγει	15:12
γεγραπται	15:21

A preliminary examination of citation formulae in Luke-Acts, Romans and Hebrews provides for some tentative conclusions. First, Luke seems to shift from a use of *γεγραπται*, 'it is written', in his gospel to a preference for some form of *λεγει*, 'he/it says' in Acts. Secondly, the writer of Hebrews never uses 'it is written' but is very fond of 'it says', etc.

Third, the very unusual form *εν ετερω λεγει*, 'one somewhere says,' or 'in another place he says,' is found only in Acts 13:35 and Hebrews 6:5. Fourth, Luke's attitude toward the Old Testament is substantially the same as the writer to the Hebrews. In using the present tense in citation formulae, both Luke and the writer to the Hebrews

emphasize the fact that the God who has spoken in times past continues to speak today not only in his Son, but also in his written word. Paul of course also makes use of the present tense, but he is more fond of the past tense. Fifth, both Luke and the author of Hebrews seldom use the Massoretic text, but quote rather from the Septuagint or from a text different from either the Massoretic text or the Septuagint. Paul, on the other hand, quotes sometimes from the Massoretic text and sometimes from the Septuagint.

Luke uses *γεγραπται* fourteen times, nine in the gospel and five in Acts. He uses *λεγει*, *ειπεν*, or some other form of 'to say' or 'to speak' twenty-seven times. There are a total of forty-one Old Testament quotations in Luke-Acts. This does not include any allusions or paraphrases, only direct quotes. Furthermore, fourteen of the Old Testament quotations occur in the gospel while twenty-seven occur in Acts. This means that nearly two-thirds of the uses of *γεγραπται* occur in the gospel, which contains only one-third of all the quotations. Thus, with two-thirds of the quotations occurring in Acts (a total of 27), *γεγραπται* is used only five times (or less than 20%). It would thus seem that Luke definitely shifts to a much more infrequent use of *γεγραπται* in Acts.

Excluding allusions or paraphrases, Hebrews contains twenty-five Old Testament quotations. The most striking thing about citation formulae in Hebrews is the total

absence of *γεγραπται*. A second feature which is marked in Hebrews is the preference for the present tense in citation formulae (18 out of 25 examples), usually some form of the verb *λεγω*. Third, most of the quotations in Hebrews are from the Pentateuch and the Psalter.

In Romans, there are forty-four Old Testament quotations, excluding allusions or paraphrases. *γεγραπται* occurs sixteen times, while some form of *λεγει* (or any verb of speaking) occurs 20 times. On four occasions, it would seem that a citation is made with no citation formula. I have used the closed brackets [] as a symbol for these occurrences.

Using the data presented, what similarities and differences can we find, and can we draw any conclusions which may have a bearing upon our question of authorship? First, it is obvious that Hebrews is in some ways unlike both Paul and Luke in its choice of citation formulae. For example, the absence of *γεγραπται* in Hebrews so far is inexplicable. It cannot be explained upon the supposition that the audience was composed of Jewish people only, for Matthew's gospel, long considered having been written to a Jewish audience, employs *γεγραπται* as a citation formula. For whatever reason, the author of Hebrews chose not to use *γεγραπται*. If I were to hazard a guess, I would suggest that this may be the case due to the desire of the author to argue for the continuity of the old and new covenants. He

desired to point out that Christianity was the logical outcome of Judaism, and that any return to Judaism constituted a lack of understanding of the radical new nature of Christianity. Yet at the same time, the author in no way wished to suggest that the Old Testament scriptures were not binding upon the people of God. Indeed, the point of the prologue to Hebrews is that the same God who spoke in times past through prophets, continues to speak today in his son, Jesus Christ. Furthermore, the scriptures are, for the author of Hebrews, still speaking to the people of God, and to emphasize this point, he avoids the use of *γεγραπται* 'it stands written', and constantly employs a form of the verb 'to speak' usually in the present tense.

The fact that one does not find *γεγραπται* in Hebrews while it is found in Luke and Acts might be explained on the basis of a stylistic shift taking place in an author's development. The majority of his uses of *γεγραπται* occur in Luke, then there is a decrease of usage in Acts, followed by a total absence of the word in Hebrews. If we date Luke ca. A.D. 60, Acts ca. A.D. 63, and Hebrews ca. A.D. 67, then this shift would have taken place over a period of some seven years.

A second characteristic of Hebrews which is markedly different from Luke or Paul is the absence of the name of the human author of scripture. For example, both Luke and Paul employ 'David says' and 'Moses says' in their citation

formulae, but these are never found in Hebrews.

Yet for all this, there are some striking similarities of Luke and Hebrews against Paul in the choice of citation formulae. First, Both Luke and Hebrews employ the noun *θεος* with some form of the verb 'to say,' while this construction is never found in Romans or in the rest of the Pauline corpus. Second, both Luke and Hebrews employ the participle *ειποντες* in quotation formulae, and this construction is never found in the Pauline corpus. Third, the form *ειρηκεν* occurs three times in Hebrews and once in Luke-Acts (Acts 13:34), but is never used by Paul in his writings. Fourth, in Hebrews 2:6 the form *διαμαρτυρατο*, 'to testify' is used as a citation formula, and although it does not appear as an Old Testament citation formula in Luke-Acts, it does appear as a quote formula in Acts 2:40, and this is the only other occurrence of this form in the New Testament. Fifth, the participle *λεγων*, 'saying,' never occurs in the Pauline corpus as a citation formula, but it does occur in both Hebrews and Acts. Sixth, the phrase 'the Holy Spirit says' as a citation formula occurs twice in Hebrews and twice in Acts, but never in the Pauline corpus.

Three conclusions follow from this evidence. First, Hebrews is unique in its choice of citation formulae in the ways listed above. Second, Hebrews does share some similarities with both Luke and Paul in the choice of citation formulae. Third, in at least six different ways

listed above, Hebrews and Luke agree against Paul in their choice of citation formulae. Fourth, it would seem that this evidence would allow us to conclude that Hebrews, while not completely identical to either Luke or Paul in choice of citation formulae, is certainly much more akin to Luke-Acts than to the Pauline corpus. On the basis of this evidence, I conclude that it is unlikely that Paul wrote Hebrews, and that due to the similarities between Luke-Acts and Hebrews, we can argue that it is certainly more probable that Luke wrote it than Paul.

2.3.5 Luke, Hebrews, and the Septuagint

Some word needs to be said regarding the use which the author of Hebrews makes of the Old Testament. Many excellent works are available which deal with this subject,⁹ so only a brief word need be said at this point. If we study the distribution of quotations found in Hebrews, twelve are from the Pentateuch, one is from the historical books, four from the prophets, one from Proverbs and eleven from the Psalms for a total of 29. Thus, of the twenty-nine quotations, twenty-three of them are taken from the Pentateuch and the Psalms. Furthermore, of the twenty-nine quotations from the Old Testament, twenty-one are unique to Hebrews.

The LXX is the text from which most of these quotations are taken by the author. The Massoretic Text is

seldom employed by him. The way in which the author of Hebrews has interwoven the quotations from the Old Testament into the fabric of his argument shows how much he revered the Old Testament and appealed to it time and time again to reinforce his argumentation.

The major point to be noticed here is the fact that while Paul makes use of both the Massoretic Hebrew text and the Septuagint for his quotations, Luke and the author of Hebrews seldom quote from the Massoretic text, but usually quote from the Septuagint or from a non-extant text not equivalent to either the Massoretic text or the Septuagint. Of course there is extensive use of the Septuagint by the other New Testament writers, but none employ it with such near-exclusivity as do Luke and the author of Hebrews. Thus, Luke and Hebrews stand closer together in comparison with the other New Testament writers in their use of the LXX for Old Testament quotations.

2.4 Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing lexical, stylistic, and textlinguistic evidence, it would seem that a viable case can be made for Lukan authorship of Hebrews. I have shown that on the basis of lexical comparison, Hebrews shares more in common with the Lukan writings than any other New Testament work. At first it appears that both Luke and Paul could be argued to be the author on the basis of a large

vocabulary unique to each with Hebrews (Luke sharing 51 lexical items with Hebrews and Paul sharing 46). On the basis of this comparison alone, no certain conclusion can be drawn in favor of Luke over Paul. However, when other lexical data are considered, as I have done in the remainder of the section on vocabulary, it would appear that Luke's writings would tend to be more closely aligned with Hebrews than the Paulines. On the basis of this, the 51 words unique to Luke and Hebrews becomes a significant argument for Lukan authorship.

Stylistically, I have shown that Hebrews is closer to Luke-Acts than to the Pauline corpus and therefore on this basis Luke is a more probable candidate for authorship than Paul.

Both Luke-Acts and Hebrews exhibit similar tendencies in their prologues in spite of the fact that Luke is narrative discourse while Hebrews is hortatory discourse. It is this difference in discourse genre which makes the comparison of the prologues all the more significant. Luke's prologue definitely reads like a narrative prologue while Hebrews does not. Yet the similarities are there and can therefore be interpreted as furnishing evidence for common authorship.

A comparison of the macrostructure and superstructures of (Luke-Acts and Hebrews reveals a tendency to superimpose a chiastic framework over the entire discourse. While chiasm

is not rare in the New Testament at the lower discourse levels, it is somewhat more rare at the highest discourse level, and hence a positive comparison for our thesis has been made. But these linguistic data do not constitute all of the evidence that can be marshalled in favor of the theory of Lukan authorship of Hebrews. The philosophical\theological framework expressed in the three works must be compared to one another and to the rest of the writers of the New Testament. This is our task in Chapter three.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

¹For example, the high correlation of shared vocabulary between the Pastoral epistles, which have been traditionally ascribed to Paul, and the Lukan writings has led Stephen Wilson (1979) to argue erroneously for Lukan authorship of the Pastorals. But notice that even in the closing personal remarks of Hebrews (13:17-19), which occur in a section that reminds one of the Pauline epistles in terms of style, there are three words or phrases which are never used by Paul, while all are found in Luke, and two are unique to him and the writer to the Hebrews.

²I have not footnoted every time I draw material from Gardiner in the next few pages of text. The reader should simply consult pages 1-29 of his work.

³Cf. van Dijk 1977 and Ibid. 1980.

⁴Michael Goulder 1964a:138, Ibid. 1964b.:195-196.

⁵Albert Vanhoye 1963; 1974:349-80; and 1979:119-47. This is just a sampling of his many writings on the subject.

⁶Her thesis has recently been published in OPTAT, 1987:1-146.

⁷The two exceptions to this statement may be Matthew and Revelation, each of which have had chiastic framework posited for the entire discourse. For our purposes we note that neither Matthew nor John have ever been considered as a possible author of Hebrews because of stylistic dissimilarity, historical testimony, and other factors. What seems to be more rare is chiasm as an overarching structure for an entire discourse. On the basis of this, I do not hesitate, in the light of other corroborating factors presented in this dissertation, to use this phenomenon as a possible argument for common authorship.

⁸I use the term 'rarely' here for the only one I am aware of who has posited chiasm as an over-arching structure for any Pauline epistle is John Bligh who argues such for Galatians. In my opinion, he has not proven the point. However, even if it is demonstrated that Paul made use of chiasm in this fashion in one of his thirteen epistles, the fact that he did not employ it in the remaining twelve would seem to show that he was not as fond of its use as was Luke.

⁹See, for example, Westcott 1892:469-495; Kistemaker 1961, and G. Howard 1968:208-216.

CHAPTER THREE
THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENTS

In 1955, an article appeared by C. P. M. Jones entitled 'The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Lukan Writings,' in which he very cogently argued that there was a certain 'family likeness' between Hebrews and the Lukan corpus, especially with regard to Christology. It is not that this kinship between the Lukan writings and Hebrews has been so much unobserved by modern scholars as much as it has been, according to Jones, simply 'unlooked for' (1955:113). He suggests that this has been true for two reasons. First, until rather recently in New Testament scholarship, Luke has been regarded as a pure historian who collected and arranged his sources with little or no theological interest or purpose. Contrariwise, Hebrews has been regarded by scholars as the work of a theologian par excellence. But now Lukan studies have shifted and Luke is viewed as a theologian of some stature. This shift is perhaps no more clearly reflected than in the title of Marshall's work on Luke-Acts, Luke: Historian and Theologian (1970). Jones points out that this shift in thinking reflected in current Lukan studies provides the impetus needed to scale the barrier which has separated Luke and his writings from Hebrews (1955:114).

Second, the widespread tendency to regard Luke-Acts as

a work of Gentile provenance with perhaps even an anti-Jewish bias, while regarding Hebrews as the work of one whose knowledge of and reverence for the Jewish institutions is so apparant, has caused scholars not to posit a connection between the two. Again however, the Gentile provenance of Luke-Acts has been questioned in recent years and alternative hypotheses have been offered (Cf. Jervell 1972; Franklin 1975). Indeed, it is my contention that a Jewish provenance for Luke-Acts better fits the data. Jones himself presents some of this data in such a way that the reader begins to feel the Jewish background and interests of Luke.

St. Luke does indeed depict God's salvation in Christ as a light to lighten the gentiles [sic], but it is equally the glory of thy people Israel (Lk.2:32). The latter St. Luke tries to make clear in many ways: by his description of the ideal law-loving piety from which the Lord arose in his opening chapters (1:5 to end of 2), which are deeply influenced by the language and associations of the Septuagint, . . . by the thrice-repeated mourning of the Lord over Jerusalem (13:34,35, 19:41-44, 23:28-31); by his desire to mitigate as far as possible the guilt of the Jews for the crucifixion (eg., 23:27,28, 23:31, Acts 3:17); by his placing the Lord's resurrection and ascension in or near Jerusalem, so that the holy city becomes not only the scene of the end of the Lord's work on earth but also the centre from which the new Church radiates (Acts 1:4,8); by emphasizing the temple as the place of the disciples' praise at the end of the gospel (Lk. 24:53) and as one of the focal points of the Christian fellowship after Pentecost (Acts 2:46, 3:1, 5:12, 6:7); and by two passages (Lk. 24:25-27, 44-47) which teach more explicitly than any other gospel passage the complete fulfillment of the Jewish Scriptures in the crucifixion and resurrection of the Christ, a theme illustrated in extenso in the speeches in Acts (1955:114,115).

3.1 Christology

Since Christological considerations are the bedrock of Hebrews, I will begin by drawing a comparison between the Christology of Hebrews and Luke-Acts. The prologue to Hebrews (1:1-4) is a magnificent description of Jesus as the glorified, enthroned Son of God. Hebrews not only implies a resurrected Christ, but emphasizes his ascension and exaltation as well. Jesus is said to have seated himself at the right hand of the majesty on high (Heb. 1:3), and this fact is never lost sight of throughout the epistle (Heb. 8:1, 10:12, 12:2).

This enthronement Christology, or exaltation Christology as it is sometimes called, is exactly what we find in the Lukan writings. Luke's narrative is constructed so as not only to bring Jesus to Jerusalem and the cross, but beyond to the resurrection and especially the ascension and exaltation. In the lengthy episode of the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, the resurrected Christ says: 'Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to have entered into his glory?' (Luke 24:26). After the Emmaus episode, Jesus appears to his disciples in the upper room. After this event, Luke concludes his gospel with the account of the ascension (Lk. 24:49-53). Again, in the opening introduction to Acts (1:1-11), Luke recounts the ascension of Christ, in essence going over once again the same narrative ground which was covered in the conclusion of his

gospel. Luke 9:51 is a major structural division in the narrative, and it is precisely at this juncture that the narrator looks ahead to the conclusion of his work and speaks of the 'days of his taking up' (*αναλημψις*), the same Greek word used in Acts 1:2, 11, and 22 to speak of the ascension. Stephen, in Acts 7:55, saw Jesus standing on the right hand of God. It is Luke among the four gospel writers who places the greatest emphasis upon the ascension of Christ (Matthew and John do not record it).

R. H. Fuller (1965) has pointed out that in the early church there were three different Christologies which circulated: two-foci, exaltation and epiphany. Talbert describes the nature of the Christology of Luke-Acts, noting that whereas John employs an epiphany Christology,

Luke-Acts employs an exaltation Christology: Jesus in his earthly life is the descendent of David and heir to the promises of the Jewish scriptures. By virtue of his resurrection he is raised to the exalted status of God's son with power. In the present he rules from heaven as Lord overall, intervening on behalf of his people to deliver and protect them. . . . Exaltation Christology functioned to express the church's experience of Jesus Christ in a two-fold way: as the present Lord who rules from heaven, and as the historical figure whose story is normative for us (1982:20,21).

It is also interesting to compare the theological posture of the prologue to Hebrews with Luke 1 and 2. The author of Hebrews makes a great effort to emphasize the fact that Jesus is God's final revelation to the Jewish nation. God has spoken (aorist participle) in times past but in

these last days he has spoken (aorist indicative) decisively in his Son. This is precisely what Luke in his gospel attempts to convey in his lengthy prelude to the ministry of Jesus. The coming of Jesus fulfills the Old Testament scriptures and the hopes of a longing Israel. This fact is confirmed by numerous personalities including Zacharias the priest, Mary, Elizabeth, Simeon, and Anna. It might be said that Hebrews 1:1-4 is a good theological synopsis of what is stated in narrative fashion in Luke 1 and 2.

Hebrews brings to the fore, perhaps more than any other New Testament book, the concept of the perfection of Christ. The verb 'to perfect', and its cognates occur most often in the writings of Luke and Hebrews. Of further interest is the fact that outside of Hebrews, the only place in the New Testament where Jesus is described by *τελειουν* is in Luke 13:32. Here the sense of 'perfection' is identical to that which is found in Hebrews, namely, the attainment of heavenly perfection through suffering and death. On the concept of the perfection of Christ, Luke and Hebrews are in close agreement.

The concept of Jesus as the ruler over Israel in the latter days, in fulfillment of the Davidic prophecies in 2 Samuel 7:14 and the Christological designation of Jesus as the Son in Psalm 2:7 is prominent in Hebrews 1:5-13 and 5:5, and is found as well in many places throughout Luke's writings, e.g., Luke 1:32,33; Acts 2:30; and 13:33.

Although Luke never directly quotes 2 Samuel 7:14, it is found to be the key Old Testament passage, along with Psalm 2:7, undergirding his infancy narratives (Luke 1 and 2), Peter's sermon at Pentecost (Acts 2) and Paul's speech in the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13).¹ There is a conceptual allusion to 2 Samuel 7:14 which stands behind the Christological discussions of much of Luke-Acts and Hebrews, yet with the exception of a non-christological allusion in 2 Corinthians 6:18 (where it is used to apply to Christians instead of Christ) this passage is nowhere quoted or alluded to in the rest of the New Testament. Likewise, Psalm 2:7 is quoted only by Luke and Hebrews in the entire New Testament (Acts 13:33; Hebrews 1:5; 5:5). The motif of Jesus as the Davidic ruler in fulfillment of 2 Samuel 7:14 and Psalm 2:7 holds greater significance for Luke and Hebrews than any other New Testament writer.

The description in Hebrews 5:7 of Jesus praying in the garden on the eve of his crucifixion is virtually identical to the same account in Luke 22:44. Hebrews 5:7 describes Jesus as praying with 'strong crying and tears.' All three Synoptics mention the prayer in the garden of Gethsemene, but only Luke describes Jesus as 'being in agony, He prayed more earnestly. And His sweat became like great drops of blood. . .' (Luke 22:44). Luke is the gospel writer known for his interest in and emphasis on the humanity of Christ, and Hebrews, more than any other New Testament epistle,

emphasizes the humanity of Christ and his ability as our great high priest to identify with those who are his.

Beyond question, the high priesthood of Christ plays an important role in the Christology of Hebrews. However, Luke-Acts does not appear ever to describe Jesus as high priest. This may seem to weaken the possibility of Lukan authorship for Hebrews. If Luke wrote Hebrews, why is such emphasis placed upon Christ's high priesthood there, but no reference is made to it in his two-volume narrative? I have already shown the Christological similarities which do exist between the three works, and this provides a conceptual base upon which to suggest Lukan authorship. Furthermore, while Luke may not overtly describe the priestly ministry of Jesus in Luke-Acts, he has at least illustrated it in a most dramatic fashion at the conclusion of his gospel.

In the account of the ascension of Jesus, Luke 24:50-51, it is stated that Jesus lifted up his hands and blessed the disciples. While he was engaged in this act, he was 'carried up into heaven.' Talbert's words express the meaning of this act:

This act of blessing is like that of the high priest, Simon, in Sir 50:19-20. With a priestly act the risen Jesus puts his disciples under the protection of God before he leaves them. . . Just as the gospel began with the ministry of the priest Zechariah, so it ends with Jesus acting as priest for his flock (cf. heb 2:17; 3:1; 6:19-20) (1982:233).

Note especially the references to Hebrews which theologially describe this act and the resultant position

of the ascended Lord in heaven. Note further that of the four gospel writers, it is only Luke who recounts the ascension of Jesus. It is, in fact, the focal point of his two-volume work which I, following others, have argued below. Thus it would seem that the theme of Jesus as our high priest can be illustrated from Luke's gospel.

Further evidence to this effect may be adduced from Augustine (A. D. 354-430) in his discussions on the interrelationships of the Synoptic Gospels. While Matthew seems to emphasize the kingship of Christ, Luke according to Augustine, emphasizes his priesthood.² He derives this distinction primarily from a study of the differing genealogies found in Matthew and Luke. Matthew carries the line of Jesus from David through Solomon, thus emphasizing the kingly aspect of the descent. Luke, differs from Matthew at this point, tracing Jesus' descent from David through David's son Nathan, who was never a king. Thus, Augustine appends the symbol of the Lion (kingship) to Matthew's gospel and the symbol of the bull (priestly sacrifice) to Luke's gospel.

Some attention should be given to the use of titles given to Jesus by Luke and the author to the Hebrews. While no extensive discussion of this subject can be made in this study, we may note that the lexical pair *αρχηγος* and *σωτηρ* (*σωτηρια*) as titles for Jesus occur together only in Acts

5:31 and Hebrews 2:10.

In summary, it has been noted that there are numerous Christological parallels between Luke and Hebrews. In both we find an emphasis on the completed work of Christ, his present glorified state, and a distinction between Christ and his faithful in terms of the nature of their suffering.

3.2 Eschatology

From the standpoint of eschatology, Luke-Acts and Hebrews also share common ground. Any comparison between the eschatological outlooks of Luke-Acts and Hebrews is at once a difficult task because of the debated issues relative to the three books. With regard to Lukan studies, Fitzmyer states that Lukan eschatology is the most difficult and most controversial aspect of Lukan theology today (1981:231). The primary question revolves around whether H. Conzelmann was correct when he asserted that Luke did not expect an imminent eschaton and instead presented a 'modified' version of the other synoptic writers to the effect that Luke envisioned a 'delayed parousia' (1960). Conzelmann assumed that the early Christian church lived with the hope of an imminent return of Christ, but when this was not realized, something of a crisis arose in the church. Luke wrote to ease this theological crisis by issuing a thoroughgoing reinterpretation of the early church's view.

While it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to

present a thorough discussion of these matters, I think it has been shown that Conzelmann's thesis has been taken to task and that most scholars today agree that it must be substantially modified.³ For myself, I think that Fitzmyer has accurately portrayed the Lukan eschatological outlook as being (1) in line with the other synoptic writers in his belief in an imminent return of Christ, (2) reflective of the already/not yet tension where the present is a time of eschatological fulfillment (realized eschatology) and yet there is a consummation which occurs at the second coming of Christ, and (3) a desire on Luke's part to shift the emphasis from the eschaton to the semeron (the Greek word for 'today') to show that present Christian conduct is informed by eschatological themes (1981:231). These factors should be kept in mind in considering a comparison of Lukan eschatology with that of Hebrews.

Eschatology in Hebrews is as difficult a subject as in Luke-Acts due to the debate over a supposed platonic dualism which lies at the heart of the book. There is without a doubt a dualism which pervades Hebrews. The crucial question is whether this dualism is to be accounted for as platonic thought mediated through Philo of Alexandria, or is it better accounted for under the rubric of apocalyptic Judaism mediated through the Old Testament scriptures and cultus. Again, numerous books and articles have been written on this subject and it is beyond the scope of this

work to delve into the question extensively. Suffice it to say at this point that the supposed dependence of Hebrews upon Philo has been severely shaken in recent years and it seems best to accept the Old Testament apocalyptic background as the most adequate explanation.⁴

To what extent are Luke-Acts and Hebrews similar to one another with regard to eschatology? Jones points out that to

prove the existence of what we may call a family likeness, shared by Luke and Hebrews, it is not sufficient to point to general and specific correspondences alone: it is also necessary to show, as far as may be possible, that the two writings stand together in contrast to the other families of writings in the New Testament (1955:129).

Jones devotes one half of his article to discussing both the similarities between Luke-Acts and Hebrews in eschatological matters and the differences between them and the other books of the New Testament, specifically Mark, the Pauline corpus, and the Johannine writings. The argument is involved and need not be rehearsed here. The key difference would seem to be that there is less emphasis upon the parousia in Luke-Acts and Hebrews than in Mark, Paul, or John. This does not constitute a contradiction between the New Testament writers, rather it merely illustrates the differing emphases which are found in their writings.

This change of emphasis can be seen clearly in a comparison of Luke 22:69 with the parallel account in Mark 14:62. Mark climaxes his version with a reference to the

parousia. However, Luke omits any reference to the parousia and concludes the section with the statement 'But from now on the Son of man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God.' By doing this, Luke places the emphasis upon the exhaltation of Christ at the right hand of God. As Franklin points out, Luke's emphasis here is controlled, not by a desire to express a delay in the parousia, but by the desire to emphasize present belief along with future hope (1975:28).

Jones' thesis that there is a 'family likeness' in eschatological matters between Luke-Acts and Hebrews in comparison to the rest of the New Testament writers has been confirmed by other New Testament scholars. For example, John Drury writes

. . . Luke and Hebrews are fundamentally at one. Prophecy and fulfillment make sense of the relation between the Christian 'now' and the Jewish 'then' in both their schemes. In Hebrews the old cultic regulations are fulfilled in Christ's eternal and heavenly priesthood, the earnest looking forward of the old historical characters in the perfection of Christian existence. The earthly life of Jesus is the middle of time, the 'little while' which links these separate epochs by his coming as both fulfillment and forerunning pioneer. The faithful Christian is set between this centre and the end. In Hebrews as in Luke the fires of earlier eschatological expectation have cooled. . .because the Church has found plenty to get on with in the present (1976:21).

Likewise, L. Goppelt in his two volume Theology of the New Testament (1981) places his treatment of Luke and Hebrews in the same chapter because of the similarity he suggests exists between these works when compared to the

rest of the New Testament.

In every respect Hebrews offered an interpretation of the gospel that is fully independent alongside of Paul and John. Its interpretation was written for the community on a long journey, the community that was growing tired under the pressure of faith in the context of society. In this orientation the document showed no greater affinity with any other New Testament writing than the composition of Luke (1982:265,266).

Goppelt pointed out that Luke and Hebrews did reflect less an emphasis on the parousia than is found in the other New Testament writings. Furthermore, he noted that there is more of an emphasis on individual eschatology found in Luke-Acts and Hebrews. This is the result of the shift of emphasis from the parousia to the exaltation of Christ, a feature most prominent in Luke and Hebrews. While both Luke and Hebrews speak of the consummation at the parousia, their attention is not primarily directed at it, but rather at the exalted Christ. To use Goppelt's words: 'That meant: the expectation became permeable to an individual eschatology' (Ibid.:288).

Franklin summarizes Luke's eschatological intent in emphasizing the exaltation of Christ:

He writes to meet the ambiguities in the lives of his readers caused by doubts, persecutions, and disappointments. In this situation he summons them to make an act of faith in the present lordship of Jesus, in the present transcendent reality of the kingdom. Their hopes are removed from this world; they rest on faith in the unseen (1975:47).

A comparison of this statement with Goppelt's analysis of the author of Hebrews' intent in writing reveals the

close proximity with which Luke-Acts and Hebrews stand.

The community to which the author addressed himself was comparable to the people of Israel during the wilderness wanderings. Like Israel back then, so now the community too was in danger of succumbing to fatigue (3:12f.); it became disappointed that the path to the promised land had become so long and arduous. Without the imagery that meant: the community had become dismayed over the fact that the revelation of glory promised it had not come about visibly and instead it experienced one new affliction after another (3:7ff.; 6:12; 10:36ff.; 12:4-11). This sense of dismay produced a result typical for the second generation. Christians began to flag in their striving to lead a life by faith (2:13; 12:4) and conformed themselves once again to a life of worldly standards (13:13f.) (1982:242).

We have thus seen that the eschatological perspectives of Luke and Hebrews are quite similar and that the texts themselves would seem to point to a similar background and need on the part of the readership. This theological similarity, particularly as it stands over against the other New Testament writers in emphasis, furnishes another argument for the Lukan authorship of Hebrews.

3.3 Angelology

Regarding the subject of Angelology, Luke records more instances of angelic activity than any other New Testament writer and Hebrews is the New Testament book most interested in their theological status. Note, for example, the discussion of angels in Hebrews 1:5-14, where they are described as having worshiped at the nativity. It is Luke alone among the gospel writers who records this event.

3.4 Hebrews 6:1-2 and Acts

In Hebrews 6:1-2, there is a remarkable correspondence of thought and language to the entire book of Acts. The following parallels can be noted (Jones 1955:125).

repentance from dead works	- Heb. 9:14; Acts 2:3; 3:19; 14:15-17; 17:30, etc.
faith in God	- Acts 14:15-17; 15:9; etc.
baptism	- Acts <u>passim</u>
laying on of hands	- Acts 8:14-17
resurrection of the dead	- Acts 17:18,31
eternal judgment	- Acts 17:31; 24:25

Only in Hebrews and Acts are baptism and the laying on of hands mentioned as being a part of the rite of Christian initiation (Acts 2:38; Heb. 6:2). Notice how repentance and faith are very carefully distinguished in Hebrews 6:1-4. This corresponds to Acts 20:21 where Paul is recorded to have distinguished the two very carefully.

3.5 The theological significance of 'the house of Israel'

In the New Testament, there is the frequent designation of the people of God as composing God's 'house.' The church is sometimes described as the 'house of God' or the 'temple of God' as in I Corinthians 3:16, 6:19; Ephesians 2:19-22; I Timothy 3:15; I Peter 2:3-ff.; 4:17; and probably Hebrews 10:21 (Michel 1967:120-129).

A second use of the term 'house' with the meaning of

'family' or 'race' is also found in the New Testament. This usage is restricted to the writings of Matthew, Luke and Hebrews (Matthew 10:6; 15:24; Luke 1:27,33,69; 2:4; Acts 2:36; 7:42,46; Hebrews 3:1-6; 8:8,10; 10:21 (where it carries a meaning similar to the people of God as the church above) (Ibid.). The use of *επι* with *του οικου* 'over the house' followed by the possessive genitive occurs only 5 times in the New Testament, once in Luke and four times in Hebrews.

One clear observation from this data is that Luke and Hebrews stand over against Paul in their employment of this concept of 'God's house' as family or race. Second, it is Luke and the writer of Hebrews who are most interested in such phraseology as can be established from running a concordance check on the Greek term *οικος* 'house' as used with 'God, Jacob, David, and Israel.' Third, with the exception of Matthew, the phrase 'house of Israel' is confined to the writings of Luke and Hebrews in the entire New Testament. Such conceptual similarity bolsters further my argument for the Lukan authorship of Hebrews.

3.6 The use of the theological concept of *σημερον* 'today' in Luke-Acts and Hebrews

The word *σημερον* 'today' occurs 41 times in the New Testament: 8 times in Matthew, once in Mark, 20 times in Luke-Acts, 3 times in Paul, once in James, and 8 times in Hebrews. As with the term 'house,' most of the occurrences

are restricted to the writings of Matthew, Luke and Hebrews. This term has both a non-theological as well as a theological use in the New Testament. Most of the occurrences of *σημερον* occur in the former category with the meaning of 'today' as opposed to yesterday or tomorrow. However in Luke 4:21, Acts 13:33, Hebrews 1:5; 4:7; and 5:5, the term 'today' carries with it both Christological and eschatological baggage (Fuchs:272-274). Three of these occurrences are found in the quotation of Psalm 2:7, a Psalm which we have already seen was quoted exclusively by Luke and Hebrews (Acts 13:33; Hebrews 1:5; 5:5).

The usage in Luke 4:21 is important for our consideration in that it appears Luke is using this statement to show that the 'today' was not only for the audience in Jesus' presence at the event itself, but also extends to Luke's contemporary audience (understood to mean the readers of his gospel some 35 years after the events of Luke 4).⁵ The seven occurrences of this word 'today' from Hebrews 1:5-5:5 are being used by the author of Hebrews in exactly the same way as Luke 4:21 and Acts 13:35. God's 'today' of salvation is available even up to the present time with the result that three times (3:7,15; 4:7) Hebrews quotes Psalm 95:7,8: 'Today, if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.'

Such conceptual similarity, especially with the quotation of Psalm 2:7 on three occasions, all in the

writings of Luke and Hebrews, lends further weight to my theory.

3.7 Additional arguments

Further theological parallels include the use of *κυριος*, 'Lord', for God and the shared concept of *μετανοια*, 'repentance,' which pervades Luke and Hebrews.

Moffatt points out that the special aspect of the epistle to the Hebrews' emphasis on apostasy and drawing back in fear of suffering is aptly illustrated in the words of Jesus at Luke 12:5: 'I will show you whom to fear--fear him who after he has killed has power to cast you into Gehenna. Yes, I tell you, fear him.' Moffatt suggests that this illustrates the spirit and situation of Hebrews, where the writer warns his readers against apostasy by reminding them of 'the living God' and of the judgement (1924:xxxvi).

Another very interesting area of comparison is the similarity of ideas among Luke-Acts, Hebrews, and the Qumran writings. In an addendum to Munck's commentary on Acts, Albright and Mann illustrated the convergence of ideas in certain sections of Acts and Qumran (1967:263-ff.). J. de Waard concluded in 1966 that the resemblance between Acts, Hebrews, and Qumran were so great that some connection must have existed among these writings (1966:82).

An interesting feature of Hebrews is the emphasis on Christ as a member of the tribe of Judah instead of

portraying him as a priestly Messiah from the Levitical line. Why is this so? Perhaps the most plausible explanation is that somehow the recipients of Hebrews were being influenced by the Qumranian sect, and the writer felt compelled to counter the Qumranian notion that the Aaronic (Levitical) messiah was more important than the messiah of Israel (Fensham 1971:9-21). To argue the high-priesthood of Christ after the order of Melchizedek rather than from Aaronic lines makes little sense if we do not understand it to be a polemic against some group which had placed a superior emphasis on the Levitical line.

Qumran emphasized such things as ritual baths, angels as saviors, two messiahs, and the Aaronic line as superior to any other. Luke-Acts and Hebrews allude to many of these ideas, as does Paul in Colossians.

I am, however, not positing any historical connection between Hebrews and the Qumran community. Although there are some similarities, it appears that these similarities are outweighed by the differences. The recipients of Hebrews were probably not members of the Qumran community, but may have been in some way influenced by certain aspects or teachings of the Qumran society, and thus the similarities can be accounted for in this fashion (Bruce 1962-63:217-232).

A comparison of Paul's speech at the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, recorded by Luke in Acts 13:14-41, with

Hebrews reveals a number of parallels. First, the phrase 'word of exhortation' is used in Hebrews 13:22 to describe the particular literary genre of the epistle. Swetnam pointed out that this word was used to describe a 'homily' or sermon in Jewish synagogue worship (1969:268). It is so used in Acts 13:15 to describe Paul's sermon in the synagogue at Antioch, and these are the only two occurrences of this phrase in the New Testament.

The emphasis on the forgiveness of sins (Acts 13:38,39) compares to Hebrews which also emphasizes this concept (for example, 9:13,14). I have already shown the lexical similarity between Luke-Acts and Hebrews in the use of *αφεσις*, 'forgiveness' and the fact that the majority of times this word is used occurs in the Lukan writings and Hebrews.

Third, the reference to Israel spending forty years in the wilderness (Acts 13:18) also occurs in Hebrews 3:17 and in Stephen's speech in Acts 7:36.

Fourth, the quotation of Psalm 2:7 (Acts 13:33) occurs also in Hebrews 1:5 and 5:5, but nowhere else in the New Testament. Fifth, the unusual citation formula *εν ετερω λεγει*, 'in another place it says,' occurs also in Hebrews 5:6 and nowhere else in the New Testament.

These similarities are heightened by the fact that the writer to Hebrews chose to describe his work as a 'word of exhortation,' a phrase possibly used in the sense of a

synagogue homily, and that Luke describes Paul's address to the synagogue at Antioch with this very phrase. If Luke were the author of Hebrews, and if his readers were Jewish Christians (former priests), then he has addressed them with a 'word of exhortation' in the same way he records Paul having addressed the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch. As a traveling companion with Paul for many years, Luke must have heard Paul preach in synagogues on numerous occasions. Perhaps he was influenced by this particular method of address and furthermore felt that his readers would respond better to it than any other method. J. Robinson has pointed out that the theme of holding fast to the Lord found in Acts and specifically in Paul's sermon in Acts 13:14-41 is 'very much the tenor of Hebrews' (1976:218).

Swetnam suggested that the theme of the 'way' in reference to Christianity appears in Hebrews 10:20 (1969:265). The only other New Testament writer to refer to the Christian faith as the 'way' is Luke in Acts 9:2; 18:25,26; 19:9,23; 22:4; 24:14,22. We may interpret this evidence as further support for conceptual similarity between Luke and Hebrews.

It is now generally recognized by New Testament scholars that the theme of prophecy and fulfillment plays a major role in Lukan theology.⁶ Luke presents Jesus as God's final prophet who stands in the long line of prophets as the culmination of God's address to his people. I assert that

this theological motif which so pervades the Lukan writings is also characteristic of the epistle to the Hebrews.

In an excursus on the fulfillment of prophecy in Luke-Acts at the end of his commentary, Talbert points out that in Luke fulfilled prophecy comes from three types of sources: (1) the Jewish scriptures; (2) a living prophet (Zacharias, Simeon, etc.); and (3) heavenly beings (angels and the resurrected Jesus himself) (1982:234-240). In the prologue, Luke refers to the 'events' which he is about to narrate as having the note of 'fulfillment.' Fitzmyer notes that these events which have been fulfilled 'belong to a past and a present which are not unrelated to what God has promised in the Old Testament' (1981:289).

The infancy narratives (Luke 1 & 2) function in Luke's overall general plan to show the continuity of salvation history. The ministry of Jesus is firmly rooted in and emerges from the Old Testament scripture and history of Israel (Carruth 1973:97). The temptation narrative in Luke 4 is presented by Luke so as to parallel Jesus with the Old Testament prophet Moses (Ibid.:136). The preaching of Jesus at Nazareth in Luke 4 functions as the inception of his prophetic role. Jesus assumed the role of the long awaited eschatological prophet by his statement 'This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears' (Luke 4:21).

The arrival of Jesus in Jerusalem and events leading up to his arrest and crucifixion are narrated by Luke in such a

way so as to emphasize the following themes (Ibid.:219; 254-55):

1. The rejection and death of Jesus is described in terms of the martyrdom of the prophets in the Old Testament.
2. The catalyst that prompted the plot to kill Jesus was the fact that he had assumed a prophet's role and overstepped the boundaries of the interpretation of the Torah by official Jewry.
3. Jesus is portrayed not merely as a prophet, but as the final prophet.
4. Jesus was rejected like all of God's prophets.
5. In Luke 24, the prophetic role of Jesus is stressed in that he is not only seen as the object of prophecy, but he is a prophet in his own right who brings to completion the word of God.

The scheme of prophecy and fulfillment continues in Acts with the emphasis on the Abrahamic promise in Stephen's speech in Acts 7 (Dahl 1966:139-158). Furthermore, in Acts Luke has identified Jesus with three figures of Jewish eschatological expectations described in prophetic categories: the Servant-Messiah, the prophet like Moses (Acts 3:22; 7:37), and the returning Elijah (prominent in the language and details of the ascension narrative) (Carruth 1973:293). From this it becomes quite evident that the motif of prophecy and fulfillment plays a crucial role for Luke. The notion of Jesus as God's final prophet is highlighted in Luke-Acts.

Turning to Hebrews, is there any evidence of the prophecy and fulfillment motif playing a role in the

author's conceptual framework? Indeed there is, and right at the very outset of the book. In the prologue (1:1-4) it is stated that God has spoken in former days by the prophets, but now he has spoken by his Son. Jesus is here perceived as God's final revelation; his final prophet through whom God has decisively spoken. This may be compared to the prologue in Luke where the events about to be narrated are described as having been fulfilled (Fitzmyer 1981:293).

The prologue to Hebrews reveals the author's conception of the history of revelation as longitudinal in which earlier and piecemeal forms of God's address have been replaced by Jesus as God's final address (Hughes 1979:6). For the writer of Hebrews, both continuity and discontinuity are factors to be recognized in the process of revelation history. Thus, Hebrews 1:1-4 states theologically what Luke narrates historically in his gospel.

G. Hughes has shown through a careful literary analysis of the text how the prologue in Hebrews functions in a programmatic way. The writer draws a contrast between Jesus and the angels (1:5-2:4), Jesus and Moses (3:1-ff.), and Jesus and the Aaronic priesthood (4:14-5:10; 7:1-28), and it is the motif of God's new revelation which serves as the guiding paradigm for the development of the argument (Ibid.:5-24).

The relationship of the old to the new serves as a key

theme in Hebrews, and such is also the case with Luke-Acts. Franklin has noted that Luke views the institutions of the past and revelatory events of the past as having been superceded by the new act of God in Christ. It is this fact which invalidates for Luke any attempt to cling to the old (1975:44). In Luke, it is Jesus set over against the old Israel, while in Acts it is the church as the new people of God who exhibit both elements of continuity and discontinuity with the people of God in the old order.

This theme, which is certainly not alien to the rest of the New Testament, does seem to find its greatest focus in Luke-Acts and Hebrews, and thus a further conceptual similarity among the three books is adduced.

3.8 Conclusion.

Moffatt is aware of some of the parallels cited in this section on theology, but argues that community of atmosphere is all that can be postulated (Moffatt 1924:lxiv). I find it difficult to conceive of two theological communities so similar and yet unconnected in the early days of the church. Godet is willing to go a step further than Moffatt and argues that the writings of Luke are both temporally and ideologically related to Hebrews.

For internal analogies compare the following . . . In Luke, the transformation of the Mosaic system into spiritual obedience. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the transformation of the Levitical cultus into a spiritual cultus. In both, the idea of the human development of

Jesus forming the foundation of the Christology
(1887:548).

He conceives of Hebrews as having been written shortly
after Luke-Acts and by Luke himself on the basis of the
above stated analogies.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

¹See Darrell Bock 1987:60-89; 240-249; Robert F. O'Toole 1983:259-268; P. Goldsmith 1968:321-24; and F. F. Bruce 1962.

²Weihrich 1904.

³See, for example, Fitzmyer 1981:231-234; E. Franklin 1975:9-47; and E. E. Ellis 1972.

⁴Crucial literature on this subject includes R. Williamson 1967; C. K. Barrett 1966:363-393; and Lincoln Hurst 1984.

⁵Cf. D. Tiede 1980; I. H. Marshall 1978:185; and Jerome Kodell 1983:16-18.

⁶See, for example, Theodore Carruth 1973; Charles Talbert 1982:234-240; Ibid. 1984:91-103; Fitzmyer 1981:287-301; Robert J. Karris 1979; and the latest effort which synthesizes and evaluates the current state of scholarship on this subject by Darrell L. Bock 1987.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE JEWISH BACKGROUND OF LUKE-ACTS

The greatest objection to the Lukan authorship of Hebrews by scholars has always been the supposition that Luke was a Greek while the author of Hebrews was Jewish. Actually neither of these conclusions is certain and it could very well be that Luke was both a Gentile and the author of Hebrews. But I do think it highly probable that the author of Hebrews was Jewish, and it is this fact which has kept most scholars from giving Luke a second look as a potential candidate for authorship. On what basis have scholars assumed Luke's non-Jewish background? Is there any evidence, either external or internal, that would support a Jewish background for Luke?

4.1 The identity of Luke

There is a long-standing church tradition beginning with the Muratorian Canon (ca. A. D. 170-180) which identifies the author of Luke-Acts as Luke the physician.

Lines 2-8 read

The third book of the Gospel: According to Luke. This Luke was a physician. After the ascension of Christ, when Paul had taken him along with him as one devoted to letters, he wrote it under his own name from hearsay. For he himself had not seen the Lord in person, but, insofar as he was able to follow (at all), he thus began his account with the birth of John (Aland 1964:538).

At the end of the second century, further evidence for Lukan authorship of Luke-Acts is found in Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* 3.1,1: 'Luke, too, the companion of Paul, set forth in a book the gospel as preached by him' (Ibid.:537). The extratextual Prologue to the Gospel, dated at the end of the second century, describes Luke as

a Syrian of Antioch, by profession a physician, the disciple of the apostles, and later a follower of Paul until his martyrdom. He served the Lord without distraction, without a wife, and without children. He died at the age of eighty-four in Boeotia, full of the holy Spirit (Ibid.:533).

It can be readily observed from these references that there is a solid tradition regarding Luke as the author of the gospel and Acts. It can be further noted that there is no reference in these statements regarding Luke's ethnic background. Modern scholarship tends to view Luke as a Gentile Christian, and thus the only non-Jewish writer of the New Testament. The evidential basis for such a conclusion consists in Luke's command of the Greek language, his occasional avoidance of Semitic words when compared to the other Synoptic gospels, the omission of Jesus' controversies with the Pharisaic understanding of the Law in Luke's gospel, the transformation of Palestinian local color and certain details into Hellenistic counterparts, and an inference drawn from Colossians 4:10-14 (Fitzmyer 1981:41,42). This evidence, though admittedly skimpy and capable of differing interpretations, has been enough to

convince most scholars of Luke's Gentile origin.

But the evidence may just as readily yield to another interpretation. We have already seen numerous examples from Luke-Acts which could suggest that Luke was writing from a Jewish perspective and primarily for a Jewish audience. Suppose we construct a theory in which Luke is of Jewish extraction and see how well it fits the textual and historical evidence. Ramsay (1915:370-384) discovered in the papyri of Pisidian Antioch a rather interesting fact. The name Luke and Lucius were used interchangeably for the same individual. The phenomenon is similar to our own use of pet names and shortened forms of longer names, such as 'Robert' and 'Bob.' One is a formal name, while the other is the more familiar form. The name 'Luke' is found three times in the Pauline corpus: Colossians 4:14, 2 Timothy 4:11, and Philemon 24. The name 'Lucius' occurs twice in the New Testament: Acts 13:1 and Romans 16:21. In the latter passage, Lucius is coupled with Jason of Thessalonica and Sosipater of Beroea. Paul refers to them all as 'kinsmen,' that is, Jews (cf. Romans 9:3 and 16:7,11).

It has sometimes been suggested that Luke and the Lucius of Acts 13:1 may be the same individual. Others have said that perhaps the Lucius of Acts 13:1 and Romans 16:21 is the same as Luke. There are good reasons for suggesting

that the Lucius of Romans 16:21 and Luke are identical.

The names of the men who gathered around Paul while he was in Corinth, where he wrote Romans, are found in two places in the New Testament, Romans 16:21 and Acts 20:4,5. A comparison of these lists of names reveals two names common to both lists, Timothy and Sopater. But note that in Acts 20:5,6, Luke was also present as indicated by his use of 'us' and 'we.' Interestingly enough, a 'Lucius' is mentioned in the Roman list. Thus, there were simultaneously in Paul's company both a 'Luke' and a 'Lucius.' It seems probable, therefore, that these two names refer to the same individual. If this identification is correct, the question may be asked, why does Paul refer to Luke on three occasions as 'Luke' and only in Romans 16:21 call him 'Lucius'? Since Paul was personally unknown to the Christians at Rome when he wrote Romans, he may therefore have chosen to use Luke's more formal name. Note that in the Roman list, 'Sosipater' is used, the more formal spelling of 'Sopater,' which occurs in Acts 20:4. Also, there is no mention of a 'Lucius' in the Acts list, which is exactly what we should expect if Luke is Lucius, and there is no 'Luke' in the Roman list, only a Lucius. On all other occasions where Paul uses the name 'Luke,' it is in writing to churches or groups whom he has previously visited with Luke and thus Luke's familiar name is used. Origen attests to this identity of Luke and Lucius, thus giving us a rather

early tradition in its favor. B. Reicke, who also believes that Luke and Lucius should be identified as the same individual, concludes:

If this hypothesis is accepted, the New Testament indicates that Luke the Evangelist was Jewish in origin. This is the simplest explanation of interest shown by the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles in the redemptive history of the Old Testament, in preaching among the Jews, and in Jewish Christian traditions.¹

The chief objection to this proposed identification is found in some scholars' interpretation of Colossians 4:10-14. Here some have inferred from the listing of Luke's name separately from 'those of the circumcision' that Luke was a Gentile. An examination of the textual evidence places this inference on less stable grounds. In verses 10 and 11, three men are said to be 'those of the circumcision.' In verses 12 and 13, Epaphras is mentioned as being from Colossae. Then comes verse 14 where Luke is mentioned. This is usually understood to mean that Luke is contrasted with those Jews and is therefore a Gentile. However, this interpretation has been contested by many for the following reasons. If Luke were a Gentile, why is there no clear mention of that fact as there is with Titus in Galatians 2 and Timothy in Acts 16? Luke was a close associate of Paul as were Titus and Timothy. Second, the train of thought has been broken in Colossians 4:10-14 by the intervening two verses dedicated to Epaphras. Third, perhaps Luke is mentioned last as being especially dear to Paul. Fourth,

Paul is not complaining that only three of his own countrymen labored with him. Rather, he is commending three men who, though Jews, stood by him in some critical situation in the past; a situation which Paul now looks back upon. Note the use of the aorist tense verb 'became' in verse 11. Finally, it is interesting to note that the assumption from these verses that Luke was a Gentile was never made by the Church Fathers (Cf. Reicke 1964:10-24).

Albright has argued that one should not infer from Colossians 4:10-14 that Luke was not circumcised (1967:266). His argument turns upon the meaning of the phrase *οι ουτες εκ περιτομης*. The phrase is usually translated 'they of the circumcision' and hence interpreted to mean Jews. He suggests that the phrase should be translated 'they of the circumcision party' as in Galatians 2:12 and thus refer to the Judaizers who insisted that circumcision was necessary for salvation.

Fitzmyer disputes Albright's interpretation on two counts (1981:44). First, it makes no sense to say that the three men named in the text were the only ones of the circumcision party who had been a comfort to Paul. Second, the phrase 'one of yourselves' in verse 12 calls for the more general meaning of 'converts from Judaism' for the phrase 'they of the circumcision.'

Whether Albright's interpretation is accepted or not, on the basis of the above evidence, it would seem precarious

to propose dogmatically a Gentile background for Luke. If Luke and Lucius were the same individual in the New Testament, then the statement about Lucius in Romans 16:21 makes it probable if not certain that Luke was a Jew.² At any rate it would seem that we should at least heed the caution of Eric Franklin.

Whether Luke was himself a Jew must remain an open question. At any rate, however, he must have been one who was influenced supremely by the Jewish faith, one who loved our nation, who was moved by its law and captivated by its Scriptures, one who was led to see in Jesus a³ fulfillment of its hopes and a widening of its promises.

Clarke, in reference to Plummer's comment about Luke's being the 'versatile Gentile', supports strongly the opposite idea that Luke must have been a Jew if he is to be considered the author of Luke-Acts.

I find this theory of the versatile Gentile very unconvincing. Greek was the literary language of the East and known to all Jews with any claim to culture. It is easy to see that a Jew when writing Greek would from time to time use native idioms and constructions. It is difficult to conceive the case of a Greek who became so saturated with Hebraic idioms as to use them when writing in his own tongue. If, therefore, the meaning of Col. iv. 10-14 is that Λουκας was a Greek, it is hard to suppose that he wrote either of the works attributed to him (Clarke 1933:393).

4.2 Jewish aspects of Luke-Acts

In recent years, the increasing awareness of the intensely Jewish aspects of Luke's writings has prompted a re-evaluation of their theology and readership. Some scholars have challenged the prevailing paradigm of Luke's

supposed Gentile orientation in favor of a more Jewish orientation. Most notable among this group is perhaps Jacob Jervell, who in his work *Luke and the People of God* (1972) argues that the traditional Gentile understanding of Luke's background and purpose is probably in error. While not denying the Hellenistic outlook of Luke-Acts, or Luke's obvious interest in the Gentile mission, Jervell and others have shown that it is possible to interpret them as having been written from a Jewish perspective and for a Jewish audience. I will argue for the probability of Luke having been a Jew and having written his gospel primarily for a Jewish audience on the basis of the evidence which the texts themselves present. Furthermore, if this possibility be admitted to the realm of credible speculation by scholars (as many have already admitted), then a major obstacle for Lukan authorship of Hebrews is lessened considerably. Hebrews is adjudged by most scholars to have been written by one who was a Jew. It is this fact coupled with the supposed Gentile background for Luke the man as well as the supposed Greek readership for his two-volume work which have prompted most scholars to reject Lukan authorship for Hebrews as a credible alternative.

Jervell argues that some of Luke's omissions from Mark are evidence of a pro-Jewish point of view. For example, he suggests that Luke's omission of Mark 7:1-23 does not reveal an anti-Jewish or pro-Gentile orientation as is

usually suggested, but rather he sees this omission as evidence of just the opposite case. The passage deals with matters of Jewish ritual (the question of cleanliness and defilement) and therefore it has been assumed that Luke disregarded it as being irrelevant for his Gentile audience. It is Jervell's contention that Luke omitted this section because he did not wish to cast Jesus in a light which would have him critical of Rabbinic halakah. In other words, Luke's purpose is to present Jesus as a loyal Jew and hence he did not include the Markan section (1972:133-147). To my mind, Jervell's work succeeds in showing Luke's intent to cast Jesus and Paul in the most favorable light for Jewish readers. Other elements of Luke's Jewish orientation will now be presented.

Luke begins his two-volume work with a very stately Hellenistic prologue, then immediately plunges the reader into two chapters of distinctly Jewish events and terminology. This sudden change is odd if Luke were writing for a Gentile audience but natural if he were writing to someone of Jewish extraction. Both the Magnificat (Luke 1:46-55) and the Benedictus (Luke 2:28-32) are filled with statements and references which would make little sense to a Gentile reader unfamiliar with Jewish customs. Emphasis is placed on the fact of Jesus' circumcision, a point omitted by the other gospel writers. It is Luke alone among the

gospel writers who feels the need to record the presentation of the child Jesus in the temple, and his subsequent teaching activity there as a child of twelve.

W. Tatum has pointed out the fact that Jerusalem and especially the temple stand at the center of attention in Luke 1 and 2.

. . . the events themselves take place wholly within the geographical confines of Palestine; and the real geographical axis of Luke i-ii is Jerusalem, the site of the Temple (i. 5-23, ii. 22-39, 41-51). Cultic acts are prominent throughout: the burning of the incense (i. 8-10), circumcision and the naming of a child (i. 59; ii. 21), the rite of purification with the accompanying sacrifice (ii.22-39), and the Passover celebration (ii. 41-3), [sic] Furthermore, such marks of personal piety as obedience to the Law (i.6), prayer (i. 10,13; ii. 37), and fasting (ii. 37) are mentioned. The theological idea fundamental to Luke i-ii is the notion of Israel as the people of God (see i. 16-17, 54, 68, 77; ii. 10(?), 32, 34. Within this overarching theological framework stand a multitude of references to the different individuals and various traditions that chequered God's long history of dealings with his chosen people: Abraham (i. 55,73), Moses (ii. 22), Aaron (i.5), David (i.27, 32, 69; ii. 4, 11), Elijah (i. 17), the fathers (i. 72), the prophets (i. 70), the Nazarite movement (i. 15), the priestly tradition (i. 5, 8; and the cultic acts above), scribal interpretation (ii. 46 f.), the monarchy (the mention of David; and i. 5), and the messianic hope (which pervades the whole; as i. 32f.; ii. 11, 25-6, 29f., 38) (1966-67:194,195).

It can be easily established from Luke's writings that he had a definite interest in matters pertaining to priests. His gospel begins with the story of Zacharias the priest performing his temple duty. Luke tells us that Zacharias was a priest 'of the division of Abijah' (1:5) and gives no further word of explanation as to what this means. Details about the manner in which he served 'according to the

customs of the priesthood' (1:9) are given. Even when Luke describes Elizabeth, he indicates that she is from a priestly family, being 'of the daughters of Aaron' (1:5). By his use of these statements Luke assumes a great deal of Jewish knowledge in his readers. In Luke 3:1-3, he refers to Annas and Caiaphas as the reigning high priests.

One may also say that if Luke were a Gentile, he was at least thoroughly conversant with Jewish priestly practices and took valuable space to record a number of details which might otherwise have been of little interest to a Gentile reader.

Turning to Acts, we find Luke referring to many priests who had become obedient to the faith (6:7). In 19:14, he mentions the seven sons of a Jewish high priest Sceva and their escapades. Why include such material if writing to Gentiles only? Of particular interest is that in Acts 23:3-5 Paul rebukes the high priest, then apologizes for his sharp rebuke upon learning that it was indeed the high priest whom he had addressed. In all, the book of Acts speaks of priests or high priests in the following places: 4:1,5,6,23,36; 5:17; 6:7; 7:1; 9:1; 19:14; 22:5,30; 23:2,3,4,5,14; 24:1; 25:2,15.

The Jewish nature of Luke-Acts is also seen in Luke's concept and use of the temple in his narrative. He speaks more about it than any other writer in the New Testament. His gospel begins and ends in the temple and this is a

significant fact in understanding Luke's purpose. Luke has topically highlighted the importance of the temple by sandwiching his first volume between two appearances of this important lexical item. The word 'temple' occurs in Luke 1:9 and again in Luke 24:53, the last verse of the last chapter. It occurs a total of 14 times in Luke and 24 times in Acts.

For Luke, the temple is the place where the gospel is first announced. Luke records that Jesus visited the temple four times. The first visit was as an infant when he was brought there by his parents in fulfillment of the Jewish law (Luke 1 and 2). The second visit comes when Jesus is a boy of twelve and he talks with the teachers within the temple precincts. The third visit occurs at the climax of the temptation of Christ, where Luke changes the order of Matthew and Mark and has Jesus come to the temple last. On his final visit to the temple, Jesus enters Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, moves immediately to the temple area and cleanses it and there confronts the leaders of Israel with the choice of acceptance or rejection.

The book of Acts also begins with the church meeting daily 'in the temple' (Acts 2:46). Paul continually preaches in the Jewish synagogues until he finally reaches Rome. What does all of this mean? Why does Luke feel compelled to give so much weight to the temple? No doubt it

played an important part in the early history of the church. But if Luke's audience consisted of Gentiles, or if he were a Gentile, as is traditionally believed, why is there such emphasis placed upon the Jewish relationship to the early church, especially the relationship of the Jewish temple to the early church? This evidence could be interpreted to mean that Luke was Jewish or writing to a Jewish audience, or both.

The city of Jerusalem has for Luke both a geographical and a theological significance as can be seen in Acts 1:8, where it is the site from which the world-wide Christian mission began. Luke records in Acts the preaching of Paul in the synagogues and then when Paul comes to Rome, Luke stresses in Acts 28 that he came as a prisoner from Jerusalem. Of further interest is the fact that when Paul arrives in Rome, Luke records that he called for the Jewish leaders and not the leaders of the Christian church. After some of the Jews believe but others do not, Paul quotes Isaiah 6 in Acts 28:26-27 and emphasizes the fact that it is the Jews who have brought God's judgment upon Jerusalem and the temple because of their obduracy. The whole of Paul's controversy at Rome is seen to lie within the framework of Judaism rather than a Gentile one.

Lampe has outlined the obvious interest which Luke places upon the centrality of Jerusalem in his gospel and Acts. For example, he writes:

The Gentile Gospel ends with the Lord commanding the eleven to stay in the city of Jerusalem, and the last words of the story are that they were continually in the Temple blessing God. Nothing could be less Gentile (1969:3).

Lampe further observes:

But the Gentile gospel opens in the heart of Jerusalem where a Jewish priest is carrying out his ritual duties in the Temple. The central episode in Luke's infancy narrative is the Presentation: the coming of the Lord's Messiah to the Temple, the revelation to Simeon of God's salvation, and the testimony to this given by Anna to all those who were awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem. . . .

An intense interest in Jerusalem is characteristic of the early part, not of Matthew but of Luke the Gentile (Ibid.:3,4).

Of further interest is the fact that Luke has arranged more than one third of his gospel in the framework of a journey on which Jesus has 'set his face to go to Jerusalem' (Luke 9:51). Three times during this travel narrative the reader is informed of the journey and the fact that Jerusalem is the goal (Luke 9:51; 13:22; 17:11).

It has been shown that both the temple and the city of Jerusalem are clearly emphasized in the early part of Luke's gospel (1:5-4:13) and in the concluding section (19:45-24:53). This prominence of the temple and the city in both Luke and Acts is one of the distinguishing features of his writings.

Another hint concerning the Jewish provenance of Luke-Acts is found in Luke's treatment of the Samaritans. Nowhere does he explain who the Samaritans are as does John in John 4:9. The introduction to the 'travel narrative'

(9:51) is virtually unintelligible to one without previous knowledge of the Samaritans and the relationship between Gerazim and Jerusalem. Luke assumes a great deal in his readers on this subject (1972:113-127). If his audience is composed of Jewish Christian readers, then they would already be aware of the situation of the Samaritans and hence there would be no need for Luke to explain it to them.

There is another feature of the gospel of Luke which may lend credence to the theory of Luke's Jewish background. In the Magnificat of Luke 1, there is an unusual combination of tenses in verses 46 and 47, a phenomenon which has received special attention resulting in a number of unsatisfactory explanations. Recently, Randall Buth (1984:67-83) has proposed a solution to this problem which I think makes the most sense of the data.

There is a feature of Hebrew poetry called 'tense shift' where the tenses in adjacent clauses are switched purely for rhetorical effect. Nothing in the surface or semantic structure of the text requires such switching. Furthermore, such tense switching does not seem to be a property of either Greek or Aramaic discourse. Of further interest is the fact that the LXX translation of the Psalms does not reflect the notion of Hebrew tense shifting. Therefore, Luke could not have used the LXX as a model for his composition of the Magnificat. Buth's suggestion is that the Magnificat is an original Hebrew poem which Luke or

more probably someone else has carefully transmitted into Greek.

Buth summarizes his study of Hebrew poetic tense shifting with the following five points (Ibid.:73,74):

1. In Hebrew poetry the tense will sometimes shift from past-complete to present-future-past-habitual, or vice versa, without a change in the referential world.
2. This tense shifting is both a cohesive device in Hebrew poetry and a way of enhancing the formal beauty or esthetic quality.
3. This phenomenon is attested in Hebrew poetry from the end of the second millennium B. C. to the end of the first millennium B. C.
4. This does not seem to be a natural feature of either Greek or Aramaic.
5. The LXX, by avoiding this tense phenomenon, could not have served as a vehicle for teaching such a poetic device to Christian readers of Greek or to Luke.

The unusual combination of the present and aorist tenses in Luke 1:46-47 can best be explained by the phenomenon of Hebrew tense shifting. Luke was sensitive enough to this phenomenon to have used it in his gospel. Yet this is very unusual, if Luke was the Gentile writer scholars have supposed him to be. The question must be asked: where did Luke learn such niceties of the Hebrew language? Some have argued that Luke composed the Magnificat himself. If so, where did he learn this subtlety of Hebrew poetry if he is non-Jewish? Buth seems to feel that someone other than Luke translated the poem into Greek and preserved the Hebrew poetic tense shift in spite of normal Greek usage and in

spite of the contrary translation practice of the Septuagint (Ibid.:74,75).

Luke may have received this information from Mary the mother of Jesus through personal interview. She could have related the incident and her response in Hebrew and Luke chose to convey carefully the tense shift of her poetic Magnificat in his Greek text. Either way one approaches the problem, Luke has used his source(s) and method of composition to preserve a textual feature that makes awkward Greek, yet reflects careful translation from a (possible) Hebrew original, a fact which illustrates further his knowledge of Jewish textual features as well as his possible Jewish background.

In summary fashion, Buth remarks that

The results of this study legitimize the verbs in Luke 1.46-47 and give us a sense of appreciation for them. The Greek verbs, although based on a Hebrew poem, are not necessarily the result of ignorance on the part of a translator. A satisfactory explanation does not need a translator who could not understand Hebrew or Aramaic; someone who understood Hebrew verbs provides a better explanation (Ibid.:75).

The linguistic evidence argues against the notion of someone of Greek background having composed the song. Buth argues against Luke having composed it because he assumes Luke to be a Gentile. Luke could have been a Gentile who got his information directly from Mary and preserved the unique phenomenon of Hebrew tense shift in his Greek narrative. If so, why would he translate it in such a way

that would make for odd reading in Greek? I think the better explanation is that which takes this evidence as being supportive of the Jewish background of Luke.

In another recent article, Buth has proposed a solution to the problem of the plural *κυριοι* found in Luke 19:31-34 (1985:680-685). Interpreters have sought to explain the strangeness of the plurality of owners as perhaps a reference to the owner and his wife. If, as Buth suggests, in Hebrew a single owner of an animal is often referred to in the plural, then we have an example of a Hebraism in Luke's text.

In the parallel account in Mark (11:5), the men are not referred to as 'owners' but a plural noun phrase is used: 'And some of those who stood there were saying to them. . . .' Buth argues that if his suggested solution is correct, then Mark cannot be the source for Luke at this point.

The alternative would be to say that Luke accidentally produced a good Mishnaic Hebrew idiom from Mark's plural. Such is not probable since there is no reason or motivation for calling all of the men owners (Ibid.:683).

Buth suggests that Luke acquired this Hebraism from a Hebrew source, but is it not also possible that no sources are involved and that Luke is the author of the idiom? If so, it may be a further pointer toward the possible Jewish background and orientation of Luke.

Luke 14:26-27 may furnish another indication of Luke's

knowledge of Hebrew (Lachs 1980:40,41).

If anyone comes to Me and does not hate his father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters, yes, and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple. And whoever does not bear his cross and come after Me cannot be My disciple.

If these verses are translated from Greek into Hebrew, there is a word play upon the verbs 'hate' and 'bear,' which contain the very same consonants in Hebrew ('hate' חָטַף, 'bear' חָשַׁף). It may be that this word play is an intentional feature by Luke, and assuming a Jewish readership, they would probably be aware of it. Certainly a Gentile audience would not be able to appreciate such a word play apart from a knowledge of the Hebrew language.

4.3 The Lukan conception of the relationship of Judaism to the Church

In further support of the thesis that Luke was Jewish, consider the way Luke has understood the Jewish nation and its relationship to the church. His writings reflect an understanding of one who is a Jewish Christian.

. . . the assumption that Luke was a Gentile has made Gentile Christians to recognize that the polemics, scriptural arguments, and proofs which are rehearsed in Luke-Acts are part of an intrafamily struggle that, in the wake of the destruction of the temple, is deteriorating into a fight over who is really the faithful Israel (Tiede 1980:6).

Furthermore, Vine points out that there is a Jewish emphasis in Acts which indicates a situation and readership with a strongly Jewish background and where an answer is urgently needed to the question Who has the truth,

Christians or Jews? (1985:47).

The interpretation of Luke's theology of mission most widely held today is that only after the Jewish people rejected the gospel offer was the door opened for the Gentiles to be saved. However, in light of the text of Acts, this thesis must be modified. Luke does not describe a Jewish people who rejected the gospel en masse save for a small minority of believers. Rather, Israel is seen as consisting of two groups: the repentant and the obdurate (Jervell 1983:19). The former group, those Jews who believed in the messiah, Luke considered to be the true Israel. Consequently 'Israel,' as the term is used by Luke, refers to the people of God consisting not of Jews and Gentiles, but of the repentant portion of national Israel. According to him, the church did not separate itself from Israel; rather, the unrepentant portion of national Israel forfeited its elect position as the people of God and the church (both Jew and Gentile) continued as the true people of God. This is not to deny that God still has an eschatological plan for national Israel a la Romans 9-11, nor is it to suggest an amillennial interpretation of the church as the new Israel. What I am suggesting is that the notion that the rejection of the kingdom by Israel is what opens the door of the gospel to the Gentiles or the church is false.

Our picture, namely of the Gentiles always willing to accept the gospel promptly and willingly and the Jews in general rejecting it, is not correct according to Acts. Both Jews and Gentiles accept the gospel, but the Jews are the great majority. Our impression that it is the other way round does not come from Acts, but from our common concept of the history of early Christianity (Ibid.:22).

According to scripture, the Gentiles have a share in salvation through the promises to Israel. The mission to the Jews is a necessary precursor before salvation could be extended to the Gentiles. It is remarkable that in Acts, Luke records not the failure, but the great success of the mission to the Jews. Mass conversions are again and again reported: 2:41,47; 4:4; 5:14; 6:1,7; 9:42; 12:24; 13:43; 14:1; 17:10ff.; 19:20; 21:20 (Jervell 1972:44). Such mass conversions of Jews belie any contention that Israel rejected Christ en bloc. Most of the references to Gentiles are to 'God-fearing' Gentiles, already related to Israel and Judaism via the synagogue (e.g.: 13:43; 14:1; 17:4,12) (Ibid.). In Acts 10, the Jewish piety of Cornelius is emphasized. Throughout, Luke demonstrates a widespread acceptance of the gospel by the Jewish people, despite strong opposition, and describes conversion of Jews and Gentiles as occurring simultaneously, rather than consecutively. The last picture of the Jews in Acts portrays an Israel divided over Christ (28:24ff.).

It seems important to Luke to show that the Jewish Christian church is a part of the reconstituted people of

God. Note his use of the phrase 'men, brethren,' and the fact that this form of address is not restricted to members of the Jewish Christian community. He characteristically uses this form throughout Acts as a Jewish address, while the term 'brothers' for Gentiles is consistently avoided (2:29,37; 7:2; 13:26,38; 15:7,13; 22:1; and 28:17) (Ibid.:50).

It is interesting how Luke portrays the influence of the Jerusalem church on the Gentile mission in Acts 21:15-ff. (Jervell 1983:22). Reports are made on the mission to the Gentiles to the Jerusalem church in verse 19. Verse 21 mentions that Jerusalem is informed about Paul's preaching among Jews in the diaspora. The Jerusalem church can even impose ritual acts upon Paul as recorded in verses 23 and following. Jerusalem makes decisions regarding how Gentiles should live, because she maintains the apostolic decree (21:25).

Of further interest is the significance which Luke ascribes to the election of Matthias to fill the vacancy created in the number of the apostles by the death of Judas in Acts 1:15-26. It is carefully stated that there was a company of 120 brethren which was the minimum number of men who could establish a community with its own council by Jewish law (Marshall 1960:62). The exegesis of this passage and its explanation in relation to the rest of the book is most difficult and most commentators discuss it only in

vague generalities. The question must be asked why the apostles find it necessary to elect a twelfth man to fill the vacancy created by the apostasy of Judas, but did not feel the similar need after the martyrdom of James? Because they were called by Jesus to perform a particular function and since that function was not given to any self-perpetuating body, the importance of the twelve must be seen primarily in their number and not in their persons. Luke viewed the twelve as having eschatological significance. Their presence challenges Israel to accept her renewal and join the reconstituted people of God. In some sense the twelve must be understood as the foundation of the remade Israel as well as the foundation of the church (Cf. Franklin 1975:95-99 and Jervell 1972:65).

Consider Luke's presentation of the events surrounding the Jerusalem conference in Acts 15. He records the fact that James quoted from the book of Amos in reference to the recent conversion of certain Gentiles.

After this I will return, and I will rebuild the dwelling of David, which has fallen; I will rebuild its ruins, and I will set it up, that the rest of men may seek the Lord, and all the Gentiles who are called by my name, says the Lord, who has made these things known from of old.

Note that the Cornelius story is cited as proof that the restoration of the fallen house of David has already occurred, as well as the Gentiles' seeking the Lord (Jervell 1972:51). The point here is that James considered the Amos

passage to have been fulfilled at that time (though such an interpretation does not preclude its being fulfilled eschatologically, i.e. during the millennium.). James stated that the conversion of the Gentiles was the fulfillment of the promises to Israel. This should not be understood to mean that the promises given to Israel had been transferred to the Gentiles, thus excluding Israel, but rather that the Gentiles had gained a share in what had been given to Israel. This fits well with Paul's theology of Israel in Romans 9-11.

Paul's parable of the olive tree in Romans 11:16-24 illustrates the relationship that exists between Israel and the church. The olive tree is a reference to Israel, but nowhere does Paul state that Israel as a whole has been set aside. Rather, he points out that 'some of the branches' have been 'cut off.' Those branches that were cut off represent the unbelieving portion of Israel as the people of God.

The wild olive represents the Gentile world. Gentile Christians are grafted into the good olive tree. Notice the continuity of the olive tree as the people of God. Notice further that Gentile Christians are grafted into the good olive tree and are not designated as a new tree. We may infer from this that there is continuity from the people of God in the Old Testament to the people of God in the New Testament age. The fact that some branches were broken off

does not imply that all were. The Gentiles are told that they have no ground for boasting because they have not in fact displaced Israel, rather they have been grafted onto Israel and are now members of the 'people of God.' The point of this parable is that the root of Israel is never uprooted to make way for a new 'tree', but rather it continues to give nourishment to the people of God.

Therefore, it is incorrect to say that only after the Jews have rejected the gospel is the way opened to the Gentiles. It would be more accurate to say that only after Israel has accepted the gospel can the way to Gentiles be opened.⁴ Note that throughout Acts in their speeches to Jews both Peter and Paul emphasize the sharing of the Gentiles in salvation, while in their speeches to Gentiles, they mention their commission to Israel.

In Peter's speech recorded in Acts 3, verse 26 implies that the missionary message has a further objective beyond the Jews (Jervell 1972:54-ff.) Thus, before God instituted the Gentile mission through the Cornelius event, and before the Jewish nation had the chance to reject the gospel offer, Peter was aware of the acceptance of the Gentiles. The addition of the Gentiles is a part of the restoration of Israel. Luke records Peter saying that God sent the messiah to Jews first with the intention of reaching Gentiles through them, and that Gentiles are added to complete the restoration of Israel.

As a result of Peter's sermon, while many Jews and proselytes were converted, others rejected the gospel. This is usually understood to mean that after the gospel was rejected by the Jews, it was preached to Gentiles, thus making the Gentile mission the result of Jewish obduracy. However, the partial rejection by the Jews was not prerequisite to the Gentile mission because the mission to non-Jews was already contained in the command of God. Moreover, it seems odd that the apostles should continue to preach in the Jewish synagogues after Luke, in Acts 13:46, quotes Paul as saying that they will now turn to the Gentiles. In Acts 18:6, Paul says for the second time, 'from henceforth I will go to the Gentiles.' Why does Luke continue throughout Acts to report mass conversions of Jews, while making only passing reference to Gentile converts? The answer seems to be that Luke was attempting to portray the church not as a totally new institution, created in consequence of the Jewish rejection, but as having been newly opened to Gentiles through the fulfillment of God's promises to Israel. Everywhere Paul preaches, there are repentant Jews who constitute the true people of God.

The reason for the preaching in the synagogues is a simple one: Christianity is for Luke the religion of Israel. The Synagogue scenes do not signal the transition from mission among Jews to Gentile mission. This is not the case even in 13,46 and 18,6. But the rejection of the gospel in one synagogue leads to preaching in other synagogues. . . . And there is not one, single, definite transition from mission among Jews to mission among Gentiles. But the preaching is

delivered in a way which shows that mission among Gentiles is connected with the mission among Jews, and that Acts contains no mission solely for Gentiles (Jervell 1983:20).

Maddox summarizes Jervell's assessment of the general ideas found in the book of Acts.

. . . in chapters 1-8 a renewed Israel is established, on the basis of repentance, piety according to the Law, and faith in Jesus. Luke repeatedly mentions the enormous numerical success of the mission among the Jews, a success which is to be understood as continuing while the diaspora-mission is going on, for by the time we come to 21:20 a high proportion of the population of Judaea must be Christian, if we are to take the figures seriously. Ch. 9-15 deal with the question of Gentiles, and show how they are allowed, both in principle and in practice, to be associated with Israel (1982:34).

4.4 Additional evidence

In a work entitled The Favorable Year of Our Lord (1977), Robert Sloan provides a penetrating analysis of jubiliary theology in the gospel of Luke. He argues that Luke 4:16-30 (the preaching of Jesus in Nazareth) is an event which has programmatic significance for the gospel of Luke. In addition, the quotation of Isaiah 61:1-2a and 58:6 read by Jesus in the synagogue in Nazareth shows that

the writer of Isaiah himself drew upon the Mosaic ordinances of the jubilee and sabbath years (Lev. 25; Ex. 21:2-6; 23:10-12; Dt. 15:1-18; 31:9-13) to picture Israel's return from Babylonian exile, and moreover, that Jesus' own subsequent use -- mediated through Isaiah -- of this priestly terminology relating to the sabbath/jubilee year ordinances was lost on neither Jesus' Nazareth audience nor the Jewish readers of the gospel of Luke (1977:1).

After a discussion of the Old Testament jubilee

passages, Sloan does an exegesis of Luke 4:16-30 and concludes that the theological provenance of the Nazareth pericope is the levitical year of jubilee mediated through Isaiah 61. Luke's positioning of this material in his gospel account as well as the terminology with which he expresses the meaning of Jesus' words reveals the importance which this theological concept had for Luke.

Sloan continues to present evidence that the theological concept of the year of jubilee undergirds several themes prominent in Luke's gospel. He examines especially Luke 6:20-38, the first half of the Sermon on the Mount, and Luke 11:4, the so called 'fifth prayer' of the Lord's Prayer. He concludes by stating that

the influence of the jubilee/sabbath year legislation . . . upon the message and self-understanding of Jesus is attestable not only in the Nazareth pericope. . . but is manifested persistently, if not pervasively, throughout the gospel of Luke, and has in fact to some extent conditioned the theological shaping and presentation of the gospel materials by Luke (Ibid.:111,112).

According to Sloan, the vision of jubilee may be adjudged to have theologically served the function of a paradigmatic Vorbild of the present/future eschatological salvation of God inaugurated and consummated by Jesus Christ (Ibid.:166).

Luke apparently considered the lexical term *αφεσις*, 'forgiveness,' to convey considerable theological weight in his writings since of the seventeen total occurrences in the New Testament, ten are found in Luke-Acts. Sloan discusses

the significance which the term had for jubiliary theology by pointing out that the word as it occurs twice in Luke 4:18 (Jesus' quotation of Isaiah 61) represents the primary theological and verbal connection with the levitical proclamation of jubilee (Ibid.:36,37). The term occurs twice in Hebrews, and interestingly enough, it occurs without any qualifiers in Hebrews 9:22 as in Luke 4:18. All other occurrences of this word in the New Testament typically add some qualifier to complete its meaning, usually the genitive *απαρτιων*, 'of sins.' Guthrie remarks that the absolute use of the word in Hebrews 9:22 should be understood as a reference not just to forgiveness from specific sins, but to general deliverance or release (Guthrie 1983:195). As such, the possibility is opened that the writer to Hebrews is using this term with its jubiliary background in mind as Luke has done in Luke 4:18. The word itself, the lack of qualifiers in Luke 4:18 and Hebrews 9:22, and the possible jubiliary background in both references further links Luke and Hebrews.

If Luke is a Greek writer writing only for a Gentile audience, the emphasis which he gives to Old Testament jubiliary themes in his gospel can be considered to be somewhat unusual. However, if Luke were Jewish or at least writing for a partly Jewish audience, then these factors are more easily accounted for. At the very least, it should be obvious that Luke is thoroughly familiar with Old Testament

Judaism and displays his knowledge of and interest in the Judaic scriptures, tradition and theological outlook.

In his doctoral dissertation at Princeton Theological Seminary entitled *The Pharisees in Luke-Acts: Luke's Address to Jews and his Irenic Purpose* (1978), Robert Brawley produces the evidence to show that more than any other writer in the New Testament, Luke presents the Pharisees favorably. He states that his study of this subject has led him to the conclusion that part of Luke's motive and purpose in writing his two-volume work was to address Jews who were not Christians with the intent of leading them to embrace Christianity (Ibid.:16). For Luke, the Pharisees are treated as respected representatives of Judaism with whom an appreciable segment of his audience would identify (Ibid.:159). Brawley offers an exegesis of several relevant passages and concludes that Luke's material is rich in persuasive admonition, the purpose of which is to persuade an audience which included Jews still outside the church (Ibid.). If Brawley's thesis is correct, then further evidence is marshalled in favor of a Lukan audience that is Jewish, and additional strength is added to the argument of Luke's Jewish outlook and interests.

In a recent article, D. W. Palmer has shown how Luke has employed a number of typical elements characteristic of a Jewish farewell scene in Acts 1:1-14 (1987:430,431). While the genre of farewell scenes and farewell speeches is

evidenced in Greek, Roman and Jewish writings, Palmer notes how the Jewish features are prominent in the prologue to Acts. Such a farewell scene includes a statement of the nearness of death or ascension either in the narrative or on the lips of the departing figure. Second, a specific audience is assembled by the departing figure. Third, sometimes there is a review of past history with paraenetic intention. Fourth, the one about to depart may appoint a successor, or transfer authority to another individual or group. Fifth, the last words of the departing figure are narrated, usually with brevity (Ibid.). Palmer illustrates each of these tendencies from Acts 1:1-14 and concludes that Luke has deliberately fashioned his narrative account along the lines of a Jewish farewell scene.

Further examples of the distinctly Jewish nature of Acts will be cited. On three occasions Luke records that Jesus died 'on a tree.' This is a distinctly Jewish way of referring to the crucifixion and occurs only two other times in the New Testament: Galatians 3:13 and I Peter 2:24. Thus, of the five occurrences of this distinctly Jewish form of expression for crucifixion, three are found in Luke's Acts.

The following Jewish chronological references are found in Acts.

- 2:1 - 'when the day of Pentecost was fully come'
- 16:13- 'on the sabbath day'
- 20:6 - 'days of unleavened bread'

20:16- 'to be at Jerusalem by the day of Pentecost'
 27:9 - 'the fast was now already past'

There is at least one reference to a Jewish method of reckoning distance: 'a sabbath day's journey.' Other examples reflecting a Jewish tinge include the following:

- 16:3 - Timothy was circumcised by Paul at the request of the Jews.
- 18:18 - Paul had shorn his head, for he had made a Jewish vow.
- 21:20 - You see how many thousands of Jews there are which have believed and they are all zealous for the law.
- 21:23,24 - Paul was advised by the Jewish leaders to join with four men who had made a vow and were now ready to fulfill the purificatory rites. He was further advised to pay the expenses of their offering, to show the people in Jerusalem that he conformed to the law of Moses.
- 28:17 - Arriving in Rome, Paul called not for the Christian leaders, but for the Jewish leaders. Verse 24 is especially significant, for there we are told of an Israel divided over Christ.

Like salt sprinkled throughout food, these many examples provide a Jewish flavor to the book of Acts that cannot be missed. Furthermore, as Juel has pointed out, they cannot be dismissed solely on the basis of the fact that the major participants in the narrative are Jewish. What is more significant is Luke's interest in their Jewishness (1983:103). If Luke were a Gentile or if he were writing for Gentiles, we would certainly expect to find less

Jewish elements in the narrative than we actually do find there. Furthermore, if the assessment of Luke's theology of Israel and her relationship to the church presented above is correct, then it is obvious that his orientation was more Jewish than has been generally recognized. We can at least say that Luke may indeed have been a Jew, and that he was a writer in the New Testament concerned with the history of salvation and the nation of Israel.

4.5 Excursus on the identity of Luke's intended reader Theophilus

A great deal of debate has occurred over the subject of the recipients of Luke's two-volume work. The bulk of New Testament scholarship has clearly opted for a Gentile audience. I propose that exactly the opposite is the case. No doubt Gentile Christians read Luke's gospel, but I propose that his primary audience was Jewish. I think it highly possible that his primary audience was a single Jewish individual named Theophilus. Both the prologue in Luke and the introduction to Acts refer to this individual, but he is never further identified. A cursory reading of any commentary will reveal that little is known about his identity.

All theories relative to the identity of Theophilus can be conveniently categorized as follows. (1) Theophilus is a pseudonym for an otherwise non-existent individual. (2) Theophilus is a pseudonym for one whom the author, for

purposes of protection, does not wish to name. Some have suggested that the name 'Theophilus' is a baptismal name given to this new convert. (3) Theophilus is actually the name of some person for whom Luke is writing. Some have suggested that Luke was not writing specifically for Theophilus, but was rather dedicating his work to him. Although this was not an unknown practice during the times, the structure of the prologue makes this highly unlikely.

The first category consists mostly in the suggestion that the two-volume work was addressed to some group of Christians and the name Theophilus is simply a designation used for all who are 'lovers of God.' However, the text uses the descriptive word 'most excellent,' an honorific title suggesting that an individual is referred to. In the book of Acts, this title is used by Luke to refer to Roman officials, and hence the suggestion that Theophilus was some Roman official to whom Luke addressed his work has found strong support from scholars. Supporters of this view see Luke-Acts as an apologetic for toleration of Christianity in the Roman empire. However, the problems with viewing Luke's purpose in this way are difficult to overcome (Cf. Ellis 1966:60).

The second category of theories is more widely supported today. Names for which Theophilus may have been a pseudonym include Sergius Paulus, Gallio, Titus, and Philo. Perhaps the greatest weakness of these suggestions is the

fact that there is some question as to whether baptismal names were given and widely used at this time in the history of the church.

The third category of theories is the one which I regard to be the most likely. At least two names have been suggested as being the recipients of Luke-Acts. Jerome suggested that a certain Theophilus who was an official in Athens, and convicted of perjury by the Aeropagus, may have been Luke's recipient. Others have proposed that Theophilus of Antioch who is mentioned in the Clementine Recognitions and who is said to have donated his house for the church to meet in may have been Luke's addressee.

There was a third individual prominent during the first half of the first century who to my knowledge has never been defended as Luke's Theophilus. The individual to whom I refer was Theophilus the High Priest, who served from A. D. 37 - 41. If Luke-Acts portrays a much more Jewish background than has been previously allowed for, why may we not suggest that Luke wrote his gospel for a Jewish High Priest perhaps to confirm his knowledge of Jesus and the early church, or to convert him to Christianity?

Theophilus was one of five sons of Annas, the High Priest mentioned in the New Testament along with Caiaphas, son-in-law to Annas. Annas ruled from A. D. 6-15 and Caiaphas ruled from A. D. 18-36. A brief history of the five sons of Annas reveals some interesting things. All

five of them served as High Priest in Jerusalem before A. D. 70. Their names are as follows, listed in the order of their rule: Eleazer (A. D. 16-17), Jonathan (A. D. 36-37), Theophilus (A. D. 37-41), Matthias (A. D. 42-44), and Ananos II (3 months in A. D. 62).

Even after his reign, Annas seems to have wielded great authority for he is mentioned along with Caiaphas in the New Testament as High Priest though Caiaphas was actually ruling at the time. This may be explained by the fact that the office of High Priest was hereditary and tenable for life, at least in the eyes of the people. Consequently, even a deposed High Priest was still considered to have considerable authority over the people.

One thing of interest to note regarding the names of the five sons of Annas is that one of them has a Greek name and not a Jewish name. Theophilus means 'lover of God' and is a Hellenized Greco-Roman name. Are we to assume that Annas would give a Greek name to one of his five sons without also giving him a Jewish name for purposes of worship? Probably not. Due to their Hellenistic outlook, the Jewish aristocracy often followed the practice of having two names. One would be their Jewish name while the other would be their Hellenistic name. If Theophilus is a Hellenized name for some other Jewish name, what could that name be? Robert Eisler proposed that Theophilus was also

known as Johannan (John) for the following reasons (1936:39-45):

First, Theophilus is the Greek translation equivalent for the Hebrew 'Johannan,' and could explain why he was called Theophilus. The name 'Theophilus' would be the most logical translation equivalent for Johannan. When a non-Jewish name was adopted in addition to a Jewish one, it often had some connection, either phonological or semantic, with the original. It is probable that other Jewish names lie behind some of the Greek and Latin names in the book of Acts (See Cadbury 1955:90).

Second, in Acts 4:6, Codex Bezae has 'Jonathan' instead of 'John,' in a reference to those of the High Priest's kin. Since Josephus mentions Jonathan son of Annas in six passages, this variant in Acts 4:6 has been explained as a correction, since no 'John' of the High Priest's kin was known. But such a correction would be unnecessary since a 'John' son of Annas and an Alexander are both mentioned by Josephus. This John is introduced as 'Ανατιου' Ιωαννης, 'John (son of) Annas,' and Josephus describes him as a commander of the Jewish forces at Gophna (where many priests lived) and Acrabetta around A. D. 66. One may ask at this point why not consider this John to be the son of an otherwise unknown Annas? One answer to this query may be that an otherwise unknown leader would probably not have been introduced as 'John, son of Annas,' but as 'a certain

John, son of Annas.' Since Josephus tells us that all of Annas' sons served as High Priests, and since Theophilus was deposed and did not relinquish the office due to death, and if 'John' was Theophilus' Hebrew name, it is not impossible to conceive of these references as being to the same individual. Even if this identification could be shown to be false, it would not set aside the possibility that Luke was writing to Theophilus, the former Jewish High Priest.

A third reason for this identification of 'John' with 'Theophilus' is also drawn from Josephus. In his Jewish Wars, the name 'Theophilus' does not occur while the name John does, but in his Jewish Antiquities the name 'Theophilus' does occur, while 'John, son of Annas,' is never found. May it not be that Josephus is using his Greek name in one volume and his Hebrew name in the other? A similar situation occurs in the New Testament use of the names 'John Mark'. He is alternately referred to as 'John' and 'Mark.'

A fourth argument for the possibility of Theophilus' Jewish name having been John is found in a consideration of the names of the Hasmonean dynasty. They are Judas Maccabeus, Jonathan, Simon, John, and Eleazer. Note that two of these five names correspond to two of Annas' five sons, namely Eleazer and Jonathan. But notice also that in the Hasmonean dynasty, both a Jonathan and a John are found. Why may we not consider Theophilus to have been given the

name of John as we suggested above, and thus three of the five sons of Annas bore names equivalent to the sons of Hashmon? It is altogether probable that Annas named some of his sons after the great Hasmonean line of 200 years earlier. We know that the Sadducean High Priestly family of Annas looked upon the Hasmonean dynasty as heroes of the faith, and at least two of Annas' sons bore their names.

If the John, son of Ananias (Annas), mentioned by Josephus as commander of the Jewish forces in A. D. 66 is the same as Theophilus who formerly served as High Priest, then we have a perfectly good reason to suggest that Luke knew him and wrote his two-volume work to either convert him to Christianity, or to further instruct him as a new Christian. Conservative scholarship tends to date Luke-Acts anywhere from A. D. 61-65. Furthermore, the honorific title 'most excellent' was used not only for Roman officials, but also for High Priests, at least in the second and third centuries (Jackson and Lake repr. 1979:505-508).

According to Josephus, Theophilus was deposed in A. D. 41 by Herod Agrippa I. It could be that Theophilus was not as opposed to the new Christian sect as Herod wanted him to be, so he deprived him of the office in favor of one less tolerant. After all, it was Herod Agrippa I who put James to death as recorded in Acts 12, and Luke may have preserved this piece of information along with his unique account of

Herod's death solely as information that would interest Theophilus.⁵

It is interesting to note the political milieu during the decade just prior to the fall of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. Ananos II, brother of Theophilus, served for three months as High Priest in 62 and played a leading role during the early stages of the Jewish war. He was executed by the populace. Of further interest is the fact that Theophilus' son Matthias also served as High Priest from A. D. 65-67 and was thus in office at the outbreak of the Jewish war in A. D. 66. Might we not suggest that Theophilus, if he were still alive, was vitally involved in these events in light of his family's participation during this time? Furthermore, if I am correct in identifying Theophilus with Josphus' reference to John son of Annas as commander of the Jewish forces at Gophna and Acrabetta, then very near the date of composition for Luke-Acts Theophilus was heavily engaged in the political arena of the time. I will argue below that Hebrews was written during the Jewish War and that pressure was being brought to bear upon Jewish Christians by their fellow countrymen to join in the struggle against Rome. I will also argue below that Hebrews was written to former Jewish priests who had accepted Christianity and were now living in Antioch. If Luke had written a previous volume to a former high priest named

Theophilus, then he could also have written a work such as Hebrews to former priests.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

¹Bo Reicke 1964:24. Origen knew of people who identified the Lucius of Romans 16:21 with Luke, thus giving an early tradition in favor of this interpretation. See his Commentary on Ep. ad Rom. 10.39.

²Some argue that the association of Luke with Antioch in Syria supports the notion that he was a Gentile. Two factors weaken such an argument. First, although Luke is, according to ancient tradition, said to be a native of Antioch, he is never said to be Greek. Second, Josephus' statement (Ag. Apion 2:1 #39) that 'our Jewish inhabitants of Antioch are called Antiochenes' could be used to support the argument that Luke was a Jew from Antioch. See Fitzmyer 1981.

³Eric Franklin 1975:79. In addition to Clarke, Albright, and Reicke, the following scholars also argue Luke's Jewish background: A. Schlatter, B. S. Easton, E. E. Ellis, N. O. King, and Donald Juel.

⁴This is a key theme found in Jacob Jervell 1972 and Eric Franklin 1975.

⁵Everything about the account in Acts 12:20-24 is thoroughly Jewish.

CHAPTER FIVE
HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION

5.1 Authorship

The earlier discussions regarding Luke's Jewish interest and outlook were necessary for several reasons. First, it had to be shown that Luke was capable of writing a book of such peculiarly Jewish Christian character as Hebrews. The greatest objection to Lukan authorship is the supposition that he was a Gentile and therefore could not have written such a work. It has already been shown that Luke may have been a Jew and that he may have written Luke-Acts to Jewish recipients. Even if these points are in error, it must be admitted that the writer, if he were a Gentile, was quite conversant with Jewish scripture, theology, tradition, and history. Consequently, claim for Lukan authorship of Hebrews cannot be dismissed solely on the assumption that he was a Gentile, for at best it is only that: an assumption.

A second reason is to present these arguments for the recipients of Luke-Acts and Hebrews as self-sustaining and capable of standing independently. Thus, my theory of Lukan authorship is not dependent upon my theory regarding the recipients of either Luke-Acts or Hebrews. If I am incorrect regarding the recipients, or other matters of provenance suggested in my overall theory, there still is a

wealth of cogent evidence in favor of Lukan authorship on the basis of textual evidence alone.

In Hebrews 13:23 and 24, there are at least six clues concerning the provenance of the letter. First, the author and readers are associated with Timothy, since he is referred to as 'our brother.' Second, both the author and Timothy are away from the location of the readers and plan to travel to the readers' location shortly. Third, Timothy had apparently been imprisoned or at least detained in some form of custody and then released. Fourth, the author was apparently in the same locale as Timothy, but was himself apparently not imprisoned. Fifth, The recipients are exhorted to greet their leaders, implying a locale of considerable population; enough to have a church with multiple leaders. It may be that this is evidence that the writer is not addressing an entire church, but rather a smaller group within the church. Sixth, whether writing from Italy, or away from Italy, the writer sends greetings from Italian Christians who are either, along with the writer, somewhere in Italy, or Italian expatriates.

The groundwork is now laid for an historical reconstruction of the circumstances surrounding the writing of Hebrews. I propose that Luke wrote Hebrews from Rome after the death of Paul and before the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. Scriptural evidence for this thesis

can be adduced upon a correlation of the statements made in the Pastoral epistles with the text of Hebrews. Imprisoned in Rome, Paul penned II Timothy around A. D. 66 or 67, in which he hints at his coming execution. Addressing Timothy, he says, 'do your diligence to come shortly.' Either before Timothy arrived or shortly thereafter, Paul was beheaded, and Timothy was probably imprisoned. Hebrews 13:23 refers to Timothy's being 'set free,' most naturally implying an imprisonment. The description of Timothy as 'our brother' in Hebrews 13 is reminiscent of Paul and links both Timothy and our author with the Pauline circle. In II Timothy 4:11 Paul comments, 'only Luke is with me,' thus placing Luke in Paul's company at or near the time of his death in Rome, ca. A. D. 66.

J. Robinson describes the author of Hebrews by saying that

the mantle of the Apostle [Paul] has in part fallen upon the writer himself. He can address his readers with a pastoral authority superior to that of their own leaders and with a conscience clear of local involvement (Heb. 13:17f.), and yet with no personal claim to apostolic aegis. There cannot have been too many of such men around (1976:219-220).

Luke was certainly one of the few men who could be accurately described by these words. Already the author of a gospel and the only history of the Christian church from its inception through Paul's arrest in Rome (Acts), Luke was known and loved by the many churches to which he had

traveled with Paul.

The above references can be converged into a theory of Lukan authorship of Hebrews in the following way. Luke was still in Rome at the time of Paul's death. Timothy arrived, was imprisoned, and sometime later was released. Both were known to the Christians at Antioch, the proposed destination for the epistle. Finally, Hebrews 13:24 says, 'they of Italy greet you.' This verse is more naturally understood to mean that the Christians now in Italy send greetings to a group living elsewhere. Although it is true that 'they of Italy' could mean Italian expatriates, it seems more natural to understand it otherwise. The phrase in Greek may be translated in any of three ways: 'they who are in Italy,' 'they who are from Italy,' or 'they who are away from Italy.' There is a similar use of the preposition, *απο*, in Acts 17:13. There we read 'those who are from (*απο*) Thessalonica.' The reference in context is clearly to people living in Thessalonica. In light of this usage in Acts 17:13, we have good textual evidence for translating the Hebrews phrase as 'those who are in Italy.'

Ruth Hoppin pointed out the problem that develops when we accept the translation 'they who are away from Italy' (1969:103). Why should the author, in writing to Rome, send greetings only from expatriate Italian Christians, and not from all Christians in his company or in his city at the time of writing? One possible answer is that the reference

is to Jewish Christians who were expelled from Rome under the Claudian persecution ca. A. D. 50, but who have regrouped in the location of the author. However, many Jews returned to Rome upon the death of Claudius in 54. It seems a bit odd for the author to bypass other Christians in his city and mention only this group if he were indeed writing to Rome from a different locale outside Italy.

Luke informs us in his prologue to the gospel that he is not an eyewitness to the events in the life of Christ, but that he has carefully verified the account and presented it to us in logical and chronological order. Thus, Luke appears to be a 'second generation' Christian if we are permitted to use this term in a rather loose fashion. There is an interesting statement in Hebrews 2:3 which is reminiscent of Luke's prologue. 'How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him.' This characterization of the author of Hebrews is semantically equivalent to that of Luke's prologue. In both places, the authors do not claim eye-witness status of the events of Jesus' life or death.¹ The phrase 'began to be spoken' is reminiscent of Acts 1:1 where Luke introduces his second volume with the words 'the former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began to do and to teach.' Furthermore, the use of the word 'first,' *αρχη*, in

Heb. 2:3 parallels the thought stated in Luke's prologue, 'they who were from the beginning (*αρχη*) eyewitnesses and ministers of the word. . . .'

J. Drury has noted that Luke and Hebrews share 'an underlying and clearly articulated view of history' (1976: 21). Hebrews 2:3 makes it clear that the writer to Hebrews (and Luke as well) recognized that a temporal gap separated them from the origin of Christianity. Drury continues, 'The life of the Church is linked to its Lord's by the apostolic eyewitnesses and the providence of the Holy Spirit with God over all; Luke and Hebrews are fundamentally at one' (Ibid.).

Of interest as well is the fact that Hebrews 2:2-4 reflects what we read in the book of Acts relative to the early church: the signs, wonders, various miracles, and gifts of the Spirit, are all specifically mentioned and illustrated throughout Acts.

When one considers the lexical, stylistic, and theological similarities between Luke-Acts and Hebrews which have already been noted, coupled with the way in which a theory of Lukan authorship can be historically reconstructed from the texts themselves, there is impressive evidence which points to the possibility of Lukan authorship of Hebrews.

5.2 Recipients

As to the recipients of Hebrews, I propose that they were the former Jewish priests mentioned in Acts 6:7, who became obedient to the faith. This suggestion is not new, but has been made by others, and has been especially argued by Spicq in his work on Hebrews. For some reason, however, this suggestion has not been given the hearing that it deserves in New Testament circles. Josephus mentions that there were some 20,000 priests while J. Jeremias informs us that there were some 7,200 priests attached to the temple in Jerusalem alone (Jeremias 1969:198-207). Given all the facts, it seems to be as plausible a theory as any other, and I am inclined to accept it for reasons given below.

Considering the nature and content of Hebrews, Jewish priests appear to be the most likely audience. With the persecution recorded in Acts 8:1 raging in Jerusalem at the time of Stephen's martyrdom, these Jewish priests would no doubt have been forced out of Jerusalem along with other Christians. The question is where would they have gone? One of the most likely and one of the safest places would be Antioch in Syria. Luke does not tell us what became of these former priests mentioned in Acts 6:7, probably out of concern for their safety. If his volume should fall into the wrong hands, it could easily furnish a clue to their location. Perhaps this is why the recipients of Hebrews are never identified in the letter, though it is clear that the

author knew exactly their circumstances. The fact that Jewish-Roman relations were strained to the point of war would be ample reason to protect former priests likely to be viewed by the Roman government as potential leaders in the Jewish cause.

Assuming Acts to have been written ca. A. D. 63, the events narrated in Acts 6:7 would have begun approximately thirty years earlier. There may have been a steady stream of converted Jewish priests leaving Jerusalem under persecution, and most likely some would flee to Antioch. Note the use of the imperfect tense in Acts 6:7. All three main verbs appear in the imperfect tense emphasizing continuous action in past time. C. B. Williams translates this verse in the following way to bring out the force of the imperfects:

So God's message continued to spread, and the number of the disciples in Jerusalem continued to grow rapidly; a large number even of priests continued to surrender to the faith (1955).

One of the important themes of Hebrews, the high priesthood of Christ, is discussed in theological detail in the epistle. Would not such a theme be of great interest to former priests? As a matter of fact, on one occasion in Hebrews, the readers are exhorted (in a figurative way) to continue as it were their priestly duties: in Hebrews 10:19-22, the readers are told to 'enter into the holy place,' with their hearts 'sprinkled from an evil

conscience' and their bodies 'washed with pure water.' Clearly this is priestly language and such language would be immediately understood and appreciated by former priests but would be less applicable to laymen.

Apparently the recipients were not the entire church, but rather a section of the church as may be gleaned from Hebrews 5:12. Furthermore, they were addressed separately from their leaders as may be inferred from Hebrews 13:24. Downey, in his exhaustive work on Antioch (1961:277-ff.), points out that it is very likely that several different groups of Christians existed in Antioch and these probably met in different locations. We may presume that at least on some occasions, the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians met separately. Orthodox Jews probably still observed the Law in the matter of eating with Gentiles. A hint of this kind of thing is recorded in Galatians 2:11,12 where Peter is eating with the Gentiles until a delegation from James and the Jerusalem church comes to Antioch. Peter then separates himself from the Gentile Christians for fear of the Jerusalem delegation. Downey further suggests that subsequent history of the Antiochene Christians makes it probable that there were a number of different congregations and that they followed different lines of teaching and practice.

Given this background and the statements of Hebrews itself, it is easy to conceive of former priests, now a part

of the church at Antioch, who may have found reasons to stand aloof from the church. Such an attitude could have sparked the exhortation found in 10:25 'not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together. . .'

C. Sandegren has argued that the statement in Hebrews 5:12 that the readers 'ought to be teachers' refers most naturally to priests who had been converted to Christianity (1955:222). Certainly an entire church would not be exhorted to be teachers, thus Sandegren speculates that a smaller group of Christians within a larger church is being addressed. Furthermore, priests were the teachers of the people (cf. Malachi 2:7) and as a group would naturally fit the statement that they 'ought to be teachers.'

Sandegren further combines Hebrews 13:2, 'forget not to entertain strangers,' with 10:34, 'took joyfully the spoiling of their goods,' and concludes that whatever the recipients had lost via persecution, they still had their houses. He points out that according to the Mosaic law priests could not be deprived of their houses (cf. Leviticus 25:29-ff.) (Ibid.). This argument might be more applicable if the recipients were being located in Jerusalem rather than Antioch. It could be argued also that Sandegren overlooks the possibility that they may have lost their homes via previous persecution (in Jerusalem, for example) and now have new homes in a new location such as Antioch.

We know from Josephus that Jews were numerous in the city of Antioch, enjoying equal rights as citizens. Furthermore, with a few exceptions, there was no persecution of Jews in Antioch as in other cities. Even in A. D. 66 with the outbreak of the Jewish war when relations between Jews and non-Jews became violent throughout the region of Syria, Josephus informs us that only Antioch, Sidon and Apamea refused to kill or imprison a single Jew (Jewish Wars II, 462,463). Probably one of the few cities of any size in A. D. 67 with a Christian population (both Jewish and Gentile) that could be described as having not yet resisted unto blood (Hebrews 12:4) would have been Antioch.

Hebrews 6:10 mentions the fact that the recipients had ministered to the saints. The Jerusalem offering given by the Antiochene church (Acts 11:27-30), may have been the referent of Hebrews 6:10. Of historical interest is Josephus' mention of the refusal by Antiochus to permit the observance of the sabbath rest in Antioch about the time of A. D. 67-69 (Jewish Antiquities XII, 120). Hebrews 4:1-10 speaks of the sabbath rest to come, a subject that would have appealed to Antiochene Jews at this time. Another interesting point is the statement in Hebrews 13:12-14 that 'we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come.' How appropriate this statement would have been to exiled Jewish priests living in Antioch, many of whom no doubt longed for

Jerusalem and who needed to be reminded of the fact that the beloved city was not to be sought after.

The admonition of Hebrews 6:1-6 may have been given to counter pressure upon those Jewish priests to return to Judaism and defend their nation against the eminent peril from the Romans. The crisis of the Jewish war, like a powerful vortex, drew in sectarians of all sorts to defend their homeland. Thus even some from the Qumran community, a strict, isolationist sect died at Masada while holding out against the Roman army. The same kind of pressure must have been brought to bear upon many Jewish Christians. The possibility that some of their fellow countrymen would try to coerce them back into Judaism seems only natural under the circumstances of the times. These factors suggest Antioch as a possible location of the recipients of Hebrews.

J. Brown has conjectured that the title appended to the book of Hebrews which reads ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ could have been accidentally or deliberately changed from its original form of ΠΡΟΣ ΙΕΡΑΙΟΥΣ by a copyist (1923:538). This latter form would be the verbal adjective 'to the priestly men' but such a form is so far non-extant. The similarity between the two titles can easily be seen and the confusion of two letters at the beginning of the word is the kind of mistake not unknown in copying scripture. Yet while a plausible explanation, it must remain in the realm of conjecture.

In further support of my theory, it should be noticed that Luke is associated both by scripture and tradition with Antioch in Syria. In the Anti-Marcionite prologue to Luke's gospel dated c. 160-180 a. d. , it is stated that Luke was a Syrian from Antioch. Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History speaks of 'Luke who was born at Antioch, by profession a physician, . . . ' (See page 140 above). While the accuracy of these traditions cannot be established beyond question, it is reasonable to assume in light of their early origin some factual basis for them. Also of interest is that in Antioch there existed a medical school where Luke may have received his training as a physician.

Scripture itself provides some verification for these traditions in that Luke is very closely linked with Antioch in Acts. He has a more than passing interest in Antioch as can be observed from a consideration of statements found in his gospel and Acts. For example, in Luke 4:25-27, Jesus reminds his hearers that there were some in Syria who were helped by the earliest of Israel's prophets. In Luke 6:17, Phoenicia is mentioned as the home of some who had come to hear Jesus preach the Sermon on the Mount.

Although Syria is not mentioned by name in Acts 2:9-11 in the table of nations listed as having expatriates in Jerusalem at Pentecost, it is the geographic center of all the nations which are listed and it is unusual that it is

left out. In Acts 6:5, Luke points out that one of the seven Hellenists who was appointed as a deacon by the church at Jerusalem was from Antioch. Perhaps of most importance, Luke considers Antioch to be the starting point for the Gentile mission and there are repeated references to it in Acts 11:20-13:1-ff. (Reicke 1964:14-16). Acts 13:1 is a crucial text in this matter because it gives a listing of five leaders of the early church at Antioch. Since no equivalent list is given for any other missionary church in Acts, this would seem to point to some prominence given by Luke to the Antiochene church.

In this list of names appears Manaen, the foster-brother of Herod. Richard Glover has pointed out the material about Herod which is unique to Luke's gospel, and suggests that Luke's acquaintance with Manaen in the church at Antioch provides the source for much of this information (1964-65:101). He at least appears to have special knowledge of and interest in the affairs of the Antiochene Christians, and this adds further support to the possibility that Luke wrote Hebrews and addressed it to Jewish Christians (former priests) in Antioch.

5.3 Date

The best date that fits the circumstances surrounding Hebrews seems to be ca. A. D. 66-69. There is little doubt that the terminus ad quem is A. D. 96, since it is quoted by

Clement of Rome in his epistle to the Corinthians about that time. Two primary lines of evidence clinch the argument for the pre-70 date. One is the significance of the Greek present tense, used in Hebrews in speaking of the temple ritual; the other is the absence of any reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. These two factors are closely related and will be briefly examined.

Those who claim that there is no evidence in Hebrews to suggest that the temple was still standing ignore the significance of the present tense in Greek. In chapters 9-13, the author uses nine present tense verbs to describe temple rituals. There may be a tendency on the part of some to interpret these present tenses as historical presents, but this is unwarrantable since one is hard pressed to find even a single historical present in the entire epistle. It seems obvious that from his use of the present tense, we should understand the author to imply that the temple practices in Jerusalem were continuing at the time of writing.

Those who would date Hebrews after A. D. 70 face the formidable task of explaining its silence on such a momentous event as the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. How could the author, despite its immediacy, have failed to use the only absolutely irrefutable argument in his attempt to show the passing nature of the temple cultus and levitical system? Barton summarizes the problem thus:

If the temple at Jerusalem had been destroyed decades before, as the hypotheses under consideration suppose, the fact would have been well known, and the employment of language which implied that its cult was still going on would have made the Epistle ridiculous in the eyes of its first readers. To refuse to be guided by this, the most tangible and definite of all the clues which exist for determining the date of Hebrews, is to throw away the key to the problem and open the door to fruitless speculation and confusion (1939:200; See also Robinson 1976:200-220).

A. Nairne in his commentary on Hebrews argued for a date shortly before A. D. 70 (1922). With the outbreak of the Jewish War, there may well have been a wave of patriotic nationalism which swept over Palestine and diaspora Judaism. This would have been a temptation to Christian Jews to revert to Judaism and the stability of the Jewish cultus. C. F. D. Moule agreed with Nairne's assessment of the date and circumstances of the epistle:

At such a time it is not only a fear of persecution and of being called traitors but also the human yearning for the ordered stability of an ancient system, with objective, tangible symbols, that will drive men back from the bold pioneering demanded by the Christian faith to the well-worn paths of the older way. It is to exactly such a temptation that the Epistle speaks, and it is thus, I think, that it becomes clearly intelligible (1950:37).

A further argument in favor of a date in the decade of the 60's can be adduced from the way Hebrews suggests that the tithe belongs to the priest (7:5). The argument that the tithe belonged to the priests and not to all the sons of Levi was apparently hotly debated at this time. Josephus notes that the high-priestly families during the reign of Felix (ca. A. D. 52-60) and Albinus (ca. A. D. 62-64)

abused this practice, thus raising the ire of the Levites since their claim to share in the tithes went unnoticed (Antiquities 20.181). In A. D. 62, the Levites demanded recognition over against the priests in this matter as recorded by Josephus (Ibid.:20.216-218).

Horbury noted that the method of the writer to Hebrews in discussing these matters places this book within the historical debates which occurred during the period of the First Revolt (A. D. 66-70) (1983:67,68) and thus furnishes another argument in favor of a date around A. D. 67.

Therefore, the evidence from the historical circumstances as well as the text itself supports more strongly a date before the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, possibly around A. D. 67.

5.4 Conclusion

My conclusion is that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by Luke from Rome ca. A. D. 67 and Luke is its independent author. The primary linguistic evidence to support this thesis was given in chapter two. There I argued that the vocabulary of Hebrews showed a closer relationship to Luke-Acts than to any other New Testament book. Likewise, from a stylistic perspective, I argued that Hebrews is closer to the writings of Luke than to any other New Testament book. Under the heading of 'textlinguistics' I evaluated four categories of evidence:

prologue similarities; similarities between Acts 7 and Hebrews 11 both linguistic and semantic; similarity in the use of chiasm as an over-arching framework for the entire discourses of Luke-Acts and Hebrews; and a comparison of the use of Old Testament citation formulae in Luke-Acts and Hebrews. The conclusion I draw from this evidence is that there is good reason to suggest Luke as a possible author of Hebrews, and indeed in comparison to all other New Testament writers, it would seem on the basis of the above evidence that we can say he is the most probable author.

In chapter three I compared the theological outlook of Luke's writings with that of Hebrews and found them to be in substantial agreement in emphasis, especially in the areas of Christology and eschatology. This furnishes further evidence to support Lukan authorship.

In chapter four I attempted to show that the greatest objection to Lukan authorship of Hebrews is his supposed Gentile origin and outlook. Yet careful consideration of his two-volume work revealed numerous examples of peculiarly Jewish thought and interest and showed him to have been capable of writing such a treatise as Hebrews. Luke may have addressed his two-volume work to a man who was a former Jewish High Priest in Jerusalem named Theophilus.

In chapter five, on the basis of the evidence presented

in chapters two through four, I attempted an historical reconstruction of the circumstances which may have surrounded the writings of Hebrews. I argued that Luke wrote the epistle from Rome shortly after the death of Paul and that it was sent to the former Jewish priests of Acts 6:7 who were then located in Antioch in Syria. Evidence from the epistle itself and the Pastoral epistles can be adduced which support a date of composition ca. A. D. 67 during the turbulent times of the Jewish War.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

¹Hebrews 2:3 makes it doubly difficult to argue for Pauline authorship, as he would probably never have referred to himself in that fashion. On other occasions, Paul does speak of himself as one who has seen the Lord and he claims apostolic authority on the basis of this fact. Neither the writer of Hebrews nor Luke-Acts claim apostolic authority. On the contrary, they disavow such a claim as can be seen from Luke 1:1-4 and Hebrews 2:3-4.

REFERENCES

- Aland, Kurt. 1964. *Synopsis quattuor evangeliorum locus parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis*. Stuttgart: Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt.
- _____, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M Metzger, and Allen Wikgren (eds.) 1977. *The New Testament in Greek*. 3rd ed. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Barrett, C. K. 1956. The eschatology of the epistle to the Hebrews. The background of the New Testament and its eschatology, ed. by W. D. Davies and D. Daube, 363-393. Cambridge: University Press.
- Barton, George. 1938. The date of the epistle to the Hebrews. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57.195-207.
- Baum, Gregory. 1961. *The Jews and gospel, a re-examination of the New Testament*. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press.
- Black, David. 1986. The problem of the literary structure of Hebrews: an evaluation and a proposal. *Grace Theological Journal*. 7.2.163-177.
- Blass, F. 1898. *Philology of the Gospels*. London: Macmillan.
- Blood, David and Blood, Doris. 1979. Overview of Acts. *Notes on Translation* 74.2-36.
- _____. 1979. Systematic summary statements in Acts. *Notes on Translation* 74.36-46.
- Bock, Darrell. 1987. Proclamation from prophecy and pattern. In *Journal for the study of the New Testament supplement series*, 12, ed. by David Hill. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Bornhauser, K. 1932. *Empfänger und Verfasser des Hebraerbriefes*. Gutersloh: Bertelsman.
- Bowman, John. 1962. Hebrews, James, I and II Peter. *Layman's Bible commentary*. Vol. 24. Atlanta: John Knox Press.
- Brandon, S. G. F. 1957. *The fall of Jerusalem and the Christian church*. London: S. P. C. K.
- Brawley, Robert L. 1978. *The pharisees in Luke-Acts: Luke's address to Jews and his irenic purpose*. Unpublished dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary.

- Brown, John. 1961. Hebrews. The Geneva series of commentaries, reprint edition, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust.
- Brown, J. Vallance. 1923. The authorship and circumstances of Hebrews--again!. Bibliotheca Sacra 80.505-538.
- Bruce, F. F. 1962-63. To the Hebrews or to the Essenes? New Testament studies 9.217-232.
- _____. 1964. The epistle to the Hebrews. The new international commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- _____. 1969. Recent contributions to the understanding of Hebrews. Expository times 80.260-264.
- Buchanan, G. W. 1972. To the Hebrews. The anchor Bible 36, eds. W. F. Albright and David N. Freedman, Garden City: Doubleday.
- Burch, Victor. 1936. The epistle to the Hebrews, its sources and message. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Buth, Randall. 1984. Hebrew poetic tenses and the Magnificat. Journal for the study of the New Testament 21.67-83.
- _____. 1985. Luke 19:31-34, Mishnaic Hebrew, and Bible translation: *is κυριοι του πωλου* Singular? Journal of Biblical literature 104.4.680-685.
- Cadbury, H. J. 1927. The making of Luke-Acts. New York: Macmillan.
- _____. 1955. The book of Acts in history. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Carruth, Theodore. 1973. The Jesus-as-prophet motif in Luke-Acts. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Baylor University.
- Clarke, Albert C. 1933. Acts of the Apostles. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Clarke, W. K. L. 1979 repr. The use of the Septuagint in Acts. The beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. 66-105. Eds. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. Vol. 2 Prolegomena II: Criticism. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Conzelmann, Hans. 1960. The theology of saint Luke. New York: Harper & Brothers.

- Croasmun, Earl and Cherwitz, Richard. 1982. Beyond rhetorical relativism. *The quarterly journal of speech* 68.1.1-16.
- Dahl, Nils. 1966. The story of Abraham in Luke-Acts, in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, eds. L. E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, 139-158. New York: Abingdon Press.
- _____. 1976. The purpose of Luke-Acts, in *Jesus in the memory of the early church: Essays*, 87-98. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Deismann, A. 1978 repr. *Light from the ancient East; the New Testament illustrated by recently discovered texts of the Graeco-Roman world*. Rev. ed. Trans. by L. Strachan. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Delitzsch, Franz. 1952 repr. *Commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews*. Trans. by Thomas L. Kingsbury. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- van Dijk. 1977. *Text and context: explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. London: Longmans.
- _____. 1980. *Macrostructures*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Downey, Glanville. 1961. *A history of Antioch in Syria*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Drury, John. 1976. *Tradition and design in Luke's gospel: a study in early Christian historiography*. Atlanta: John Knox Press.
- Dubarle, A. M. 1939. Redacteur et destinataires de l'epitre aux Hebreux. *Revue Biblique* 48.506-529.
- Easton, B. S. 1955. *Early Christianity*. London: S.P.C.K.
- Ehrhardt, A. 1964. The construction and purpose of the Acts of the apostles. The framework of the New Testament stories, 64-102. Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Eisler, Robert. 1936. *The enigma of the fourth gospel*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Ellegard, Alvar. 1962. *Who was Junius?* Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- _____. 1982. Genre styles, individual styles, and authorship identification, in *Text processing, Proceedings of nobel symposium 51*, ed. by Sture Allen. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

- Ellis, E. Earle. 1972. Eschatology in Luke. Facet books, Biblical series 30, Philadelphia: Fortress.
- _____. 1977 repr. The gospel of Luke. The century Bible, London: Oliphants.
- Fensham, F. C. 1971. Hebrews and Qumran. Neotestamentica 5.9-21.
- Filson, Floyd. 1967. 'Yesterday'. A study of Hebrews in the light of chapter 13. Vol. 4 in Studies in biblical theology. Ed. C. F. D. Moule, Peter Ackroyd, Floyd V. Filson, and G. Ernest Wright. London: SCM Press.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. 1981. The gospel according to Luke (I-IX): introduction, translation, and notes. The anchor Bible 28. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Ford, R. C. 1920-21. St. Luke and Lucius of Cyrene. Expository times 32.219-220.
- Franklin, Eric. 1975. Christ the Lord. A study in the purpose and theology of Luke-Acts. London: S.P.C.K.
- Fuchs, E. 1964. 'semeron' Theological dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Ed. by G. Kittel and C. Friedrich. Trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Fuller, R. H. 1965. The foundations of New Testament christology. New York: Scribner's.
- Gardiner, F. 1887. The language of the epistle to the Hebrews as bearing upon its authorship. Journal of Biblical literature 7:1-27.
- Glover, Richard. 1964-65. 'Luke the Antiochene' and Acts. New Testament studies 11.97-106.
- Godet, F. 1887. A commentary on the gospel of Luke. 3rd ed. Trans. by E. W. Shalders and M. D. Cusin. New York: Funk and Wagnalls.
- Goldsmith, P. 1968. Acts 13:33-37: a peshet on II Samuel 7. Journal of Biblical literature 87.321-24.
- Goodspeed, E. J. 1937. An introduction to the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goppelt, Leonard. 1982. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. ed. by Jurgen Roloff, trans. by John Alsup, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans

- Goulder, Michael. 1964. The chiastic structure of the Lucan journey. *Studia evangelica*, II. Ed. by F. L. Cross, 195-202. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- _____. 1964b. Type and history in Acts. London: S. P. C. K.
- Grotius, Hugo. 1679. Annotationes in epistolam ad Hebraeos, in *Opera omnia theologica*, vol. 2, 1010-1069. Amstelodamum: Apud Heredes Joannis Blaev.
- Guthrie, Donald. 1970. New Testament introduction. 3rd ed. revised. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- _____. 1983. Hebrews. Tyndale New Testament commentaries. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans
- Han, Nathan E. 1971. A parsing guide to the Greek New Testament. Scottdale: Herald Press.
- Hawkins, J. C. 1909. *Horae synopticae: contributions to the study of the synoptic problem*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hoppin, Ruth. 1969. Priscilla: author of the epistle to the Hebrews. New York: Exposition Press.
- Horbury, W. 1983. The Aaronic priesthood in the epistle to the Hebrews. *Journal for the study of the New Testament* 19.43-71.
- Howard, G. 1968. Hebrews and the Old Testament quotations. *Novum Testamentum* 10.2-3.208-216.
- Howard, W. F. 1951. Epistle to Hebrews. *Interpretation* 5.80-91.
- Hughes, Graham. 1979. Hebrews and hermeneutics. Society for New Testament studies monograph series 36, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hurst, Lincoln. 1984. Eschatology and 'Platonism' in the epistle to the Hebrews. Society of Biblical literature seminar papers. Ed. by Kent H. Richards. California: Scholars Press.
- Jeremias, J. 1969. Jerusalem in the time of Jesus. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Jervell, J. 1972. Luke and the people of God: a new look at Luke-Acts. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

- _____. 1983. The Acts of the apostles and the history of early Christianity. *Studia theologica* 37.
- Jones, C. P. M. 1955. The epistle to the Hebrews and the Lucan writings, in *Studies in the gospels: essays in memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. by D. E. Nineham. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Josephus, Flavius. 1966. *Loeb classical library*, 8 vols., trans. Henry Thackeray. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- _____. 1974. *Jewish antiquities*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- _____. 1974. *Jewish wars*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Juel, Donald. 1983. *Luke-Acts: the promise of history*. Atlanta: John Knox.
- Karris, Robert. 1979. *What are they saying about Luke and Acts?* New York: Paulist.
- Kistemaker, Simon. 1961. *The Psalm citations in the epistle to the Hebrews*. Amsterdam: Wed. G. Van Soest.
- Kodell, Jerome. 1983. Luke's gospel in a nutshell. *Biblical theological bulletin* 13.1.16-18.
- Kuhn, Thomas. 1970. *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- Kummell, W. G. 1975. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Lachs, Samuel. 1980. Hebrew elements in the Gospels and Acts. *Jewish Quarterly Review* 71.40-41.
- Lampe, G. W. H. 1969. *St. Luke and the church of Jerusalem*. University of London: The Athlone Press.
- Legg, John. D. 1968. Our brother Timothy; a suggested solution to the problem of the authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews. *Evangelical quarterly* 40.220-223.
- Lo Bue, Francesco. 1956. Historical background of the epistle to the Hebrews. *Journal of Biblical literature* 75.52-57.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1983. *The grammar of discourse*. New York: Plenum Press.

- Lunemann, G. 1885. Commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews. Translated from the 4th German edition by Maurice Evans. Meyer's critical and exegetical handbook to the New Testament. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.
- Maddox, Robert. 1982. The purpose of Luke-Acts. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Manson, T. W. 1949. The problem of the epistle to the Hebrews. Bulletin of the John Rylands library 32.1-17.
- Manson, William. 1951. The epistle to the Hebrews: an historical and theological reconsideration. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Marshall, I. H. 1960. Acts. Tyndale New Testament commentaries. London: Leicester.
- _____. 1970. Luke: historian and theologian. Exeter: Paternoster.
- McKeon, Richard. 1971. The uses of rhetoric in a technological age: architectonic productive arts, in The prospects of rhetoric, 44-63. Ed. by Lloyd Bitzer and Edwin Black, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Michel, Otto. oikos in the Theological dictionary of the New Testament, vol. 5, 120-129. Ed. by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich; trans. by G. Bromiley, 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- _____. repr. 1975. Der brief an die Hebraer. Kritisch-exegetischer kommentar uber das Neue Testament. Ed. by Heinrich Meyer. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Miesner, Donald R. 1978. The missionary journeys narrative: patterns and implications, in Perspectives on Luke-Acts. Ed. by Charles H. Talbert, 199-214. Special study series, no. 5 Danville: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion.
- Moffatt, James. 1918. An introduction to the literature of the New Testament. 3rd edition revised. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- _____. 1924. A critical and exegetical commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews, International critical commentaries, ed. by A. Plummer. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Montefiore, H. W. 1964. A commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews. Black's New Testament commentaries. London: Adam and Charles Black.

- Morgenthaler, R. 1958. Statistik des neutestamentlichen wortschatzes. Frankfurt am M./Zurich: Gotthelf-Verlag.
- Moscato, M. A. 1976. Current theories regarding the audience of Luke-Acts. Currents in theology and mission 3.355-361.
- Moule, C. F. D. 1950. Sanctuary and sacrifice in the church of the New Testament. Journal of theological studies, n. s. 1.1.29-41.
- Moulton, W. F., and Geden, A. S. 1963. A concordance to the Greek New Testament. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark
- Munck, J. 1967. The Acts of the apostles. The anchor Bible 31. Revised by W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann. New York: Doubleday.
- Nairne, A. 1922. The epistle to the Hebrews. The Cambridge Greek Testament for schools and colleges, ed. by R. John Parry. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Neeley, Linda Lloyd. 1987. A discourse analysis of Hebrews. Occasional papers in translation and textlinguistics, nos. 3-4.1-146.
- Orchard, Bernard and Riley, Harold. 1987. The order of the Synoptics: why three synoptic gospels? Macon: Mercer University Press.
- O'Toole, Robert. 1983. Acts 2:30 and the Davidic covenant of Pentecost. Journal of Biblical Literature 102.2.245-258.
- _____. 1984. The unity of Luke's theology. Good news studies, vol. 9. Wilmington: Michael Glazier.
- Palmer, D. W. 1987. The literary background of Acts 1:1-14. New Testament studies 33.427-438.
- Plummer, A. 1922. A critical and exegetical commentary on the gospel according to saint Luke. International critical commentaries. 5th ed. New York: Scribner.
- Ramsay, William. 1915. The bearing of recent discovery on the trustworthiness of the New Testament. 2nd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- _____. 1956 repr. Luke the physician and other studies in the history of religion. Grand Rapids: Baker.

- Rees, T. 1949. Epistle to the Hebrews. The international standard Bible encyclopedia. James Orr, ed. 5 vols, vol. 2, 1355-62. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Reicke, Bo. 1964. The gospel of Luke. Tr. by R. Mackenzie. Richmond: John Knox.
- Riggenbach, E. 1913. Der brief an die Hebraer. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, ed. by T. Zahn. Leipzig: A. Deichert.
- Robertson, A. T. 1934. A grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research. Nashville: Broadman Press.
- Robinson, John A. T. 1976. Redating the New Testament. London: SCM Press.
- Salmon, G. 1888. Introduction to the New Testament. 3rd ed. London: John Murray.
- Sandegren, C. 1955. The addresses of the epistle to the Hebrews. Evangelical quarterly 27.221-224.
- Schlatter, A. 1960. Das evangelium des Lukas: aus seinen quellen erklärt. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Calwer.
- Scott, Robert. 1967. On viewing rhetoric as epistemic. Central states speech journal 18.9-16.
- Simcox, W. H. 1902. The writers of the New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Sloan, Robert. 1977. The favorable year of the Lord. Austin: Schola Press.
- Snell, A. 1959. New and living way: an explanation of the epistle to the Hebrews. London: Faith Press.
- Spicq, C. 1952-53. L'epitre aux Hebreux. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre.
- _____. 1959. L'epitre aux Hebreux, Apollos, Jean-Baptiste, les Hellenistes et Qumran. Revue de Qumran 1.3.365-390.
- Stuart, Moses. 1860. A commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews. Ed. and rev. by R. D. C. Robbins. 4th ed. Andover: Warren F. Draper.
- Swetnam, James. 1969. On the literary genre of the 'epistle' to the Hebrews. Novum Testamentum 11.261-269.

- Synge, F. C. 1959. Hebrews and the scriptures. London: S. P. C. K.
- Talbert, C. H. 1974. Literary patterns, theological themes and the genre of Luke-Acts. Society of Biblical literature monograph series 20. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- _____. 1983. Reading Luke. New York: Crossroads.
- Tatum, W. B. 1966-67. The epoch of Israel: Luke i and ii and the theological plan of Luke-Acts. New Testament studies 13.184-195.
- Tiede, David. 1980. Prophecy and history in Luke-Acts. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Turner, N. 1976. Style. A grammar of the Greek New Testament, 4 vols. (by J. H. Moulton; 3rd and 4th vol. by N. Turner). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Vanhoye, A. 1963. La structure litteraire de l'epitre aux Hebreux. Paris: Desclée De Brouwer.
- _____. 1964. A structured translation of the epistle to the Hebrews. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- _____. 1974. Discussions sur la structure de l'epitre aux Hebreux. Biblica 55.349-380.
- Vine, Victor. 1984. The purpose and date of Acts. Expository times 96.45-48.
- de Waard, J. 1966. A comparative study of the Old Testament text in the Dead Sea scrolls and in the New Testament. Vol. 4 of Studies in the texts of the desert of Judah. Ed. by J. Van der Ploeg. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Wallis, Ethel. 1979. Thematic parallelism and prominence in Luke-Acts. Notes on Translation 75.2-6.
- _____. 1983. Four gospels, four discourse genre. Notes on Translation 94.2.3-16.
- Weihrich, Franciscvs, ed. 1904. Sancti Augustini, de consensu evangelistarum. Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum. Vol. 43. Vindobonae: F. Tempsky; Lipsiae: G. Freytag.
- Welch, A. 1898. The authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier.

- Westcott, B. F. repr. 1955. The epistle to the Hebrews. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.
- Wickham, E. C. 1910. The epistle to the Hebrews. Westminster commentaries, Walter Lock, ed. London: Methuen and Company.
- Wikenhauser, Alfred. 1958. New Testament introduction. Trans. by Joseph Cunningham. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Williams, C. B. 1955. Williams New Testament. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Williamson, Ronald. 1970. Philo and the epistle to the Hebrews. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Wilson, Stephen. 1979. Luke and the pastoral epistles. London: S. P. C. K.
- Windisch, Hans. 1931. Der Hebraerbrief. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 14. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr.
- Wolfe, Kenneth. 1989. The chiastic structure of Luke-Acts and some implications for worship. Southwestern journal of theology 22.60-71.
- de Young, James. 1973. A grammatical approach to Hebrews. Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary.