

## Who Wrote the Gospel of Luke?

The author is present in the text. And here's what I mean by that. The author is writing to a specific person, Theophilus, who both Jack and I agree and is really the consensus of both scholars and non-scholars now that Theophilus was a real person. There was a time where it was thought it was a metaphorical name for Christians, but that's generally been abandoned by the most. So he's writing to a specific person, Theophilus. And he's writing about his writing and research process. He talks about here's what I went to do. I went and talked to these people who were there from the beginning. This adds some probability to the fact that the historical attribution is correct because it is more likely that the audience knew who the author was. Hello, everybody. Welcome back to the Thinking Theologically podcast, the show where we teach you how and why you should think theologically. I'm one of your hosts, Jack Dodgen, joined as always by the master resident theologian in training. I'm so sorry. Spencer Shaw. I thought we would finally get it right. We're bad again. We got it last time. All of, all of these episodes. I combined, it was, it was, uh, mass, or, uh, resident and theologian. That's, that's what I was trying to combine. Um, if I can make it all one word, I will. Uh, and then we'll just do that. Uh, we'll just write our own. Yeah. People do that now make their own words. The, Word makes it into the dictionary and then it, it's a real word. So we can do that. Uh, we are excited to be back at, uh, on, on our, not on our normal schedule. Uh, we were on a normal schedule a week. Yeah. I ruined it. My bad. My bad. I got sick. We jinxed it. Uh, never should have said anything. So, uh, hopefully we'll get back to a, a right schedule here, but, uh, uh, excited to be back. Sorry. What's that? Something will come up. Something will come up. We're heading into the summer. We're heading into the summer very soon, which means camps and other, just other stuff. VBSs and... Uh, ministries of all kinds. And then it's just hot. Some days you don't want to record because it's just too hot. Yeah. Uh, so, uh, but we're continuing our gospel authorship series with, uh, I don't know, an episode for the conservatives. Here we go. The guy who wrote it put his name on it. It's on the top of the thing. Or they put his name on it or whatever, so. Well, someone else put his name on it, but. But it's probably that guy. Probably that guy. I said, I said this one is going to one that, that makes me no longer a, a heretic in this. Cause we've, we've done Mark, we've done Matthew and I'm eh. Maybe some guy named Mark, but I don't know who he is and definitely not Matthew. And now I think I'm on board with, well, we're jumping to the end. I might be on a little bit more on board with. There you go. But just like our recording schedule, the next one, you'll go back to being the. Well, the next one will be fun. Very liberal you are. So. Next one will be fun. We haven't talked about John, but I actually think you and I will disagree on that one. Like. Actually, the other ones I'm just like, ah, I don't know, but interesting. I think we'll disagree on John. So we'll talk about that another time, uh, here in the next episode. But today we're talking about who wrote the gospel of Luke. Uh, as we continue our way through the gospels here, nearly done with the gospel side of stuff. Uh, there should be an interview at the end of all of these that we're excited about, but we'll say more about that later. Uh, as that becomes more, more real. Uh, but today our focus... Hopefully a couple. Hopefully a couple. Hopefully. Excellent. Hopefully we can get a couple people to talk about some of the gospel-related stuff that we've been talking about, so... So be on the lookout for those on our Facebook page, Thinking Theologically, or our website, [thinkingtheologically.org](http://thinkingtheologically.org). Also on the website, you can find various articles and things that if you aren't on our Facebook page or Uh, checking the website regularly, you're going to miss. We just had Easter weekend and we had multiple posts go up, uh, things that we had discussed about or written about resurrection, uh, and all of that. Uh, leading up to it, uh, in, I think, I think last year, but we brought those things back around good stuff to talk about again. So if you're not checking the website or on our Facebook page, you're missing out on a bonus. Bonus conversations about things. So be sure to check that out. And, uh, I think that's, I think that's it for intros other than this introduction we're about to have. Uh, about who wrote the gospel of, of Luke. Uh, I made the comment. He put his name on it and then backtracked really quick. He didn't put his name on it, but somebody did. What do you want to tell us about the, uh, the gospel of Luke here? Yeah, we just need to start with a reminder of, especially if you haven't seen the first two episodes in the series, that The Gospels were originally anonymous. That is, they didn't include an author's name. It wasn't like one of Paul's letters, I, Paul, to the church and Rome, grace and peace to you, that typical letter introduction, because the Gospels are not letters. We've talked about that in previous episodes before about the nature of the Gospels, what kind of literature they are. So on and so forth. So that's one thing there. The other thing is in thinking about the author of the Gospel of Luke, it's important to remember that Luke has a part two in the book of Acts. It's, I don't know anyone off the top of my head that argues that they were written by different people. Uh, so Luke wrote both. Or the author wrote both the Gospel of Luke as well as the Book of Acts. So in trying to figure out who wrote the Gospel of Luke, we're also asking

who wrote the Book of Acts? And so some of the evidence for the authorship of Luke will take from Acts and vice versa. We have to kind of think about the authorship of both of them at the same time. Um, which... Not really anything to add here other than John really the way we have John placed within our canon really messes that up. You should read Luke acts, go, go Luke into acts, really get that similar to you really ought to read Ezra, Nehemiah and not. Study them separately. Look at them together. Kind of a thing. Uh, but yeah, Luke acts is, uh, how you ought to read it. Cause it's how it was written. And it, uh, Acts, well, both books open up a lot more when you view them together as one and do that study. So a little bonus there as far as that goes. But we're looking at authorship of two books, two books that claim to be Written by same individual and we're fine with it. We're fine with this today. Why are we okay with Luke and authorship here? What's the external evidence? So there are quite a few early witnesses, and this is similar to what we've talked about with the other Gospels. A P75, which is our oldest extant copy of the Gospel of Luke. Dating to the end of the second century, beginning of the third, somewhere between 175 and 225. Ends with the phrase, gospel according to Luke. So euangelion kata lukan in Greek, saying that it is by somebody named Luke. It is called the Gospel According to Luke in Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, two of our most important uncial manuscripts of the Gospel of Luke. Also, in the Muratorian canon, which dates 170, 180, maybe as late as 200, It's the oldest list that we have of the books of the New Testament. Now, it's not the exact same list of the books that made it into the New Testament. That might be a discussion for another episode at some point, but it's the first list that we have of someone kind of listing out authoritative books that are written after the Old Testament that kind of become the New Testament. In the Mauritian canon, it identifies the author of the Gospel of Luke as Luke the physician, the traveling companion of Paul, Which fits very well with the evidence that we have also from the church fathers. So, for example, Irenaeus, based on the wee passages in Acts, which we'll talk about in more depth here in a moment, he attributes the gospel to Luke. The traveling companion of Paul and says that Luke was recording Paul's gospel. So this is kind of similar to the gospel of Mark that's connected to Peter and it was believed that Mark wrote down The teachings of Peter, you get something similar here according to Irenaeus that the Gospel of Luke is Paul's version of the Gospel. Which, as we'll talk about as we move on, it is absolutely not. Read Luke, read Paul's letters. There's plenty of differences in the way that they conceptualize the gospel, but we'll talk about that later on. Other church fathers, Tertullian, Eusebius, Jerome, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Justin Martyr all attribute The Gospel of Luke to Luke, the traveling companion of Paul. As did Marcion, or the correct term is Martian, but most people say Marcion. That's beside the point. I'm going to say Martian. Martian. was an early church heretic, that one of the first most important heretics. So real quickly, just a brief synopsis of what Martian believed. He believed that the God of the Old Testament Jesus was a different God than the one that was revealed in Jesus. He believed that Jesus was God, but not human. And because of that, he rejected the Old Testament and Judaism. So if Jesus is presenting a different God than what we get in the Old Testament, We throw out the Old Testament. We throw out Judaism. And so he really liked Paul because he read Paul as rejecting Judaism as well. Which is kind of funny because if he does, he does so with a lot of references to the authority of the Old Testament. Anyway, Martian, uh, was a Paul person. He liked the, at least some of the letters of Paul. And because he read Paul is Rejecting Judaism, he accepted—he kind of put together his own canon, so his own list of authoritative books, and that kind of— Is what led to the need to put together what became the list of books in our New Testament, because the Church kind of had to figure out, well, Martians wrong, what is the right set? In the order that he put together, the only gospel that he included was an edited version of the gospel of Luke, because Luke is probably the least Jewish gospel. Though it's very Jewish, that's an argument we can make in another episode, but I've, I've argued in some works that I've Written and presented that Luke is very heavily not only influenced by the Old Testament, but Luke expects his audience to pick up On allusions to the Old Testament and connections to Old Testament stories. But it does so the least out of all the Gospels. So he liked Luke, though he had to edit some parts out that were too pro-Jewish. But one of the other reasons that Martian likes Luke is because he connects it to Paul. He believed that Luke was the traveling companion of Paul. He likes Paul because he thinks that Paul rejects Judaism as well, and so that leads him to accept the gospel of Luke. The anti-Marcionite prologues, which are introductions to the books of That end up becoming in our New Testament, or at least they don't all, but some of the books that end up in our New Testament as a pushback against the teachings of Martian also attributes the gospel to Luke. It places Luke in Syria and Antioch and says that he is a physician who is a traveling companion of Paul. So quite a bit of external evidence for Luke in authorship, though I will say just like All of the other evidence, this comes decades after the gospel was written. So you do have to take it with a little bit of a grain of salt, because we're talking about people A generation or more removed from Luke writing his gospel who are making these attributions. So plenty of

information can be lost over the course of time, so you have to take it with a grain of salt. Yeah, the the time is going to be similar to Matthew and Mark as we talked about, but there is a lot more. Just the quantity of attribution is higher. That's that's where it starts to differ a little bit here between what we saw with Matthew and Mark, which was The name specifically, I do not remember, but these two saying, well, he attribute it back down this way. And now here you have a little bit more of. He said it, he said it, he said it, he said it, he said it. The quantity doesn't make it correct, as Spencer said there, but it does make you maybe take a little bit, a little bit more time looking at it. Yeah, something to add there that's just important to remember is if the first person got it wrong, And all the people after him rely on his testimony, then they're all gonna get it wrong. And so that's something to remember about the quantity doesn't necessarily mean Uh, quality because there's kind of, there can kind of be this snowball effect of misinformation. You see that Even in, when we try to figure out, when we're comparing Greek manuscripts to figure out what an original gospel or letter said, The older the reading, the better, even if it doesn't show up very often. Because a... Change or a misspelling or something that happens early on then gets copied and copied and copied and copied and copied. And then you get it in hundreds of different versions, but it's not original and you can get the same thing that's happening here. With the authorship of the gospel is someone early on gets it wrong and everybody else relies on him. And so they all get it wrong because the first and it becomes just a snowball. And so. A lot of people is important, but it's not the most important thing. There's a lot of other more important things to consider, and that's where we're going to be going. I'll say too, what we have under Irenaeus here is at least a textual argument from him of like, it's because of what we see in Acts that we get. Which is, that's also just better reasoning than what we've seen with, with Matthew and Mark, uh, external evidence as well, so. Um, okay. So moving from external now into internal evidence, as far as Luke acts is concerned, what does it do, uh, internally to, to point to a guy named Luke? So I'll start with just some of the basic things that we talked about with Matthew Mork as well. The author is educated because he's able to not only read and write, which maybe only up to 5% of the early Christian community was able to. But Luke is probably the most polished and structured Greek of any of the Gospels. So not only is he educated... To be able to read and write, he seems to be more educated than the other evangelists who wrote the other gospels. And this does not necessitate that he is a physician. So I mentioned that some of the evidence that we have Externally identifies him not only as Luke, who was the traveling companion of Paul, but also calls him Luke the physician. And some people have said, well, because the polished Writing he must have been a physician and that is a very fallacious argument because physicians were not the only people in the ancient world who were educated and who would be able to write very well. And it's even debatable how well a physician was able to write. Like, you go and you get a doctor today. They... Are actually known for very poor penmanship, by the way. But you get a doctor today who has had more education than most of us, gone through more schooling to become a doctor. It doesn't mean they can write a literary work. I mean, it just, it means that they're able to read and write and probably think better maybe than the average person without as much education. But it doesn't mean they can write a literary work like the Gospel of Luke. There's really no connection between the way that Luke's written and him needing to be a physician. Those are just two separate things for us to consider. He's familiar with the Old Testament. We've talked about that before. He uses a lot of Old Testament quotations and a lot of allusions to the Old Testament, and I think he expects his audience to pick up on those as well. That leads to this may be a Another podcast episode. But there's debate about whether or not Luke is a Hellenized Jew, so a Jew Who has kind of accepted and being influenced by Greco-Roman culture, or if he is our only known Gentile author of a book in the New Testament. And part of that hinges on his use of the Old Testament. Is this something that we can expect from a God-fearing Gentile or a Gentile who was introduced to the Scriptures when he became a Christian? Or is his depth of knowledge of the Old Testament something that you would only expect from a Jew? Though all of the Greek stuff, his audience probably being Gentile, he would have had to have been a Hellenized Jew. I'll say I think he was a Hellenized Jew. I think there's too much Jewishness in the Gospel of Luke for him to have been a Gentile, but... That's just my opinion. We also know that he is not an eyewitness. He says in Luke chapter one verses two and three that he investigated what had been handed down by eyewitnesses. So he says, I wasn't there. So it's not like the Gospel of Matthew where we're trying to figure out, is this person an eyewitness or not? It's the author comes out and says, I was not there, but I investigated and talked to the people who were there. Something else that's interesting about the text is that the author is present In the text. And here's what I mean by that. The author is writing to a specific person, Theophilus, who both Jack and I agree and is really the consensus of both scholars and non-scholars now that Theophilus was a real person. There was a time where it was thought it was a metaphorical name for Christians, but that's generally been abandoned by the most. So he's writing to a specific person, Theophilus.

And he's writing about his writing and research process. He talks about, here's what I went to do. I went and talked to these people who were there from the beginning. This adds some probability. To the fact that the historical attribution is correct because it is more likely that the audience knew who the author was. And part of this is dependent on who we think the audience is. It's something that we'll come to in an episode in the future, I know. But what I want to highlight here is that unlike Matthew and Mark, who the author's not present in the text. There's no, I did this, I did that. It leaves us trying to figure out were they intended to be anonymous? Did the author not want to be known? And that's a possibility. If the author didn't want to be known, there's a problem with the historical record of who wrote it because there would have been very few, if any people. Who knew who this author was. Luke's different because he's writing to a person, Theophilus, who I believe is the patron who commissioned and financed the writing of the gospel. And so since this guy paid the author And came to him and said, hey, I want you to write down, I want you to go investigate and write all these things down. At least somebody, and it was probably written not just for Theophilus, but for a group of people around Theophilus, they all would have known who wrote it. So this raises the likelihood in the Gospel of Luke, unlike all the other Gospels, that maybe the historical evidence is true. You still have to hold it with a grain of salt. But maybe not quite as much as we do for the other Gospels. The final thing that we get internally, and this comes from the book of Acts, is the we passages. Kind of in the back half, the back third, let's say, of the Gospel of Luke, there's this transition into the Um, first person plural pronoun we. We did this. We did that. So the author is speaking of the travels and missionary work of Paul. And says we as if the author was actually there with Paul. And something to consider when we think about these we passages in Acts is that eyewitness testimony was important for ancient historians. And so if an author was an eyewitness to some of the events being described, we would expect them to reveal so because you wanted to say, I was there to lend some credibility to what you're writing. If you listen to our episode on the Gospel of Matthew, that's why I'm skeptical of the Apostle Matthew writing the Gospel, because there's nothing in there that says, yeah, I was actually there for these things. And you would expect that, because people in the ancient world Wanted their historians to have been there. There was an increase in credibility for being an eyewitness. And so you would expect that to be added if someone was an eyewitness. So it at least lends the possibility that the author was an eyewitness in there for that part, at least, of Paul's missionary journey. It's also the possibility that someone could have just added that to claim to be an eyewitness. But in other words, if it is an eyewitness, the Something like we statements would have to be there, you would expect, but it just because they're there doesn't mean that it had to have been by an eyewitness. However, If it was merely a rhetorical device or someone trying to claim to be there who wasn't actually there, you would expect it to be used throughout the narrative. The first two thirds of acts, there's no we statements. And then all of a sudden these we statements pop up. If someone was just claiming to be there who wasn't there, you would expect them to do it throughout the entirety of the Book of Acts to say, yeah, I was there for all of this, not just... I was there for a very small portion of it, and that's all we get, a small portion of these we statements, which lends credibility To the fact that the author was actually there for these portions of Paul's ministry. Now Luke's not the only one that fits that description. We'll talk about that in a minute. It lends even more credibility to the author was probably there. Yeah. Uh, I'm familiar with the Wii and then you have you have switches to to the uh, then they went to this place and it's interesting to kind of You can kind of map out like, oh, he was he was with him here and then they split up in this spot. And then when you get into later letters where he appears to be talked about by like Paul. Uh, it's just kind of interesting to see those workers where they came together, where they split up. That's, that's true with like Timothy Epaphroditus, all those guys, you get to see them together and apart and all that, but. Um, I did want to say we've talked about this before. Um, this kind of fits into the vein of what we're doing right now. Uh, somewhat of the authorship stuff. Luke being a, an investigator or researcher, uh, in what he's doing here, uh, when we've talked about inspiration in the past, this, this is where. We would, we believe Luke is inspired, but our definition has to fit this researcher investigator sort of idea because that is what he is. That is what the text says. That's what he calls himself. You can look at what those words mean. Uh, and it does mean exactly as we've presented here of he's, he's reading, he's reading what's been written and he's having conversations with, with people. And he was also there for some of these, uh, for some of this stuff, at least as far as acts goes. Uh, so something to think about as you're reading through it and particularly reading Luke acts together, uh, of watching him transition in places from. Heard and read about these things to I was actually here for this stuff and then I heard about these things as I was just an interesting layer to the study as you're reading through it. Okay. We've brought up. Uh, Paul a little bit with the act stuff of them, the, the, we and Paul being around for some of this, uh, in as far as the, we goes as Paul is moving the, the back, I think it's the back half of acts. Is when it moves really

from Peter focus to Paul focus. Um, and that's where we find some of these, these weeds here, uh, is with, with Luke and Paul. Um, so what do we know about Luke from other places in the new Testament? Uh, particularly Paul here, as you'll mention in a second. So Luke's not a... The primary or prominent character in the New Testament, which kind of like Mark, and even a little bit with Matthew, is he's not someone that you would choose to write a gospel without some reason. That's going to be different when we move on in the next episode to John. Like John is a guy that you would pick. He's in a pop, which. Yeah. Makes us have to be a little bit skeptical of that attribution just because he's, it's like, that's a little bit too easy. Doesn't mean we reject it, but we have to be a little bit more skeptical than a Mark or a Luke in particular who were not there. Like, you would choose, again, you would choose an eyewitness. And Luke's not that. Luke says that he's not that in the gospel. He claims to be a part in a small portion of Acts. And like Jack said, the way that he hops around from not being an eyewitness to being an eyewitness to not being, lends some credence to maybe someone like Luke. Having written the gospel, he's only mentioned conclusively as Paul's companion in three passages, Colossians 4.14, Philemon verse twenty-four and two Timothy 4.11. He's identified as the beloved physician in Colossians four and as a fellow worker in Philemon twenty-four So Luke does fit. The mold of someone who would have been there with Paul for part of his missionary journey. He's someone that could have been there during the wee passages in Acts, if we assume that the author was actually present for those. So Luke would fit from the little bit that we know from the New Testament, but that's really it. That's the extent of what we can know about Luke, at least from the internal evidence of the New Testament. Um, this does lead into another interesting discussion though about if, if Luke and Paul are hanging out. Cause this is how it works with people. As you hang out with people, you adopt, uh, terminology, mannerisms, uh, various behaviors, schedule, whatever, uh, as, as you're around people. We would expect there to potentially be some linkage between all of Paul's writings, and then you have, though just Luke and Acts, two very Substantial writings in Luke and Acts, you would expect there to be some overlap, some things where they agree that that kind of stuff and come together. So is there a connection between Luke, Acts and the writings of Paul? Yeah, as you just said, the key point of discussion with Luke and authorship, I think, is if a connection can be made between Luke, Acts, and the writings of Paul. Because if Luke was a traveling companion of Luke, Paul, and he wrote Luke-Acts, then we would expect there to be some kind of overlap in history and theology. If there's not, it's very doubtful that a traveling companion of Paul... Wrote it. Now, like I said, Luke's not the only traveling companion that would kind of fit the evidence that we've talked about thus far. But at the minimum, if it was a traveling companion, we would expect there to be some kind of overlap. There are, though, some significant differences between Luke-Acts and the writings of Paul. Which have caused many scholars to doubt Lucan authorship. Here's a couple of examples. One. There are different descriptions of the early church. Paul presents himself much more as an independent leader and missionary, even distancing himself from other While Luke presents a much more harmonious and unified early church that was led less by Paul and more by the apostles. Here's an example. If you read Galatians, which was one of the first... Some would say the first letter of Paul. It's kind of between, generally, Galatians and one Thessalonians, which one Paul wrote first. But an early letter Paul is defending his apostleship, and he does so by distancing himself from the other apostles, right? He says, I... I didn't get my gospel from them. I really didn't confer with them. It was years after that we got together and they were just like, yeah, keep doing what you're doing. And we had no connection. Paul is kind of like a lone wolf going and doing his own thing, which is a bit different than what we get in the book of Acts. Right, so Jack alluded to this earlier. The first half is very Peter focused and really the apostles as a whole. They're still there in Jerusalem. It's Peter and the other apostles. They're leading the church and Paul comes in later on after his conversion, but he and Barnabas are commissioned by Peter and the other apostles to go out and do their work and Paul's still kind of connected to them. You think of the Jerusalem council where Paul had a role in it, but not like a primary role. In it, he spoke, but it was in the context of him and other apostles and leaders in the early church were coming together to try to figure out what they were going to do. And it's just a slightly different way than Paul presents things in Galatians. And so it leads people to wonder, and this isn't necessarily a thing of having to say, oh, they contradict one another, but just very different ways of thinking about the same events of Who was in charge and who was dependent on who, and it's perfectly fine for two people to describe that differently, which Acts and Paul's letters do. A second difference is that there are different descriptions of Paul's Ministry. So I've alluded to this already. The Jerusalem Council in...that's mentioned in Acts... And we think in Galatians, now there's kind of some debate about how we talk about these, Paul's trips to Jerusalem in Galatians, but Paul says that in one of his trips he has this confrontation with Peter. And we don't get any confrontation with Peter in the book of Acts. The only thing that we get is Peter, James, and Paul in agreement at the Jerusalem Council. So when

they do come together, there seems to be some harmony. In Acts, and Paul speaks of this confrontation that we don't ever hear of. And it doesn't mean it didn't happen, but... It's something that we might find a little bit weird for Luke not to have mentioned if he was so well acquainted with Paul. One of the most important ones, though, is the lack of significant tenets of Pauline theology. So you read through Paul's letters. What's important to Paul... Is justification by faith apart from works of the law? Like, that's kind of how you can summarize almost everything that Paul writes, right? You are justified by faith, not by the law. And you don't get that in Luke-Acts. Luke, like most of the Gospels, thinks of the significance of Jesus' death and resurrection not as... Justification by faith, but more as a conquering, as the kingdom of God coming, the kingdom of God conquering sin and death. Things like that. Um, I'm gonna have more to say on that when I get to some of the ways to explain those differences, but you don't get the justification by faith. Which again might be a weird thing if Luke was a companion or a disciple or something like that of Paul. You would expect some overlap in theology. But with that being said, there are also some notable overlaps between Luke-Acts and Paul's letters. The biographical information about Paul, so basically the same timeline of events that Paul recounts as what we get next. There is some difficulty because there's not complete overlap, and so trying to figure out You know, like I said in Galatians, when Paul talks about these trips of, are these the same trips that are mentioned in Acts? Is Paul talking about a different trip? There is some debate about that, but generally... You can understand Paul's speaking about his timeline and history and stuff can kind of be layered on top of the Book of Acts. We get overlap in Traveling Companions, so Barnabas shows up in Acts and is mentioned in Paul's letters. We get an overlap of Paul's calling to be an apostle to the Gentiles. Both Acts and Paul's letters agree that he was, had this experience of god on the road to Damascus and he changes his mission to be an apostle on behalf of Jesus to the gentiles there is some theological overlap so the gentile mission Paul, I mean, Luke in both Luke acts is very concerned about how the gospel and work of Jesus is open, not just to Jews, but also to Gentiles. That's one of his thrusts. And that fits very well. with Paul's letters and Paul's entire ministry being to allow Gentiles into the people of God, that it's not just for Jews. The Holy Spirit is also something that's important in pretty much all of Paul's letters. The Holy Spirit is kind of central to Paul's theology. It's also central to Luke's theology. The Holy Spirit is very much more present in Luke-Acts than it is in the other Gospels. And so that would be an overlap between Luke-Acts and Paul. There's also at least one prominent example of textual dependence, and I would refer you back to The series that we did on the Lord's Supper, because we talked about this there, but Luke's version of the Lord's Supper seems to be partially dependent on the Pauline tradition preserved in one Corinthians eleven So the phrase for you, a reference to the covenant as a new covenant, and the phrase in remembrance of me are unique only to Luke and to Paul. So it seems that at the minimum... The author knew the tradition of Paul, I think, preserved in one Corinthians eleven Doesn't mean that he knew Paul It doesn't even mean that he knew or had an access to the letter to the Corinthians, though I think that's More possible, but just minimum that he knew that tradition of Paul, because there's overlap that is only between Paul and Luke, and so that raises the possibility of, well, maybe he knew it because he knew Paul, and he traveled with Paul and was a part of His ministry. There are ways to explain away both the disagreements as well as the agreements. I'll start with the way to... Explain away the disagreements. The wee passages in Acts suggest that Luke was only a sometimes companion of Paul. He was not with Paul... All the time, nor a lifelong disciple. So we would expect Luke acts not to perfectly mirror. All of the events and all of the theology and everything in Paul because according to Acts, Luke was only with Paul for a small period of time. So he might have picked some things up from Paul. Like a Lord's Supper tradition, but he wasn't like a lifelong disciple where we would expect them to think very, very similarly on everything. That's connected with that Luke is capable of and should be seen as developing his own theology. In a way of understanding the life and death of Jesus, we need to allow Luke to think as Luke. We don't think that Paul wrote it. We think that maybe Luke wrote it. And so even if Luke was influenced by Paul, we would expect Luke to still do Luke things and not just rehash everything that Paul would have said. Especially if he was only with Paul for a small period of time. Luke, it seems, is intentionally trying to present the life of the early church as harmonious and so maybe he intentionally includes not to talk about some of the things that makes it appear less harmonious. Paul doesn't seem to care about that. He's perfectly fine with talking about some of the disagreements that he had. Luke may be trying to do a different thing. Something that I would add to that also is that Luke is writing A different genre of literature than what we get in Paul's letters. So what's interesting is atonement. So Jesus dying for our sins, justification, that kind of language. You really only see in letters. It's not present in any of the gospels, really. John gets the closest. But it seems to me that that might be part of genre, that by nature the Gospels are going to be more concerned with presenting The death of Jesus in terms of this story of the coming of the kingdom of God and less concerned with the particularities of

a theology of what exactly happened. At the cross. How exactly does Jesus' death deal with sins? And just more that Jesus deals with sins. The kingdom of God wins. That might be just more a genre difference, so the lack of justification, than it is a real difference in theology. And then you add that to the fact that Luke not only has some overlaps, but he wasn't a lifelong disciple of Paul. So you'd expect some similarities, but also for Luke to be his own independent thinker and developing his own independent theology. There are also ways to explain away the agreements. The agreements do not necessitate that Luke was a companion of Paul, but perhaps merely that he had secondhand knowledge of Paul's life. And travels and perhaps even knowledge of Paul's letters. So you could say in this investigation, he talked to a lot of people that knew Paul. Maybe he talked to a Luke who knew Paul. And that's where he, the author got his information from. Maybe he has access to Paul's letters. Paul wrote most of his letters in the 50s. Luke was probably written in the 80s, so it's definitely within reason. That the author would have access to Paul's letters. And maybe that's what explains their similarities and some of the overlap. If the author was present during the we sections of Acts, Luke is also not the only person that fits those qualifications. So you could also say, yeah... We think that this was someone who knew Paul, who was there during Louise's sections of Acts, but We can't know for sure. Is that Luke, as the tradition says, or might this be somebody else who could have also been traveling with Paul during this periods of time? Uh, the, the thing that's coming to mind, and I know that we're gonna, uh, wrap this up here of Who do you think wrote the gospel of Luke? And this will, this will kind of come with it, but. The thing coming to mind is we even ending with the you can explain away the agreements thing there. There's so much more within this particular discussion. Uh, of overlap than like the, the supposed overlap with, uh, Mark and Peter and all of that. There's, there's a lot more here. That's like, Well, yeah, this is a unique phrase to Paul and to this particular author. You just get a lot more of this kind of thing that I think Hopefully you've already listened to the previous episodes leading up to this one, but I think if you were to go back and listen to the other episodes, you would go, okay, it makes a little more sense now why I might go Not, not Matthew or it's a guy named Mark, but it's like not the mark I'm thinking of in light of. This particular episode and all the various evidence and discussion that it lays out. Something to add to that real quick is to give another example of how this works. Jack and I, before the episode, we were discussing the Johannine letters, first, second, and third John, for hopefully some stuff that we have coming later on this year, but... In those letters, for example, there is a lot of overlap in language between one John and like the Gospel of John. The term paraclete for the Holy Spirit, which is unique only to the Gospel of John, it shows up in one John. And so you have a lot of overlap. And so when you think as... Jack mentioned, you go back and you watch the other episodes or you have and you see, well, there's just not much here and you compare that to Luke. Or you compare that to trying to figure out who wrote one John, because there's no name there either. It's not, you don't get a letter greeting, and so you don't get a name. And so trying to figure out, well, who... Who wrote this and there's a lot more overlap in some very unique ways that you just don't get, which is what leads scholars and myself to question Like Matthew and Mark, because it's like we've got other things that have a lot more overlap than what we're seeing here. The other thing to say about that, though, is just trying to make this distinction of overlap. Does not mean that it's the same author, but merely that an author is familiar with And has been influenced by another work or another author, not even another work. So like with one John, one of the things is, does he know the author of the Gospel of John or does he know the actual Gospel of John? There's no, like, quotations from the Gospel of John. Like, and Luke doesn't quote from one of Paul's letters to be like, oh yeah, he had to have had one Corinthians because he quotes this line. But just there are some similarities that you might get just talking to a person. And so, or that you might get just by reading a work as well. You don't have to ever meet the person. So, you know, Jack and I talk about new heavens and new earth stuff, right? It doesn't mean that we're in T. Wright. Right. Uh, because we might steal some of his language or somebody else's language. It's nor that we've ever met him. Well, I have met him, but, um, it, it, it, It uh, it doesn't mean that I am N.T. Wright or even that I had to have met him, but simply that I'm been influenced by his work. And so that's the other thing of just saying, like, let's not jump too far and say, oh, there's similarities. And jump to, well, it must have been, well, But there's other ways to explain that as well. So we just kind of have to be, I'm just saying be careful. So in one Timothy five and maybe you didn't include this for a reason, because maybe I'm wrong about this. one Timothy five eighteen says, The. The author of that book, maybe that's why it's not included. I don't know how you feel about the authorship of that book. Maybe that's what that is. But there is a, there is a quotation of Luke. When you said the quotation of Paul thing the other way around, that made me think of, isn't there a quote of Luke with, Uh, in connection with Deuteronomy as well. Um, if you think Paul wrote that book, there's another like layer of they hung out. They apparently, or they at least knew of each other and talked and that kind of stuff. That's a, that's a good point

because I mentioned that there's, let's see the way that I worded it, um, He's only mentioned conclusively as Paul's companion. Yes, yes, yes, yes. And so part of this I took from, I had to address this a little bit in my thesis, and from a scholarly perspective, just to understand how scholars think, is that If I'm trying to make a connection between the, between Luke and Paul, and I want to go to Timothy, which scholars are split on whether or not Paul wrote it. I now have to argue that Paul wrote it in order to then argue that this accurately reflects, which is just, which is just too much work. And that's something that I also caution people on when you're trying to prove a point. Understand, uh, just understanding the scholarship there is, is, is helpful because in trying to make a definitive point about Paul, I would never go to first Timothy, first, second Timothy and Titus, even though. I don't necessarily have a problem with Paul writing it. I'm not exactly sure what I think about all of that. You could, but it's another layer removed. Yes, you have something else that you... I now have to prove that versus... Philemon, nobody disputes. Colossians, nobody disputes. Those are a lot easier for us to go to and to. No, that makes sense. That makes sense. So those are the two big ones I did in the handout. I include Timothy in there, but in just talking about like what we can know Colossians and Philemon is kind of where I'd hang my hat though. Timothy does connect them. Uh, no, that makes sense. Uh, just, just popped into my head. I'm glad to know I wasn't going crazy. I was like, I think it's quoted, but that's also. That that's a good I'm trying to remember where I've it's been in various books I've seen where you have I think they've argued those kinds of things first. So like, here's a bit of potential evidence, but there's a little bit of discussion on it. But then here's the, these are more conclusive and stronger and whatever. So. It's like Spencer said, it's not that you can't argue that, but it does require more work and might be shakier than some other pieces that are a little more explicit in the connection. Okay, all this, all this being said, with all of the internal, external, all the various things we've discussed, overlap, and all that kind of thing, who do you think wrote the Gospel of Luke? So, maybe surprisingly, kind of like we said at the beginning of the episode, I actually think that Luke wrote Luke. Luke, The physician, the traveling, sometimes traveling companion of Paul wrote the gospel. Uh, I think that for a couple of reasons, like with, with Mark that I said, I think there's a decent Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. You would rather have an eyewitness to the ministry of Jesus, like a Matthew, like a John. Those are names that someone might attach because... They want an eyewitness. Luke's not a person that you would pick, which is just kind of an odd thing that that becomes the name that is attached to it. I think it's the best explanation of the we passages if it was a rhetorical device, which if it's a rhetorical device, it doesn't mean the author's trying to lie to us. It just means they're using it as authors do for some rhetorical purposes. If that's it, I don't know why it's only in a small section. I don't think there's a good explanation for why we flip-flop between Not there, there, not there. Yeah. Um, the best explanation of that is that the person was actually there. Now, That doesn't mean that it had to have been Luke, but again, being the only name that's attached to it, the author being present in the text, so somebody knew who wrote it, I think lends a little bit more credibility to the historical attribution being correct as compared to Matthew and Mark that we've talked about at this point. And I do think there's enough significant overlap between Luke, Acts, and Paul's letters. The overlap is enough to say this was somebody who knew Paul. But there's enough disagreements where it was someone that wasn't a lifelong disciple of Paul, which Luke seems to kind of fit that mold as well. He was around sometimes. He wasn't around all the time. And to me, that seems to fit the overlap that we do have. And so there's enough there for me to say, I think Luke The traveling companion of Paul, a Hellenistic Jew, though that's not really what we talked about. I think he was the one that wrote the gospel. Okay, there you go. There you go. Do you disagree? Uh, let us know. You can reach us anywhere and by, by us, I mean you can. Reach me at Facebook and Spencer everywhere. Uh, and we'd, uh, we'll take any feedback that we can get, uh, as far as positive, negative, any questions, additional things like that. If, if, if you have like further questions, Especially ones that kind of prod at some of the things that we've brought up and said, well, hold on. I need a little bit more here, uh, before I, before I, uh, accept or go along with this idea. We'd love to hear that. Uh, we'll, we'll do a questions episode or all for it. Let us know what you think. Share these things around if you think they'd be helpful to others as well or let us know if you are finding them useful in personal study or maybe in Uh, conversations that you're having with, with other Christians or, or with non-Christians. Uh, and be sure to check out [thinkingtheologically.org](http://thinkingtheologically.org) and Thinking Theologically on Facebook. Uh, for all of our episodes like this, interviews, and then various articles, uh, that we write, uh, from time to time, uh, about all kinds of things pertaining to these episodes that maybe didn't Uh, get to make it in, uh, to the episode proper. So, uh, that's the episode for this week. I'm Jack and that's Spencer. We'll see you next time.