THE AUTHORSHIP OF HEBREWS: A FURTHER DEVELOPMENT IN THE LUKE-PAUL RELATIONSHIP

Andrew W. Pitts and Joshua F. Walker
McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, ON, Canada

Introduction

Regardless of its genre, with 1 John, Hebrews represents one of the only two non-narrative portions of the New Testament that lacks self-attestation regarding its authorship. The document's anonymity has not, however, discouraged conjectures regarding the identity of the writer. A number of possibilities for its origination have been suggested, including but not limited to Paul,[1]

---

[1] Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 6.25.11–14) records that several Alexandrian scholars held to Pauline authorship, particularly Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–215 C.E.) and Origen (185–254 C.E.), both of whom held to Pauline authorship with some reservations. Others in the early Church who adopted Pauline authorship—notably from the Western Church—include Jerome (*Epist.* 129.3) and Augustine (*Pecc. merit.* 1.50). The Pauline view has persisted in modern scholarship, as we see in M. Stuart, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (2d ed.; Andover, Mass.: Flagg, Gould, and Newman, 1833); R. Milligan, *Epistle to the Hebrews* (The New Testament Commentary; St. Louis: Christian Publishing Co., 1875); W. Leonard, *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews: Critical Problem and Use of the Old Testament* (Rome: Vatican Polyglot Press, 1939). This view died out almost entirely among scholars until J. Philips revived it in *Exploring the Scriptures* (Chicago: Moody, 1965), 268–69. However, Philips's view never gained acceptance and the Pauline perspective enjoyed a hiatus until it emerged again through D.A. Black, e.g., his "On the Pauline Authorship of Hebrews (Part 1): Overlooked Affinities between Hebrews and Paul," *Faith & Mission* 16 (1999): 32–51; "On the Pauline Authorship of Hebrews (Part 2): The External Evidence Reconsidered," *Faith & Mission* 16 (1999): 78–86. Black also promises an extensive forthcoming book arguing for this position. In more recent German scholarship, see also Eta Linnemann, "Wiederaufnahme-Prozess in Sachen des Hebräerbriefes (Part 1)," *Fundamentum* 21 (2000): 102–12. Clare K. Rothschild (*Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon: The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews* [WUNT 237; Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2009]) argues that Hebrews is "Pauline Pseudepigraphy." This remains unconvincing for at least two reasons. First, if someone was attempting to pass off Hebrews as a Pauline letter, then why leave out many of the standard components of Paul's other letters, such as basic epistolary structure and formulas? It seems to us to be too unique of a document to be an attempted Pauline forgery. If it was a forgery of a Pauline letter, this Paulinist sure did a bad job. But such a situation seems highly unlikely given the composer's skill and education in literary production. Second, from a very early date the Christian community accepted this letter as an authentic Pauline letter—as substantiated by the

Luke,[2] Barnabas,[3] Apollos,[4] Clement,[5] Priscilla[6] and Philip.[7] We hope, however, to put forward a collaborative proposal that to our knowledge has not been suggested in modern scholarship up to this point—at least not in

external evidence provided out above. To overturn this evidence, a significant case would need to be made, a case which Rothschild fails to deliver.

[2] See J.F. Köhler, *Versuch über die Abfassungszeit: Der epistolischen Schriften im Neuen Testament und der Apokalypse* (Leipzig: J.A. Barth, 1830); K. Stein, *Kommentar zu dem Euangelium des Lucas: Nebst einem Anhange über den Brief an die Laodiceer* (Halle: Schwetschke und Sohn, 1830); J.L. Hug, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. D. Fosdick; Andover: Gould and Newman, 1836); R. Stier, *The Epistle to the Hebrews Interpreted in Thirty-Six Meditations* (2 vols.; 2d ed.; Brunswick: Schwetschke, 1842); J.H.A. Ebrard, *Biblical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in Continuation of the Work of Olshausen* (trans. J. Fulton; Clark's Foreign Theological Library 32; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1853); H. Cowles, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (New York: Appleton, 1878); L. Zill, *De Brief an die Hebräer: Übersetzt und erklärt* (Mayence: Franz Kirchheim, 1879); J. Döllinger, *The First Age of Christianity and the Church* (trans. H. Oxenham; 4th ed.; London: Gibbons, 1906) and now most recently, D. Allen, *Lukan Authorship of Hebrews* (New American Commentary Studies in Bible and Theology; Nashville: Broadman & Holman Academic, 2010).

[3] Tertullian (c. 160–220 C.E.) (*Pud.* 20) refers to "an epistle of Barnabas titled 'To the Hebrews.'" John Calvin also favours this view. See *Calvin's Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: S. Cornish, et al., 1841). Over the last century, an authorship by Barnabas has found supporters in E.C. Wickham, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: Methuen, 1910); E. Riggenbach, *Der Brief an die Hebräer ausgelegt von Eduard Riggenbach* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1922); H. Strathmann, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, Der Brief an die Hebräer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954); P.E. Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).

[4] Martin Luther (*Luther's Works*, Vol. 29: *Lectures on Titus, Philemon and Hebrews* [ed. J. Pelikan and Walter A. Hansen; Saint Louis: Concordia, 1968]) adopts Apollos as the author of Hebrews for the first time (but cf. J. Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1911], 438, who denies that Luther first proposed this view). Advocates of this position typically cite Acts 18:24 regarding Apollos's excellent speech and knowledge of the Scriptures as support. See also J.E. Howard, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Revised Translation, with Notes* (London: Yapp and Hawkins, 1872); J. Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. J.M. Trout et al.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1909), 356; D.E. Riggenbach, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1913); E.H. Plumptre, "The Writings of Apollos: An Attempt to Fix the Authorship of the Wisdom of Solomon and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *The Expositor* 1 (1875): 329–48; T.W. Manson, "The Problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *BJRL* 32 (1949): 1–17; P. Ketter, *Hebräerbrief, Jakobusbrief, Petrusbrief, Judasbrief* (Die Heilige Schrift für das Leben erklärt, Bd. 16/1; Freiburg [im Breisgau]: Herder, 1950); C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (2 vols.; Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1952); F. Lo Bue, "The Historical Background of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JBL* 75 (1956): 52–57; P. Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993); G.H. Guthrie, "The Case for Apollos as the Author of Hebrews," *Faith & Mission* 18 (2001): 41–56.

[5] J. Moffatt, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1924); K. and S. Lake, *Introduction to the New Testament* (London: Christophers, 1938).

[6] A. Harnack, "Probabilia über die Adresse und den Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes," *ZNW* 1 (1900): 16–41; J. Rendell Harris, *Side Lights on New Testament Research* (London: Kingsgate, 1908).

[7] W.R. Ramsay, *Luke the Physician and Other Studies in the History of Religion* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908).

the precise form that we put forward. Some have proposed multi-levelled authorship theories, such as John and Luke's collaboration with Mary.[8] The evidence we will examine, however, suggests that Hebrews likely represents a Pauline speech, probably originally delivered in a Diaspora synagogue, which Luke documented in some way during their travels together and which Luke later published as an independent speech to be circulated among house churches in the Jewish-Christian Diaspora. From Acts, there already exists a historical context for Luke's recording or in some way attaining and publishing Paul's speeches in a narrative context. Luke remains the only person in the early church whom we know to have published Paul's teaching (beyond supposed Paulinists) and particularly his speeches. And certainly by the first century we have a well-established tradition within Greco-Roman rhetorical and historiographic stenography (speech recording through the use of a system of shorthand) of narrative (speeches incorporated into a running narrative), compilation (multiple speeches collected and edited in a single publication) and independent (the publication of a single speech) speech circulation by stenographers. Since it can be shown that early Christians pursued parallel practices, particularly Luke and Mark, that Hebrews and Luke-Acts share substantial linguistic affinities, and that significant theological-literary affinities exist between Hebrews and Paul, we will argue that a solid case for Luke's independent publication of Hebrews as a Pauline speech can be sustained.

The proposal that perhaps most closely resembles ours is theorized, for example, in a footnote by Black when, in attempting to account for the linguistic evidence in Allen's dissertation on the Lukan authorship of Hebrews, he suggests Luke was perhaps Paul's amanuensis.[9] The problem with this proposal is that it assumes, contrary to the dominant perspective in scholarship, that Hebrews is a letter. Even if this is not an unargued assumption, Black's idea remains underdeveloped and is not robust enough to be compelling. In distinction from Black, we argue that Hebrews is a Pauline speech, independently documented and circulated by Luke, probably based upon his work as a stenographer—a more precise secretarial function related to speech recording than the broader domain of the amanuensis for which Black argues. J.V. Brown, almost a century ago, advanced a theory similar to our proposal when he argued

[8] J.M. Ford, "The Mother of Jesus and the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *University of Dayton Review* 11 (1975): 49–56.

[9] D.A. Black, "Who Wrote Hebrews? The Internal and External Evidence Reexamined," *Faith & Mission* 18 (2001): 3–26, here 23 n. 3.

that Paul authored the text but Luke edited it and published its final form.[10] Again, we believe a more convincing case can be made through establishing a historical framework in Greco-Roman and early Christian practice, that Luke, as he was accustomed to doing, somehow attained or documented first-hand a Pauline speech and then published it as an independent speech to be circulated in early Christian communities within the Diaspora.

The Historical Context for a Literary Collaboration between Luke and Paul

Assuming its reliability and Lukan authorship, Acts provides one possible plank of evidence for Luke's status as a traveling companion of Paul based upon the so-called "we" passages. But while the "we" sections of Acts certainly may indicate Luke's communication of an eyewitness testimony (including many Pauline speeches), the possibility that Luke has incorporated a previous we-source cannot be ruled out. If the "we" passages do convey eyewitness tradition as a number of scholars have argued,[11] this places Luke on at least two of Paul's missionary journeys. From these sections in Acts, we glean that: (1) Luke joins Paul at Philippi (16:10–17); (2) Luke accompanies Paul on his return visit to Philippi (20:5–15); (3) Luke went with Paul on his way to Jerusalem (21:1–18); and (4) after Paul's two year imprisonment, Luke set out with Paul to Rome (27:1–28:16). Further evidence for Luke's collaboration with Paul is documented in the Pauline letters. Paul refers to Luke as a fellow worker (Phlm 24). Evidence also exists for Paul's collaboration with a physician named Luke in Col 4:14, who apparently accompanied Paul at the time when he composed the letter and even sent his regards to the Colossian church. If we locate the prison letters within the Roman imprisonment, then Acts likely ends with Paul in prison because Luke has just joined him there. In other words, Acts concludes by narrating the circumstances directly surrounding its time of composition. This provides a time when Luke could have collaborated with Paul, including gathering source material, both for Acts and Hebrews. And—again, if we assume Pauline authorship or at least

[10] J.V. Brown, "The Authorship and Circumstances of Hebrews—Again!" *BibSac* 80 (1923): 505–38.

[11] For discussion, see S.E. Porter, "The 'We' Passages," in D.W.J. Gill and C. Gempf (eds.), *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting* (vol. 2 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*; ed. B.W. Winter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 545–74. Porter, however, adopts the view that the "we" passages are likely derived from a continuous independent source.

the validity of the tradition a Paulinist may have communicated—at the end of his life, Paul says "Luke alone is with me" (2 Tim 4:11), indicating a fairly close companionship. These comments in 2 Timothy, combined on the one hand with the historical record in Acts and on the other with numerous strands of literary and linguistic evidence, have generated a sizable body of literature that proposes a literary collaboration between Paul and Luke in the production of the Pastoral letters.[12] Such a scenario would only reinforce the likelihood of a previous or posthumous collaborative work in the publication of Hebrews—the date for Hebrews, whether it was circulated in Paul's lifetime or not, is not essential to our theory. If Paul and Luke did co-author the Pastorals, this would imply an open exchange of literary materials between them and would provide a context in which Luke could have worked with Paul to also publish an independent speech such as Hebrews—though, on our theory, he need not necessarily have done so.

In any case, through some means or another Luke gained access to a number of Paul's speeches and integrated them into his narrative. This, in addition to Paul's consistent reference in his letters to Luke's companionship at the sending locations for the letters and possibly further support marshalled from the "we" passages as well as possible evidence for Luke's involvement in the Pastorals, establishes a fairly stable historical context in which collaboration between Paul and Luke could have taken place. But the nature of this collaboration must be explored further. What process or method might Luke and Paul have undertaken in contributing to a literary production such as Hebrews? What contexts in early Christianity might have allowed for such a procedure? And what reference-points in Greco-Roman antiquity might we point to as evidence of parallel literary activity?

Speech Circulation in Greco-Roman Historiography

Interpreters of Acts slowly seem to be forming a consensus concerning the literary location of the document within the spectrum of genres in the ancient world. Most, at this stage, grant the historical nature of Acts,

[12] C.F.D. Moule ("The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: A Reappraisal," *BJRL* 47 [1965]: 430–52) has revived this view in recent scholarship. On the discussion and research subsequent to Moule, see G.W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 48–51; W.D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC 46; Dallas: Word, 2002), cxxvii–cxxix.

even if far fewer are willing to concede that the question of authenticity is reducible to the question of literary form: According to several, Acts may be history and yet its author may still invent large amounts of material.[13] Regardless, the debate over the genre of Acts seems fairly stable at this point in the history of interpretation—it represents some form of ancient history. It is appropriate then, without further defence, to move on to assess Acts as history. Specifically, our concern involves the speeches—particularly the Pauline speeches—in Acts and, therefore, within ancient historiography. And in this domain, a great deal of uncertainty revolves around the question of the nature and extent of the liberties taken by ancient historians in recording speeches. Before addressing this issue, however, it will be helpful to establish the kinds of mechanisms that were in place in Greco-Roman antiquity for documenting and then circulating public discourses for historical purposes.

How would an ancient historian have come across speech material? As we turn to the historians, we find various responses to this question. Thucydides (c. 460–395 B.C.E.) (1.22.1) says that "with reference to speeches," "some I heard myself, others I got from various quarters; it was in all cases difficult to carry them word for word in one's memory, so my habit has been to make the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions, of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said" (Smith, LCL). We will address the implications of this reference for the reliability of the speeches that Luke transmits below, but for now we wish to draw attention to what Thucydides says regarding the origin and transmission of speeches in antiquity. He acknowledges two points of origination for speech material: (1) speeches that he heard and (2) speeches he got from other places. Thucydides does not seem to employ written aid because he mentions the difficulty of retaining the speeches word for word. Polybius (c. 220–146 B.C.E.) (36.1), by contrast, appears to assume a previously existing deposit of speech material, not commenting directly on its origins, when he says that historians should "adapt their speeches to the nature of the particular occasion" (Paton, LCL). Plutarch (c. 46–120 C.E.) famously comments on the issue in a still more revealing way:

[13] For a detailed review of recent research on the genre of Acts, see T.E. Phillips, "The Genre of Acts: Moving Toward a Consensus?" *CBR* 4 (2006): 367–96. Phillips concludes his survey by noting that "In the eyes of most recent scholars, [Acts] is history—but not the kind of history that precludes fiction" (385).

> [A]nd its [i.e. Cato's speech's] preservation was due to Cicero the consul, who had previously given to those clerks who excelled in rapid writing instruction in the use of signs [σημεῖα], which, in small and short figures, comprised the force of many letters; these clerks he had then distributed in various parts of the senate-house. For up to that time the Romans [note the variant] did not employ or even possess what are called shorthand writers [σημειογράφους], but then for the first time, we are told, the first steps toward the practice were taken. Be that as it may, Cato carried the day and changed the opinions of the senators, so that they condemned the men to death (Plutarch, *Cat. Min.* 23.3–7) (Perrin, LCL).

The term σημειογράφους occurs here for the first time in the Greco-Roman literature, but Plutarch clearly understands the practice of recording speech through shorthand (stenography) to be introduced at the time of Cicero (c. 106–46 B.C.E.) and to have become somewhat pervasive by the first century C.E. According to this text then, on December 5th, in 63 B.C.E., with Cato's speech to the senate, we have the first documented instance of what would become a very common practice in subsequent centuries. And the language itself implies that the Romans derived the terminology from the Greeks, indicating a primitive Greek practice upon which the Roman practice was based.[14] "The Romans" (if that is the original reading) likely refers to broader Greco-Roman antiquity rather than merely the Latin development of stenography, so that the Greek and Latin traditions probably developed side by side. Cicero (*Fam.* 16.4.3) acknowledges this practice as well when he thanks Trio, apparently for his services as a "stenographer" in this instance (cf. also Cicero, *Fam.* 16.10.2; 16.17.1; *Att.* 13.32).[15] That a system for recording speeches emerged out of these beginnings by the first century is evident in Seneca's remarks (c. 63–64 C.E.) that there are *Quid verborum notas, quibus quamvis citata excipitur oratio et celeritatem linguae manus sequitur* ('signs for words, by which a speech is recorded, however quickly, and the hand follows the speed of the speech') (*Ep.* 90.25). Seneca (*Apol.* 9.2) also mentions a speech by Janus that was too long and eloquent for the stenographer to record. Such an admission likely implies that this stenographer had no trouble following other speakers.[16] Also worth noting is the development from the initial instance involving Cato's speech, which required a group of scribes, to the situation

[14] Cf. E.R. Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition, and Collection* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 69.

[15] See O. Morgenstern, "Cicero und die Stenographie," *Archiv für Stenographie* 56 (1905): 2–4.

[16] Cf. G. Bahr, "Paul and Letter Writing in the First Century," *CBQ* 28 (1966): 465–77, here 473.

in the first century in which a single scribe is sufficient for ordinary circumstances.[17] The skill of stenography was clearly useful to those who delivered speeches as well. Titus both gave impressive speeches and practiced the art of stenography, even to the point of competing with professionals of the trade for sport (Suetonius, *Tit.* 3) (indicating an established profession by the first century). Quintilian (c. 35–100 C.E.) (*Inst.* 10.3.19) further testifies to the practice of speech recording as the "fine fancy of dictation" in his classic work on the education of an orator.

We have evidence of stenography among the (especially epistolary) Greek tradition as well. Most cite as the earliest evidence for speech copyists the contract in P.Oxy. 724 (155 C.E.) in which Panechotes sends his slave to study under the stenographer Apollonius (cf. also P.Mur. 164),[18] establishing a flourishing trade of Greek shorthand writers at the very least, by the time of Paul and Luke. Clearly, a context appropriate for sending a person abroad for the purpose of mentorship in the profession assumes the previous development of a system of short hand that had been established and was being passed down. But as Hartman and Bahr notice, the evidence for Greek shorthand certainly predates the mid-second century C.E., being testified to in the mid to late first century C.E. with Arrian's method of transmitting *Epictetus's Discourses*.[19] Arrian writes in the introduction to his compilation of *Epictetus's Discourses*:

> I neither wrote these Discourses of Epictetus in the way in which a man might write such things; nor did I make them public myself, inasmuch as I declare that I did not even write them. But whatever I heard him say, the same I attempted to write down in his own words as nearly as possible, for the purpose of preserving them as memorials to myself afterwards of the thoughts and the freedom of speech of Epictetus. Accordingly, the Discourses are naturally such as a man would address without preparation to another, not such as a man would write with the view of others reading them (Arrian, *Epict. diss.* prol. [Long, n.p.]).

Notice that already in the first century B.C.E. we have an established practice of speech copying in place, making expectations for (abundant) parallel developments by the first century C.E. far from unreasonable. The length

[17] A. Stein, "Die Stenographie im römischen Senat," *Archiv für Stenographie* 16 (1905): 182; Bahr, "Paul and Letter Writing," 473.

[18] E.g. Bahr, "Paul and Letter Writing," 473; Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing*, 473.

[19] K. Hartmann, "Arrian und Epiktet," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik* 8 (1905): 257, and Bahr, "Paul and Letter Writing," 474.

and complexity of Epictetus's discourses also makes it hard to imagine that Arrian did not use a form of shorthand notes that he could convert into his own words at a later stage. He was not himself a philosopher and would, therefore, have needed to rely on Arrian's original concepts as closely as possible to preserve them accurately. Perhaps this is why he says he renders them "as nearly as possible." He also emphasizes the raw nature of the material that he has digested from Epictetus and its intent for private use. He obviously distinguishes between what he copied down based on the speeches he observed and the finer edited products typically prepared for public circulation. We must further stress that it was Arrian, the speech copyist, who was responsible for compiling and publishing the speeches (Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 1.2; 17.19; 29.1). And we must not forget that the accreditation of the origins of stenography to Cato's speech derives from the Greek tradition (Plutarch, *Cat. Min.* 23.3–7).

Arrian is not the only example of a (proto-) stenographer who published recorded speeches. Asconius Pedianu records[20] that a speech of Cicero's, his *Pro Milone*, had been circulated by a stenographer who recorded it, and furthermore that it differed drastically from the later edited/improved version that Cicero published—such a dual publication having no parallel in Greco-Roman antiquity. Cicero then became the subject of mockery because of the poor quality of the first version of the speech, published by the stenographer (Dio 40.54). Apparently stenographers published a number of Caesar's speeches as well. *Pro Q. Metell* suffered publication at the hand of a bad stenographer (Suetonius, *Jul.* 55.3), for example. But Suetonius's indication that the stenographer in this case did a disservice to Caesar substantiates the notion that people expected a reliable and accurate practice (otherwise, why comment upon incompetent stenography?). The success of the profession is further shored up by Quintilian's inclinations to accept a stenographer's version of *Pro Milone* as a more accurate rendition of the speech than the one Cicero himself later published (*Inst.* 4.2.17, 25). Nevertheless, Quintilian does not delight in the fact that stenographers have published all but one of his speeches delivered within the courts (*Inst.* 7.2.24). Further, T.N. Winter argues convincingly that Apuleius's (c. 125–180 C.E.) *Apology* furnishes yet another speech recorded and published by stenographers, based partially upon a developing tradition of this activity within Greco-Roman rhetoric: "the ancient notices of stenography which antedate the *Apology* of Apuleius indicate

[20] Cited in T.N. Winter, "The Publication of Apuleius' Apology," *TAPA* 100 (1969): 607–612, here 608. This paragraph was greatly aided by Winter's article.

that speeches could be faithfully recorded, and that court speeches were especially liable to recording and publication by stenographers."[21] Later still into the second century we have evidence of a Socratic speech (c. 200 C.E.) that apparently circulated as the result of a stenographer (Ps.-Socrates, *Ep.* 14.4).

We should note a few things at this juncture. To begin with, there is a well-substantiated practice in which speeches were recorded, published and circulated by stenographers in Greco-Roman rhetoric and historiography, especially within the Latin tradition, but in the Greek tradition as well. When Thucydides says that he uses speeches from various places, we may assume that he has likely gathered, at least in part, the work of stenographers as well as first-hand publications by the various authors he documents. But perhaps more interesting for our purposes is his comment that he records speeches that he has heard. Nevertheless, reliance upon memory seems to be his method of choice in most instances. This was not the case with someone like Arrian, however—a historian who, in much the same way that we are proposing for Luke, published a wide range of speeches embedded among his historical narratives in, for example, his *Indica* and his *Anabasis*,[22] but also published a compilation of Epictetus's speeches. This substantiates the practice of publishing speeches in both narrative and independent contexts among Greco-Roman historians. But were speeches published apart from such collections? Clearly they were. We have been able to document a flourishing and fairly developed stenography profession by the first century C.E. in which a number of stenographers published single speeches, often before those who delivered the speeches had the chance to circulate a more polished version. To summarize: speeches were published by historians and/or stenographers in three ways: (1) within narrative history; (2) as compilations; and (3) independently, as standalone documents. This still leaves the question of the style and language that the stenographer or historian might have introduced when recording speeches, whether using ancient shorthand or not. This question remains especially pertinent for our purpose since it frames our expectations regarding how much of Luke's own style might have penetrated Hebrews if it was a recorded Pauline speech.

[21] Winter, "Publication," 611.

[22] On these speeches, see M.G.L. Hammond, "The Speeches in Arrian's *Indica* and *Anabasis*," *CQ* 49 (1999): 238–53.

The most programmatic passage for assessing the reliability of ancient speeches, especially in Acts,[23] has been Thucydides 1.22.1:

> With reference to the speeches in this history, some were delivered before the war began, others while it was going on; some I heard myself, others I got from various quarters; it was in all cases difficult to carry them word for word in one's memory, so my habit has been to make the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions, of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said (Smith, LCL).

However, as Porter notes, there are a number of lexical and grammatical ambiguities that complicate any interpretation of this passage.[24] First, the word translated above as "difficult" (χαλεπόν) could indicate anything from virtual impossibility (i.e. 'something which cannot readily be accomplished, perhaps under any circumstances') to mere difficulty (i.e. 'difficult, but within the realm of possibility'). A mediating sense is even possible, where χαλεπόν is understood to mean 'impossible unless the right circumstances obtain' (e.g. a certain method must be employed). Second, the meaning of the phrase τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων (translated above "word for word") is unclear. Does this refer to the individual utterances or the reliability of the record as a whole? Third, does the adverb μάλιστα ("likely," "especially") go with the thing "demanded of them," to "say," or with the whole clause, to "say what was in my opinion demanded of them"? Fourth, the phrase translated above as "demanded" (τὰ δέοντα) leaves open the question as to how exactly the situations demanded things from the speaker and what exactly they demanded. Fifth, the phrase ὅτι ἐγγύτατα, translated "as closely as possible," could be a reference to keeping as closely as possible to what Thucydides deemed as necessary or it could refer to keeping as close to the general sense of what was said in light of the situation. Sixth, the phrase τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης ("the general sense") could mean the basic "gist" of what was said or the line taken by the speaker. Seventh, τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων ("really said") could denote either "spoken truthfully" or "truly spoken." These exegetical ambiguities make a "Thucydidean View" hard to maintain and of little help in

[23] The following discussion expands significantly upon material found in A.W. Pitts, "Paul's Hellenistic Education: Assessing Literary, Rhetorical and Philosophical Influences," in S.E. Porter and A.W. Pitts (eds.), *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament* (TENTS; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

[24] S.E. Porter, "Thucydides 1.22.1 and Speeches in Acts: Is There a Thucydidean View?" *NovT* 32 (1990): 121–42; reprinted in *Studies in the Greek New Testament: Theory and Practice* (SBG 6; New York: Peter Lang, 1996), 173–93, here 179–91.

evaluating how speeches were recorded in Acts. Furthermore, Thucydides has been shown to be somewhat atypical among the historians, at least in particular aspects of form and style.[25]

Porter's cautions concerning Thucydides are duly noted, but the picture of speeches in Greco-Roman historiography still needs to be filled out by other theorists. Isocrates, although not a historian himself, sets the agenda for many of the Greco-Roman historians. He suggests that when producing an account of a person's achievements it is best to add artistic style and then distribute the stylized results:

> For these reasons especially I have undertaken to write this discourse because I believed that for you, for your children, and for all the other descendants of Evagoras, it would be by far the best incentive, if someone should assemble his achievements, give them verbal adornment, and submit them to you for your contemplation and study. (Isocrates, *Evag.* 76 [Hook, LCL])

This methodology was carried over into historiography by several of Isocrates's students, including Theopomus, Ephorus, Diodorus and Xenophon.[26] Historians who followed in the tradition of Isocrates enhanced the original events and speeches with rhetorical style and aesthetic ornamentation. Similarly, Dionysius of Halicarnassus understood the historian's task as an extension of rhetoric (see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 18, 41). As Gempf notes, "For Dionysius, the fashioning of speeches is taken to be the test of a real historian's ability, that ability being reckoned in terms of rhetorical style and skill.... Artistry was most important, even at the expense of faithfulness.... There can be no doubt that Dionysius composes the speeches he presents in his own books in a stereotyped rhetorical fashion."[27] Cicero echoed the same perspective in his criticisms of past historians (e.g. Cicero, *De or.* 2.12.53–54 and 2.15.62). He states that "the privilege is conceded to rhetoricians to distort history in order to give more point to their narrative" (Cicero, *Brut.* 11.42–3 [Hendrickson and Hubbell, LCL]). Likewise, Lucian held that the historian must remain true to the facts that he records, even if their form is altered: "expression and arrangement" could be adjusted but not details such as geography (Lucian,

[25] See S.A. Adams, "Luke's Preface and its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander," *JGRChJ* 3 (2006): 177–91.

[26] C. Gempf, "Public Speaking and Published Accounts," in B.W. Winter and A.D. Clarke (eds.), *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (vol. 1 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*; ed. Bruce W. Winter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 259–303, here 270.

[27] Gempf, "Public Speaking," 275–276, 282.

"The Way to Write History," 24 [trans. Fowler and Fowler]).[28] With respect to speeches, Lucian suggests that the historian is completely justified in showing off his eloquence and "bringing the speech into a good rhetorical style" (ῥητορεῦσαι, rhetorizing) once the speaker and occasion have been accurately situated:

> When it comes in your way to introduce a speech, the first requirement is that it should suit the character both of the speaker and of the occasion; the second is (once more) lucidity; but in these cases you have the counsel's right of showing your eloquence (ῥητορεῦσαι καὶ ἐπιδεῖξαι τὴν τῶν λόγων διενότητα). (Lucian, "The Way to Write History," 58 [trans. Fowler and Fowler])

Although Lucian insisted on the value of recording historical truth, he saw no problem with reconstructing a speech so that it accorded with the canons of rhetoric. Herodotus is an interesting contrast to the historians insofar as he combines his historical investigations with the art of epic poetry, often creating imaginary speeches for his characters—but this is no doubt due to his unique place in the development of Greek historiography, developing as he did the practice of Greco-Roman history out of the traditions of Homeric poetry. Of the evidence available to us, Polybius seems to be the most concerned of the historians to report truthfully and accurately what was said, but even then, only when it is most effective:

> Still, as I do not think it becoming in statesmen to be ready with argument and exposition on every subject of debate without distinction, but rather to adapt their speeches to the nature of the particular occasion, so neither do I think it right for historians to practice their skill or show off their ability upon their readers: they ought on the contrary to devote their whole energies to discover and record what was really and truly said, and even of such words only those that are the most opportune and essential. (Polybius 36.1 [Paton, LCL])

Clearly, Polybius is on the more conservative side of the spectrum; nevertheless, he does seems to condone editing what was said in order to produce the greatest literary impact.

Gempf points to two important examples of speech writing where the originals can be compared with the accounts of the speeches recorded by the historian.[29] The first is an account of a series of speeches recorded by Livy (12.42; 28.27; 30.30; 37.53) that he found in Polybius (3.62; 11.28;

[28] Lucian, *The Works of Lucian of Samosata* (trans. H.W. Fowler and F.G. Fowler; Oxford: Clarendon, 1905), 2:134.

[29] Gempf, "Public Speaking," 281–82.

15.6.4; 21.1), a situation that may be comparable to the circumstances under which Acts was composed where Luke used sources of some kind to construct his account of the early church, including Paul's speeches—although the possibility must also be allowed that Luke was able to hear some of Paul's speeches and that he may have had to rely upon memory or personal notes to document certain speeches. The second is an example from Tacitus's *Annals* (11.24) that can be compared to a bronze tablet found in Lyons that records what appears to be an original version of a speech that was given by the Emperor Claudius. Gempf's comparative analysis illustrates that:

> Livy treats the speeches in his sources with some respect, reproducing the content while changing the form.... Tacitus' version [of Emperor Claudius's speech as compared with the bronze tablet] is much shorter, the order in which the topics are addressed is drastically altered and the style is much more polished.... Much in the original... has been condensed and even left out entirely in the published account.... Tacitus' text is a better organized and more cogent version of the same arguments....[30]

These examples, taken in tandem with the theoretical dimension of ancient historiography, highlight the nature of the alterations likely made by Luke to Pauline speech material. It is clear that historians would typically "play the orator" in their accounts of ancient speeches. Many would attempt to remain true to the original content of a speech, but most seem to have altered its form in order to enhance its aesthetic appeal. There is no reason to believe that Luke did not do the same. The Pauline speeches in Acts, therefore, probably tell us more about Luke's rhetorical abilities than those of Paul. At the same time, their content probably does reflect a genuine Pauline theology. This applies to the Pauline speeches in Acts and, if our theory is on the mark, we should have a similar expectation for Hebrews as well: Pauline content with Lukan style.

Speech Circulation in Early Christianity

If Hebrews emerged out of Luke's efforts to publish Pauline speech material (whether using his own eyewitness records or available sources [perhaps obtained from Paul, 2 Tim 4:11]), it would not be an isolated instance for such activity within the transmission of early Christian literature. The

[30] Gempf, "Public Speaking," 281–82.

entire literary enterprise represented by early Christian Gospels employed this practice in recording the sayings and speeches of Jesus. Perhaps the rabbinic traditions, with their emphasis upon recording speech material as represented among the Tanniatic (and later) rabbinic traditions (e.g. the Mishna), provided the literary context for such activity. The publication of various Acts of the apostles also required the transmission of speeches. Within the canonical material, Mark's Gospel and Luke-Acts are particularly interesting in this connection.

Early Christian Gospels take a number of forms. Many have noticed that there is a tendency for some Gospels to adopt a narrative framework while others (but far fewer) are collections of independently circulated sayings with very little narrative framing. The canonical Gospels and later apocryphal Gospels are examples of the former, whereas texts like the *Gospel of Thomas*, P.Egerton and Q (if such a document existed) provide examples of the latter. The sheer volume of recorded sayings and discourses of Jesus produced by these Gospel writers reveals the importance that early Christians attached to the circulation of the speech traditions of Jesus. Such practices are clearly intelligible within the publication industry of the first century. The possibility of stenographers and/or scribes recording and then transmitting notes or even entire speeches cannot be ruled out, but the role of memory and eyewitness testimony in transmitting oral speech traditions appears to be the dominant method employed in passing down the sayings, at least in the early phases of the process. Despite the nature of the procedure, the practice of transmitting Jesus' speeches was clearly pervasive in early Christianity. In some circles, this material apparently took precedence over story-based tradition, as indicated by the *Gospel of Thomas*, P.Egerton and Q. Although these traditions are usually more accurately described as "sayings," we do find some instances of extended discourse that we might classify as small speeches (e.g. P.Egerton frag. 2, recto—the remainder of the speech has not been preserved; *Gos. Thom.* 21, 28, 47; Q 3:7–9; 7:24–28). If one accepts form-critical assumptions, the primitive nature of such speech material indicates that a great importance was placed upon its circulation at a very early stage of Christianity's textual history. We say all this only to highlight the pervasiveness of the practice.

We find more substantial evidence for a type of speech circulation parallel to what we are proposing in Luke's case with respect to Paul and Hebrews within early Christian testimony regarding the literary origins of the third Gospel. The following comments are made regarding Papias, as transmitted through Eusebius:

> This also the presbyter said: Mark having become the interpreter [ἑρμηνεύτες] of Peter, wrote down accurately, though not in order [οὐ μέντοι τάξει], whatsoever he remembered of the things said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but afterward, as I said, he followed Peter, who adapted his teaching to the needs of his hearers, but with no intention of giving a connected account of the Lord's discourses [κυριακὸν λόγιον], so that Mark committed no error while he thus wrote some things as he remembered them. For he was careful of one thing, not to omit any of the things which he had heard, and not to state any of them falsely (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15 [*NPNF*²]).

While most interpreters grant that Papias has Mark in mind here, some have argued for identifying this deposit of Peter's tradition with Q[31] (such proposals have not caught on, however). The tradition Papias communicates likely goes back as early as 130 C.E.[32] and enjoys external corroboration with other ancient sources (e.g. *Anti-Marcionite Prologue* to the Gospel of Mark;[33] Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.5.3; Jerome, *Comm. Matt.* 6:495; *Vir. ill.* 8.1–2). Further sources locate Peter's preaching in Rome as the social context for Mark's acquisition of the Petrine Jesus tradition. According to Clement of Alexandria as transmitted by Eusebius, when Peter preached in Rome, "many who were present requested that Mark, who had followed him for a long time and remembered his sayings, should write them out. And having composed the Gospel he gave it to those who had requested it" (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.14.5–7 [*NPNF*²]; see also Origen in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25.5; Hippolytus, *Haer.* 7.30.1).

Mark's Gospel, then, according to a quite impressive accumulation of external evidence, consists of a collection of Peter's discourses delivered in Rome, organized and contextualized by Mark to suit the needs of his audience. And even if we dismiss the Papias tradition, for example, as flavoured by apologetic rather than historical interests, our point would still stand that such activity—recording and publishing apostolic speeches—was an accepted part of early Christian literary culture. Whether or not the tradition accurately relays the literary history of the second Gospel, its deep proliferation within primitive Christian literature demonstrates the intelligibility and acceptance of the practice. The method Mark employed to remember these discourses of Peter remains unclear. When Papias says "For he was careful of one thing, not to omit any of the things which he had

[31] E.g. J.N. Sanders, *The Foundation of the Christian Faith* (London: A&C Black, 1950), 53.

[32] For substantiation of this date and on the validity of the Papias tradition, see M. Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 47.

[33] R.E. Heard, "The Old Gospel Prologues," *JTS* 6 (1955): 4.

heard, and not to state any of them falsely" (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15), he may be affirming the use of shorthand by Mark. More than likely, in Rome, Mark would have been exposed to stenographers as they recorded speeches and could have employed similar techniques. If Irenaeus transmits a reliable tradition, and Mark compiled Peter's speech material after his death (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.1.1), the process Mark deployed to ensure that he remembered Peter's sermons correctly must have involved some way of making permanent the material, likely through writing. Some form of stenography would have been conducive to these purposes. Perhaps Papias refers to precisely this when he describes Mark as Peter's "interpreter" (ἑρμηνεύτης)—in any case, it appears to imply something regarding the writing process that Mark employed as he worked through the material he received from Peter. It should come as no surprise then that several interpreters insist upon understanding Mark's relationship to Peter as that of an amanuensis or scribe due to Papias's use of ἑρμηνεύτης in this context.[34] Technically, however, the appropriate categories for Mark's work should be developed out of ancient stenography, since Papias informs us that Mark's primary content was speech material. Nevertheless, stenography was one role an amanuensis or scribe could occupy if they had the appropriate training in Greek shorthand.

We have now come to a place where we can begin to bring together a few of the strands of evidence considered so far. The social relationship between Peter-Mark and Paul-Luke are similar enough to warrant our attention—a major implication of this essay, especially pertinent to the orientation of the present volume. The basic structure for both relationships seems to be that between an apostle and his disciple (although this is less clear with Paul-Luke)—both definitely seem to be traveling companions and ministry partners. Both sets of relationships evidence literary collaboration. Mark apparently compiled a collection of Peter's discourses into a running narrative that we now possess in its final form as the second Gospel, and we know that Luke recorded Paul's speeches within his own narrative framework. But what if, perhaps having unused speech material from Paul after composing Acts, Luke—inspired by Mark (who is listed with Luke in Col 4:14) while in Rome (assuming a Roman

[34] E.g. T.W. Manson (*The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of Its Form and Content* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963], 23) and B.D. Schildgen (*Power and Prejudice: The Reception of the Gospel of Mark* [Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999], 35) cast the relationship in terms of an ancient secretary. On the scribal view, see J.C. Anderson and S.D. Moore, "Introduction: The Lives of Mark," in J.C. Anderson and S.D. Moore (eds.), *Mark & Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 2–3.

imprisonment for the Prison letters)—compiled Paul's speech material in a way that loosely parallels how Mark treated Peter's speech material, resulting in Hebrews. Or what if Luke functioned as a stenographer, taking shorthand notes during one of Paul's Diaspora speeches, and then compiled and expanded his notes into what we now know as Hebrews, and then published it to be circulated in the Diaspora home churches as a full-length message to serve purposes that his compressed Pauline speeches in Acts could not serve. If Luke-Acts functioned politically as some kind of apologetic treatise to acquit Paul, then perhaps Hebrews was circulated as a Jewish missional document, published in Paul's absence due to his imprisonment. The historical and social settings for the Paul/Luke relationship not only allow but—we would argue—are suggestive of these possibilities. We can further substantiate this claim by comparing the social settings for Hebrews with the speeches of Paul that Luke documents in Acts.

The Social Settings for Hebrews and Paul's Speeches in Acts

In comparing the historical contexts in which Hebrews and Luke's Pauline speeches originated, we begin our investigation by highlighting two observations that set the agenda for this discussion: (1) Luke is the only person in first-century Christianity (assuming a somewhat early date for Acts) that we know to have published Paul's speeches, and Luke is alone with Mark in first-century Christianity in publishing apostolic speeches; (2) Hebrews is the only document in the New Testament thought by many to be a single independently published speech (i.e. sermon, synagogue homily, etc.). Many of the authorship views of the past—and surprisingly into the present—remain outdated in this sense, proposing authorship views based upon an assessment of Hebrews as a letter (e.g. the Luke-as-amanuensis theory). If we begin with the contemporary assumption that Hebrews is a speech or sermon of some kind, this opens up new avenues of exploration for the authorship question. We shall unpack these in the reverse order.

In contemporary study of Hebrews, it has become commonplace to refer to Hebrews as a sermon.[35] Two lines of reasoning lead to this conclusion. First, a number of references in the document refer either to speaking or hearing its content. This seems to indicate that the original audience would have heard the content of the document aloud (e.g. Heb 2:5; 5:11; 6:9; 8:1; 9:5; 11:32; 13:22). Many have also proposed the absence of contextual features that typically appear in literature written in epistolary settings—the absence of epistolary formulas, non-explicit letter structure, including a formal letter opening, body-opening, -middle, and -closing, etc.—as a second motivation for understanding Hebrews as a speech/homily. It seems unlikely, as some have supposed, that the original greeting to Hebrews was lost, due to the strong rhetorical nature of Heb 1:1. As far as we are concerned, the absolute disparity of evidence for this conjecture in the textual tradition puts the final nail in the coffin for this view. Based on the salutation at the end of Hebrews, some have insisted upon viewing Hebrews as a "personal letter"[36] or as a "hybrid" document, featuring elements of both a sermon and a letter.[37] Such a proposal appears odd, however, in the literary environment of the first century, where speeches published as letters were at the very best a rarity and at the worst non-existent (Plato's *Seventh Letter* and other such far-fetched examples not withstanding).

We hesitate, however, to accept the "synagogue homily" or "sermon" as a legitimate first-century genre on the basis of Mosser's analysis.[38] Mosser demonstrates quite convincingly that the evidence from Hellenistic Judaism does not allow us to posit the currency of a "synagogue sermon" form during the time of Luke or Paul. Instead, activities in the first-century synagogue appear to be restricted to prayer, scripture reading, discussion, and, especially in early Christian settings, prophecy. He contends that Acts 13 functions as perhaps the closest thing one will find to a sermon in the synagogues, but still what we have in this case seems far closer to New Testament prophecy than a sermon format. He grounds his argument in the identification of Paul's speech in Acts 13 as a "word of encouragement" (λόγος παρακλήσεως) (Acts 13:15) in tandem with Paul's description of the gift of prophecy in terms of encouragement (παράκλησιν) (1 Cor 14:3). But

[35] Since this is a common understanding of Hebrews, minimal argumentation will be given here. For example, F. Thielman, *Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 585, can refer to Hebrews as a "homily" as a passing reference, supporting his statement only with a brief footnote. See also W.L. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8* (WBC 47A; Dallas: Word, 1991), lxx–lxxx.

[36] S.J. Kistemaker, "The Authorship of Hebrews," *Faith & Mission* 18 (2001): 57–70, here 62.

[37] Thielman, *Theology of the New Testament*, 585 n. 1.

[38] K. Mosser, "Torah Instruction, Discussion, and Prophecy in First-Century Synagogues," in S.E. Porter and A.W. Pitts (eds.), *Christian Origins and Hellenistic Judaism: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament* (TENTS 10; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 523–51.

also interesting in this connection is the author of Hebrews's description of his composition as "a word of encouragement" (τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως) (Heb 13:22). Hebrews and Paul's speech in Acts 13, are in fact, the only New Testament documents identified by the phrase λόγος παρακλήσεως. We agree with Mosser's appraisal that Acts 13 likely represents a (condensed) prophetic Pauline speech documented by Luke, but we want to go further in suggesting that Hebrews probably has a parallel literary origin due to their similar historical settings and the social context provided by the Luke-Paul relationship. Due to its rhetorical features, lack of formal evidence for an epistolary settings, strategic and frequent use of scripture, focus upon Judaism, and anonymity (which was rare for an early Christian letter), recent scholars almost universally locate the document as a representation of the sermons preached by Christians in first-century (esp. Diaspora) synagogues. While we agree with this social setting for the origination of Hebrews, we are inclined to agree with Mosser in terms of the literary status of the so-called first-century "sermon." This type of oratory delivery had not emerged yet, being a product of later Christianity. Instead, both Hebrews and Acts 13 represent instances of early Christian prophetic discourse delivered within the ancient synagogue by part of the Pauline Jewish mission—to the synagogue first and then to the urban assemblies, schools and points of gathering where Gentiles congregated.

The postscript at the end of Hebrews (13:22–25) poses itself as the most substantial objection to a speech format, but we find in this further evidence for a Luke-Paul collaboration. Such postscripts or even prescripts were often added by a stenographer to indicate a context for the composition or the publisher's relationship to it, as we noted in Arrian's case. The use of ἐπιστέλλω in Heb 13:22 is a distinctly Lukan publication formula. The term only occurs in two other places in the New Testament (Acts 15:20; 21:25), both in Luke's description of an early publication from the apostolic circle. Granted, these both refer to the publication of a letter, but the term itself merely signifies sending or circulating a document (e.g. P.Oxy. II 276; P.Amh. II 33)[39] so that it could easily have this more general function in Heb 13:22 as well. The information in the postscript also identifies the social context one would expect on a Luke-Paul speech collaboration theory. The sending location is Italy, where Paul may be imprisoned and likely accompanied by Luke and Mark, and Timothy's status is mentioned, a person known in connection within the Pauline circle. If we translate

[39] BDAG, 381; MM, 245–46; LSJ, 660.

ἐπιστέλλω in the more general sense as "I send to you" then we can take the postscript to be a distinctively Lukan addition contextualized for the recipient body of believers. Perhaps an objection to this rendering would be its modification by βραχέων. But this could refer to the shortness of the publication he sent, especially compared with the two volume work in Luke-Acts, or it could refer to short spatial proximity as in Acts 27:28—he sent them the publication from a short distance away.[40] The information included seems, furthermore, quite general, indicating that the speech was likely sent to a region to function as an encyclical document rather than to a specific house church, since no specific individuals are named. Such a view would further support Luke's intentions to see the speech circulated in the Diaspora synagogues in Paul's absence as a result of imprisonment. And if the postscript is the result of a Lukan redaction, then a further parallel with the social context of Acts 13 can be established in that both speeches are described as a "word of encouragement" from outside of the speech margins.

Rhetorically, then, the composition of this document would have afforded Luke with the opportunity to publish a Pauline speech that is closer to its original length than the narrative purposes of Acts would allow. Paul's prophetic discourse in Acts 13 and Hebrews are the only two pieces of New Testament literature self-designated as λόγος παρακλήσεως and both address Jews: Acts 13 evidently takes places in a synagogue context and many have situated Hebrews within a synagogue setting as well.[41] In other words, the parallel social settings between Hebrews and Acts 13 are strongly suggestive of parallel points of origin. It is easy to imagine Luke publishing a fuller version of a prophetic speech given in a Diaspora synagogue (as in Acts 13) because we already have evidence of him compiling the same type of material within his narrative contexts. Again, Luke remains the only person in earliest Christianity known for documenting Pauline speeches and he is alone with Mark in recording apostolic speeches. If we take Hebrews to be a speech and combine this with examples from the Greco-Roman world of stenographers who published speeches in narrative, compilation and independent literary forms, we seem to have a significantly rich historical context for putting forward

[40] BDAG, 183.

[41] See most recently, for example, G. Gelardini, *"Verhärtet eure Herzen nicht: Der Hebräer, Eine Synagoghomilie zu Tischa be-Av* (BibInt 83; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007); P. Walker, "A Place for Hebrews? Contexts for a First-Century Sermon," in P.J. Williams et al. (eds.), *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 231–49.

the suggestion that Luke recorded and then compiled either a group of Pauline speeches (as Mark did with Peter) or published a single speech of Paul—altering the form, but not the content, as was the pattern in Greco-Roman historiography and (based on Mark's activities) early Christianity. The historical situation was ripe for the emergence of Hebrews in this fashion, so we now turn to examine the documents themselves to see whether the external and internal evidence can sustain this claim.

Evidence for a Pauline Origin for Hebrews

Both external and internal evidence substantiates the case for Paul's involvement in the production of Hebrews. However, a Luke-Paul collaboration would yield, it seems, a fairly unique scenario in terms of both of these categories. With regard to the external evidence, we should probably expect a fairly high level of the reception history to document a Pauline origin since the scribes, stenographers and historians that circulated such speeches were rarely credited with authorship or if they were, it was merely as a co-author, as we see in many of Paul's letters. Under the assumption of a Paul-Luke collaboration, neither should we expect a one-to-one-correspondence with the broader Pauline register represented in his letters. Speeches, especially those later developed from stenographic practices, recorded and circulated by ancient historians, rarely preserved the form or language of the original. They mainly focused upon rendering the content to the best of their ability in their artistic expression. The purpose of this and the following section on Luke is not, however, to provide a comprehensive catalogue of external and internal evidence in favour of their respective involvement. Such projects have been attempted elsewhere at great length (see notes 1 and 2 above). We merely provide a survey of what we feel to embody the strongest case for their involvement collaboratively while at the same time attempting to introduce new evidence along the way.

External Evidence

The Chester Beatty Papyrus 𝔓[46] ranks among the most significant pieces of external evidence for the Pauline authorship of Hebrews, indicating a quite early Pauline reception of the document within the earliest extant canon of Paul's letters.[42] And we find Hebrews not tacked onto the end

[42] For further analysis of the external evidence for Pauline authorship, see Black, "On the Pauline Authorship of Hebrews (Part 2)," 32–51.

of the collection as an afterthought, but located between Romans and 1 Corinthians.[43] This prominent location of Hebrews within the Pauline canon strongly suggests that the Christian community, or at least those involved in the production of 𝔓[46], understood Hebrews to be Pauline in some sense. We may further substantiate this proposal by noticing the parallel pattern in the titles of the letters. For example, Romans takes the title ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ and, correspondingly, Hebrews receives the label ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΥΣ. This titular uniformity appears to associate Hebrews closely with the rest of this collection of literature believed by early Christians to be written by Paul. But 𝔓[46] is only one part of a much wider body of external evidence that favours situating Hebrews immediately after the Pauline letters to the Churches and before those written by Paul to individuals, as we find in ℵ B C H I P 0150 0151, a Syrian canon from c. 400 (Mt. Sinain Cod. Syr. 10) and six minuscules from the eleventh century (103).[44] Perhaps such an organization represents a shift in register: from (1) letters to churches, to (2) a speech to a church (or churches), to (3) letters to individuals.

The early Eastern fathers also consistently identify Hebrews with Paul. Eusebius records the views of both Clement of Alexandria (*Hist. eccl.* 6.14.2–3) and Origen (*Hist. eccl.* 6.25.13) to this effect. When we turn to primary sources, this same view persists. Origen constantly attributes Hebrews to Paul when he cites the document (*Princ.* 1; 2.3.5; 2.7.7; 3.1.10; 3.2.4; 4.1.13; 4.1.24; *Cels.* 3.52; 7.29; *Ep. Afr.* 9). Clement states that "the blessed presbyter," Pantaenus (d. c. 200 C.E.), held that Paul wrote Hebrews but left his name off the letter out of respect for Christ, whom Pantaenus considered the Apostle to the Hebrews:

> But now, as the blessed elder said, since the Lord being the apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul, as sent to the Gentiles, on account of his modesty did not subscribe himself an apostle of the Hebrews, through respect for the Lord, and because being a herald and apostle of the Gentiles he wrote to the Hebrews out of his superabundance. (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.14.34 [*NPNF*[2]])

Eusebius himself believed that Hebrews was Pauline. He refers to "Paul's fourteen epistles" that "are well known and undisputed" while at the same time acknowledging that "it is not indeed right to overlook the fact that

[43] 𝔓[46] contains the last eight chapters of Romans; all of Hebrews; nearly all of 1 and 2 Corinthians; all of Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians; and sections of 1 Thessalonians.

[44] On the canonical location of Hebrews in the various MS traditions, see W.H.P. Hatch, "The Position of Hebrews in the Canon of the New Testament," *HTR* 29 (1936): 133–51.

some have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, saying that it is disputed by the Church of Rome, on the ground that it was not written by Paul. But what has been said concerning this epistle by those who lived before our time I shall quote in the proper place" (*Hist. eccl.* 3.3.5 [*NPNF*²]). But although Eusebius acknowledges scepticism regarding Pauline authorship of the letter in the Roman Church, Jerome (*Epist.* 129.3) and Augustine (*Pecc. merit.* 1.50) would later accept Pauline authorship of Hebrews with some reservations.

The support for Pauline authorship within the textual tradition is, in other words, substantial. At the very least, the Pauline view enjoys a wider range of external support than any of the competing views for authorship—even if the earliest evidence remains restricted mostly to the Eastern Church.

Internal Evidence

Turning from the external evidence to the internal evidence for authorship, several correlations indicate a connection between Paul and Hebrews.[45] Assessing the internal evidence in this discussion is tricky. It is difficult to make a theological argument for Pauline origination by comparing Paul and Hebrews since the apostolic circle shared in a somewhat unified theological perspective in drawing from a common deposit of primitive Christian tradition. At best we can show similar emphases or tendencies adopted by Paul and Hebrews, illustrating at the most that the authors accessed and utilized tradition in a strikingly similar way, making the case for Paul's involvement more likely.[46]

To start things off, we find it difficult to imagine another person in early Christianity with the background necessary to produce such a composition. We do not have enough information to make solid judgments regarding the abilities of many proposed authors (Barnabas, Pricilla, Apollos, etc.). Of the people for whom we have a fair bit of information regarding their theological and rhetorical abilities, Paul appears to us to be the best candidate for the person behind the major content of the letter. Lane suggests

[45] For further parallels, see Black, "On the Pauline Authorship of Hebrews (Part 1)," 32–51. Some of his observations have been freely incorporated below within the content of our own analysis, but often expanded or developed within our own framework. Where extensive material is taken over, we make note of this.

[46] See C.H. Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987) and D. Wenham, "Appendix: Unity and Diversity in the New Testament," in G.E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 684–719.

that the author was "well educated by Hellenistic standards,"[47] which Paul clearly was. That the author had first-hand contact with Diaspora Judaism, as is documented by his or her extensive use of the LXX, cannot be denied. Again this fits Paul, who both grew up (Acts 22:3) and ministered in the Diaspora synagogues. The detailed assessment of the atonement and the theological elaboration of the relationship between first-century Judaism and its fulfillment in Christianity also appears to us to reinforce the Pauline origin of the letter.

The most significant argument from our perspective, however, is that the major theological content of the letter seems decidedly Pauline—its non-Pauline linguistic and literary style, notwithstanding. First, Hebrews and Paul's letters appear to reflect a similar christological emphasis, even to the point of employing parallel citation strategies in support of christological assertions. Hebrews 1:1–14 positions Christ above the angelic beings.[48] Both Phil 2:9–10 and Col 1:14–19 emphasize exalted christology. The latter of these passage bears special interest in this connection. In both Hebrews and Colossians, Jesus' dominance over the cosmos is asserted on the basis of his creative power. The theological progressions even resemble one another. Both begin with Jesus as creator and ultimately terminate with his sovereignty—in Colossians over all things and in Hebrews over the angels. But whereas Hebrews focuses on one entity of creation (angels), Colossians uses more all-encompassing language, terminating with Christ's exaltation "far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and above every name that is named" (Col 1:21). Presumably Paul intends by "all rule and authority and power and dominion" to incorporate Christ's pre-eminence over the angelic world. One cannot help but wonder then whether the passages were mapped on the same or a similar strand of primitive traditional material.

The christological use of scripture in Hebrews and in Paul appears to be backed by a similar rhetorical strategy. In Heb 1:1–14, the writer cites five passages from the Psalter to make his point. The author links these scripture citations with the adverb "again" (πάλιν), a strategy only known elsewhere in Paul's use of the term to join scripture citations (Rom 15:10–12; 1 Cor 3:20). The author begins by citing Ps 2:7, to which Paul alludes in Rom 1:4 to make a strikingly similar christological point. Paul also cites this text in his speech in Acts 13:33. We find it significant that both Hebrews and this prophetic discourse in Acts are referred to with the parallel

[47] Lane, *Hebrews*, l.

[48] Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 67–68.

literary designation (a word of encouragement) and use related kerygmatic citation strategies. Hebrews (1:5; 5:5) and Paul (Rom 1:4; Acts 13:33) are alone in the New Testament literature in using this passage in support of claims about the risen and exalted Christ. The psalm finds some currency in the Gospels, but these instances occur in narratives about John's baptism of Jesus, not as supporting evidence for Jesus' post-mortem existence. That the passage is put to quite differing uses in the Gospels but serves parallel functions in Paul and Hebrews suggests an important literary-rhetorical connection between the two. The use and function of Ps 8:6 not only finds a distinct parallel in Paul and Hebrews, both also interpret the psalm the same way with quite similar language. In both places, the text is interpreted messianically within an already-not-yet framework. After citing the Ps 8:6, the author of Hebrews says, "Now in putting everything in subjection to him, he left nothing outside his control. At present, we do not yet see everything in subjection to him" (Heb 2:8). When Paul explains the passage, he says that "When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to him who put all things in subjection under him, that God may be all in all" (1 Cor 15:28).

Another parallel development of early Christian tradition involves the prominence of the discussion of σωτηρία (including its various eschatological dimensions) in both Paul and Hebrews, compared to relatively sparse coverage of the topic elsewhere in the New Testament. Of its 45 occurrences spread across the New Testament, Paul employs the term 18 times in his letters[49] and we find it in Hebrews an additional 7 times,[50] with Hebrews having the highest number of occurrences of the term in a single document within the New Testament. When we add to this the fact that two of Luke's usages of σωτηρία in Acts are from Pauline speeches, the use of σωτηρία in Paul and Hebrews comprises 27 or 60% of its total usage within the New Testament.[51] In addition to the frequency of the term σωτηρία, the soteriological system portrayed in Hebrews has numerous points of contact with Paul's. First, Heb 2:3 sets forth that salvation is something that is "already present and available through the Christian message first announced by Jesus."[52] The same point is made by Paul in Eph 1:13 when he declares that the gospel of salvation was proclaimed

[49] Rom 1:16; 10:1, 10; 11:11; 13:11; 2 Cor 1:6; 6:2 (x2); 7:10; Eph 1:13; Phil 1:19, 28; 2:12; 1 Thess 5:8, 9; 2 Thess 2:13; 2 Tim 2:10; 3:15.

[50] Heb 1:14; 2:3, 10; 5:9; 6:9; 9:28; 11:7.

[51] Acts 13:27, 47.

[52] Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 73.

by Paul. Second, Hebrews frames salvation within Christ by affirming that Jesus is the cause or source (αἰτία) of salvation (2:10 and 5:9). Paul's language of "in Christ" makes the same point with great emphasis upon mystical union. For both Paul and Hebrews, salvation is found in Christ, for he is the source and context of salvation. Third, the idea that righteousness comes by faith is a notion expressed by both Hebrews and Paul. Hebrews 11:17 states that righteousness comes by faith (τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης). This idea of righteousness coming by faith remains a central focus for Paul, perhaps most notably in Rom 4:1–12. In this stretch of text in Romans, Paul associates righteousness and faith on at least four occasions (4:5, 9, 11, 13). The lines of continuity drawn between the ministry of Christ and Abraham are also apparent in both soteriologies (cf. Heb 2:16). Fourth, both Paul and Hebrews stress the importance of perseverance in the faith. Hebrews has, of course, gained quite a reputation for its five so-called "warning passages" (2:1–4; 3:7–4:13; 5:11–6:12; 10:26–39; 12:14–29). These passages, in one form or another, exhort the reader (or listener) to hold firm to their calling and not to stray from the faith. Such a theology was not foreign to Paul, however. He exhorts his readers, for example, to "continue in the faith" (ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει; Col 1:22–23). Similarly, Paul warns that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God if they persist in ungodliness (1 Cor 6:9). Fifth, Paul (Rom 11:7, 2×) and Hebrews (6:15; 11:33) are unique in using ἐπιτυγχάνω to refer to the acquisition of salvation. Although Jas 4:2 uses the term, its distinct soteriological application is unique to Paul and Hebrews. Finally, we may highlight the soteriological function of ἐπουράνιος in both Hebrews and Paul. Besides a single occurrence in John 3:12—which may explain its origination within the Jesus tradition—the soteriological function of ἐπουράνιος remains an exclusive theological feature of Paul and Hebrews. The term occurs a total of 19 times. It occurs more in Hebrews than in any other New Testament book (6×). The Pauline letters account for its remaining occurrences (12×). The way ἐπουράνιος functions theologically, however, occupies a point of interest. In Hebrews, it refers to the heavenly calling (3:1), the heavenly gift (6:4), the gifts of the priests as a shadow of heavenly realities (8:5), the heavenly things purified by better sacrifices (9:23), the heavenly country (11:16) and the heavenly Jerusalem (12:22). In the earlier occurrences the term denotes soteriological realities and as the text progresses they become more and more eschatological. Or, better, they move from a realized soteriological-eschatological framework to a more futurist soteriological-eschatological emphasis. In Paul, we detect a similar pattern of usage. Ἐπουράνιος populates 1 Corinthians (5×) and

Ephesians (5×) most frequently—the remaining two instances are in 2 Tim 4:8 and Phil 2:10. The emphasis in Hebrews certainly fits with 1 Corinthians. In the latter text, the cluster results from Paul's discussion of the resurrected or heavenly body in 1 Cor 15:40–49. As with Hebrews, in Ephesians ἐπουράνιος has highly realized connotations, two of which Paul says birth directly out of salvation (1:3; 2:6)—the other three instances refer to the realm of spiritual activity (1:20; 3:10; 6:12), also embodying a realized notion.

Even if we do not have enough evidence in certain places to infer a parallel systemization of early Christian traditional/scriptural materials, we do find corresponding theological catch-phrases unique to Paul and Hebrews.[53] We confront, for example, a unique anthropological description in that Paul (1 Cor 15:50; Gal 1:16; Eph 6:12) and Hebrews (2:14) remain alone within the New Testament literature in framing the human nature in terms of σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα ("flesh and blood")—something that likely developed out of the Jesus tradition (Matt 16:17). They are also alone in describing God as πιστὸς (1 Thess 5:24; 2 Thess 3:3; 1 Cor 1:9; 10:13; 2 Cor 1:18; Heb 10:23; 12:5, 7, 11). The moral use of παιδεία (6× in the NT) in the context of training/discipline represents another distinctive feature of both Paul (3×: Eph 6:4; 2 Tim 3:16) and Hebrews (3×: Heb 12:5, 7, 11). The perfect of πείθω is also only found in Paul (Rom 8:38, 15:14; 2 Tim 1:5, 12) and Hebrews (6:9). The description of the people of God as ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι is a distinctively Pauline phrase (Col 1:2) that also finds representation in Hebrews (3:1).

Although we argue that the style of the letter is essentially Lukan, distinctive elements of Pauline style have nevertheless found their way into the composition. These include the use of διὰ τοῦτο (74× in the NT; 34× in Paul; 1× in Heb [2:1]), περισσοτέρως (12× in the NT; 10× in Paul; 2× in Heb [2:1; 13:9]) and καθάπερ (13× in the NT; 12× in Paul and 1× in Heb [4:2]). We do not want to convolute the argument that the use of Christian tradition and Scripture and the overall theological emphasis of Hebrews remains essentially Pauline by highlighting the penetration of these stylistic features into the document, but if Hebrews was compiled by Luke on the basis of a set of stenographic notes, we might expect traces of Pauline style to slip through and this is exactly what we find. The case we are making will not, of course, stand or fall on these points, but they do provide a small amount of confirmatory evidence for the point we are making.

[53] This paragraph and the next draw significantly from Black, "On the Pauline Authorship of Hebrews (Part 1)," 32–51.

So what we find is, we think, what we would expect if Hebrews originated as a Pauline speech. The content seems to have numerous points of contact with Paul's use of Christian tradition to articulate his theology with traces of Pauline stylistic features slipping into the literary composition. One argument that could be marshalled against this interpretation would be the theological elements unique to Hebrews that do not find representation in Paul. However, Pitts has shown that we should expect theological elements to arise in Pauline literature based upon the rhetorical exigency of the situation rather than the theological expectations of the systematician.[54] In other words, the expression of Pauline theology is highly constrained by the demands of individual situations. If Hebrews is a Diaspora speech, preached by Paul in a Jewish synagogue as part of his mission to go to the Jew first, then Hebrews would indeed represent a substantial shift in register (social situation, genre, audience-addressee relations, etc.) when compared to Paul's letters. This would explain the unusually thorough development of Jewish theology at a level that we do not find represented in his other literature. Perhaps this framework also renders statements like Heb 6:1–2 intelligible: "not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith toward God, and of instruction about washings, the laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment." In any case, a certain amount of distinct theological emphasis should be expected on our model due to the unique registers out of which Paul and Hebrews were produced. This unique material cannot count as evidence for our position, but the fact that it meets our expectations regarding how things would be in light of our historical abduction, it constitutes weak evidence against our position. It seems to us that broad patterns of a parallel framework can be shown from Hebrews, but that Paul spends more time in this composition developing his theology in relation to contemporary Judaism.

Evidence for Luke's Collaboration with Paul in Hebrews

In Acts, Luke has already shown a great appreciation for recording Pauline speeches, documenting a total of twelve speeches: (1) 13:16–41, 46–47; (2) 14:15–17; (3) 17:22–31; (4) 18:6; (5) 20:18–35; (6) 21:13; (7) 22:1–21; (8) 23:1–6; (9) 24:10–21; (10) 25:8–11; (11) 26:2–29; (12) 28:17–20, 25–28.

[54] A.W. Pitts, "Unity and Diversity in Pauline Eschatology," in S.E. Porter (ed.), *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman* (PAST 5; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 65–91.

In addition, Luke records a collection of scattered speech material during Paul's sea voyage (27:10, 21–26, 31, 33–34), which we may count as a single speech, bringing the total to thirteen Pauline speeches recorded by Luke. These thirteen speeches constitute one third of Luke's 33 total recorded speeches, including speeches by Peter, the twelve, Stephen, the Jews, the Pharisees, Gamaliel, James, Demetrius, the Ephesian town clerk, Agabus, Tertullus and Festus. Of these, only Peter's speeches begin to approach the level of coverage that Paul receives in Acts, totalling seven speeches, about half as many as Luke records for Paul. Next to Peter, we have James with two speeches. Since Luke records two times more speeches for Paul than anyone else in Acts, we have a solid precedent for asserting Luke's unique interest in recording and publishing Pauline speech material. This established context certainly warrants an exploration of the external and internal evidence to see whether Hebrews represents a further literary-social development between Luke and Paul. We will argue that it does.

External Evidence

Although as far as we can tell, no modern scholar has suggested the thesis for which we are arguing, there does seem to be some support for our view among the earliest Church fathers in two important Alexandrian scholars: Clement and Origen. We mentioned both of these individuals in our discussion of the external evidence for Pauline authorship, but here we want to expand upon their words as early fathers who supported Luke's participation in the production of Hebrews (Clement) or believed that Hebrews is the result of one of Paul's students, who compiled it on the basis of Paul's teaching (Origen).

At the end of the second century—in some of the earliest evidence we have regarding the authorship of Hebrews—Clement theorizes that Hebrews was originally written by Paul in Hebrew and later translated into Greek by Luke. He may have come to this conclusion for reasons not too dissimilar to the ones that have led us to our conclusion: the content of Hebrews is distinctly Pauline whereas its linguistic style is remarkably similar to Luke-Acts. In other words, his proposal enabled him to account for the Lukan style of the document while at the same time acknowledging its Pauline origin. Eusebius tells us of Clement's view:

> He says that 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. Farther on he says: "But now, as the blessed presbyter said, since the Lord being the apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul, as sent to the Gentiles, on account of his modesty did not subscribe himself an apostle of the Hebrews, through respect for the Lord, and because being a herald and apostle of the Gentiles he wrote to the Hebrews out of his superabundance" (*Hist. eccl.* 6.14.2–4 [*NPNF*^{2}]).

So in Clement we find a collaborative theory based upon Pauline theology with Lukan style. We can even locate in Clement the idea that in Hebrews Luke converted and published Pauline material to be circulated among the Gentiles. The explanation of how and why the authorial prescript was lost and thus why the authorship question became uncertain in some circles is at the very least an intelligible historical explanation from a very early period in church history. It seems unlikely, however, that the document was originally a Hebrew composition. If Hebrews was a letter—as Clement assumes—this might be a helpful component in an explanation, but if we adopt the view that Hebrews is a speech or even a sermon, we can maintain that Paul preached the sermon in Greek and elements of Lukan style were introduced not as the result of a translation but because he reconstructed the original speech in his own language, as was the custom of historians and stenographers when dealing with speech material. This speech hypothesis also accounts for the lack of authorship attribution—as with the Gospels, such prescripts were not part of the genre. Hebrews was published without a prescript, with Luke providing only a few contextual notes in a historical postscript.

Origen, likewise, argued for a collaborative hypothesis in the mid-third century:

> [T]he 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. If I gave my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are those of the apostle, but the diction and phraseology are those of some one who remembered the apostolic teachings, and wrote 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. For not without reason have the ancients handed it down as Paul's. 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. (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25.11–14 [*NPNF*^{2}])

Several things are worth noting here. First, it is widely acknowledged that Origen's comments identify the use of an amanuensis of some type.[55] As we argued above, stenography was a secretarial function that could easily fit within the framework Origen describes here. What better candidate than Luke to be a person with good diction and style who documented Paul's teaching and later compiled and published it in what we now know as Hebrews? Second, unlike Clement's view, Origen appears to adopt the view that Hebrews is based upon the spoken material of a teacher. Again, the historical context for such a relationship already exists for a Paul-Luke collaboration. Third, Origen indicates that the content or "thoughts" found in Hebrews are those of Paul. Thus, for Origen, Hebrews was originally spoken by Paul and then written down by a student of the apostle at a later time, although he still holds that Hebrews is "by Paul." Origen also consistently cites Hebrews as originating with Paul (*Princ.* 1; 2.3.5; 2.7.7; 3.1.10; 3.2.4; 4.1.13; 4.1.24; *Cels.* 3.52; 7.29; *Ep. Afr.* 9). And Origen closes by acknowledging that some before him had proposed Luke as a likely candidate for authoring Hebrews. While Origen is not as explicit as Clement, his remarks are highly suggestive of a collaborative hypothesis. The best candidates for the framework he proposes are clearly Paul and Luke.

Our view, then, essentially combines that of Clement and Origen. With Origen, we agree that Hebrews was based upon the spoken teaching of Paul. And with Clement, we affirm Luke's documentation and publication of the document—in this publication process, we acknowledge him as the student that Origen has in mind.

Internal Evidence

On the thesis that, during his travels with Paul, Luke documented and later published Paul's speech material (one or more speeches) in Hebrews, we would expect—given what we know about speech recording in Greco-Roman historiography—that Luke's literary and linguistic style will have significantly dominated the document, even if the major content behind the composition remains Pauline. The striking stylistic similarity of Hebrews and Luke-Acts has not gone unnoticed. The linguistic affinities between the two have led a number of interpreters to posit Luke as the author of Hebrews. Of course, this argument derives its case almost

[55] See Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing*, 60–64.

entirely from the internal evidence, which is in fact quite strong.[56] As Westcott observes, the Greek "likeness" between Luke-Acts and Hebrews "is unquestionably remarkable" so that "no one can work independently at the Epistle without observing it."[57] Allen goes as far as to suggest that no volume in the New Testament is more similar in its language to Luke-Acts than Hebrews.[58]

We at first notice that, in terms of linguistic formality on the scale of Hellenistic Greek represented in the New Testament corpus (vulgar, non-literary, literary), Hebrews and Luke-Acts together fall closest to the literary spectrum. Although Turner remains agnostic with respect to the question of authorship in relation to linguistic style, he does acknowledge that the author of Hebrews "often inserts material between adjective and noun (e.g. 1^{4} 4^{8} $10^{12.27}$), and between article and noun (e.g. 10^{11} 12^{3}); and his periods are often long and contrived (1^{1-4} $2^{2-4.14-15}$ 3^{12-15} $4^{12.13}$ $5^{1-3.7-10}$ etc.), approaching the style of classical Greek, as with Luke-Acts."[59] Turner here highlights a number of significant elements—though they are "literary" not "classical" features—that help group Hebrews and Luke-Acts within the same domain of language formality. He mentions discontinuous syntactic structures in which intervening elements are nested within the modification structure of a discontinuous group. He also mentions periodic structure. Most of the New Testament is constructed using paratactic relations. In more literary expressions, the discourse is mapped onto hypotactic relations—this latter phenomenon being most pervasive within the New Testament in Hebrews and Luke-Acts.

Allen notes a sustained similarity in the lexical stock employed by Luke-Acts and Hebrews.[60] Luke-Acts and Hebrews have the highest ratio of *hapax legomena* in the New Testament. Only 337 (168 of which are *hapax legomena*) of its 1,038 words do not occur in Luke-Acts, meaning that Hebrews shares 67.3% of its total vocabulary with the Lukan writings. There are 53 words unique to Luke-Acts and Hebrews, 56 words unique to Paul and Hebrews and 33 words unique to Luke, Paul and Hebrews. Such a comparison becomes especially powerful when the relatively shorter

[56] See Allen, "Authorship of Hebrews," 27–40, for a survey of the secondary literature and various internal evidence for Lukan authorship. For a more detailed analysis, see Allen, *Lukan Authorship*.

[57] B.F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews the Greek Text With Notes and Essays* (3d ed.; London: Macmillan, 1920), lxxvi.

[58] Allen, "Authorship of Hebrews," 32–33.

[59] N. Turner, *Style* (vol. 4 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*; ed. J.H. Moulton; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976), 106.

[60] This paragraph builds on Allen, "Authorship of Hebrews," 28–33.

length of Hebrews is taken into consideration, showing a high level of lexical affinity between these two authors and Hebrews. The following chart gathers information from Allen's extensive study into a concise format in which lexical and syntactic similarities can be readily observed between Luke-Acts and Hebrews in comparison with Paul and the rest of the New Testament. We found that Allen's statistics did not always line up with what we came up with in our independent searches on the same data, and so we have adjusted his numbers in many cases to more accurately reflect the data.

Linguistic Element	Occurrences in Luke-Acts	Occurrences in Hebrews	Other Occurrences in NT and in Paul	Comments
ἄφεσις (forgiveness)	10× in Luke-Acts	2× in Hebrews	3× in the NT 2× in Paul	
καθαρίζω (cleansing)	10× in Luke-Acts	4× in Hebrews	14× in the NT 3× in Paul	
ἡγέομαι (leader or chief leader)	5× in Luke-Acts	6× in Hebrews	6× in the NT 11× in Paul	Only in Luke-Acts and Hebrews does it refer to leaders or chief men in the church.
Similar phrase: γράφω + ἐν and a dative of οὐρανός	1× in Luke	1× in Hebrews		Nowhere else in the NT.
ἔτι			77× in the NT 16× in Paul	
ἔτι + the infinitive	2× in Luke	1× Hebrews		
ἔτι followed by δέ	4× in Luke-Acts	2× Hebrews		
δάκρυον (tear)	4× in Luke-Acts	2× in Hebrews	2× in the NT 2× in Paul	
genitive (δακρύων) preceded by καὶ and μετά	2× in Acts	2× in Hebrews	0× in the NT 8× in Paul	

Table (*cont.*)

Linguistic Element	Occurrences in Luke-Acts	Occurrences in Hebrews	Other Occurrences in NT and in Paul	Comments
ῥῆμα	160× in Luke-Acts	4× in Hebrews	23× in the NT 8× in Paul	It is used 7 times with θεοῦ, and θεοῦ is only fronted in relation to ῥῆμα in two of these instances (Luke 1:37; Heb 6:5).
τε	159× in Luke-Acts	20× in Hebrews	10× in the NT 25× in Paul	The distribution here is remarkable, highlighting strong affinities between Paul, Luke and Hebrews.
Aorist active indicative 3rd plural of λαλέω	1× in Acts	1× in Hebrews		This form in these passages is followed by the articular accusative (τὸν λόγον) and a genitive (θεοῦ in Hebrews; κυρίου in Acts).
οὗτοι πάντες	2× in Acts	2× in Hebrews		Nowhere else in the NT.
αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου	1× in Acts	2× in Hebrews		Nowhere else in the NT.
εἰς τὸν καιρὸν	1× in Luke	1× in Hebrews		Nowhere else in the NT.
ὡς with the infinitive	2× in Luke-Acts	1× in Hebrews		Nowhere else in the NT.
διὰ with πνεύματος	3× in Acts	1× in Hebrews		Nowhere else in the NT.
καὶ and αὐτός with a proper name	3× in Luke-Acts	1× in Hebrews		Nowhere else in the NT.
διὰ followed by τὸ μηδεμίαν	1× in Acts	1× in Hebrews		Nowhere else in the NT.

Table (*cont.*)

Linguistic Element	Occurrences in Luke-Acts	Occurrences in Hebrews	Other Occurrences in NT and in Paul	Comments
The article ὁ followed by τέ and a noun or substantival participle	8× in Luke-Acts	1× in Hebrews	3× in the NT 1× in Paul	The Pauline usage dominates a third of NT material.
τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα	1× in Luke	1× in Hebrews	2× in the NT 1× in Paul	In these passages Luke and Hebrews are the only that elide the equative verb while all the others employ it.
διαμαρτύρομαι	10× in Luke-Acts	1× in Hebrews	0× in the NT 4× in Paul	All occurrences of this term are accounted for within Paul, Luke-Acts and Hebrews.

A few of the more compelling distinctive linguistic features Allen mentions are worth expanding upon, apart from the chart. For example, ἀρχηγός and σωτηρία collocate together in the New Testament only in Acts 5:31 and Heb 2:10. Acts 5:31 is part of a speech that Peter gives to the high priests in defence of his preaching. Similarly, ἀρχηγός occurs only four times in the New Testament: Acts 3:15; 5:31, Heb 2:10 and 12:2. As is the case with Acts 5:31, so too Acts 3:15 appears in a speech of Peter's recorded by Luke. The Greek word for "star" appears in the New Testament with two different forms, ἀστήρ and ἄστρον. This word, in its two forms, appears twenty-eight times in the New Testament. Four of these are found in Luke-Acts and Hebrews. However, these four uses all take the same form, ἄστρον, while the other twenty-four occurrences in the New Testament use ἀστήρ. In other words, Luke-Acts and Hebrews use one form that remains distinct to them while the rest of the New Testament uses another form.

In addition to the evidence Allen provides, we note further that while the Greek term μονογενής is employed nine times in the New Testament (Luke 7:12; 8:42; 9:38; John 1:18; 3:16, 18; Heb 11:17 and 1 John 4:9), only Luke and Hebrews use the term to refer to a physical descendant. The other uses refer to Christ and his relation to the Father.

That Luke's distinct vocabulary and syntax appears in Hebrews points again to his involvement in its composition, but still further evidence can be marshalled for Luke's collaborative efforts with Paul in the production of Hebrews by means of a comparative analysis between Paul's speeches in Acts and Hebrews. If our interpretation of the data is correct, these speeches of Paul collected by Luke form the closest literary parallel we have to Hebrews in the New Testament. The main difference between the two would be that Luke's record of Paul's speeches in Acts represent intentionally condensed (or sometimes interrupted!) versions of the speeches that were suited for his narrative purposes in Acts. If Hebrews is a Pauline speech or compilation of speeches (but we think the former is much more likely) independently published by Luke, then its written length likely approximates its original spoken length. We might expect then to find significant parallels between the Pauline speech material recorded in Acts and Hebrews.

The first Pauline speech that Luke records is found in Acts 13:16–47. Paul is speaking to the "Men of Israel" (Acts 13:16), a Jewish audience, perhaps parallel to the one Hebrews addresses. Both this speech and Hebrews are referred to as a word of encouragement (Acts 13:15; Heb 13:22). The speech opens in the same way Hebrews opens in emphasizing God's revelation to the fathers and then moving on to the revelation of Jesus. Paul's speech here in Acts 13 covers this terrain with much greater detail than the Hebrews prologue—nevertheless, both open with God's revelation in terms of a statement of Israel's history. In Acts 13:26 Paul employs the rare genitive phrase τῆς σωτηρίας. This exact phrase is used only two other times in the New Testament, once by Paul in Eph 1:13 and once in Heb 2:10. The genitive for Abraham (19× in the NT) in Acts 13:26 is represented extensively in Paul's letters (6×) and Luke-Acts (7×), and occurs in Hebrews (1×) as well—only occurring 4 times outside of this collection. As we have already noted, the fact that Ps 2:7 appears only in a speech by Paul in Acts and in Hebrews is highly suggestive of our proposal. After arguing for the resurrection, Paul moves on in v. 34 to state that since Christ is raised from the dead he will no longer return to corruption (διαφθορά). Hebrews 9:25–28 echoes this idea by stating that Christ will return again "not to deal with sin but to save those who are eagerly waiting for him." Thus, in this passage from Hebrews, Christ will not be under sin when he returns. Similarly, in Acts 13:39, Paul makes the point that the "law of Moses" could not free anyone from sin. This same point is made in Heb 7:19 when the author states that "the law made nothing perfect."

A number of parallels can also be located in the Pauline speech Luke records in Acts 17:22–31. In 17:28, Paul emphasizes God's all pervasive providence when he states that "in him we live and move and have our being." A similar point is made in Heb 1:3 where Jesus upholds the entire universe by the word of his power and in Heb 2:11 where God is the source of all who are being sanctified. In all three passages the stress rests upon God being the one behind what transpires on earth. Further, Acts 17:29, Heb 1:2 and 12:9 all acknowledge God/Jesus' universal creative power. Acts 17:31, Heb 9:27 and 10:30 make the case that Christ, who is the man God has appointed (Acts 17:31) and the Lord (Heb 10:30), will judge the world, including his people (Heb 9:27).

In his address to the Ephesian elders, Paul insists upon the importance of repentance and faith (Acts 20:21). The writer to the Hebrews makes the same point in 6:1. Acts 20:28, Heb 9:12 and Heb 13:12 all speak of the blood used by God in redemption. Although Hebrews is replete with references to the blood atonement, what makes these two passages particularly interesting is, with Acts 20:28, they represent the only usages of ἴδιος to modify αἷμα. Towards the end of Paul's speech to the elders he exhorts them to "be alert" as they watch over the flock of God (Acts 20:31). Hebrews 13:17 reminds the flock of God that the elders are "keeping watch" over their souls. In other words, there is evidence of a parallel paraenetic strategy presented from two different angles. In Acts 20 Paul encourages the elders to rule in a certain way while the writer of Hebrews tells the people how to respond to the elders. The terminology employed to describe the leadership in the speech is also distinctive of the lexical usage in Hebrews. Paul's speech here and Hebrews are alone in using ἡγέομαι to refer to church leaders.

In addition to these patterns, it is worth highlighting that a good bit of the material to which Allen points in his analysis is derived from Paul's speech material in Acts. We represent the evidence derived from Paul's speech material, including the additional insights highlighted in the preceding paragraphs, in the following chart. What this shows is that a good number of Allen's supposed Lukan features for Hebrews are actually Lukan-Pauline features (i.e. features of Luke's recorded Pauline speeches), precisely the authorial and literary designation we are proposing for Hebrews.

Paul's speeches in Acts could easily be mined for further parallels—and this may be a worthwhile ambition for future research—but these patterns are, we think, sufficient to highlight the significant linguistic and theological overlap between Luke's documentation of Paul's speeches in

Linguistic Element	Occurrences in Pauline Speeches and in Hebrews
ἄφεσις (forgivness)	Acts 13:38; 26:18 // Heb 9:22; 10:18
ἡγέομαι (leader or chief)	Acts 26:2 // Heb 10:29; 11:11, 26; 13:7, 17, 24
genitive (δακρύων) preceded by καὶ and μετὰ	Acts 20:19; 20:31 // Heb 5:7; 12:17
ῥῆμα	Acts 26:25; 28:25 // Heb 1:3; 6:5; 11:3; 12:19
Aorist active indicative 3rd plural of λαλέω	Acts 28:25 // Heb 1:2; 7:14
αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου	Acts 20:28 // Heb 9:12
διὰ followed by τὸ μηδεμίαν	Acts 28:18 // Heb 10:2
The article ὁ immediately followed by τέ	Acts 26:23 // Heb 2:11; 9:1–2
διαμαρτύρομαι	Acts 20:21, 23 // Heb 2:6
Genitive phrase τῆς σωτηρίας	Acts 13:26 // Heb 2:10
ἴδιος to modify αἷμα	Acts 20:28 // Heb 9:12; 13:12

Acts and the speech preserved for us in Hebrews. The internal evidence appears to us to most strongly favour a Lukan collaboration with Paul in the context of a specific literary-historical relationship. Luke, in his historical endeavours, seems to have documented Paul's speech material and later published it in what we now know as Hebrews.

A Few Possible Objections

The current view in New Testament scholarship denies a strict Pauline authorship of Hebrews, probably making our thesis difficult to sustain in the minds of some. The most enduring of these criticisms has been the argument from style. As DeSilva argues, "None of Paul's other writings come close to the rhetorical finesse and stylistic polish of Hebrews."[61] This objection is closely linked with the objection that the vocabulary of Hebrews is not Pauline.[62] We are willing to grant the legitimacy of these

[61] D.A. DeSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods and Ministry Formation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 787.

[62] E.g. Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 11–12.

claims at some level, but on our theory we would not expect the linguistic style and vocabulary to be precisely Pauline since the practice among stenographers in Greco-Roman historiography and rhetoric was to preserve the major content of the speech while adapting the language and style to the highest level attainable by the stenographer, making for a nicely polished composition. So, far from constituting an objection to our theory, in a backhanded way it actually provides support for it—that is, on our explanation, the data that presents itself to us is exactly what we would expect to find: Lukan style/language with Pauline theological content.

Others object that Paul could never have written (or spoken) Heb 2:3, where the author of Hebrews states that the message of salvation was "confirmed" (βεβαιόω) "to us" by those who heard from Christ. Paul, who wrote Gal 1:12, which states that Paul did not "receive" (παραλαμβάνω) the gospel from men, could not have also written Heb 2:3—or so the argument goes.[63] However, this objection is hardly definitive. Notice first that Paul says that he did not "receive" his message from men. This means that the source of Paul's message is not human. On the other hand, the author of Hebrews says that men "confirmed" his message. The use of βεβαιόω here indicates not a new revelation, but a firming up of an existing one, which is exactly what happened when Paul eventually did meet up with the apostles. So, on the assumption of a Pauline origin for the speech to the Hebrews, Paul seems to be communicating that after having received his message from Jesus, it was confirmed by the apostles and also through signs and wonders.

What about the objections to Lukan authorship? Kistemaker's comments represent a fairly standard protest: "Luke, as a Gentile Christian, would not be able to write, 'In the past God spoke to our forefathers through the prophets' (1:1 NIV)."[64] He goes on to argue that "[Luke] only reports Old Testament passages spoken by others but he does not expound a single quotation for doctrinal purposes as is the case in Hebrews."[65] But this is not a stylistic feature; rather it references the main content of the speech. Our view remains immune to such objections since it argues that the content of Hebrews originates with Paul, a Jew. Again, the phenomenon that Kistemaker recognizes is exactly what we would expect on the interpretation of the data that we are suggesting. If Hebrews is a Pauline

[63] E.g. Kistemaker, "The Authorship of Hebrews," 62.

[64] Kistemaker, "The Authorship of Hebrews," 59.

[65] Kistemaker, "The Authorship of Hebrews," 59. On the same page Kistemaker admits that there are "linguistic similarities in the vocabulary of Luke's writings and that of Hebrews."

speech recorded by Luke, then we would anticipate a good number of Old Testament citations within the speech, as we find in Luke's recorded speeches of Paul in Acts. Neither would Paul, a Jew, be uncomfortable expressing the words contained in the prologue of Hebrews.

The traditional arguments against Pauline and Lukan authorship of Hebrews can be weighty when either Paul or Luke are thought to have authored the document alone. However, on a collaborative proposal in the social context of historical-rhetorical speech recording, many of the arguments against either or the other of the authors fail to convince. Now, it might be objected that the very structure of our argument is fallacious because it is non-falsifiable: whatever features are not Pauline are Lukan and vice versa. But notice that this has not been the structure of our argument. We have argued for Lukan style and Pauline content and have been careful to show where each departure is a feature of the other. In other words, we have sought to positively establish each feature in the respective corpus instead of making universal appeals where the evidence remains silent. But this leaves a third body of evidence. If we have stylistic features distinctive of Luke-Acts and Hebrews and content features distinctive of Paul and Hebrews, what about material that cannot be accounted for within Luke-Acts or Paul? What about material distinctive just to Hebrews? Well, as we noted at the end of the section on the Pauline evidence, a certain amount of unique material should be expected due to the rhetorical exigency of the situation, especially given the very unique literary status of Hebrews. In fact, assuming that our theory is correct, the amount of theological and linguistic parallel material that we do find is staggering given the vast difference in register from other Pauline and Lukan writings. In terms of Pauline material, this is his only independently published speech in extended form. From Luke's perspective too, Hebrews would be his only Pauline speech published independent of a narrative framework. So we cannot hope to correlate every feature of Hebrews to some previous rhetorical-literary situation and so the amount of material we can corroborate in this way does seem highly suggestive of our Paul-Luke speech collaboration theory.

Conclusions

Although Hebrews has been handed down to us without an author, we have argued that both external and internal considerations suggest that Hebrews constitutes Pauline speech material, recorded and later

published by Luke, Paul's traveling companion. The speech (or possibly, speeches) was likely a prophetic discourse delivered in a Diaspora synagogue, very much parallel to the speech by Paul that Luke records in Acts 13. Luke very probably took stenographic notes on the essential content of Paul's discourse that he later converted and expanded using his own diction and style, as was the practice for speech publication among Greco-Roman historians and, apparently, among early Christians as well—e.g., Mark's Gospel. We believe that a possible point of origin for the document could have been Rome where Luke may have been inspired to do with Paul's speech material what Mark had done with Peter's. This also makes sense in light of Paul being locked up and perhaps executed (if it was published after Paul's death). In such an event, Hebrews might serve to continue Paul's Jewish mission in a way that his other letters were serving his Gentile mission. If this scenario is correct, then it certainly furthers our understanding of the social relationship between Paul and Luke from a distinctively literary standpoint, but at the end of the day, we must acknowledge with Origen regarding the authorship of Hebrews that "in truth, God [only] knows."

Pauline Studies

Series editor

Stanley E. Porter
Professor of New Testament at
McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario

VOLUME 7

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/past

Paul and His Social Relations

Edited by

Stanley E. Porter
Christopher D. Land

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013