

Luke: a Gentile or a Jew?

By Max Debono-De-Laurentis MTh

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
The Gentile Luke Viewpoint	3
Colossians 4:11-14	6
Bible Version Disclaimers	8
Was Luke a Preacher?	9
The Jewish Luke Viewpoint	10
Scribes	10
Was Luke a Proselyte?	12
Oracles	12
Luke's Temple Knowledge.....	13
To the Jew First.....	13
In Conclusion	13
Bibliography	14

Introduction

On a number of occasions I have come across believers who have been taught that Luke was a Gentile. In fact just recently I have had this discussion with some fellow brothers at my local fellowship. They contend that on the evidence of Colossians 4:11-14 Luke must be a Gentile as he is not named among the circumcised. I on the other hand consider that he was a Jew and fully versed in Judaism.

As I started investigating this subject in more depth I discovered that there are arguments for both sides of the debate but not a lot of biblical evidence to declare on a personal basis his ethnicity. With this in mind I will endeavour to be honest and act with integrity when dealing with all the claims regarding the views of the various parties.

As we examine this topic in more detail it is only appropriate that it be approached with an honest view to examine truth and not to maintain a preferred belief. This I will endeavour to achieve in offering the facts on all sides of this discussion and I hope that the reader will also be honest in approach to reading and studying this material.

The Gentile Luke Viewpoint

As soon as one says Luke was not a Gentile, then one is usually directed to Colossians 4:11-14:

11 And Jesus, which is called Justus, who are of the circumcision. These only are my fellow workers unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort unto me. 12 Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God. 13 For I bear him record, that he hath a great zeal for you, and them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis. 14 Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas, greet you.

These scriptures have been taken as proof that Luke was a Gentile because he wasn't named with the believers called circumcised in verse 11. This fact and this alone is the basis of proof and main declaration of Luke's heritage. A look on the internet and the proponents of Luke's Gentile heritage can be rapidly found, but one must take care of the statements made as if proof is certain.

Here are two such articles from biblical answers websites:

“Luke was a Gentile. He was Paul the Apostle's, missionary companion to the Gentiles. It is obviously wise for a Jew, as Paul was, to have a Gentile companion when preaching and teaching the Gospel to non-Jewish people. It is obvious also that Luke's Gospel was written and directed at the Gentile which is again wisdom at work. Through a vision Peter received from the Lord, Luke knew that the gospel was for all

people, both Jew and Gentile, male and female, rich and poor, etc. This would apply to Gospel missionaries as well whether they be Jew or Gentile.

The question is would the oracles of God be taught to an uncircumcised Gentile? The answer is of course! Who is worthy before the Lord Jesus, a Jewish convert to Christianity only? But they who have faith in Jesus Christ; who live righteously and walk humbly before Him in willing service. Who preaches the Gospel in these last days, the Jews? Man is not justified by the Law of Moses. They who supposed they were justified, crucified their God.

Also Luke practiced medicine so we can assume he was intelligent - not that one's standing before God is influenced by ones profession or nationality - and we can assume also that the law of Moses; Temple ordinances; Jewish history, etc., would have been discussed by Paul in their travels, after all, Paul was a zealot when it came to the letter of the law of Moses, that's why he was chosen; Place him on the right track and let him go; I say that within great respect for Paul. Besides everything that is written about whether Luke was a Gentile or not - and in the scheme of things whereby a person is working out his own personal salvation before God the Father, it matters zero what nationality Luke was, but after all that is said about the matter, the truth is, Luke was born of Gentile parents". (Sheon, 2011)

And another:

"Luke was a Gentile, the only Gentile writer in the New Testament. There's nothing in his gospel that a Gentile can't grasp. He habitually gives Hebrew words in their Greek equivalent so that a Gentile can understand. "Simon the Cananaean" becomes "Simon the Zealot." Calvary isn't called by its Hebrew name, "Golgotha", but by its Greek name, "Kranion." ("Golgotha" and "Kranion" both mean "the place of a skull.") Luke never uses the Jewish term "Rabbi" of Jesus, but always a Greek term meaning "Master." In tracing the descent of Jesus he follows it back not to Abraham, the fore parent of Jews (as Matthew does), but to Adam, the fore parent of all humans." (Shepherd, 2005)

The first extract makes an interesting claim at the end – *“but after all that is said about the matter, the truth is, Luke was born of Gentile parents”*. The evidence for this is nowhere in scripture or extra biblical writings so it would nice to have a record of this proof text produced as it would clear in one stroke the issue of Luke's lineage. However, sadly too many people make this kind of claim because of what they prefer to believe rather than what is actual fact.

However, to be fair in this study we must look properly and earnestly at the various arguments for and against the debate to build a balanced picture. There are many bible commentaries by various authors that are well respected and followed for theological advice and it is to them we will turn now in the hope that they can produce biblical or extra biblical proof on the topic:

John Calvin

Calvin speaks of Luke in verse 14 as being a different Luke altogether:

14. *Luke saluteth you.* I do not agree with those who understand this to be Luke the Evangelist; for I am of the opinion that he was too well known to stand in need of such a designation, and he would have been signalized by a more magnificent eulogium. (Calvin, 2009)

As can be clearly defined, to avoid the controversy of Luke's ethnic background, Calvin chooses to be of the opinion that it was a different Luke spoken of.

Albert Barnes

Luke, the beloved physician - This was undoubtedly the author of the Gospel which bears his name, and of the Acts of the Apostles. He is mentioned as the traveling companion of Paul in Act 17:10, and appears to have accompanied him afterward until his imprisonment at Rome (see 2Ti 4:11). From Col 4:11, it is evident that he was not by birth a Jew, but was probably a proselyte. He is supposed to have been a native of Cyrene, and to have died in Achaia, soon after the martyrdom of Paul, at the advanced age of 84. (Barnes)

Matthew Henry

VII. Luke is another here mentioned, whom he calls the beloved physician. This is he who wrote the Gospel and Acts, and was Paul's companion. Observe, He was both a physician and an evangelist. Christ himself both taught and healed, and was the great physician as well as prophet of the church. He was the beloved physician; one who recommended himself more than ordinary to the affections of his friends. Skill in physic is a useful accomplishment in a minister and may be improved to more extensive usefulness and greater esteem among Christians. (Henry)

Adam Clarke

Luke, the beloved physician - This is generally supposed to be the same with Luke the evangelist. See the preface to the notes on this gospel. Some, however, suppose them to be different persons; because, where it is evident that Luke the evangelist is meant, he never has more than his simple name Luke; and because the apostle is supposed to intend a different person here, he adds, ὁ ἰατρος ὁ ἀγαπητος, the beloved physician. The word ἰατρος signifies a healer, and must not be restricted to physician, in the sense in which we use that word; he was surgeon, physician, and dispenser of medicines, etc., for all these were frequently combined in the same person. (Clarke)

Jamieson, Fausset and Brown

It is conjectured that Luke “the beloved physician” (the same as the Evangelist), may have first become connected with Paul in professionally attending on him in the sickness under which he labored in Phrygia and Galatia (in which latter place he was detained by sickness), in the early part of that journey wherein Luke first is found in his company (Act 16:10; compare Note, see on Gal_4:13). Thus the allusion to his

medical profession is appropriate in writing to men of Phrygia. Luke ministered to Paul in his last imprisonment (2Ti 4:11). (Jamieson)

New Bible Commentary

12-14: Next Paul mentions three others who, in the light of verse 11, must be Gentiles.... Only here do we learn that Luke was a doctor. (D Guthrie, JA Motyer, AM Stibbs, DJ Wiseman, 1970)

New Concise Bible Dictionary

Luke – a companion of Paul described as ‘the beloved physician’ (Col 4:14) and a ‘fellow worker’ (Philemon 24), who on one occasion provided Paul’s only company when others had left him (2 Tim 4:11). On the basis of the exclusion clause in Col 4:11 he is usually believed to have been a Gentile. (Briscoe, Green and John, 1989)

Reading these various accounts we come across the interesting observation that none provide proof of the allegation of Luke's ethnicity other than Col 4:11-14. It is also interesting how the claims are affirmed as factual without consideration of other factors which we will examine later on. It is easy to understand why so many people have taken this opinion as it has been proffered on a regular basis by the various commentaries and teachers of scripture. But we must examine thoroughly the evidence, not only in light of a western Hellenised biblical learning, but also from the perspective of the scripture themselves from a 1st Century interpretive perspective.

Colossians 4:11-14

Before continuing, let us examine Col 4:11-14 in several translations for a comparison, this will alleviate the issue that perhaps various versions declare different things, and if they do; what those differences are:

Col 4:11-14 KJV (King James Version)

And Jesus, which is called Justus, who are of the circumcision. **These only are my fellow workers** unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort unto me. 12 Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God. 13 For I bear him record, that he hath a great zeal for you, and them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis. 14 Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas, greet you.

Col 4:11-14 ISV (International Standard Version)

Jesus, who is called Justus, also greets you. **These are the only ones of the circumcision** who are fellow workers for the kingdom of God. They have been an encouragement to me. 12 Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of the Messiah Jesus, sends you his greetings. He is always wrestling in his prayers for you, so that you may stand mature, completely convinced of the entire will of God. 13 For I can testify on his behalf that he has a deep concern for you and for those in Laodicea and in Hierapolis. 14 Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas greet you.

Col 4:11-14 GNB (Good News Bible)

Joshua, also called Justus, sends greetings too. **These three are the only Jewish believers** who work with me for the Kingdom of God, and they have been a great help to me. 12 Greetings from Epaphras, another member of your group and a servant of Christ Jesus. He always prays fervently for you, asking God to make you stand firm, as mature and fully convinced Christians, in complete obedience to God's will. 13 I can personally testify to his hard work for you and for the people in Laodicea and Hierapolis. 14 Luke, our dear doctor, and Demas send you their greetings.

Col 4:11-14 NIV (New International Version)

11 Jesus, who is called Justus, also sends greetings. **These are the only Jews[a] among my co-workers** for the kingdom of God, and they have proved a comfort to me. 12 Epaphras, who is one of you and a servant of Christ Jesus, sends greetings. He is always wrestling in prayer for you, that you may stand firm in all the will of God, mature and fully assured. 13 I vouch for him that he is working hard for you and for those at Laodicea and Hierapolis. 14 Our dear friend Luke, the doctor, and Demas send greetings.

Col 4:11-14 YLT (Young's Literal Translation)

“and Jesus who is called Justus, who are of the circumcision: **these only are fellow-workers** for the reign of God who did become a comfort to me. 12 Salute you doth Epaphras, who is of you, a servant of Christ, always striving for you in the prayers, that ye may stand perfect and made full in all the will of God, 13 for I do testify to him, that he hath much zeal for you, and those in Laodicea, and those in Hierapolis. 14 Salute you doth Lukas, the beloved physician, and Demas;”

It is interesting when reading this scripture from the various translations where the emphasis is placed. In reading the KJV and YLT translations the emphasis is on the fellow workers whereas the others are emphatically stating that only the Jews were the fellow workers. Thus leaving the opening for a claim that as Luke was not mentioned he cannot be a Jew.

This observation must make one aware that perhaps the emphasis is placed because of scholarly preference rather than biblical accuracy. It must be remembered that as bible scholars translate the bible they will always infer in the text their preferred belief system. This can be clearly read in the disclaimer or intro to the particular version. The text can usually be summed up something like this – “we have endeavoured to accurately reproduce the intended meaning of the text” – this is of course is limited by the bias and learning of the particular translators. If a translator has pre-determined that Luke was a Gentile then that is what will be reflected in the translation.

Bible Version Disclaimers

As an example of the statement in the previous chapter I have drawn the first three bibles I came across on my bookshelf to substantiate the above statement.

The RSV (Revised Standard Version)

“In the end the decision was reached that there is a need for the thorough revision of the version of 1901, which will stay as close to the Tyndale-King James tradition in light of our present knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek **and their meaning on the one hand, and our present understanding** of English on the other” (Division of Christian Education and the National Council of the Churches of Canada and the USA, 1971)

The GNB (Good News Bible)

“The primary concern of the translators has been to provide a faithful translation **of the meaning** of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts”. (The American Bible Society, 1976)

The Living Bible (A Paraphrased Bible)

“There are dangers in paraphrases, as well as values. For whenever the author’s exact words are not translated for the original languages, there is the possibility that the translator, however honest, may be giving the English reader something that the original writer did not mean to say... **When the Greek and Hebrew are not clear then it is the theology of the translator.**” (Taylor, 1971)

I have highlighted the salient points above to indicate that they freely admit, The Living Bible most clearly, that the interpretations are dependent on the theology and biblical understanding of the translators. When studying scripture this should always be taken into consideration. Every bible translation is biased in one form or another depending on the prevailing views of the society or individual bringing that translation. There may not be malicious intent, however theological bias does not mean that all translations are correct or can on all points be accepted on face value. It is always advisable to use a variety of translations when studying and examine the original text where possible to alleviate the problem of consistent bias. This can obviously be seen clearly in the Luke issue. Are the translations wrong or is the bias of the authors dictating doctrine? If the latter action, then we must examine and repair the damage done by long term traditionalism.

Another issue to be considered with the various translations is that they are copyrighted, this of itself is not an issue but it does have a massive impact on translational ability. So as not to infringe copyright, each translation must be different from all others by a minimum of 30%. That means that words must differ and sometimes a translation is limited in the descriptive terms it can use because they are in use by others. That is nearly a third of the bible has to be

worded differently and in order to do this there has to be a certain amount of compromise. The more versions we have the greater the compromise becomes. I am not a KJV only advocate but do advise discernment in the bible issue one is using. We must also beware in ourselves that our preference for a version is not based on a preferred verse written in a way that we like for convenience to ourselves. Discernment must be observed and practiced at all times.

Was Luke a Preacher?

Luke was not ever described as being actively involved in the work of preaching, but was rather Paul's personal physician and historian. It would not be appropriate to put Luke in the list with those who were active in the preaching ministry.

Looking at the various translations we can see that Col 4:11-14 can equally be translated as the CJB does without loss of biblical or scriptural integrity and place the wording back into a 1ST Century theological viewpoint.

Col 4:11-14 CJB (Complete Jewish Bible)

Yeshua, the one called Justus, also sends greetings. **These three are among the Circumcised;** and among my fellow workers for the Kingdom of God, only they have turned out to be a comfort to me. 12 Epaphras sends greetings; he is one of you, a slave of the Messiah Yeshua who always agonizes in his prayer on your behalf, praying that you may stand firm, mature and fully confident, as you devote yourselves completely to God's will. 13 For I can testify to him that he works hard for you and for those in Laodicea and Hierapolis. 14 Our dear friend Luke, the doctor, and Demas send you greetings.

A look at the Literal translation of the wording can reveal much:

Col 4:11 LITV (Literal Translation of the Holy Bible)

And Jesus, the one being called Justus, those being of the circumcision, greet you, these only fellow workers for the kingdom of God, who became a comfort to me.

The Interlinear Bible words it thus:

“Those being of the circumcision, these only fellow workers for the kingdom.”

The declaration is that the fellow workers, those that taught and preached as Paul did were fellow Jews; this should not then be tied in with v14 mentioning Luke as a doctor. Luke was not a preacher but a historian, a scribe if you like, and a doctor, to claim he was not counted in with the circumcision on this account is flimsy evidence, especially as it can be translated equally without error as: “These three are among the Circumcised; and among my fellow workers”. This corrects for any disparity in the verse created from a Hellenistic and traditional standpoint.

The Jewish Luke Viewpoint

Some have claimed that Luke's profession as a physician would be evidence that he was a Gentile. This would assume that there were no Jewish doctors in the Roman world. Such an idea is preposterous. Yeshua referred to physicians in Israel on several occasions:

“Physician, heal thyself...” (Luke 4:23)

“They that are sick have need of a physician...” (Matt. 9:12)

There is as much reason to believe that Jews were in the medical profession in ancient times as they are today.” (McCall, 1996)

Jesus also sent the lepers who were healed to the Priests to be tested for 10 days. This involved cleansing rituals and observations by a trained Rabbi in the medical field. It was usual for the doctors to also be Rabbi's as they were the ones that had the most education. The education of the student in 1st century Jerusalem was through the synagogue and that included all ages from 5 upward. (See Alfred Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*). Not to mention Luke 2:46 –

And it came to pass, that after three days they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the *doctors*¹, both hearing them, and asking them questions.

Remember, non-Jews were not allowed in the Temple so the fallacy that the doctors were Roman is put to rest by scripture itself. As a writer of the New Testament with recording the events as they happened, Luke would have in all probability been a scribe.

Scribes

The root meaning of the name "scribe" is "one who writes". The original occupation of a scribe was to make copies of official documents in the age before printing. They would also write letters, decrees and other documents. Jeremiah 8:8 How do ye say, We are wise, and the law of the LORD is with us? Lo, certainly in vain made he it; the pen of the scribes is in vain.

In Esther 8:9 Then were the king's scribes called at that time in the third month, that is, the month Sivan, on the three and twentieth day thereof; and it was written according to all that Mordecai commanded unto the Jews, and to the lieutenants, and the deputies and rulers of the provinces which are from India unto Ethiopia, an hundred twenty and seven provinces, unto every province according to the writing thereof, and unto every people after their language, and to the Jews according to their writing, and according to their language.

..., the king's scribes were called and "it was written according to all that Mordecai commanded unto the Jews." Because the scribe could write, he could also keep financial records and he would sometimes be used in that area (2Kings 12:10 And it was so, when they saw that there was much money in the chest, that the king's scribe

¹ did-as'-kal-os – this word can be translated Doctor, teacher or Master: the latter two are terms used for Rabbi and with correct exegesis be translated as Rabbi's and/or Doctors. As some Rabbis were doctors this explains the verse and removes the conundrum. The various words are used depending on translation.

and the high priest came up, and they put up in bags, and told the money that was found in the house of the LORD.

...). Since the scribes often worked closely with the king, some scribes gained authority beyond that of simply copying documents. In 2Kings 25:19 And out of the city he took an officer that was set over the men of war, and five men of them that were in the king's presence, which were found in the city, and the principal scribe of the host, which mustered the people of the land, and threescore men of the people of the land that were found in the city:

..., "the principal scribe of the host" actually "mustered the people of the land" and prepared them for battle. The scribes were often considered to be wise by reason of their learning. An uncle of King David named Jonathan was "a counsellor, a wise man, and a scribe."

The New Testament scribes are a special group among the Jewish religious leaders. Their primary duties were to study the Torah of Moses and the Oral Torah² (See Isaiah 29:13, Mark 7:1-9) religiously added, teach it to the people, and even to help settle disputes involving the questions of the law (Torah interpretation). The New Testament scribes traced their origin back to Ezra who was called "a ready scribe in the law of Moses" (Ezra 7:6 This Ezra went up from Babylon; and he was a ready scribe in the Law of Moses, which the LORD God of Israel had given: and the king granted him all his request, according to the hand of the LORD his God upon him.)

..., "a scribe of the words of the commandments of the LORD, and of his statutes to Israel" (Ezra 7:11 Now this is the copy of the letter that the king Artaxerxes gave unto Ezra the priest, the scribe, even a scribe of the words of the commandments of the LORD, and of his statutes to Israel.

..., and "the scribe of the law of the God of heaven" (Ezra 7:21 And I, even I Artaxerxes the king, do make a decree to all the treasurers which are beyond the river, that whatsoever Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven, shall require of you, it be done speedily,

... Ezra received these titles because he "had prepared his heart to seek the law of the LORD, his heart to seek the law of the LORD, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments.

Ezra was therefore the ideal type for the New Testament scribe. In that vein, as a Rabbi with the power and authority Rabbi Sha'ul (Paul) had whilst working for the Pharisaic sect he was associated with would have been used to a scribe working with him. There is dissention by scholars over the time Luke wrote his papers and whether or not it was a different Luke all together, however, despite his excellent grasp of Greek his writing style and prose are distinctly Jewish. He explains clearly in Greek the Jewish concepts that a non-Jew could not grasp without intimate knowledge. The descriptions and thought patterns are not that of a gentile, no matter how long he spent within the nation.

Historically we know for certain that a man of Sha'uls) Pauls position would have had a scribe recording his works and judgements, writing up arrest documents etc... so it is possible though no proof can be put forward that Luke was Pauls scribe before he met Jesus

² Oral Torah – legalistic system instilled by the leaders over time to protect the Written Torah. However they began to see the oral Torah as equal to the written Torah and the following of the traditions of men became prevalent. They would see both Torah's as one Torah and therefore equal.

on the road to Damascus. Though this is conjecture on my part – sorry said I would avoid that.

Was Luke a Proselyte?

If we were to take the position that Luke was a proselyte, a convert to Judaism – we come across the same concerns. This is again an assumption made on little or no evidence; however this position cannot be dismissed out of hand, but then again it does not answer some important questions. If Luke was a proselyte he would have had access to the Temple but this does not explain him being left out of the list called the circumcised if that was the criterion to judge by. As a proselyte he would have been circumcised as part of the ritual to become a Hebrew and this is not mentioned in scripture, unlike Timothy. Had he not given himself fully over to Judaism he would not have been allowed in the Temple.

As a proselyte he would have had instruction on Temple service and rituals, and would be classed as a Jew. Therefore, as a proselyte was considered a Jew it would be possible for him to receive the Oracles of God. But again we are left with the issue that if he was not a Gentile why was he not mentioned with the others of the circumcision? He would have been accepted and become a Jew but to not mention him in this context again leaves questions unanswered.

The more one attempts to place Luke in a Gentile setting the more questions it raises about the possibility, however if Luke was a Jew from the start the issues are moot points. Linking Luke to Gentiles and being a Gentile author does not stand against scripture or historic Judaism and the working of both the Temple and judicial system of the first century.

Oracles

After showing the sinful condition of the Jewish people, explaining how the Jews are just as much subject to sin as are the Gentiles, Paul asks the question,

Rom. 3:1-2

“What advantage has the Jew?” His answer was “Much in every way, chiefly because that **unto them** were committed the oracles of God”.

The main advantage that Paul recognizes in the Jewish people was that when God gave revelation to the human race, He gave it to and through the Jews. He did not utilize the Gentile people for this purpose at any time in biblical history.

Rom. 3:1-2 is a rule that cannot be broken for biased favouritism or preference: that Jews were the vehicle for revelation is indisputable when compared to biblical integrity. If Luke was a Gentile then it is up to the scholars to prove that beyond doubt. Sadly, or gladly this is not the case and it is through traditionalism that this view is maintained and propagated.

If one cannot prove conclusively that Luke was a Gentile than the only course of action is to maintain biblical integrity and accept that he was Jewish and that he recorded the oracles of God as a Jew in the Jewish tradition of the Word revealed to the Jewish nation. As we have seen above, the evidence from the lists in Colossians and that the doctors were Roman are weak arguments that do not meet that criterion of proof. In every scriptural reference to do

with God speaking to man to record his revelation it has been to a Jew – His chosen people as a light to the nations (Gentiles):

Isa 62:1

For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. (The light of salvation comes forth from the Jews)

Luke's Temple Knowledge

Another example of the Jewishness of Luke is his intimate knowledge of the Temple and its workings. His descriptions are as a witness³ to the events taking place and not a Gentile refused admittance. When he describes the announcement to Zacharias concerning the birth of John the Baptist, Luke goes into extensive detail to describe the rotating selection of the Levitical priests for service according to their families. He further described the position of the priest before the altar of incense, where the angel appeared to Zacharias etc... (Luke 1:8-20).

The fact that Luke alone of the four Gospel writers gives this account, and he does so with such colourful detail, attests for his being a Jew, familiar with the Temple and Levitical procedures. It is possible that he was a Levite himself with the knowledge he possessed.

To the Jew First

The last points to consider are 1st) the scriptures were revealed to the Jew first (Rom 1:16; Rom 2:9; Rom 2:10) and 2nd) that the first Gentiles were not brought into the plan of salvation until 10 years after Pentecost; It was at Caesarea that they were first accepted as believers. So the short period of time from Luke becoming a believer after Caesarea and intimately knowing the details of the inner workings of the Temple making his being a Gentile hypothesis highly unlikely, especially as his detailed history starts before and includes this time in Acts 10:45 when Gentiles were integrated into the kingdom as *written by Luke*. Sadly another traditionalism that has been proliferated it that the church started at Pentecost therefor these must have been Gentiles. This argument is based on the same premise as the Gentile Luke view: Replacement Theology, where according to their doctrines the church at this point replaced the Jews. However, what is forgotten is that the first church consisted of only Jews, any gentiles would have been proselytes and therefor, again, Jews.

There are many other surrounding issues that can be raised to support the Jewish Luke from scripture that the Gentile Luke cannot adhere to and maintain scriptural integrity.

In Conclusion

The evidence far outweighs the Gentile Luke in favour of a Jewish Luke. Scripture must support scripture and scripture declares that the Oracles of God were only given to the Jews to disseminate to the nations. To use weak and unsupportable arguments to declare Luke was a Gentile is the worst kind of isogesis. It removes the integrity of scripture to promote a doctrinal stance that is neither biblical nor one that can be sustained by scripture. This

³ (Luke 1:3KJV) It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus. This is another scripture that s be re-worded to support the Gentile view of Luke.

teaching became prominent as the Replacement apologists try and prove that God has now replaced Israel with the Christian church and is finished with the Jews.

It is important to always try and understand within ourselves why we choose to believe something: is it because we were taught it or because it is scriptural truth? It is a sad fact that much of biblical integrity is questioned due to traditionalism without investigation. Do we support a doctrine because it's traditional like Easter and Christmas or because it is ordained by God!?

This author always purports that one should examine all church traditions and establish whether they hold up to biblical integrity or are they the desires of men.

2Ti 2:15 Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

Bibliography

Barnes, A. (n.d.). Barnes Commentary. *Esword*.

Briscoe, Green and John. (1989). Luke. In *The Concise Bible Dictionary* (p. 324). Oxford: Tyndale House Publishers.

Calvin, J. (2009). Commentary on Colossians. In J. Calvin, *Calvins Commentaries Volume XXI* (p. 230). Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

Clarke, A. (n.d.). Clarke's Commentary. *Esword*.

D Guthrie, JA Motyer, AM Stibbs, DJ Wiseman. (1970). Colossians. In *New Bible Commentary* (p. 1153). Grand Rapids: Wm B Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Division of Christian Education and the National Council of the Churches of Canada and the USA. (1971). *The Bible Revised Standard Version*. Sevenoaks: Stephen Austin and Sons Ltd.

Henry, M. (n.d.). Henry Commentary. *Esword*.

Jamieson, F. a. (n.d.). Commentary. *Esword*.

McCall, T. S. (1996, March). *Was Luke a Gentile?* Retrieved March 16th, 2011, from Zola Levitt Ministries: <http://www.levitt.com/essays/luke.html>

Sheon. (2011). *Was Luke a Jew or Gentile?* Retrieved March 16th, 2011, from [wiki.answers.com](http://wiki.answers.com/Q/Was_Luke_a_Jew_or_Gentile): http://wiki.answers.com/Q/Was_Luke_a_Jew_or_Gentile

Shepherd, V. (2005, June). *LUKE: PHYSICIAN AND APOSTLE*. Retrieved March 16th, 2011, from [victorshepherd.on.ca](http://www.victorshepherd.on.ca/Sermons/Luke.htm): <http://www.victorshepherd.on.ca/Sermons/Luke.htm>

Taylor, K. (1971). *The Living Bible Paraphrased*. Aylesbury: Tyndale House Publishers For Hodder and Stoughton Ltd.

The American Bible Society. (1976). *Good News Bible*. Swindon: The British and Foreign Bible Society (Publishing Division).

Copyright ©2011 MDDL Discernment and Study Ministry – Please feel free to copy and reproduce on websites or printed articles, but please give proper credit to the author and keep this copyright notice intact. Thank You.

If you found this article useful or have any questions please contact us through our website www.maxddl.org