

SAMSON UYTANLET

# Luke-Acts and Jewish Historiography

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

366

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)

James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)

366





Samson Uytanlet

# Luke-Acts and Jewish Historiography

A Study on the Theology, Literature,  
and Ideology of Luke-Acts

Mohr Siebeck

SAMSON UYTANLET, born 1970; 1995–2007 Bible teacher at Central Bible Seminary, Philippines; 1998–2007 Pastor at Christian Bible Church of the Philippines and Seminar Teacher for WorldTeach Philippines; since 2013 Professor at the Biblical Seminary of the Philippines.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-153172-9

ISBN 978-3-16-153090-6

ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2014 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

## Preface

This work is a revised version of my doctoral thesis that was submitted to the London School of Theology (Middlesex University, UK) in the Fall of 2012 and was defended in the Winter of 2013. The production of both the initial work and this final version had been long and arduous, as those who had gone through a similar process can attest; thus, I am grateful for the people who had provided help along the way making the completion of both the original thesis and this monograph possible.

Professor Joel B. Green, my doctoral supervisor who had meticulously read every draft of my thesis, merits much appreciation. His invaluable input and constructive critique helped me, not only to stay focused, but also to explore other possibilities in interpreting the Scriptures. Professor Fredrick J. Long, under whom I served as a teaching intern, had also provided helpful feedback in the process. I consider it a great privilege to work with these two gentlemen and faithful servants of God whose commitment to see their students succeed is evident in their selflessness and generosity. I am also grateful to Professor Loveday Alexander and Dr. Conrad Gempf who had provided helpful suggestions as I worked on the final version of my thesis, and to Professor Markus Bockmuehl who had recommended important resources as I revise my thesis for this monograph series.

The Langham Partnership, USA (formerly John Stott Ministries) had been a channel of blessing throughout the years I was working on my thesis, not only for providing the funds needed to complete the program of study, but also through their encouragement and prayers. Dr. Elaine Vaden deserves a special mention as she tirelessly looked after the welfare of their scholars. I am also grateful to Dr. Joseph Shao, president of the Biblical Seminary of the Philippines (BSOP), who had been, in many ways, instrumental in making this pursuit possible. To the faculty and staff of BSOP, I am also thankful for their continuous prayer and support. The Christian Bible Church of the Philippines (Talayan, Quezon City) had been very supportive as well in this undertaking. Two individuals had played an important role in my decision to pursue this endeavor, namely, Dr. Randall Gleason and Rev. Danny Reyes; to them I am also grateful. I have a number people who had helped me in various ways as I complete my

dissertation and its revision: Rev. Andy Ponce, Ptr. Caleb Wang, and Susie Patrick, who helped me gather additional materials which I have included in this work; Dr. Eunice Irwin, Dr. Laurence Wood, and Dr. Robert and Mrs. Ellen Stamps, who through their lives brought encouragements to me and my family as I complete my work.

To my wife, Juliet, and our son, Johann, many thanks. I appreciate of the sacrifices they made to allow me to complete this work. May the blessed Lord be praised in all these things!

Biblical Seminary of the Philippines  
January 2014

Samson Uytanlet

## Table of Contents

Preface.....	V
List of Charts .....	XIII
Abbreviations .....	XV

### Part 1 Introduction

<i>Chapter 1. Theology, History, and Ideology</i> .....	3
Luke-Acts: Hellenistic Writing with Jewish Theology? .....	4
<i>History and Theology in Lukan Studies: The “Great Divide”</i> .....	4
<i>Luke the Jewish Theologian</i> .....	8
<i>Luke the Hellenistic Writer</i> .....	12
<i>Luke the Hellenistic-Jewish Ideologist</i> .....	19
Where Do We Go from Here? .....	21

### Part 2 Divine Involvement in Ancient Historical Accounts

<i>Chapter 2. Divine Involvement in Greco-Roman</i> <i>Historical Accounts</i> .....	27
Divine Stories and Human Histories.....	27
Divine Authority and Human Assent.....	30
Divine Regents and Human Agents .....	31
Summary and Conclusion.....	33



<i>Chapter 3. Divine Involvement in Jewish</i>	
Historical Accounts .....	35
Divine Story and Israel's History .....	35
Divine Authority and Human Assent .....	37
Divine Regent and His Human Agents .....	39
Summary and Conclusion .....	41
 <i>Chapter 4. Divine Involvement in Luke-Acts</i> .....	43
Divine Story and Continuation of Israel's History .....	44
Divine Authority and Human Assent .....	50
<i>Epiphanies</i> .....	51
<i>Exorcisms and Healings</i> .....	53
<i>Exposition and Divine Revelation</i> .....	59
Divine Regent and His Human Agents .....	64
Summary and Conclusion .....	67
 <i>Summary and Conclusion to Part 2. Luke-Acts</i>	
as a Theological History .....	68

## Part 3

### Literary Parallels and Succession Narratives in Ancient Historical Narratives

Taxonomy of Parallels in Luke-Acts .....	72
<i>Structural Parallels</i> .....	72
<i>Episodic Parallels</i> .....	74
<i>Circumstantial Parallels</i> .....	75
<i>Verbal Parallels</i> .....	75
<i>An Attempt at Categorization</i> .....	76
Purpose of Parallels in Luke-Acts .....	76
<i>Apologetic</i> .....	78
<i>Historical Continuity or Literary Unity</i> .....	78
<i>Succession</i> .....	78
Luke-Acts as a Succession Narrative .....	80

<b>Chapter 5. Literary Parallels and Succession Narratives in Greco-Roman Historical Accounts .....</b>	<b>83</b>
Diogenes Laertius' <i>Lives of Eminent Philosophers</i> .....	83
Parallels without Successions .....	84
Successions without Parallels .....	87
Summary and Conclusion .....	90
 <b>Chapter 6. Literary Parallels and Succession Narratives in Jewish Historical Accounts .....</b>	 <b>91</b>
Parallels and Succession in the Moses-Joshua Narratives .....	91
<i>Parallel Episodes</i> .....	92
<i>Parallel Incidents</i> .....	98
<i>Farewell Speeches of Moses and Joshua</i> .....	100
<i>Moses-Joshua Parallels</i> .....	101
Parallels and Succession in the Elijah-Elisha Narratives .....	102
<i>Structure of the Elijah-Elisha Narratives</i> .....	102
<i>Parallel Episodes</i> .....	106
<i>Parallel Incidents</i> .....	110
<i>Elijah-Elisha Parallels</i> .....	111
Succession in Other Jewish Writings .....	112
Summary and Conclusion .....	116
 <b>Chapter 7. Literary Parallels and Succession Narratives in Luke-Acts .....</b>	 <b>118</b>
Succession in Luke-Acts .....	118
"Ascension" of the Predecessor as Narrative Structural Center .....	121
Parallel Episodes: Jesus-Peter .....	130
<i>The Two Centurions</i> .....	130
<i>Stone Rejected by Builders</i> .....	133
Parallel Episodes: Jesus-Paul .....	137
<i>Beginning of the Ministries of Jesus and Paul</i> .....	137
<i>Healing of Fevered Parents</i> .....	141
<i>Trials of Jesus and Paul</i> .....	143
<i>Jesus, Peter, and Paul: The Giving of the Spirit</i> .....	146
Other Jesus-Peter and Jesus-Paul Parallels .....	150

## Literary Parallels and Succession Narratives:

Deuteronomic Precedents .....	153
Summary and Conclusion.....	153

*Summary and Conclusion to Part 3. Luke-Acts*

as a Succession Narrative .....	156
---------------------------------	-----

## Part 4

Land, Genealogies, and the Reign of the Gods  
in Ancient Historical Accounts

*Chapter 8. Land, Genealogies, and the Reign of The Gods*

in Greco-Roman Historical Accounts .....	163
--	-----

Migrations, Conquests, and Territorial Claims .....	164
Land and Genealogies .....	167
Reign of the Gods and Piety of the Kings .....	175
Summary and Conclusion.....	178

*Chapter 9. Land, Genealogies, and the Reign of God*

in Jewish Historical Accounts .....	179
-------------------------------------	-----

Migrations, Conquests, and Territorial Claims .....	179
Land and Genealogies .....	180
Reign of the Gods and Piety of His Kings .....	190
Summary and Conclusion.....	194

*Chapter 10. Land, Genealogy, and the Reign of God*

in Luke-Acts .....	195
--------------------	-----

Land in Luke-Acts .....	196
Territorial Claims: Not Just Historical Markers.....	198
<i>Herod the Great and the Temple</i> .....	199
<i>Augustus and "All Inhabited Earth"</i> .....	200
<i>Tiberius, Pilate, the Tetrarchs, the Priests, and the Districts</i>	
<i>Around the Jordan</i> .....	202
Son of God as Heir to His Father's Land .....	205
<i>Baptism: Announcement of the Heir</i> .....	206
<i>Genealogy: Legitimacy of the Heir</i> .....	206

<i>Temptation: Heir as the Rightful Possessor of the Land</i> .....	209
<i>The Year of the Lord's Favor: Hope of Repossessing God's Land</i> ....	211
<i>The Parable of the Wicked Tenants: Rejection of the Rightful Heir</i> ...	212
New Moses, Old Law .....	215
<i>Jesus as the New Moses</i> .....	216
<i>Jesus as the Embodiment of the Law</i> .....	218
Trespassers of God's Law, Trespassers in God's Land .....	222
<i>Jewish Leaders: The Pharisees, the Scribes, and the Chief Priests</i> ...	222
<i>Pontius Pilate</i> .....	225
<i>Herod Antipas</i> .....	225
<i>Herod Agrippa I</i> .....	226
<i>Sergius Paulus</i> .....	228
<i>Gallio</i> .....	228
<i>Felix</i> .....	229
<i>Festus</i> .....	230
<i>Herod Agrippa II</i> .....	231
<i>The Kingdom of Caesar and the Dominion of Caesar</i> .....	232
<i>Portraits of Jewish and Roman Authorities</i> .....	233
Geographical Movements and God's Land Claims .....	233
<i>Jerusalem and Judea: Local and Diaspora Jews</i> .....	235
<i>Samaria (and the Coastal Regions): Samaritans and Gentiles</i> .....	240
<i>End of the Earth: Rome and the Gentiles</i> .....	247
Summary and Conclusion.....	251
 <i>Summary and Conclusion to Part 4. Luke-Acts</i> <i>as an Ideological Writing</i> .....	  253

## Part 5

## Summary and Conclusion

<i>Chapter 11. Where Can We Go from Here?</i> .....	257
Luke-Acts and Jewish Theological Histories .....	257
Luke-Acts and Jewish Succession Narratives .....	258
Luke-Acts and Jewish Ideological Writings.....	259
Where Can We Go from Here?.....	260

Bibliography ..... 261

Scripture Index ..... 285

Index of Greco-Roman Writings ..... 309

Index of Jewish Writings ..... 316

Index of Modern Authors ..... 320

Subject Index ..... 325

## List of Charts

4A	Divine Involvement in Greco-Roman and Jewish Historiography .....	44
6A	Espionage Episodes in Numbers and Joshua.....	93
6B	Crossing the Water in Exodus and Joshua .....	96
6C	Israel-Ai War and the Review of the Covenant Stipulation .....	97
6D	Moses-Joshua Circumstantial Parallels.....	98
6E	Parallels in the Farewell Speeches of Moses and Joshua.....	101
6F	Structural Parallels of the Elijah-Elisha Narratives .....	104
6G	Bountiful Oil Supply, Raised Son to Life .....	107
6H	Famine, Sole Sovereignty of the God of Israel Confirmed .....	109
6I	Elijah-Elisha Circumstantial Parallels .....	111
7A	Test for Legitimate Successors .....	120
7B	“Ascension” Account as Narrative Center .....	122
7C	Succession in OT and Luke-Acts .....	123
7D	Two Tales of a Centurion in Luke and Acts .....	131
7E	The “Stone Rejected by Builders” Episodes in Luke and Acts .....	134
7F	Formal Beginning of the Ministries of Jesus and Paul .....	138
7G	Healing of Fevered Parents.....	142
7H	Trials of Jesus and Paul .....	146
7I	The Holy Spirit for Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles .....	147
7J	Circumstantial Parallels for Jesus-Peter/Paul.....	150
10A	Land, Genealogies, and the Reign of the Gods .....	195
10B	Jesus and Moses .....	216



## Abbreviations

A1CS	The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting
AB	Anchor Bible
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AcBib	Academia Biblica
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AJP	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
AJPS	<i>Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies</i>
AmAn	<i>American Anthropologist</i>
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der Neueren Forschung</i>
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentary
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
BapT	<i>Baptistic Theologies</i>
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BCSBS	<i>Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies</i>
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentum
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BerOI	Berit Olam
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentary
BR	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BSac	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BSL	Biblical Studies Library
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBR	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CJ	<i>Classical Journal</i>
CJA	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CTM	<i>Concordia Theological Monthly</i>



<i>CTR</i>	<i>Criswell Theological Review</i>
<i>CW</i>	<i>Classical World</i>
<i>DCLY</i>	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook
<i>EJT</i>	<i>Evangelical Journal of Theology</i>
<i>ERT</i>	<i>Evangelical Review of Theology</i>
<i>ESC</i>	Emory Studies in Christianity
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
<i>EuroUS</i>	European University Studies
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ExpT</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
<i>GNS</i>	Good News Studies
<i>GR</i>	<i>Greece and Rome</i>
<i>HNT</i>	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
<i>HS</i>	<i>Hebrew Studies</i>
<i>HSCP</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>HSM</i>	Harvard Semitic Monograph
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HT</i>	<i>History and Theory</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>IBC</i>	Interpretation
<i>IBS</i>	<i>Irish Biblical Studies</i>
<i>ICC</i>	International Critical Commentary
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JBQ</i>	<i>Jewish Bible Quarterly</i>
<i>JBT</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JITC</i>	<i>Journal of the Interdenominational Theological Center</i>
<i>JP</i>	<i>Journal for Preachers</i>
<i>JPS</i>	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Studies</i>
<i>JPT</i>	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Theology</i>
<i>JPTSup</i>	Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JRT</i>	<i>Journal of Religious Thought</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSNTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSPS</i>	<i>Journal for the Society of Pentecostal Studies</i>
<i>JSPSup</i>	Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>KEK</i>	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
<i>LNTS</i>	Library of New Testament Studies
<i>LHB/OTS</i>	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies

<i>Mnem</i>	<i>Mnemosyne</i>
NICNT	New International Commentary of the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary of the Old Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTM	New Testament Monograph
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTT	New Testament Theology
ÖBS	Österreichische Biblische Studien
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology
OTL	Old Testament Library
PBM	Paternoster Biblical Monographs
<i>PEW</i>	<i>Philosophy East and West</i>
PMAAR	Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
<i>Proof</i>	<i>Proof texts: A Journal of Jewish Literary History</i>
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i> (Journal)
PRSt	Perspectives in Religious Studies (Monograph)
PrTMS	Princeton Theological Monograph Series
PTMS	Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series
<i>PzB</i>	<i>Protokolle zum Bibel</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RelEd</i>	<i>Religious Education</i>
<i>ResQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
<i>RevScRel</i>	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
<i>SBLSP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTSMS	Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Sacra Pagina
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion</i>
StPB	Studia Post-Biblica
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
<i>SwJT</i>	<i>Southwestern Journal of Theology</i>
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
<i>TJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TJT</i>	<i>Toronto Journal of Theology</i>
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentary
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
UNDCSJCA	University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity

<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WCLBS	Westminster College Library of Biblical Symbolism
<i>WJT</i>	<i>Wiener Jahrbuch für Theologie</i>
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
YNER	Yale Near Eastern Researches
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

## Part 1

### Introduction

Inasmuch as many have undertaken to investigate the literature and theology of Luke-Acts, and most of them, although diverse, conclude that ancient Hellenistic writings provide literary precedents and the Jewish Scriptures provide the theological framework for Luke-Acts, it seems necessary to reopen the discussion, investigate other evidence that may have been left out in previous inquiries, and evaluate the things we have been taught.

Despite the obvious differences, readers who are familiar with the Lukan preface in English can immediately detect my conscious effort to imitate, albeit epigonic, the introductory statement of the Third Gospel. Such an introduction may be unusual for works of this nature, and perhaps its verbosity would move any editor to make many revisions, yet the point is clear: my choice of language and composition makes it obvious which work is being imitated. Identifying the ancient works that influenced Luke's *Doppelwerk* poses a greater challenge, however. Many scholars have recognized the influence of the Jewish Scriptures on Luke's theological ideas. Nevertheless, the default in Lukan studies has been to examine Luke's narrative in light of Greco-Roman writings, with the result that few attempts have been made to examine the influence of Jewish historiography on Luke-Acts. This creates an unnecessary disjunction between contents and literary features – that is, between theology (generally recognized as essentially Jewish) and literature (generally deemed as essentially Hellenistic). There is no question that Luke-Acts contains observable Hellenistic literary features. However, influence should not be limited to style and literary features. Luke's theological and ideological stances are also integral to his historical narrative. In this introductory section, I will briefly review the history of Lukan scholarship with respect to the theology and literature of Luke-Acts, after which an assessment will be made to identify some lacunae within these studies that require further investigation.



## Chapter 1

# Theology, History, and Ideology

Much of modern study on Luke-Acts has assumed the “unity” of the two works attributed to Luke. “Unity,” however, carries diverse nuances in modern Lukan scholarship.<sup>1</sup> It is beyond the scope of this present work to discuss this issue in detail. Nevertheless, part of my aim in this work is to show that common theological strands hold Luke’s *Doppelwerk* together. Thus, in this *Forschungsbericht* I will make no distinction between the works done for Luke only, for Acts only, for Luke and Acts, and for Luke-Acts. Moreover, despite the recent reopening of the question concerning the issue of the authorial unity that challenged the common assumption of single authorship of Luke-Acts, I find it unnecessary to abandon the use of “Lukan” as modifier for Luke and Acts, or to avoid the usual reference to the author as “Luke” or the “Third Evangelist.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The complexity of this issue was elaborated in Michael F. Bird, “The Unity of Luke-Acts in Recent Discussion,” *JSNT* 29, no. 4 (2007): 425–48.

<sup>2</sup> Patricia Walters (*The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009]) has argued against its authorial unity. Questions have been raised about her conclusions (e.g., Sean Adams, review of Patricia Walters, *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence*, *EJT* 20, no. 1 [2011]: 81–82; Heather Gorman and Mikeal Parsons, review of Patricia Walters, *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence*, *CBQ* 74, no. 1 [2011]: 179–80; Joel B. Green, review of Patricia Walters, *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence*, *Review of Biblical Literature* [<http://www.bookreviews.org>] [2009]; Richard I. Pervo, review of Patricia Walters, *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence*, *Review of Biblical Literature* [<http://www.book-reviews.org>] [2009]). Moreover, despite the questions raised by Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo on the narrative unity of Luke and Acts, they maintained that the narrative “disunity” of Luke and Acts does not affect the question of its authorial unity (*Rethinking the Narrative Unity of Luke and Acts* [Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993], 126). For a more recent inquiry on the authorship of Luke-Acts by Luke the physician, see Alexander Mittelstaedt, *Lukas als Historiker: zur Datierung des lukanischen Doppelwerkes* (TANZ 43; Tübingen: Francke, 2006), 11–48.

## Luke-Acts: Hellenistic Writing with Jewish Theology?<sup>3</sup>

### *History and Theology in Lukan Studies: The “Great Divide”*

The contours of Lukan studies have continuously changed throughout the past two centuries. Discussions concerning history in Luke-Acts have been projected in different directions over these years. My aim is not to provide a comprehensive review of works that discuss Lukan history and historiography,<sup>4</sup> but to locate this work in relation to earlier writings.

An important focus of discussion in the latter half of the nineteenth century concerns the historicity of Luke-Acts. Many critics have questioned the historicity of Luke's accounts and the reliability of his works,<sup>5</sup> while others defended the veracity of Luke's records.<sup>6</sup> Both critics and defenders of the historicity of Luke-Acts show little interest in theology.

---

<sup>3</sup> The collection of essays in David P. Moessner, ed., *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy* (Luke Interpreter of Israel 1; Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity University Press, 1999) illustrates this disjunction. The literary features of Luke-Acts are set in Hellenistic literary backgrounds (see the essays by L. C. A. Alexander, Daryl D. Schmidt, Vernon K. Robbins, and David P. Moessner), with the Hellenistic Jewish writings providing hints of the possible ideological motivations behind Luke-Acts (see the essays by William Kurz, Carl R. Holladay, and Gregory E. Sterling); moreover, Luke's theological stance finds its basis in Israel's Scriptures (see the essays by Michael Wolter, Robert C. Tannehill, and I. Howard Marshall).

<sup>4</sup> Other works have already accomplished this feat. Cf. W. Ward Gasque, *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975); Joel B. Green and Michael C. McKeever, *Luke-Acts and New Testament Historiography* (IBR Bibliographies; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994); and François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian* (2nd ed.; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006).

<sup>5</sup> F. C. Baur, for instance, observes the differences between Luke's portrayal of Paul to Paul's self-portrait in his epistles and proposes that where Acts contradicts the Pauline writings, the latter should be given priority because only one version can be historically accurate (*Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ* [Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003], 4–5). For a survey of similar works (e.g., Bauer, Renan, Overbeck, and Schmiedel), see Gasque, *History*, 73–95; also Jens Schröter, “Paulus als Modell Christlicher Zeugenschaft,” in *Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres* (ed. Daniel Marguerat; BETL 229; Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 53–60.

<sup>6</sup> See Gasque's reviews the works of some of Baur's contemporaries and other later scholars (*History*, 55–72, 136–63). William M. Ramsay ranked Luke with other ancient Greek historians (*Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898], 10–15). C. K. Barrett called for critics to evaluate the works of Luke based on the standards of ancient history-writing instead of expecting Luke to meet modern standards. Although Luke was not an eyewitness, he claimed to have received information from eyewitnesses, investigated them, arranged these materials in an orderly manner, and presented only accurate information (*Luke the Historian in Recent Study* [London: Epworth, 1961], 9). More recently, the reliability of Luke's accounts is reaffirmed by Colin J. Hemer (*The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* [ed. Conrad H. Gempf; WUNT 49; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989], 429) and Claus-Jürgen Thornton, *Der Zeuge*

Discussions of Luke-Acts began to take on a “new look” during the early part of the twentieth century. The discussions go beyond issues like *How accurate are Luke’s accounts?* or *Are Luke’s accounts consistent with Paul’s letters?* or *How does Luke compare with other ancient historians?* There was a growing recognition of the relationship between theology with history and the artistic nature of ancient histories; as a result, questions like *Does Luke record the events “as they actually happened”?* or *How does Luke’s theological agenda shape his work?* or *Do historicity and accuracy of Luke’s accounts matter at all?* come to the fore.

These new questions shift the focus of Lukan scholarship. This shift is seen in the contributions of Martin Dibelius, particularly his studies on Acts.<sup>7</sup> He claimed that stories and sayings of Jesus found in the Third Gospel were committed to memory by the early Christians for purposes of propaganda and edification. Hence form criticism is an appropriate method to use in studying Luke. In Acts, however, the stories of the apostles were passed on as a result of the early Christian communities’ natural impulse to tell stories, but without a “cultic-christological interest.” Moreover, the higher literary standard employed in Acts as seen in the speeches requires another method of study. Hence, he introduced “style criticism.”<sup>8</sup>

Dibelius suggests that in both Luke and Acts, Luke is an evangelist who portrays “God’s leadership of the Christian community within the framework of history.”<sup>9</sup> As a historian, Luke can be considered an artist who not only collected and framed traditions, but also endeavors to illuminate and present the meaning of the events.<sup>10</sup> He considers Luke as a historian comparable to ancient historians like Thucydides. Luke’s literary ability is evident particularly in the speeches in Acts.<sup>11</sup> These speeches, argues Dibelius, show that history is not the ultimate object of Acts.<sup>12</sup> Since ancient historians were unaware of any obligation to reproduce the text of a speech, the question of historicity has to take the backseat in the discussion.<sup>13</sup>

---

*des Zeugen: Lukas als Historiker der Paulusreisen* [WUNT 56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991], 361).

<sup>7</sup> More relevant to our discussion are Dibelius’ articles (written within 1923–1951) that are compiled in his *Studies in the Acts of the Apostle* (ed. Heinrich Greeven; London: SCM, 1956): “Style Criticism of the Book of Acts” ([1923], 1–25), “The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography” ([1944], 138–85), “The Acts of the Apostles as an Historical Source” ([1947], 102–108), and “The First Christian Historian” ([1948], 123–37).

<sup>8</sup> Dibelius, *Studies*, 3.

<sup>9</sup> Dibelius, *Studies*, 107.

<sup>10</sup> Dibelius, *Studies*, 125. Unfortunately, Dibelius does not elaborate on the idea of Luke’s artistry. This assumption, however, will be significant particularly in the discussions on the genre of Luke-Acts in the later decades.

<sup>11</sup> Dibelius, *Studies*, 138–85.

<sup>12</sup> Dibelius, *Studies*, 102.

<sup>13</sup> Dibelius, *Studies*, 139, 165.



In the mid-twentieth century, form criticism began to give way to redaction criticism. Hans Conzelmann assumes the unity of Luke-Acts and argues that there are two main factors that determine Luke's picture of history: (1) the periods of Jesus and the church as two distinct but systematically interrelated epochs; and (2) the period between the "present" and the "arche" (i.e., the foundational period of the apostles and eyewitnesses).<sup>14</sup> The delay of the parousia not only motivated Luke to reinterpret his sources, but also inevitably extended Luke's view of redemptive history so that a significant period can be placed between Jesus' earthly life and the eschaton. With Jesus placed in *der Mitte der Zeit*, history can then be divided into three main epochs: (1) Israel, Law and Prophets; (2) Jesus, foretaste of salvation; and (3) the period between Jesus and parousia in which the Spirit and ethical regulations replace the imminent expectation of the eschaton.<sup>15</sup>

As we move into the 1970s, valuable contributions to Lukan scholarship would be made by I. Howard Marshall and Martin Hengel. It was commonplace for redaction critics to treat history and theology as mutually exclusive. Moreover, they viewed Luke's interest as primarily to advance his theological agenda by creatively using his sources, and at times, even at the expense of historical accuracy.<sup>16</sup> Marshall moved away from an "either/or" to a "both/and" view concerning the relationship between history and theology. He claims that the separation between history and theology allowed redaction critics to shift their focus from examining the traditions behind the Gospel texts to identifying the theological agenda of the Gospel writers based on the finished product. Moreover, as Marshall observes, this separation allowed redaction critics to reach a "dead end of the study of the historical Jesus to continue their study of the Gospels without raising the problem of historicity."<sup>17</sup> He argues that such a distinction is unnecessary and agrees with Ernst Käsemann, who suggests that Luke can be appreciated as a historian only when one sees him as a theologian, but takes this further by suggesting that the converse is also true, that "Luke can be properly appreciated as a theologian only when it is recognized that he is also an historian."<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (New York: Harper & Row, 1960), 14–16.

<sup>15</sup> Conzelmann, *Theology*, 150.

<sup>16</sup> Recently, Gerd Lüdemann writes, "By interweaving history and legend, Luke confused facts, fiction, and faith. He blended historical and supra-historical fact, thereby falsifying history for the sake of piety, politics, and power" ("Acts of Impropriety: The Imbalance of History and Theology in Luke-Acts," *TJT* 24 [2008]: 77).

<sup>17</sup> I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1971), 17.

<sup>18</sup> Marshall, *Historian*, 18.

Marshall affirms that Luke has a theological agenda, namely, to present a theology of salvation. However, he denies the allegations that Luke does not care about historical accuracy as he presents his theology.<sup>19</sup> First, he claims that the evangelist had been accurate in his presentation of geography and politics. While acknowledging that Luke may have erred in some details (e.g., Quirinius' census), these errors need not discount the overall accuracy of Luke's account. Second, it is hard to establish whether Luke was aiming to produce "Thucydidean verisimilitude" in the speeches in Acts. What is clear is that Luke used these speeches to bring out the theological significance of the events he recorded. Finally, Luke was not as interested in presenting detail as he was in presenting an "idealized and simplified" picture of the early church.<sup>20</sup> Marshall concludes by presenting Luke as an evangelist who aimed to present a theology of salvation by recording historical events pertinent to his message of salvation.<sup>21</sup>

Like Marshall, Hengel razed the wall separating history and theology. He proposes that Luke should be recognized as a "theological historian."<sup>22</sup> He distinguishes between romantic biographies and real histories. The ancients' natural delight to tell and listen to stories is considered one important factor in the production of some romances which took the form of the "acts" of the apostles, but these are considered second-rate compared to real history. Luke's *Doppelwerk* cannot be classified together with these works.<sup>23</sup>

He notes further that early Christian historical accounts were predominantly biographical – a practice not unusual during that period.<sup>24</sup> Writing of biographies was rooted in the panegyrics of great leaders and these were based on reliable historical facts.<sup>25</sup> He critiques K. L. Schmidt who sharply distinguished ancient biographies and histories from the Gospels and Acts, "for all [the four evangelists'] religious concern, they set out to depict the activity and the suffering of a real man and not a phantom figure."<sup>26</sup> In re-

---

<sup>19</sup> Marshall, *Historian*, 53. Joel B. Green proposes that there cannot be a sharp distinction between "history" and "interpretation." By choosing what and what not to include, Luke imposes certain significance on certain past events. (*The Theology of the Gospel of Luke* [NTT; Cambridge, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1995], 17–20, 144–47).

<sup>20</sup> Marshall, *Historian*, 69–74.

<sup>21</sup> Marshall, *Historian*, 216.

<sup>22</sup> Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 44, 67.

<sup>23</sup> Hengel, *Earliest*, 12.

<sup>24</sup> Hengel, *Earliest*, 18.

<sup>25</sup> Hengel, *Earliest*, 15–16.

<sup>26</sup> Hengel, *Earliest*, 19. See K. L. Schmidt, "Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte" in *Eucharisterion: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (ed. Hans Schmidt; 2 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), 2:50–134.

sponse to radical criticism that divorces kerygma and history, he stresses that just as theology and history are inseparable, so are history and kerygma. He notes an important similarity between the four evangelists and other Jewish historians, namely, the assumption that God revealed himself in history. Hence there can be no proclamation of the gospel without narration of the past history.<sup>27</sup>

In summary, a “great divide” was placed between theology and history by early historical critics who showed little interest in discussing the issue of theology in relation to history. Although redaction criticism had created a “bridge” between theology and history, both are still held apart. Marshall and Hengel should receive credit for attempting to pull history and theology closer together. Yet the question remains whether the relationship between theology and history is nothing more than “contiguous.”

### *Luke the Jewish Theologian*

More recently, Scott Shauf moved towards an understanding of a closer relationship between history and theology. For him, a “presentation of the theology of Acts should consist of an elucidation of the reflection about God or gods that is exhibited in the narrative of Acts.”<sup>28</sup> He further comments, “In studying the theology of Acts, therefore, divine elements in the story are purposefully considered as threads woven into the fabric of the overall narrative.”<sup>29</sup> Although Luke-Acts is infused with accounts of divine activities, the significance of these accounts is dependent upon the other events in the whole narrative, which remain fundamentally human. Luke’s attempt to shape Christian identity necessitated the link between his historical accounts with biblical history.<sup>30</sup>

The continuity between Luke’s theological-historical accounts with the OT narrative is widely recognized. Bovon points out that the works of God

---

<sup>27</sup> Hengel, *Earliest*, 44. Robert G. Hall highlights Josephus’ expectations from the best historians – that they should be prophets and record events of their own times (*Ag. Ap.* 1. Proem 7 §§37–40). Like prophets, the historian interprets current events in light of God’s plan and purpose. Hall assesses Luke as one who had met these expectations through the “inspired history” in Luke-Acts, which aims to show how the plan of God was worked out in the life of Jesus (*Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography* [JSPSup 6; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991], 171–208).

<sup>28</sup> Scott Shauf, *Theology as History, History as Theology: Paul in Ephesus in Acts 19* (BZNW 133; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005), 48.

<sup>29</sup> Shauf, *Theology*, 49. Mark Coleridge, likewise, acknowledges the infancy narrative as theology: “it offers an account of the divine visitation which has at its heart a dynamic of promise-fulfillment: God appears as one who before he acts announces what he will do” (*The Birth of Lukan Narrative: Narrative as Christology in Luke 1–2* [JSNTSup 88; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], 23).

<sup>30</sup> Shauf, *Theology*, 302, 307.

were accomplished in space and time, allowing Luke to write a historical narrative of these events. He rightly observes that the “spatio-temporal details of these events fit into the framework of powerful rulers: the kings and leaders who reign at a certain moment in time.”<sup>31</sup> Although Luke’s narrative coincides with the history of his world, his main interest was to identify specific acts of God that resulted in the salvation of his people, which commenced in the OT and continued in Luke’s narrative. J. Bradley Chance suggests that the inauguration of the “eschatological age” does not require the replacement of Jerusalem and the temple as the Jewish center for salvation, and that Luke’s understanding of the importance of the temple and his Christology is grounded in the OT.<sup>32</sup> From another perspective, John T. Carroll claims that although there was a movement of “the Way” beyond the synagogue, they “continued to claim for themselves the scripture, heritage, and promise – the past *and* the future – of Israel.”<sup>33</sup> This claim is grounded in the continuity of God’s salvation in history. Joel B. Green notes that one of the primary means by which Luke shows his interest in the divine plan is the way he grounds his writings on Israel’s Scriptures.<sup>34</sup> The continuity between God’s salvific acts for Israel in the OT and Christians in Luke-Acts is central to Robert O’Toole’s arguments; this continuity is also seen in Jesus’ saving acts during his earthly ministry and the activities of the risen Jesus.<sup>35</sup>

There is also a general consensus that, aside from Luke’s concept of salvation-history, his idea of “the people of God” is grounded in Israel’s Scriptures. Jacob Jervell strongly suggests that there is no concept of the church as “the new/true Israel” in Luke-Acts. The missionary proclamation is what divides the one people of God (which includes both Jews and God-fearers) into two (believers and unbelievers of Jesus). Even in Acts, the term “Israel” continues to refer to the Jewish people who repent.<sup>36</sup> The restoration of “the dwelling of David” opened the way for “the rest,” which Jervell understands to be a reference to the Gentiles, who may be included within “Israel, the people of God” (Acts 15:16–17; cf. Jer 12:15).<sup>37</sup> David

---

<sup>31</sup> Bovon, *Theologian*, 83.

<sup>32</sup> J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988), 146.

<sup>33</sup> John T. Carroll, *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 92; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 165 (*italics original*).

<sup>34</sup> Green, *Theology*, 22.

<sup>35</sup> Robert O’Toole, *The Unity of Luke’s Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts* (GNS 9; Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1984), 266.

<sup>36</sup> Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock, 1972), 43.

<sup>37</sup> Jervell, *People*, 51. Cf. Martina Böhm, *Samarien und die Samaritai bei Lukas* (WUNT 2/111; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

Pao suggests that like the Qumran community (e.g., 1QS 9:16–21), Luke used the ὁδός terminology as part of the Christians' self-designation and identity marker. The language of "the Way" is part of the wider Isaianic program that foresees the inclusion of the Gentiles into God's people.<sup>38</sup> Kerstin Schiffner considers Israel's exodus from Egypt as a model of God's salvation and argues that the confirmation of Jesus as Messiah opens the way for the rest of the world to be part of God's people.<sup>39</sup> Robert L. Brawley aims to destroy the "conventional theory that Luke gives up on the Jews as hopelessly hardened against the gospel and that he views them as providing antecedents for Christianity only as a part of a remote past." He concludes that gentile Christianity is inevitably tied to its Jewish roots.<sup>40</sup> In examining intertextual issues between the OT and Luke-Acts, Kenneth Litwak claims that Luke's use of the OT is for the purpose of validating Christianity by showing its link with the people of God in the OT.<sup>41</sup>

The ancient Jewish writings have often been mined for parallels in investigating the source of Luke's Christology. Peter Doble demonstrates the influence of the language of the Wisdom of Solomon on Luke's understanding of Jesus' death in relation to his identity as the Righteous One.<sup>42</sup> Martin Rese proposes that the OT quotations in Luke-Acts ground Luke's Christology in the OT.<sup>43</sup> For Darrell Bock, the typological relationship between Luke's Christ with OT figures shows that Luke's main concern was to present Jesus as the long-expected ruler.<sup>44</sup> David Crump provides numerous examples from Jewish writings of divinely chosen heavenly intercessors distinguished through the efficacy of their prayers during their earthly existence.<sup>45</sup> H. Douglas Buckwalter insists that the exalted Jesus' characteristics parallel those of Yahweh: invisibility or transcendence,

---

<sup>38</sup> David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 2/130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 41–42.

<sup>39</sup> Kerstin Schiffner, *Lukas liest Exodus: Eine Untersuchung zur Aufnahme ersttestamentlicher Befreiungsgeschichte im lukanischen Werk als Schrift-Lektüre* (BWANT 12; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008), 253–59.

<sup>40</sup> Robert L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (SBLMS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 155.

<sup>41</sup> Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 32.

<sup>42</sup> Peter Doble, *The Paradox of Salvation: Luke's Theology of the Cross* (SNTMS 87; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 187–225.

<sup>43</sup> Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969), 208.

<sup>44</sup> Darrell Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 278–79.

<sup>45</sup> David Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts* (BSL; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 204–36.

uniqueness, and personal presence and activity. These parallels were aimed at portraying the “exalted Jesus as the Father’s co-equal.”<sup>46</sup>

Luke’s understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit is also seen to have Israel’s Scriptures as its basis. Roger Stronstad points out the charismatic motifs in the OT and the Septuagintal language concerning the Spirit’s work that are found in Luke’s writings. He notes the OT prophetic anticipation of the Spirit’s work in the messianic age which Luke saw as being fulfilled among the early believers.<sup>47</sup> Robert P. Menzies highlights the role of the Spirit in connection to prophetic speeches. This connection is seen particularly in Jewish writings, whether Palestinian or Diaspora writings, Qumran or Rabbinic literature.<sup>48</sup> The role of the Spirit in connection to prophecy was also central to William Shepherd’s thesis.<sup>49</sup> Max Turner, after surveying the various ways in which the “Spirit of prophecy” was presented in Jewish writings, argues against the distinction between the “Spirit of prophecy,” “charismatic Spirit,” and the “soteriological Spirit,” concluding, “This in turn means we cannot so easily assume that the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ would be irrelevant to Luke’s concept of salvation, and that it may safely be described as a *donum superadditum* of empowering for mission.”<sup>50</sup> Turner grounds Luke’s pneumatology on the Jewish understandings of the Spirit. John Michael Penney betrays a similar assumption. His work focuses on the involvement of the Spirit in missionary activities which is based on God’s promise to bless the nations through Abraham’s descendants.<sup>51</sup> Matthias Wenk probes the ethical dimensions of the Spirit’s work among the believers, and this also finds precedence in the OT.<sup>52</sup> Edward J. Woods is convinced that there is no real parallel to Luke’s use of the language “finger of God” in Luke 11:20 outside the OT (Exod 8:19; 31:18; Deut 9:10).<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> H. Douglas Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose of Luke’s Christology* (SNTMS 89; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 279.

<sup>47</sup> Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of Luke* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendricksen, 1984), 13–26.

<sup>48</sup> Robert P. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 102.

<sup>49</sup> William Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 147; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2009), 40.

<sup>50</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (JPTSUP 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 138.

<sup>51</sup> John Michael Penney, *The Missionary Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology* (JPTSUP 12; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 25.

<sup>52</sup> Matthias Wenk, *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts* (JPTSUP 19; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 64.

<sup>53</sup> Edward J. Woods, *The ‘Finger of God’ and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSUP 205; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 98.

In summary, despite the various ways in which Luke's theology has been understood, scholars share the same assumption, namely, that early Jewish writings, and particularly Israel's Scriptures, provide the foundations for Luke's eschatology, soteriology, ecclesiology, Christology, and pneumatology. What should be noted is that all these theological facets can be subsumed under the heading of *theopraxis*.<sup>54</sup> There is no eschatological concept without God directing the course of history; no salvation unless God orchestrated the events in history to fulfill his salvific plans; no people of God had God not created a people for himself; no understanding about the Christ if God had not raised his Messiah; and no pneumatology apart from God's sending of his Spirit. In short, *there is no theology unless God acts in history*. Although it is true, as Shauf claims, that divine beings do not enter the into Luke's story directly (but always in interaction with human characters), his conclusion that divine beings only provide a "supporting role" in Luke's historical narrative seems unnecessary.<sup>55</sup> This raises the question regarding ancient historians' understanding of divine involvement in history and how the acts of the gods were typically narrated in ancient historiography.

### *Luke the Hellenistic Writer*

A different trajectory can be observed with regard to the works on the Lukan literature. Decades before literary criticism took center stage in NT scholarship, Henry J. Cadbury advanced the study of Luke-Acts as literature. Like Dibelius, Cadbury considers the issue of historicity of Luke-Acts to be less important compared to other issues, such as Luke's sources, his literary methods, and his intention for writing. Unlike Dibelius, Cadbury considers it important to stress the unity of Luke-Acts.<sup>56</sup> Cadbury gives more importance to the written work than to accomplished events. For him, the importance of Luke-Acts as a historical writing rests not on whether the recorded events are true, but on the fact that they were told.<sup>57</sup> Nonetheless, Cadbury still views Luke as a historian, "Artist or advocate, the historian is still historian, even if not in our modern sense."<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> In this work, I use the term *theopraxis* to refer to τὰς πράξεις τοῦ θεοῦ or "the acts of God."

<sup>55</sup> Shauf attempts to distinguish Luke's accounts from mythological works wherein the gods take a primary role in the narrative. The gods are the primary actors, so to speak, in mythological sagas and interactions take place among these gods (*Theology*, 299).

<sup>56</sup> Henry J. Cadbury, *Making of Luke-Acts* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendricksen, 1927), 8. Cadbury also acknowledges that Luke-Acts is a valuable source of information for first-century Judaism (*The Book of Acts in History* [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955], 86).

<sup>57</sup> Cadbury, *Making*, 4.

<sup>58</sup> Cadbury, *Making*, 300. For some, Luke's artistry in crafting his work does not present any inconsistency with his ability to write history and/or do theology (e.g., G. H. R.

A growing appreciation of Luke's artistry is evident in other works on Luke-Acts. Charles H. Talbert views Luke's work as a biography comparable to Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*.<sup>59</sup> Talbert claims that the correspondences between Luke and Acts are not only in

---

Horsley, "Speeches and Dialogue in Acts," *NTS* 32, no. 4 [1986]: 613); some finds this problematic (e.g., Richard I. Pervo, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987], 8).

<sup>59</sup> Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1974), 134. The assessment of Luke-Acts vis-à-vis Greco-Roman genre is common. For a concise survey of the recent discussion of genre of Acts, see Thomas Phillips, "The Genre of Acts: Moving toward a Consensus," *CBR* 4, no. 3 (2006): 365–96; Richard Burridge, "The Genre of Acts – Revisited," in *Reading Acts Today* (ed. Steve Walton, et al.; London: T. & T. Clark, 2011), 3–28; Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary* (vol. 1; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 51–89. Richard A. Burridge shares Talbert's conclusion, suggesting that Luke as well as the other gospels are to be considered biographies (*What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Greco-Roman Biographies* [Second Edition; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004], 250). David E. Aune admits that the Gospel of Luke shows features of Greco-Roman biography, but because Acts cannot be separated from Luke, the Third Gospel does not easily fit in this category (*The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* [LEC 8; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987], 77). David Balch compares Luke-Acts with Dionysius' *Roman Antiquities* and concludes that Luke-Acts is best classified as ancient history, although later he admits that the distinction between biography and history is not easy to define, either way, Luke-Acts can be considered "historical literature" ("The Genre of Luke-Acts: Individual Biography, Adventure Novel, or Political History?" *SWJT* 33 (1990): 5–19; METABOAH ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse* [ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele; SBLSymS 20; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003], 186). A number of works acknowledge Luke's work as some form of historical writing, e.g., historical monograph (Hengel, *Earliest*, 36; Darryl Palmer, "Acts and Ancient Historical Monograph," *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting: Ancient Literary Setting* [ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke; A1CS 1; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993], 26–29), tragic history (Thornton, *Zeuge*, 355–60; Doohee Lee, *Luke-Acts and 'Tragic History'* [WUNT 2/346; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck], 281–83). Loveday C. A. Alexander correctly points out that detaching the generic label "historiography" does not make Acts (and for this matter even Luke) more or less reliable. Neither an accurate classification of its genre can clearly define whether Acts is fact or fiction. Nonetheless, expediency (at the very least) requires that there be some kind of generic classification within which Luke-Acts can fit and be understood (*Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* [LNTS 298; London: T. & T. Clark, 2005], 135). Nonetheless, given the nature of Luke's narrative, "history" remains the best description for the *Doppelwerk*. Moreover, the dissimilarities between the formal features of Luke's work and those of ancient Hellenistic historians do not necessarily suggest that Luke did not write history, "for Luke has been influenced as well by Israelite and Jewish historiography, especially with respect to the use of historical sequence to shape a narrative theology" (Joel B. Green, "Internal Repetitions in Luke-Acts" in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts* [ed. Ben Witherington, III; Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996], 286).



terms of the sequence of materials and their content, but also in type of parallel structure between the first and latter halves of the Acts of the Apostles. This “architectonic pattern” results from a “deliberate activity by the author of Luke-Acts.”<sup>60</sup> Aside from the use of parallel structures, Luke also employs chiasm particularly in the account of Jesus’ journeys in Luke 9:51–19:46.<sup>61</sup> Such literary models are part of the “patterns of balance” used in both ancient Greek and Jewish literatures.<sup>62</sup> Luke’s use of literary structures in Luke-Acts is not purely for aesthetical purpose, but is important for the evangelist’s theology, particularly his understanding of *Heilsgeschichte*.<sup>63</sup>

Lukan scholarship has been characterized by the general impulse to study Lukan literature *qua* literature in light of Greco-Roman writings. One of the few who ventured to examine Luke-Acts from another vantage point was Bertil Gärtner. In his 1955 monograph, he distinguishes between the Gospel writers and ancient “profane historians.”<sup>64</sup> He proposes that the distinction between Jewish and Greco-Roman historiography is seen in the function of the speeches that historians include in their works. In the Greek societies, speeches were given either for the purpose of political propaganda or for popular entertainment. Speeches that were included in their historical writings served the same function. In Jewish histories, however, speeches are included for the purpose of edification and teaching.<sup>65</sup> Gärtner acknowledges the Greek model behind Luke’s writings, but he critiques his predecessors like Dibelius and Cadbury for proceeding from a comparison with the principles of Greek historiography without allowing for the possi-

---

<sup>60</sup> Talbert, *Patterns*, 23. A similar idea was advanced almost three decades earlier by Robert Morgenthauer. He proposed that Luke, as an artist, creatively arranged his materials in doublets (*Zweigliedrigkeit*) which he built using travel-to-Jerusalem narratives (*Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis: Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas* [ATANT 14–15; 2 vols.; Zürich: Zwingli, 1949], 1:12–13).

<sup>61</sup> Talbert, *Patterns*, 51.

<sup>62</sup> Talbert, *Patterns*, 67–71.

<sup>63</sup> Talbert, *Patterns*, 89. Talbert raises the issue of “succession motif” in his discussion of the implications of Luke’s literary structure on his presentation of his theology. Thomas L. Brodie observes the same feature in the Elijah-Elisha narratives which he claims as literary model by which the Gospels must be interpreted (*The Crucial Bridge* [Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1999], 3).

<sup>64</sup> Bertil Gärtner, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (Uppsala: Almquist & Wiskells, 1955), 7.

<sup>65</sup> Gärtner, *Areopagus*, 8. J. W. Bowker suggests that the speeches in Acts, particularly Paul’s speech in Acts 13, may have been derived from an original synagogue homily given by the apostle (“Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form,” *NTS* 14, no. 1 [1967]: 96–111).

bility of Jewish influence.<sup>66</sup> After examining the Areopagus speech, he concludes that the contents and purpose of Paul's speech in Athens resembles Jewish theology more than Stoic philosophy. On the one hand, the reference to the nature of human connection to the Deity, for the Stoics, is an important argument for the existence of the gods. On the other hand, the Jews "adduced nature to underline that there were no others save the One almighty God, and that the idols were nothing."<sup>67</sup> The polemics behind the Areopagus speech puts it closer to Jewish than Greek historiography.

In the mid-1960s, W. C. van Unnik assessed the state of discussion on Luke-Acts as history and acknowledged that there was already a growing recognition of Luke as a historian (e.g., Ehrhardt, Barrett).<sup>68</sup> However, this consensus had grown prematurely since a comparative work on Luke and ancient histories remained missing.<sup>69</sup> Eckhard Plümacher took van Unnik's challenge seriously and published his *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller* in 1972. He highlights Luke's literary artistry particularly in the second volume of his work. Luke was not a writer who follows a certain literary style perforce. Like other ancient writers, he had the freedom to choose which technique to use. His choice of the Hellenistic style of writing qualifies him *als hellenistischer Schriftsteller*. In terms of methodology, Luke appropriated the technique of *mimesis* common among Hellenistic writers, with the LXX as his model.<sup>70</sup> Plümacher claims that the methodological similarity between Luke's work and the classical Greek writers is evident especially in the speeches in Acts.<sup>71</sup> Just as the words of the

---

<sup>66</sup> Gärtner, *Areopagus*, 27. William Kurz proposes that the genealogy in Luke is one of the evidences that Luke used materials and adapted methods seen in the Greek Bible ("Luke-Acts and Historiography in the Greek Bible" [*SBLSP* 19; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980], 283–300). Likewise, Daryl Schmidt suggests that Luke's emphasis on obedience and the use of deuteronomistic phraseology are evidence that the influence on the historiography in Acts is traceable to the deuteronomistic historian ("The Historiography of Acts: Deuteronomistic or Hellenistic?" [*SBLSP* 24; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985], 417–28).

<sup>67</sup> Gärtner, *Areopagus*, 167. Arnold Ehrhardt argues along the same line and suggests that in Luke-Acts, Luke practiced the art of writing "historical biography" similar to the ones in the OT ("Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles," *ST* 12 [1958]: 45–79).

<sup>68</sup> W. C. van Unnik, "Luke-Acts: A Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. Leander Keck and J. Louis Martyn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), 15–32.

<sup>69</sup> Van Unnik, "Storm," 27.

<sup>70</sup> Eckhard Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 78.

<sup>71</sup> He came to a similar conclusion after examining the so-called "we sections" of Acts which is often interpreted either as evidence of eyewitness account, as "relics" of Luke's sources written by an eyewitness, or as a simple literary device commonly used in Hellenistic writings ("Wirklichkeitserfahrung und Geschichtsschreibung bei Lukas," in *Ges-*

*hervorragender Politiker* or *bedeutender Feldherren* were considered valuable in Greek historiography – for they can be the “determining force” (*die geschichtsbestimmenden Kräfte*) in the unfolding of history – the speeches of the apostles serves the same function in Acts. Like Dionysius, Luke attempted to present by way of *mimesis* the ideal conception of the epoch he presents. For Dionysius, it is the Roman primeval era. For Luke, it is the holy character of the earliest church.<sup>72</sup> In his examination of the dramatic episodes in Acts, Plümacher observes that Luke’s narrative shows resemblance to Livy’s works, although this affinity does not necessarily suggest dependence. The purpose of the *dramatischen Episodenstil* is to concretize abstract political, apologetic, and theological ideas so that they may come alive for the readers. Such style is intended for the edification of the readers.<sup>73</sup>

Colin J. Hemer examines the features of ancient histories (such as their scope and scale, order and arrangement, use and construction of speeches, moral and religious stance, and bias), and shows that there is considerable diversity in ancient historiographical practice. Thus, studying literary parallels is not enough.<sup>74</sup> He concludes, “It is not that we have particular literary parallels which demand such comparisons, but rather there is a common world of traditions and conventions which the author of Acts seems to share with other ancient writers of allegedly historical narratives.”<sup>75</sup>

John T. Squires stands in the line of scholars who view Luke-Acts alongside Hellenistic historiography. He proposes that “the plan of God” is a distinctively Lukan theme, yet God’s involvement in history in Luke-Acts betrays Hellenistic influence. He suggests that the role of Providence in Hellenistic historiography creates points of contact between Greek histories and Luke-Acts. For examples, Dionysius and Diodorus relate portentous occurrences as signs indicating gods accomplishing their wills.<sup>76</sup> Such elements are also features of Luke’s work. The common use of epiphanies, the phenomenon of oracles, and the language of necessity, which high-

---

*chichte und Geschichten: Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte und zu den Johannesakten* [ed. J. Schröter and R. Brucker; WUNT 170; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], 85–107).

<sup>72</sup> Plümacher, *Schriftsteller*, 38, 72.

<sup>73</sup> Plümacher, *Schriftsteller*, 110–11, 126.

<sup>74</sup> Hemer, *Setting*, 100.

<sup>75</sup> Hemer, *Setting*, 411. After examining the relationship between first-person narration and eyewitness accounts in ancient Hellenistic and Jewish prose, Thornton admits that identifying the model used by Luke in his work is close to impossible; nonetheless, he insists that in the case of Acts, the “we-section” is evidence of eyewitness accounts supplemented by materials from Paul’s travel journal (*Zeuge*, 113–17).

<sup>76</sup> John T. Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts* (SNTSM 76; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 78.