

“*Luke–Acts in Modern Interpretation* is an important collection of studies in the Milestones in New Testament Scholarship series. The two-volume work known as Luke–Acts warrants scholarly scrutiny not only because this work represents almost one quarter of the entire New Testament, but because it preserves a vital link between Jesus, his life and ministry, and the first generation of the church that emerged in the aftermath of his death and resurrection. Editors Stanley Porter and Ron Fay have assembled an impressive roster of contributors who have reviewed the history of scholarship concerned with Luke–Acts and have done so with critical judgment and keen insight.”

—Craig A. Evans,
John Bisagno Distinguished Professor of Christian Origins,
Houston Baptist University

“*Luke–Acts in Modern Interpretation* is a well-conceived and readable high-level introduction to the history of the study of Luke–Acts. The pattern of introduction, survey of scholarship, and evaluation for each scholar serves well, and is supplemented by an introduction that reaches earlier and wider than the scholars chosen for inclusion.”

—John Nolland, former Vice-Principal and Academic Dean at Trinity College
Bristol and Visiting Professor at the University of Bristol

“Luke–Acts represents the largest portion of the New Testament. It was long neglected but has been at the center of much New Testament discussion in recent times. This survey of major contributors provides a wonderful orientation to the issues that swirl around these two important parts of the New Testament. It prepares one well for engagement with the issues tied to these books.”

—Darrell L. Bock, Executive Director for Cultural Engagement,
Howard G. Hendricks Center for Christian Leadership and Cultural Engagement;
Senior Research Professor of New Testament Studies, Dallas Theological Seminary

“This book is a handy guide to many of the most prominent and influential figures in critical Luke–Acts scholarship. For those wanting to get their feet wet in the world of Lukan studies, this is a great place to start.”

—Craig S. Keener,
F. M. and Ada Thompson Professor of Biblical Studies,
Asbury Theological Seminary

MILESTONES IN NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP

LUKE-ACTS IN MODERN INTERPRETATION

Stanley E. Porter and Ron C. Fay
EDITORS



Luke–Acts in Modern Interpretation

© 2021 by Stanley E. Porter and Ron C. Fay

Published by Kregel Academic, an imprint of Kregel Publications, 2450 Oak Industrial Dr. NE, Grand Rapids, MI 49505–6020.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise—without written permission of the publisher, except for brief quotations in printed reviews.

All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are from the New American Standard Bible®. Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission. www.Lockman.org

The Hebrew font, NewJerusalemU, and the Greek font, GraecaU, are available from www.linguistsoftware.com/lgku.htm, +1-425-775-1130.

ISBN 978-0-8254-4569-9

Printed in the United States of America

21 22 23 24 25 / 5 4 3 2 1

CONTENTS

Series Introduction	9
Preface	11
List of Contributors	15
Introduction to <i>Luke–Acts in Modern Interpretation</i>	
Stanley E. Porter and Ron C. Fay	17
Adolf Harnack and Lukan Scholarship at the Height of Classical Liberalism	
Zachary K. Dawson	57
Martin Dibelius on the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles: The Most Literary Writings in the New Testament	
James D. Dvorak	93
Henry Joel Cadbury and the Study of Luke–Acts	
Oswaldo Padilla	129
Ernst Haenchen and His Impact on Luke–Acts Scholarship	
Karl L. Armstrong	151
F. F. Bruce, Luke–Acts, and Early Christian History	
Stanley E. Porter	193
Hans Conzelmann: Luke as Theologian of Salvation History	
Alan J. Thompson	247

Charles Kingsley Barrett: A Historian by Nature, a Theologian by Grace John Byron	271
Jacob Jervell and the Jewishness of Luke–Acts David K. Bryan	299
Richard I. Pervo: Luke as Novelist and Acts as Entertainment Ron C. Fay	321
Loveday C. A. Alexander: Luke–Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context Laura J. Hunt	347
Conclusion to <i>Luke–Acts in Modern Interpretation</i> Stanley E. Porter and Ron C. Fay	381
Scripture Index	390
Author Index	393

SERIES INTRODUCTION

The *Milestones in New Testament Scholarship* (MNTS) series fills a necessary place between a proper biography and a dictionary entry. Each person chosen as a subject of a chapter has had a major influence upon how scholarship, and usually along with it lay readers, have thought about a specific book, group of books, or topic in the New Testament. The history of scholarship leaves certain fingerprints that stand out more than others; yet many times some important makers of fingerprints are overlooked due to the time period in which they lived, the circumstances in which they wrote, or the influence of one of their contemporaries. MNTS will often shine a light on significant scholars who have been overlooked, while also giving space to those whose names are nearly synonymous with the books they studied.

The vision for this series is to cover numerous books and topics in the New Testament, with each volume providing a small snapshot of milestones in New Testament scholarship. We seek to balance canonical studies with textual and theological studies. This series will produce brief biographies of scholars who have had an impact on the study of a given book, corpus, or major issue in New Testament studies, and thereby established a milestone in the area. By looking at the lives of these scholars, the impact of their work can be felt. We have intentionally utilized an extended chronology for the chosen scholars, in order to show how their impact is felt by subsequent generations. Each article tells the story of a single person. It communicates the life circumstances, the influences on the person, and how that person impacted the specific area in New Testament studies. In turn, each volume of this series then tells multiple stories forming a timeline, and thus a narrative of the subject of each volume can be seen through the intellectual progression within the topic.

These volumes will then create a history of New Testament studies. In order to see how work in the Johannine literature has progressed, one would read the volume on John. To see how New Testament studies in general have progressed and to diagnose general trends, the entire series would be necessary. This allows both a deeper understanding of each individual subject and a more comprehensive view of how change in each subfield of New Testament studies has occurred. This makes MNTS perfect for those studying for comprehensive exams; those examining why certain trends in specific fields have occurred, wanting to understand the history of New Testament studies; or those wishing to see ideas embodied in the stories of the participants rather than simply in didactic material.

Our goal for MNTS, to fit in scope between a single biography of a certain scholar and an encyclopedia or dictionary of various New Testament interpreters, means that these volumes allow for a quicker read than a biography¹ but greater depth than a dictionary.² Each volume also allows the reader to approach each chapter individually, as each is a story with a beginning and an end. Since the chosen scholars are treated separately, researchers have a place to start when working on bibliographies. Since each chapter is written by someone working in the field, the nonspecialist gains a glimpse at how an expert understands and assesses an important scholar.

The purpose of MNTS is to open historical vistas normally closed to nonexperts, without having to dig into sources not readily available. This approach gives the student shoulders on which to stand, the expert a quick reference tool, and the biographer a short sample. Our hope is that MNTS brings joy and information to all who use the series.

—Stanley E. Porter and Ron C. Fay

-
1. For example, Konrad Hammann, *Rudolf Bultmann: A Biography* (Farmington, MN: Polebridge Press, 2012).
 2. For example, William Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, 3 vols. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993–2013).

PREFACE

We are pleased to present this second set of essays in the Milestones in New Testament Scholarship series, this volume focused upon Luke–Acts. The chapters are freshly written essays commissioned for this book by authors who are closely connected with scholarship on Luke–Acts. Some, in fact, have more than passing acquaintance with the authors on whom they have written in terms of research and writing interests. We are pleased that the individual authors were willing to contribute their essays to this volume. Enthusiasm for Luke–Acts as an area of scholarly interest has risen and fallen over the course of the last two centuries of modern scholarship. However, as this volume attempts to make clear, there has always been scholarship done on one or both of these important New Testament books. Sometimes there has been more scholarship on Luke’s Gospel and sometimes more on the Acts of the Apostles, and sometimes more on both of them together. Nevertheless, Luke–Acts as the significant corpus of writing that it is within the New Testament continues to demand that scholars return to it. We hope that this volume will play a role in this continuing discussion as we revisit the contributions of a number of scholars who are milestone figures within Luke–Acts scholarship. The varied figures included within this volume reflect both continuity and discontinuity within Lukan scholarship. On the one hand, there are a number of recurring questions that continue to be raised within critical scholarship, including such issues as authorship, historicity, theology, genre, and the like. On the other hand, there are always new questions being raised—or at least new perspectives being suggested—in light of continuing discussion. We see the latter in some of the literary approaches that have come to the fore in more recent studies of Luke–Acts. We wish for this volume to help to inspire further questions and new perspectives in the study of these two major New Testament books.

This volume, however, is not geared toward the future of Luke–Acts scholarship, but to its past. We believe that a volume such as this helps to further inform scholarship as we critically assess the contributions of major figures in the history of discussion. We have included ten scholars who rightly belong in a volume that attempts to represent milestones in previous interpretation of Luke–Acts. Not all have focused equally on both books; some have concentrated upon Luke’s Gospel and some on Acts. It appears, as a matter of fact, that more of them have concentrated on Acts than Luke’s Gospel, but that is not the result of an attempt to skew the orientation of the volume. Nevertheless, each has made a contribution to study of the Lukan corpus. The scope of their work extends well over a century and a half, from the mid-nineteenth century to the twenty-first. We do not believe that any of these scholars requires justification—even if some of them are more widely known than others, some of their positions are more positively viewed than others, and some fit more widely known or endorsed theological paradigms.

The introduction to this volume attempts to set the ten authors treated in this volume into their larger context. We begin the introduction by discussing F. C. Baur, whose theories regarding Acts, as well as Luke, have had an enduring effect upon study of Luke–Acts. In many respects, his interests shaped the agenda for study of Luke–Acts, in Germany and elsewhere. In the course of situating the authors discussed within this volume, we also include brief descriptions of the contributions of a number of other Luke–Acts scholars. This discussion provides a context in which to consider those treated here. Adolf Harnack will always be remembered as one of the greatest scholars of his or of any generation. The breadth of his knowledge and writing is astounding, and he towered above most of his peers in an age of many accomplished scholars. Harnack would merit mention in any number of different volumes on milestones in scholarship. He made a significant contribution to Luke–Acts as well. Although a theological liberal, he argued for some surprisingly early dates for composition of both Luke and Acts, which put him at odds with the mainstream of German scholarship of his time. Martin Dibelius was at the forefront of a surprisingly prolific period in German scholarship, with the rise to significance of form criticism. Dibelius was instrumental in shaping the agenda for future work in Luke–Acts with his form-critical study of both the Gospel and Acts. Dibelius’s approach is still reflected in much subsequent scholarship, German or otherwise. Henry J. Cadbury, an American scholar with

Quaker perspectives, represents an independent and innovative voice in Luke–Acts scholarship. Cadbury is probably less well-known than some of the other authors studied in this volume, but his contribution was highly significant. Cadbury was on the forefront of appreciating the stylistic and other innovations of the Lukan author, while attempting to fit the corpus of Luke–Acts within its contemporary context. Ernst Haenchen remains best known in scholarship for his commentary on the book of Acts, a commentary that has continued to play a significant role in reflecting the views of much German scholarship and providing a foil for others. Although a theologian by profession before being a New Testament scholar, Haenchen became a leading New Testament scholar as a proponent of redaction criticism, which he used in his study of Acts. F. F. Bruce exemplifies a British perspective on scholarship on Luke–Acts that runs contrary to the major stream of German scholarship. Whereas German scholarship was skeptical of Lukan historicity, Bruce was highly influenced by his classical education and saw Luke as a reliable historian. Bruce was instrumental in establishing a conservative (even evangelical) approach to Luke–Acts as a respectable perspective from which to do biblical scholarship. Bruce represents a trend in British scholarship that has continued to be developed to the present. Hans Conzelmann and Haenchen were in many ways closely aligned in their scholarship on Luke–Acts. Conzelmann formulated a clear outline of salvation-history that encompasses both Luke and Acts, and this formulation has had an enduring effect upon New Testament scholarship, not least in the influence that it had on Haenchen in his commentary. C. K. Barrett, one of the most significant British New Testament scholars of the twentieth century, approached Luke–Acts with recognition of the issues raised in German scholarship but without some of its extremes. His concern for the effects of critical scholarship on Christian belief is readily seen in his scholarship on Acts. Jacob Jervell, a Norwegian scholar, represents a major break from the main trends in German scholarship. Whereas much German scholarship had emphasized the conciliatory role of Acts in the tension between Jew and Gentile, with the author approaching this tension from a position of Gentile universalism, Jervell reinterpreted the Lukan corpus, with Acts focusing upon the Jewish mission of the church that only later spread to the Gentiles. Jervell's major commentary on Acts was written to succeed Haenchen's, thus pitting two different perspectives on Acts against each other in the same commentary series. Richard I. Pervo challenged many of the standard theories regarding Acts

and revived a number of ideas that have not been at the forefront of Acts studies—until recently. He reopened questions regarding genre, unity, authorship, and especially date of composition. It appears that many of these questions will grow in importance in the years to come. Finally, Loveday C. A. Alexander is the scholar with whom we close this volume and bring it up to the present. In some ways, Alexander returns to the emphasis upon classical study of Acts, while she also has a methodological awareness that pushes her into new arenas of scholarship. We wait to see if and how these ideas are further developed within Acts studies.

We have included essays on the above ten authors in this volume, as well as referred to a number of others in the introduction and elsewhere. We realize that there are many other worthy and able scholars who could have been included in this discussion. We cannot attempt to list such names here. We realize that any similar volumes, and those who edit them, will have various opinions on what constitutes true milestones in Luke–Acts scholarship, but the list of worthy scholars to consider would exceed the confines of a single volume such as this one. We, however, are satisfied with our list. These scholars represent a variety of methods, some of them being innovators and others solidifiers. They represent various current issues in Lukan scholarship of their times, some of them being on the avant-garde and others in defensive response to the onslaught. They represent some new departures and some well-established paths of endeavor. They also represent some new findings and able defenses of traditional viewpoints. One of the common threads that emerges in this series of essays is that each of these scholars endeavored to interpret the Lukan literature for their day and age, and as a result brought insights to the discussion. Our contributors are to be commended for their efforts to capture the sense of each of these scholars.

The editors wish to thank the individual contributors for their chapters in this volume and their willingness to share their expertise. By doing so, they help to advance discussion of Luke–Acts and bring to mind those who have established this discipline as the vibrant area of scholarly endeavor that it is. We also wish to thank our friends at Kregel for their continuing support of this series of volumes. In particular, we thank Laura Bartlett for her suggestions on various dimensions of the series and how it can continually be refined and improved, and Robert Hand for his fine editorial work on this volume. We also want to thank Shawn Vander Lugt for typesetting this volume and for his work on the index.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Karl L. Armstrong, McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, Ontario

David K. Bryan, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois

John Byron, Ashland Theological Seminary, Ashland, Ohio

Zachary K. Dawson, Regent University, Virginia Beach, Virginia

James D. Dvorak, Oklahoma Christian University, Edmond, Oklahoma

Ron C. Fay, Liberty School of Divinity, Lynchburg, Virginia

Laura J. Hunt, Spring Arbor University, Spring Arbor, Michigan

Oswaldo Padilla, Beeson Divinity School, Samford University,
Birmingham, Alabama

Stanley E. Porter, McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, Ontario

Alan J. Thompson, Sydney Missionary and Bible College, Croydon,
New South Wales

INTRODUCTION TO *LUKE-ACTS* *IN MODERN INTERPRETATION*

Stanley E. Porter and Ron C. Fay

The Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, two books that have historically been linked whether by authorship, chronology, or canon, comprise nearly one third of the content of the Greek New Testament. These two books, the longest and second longest in the New Testament, have occupied a provocative place within the history of New Testament scholarship. As this introduction will indicate, and as a number of the essays in this volume will further illustrate, many significant scholarly controversies involving some of the most significant New Testament scholars in the history of critical scholarship have focused serious efforts on discussing these books, whether individually or together. As a result of their study, we are able to observe some of the major trends in the history and development of New Testament scholarship, because of the implications of their research on Luke and Acts. The significance of these two books in the history of the development of early Christianity, and the critical scholarship that has accompanied them, has meant that many fine scholars in the history of New Testament scholarship have devoted their not inconsiderable talents and abilities to their critical analysis. Sometimes these scholars agree and sometimes, in fact, many times, they do not. Nevertheless, they continue to visit and

revisit important historical, theological, literary, and textual issues that attend to these two books. In this introduction, we attempt to lay out, even if only briefly and incompletely, the history of scholarship on Luke–Acts. Because a volume such as this cannot include every important scholar, to say nothing of treat them in detail, we will attempt to mention—and sometimes that is all that we can do—the major scholars who, in the history of scholarship, have made a noteworthy and enduring contribution to study of Luke–Acts.¹ This higher level picture of Luke–Acts scholarship will then provide the basis for a contextual understanding of the individual scholars discussed in far greater detail in the chapters that follow.

The history of New Testament scholarship on Luke–Acts can be conveniently divided into four major periods, each one representing a period of time in which there were currents and countercurrents in the various opinions advocated and refuted. It is perhaps appropriate in a discussion of Luke–Acts that this dialectic of proposals and counterproposals is used as a framework for further discussion, as such a Hegelian idealistic analysis stands at the advent of major critical study of Luke–Acts, in particular the book of Acts. Much of the history of discussion of these two books continues to be performed in light of this original dialectic. This introduction focuses upon scholars who have established their reputations in Luke–Acts studies over the course of time and hence only considers for sustained consideration those who have either died or concluded the vast bulk of their careers, since attempting to assess our contemporaries is often difficult. Because of the nature of our audience, we also tend to concentrate upon scholars who write in English, especially when considering contemporary scholars.

1. There are several volumes that survey scholarship on Luke and/or Acts. Those most valuable to us in this study, in chronological order, are: W. Ward Gasque, *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles* (repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975); François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 2nd rev. ed. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006 [1978]); Mikeal C. Parsons and Joseph B. Tyson, eds., *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: American Contributions to the Study of Acts*, SBLBSNA (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), although we do not include John Knox in our survey; and Joseph B. Tyson, *Luke, Judaism, and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke–Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999), but we do not include Adolf Schlatter, because his contribution was more to the debate over Judaism rather than to study of Luke–Acts.

SETTING THE FOUNDATIONS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The foundations of subsequent Luke–Acts scholarship were clearly laid in the mid-nineteenth century, and in particular in German scholarship. We do not wish to minimize the significance of other scholars who studied Luke–Acts before that time. Such scholars include: some of the Reformers, who wrote commentaries on Luke and Acts, with Jean Calvin’s (1509–1564) commentaries on Luke and especially on Acts being noteworthy; Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687–1752) and his *Gnomon*, a commentary on the Greek text of the entire New Testament;² Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) and his famous 1817 essay on Luke’s Gospel as a work of collection and reporting of the accounts of others, including the incorporation of another’s travel narrative (Luke 9:51–19:49);³ and Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette (1780–1849), one of the great scholars of the nineteenth century, who wrote on a wide range of topics, including a significant introduction to the New Testament and a short commentary on the book of Acts, both of which reflect his view that the book was far less programmatic and planned than was thought by other scholars.⁴

The most important figure in the history of Luke–Acts scholarship is Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860).⁵ Baur, a church historian, wrote on the New Testament as part of his set of wider theological interests that focused upon the thoroughly historical nature of Christianity. One can see the influence of German idealism, probably including

2. John Albert Bengel, *Gnomon of the New Testament*, 5 vols., trans. Andrew R. Fausset (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1857–1858), esp. vol. 2, with both Luke and Acts (as well as John’s Gospel).

3. William Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, 3 vols. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992–2013), 1:215–16, citing Schleiermacher, *A Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke*, trans. Connop Thirlwall (London: J. Taylor, 1825).

4. Gasque, *History of the Criticism*, 24–26, citing W. M. L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel Alten und Neuen Testaments. Zweyter Theil: Die Einleitung in das Neue Testament enthaltend* (Berlin: Reimer, 1826); and de Wette, *Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1838).

5. See Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, 1:258–69; Horton Harris, *The Tübingen School: A Historical and Theological Investigation of the School of F. C. Baur* (repr., Leicester: Apollos, 1990 [1975]), 11–54, 137–80; J. C. O’Neill, *The Bible’s Authority: A Portrait Gallery of Thinkers from Lessing to Bultmann* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 117–25 (with 95–107 on Hegel); Tyson, *Luke*, 12–29; Roy A. Harrisville and Walter Sundberg, *The Bible in Modern Culture: Baruch Spinoza to Brevard Childs*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 104–22; Hughson T. Ong, “Ferdinand Christian Baur’s Historical Criticism and *Tendenzkritik*,” in *Pillars in the History of Biblical Interpretation, Volume 1: Prevailing Methods before 1980*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, MBSS 2 (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016), 118–38.

that of the philosopher Hegel, whose dialectic approach seems to have influenced Baur's conception of the development of thought as the development of Absolute Spirit, a dialectic that had an influence upon much of Baur's criticism. His critical approach is called *Tendenzkritik*, or tendency criticism, which emphasizes the intention of the author, a literary-critical position very much at home in the nineteenth century.⁶ Although Baur wrote only a relatively small number of books dedicated to New Testament studies, the entire corpus of his work was concerned with historically accounting for the development of Christian thought. Within this body of work, he wrote on major areas of the New Testament, including the Synoptic Gospels, John's Gospel, Acts, and Paul. Baur's theories are well-known in New Testament studies but bear brief repetition here.

Baur posited that there were two major factions within early Christianity: the Pauline and the Petrine Christians, or the Hellenistic and the Judaistic Christians, with the Pauline view found in the Pauline letters and the Petrine Christians centered upon Jerusalem.⁷ The first group focused upon justification and the second on circumcision, which tension resulted in conflict depicted within the Corinthian church. The height of the conflict between the parties is represented in Luke's Gospel, which is, next to Paul's letters, the best source of the Pauline perspective. Written after AD 70 (Baur thought AD 130–140), Luke's Gospel depicts the destruction of Jerusalem and represents Jesus as the redeemer of humanity. This tendency toward universalism (against Matthew's particularism) is seen in Jewish rejection and Gentile acceptance of Jesus, the mission of the seventy, and Jesus's trips to Galilee. Luke's Gospel declares the Mosaic law ended and excludes Peter's declaration regarding Jesus.⁸ In that sense, Luke's Gospel is further from Matthew's Gospel and closer to John's Gospel, which Baur posits was written possibly as late as AD 160–170. Marcion, apart from Luke's Gospel, is the greatest

6. See Ong, "Ferdinand Christian Baur's Historical Criticism," 131.

7. F. C. Baur, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom," *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 4 (1831): 61–206. The entire sweep of the history of the development of the first three centuries of the church, from the foundational events to its theology, is found in Baur, *The Church History of the First Three Centuries*, 3rd ed., 2 vols., trans. Allan Menzies (London: Williams and Norgate, 1878–1879); ET of Baur, *Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (Tübingen: Fues, 1853; *Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 3rd ed., 1863), and followed in the recounting here.

8. See Baur, *Church History*, 1:77–81.

advocate of Paulinism, taken to its extremes in his Gnosticism and his rejection of the Old Testament.⁹

These two parties, Pauline and Petrine, remained at odds with each other until into the second century, when there were efforts to reconcile them brought about by both sides, with intermediate positions attempting to mediate the extremes. One of the major developments was baptism replacing circumcision. A number of New Testament books reflect attempts to reconcile these two parties (e.g. Hebrews, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, the Pastoral Epistles, James, and 1 Peter), but the major reconciliatory book was Acts. The foundational tension between the early apostles threatened the church, so it became incumbent, once there was more unity between the parties, to show that this unity had existed from the start. Acts, written by a member of the Pauline party in the second century (c. AD 130–140), was a literary work that also influenced the history of these movements by depicting Paul in relation to the earliest apostles. Acts retains the Paulinist perspective by defending Christian universalism, in which Gentiles, without needing to follow the law, are depicted as equal with Jews. Even if Jews are to follow the law, Gentile Christians were free from following the law apart from cases of greatest offense (see Acts 15:28–29).¹⁰

Even though Baur does not treat Luke and Acts as a two-part work for the purposes of his reconstruction, he clearly identifies them with important moments and movements within the development of early Christianity. Baur's hypothesis about factions within early Christianity has had continuing significance throughout New Testament scholarship to the present. Several of the major ways it has influenced New Testament criticism include identifying rival factions within the earliest events of Christianity, defining them around major figures in the New Testament, equating the divisions with important cultural and theological beliefs, and seeing the books of the New Testament, in this instance Luke and Acts, in relationship to this fundamental tension. Luke's Gospel represents an encapsulation of Pauline Christianity that stands opposed to the Petrine party, while Acts attempts to rewrite the history of their tension, although from the Pauline perspective.

The effects of Baur's reconstruction of the history of Christianity was seen in two immediate ways, by those who supported his

9. Baur, *Church History*, 1:82–84.

10. Baur, *Church History*, 1:131–33.

conclusions and those who opposed them. As one can imagine, Baur's conclusions regarding early Christianity—and in particular the role that Luke and Acts played within it—aroused significant response within scholarship, much of it negative. Baur's position was often rejected outside of Tübingen and led to many of Baur's direct followers having difficulties in securing academic positions. Nevertheless, there were a number of scholars in the mid-nineteenth century connected with Tübingen who accepted and developed his theories regarding the divisions within the early church, to the point that there became what has been called the Tübingen School (1831–1860).¹¹ Despite its actual demise, many of its suppositions regarding diversity and reconciliation came to characterize New Testament study long after Baur's particular reconstruction was no longer commonly accepted. The follower who was arguably the most radical of all was Bruno Bauer (1809–1888), whom Ward Gasque labels “one of the tragic figures in the history of New Testament interpretation.”¹² Baur was so radical in his perspectives that he even alienated David Friedrich Strauss (1808–1874), who was closely aligned with Baur, and thought that Baur had not taken his conclusions far enough. Bauer argued that both Paul and the book of Acts were not historical accounts of early Christianity (and he disputed the authorship of *all* of the Pauline letters). The purpose of Acts is to show how a Jewish group became a universal religion, a view in line with Baur. Written after any contention was long past (but not as a mediating position), Acts depicts a conservative Judaism with Gentile Christianity.¹³ Gustav Volkmar (1809–1893) was also a radical among a group that was known in its day for being radical. He assumed most of Baur's presuppositions, such as the Pauline and Petrine parties, and then took them to extremes that even others of the Tübingen school commented upon. As Horton Harris states, “when Volkmar discovers everywhere in the New Testament Pauline and Jewish Christians, Gnostics and anti-gnostics; when Paul entreats Euodia and Syntyche to agree in the Lord (Phil. 4:1) and Volkmar argues that the names refer not to two individuals but to the Pauline and Jewish parties; when he expresses the view that the stories about Jesus in the Gospels are actually descriptions of Paul, then he is only

11. See Harris, *Tübingen School*, 238–39; cf. 181–237.

12. Gasque, *History of the Criticism*, 73. Cf. O'Neill, *Bible's Authority*, 150–66.

13. Gasque, *History of the Criticism*, 74–77, citing Bruno Bauer, *Die Apostelgeschichte: Eine Ausgleichung des Paulinismus und des Judenthums innerhalb der christlichen Kirche* (Berlin: Gustav Hempel, 1850).

carrying Baur's principles to their logical conclusion."¹⁴ One of the most significant of the Tübingen scholars who wrote on Luke and/or Acts was Eduard Zeller (1814–1908), Baur's son-in-law. Zeller is probably best known for his work on Acts in which he (perhaps not too surprisingly) "confirms Baur's reconstruction of early Christianity and his assessment of Acts as a tendency document."¹⁵ Before Baur himself wrote his own history of the early church, one of the Tübingen school, Albert Schwegler (1819–1857), published a history of the post-apostolic period in which he attempted to fill out Baur's reconstruction. The work was not well received and so he abandoned writing in the area of theology, even though Baur and Schwegler probably had the closest viewpoint and Schwegler represented the fullness of the position in the mid-nineteenth century. Schwegler was apparently a troubled and generally unpopular person who never held a full-time academic position.¹⁶ Karl Reinhold Köstlin (1819–1893) was more successful in securing academic positions even if he made only a modest contribution to scholarship, including a large two-part article in which he argued for a mediating position regarding the development of the early church. He posited that there was a growing and significant middle party rather than the tension between Paulinism and Petrinism or the triumph of Paulinism (argued by Ritschl; see below).¹⁷ Finally, although he was not associated with the study of Luke or Acts in particular, Adolf Hilgenfeld (1823–1907) was probably the most prolific scholar of Baur's followers. Even though he had some difficulties with all of Baur's presuppositions (e.g., he argued for the authenticity of 1 Thessalonians, which would upset Baur's historical scheme), he generally supported the Tübingen position.¹⁸

Reaction to and rejection of the Tübingen school was not long in coming, with one of its most important figures being a person who began his academic life as a member. Albrecht Ritschl (1822–1889) made a special effort to move from the north of Germany to Tübingen in the south so that he could study with Baur. Although at first he accepted the Tübingen approach, he soon began publishing works that

14. Harris, *Tübingen School*, 133; cf. 127–33.

15. Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, 1:271.

16. Harris, *Tübingen School*, 78–88, esp. 84, referring to Albert Schwegler, *Das Nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung* (Tübingen: Fues, 1846).

17. Harris, *Tübingen School*, 96–100, esp. 98, referring to Karl Reinhold Köstlin, "Zur Geschichte des Urchristentums," *Theologische Jahrbücher* (1850): 1–62, 235–302.

18. Harris, *Tübingen School*, 113–26, esp. 119–20.

rejected its major suppositions regarding the major factions within the early church. This criticism began in Ritschl's well-known book on Marcion that included some criticism of Schwegeler's book on the post-apostolic church and then continued in a variety of writings, including a critical review of Baur's major work on the apostle Paul.¹⁹ Ritschl questioned such elements of the position as Baur's rejection of authenticity of the Thessalonian letters and 2 Timothy and Titus until the point where Ritschl recognized that, although he had respect for Baur and his approach, he could not accept his views regarding authorship and hence his reconstruction of early Christianity. Ritschl's work was followed by that of others who directly attacked the Tübingen position and developed their own opinions in other directions.²⁰ Ritschl is known today as the leading figure in the development of theological liberalism. One could argue that Philip Schaff (1819–1893) and Joseph Barber Lightfoot (1828–1889) reflect a more conservative reaction to Baur and the Tübingen approach, although their work on Luke and Acts is contained within their history of the early church. Educated at Tübingen and appreciative of Baur's historical approach, Schaff however was much more conservative in his approach to the history of early Christianity.²¹ Lightfoot reacted directly to Baur's hypotheses in his multivolume treatment of the Apostolic Fathers, in which he directly challenged the historical reconstruction of the second century and the development of early Christianity by the Tübingen school.²² In the few things that he directly wrote on Acts, Lightfoot endorses traditional views of Lukan authorship, historicity, and early date.²³

19. Albrecht Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas* (Tübingen: Osiander, 1846) and Ritschl, review of Baur in *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* (Halle and Leipzig, 1847), 124–27, reviewing Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi: Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre* (Stuttgart: Becker & Müller, 1845; 2nd ed., 1866–1867); ET Baur, *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings*, 2 vols. in one (repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003 [1873–1875]).

20. See Harris, *Tübingen School*, 238–48.

21. Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, 2:43–52.

22. Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, 2:66–73, esp. 71–73, with reference to J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 parts in 5 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1890, 1885); and Gasque, *History of the Criticism*, 116–23.

23. Several of Lightfoot's publications on Acts, including his article on it in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* and his incomplete commentary based on lecture notes, have recently been published in J. B. Lightfoot, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Newly Discovered Commentary*, Lightfoot Legacy Set 1, ed. Ben Witherington III and Todd D. Still (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2014). The dictionary article is on pp. 279–326 (without full publication information).

There are several different ways in which the history of scholarship on Luke–Acts, and those who have had the greatest impact on such scholarship, may be told from this point to the present. One way would be to treat the discussion of Luke and Acts separately, as there are numerous issues that focus more upon one book than another. These include issues related to the Synoptics and Luke and the Gentile mission of the church in Acts. A second way is simply to identify a number of different topics within Luke–Acts scholarship and treat them synchronically. A third way is to treat them together according to major topics within Luke–Acts scholarship as it has diachronically progressed. Rather than treating the two books separately, we will treat them together and we will diachronically trace the history of research. Out of the history of Luke–Acts scholarship, however, two major topics have emerged. These are the importance of theology and history. The two have been intertwined in Luke–Acts scholarship since at least the time of Baur and continue to be important in contemporary discussion. We will focus upon these two topics, while also noting others of importance.

THE LATE-NINETEENTH AND EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURIES

As we move into the post-Baur and Tübingen period, there was an increasing diversity in New Testament scholarship as centers of study developed not just in Germany and Britain but in North America and elsewhere. There began to emerge some clear, diverse lines of thought regarding Luke–Acts. The late nineteenth and early twentieth century was a period in which some of the major lines of thought became significant.

A strong line of continuity with the dominant Tübingen trend in earlier nineteenth-century scholarship is found in the work of Franz Overbeck (1837–1905).²⁴ Although a professor of theology in Basel, Overbeck was an agnostic who had little regard for Christianity and was a good friend of Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900). Overbeck identified with the Tübingen approach to history with its developmentalism and anti-supernaturalism, although without the same Hegelian assumptions. Overbeck argued for a rigorous historiography that, in many respects, arguably takes the Tübingen approach to its logical conclusions. His

24. Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, 2:138–44, esp. 140–41; O’Neill, *Bible’s Authority*, 179–90 (on Nietzsche, see 191–97).