The Unity of Luke––Acts: A Four-Bolted Hermeneutical Hinge

Patrick E. Spencer

Currents in Biblical Research 2007 5: 341
DOI: 10.1177/1476993X07077967

The Unity of Luke–Acts: A Four-Bolted Hermeneutical Hinge

PATRICK E. SPENCER
San Ramon, California
patrickespencer@comcast.net

ABSTRACT

Nearly every scholarly investigation of Luke–Acts today must address the question of unity. It is a hermeneutical hinge and the answer to the question has wide-ranging interpretive implications. The call to dissolve the unity of Luke and Acts—and the 'hyphen' Cadbury inserted—focuses on four 'bolts': (1) genre, (2) narrative, (3) theology, and (4) reception history. Despite far-reaching argument over the past twenty years favoring removal of the four 'bolts', the hinge remains securely fastened. In addition, there is significant coalescence around certain issues such as the presence of an intermixing of genre types in Acts and an intertwining of the narrative and theological themes in Luke and Acts. And questions about unity have led to new avenues of exploration and the identification of trajectories that crisscross both volumes and tie them together.

Keywords: Acts of the Apostles, genre, hermeneutics, Gospel of Luke, Luke–Acts, unity of Luke–Acts

Introduction

The question concerning the unity of Luke–Acts is a 'prickly' issue that has been a 'thorn in the side' of Lukan scholarship for the past two decades. As the issue touches most interpretive endeavors regarding Luke–Acts, it is virtually impossible to deal with thematic or theological issues, or even individual, isolated texts, without assuming a position. The 'unity' hinge consists of four 'bolts': genre, narrative, theological, and reception history. Are the bolts coming out of the hinge? Or are the bolts still fastened securely and holding both sides of the hinge together?

Currents in Biblical Research
 Vol. 5.3: 341-366
http://CBI.sagepub.com ISSN 1476-993X DOI: 10.1177/1476993X07077967

In 1927 Henry Cadbury in *The Making of Luke–Acts* (1927) argued on literary and stylistic grounds that Acts is the second volume in a two-work sequel. Until the past twenty years, his argument went largely unchallenged by the scholarly community. Then, in the late 1980s, the cohesive unity between Luke and Acts was brought into question by several scholars on the basis of generic, narrative, theological and stylistic incoherence, and, most recently, reception history. They contend the 'hyphen' Cadbury inserted in 'Luke–Acts' should be removed. Richard Pervo issued the initial salvo in 1987, arguing in *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* that Acts employs the generic conventions of the ancient novel. Stylistic peculiarities led James Dawsey (1989a) to question the validity of claiming narrative unity. Then, in 1993, Pervo teamed with Mikeal C. Parsons in *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* to dispute the unity of Luke–Acts on the basis of differences in genre, narrative, and theology. (They mention two other areas in passing as possible evidence: author and canonical.) The stage for the 1993 monograph by Pervo and Parsons was set with Pervo's earlier monograph on the genre of Acts (1987) as well as a Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Paper by Pervo (1989) and an essay by Parsons in a festschrift for Henry Jackson Flanders, Jr (1989). Just recently, an additional argument against the unity of Luke–Acts was proposed: late second-century use of Luke and Acts evinces a separation of the two volumes. Specifically, based on the lack of evidence in the early church, C. Karl Rowe suggests that each volume was circulated and read as an independent narrative (2005). The following analysis will review the different arguments that have been posed against the unity of Luke–Acts and then cover the reasons why Cadbury's 'hyphen' remains intact.

1. *Narrative Incoherence Leads to the View of Disunity*

There is a prodigious amount of scholarly investigation over the past 25 years surrounding the genre of Luke and Acts. Cadbury only dealt briefly with the question of genre, concluding—after comparing the potential merits of biography, historiography, and other genre types—that Luke–Acts is more like historiography than any other genre (1927: 132-34). Recent genre classification of Luke–Acts loosely breaks into four Greco-Roman categories: biography, history, epic, and novel (Phillips 2006). Those who argue against the unity of Luke–Acts envision that Acts most closely coincides with the traits of the ancient novel and that Luke falls into the vein of ancient biography (Parsons and Pervo 1993). Nevertheless, though the exact classifications vary based on comparison and narrative traits, the

preponderance of scholarly investigation places Luke–Acts in the continuum of ancient historiography (Aune 1987, 2003; Balch 1985, 1989, 1990, 2003; Sterling 1992; Green 1997a, 1997b, 2002; Cancik 1997; Löning 1997: I, 24-25; Yamada 1996, 2000; Rothschild 2004).

Parsons and Pervo contend that differences between Luke and Acts cannot be adequately explained based on the underlying sources (Parsons and Pervo 1993: 37). Their argument is threefold: (1) the implied author of Luke, like the counterpart of Acts, is quite capable of introducing episodic pieces and scenes; (2) the type of sources selected or available is not without relevance to the issue of genre; and (3) the implied author of Luke is seemingly an active editor able to modify sources to coincide with genre intent. They then proceed in pinpointing a number of differences between Luke and Acts as evidence of disunity (Parsons and Pervo 1993: 37-40). First, the speeches of Acts distinguish it from the narrative of Luke, which is largely void of speeches. Second, journeys in Luke serve as vehicles for moving the plot along but lack circumstantial detail. In contrast, the journeys in Acts contain significant detail on geography and other relevant facets as the missionary activity moves from one locale to the next. Third, punishment is dispensed to those who commit wicked deeds in Acts, whereas sinners receive forgiveness in Luke. Finally, the community of believers in Luke stands in stark contrast with that in Acts: persons from the margins of society and religion are embraced by Jesus as 'true' disciples in Luke, while the very groups denounced in Luke—persons of wealth and status—largely comprise, and even lead, the believing community in Acts.

a. *Generic Incoherence: Genres, Genres Everywhere!*

The premise of Parsons and Pervo that Acts coincides most closely with the genre of ancient novels largely draws upon Pervo's dissertation at Harvard University that was published as a monograph, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*, in 1987. Their methodological approach examines successors to Luke and Acts, not predecessors as is the case with much of ancient generic analysis, identifying trajectories of similarity that they trace back to Luke and Acts. They reject classification of Luke and Acts as historiography on the basis that the narrative exhibits facets incongruent with historiography. The various areas they identify as running counter to ancient historiography include: (1) persistent use of an omniscient narrator; (2) breadth of dialogue and direct speech; (3) techniques for plotting and structure, including quantity and quality of entertaining narrative; (4) limitations of style; (5) nature of the subject (i.e., the focus of historiography was character formation, something they do not

believe is present in Luke–Acts); and (6) presence of 'fiction' (i.e., literary license in creating episodic narrative).

Pervo concludes, more recently, that the narrative discourse of Luke and Acts necessitates two separate stories: Luke presents the story of 'a reform movement or sect within emergent Judaism', whereas Acts delineates a story 'of an explosion of Gentile converts who worshiped Jesus Christ the Lord, that is, the rise of a new cult' (Pervo 1999: 142-43). At the basis of this argument is the contention that Luke envisions the Christian movement as an outgrowth of the Jewish community, while Acts demarcates the Christian movement as exclusive—an entity separate from the Jewish community. Also integral to Pervo's case is that Luke and Acts fit into a model of successive competition. On the one hand, Luke rewrites the stories found in Mark and Q and is intended as a 'replacement' to those prior stories. In particular, Pervo contends the influential Gospel of the later second century, *Protevangelium Jacobi*, for which Luke was a major source and model, was intended as the 'replacement' to Luke. In regards to Acts, on the other hand, Pervo proposes that it was a 'replacement' to the letters of Paul, and that the *Acts of Paul* was its 'replacement' successor (1995).

Recently, Pervo added to his prior argument by conducting a statistical comparison of direct speech in Acts and direct speech in ancient historiography and fiction, concluding that Acts has a much larger percentage of direct speech than found in ancient historiography. Further, his analysis finds that direct speech in Acts more closely aligns with the breakdown found in ancient novels (2006).

Based on their comparative analysis of Luke, Acts, ancient historiography, ancient biography, and ancient novel, Parsons and Pervo locate Luke within the genre of ancient biography and Acts within the genre of the ancient novel. They use the shape of the early New Testament canon as evidence of the generic distinction between Luke and Acts, proposing that the separation of Luke and Acts—specifically, placement of Acts with the General Epistles—shows a preference in the early church to view both works separately by early readers (1993: 8-13, 42-43).

b. *Narrative Differences: Cracks Between the Two Volumes*

Parsons and Pervo build upon the areas of narrative incoherence identified by Hawkins (1907) and Clark (1933) and more recently Dawsey (1989a, 1989b). Their argument reduces to six basic areas: (1) wording and use of titles, (2) stylistic variations, (3) differences in the voice of the narrators, (4) disappearance of parables in Acts, (5) omission of repetition and parallels in Acts, and (6) narrative gaps and discrepancies (1993: 8-13, 42-43).

First, some words in Luke that coincide with the development of the early church are largely absent in Acts, a reoccurrence one would expect to find. Some of the more obvious discrepancies include the following: (1) the word ματητετσ (*mastaetes*) appears almost always with the personal genitive in Luke, which directs the implied reader to ascribe a possessing noun or pronoun to it for qualification, whereas ματητετσ appears only once with a qualifying genitive in Acts; (2) the appellation *adelphos* is a designation for 'fellow Christian' in Acts but is used to denote kinship in Luke; and (3) the careful use of titles for Jesus in Luke is not near as noticeable in Acts, where titles and appellation formulae are often used interchangeably.

The second discrepancy, though certainly not a new argument (Argyle 1973–74; however, cf. Beck 1976–77), relates to variations in the styles of Luke and Acts. These include semitisms and Septuagintalisms that are not used in the same way in Luke and Acts, as well as a potential stylistic tendency towards Attic construction in Acts. Examples afforded by Dawsey include construction of *kai egeneto* with a verb following it in Luke, use of the Attic formula *ouk oligos* in Acts, and more frequent use of the Attic *te* in Acts (1989a: 58-61).

Third, the voice of the protagonists and the voice of the narrator in Acts are difficult to distinguish, whereas Jesus' voice and the voice of the narrator in Luke are clearly demarcated.

Fourth, parables as pedagogical vehicles, in contrast to their regular use in Luke for such purpose, virtually disappear in Acts.

Fifth, based on redactional analysis of Luke's use of Mark, there is a tendency to omit repetition and parallels. This tendency contrasts with the frequent use of pairs in Acts, such as the Conversion of Cornelius (10.1–11.18) and the Conversion of Paul (9.1-19; 22.2-21; 26.2-23) (Witherup 1992, 1993).

Finally, despite widely recognized linkages or interlacing between Luke and Acts, there are a number of gaps and discrepancies between the two works. Parsons and Pervo cite the following instances where this is the case: (1) differences in the ascension narrative (Lk. 24.50-53 versus Acts 1.5-11); (2) reference to a saying of Jesus in Acts 20.35 that has no reference in Luke; (3) significant variance between the characterization of John the Baptist in Luke (Lk. 3.1-22; 7.18-35) and the quotation of John the Baptist in Acts 13.25; (4) the Lukan prologue (Lk. 1.1-4) shows no evidence of anticipating a second volume and, in addition, the concluding section in Luke (24.12-53) goes to great lengths to provide a sense of narrative closure; and (5) there are various differences between the narrator in Luke and the narrator in Acts.

The most notable gap between Luke and Acts according to Parsons and Pervo is in the type of narrator in Luke versus the one in Acts: the heterodiegetic narrator of Luke (i.e., one who does not participate in the story) becomes a homodiegetic narrator in Acts (i.e., one who participates in the story). Other discrepancies between the narrators of Luke and Acts that Parsons and Pervo note include: (1) attention to settings in Luke not present in Acts; (2) use of unique techniques in Acts to identify certain characters, a mode not employed in Luke; (3) greater importance of temporal summaries in Acts versus Luke; (4) more favorable characterization of the Jewish populace in Luke than in Acts; (5) the Jesus of Luke, unlike the protagonists of Acts (the twelve apostles, Peter, John, Paul), is able to discern the feelings and thoughts of other characters; and (6) narrative asides in Luke provide details on persons or places unfamiliar to the reader, whereas narrative asides in Acts convey the reliability of the narrator to the reader (Parsons and Pervo 1993: 67-77).

c. *Theological Dissonance: Methodological Concerns*

Theological dissonance between Luke and Acts is the final area Parsons and Pervo cite as evidence against the unity of Luke–Acts (1993: 84-114). Rather than an argument in favor of disunity, their discussion in this area is more of a complaint than a detailed case. In particular, they contend that theological investigation of Luke and Acts is flawed: it begins with Luke and then locates the themes identified in Luke within the narrative discourse of Acts. They also assert that the Jesus of Luke is different from the exalted Jesus of Acts: Jesus does not seem to have a particular saving relevance in Acts, in contrast with his salvific representation in Luke.

d. *Historical Separation: The Late Second-Century Church Reads Luke and Acts*

There is increasing interest in the reception history of Luke and Acts, especially how they were received and read by the early church (Bellinzoni 1998; Gregory 2003; Bovon 2005). Recently, in a thorough-going examination of the manuscript history and early church writings, Andrew Gregory concludes that, with only two exceptions (Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 3; Muratorian Fragment), there is no evidence Luke and Acts were read as one work in the early church (2003: 39). Extending Gregory's argument, Rowe challenges interpretive approaches to Luke–Acts seeking to read them as they were most likely heard (2005). In particular, in contrast to the view that Luke and Acts were initially circulated together in the early church but then separated with the acceptance of Luke into the fourfold Gospel as part

of the canonical process (cf. Stanton 1997), Rowe suggests the opposite actually took place (also Gregory 2003, 2005): 'Luke and Acts were not divided because they were not really read together in the first place. By itself, Luke was rather naturally grouped with other Gospels and found its way unhindered into the fourfold Gospel rather early on' (2005: 142). Rowe then proceeds to emphasize the importance of not confusing literary unity with historical unity, arguing that those who seek to read Luke–Acts as a unity do so as it was intended but not as was the actual practice of the earliest readers (2005: 145).

As most investigations of Lukan intention (or purpose) and theology assume a sequential reading of both volumes together, Rowe contends their conclusions need to be reconsidered. Specifically, since a reading of Luke in the early church was not followed by a reading of Acts and a reading of Acts was not necessarily read as the successor to Luke but rather of various other New Testament or other early Christian texts, the parameters of purpose and theology may not be the same—for both Luke and Acts. Further, Rowe contends evidence of early Christian readings makes it more legitimate to read Luke with Matthew, Mark, or John than with Acts ('the evidence of early Christian readings would press us more towards studies of Luke in the context of other Gospel traditions than toward studies of Luke–Acts') (2005: 153). In the case of Acts, Rowe proposes a wide variety of ways in which it should be read: 'as a sequel to the fourfold Gospel tradition, as a prelude or sequel to the Pauline letters and so on' (2005: 153).

2. *Coherent Unity*

Despite the amount of attention paid to the issue of unity, those who argue for a separation of Luke and Acts remain in the vast minority. In addition, though variance exists as regards to the precise genre of Luke–Acts, and if Luke and Acts represent the same genre, most scholars concur there is significant evidence within the narrative discourse to view Luke–Acts as a single corpus. In particular, a growing number of scholars conclude that Luke and Acts contain a mixture of genres, with a tendency towards ancient historiography (Phillips 2006). And while the unity of Luke and Acts is rebutted on various grounds, there is virtual consensus that Acts forms some sort of literary (or narrative) sequel to Luke (even Rowe 2005, Parsons and Pervo 1993 admit literary trajectories crisscross both volumes). Rowe's comment here is apropos: 'Insofar as Luke intended Acts to go with Luke as two volumes of a connected work, and insofar as they exhibit literary connectedness, it is clearly legitimate and valuable to study the two works

as the literary unity Luke–Acts' (2005: 152-53). Though initially broached by Parsons and Pervo (1993: 8-13, 42-43), the most recent challenge to the unity of Luke–Acts on the basis of reception history is a relatively new caveat that must be examined in greater detail, a scholarly discussion that will play out over the next several years.

a. *Generic Coherence: Prologues and More*

The Lukan preface has been long been the subject of much scholarly attention. The work of C.A. Loveday Alexander over the past two decades has spurred significant interest in the prologues to both Luke and Acts (Lk. 1.1-4; Acts 1.1-2). Her initial research was published as an article in *New Testament Studies* in 1986, which was followed by a comprehensive monograph in the Society of New Testament Studies Momograph Series (1993). Since the publication of the monograph, Alexander has published a series of articles and essays on various aspects related to the two prologues (1996, 1998a, 1998b, 1999a).

Cadbury's hyphen connecting Luke and Acts is rooted in the claim that Luke–Acts represents the same genre type. In the case of Cadbury, he argued that Luke–Acts is nearer to history than any other classification (1927: 132-34). However, since the publication of Cadbury's work eighty years ago, Luke–Acts has been associated with myriad genres—particularly in the past twenty years. For those who argue for the generic unity of Luke–Acts, they divide into four basic areas.

First, while there is significant deviation as to what type of history—ranging from political history (Balch 1985, 1989, 1990, 1999) to deuteronomistic history (Brodie 1990, 2004) to apologetic history (Sterling 1992) to general history (Aune 1987, 2003) to rhetorical history (Yamada 1996, 2000)—the majority of scholars still agree with Cadbury and place Luke–Acts in the vein of ancient historiography.

Second, based on the *Lives of the Philosophers* by Diogenes Laertius, Charles H. Talbert concludes that Luke–Acts corresponds as a succession narrative, a type of ancient biography (1974: 125-34; 1989; 1992): (1) Life of the founder, (2) narratives about disciples and successors, and (3) summaries of the doctrine of the philosophical school. More recently, Talbert, with his student Perry Stepp, pinpoint the theme of succession as a key linkage between Luke–Acts and ancient biography, though they conclude that the succession theme does not automatically answer the question of genre since various genres were shaped by it (1998a, 1998b). Though most scholars have not accepted Talbert's attribution of biography for both Luke and Acts, and Talbert and Stepp equivocate on the issue in their latest

publication (1998a, 1998b), Stanley E. Porter recently embraced it as the most logical generic derivation for Luke–Acts (2005), citing many of the same arguments.

Third, the two prologues, according to Alexander, contain too many features normally associated with historiography. She surveys a breadth of Greco-Roman narrative types and concludes that Luke–Acts, primarily on the basis of the Lukan prologue (Lk. 1.1-4), aligns with the scientific tradition (or technical prose) (1986, 1993, 1999a).

Fourth, Dennis R. MacDonald, building upon his investigation of the apocryphal Acts, contends that Luke–Acts, like Mark, is intended as an imitation of the Homeric epic, with close correspondence between the *Odyssey* and the ending of the *Iliad* (1994, 1999, 2000, 2003a, 2003b). According to MacDonald, epic is the only literary form from the late-first-century Greco-Roman world that could bridge the gulf between the seriousness of high literature and the accessibility of popular literature. And in the case of Luke-Acts, he contends the values in Homer are replaced by the new values of Christianity (also see Bonz 2000: 189-93).

1. *One—Not Two—Generic Category.* As discussed above, some argue for two different generic classifications for Luke and Acts. However, there are a number of issues favoring one generic category. In particular, the preface in Acts 1.1-2 refers to an initial volume and exhibits an awareness of the story presented in Luke (Alexander 1996, 1999a). The beginning of a second volume, rather than indicating a turn to a different story, would have been a matter of physical expediency, as ancient authors divided their lengthy works into individual books, each of which fit on to one papyrus roll (Gamble 1995: 45-47). In addition, the division of Luke–Acts into two volumes was a matter of symmetrical separation of the narrative discourse: the structure and narration in Luke parallels the structure and narration in Acts (Green 1997a: 6-10). First, the narration of Jesus' final days in Jerusalem in Lk. 19.28–24.53 parallels Paul's arrest, trials and arrival in Rome in Acts 21.27–28.31, with each occupying approximately 25 percent of their respective volumes (Aune 1987: 118). Second, both Luke and Acts begin in Jerusalem (Lk. 1.5–2.52; Acts 1.6–8.3). Third, Luke ends and Acts begins with the episode regarding the ascension of Jesus (Lk. 24.50-53; Acts 1.6-11). Finally, the time span covered by both volumes is approximately thirty years.

Suggestions that Luke—and even Acts—corresponds with the genre of ancient biography versus ancient historiography (Talbert 1974, 1989, 1992; Burridge 1992; Porter 2005) do not completely fit with the narrative discourse. While Luke certainly contains elements of various literary

genres, including biography, it exhibits characteristics that point beyond the boundaries of the biographical genre. First, if Luke is a succession biography (i.e., such as that of the ancient philosophers in which the story of the teacher is followed with a story about his students), as initially argued by Talbert, one would expect for it to conclude with a succession list. Second, most biographies focus on the life and character of one individual, with this focus clearly denoted in their prefaces (Witherington 1998; Callan 1985). However, the preface of Luke is larger in scope, referring not only to the life of Jesus but to a series of events (Moessner 1988, 1992; however, cf. Talbert 1992). Third, historiography contains elements of biography, an observation that discounts the tendency to categorize Luke as biography on the basis that it exhibits biographical conventions (Phillips 2006). Finally, though examples of multi-volume works from antiquity exist that represent distinct genres, including biography and historiography, these instances clearly indicate a change in subject matter and genre in the preface. And while several suggest that Luke and Acts represent different genres (Parsons and Pervo 1993; Palmer 1992), reference to a generic change is absent in the preface of Acts (Alexander 1996).

2. *Historiography with a Mixture of Other Genres.* Luke and Acts share various characteristics with historiography, including symposia, travel narratives, speeches, dramatic episodes, letters, and more (Aune 1987: 120-31). Yet despite growing consensus around classification of Luke–Acts within the genre of historiography, there remains significant disagreement as to how the two works relate. Comparison of the prefaces of Luke and Acts finds that they embody too many features normally not associated with ancient historiography and lack enough of the style and language characteristic of such highly literary art (Alexander 1986, 1993, 1996). Regardless, there is growing consensus that the prefaces contain sufficient rhetorical components, in conjunction with the remainder of the narrative, for the implied reader to locate Luke–Acts within the boundaries of ethnographical or cultural historiography (Alexander 1986, 1993; Balch 1985, 1989, 1990, 1999; Marshall 1999b; Sterling 1992). As the generic style and conventions of Luke–Acts fit most closely within a literary matrix of the Greek-speaking Jewish Diaspora, Luke–Acts is situated by the two prefaces at a generic intersection, whereby historiography—formulated within the generic context of biblical historiography—forms the center and is surrounded by other elements from genres such as the novel, the epic, and the biography (Alexander 1998a, 1998b; Phillips 2006). Significant fluidity in ancient genre types denotes the ease with which generic forms

overlapped and moreover could be manipulated to serve the rhetorical aims of the implied author. Alexander summarizes the coexistence of genres in ancient narrative:

> Unlike Herodotus, Luke does not create an epistemological space that would allow him to question the religious beliefs of his characters; indeed, his use of the first person makes it clear that he shares them. In terms of a stark distinction between 'Greek' and 'Jewish' historiography, Luke falls ineluctably on the 'Jewish' side. The paradigm for the writing of history, in that tradition, is not so much 'investigation' as testimony, and its parameters are defined by a commitment to a concept of truth that is nothing if not theological. Precisely for this reason, it is a tradition that makes a much more insistent claim on the reader than Homer or even Herodotus. Readers whose notion of history was defined by this tradition would have had no difficulty in recognizing Acts as the work of a historian (1998a: 124-25).

b. *Narrative Coherence: Connections and Echoes*

Despite a few cracks separating the narrative of Luke from the narrative of Acts, narrative coherence presents the most compelling case for overarching unity between the two works. The few instances of narrative incongruity withstanding (cf. Parsons and Pervo 1993: 45-83), the narrative discourse of Luke and Acts exhibits a number of links, ranging from direct connections to indirect echoes. And many of the so-called narrative 'gaps', identified by those who contend there is significant incongruity between the narrative discourses, are indicative of any narrative discourse, including Greco-Roman narrative.

The most obvious connection between the two narratives is internal parallelisms that tie together the plot line as well as various thematic motifs (Talbert 1974; Praeder 1984; Green 1996, 1998; Alexander 1999b). The following are some of the more notable parallels. First, the narrative of Luke contains instances of foreshadowing that function as a focusing technique, prompting the implied reader to listen for certain thematic motifs in the following narrative. Foreshadowing in this case entails both proleptic and analeptic activity on the part of the implied reader. For example, upon hearing Acts 27, the implied reader recalls the foreshadowing of Lk. 8.22–9.7—which portrays Jesus in control of the sea and having authority over demons (Talbert and Hays 1999: 280-82). This association also prompts the implied reader to associate both scenes with Acts 16.16-18 and 19.13-20, where divine authority is depicted as superior to demonic power and magic. In another instance of foreshadowing, Jesus' emphasis on the responsibility of benefaction by

the wealthy in Luke (e.g., 12.22-34; 16.19-31) is enacted by wealthy disciples in Acts (e.g., 2.43-47; 4.32-37). Second, a series of complementary visions form a juxtaposed thread that extends from Luke into Acts—from Zachariah and Mary (Lk. 1.8-56), to Saul and Ananias (Acts 9.1-9), to Cornelius and Peter (Acts 10). Indeed, there are a number of close parallels between each of these episodes, with resulting ramifications on the construction of meaning by the implied reader (Green 1994, 1996). Third, there is significant correspondence between Jesus' journey to Jerusalem in Luke (9.51–24.53) and Paul's journey to Rome in Acts (19.21–28.16): length of journey, divine necessity, understanding of friends/disciples, seizure/arrest, four trials, declaration of innocence, and salvation (Talbert 1974: 15-23; Talbert and Hays 1999). Finally, parallelism in the narrative discourse extends to the actual depiction of characterization, with noted parallelisms between Jesus and Paul, Jesus and Stephen (Talbert 1974; Praeder 1984), and Joseph of Arimathea and Gamaliel (Darr 1998). Emphasis on parallelisms between characters in both Luke and Acts is further corroboration of this point; there is an obvious interest on the part of the implied author to construct meaning for the implied reader through character parallelism, with examples that include Jesus and John the Baptist, Elizabeth and Mary, Peter and Paul, and Barnabas and Ananias/Sapphira.

Rather than serving as evidence of disunity, many of the differences in the narrative discourse function as rhetorical vehicles and coincide with the tendencies of ancient narrative. A significant amount of research has been expended on the dissonance between the narrative closure of Luke (24.50-53) and the narrative opening in Acts (1.6-11). The preface in Acts (1.1-2) presents Acts as a sequel to the earlier volume, a continuation of the story started in Luke, with the closing scene of the first volume serving as the opening scene in the second. This has certain implications on how the implied reader construes plot, characterization, and thematic motifs in Acts; the narrative discourse of Luke establishes a precedence that serves as an analeptic interpretive framework for the implied reader. In addition, per Alexander, use of narrative recapitulation at the beginning of successive volumes is a common mode of discourse for multi-volume Greco-Roman narrative works (1996: 79-82, 89-92). Of course, she also notes that this does not preclude the possibility that Luke was originally conceived as a single-volume work, with the implied author making a decision to add Acts as an afterthought. Evidence of apparent redactional activity by the Lukan implied author, however, points in the direction that the implied author had the composition of Acts in mind when writing Luke. Specifically, the

implied author modifies material from Mark and Q in order to retain the use of material in Acts. The redactional activity includes the false witness concerning the destruction of the temple in Mk 14.58 to Acts 6.14, the suspension of purity law in Mk 7.1-23 to Acts 10, and the abbreviation of the citation from Isa. 6.9-10 in Lk. 8.10b for a much fuller elaboration in Acts 28.16-31 (Marguerat 2002: 47-48).

A couple of other narrative issues provide further stitching of the two volumes. First, the narrative discourse of Luke includes thematic trajectories that do not come to fruition until Acts. For example, the prophetic prediction of Simeon in Lk. 2.25-35 that Jesus would enact the extension of salvation to the Gentiles ('a light for revelation to the Gentiles') is largely unrealized in Luke, as Jesus has minimal interaction with non-Jews. Rather, this prophecy only becomes a reality in the narrative of Acts (Green 1997a: 10): the notation of *soterian tou theou* in Acts 28.28 forms an inclusio with the episode involving Simeon (Lk. 2.34) and transition to the ministry of John the Baptist (Lk. 3.6) (Tiede 1999). Second, the presence of narrative cycles tie Luke and Acts together—beginning, middle, and end (Bal 1985: 19-23): the progression from possibility (Lk. 1–Acts 1), to realization (Acts 2–15), to result (Acts 16–28) is only complete when Luke–Acts is viewed as a whole (Green 1997a: 8-9).

Variation in word usage between Luke and Acts is relatively minor and does not present sufficient grounds to pose a narrative division between Luke and Acts. Indeed, in most instances, the case is fragile. Several examples will suffice. First, differences in Septuagintalisms are a contested issue and some of the LXX stylistic features of Acts are found in other Hellenistic historians (Mealand 1991). Second, the redactional tendency of the implied author of Luke to minimize or eliminate repetitions found in Mark does not obviate the presence of repetition in the narrative discourse (Green 1997b). Intratextual linkages between the four Galilean ministry speeches are an example of this tendency (Spencer 2007). Third, insertion of the narrator into the actual story in Acts is not indicative in-and-of-itself of evidence against Luke–Acts unity. Rather, the first-person narrator likely provides the implied reader with an intertextual link to the Homeric epic—as found in the storm scene of the *Odyssey*, as well as elsewhere in the *Odyssey* (Robbins 1978; MacDonald 1999). The use of the 'we' passages also serves a rhetorical purpose: the implied reader indirectly participates in the Pauline missionary activities, which guides the implied reader to embrace Paul's message and actions (Talbert 1974; Kurz 1993: 111-24; Bonz 2000: 170-73). Further, simply from the standpoint of logical argumentation, inclusion of the first-person narrator in Acts—in contrast

to the use of the omniscient third-person narrator throughout the narrative of Luke—is insufficient evidence to argue against the unity of Luke–Acts. Finally, absence of parables as pedagogical vehicles in Acts is not necessarily evidence of an incoherence in style between Luke and Acts. Rather, the ascension of Jesus brings about—as recognized by the closure of the first volume and beginning of the second—a transformation in the teaching focus to the Lord Jesus Christ.

c. *Theological Coherence: Themes Cross the Volumes*

The argument of Parsons and Pervo against the theological unity of Luke–Acts is, at best, tenuous (1993). They do not specify differences but rather remonstrate against the methodological approach of typical theological investigation, contending that it begins with Luke and then overlays identified themes onto Acts. To begin, there is nothing wrong in building a picture of theological coherence between Luke and Acts by starting with Luke. The findings of those who start with Luke are legitimate. In addition, the reasons Parsons and Pervo cite are not evidence of theological disunity but rather merely a complaint against current theological investigation of Luke–Acts. As with the narrative discourse, there has been a significant amount of discussion involving the theological coherence of Luke–Acts (Marshall and Petersen 1998). Specifically, I.H. Marshall pinpoints five theological themes that overlap Luke and Acts (1999a, 1999b): (1) Jesus as proclaimer and proclaimed; (2) the sending of apostles and witnesses; (3) the prominence of the kingdom and Messiah; (4) discipleship as the appropriate response to the Gospel; and (5) salvation offered to all.

Parsons and Pervo are correct in noting the need to recognize that the mode of reading is both a forward and backward activity (viz., start with Acts when constructing the theological themes of Luke–Acts). However, as Alexander demonstrates (1999b), a retrospective reading of Luke–Acts by the implied reader engenders a number of thematic motifs. Through the lens of the conclusion of Acts 28.16-31, she pinpoints a significant amount of coherence—as demanded from retrospective dependence. In particular, she identifies a number of connections between the conclusion of Acts (28.16-31) and the beginning of Luke (1.1–4.30), which play a key role in the construction of Lukan theology (also, Green 1998, 2005).

d. *Reception History: Late Second-Century Readers and 'First' Readers*

Reception history is the latest challenge to the unity of Luke and Acts. At first pass, the evidence Rowe (2005) and others (Gregory 2003; Parsons and Pervo 1993) cite is quite impressive: it appears Luke and Acts were not

received or read as a unity in the late second century. The problem with the argument is that late second-century approaches to New Testament writings do not answer the question of how the first readers—or the earliest readers—may have circulated and understood Luke and Acts.

Luke T. Johnson posits two gaps in the reasoning of those who draw a direct line between late second-century reception history and the earliest readers of Luke–Acts (2005). To begin, there is little evidence that any New Testament writings were read in the late second century as literary compositions. A methodological approach that searches late second-century writings for evidence of how New Testament writings were seen as literary compositions is flawed. Second, issues facing the late second-century writers to whom Rowe and others refer revolved around the question of what writings should be read in church, versus those that should not be read in church. Specifically, the earliest readers of Luke–Acts would not have approached them as parts of a larger collection of writings but as individual compositions addressed to them—and possibly others—in the present. In contrast, late second-century readers approached New Testament writings as parts of a larger collection written in the past. Johnson explains: 'there is a gap between the authors cited by Rowe and the first readers of Luke–Acts, a gap not only of time, but also circumstance and therefore of perspective' (2005: 160). Indeed, Rowe seems to mesh circumstances facing the first reader—or earliest readers—of Luke and Acts together with those facing the late second-century church: 'It would seem that when we read Luke–Acts together as a single work we have made the hermeneutical choice to focus upon Luke's intention, or the effect generated from reading two volumes together, and given up claim to an understanding of the perception of the text by its early auditors' (2005: 148).

Beyond those that Johnson addresses, a couple of other issues that Rowe raises are problematic. First, in concordance with Parsons and Pervo, he suggests that Luke is self-sufficient on literary grounds; the Gospel is intelligible without Acts (2005: 138-39). This is an argument from silence, and there is significant evidence, as discussed above, of narrative linkages between Luke and Acts. In particular, as Alexander demonstrates, the implied reader of Acts must draw upon various narrative connections and echoes to Luke in order to process the narrative discourse of Acts (1999b). Second, Rowe argues for chronological separation between the two volumes, suggesting that the chronological distance (which he does not specify) gave rise for Luke to be associated with other 'Gospels' prior to the publication of Acts. And because of the distribution and circulation process of documents in Greco-Roman antiquity, Luke would have had

little or no control over the distribution of Acts. Rowe's argument at this juncture is tenuous on a couple of grounds: (1) most scholars find little or no evidence for a chronological rift between the writing of Luke and Acts (Green 1997a: 6-10, 33-46; Green 2002; Moessner 1999) and (2) as noted above, the narrative of Acts assumes the Lukan precursor in a number of places (Alexander 1999b; Green 1996; Spencer 2007). When the different pieces of the puzzle are assembled, and Rowe's approach is dissected, a one-legged stool is revealed. Specifically, he involves just one—namely, 'reader'—of the three components in the tripartite hermeneutical framework of author–text–reader (Moessner 2005). In sum, not only is his 'reader' a late second-century church apologist but the other two legs to the hermeneutical stool—'author' and 'text'—are non-entities in his examination.

Notwithstanding, the above does not invalidate the legitimacy of reading Luke and Acts from the lens of the late second-century church, as parts of the larger New Testament canon (Wall 2002), or even as part of a larger corpus of early Christian writings (Pervo 1995). In particular, the Lukan preface places the Gospel within the context of one or more other gospels, of which the earliest readers were seemingly familiar. As the 'earlier accounts' in question likely encompass Mark (Moessner 1999, 2002; Green 1997a: 6-10; Robbins 1999), assuming a two-source theory, more attention to ways in which the earliest readers would have construed Luke as a re-reading of Mark—and perhaps Q or even an early version of John (Waetjen 2005)—is necessitated.

3. *Consensus, Future Direction*

At various points in the past twenty years, the four bolts holding Luke and Acts together have been unloosened and, in a few instances, removed. Yet, despite inquiries from multiple sides of the issue, the hinge remains bolted. In particular, while the hinge may 'rattle', there are key 'sticking points' in each of the four areas that prevent removal of the bolts. And while the hinge remains seemingly intact, discussion as regards to unity has laid the groundwork for some additional areas of exploration that will play out over the next five to ten years.

a. *Non-LXX Intertextuality*

As regards to genre, there is coalescence around two basic trends: recognition of a weaving of different generic types in Luke–Acts and acknowledgement that there is insufficient evidence to separate both volumes as different genres. In particular, the majority of scholars now place Luke–Acts

within a framework of 'apologetic historical literature', while admitting a likely confluence of different genre types (Phillips 2006). Recognition that the narrative consists of traces of different genres should lead to increased interest in intertextuality with Greco-Roman narratives, with a renewed focus on uncovering new ways of processing individual narratives, as well as the narrative of Luke–Acts at large by the authorial audience (for 'authorial audience', see Rabinowitz 1987). Hence, for example, while the majority of scholars may not agree with MacDonald on the derivation of the framework for the Gospels as a transvaluation of Homer (2003b), they should heed the relevance of understanding how the authorial audience might construe the narrative against the backdrop of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* or even other Greco-Roman narrative.

b. *Intertextual Continuity in Luke–Acts*

Several studies over the past fifteen years identify various intertextual connections between the LXX and the narrative of Luke–Acts (Brawley 1995; Green 1994). However, most concentrate on individual texts and do not examine how intertextual connections and echoes span across Luke and Acts, either forming intertextual unity or disunity. Of course, there are exceptions, and these studies have raised some interesting instances of narrative continuity between Luke and Acts (Brodie 1990, 2000, 2004; Litwak 2005; Alexander 2004).

One of the most interesting areas of exploration is the intersection of Isa. 51.17-23 in the prophecy of Simeon in Lk. 2.34, where 'falling' and 'rising' represents two distinct salvific-historical movements. Bart J. Koet explains: '… just as in Deutero-Isaiah the city of Jerusalem will rise again despite its destruction, so also does Luke believe that the one Israel, though fallen, can yet hope to be raised again based on the experience of salvation history' (1992: 1163). In particular, Simeon's prophecy plays a pivotal role in the conclusion of Acts: the Christological reference to *to soterion* ('salvation') and its extension to the *ethnon* ('Gentiles') by Simeon in Lk. 2.29-32 provides the interpretative 'key' to Paul's concluding words to the Roman Jews—*tois ethnesin apestale touto to soterion tou theou* (Acts 28.28). Consequently, for the implied reader, the intertextual meaning generated in Lk. 2.29-34 stretches to the very end of the narrative in Acts. This certainly fits with the eschatological position of the implied author: the expectation that salvation will be bestowed upon all of the Jewish people at the time of the Parousia.

Another intertextual continuity between Luke and Acts involves the use of Isa. 6.9 in Lk. 8.9-10 and Acts 28.25-27 (Bovon 1995). The implied

author omits the final clause of the citation from Isa. 6.9 in the narrative aside of Jesus' fourth speech of the Galilean ministry (cf. Mk 4.12c: 'lest they should turn again and be forgiven'; Lk. 8.9-10) and then includes it in the closing scene of Acts (28.25-27). In particular, the implied author reverts to the LXX for the citation in Acts 28.27, versus the redactional source of Lk. 8.9-10 (viz., Mk 4.12c): *afiemi* is used rather than *iaomai*. As a result, the implied reader, as part of the process of building consistency and coherence and filling gaps in the narrative, identifies intratextual connections between the closing scene in Acts (28.25-27) and the fourth Galilean speech of Jesus (Lk. 8.4-18). This retrospective activity of intratextual connectivity prompts the implied reader to reevaluate the various Jewish characters and character groups through the four character taxonomies delineated in the fourth speech (Spencer 2007). The result reinforces judgments made by the implied reader about the classification of those characters and character groups, highlighting the division between the Jewish people who fall into the fourth character taxonomy and the Jewish people who fall into the three other character taxonomies.

c. *Ideological Formation: Confirming and Confronting*

Recent research by Balch (1999, 2003), Moessner (1999, 2002, 2004a, 2004b, 2005), among others (Rothschild 2004), that pinpoints—building upon Sterling's initial categorization of Luke–Acts as apologetic history (1992)—connections between Greco-Roman history, as represented by Dionysius, Polybius, and Diodorus, plots an investigative direction towards narrative discourse and ethical and community formation (Penner 2003, 2004a, 2004b). This interpretive turn extends to the use of rhetoric and its reception by the authorial audience—from rhetorical construction in the prologues to the individual speeches to larger segments of narrative (Moessner 1999, 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Parsons 2003; Tyson 2003; Spencer 2007)—and eventually ways in which the rhetorical power of the text confirms, reinterprets, and confronts the ideological frameworks of the authorial audience.

d. *Narrative and Theological Intratextuality*

Admittedly, while a number of the seams and gaps between the narrative of Luke and Acts are questionable, or largely insubstantial, some of them are valid. However, in the case of those that are valid, they are overshadowed by the preponderance of intratextual connections, including instances where Acts presupposes the prior Lukan narrative (Alexander 1999b). In addition, while certain elements in the narrative of Luke reach closure at

the end of the Gospel (24.50-53), there are numerous threads that remain untied, gaps that remain incomplete without the narrative of Acts (Green 1996). Additional studies are needed in both of these areas—'completions' and 'gaps'—and the ways these assist the implied reader, as well as disrupt, in building narrative consistency and coherence.

e. *Reading Mark and Q for Narrative Coherence between Luke and Acts*

Historically, redaction criticism focused on peeling back theological and narrative layers to expose a historical core and on identifying the narrative and theological aims of the implied author. An intersection of redaction and literary criticisms recently took hold in biblical scholarship, including a focus on theological implications (Donahue 1996). In the case of Luke, it is a matter of gaining a better understanding as to how the Lukan implied author reads Mark and Q and how this impacts the larger narrative discourse. In the case of Acts, more investigation is needed in order to determine possible intratextual connections between redactional changes in Luke and theological and narrative concepts in Acts (Witherington 1996).

f. *Intertextual Influence of Luke and Acts on Non-canonical Gospels and Acts*

The past decade has seen a growing level of interest in intertextual connections between the canonical Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles and non-canonical Gospels and Acts. As part of his argument favoring a generic separation of Luke and Acts, Pervo suggested that the non-canonical *Acts of Paul* functions as a sequel to the canonical Acts—with both standing in the genre of the ancient novel (1987; 1995; 2006). While most scholars reject his argument that Acts and the *Acts of Paul* conform to the same generic type, most recognize the validity of the intertextual connections he pinpointed between the two narratives, including the possibility that the *Acts of Paul* was composed as a sequel to Acts (Bauckham 1993). The next step in the intertextual comparison is the examination of similarities and differences between the canonical and non-canonical Acts (Bovon 2003), analysis that will aid in unearthing ways in which the early church interpreted the canonical Acts as well as theological emphases in the non-canonical Acts.

4. *Conclusion*

The debate over unity—or extent of unity—has become the new 'storm center' in Lukan studies (van Unnik 1966). While the 'unity hinge' holding Luke and Acts together remains bolted, the efforts to loosen and remove

the bolts have created some interesting avenues for new exploration. In particular, Lukan scholarship is better off today because of these efforts, and generic, narrative, and theological analysis of Luke–Acts is producing broader and deeper insights as a result.

Bibliography

Alexander, L.C.A.

1986 'Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-Writing', *NTS* 32: 48-74.

1993 *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1* (SNTSMS, 78; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

1996 'The Preface to Acts and the Historians', in Witherington III (ed.) 1996: 73-103.

1998a 'Marathon or Jericho? Reading Acts in Dialogue with Biblical Historiography', in Clines and Moore (eds.) 1998: 92-125.

1998b 'Fact, Fiction and the Genre of Acts', *NTS* 44: 380-99.

1999a 'Formal Elements and Genre: Which Greco-Roman Prologues Most Closely Parallel the Lukan Prologues?', in Moessner (ed.) 1999: 9-26.

1999b 'Reading Luke–Acts From Back to Front', in Verheydon (ed.) 1999: 419-46.

2004 'Septuaginta, Fachprosa, Imitatio: Albert Wifstrand and the Language of Luke–Acts', in Breytenbach and Schröter (eds.) 2004: 1-26.

Argall, R.A., B.A. Bow and R.A. Werline (eds.)

2000 *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International).

Argyle, A.W.

1973–74 'The Greek of Luke and Acts', *NTS* 20: 441-45.

Aune, D.

1987 *The New Testament in its Literary Environment* (LEC, 8; Philadelphia: Westminster Press).

2003 *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville and London: Westminster/John Knox Press).

Bal, M.

1985 *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

Balch, D.L.

1985 'Acts as Hellenistic Historiography', *SBLSP* 25: 429-32.

1989 'Comments on the Genre and a Political Theme of Luke–Acts: A Preliminary Comparison of Two Hellenistic Historians', *SBLSP* 28: 343-61.

1990 'The Genre of Luke–Acts: Individual Biography, Adventure Novel, or Political History?', *SWTJ* 33: 5-19.

1999 'ἀκριβῶς…γράψαι (Luke 1:3): To Write the *Full* History of God's Receiving All Nations', in Moesnner (ed.) 1999: 229-50.

2003 'ΜΕΤΑΒΟΑΗ ΠΟΑΙΤΕΙΩΝ—Jesus as Founder of the Church in Luke–Acts: Form and Function', in Penner and Vander Stichele (eds.) 2003: 139-88.

Bartholomew, C., and J.B. Green and A.C. Thiselton (eds.)

2005 *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation* (London: Paternoster Press; Grand Rapids: Zondervan).

Bauckham, R.
1993 'The Acts of Paul as a Sequel to Acts', in Winter and Clarke (eds.) 1993: 105-52.
Beck, B.E.
1976–77 'The Common Authorship of Luke and Acts', *NTS* 23: 346-52.
Bellinzoni, A.J.
1998 'The Gospel of Luke in the Second Century CE', in Thompson and Phillips (eds.) 1998: 59-76.
Bieringer, R., G. Van Belle and J. Verheyden (eds.)
2005 *Luke and His Readers: Festschrift for A. Denaux* (BETL, 182; Leuven: Leuven University Press).
Bonz, M.
2000 *Past as Legacy: Luke–Acts and Ancient Epic* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).
Bovon, F.
1995 '"How Well the Holy Spirit Spoke Through the Prophet Isaiah to Your Ancestors!" (Acts 28:25)', in *idem*, *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narrative* (trans. Jane Haapiseva-Hunter; PTMS, 36; Allison Park, PA: Pickwith Press): 43-50.
2003 'Canonical and Apocryphal Acts of Apostles', *JECS* 11: 165-94.
2005 'The Reception and Use of the Gospel of Luke in the Second Century', in Bartholomew, Green and Thiselton (eds.) 2005: 379-400.
Brawley, R.L.
1995 *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke–Acts* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press).
Breytenbach, C., and J. Schröter (eds.)
2004 *Dei Apostelgeschichte und hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung: Festschrift für Dr. Plümacher* (AGJU, 57; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Brodie, T.L.
1990 'Luke–Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative', in Richard (ed.) 1990: 78-85.
2000 *The Crucial Bridge: The Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels* (Minneapolis: Liturgical Press).
2004 *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings* (NTM, 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press).
Burridge, R.A.
1992 *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (SNTSMS, 70; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Cadbury, H.
1927 *The Making of Luke–Acts* (London: Macmillan).
Callan, T.
1985 'The Preface to Luke–Acts and Historiography', *NTS* 31: 576-81.
Cancik, H.
1997 'The History of Culture, Religion, and Institutions in Ancient Historiography: Philological Observations Concerning Luke's History', *JBL* 116: 673-95.
Christophersen, A. *et al.* (eds.)
2002 *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J.M. Wedderburn* (JSNTSup, 217; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Clark, A.C.
1933 *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
Clines, D.J.A., and S.D. Moore (eds.)
1998 *Auguries: The Jubilee Volume of the Sheffield Department of Biblical Studies* (JSOTSup, 269; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Darr, J.A.
1998 Irenic or Ironic? Another Look at Gamaliel before the Sanhedrin (Acts 5:33-42)', in Thompson and Phillips (eds.) 1998: 121-40.
Dawsey, J.M.
1989a 'The Literary Unity of Luke–Acts: Questions of Style—A Task for Literary Critics', *NTS* 35: 48-66.
1989b 'Characteristics of Folk-Epic in Acts', *SBLSP* 28: 317-25.
Donahue, J.R.
1996 'The Literary Turn and New Testament Theology: Detour or New Direction?', *JR* 76: 250-75.
Gamble, H.Y.
1995 *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
Green, J.B.
1994 The Problem of a Beginning: Israel's Scriptures in Luke 1–2', *BBR* 4: 61-84.
1996 'Internal Repetition in Luke–Acts: Contemporary Narratology and Lukan Historiography', in Witherington III (ed.) 1996: 283-99.
1997a *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
1997b 'Acts of the Apostles', in Martin and Davids (eds.) 1997: 7-24.
1998 ' "Salvation to the Ends of the Earth" Acts (13:47): God as Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles', in Marshall and Petersen (eds.) 1998: 83-106.
2002 'The Book of Acts as History/Writing', *LTQ* 37: 119-27.
2005 'Learning Theological Interpretation from Luke', in Bartholomew, Green and Thiselton (eds.) 2005: 55-78.
Gregory, A.
2003 *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (WUNT, 2.169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
2005 'Looking for Luke in the Second Century: A Dialogue with François Bovon', in Bartholomew, Green and Thiselton (eds.) 2005: 379-400.
Hawkins, J.C.
1907 *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2nd edn).
Johnson, L.T.
2005 'Literary Criticism of Luke–Acts: Is Reception-History Pertinent?', *JSNT* 28: 159-62.
Keathley, R.H. (ed.)
1989 *With Steadfast Purpose: Essays in Honor of Henry Jackson Flanders, Jr* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press).
Keck, L.E. (ed.)
2002 *New Interpreter's Bible* (NIB, 10; Nashville: Abingdon Press).
Keck, L.E., and J.L. Martyn (eds.)
1966 *Studies in Luke–Acts* (New York and Nashville: Sigler Press).

Koet, B.J.
1992 'Simeons Worte (Lk 2,29-32c-35) und Israels Geschichte', in Segbroeck, *et al.* (eds.) 1992: 1149-69.
Kurz, W.S.
1993 *Reading Luke–Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press).
Litwak, K.D.
2005 *Echoes of Scripture in Luke–Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup, 282; London: T&T Clark International).
Löning, K.
1997 *Das Geschichtswerk des Lukas* (3 vols.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer).
MacDonald, D.R.
1994 'Luke's Eutychus and Homer's Elpenor: Acts 20:7-12 and Odyssey 10-12', *JHC* 1: 5-24.
1999 'The Shipwrecks of Odysseus and Paul', *NTS* 45: 88-107.
2000 'The Ending of Luke and the Ending of the *Odyssey*', in Argall, Bow and Werline (eds.) 2000: 161-68.
2003a 'Paul's Farewell to the Ephesian Elders and Hector's Farewell to Adromache: A Strategic Imitation of Homer's *Iliad*', in Penner and Vander Stichle (eds.) 2003: 189-203.
2003b *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? Four Cases for the Acts of the Apostles* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press).
Marguaret, D.
2002 *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'* (trans. K. McKinney, G.J. Laughery and R. Bauckham; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Marshall, I.H.
1999a ' "Israel" and the Story of Salvation: One Theme in Two Parts', in Moessner (ed.) 1999: 340-57.
1999b *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Gospel Profiles, 3; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 3rd edn).
Marshall, I.H., and D. Petersen (eds.)
1998 *Witness to the Gospel: Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
Martin, R.P., and P.H. Davids (eds.)
1997 *The Dictionary of the Later New Testament and its Development: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press).
Mealand, D.L.
1991 'Hellenistic Historians and the Style of Acts', *ZNW* 82: 42-66.
Moessner, D.P.
1988 'And Once Again: What Sort of "Essence"? A Response to Charles Talbert', *Semeia* 43: 75-84.
1992 'Re-reading Talbert's Luke', in Parsons and Tyson (eds.) 1992: 203-28.
1999 'The Appeal and Power of Poetics (Luke 1:1-4): Luke's Superior Credentials (παρηκολουθηκότι), Narrative Sequence (καθεξῆς), and Firmness of Understanding (ἡ ἀσφάλεια) for the Reader', in Moessner (ed.) 1999: 84-126.
2002 'Dionysius' Narrative "Arrangement" (*oikonomia*) as the Hermeneutical Key to Luke's Re-vision of the "Many" ', in Christophersen, *et al.* (eds.) 2002: 149-64.

2004a ‘ “Completed End(s)ings” of Historiographical Narrative: Diodorus Siculus and the End(s)ings of Acts’, in Breytenbach and Schröter (eds.) 2004: 193-221.
2004b ‘ “Ministers of Divine Providence”: Diodorus Siculus and Luke the Evangelist on the Rhetorical Significance of the Audience in Narrative “Arrangement” ’, in Ringe and Kim (eds.) 2004: 304-23.
2005 ‘ “Managing” the Audience: Didorus Siculus and Luke the Evangelist on Designing Authorial Intent’, in Bieringer, Van Belle and Verheyden (eds.) 2005: 61-80.

Moessner, D. (ed.)
1999 *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke’s Narrative Claim Upon Israel’s Legacy* (Harrisburg, PN: Trinity Press International).

Palmer, D.W.
1993 ‘Acts and the Ancient Historical Monograph’, in Winter and Clarke (eds.) 1993: 1-29.

Parsons, M.C.
1986 ‘Narrative Closure and Openness in the Plot of the Third Gospel: The Sense of an Ending in Luke 24:50-53’, *SBLSP* 25: 201-23.
1989 ‘The Unity of the Lukan Writings: Rethinking the *Opinio Communis*’, in Keathley (ed.) 1989: 29-53.
2003 ‘Luke and the *Progymnasmata:* A Preliminary Investigation into the Preliminary Exercises’, in Penner and Vander Stichele (eds.) 2003: 43-63.

Parsons, M.C., and R.I. Pervo
1993 *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).

Parsons, M.C., and J.B. Tyson (eds.)
1992 *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: American Contributions to the Study of Acts* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Penner, T.
2003 ‘Civilizing Discourse: Acts, Declamation, and the Rhetoric of the *Polis*’, in Penner and Vander Stichele (eds.) 2003: 65-104.
2004a ‘Madness in the Method? The Acts of the Apostles in Current Study’, *CBR* 2.2: 223-93.
2004b *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic History* (ESEC, 10; New York: T&T Clark International).

Penner, T., and C. Vander Stichele (eds.)
2003 *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse* (SBLSS, 20; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Pervo, R.I.
1987 *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
1988 ‘Must Luke and Acts be Treated as One Genre?’, *SBLSP* 27: 306-17.
1989 ‘Must Luke and Acts Belong to the Same Genre?’ *SBLSP* 28: 309-16.
1995 ‘A Hard Act to Follow: *The Acts of Paul* and the Canonical Acts’, *JHC* 2: 3-32.
1999 ‘Israel’s Heritage and Claims upon the Genre(s) of Luke and Acts: The Problems of a History’, in Moessner (ed.) 1999: 127-45.
2006 ‘Direct Speech in Acts and the Question of Genre’, *JSNT* 28: 285-307.

Phillips, T.E.
2006 ‘The Genre of Acts: Moving Toward a Consensus?’, *CBR* 4.3: 365-96.

Phillips, T.E. (ed.)
2005 *Acts and Ethics* (NTM, 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press).
Porter, S.E.
2005 'The Genre of Acts and the Ethics of Discourse', in Phillips (ed.) 2005: 1-15.
Porter, S.E., and T.H. Olbricht (eds.)
1996 *Rhetoric, Scripture, and Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference* (JSNTSup, 131; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Porter, S.E., and D.L. Stamps (eds.)
2000 *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference* (JSNTSup, 180; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Praeder, S.M.
1981 'Luke–Acts and the Ancient Novel', *SBLSP* 20: 269-92.
1984 'Jesus-Paul, Peter-Paul, and Jesus-Peter Parallelisms in Luke–Acts: A History of Reader Responses', *SBLSP* 23: 23-39.
Rabinowitz, P.J.
1987 *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
Richard, Earl (ed.)
1990 *New Views on Luke and Acts* (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier).
Ringe, S.H., and H.C. Paul Kim (eds.)
2004 *Literary Encounters with the Reign of God: Studies in Honor of Robert C. Tannehill* (New York: T&T Clark International).
Robbins, V.K.
1978 'By Land and By Sea: The We-Passages and Ancient Sea Voyages', in Talbert (ed.) 1978: 215-42.
1999 'The Claims of the Prologues and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Prefaces to Luke and Acts in Light of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Strategies', in Moessner (ed.) 1999: 63-83.
Rothschild, C.M.
2004 *Luke–Acts and the Rhetoric of History: Investigation of Early Christian Historiography* (WUNT, 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
Rowe, K.C.
2005 'History, Hermeneutics and the Unity of Luke–Acts', *JSNT* 28: 131-57.
Segbroeck, F., *et al.* (eds.)
1992 *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, II (Louvain: Louvain Press).
Spencer, P.E.
2007 *Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories of the Lukan Galilean Ministry Speeches: Hermeneutical Appropriation by Authorial Readers of Luke–Acts* (LNTS, 341; London: T&T Clark International).
Stanton, G.N.
1997 'The Fourfold Gospel', *NTS* 43: 317-46.
Sterling, G.L.
1992 *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke–Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSup, 64; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Talbert, C.H.
1974 *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke–Acts* (SBLMS, 20; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press).
1989 'Once Again: Gospel Genre', *Semeia* 43: 53-74.

1992 'Reading Chance, Moessner, and Parsons', in Parsons and Tyson (eds.) 1992: 229-40.

Talbert, C.H. (ed.)
1978 *Perspectives on Luke–Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark International).

Talbert, C.H., with P. Stepp
1998a 'Succession in Mediterranean Antiquity: The Lukan Milieu', *SBLSP* 37: 148-68.
1998b 'Succession in Mediterranean Antiquity: Luke–Acts', *SBLSP* 37: 169-79.

Talbert, C.H., and J.H. Hays
1999 'A Theology of Sea Storms in Luke–Acts', in Moessner (ed.) 1999: 267-83.

Thompson, R. P., and T. E. Phillips (eds.)
1998 *Literary Studies in Luke–Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press).

Tiede, D.
1999 '"Glory to Thy People Israel": Luke–Acts and the Jews', in Moessner (ed.) 1999: 21-34.

Tyson, J.
2003 'From History to Rhetoric and Back: Assessing New Trends in Acts Studies', in Penner and Vander Stichele (eds.) 2003: 23-42.

van Unnik, W.C.
1966 'Luke–Acts, a Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship', in Keck and Martyn (eds.) 1966: 15-32.

Verheydon, J. (ed.)
1999 *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (BETL, 112; Leuven: Leuven University Press).

Waetjen, H.C.
2005 *The Gospel of the Beloved Disciple: A Work in Two Editions* (New York and London: T&T Clark International).

Wall, R.W.
2002 'The Acts of the Apostles', in Keck (ed.) 2002: 3-370.

Winter, B. W., and A. D. Clarke (eds.)
1993 *The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting: Volume 1* (The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting, 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Witherington, B., III
1996 'Editing the Good News: Some Synoptic Lessons for the Study of Acts', in Witherington III (ed.) 1996: 324-47.
1998 *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans).

Witherington, B., III (ed.)
1996 *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Witherup, R.D.
1992 'Functional Redundancy in the Acts of the Apostles', *JSNT* 48: 67-86.
1993 'Cornelius Over and Over Again: "Functional Redundancy" in the Acts of the Apostles', *JSNT* 49: 45-66.

Yamada, K.
1996 'A Rhetorical History: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles', in Porter and Olbricht (eds.) 1996: 230-50.
2000 'The Preface to the Lukan Writings and Rhetorical Historiography', in Porter and Stamps (eds.) 2000: 154-72.