

JIMMY MYERS

Luke's Pauline Theology

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*
664

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · Ruben Bühner (Siegen)

James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala) · Christina M. Kreinecker (Leuven)

Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · Janet Spittler (Charlottesville, VA)

J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

664



Jimmy Myers

Luke's Pauline Theology

Mohr Siebeck

Jimmy Myers, born 1991; 2025 Th.D. from Duke University; Senior Post-doctoral Academic Associate at Chesterton House, Cornell University.
orcid.org/0000-0002-1376-2659

ISBN 978-3-16-200559-5 / eISBN 978-3-16-200560-1
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-200560-1

ISSN 0340-9570 / eISSN 2568-7484
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

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

© 2026 Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.

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

The right to use the content of this volume for the purpose of text and data mining within the meaning of Section 44b UrhG (Urheberrechtsgesetz) is expressly reserved.

Printed on non-aging paper.

Mohr Siebeck GmbH & Co. KG, Wilhelmstraße 18, 72074 Tübingen, Germany
www.mohrsiebeck.com, info@mohrsiebeck.com

For Mary Lynn

Preface

I'd like to thank my teachers at Duke, especially those on my dissertation committee, who gifted me with an excellent education and helped me make progress as a scholar in the field of NT studies. With Dr. Mark Goodacre I learned an appreciation for attending to the details of the Synoptic Gospels with an eye toward investigating their relation and witnessed a winsomeness that somehow found a way to combine serious scholarly endeavor with wit, charm, and humor. From Dr. Brittany Wilson I received a rigorous immersion into the history of research on Luke-Acts that first introduced me to the problem animating this project and an excellent model of the craft of teaching the NT to students in an engaging and dialogical manner. From Dr. Ross Wagner I not only received advanced instruction in the Greek language, a wealth of training in Second Temple Jewish literature, and a living example modeling how serious scholarly work can be done with humility and generosity. More importantly, Dr. Wagner showed me what it can look like to teach students with rigor while also caring for them pastorally as well. He showed this care to me often on walks along the Eno River, where the conversation ranged from research matters to personal ones and was always marked by a mutual desire to grow in understanding of scripture. Finally, my supervisor Dr. Kevin Rowe: in an important sense, my education in the NT goes back to him. It was because of a personal meeting with him that I first discovered an interest to study the New Testament and, curiously enough, this fact was as much due to his patient listening, sage advice, and what I gleaned about the character of his life as it was due to his scholarly work. I have learned much over the years from the courses he's offered on the New Testament, his probing research, and conversations with him on his porch. He deserves special recognition, moreover, for helping me find my way in this project, reading every chapter along the way, and providing detailed and instructive feedback. It has been a gift to be supervised by him, for it has meant not only receiving critical engagement on matters of exegetical detail and theological/philosophical viability vis-à-vis the method and thesis, but also a model of how to unite the activity of scholarship with Christian commitment.

Studying at Duke has also involved discovering friendship with keen-eyed peers who have sharpened my thinking and research over the years. Aaron Ebert, Josh Miller, Wilco DeVries, and Joel Archer are among those who have

helped to refine this work by reading and commenting on various chapters. I owe them all many thanks.

Close by Duke, Blacknall Memorial Presbyterian Church has proved to be a stable pole through the ups and downs of a doctoral program. Time worshiping there first under Allan Poole's leadership and now Goodie Bell's has meant being nourished and challenged by scripture afresh each week in a way that academic study of scripture can't quite approximate. Friends like Christian Pikaart, Adrian L'Esperance, and Zach Bond have also sustained me in playful, joyful, and often musical ways while working to complete this project.

To my parents, William and Wendy Myers, and my parents-in-law, William and Kim Alexander, I owe an enormous debt of gratitude. The depth of their support and love is too deep to fathom. I could not be more proud or thankful for all the nurture, formation, gifts, help, and especially presence they have given over these years. The endurance of their commitment and love has always been and remains an inspiration to me.

This book probably would have been completed more quickly without three little girls named Lila, Kitty, and Adele, but such speediness would have had little worth in comparison to the joy they bring to life. It has been one of the unexpected gifts of this season as a doctoral student that I have had the chance to spend the majority of my days managing sibling rivalries and becoming friends with my daughters. That has been some of the hardest and best work I've ever gotten to do.

This work is dedicated to my wife, Mary Lynn. This is because it would not have existed without her. Her dedication to her craft as a writer has made me a better writer and thinker; her assiduous work as a professional has inspired me to pursue this work with attention and diligence; her partnership in parenting has shown me how to balance work and family life well; and her resolve and strong determination to carry on through the changes and chances of life have been a model of endurance for me in this work. Above all, her perceptive intellect and probing enquiries have required me to rethink the arguments I make throughout this project. Thank you, Mary Lynn, for your love and all you have done to support our family in these years. I hope this work is worthy of you and reflects the incalculable gift that our life together is.

Finally, I express my thanks to Tobias Stäbler for accepting this former dissertation for publication in WUNT II and to the excellent editorial staff at Mohr Siebeck, especially Julius Furthtmüller and Jutta Thumm, who helped bring it to press.

Ithaca, NY, May 1, 2026

Jimmy Myers

Table of Contents

Preface.....	VI
List of Abbreviations.....	XIII
 Chapter 1: Introduction.....	 1
<i>A. The Overall Problem of Paul and Luke's Theological Relation.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>B. Four Methodological Concerns.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>C. Procedure and Brief Outline of Chapters.....</i>	<i>7</i>
 Chapter 2: Natural Theology.....	 11
<i>A. Introduction: The Definitional Problem and Guiding Question.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>B. The Problem of Theological Epistemology in Luke and Paul.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>C. Knowing God in Paul.....</i>	<i>16</i>
I. Knowledge and Ignorance of God from Creation.....	16
II. Wisdom's Incapacity and the Spirit's Prerogative.....	20
III. The Mediation of Knowledge through Israelite Apostles.....	23
IV. Concluding Paul on the Knowledge of God.....	27
<i>D. Knowledge of God in Luke.....</i>	<i>28</i>
I. Natural Ignorance of God in Athens.....	28
II. Cultic Futility in Lystra and Paul's Mission of Epistemological Reconciliation in the Speech at Caesarea.....	33
III. The Pneumatic Gift of Knowledge: Israel's Privilege and the Surprise of Gentile Reception.....	36
IV. Concluding Luke's Theological Epistemology.....	41
<i>E. Conclusion: Family Resemblances of Paul, Luke, and Justin</i>	<i>42</i>

Chapter 3: Law.....	49
<i>A. Introduction: The Problem of the Law in Luke and Paul</i>	49
<i>B. Paul on the Law</i>	54
I. The Law in Paul's Dialectical Grammar.....	54
II. Dialectical Contrasts in 2 Cor 3.....	55
III. Dialectical Extremes in Gal 2–4.....	57
IV. The Law and Sin.....	63
V. Concluding Paul's Negation of the Law; Introducing Paul's Affirmation of the Law.....	67
VI. Law-Messiah Synthesis: Law of God, Messiah, Pneuma, Faith, and Mind.....	68
VII. Indifferent, Prohibited, and Required: <i>De Facto</i> Distinctions in Paul's View of the Law and the Retention of Mosaic Norms in the Gentile Mission.....	71
VIII. Concluding Paul on the Law.....	82
<i>C. Luke on the Law</i>	85
I. Israelite Messiah-followers as Keepers of the Law.....	85
II. Luke's Law-observant Lord of the Law.....	93
III. Luke's Exclusive Soteriology and Gentile Law Observance.....	100
IV. Concluding Luke on the Law.....	106
<i>D. Conclusion: Family Resemblances of Paul, Luke, Hebrews, and James</i>	107
I. Hebrews and James on the Law.....	108
II. Paul and Luke's Differences and Resemblances on the Law.....	110
Chapter 4: Christology.....	119
<i>A. Introduction: The Problem of Christology in Paul and Luke</i>	119
<i>B. Paul's Christology</i>	124
I. Jesus' Identity in Paul.....	124
II. The Soteriological Center of Paul's Christology.....	130
III. Concluding Paul's Christology.....	140
<i>C. Luke's Christology</i>	141
I. Jesus' Narrative Identity in Luke and Acts.....	141

II. The Soteriological Center of Luke's Christology.....	130
III. Concluding Luke's Christology.....	154
<i>D. Conclusion: Family Resemblances of Paul, Luke, and John.....</i>	<i>156</i>
 Chapter 5: Eschatology.....	 165
<i>A. Introduction: The Problem of Paul's and Luke's Eschatology.....</i>	<i>165</i>
<i>B. Paul's Eschatology.....</i>	<i>172</i>
I. The Nonoccurrence of the Parousia and Paul's Perduring Expectation.....	172
II. God's Continuous Action in History from Abraham to Messiah to Parousia.....	177
III. Concluding Paul's Eschatology.....	185
<i>C. Luke's Eschatology.....</i>	<i>186</i>
I. Imminent Expectation Together with Historical and Ethical Concern in the Gospel of Luke.....	186
II. The Retention of Near Expectation in Acts.....	195
III. The Character of Luke's Salvation History.....	201
IV. Concluding Luke's Eschatology.....	205
<i>D. Conclusion: Family Resemblances of Paul, Luke, and Mark.....</i>	<i>205</i>
 Chapter 6: Luke – Theological Companion of Paul.....	 213
 Bibliography.....	 219
Index of Ancient Sources.....	231
Index of Modern Authors.....	239
Index of Subjects.....	241

List of Abbreviations

<i>1 Apol.</i>	<i>First Apology</i>
1QpHab	Peshier Habakkuk
1QS	Rule of the Community
<i>2 Apol.</i>	<i>Second Apology</i>
4Q434	BarkhiNafshi ^a
AB	Anchor Bible
<i>A. J.</i>	Josephus, <i>Antiquitates judaicae</i>
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>B. J.</i>	Josephus, <i>Bellum judaicae</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>C. Ap.</i>	Josephus, <i>Contra Apionem</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBR	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CD	Cairo Genizah copy of the Damascus Document
<i>Cels.</i>	Origen, <i>Contra Celsum</i>
CTM	<i>Concordia Theological Monthly</i>
DCLS	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies
<i>Dial.</i>	<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>
EC	<i>Early Christianity</i>
ETL	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
<i>EvTh</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
FTS	Frankfurter theologische Studien
HBT	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
ICS	<i>Illinois Classical Studies</i>
IJST	<i>International Journal of Systematic Theology</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
JAAR	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JSHJ	<i>Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>

JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSPL	<i>Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters</i>
JTI	<i>Journal of Theological Interpretation</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KEK.	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer Kommentar)
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LXX	Septuagint (Pentateuch)
MT	Masoretic Text
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTL	New Testament Library
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OG	Old Greek (non-Pentateuch)
PLJP	<i>Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People</i>
<i>QE</i>	Philo, <i>Questions and Answers on Exodus</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RS</i>	<i>Religious Studies</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Monograph Series
SP	Sacra Pagina
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>Virt.</i>	Philo, <i>De virtutibus</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
<i>ZWT</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie</i>

Chapter 1

Introduction

A. The Overall Problem of Paul and Luke's Theological Relation

This study takes up a classic problem in New Testament studies: whether and how far Luke, Paul's earliest biographer, belongs together theologically with the apostle to the gentiles.¹ The overall argument proposes that, though certainly not identical or even similar on every matter, Paul and Luke share significant theological agreements that should serve to revise the scholarly view which has dominated the field up to this day.

The question of Luke and Paul's historical relation shaped much of the critical research on Acts of the Apostles from the 18th century to the middle of the 20th.² The proximity of their theological perspectives played a role in this phase as well, but it remained ancillary and subservient to the more vexing questions about Luke's companionship with Paul, the dating of Luke and Acts, and Luke's reliability as an ancient historiographer.

But in 1950 the dispute became theologically and hermeneutically focused by Philipp Vielhauer's famous essay "On the Paulinism of Acts."³ Vielhauer compared the views⁴ of the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the letters on four

¹ By "Luke" I mean the author of the Gospel of Luke and Acts of the Apostles. Though my thesis does not depend on the point, I am also persuaded by arguments that the author was a sometime historical companion of Paul, though not necessarily the "Luke" of Philm 23–25, Col 4:14, and 2 Tim 4:11.

² For *Forschungsgeschichten*, see W. Ward Gasque, *A History of the Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989); P. G. Müller, "Der 'Paulinismus' in der Apostelgeschichte: Ein forschungsgeschichtlicher Überblick," in *Paulus in den neutestamentlichen Spätschriften*, ed. K. Kertelge (Freiburg: Herder, 1981), 157–201; and Odile Flichy, "The Paul of Luke: A Survey of Research," in *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Paul's Claim upon Israel's Legacy in Luke and Acts in the Light of the Pauline Letters*, eds. David P. Moessner, et al. (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 18–34.

³ Vielhauer, "Zum 'Paulinismus' der Apostelgeschichte," in *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1965), 9–27.

⁴ Vielhauer, "Zum 'Paulinismus,'" 10, states that his study is "vor allem, wenn auch nicht ausschließlich" limited to Paul's speeches in Acts, but when he broaches the topic of Law he investigates Paul's practical attitude toward the Law in Acts, and when he addresses

distinct topics: natural theology, Law, Christology, and eschatology. What he finally concluded was that “there is not a single specifically Pauline thought to be found” in the author of Acts (*es findet sich bei ihm kein einziger spezifisch paulinischer Gedanke*); that the theology of Acts and Paul stand at an “obvious material distance” (*offenkundige sachliche Distanz*); and that Luke’s “Paulinism” consisted solely in his “zeal for the universal mission to gentiles and in his veneration for the greatest missionary to gentiles” (*Eifer für die universale Heidenmission und in seiner Verehrung für den größten Heidenmissionar*). Vielhauer pithily summarized his result in this way: “The author of Acts is in his Christology pre-Pauline (*vorpaulinisch*), in his natural theology, concept of law, and eschatology, post-Pauline (*nachpaulinisch*).” As this last quotation intimates, Vielhauer ultimately drew from his theological investigation the historical conclusion that Luke stood not “within earliest Christianity but in the nascent early Catholic church.”⁵

The textured history of research and discussion after Vielhauer need not detain us here, since it is sketched for each of the four topics in the subsequent chapters. It suffices to say that, to this day, leading scholars in the guild continue to maintain this position regarding Luke’s nonconformity with Paul’s theology, and for similar reasons, in both general introductions to the New Testament as well as specialized studies of Pauline and Lukan theology. In Bart Ehrman’s oft-reprinted and revised introduction, he and Hugo Méndez argue that Paul and Luke stand in considerable disagreement on significant matters of teaching. The reasons given to support the claim about their theological distance are, first, the different postures each takes toward the Law, and, second, the different views each presents regarding pagan knowledge of God.⁶ The result is that Luke’s account fails to give its readers access to an accurate “understanding of Paul.”⁷ Because of important differences over positions on Law and natural theology, in other words, readers look in vain for a reliable interpretation of Paul and his theology in Luke’s account.

Similar moves appear in Luke Timothy Johnson’s widely respected introduction. Important chronological differences between Paul and Luke stand in the foreground of Johnson’s discussion of Luke’s presentation of Paul, but the putative divergences over Paul’s characteristic activity and theology lead Johnson to conclude that “Luke-Acts contains little of what is distinctively Pauline

eschatology he widens the scope to include Luke’s eschatological view more broadly, not just the eschatological statements of Paul in Acts.

⁵ For the quotations in the preceding two sentences, see Vielhauer, “Zum ‘Paulinismus’,” 26. Richard Hays wryly wonders how “an author who ‘no longer stands within earliest Christianity’ could have a ‘pre-Pauline’ Christology.” See Hays, “The Paulinism of Acts, Intertextually Reconsidered,” in *Paul and the Heritage of Israel*, 35–48, quote on 35n2.

⁶ Bart D. Ehrman and Hugo Méndez, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*, 8th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2024), 343–44.

⁷ Ehrman and Méndez, *The New Testament*, 345.

theology.”⁸ As with Ehrman and Méndez, the different postures toward the Law, Paul's relation to Judaism and Jerusalem, and natural knowledge of God are, among other considerations, significant reasons adduced to display the problem and buttress Johnson's conclusion.

Research within Pauline and Lukan studies also carries forward the dominant view in the field. Sometimes the viewpoint is taken to be so obvious that it is asserted without argument. In his final book on Paul, for instance, E. P. Sanders claimed that the “comparison of Acts and Paul often shows that Luke was not omniscient about Paul's activities and that he had very little understanding – if any – of Paul's theology.”⁹ Sanders offers a thick discussion to support his claim about Luke's knowledge of Paul's activities, but feels no need to do so vis-à-vis Luke's understanding of Paul's theology. It is simply a given. This is also the case in Terrence Callan's book on dying and rising with Christ in Paul. Without anything more than a passing reference to Vielhauer's piece, he writes, “It is generally agreed ... that the presentation of Paul's theology in Acts does not conform very closely to the information provided by Paul's own letters.”¹⁰

It is therefore difficult to dispute Joseph Tyson's assessment that Vielhauer's “work has been influential on a generation of Acts scholarship.”¹¹ Tyson himself admits the ongoing pertinence of Vielhauer's reading for his own interpretation of Lukan theology, arguing that it is especially “the theme of the community's fidelity to Jewish traditions and practices that is most problematic for us. ... In my judgment the employment of this theme in Acts creates a characterization of Paul that distances him from his letters.”¹² For Tyson, the postures Luke takes and has Paul take toward the Law simply do not conform with Paul's rejection of the Law in his epistles; Luke is not a guide for understanding Paul's theology but for understanding how anti-Marcionite Christians responded to a Marcionite use of the Pauline letters.

Other Lukan scholars like Daniel Marguerat are more critical of aspects of the regnant view, but nonetheless admit its basic contention on the basis of Paul's and Luke's differences over Law and Christology. Marguerat writes that “the positions set forth by [Paul and Luke] regarding the Torah cannot be superimposed. Vielhauer is correct: the acuity of the debate regarding the validity

⁸ Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010), 219.

⁹ E. P. Sanders, *Paul: The Apostle's Life, Letters, and Thought* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 56.

¹⁰ Terrance Callan, *Dying and Rising with Christ: The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2006), 2.

¹¹ Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 64.

¹² Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 68.

of the law is no longer Luke's concern. The Christology of Acts is not at all that of Paul, which is focused on the cross."¹³

Thus, if the present-day consensus of the guild is anything to go by, it appears we must resign ourselves to admitting that Paul is Paul, Luke is Luke, and, with respect to Paul's views about natural theology, the Law, and Christology, hardly, if ever, the twain do meet.

To be sure, aspects of this interpretation have received a considerable amount of criticism over time. Among the arguments made in commentaries, articles, and book chapters, many of which are engaged in the main chapters of this study, a monograph by Stanley Porter, collected essays of Daniel Marguerat, and the relatively recent volumes *Reception of Paulinism in Acts* and *Paul and the Heritage of Israel* stand out for mention.¹⁴ Sundry important criticisms, revisions, and advances have been made in works such as these. Some like Daniel Marguerat and Christopher Mount have even called for the abandonment of comparing Luke and Paul head-on. Marguerat considers the differences in genre and rhetorical occasion too great to permit a comparison between Luke's and Paul's convictions, while Mount finds such comparisons shackled to what he considers a fictional construct stemming from Irenaeus' pen "intended to produce a particular interpretation of early Christianity."¹⁵ As the editors of the 2012 volume *Paul and the Heritage of Israel* put it, "Paul's relation to Luke's writings is still disquieting and debated as ever, reeling in new generations of scholars and teachers alike."¹⁶

Notwithstanding this, the consensus view of the guild remains firmly in place.¹⁷ Several things could account for this state of affairs, but in my estimation one of the more important reasons is that the foundational comparative proposal nourishing the dominant view has never received comprehensive testing in the field in a single, extended work. There have been countless appraisals and reappraisals of Paul's and Luke's theology separately and shorter studies that compare Paul and Luke on one or two theological topics. But not once in

¹³ Daniel Marguerat, *Paul in Acts and Paul in His Letters*, WUNT 310 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 2–4.

¹⁴ Stanley Porter, *The Paul of Acts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999); Daniel Marguerat, *Paul in Acts and Paul in His Letters*; Daniel Marguerat, ed., *Reception of Paulinism in Acts* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009); David P. Moessner, et al., *Paul and the Heritage of Israel: Paul's Claim upon Israel's Legacy in Luke and Acts in the Light of the Pauline Letters*. (London: T&T Clark, 2012).

¹⁵ Mount, "Paul's Place in Early Christianity," in *Paul and the Heritage of Israel*, 90–114, quotation from 114. For Marguerat, see *Reception of Paulinism in Acts*, x.

¹⁶ David P. Moessner, with D. Marguerat, M.C. Parsons, and M. Wolter, "The Legacy of Paul in Acts – A 'More Complete and Inhabitable' New Testament?" in *Paul and the Heritage of Israel*, xvi.

¹⁷ It is interesting that the consensus view remains in place vis-à-vis Luke and Paul, even though it has begun to shift with respect to the relation of Mark and Paul. See John van Maaren, "Is the Gospel of Mark Distinctly Pauline? A Critical Evaluation," *JBL* 143 (2024): 125–42.

the past seventy years has the generation-influencing comparison of Luke's and Paul's theology, and the reasons given in support of its conclusion, received critical engagement at its root. This is a key reason why I decided to restrict this study to re-examining Paul and Luke on the four topics of natural theology, Law, Christology, and eschatology. Not only are these significant topics for any comparison in New Testament Theology; as the previous discussion of the current consensus view indicates, they continue to function as the pillars buttressing the ruling interpretation of Luke's theological distance from Paul. Put differently, in order to test the firmly established consensus position, nothing less will do than to examine the structure upon which the edifice stands. But that means beginning once again at the beginning and re-opening the fundamental question of the proposal that gave birth to the regnant scholarly reading in the first place: with respect to natural theology, Law, Christology, and eschatology, do Paul and Luke belong together theologically?

B. Four Methodological Concerns

Four concerns are worth articulating as a way of making clear my approach in this project. First, and very briefly, this study does not engage in any of the chronological questions that attend investigations into Luke and Paul's relation. This is not because I consider these to be unimportant, but because the chronological and theological questions are distinct and my interest is focused on the latter aspects of the problem.

Second, with respect to the question animating this study, it is important to underline that it is indeed a real *question*: the thick descriptive and concluding comparative work of each chapter depended for their force and significance on the possibility that the study may have ultimately concluded in agreement with the leading interpretation in the field. Of course, like any self-aware researcher, I brought a hypothesis loaded with a past theological and social formation with me to the project. But throughout I tried my best to remain susceptible to the grain of Paul's and Luke's theological grammar. Had the investigation pushed in the direction of arguing that Paul and Luke are only distantly related on these four theological topics, then I think we would need to admit the point. In other words, I consider it methodologically crucial that hypotheses, as essential as they are to scientific studies, remain vulnerable to the pressure that the phenomena exert in their textured and comprehensive manifestation. The point of emphasis in this study thus lies on in-depth exegesis of the works of Paul and Luke, as well as of a few other early Messiah-followers, in pursuit of testing hypotheses and answering the overall question.

This leads nicely to the third methodological concern. One of the critical contentions of this study is that theological comparisons of Paul and Luke have not infrequently been marked by an injudicious selection of data within both the Pauline and Lukan set that has contributed to skewing the results of the

investigation. For instance, researchers turn almost exclusively to Romans 1 and Acts 17 when they ask the question about the relation between Paul's and Luke's natural theology. Likewise, many centralize Paul's negative construal of the Law in certain passages in Galatians, Philippians, and Romans when discussing Luke's and Paul's view of the Law. On the other hand, the purview for discerning Luke's theological convictions has too often been restricted primarily to Luke's redaction, or the speeches he places on character's lips, or the narrative of the Gospel or Acts alone.¹⁸ Such a procedure is unnecessarily reductive and methodologically questionable. If what we are after is discerning the theological proximity of Paul and Luke – writers whose theology is represented by the totality of their work – comparing some parts of the former with some parts of the latter will not suffice. Something more comprehensive is in order: comparing the *whole* of the topic-pertinent data in Paul's seven undisputed letters to the *whole* of the topic-pertinent data in Luke and Acts.¹⁹ This makes the task more complicated and unwieldy, for it involves synthesizing theological arguments of occasion-specific Pauline letters which in some cases evince theological development over time, and paying attention to minute details as well as larger narrative patterns in both Luke and Acts.²⁰ But anything less would be susceptible to the dangers of tendentious selectivity which can function to stack the deck in favor of particular hypotheses from the start. Some measure of selectivity will always attend any study conducted by finite creatures, of course, but some of the risks of selection can be warded off by seeking to incorporate the widest possible range of evidence in the investigation. Hence, the overall question for our study becomes more specific: Do Paul and Luke showcase significant theological belonging when all the topic-pertinent data of Paul's occasional, discursive letters are juxtaposed with all the topic-pertinent data of Luke's two-book narrative?

The fourth methodological point concerns the nature of comparative projects such as this one. Put simply, in order to compare the theological convictions of Paul and Luke, I will not only examine Paul and Luke, but also bring in other early Messiah-followers into the picture. This will allow me to discern similarity/difference with greater nuance and texture by asking basic questions of the evidence: What convictions do all the figures hold in common? What convictions are distinctive of each? Do Luke and Paul share perspectives that

¹⁸ Some studies of this question continue to examine the Pauline character of the Lukan Paul's speeches. E.g., Armin Baum, "Paulinismen in den Missionsreden des lukanischen Paulus: Zur inhaltlichen Authentizität der Oratio recta in der Apostelgeschichte," *ETL* 82 (2006): 405–36.

¹⁹ With no prejudice against 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus, the study will accept the standard critical delimitation of Paul's authentic letters in order to examine the consensus view from within its own presupposed data set, and to make it harder, rather than easier, to corroborate my hypothesis.

²⁰ See Beverly Roberts Gaventa, "Towards a Theology of Acts: Reading and Rereading," *Int* 42 (1988): 146–57.

are not shared by others? Does Luke share perspectives with other figures that he does not share with Paul? Does Paul share perspectives with other figures that he does not share with Luke? In a word, I will look at Luke and Paul within the wider “familial” matrix of early Christianity to see if they look more alike with respect to certain features than either one of them does vis-à-vis other family members. They may not be identical or even fraternal twins, and their features may not overlap and crisscross on every point, but if they show themselves to be siblings, and siblings who share important, distinguishing marks which set them apart from others, then these need to receive their due and be marked out accordingly. And the converse is true as well: what Luke shares with others and does not share with Paul, and what Paul shares with others and does not share with Luke, needs to receive its due.

Each chapter ends, therefore, by synthesizing the views of Paul and Luke in relation to at least one other early figure: Justin Martyr in the chapter on natural theology; Hebrews and James in the chapter on Law; the Gospel of John in the chapter on Christology; and the Gospel of Mark in the chapter on eschatology. Ideally, every early Messiah-follower with views relevant to the topic would have been incorporated into the discussion, but constraints of space required restricting the comparative scope. The selections I made, however, were either required by the subject matter (e.g., in the case of natural theology, no other early Messiah-follower besides Justin shows extended reflection on questions of theological epistemology); or were intended to be representative of some of the range of views within early messianist communities (e.g., in the case of Law, Matthew’s and Mark’s Gospel should arguably receive discussion, but James’ and Hebrews’ perspectives represent the range between Matthew and Mark relatively well); or seemed to me to be the right choices (e.g., John for Christology; Mark for eschatology). In every case, the goal was to select figures based on their fittingness for the topic who would not make it easier to make my case, but instead more difficult.

C. Procedure and Brief Outline of Chapters

The four main chapters proceed along the same line. First the problem is introduced, then the history of research on the question is sketched, and then the question guiding the discussion is articulated. This is followed by a global inquiry into Paul’s and Luke’s perspectives that relate to the question. Finally, the discussion is synthesized by incorporating the convictions of at least one other early Messiah-follower, and through comparative discernment a decision is reached as to the proximity/distance of Luke and Paul on the topic. This procedure is broken only once in the first chapter, where a brief discussion of the term “natural theology” is given at the start in order to clarify the nature of the investigation.

Chapter One discusses natural theology, ultimately concluding that, when Justin Martyr is brought into the comparative picture, Paul's and Luke's resemblances to each other with respect to four theological-epistemological features – the role of the *pneuma*, the tethering of theological epistemology to cultic practice, the epistemological primacy and centrality of Israel, and, finally, the exclusively polemical appeal to creation as God's witness – draw them together and make them stand out from Justin in a striking way.

Chapter Two takes up the classic question of the place and function of the Law in the theology of Paul and Luke, proposing that with the help of Hebrews' view of the Law, on the one hand, and the letter of James, on the other, both Luke's difference from Paul on certain points *and* resemblance to Paul on other points become discernible. The chapter argues that Luke lacks and is dissonant with Paul's negation of the Law and his interpretation of its relation to sin. It further proposes that Luke configures the relation of righteousness and Law observance more like James and less like Paul and Hebrews. But it maintains that Luke and Paul nevertheless display notable resemblances to each other in the way they connect the Law and the Messiah/*pneuma* together; emphasize the *de facto* Law observance of those possessed by the *pneuma*; place the problem of the Law specifically in the context of the gentile mission; expressly reject circumcision as an entry requirement for gentiles and as something that delivers eschatological life; and, finally, retain a differentiated place for Law observance for Israelites and gentiles, respectively, enjoining gentiles to observe especially those laws that have to do with loving and worshipping God.

Chapter Three probes Paul's and Luke's Christology. Incorporating the Gospel of John into the conversation yields a nuanced conclusion: on some matters John and Paul resemble each other more closely (preexistence and quantity of references to/qualitative prominence of Jesus' atoning death); on some matters Luke looks more like John (identification of Jesus as "the son of the human" and incorporation of Jesus' earthly activity in the saving event); and on some matters Luke and Paul come into greater resemblance (*kyrios* Christology, Davidic messianism, and the soteriological center of gravity). However, the consideration that the resurrection constitutes the central soteriological event in Paul's and Luke's Christology, but not in John's (or Mark's), ultimately leads me to argue that Paul's and Luke's Christological convictions showcase greater proximity on this subject than has been recognized hitherto.

Chapter Four completes the main examination of the study by considering eschatological matters. It argues that, as much as a dialectic between imminent expectation and historical duration exists in Paul and Mark, it also appears in Luke. But Luke and Paul also evince greater resemblances to each other than either does to Mark in the way that the eschatological perspectives of the former give greater attention to the salvation history leading up to and stemming from the Messiah event. While not identical, it is ultimately significant that Paul and Luke, and not Mark, display a concern to narrate the eschatologically charged historical movement existing between Jesus' resurrection and the

parousia and emphasize that rejection of the eschatological gift in the past is not decisive for turning in the future.

The concluding chapter ties the investigation together, proposing that, while Paul and Luke are dissonant on some matters, hold things commonly with other Messiah-followers on other matters, and display distinction from each other and other early Messiah-followers on still other matters, the convictions they share with each other – which are not commonly held among early Messiah-followers – are qualitatively significant. Insofar as these are perceived, they should lead to a fundamental reconsideration of the relation of Paul's and Luke's theology.

Index of Ancient Sources

Old Testament

Genesis

17 72

Exodus

20:14 97

22:27 93

Leviticus

12 72

17–18 105

19:18 79–80, 99–100, 109

Deuteronomy

5:18 97

6:4 77–78, 100, 126

6:5 98

6:13 98, 106, 144

6:16 98

8:3 98

10:12–13 76

10:16 76

10:20 76

15 100

24:1–4 96–97

25:4 78

2 Samuel

7 30, 142

Psalms

82:6 156

Isaiah

1:3 44

45:22–23 127

65:1–3 44

66:1 89

Jeremiah

31:33 21

Ezekiel

4:14 90

Daniel

7:13 147

Joel

3:4 198

Wisdom of Solomon

13 14fn9, 47fn104

13:6 30fn58

1 Maccabees

2:41 95fn96

2 Maccabees

4 74

Jubilees

1:23 76fn56

22:16 91

50:12 95

New Testament

<i>Matthew</i>		4:8	106, 144
11:27	44	4:16	96
		5:14	98
<i>Mark</i>		6:1–5	94–95
1:2–3	208	6:6–11	96
1:15	206, 208	7:50	101
1:44	208	10:21–24	36
2:25–26	208	10:25–37	99–100
4:11–12	208	11:37–52	98
7:6–7	208	12:35–48	186–88
7:10	208	13:15–16	96
8:18	208	16:16–17	98
9:1	206	16:18	97
10:3	208	16:19–31	98
11:17	208	17:20–18:8	189–91
12:10	208	18:20–30	100
12:26–27	208	19:10	146–47
12:28–34	208	19:11–27	188–89
13:7–35	206–7	21:5–36	191–95
13:7	206	22:19–20	148, 150
13:8	206	23:41	99
13:10	206, 208	23:45	148
13:13	206	23:47	99
13:20	207	23:56	96
13:29	207	24:39–40	145
13:30	206–7	24:52	144
13:32	207		
14:9	208	<i>John</i>	
14:27	208	1:1–4	156, 158
14:61–62	206	1:4–14	159
		1:14–18	156, 158
<i>Luke</i>		1:29–34	158
1–2	37	1:41	158
1:6	85	1:49	158
1:18–20	85	2:11	159
1:32–33	142	3:13	156
1:35	143	3:18–19	160
1:43	144	4:34	158
1:68–70	101	5:18	156
2:11	101	5:19–30	158
2:22–24	86	5:22–23	157
2:25–32	87, 101	5:24–25	160
3:22	98	5:26–27	156, 160
4:1	98	6:38–40	158, 160
4:4–12	98	6:53	157
4:7	144	6:56	160

6:63	159	11:1–18	91
7:28–29	158	11:28	200
7:39	160	13:38–39	101–102
7:42	158	13:47–49	203
8:12–14	159	14:15–18	34, 92
8:58	156	14:22	153
10:15	158	15	102, 203
10:29	157–58	15:1–5	103
10:30–33	156	15:8–11	104
10:38	156	15:17–29	104
11:23–26	160	16:3	92
11:50–52	158	16:4	105
12:31–33	159–60	16:19–24	203
12:44–45	158	16:30–31	101
14:10	156, 158	17	6, 14–16
14:15–20	160	17:2	92
14:28	157	17:16–34	28–33, 92
15:3–4	160	17:28	34–35, 45
15:13	158	17:30–31	199
17:3–5	156	17:33	149
18:14	158	18:6–8	203
19:28–30	158	18:18	92
20:17	158	19:8	203
20:28	157	19:23–41	203
		19:26	92
<i>Acts</i>		20:16	92
1:6–8	196	20:28	149
1:11	197	21:21	92
2:17	152, 197	21:24–26	92
2:20	198	21:25	105–106
2:33	152	22:3	92
3:19–21	198	22:12	92
3:20–21	154, 199	22:17	93
4:12	101	23:3–5	93
4:31–33	152–53	23:6	93
5:1–11	203	24:11	93
5:30–31	151	24:14–15	93
6:1–6	203	24:15	199–201
6:13–14	88, 90	24:17	93
7:5–53	88–90, 202	24:21	93
7:44	89	24:25	199
7:53	90	25:8	93
8:12–24	203	25:23–26:29	35–36
9:5	154	26:4–5	93
10–11	102	26:22	200, 203
10:13–15	90	27:10	200
10:19–48	91	27:23	93
10:20	91	28:24	203
10:25–26	106, 145	28:25–28	203

Romans

1	6, 14–16
1:1–4	129
1:5	182
1:18–32	16–18
2:14	20
2:26–29	21
3:20	65–66
3:21	70
3:22–25	134
3:27–4:25	70
3:31	70
4:11–16	180
4:14–15	65–66
4:24–25	136
5:6–10	134
5:10	136
5:13	65–66
5:20	65
6:14	65
7:1–6	65–66
7:7	66
7:8–10	67
7:8	66
7:10–13	67
7:10	67
7:12	68–69
7:14–23	69–70
7:14	69
7:24	70
7:25	69
8:2–4	66
8:2	69
8:3	70, 125
8:7–9	70
8:19–25	20
8:23	139
9–11	180
9:1–5	25, 180
9:6–8	180
9:10–13	180
9:24–30	181
10:4	70
10:5–8	70
10:9	136
10:14	23
11:2–7	180
11:14	183

11:20	181
11:21–23	181
11:25	183
11:26	181
11:28	181
11:29–32	181, 183
12:2	184
13:8–10	80
13:8	80
13:11–14	173, 184
14:2	73
14:3	73
14:5–6	73
14:8	73
14:14	73–74
14:20	73
15:3	130
15:8–12	130, 181
15:18–24	183
15:18	183
15:27	182

I Corinthians

1:17–29	21
1:18	137
1:24	137
2:2	133
2:3–4	133
2:5–16	22
7:17–19	72–74, 111
7:18	74
7:29–31	72, 173
8:4	77
8:4–6	126
8:6	78, 125
8:9–11	138
8:10	78
9:8–12	78–79
9:11	79
9:14	79
9:15	79
9:19–23	50
9:21	71, 74
10:4–9	125
10:14–22	78
10:28–29	78
11:3	128
12:2	19
15:13–19	135

15:20–28 128
 15:23 182
 15:43–45 137
 15:50–54 185
 15:56 65
 16:22 173

2 Corinthians

3:1–17 56–57
 3:18 138, 184
 4:4 126
 4:16 138
 5:1 176
 5:15 136
 5:17 138
 11:23 140
 13:4 137

Galatians

1:8 61
 1:16 183
 2:11–14 74–75
 2:14–3:4 57
 2:15–16 57–58
 2:18–21 132
 2:19–20a 58
 2:21–3:1 132
 2:21b 58
 3:2–5 58
 3:6–29 59
 3:12 70
 3:13 133
 3:16 178
 3:19–20 60
 3:19 64
 3:20 61
 3:21 61, 67
 3:22 61, 64
 3:22–4:2 62
 4:8–10 19, 24, 62
 4:14 61
 4:21–29 178–79
 4:21 60, 70
 5:2–6 62, 75
 5:3 74
 5:6 72
 5:11 76, 133
 5:14 73, 79
 5:24–25 133

6:2 70
 6:12 75, 133
 6:14 133
 6:15 72

Philippians

1:19–24 176
 1:22 177
 2:5–11 125–26
 2:10–11 127
 3:2–9 68
 3:20 177
 4:5 177

Colossians

4:14 1

1 Thessalonians

1:9–10 24, 174
 4:5 19
 4:9–11 176
 4:13–18 174
 4:13 174
 4:14 174
 4:15–16 175
 4:17 175
 5:2–5 175
 5:6–8 175

2 Timothy

4:11 1

Philemon

23–25 1

Hebrews

1:1–2 108
 2:1–2 108
 3:7–4:11 108
 7:12 108
 7:14 108
 7:18–19 108
 8:13 109
 9:19 108
 10:1 109
 10:9 109
 11:4 109
 11:7 109

<i>James</i>		2:10–13	110
1:25	109	2:14–24	110
2:8	109		

Dead Sea Scrolls

<i>Community Rule</i> (1 QS)		<i>Damascus Document</i> (CD)	
4	37fn78	A 8.14–18	26fn50
5	76fn56	2	39fn83
8	39fn83	4:20–5:12	97fn104
		10:22–23	94fn94
<i>Commentary on Habakkuk</i> (1QpHab)		11:16	95fn96
2.7–10	39fn84		
7:2–5	39fn84	4Q246	142n81
11:13	76fn56	4Q434	76fn56

Ancient Authors

Augustine		<i>Enchiridion</i>	
<i>City of God</i>		31.1	20fn29
6–8	11		
8.10	31	Herodotus	
<i>Epistulae</i>		<i>Historiae</i>	
40.4–6	53fn20	2.104	74n51
Clement of Alexandria		Josephus	
<i>Stromateis</i>		<i>Antiquitates judaicae</i>	
1.19	31	4.233	79fn65
5.76.1	32fn65	12.125–126	24fn44
Cicero		12.5	95fn96
<i>De Natura Deorum</i>		12.276	95fn96
1.61	20fn29	20.17–96	76fn58
Dio of Prusa		<i>Contra Apionem</i>	
<i>Oratio</i>		2.79	24fn44, 76fn58
12.27	28	2.258	24fn44, 76fn58
Epictetus		Justin Martyr	
<i>Diatribai</i>		<i>I Apology</i>	
1.9.5	45fn101	5	43
		31	42, 44
		33	42
		44	43

46	42–43		
49	44	Philo	
53	44		
63	42, 44	<i>De virtutibus</i>	
		20.102–3	76fn58
2 <i>Apology</i>			
10	43	<i>Questions on Exodus</i>	
13	45	2.2	76fn56
<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>		Plato	
1–8	45fn100	<i>Apologia</i>	
47	105fn118	20E–21B	18
93	44		
		<i>Phaedo</i>	
Juvenal		118A	18
<i>Satirae</i>		Plutarch	
14.96–106	76fn58		
		<i>Moralia</i> 1034B	32fn65
Lucian			
<i>De Gymnasiis</i> 19	29fn54	Seneca	
		<i>Epistulae</i>	
Marcus Aurelius		41.3	32fn65
		65.12	45fn101
<i>Meditations</i>		90.29	45fn101
12.26	12.26	92.1	45fn101
		95.47	20fn29
Origen		95.48	32fn65
<i>Contra Celsum</i>		Tacitus	
5.25	76fn58		
5.41	76fn58	<i>Historiae</i>	
6.3	46fn102	5.5.2	24fn44, 76fn58

Index of Modern Authors

- Anderson, Paul 158
- Barclay, John 21, 24, 71, 79, 171
- Barth, Karl 12, 129
- Barrett, C. K. 123, 153
- Baur, F. C. 49–52, 82–83, 111, 113
- Beker, J. C. 171
- Blomberg, Craig 88, 93
- Boakye, Andrew 139
- Boccaccini, Gabrielle 103fn116
- Bock, Darrell 122
- Bousset, Wilhelm 157
- Bovon, François 200
- Bruce, F. F. 198–99
- Buckwalter, H. Douglas 122
- Bühner, Ruben A. 54fn23
- Bultmann, Rudolf 121, 157–58, 166, 170–71
- Callan, Terence 3
- Campbell, Douglas 17fn23, 170–71
- Capes, David 127
- Carroll, John T. 169–70, 187, 194–95, 198
- Clivaz, Claire 146
- Cohen, Shaye 74, 77
- Conzelmann, Hans 88, 155, 165–66, 168, 186, 192, 197, 199
- Cousar, Charles 135
- Crabbe, Kylie 169, 200
- Creed, J. M. 121
- Cullmann, Oscar 170
- Davies, W. D. 50
- De Boer, Martinus 60, 79–80, 170, 177–78
- Dibelius, Martin 14
- Dodd, C. H. 121
- Donaldson, Terence L. 77
- Downing, F. G. 113
- Drane, John 79
- Dunn, James D. G. 77, 124–25, 128, 170, 173, 177
- Ehrman, Bart 2–3, 148–50
- Eisenbaum, Pamela 74
- Emden, Rabbi Jacob 74
- Esler, Philip 52
- Fitzmyer, Joseph 94
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin 122
- Francis, F. O. 169
- Fredriksen, Paula 24, 53, 72, 76
- Gaston, Lloyd 56
- Gathercole, Simon 146
- Gaventa, Beverly 153, 169–71, 179, 195
- Gorman, Michael 137, 139
- Grässer, Erich
- Green, Joel 151, 153, 193
- Grindheim, Sigurd 85–87
- Haenchen, Ernst 166, 168
- Harnack, Adolf von 50, 74, 121
- Hauck, Marion Christian 123
- Hays, Richard 2fn5, 60, 122, 129, 143, 146, 170
- Hiers, R. H. 169
- Hodge, Caroline Johnson 77
- Horton, Dennis 153
- Hübner, Hans 60
- Hurtado, Larry 24, 125, 127
- Jantsch, Torsten 123, 149
- Jervell, Jacob 52, 74, 88, 90, 106, 114
- Jewett, Robert 173
- Johnson, Luke Timothy 2–3
- Käsemann, Ernst 132, 157, 166, 168, 170–71
- Kirk, J. R. Daniel 122, 143–44, 145, 155
- Klinghardt, Matthias 52

Künneth, Walter 136

Longenecker, Bruce 170, 182

Longenecker, Richard 173–74

Maaren, John van 4fn17

Maddox, Robert 91, 169, 193

Malherbe, Abraham J. 173

Marcus, Joel 207

Marguerat, Daniel 3–4, 113

Martyn, J. L. 60, 79–80, 170, 177–78

Mason, Steve 53, 68, 82–83

Maston, Jason 170

Mattill, A. J. Jr. 169, 199, 201

Mendez, Hugo 2–3

Moffit, David 151

Mount, Christopher 4

Norden, Eduard 14

Novenson, Matthew 129

Oliver, Isaac W. 52, 90

Overbeck, Franz 14, 113

Pascal, Blaise 13

Porter, Stanley 4

Proctor, Mark A. 135

Räisänen, Heikki 54, 60, 65, 69

Radl, Walter 199

Rowe, C. Kavin, 22, 29, 31, 122, 141,
144

Rudolph, David 74

Salo, Kalervo 52, 96

Sanders, E. P. 3, 24, 52, 55, 57, 60, 77,
174

Sandnes, Karl Olav 54fn23, 102

Schmiedel, Paul 14

Schnackenburg, Rudolf 198

Schneckenburger, Matthias 14

Schweitzer, Albert 14, 50, 53, 60, 74

Sebond, Raymond 11

Seifrid, M. A. 90

Smith, R. H. 169

Stendahl, Krister 26fn47, 53, 170–71

Strauss, Mark 142

Talbert, Charles 169

Tan, Rachel 139

Thiessen, Matthew 52, 74–75, 77, 91,
102

Tomson, Peter 74

Tyson, Joseph 3

Vielhauer, Philipp 1–3, 14, 50–52, 82–
83, 111, 113, 115, 119–22, 132, 138,
141, 152, 155, 165–67, 170–71, 182,
186, 201

Wagner, J. Ross 26

Weiss, Johannes 120–21

Wendel, Jason 52

Wilson, Benjamin R. 123, 148, 150

Wilson, Brittany E. 30, 122, 145–46

Wilson, Stephen 94, 96–97, 169, 195

Wolter, Michael 123, 169–70, 186, 191,
193

Wittgenstein, Ludwig 16

Wrede, William 53–54, 120, 170

Wright, N. T. 170

Zeller, Eduard 14

Index of Subjects

- Abraham 59–61, 63, 88–89, 177–80
- Adam typology 125–26, 143
- addressees, of Romans 64fn36
- adoptionism, 119–22, 141–42, 155
- adultery, *see* divorce
- allegory 60
- almsgiving 98–99, 110
- angels 60–61
- Apologists 42
- Aratus 31
- Areopagus speech 15–16, 28–33
- Asclepius 18, 44
- Athenians 28–33, 43, 46
- atonement 134, 148–50
- authority 78

- blood 149
- book of nature 11

- Caesareans 35–36
- center of theology, 67, 83, 131, 151, 155, 158, 161–63
- Christology 4–5, 119–24, 213–14
- children of Abraham 59
- chronology 2, 5
- circumcision 21, 51, 63, 72–76, 86–87
 - of Timothy 111
- commandment 72, 77–79
- comparison 4–7, 16, 42, 213
- consensus view 2–5, 213
- consistency 53
- context, epistolary 57
- cosmic powers 62, 69, 75
- covenantal continuity 51, *see also* new covenant
- creation's testimony 18, 20, 30, 34, 41
 - and gentile worship of the gods 47
- cross, theology of 120, 122, 124
- cult, *see* worship

- David 94–95

- davidic messianism 129, 142–43, 158, 162
- day 173
- death before parousia 174
- decatalogue 56, 68, 100
- Decree, Apostolic 105–106, 116
- development in Paul 176
- dialectic in Paul 54–55, 60, 68–69, 71, 85
- disagreement, intracanonical 113
- divorce 96
- Docetism 157, 178
- docetic redaction 150
- dying and rising with Christ 139–40, 152–54, 160–61

- election 26, 180–81, 183
- Elizabeth 86
- Epicureans 32
- epispasm 72–73
- epistemology, *see* Knowledge of God
- epistemological crisis 27
- eschatology 2, 5, 165, 214
 - contingent articulation of ~ 172–73
 - and ethics 175–76, 186–89, 194, 198–99, 207–8
 - and history 166–72, 186–89, 206, 208
 - and ignorance about timing 176, 206–7
 - inaugurated, but incomplete 137–39, 152, 154, 172, 189–90
 - and flexible fervency 177, 187–95, 207–8
 - realized ~ 166–67, 172
 - *see also parousia*
 - *see also salvation history*
- ethnicity 24, 77

- faith 101, 109
- family resemblances 7, 42
- flesh v. spirit 58, 60, 69, 75–76, 84, 157, 178–80, 185
- freedom 49–50, 69, 78–79, 94, 109–110

Frühkatholizismus 168

fulfillment 79–80

generation 193–94

genetic connection to God 143

Gifford Lectures 13

glory 56

God, *see* theos

god of Delphi 18, 44

halakha 95–97

hermeneutical implications 215–18

Hermes 33

Hellenizers 74

hierarchy, in God 128, 145–46, 157

historical relation 1–2, 216–18

historiography 167–68

hostility, internecine 84

hypothesis testing 5

idealized human figures 143–45, 155

identity, Jesus' 124

idolatry, *see* polylatreia

ignorance of God, 18–20, 29, 36, 38

images 28, 31–32, 77

imitation of Christ 153

– *see also* participation

incarnation 131, 158

infancy narratives 85–87

Jerusalem 192–93

Judaism 3, 49

judgment 199

justification, *see* righteousness from faith

kerygma 23–24, 30, 151

kerygmatic intention of Acts 196–97

knowledge of God 2, 11–12, 213

– from creation, 16–20, 27, 30, 26, 47

– and gentiles 23–24, 29, 42–44, 46

– and human wisdom 21–22, 27

– and human testimony 23, 27–28, 38–

– among Israel 24–27, 38–41, 44, 46

– partial ~ 43

– in Socrates 18, 43

– and the Spirit 22, 36–37

– and worship 14–15, 18–20, 31–32

– *see also* natural theology

kinship with God 35

– *see also* natural theology

Kyrios, God and Jesus 126, 144, 157, 162

law 2–6, 214–15

– and its aim of life 67–68

– and association of Israelites and gentiles 91

– death to the ~ 58

– divine origin of ~ 60–61, 86

– and eschatological life 59, 61

– regarding food and festivals 73–75, 90–91

– functions of the ~ 62, 64

– and gentile observance 52, 75–81, 84, 104–106, 116

– and the gentile problem 115

– indifferent laws within the ~ 72–75

– and Israelite observance 52, 74–75, 83–84, 88–93, 116

– and Jesus' teaching in Luke's Gospel 94–100

– as Lord 65–66

– moral and ritual ~ 68

– as norm 71–72, 108

– Paul's observance in Acts 92–93, 105–106

– Paul's reclamation of ~ 70

– of priestly descent 108–9

– as prophetic writings 108

– and relation with Messiah, faith, pneuma 58–59, 67–71, 79, 84, 85–88, 98, 111, 114–15

– and sin 64–67

letter and spirit 56–57, 81–82

light 35–36, 41

logos 42–43, 45, 156

Lord 95

love 73

Lystrans 34

Maccabeans 74

marriage 173

– *see also* divorce

mediator 61

Melchizedek 108

mission

– among Israel and gentiles 183, 209–10

– the eschatological motivation for ~ 197–98, 206–7

– eschatological realization through ~ 198–99

- and witness to the parousia 199–200
- modernity 49
- monolatrea* 76–78, 81, 126–28, 144–45
- Mary 86–87
- mercy, acts of, *see almsgiving*
- Moses 42–43, 56, 61, 89
- mysticism 34
- narrative context 6, 28
- narrative identity 122, 130, 141
- natural reason 20–21, 27–28, 36
 - *see also* natural theology
 - *see also* wisdom
- natural theology 2–6, 11, 15–16, 27–33, 47, 213
 - in Augustine 11
 - in the Bible 13–16
 - meaning of ~ 12
 - in Pascal 13
 - in Raymond Sebond 11
 - in Thomas 13
 - *see also* knowledge of God
- new covenant 56–57, 109
- occasion, epistolary 57, 64
- Parisian Condemnations of 1277 13
- parousia 167–68, 191–201
 - and imminent expectation 169, 186, 193–201, 205–6, 208
 - and historical interim 189–90, 192, 195–96, 206–8
 - nonoccurrence of ~ 169, 175, 208
 - timing of ~ 187–88, 196, 206–7
- participation in Christ 123, 138–40, 152–54, 160–61
 - *see also* resurrection
- Paulinism 1–2, 49
- Paul within Judaism 50, 53, 73–75, 83–84, 214
- Pharisees 94
- Plato 42, 45
- pneuma 22, 36–37, 42–43, 45, 69, 81–82, 87, 93, 104, 117, 184–85
 - *see also* flesh v. spirit
- poets 31–32
- polylatreia* 20–21, 24, 27, 34, 38, 41, 47
 - in biblical law 77, 106
 - *see also* worship
 - *see also* theological relation
- pre-existence 119, 124, 146, 156, 161
- procedure 7
- promise/fulfillment 182, 201–2, 208
- prophets 39, 41
- rejection and restoration 202–5, 208
- realized eschatology, *see* eschatology
- repentance 30, 32, 34, 198
- resurrection
 - centrality of 131, 135–40, 151, 155, 163–64, 214
 - and the emergence of the eschaton 136–38, 152
 - and mystical participation in Christ 138–40, 152–54
- righteousness
 - from faith 51–53, 57–59, 63, 84, 109, 112
 - from Law observance 85, 112
 - and salvation 101–102, 110
 - from works 110
- Sabbath 94–96
- sacrificial food 78, 126
- salvation 50–51, 100–104, 183
 - *see also* righteousness
- salvation history 88, 167–72, 201–5
 - from Abraham to the Messiah 177–82, 202
 - between resurrection and parousia 182–85, 202–3
 - and Luke's orientation toward restoration 203
- seed 178
- selectivity 5–7, 16
- sent, from God 158
- shema 77, 126
- sin, as cosmic power 66–67, 69
- Sinai 56, 80, 83
- Socrates 43
- Solomon 89
- solution to plight 57–60
- son of the human/man 95, 146–47, 156, 187, 190
- sophia, *see* wisdom
- speeches in Acts 121–22
- Spirit, *see* pneuma
- spirits 37
- Stephen 88–90
- Stoics 32
- subordinationism 155
- superstition 29

- Temple 87–90
- Temple curtain 148
- theology of the cross 131–34, 147–50, 158–59
- theological epistemology, *see* knowledge
- theological relation 1–5, 215–16
- Theos* 156, 161–62
- transformation 184

- union with Christ, *see* participation
- unknown God 29–30

- wisdom 21–22, 36, 45
 - Christology 125
 - *see also* natural reason
 - *see also* natural theology
- worship 18–20, 24, 27, 32–33, 34, 38
 - and gentile observance of the Law 76–78, 106
 - of Jesus 126, 144–45, 157
 - knowledge of God tethered to ~ 45–46
 - *see also* monolatrea
 - *see also* polylatrea

- Zechariah 85–86
- Zeus 31–33