

1. THE CHURCH'S OLDEST WITNESSES FOR ACTS AND ITS AUTHOR

When is Acts first mentioned, either by the naming of its author or through a verbal citation? It was once thought possible to show in this way that by the end of the first century Acts was already an authoritative document of the Church. Its composition would then lie considerably earlier. We shall first consider such 'quotations' and then discuss the explicit references to Acts and its author.

I. The earliest document said to make use of Acts is the *First Epistle of Clement*¹:

(a) First there are two passages which are linked by their use of the word *place* (τόπος) with Acts 1.25: 'that he might go to his own place.' These are I Clem. 5.4: 'Peter, who . . . , having borne witness, has gone to the place of glory which befits him', and 5.7: 'After he [Paul] had borne witness before the governors, he departed this world and was received into the holy place.' But in fact Acts was not the model here. It is simply a matter of a familiar image of edifying language, which can be used in various connections, as in the following related passages: Ignatius *Magn.* 5.1: 'and since each man will go to his own place'; Polycarp *Phil.* 9.2: 'all these are in their rightful place beside the Lord'; Hermas *Sim.* IX 27.3: 'their place is with the angels'.

(b) At I Clem. 2.2: 'and there was a full outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon all', K. Bihlmeyer² recalls Acts 2.17: 'I shall pour forth of my spirit on all flesh' (quoted from Joel 3.1). This peculiar expression is however too far removed from the Lucan thought and wording to justify the assertion of a use of Acts.

(c) There is a strikingly exact coincidence between I Clem. 18.1: 'God said, I have found a man after my heart, David the son of Jesse; him I have anointed with eternal mercy,' and Acts 13.22: 'I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after my heart.' Both link up Psalm 89.21 ('I have found David'), I Samuel 13.14 ('a man after his heart')³ and II Samuel 23.1 ('David the son of Jesse'; so also Psalm 72.20). However, we need not think

¹ Harnack dates it between 93 and 95, Knopf to 95 or 96, Molland to 96, Kümmel between 80 and 90. See Harnack, *Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Euseb.*, I, 255; R. Knopf, *Hdb. z. NT*, Suppl. 1920, 43; E. Molland, *RGG*³ I, 1837; W. G. Kümmel, *Einleitung in das NT* 1965², 125 (ET 1966, 304).

² Karl Bihlmeyer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, Part I 1924, 156.

³ Here LXX renders the word שׂוֹאֵל by ἀνθρώπος.

of a borrowing from Acts. Luke continues with the words 'who shall do all I will', from Isaiah 44.28 LXX, while Clement completes the sentence with words from Psalm 89.21: 'him I have anointed with eternal mercy'¹. Moreover the composite quotation stands in each case in a quite different and self-contained context. Acts brings out God's pleasure in David, but Clement emphasizes that even the pious David was a sinner who had to sue for mercy. Finally it is unlikely that Clement waited until the moment of writing to the Corinthians before assembling in his mind the men who had won God's approbation (μεμαρτυρημένοι). More probably, in this list, as elsewhere, he was taking over an item of tradition, in which the same composite quotation as in Acts appeared. According to A. Loisy and L. Cerfaux this is explained by the use of a 'book of testimonies'.²

(d) One might claim I Clem. 2.1: 'rather giving than taking', as a quotation of Acts 20.35: 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.' However, as shown in the commentary on this passage, both texts simply make independent use of the same Greek proverb. Luke regards it as a saying of Jesus, but no such claim appears in I Clem. 2.1.

(e) Bihlmeyer³ has drawn attention to the similarity between I Clem. 59.2: 'who has called us from darkness into light', and Acts 26.18: 'that they may turn from darkness to light' (cf. Isaiah 42.7, 16). The position of this expression in Clement's great final prayer shows that what we have here is a liturgical formula. Luke uses it as part of the utterance of the exalted Lord.

II. The next Christian writer we have to consider is IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH⁴:

(a) We have already dealt, under I(a) above, with the relation between Ignatius *Magn.* 5.1 and Acts 1.25.

(b) Ignatius *Smyrn.* 3.3: 'after the Resurrection he ate and drank with them as a man of flesh', corresponds with Acts 10.41: 'we who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.' As Loisy rightly remarks (op. cit., 8), this correspondence nevertheless does not prove any dependence of Ignatius on Acts, especially as he quotes immediately before, in 3.2, an extra-canonical gospel. All we can say is that both Ignatius and Acts are here following a relatively recent tradition (produced in opposition to Docetism).

(c) Still less convincing is the supposed link (through the use of the 'wolf'-idea) between Ignatius *Phil.* 2.2: 'for many wolves, who feign trust-

¹ Here LXX, in accordance with the Hebrew, reads, 'with holy oil' (ἐλαίῳ). Only MS B offers the spiritualizing ἐλέει.

² Alfred Loisy, *Les Actes des Apôtres*, 1920, 7; Lucien Cerfaux, 'Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre des Actes', in *Aux sources de la Tradition chrétienne. Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel*, 1950, 43-51 (references to testimony books, 46, 48f.).

³ Bihlmeyer, op. cit., 156.

⁴ Harnack (op. cit. 406) dates his letters 110-17 but adds 'perhaps . . . 117-25'. H. W. Bartsch (*RGG*³ III, 665) sets the martyrdom of Ignatius soon after 110.

worthiness', and Acts 20.29: 'I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you.' Metaphors of the shepherd, wolf and flock are standard components of early Christian edificatory language (cf. Matt. 7.15 and John 10.11ff.).

III. Perhaps the third place should be allotted to the author of the *Second Epistle to Timothy*¹: the sufferings and persecutions mentioned in 3.11 as endured by Paul 'at Antioch, Iconium and Lystra' seem to refer to Acts 13.50 and 14.5,19. But the mention of Timothy's mother Lois and grandmother Eunice in II Tim. 1.5, and of Onesiphorus in 1.16 (quite apart from the persons named in 4.10-21!), suggests that the author is probably making use of a legendary tradition concerning Paul.² But another opinion is held by Conzelmann, *Hdb. z. NT*, 13³, 4.

IV. Neither can the *Epistle of Barnabas*³ vouch with certainty for the use of Acts:

(a) The beginning of 5.9: 'but as he was choosing his apostles who were to declare his message', certainly recalls the text of D (not simply the 'Western' text) in Acts 1.2. But the resemblance is not close enough to prove dependence. The word ἐκέλευσεν is lacking in Barnabas, and no form or variant of the Western text (see the commentary on this verse) has the μου, following 'message', which would correspond with the text of Barnabas. Moreover it can be shown that D here offers a secondary reading within the Western text.

(b) By calling the Son of God him 'who will judge the quick and the dead', Barnabas 7.2 recalls Acts 10.42: 'judge of the quick and the dead'. But what we see here is two different forms of a very old kerygmatic formula: the verb-form in Barnabas (as also in II Tim. 4.1, I Peter 4.5, Hegesippus *apud* Euseb. *H.E.* III 20.4, and in the Apostles' Creed) and the substantive in Acts—as in Polycarp *Phil.* 2.1 and II Clem. 1.1.

(c) Barnabas 16.2 quotes Isaiah 66.1, 'Heaven is my throne', also found in Acts 7.49. But the concordant idea—the rejection of the Temple—is differently motivated and linked with different OT verses: in Barnabas with Isaiah 40.12 ('Who hath . . . meted out heaven?'), in Acts with Isaiah 66.2 ('What manner of house will ye build unto me?'). Windisch convincingly argues that Barnabas was quoting 'in substance from a testimony book' (*Hdb. z. NT*, Suppl., 314f.).

(d) As for Barnabas 19.8, see V(b) below.

¹ According to W. Schmithals (*RGG*³ V, 147) to be dated about 150. The older dating in Jülicher-Fascher, *Einleitung in das NT*, 7th ed., 1931, 186 (ET *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 1904): about 115.

² Dibelius, *Hdb. z. NT* Vol. 3, II 1913, 196: 'in a genuine epistle of Paul we would be suspicious to find . . . no mention of the vicissitudes shared by Paul and Timothy (Acts 16 & 17).' Similarly *Hdb.* 13³, 89.

³ Written in 130 or 131 (so Harnack, *op. cit.*, 427); R. Schütz (*RGG*³ I, 880): second century; Kümmel (*Einleitung* 355; ET 340): soon after the middle of the second century.

V. The *Didache*¹ reminds us of Acts in two places:

(a) *Didache* 9.2 and 10.2 call Jesus $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ θεοῦ, as in Acts 3.13,26 & 4.27, 30. This is an application of an old tradition² corresponding to the 'liturgical formula of late Judaism',³ 'David thy servant'. The formula 'through thy servant Jesus' has nothing to do in the *Didache* with the idea of the suffering Messiah.

(b) *Didache* 4.8: 'thou shouldst have everything in common with thy brother and not say that it is thine own', derives, as the parallel in *Barnabas* 19.8 shows ('thou shouldst have community with thy neighbour in everything and not say it is thine own'), from a source on which both writings have drawn, an earlier version of the doctrine of the two ways. The reasoning which follows in both *Barnabas* and the *Didache* pertains likewise to this origin. Acts 4.32: 'no one said that any of the things he possessed was his own', is connected with these passages only inasmuch as it depicts the fulfilment of the injunction and can therefore lay no claim to priority.

VI. We now come to the '*Shepherd of Hermas*'⁴:

(a) *Hermas Sim.* IX 27.3 has already been discussed under I(a) above.

(b) *Hermas Sim.* IX 28.2 employs the formula 'suffer for the name of the Son of God' (as a variant of which we have 'on account of the name' in IX 28.3, 5, 6). Thereby it recalls Acts 5.41: 'to suffer dishonour for the Name'; 9.16: 'for my name's sake'; 15.26: 'hazarded their lives for the name'; and 21.13: 'to die for the name'. But this is no borrowing; it is simply a common Christian figure of speech.

VII. There are many correspondences of detail between Acts and the *Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians*⁵:

(a) There is a strikingly close resemblance between *Polycarp Phil.* 1.2: 'whom God hath awakened, loosing the pangs of Hades', and Acts 2.24: 'whom God raised up, having loosed the pangs of death'. Both are variants of an old kerygmatic formula, liturgically amplified. This is evident from the variations in detail.

(b) We have already discussed, under IV(b) above, the formula 'judge of the quick and the dead', which appears in *Polycarp Phil.* 2.1 and Acts 10.42.

(c) With its introductory formula, 'mindful of what the Lord has said, teaching . . .', *Polycarp Phil.* 2.3 recalls Acts 20.35: 'to remember the words of the Lord Jesus', but also II Clem. 17.3: 'let us remember the commandments of the Lord'. But the content of the injunctions of Jesus, introduced by

¹ Harnack (op. cit. 438) dates it broadly 131-160; E. Molland (*RGG*³ III, 242) 'about the middle of the second century'.

² J. Jeremias, *ThWb* V, 705, lines 11ff. (ET 707, lines 15f.).

³ Id., 698f. (ET 700f.).

⁴ Dates proposed: Harnack (op. cit. 266f.): -110-140; Dibelius (*Hdb. z. NT*, Suppl., 423f.): -120-130, but in *RGG*² II, 1822, between 120 and 140.

⁵ Dates proposed: Harnack (op. cit. 388): -110-154; von Campenhausen (*RGG*³ V, 449): chapters 13f. about 110, chapters 1-12 'a much later second letter'.

this flexible formula, is very different in Polycarp *Phil.* 2.3 and Acts 20.35. On the other hand, the continuation in Polycarp is in much closer agreement with I Clem. 13.1f.¹ In R. Knopf's judgment², both Polycarp and Clement are perhaps dependent on some 'lost apocryphal collection'.

(d) As the parallel I Clem. 17.1 (the prophets 'announcing the coming of Christ') makes clear, the agreement between Polycarp *Phil.* 6.3: 'the prophets, who announced beforehand (προκηρύξαντες) the coming of our Lord', and Acts 7.52: 'the prophets which shewed before (προκαταγγείλαντας) of the coming of the righteous one', is explained by the fact that here we have a τόπος, which can be variously formulated, of the first coming of Christ.

(e) We have already dealt, under I(a) above, with Polycarp *Phil.* 9.2 and its connection with Acts 1.25.

(f) Polycarp *Phil.* 12.2 includes the clause 'who are under heaven', which has its counterparts in Acts 2.5 and 4.12. The expression is also found in Col. 1.23. It derives from LXX Eccles. 1.13 and 3.1. It is therefore very improbable that Polycarp is here quoting Acts.

(g) In the same section, 12.2, appears the expression 'lot and part'. It is a positive counterpart to the negative 'neither part nor lot' in Acts 8.21 (cf. Col. 1.12), which is formed on the model of Deut. 12.12 and 14.27,29—so there can be no question of quotation here.

(h) Finally 12.2 ('*det vobis . . . partem inter sanctos suos*') recalls Acts 20.32: 'to give the inheritance among all them that are sanctified', and 26.18: 'to receive . . . inheritance among them that are sanctified'. One may say that here we have a variable formula (also present in Col. 1.12) for which Deut. 33.3f. supplied the material: 'all the saints . . . an inheritance for the assembly of Jacob'.

The conclusion therefore is that Polycarp, despite the numerous echoes, did not use Acts as a source, but that both he and the author of Acts were working with a stock of contemporary formulae held largely in common.

VIII. *The Second Epistle of Clement*³ offers four passages which Bihlmeyer⁴ connects with Acts:

(a) 1.1 has 'judge of the quick and the dead', as has Acts 10.42. See IV(b) above.

(b) II Clem. 4.4: 'and we must not fear men, but rather God', certainly resembles Acts 4.19: 'whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God', and, still more closely, 5.29: 'We must obey God rather than men'. But 'the idea that one must obey God rather

¹ W. Bauer, *Hdb. z. NT*, Suppl., 286.

² R. Knopf, *Hdb. z. NT*, Suppl., 64.

³ Dates proposed: Harnack (op. cit. 448f.):—130–170; Knopf (*Hdb. z. NT*, Suppl., 152):—120–50; E. Molland (*RGG*³ I, 1838): 'from the middle of the second century'.

⁴ Bihlmeyer, op. cit. 158.

than men is a widespread commonplace¹—cf., for example, I Clem. 14.1. The present verse is at least as strongly influenced by the idea expressed in Matt. 10.28, i.e. 'fear not men, but fear God'. We may not therefore assert a quotation from Acts.

(c) II Clem. 13.1 is too far removed from Acts 3.19: Clement speaks of our throwing off our sins by our own efforts: in Acts it is God who blots them out.

(d) In the words σωτήρα και ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας II Clem. 20.5 seems linked with Acts 3.15: ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς and 5.31: ἀρχηγὸν και σωτήρα. As Heb. 2.10: ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας shows, we are here dealing with an elastic figure of speech characteristic of sub-apostolic, Hellenistic edificatory language. It cannot therefore be proved that Clement's second epistle actually quotes Acts.

IX. Eusebius has not transmitted to us any sayings of PAPIAS² alluding to Luke's Gospel and Acts. According to Jülicher, he probably withheld the judgment of Papias from us because 'it offended his feeling for the Church' (Jülicher-Fascher, 312). But there remains the other possibility, that Papias said nothing about the two documents because he knew nothing of them. Certainly Papias mentioned persons who appear in Acts, e.g. Judas, Justus Barsabbas³. But it is clear that he was reaching back to other traditions than those offered in Acts. In any case, his silence on the subject precludes his recognition of Luke's work.

X. Not until JUSTIN MARTYR⁴ can a knowledge and use of Luke's two works be established.

(a) *Apol.* I 39.3, speaking of the twelve Apostles as ἰδιῶται, λαλεῖν μὴ δυνάμενοι is strongly reminiscent of Acts 4.13: ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοι . . . και ἰδιῶται. But this coincidence does not offer convincing proof when taken by itself.

(b) Similarly, *Apol.* I 49.5, where the Gentiles, hearing the gospel from the Apostles, are said to be 'filled with gladness', seems to allude to Acts 13.48: 'And as the gentiles heard this they were glad.'

(c) But the first decisive reference is *Apol.* I 50.12. This first quotes the substance of Luke 23.49a in recapitulating the story of the Passion, next makes clear use of Luke 24.25, 44f. as the account continues, and finally narrates the Ascension and the conferring of the Holy Spirit with a verbal echo of Acts 1.8: δύναμιν . . . λαβόντες corresponding to λήμψεσθε δύναμιν in Acts.

¹ Knopf, *Hdb. z. NT*, Suppl., 65.

² Dates proposed: Harnack (op. cit. 357):-140 (145)-160; E. Bammel (*RGG*³ V, 47): 'about 130/140 A.D.'; second third of second century; Jülicher-Fascher (256):-about 150.

³ As we are told by Eusebius, *H.E.* III 39.9; on Judas, see 160 below.

⁴ Harnack (op. cit. 284) dates the *Apology* and the *Dialogue with Trypho* between 150 and 160; C. Andresen (*RGG*³ III, 891): about 180.

(d) Consequently we may perhaps attribute the mention of θεός ἄγνωστος (*Apol.* II 10.6) to the influence of Acts 17.23.

This survey shows two things. First, until the middle of the second century Acts was not yet considered an authoritative book to which one might appeal.¹ But to this negative conclusion a positive one must be added: the supposed borrowings from Acts in writers from Clement of Rome to Polycarp demonstrate that the edificatory language of the sub-apostolic period was familiar to the writer of Acts and readily employed by him. Acts breathes the very spirit of this age. But why then was this work not earlier acknowledged as a book of the Church? The only answer is that, unlike the gospel, it had no 'life-situation' in the Church at all. In Acts the Christian reader encountered a book unlike any he had previously known, and one which was neither necessary nor customarily used in preaching or instruction. Only because of its connection with the third gospel, then, was Acts allowed to cross the threshold of the Canon.²

XI. This step was taken a generation after Justin. In the struggle waged by IRENAEUS³ against gnosticism, Acts proved immediately useful: from it one could demonstrate the unity of the apostolic message—and for this purpose it was copiously quoted by Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* III, 12.1–15). Now we are even presented with statements, eagerly repeated in years to come, about the author of Acts:—Luke was a 'sectator Pauli' and 'wrote into a book the gospel Paul preached.' (*Adv. haer.* III, 1.1). Irenaeus offered no backing for this assertion; we may suppose it derives from those Pauline passages where the Apostle speaks of 'his gospel'⁴. That Luke was Paul's inseparable collaborator in spreading the Gospel, Irenaeus proves from the 'we' passages in Acts. The fact that Luke there withholds his own name shows only that he was modest. In II Tim. 4.10f. and Col. 4.14, Paul himself affirms that Luke was 'always associated with him and inseparable from him' (*Adv. haer.* III, 14.1). Finally, Irenaeus took the idea that Luke had been the 'disciple and companion of the Apostles' from Luke 1.2: 'eyewitnesses . . . have delivered unto us.' (*Adv. haer.* III, 10.1; 14.2).

The tradition about Luke which Irenaeus outlined in this way contains nothing which he could not have read out of Luke's two-volume work. There is no trace of any knowledge of Luke from independent sources.

¹ Cf. M. Dibelius, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*, ed. H. Greeven, 1951, 127f., 80 (ET *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, 1956, 147f., 89. Future references will be given to the English translation only.) Harnack's judgment is in fact even more sweeping: ' . . . so far as we know, the Acts of the Apostles was hidden in obscurity up to the time of Irenaeus (even taking into account the writings of Justin and the Gnostics) . . .' (*TLZ* 53 (1928) 126). In our opinion, Harnack has undervalued Justin's quotations.

² Wendt, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 9th ed. 1913, 48.

³ W. Eltester locates his main work c. 180 (*RGG*³ III, 891). The relevant references here are *Adv. haer.* III, 1.1; 10.1; 14.1–4.

⁴ E.g. Rom. 2.16. Eusebius (*H.E.* III, 4.6) was of course the first to discuss Paul's 'gospel' at any length.

The so-called Anti-Marcionite Prologues are neither an organic unity nor in fact anti-Marcionite in character.¹

¹ A word is needed here on the so-called Anti-Marcionite Prologues. In 1928 Dom Donatien de Bruyne made the assertion that three Latin gospel-prologues were anti-Marcionite ('Les plus anciens prologues latins des Évangiles', *Revue Bénédictine* 40, 195–214). When, save for a few points of difference, A. von Harnack allied himself to this view ('Die ältesten Evangelienprologe und die Bildung des NTs', in *SBA* 1928, 320–41), even scholars like Jülicher and Lietzmann considered the theory as good as proved. Opposition was not however entirely lacking: refutations were offered by M.-J. Lagrange (*Rev. Bibl.* 38 (1929), 115–21) and B. W. Bacon (*JBL* 49 (1930), 43–64; cf. his article in *JTS* 23 (1922), 134–60), while among others who demurred were W. F. Howard ('The Anti-Marcionite Prologues to the Gospels', *Exp. Tim.* 47 (1936), 534–8), R. M. Grant (*AngThR* 23 (1941), 231–45) and R. G. Heard (*JTS* 56 (1955), 1–16). Jürgen Regul's recently published Bonn dissertation, *Die antimarcion. Evangelienprologe* (Herder, Freiburg 1969), has confirmed and expanded our results (p. 269).

The theory's point of outset is anything but brilliant. After twenty years of research de Bruyne had found in 31 Latin manuscripts ranging from the fifth to the fourteenth century, prologues to Mark, Luke and John which he considered anti-Marcionite. Only six of the manuscripts included all three prologues; 21 others (among them the oldest) included only the prologue to Luke. De Bruyne does not mention what other prologues appear in these 31 manuscripts—it is certainly not unknown for a gospel to be introduced by more than one.

De Bruyne assumed that Marcion had issued his version of the NT (i.e. Luke plus ten Pauline epistles) with prologues for the epistles, which prologues were therefore of his own making. Thereupon the Roman community riposted with a Catholic edition of the NT containing four gospels and ten 'or probably thirteen' Pauline epistles. In doing so—without noticing the fact—it simply took over Marcion's prologues to the epistles, and supplied further prologues for the gospels (also the Pastoral Epistles). This is the alleged origin of the 'anti-Marcionite' gospel-prologues.

Now this thesis is untenable. If Rome did publish such a counter-edition, the editors must have had the loathed heretic's work (his NT or his *Antitheses*, which according to Jülicher contained the Pauline prologues) under their eyes, and they could not have transcribed the prologues without noticing where they came from. It is moreover highly unlikely that Marcion himself wrote *Romani sunt in partibus Italiae* or *Galati sunt Graeci*—in either case his information was somewhat less vague!

As for the allegedly anti-Marcionite gospel-prologues, these three (for de Bruyne did not find one to fit Matthew) appear only in Latin manuscripts; only one Greek manuscript of the twelfth century (see Von Soden, Vol. 1, 327) also contains the prologue to Luke, and *Cod. Bodl. Misc. Graec.* 141 (eleventh century) the first sentence of it. Now do these three prologues form one literary unit? Are they all modelled on similar lines? Is each written with the others in mind, so that they neither overlap nor contradict each other and could have been written by the same hand? Lastly, were they levelled at Marcion? The answer to all these questions must be—No!

The *Prologue to Mark* is short and contains nothing directly or indirectly anti-Marcionite. De Bruyne considers it to be genuinely old-Roman because Mark is called *colobodactylus* and 'that is not the kind of thing that anyone would invent' (201). But the prologue's innocuous explanation of the word (that Mark's fingers were too short in relation to his body) does not really offer a very competent gloss on the epithet 'stumpyfingers'—which could have been borrowed from Hippolytus. De Bruyne points to 'Justus the flat-footed' in the apocryphal Acts of Paul, but this leads in another direction: such traits are survivals of popular phantasy.

The *Prologue to Luke* is by far the most extensive. It answers among others the question why Luke wrote his gospel *in partibus Achaiae*: Judaea had already been provided for by Matthew, and Italy by Mark! To the discussion of Luke's gospel (see below) are joined the following remarks: 'And afterwards this same Luke wrote the Acts of the

Apostles. But later the Apostle John wrote the Revelation on the island of Patmos, and afterwards the gospel in Asia Minor' (yet the Prologue to John says that he dictated it!). Thus the writer expands his introduction to the third gospel into a general view over the whole non-epistolary half of the NT. This is not a prologue intended to accompany others, but an independent unit.

But can we at least say that it is directed against Marcion? Indirectly, yes, says de Bruyne, for the prologue dwells on the story of the Baptist's birth, which Marcion had suppressed. Yet Marcion had also deleted the account of Jesus' own birth, while he did not on the other hand contest the precursory status of the Baptist. Any anti-Marcionite polemic would therefore have to wear a different complexion. In reality the prologue here simply explains what distinguishes Luke from the other three gospels: the infancy narrative and the peculiar parallelism between John and Jesus. The prologue ends with a reference to Malachi, who has already thought of *ταύτης τῆς οἰκονομίας* (= 'this divine dispensation'). The term *οἰκονομία* is here used in the same way as in e.g. Theodore of Mopsuestia's prologue to John (see Von Soden, op. cit. 326), where the overall sense of the word (= 'divine plan of redemption'; cf. O. Michel, *ThWb* V, 154f., ET 151f.) is particularized, as in the *ταύτης τῆς οἰκονομίας* at the end of our prologue to Luke, to mean a special dispensation of God (so that Theodore can speak, line 11, of *διαφόροις οἰκονομίαις*). So here there is no evidence of the anti-Marcionite polemic that Strobel professes to discern. On the contrary, the prologue contains something which would have brought water to Marcion's mill, for it is specially mentioned that Luke remained unmarried and childless, and therefore served the Lord without distraction: this is precisely the virginity which Marcion demanded of his 'electi'! However, there is something even stranger: the Latin text of this prologue to Luke describes the primary purpose of the gospel in these incomprehensible words: '*ne Iudaicis fabulis desiderio tenerentur*'. Only the variant makes sense: '*ne Iudaicis fabulis adtenti in solo legis desiderio tenerentur*'. But this variant, according to de Bruyne, derives from the Monarchian revision of the prologue to Luke. Yet this is the only place where such a Marcionite tendency is discernible in any Monarchian prologue! The question therefore remains open whether its text '*ne Iudaicis fabulis intenti in solo legis desiderio tenerentur*' does not simply reproduce the wording of the so-called anti-Marcionite Prologue to Luke—which in that event would be anything but anti-Marcionite. But even ignoring all this, it is very striking that the 'anti-Marcionite' prologue to Luke contains, alongside its anti-gnostic bias, an 'anti-Judaic' tendency of the third gospel: as Lagrange has already noted, the expression '*Iudaicis fabulis*' distinctly echoes I Tim. 1.4-6. One cannot, with de Bruyne (205), dismiss this as a commonplace. Again, de Bruyne takes the 84 years of age which Luke enjoyed, according to the prologue, as valuable evidence of old tradition. But would not Luke 2.37 have provided the model for this detail? De Bruyne himself, moreover, is astonished that the Roman community, which knew so little of Mark, should have possessed this exact information about Luke.

In sum, there is no polemic against Marcion here, neither direct or indirect.

On the other hand, the *Prologue to John* does mention Marcion—but in what terms? Marcion is said to have been repudiated by John! De Bruyne (208) and Harnack only circumvented this difficulty by striking out the words '*ab Johanne*'. But de Bruyne played fair enough not to hush up the difficulty which still remains: 'Why speak of Marcion at all in a prologue to John, when John was not involved in the affair?' He found no answer to this question. Our own surmise is that the writer had only a vague notion of the relationships in the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages. It was thus he could arrive at his fantastic assertions that Papias was 'one of John's cherished disciples' and that John had dictated his gospel to Papias! This is certainly no prologue written in the latter half of the second century (so de Bruyne 210) and used by Irenaeus. It is a later production. Furthermore, it is not this one which is used in the Monarchian prologue to John, but the 'anti-Marcionite' prologue to Luke!

Strobel (*ZNW* 49 (1958) 132 n. 5) claims that the words of Irenaeus, '*Lucas autem sectator et discipulus apostolorum*', were copied from the 'anti-Marcionite' prologue to Luke. But if Irenaeus had made use of the latter, he would also have taken over the detail '*Lucas Antiochenus Syrus*'. In reality, Irenaeus took his information about Luke from the NT itself. Since he did not yet read, in his text of Acts, the 'we' of Acts 11.28, Codex D

XII. The case of the *Muratorian Canon*¹ is not very different. Here too we see how the tradition concerning Luke is inferred from what one finds—or does not find—in Luke's writings themselves. From the lack of reference to Peter's martyrdom and Paul's voyage to Spain (accepted without question on account of Rom. 15.24 and perhaps I Clem. 5.7), it was concluded that Luke confined himself in Acts to his own experiences.² If the Muratorian Canon affirms that Luke narrated the 'deeds of all Apostles',³ it appears we should ascribe this to the kind of optical illusion which lets one see what one really wants to see (cf. Loisy, *Les Actes des Apôtres*, 10).

The received text of the Muratorian Canon describes Luke as '*iuris studiosus*'⁴. This would certainly be a new tradition concerning Luke. But this reading is untenable. Zahn's suggested amendment '*itineris studiosum*' would only be possible if one took *itineris* as the equivalent of ὁδοῦ in the sense of Acts 9.2 and similar passages, and *studiosum* as a translation of σπουδαστήν—cf. the description of Luke as σπουδαστῆς Παύλου in the *Bios* of Sophronius (Von Soden, 309), and *De vir. ill.* 7, Migne P.L. 23, Col. 652A. Hort has conjectured '*itineris sui socium*'.⁵

XIII. The succeeding Fathers add little new to this information about Luke. According to CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA,⁶ Luke translated the Epistle to the Hebrews into Greek for Paul—evidently a learned hypothesis intended to explain the un-Pauline style of this allegedly Pauline letter.

XIV. TERTULLIAN⁷ shows what his age in fact demanded of a canonical gospel: '*Constituimus evangelicum instrumentum apostolos auctores habere*'. Considering the traditional status of Mark and Luke, this stipulation must

(see *Adv. haer.* III 14.1), he had no reason to describe Luke as a man of Antioch. It was from Luke 1.3, where he misconstrued πᾶσιν as masculine, that he inferred Luke to have been '*sectator et discipulus apostolorum*'.

Thus the three so-called anti-Marcionite gospel-prologues do not form a single literary unit and are not levelled at Marcion. The words in the prologue to Luke, '*Lucas Antiochenus Syrus*', do not come down to us from the time before Irenaeus.

¹ See Hans Lietzmann, *Kleine Texte* Vol. 1, 4th ed., 1933, and Preuschen, *Analecta* II, 2nd ed. 1910. Zahn, *Gesch. d. ntl. Kanons* II, 1890, 1–143, offers text and commentary. English trans. in Hennecke-Schneemelcher *NT Apocrypha* i, 42ff. According to G. Strecker (*RGG*³ IV, 1191), 'towards the end of the second century.'

² *Can. Mur.* line 36 read '*quae*' for '*quia*', line 37 '*semotapassione*', line 38 '*profectione*'. In *ZNW* 14 (1913), 216–21, Friedrich Pfister ascribed the extant text '*semote passionem*' and '*profectionem*' to the *Actus Vercellenses*, which begin with Paul's departure for Spain and go on to Peter's martyrdom: the suggestion is that the end of Luke's *Acts* was cut in order to join on these two highly-treasured apostolic acts. But the end of *Acts* is not in fact removed. On M. R. James's explanation, which is reminiscent of Pfister's, see Cadbury, *Beg.* V, 495.

³ Muratorian Canon, line 34.

⁴ Muratorian Canon, line 4.

⁵ Zahn's suggestion of an implied contrast here between Luke and the reluctant traveller John Mark (Acts 13.13) is a mere bow drawn at a venture. E. Klostermann suggested '*melioris studiosum*' (*ZNW* 22 (1923), 308f.).

⁶ Clem. Alex., *Adumbr. in I Petr.* (*GCS*, Vol. 17, 206), quoted in *Beg.* II, 222.

⁷ Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem* IV 2 (*CSEL*, Vol. 47, 426ff.), quoted *Beg.* II, 222ff.

of course be widened to include (direct) disciples of the Apostles. In this way the 'sectator Pauli' is reprieved.

XV. According to ORIGEN (*apud* Euseb. *H.E.* VI 25.6), Luke wrote down for the Gentiles the gospel preached by Paul. II Cor. 8.18 also is now referred to Luke: he is the brother 'cuius laus in Evangelio est per omnes Ecclesias'.¹

XVI. EUSEBIUS² has something new to add—Luke came from Antioch. He does not betray the source of his knowledge.³ His other relevant statements tell us only what we already know—that Luke was a physician, was generally in Paul's company and had also close relations with the other Apostles. It was apparently from taking πᾶσιν in Luke 1.3 as a masculine that Eusebius inferred Luke to have been the follower of them all.

XVII. JEROME indeed reiterated the traditional data, but in *De viris illustribus* 7 he had new details to add: Acts with Paul's two-year imprisonment in Rome extends as far as the fourth year of Nero's reign.⁴ 'Ex quo intelligimus, in eadem urbe librum esse compositum'—thus once again we see how the tradition about Luke is augmented by the evaluation of his work. The preamble of Jerome's Commentary on Matthew⁵ asserts that Luke wrote the gospel in Achaea and Boeotia: this agrees with Jerome's later statement that Luke died in Thebes. The origin of this late tradition we do not know.

Jerome exhibits a particular interest in Lucan style: Luke wrote the best Greek of all the Evangelists, not surprisingly, since he had studied and indeed had also penned the gospel among Greeks.⁶ Accordingly he preferred to omit words if they could not be precisely translated into Greek. Both in the gospel and in Acts his language is more elegant and betrays a secular eloquence (Commentary on Isaiah 6.9, Migne P. L. 24, 100D).

But for Jerome another problem is linked with the question of Luke's Greek: his use of the Septuagint, even in cases where the Greek text does not correspond with the Hebrew. Jerome offers two explanations. According to the first, Luke, like the Apostles and apostolic workers in general, used mostly the form of text already well-regarded by Gentile Christians: the

¹ *Hom. in Luc.*, trans. Jerome; Migne P. L. 26, 234.

² *H.E.* III 4, 6.

³ Perhaps he took this information from Julius Africanus, but more probably it was already part of his (lost) *Quaestiones evangelicae* (see *Beg.* II, 247f.).

It is a reasonable conjecture that this tradition is connected with the 'we'-reading of D sy^{hm} sy^p gig p in Acts 11.28. Nevertheless, this reading is not one of the original constituents of the Western text. For Irenaeus, who read the NT in a Western version (as is especially clear from his quotation of Gal. 2.5 in *Adv. haer.* III, 13.3), speaks of Luke as Paul's companion only from the 'we'-reference in Acts 16.8ff. onwards (III, 14.1). We may confidently assume, from the exactitude with which he made use of Acts, that a 'we' in 11.28 would not have escaped him. But this means we have no grounds for supposing that the tradition of Luke's Antiochian origin was already current in the days of Irenaeus.

⁴ The year 58, says Jerome, without revealing how he computed that date.

⁵ Migne P. L. 26, 18.

⁶ *Epist. 20 ad Damasum* (CSEL, Vol. 54, 108): 'inter omnes evangelistas Graeci sermanis eruditissimus fuit, quippe ut medicus et qui in Graecis Evangelium scripserit'.

Septuagint possessed great authority, whereas Luke did not.¹ At the same time, Jerome repeatedly alludes to the reputed weakness of Luke's accomplishment in Hebrew²—indeed he quotes the assertion that as a proselyte Luke was entirely ignorant of that language.³

XVIII. In the Dialogue of ADAMANTIUS called *De recta in Deum fide*,⁴ Megethios maintains that neither Mark nor Luke was a disciple of Christ—why then were these two gospels written by non-disciples? But Adamantius knows better: Mark and Luke were in fact two of the seventy-two disciples . . .

XIX. Let us conclude with the *Monarchian Prologues*⁵; whether they are Priscillian's work or not, they give us a tradition about Luke advocated in the fourth century and add (as demanded by the piety of the age) the following: Luke was *serviens Deo sine crimine. Nam neque uxorem unquam habens neque filios LXXIV annorum obiit in Bithynia plenus spiritu sancto*. Despite the precedent set by Zahn, it would be naive to deduce the authenticity of these data from the fact that they are unmatched in the NT. The mention of 'seventy-four years' could have arisen from the inadvertent dropping of an 'X' from the older tradition of LXXXIV (cf. Luke 2. 37!). Likewise 'Bithynia' and 'Bethany'—which is also a possibility—could result from misreadings of the older 'Boeotia'.

Cadbury's argument on this matter⁶ holds: whatever information we glean from the earliest tradition about Luke could have been taken, although not necessarily so, from the Lucan writings themselves. Quite possibly, but not necessarily, it was a process of elimination, for which II Tim. 4.11 ('Only Luke is with me') would have provided the starting-signal, that led to the name of Luke. Whenever the 'internal evidence' of the Lucan writings demonstrates Luke's authorship, this is worth more than all the traditions put together. But it is only in recent times that the traditions have come to be regarded thus critically. For centuries they remained undisputed and were taken for granted.

2. SURVEY OF HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL RESEARCH INTO THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES⁷

Towards the end of the eighteenth century the traditional view of Acts began to weaken. Until then it had been customary to see the book as the 'history of all the Apostles', as the first history of the Church, composed by Luke the

¹ *Lib. heb. quaest. in Genes.*, Migne P. L. 23, 1053B.

² Commentary on Isaiah 6.9, Migne P. L. 24, 100D, 101A.

³ *Lib. heb. quaest. in Genes.*, Migne P. L. 23, 1053B.

⁴ *GCS*, Vol. 4 (1901) 8ff., quoted *Beg.* II, 240ff.

⁵ For text see p. 12 n. 1 above; Preuschen, *op. cit.*, 91f.

⁶ *Beg.* II, 260ff.

⁷ For Acts, unfortunately, we possess no real counterpart to Albert Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus*—or, for that matter, his less successful history of Pauline

companion of Paul. Now the reader began to look at the work with his own eyes, and he noticed to his astonishment that the traditional picture did not accord with what he saw. At first Luke's authorship remained undoubted. But it was discovered that, far from telling the history of all the Apostles, he had been writing only of Peter and Paul. Moreover the Lucan account was not even complete in that respect, for Luke is silent about many things we learn from the Epistles of Paul.

As Schwanbeck¹ saw, this situation could be explained in one of two ways: either the author of Acts was *unwilling*, or he was *unable*, to say more. The latter possibility led to source-criticism, the former—with which we begin our survey—to so-called 'tendency-criticism'.

A. The Age of Tendency-Criticism

If Luke deliberately omitted much of what he must have known, he must have made a selection. What interest guided him in his selection? What aim, what 'tendency', was he pursuing? It was no longer possible for scholarly criticism to understand Acts as a simple reproduction of what had happened. For Acts to be comprehensible, one first had to appreciate the impulse which drove the author's pen.

Now the guess-work began. The scholars of the day—Michaelis, Griesbach, Eckermann, Hänlein, Eichhorn, Frisch, Mayerhoff, Credner, Hug—differed widely, each according to the individual point of view from which he determined the purpose of Acts.² It was Schrader³ who took up the most advanced position. He was not only struck by the degree to which

research. However, there are three works which provide some kind of substitute. The principal is A. C. McGiffert's contribution to *Beg.* II 1922 (363–95), 'The historical criticism of Acts in Germany', which is outstanding in its copious use of literature and excellent choice of quotations, but nevertheless presents, in effect, no more than the age of 'tendency-criticism'. We have gratefully made use of McGiffert's quotations from inaccessible works. To this survey we must add § 2, 'Le travail critique sur le livre des Actes' (17–50) from A. Loisy's great commentary, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris 1920), which is more concerned with source-criticism, and finally the 'Histoire de la critique des Actes des Apôtres' (XV–LV) from E. Jacquier's voluminous Catholic commentary *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris 1926), admittedly more an anthology than a true history.

¹ Schwanbeck, *Über die Quellen der Schriften des Lukas*, 1847, 74: quoted in *Beg.* II, 364.

² J. D. Michaelis, *Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes*, 3rd ed. 1777, Vol. II § 154 (ET *Introduction to the NT*, 1793) (quoted *Beg.* II, 364):—There are two intentions behind Acts, firstly to give a trustworthy report on the first outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the first miracles corroborating the truth of the Christian religion; secondly to recount the circumstances which proved the validity of the Gentile mission over against the Jews. Luke is said to have written during Paul's Roman captivity.

J. J. Griesbach, the Jena Easter-programme for 1798: '*De consilio, quo scriptor in Actibus Apostolicis concinnandis ductus fuerit*' (quoted *Beg.* II, 364):—Acts is intended to defend Paul against the attacks of Jewish Christians. This aim was also suggested by

the Paul of Acts was dependent on the original Apostles and the miracles of this Paul ran parallel with those of Peter, but he also saw that the Paul of the Epistles was another Paul. He therefore ventured to assert that the apologetic purpose of Acts had compromised its historical reliability.¹ What is striking about this conclusion is not only the discrediting of a canonical document, for Schrader also begins to link together the questions of Acts and of the Pauline epistles. Nevertheless one should refrain from naming him, as McGiffert does, in the same breath as F. C. Baur.²

H. E. G. Paulus in pages 281ff. of his *Introductionis in Novum Testamentum capita selectiora* (1799), and Lechler (see pp. 19f. below) indeed attributed '*De consilio*' to him.

Eckermann, *Erklärung aller dunklen Stellen des Neuen Testaments*, 1807, Vol. II, 164ff. (quoted *Beg.* II, 365):—Luke selected only those events which most clearly demonstrate the wonderful workings of God in the setting up of his kingdom on earth.

Hänlein, *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2nd ed. 1809, Part 3, 156f. (quoted *Beg.* II, 365):—Acts is intended to show God's help in the propagation of Christianity, enhance the Apostles' reputation by reporting their miracles, and urge the equal right of gentiles as well as Jews to the blessings of the faith.

J. G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1810, Vol. II § 147 (quoted *Beg.* II, 365):—Acts is intended to give a history not of the Church nor of the Apostles, but of the Christian mission.

S. G. Frisch, Dissertation '*Utrumque Lucae commentarium de vita, dictis factisque Jesu et apostolorum non tam historicae simplicitatis, quam artificiosae tractationis indolem habere*', 1817, 53 (quoted *Beg.* II, 365f.):—In Acts, Luke was attempting to convince Jews and Jewish Christians that the worth and standing of the Messiah Jesus was greater than that of Moses, and that it was the will of God and of his Messiah Jesus that all men should share in the Christian salvation.

Mayerhoff, *Einleitung in die petrinischen Schriften, nebst einer Abhandlung über den Verfasser der Apostelgeschichte*, 1835, 5 (quoted *Beg.* II, 366):—It was the aim of Acts to set down 1. the spread of Christianity from Jerusalem, the centre of Judaism, to Rome, the centre of paganism, 2. the reaction against this (which nevertheless always served the further propagation of the Church) and 3. the Church's internal consolidation.

K. A. Credner, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1836, Vol. I, Pt. 1, 269 (quoted *Beg.* II, 366f.):—As a disciple of Paul, the author of Acts selected only what was important for Pauline doctrine. The whole work is a historical commentary on the following verses in Romans: 1.16, 3.9, 10.12. The author intended to write yet a third book (279); that is why he gives no account of Paul's death.

J. L. Hug, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1st ed. 1808, 4th ed. 1847 (quoted *Beg.* II, 367):—Acts is a historical work; its author exercised selection in accordance with the special needs of Theophilus.

³ Karl Schrader, *Der Apostel Paulus*, Vol. V, 1836 (exposition of the Epistles).

¹ *Op. cit.*, 537f., quoted *Beg.* II, pp. 367f.

² Ferdinand Christian Baur, 'Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde; der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche', in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1831, No. 4. In 1836, in the same periodical (No. 3, 100ff.), Baur published 'Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefs und die damit zusammenhängenden Verhältnisse der römischen Gemeinde'; here Acts is characterized as the work of a Paulinist wishing to defend the Apostle against the attacks of Jewish Christians. In 1838 (No. 3, 142ff. 'Über den Ursprung des Episkopats') Baur gave a reasoned account of his fundamental views on Acts. His *magnum opus*, entitled *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*, 1845 (ET *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ*, 2 vols., 1873–6), is of particular importance; the second edition, edited by Zeller, appeared posthumously in 1866/7.

BAUR's contribution unites three important theses. The first does not concern Acts at all, but deals with the Epistles. Paul, says Baur, preached a different gospel from that of the original Apostles (the gospel of freedom from the law, as against that of circumcision), and the outcome of this antithesis was a struggle between two Christianities in early Christendom—the Pauline and the Petrine. On this basis Baur arrived at his second thesis, which deals with Acts and maintains that the book was an attempt to reconcile the hostile parties of the Paulinists and the Judaists. But the significance of this second thesis became clear only with the enunciation of the third: that an age is not really understood—and this includes the age of the New Testament—until it is viewed from the standpoint of its central problem. In every age, that is to say, there is a struggle between two great powers, the old and the new, until they are at length reconciled in some higher unity.¹ Every document has to be located in the context of this process. Only when this has been done is the document historically understood.

The vital question of the New Testament age, i.e. the apostolic and sub-apostolic, was the question of the legitimacy of the mission to the Gentiles. Acts seeks to reconcile the opposing parties; it therefore belongs to the closing stage of the process, is unhistorical and not the work of Luke.

Thus took shape, in all its strength and weakness, the picture of early Christianity advocated by the Tübingen school. Its strength lay in the elevated vantage point from which it was drawn—permitting a broad survey of the development of Christianity as far as the early Catholic Church. But its weakness is none the less patent: it makes an unwarranted simplification of history, rigidly differentiating 'Gentile Christianity' from 'Jewish Christianity,' and turns a problem of the initial stages into the driving force behind an epoch which had long since been moved by other questions and forces. From the beginning, therefore, Baur's solution bears within itself the seed of its demise.

The master's views were developed, enlarged and intensified by his disciples Schwegler and Zeller. Baur had thought it possible that the author of Acts had used certain sketches or diaries of Luke.² Acts thus remained, even if it would take a most rigorous criticism to sift out the true historical picture, a highly important source for the Apostolic age (op. cit., 17). SCHWEGLER,³ on the other hand, explained Acts as a peace-offering and attempt at reconciliation 'in the form of a history.' He maintains that the author treated tradition as arbitrarily and high-handedly as it was treated in

¹ Of course, this unity immediately becomes the power of the old, provoking the rise of a new in opposition. That is the Hegelian dialectic of history which Baur used to teach. On this point, see Emmanuel Hirsch, *Geschichte der neueren evangelischen Theologie*, Vol. V, 1954, 518-552, and, among older presentations, Albert Schweitzer, *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, 1911, 10-17 (ET *Paul and his Interpreters*, London 1912, 12ff.).

² *Der Apostel Paulus*, 2nd ed., 16.

³ Albert Schwegler, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, 1846, Vol. II, 73ff.

the Clementine homilies. Taken as a whole, Acts has the value of a historical document only for the time, the circumstances and the situation in which it arose. The period in question, according to Schwegler, was 110–50, when, he says, the Jewish form of Christianity was still dominant.¹

ZELLER² arrived at a similar conclusion. The Peter-Paul parallelism is a scheme devised by the writer himself. He had no intention whatever of presenting a historical account,³ but was striving to influence the conflicting parties of the Paulinists and Judaists.⁴ Acts has a 'conciliatory tendency'.⁵ Seeing that Acts scarcely touches on the antithesis of faith and works, and that only the practical question of the law's validity plays a part, Zeller placed Acts in a period when 'the significance of the dogmatic antithesis . . . had already receded'.⁶ In this way he came to choose the first decades of the second century.

Although such respected scholars as Hausrath⁷ and Hilgenfeld,⁸ together with the rising stars Ritschl⁹ and Holtzmann,¹⁰ confessed their allegiance to Baur, his view of early Christian history did not carry the day. This was not surprising. Very few theologians were ready to admit that the New Testament could be contradictory in a central doctrine, and it was obvious that Baur's historical picture had points of weakness. The opposition was most diversified in form and content. Such a man as NEANDER¹¹ could indeed describe Baur's essay on the Christ-party as 'ingenious'—but remained wholly unconvinced. In his *Paulus*, Baur sharply but not unjustly censures Neander for passing off as perfectly innocuous certain parts of Acts which gave Baur himself real difficulty;¹² nevertheless it was this way of proceeding which rendered Neander and others like him immune against infection from Baur's thought. Schneckenburger¹³ ventured deeper into the dangerous jungle of criticism.

¹ Op. cit., 113.

² Eduard Zeller, *Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht*, 1854.

³ Op. cit., 357.

⁴ Op. cit., 344.

⁵ Op. cit., 358.

⁶ Op. cit., 474.

⁷ Adolf Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1868. (ET *History of New Testament Times*, 4 vols.)

⁸ Adolf Hilgenfeld, *ZwTh* 1858, 54–140, 377–440, 562–602 ('Das Urchristentum und seine neuesten Bearbeitungen von Lechler und Ritschl'), and *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1874.

⁹ Albrecht Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas*, 1846.

¹⁰ H. J. Holtzmann, *ZwTh* 1882/3, quoted *Beg.* II, 376.

¹¹ August Neander, *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel*, 2nd enlarged ed., 2 vols., Hamburg 1838. The comment here reproduced is in Vol. I, p. 302 n. 1, and further references to Baur—purely mere polite rejections—are to be found in the notes to pages 307, 308, 310, 311, 325, 341, 361, 363, 366, 367, 373, 379, 389 and 421.

¹² Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*, 2nd ed., 26 n. 1 and 29ff. (ET *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ*).

¹³ Matthias Schneckenburger, *Über den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte*, Berne 1841.

He saw the apologetic character of Acts. In spite of this, he did not abandon the idea of its Lucan origin; the apologetics did no harm to the book's credibility. Undeniably, Paul appears other in Acts than he is in the Epistles.¹ Luke has presented him in such a light that Judaist recriminations are powerless against him. Yet Luke achieved this result not by distortion of history, but by the choice of what he adduces.²

Baur had little difficulty in showing the untenability of Schneckenburger's position.³ But there were doughtier opponents than Schneckenburger (whose services in demonstrating the apologetic element in Acts were, by the way, readily acknowledged by Baur). In connection with a prize-competition, the Teyler Theological Society of the Netherlands spoke openly, as of something generally known, about the Tübingen school's 'hostility to Christianity'.⁴ The prize was won by G. V. LECHLER.⁵ He had no objection, to be sure, against 'striving to get a satisfying insight into the positive historical and genuinely human evolution of primitive Christianity.'⁶ He goes indeed so far as to recognize that the Tübingen school had opened access to a development 'which as a historical process embraces both uniformity and also differences.' But this is the very point of departure for his censure. Instead of a peaceful evolution the Tübingen school insist on an absolute contradiction between Paul and the Jerusalem Apostles regarding 'that which forms the very essence of Christianity'; thereby they are contributing to the 'overthrow' of Christianity. The historical picture which Lechler opposed to Baur's was governed by his idea of such a peaceful evolution. Paul was no 'assailant of the law'.⁷ He used to observe the Jewish feasts and the Mosaic law.⁸ Acts—whose author is Luke—portrays him correctly.

The Tübingen school could dispose of this objection without much trouble. The second thrust was, however, more difficult to parry, for it struck at a most vulnerable place in Baur's edifice. Lechler maintained that Jewish

¹ Op. cit., 150.

² Op. cit., 58, 92.

³ Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*, 2nd ed., 8-17. On page 13 we read, 'Any person who intentionally suppresses so much, and who thereby has already placed the objects in another light, will not scruple, if necessary, to proceed more unhistorically still.' And on page 14: 'It is probable that the author altered the actual history not only in a negative sense, through the suppression of essential facts, but also in a positive.' Finally, 13f.: 'The fact remains that the Peter-Paul parallelism was not achieved purely by selection of material!'

⁴ To quote from *ZwTh* I, 1858, 56: 'It is well known that the so-called school of Tübingen seeks to base its hostility to Christianity on its own assumption of an absolute discrepancy between Paul's doctrine and tendency and those of the other Apostles, as well as on its alleged ability to prove the rise of a conflict between the two consequent parties, who are supposed to have achieved at length a reconciliation and a settlement of differences.'

⁵ Gotthold Viktor Lechler, *Das apostolische und das nachapostolische Zeitalter mit Rücksicht auf Unterschied und Einheit zwischen Paulus und den übrigen Aposteln, zwischen Heidenchristen und Judenchristen*, 1st ed., Haarlem 1851 (the prize-winning work); 2nd rev. ed., Stuttgart 1857.

⁶ Op. cit., 2nd ed., 2.

⁷ Op. cit., 524.

⁸ Op. cit., 418f.

Christianity had rapidly lost its authority after the destruction of Jerusalem and the death of most of the Apostles. For that reason it would have been completely unable to play the part assigned to it by the Tübingen school for the second century. It follows, however, that the advance to the early Catholic Church must have taken place within Gentile Christianity itself. 'As in the case of the general idea of the Church, it was in Pauline circles that her self-contained organization took definite shape.' By the end of the second century, the Gentile Christian majority 'without either borrowing from Jewish Christianity . . . or coming to terms with it' had been led 'by the implicit evolution of its being' and by its opposition to gnosticism, 'to a legal and hierarchical standpoint intimately related to the theocracy of the Old Testament'.¹

This point was also raised by ALBRECHT RITSCHL, who specifically made his final break with Baur's theories in the second edition of his work on the rise of the early Catholic Church.² He objected to Baur that Catholic Christianity is not a reconciliation of Paulinism and Jewish Christianity, or at least not one resulting from a blurring of antitheses, but a stage in Gentile Christianity alone, which had never been under the overall domination of Paul's peculiar doctrinal emphases.³ Furthermore, Ritschl saw the insufficiency of Baur's Pauline-Judaist dichotomy: 'It is necessary to make many more distinctions before we can make proper combinations.'⁴ Finally he posed the troublesome question of the common ground which, despite everything, Paul and the Jewish Christians must have shared.⁵

Baur found a reckless, ruthless and at all events highly unwelcome comrade-in-arms and at the same time antagonist in the former *Privatdozent* BRUNO BAUER.⁶ Basically, the ideas which Bauer tossed into the debate were three in number. In the first place he insisted passionately and without restraint on the transformation undergone in Acts by the Paul of the epistles:

¹ Op. cit., 523.

² A. Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche: eine kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Monographie*, 2nd, thoroughly revised, edition, Bonn 1857.

³ Op. cit., 271.

⁴ Op. cit., 22.

⁵ Op. cit., 15.

⁶ Cf. Emanuel Hirsch's acute character-sketch in his *Geschichte der neueren evangelischen Theologie*, Vol. V, 601. In his *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, 2nd ed., 141-61 (ET *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, London 1910, 137ff.), Schweitzer presents a moving portrait of this man, whose genius failed to save him from an obduracy of negation and whose radical criticism of the gospels (*Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte des Johannes*, Bremen 1840; *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker*, 3 vols., Leipzig 1841/42) had cost him the *venia legendi*. His work of most present relevance is *Die Apostelgeschichte, eine Ausgleichung des Paulinismus und des Judenthums innerhalb der Kirche*, which appeared in 1852 immediately after his *Kritik der paulinischen Briefe*, Parts 1-3, 1850/2. See also Schweitzer's *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, 94-7 (ET 120ff.), and Martin Kegel's *Bruno Bauer und seine Theorie über die Entstehung des Christentums*, 1908, as well as Karl Löwith's *Von Hegel zu Nietzsche*, 142ff., 411ff., 467ff. (ET *From Hegel to Nietzsche*, London 1965.)

the religious dialectician, accustomed to fight only with words, is supplanted by the 'wizard' who 'dazzles his opponents'.¹ The Apostle, 'who fulfils his historical work through sufferings, struggles and trials,' becomes the 'miracle-worker'.² The author of Acts is out to convey the 'godlike impression' made by Peter and Paul alike.³

But Acts effects a second transformation: it takes away from Paul the honour of the mission to the Gentiles and gives it to Peter, who then 'legitimizes and sanctions' Paul's activity.⁴ Paul has in the end to give the assurance 'that he is a strict servant of the law, who could never have dreamed of abandoning the basis of the Law'.⁵ 'Thereby the contrast with the Epistles reaches its peak'.⁶

Nevertheless—and this is where Bruno Bauer attacked the master from Tübingen—this was no late attempt at reconciliation. F. C. Baur's working-hypothesis, the opposition between Paulinism and Jewish Christianity, was simply no longer present.⁷ Inasmuch as the Church recognized in Acts the canonical expression of her own consciousness, the victor was 'Judaism', i.e. the power which will brook no individual reshaping and immediately brings the new 'to the level of the established'.⁸ 'It was no single-handed revolution—this is the basic thesis of Acts—when Paul brought salvation to the Gentiles.' 'The revolutionary is absorbed into the holy chain of tradition'.⁹

If it at first appeared that Bruno Bauer was trying to uphold the *theologia crucis* of Paul's Epistles against a *theologia gloriae* in Acts, it becomes clear here that, under the impress of his own experiences, he conceives the Apostle, in the romantic, idealist way, as the free, creative individual, who is kept down by the 'existing' order: Paul is the 'hero strong in his own powers,' 'who draws resolve and power to act from the spring of his inner being'.¹⁰

But Bruno Bauer, in whose sceptical hands all texts crumbled, could not even hold together the great Pauline documents which had been his base for the assault upon Acts. Even they became for him the 'works of free reflexion',¹¹ and in the end he considered Acts a necessary precursor of Galatians!¹²

This thesis was advanced afresh in 1882 by A. D. LOMAN,¹³ independently of Bauer. The Paul of the great Epistles is, he says, an idealization(!) of the

¹ Bauer, *Apostelgeschichte*, 7-9.

² *Apostelgeschichte*, 8: 'The wizard has nothing in common with the religious dialectician; the miracle-worker contradicts the spiritual hero.'

³ Op. cit., 21f.

⁴ Op. cit., 53.

⁵ Op. cit., 91.

⁶ Op. cit., 92.

⁷ Op. cit., 121.

⁸ Op. cit., 124.

⁹ Op. cit., 125.

¹⁰ Op. cit., 124.

¹¹ Bauer, *Kritik der paulinischen Briefe*, Part 1, 'Der Ursprung des Galaterbriefes', 1850, III.

¹² Idem, VI.

¹³ Loman, 'Quaestiones Paulinae' in the *Theol. Tijdschrift* for 1882, 141ff., 302ff., and 452ff.; also 1883, 14ff. and 241ff., and 1886, 42ff., and 387ff. Cf. 98 of Schweitzer's *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung* (ET *Paul and his Interpreters*, 1956) and Rudolf Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, 1888, 12-14.

historical figure of the Apostle. The Paul-figures of the 'we'-narrative, of the rest of Acts and of the main Epistles are 'the progressive evolutionary stages of a legend of Paul'.¹ After long examination, RUDOLF STECK,² Professor at Berne, decided in 1888 that Loman was right—the Pauline Epistles were the work of a school.³ ('We shall have to get used to the idea that no Apostle wrote anything, any more than Jesus himself did.'⁴) The report which Acts represents is the fundamental datum for the historical situation.⁵

Thus we come to the grotesque spectacle of 'ultra-radicals' transformed into champions of Acts. But there is nothing new under the sun. As long before as 1792, an English divine, EDWARD EVANSON,⁶ had denied the authenticity of the Epistle to the Romans on the grounds of its being at variance with Acts.

The only followers that F. C. Baur found in England, where the great scholar J. B. LIGHTFOOT opposed the Tübingen theories (see *Beg.* II, 419f.), were SAMUEL DAVIDSON and W. R. CASSELS.⁷

Neither was Baur a success in France. ERNEST RENAN⁸ believed Acts to be a very carefully planned work, written by Luke about the year 80 (later Renan went as far as 100). It is Luke who speaks in the 'we'.⁹ The book is well-disposed to the Romans (hence breaks off before Nero's persecutions¹⁰) and delights in miracles: 'a dogmatic quasi-history, designed to support the orthodox doctrines of the time or to impress on readers' minds the ideas *qui souriaient le plus à la piété de l'auteur*'. Why not? 'It is only from the writings of the faithful that we know about the origins of any religion. Only the sceptic writes *ad narrandum*'¹¹ (a truth often overlooked in Harnack's generation of source-critics!). Luke was less concerned, says Renan, with stating historical facts or satisfying the demands of logic than with edifying the pious reader. His work belongs to those semi-historical, semi-legendary

¹ As summarized by Steck, from whose work we borrow our representation of Loman's ideas.

² Steck, *Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht nebst kritischen Bemerkungen zu den paulinischen Hauptbriefen*, Berlin 1888. In this context we should also mention the Dutch critic Van Manen, the first volume (1890) of whose *Paulus* is entitled *De Handelingen der Apostelen*. See Schweitzer, *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, 98ff. (ET 125ff.).

³ Op. cit., 363.

⁴ Op. cit., 353.

⁵ Op. cit., 357.

⁶ According to J. W. Hunkin, 'British Work on the Acts' (*Beg.* II, 396-433), 417f. Evanson's work was entitled *The Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists, and the Evidence of their respective Authenticity examined*.

⁷ Davidson, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, London 1894, Vol. II, 76-175; E. Jacquier, op. cit., XXIf.

Cassels, *Supernatural Religion: an Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation*, 1874 (see Hunkin, *Beg.* II, 419).

⁸ Renan, *Les Apôtres*, 1866. (ET *History of the Origins of Christianity*, Vol. II, *The Apostles*, 1890.)

⁹ *Les Apôtres*, Xf.

¹⁰ Op. cit., XXII.

¹¹ Op. cit., XXIX.

documents which one can take neither as history nor as legend. Though nearly every detail is false, such works enshrine valuable truths which are there for the finding.¹

In his commentary on Acts, Nietzsche's friend FRANZ OVERBECK² assembled the body of evidence so far gathered against Baur's historical synthesis. Acts does not stand midway between the earliest Christian parties: 'its Gentile Christianity is not the Pauline one, still less is its Judaism that of the first Apostles.' Rather is the Judaistic element already a constituent of its own peculiar Gentile Christianity, which—itself strongly influenced by the original Christian Judaism—can be seen trying 'to come to terms with its own genesis and with its founder Paul'. Save for the universalism, the specifically Pauline is laid aside, not as a concession to an alien party, but only because Paul is no longer understood.³ On the other hand, Acts is concerned to win the favour of the Roman authorities⁴: the intention of averting political discredit from Christianity is obvious.⁵ Gentile Christianity is not justified from the theology of Paul: the universal mission is for the Christian community already established from the very first (cf. Acts 1.8!). Far from being presupposed, the gospel according to Paul is effaced.⁶ The antagonists of Paul as of the earliest community are the *unbelieving* Jews; his conflict with the 'Judaists' is in Acts not only without trace, but inconceivable.⁷ Where the author's share predominates (he is not Luke), historical details can scarcely be established; at most in the accounts relating to Peter, and in certain individual references.⁸ It is 'particularly the fact that Paul is the hero of Acts', and that nonetheless his portrait is already so distorted, which makes it probable that the work was composed in the second or third decade of the second century.⁹ The external and internal detachment from Judaism, together with the implication of conflicts with the Roman authorities, suggests the time of Trajan: Acts is a direct precursor of the apologetic literature.¹⁰ Probably it originated in Asia Minor, perhaps Ephesus.¹¹

JOHANNES WEISS's work of 1897, *Absicht und literarischer Charakter der Apostelgeschichte*, gives the impression of being a late straggler of 'tendency-

¹ Op. cit., XLI.

² Overbeck was the editor of the fourth edition (1870) of W. M. L. de Wette's *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* I, 4, where he inserted his own glosses, indicated by half-brackets, within De Wette's text. This makes him wearisome to read, but the effort is well rewarded. McGiffert (1922) considered Overbeck's commentary to be in many respects the best we possess (see *Beg.* II, 381).

³ Op. cit., XXXIf.

⁴ Op. cit., XXXII.

⁵ Op. cit., XXXIII.

⁶ Op. cit., XXXVI.

⁷ Op. cit., XXXVI.

⁸ Op. cit., LXII.

⁹ Op. cit., LXIV.

¹⁰ Op. cit., LXV.

¹¹ Op. cit., LXIX. In *Der Paulinismus*, 1873, 495 (ET London 1877, vol. II, 228), Otto Pflieger concurs with Overbeck (XXXI) in the following judgement: 'The Acts of the Apostles bears witness to late Paulinism's awareness of its own past.' The author has, in all good faith, transferred the relationships of his own time into that of the Apostles (497).

criticism' who has fallen in with a strange column.¹ He defines the spiritual climate of Acts exactly like Overbeck: it stands materially nearer to the Apologists than to Paul,² being 'an apology for the Christian religion before the Gentiles in the face of Jewish indictment, one which demonstrates how it has come about that Christianity has taken over and fulfils the worldwide mission of Judaism'.³ Two ideas constantly recur: 1. The Christians are guiltless of any transgression within the competence of the Roman authorities, who have therefore no cause for taking steps against them;⁴ 2. Christianity is a Judaism teaching the fulfilment of Jewish hopes. Thereby it replaces Judaism proper.⁵

After this work of Weiss's, 'tendency-criticism' fell silent.

B. The Age of Source-Criticism

'Tendency-criticism' had ascribed the fragmentary character of Acts to the author's *unwillingness* to say more.⁶ The other possibility, his *inability* to say more, would imply that he was restricted by the incompleteness of his sources. This idea played a big part at the beginning of the nineteenth century. One hundred years later the question of sources again became a burning topic. On both occasions a spate of writings promptly poured forth. But soon the flow dwindled, and at length it ceased altogether.

The first epoch of source-criticism stretched from its advent to the triumph of Baur's 'tendency-criticism'. McGiffert (*Beg.* II, 385ff.) has given a very thorough account of the now mostly forgotten scholars of that age, and we shall make grateful use of his information.

It was the Flensburg Rector BERNHARD L. KÖNIGSMANN who set the ball rolling in 1798 with a seminar-programme, '*De fontibus commentariorum sacrorum, qui Lucae nomen praeferunt, deque eorum consilio et aetate*'.⁷ He inferred from the prologue of Luke that the author of the work did not claim to be an eye-witness and ought therefore to be distinguished from the writer of the 'we'-passages. He concluded the presence of further sources (which, however, he did not seek to define more closely) from the variety and unevenness of the style and from contradictions in the matter presented.

¹ In this connexion we do not enter into the valuable researches on the composition of Acts, which Weiss carried out in order 'to elicit the ultimate intention of the book and therewith its literary character' (2).

² *Absicht*, 56.

³ *Op. cit.*, 57.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 58. Likewise Carl Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*, 1886, 459 (ET *The Apostolic Age* II, 123): The author was trying 'to show that Christianity held absolutely no danger for the Roman state and embodied no crime deserving of punishment by the law'.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, 59.

⁶ See the quotation from Schwanbeck, p. 15 above.

⁷ Reprinted in Potts, *Sylloge Commentationum Theologicarum*, Vol. 3, 1802, 215-39; see *Beg.* II, 385.

In a work which appeared in 1799, J. A. BOLTEN showed by the very title—*Die Geschichte der Apostel von Lukas übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen*—that he held quite a different opinion on the origin of Acts: Luke is said to have translated and annotated one, or even several, Aramaic sources. This raises the problem of the Lucan semitisms. Bolten's solution foreshadowed Torrey's.

An article published by W. K. L. ZIEGLER¹ in 1801 pointed in yet another direction. The accounts concerning Peter reminded him of the Acts and Kerygma of Peter which are mentioned by the early Fathers. At the same time he conjectured written accounts of Stephen's martyrdom and Paul's conversion as sources for the first part of Acts, which played a special rôle in these investigations.

J. G. EICHHORN² found in Acts a 'self-consistent original historical narrative' and for this reason wished to attribute to Luke even the speeches of Acts, 'which all take place under circumstances where no one could have written them down'.

The Dutchman J. C. RIEHM³ dealt exhaustively with the source-question in 1821 in his *Dissertatio critico-theologica de fontibus actuum apostolicorum*. Since Luke, as a friend of Paul and of other participants as well as an eye-witness (the 'I' of the 'we'-passages!), was himself the principal authority for the second part of Acts, he had little need of sources there, but on the other hand he used many minor, fragmentary sources for the first part.

In 1831/2, FRIEDRICH SCHLEIERMACHER⁴ devoted his §§ 85–90 (pp. 344–79) to the Acts of the Apostles. Acts formed one dual work with the third gospel, but had an independent and peculiar genesis. Whereas the separate stories underlying the gospels were a necessary complement of apostolic preaching (which—Schleiermacher does not think like Dibelius!—did not publicly proclaim anything of the sort), it was only the Christians' historical sense which could have aroused interest in the tales of the Apostles. Both documents were intended to present a coherent account *de rebus christianis*. The prologue in Luke applied to both—which meant one must presuppose guarantors and sources for Acts too! The author was not the 'I' who speaks in the 'we'-parts: rather do these represent a source. The fact that there are three separate accounts of Paul's conversion, and two of Peter's vision, likewise suggests multiple sources. On several occasions it is clear that a new report is beginning, hence with it a new source. The author compiled Acts

¹ Ziegler, 'Über den Zweck, die Quellen und die Interpolationen der Apostelgeschichte' in *Gablers Neuestes Theologisches Journal*, Vol. VII, 1801, 125ff.; *Beg.* II, 385.

² Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1810, Vol. II, 149; discussed by Schleiermacher, *Einleitung*, 371—see note 4.

³ Our account is taken from *Beg.* II, 386.

⁴ Schleiermacher's Collected Works, Division I: *Zur Theologie*, Vol. VIII, *Einleitung ins Neue Testament*, ed. G. Wolde, Berlin 1845.

from already assembled written sources, probably opuscles from the communities at Jerusalem, Antioch and Ephesus, as well as a travel-diary. The Lucan work, composed after the sack of Jerusalem, remained incomplete. Its author was unacquainted with Paul's Epistles. Through a misunderstanding he recorded, in 11.30, a journey which never took place. The speeches were already present in one or other of the separate accounts comprising the author's source-material. Yet they employ the Septuagint, while Aramaic was the language of Jerusalem. Schleiermacher's way out of this difficulty is the hypothesis that the Aramaic tradition had been adopted and revised by Hellenistic Christians.

So here we have an astonishing variety of observations and points of view. Which makes all the more astonishing the patent inability to combine the idea of a use of sources with that of a comprehensive revision and presentation. But did not form-criticism also regard the Evangelists—including Luke—at first as essentially transcribers and editors?

MAYERHOFF (see p. 15 n. 2 above) rose to protest against Schleiermacher's distinction between Luke and the 'I' in the 'we,' and proceeded to demonstrate the stylistic accord between the 'we'-passages and the rest of Acts. Actually, the author of both Acts and the third gospel was—Timothy. Whereupon FRIEDRICH BLEEK and M. ULRICH rose up in their turn to expostulate.¹ Both saw in Timothy the 'I' of the 'we'-passages, and ascribed to Luke the penning of Acts. A. F. GERÖRER's solution, in his *Geschichte des Urchristentums* (1838), was different again.² Chapters 1 to 12 (highly legendary, with few and incomplete sources) are the work of one author, whereas 13 to 28 are the work of another—Luke, the eyewitness and the companion of Paul. The two parts were united by an unknown hand towards the end of the first century.

With EUGEN SCHWANBECK's book, *Über die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte*, 1847, the first age of source-criticism came to an end. He detected as sources not only a biography of Paul but also a supposed life of Barnabas and memoirs of Silas, these last forming the basis of Chapters 15–28.

This age undoubtedly produced an abundance of important observations. But their evaluation was a matter of disagreement, and often the scholar's imagination ran away with him. Nevertheless, the viewpoints which have arisen in source-criticism were, almost without exception, established in this first epoch, when the explorers of the subject were still venturing into uncharted regions.

¹ Bleek's discussion of Mayerhoff in *Studien und Kritik*, 1836, pp. 1021ff.; see *Beg.* II, 387.

Ulrich, 'Kommt Lukas wirklich in der Apostelgeschichte vor?' in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1837, 369ff., and 'Lukas kommt nicht in der Apostelgeschichte vor' in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1840, 1003; see *Beg.* II, 387.

² According to *Beg.* II, 387 n. 2.

It was only in 1885 that JACOBSEN's work, *Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte*, showed that interest in the problem was not yet extinct. Jacobsen believed that in Acts 1–12 the author offered 'in the main more or less happy combinations, chiefly with reference to notices' in Pauline Epistles(!).¹ He assumed that some document about Barnabas was the source for Chapters 13 to 15.

The following year, in the first edition of his introduction to the New Testament, BERNHARD WEISS presented an exhaustive source-criticism of Acts (570–84), which made a strong impression. Acts, he said, is the work of Paul's companion Luke, from whom the whole of the second part derives; here he was reshaping his own travel-notes.² For the first part he made use of an account by a Jewish Christian eyewitness.³ Luke is therefore responsible for everything unhistorical between Acts 1.1 and 15.31.⁴ Weiss attributed the following sections⁵ to communications made to Luke by word of mouth: 9.1–30; 11.19–30; 12.25; Chapters 13 and 14.

The weakness of this division of sources is, once again, not hard to discern. Anything discordant with the hypothetical eyewitness is said to be a later addition. But this begs the question, for it presupposes that a merely conjectural eyewitness record is already a proven fact. On the other hand, there is no denying the value of many separate observations presented by Weiss in the notes to these few pages of introduction.

Though VAN MANEN's ultra-radical position stands undisguised, his analysis of Acts,⁶ published in 1890, calls Wendt to mind, where it touches on the question of sources. He assumes the basic source to be certain *Acta Pauli*, into which a Lucan travel-diary (from the first meeting in Troas to the arrival in Rome) had already been interwoven. The editor responsible for Acts, writing between 125 and 150, further employed an analogous Acts of Peter (an imitation of minimal historical value), which plays roughly the same rôle as Weiss's Jewish Christian source, and to it he added traditions current in the community of Damascus on the subjects of Stephen, Paul's conversion and the foundation of the community in Antioch.

¹ See *Beg.* II, 388. The formulation quoted is in H. J. Holtzmann, 'Forschungen über die Apostelgeschichte', *ZwTh* 1885, cited by Heitmüller, *ThR* 2 (1899) 52.

² Weiss, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 2nd ed. 1889, 584.

³ *Op. cit.*, 574.

⁴ E.g. the Pentecostal gift of tongues, the session of the council in Ch. 4 (*op. cit.*, 572), the earthquake of 4.31 (573), the delivering angel and the reference to Theudas in Ch. 5 (574), everything postulating an orderly trial in the story of Stephen (574 n. 5), the references to Paul in 8.3 & 9.1 (577), the dispersal of the community (574 n. 5), the aside of 10.41 (575) and the remarks about the growth of the Church (574) and the community of goods (573 n. 3).

⁵ *Op. cit.*, 576.

⁶ Van Manen, *Paulus*, Vol. I: *De Handelingen der Apostelen*, Leyden 1890. Our account rests on Heitmüller's report in *ThR* 2 (1889) 86ff.

Here we may recognize two methods of looking for sources. Either there is a person round whom the sources revolve (hence the supposition of Acts of Paul or Peter), or a community in which they are handed down—here it is Antioch, but we saw that Schleiermacher would add Ephesus and Jerusalem.

In the same year there appeared the work of MARTIN SOROF, *Die Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte*. According to Sorof, the basis of Acts was the document destined for Theophilus by Luke, who had already, for Chapters 13 and 14, made use of a source relating to Barnabas. Considerably later Timothy added legends glorifying Peter and generally acted as editor, making a large number of interpolations. With this theory, Sorof is Loisy's forerunner: there is an authentic foundation to Acts, later extensively built upon by the redactor. Like many another student of Acts in this period, Sorof lived in the naive assurance that all revisions consisted simply of the addition of new material, so that it must be possible to name the origin of every verse.¹ Moreover, underlying his entire scheme is the primitive impression that certain parts to the scholar are historically possible and probable, while others are not: the first constitute the Lucan substratum, the rest the additions unfortunately inserted by Timothy. For the scholars of the time (as also, however, for Emanuel Hirsch in later days) it was an overwhelming temptation to attribute sources as far as possible to known persons of the apostolic age.

The year 1891 brought two works on the sources of Acts. PAUL FEINE, with his *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte*, threw a wholly new idea into the debate²: the special source of the third gospel, he says, runs beyond Luke 24 and appears in Acts 1.4,5,(8),9-17 etc.; its use even extends to Acts 12.24³! This source, a Jewish Christian document composed before the year 70 and mainly con-

¹ Two examples must suffice: (1) Acts 1.1,2 are ascribed to Luke, 1.3-2.42 to the legend of Peter inserted by Timothy (this 'explains' in terms of source-criticism the difficult transition from 1.2 to 1.3); 2.43-5 were added from Timothy's own ideas; 2.46 represents the resumption of the Lucan document. (2) Chapter 15 is divided as follows: 1-7a are by Luke, Timothy inserted 7b-18, while Luke's text is resumed with 19-34; James is thus cast adrift.

² Feine had already made his idea public in 1890 through the article, 'Die alte Quelle in der ersten Hälfte der Apostelgeschichte' (*Jahrb. für prot. Theologie* XVI, 84. 133). Later Emanuel Hirsch was to advocate the notion that the special source of Luke extends into Acts (*Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums*, vol. 1: *Das Werden des Markusevangeliums*, XXX-XXXIX of the 2nd enlarged edition, 1951). In support of this case, Hirsch dismissed Acts 1.3 from the text of the old source and made two conjectures: in 1.4, συναλιζόμενοις for συναλιζόμενος and ἡκουσάς μου (just as Hemsterhuis had suggested before him). The original account continues with Acts 1.12, 15a, 16-17, 20-6. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν should be deleted in 1.21, and everything in 1.22 before μάρτυρα: instead of τούτων read τῶν δύο. Thus, in Hirsch's reading, one of the two disciples of Emmaus was designated as the new Apostle. The whole conjectural edifice exemplifies the strength and weakness of the kind of source-reconstruction, in the spirit of H. J. Holtzmann's age, which proceeds with the aid of rash hypotheses.

³ *Überlieferung* 156-212.

cerned with Peter and Jerusalem, is according to Feine of unusual historical value. But in Chapters 6 and 7 he detects traces of a second source. Whereas one source in the story of Stephen develops the theme that 'the Jewish people has always ungratefully striven against God',¹ the other deals with the idea that God's saving presence is not bound to any particular place.² At other points also the story of Stephen shows the use of two sources; 9.1-30 and 11.15-31, and perhaps 8.25-40, should be referred to the second source,³ which portrays Stephen as the precursor of Paul.⁴

How it should be intrinsically possible for a Jewish Christian, before the year 70, to break the established mould of the gospel by prolonging it into a history of the Church—that is a question which Feine neglected to ask. Admittedly, it has remained largely disregarded even later.

The second work on Acts of the year 1891 was by FRIEDRICH SPITTA: *Die Apostelgeschichte, ihre Quellen und deren geschichtlicher Wert*. Spitta too is convinced that Acts 1 is a continuation of Luke 24.53⁵: this source he calls *A*. As an eyewitness-report⁶, it has higher historical value than the second source, *B*,⁷ which is of an artless, popular character.⁸ These two sources are interwoven throughout Acts; the German translation of the sources which Spitta supplies in his appendix⁹ conveys an impression of how ingeniously the whole of Acts has been dismembered into these two sources without leaving too much of a surplus to be attributed to the editor.¹⁰ While *A* probably derives from Luke himself (p. 312), *B* was not written until after the sack of Jerusalem (p. 317). The (unknown) editor combined the two documents as early as the first century. As for the third book, concerned with the remaining history of the Apostles, either he was no longer able to compile it, or it has been lost.¹¹

Spitta's skill in dissection is as astounding as his trust in the editor's skill in combination.

After this high tide of source-hypotheses there followed a perceptible slackening of output in research on the subject. In his *Chronologie der paulinischen Briefe*, 1893,¹² C. CLEMEN developed a somewhat complicated

¹ Acts 6.9-11, 15; 7.22-8, 35-43, 51-6, 59f.; 8.1, from ἐγένετο, 8.2 (*Überlieferung*, 193).

² Acts 6.13f., 7.2-21, 29-34, 44-50, 57-8a; 8.1, up to ἀνατρέσει αὐτοῦ (op. cit., 190f.).

³ This source according to Feine begins with Acts 6.1ff. (193).

⁴ Op. cit., 192f.

⁵ Specifically in verses 15-26.

⁶ Spitta, 303.

⁷ To which belong, in Chapter 1, verses 4-7, 9-14, 18 and 19.

⁸ Op. cit., 291.

⁹ Op. cit., 321-80.

¹⁰ E.g. 1.18f. (op. cit., 14), 21b & 22a (13f.). In Chapter 15, he inserted verses 5-12 into *B*, which alone reports the Apostolic Council (186ff.). On the other hand, 11.27-32 & 12.25 come from *A*.

¹¹ Op. cit., 319.

¹² Supplemented by his article in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1895, 'Der Zusammenhang von Apostelgeschichte 1-5'.

story concerning the genesis of Acts: a Life of Peter, already embodying half a dozen minor sources, was united by a Judaistic editor with a Life of Paul based on Luke's travel-journal; the whole was revised and emended by an anti-Judaist.¹

The ground-plan of the 'good' source *A* (stemming from Luke²) and the 'legendary' (Jewish Christian) source *B* was once more put to the test by JOHANNES JÜNGST in his *Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte* (1895). A 'redactor' of Trajan's or even Hadrian's time, one who already tended toward the ideas of the Apologists and wished to secure for Christianity the character of a *religio licita*, wove *A* and *B* together, adding much material of his own,³ especially in the second part of Acts. *B* continues the special source of the Third Gospel. But Jüngst also takes into account the very strong probability of editorial transpositions.⁴

The last work of this kind came from ADOLF HILGENFELD.⁵ He assumes three sources: 1. Judaistic *Acta Petri*, 2. Hellenistic 'Acts of the Seven', 3. Lucan *Acta Pauli*. To these three sources the 'redactor', who wished to show Paul and the Gentile Christians on good terms with the original Church, occasionally made considerable additions.

'Since 1896 . . . high tide has suddenly yielded to the ebb. Has the problem been solved? Has it been recognized as insoluble? Or has that vigorous *Quos ego!* which in his well-known thesis on the text of Acts a "master of the lower criticism", Friedrich Blass, hurled at the "higher critics" while they still sailed aloft in Icarian flight made so strong an impression that in shame and horror people abandoned the outlawed venture?' Such was Heitmüller's question in 1899.⁶

The philologist FRIEDRICH BLASS had put forward the thesis that Luke drafted Acts at Rome between 57 and 59 A.D. Copies of the draft were circulated, and so arose the 'Western' text of Acts. Once back in the Levant, Luke recast the book with prunings and improvements for Theophilus, the 'most excellent citizen of Antioch', and thus he made the 'Eastern' text.⁷

¹ Clemen retracted this hypothesis in his *Paulus* of 1904 (VII).

² See Jüngst, 201.

³ E.g. Acts 14.8-21a, 15.5-13a, 21-9, 16.23a, b, c-34.

⁴ Thus in *A* 15.1-4, 30a, 32, 35 are said to have followed immediately after 11.19-23, 25f., while 11.27-28a, 30 & 12.25ab followed 14.1f., 6f., 21b-27ab, 28; to this latter sequence 15.36 & 16.1, 3a, 6a, 7-23a were attached.

⁵ Hilgenfeld, 'Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihren Quellen untersucht', *ZwTh* 1895/6. Our account of Hilgenfeld's views is based on Heitmüller's review in *ThR* 2 (1899) 133f. Later Hilgenfeld published, in *ZwTh* for 1899, two articles: 'Das Aposteldekret nach seinem ursprünglichen Wortlaut' (138ff.) and 'Nachwort zu *Acta apostolorum graece et latine*' (382ff.).

⁶ *ThR* 2 (1899) 48.

⁷ Blass, 'Die Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte', in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1894, 86-119. Also, *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter (editio philologica)* 1895; *Acta Apostolorum secundum formam quae videtur romanam*, 1896.

Zahn, who along with others adopted this hypothesis, altered it at the same time: Luke, he suggested, sent his draft to Theophilus as a mark of personal regard. Copies of this draft produced the 'Western' text. When the question of regular publication presented itself to Luke later on, he revised the book, deleting personal details, and thus arose the 'Eastern' form of text, as in B N etc.¹

Most scholars—rightly—rejected Blass's theory, because the two texts are to some extent mutually exclusive (Zahn avoided this admission only by rejecting from the 'Western' text the 'Western' form of the Apostolic Decree) and because it is in fact the 'Western' text which seeks to remove tensions and disagreements. This apart, the hypothesis in no way renders the source-question redundant: it merely, as Loisy saw,² puts it back behind the textual problem.

A final attempt to clarify the problem of sources—and not only this, but the problem of Acts in general—was made by ADOLF HARNACK in the first years of the new century. In his *Lucas der Arzt* (1906),³ he took up again the researches of W. K. Hobart⁴ and endeavoured to demonstrate from the language of the twin 'Lucan' works that a physician must have been their author—Luke the 'beloved physician' of Col. 4.14.⁵ Two years later, his book *Die Apostelgeschichte* dealt among other things with the question of sources.⁶ 'If Luke the physician is the author of Acts, the source-question is simply and quickly settled for the whole second half of the book' (p. 131): for one part of the events recounted Luke was himself an eyewitness, for the remainder he possessed the reports of eyewitnesses. As for the first half of the book, it is impossible to ascertain its sources through stylistic analysis. Accordingly Harnack first turns his inquiry to the scenes and persons recounted.⁷ The story of Stephen must have a documentary source,⁸ to which belong 6.1–8.4, 11.19–30 and 12.25 (13.1)–15.35. This 'Antioch-Jerusalem source', perhaps as a whole to be considered documentary,⁹ derives its authority from Silas. We may call it C. Harnack distinguishes it from a 'Jerusalem-Caesarea source A,' from which come 3.1–5.16, 8.5–40, 9.31–11.18 and 12.1–23: here Luke received partly oral, partly written information from Philip—or from him and his prophetess daughters, whence the predilection for the enthusiastic!¹⁰ Finally, running parallel with the historically

¹ Theodor Zahn, 'Die Urausgabe der Apostelgeschichte des Lucas', *Forsch. z. Gesch. des ntl. Kanons* IX, 1916, 2–6.

² *Les Actes*, p. 41.

³ *ET Luke the Physician* (1907).

⁴ Hobart, *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, 1882; cf. Zahn, *Einleitung in das NT*, 3rd ed., Vol. 2, 433f. & 442f. (*ET Introduction to the NT*, Edinburgh, 1909).

⁵ See p. 73 n. 2.

⁶ *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das NT III* (1908); *ET The Acts of the Apostles* (1909).

⁷ *Op. cit.*, 132ff.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, 138.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, 187.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, 151 and 185.

respectable source A there is a legendary source B (Chapter 2 and 5.17-42) with which Harnack refuses to saddle any member of the apostolic circle. Thus it remains as anonymous as it is worthless.¹

To make a really sound case for the parallelism of *A* and *B* Harnack simply described the coming of the Spirit with the gift of tongues in 4.31ff. as the 'real historical Pentecost', to which Chapter 2 is the legendary counterpart.² It goes without saying that the two arrests of Chapters 4 and 5 were likewise interpreted as parallel accounts.³ Finally, in his *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte*,⁴ Harnack demonstrated the stylistic accord of the 'we'-passages with the rest of Acts, hastening somewhat rashly to infer the identity of their author with the writer of the whole. Originally,⁵ by the way, Harnack had placed Acts c. 80 A.D. In the last-mentioned work, however, he opted for composition at Rome some time before the outcome of Paul's trial.⁶

At a meeting of the Royal Göttingen Scientific Society on 12 January 1907, JULIUS WELLHAUSEN read a paper on Acts⁷ in which he dealt with a number of selected passages. His general conclusion, in criticism of research up to that time, runs: 'Of late we have seen an endeavour to apportion the Acts of the Apostles by source-criticism in such a way that very little remains for Luke, who yet was certainly no mere compiler . . . Yet the fact remains that often enough the documentary information used by Luke floats like *croûtons* in the soup . . . joints and seams are discernible at many points, . . . and in Chapters 16 to 21 in particular there comes to light a travel-journal, which of course has been revised and enriched with episodes'.⁸

A similar view is found in perhaps the best thing written on Acts before the first World War: § XII, 'Apostelgeschichten', of PAUL WENDLAND's 'Urchristliche Literaturformen'.⁹ Wendland does not engage in a source-theory of the kind favoured so far. With regard to the history of the primitive Church and the earliest spread of Christianity, he says, 'the writer possessed only separate traditions, whose sequence and interconnection lie open to strong suspicion.'¹⁰ The inadequacy of many references is to be explained not by Luke's exercise of selection but by 'the fragmentary character of the

¹ 'The latest and least trustworthy' portions of the book (op. cit., 184).

² Op. cit., 146.

³ Op. cit., 143f.

⁴ *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das NT IV* (1911); ET *The Date of the Acts . . .*, 1911.

⁵ Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, Vol. I, 1897, 246-50; see 248: '. . . the indication is, therefore, that the book . . . may be dated roughly as far back as the year 80.'

⁶ *Beiträge IV*, 63-114.

⁷ 1-21 of the Proceedings of the *Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, 1907. 263-99 contain the extremely important article by Eduard Schwartz, 'Zur Chronologie des Paulus', in which he dates the council of the Apostles in the winter of 43/44 (p. 269).

⁸ Wellhausen, 21.

⁹ *Hdb. z. NT Vol. I, Part 3*, 2nd & 3rd edd., 1912.

¹⁰ Op. cit., 315.

traditions known to him'.¹ His 'presentation, eschewing tensions and controversy, is not the ingenious product of a would-be conciliator, but the natural expression of more developed church conditions and the changed historical outlook they brought'.² 'The special vocation of Paul to be an Apostle to the Gentiles' is no longer evident. The theory which dominates the presentation in 13.46, 18.6, 19.9, and 28.25ff. lifts 'the events described out of their limits to the level of images having a universal and typical significance'; it thus illustrates the replacing of God's revelation to the Jews by its communication to the Gentiles.³ The Jews (the Judaists being as good as forgotten) are the Apostle's enemy, although he is presented as a law-abiding Jew in a way irreconcilable with his own statements.⁴ Joins and contradictions show that a diversity of presumably documentary sources has been used. The author is acquainted with secular literature; the gospel begins with a stylish exordium in the traditional manner.⁵ But the whole is not a genuine history; like the Books of the Maccabees, it hovers between history and epic. Its lineal descendants are the Lives of the Saints and Martyrs. Its loose composition, its absorption in anecdote, are akin to the embroidered or panegyric presentation of great historical persons or religious miracle-workers.⁶ The technique of such models is more familiar to the author than the style of (rhetorical) history. The many repetitions betray the carelessness of the popular story-teller,⁷ whose habit is to present scene after scene without making sure that each is wholly in harmony with what has gone before.⁸ 'In the formulation of the speeches', the author 'stands on a level with John'⁹; as in the fourth gospel, the speeches often do not suit the situation, but express his religious opinions. Luke, however, is not the author: the prologue is far removed from the time of the Apostles.¹⁰ His medical knowledge does not exceed that of an educated layman.¹¹

And so Wendland's study opened the way for a new view of Acts, one which abandons the various biases of 'tendency'- and source-criticism, thereby allowing the problem of literary form to come into focus. Wendland's observations form a transition to the method of style and form criticism practised by Dibelius.

In 1913 *Agnostos Theos*, a work by the great Berlin philologist EDUARD NORDEN,¹² caused quite a stir among the experts on Acts. Even today Norden's historical investigations into the style of liturgical and preaching formulae,¹³ and his Appendices IV to VIII on stylistic questions, have not lost their

¹ Op. cit., 316.

³ Op. cit., 322.

⁵ Op. cit., 324.

⁷ Op. cit., 328.

⁹ Op. cit., 331.

¹¹ Op. cit., 335.

¹² The book has the sub-title *Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede*.

¹³ Op. cit., 143-308.

² Op. cit., 321.

⁴ Op. cit., 323.

⁶ Op. cit., 325.

⁸ Op. cit., 329.

¹⁰ Op. cit., 334.

validity or value. His demonstration that in the Areopagus speech a Jewish-Christian basic theme goes hand in hand with a Stoic secondary theme¹ has likewise been gratefully accepted. On the other hand we have abandoned his thesis that Luke borrowed the altar-inscription to the unknown god from the work of Apollonius of Tyana, *περὶ θεσιῶν*.² Moreover, to identify the 'unknown god' with the supreme, unknowable God of the gnostics seems inappropriate.³ Luke was hardly anxious to maintain that this was the God whom Christianity proclaimed! However, Norden did in fact assume that the 'unknown Father' was an item of doctrine in the community at Jerusalem.⁴

The commentary on Acts which THEODOR ZAHN completed in 1920 represented an unbroken traditionalism unembarrassed by source-problems. The great scholar sacrificed all too large a part of his 884 pages to proving that even the 'Western' text derived from Luke. Zahn hardly examined dissenting opinions with any degree of thoroughness, nor did he lay bare Luke's particular theological bent.

It is scarcely possible to imagine a greater contrast to Zahn's work than ALFRED LOISY's commentary, *Les Actes des Apôtres*, which appeared in the same year. Stimulated by the writings of Wellhausen and Schwartz,⁵ he represents the resurgence of a bygone age of research, a straggler like Johannes Weiss before him in 1897 (see p. 23f. above). But just as Weiss already faced the problems of form in Acts, which were not to come into their own until the rise of Form-criticism, so Loisy in fact left all previous research behind. True, he still believed that Luke did at one time write a genuinely historical—in the modern sense—Acts of the Apostles. But, he said, the extant work represents an editor's rewriting of the whole to suit the taste of a later age! If, however, we substitute the actual author of Acts for this supposed 'redactor', we are confronting the real problem of Acts, a problem for whose solution Loisy paved the way with innumerable flashes of insight. To this extent Loisy's commentary, which, with its 980 pages of close print, stands like a giant among its brothers, is not merely in outward appearance an imposing production.

C. Criticism up to 1945. The First Phase of Form-Criticism

The Smaller Units

In 1923 a short essay of only 23 pages by Martin Dibelius ushered in a new era of research on Acts: 'Stilkritisches zur Apostelgeschichte'⁶. The

¹ Op. cit., 1-30.

² Op. cit., 31-55 & 333-46.

³ Op. cit., 56ff.

⁴ Op. cit., 77. Admittedly the saying stood in Q. But this merely indicates that even Q is not synonymous with 'oldest tradition.' Q has more recent elements also, of which the logion Matt. 11.27 or Luke 10.22 is probably the latest.

⁵ Notably those mentioned in note 7, page 32 above.

⁶ *Εὐχαριστήριον für Hermann Gunkel II*, 27-49; translation in Martin Dibelius, *Studies*, 1-25.

characteristic of the new era is that interest in reconstructing the early history of Christianity recedes, and its place is taken by an uncovering of new possibilities in the field of Christian *literary* history. The real instigator of this change was Hermann Gunkel. His predecessors had been accustomed to think in terms of great source-documents, e.g., in the case of the Old Testament, those of the Yahwist and the Elohist. Now Gunkel drew attention to the smaller units and their types. These smaller units stand at the beginning of the tradition (for instance separate accounts later woven into a legendary anthology). They are far older than the supposed source documents, not to mention the canonical books themselves. One is therefore justified in investigating them first and for their own sake.

In 1919 Dibelius applied this 'Form-critical' method to the Synoptic Gospels.¹ In 1923 he used it for the first time on Acts. Thereby he brought to an end, to use his own words, the 'one-sided attention to the source-question' and the 'one-sided interpretation, which only inquired about the historical reliability of the material'.² His initiative produced an astounding result, whose consequences Dibelius himself did not at first grasp: the smaller units which he had demonstrated to exist in the Synoptic Gospels can only be found in one part of Acts. 'The examples intended for preaching' (i.e. the paradigms) 'one seeks in Acts . . . in vain, for so far there has not been any preaching about the Apostles in the early Church.'³ This is an extremely important statement. It shows that for Acts we cannot presume the extensive mass of separate stories which Luke was able to use in his gospel. This very fact shows how questionable was the assumption, hitherto prevalent, that Luke used the same working-method in Acts as in the third gospel. The preconditions in each case were far too different for this to be so. In the composition of Acts Luke neither possessed the great mass of material at his command for the gospel, nor was he able to lean on a predecessor who had already marshalled the available material and offered a prototype.⁴ For, seeing that the first Christians lived in expectation of the imminent end of the world, they felt no call to write down for posterity 'how it all really happened'—they had actually stopped thinking in terms of a future generation. As unlettered people, moreover, they were inclined neither to write nor to read works of history. In addition, the lack of traditional material and the need to supplement or supply deficiencies with original composition, giving the whole a suitable form, compelled the author of Acts to adopt a new method of work.

¹ *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (=FRLANT, New Series 42), 2nd ed. 1933 (ET *From Tradition to Gospel* 1934).

² Dibelius, 'Zur Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments' (*ThR*, New Series 3 (1931) 207-42) 211. See now Klaus Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte?*, Neukirchen 1964 (ET *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition* 1969).

³ *Ib.*, 236.

⁴ *Studies*, 3, 124, 148, 192, 196.

These observations and considerations are borne out by Dibelius' findings. Apart from the 'travel-journal', he finds in Acts no substantial, coherent sources, but rather a number of smaller, self-contained accounts. For the most part the 'heroes' of these smaller units, which Dibelius often calls 'legends', are Peter and Paul. But on the other hand it is a 'travel-journal' which in the middle part of Acts governs the structure of the narrative.¹ The journal does not however coincide with the 'we'-passages, for the 'we' 'may equally well indicate an old source or a new literary work'.² Further, lists of names (6.5, 13.1) and details like 11.20,26 can be singled out as data woven in by Luke.

If this represents all the existing material incorporated by Luke, a very much larger part of Acts must be laid to the account of the author himself, including 1. the so-called summaries—'little cross-sectional descriptions of a general kind', at which Luke arrived by generalizing particular events;³ 2. Lucan reworkings and expansions of legends—of which the story of Cornelius, 10.1–11.18, offers a specially clear example;⁴ 3. Lucan links of various kinds between items from the tradition; and 4. the speeches composed by Luke. These last, numbering 24 according to Dibelius, comprise nearly one third of the book. They are intended to bear witness to the gospel. This is especially true of the Apostles' missionary addresses, which probably correspond to Christian preaching of about the year 90: 'So does one preach—and so should one preach!'⁵ On the other hand, by the apologetic speeches of Paul in the later chapters, 'the author wishes . . . to advise the Christians of his time to employ these ideas in self-vindication'.⁶ Paul's Miletus address shows the portrait Luke wished to present of the Apostle, and is at the same time an admonition to the whole Church.⁷

At the end of his essay Dibelius stresses that such style-criticism in no way serves to determine the historical authenticity or inauthenticity of the individual stories. The question of historicity must be decided differently for each different part (obviously it is the journal which receives the most favourable verdict). Nevertheless, this judgment can only ensue once style-criticism has done its work. Instead of prematurely asking them historical questions, one should first 'listen to what the stories have to say' (p. 25).

This essay had scarcely any effect. This is not surprising, for Dibelius had robbed Acts-research of its source-documents and replaced them with a mere handful of separate stories of varying historical value, plus a few *faits divers*. The further implications of his findings were only made apparent in his own later work on Acts. If, however, scholars had examined the essay

¹ *Studies*, esp. 5f., 69f., 73–6, 86, 105, 129f., 196–201.

² *Ib.*, 204.

³ *Ib.*, 127.

⁴ *Ib.*, 13f., 94f., 109–22.

⁵ *Ib.*, 165.

⁶ *Ib.*, 213.

⁷ *Ib.*, 158.

more closely, they could already have asked Dibelius whether he had not in fact demonstrated the inapplicability of Form-criticism to Acts. After all, Dibelius himself had let slip (p. 4) that in Acts—where Luke had not, as for the gospel, a ready-made tradition to hand—it was a question ‘not of any Form-critical approach, but only of style-criticism’.

Since Dibelius’ further work on Acts became known only after the second World War, research at first went its way, to all intents and purposes, completely uninfluenced by him. Let us now turn, then, to the *Anglo-Saxon* field of study. The five volumes appearing between 1920 and 1933 of the gigantic work entitled *The Beginnings of Christianity*, for which Jackson, Lake and Cadbury were chiefly responsible, remained close in essentials to the outlook of Harnack’s time.¹ In the chronology, and hence in the historical outline, one may trace the influence of Eduard Schwartz. The theology of Acts remains rather in the background, but so do its qualities of composition. As against this, the rich abundance of linguistic, historical and archaeological details renders the work, now as then, indispensable to the scholar, and ensures its value even on the Continent.

At the same time as the fifth volume there appeared in Oxford an edition of Acts by A. C. CLARK,² provided with an introduction and notes, which is still important as a study of the ‘Western’ text. In 1936 B. S. EASTON³ published his Reinicke Lectures on ‘The Purpose of Acts’, which anticipate Dibelius—even ‘late’ Dibelius—to an astonishing extent: Luke, according to Easton, was not writing for only *one* public but wished both to edify the Christians and to present an apology for the attention of pagan Rome. The first aim caused him to simplify the story: geographically (Jerusalem—Rome), biographically (Peter—Paul) and chronologically through abandonment of strict chronology.⁴ The speeches show the nature of Christianity, as Luke understood it, and already constitute part of the apologetic attempt to make Christianity a *religio licita*.⁵ Clark had tried to prove through a word-count that Luke and Acts are not by the same writer.⁶ This thesis was refuted in 1948 by W. L. KNOX,⁷ whose book on Acts, derived from summer-school

¹ Part I, *The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. Vol. 1 (1920): *Prolegomena I*—the Jewish, Gentile, Christian Background. Vol. 2 (1922): *Prolegomena II*—Composition and Authorship of Acts; History of Criticism. Vol. 3 (1926)—Text of Acts, by J. H. Ropes. Vol. 4 (1933)—English translation and commentary by Lake and H. J. Cadbury. Vol. 5 (1933)—Appendices. In all, 2450 pages.

² Albert Curtis Clark, *The Acts of the Apostles*, critical edition 1933. Discussed with important corrections by K. and S. Lake in *JBL* 53 (1934) 34–52.

³ Burton Scott Easton, *Early Christianity: ‘The Purpose of Acts’ and other papers*; ed. F. C. Grant, London SPCK, 1955.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 33–5.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, 36f., 41–56.

⁶ Clark, *op. cit.*, 394–408: Appendix III—Authorship of Luke and Acts; sample statistics: τε Luke 8 times, Acts 158; μὲν οὖν Luke 1, Acts 27; μετά Luke 52, Acts 32; σύν Luke 26, Acts 51; ἐγένετο + finite vb., Luke 22, Acts 0; ἐγένετο + inf. Luke 5, Acts 16; ἵνα Luke 38, Acts 12; ὅπως Luke 7, Acts 15.

⁷ Wilfred L. Knox, *The Acts of the Apostles*. See especially pp. 100–9 and 3–15.

lectures, retains the freshness of its first oral delivery, and to that extent may readily be excused for a certain lack of co-ordination in the material of its five chapters.¹ Stimulated by Torrey, this ingenious author detected, in 1.4-5.16, Aramaic material which had been incorrectly translated (KNOX, p. 18); for the rest, he thought in terms of oral sources available to Paul's travelling-companion Luke, whom he declared to be no historian in the proper sense. Luke was casting the advance of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome into the forms of a traveller's tale. 'Such stories, whether true or fictitious, appealed to the popular taste by providing a variety of scenes and adventures, with plenty of marvels thrown in' (p. 55).

Turning to *French* research, let us first mention the investigation of Acts undertaken by MAURICE GOGUEL in 1922 as the third volume, *Le Livre des Actes*, of his *Introduction au Nouveau Testament*. It deals with the traditions (pp. 15-36), the history of criticism (pp. 36-72), the text—the 'Western' form being secondary—(pp. 73-104), literary connections with Luke, the Pauline epistles and Josephus (pp. 105-29), the style and language (pp. 130-46) and the book's literary character (pp. 147-71); under this last head the book is said to have no exact plan, even if the second part is relatively coherent: the prologue and the story of the Ascension are the work of an interpolator, and the 'we'-passages are parts of an extensive report on Paul and his mission by a temporary companion. Goguel continues with a critical analysis of the first half (pp. 172-257) and the second (pp. 258-341). The author, says Goguel, had planned a third book. The strictly historical Acts which Loisy thought Luke to have written is a figment of wishful thinking: Luke did in fact write the travel-diary, which was used by the *auctor ad Theophilum*. He wrote around the year 80—where, it is impossible to say. He does not offer a complete theology. The book contains, alongside parts of minimal historical value, material which is essential to the history of primitive Christianity. Its place in literary history?—The gospels had shown how faith rests on the person and work of Jesus. It was now necessary to go further and show how 'the principle created by the gospels'(!) had been realized in practice (p. 368); here Goguel is brushing aside a serious problem. The work, he goes on to say, falls into a new category, foreshadowing the Lives of the Martyrs and apocryphal Acts of Apostles (pp. 342-70). The picture of early Christianity which thus results was later outlined by Goguel in *La Naissance du christianisme*²: the Church's year of destiny was the year 44, during which

¹ Authorship, 1-15; Sources, 16-39; Galatians and Acts, 40-53; Acts and History, 54-68; Theology, 69-99.

² *La Naissance du christianisme*, 2nd ed. 1946 (ET *The Birth of Christianity*, 1953); it is the second volume of his survey *Jésus et les origines du christianisme*, which recalls Eduard Meyer's three-volume *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (1921-3). Vol. 3 treats of Acts. Like Goguel, Meyer considers Luke, the companion of Paul, to be the author, and locates the 'Apostolic Council' before the year 44.

the recognition of Paul's apostolate unleashed persecution, eliminated the Apostles, and brought James to the leadership.¹

On the other side the Catholic exegete E. JACQUIER² defended the traditional points of view. The product of a truly beaver-like industry, his enormous volume of over 1000 pages frankly assembles the material rather than masters it. In 1949 J. RENIÉ translated the Vulgate text of Acts into French, providing a conservative but knowledgeable commentary.³

Even in *Germany*, for the time being, research by-passed the work of Dibelius. The commentary of H. W. BEYER⁴ pressed psychology into the service of pious exegesis, seeking thereby to open Acts to a wider public. Only on occasion does he take up critical questions, including, as it happens, the concession that Luke was the author only of the 'we'-passages, not of Acts as a whole.

In 1925 H. H. WENDT, who from 1880 to 1913 had dealt with Acts in Meyer's Commentaries, from the fifth to the ninth edition, re-opened the source-question.⁵ Independently Joachim Jeremias in 1937 developed almost the same hypothesis.⁶ Both attempted to isolate an Antiochian source beginning with Chapter 6. At the same time Jeremias disputed Harnack's source-theory whereby Acts 4 and 5 represent the same trial as seen in two parallel traditions.

OTTO BAUERNFEIND⁷ wrote the only German commentary of any size during this period (1939). Writing in the menacing atmosphere of National-Socialism, to which he makes constant allusions, he sought to reconcile the exigencies of scientific criticism with the desire for moral comfort evinced by pastors and their flocks. Only the thorough reader notices that critical questions are not merely recognized but thoughtfully considered.

D. Criticism after 1945. The Second Phase of Form-Criticism: The Composition

Meanwhile MARTIN DIBELIUS had forged ahead with the problems of Acts in his history of early Christian literature (1926)⁸ and his interim survey of 1931, 'Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments'⁹. The various papers on Acts which Dibelius had produced up to his untimely death in 1947 were

¹ *Naissance*, 124-7. ET 106ff.

² *Les Actes des Apôtres: Études bibliques*, Paris 1926.

³ *La Sainte Bible*, tome XI, Paris, Letouzey & Ané, 368 pages.

⁴ *Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, 5. Die Apostelgeschichte übersetzt und erklärt von Hermann Wolfgang Beyer, Göttingen 1933, 4th ed. 1947.

⁵ 'Die Hauptquelle der Apostelgeschichte', *ZNW* 24 (1925) 293-305.

⁶ 'Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte', *ZNW* 36 (1937) 205-21.

⁷ *Die Apostelgeschichte, Theol. Handkommentar zum NT*, V, 1939.

⁸ *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur II*, Göschen Collection No. 935, 95-106 (ET *A Fresh Approach to the NT and Early Christian Literature* 1936).

⁹ *ThR*, N.F. 3, 207-42.

collected together in 1951 and published by H. Greeven under the title of *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*. An English edition appeared in 1956.¹

Now for the first time the picture of the writer Luke which was faintly delineated in the 1923 essay becomes plainly visible. Luke, the companion of Paul, wrote Acts: the Lucan writings cannot have appeared anonymously. But that is still no reason for supposing that Acts is historically reliable in its rendering of events. For Luke, whose literary plans are most probably the product of later years, does not stand as a mere reporter vis-à-vis Paul.² Above all, it must be remembered that he was a historian in the ancient, not the modern sense. As such he wanted 'to present and illuminate the typical. And this penchant for the typical and significant led even the author of Acts partly to omit, alter or generalize what really happened'.³ 'In order to bring out the communal ideal . . . , he overdoes the communism; in order to make effective the Apostolic ideal, he minimizes the differences between one Apostle and another. For the sake of intellectual symbolism, Athens has to be the place of encounter between Antiquity and Christianity, even though the historical centre of the mission was Corinth.'⁴ But Luke is not only an ancient historian: he is a preacher, inasmuch as he 'expounds the destination of events'.⁵ He shows that events do not take place by chance but move in a definite direction, and that these directed events have a meaning: they are realizing God's plan of salvation.

We can see nowadays that in this conception of Acts the doubtful and the promising lay side by side. For it is highly improbable that the ancient historians' striving for the typical should have brought a companion of Paul to the point of suppressing his own experiences in Paul's company (Chapter 27!) and substituting a fictional story of travel and adventure (*Studies*, 205f., 213f.). It is even more improbable that for the same reason he should allow the Apostle's portrait to disappear in favour of an apostolic stereotype. It is much more likely that Luke in fact knew only the uniform Apostle figure of his time, and that consequently he did not himself accompany Paul on his wanderings at all. According to Dibelius, the apologies of Paul are intended to show the Christians what ideas they should employ in self-defence⁶—this too seems

¹ *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, tr. M. Ling, 1956.

² *Studies*, 98 n. 11. Zahn disagrees (813f.): 'What stood in the way of the natural desire . . . to obtain exact information from Paul as to his latest experiences and to satisfy curiosity by interjecting questions? Moreover, Luke would not have omitted, as was his . . . habit, to write down what he heard, without delay, in his diary.' Here Zahn is obviously confusing Paul and Luke with Goethe and Eckermann. Unfortunately Zahn did not pause to consider what Acts must have looked like if Luke had really followed this procedure.

³ *Studies*, 136f.

⁴ Thus Dibelius in a letter to the present writer, 10 February, 1947.

⁵ *Studies*, 129, also 134, 163.

⁶ *Studies*, 213: 'They should stress the fact that they have transgressed neither against Caesar, nor against the Temple, nor against the Law . . .' What have the Christians of Luke's time to do with the Temple that was destroyed in the year 70?

very dubious. For these addresses contain far too much biographical matter: Christians about the year 90 were no longer, for the most part, people like Paul, who had had their origins in Jewry or had been Pharisees. Dibelius maintains that these speeches stand loosely in their surroundings; if Luke had composed them, we should have expected otherwise. But in reality they are not so loosely inserted; in other words, the problem of the speeches has here clearly not yet been fully solved. The same is true of the travel-journal. For it is not a really satisfying conclusion that it noted routes and places to spend the night for the sake of later missionary travellers.¹ As soon as the Pauline mission had got a foothold and Paul was in correspondence by letter and emissary with the various communities such travel-guides became superfluous.

What was promising in Dibelius' work was that now at last it gave due prominence to the New Testament author. No longer was Luke a mere 'compiler or transmitter,' but a writer with his own positive characteristics—and a theologian. For the first time the deeply-rooted tendency to regard Acts as no more than a quarry to furnish material for the reconstruction of primitive Christianity was overcome. For the first time the question could be faced of what this biblical author was trying to tell his readers. In this way Dibelius was the instigator of a trend which has ever since become increasingly pronounced in New Testament research. Investigations, that is to say, have turned from the question of historical reliability to that of the message of the New Testament writings.

Beyond a doubt, however, Dibelius and his followers must expect to encounter strong resistance. Although Catholic research now handles New Testament problems with far greater freedom than before, the kind of liberty which Dibelius claims for the writer Luke is hard to stomach—and not only for Catholic scholars. Wherever, as in England, scholarship is governed by the spirit of conservatism, Dibelius' interpretation of Acts is bound to seem a revival of that radicalism which chronically afflicts the Continent. But it is not only a question of overcoming the reverence attaching to a Biblical commission's decision, scholarly tradition or the desires of congregations: it is a question of disappointing the longing for historical information, which it had been customary to lift from every part of Acts. The purely historical outlook, after a reign of two hundred years, could scarcely be dethroned overnight.

English theologians have remained almost wholly uninfluenced by Dibelius (perhaps the English translation of his Essays will change this). As far back as 1942 F. F. BRUCE published a study of *The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles*, which, he claims, reproduce more or less verbatim the text of sources that Luke may well have held to be authentic renderings of the

¹ *Studies*, 199: '... so that on retracing the journey one might rediscover the routes and the former hosts'. Cf. G. Schille, *TLZ* 84 (1959) 165ff.

original addresses. In 1951 appeared Bruce's commentary on Acts,¹ which goes carefully into philological and historical questions; the theological problems are dealt with in his *New International Commentary* volume (1954, 1956²).

In 1953 C. S. C. Williams issued the second, revised edition of A. H. McNEILE's *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*. This assembles practically everything which with any shadow of justification can be brought against Dibelius: 1. literary forms are arbitrarily ascribed to certain sections; 2. the 'community myth,' i.e. that of the collective production of the Gospels, is unwarrantably created; 3. a false analogy is drawn with folklore ('a ballad is written by only one poet')—moreover the time between Jesus' death and Mark is too short for the development of a tradition; 4. I Cor. 7.25 shows how exactly the words of Jesus were handed down; 5. the form of a miracle-story has nothing to do with its historical value; 6. the gospels say nothing at all about the questions which later exercised the Church; 7. the Marcan framework is historically authentic(!). Dibelius is not of course refuted by these arguments. But the objections are well worth thinking over.

In the same year, 1953, appeared the posthumous work of DOM GREGORY DIX, *Jew and Greek, A Study in the Primitive Church*. The author wanted to call it 'the problem of the sub-Apostolic Church', and it was this which really interested him.² It was only by dethroning Paul that he was able to justify the sub-apostolic Church: Paul was, according to Dix, only one of the missionaries from the Jewish Christian(!) mission in the diaspora who accepted Gentiles in the years 40 to 50,³ and Jerusalem did not pronounce any veto against the practice. This is how the 'leap' was made from the Syrian into the Greek world (Toynbee!). The full form of the Syrian gospel was however first developed by the Palestinian John. The Pauline doctrine of justification was the basis of the whole Jewish Christian Church⁴—which surely makes it utterly incomprehensible why Paul should have had to put up such a stiff fight on its behalf against both Jews and Jewish Christians.

In *The Interpreter's Bible*, an interesting commentary on Acts appeared in 1954. G. H. C. MACGREGOR contributed an introduction and scholarly exegesis of a mildly critical order,⁵ while Theodore P. Ferris provided the

¹ *The Acts of the Apostles*, Oxford 1951, 2nd ed. 1952. Bruce explains in the preface to the second edition, VIII: 'it is not a theological commentary'.

² Dix: 'The problem of the following discussion will . . . be the problem of the legitimacy of the sub-Apostolic Church . . .'

³ *Op. cit.*, 30ff.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 45.

⁵ Macgregor says a 'cautious Yes' to Luke's authorship (p. 20). The 'travel-journal' contained parts in the first and third persons (p. 16).—In vol. 5 of the Moffatt commentary series, 1931, Foakes-Jackson worked with Moffatt's translation: 'This commentary is critical in places, but it is frankly an appreciation of the work of Luke' (p. XX).

devotional exposition. Over the two commentaries is printed the English text to which they refer (King James and RSV).

In 1957 C. S. C. WILLIAMS issued his commentary on Acts.¹ His conclusions were that Luke the companion of Paul wrote Acts between 66 and 70, though perhaps he did not publish until much later. The discrepancies between Acts and the Pauline epistles are not so important as to cast doubt on this authorship. Galatians could have been written before the Apostolic council. Paul did not meet the Apostles in the course of the events of Acts 11, and therefore did not need to mention this visit in Galatians. The speeches are not free compositions of Luke. Peter's speeches in the first chapters show Christianity still as a reformed Judaism. Since Williams simply fails to see many of the historical and literary problems, they do not disturb him and he has no occasion to avail himself of Dibelius' ideas.

In the same year N. B. STONEHOUSE² also crossed swords with Dibelius. He denied that Luke made free with historical facts. It is true that the Areopagus address is condensed, but it has real individuality and is no mere adapted formula. To suppose, however, that a writer could not endow his adaptations with individuality is a deplorable misunderstanding. In general, moreover, Stonehouse tends to minimize difficulties in his polemic against Dibelius. When he reproaches Dibelius and Eduard Schweizer for failing to observe that according to I Thess. 1.9 conversion is a turning from idols to God, that does not yet prove Acts 17.30f. a Pauline sermon!

The doyen of Anglo-Saxon research on Acts is H. J. CADBURY. To him we owe the investigation of Luke's style and literary method³ which among other things put an end to the myth of Luke's medical language; also *The Making of Luke-Acts* (1927, reprinted 1958), described by Dibelius as 'excellent', which at that time provided the profoundest introduction to Luke's creative mind, and the linguistic and literary part of Vols. 4 and 5 of *The Beginnings of Christianity* (1933). Subsequently, in 1955, he produced a further book entitled *The Book of Acts in History*.⁴ Here he discusses the place of Acts in its historical setting, first in general terms, then with respect to its Greek, Roman, Jewish and Christian environment, and finally the book's subsequent destiny. The connections of Acts with all the elements of its time have probably never been so illuminatingly and convincingly presented as here, through the medium of Cadbury's sovereign command of the primary and

¹ *The Acts of the Apostles*, Black's NT Commentaries, 1957.

² *Paul before the Areopagus, and other NT Studies*, London, 1957, III + 197: 1-40—'The Areopagus Address'; 151-85—'Martin Dibelius and the relation of History and Faith'. Earlier Stonehouse had published *The Witness of Luke to Christ*, Michigan, 1951—an expanded version of lectures delivered in Edinburgh in April 1949.

³ Henry Joel Cadbury, 'The Style and Literary Method of Luke' in *Harvard Theological Studies* 6, 1919-20. His proofs are consolidated in articles *JBL* 45 (1926) 190-209, and 52 (1933) 55-65.

⁴ In addition there are important articles.

secondary literature involved. The problem of authorship is set aside as inessential.

In French-speaking circles research into Acts has become more lively. The edition of Acts in *La Sainte Bible de Jérusalem*¹ includes a well-balanced introduction by LUCIEN CERFAUX, who already had to his credit a series of separate papers on Acts, while the translation and notes are by JACQUES DUPONT. The latter had published in 1950 a praiseworthy survey of recent literature on Acts, and has since made a number of valuable contributions to individual problems.²

1957 saw the publication in Paris of ETIENNE TROCMÉ's interesting study, *Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire*, dedicated to the memory of Goguel and gratefully indebted—though with no cession of independence—to Ph.-H. Menoud (from whom, after his important articles,³ we expect also a commentary on Acts). As indicated by the fifty-three references in the index, a running controversy is sustained against Dibelius, but indeed the whole range of research is touched upon. The theme brings the source-question once more to the fore. The author of Acts is said to have written between 80 and 85 and to have been an eyewitness of many of the incidents, as attested by his 'we'. But Chapters 16 to 28 are not simply an eyewitness-report: the author used sources. Not a *ὑπόμνημα* (that would have been a literary work!), but a '*diare personnel*' (Trocmé, p. 135) which Paul from time to time had one of his fellow-workers keep and which in the end passed into Luke's possession. It was to this that he resorted when, twenty years later, he wrote a 'gospel' in which Paul played a leading rôle in the sacred history. For, like Sahlin and Menoud, Trocmé assumes that Luke 24.50-3 and Acts 1.1-3 were inserted when Luke's work was divided 'on its acceptance into the canon.'

¹ *Les Actes des Apôtres*, by Canon L. Cerfaux and Dom J. Dupont, OSB; Editions du Cerf, Paris 1954, 3rd ed. 1964.

² Jacques Dupont, *Les Problèmes du Livre des Actes. État de question*, Bruges 1950; id. *Les Sources du Livre des Actes*, Bruges 1960 (ET *The Sources of Acts*, 1964); 'L'Utilisation apologétique de l'Ancien Testament dans les discours des Actes', *Eph. Theol. Lov.* 26 (1953) 289-327. 'Notes sur les Actes des Apôtres', *Rev. Bibl.* 62 (1955) 45-59. 'Pierre et Paul dans les Actes', *Rev. Bibl.* 64 (1957) 35-47. 'La Mission de Paul "à Jérusalem" (Actes 12.25)', *NovTest.* I (1956) 275-303. 'Pierre et Paul à Antioche et à Jérusalem', *RScR* 45 (1957) 42-60 and 225-39. ΛΑΟΣ 'ΕΞ 'ΕΘΝΩΝ (Acts 15.14)', *NTS* 4 (1957) 47-50. *Paulus und die Seelsorger*, Patmos Verlag 1966.

³ 'La Mort d'Ananias et Saphira (Actes 5.1-11)' in *Mélanges Goguel*, 1950, 146-52. 'The Western Text and the Theology of Acts' in *Stud. Novi Test. Soc. Bulletin* Vol. 2, 1951, 19-32. 'Remarques sur les textes de l'Ascension dans Luc-Actes' in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, 1954, 148-56. 'Les Actes des Apôtres et l'Eucharistie' in *RHPPhR* 33 (1953) 21-36. 'Le Plan des Actes des Apôtres' in *NTS* II (1954) 44-51. 'Les Additions au groupe des douze apôtres d'après le Livre des Actes' in *RHPPhR* 37 (1957) 71-80: a reply to Charles Masson's 'La reconstitution du collége des Douze d'après Actes 1.15-26'.

On the basis of Trocmé's book, JEAN-PAUL BENOÎT has produced an exposition of Acts intended for a wide circle of readers.¹ It is written with breathtaking verve and is marvellous to read, but could scarcely be translated. None of the more popular German presentations of Acts—not even Otto Dibelius' *Die werdende Kirche*—comes near its blend of edification and scholarship.

In 1958 appeared MARCEL SIMON's *St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church*.² It puts forward the view that the Hellenists were a group of Jewish reformists. Jesus' saying about the Temple had brought this anti-Temple, anti-sacrificial group into alliance with the Christians. Driven from Jerusalem, they began the mission in Samaria and Antioch. Simon does not consider the contribution of Lucan composition very great.

To Dutch scholarship we owe D. PLOOIJ's fundamental work on Pauline chronology and a number of special investigations such as A. F. J. KLIJN's critical survey of work on the 'Western' text and W. C. VAN UNNIK's fine study on the question whether Paul spent his youth in Tarsus or Jerusalem.³ The commentary on Acts by F. W. GROSHEIDE⁴ considers it impossible that Luke the companion of Paul should have made use of a written source. This conservative scholar pursues his thesis with such consistent rigour that he will not even hear of any use of Mark in the Third Gospel.

The *Scandinavian* countries also have made a considerable contribution to research on Acts in recent years. We must therefore mention the work of three Norwegians: F. BIRKELI, who treats the historical problems of Acts 15, R. LEIVESTAD, writing of Luke as the 'pietist among the Evangelists', and A. KRAGERUD, who discusses the travel-journal (from 13.4 to 21.16!).⁵

¹ *Combats d'Apôtres pour une humanité nouvelle: traduction et commentaire du Livre des Actes des Apôtres*; SCE 1957.

² Simon had previously published the excellent *Verus Israel*, Paris 1948 (ET in preparation); 'Retour du Christ et Reconstruction du Temple dans la pensée chrétienne primitive' in *Mélanges Goguel*, 1950, 247-57; 'St. Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple' in *JEH* 2 (1951) 127-42; and 'La Prophétie de Nathan et le Temple' in *RHPPhR*, 1952, 41-58.

³ D. Plooiij. *De Chronologie van het Leven van Paulus*, Leyden 1918; Albert Frederik Johannes Klijn, *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Utrecht 1949, and 'Stephen's Speech, Acts 7.2-53' in *NTS* 4 (1957) 25-31; W. C. van Unnik, *Tarsus of Jerusalem?*, Amsterdam 1952 (ET *Tarsus or Jerusalem*, London 1962); 'Opmerkingen over het doel van Lucas' Geschiedwerk (Luc. 1.4)' in *Ned. Teol. Tijdschr.* 9 (1955) 323-31; and 'De Achtergrond en Betekenis van Handelingen 10.4 en 35' in *Ned. Teol. Tijdschr.* 3 (1948-9) 260-84 & 336-54.

⁴ *De Handelingen der Apostelen: Kommentaar op het Nieuwe Testament V*, Amsterdam 1942-9.

⁵ Fridtjov Birkeli, 'De historiske problemer som knytter sig til beretningen om Apostelkonsilet i Apostlenes gjerninger Kapitel 15' in *Norsk Teol. Tidsskr.* 54 (1953) 144-64; Ragnar Leivestad, 'Pietisten bland evangelistene' in *Norsk Teol. Tidsskr.* 55 (1954) 185-200; Alf Kragerud, 'Itinerariet i Apostlenes gjerninger' in *Norsk Teol. Tidsskr.* 56 (1955) 249-72.

To the Swedish scholar GUNNAR RUDBERG we owe a lively book on Hellas and the New Testament, as well as a number of weighty essays.¹ ALBERT WIFSTRAND has corrected our conception of Lucan language in several articles packed with information.² HARALD SAHLIN's work on the 'Messiah and the People of God'³ includes a source-theory, inspired by Torrey, for Luke's writings. In one of those solid and learned dissertations that Swedish scholarship is wont to produce, BERTIL GÄRTNER⁴ has undertaken to demonstrate the compatibility of the Areopagus address with Pauline theology: in his view the Stoic element of the speech recedes in favour of the Old Testament. BO REICKE⁵ has sought to represent the 'faith and life of the primitive Church' in accordance with Acts 1 to 8 and without lapsing into a 'destruction of the portrayal' (Reicke, p. 8), i.e. without allowing contradictions to open up between Lucan and Pauline theology.

In an essay on primitive Christianity in Acts, the Danish scholar JOHANNES MUNCK revealed a part of the individualistic historical picture which he later developed in his book *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*.⁶ Munck fights a lone battle against the picture hitherto accepted: he says that the Judaists were Galatian Gentile Christians who had misunderstood Paul's respectful references to the Jerusalem Apostles—Luke wrongly transplanted them to Jerusalem. The 'hellenists', including the 'Seven', were not a splinter-group; but the whole Jerusalem community was banished, only to return later without anyone taking exception to it. Peter had no other standpoint than that of the Hellenists. The 'thousands' of Jewish Christians in Acts 21.20 should be changed into Jews by striking out the words τῶν πεπιστευμένων—

¹ *Hellas och Nya Testamentet*, 1929; 'Hellenistisk litteraturforskning och Nya Testamentet: Några Synpunkter' in *Eranos* 23 (1925) 193–205; 'Ad usum circumscribentem praepositionum graecarum adnotationes' in *Eranos* 19 (1919–20) 173–206 (Acts: p. 180); 'Parentesen in Nya Testamentet' in *SEÅ* V, 1940, 126–37; and 'Concerning Codex Cantabrigiensis' in *SEÅ* XII, 1947, 287–92.

² 'Lukas och den grekiska klassicismen' in *SEÅ* V, 1940, 139–51; 'Lukas och Septuaginta' in *SvTKv* 16 (1940) 243–62; 'A Problem concerning the Word Order in the New Testament' in *Stud. Theol.* III, 1950–1, 172–84; and 'Det grekiska prosaspråket: en historisk översikt' in *Eranos* 50 (1952) 149–63.

³ *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk. Studien zur protolukanischen Theologie (Acta Sem. Neotest. Upsal. XII, 1945)*, p. 9 & passim; and 'Pingstberättelsens teologiska innebörd' in *SvTKv* 25 (1949) 185–200.

⁴ *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation (Acta Sem. Neotest. Upsal. XXI, 1955)*; and 'Missionspredikan i Apostlagärningarna' in *SEÅ* XV, 1950, 34–54.

⁵ *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde (ATHANT 32)*, 1957; 'Der historische Hintergrund des Apostelkonzils und der antiochenischen Episode Gal. 2.1–14' in *Studia Paulina* 1953, 172–87; and 'Die Mahlzeit des Paulus auf den Wellen des Mittelmeeres Act. 27.33–8' in *ThZ* 4 (1948) 401–10.

⁶ 'Den ældste Kristendom i Apostlenes Gerninger' in *Dansk Teol. Tidsskrift* 16 (1953) 129–64, and *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte (Acta Jutlandica 26: 1)*, Aarhus-Copenhagen 1954, ET London 1959. Cf. also 'Paulus og Apostelbegrebet' by the same author, in *Dansk Teol. Tidsskrift* 11 (1948) 141–57, as well as Holger Mosbech's 'Apostolos in the New Testament', *Studia Theol.* Vol. II, Lund 1949–50, 165–200, and Mosbech's commentary, *Apostlenes Gerninger inledet og forklaret*, Copenhagen 1929.

the community at Jerusalem welcomed Paul joyfully, etc. What is useful for scholarship here lies in Munck's observations, not in the conclusions he draws from them.

The same is true—and here we return to the literature on Acts in *German*—of PAUL GÄCHTER, S.J. His articles¹ discuss the stumbling-blocks which he encounters in the text of Acts and overcomes in his own way. 'The uproar against St. Stephen was to a large extent a fraud', provoked by Annas. Peter appointed not only the Hellenist Seven but also a Hebraic Seven, namely the presbyters. Both groups obtained, though perhaps not both immediately, full power of consecration and jurisdiction: it followed that the circle of the Twelve came eventually to appreciate the redundancy of their own empirical existence, since those whom they had consecrated had consecrated others in their turn. The election of Matthias, together with the mode of election, must derive from an instruction of Jesus ('if there were none such, we would come up against insoluble difficulties'). Gächter presumes that Jesus gave this instruction after John 21.19. Another of his conclusions is that Jerusalem owed its central position only to Peter's residence there; as soon as he leaves the city, the 'Rome-feeling' of the communities towards Jerusalem dies away ('Jerusalem und Antiochia', p. 36). Incomparably more valuable is the commentary of ALFRED WIKENHAUSER² who, with his work on the historical value of Acts,³ had shown his merits as far back as 1921.

In 1949 the Swiss ROBERT MORGENHALER⁴ threw a new idea into the debate: the Lucan writings are a work of art! Unfortunately this fruitful idea was reduced to the simple implication that Luke deliberately followed the 'rule of duality' ('duality' here being understood in very various ways). This 'Lucan' method is justified by the strange contention that double utterance lends breadth and assurance to the narrative. In 1958 Morgenthaler published a statistical analysis of NT vocabulary (*Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*): this immensely industrious work is a useful tool for

¹ 'The Hatred of the House of Annas' in *Theological Studies*, Vol. 8, 1947, 3fr.; 'Jerusalem und Antiochia: ein Beitrag zur urkirchlichen Rechtsentwicklung' in *ZkTh* 70 (1948) 1-48; 'Die Wahl des Matthias (Apg 1.17-26)' in *ZkTh* 71 (1949) 318-46; and 'Die Sieben' in *ZkTh* 74 (1952) 129-66.

² *Die Apostelgeschichte übersetzt und erklärt* (Regensburger Neues Testament No. 5), 3rd ed. 1956. (The commentary on Acts by Joseph Kürzinger in the *Echter-Bibel*, 1951, is intended for wider circles).

³ 'Die Apostelgeschichte und ihre Geschichtswert' (*Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen* 8, 3-5), Münster 1921; 'Die Traumgesichte des Neuen Testaments in religionsgeschichtlicher Sicht' in *Pisciculi . . . Dölger . . . dargeboten*, Münster 1939, 320-33; 'Doppelträume' in *Biblica* 29 (1948) 100-11; 'Die Belehrung der Apostel durch den Auferstandenen', *Meinertz Festschrift*, Münster 1951, 105-13; and 'Die Wirkung der Christophanie vor Damaskus auf Paulus und seine Begleiter nach den Berichten der Apostelgeschichte' in *Biblica* 33 (1952) 313-23.

⁴ *Die lukianische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis: Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas* (ATHANT 14), Zürich 1948. See the reviews by W. G. Kümmel ('Das Urchristentum' in *ThR* 22 (1954) 197f.) and E. Käsemann (*VuF* 1947-8, München 1950, 210).

the scholar to range beside the dictionary, grammar and concordance for work on the linguistic questions of Acts.

Dibelius had shown that, being an author as well as a historian, Luke was capable of reproducing reality in an altered form in order to illuminate its meaning. In the 1950's, Protestant research on Acts in Germany focussed its attention on this unexpected phenomenon of a Luke with independent ideas of authorship, because it was Luke the *theologian*—not the historian—who became important. The new development became apparent in 1950 when an article by PHILIPP VIELHAUER,¹ in which he compared Luke's theology with Paul's, attracted considerable notice. He found that Luke, the supposed companion of Paul, is everywhere at odds with the Apostle: he lends a positive tendency to the *theologia naturalis*, plays down the redemptive significance of the Cross and abandons expectation of the End. Vielhauer found an ally in HANS CONZELMANN, whose studies in Lucan theology² demonstrated that Luke replaces primitive Christian doctrine, obsessed with the imminent End, by a theology of saving history with three successive periods: 1. the law and the prophets (including the Baptist); 2. the time of salvation corresponding to Jesus' life on earth—the middle of history (p. 146); and 3. the period stretching thenceforward up to the Parousia; a period which, to use an expression not yet employed by Luke, may be called the time of the Church. On the other hand, ERNST KÄSEMANN³ was of the opinion that Luke's real theme was to represent the hour of the Church as the middle

¹ 'Zum "Paulinismus" der Apostelgeschichte' in *Ev. Th.* 10, New Series No. 5, 1950–51, 1–15; 'Franz Overbeck und die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft', *ibid.* 193–207; and 'Urchristentum und Christentum in der Sicht W. Kamlaß' in *Ev. Th.* 1955, 307–32. The first-named article gave rise to the following: Götz Harbsmeier, 'Unsere Predigt im Spiegel der Apostelgeschichte' in *Ev. Th.* 1950–51, 352–68; Wilhelm Andersen, 'Die Autorität der apostolischen Zeugnisse' in *Ev. Th.* 1952–3, 467–81; Vielhauer, 'Zu W. Andersen', *ibid.* 482–4; Bauernfeind, 'Vom historischen zum lukanischen Paulus' in *Ev. Th.* 1953, 347–53, and 'Zur Frage nach der Entscheidung zwischen Lukas und Paulus' in *ZsyTh* 23 (1954) 59–88; lastly Willi Marxsen, 'Exegese und Verkündigung' in *Theol. Existenz heute*, New Series 59, 1957: 'Exegese im NT' 5–30 and 'Der Beitrag der wissenschaftlichen Exegese des NTs für die Verkündigung', 31–36.

² *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 17)*, Tübingen 1954, 3rd ed. 1960 (ET *The Theology of St. Luke*, London 1960). Also 'Zur Lukasanalyse' in *ZThK* 49 (1952) 16–33, and 'Die Rede des Paulus auf dem Areopag' in *Gymnasium Helveticum* 12 (1958) 18–32.

³ 'Aus der neutestamentlichen Arbeit der letzten Jahre' in *VuF: Theologischer Jahresbericht* 1947–8, Munich 1949–50, 196–223, esp. 219ff.; 'Ein neutestamentlicher Überblick' in *VuF: Theol. Jahresb.* 1949–50, Munich 1950, 191–218, esp. 208f.; 'Probleme neutestamentlicher Arbeit in Deutschland' in *Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie*, Vol. 15, Munich 1952, 133–52, esp. 141f.; 'Die Johannesjünger von Ephesus' in *ZThK* 49 (1952) 144–54; 'Begründet der neutestamentliche Kanon die Einheit der Kirche?' in *Ev. Th.* 1951–2, 13–22; 'Eine Apologie der urchristlichen Eschatologie' in *ZThK* 49 (1952) 272–96, esp. 279; 'Das Problem des historischen Jesus' in *ZThK* 51 (1954) 125–53, esp. 136–8; lastly, 'Neutestamentliche Fragen von heute' in *ZThK* 54 (1957) 1–21, esp. 20f. (The article from *Ev. Th.* 1951–2, the two articles from *ZThK* 49 and that from *ZThK* 51 are available in English in *Essays on NT Themes* 1964, that from *ZThK* 54 in *NT Questions of Today* 1969.)

of time: 'Luke is . . . the first representative of evolving early Catholicism' (*ZThK* (1957) 20). The problem of his theology can be reduced to the formula that he replaces the *theologia crucis* with the *theologia gloriae*.

The Tenth Edition of the present commentary¹ joined the chorus of these voices, albeit with some moderation. There were two reasons for this. Firstly, it did not treat the theology of Acts as the only theme of this book, because its immediate concern was to expound the composition of the writer Luke both as a whole and in detail, a composition which at times appears almost to create *ex nihilo*. It is only by virtue of this astounding freedom that Luke's historical narrative can become the trusty tool of Lucan theology. Secondly—and at this point, in order not to anticipate the argument of §7 below, we are content simply to notice the fact—the following must be considered: Luke does not yet present, like the Ignatian letters, a theology of the episcopal office, he outlines no theory of all-embracing ecclesiastical organization (only in 9.31 does ἐκκλησία mean anything more than the individual community), nor does he develop any sacramentalism such as may furnish a φάρμακον ἀθανασίας. No, the real subject of Acts is the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ and its growth. It is certainly proclaimed by men and authenticated by God through signs and miracles. This theology is no steep tumble from the Pauline heights—for on those heights Luke never stood. His teaching is one of the many variants of Gentile Christian theology which—more or less independent of the great Apostle to the gentiles—grew up alongside and after the theology of Paul. The germs of what then evolved into early catholicism may well have lain, even before Luke's time, in this gentile theology, which bore in itself a tendency to law and observances even where it was not influenced by Jerusalem. Recognition of this fact does not preclude us from finding the *vera vox evangelii* in Paul's *theologia crucis*.

Bibliography

H. Mosbech, *Apostlenes gerninger, indledet og forklaret*, Copenhagen 1938; J. A. Findlay, *The Acts of the Apostles. A Commentary*, London: 3rd ed. 1946; F. J. Foakes Jackson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Moffatt Commentary), London: 8th ed. 1951; J. Keulers, *De Handelingen der Apostelen* (De boeken van het NT IV), Roermond-Maaseik, 2nd ed. 1952; C. F. Dessain, *The Acts of the Apostles*, in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, 1953;

¹ Ernst Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Division 3), 10th ed. 1956, 15th revised ed. 1968. See also Haenchen, 'Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte' in *ZThK* 51 (1954) 153–67; 'Tradition und Komposition in der Apostelgeschichte' in *ZThK* 52 (1955) 205–25; 'Zum Text der Apostelgeschichte' in *ZThK* 54 (1957) 22–55. 12th revised ed., 1959; 'The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity' (*Studies in Luke-Acts*. Essays presented in honour of Paul Schubert, 1966, 258–78); and 'Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte' (*Die Bibel und Wir*, 1967, 338–74).

R. R. Williams, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Torch Bible Commentaries), London 1953; H. A. Guy, *The Acts of the Apostles*, London (Macmillan) 1953; F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of Acts*. The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes (The New London Commentary on the New Testament), 2nd ed. 1956; W. Barclay, *The Acts of the Apostles* Philadelphia (Westminster Press) 1957; A. C. Winn, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Richmond 1960.

3. THE TEXT OF ACTS

For the textual problem of Acts¹ the least ancient, Byzantine version (Von Soden: Koine text—siglum \mathfrak{K} taken over by Nestle) and the so-called Caesarea text² are of little significance. The only two important forms are the text once called ‘neutral’ or ‘Egyptian’ (Von Soden’s Hesychius text—siglum \mathfrak{S} adopted by Nestle) and the so-called ‘Western’ text.

In the case of Acts the chief witnesses for \mathfrak{S} are the manuscripts B \aleph A C 81³ and the Sahidic and the Bohairic—i.e. Upper (South) and Lower (North) Egyptian—Coptic translations.⁴ A similar text is attested by Egyptian papyrus discoveries for a date as early as the second century.⁵

¹ Eberhard Nestle’s *Einführung in das griechische Neue Testament*, 4th ed. thoroughly revised by Ernst von Dobschütz, Göttingen 1933 (out of print; ET *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*, tr. from 2nd ed., 1901), was not able to handle the overflowing wealth of material in a lucid manner. To some extent F. G. Kenyon’s *Text of the Greek Bible* (1937) offers a substitute; see further H. Vogels, *Handbuch der Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, 2nd ed. 1955, B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the NT*, 2nd ed. Oxford 1968.

² This text is dealt with in detail by A. F. J. Klijn, *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Utrecht 1949, 110–28. It may be that we possess evidence for the Caesarea text of Acts in Codex 1739 (K. and S. Lake published a collation in 1932 in ‘Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts’, *Harvard Theological Studies* XVII, 142ff.; cf. by the same, ‘The Scribe Ephraim’ in *JBL* 62 (1943) 263–8.) On this see, as also in connection with what follows, E. Haenchen, ‘Zum Text der Apostelgeschichte’ in *ZThK* 54 (1957) 22–55, and the earlier article ‘Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte’, *ZThK* 51 (1954) 153–67. In Vol. III of *Beg.* 1926, J. H. Ropes compared the Acts texts of B and D and appended the translation of *d* (frequently also of *h* and *Iren. lat.*); the exhaustive introduction to this volume is also highly valuable.

³ Ropes CCL–CCLXXV.

⁴ Ropes CXLIII–CXLVI; 317–71; Kenyon 129ff.

⁵ The discovery of Papyrus 66, dated c. 200 (v. Papyrus Bodmer II, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana V, Cologny-Genève 1956) has shown in respect of John that the B text in Egypt is as old as the ‘Western’ text; see A. F. J. Klijn in *New Testament Studies* III, 1956–57, 327–34. In *BZ*, New Series 2, 1958, 214–43, Heinrich Zimmermann demonstrated that the text of \mathfrak{P}^{66} , like that of Sinaiticus only to a far less marked degree, was subsequently exposed to the influence of the ‘Western’ text. \mathfrak{P}^{75} (Bodmer XIV–XV, 1961; written about 200) agrees astonishingly closely with the B text (see below, pp. 56f.).

Evidence for the 'Western' text is found above all in the Uncial D,¹ old Latin translations² and the variants of the Syrian Harklensis.³ But such early figures as Marcion,⁴ Tatian⁵ and Irenaeus⁶ already used a similar text, whose existence in Egypt also is attested by papyri.⁷

In Acts the two text-forms show such wide divergences that Blass and Zahn supposed Luke to have issued two different editions.⁸ This hypothesis comes to grief, however, from the very fact that the texts often contradict each other, e.g. in the case of the 'Apostolic Decree' (see p. 449 n.6 below).

What is then the relationship of the 'Western' to the § text in Acts?

1. As in the gospels and the Pauline epistles, the 'Western' text in Acts shows a mass of small alterations intended to clarify and smooth. For example, they expressly name subject or object, improve this or that expression, introduce pious turns of phrase: 'Jesus' becomes 'the Lord Jesus Christ'. As an instance of such changes, let us take the variations in 12.1-7.

In verse 1 the 'Western' text adds the clarification 'in Judaea' to the word 'Church'. In the § text verse 3 reads: 'when he saw that it pleased the Jews'—the reader having to deduce the exact sense of 'it', which the Greek does not express at all; D and sy^{hmg}, however, specify: 'his proceeding against the faithful'. In verse 4 the phrase *ὃν καὶ πιάσας* is one of those quasi-relative clauses to which Luke was addicted and which seem to us to contain a redundant *καί*. D and gig offer normal Greek, substituting *τοῦτον* for *ὃν καί*. Verse 5 is stylistically improved. In verse 7 an explanatory 'to Peter' is inserted, and the verb *πατάσσω*, which generally means 'strike', is replaced by *ύσσω*, meaning 'nudge', so as to obviate misunderstanding. In all these emendations the 'Western' text of Acts shows no difference in spirit from the 'Western' text of Matthew or Mark.

2. Variants of another kind are peculiar to the 'Western' text of Acts. Quite often, where the author of Acts has worked small details in, the seam

¹ Von Soden, esp. 1720-7 & 1814-36; Ropes LVI-LXXXIV; Kenyon 89ff

² Von Soden 1544-72, 1824 (Gigas); Ropes CVI-CXXVII; Kenyon 135ff.

³ Von Soden 1824; Ropes CLV-CLXXX; Kenyon 125; Klijn 78-82. In 616 Thomas of Harkel, at Enaton Monastery near Alexandria, collated the text translated from Greek in 506 by Philoxenus with three old MSS in the case of the Gospels and, in the case of Acts, with one, which contained a Western text.

⁴ Von Soden 1624-9; see also Harnack, *Marcion: das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, 2nd ed. 1924, 65-123 & 165-220.

⁵ Von Soden 1632-48.

⁶ Von Soden 1838-48; Ropes CLXXXVIII.

⁷ On the Pierpont Morgan Coptic text of Acts see Haenchen-Weigandt. *NTS* 14 (1968) 469ff.

⁸ See 30 n.7 and 31 n.1 above. While differing in details, the Catholic scholar Johannes Belser allowed himself on the whole to be persuaded by Blass, as shown by his *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte auf Grund des Codex D und seiner Genossen*, Freiburg/Br. 1897. Provided this work is read in a critical spirit, it furnishes a useful comparative study of the 'Western' variants and their characteristics. In 1896 Eberhard Nestle published a short but exemplary collation of the Codex Cantabrigiensis in his *Novi Testamenti Supplementum*, 7-66. See also Kenyon 232.

remains visible. Thus for example, in 3.8, Peter and John go into the *ἱερόν* with the healed cripple, and in 3.11 the people come running up to them 'in Solomon's Portico'. But this did not lie within the *ἱερόν*. For this reason the 'Western' redactor has the Apostles and the healed man 'go out' again in verse 11 before the crowd gathers in the Portico. The first thing this alteration shows is that the redactor knew his Temple better than the author. But at the same time it shows how attentively he had read the text. Thirdly it reveals that he did not yet consider Acts to be 'holy writ' which no one was allowed to alter. These observations are corroborated time after time. The alterations made by this redactor of the 'Western' text reveal a meticulous, alert and erudite man, anxious to remove the faults in a book which strikes him as potentially valuable. A few examples will vouch for this.

Reading 16.35, the redactor said to himself, 'We have just had an account of an earthquake which shattered the prison and freed the prisoners, but we learn nothing more about it. Moreover, why do the authorities suddenly change their attitude and release Paul and Silas?' Thinking the matter over, he thought he saw the solution: it was the thought of the earthquake that made the magistrates change their mind! He therefore recast verse 35 as follows: 'But when it was day the praetors came together in the forum, and when they remembered the earthquake which had taken place, they were afraid and sent the lictors . . .' As we can see, the redactor of course believes in the miracle narrated. But he is also a realist and wants a clear sequence of events. Once he is persuaded that he has found the link, he makes no bones about altering the Lucan text. Admittedly, his limitations as a critical reader are also clear. The *reader* knows that the earthquake appears to ensue from the hymns sung by Paul and Silas: but how could the authorities suspect the connection?

A further emendation, in verse 30, reveals more of this redactor's characteristics. According to the § text, the jailer had eyes only for Paul and Silas. About the other prisoners—though they too were now free!—he does not trouble himself at all. That is no way for a jailer to behave! And so the redactor inserts the words: 'after he had secured the rest'. A miracle and a conversion are all very fine—but people must continue to behave as they normally do in everyday life.

Acts 20.4 contains a list of Paul's travelling-companions. According to the § text these include one Gaius from Derbe. But the 'Western' redactor had noted that in 19.29 the Ephesian mob had dragged two companions of Paul into the theatre, *Γάϊον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον Μακεδόνας*. He therefore took this Gaius to be the same as that in 20.4. It followed, however, that the latter could not come from Derbe, which is in Asia Minor, not Macedonia. *Δερβαῖος* was therefore a scribal error, and a similar Macedonian place-name had to be found which could feasibly have been confused with the better-known Derbe. The redactor actually came up with such a name—that of the

little Macedonian township Doberus, otherwise practically unknown—and in 20.4 conjectured Δουβέρσιος for Δερβαῖος. Clark and other scholars¹ have taken this to be the original reading. Like the redactor himself, they have overlooked the fact that the seven companions of 20.4 are named in a systematic order. First comes Sopater of Beroea, then two Thessalonians (Secundus and the aforementioned Aristarchus), next Gaius of Derbe and Timothy from Lystra, which lies near Derbe, and finally two men from Asia Minor, Tychicus and Trophimus. Thus the last six are paired according to their home-region, and accordingly Gaius must come from Derbe, not Doberus! Either, therefore, the Gaius of 19.29 is another person—and after all the name was then as common as Smith today—or the final sigma of Μακεδόνα derives from an old dittography of the initial sigma of the following συνεκδήμιος.²

The 'Western' text treats 20.15 in similar fashion, adding 'and stayed in Trogylion' after 'we passed over to Samos'. Since the redactor held it unlikely that the ship spent the night in the roads instead of putting in at the nearest harbour, he emended accordingly.

Likewise, in 21.1, the phrase 'and from there to Patara' is completed with 'and Myra'. Myra—cf. 27.5—was the normal trans-shipping port which the redactor here found wanting and supplied. It did not strike him, however, that the distance was now much too long for one day's sailing. Even as the crow flies, from Patara to Myra makes fifty miles. And so what we have here is no better and older text, but the old conjecture of Acts' earliest commentator.

It follows that the famous 'seven steps' which the 'Western' text adds in 12.10 are only a local tradition of the redactor's time, not a remnant of an original Lucan text.

3. Other variants do not belong to the 'Western' text as such, nor to the redactor we have been discussing, but to a particular codex, the famous Codex Bezae. This was written about the year 500 and is a bilingual manuscript with the Greek text (D) on the left and the Latin (d) on the right. It was evidently the custom in services of that time (and indeed somewhat earlier, already in the model for our manuscript) to read out still from the Greek, in each case a short sense-line—but immediately to follow up, for the hearers' benefit, with the Latin translation. It is plain that the congregations of that locality, which we cannot exactly identify, understood practically no Greek. Hence it is also conceivable that the scribe's own accomplishment in Greek was likewise limited. This is the only way in which we can explain the influence which the Latin text has in many places exercised upon the Greek. When for example in 5.32 D reads τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃν ἔδωκεν, it is the

¹ A. C. Clark, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1933, XLIX–XL & 374–6; Kenyon 234 n. 1.

² Nestle/Dobschütz, *Einführung* (see 50 n.1) 4, line 22 up.

Latin *spiritum sanctum quem dedit* which has led the scribe. Likewise in 4.12 D's reading, ὄνομα . . . δ̄ δεδόμενον, shows the influence of the Latin *nomen . . . quod datum est*. In 2.30 D gives καρποῦ τῆς καρδίας, a mistranslation of *fructum de praecordia*; d had rendered the κοιλία of the Greek source as *praecordia*, which means 'loins' but may also signify 'heart'.

However, D also exhibits quite other kinds of scribal error. It is true that such mistakes were more likely in uncial writing, with neither accents nor separation of words, but they go beyond anything one would *a priori* expect. In 4.34 the ̄ text reads ἔφερον τὰς (τιμὰς). The D scribe pronounced αι like ε; he therefore often wrote αι for ε. Thus here he wrote αιφερον. But that is not all—he misread the article τας as the participial suffix τες and produced the non-existent participle αιφεροντες¹!

Likewise in 15.4 the scribe turned ἀνήγγειλάν τε into an aorist participle ἀπηγγείλαντες.

In 8.2 we find a further instance, and it is only because of it that we have mentioned the two foregoing errors. Here B reads συνεκόμισαν δὲ . . . καὶ ἐποίησαν, but D: συνκομίσαντες . . . καὶ ἐποίησαν.² In his well-known work, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*,³ Matthew Black interprets this connection of the participle to a finite verb by 'and' as an Aramaism and concludes from these instances that D, with such Aramaisms, stands closer than B to the original text. When we consider what pains Luke took to improve the Greek, when recapitulating Mark, then it is as a matter of course improbable that in Acts he tolerated such Aramaisms, impossible in the Greek of his time. This last example has in fact quite a different explanation, one similar to those preceding. The Latin text d reads *comportaveruntque*, to which would correspond συνεκόμισάν τε, and this the scribe has drawn together and expanded into one of the above-mentioned participle-forms: συνκομίσαντες.

Other instances of D's following a participle by 'and' with a finite verb have a different origin. Latin has no counterpart to the aorist participle active. For that reason the Latin translation often transforms such a participle into a main verb, linking it to the original main verb by means of *et*. If the

¹ Ropes (p. 45) makes things worse by correcting αιφεροντες to [κ]αι φεροντες.

² There are two ways of explaining this carelessness. First of all, it looks as if the transcriber scarcely took in more than three words of the text at a time. Secondly one should not forget that for the century in which he wrote Radermacher's remark is fully valid: 'To a great extent in that age καὶ presents itself as a particle which shatters the firm structure of the sentence' (*Ntl. Grammatik*², 218). In John Malalas a genitive absolute attached by καὶ to the main verb occurs twenty times (A. Werner, 'Die Syntax des einfachen Satzes bei Genesios' in *Byzant. Zeitschr.* 31 (1931) 258–323: see 322).

³ 2nd ed. Oxford 1956, 50. Black names a string of forerunners in the field. The most important are J. Wellhausen (*Einleitung in die ersten drei Evangelien*, 2nd ed. 1911, 4–32) and A. J. Wensinck ('The Semitisms of Codex Bezae and their relation to the non-Western text of the Gospel of Saint Luke', *Bulletin of the Bezan Club* No. XII, Leyden 1937, 11–48). Chapters 3 to 5 of Black's work are chiefly relevant for us here (third edition: Oxford 1967).

Latin and Greek texts were placed in sense-lines side by side, it would seem that where such an *et* appeared, a corresponding *καί* was missing. The scribe accordingly made bold to supply the 'deficiency' in the bilingual manuscript, without troubling about the construction. We find a case of this kind in 7.4, where the \S reading is ἐξελθὼν . . . κατώκησεν. This the Latin d renders *exiit . . . et habitavit*, which in turn produces ἐξελθὼν . . . καὶ κατώκησεν in D. The same phenomenon¹ recurs in D 5.23, 12.16, 13.29, 14.6 & 14, 16.17, 19.19 and 20.10. There is no question of an Aramaism in any of these cases.

Black also thinks to detect² a trace of the Aramaic particle η (which may equal *לְנָא*, *ὥστε*, *ὅτι* and the relative pronoun) in d 1.17, where the Latin translates *ὅτι κατηριθμημένος ἦν* by *quī adnumeratus erat*. Has the translator really reproduced an Aramaic η here? Not in the least! This is just one of the haplographies to which *scriptio continua* is highly conducive—*quiadnumeratus* stands for *quia adnumeratus*. We have likewise in 5.9 *efferente* for *efferent te*, and in 5.19, with in addition the miswriting of *u* as *i*, *cumquedixisset* for *cumque eduxisset*. Black's second example of η is in 7.39. Here, with gratifying unanimity, B, d, gig and Iren. lat. give the relative pronoun ϕ . But D in fact reads *ὅτι*! This, however, in the context does not make the slightest sense, and simply represents a misreading of a smudged or faint ω .

As examples of the Aramaic anticipation of the pronoun Black cites D's version of 3.2 and 7.52. Yet in the first case he himself admits that it probably originated only through a scribal oversight. But this is an error the scribe often commits, and Bernhard Weiss³ saw long ago how it came about: the copyist wrote down the word he expected, and then when he saw that his model offered something else he simply wrote that down too. It has to be

¹ Cf. 41f. of Haenchen's article 'Zum Text . . .' (see p. 50 n.2 above). The inverse phenomenon is found in 19.29: \S text ὤρμησαν . . . συναρπάσαντες; d—*impetumque fecerunt . . . et rapuerunt*; D—ὤρμησαν . . . καὶ συναρπάσαντες.

² Black op. cit., 56. The instances of *casus pendens* and hyperbaton (an anticipated subject or object later resumed by a personal pronoun) which Black considers Aramaisms (p. 38) occur in 2.22f., 3.6, 4.10, 7.35ff., 13.32f. In all of them, however, we find only the repetition, customary in Greek rhetoric, of concepts which have been moved to the front for emphasis: see pp. 43f. of 'Zum Text . . .' Of the 33 cases of asyndeton (Black 38 [2nd ed.], 59 [3rd ed.]), 7 do not come into question, because the text in reality is not asyndetic. A further 17 are the product of rhetorical considerations (see 'Zum Text . . .' 44f.). The remaining nine stand in D, but only one is also covered by d, and they derive from the negligence of our notorious scribe. There is certainly a preponderance of parataxis in D as against the \S text (Black 44–51), but that only shows D to have been formulated according to a more popular style. The expression αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ in Acts 16.18 & 22.23 is not, as Black thinks (pp. 78–81), an Aramaism (this had already been established by J. Jeremias in *ZNW* 42 (1949), 217 n. 6) but a borrowing from the Septuagint. As for Black's other alleged Aramaisms, see 'Zum Text . . .' 49–51 and the commentary below on 2.47, 4.19, 5.32, 12.10. An 'Aramaic approach' to Acts has not yet been found.

³ Weiss, *Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte: Textkritische Untersuchung*, Leipzig 1897 (=TU XII, New Series II, 1899), 7–16.

understood that he only read one small part of the text at a time and transcribed in a purely mechanical fashion. Let us illustrate this fault with a few examples:

In 3.2 the scribe expects *παραυτων*, and in fact he is nearly right, for the text has *παρατων* (one must bear in mind the *scriptio continua*). Having written *παραυτων*, however, he sees that after *των* the text continues with *εισπορευομενων*, and so he placidly writes this word down. Similarly in 7.52 he wrote *απεκτειναναυτους* in accordance with his expectation (he noted only the *τους*, and thought it was the accusative object *αυτους*). But then he noticed that the text continues with *προκαταγγειλαντας* and transcribed this word with no hesitation. This has nothing to do with the Aramaic use of a proleptic pronoun, as other instances make very clear. In 14.2 the scribe expected *επηγαγον αυτοις διωγμον* ('they brought up a persecution against them') and duly wrote that down. But when he found that the text designates the object with *κατα των δικαιων*, he had no qualms in putting that too. Likewise with 15.2 and 16.38. The latter instance is particularly glaring: the scribe expected, and wrote, a dative 'to them' after the verb 'reported' which opens the sentence, then he began to add the subject, 'the lictors' (or police). Thus he had already 'committed' *αυτοις οι* to paper when he noticed that the text expressly said 'to the praetors' (magistrates). Thinking that he had just written the article *τοις*, he merely added *στρατηγοις*.

And so we see that our original question—'What is then the relationship of the "Western" to the § text in Acts?'—is in reality ambiguous, because the expression "'Western" text' does not have one clear and invariable meaning. It may denote 1. the text which we already encounter in Marcion, Tatian and Irenaeus, and which is clearly everywhere, in East and West, the product, albeit by no means uniform, of elucidations and of explanatory or occasionally pious interpolations and expansions; there is no reason to call this a 'recension'—this text is not and never was a unity. But "'Western" text' may also denote 2. the revision to which a thoughtful, painstaking and erudite reader—already using a 'Western' text in the first sense—subjected our book, removing seams and gaps and inserting a detail here and there. Finally 3. it may denote those variants which sometimes resemble Aramaisms but are no more nor less than the careless mistakes of a scribe (or two successive scribes), working *ca.* 500, mistakes which have added a special flavour to one particular codex based on the 'Western' text in the first two senses.

In none of these three cases does the 'Western' text of Acts provide us with the 'original' text: that is the lesson we have been in gradual process of learning.

The highly meritorious publication of the Lucan text of Pap. 75 (which appeared in 1961 as No. XIV of the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, with the Johannine text of the same Papyrus codex as No. XV) seems to us to suggest

that the situation for the third gospel was similar to that for Acts, and thereby indirectly corroborates the observations on the text of Acts. Not that the Lucan text of Pap. 75 was a 'Western' text! It looks rather, over considerable stretches, like an anticipation of the Nestle Text and contains only a very few readings from the first group of the 'Western' text; as the editors Victor Martin and Rodolphe Kasser note (p. 29), it stands nearest to Vaticanus.

This oldest (at least to the present) extant Lucan text poses the question: Do the famous 'Western non-interpolations'—which are supported mostly by D, it, sy^{cs}, Marcion or some of them—not belong in the final analysis to those emendations which were created by an astute and extraordinarily precise reader of the Lucan work and up till the present have enjoyed the honour of standing 'above' in the Nestle Text, while the corresponding 'neutral' readings had to be content with a miserable existence below in the apparatus? How does the situation stand, for example, in Chap. 24?

Let us begin with Lk. 24.1. D it sy^{cs} sa omit the word *αρωματα* here, and probably not as an oversight but as a carefully considered correction. In 23.56 it had been related that the women had prepared not only *αρωματα* but also *μυρα*. In 24.1, in the 'neutral' and here probably also original text, only the *αρωματα* are mentioned. This contradiction is removed by the omission of *αρωματα* in the 'Western' text of Lk. 24.1. Now the women bring 'what they had prepared'. This alteration corresponds exactly to those corrections by which the 'Western' text of Acts removed tensions and contradictions.

Now we turn to Lk. 24.53. Luke had (see below, p. 79) the characteristic of promptly repeating a word just used. In Lk. 24.51 he had employed the word *ευλογειν* for that blessing with which the ascending Christ departed from his disciples. He uses the same word afresh in 24.53, although *ευλογουντες τον θεον* here means 'praising God'. D and it read instead the synonym *αινουντες τον θεον*. This does away with the offence that *ευλογειν* is applied to the disciples immediately after it has been ascribed to the ascending Lord.

Even more of an offence was the fact that the ascension itself was recounted twice, and on quite different days: in Lk. 24.51 it happened on Easter Sunday, in Acts 1.9–11, on the other hand, forty days later. On account of this discrepancy—so we may think—D it sy^{cs} have omitted the words *και ανεφερετο εις τον ουρανον* in Lk. 24.51, as Joachim Jeremias (see below, p. 138 n.8) long ago assumed. As has been seen even more clearly in recent years, the ascension actually possesses a somewhat different meaning at the conclusion of Luke than at the beginning of Acts: it triumphantly closes the existence of the Lord on earth. In the context of Acts, on the other hand, it links the instruction of the disciples by the risen Lord—and thus the Church's instruction by him—with the further history of the Christian proclamation

and the growing congregation. The correction which the 'Western' text achieves by deleting *και . . . ουρανον* has only perceived the conflict, but has not grasped the freedom with which Luke by the use of two different traditions had expressed the different aspects of the ascension.

Pap. 75 reads *αρωματα* in Lk. 24.1 with the 'neutral' text, in Lk. 24.53 *ευλογουντες* and in 24.51 *και ανεφερετο εις τον ουρανον*. These readings of the oldest Lucan text yet found suggest that we should no longer describe them bluntly as 'interpolations,' or call them more politely 'Western non-interpolations,' but that we should see in them the original text.

The same may hold also for a fourth passage in Lk. 24. D it sy^{cs} have omitted the words *προσκυνησαντες αυτον* in v. 52. In their view with good reason: as soon as Jesus at the end of Luke was no longer understood to be taking final leave of the disciples, the expression for the behaviour of the disciples corresponding to this final departure also lost its meaning, and became superfluous.

We are then faced with the question: Has the verse Lk. 24.12, missing in D it and Marcion, been correctly relegated by the Nestle Text to the apparatus, although it is contained in the \mathfrak{S} -text and now also Pap. 75? This question is not so easily answered as the previous one concerning the so-called Western non-interpolations. For Lk. 24.13-43 is indeed so constructed that the proclamation of the reality of the Resurrection again and again meets with incredulity among the disciples, and thereby elicits ever new, clearer and more convincing evidences of the risen Lord. So far v. 12 seems to contradict the direction which the Lucan composition is here following. But this objection against the authenticity of the verse is not unshakeable. The Lucan composition of Lk. 24.13-43 is not an entirely self-contained unity. This is shown by the episode of the Emmaus disciples: it derives from another tradition than the stories of the empty grave and the appearances before Peter and the Twelve, and 'all the Apostles'. This episode ends not with disbelief, but rather with recognition and belief. It is, therefore, very possible that v. 12 also—which does not lead to belief but only to wonder!—is an organic part of the Lucan account (see now K. Aland, *Stud. z. Überl. d. NTs* II, 1967, 155-72, especially 168f.).

It has, of course, been pointed out against the verse that it makes use of John 20.8-10. It does in fact contain all sorts of similarities, even to the wording. But it is very questionable whether in this case also, as in many others, the fourth gospel does not presuppose a tradition which is very closely related to the Lucan and reported Peter's visit to the empty grave.

Finally objection has been taken to v. 12 on the basis that if it were original then there must be a reason for its omission, and there is nothing of the sort. But the situation may be different: actually v. 12 contradicts v. 24, according to which *several* disciples went to the grave and found it empty. The expression 'some of those with us' moreover seems actually to

exclude a primary disciple such as Peter. It is, therefore, thoroughly possible that the early reader who searched out and deleted the contradictions has removed the apparently inaccurate and contradictory v. 12. We must therefore consider very seriously—in spite of D, it and Marcion—whether we should not release v. 12 from its exile in the apparatus and accept it into the text of the gospel, as Pap. 75 suggests.

But the importance of this papyrus is not yet exhausted. The distinguished Dutch textual scholar A. F. J. Klijn wrote in 1959 (*Nov. Test.* 3, 18) on the basis of his studies on Pap. 66 (*NTS* 3 (1956–7) 327–34): ‘a neutral text existed, but it certainly is not palpable in a MS. or in any one type of text. The neutral text was manifest in numerous readings which were strewn over a great number of MSS. Only by a long purifying process did the readings come together in the present so-called neutral text.’ This judgement could at that time appeal to the findings which Pap. 45 and Pap. 66 had revealed. But Pap. 75, it seems to us, has made this judgement obsolete. For in this MS., which may have been written around 200 A.D., the ‘neutral’ readings are already practically all present, without any need for a long process of purification to bring them together *miro quodam modo* out of a multitude of manuscripts. For the reference to a long continuing eclecticism, in which probably Origen unconsciously played a role (Klijn, *ibid.*), does not show us the magnet which gradually brought the ‘neutral’ readings together. Pap. 75 allows us rather to see the ‘neutral’ text already as good as finished, before that slow development could have started at all; it allows us the conclusion that such manuscripts as lay behind Vaticanus—even if not in all New Testament books—already existed for centuries alongside all the confusion into which Papyri 45 and (although not so clearly) 66 afford us an insight. The ‘neutral’ text of the Lucan work (about which we are here speaking) is no scholarly construction, but rather a text which was not, or at any rate only a little, affected by the adaptation to contemporary taste which set in in the second century or by the arbitrary procedure of the scribes. This is not to say that a specific individual manuscript¹—such as Pap. 75—contains the Lucan text word for word as the author wrote it down. It is, however, probable that the original text of the Lucan work is not far different from the text of B and Pap. 75. In so far as Pap. 75 leads us to this picture of the development of the Lucan text, it is—although it permits only indirect conclusions about the text of Acts—more important than Pap. 74, which itself contains a text of Acts.

¹ What the editors report (p. 22) about the writing of the names Johannes and Bethsaida arouses the suspicion that the writer of the manuscript (or of his model?) united the text of Luke and John from two independent individual gospel manuscripts into one large papyrus codex. Very probably there existed beside this—as Kurt Aland at once remarked in conversation—a second volume with the gospels of Matthew and Mark.

Bibliography

A. Pott, *Der abendländische Text der Apg. und die Wir-Quelle*, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1900; A. Jülicher, 'Kritische Analyse d. lateinischen Übersetzungen der Apg.', *ZNW* 15 (1916), 163-88; H. A. Sanders, 'The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts', *HTR* 26 (1933), 77-89; B. H. Streeter, 'The Primitive Text of Acts', *JTS* 34 (1933), 232-41; P. L. Hedley, 'The Egyptian Text of the Gospels and Acts', *CQR* 118 (1934), 188-230; J. A. Montgomery, 'The Ethiopic Text of Acts', *HTR* 27 (1934), 169-206; R. P. Langrange, 'Le Papyrus Beatty des Actes des Apôtres', *Rev. Bibl.* 43 (1934), 161-71; J. M. Creed, 'The Collations of the Text of Acts in Codex 876 etc.', *JTS* 38 (1937), 395-9; R. V. G. Tasker, 'The Nature of the Text of the Chester Beatty Papyrus in Acts', *JTS* 38 (1937), 383-94; W. G. Kümmel, 'Textkritik und Textgeschichte des N.T. 1914-1937', *Th. R.* 11 (1939), 84-107; G. D. Kilpatrick, 'Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts', *JTS* 44 (1943), 24-36; R. C. Stone, *The Language of the Latin Text of Codex Bezae*, Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. 30, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1946; W. B. Sedgwick, 'St. Paul and the D-Text', *Exp. Tim.* 59 (1947-8), 222f; B. K. Soper, 'St. Luke and the Western Text (Luke 24³⁴)', *Exp. Tim.* 60 (1948-9), 63; C. S. C. Williams, 'St. Luke and the "Western" Text', *Exp. Tim.* 60 (1948-9), 25f; Ph.-H. Menoud, 'The Western Text and the Theology of Acts', *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Bulletin* II (1951), 19-34; J. Heuschen, 'De oudste texten van de Handelingen in verband met de verrijzenis', *Rev. Ecclés. de Liège* 38 (1951), 33-42; C. S. C. Williams, *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, Oxford (Blackwell), 1951; A. F. J. Klijn, 'A Mediaeval Dutch Text of Acts', *NTS* 1 (1954-5), 51-6; J. D. Yoder, *The Language of the Variants of Codex Cantabrigiensis*, Princeton Library, 1958; J. N. Birdsall, *The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John*, London (The Tyndale New Testament Lecture 1958), 1958; A. F. J. Klijn, 'A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts (1949-59)', *Novum Testamentum* 3 (1959), 1-27; Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV, *Évangiles de Luc et Jean*, Tom. I, XIV, Luc chap. 3-24, 1961; Papyrus Bodmer XVII, *Actes des Apôtres etc.*, Coligny-Genève, 1961; A. F. J. Klijn, *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts (Part Two, 1949-1969)*, Leiden 1969.

4. THE CHRONOLOGY OF ACTS

There are few details in Acts which may be turned to chronological account. The readers did not look for them, neither did Luke have much material for them.¹

¹ In 'A Tentative Synthetic Chronology of the Apostolic Age' (*JBL* 56 (1937), 177-91) C. J. Cadoux interpreted the statements at 2.47b, 6.7, 9.31, 12.24, 16.5, 19.20 and 28.31 as references to Pentecostal feasts recurring at five-yearly intervals from the year 30 to 60. But no reader would have noticed such recondite chronological clues, and Cadoux passes in silence over similar places, such as 4.4 and 5.14.

1. Chapters 1 to 8 contribute nothing to chronology. According to the parallel II Cor. 11.32f., Paul's flight from Damascus, described in 9.23-5, took place during the lifetime of the Nabataean king Aretas (Harithat IV), who died in the year 40. The date of the flight cannot be more closely determined.¹

2. Acts 11.27-12.25 admit of chronological evaluation. Here, of course, five questions overlap: (a) When did Herod Agrippa die? (b) When did he persecute the Christians? (c) When was there a famine? (d) When was it prophesied? (e) When was the collection delivered?

(a) Herod's death fell in the year 44.² The games³ at which he was taken ill in Caesarea must have been the *ludi pro salute Caesaris*.⁴ According to Eusebius, these took place on 5 March. Herod died five days later, thus on 10 March 44 (by Schwartz's reckoning⁵).

¹ In *Aretas IV, König der Nabatäer*, Freiburg/Br. 1909, Alfons Steinmann puts it in the year 37, it being in this year that Caligula presented Damascus to the Nabataeans (Steinmann thence infers that Paul was converted between 35 and 37). This contention is based solely on the fact that no Roman coins for the period 37 to 54 have yet been unearthed at Damascus. However, Aretas' ethnarch, in II Cor. 11.32f., lies in wait for Paul not *in* but *before* the city (see below p. 332 n.2). Eduard Schwartz disputes the alleged gift of the city in *NGG* 1907, 275 n. 3.

² According to Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII 236f., 'a few days' after the death of Tiberius (16 March 37) Herod Agrippa received from Caligula, with his freedom and the diadem, the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias. It is therefore possible that his reign had begun by 1 April 37. In the fourth year of his reign (Spring 40 to Spring 41) he received from Caligula Galilee also, which had been taken from Antipas (*Ant.* XVIII 252). In January 41 the new emperor, Claudius, gave him Judaea and Samaria as a reward for services rendered in connection with the Senate's recognition of Claudius (*Ant.* XIX 236-44; 274). Over the thus restored kingdom of Herod the Great, Agrippa had reigned three full years when he died (*Ant.* XIX 343, recapitulated 19, 351). Accordingly Agrippa must have died early in 44 after a reign of seven years. This fits in with Claudius' missive to the Jews of Summer 45 (*Ant.* XX 11-14; see *Beg.* V, 452f.). Doubt was cast on this reckoning by two coins which have since disappeared, to be dated, according to Madden (*The Coins of the Jews*, London 1881, 129ff.), from the eighth and ninth years of Agrippa's reign.

³ In Vol. I, 4th ed., of his *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* (ET *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*), 560 n. 40, Schürer writes in terms of special games which 'were organized in Rome to celebrate the return of Claudius from Britain in the year 44 . . . and were afterwards probably copied in the provinces'. This was also Zahn's interpretation of the celebrations (*Einl.* II³ 641), based upon Dio Cassius LX 23, Suetonius (*Claudius* 17) and Eusebius (*Chron.* ed. Helm, 179). But all these speak only of the emperor's triumph in Rome, not of celebrations in the provinces. Schürer and Zahn were trying to overcome the incompatibility between the date of the Passover and that of Agrippa's death if the games were identified with the *ludi pro salute Caesaris* of 5 March 44—an equation which Schürer moreover rejected owing to his own error of calculation (see next note). Unfortunately the as yet unpublished Habilitationsschrift by Dr. Alfred Suhl, 'Paulus und seine Briefe. Ein Beitrag zur paulinischen Chronologie', could not be taken into account.

⁴ In the same footnote Schürer contended that these games would yield the year 43, not 44; Plooiij (pp. 13f.) followed him in this. But, as Lake shows in *Beg.* V, 451, Josephus (*Ant.* XV 354) places the journey of Augustus to Syria (Dio Cassius LIV 7), which can be dated in the summer of 20 B.C., in the seventeenth year of Herod's reign. The twenty-eighth year of this reign, the year in which the games were founded in honour of the emperor, was therefore 9 B.C., and their quinquennial recurrence brings us to 44 A.D.

⁵ Eduard Schwartz, 'Zur Chronologie des Paulus' in *NGG*, 1907, 265f.

(b) According to Acts 12.3f., the persecution took place about the time of the Passover before the king's death. In 44 the fifteenth day of Nisan fell on the first of April¹—thus nearly three weeks *after* the king's death! This² means that he must already have persecuted the Christians during the Passover³ of 43, but many months would then have lain between the Passover and his death. Or it may be that the connection of the persecution with the Passover is merely a secondary assimilation to the Passion of Jesus. It is already clear that these Lucan dates do not admit of any exact chronological evaluation. The only thing one may say with certainty is that Herod Agrippa persecuted the Apostles at some time during the last years of his life.

(c) According to Luke,⁴ famine spread over the whole world during the reign of Claudius. But there never was such a world-famine. On the other hand the whole reign of Claudius was afflicted by local famines.⁵ Palestine was particularly hard-hit, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 20, 101), in the term of office of Tiberius Alexander, i.e. in the years 46 to 48.⁶ Now, as Joachim

¹ See Plooij, 15.

² Since in Acts 12.3f., as in Luke 22.1, Luke equates the Passover with the seven-day feast of unleavened bread (so—rightly—*Beg.* IV, 134 against Zahn, 385 n. 36), the end of the feast would in 44 have been as much as four weeks after the king's death. To obviate this contradiction, Lake assumed (*Beg.* V, 452) that during the first century the games at Caesarea began not on 5 March, as in the time of Eusebius, but, as at Lyons (Suetonius, *Claudius* 2), on the first of August. In this case Agrippa would have died on 6 August. Had this been so, however, the news of his death would not have reached Rome before the end of September, and by the time a decision had been taken it would have been too late for the new procurator to complete his journey in 44. The latter (Fadus) was nevertheless already in office in 44. Lake retrieves himself by having Agrippa die on 6 August 43, but thereby contradicts Josephus on the length of the king's reign.

³ The fact that Passover was considered especially as a time of salvation (August Strobel, Erlangen) prompts a double interpretation of the case before us: (a) here once again the Passover confirmed its character as the special time of God's saving help (so Strobel); (b) Peter's rescue was assigned to Passover as the special time of 'saving' (see Strobel, *ZNW* 49 (1958) 157ff.).

⁴ Acts 11.28. The interpretation of *οικουμένη* as restricted to Palestine is a mere apologetic artifice.

⁵ In 'The Universal Famine under Claudius' (*HTR* 28 (1935), 258–65), K. S. Gapp points out that the Teptunis papyri testify to a record high price for wheat in Autumn 45 (an exceptionally high Nile flood had been catastrophic for the harvest). This had for result not only famine in Judaea but a steep rise in the cost of living in the West, while an African campaign of Galba's in 45 had perhaps reduced corn-supplies from Mauretania. But since Queen Helen of Adiabene had corn brought from Egypt during the famine in Judaea, the failure of the Egyptian harvest must have been overcome by the time famine was reaching its peak in Jerusalem in 47/48. There were shortages of corn in Rome in 41, 42 and 50/51 (Tacitus, *Ann.* 12, 43, says 51; Orosius, *Hist.c.pag.* VII 6, 17 says 50). Against all good nautical precedents Claudius had the big grain-ships bring corn in winter from Egypt (as well as Africa), himself underwriting both vessels and cargoes. The gamble succeeded, as the winter storms held off. All this is recounted by Suetonius (*Claudius* 18), but without dates. One may not speak of a famine covering the whole Roman Empire.

⁶ In *Ant.* XX 101, Josephus dates the Judaeian famine with the words *ἐπὶ τούτοις δὲ καὶ τὸν μέγαν λιμὸν κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν συνέβη γενέσθαι*. In the expression of dates 'on which' Josephus correctly uses *ἐπὶ* with the genitive (e.g. *Ant.* XX 14, 144 or 228; *Vita* 37: places where—according to H. St. John Thackeray, *Josephus, the Man and the Historian*,

Jeremias has pointed out, the year 47/48 (the Jewish year beginning and ending in autumn) was a sabbatical year, in which the land remained untilled and there was no harvest. Jeremias says, 'In the summer of 47 the harvest failed, the sabbatical year 47/48 intensified the famine and prolonged it until the next harvest in early 49.' This catastrophe, therefore, did not occur until several years after the death of Herod Agrippa.

(d) The prophecy of this famine must surely have been uttered before 46. Zahn¹ inferred from the words 'and this came to pass in the days of Claudius' that the famine was prophesied under his predecessor Caligula (d. 24 January 41). But Luke could not have possessed any exact information here—he does not even specify any particular year. He intended that the phrase should not so much provide a date as emphasize the fulfilment of the prophecy.

(e) Zahn and Ramsay contend that several years elapsed between the decision to collect relief (verse 29) and its actual delivery (verse 30).² But no

1929, 100ff.—Josephus' Greek assistants have not made stylistic revisions). ἐπὶ with the dative, on the other hand, he uses to denote 'to', 'on (grounds of)', 'in addition to'—thus for example *Ant.* XX 10 ('in addition to this reply') or 120 ('the baseness additional to the offence'). By extension, ἐπὶ + dative sometimes assumes the meaning of 'then' or 'next', as in *Ant.* XX 267: 'and then I intend to make an end of archaeology'. ἐπὶ τοῦτοις means 'in these circumstances' neither in Josephus nor in Eusebius, where it always means 'in addition to this' (e.g. *H.E.* I 1. 2; I 8. 15; II 6. 8; III 9. 1; III 32. 7). In Josephus the word συνέβη corresponds to the Lucan ἐγένετο and marks the advent of some new occurrence. Accordingly the words ἐπὶ τοῦτοις συνέβη κτλ. imply 'it next happened that famine appeared', hence under Tiberius Alexander, the successor of Fadus.

Fadus will have landed in Caesarea in the summer of 44 (the news of Agrippa's death having reached Rome at the end of April, and the decision having been taken, after some hesitation, to send out a Roman governor in view of the extreme youth of Agrippa the Younger, his son and heir). After taking punitive measures against the inhabitants of Caesarea (for on the news of the king's death they had dragged the statues of his daughters into the brothels—a sign of how unpopular Agrippa had become: *Ant.* XIX 364–6), after suppressing unrest in Peraea and removing the partisan-leader Ptolemy (*Ant.* XX 2–5), Fadus joined forces with the legate of Syria, Cassius Longinus, marched on Jerusalem and compelled the surrender of the high-priestly vestments—which had been kept by the Jews themselves during their independence. The Jewish politicians were obliged to yield, but obtained permission to send a deputation to the emperor. We must suppose that it was by then too late in 44 to undertake the voyage. If it ensued in March 45, the deputation could have arrived in Rome at some time during April or May. The emperor's favourable reply to their petitions (*Ant.* XX 11–14) bears the date 28 (month missing) 45—only manuscripts of the Latin translation give 'June' (*Beg.* V, 453). But even if this document dates from the earliest possible *terminus a quo*, i.e. the end of May, it would still imply that Fadus's tenure of office was extended. For, in accordance with an ordinance made by Claudius in 43, any successor of Fadus would already have taken ship for Palestine in the middle of April. It follows that Fadus held office for a διετία, from 44 to 46. His successor, Tiberius Alexander, seems also to have held office for a διετία, since Cumanus relieved him in 48.

¹ *Einkl.*³ II, 643 (ET *Introduction to the NT*, 1909).

² Here Zahn takes the Pauline collection as model. But Luke's aim is not to present what is usual in a rational and realistic manner but to present what is unusual and edifying. Hardly has the Church at Antioch heard of the threat of famine when it thinks, not of itself, but of Jerusalem, decides on a collection, carries it out—everyone giving what he can—and lo! Paul and Barnabas are already on the road to Jerusalem. That they happen

reader understands Luke's words in this sense. He speaks of the delivery of the relief in **11.30** and **12.25**, i.e. before the account of the persecution begins and after the end of the Herod story. This gives the impression that Paul and Barnabas stayed in Jerusalem throughout the most critical period and that it was on this account that they entrusted their gift to the elders, not to the Apostles, who were being persecuted and were on the run. This is not of course expressed in plain words: Luke is telling his story for the sake of edification, and does not go into chronological details. Doubt has been thrown on his report—not without reason—by the fact that Paul does not mention this relief-mission in **Gal. 1.18–2.10**. It remains, however, possible that Barnabas alone, without Paul, did at one time carry relief from Antioch to Jerusalem (see our commentary on **11.30** below).

3. In Acts **13.7ff.**, Sergius Paulus is named as the proconsul of Cyprus. So far the hope of finding his year of office mentioned in an inscription has been disappointed.¹

4. Acts **15.1ff.** shows such striking similarities to **Gal. 2.1–10** that most scholars consider the two accounts, both telling of a journey by Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem on account of the circumcision question, to refer to one and the same episode. It likewise appears that both Acts **9.26–9** and **Gal. 1.18–20** describe Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion.

The fact that between these two journeys Luke relates, in Acts **11.30**, another journey of Paul's (with Barnabas) to Jerusalem, the relief-expedition discussed above, may perhaps be ascribed to Luke's misconstruing some less worthy tradition (see commentary on **11.30** below). A number of scholars²

to arrive in the midst of the persecution serves but to heighten edification: could anything show better the close bonds of affection between the two communities?

¹ In *CIL* VI 4, II, 3116 (No. 31545) a certain Lucius Sergius Paullus is named as a member of the Roman authority the *curatores riparum*—but without a date. The manuscripts of Pliny's *Nat. hist.* mention in Book 1, as source for Book 2, one Sergius Plautus, and in the source-list for Book 18 sometimes Sergius Plautus, sometimes Sergius Paulus (*Beg.* V, 457f.). The first name is right without a doubt. An inscription from Soli in Cyprus (in 1889 D. G. Hogarth published the full text in *Devia Cypria*, p. 114) shows at the end two lines, apparently added later, to the effect that the erector of the memorial worked as a censor under the pro-consul Paulus. The body of the inscription is dated 'in the thirteenth year.' If this meant the thirteenth year of Claudius' reign (53 A.D.), Paulus must have become proconsul after this year, which would rule out any encounter with the Apostle. Other possibilities for the dating (e.g. the thirteenth year since Cyprus became a Roman province) give 42 B.C. or 14 B.C.: neither of these would have anything to do with the Apostle's travels. The inscription may perhaps refer to Paullus Fabius Maximus, who was consul in 11 B.C. (Mommsen in *ZNW* 2 (1901), 83; cf. Plooiij, 25f.). Bibliography: Zahn in *NkZ*, 1904, 189–95, & *Einl.*³ II, 645; W. Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discoveries . . .*, 1915, 150–72; Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung*, 4th ed., 676ff. (ET *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*); Wikenhauser, 338–41; Lake, *Beg.* V, 455–9.

² Holtzmann (p. 82), Emanuel Hirsch (*ZNW* 29 (1930), 64f.), H. W. Beyer (*NT deutsch*, *App.*, 1933, 89ff.), H. Lietzmann (*Hdb. z. NT, Brief an die Gal.*, 2nd ed., 1932, 9), J. Jeremias (*ZNW* 36 (1937), 205ff.), A. Oepke (*Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, 1937, 39) and G. Hölscher (*SAH*, 1939–40, 25f.). Lake too (*Beg.* V, 202–4) may be included here.

have seen in 11.30 an inferior parallel tradition to Acts 15, but believe that 11.30 correctly gives the time of the journey to the 'Apostolic council': Herod Agrippa persecuted the 'pillars' (Gal. 2.9)—at the instigation of the Pharisees—precisely because, in their negotiations with Barnabas and Paul, they consented to the mission to the gentiles without circumcision.¹ But this hypothesis comes up against difficulties which in our opinion are insurmountable: the meeting of the Apostles would have taken place in the winter of 43/44 (if not indeed a year earlier—see 2(b) above), and Paul would then have been converted 'fourteen years' before—i.e. almost immediately after the death of Jesus in the year 30. Even if Jesus' death is dated back to 29, the interval is insufficient to accommodate all the events implied in Acts 6. It is more plausible to date the 'Apostolic council' about the year 48.

5. The chronological value of Acts 18.1f. is a matter of debate. Aquila and Priscilla are here said to have come recently from Italy to Corinth 'because Claudius had commanded all the Jews to leave Rome'. This recalls a famous sentence in Suetonius: *Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit* (Claudius 25). Evidence that the uncomprehended name *χριστός* was construed as the common proper name *χρηστός*, both words being pronounced alike,² is forthcoming *inter alia* in the pun of Tacitus, *Ann.* XV 44: *quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Chrestianos appellabat*. Admittedly the historian, as a man of education, adds: *Auctor nominis eius, Christus*. . . . According to Orosius, writing about the year 400 (*Historia contra paganos* VII 6, 15f.), this expulsion took place in the ninth year of Claudius' reign (49 A.D.). We should then have to assume that at some time in the forties Christians (whose names we do not know) brought the gospel to Rome and that this messianic preaching led to violent upheavals in Roman Jewry. Unfortunately Orosius appeals to Josephus as his authority, and in the latter's extant writings no such statement has been found. Moreover Dio Cassius raises doubt with his assertion that Claudius did not indeed drive out the Jews (which on account of their great number would not have been possible without serious disturbances), but denied them the right of association³ (at least, this is the most likely interpretation of LX 6, 6f.). In view of this we cannot reject out of hand the conjecture that only the more factious Jews and Jewish Christians were expelled from Rome—but a conjecture it remains.

¹ J. Wellhausen (*NGG*, 1907, 7f.; *Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte*, 1914, 30), Eduard Schwartz (*NGG*, 1907, 267ff.), P. Wendland (*Urchristliche Literaturformen*, 3rd ed., 1912, 317–21), E. Preuschen (*Hdb. z. NT, Apg.*, 1912, 75f. & 91ff.), W. Bousset (*ZNW* 15 (1914), 157ff.), A. Loisy (pp. 474 & 509), Eduard Meyer (III, 165ff.), R. Bultmann (*ZKG*, New Series 12 (1930), 91), M. Goguel (*La Naissance du christianisme*, 1946, 322ff. ET *The Birth of Christianity*, London 1953) and now A. Suhl (see above, p. 61 n.3).

² Similarly even *ℵ** reads *χρηστιανους* for *χριστιανους* in Acts 11.26.

³ This is perhaps why the individual Jewish communities shown by inscriptions to have existed in Rome did not combine in one large colony. In view of Claudius' general Jewish policy, the prohibition of synagogue-services suggested by Bruce (p. 342) is unlikely.

6. The most important chronological datum—moreover supporting this interpretation of 18.1—is furnished by an inscription found at Delphi which mentions the proconsul Gallio referred to in Acts 18.12–17.¹ The inscription says among other things that Claudius has been acclaimed Imperator twenty-six times. This acclamation must have taken place between 25 January and 1 August 52, and within this period Gallio's proconsular year must have either begun or ended: in other words, his term of office ran either from 1 May² 52 to 1 May 53 or from 1 May 51 to 1 May 52. A careful analysis of the possibilities lends support to the second hypothesis³: Gallio must have taken office in Corinth (the seat of government for Achaëa) about the first

¹ The four fragments *Delphi* 2178, 2271, 3883 and 4001 permit the following reconstruction: 'Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, *pontifex maximus*, in the twelfth year of office as tribune, for the twenty-sixth time acclaimed emperor, father of the fatherland, for the fifth time consul, censor, greets the city of Delphi. I have long been devoted to the city of Delphi and it has from the beginning stood in my favour: I have ever revered Pythian Apollo. But now the common rumour, and that strife among citizens of which my friend Lucius Junius Gallio, proconsul of Achaëa, has sent me word . . . ' (see C. K. Barrett, *The New Testament Background* (London, 1956) p. 48f.)

Of the numbers involved, only the number '26' has been preserved: the others have been inferred. The emperor used to be acclaimed as *imperator* not at regular intervals but on the occasion of major successes of the Roman troops (though by the time of Claudius the requirements for the fulfilment of this condition had become quite modest). The 22nd, 23rd and 24th acclamations took place during the eleventh year of Claudius' reign (see *CIL* III, 467 and 1977), thus by 25 January 52 at the latest. Since Claudius was never acclaimed more than three times in any one year (*Beg.* V, 463), the unidentified twenty-fifth acclamation must belong to the twelfth year of his reign and have taken place some time after 25 January 52. Of the twenty-sixth acclamation we know first of all that it occurred in the year 52 (see G. Cousin and G. Deschamps, 'Emplacements des ruines de la ville de Kōç en Carie' in the *Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique* IX, 1887, 305ff.). But the inscription *CIL* 1256, whose date has been fixed (*via* Frontinus, *De Aquis* I, 13) as 1 August 52, already mentions the 27th acclamation. It follows that the twenty-sixth acclamation took place some time between 25 January and 1 August 52.

² According to Dio Cassius LX 17. 3, Claudius had decreed in 43 that newly-appointed governors should leave for their provinces before the middle of April. Gallio will accordingly have arrived in Corinth about 1 May. Remoter provinces were reached later: for Judaea, 1 July, which Mommsen (*Römisches Staatsrecht* II, 2nd ed., 255f.) called the 'normal terminus', may be considered an average date of arrival. Pliny the Younger did not get to Bithynia until 17 September (*Zahn, Einl.*, 655).

³ The inscription records the imperial decision in a Delphic controversy reported by Gallio. Supposing that Gallio had reached Corinth on 1 May 52 and had heard the parties that very month, he would still have had to order the drafting of a report and send it by courier to Rome, where it would have been caught up in the bureaucratic machine. Yet the answer was forthcoming before the emperor's 27th acclamation, hence before 1 August 52. How long before, we do not know—perhaps in July, but it may have been even in June. But in that case, there would not have been sufficient time for Gallio's investigation, the drafting of the report, the courier's journey to Rome, and the document's progress through the organs of State. If, on the other hand, Gallio had taken office on 1 May 51, these chronological difficulties vanish. The 26th acclamation could have occurred in March 52 (for the 25th must, as we have shown, be placed after 25 January 52, say in February), and the imperial reply, which postulates that Gallio is still in office, would then have been composed in March or April.

At all events, the year 52 brought no great victories. Ummidius Quadratus (see p. 69 below) pacified Palestine, Antiochus III of Commagene subdued the Clites (Tacitus,

of May 51. It is probable that the Jews sought—even perhaps as early as that same May—to lay their complaint against Paul before the new governor. Paul would in that case have left Corinth in the early summer of 51. Since, according to Acts 18.11, he had stayed there for eighteen months, he would have come to Corinth in the winter of 49/50. This fits the statement that Aquila and Priscilla had ‘lately come from Italy’, in conjunction with Orosius’ dating of the expulsion to 49.

7. According to the chronology devised by John Knox,¹ the obscure verse 18.22 alludes to Paul’s journey to the Apostolic Council! The starting-point here, for Knox and a number of other scholars, is the references to ‘fourteen years’ in Gal. 2.1 and II Cor. 12.2, and the identification of the ‘catching-up into the third heaven’ with Paul’s call on the road to Damascus. Hence they deduce the following chronology: conversion 37; first journey to Jerusalem 40; mission in Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, Macedonia, Greece and Asia Minor 40–51; second journey to Jerusalem (to the Apostolic council = Acts 18.22) 51; thereupon preparation of the fund and further mission in Greece and Asia Minor 51/52; last journey to Jerusalem (the relief-expedition) and arrest 53. The journey of Acts 11.30 never took place, and—since he was already in Corinth in 45—Paul never came up before Gallio! But it is already very doubtful whether Acts 18.22 refers to a journey to Jerusalem at all, and whether Paul was really in Jerusalem about that time. Presumably Paul went from Caesarea direct to Antioch, then in the early summer of 52 made his way over the Taurus passes and across Asia Minor to Ephesus. The dates in Acts 19.8 & 10 contain the exact details, while the *τριετία* of Acts 20.31 represents a round total counting in full the year of commencement, in accordance with the inclusive reckoning of the ancients. This sojourn in Ephesus came to an end in the autumn of 54: Paul then reached Corinth via Troas and spent there three months of the winter of 54/55. In the spring of 55 he journeyed over Macedonia on the way to Jerusalem, conveying the fund. He had no sooner arrived, about the time of Pentecost, than he was arrested.

Ann. XII 55) and in Britain the Siluri were finally vanquished (Tacitus, *Ann.* XII 40): Plooi, 37.

Bibl.: Plooi, 28 lists a bibliography for 1912–17; his own chronological estimates appear in *Hoofdstuck* IV, 27–45. He regards F. Prat, ‘La chronologie de l’âge apostolique’ in *RScR*, 1912, 374ff., as particularly important. Zahn 867 recommends Wohlenberg’s article, ‘Die Claudiusinschrift von Delphi in ihrer Bedeutung für die paulinische Chronologie’ in *NkZ* 23 (1912), 380–96. Cf. Lake, ‘The Chronology of Acts’, *Beg.* V, 460–4.

¹ Knox, ‘“Fourteen Years Later”’: a note on the Pauline chronology’ in *Journal of Religion* 16 (1936) 341–9; ‘The Pauline Chronology’ in *JBL* 58 (1939), 15–40; *Chapters in a Life of Paul* 1950, 54ff. P. S. Minear, ‘The Jerusalem Fund and Pauline Chronology’ in *AngThR* 25 (1943), 389–96. D. T. Rowlingson, ‘The Jerusalem-Conference and Jesus’ Nazareth Visit’ in *JBL* 71 (1952), 69–74. George Ogg, ‘A New Chronology of St. Paul’s Life’ in *Exp. Tim.* 67 (1955/56), 120–3. Dieter Georgi, *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem* (*Theol. Forschung* 38 Hamburg-Bergstedt 1965).

8. Shortly after, according to Acts 23.23ff., Paul was brought to the procurator Felix in Caesarea, where (24.27) he remained in custody for two years. It is possible however that in 24.27 Luke has mistakenly applied to Paul, instead of to Felix, his source's mention of the *διετία*: 'But when the *διετία* was fulfilled, Felix was succeeded by Porcius Festus.' Evidence for this is not wanting.

Our extra-biblical sources, Tacitus and Josephus, are admittedly at variance here. Tacitus, who is often ill-informed about provincial affairs and shows little appreciation of military matters, maintains in his presentation of the year 52 (*Ann.* XII 54) that Felix had already been governor of Judaea 'for a long time' and had arranged with Cumanus that he, Felix, should rule Samaria, and Cumanus Galilee. The Galileans and the Samaritans had been fighting each other, the situation being tolerated by the governors—who had their share in the booty. But when civil war threatened to flare up in the province and military measures were imperative, Quadratus, the legate of Syria, intervened and executed the Jews responsible for the death of Roman soldiers. Felix he accepted into the college of judges (for he had been empowered by the emperor to try the governors), Cumanus he condemned.

Now all this is extremely improbable, for the following reasons: 1. That in 52 Felix was *iam pridem Iudaeae impositus* conflicts with Josephus' precise indications (*Bell.* II 233 & *Ant.* XX 103) as to the succession of Tiberius Alexander. 2. Such a partition of Judaea is unparalleled. 3. Both Judaea and Jerusalem are disregarded. 4. Tacitus speaks only of guerilla-warfare between Galileans and Samaritans. Of their more exact relationships he knows nothing. The only concrete detail, namely that Quadratus had Cumanus' Jewish captives executed, fits only the account given by Josephus, who specifically mentions hostilities engaged by Cumanus against the Jews. 5. If Quadratus had pronounced judgment on the two governors, the proceedings in Rome, which are circumstantially reported by Josephus, would not have ensued.

Possibly Tacitus misconstrued a source that ran like this: under the procurators Cumanus and Felix there were troubles in Palestine. The conflicts between Galileans and Samaritans even reached the point where the legate Quadratus intervened, sending Cumanus to Rome for trial.

An account of this kind could easily have been misinterpreted to imply that Cumanus and Felix were procurators in Palestine at the same time. It only remained to apportion them the areas of the respective dissidents, and there was the broad outline of Tacitus' version! Such an account as we suggest as Tacitus' source would also, however, correspond in all points with Josephus.

By and large, there is no disagreement between the version of Josephus in the *Bellum Iudaicum* and his version in the *Antiquities*: In 48 Cumanus took over the province of Judaea. In the autumn of 51, one of the Galilean

pilgrims to the Feast of Tabernacles, making their way through Samaria to Jerusalem, was set upon and killed in a Samaritan village.¹ The 'first men among the Galileans' demanded in vain that Cumanus should punish those guilty.² Whereupon Jews from Jerusalem and Galilean pilgrims, reinforced by partisans and commanded by two rebel leaders,³ undertook a punitive expedition. They burned Samaritan border-villages and massacred the entire population. At this juncture Cumanus at last made haste with his men from Caesarea. He inflicted heavy losses on the plundering rabble, who were forced to disperse.⁴ The Samaritans now complained to the legate Quadratus of the destruction of their villages, but the Jews also sought his ear: the Samaritans, they claimed, had begun the fight, and had bribed Cumanus to stay his hand until the clash could no longer be averted.⁵

Quadratus had all the Jews captured by Cumanus executed after trials at Caesarea⁶ and Lydda,⁷ and sent the former high-priest Jonathan and the reigning high-priest Ananias, together with the latter's son (the captain of the Temple Ananos) and a number of other Jews, as prisoners to Rome.⁸ Evidently he had no faith in the innocence of the Jewish authorities, upon which Josephus insists. But he also sent the leaders of the Samaritans, as well as Cumanus and a tribune named Celer, to answer for their actions in Rome.⁹ The Jews were saved by the intercession of Agrippa the Younger (the 'King Agrippa' of Acts 25.13): Claudius declared the Samaritans guilty, executed three of them, exiled Cumanus and delivered Celer to the Jews for execution.¹⁰ At Jonathan's request¹¹ he appointed Felix, the brother of his favourite, Pallas, to be governor over Judaea, Samaria, Galilee and Peraea.¹²

This convincingly reveals the clever strategy which enabled the Jewish politicians to outwit and checkmate Cumanus and his backers. Agrippa acted as broker for a 'gentlemen's agreement' between Pallas and Jonathan: if Pallas could get the empress—politically and otherwise in his debt¹³—to secure the Jews' triumph and release, Jonathan would ask that the brother of

¹ *Bell.* II 232, 234, 237; *Ant.* XX 118.

² *Bell.* II 233; *Ant.* XX 121.

³ *Bell.* II 235; *Ant.* XX 121.

⁴ *Bell.* II 236f.; *Ant.* XX 122ff.

⁵ *Bell.* II 239f.; *Ant.* XX 125-7.

⁶ *Bell.* II 241.

⁷ *Bell.* II 242; *Ant.* XX 130f.

⁸ *Bell.* II 243; *Ant.* XX 131f.

⁹ *Bell.* II 243; *Ant.* XX 131f.

¹⁰ *Bell.* II 245; *Ant.* XX 134-6.

¹¹ *Ant.* XX 162.

¹² *Bell.* II 247; *Ant.* XX 137.

¹³ Pallas had helped secure Agrippina's marriage to Claudius (*Tacitus, Ann.* XII 1ff.) and expedited the latter's adoption of her son Domitius, later called Nero (*Ann.* XII 25): *C. Antistio M. Suillio consulibus* (i.e. in the year 50) *adoptio in Domitium auctoritate Pallantis festinatur, qui obstrictus Agrippinae ut conciliator nuptiarum et mox stupro eius inligatus, stimulabat Claudium, consuleret rei publicae . . .*

Pallas be appointed procurator of Palestine. It was at that time novel, unheard-of, that a freed slave, such as was Felix, should obtain the high and lucrative office of a provincial governor. Such an innovation would however be facilitated if the representative of the people affected should himself request it. Not only was Cumanus powerless against such a combination—he actually had to lose his post so that Felix could get it.

Comparison of the two versions shows: Tacitus once again draws his recurrent portrait of the man who stops at no iniquity when driven by avarice, self-interest and the lust for power. Felix and Cumanus are made into exemplary specimens of such depravity. But even the man of still higher standing, the legate who finally intervenes to restore order, is swayed by self-seeking partiality: he spares Felix because he is the brother of the all-powerful Pallas! Politically and militarily, on the other hand, Tacitus' version of these events is wellnigh worthless. It is true that Josephus—especially in the *Antiquities*—seeks to exonerate the Jews. Nevertheless he allows the reader a penetrating look behind the scenes of the political game which, developing out of that scuffle between Galilean pilgrims and Samaritan peasants, found its catastrophic conclusion in the great revolt. For it was the sending of such procurators as Felix that finally provoked the Jewish uprising.

When did Felix take office in Palestine? The captive Jews, whose journey to Rome began about the Passover of 52, must have arrived in the early summer.¹ The trials did not begin at once: the parties were given time to prepare their case.² Moreover the trials did not take place before Pallas and Jonathan had made their compact and the empress had persuaded her husband to recognize the innocence of the Jews. We must further suppose that Jonathan waited a little before asking that Felix be appointed, otherwise his game would have been all too blatant. Felix would thus have received his new commission in the autumn of 52, and it is questionable whether he did not land in Caesarea only in the spring of 53, after the resumption of shipping.

When was he recalled? According to Josephus (*Ant.* XX 182), the Jews of Caesarea sent complaints about him to Nero, 'and he would certainly have had to pay for his crimes against the Jews if Nero had not yielded to the entreaties of his brother Pallas, then in the emperor's highest esteem'. Now the date of Pallas' downfall can be inferred with fair accuracy.³ He

¹ In 52 the Passover fell either on 4 April or 3 May (Plooi, 85). This means that the captives would have arrived in Rome about the middle of May or June.

² *Ant.* XX 134.

³ In *Ann.* XIII 14, Tacitus relates the downfall of Pallas immediately before the murder of Britannicus. According to *Ann.* XIII 15, Nero decided during the Saturnalia (17–19 Dec.) that Britannicus should be forthwith dispatched by poison 'as the day was near whereon Britannicus would have completed his 14th year'. When would this fourteenth birthday have fallen? Suetonius (*Claudius* 27) says: *Britannicum vicesimo die inque secundo consulatu natum sibi*. Plooi (p. 66 n. 7), like others, has noted a discrepancy here: the 20th day of

lost his position towards the end of 55. It was therefore still possible, if Felix came to Rome in the summer of 55, for him to be saved by Pallas. His *διετίξα*, then, mentioned in Acts 24.27, ran from 53 to 55.

It was mostly assumed earlier that Felix was not relieved until the year 60, and that Festus died after only one year. This supposition was largely based upon an *argumentum e silentio*: Josephus has little to say about Festus. But Festus seems to have been an honest man whose conduct did not give rise to such scandals as Josephus recorded. Other scholars conclude from the minting of new Palestinian coins in 59 that there had been a change of procurator. Yet Pilate took office in 26 and issued no new coins until 29/30.

Under the circumstances one should seriously consider whether Felix might not have been replaced as early as 55, and Paul have already reached Rome in early 56. In that case, the last two verses of Acts would take us to 58 A.D.

We therefore propose, as a basis for discussion, the following Pauline chronology: conversion around 35, then a stay in Nabataean Arabia. About 37/38, first journey to Jerusalem. Activity in Syria, Cilicia, Antioch. About 48, the Apostolic Council. Stay in Corinth: winter 49/50—summer 51. Journey to Antioch via Caesarea. Early 52, through Asia Minor to Ephesus, thence in 54 to Macedonia. Winter 54/55: three months in Corinth. Pentecost 55 in Jerusalem. Arrest. Transfer to Caesarea. Late summer 55, departure for Rome. Malta. Early 56, arrival in Rome. End of Acts—58. Cf. H. Braun (*RGG*³ I, 1964) on the chronological problems.

Bibliography

C. H. Turner, 'Eusebius' Chronology of Felix and Festus', *JTS* 3 (1901), 120-3; J. Knox, 'Fourteen Years Later', *Journal of Religion* 16 (1936), 341-9; Id., 'The Pauline Chronology', *JBL* 58 (1939), 15-29; C. King, 'The Outline of New Testament Chronology', *CQR* 139 (1945), 129-53; G. S. Duncan, 'Chronological Table to illustrate Paul's Ministry in Asia', *NTS* 5 (1959), 43-5.

the *imperium Claudii* fell on 13 Feb. 41, but the second consulate in 42. Yet so flagrant a contradiction would surely have been noticed by Suetonius himself. Actually it is merely the *day* which he denotes with the first part of his twofold expression: the *imperium Claudii* was renewed every 25 Jan., therefore the 20th day was always a 13 Feb. The second part gives the *year*—42. Hence 13 February 56 was Britannicus' 14th birthday, and he was murdered at the end of December 55. If Pallas was removed from office immediately before, this must have happened in November or at the beginning of December 55.

5. THE LANGUAGE AND STYLE OF ACTS

A. Luke's Vocabulary

A rich vocabulary is a sign that an author is well-educated. For this reason counts have been made of the different words with which Luke operates. But since the calculations have been based on different editions of the text and different ways of reckoning, there have been fairly wide divergences in results.¹ Yet this much has become clear: of NT writers, only Paul has a comparably exhaustive vocabulary at his command. Luke and he surpass the rest of the New Testament writers in the number of words peculiar to each of them.²

Even when compared with other writers, Luke acquits himself well in this respect. In his *Memorabilia*, a work comparable in scope with Luke-Acts, Xenophon used a somewhat smaller vocabulary; in *Anabasis*, Books 1 to 4, one slightly larger. In contrast, Luke's vocabulary far surpasses that of such orators as Aeschines or Antiphon.

Nine-tenths of this vocabulary is also found in the Septuagint.³ This does not of course mean that Luke took all these words from that source. This becomes clear from the very fact that 85 per cent of the Lucan vocabulary coincides with Plutarch's, but only 70 per cent with the rest of the New Testament, while 70 per cent again may be found in the satirist Lucian of

¹ In *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*, Harvard Theological Studies VI (Part I, 1919, Part II, 1920), H. J. Cadbury gives the counts of previous writers: according to Goodspeed (*JBL* 31 (1912), 92ff.), Acts contains 2054 different words, Luke and Acts together 3120. J. R. Smith (*Presbyterian and Reformed Review* 2 (1891), 647ff.) counted 2697 in Luke and Acts, while F. Blass (*Acta Apostolorum*, editio philologica, 1895, 334) found 1787 in Acts, excluding proper nouns.

² Cadbury, *op. cit.* 2ff.: the words peculiar to Luke's work number according to Thayer between 750 and 851, to Smith 715, and to Hawkins 732 (Thayer's count for Paul gives between 593 and 627). But Cadbury, in *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 214, rightly warns against considering a word as 'peculiar to Luke' because it happens to occur only, or more frequently, in his work. If their subject-matter had so required, Matthew or Paul would also have employed words like 'tanner', 'eyewitness' or 'fathom'. *Hapax legomena* 'indicate not so much the limitation of their currency as that of our knowledge': the 'hapax' ἀλιώμα of Acts 25.7 suddenly came to light in an indictment dating from the end of Domitian's reign, brought against a muleteer for running over two pigeons.

³ As might be expected, the 90 per cent must be reduced to 80 if the Apocrypha are excluded. Luke has most in common with the historical books—Judges, Samuel, Kings—and then with II Maccabees. On his relation to LXX, see W. K. L. Clarke, 'The Use of the Septuagint in Acts' (*Beg.* II, 66–105), A. Wifstrand, 'Lukas och Septuaginta' (*SvTKv* 16 (1940), 243–62) and H. F. D. Sparks, 'The Semitisms of Acts' (*JTS*, New Series I (1950), 16–28). See Max Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, Oxford 1965, with my review, *TLZ* 91 (1966), 355ff.

Samosata (second century A.D.), 67 in Greek comedy and 65 in the Papyri.¹ This shows that Luke's vocabulary is flavoured both by the spoken vernacular (the *koine* in the narrower sense) and by the Hellenistic written language—as yet untouched by Atticism, though containing a good deal of Attic material (see § B. ii below).²

B. The Peculiarities of Luke's Language

It is impossible here to discuss every detail of these peculiarities. We shall therefore confine ourselves to two questions: (i) Does the language of the first half of Acts (Chapters 1 to 15.35), or of the greater part of it, represent a 'translation Greek' which renders the Aramaic text of one or more source-documents? and (ii) How does Luke's language stand in relation to the *koine* and to Atticism?

(i) According to C. C. Torrey,³ Acts 1.11–15.35 is Luke's translation of an Aramaic document written by a Palestinian Christian at the end of 49 or the beginning of 50, shortly after the Apostolic Council (p. 68), one which entered Luke's possession after he had come to Rome in 62 (p. 67): 'The book of Acts . . . was not a work of research, nor of any considerable labor. It was merely the translation of a single document—a lucky find—supplemented by a very brief outline of Paul's missionary labors, enlivened by miscellaneous personal reminiscences' (p. 68 n. 1). On pages 23–41 Torrey adduces fifty-two 'minor slips' of the translator (including over-literal renderings). He relies above all, however, on the conclusiveness of six especially striking examples of mistranslation⁴ (pp. 10–22), where translation back into Aramaic allows the fault to be easily traced and put right.

¹ See Cadbury, *The Style . . .*, p. 5.

² In *The Style . . .*, pp. 39–72 (cf. also *JBL* 14 (1926), 190–209), Cadbury disproved the thesis supported by W. K. Hobart (*The Medical Language of St. Luke*, 1882), Zahn (*Einl.* III, 3rd ed., 160ff.) and Harnack (*Lucas der Arzt*, 1906; ET *Luke the Physician*, 1907), namely that Luke's use of words betrays 'Luke the physician': by the same criterion Lucian of Samosata would also have been a doctor. On p. 335 of *Urchristliche Literaturformen* (2nd & 3rd edd. 1912) Paul Wendland says that Luke's medical knowledge 'does not go beyond what is to be expected in educated laymen . . . Philo's knowledge in this field goes considerably farther than our author's, yet he was no doctor': cf. Cadbury, *The Making . . .*, pp. 118f., 178, 196, 219 & 358. Against the special plea that Luke's very interest in healings is proof enough that he was a physician, Cadbury objects: 'It is doubtful whether his interest in disease and healing exceeds that of his fellow-evangelists, or other contemporaries who were not doctors . . .' (*The Making . . .*, p. 358).

³ Charles Cutler Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts*, Harvard Theological Studies I, 1916. By the same author: 'Facts and Fancy in Theories concerning Acts' in *American Journal of Theology* 23 (1919), 61ff. & 189ff.; *Our Translated Gospels: Some of the Evidence*, London and New York 1936; *Documents of the Primitive Church*, 1941.

⁴ Acts 2.47, 3.16, 4.24f., 8.10, 11.28 and 15.7: see Commentary on these verses.

De Zwaan¹ only holds it likely that Acts 1.1b–5.16 and 9.31–11.18 derive from an Aramaic source, while W. Knox² demands an Aramaic original solely for 1.1b–5.16.

Unfortunately Torrey neglected to compare the Septuagint usage in every case where he wanted to demonstrate an Aramaic substratum.³ His contention that as a Hellenist Luke systematically reproduced the LXX wording for every OT quotation occurring in the Aramaic source (p. 58) overlooks the fact that in Chapters 2 and 15 the argument depends on the LXX text, and that the Hebrew text would have been useless for the purpose. Furthermore Torrey has enlisted, in support of his 'Aramaic' hypothesis, certain expressions which were perfectly admissible in the Greek of that time.⁴ Again, Torrey, taking his stand on the *koine* (p. 7), denies that an Aramaic original was used in the second half of Acts, though the presumable semitisms in these later chapters are in no way distinct from those of the first half. Finally, Torrey did not fail to remark the correspondence in thought between the two sections of Acts (p. 65), but he did fail to notice the difficulty produced thereby: that the original author of the first part must have been 'a veritable *âme sœur* of Luke' (De Zwaan, *op. cit.*, 55). All this—quite apart from the fact that his six stock examples of Lucan mistranslation are anything but convincing—goes to show that Torrey's thesis is untenable.

The phenomena claimed by Torrey as Aramaisms are, as H. F. D. Sparks⁵ already saw, 'Septuagintisms'. It was to the Greek Old Testament, his own Holy Scripture, that Luke turned for the linguistic means of presenting the holy apostolic age, especially in Palestine: he had the Apostles speak a 'sacred tongue'.⁶ But even apart from their speeches (in which he also used the liturgical heritage of the Christian community⁷), we encounter Septuagint words and phrases over and over again. Luke employed this medium in a most scrupulous and deliberate manner. For example, he calls Peter by that name, but in 15.14 he makes the Lord's brother speak not of Peter but of Συμεών. By this periphrasis Luke shows the reader that James

¹ 'The Use of the Greek Language in Acts' in *Beg.* II, 30–65.

² *The Acts of the Apostles*, Cambridge 1948, 18.

³ Of the alleged Aramaisms the expressions which Torrey criticizes in 11.22a, 12.3, 14.2b and 15.7, for example, derive from LXX.

⁴ ῥύμην μίαν is for example 'sound *koine*' (De Zwaan, 59); ἐκπλησσομένης ἐπί in 13.12 is also 'good *koine* after verbs of emotion' (*ibid*) and οὐκ ἐγώ εἰμι in 13.25 is 'quite sound vernacular Greek' (*idem*, 60).

⁵ *JTS*, NS 1 (1950), 16–28.

⁶ Jacquier, CXCII: 'He wrote what one might call "sacred prose", in imitation of LXX style.' But De Zwaan also (p. 53) warns against confusing 'sacred prose' and translation Greek.

⁷ Acts 3.16 & 26 and 4.27 & 30. Jeremias says (*ThWb*, V, 700f.): 'This simple liturgical formula is very old . . . The title survived in the gentile Church . . . as a liturgical formula which crystallized at an early date and was anchored in the eucharistic prayer, the doxology and the general confession.'

is employing the Semitic form $\eta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ and is therefore speaking $\epsilon\beta\rho\alpha\iota\delta\iota$ $\delta\iota\alpha\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega$, i.e. in Aramaic.¹ There is the same implication when the exalted Lord addresses Paul as $\Sigma\alpha\omicron\upsilon\lambda$ on the road to Damascus: in 26.14 it is expressly stated that Christ spoke in Aramaic. Here we have already met with one of those passages in the second half of Acts where Luke felt obliged to use 'biblical' utterance. That is why here too alleged 'semitisms' occur. Acts 26.14–18 is in fact splendid evidence of the forethought with which Luke went to work: Paul is speaking to a mixed audience of Jews and educated gentiles; Luke takes both parties into account, and this determines his rendering of Christ's words: alongside biblical phrases stands the Greek proverb of the goads.²

And so no case can be made out for 'translation Greek'.

(ii) We now come to the second linguistic problem which we propose to discuss: the relationship of Acts to the *koine* and 'Atticism'. Albert Wifstrand³ has shown that Luke is uninfluenced by Atticism. He employs the educated written language of Hellenism, which in his time was as yet untouched by classicism and Atticism. If there are nevertheless quite a few Attic elements, it is because the written language of the Hellenistic age had preserved a certain continuity with the Attic literary language of the fourth century B.C. Spoken *koine* Greek, on the other hand, diverged far more sharply from the everyday Attic of that time. It is to the Attic heritage of the Hellenistic written language that we may attach, in Acts, the use of the optative (whether in a potential clause, as in 5.24 or 10.17, or in a conditional clause, as in 17.27, 24.19, 25.20 or 27.12), of the future participle and infinitive and of the occasional negation of the participle by $\omicron\upsilon$ (Wifstrand. 141f.). Wifstrand also points, quite rightly, to the LXX style from which are derived many of the details held to be classicisms by Eduard Norden.

Luke is at his most 'literary', from the viewpoint of Hellenistic written language, in the four scenes where the subject matter demands it: 17.16–34, 19.21–40, 24.1–23 and Chapter 26. But the first part of Acts also contains such 'literary' passages, e.g. Gamaliel's speech, 5.35–9, and others are to be found in the second half apart from the four scenes mentioned, e.g. Paul's

¹ Grotesque misconceptions of the situation are to be found in two articles: Donald W. Riddle, 'The Cephas-Peter Problem and a possible Solution' in *JBL* 59 (1940), 169–80, and Donald Fay Robinson, 'Where and When did Peter die?' in *JBL* 64 (1945), 255–67: Simon and Peter are supposed to have been two different early Christian leaders whose identities were only merged by later tradition. Robinson says the Symeon of 15.14 was the Symeon Niger of 13.1, while Peter was executed in 44: 'he went to another place' (Acts 12.17) (!)

² Acts 26.14, $\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$ σοι κτλ. beside Ezek. 2.1 & 3, Jer. 1.7 and Isaiah 33.5, 42.7 & 16 and 61.1.

³ 'Lukas och den grekiska klassicismen' in *SEÅ* V (1940), 139–51, and 'Det grekiska prosaspråket: en historisk översikt' in *Eranos* 50 (1952), 149–63. Cf. also a dissertation by Wifstrand's pupil, Jonas Palm, 'Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien: ein Beitrag zur Beleuchtung der hellenistischen Prosa', Lund 1955, and A. Debrunner's review of it in *Gnomon* 28 (1956) esp. 588.

words to the tribune, 21.39. Yet even in the four renowned scenes—on the Areopagus, in Ephesus, before Felix, before Agrippa—Luke's stylistic prowess leaves something to be desired. Codex D finds the threefold ἐν of 17.31 troublesome, and therefore discards ἐν ἧ μέλλει. The town-clerk's great speech in 19.35–40 ends in obscurity, for no interpreter is sure what he should do with the three περί-expressions (D already offers a forceful correction). But even the elegant utterances of Tertullus (24.2–8) tail off into three parallel relative clauses, and it has long been recognized that Paul's speech before Agrippa departs from exemplary Greek with ὧν . . . μελλόντων. Small wonder that textual corruption has been suspected in such cases, since we hardly expect such lapses from the *auctor ad Theophilum*. In using this familiar description we are usually thinking of Luke 1.1–4 and assuming that a writer capable of so beautiful a period must also have written elegant Greek elsewhere, especially where the subject matter called for it. But at that time a zealously cultivated technique, which anyone could learn, facilitated the composition of such prologues.¹ Moreover, there were plenty of writings whose prologues could serve as models. We may not therefore draw any conclusions from the special case of Luke's prologue.

Furthermore, Blass and Cadbury² have demonstrated that even this prologue is not linguistically unimpeachable. Luke begins with ἐπειδήπερ—in normal usage this word would be preceded by the main clause. But Luke uses it as he does because it is weightier and sounds loftier than mere ἐπειδή. Probably πεπληροφορημένων is another case in point—Luke 'might have written πληρωθέντων' for this grandiloquent word, and it would have been clearer (Blass, *op. cit.*, 8). καθώς being frowned upon by the Atticists, D substitutes the 'correct' καθά.

In Acts 26.4, where Luke is particularly anxious to use high literary style, he writes the form ἴσασι—elsewhere he employs the vulgar οἶδασι, as in Luke 11.44. The number of *koine* forms in verbs and nouns is far from negligible, beginning with such forms as εἶπαν and χάριτα (24.27). It is particularly striking that Luke puts εἰς for ἐν—Wendt took great pains to demonstrate, in these cases of allegedly 'pregnant' usage, the after-effect of an earlier movement reflected in the εἰς. No less Hellenistic is the replacement of ἐκεῖ by ἐκεῖσε in 21.3 and 22.5, the use of reinforced expressions such as ἕως ἐπί in 17.14 and ἕως εἰς in 26.11, or the intrusion of ὅστις in the rôle of the simple relative, so that it no longer means 'everyone who' or 'every such'. πρότερος is replaced by the Hellenistic πρώτος, which puts paid to

¹ Cadbury, *The Making . . .*, pp. 194f.: 'Neither the ancient Greek writers nor the Semitic authors used prefaces. They came into vogue in the Hellenistic age.' In LXX they are used only by Jesus Sirach and the author of II Maccabees—'The contents of the preface were prescribed by rhetorical rulebooks, largely on the basis of the technique of the orator's exordium.'

² F. Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, London 1898, 7–20; Cadbury, *Beg.* II, 489–510.

Zahn's thesis that Luke intended to write a third book (see Commentary on 1.1). In 19.16 ἀμφοτέροι must simply mean 'all', even though the examples we have of this vulgar usage are rare and late.¹ But we should not forget that for everyday spoken Greek we have nothing like the mass of evidence we possess for literary Greek.

If we take into account all the linguistic observations made by scholars, we can hardly reject Radermacher's judgment: 'Luke possesses the determining characteristics of a *koine*-writer. He writes the language of the people with a slight varnish, inasmuch as he has appropriated, perhaps from school, perhaps from reading, individual words and expressions which were no longer current in popular speech.'²

With good reason De Zwaan had pointed out that, especially in the first half of Acts, Luke did not make things easy for his Greek readers.³ Certainly even in those days people appreciated the fascination of the oriental, and could put a positive value on the 'barbarous', when it promised to impart religious mysteries. But any reader not to some extent familiar with the Septuagint, the holy book of the Gentile Christians, must at times have shaken his head sadly over the Greek of Acts. The book was not written for strangers to whom things Christian were *terra incognita*.

C. The Peculiarities of Lucan Style

It is not easy to define the individuality of Lucan style. We cannot speak of a Lucan style in the sense in which we speak of the style of Tacitus, which stamps every sentence of the *Annals*. We may indeed point to certain words, expressions, turns of phrase, for which Luke appears to have a special liking. But here we must ask ourselves to what extent Luke thereby distinguishes himself from contemporary writers of similar cultural background. For example, he likes to use ἰκανός in the sense of 'great' or 'much.' The word can be seen gradually acquiring this sense in the later books of LXX—μέγας and πολύς are so hackneyed! What is 'Lucan,' therefore, is probably only the frequency of his use of the word.

It is perhaps the same with relative clauses, which are frequently main clauses introduced by a relative. Acts 11.23, for example, ὃς παραγενόμενος . . . ἐχάρη κτλ, is a regular main clause whose introduction by a relative looks like a Latinism. But a contemporary of Luke's, Diodorus Siculus, has 53 sentences introduced by a relative in each of Books XIII and XIX, while Agatharchides, in the second century B.C., seems to have employed the relative connection even more frequently.⁴ Luke therefore was not the only

¹ See *Beg.* IV, 241f.

² Radermacher, 25.

³ *Beg.* II, 65.

⁴ Palm, *op. cit.* p. 75 n.3 above, p. 69.

writer of his time to favour this construction. Nevertheless, it belongs among the peculiarities of his style.

Worthy of special note is the quite frequent use of *καί* after a relative pronoun. The *καί* should be omitted in translation. When, for example, it is said of the two men in white raiment, in 1.11, οὗ *καί* εἶπαν, this is not to be explained, with Bernhard Weiss,¹ in the sense that they let themselves be *not only* seen *but also* heard. The meaning is simply 'These said'. Likewise, in 28.28, αὐτοὶ *καί* ἀκούσονται does not mean 'They will also hear' but stresses 'They will hear.' This *καί* also is not *in itself* a characteristic of Lucan style, but only by virtue of its frequency, for Justin and Eusebius also employ it.

In order to enliven the narrative, Luke occasionally resorts to the same stylistic device: omission of the verb '(he) said,' as in 2.38: Πέτρος δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς. Most MSS. naturally insert ἔφη or φησιν. But instances such as 5.9, 9.11 or 26.27 show that Luke really intended to ensure the vitality of the scene by this means.

Similarly with the transition from indirect to direct speech.² Some have supposed Luke simply incapable of sustaining indirect speech.³ But this is to underrate his ability and individuality as a writer. This transition occurs frequently between Acts 1.4 and 25.5 and is intended to avert stiffness in the presentation. The converse transition to indirect speech is to be found in 23.24.

Litotes—e.g. the famous 'no mean city'—offers a further example of Lucan style, again revealing his attachment to his age. 'In Hellenistic times,' writes Wifstrand's pupil Jonas Palm,⁴ 'litotes was clearly a feature of studied language.' He goes on to note the following instances in Acts: 12.18, 14.28, 17.4 & 12, 19.11 & 23f., 20.12, 21.39, 27.20 and 28.2, then has this remark: litotes 'is at times rather pointless here; it is evidently regarded as no more than a refinement, as is perhaps also the word *ἱκανός*, similar to litotes. All the examples are very stereotyped'.

Even the occasional freedom of word-order which we encounter in Acts is not exclusive to Luke but widespread in Hellenistic literature. It should however be acknowledged that Luke has made discreet and meaningful use of this freedom. Sometimes he displaces the words because he meets with specific difficulties of formulation. Thus in 11.22 the expression ἡκούσθη εἰς τὰ ὄτα (cf. Isaiah 5.9 LXX) could not be too widely pulled apart; hence περὶ αὐτῶν had to go to the end. In 20.3 the author was in dire straits: the genitive absolute after ποιήσας was an unhappy start, and now this genitive, γενομένης ἐπιβουλῆς, could not very well be separated from αὐτῶ; on the

¹ *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Textkritische Untersuchungen und Textherstellung, Leipzig 1893 (=TU IX 3/4), 74.

² Luke 5.14; Acts 1.4, 14.22, 17.3, 23.22 and 25.5.

³ Bl.-Debr. § 470, 2.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 75 n.3 above, 155.

other hand, τῶν Ἰουδαίων could not be held back for the μέλλοντι . . . Συρίαν which is the logical continuation of αὐτῶ. Thus the tangle of words here betokens a difficulty the writer could not quite work out. Considerations of rhythm must have determined the division of τοῦτο τὸ μέρος in 19.27 and the strange word-order of ἀνὴρ ἀδύνατος κτλ in 14.8. But in the majority of cases Luke displaces words in order to bring what is being stressed into the emphatic positions, i.e. the beginning and the end. In 10.28 he wishes to emphasize that Peter has learned to call no man unclean, whoever he may be. He achieves this emphasis by putting μηδένα at the beginning of the clause and ἄνθρωπον at the end, with κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν in the middle. Similarly in the case of 13.23: 'of his seed' is to be stressed, consequently τούτου goes to the beginning and σπέρματος to the end. We have doubtless another case of this kind in 21.20, where τῶν πεπιστευκότων does not immediately follow πόσαι μυριάδες. Likewise the purpose of the inversion is clear at 19.26, where the opening words οὐ μόνον Ἐφέσου . . . Ἀσίας depend on the final ἰκανὸν ὄχλον. Once one is familiar with this Lucan stylistic artifice, even the text of 12.25 is no longer a problem: εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν belong together, and show the accentuated ideas at the beginning and the end.¹ Probably the most striking inversion occurs in 4.33. At first glance the text appears to refer to 'Apostles of the Lord Jesus'. But in fact Luke is speaking of 'witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus', and because he wishes to emphasize both the Apostles' attestation and the overwhelming fact of the Resurrection he places τὸ μαρτύριον at the beginning and τῆς ἀναστάσεως at the end of the whole. Most manuscripts have 'normalized' the word-order in one way or another,² thus destroying the verse's distinct Lucan flavour; B in contrast here stands vindicated once again.

'Like the rest of us (Luke) has the habit of soon repeating a word when he has used it.'³ Hence certain words and expressions occur in one part of his writings and others in another part. It is unwise to attribute these phenomena to his sources,⁴ for his Greek sources at least are largely recast in his copying of them.' Here⁵ as usual Cadbury is correct in his observations.

¹ See Commentary on this verse.

² NA: τῆς ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου; Pap.^B D: τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; B τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.

³ Examples: 19.35f. καταστέλλω; 19.38 & 40 ἐγκαλέω; 20.1f. παρακαλέσας. Theodor Vogel (*Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil*, 2nd ed., Leipzig 1899, 17) had already drawn attention to the matter (9.13, 32, 41 ἅγιοι; 13.46 & 48 ζωὴ αἰώνιος; 15.32 & 41 ἐπιστηρίζω; 5.29 & 32 πειθαρχέω; 2.42 & 46 προσκαρτεροῦντες).

⁴ As did H. Waitz in respect of the repetitions of 8.6 & 10 ('Die Quellen der Philippusgeschichte in der Apostelgeschichte 8.5-40' in *ZNW* 7 (1906), 340-55). But μαγεύων καὶ ἐξιστάνων (8.9) is repeated by μαγείαις ἐξεστακέναι (8.11), and here Waitz does not speak in terms of source-differences.

⁵ *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 218f.

Cadbury has also pointed out¹ the versatility of Lucan style. It was taken for granted by Luke that Apostles should speak with dignified biblical expressions, especially on solemn occasions. Thus came into being those speeches which to our ears have a remarkably stilted, not to say artificial ring: those speeches of Paul (13.10f.), Peter (15.7-11) and James (15.14-21) that have so troubled the exegetes. But when Luke does not feel compelled by the occasion to employ these solemn tones, he is capable of painting a scene easily and expansively, dwelling lovingly on details, in almost conversational tones, as in the visit of Paul's nephew to the tribune, 23.17ff. Luke may have found the story of the rescue of Peter (Ch. 12), with its popular bluntness, in tradition—left to himself, he would probably have had the angel treat Peter with a little more courtesy!—but he left this down-to-earth style untouched because it renders so credible the reality of this miraculous incident. In 25.22 Luke puts in the mouth of the Procurator Festus a phrase which in its Roman curtness (*'cras audies eum'*) recalls the more famous *quod scripsi scripsi* of Pilate (John 19.22). He can provide the orator Tertullus with a set-piece of rhetoric (24.2-8), let Demetrius incite the workers (19.25-7), and again portray the Christians as they fall weeping on the neck of Paul, who is marked for death (20.37). He varies his style according to the tone required and the situation he is depicting, and the stylistic contrast in the alternation of dry log-book and exciting 'legends' does much to heighten the effect.

At first this stylistic versatility is less impressive than the monumental monotony we find in Tacitus. But Luke's readers must have been grateful for a variety which did not drill life into the uniform grey of pessimism. Similarly they will not have felt it a defect, as modern critics do, that Luke, although he had all the necessary stylistic capabilities, painted no individual portraits of the Apostles.² Peter and Paul are figures drawn from the same model: they embody the apostolic ideal as seen through the eyes of Luke's age. That they preached the same doctrine Luke would not have doubted for a moment. What difference, then, remained to be indicated, save that the Paul of the later chapters should appear more Hellenistic than the man who preached in Pisidian Antioch and the orator of Pentecost?

Bibliography

V. H. Stanton, 'Style and Authorship in the Acts of the Apostles', *JTS* 24 (1922-3), 362-81; W. G. Letham, 'Luke's Literary Method as a Controlling Factor in the Composition of Acts' (diss.), Divinity School, University of Chicago, 1926; D. W. Riddle, 'The Logic of the Theory of Translation

¹ *Op. cit.*, 221ff.

² Dibelius judges somewhat differently: *Studies*, 182.

Greek', *JBL* 51 (1932), 13-30; G. A. Barton, 'Prof. Torrey's Theory of the Aramaic Origin of the Gospels and the First Half of the Acts of the Apostles', *JTS* 36 (1935), 357-73; H. F. D. Sparks, 'Some Observations on the Semitic Background of the N.T.' in *Novi Test. Soc. Bulletin* II, 1951, 33-42; N. Turner, 'The Relation of Luke I and II to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts', *NTS* 2 (1955-6), 100-9.

6. THE SOURCE-QUESTION

Scholars have long been in suspense over the question of sources in Acts.¹ Even today it has not been finally answered. Form-criticism, with its interest in the smaller units² and in the literary and theological composition,³ pushed the source-problem into the background. This was not unjustified: during the long period of preoccupation with 'What really happened?'—and this question was the motive force behind source-research—scholars had failed to do justice to the aim and intentions of the biblical writings. Nevertheless, Form-criticism by no means 'disposed' of the source-question once and for all—certainly not in so difficult a case as that of Acts. No more than the third gospel can this voluminous work have arisen without 'sources.'

But—and this is what makes the source-problem in Acts so difficult—comparison with Luke's Gospel is full of risk. For the situation in Acts is utterly different. We are in possession of one of the sources for Luke: the Gospel of Mark. Another—Q—can to a large extent be inferred. In the case of Acts we are not in the happy position of possessing one of its sources. This is the more regrettable since Luke, as we have learned from comparing him with Mark, subjects his sources to a stylistic revision which renders their reconstitution impossible from his text alone.⁴ We may assume that he did not treat the underlying sources of Acts any differently. No sources can therefore be discerned in Acts by stylistic criteria.⁵

On the other hand it is highly improbable that Luke had so many and varied sources at his command for Acts as for his gospel. The Apostles and

¹ See 24-34 above.

² See 34-39 above.

³ See 39-50 above.

⁴ This is the real significance of Harnack's finding that the 'we'-passages are not stylistically distinct from the rest of the book. Cf. F. C. Burkitt's outstanding investigation, 'The Use of Mark in the Gospel according to Luke' in *Beg.* II, 106-20. It is only when we place Mark and Luke side by side that we can see the style of the second Evangelist 'shining through' that of the third (so C. S. C. Williams, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1957, 6).

⁵ It has occasionally been held as a pointer to Aramaic sources that the first half of Acts sounds so much more Semitic than the second (see pp. 28f. & 73ff. above). But this phenomenon is simply due, in fact, to a more intensive use of 'biblical' language (see pp. 74f. above).

other Christian missionaries did not proclaim their own words and deeds, but those of the Lord Jesus. Hence no tradition corresponding to the Synoptic had formed with reference to Paul and the Apostles.¹ Certainly we encounter miracle-stories in Acts—mostly concerning Peter—which resemble those in the Synoptic Gospels and are probably not uninfluenced by them.² But the *speeches*³ do not in Acts, as in the Synoptic Gospels, consist of individual logia which gradually grew together, but are literary compositions thought out to the last detail. Admittedly they did not come to the author out of the blue: the kerygma of Jesus and scriptural warrant are behind the missionary sermons of Acts⁴ as the biography of Paul and the story of his conversion stand behind his great apologetic discourses. Those who naively believe that Luke went to work with Acts in exactly the same way as with his gospel⁵ fail to notice that their opinion rests on an untenable assumption: there just were no ‘histories of the Apostles’ which Luke could have woven together as, in the case of the third gospel, he wove together Mark, Q, and that other gospel from which he derived his special material.

This is not to deny that in some sections of Acts Luke was able to make use of written ‘sources’. Two such hypothetical sources deserve serious consideration: the ‘Antiochene source’ and the ‘travel-journal’. But precisely here we encounter peculiarly difficult problems. To see these clearly, we shall do well to look first at the *story of Stephen*.

Here the account of the martyrdom is broken off in the middle of the description of the stoning (Acts 7.58b), and the author inserts the detail that the witnesses laid their garments at the feet of a young man—he was to guard them, as 22.20 will add. In this way Paul is drawn into the sombre affair. But here is the astounding thing: the martyrdom of Stephen did not mention Paul at all! Luke however knew (like probably every Christian of his time) that ‘Paul persecuted the Church’ (cf. Acts 9.21 and Gal. 1.13). But for Luke there was in those early days only one Church: that of Jerusalem. He must

¹ See Dibelius, ‘Zur Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments’ (*ThR*, New Series 3, 1931, 207–42), 236; *Studies*, 2f., 124, 146, 196.

² The awakening of Tabitha especially is reminiscent of the awakening of Jairus’ daughter with ‘*Talitha qum*’ in Mark 5.41. But *Δορκάς* was already in the source. Wellhausen (p. 20) was of the opinion that ‘The captain of Capernaum has probably rightly been considered the model of Captain Cornelius.’

³ See Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, London 1927 (reprinted 1958) 61; Dibelius, *Studies*, 138–85; and Ulrich Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte*, Neukirchen 2nd edn. 1967.

⁴ Dibelius, *Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 2nd ed., 15f. (ET *From Tradition to Gospel*), and *Studies*, 165; C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, 2nd ed., 1951.

⁵ Certainly fragments of different provenance succeed one another in Acts too, but there is no question of a blocklike juxtaposition of sources. Moreover Dom Jacques Dupont has shown, with specific reference to the Beatitudes (in *Les deux versions du Sermon sur la montagne et des Béatitudes*, Louvain 1958), what freedom Luke allowed himself, even in the Gospel, in expounding and interpreting his material.

necessarily conclude that this was the Church which Paul persecuted. If now the source maintained a puzzling silence on the fact, what was missing had to be supplied and inserted. Hence the sentence about the 'witnesses', which told the reader that Saul/Paul was present in person at the stoning and—as is added expressly in 8.1—approved of it. Only, even this did not amount to showing that 'Paul persecuted the Church'. For this reason Luke dared the bold leap of 8.3: he suddenly turns the approving onlooker¹ Saul into the only persecutor who is even so much as named, and no sooner is he converted than the Church has peace (9.31). Later (26.10ff.) Luke gives us in detail his idea of this persecution: Saul was one of the judges at the many trials of Christians, and he always voted for the death-penalty! The old tradition knew indeed of only a single victim, Stephen. Luke, however, conceived of the situation differently—otherwise there would have been no Pauline persecution of Christians in Jerusalem! Stephen's trial marked the beginning of a long series of similar incidents. Yet not content with this, so Luke inferred, Saul carried his persecutions into the 'cities without' Jerusalem, hence as far afield as Damascus.² In this way Luke neatly dovetails the story of Stephen with his next item of tradition: the account current among the communities of Paul's conversion before Damascus.³

We see, then, that here Luke had no continuous source at his disposal (the same holds for chapters 1 to 5)⁴. He seeks to supply this deficiency by drawing conclusions from the information available and adding complementary details. In this he is guided by certain preconceptions as to the course and the coherence of the history of the primitive Church.

To this extent the source-question and the author's procedure are relatively clear. But the question now arises: did Luke use only an isolated account of a martyrdom⁵ or was this account already part of a larger whole, an 'Antiochene source'? The latter answer is suggested by Luke's mention, in the introduction to the Stephen episode (6.1ff.), of a dispute between 'Hellenists' and 'Hebrews', hence a conflict between groups within the primitive Church. This is scarcely in harmony with the ideal picture of this

¹ Cf. Dibelius, *Studies*, 208. When Albert Schweitzer maintains (*Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*, Tübingen 1930, 154 n. 1. ET *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, 2nd ed., London 1956.) that the witnesses' laying of their garments at the feet of Saul 'makes him recognizable as the leader of the action,' he is disregarding 22.20. When he goes on to find in the mention of witnesses proof of a 'regular execution as described in the Mishnah tractate Sanhedrin', he is overlooking the fact that in this very tractate a wholly different method of stoning is described, which would rule out any kneeling-down on the part of Stephen. The traditional view of the scene is so powerful that it distorts the better judgment even in a book so rich in inspired insights as this one.

² Luke has caused his interpreters much trouble with this historical reconstruction. He was unaware that the High Priest enjoyed no right of arrest in Damascus. See p. 320 n.2 below.

³ Cf. § 7 below, pp. 107–110.

⁴ This is now fairly generally admitted.

⁵ So Dibelius, *Studies*, 176 n. 68.

community which Luke otherwise paints for the reader. It follows that he did not invent it but received it from some tradition. Moreover, in 6.5 he presents us with a list of the 'Seven' which almost certainly did not flutter down on to his desk as an isolated note. But Luke's information about the preaching to the Gentiles in Antioch (11.19f.), the Antiochian origin of the name 'Christian' (11.26), the prophecy of Agabus and the 'Jerusalem fund' (11.27-30) has also been regarded as drawn from such an Antiochene source, to which might also have belonged in some form the account of the so-called first missionary journey (13.1ff.).

We can therefore understand why in 'Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apostelgeschichte' (*New Testament Essays*, edited by A. J. B. Higgins, Manchester 1959, 68-80) Rudolf Bultmann should have opted for a hypothetical Antiochene source, a chronicle of this community which the author of Acts unearthed from the archives of Antioch (Wendt and Jeremias¹ had already postulated an Antiochene source, without, however, indicating how Luke came to know of it).

But there are two problems which damp our enthusiasm for this suggestion. We have in the first place the riddle of how this chronicle could have come into being: a generation which thinks itself the last does not write for posterity.² What could then have moved the Christians of Antioch to record the events leading to the foundation of their community, together with its subsequent deeds and experiences?³ In the second place it seems inconceivable that the author of Acts should have twisted what he read in this old chronicle into its very opposite, as must have happened in his account of the election of the Seven.⁴ After all, he was not simply dealing with any mere rumour that could and must be corrected, but with the truth as set down by the eyewitnesses of the actual events!

So we need not be surprised that Etienne Trocmé—and in this he too is the heir of a worthy tradition—should advocate another view of the source on which Luke drew for his knowledge of the past: it was an itinerary—*un diaire*—which Luke had at his disposal.⁵ Paul, on his missionary travels,

¹ H. H. Wendt, 'Die Hauptquelle der Apostelgeschichte' in *ZNW* 24 (1925), 293-305, and Joachim Jeremias, 'Die antiochenische Quelle und die Datierung der ersten Missionsreise' in 'Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte' (*ZNW* 36 (1937), 205-21) 213-20. See below, literature to § 34.

² Cf. Dibelius, *Studies* 103.

³ At most it might have been a question of an account of their history in self-vindication over against Jerusalem. But when the dispute with the Jerusalem community arose—for the latter apparently did not at first concern itself with the distant and essentially gentile community—it was about the concrete question of circumcision.

⁴ See Commentary on 6.1-7, pp. 264ff. below.

⁵ Trocmé (*Le Livre des Actes et l'histoire*, 1957) 134-40. Trocmé indeed admits (p. 135) that we possess no document of this kind from antiquity, but he asserts that the analogy of later times is evidence enough. He is here, however, in a more favourable position than he suspects; A. D. Nock (*Gnomon* 25 (1953), 500) draws attention to examples

from time to time got an assistant to record the day's events with a few brief notes, or even set pen to paper himself when the occasion required. Eventually it was Luke who kept this journal, and much later he made use of it when he set about the composition of Acts (Trocmé, 138). Here then is another very plausible theory although, on closer examination, it too leaves room for doubt.

Evidently the brief notices of the day's events in 16.11f. and 20.5–21.18 have been thought to imply such a hypothesis as this. For it is only in these two sections that we find, at one and the same time, both the 'we' implying that the writer was Paul's companion¹ and the day-by-day description of the journey. One is naturally tempted to assume the same source for every travel-report in Acts. But Dibelius has already drawn attention to the fact that the 'we' may just as well represent the author's last-minute embellishment as an original component of an old source (*Studies*, 104f., 205f.). In 16.16f., for example, it occurs in an episode which is not part of a travel-journal but a separate, self-contained story. It has obviously been taken over as a link from the preceding journal-entries. If 27.1–6 is examined closely, it will be seen that the 'we' is by no means entirely appropriate: it has been inserted in order to lend the narrative of the voyage the appearance of a fellow-traveller's account. This points to the conclusion that the 'we' was in fact used here as a stylistic device.

Trocmé believes that the author of the book was Luke the companion of Paul. If we should conclude (see Intro. § 8 below) that this assumption is unacceptable, we are immediately faced with the problem of how this travel-journal could have come into the hands of the author. But that is not all: it is also a question whether the extremely meagre and obscure details (Barjesus—Elymas!) have been taken from a travel-diary at all. It is no less questionable whether Paul really kept a diary on the long journey from Ephesus to Caesarea and Antioch, then back again to Ephesus across the whole of Asia Minor. What exactly would have been the use to him of this '*diare*', of which his epistles give no hint? After his separation from Barnabas, Paul carried on his mission in independence of any local congregation, at his own risk and answerable to no earthly master. If in Antioch he related his missionary travels (18.22), he did not need to enumerate every stage of the journey. Finally, who can believe that when in Cenchreae Paul would have confided to such a diary that he had had his hair cut (18.18)—quite apart from the facts that a Nazirite vow could only be absolved by having

of such journals. According to Trocmé, Paul used the '*diare*' as an '*aide-mémoire*'. This is doubtless preferable to Dibelius' explanation of it as 'a catalogue of resting-places such as it was probably the custom to draw up on such journeys, for the practical purpose of being able to rediscover the route and the former hosts should the journey be repeated' (*Studies*, 199).

¹ In the 'Western' text's 'we' at 11.28 this is simply not the case.

the hair cut in Jerusalem and that the 'quasi-Nazirite private vow' has been invented by the commentators to suit only this passage and no other)?

But have we in fact only the choice between a travel-journal¹ and the chronicle of Antioch? Not at all. When, years after Paul had run his course, Luke set about the task of describing the era of primitive Christianity, various possibilities of collecting the required material lay open to him.² He could himself, for example, look up the most important Pauline communities—say Philippi, Corinth, Ephesus, Antioch. He might even visit Jerusalem. But it was also possible for him to ask other Christians travelling to these places to glean for him whatever was still known of the old times (if he was preparing Acts about the year 75, twenty years would not yet have elapsed since Paul's death, and perhaps forty from the foundation of the community in Antioch). Lastly, he could have written to the congregations in question and asked them for information. Yet in each of these cases, whether the author himself listened to the reminiscences of older members of the congregations and then wrote them up, or received the reports of his informants or replies to letters, he had before him a collection of reports which may well have included some of the

¹ In his article, 'Die Fragwürdigkeit eines Itinerars der Paulusreisen' (*TLZ* 84 (1959), 165–74), G. Schille has demonstrated that Dibelius' arguments in favour of the use of an itinerary in Acts 13 to 21 do not hold water. His own solution is indicated by his closing sentences: The itinerary-hypothesis 'is perhaps no more than a last vestige of those source-theories which M. Dibelius so severely castigated. His reference to Luke's literary capacity throws light upon more things than even Dibelius himself assumed.' Luke's literary capacity is thus to explain what was previously accounted for by the assumption of an itinerary. Yet one should not overwork the discovery that at times (e.g. Acts 25.13–22) Luke was capable of entirely independent composition. Schille takes his picture of Paul's missionary proceedings from *Didache* 11.4–6: the Apostle was not allowed to spend more than two days in one place. 'Presumably, then, Paul's so-called travelling-companions were independent fellow-workers who followed in the footprints of the founder of communities. One must therefore be prepared to find a great part of the "Pauline mission" was Pauline at most in that Paul led the way' (p. 174). Other considerations apart, Schille is here misapplying to Paul a rule designed for an entirely different age—two generations later—and an entirely different situation, when it was a question of regulating the activity of wandering preachers among congregations already organized under monarchic bishops. Paul was after all a founder of congregations where nothing existed, whereas the 'apostles and prophets' in the *Didache*, already become suspect, were active in Christian communities of long standing and had to be prevented from becoming a burden upon them. The rule for the early Christian mission in Mark 6.10 *Par.* presupposes a fairly long stay by the missionaries in one place: this is clear precisely from the prohibition against changing hosts during this period. A community cannot be founded overnight, and the *Didache* does not justify our dismissing all references to Paul's staying longer in one place. Our examination above of the possible ways in which Luke could have obtained his material on the Pauline mission, and to a large extent its arrangement, shows that we are not reduced to the mere choice between a weak itinerary-hypothesis and Luke's 'story-telling' capacity.

² This is no modernization! We can see from the third gospel what pains Luke took over sources: it can by no means be taken for granted that Mark's gospel was available in his congregation, and in addition he procured the gospel from which he derived his special material, and further also 'Q'. For Acts, the material was not easier but harder to come by, and only one who considered the task highly important would have undertaken the toil involved.

episodes which we now find woven into the descriptions of travel.¹ It is entirely possible that from Philippi Luke received the diary of one of those men who, as representatives of that community, had accompanied Paul from there to Jerusalem with the large fund that had been collected, and gladly incorporated it, with only a slight amount of editing, in his book. It would be wholly understandable that least should be known about the very first missionary journey (Chapters 13 and 14) and that the remembrance of what took place at the court of Sergius Paulus should have become somewhat dim; it is hard to say whether—apart from the names of the Seven and the later venerated teachers—people in Antioch would have retained exact knowledge of the conflict over the widows. At all events, in this way we can quite well understand the greater part of the material which Luke introduces into Acts as tradition that has undergone a literary revision at his hands. The fact that the description of the journey to Rome shows these signs of literary revision in special measure impelled Dibelius (*Studies*, 205) to assume that Luke was here using ‘a “secular” representation of voyaging and shipwreck as example, model or source’. The correct view will be that here there was no travel-diary (the papyrus-scroll—or would it have been a codex?—would scarcely have survived the shipwreck²), but a tale told from memory which Luke then enriched with interpolations.

Of course this still does not answer the historian’s question as to the real events underlying the stories of Acts: we have done no more than indicate certain possible ways in which Luke may have come by his material. The historical value of the single item of information will have to be weighed more exactly where appropriate in the Commentary. Here we can only discuss a few individual cases by way of example.

(a) That Luke in general used written sources is suggested by 18.18–22 (see pp. 542–8 below). The somewhat meaningless text ‘and he left them there’ (in Ephesus) ‘but he himself entered into the synagogue’—which also was in Ephesus (moreover it is hard to see why the pious couple, whom we actually meet in the synagogue in 18.26, did not accompany him)—can only be understood properly on the assumption that the text before Luke ran ‘and he left them there, but he himself sailed away from Ephesus’ (cf. verse 21). Luke would then have added the rest in order to secure for Paul the first preaching of Christ in Ephesus and thereby make him the real founder of the Church there. We learn however from 18.27 and 19.9 (see p. 559 below) that a Jewish Christian community already existed within the fold of the synagogue. Paul however later, after three months’ activity, formed the

¹ This may explain the interpolations which appear to be present in 14.8–20, 18.18–21, 20.16–21.1 etc., and also helps one understand the insertions in Chapter 27 (see commentary on these passages).

² A. D. Nock, *Gnomon* 25 (1953) 499 n. 3: but ‘authentic transcription of the recollections of an eyewitness’.

Christians into a congregation independent of the synagogue. To that extent he is in fact the founder of the self-contained Christian community of Ephesus. Hence Luke intended by his interpolation to underline and magnify Paul's importance for the Ephesian community.

(b) If Luke gathered his sources in the manner indicated above (p. 86f.), he probably received accounts not only of journeys but of striking incidents that had lodged in the memory—even legends that had grown up in the meantime might thus have come to his notice. The episode in 16.25–34 may for instance be explained in this way: it is entirely possible that Paul's erstwhile jailer later became a Christian, and that it was then even said that Paul himself had baptized him. Luke would then have recounted this conversion with all the resources of Hellenistic narrative art (see p. 501 below). Similarly in the case of 14.8–18 (see pp. 430–4 below): the healing of the unnamed cripple—it is typical of old healing stories not to give the name of the person healed—may have been handed down through the congregation at Lystra; but Luke must then have placed this material in a setting which his own culture (a visit from the gods, as in the legend of Philemon and Baucis—see p. 426f. below) made incomparably more impressive. It is however clear that in such hypotheses the line between tradition and literary embellishment cannot always be sharply drawn: we are moving in the realm of the possible, at most the probable, in no sense the rigorously demonstrable.

(c) Another point to be considered is that information about a given community need not derive from that community itself. How, for example, did the author come to learn the background to the Stephen episode and the subsequent persecution, as it is sketched in 6.1ff.? From Jerusalem, or from Hellenists driven out (say) to Antioch? The unexpected light thrown on the state of the Jerusalem congregation by the mention of the two groups, the Hebrews and the Hellenists, and the crisis over the widows, betrays such an intimate knowledge of the situation as one expects only from participants. On the other hand, the conflict in 6.1ff. has been minimized—by whom? Is Luke simply transmitting, without important alterations, the view of things bequeathed him by former members of the Jerusalem congregation? Has he himself rubbed down the most jagged points of a 'Hellenistic' recollection? Or had the original tradition mellowed, even in gentile circles, into a harmonious overall picture?¹ Here we come to a further problem.

(d) How tangled the strands of tradition may have become is shown by a fact to which Olof Linton² has drawn attention, namely that Acts

¹ Generally speaking, this means: Should we lay the discrepancies of Acts from the picture arising out of our historical reconstruction at the door of tradition or of the author? If the former, we have still to answer the further question: Where lie the reasons for such a transformation within the tradition?

² Olof Linton, 'The Third Aspect—a neglected point of view: a study in Gal. I-II and Acts IX and XV' (*Studia Theologica*, Vol. III, Lund 1950/51, 79–95).

contains traditions against which Paul already had sought to defend himself! In Gal. 1.15–20 he is evidently combating the calumny that immediately after his conversion he went to Jerusalem and was initiated into the gospel by the Twelve. He was thus not an Apostle in his own right, and when—as on the circumcision question—he departed from Judaistic doctrine (which rightly or wrongly appealed to Jerusalem), he was speaking without authority.¹ Against this, Paul points out that he did not visit Jerusalem for three years, and then only for a fortnight, also that of the Apostles he saw only Peter (apart from James ‘the Lord’s brother’). For all this he calls God to witness (Gal. 1.20)—a sure sign that he is warding off assertions to the contrary. However, Luke also knows nothing of those three years or of Paul’s journey into Arabia: he has Paul, after a time (*ἡμέραι ἱκαναί*—9.23), go straight from Damascus to Jerusalem, where he becomes inseparable from the Apostles (9.28). This does not of course mean that Luke wanted to challenge Paul’s claim (Gal. 2.7) to occupy a place equivalent to Peter’s, for Luke was totally unaware of such a claim. Rather was he glad to be able in this way to associate Paul with the original congregation and with the front of Church unity whose existence he was everywhere anxious to demonstrate. But where did he get his version of this chapter of Paul’s life? Or let us take Gal. 5.11. Here Paul defends himself with bitter irony against the assertion of the Judaists that he still occasionally preached circumcision. Once again we find that the version in Acts is astonishingly near the Judaistic: Paul circumcises Timothy ‘because of the Jews in those parts’ (16.3). Here—in all innocence—Luke ascribes to Paul the very thing which in Gal. 5.11 he passionately declares a falsehood, that from time to time he practised circumcision in order to avoid untoward consequences. Once again, Luke is not seeking to bring Paul into discredit. On the contrary, he is pleased to be able to show what a pious Jew Paul always was. And where did he get this version of affairs—a version, moreover, to which otherwise highly perceptive scholars have bowed assent? Perhaps we may infer that the Judaistic image of Paul was not merely current among Jewish Christians (cf. 21.21) but had insinuated itself into Gentile Christianity too. There, however, it was toned down and lost its polemic accent—Paul becomes a missionary recognized and recommended by the Twelve (cf. 15.25!). This portrait Luke gladly adopted, presumably ‘improving’ it in his own way: by baptizing Cornelius, Peter relieves Paul of the odium of the Gentile mission, and thus the much-maligned ‘innovator’ is exonerated. This could be an exploitation, brilliant in its own way, of the Caesarean community’s legend of its own origin.

That the source-question has not come to a standstill is shown by works by Dom Jacques Dupont, A. J. Mattill Jun., and Walter Eltester. We discuss

¹ So J. Jeremias also interprets Gal. 1.10–12 (‘Chiasmus in den Paulusbriefen’ in *ZNW* 49 (1958), 153). This takes into account the concern of W. Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church*, 1969, 182ff.

these below in §9, 'The Work Continues'; the Paul Schubert Festschrift (*Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, Nashville 1966, 258ff.) contains an essay by the present writer on 'Acts as Source-Material for the History of Early Christianity'.

Bibliography

G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga, 'Iets over bronnenscheiding in de Handelingen der Apostelen', *Nieuw Theol. Tijdschr.* 12 (1923), 274-98; Id.: 'Nog iets over bronnenscheiding in Handelingen', *ibid.* 18 (1929), 146-64; Id.: 'Bronnenscheiding in Handelingen 17-28', *ibid.* 19 (1930), 124-38; P. L. Couchoud and R. Stahl, 'Les deux auteurs des Actes des Apôtres', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 97 (1928), 6-52; M. H. Shepherd, 'A Venture of Source Analysis of Acts' in *Munera Studiosa*, Cambridge, Mass. (1946), 92-103; R. Bultmann, 'Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apostelgeschichte' in *New Testament Essays in Memory of T. W. Manson* (1959), 68-80; E. Haenchen, 'Quellenanalyse und Kompositionsanalyse in Apg. 15', *Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias* (Berlin 2nd. edn. 1964), 153-64; Dom J. Dupont, *Les sources du Livre des Actes, État de la question*, Bruges, 1960 (ET London 1964); E. Haenchen, 'Das "Wir" in der Apostelgeschichte und das Itinerar', *ZThK* 1961 (ET in *Journal for Theology and the Church*, Vol. I: *The Bultmann School of Biblical Interpretation: New Directions*, New York 1965).

7. LUKE AS THEOLOGIAN, HISTORIAN AND WRITER¹

There is an uncommonly close tie in Luke between theology, historiography and literary prowess. One cannot avoid treating the three separately, but that remains an expedient. Scholars of past generations regarded Luke as above all a historian (see pp. 12-34 above). More recently the worthy labours

¹ Prompted by the *Christusbilder* of Ernst von Dobschütz (*TU XVIII*, Leipzig 1899), Dorothee Klein went into the question how 'Luke the physician' became a painter and patron of the painters' guild, in her Hamburg dissertation *St Lukas als Maler der Madonna: Ikonographie der Lukas-Madonna*, Berlin 1933 (cf. review by Dobschütz, *TLZ* 59 (1934) 278). The first known mention of paintings by St. Luke occurred in the 'image controversy' of the eighth century (Klein, 8). Dobschütz had surmised that even earlier, in Rome, wonder-working images had been attributed to Luke the evangelist (p. 10). But just as the first testimony to Luke's painting appears in the East, so the oldest representation of him as a painter originates there (p. 18). The motif of the painting evangelist had evolved in Byzantine art by the ninth or eleventh—at the latest the thirteenth—century (p. 22). But the image has a long pre-history: first the portrayal of the reading philosopher (gravestone, fifth cent. B.C.) evolved into that of the writer (Augustan period), which served as model for the writing evangelist; then the substitution of a painting-board for the codex converted the figure into the painter-saint (pp. 24f.). However, it remains obscure just why Luke, in particular, should have been transformed from a writing to a painting evangelist.

of Vielhauer and especially Conzelmann (p. 48 above) have done much to bring his theology to light. It is the art of the writer¹ which now stands most in need of evaluation.

I. Lucan Theology in Acts

Luke is no systematic theologian. He does not seek to develop any unified doctrine, the product of thorough reflection. Nevertheless he has a theology of his own; he sets out from definite theological premises and treats the immediate theological questions of his age. But he does not proceed by the systematic discussion of dogmatic themes: these are rather, directly or indirectly, suggested to the reader in his historical presentation by means of vivid scenes.

A. The Theological Premises

Upon occasion Luke has been praised for presenting so faithful a picture of the primitive theology of early Christian times.² But it is his own simple theology (which he shared with his community) which he everywhere presupposes and which should be understood behind the sermons, prayers, liturgical expressions and occasional pertinent remarks in Acts.

It is *God* (the Father) who occupies the dominant place³; Luke would joyfully have subscribed to the words of Paul in I Cor. 8.6: 'We have one God, the Father, of whom are all things, . . . and one Lord, Jesus Christ. . . .' Everywhere God appears placed over Christ. He is the Creator,⁴ but in the work of salvation also the real direction of events is in his hands: the plan of salvation was his design, and he has reserved for himself the moment of redemption.⁵ It is also he who causes miracles to happen through Jesus⁶ and the Christians.⁷ He raised Jesus from the dead.⁸

Luke does not mention any pre-existence of Jesus. In 2.22 he describes *Jesus* as a man whom God has legitimated by mighty works, wonders and signs, which he has done through him. Jesus made his way doing good and

¹ In which field Dibelius has hitherto made the most valuable contribution—see pp. 34ff. and 39ff. above.

² Foakes-Jackson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1931, XVI: 'Luke seems to have been able to give us an extraordinarily accurate picture of the undeveloped theology of the earliest Christians . . .'

³ See Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, 149 (ET *The Theology of St. Luke*, London and New York 1960, 173). Conzelmann has also done the decisive spadework for the further statements in Section A—cf. further Acts 2.36, 3.15 & 26, 5.31, 10.40 and 13.30.

⁴ Acts 4.24, 14.15 and 17.24; Conzelmann 173.

⁵ Acts 1.7; 2.33; 8.26 & 29; 10.4, 13 & 38; 11.5ff.; 12.7; 17.31; Conzelmann 174.

⁶ Acts 2.22 & 10.38.

⁷ 3.13, 4.30, 19.11 and 21.30.

⁸ 2.24, 3.15, 4.10, 5.30, 13.37, 17.30 and 26.8; Conzelmann 175.

performing miracles through the country of the Jews, and healed all those who were oppressed by the devil.¹ The title of 'Son'² recedes almost out of sight behind those of 'Lord' and 'Anointed'.³ Jesus sends the Spirit, true—but he received the Spirit from the Father. Luke thus clearly advocates a subordinationist Christology: God bestowed the Spirit on Jesus at his baptism, making him the Lord and the Anointed.⁴ By his resurrection he became the 'Leader of Life'⁵; i.e. he was the first to rise from the dead, therefore the first to receive the new life on the farther side of death and mortality. Through his resurrection he is our hope; on the other hand, Acts does not contain a doctrine of vicarious atonement⁶—not even in the book's one quotation from Isaiah 53.⁷ God has taken Jesus to sit at his right hand on his throne,⁸ and to him he has confided the judgment of the world.⁹ That is why it is so imperative to have Jesus as one's Lord and to belong to the community which calls upon his name.¹⁰ For while Jesus himself dwells in heaven until the Parousia,¹¹ his Name is present and active among us here and now¹²; it performs miracles and is the channel of salvation. Luke takes pains to distinguish this calling on the Name of Jesus from the magic conjurations of antiquity: it is God who acts when the name of Jesus is invoked, and who thereby glorifies his *παῖς*.¹³ Herein is seen at once the bond between God and Jesus and the supremacy of God.

In his teaching concerning the *Holy Spirit*,¹⁴ likewise, Luke does not yet show the balance attained by later theology in the doctrine of the Trinity. He links together three predicates of different provenance. Firstly, he presents the Spirit as the gift which every Christian receives at baptism;¹⁵ its

¹ Acts 10.38f.; cf. Conzelmann pp. 146ff.

² Acts 9.20, 13.33; Conzelmann, 147 n. 2.

³ Jesus as *Kyrios*: Acts 1.21; 2.21, 25 & 36; 4.33; 5.14; 7.60; 8.16; 9.1, 5, 10f., 13, 15, 17 & 27f.; 10.36; 11.16f. & 20; 13.12; 14.23; 15.11 & 26; 16.15 & 31; 18.9; 19.5, 13 & 17; 20.19, 21, 24 & 35; 21.13; 22.8, 10, 16 & 19; 23.11; 26.15; 28.31: since God also is called '*Kyrios*' there are many places where it is hard to tell whether he or Jesus is meant.—Jesus as *Christos*: 2.31 & 36; 3.6, 18 & 20; 4.10, 26 & 33; 5.42; 8.5 & 12, 9.22 & 34; 10.36 & 48; 11.7; 15.11 (*var.*); 16.18 & 31; 17.3; 18.5 & 28; 20.21 & 24; 26.23; 28.31: this list also includes the verses containing the title Jesus Christ. Cf. Conzelmann, 174 n. 3.

⁴ Acts 2.33, cf. 5.32: it is God who bestows the Spirit!—see Conzelmann, 174.

⁵ Acts 3.15, cf. 5.31; Conzelmann, 205f.

⁶ Though there is an echo of this in the formula of 20.28, with which I Peter 5.2 should be compared.

⁷ Acts 8.32f.

⁸ 2.25 & 33f.; 5.31; 7.55f.

⁹ 10.42 and 17.31.

¹⁰ 2.21; 9.14 & 21; 22.16.

¹¹ 3.21.

¹² 3.16; 4.10, 12 & 30; 8.12; 9.16 & 27; 10.43; 15.26; 19.13; 21.13; Conzelmann, 177f.

¹³ Acts 3.13.

¹⁴ Conzelmann, 179ff.

¹⁵ Acts 1.5 & 8; 2.4 & 38.

ecstatic effects afford Luke the welcome opportunity of making the reality of the gift visible.¹ Secondly, Luke describes the Spirit as the equipment possessed by individual Christians for a given task at a particular moment²; it was already possible for Judaism to speak of the Spirit in this manner. Thirdly, according to Acts, the Spirit gives specific directions for the Christian mission at important junctures³—like a *bath qol* in Jewish tradition; but in such cases the Spirit could as well be replaced by ‘the angel of the Lord’⁴ or a ‘vision’⁵.

Luke elaborates no doctrine of the *Church*—only once (9.31) does the word *ἐκκλησία* have a meaning beyond ‘local congregation’ and it then simply covers the Church in Judaea, Galilee and Samaria. We have once again to fall back upon scattered clues in the historical narrative. The first vehicles of the ‘Word of God’⁶ are the twelve Apostles. They are witnesses of Jesus’ life and resurrection⁷; to this extent the whole of Christian missionary preaching goes back to them. At the same time it is they—mostly represented by Peter—who inaugurate the principal stages of the Christian mission. Peter preaches the first missionary sermon in Jerusalem⁸; he and John successfully complete the mission to the Samaritans⁹; with the baptism of Cornelius Peter opens the mission to the Gentiles, which of course is then endorsed by the other Apostles and the whole of the community in Jerusalem.¹⁰ From that point the Twelve fade out of Acts—they are actually mentioned for the last time in 16.4—without any declaration of an apostolic succession: Luke does not indicate whether they installed the Lord’s brother James and the presbyters, who succeeded them in the leadership of the Jerusalem community.¹¹ According to Luke it was in essentials Paul who carried out the mission to the diaspora—Paul, whom Jesus called in a special appearance,¹² and to whom time and again he revealed his instructions through visions.¹³ In newly-founded communities Paul and Silas appointed elders, but here again we cannot speak

¹ 2.33 & 38; 8.15f. & 18f.; 10.44 & 47; 11.15; 15.8; 19.6.

² 4.8 & 31; 7.55; 11.28; 13.2, 4 & 9; 15.28.

³ 8.29; 10.19; 11.12; 16.6f.; 21.4 & 11; 23.9f.

⁴ 8.26; 10.3; 23.9; 27.23.

⁵ 7.31; 9.10 & 12; 10.3; 11.5; 16.9f.; 18.9.

⁶ 2.41; 4.4, 29 & 31; 6.2, 4 & 7; 8.4, 14 & 25; 10.36 & 44; 11.1 & 19; 12.24; 13.5, 7, 26, 44, 46 & 48f.; 14.4, 12 & 25; 15.7 & 35f.; 16.6 & 32; 17.11 & 13; 18.11; 19.19f. Mark already employs *ὁ λόγος* for the delivery of the message: ‘he spoke the word to them’ (2.2 and elsewhere).

⁷ Acts 1.21f.

⁸ 2.14f.

⁹ 8.14f.

¹⁰ 10.1–11.18.

¹¹ The elders first appear in 11.30; in 15.6, 22 and 16.4 they are mentioned together with the Apostles; in 21.18 they are evidently, with James, the leaders of the community at Jerusalem.

¹² Acts 9.1–19a; 22.6–21; 26.12–18.

¹³ 16.9; 18.9; 22.17–21; 23.11; (27.23).

of an 'apostolic succession': the elders are regarded rather as holding their authority from the Holy Spirit, and as entrusted by the Spirit with the leadership of the congregation.

Nor does Luke provide any systematic teaching on how one becomes a *Christian*; we can only gather certain essentials from a mass of scenes and separate statements. First, *μετάνοια* is required, both from Jewish and from gentile listeners. This word may embrace the whole 'conversion'-process¹; it may however signify merely the 'negative' aspect: the turning-away from the former, perverted life. In the latter case it is completed by the positive 'turning to' God² and faith in Christ.³ These form the preconditions for baptism,⁴ and in baptism the Spirit is bestowed. It is the Spirit which is the essence of Christian baptism and distinguishes it from John's.⁵

For 'conversion' in the inclusive sense Luke also favours the term *πιστεῦσαι*. It may be translated simply as 'to become a Christian': οἱ πιστεύοντες or πιστεύσαντες are 'the Christians'. What they 'believe' may be 'the Word'⁶ which they have 'heard'⁷ or 'received',⁸ but believing may also signify 'trust in'⁹ or 'believing *on* the Lord'.¹⁰ That God 'cleanses hearts' by faith¹¹ shows the high value which Luke attaches to the moral effects of faith.

Of baptism we have already spoken. The *breaking of bread*, performed in private Christian houses,¹² appears as a Christian custom whose practice is everywhere a matter of course: in 2.46 it is performed 'with gladness'. But of a sacramental piety which saw in the Lord's Supper the *φάρμακον ἀθανασίας* there is as little mention in Acts as of a monarchical episcopate. Among other things, this shows how carefully one should handle the label 'early Catholicism'.

B. Theological Questions of the Day

Two theological questions of the day appear to receive special attention in Acts: the expectation of the imminent end of the world, and the mission to the Gentiles without the law. It was only the position which Luke adopted with regard to the eschatological problem that made his writing of history intrinsically possible; it may therefore aptly be treated here and now. The question of the mission to the Gentiles and freedom from the law is on the other hand so inextricable from the course of the historical narrative that we must hold it back until the next section, on Luke the historian.

¹ 2.38; 17.30; 5.31; 11.18; 20.21.

² 3.19; 8.22; 26.20.

³ 20.21.

⁵ 1.22; 10.37; 13.24; 18.25; 19.3f.

⁶ 4.4.

⁸ 2.41.

¹⁰ 9.42f.

¹² 2.46 and 20.7.

⁴ 8.13 & 18.8.

⁷ 10.44.

⁹ 5.14.

¹¹ 15.9.

(1) *How the first generation saw history*

The Christians of the first generation were convinced that they stood amid the decisive revolution of the ages; this world, the present era, was passing away,¹ and the era to come was upon them.² John the Baptist had been the Elijah foretold,³ but Jesus himself was the Messiah⁴; his resurrection would soon⁵ be followed by his second coming and the general resurrection of the dead⁶; the short interval before the Parousia must be used by his disciples to spread the glad tidings as wide as possible: believe in Jesus, the judge of the world, and you will be saved in the judgment shortly to come! The powers of the coming reign of God were already at work in the healings and exorcisms performed by Jesus and his disciples.⁷ In the teachings of Paul the ferment of the new is even more clearly all-pervading—whoever possesses the Spirit (=is in Christ) has already died to the old,⁸ and at the coming of Christ will also receive the ‘body of glory’ which the Lord exalted already enjoys.⁹

(2) *How the view of history changed*

This expectation of the imminent end was not fulfilled. When Luke wrote Acts, Paul had been executed and James the brother of the Lord had died a martyr; Christians had burned as living torches in the gardens of Nero; the Holy City and its Temple lay in rubble. Yet the world went on. By this many Christians recognized that the imminent expectation of the end was false. If, however, the end was not to come soon, when would it come?

Here two possibilities presented themselves. One might see the last things happening here and now, in the present, or one might expect their realization only in a remote, indefinite future. Both courses were followed.

(a) The Fourth Evangelist sought to show his readers that they had, or could have, the resurrection and the life here and now. Whenever the word of Jesus—which is none other than God’s own Word!—issues from the mouth of Jesus or is uttered in Christian preaching by one of his disciples, its hearers are confronted with the eternal decision, and then is the moment of resurrection—or damnation.¹⁰ Whoever believed this affirmation of the evangelist need no longer gaze anxiously to the skies in longing for the Son

¹ I Cor. 7.31. On what follows, cf. R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, § 6 (ET *Theology of the New Testament*, London 1952).

² Luke 11.20.

³ Mark 9.13; Matt. 11.14.

⁴ Mark 8.29.

⁵ Rom. 13.11.

⁶ I Thess. 4.15.

⁷ Luke 11.20.

⁸ Rom. 6.2 & 8; II Cor. 5.14f.; Gal. 2.19.

⁹ I Cor. 15.44; Phil. 3.21.

¹⁰ John 5.24f. and 11.25.

of Man descending with clouds, for to him the Son, with the Father, had already come, and they had taken their dwelling with him. This fulfilment in the here-and-now developed to its highest pitch what Paul had expressed in his doctrine of being 'in Christ.' This was only possible, however, by virtue of the confluence in the hearer's 'now' of all those elements which had been chronologically divergent in the teaching of the earliest Christians: the preaching of Jesus in Galilee and Jerusalem, the proclamation of the gospel by his disciples, and the last day.

(b) The Third Evangelist also denied the imminent expectation. It seemed to him to claim a knowledge which God has reserved for himself alone.¹ Christian life should no longer be governed by speculation as to whether this world would soon come to an end.² Christians must reckon with the world's survival.

But in rejecting the imminent expectation Luke did not take the same course as the Fourth Evangelist. Instead, he took the chronological dimension, rendered meaningless in John, into serious consideration, and asked himself where and how God's work of salvation proceeds in time. He saw the history of salvation as a great unity which ended in the parousia.

In this history we may distinguish³ three periods. The first was that of the law and the prophets.⁴ This came to an end with John the Baptist, who no longer belonged to it. The second—hence the 'middle of time'⁵—was the earthly life of Jesus, up to his Ascension. This has with the forty days of the risen Lord among his disciples passed over into a new, third era. Luke has as yet no name for it, but we may call it the age (or period) of the Church. And this will one day end with the return of the Lord in judgment.⁶ But the time is not yet ripe. First must run its course a period in which the 'Word of God' spreads far and wide,⁷ the period of the mission 'to the ends of the earth'.⁸

(3) *Luke's first book to Theophilus*⁹

Luke accepted the reality of time, with its threefold division into past, present and future. He did not shrink from treating the earthly life of Jesus as something belonging to the past.¹⁰ But if it really lay in the past, he had to

¹ Acts 1.7.

² Acts 1.11—despite 2.20!

³ Conzelmann, 128f.

⁴ Luke 16.16.

⁵ Conzelmann, 129 and 146ff.

⁶ Acts 1.11.

⁷ Acts 6.7; 12.24; 13.49; 19.20.

⁸ 1.8 and 13.47.

⁹ It is quite possible that the two books bore no title; cf. commentary on 1.1 below.

¹⁰ Luke 4.18; cf. Conzelmann, 144f.

seek to grasp it as one seeks to lay hold on anything from the past: as a historian. This meant that he was obliged to gather and sift the 'sources' of the biography, arrange the events of that life in their proper chronological order, distinguish and relate causes and effects, and finally immerse himself in the psychological climate of past history. He had, in short, to overcome the historical remoteness of this bygone life with the methods of the historian. All this Luke did in fact accomplish, and so it is that his gospel is the first 'Life of Jesus'.¹

Two things helped him in this work. One was that he found a rich store of traditions regarding Jesus ready to hand; the other, that he had predecessors who had already formed this material into a definite shape. Yet this help was at the same time a hindrance: it meant that his own initiative was frequently reduced to the stylistic re-working which he imposed on the mass of collected material. However, as a result of this re-working we can only recognize his sources when they have come down to us along with his own work.²

(4) *Luke's second book to Theophilus*

Now if the earthly life of Jesus, brought to a close by his Ascension, represents an epoch in chronologically regarded history, one is drawn to the highly important inference that it had a chronological sequel. With bold logic Luke considers this sequel also a historical event, and presents it as the continuation of his gospel! This was a daring enterprise which none of his predecessors had thought to execute,³ and in which he found no successors.⁴ We need not be surprised at this, since what was important for salvation was knowledge of the history of Jesus—could the same be said of the history of the Church? To Luke the question appeared in a rather different form: what was the inner link between the previous epoch, the life of Jesus, and what followed? Some scholars have credited Luke with a very simple answer: the first book depicts what Jesus himself did, the second represents what he accomplished through his Spirit in the Apostles.⁵ But Luke knows no counterpart to Paul's 'being in Christ'. Jesus is dwelling in heaven, which

¹ E. Käsemann, 'Problem des historischen Jesus' in *ZThK* (1954), 137 (ET *Essays on NT Themes*, 1964, p. 29): 'His Gospel is indeed the first 'life of Jesus'. In it, consideration is given to the points of view of causality and teleology; and psychological insight, the composition of the historian and the particular slant of the writer who aims at edification are all equally discernible.'

² C. S. C. Williams, *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, London 1957, 7: '... if Mark's Gospel did not exist, it would be impossible to reconstruct it accurately from Luke's...; so any reconstruction of the sources behind Acts must be tentative.'

³ Dibelius, *Studies*, 3.

⁴ The apocryphal Acts of Apostles are not intended to continue a gospel; see W. Michaelis, *Das Neue Testament verdeutscht und erläutert*, 1935, Vol. II, 1.

⁵ Cf. Harnack, *Beitr.* III, 4 (ET): 'A historical presentation of the power of the Spirit of Jesus in the Apostles.'

must receive him until the Parousia.¹ Only on exceptional occasions (above all at the call of Paul) does he interfere, through 'visions' and appearances, in earthly happenings. It is only in 16.7 that Luke speaks of the 'Spirit of Jesus', and even here the effect is no different from that of 'the angel of the Lord' or 'the Spirit (of God)', namely to give a direction at a specific juncture of the mission. In reality it is God himself—the supreme authority—who governs and prescribes, in accordance with his plan, the course to be followed by the 'Word of God'.

It is this '*Word of God*' which fills the time after Pentecost; this Word is furthermore the message concerning Jesus, belief in whom brings forgiveness of sins and deliverance in the judgment. Here then is the clamp which fastens the two eras together and justifies, indeed demands, the continuation of the first book (depicting the life of Jesus as a time of salvation) in a second; for the salvation which has appeared must be preached to all peoples, and the very portrayal of this mission will serve the awakening of belief, and hence the attainment of that salvation.

But at what point should this portrayal stop? Of course its proper end would be the return of Jesus, but this is hidden from us in an unknown future. And so the historian, who can only report what has already actually happened, is obliged to call a halt somewhere before his true conclusion. The presumption that Luke brought his account up to his own time falls to the ground from the fact that Paul (as is hinted to the alert reader in 20.25 & 38 and 27.24) bore witness before the emperor and did not return to his congregations; thus he suffered martyrdom. Luke did not take this event into his story but concluded with a picture of Paul at work unhindered in Rome. The path of the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome formed a complete story, a rounded whole, in itself. It brought comfort and reassurance to the faithful, for it showed them how God's ways continued even after the departure of Jesus. The interval of time thus represented by the second book roughly corresponds to what we call 'the apostolic age'. For to Luke Paul is a kind of typical substitute for the twelve Apostles, the last representative of the 'heroic age'² when the Church was as yet undefiled by heresy (which did not break out until after Paul's death) and exemplary in its way of life.

II. Luke the Historian in Acts

It was his familiarity with the theological situation, and his understanding of what it required, that led Luke to turn historian and write a

¹ Acts 3.21.

² So styled by A. D. Nock, *Gnomon* 25 (1953), 498. Cf. A. Schweitzer, *Mess. u. Leid.-Geh.* 109.

historical work in two volumes.¹ The picture which he there sketched of the history of primitive Christianity is marked by astonishing uniformity and simplicity. Everything that might interfere with its straightforward movement is smoothed out or omitted.

In the earliest times² the Christian community was entirely confined to Jerusalem, though here it registered extraordinary missionary successes: among the first converts were Jews from the whole Eastern half of the Empire and beyond, as far as the Parthians and Elamites.³

The persecution consequent upon the Stephen episode—and above all the work of Paul!—temporarily drove the whole community out of Jerusalem (only the twelve Apostles uphold the continuity of the mother Church!) and gave rise to the mission in Samaria, Galilee and the coastal reaches from Gaza to Caesarea.⁴ All these communities were won or taken over by Peter (and John) and were thus incorporated in the apostolic Church.⁵ With the baptism of the Gentile Cornelius, Peter legalized the subsequent mission to the Gentiles in Antioch,⁶ which was moreover approved and taken over by Barnabas, the delegate from Jerusalem.⁷

The execution of James son of Zebedee,⁸ then Peter's escape and flight,⁹ brought James the Lord's brother into the foreground. He first appears, together with the elders,¹⁰ at the Apostles' side,¹¹ and later supersedes them in Jerusalem.¹²

From Chapter 13 onwards, Syrian Antioch occupies the centre of the missionary scene. It is from here that Barnabas and Paul set out on the mission to Cyprus and to found congregations in Pisidia and Lycaonia.¹³

¹ Many (e.g. Torrey, Sahlin, Menoud, Trocmé) have surmised that Luke's work was once a single book, which was only divided 'when it was taken into the canon,' on which occasion the conclusion of Luke (24. 50-3) and the beginning of Acts (1. 1-5) were added. Many things led to this hypothesis: the contradiction in the dating of the Ascension, real or apparent stumbling-blocks in Acts 1. 1-5, the 'biblical' tone of the first half of Acts, which fits with the gospel so well, and the interpretation of Luke 1. 1-4 as a prologue to the whole work. Yet a careful examination destroys the cogency of these reasons (see commentary to 1. 1ff.). Here we would only point to two things. First, the works were not taken into the canon by an ecclesiastical authority able to ensure the simultaneous alteration of all existing copies: their acceptance was, rather, a long drawn-out process. Nowhere have any traces come to light of the hypothetical older book. Second, it was daring enough to provide the gospel with a sequel in the shape of a book on the apostolic age, but it is downright unthinkable that, instead of closing the gospel with the Resurrection and Ascension, Luke should prolong it until Paul's arrival in Rome; for him the life of Jesus was a self-contained epoch in the history of salvation, one distinct from the period which followed.

² Acts 1 to 5.

³ Acts 2. 9. Here belong also the other references to the growth of the Jerusalem community: 2. 41, 2. 47, 4. 4, 5. 14, 6. 7 and finally 21. 20.

⁴ Chapters 6 to 8.

⁵ 8. 14-25; 9. 32-42.

⁶ 10. 1-11. 18.

⁷ 11. 22-4.

⁸ 12. 2.

⁹ 12. 3-17.

¹⁰ See p. 93 n. 11 above.

¹¹ 12. 17; 15. 13.

¹² 21. 18.

¹³ Chapters 13 and 14.

Since this mission is sanctioned by Jerusalem, nothing more stands in the way of Barnabas' further mission to Cyprus, and more especially, the mission of Paul.¹

And so Paul carries on the mission, from Chapter 16, pressing on through Asia Minor² and Macedonia to Corinth.³ His next base is Ephesus, from where his influence radiates over all the province of Asia.⁴

His captivity in Jerusalem⁵ and Caesarea⁶ affords him repeated opportunities to defend the Christian mission to the Gentiles,⁷ in the face of Jewish accusations, before the Roman authorities. His appeal to Caesar⁸ finally brings Paul to the goal for which he has striven so long: Rome.⁹ The book closes with his unhampered missionary activity in the capital of the world.¹⁰

This presentation gives the impression of a problem-free, victorious progress on the part of the Christian mission. But in reality Luke the historian is wrestling, from the first page to the last, with the problem of the *mission to the Gentiles without the law*.¹¹ His entire presentation is influenced by this. It is a problem with two aspects: a theological and a political. By forsaking observance of the Jewish law Christianity parts company with Judaism; does this not break the continuity of the history of salvation? That is the theological aspect. But in cutting adrift from Judaism Christianity also loses the toleration which the Jewish religion enjoys.¹² Denounced by the Jews as hostile to the state, it becomes the object of suspicion to Rome. That is the political aspect. Acts takes both constantly into account.

According to Luke, the problem's true solution, which he supports with a number of auxiliary ideas, lies in demonstrating that the instigators and leaders of the Christian mission, far from falling away from their Jewish faith, in fact held fast to it, but that God unmistakably and irresistibly steered them into the mission to the Gentiles.

Accordingly Acts opens in Jerusalem. The traditional Galilean appearances of the Lord are set aside: there was of course no denying the Galilean origins of the Apostles,¹³ but the community arose in Jerusalem¹⁴ and there remained. The Apostles, with Peter to the fore, are devout temple-goers¹⁵ and keepers of the law who refrain from entering any Gentile Christian house and rigorously observe the regulations concerning clean and unclean food.¹⁶

¹ Chapter 15.

³ Chapters 16 to 18.

⁵ 21.1-23.30.

⁷ 22.1-21; 23.6; 24.10-21; 26.2-29.

⁹ 28.14 & 16.

¹¹ This problem is heralded as early as 1.8 and remains a burning question right up to 28.28.

¹² See B. S. Easton, *Early Christianity*, 1955, § II 'Religio licita', 41-57.

¹³ Acts 2.7.

¹⁵ 3.1 & 5.12.

² 16.6ff.

⁴ 19.10 & 16.

⁶ 23.31-27.1.

⁸ 25.11.

¹⁰ 28.31.

¹⁶ 10.14f. & 11.3.

The only way in which such men can be led to the Gentile mission is that God should constrain them against their will. This much becomes evident in the Cornelius episode,¹ so far as Peter and the original community are concerned, and in the conversion² and apologies³ with regard to Paul. If God has endowed Gentile audiences with the Spirit, who can deny them baptism?⁴ In the same way Paul, the Jewish missionary who was brought up in Jerusalem,⁵ must bow to the irresistible will of God: it is no use his kicking against the pricks!⁶

Yet the Christian mission need not have become the purely Gentile mission which in fact it was in Luke's day: it was to the Jews that salvation was first offered, and offered again and again. It was not until they refused it by their vilification of Jesus that the emissaries of Christianity turned to the Gentiles.⁷

There is, finally, along with the foregoing, a third line of thought which justifies the Gentile mission, namely that God has no partisan prejudice in favour of one particular people. If he were to admit only Israel to salvation, that would be an unfair preference such as one may not ascribe to God.⁸ In this, the thought of Gentile Christians in Luke's time is particularly discernible.

But over and above all these considerations, Luke was also anxious to disprove the accusation that the Gentile Christians did not care for the law. Not only does he stress the fact that Paul continued to live and feel as a Pharisee, but he indicates that even the Gentile Christians kept the law so far as they were bidden by the Old Testament.⁹

Nevertheless this defence of the Gentile Christian attitude to the law is still inadequate to present, as Luke would like, the complete resolution of the conflict between Jew and Christian. There are two further points here: firstly, the thoroughly developed scriptural proofs¹⁰ attest the resurrection whereby Jesus has become the pioneer of the new life beyond the grave, the Lord and the Anointed. When Paul asserts that he says nothing other than what Moses and the prophets foretold he is referring to the death and resurrection of the Messiah.¹¹ Thus Israel's own holy writ bears witness to Jesus' resurrection, hence to the focal point of Christian doctrine. But—and this is the second point—this very centrepiece of the kerygma, the doctrine of the resurrection, already had adherents in Israel itself: the Pharisees!¹² Accordingly, the strictest tendency in Judaism was properly speaking on the side of the Christians—if they refused to recognize the resurrection of Jesus, it was out of mere inconsistency. Correspondingly Luke represents the Pharisees, whom the tradition which lay before him depicted as the explicit enemies

¹ 10.1–11.18.

³ 22.1–21.

⁵ 22.3 & 26.4.

⁷ 13.46, 18.6 & 28.28.

⁹ 15.21 & 21.25.

¹⁰ In Chapters 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 13, 15 & 26, to mention only the principal references.

¹¹ 26.22f.; cf. 23.6 26.6 & 28.20.

² 9.1–19a.

⁴ 10.47 & 11.17.

⁶ 26.14.

⁸ 10.34f.

¹² 23.8.

of Jesus and the young Church, to be as pro-Christian as he could possibly make them: Gamaliel takes it upon himself to plead the Apostles' case,¹ and before the High Council the Pharisees take Paul's part against the Sadducees, who alone remain as opponents of the Christians.²

Yet these efforts on Luke's part to minimize the distance between Jews and Christians will be seen in a false perspective unless one bears in mind from the outset that, unlike Paul, Luke has abandoned hope of converting Israel. It is in Rome itself that stubborn Israel is subjected to one last appeal—and dismissed; 'this salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and they will hear!'—such are Paul's last word in Acts.³ In the circumstances, the book's manifold attempts to throw a bridge between Jews and Christians no longer represent a missionary wooing of Israel: by Luke's time the Christian mission was directed solely to the Gentiles, whose readiness for the word and willingness to listen were the current experience. No, what the demonstration of the links with Israel is intended to make plain is the implicit unity which confirms the continuity of the history of salvation in the divine will.

In this way Luke as a historian solved as best he could the theological problem posed by the mission to the Gentiles without the law. But he had also at the same time done most of the work necessary for the solution of the political problem. As a religion of the resurrection, Christianity was in the direct line of succession to Judaism. And one cannot, indeed one should not, expect the Roman State to trouble itself with theological niceties alien to its concern.⁴ On the other hand Christianity does not imply any transgression of Roman laws. Consequently the intelligent representatives of Rome always took a benevolent view of the Christian mission: the procurator Sergius Paulus lets himself be converted;⁵ the procurator Gallio dismisses a Jewish complaint against Paul;⁶ some of the Asiarchs (whose office it was to promote the cult of the emperor) are friendly with Paul;⁷ the town-clerk of Ephesus defends the Christians against the charge of profanation;⁸ the tribune of Jerusalem, Claudius Lysias,⁹ likewise the governors Felix¹⁰ and Festus,¹¹ refuse to condemn Paul out of hand; and as a prisoner in Rome Paul is allowed to carry on his missionary work unhindered¹²—indeed that very word, ἀκωλύτως, is the last word in the book, standing as the summation of past experience and a recommendation in respect of future policy.

But for such a simplification of the course of history, for thus mastering the problem of the mission, Luke the historian was obliged to pay a heavy price—one heavier than he suspected. Two instances make this clear. Luke

¹ 5.35-9.

³ 28.28.

⁵ 13.12.

⁷ 19.31.

⁹ 23.29.

¹¹ 25.4, 16 & 25; cf. 26.32.

² 23.9.

⁴ 25.19 & 26; 26.14.

⁶ 18.15.

⁸ 19.37.

¹⁰ 24.22.

¹² 28.31.

himself could not entirely sustain his thesis that the persecution beginning with Stephen drove the entire Jerusalem congregation out on the missionary road,¹ for by 9.31 the community is already back in Jerusalem and thriving in peace, whereas 11.19ff. shows the victims of persecution still scattered over the face of the land. The natural inference is that it was not the Church at Jerusalem (nor Peter himself) that began the mission to the Gentiles without the law, but Hellenists from the expelled splinter-group of the 'Seven'.² This means that Luke's attempt to reduce the tension between 'Hellenists' and 'Hebrews' to the minimal issue of the widows³ has not succeeded. Moreover Paul's conflict with the Judaists⁴ would be incomprehensible if Peter had already lifted from his shoulders the responsibility for the mission to the Gentiles.

Even the uplifting picture with which Acts closes is not entirely above suspicion. To make such a picture possible, Luke had to suppress the fact that long before Paul ever reached Rome the Christian mission had got a foothold and created a community there. But for the moment we must hold over to the next section (§ 8) the question of the unhistorical character of Luke's presentation of Paul.

The spread of Christianity was no such simple uniform process as the reader of Acts must at first impression be given to believe. The congregations at Damascus, Antioch, Ephesus and Rome were founded by unknown Christians. It is not the oft-broken line of the mission's actual evolution that Luke traces—but its ideal curve.

III. Luke the Writer and Edifier

The elegant exordium of the third gospel has left many scholars with the impression that Luke would have been capable of writing the history of the dawn of Christianity in the style of a Xenophon, if not a Thucydides. However, he lacked at least two requisites for such an undertaking: an adequate historical foundation—and the right readers. Any book he might conceivably offer his readers—especially as a sequel to the third gospel—had to be a work of *edification*. Of course Luke firmly believed that the history of Christian beginnings was edifying in itself, but to present it as such he had to employ a special technique and offer his readers history in the guise of stories. Everything he knew concerning apostolic times, or thought himself entitled to infer, he had to translate into the language of vivid and dramatic scenes. Let us illustrate:

At the beginning of Acts Luke could merely have told his readers: Since the treason of Judas had left a vacancy in the circle of the Twelve, a

¹ 8.4.

³ 6.1ff.

² Cf. 11.19f.

⁴ See especially Galatians.

new Apostle had to be chosen to replace him; Matthias was the man. But such a sentence would not have conveyed much significance to the readers. So Luke the writer sets about it another way: he causes a living scene to rise before their eyes. Peter stands up among the brethren and begins a speech¹: the scripture concerning the death of Judas has been fulfilled and Peter reveals with what manner of death he has been punished. He goes on to cite the psalm-verse which has thus been fulfilled, and that other to whose fulfilment the disciples must now contribute: another must now take the office of Judas. This gives an opportunity for Peter to inform—the readers!—of the qualifications which an Apostle must possess: he must have been a companion of Jesus from the latter's baptism to the Ascension and therefore be able to bear witness to the Resurrection. Lots are cast between two disciples possessing this qualification—for the Holy Spirit capable of deciding the issue has not yet been poured forth—and when the assembly has prayed God to guide them to the man of his choice, the lot falls on Matthias.

This example serves to show Luke's ability to transform a simple report into action and to weave a speech into the course of such an action. That he himself composed the speech is evident from the fact that only the Septuagint text of Psalms 69 and 109 gives the meanings required.

Hand in hand with this gift of enlivening bare facts goes Luke's ability to condense events ranging over a long period and encompass them within

¹ The speeches in Acts—Dibelius (*Studies*, 150) has counted 24, of which 8 belong to Peter, 9 to Paul—occupy, in round figures, 300 of the book's 1000 verses. In his valuable essay, 'Hebreisk berättarstil' (*SvTKv* 25 (1949), 81-90), Gillis Gerleman has pointed out that the OT narrators did not interpose themselves between the event and the reader, and therefore allow the reader to 'hear' the direct speech (indirect speech has always passed through the reflection of the narrator, and shows the fact). Luke follows this OT narrative style when, putting words in his characters' mouths with the freedom of an ancient historian, he practically always uses direct speech. There was a schematic preaching-method, much favoured in Luke's time, which has been investigated by Dibelius (*Studies*, 165ff.) and C. H. Dodd (*The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, 2nd ed. 1944, 7-36), and it is on this that Luke rings the changes in the missionary speeches of Acts (Chapters 2-4, 7, 8, 10 & 13). Dibelius describes the paradigm in these words: 'An introduction suggested by the actual situation is normally followed by the kerygma of Jesus' life, passion and resurrection, usually with emphasis on the disciples' witness; to this is subjoined a scriptural proof and an exhortation to repentance' (165). Stephen (7.2ff.) and Paul in Antioch (13.15ff.) open with a survey of the history of Israel, as must have been frequent in synagogue homilies. On the other hand, the Areopagus address (17.22ff.), with which we may link the speech at Lystra (14.15-17), gives the model sermon as addressed to Gentiles (Dibelius, *Studies*, 71f.): here the reference to pagan poets is a kind of substitute for the scriptural proof. Paul's Miletus address (20.19-35) is a testament, as it were, portraying the Apostle as the exemplary missionary and leader of the flock whose necessity to the Church will be all the more urgent in the face of the gnostic seduction to come. In Paul's later speeches, relevance to his own trial steadily recedes in favour of the real business in hand, which is to prove Christianity itself innocent of all crimes against Roman law: at bottom it is the one true Judaic religion, and is thus entitled to the tolerance which the State extends to Judaism itself.

a single scene.¹ In his gospel he tells of the two disciples at Emmaus who are joined by the risen Jesus, fail to recognize him, invite him to supper, then realize his identity when he breaks the bread and vanishes (Luke 24.13–35). It goes without saying that Luke is here using a tradition. But one feature of the story does not breathe the air of popular tradition, namely that in the course of conversation the strange fellow-traveller should expound to the two disciples the whole of the scriptures concerning himself (Luke 24.25–7, though we must note that the preceding conversation is also moving up to this point). In reality the Church was not presented with its scriptural proofs complete in one single moment—certainly not in the peculiar manner we find in Luke.² On the contrary, they were a gradually accumulated treasure, built up piece by piece as each new teacher or prophet came to grasp the hitherto concealed but actually intended testimonies to Christ in the Old Testament scripture. Such recognitions were the gift of the Lord, indeed, but of the exalted Lord. And it is this whole process whereby the Church acquired its scriptural proofs that Luke draws together in a single scene where the risen Christ gives the disciples at Emmaus the entire scriptural proof from Moses and the prophets for the passion and resurrection of the Messiah.

In Acts, too, Luke employs this device of condensation. In the Palestine of the Apostles there had been much unrest and frequent insurrection. Often in the jostling and turmoil of the great feasts, the daggers of the *sicarii* had struck down suspected collaborators of the Roman occupier. Fired by some ‘prophet’s’ message, great trains of pilgrims had set off into the wilderness, with the hope that there the Messiah would manifest himself. And an Egyptian Jew had led his followers up the Mount of Olives, expecting that now the walls of Jerusalem would fall down before them. But Luke fuses all this in one. ‘Aren’t you the Egyptian,’ says the tribune at 21.38, ‘who stirred up a revolt some time ago and led four thousand sicarii into the desert?’ In this way Luke makes the point that the Christian message has nothing to do with any political revolution. It would be an error of method to interpret

¹ Luke learned another way of representing long periods from Mark—the résumé or ‘summary,’ as we call it. The longest and most important are to be found in Acts 2.42–5, 4.32–5 and 5.12–16. Luke obtained them largely by generalizing individual incidents. If they contain repetitions, that is no oversight on the writer’s part: it is Luke’s way of imprinting on the reader’s mind his image of the ideal apostolic community. The structural problems of each summary are treated below in the general commentaries on the passages mentioned. With the summaries may also be counted the statements about the growth of the Christian mission. In the article ‘Chronology’ of the *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, C. H. Turner calls six of these (6.7, 9.31, 12.24, 16.5, 19.20 and 28.31) ‘panels’ separating one important period of the mission from another; but the summaries of 2.47 and 11.21 are at least as significant.

² The essential content of the Lucan scriptural proof is the death and resurrection of the Messiah.

such a 'condensed' sentence as historical information and hence, say, identify the unarmed pilgrims of the wilderness with the dagger-men of Jerusalem.¹

Luke was most anxious to impress upon his readers that the Roman authorities treated the Christian missionaries with benevolence and acknowledged them to be politically harmless. Put in the form of a general contention, the idea would scarcely have carried weight: after all, the fate finally suffered by both Peter and Paul spoke clearly against it. Luke was therefore obliged to show in concrete stories how friendly and correct had been the behaviour of Roman officials towards Paul. He found suitable material in the anecdotes of the conversion of Sergius Paulus (13.7-12) and Gallio's attitude in Corinth (18.12-17). But this was insufficient. Matter was especially lacking for the last period of the captivity in Caesarea. Why did the new and efficient governor Festus not release Paul but send him to Rome? Did this not speak against Paul's innocence, or at least the justness of the Roman? Luke had to prove the contrary by the use of dramatic scenes: a disquisition on legal technicalities would have meant nothing to his readers. Consequently, like a dramatist, he produces a rapid succession of vivid and lively scenes (25.14-26.32):

Scene 1: in the palace of the Roman governor; Festus and King Agrippa in close conversation. The governor is concerned about a prisoner on a serious charge: the Jews have demanded his condemnation, but Rome lives by the rule of law and condemns no-one unheard. Festus has satisfied himself that Paul has not broken the laws of Rome. But then, there are these intricate questions of Jewish religion, with which Festus is not wholly familiar: the Jews maintain that a certain Jesus is dead, and the prisoner Paul says 'He lives!' (In this way the Christian reader is indirectly shown that poor pagan Festus has not understood the resurrection-message in the slightest. He is not an exception, though, but a typical Roman official, hence this is no case for Roman justice!) Now Festus has to make his report to Rome. What should he write? His Jewish guest shows interest: 'I should like to see this man.' 'You'll hear him tomorrow,' promises Festus.

Scene 2: next day; the audience-chamber is filling; the Caesarean authorities and the officer-corps are already here, and the governor too. Enter King Agrippa with his sister Berenice and an imposing retinue. But the real centre of interest is Paul, who is now brought in by a legionary. Festus recapitulates the case; can Agrippa, the expert *in rebus Iudaicis*, advise him what to do?

¹ One cannot help wondering whether a similar 'condensation' is not present in 19.35. It is never said that the statue of Ephesian Artemis fell from the sky, although it is said of other images. Probably Luke here is making the town-clerk superimpose different features drawn from the cult in order to characterize the veneration in which the local goddess was held.

Scene 3: Paul—in close-up, as it were—speaks. It is of course the readers of the book who are his real public. They hear the story of his life for the second time from his own lips. What is already known is therefore lightly touched upon: he, Paul, who from his earliest youth had lived a Pharisee in Jerusalem, now stands accused by virtue of his adherence to that very hope of resurrection which is Jewish through and through (and has been fulfilled in Jesus!). He did indeed once grievously persecute the followers of this Jesus—here is a rapid flashback to Paul the persecutor, the judge who always voted for the death-penalty. But then came Damascus. A man cannot pit himself against God (the image of the goads!), therefore Paul must be obedient to the commands of Christ. Then comes dramatic by-play between Paul and Festus (who can again make neither head nor tail of the resurrection-message), then Paul and the king, who, however non-committally, expresses his appreciation to the Christian. The final scene is a short consultation in an adjoining room, Agrippa summing up in these words: Paul could have gone free had he not appealed to the emperor.

Thus we may clearly discern Luke's dramatic technique of scene-writing¹ in an episode where, untrammelled by tradition, he enjoyed freedom of movement. Scholars like Zahn, who thought to see in this episode an eyewitness-report by a companion of Paul, have completely overlooked this technique. In reality, once Paul had appealed to the emperor, the case was out of Festus' hands. It no longer mattered whether he thought Paul guilty or not.

But even where a given tradition lay before Luke, he did not by any means feel himself slavishly bound to it. Tradition is not petrified but still molten lava, and the conjuncture of circumstances may permit its transformation, the realization of its many latent possibilities.² The clearest

¹ In the style of these dramatic episodes De Zwaan (*Beg.* II, 64f.) detects the Alexandrine influence also present in Virgil. Dramatic scenes replace the even flow of narrative. What Wilhelm Kroll, in 'Die Originalität Vergils' (*Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, Leipzig 1908, 521ff.), says about Virgil sounds to a large extent like a description of Luke's procedure: 'his goal is everywhere dramatic and solemn effects, and he heedlessly casts aside everything which does not serve this end; . . . renouncing all broad expansions or digressions, his narrative strives onward to given climaxes, which always possess a strong emotional value' etc. But it was probably the Greek OT and the tradition of the gospels which were Luke's real models for the style of Acts. Whatever reminded a Greek reader of Plutarch, or a Roman of Virgil, appeared to the Christian as the heritage of the sacred past.

² This has been most convincingly expressed by Dom Jacques Dupont in his work, *Les Béatitudes*, 2nd ed. 1958: 'It was not the ambition of Matthew, Mark and Luke to preserve for posterity the minutes of Jesus' speeches or any kind of authentic account of the minutiae of his behaviour. An "evangelist," as the name shows, takes it upon himself to declare the good news; whether he does this by speaking or by writing, he performs the work of a preacher. This preaching, being in the direct line of a still vital tradition, bears the impress of eye-witness recollections. But the preacher's purpose in recapitulating these is not simply historiographic: he aims at the same time to consolidate the incidence of Jesus' words and deeds on the life of the Christians he is addressing. Thus the things recounted do not merely belong to a past that is over and done with: what Jesus says and does remains "topical", full of lessons for everyday life' (pp. 10f.).

illustration of this lies in Luke's recounting one and the same event, namely Paul's conversion, in three different ways. Even earlier scholars had noticed the differences. It did not however occur to them to ascribe this diversity to internal causes, the changing necessities of the literary situation. Only an external reason was given, that Luke had differing sources before him and reproduced now this one, now that. This interpretation is at its most triumphant in Emanuel Hirsch,¹ according to whom Luke in Chapter 9 reproduces the account of the Damascene congregation and in Chapter 26 that of Paul himself, whereas in Chapter 22 he shows, as a good historian, how he imagines the two traditions can be reconciled. But for Luke 'the conversion of Paul' was an event which had to be told differently according to the context. Of course certain elements always recur—Paul on the road to Damascus; the light from heaven; the voice crying 'Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?'; the question, 'Lord, who are you?' and the answer: 'I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting!' But every other feature of the story may be changed if necessary. And it is necessary.

It is in Chapter 9 that the story is first told, as a report of the writer referring to Paul in the third person. The reader is not yet acquainted with the incident and its consequences, therefore must be made aware of the significance of the episode. For this purpose, a present-day narrator would, having described the event, break into the account with an observation of his own: 'Now consider what an unprecedented transformation we have here—the persecutor becoming the missionary of the persecuted' etc. But Luke goes to work another way. He does not break off the description, but puts everything he wishes to say to the reader in the mouths of the protagonists themselves. He does the same thing elsewhere in Acts: thus in 1.18f. it is Peter who announces the fate of Judas, in 2.8–11 it is the actual witnesses of the events of Pentecost who enumerate the peoples, and in 21.21 the elders in Jerusalem who inform Paul of the Jews' accusations against him. Here, in the conversion episode, the reader must have everything from the lips of Ananias or of the Lord himself. Luke to begin with resorts to a device belonging to Hellenistic narrative technique: the 'double dream.' This enables him to show at one and the same time how Paul behaved during the three days in question, and how it came about that Ananias rescued him. Next Luke employs a dialogue, in which Ananias portrays Saul as the dreaded persecutor who has come with full authority to launch a reign of terror. With this Christ contrasts what Saul is henceforth—no longer a persecutor of the name of Christ, but one who will carry that name before the Gentiles, the kings and the sons of Israel: no longer one who brings suffering to the Christians, but one who himself suffers for the sake of Christ.

¹ *ZNW* 28 (1929), 305–12; see our commentary below on 9.1–19a.

But all this is already known to the reader of Chapter 22. Here it is a question of vindicating the gentile mission in the teeth of the fanatical Jews, and this is achieved by a Pauline autobiography: he who carried the mission to the Gentiles recounts his life and his vocation. Like every speech of antiquity, this one begins, however unobtrusively, with a *captatio benevolentiae*, inasmuch as Paul first (verses 3f.) dwells on what he has in common with the listeners: he first came to Jerusalem as a little child (hence is practically a born Jerusalemite), and there Gamaliel instilled in him the strict observance of the law. He was therefore as zealous for the law as his present audience—more zealous, even, for he had hounded Christians to their deaths. But now is told again, with certain discrepancies of detail, the incident of the Damascus road, up to the moment where he had to wait in that city for further guidance. This time, however, the dialogue between Christ and Ananias is left out. For with this the readers are already acquainted—and before this fanatical audience Jesus must be mentioned as little as possible. Instead, Ananias is represented as a pious Jew whom the Damascus Jewish community holds in high esteem: thus to become a Christian, it is implied, does not mean cutting oneself off from one's people as a renegade. But so pious a Jew cannot very well disclose to Paul his missionary vocation towards the Gentiles. A second scene is therefore necessary, and on this Paul embarks immediately: praying on the holy ground of the Temple, he, whose only desire was to be a witness of Christ to the Jews, fell into a trance and heard Christ commanding him to go forth from Jerusalem, since his witness would be rejected: 'I send you afar to the Gentiles!' At this the anger of the people flares up anew, and Paul's speech is brought to an abrupt end. Yet Luke has made his point: that Christ made Paul a missionary to the Gentiles against Paul's own wish and on account of Jewish unbelief.

In Chapter 26 it is once again a question of justifying the Christian mission to the Gentiles, as symbolized by Paul, but this time in the presence of the Roman authorities and the expert in Jewish affairs, King Agrippa II. Thus Paul's speech is constructed somewhat differently. It is unnecessary to recapitulate in detail what is already familiar to the reader, Paul's childhood and the instruction of Gamaliel. Paul needs only to represent himself as a man of Jerusalem and a strict Pharisee. On the other hand, his persecution of the Christians in Jerusalem is more vividly depicted so as to intensify the contrast with the vision before Damascus. Paul (and Luke), for the sake of the Greek listeners (and readers), explains the necessity of obeying Christ's command by the Greek proverb of the goads: Greek paganism, too, knew well enough that fate was irresistible. For the Jewish listeners however (and readers who knew their Bible), the directive of Christ is presented in an elaborate tissue of OT quotations: Old Testament prophecies find their fulfilment in Paul's call to the Gentile mission. Paul cannot disobey this direct command of God. But since it is direct, Ananias the intermediary has to

disappear, and with him also the healing of the blindness, and the blinding itself. All, both Paul and his travelling-companions, now see the light and fall to the ground (26.13), but nobody is blinded. Thus, when the situation demands, the narrator has even to renounce the feature of the blinding of Paul, which quite certainly was part and parcel of the conversion-story current in the Church.

That a writer should thus make free with tradition¹ must at first strike us as irresponsible, as an unwarranted licence. But evidently Luke has a conception of the narrator's calling that is different from ours. For him, a narration should not describe an event with the precision of a police-report, but must make the listener or reader aware of the inner significance of what happened, and impress upon him, unforgettably, the truth of the power of God made manifest in it. The writer's obedience is indeed fulfilled in the very freedom of his rendering.

Bibliography

- H. J. Cadbury, 'Luke Translator or Author?', *American Journal of Theology* 34 (1920), 436-50; J. de Zwaan, 'Was the Book of Acts a Posthumous Edition?', *HTR* 17, 95-153; M. A. Reinke, 'The Church in Acts' (diss.), The Divinity School, University of Chicago, 1926; W. G. Letham, 'Luke's Literary Method as a Controlling Factor in the Composition of Acts' (diss.), The Divinity School, University of Chicago, 1926; W. Bartlett, 'St. Paul and the Twelve', *Exp. Tim.* 39 (1927-8), 39-44; J. R. Smith, 'The Purpose of Luke-Acts' (diss.), The Divinity School, University of Chicago, 1929; E. Barnikol, *Der nichtpaulin. Ursprung des Parallelismus d. Apostel Petrus u. Paulus* (Gal. 2⁷⁻⁸), 1931 (= *Forsch. z. Gesch. d. Urchrts. u. d. Kirche*, V); L. B. Radford, 'St. Peter and St. Paul', *Exp. Tim.* 35 (1933-4) 300-5; K. Lake and S. Lake, 'The Acts of the Apostles', *JBL* 53 (1934) 34-45; M. Riddle, 'The Admission of the Gentiles in St. Luke's Gospel and Acts', *JTS* 36 (1935), 160-73; J. Renié, 'Valeur historique des Actes des Apôtres', *Rev. Apologétique* 61 (1935), 24-37; Id., 'L'enseignement doctrinal des Actes des Apôtres', *La nouvelle revue théologique* 62 (1935), 268-77; E. M. Schofield, 'Luke's Interest in Medical Terms' (diss.), Southern Baptist Theol. Seminary, 1937; K. Karner, 'Die Stellung d. Apostels Paulus i. Urchristentum', *ZsystTh.* 14 (1937), 142-93; O. Bauernfeind, 'Die Geschichtsauffassung d. Urchristentums', *ZsystTh.* 15 (1938), 347-78; M. S. Enslin, "'Luke" and "Paul"', *JAOS* 58 (1938), 81-91; S. E. Johnson, 'A Proposed Form-Critical Treatment of Acts', *AngThR* 21 (1939), 22-31; W. Grundmann, 'Das Problem des hellenist. Christentums innerhalb d. Jerusalemer Urgemeinde', *ZNW* 38 (1939), 45-73; Id., 'Die Apostel zwisch. Jerusalem u. Antiochia', *ZNW* 39 (1940), 110-37; W. G. Kümmel, 'Das Urchristentum', *ThR* 14

¹ See Haenchen, 'Tradition und Komposition in der Apostelgeschichte' in *ZThK* 52 (1955), 205-25.

(1942), 81–95, 155–73; S. H. Price, 'The Authorship of Luke-Acts', *Exp. Tim.* 55 (1943–4), 194; T. W. Manson, 'The Work of St. Luke', *BJRL* 28 (1944), 382–403; B. Katzenmayer, 'Die Beziehungen des Petrus zur Urkirche v. Jerusalem u. Antiochia', *Intern. kirchl. Zeitschrift* 35 (1945), 116–30; H. Sahlin, 'Kyrkotanken på apostlarnas tid. En studie av Apostlagärningarnas förra hälft', *Ny kyrkl. Tidskr.* 16 (1947), 81–98; R. Leija, 'Prédication des Apôtres', *La nouvelle rev. théol.* 69 (1947), 605–18; V. Jacques, 'L'expansion chrétienne à partir de la Pentecôte', *Rev. diocésaine de Namur* 2 (1947), 73–89; Id., 'L'apostolat de Saint Pierre auprès des Juifs', *ibid.* 153–60; W. G. Kümmel, 'Das Urchristentum', *ThR* 17 (1948–9), 3–50, 103–42; M. Goguel, *Les premiers temps de l'église*, Paris 1949; W. G. Kümmel, 'Das Urchristentum', *ThR* 18 (1950), 1–53; A. Rétif, 'Témoignage et prédication missionnaires dans les Actes des Apôtres', *La nouvelle revue théol.* 83 (1951), 152–65; C. F. D. Moule, *Christ's Messengers. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, New York 1954 (World Christian Books, Association Press); C. S. C. Williams, 'The Date of Luke-Acts', *Exp. Tim.* 64 (1952–3), 283f; A. Rétif, *Foi au Christ et mission d'après les Actes des Apôtres*, Paris 1953; W. G. Kümmel, 'Das Urchristentum', *ThR* 22 (1954), 138–70, 191–211; Ph.-H. Menoud, 'Le plan des Actes des Apôtres', *NTS* 1 (1954–5), 44–51; G. W. H. Lampe, 'The Holy Spirit in the Writings of Luke' in *Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. Nineham, Oxford 1955, 159–200; W. C. van Unnik, 'Opmerkingen over het doel van Lucas' Geschiedwerk (Luc. 1^{1–4})', *Nederl. Theol. Tijdschr.* 9 (1955), 323–31; F. Stagg, *The Book of Acts; The Early Struggle for an Unhindered Gospel*, Nashville, Broadman Press, 1955; H. M. Féret, *Pierre et Paul à Antioch et à Jérusalem* Paris, 1955; C. P. M. Jones, 'The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Lucan Writings' in *Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. D. E. Nineham, Oxford 1955, 113–43; E. Molland, 'La circoncision, le baptême et l'autorité du décret apostolique dans les milieux judéo-chrétiens des Pseudo-Clémentines', *Stud. Theol.* 9 (1955), 1–39; W. C. van Unnik, 'Christendom en nationalisme in de eerste eeuwen der kerkgeschiedenis' in *Christendom en nationalisme*, 's Gravenhage 1956, 38–54; C. F. Evans, 'The Kerygma', *JTS* 7 (1956), 25–41; J. Baker, 'Luke the Critical Evangelist', *Exp. Tim.* 68 (1956–7) 123–5; J. Dupont, 'Pierre et Paul dans les Actes', *Rev. Bibl.* 64 (1957), 35–47; E. Haenchen, 'Apostelgeschichte' in *RGG³ I*, Tübingen 1957, 501–7; W. Hillmann, 'Grundzüge d. urkirchliche Glaubensverkündigung', *Wissensch. u. Weisheit* 20 (1957), 163–80; G. Heuthorst, 'The Apologetic Aspect of Acts 2:1–13', *Scripture* 9 (1957), 33–43; J. Hamaide and P. Guilbert, 'Résonances pastorales du plan des Actes des Apôtres', *Église vivante* 9 (1957), 95–113; W. Baird, 'What is the Kerygma? A Study of I Cor. 15:3–8 and Gal. 1:15–17', *JBL* 76 (1957), 181–91; R. G. Nikolainen, 'Till frågan om Apostlagärningarnas komposition', *Sv. Exeg. Årsskr.* 22–3 (1957–8), 119–26; A. Ehrhardt, 'The Construction and Purpose of Acts' in *Stud. Theol.* 12 (1958), 45–79; W. G. Kümmel, 'Futurische u. präsent. Eschatologie im ältesten Urchristentum', *NTS* 5 (1959), 113–26; A. C. Winn, 'Elusive Mystery. The Purpose of Acts' in *Interpretation* 13 (1959), 144–56;

J. Munck, 'Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times', *NTS* 6 (1960), 103-16; W. C. van Unnik, 'The "Book of Acts" the Confirmation of the Gospel', *Nov. Test.* 4 (1960), 26-59; G. Klein, 'Galater 2:6-9 u. d. Geschichte der Jerusalemer Urgemeinde', *ZThK* 57 (1960), 275-95; Id., *Die zwölf Apostel. Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee*, Göttingen 1961; U. Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte*, Neukirchen Kreis Moers 1961 (= *Wiss. Monographien z. A. u. N.T.*, vol. 5); C. K. Barrett, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study*, London, Epworth Press 1961 (A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture No. 6); W. Eltester, 'Lukas und Paulus' in *Eranion. Festschr. f. H. Hommel*, Tübingen 1961, 1-17; W. Schmithals, *Das kirchliche Apostelamt. Eine historische Untersuchung*, Göttingen 1961 (ET *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church*, 1969); E. Haenchen, 'Das "Wir" in der Apostelgeschichte und das Itinerar', *ZThK* 58 (1961); Id., 'Acta 27' in *Zeit u. Geschichte* (Bultmann Festschr.), Tübingen 1964, 235-54; Id., 'The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of the Early Church', *Stud. in Luke/Acts* ed. by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martin, 1966, 258-78.

8. LUKE AND PAUL

It was a tradition from the second half of the second century¹ which first identified the author of Acts with 'Luke, the beloved physician.'² For the sake of simplicity we have up to now likewise denoted the author as 'Luke,' and shall continue to do so. But we have to ask ourselves whether this writer was really that companion of Paul, or any companion of his at all. To prepare for an answer to this question, let us recall three things:

1. For both 'Luke' and Paul, the overriding problem was that of the *mission to the Gentiles without the law*. But 'Luke' is *unaware of Paul's solution*. Paul was able to justify the mission without the law on *internal evidence*: the law leads not to God, but into sin.³ For it causes man to put his trust not in God, but in his own righteousness.⁴ Even so, admittedly, it still has served the purposes of God, who has shut up all under unbelief.⁵ But Christ is the end of the law for all who believe.⁶ For when the sinner places his trust in Christ, the son of God, he thereby enters into the right

¹ Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* III 1.1; 10, 1; 12.1-15; 14, 1. *Canon Muratori* (ed. Lietzmann) fol. 10r, lines 2ff.; 10v, lines 34ff.

² Col. 4.14. Irenaeus and the theologian author of the *Canon Muratori* both obviously derived their evidence of Luke's authorship from an appraisal of NT data.

³ Gal. 3.19; cf. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 261ff. (ET *Theology of the New Testament I*, 259ff.), and see also Rom. 4.13-16, II Cor. 3.6 and I Cor. 15.56.

⁴ Rom. 10.3.

⁵ Gal. 3.21f.

⁶ Rom. 10.4.

relationship to God. Of this view of the law, with its simultaneous affirmation and negation, there is no trace in Acts. When in 15.10 Peter says of the law that 'neither we nor our fathers could bear' this 'yoke,' something quite different is meant: here the Judaic law is regarded as through the eyes of a Gentile Christian, who would see in it a mass of commands and prohibitions such as no-one could unravel or master.

Luke has no doubt whatever of the legitimacy of the Gentile mission; on the contrary he takes it for granted. Yet he is incapable of justifying it, like Paul, 'from within'. He must therefore seize on a justification 'from without'—God willed the mission, and that was sufficient. One can speak here of a majestic divine will that will brook no discussion; nevertheless, inasmuch as men cannot grasp it on its inward side, it smacks of that ineluctable destiny known to pagan belief.¹ Be that as it may, Luke was not greatly helped by the bare reference to the will of God: how could he persuade his *readers* that God really willed *this* and no other thing? It is here that the miracle, the 'sign,' attains its full significance for Luke—and, we may be sure, for the community in which he lived. The miracles and signs form the visible, demonstrable, reliable legitimation. That is why they play so dominant a role in the work of Luke. They are the accompaniment of the beginning and development of the mission in general, from 2.1ff. onwards, but more especially of the Gentile mission.² The miracles give to the Gentile mission the good conscience that 'it is God's will.'

2. On this basis we can understand a further fact: there is a *discrepancy between the 'Lucan' Paul and the Paul of the epistles.*

(a) Luke portrays in Paul (as in Peter before him) the great *miracle-worker*. Paul blinds Elymas (13.6–12), gives the cripple at Lystra the power to walk (14.8–10) and, when apparently killed by stoning, rises up and continues his mission (14.19f.). In healings and exorcisms, moreover, the touch of his hand is superfluous: his very body-linen, his handkerchiefs, are so full of his miraculous power, that they quell disease and drive out evil spirits (19.12). In such a context it is not surprising that a serpent's venom should leave him unscathed (28.3–6) or that Eutychus should return to life (20.7–12) when Paul lies upon his corpse, as Elijah and Elisha lay on the dead boys (I Kings 17.21 & II Kings 4.34). Now it is true that the real Paul did on one occasion lay claim to the 'signs of an Apostle' (II Cor. 12.12), but the exploits in question were so little out of the ordinary that his opponents flatly denied his ability to perform miracles.³ The important fact is

¹ This is why Luke is able to employ the proverb of the goads with reference to Paul's vocation (26.14). Of course Paul himself speaks (in I Cor. 9.16) of a necessity which is laid upon him, but here it represents his being subjectively conquered by his recognition of the glory of God in the countenance of Christ: II Cor. 4.6.

² Acts 10.1–11.18; cf. also 9.1–19a *Par.* & 13.1–4 and see the commentary on these passages.

³ Cf. E. Käsemann, 'Die Legitimität des Apostels' in *ZNW* (1942/43) 35.

that Paul did not see the essential of his apostolate in such feats; far from overcoming all obstacles by miraculous means, an Apostle must plunge into the depths of suffering and *there* experience the help of Christ (II Cor. 12. 10).¹

(b) The same state of affairs may be demonstrated from a second point of difference: the 'Lucan' Paul is an *outstanding orator*. His enemies are obliged to engage an advocate—Paul defends himself with convincing eloquence (Acts 24. 1ff., 10ff.). Hardly snatched from the rough handling of the raging mob, he steps forward once again with the orator's raised hand, and the turbulent throng is hushed (21. 40, 22. 1f.). Whether he speaks before Jews² or Gentiles,³ governors⁴ or philosophers (17. 22–31), he is never at a loss for the right word. He is a born orator, imposing himself with the eloquence of a Demosthenes. Alas, the real Paul, as he himself admits, was anything but a master of the improvised speech. He has found, in dictating his letters, words which have echoed down the centuries: as a speaker he was feeble, unimpressive (II Cor. 10. 10). When Luke paints so different a portrait of him, it is not the alchemy of remembrance which is at work, but the presumption, so tempting for the later generation, that Paul the great missionary must also have been Paul the great orator.

(c) It is not until we thus see the splendour in which Luke has bathed the figure of Paul that we can properly appreciate the remarkable fact that *he did not affirm Paul's real claim*. When Paul embarked upon his European mission, he demanded of the communities he founded that they should recognize him as an Apostle in the highest sense, with as good a title to the name as the Twelve, nay Peter himself (Gal. 2. 8). In the kerygma proclaimed to the Church it is reported: 'Christ appeared to Cephas . . . then he appeared to James,' and from there Paul continues with his own, 'he appeared also to me' (I Cor. 15. 5–8). And Paul had furthermore received—from no man, not even from any of the Twelve—a unique commission: to bring the gospel to the Gentiles (Gal. 2. 7).

Acts takes another view. In Acts only the Twelve are Apostles.⁵ They were called by the Lord himself and lived in community with him from his baptism to the Ascension (Acts 1. 21f.). They had eaten and drunk with the risen Christ (10. 41). They alone, therefore, could fulfil the conditions of apostolic witness. Paul, like any other Christian missionary, must appeal to their authority (13. 31). Not only is the place thereby assigned to him completely at variance with his own claim, but also the underlying notion of events. For Paul, Jesus was no longer 'flesh and blood' (I Cor. 15. 50) after

¹ Cf. E. Käsemann, 'Die Legitimität des Apostels' in *ZNW* (1942/43) 69–71.

² Acts 13. 16–41; 22. 1–21; 23. 1ff.; 26. 2–23, 27; 28. 17–20, 26–8.

³ 14. 15–17; 17. 22–31.

⁴ 13. 9–11; 24. 10–21; 25. 10f.; 26. 2–26.

⁵ It makes no difference that in 14. 4 & 14 Paul and Barnabas, as envoys from Antioch, are called 'Apostles'.

his resurrection—he and Peter had been allowed to *see* the transfigured Lord (I Cor. 9.1), and the idea that the risen Christ had eaten and drunk with the disciples would have rung like a blasphemy in Paul's ears. Luke, however, oblivious of difficulties, takes for granted the more down-to-earth representation that had grown up as almost a practical necessity in a later generation, when all those witnesses had died and the reality of Jesus' resurrection had to be defended against gnostic docetism and Jewish or pagan scepticism at one and the same time.

3. Finally, Acts draws a *picture of relations between Jews and Christians which contradicts that of the Pauline epistles*. From beginning to end, according to Acts, the Jewish hostility to the Christians was kindled by the latter's preaching of the Resurrection (Acts 4.2, 28.23). In Acts it is no special doctrine of his which brings Jewish persecution down on Paul's head, but the general Christian message of the resurrection. This exactly matches the overall view of Acts, according to which all Christian missionaries taught the same doctrine (7.52, 55f. & 18.24–8). Since Luke is moreover convinced that this very teaching corresponds to the hope of the Jews,¹ we necessarily arrive at the astounding contention that Paul was expressly persecuted by the Jews for disseminating an age-old Jewish doctrine. There is clearly something amiss in this contention, and indeed one has only to examine the matter closely to discover two points in which Luke has distorted the position:

In the first place, the Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection is by no means congruent with the Christian. The Pharisees expect the resurrection of the dead at the *end* of this aeon; a resurrection in the *middle* of this aeon—and such, according to Luke, was that of Jesus—has nothing in common with the Pharisaic expectation.² But—and here we come to the second point—it was not the message that Christ had risen which set the Jews against Paul and the Gentile Christians. Even in Acts itself, at certain places, a quite different situation may be glimpsed: in 15.5 Christian Pharisees demand the circumcision of the Gentile Christians; in 21.21 the Jews declare that Paul is teaching men to forsake the law; in 21.28 the Ephesian Jews on pilgrimage in Jerusalem fall upon Paul in the Temple because he everywhere teaches against the law!

In fact, any fellow-worker of Paul's must have known that what brought him everywhere into conflict with the Jews was his teaching with regard to the law and his corresponding missionary practice.³ If any of Paul's fellow-workers had maintained that the stumbling-block was not his view of the law but his message of resurrection (an ostensibly Jewish message at that!), he

¹ Acts 23.6; 24.15, 21; 26.6f., 27; 28.20.

² Still less has the Christian doctrine of the death and resurrection of the Messiah anything to do with the Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection.

³ Cf. I Thess. 2.15; the Jews who 'hinder us from speaking to the Gentiles that they may be saved.'

could only have been speaking against his better knowledge. On the other hand this contradiction is easily resolved if here, in Acts, we are listening to the voice of a man of the sub-apostolic age. For such a person, Christianity and Judaism had already drifted apart: they still spoke against each other, but no longer listened to each other. Only a Christian of the sub-apostolic period could have entertained the 'Lucan' viewpoint, according to which Christianity and Judaism were at bottom, in their resurrection faith, really one, and it was only an unfortunate misunderstanding on the part of the Jews which caused the conflict to break out just at this point. This argument could no longer, of course, be expected to convince a Jew. But then, it was not designed to win Jews to the fold; it was designed to win over the Roman authorities.

The time has come to strike the balance: the representation of Paul in Acts—not to mention the overall picture of missionary beginnings—shows that here we have no collaborator of Paul telling his story, but someone of a later generation trying in his own way to give an account of things that can no longer be viewed in their true perspective. That this writer venerated Paul and sought in every way to bring his achievements to light, to make them 'tell,' that much is evident from every line he devotes to the Apostle—and quite half of Acts is concerned with Paul. Yet it is no less evident that the real Paul, as known to his followers and opponents alike, has been replaced by a Paul seen through the eyes of a later age, and that the primitive age of Christianity is not described here by one who lived through the greater part of it. We need have no qualms about letting this truth be the last word, for without detracting from Luke's real merit, it ensures that the gospel according to Paul will not be robbed of its due.

Bibliography

See on § 7, p. 110ff. above.

9. THE WORK CONTINUES

Research into Acts in recent years has made rapid progress. For long it had been at a standstill, because scholars disagreed on the one question in which they were interested, namely that of the sources. Only when it was recognized how important are the questions of Lucan composition and theology did the picture change. Acts became a favourite theme for NT research. But the more clearly the uniqueness of the Lucan theology appeared, the livelier became the opposition. Acts was accused of replacing the Pauline

theologia crucis with the *theologia gloriae* and thereby introducing early Catholicism.

In recent years the traditional questions concerning the author of Acts and his sources have not been silenced, but rather have become even more lively. At the same time it has been shown that there are various ways of explaining why Luke portrays Paul as such a law-abiding Jew. The portrait of Paul in Acts becomes an especially attractive problem. The big surprise is, however, something else: Lucan theology has found fervent supporters who maintain that it is precisely the Lucan doctrine of salvation history that permits a deeper understanding of revelation. We shall briefly discuss the most important literature according to this sequence of problems: 'author and sources,' 'the meaning of the Lucan portrait of Paul', and 'the significance of the Lucan theology of history'.

I

The question of sources had already been considered in some detail in 1959 in the 12th edition of the present commentary (see above § 6, pp. 81–90). A year later appeared the learned book of DOM JACQUES DUPONT: *Les sources du Livre des Actes. État de la question* (ET London 1964). Dupont, appealing especially to J. Jeremias, M. Dibelius and H. J. Cadbury, came out in favour of authorship by Paul's companion Luke, the physician, who had made use of an itinerary. The arguments of the 12th edition against this authorship (see above § 8, pp. 112–116) he rejected: 'We must admit that these massive objections impress us very little' (ET, 127 n. 52); in another place (141 n. 10) he even states: 'Such antitheses seem to us very superficial.' Yet Dupont admitted in the summary at the end of his investigation: 'The predominant impression is certainly very negative . . . it has not been possible to define any of the sources . . . in a way which will meet with widespread agreement among the critics' (166).

In this admission of problems which remain unsolved, Dupont is very close to ANDREW JACOB MATTILL, Jr., at that time Assistant Professor, who in 1959 in his work *Luke as a Historian in Criticism since 1840* recognized at the conclusion of his presentation: 'Many problems remain unsolved, perhaps unsolvable, and many ghosts refuse to be laid' (383). Mattill's work—it earned him the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Religion at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee—did not only deal with the source problem. The author reviewed for the reader the different epochs of research since Schneckenburger and the Tübingen school, and questioned each one about what they thought of Luke as a historian. Mattill has withheld his own opinion as much as possible, making reference to the words of William Sanday: 'Opinions are always less important than the presentation of the

data' (p. 8). Yet he came to the concluding judgement: every objective investigation will see in Luke one of those true historians whom Polybius (I, 14) characterized as writing 'for the truth and the good of mankind' (p. 383). One might formulate the conception of a good historian that is presupposed here as follows: He presents the events as they actually happened. But what does one do, then, with the discrepancy between the Lucan picture of Paul and the Pauline epistles? Mattill does not deny it, but thinks he can smooth it away by the following statement: 'Paul was less "Pauline" and more Jewish than "hyperpaulinists" have allowed. . . . Whatever disagreement there was between Paul and Jewish Christians in principle, there was inevitably accommodation in practice on both sides.' (p. 322)

WALTER ELTESTER ('Lukas and Paulus' in *Eranion*, Festschrift für H. Hommel, Tübingen 1961, 1-17) also sees the differences between the Paulines and the picture of Paul in Acts. They do not however preclude Lucan authorship, but rather can be explained: 'In view of the extraordinary value for Luke of the tradition "from the beginning", he had to give special distinction to the disciples, who were now the guarantors of the gospel tradition, by recognizing them alone as Apostles' (10). The fact that Luke depicts Paul and the other disciples as devout Jews and men of the law is explained by the fact that Luke saw 'in the Church the Israel of Promise' (15). He had to make the Gentile Christians certain of this, that they were really the people of promise. 'It is simply the will to self-assertion of a Church which has usurped the documents of its faith that finds expression in Luke' (*ibid.*). Finally: Luke was 'not a Jew, but a Greek' (16). Hence the inner problems of the OT were to him a closed book. He could not therefore appropriate the Pauline doctrine of the law.

Three different solutions to the question of authorship have thus been offered, each of which assumes that Luke the physician wrote Acts. But the first solution says that there was no difference at all between Luke and Paul. The second admits the difference, but considers it purely theoretical. Finally, the third seeks to explain why Luke did not understand Paul although he was his pupil. In our opinion none of these solutions is very happy.

DUPONT's three authorities leave him in the lurch. The arguments of the preceding commentary against Jeremias (see below, p. 255) have still not been refuted. If they sound weak in Dupont's reproduction, it is only because they are not accurately quoted. Dibelius had only one reason for considering Luke the author of Acts, as we have shown in the article 'Das "Wir" in der Apg. und das Itinerar' which appeared in *ZThK* 58 (1961) 329-66 (ET 1965): an ancient writing with a dedication was intended for the book-market. It could not however appear without an author's name. A. D. Nock has shown (*Gnomon* 25 (1953) 501) that Dibelius misunderstood the ancient dedication and the ancient method of book publication. There were anonymous books; they were cited according to the name of the person to

whom they were dedicated (Dupont in mentioning Nock's objections against Dibelius names among others the 'Letter to Diognetus' and the four books on rhetoric 'ad Herennium': ET p. 138 n. 3); the books were disseminated mostly by private copyists. Dibelius is thereby excluded as a primary authority. Cadbury finally had inferred the Lucan composition of Acts from the prologue to the third gospel. We believe we have shown in the above-mentioned article on the 'we' in Acts that Cadbury's explanation of the prologue to Luke is not possible. Luke 1.1 speaks of the events which have occurred 'among us' (the Christians). These events have been reported by 'many', scil. in gospels. This already indicates that this prologue says nothing about Acts. For at that time there were several gospels but not several Acts. Luke 1.2 indicates the presupposition of these gospels: the eyewitnesses have reported the events (of the life of Jesus) as 'servants of the Word'. Luke apparently knows of no gospel written by an Apostle. He clearly differentiates himself and the 'many' from the 'eyewitnesses'. Luke 1.3 describes his own work: '(Since many have composed "gospels"), I also have decided . . . to write for I have carefully followed everything from the beginning.' According to Cadbury παρακολουθεῖν here means 'to have participated directly in the events' and not to have received the information second-hand. This meaning παρακολουθεῖν cannot possess here because of its connection with ἀκριβῶς. I can obtain accurate information, but not participate accurately in the mission. Moreover, 'everything' does not fit Cadbury's proposed meaning: Luke would indeed have been present only during a part of the Pauline mission. If none the less we wished with Cadbury to assume that the sentence 'for I have followed everything carefully for a long time' refers to Luke's participation in the Pauline mission in the second half of Acts, then the entire prologue to the third gospel would lose its meaning; for Luke then in this prologue to the gospel would only be demonstrating his qualifications as a writer of the *historia Pauli*, but would say not a word of his qualification as a writer of the *historia Jesu*. In other words, the prologue to the third gospel says nothing about Acts.

Dupont has further appealed to the 'we' in Acts. It need not however by any means indicate that the author writes as an eyewitness. Dibelius himself in 1923 (*Studies*, 7 n. 15) had described it as possible that Luke 'obtained a short report of the events from some other place (and affirmed his informant's part as a witness in the "we") . . .'

We have decided in favour of just this possibility for good reasons. However, BARRETT also writes in his recent book, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* (London 1961, 22) concerning the 'we' in Acts: 'This means, not necessarily that the author was an eye-witness but that he had some sort of access to some sort of eye-witness material for this part of the narrative.' Thus this argument for the composition of Acts by an eyewitness also fails. It is indeed very noteworthy that the author does not, like Josephus in the

'Jewish War,' refer to his having seen the events personally. Rather he indicates indirectly that he has utilized written sources for his gospel.

MATTILL's work (kindly made available to me on microfilm) is valuable not only for its very perceptive and lively account of the history of scholarship on Acts, which is supplemented by numerous 'Appendices' (384-468), but also for its almost exhaustive bibliography (469-634), to which we are obliged for many otherwise unattainable accounts. But Mattill's conception of correct historiography makes him consider the form-critical view of the Lucan composition of Acts as an evasion of the historical question (315), indeed as historical scepticism. Thus he can derive from the present commentary, to the tenth edition of which he devoted a chapter of its own ('The Revaluation of Acts by Haenchen': 297-314) the conception that Acts is only a historical novel. In reality the passage cited for this (*ZThK* 52 (1955) 210) only affirms that Luke as a historian enjoyed a freedom which we today grant only to the historical novel; it thus by no means affirms that Acts as such is 'a historical novel'.

The way in which Mattill interprets the 'disagreements' between Paul and the Jewish-Christians, namely as an opposition only in principle but not sustained in practice, does not seem to us commendable, although Alf Kragerud ('Itinerariet i Apostlenes gjerninger', in: *Norsk teologisk tidsskrift* 56 (1955), 249-72; see p. 268) differentiates in a similar manner Paul's 'theory and transcendental perspective' on one hand and his 'actual practice and immanent level' on the other hand. For Gal. 2.11ff. shows all too clearly that for Paul his theology was just not simply theory, but determined his practice. The distinction drawn by Mattill and Kragerud means only, strictly speaking, that one decides against the Pauline self-attestation (as a purely 'theoretical' speculation!) in order to be able to consider the statements in Acts as historically reliable.

ELTESTER's article contains important insights and observations to which we shall return later. But his attempt to secure the ecclesiastical tradition concerning the composition of Acts by the physician Luke encounters insurmountable difficulties. This companion of Paul, according to tradition—this one may not forget—was with Paul not only during the short journey from Troas to Philippi and the longer one from Philippi to Jerusalem, but also (if for the moment we disregard the period of Paul's imprisonment in Caesarea) during the journey to Rome and the two years of the Roman imprisonment, of which Acts 28.30 speaks. Such a fellow worker of Paul would have known exactly how energetically Paul laid claim to the title of Apostle and how tenaciously he defended it—for to reject his apostleship was to deny his gospel. When Eltester refers to the extraordinary value of the tradition of the life of Jesus, authenticated by the Twelve, which allowed only the Twelve to be considered Apostles, then he ought to ascribe to Luke a second conversion: from the Pauline proclamation of Christ to the apostolic

Church of the Twelve. In other words: this Luke must have taken a mental leap out of the apostolic age, in which he had very actively participated, into the post-apostolic generation and its view of things, if he had written Acts. Eltester's second explanation leads to difficulties just as deep. That to this fellow worker of Paul's the Old Testament should appear as an usurped document of faith, and that to conceal this usurpation he presented Paul, against his better knowledge, as a man of the law, certainly cannot be maintained. And finally: even if Luke as a 'Greek' did not understand the 'inner problematics' of the Old Testament, this would not in the least explain why—again against better judgment—he should have suppressed the fact that the Jews persecuted Paul because of his attitude to the law. That Paul, to whom his one-time Pharisaism was 'dung' (σκύβαλα, Phil. 3.8!), from which he had turned away in order to win Christ; that this Paul before the council should recall his unbroken association with the Pharisees and therefore was to a large extent shielded by them (Acts 23.6,9), is an idea so grotesque that it is only comprehensible in a member of the post-apostolic generation who no longer had any notion of Paul's real conflicts. He who, like Eltester, has eaten of the tree of historical criticism cannot remain in the paradise of naive tradition.

II

The portrait of Paul in Acts has occasioned much discussion on account of its differences from the Pauline epistles. In spite of this it is questionable whether one may consider it 'the' problem of Acts, or whether it ought not rather to be classified in a larger context. It is further in dispute whether there is only one such comprehensive problem, or whether we have to reckon with a number of questions which cannot be traced back one after another.

Barrett's excellent book already mentioned, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study*, briefly discusses, pp. 8–26, half a dozen questions: the original text of Acts, the position of Luke within Hellenistic historical writing, his relationship to the religious authors of Hellenism, to the Old Testament and to the Christian tradition, and the image of the Church which he projects in Acts. But finally (26) he names—over against 'such naive questions' as that of authorship—as 'vital questions': What did Luke intend to do and what did he in fact achieve? What made him embark on religious history? What does he reveal to us, consciously or unconsciously, about the life of the Church before and in his time? On p. 50 Barrett then takes up his questions again: To what category do the Lucan writings belong? He answers: Luke himself would not have understood at all the distinction between Church History and proclamation. Hence for Barrett also it plays no further role. Instead, two

basic problems now emerge. First: Luke was the first (?) NT writer who consciously sought by his two-fold work to combine two different epochs. While Paul begins where Mark ends (54), Luke allows his two books to overlap in order to build a bridge from the life of Jesus to that of the Church (55). The ascension thus takes on a double aspect: on the one hand it closes 'the story of Jesus, who works cures, perishes in Jerusalem and on the third day is perfected'; on the other hand it begins the history of the Church (56). It closes the first and opens the second period. That means, however, that in Luke's thought the end of the story of Jesus is the Church, and the story of Jesus is the beginning of the Church (57). Luke recounts the story of Jesus as that of the founder of a religion. The stress is laid upon the acts of Jesus and not upon his death. Barrett cites (23 and 59) the words of J. M. Creed that in Luke there is no *theologia crucis*, beyond the affirmation that the Christ must suffer because it was so foretold. Barrett considers this statement to be overdrawn; but in the speeches of Acts the death of Christ 'tends to be treated negatively, as an unfortunate event which nevertheless, in view of the resurrection, need not be an obstacle to faith' (59). The cross is not an atoning sacrifice but a temporary reverse, not unforeseen, and speedily retrieved (60). The relationship of Jesus to the Church determines that of Acts to the gospel: 'The story of the Church was not an independent or spontaneous movement, but the outcome of the life of Jesus.' Luke simplifies and smoothes over the story of the Church, partly because he did not have more accurate knowledge and partly because otherwise the connection between the story of Jesus and the story of the Church would have been obscured. Luke 'found it necessary to show that those who had been with Jesus in his ministry took the lead in the gentile mission, because only in this way could he visibly connect the gentile mission with Jesus (61)'. This accounts for the way in which Luke writes history.

But what made Luke—toward the end of the first century—present this connection of the life of Jesus with the Church in his two-volume work? Here we come to the second fundamental question with which Barrett deals. Luke avoids gnostic thought and language. Acts is 'an apology addressed to the Church' which demonstrates 'Paul's anti-Gnostic orthodoxy, and his practical and doctrinal solidarity with the church at Jerusalem.' Out of the eschatological expectation is evolved the *Heilsgeschichte* described by Conzelmann (although the expectation of the return of Jesus is retained). If one wishes to call this defence against the Gnostics and transformation of eschatology 'early Catholicism', the expression is justified. If, however, 'early Catholicism' means something more, namely the Church as an institution of salvation as with Clement and Ignatius, then Luke does not belong to 'early Catholicism'. For the Church of Luke lives by and for the Word (76).

Günther Klein's book *Die zwölf Apostel. Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee*

(Göttingen 1961; cf. also his articles 'Gal. 2:6-9 und die Geschichte der Jerusalemer Urgemeinde', *ZThK* 57 (1960) 275-95 and 'Die Verleugnung des Petrus', *ZThK* 58 (1961) 285-328, together with his review of the 13th edition of the present commentary, *ZKG* 1962, 358-63) deals fundamentally with Barrett's second question. Klein also finds the key to the Lucan presentation of the early Church and of Paul in the conflict with Gnosticism. Nevertheless an entirely different picture emerges here. Luke—he writes according to Klein (*ZKG* 1960, 371) in the second century—knows the Pauline epistles, but he does not utilize them. For Paul, so Klein conjectures, was at that time under suspicion as a Gnostic in orthodox eyes. He can only be rescued if he is brought as a subordinate member into the Church of the 'twelve Apostles'. Luke's great achievement was his identification of 'the Twelve', who in the early days of eschatological expectation were temporarily an authoritative council for the earliest community of all (215), with 'the Apostles'. The circle thus created he projected back into the story of Jesus. In this way 'the truly irreplaceable role of Paul in the development of the Church is preserved,' but on the other hand he is subordinated to 'the guarantors of the *historia Jesu* which was set in opposition to incipient Gnostic thought.' By this 'domestication' Luke preserved Paul for the Church (215f.).

How consciously Luke carried through this undertaking Klein seeks to show from Acts 14.4, 14 (212). Here Barnabas and Paul are called 'Apostles'. Why? So that the reader (who meanwhile has already learned that only the Twelve are 'Apostles') does not notice that Acts withholds from Paul the title of apostle! That Luke here uses the word 'apostle' can only be explained as 'a part of that mimicry under cover of which he accomplished the portentous modification of the traditional conception of the Apostle.' Luke accepts 'with the greatest composure (or should one say: with the utmost cunning?) serious flaws in the objectivity of his presentation, so long as his primary intentions remain undisturbed.'

Thus: since Paul had become the great Gnostic authority Luke, according to Klein, consciously rewrote the history of early Christianity—and indeed with the utmost cunning!—in order to preserve Paul for the Church. Of an unrestricted cult of Paul (215) there is frankly not a trace, either in the writings of Paul himself or in the Deutero-Paulines, and that Luke intends to show that 'this man too was a human being with normal characteristics and weaknesses' is in view of Acts as far from the mark as possible. Paul according to Luke's presentation is a chosen instrument of Christ, and this is evident also, indeed precisely, in the fact that he never loses heart or surrenders, that in every situation he finds the right word, and wins one missionary success after another. But Paul for Luke is also not a man with average shortcomings: he is rather the great persecutor of the infant Church, and as soon as he is called by Christ the persecution at one stroke is at an

end. As an enemy of the Christians he is of demonic stature; but as the emissary of Jesus he more and more takes over the apostolic task alone and unaided. To speak of normality here (215) is to close one's eyes to the fact that in Acts Paul is actually presented as a man out of the ordinary.

Klein's construction however cannot rest content with introducing Paul into the non-Gnostic Church as a subordinate member; rather must it go further and ascribe to Luke the creation also of that authoritative circle which represents this Church. In order to exclude Paul from this new-formed church leadership, Luke has first of all to invent this body, by identifying 'the Twelve' with 'the Apostles'. The major part of Klein's book is therefore concerned with 'the twelve Apostles', and only the last three pages (213-16) raise the question of the reason for the new conception of the apostolate, and answer it by the theory of preserving Paul for orthodoxy.

A substantial part of the space devoted to the Lucan concept of the apostle is claimed by discussion of those New Testament passages outside the Lucan writings in which the 'twelve Apostles' also appear. For they threaten to prove that Luke's 'inspired plan'—this very identification of the 'twelve' and the 'Apostles'—was already taken over by Luke.

The chief stumbling-block is Rev. 21.14, for here in the description of the new Jerusalem it is said: 'The wall of the city has twelve foundation stones, and on these stand (the) twelve names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.' These 'twelve Apostles' are not to be removed by the aid of textual criticism, so the only recourse is the bold statement: 'It is not because the author knows of twelve original apostles that the number twelve is relevant for him; but because it is relevant, then where he is concerned about the relation between the ideal 'twelve tribes' and the apostolic faith he has to postulate an ideal 'twelve apostles'—without regard to the number there may have been on the level of empirical fact' (78). The sense of the text is missed when 'the singular combination(!) of the number twelve and the noun is treated in isolation and its special significance ignored—this significance lies specifically in the uniform functional dependence of the variable nouns upon the constant number' (78). But however we interpret the number in Rev. 7.4ff., 21.16ff. or 21.12—that here in 21.14 the names of the twelve Apostles are written on the foundation stones is only possible if the author knew of twelve Apostles who were known by name, but not if the number of the Apostles was in the mind of the author and his readers quite indefinite. It is only because the number of the names of the twelve Apostles was for the author (and his readers) a given fact that he could fit the twelve Apostles into a description of the New Jerusalem structured on the number twelve. This presupposes that co-ordination of the twelve disciples and the twelve tribes of Israel which is already attested in Matt. 19.28 and Luke 22.30 (i.e. Q), save that here in 21.14 the twelve disciples are already identical with the twelve Apostles known by name.

But it is not a question of Rev. 21.14 alone; rather must we also consider Mark and Matthew. In Mk 3.14, B N (W) Θ sy^{hms} sa read, after *καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα*, the words *οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν*. R D pl omit them. Nestle and other editors omit, because they see here the influence of Lk 6.13, where the same text occurs. This seems to have in its favour the fact that here we find the expansion of the relative by *καί*, frequent in Luke (it simply gives a stronger emphasis to the relative; see above, p. 139 n.8). In our view however the situation is different. In Luke 6.16 it is said of Judas: *ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης*, while Mk 3.19 has *ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν*. Matthew reproduces the statement as *ὁ καὶ παραδούς αὐτόν*. It is thus by no means stated that D and the Koine manuscripts present the original text in Mk 3.14, while the longer text is expanded from Luke. Rather may Luke have taken over the phrase from Mark, but—like Matthew—made stylistic improvements.

The situation is different again with Mk 6.7 and 6.30. In 6.7 it is said of Jesus: ‘and he called the twelve and began to send them out (*ἀποστέλλειν*) two by two’ (D 565 al it offer a clear stylistic improvement: ‘summoning the twelve disciples he sent them’). Here the noun ‘apostle’ is missing, certainly not without reason: Mark wishes to explain how the designation ‘apostle’ was arrived at, and he then uses it in 6.30: ‘and the apostles came together.’ But these according to 6.7 are the twelve. The result is, then, that Mark firstly knows of the sending out of the twelve during the earthly life of Jesus, and secondly understands the designation *ἀπόστολος* on the basis of this sending.

Basically the situation is no different in Matthew. In 10.1 he speaks first of Jesus calling the twelve disciples and endowing them with authority over the demons and for healing. Then he continues in v. 2: ‘The names of the twelve Apostles are these’. V. 5 repeats: ‘These twelve Jesus sent out (*ἀπέστειλεν*), saying . . .’

The outcome is thus: the sending out of the twelve, described by the verb *ἀποστέλλειν*, and the explanation of the designation *ἀπόστολος* on the basis of this verb, are already found in Mark and Matthew. When therefore Klein writes (214): ‘The creation by Luke of the apostolate of the twelve is the most inspired plan . . .’, it must be answered that Luke found ready to hand not only the designation ‘the twelve’ in the sense of ‘the twelve disciples’ (during the earthly life of Jesus!) but also their sending out, from which according to Mark and Matthew they derived the designation ‘apostles.’ ‘The twelve Apostles’ are therefore not a group first created by Luke, but a circle which he already found before him in the tradition. For the view that this circle played a special role after Easter Mark and Matthew yield as little evidence as does Luke.

For Luke’s knowledge of the Pauline epistles, and hence also of I Cor. 15.5, no proof can be offered. That Paul’s persecuting activity is described

in Gal. 1.13 and Acts 9.21 by the verb *πορθέω* cannot be taken to show that Luke knew the Pauline letters.

Thoroughly questionable, finally, in our opinion is Klein's conjecture that Luke had to rescue Paul from Gnosticism. We do indeed occasionally hear (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* VII 106.4) that Valentinus (or his disciples?) appealed to a disciple of Paul named Theodas. But in the same way Basilides allegedly appealed to Peter, with Glaucias, an interpreter of the apostle's, as intermediary. In that they claimed to possess such apostolic traditions, certain Gnostic circles evidently wanted to prove their orthodoxy at a time when Peter and Paul already ranked as the chief Apostles. It would therefore be completely mistaken to conclude from these Gnostic efforts that Peter and Paul counted as Gnostics; and this Klein has not maintained.

According to the Revelation of John there had been Gnostic groups in some churches of Asia Minor, but only in Pergamum and Thyatira had they held their own within Christian congregations; in Ephesus they had been excluded. That apart from the seven churches no others are named in the missive is certainly connected with the sacred number seven, chosen for reasons of composition; the 'letters from heaven' are not intended to give a comprehensive survey. Hence we cannot draw any conclusions from the silence about the churches in Colossae and Hierapolis. That the churches in Asia Minor were submerged in the Gnostic flood would be a hasty judgment. But this means that the conjecture that Paul as a Gnostic was suspect in the eyes of the Great Church now itself becomes questionable. That II Peter 3.15 says of 'our dear brother Paul' that 'according to the wisdom given to him' he has written some things hard to understand, which the *ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι* distort as they do the other Scriptures, is not enough to provide a foundation for Klein's conjecture.

A further word on the new interpretation of the Lucan prologue which Klein has put forward (*Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag, Tübingen 1964, 193–216*). Klein would relate the word *παρέδωσαν* in Lk. 1.2 not to the immediately preceding *πραγμάτων* but to the more distant *διήγησιν*: the eye-witnesses had already proclaimed a connected narrative of the words and works of Jesus; the 'many' had only repeated this oral report in writing (*ἀνατάξασθαι*); Luke himself on the other hand was not thinking of the line of tradition but of its relation to the facts themselves, and he endeavoured to break through the *traditions-geschichtlich* gap between the *διήγησις* and facts preserved in it (206). In our opinion the Lucan prologue does not admit of this interpretation. It describes the eye-witnesses as 'servants of the Word', which means for Luke: as preaching missionaries. Such missionaries however do not give any—oral—*διήγησις* in the sense of a connected presentation of the works and words of Jesus. Rather was it first the 'many' who undertook to compose a *διήγησις* out of the material handed down, and because *they* did so Luke also resolved

to present in sequence 'what has happened among us Christians', after investigating everything from the beginning. Certainly the word *δοκεῖ* is like the same word in Acts 15.28, but it does not follow that this 'I have resolved' possesses the same quality as 'we and the Holy Spirit have resolved'. We cannot therefore impute to the ordinary phrase *δοκεῖ μοι* the idea that in its author's mind a fundamental importance attaches to Luke's work (215); it is not this phrase which indicates the authority in 15.28, but the accompanying 'and the Holy Spirit'. To claim the Spirit as co-author for his work, however, did not occur to Luke.

That Luke found his superiority over his predecessors in the fact that he was concerned with the facts and they only with the tradition is said to be reflected also in the word *ἐπιχειρεῖν*, with which Luke describes their undertaking (195). Klein feels something derogatory here. But the negative tone, where it is present, comes in only through the context, and not through the word *ἐπιχειρεῖν*. Klein indeed affirms that its use *in malam partem* is the rule elsewhere in Luke. Disregarding for the moment the disputed passage in the prologue, only two passages in Luke call for consideration: Acts 9.29 and 19.13. In Acts 9.29 the negative tone is brought about only by the following 'to kill him'; in 19.13 it is not the attempt at exorcism as such that is censured, but the attempt by 'unqualified' people! Klein further appeals to Hermas *Sim.* IX.2.6, the only other early Christian passage which comes into question. But here again we see the same spectacle: the 'derogatory' sense is not due to the *ἐπιχειρεῖν*, but to the accompanying *ὡς συνετὸς ὢν*; one ought instead to enquire of the Lord. There can therefore be no question of *ἐπιχειρεῖν* having a 'negative touch' in Luke.

Finally Klein's interpretation of *καθεξῆς* in the Lucan prologue is untenable (210ff.). It is intended not to refer to arrangement of the material, but to be 'chronologically structured', i.e. to indicate the connection of several phases of the history; it is to mark 'the succession of *historia Jesu* and time of the Church', to bring to expression the continuation of Luke by Acts. Here also the wish appears to be the father of the thought. What reader would really guess from Luke's intimation that he intends to write in sequence—an intimation, be it noted, contained in the prologue to the *gospel*—that Luke thereby is alluding to a coming sequel in a book of Acts?

In short, the attempt to ascribe to Luke a consciously manipulated method—distinct from that of the 'many'—appears to us unsuccessful. We do not dispute that Luke's presentation does not coincide with that of Mark, however much he has taken over from Mark. Nor do we deny that Luke's Acts was something new; rather do we hope ourselves to have made that clear. What we are resisting is simply the attempt to look for the meaning of Luke in a passage where his text does not allow it.

We should however like here to go further into the questions of the Lucan picture of the early Church and of Paul, quite independently of Klein's

theses. Acts contains a remarkable contradiction not always noticed: on the one hand it is not only related that Peter converts 3,000 Jews with his preaching on Pentecost (Acts 2.41), and that after the next Petrine sermon the number of these Jewish Christians mounts to 5,000 (Acts 4.2), but finally we even hear, at 21.20, that there are many tens of thousands of Jewish Christians who are all ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου. On the other hand Luke develops in the speech of Stephen (which is even more important for the recognition of his own theology than we have indicated on pp. 289–90) a picture of the Jewish people which shows the Jews as already rebellious and unbelieving over against Moses (Acts 7.35ff.). During the sojourn in the wilderness the Jews, according to Acts 7.42f., brought sacrifices to strange gods, and on their arrival in Canaan they built the temple against God's will. They have murdered the prophets (7.52) and killed Jesus himself. Stubborn and uncircumcised in heart and ears, they always resist the Holy Spirit. Already in Peter's second speech (3.23!), but especially in Paul's first speech (13.40f.!), the possibility looms threateningly up that the Jewish listeners have missed their chance and refused the salvation offered to them in Jesus. And then three times over—before the Jews of Asia Minor (13.46), Greece (13.6) and Rome (28.28)—it is explained that the Jewish people (λαός 28.26!) has forfeited its salvation. For Luke the Jews are 'written off'. Acts 28.28 is not only a very effective conclusion of the book but also the expression of a conviction which already resounds in the Lucan account of the first sermon of Jesus at Nazareth: in the days of Elijah there were many widows in Israel, but the prophet was sent to a widow in Zarephath, hence into pagan country. And at the time of Elisha there were many lepers in Israel, but only the pagan Naaman was healed (Lk. 4.25–27).

If this however is the case, if for Luke the Jews have finally excluded themselves from salvation, why does he portray the men of the early Church and Paul as devout and law-abiding Jews? It is to Eltester's credit that he has not allowed this question to rest. We do not of course seek the answer, like Barrett and Klein, in the fact that Luke in this manner conducted an apologetic against Gnosticism. But Luke shows it is not the fault of early Christianity if the Jews reject the proffered salvation, if they 'consider themselves unworthy of eternal life' (13.46). Hence Luke grasps eagerly at all traditions which depict Paul as a law-abiding Jew; hence he reports the circumcision of Timothy; hence he has Paul come to Jerusalem already as a small child and return there as often as possible; hence he was happy to have discovered in the resurrection faith a bond between the Pharisees and the Christians. These were not the tricks of a skilful propagandist—Luke was himself convinced, precisely on the basis of such traditions, that this was actually the situation. In this context the statements about the mass conversions of Palestinian Jews at the beginning of the Church and the zeal for the law of the myriads of Jewish Christians take on particular meaning. They

prove—just like the reference back to the apostolic decree at 21.25—that the Christians were in no way guilty if the Jews hardened themselves against the Christian message of salvation.

That Luke depicts the Jewish people as a whole as in such a way abandoned is the negative side of that view of history whose positive aspect Dom J. Dupont has presented in his important and fruitful article 'Le salut des gentils et la signification théologique du Livre des Actes' (*NTS* 6 (1960) 132–55). The Gentile mission belongs from the beginning to the theme of Luke's two-fold work! It is not for nothing that Luke—alone among the evangelists!—quotes Is. 40.3–5 in full, including the words 'and all flesh will see the salvation of God' (Lk. 3.4f.). It is of this very salvation—and with the same Greek expression τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ—that Acts 28.28 also speaks: 'This salvation of God was sent to the Gentiles; they will listen!' Between these two passages, however, thus between the beginning of the actual story of Jesus in the third gospel and the end of Acts, Luke emphasizes again and again the fact that the Gentile mission belongs to God's promises which will find their fulfilment through Christ. This makes it more comprehensible than in the commentary why Luke could let Acts follow upon his gospel: it describes an event which belongs to the *Heilsgeschichte* planned by God and proclaimed. In that the gospel is made accessible to the Gentiles, a salvation promised in the Old Testament is realized, and the story of Jesus is thus continued. In this connection one may perhaps also refer expressly to the fact that Simeon's song of praise (Lk. 2.30) already speaks of this σωτήριον and then dies away in the words: φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν—the child Jesus is the light which is to be revealed to the Gentiles (cf. Acts 13.47).

Christianity for Luke is not (as Eltester thinks) the Israel of Promise, but from the beginning salvation was promised to both: the Jews and the Gentiles. The early Church consisted of devout Jews, but Judaism in the Roman Empire did not want to know anything about the proclamation of Christ, and so now the mission goes only to the Gentiles. Luke did not have a bad conscience because of the usurping of documents of the faith: the Old Testament itself warned the Jews and promised salvation to the Gentiles. What became of the myriads of believing Jewish Christians mentioned at 21.20, Luke tells us just as little as he does the fate of the Apostles. We learn only that one of these was executed by Herod Antipas. But he is not replaced: the 'Twelve Apostles' are not a permanent institution. They bore witness to the life and teaching, death and resurrection of Jesus and directed the congregation of Jerusalem until it was time for the Gentile mission. The apostolic decree is at the same time the last word of the Apostles.

III

Ulrich Wilckens in his work *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte* (Neukirchen 1961¹, 1963²) has proved against Dibelius and Dodd that

Peter's speeches in the first part of Acts do not contain any old pattern of Jewish-Christian missionary preaching. Rather Luke is here using his pattern of the Gentile Christian missionary preaching to present the early Jewish mission. This demonstration is well worthy of recognition; for it makes still clearer the manner and the extent of the Lucan composition. More important for our present purpose however is the final section of the work, the third chapter: 'Results and Outlook', and above all its second section: 'On the problem of the theological evaluation of the Lucan outline' (pp. 193–218). Beside other differences from Paul, Wilckens singles out the fact that 'the problem of the historical time of Christianity, the theological problem of Church History, and hence the historicity of the Christian faith as such' had forced itself upon the Third Evangelist. Luke's concern is thus not merely with the delay of the Parousia. This 'negative experience of the non-arrival of the events of the end' led Luke alone among the Evangelists to the 'positive discovery of the reality of history as such, which as a whole became intelligible to him as a sequence of events controlled by God and directed toward an end' (p. 201). 'The stance of the Lucan theology is . . . accordingly positively to be described as an "inclusive horizon of Christian theology"' (ibid.).

This formulation, taken over from Pannenberg's essay 'Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte' (*Kerygma und Dogma* 5 (1959) 218), shows like other things that Wilckens belongs to the group of younger theologians (Pannenberg, R. Rendtorff, D. Rössler *et al.*) who ultimately wanted to correct the follies of the older generation—that of Barth, Bultmann, Gogarten and their pupils—by setting themselves to replace the 'theology of the Word' by a 'theology of history'. In this the Lucan design, taken over from H. Conzelmann (*Die Mitte der Zeit*, ET *The Theology of St Luke*), plays an important role. True, it differs from that in Käsemann ('Das Problem des historischen Jesus', *ZThK* 51 (1954) esp. 136–9, ET in *Essays on NT Themes*, 15–47), who had likewise adopted Conzelmann's view (esp. p. 137, ET 28f.). Käsemann saw in the recession of eschatology the reason for the Lucan picture of history. According to Käsemann the Lucan period of the Apostles directly continues the *historia Jesu*, unrealistically combines the life of Jesus and the apostolic age, and sets between the latter and all post-apostolic Church History a clear caesura, because fundamentally the later Church has to live from the apostolic tradition. If the time of Jesus and the apostolic age were actually set together as a 'holy past' over against the post-apostolic Church, then Acts would in fact not offer any historical theological conception, but the time of Jesus and that of the Apostles would be set outside the limits of the normal course of history, and the *initium Christianismi* would be mythologized. This Wilckens admits (p. 208). But he declares: Paul—and with him the second half of Acts—does not represent the Apostles, but the Church as such: Paul's work already belongs to Luke's Gentile-Christian post-apostolic present. Acts does not portray a 'holy past,' but 'the real

connection of the time of Jesus, the apostolic age and post-apostolic Gentile Christianity' (p. 210).

This Lucan outline is according to Wilckens theologically legitimate. To Käsemann's critical question 'How can Jesus possess saving power for present believers . . . if Jesus himself does not continually encounter them in the present as the exalted Lord?' (*ZThK* 51 (1954) 139), Wilckens answers: 'What happens if not only do the historical Jesus and the *Christus praesens* draw apart with the progress of historical time, but at the same time also the presence of the exalted Lord detaches itself more and more from his eschatological coming?' (p. 212). If the past is to have only exemplary significance, then 'every present experience of the exalted Lord becomes of necessity a mythical *Nunc* of mythological religiosity' (213). 'That Luke consistently blocked this way to the solution of the problems of his time . . . should not be brought as a reproach against him, but rather only assessed as theologically legitimate' (213). Luke set the Jesus-event as 'the middle of time' 'at the same time in the context of a universal history understood as *Heilsgeschichte*' (*ibid.*). In so doing—Wilckens thinks—Luke did not imprison the saving event as a 'brutum factum' in a 'causal relationship' (which Jewish and primitive Christian antiquity did not know). Rather—and this in Pannenberg is a central idea—in Jesus all promises are fulfilled: 'In the life of Jesus that is *completely anticipated* which tradition described as the eschatological time of salvation . . .' (214). 'What will happen in the Parousia is thus basically the return of the exalted Lord in the *heilsgeschichtlich* function of the immediately present locus of salvation. . . .' 'The soteriological importance which pre-Lucan Christianity attributed to the eschatological coming of Christ Luke has thus consistently transferred to the past epoch of the earthly time of Jesus' (*ibid.*). The salvation which the Parousia 'will inaugurate for the elect' is 'in no respect different from the salvation which was already fully present in the earthly life of Jesus' (p. 216).

Did Luke really—as Pannenberg and Wilckens affirm—understand the past life of Jesus as proleptic, an anticipation of the future time of salvation, and thus point Christian faith back from the expectation of a mythical Parousia to the past history of Jesus of Nazareth? Wilckens admits that in the process Jesus' significance as judge of the living and the dead at the Parousia is left out of consideration (216). Luke still expects—although for an indeterminate date (Acts 3.19ff.)—the 'mythical' Parousia, after which no more sick will be healed, no more sinners converted. To that extent the earthly work of Jesus is for Luke *not* an anticipation of the consummation of all history at the Parousia. But over and above that there remains to be considered (as Wilckens himself, p. 216f., recalls to the reader's memory by spacing the type): 'The death of Jesus has' (for Luke) 'no redemptive significance, and hence the Lucan Christology in general lacks any substantial soteriology.' But what then has the (alleged) anticipation of the consummation

of the divine saving activity in the earthly life of Jesus to say to Luke's reader—and to us?

Käsemann thinks to detect a deep caesura in Luke between the time of Jesus and the Apostles and the time of the Church. Wilckens on the other hand saw such a caesura between the time of Jesus and the time which follows; only so does the time of Jesus take on for him its proleptic character. Perhaps both have read too much theory of history into Luke's work. For Luke a mighty arch stretches from Abraham to the Parousia; Luke knows that he himself—even if Jesus now dwells in heaven until his coming again, and only his name is here miraculously present—he himself is in the same time and under the same saving plan of God as the disciples in Galilee. In that Luke has Jesus meet with the Apostles for forty days before his Ascension, there is no deep caesura between the time of Jesus and that which follows. Our time (Luke does not yet use the word 'Church' in its present-day sense) in which the 'Word of God', the Christian proclamation, spreads victorious over all the earth, belongs for Luke to the saving plan of God just as much as the time of Jesus.

Admittedly we must confess: the fact that Luke thus levelled out the difference between the times did not remain without its consequences. The risen Jesus—in contrast to the Pauline doctrine—has flesh and bones again. Earth and heaven are not so far apart that a cloud cannot provide transport from here to there and back again. This massive theology (in which now and then 'direct experiences of transcendence', i.e. of God, occur) is not a positive appraisal of history. Luke is just as little an anticipation of Hegel as a Kierkegaard before his time. He seeks for his Church a way which will preserve it against the worst evil in this world; he shows his Church a meaning for its life during this time, in the victorious proclamation of the message of Christ. He no longer watches passionately, like Paul, for the imminent turn of the ages, but he lives in the certainty that even in this our time God's goodness is new every morning.