



Durham E-Theses

The gentiles and the gentile mission in Luke-acts

Wilson, S. G.

How to cite:

Wilson, S. G. (1969) *The gentiles and the gentile mission in Luke-acts*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/8125/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

THE GENTILES AND THE GENTILE MISSION
IN LUKE-ACTS

S G WILSON, B A

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged

Ph D 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	1
Table of Contents	11
Abbreviations	111-1v
Abstract	v
I Mission in the Old Testament and Judaism	1
II A Summary of the main views on Jesus' Eschatology	8
III Jesus and the Gentiles	16
IV The Gentiles in St Luke's Gospel	95
V Luke's Eschatology	138
VI The Historical Reliability of Acts	212
VII The Early Chapters of Acts	222
VIII Stephen and the Hellenists	281
IX Paul's Conversion	316
X The Conversion of Cornelius and the Apostolic Council	340
XI The Speeches to the Gentiles	374
XII Programmatic Statements about the Gentile Mission	404
XIII Conclusions	429
Bibliography	467

ABBREVIATIONS

Arndt & Gingrich	W F Arndt and F W Gingrich, "A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature", Cambridge, 1957
A R W	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, Leipzig
B C	"The Beginnings of Christianity" Vols 1-3, ed F J Foakes-Jackson and K Lake, London, 1920-26
	Vols 4 & 5, ed K Lake and H J Cadbury, London, 1933
Bib	Biblica, Rome
B J R L	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester
Blass-Debrunner	F Blass & A Debrunner, "A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian Writings" Cambridge, 1961
B Z	Biblische Zeitschrift, Freiburg
C B Q	Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Washington
E T	Expository Times, Edinburgh
E M Z	Evangelische Missionszeitschrift, Stuttgart
Expos	Expositor, London
Ev Th	Evangelische Theologie, Munich
H T R	Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
J B L	Journal of Biblical Literature, Philadelphia/Pennsylvania
J T S	Journal of Theological Studies, Oxford
Liddell & Scott	H G Liddell and R Scott, "A Greek-English Lexicon", Oxford, 1940 (revised by H S Jones)
Moulton & Milligan	J H Moulton and R Milligan, "The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament", London, 1930
N T S	New Testament Studies, Cambridge
Nov Test	Novum Testamentum, Leiden
R H Ph R	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, Strasbourg-Paris
S B	H L Strack and P Billerbeck, "Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash" (4 vols), Munich, 1922-28
S B U	Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses, Uppsala
S J T	Scottish Journal of Theology, Edinburgh
St Th	Studia Theologica, Lund
S N T S	Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societa, I-III, 1950-2, Oxford
Theol	Theology, London
Th Rund	Theologische Rundschau, Tübingen
Th Viat	Theologia Viatorum, Berlin
T L Z	Theologische Literaturzeitung, Leipzig/Berlin
T Z	Theologische Zeitschrift, Basle
T U	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristliche Literatur, Berlin

T W. N T

Vols 1-4, "Theological Dictionary of the New Testament", ed G Kittel and G Friedrich, London, 1964f Vols 5f, "Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament", ed G Kittel and G Friedrich, Stuttgart, 1955f

U N T

Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, ed H Windisch, Leipzig

Z K G

Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, Stuttgart

Z N W.

Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Berlin

Z T K

Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, Tübingen

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is twofold. First, to make a detailed study of the theme of the Gentiles and the Gentile mission in Luke-Acts. And second, to use these results as an avenue of approach to broader problems in the teaching of both Jesus and Luke. As regards Jesus, how his teaching on the Gentiles is related to his eschatology. As regards Luke, both how he sees the relationship between Jesus' view of the Gentile mission and eschatology and how far his account of this mission in Acts squares up with the actual course of events, so far as they can be deduced from the illogicalities and tensions within Acts itself and from the first-hand accounts of Paul.

Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles is studied and used as a key to understanding his eschatology. Luke's presentation of Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles is then examined, to see how far it differs from the views both of Mark and of Jesus himself. Luke's presentation of Jesus' eschatology is then considered, to see if and how he alters Jesus' eschatology to fit his presentation of Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles. The main sections in Acts which relate to Luke's presentation of the Gentile mission are then examined, in order to discover both Luke's view of the Gentile mission and how close his account is to the historical facts.

The main conclusions are that Jesus did not foresee a Gentile mission such as occurred after his death, a fact which is explained by his eschatology and which explains many of the problems which arose in the early stages of the Gentile mission, that Luke's presentation of the Gentile mission and Jesus' eschatology shows him to be a pastor and a historian rather than a theologian, a point which is emphasized by a comparison with Paul, and that while Luke's account in Acts is often misleading, he has left enough loose ends to make it a valuable historical source for the careful and critical reader.

CHAPTER IMISSION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND JUDAISM

Material which falls under this heading forms an essential part of the background to the teaching of Jesus and the practice of the early Church. However, a long and detailed discussion is unnecessary, since the majority of recent authors have reached similar and, as far as one can see, correct conclusions on this subject.¹ A brief outline of these conclusions will, therefore, suffice.

The most important distinction to be made at this point is that between mission and universalism. The latter notion asserts that God is Lord of all the earth, including all the nations other than Israel, but it does not imply that Israel has any responsibility for evangelising other peoples. The idea that God is the Lord of all Creation may be an essential presupposition for universal mission, but the idea of mission is not, at least for the Old Testament, a logical implicate of universalism. Further, the process of assimilation, whereby an alien who lived among Israelites eventually became accepted as one of them - for example Ruth - is also to be distinguished from mission. Such cases resulted not from any missionary work of Israel's, but from the fact that they happened to be living among Israelites.

A fundamental element of missionary inspiration is the notion of monotheism. Old Testament monotheism allows for the existence of other

¹ Jeremias, pp11-19, 57-62, Hahn, pp18-25, Bosch, pp17-43, Munck, pp264-72, Martin-Achard, pp8f, Alt, Z T K, 56, 1959, pp129f

gods, but they are always considered to be inferior to Yahweh and the exclusive claim of the God of Israel is continually asserted, above all in the first commandment. This finds its logical development in the prophets, where not only these gods, but also the nations they represent, are seen to be both used by and subordinated to Yahweh, as for example Cyrus in Is 45 1.

The classic expression of the Old Testament's most consistent positive approach to the nations is to be found in Is 2 2-4 (Mal 4 1-4). This is the idea of the nations' pilgrimage to Zion in the last days when they will witness the glory of Yahweh as mediated in and expressed through his relationship with Israel. The seeds of this idea are found in the earliest traditions of Israel, namely the promise to Abraham (Gen 12 3). Whether one translates the promise reflexively or passively, in either case it is clear that Abraham and his descendants play an important role for all mankind. The reflexive rendering, whereby God's blessing of Abraham will become proverbial for all mankind, excludes any notion of mission. The passive rendering, which makes Israel the means whereby God's blessing is bestowed on all nations, leaves undefined how this will take place. No mention is made of a mission of Israel and it would probably best be interpreted in line with Is 2 2-4. The notion of the nations' pilgrimage to Zion is not limited to Isaiah and Malachi, it crops up regularly in both pre- and post-exilic prophecy (Is 18 7, Jer 3 17, 16 19, Is 45 18-25, 60 1f, Zeph 3 8-11, Hag 2 6-9, Zech 2 10-13, 14 16, cf Ps 68 29-31, 86 9, 96 8-10). The important elements to be noted in all of these passages are the following: first, in all of them Israel is the centre of attention, it is God's relation-

-ship with her which the nations see and respond to Second, none of them speak of a missionary role of Israel, rather, it is emphasized that the influx of the nations is a result solely of the intervention of God Third, a point related to the last one, the view of history implied in these passages is centripetal and not centrifugal, Israel does not go out to reach the nations, but the nations come to Jerusalem to witness God's dealings with Israel Finally, it should be noted that most of these passages see these events as occurring in the End-time and not before

To those passages mentioned above can be added others, such as Mal 1 11, Is 19 21f, and the frequent references in the Psalms to the whole of Creation praising God (Ps 9 11, 66 8, 67 5, 117 1 etc) The exact interpretation of some of these texts is disputed, for example Mal 1 11, but the general drift is clear they express some form of universalism, either in terms of God's activity or in terms of men's worship of him But none of them speak of any sort of mission which Israel has to the nations, so that they do not add anything to the conclusions drawn above¹

The two main places to which people point when they wish to prove that the Old Testament has a concept of mission are Jonah and II Isaiah² The book of Jonah has been seen as 'the missionary manual par excellence'³ or as an apology for the legitimacy of missionary work among the heathen But nothing is said in the book about a preaching mission for which Israel, as represented by Jonah, is responsible Jonah is sent to warn

1 Martin-Achard, pp41f and the literature cited there

2. Gelin - quoted by Martin-Achard, p50

3 Bousset, p82

the Ninevites of their impending doom rather than to persuade them to embrace Israel's faith, and nothing is said about the Ninevites believing in Israel's God. His oracle is reminiscent of the many prophetic oracles against the nations. The main point of the book is not to inspire Israel to missionary endeavour, but to correct a false conception of God prevalent at that time. The writer of Jonah lays stress on the infinite mercy of God and, by pointing to God's concern for the fate of all the nations (cf Am 9 7), tries to correct a narrow and particularist conception of God. The book is about God's and not Israel's relationship with the nations.

The prophecies of II Isaiah have frequently been seen as the supreme expression of the Old Testament view of mission.¹ The twin themes of universalism and monotheism are fundamental to II Isaiah's thought and, it is argued, they inevitably imply a concept of mission. Rowley's statement is typical: "With him universalism was the corollary of monotheism, and the world-wide mission of Israel the corollary of her election."² Within II Isaiah the 'locus classicus' for this missionary theme is said to be the Servant songs, especially 42 1-6, 49 6. The Servant's role is to announce justice to, make a covenant with, and be a light amongst the nations, and to spread salvation to the ends of the earth. But although at first sight this may seem a valid interpretation, a closer look shows that the facts are not so straightforward as they appear. First, II Isaiah is addressing a defeated and dispirited people,

1 Eg Volz, p169, Jacob, p220

2 Rowley, "Faith", p185

many of whom, as a result of their exile, had begun to doubt God's concern for them as a nation. Isaiah's primary aim was to bring a message of comfort to his people, in order to bolster up their shattered faith. To this end he stresses the themes of monotheism and universalism. They are not treated as themes in their own right, but are subordinated to his main purpose of bringing comfort to his people. Second, it has been pointed out that there is an equally, if not more, emphatic particularist strain in II Isaiah. Frequent reference is made to the punishment of the nations (41 11f, 43 3f, 47 1f, 49 23, 51 23) and although it is said that Cyrus will be used by God (45 1, 44 28), this is solely to fulfil his purpose for the restoration of Israel.¹ Third, the key words in the Servant songs are all ambiguous. Each of the phrases - חֹשֶׁבֶת

לְאֹרֶךְ יָמִים , גְּרִיטָהּ - can legitimately be interpreted² in a particularist or in a universalist way. Taking all these points into account, it becomes apparent that there is no concept of mission in II Isaiah. The whole book, including the Servant songs, is directed towards the salvation of the people of God and not the salvation of the whole world. Certainly, the salvation which is effected by God in Israel will have universal repercussions, and in this sense Israel is God's witness to all peoples. But this witness does not involve an outreach to the nations, rather, by her very existence as the people of God, Israel testifies to the greatness of God. Confronted by the work of God in Israel, the heathen will be subdued and will give him the glory due to his Name. Although II Isaiah's assessment of the role of suffering in Israel's

¹ Snaith, pp186-200

² Martin-Achard, pp8-31, Davidson, S J T , 16, 1963, pp166-85

fortunes is profound, in terms of mission he, like the author of the book of Jonah, does not add anything to the conclusions we drew from the rest of the Old Testament II Isaiah's originality lies in his profound reinterpretation of familiar ideas and not in the production of novel ideas about mission

In later Judaism some of these Old Testament themes are preserved but some new factors also call for consideration The notion of the eschatological pilgrimage of the nations is retained, but it plays a less important role (Tob 13 13, Sib Or III 716f, 772f, Test Ben 9 2,

1
1En 10 21, 48 5, 53 1, 90 33, Ps Sol 17 31, IV Ezr 13 12f) In Apocalyptic writings and the Qumran literature there is no evidence for the idea of winning over the Gentiles, the opposite hope, namely for
2
their destruction, is far more predominant Even within the Rabbinic
3
tradition, for example among the Shammaites, a negative attitude is found

On the more positive side, Hellenistic Judaism went a long way to make converts in the form of proselytes or God-fearers, although the
4
extent of this Diaspora mission is uncertain In Palestinian Judaism extensive efforts were made to contact non-Jews, particularly under the influence of R Hillel Here the aim seems always to have been to gain a proselyte whenever possible, whereas in the Diaspora this was not considered to be of such vital importance Some writers conclude that the efforts of Diaspora Judaism are best described as religious propaganda, while the proselytizing movements were aimed only at the naturalization

1 Jeremiah, pp61f, Hahn, pp21f

2 Hahn, p21, Schweitzer, "Mysticism", pp177f, Bosch, pp35f, and on Qumran see Kuhn, E M Z , 11, 1954, pp163f

3 Jeremiah, p16

4 Hahn, pp21-4 and the material quoted there

of Gentiles and not at their worship of the true God. How far this is a fair distinction is not easy to say since, as Jeremias says, there was "an inseparable connection between religion and national custom"¹ In the process of evangelizing the Gentiles the Jews therefore naturally demanded some form of naturalization, since they could not conceive of their faith in any other way. Their viewpoint was limited, but it need not necessarily carry unhealthy nationalistic undertones. Having said this, and noting how these proselytizing efforts paved the way for the later Christian missions, it is important to distinguish these phenomena from the concept of mission as it developed in the early Church. The Jewish approach to the heathen was basically a matter of private enterprise undertaken by individuals, it did not spring from a belief that the community as a whole had a responsibility for all mankind. Also, the eschatological basis of the Gentiles' conversion, which is so important both in the Old Testament and in the early Church, plays no role in the efforts of Judaism. Nor is there any consciousness of a special Divine commission for this task. Finally, there is the limitation of their nationalistic approach, an attitude from which, if at first a little reluctantly, the early Church did eventually break free.

¹ Jeremias, p17

8
CHAPTER II

A SUMMARY OF THE MAIN VIEWS ON JESUS' ESCHATOLOGY

The main purpose of this chapter is simply to outline the main views on Jesus' eschatology, concentrating in particular on the question of when he expected the End to come. The intention is not to criticize, but simply to state, the various viewpoints. When this has been done, it will be shown how each viewpoint logically affects Jesus' attitude towards the Gentile mission. A detailed study of Jesus' attitude to the Gentile mission will then be made and, by reversing the logic, conclusions drawn about Jesus' views on eschatology.

For our purposes the views on Jesus' eschatology fall broadly into two camps: those who believe Jesus expected the End to come either simultaneously with his death and vindication or after a delay of just a few years, and those who claim that Jesus foresaw an indefinite continuation of history after his death. The former view, often labelled 'konsequente Eschatologie', is particularly associated with the name of A. Schweitzer, and the latter view, often called 'realized eschatology', with the name of C. H. Dodd. Clearly, various combinations of these two basic viewpoints are possible, and when we lump together various scholars under these two main headings this is not meant to imply that they share a uniform outlook, but simply that their conclusions on the one point which concerns us, namely Jesus' dating of the End, are similar. A combination of imminent futurist eschatology with the notion of the Kingdom in the process of realization in Jesus' ministry gives the same result for Jesus' view of the Gentile mission as Schweitzer's view does. Similarly, a combination of realized with indefinite futurist eschatology

has the same results for mission as the view of Dodd

After his remorseless 'exposé' of the weaknesses of the 19th century liberal lives of Jesus Schweitzer, building on the work of J Weiss, offers an interpretation of the life and teaching of Jesus which places eschatology at the very centre. All the other themes of his teaching are subordinated to this one central factor - Jesus' expectation of an imminent End. He is portrayed as a sort of eschatological storm-trooper, who is dominated by the belief that by his life and, above all, by his sacrificial death he can precipitate the End. But this was not Jesus' original view for, according to Schweitzer, he underwent a radical change in mid-stream. At first, Jesus sent the disciples out on a preaching mission which he believed would usher in the End (Matt 10, especially v23) consequently he did not expect them to return. But the disciples did return (Mk 6 30) and the End did not come. Jesus, therefore, had to re-think his position radically. As a result of reflection on the Servant figure in II Isaiah and on the fate of John the Baptist, he realizes that he must bear the suffering alone. He must himself absorb all the Messianic woes, die vicariously on behalf of the many (Mk 10 45), and thereby precipitate the End. In the one act he could fulfil his Messianic vocation and bring in the Kingdom of God. Thus he expected the End to occur simultaneously with his own death. There would be no gap between the Resurrection and the Parousia, his own and the general Resurrection would be one and the same event¹

Into this basic outline Schweitzer fits much of the Gospel narrative. Jesus' ethical teaching is characterized as an 'Interimsethik',

1 Schweitzer, pp358-90, Schweitzer "Mystery", pp226-40

appropriate only to the short period before the End¹ Jesus knew himself to be the Messiah from the start, but the three disciples discovered this only after the Transfiguration and the ordinary people, including John the Baptist, never² Jesus also both knew and prophesied that he would be revealed as the Son of Man when the Kingdom of God came His whole life was shot through with events of an eschatological nature his baptism, the feedings of the multitudes, the Entry into Jerusalem and the Last Supper³ In fact, everything which Schweitzer considered to be authentic in the Gospel records of Jesus' life is both subordinated to and interpreted by the dominant theme of eschatology⁴

A common variation on Schweitzer's view is typified in the view of W G Kümmel He accepts Schweitzer's main contention, namely that Jesus expected an imminent End, but modifies it to allow for a short interval between Jesus Resurrection and Parousia Jesus' expectation of an imminent End is made clear, he thinks, in such passages as Mk 9 1, 13 30pars , 14 25,62, Matt 10 23, Lk 18 8, and the parables of watchfulness, Mk 13 34f, Lk 12 36-8, Matt 12 42f, 25 1f⁵ He then goes on to argue that there is no evidence that Jesus ever connected his own death and Resurrection with the coming of the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man⁶ Rather, he foresaw that there would be a short interval between these two events - a view which Kümmel finds in Mk 2 18, 14 28, 16 7, Lk 17 22, 18 8a, and

1 Schweitzer, pp352f, Schweitzer, "Mystery", pp84-115

2 Schweitzer pp380-3, Schweitzer, "Mystery", pp132f

3 Schweitzer, pp377-8, 375, 318, Schweitzer, "Mystery", pp169f

4 Of the same view as Schweitzer are, to mention only a few, Bultmann, "Theol", I, pp3-8, "Word" pp35f, Barrett, "Spirit", pp157f and S J T , 6, 1953, pp163f, 225f, Cullmann, "Time", pp88, 149, "Church", pp148f, Owen, S J T , 12, 1959, pp171f, F W Manson, "Teaching", pp277f

5 Kümmel pp19-63

6 Kümmel, pp64-74

¹
Matt 23 27-9 Thus while he has modified Schweitzer's view, Kümmel has not abandoned the central point, namely that Jesus' whole life and ministry was dominated by his expectation of an imminent End²

The work of C H Dodd leads us to completely different conclusions For him, the most distinctive, characteristic and unequivocal of Jesus' sayings about the Kingdom of God are those which state that it has already come in his own ministry (Mk 1 15, 9 1, Matt 5 13, 10 15, 12 28, 13 34-6 Lk 7 18-30, 10 9,11,23-4, 11 31-2) Of all Jesus' sayings, these cannot be ignored, since they dislocate the traditional eschatological scheme by claiming that the End has moved from the future to the present For Dodd these sayings are fundamental, they provide the key to the whole of Jesus' teaching³

Yet Dodd was too honest not to admit that there was still a considerable amount of Jesus' teaching which pointed to the future How then are we to interpret it ? Some sayings, like Mk 14 25 and Matt 8 11, are to be interpreted not on the present-future but on the earthly-transcendent scale They speak of eternal and not of future realities Further, although Jesus forecast future disasters which would overtake both himself and the Jews, including the destruction of the Temple, he saw them as historical and not as apocalyptic events (Mk 8 34, 10 44, 13 2,14f, 14 58, Matt 23 37-3, Lk 10 9-11, 11 31-2, 13 1-5,34-5 19 40-4, 21 20-4)⁴⁵

1 Kümmel, pp74-86

2 Cf Beasley-Murray, p183f, Cadoux, pp194-203, 280-98 It is difficult to place someone like Taylor ("Life", pp76f), who thinks that apocalyptic ideas were important at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, but that their importance diminished as his ministry progressed

3 Dodd, pp36-41

4 Dodd, pp43-5

5 Dodd, pp46-61

However, there are still other predictions of the future which are not references to historical events some of these, for example references to Judgement (Matt 10 15, 11 21-2, 12 41-7), are to be explained simply as Jesus' use of vivid and familiar language to solemnize his warnings, others, such as references to the Day of the Son of Man (Mk 13 24-6, 14 62, Matt 24 27, 37-9), do not necessarily refer to the Son of Man as Judge on the final Judgement Day¹

Even so, there are still other predictions of Jesus which seem to imply that he saw the Resurrection, Ascension and Parousia as one and the same event (Mk 8 31, 9 31, 10 34, 14 28,62), and these are not easy to reconcile with Jesus' ethical teaching which, Dodd thinks, implies a continuation of history after Jesus' death Their reconciliation is possible only when we understand the symbolic character of Jesus' apocalyptic language It is meant to be taken not literally, but as an expression of the absolute, eternal order beyond this realm of time and space Since the historical order cannot contain all the significance of the absolute, this futurist, apocalyptic language symbolism is retained, in an attempt to express ultimate truths "But these future tenses are only an accommodation of language There is no coming of the Son of Man in history after his coming in Galilee and Jerusalem whether soon or late, for there is no before or after in the eternal order "²

This then was Jesus' teaching But it was misunderstood by the early Christians, who interpreted the apocalyptic language literally and began to hope for a second advent Jesus did not intend us to think of an³

1 Dodd, pp62-73

2 Dodd, pp74-82, quotation from p81, Dodd, "Preaching", pp82-96

3 Dodd, pp144, Dodd, "Preaching", pp32-46

imminent end of history which would occur after his death, rather, he believed that the End had already come with his own life and ministry. History was to be an ongoing, if transformed, process.

Dodd's basic conclusions have been used by several other scholars, particularly in the work of T. F. Glasson. He thinks that those who believe Jesus expected an imminent End fail to distinguish the end of the world from the end of an age, have false views on the Messianic hope of Jesus' contemporaries, and neglect both the symbolic character of apocalyptic language and the Rabbinic notion of the Kingdom of God as an earthly Kingdom.¹ That Jesus expected a continuation of history is clear from his teaching on ethics, the Church and the Gentile mission.² The early Church misunderstood Jesus' teaching by failing to realize that the End had been fulfilled in his ministry and, by using Old Testament passages out of context, they aroused belief in an imminent End.³ Like Glasson, J. A. T. Robinson also tries to show that the Parousia belief of the early Church does not correspond to the expectation of the historical Jesus. Unlike Glasson, however, he admits that Jesus did expect a future consummation of all things, a general Resurrection and a final Judgement,⁴ which would involve the separation of the saved and the lost. However, in his overall interpretation of Jesus' teaching this theme plays no great role and is never clearly defined. Robinson's emphasis is on realized eschatology, and most of the references to future events in

1 Glasson, pp110f

2 Glasson, pp138-53

3 Glasson, pp204-8

4 Robinson, pp36f

Jesus' teaching are interpreted in terms of historical rather than
¹
 apocalyptic occurrences

Finally, we can note the more theological understanding of the tension between realized and future eschatology, which also allows for an extensive continuation of history after Jesus' death. For example, C. E. B. Cranfield's statement that, "In some sense the Parousia is near. It is near, not in the sense that it must necessarily occur within a month or a few years, but in the sense that it may occur at any moment and in the sense that, since the decisive event of history has already taken place in the ministry, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, all subsequent history is a kind of epilogue, an interval inserted by God's mercy in order to allow men time for repentance, and, as such an epilogue, necessarily in a real sense short, even though it may last a very long time."² This dialectic approach to eschatology assumes that Jesus did believe in an imminent End, but that this belief was such that it did not preclude him from foreseeing that history might well continue for several centuries.

In one way or another, therefore, scholars can be placed into one of two main groups: those who think Jesus expected the End to come simultaneously with or soon after his death, and those who believe that he foresaw that history would continue indefinitely or at least for a very long time. On the first view, Jesus could not have expected, prophesied or commanded a Gentile mission such as we know took place after his death, since he did not envisage any continuation of history. Even

1 Cf Wilder, pp51-69, who also holds a view similar to Dodd's

2 Cranfield, S. J. T., 16, 1963, pp300-1, Cranfield, p408, cf Barth, C. D., I, 1, pp530f, whose view is at times also close to Dodd's

if he expected there to be a short interval between his resurrection and the Parousia, such an interval would scarcely be long enough to contain a mission such as is envisaged in Mk 13 10 pars , a problem which Kümmel recognizes and then solves by denying that Jesus foresaw a Gentile mission On the second view, where Jesus foresees an indefinite period of ongoing history, he could have foreseen and prophesied the Gentile mission which took place after his death For those who think he did envisage such a mission, this can become - as with Glasson - an argument against Jesus having expected an imminent End Our task now is to make a detailed study of Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles and the Gentile mission, and to try to work back from this to his probable views on eschatology

JESUS AND THE GENTILES

In dealing with the question of Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles we will be faced with two conflicting strands of evidence. This has inevitably led to strong suspicions about the authenticity of one or the other strand, or even of both. We shall discuss first, therefore, the material which can reasonably be said to be authentic to see whether it gives a uniform picture. The more controversial texts will be left till last, so that they can be discussed in relation to the overall picture gained from the other material. Further, it should be noted that two distinct questions are in mind throughout this study: first, what was Jesus' attitude towards the Gentiles and second, the more specific question, did he foresee a historical Gentile mission? A full treatment of these questions would also involve a complete study of Jesus' attitude towards the Jews, since these two themes are closely interlocked. However, as our main task is to discover Jesus' attitude towards the historical Gentile mission, his attitude towards the Jews will be dealt with only incidentally as it arises in connection with our main theme. Moreover, Jesus' negative attitude towards the Gentiles, when he condemns some of their customs and ways - saluting their brethren (Matt 5 47), prayers (Matt 6 7), anxieties (Matt 6 31-2) and lordly authority (Matt 20 25) - while important, is again only indirectly related¹ to our main theme, so that we can merely note it here and leave it at that.

Jesus, the Sinners and the Samaritans

Two points can be noted here which have a bearing on our theme.

1 Jesus' turning to the tax-collectors and sinners breaks through one

¹ Manson, "Jesus", p3, thinks Matt 7 6 shows Jesus forbidding the disciples to preach to Gentiles, Jeremias, p20 n8, and Schniewind, "Matt", p98 see the reference to be to all who refuse God's calling (cf II Pet 2 22) - a more likely interpretation.

of the religious barriers of his day and can be seen as "a necessary step for the door also to be opened to the Gentiles "¹

²
2 Jesus' attitude to the Samaritans also oversteps one of the most bitter hostilities of his day - that between Jews and Samaritans (of Lk 9 51, 17 18, Jn 4 9, 8 48)³ This is not to say that Jesus made any real attempt to reach the Samaritans (Lk 9 55, 10 25-37, 17 11f), this is in fact unlikely (Matt 10 5-6) But the evidence, such as it is, shows Jesus ignoring the conventional attitude of most of the Jews of his day

Jesus' Northern Journey

⁴
It appears from Mark (7 24-8 36) that Jesus made a journey North and East of Galilee The motivation for this journey is variously explained as a withdrawal to solitude,⁵ a flight from Herod,⁶ or an attempt to reach the outposts of the Jewish nation⁷ The last suggestion is probably correct, but it is not certain or, for our purposes, important It is important that Jesus clearly made no attempt to preach to the inhabitants, if anything, he⁸ tried to avoid them⁹ The inhabitants were probably Jews, at least in part, and it is possible that Mark understood them to be Jews as well

1 Liechtenhahn, p34, quoted by Hahn, p30

2 The religious status of the Samaritans is obscure (S B , I, pp538-60) The Mishnah gives a fair scope of attitudes the Samaritans can be seen as equal to Jews (Ber 7 1, Dem 3 4, 6 1, Ter 3 9), as suspect (Ber 8 8, Shek 1 5, Kid 4 3), or they can be likened to swine (Dem 5 9), bastards (Ket 3 1) and unclean things (Nid 4 1, 7 4) This evidence is of course late and indirect, most of it dating from a period when relations were better than in Jesus' day

3 Jeremias, pp42-3

4 Mk 3 7 should be mentioned here Hahn, p112, thinks both Jews and Gentiles came to Jesus, many restrict it to the Jews Hahn is probably correct, but it is at any rate only an editorial summary of Mark's

5 Bosch, p97, Cranfield, p246

6 Wellhausen, "Mk", pp44f

7 Hahn, p31, Jeremias, pp35f

8 So most commentators Taylor, pp632-6 Cranfield, p246, Bosch, pp96-7, Marxsen, p44, Jeremias, pp35-7

9 Alt, "Stätten", pp436f, Hahn, pp112f

We certainly cannot, with Spitta, make this journey the basis for calling Jesus the first Christian missionary. If Mark did intend this, then the only real evidence he offers is the story of the Syrophenician woman which, as we shall see, scarcely bears out this interpretation. That Jesus must have had limited contact with some Gentiles in Galilee and Jerusalem is probably true, but scarcely significant.

Matt 8 11, Lk 13 28

We turn now to a discussion of the main passages in the Synoptics which are relevant to our study, starting with one whose authenticity is rarely doubted. There are several factors which support its authenticity:

a The text contains Aramaisms ⁴ πολλοί, which means 'a great multitude' or even 'all', ⁵ ὑμᾶς δε ἐκβαλλομένους ⁶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, and ⁷ οἱ δε υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας.

b The style is Semitic. Matthew has antithetic parallelism and Luke an adverbial clause and parataxis.

c The verse is cast in a Jewish thought-mode, namely the ideas of the Messianic Banquet and of the damned seeing the blessed.

1 Spitta, pp109f

2 Attempts to interpret Jesus' immediate refusal and later acceptance of the Gentile woman as the last psychological revulsion against his necessary turning to the Gentiles are wholly speculative.

3 Jeremias, p37, may be right when he uses Rom 15 7f to support this view. If Paul could have referred to activity of Jesus amongst the Gentiles, it would have strengthened his point, as it was he had to resort to OT examples. This may, however, be reading too much into the text.

4 This appeal to Aramaisms, Semitic structure and Jewish thought-modes will recur frequently in the following pages. We do not assume, as Jeremias normally does, that we are therefore dealing with the 'ipsissima vox Jesu'. Clearly, they could also be the creation of the Aramaic-speaking Church. However, it can be used as a tool - one of the few objective ones we have - for hinting at the reliability of a passage.

5 Jeremias, pp55f

6 Black p63, sees this phrase as an unfortunate rendering of an Aramaic original.

7 IV Ezr 7 38, S B, II, pp228f

The whole passage is packed with Old Testament and Jewish notions, though there is one idea which is unique the connection of the Gentiles with the Messianic Banquet is not found in Judaism and may well be an original interpretation of Jesus. The ¹ πολλοί here are clearly the Gentiles, since they are contrasted with 'the sons of the Kingdom', that is, the Jews (cf Matt 11 19). The time reference is, however, disputed. Some authors, unconvincingly, refer it to the present reality of Jesus' ministry. Hahn claims that the reference is not merely " to the future, but that the future and present aspects are bound up together ", and he points to Lk ³ 12 8 for support. But although it is true that there is evidence for speaking of realized eschatology or eschatology in the process of realization in the teaching of Jesus, this cannot justify Hahn's illegitimate combination and confusion of the present and future aspects. That they can be combined is true, but future references remain future references. The reference in this verse is clearly to a future apocalyptic event ⁴. This is shown by the presence of the Patriarchs, the irrevocable judgement on the sons of the Kingdom, the traditional apocalyptic themes of the Messianic Banquet and the outer darkness, and the future tenses of the verbs.

We note in conclusion the privileged position of Israel is challenged, the Gentiles will definitely be included in the Kingdom, and the reference is unequivocally to an apocalyptic as against a historical future.

Matt 11 21-4 par Lk 10 13-6, Matt. 10 15 par Lk 10 12

These words are normally considered to be authentic, on the grounds

-
- 1 Hahn, p34
 - 2 Guy, p47, Sharman, p128
 - 3 Hahn, p34 n2
 - 4 Jeremias, p55, Kümmel, p85

1 that the language and style point to the ancient nature of the text, this is the only place where we have a reference to a ministry of Jesus in
 2 Chorazin, the words are so striking that they are only intelligible on the lips of Jesus. These appear to be good grounds for accepting the verses as genuine. The longer version of Matthew is probably to be preferred, since it preserves the strophic parallelism. In the Old Testament Tyre and Sidon are seen as the epitome of heathen sin and pride (Ezek 26-8) and Sodom and Gomorrah as the scene of the vilest heathen practices (Gen 13-8). Thus in the milieu of 1st century Palestine these words are particularly vivid and striking. These places and their inhabitants, condemned outright in the Old Testament, will fare better in the Judgement than those who refuse Jesus.

C J Cadoux gives these words an improbable historical reference - to
 3 the coming Roman war and the massacre by Roman legions. They appear, however, to refer explicitly to an eschatological future, namely the Day of
 4 Judgement. Exactly what the implications are for the fate of these Gentile cities is not clear. The most one can say is that they may, in a roundabout way, share in the final salvation for it only says that they will fare better than those who refuse Jesus - which is not saying much.

Matt 12 38-42, Lk 11 29-32, Mk 8 11-12

Few would doubt that this saying about signs is, in one form or

1 So Hahn, p34, Jeremias, p50, Manson, p77, Schniewind, "Matt", p162. Bultmann (p112) thinks them unauthentic because (a) Jesus' life is seen as a past event. But this is true only in Matt 11 20, which is probably Matthew's editorial introduction to the sayings, and at any rate, the reference could be to Jesus' ministry up to that point. (b) It is difficult to think that Jesus thought Capernaum could be exalted by his preaching. But it is not clear that this is the meaning of Lk 10 16, the main idea is not her exaltation, but her ignominious descent. (c) They reflect the failure of Christian preaching in Capernaum. But this is an unprovable and unnecessary assumption.

2 Jeremias, p59

3 Cadoux, p268

4 Hahn, p34, Kümmel, pp36-7

another, a genuine saying of Jesus. It contains one unequivocal and one possible reference to the Gentiles. To take the more obscure reference first, Jesus and Jonah were both signs to their respective generations - but how? Related to this is the question of the original form of the logion

2

a Lohmeyer thinks that Mk 8 12 is the original core and all the rest embellishment. However, the enigmatic reference to the 'sign of Jonah' does not smack of a later addition, and the versions which include this phrase may reflect an Aramaic idiom

3

4

b Schniewind sees Matt 12 40, which draws a parallel with the Resurrection, as the original form. It would then be a close parallel to the sayings about the vindication of the Son of Man 'after three days', which to some scholars would support, and to others would undermine, its authenticity. The parallel was close enough for Matthew since he does not appear to distinguish 'on the third day' from 'after three days' (Matt 16 21, 27 63), and Luke may have omitted it because it did not fit the actual events of Jesus' death and resurrection. However, Matthew's version does draw a rather unnatural parallel between Jonah and Jesus and it looks suspiciously like a later attempt to interpret Jesus' enigmatic saying about the 'sign of Jonah',

6

c Bultmann claims that Lk 11 30 is the original form and takes the reference to be to the future coming of the Son of Man. As Jonah came from a

1 Bultmann, pp112-3, rejects it on the grounds of its striking similarity to Matt 11 21-4, which he thinks is secondary - on which see above

2 Lohmeyer, "Mk", p156 n4

3 Perrin, p193, calls it a 'relative negation', where an apparent exception is in fact an affirmation (Matt 15 24, 25 29, Mk 2 17, Jn 1 11, 7 16)

4 Schniewind, "Matt", p162, Barrett, "Spirit", pp90f, Cullmann, "Christology", pp62f. Seidilin, St Th 5, 1951, pp119-31, thinks Matt 12 40 is Matthean, but nevertheless close to Jesus' original meaning

5 To many (eg Higgins, p134) the identification of Jesus with the Son of Man is a sure sign of secondary origin

6 Bultmann, pp112-3. Klostermann, "Matt", pp111f, Jüngel, pp257-8, Higgins, pp134f

distance , so will the Son of Man come in judgement on this generation
 The main support for this view is the future tense of ἔσται in v30
 However, one cannot ignore the ὥστε of vv31-2 (cf Matt 12 41-2), which
 stands in contrast to the future tense of v30 The parallel is also un-
 natural, since there was no vindication of Jonah If Luke did intend a
 reference to the Parousia in v30, then this should probably be seen as
 a secondary interpretive^{at} addition

¹
 d Kümmel and others offer the most convincing interpretation when they
 take Matt 12 39, Lk 11 29 as the original saying of Jesus and interpret the
 similarity between Jesus and Jonah in a general way, as referring to their
 preaching of repentance in the face of impending doom However, this does
 not justify Cadoux's suggestion that the important point of comparison be-
 tween Jonah and Jesus is that they both preached to the Gentiles, for even²
 if we claim that Jesus foresaw the Gentile mission, there is no evidence
 that he preached to the Gentiles Jesus as the preacher of judgement is
 the sign and not Jesus as the preacher to the Gentiles

Thus what we described as a possible reference to the Gentiles turns
 out not to be a reference at all Our only clear reference to them is in³
 the statement that they will judge the Jews - another startling, direct
 reversal of Jewish expectation In their day they responded to the revela-
 tion of God, such as it was, in Jonah and Solomon, but Jesus' generation

1 Kümmel, p68, Taylor, pp361-3, T&dt, p53, Jeremias, p50, Hahn, p36, Manson, p90
 2 Cadoux, p153 Micheal, J 1 S , 21, 1920, pp146-59, thinks the original
 saying referred to the preaching of John the Baptist as the sign Glombitza,
 N 1 S , 8, 1962, pp359-66, thinks the verse speaks of a sign given to the
 Son of Man (cf Matt 24 30), ie his deliverance from death Howton, S J T , 15,
 1962, pp288-304, thinks the original saying referred to the redemption of
 the remnant of Israel by the Son of Man, since in Jewish symbolism Israel =
 dove and in Aramaic dove = Jonah

3 Jeremias, p50, thinks ἀνίστασθαι (ἐγείρεσθαι) μετὰ τινος is the same as the
 Aramaic ܕܝܢܐ ܕܝܢܐ , which means 'to appear in court with someone',
 probably as a hostile witness, and that ܕܝܢܐ ܕܝܢܐ is a

have rejected him These Gentiles will, therefore, have a privileged position in the Last Judgement

The light under the bushel Mk 4 21, Matt 5 15, Lk 8 16, 11 33f

The Evangelists themselves interpret this saying differently, probably because they did not know its original meaning The 'light' refers to the disciples in Matt 5 15, to the gospel in Mk 4 21, and to the inner light within a man in Lk 11 33f The original reference was probably to Jesus himself and/or the Kingdom of God, alluding to their present hiddenness¹ and future open manifestation

2

Both I W Manson and Jeremias claim that there is an allusion to the Gentiles in this logion - Manson via the use of Is 42 6 and Jeremias via the idea of God's eschatological light shining forth from Zion which is a call to the nations to come Manson's parallel, on the basis of the single catchword 'light', is, however, unwarranted and Jeremias' only a possibility, since there is no evidence either that *λύχνος* was solely or even chiefly an eschatological term for Jesus or that he would connect it with the Gentiles However, if there is a reference to the Gentiles in this verse, it is to their inclusion in the future manifestation of the Kingdom of God

The mustard seed Mk 4 30-2 pars (cf the Leaven, Matt 13 32 par)

Hahn says that this passage is editorial, in particular v32, but he³ offers no evidence for this opinion and it does not seem well-founded Two main references to the Gentiles are seen in these words first, in some

(cont) Semitism meaning 'to bring a charge against someone'

1 Since in the Gospels both the Kingdom and Jesus' Messiahship are presently hidden but will be made manifest in the future, it is difficult to choose here - if choosing is necessary

2 Manson, pp92-3, Jeremias, p67

3 Hahn, p39 n1, Black, p123, shows that when translated back into Aramaic, this parable would give clever alliteration and word-play

Jewish literature 'birds' can mean Gentiles,¹ and second, *κατασκηνοῦν* is often an eschatological term and is sometimes used of Gentiles seeking refuge in the city of God.² Of these two arguments the second is extremely tenuous, since only one example is given of a link with the Gentiles, and it can safely be ignored. The first is stronger, but as the allusion is obscure it would scarcely have been picked up by Jesus' audience, if in fact he intended such a reference at all. We can only say with Dodd that "maybe the Gentiles are included too".³ If they are, then the time-reference is to the future Kingdom of God.⁴ As Jeremias notes, in such parables the two significant temporal points are the beginning and the end. It is dubious to give any significance to the intermediate period of growth, so that nothing can be read into this parable about an intermediate historical process which will affect the Gentiles.

The wicked husbandmen Mk 12 1-9 pars

Several authors consider this parable to be a creation of the early Church,⁵ the reasons they offer are as follows

a The story reflects closely the experiences of Jesus. However, this is true mainly of the versions in Matthew and Luke, where it is said that the son was killed outside the vineyard (Matt 21 39, Lk 20 15, cf Jn 19 17, Heb 13 12). These are probably editorial additions, since they reverse the order in Mk 12 8, where the son is first killed and then thrown out of the vineyard. Apart from this it only says that the son will die, and there is

1 Manson, p123, Jeremias, "Parables", p146. Between them they give as examples Midr. on Ps 104 2, I En 90 33, Num R 13 on Num 7 13 based on Is 10 14, and J Abod 2 III 42, 44.

2 Jeremias, p68. He quotes only 'Joseph and Aseneth' 15 for connecting *κατασκηνοῦν* and the Gentiles.

3 Dodd, p191.

4 Jeremias, "Parables", pp90f.

5 Bultmann, pp177, 205, Kümmel, p83, Lohmeyer, "Mk", p244, Klostermann, "Mk", p135.

no reason why Jesus should not have foreseen his own death

b 'Son' was never used in pre-Christian Judaism as a Messianic title and its use here is a sign of secondary origin. It is true that although the word 'son' as a designation of the coming King lay to hand in Judaism (Ps 2 7, IVQ Flor 1 11), there is no certain use of it as a title in pre-Christian literature. On the other hand, for Jesus to think of himself as God's son could be said to spring naturally from his filial consciousness, and the death of the son could be seen as a natural part of the story. Even so, it is probably best seen as a later addition which, together with

ἀνακητόν (Mk 12 6), heightens the climax of the story

c In the parable the wicked servants are punished for the death of the master's son, whereas in the Gospels the Jews are punished because they reject and not because they murder God's son. However, this objection is unconvincing, because it presses the details of the parable too far. Besides, the same authors reject the parable because it is sometimes too close to and at other times too far from the actual events and they cannot have it both ways'

Accepting that there are some later accretions, we are still left¹ with a core which may well accord with an original parable of Jesus. We shall take it that the original parable consisted of the reference to Is² 5 1-2 (Mk 12 1), the three servants - the third, who is killed, being Jesus³

1 Cranfield, pp306-8, Dodd, pp93-8, Jeremias, "Parables", pp70-6, Hahn, p39

2 Jeremias, *ibid*, regards this, and consequently v9b which refers back to it, as later additions

3 Dodd, p97, and Jeremias, "Parables", pp71-2, regard the third servant as an addition which reflects the actual fate of the prophets. With the two servants and the son we get a common feature of ancient tales - a climactic series of three. Also, the third servant's death spoils the dramatic climax of the son's death. Bosch, p118, thinks that Luke's version, with three servants, none of whom are killed, is original. We take as original the reference to three servants, with the last one being killed

himself, Jesus' question (Mk 12 9a) and answer (v9b)¹ In favour of the basic authenticity of the parable is the lack of any reference to Jesus' resurrection in the parable itself² Also, it has been shown that the basic story reflects a common problem in the social relationships of 1st century Palestine, namely the conflicts between absentee landlords and defaulting tenants³

Jesus takes a familiar Old Testament allegory, thereby making clear the reference he wishes to make (cf Mk 12 12), and goes on to recount Israel's past rejection of all God's messengers, culminating in their rejection of himself (cf Lk 13 34 and Jesus' other prophecies of his own death) He then pronounces that the result of this reaction is that the Jews lose and others inherit their unique position as the people of God⁴ Assuming, for the sake of argument, that v9b is genuine, who are these ἄλλοις⁵ ? Jeremias suggests that they are the 'poor' (Matt 5 5 etc), which is possible but unlikely if vv2f refer to the Jews as a whole Nor⁶ is it likely that the 'others' are the Twelve apostles⁷ The reference, though undefined, seems to be to the Gentiles

1 Dodd, pp94-5, Jeremias, *ibid* , regard v9b as secondary, since it is a phenomenon which is unparalleled in the Gospels It does not, as Dodd thinks, merely state the obvious, since the only obvious answer is that the wicked servants would be condemned For the sake of argument, we shall take it as genuine, without being certain that this is so

2 Mk 12 10-11 (Ps 118 22), Mark's addition, is carefully kept separate from the parable itself

3 Dodd, pp93-8, Jeremias, "Parables", pp70f, give the parable a 'realistic' interpretation But there is not necessarily any exact reference to political events and, if 12 1 is original, a reference to the prophets is more likely Also, is it feasible that a man would send his son in such a dangerous situation ?

4 A reference to all Jews is more likely than a reference to their leaders alone (cf the use of Is 5 1-2)

5 Jeremias, "Parables", p76

6 Dodd, p97

7 Bosch, p123, suggests that it refers to the new people of God, both Jews and Gentiles

Thus once again the Gentiles enter Jesus' purview, but we are left no hint as to how they will inherit this promise. It will apparently be after Jesus' death and in some way related to it (cf Mk 10 45, 14 25)

Perhaps the best commentary on this verse is to be found in Matt 8 11 par ¹
Mk 10 45, 14 24-5 and pars

The authenticity of these two verses is hotly disputed, in particular Mk 10 45. The main reasons for regarding it as a dogmatic construct are ²
 as follows

a The main idea of the whole passage in context is that of service, and it is claimed that v45b does not fit naturally with this. However, the link between v45a and v45b, which sees Jesus' service as consisting primarily of laying down his life for the many, is not unduly forced, it could be argued that it is a natural and profound continuation of the idea of service

b It is said that ἡλθεν implies that Jesus' death is being seen as a past event. But surely this ἡλθεν could refer to the Incarnation?

c λύτρον is a concept unique in the Synoptics and is therefore secondary, and maybe the result of Pauline influence. But it is not a ³
 characteristic Pauline idea and we have a similar notion in Mk 14 24, so there is no 'a priori' reason for rejecting this saying as unauthentic

There is also much dispute over the original form of the cup saying

¹ Bosch, *ibid*, sees a reference to the Gentile mission in the early Church. But nothing is said about mission. The use of Matt 8 11 as a parallel reveals our own interpretation. Neither can be proved from the text itself. The logical step is to interpret it together with Mk 10 45, 14 24-5, on which see below.

² Bultmann, pp148f, Tödt, pp206-8

³ See below. A unique idea is not necessarily unauthentic, though it is suspect. Some see Mk 10 45 as a dogmatic development of Lk 22 27. But the connection between them is far from natural. Also, Lk 22 27 has Hellenistic and Mk 10 45 a Palestinian colouring (Jeremias) which if anything speaks for the originality of Mk 10 45. They may, of course, be independent traditions.

(Mk 14 24, Matt 26 28, Lk 22 20, some mss , I Cor 11 25) Many see Mark's version as a liturgical development and treat I Cor 11 25 as the original text.¹ Jeremias, on the other hand, by comparing the four versions and eliminating the obvious liturgical, explanatory and non-Semitic additions,² arrives at a basic minimum which is the same as Mark's version. It is not easy to assess the various approaches to this problem or their results, but we shall assume, for the purposes of our thesis, that Mark's is the original form to see what, if it is authentic, it tells us about Jesus and the Gentiles.³

For our purposes, the two key phrases are $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\ \kappa\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ in Mk 10 45 and $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\ \kappa\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ in Mk 14 24. What is the meaning of $\kappa\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$? Jeremias has shown, with careful and convincing arguments, that $\kappa\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ reflects a Semitism which could mean not just 'many' but also 'all'.⁴ Here, he argues, it has an inclusive and not an exclusive meaning. But one must still ask exactly who these $\kappa\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}$ are. Jeremias thinks there is a clear reference to the universal mission of the Servant figure in II Isaiah, because

a $\kappa\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$ is often used without the article, as in Mk 10 45 and 14 24, in II Isaiah, for example in 52 14, 53 11,12

b In post-Christian Jewish literature the $\kappa\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}$ is referred

1 Bosch, p36, Cranfield, pp426-7, Kümmel, pp73f, Bornkamm, Z T K , 53, 1956, pp327f

2 Jeremias, "Words", pp160f

3 This involves taking Luke's $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\ \sigma\upsilon\acute{\omega}\nu$ as secondary. Jeremias, "Words", p167, says that it makes impossible Aramaic, but it could be a natural Greek rendering of an Aramaic meaning the same. It is probable that the $\sigma\upsilon\acute{\omega}\nu$ is a liturgical 'personalizing' of the more impersonal $\kappa\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$.

4 Jeremias, "Words", pp179f. The main reason is that Semitic languages have no word for the noun 'all', his argument is well documented. Cf Lohmeyer, "Mk", p306, Schniewind, "Mk", pp143-4, Cranfield, p343

5 Jeremias, "Words", pp226f, Bosch, p177, Lohmeyer, "Mk", pp306-7, Cullmann, "Christology", pp51-83. Higgins (pp40-5) admits the lack of linguistic connections, but still thinks Is 40-55 is the main background to Mk 10 45

exclusively to Israel This, Jeremias argues, is due to Jewish polemic, since these passages were of such vital significance to the Church

c In pre-Christian Jewish literature πολλοι is sometimes taken as a reference to the Gentiles

d Although in these last-mentioned passages the reference is only to Is 53 14-5, namely the 'many' who are judged by and subordinated to the Servant and not those whose sins he bears, this is unimportant, because II Isaiah does not distinguish between the two groups

But against Jeremias' interpretation we can note the following

a The evidence for Jesus identifying himself with the Servant figure in II Isaiah is, to say the least, slight¹ Mk 10 45, 14 24 are probably the strongest evidence for such an identification and πολλοί the most exact parallel But there is no compelling reason for thinking that such a reference is intended

b The post-Christian Jewish interpretation is not necessarily polemical, since this depends on the assumption that the Servant concept was of capital importance to the early Church In fact, it was not a major category in early Church Christology That is, this post-Christian interpretation may reflect a quite normative pre-Christian view as well, though one cannot be certain

c The pre-Christian references, as regards exactly who is meant, are ambiguous and, as Lohmeyer notes, give no basis for confident conclusions² Moreover, the fact that they refer only to Is 53 14-5 may be more significant than Jeremias admits, since a reference to these verses does not necessarily carry with it a reference to the whole of Is 53

1 Hooker, p78 on πολλοί , pp80-2 on Mk 14 24 The whole book is, of course, relevant

2 Lohmeyer, "Mk", p307

Bosch expresses this vexed problem well "Ireilich handelt es sich hier weniger um Zitate aus Jes 53, als vielmehr ^{um} eine Antwort auf Jes 53 " That is, Jesus performs a "gelebte Exegese" ¹ This may be clear to us and it may have been clear to the Evangelists, but whether it was also in Jesus' own mind is another question

Another suggestion is that the πολλοι here are the 'poor of the land', and that λύτρον refers to the obedience which they owe to official Judaism, an obedience which Jesus will fulfil for them in a vicarious manner ² But this explanation, like so many others, is fraught with difficulties, and the precise background to these verses, especially Mk 10 45, is extremely difficult to surmise ³ To go further into this problem, if indeed one can go further, is beyond the limits of this study Suffice it to say that it seems that some form of universal reference is intended here and that it is closely linked with Jesus' death If there is a universal reference, then it is clear that it will come into effect only after Jesus' death

The key, we would suggest, which best opens for us the temporal reference of Mk 10 45, 14 24 and 12 1-9 is Mk 14 25 As we have seen, all these passages have a similar type of universal reference - undefined and connected with Jesus' death - and Mk 14 25 is linked closely with one of them

1 Bosch, p177

2 It is not even clear who the 'poor' in the Gospels are Some would see it not as a religious designation, but as a reference to those in physical need (Percy, pp68f) However, in some OT references 'poor' and 'pious' seem to be parallel terms (eg Ps 36 1, 132 15, Ps Sol 10 6) so that 'poor' probably had religious connotations as well Others think the reference is to pietist groups who in Jesus' time kept apart from official Judaism, quietly kept the Law, and waited for the fulfilment of their eschatological hopes (Lohmeyer, "Galiläa", pp64f)

3 See Barrett, "Mark 10 45", where the background to and various possible interpretations of this verse are discussed

Assuming that Mk 14 25 is the original form of this logion, we must try¹
 to discover the exact future reference of this vow² Schweitzer claims
 that because Jesus expected the Messianic era to be forced in by his death,
 he also expected to eat the Messianic meal with his disciples on the first³
 Easter Sunday Kümmel is more cautious and thinks that although the
 limitation of the vow implies a near End one cannot say exactly now near⁴
 Whichever of these interpretations is correct, but accepting that if any
 interval is expected it is to be only a short one, this verse has important
 repercussions for the sayings concerning the πολλοί⁵ for example,
 Liechtenhahn thinks Mk 14 24 signifies the hour when the Gentile mission
 was born, in that now the proclamation to the Gentiles, in a historical
 sense, can begin⁵ Bosch, while not agreeing with Liechtenhahn, treats
 Jesus' death as one of the necessary presuppositions (the others are the⁶
 Resurrection and Pentecost) for the Apostolic proclamation to the Gentiles
 However, both of these views are ruled out by our interpretation and use
 of this verse (Mk 14 25) Our own conclusions from Mk 10 45, 14 24 and

1 Kümmel p30, Jeremias, "Words", pp160f

2 Jeremias, "Words", pp207f, has convincingly shown that this is a vow He thinks that Jesus did not drink from the cup, but even if he did the saying could still be a vow

3 Schweitzer, see above p10 n3

4 Kümmel, p32, Jeremias, "Words", pp216f Many other unconvincing interpretations have been offered For example, (a) Cranfield, p428 (following Barth), sees a reference to the time between the Resurrection and the Ascension (b) Bosch, pp178-82, refers it to the period between the Resurrection and the Parousia, where the Twelve have the task of reaching the 'many' by common participation in the Lord's Supper (c) Dodd, p56, removes the imminent reference by taking 'new' to mean 'a new sort of wine', i.e. the heavenly wine which Jesus will drink Cf Glasson, p113

5 Liechtenhahn, p40

6 Bosch, p178.

14 25 can be summarized as follows

a There is some form of universalistic reference (πολλοί Mk 10 45, 14 24, cf ἄλλους 12 9) but it is undefined and inexact

b This reference is connected with Jesus' understanding of his own¹ death and is to be effected after it

c There is no reference to a historical proclamation to the πολλοί after Jesus' death

d The time reference we do have seems to show that Jesus expected the Parousia to come immediately or very soon Thus Jesus' death and its significance for the 'many' is linked with the imminent Kingdom, which rules out any notion of a universal, historical proclamation to the Gentiles
The cleansing of the Temple Mk 11 15-17 pars

There are difficulties in the Evangelists' presentation of this event For example, if it was such a majestic event as they say, why was Jesus not arrested and why was it not used as evidence against him at his trial ? Further, the Gentile court was huge, so would it have been physically possible for Jesus to have prevented the forecourt being used as a thoroughfare ? Although these are real difficulties, we need not assume that the narratives are totally unreliable, but simply that the event occurred on a much less extensive scale than the Evangelists would lead us to believe

A further question now arises was the action prophetic, Messianic² or a combination of these two ? Schrenk argues that it was solely a prophetic action He uses for evidence the first of the difficulties we

1 Kiddle, J T S ,35,1934,pp45f

2. Schrenk, art ἔπος , T W N T ,III, pp243f

mentioned above and the frequent recurrence of prophetic themes, namely, the reference to Jer 7 11 and Is 56 7 and the prophetic notion that prayer takes precedence over sacrifice ¹ Kummel argues that Jesus' action was Messianic on the grounds that both the renewal of the Temple and the worship of the Gentiles were connected with the Messianic era, and because Jesus' attack on authority far exceeded that of the prophets. There seems no good reason to treat these views as alternatives. It is probable that Jesus' action was both prophetic and Messianic. To the bystanders it was probably seen mainly as a prophetic action similar to those in the Old Testament, whereas for Jesus it had a hidden Messianic significance. What then is the meaning of this prophetic-Messianic action?

a Sundkler sees it as the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary which in Jewish thought is the centre of the world, thereby preparing for the cosmic renewal and the consequent influx of the Gentiles to worship. The unique position of the Temple thus carries with it the inclusion of the Gentiles ² Lohmeyer has a similar view, although he thinks the action was more directly concerned with the Gentiles and only indirectly with the Jews ³ Both men think the action is concerned with the earthly Temple ⁴

b Hahn and Jeremias interpret it within the same scope of ideas, but they relate it to the New Temple of the Messianic era. Jeremias thinks that

1 Kummel, p118

2 Sundkler, R H Ph R 16, 1936, pp 491f

3. Lohmeyer, "Kultus", pp 44f, cf Lightfoot, "Mark", pp 60f

4 Hahn, pp 36-8, Jeremias, pp 65f

Is 56 7 inspired Jesus' action, while Hahn thinks Jesus was creating a token space for the Gentiles in the earthly sanctuary which was symbolic of the reality that would be in the New Temple

The latter interpretation is preferable since it interprets Jesus' action together with his words about the destruction of the Temple. Although it is difficult to find the original words of Jesus about the Temple from the many versions we have, it appears that Jesus prophesied the destruction of the Temple and its rebuilding after a short while, and that by this rebuilding he meant the appearance of the new, Messianic Temple¹

We need now to look more closely at the evidence for the inclusion of the Gentiles. It is twofold: the phrase $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\varsigma\iota\nu$ in Mark's quotation of Is 56 7, and the link between the worship of the Gentiles and the New Temple in Jewish messianic beliefs. The first piece of evidence is not easy to assess. The absence of this phrase in Matthew and Luke is probably due to the fact that they both wrote after A D 70, when the Gentiles had destroyed the Temple. But the whole quotation from Is 56 7 may be Mark's editorial addition drawing out what he saw to be the point of Jesus' action, alternatively, Mark may have expanded Jesus' original quotation to include the phrase about the Gentiles. That the action took place in the Gentile court is no certain guide to interpretation since, as Jeremias notes,² this setting is simply due to the fact that it was there that the money-changers set up when the Temple tax was due three weeks before the Passover. The only certain reference to the Gentiles, therefore, arises incidentally in connection with Jewish beliefs about the

¹ Hahn, pp 37 n1 and the literature cited there

² Jeremias, p 65. T W Manson "Jesus", pp 11-12, makes the setting in the Gentile court the basis of his interpretation

New Temple

Jesus' parabolic action, therefore, includes the Gentiles only as a secondary theme. Their inclusion is to take effect in the New, Messianic Temple which Jesus expected to be inaugurated within a very short time. If we assume that Jesus did quote Is 56 7 as in Mark, then the inclusion of the Gentiles is brought into the centre of the picture and, as often, is set against the background of the Jews' disobedience. This does not, however, affect the temporal reference, in neither case is there room for a historical Gentile mission.

The Sheep and the Goats Matt 25 31-46

Several reasons have been given for regarding this parable as
¹
 unauthentic

a That Jesus and not God is the Judge is said to be a late idea. However, the Judge is the Son of Man, who is not necessarily to be equated with Jesus. Also, it should be noted that the Son of Man merely announces the judgement of God (v34) and that Mk 8 38, if it is authentic, may imply a notion of the Son of Man as Judge.

b Similarly, the equation of Jesus with the King is said to be unique and, therefore, secondary. But one can compare Mk 15 2, Jn 18 37, and the fact that Jesus' Messianic consciousness involves some form of Kingship.
²
 The suggestion of T Preiss is also worth noting, namely that Jesus gave himself the title of 'King' only with reference to the Parousia.

c Διὰβολος is said to be a later form than the more primitive ἑταῖρος

However, if these objections to the parable's authenticity are valid

1 Bultmann, p124, Jeremias, "Parables", pp207-8

2 Preiss, p46

they only reveal that there has been a certain amount of linguistic and christological recasting by Matthew, they do not affect the substance of the parable Attempts to draw parallels with Egyptian and Rabbinic material¹ though sometimes enlightening, say nothing about authenticity, since their basic ideas and attitudes are a far remove from Matt 25 It seems that basically we have here the words of Jesus, since the parable "contains features of such startling originality that it is difficult to credit them to anyone but the Master himself"² In fact, we have here not so much a parable as a picture of the Last Judgement,³ and although certain basic features are Jewish⁴ its exact origin is difficult to surmise⁵

There are five main characters or groups, whose identity and relationships are not too clear the Son of Man and his angels v31, the King v33, the King's father v34, the nations v32, and the King's brethren vv40,45 Matthew seems to equate Jesus with both the Son of Man and the King This rather confusing picture is best explained if we take v31 as an editorial addition of Matthew's A comparison with Matt 16 7, 19 28 shows a close linguistic similarity, and nowhere in Jewish literature are angels⁶ said to attend anyone other than God Also, only once is anyone other than

1 Cf Bultmann, p124. Jeremias, p48, "Parables", p208, correctly points out the differences (a) In the Egyptian Book of the Dead and in Midrashic literature the dead man complacently and self-righteously proclaims his deeds of charity, (b) In Rabbinic parallels it is always the salvation of Israel and the condemnation of the Gentiles which are related

2 Manson, p249

3 Dodd, p65, Kümmel, p92

4 S B ,IV, pp1199-1212, G F Moore, II, pp279f

5. Various solutions have been offered (a) Jesus gave a description of the Judgement which was later 'Christianized' with Jesus as Judge - Jeremias, ibid (b) Jesus' idea of judgement according to works of charity was introduced into a Jewish apocalyptic picture - Bultmann, p124 (c) the basis is Matthean, but the ethical content Jesus' - Glasson, pp129f (d) the whole parable is a Christian construction - Shermann, pp56f

6 S B ,I, pp973f

God said to sit on the throne (IEn 45 3, 51 3, 55 4 etc) Originally then, the parable spoke only of the King and his father However, further problems of identification now arise In particular, who is included in πάντα τὰ ἔθνη v32 and τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων vv40, 45 ? The identification of these two interrelated groups is essential, but difficult First, who are τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων ?

¹
a T W Manson takes the reference to be to the disciples of Jesus, who are the true Israel The remainder of empirical Israel are counted as Gentiles and are included in v32

²
b Most authors see it as a reference to all in need

The terminology itself is not much help ἐλάχιστος is not used elsewhere in the Synoptics to describe people ἀδελφός in a figurative sense is vague In Matt 23 8 it is used of Jesus' followers The equivalent phrase to Matt 25 40, that is ἀδελφοί μου in Matt 28 10 and Mk 3 33 pars , seems to refer exclusively to the disciples It is often said that in Matt 5 22f, 7 3f, 18 35 ἀδελφός is used in the general sense of 'neighbour', but even here it is probably a reference to fellow Israelites and, therefore, has nationalistic limitations ³ We have in the Synoptics another term which could shed light on our problem, namely μικρός Special honour is afforded to the group described by this word and those who cause them to stumble are severely punished (Mk 9 42 pars, Matt 10 42, 18 10,14) But even here there is no agreement about who is

1. Manson, p250

2. Schniewind, "Matt", p246, Preiss, p52, Filson, "Matt", p267, Jeremias, "Parables", p206

3 Kummel, p94 Arndt-Gingrich, p16, give two LXX examples for the meaning 'neighbour' - Gen 9 5, Lev 19 15 But in both the reference is to the Israelite people alone

being referred to Bultmann takes it to mean real children and thinks
 that its origin is non-Christian K  mmel² interprets Matt 10 42 and 18 10
 to mean the 'poor', as in Matt 5 3f Michel³ has offered what is probably
 the most convincing explanation when he interprets the word as a special
 name for the disciples - a view which Matthew certainly seems to have
 shared⁴

All the evidence so far points to the identification of ἀδελφοί
 with either an exclusive group like the disciples or a wider, nationalistic
 group such as Israel However, it is quite probable that ἀδελφοί v40
 is a Matthean addition, since it is lacking in v45⁵, so that we cannot
 safely use it as evidence for what Jesus meant We are left then with the
 enigmatic ἐλαχιστος Although it is impossible to be certain, Jesus
 probably meant to refer to anyone in need rather than any specific
 religious or national group The closest parallel is perhaps Lk 10 30f
 where, among other things, the duty of helping all in need is emphasized

The next problem is to discover who is meant by πάντα τὰ ἔθνη v32
⁶
 a K  mmel suggests that it refers to all those whom the gospel has
 reached, namely all Christians He refers to vv34 and 37 as support for
 his view

⁷
 b. Jeremias thinks it refers to the Gentiles alone it "is dealing with

1 Bultmann, pp122-3

2 K  mmel, p94

3 Michel, art μικρός, T W N T, IV, pp648f

4 J A T Robinson, N T S, 2, 1955/6, pp228f

5 G Barth, pp122-3

6 K  mmel, p94

7 Jeremias, pp49f, "Parables", pp206, 209

the problem, how shall the heathen be judged ?"

1

c Bornkamm considers both of these interpretations to be too narrow and takes the reference to be to all peoples, Jew and Gentile, Christian and non-Christian alike

Kümmel's interpretation is misleading, since vv34 and 37 need not refer to Christians alone Both Jeremias and Bornkamm can find support in Matthew's use of *ἐθνῆ*, because sometimes it seems to mean literally all nations, including the Jews (Matt 24 9,14, 28 19), while at other times it is limited to the Gentiles (Matt 6 32, 10 5, 20 19) For our purposes it is not necessary to choose between the two, since the Gentiles are included in both, although the predominant linguistic usage probably favours Jeremias

Thus we have here a picture of the Last Judgement, where the Gentiles will be judged according to their treatment of the needy, with whom Jesus identifies himself We can now draw together from this parable the results which are relevant to the Gentile question

2

a The time reference is wholly futuristic - to the Last Judgement

3

Jeremias has pointed out the eschatological language used in this

parable *συναχθήσονται* (cf Test Benj 9 2), *κληρονομεῖν*,
and the interesting reference in v32 (*συναχθήσονται*) to the
angelic summons to the Gentiles in the last days

4

b Not only is there a positive hope for the Gentiles, but also a

1 Bornkamm, "Matt", pp23-4, Filson, "Matt", p267, Schniewind, "Matt", p267

2 The attempt of Glasson (p130) to interpret Matt 25 as a description only of the eternal principles of judgement is unconvincing

3 Jeremias, p48, "Parables", pp206-9

4 Foerster, art *κλήρος* T W N T , II, pp758f

negative judgement in store for some of them. The most we can say is that at least some of them will have a share in the Kingdom of God.

c According to this parable the Gentiles are to be judged on the assumption that they have not heard the gospel, since they are unaware that they are acting for or against Jesus. This confirms that Jesus did not foresee a historical Gentile mission.

The Syrophoenician Woman. Mk 7 24-30, Matt. 15 21-8

So far we have been dealing only with the words of Jesus - but what of his actions? Did he not heal Gentiles, did he not feed them? We turn now to the Gentile healing miracles and the two feeding miracles in order to consider their significance for the Gentile question as a whole.

The story of the healing of the Syrophoenician woman raises complex literary problems as regards both later accretions to and the interrelation of the two versions. It has been suggested that the original version was a simple conversation piece which was later attached to the healing narrative in order to give it a definite setting.¹ Hahn objects to this on the grounds that the narrative bears all the marks of a typical miracle story.² On the other hand these marks might be a result of the literary skill of the Evangelists, although we cannot prove this either way. We shall take the narrative basically as it stands, accepting that the interweaving of dialogue and healing is an integral part of the original, but we will analyse some of the details below. However, we

1 Bultmann, pp 38f; Lohmeyer "Mk", pp 144f. The basis of this view is the fact that the only common feature in Matthew and Mark is the conversation, the beginning and end of the narrative differs in each. This can, however, be exaggerated.

2 Hahn, p 32. The marks are, in Mark, (a) a preliminary statement of the request vv 24a, 25 (b) a debate which proves the woman's faith vv 27b, 28 (c) the granting of the request and the confirmation of the cure vv 29, 30.

must first sort out the problem of the interrelation of the versions in Matthew and Mark. There seem to be good reasons for regarding Matt 15 21f¹ as secondary, although Bosch thinks it is the more original version². It could be that the two are entirely independent, but this seems unlikely. It seems that Mark is nearer the original version, while Matthew has added details from another source and recast the narrative in his normal way³. The only exception to this is that Mk 7 27a is probably secondary and Matthew's version at this point the more original.

Clearly, this narrative had immense significance for the early Church, faced as it was with the problem of Jew-Gentile relationships⁴. It has inevitably, therefore, been tampered with, and we must now consider some of the details in order to reconstruct an original form as a working basis⁵.

a Mk 7 27a Ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα is considered by many scholars to be a later addition which softens Jesus' reply, since the πρῶτον implies a δεύτερον⁶ and reflects a notion similar to Rom 1 16, 2 9, Acts 3 26. The Jews' priority thus becomes a temporary rather than

1 Hahn, p32, Schniewind, "Mk", pp107-8. The reasons are that in Matthew's version vv22-4 are an editorial addition (cf Matt 9 27, 20 30), the request (v25) is transposed, the answer (v28) is formularized, the scene is set in a street and not in a house, reflecting the fact that Gentiles were not allowed in Jewish houses, v24 is similar to other Matthean material (10 5-6) and suits Matthew's purpose, and the woman's faith is emphasized even more than in Mark - a common feature of Matthean miracle stories (Held, pp165-301).

2 Bosch, pp98-99.

3 Held, ibid.

4 This does not mean that it is the creation of particularist Jewish Christians (Bultmann, pp48, 64, Klostermann, "Mk", pp81-2), for this depends on one's interpretation of the whole passage and ignores the fact that the woman is eventually granted her request.

5 There are inevitable difficulties in attempting to reconstruct an 'original', since so much subjective opinion is involved and the results are not always worth the ingenuity. This passage, however, cries out for some form of critical analysis.

6. Klostermann, "Mk", p82, Lohmeyer, "Mk", pp144f, "Matt", pp253-4, Munck, p261, Jeremias, p29, agrees, although he thinks it was an addition which Mark

an absolute, permanent right Bosch claims that v27a is original because Matt 15 24 is to be interpreted by the notion "Jew first and then Greek" and so means the same as Mk 7 27a, and because the woman's reply is inexplicable without v27a The former argument is based on a false interpretation of Matt.15 24 and the latter simply not true It is safest, therefore, to accept Mk 7 27a as a later addition But even if it is not, it does not follow that Jesus understood it in the same way as Luke and Paul He need not have thought of it as working out in terms of a historical mission to both Jews and Gentiles

b While some maintain that Matt 15 23-5 are authentic, it is more likely that they are literary additions of Matthew They dramatize the requests and refusals, highlight the woman's faith, and v24 both excludes a possible misinterpretation of Mark's version and gives Matthew's own interpretation of Jesus' words

c The answer in Matt 15 27 contains a subtle change of emphasis from Mk 7 28 Child and dog are united under the same master, both are part of his household and he is responsible for providing for them, even though the children take precedence This verse, like Mk7 27a, may reflect a softening of the harsher original and certainly does emphasize that the woman's faith was directed towards the "Lord"

cont found in his source Cranfield, p246, agrees that Mark probably added it but thinks he hit on Jesus' actual meaning On this see below

1 Bosch, pp98-9

2. Bosch, ibid , cf Cranfield, p245.

3 Matt 15 24 may, however, be a genuine saying of Jesus in another context See below

d The diminutive form κυνάριον (Matt 15 26, Mk 7 27) is thought by some to refer to household rather than street dogs and is therefore considered to be a softening of Jesus' reply which either originated with him or was added later by the Evangelists¹ Bosch thinks it is particularly important because it appears in Matthew as well as Mark, since Matthew is not following Mark at this point² But if, as we have argued, Matthew is following Mark here, then it may not be of much significance, since Mark is fond of using diminutive forms³ Further, as Jeremias notes, Aramaic has no diminutive form for dog⁴ Moreover if, as is likely, Mark has given the correct setting for the narrative - in a house - then the diminutive form may simply have been the most natural term for him to use in describing household dogs Nothing can therefore be built on the use of this diminutive form⁵

We shall take, therefore, as the basic original form the setting in the house (Mk), the woman's single request (Mk), Jesus' answer (Matt), the woman's reply (Mk), and the distant healing How then are we to interpret this healing of a Gentile?⁶ Spitta thought that the fact that the woman was a Gentile played no part at all in Jesus' action Originally, Jesus and his disciples (τέκνα) were sitting in a house eating a meal, when along came a woman who asked for her daughter to be healed Jesus said that first his disciples must be filled and the crumbs thrown to the

1 Jeremias, p29, Cranfield, p248 Following Lagrange "Mc", p194, many see a reference to the particularly precious κυνάρια μελιτάρια cf Taylor, p350, Michel, art κύων, T W N T, III, p1104f

2. Bosch, ibid.

3 Bosch himself admits this

4 Jeremias, p29 Schniewind "Mk", p107, makes the improbable suggestion that Jesus and the woman spoke in Greek

5 Haenchen "Weg", p275.

6. On the obscure ἑλληνίς and ζυροφονικισσα in Mark see the notes by Lohmeyer "Mk", pp144-5 and Haenchen "Weg", p273

dogs before they could come with her She replies that this is not necessary - a simple word from Jesus will suffice¹ Spitta's view scarcely needs refuting, suffice it to say that if this was to be our exegetical method, then the prize would go to the man with the most ingenious² imagination Bosch suggests that Jesus referred to household dogs who have a definite, although secondary, place in God's household Matt 15 24, he thinks, says no more than Mk 7 27 the Jews are the first but not the only recipients of salvation, the Gentiles also have their share in it But Bosch builds too much on ΚΟΥΛΨΙΟΝ and gives a forced interpretation to Matt 15 24³ Michel, similarly, builds on the diminutive ΚΟΥΛΨΙΟΝ and thinks that the original contrast was probably not between Jews and Gentiles⁴ But, as we shall see below, ΤΕΚΝΑ and ΚΟΥΛΨΙΟΝ have a definite reference, and we cannot ignore the fact that the whole passage revolves around the woman as a Gentile Hahn thinks that the emphasis lies on the contrast between Jew and Gentile and on the woman's faith Jesus⁵ speaks of the supposed boundaries and is then prepared to cross them For Jeremias the main point is the refusal and insult, and he notes that the woman is granted her request only when she recognizes the Divine⁶ division between Jews and Gentiles

What then can we conclude from this mass of opinion ? First, the

1 Spitta, pp41-9

2 Bosch, pp102-3

4 Michel, art cit ,pp

3 A fuller discussion of Matt 15 24 will be undertaken later

5 Hahn, p32

6 Jeremias, p29 The discussion of Munck (pp255f) is interesting, but he uses it as evidence for the ideas not of Jesus, but of Jewish Christianity He thinks Matthew's version 'stricter' and therefore more original, and thinks it is being used to refute the Jewish Christian view that there was no need for a Gentile mission, since God would effect this in the last days

reference is undoubtedly to the contrasting status of Jews and Gentiles. Both ΤΕΚΝΑ and ΚΥΝΑΡΙΟΝ have definite meanings - the former refers to the Jews and the latter to the Gentiles¹. Secondly, Jesus' refusal is harsh. This becomes clear when it is recognized that the term "dog" was an insult, a fact which is probably reflected in Luke's omission of the story (cf too Matt 5 47, 6 7,32, 18 17). Thirdly, it is the woman's faith and not her native wit which is the cause of Jesus' eventual response. Fourthly, it is significant that the healing is done from a distance.

We are now in a position to draw together the relevant points from this passage for the Gentile question as a whole.

1. Jesus is reluctant to heal and is surprised at the woman's faith.

2. In the first instance the woman comes to Jesus, he does not go out of his way to meet her.

3. The woman appears to recognize the priority of the Jews.

4. The healing of the Gentile woman's daughter is treated by Jesus as an exception to his normal practice, which is to confine himself to the Jews. This can be seen in the following facts:

(a) It is probably significant that the healing was done at a distance, since the only other instance of this is in the case of the Gentile centurion.

(b) There are only two or three incidents recorded of Jesus helping a Gentile. These do not alter the basic pattern of Jesus' ministry,

1 cf S.B ,I, pp 724f.

which was directed towards Israel

¹
(c) J Munck notes that commands of Jesus such as we find in Matt 10 5b-6, 15 24 imply that some of his hearers were inclined to think in terms of a Gentile mission. Taking up Munck's hint, we can go on to suggest that these words were spoken to the disciples in order to prevent them from misunderstanding Jesus' exceptional dealings with the Gentiles and concluding that he intended there to be a Gentile mission.

Before concluding this section, we can include here a short study of two more healings which are apparently concerned with Gentiles.
²
In Matt 8 5-13, Lk 7 1-10 we find the healing of the centurion's son. This narrative can be treated briefly, since it is far more straightforward than Mk 7 24f. Matthew's version is probably more reliable than Luke's, since Luke has been influenced by his later description of Cornelius and has dressed the centurion up to appear as a particularly pious 'God-fearer'. The most important points for us to note are the following.

³
1 Matt 8 7 is thought by many originally to have been a question. If this were true, it would be yet another example of Jesus temporarily refusing the request of a Gentile.

2 The man's faith, which amazes Jesus, is particularly emphasized and is the cause of the healing eventually being effected. Jesus says

1 Munck, pp255f

2 On John's version cf Schweizer, Ev Th ,11,1951/2, pp64-75

3 Jeremias, p30, Klostermann, "Matt", p74. Schniewind, "Matt", pp109f, takes it as a statement, and thinks it is a delaying tactic used by Jesus.

that the centurion's faith is greater than any he has found in Israel
 - a statement which, in the context of Jesus' ministry, is startling¹

3 The healing is done from a distance (Matt 8 13)

The parallels with the story of the Syrophenician woman are many and obvious, and virtually all that we said in our conclusions from that passage applies here too

Another narrative which may refer to the healing of a Gentile is found in Mk 5 1-20 pars. There are several hints that the Gadarene demoniac was a Gentile: the scene is set in Decapolis v20, the man lives among the tombs, which were unclean to Jews v3, v11 refers to swine - animals which to Jews were unclean but which were kept by Gentiles, the appellation 'the Most High God' (v7) is used in the Old Testament mainly by non-Jews. Jesus heals the man, refuses to let him follow him, and tells him to go and tell $\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\ \hat{\omicron}\lambda\kappa\omicron\upsilon$ what has been done for him. The phrase $\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\ \hat{\omicron}\lambda\kappa\omicron\upsilon$ probably refers² to a wider circle than the man's family, namely his fellow countrymen. This command is unique in Jesus' healing miracles and is therefore³ considered by some to be an accretion to the original. On the other hand, its uniqueness may count in favour of its genuineness, and may partially be explained by the fact that the man was a Gentile living among Gentiles⁴. At any rate, the only thing he is to proclaim is the account of his healing. Once again we can merely refer back to the

1 For an explanation of the confusing reply of the centurion see Jeremias, p30 n4

2 Cranfield, p181

3 Lohmeyer, "Mk", p98

4 Cranfield, ibid

conclusions we drew from Mk 7 24f, some of which are relevant here as well

We have offered several negative observations on these miracle stories concerned with the Gentiles in order to counteract any attempt to overrate their significance, but now we must consider their positive value ¹ Hahn is at pains to show, on the basis of Lk 11 20 par , that these narratives signify a very real access to the Kingdom of God for the Gentiles, for in these and any other miracles the Kingdom of God is realized He quotes Liechtenhahn on the interrelation of Jesus' message and miracles ² " in both contexts we find people drawn into the sphere of God's rule and the gifts of the Last Days being offered, and the Gentiles are not excluded from either " Hahn goes on, " when Jesus confronts the world's hostile powers, in the form of demons, then this goes beyond any particularist boundaries "

This is a point which is well made, but it should not be allowed to obscure the fundamental fact that Jesus limited his task to Israel and that the main thrust of his teaching is that the Gentiles will come into their own only in the future and manifest Kingdom of God That exceptional Gentiles received healing, and yet that their place in the Kingdom is predominantly a future one, fits well with the notion that Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom was chiefly futuristic but that he also saw a partial realization of this Kingdom in the present Jesus himself could have seen this and yet still have

1 Hahn,p33, Jeremias,p28

2 Liechtenhahn,p33

maintained a basically futuristic hope for the Gentiles, which would be fulfilled with the final, manifest inbreaking of the Kingdom. When trying to discover Jesus' teaching, therefore, we cannot use the Gentile healing miracles as evidence that he either inaugurated or intended there to be a historical Gentile mission.

The two feedings Mk 6 32f, 8 1f pars.

1

G H Boobyer has argued that both the Markan feedings are concerned with Gentile crowds. His evidence is as follows:

a Mk 6 45 is a reference to Bethsaida on the East coast of the sea of Galilee.

b The word *κλίσματα* Mk 6 43, 8 8 is intelligible only if it was an allusion to the inclusion of the Gentiles, since the disciples already knew that Jesus' mission included the Jews.

c If we interpret the two narratives as the feeding of Gentile crowds then they are appropriate to the great Northern Journey of Jesus into Gentile territory, Mk 6 14 - 8 26.

d The warning in Mk 8 15, which refers to the hostile spiritual and temporal leaders whom Jesus encountered, is easier to interpret if it is seen in a "Gentile" context.

As regards (a), it is just as likely that a crowd followed Jesus there and that they were Jews - not to mention the vagueness of some of Mark's topographical references. Argument (b) rests on an

1 Boobyer, S J Th ,6,1953,pp80f

unwarranted allegorical interpretation of κλάσματα¹ We have already commented on point (c), and we can not that Mk 8 15 seems neither more nor less intelligible when placed in a Gentile context²

Other scholars, more reasonably, see only Mk 8 1f as a reference to a Gentile crowd, because

a. Mk 8 1f probably refers to the people who lived East of the Jordan

b In 6 43 Mark uses the word κόφινος while in 8 19 he uses σκυρίς There is some evidence that κόφινος was a characteristic Jewish article

But the population East of the Jordan was mixed, and there is no evidence that Mark thought of its inhabitants as part of the 'Galilee of the Gentiles' Further, lacking any complementary evidence that σκυρίς was a characteristic Gentile article, and considering that the difference, if there was any, between the two may simply have been³ that different materials were used in their construction, we cannot build much on argument (b) Besides which, the narratives are probably doublets, and the main point of them for Mark lies in the christological understanding, or lack of understanding, of the disciples The sum⁴ total of which scarcely encourages us to find any reference to the

1 See above, p17

2 Eg Hahn, p113 n6, Cranfield, p233

3. Moulton & Milligan, "Vocabulary", p357

4 Lohmeyer, J B L , 56, 1937, pp235f, suggests that the twelve baskets of ch 6 = the Twelve Apostles and the seven baskets of ch 8 = the seven Hellenist deacons Whether such an allusion was intended is anybody's guess J Robinson, "Mark", p85, makes the improbable suggestion that the left-overs are to be linked with the crumbs which are mentioned in Mk 7 28

Gentiles here at all

Before we tackle the more controversial material, we must briefly consider several passages which various authors have used to support their interpretation of Jesus' attitude towards the Gentiles. None of them have any direct references to the Gentiles, but they can be used to bear on this question. Most of the suggestions, as we shall see, are unconvincing.

Commenting on Matt 5:35, where the title ¹μεγάλου βασιλεως is used, Jeremias notes that in the Old Testament this title is always used of God as Lord of the whole world. Thus he thinks that this title expresses the universality of the rule of the Kingdom of God, and that therefore in all the passages where Jesus speaks about the Kingdom of God the Gentiles are to be included - a conclusion that is scarcely justifiable from the text. Commenting on the parable of the Drag-net ²(Matt 13:47-50), Hahn says that in the phrase ³ἐκ παντος γενους (v47) "we cannot exclude the Gentiles." But, as many authors have noted, any such allegorical reference to the Gentile mission is not necessary, ³the varied catch is a necessity for the selection described in v48.

⁴With regard to Matt 22:1-10, Lk 14:16-24, Hahn notes that while the double sending-out in Lk 14:21-3 reflects the missionary experience of the Church, and while there is certainly no direct reference to the Gentiles, nevertheless, since all the traditional barriers are

1 Jeremias, p70

2 Hahn, p39 n1

3 Jeremias, "Parables", p225, Dodd, pp140-1, Manson, p197

4 Hahn, pp35-6

broken down," the church has with good reason related the text to the mission " Bosch wants to go even further In Matthew's version, where two invitations go out to the original guests, he finds in the first a reference to the preaching done by John the Baptist and Jesus, and in the second an allusion to the preaching of the Apostles after the Resurrection He then takes v7 as a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in A D 70, after which the message goes directly to the Gentiles, and interprets v10 as a reference to the new people of God who are called in, both Jews and Gentiles In Luke's version there is only one invitation to the original guests, and Bosch includes in this all the things which he thinks are referred to in Matthew's two sendings The first of Luke's invitations to those who were originally uninvited (vv21-3) he takes to refer to the immediate¹ post-Pentecost offer to the Jews and the second to the Gentile mission In response to Bosch's interpretation we can note that

a The double invitation in Lk 14 21-3 may refer to the "poor of the land" and the Gentiles It is likely, however, that one of the invitations is an insertion by Luke which reflects the Church's missionary experience and cannot, therefore, be used as evidence for² Jesus' own view

b. If one accepts Bosch's interpretations, which are at any rate a little over-zealous in their interpretation of the details of the parable, one can only conclude that the Church's experience has so

1 Bosch, pp 124f

2. Jeremias "Parables", pp 63-70, Bultmann, p174.

coloured the narratives that Jesus' original meaning has been lost

c With regard to the Gentiles, Hahn has probably said about as much as one can say on this parable. If, as is possible, Jesus did originally refer to the Gentiles, we would suggest that it was along the lines of Matt 8 11-12, that is, as part of his teaching about the Messianic banquet

1

Jeremias, under the heading "The redemptive activity and Lordship of Jesus which includes the Gentiles", makes a number of points

1. Jesus' use of the title Son of Man has universal implications. He compares Dan 7 14 where the Son of Man is surrounded by peoples of all lands

2. Jesus' awareness that he was fulfilling the role of the Servant figure of II Isaiah must have carried with it the Servant's universal mission

3. In Mk 12 35-7 pars, the logion on David's son, reference is apparently made to Ps 110 1, and this carries with it the following verse, Ps 110 2, which has universal implications

4. In Mk 11 1-10 pars Jesus appears to be consciously fulfilling the prophecy of Zech 9 9. This being so, we can include the neighbouring verse, Zech 9 10, which has a universalistic reference

The first of these arguments makes a fair point, since the possibility of a universal reference may have been the reason why Jesus chose this uncommon title. However, this says no more than the material we have already studied. Apart from the fact that II Isaiah's universalism needs careful definition, we have already expressed doubt

as to whether Jesus saw himself as the Servant of II Isaiah The third and fourth of Jeremias' arguments make use of an illegitimate exegetical method, namely the assumption that the quotation of one verse of the Old Testament carries with it any of the surrounding verses we might like to include. Thus we are not left with much material¹ to work on here, what there is says no more than we have already discovered from other material

Matt. 10 5b-6, 15 24

We turn finally to the really controversial material, whose authenticity has been most frequently doubted or forcefully maintained We refer both to the commands which appear to limit the activity of Jesus and his disciples to Israel and to the sayings which appear to envisage a historical Gentile mission

A remarkable number of reasons have been given for regarding Matt 10 5b-6, 15 24 as unauthentic Since the verses are so controversial, we shall have to consider the arguments in some detail

1 They are said to be the creation of the narrowest form of² Jewish Christianity, or, similarly, they are seen as the creation of³ the Matthean circle

2 The use of the aorist ἀπεστάλην Matt 15 24 both reflects the language of the later Church and treats the Jesus-event as being wholly

1. If one is so inclined, by the use of allegorical exegesis one can unearth references to the Gentiles in most of the parables This method, employed most widely by A T Cadoux ("Parables", pp30-2, 95-114, 167f), is, however, extremely suspect

2 Käsemann, Z T K, 57, 1960, pp167f, Bultmann, p145 n1

3 Hirsch, "Frühgeschichte", II, p50

¹
in the past

3 They are said to contradict Jesus' openness to the Gentiles
²
which can be seen in authentic tradition

4 The various developments in the mission of the early Church
are best explained if Jesus was open to the Gentiles in principle and
³
not so exclusive as these verses imply

5 Both chapters 10 and 15 of Matthew are secondary developments
of more original material in Mark, and these verses are particularly
⁴
suspect because they occur only in Matthew

6 These verses are incompatible with Matt 10 18 where it is said
⁵
that the disciples will appear before Gentile kings and governors

These are a formidable array of arguments, which might appear
to present a watertight case But in reply we can note the following
points

1 If such a narrow and exclusive group in the Church created these
sayings, how did they come to be accepted by other groups who were
not so narrow? The answer surely is that they could only have been
accepted if they did not flatly contradict Jesus' own teaching and practice
as more widely recognized If this is true, then there is no reason
⁶
why Jesus could not have spoken them in the first place Similarly,

1 Bultmann, pp155f, 163.

2 Hahn, pp54f

3 Hahn, ibid

4 Hahn, ibid, Glasson, pp103-4, Manson, pp221f, Streeter, p225

5. Robinson, p76, Higgins, p102

6 The early start of the Gentile mission after the Resurrection makes
the creation of these sayings perhaps less likely, but not, as Kümmel
thinks (p85 n222), impossible

as has often been noted, these sayings stand in contrast to an equally important strand in Matthew's thought, namely his universalism¹

2. The argument based on the aorist ἀπεστάλην is difficult to maintain. Jeremias has pointed out that in John's Gospel - which is Bultmann's source for 'late terminology' - the passive is never used of Jesus being sent, rather, an active verb is used. The passive in Matt 15 24 may be ancient and may reflect the Semitic idiom which uses a passive as a circumlocution for the Divine Name. Further, an Aramaic perfect need not imply a past event, but could be a 'perfect present', which means 'God has sent me'². Moreover, the 'sending' could refer to the Incarnation.

3. What is and what is not 'authentic tradition' is debatable, but it is important to note that there is no essential contradiction between these verses and all the other material we have already discussed - which includes all the material which Hahn accepts as 'authentic tradition' and more. The fact that Jesus appears to limit his own and his disciples' ministry to Israel - apart from a few exceptional healings of Gentiles who come to him and persist in their requests - while reserving the Gentiles' inclusion for the future Kingdom, fits neatly with Matt 10 5b-6, 15 24.

4. Arguments back from the actual events of the mission in the early Church are problematic, since the development and details of this mission are obscure. It is sufficient at this point to note that the

1 Trilling, pp78f, Schurmann, "Matt 10 5-6", p270f, Schniewind, "Matt", p128

2 Jeremias, pp27-8

developments in the mission of the early Church, insofar as they can be discovered, are explicable on views other than Hahn's

5 The fact that Matt 10 and 15 are Matthean compositions is not an argument against the authenticity of individual verses in them. Further, it is quite probable that these verses appeared in Matthew's sources and that Luke omitted them because they would have been offensive to Gentile readers, as they may have been to Luke himself

6 Matt 10 18 has been transposed by Matthew from its original context, namely the eschatological discourse where Jesus spoke of the events which would occur after his death (Mk 13 pars). Two things are worth noting first, some of the teaching in the eschatological discourse, including this verse, has been coloured by the later experience of the Church, second, appearing before Gentile courts does not necessarily imply a Gentile mission

It appears, therefore, that for every argument against the authenticity of these verses there is an equally forceful counter-argument. Are there any other factors which may tip the scales one way or the other ?

a. Jeremias argues that these sayings are full of Aramaisms

In Matt. 10 5b-6 1 εἰς ὁδόν = Aramaic ܐܢܝܢܐ = 'in the direction of', 'towards'

1. Cf Schurmann, ibid

2 If in his account of the sending of the Seventy (Lk 10 1f) Luke is trying to relate the Gentile mission of his day to the life of Jesus, this would give another reason for his omission of these verses

3 See later on Mk 13 9-10

4 Jeremias, pp19f, 26f

2 οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ is a Semitism which = 'tribe' or 'lineage'¹

3 εἰς πόλιν Σαμαρειτῶν The absence of the article before πόλιν points to an underlying construct state in Aramaic. The Aramaic ܐܠܦܝܢ in its indeterminate state means 'province' and in its determinate state 'city'. The former was intended but the latter translated, because the Aramaic was misunderstood.

In Matt 15 24 1 οὐκ εἰ μὴ = the Aramaic ܐܢܝܢ , which means 'only'

2 The passive ἀπεστέλλην is a Semitism, a circumlocution for the Divine name

3 The variation between εἰς (15 24) and πρὸς (10 6) is to be explained as a translation variant of an original Aramaic

These arguments are imposing, but they have to be treated with great care. For example, εἰς ὁδόν may simply be a parallel to εἰς πόλιν, οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ does not necessarily reflect a Semitism any more than the use of the passive does, and the two prepositions

εἰς and πρὸς may simply represent a stylistic variation, since² they were interchangeable in the Koine. Further, even if we can prove a Semitic background here, as is probable, this is only a hint towards and not a proof of authenticity

1 The genitive οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ is obscure: it could be a partitive genitive, referring either to those who are Israelites by right but are now excluded, or to those Israelites who have responded to Jesus' call, or it could be an explicative genitive, referring to the whole of Israel. The latter is preferable for both Matt 10 6 and 15 24, since the contrast is with Samaritans and Gentiles and it also fits with OT usage (cf Jer 50 6, Is 53 6, Ezek 34 5).

2 Blass Debrunner, 207 1

b The strongest argument in favour of the authenticity of these verses is the fact that they fit in well with the picture which we have already gained from the less disputed of Jesus' sayings on the Gentiles. In plain, unequivocal language Jesus limits his own and his¹ disciple's activity to the confines of Israel. That this is not an expression of undiluted nationalism can be seen from the other material where Jesus condemns the Jews and in the same breath announces that the Gentiles will participate in the future Kingdom. It appears then that Jesus expressly excluded the possibility of a full-scale historical Gentile mission. However, closely connected with these verses and their interpretation is the problematic verse in Matt 10 23, and to this we now turn Matt 10 23

On the question of the authenticity of this verse we can refer back to all except the second of the objections which were raised with regard to Matt 10 5b-6, 15 24 and the appropriate answers. There are, however, additional objections to Matt 10 23, they are as follows

1. The saying is placed in the context of teaching about the persecution of the disciples, teaching of this kind normally had a² late origin. Similarly, many see it as having arisen directly out of³ a persecution, as over against a mission, situation in the Church

1 It is interesting to note how Matthew may have understood these words that he was not simply a nationalist is shown by 28 16f, he may have understood 'Jew first then Greek' in a qualitative way i.e. the Jews always have first place as a result of God's election, he may have seen them as fitting into a 'Heilsgeschichtliche' pattern, i.e. these sayings applied only to the time before and not to the time after the Resurrection, or, finally, he may not have seen, or if he did see may not have bothered to harmonize, any contradiction

2. Hahn, pp56-8

3. Glasson, pp103-4

2 It is said that Jesus made no such temporal predictions

3 The use of the title Son of Man makes the whole verse suspect to some authors

4 It is said that in its present form the saying is not genuine J A T Robinson, for example, thinks that originally it spoke of an imminent historical crisis - maybe the flight to Pella The temporal limitation of v23b is a later addition, since it takes the accent off the life of Jesus and places it on some future event³

With regard to the first argument we can reply that although in their present form the passages about persecution have been coloured by the experience of the Church, there is no reason why Jesus should not have foreseen that his disciples would encounter persecution. As a result of his own experience of opposition it would not be a particularly difficult prediction to make The statement that Jesus made no such temporal predictions is based on an impossible exegesis of several passages (for example, Mk 9 1, 13 30 pars), many of which we shall be discussing later It is enough to note that for many scholars Matt 10 23 confirms the 'Naherwartung' of Jesus attested elsewhere The view that Jesus never used the title Son of Man is unconvincing The fact that the title appears only once outside the Gospels (Acts 7 56) is formidable evidence for the authenticity of at least some of the Son of Man sayings We can also note that in Matt 10 23 Jesus and the Son of Man are not directly identified, which for some

1 Wilder, pp129f

2 Taylor, "Names", p29 - although he does not suggest what the original was

3 Robinson, p76

is a mark of the authentic Son of Man sayings. Even if the Son of Man title is not original, the saying itself may be a genuine saying of Jesus which was later recast on the form of a Son of Man saying. The argument of Robinson will be discussed later, suffice it here to say that there does not seem to be any good reason for removing the temporal element from Matt 10 23. Moreover, against Robinson's argument, and as a comment on the general question of the Church's creative activity, it is worth noting that this particular verse remained doubly unfulfilled in the experience of the Church: the mission did reach out to those beyond the boundaries of Israel and the Son of Man did not come. And the temporal limitation of this verse is so narrow that it is difficult to suppose that it was created even by the earliest Christians. Finally, in favour of the authenticity of this verse we can once again quote Jeremias' argument on the basis of ¹ Aramaisms and the fact that there is no contradiction between this verse and the other material we have discussed so far.

We can, therefore, reasonably accept the saying as authentic. However, we are now faced with the task of interpreting it. ² First,

1 Jeremias, p20. In the phrase ἐν τῇ κολῇ ταύτῃ the superfluous translation of a demonstrative reflects a Semitic idiom, the definite article in εἰς τὴν ἐτέραν reflects a Semitic idiom, and the word ἄμην is based on a Semitic original.

2 Among the innumerable interpretations given by those who treat it as unauthentic we mention

A Those who think it arose from a persecution situation -

a E Bammel, St Th, 15, 1961, pp79-92, argues that it was a community creation based on OT and Jewish parallels and that it arose in a time of persecution. The idea of mission came in only with its inclusion in Matthew. Matthew's only addition is "Truly, I say to you". Similarly Ph Vielhauer, "Gottesreich", pp51f.

b Glasson and Robinson, ibid, refer it to the flight of the Christians

should we separate v23a and 23b ? Although some have argued that

¹
they cannot be separated, it seems quite probable that v23b is an isolated logion, since v23a occurs in Lk 6 40 without v23b, and v23a

²
and v24 link well together Matthew may have found it in the same context as it now has in ch 10, since it fits in well with its

surroundings, or he may have placed it, correctly, in a general

³
missionary context How then are we to interpret it within this missionary

(cont) to Pella The reference to mission and the temporal limitation are later additions

B Those who think it arose from a missionary situation -

a Schweizer, Z N W ,50,1959,pp191f, thinks it represents the narrow view in the disputes over the Gentile mission in the Church It was later put into a persecution context Cf Cadoux,pp95,143, Klostermann, "Matt",p89

b Kilpatrick,"Matthew",pp119f , interprets it against a Diaspora background and thinks it must be read in the light of Paul's habit of preaching in the synagogues first In fact, he thinks it reflects an acceptance of the Gentile mission

C Those who see a reference to both persecution and mission or neither -

a Tödt (pp60-2) and Higgins (pp100-4) think it arose in a situation of persecution during a mission to the Jews

b Hahn,pp54-8, sees the origins of this exclusivism in the teaching of Jesus Jesus used apocalyptic language, but denied or recast most apocalyptic ideas His followers, however, understood this language literally, and so arrived at the exclusivism of Matt 10 23 They believed that the Gentiles had a place but that it was only in the future Kingdom Thus what Jeremias takes to have been Jesus' view, Hahn thinks was the view only of particularist Jewish Christianity

1 Tödt, Higgins and Bammel, ibid The first two argue that one can only divide the verse if the two halves come from manifestly different contexts, and in this case they do not, also, v23a is not complete in itself Neither of these arguments carries much weight Bammel thinks the whole verse, apart from "Truly, I say to you ", was constructed from O T and Jewish parallels at the same time

2 Kümmel,pp61-7, Cadoux,ibid , Grässer,pp137f, Hare,p110

3 This cancels out two interpretations which treat it as an authentic persecution logion

a Schurmann,B Z (N F),3,1959,pp82-8, thinks it was originally a persecution logion giving comfort The idea of mission was added later

b Feuillet,C B Q ,23,1961,pp182-98, links Schurmann's view with that of J A T Robinson Thus the coming of the Son of Man refers to the flight to Pella and is a word of consolation The Divine judgement that comes on Israel is at the same time a deliverance for the Church, and this judgement is a proleptic coming of the Son of Man before his Parousia

context ?

a Filson interprets it to mean that as the missionary work of the Church advances and men are converted, so, in the very fact of this activity, the Kingdom of God or Son of Man comes ¹ This is, however, an interpretation which is influenced by modern ideas and seems to ignore the plain meaning of the text

²
b As we saw, A Schweitzer made this verse the key to his understanding of Jesus' life Taking the whole of Matt 10 as authentic down to the smallest detail, he interprets v23 as Jesus' sending out of his disciples on a mission which would precipitate the End But when they return and the End does not come, Jesus realizes that he must die alone, absorb all the Messianic afflictions, and thereby bring in the End -But Schweitzer's thesis, as many have since noted, takes no account of the composite and secondary nature of Matt 10 and makes a false chronological link between Matt 10 and Mk 6

³
c. Michaelis interprets the verse to mean that the disciples must not hold out under persecution in the hope that Israel will be converted, since she will be rebellious up till the End The text itself, however, contains neither the idea of converting all of Israel nor that of forcing this conversion by holding out under ⁴persecution Schniewind offers an exegesis which is even further from the text the Jews are offered salvation but refuse it, therefore it

1 Filson, "Matthew", pp131f

2 See above pp9f

3 Michaelis, pp63f

4 Schniewind "Matt", pp130-1

goes to the Gentiles When the Son of Man comes - in an indefinite future - the conversion of Israel will be incomplete, but when the Parousia comes Israel may realize what she has rejected and repent All this may well be true, but none of these ideas appear in the text of Matt 10 23'

1

d Grässer, reflecting on this verse in a missionary context, suggests two possible emphases it could be a stimulus for the disciples to encourage them to hasten in their task, or it could be a word of comfort in view of the trials and frustrations they will encounter in their missionary work

Both of Grässer's suggestions are fruitful, and a combination of them is possible With this in mind, we can conclude our study of this verse with the following observations

a. The mission of Jesus and his disciples is once again limited to Israel

b The clear implication of the verse is that this mission will not be completed because the Son of Man will appear very soon, in fact before all the towns of Israel have been covered

2

c. The above observations and the plain meaning of the verse in a missionary context exclude any possibility of a historical Gentile mission

Before we turn to the final section of this chapter, this is a convenient point at which to summarize briefly the results we have

1 Grässer, pp137-41

2. Here, τετέλεσται appears to mean to complete or fulfil, which is a possible, though not perhaps the most usual, meaning of τελέω cf. Arndt & Gingrich, p818

obtained so far

1 Jesus limited himself, in his earthly ministry, to Israel and commanded his disciples to do likewise. There is no evidence that he was diverted from this his main purpose or that he preached or even desired to preach to the Gentiles.

2 Nevertheless, according to Jesus' teaching, the Gentiles have a definite place in the Kingdom of God. This place is almost wholly reserved for the future, when the Kingdom of God will be manifested in all its fullness. As subsidiary points we note that this hope for the Gentiles is frequently played off against the present disobedience and obduracy of the Jews, and that it will apparently be effected after and as a result of Jesus' death.

3 The link between the Gentiles and the Kingdom of God is frequently made in a context where Jesus appears to have thought that this Kingdom was imminent.

4 On exceptional occasions Jesus responded, though with considerable reluctance, to certain Gentiles who persistently appealed to him. Jesus' response of healing shows that at least these few Gentiles were participants in the Kingdom of God which was, in a partial, hidden manner, in the process of realization. This point is entirely consonant with what has been said in points 1-3.

5 There is no evidence that Jesus either foresaw or intended any historical mission to the Gentiles such as actually took place in the early Church. In fact, such a mission is indirectly excluded by Matt 10 23.

Having thus formularized and summarized our results so far, we turn finally to the material which seems directly to contradict some of these results. In doing so we shall consider the many attempts to resolve this contradiction and offer the solution which seems to us to be the most satisfactory

Mk 14 28, 16 7

Two authors in particular, C F Evans¹ and G H Boobyer,² have interpreted these enigmatic verses as a direct reference to a historical Gentile mission. The evidence which they offer is as follows

1. $\pi\rho\omicron\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ most of the Classical and LXX evidence shows that when it is used with an object this verb means 'to lead' and not 'to precede'. That Mark means 'lead' may be supported from the fact that 14 27 quotes Zech 13 7, where the metaphor is of a shepherd and his flock - a metaphor which is probably continued into v28

2. $\Gamma\alpha\lambda\iota\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ if, as often in Jesus' use of place-names (Matt 11 21, 11 23, 23 27 and pars), this word has more than mere geographical significance, then on the basis of Old Testament usage, where 'Galilee' is almost synonymous with 'Gentiles', the reference would be clear

3. On the basis of this evidence, Evans goes on to consider the two more usual interpretations. The first is that the words refer to a Resurrection appearance.³ Against this view Evans notes that

1 Evans, J T S, ns5, 1954, pp3f

2 Boobyer, B J R L, 25, 1952-3, pp34Of

3 Cranfield, pp428, 468-9 and many others

a If προάγειν means 'lead' then this would not naturally suggest a reference to the Resurrection appearances

b The reference to the Resurrection itself -μετα το ἐγερθῆναι - is then placed in parenthesis, subordinated to an appearance

c Above all, there is no sound tradition for Galilean Resurrection appearances, apart from the hypothesized lost ending of Mark there is only Matt 28 and Jn 21, which are best explained as attempts to interpret Mark's cryptic statements

1

The second interpretation is that given by E Lohmeyer, who thinks that these verses refer to the Parousia Against this view Evans notes that

a Again, if προάγειν means 'lead', this would not naturally suggest a reference to the Parousia

b Lohmeyer himself admits that if we translate it as 'precede', what Jesus does between the Resurrection and the Parousia remains obscure

c One can note incidentally that the evidence which Lohmeyer gives for taking ὄψεσθε as a technical word meaning 'to see the Parousia' is inconclusive

4 Additional support for taking these verses as a prophecy of the Gentile mission ² is sought in the following facts

1 Lohmeyer, "Galiläa", pp13f, similarly J Weiss, "Christianity", I, pp14f

2 Cf also Ramsey, "Resurrection", p71, Lightfoot, "Mark", pp106-16

a The Gentiles play an important role in Old Testament and Jewish eschatology

b The themes of the Temple and the Gentiles become increasingly dominant towards the end of Mark

c In Matthew, Luke and John the Resurrection is the transition point for the Gentile mission

d The alteration of these verses in Matthew and Luke are best explained as attempts to understand Mark Thus Matt 28 10 (cf 26 32) makes a clearer connection with the Resurrection appearances, while Luke, omitting Mk 14 27-8, transposes Mk 16 7 into "remember how he spoke to you concerning Galilee "

Although on first sight these seem to be a formidable array of arguments, on closer analysis they appear far less convincing

1 Although most of the evidence does show that προάγειν means 'lead', there are cases where it means 'precede' (Matt 14 22, 21 31 with the accusative of the person, and Mk 6 45 without the accusative) Therefore both meanings are possible in Mk 14 28 and 16 7¹

2. In the rest of Mark the word 'Galilee' appears always to have a strictly geographical meaning, referring to the locale where Jesus enacted the earlier part of his ministry To deny the symbolic significance of Galilee is to remove one of the key points in the above-mentioned thesis²

1. Arndt & Gingrich, pp268-9 Moulton & Milligan also give a few examples of this meaning from the papyri

2 The OT background is important, but there is no evidence that it has influenced Mk 14 28 and 16 7 Evans admits this, but Boobyer tends to give a symbolic significance to Galilee throughout Mark's Gospel This is unconvincing, but even if it were true, it does not follow that Jesus shared Mark's view

3 The only other point in their supporting evidence which carries much weight is the observation that in Matthew and Luke the Resurrection is seen as the turning point for the Gentile mission. As regards the historical value of this observation for Jesus' own view, we refer to the following study of Matt 28 16-20 and, for Lk 24 44f, to the next chapter of this thesis. The rest of their observations are valid, but do not provide positive support for their thesis.

4 The phrase $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\lambda\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \delta\psi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ in Mk 16 7 makes it improbable that Mark intended a reference to the Gentile mission in 14 28 and 16 7, since this phrase presumably shows that he understood $\pi\rho\acute{o}\gamma\epsilon\lambda\upsilon$ to mean 'precede', whereas 'lead' would have been more natural in a prophecy of the Gentile mission. However, it could be argued that this phrase is Mark's interpretative addition.

Any reference to the Gentile mission in these verses is therefore highly improbable, and certainly unprovable. What then was the original meaning? Mark could scarcely have understood it as a reference to the Parousia, since he was writing approximately thirty years after the prophecy was given. Since we have excluded the possibility of a reference to the Gentile mission in Mark, presumably

1. Evans ends with the words: "Either 'he anticipates you into Galilee and there, in the Parousia, you will see him', or 'he is leading you to the Gentiles, it is there you will behold him'" as the two possible alternatives. For our purposes it would be ideal if, instead of choosing, we combined them and saw a double reference both to the Parousia and to the Gentiles who will participate in it. It would then fit in admirably with the other material on the Gentiles. However, this would be stretching exegetical ingenuity too far - even for the sake of a thesis.

he understood it as a prophecy of a Resurrection appearance. Moreover, the tradition for Galilean Resurrection appearances is not quite so easily dispensed with as Evans supposes.¹ But is this how Jesus intended the words to be understood? The fact that Mark interpreted them in this way is 'a priori' in favour of this view and yet, while admitting that none of the interpretations are immune to criticism, we would suggest that the original reference was to the Parousia. We note the following points

1 *μετα τὸ ἐγερθῆναι* Mk 14 28 at other times when Jesus refers to his own raising (Mk 8 31, 9 31, 10 34) he appears to have expected God to vindicate him shortly after his death ('after three days'). Many see this as an expression of Jesus' expectation of the Parousia which would follow quite soon after his death. If this interpretation is correct, it might suggest a reference to the Parousia in Mk 14 28, 16 7.

2 While Lohmeyer was wrong to think of *ὄψεσθε* as a technical word meaning 'to see the Parousia', the occurrence of this verb in connection with the Parousia may be significant (cf Mk 13 26, 14 62). However, one should also note that the verb can be used of seeing the Risen Lord (Matt 28 10, and Mark's interpretation of Mk 16 7) and that

1 Luke is the only Gospel with Resurrection appearances but with none in Galilee, but then Luke has a Jerusalem bias. Matt 28 and Jn 21 may well preserve ancient and reliable traditions which were obscured and underrated by what was from very early on a predominantly Jerusalem-orientated Church. Unfortunately, we know all too little about Galilean Christianity (if there was such a thing) and, despite Lohmeyer, attempts at reconstruction are highly speculative.

the phrase ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε in Mk 16 7 may be a Markan addition

3 The translation of προάγειν by 'precede', which we have seen to be possible, would be most natural in a reference to the Parousia, although even the translation 'lead' would not rule out such an interpretation

4 The placing of the Resurrection in parenthesis (Mk 14 28), as secondary to something else, is perhaps more natural with a reference to the Parousia than with a reference to a Resurrection appearance

We conclude, therefore, that whereas Jesus intended a reference to the Parousia, Mark understood these verses as referring to a Resurrection appearance, neither made or intended to make a reference to the Gentile mission

Matt 28 16-20 The command for the mission¹

In the commands of the Risen Lord we have words which fundamentally contradict our results so far We are, of course, dealing with specifically post-Resurrection material, which is thus not directly related to the teaching of Jesus in his earthly ministry Moreover, we are seeing it through the eyes of a post-Pentecost, post-Cornelius Church As it bears indirectly on our study we shall, however, take

1 Four studies of this passage are particularly valuable Hahn, pp63f, G Barth, pp131f, Michel, Ev Th ,10,1950-1, pp16-26, Lohmeyer, "Gewalt", pp22-49 Luke's version of the post-Resurrection commands will be dealt with in the next chapter

a closer look at this passage, since it may be instructive in other ways. ¹ Despite Bosch and Filson, who treat vv19-20 as genuine commands of the Risen Lord, we would suggest that the whole passage looks suspiciously like a Matthean construction, reflecting many of the theological ideas and problems of the Church of his day. The reasons for this view are as follows

1 There are, in these few verses, an unusual number of Matthean linguistic peculiarities -

ἰδόντες - it is a Matthean peculiarity to place an aorist participle before the aorist of the main verb when two actions are linked in an event

προσεκύνησαν - Matt 13 times, Mk 2 and Lk 2

ἐδίστασαν - only in Matthew

προσελθών - Matt 52 times, Mk 5 and Lk 10

μαθητεύσατε - Matt 3 times and Acts 14 21.

τηρεῖν - Matt. 6 times, Mk 1 and Lk 1.

ἰδοὺ - occurs 18 times more in Matthew than in Mark and Luke together, after a genitive absolute, peculiar to Matthew

2 The setting on the mountain is probably Matthean in line with parallels from the Old Testament, where it is the place for God's theophanies, and from the New Testament, where it is the place for

1 Bosch, pp184f, Filson "Matthew", pp304-6 The arguments of Michel for authenticity merely show that Matthew was restrained rather than excessive in his description of these events and that the more mythological elements were not his main interest

Jesus' revelations (Matt 5 1f, 15 29, 17 1f, 24 3f)

3 v17 "some doubted" cf Mk 16 14, Lk.24 41 Though here, as in Mark and Luke, the doubt is overcome by the presence of the Risen Lord, Matthew offers and emphasizes his own distinctive answer to this problem That is , it is the word of Jesus and not his Risen presence which dispels all doubt " es ist eine letzte Hindeutung dass nicht dem Ereignis der Erscheinung, sondern den Worten des Erschienenen alles Gewicht und alle Bedeutung zukommt " ¹ This deals directly with the problems of the post-Ascension Church when the Resurrection appearances were finished

4 v18 Ἔδοθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ² expresses an Exaltation christology-which, as Hahn notes, was one of the Church's substitutes for Eschatology The whole utterance is dominated by this theme and Dodd has correctly labelled it a "proleptic Parousia" ³

5 The command to mission is reflected in Matthew's universalism ⁴ (Matt 10 18, 24 14).

6 The command to baptize is found nowhere else in Jesus' teaching and is, like the Trinitarian formula with which it is connected, almost certainly a later addition ⁵ Eusebius often quotes these verses with the simpler formula "baptize them in my name" and some would therefore treat the Trinitarian formula as a late addition However, since it

1 Lohmeyer "Gewalt",p27 - although Lohmeyer denies that it is used to dispel the disciples' doubt

2 Hahn,p64

3 Dodd,"Studies",p56

4. Hahn,p63 thinks it may reflect an old and genuine command of the Risen Lord.

5 Conybeare,Z N W ,2,1901,pp275-88.

is in all known manuscripts of Matthew, we should have to postulate a very early addition for there to be no traces of it in any of the manuscripts, which in turn defeats the original purpose of proving it to be a late alteration. Since in Acts the shorter formula is used,¹ Matthew presumably reflects the normal usage of his day

7 We have already noted that $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ v19 reflects a distinctive Matthean concept² So too does the command to "teach them to keep all that I have commanded you " This teaching is not only a precondition of Baptism, but also characterizes all preaching The $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ here may have polemical overtones, directed against those who wanted to abolish part of the Law

8. v20 expresses the concept of the Lord's abiding presence with his Church - a familiar theme in Matthew (Matt 1 22-3, 8 23f, 18 20, cf Gen 28 15, Judges 6 12), which reflects the theology and experience of the post-Ascension Church

Thus at every stage we have found Matthean ideas and the problems of the post-Ascension Church protruding in this passage, and we are forced to conclude that we have here a theological construction of Matthew and his Church³ We have noted the frequent echo of Old

1 Lohmeyer, op cit ,pp28-33, thinks that Eusebius' version reflects an ancient, independent tradition (Jerusalem) and Matthew's an equally ancient tradition (Galilee) He would explain the evidence of Acts as a result of Luke recording only one stream of primitive Christian tradition

2 See the excellent study of G Barth,pp71f,131f

3 Spitta (pp61-71) tries, unconvincingly, to explain Matt 28 16f as a recasting of a pre-Resurrection sending out of the disciples

Testament ideas The primary reference appears to be to Dan 7 14¹,
 although there may also be a reflection of Ps 110 1f² This has led³
 some to see here the influence of the Enthronement festival, but⁴
 the parallels are not close and the most that can be said is that it
 may hover in the background

We must ask finally what Matthew's purpose was in constructing
 this passage and what relevance it has for the Gentile question as
 a whole We offer the following two observations

a This Exaltation christology is Matthew's answer to the problem
 of the delayed Parousia, it acts as a stopgap for the unexpected
 'Zwischenzeit' One might note that Dan 7 14, which is in the
 background here, arose historically amongst a people under stress,
 who were awaiting an imminent inbreaking of the Kingdom of God We
 can also note Lohmeyer's suggestion of one possible interpretation
 of v20, namely that the work of the 'Vollendung' has not only begun,
 but is complete, and what follows is only the logical continuation of
 this single, unique event

1 Michel, Lohmeyer, *ibid*, Jeremias, pp38-9, Bosch, pp184f

2 Hahn, *ibid* He rejects the reference to Dan 7 14

3 Notably Michel and Lohmeyer, *ibid*

4 Michel sees three basic elements influenced by the Enthronement
 festival and combined by Matthew the assertion of authority v18, the
 missionary command vv19-20, and the promise of help v20 Hahn, *ibid*,
 correctly notes the differences from an Enthronement pattern v18 speaks
 of a revelation of an accomplished exaltation, not of an enthronement,
 vv19-20 is not a proclamation to other powers of the Lord's ascension
 to the throne, but a proclamation that his earthly messengers are being
 sent to all nations, v20b speaks of the exercising of this accomplished
 sovereignty

5 Lohmeyer, *op cit*, p35

b The Gentile mission is embedded in a command of the Risen Lord This mission thus becomes an integral part of christology, a postulate of the universal sovereignty of the Exalted Lord and not simply a command of the earthly Jesus What was to Matthew an indisputable historical fact is theologically justified, a full-scale, systematic mission can therefore proceed under the protection and on the authority of the Risen Lord Matthew, like Luke, justifies the Gentile mission by a post-Resurrection command (though of Matt 24 14) Mk 13 10 par , 14 9

We turn finally to the str^aightforward prophecies of the Gentile mission by the earthly Jesus, whose plain meaning once again contradicts several of our results so far We shall consider the general arguments for authenticity, interpret the verses as they stand in Mark, and then discuss the various methods by which scholars have dealt with them, at the same time propounding their own views on the Gentile question The arguments against the authenticity of Mk 13 10 - and with it Mk 14 9, which many see as a doublet of 13 10 - are

1. Mk 13 10 is clearly an editorial insertion¹

2 It uses the language of early Christian preaching - πάντα τα ἔθνη , κηρύσσειν , εὐαγγέλιον - and is therefore a 'vaticinium ex eventu' from the 'Missionszeit'

1 Marxsen, pp119f, Harder, Th Viat ,4,1952,p78, Conzelmann, Z N W ,50, 1959, pp210f, Taylor, pp507f - though he thinks it represents Jesus' view
 2 Bultmann, pp122f, "Word", p46, Klostermann, "Mk", pp147f, Hahn, pp71f

3 Jesus expected the End within his own generation, which¹
excludes a universal mission

4 It is asked now, with such an unequivocal command, there was²
so much disagreement in the early Church over the Gentile mission

5 The omission of Mk 13 10 in Luke is because it was not in³
Luke's version of Mark but was a later addition

With regard to these arguments we note the following points the fact that 13 10 is an insertion, which it may not be, says nothing for or against its authenticity, it could be an isolated, but genuine, word of Jesus The use of the language of early Christian preaching hints at a late origin, but one cannot say more In using this language Mark is doing only what was natural for a Christian author who was writing circa A.D 60-65, but this does not preclude the possibility that behind this language there lies a genuine logion of Jesus The argument that Mk 13 10 was created in the 'Missionszeit' is not, on its own, convincing, rather, it is a possible explanation if for other reasons we suspect the authenticity of this saying Moreover, the early⁴ communities do not seem to have been such hives of creativity as Bultmann

1 Kümmel, p84

2 Kümmel, ibid

3 Grässer, pp158f

4 This is, of course, a value-judgement demanding more proof than there is room for here The study of Matt 28 16f above may seem to contradict this view, but in the post-Resurrection material we have a special case with its own peculiar problems There is clear evidence of oral and literary accretions in the Gospel traditions, and it is true that the Evangelists sometimes attribute statements to the earthly Jesus which he did not make during his ministry, but the idea that the primitive communities created material willy-nilly to suit their situation is unproven

supposes With regard to arguments 3 and 4, both of which will be taken up later, we merely note at this point both that it depends on the interpretation given to 13 10 and 14 9 whether or not they fit in with Jesus' 'Naherwartung', and that the problems of the early Church's mission have to be more closely defined before they can be read back as arguments for or against authenticity Finally, it can be said that there are more convincing explanations for Luke's omission of Mk 13 10

Once again we find that for every argument against authenticity there is also a counter-argument Have we anything which will tip the scales one way or the other ?¹

a. The linguistic argument goes against authenticity this time, but, as we have seen, on its own it is not sufficient evidence on which to base a decision

b The plain meaning of these verses (see below) contradicts what we have previously found to be Jesus' view However, if we can explain these verses in a way which does not contradict, but rather confirms, our previous results, we shall be home and dry

1 The arguments offered by Bosch (p132) are unconvincing They are (a) Since Matt 16 18 is authentic, Jesus foresaw a Church As there cannot be a Church without mission, it is only a small step to Mk 13 10 (b) The parables of vigilance - Mk 13 28f, Matt 24 37-9 - are authentic Therefore, Jesus foresaw a 'Zwischenzeit' in which the disciples would be active (Matt 25 14f, Lk 19 12f) This activity consists of the universal preaching of the gospel The arguments of Beasley-Murray (pp191f) about Jesus' universalism are too vague to be of much use Liechtenhahn (pp31f) argues that for Jesus, mission must have been a postulate of his eschatology This is true, but we do not agree that this mission should take a historical form Two more attempts to explain Jesus' relative

First, we must discover the meaning of 13 10 within the context of Mark

a Mark probably understood the phrase εἰς μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῖς in 13 9 to mean witness of a positive kind That is, when the disciples were brought to trial, this would be an opportunity for their accusers, both Jew and Gentile, to hear the Gospel Accordingly, Mark has inserted v10 at this point.

b There was to be a historical mission to the Gentiles which would give positive significance to the "Zwischen^{de}-zeit", so that it would not simply be a time of endurance The Gentile mission, therefore, helped to answer the problem of the delayed Parousia¹

c This mission would extend to every part of the then known world² before the End came³

This appears then to be Mark's understanding of 13 10 (and together with it, 14 9), it is clear how this contradicts the results

(cont) silence on the Gentile mission are unconvincing (a) That such teaching would have been so radical that it would have provoked violent opposition and ruined Jesus' chances of a successful mission to Israel (Cadoux, pp162f) (b) That Jesus was too absorbed in his impending death and Passion to think of the Gentiles (Taylor, p507)

1. Grässer, pp158f, Conzelmann, art cit , pp218-9
- 2 In the context of Mk 13, πρῶτον must be translated as "first" and not as "above all" (cf Hahn, pp72-3 for the former and Marxsen, p120 for the latter)
- 3 Bosch, pp161-3, has argued, correctly, against the view of Meinertz, pp 151-7, that 13 10 refers only to the Mediterranean peoples of one generation who will hear the Gospel in the short time before the Parousia Marxsen, ibid, thinks that 13 10 means that the Gentile mission will hasten the coming of the Parousia, a view which is based on his total analysis of 13 5f - all of which he takes to be a description of the Eschatological drama proper However, his analysis of 13 5f is not convincing, and even if it were, the interpretation he gives to 13 10 cannot be found in the text itself.

we have so far obtained How can we resolve this contradiction ?

It is in their answers to this problem that we find various scholars revealing their own interpretation of the Gentile question as a whole

1. The most convenient way of solving the problem is simply to regard both strands of evidence as having originated in the creative activity of the early Church This is basically the approach of Bultmann, to whom the two strands merely "reveal the growing and developing ideas of mission in the early Church "¹

2 The next most simple solution is to deny the authenticity of one or other of the strands

A. Harnack argues that all references to the Gentile mission in Jesus' teaching - and in fact almost all references to the Gentiles, regardless of their connection with the idea of mission - are not authentic² In his own words, "the universal mission was an inevitable issue of the religion and spirit of Jesus, and its origin, not only apart from any direct word from Jesus, but in verbal contradiction to many of his sayings, is really a stronger testimony to the method, strength and spirit of his teaching than if it were the outcome of a deliberate command " Or again, " all that Jesus promulgated was the overthrow of the Temple and the judgement impending upon the nation and its leaders He shattered Judaism and brought out the kernel of the religion of Israel Thereby, that is by his preaching of God as

1 Bultmann, p145 n1

2. Harnack "Mission", I, pp36-43 Quotations from pp37 and 43

Father and by his own death, he founded the universal religion, which was at the same time the religion of the Son "

1

B Spitta thought that from the very beginning Jesus intended to promote the Gentile mission, an intention which clashed with the typical outlook of the Pharisees Jesus can, therefore, be regarded as the first Christian missionary and sayings such as those found in Matt 10 5-6, 15 24 cannot be attributed to him

Hahn, while also rejecting Mk 13 10, 14 9 pars , similarly rejects the particularist sayings on the grounds that in the authentic tradition Jesus was open to the Gentiles The promises to all nations and the acceptance of individual Gentiles are not to be torn apart While Jesus did not perform a mission to the Gentiles," -his message and work in Israel became a witness among the Gentiles, and still more as the eschatological Event began to be realized, salvation came within reach of the Gentiles " By proclaiming the Kingdom of God Jesus preached the salvation of God for everyone to hear, and even the Gentiles heard the news.

2

Enough has already been said to make it clear that, on the basis of the evidence we have discussed, none of these views (1 and 2) are acceptable

3 Another approach is to accept both strands of evidence and to argue that there is no contradiction between them. We have already

1 Spitta, pp72f, 83f, 109f

2. Hahn, p39

met this view in Schniewind's exegesis of Matt. 10 23 and we refer back to the comments there ¹ Beasley-Murray has a similar view he claims that Matt 10 23 and Mark 13 10 are not contradictory "once the perspective of the primitive Church be adopted" It is doubtful that this is true, but even if it is, we cannot assume that Jesus shared the perspective of the primitive Church ² Bosch, commenting on the imminent expectation of Mk 9 1, 13 30 in relation to Mk 13 10 says, "Das ist aber gerade die Dialektik des Glaubens der Urchristenheit, dass sie die eine Aussage ernst nimmt, ohne die andere zu vernachlässigen oder abzuschwächen " And commenting further on the relation of Matt 10 23 to Mk 13 10 he says, "Auch aus diesem Grund müssen wir darum Matt 10 23 als selbständiges Jesuswort betrachten, das analog zu dem Wort von der Heidenmission Mk 13 10, auch eine Judenmission während der ganzen Zwischenzeit erwartet "The fact, which Bosch himself notes, that " nach Mk 13 10 die Heidenmission als ein opus perfectum erscheint, während nach Matt 10 23 die Judenmission noch nicht zu Ende gekommen sein wird", only hints at one of the difficulties of his interpretation Others will be raised later under the so-called "Heilsgeschichtliche" interpretation

4 Another possible way out of the dilemma would be to divide Jesus' ministry into two periods: at first he was concerned only with the Jews - and so one could date the particularist material in this period, but after being rejected by the Jews he turns to the Gentiles - a

1. Beasley-Murray, pp197f

2. Bosch, p147, second quotation from p157.

change which gave rise to the universalistic material. However, this interpretation is full of loopholes First, neither the particularist nor the universalist sayings can confidently be placed chronologically in Jesus' ministry Secondly, there is no evidence to suggest that the particularist sayings were relevant for only one part of Jesus' ministry Thirdly, the so-called Northern journey of Jesus is the only recorded period which could conceivably be called a Gentile ministry, and we have commented sufficiently on this already

5 A further attempt to explain all the material in the Synoptics is found in the views of C J Cadoux,¹ T W Manson² and J Munck,³ all of whom resort to the concept of "representative universalism". The basic notion is that Jesus' purpose in limiting his activity to Israel was that "Israel should bring the knowledge of the true God to the Gentile peoples and should prevail upon them to serve him aright"⁴ Or, as Manson puts it, "Throughout the ministry he was patiently awaiting the conversion of the Jewish people to himself, in order that the conversion of other races might be effected through them"⁵ Jesus' task was first and foremost to create "such a community in Israel in the faith that it would transform the life of his own people, and

1 Cadoux, pp160-1

2 Manson, "Jesus",

3 Munck, pp260, 271f: "Jesus' apparent particularism is an expression of his universalism, it is because his mission is to the whole world that he comes to Israel "This may be true, but he does not define how and when this particularism will expand ie is it to be a historical or an eschatological process ? Munck rejects Jeremias' view (see below), yet oddly enough on p272 he makes some statements which come remarkably close to Jeremias' theory

4 Cadoux, ibid

5 Manson, "Jesus", p5.

that a transformed Israel would transform the world "¹

There are advantages to this view, in that we know that Jesus did restrict his mission to Israel and that he did intend the conversion and reconstitution of his people, as is shown by his significant choice of the Twelve² On the other hand, one cannot ignore the material where Jesus condemns Israel for her failure to repent and, more significantly, the way in which he frequently connects the Jews' obduracy with the future inclusion of the Gentiles (Mk 11 15-7, 12 1-9, Matt 8 11, 10 15f, 11 21-4, 12 38-42 pars) This is a far cry from the notion of Israel as the light of the world Moreover, these authors assume that after the conversion of Israel a historical mission to the Gentiles would take place, whereas it seems more likely that Jesus' mission to Israel was for the purpose of converting and reconstituting her in preparation for the Messianic era, in accordance with the Jewish belief that this would be one of the events of the Last Days If the conversion of the Gentiles is included incidentally in this purpose, then it would have to be understood as an apocalyptic event In conclusion, we can note that the temporal limitations of Matt 10 23 militate against the interpretation of Manson and Cadoux, both of whom, significantly, suspect that it is unauthentic

1. Manson, "Jesus", p18

2. The fact that most of the Twelve play no significant part in the early Church, the inclusion of Judas in their number, and the story of Matthias' election are good reasons for supposing that the Twelve are not a fantasy of the Evangelists

1

6 G D Kilpatrick tries to eliminate Mk 13 10 and 14 9 by the use of textual and linguistic criticism Briefly, his arguments are as follows

a κηρύσσειν εἰς normally the verb is used with a dative for persons addressed, therefore, the accusative here means to preach 'in' or 'among' and not to preach 'to', of which there is no clear example in the New Testament The same argument applies to the phrase εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς v9 He then interprets the verses as referring only to a mission to Diaspora Jews.

b Some manuscripts have a full stop after ἔθνη v10 This punctuation is supported by Matt 10 18 He then notes that in Mark many sentences begin with a verb, so that where the punctuation is in doubt this should be the deciding factor Thus he connects v10a closely with v9 and v10b with v11, the result of which is to remove any idea of mission

There are, however, decisive objections to Kilpatrick's view First, while his comment on κηρύσσειν εἰς has some validity, the phrase could mean to preach 'unto' or 'as far as' as well as 'in' or 'among' With either of these meanings it could still refer to a Gentile mission Second, Matt 10 18 is Matthew's variation of Mk 13 10, another of which he gives in 24 14, neither is very strong supporting

1 Kilpatrick, "Gentiles", pp145-58

2. Jeremias, p22, thinks that κηρύχθην εἰς in 14 9 = the Aramaic ܟܪܝܬܐ followed by the indication of the individual or group being addressed

3 Jeremias, p23, thinks that Matt 24 14 is more original than Mk 13 10

evidence for Kilpatrick's interpretation of Mk 13 10 The secondary reading in Mark is quite probably due to early scribes who, being more familiar with Matthew than with Mark, assimilated the latter to the former Moreover, since the figures which Kilpatrick gives for Markan sentences are that the verb comes at the beginning of the sentence 48 times, 16 times in the middle, and 19 times at the end, one can scarcely use this as the decisive criterion when the punctuation is in doubt Finally, the connection of 10a with v9 and v10b with v11 is unconvincing, for v10b seems pointless in this context unless¹ qualified by v10a, v11 does not convincingly perform this task In fact, there are good reasons for supposing that v10 is an insertion into vv9-11, because verses 9 and 11 are linked by their similar content and by the catchwords $\kappa\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\omega\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon$ v9 and $\kappa\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\iota\delta\acute{o}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ v11 Also, it is easy to imagine how the subject matter of vv9 and 11² attracted v10 into this context

We must conclude, therefore, that although Kilpatrick's argument is ingenious, it proves on closer inspection to be weak at every³ point

7 A commonly accepted thesis, first given in detail by M Meinertz,⁴

1. Cranfield, pp398-9

2 Hahn, *ibid*, Grässer, *ibid*, Taylor, p507, Cranfield, *ibid*

3 We might add that Kilpatrick (J T S, ns9, 1958, pp81f) successfully refuted the objections to his thesis raised by Farrer and Moule (J T S ns7, 1956, pp75-9 and 281 respectively)

4 Meinertz, pp84f, 114f, 159f

is the so-called "Heilsgeschichtliche" interpretation. On this view it is possible to accept both strands of evidence by fitting them into a "Heilsgeschichtliche" pattern. Thus the particularist sayings were meant to apply only to Jesus' lifetime, for Jesus saw that after the Resurrection the Church's mission would reach out to the Gentiles and this is what he meant when he spoke Mk 13 10, 14 9, sayings which themselves lead on naturally to the post-Resurrection commands. So that what had hitherto been spoken only occasionally and with his eyes on the future became reality in his universal commission. There are, however, objections to this view.

a While Matthew may have thought in "Heilsgeschichtliche" terms, there is no evidence to suggest that Jesus saw the two sets of sayings as fitting into such a pattern.

b There is no evidence that Jesus intended the particularist sayings to apply only to the pre-Resurrection period, in fact, the limitations of Matt. 10 23 would exclude such a view.

c In all the material we have discussed so far, the inclusion of the Gentiles is seen to be primarily a future event, the future, that is, seen as part of the End events.

These seem to be good reasons for suspecting a view which otherwise makes sense of much of the material.

1. A similar view is found in several author's interpretations of Mk 7 23 and we refer back to the discussion of this verse. Also similar are the views of those who try to ignore or explain away the apparent contradiction, see pp 81-2 above and cf H Schlier, "Heidenmission", pp 90-107. Filson has a similar view but tries to argue away the temporal reference of Matt 10 23.

8. The final view we shall look at is that of E Lohmeyer and J
¹
 Jeremias Lohmeyer merely hinted at it while Jeremias has worked it
 out more fully Their solution is to argue that Mk 13 10, 14 9 did
 not originally refer to a historical Gentile mission as they do in
 their present context They are authentic words of Jesus which
 originally had quite another reference, namely to the apocalyptic
 proclamation to the Gentiles by God or his angels in the End-time -
 a concept which we have already found in the Old Testament and Judaism
²
 Jeremias, interpreting Mk 14 9, makes the following observations

a. ὅπου ἔαν should be translated in the temporal sense of
 "whenever" as in Mk 9 18 and, moreover, refers to a single event as
 in Mk 14 14a

b. εἰς μνημόσυνον is a hapax legomenon in the New Testament
 From Old Testament examples Jeremias argues that it refers to God's
 remembrance of the woman's deed at the Day of Judgement (cf Gen 30 32,
 Num 10 9, Ps 25 7 etc)

c. κηρυχθῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον has the same meaning as in
 Rev 14 6, namely the early pre-Pauline meaning of the apocalyptic
 proclamation of the eternal gospel

On the basis of these observations, Jeremias interprets the
 whole verse (and Mk 13 10, or to be more precise Matt 24 14, which
 he takes to be the original form) as a reference to the proclamation
 to the Gentiles in the End-time

1 Lohmeyer, "Mk", pp 272f, 295f, Jeremias, p22-3

2 See also Jeremias, Z N W , 44, 1952-3, pp103-7

Jeremias' linguistic arguments are, however, open to doubt

a $\acute{\omicron}\kappa\omicron\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ does not necessarily have the meaning "whenever" in either Mk 9 18 or 14 14, in both cases it could mean "wherever", which is the more usual meaning of the phrase This would also exclude the argument about a reference to a single event

b The idea of God's remembering people does occur in the Old Testament, but the root $\gamma\gamma\iota$ is more often used of remembrance by men, as is the noun $\mu\eta\mu\acute{o}\sigma\upsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ in the LXX In the absence of any other evidence here, it should probably be given its more usual¹ meaning of remembrance by men

c $\tau\omicron \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$ is a typically Markan term which reflects the language of early Christian preaching, the presumption is that it has this meaning here There is no evidence whatsoever that Rev 14 6 reflects an early pre-Pauline usage Apart from the fact that Rev 14 6 is probably a Christian apocalyptic development of some such saying as Mk 13 10 or 14 9, the word $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$ in Rev 14 6 probably means "good news" in a general sense, that is, to a Church suffering from severe persecution, the good news that God's vindication is near at hand, which is certainly not the meaning in Mk 13 10, 14 9 The normal use of $\kappa\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$ in Mark is with reference to the preaching or proclamation of men (John, Jesus, the Twelve, or those whom Jesus has healed), and the presumption is that it also has this meaning in 13 10 and 14 9

¹ Cranfield, p418

Thus on linguistic grounds we cannot accept Jeremias' argument as proven. We must therefore see if it can find support elsewhere. With regard to Mk 13 10 we can make two preliminary observations:

a Mk 13 10 stands significantly in a general apocalyptic context, that is, Mk 13 1f

b In this chapter Mark has "historicized" a certain amount of the material. The extent of this historicizing is a matter of dispute,¹ but many would agree that vv5-14 are to be understood historically or² eschatologically rather than apocalyptically.

With regard to the difficult phrase εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς v9 which, if taken in a positive sense, implies some sort of preaching in Gentile lands, we can note the following. First, these texts about persecution have been edited by the Church in the light of her actual experiences. Certainly, Jesus could have foreseen his disciples' persecution, but the exact reference to the Gentile courts etc, is probably a later accretion. Secondly, while Mark probably understood the phrase εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς in a positive sense, it is possible that originally it was meant negatively, that is, "as a³ witness against them". A similar meaning is apparent in Mk 1 44, 6 11.

1 Three representative views are (a) Marxsen, pp101f, who sees all of 13 5f as part of the End events (b) Conzelmann, loc cit, who interprets the whole of vv5-23 historically (c) Hahn, p116 n2, thinks vv5-13 describes historical events, vv14-23 the signs of the End, and vv24f the End itself.
2 The definition of the terms used is as follows (a) APOCALYPTIC - related to the supernatural End events effected by the direct intervention of God (b) HISTORICAL - related to the normal course of human history, not implying, of course, autonomy from Divine control (c) ESCHATOLOGICAL - that which has End-significance. Thus it could include both apocalyptic and historical events.

3. H Strathmann, art μαρτυς T W N T ,IV, pp508f

Taken together, these two points exclude any incidental reference to a Gentile mission in Jesus' teaching

Thus we are left with Mk 13 10 and 14 9 Since in all the material on Jesus' teaching about the Gentiles they are the odd men out, and since all attempts to reconcile them as they stand with the other material have failed, we are left with two alternatives We can either simply reject them as unauthentic - an approach which we have already seen to be difficult, or we can interpret them differently from Mark, since as they stand in Mark they cannot be Jesus' words We would suggest that behind Mk 13 10, 14 9 lie genuine words of Jesus, which had some such reference as Jeremias and Lohmeyer suppose, namely to the future, apocalyptic proclamation to the Gentiles in the Last Days We could then understand Mark's versions as a conscious recasting or a genuine misunderstanding of Jesus' words, a process which probably took place long before Mark wrote This process can then be considered to be one more example of the Church's historicizing of material in order to accomodate it to the unexpected "Zwischenzeit" Thus the relevance of our two preliminary points becomes clear as a result of its setting in Mk 13, v10 has retained some of its links with apocalyptic ideas, but it has also come under the influence of the process whereby apocalyptic material was historicized We would also suggest that a similar process has been at work in Mk 14 9, that is, if it is not better described as a doublet of Mk 13 10 Whether we regard this as a deliberate or unconscious alteration in the light of later events, a misunderstanding, or simply say that the original meaning was lost somewhere in the course of oral tradition, we would

suggest that it has in fact happened This interpretation has several advantages

1 It accords with our previous judgement that the early Church did not make a habit of creating sayings to suit their own apologetic or polemic purposes and then place them on the lips of Jesus The other process, whereby authentic words of Jesus have gained or lost a little or where their original meaning has been obscured or misunderstood in the course of transmission, is far more likely

2 It is based on a well documented Old Testament and Jewish expectation We know from other sayings of Jesus that he shared in this expectation We have seen how his hope for the Gentiles was orientated towards the future Kingdom of God and that there is no hint that he foresaw or expected a historical Gentile mission Thus this interpretation has the added advantage of fitting in well with Jesus' teaching as we have found it elsewhere

3 If we attribute this view to Jesus, then it goes a long way towards explaining the reluctance of the early Church to embark on a Gentile mission If Jesus gave no command for the Gentile mission and if his followers held the same apocalyptic view of this mission as he had, it becomes clear why the Gentile mission was so slow to get off the ground and why it encountered so much hostility It is often said that the real problem in the early Church was not Gentile mission as such, but merely the terms on which Gentiles could become members of a predominantly Jewish Church However, we note that there was nevertheless a considerable time-lapse between the Ascension and the

beginning of the Gentile mission, a fact for which some explanation must be given. Further, almost all the Gentile missionary preaching was done not by those who were supposed to have received the direct command of Jesus but by the Hellenists, Paul and Barnabas. Also, although it appears that sometimes the disputes in the early Church were over the terms of the Gentiles' entry into the Christian community, we can go on to ask what lay behind this strict line. Was it merely Jewish scruples, or was it not also a more fundamental conviction, namely that the Gentiles would not become part of the Church until the final inbreaking of the Kingdom? It is to these murky, obscure corners of the actual developments and disputes in the early Church that we shall turn to in our attempt to unravel the narrative of Acts.

Conclusion

As a final word on Jesus and the Gentiles we turn now to the problem of Jesus' eschatology. The relation between the two themes of the Gentiles and eschatology has come to light at several points in our study. In fact, it is fair to say that scarcely any of the material concerned with the Gentiles stands in isolation, almost all of it is connected, in one way or another, with the theme of eschatology. It is for this reason that Bosch rightly sub-titles his book on Jesus and the Gentiles as "Eine Untersuchung zur Eschatologie der synoptischen Evangelien."

We can now refer back to our introductory chapter which outlines the main views on Jesus' eschatology and draw out the logical

implications for his attitude to the Gentiles and the Gentile mission. We have found that Jesus did not expect there to be a historical Gentile mission and that his teaching about the Gentiles is inseparably linked with his teaching on eschatology. The answer to the question why Jesus did not expect such a mission is implied in the second observation, that is, his eschatological expectations logically disallowed it. Jesus believed that the Parousia was imminent, so that there was no room for a historical Gentile mission. Jesus maintained a positive hope for the Gentiles, but believed that this hope would be fulfilled in the apocalyptic events of the End-time, then and only then the Gentiles would receive the Kingdom prepared for them before the foundation of the world. Thus our study of Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles has become a key to the understanding of his eschatology.

CHAPTER IVTHE GENTILES IN ST LUKE'S GOSPEL.

The previous chapter has, by implication, dealt with the Markan view of the Gentiles and the Gentile mission. However, before embarking on a study of the Gentiles in Luke's Gospel it is necessary to draw this material together and to summarize Mark's view. This will serve to clarify what has happened to the tradition from Jesus up to and including Mark, with which Luke's presentation can be compared to see if and how it differs.

Four passages are especially worthy of note. We shall state only our conclusions, since the detailed arguments have already been given.

1 In Mk 12 1-9 we noted that Mark has probably added the reference to the "others" in v9, although this is not certain. If he did add it then he has made a clear reference to the Gentiles which would otherwise be lacking in the parable. We noted also that it is almost certain that Mark has added the reference to the "beloved son", recalling Mk 1 11, 9 7. This addition enhances the connection which Mark sees between the death of Jesus and the admission of the Gentiles. The original parable spoke of three servants, the last of whom was killed, by adding a reference to the son, Mark has made the meaning of the parable unambiguous, for there is no longer any doubt that a reference to Jesus' death is intended.

2 In Mk 11 15-17 we argued that Mark probably added the quotation from Is 56 7, drawing out - quite correctly - the implications of

Jesus' action, namely that in the new, Messianic Temple the Gentiles would have their rightful place. The whole action is best understood in the light of the sayings about the destruction of the Temple, showing that the inclusion of the Gentiles is to be connected with the End events.

3 More significant for our purposes is that Mark has added the phrase "Let the children first be fed" in Mk 7 27a. The $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\nu$ implies a $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ and probably reflects the notion "Jew first and then Greek" as it is found in Rom 1 16, 2 9, Acts 3 26, 13 46. Israel's priority becomes a passing right of only temporary significance, for as a result of her refusal the Gospel goes to the Gentiles. For Jesus, the healing of the Gentile's daughter was an exception to his normal practice. It was the exception which proved the rule, the rule being that his own ministry was directed almost exclusively towards Israel. Whereas for Jesus this incident was a proleptic sign of the future participation of the Gentiles in the Kingdom of God, for Mark it has become part of the justification for the Church's Gentile mission.

4 Mk 13 10, 14 9 show that Mark clearly envisaged a historical Gentile mission which would give positive significance to the "Zwischenzeit" caused by the delay of the Parousia. This mission would extend to every part of the then known world before the End. It is not clear whether Mark means literally the whole world or whether he thought in terms of representative cities or areas. The temporal limitations of the whole chapter perhaps suggest the latter.

The results of these few observations can be summarized as follows

a Mark firmly connects the inclusion of the Gentiles with Jesus' death In all the passages, 10 45, 14 24 and 12 1-9, it is made clear that this will occur after Jesus' death Apart from this temporal connection between the two events, 12 1-9 suggests a direct causal relationship between them The other two sayings express not so much a causal relationship, but are rather statements of the universal implications of Jesus' death

b. Mark does not introduce the Gentile mission anachronistically into Jesus' ministry, rather, he adopts what we have called the "Heilsgeschichtliche" view The Gentile mission is not considered by Jesus to be part of his own vocation, but he nevertheless foresees that it will take place after his death and Resurrection Jesus himself is not a Gentile missionary, but he does command his followers to fulfil that role

c For Mark, the Gentile mission is to be seen in an eschatological context By this is meant that although not in itself one of the supernatural, apocalyptic events of the End, it is a necessary prelude to them Thus Mark's view is one remove from that of Jesus Whereas for Jesus the proclamation to the Gentiles was an apocalyptic event, for Mark it is a historical event But since it is a necessary prelude to the End, it also has eschatological significance

We can now turn to the material in Luke's gospel The purpose of this section is to discover what, if anything, is distinctive in Luke's presentation of Jesus' attitude to and teaching about the Gentiles Since this is the case, we can briefly dispense with four

passages which merely repeat, without significant alteration, the tradition which Luke received. These are the oracle on Tyre and Sidon Lk 10 12-16, the oracle against the Galilean towns Lk 11 29-32, the parable of the mustard seed Lk 13 18-21, and the parable of the wicked husbandmen Lk 20 9-19. For the first three passages we merely refer to the chapter on Jesus and the Gentiles, and for the last passage to the comments in our summary of Mark's view.

We turn now to passages in Luke's Gospel which have direct parallels in the other Gospels but which differ, according to some scholars, in significant details.

The Centurion's son Lk 7 1-10

As we noted in the previous chapter, the parallel versions of Matthew and Luke agree at this point only in the description of the man as a centurion and in the dialogue. The framework of the narrative is given separately by each Evangelist. Ellis thinks that Luke's is the more original version and that Matthew's is a telescoping of it "which corporately identifies the representatives with the centurion".¹ It is more probable, however, that Luke has added these details both to bring into focus the personality of the centurion and his faith, and to enhance the parallel with the narrative of Cornelius, the first Gentile Christian (Acts 10-11).

For Luke, the man was clearly a God-fearer or, less probably,² a proselyte.³ King argues that this implies a damping down of Luke's

1 Ellis, p118

2 Rengstorff, p97, Leaney, p141, Manson, p64

3. Caird, p108, Bosch, p95

universalism because," the only reason that can be given for helping a Gentile is that he loves the Jewish race and built them a¹ synagogue " But it should be noted that

a According to Luke, Jesus heals the boy because of the centurion's faith The fundamental significance of the narrative is to be found in the climax in v9 -"I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith " It is quite probable too, that although in this case the healing is effected by Jesus' word from a distance, Luke saw it as prophetic of the reception of the Gentiles in Acts

b This narrative as a whole is closely parallel to the Cornelius narrative in Acts Luke's knowledge of the Cornelius episode may well have influenced his description of the centurion here If this is so, then it is improbable that the description of the centurion's piety and partial committal to Judaism is an anti-universalist device, for this is patently not the case in Acts 10-11

c. We would suggest that the motivation for Luke's portrait of the centurion is quite different, namely, what we shall call his pragmatic approach to the Jew-Gentile problem By emphasizing the piety of this Gentile, Luke seems to imply that on the whole the Gentiles are just as good as the Jews, they are not necessarily any better, but neither are they any worse Gentiles can be as dedicated to and respectful of God as the Jews, and there is therefore no good reason why the Church should not accept them We shall find this pragmatic approach again in Acts where we shall discuss it further Thus Luke has one eye on the problems of the Church of his day, in

particular, the right of the Gentile mission

We conclude, therefore, that Luke's alterations to this passage do not weaken the universalistic element as understood by both Jesus and Matthew, rather, they enhance it. Insofar as Luke has altered the narrative, it is with the purpose of emphasizing rather than toning down the implicit universalism. Apart from the pragmatic element which has influenced Luke's description of the centurion, there is nothing significantly new for his presentation of Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles.

The sayings on Light Lk 11 33

1

T.W.Manson argues that the Matthean version of this saying - "and it gives light to all that are in the house" Matt 5 15b - refers to a reform within Judaism, whereas the Lukan form - "that those who enter may see the light" - looks forward to the influx of the Gentiles.² But as Dodd notes, Luke's version reflects a house of the Graeco-Roman style with a lamp in the vestibule, whereas Matthew's reflects the simpler, single sitting-roomed Galilean house. That is, Luke's reference to a lamp which guides the visitor arriving in the dark merely reflects the type of house most familiar to him, it is not the result of a desire to make a veiled reference to the influx of the Gentiles.

Lk. 13 28, Matt 8 11.

3

King argues that since Lk. 13 28 echoes Ps 107 3, where the

1. Manson, pp 92-3.

2. Dodd, p106 n32.

3. King, pp202-3, Leaney, p209.

reference is to Diaspora Jews, Luke's reference is to the same group of people. Thus Luke gives a neutral interpretation to a potentially universalistic saying. Certainly, Luke omits the words "sons of the Kingdom" and "many" from Matthew and reverses the order of Matthew's vv11 and 12. But it is doubtful whether this materially affects the basic sense of the saying as we interpreted it in the previous chapter. Although Luke lacks the phrase "sons of the Kingdom", the general context implies that he is referring to the same group of people, that is, the Jews. And the reference in Lk 13:29 is, in contrast to the group mentioned in v28, presumably to the Gentiles. Thus the divergences in Luke's version of this text are not sufficient to justify the statement that he has neutralized or altered the original¹ meaning. The same can be said with regard to the setting of the saying in Luke and Matthew. Whereas Matthew's setting makes the meaning of the saying unambiguous, by connecting it with the story of the centurion, it could be argued that Luke's setting does not make the meaning so obvious. However, it is probably Luke rather than Matthew who retains the original setting, so that it is a case of Matthew emphasizing rather than Luke toning down the meaning by means of the context.

Lk. 14:16, Matt. 22:1-10

We have already seen that it is not easy to use either version of this parable for Jesus' view of the Gentiles, but what of Luke's view? Almost all the commentators think that the double invitation

1. Rengstorff, p276, Caird, p173, and Geldenhuys, p380, assume this without discussing it.

to those who were originally uninvited includes, in the second group,
¹ the Gentiles It is possible that Luke preserves the original point
² of the parable here, but much more likely that he has added the second
 invitation to those originally uninvited, thereby reflecting what to
 him was already a historical fact, namely the inclusion of the
 Gentiles If this is Luke's addition and if it refers to the Gentiles,
 then he must have understood it as a reference to the Church's
 Gentile mission And although it is no more than an unspecified
 allusion, it is perhaps significant that whereas Jesus sees the Messianic
 banquet wholly as an apocalyptic event, Luke sees it as being prepared
 for on a historical plane For while Luke probably does not think of
 the Messianic banquet itself as taking place in the present, he does
 see the calling of Jews and Gentiles in preparation for the Messianic
 banquet of the future as occurring in history

So far we have found that apart from the description of the
 centurion in ch 7 and the veiled allusion in ch 14, when Luke transmits
 material which we can compare with Mark or Matthew or both, the evidence
 suggests that he neither minimizes, nor in any protrusive manner expands,
 the references to the Gentiles in Jesus' teaching We turn next to those

1 Hahn,p130, Jeremias,p24, Manson,p130, Caird,p177, W Manson,p174
 Most scholars take the first group to be the 'poor of the land' Bosch
 p124, thinks they are Jews, those to whom the gospel was preached
 immediately after the events at Pentecost

2 The original parable was probably parallel to Matt 8 11-12, having
 two calls all told, one to the invited and one to the originally
 uninvited Both Matthew and Luke have added an extra call at different
 points in the narrative

passages which are peculiar to Luke to see how far they either confirm or alter the impression we have gained so far

Lk 2 10

The proclamation of the angel to the shepherds includes the phrase $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omega\ \lambda\alpha\omega$ ¹ Some take this to be a reference to the Gentile nations, while others think the reference is to all the people of Israel Rengstorf² thinks that the two terms $\zeta\omega\tau\eta\rho$ ³ and $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, which can be interpreted against a pagan background, are used deliberately with Gentile readers in mind This could perhaps then be said to support the interpretation of those who see a reference to the Gentiles

The main criterion is, of course, Luke's other uses of $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ in the singular Oliver⁴ argues that $\lambda\alpha\omega$ here can include the Gentiles because elsewhere the reference is to the Jews only because they are Jesus' or the Apostles' audience, and where there is a question of identity the word "Israel" is usually added (Acts 4 10, 13 24) But while these last two observations may be correct, they are no basis for assuming that the Gentiles are included in Lk 2 10 The only positive support for such an interpretation is the use of $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ in Acts 15 14, 18 10,⁵ where the context makes it clear that the Gentiles

1 Oliver, N T S , 10, 1963-4, pp 202-26, here p 221, Rengstorf , p 41, Geldenhuys, p 119

2 Sahlin, p 213, Leaney, p 94

3 Rengstorf, p 41

4 Oliver, ibid

5 cf Dupont, N T S , 3, 1956, p 47f, Dahl, N T S , 4, 1957, pp 319f, and Flender, pp 119-21 A more detailed study of these verses will be given later

are included in the new people of God. But apart from these two examples, the singular $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ always refers to the Jews. Moreover, the normal reference of the phrase $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \delta\epsilon \lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ is to the Jews (Lk 3 21, 7 29, 8 47, 18 43, 19 48, 21 38, 24 19), and although the context and emphasis is not always the same as in 2 10, it does show that Luke can use the phrase without any emphasis on $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in a universalistic sense. Thus while admitting that a reference to the new people of God, both Jews and Gentiles, is possible in 2 10, we conclude that it is unlikely. Also, while it is true that the words $\zeta\omega\tau\eta\rho$ and $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\varsigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ both have Hellenistic connotations and that Luke may be using them with an eye on Gentile readers, both words also have a distinctive Old Testament background and they do not necessarily affect the meaning of the word $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$.

Lk 2 30-32

The three crucial phrases to be considered in Simeon's prophecy are, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon\upsilon \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \lambda\alpha\omega\upsilon\upsilon$, $\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\psi\iota\nu$ and $\epsilon\theta\nu\omega\upsilon\upsilon$

¹ G D Kilpatrick argues that the plural form $\lambda\alpha\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ is, like the only other examples in Luke-Acts (Acts 4 25-7), a reference to the Jews. He also notes that if Luke is echoing Is 52 10 then he has substituted $\lambda\alpha\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ for the $\epsilon\theta\nu\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ in the LXX, which may be more than Luke simply avoiding repetition - a thing to which he is normally insensitive. However, this last point loses some of its weight when we consider how elusive some of Luke's references to Isaiah are. Is 42 6, 49 6, 40 5, and 52 10 are all alluded to, but never exactly quoted.

Kilpatrick is probably correct in his interpretation of Acts 4 25-7,

¹ Kilpatrick, J T S, ns16, 1965, p127

because the phrase ἔθνεσιν καὶ λαοῖς Ἰσραὴλ v27, which gives Luke's own interpretation of the previous two verses, excludes the possibility of taking ἔθνη and λαοί as synonymous¹ However, we may be dealing with a different case in Lk 2 30, because here πάντων is added to the plural λαῶν² It may be that by this phrase Luke wishes to incorporate both Jews and Gentiles under a common designation³ If so, then it is quite logical for Luke to make a reference to each group separately in the following two phrases the Jews as λαοῦ σου Ἰσραὴλ and the Gentiles as ἐθνῶν⁴ But even if this interpretation is illegitimate, we still have other references to the Gentiles, and to these we now turn

2 Two attempts have been made to avoid seeing a reference to the Gentiles in the word ἐθνῶν⁵

a By taking ἐθνῶν as a synonym for Ἰσραὴλ⁶

b H Sahlin argues that the phrase φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν is a mistranslation of a proto-Lukan φῶς τῇ αἰχμαλωσίᾳ (διασπορᾷ) τῶν ἐθνῶν That is, the phrase originally referred to Diaspora

3 The phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη Lk 24 47 may include the Jews, whereas ἔθνη standing alone in the plural refers to the Gentiles alone It depends to some extent on the phrase ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, which may add the Jews to the Gentiles already mentioned in τὰ ἔθνη or may simply state that the preaching to Jews and Gentiles will begin from Jerusalem

1 Luke apparently treats it as the same as his more usual contrast between the ἔθνη (plural) and the λαός (singular) cf Acts 26 17,23

2 We have already seen that πᾶς ὁ λαός means the Jews

4 Oliver, ibid, Caird, p62, Dupont, "Gentils", pp142f

5 The omission of ἐθνῶν in D is not to be taken seriously, since it spoils the parallelism It may be due to the grammatical difficulty, since we might have expected ἔθνεσι

6 Sahlin, p256

Jews

Sahlin's argument is not strictly related to our theme, since we are not concerned with the task of searching out proto-Lukan theology, but with what Luke actually wrote, whether he transmitted, created or mistranslated it. It would be significant if we could show that Luke had altered his source, but unless we are dealing with Markan or Matthean parallels the contents of Luke's source is a matter of sheer conjecture. Moreover, this phrase as a whole probably alludes to Is 49 6, which Luke certainly understood in a universalistic way.

There is no justification for taking $\epsilon\theta\upsilon\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ as a synonym for "Israel". In Lukan usage the plural of $\epsilon\theta\upsilon\varsigma$, when it stands alone, always refers to non-Jewish peoples. Combined with $\pi\alpha\varsigma$ in the plural it might include the Jews, but never refers to them exclusively.

¹
3. Kilpatrick interprets the phrase $\phi\omega\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\psi\iota\nu \epsilon\theta\upsilon\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ to mean "a light that the Gentiles may see", that is, something they can observe but which does not affect them. One might go on to argue that the word $\phi\omega\varsigma$ is ambiguous, since it could refer to a light which brings judgement rather than salvation.

With regard to the first argument, we should note that while such an interpretation may be suitable for Is 42 6, 49 6, it cannot automatically be transferred to Luke, since he gives his own interpretation of these prophecies when he recalls them in Acts 13 47.

1 Kilpatrick, op cit, p127

and 26 22-3, where they clearly mean that salvation has come to the Gentiles

The term $\phi\omega\varsigma$ in the LXX is ambiguous. It is normally a symbol of salvation and is compared to the natural darkness in which men live (Ex 10 23, Job 12 22, Ps 4 6, 36 9, 56 13, 119 105, Is 2 5, 9 2, 60 1), but it can also have strong connotations of judgement (Job 28 11, Ps 37 6, 90 8, Is 10 17, 51 4, Hos 6 5). In Luke too, we find that it can be used as a symbol of judgement (Lk 8 17, 12 2-3) as well as a sign of salvation (Lk 16 8, Acts 9 3, 22 6, 9, 26 18). With regard to the verse we are discussing, it is the usage in Acts 13 47, 26 22-3 which reveals the primary reference at this point, Luke is thinking of the salvation that would be offered to the Gentiles. It would be false, however, to think in terms of an antithesis between salvation and judgement as the function of $\phi\omega\varsigma$, since both functions spring from the same source and are in reality inextricable. Salvation inevitably brings judgement with it, and judgement, if it is the judgement of God, is a prelude to the offer of salvation.

We can therefore conclude that the attempts that have been made to prove that Luke did not intend a universalistic reference in 2 30-2 are unsuccessful. Luke has placed in Simeon's mouth a prophecy, the fulfilment of which he describes in his second volume. It is significant that Luke picks up this prophecy at the very end of the Gospel and in Acts, he does not anachronistically place its fulfilment in Jesus' earthly ministry.

Lk. 3 1,6

In 3 1 Luke synchronizes salvation history with general world¹ history. Luke is not so much seeing two lines of history, the sacred and the secular, which meet at a certain point, as placing a set of events in the context of world history and thereby hinting at their universal significance. It is probably part of Luke's attempt to convince educated Gentiles that Christianity is not a narrow sect, but has world-wide significance.

In 3 6 Luke alone of the Evangelists extends the quotation of Is 40 3f to include the phrase "and all flesh shall see the salvation of God." He has substituted *Τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ* for *ἡ δοξα κυρίου* in the LXX, probably because the word *σωτήριον* is one of his favourite terms.

Two authors doubt whether Luke is particularly concerned to make a universal reference here.

a Cadbury thinks that it is more likely that the phrase Luke was interested in when he extended the quotation was "the salvation² of God" rather than "all flesh". In support of this he notes how in Lk 19 46 Luke omits the phrase "for all nations" from Mark's sentence "My house shall be called the house of prayer for all nations" (Mk 11 17).

We shall note later that there are other, more convincing

¹ cf Flender, p105, Caird, p69

² Cadbury, p254

reasons why Luke should have omitted the phrase in 19 46, rather than mere indifference to its universalist implications. Further, we cannot assume that Luke was interested in one rather than the other half of this phrase. While it is true that Luke does use Old Testament passages with his eye on only one part of the quotation, the way in which he connects the concept of salvation with the universal proclamation of the gospel at other points in his narrative (Lk 2 30-2, Acts 28 28) suggests that in Lk 3 6 the whole quotation was important to him.

²
b King remarks that $\kappa\alpha\sigma\alpha\ \sigma\alpha\rho\chi$ could be equivalent to $\gamma\psi\gamma\text{-}\text{ל}\text{ל}$ which can mean 'everyone' and, therefore, " does not imply any conscious universal intent." This is a curious form of argument, for one would have thought that 'everyone' was as universalistic a word as one could use. One certainly cannot avoid the universal implications of $\kappa\alpha\sigma\alpha\ \sigma\alpha\rho\chi$ by referring back to Hebrew equivalents. Moreover, such an interpretation ignores both the way in which this theme is taken up in the whole narrative of Acts, where a universal intent is indisputable, and Luke's interest in and interpretation of the universal prophecies from Isaiah (Lk 2 30-2, Acts 26 22-3).

³
We can conclude, therefore, with Dupont and many others, that we

1 See later on Acts 3 25 and 15 16

2 King, p200

3 Dupont, "Gentils", pp138-9, Rengstorff, p56, Conzelmann, "Luke", p161, Caird, p71, Hahn, p129

are dealing here with a conscious addition by Luke, which therefore points to a theme which was of prime importance to him. This is enhanced by the fact that this verse, picking up 2:32, stands at the head of Luke's narrative of Jesus' ministry. Since it is a prophecy, it is perhaps as important to see how Luke thought it was fulfilled as it is to note that he has it. Clearly, it is a further expression of what Luke has already hinted at in 3:1, namely the universal significance of Jesus. To discover how and when this universality becomes operative, we must turn to the other material in Luke's Gospel.

Lk. 3:23

It is common among commentators to assume that by taking Jesus' genealogy back to 'Adam, the son of God', Luke wished to show "the organic relation of Christ to all humanity"¹ and that "his mission was ultimately to all mankind."² This, it is said,³ is the main point of including the genealogy. However, others have argued that the mention of Adam, the son of God, is from Messianic rather than universalistic motives. Luke places the narrative "among a series of narratives attesting Jesus' Messiahship"⁴, and it is a possibility, though a remote one, that his alteration of the numbers of the descendants to eleven groups of seven reflects the tradition that

1 W. Manson, p35

2. Caird, p77

3 Geldenhuys, p153

4 Ellis, p93

the Messiah would come at the end of the eleventh week

It is not easy to decide between these two alternatives, maybe Luke intended both. Suffice it to say that if there is a universalistic reference here, it is probably a secondary motif, which is obscure and undeveloped

Lk 4 16f

The mention in 4 25-7 of the actions of Elijah and Elisha are correctly taken by most commentators to contain an allusion to the future inclusion of the Gentiles. The whole section 4 16-30, which is basically a Lukan construction, gives a programmatic statement of the rest of Luke's account of Jesus' ministry. It is significantly placed at the very beginning of Jesus' public ministry and differs considerably from the parallel openings in Matthew and Mark. Several of Luke's most important themes, among them universalism, are previewed here: the Holy Spirit, the Jews' rejection of the gospel, prophecy and fulfilment, eschatology, Elijah typology, and the poor and needy. The numerous problems of interpretation do not, on the whole, concern us directly. We merely note the following points:

a The prime motif of this section is the rejection of Jesus by the Jews, which is a recurrent theme of Luke-Acts

1 Rengstorff, pp62-4. As evidence he only quotes the Latin text of IV Ezra 14 11. The more usual expectation was that the Messiah would come after the ninth week.

2 eg King, p200, Conzelmann, "Luke", p38, Flender, p132, Caird, p86

3 These are fully and variously treated in Jeremias, pp44-5, Ellis, pp95-7, Violet, Z N W, 37, 1938, pp251f, Flender, pp132-8, Leaney, pp50f, Conzelmann, "Luke", pp35-8

b The main reason, in the immediate context, for the inclusion of vv25-7 is that they give Old Testament precedents for performing miracles among strangers. Jesus' fellow countrymen are jealous of the works he has performed in Capernaum and he defends himself by reference to the Old Testament.

c The deeper meaning of vv25-7, however, is that they are prophetic of the one positive result of the Jews' rejection, namely the inclusion of the Gentiles. However, we should note that the reference to the Gentiles is not made explicit. For Luke, who was to write a second volume, and for us who read both Luke and Acts, the deeper significance of the rejection narrative is apparent, but in its immediate context it is allusive and unspecified.

Lk. 9:51-18:14 The Samaritan Journey ?

The central section of St. Luke's Gospel poses many problems for the interpreter, since exactly what Luke is trying to relate and his purpose in doing so is obscure. It is relevant to our theme because it may bear on Luke's presentation of the Samaritan mission in Acts, which he sees as the stepping-stone between the Jewish and Gentile missions.

The first and most basic problem is whether or not Luke intended to describe a journey at all. An affirmative answer is given by several¹ scholars and especially by Conzelmann,² who thinks that it is the

1. Bosch, pp103f, Rengstorff, p132, Flender, pp35f, Gasse, Z N W, 34, 1935, pp293-9

2. Conzelmann, "Luke", pp60-65.

journey motif above all which Luke wishes to convey Others consider the journey motif to be subsidiary, if not absent altogether, they interpret this section of Luke thematically rather than chronologically¹ There is the additional problem of whether the journey, if there was one, went through Samaria, and if it did, what significance this had for Luke To help sort our way through these problems we note the following points

1 The traditional interpretation which takes the whole of 9 51f as a journey through Samaria is based on taking v56 as a reference to a Samaritan village² But several scholars³ have noted that this verse could as well refer to a Jewish as to a Samaritan village, thereby⁴ affording something of a parallel to 4 16f We merely note that Luke leaves the matter open, and that to build on it either way is a precarious undertaking Moreover, if Luke intended to convey something significant by a specifically Samaritan journey, it is perhaps odd that he has left the reference so vague

2 The notices which signify the movements of a journey are exceedingly sparse

9 51f Jesus determines to go towards Jerusalem

1 Ellis, pp146f, Schlatter, p331f, W Manson, p119, Manson, p256, "whatever else 9 51-18 14 may be, it does not appear to be a chronicle" cf Blinzler, "Reiseberichte", pp20-52, Grundmann, pp198-200

2 Caird, p139, Flender, p35, Lohse, T Z , 10, 1954, pp1f

3. Gasse, op.cit , pp293f, Bosch, p104, Conzelmann "Luke", pp65-6, Manson, ibid , W Manson, ibid

4 cf Ellis, p150 on the rejection theme in Luke's Gospel

9 52 Jesus is in a Samaritan village

17 11 The debated phrase ¹ και αὐτος διήρχετο διὰ μέσον
Σαμαρίας καὶ Παλιλαίας

18 35 Jesus comes to Jericho

Other than these we have a handful of vague phrases like "as they went on their way" (10 38, 13 22, 14 25), which sometimes refer to unspecified towns and villages. While these verses leave an impression of movement, they do not follow any exact chronological or geographical pattern. It is pertinent to note that Jesus is no nearer Jerusalem in 17 11 than in 9 51, so that it is difficult to imagine that the journey motif as such was of supreme importance to Luke.

3 Support for the above contention is found in the fact that much of the material in 9 51f demands a setting which makes havoc of any notion of a neat chronological account. In 13 31 Jesus appears to be in Galilee, and several passages are set in Judea (10 1f, 25-7, 11 37f, 13 1-9, 14 1-6, 18 1-10). It can scarcely be argued that Luke has arranged his material carefully, his method is either haphazard or based on something other than a travelogue. Luke can hardly have been

1 The following are some of the views (a) Conzelmann, "Luke", p71, assumes Luke's ignorance of the geography. He thought of Galilee and Judea as adjacent with Samaria lying alongside them, bordering on both. (b) Some interpret διὰ μέσον to mean "between" i.e. along the border between Samaria and Galilee. So Gasse, op.cit., p295. (c) Many take διὰ μέσον to mean "through the midst of". It is often objected that since Samaria is mentioned first, the implied direction is South to North, the opposite of that in 9 51 (the textual variants show the various attempts to correct this). Lohse, art.cit., p7, replies that Luke often reverses topographical references (Acts 16 16, 18 23) or leaves them inexact (Acts 24 13). (d) Bosch, p106f, says that Luke will "lediglich unterstreichen, dass Jesus sich auf der Reise nach Jerusalem befindet, und dass diese Reise irgendwie mit Samarien zu tun

unaware of this fact, and we must either admit the tension between his framework (if it is meant to be a Samaritan journey) and its contents, or argue with Lohse that Luke ¹ " hat die einzelnen Perikopen dem heilsgeschichtlichen Aspekt seiner Theologie untergeordnet, und somit der ganzen zweiten Hauptteil der Wirksamkeit Jesu unter das Thema der Reise nach Jerusalem auf dem Weg durch Samaria gestellt " It may be simpler and, in view of points 1 and 2 above, more faithful to the facts to abandon the notion of a journey through Samaria altogether

4 Some have argued that the Samaritan material in 10 30f, 17 11 supports the notion that 9 51f is a portrayal of a journey through Samaria ² However, when we consider that both narratives gain their point by being directed at Jews ³ and only have meaning in this context, ⁴ and when we note that there is no hint (apart from 17 11) that they are local Samaritan traditions, ⁵ this argument loses much of its weight ⁶

5 Lohse believes that 9 51f is intended to be a Samaritan journey

(cont) hat Dass diese Reise durch Samaria führt, wird gar nicht gesagt " Together with the observation that this topographical notice is probably attached only to the following pericope and has no further significance, this seems the best explanation

1 Lohse, art cit ,p9

2 Rengstorff, p132

3 Bosch, p106

4 We can note the phrase ο ἀλλογενής οὗτος in 17 18 - a notion which is implied throughout 10 30f

5 Conzelmann, "Luke", pp71-2

6 Lohse, art cit ,p11 Cf Conzelmann, "Luke", p72, who sees 17 11f as Luke's attempt to justify the Samaritan mission in the early Church

of Jesus, which was constructed by Luke primarily as a precedent for the Church's Samaritan mission (and in Lk 10 1f, the Gentile mission)

" der irdische Jesu - so will er zeigen - hat sich darum bemüht, auch den fremdstämmigen Samaritanen den Anbruch des Reiches Gottes zu verkündigen Die Samaritaner stehen geradezu beispielhaft für die Heidenvölker da, die auch zur Teilhabe an der Heilzeit geladen sind "

However, we have already seen reason to doubt the validity of the words 'Samaritan' and 'journey' as a description of 9 51f Besides, one cannot overlook the Samaritans' brusque rejection of Jesus in 9 51f, which offsets 10 30f and 17 11 more than Lohse is prepared to admit Further, there is no warrant for the statement that Jesus preached the inbreaking of the Kingdom of God to the Samaritans Even so, we might still ask whether despite the fact that we cannot speak of a Samaritan journey or of Jesus preaching to the Samaritans these pericopes have any significance Treated as individual narratives, they probably do They are one of the examples of Jesus breaking down traditional barriers by meeting with and healing non-Jews Since Luke wrote the story of the Samaritan mission in Acts, he can scarcely have been unaware of the precedent set by Jesus' healing of a Samaritan But apart from the fact that he relates the narrative in 17 11f and is the only Evangelist to do so, Luke does not use it specifically as a justification of the later Samaritan mission

1 Bosch, p107, thinks the Samaritan stories are placed here because Jesus is on his way to Jerusalem and death, since there is a clear connection between Samaritans, Gentiles and Jesus' death

2 See above pp40f

6 What then are we to make of 9 51f ? B Reicke has pertinently observed that the bulk of this central section of Luke is concerned with the teaching of Jesus, alternating between instruction for the disciples and controversies with opponents - both of which were important for leaders and missionaries in the early Church Ellis, developing this point, correctly describes Luke's picture as one of Jesus the teacher rather than Jesus the traveller References to the latter theme, while present, are subordinate to the former, they help to keep the teaching in perspective, since they are seen as the teachings of a Messiah who is rejected by the Jews and who is appointed by God to suffer in Jerusalem (9 51, 12 50, 13 33, 18 31)³ This links well with Conzelmann's comment that according to 13 33f the journey (we would add, such as it is) is an expression of Jesus' awareness that he must suffer "He does not travel in a different area from before, but he travels in a different manner"⁴ To which one can add the comment of Flender that "Der Zug nach Jerusalem ist also nicht nur unter dem Gesichtspunkt des Weges zum Leiden, sondern zugleich als ein 'Siegezug

1 Bo Reicke, *Studia Evangelica*, p216, quoted by Ellis, p147

2 Ellis, pp146f

3. We mention two other articles which interpret 9 51f thematically and emphasize Jesus as the teacher (a) Grundmann, *Z N W*, 50, 1959, pp252f divides the narrative into three journey reports (9 51-10 42, 13 22-35, 17 11-19) each followed by a block of teaching, he correctly sees that the journey reports are not markers in a continuous chronological account (b) Evans, "Central Section", notes the theme of Jesus as the new Moses, and that the word *αναληψις* 9 51 is the title of a book about the death and assumption of Moses He goes on to draw parallels with Deuteronomy, some of which are striking, while others are too ingenious and unconvincing

4 Conzelmann, "Luke", pp64-5, cf Grundmann, p198, J Schneider, "Reiseberichte", pp207-29

Jesu' zu seiner himmlischen Erhöhung zu sehen "¹

We conclude that the whole section 9 51f has no direct or exceptional significance for Luke's view of mission

The mission of the Seventy Lk 10 1f

There are two problems which concern us in 10 1 first, is the correct reading '70' or '72' and second, is the number symbolic, and if so to what does it refer ?

²
Many commentators think that the basic reference is to Gen 10, where it is said that there are 70 nations in the world The LXX at this point has 72 and this is thought to account for the textual variant in Lk 10 1 The reference is then frequently assumed to be to a Gentile mission of the Seventy, seen as a parallel to the mission of the Twelve to Israel (Lk 9) Thus Lk 10 1f foreshadows the Gentile mission in Acts

³
Others think that the primary reference is to Num 11 16-7,24-5, where 70 elders are appointed by Moses to help him bear the burden of his task ⁴ Leaney thinks that as in Num 11 Eldad and Medad are added,

1 Flender, pp35-6, 85-6 (here p36). The word ἀναλημψεως in 9 51 may refer forward to the Ascension (cf Acts 1 11), but in Acts the singular 'day' is used (Acts 1 2,11,22, 2 1), so that some scholars understand 9 51 to be a reference to Jesus' death, resurrection and ascension Flender (ibid) thinks the reference is to the time of Jesus' exaltation, which reaches its fulfilment in the Ascension and extends beyond it Whichever view is true, a reference to the Ascension either as the beginning or the end of the 'days' is almost certain

2 Rengstorff, p135, Jeremias, p24, Flender, p26, W Manson, p123

3 Caird, p143, King, p201, Leaney, p176, Geldenhuys, p303, Manson, p257

4 Leaney, ibid

it may mean that the number of elders was 72, and that this explains the variant reading in Lk 10 1

1

B Metzger has dealt thoroughly with the problems which face the interpreter of Lk 10 1. He has made it clear that the problem of the variant reading cannot be decided by the normal logic of textual criticism. Both readings have good manuscript support, and every argument in favour of one or the other reading can be countered or reversed. He goes on to list all the possible references in the Old Testament and Judaism for the numbers 70 and 72, once again the result is negative, since there are various feasible allusions for

2

both numbers. To aid us in our decision we note the following points

a As a preliminary point we note that to assert with any certainty one or the other reading or reference is impossible. There is no single interpretation which is indisputable.

b The attempt by Bosch to include a double reference to both Num 11 and Gen 10 probably asks too much of the text

3

c We must allow for the possibility that the number is merely a

1. Metzger, N T S, 5, 1958-9, pp299-306

2 Nevertheless, many of the possible allusions listed by Metzger are highly improbable. To take as a possibility any reference with the number 70 or 72, whether it be to books, angels, or bullocks, is to go beyond the bounds of credibility. Luke is, after all, thinking of men whose task is to preach (making improbable a reference to the Letter of Aristeas, where the 72 are translators of the Hebrew O T cf Jellicoe, N T S, 6, 1959-60, pp319-21). Gen 10 and Num 11 are still the most likely references (or the Rabbinic variations on the latter passage given by Metzger).

3 Bosch, p109, cf Hahn, pp129-30, Ellis, p153

convenient round number which has no symbolic significance

d The chief argument in favour of a reference to Gen 10 is the fact that we know that Luke wrote the story of the Gentile mission in Acts. It is perhaps also true that the number 70 as a reference to the nations of the world is the most obvious of the possible allusions. The fact that the Pentecost narrative (Acts 2) can be read as a reversal of the story of the tower of Babel (Gen 11) might add a little support to this interpretation of Lk 10 1f. Moreover, the 72 nations enumerated by the LXX of Gen 10 is probably the simplest explanation of the textual variant in Lk 10 1. But this last point does not necessarily support the claim that Luke intended a reference to Gen 10. He may have alluded to Num 11 and a later editor altered it to a reference to the LXX of Gen 10.

e There are several factors which support a reference to Num 11. First, the parallelism with the mission of the Twelve. Secondly, the fact that whatever Lk 10 1 symbolizes, if it symbolizes anything at all, according to the rest of the chapter the mission of the Seventy was to Israel. Thirdly, Luke is fond of using Old Testament figures, especially Moses and Elijah, typologically of Jesus' person and work.¹ Finally, the process of reading back our knowledge of Acts into Luke's Gospel, while often legitimate, has to be treated with considerable care. We can easily see references which Luke may not have intended. Further, the Lukan material we have already considered, shows that Luke

1 Lampe, N T S, 2, 1955-6, pp160f

does not anachronistically place the Gentile mission in Jesus' pre-Resurrection ministry

Taking these points together, it seems that if a symbolic reference is intended, it is to Num 11 rather than to Gen.10 In recounting the mission of the Seventy, Luke may well have had one eye on the later mission of the Church, but in the immediate context the mission of the Seventy is clearly to Israel

Lk 24 46f.

1

The last passage for our consideration contains the first open and direct command for, as distinct from prophetic hints of, the Gentile mission The importance of this section can be seen in the following observations

1 Lk 24 47 is Luke's equivalent to Mk 13 10 Various reasons have been suggested for Luke's omission of Mk 13 10 Grässer suggests that it may have been because Luke's version of Mark did not contain Mk 13 10, the verse having been added by a later editor² Harder thinks that it was because the universal mission had not begun by the time Luke wrote his Gospel³ Conzelmann makes a far more convincing suggestion when he says that Luke omits Mk 13 10 because he wants to sever the connection between the mission and the End⁴ Luke's equivalent

1 Some would include Lk 15 11-32 Ellis, p198, thinks Luke's readers would have seen the prodigal son as a symbol of the Gentiles Luke gives no hint that this is so The contrast is probably between the Jewish leaders (elder son) and the "poor of the land"(prodigal)

2 Grässer, p160

3 Harder, art cit , p79

4 Conzelmann, "Luke", p214 n1

to Mk 13 10 is lifted out of the apocalyptic context it has in Mark and, as a result, loses the temporal limitations implicit in the whole of Mk 13 For Luke the End comes after, but in no way determines, the Gentile mission The way is thus cleared for Luke to give a historical account of the progress of this mission in his second volume But while Conzelmann has explained the significance of Luke's omission of Mk 13 10, he does not emphasize the equally important equivalent to this verse in Lk 24 47¹

2. The command for the Gentile mission is closely connected with several other important Lukan themes witness, the Holy Spirit, prophecy and fulfilment, Jerusalem, the Ascension and eschatology Later, we shall look more closely at these themes There is also a close parallelism between Lk 24 46f and Acts 1 1f The command for the Gentile mission and its related themes are inseparably linked with the account of the development of this mission in Acts

3 The phrase ΟΥΤΩΣ ΓΕΥΡΑΚΤΑΙ in v46 is of immense significance in this context It introduces a new line of thought, namely that the mission is based not only on Jesus' command but also on Old Testament prophecy The reference is probably intentionally dual, both to the Old Testament prophecies themselves and to Luke's versions of them in 2 10, 2 30-2, 3 6 Luke picks up a prophetic theme of the

1 Hahn, p130-1, draws out the parallels between Lk 24 47 and Mk 13 10
 2 O T prophecies for Jesus' death and resurrection were found in Is 53 4,11, Hos 6 2 The exact reference for "the preaching of repentance for the forgiveness of sins to all nations" is not clear No O T passages give a precise parallel to this commission (cf Is 42 6, 49 6, Joel 2 1, 3 9, Zech 9 9f, Wisd 3 14)

earlier part of his work and re-presents it in the form of a direct command of the Risen Lord. A comparison with Mk 13 10 is also instructive. In place of Mark's $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$, which is both set in and to be interpreted by its eschatological context, we have Luke's οὕτως γεγραπταί , which alters the setting to that of prophecy and fulfilment. The Gentile mission is thus firmly embedded in the scheme of prophecy and fulfilment.

4. In the phrase $\text{μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν}$ Luke introduces concepts which are especially significant for him. The term μετάνοια is connected with Jesus' preaching and, above all, with the missionary preaching in Acts (Lk 5 32, Acts, 2 38, 5 31, 17 30). When connected with $\text{ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν}$ (Lk 3 3, Acts 2 38, 5 31) or $\text{πίστις / πιστεύειν}$ (Acts 11 17-18, 17 30f, 20 31f, 26 18-20), it becomes the term for conversion in Luke-Acts. The phrase $\text{ἐκ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ}$ expresses for Luke, in a special way, the presence of Christ. This terminology betrays the influence of the preaching of the early Church and of the Church in Luke's day, in particular, the concept of conversion and the Exaltation christology which is so predominant in Acts.

The Lukan omissions

Before turning to a final summary of the results of this chapter

1. Conzelmann, "Luke", pp99f, 225f, Wilckens, p178

2. Conzelmann, "Luke", p177

we must consider several significant omissions which directly relate to the Gentile question. For example, the omission of Mk 7 24-30, 10 45, 11 17 "all nations", 14 9, all of which make either direct or indirect references to the Gentiles, could be taken to betray a deliberate attempt by Luke to damp down the universalism of Mark. On the other hand, the omission of verses such as Matt 10 5b,6, 15 24, reveal exactly the opposite tendency, which in turn should make us wary of assuming that the other omissions are significant for Luke's overall picture of the Gentiles.

1 The omission of Mk 7 24-30 could be explained by saying that Luke is writing for Gentile readers, to whom the equation dogs = Gentiles would have been offensive. However, since the end of the story is definitely pro-Gentile, and since Luke could have rewritten the incident with the omission of the reference to dogs, this explanation is not convincing. This omission is part of the so-called "great omission" from Mark (Mk 6 47-8 26), which has puzzled scholars for many years. It may well be that the explanation for this is a purely mechanical one, namely, Luke did not have this part of Mark, since all of Mk 7 is the sort of material which Luke could well have used. The fact that he has the story of Jesus' healing of the centurion's servant shows that his omission of the story of the Syrophenician woman is not because he wants to reduce Mark's universalism.

2 The omission of Mk 10 45 is very difficult to explain. If it was the ἅντι πολλῶν which worried Luke, then presumably he could have omitted this phrase and included the rest of Mk 10 45. Therefore,

the omission cannot be described as anti-universalist. It might be argued that the sacrificial interpretation of Christ's death was uncongenial to Luke and that this accounts for the omission. It may be true that Luke has no distinctive "theologia crucis",^{but} it is also apparent from Acts 20 28 and Lk 22 19b-20, if we can include the latter¹ text, that where Luke finds such material in his tradition, he does not see any need to suppress it. Presumably, therefore, he did not find it objectionable. It could be that Luke's rearranged setting of Mk 10 42-5 explains the omission. That is, he has transposed Mk 10 42-5 to the setting of the Last Supper Lk 22 24-7, so that if we take 22 19b-20 as genuine, it could be argued that, having already included a saying on the redemptive significance of Jesus' death, he does not repeat himself in vv24-7. If this explanation is unsatisfactory, then the purpose of Luke's omission remains a mystery.

3 The omission of the phrase "all the nations" from Mk 11 17 is understandable on the presupposition that Luke wrote his Gospel after A D 70, when the Temple had been destroyed and was manifestly not a house of prayer for all nations. One can compare Luke's account of the destructive work of the Gentiles in the Temple and its surroundings in Lk 21 20-24.

4 The omission of Mk 14 9 could also be explained on the assumption

1. We cannot enter into this most complex of textual problems. See the commentaries ad loc, Chadwick, H T R, 50, 1957, pp257f, Schurmann, Bib, 32, 1951, pp364-92, 522-41, Jeremias, "Words", pp138f.

that Luke is correcting sayings which in his time were either manifestly unfulfilled or even contradicted. Luke, who wrote the story of the preaching of the gospel in all the world, could find no trace of the fulfilment of this prophecy, the woman was not mentioned in every place that the gospel was preached. More likely, however, is that Luke preferred to follow a separate version of the story of the sinner woman (Lk 7 36-50) which did not contain an equivalent to Mk 12 9.

5 Assuming that Lk 22 19b-20 was originally in Luke, it is noticeable that Mark's ὑπὲρ πολλῶν Mk 14 24 is altered to Luke's ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν , thus obliterating one more universal reference. But since Luke is probably quoting a liturgical formula at this point the alteration cannot automatically be ascribed to him. It probably arose as a result of a tendency to personalize the reference in liturgical usage, a process which had affected the tradition before it reached Luke.

6 The omission of Matt 10 5b-6, 15 24, is difficult to assess, since we cannot be sure that these verses were in the common source used by Matthew and Luke, they may have been known to Matthew alone. If we assume, for the sake of argument, that they were in "Q" and that Luke knew of them, then their omission is understandable. Matt 10 23 remained unfulfilled, and Matt 10 5b-6, 15 24 express a particularism which is uncongenial to Luke's own understanding of Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles. Matthew can incorporate them by reinterpreting them.

in a special way He neutralizes their particularism by understanding it to be confined to one period of a 'Heilsgeschichtliche' scheme That is, Jesus' particularism applied only to his pre-Resurrection ministry Matthew's understanding of the temporal limitations of 10 23 is not so easy to explain Perhaps he took it to mean that the Son of Man would come to the villages before the disciples could get there, that is, he would move faster than them, or perhaps he recorded the saying without fully realizing its implications Luke omits these sayings because he, unlike Matthew, did not see the possibilities of reinterpretation

We can conclude from the above points that for each of the Lukan omissions a convincing explanation can be found without assuming that they have any particular relevance for the Gentile question, except to say that Luke was keen to avoid both unfulfilled prophecies and expressly particularist sayings Certainly, none of them can be said to prove that Luke was anxious to tone down the universalism which he found in Mark

Summary

1 It has frequently been assumed that of all the Evangelists it is Luke, above all, who is the universalist In the past it has been the habit of commentators to accept this uncritically and pass it on to the next generation ¹ Cadbury was the first to challenge the notion,

1 Cadbury, pp254f

though with a certain amount of moderation More recently King has spoken of a " partial krypsis of his (Luke's) universalism while he is writing his Gospel";¹ and in the course of proving this he has reinterpreted almost every universalist reference in Luke in a non-universalist manner

Our results lead us to maintain both of these viewpoints with some modification The addition of 2 10, 30-2, 3 6, 4 25-7, and 24 47 to the gospel narrative by Luke encourages the notion of Luke as a universalist Yet while we have seen reason to disagree with almost all of King's detailed exegesis, he is nevertheless right in speaking of a partial krypsis We note, for example, that the distinctively Lukan material we have just mentioned occurs in the chapters which either precede or programmatically outline the ministry of Jesus, or, as with 24 47, is limited to Jesus' post-Resurrection activity But we cannot agree with King that this krypsis is a result of a deliberate damping down by Luke of the universalism which he found in Mark Rather, he is basically following the tradition he received, and where he does not follow it, as for example in his omissions, it is normally for a very good reason. Luke does not anachronistically place the Gentile mission within the earthly ministry of Jesus His additions at the beginning of the Gospel are always prophetic and forward-looking, they are only picked up in the form of a command in 24 47, a passage which points forward to the unfolding universal mission which Luke

1 King,p205, Hahn,p128

relates in Acts

2 We have already led ourselves into our second conclusion, namely that Luke is almost always a faithful recorder of tradition which speaks about the Gentiles. He relates material which gives both what we have found to be Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles (Lk 7 1-10, 10 12, 13-16, 11 29-32,33, 13 18-21,28) and what we have considered to be a Markan development of this theme (Lk 20 9-19). In these passages Luke gives no hint of his own view, but simply passes on the tradition which he received.

3 In two cases, 14 16-24, 24 47, we have discovered material which is distinctively Lukan. The latter verse especially, is fundamental for discovering Luke's own viewpoint. Cadbury, in his discussion of Luke's universalism, merely noted that it exists without offering any explanation of it or attempting to relate it to Luke's overall plan. King² attributes Luke's special material, including this verse, to Luke's artistic genius. "The theme which he played over earlier and had repeated now and then, has to wait until the second part of the work for its crescendo." But apart from this general comment, King does not consider 24 47 in any detail or try to relate it to the total framework of Luke's thought. Hahn³ comes closest to understanding Luke's

1 Cadbury, pp254f, Jeremias, pp33-4

2 King, p205, from which this quotation is taken

3 Hahn, p129

own viewpoint, both because he sees the importance of 24 47 and because he relates it to other themes in Luke. He speaks of "the fact that the preaching of the gospel among the Gentiles belongs neither to Jesus' earthly activities nor to the eschatological events, but has its place in the period of the Church. Luke, therefore, logically connects the first saying about it with an appearance of the Risen Lord, and does not develop his own view of mission until he comes to Acts "¹ Thus Hahn has begun, but not fully developed, a study of the distinctiveness of Luke's viewpoint and its relation to the rest of his ideas. Two of these, in particular, are of fundamental importance for understanding Luke's attitude to the Gentiles, others can wait for fuller treatment when we delve into Acts "²

The first of these is the notion of proof from prophecy - or perhaps better, promise and fulfilment - which has slowly come to light as a central theme of the Lukan writings.³ Again, Cadbury gave it its embryonic form,⁴ and since then it has received increasing attention.⁵ In connection with the Gentiles we noted the use of or

1. Hahn, *ibid*

2. These are the connection with Jerusalem, 24 47, the Apostles as witnesses, 24 48, salvation, 2 10, 32, 3 6, and the connection between the acceptance of the Gentiles and the rejection of the Jews, 4 25-7, 7 9, 13 28, 14 16-24.

3. Oliver, p225, doubts its importance as a theme "Against it is the consideration that it has played no part in recent "redaktionsgeschichtliche" study of Luke-Acts" To which Dahl, "Abraham", p157 n54, aptly replies "All the worse for "Redaktionsgeschichte" if that is the case "

4. Cadbury, pp303f

5. Schubert, pp165-86, Conzelmann, "Luke", pp157-63, Lohse, "Lukas", pp256f, Vielhauer, "Paulinism", pp33f, Minear, "Birth stories", pp111f, and Dahl, "Abraham", pp139f

allusion to prophecy in Lk 2 30-2, 3 6, 4 21, 25-7 and, above all, in 24 45-6. In this manner Luke makes it clear that the inclusion of the Gentiles is not the result of a mere quirk of history or a whim of God, rather, it is grounded in the eternal will of God and is an integral part of his promises to Israel

The theme of promise and fulfilment is closely connected with Luke's conception of "Heilsgeschichte" As will be seen in the next chapter, we do not use the term "Heilsgeschichte" pejoratively, nor do we necessarily imply, pace Conzelmann, that Luke saw this "Heilsgeschichte" as divided into three distinct epochs It is the twofold structure of promise and fulfilment which dominates Luke's understanding of salvation history In fact, because of the various connotations which have attached themselves to the term "Heilsgeschichte" in recent Lukan studies, the theme of promise and fulfilment is probably a better framework in which to place Luke's ideas It is also important to note that the theme of promise and fulfilment is not automatically to be seen as a substitute for imminent eschatology,¹ this pattern can as easily be present in a scheme dominated by imminent expectation, or where this expectation is present in one form or another Nevertheless, it is a fact that the theme of promise and fulfilment is one of if not the fundamental theme which characterizes Luke's account of Jesus' ministry and the history of the Church,

1. As Vielhauer and sometimes Conzelmann appear to do

an account which in turn has moved away, at least in part, from
 imminent expectation¹ As Vielhauer says "The old and the new (aeons)
 are related to each other as are promise and fulfilment, that is as
 historical processes The expectation of the imminent End has
 disappeared and the failure of the Parousia is no longer a problem,
 Luke replaces the apocalyptic expectation of the earliest congregation
 and the christological eschatology of Paul by a redemptive historical
 pattern of promise and fulfilment in which eschatology also receives
 its appropriate place"²

The importance of this theme for Luke's understanding of the
 Gentile mission now becomes clear It confirms what we have already
 concluded from 14 16-24 and 24 46-7 Luke has lifted the Gentile
 mission out of its Markan eschatological context and placed it in
 his scheme of "Heilsgeschichte" Thus in the promise-fulfilment theme
 we can claim added support for our contention that Luke's handling of
 the Gentile mission is deliberate rather than accidental How far
 this can be called a Lukan 'theology' of the Gentiles and the Gentile

1 cf the comments on 24 47 The importance of this theme for Luke
 may be indicated in Lk 1 1f, if "those things which have been accomplished
 among us" can be taken as a reference to the fulfilment of O T prophecies,
 (so Dahl, "Abraham", p153, who also takes ἀσφάλειαν to refer to
 the certainty that comes from a thing being foretold in the O T) More-
 over, as Dahl, ibid notes, this theme is found especially where there
 may seem to be a break in historical continuity the beginning of the
 Gospel story, the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus, the transition to
 the time of the Church, and the conversion of Cornelius

2 This does not mean that we subscribe fully to all the statements
 in this quotation or the whole of Vielhauer's reconstruction of Lukan
 and Pauline theology

mission is not easy to say, for in many respects Luke is simply reflecting what were for him two indisputable historical facts the delay of the Parousia and the Gentile mission of the Church. However, we shall return to this theme when we have studied the material in Acts.

The second theme which we shall discuss at this point in connection with the Gentile mission is that of the Holy Spirit, which has long been recognized as one of the major theological ideas in Luke's writings.¹ There is much that can be said, but for our purposes it is sufficient to consider the relationship between the Holy Spirit, the Gentiles and eschatology. The connections between the Gentiles and the Holy Spirit are not so abundant in Luke's Gospel as they are in Acts. However, we can note that the prophecy of Simeon in 2:30-2 was spoken "in the Spirit" (2:27) and that the mention of the Gentiles in 4:25-7 is made by one who claims that "the Spirit of the Lord is upon me" (4:18a, 21). In fact, all of Jesus' sayings or activities concerning the Gentiles are, in Luke's view, the words and deeds of one who was conceived (1:35) and anointed (3:21f) by the Spirit, and whose possession of it, while in some ways similar to that of the pious men and women in Lk 1-2 and Acts, was in other ways unique. In Acts,^{2 3}

1. Lampe, "Spirit", pp159f, Ehrhardt, pp64f, Conzelmann, "Luke", pp173-84, Flender, pp122-31, Cadbury, pp286-8, Schweizer, T W N T, art $\piνεμα$ VI, pp399f, H. Anderson, "Jesus", pp253-61, Lohse, "Pfingstberichtetes", pp422f, Barrett, "Spirit", and the older study by von Baer, "Geist".

2. Barrett, "Spirit", p101, Conzelmann, "Luke", pp180f.

3. This is merely a sketch, in anticipation of fuller treatment in later chapters.

the link between the Spirit and the Gentiles is firmly forged, but it is prepared for in Lk 24 47f. The disciples are commanded to go on a universal mission, but not before they have received the "power from on high" (v49), and in Acts 1 4-8 the two themes are inseparably linked. This is confirmed throughout the rest of Acts, where the Spirit guides and prompts every vital stage of the Church's mission (Acts 8 29, 10 19f, 13 2, 16 6 etc.)

How then is the Spirit related to Luke's eschatology? For Conzelmann and Schweizer¹ the Spirit is no longer the eschatological gift, but is a theme which Luke uses to deal with the delay of the Parousia. "Luke is the first to make this deliberate appeal to the phenomenon of the Spirit as a solution to the delay of the Parousia."² It is probable that Conzelmann overestimates both the originality³ and the extent of Luke's 'theological' thinking about the Spirit, but there is some truth in what he says. Three observations make it clear how Luke understood the relationship between the Spirit and eschatology.

1 In Mk 9 1, 13 26, the word *δύναμις* is used in one of its characteristic Markan contexts, namely that of eschatology. In Lk 4 14, 24 49, Acts 1 8 the concepts *δύναμις* and *πνεῦμα* are linked. Only Luke connects *δύναμις* with the Spirit, that is, "the

1 Conzelmann, "Luke", pp95f, 136, Schweizer, art cit, pp404f. Cf. also Lohse, *ibid*, who sees Pentecost both as being an eschatological event and as inaugurating a new period of salvation history, the last stage before the Parousia of Christ and the End of the world.

2 Conzelmann, "Luke", p136.

3 Conzelmann underestimates the extent to which Paul has thought out the relationship between the Spirit and eschatology (Rom 8 23, II Cor 1 22, 5 5). In fact, if anything it is Paul rather than Luke who has 'thought it out theologically'.

third Evangelist seems to have regarded "power" as the energy of the Spirit, whereas the characteristic connotation of $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ in Mark is eschatological ¹ "Conzelmann comments," thus in Luke the concept $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ is linked with the historical ministry of Jesus and the present life of the Church ²

2 In Acts 1 8 the gift of the Spirit and the universal mission - the one being, in Luke's view, the implicate of the other - are seen as the substitutes (nb especially $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ v8a) for the knowledge of the End This does not, of course, cancel out hope for the End (Acts 1 11), but it does correct the expectation that it was imminent ³

3 If we take the longer reading in Acts 2 17, then we have another clear example of the meaning of the Spirit for Luke The Old Testament prophecy from Joel is expanded by Luke to include the phrase "in the last days" For Luke, as well as for Joel, the Spirit is a sign of the End, but for Luke the emphasis is on "days" and not "last", since the phrase refers to an extended period of history in which the Spirit is active ⁴

These examples are sufficient to show that for Luke the Spirit is the power at work in salvation history He is no longer the gift of the last days, in the original sense, but is the gift to the Church in the "Zwischenzeit" It would be misleading to call this a 'theology'

1 Barrett, "Spirit", p77

2 Conzelmann, "Luke", p183

3 Conzelmann, "Luke", p136, Grässer, pp204f

4 This text and the whole of the Pentecost narrative will be dealt with in detail in a later chapter

of the Holy Spirit, if by this we mean something that has been carefully and methodically thought out Luke does not appear to have done this, rather, he simply tries to reconstruct and make intelligible the experience of the early Church, at the same time reflecting the experience of the Church of his day The evidence we have adduced, therefore, is best described as a number of uncoordinated hints of how Luke understood the gift of the Spirit to the Church

Both of the themes with which Luke links the Gentile mission, promise and fulfilment and the Holy Spirit, express his awareness of the continuation of history, they both allow for and to some extent explain the delay of the Parousia Thus Luke makes it clear that the Gentile mission is no longer to be seen as an apocalyptic or even as an eschatological event, it is a part of ongoing history How far this is a result of systematic theological thinking by Luke, and how far simply a reflection of the historical facts as he knew them, is a question to which we shall return

We can now draw together some of the results we have gained so far For Jesus, the proclamation to the Gentiles was strictly an apocalyptic event He neither promised, foresaw, nor commanded a historical mission to the Gentiles When we turn to Mark, we find that a significant change has taken place Now the Gentile mission is seen to be a historical process which must be completed before the End comes For Mark, the Gentile mission still stands in an eschatological context, but it is no longer an apocalyptic event Luke makes

the final and perhaps inevitable break, by severing even the eschatological connections. Both in the verses 14:16-24, 24:47 and in the way he consistently links the Gentile mission with the Holy Spirit and the fulfilment of prophecy, Luke betrays his own viewpoint. The Gentile mission, planned for in God's eternal purpose, takes place in ongoing history, the salvation history of the Church. It is neither determined by nor determines the End. In this manner Luke, in his Gospel, prepares for the narrative which he relates in Acts.

In the previous chapter we noted the firm interconnection in Jesus' teaching between the Gentiles and eschatology. The fact that Jesus expected the End to come soon or even immediately after his death had as one of its logical implications an apocalyptic view of the Gentile mission. The explanation of Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles lay in his eschatology. The same is true of Luke, to the extent that his view of the Gentile mission fits in with his understanding of history and eschatology. His presentation of Jesus' attitude towards the Gentile mission should logically lead him to tone down Jesus' imminent expectations. To this extent it is the opposite for Luke as it was for Jesus, in that it is the Gentile mission as a historical phenomenon which is one of the factors which explains Luke's eschatology rather than vice-versa. We know, therefore, what Luke should have done with the eschatology of Jesus. It is now our task to discover how far he did it.

CHAPTER VLUKE'S ESCHATOLOGY

Our chief concern in this chapter is to discover how far Luke betrays his own views in his portrayal of Jesus' eschatology. Frequent¹ reference will be made to Conzelmann, since his is the view which is most influential and widely held today. Since the advent of his book "The theology of St. Luke" it has become a byword of New Testament studies that Luke is a man with a theological axe to grind. He is pictured as one who has systematically manipulated and recast his sources down to the smallest detail, in order to squeeze them into his overall theological framework. A brief outline of Conzelmann's view will suffice at this stage. Jesus and the early Christians expected the Parousia to occur very soon, at least within their lifetimes. This hope was disappointed and it led to a series of crises. By the time Luke came to write, stop-gap answers had worn thin, it was no longer sufficient to postpone the date of the End bit by bit, a final, lasting solution was needed. This Luke provides. He consistently eradicates expectation of an imminent End from his texts, in its place he propounds a theory of "Heilsgeschichte" in which the Parousia loses its dominant position by being relegated to the far-distant and indefinite future. This "Heilsgeschichte" is divided into three distinct epochs: the first is the Old Testament epoch, up to and

¹ Conzelmann, "Luke", cf. Lohse, "Lukas", pp300f, Grässer, pp180f, Käsemann, "Jesus", pp41f, Vielhauer, "Paulinisms", pp33-50, Cadbury, pp282f

including John the Baptist, the second is the period of Jesus' earthly ministry, characterized in the German title of Conzelmann's book as "The Middle of Time", the third epoch is that of the Church. These three eras are, for Conzelmann, more significant for their differences than for their continuity, and he sees this scheme as the key to the whole of Luke's theology. The details of Conzelmann's theory will be elucidated in the discussion of individual texts.

A John the Baptist and the three epochs

1

Conzelmann argues that the spheres of activity of John and Jesus are precisely demarcated and that John is no longer seen as the forerunner of apocalyptic events. In Lk 3 16 the words ὁπίσω μου are omitted from the Markan equivalent (Mk 1 7). Jesus' baptism is described (Lk 3 21-2) without reference to John, whose imprisonment is related in the previous verse. In Matthew and Mark John is seen as an apocalyptic forerunner and equated with Elijah (Mk 9 9-12, Matt 11 3). In Matt 3 2 John proclaims the imminent Kingdom of God, and the descriptions of his food and clothing recall those of Elijah (Mk 1 6, Matt 3 4, cf II Kings 1 8, Zech 13 4). In Luke the connection between John and Elijah is severed and, consequently, these verses are omitted. John is firmly embedded in the Old Testament era and preaches a timeless ethic which is no longer motivated by the expectation of an imminent End.

1 Conzelmann, "Luke", pp18f, 101-2, Grässer, pp179f

Wilckens has argued that a similar description of John is
¹
 to be found in Acts. In Acts 10 37 Jesus' activity is said to have
 begun after the baptism which John preached, and in 13 24 John is
 said to have preached repentance before Jesus' coming. The use of the
 preposition *πρὸ* in *προκηρύξαντος* and *πρὸ προσώπου* 13 24
 is Luke's way of emphasizing that John belongs to the Old Testament
 epoch. Further, the use of *μετ' ἐμέ* in 13 25 denies John the role
 of apocalyptic forerunner and shows him to be merely the last of the
 prophets. With regard to these arguments of Conzelmann and Wilckens
 we note the following points:

1. In Lk 1 17 it is said that John will act "in the spirit and
 power of Elijah" which, though admittedly not a direct identification
 of John with Elijah, does draw a close parallel between the two figures.
 Moreover, in Lk 7 27 the passage from Mal 3 1 - "behold I send my
 messenger before you who shall prepare your way before you" - is used
 of John, so that the omission of *ὀπίσω μου* in 3 16 is scarcely
 significant. In Jewish tradition the messenger of Mal 3 1 is identified,
 by way of the explanatory addition in Mal 4 5, with the figure of
 Elijah, who in turn is seen as the eschatological forerunner of the
 Messiah.
³
 Luke may, of course, have been unaware of this tradition, but
 we cannot simply assume this.

1. Wilckens, pp101f

2. Conzelmann expressly ignores Lk 1-2, for which he is correctly
 criticized by Oliver, p215, Minear, "Birth stories"

3. Dodd, "Scriptures", p21f. Mal 4 5 may be a late addition to explain

3 1. For other material on Elijah as forerunner see Jeremias, art
 'הָאֵלֹהִים T W N T, II, pp928f, S B, IV, pp748f

2 The omission of the references to John's food and clothing are not necessarily eschatologically motivated. The references do not necessarily recall Elijah alone,¹ though this is often assumed. That Elijah wore a mantle is in no way distinctive. It would be more significant if לְיָדָיו in II Kings 1:8 meant that Elijah wore clothing of hair, but the LXX and targum take it to mean that he was a hairy man. Further, according to Zech 13:4 hairy garments were common prophetic garb. Moreover, if Luke was intent on removing all eschatological overtones from John's ministry, why has he retained the reference to the desert³ 2, which was one of the traditional locales for the End events?² If it is argued that Luke was unaware of the significance^{of} such a detail, then it could be said that he was also unaware of the significance of the description of John's food and clothing. The reason for the omission may be that Luke wishes to highlight John's activity as a preacher.

3 John's preaching can hardly be described as a "timeless ethic". The use of ἤδη in 3:9 and the tenses of the verbs in 3:17 show that John's preaching was motivated by a belief in an imminent judgement. Conzelmann avoids this conclusion by saying that "John does not declare that judgement is near but that the Messiah is near"³, thereby making a distinction which Luke himself does not appear to make. The

1 Jeremias, art. cit., p. 936 n. 70

2 Caird, p. 75f

3. Conzelmann, "Luke", p. 102

use of *εὐηγγελίσετε* with reference to John's preaching in Lk 3 18 does not, as Conzelmann thinks, merely mean that John exhorted the people with moral homilies¹ The other twenty-five occurrences of the verb in Luke-Acts show that it has strong overtones of eschatological proclamation,² so that presumably a similar reference is intended in Lk 3 18 The fact that Luke lacks Matt 3 2, where John proclaims the imminent Kingdom, is only significant if the verse was in "Q", which we have no means of telling

4 More convincing reasons can be given for the separation between John's imprisonment and Jesus' baptism Caird suggests a purely literary motive, namely the desire to round off one narrative before starting another⁴ He compares Acts 11 27-30 where the fulfilment of Agabus' prophecy of famine is immediately related, though it actually occurred years later in Claudius' reign A more likely explanation is that the division is due to the embarrassment the early Church felt over Jesus' baptism by John, with which one could compare Matt. 3 13f It may also reflect an attempt to damp down excessive veneration of John by his followers - a motive we shall consider later The reason why this seems a better explanation than Conzelmann's is twofold First, if Luke had only wanted to separate the public ministries of the two

1 of Braumann, Z N W , 54, 1963, pp 123-9

2 Lk 1 19, 2 10, 3 18, 4 10, 43, 7 22, 8 1, 9 6, 16 16, 20 1, and some mss of 1 28 Acts 5 42, 8 4, 12, 24, 35, 40, 10 36, 11 20, 13 32, 14 7, 15, 21, 15 35, 16 10, 17 18, and some mss of 16 17

3 cf Friedrich art *εὐαγγελίζομαι* T W N T , II, pp 719f and Flender, p 26, against Conzelmann, "Luke", p 23, and Bultmann, "Theology", I, pp 87-8

men, he could have related John's imprisonment between Lk 3 22-3, that is, after Jesus' baptism (cf Mk 1 14) By placing it where he does, Luke appears to be avoiding the connection of John with Jesus' baptism more than anything else¹ Secondly, at several points, including ch 1-2, Luke seems concerned to interweave the chronology and significance of John and Jesus For example, Lk 3 1 synchronizes the beginning of the activities of both John and Jesus with contemporary history, on which Flender comments, "Wenn Lukas eine klare Scheidung der Zeit Johannes und der Zeit Jesu beabsichtigte, dann dürfte er den Beginn der Wirksamkeit beider nicht in eins sehen"² Caird makes a similar assessment of Lk 7 29-30, 20 1-8, commenting on the latter passage that "John and Jesus belong together A person's attitude to John is a decision about Jesus"³

5 The implication of points 1-4 is that while Wilcken's interpretation of Acts 10 37 and 13 24 is feasible, it is unnecessary When it is said that John came before Jesus or that Jesus came after John, these are to be taken as chronological statements, without any theological significance It is, after all, a commonplace of early tradition that John came before Jesus (Mk 1 7)

The sum total of points 1-5 is that John is not denied eschatological significance as a preacher and forerunner of the Messiah,

1 W C Robinson Jnr ,pp11f, see also pp10-11 for a critique of Conzelmann's understanding of Luke's geography

2 Flender,p111

3 Caird,p75, cf Rengstorf,p100, Flender,pp26,48

and that where there is a demarcation of John's and Jesus' activity it is not for eschatological reasons. This is not to say that Luke does not distinguish them, this he does - a distinction which Oliver has conveniently summarized under the titles "son of the Highest" (Jesus) and "prophet of the Highest" (John)¹, but this does not stop him from interweaving their activity and significance.

Although one may not agree with many of the details of Conzelmann's interpretation of Luke's presentation of the relationship between John and Elijah, one must still find some explanation for the lack of any direct identification of the two figures such as is evident in Mk 9 9-13, Matt 11 14:

2

a Cadbury suggests that Luke omits this obscure detail of Jewish Apocalyptic in deference to his Gentile readers, who would not have understood it. Yet Luke retains such concepts as the Son of Man and the Kingdom of God, which are just as Jewish and, for a Gentile, just as obscure. It might be argued that these concepts were too fundamental to omit, whereas the Elijah typology was not, but if this were so, why does Luke use the phrase "the spirit and power of Elijah" in 1 17?

3

b Conzelmann's explanation has much to recommend it, since if Jeremias is correct in thinking that Mk 9 9-13 shows that Jesus and Mark expected an imminent End, Elijah redivivus being its herald, then it would fit in with Luke's other attempts to tone down imminent

1 Oliver, pp205f

2 Cadbury, p290

3 Jeremias, art cit, pp937f

eschatology Yet we have seen that Luke presents John as the herald of an imminent judgement, the very thing which the omission of the identification with Elijah is supposed to avoid

c It could be argued that the omission is caused by Luke's desire¹ to combat excessive veneration of John in the Baptist sect Lk 3 15 shows that many thought John was the Messiah If Käsemann is right in thinking that Luke is dealing with the problem of the 'Una Sancta Catholica' in Acts 18 24f,² then one might expect him to prepare for this in his presentation of John in his Gospel However, although this might explain the tendency to play down John's importance, it does not explain the omission of the identification with Elijah, since such an identification would once and for all put John firmly in his place - as Elijah and not the Messiah - thereby denying any Messianic pretensions of the Baptist sect

d There remains one further explanation One of the striking facts about Luke's Gospel is that whereas he omits some of the Elijah material from the other Gospels, he also preserves Elijah traditions which we do not find elsewhere More significantly, most of these traditions are applied to Jesus and not to John cf Lk 4 21 (I Kings 17 1), Lk 7 11 (I Kings 17 17-24), Lk 22 43 (I Kings 19 5), and certain words which may recall Jewish traditions about Elijah,

ἄνναλῆμψευς in Lk 9 51 and ἀποκατάστασις in Acts 3 21

1 J A T Robinson, N T S ,4, 1957/8, pp263f, denies the existence of such a sect His argument is not always convincing, though it is not essential for our purposes to decide

2 Käsemann, "Ephesus", pp136f

It may be that we have here a relatively simple answer to our problem. Luke was keen to use the Elijah typology of Jesus as well as of John, and consequently makes the appropriate adjustments to the material in Mark. For Luke, Elijah was the classic example of a godly and devout man, and it is in this sense that he uses him as a type of both Jesus and John. Direct identification with either figure is avoided because of this double purpose. We can conclude, therefore, that Luke's immediate motive for omitting the identification of John with Elijah is christological rather than eschatological. However, this conclusion depends to some extent on our interpretation of Lk 16:16, and it is to this verse that we must now turn.

Lk 16:16

2

For Conzelmann this is the key verse for understanding Luke's eschatology. John, he says, is placed firmly in the Old Testament epoch, which is quite separate from the second epoch - that characterized by the preaching of the Kingdom of God. His use of the verse has earned a timely, if somewhat sharp rebuke from P Minear.¹ It must be said that rarely has a scholar placed so much weight on so dubious an interpretation of so difficult a logion.² Conzelmann's interpretation,³ like many others, is based on two main suppositions: first, that in both context and content Luke's is a secondary version of the "Q"

1 On Luke's allusions to Elijah see Flender, p48 n6, Jeremias, art cit pp934f, Daube, pp295f

2 He refers to it on pp16, 20f, 25f, 40, 101, 112f, 160f, 185 and 220

3 Minear, "Birth stories", p122

saying in Matt 11 12-13, and secondly, that Matthew's ἀπὸ δε τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου includes, whereas Luke's ἀπὸ τότε excludes John from standing on the same side of the change of aeons as Jesus. However, we can note the following points

1. It is probable that this saying reached Matthew and Luke as an isolated logion, but if we were going to argue that either of them has retained the original context, then surely Luke's is the more original, since it gives the "connexio difficilior"¹ Verses 16, 17 and 18 are connected by the link-word νόμος but otherwise share no apparent logic,² and their position between 16 1f and 16 19f bears no obvious relation to these parables. The very obscurity of its position should warn us not to place too much weight on 16 16 in any reconstruction of Luke's theology.³

2. It is quite probable that v16a is better preserved in Luke than in Matthew. Jüngel, for example, thinks this is so.⁴ He argues that Matthew has placed John on the same side of the change of aeons as Jesus "out of anti-Jewish polemic" - a motive which he leaves undefined any further and which, as it stands, does not mean very much.⁵ G. Barth offers a more convincing reason for Matthew's alteration: Matthew was, in part, combating antinomians who denied the validity of the Law (cf Matt 5 17-18, 7 12-27, 24 10, and the use of πᾶς in

1 Daube, pp294f

2 Contra Daube, ibid

3 Wilckens, p104 n4

4 Jüngel, p191, cf Kümmel, Z N W ,33,1934,p129 n89

5 G. Barth, pp63-4

connection with the Law, 3 15, 5 18, 23 3, 28 20), Luke's version, that is, "Q", could be taken to imply that the Law was valid only up until John, and Matthew, therefore, was forced to alter it

3 It could be argued that Matthew's ἀπὸ δε τῶν ἡμερῶν excludes John from the era of the Kingdom of God, whereas Luke's ἀπὸ τότε² includes him, or alternatively that both exclude or both include him. The word ἀπό¹ is ambiguous and it would be unwise to build on it either way

These three points are sufficient to challenge Conzelmann's interpretation and to suggest that in v16a Luke is merely reporting the original version of "Q". When we turn to v16b, however, things are somewhat different. Matthew's version seems to be more original at this point since it is more obscure, whereas Luke's is a simplified, "christianized" version. There are as many interpretations of this obscure and difficult saying as there are people who, in various connections, have written on it. We cannot hope to survey all of their results,³ but must make do with a few observations

a The first problem, assuming Matthew to be original, is the meaning of βιάσεται. Is it middle, that is, the Kingdom exercises violence? Or is it passive, that is, the Kingdom is violated? If the latter, who is the subject? God, who pushes the Kingdom forward,

1 The phrases ἕως Ἰωάννου (Matt) and μέχρι Ἰωάννου (Lk) are equally ambiguous

2 So Grundmann, p323, Daube, p235

3 See the excellent summary by Kümmel, pp121f, cf Jüngel, pp190f, Flender, pp112f, Daube, pp285-300 offers some fascinating sidelights on the various problems

men who are eager to get into it, or men or demons who oppose it ?
 Probably the verb should be taken in a bad sense and therefore as
 passive, the reference being to the enemies of the Kingdom who try
 to violate it, but who are left undefined¹

b Luke has reinterpreted the saying with a reference to men who
 push violently to get into the Kingdom which is preached to them²
 What we should notice is that this "preaching" of the Kingdom is done
 by John (Lk 3 18), Jesus and his disciples (Lk 4 43, 8 1, 9 11, 60f),
 and by the early Church in Acts (Acts 8 12, 20 25, 28 23, 31) This
 reveals a very real connection between John, Jesus and the Church
 which runs across Conzelmann's strict three-epochal notion and hints
 that such a pattern is unnatural for Luke

Lk 22 36

Before concluding this section we must consider briefly one
 more verse³ to which Conzelmann constantly refers to support his threefold
 pattern He considers the short phrase $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha \nu\upsilon\tau$ to be of immense
 significance. Jesus is warning his disciples that the time of
 persecution and struggle is beginning again, after a temporary respite,
 Satan is now back at work The time of Jesus' ministry had been one of
 relative peace and protection for his followers, the time of the Church
 will involve them in an intense struggle and it is this to which the

1 So Kümmel, Jüngel *ibid*, contra Schnackenburg, pp130f

2 One might contest this by arguing either (a) that $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ means "against", a possible but unusual meaning of the preposition, or (b) that the Aramaic behind Luke's version meant "everyone oppresses it", $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ being the equivalent to an Aramaic preposition not needed in Greek but included because a direct, literal translation was being made (Black, p84)

3 Conzelmann, "Luke", pp16, 81f, 107, etc

ἀλλὰ νῦν refers While admitting that this is an obscure and difficult verse, it does seem more likely that the reference of ἀλλὰ νῦν is both specific and limited It is specific in that it refers to the disciples, and limited in that it refers to the immediate future¹ Whatever may have been the original meaning of vv35f, in their present context they appear to fit into Luke's general theme of prophecy and fulfilment The phrase ἀλλὰ νῦν refers forward to the story of the disciple who cut off the ear of the slave of the High Priest The disciples are seen as the ἀνόμων (Is 53 12)² and the obscure phrase ἱκανόν ἐστὶν may then mean "it is enough to fulfil the prophecy"³ The fulfilment of the prophecy is then immediately related in vv49f, and in v51 Jesus intervenes so that the situation does not get out of hand Jesus' command is thus to be seen partially as an artificial literary device to set the stage for the fulfilment of Scripture, and partially as a means of disclosing that the disciple's had already secretly, disobediently secured swords, thereby nullifying Jesus' previous teaching and practice Luke thus explains the incident of the cutting off of the slave's ear by seeing it as the fulfilment of prophecy We can conclude, therefore, that the reference

1 The following interpretation is that given by P S Minear, Nov Test ,7,1964,pp128f

2 In support of this is Luke's alteration of Mark to the plural οἱ εἰπὼν in v49 Also, the present tense in v37 τέλος ἔχει could imply that what is written is now being fulfilled

3 For other translations see Winter, St Th ,8,1954,pp160f, and the commentaries ad loc

4 This would fit in with the other units of dialogue - with Judas(22 3), the disciples(22 23f) and Peter(22 31) - all of which are fulfilled almost immediately vv47-8 Judas betrays, vv21f the disciples argue, and v54 Peter betrays

of v36 is to the immediate future and not to the time of the Church, and that the *dramatis personae* are the disciples alone and not all Christians at all times

We can now draw together some conclusions with regard to Conzelmann's theory of the three epochs in Luke. If our interpretation is correct, then it must be said that Conzelmann's attempt to strait-jacket Luke into a strict threefold pattern has failed. This is not the key to Luke's eschatology. Luke was not concerned to draw hard and fast lines between John, Jesus and the Church. This is not to say that Conzelmann has not hit on some important distinctions in Luke's writings, in particular the division of his writing into two volumes, an account of the ministry of Jesus and an account of the history of the Church. But even here, as we shall see later, Luke was far more concerned to show how these two periods were closely linked than how they were separated.¹ Again, Luke does distinguish clearly between John and Jesus, but this is not motivated by his eschatology or by any theory of "Heilsgeschichte". If we have to find a scheme for Luke's ideas, then a far more natural one would be that of promise and fulfilment. The period of promise covers the Old Testament era up to but not including John, the period of fulfilment everything from and including John. There are differences between the activity of John and Jesus, as there are between the various parts of Jesus'

1. See later on Luke's treatment of the Ascension and Apostleship

ministry, but they are all linked by being part of the era of fulfilment. It is this broad, twofold scheme rather than any strict threefold pattern which dominates Luke-Acts and which takes over from the more traditional eschatology at various points in Luke's writings. We can compare Mk 1 15, "The Kingdom of God is at hand", with Lk 4 21 "Today this scripture is fulfilled in your ears", Lk 21 22 where the destruction of Jerusalem is seen as a fulfilment of prophecy, whereas for Mark it is a mysterious apocalyptic event, and Lk 24 46f, where Mark's prophecy of the Gentile mission is transformed into a direct¹ command and removed from its eschatological context.

B The Two Strands in Luke's Eschatology

In this section our aim is to show that there are two strands in Luke's eschatology, one which quite definitely allows for the delay of the Parousia and one which, with equal firmness, asserts that the End will come soon.

I The Delay Strand

As a result of Conzelmann's work it seems impossible to deny that at least some parts of Luke-Acts are allowing for a delay of the Parousia. We shall now consider the verses which reveal this tendency.

Lk 9 27 Mk 9 1

An immense amount has been written on this verse and its parallels and we cannot hope to cover all the ground. We shall make

1 To the extent that he places more emphasis on the theme of promise and fulfilment Lohse's analysis ("Lukas") is more satisfactory than Conzelmann's.

do with a statement of what appears to be Mark's meaning in order
 to see whether Luke has altered it¹

²
 G Bornkamm argues that Mk 9 1 allows for a delay of the Parousia, even though a limited one. He thinks it reflects an acute problem in at least a part of the early Church, namely that some Christians were dying before the Parousia had come (cf I Thess 4 15, I Cor 15 51, II Cor 5 1-4). There is a subtle change of emphasis in this verse, for it is no longer said that the End will break in in this generation, but that some will live to see the Parousia come. Without accepting Bornkamm's contention that the whole saying is a creation of the early Church, a first attempt to resolve the crisis caused by the delay of the Parousia, it does seem that Mark's meaning is that the End is near although there may be some delay.

³
 As Conzelmann notes, Luke's omission of the phrase ἐληλυθῶσαν ἐν δυνάμει from Mark opens his version to an interpretation which is independent of any temporal limitation. Conzelmann also argues that the meaning of ὁρᾶσιν has been altered, for in Mark⁴ it means "see" whereas in Luke it means "perceive". Taking the phrase "some of those standing here" to refer to mankind in general rather than to any specific group of people, Conzelmann interprets the whole

1. On Mk 9 1 see Kümmel, pp27f, Beasley-Murray, pp150f, Moore, pp125f

2. Bornkamm, "Parusie", pp116f, Conzelmann, "Luke", p104, Grässer, pp131f

3. Conzelmann, "Luke", pp104-5

4. Kümmel, p27 contra Dodd, pp42, 53f

saying to mean that some of mankind will, before they die, perceive the Kingdom, thought of as some transcendent reality. It is doubtful, however, if Conzelmann's interpretation of the phrase "some of those standing here" is feasible, and while Luke can use the word "see" in connection with the salvation-historical significance of Jesus' ministry (Lk 2 30, 10 35, 13 35, 19 38), it can also be used with a clear reference to future eschatological events (Lk 13 28, 21 27). Even so, the omission of the phrase "coming with power" may be said to support Conzelmann's interpretation of ὁδωσεν at this point.

It has been argued that Luke saw the fulfilment of this saying either in the Transfiguration or in the Pentecost narrative. The former view is feasible but unprovable. It is often said that the phrase "after eight days" (Lk 9 28, "after six days" in Mk 9 2) closely connects the two, but this is not necessarily so, for it might be intended to separate rather than link the two events. The connection with Pentecost is also unlikely, because Luke sees it as the fulfilment of Joel 2 28f and the Baptist's prophecy in Lk 3 16 and not of Lk 9 27.

Another way of interpreting this verse is to take ὁδωσεν to mean "see", as in Mark, and assume either that Luke has simply handed on an unfulfilled saying without fitting it into his other material which allows for a delay, or that when Luke was writing there were still some alive who had been alive during Jesus' ministry and who might yet see the coming of the Kingdom. Either of these assumptions, as we shall see when we discuss Lk 21 32, gives a possible explanation

for Lk 9 27 It is not easy to choose between these and something along the lines of Conzelmann's interpretation, which explains this verse better than most other views It might be objected to Conzelmann's view that if Mk 9 1 was an embarrassment to the early Church and to Luke then he would have omitted it altogether¹ Certainly, Luke is not immune to this practice, but he retains it because, in its revised form, it expresses his special view of the Kingdom Straightforward omission would not solve any problems, whereas retention, in a revised form, could give a new slant on the Kingdom

This last point leads us to consider briefly Conzelmann's overall interpretation of the theme of the Kingdom of God in Luke's Gospel:²

a Conzelmann correctly notes that language about the "coming" of the Kingdom is usually avoided in Luke, and that when it is used (Lk 17 20, 19 11, Acts 1 6f) Luke often criticizes it In contrast, language about "seeing" or "preaching" the Kingdom is more frequent (Lk 4 43, 9 2, 11, 27, 60) It should be noted, however, that Luke has no monopoly of this kind of language (of Mk 1 14, 9 1, Matt 4 23, 9 35, 16 28, and in Mk 4 11 we have a close parallel to Luke's use of ὁραω to mean "perceive")

b Conzelmann claims that Luke only speaks of the Kingdom as future and never as present It is the "message" or "image" of the Kingdom

1 Moore, p130

2 Conzelmann, "Luke", pp113f

which is present and not the Kingdom itself This is a false distinction, for Lk 11 20 and 16 16 imply that the Kingdom itself¹ and not just its "image" or "message" is present

Lk 11:2f The Lord's Prayer

1. The first variation in Luke's version which is relevant for our purposes is the phrase δίδου ἡμῖν το καθ' ἡμέραν v3, which Matthew gives as δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον (Matt 6 11) The present imperative δίδου appears to have an iterative sense, which is reinforced by το καθ' ἡμέραν meaning "day by day" This alteration may be significant if, as is likely, it reflects a Church settling down to a regular existence which is not motivated by imminent² expectation

2 In place of "Thy Kingdom come" v2 a few witnesses have the phrase "Send thy Holy Spirit upon us and cleanse us" It is almost certain that this is not what Jesus said,³ but it is not easy to decide whether or not Luke wrote it The primary objection to Lukan authorship⁴ is the paucity of manuscript evidence, the shorter reading is indisputably better attested Also, it is difficult to see how Luke could have altered the fixed liturgical usage of his time, unless of course he knew of a different liturgical tradition from that which later pre-dominated But this argument works both ways, for it is just as

1. See Kümmel, pp105-7, on ἐφθάσεν .

2 Grässer, pp107f, Grundmann, p232, Ellis, p163 says, "Luke's interpretation shifts the emphasis from the future to the present manifestation of the Kingdom "

3 contra Leaney, pp60f

4 So von Baer, "Geist", p152, Grundmann, pp231f

difficult to imagine a later scribe altering a fixed liturgical tradition

1

In support of the originality of the Holy Spirit petition one can argue that it would fit naturally into what we know about Luke's understanding of the Holy Spirit from elsewhere. In particular, the relationship between the Spirit and the Kingdom in Acts 1 6-8 is such that it would afford a close parallel if Luke did substitute the Holy Spirit for the Kingdom of God petition in Lk 11 2. One can also compare Lk 11 13, where it is said that the Father will give the Spirit to those who pray for it. Moreover, according to 11 1 the Lord's prayer was given specifically to Jesus' disciples as over against the disciples of John. Elsewhere in Luke-Acts the decisive difference between Jesus and John is the gift of the Holy Spirit (Lk 1 35, 3 16, Acts 1 4-5, 19 1-6). This would make a petition for the Holy Spirit particularly appropriate at this point. One might also claim that there is nothing else as good as the theology of Luke to account for the creation of this petition, it does not reflect any patristic controversies or theological specialities, nor does it reflect any theological tendencies of Gregory of Nyssa, who is the chief witness of this reading. However, despite this impressive array of arguments, the lack of manuscript evidence is still a stumbling block. Suffice it to say that if Luke did write it, then it is one more example of his reinterpretation of eschatology in terms of the present experience of the

1 Ott, "Gebet", pp112f, Leaney, *ibid*, Grässer, pp109-11, Loisy, pp315f

Holy Spirit

Lk 12 49-50

It is generally agreed that v50 is a reference to Jesus' death described in baptismal imagery similar to Mk 10 38¹ The main problem is to discover the meaning of v49 and its relation to v50. It seems probable that v49 was originally a prophecy of Jesus which referred to an imminent judgement that was to engulf the world² The fire is the fire of judgement and v52 describes, in traditional apocalyptic terms, the time of distress which will precede the Messianic Kingdom (cf Mich 7 6, Jubilees 23 19, I Enoch 100 1f) What then has Luke made of this ?

³
a Some see 'fire' in v49 as a parallel to 'baptism' in v50, that is, as a reference to God's penal judgement, of which Jesus' death is the first instance

b. More probable is the suggestion that Luke understood 'fire' as a reference to the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost,⁴ which will mediate the judgement of the Kingdom and which is closely related to, but not identical with, the fire of the Final Judgement

It is not easy to be certain how Luke understood the relationship between these two verses, but we would suggest that the following

1 Grässer, pp190f, Rengstorff, pp166-7, Caird, pp121f, Ellis, pp181-2, Conzelmann, "Luke", p109

2. Grässer, ibid, Caird, ibid, Kümmel, pp70f Cf Mk 9 43, 49, Matt 25 41

3. G Delling, Nov Test, 2, 1958, pp109f Cf Rengstorff, ibid, who thinks the events in v49 are absorbed by the event in v50 ie Jesus' death will enact the fire of judgement

4. Grundmann, pp170-1, Ellis, p182

process has taken place

1 Originally the passage spoke of an imminent judgement in terms of fire and probably contained a reference to Jesus' death as an integral part of this judgement

2 Luke retains the reference to Jesus' death, but it is no longer seen as an integral part of the End events. It is now seen as one stage in a series of events which must occur before the End¹

3 The reference to fire is taken by Luke as a hint of the future gift of the Spirit to the Church at Pentecost. In turn, vv52f, which originally described one of the characteristics of the End times, is taken as a description of one of the features of the ongoing life of the Church²

The implications of this process are twofold: there is in Luke an emphasis on the ongoing life of the Church, inspired by the Holy Spirit and suffering persecution and division, and there is a reduction of the original emphasis on an imminent judgement. This does not mean that Luke was aware of the original meaning of the passage and has consciously reinterpreted it; rather, his interpretation simply reflects the fact that he lived and wrote several decades after Jesus' death.

Lk 14 12-14

Conzelmann notes that the notion of individual resurrection,

1 Conzelmann, "Luke", p109, Grässer, p190

2 Klein, Z T K, 61, 1964, pp374-7

which appears again in 16 9,31, 23 43, represents a development of the more primitive theme of a general Resurrection associated with an imminent End expectation¹

Lk 16 1-13

It is generally recognized that vv 9-13 are a later addition² to the original parable. They represent the homiletic notes of an early preacher, who interprets the parable as a lesson on the correct use of wealth - an interpretation which Luke seems to share³

Some argue that vv9-13 give the original meaning of the parable. Rengstorf, for example, thinks the original parable was "einer Belehrung über das richtige Verhältnis zum Gelde im Stande der Vergebung"⁴. However, the original meaning was probably quite different⁵ from this. The parable is about a man who reckons with a future which is pressing and near. His preparatory action allows him to face it without anxiety. As Jüngel puts it "Die Drohende Zukunft - seinen Posten wird er verlieren, graben kann er nicht, betteln mag er nicht - wird in einer Weise an die Gegenwart gebunden, die der Gegenwart der Chance gibt, die Drohung der Zukunft zu übertreffen, so dass man der Zukunft ohne Angst entgegensehen kann"⁶. The situation of this man is

1 Conzelmann, "Luke", pp111-2

2 Jeremias, "Parables", p34, Dodd, p30, Ellis, p200, Leaney, p222, Jüngel, p158, Rengstorf, p188

3 Manson, pp290f, Rengstorf, ibid

4 Rengstorf, ibid

5 A subtle but unconvincing analysis is given by Derrett on the basis of Jewish laws of usury (N T S, 7, 1960-1, pp198-219)

6 Jüngel, p157, Caird, p185, Bornkamm, "Jesus", p88 says, "16 1-8 show how to make use of the present moment in view of a relentless future"

the situation of all men in the face of an imminent Kingdom¹

Luke takes this parable and addresses it to the Church of his day (16 1), in the process of which the original note of urgency is lost. The original eschatological perspective is replaced by timeless ethical teaching. However, we cannot be certain that it is Luke who has done this,² for it may well be that the parable had already been reinterpreted before Luke received it. But even though we may not be able to attribute the alterations to Luke, it is still perhaps significant that he is quite content to use a parable in which timeless ethical teaching and the notion of individual Resurrection pre-dominate.

Lk 17 20-37

The problems of this section are complex, since both the meaning of individual phrases and the relation of each verse to the others is frequently obscure. Taking the last point first, we have to ask what the relationship is between vv20-1 concerning the Kingdom of God and vv22f concerning the Son of Man. Does Luke see the former as present and the latter as future?³ Or does he see them as having the same basic reference, so that we can think of them as parallel terms⁴

1. Jüngel makes his interpretation depend to some extent on the meaning of κύριος v8a originally it referred to Jesus, but for Luke it refers to the servant's Master. However, Jüngel's overall view of the parable is supported but not fundamentally affected by this interpretation of v8a cf Ellis, p200, Jeremias, "Parables", pp45-8

2. Conzelmann, "Luke", p111-2

3. Ellis, p210, who thinks that the juxtaposition of present and future eschatology is characteristic of Luke

4. Conzelmann, "Luke", pp113f, Caird, p197, Bultmann, "Theology", I, pp6f, Manson, p303

and take what appears to be a reference to a future, sudden coming of the Son of Man vv22f and use it to interpret vv20-1 in a similar way ? Why is it that 'they' will not say "Lo here, Lo there" for the Kingdom, but will say it about the day of the Son of Man ? First of all, therefore, we shall consider vv20-1, indicating briefly the main problems of interpretation and offering what appear to be the most commendable solutions to them

1 Does ἔντος ὑμῶν v20 mean "among" or "within" you ? Both translations are possible, but the latter is more frequent. However, the difficulty with "within" is that it presumably means "within your hearts", which would be a unique concept for the New Testament. This translation is made even more difficult if, as is implied by the context, it was addressed to the Pharisees. Thus while "among" is normally represented by ἐν μέσῳ in Luke, and while it is not the most natural meaning of ἔντος¹, we should probably take it as the intended meaning in v20. Even so, we still have to discover the exact reference of "among", which in turn depends chiefly on the time-reference of v21. Is it to the present or to the future manifestation of the Kingdom ? If to the future, then presumably it refers to the final manifestation of God's Kingly Rule at the End, if to the present, then it probably refers to the realization of the Kingdom in the activities of Jesus²

1 So Kümmel, pp32-6, Dodd, p84, Manson, p308, Perrin, pp68f, the most recent advocates of "within" are Baird, "Justice", pp169f and Sneed, C B Q, 24, 1962, pp381f

2 Jünger makes the improbable suggestion that the Kingdom is among us in the sense of the "Nearness of one's neighbour" (p193)

2 The obscure word ¹καπαθησῆως has been given various interpretations. Leaney suggests two possible translations: either "observation" in the sense of the keeping of regulations, or "to watch for" in the sense of trying to catch someone out. He translates the verse as "The Kingdom comes neither through meticulous keeping of the tradition, nor by hostile watching of Jesus." A more convincing suggestion² is made by A. Strobel. He argues that the whole of vv20-1 is a Lukan creation, written in order to refute the view, held especially by the Pharisees, that the Messiah would come on the night of the Passover, that is, the night of observation. He notes that Aquila uses the word ³καπαθησῆς in his translation of Ex 12:42 and that there is a Jewish tradition for the expectation of the Messiah on that night. Perrin³ criticizes this view: first, he considers it to be a genuine saying of Jesus - though even if this were true, one could still accept Strobel's interpretation as being the meaning which Jesus intended; secondly, he argues that there is no evidence that this Jewish tradition goes back as far as the New Testament. Certainly, even if this second objection is considered invalid, there is no evidence that Luke was aware of this Jewish tradition or of Pharisees who believed it. When Luke does characterize the Pharisees, it is as those who, in contrast to the Sadducees, believe in the Resurrection.

1. Leaney, pp230f

2. Strobel, Z N W ,49,1958,pp157-83, B Z ,7, 1963,pp111-13, cf Grundmann,pp339f, Jeremias,"Words",pp137f

3. Perrin,pp69-70

It would seem that the most probable meaning of the word is that given by Kümmel, who sees it as a reference to the attempts made at calculating the exact date of the Kingdom's arrival. It means "observation,¹ especially of premonitory signs and symptoms."

3. The phrase "Lo here, Lo there" is also ambiguous. It could be a reference to the many Messianic pretenders who appeared after Jesus' death,² or it could be a reference to the mistaken idea that the Kingdom, when it comes, will be a "sichtbaren räumlichen Grösse"³ As part of the stock-in-trade of Christian Apocalyptic (Mk 13 21 pars), the primary reference is probably to Messianic pretenders who claim that the Kingdom is already here in this or that place, but the latter idea may also be present.

4. We must return finally to the problem of the time reference of this saying. Does it refer to a sudden, future inbreaking of the Kingdom⁴ or to a Kingdom that is already here?⁵ If, as seems probable, Luke is not only recording words of Jesus but also combating the false Messiahs of his day, then he probably intended the former meaning. It would scarcely have been relevant to say that the Kingdom is already here, since that is the very thing that the false Messiahs

1 Kümmel, p32

2 cf Perrin, p74 and many others

3 Jüngel, p194, Grundmann, p339

4 Bultmann, "Theology", I, p6, Manson, p304

5 Kümmel, pp35-6, Ellis, p211, Grundmann, pp340-1, Schackenburg, pp134f, cf also the long discussion of these verses by B Noack, "Gottesreich", pp3f

1

themselves were claiming. Thus we take it that Luke understood this verse as a reference to the sudden inbreaking of the future Kingdom of God. In answer to the Pharisees' question Jesus replies that the date of the coming Kingdom cannot be calculated by men and that the false Messiahs will not be able to say "Lo here, Lo there", because the Kingdom will come suddenly in the future and when it comes it will be unmistakeable. It is to this last problem which Luke turns, in part, in vv22f.

The problems of vv22f fall broadly into two questions. First, what is the meaning of the various uses of "day" and "days" and how is this related to v20-1? Secondly, does Luke understand the basic reference of v22f to be historical or apocalyptic? The relationship between the singular "day" in vv24,30 and the plural "days" in vv22, 26, has perplexed many an exegete. We shall begin with the odd phrase in v22, "one of the days of the Son of Man".

2

a. Dodd takes "days" here to mean one of the days of Jesus' earthly life, but in the context of an eschatological discourse this seems improbable.

3

b. T. W. Manson accepts Torrey's view that an original Aramaic meaning "very much" has been misread to mean "one", so that the original sentence said "you will desire very much to see the days of the Son of Man". Though feasible, this solution has to be treated

1 This may not, of course, have been Jesus' meaning.

2 Dodd, p108 n1, cf T&dt, p104.

3 Manson, p142, Torrey, p312.

with care, since it is based on the problematic belief in a written Aramaic source lying behind the Gospel traditions

1

c Leaney takes the plural "days" to refer to all the great turning points of Jesus' ministry, both past and present. Thus the Transfiguration, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the destruction of Jerusalem and the Parousia are all days of the Son of Man. The difficulty with this view is that the disciples did see the Transfiguration, the Resurrection, the Ascension and the destruction of Jerusalem, whereas v22b says "but you will not see it". A similar objection

2

can be raised to Flender's view that "days" refers to the time of Jesus' Exaltation

d The most likely solution is that the plural "days" means the same as the singular "day" and refers to the same set of events, namely the End events connected with the coming of the Son of Man

3

The question now is whether this plurality of expressions has any special significance for Luke. Some regard the plural "days" as a creation of Luke expressing something distinctive in his eschatology, that is, it expands the coming of the Son of Man from a day into a period. The "days" are the period that precede the "day"

4

But if both of these terms refer to the events connected with the Parousia, it is difficult to see how Luke gained by this. He may be extending the End

1 Leaney, pp69f, similarly Grundmann, pp341f

2 Flender, pp87-9

3 Kümmel, p37, and the literature cited there. This has some support in the Matthew parallel which takes both to refer to the Parousia, that is, if Luke's vv24,26 were in Matthew's version of "Q"

4 Tödt, pp49f, Higgins, pp88-9, Grässer, p35, Jüngel, p254, Conzelmann, "Luke", pp120f

events over a period of time rather than limiting them to a single day, but this is of no lasting value when faced with a forty to fifty year delay of the Parousia. Thus for Luke it seems that the two terms have basically the same reference and do not express anything which is distinctive in his eschatology. The plural "days" may have arisen¹ under the influence of the Rabbinic notion of the "days of the Messiah"² and Luke probably found it in his source at this point. It probably referred to the short period preceding the End (the day), that is,³ the signs which show that the End is near. This is one of the points of comparison with the generations of Noah and Lot, both of whom lived⁴ in the last generation before the particular 'End' which befell them.

However, the main point of comparison with Noah and Lot is that these two generations lived in a state of unpreparedness, unaware of the sudden and all-engulfing fate which lay just round the corner. Those who experience the coming of the Son of Man will also be caught unawares by a universal, irrevocable disaster. This is the point of comparison with a flash of lightening: it is both universally⁵ visible and incalculably sudden. The disciples are warned not to follow those who say "Lo here, Lo there", for on the day of the Son

1 Grässer, p35, Higgins, p89, Ellis, p211, S B, II, pp237f, IV, pp816f

2 Some mss omit "his day" in 17 24, but its omission because of homoteleuton or because of its apparent oddity next to v22f is easier to understand than its addition by a later scribe

3 It is just possible that "days" refers to the period after the Parousia of the Son of Man

4. T8dt, pp50-1

5 Some prefer to limit the lightening image either to "universal visibility" (Leaney, p231) or to "incalculable suddenness" (Jüngel, p256)

of Man there will be no need for such cries because it will be¹
 universally visible, and no time for them because it will be so sudden
 That is why it is said in vv20-1 that when the Kingdom of God comes
 they will not say "Lo here, Lo there", for such claims will be both
 unnecessary and impossible As Caird puts it "The Kingdom of God
 and the Son of Man alike will come with the unpredictable ubiquity
 of a lightning flash, defying all calculation, so that no sentries
 can be posted to give warning of their approach Their coming will
 mean irrevocable disaster for a heedless and unprepared generation "²

For Caird, though, this event is to be seen mainly as a political
 rather than an apocalyptic occurrence He points to the incongruity of
 vv31-2 in an apocalyptic passage How can one flee from the day of
 the Son of Man if this is a day of universal judgement ? Further,
 some commentators interpret v37 politically the eagles represent the³
 Roman standards borne by the troops conquering Jerusalem However,
 this enigmatic verse is open to other, more convincing interpretations
 In the Matthew parallel (24 28) the carcass is likened to the Son
 of Man, who will attract all men at his coming as a carcass attracts
 vultures Luke probably found this metaphor offensive and therefore⁴
 altered and recast it For him, it probably had a proverbial meaning,
 something like 'Judgement will occur where it is required, that is,

1 We may also have here "an attack on the concept of the hidden Messiah," (Ellis, p210, cf Klostermann, "Matt", p194).

2 Caird, p197

3 Leaney, p232

4. Manson, p199, Ellis, p212

universally '(cf Hab 1 8) Verses 31-2 were probably spoken by Jesus in a politico-apocalyptic context, since he seems to have seen the destruction of Jerusalem and the End events as inseparably linked (of Mk 13 15-16) Political upheaval was, for Jesus, an integral part of the signs of the End In Luke, these verses have been removed from this political context and have lost the specific reference to the destruction of Jerusalem and the events of A D 70 They have been placed in the general context of teaching about the Parousia of the Son of Man In this context they are used to warn men of the sudden and irrevocable judgement that comes with the day of the Son of Man On this day, by being bound to the past and to their possessions, men can still, at the last moment, lose their salvation (v33)¹ Thus we would argue that the whole of vv22f refers fundamentally to apocalyptic rather than to any interim political events

What then are the conclusions we can draw from 17 22-37 for Luke's eschatology as a whole ?

1 All attempts to calculate the date of the End are eliminated It is both impossible and unnecessary

2 Any claim that the Kingdom of God or the Son of Man had returned secretly or in one particular place is denied, since both events when they occur will be sudden and universal

3 There is a noticeable emphasis in this section on the suddenness rather than on the nearness of the End Conzelmann argues that in

1 Grundmann, p344

Luke this signifies a shift away from the primitive "Naherwartung"¹
 This is a point well made, but its importance when we are thinking
 specifically of Lukan eschatology is considerably lessened when we
 note that

a It is almost certain that Jesus, as well as speaking of an
 imminent End, also spoke of its suddenness and warned his followers
 to be wary of being caught napping In other words we are dealing
 here with one of the strands of Jesus' teaching rather than with a
 new emphasis imposed on his eschatology by Luke

b All the basic teaching of Lk 17 20f is paralleled by similar
 teaching in Mark 13 false prophets and Messiahs vv5-7, the in-
 calculable nature of the End,v32, the suddenness of the End and the
 need to watch at all times vv33f

Thus although there may be a slight change of emphasis in Lk
 17 20f, none of the basic teaching is specifically Lukan, rather, it
 is material which he received from his tradition

Lk 19 11

This verse is probably a creation of Luke's,² serving as an
³
 introduction to the parable which follows It gives to the parable a

1 Conzelmann,"Luke",pp120f This does not mean that the day of the
 Son of Man is in the far distant future v22 implies a certain delay
 if we take it as a reference to the End events("but you will not see it")
 But the main emphasis is on the care needed in order not to be misled
 by false prophets who will play on the fact that the disciples will be
 yearning for the End, which will confirm and vindicate their faith in
 Jesus The delay must be long enough for this situation to arise, but
 it could as easily imply a short as a long period

2 Jeremias,"Parables",pp99f, Ellis,pp244-5, Flender,p58, Rengstorf,p215

3 Matt 25 14-30 may be an independent parable, or it may be that Luke

new meaning, which is basically that "Jesus is not coming, ne's
 going " ¹ The disciples have the idea that the Kingdom is earthly -
 a political Messianic Kingdom - and that it is coming soon The following
 parable tells of a King who goes away for a certain period and then
 returns This is apparently to teach the disciples that they are not
 to expect the End immediately, the Messianic Kingdom will not break
 in when Jesus arrives in Jerusalem, before the Kingdom comes Jesus
 must go This situation is closely paralleled in Acts 1 6-8, where
² a similar misunderstanding is corrected

It is even more significant if, as some think, v11 reflects
 a view which Jesus himself held, that is, that his entry into
 Jerusalem was connected with the coming of the Parousia ³ Grässer has
 argued this in some detail, chiefly on the basis of Mk 11 10, but
 though attractive, it is a difficult view to prove If it is true,
 then Luke is directly contradicting it His contradiction has, how-
 ever, more than a mere negative value since, positively, it makes
 room for a theology of the Ascension, which is of central importance
 for Luke(cf v14) ⁴ As Flender says, " So ist der Einzug Jesu in
 Jerusalem von der urchristlichen Tradition im Zusammenhang mit seiner

(cont) has so reworked his version, originally parallel to Matthew's,
 that it has become unrecognizable as a parallel to Matt 25 14-30

1 Manson, p212

2 cf Lk 10 18f, 24 21, where a similar interpretation could be argued,
 but not so convincingly

3 Grässer, pp24-8, cf Schniewind, "Matt ", p177, Klostermann, "Mk", p112,
 Lohmeyer, "Mk", p233, Taylor, p452

4. Flender, p85

Parusie gesehen worden Bei Lukas dagegen wird aus dem 'Typos der Parusie' ein Typos der Herrschaft Jesu im Himmel "

Lk 21

We shall consider several verses in this chapter, some quite briefly and others in more detail, since they are of central importance. A preliminary problem is the connection between this chapter and Lk 17 20-37. In Mark the Apocalyptic discourse is in one piece and is given to the disciples (Mk 13 1,13). Luke 17 is addressed to the disciples, whereas Lk 21 appears to be open teaching in the Temple vicinity for all to hear (Lk 21 1,37). Wellhausen¹ thought that the explanation for this is that in ch 17 the disciples have already asked the same questions as are asked in ch 21 and have received their answers, ch 21, therefore, is presented as public teaching. Conzelmann² thinks that the limitation of 17 22f to the disciples is due to a literary motive, preparing for Lk 18 1f, and that ch 17 and ch 21 are concerned with the same sort of teaching. It is more probable, however, that the two chapters are talking of different things. In ch 17 the emphasis is "auf der Plötzlichkeit und Unübersehbarkeit des Hereinbrechens der Tage des Menschensohnes", whereas in ch 21 it is "von der diesem plötzlichen und unübersehbaren Ende vorauslaufenden Zeit"³. That is to say, ch 17 is esoteric teaching which only the disciples can understand. This explains, too, the apparent contradiction

1 Wellhausen, p116

2 Conzelmann, "Luke", pp120f

3 Grundmann, p378, Flender, p18

between ch 17, which denies the possibility of calculating the End, and ch 21, which speaks of the signs by which men can recognize the approach of the End. That is, ch 17 is about the End itself, whose exact date of arrival is incalculable, whereas ch 21 speaks of the interim period in which, from time to time, observable signs "will show that God is watching over his word to perform it "¹

v7 Luke substitutes ταῦτα γίνεσθαι for Mark's συντελεῖσθαι πάντα (Mk 13 4) because he, unlike Mark, is not going on to speak of apocalyptic events. In this way Luke prepares for his later interpretation of the destruction of Jerusalem as a non-apocalyptic event.² It might be objected that this is an unnecessary exegesis, since Luke has already referred to the destruction of the Temple in apocalyptic terms in Lk 13 35.³ However, the interpretation of Lk 13 35 is not so straightforward. Matthew places the saying later in his Gospel, that is, after the 'Triumphal Entry' (Matt 23 38f), so that the most natural reference of ὁ ἐρχόμενος is to Jesus' Parousia, when he will return to judge the world. The word ἀφίεσθαι then refers to the destruction and abandonment of the Temple which will take place in the whole complex of events preceding the Parousia.⁴ In Luke, however, another interpretation is possible, namely to take it as a prophecy of the 'Triumphal Entry' which is picked up and

1 Barrett, "Luke", p65

2 Conzelmann, "Luke", p126

3 For this interpretation see Kümmel, pp81f, 100f, Dodd, pp62f, Manson, pp126f

4. Grässer, pp38-40, Schniewind, "Matt", pp159f

fulfilled in Lk 19 38f ὁ ἐρχόμενος still refers to Jesus the Messiah, but to Jesus entering Jerusalem on an ass and not to the glorious Messiah at his Parousia. The word ἡφίετα then has a figurative meaning, something like "desolated", referring to the desolation of the Temple when Jesus leaves it for the greater part¹ of his ministry. Thus what was originally an eschatological logion,² referring to the destruction of the Temple and the Parousia, becomes for Luke a prophecy of the 'Triumphal Entry' which, as we have seen, may itself have been shorn of its original eschatological significance.

v 8 Luke adds ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικεν to Mark's Ἐγὼ εἰμι.³ The word καιρὸς almost certainly refers to the Parousia, so that we have here a direct warning against those false prophets who claim that the End is near. This reinforces and expands the simple Ἐγὼ εἰμι of Mark, which probably refers to the claims of the false Messiahs.

v 9 The phrase οὐκ εὐθέως τὸ τέλος implies exactly the same as the addition in v8. These things will occur, but not yet. The Markan parallel makes the same point.

v 12 Luke adds πρὸ δὲ τούτων πάντων to Mark at this point, suggesting adjustment to a period of persecution, though not necessarily a long period. The phrase could mean "before all of these things" or, by analogy with James 5 12, "more important than all of

1 Flender, pp85f, contrast Ellis, pp189f

2 There is no good reason for Grässer's assertion (pp39-40) that this saying is a creation of the early Church to explain the gap between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Parousia.

3 Conzelmann, "Luke", pp127f, Grässer, pp151f for this and the following points.

these things", that is, verses 12-19 describe events which are more important for the disciples than those described in vv10-11. The general context and the presence of numerous temporal links throughout ch 21 (vv9,10,12,20,21,27) suggest the former translation

v19 A period of waiting before the End is implied in this verse. Luke's omission of εἰς Τέλος from Mk 13:13 may be significant. Τέλος could refer to the end of the world or to the end of a person's life. When the former meaning is intended Τέλος is normally used with the definite article, but this is not always the case (cf I Cor 1:8, Rev 2:26). If Luke understood Mark to mean the end of the world, then this is yet one more example of his alteration of Mark's eschatology.

vv20-24 We shall consider this passage together with that in Lk 19:41-44. The origin of these oracles has been much disputed and their interpretation even more so.¹ Dodd suggests that Luke's version is entirely independent of Mark. Both oracles, he thinks, were composed on the basis of Old Testament prophecies before the events of A.D. 70. But though this has become a popular view, especially in English scholarship, it is difficult to accept. The main reason is that one has to imagine a hotch-potch oracle being compiled from one word of one Old Testament verse and two of another, and so on - scarcely a conceivable process. We shall take it that Luke is dependent on Mark at this point.

First, what did Mark mean in 13:14f? It appears that he saw

1 Dodd, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 37, 1947, pp47-54.

the destruction of Jerusalem as connected in some way with the End¹
 This is not to say that it is the End itself, or that it precludes
 other signs meanwhile² Those who experience the destruction of Jerusalem
 are not experiencing the End, but the End will follow very soon, they
 are the community of the "End-time"³ Already in Mark there appears to
 be a separation between the two events, the destruction of Jerusalem
 and the End are closely connected, but not identical

⁴
 Luke, it is argued, has taken the final step of divorcing the
 End and the destruction of Jerusalem completely He has produced a
 complete "Eliminierung der Parusieerwartung aus dem Zusammenhang
 mit der Zerstörung Jerusalems"⁵ We no longer have the cryptic
 apocalyptic references of Mk 13 14f, but a cool, objective description
 of an event which has already occurred The destruction of Jerusalem
 is seen as a purely historical event with no eschatological significance
 whatsoever Moreover, vv24b marks a long gap between the events of
 vv20-24 and those of vv25f

It is almost certain that the oracles in Lk 19 41f and 21 20f
 were written after A D 70 and, this being so, it is inevitable that
 Luke should distinguish the destruction of Jerusalem from the End
 more clearly than Mark had done⁶ Flender argues that if the connection

1 Dodd, pp60f and Cadoux, pp275f think Mark saw it purely as a historical event

2 Kümmel, pp99f, Cranfield, pp395f

3 Marxsen, pp128f, Conzelmann, Z N W , 50, 1959, pp219f

4 Conzelmann, ibid , and "Luke", pp132-4, Marxsen, ibid , Grässer, ibid

5 Marxsen, p134

6. Flender, p103

between the destruction of Jerusalem and the End was embarrassing for Luke and his contemporaries, he would have omitted it altogether. This is not a very convincing argument. It was very much to the point for Luke to include it in his Gospel and to interpret it in what he considered to be the correct manner. Omission would not solve any problems, whereas inclusion could dispel misunderstandings.

Even so, too much has been made of the split between v24 and v25 in Luke. Verse 24b is ambiguous; it could refer to the Gentile mission, the time when the Gentiles turn to God, more probably it refers to the Gentiles' destruction and military occupation of Jerusalem after A D 70.¹ This certainly suggests a hiatus between the destruction of Jerusalem and the End, but nothing is said as to its length. Moreover, the *Kal* at the beginning of v25, though vague, gives some form of a connection between v24 and v25.

One way of avoiding this conclusion is to maintain that the whole of vv25f refers to political and historical events, albeit in cosmic and eschatological language. This is, however, a forced and unconvincing interpretation which seems to ignore the plain meaning of the words. The connection between vv20-4 and vv25f is not to be understood in this way, as if both sections are speaking only of historical events. Luke may have understood the connection to be a symbolical one: the destruction of Jerusalem was a warning to all men.

¹ Ellis, p245, Grundmann, p383, thinks both references may be intended.

² Leaney, pp262f, Caird, p232, cf Ellis, pp245f.

of the fate that would befall them at the Last Judgement It revealed the way of God with the world when that world was rebellious against him As Flender says, "Das Schicksal Jerusalem ist vorlaufendes¹ Endgericht " Or it may be that Luke saw no connection, either temporal or symbolic, between the destruction of Jerusalem and the End, and that his objective description of the former event, together with the vague connecting link in v25a are his way of making this clear

We would, however, be doing Luke an injustice if we were to think of him sitting down to rethink carefully and radically what he found in Mark To a large extent he merely reflects the fact that he was writing after A D,70 It was natural and inevitable that he should separate the events of A D 70 from the End, since one was inescapably a fact of past history and the other as yet unfulfilled Furthermore, in Mark the seeds had already been sown for making such a distinction

Before leaving Lk 21 we should also note the omission of the reference to the Lord "shortening the days" (Mk 13 20) The Markan phrase refers to the *ὥρες*, the days of tribulation which immediately precede the Messianic era, and its omission by Luke fits in with his other alterations which allow for a delay of the Parousia On the significance of Luke's transposition of Mk 13 10, we refer back to the previous chapter

Lk 22 69 Mk 14 62

Before we can discuss Luke's meaning, we must first decide what

1 Flender,p104

the Markan parallel says T F Glasson has tried to show that the two halves of Mk 14 62 are synonymously parallel The second part of the verse - "coming with the clouds of heaven" - refers to the vindication of the Son of Man in the sense of a coming to God, and is therefore parallel to the first half which speaks of his Exaltation (cf Ps 110 1, Dan 7 13f) Thus the verse does not speak of the Parousia in the sense of a coming of the Son of Man to earth from

God There are, however, several objections to this interpretation

a As soon as Dan 7 13f, which is the basis of Mk 14 62, was interpreted Messianically in Jewish literature, it was used of the Son of Man's coming from God to earth

b The text of Dan 7 13f presupposed by Mk 14 62, is one in which the adverbial phrase "in or with the clouds" has been moved from its original place in the sentence and brought into close conjunction with the verb "coming" This is the word-order presupposed by the Jewish interpretation of Dan 7 13f, but not by the Massoretic text or the LXX.

c In Daniel the order is "coming" and then "sitting" - the order one would expect in Mark, if Glasson were correct, but which one does not find

Thus it seems clear that the two halves of Mk 14 62 refer not only to the Exaltation but also to the Parousia of the Son of Man Now

1 Glasson, pp63-8, Robinson, pp44-5, Taylor, ad loc

2. As given by T8dt, pp36-8

another question arises are we to see the two halves of this verse as referring to "zwei zeitlich und sachlich deutlich voneinander¹ abgehobene Ereignisse", or are we to see them as distinct and yet³ closely linked ? Probably neither of these is true, for in Mark it seems that they are not to be seen as two stages but as two factors in the coming of the Son of Man The allusion to Ps 110 1 in the first half of the verse means that the one who comes is the one to whom belongs the seat at God's right hand and with it the full authority to act on God's behalf² As it stands in Mark, this verse clearly implies that the Parousia of the Son of Man will occur in the near future, at least in the lifetime of the members of the Sanhedrin whom Jesus addressed⁴ What then has Luke done with this verse ?

a He has added the phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν⁵, which is more or less equivalent to Matthew's ἀπ' ἄρτι (Matt 26 64) The use of νῦν⁵ is significant, because the other occurrences in Luke-Acts show that it normally marks a decisive time-change⁶ Here and in Lk 22 18 it seems to refer to the period after Jesus' death, that is, to the time of the Church as distinct from the time of Jesus' earthly ministry However, we cannot make much of this in terms of a rigid division of these two epochs, since the same phrase is used in Lk 12 52, where its

1 Grässer,p174, Perrin,p173

2 Tödt,p38

3 Flender,p92

4 It is unlikely that either Jesus or Mark meant that the Sanhedrin would see the Son of Man after their deaths, at the Last Judgement (so Cranfield,p445)

5 Lk 1 48, 5 10, 12 52, 22 18, Acts 18 6

6 Stählin,T W N T ,IV, art νῦν pp1112f

position in the Gospel means that the future referred to includes the rest of Jesus' ministry as well as the time of the Church

b As we have seen, Mark's phrase "and you shall see the Son of Man" most obviously refers to an expectation that the Parousia would occur within the lifetimes of the members of the Sanhedrin. Luke changes Mark's ὄψεσθε to ἔσται¹ it is no longer a question of men seeing, but of the Son of Man's being. Luke also omits the phrase "coming with the clouds of heaven" and consequently all weight is placed on the 'sessio ad dextram Dei'. These alterations are partially motivated by a desire to tone down imminent expectation, but not only this. Luke speaks elsewhere of the coming of the Son of Man (Lk 17 24-30, 18 8, 21 27) and if he had only wanted to avoid imminent expectation he could simply have omitted the part about the Sanhedrin seeing. The reason why the phrase "coming with the clouds of heaven" is omitted, is because he wants to place considerable weight on the Ascension, which for Luke bears some of the weight which in Matthew² and Mark is placed on the Parousia. Luke's motivation is pastoral, he wants to strengthen the Church of his day. Jesus' Exaltation is the basis of their faith, his commission in Acts 1 8 is unthinkable without it. The End has not come and the Church must go on living and expanding.³

1 Conzelmann, "Luke", p109, Grässer, p176

2 T&dt, pp102-3, Flender, p94

3 Flender, ibid, is saying more or less the same when he claims that one of the problems facing the Church was the certainty of the End-victory of Christ. Previously it had been closely bound up with "Naherwartung", but in Luke it is closely connected with Exaltation.

II The imminent expectation strand.

We turn now to the material in Luke's Gospel which reveals some form of imminent expectation. It is not so well attested as the delay strand, but there is sufficient evidence to show that it is an important element in Luke's eschatology.

Lk 10 9,11

In both of these verses there appears to be a reference to the nearness of the Kingdom. One might dispute this by arguing that ἡγγικεν¹ means "has come"; or by saying that the Kingdom is not necessarily to be identified with the Parousia. With regard to the first point, Kümmel² has shown the linguistic improbability of the translation of ἡγγικεν³ by "has come". Secondly, despite various attempts to understand the coming of the Kingdom in terms of political and historical events (see on Lk 9 27, 21 25f), it is highly improbable that when he speaks of the future coming of the Kingdom Luke means anything other than the Parousia (cf 21 32).

The kind of challenge that the preaching of Jesus and his disciples brought to men may be reflected in Lk 9 57f. Luke, like

(cont) theology, since in his Exaltation Jesus has all the glory he will have at the Parousia, only now it is hidden and then it will be revealed. Again, the argument that if Mk 14 62 was embarrassing to Luke he would have omitted it is not a strong one. By retaining and revising it Luke expresses one of his central themes.

1. Dodd, p44f, Black, E T, 63, 1951-2, pp289f

2. Kümmel, pp23f, Clark, J B L, 59, 1940, pp367f

3. Ellis, p155, and Schnackenburg, p139, think that the addition of ἐφ' ὧς in Lk 10 9 may mean that Luke understood it to mean that the Kingdom was "here" rather than "near". However, the phrase can also mean that the Kingdom is chronologically near - so Rengstorff, p135

Matthew, does not make clear the motivation for the complete and immediate response demanded by Jesus. Conzelmann¹ thinks that whereas the original motivation was the nearness of the Kingdom, in Luke the verses speak merely of the importance of missionary preaching. Yet it may be that Luke has retained a note of urgency, and that he understood Jesus' radical demands to be motivated by the possibility of a near and sudden End.

Lk 12 35-48

This parable is found in essentially the same form in Matt 24 42f. It is thought by many scholars,² probably correctly, that the original version referred to an imminent crisis, namely the Parousia.³ As we have it in Luke, however, the parable makes provision for a delay in the same way that the Markan parallel does (Mk 13 34). The Lord is coming, but he may not come until the second or third watch.⁴ This is not, however, the point which Luke is most concerned to emphasize. In v41, by means of the question of Peter, Luke brings the parable up to date. The answer given to Peter is intended to be a warning to all the Church leaders of Luke's day, although it is not restricted to them. These leaders have special responsibilities and, owing to their position, are open to special dangers (vv44,46,47).⁵

1 Conzelmann, "Luke", p105

2 Conzelmann, "Luke", p109, Dodd, p167, Jeremias, "Parables", pp93f, Glasson, p95, Robinson, p113. Jeremias points out that the idea of the "thief in the night" is always a sign of the imminent End (cf I Thess 5 2,4, II Pet 3 10, Rev 3 3,16)

3 Glasson and Robinson think of a political crisis, Dodd of the crisis caused by Jesus' ministry

4 Grässer, pp87f

5 Leaney, p202, Ellis, p180, Caird, p164, Dodd, pp160f

Luke is addressing his contemporaries at this point who, owing to a delay in the Parousia, were apt to be lax and complacent. By warning them that they need to watch out lest the End should come and catch them unawares, Luke shows that the hope of an imminent End was not a lost cause to be abandoned by the Church. Luke thinks it a distinct possibility that the man who says "My master is delayed in coming" (v45), blithely supposing that he can ignore his responsibilities, will be caught napping. Hope for the Parousia was not dead, nor was it simply projected into the far-distant future. The End was a real and threatening possibility.

What we have said here is confirmed by an observation of Tödt in his book on the Son of Man, namely that in Luke's Gospel the Son of Man motif tends to be used for the purpose of exhortation to watchfulness.¹ Tödt, like Grässer,² seems to think that the motif of watchfulness itself implies that men must reckon with a delay of the Parousia. This is similar to Conzelmann's point that in Luke the Kingdom is thought of as coming suddenly rather than soon, an emphasis which he thinks originated in the early communities as a result of a disappointed hope in the imminent End. However, there is no reason to suppose that as well as announcing an imminent End, Jesus did not also warn men of the suddenness of this End which, if they were not watchful, would catch them unawares. It is true that in Luke the Son

1 Tödt, pp103f

2 Grässer, pp84f

of Man motif is used as an exhortation to watchfulness, as in Lk 21 36, but the point here is not so much that Christians cannot be sure of an early return of Jesus, rather, it is that they cannot rely on an indefinite delay Luke's exhortation presupposes that the End could come very soon, a point which confirms our exegesis of Lk 12 38f

Lk 12 54-13 9

¹
Conzelmann, probably correctly, interprets vv54-6 to mean that one must not be led astray by the delay If this is so, then the implication is that a near End is a distinct possibility The verses speak of those who are unable to interpret the signs of the times, as they can the signs of the weather, and make a prognosis for the future Again, Luke may be combating the complacent attitude of his contemporaries who, as a result of the delay, were inclined to ignore the possibility of a near End. Verses 57-9 depend for their point on the nearness of the judgement men will meet, and in connection with them vv54-6 probably also have a note of urgency ² The problem is to discover how Luke understood this judgement, and to this end we shall ³ turn to 13 1f

The message of 13 1-9 seems to be that there is an impending judgement on Israel, and the parable in vv6-9, in particular, emphasizes ⁴ the imminence of this judgement If this parable is Luke's equivalent

1 Conzelmann, "Luke", p109

2. Kümmel, p22, Ellis, pp182-3, Rengstorff, p167, W Manson, p161

3 of Caird, p169, who takes 12 57-13 9 as the explication of 12 54-6.

4 Creed, p181, Manson, pp272f, Jeremias, "Parables", pp170f, Leaney, p207

to Mk 11 12f then it is significant that Luke has more emphasis on the imminence of the End. The warnings appear to be directed primarily at Israel,¹ but we still have to ask how Luke understood this judgement

a. Luke may have understood it to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem,² which Jesus prophesies elsewhere (19 41-4, 21 20-24). This probably was Jesus' meaning, since he understood this destruction to be part of the End events. But as we have seen, Luke did not view these events in the same way. For him, the destruction of Jerusalem was not connected closely with the End. Thus if Luke understood 13 6-9 to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, although there is a note of imminence, it refers to the events of A.D. 70 and not to the End.

b. It could be that the reference of 13 6-9 is to the Last Judgement rather than simply to the events of A.D. 70.³ If so, then we would have one more example of Luke's imminent eschatology.

It is difficult to decide between these two alternatives, since both are quite feasible. Perhaps the answer is that Luke understood these verses as referring to both events. The warning, which is addressed particularly to the Jews, was partially fulfilled in the events of A.D. 70, but that was only a foretaste of what was to come. As the story of Acts shows, Luke was well aware of the persistent

(cont) says, "There is only a short time for the inhabitants to change their ways." Cadbury, p292, thinks the main point is that there will be a delay.

1. Either the vineyard = Israel (cf Lk 3 8f, Is 5 1-7) or the fig tree = Israel (cf Hos 9 10, Rom 11 17f)

2 Rengstorff, p169

3 Ellis, pp182-3, Moore, p86

obduracy of the Jews, and it may well be that he is warning the Jews of his day that the day of Judgement was not far off. However, since the primary message of the parable is the urgent need for repentance, its application was not limited to the Jews, it could serve equally well as a warning to all men.

Lk 18 8

It is not clear whether this parable (18 1-8) is a continuation of 17 20f or distinct from it, at any rate it is concerned with problems very much related to the day of the Son of Man (v8b).

Our problem is to interpret v8a, in particular the way in which it connects with v7b. The phrase *καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐν αὐτοῖς*² in v7b is obscure, but whichever translation we take, a delay in God's activity of vindication seems to be envisaged. In contrast, v8a gives an assurance that God will act speedily on behalf of his elect. The phrase *ἐν τάχει* most naturally means "speedily", "very soon", and since the reference is to the coming of the Son of Man, this implies an imminent Parousia. To avoid this conclusion, some scholars

3

1. This would fit in well with Flender's interpretation of Lk 21 20-4 as a "vorlaufendes Endgericht" cf on Lk 21 20f above

2. A host of different translations have been offered (a) Jeremias, "Parables", pp116f thinks the reference is to God patiently listening to the complaints of the elect. Similarly, Ljungvik, N T S, 10, 1963-4, p293 (b) Manson, pp307-8 suggests an underlying Aramaic meaning "removes his wrath to a distance" i.e. postpones it out of mercy for the enemies of the elect (c) Creed, p223, translates "does God restrain his anger in the case of the elect?" (d) Leaney, p233, translates "while he is slow to help them" (cf Liddell Scott, p1074). See the excellent articles by Cranfield, S J Th, 16, 1963, pp297-301, and Dellings, Z N W, 53, 1962, pp 1-25, here pp19-20

3. Grässer, p38, Jeremias, "Parables", p116, Ellis, p214, Ott, "Gebet", pp63-5

have suggested the translation "suddenly" However, there is no evidence whatsoever for this translation, the only possible meaning is "soon", or "quickly"¹ Thus in v7b we have a recognition of the delay of the Parousia, which is followed immediately in v8a by the assurance that this delay will be short Nothing is said about the exact date of the End, but clearly it is expected within a very short time and is not projected into the far-distant future²

This reaffirmation of an imminent hope is of the greatest significance for Luke's eschatology, even more so if, as some suggest, this particular element is a Lukan insertion into the original parable In its Lukan form the parable seems to have been motivated by a desperate pastoral situation³ The Church, like the widow, suffered frequent injustices and persecution and, as a result of the delay in God's intervention to vindicate the elect, many of its members lost their faith Luke's response to this situation is twofold first, their expectation of immediate vindication is taken seriously, and v8a reaffirms that God will intervene in the very near future, secondly,

1 The evidence offered for "suddenly" is the LXX of Dt 11 17, Ps 2 12, Josh 8 18 However, (a) the Hebrew of Ps 2 12 is פִּינָה and of the other two verses הִנֵּה . For neither of these words do the Hebrew lexicons give the meaning "suddenly"; and (b) None of the Greek lexicons give "suddenly" as a possible meaning for Ταχως or for adverbial phrases which use the noun Ταχος Also, in the context of 18 1f, a reassurance that the End will come suddenly but not necessarily soon, would scarcely have been any comfort to the oppressed

2. Contra Cadbury, p296, who thinks the main point is that the End may be long in coming

3 of Ellis, p213, " 'Sunshine' delay causes no problems But a thousand years can go by in one hour waiting for the lions' " cf also Delling, art cit pp22f

their questioning of God's reliability is turned back on them as a question of their own reliability "Die sich als die Gemeinde Gottes wissen, fragen danach, ob Gott zu seinem Wort stehe - Gott fragt, ob sie zu und bei dem Menschensohn stehen werden "¹

²
Lk 21 32

Luke omits $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ from Mark's phrase $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ (13 30)
³
Conzelmann thinks that Luke's $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ now means both the End itself and the signs of the End, that is, the whole of the Divine plan To facilitate an interpretation of the whole verse in line with his overall theory, Conzelmann takes $\eta \gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ to mean "humanity in general"⁴ Thus,⁵ "The saying is no longer a declaration that the End is near at hand " Similar attempts have been made to avoid the obvious meaning of the Markan parallel,⁶ namely a delimitation of the End and the signs which precede it to one generation

The reference that Conzelmann gives to $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ is probably correct, but the omission of $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ does not alter the meaning

1 Delling, art cit ,p25

2 The meaning of Lk 21 31 is unclear Conzelmann takes the $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ to refer only to vv25f it is only in the final cosmic stage that men can say that the End is near This is supported by Luke's recasting of vv20-24 However, the $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ could refer back to all the signs of the End, vv6f This would be supported by our interpretation of v32

3 Conzelmann, "Luke", p131

4 Leaney, p263 and Ellis, p246f agree The latter also suggests "the generation of the End times" as a possible interpretation

5 Conzelmann, ibid

6 cf Kümmel, pp61f

of the Markan parallel In 13 29 Mark has ταῦτα and in 13 30 ταῦτα πάντα ; Matthew has πάντα ταῦτα in both 24 33 and 24 34, Luke has ταῦτα in 21 31 and πάντα in 21 32 Both Matthew and Mark seem to be smoothing out, on stylistic grounds, the odd combination in Mark¹

The meaning of ἡ γενεά both here and in the Markan parallel is disputed Various translations have been offered, the most common being the Jewish race,² the human race as a whole,³ Christians or members of the Church,⁴ and Jesus' contemporaries.⁵ Of all the examples of its usage in Luke only two are possible parallels to the second and none to the third translations Sayings including this phrase are often addressed to Jews, since they were Jesus' main audience, but this does not mean that a reference to all Jews of all times is intended The most likely and natural reference of the word is to Jesus' contemporaries.⁶⁷⁸

1 Moore, p 136 n2

2 Geldenhuys, p538, Rengstorff, pp236-7, Schniewind, "Mk", p176

3 Conzelmann, ibid , Leaney, ibid , Ellis, ibid

4. Grundmann, p385

5 Kümmel, ibid

6 Lk 1 48, 50, 7 31, 9 41, 11 31-2, 50-1, 16 8, 17 25, 21 32, Acts 2 40, 8 33, 13 36, 14 16, 15 21

7 cf Lk 1 48, 50

8. See the evidence given by Kümmel, ibid Ellis, p246, offers two main objections to this translation in Luke (a) Luke must have understood it differently when he wrote This is a fair point, but it is a presupposition which must not be allowed to influence exegesis too far A different exegesis may alter our presupposition as to what Luke must have meant (b) In IQHab 2 7, 7 2 the phrase "the last generation" apparently includes several lifetimes, so that "this (last) generation" means only the last phase in the history of redemption However, the Qumran phrase is not a sufficiently close parallel to "this generation" (it is illegitimate to add "last", even in parenthesis) to demand that they be interpreted in the same way

If we take the reference to be to Jesus' contemporaries then we are faced with a problem. Much of the evidence we have studied so far shows Luke moving away from such a delimitation of the End. Certainly, we have found material where Luke emphasizes the nearness of the End, but never has it been limited by one generation. Also, we have already discounted the historical interpretation of 21:25f, which sees the reference to be to non-apocalyptic events, which would have been one way of easing the difficulty. One might claim that Luke has unwittingly taken over from Mark a saying which does not fit in with his overall view and which by some oversight he has omitted to reshape. But Luke's regular avoidance of such a narrow temporal limitation makes this unlikely. The only other solution is to assume that Luke stretched the meaning of "this generation" to its fullest extent. If we think of Luke writing circa A.D. 75-85, then it is almost certain that some of Jesus' contemporaries were still alive at that time. It is amongst this group that he expected the fulfilment of Lk 21:32. If this is true, then it carries with it the implication that although he had made ample room for a delay in the Parousia, it was still a possibility, and a real one, that the End would come soon.

C The Eschatology of Acts

In later chapters we shall study Acts 1-2 in considerable detail, but to round off our study of Lukan eschatology it is necessary to take a brief look at the relevant material in Acts. Three points in

particular call for comment

1 The very fact that Luke thought of writing Acts reveals a significant shift away from primitive eschatology. That Luke saw the need for some form of Church history is significant because it reveals a Church which is reflecting on its own past and not single-mindedly looking forward to an imminent End¹

2 In Acts 7:56 we have a verse in which Luke seems to be trying to answer one of the problems caused by a delayed Parousia, namely the death of some Christians. Admittedly, the explanation of the two odd features of this verse - the use of ἱσθημι¹ and the use of the title Son of Man - is a matter of great dispute,² but the only suggestion which seems to give anything like a satisfactory explanation of both of these problems is that which understands it as a reference to a personal, private Parousia which Stephen experiences at the moment

1 Grässer, p204, Haenchen, p87

2 All the main views are summarized in Barrett, "Stephen", pp32f. See also Higgins, pp144f, Tödt, pp304f, Sidebottom, pp76f, and commentaries on Acts ad loc. Barrett points out the difficulties of most views (a) Dodd, "Scriptures", p35 n1, thinks ἱσθημι means 'to be situated' and is therefore no different from Mk 14:62 pars. However, there is not much evidence for this meaning of ἱσθημι and there is no explanation of the change from the more usual καθήμενος. (b) The idea that Jesus is here seen as one of the angels serving God is scarcely a view which Luke would have held cf. Bauernfeind, p120. (c) Stählin, p113, thinks that the Son of Man is standing to welcome the martyr, Stephen - an interpretation which is, correctly, connected with Stephen's fate. (d) The idea that the Son of Man is here seen as an Advocate is feasible, but ignores the fact that the Son of Man is normally seen as the Judge of Cullmann, "Christology", p188, Preiss, p50, Moule, SNTS, 3, 1952, pp46f. (e) Owen, NTS, 1, 1954-5, pp224f, thinks the Son of Man is standing because he is about to return, i.e. it is a reference to the Parousia - an interpretation which, if it were true, would give an emphasis unique in Acts. Most of these interpretations fail to explain satisfactorily the use of the title Son of Man. The weaknesses of the explanations

of death Luke knew that the delay of the Parousia would mean that some Christians would die before it came and, as part of his answer to this problem, he introduces this concept of the individual's 'eschaton', which he speaks of in eschatological terms "Thus the death of each Christian would be marked by what we may term a private, personal Parousia of the Son of Man That which was to happen in a universal sense at the last day, happened in individual terms when a Christian came to the last day of his life "¹ The advantage of this view is that as well as explaining the two exegetical problems, it fits in well with Luke's other developments of both the Son of Man concept (cf Lk 22 69) and eschatology in general A fairly close, though less developed parallel can be found in the words to the thief on the cross, "Truly I say to you, today you will be with me in Paradise" (Lk 23 43) We can also refer back to our comments on the appearance of the idea of individual resurrection in Lk 14 12-14, 16 9,31

3 One of the most striking characteristics of Acts is the total absence of imminent expectation Four points are worth noting

a It may be that the command to stay in Jerusalem (Acts 1 4f)² was originally for the purpose of awaiting the Parousia It is a

(cont) of the appearance of the title given by Cullmann, *ibid*, W Manson, "Hebrews", pp30-33 and Simon, pp67-74 are pointed out by Barrett, *art cit*, pp 34-6

¹ Barrett, *art cit*, p35-6

² Haenchen, p112 n4, Gewiess, pp5f For Jerusalem as the place of the Parousia see S B ,II, pp300f, Test Zeb 9 8 and on the nationalistic hope of v6 see S B ,II, pp588f

conjecture which is difficult to prove, but if it were true it would be significant that Luke has substituted the event of Pentecost for that of the Parousia as the purpose of this command. Even so, Acts 1 6-8 gives a direct connection between the delay of the final establishment of the Kingdom, the Spirit and the mission. The delay is not simply stated, but the resulting hiatus is given positive significance as the time of the Spirit-inspired mission¹

b One of the most characteristic features of Acts 1-2 is the schematic, objective approach that Luke has to eschatological events². Thus it is only in Luke's writings that we have a description of the Ascension as a distinct event. It is clearly distinguished from the Resurrection on the one hand and from the event of Pentecost on the other. Other New Testament passages speak of the Ascension (Eph 4 8f, Col 1 3, Phil 2 8-9, Rom 8 34, I Pet 3 21-2, Jn 6 62, 20 17), but none of these texts speak of the Ascension as an event distinct from the Resurrection, even though they see them as theologically distinct³. This tendency to rationalize events and present them in a concrete, objective form, has found expression in Luke's account of Pentecost, where an originally obscure tradition has been reshaped into what was for Luke a relatively intelligible narrative. Like the Ascension, it is also given a definite position in Luke's time-scheme of the immediate post-Easter events.

1 Conzelmann, "Luke", p136, Grässer, pp204f, Gewless, pp102f

2 Cadbury, "Eschatology", pp300f

3 Ramsey, "Ascension", pp49f

c The Kingdom of God is mentioned in Acts, but it is never said that it is imminent. It is the object of εὐαγγελίζω in 8 12, of κηρύσσω in 20 25, 28 30-1, of πείθω in 19 8 and of διαμαρτυρομαι in 28 23. That is, in one way or another, it is said that the Kingdom is preached or proclaimed, nothing is said, except critically in 1 6-8, about the coming of the Kingdom. The majority of the references in Acts seem to imply that the Kingdom is already present.¹ Apart from 1 6-8, the only clear reference to the future Kingdom is in 14 22, and here it is a question of men coming into the Kingdom rather than the Kingdom itself coming.²

d The motivation for repentance given in Acts is never the imminence of the Kingdom (contrast Mk 1 15). In 10 42 judgement is mentioned as a motive, but nothing is said about its nearness. Other motives are the need for forgiveness and the reception of the Spirit (2 38, 10 43, 13 28, 26 18), the need to be saved from the present sinful generation (2 40, 4 12) and the certainty of the coming Resurrection (24 14f, cf 4 2,23, 17 18, 23 6, 24 21, 26 6f).

1 Haenchen (p254) takes the preaching of the Kingdom to mean the proclamation of the coming Kingdom. In Acts 8 12 the phrase 'Kingdom of God' stands next to τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and in 28 23,31 next to περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Haenchen interprets these verses to mean the 'other worldly' Kingdom which will come with the return of Jesus (p646). However, in 1 3, 19 8 and 20 25 the phrase 'Kingdom of God', on its own, characterizes the whole of Christian preaching, in 19 8 it is equivalent to 'the Way', and in 20 25 it is parallel to such phrases as 'repentance to God and faith in Jesus Christ' (v21), 'the gospel of the grace of God' (v24), and 'the whole counsel of God' (v27) - all of which could be taken to show either that Luke saw the Kingdom as present, or perhaps that his use of the phrase is haphazard and loose. When he uses the phrase, Luke does not appear to mean specifically the future Kingdom, rather, it is a vague way of characterizing the content of Christian preaching.

2 Cf Conzelmann, p81. It is unlikely that the reference is to the

Two special examples occur in 3 20f and 17 31, for Kümmel has argued that we have here imminent expectation as a motive for repentance¹ However, 17 31 speaks only of the certainty and not of the imminence of judgement, it is a fixed and definite part of God's plan, but it is necessarily near Acts 3 20 is a much more complicated section Although the whole passage is obscure, it appears to alternate between realized and future eschatology one strand (vv18,22,26) speaks of the sending of a prophet which has already occurred, the other strand (vv19-21) speaks of a Messiah yet to come Most scholars interpret² the latter strand as a reference to the Parousia, although some see³ it as a reference to something which is already realized, namely the meeting of a repentant man with the Risen Lord which brings 'seasons of refreshing' It is important to note, however, that even if we take it as a reference to the Parousia, there is no suggestion that this Parousia is near, rather, as in 17 31, it is a fixed part of God's⁴ plan

How then are we to explain this surprising silence of Acts on the topic of imminent expectation? J A T Robinson thinks it is because the Parousia was not originally part of Jesus' or the early Church's

(cont) birth-pangs of the Messianic era, so B C ,IV,p168

1 Kümmel, Th Rund ,22,1954,pp208-10

2 See commentaries ad loc

3 Flender,pp89f, Wikenhauser,p61 Flender thinks this is another case of Luke reinterpreting an original Parousia reference in terms of Ascension theology repentance is no longer related to the Parousia-hope, but to the present meeting of a repentant man with the Exalted Lord

4 Contrasted with Kümmel is Conzelmann's assertion that 3 19f envisages a long hiatus between the Resurrection and the Parousia (Conzelmann,p35) The passage speaks neither of the imminence nor of a lengthy delay of the Parousia, but only of its certainty

¹
 belief Two factors, he says, warrant this assumption First, the Parousia is not a regular part of the speeches in Acts They do not give the impression that the last article has been lopped off, since they have a climax of their own, namely the Ascension (Acts 2 32-6, of Phil 2 6-11) Secondly, the earliest traceable, irreducible element of the Church's confessions is the phrase "Jesus is Lord" (Rom 10 9, I Cor 12 3), which emphasizes the present Lordship of Christ and not his Parousia However, apart from much dubious exegesis, some of which we have already considered, the basic objection to Robinson's view is that he gives no convincing reason why belief in a Parousia should have developed A crisis caused by a delay in the Parousia gives a cogent reason why an original imminent expectation should have been toned down, but Robinson's idea of a crisis of christology, which he finds in Acts 2-3, is scarcely a convincing explanation for the growth of belief in a Parousia Moreover, while belief in an Exalted Lord may have been the dominant conviction of the early Church, it could happily co-exist with belief in a Parousia

²

H J Cadbury thinks that the silence of Acts about the Parousia is because it is being assumed rather than denied We would not expect many references in a mainly narrative work Cadbury also notes that we should be wary of thinking of the kerygma in fixed terms A certain elasticity must be recognized For example, not all the clauses are coeval, and both before and after the kerygma as we have it in Acts

1 Robinson, pp144-54

2 Cadbury, ibid

there were processes of development. Taking the speeches as mutually supplementary, we could argue that the references to the Parousia in 3:19f can be assumed in all the other speeches. However, while many of these comments are penetrating and illuminating, they are not sufficient to explain either the overall silence of Acts about the Parousia or why the references we do have to the End never imply its imminence.

The correct explanation seems to be that in Acts we have a further development of one of the strands we found in Luke's Gospel to the exclusion of the other. Luke has moved away from the belief in an imminent End. One of his methods of doing this is to objectify and schematize the eschatological time-table. Another is to substitute Ascension theology, the present activity of the Exalted Lord in his Church, for belief in an imminent End. This is done not so much by dogmatic statement as by the assumption and concentration on this element in Acts. The time-scheme of Acts allows for a hiatus between the Resurrection and the Parousia in which the Church can exist and grow. His readers are exhorted not to yearn wistfully for the End, but to receive the Spirit and fulfil their missionary task.

D. Conclusions

We have now discussed all the important material which relates to the question of Luke's eschatology. The task before us now is to explain our findings and to draw conclusions both on the problem of Luke's eschatology in general and on its relationship to the Gentile mission.

Before drawing out our conclusions a few preliminary points need to be made. The first is that Luke was not the first or the last to tackle the problem of the delayed Parousia. We have already seen how the first steps in this direction had already been taken by Mark (see on Lk 9 27, 12 38f, 17 20f, 21 9,20-4.) A brief review of the important points is essential at this point if we are to isolate the distinctively Lukan element. It may also help to dispel the caricature of Luke as a man who received a tradition wholly orientated towards an imminent End and who was forced by his recognition of the delay of this End to reinterpret the tradition in an original way, thereby giving a final answer to the problem.

We have already noted Bornkamm's¹ suggestion that Mk 9 1 reflects one of the acute problems in the early Church caused by the delay of the Parousia, namely the death of some Christians. As Bornkamm says, "Hier geht es also nicht mehr nur um die Verkündigung, dass über dieses Geschlecht noch die Eschata hereinbrechen werden, sondern um die Zusage einige werden bei der Parusie noch am Leben sein."² It does³ not follow that this saying is a creation of the early communities. For Jesus it was probably just a figurative way of speaking about the imminence of the End, while the communities took it literally to help

1 Bornkamm, "Parusie", pp116f

2 Bornkamm, art cit, p118

3 The view that the communities would not create a manifestly unfulfilled saying is not, as Grässer (pp134-5) says, convincing. It could be a first attempt to answer the problem by the first generation of Christians, for it was still possible that some of them would live to see the Parousia.

answer one of the problems which they faced. For Mark it expressed his general view, namely that the End was near although there may be a short delay. We have already dealt thoroughly with Mk 13 10 and 13 14f. The former verse makes it clear that Mark was fully aware of the delay of the Parousia, for before the End can come the gospel must be preached to all nations. The destruction of Jerusalem is both distinct from and intimately connected with the End events. It heralds the End but it is not the End itself. Both of these verses, while making allowance for a delay, fit in with what appears to be Mark's view, namely that the End would come within a generation.

As we noted previously, Mk 13 33f, like Lk 12 38f, seems to presuppose the possibility of a delay. Mark, like Luke, is aware of the problems this causes and, as well as recording the teaching of Jesus, he may also be addressing the Church of his day.

¹
Grässer argues that two other verses in Mark originated in communities concerned with the problem of the delay. Mk 13 30 is, he thinks, one of the first attempts to answer the problem "die Parusie verzögert sich, und nun lautet die Frage wann kommt sie endlich?"
²
Antwort: noch in diesem Geschlecht." It seems much more likely, however, that this is a saying of Jesus by which he announced the imminence of the End. Mark may have used it to explain the delay, by taking the word "generation" quite literally to mean 30-40 years, but even so the emphasis seems to be on the fact that "generation" delimits the End.

1 Grässer, pp 78f, 128f

2 Grässer, p 130

rather than that it explains its delay. Similarly, Mk 13 32 is said to be a product of communities who were anxious to know the date of the End. They ask, 'why do we know so little about the End?' The answer given is that they cannot know more, for even Jesus was ignorant of these facts. Grässer rejects this as a saving of Jesus on the grounds that the absolute $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ is used and that it implies that Jesus was uncertain about his future expectations. This latter, he says, is different from the denial of exact apocalyptic calculations (Lk 17 20f), since it reflects an uncertainty as to whether the End will be soon or late. However, apart from the fact that it is difficult on christological grounds to view this verse as a community creation, there is nothing to suggest that it says anything more than Lk 17 20f, that is, if the distinction which Grässer draws is real. It fits well in the context of Mk 13 even if we take this as teaching about an imminent End which is preceded by signs, for even with such signs the exact date of the Parousia remains incalculable. We conclude, therefore, that Mk 13 30 and 32 have no direct bearing on the problem of the delay of the Parousia in Mark.

We have detected in Mark several hints that the problem of the delay of the Parousia was already being felt and that preliminary attempts were made to answer it. This, in turn, leads us to conclude that Luke's recognition of and attempts to deal with this problem are by no means distinctive. In many instances, Luke is merely drawing out the implications of the tradition he received. A related point is that the tendency to place more soteriological weight on Jesus' earthly

ministry is an early factor in the Gospel tradition, a tradition which Luke received at a relatively late stage of development (Lk 1 1-4)

"To overstate the matter for emphasis an essential fact about the Jesus-tradition was that it had already basically solved the problem of the delayed Parousia by concentrating salvation in Jesus himself and by affirming that his followers participate in salvation now Only when we recognize that the Lukan theology of 'Heilsgeschichte' fits into the history of the Jesus-tradition in this manner, can we properly evaluate Luke's personal theological achievement "¹

One further point needs mention before we try to explain Luke's eschatology As well as the fact of Acts which, as we have seen, is often taken to show how uneschatologically Luke thinks, we could also argue that the fact of Mark's Gospel is equally significant It is not wholly clear why the Gospels came to be written The pastoral and liturgical needs of a growing Church was one reason, the death of the original eye-witnesses and the consequent need to put their testimony in a more permanent form was another But a contributory, if not fundamental cause of the composition of Mark and the other Gospels was that it had begun to dawn on the Church that the End was not going to come as soon as they expected, and that the continued existence of the Christian communities meant that their various needs - whether they were liturgical, doctrinal or practical - had to be met

1 Wilckens, "Interpreting Luke-Acts", p67

The result of these few preliminary points is to show that Luke is not such a unique man as he is often made out to be. Much of his teaching on eschatology he holds in common with his sources and it is false to imagine that, receiving a tradition wholly orientated towards an imminent expectation, he went through it meticulously lopping off the bits he did not like and replaced them with his own theory of "Heilsgeschichte"

How then are we to explain Luke's eschatology? This is the question to which the whole of our study has been leading us, for we have found that Luke has two apparently contradictory strands of teaching, both of which he asserts with equal firmness. On the one hand he moves away from imminent expectation by claiming that Jesus foresaw the time of the Church and his own Exaltation (Lk 9 27, 11 3, 12 38-48, 12 49-50, 16 1-8, 19 11, 21 7,8,20-24, 22 69, Acts 1 6-8). Consonant with this is Luke's answer to the problem of Christians dying before the Parousia. Rather than a simple affirmation that some will survive until the Parousia, as we find in Mark, Luke gives a more lasting answer in terms of individual resurrection and a personal, private Parousia which each Christian experiences at death (Lk 14 12-14, 16 9,31, 24 43, Acts 7 56). On the other hand, Luke firmly maintains the possibility of an imminent End (Lk 10 9,11, 12 38-48, 12 54-13 9, 18 8, 21 32). How are we to explain these two apparently contradictory strands?

1 The explanation given by Conzelmann and many others is that the

material which betrays an imminent expectation is a hangover from the tradition Luke received and does not represent his own view. He records it only because he was faithful to his sources and not because he agreed with it. One meets this form of argument frequently in books on Luke and it is often used for the purpose of ignoring one strand of evidence in the interests of a neat, logical scheme. If one were to accept this explanation, then it has a corollary which is not often recognized, namely that Luke is not the theologian he is often made out to be. His scheme is not neat and tidy, it has many loose ends, if not contradictions. However, although it may help to explain some of the evidence (eg 21 32), there are good reasons for thinking that this explanation is insufficient.

a There is too much evidence for both strands in Luke's eschatology for one to be eliminated in this convenient manner. Moreover, who is to say that because Luke merely transmits some material unchanged this does not represent his own view? Surely, the very fact that he transmits material shows, at the least, that he did not find it objectionable, if it had been, then presumably he would have omitted or altered it. According to Conzelmann, Luke has no scruples on this score, he is a dab hand at manipulating his sources to fit his theories. If at some points Luke eliminates imminent expectation by fiddling the books, why, on Conzelmann's logic, does he not go the whole hog?

b It is at least probable that some of the texts which show an imminent expectation are Luke's creation and not from his tradition (Lk 18 8 and possibly 12 38f). Here the argument from tradition falls

down, for we have Luke's own hand at work

2 A second explanation would be to date Luke very early (say, 65-70) and argue that he wrote soon after Mark. We could then think of him as allowing for a delay long enough to include the Ascension, Pentecost and the Gentile mission, but a delay which would come to an end with the destruction of Jerusalem. We could then interpret the oracles on Jerusalem as prophecies before rather than descriptions after the event. The difficulty of this view is that it involves dating Luke before A D 70, which is not the impression one gets from Lk 19 41-4, 21 20-24, nor is it the impression one gets from the way Luke handles Mark's material. Why, for instance, were all the alterations necessary if he was writing so soon after Mark?

A variation on this view which dates Luke after A D 70 but not long after (say, 75-85) is a valuable alternative. It would explain why Luke saw the need to alter some of Mark - because of the upheavals of A D 70 - and why he left other parts intact. Taken together with our next point this helps to explain what Luke has done, but on its own it does not get to the heart of Luke's teaching.

3 The fundamental explanation of the two strands in Luke's eschatology is to be found in the pastoral situations with which he was faced. A Church faced with a delayed Parousia could easily lapse into one of two false extremes. The first is a fervent renewal of Apocalypticism, which included false Messiahs who claimed that the End was near or already here. If sometimes their hopes were dashed they were not destroyed, but were renewed all the more fervently. Disappoint-

-ment only served to fan the flame of their fanaticism. Not satisfied with the promise of God, they wished to force the Kingdom in by their own efforts or, at least, to be able to calculate exactly when it would come. This reaction J Pieper called "praesumptio" - "a premature, selfwilled anticipation of the fulfilment of what we hope for from God".¹ Such views Luke was combating in Lk 17 20f, 21 7,8,20-24, Acts 1 6-8. This does not explain all of what we have called the delay strand, since some of these passages seem to be no more than the inevitable reflection of the fact that Luke was writing some forty or more years after Jesus' death. Passages like 19 11 and 22 69 are simply due to the realization that after Jesus' death it was not the Kingdom but the time of the Church with its Exalted Lord which came. Nevertheless, false Apocalypticism is one, if not the most important explanation of why Luke emphasizes the delay of the Parousia and makes it clear that when the End comes it will be sudden and universally manifest.

But yet another problem can arise from a situation where an expected Parousia fails to materialize, namely a denial that the Parousia would come at all. For some, when their expectations were not fulfilled, they simply abandoned them altogether. Disappointment did not serve to feed but to destroy their hope. This situation may have been aggravated by intense persecution.² Those undergoing it

1 J Pieper, "Über die Hoffnung", 1949, quoted by J Moltmann, "Hope", p23

2 Braumann, Z N W, 54, 1963, pp117-45, thinks Luke was dealing with practical problems, especially persecution. However, he thinks that Luke's response is not to reaffirm the imminent End, but both to show the

would look to their Lord to vindicate them, and when this did not take place they would be tempted to abandon their faith altogether. This reaction J Pieper would call "desperatio" - "a premature, arbitrary anticipation of the non-fulfilment of what we hope for from God".¹ Such a situation appears to lie behind Lk 18 1-8 where, faced with an urgent crisis in which men are denying their faith, Luke encourages them with the promise that the Lord will come soon. It is noticeable that most of the other passages which reaffirm imminent expectation spring from pastoral situations. Lk 12 38f which addresses Church leaders in particular, and Lk 21 36 which speaks to all Christians, speak to a situation in which, as a result either of projecting the Parousia into the far-distant future or of abandoning hope for it altogether, Christians were becoming morally lax. Similarly, Lk 12 54-13 9 is addressed to those who live under the false impression that since judgement is a long way off, there is no need for immediate repentance. Nor would it be too fanciful to see 10 9,11 as pastorally motivated because, as has often been noted, the mission of the Seventy in Lk 10 is described with at least one eye on the later mission of the Church.

To summarize both strands in Luke's eschatology are well attested and neither one can legitimately be ignored, more especially,

(cont) Church that she stood on the side of God and to assert that the End, even though a long way off, was certain

2a (from previous page) Moltmann "Hope", p23

1 Moltmann, "Hope", p23

neither one should be overrated at the expense of the other. Both strands are motivated essentially by practical, pastoral problems which faced Luke in the Church of his day. It is this which explains their apparent contradiction, since it was both necessary and possible for Luke on the one hand to allow for a delayed Parousia and on the other to insist that the Lord would come soon. Thus Luke was fighting not merely on one but on two fronts. By treading a deliberate "via media" he both avoided and corrected the two false extremes which some of his contemporaries had fallen into. Exactly how we are to translate this into chronological terms is not easy to say. At a guess we can say that Luke was writing around the period A.D. 75-85, sufficiently close to Mark to account for both their similarities and differences. For Luke the date of the End is not tied up with the events of A.D. 70, nor is it limited to 30-40 years after Jesus' death. On the other hand, he did not expect the Church to continue existing for some 2,000 years. For him the End was a sure hope, which he expected to be fulfilled in the near future. To define it any further would be to go beyond what the facts warrant.

A few important conclusions emerge from this study of Luke's eschatology.

- 1 This emphasis on the pastoral, practical motivation of Luke's eschatology has an important corollary, namely that Luke was not concerned with the delay *qua* delay. It was for him not a theoretical but a practical problem. It was the pastoral effects of the delay of the Parousia which led him to write as he did and not a desire to find

a semi-philosophical and lasting solution for the Christian Church. Primarily Luke was a pastor and not a theologian. This is not meant to imply that a theologian cannot be a pastor and vice versa. In putting it in this way we are simply trying to show where the centre of gravity of Luke's thought lies.

2 Because Luke was writing in this way, we have to be wary of talking about Luke writing with set plans in mind, of Luke the theologian who sets out to fit all the material before him into a neat outline. We may for our own convenience find a "Heilsgeschichtliche" or a prophecy-fulfilment pattern in Luke's writings as an aid to sorting out his ideas, but it is false to imply that such a pattern was in Luke's mind when he wrote. It is to put the cart before the horse.

3 Luke's eschatology is not the same in the Gospel and Acts. In the Gospel there is a tension between imminent expectation and the allowance which is made for a delay in the Parousia, in Acts there is no imminent expectation. This can best be shown by putting Lk 18 1-8 and Acts 1 6-11 side by side. In both the delay is presupposed, and in both the hope for a Parousia is explicitly reaffirmed. The difference is that in the Gospel Luke speaks of an imminent Parousia, whereas in Acts he avoids any such temporal limitation (v11). This, like other differences between the two books, should make us wary of expecting the same teaching in both - an assumption which is common in recent studies of Luke. It might also suggest that Acts was written a considerable time after the Gospel and that it is not improbable

that Luke's views had developed in this time or perhaps, in the case of eschatology, the problems he faced had altered

4 It is a common practice to compare Luke unfavourably with Paul Luke, it is said, with his notion of "Heilsgeschichte," has lost the Pauline existential dialectic, the moment of crisis and decision which all men face in the eschatological 'now' ¹ Thus Conzelmann contrasts Lk 4 21 "Today this scripture is fulfilled in your ears" with II Cor 6 2 "Behold, now is the acceptable time", and says that whereas for Paul the "now" expresses an eschatological present, for Luke salvation is a thing of the past This is, however, a false analogy Paul is writing in the present about the present, whereas Luke is writing in the present about the past Paul is speaking of present realities and Luke of historical facts Moreover, Luke's "today" does not exclude Paul's "now" if it had been Luke's purpose to express it More generally, it is probably as false to interpret Paul exclusively in existential terms and to deny him a concept of "Heilsgeschichte" as it is to do the opposite with Luke

5 We set out in this study to see how far Luke is logical in his presentation of Jesus' eschatology as it is related to his teaching about the Gentile mission The immediate answer to our question has become abundantly clear When he portrayed Jesus as both foreseeing and commanding the Gentile mission, Luke altered Jesus' eschatological

1 Conzelmann, "Luke", p103, Grässer, pp187-8

expectations to allow for this Jesus' eschatological predictions leave ample room for the Gentile mission. Some of Luke's alterations which allow for a delay of the Parousia seem to be a direct result of his awareness that it was the Church with its mission and not the Kingdom which came after Jesus' death. In doing this Luke was not an innovator, he merely extends a process already begun by Mark. Yet while Luke has removed the Gentile mission from the apocalyptic context of Mk 13, with its temporal restrictions, he does not abandon imminent expectation altogether. He has not produced a neat theory of "Heilsgeschichte" in which the Parousia has been relegated to the far-distant and indefinite future. The End had been delayed, but Luke still thought it was near. For, while one of the motivations of Luke's eschatology was the need to make allowance for indisputable historical facts, such as the existence of the Church and the Gentile mission, it was the practical problems of the Church of his day, above all, which were his main inspiration. The former motive he shared with his predecessors, it was the latter which called forth his distinctive eschatological teaching.

CHAPTER VITHE HISTORICAL RELIABILITY OF ACTS

The aim of this chapter is to give a brief outline of the main views on the reliability of Acts. When we have completed our study of Luke's account of the Gentile mission in Acts, we shall then be able to assess some of these views and draw some tentative conclusions of our own. We cannot hope to give an exhaustive summary, so we shall merely aim at giving a representative selection of the main opinions. At this stage our purpose is to state and not to criticize these views.

Opinions on the reliability of Acts range between those who see it as a bundle of legends, an uninterrupted fiction, to those who claim that it is a history unsurpassed in respect of its trust-¹worthiness. Between these two extremes there are endless variations. For our own convenience we shall place them in three main categories.

The first of these includes those who claim that Acts is almost totally unreliable and, moreover, that this is a result not of Luke's lack of critical acumen or lack of reliable sources but of his deliberate perversion of the facts as he knew them. If at some points Luke is accurate, it is not because he was genuinely concerned with historical truth, but because the truth at that point happened to fit in with the particular axe he was grinding. This view is most frequently associated with the name of F. C. Bauer and the so-called

¹ See the concluding remarks of Matill, p. 357.

Tübingen School Bauer believed that the early Church was deeply divided There were two parties - Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, two leaders - Peter and Paul, and two gospels - the gospel of circumcision and the gospel of uncircumcision The Judaizers who pestered Paul and continually disrupted his work were delegates of the Apostles and Jewish Christianity Within the Jewish Christian party there were shades of opinion the Judaizers met Paul with uncompromising resistance at every point, while the Apostles were a little more liberal The essence of this conflict was the position of the Law Paul wanted to abolish the Law for all Christians, Jew and Gentile alike, the Jewish Christians wanted ^{to} retain it for Jews and impose it on Gentile converts This bitter and divisive conflict did not die out with the death of Paul and the Apostles, but extended into the middle of the 2nd century As evidence for Paul's views, Bauer used only Romans, I and II Corinthians and Galatians, the other epistles he considered to be unauthentic His interpretation of Christian history is basically Hegelian, since he sees three basic trends in history thesis, antithesis and synthesis It is Acts which characterizes this last trend ² It was written, Bauer thinks, around A D 110-25, with the specific purpose of uniting a divided Church Since it was written with this irenic purpose, all the hostility between the two groups in the early Church is covered up and Paul is

1 Apart from Bauer, the most consistent exponent of this view was E Zeller

2 Bauer, I, pp135f, 228f

presented as being in complete harmony with the Apostles This is evident particularly in Acts 15, which is seen as the 'locus classicus' for Luke's perversion of the facts, for it misrepresents the views¹ of all the parties concerned Throughout Acts Peter and Paul are continually misrepresented Peter is 'Paulinized' and Paul is 'Petrinized' The close parallelism between these two figures is not a result simply of readjustment and selection of the facts, but involved Luke in the creation of facts to suit his purpose² The speeches of Paul in Acts are fictional, since they contain none of his characteristic beliefs, and the description of Paul's Jewishness is completely unhistorical³ Thus Bauer concludes that Luke's aim was in no way historical, he did not try to relate what actually happened, but made up a story which he hoped would help conciliate two factions in the Church of his day The result was a deliberate, intentional perversion of history⁴

Very few scholars have gone the whole way with Bauer, but some modern studies betray a similar opinion of Luke's reliability,⁵ in particular the work of G Klein His main concern is with the figure of Paul and the concept of Apostleship in Acts He argues that Luke

1 Bauer, pp126f, Zeller, II, pp153f

2 Bauer, pp10f

3 Bauer, pp135-6

4 Bauer, pp5, 11, 109, Zeller, II, pp108, 113, 139

5 A recent revival of the Tübingen School can be found in Brandon, "Jerusalem", who does not accept their interpretation 'en bloc', but does accuse Luke of deliberate distortion in a similar way

was trying both to degrade and uplift Paul at the same time His portrait of the pre-Christian Paul shows him as a violent persecutor of the Church and also emphasizes that he is no more than a typical Jew¹ In his threefold account of Paul's conversion Luke goes out of his way to emphasize the element of human mediation In particular, the introduction of Ananias, the representative of the Apostles, shows that Paul is being subordinated to the Twelve² It is for this reason that Luke also denies Paul the title 'Apostle' and limits it to the Twelve In the earlier part of his ministry Paul is subordinate not only to the Apostles but also to Barnabas and the Elders at Jerusalem³ Because Paul was legitimized by the Jerusalem Church Luke can go on in the later chapters of Acts to describe Paul's position of authority over the younger Churches he visits⁴ Luke's motive in doing all this was to reclaim Paul for the Christian Church from Gnostics who were claiming him as their authority In composing this picture of Paul, Luke was consciously distorting and altering the facts which he knew⁵ He knew of the letters of Paul but chose to ignore them Thus while he approaches Acts from only one particular angle, Klein's assessment of Luke's good faith as a historian is as sceptical as that of the Tübingen School

The opposite school of thought to this claims that, barring a

- 1 Klein, pp114-44
- 2 Klein, pp145-62
- 3 Klein, pp163-75
- 4 Klein, pp176-88
- 5 Klein, pp188-201

few excusable errors of fact, the narrative Luke relates is substantially reliable. This sort of view came to the fore in modern studies¹ as a reaction against the extremes of the Tübingen School. Men like Baumgarten, an arch-conservative, and Lechler, who held more moderate opinions, claimed that Luke's aim was mainly to write a true and reliable account of the early Church. He did not have a 'tendency', nor did he pervert facts which he knew to be true, rather, he aimed at recounting the historical movement of the Church from Jerusalem to Rome. Luke was certainly an artist, who selected and arranged his facts, but he did not therefore distort them.² Luke's omissions are due either to his sources or to his ignorance, for while he omits to relate some conflicts he does recount others. Paul was not an extreme antinomian, he was quite content to have Jews keeping the Law so long as they did not try to impose it on Gentiles.³ There was no basic hostility between Paul and the Apostles, their relationships were always friendly. James was stricter than Paul, but he was not anti-Pauline. Acts 15 is basically a reliable account and the parallelisms⁴ between Peter and Paul are reliable. The speeches, though schematized, both aim at and achieve historical accuracy.

An equally enthusiastic acceptance of the reliability of Acts is to be found in the writings of W Ramsay. Paul, he argues, was in

1 Matill, pp73-131

2 cf Lekebusch, pp364, 374, quoted by Matill, loc cit

3 Baumgarten, II, pp97-9, Lechler, I, p224

4 Baumgarten, II, pp418f, Lechler, I, pp243f

complete harmony with the Twelve Paul wrote Galatians before the Apostolic council when he was concerned to defend his independence, after this he went to the Apostolic council and submitted to the authority of Jerusalem for the sake of the Church's unity¹ Paul's speeches are based on eye-witness accounts and give reliable reports² of what was said. The earliest chapters are the least reliable, but the rest of Acts is based on good sources, including Luke's own travel notes which he made when he accompanied Paul on his journeys Luke knew the epistles of Paul and writes Acts as a comment on them Thus Luke had access to reliable sources and used them in a skilful and artistic way There are a few mistakes, but on the whole Luke is a historian of the first rank and he is reliable both in general and in detail³

Not many scholars have found themselves able to credit Luke with such a high rating as Ramsay, but many of them hold opinions which come close to this Filson, for example, thinks that Luke "is not infallible, but he is a generally dependable guide"⁴ W L Knox, while admitting that Luke is limited by his failure to give exact dates and his preference for dramatic and miraculous incidents, thinks he has "preserved on the whole an accurate account of the development

1. Ramsay, pp54f

2. Ramsay, pp150f

3. Ramsay, pp383-6.

4. Filson, "Decades", p2 of the Foreward

of Christianity " ¹ B Gärtner, in his study of the speeches of Acts, concludes that although their outer form is Lukan, their content is ² a true representation of early Christian preaching Likewise, several commentators on Acts consider the bulk of Luke's narrative to be a reliable account of what actually happened in the early Church The comment of F F Bruce is typical " ³ when we come to test it by the letters of Paul we find it to be historical, not fabulous "

The third main school of thought which we shall consider in this chapter is distinguished by its relative lack of concern with the question of historical reliability Most of the authors we shall mention are far more concerned to understand and interpret Luke's theology than they are to discuss his reliability Most of these writers agree that at some points Luke's account accords with the historical facts, but they frequently argue that the important question is what Luke means by a narrative and not how reliable it is Even so there is a wide variety of opinion some, like Haenchen and Dibelius, are sceptical about Luke's reliability, others, like Hanson, think he is frequently very close to the truth

In his analysis of various parts of Acts, Dibelius frequently notes that Luke appears to be addressing the Church of his day The

1 Knox, "Acts", pp54-68, here p61 Cf also the work of Harnack, "Acts", Munck, Ehrhardt, pp64f

2 Gärtner, pp1f

3 Bruce, p40, quoting Burkitt Cf the commentaries by Williams and Wikenhauser

speeches in Acts are not a record of what was actually said on each occasion, but a reflection of Luke's own understanding of the gospel. Their purpose is not so much to give information about the Apostolic era as to teach Luke's contemporaries how to preach "This is how the gospel is preached and ought to be preached"¹ It is often impossible to discover a historical core in the narratives of Acts, since it has been obscured by Luke's own interpretation and use of each incident.² Sometimes one can detect the original narrative, as in Acts 10-11,³ but it is normally a far remove from the version which Luke offers. Thus while his main purpose is to discover Luke's teaching, Dibelius shows incidentally that he does not regard Acts as a reliable historical account.

E Haenchen is perhaps the best known exponent of the theological approach to Acts.⁴ He thinks that the primary task is to discover what Luke intended to say and how each individual section fits in with Luke's total construction. The question of historical trustworthiness he considers to be secondary, for it does not touch the central concern of the book. But when he does discuss it his conclusions are usually sceptical. Luke's portrait of Paul, for example, is not reliable. Paul himself abandoned the Law and, therefore, Luke is wrong when he says that Paul had Timothy circumcised and that he

1 Dibelius, pp138f, here p165

2 Dibelius, pp1f

3 Dibelius, pp109f

4 See also the older works of Schneckenburger and Pfleiderer, and more recently, Conzelmann, O'Neill, Wilckens, Vielhauer "Paulinism" and Barrett "Luke" pp52f

took a Jewish vow Luke also gives a false picture of the harmony between Paul and the Apostles in Jerusalem Acts 15 is not historical, but is Luke's way of showing how the Gentile mission was sanctioned by both God and the Apostles The speeches in Acts are Luke's own compositions aimed at giving model sermons for the Church of his day In fact, most of what Luke writes is motivated by the problems of the Church of his day, such as the delay of the Parousia, the legitimacy of the Gentile mission and the need to find a working relationship with their Roman governors Acts is to be read as a historical novel written mainly for edifying reasons Luke could not have written a straight historical account even if he had wanted to, because he lacked both the sources and a public who would read it Haenchen, like Dibelius, makes it clear that where Luke is unreliable it is not because he distorts the facts, but because his sources of information¹ were scanty and ill-informed

Other commentators, while agreeing with Haenchen that Luke both reflects the beliefs and tackles the problems of the Church of his day, discuss the question of historical reliability more frequently and come to less sceptical conclusions Hanson, for example, thinks that while the early chapters of Acts are "enveloped in a certain vagueness",² from ch 9 onwards it becomes steadily more reliable There are many remarkably correct details in the account of Paul's

1 Haenchen, pp87f and the commentary ad loc of the comment of Barrett that Luke " would not in cold blood distort the truth or say that things had happened when he knew that they had not happened" ("Luke", p53)

2 Hanson, pp1-56, here p13, cf also the commentary by Stählin and Vols IV and V of B C

journies, which probably show that Luke was Paul's travelling companion although he did not understand Paul's ideas. The speeches contain some primitive elements, but they also reflect the theology of the end of the 1st century. The speeches of Paul to the Gentiles (Acts 14,17) are very close to the teaching of Paul. Luke did not have a coherent account of the preaching and events of the Apostolic age, but he did have some ability to project himself back into it, though not consistently. Acts is clearly the work of a second generation Christian writing in the 70-80's, but one who has also experienced the 50-60's.

We have now summarized a variety of opinions on the reliability of Acts. There are many variations within the broad outlines we have given and many of our summaries are too brief to do full justice to the complexity of the various viewpoints. Nevertheless, they are sufficient to show the wide range of opinion in modern studies of Acts and to serve as a background to our study of the Gentile mission.

CHAPTER VIITHE EARLY CHAPTERS OF ACTS

Our aim in this chapter is to discuss four separate sections of Acts 1-2 Acts 1 6-8, Acts 1 9-11, Acts 1 15f, Acts 2 1f. Some of these have either a direct or an indirect bearing on the Gentile mission and the reason for our discussion of them is obvious. The story of Matthias' election is relevant because it gives us an insight into the problems of the title 'Apostle', which for Luke is closely connected with the Gentile mission. The Ascension is important for Luke's eschatology in Acts and as a background to Jesus' command for the universal mission. Moreover, all of these topics are very important for giving us a clue to the beliefs and practices of the earliest Christians, which may in turn shed light on their attitude towards the Gentile mission.

A Acts 1 6-8

As the following study will show, these three verses bristle with problems. As usual in Luke-Acts, the problems are easier to state than to answer, but we shall attempt to do both.

v 6

We must first ask who is included in οἱ συνεληθόντες

¹ Haenchen thinks the reference is intentionally inexact, since 1 21

² implies that at least two more than the Eleven were present. But the

1 Haenchen, p111, Schille, Z N W, 57, 1966, pp183-99, here p186

2 Lk 24 33 implies that more than the Eleven were present at the subsequent commissioning and departure of Jesus, since it is the last notice in ch24 of who was present. However, as the dating of the Ascension shows, we cannot expect complete harmony between Lk 24 and Acts 1

most obvious reference for $\alpha\upsilon$ v6 is not a vague but an exact one, namely to the Eleven (¹ τοῖς ἑποστολοῖς v2) At first sight this contradicts vv21-2, but this depends somewhat on our interpretation of these verses The qualification of an Apostle is that he should have been a member (² ³ συνελθόντων v21 = "to accompany") of the larger group of disciples who existed from the beginning of Jesus' ministry until the Ascension. This does not mean that such men have experienced all that the Twelve have This is precluded by the unique position of the Twelve in the Gospel narratives "to accompany" is a vague term which does not imply that this wider coterie impinged on the special privileges of the Twelve

"Lord, will you at this time restore the Kingdom of Israel ?"

It is certain that this question reflects a nationalistic Jewish expectation ⁴ Less clear is the extent to which it implies an imminent expectation and how an apparently gross misunderstanding on the part of the disciples could still exist after forty days of teaching on the subject (Acts 1 3) To take the last point first ⁵ Haenchen argues that we cannot take Acts 1 1f as a genuine historical record, for if the disciples retained this misunderstanding after forty days of teaching then we must assume either that they were exceptionally stupid

1 Acts 1 2f does not mention appearances to any but the Eleven To assume appearances to others is to argue 'e silentio'

2 In Lk 6 13 the 12 Apostles are chosen from a wider circle of disciples, cf also Lk 10 1f, 24 33

3 In vv 17, 21-2, $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ is ambiguous in v22b it appears to refer to the 12 (cf v17), but in v21-22a it could refer to the 120 brethren, v15

4 Haenchen, p111, Grässer, p206

5 Haenchen, Z N W , 54, 1963, pp155-87, here p160

or that Jesus was a singularly incompetent teacher. Rejecting both of these possibilities, he argues that v3 is to be explained on literary-stylistic grounds as the preparation for vv6f where Luke intends to give his own view of the relationship between End events, the Spirit and the mission. This may be the correct explanation, or it may be that the reference to teaching in v3 is no more than an artificial filling-up for the forty days, where the Kingdom of God, as often in Acts, is a non-specific term equivalent to "the whole Christian message" (cf Acts 19 8, 20 25 and 8 12, 28 23,28)

Most commentators assume correctly that v6 expresses an imminent expectation. Although *Χρόνος* is a general word for time, its use in v6 and in the whole context of vv1f imply a reference to an imminent End. The phrase "at this time" v6 refers back to the phrase "before many days" in v5. When told that the Holy Spirit was coming, the disciples naturally connected this with the End events, therefore they ask Jesus whether when the Spirit comes the End would come also.

v 7

Jesus' answer is both negative and positive, but in neither case is it straight-forward. This verse is the negative response which picks up a logion found in a different form in Mk 13 32, Matt 24 36 (cf I Thess 5 1). Luke has done two things with the original: first he has omitted the reference to the son's ignorance, so that his

1 Since the Spirit was part of the End events in Jewish expectation Joel 2 28f, S B, II, pp128f. Some think that behind Acts 1 4 there is an old tradition that the disciples were in Jerusalem to await the Parousia (Loisy, "Actes", p152, Wellhausen, "Apg", p2, cf Test Zeb 9 8, S B II, pp300f), if this is so, then v7 comes close to the historical truth.

version is open to the assumption that the son does know the times and the seasons, secondly, he has removed it from the apocalyptic discourse and placed it in this post-Resurrection context. In itself this verse is not a denial of "Naherwartung"¹. It corrects the disciples' concern to know exactly when the End will come, but it does not say whether the End will be delayed or not. At this point Jesus does not say that the End will not come with the Spirit, but that what will occur is God's concern and not their's.

v 8

This verse contains the positive element in Jesus' reply. He will not say when the End will come, but he does say that when the Spirit comes they will receive the power to perform miracles² (δύναμις³) and will be his universal witnesses³. Luke has left unclear the exact relation between the Spirit, the mission and the question in v6. It could be that the Spirit is the substitution for or elimination of "Naherwartung" and the mission is the correction of the nationalistic hope, that is, the Spirit and the mission are two promises which correct the double misunderstanding of v6⁴. Yet the actual sequence of thought suggests that the Spirit is not the substitute for but the cause of "Naherwartung" and that this part of the disciples' question is answered in v7, which leaves the date of the End open. If anything

1 contra Grässer, p205

2 δύναμις is used of the miracles of Jesus (Acts 2 22, 10 38) and the early Church (Acts 3 12, 4 7, 8 10, 13, 9 11). It is again connected with μαρτυρεῖς in 4 33.

3 "Witness" in Acts is mainly witness to the Resurrection, cf 1 22, 2 32, 3 15, 4 33, 5 32, 10 41, 13 31.

4 Haenchen, p112, Conzelmann, p22, Stählin, pp17-8, Wikenhauser, p27.

it is the mission which is the substitute for "Naherwartung", since a world mission such as is envisaged in v8 will necessarily postpone the End. At the same time this universal mission corrects the nationalistic hope of the disciples. Whatever the exact details of interpretation, it is generally agreed that in vv6-8 Luke is saying in effect that the End will be delayed. The coming of the Spirit is not the herald of the End but of the universal mission of the Church. It is also probable that Luke is not concerned here merely with giving a historical record but is also addressing the Church of his day, some of whose members not only believed in an imminent End but also tried to calculate the exact date of its arrival.

" you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth "v8b This half of the verse is equally problematic. We shall ask a series of questions and, in our answers, attempt to clarify and answer some of the problems.

1 Is it deliberately ambiguous? K H Rengstorff¹ suggests that Luke intentionally left v8b open to two interpretations. As well as a reference to the world-wide mission which would include the Gentiles,² it could also be understood as a command only for a Jewish Diaspora mission. Thus he explains the odd fact that according to Acts it required a special vision to convince Peter that preaching to the

1 Rengstorff, "Matthias", pp 186-7, Haenchen, art cit, p160

2 The future *ἐσθθθ* is probably used as an imperative (cf v2)

Gentiles was part of God's will, when in 1 8 Jesus had already commanded such preaching. It is true that v8b could be interpreted in this way, but it is improbable that Luke understood it so. He never uses it as an excuse for the Jerusalem leaders' reluctance to embark on a Gentile mission, on the contrary, the same phrase as in v8b, ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς (Is 49 6 LXX), is used in Acts 13 47 as Paul's justification for his missionary work among the Gentiles. Further, v8 is parallel to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη - ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ in Lk 24 47, where the reference to the Gentile mission is unequivocal. The contradiction between Acts 1 8 and Acts 10 is best seen as a tension between Luke's own view - that Jesus authorized a Gentile mission, and the actual course of events - the Church's reluctance officially to endorse this mission, partially because Jesus had not in fact commanded it.

2 Does v8 give the plan of Acts? This question is answered in the affirmative by most scholars.¹ v8 is the δέ -clause, the apodasis which is otherwise lacking in vv1f. While it may not be possible to divide up Acts exactly according to this plan, v8b certainly corresponds² to the fundamental movement of the Church's mission in Acts. It foretells the decisive moments when the mission will take a new direction and is rightly understood to give the narrative of Acts in a nutshell.

3 How is v8b related to Luke's concept of Apostleship? This

1 Haenchen, p112, Conzelmann, p22, Stählin, p18, Dupont, "Gentils", pp140f, contrast Trocmé, p206, Klein, p209.

2 Haenchen, ibid, uses the rough divisions 1-7 Jerusalem-Judea, 8-9 Samaria, 10-28 all the world. Schille, art cit, p187, thinks that v8 refers to the various lists of workers: 1 13 the Twelve, 6 1 the Seven, and 13 1 the Antiochean prophets and teachers.

question is inspired by one of the most curious facts about v8, namely that it is addressed to the Apostles. As Stählin says, "Auffällig ist freilich, dass die Zwölf auch nach Pfingsten nicht daran denken, die Weltmission in Angriff zu nehmen, dass sie vielmehr erst, teils durch ausdrückliche Führungen Gottes (10 9f), teils durch die Unternehmungen anderer (8 5f, 11 19f, 15 12f) halb widerwillig dazu gebracht werden, ein Ja zur Mission ausserhalb des Judentums zu sagen." ¹ The remarkable fact is that the Twelve, apart from Peter, are not only non-participants in this mission, but seem reluctant for it to occur at all. Even within Judea their fundamental role is that of guiding and leading the Christian community and not one of active missionary enterprise. According to Acts, even when the whole community scatters under persecution the Twelve remain firmly entrenched in Jerusalem. ² We saw above that Rengstorff's explanation of this as a result of the disciples' misinterpretation of Jesus' command in 1 8 is improbable. Equally improbable is Trocme's view that 1 8 finds its fulfilment in the Pentecost narrative. ³ Apart from the fact that the details of 1 8 and 2 1f do not coincide, a more fundamental objection is that the basic direction of the two are diametrically opposed. 1 8 speaks of a centrifugal movement of the mission out from Jerusalem, while 2 9-11 portrays a centripetal influx of Diaspora Jews from all nations into Jerusalem.

1 Stählin, p18

2 Trocme, p206

3 This accords with Paul's view that the Apostles were normally to be found in Jerusalem (Gal 1). Paul only speaks of Peter as a missionary (Gal 2 1f). We shall return to the question of the origin and use of the concept of Apostleship later.

G Klein argues that v8 expresses the characteristically Lukan concept of Apostolic succession. One of the Twelve, Peter, clears the basic hurdle and the way is then open for others like Paul and Barnabas to do the bulk of the missionary work. It is not the Twelve in person who will go to the ends of the earth, but their representatives. Klein thinks that, "Prägnanter kann das Prinzip der Apostolizität von Tradition und Sukzession nicht formuliert werden"¹ In the context of 1 6-8 this means that "Neben dem Geist wird die Apostolische Tradition und Sukzession als Surrogat für die zum 'locus de novissimis' deklassierte Eschatologie etabliert"² However, although Klein may have hit on a partial explanation of v8, one cannot draw such far-reaching conclusions about a Lukan principle of Apostolic succession which is inserted between the Ascension and the unexpectedly delayed Parousia.³ Where he may be correct is that Luke, if he was aware of the anomaly of v8, may have understood Peter's initial step as a sufficient fulfilment of 1 8. But even so, the Apostles can scarcely be said to have preached widely in Judea and Samaria either. It may be that Luke's view of the Apostles as the founder-members of the Church means that what the Church did through its individual members the Twelve, as the basis of this Church, also did. But while this takes account of the importance of the Twelve for Luke, it does not explain their curious disappearance halfway through Acts, at a time

1 Klein, 210

2 Klein, 210

3 Unless with Klein one sees this as the dominating theme of Acts. Even so, it would be difficult to read all this into Acts 1 8.

when the Gentile mission was really getting under way One might say that as the impetus for the Gentile mission increases so, in inverse proportion, the significance of the Twelve decreases

It seems that we must understand v8, in its relationship to the Twelve, as an anomaly of which Luke may well have been unaware It is best understood as a Lukan creation, which does not accord with some of the more traditional material he relates elsewhere In this he may have been influenced by the early Patristic picture of the Twelve as active missionaries (cf I Clem 42 3f, Just Apol ,I,39,3f)

4 Is v8b to be understood representatively ? This is a question which must be put with regard to all the early texts which authorize a Gentile mission Mk 13 10, for example, can scarcely be interpreted to mean that the gospel must be preached to every single Gentile or even to every town or village in each nation, in view of the temporal limitations of Mk 13 as a whole Therefore it must be understood representatively, namely that all the main cities of each nation should be evangelized before the End Paul's statements in Rom 15 19-20 have been interpreted in the same way With Luke there could be a difference, because he has removed Jesus' prophecy of the Gentile mission from the apocalyptic context it has in Mark In the Lukan post-Resurrection context it lacks any specific temporal limitations Even so, it is probable that Luke understood v8b basically in a representative sense, at least that is the impression he gives in the narrative of Acts The ending of this narrative in Rome may, therefore,

be significant, because in a sense Rome represented the end of the earth

5 What is the purpose of v8 in the context of Acts ? The answer to this question is complex, since we have to consider all the possible views which Luke was trying to combat or encourage in the Church of his day We shall mention several possibilities in order of preference, while acknowledging that the preference is arbitrary and that Luke may have been concerned with only one or with a combination of these motives

a Fundamental to v8 is that the mission of the Church, and in particular the Gentile mission, is rooted in a command of Jesus Jesus foresees the development of the Church after his death and gives it his Divine seal We have already suggested several times that this verse and others like it are constructions of the early Church or, at least, a misunderstanding of Jesus' prophecies of an apocalyptic

2

Gentile mission This is confirmed by the material we find later in Acts which, as we have seen, makes it difficult to suppose that Jesus commanded a Gentile mission, still less a mission to be performed by the Twelve This process is similar to Luke's use of Old Testament

1 The exact meaning of 8b is obscure The first three areas are clear enough, but the last phrase - "the end of the earth"- if it denotes Rome, is odd For Luke and his readers Rome was scarcely the end of the earth (though it may possibly have seemed so to Palestinian Jews of Ps Sol 8 15) However, Acts 13 46-7 show that the expression can have a meaning which is not strictly geographical, namely as a reference to the Gentile mission Also, Rome could perhaps be seen as the symbolical rather than the geographical end of the earth

2 cf B C IV, p6 " the disciples came to this (the Gentile mission) reluctantly, and only by the light of their experience, but once they had done so their conclusion was justified by being thrown back into the mouth of Jesus in the form of Matt 28 19, Lk 24 47f and Acts 1 8 "

prophecies of the Gentile mission Both are intended to show that this universal outreach was not a chance occurrence, a mere trick of Fate, but was from the beginning an integral part of the eternal will of God

b The central significance of Jerusalem as the base camp for the Church's mission is drawn out here and in Lk 24 47f In a similar way to the Ascension, Jerusalem plays an important role in Luke-Acts¹ It is one of the central bearings on which the double work swivels it is the goal towards which Jesus' ministry moves and the base from which the Church's mission expands The basic pattern of vv8 is that found elsewhere in the New Testament (cf Rom 1 16), namely 'Jew first and then Greek' The narrative of Acts follows this pattern throughout and even Paul, the Gentile missionary 'par excellence', begins his preaching in each new area with an appeal to the Jews The continual obduracy of the Jews opens the way for a Gentile mission, but this does not mean that the Jews are excluded The Jewish mission does not end with Jesus' ministry

c It is implied in vv6-8 that the essence of the Church is its mission Church and mission are inseparably interrelated On Luke's definition, a Church with no missionary activity is not a true Church It may be that Luke's contemporaries were lacking in missionary zeal and that by his account of the mission of the early Church he is trying to show that missionary endeavour is of the essence of a true Church

d By giving an exact, detailed plan of the progress of the

1 cf Conzelmann, "Luke", pp132f, O'Neill, pp54f

Church's mission, v8b differs significantly from any other word on the Gentile mission attributed to Jesus. The other, probably earlier versions (Lk 24 47, Mk 13 10, Matt 28 19) are simple commands, promises or statements to the effect that there will be a Gentile mission. Luke's version in Acts 1 8 may be no more than an expansion which reflects his own view of the course of the mission and which at the same time gives a rough outline of Acts. It may, however, partially be an explanation, if not an apology, for the fact that the Gentile mission was so slow to get off the ground. Once the mission was rooted in the words of Jesus, it must have seemed odd that it was only slowly and reluctantly accepted by the early leaders. By showing that it was not simply an immediate outward rush to the Gentiles, but a gradual, planned development that Jesus envisaged, Luke may be explaining why the mission took the form it did.

B The Ascension Acts 1 9-11

Fully to understand Luke's account of the Ascension in Acts, that is, to discover the purpose and meaning of it, we have to view it together with his earlier version in Lk 24 50f and against the background of the New Testament as a whole.

To take the latter point first in other parts of the New Testament the Ascension is spoken of as distinct from the Resurrection¹ (Jn 20 17, Eph 4 8-10, I Tim 3 16, I Pet 3 22, Heb 4 14, 6 19, 9 24)

¹ cf. A. M. Ramsey, *S. N. T. S.*, 2, pp. 49f, Wikenhauser, pp. 27f

These passages show that there was a widespread theological distinction between the Ascension and the Resurrection, but that Luke is alone in giving a concrete description of them as separate events in a logical sequence. This is particularly true of the Acts narrative¹ where Luke attempts to give a logical rationale of the immediate post-Easter events, while at the same time his concrete bent of mind encourages him to give a firm historical foundation to some of the cardinal beliefs of the Church of his day. Luke's earlier account betrays what appears to be a more primitive view, namely that the Ascension was part of the events of the first Easter day.² Thus the Ascension has a distinct place in Luke's scheme, which comes out particularly clearly in Acts.³ It is distinct from the Resurrection on the one hand and Pentecost on the other. It is separated from the Resurrection by a forty-day interval and it is the necessary pre-supposition for the sending of the Spirit (Acts 2:33). Yet we should not make too much of this. Although the narrative of the Ascension in Acts is unique, its uniqueness is to some extent inevitable, since Luke is the only New Testament author who attempts to give a historical account of the early years of the Church. He alone tries to unravel the complex and obscure chronology of the first few years after the Resurrection, and at the same time provide the historical origins of

1 Cadbury, "Eschatology", pp300f

2 Wilder, J B L, 62, 1943, pp307f

3 Conzelmann, "Luke", p203 n4, Barrett, "Luke", p57. Curiously, Ascension theology plays a small part in the rest of Acts (only in 2:32-6, 5:31). The Resurrection is the dominant theological concept of Acts.

the Church's belief in her Exalted Lord and the Holy Spirit Luke's distinctive approach to the Ascension is therefore to a large extent a part of his unique position in the New Testament as the first and only Church historian

We turn now to a comparison of Luke's two versions of this event To ease some of the difficulties in harmonizing them it has been suggested that the shorter text of Lk.24 50f, which omits the phrase $\kappa\kappa\iota \ \alpha\nuεφ\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\tau\omicron \ \epsilon\iota\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\nu \ \omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\acute{o}\nu$, is the more original¹ However, there are good reasons for thinking that the longer text is the one which Luke wrote² And even with the shorter text there is still a reference to the Ascension in Lk 24, since Acts 1 2, in particular the word $\alpha\nu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\mu\phi\theta\eta$ ³, refers back to and interprets the phrase $\delta\iota\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta \ \alpha\pi' \ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ in Lk 24 51. Despite the difficulties, therefore, we must accept it that Luke wrote two accounts of the Ascension

1 Conzelmann, "Luke", p94, Argyle, E T, 66, 1955, pp240-2

2 Haenchen, p116, Wilder, art cit, p311, Grundmann, p454 The arguments are most comprehensively set out by van Stempvoort, N T S, 5, 1958/9, pp30f (a) In view of the discrepancies with Acts, its omission is easier to understand than its addition (b) The imperfect $\alpha\nu\epsilon\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\tau\omicron$ amongst the aorists is odd, and is perhaps best explained as describing an action which takes some time The verb is a concrete, realistic word, which recalls Luke's realism elsewhere (c) Jeremias' argument on the basis of sentence structure ("Words", p145) has to be treated with care, but it can be used to confirm what has been concluded on other grounds

3 van Stempvoort, art cit, p32, thinks that $\alpha\nu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\mu\phi\theta\eta$ in Acts 1 2 should be interpreted like Lk 9 51, i.e. in a general, non-technical way, which refers to the whole process of passing away and being taken up But while in general his correction of the over-literal interpretation of Acts 1-2 in the light of the 'annus ecclesiae' is a healthy reaction, in Acts 1 2 the singular $\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$ defines the word $\alpha\nu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\mu\phi\theta\eta$ and implies that it refers to a specific event, namely the Ascension (cf Acts 1 11), rather than that it has the wider meaning which van Stempvoort correctly gives to Lk.9 51

Before noting the differences between the two narratives it is instructive to observe their basic similarities. Both narratives are compact and precise, in neither is there any excessive legendary embellishment. The account of the actual Ascension is in both cases remarkably brief. Yet despite this there are striking differences.

a Most obvious and problematic are the two different dates. The whole of Lk 24, including the Ascension vv50f, is presumably dated on Easter day, since Lk 24 1 is the last time reference which Luke gives in his Gospel. Acts 1 3 assumes a forty day interval between the Resurrection and the Ascension.

b According to Lk 24 33 there were more than the Eleven at the Ascension, whereas the implication of Acts 1 2 is that only the Apostles were present.

c In Lk 24 50 the Ascension takes place in Bethany and in Acts 1 2 on the Mount of Olives. This may not have been a discrepancy for Luke, since he may have thought of the latter as situated within the former.

d There are several further details which are different in each account. The picture of Jesus departing as he blesses¹ the disciples is missing in Acts, the reference to the two angels in Acts 1 10-11, which forms the bulk of this narrative, is lacking in the Gospel, finally, Lk 24 52-3 tells of the disciples great joy and continual praising of

1 van Stempvoort, pp34-5, and Daube, p231, interpret Lk 24 50 as the blessing of a priest, since "lifting up the hands" means "to bless". Sir 50 20, where there is a picture of a blessing priest and responding worshippers, may have influenced Luke at this point (Haenchen, p114, van Stempvoort, p35).

God in the Temple, whereas Acts makes no mention of their joy and says that they went back to the upper room

Why did Luke write two such different accounts ? If he had written two similar accounts, one at the end of the Gospel and one at the beginning of Acts, our question would be relatively easy to answer. It is the divergence of the two accounts which complicates matters. Above all, the new dating in Acts needs some explanation, since it is the most serious discrepancy.

The 40 days of Acts 1:3 has attracted many explanations. It is almost certain that the choice of this round number is based on¹ Biblical and Jewish parallels. It is probably not meant to be chronologically exact,² though neither is it grossly inaccurate.³ Schille is probably correct when he says that Luke was not motivated by the same reasons as the Gnostics who later extended the period to 545 days or more in order to accommodate their claim to possess secret traditions of Jesus' post-Resurrection teaching (Iren. Haer. I 30:14, 32 etc). The period of 40 days is too short for this and Luke gives the content of the teaching in 1:3, moreover, teaching about the Kingdom of God was not confined to the post-Resurrection period.⁴ Haenchen thinks the significant fact is that Jesus and his disciples drank together

1 Apart from being a favourite round number (Ex 34:28, I Kings 19:8, Mk 1:13 pars) it may be significant that both Ezra and Baruch waited 40 days before they ascended (4 Ezr 16:23, 49, Apoc Bar 76:4).

2 cf the parallel phrase in Acts 13:31 ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους which is vaguer.

3 Schille, art cit, pp184-5

4 Haenchen, p159 in Z N W, 54, 1963, pp155f

and ate together after as well as before the Resurrection (Lk 24 42,
 Acts 1 4, 10 41) " sie waren also imstande zu bezeugen, dass der
 irdische Jesus und der auferstandene ein und diesselbe Person war "

But while this probably gives the correct explanation of the references
 to eating and drinking in Lk 24 and Acts 1, it does not explain why
 Luke extended the period from one to forty days, since one day of
 eating and drinking would be as convincing as forty days It may simply
 be that after completing his Gospel Luke received new traditions about
 the post-Resurrection appearances , but then one would have expected
 him to have given a few more details He gives no new accounts not
 already in Lk 24, the only new thing is the forty days dating

The explanation of the forty days is probably quite simple and
 is the result of two main factors The first is that in Lk 24 Luke could
 afford to be vague in his chronology, since he was not writing an
 account of the Church's origins but an account of the triumphant climax
 to Jesus' ministry When faced with the problems of a Church history,

1 The word *συναλιζόμενος* is obscure it probably means "to eat
 with", but could mean "to be together" (B C IV,p5), which would involve
 assuming the meaning "to be together with" (Haenchen,p110)

2 Haenchen,ibid

3 It is improbable that Luke was intentionally allowing for Galilean
 Appearances (A M Ramsey,"Resurrection",pp66-7, Moule,F T ,68,1957,p207)

4 Cf Stählin,p13, who comments on the vague chronology of Lk 24 "In
 Lk 24 liegt einer der häufigen Fälle vor, in dem Lukas bei der Erzählung
 zeitlich sicher getrennter Ereignisse auf jegliche Zeitangaben ver-
 zichtet, so dass der Eindruck entsteht, sie hätten gleichzeitig statt-
 gefunden " It is probable that Luke was not too concerned to date the
 Ascension exactly in Lk 24 the chronology is vague, and although Acts
 is more exact, the purpose of the 40 days is not so much to give an
 exact date for the Ascension as to fill in the gap between Easter and
 Pentecost We must also allow for the possibility that by the time he
 came to write Acts Luke had quite simply forgotten what he had written
 in Lk 24

as he was in Acts, Luke is forced to think more about the timing and order of the post-Resurrection events. This leads us to the second factor, namely the dating of Pentecost. Luke wanted to date the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost as this was one, if not the only, date which Luke had for the first year of the Church in what little tradition¹ he received. This left him with the task of filling in the fifty day hiatus between Easter and Pentecost, which he does by means of the forty days. By mentioning the forty days in Acts 1:3, which he vaguely characterizes as a time of teaching about the Kingdom of God, and by use of the inexact notice in Acts 1:15, Luke manages to bring the narrative in Acts 1 more or less up to the date at the beginning of Acts 2. Thus it is not the forty days which forces Luke to date the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost, but the date of Pentecost which forces him to use the forty days.

The problem of the forty days is, however, only one of the differences we have to explain. We have yet to look at the various attempts to explain why Luke wrote two accounts and why they came out so differently.

1 Ph Menoud argued that both Luke and Acts were expanded after the original single book containing these two parts was divided.² Lk 24:50-53 and Acts 1:1-5 were added in order to tidy up the loose ends left by the separation of the two books. However, Haenchen has argued decisively

1 See the section below on Pentecost

2 Ph Menoud, "Remarques", pp148-56

against this view and Menoud has retracted it in favour of another¹

² Wikenhauser thinks that Acts 1 9-11 is not to be understood as an account of the Ascension, but as a description of Jesus' final departure after the Resurrection appearances. The Ascension took place on Easter day (Lk 24 50f) when Jesus was exalted to the right hand of Power, from there Jesus appeared to his disciples for forty days until his final departure (Acts 1 9-11). "Damit (Lk 24) steht der Bericht der Apg von der Himmelfahrt Christi 40 Tage nach Ostern nicht im Widerspruch. Denn die Himmelfahrt auf dem Ölberg vor den Augen seiner Jünger ist nur der Abschluss des letzten Beisammenseins mit ihnen."³ There is, however, no warrant for this view in Lk 24 and Acts 1. The end of Luke and the beginning of Acts are not to be read as chronologically successive. Lk 24 is as much a farewell scene as Acts 1 9f. Both follow immediately on teaching about the Holy Spirit and the Gentile mission and presumably, therefore, describe the same event.⁴ Wilder makes a similar point when he argues that Acts 1 3 should be read in parenthesis, and that this forty day period of appearances occurred after the Ascension. Certainly, Acts 1 3 does not connect naturally⁵ with Acts 1 1-2 because, after a review of the previous work, we would expect a preview of the present work and not

1 Haenchen, pp107, 113-115, Menoud, in "Neotestamentica et Patristica", p148 n1

2 Wikenhauser, pp27-8

3 Wikenhauser, p28

4 Wilder, art cit, p312 - following a suggestion of B W Bacon, Exp 1909, pp254-61

5 Haenchen, pp105f, Conzelmann, pp20f

a return to events which occurred before the terminus given in v2 In this case, however, we should have to read the whole of vv3-11 in parenthesis and not just verse 3

3 One scholar, G Schille, has recently made a serious attempt to show that the bulk of vv9-11 is not Lukan but comes from an early liturgical tradition He thinks that, "Die Himmelfahrtserzählung (Apg 1 9-11) wäre eine Kultätologie für eine Versammlung der Jerusalemer Gemeinde auf dem Olberg am 40 Tag nach dem Passa gewesen, bei welcher man der Himmelfahrt Christi¹ gedachte" However, there are several reasons for supposing that Schille's attempt to find a liturgical "Sitz im Leben" for Acts 1 9-11 is unconvincing

a While he gives a detailed analysis of vv9-11, Schille omits the observation that the language and style of these verses is predominantly Lukan, which makes it highly probable that the narrative is his own construction rather than a unit of tradition which he received If it reflects pre-Lukan tradition, then we must assume that Luke has re-written it to an extent which makes it impossible to distinguish Lukan and pre-Lukan elements Admittedly, a mere word-count is not always easy to assess, because Luke-Acts forms such a large part of the New Testament that some words inevitably occur more frequently here than in other parts of the New Testament However, the statistics are reasonably conclusive the 'conjugatio periphrastica'

- ἀπενίqvτες ἦσαν - is a construction particularly common in

1 Schille, art cit ,p193

Luke-Acts, revealing an author fond of describing concrete situations,¹
 καὶ ἴδου is a LXX phrase frequent in Luke (24 times) and Acts (8
 times) of καὶ νυν ἴδου in Acts 13 11, 20 22, 25, ἀτενίζω
 occurs twelve times in Luke-Acts, otherwise only in II Cor 3 7, 13,
 the singular νεφέλη is often seen as a parallel to Luke's use of
 Dan 7 13 in Lk 21 37, ἄνδρες δύο is parallel to Lk 24 4 (cf
 Jn 20 12), but not to Mk 16 or Matt 28, ὑπολαμβάνω occurs
 four times in Luke-Acts, otherwise only in III Jn 8, ἐσθής occurs
 five times in Luke-Acts, otherwise only in James 2 2, Luke has ten
 out of fifteen uses of ἀναλαμβάνω in the New Testament, and five
 out of the seven of those which refer to the Ascension

b Schille thinks that the forty days of v3 is to be explained
 by analogy with the fifty days of Acts 2 1² The dating of Pentecost
 is based on the Jewish calendar and is, he says, therefore a result
 of a liturgical concern rather than of the inner logic of the Church's
 Easter faith Similarly, the dating of the Ascension on the 40th day
 after the Passover is a piece of pre-Lukan tradition which is liturgi-
 cally motivated We have already given our own explanation of the forty
 days and when we turn to the Pentecost narrative we shall discover
 that when Luke dates the first outpouring of the Spirit at this time
 he was not motivated by liturgical concerns or by any desire to draw
 analogies with the Jewish Pentecost festival For Luke, the dating of
 Pentecost had neither theological nor liturgical significance, it was
 simply a date

c Schille suggests that the use of συνελθόντες in Acts

1 Haenchen, p116 n7

2 Schille, art cit , p185

1 6 may reflect the notion of Christians coming together to worship. Otherwise, he thinks, the phrase οἱ συνελθόντες is redundant, since according to Acts 1 3f they are already together. However, there is no linguistic evidence to support this interpretation. Two of the three parallels he points to in Acts (Acts 10 27, 28 17) appear from their context to have the neutral, non-technical meaning "come together". The third (Acts 16 13) does refer to women who come together to pray, but only as a result of its context and not because any such meaning is inherent in the word itself. From this one example we cannot say that this word sometimes has a neutral and sometimes a semi-technical meaning. Its other uses in Acts (5 16, 19 32, 21 22, 22 30) are neutral and, unless otherwise defined (as in 16 13), we must always assume this neutral meaning. An occasional usage in a technical way in Paul (I Cor 11 18,20, 14 23,26) cannot be used to interpret a passage in Acts. Further, although "when they had come together" v6 is repetitive it is not redundant, since it presumably marks the change of scene from wherever they were in vv2f to the Mount of Olives in vv6f.

2

d Schille notes that vv9-11 are quite distinct from their context. There is a sudden change of scene from eating together (v4) to the Mount of Olives (v6), combined with an equally sudden change from dialogue to description (vv4-8 and vv9f). This, he thinks, can only be explained on tradition-historical grounds. In vv9-11 Luke is using a source. Certainly, the change of scene in v6 is odd, but not

1 Schille, art cit ,pp186f

2 Schille, art cit ,pp187-8

more so than most of the first two chapters of Acts, where the exact time and place is often obscure probably a result of Luke's lack of any detailed knowledge of these first few weeks of the Christian Church. Moreover, the switch from dialogue to narrative in v9 is a natural result of the change of subject matter from Jesus' final command to the Ascension itself, after all, Luke could scarcely have recounted the Ascension in the form of a dialogue.

e The actual description of the Ascension is, as Schille notes,
¹
 brief and concise. The lack of legendary embellishments together with some almost hymnic elements (eg οὗτος ο v11) are explicable, he thinks, only on liturgical grounds, a result of their "Sitz im Leben" in early Church worship. The only element which spoils the rhythmic structure is the phrase "while they were gazing into heaven as he went" v10, and he therefore takes this to be a Lukan addition which reinforces the point of the narrative. However, this last point is clearly arbitrary, for why should Luke have been so heavy-handed as to ruin the rhythmic structure of this unit of tradition simply to labour a point that was already clearly and emphatically made in the tradition itself by the threefold repetition of the phrase "into heaven"? Apart from this, the brevity of the narrative would be explained if we could place it in a liturgical context where "Die Begehung selbst ist die Exposition ihrer zentralen Perikope"². But there

1 Schille, pp188-90

2 Schille, p193

is also another explanation of why Luke, if we take him to be the author of it, should deliberately have kept his description of the actual Ascension brief. Although the Ascension itself was important for Luke as an event separate from the Resurrection, it was equally important for him to emphasize men's correct response to it. Thus it is that the description of the event itself is brief, while far more weight is placed on the disciples' response to it. This is a point we shall return to later.

f Finally, Schille suggests that the phrase "a sabbath day's journey away" v12 reflects a take-over of Jewish sabbath laws by Jewish Christians, who then applied them to their own festivals.¹ They could overlook the discrepancy² in distance for the sake of celebrating their Ascension Feast in the desired place, namely the Mount of Olives. However, we have no evidence that the early Christians took over Jewish laws for their own festivals. Certainly it seems that if not in belief at least in practice they remained within Judaism. This may have involved them in keeping the Jewish sabbath laws on the Jewish sabbath, but not on their own festivals. This verse is probably no more than Luke's way of giving a rough estimate of the distance between the Mount of Olives and Jerusalem, and, after all, his estimate is not too far out.

1 Schille, art cit, pp190f. Despite his attempt to do so, Schille does not convincingly explain the close connection between vv9-11 and v12.

2 Schille gives the distances as follows: a sabbath day's journey 880m (S B II, pp590f) and the distance between the Mount of Olives and Jerusalem just over 900m (Jos Ant 20 169).

The sum total of the above points is that there is good reason to suppose that Acts 1 9-11 is not a unit of pre-Lukan tradition whose original "Sitz im Leben" was the worship of the early Church, but an expression of Lukan theology. Much of the evidence points to a Lukan origin and certainly none of it is irreconcilable with this view. To argue that Acts 1 9-11 is a piece of Luke's handiwork is not a particularly unusual conclusion, but it needed to be shown that, despite Schille's view, this is still the most likely hypothesis.

4 P A van Stempvoort has provided the basic clue for understanding Luke's double account of the Ascension, namely that the two versions differ because they were written for different theological purposes. "The first was a doxology in the refined style of worship, the second hard and realistic, leading to the future, but at the same time into the history of the Church 'beginning from Jerusalem' "

Taking this as his starting point Flender goes on to give a different account from van Stempvoort of the purpose of the two narratives. Lk 24 50f, he says, is basically a farewell scene which

1 Various parallels may have influenced Luke. Davies, J T S, ns6, 1955, pp229-31, suggests the Transfiguration Lk 9 1f, some parallels he draws are clear, most of them are irrelevant or unconvincing. Haenchen, p118, suggests the story of the empty tomb Lk 24 4f, but apart from a few details there is no real parallelism. G Kretschmar, Z K G, 66, 1954-5, pp217f, suggests, perhaps a little more plausibly, the Jewish tradition of the Ascension of Moses.

2 In many ways Lk 24 50f has a more 'liturgical' atmosphere than Acts 1

3 van Stempvoort, art cit, p39, Hanson, pp57-8, Barrett, "Luke", p57, says, "There (Lk 24) the Ascension closes an epoch, here it opens another which will last until it finds its end in the return of Christ from heaven."

4 Flender, pp11-12, 93-4

says that " ein solcher Anblick Jesu nicht jederzeit und allen Glaubenden verheissen sei, sondern auch für die Jünger ein Ende hatte " ¹

This is the Ascension as seen from an earthly viewpoint Acts 1 9-11 sees the Ascension from a heavenly viewpoint, in the light of the destiny of the Lord of heaven The language of these verses is eschatological, implying that Jesus is now the Lord of heaven, who will one day assume his dominion visibly However, although Flender is right to find different purposes for the two versions, his analysis is unconvincing In particular, the narrative in Acts does not seem so concerned with the heavenly viewpoint of the Ascension as with the reaction of the disciples to this event on earth The bulk of the narrative is concerned with the communication between the angels and the disciples and not with the Ascension itself

Lk 24 50f is, as van Stempvoort says, basically a doxological interpretation of the Ascension The departing Christ, like a priest, blesses his disciples, who in turn respond with worship The Ascension brings them joy and not sadness It is the end of Jesus' ministry, but it is a triumphant end The Gospel is concluded on the same triumphant note which permeates Luke's Passion narrative ² This is the Ascension as seen from the viewpoint of Jesus' ministry of which it is the glorious climax "It is a glorious but limited interpretation, for

¹ Schlatter, p457, quoted by Flender, p17

² Apart from Lk 22 43-4, a curious and dubious reading, there is no hint of the heart-rending struggle that we find in Mark (Mk 15 34) is omitted In Luke, Jesus approaches and undergoes the Passion with complete control and calmness

history goes on and the Church cannot remain in the attitude of the
 προσκύνησις and the εὐλογία¹ " But as well as being the climax
 of Jesus' ministry it is also the beginning and presupposition of
 the Church " the Ascension is not one event but two, or, rather,
 it is one event which bears different appearances when looked at from
 different angles² " Thus while it marks a division between the story
 of Jesus and the history of the Church, much more significant is the
 way in which it firmly links these two epochs³

Yet we have still not explained the details of Luke's second
 version van Stempvoort is right insofar as he calls it an
 ecclesiastical-historical interpretation, but he does not apply this
 in any exact manner to the text " it is clear that the second
 interpretation and the surrounding text are an answer to the questions
 of the old Church Why did the Christophanies end ? Why did the End not
 come ? Why hang on in Jerusalem where the prophets were killed ?⁴ But
 which of these in particular, if any, was Luke concerned with ? We
 have noticed several times in passing that the most striking feature
 of the narrative in Acts is that two-thirds of it are concerned not with
 the event itself, but with the disciples' response to it This suggests
 that Luke was motivated primarily by practical, pastoral problems in
 the Church of his day He is concerned to teach his contemporaries by

1 van Stempvoort, art cit ,p37.

2 Barrett, "Luke", p57

3 Thus Conzelmann is wrong when he says that " the Ascension does not form the conclusion of the first, but the beginning of the second volume of Luke's historical work " ("Luke", p203 n4) As his double account of the Ascension and his concept of Apostleship show, Luke was far more concerned to show how these two epochs were linked than how they were separated

4 van Stempvoort, art cit ,p39

way of using the disciples as examples "Lukas nimmt die Jünger, wie in 1 6, hier sozusagen als Modell eines bestimmten Verhaltens, das auch in seiner Gegenwart noch in mancher christlichen Gemeinde vor-herrschte der Naherwartung des Endes " Now insofar as he sees¹ that Luke is writing for his contemporaries Haenchen is correct, but when he defines the problem being dealt with simply as "Naherwartung" he fails to go far enough The phrase *καὶ ὡς ἀτενίζοντες ἦσαν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν* v10 does not imply that the disciples were² waiting for an immediate Parousia, it is merely descriptive further, the words *οὕτως ἐλευσάτω ὁν τρόπον* v11 are scarcely an answer to men who are expecting an imminent End Rather, they are an answer to those who were inclined to deny that there would be any Parousia at all Luke is not dealing with the problem of "Naherwartung" as such He is dealing with a problem that arose as a result of a disappointed "Naherwartung", namely a denial that the End would come at all In the face of this denial Luke firmly reasserts that the End will come (v11) The delay of the Parousia does not mean that hope for it should be abandoned The Parousia is guaranteed not nullified by the Ascension Christ will return in the same way that he has gone

Thus within the short compass of Acts 1 6-11 Luke deals with two practical problems in the Church of his day false Apocalypticism and loss of faith They are the same two problems which we found to underlie Luke's teaching on eschatology in general The difference is that here,

1 Haenchen, p118

2 Haenchen, p118, Conzelmann, p23

unlike in the Gospel, Luke does not say that the End will come soon. Thus our study of the Ascension confirms our findings in the chapter on the eschatology of Luke. It also forces us to conclude that the narrative in Acts 1:9-11 tells us nothing about the experiences and beliefs of the earliest Christians. If Schille's hypothesis was correct, we would be able to speak a little more confidently about the beliefs of the earliest Christians, but as it stands in Acts, Luke's account of the Ascension gives us an insight only into the problems of the Church of his day. This is not to say that there was no such thing as the Ascension, for presumably the Resurrection appearances came to an end at some time. But exactly what happened and how the Church reacted to it cannot be discovered from Luke's accounts.

C The Election of Matthias Acts 1:15f

The total impression which Acts 1:15f leaves is of a complex amalgam of old tradition and Lukan innovation. The language Luke uses is reminiscent of the Old Testament. Some have claimed the influence of Jewish traditions at this point, especially those from the Qumran scrolls¹, but the parallels are often imprecise and unconvincing². Certain parts of the narrative seem to reflect reliable

1 Particularly Bo Reicke, T Z , 10, 1954, pp95-112 and Stauffer, T L Z , 77, 1952, pp201f

2 The number 120 in v15 is said to reflect the Jewish rule that 120 people were needed before a synod could be elected. The 120 are equivalent to the local Sanhedrin. Though the equation is uncertain (because as Conzelmann, p23, notes, in vv13-14 women are included), if it did reflect Jewish practice one would probably not conclude with Reicke that this was "weil er die Wahl der neuen Apostels als juristisch gültig darstellen wollte" (art cit, p98). Reicke's attempt to find a parallel between the Apostles and the twelve men and three priests of Qumran - by assuming that the three priests are part of the

tradition Matthias' election is a case in point. The fact that Matthias rose from and, after a brief moment under the spotlights, returned to obscurity, and that he had no known significance in the later development of the Church is 'a priori' in favour of its reliability. The use and interpretation of the two Old Testament verses in v20 probably reflects a pre-Lukan usage, though how far back it goes is difficult to say.¹ The casting of lots v26 may reflect old tradition. The same procedure is found in the Old Testament (Num 26 55f, I Sam 10 20f), but it played a relatively small part in post-²Exilic Jewish tradition. As a procedure it was more common in the Graeco-Hellenistic world (cf Hom Il VII,170f). More important in Jewish tradition is the theological use of the metaphor to describe the sovereign purpose of God (Ps 16 5, Is 34 17), a usage which recurs in Apocalyptic and Qumran literature (IEn 37 4, 48 7, Dan 12 13, Jub 5 13, IQs 1 9f, 2 2,4, IQm 13 5, 9, IQh 3 22-3). The way in which

(cont) group of twelve - is unconvincing (he admits himself that it is "nur eine Möglichkeit, und es lässt sich keineswegs mit Sicherheit behaupten", p107). Apart from the inexactness of the parallel, owing to the arbitrary inclusion of the priests in the twelve, the total atmosphere of the two groups and their roles are very different. See the sober words of Haenchen "Man darf nicht Einzelheiten der Urgemeinde mit solchen von Qumran vergleichen, sondern muss die Gesamt Zusammenhänge in den Blick nehmen. Erst dann sieht man, was die Urgemeinde mit Erscheinungen ihrer Umwelt verbindet und was sie besonders auszeichnet" (p129).

1 Schweizer, T Z ,14,1958,p46, Haenchen,p128. Both verses reflect the LXX and the original meaning of both passages is lost in the Church's reapplication of them.

2 See especially Beardslee, St Th ,4,1960,pp245-52. Much of the above paragraph depends on this excellent article.

Luke probably handles this tradition is well expressed by Beardslee "Luke's sources told of a decision of the community, using the metaphorical language which is evidenced from Qumran. Luke understood its theological meaning, that this was God's choice not men's, and in shaping his story he objectified the mechanism of the divine choice in a literal casting of lots, a practice particularly familiar for the choice of responsible officials in the tradition of the Gentile world" ¹

At the same time Acts 1 15f has a number of elements which are Lukan and which reflect a later date. The account of Judas' death vv 18-9 is probably secondary to Matthew's version (Matt 27 3-10, though this version may also be legendary), as it reflects a common literary motif (II Macc 9 7-12, Jos Ant XVII, 168f, Acts 12 23). The translation of the Aramaic "Akeldama" v19 shows that Luke is writing for Greek readers, as does the use of the LXX in v20. The term καρδιογνώστα v24 is a favourite with post-Apostolic writers (Ap Const II, 24, 6, III 8, IV, 6, 8 etc). The way in which Luke brings the casting of lots up to date has already been mentioned. ² Klein ³ has argued that the whole of vv 21-2 are Lukan, whereas Flender ⁴ considers only the phrase ἐν παντί χρονῷ ἀνελήμφθη ἀφ' ἡμῶν to be Lukan. It is almost impossible to decide what is Lukan and what is tradition. The only certain thing is that the verses 'in toto' express, whether in his own or traditional terms, Luke's view of apostleship. The qualification of having been with Jesus from his baptism onwards is almost

1 Beardslee, art cit, p35

2 B C IV, p15 think, improbably, that a process of election is involved

3. Klein, p205

4 Flender, p110

certainly late and probably Lukan. It is never elsewhere mentioned as a qualification for apostleship and even some of the Twelve did not fulfil these requirements since, according to the Gospel accounts, they were called after Jesus' baptism. The verse also contradicts Acts 1:2 unless v21 refers in a general way to members of the wider circle of disciples.

If it is accepted that, despite frequent Lukan impositions and alterations, there is an old tradition underlying the present narrative, we have to ask what the original significance of Matthias' election¹ was. Why was the circle of Twelve reconstituted after the Resurrection? One might argue that it was for the purpose of making them the leaders of the new community, but this does not explain the need for twelve² rather than eleven. Rengstorff suggests that the passage demonstrates "the personal 'Yes' of God to the evangelization of Israel, empha-

1 This assumes that the Twelve were chosen by Jesus during his ministry. The suggestion (Klein, pp34-8, Schmithals, pp59-61) that the 12 were a post-Resurrection synod elected to rule the early Church is incredible. The assertion that all the places where *οἱ δώδεκα* occurs in Mark are late, is unfounded. This view also necessitates taking Lk 22:30 as a community creation, a possible but unlikely view, since it fits in well with what we know from elsewhere about Jesus' eschatological expectations. The unimportance of the Twelve in the early Church and the confusion over their names, is taken not as an argument in favour of Jesus having chosen them, but as proof that this original synod was quickly disbanded after the Church's eschatological hopes were dashed. Most difficult of all is their explanation of the figure of Judas and the use of the title 'Eleven' in the Gospels. This is explained by the fantastic thesis that Judas, who was originally a member of the synod, became an apostate and was condemned and executed by the others, and that his apostasy was projected back in the form of an actual betrayal of Jesus when the Twelve as a whole were projected back into Jesus' ministry. In fact, the betrayal of Judas is an argument in favour of Jesus having chosen the Twelve during his ministry.

2 Rengstorff, "Matthias", pp178-92

sized with irrefutable clearness even after Israel had rejected Jesus and the group of the Twelve, as Jesus' sign of his claim to his people had become incomplete" However, we know nothing of any missionary activity of the Twelve apart from Peter¹ All our evidence shows that under normal circumstances the Twelve resided in Jerusalem(Acts 8 1, Gal 1 17) One might assume that this passage reflects their original missionary intention which, for some unknown reason, was never fulfilled However, this is improbable, for the evidence of both Acts and Paul shows that, apart from Peter, the Twelve were from the beginning lacking in missionary zeal Where Rengstorff may be correct is in his emphasis on the claim being laid on Israel, that is, the reconstitution of the Twelve seems to have been directed at the hoped for reconstitution of Israel, but not in any missionary sense The clue to the action of the early community is in Lk 22 30 par -

" that you may sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel " The election of Matthias was a result of the fervent eschatological expectations of the earliest community² Jesus had led them to expect that when the End came they would rule and judge the reconstituted Israel which was expected in the End time Thus the number twelve was essential for the fulfilment of the eschatological programme which they believed to be imminent The reference to the casting of lots agrees with this, and it also explains why no successor was

³

¹ "Von Missionreisen der 12 Jünger weiss die frühe Überlieferung nichts " Schmithals, p57

² Wikenhauser, p33, Rengstorff, "Matthias", p184, Beardslee, art cit , p252, Schweizer, "Church Order", p48 n155

³ Dodd, "Scriptures", p58 n1, Beardslee, ibid , Stauffer, art cit , pp201f Cf the view that the title "pillar"(Gal 2 9) may have had an eschato-

chosen for James (Acts 12 2)¹ By this time, twelve to fourteen years after Matthias' election, eschatological expectations had become less fervent and the need for a continuation of the institution of the Twelve on a historical plane no longer felt. If this was the original significance of the Matthias narrative then it is clear that Luke was either ignorant of or has overlooked it. Nothing in his version suggests that the purpose of Matthias' election was to prepare the Twelve for the End. To discover Luke's purpose we must look further.

An important point is that the context of the narrative appears to enhance its significance.² It is said that Luke must have had other traditions of events which occurred between the Ascension and Pentecost. That he chose to relate only Matthias' election signifies that it was particularly significant for him. But this form of argument has to be treated with care, for we do not know what traditions Luke had at his disposal and it is quite probable that this was the only section he had which could reasonably be fitted in between the Ascension and Pentecost. More important is its inclusion in the first two chapters of Acts where Luke sets out many of the themes which are to be important in the later narrative. One assumes that the Twelve are to play an important role in the rest of Acts and to some extent this is the case. The Twelve are mentioned only in 6 2 and by implication in 1 26, 2 14,

(cont) -logical meaning in connection with the hope for a new Temple, cf Barrett, "Pillar", pp16,19, Schweizer, "Church Order", p202 n774

1 Also, Judas died dishonourably and James after faithful service to Jesus. Klein, p206, thinks it was because by the time James died the principle of Apostolic succession had been firmly established.

2 Stählin, pp28-9, Flender, pp111f

but wherever the word 'apostle' is used (apart from 14 4, 14) it means the Twelve, they organize the Jerusalem community (ch1-5), appoint assistants (6 1f), control other communities (11 22f, 15 22f) and dispense the Holy Spirit (8 17-19) In contrast to this it is odd that most of their activities are the work of one man, Peter (2 14f, 3 1f, 5 1f, 8 14f, 9 32f, cf John, 3 1f, 8 14f, 12 2f), that the control of the Jerusalem Church is mysteriously taken over by Jesus' brother James who was not an apostle (ch15,21) and that after ch15 the Apostles disappear altogether These paradoxical facts must be accommodated in any attempt to assess Luke's purpose in recounting the Matthias narrative

Before speculating on possible theological motives we must first recognize that the primary reason for Luke's recounting of this narrative is that he received a tradition which led him to believe that this event actually took place at this time In the course of writing it up, however, Luke has naturally " nicht zu einem trockenen historischen Referat verarbeitet, sondern daraus eine lebendige Szene geschaffen "¹ Various motives may have been at work Rengstorf thinks Luke used the narrative gladly, as a confirmation of God's plan for a continuing mission to Israel Luke uses it " to help his readers recognize that any feeling in the Church against Jewish evangelism is wrong - it is not in accordance with the will of God "² This finds support in Acts 1 8 where the Apostles are commanded to perform

¹ Haenchen, p128

² Rengstorf, "Matthias", p189

a universal mission. It may also help to explain why Luke, after restricting the title 'apostle' in 1 21f, can also call Paul and Barnabas apostles (14 4,14), for these two were, above all, missionaries. The pattern of Paul's missionary work is also "Jews first, then Greeks", which shows that the Jewish mission was not unimportant. But there are problems: although the Apostles' call to mission is confirmed by 1 8, which includes a Jewish mission, this verse speaks also of a world mission as the ultimate goal, which in a sense contradicts the re-establishment of the Twelve, further, if this was Luke's motive, we would expect to find its fulfilment in the rest of Acts, which is not the case. Apart from Peter, Acts relates no missionary activity of the Twelve, nor does it suggest that lack of enthusiasm for the Jewish mission was a problem with which Luke was concerned. It is the problems of the Gentile mission which, if anything, Luke faces. Similarly, Rengstorff's view that as a result of "a wide experience of human obstinacy" and a "long exper^ence of the Holy Spirit and his activity" "Luke relates before the Pentecost story the by-election of Matthias, with its almost too pompous air, and then afterwards lets the Twelve disappear so suddenly and so completely into the background",¹ spiritualizes and makes too much of the legitimate observation that the relative sobriety of the Apostles in 1 15f contrasts with their ecstasy in 2 1f.² Again, we saw above that the Twelve had a certain juristic function

1 Rengstorff, "Matthias", pp191-2

2 B C V, pp52f, Reicke, art cit, p94

in ch1-15, but this is not of the essence of an apostle in 1 21f

Luke sees one basic qualification and one basic function of an apostle in 1 21-2 the qualification is to have been with Jesus throughout his ministry, the function is to be a witness of the Resurrection. Qualification and function are closely interrelated. 'Witness to the Resurrection' sums up one, if not the, basic theme of Christian preaching in Acts,¹ and the qualification for this role is important because it acted as a guarantee that it was the same Jesus who had led his disciples during his ministry that now led the Church as her Exalted Lord. Thus a link was forged between the epochs of Jesus and the Church, this link² was the Apostles. They stood astride the two eras, a foot planted firmly in each. For Luke, the number twelve is not significant as such, it occurs because it was in his tradition. He was much more concerned to show the historical link between Jesus and the Church³.

We must finally consider the thorny problem of the origin of Luke's concept of apostleship and its relation to Paul's view. For our purposes the essential question is whether Luke's view is his own creation or part of the tradition he received. It divides into two parts: how did the Twelve get the title apostle, and why in some circles of the Church was it limited to them? These questions revolve mainly around the relationship between the Lukan and Pauline views, since of the 79 occurrences of the word in the New Testament 34 are in Luke and 25 in Paul. We cannot hope to review fully the background, origin and

1 "Seine Theologie hat ihren Schwerpunkt in der Auferstehung", Haenchen, p128

2 Flender, p110f, Barrett, "Luke", pp52f

3 This, like the Ascension, cuts across Conzelmann's threefold division

usage of the word 'apostle', for this is a complex task and at every point there is disagreement¹ Our task is to concentrate on Luke and pass quickly over the other, important areas of study We would be wise at the start to take note of von Campenhausen's conclusion that, with regard to the origin and development of the idea, "sind nur Vermutungen möglich, die sich beim Mangel primärer Quellen wohl niemals zu wirklicher Gewissheit erheben lassen"²

The background to both the form and content of the Christian use of 'apostle' is obscure The LXX, Philo and Josephus only rarely give relevant parallels³ The Cynic-Stoic concept of $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma$ is the closest parallel which Classical Greek affords to the common technical usage of $\alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ in the New Testament, but it cannot be considered a direct influence on the growth of the Christian use of 'apostle'⁴ Rengstorff⁵ appeals to the Jewish $\eta'לפ$ concept of a fully empowered representative who is "as good as oneself" (Bar 5 5) But this does not

1 The main studies used here are Klein, Schmithals, von Campenhausen, St Th ,1,1948,pp96-130, Mosbech, St Th ,2,1949-50,pp166-200, Rengstorff, art $\alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ T W N T ,I,pp407-47, Lake, B C ,V,pp37-59, Lohse, T Z ,9,1953,pp259-75, Kümmel, "Kirchenbegriff", S B U ,1943,pp1-52, Schoeps, "Paul", pp70-4, Munck, St Th ,3,1950-1,pp96-110, Käsemann, "Legitimität", Fridrichson, "Apostle", Schweizer, "Church Order", Flender, pp110f

2 Von Campenhausen, art cit ,p127

3 I Sam 14 6 LXX is the only example of the noun The verb is, of course, used quite frequently

4 Rengstorff, art cit ,pp409f, Williams, pp279-82 Schmithals concludes, "Aber mit gleich grosser Sicherheit darf man feststellen, dass der urchristliche Apostolat ebensowenig eine Weiterbildung des $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma$ ist, wie dieser nicht aus jenem entstanden ist " (p103)

5 Rengstorff, art cit ,pp407f, von Campenhausen, art cit ,pp98-100, Lohse, art cit ,pp260-2, Dahl, "Volk", pp158f

explain much of the content of the Christian usage, and there is no evidence that ἀπόστολος was ever used to translate תַּלְמִיד before A D 70, since there were other more common and natural equivalents (ἄγγελος, πρεσβευτής)¹ Schmithals tries to prove Gnostic influence on the Christian usage, but he never really proves that it was not the Gnostics who borrowed from the Church rather than vice versa² to date, therefore, the background of the Christian use of 'apostle' is obscure

Who originally used the word 'apostle' and where is equally difficult to decide It is unlikely that the originator was Jesus, since the word is used only once in the Gospels where we can be sure that he spoke it, or rather its Aramaic equivalent³ The most likely guess is that the word was first used, probably quite fortuitously, in some early Christian centre, possibly Antioch⁴ It may well be that the word was first used without any specific background in mind, as a description of those who had a special commission from Jesus or his Church

Paul's use of the word has frequently been seen as the key to its development It is universally recognized that Paul thinks of the apostles as a relatively wide circle Junias and Andronicus (Rom 16 7),⁵

1 Schmithals, pp87-9, Klein, pp22-9, Ehrhardt, "Succession", pp15f

2 Schmithals, pp103-216 He tends to overlook the late date of most 'Gnostic' evidence

3 Mk 6 30, and even here it is probably not used technically If 'apostle' is read in Matt 10 2, it probably reflects later usage The uses in Luke's Gospel reflect his own and not Jesus' ideas

4 Mosbech, art cit, pp193f, B C, V, pp50f, Schmithals, pp78-84 This active missionary centre may have been the first to use ἐκκλησία as well as Χριστιανός

5 The ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις is ambiguous, but ἐν probably means "among" rather than "by" and includes them in the rank of apostles (so Schmithals, p51, von Campenhausen, art cit, p107)

Paul himself (Gal 1 1, I Cor 1 1, 9 1f, Rom 1 1), and maybe Barnabas (I Cor 9 6, Gal 2 9)¹ and James (I Cor 15 5, Gal 1 18)² are all apostles Paul only mentions the 'Twelve' in I Cor 15 5 and if he means v7 to refer back to v5 then he also saw this group as apostles Gal 1 17 is also ambiguous it probably refers to a ruling college of apostles resident in Jerusalem, since Paul's opponents seem to have assumed that when in Jerusalem Paul saw the apostles, and it is quite probable that the Twelve were at least a part, if not the dominating element, of it³ Thus it seems that for Paul the Twelve, as well as many others, were legitimately called apostles

The distinctive mark of an apostle is not easy to define After a careful survey Schmithals concludes that any closely defined answer is impossible⁴ Apostles perform miracles (II Cor 12 2) and live off Churches (I Cor 9 5f), but so do others (Rom 15 19, Gal 6 6) Apostles⁵ were often missionaries, but not all missionaries were apostles Many⁶

1 Kümmel, art cit ,p45, Schmithals,p53, Lightfoot,"Galatians",p96

2 Both passages are ambiguous I Cor 15 7 may refer to the Twelve and James (v5) or may simply refer to all the apostles up till that time (Klein,p46) Gal 1 19 may not refer to James as an apostle (Klein,p46), and Paul may be stating his independence from both the Apostles and the non-apostolic leader James However, the mention of James in this context can only mean that he is equivalent to (and probably therefore in fact) an apostle (Schmithals,p54, Mosbech,art cit ,p175)

3 Cf also Käsemann's view (ibid) that in II Cor 11 5f Paul is addressing the self-styled emissaries of the Twelve Klein's objections (p58 n248) amount to little more than saying that Käsemann's view is now outmoded

4 Schmithals,pp14-46

5 Cf von Campenhausen,art cit ,p110 "Evangelium und Apostolat sind engstens zusammenhängende Begriffe "

6 The Twelve were not missionaries and Timothy (Rom 16 21, I Cor 16 10) and Titus (II Cor 2 13, Gal 2 1) were missionaries but not apostles

apostles witnessed a Resurrection appearance, but not all (I Cor 15 6)²
³ Munck thinks that the distinctive element in Paul's apostleship is his
 unique sense of calling to a special place in the eschatological plan
 of God, namely as apostle to the Gentiles (Rom 9-11, Gal 2 7-9, Rom
 15 15-6) This certainly appears to be a clue to Paul's self-under-
 standing, but it does not advance our attempt to discover the meaning
 of apostleship for the other apostles In fact, we are left with the
 situation where it is impossible to define the distinctive mark of an
 apostle more closely than to say that it involved a special commissioning
⁴ either from Jesus or his Church

We must now define Luke's view of apostleship and attempt to
 trace its origin Luke normally restricts the title apostle to the
 Twelve Only twice is it used of anybody else (14 4,14) Taking this
 as a clue, some scholars have noted the emphasis which Luke places on
 Paul's conversion, when he met the Risen Lord, and have concluded that
 he also saw Paul as an apostle Moreover, Paul is equal to Peter when
⁵ it comes to miracles, is called God's "chosen vessel" (Acts 9 15), and
⁶ is distinguished by his sufferings Clearly there is a tension here
 which needs some explanation The majority of scholars either ignore

1 Rengstorff, art cit , pp431f, thinks this was the distinguishing mark

2 von Campenhausen, art cit , p113, Schmithals, p20

3 Munck, art cit , pp97-9, Fridrichsen, "Apostle", pp1f Schmithals'
 objections (pp34-6) are not compelling

4 von Campenhausen, art cit , p103, Schmithals, p21

5 Flender, pp110f

6 Klein, p148, who notes that while Luke normally uses ἀπόστολος of
 Jesus' sufferings, in Acts 9 15-6 it is used of Paul's

or explain away 14 4, 14 and argue that all the other factors, although¹ important, do not qualify Paul for apostleship. However, all attempts to explain away 14 4, 14 are unsatisfactory.

²
1. Haenchen treats 14 1f as a piece of old tradition which Luke has unwittingly included and which does not represent his own view. It may be that the material is traditional, but this does not mean that one can assume that the passage has no significance for Luke. Its inclusion by him means, at the very least, that the significance attached by many scholars to Luke's apparent restriction of the title 'apostle' to the twelve is dubious. For if it was imperative for Luke to restrict the title to the Twelve, it is difficult to understand why he did not omit 14 1f or at least erase the word 'apostle'.

2. It is possible to omit the word 'apostle' from v14 with the Western text, but one cannot go on to say that v14 is then "nicht mehr³ eindeutig auf Paulus und Barnabas zu beziehen."

3. It is difficult to take seriously the suggestions of Klein and⁴ Schmithals as a means of explaining these two verses. Klein thinks Luke includes them as a deliberate decoy, in order that his readers should not realize that it was he who had restricted the title to the Twelve and excluded Paul. This explanation is desperate in the extreme and is clearly inspired by the necessity of explaining away these verses if Klein is to maintain his thesis that Luke was the first to restrict

1 Schmithals, pp235f, Klein, pp210f, Haenchen, p102, Schweizer, op cit, p69

2 Haenchen, pp360f, Schmithals, p235 n79, B C, V, p51

3 G Sass, "Apostel", p235, Klein, p213 thinks this also a possible explanation

4 Klein, pp212-3

the title to the Twelve Schmithals is completely illogical when he says that "Er (Paul) gilt so selbsverständlich nicht als Apostel im Sinne des Lukas, dass er Apg 14 4,14 bedenkenlos Apostel genannt werden kann "¹ This amounts to saying that Luke calls Paul an apostle because he is not one, the logic of which is not easy to follow

It appears that we must accept that for Luke, Paul and Barnabas also were apostles,² in many ways equal to the Twelve, but unable, of course, to usurp their unique historical position This might also imply that the title 'apostle' as such was not important to Luke He uses it so frequently in the first part of Acts because it was a convenient designation for some or all of the Twelve and meant that he did not have to list all their names each time they appeared He can call Paul and Barnabas apostles, but does not do so frequently because it was easy enough to give their names This is not a very exciting or theological explanation of Luke's use of the word, but it may be the correct one It is similar to our earlier point that the number twelve was not in itself important for Luke, it occurs because it was in his sources

The source of Luke's ideas is not easy to surmise Klein has argued in considerable detail that the restriction of the title to the Twelve is a Lukan construction deliberately aimed at the exclusion

1 Schmithals,p236

2 Not simply 'apostles of the Churches' (Lohse,art cit ,p273 n46, von Campenhausen,art cit ,p115) as contrasted with the 'apostles of Christ' The relation between these two groups in Paul is not clear, it is difficult to know whether he equates or distinguishes them

of Paul Luke was motivated by the claims of ex-Christian Gnostics who used Paul as their authority Luke reclaimed Paul for the Church by subordinating him to the Twelve and thereby placing him in the line of true Apostolic succession reaching back to the earthly Jesus Klein's thesis has been subjected to damaging criticism by Schmithals,¹ from which it can no longer emerge as the answer to Luke's usage and the development of the apostolic idea Aside from all the details of Klein's argument, one is left at the end of his book with the uneasy feeling that he has totally misunderstood Luke This is not easy to define, but the best example is his treatment of Acts 14 4,14, which belie Klein's attempt to prove that Luke was the first to restrict the title to the Twelve His interpretation of these verses credits Luke with a subtlety which is difficult to accept, for as a rule Luke gives the impression of being theologically naive He does not come across as a

1 Schmithals, pp244-7, 266-72 Stated briefly his points are (a) Not all writers with the 12 apostle idea are later than Luke, even if they were, it does not prove that Luke was the originator of this view (b) Paul's theology is in many ways anti-gnostic, it is unlikely that the Church would abandon the instrument of Paul's letters in their struggle with Gnosticism (c) Many of the early anti-gnostic writers use Paul (eg Polycarp and Clement of Rome) Conversely, some Gnostics used the Twelve or individuals from them (Epiph Haer 30 13,23 etc) while others expressly reject Paul (Epiph Haer 28 5) (d) If one works out the logic of Klein's position on his own presuppositions some curious results emerge If Luke was writing for Gnostics, then his picture of Paul in Acts would play into their hands, by showing that when they call on Paul they are in fact calling on the historical Jesus via the Twelve One would have to assume therefore that Luke was writing for Gnostics for whom the Lukan portrait of the historical Jesus was a scandal But even so, Luke could not have imagined that his picture of Paul would arouse anything but derision from Gnostics who knew the true Paul, since they could disprove it by a few sentences from Galatians If Luke was writing for the Church, one has to show that there were communities where Paul's position was in doubt owing to Gnostic use of him, it is difficult to find positive evidence for such communities Further, one must ask, 'Which Paul is Luke preserving?' On Klein's presuppositions Luke's is a false picture of Paul, ignoring the true man

fully-fledged, systematic theologian. However, this is a theme to which we shall return.

If the origin of the '12 Apostles' idea is not Lukan then it is presumably pre-Lukan. Exactly where and why it originated is difficult to say. Some date it early, either contemporary with¹ or before Paul². Others date it later, supposing it to be a result of Paul's unique sense of vocation³. Schmithals dates it later still and does not see

1 Mosbech (op cit, p191f) thinks the source of the restriction to the Twelve was the controversy between Paul and the Judaizers. It was a result partially of Paul's claim to be on a par with the other apostles, and more especially due to Paul's opponents, who attempted to deny his authority by claiming that the 12 were apostles in a unique way, since they had been with Jesus and received their apostleship from him. Klein and Schmithals (pp 53f, 217f respectively) reject this view on the grounds that Paul's opponents in Corinth and Galatia were Gnostics and not Judaizers. However, the two designations are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and it is difficult to think that the central controversy in Galatia was not a question of the validity of the Law - stirred up by Judaizers, albeit with gnostic tendencies.

Lohse (art cit, pp266-9) thinks that the use of 'apostle' was widespread before Paul. Paul's opponents accused him of not being a true apostle because he was not sent by the Jerusalem Church. Paul defends himself by claiming to be an 'apostle of Christ' (I Thess 2.7 etc), but also recognizes that the Twelve are apostles and gives them that title. The title was given to the Twelve, therefore, as a result of Paul's unique self-consciousness. von Campenhausen (art cit, p103) and Munck (art cit, p101f) also see 'apostle of Christ' as a novel Pauline idea. Klein (pp55f) argues that the notion 'apostle of Christ' was a pre-Pauline formula, but one which Paul used in a special way to express his unique sense of vocation. However, Paul does not use it (contra Klein) to claim superiority, but to assert his equality.

2 Rengstorff's view (loc cit) is that the Twelve were chosen by Jesus and after the Resurrection they, and others, received a new commission from him. The expansion of the idea of an apostle includes Paul, whose unique position brings apostleship to its classic expression. Schoeps ('Paul', pp70-3) is alone in the view that "It is quite plain that the title of 'apostle' as the highest description of rank in earliest Christianity was limited to the Twelve, and I suppose that this reflects the oldest view of the character and status of a Christian apostle."

3 Munck and Fridrichsen (loc cit). Munck's idea is that Paul's unique sense of vocation caused a change in the basic reference of 'apostle'. It became no longer a missionary title but referred to one who was

any necessary connection with Pauline thought. It is not easy to assess these views, since there is a lot to be said for almost all of them. We would suggest, very tentatively, that the development of the word apostle was something like the following:

a. As we saw earlier, the origins of the word are obscure. Its original use by Christians was probably fortuitous and, with regard to the content of the word, they had no particular background in mind. It was used to describe those who had received a special commission from Christ or his Church. This commission was probably for missionary work amongst both Jews and Gentiles. The title was probably also given to the Twelve early on in its development, on account of their missionary work during Jesus' ministry, for in a sense they were, if not in name then in practice, the first 'apostles'. Thus originally the word described a function rather than an office and it was not restricted to any one group like the Twelve. However, once the Twelve had been called apostles, the word would gain extra weight, since their connection with the historical Jesus probably meant that they were specially revered. The vogue for this word must have been pre-Pauline, since

(cont) preeminently called by Christ. The emphasis was more on the calling than the sending. Thus Munck does not see the judaizing controversy as decisive, and he dates the limitation of the title to the Twelve relatively late.

1. Schmithals (pp247-54) divides Hellenistic Christianity into two strands, the 'Pauline' and the 'Synoptic'. In the latter stream, as the memory of the Twelve diminished their significance grew, in particular with regard to their missionary activity. Since the title 'apostle' originally meant a missionary, it was therefore natural for it to be given to the Twelve. This process took place late in the 1st century A.D. and was probably helped by the fact that Peter was an apostle in earlier days. "Dieser Vorgang ist nur natürlich, und darf in keiner Weise dramatisiert werden." The struggle with Gnosticism may have aided this process but did not involve a degrading of Paul. For criticism, see Klein, pp64-5.

Paul does not appear to be the innovator of its use, and he also seems to know that the Twelve were called apostles

b During the judaizing controversies there may have been an early attempt to limit the title to the Twelve, which was aimed at denying Paul's authority ¹ Paul's reaction is to claim equality with the Twelve, which may be the source of his frequent use of the phrase 'apostle of Christ' - the highest Christian appellation, which Paul believed he, too, could claim

c If there was such an early attempt to limit the title to the Twelve, this opinion may have lingered on in certain circles and formed the basis of later views. At any rate these controversies were soon forgotten, which left the tradition open to various lines of development. The title 'apostle' could be used of the Twelve alone, of Paul or of both together - a process which was probably influenced as much by geographical as theological factors. In some areas the notion of the Twelve as the only apostles arose, maybe for a second time. The causes of this development were probably similar to those suggested by Schmithals: the excessive veneration of the Twelve and their missionary activity, and the struggle with Gnosticism, where an appeal back to the historical Jesus was of paramount importance.

Whatever may have been the origin of the idea of the 'Twelve Apostles', Luke stands at the end of the process, if it developed out

1. Exactly how this was done is unclear. Probably one or a combination of the following accusations were made (a) that Paul had no knowledge of the earthly Jesus - hence II Cor 5 16 (b) that Paul did not experience a Resurrection appearance - hence I Cor 9 1, 15 8 etc (c) that Paul was dependent on Jerusalem for his authority - hence Gal 1-2

2 Schmithals, pp253f, von Campenhausen, art cit, p119

of a judaizing or gnostic context all this is lost on him. Although he normally uses the title of the Twelve, the casual references in 14:4, 14 show that the word has no polemical significance for him. He is quite content to have two apparently contradictory strands standing side by side - a phenomenon which we shall come across frequently in Acts. This may show that the title as such was of little importance to him, other than as a convenient designation of the Twelve. For Luke it was the unique position of the Twelve and the unique activity of Paul which was important. Thus in a way, the so-called qualifications for apostleship (1:21-2) are perhaps better called the qualifications for belonging to that unique circle of first-generation Christians who stood astride the two eras of Jesus' earthly and heavenly existence. The original missionary connotations of the word are lost on Luke, for while the Twelve do receive the commission in 1:8, the ensuing narrative shows that, with the exception of Peter's preaching to the Jews and initial step towards the Gentiles, they never fulfil it. The missionary work of the Church is carried on in the main by Paul and Barnabas, and they are only twice called apostles.

D Pentecost Acts 2:1f

Of all the narratives in Acts, the description of Pentecost is
¹
 exceptionally obscure. The first question to ask is, 'Did Luke intend

1 Lake, B. C. V., pp. 112-21, Cadbury, J. B. L., 47, 1928, pp. 237-56, Enslin, J. B. L., 72, 1953, pp. 230-8, G. Davies, J. T. S., ns. 3, 1952, pp. 228f, Lohse, art. 1 W. N. T., VII, pp. 44-53 and Ev. Th., 13, 1953, pp. 422-36, Kretschmar, art. cit., H. Fuchs, T. Z., 5, 1959, pp. 233f, Sleeper, J. B. L., 84, 1965, pp. 389f, Knox, "Acts", pp. 80f, Harnack, "Acts", pp. 65f, Flender, pp. 140f, Schweizer, "Spirit", pp. 40f, plus commentaries.

to relate a speaking or a hearing miracle ?' If the former, did he think in terms of foreign languages or glossolalia ?

The linguistic evidence is ambiguous ¹ ἕτερος can mean 'different' or 'foreign', ² γλῶσσα could refer to foreign languages or to a mysterious "Geistsprache", ³ δῖάλεκτος can refer to both national languages and to local dialects. Various combinations of the different translations lead to different interpretations.

⁴ Some think that the ⁵ Apostles spoke a mysterious "Geistsprache", which the crowd heard as their own language or dialect. The evidence for this view is threefold. First, the other references in Acts (10,46, 19,6) to speaking in tongues say nothing about foreign languages, so Luke presumably did not mean that in 2,4. Secondly, apart from v4, which is ambiguous, it is never said that the Apostles spoke in foreign languages but that the crowd heard them speak in foreign languages. The repetitive use of ἀκούω (vv6,8,11) may be a simple reporting of speech. But if the Apostles spoke in tongues, this may be Luke's way of emphasizing the hearing miracle, and one might argue that it means, in effect, they heard them as if they were speaking in foreign

1 Arndt-Gingrich, p315 cf Is 28,11 LXX, Sir Prol 122

2 Arndt-Gingrich, p161 Moulton-Milligan, "Vocabulary", p128 show how it could also mean "local peculiarities of speech" or "sub-dialects"

3 Arndt-Gingrich, p184, Moulton-Milligan, "Vocabulary", p150

4 Wikenhauser, pp37f

5 ἀντες in 2,1 is ambiguous. It could refer to the 120 brethren (1,15. So Haenchen, pp131-2, Hanson, p65) or to the twelve alone (so Conzelmann, p25, Wikenhauser, p37, Knox, "Acts", p82, B C IV, p17). In support of the latter is the fact that in 1,4f it is only the Apostles who receive the promise of Jesus, cf 10,41. Also, in 2,14 it says "Peter, standing up with the Eleven", which also supports a reference to the Apostles in 2,1.

languages, though in fact they were speaking a "Geistsprache" Thirdly, if Judea is included in the list of nations vv9-11, as it probably should be,¹ it might be argued that this is more natural if the Twelve spoke a "Geistsprache", since this would be as unintelligible to Judeans as to any others²

However, the above interpretation places too much weight on the use of *ἑκούσως*, and it is more likely that Luke intended to describe a speaking miracle involving either foreign languages or local dialects³ The usual argument for this view is that since *διάλεκτος* normally means 'language', the ambiguous phrase *ἐτέροις γλώσσαις*⁴ v4 must mean the same This would explain the amazement of the crowd in v7 and, if as is likely the original tradition described some form of glossolalia,⁵ it would not be out of character for Luke to rationalize this by interpreting it as speaking in foreign languages The inclusion of Judea in v9 is odd, but if Luke thought the miracle involved speaking in dialects,⁶ the inclusion of Judea can be justified on the

1 Contra Haenchen, p134, Harnack, op cit, p65 Most authors retain it There is very little mss evidence for omitting it, and variations like Chrysostom's "Indian" and Iertullian's "Armenian" are best explained as attempts to resolve the tension with v5 The inclusion of Judea is best explained as a rough way of saying that all nations were present

2 Since the Judeans spoke the same language as the Twelve and a speaking miracle, therefore, would in their case be unnecessary

3 Haenchen, pp132f, Conzelmann, pp25-6, Lohse, T W N T, art cit, pp50-1, Knox, "Acts", p83, Williams, pp62-3, Sleeper, art cit, p390

4 Haenchen, p133 "Das zeigt die Hörer glauben nicht eine Geistsprache zu hören, denn eine solche könnte ein Galiläer ebensogut reden wie jeder andere" The accusation of drunkenness v13 can be used to argue either way glossolalia might seem like drunken gibberish, but so also might foreign languages when spoken fervently - especially if the Twelve all spoke at the same time

5 It is unlikely that it referred to the speaking of foreign languages, since Diaspora Jews probably did not know the languages of the countries they lived in, and they would all have known Aramaic and/or Greek, so

grounds that they may have spoken a dialect different from the Galilean dialect of the Twelve. However, it is probably best explained, in the context of vv9-11, as part of Luke's rather loose way of saying that all nations were present. It is quite probable, therefore, that the original event of Pentecost was concerned with a miracle of glossolalia, a phenomenon which Luke's concrete mind has transposed into a miracle concerned with the speaking of foreign languages.

¹ Some authors have claimed that the crowd consisted mainly of Gentiles. The evidence for this view is as follows: some verses in the surrounding narrative are universalistic - ² $\kappa\alpha\sigma\alpha\upsilon \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\alpha$ v17 (cf Lk 3 6), $\kappa\alpha\varsigma \delta\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ v21, and $\kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\sigma\iota\nu \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \mu\alpha\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$ v39, vv9-11 are parallel to the universal outreach of the Church's mission as described in Acts, v9 mentions Judeans, so that the others are presumably Gentiles, and finally, this interpretation would give a partial fulfilment of Acts 1 8.

³ However, vv17,21, and 39, if they refer to Gentiles, are not descriptions of what has happened but proleptic hints of what will happen. The only parallel between vv9-11 and the rest of Acts is that they both end with a mention of Rome and, as we have seen, the mention

(cont) that two languages would have been sufficient at Pentecost. See Haenchen, pp134f, Knox, "Acts", p83.

6 (from p271) Bruce, p83 thinks that the main miracle was that the Twelve were freed from their rough Galilean dialect.

1 B C, V, p114, Sleeper, p390. Lohse and Wikenhauser do not always make it clear whether they see Pentecost as the actual or symbolic beginning of the world Church.

2 D has the plural at this point ($\kappa\alpha\sigma\alpha\varsigma \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha\varsigma$) whereas the other mss follow the LXX. D is probably secondary (so Haenchen, p142, Conzelmann, p28, Klipjn, "Search", p108), but even so the singular form is as universal as the plural (cf $\kappa\alpha\sigma\alpha \sigma\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ Lk 3 6).

3 V 39, for example, may refer to Diaspora Jews.

of Judea in vv9 does not imply that the rest of those present were Gentiles, but is simply part of Luke's way of saying that Jews from all nations were present. Moreover, vv21f could at the most be only a partial fulfilment of vv18, for the latter speaks of a centrifugal movement out from Jerusalem not a centripetal influx to it. Also, if we include ¹Ἰουδαῖοι in vv5 and interpret "Jews and proselytes" ²vv11 as a description of all the aforementioned groups, as we probably should do, a reference to the Gentiles is excluded. We can add that the references in Peter's speech are mainly to Jews (vv22,36,39) and that according to Acts 10:45 the Spirit is indisputably given to the Gentiles, apparently for the first time.

Thus we conclude that the crowd were Jews. They may have been ³visitors who had come in for the festival of Pentecost, or they may have been former Diaspora Jews who were now permanently residing in ⁴Jerusalem. If the former is intended, as is most probable, Luke has presumably overlooked the fact that these men would probably begin to

1 Many authors omit Ἰουδαῖοι with R and Vulg (2) (Harnack, "Acts", p65, Sleeper, art cit, p391, B C V, p113, Bruce, p83). B C, loc cit think it is an early gloss on εὐλαβεῖς, which has been mistakenly included in the text. Many omit it in order to interpret vv9-11 as a reference to Gentiles. However, it is best to include it (so Haenchen, p132, Conzelmann, p25, Knox, "Acts", p81f), because the mss evidence for its omission is slight and probably arose because of the apparent contradiction with "Judea" vv9.

2 In view of "Judea" vv9 it is unlikely that this phrase describes a separate group. It could grammatically qualify 'those dwelling in Rome', but probably describes all the aforementioned nations. "Cretes and Arabians" does not add two new groups, but describes all the previous groups as belonging either to the West or the East (Lissfeldt, T L Z 12, 1947, pp207-12).

3 Bruce, pp82-3, Hanson, pp62-3, Knox, "Acts", p82.

4 Haenchen, p132, Conzelmann, pp25-6, Wikenhauser, p37. The distinction between κατοικοῦντες as 'habitual dwellers' and ἐπιδημοῦντες as 'temporary dwellers' was not always made (B C IV, p19).

preach when they returned to their own countries, since he does not utilize this in his account of the progress of the Gentile mission. It may be, however, that although this does not fit Luke's pattern of events, it hints at what actually happened, that is, the gospel first reached the Gentiles not as a result of a planned, centralized mission of the Church, but through the intermittent preaching of travelling believers.

While Acts 2:1f is not directly concerned with the Gentiles, Luke probably intended it to be prophetic of the future universal extension of the Church's mission for he could not have been blind to the implications of vv 17 and 21. The experience of the Spirit given to the Jews of all nations is a proleptic hint that the Spirit will eventually be given to the Gentiles. In this limited sense these Diaspora Jews can be called the representatives of all nations. However, the universal implications of Pentecost are best described as 'proleptic' rather than 'symbolic', for whereas the movement of Acts 2 is centripetal, the movement of the Church's mission, as commanded in Acts 1:8 and as it actually developed, is centrifugal.

1

Lohse has shown how the Pentecost narrative fits neatly into Luke's concept of "Heilsgeschichte". It is part of his account of a logical sequence of events following the Resurrection. The Ascension

1 Lohse, "Pfingstberichten", pp 422f, Conzelmann, p 25. Lohse (T W N T art cit, p 50) translates 2:1 to mean "As the promised time of Pentecost was there", Haenchen (p 131) and Conzelmann (p 25) rightly reject this, for one would expect a perfect rather than a present tense (συμπλη-
ροῦσθαι). As van Stempvoort (art cit, p 39f) has shown, the present tense "is more chronologically suggestive than exact", and he is right to translate it "And when it was going on for the great day of Pentecost".

was a necessary prelude to the outpouring of the Spirit (Acts 2 33), an event which itself signifies the beginning of a new era characterized by the inspiration and guidance of the Spirit in every aspect of the Church's life. Thus the event of Pentecost, which is the fulfilment of the promises of the Old Testament (Joel 2 28f), John (Lk 3 16) and Jesus (Lk 24 47f Acts 1 4f), fits well into the overall framework of Luke-Acts

¹
For Lohse, as well as fitting into the pattern of "Heilsgeschichte",
Pentecost is also an eschatological event. For Conzelmann and Schweizer²
eschatology and "Heilsgeschichte" are, as far as Luke is concerned, mutually exclusive. But this is in fact only a terminological difference, since in essentials these authors agree. We must ask, however, how far Luke saw Pentecost as an eschatological event. The coming of the Spirit to the Church is clearly not for Luke equivalent to the End itself. This view is expressly rejected in Acts 1 6-8, and elsewhere Luke speaks of an End which is still to come (Acts 1 11, 3 19f, 17 30-1). It is eschatological insofar as it marks the inauguration of the last period before the End, namely the period of the Church, and insofar as the Spirit is a gift of the Last days. But³
in Acts 2 17 Luke's emphasis is on 'days' rather than 'last', for he

1 Lohse, "Pfingstberichten", p432

2 Conzelmann, "Luke", p183, Schweizer, "Spirit", p48

3 Haenchen argues that the $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ of B and the LXX is the original text here (p142), because "nach der lukanischen Theologie bricht mit der Geistausgiessung noch nicht die Endzeit an". Conzelmann, p29, accepts the reading of D but thinks it has no theological significance. D is probably correct at this point (so Hanson, p65, B C V, p113, Williams, p65), since in the context of Acts it is the more difficult reading, also, it differs from the LXX, and later scribes were more likely to harmonize with than vary from the LXX (Klijn, "Search", p104).

goes on to describe a lengthy period of Church history. The significance of the several "Endzeit" themes which appear to hover in the background of Acts 2 1f¹ is lost on Luke. For him, the coming of the Spirit is the realization of one of the promises of the Last days, but there are still many other phenomena which must occur (Acts 2 19-21) before the realization of the End itself.

Finally, we turn to the question of whether Luke used sources in Acts 2 1f and how far he was influenced by Old Testament and Jewish parallels. It is frequently asserted that the Pentecost narrative can be divided into two sources, one of which spoke of glossolalia (vv1-4,13)² and the other of speaking in foreign languages (vv5-12). Luke, it is said, has either imposed the latter on the former or vice versa. But these and other source theories are both unprovable and unnecessary.³ It is more likely that Luke received a vague and confused tradition, which he then attempted to unravel and present as an intelligible.⁴

1 See below, pp 279f

2 Dupont, "Sources", pp39-61, gives a summary of the main views

3 Lohse, T W N T, art cit, p50, Sleeper, art cit, p391, and tentatively B C V, pp118f

4 Conzelmann, pp26-7, Bauernfeind, pp55f

5 Knox, "Acts", p83, thinks Luke used a tale of the promulgation of the Torah to the 70 nations through their representatives who were at the feast. On this see below. Williams, p62, thinks that Luke's source told of the Twelve Apostles going to twelve different parts of the world, Luke altered this to fit the plan of Acts given in 1 8, namely the gradual extension of the gospel throughout the world. But if Luke did have such a source it is inconceivable that he would have changed it for one which did not fulfil 1 8 with anything like the same exactness.

6 The variation between $\gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha$ and $\delta\iota\alpha\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is probably stylistic and does not necessarily betray the use of sources. The accusation of drunkenness v13 is often said to be appropriate only to glossolalia, but we have seen that it is also appropriate to the fervent speaking of foreign languages.

7 So Haenchen, pp135f

narrative The confusion of his sources probably reflects the fact that the early Church itself did not fully understand this experience The actual event was probably one of mass ecstasy or glossolalia, which Luke has interpreted as speaking in foreign languages¹ This does not mean that Luke has deliberately substituted his own interpretation for another, but simply that he did his best to make intelligible a confused and vague tradition

There are various possible traditions which may lie behind Luke's account of Pentecost The LXX of Isaiah 28 11 - *διὰ φαυλισμον χειλέων δια γλώσσης ἑτέρας ὅτι λαλήσουσιν τῷ λαῷ τουτω* - may be a source of some of the ideas in Acts 2, but it is unlikely that reflection on this verse alone has produced the whole narrative A reversal of the story of the tower of Babel (Gen 11) hovers somewhere² in the background of Acts 2 1f It may have been more prominent in Luke's tradition than it is in his own version, for whereas the original story told of speaking in a single "Geistsprache", Luke tells about speaking in several foreign languages

1 Davies, art cit ,pp229f, argues that in I Cor 12-14 Paul is also thinking in terms of foreign languages But although it is true that *ἐρμηνεία* often means 'translation' of foreign languages in the LXX, it does not follow that when Paul uses it he means 'translation' rather than 'interpretation' or, if he does mean 'translation', that he is referring to known foreign languages The relationship between glossolalia in Luke and Paul is obscure The fact that Paul distinguishes and Luke probably identifies 'glossolalia' and 'prophecy' (Acts 2 4,17, 19 6) is probably a terminological as much as an essential difference The fact that Paul sees glossolalia as the least of the Spirit's gifts whereas Luke sees it as a primary sign of the Spirit's activity shows a difference between the two However, this should not be overrated, for Paul is thinking of a particularly unintelligible form of glossolalia, whereas Luke - at least in Acts 2 - is thinking of speaking in foreign languages Moreover, Luke did not face the same sort of pastoral problem that Paul had to deal with in Corinth

2 Haenchen, pp137f

It was usual a few years ago to assume that the Jewish tradition¹ which connects Pentecost with the giving of the Law² was later than Luke and could not, therefore, have influenced him, since he would have known Pentecost only as a harvest festival (Lev 25 15f, Dt 16 9). However, new evidence for a pre-Christian dating of this connection³ has been found, it is said, in the Qumran texts, and it may therefore have influenced Luke. The Qumran sectarians are said to have celebrated Pentecost as a feast of the renewal of the Covenant. Conzelmann, however, is wisely more cautious and shows how difficult it is to draw such far-reaching conclusions. He notes that at Qumran Pentecost was celebrated more as a 'sign' than as a 'renewal' of the Covenant. "Eine Bundeserneuerung freilich ist nicht zu belegen, und das Argumentum e silentio ist angesichts der Festordnung IQs 1f schlüssig"⁴

Many would agree that this complex of traditions has had some influence on Luke or his tradition, but none of it is exact enough to be pinned down as a direct source. For example, Luke does not appear to be interested in the Philonic notion of the Torah being given to the seventy nations in seventy languages. Nor does he give any hint that the Torah tradition was in any way relevant or meaningful for him, certainly not enough to warrant the statement of Williams⁵ that "All that the Torah was to a Jew, Jesus was to Paul and the Holy Spirit

1 Lohse, I W N T, art cit, pp47-9, B C, V, pp114-5

2 S B, II, pp604f, Philo De Dec, 32, 33

3 Dupont, "Gentils", p144

4 Conzelmann, p27

5 Williams, p62

to Luke, and more "

Thus when Luke dates the first outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, it does not appear to have any special theological significance. It may have been his way of giving an air of realism to the narrative, since at that time there would probably be representatives from most areas of the Diaspora in Jerusalem for the festival. More probable is that Luke merely repeats what is in fact good tradition, namely that the Church first received the Spirit on the first Pentecost after Easter. For Luke and, as far as we can see, for his tradition it had neither theological nor liturgical significance. It was simply a date. This is in accord with what we suggested earlier, namely that it was the dating of Pentecost which forced Luke to use the forty days of Acts 1:3 rather than vice versa.

There is one more area of Old Testament and Jewish background which is rarely exploited as a possible source for the main ideas of Acts 2:1f, namely the notion that in the End times the nations would flock to Jerusalem and there hear a proclamation from God. The presence of all nations, at least in a representative sense, and the setting in Jerusalem are not the only "Endzeit" themes in Acts 2, the concept of a single language, which was probably an original element in the tradition, and the gift of the Spirit are also themes which are con-

1 Mentioned by Conzelmann, p26, and developed a little more by Hanson, pp62-3

2 Cf Is 66:18f and the earlier section on Jesus and the Gentiles

3 Test Zeb 9:8, S B, II, pp300f

4 Test Jud 25:3

5 Joel 2:28f, S B, II, pp128f

-nected with the End Behind the narrative in Acts 2, therefore, it would seem that we have an ancient picture of an apocalyptic event, where the nations flock to Jerusalem and, through the agency of the Spirit, are reached by a Divine "Geistsprache" which leaps the bounds of nationality and communicates with all those present, thereby reversing Gen 11 It is probable that Luke did not deliberately alter, but simply failed to understand this tradition When he utilizes it he reshapes it to fit his own understanding of the course of the Church's mission For him, Pentecost is concerned with Jews alone, the Gentiles will be reached later, according to a definite plan (1 8) Thus by historicizing the narrative and by understanding it as concerned with Jews alone, he can utilize¹ a tradition which is orientated in the opposite direction to his own narrative, that is, centripetally rather than centrifugally

Thus this early tradition which we can detect behind Acts 2 reflects the same apocalyptic view of the Gentile mission which Jesus held If we can attribute this view to the earliest community, we may have discovered one of the major reasons why the Gentile mission was only slowly and reluctantly begun, namely that the early Church, like her Master, expected only an apocalyptic and not a historical proclamation to the Gentiles And since they believed it was God's concern and not their's, they needed a considerable amount of prompting before they would embark on a Gentile mission

CHAPTER VIIISTEPHEN AND THE HELLENISTS

In an attempt to find a path through the maze of problems associated with this section our summary will be divided into two distinct sections. The first will deal with Luke's use of this episode and its relation to the total structure of Acts. The second will consider criticisms of Luke's presentation and consequent attempts to reconstruct the course of events.

I The narrative according to Luke

The sudden, unexpected appearance of two groups within the Jerusalem Church in Acts 6:1 probably means that Luke is drawing on a source at this point.¹ We are not told the difference between the two groups apart from their names. It is clear that for Luke the Hellenists are Jews and not Gentiles, since according to Acts 10:2 Cornelius is the first Gentile convert. That Luke saw the Seven as Hellenists is probable though not certain. If he did, then the fact

1 Since previous to this, stress had been laid on the unity of the Church (Acts 1:14, 2:1, 4:32, 5:12). Also, several new words appear at this point, the most obvious being the pair 'Hebrews' and 'Hellenists'. Also, *μαθητης* occurs 28 times between 6:1-21:16, but not elsewhere. The Apostles are called 'the Twelve' only here (v2) and v12 gives the first reference to 'the people' (*ο λαος*) as opponents of the Church (contrast Acts 2:37, 5:13, 26). This so-called "Antioch source" is defended by Harnack ("Acts", pp199f), Jeremias (Z N W, 36, 1937, pp205f) and Bultmann ("Quellen", pp68-80). Others (Dupont, "Sources", pp62-72, Haenchen, pp308f, Schmithals, "James", pp30-41) think there was no such source. It is normally said to consist of Acts 6:1-8:4, 11:19-30, 12:25-14:28, 15:35-21:16 (Jeremias adds 9:1-30). There appear to be no good reasons for denying the connection between 8:4 and 11:19f in a pre-Lukan source - the important point for us at this stage - but how far it extends beyond 11:30 and whether it is correctly called the 'Antioch source' is not easy to say.

2 Contrast Cadbury, B C, V, pp59-74, which we shall consider later.

that Nicolaus is called a proselyte¹ and that the speech attributed to Stephen begins, "Brethren and fathers, hear me, The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham" confirms that Luke saw the Hellenists as Jews. The distinctive mark of the Hellenists is less clear² they may have been Greek-speaking, of Diaspora origin, 'hellenizers', that is, those who ape and propagated the Greek way of life, or any combination of these three.

The dispute between the Hebrews and Hellenists and the consequent institution of the Seven is not related because Luke has a particular interest in 'offices' or 'ranks' in the Church. He is not concerned to give the historical origins of the diaconate or presbytery,³ though⁴ the practices of his own day may have coloured his presentation.⁵ Luke includes 6:1-7 mainly in order to introduce Stephen and Philip and to show how they rose from a position of obscurity to one of prominence.

1 This is not meant to call attention to his place of origin (Reicke, "Glaube", p117, Grundmann, Z N W, 38, 1939, p57) or to imply that all the others were Jews (Wetter, A R W, 21, 1922, p412), rather, it means that the others were Jews by birth (so most commentators).

2 Blackmann, E T, 48, 1937, pp524-5 thinks that all the Hellenists were proselytes. But if so, why did Luke not simply call them proselytes? Moule, E T, 70, 1959, pp100f, thinks the Hellenists spoke only Greek and the Hebrews a Semitic language and Greek, thereby harmonizing Paul's use of Ἑβραῖος in Phil 3:5 with Luke's. This may be true, but cannot be proved.

3 Gore "Church", pp8f. Luke uses διακονία vv1,4 and διακονέω v2 in a non-technical sense, he does not use διάκονος, though his readers may have understood a reference to the diaconate of their day.

4 Farrer, "Ministry", pp138f. Luke knew of the office of elders and would have mentioned it if this had been its historical beginnings.

5 The Seven are parallel to the similar Jewish institution (S B, II, pp641f). There are Jewish parallels to the laying on of hands, whether done by the people or the Twelve (Daube, pp229f), so that Conzelmann (p44) may be wrong when he insists that Acts 6:1f is a witness only to the practices of Luke's day and not to those of the early Church.

1

in the early community This is already clear in 6 5 where Stephen² is singled out as a man "full of faith and the Holy Spirit " Accordingly, Stephen is presented both as an individual rather than as a representative of typical Hellenist views, and more as a representative of the whole Church than as a leader of a breakaway faction over against the Twelve and the Hebrews

Stephen's trial and death are closely paralleled to those of Jesus in Luke's Gospel Stephen is rejected by his own countrymen (Acts 6 9, cf Lk 4 16f), his vision of the Son of Man is parallel to Jesus' words at his trial (Acts 7 56, cf. Lk 22 69) as are his final prayers (Acts 7 59-60, cf Lk 23 34, 46) But there are also significant differences the charges against Stephen (Acts 7 11-13, 14, cf Mk 14 58, 15 29, Matt 26 61, 27 40) and the words about false witnesses (Acts 7 13, cf Mk 14 56 pars) use elements which are missing from Luke's account of Jesus' trial. It is unlikely that Luke transfers this material because it did not accord with his own and the early Church's attitude towards the Temple,³ since if this were so he could as easily have omitted it from

1 Stählin, p100, Haenchen, p219

2 Glombitza, Z N W , 53, 1962, pp238-44, points to the contradiction between Haenchen's interpretation of σοφία in v3 as 'worldly wisdom' and in v10 as 'religious knowledge and capacity' From the other uses of in Luke-Acts (Lk 2 40, 52, 11 49, 21 15) he singles out Lk 11 49 as giving Luke's own meaning of the word It refers not only to the wisdom of God in the Torah, but also to the wisdom of God in the Messiah, that is, men who have God's σοφία can see God's will in the O T and interpret it Messianically They are "Männern also, die den Zusammenhang von Alten und Neuen im Handeln Gottes richtig wahren "(p242) However, it may be that for Luke's use of σοφία , Lk 11 49 is the exception rather than the rule Nor is it clear how one gets from Lk 11 49 to the idea that this attribute signifies the ability to interpret the O T Messianically If Glombitza were correct, we would expect emphasis on the Messianic interpretation of the O T in Stephen's speech, whereas it is precisely this element which is conspicuous by its absence

3 Simon, pp23-6, Knox, "Jerusalem", p50 n10 Haenchen suggests that it

Stephen's as from Jesus' trial O'Neill is correct when he suggests that Luke was concerned with what he considered to be a genuinely false charge. He thinks that the charge was that Jesus, Stephen and Paul prophesied only the destruction of the Temple and not its rebuilding. In this way he explains the omission of the second half of Mark's version - "in three days I shall build another not made with hands" (Mk 14 58). At the same time, O'Neill thinks that Luke may be answering a charge¹ levelled at Christianity in general.

It is significant, however, that the only version of the Temple logion in Luke's Gospel (21 5-6) is not cast in the first person singular such as we find in Mk 14 58, 15 29, Matt 26 67, 27 40. In Lk 21 5-6 the destruction of the Temple is prophesied, but it is not said that Jesus will either destroy or rebuild it. It is foreseen as a historical² event of the future, divorced from the End events. Thus by the reference to false witnesses Luke is not asserting, as O'Neill thinks, that in fact Jesus claimed that he would rebuild as well as destroy the Temple, on the contrary, he is denying that Jesus claimed any³ connection at all with this event. According to Luke, Jesus merely

(cont) was because it would have been dangerous to use this material in Jesus' trial (p227, Conzelmann, p45), but why was it less dangerous in Acts than in the Gospel? Stählin, p102, suggests that Luke is avoiding doublets, but this explains neither the close parallels between Jesus and Stephen, nor the use of this material here rather than in the Gospel.¹ O'Neill, pp73-4.

² On the original form of the Temple logion see Bultmann, pp120f, Hahn, p37 n1, Lohmeyer, "Markus", pp326f.

³ There are various other suggestions of what the false witnesses refer to: it could be because Stephen did not disobey or disregard the Law (Conzelmann, p45), or because what Stephen said was not blasphemy (Wikenhauser, pp83, 87), or because he did not continually speak against the Law and Temple (Stählin, p102). As a Christian writer Luke probably saw all accusations which attacked the Church or its leaders as false. What is meant by blasphemy is unclear, by Law, it involved using the Divine name

prophesied the destruction of the Temple, he did not claim to be the instrument of that destruction or that the Temple would later be rebuilt. Clearly, Luke is exercising hindsight writing after A D 70, he knew that the Temple had been destroyed without any personal intervention by Jesus and that it had not been rebuilt, so he adjusted his material accordingly. Thus we can see this as part of Luke's reinterpretation of the significance of the destruction of Jerusalem (cf Lk 19 41-4, 21 20-4.)

The second part of the accusation against Stephen, that he "will change the customs which Moses delivered to us", is obscure. It may refer to the introduction of a new interpretation of the Torah¹ or to a rejection of circumcision². Whatever it was, Luke makes it clear in ch 7 that it was a false charge and that it was the Jews and not the Christians who were disobedient to the Law.

Stephen's speech poses two major problems. The first is that there is no obvious connection between the charges against him and his speech,³ and the second is that when the speech finally does touch upon the accusations (vv35f)⁴ it appears to confirm rather than to deny them. We shall discuss the latter point first, at the same time assuming that at least part of the speech is related in some way to the charges in 6 11.

1 Hanson, p93

2 Haenchen, p227

3 Dibelius, p167 "The irrelevance of most of this speech has for long been the problem of exegesis "

4 Caird, "Apostolic Age", p85 Luke calls them false witnesses " but at once contradicts himself by putting into the mouth of Stephen a speech that goes far to substantiate the charge on which he was indicted "

The apocalyptic view in 6 14 is neither mentioned nor refuted in the speech. On the contrary, the whole speech is concerned with Israel's past and not with apocalyptic predictions of the future. The speech is clearly, therefore, not a direct rebuttal of the charges. Yet it is difficult to think that the charges, whether Luke created or received them, bear no relation to the speech. As we shall see, there is a connection, though only a loose one.

The sections most directly related to the question of the Law are vv35-40 and 50-53. They do not pick up the question of 'changing the customs of Moses' (6 12), but do deny that Stephen and the Church were disobedient to the Law. This is done both subtly by the amount of space devoted to a veneration of Moses and more bluntly by turning the charges back on the Jews themselves, showing that from the beginning they received the Law and did not keep it. Their disobedience culminated in the rejection and execution of Jesus (v52). Thus the characteristic disobedience of the Jews from Moses until the present, puts them in no position to sit in judgement on Stephen. And "there is no suggestion in the speech that the Jewish charge of antinomianism is justified."

1 Nor is it a typical martyr's speech. Cf Haenchen, p239, Dibelius, p169, Mundle Z N W, 20, 1921, pp133f.

2 O'Neill, p73, "Since Luke formulated the charge he must have believed that the speech answered it."

3 Schmithals, "James", p20 thinks the charge that Stephen spoke against the Temple and the Law is pre-Lukan.

4 Klajn, N T S, 4, 1957, pp25-31, thinks Stephen distinguished two groups in Israel's history, 'our fathers' and 'your fathers'. For saying that the one was obedient and the other not Stephen is put to death. However, this interpretation is based on the poorly attested reading 'your fathers' in 7 39 which, even if original, does not justify the thoroughgoing division between the two groups in the rest of the speech.

5 O'Neill, p77, similarly Conzelmann, p45, Stählin, p111, Wikenhauser, p87, Easton, "Early Christianity", p117.

Opinions vary on how we are to interpret the section on the Temple and its cult in vv41-50. It is unlikely that Stephen is radically rejecting the sacrificial cult as idolatrous in vv41-3¹. Luke probably took this section to be a condemnation not of the cult per se, but of a wayward people who preferred the worship of the creature to the Creator. The point is not so much that God did not require sacrifice, but that the sacrifice he desired was offered to other gods². In vv45-50³ Simon finds an "absolute and unrestricted opposition to the Temple". Although this statement is a little extreme, there is nevertheless a direct contrast in these verses between the tabernacle which is of Divine origin and the Temple which is made with hands⁴. This amounts to a denial of the validity of the Temple as the exclusive confine of

1 As, for example, Simon thinks (pp45f) his view is based mainly on a radically anti-cultic interpretation of the quotation from Am 5 25-7 LXX (on the differences between the LXX and the Hebrew see Haenchen, p 235 n3). Simon thinks this shows that sacrifice, like the Temple itself, was never desired by God, it had its origin not in the will of God but in the wilful disobedience of man. But, as Conzelmann notes (p49), this interpretation of the quotation does not fit very well with either v42a or v44. Easton (op cit, p118) thinks that Stephen admits the charges against him, but tries to show that his views were not in the least unorthodox.

2 Stählin, pp111-112, Wikenhauser, p87, Haenchen, p236. This may not, of course, have been the original meaning of the prophecy.

3 Simon, p53. He thinks there is a direct contrast between the two figures David and Solomon and the buildings each represents. However, to get this he has to fill out the few verses in Acts with Nathan's prophecy in II Sam 7, and he also omits to notice that Solomon is not condemned directly in vv46-7, but only implicitly in vv48-9 (the quotation from Is 66 1 LXX).

4 It is apparently overlooked that the tabernacle was also made with hands. The language used here, especially the word *χειροποιήτος*, was used by Hellenistic Judaism when attacking pagan idolatry, so that it is particularly striking when used of the Jewish Temple. See Simon, pp86f, Conzelmann, p50, and Gärtner, pp211f, who traces the O I' background.

God's presence and activity In other words it is an attack on the fundamental position of the Temple in the Judaism of that time This being so, we must conclude that the charge that Stephen spoke "against this holy place" (6 13) is justified, while the charge that he had said that "Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place" (6 14) has no foundation His attack on the Temple is based not on apocalyptic predictions, but on an ^aanalysis and reinterpretation of its historical origins, supported by quotations from the Old Testament itself Perhaps Luke, writing after A D 70, is saying that even if the Temple is destroyed it is of no matter, since from the beginning God has never shared Israel's excessive veneration for it Since it has no great value, its destruction is no tragedy This kind of view is probably, therefore, a 'post eventum' rationale of the events of A D 70

We can conclude, therefore, that there is at least a general thematic connection between the charges brought against Stephen and his speech in vv35f Both charges are indirectly denied, but that concerning the Temple is seen to be partially justified But what of vv2-34 ? How are they related to Stephen's situation ? There is much justification for Dibelius' remark that "From 7 2-34 the point of the speech is not obvious at all, we are simply given an account of the history of Israel " ¹ This same fact has inspired commentators to any number of ingenious interpretations For some, the clue lies in typological exegesis, for in this way the speech can be seen to be ² packed with allusions to Christ, but this kind of approach is as

1 Dibelius, p167

2 Hanson, pp94-102, also in Theol , 50, 1947, pp142-5, Williams, pp104-110, and contrast Conzelmann, p51

ingenious as it is unconvincing. The only reference to Christ, apart from 7 52, is 7 37, other than this, typology is present only in the sense that the treatment of Jesus was typical of the way Israel had always treated its leaders and prophets.

In an original and interesting piece of exegesis, Dahl has argued that 7 2-34 " contains a philosophy or rather a 'theology of history',¹ dominated by the motif of prophecy and fulfilment " Dahl is right in emphasizing the prophecy-fulfilment theme as the key to this section he notes the prominence given to the quotation of Gen 15 13-14 in Acts 7 6-7, and points out how the fulfilment of this promise is related to the stories of Joseph (7 9-16), Moses (7 20-36) and finally Joshua (7 45). But his exegesis of 7 46-50, though attractive, breaks down² on a vital point and destroys his case for a unified theme throughout the speech.

When it becomes difficult to view this section as relevant to the charges, one may simply admit with Haenchen that " hier wird einfach die heilige Geschichte erzählt, ohne ein anderes Thema als diese Geschichte " and conclude that it is irrelevant to the situation³

1 Dahl, "Abraham", pp142-8, here p147

2 Dahl notes the alteration of Gen 15 14b in Acts 7 7b - " and afterwards they shall come out and worship me in this place" ie the goal of the Exodus is the worship of God not simply the conquest of Canaan. Joshua conquers Canaan, bringing the tabernacle with him, and eventually Solomon builds a Temple. This may appear to have fulfilled the promise to Abraham, but no, "The Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands " Dahl interprets this by analogy with Heb 4 3-11 if Solomon's Temple had been the fulfilment of David's prayer and the promise to Abraham, then the prophet would not have spoken as he did in Is 66 1f. The fulfilment of the promise to Abraham was not with Solomon, but with the "Temple not made with hands", ie Christ and his Church. But Acts 7 46-50 cannot, without much reading between the lines, be interpreted by analogy with Heb 4. Hanson, *ibid*, and Gärtner, pp208f, also see a reference to Christ in "The Temple

of Stephen. One might argue that it is a sort of "captatio benevolentiae", but it is difficult to avoid the impression that had this really been Stephen's speech he would soon have been interrupted and told to keep to the point'

Consequently, many commentators have tried to interpret this section from the situation of Luke rather than that of Stephen. For some it is a prefigurement of the Gentile mission the speech is "a theoretical justification in advance for Christianity's turning away from the Jews to the Gentiles, made in terms of the stubbornness of the Jews. This is, from the point of view of the author of Acts, the main purpose of the speech"¹ One might argue that this is a natural conclusion to draw since, according to Luke, one of the main results of Stephen's death and the ensuing persecution was the start of the Gentile mission. But in fact the speech gives no hint of a turning to the Gentiles.² It may be implied, but it is not stated. Certainly, the condemnation of the Jews in 7:51-3 is parallel to the key passages in Acts 13:46, 18:6 and 28:28. But in each of these it is expressly concluded that the Jews' rebellion leads to the Gentile mission, while in Acts 7 this is not the case. Nor is the theme of God's revelation

(cont) not made with hands"

3 (from p289) Haenchen, p239, Dibelius, pp167-8, Wikenhauser, p91

1 Overbeck (quoted by J Weiss, "Absicht", who in turn is quoted by O'Neill, p83), cf Stählin, W Manson, "Hebrews", pp31f

2 Hanson, p101, suggests that Acts 7:45 should be translated, "when he (Jesus/Joshua) gained possession of the Gentiles", which would then give a definite reference to the Gentile mission in the speech

to his people outside the Promised Land a prefigurement of his intention to turn to the Gentiles,¹ since the promise (and fulfilment) of possession of the Holy Land is taken for granted in Acts 7 Here we should distinguish between the content of the speech itself and its position, together with the Stephen-episode as a whole, within the total structure of Acts Thus Dibelius is correct when he says that the speech "inaugurates that section of Acts (ch 6-12) which portrays the progress of the gospel to the Gentile world",² for this is its function within the framework of Acts But Hanson, when speaking about the content of the speech, is also correct when he notes "that the speech does not so much prepare us for the movement of the Church's mission towards the Gentiles as for its movement away from the Jews "³ It is to this last point which some refer for the main theme of vv2-34,⁴ and if we were to look for a unified theme for the whole of the speech it would be here, since this theme most naturally includes vv2-34 Even so, it is better to speak of a unified complex of interrelated themes than of a single theme These are the faithfulness of God in keeping his promises, the constant disobedience of the Jews, who have rejected his Law, prophets and leaders, and the steady stream of individuals who, over against the mass of Jews, remain righteous - Joseph, Moses, the⁵

1 Munck, pp222-4

2 Dibelius, p169

3 Hanson, p102

4 Bauernfeind, p110

5 Reicke, "Glaube", p141, sees Joseph as the type of a guiltless sufferer, but as Conzelmann (p47) notes, it is precisely Joseph's sufferings which are passed over here and the emphasis is more on the fact that "Gott das Heil gegen menschliche Warscheinlichkeit durchföhrt "

prophets, Jesus and Stephen This theme of the Jews "who always rebel against the Holy Spirit"(v51) has as its corollary later in Acts a turning to the Gentiles But this corollary is not specifically drawn out here

Despite the views attributed to Stephen in his speech, it does not appear that even these were sufficient to ensure his condemnation and death The climax is reached in 7 56, when he claims to see the Son of Man, so that like his Master before him, he provides the final provocation which leads to his death In the end it is not his attitude to the Law and Temple, but his confession of Christ which, in Luke's view, is the final cause of his death

2

How Stephen died is not clear There seems to be some confusion between a legal trial before the Sanhedrin and a public lynching This has led some to suppose that Luke is combining two sources, and others to think either that Luke's source had an account of a public lynching which he has re-shaped as a formal trial or vice versa If the original version told of a trial by the Sanhedrin, there remains the problem of whether they had the power of capital punishment Also, many of the

3

4

5

6

1 Haenchen, pp240-1, emphasizes how Luke sees Stephen's death within the wider context of the rejection and murder of the prophets (which is in itself partially a late Jewish legend, cf B C ,IV, pp82f)

2 Haenchen, p246, thinks the vision in 7 56 shows that "die Christen sind vor Gott im Recht und der Hoherat ist auf dem Weg der Gottesfeindschaft "

3 B C ,II, pp148f

4 Haenchen, pp225-6, cf Conzelmann, p45

5 Loisy, "Actes", p308

6 This difficulty is avoided by (a) simply asserting that they did have such powers (b) Claiming that these events occurred during an inter-regnum between two procurators, probably in A D 36-7, after Pilate's departure In the absence of a procurator the Sanhedrin assumed full judicial powers So Knox, "Jerusalem", pp42-5, 52-4 (c) Assuming that the Sanhedrin had some special arrangement with the Romans with regard to the persecution of Christians So Stählin, p115

details of Stephen's death do not fit the usual Jewish process of legal stoning¹ However, there may not be any need to speak in terms of sources, for the confusion may have arisen out of the event itself It is not inconceivable that Stephen was forced into defending himself before the Sanhedrin They may have indicted him, possibly with a view to securing a judgement on him from the procurator, when the frenzied crowds took matters into their own hands, dragged Stephen out and publicly lynched him - an action which the Sanhedrin had no good reason to halt, as long as it did not cause too much of a public disturbance It is possible, therefore, that we need not think of two sources, or of Luke imposing his own view on a source with another view, the confusion may reflect the actual course of events

The immediate result of Stephen's death is a persecution of the whole Church Acts 8 1 says the whole Church was scattered, except the Apostles Luke makes it clear by his use of *πάντες* in 8 1 that Stephen was a representative of the whole Church and not just of a Hellenist faction This does not mean that Luke thought that the whole Church agreed with Stephen's views, this would not have been necessary for them to become victims of the persecution The instigator of this persecution was Paul, who develops quickly from a bystander at Stephen's death to the leader of the opposition to the Church²

Finally, we must note how brilliantly Luke has woven this episode into the total structure of his work First, it forms a climax to ch 1-5

1 Haenchen, pp242-250

2 Klein, pp114-120, who combines some acute linguistic observations with an inability to distinguish literary artistry from serious theological intent

in 4 17,21 the Christians receive a mere warning, in 5 40 a flogging and, finally, in ch6-8 one of them is put to death Ch 7 is also the climax to a progressive condemnation of the Jews 2 23 merely mentions their guilt and 3 23 excuses it as ignorance, in 4 12 Jesus' claim is formulated more exclusively, and in 5 29 the Apostles claim that they obey God rather than men (the Jews), finally, ch 7 - in a long and pessimistic survey of Israel's history - shows how the Jews' rebellion and disobedience has been a constant factor in their relations with God Secondly, a connection is made forwards, for the persecution becomes the immediate cause of the Church extending its frontiers to Samaria (8 4 referring back to 8 1) and to the ends of the earth (11 19 referring back to 8 1) The Church's mission grows from the persecution which tried to destroy it Moreover, Luke takes the opportunity to introduce Paul, whose conversion and central role in the Gentile mission we will later relate His role as a violent persecutor contrasts vividly with his later role as the Church's chief missionary Thirdly, by the phrase "except the Apostles" in 8 1 Luke maintains one of his most consistent themes in the early chapters of Acts, namely the role of Jerusalem as the headquarters of Christianity from which all its various developments emanate Thus he prepares not only for the expansion of the Church to include Samaritans and Gentiles, but also for the Apostolic sanction which makes this expansion valid (8 14, 11 22) Thus we can say that Luke's handling of this episode is masterly He has seen and utilized to the full all the possibilities of this episode in its relation to the events which both precede and follow it Luke the artist has been highly successful, but has he neglected the role

of Luke the historian ?

II Inconsistencies and Reconstruction

The first and most pressing problem is to define the terms Ελληνιστής and Εβραῖος. In a celebrated essay Cadbury¹ argued that on linguistic grounds we must understand 'Ελληνιστής as a synonym for 'Ελλην, that is, it refers to Gentiles and not, as Luke thought, to Jews. In contrast to this, the majority of modern scholars maintain that the reference is to Jews, though they are not always agreed on the exact distinction between the Hellenists and² Hebrews. Some consider the distinction to be basically linguistic, while others add to this a distinction in origin: the Hebrews were Pales-³tinian and the Hellenists Diaspora Jews. Others argue that while differences of language and origin may be incidentally included, the basic meaning of 'Hellenist' is one who is committed to the Greek way of life as a whole, a word which could be applied to Jew and Greek alike,⁴ depending on the word with which it is contrasted.

How are we to assess these views ? Cadbury starts from Acts 11 20, arguing that only here do we find a decisive definition of 'Ελληνιστής. He takes 'Ελληνιστάς as the original reading and argues that in contrast to 'Ιουδαίους (v19) it must mean 'Gentiles'. Thus for

1 Cadbury, B C, V, pp59f, Windisch, art 'Ελλην T W N T, II, pp 511-2. Cadbury thinks that Luke also saw them as Gentiles.

2 Munck, pp218-21.

3 Haenchen, p214, Conzelmann, p43, Stählin, p97, Wikenhauser, p78, Hanson p89, Williams, p95, Goppelt, pp35-6, J Weiss, "Christianity", pp165f.

4 Simon, pp9-15, Schmithals, "James", pp26-7, Wetter, art cit, pp410f.

Luke Ἑλληνιστάς = Ἕλληνας and Ἑβραίου = Ἰουδαίου

A glance through the lexicons shows that such as it is, the evidence¹ is in favour of Cadbury's view. Apart from Acts, the other occurrences of Ἑλληνιστής are late, but none of them support a purely linguistic interpretation and most of them could be said to support Cadbury's view.² The same can be said for Ἑβραῖος, very little evidence supports a purely linguistic interpretation, its normal usage showing it to be synonymous with Ἰουδαῖος.³ It is possible that Luke was either⁴ unaware of the significance of the distinction or deliberately covered it up, since it did not fit in with his view of the progression of the Gentile mission.⁵

However, despite this evidence - and it must be said that Cadbury makes the most of the evidence for his view - there remain both linguistic and historical problems. Acts 11 20 is ambiguous if Ἑλληνιστάς is taken as the original reading, on the grounds of it being the "lectio difficilior", we would then have to assume that for Luke at least, who is our earliest witness to its usage, the word referred variously to

1 Philo, De Con Ling, 129, is ambiguous, Chrys Hom 14 (on Acts 6 1) is no more than an inspired guess, and Test Sal 6 8 is also confused by a textual variation between Ἑλληνιστάς and Ἕλληνας. A difference of language is historically possible (S B, II, pp 448f) and if other reasons made it necessary, it might be argued that Ἑλληνιστής arose as a definition of language as a result of a popular misconception that the two endings -ιστί and -ιστής were synonymous.

2 Philostorgius, H E, 7 1, Sozomenos, H E, 3 17, 5 16, 7 15. The variant reading in Acts 11 20 may reveal that its perpetrator was unaware of any difference between the two words, but there are other explanations of this.

3 II Cor 11 22, Phil 3 5, Eus H E, II 4 2, Praep Ev, XIII 11 2.

4 The Greek names of the Seven is possible support, though Jews also had Greek names. Luke speaks of other Greek-speaking Jews without calling them Hellenists, but this name may have been restricted to Jerusalem.

5 Cadbury argues against this by introducing Gentiles as early on as Pentecost (see above, ch VII).

Jews and Greeks according to the context For we saw that in 6 1f Luke sees the Hellenists as Jews, whereas in view of Ἰουδαίους (11 19) the reference in 11 20 must be to Gentiles It is difficult, therefore, to think that Luke originally wrote Ἑλληνιστάς in 11 20 and it is probable that ¹Ἕλληνας is the more original reading The reading Ἑλληνιστάς may be an attempt to avoid the harsh juxtaposition of vv19 and 20 or possibly to avoid diminishing the importance of Peter as the inaugurator of the Gentile mission ²Left only with 6 1 and 9 29 there is nothing to suggest that the reference is to Gentiles Both references are explicable as being to Jews - Christian Jews in 6 1f and non-Christian Jews in 9 29 It is improbable historically that there was a separate Gentile Church in Jerusalem at this time, or even that there were sufficient Gentiles there for some of their number to form ³such an important faction in the Christian community Further, it involves taking two words as synonymous whose linguistic roots are, strictly speaking, separate ⁴Ἑλληνιστής is based on the verb ἑλληνίζω ⁵, which means to live like a Greek, to simulate their customs and culture Moreover, if the reference to Nicolaus in 6 5 as a proselyte is taken to imply that the rest of the Seven were Gentiles, it is difficult to understand why he is associated with them and not with the Hebrew faction

1 Haenchen, p309, Conzelmann, p67, Stählin, p162

2 Since the reference of 11 19-20 is to a time before the events of Acts 8-10 Haenchen, ibid, Moule, art cit, p100

3 Schmithals, "James", pp20-1, cf Jeremias, "Jerusalem", I, pp66-82

4 Cadbury (art cit, p70) draws a parallel with the use of Greek and Semitic spellings in Ἱεροσόλυμα - Ἱερουσαλημ and φοβούμενοι - σεβόμενοι, but these are not true parallels to the pair Ἕλληνας - Ἑλληνιστάς, neither of which is Semitic

5 The linguistic arguments are further confused by the fact that the opposite of Ἑλληνιστής should be Ἑβραϊστής and not Ἑβραῖος

in the Church Further, if the Hellenists were Gentiles, it is odd that when driven out of Jerusalem they preached at first only to Jews (11 19)

Thus almost all the snippets of evidence we can glean from Acts suggest that the Hellenists in Jerusalem were Jews, which in turn may seem to produce a tension with the later linguistic evidence which uses the word of Gentiles However, if we resort to the root form $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$, most of the evidence can be explained Given the basic meaning "to live like a Greek", we can argue that the reference of the word $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ is only further defined by its context If we read $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ in 11 20 then Luke is our first witness of this variable usage For in 9 29 it probably refers to Diaspora Jews as opposed to Palestinian Jews, whereas in 11 20 the reference is to Greeks as opposed to Jews Thus it is that some later writers call Greeks, who remain pagan and refuse Christianity, 'Hellenists' as opposed to 'Christians'¹ In contrast, $\epsilon\beta\rho\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ "is the name of the genuine Jew who is aware of his intimate bond with the traditions of his fathers, his national and Palestinian home, even though he speaks the Greek language"² Therefore, neither word is connected essentially with either place of origin or language, but with an attitude to and way of life

When we turn to the rest of the narrative we find several alleged inconsistencies The dispute over the widows' charity is in itself understandable Although Luke may be exaggerating when he gives the

¹ This would also explain the evidence from Philostorgius and Sozomenos used by Cadbury

² Schmithals, p26 ('James')

numbers by which the Church increased (2 41,47, 4 4, 5 14, 6 1), it is quite feasible that a sizeable increase in membership occurred and it put considerable strain on the primitive economy of the Church

The Seven who are chosen to deal with this problem all have Greek names, and this has led to the assumption¹ that they were all members, if not leaders, of the Hellenist section of the Church. If this is so then it is argued that it is inconceivable that the twelve and the rest of the Hebrews would have allowed seven members, and still less leaders, of the disgruntled faction to take over the administration of charity for the whole community.² This depends, however, on the size of the Hellenist faction, for if they were in the majority and it was the community who made the decision, the result may have been quite natural. Besides it would be a shrewd tactical move by the Hebrews to make such an appointment, for it would channel the energies of the Hellenists' leaders into an area where they would be well out of harms way.³

A further oddity is that after Luke has specifically said that the Seven were appointed to "serve tables", in order that the Twelve can be free to devote themselves 'to prayer and to the ministry of the word', he immediately goes on to describe Stephen as a preacher (6 9,11, 13-14) and miracle worker (6 8). One could argue that once they had been given a prominent position as leaders, the Seven developed other

1 Stählin, p99, Haenchen, pp219f, Conzelmann, pp43-4, Simon, p6, Knox, "Jerusalem", pp40f, Schmithals, "James", p7. Wikenhauser, p79 challenges this assumption.

2 Simon, ibid, Schmithals, ibid.

3 Moule, art cit, p101, thinks it was either "a generous gesture" by the Church or that it was assumed that care for the Hebrew widows would continue smoothly as before. Knox, "Jerusalem", p49 n5, thinks the Seven were appointed to deal only with the Hellenist widows.

1

latent gifts, but it is more likely that we should take this as a hint that the Seven were already leaders of the Hellenists before their appointment by the Twelve. The fact that they were already recognized leaders helps to explain why only members of one section were chosen to act on behalf of the whole community.

We turn now to the difficult verse in 8 1, the rewriting of which is the basis of most attempts to reconstruct the actual events behind Acts 6 1-8 4. Luke says that the whole of the Jerusalem Church was persecuted as a result of Stephen's death and that they all dispersed into Judea and Samaria, apart from the Apostles. This account is clearly suspect, for if a Church is persecuted one expects the leaders to be attacked first, and it is difficult to think that they alone remained
2
inviolable. Further, the hints that we have later in Acts seem to contradict this picture. In 9 26 it is said that there were disciples in Jerusalem, according to 9 31 the Church in Judea and Samaria is happily united and living peacefully, and in 11 1-2 it is implied that more than the Twelve were in Jerusalem. Then in 11 19-20 we read that those who were scattered by the persecution were preaching far and wide in the Diaspora. Moreover, those who are specifically mentioned as preaching are Hellenists: Philip (8 4f) and "the men of Cyprus and Cyrene" (11 20).

1 Knox, "Jerusalem", pp 39f. Haenchen, *ibid*, may be right in thinking that Luke is reluctant to portray the Hellenist leaders as preachers and missionaries in Jerusalem, since this would usurp the role of the Twelve, but it should not be overlooked that Stephen is portrayed as a preacher.
2 Bruce, p 181, and Caird, "Apostolic Age", p 187, think the Twelve remained out of a sense of duty. But one might argue that their duty was with their community, which was scattered. Moule (*art cit*, p 101) supposes that being Galileans, the Twelve may not have joined a synagogue and would therefore have been unnoticed, since the attacks would have been mainly against the renegades from within a community. But if so, why is it that the Twelve are persecuted in the earlier chapters of Acts?

This has led to the almost universal assumption that 8 1b is no more than a "redactional expedient"¹ of Luke to preserve the continuity of the Mother Church at Jerusalem. If this is so, there are various possibilities open to us.

One might argue that in fact there was no persecution in Jerusalem immediately after Stephen's death and, more particularly, that Paul had no part in it. However, it is not clear that Galatians does conflict with Acts at this point to the extent which Haenchen,² for example, supposes. Certainly, there is no warrant for Caird's view that the phrase *τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ* Gal 1 13 means the "Church at Jerusalem", but it could nevertheless be a reference to the events described in Acts 8 1f, 9 1f. It is argued against this that Gal 1 22 excludes persecution activity by Paul in Jerusalem. However, it may be that we should distinguish between Jerusalem and Judea,⁴ or that we should distinguish between Paul's pre- and post-conversion activity.⁵ Even if we include Jerusalem in Gal 1 22, it is not certain that Paul's persecution activity brought him face to face with the Churches. Thus while there are ambiguities, Gal 1 22 is not incompatible with persecution activity of Paul in Jerusalem. And even if Paul was not involved, there is no good reason

1 J Weiss, "Christianity", p170 - and so most writers

2 Haenchen, pp248-9, Stählin, p118

3 Caird, "Apostolic Age", p87

4 Lightfoot, "Galatians", p86. Schlier, "Gal", p63, says the question cannot be settled, but thinks that while Paul was known at least in Jerusalem, he was not known to the Judean Church as a whole.

5 Altheus, "Gal", p14, that is, the Christian Paul was not known to the Judean Church.

6 Burton, "Galatians", pp63-4. If *τῷ προσώπῳ* means 'personally' rather than 'by sight' (so Schlier, *ibid*), and if we recognize that Paul must have had a gang of helpers for the activity described in Acts 8 1f, then Burton's suggestion has some force.

to doubt that the Church was persecuted at this time

Alternatively, we could suppose that not only the Church but also most, if not all, of the Apostles fled at this time. Certainly, we have¹ no evidence for a mass exodus from Jerusalem at this time, but it might explain, for example, how it was that not so long after the leadership of the Jerusalem community passed into the hands of James. If all or most of the Apostles had gone and James had remained, he could easily² have usurped the position of Peter. It might also explain why when Paul went to Jerusalem a few years after his conversion he saw only³ Peter and James. But this solution is improbable, for if we can take Gal 1 11f as to some extent parallel to Acts, then Gal 1 17 implies that immediately after Paul's conversion the Apostles were still in⁴ Jerusalem.

The only other solution, which is taken by the majority of scholars, is to assume that it was only the Hellenists and their⁵ leaders who were persecuted and subsequently scattered, whereas the

1 Schmithals, "James", p19

2 Cf Acts 9 31f, where Peter is portrayed as travelling around preaching and healing outside Jerusalem

3 Gal 1 18-19 does not necessarily imply that of the Twelve only Peter was present in Jerusalem, but it is difficult to understand why, if they were there, Paul did not see them

4 This view would also involve either dating the Stephen-episode much later than Luke does, or drastically readjusting the chronology of Acts - at least up till ch15 - for which there is very little evidence

5 We could, of course, dispense with the notion of a persecution altogether and simply assume that the Hellenists scattered because they feared that they would suffer the same fate as Stephen if they stayed in Jerusalem. If there was a persecution and if Paul was involved in it, then it would be natural that he, a Hebrew (Phil 3 5), should persecute the Hellenist and not the Hebrew section of the Church

Twelve and the Hebrews remained in Jerusalem. The fact that it is one of the Hellenists, Stephen, who is killed - whereas earlier the Apostles had escaped with warnings and floggings - and the fact that the preaching that is a result of the persecution is apparently done by Hellenists (8 4f, 11 19f), supports this view.

However, if we take this view, we cannot stop here, for we are then led to suspect that behind Acts 6-8 there lies a deeper rift between the Hellenists and Hebrews than a mere dissatisfaction over the administration of the widows' charity. ² Otherwise it is difficult to explain why one group incensed the Jews sufficiently for them to react with murder and persecution, while the other group, both before and after this episode, melted into their Jewish background and remained relatively undisturbed. What was the distinctive viewpoint of the Hellenists and where did it and they originate?

Traditionally, one has looked to Luke's account to provide an answer to these questions. Clearly, we are looking for something which

1 We cannot exclude the possibility that some Hebrews were caught up in the general melee, fled into Judea and Samaria, and either returned to Jerusalem soon after or settled elsewhere. The Hellenists on the other hand went further afield into Diaspora Judaism and eventually to the Gentiles. We need not assume, as Schmithals ("James", pp32f) does, that Luke was aware of a deep rift in the Church, but preferred to cover it up. We have to distinguish carefully between a deliberate attempt to hide unpleasant facts and an honest attempt to unravel what went on in the early Church. Luke seems to be more concerned with the latter than with the former. The form of the narrative in Acts 6 1-8 4 is as it is, because this was the only way he could explain the position of the narrative in the history of the early Church.

2 The dispute in 6 1f may, therefore, be symptomatic of the deeper rift, which may have led to a cooling off of relations between the two groups and a subsequent neglect of the Hellenist widows.

was both distinctive to the Hellenists and abhorrent to the Jews Haen-
 chen, in the first edition of his commentary,¹ suggested that Luke was
 basically correct to see the peculiarity of the Hellenists' teaching
 in their attitude to the Temple and the Law What Luke ascribes to
 false witnesses is probably what the Hellenists actually taught,² namely
 that Jesus would destroy the Temple and change the Mosaic customs This³
 view has been disputed and Haenchen himself has abandoned it in favour⁴
 of another⁵ The objections to it are set out by Schmithals⁶ First, any
 Jew could announce the abolition of the Temple at the End time Moreover,
 it was not uncommon in Judaism lightly to regard the Temple and its
 cult Schmithals refers to the Old Testament (I Kings 8 27, Ps 40 6,
 50 8f, 51 7, Is 1 11, 66 1f, Jer 7 21f, Hos 6 6, Mic 6 6-8), to the
 attitude of Qumran and the Samaritans, to a passage from Justin (Dial
 117 2) and to the fact that even though the early Christian community
 gathered in the Temple, Luke does not say that they joined in the
 sacrificial worship Secondly, it was not uncommon to ignore or dispute
 individual regulations of the Mosaic Law The "poor of the land" and⁷

1 10th edition of the Meyer commentary, 1956, p226

2 Luke's view that it was a confession of Christ which caused Stephen's death is unlikely to be correct It may have been a contributory cause, but on its own it would not have caused his death

3 Schmithals "James", p20, thinks that in 6 14 Luke has given a more concrete form to the general accusation that Stephen spoke against the Temple and Law

4 By Knox, "Jerusalem", p50 n10, but especially by Klein in his review of Haenchen's commentary in Z K G, 68, 1957, p368

5 14th edition of the Meyer commentary 1965, pp221f

6 Schmithals, "James", pp21-2

7 S B, II, p495, cf Jn 7 49

¹
Diaspora Jews were not strictly obedient to the Law, but they were not persecuted or killed on that account "If a certain laxity in observing or esteeming the Law had brought Stephen to his death, it would have been consistent to depopulate half Palestine "²

It is true that ³6 14, whether we take it at its face value as an apocalyptic prophecy or whether we see in it a hint that Stephen himself disputed individual regulations of the Law, would not in itself be sufficiently unorthodox to excite violent opposition. If it was a dispute over the Law which led to Stephen's death, we must assume that the disagreement was greater than a mere squabbling over details. Stephen and the Hellenists must have challenged orthodox Judaism on a sensitive and fundamental point. When we turn to Stephen's speech we are disappointed, for there is no hint in it of an unorthodox or radical critique of the Law. The summary of Israel's past, though concluding on an unusually pessimistic note, is not unparalleled. Such summaries were⁴ frequently made, though as a rule they concluded with a call to repentance and an emphasis on God's continuing love.

Klein suggests, therefore, that we must read back into ch6-8 the situation of 11 19f. The scattered Hellenists preached to the Gentiles in Antioch and we must assume that this approach to the Gentiles was not hampered by demanding their submission to the Law. Accordingly, Klein sees " in their avowal of a mission to the Gentiles unfettered by

1 S B ,I,pp106f,362f, III pp79f

2 Schmithals,"James",p22

3 Davies,"Sermon",pp156f, has collected the Jewish material for this view

4 I Sam 12 6-15, Ps 78, 106, Jer 2, Ez 20, Neh 9, IQs 1 21-3, cf Acts 13 17f

the Law their fundamental heresy in Jewish and Hebrew Christian' eyes "¹
 The difficulty with this view is that the problem of the Gentile mission,
 while at home in the Diaspora, is unlikely to have arisen at this stage
 in Jerusalem. Moreover, we know from Gal 2 1f that Paul's Law-free
 Gentile mission was recognized by the Church in Jerusalem.² Further,
 unless we regard the whole of the speech in ch7 as Lukan, we can note
 that there is no hint here of a mission to the Gentiles. Schmithals,
 having rejected Klein's view, goes on to suggest an even more radical
 viewpoint for Stephen and the Hellenists. It was not simply a question
 of a Law-free Gentile mission, but that they "³ declared the Law as
 a whole, including circumcision, to be abolished both for Jews and for
 Jewish Christians, as Paul also did "³ If this were true, it would cer-
 tainly explain the violent reaction of both the Jews and the Jewish
 Christians'.⁴ But apart from the dubious nature of the last phrase in
 Schmithals' assertion, he can give no convincing explanation of either
 where and why such radical antinomianism originated or how it came to
 be propounded in Jerusalem.⁵

1 Klein, art cit, p362, quoted in Schmithals, "James", p25

2 Schmithals, ibid, adds a further criticism of Klein. Why should a Jew be concerned when the Jewish Law was not imposed on a Gentile who became a Christian? But the force of this point is considerably diminished when we consider that at this stage Christianity in Jerusalem, in practice if not in belief, was still intimately bound up with Judaism, so that joining the Church involved becoming a part of Judaism. Also, even in Antioch, which was probably open to more liberal influences than Jerusalem, problems of table fellowship between Jews and Christians could still arise.

3 Schmithals, "James", p25

4 As Schmithals notes, such views would provoke violent political as well as religious reaction. The Law was the basis of their national existence and suppression of such antinomianism would have been "an absolutely necessary act of national and religious self-defence" (p26)

5 Schmithals has to admit that the Hellenists originated outside Jerusalem. He thinks that early on the gospel was spread widely and quickly

This being so, can we find any other source for what seems to have been "einer grossen Freiheit gegenüber dem Gesetz?"¹ Haenchen suggests that the source of the Hellenists' views was the teaching and practice of Jesus, and that the Hellenists remained more faithful to Jesus' view than the Hebrews. The problem with this view, if we assume that the Hellenists had interpreted Jesus correctly and had not perverted his teaching, is that while Jesus claimed an authority which at times appears to usurp the position of the Law (cf Mk 3 1-6, 10 21, 2 1-12, Matt 5 21f), as a rule his interpretation of the Law, though radical,² remains within the scope of the scribal discussion of it. Even so, it does seem that it is here, if anywhere, that we shall find the source of the Hellenists' views. Perhaps they overemphasized one side of the delicate balance in Jesus' teaching between obedience to and criticism of the Law. But what this freedom involved and how radical their antinomianism was is impossible to say.

Can we find any additional clues in their attitude to the Temple? Here we meet with a further difficulty, for if the views imputed to

(cont) by the nucleus of disciples who had remained in Galilee after the Crucifixion. They soon reached Antioch, among other places, and it is here that he thinks the antinomianism arose, possibly in connection with a Gentile mission. This in turn involves a reversal of Luke's account in Acts 11 19f, namely that the Hellenists came from and did not found the Church in Antioch. He suggests that they came to Jerusalem to await the Parousia. Most of this is pure speculation, with scarcely a shred of supporting evidence. He does not explain how it was that some Jews permanently abandoned the Law (ie became non-Jews) and demanded the same for all others. We have no other evidence of any Jewish Christian, not even Paul, who unambiguously and permanently abandoned their Jewish heritage, or who propagated such a radical form of antinomianism, because they had become Christians - though this did not, of course, mean that Paul could not defend the Gentiles' right to freedom from the Law and deny that the Law was efficacious for salvation.

1 Haenchen, p221

2 Bultmann, "Theology", I, pp34f, Winter, "Trial", pp132f

Stephen in Acts 7 are those which he and the Hellenists really held, as Simon thinks, then it could be argued that most of the evidence which Schmithals produces is irrelevant. The Old Testament passages he quotes have frequently been interpreted not as attacks on the cult itself, but as a polemic against the abuses and corruptions which have become associated with it.¹ But either way, it is still true to say that

"important though it is for an explanation of Stephen's thought, even the prophetic tradition is not sufficient, for he goes a good length further than the prophets."² The same can be said for the Qumran³ sectarians' attitude to the Temple: they were opposed to what they considered to be a false priesthood and invalid cult, but they were not opposed to the Temple as such. Like-wise the Samaritan critique of the Temple was not a rejection of the notion of a Temple in principle, but a claim that their Temple on Mt Gerizim and not the one in Jerusalem was God's real dwelling place. Moreover, because Luke does not specifically say that the early Christians were involved in the sacri-

1 Gärtner, pp205f

2 Simon, p84

3 The Qumran critique of the Temple is found mainly in IQs 9 3, IQm 2 5, but there is no parallel to Stephen's radical position, it is more in line with the OT prophecies. Cullmann has, in several places, propounded the theory that the Hellenists were syncretists who formed the link between Qumran and the 'Urgemeinde' and that they had close affinities with the Samaritans (JBL, 74, 1955, pp213-26, NTS, 5, 1958/9, pp157-73). Most of the connections he finds turn out to be no more than superficial and his exegesis of Jn 4 43 is sheer fancy. Haenchen has rejected Cullmann's view decisively, point by point (p214 n1). Others try to connect the Hellenists and Qumran because they both use Am 5 25-7 (Acts 7 41f, CD 7 14), but in Qumran the text is used to show the degeneration of the cult, in Acts to show the disobedience in the desert (Klijn, art cit, p29 n4).

-ficial cult, we cannot conclude that they were not, Matt 5 23 may suggest the opposite¹ Further, groups like the Qumran sectarians and the Samaritans probably escaped persecution largely because, unlike the Hellenists, they did not make a habit of preaching their beliefs in Jerusalem - the very nerve centre of Judaism Also, while it may not have been uncommon to announce the abolition of the Temple in the End times,² it is understandable that Sadducean orthodoxy, for whom the Temple was a symbol of personal and national prestige, when brought face to face with this belief through the preaching of the Hellenists, would have been aroused to violent opposition. Finally, the passage from Justin, like many similar examples from Hellenistic Judaism which show a light regard for the Temple and cult, reflects a view which arose only after A D 70³ With the destruction of Jerusalem and the movement of the centre of orthodox Judaism to Jamnia, a re-evaluation of the cult became essential All the close parallels we have to Stephen's view in Acts 7 40⁴ come from sources later than A.D 70 (Sib Or 4 8-12, Ep Barn 16 1-2, Ps Clem I, 38, II, 44, Acts 17 24)

Yet it is just this fact which raises a problem, namely how far we can attribute the views of Acts 7 to Stephen and how far they are

1 Schmithals, "James", p21, thinks that this verse shows only that the early Church did not pull out of the sacrificial cult on principle

2. I En 90 28, Tobit, 16 5, IV Ezr. 7 26, 13 26

3 O'Neill, pp84f, Davies, "Paul", pp257f, Gärtner, pp205-6, Conzelmann, p50

4 Barnard, N T S, 7, 1960/1, pp31-45, suggests that in view of the close parallels between Acts 7 and the Epistle of Barnabas, the author of Barnabas borrowed Stephen's views around A D 117 when Hadrian's proposal to rebuild the Jerusalem Temple aroused new interest in the Temple and cult among Jews and Jewish Christians, against which a polemic was necessary

the views of a later generation, or even of Luke himself. In other words, what is tradition and what is Lukan in Acts 7? This is not an easy question to answer. For example, much of the speech, especially vv2-34, is quite conceivable on the lips of Stephen, though whether it is relevant to his trial is another question. On the other hand, because all the parallels to Acts 7:41-50 are later than A.D. 70, it is probable that we have here not the words of Stephen, but the sort of thing which Luke, writing towards the end of the 1st century, thought a Hellenistic Jew would say in Stephen's situation. They are the views of a later Hellenistic Judaism and may have been shared by Luke himself. This would not exclude the possibility that these views were to be found in embryonic form among Stephen and the Hellenists. Their views must have been more radical than those normally held by the Diaspora Jews of that time, because it was apparently they who first took exception to them (6-9).

Can we glean anything else which may help us to locate the origin of Stephen's distinctive view? As with the Law, Jesus' teaching is as likely a source as any. It is possible that the Hellenists, already

1 We need not, with Haenchen (p240), exclude all the polemical elements as Lukan interpolations (vv35,37,39-43,48-53). Verses 50-53, for example, may well be close to what Stephen said - although it is true that what is understandable on the lips of Stephen is not necessarily what he said.

2 Contra Simon, pp100,115, who thinks that Stephen formed his radical views under the influence of Hellenistic Judaism before becoming a Christian.

3 On the number of synagogues implied by 6-9 see commentaries ad loc. The members were Diaspora Jews and were probably also called Hellenists (Acts 9:29). It is odd that they and not the Palestinian Jews first objected to Stephen's views, unless we can assume that they were not so influenced by the freer attitude of Hellenistic Judaism or that when in Jerusalem they maintained a strict line.

4 Goppelt, pp36-7. Simon (pp94-5) thinks it was one among many elements. O'Neill (p88) thinks it cannot have been the source of Stephen's views.

perhaps inclined by their background to be critical of the Temple, picked up and used Jesus' sayings about the destruction of the Temple. They may have received or propagated a perverted form of them, but it may also be that 6 14 is nearer the truth than is often supposed. Luke may unwittingly have given the real teaching of Stephen about the Temple. For while it was certainly not just Messianic claims which caused the uproar, since the early preaching of the Apostles did not provoke a similar reaction, nor was it caused by a simple announcement of the abolition of the Temple at the End, it may be that the fusion of these two notions was the last straw. An announcement that it was Jesus - a Jew whom his countrymen had only just put to death as a Messianic pretender - who would destroy the Temple, may have been precisely the sort of fusion which would spark off a violent reaction.

If this kind of view about the Temple was combined with a certain antinomianism, we can understand why it was that Stephen and the Hellenists were persecuted. They shared a certain laxity in both respects with other Diaspora Jews, but it was the addition to this of distinctively Christian elements which caused even their fellow countrymen to take offence. How far they perverted Jesus' own views and exactly what they taught is unclear. If Acts 7 50-3 is not simply a Lukan construction, then such an abusive condemnation of the Jews may well have been the last straw which led to Stephen's lynching, in the wake of which the opportunity was taken to winkle out all those who had been associated with Stephen, even though they may not have shared his extreme views.

(cont) because Jesus' words imply that the Temple was of Divine significance, whereas Stephen's do not

This group of Hellenists probably came from the Hellenist synagogues in Jerusalem (9 29, cf 2 9-11), who probably attracted this name to themselves because they were more open to influence by Greek ways. They probably originated in the Diaspora, and may well have been the descendants of those Jews who were sent by Pompey to Rome in 63 B C and liberated soon after. Greek was probably one of their main languages, which would explain the facility with which they picked up Greek ways. The members of this group who became Christians probably brought the name Hellenists with them,¹ as well as a tendency to be somewhat offhand with regard to the Temple and Law. With this tendency they fused elements of Jesus' teaching and produced an amalgam that was even more radical and, for the more orthodox Jews, more offensive.²

Finally, we must consider the results of our investigation as they bear on the history of the beginnings of the Christian mission. For Luke it was clear that the Gentile mission had always been an integral part of God's will, even so, its beginning is marked as a decisive turning point in the development of the early Church. Above all, it is given Divine sanction through a miraculous intervention by God and Apostolic sanction by the decisive role which Peter plays in the conversion of Cornelius. Luke follows the plan of Acts 1 8 almost exactly - a straight line of development from Jerusalem out to the Gentiles. This is clearly an idealized and simplified picture, but how close is it

1 Thus it was not originally a nick-name for a faction in the Church (Wetter, art cit ,p410, Cadbury, art cit ,p70)

2 Thus although Luke has overdone the parallelism between the deaths of Jesus and Stephen, there may have been a close similarity between the charges on which they were both indicted

1

to the events ? Schmithals considers it to be a long way off the truth
 He thinks that the Christian mission was initiated in Galilee, from
 whence it spread quickly to other centres, including the places in Acts
 where Christian communities are taken for granted (Antioch, Damascus etc)
 It is in Antioch that he places the beginnings of the Christian mission
 to the Gentiles, which was either inspired by or the inspiration of
 the antinomianism of the Hellenists, who eventually came to Jerusalem
 to form the Hellenist faction of the Church But this reconstruction
 is extremely speculative, for we do not know that there was a Galilean
 Christian community at all, and there is no good reason totally to
 reverse the implications of the connection between Acts 8 4 and 11 19f
 and to assume that Luke has got things completely back to front

2

Rather, with Simon, we can guess that Luke has got things basically
 correct Certainly, there is a tension between Acts 11 19f and ch8-10
 of Acts Luke appears artificially to have separated 8 4 and 11 19,
 in order to insert the accounts of the Samaritan mission (8 4f), Paul's
 conversion (9 1f) and the conversion of Cornelius (10-11) Thus we
 should probably assume that 11 19f refers to a time prior to ch10-11
 at least, at the same time giving Luke full credit for an artistically
 persuasive account - since in 8 1-4 those who were scattered are located
 carefully in Judea and Samaria alone, whereas in 11 19 they are much
 further abroad

3

Thus it appears that the earliest missionary work among Gentiles

1 Schmithals, "James", pp20f

2 Schmithals avoids the more obvious faults of Lohmeyer, but he still
 relies heavily on speculation

3 Simon, pp34-6

was haphazard, it was not organized or authorized and it was effected by unknown disciples. This contrasts with Luke's account of a simple and straightforward development, which was initiated and authorized by a major Apostolic figure. Moreover, these early Gentile missionaries seem to have gone about their task unaware of the principle behind the Cornelius narrative. There was no decisive theological step, rather, the Gentiles were accepted freely into the Church. They were not asked to become Jews before they could become Christians, it was taken for granted that this was not necessary. If the Gentiles accepted the gospel they were accepted into the Church, since there was no good reason for excluding them. Moreover, it is significant that the first steps out to the Gentiles came not as a result of a conscious intention to fulfil a command of Jesus, but as a result of persecution by the Jews.¹ If Luke is correct in supposing that the scattered Hellenists preached only to Jews and Samaritans at first,² why was it that they eventually turned to the Gentiles? Presumably it was partially a natural result of the geographical circumstances, since beyond Judea Jews would become more scarce and Gentiles more populous. But there may have been more to it than this. Our study of the Gospels and Acts 1-2 led us to think that the early Church, like Jesus, expected the influx of the Gentiles to be effected only by an apocalyptic act of God and not by a historical

1 This confirms our earlier conclusion that Jesus did not command a Gentile mission. Cf Goppelt (p38) "Das Verhalten der Jünger nach Ostern schliesst jedoch aus, dass sie einen Universalen Missionsbefehl in dieser Gestalt erhalten hatten, die uns vorliegenden Fassungen des österlichen Missionsbefehls sind von der späteren universalen Wandermission her formuliert."

2 As the Hellenists were Jews they would naturally approach other Jews. They may have approached Samaritans because they shared similar views about the Jerusalem Temple (Simon, pp34f).

Gentile mission Moreover, they believed that these End events were near at hand Thus the way in which they centred their life around the Temple and Jerusalem was not the result of blind obedience to the Jewish cult, nor was it simple a missionary tactic, rather, it was because they fully expected the arrival of the End in a short while. Perhaps it was the continual disappointment of this expectation over a matter of months and even years - the last straw being when they were driven out of Jerusalem - which led those who were scattered to abandon their apocalyptic hopes It had become manifestly clear that there was going to be no mass conversion of the Jews, which would have been the prelude to God's apocalyptic proclamation to the Gentiles, so that this new turn of events may have been the factor which first of all convinced the Church that God was pushing them out into the Gentile world, with the ultimate purpose of carrying out a mission among its inhabitants

CHAPTER IXPAUL'S CONVERSION

The pre-Christian history of Paul has been probed often enough, but without much success. Psychological analyses of Paul, which usually result in his being portrayed as the victim of a divided mind or as thoroughly disoriented with the Law and Pharisaism, have been justly discredited. There is no positive evidence for such views, unless one reads Rom 7 as a thinly disguised autobiography of Paul's pre-Christian existence,¹ or overloads with significance the proverb which Luke uses in Acts 26² 14. Moreover, they are contradicted by the significant remark of Paul in Phil 3 6 - "as to righteousness under the Law blameless,"- which reveals a man who had not the slightest qualms about the value of the Law or of his own ability completely to fulfil its demands. As Dibelius says, "Paul was not converted from a life of sin to a life of righteousness, one might rather say that he turned from a religion of righteousness to a religion of the sinner."³ This is not to say that

1 Deissman, "Paul", p130. This view is refuted by Kümmel (U N T ,17, 1929, "Bekehrung") and Nygren ("Romans", pp277f). Both the use of the present tense in Rom 7 14-18, 25b and the fact that if 7 7-25 are autobiographical they contradict all other records (especially Phil 3 6), make it improbable that Rom 7 can be used to describe Paul's pre-Christian existence.

2 Much has been read into this verse to the effect that Paul's persecution activity shows an inward pull towards the truth of Christianity (eg Nock, "Paul", p73). Reference is usually made to Paul's inner conviction of the truth of the Christian claims or to the effect of Stephen's martyrdom on him. Munck (pp11f), who has done much to discredit the misuse of this proverb, refers it, unconvincingly, to Paul's future as an apostle of Christ. He fails to see that it is merely a literary device of Luke, whose Hellenistic readers would give it its general proverbial meaning, namely that it is impossible and stupid to struggle against one's destiny. It is a Greek proverb (cf Euripides, Bacc 795) not found in Aramaic, and its use here shows that it was a popular proverb, rather than that Luke was dependent on Euripides.

3. Dibelius, "Paul", p46

psychological analyses are inherently false. An analysis which took account of all the facts might be correct, but it might just as easily be false. Since the evidence is so sparse, speculation is endlessly possible, but ultimately fruitless. Besides, this kind of speculation is basically anthropocentric, whereas the overriding impression conveyed¹ by the narratives of both Luke and Paul is theocentric. It shifts the centre of gravity from God to man. Neither Luke nor Paul were concerned with psychological explanations, but with an act of God and its palpable results.

U Wilckens tackles the problem of Paul's pre-Christian existence² in a novel and interesting way. He tries to discover a structural continuity between Paul's pre- and post-Christian thought. On the basis of I Cor 15 8, Gal 1 11f and Phil 3 4f he argues that in his calling as apostle to the Gentiles Paul sees a special fulfilment of the "Heilsgeschichtliches" plan of God, in which the gospel is open to both Jews and Gentiles. For Paul the gospel to the Gentiles is equivalent to the gospel of Christ which is, in turn, antinomian, since "Christusglaube³ und Gesetzdienst schliessen sich aus." The bone of contention between Paul and his opponents was his new understanding of the role of the Gentiles in the "Heilsgeschichte." For whereas Paul claimed that the Gentiles had an independent and distinctive place in the "Heilsgeschichte" together with the Jews (Rom 9-11), the Judaizers demanded circumcision of the Gentiles in order that they might become part of the salvation-

1 Cf Goppelt, p49

2 Wilckens, Z T K, 56, 1959, pp273-93

3 Wilckens, art cit, p276

community, whose position was based on the gift, recognition and preservation of the Law. Thus the puzzle of Paul's conversion resolves into the question of his radical change from the Law to Christ, the latter usurping the role of the former. The only explanation for this, Wilckens argues, is to conclude that Paul's view of the Law was not 'Pharisaic-Rabbinic' but 'apocalyptic'. Here, he is using a distinction¹ made by D. Rössler: in apocalyptic literature the Law is seen as a unity and not as a bundle of individual precepts, and the language used is that of 'keeping the Law as a whole' or 'preserving it' and not that of 'doing' any particular command. The Law has a specific function in line with the distinctive apocalyptic view of history, namely to show in 'this Age' that those who preserve the Law will participate in the 'Age to come'. It is this "Heilsgeschichtliches" function which is usurped, in Paul's thought, by Christ, thus revealing a structural continuity between the two phases of Paul's existence.

Wilckens' view is interesting if only because it is the best modern example of a scholar who, aware of all the dangers, attempts to probe into Paul's pre-Christian existence without shirking the difficulties. But there are problems, not the least of which is his reliance on Rössler's results. It is questionable how far Rössler is making a real distinction between Rabbinic and apocalyptic thought, and, even if we could accept his conclusions, how does it accord with Paul's description of himself as a Pharisee in Phil 3:4f? If we are to take Paul seriously in Phil 3, and yet accept that the so-called 'apocalyptic'

¹ Rössler, "Gesetz"

view of the Law is at least an, if not the, element in Paul's thought, we must conclude that Rössler has made a too rigid distinction between the 'Rabbinic-Pharisaic' and 'apocalyptic' strands of Judaism, since here is one man, at least, in whom they are combined. Also, Wilckens' reliance on the simple contrast between Law and gospel in Paul rests too heavily on Rom 10 4 (and on one interpretation of this verse), he never defines, for example, in what sense Paul was antinomian - a problem which is far more complex and problematic than Wilckens would have us think. Nor does he make clear the precise relationship between the Law and the Gentiles: that is, did Paul's insight into the usurpation of the Law by Christ lead to his attitude to the Gentiles, or was his call to and experience of the Gentile mission a decisive factor in his final attitude to the Law? Wilckens inclines towards the former view without seriously considering the latter. Finally, he does not allow sufficiently for any element of originality in Paul's thought. He argues, for example,¹ that if Paul held the 'Rabbinic-Pharisaic' view of the Law and then saw fit to throw it overboard, this leaves unexplained why his Christian predecessors had not done this before him. This assumes, however, that Paul never had an insight which others before him had missed - a palpably false assumption. It is distinctly probable that Paul possessed a unique perception of the essentials of both Judaism and Christianity. It may well be that he was the first man really to understand how Judaism was radically undermined by the Christian faith. Possibly

1 Wilckens, art cit, pp273f

this was a result of belief in a crucified Messiah (Dt 21 23'¹) and that Paul, precisely because of his Pharisaic scrupulosity over individual regulations, was quick to see how this undermined the Jewish attitude to the Law

In Paul's writings and Acts we are given only two facts about Paul's pre-Christian existence, namely that he was a Jew and that he persecuted the Church In considering these we must turn immediately to the views of G Klein, who has given them detailed treatment He offers a detailed exegesis of the passages in Acts where Paul's persecution activity is described He notes, correctly, that Luke is at pains to paint a vivid and detailed picture of Paul's persecution activity in 8 1 Paul is a bystander, but has some responsibility for Stephen's death, in 8 3, 9 1-2, 13-14, 21, and 22 4 his activity is more direct, putting his victims in dire straits, both men and women, in 22 4-5 and 26 11 the picture grows in intensity, revealing a man whose ferocity

1 So Wood, N 1 S , 1, 1954/5, pp 176-89, here p 178 Nock (op cit , p 64) suggests that to Paul the Jew Christianity was "an insidious form of national apostasy" - but defines this no further Dibelius ("Paul", pp 51f) suggests that the Church's claim to possess the Messiah was to the pre-Christian Paul "an insult to God and a subversion of the Law", because they stood on the fringe of Judaism and included many of the "poor of the land" in their midst After his conversion Paul learns that salvation is intended for the outcast and even for those outside the Law

2 Klein, pp 114-44

3 Klein, pp 116f thinks συνευδοκέω (8 1, 22 20) is connected with Luke's idea of 'witness', which involves a recognition of the significance of and an involvement in the facts It implies, therefore, "Die Zustimmung zur und damit die selbstverantwortliche Teilhabe an die Beseitigung von Gottes Boten bezweckenden Mordtaten "

4 Klein, pp 118-9, thinks λυμάλινωμα (8 3) has "Unterton des Mutwilligen Unverständigen Hemmungslosen" activity, whereas κορθεύω (9 21, Gal 1 13, 23) has no moral undertones This is probably a false distinction, for a glance through the lexicons shows that both words have a similar variety of meanings and undertones

5 Klein, pp 123-5, δῶκω , a conventional verb, is used in 22 4-5, but is qualified by ἄχρι θανάτου In 22 5 emphasis is placed on the ἐγώ ie Paul throws them into prison, whereas in 8 3, 22 5 he merely hands

knew no bounds in its attempt to stamp out the Church. In contrast to this, as an individual Paul is levelled off and portrayed as a typical Jew (Acts 22 3). This picture, Klein thinks, contrasts strikingly with Paul's epistles. For here Paul's persecution activity is merely mentioned and not described and there is no hint of the vivid, progressive sketch we find in Acts. Thus the verbs used are commonplace and 'neutral' (κορθεω διωκω especially Gal 1 13f) and most of the references are incidental and unemphatic (I Cor 15 9, II Cor 11 22, Phil 3 5f). Moreover, he does not see his position in Judaism as typical, rather he sees himself as an exceptional and eminent Jew (Gal 1 14, Phil 3 4 ἐγὼ μᾶλλον II Cor 11 22 ὑπὲρ ἐγώ). Thus Klein concludes "Jener (Lk) nivelliert die ἀναστροφή ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ und akzentuiert die Verfolger-schaft des Paulus, dieser (Paul) nivelliert seiner verfolgertätigkeit und akzentuiert seine ἀναστροφή ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ" ¹

Concentrating on Acts for a moment, let us try to follow Klein's logic a little more closely. Luke, he argues, emphasizes that Paul is a violent and extreme persecutor of the Church, while at the same time he portrays him as a typical Pharisaic Jew. This may be so, but Klein tries both to have his cake and eat it, for, taken together, his two assertions exclude precisely those conclusions he wishes to draw. If Paul is characterized both as an extreme persecutor and as a typical Jew then, logically, we can only conclude that Luke saw all Pharisaic Jews as violent and extreme persecutors of the Church. In turn, this

(cont) them over - not, one would think, an important distinction 6 (from p320) In 26 11 Paul tries to make the Christians blaspheme, the emphasis is on Paul and his activity and not on Paul as a typical representative of the Pharisees

¹ Klein, p132

tells us nothing about Luke's view of Paul in particular, but only about his view of the Jews in general. Yet clearly this is not the conclusion Klein wishes to draw, in fact, he explicitly denies it. Commenting on Acts 26:11, where it is said that Paul forced Christians to blaspheme, Klein asks whether this is because Luke, thinking of Paul as a typical Pharisee, wishes to characterize all Pharisees as persecutors so ruthless that they forced Christians to blaspheme. He concludes correctly that this is not Luke's purpose, for in vv5-8 he emphasizes the close affinity between Pharisees and Christians. Luke is interested in spotlighting not the Pharisees but Paul, to show "dass er seinen Opfern das Schlimmste¹ antut, was ein Mensch dem anderen antun kann." The whole point of Klein's analysis, as he makes abundantly clear, is to characterize Paul's activity as violent and his person as typically Pharisaic. But unless he intends a false and over-subtle distinction between Act and Being, Klein fails to see that while in Acts Paul is seen as a Pharisee, the one thing which singled him out from his fellow Pharisees was precisely his excessive zeal for persecution. He was not, therefore, a typical Pharisee in every way. Thus apart from details of exegesis, in purely logical terms Klein is arguing in a circle.

While Klein is correct when he says that Paul never equals Luke's detailed description of his persecution activity, nevertheless Paul does give us a hint in Gal 1:13 that Luke's picture is not wholly unwarranted. The phrase καθ' υπερβολήν (='utterly', 'excessively', 'to an extraordinary² degree') gives us a description of the intensity and ferocity of Paul the persecutor. One cannot, with Klein, pass this off as a formal

¹ Klein, p126

² Arndt-Gingrich, p848

emphasis on the reality of the persecution, it is also a description of it, even if a brief one. Further, we must enquire more closely into Paul's eminent position in Judaism to which he refers in Gal 1:14. Paul says that he was advanced over and above the Jews of his own age group (συνηλικιώτας), he is not comparing himself with Pharisaic Judaism as a whole. And when Paul says, 'so extremely zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers' (v14b) is it not possible that he is making a veiled reference to his persecution activity (cf Phil 3:6, Acts 22:3)? If not, then at least we can say that the immediate and most tangible result of Paul's zeal for the Law was his persecution of the Church. Either way, we are not far from the picture Luke gives in Acts. To this we must add that the reference in Acts 22:3, on which Klein places so much weight, is surely no more than a parallel to Phil 3:4f. In both places Paul emphasizes what he has in common with other Jews, since that is what the situation demands. In Philippians Paul is using himself as an example of how a man could, but should not, 'boast in the flesh'. In Acts Paul is faced with a hostile crowd of Jews and Luke, therefore, portrays him as opening his speech with an astute emphasis on his Jewishness and orthodoxy, both past and present. Luke, with sensitive artistry, convincingly portrays Paul as opening with a 'captatio benevolentiae'. Luke's emphasis here on Paul's orthodoxy does not preclude him (or Paul, in places other than Phil 3) from showing how at other times Paul's activity was exceptional.

The origin of Luke's picture of Paul's pre-Christian existence is obscure, but not too difficult to surmise. Klein, for the reasons given above, rejects the suggestion that Luke's view goes back to the historical

self-understanding of Paul. Nor, he claims, does it come from the post-Pauline Church. Eph 3 8 is a mere rhetorical reference and I Tim 1 12-16 is a parenthetic picture which contrasts the two phases of Paul's life as a typical example of conversion. Later references, when one omits those that merely deny Paul's apostolic office or those Jewish traditions where accusations are made against the mode of Paul's conversion, are sparse and dependent on Acts (eg Ps Clem I 71). Thus Klein concludes that the Lukan portrait stands as "ein erratischer Block", a result of Luke's own handiwork, into which he has worked specific tendencies. When we ask what is the purpose of Luke's portrait, Klein answers, "Ist klargestellt¹ muss diese in der Tat als eine Degradation wirken."

We have already seen reason to disagree with Klein's exaggerated contrast between Luke and Paul. If we are right, then Paul's remarks are to be seen as the ultimate source of Luke's portrait, for in essentials they are the same. To say, as Klein does, that what Paul only mentions Luke amplifies is true, but insignificant. It really says no more than that Paul was writing an epistle and Luke a narrative. For this is their real difference. Luke is a historian with a story-teller's eye for vivid, colourful tales, Paul uses an autobiographical sketch only occasionally, to illustrate a homiletic or theological point - in Galatians to show that he could not conceivably have been dependent on the Jerusalem Apostles for his own apostleship or gospel, and in Philippians to show the stupidity of 'boasting in the flesh'. In the

1 Klein, 144

same way Luke differs from Ephesians and I Timothy. Not that he was blind to rhetoric or to the parenetical use of a narrative, including this one, but his primary aim at this point was to tell a lively and interesting story. Whether all the extra details in Acts are 'Lukan' is impossible to say. The likelihood is that they are not. It is a psychological fact that some men, when converted, tend excessively to blacken their pre-Christian past in order to heighten the contrast with their present transformation. A similar process may have occurred in the account of Paul's pre-Christian life as it developed in tradition. When Luke received it he touched it up for use in his work, but between the time it left Paul and reached Luke it had probably already acquired various accretions.

How then are we to assess Luke's purpose in giving this extended description of Paul's pre-Christian life? We have already both disagreed with Klein and implicitly given the correct explanation. Luke is not intentionally degrading Paul, but is rather concerned to tell a vivid and dramatic story. The blacker Paul's pre-Christian existence is painted, the more striking is both the miracle of his conversion and his eminent position as the leading Gentile missionary. In other words, Luke's purpose is to produce a contrast-effect between Paul the per-
 1
 secutor and Paul the Christian. Even this Klein has disputed, on two
 2
 grounds. First, the unique miracle of Paul's conversion is never specially described apart from Acts 9:21, and since this reference is omitted in ch 22 and 26 it is inessential to Luke, with this, Klein contrasts Gal

1 Loisy, "Actes", p357, Reicke, "Glaube", p170

2 Klein, pp143-4

1 23 Secondly, if Luke had intended a contrast-effect he would have portrayed Paul as the Jew 'par excellence' and not as a run-of-the-mill Pharisee, since this would have produced a more dramatic contrast We have already disputed and can, therefore, safely ignore the second point Exactly what Klein means by his first objection is not clear By referring to Acts 9 21 and Gal 1 23, he appears to equate "the unique miracle of Paul's conversion" with the reaction to it of other Christians If this is so, then the single reference in Gal 1 23 is not significantly different from Acts 9 21 Besides, one can scarcely claim that Luke does not emphasize Paul's miraculous conversion, for he relates it three times, each with a theophany The very fact that he does this shows that, in view of the dominance of Paul in the second part of Acts, for Luke, Paul's conversion was a miraculous event of immense significance

We turn now to the accounts of Paul's conversion The variations between Luke's three accounts are well known There are minor variations which are of no real significance in 9 27 Paul's companions hear but see nothing, while in 22 9 they see but hear nothing, in 9 4 Paul falls to the ground and his companions remain standing, while in 26 14 they all fall to the ground These variations are classic examples of Luke's inconsistency in detail, they are odd and untidy, but each assertion has, in its place, a point, without essentially altering the narrative

" dann sind damit nur die Ausdrucksmittel gewechselt, nicht der Sinn der Aussage " ¹ There is no need to resort to source theories at this

¹ Haenchen, p271

1
point and most modern commentators correctly see the three accounts
as Lukan variations on a theme²

There is one major difference between the three versions, namely the gradually diminishing role of Ananias from ch9 through ch22 to ch26. Together with this goes the account of Paul's blindness and his healing and baptism by Ananias. A more important concomitant is the varying account of the time, place and manner of Paul's call. In Acts 9:6 Paul is told to go to Damascus and there he will be told what to do. This promise is not, at least in ch9, fulfilled. For although it is made clear to Ananias in a vision what is God's purpose for Paul in the future (9:15-16), it is not said that Ananias passed this on to Paul. It is merely said that he laid his hands on Paul, who was immediately both healed and filled with the Holy Spirit. In ch22 Ananias does explain to Paul the purpose of his conversion (22:14-16), but the explicit call to the Gentile mission is reserved for a subsequent vision in the Jerusalem Temple (22:17-21). Also, in ch22 it is not said that Ananias laid hands on Paul, that Paul received the Holy Spirit or that he was baptized.

1 Haenchen, pp274f gives a summary of the main views. The most interesting are those of Lake (B C, V, pp188-95) - who labels them 'Pauline' (ch26), 'Jerusalem' (ch9) and 'Antiochian' (ch22), and Hirsch (Z N W, 28, 1929, pp305-12) - who thinks ch9 reflects the interests of the Church at Damascus, that ch26 is basically Pauline, and that ch22 is Luke's combination of these two into what he thought lay behind the variant traditions.

2 Haenchen, *ibid*, Conzelmann, p59, Klein, p144, Stählin, pp309f, Hanson, pp216f. O. Linton (St Th, 3, 1950/1, pp79-95) holds the interesting, though unprovable, view that the various elements in the narratives Luke uses are old traditions, which go back to the kind of thing which was said by Paul's opponents in his lifetime. His argument is based on the contradictions between Acts and Gal 1-2. Luke, he thinks, used these traditions unwittingly, with no intention of degrading Paul.

In ch26 Ananias disappears altogether, and with him the account of Paul's blindness and healing. This time Paul receives his call directly from the Lord on the road to Damascus, at the time of his conversion (26 16-18)

It has been claimed on the basis of Gal 1 that Ananias is a figure who has been imported into the account of Paul's conversion either by Luke or his predecessors. In Gal 1 1 (cf 1 12) Paul says that he is an apostle "not from men nor through man", it is asserted, therefore, that the Ananias incident is a piece of "unkontrollierbare Legende".¹ But it is easy to draw excessively narrow conclusions from Gal 1, for we have to remember that in Galatians Paul is defending his independence from Jerusalem and not from the Church in Damascus. In fact, it is quite possible that in Gal 1 Paul is referring obliquely to a Jewish-Christian perversion of the Ananias incident which was prevalent in the Jerusalem Church. Exactly what Ananias' real role was is difficult to say. Certainly, in view of Gal 1 1,12, he cannot have played a role of major significance. That is, he neither ordained Paul as an apostle nor taught him his gospel, otherwise Paul would have been compelled to mention him in Gal 1 or to have omitted vv1 and 12. This is also what we would conclude from Acts, for there Ananias never instructs Paul in any detailed manner, rather, he lays hands on him, as a result of which Paul is healed and receives the Spirit. In only one of the versions is it said that Ananias explained to Paul the purpose of his call (22 14-16), and here the chief purpose of the call, namely the Gentile mission, is only

1 Hirsch, art cit, p311, Prentice, Z N W 46, 1955, pp250-55

alluded to and is not made explicit until 22 17f. One cannot and should not read into this that Paul came under the direct influence of Ananias or that the essentials of Paul's later gospel were passed onto him at the beginning.¹ Luke may have overplayed, as Paul has probably underplayed, the true role of Ananias, but in essentials Acts is probably correct. The omission of Ananias in ch26 is because Luke is telescoping the narrative either simply for the sake of brevity or because the Ananias incident was not particularly relevant for Paul's defence before Agrippa. On the other hand, by emphasizing Ananias' Jewishness in ch22, Luke has made good use of the narrative in the immediate context.

²
It is sometimes said that while Luke, by way of the Ananias incident, separates Paul's conversion and call, Paul himself sees the two as inseparable, (Gal 1 12). But in Gal 1 12 Paul is talking of his gospel and not of his call, and in Gal 1 16 where his call and vision are connected, they are connected in a causal and not a temporal manner (nb ἵνα εὐαγγελίσωμαι), which accords closely with the accounts of Acts.

The fact that Luke retains and Paul omits the Ananias incident is of immense significance to some, since it implies that Paul's call was indirect, mediated by a human agent. Ananias is seen as a representative of the Church and its tradition and Paul, consequently, is no longer the independent apostle he claims to be in Gal 1. He is subordi-

1 Nock, "Paul", pp63f

2 Klein, pp145f

3 Klein, p146 n704. "Aber dass er in dieser Geschichte die kirchliche Tradition repräsentiert, leidet kein Zweifel."

-nated to ecclesiastical tradition and, ultimately, the Twelve "Das Amt¹
des Paulus in der Kirche wird von seinem Ursprung her mediatisiert "²

But Klein is in danger here of falling foul of the same perversion as some of Paul's contemporaries were guilty of, namely grossly misinterpreting the role of Ananias. For if Luke's overriding purpose had been to subordinate Paul to the Church's tradition, it becomes difficult to explain why he is so vague about it. Why does he never say that Ananias mediates Paul's call in ch 9? Why does he allow ch 26 to stand, where Paul's call comes directly from the Lord? Why in the one place where Ananias unambiguously sets out to announce the purpose of Paul's vision (ch 22 14-16), is the reference to the Gentile mission allusive and made explicit only in a later, private, unmediated vision in the Temple? The answer to these questions is surely that it was not Luke's overriding purpose to emphasize the mediatorial role of Ananias in Paul's call. Had it been, he would not have hesitated to make his view clear with each opportunity.

To this we must add that if the point of ch 9 was primarily to show how Paul was absorbed into the Church's tradition or, as Haenchen would have it, legitimized by the Twelve through their representative, then one might have expected Luke to have made a clearer line of contact between the Twelve or the Jerusalem Church and Ananias in Damascus. It

1 Haenchen, p277

2 Klein, p146 Klein becomes very obscure when he claims that the "objectification" of Paul's conversion means that the mediatorial element is a matter of "principle" and not only applicable at the beginning (p148). He appears to be trying to explain away the disappearance of Ananias in the later accounts. It is unlikely, however, that Luke would have drawn the same conclusion as Klein.

is an oft-noted fact that Ananias, a Christian who apparently permanently resides in Damascus, suddenly appears in Acts 9 without any clue being offered how Christianity had spread from Jerusalem to Damascus. We are not told that the Twelve preached or legitimized preaching there as, for example, they did in Antioch and Samaria.

Luke portrays Ananias as he does primarily because he believed this was really his historical role. There is no anti-Pauline tendency here; Luke is far removed from the disputes which gave rise to Gal 1-2. Certainly there is a difference between Luke and Paul insofar as Paul claims that his own meeting with the Risen Lord was equivalent to that of other apostles in the immediate post-Resurrection period (I Cor 9 1, 15 8, Gal 1 11f), whereas in the scheme of Luke this is not so (Acts 1 21-2). But this is not done for polemical purposes, for by the time Luke wrote the disputes of the Apostolic era were scarcely known and, if known, scarcely understood. Luke is, at this point, more concerned with historical truth than with theological polemic. He may not have got the truth, but this was his aim. For Luke it was natural and inevitable that at some stage Paul should be accepted into the fellowship of the Church like all new converts (cf Acts 8, 10-11, 18-19). On the basis of tradition he received, Luke believed that with Paul this event took place in Damascus, primarily through Ananias. As a human figure or as a representative of the Church Ananias is unimportant for Luke in Paul's call, though more important in his healing and baptism. The use of the double vision makes it clear that Ananias' significance is not as a representative of the Church, but of God (9 10-16, 22 12-16). To Luke, whether Paul's call came directly or through Ananias its source

was the same and it was still essentially the call of God. In 22 14-16, where Ananias relates Paul's call to the Gentiles, God is the subject of Paul's election and sending. It is not Ananias or the Church who elects, converts, or commissions Paul, but God. Ananias is God's instrument not his substitute.

We turn now to the second account and, in particular, the vision in the Temple 22 17f. Klein attempts to show that ch 22 strengthens rather than weakens the principle of mediation he finds in ch 9. He considers the important element of vv17-21 to be the location of Paul's vision, namely the Jerusalem Temple, which is an important centre of Luke's "Heilsgeschichtliche" scheme "Erst dadurch, dass die Berufung am heilsgeschichtlich ausgezeichneten Ort festgemacht wird, tritt sie in Kraft die Mediatisierung ist gleichsam verdoppelt".¹ It is probable that the location of Paul's vision is important for Luke, but it is not so clear why, nor is it clear what is the main theme of vv17-21. Where Luke found the narrative is impossible to say, and he may simply have constructed it. He does not date the incident, but it seems most probable that he thought it occurred during Paul's visit to Jerusalem soon after his conversion.²

It seems that the point of placing this vision in the Temple is, like the whole of 22 6f, an attempt to show Paul's Jewishness. This is the reason for Acts 22 3f, which we have already discussed, it is

¹ Klein, p155

² Acts 9 27f differs considerably from the parallel account in Gal 1 17f. Luke's timing of the visit of Paul to Jerusalem is vague (vv 19, 23, 26) but he does not seem to have thought it was three years after his conversion. Also, Paul says he saw only Peter and James, whereas Luke says he was introduced to all the Apostles.

also the reason why Ananias is portrayed here as a devout Jew (cf 22
 12, and the language of v14)¹ This is a master-stroke of Luke's who,
 recounting Paul's self-defence before the Jews, places all the weight
 on his Jewishness. It captures the audience's attention and also helps
 2 to appease their anger. This has to be seen also within the wider context
 of Luke's attempt to show an element of continuity between Christianity
 and Judaism. But this is not all, for more important than the location
 is the content of the vision. It is partially to be seen as a defence
 3 of the legitimacy of the Gentile mission and, in particular, of Paul's
 4 unique role in this. But it also has to be seen in the wider context
 of Luke's scheme of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity.
 For while one element in this is the emphasis on the continuity of the
 two, yet another, more important, element is that the Gentile mission
 develops as a direct result of the Jews' rejection of the gospel. Luke
 expresses this schematically in 13 46, 18 6 and 28 28, and the same
 theme protrudes in 22 17-21. Paul wishes to stay in Jerusalem, thinking
 that the Jews will be bound to listen to him after his miraculous con-
 version from persecutor to preacher of the gospel. But the Lord commands
 him to leave Jerusalem, because he knows that they will not listen to

1 In ch 22 the only hint that Ananias is a Christian is the appellation 'brother' (v13). Ch 9 portrays him as a full-blown Christian (9 10).

2 Haenchen, pp555f, Conzelmann pp125-7. It is no argument against this to ask, 'Why then does Luke mention the vision of Christ which would be repellent to the Jews?' (Klein, p154). It is precisely this vision and the ensuing command which Paul is justifying to the Jews by claiming that it occurred in the Jerusalem Temple.

3 Haenchen, pp558f. Klein objects that the problem of the Gentile mission is not limited to Paul in Acts - but surely this does not exclude a reaffirmation of its legitimacy to its chief herald, Paul? Klein (p153) also asks, 'Why should a vision to a Jew in Jerusalem be any more legitimizing than a vision on the Damascus road?' But at this point Paul is talking to Jews, for whom a vision in the Temple would carry more weight.

4 Knox, "Acts", p27

Paul Paul's task lies farther afield, among the Gentiles (22 21) It is emphasized that Paul was reluctant to go on the Gentile mission, but could not disobey a direct command of God Ironically, it is in the Temple itself, the heart of Judaism, that God prophesies the Jews' rejection of the gospel and the consequent turning to the Gentiles Thus the location plays a role in 22 17f , but it is not the only or the most important one, nor is it the role of limiting Paul's call spatially

Before going further we must take a look at the last point in Klein's thesis Having argued for a strong element of human mediation in ch 9 and spatial mediation in ch 22, he turns his attention to ch 26 here, as Klein admits, the account is telescoped and very close to Paul's account in Gal 1 But, on the basis of the use of the word ὑπηρέτης , which is used of Paul in 26 16, Klein argues¹ that despite the disappearance of Ananias there yet remains a 'limitation' - this time a 'temporal limitation' For, he argues, there are only two other comparable uses of ὑπηρέτης or the verb ὑπηρετέω in Luke-Acts, namely in Lk 1 2 and Acts 13 36 Klein proceeds the one, Lk 1 2, is not a relevant parallel, since it is qualified by its connection with αὐτόπτεω , the other, Acts 13 36, has another meaning, since it is used of David, who was 'a bearer of the word of God for his generation only' Klein's conclusion is simple in Acts 26 16 ὑπηρέτης implies that Paul was a witness, but only to his own generation, that is, there is still a limitation Thus, regardless of semantic context, Klein extracts all the connotations of ὑπηρετέω gained from the context of Acts 13 36 and, without a moments hesitation, adds them to ὑπηρέτης in 26 16 He

¹ Klein, pp157-8

thus underpins his theological conclusions by illegitimate semantic analysis¹ For Acts 13 36 is no more a parallel to Acts 26 16 than Lk 1 2,² since the phrase γὰρ ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ (Acts 13 36) qualifies ὑπηρέτω as much as αὐτόπαι qualifies ὑπηρέτης in Lk 1 2 In fact, the context of both occurrences (Acts 13 36 and Lk 1 2) disqualify them from use as close parallels to Acts 26 16 The words ὑπηρέτης and ὑπηρέτῳ (=minister, servant) are 'neutral', they gain 'extra' meaning only as a result of their individual semantic contexts We cannot agree with Klein, therefore, when he says in conclusion that, "Im ersten Bericht mediatisiert er das Amt des Paulus über einen Menschen, im zweiten ausserdem noch über einen Ort, im dritten über die Zeit"³

The purpose of Paul's conversion is, as we have noted in passing, primarily to spread the gospel to the Gentiles This is clear from all three accounts which, in their varied, though essentially similar ways, recount the Gentile mission as Paul's major task for the future (Acts 9 15, 22 15, 21, 26 16-18) The language used here is unremarkable and of no great significance except for the echoes of the calls of some Old Testament prophets, in particular Jeremiah and the Servant figure of II Isaiah This is particularly so in Acts 26 16-18 v16 echoes Is 42 7, v17 echoes Jer 1 7-8 (especially ἐξελρέω), and v18 recalls Is 42 6-7 (cf Is 61 1), the phrase σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς (Acts 9 15) has no direct Old Testament parallel, but it recalls Jer 27 25 (cf 50 25)⁴

1 Much of Barr's 'Semantics' would be relevant here

2 In some ways the connection with μαρτυρεῖ in Acts 26 16 makes the use in Lk 1 2 a closer parallel than Acts 13 36

3 Klein, p159

4 Munck, pp27f, refers to similarities between the accounts in Acts and Ez 1-2, IEn 14 18-16 4 Others think the Heliodore legend (II Macc 3) has influenced Luke cf Windisch, 4 N W, 31, 1932, pp1-23

The echoing of Old Testament prophecies is also a feature of Paul's accounts of his conversion, especially in Gal 1 14f, where it is also said that the prime purpose of Paul's vision is his call to the Gentile mission. As in Acts, Paul meets with the Risen Lord and is immediately commissioned to his apostleship to the Gentiles (Gal 1 11f, 16). The prophecies alluded to in Gal 1 15f are the same as in Acts 26 16f, only the reference is more clearly to Jer 1 4f and Is 49 1-6. Thus both Luke and Paul see Paul's call as parallel to, though more than, the prophetic call in the Old Testament.

Intimately connected with Paul's call in Acts is the foreshadowing of his suffering. This is made explicit in Acts 9 16 ($\kappa\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ is used of a Christian's, as distinct from Christ's, suffering only here in Luke-Acts). There is more emphasis in Acts on the suffering of Paul than on the suffering of the Apostles (Acts 1 8, 8 1, though cf Acts 3-5, and 12 1f).¹ This close connection between Paul's call to the Gentiles and his suffering is paralleled by Paul, since he also connects apostleship and suffering intimately (I Cor 4 9, 15 30, II Cor 11 23f, 6 3f, and cf Col 1 24, which forms a close parallel to the use of $\kappa\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ in Acts 9 16).² Thus in both Acts and Paul a necessary concomitant of apostleship is suffering, which is "dasselbe wie das Leiden Christi und ihm gleichwertig."³

There are a few more conclusions we can draw for our study of the Gentile mission in Acts. The unexplained presence of a Church in

1 Klein, pp 148f

2 Schmithals, pp 38-9

3 Schmithals, p 39

Damascus is one of the frequent lacunae in Luke's work. It is improbable - if we can place any value on the incidental remark of Ananias in Acts 9 13 - that we can assume that the Church in Damascus was founded as a result of the flight mentioned in 8 1f, though it is not improbable that it received a new influx after that event. Nor do we need to resort to the theory of a Galilean origin of the Damascus Church. More probable is that it was begun by tradesmen and merchants who frequently travelled between Jerusalem and Damascus, or possibly by some of those Jews who had been present at Pentecost. Whichever is correct, this Christian community is yet another witness to the idealism of Luke's plan of the development of the Church's mission. For here we have a community founded by unknown Christians who, as far as we know, worked with no set plans or official authorization.

Further, the primary narrative of Paul's conversion is astutely placed within the total structure of Acts. The call of the Gentile missionary 'par excellence' is slotted between the brief account of the beginnings of the Samaritan mission (Acts 8) and the twice-repeated account of the first symbolic step in the Gentile mission. The threefold account of Paul's conversion, like the twofold account of Cornelius' conversion, shows that both events were of great significance for Luke, to whom the most obvious way of impressing this on his readers was the simple, but effective, method of repetition.

Another important fact, which is particularly clear in 22 17f, is Luke's penchant for finding the impetus for the Gentile mission in two main factors. First and most important, it is a result of a direct, unequivocal command of God, which even the reluctant Paul cannot disobey,

second, on the human level, so to speak, the Gentile mission is a direct result of the rejection of the gospel by the Jews. In both of these points, as in much else, Luke has a similar view to Paul himself - though not in every respect (cf Gal 1 14, Phil 3 4f, Rom 9-11). We might also note in passing one more connection between the Gentile mission and the work of the Spirit, for Paul receives the Spirit almost simultaneously with his call. However, this connection is only implicit and we cannot make much of it.

In conclusion, it will be valuable to draw together our results with regard to the similarities and differences between the accounts of Luke and Paul.

1 On Paul's pre-Christian life they are essentially in agreement. There were two important things to be known about Paul, namely that he was both a Jew and a persecutor of the Church. The major difference, namely that Luke is far more effusive in his descriptions than the reticent Paul, is explained by the different genre of writing each was employing. In neither case is there any evidence for saying that Paul was a budding schizophrenic or a dissatisfied legalist.

2 On the road to Damascus Paul saw the Risen Lord (Gal 1 17).

3 There was no mediation by any human agent of Paul's apostleship or gospel. This is clear from both Gal 1 1,12,16 and Acts 9,22,26. The role of Ananias is ambiguous, perhaps as a result of Luke expanding and Paul telescoping his true role.

4 At the time of his conversion Paul received his call to be 'apostle to the Gentiles'. The language used to describe this call echoes the call of Jeremiah and the mission of the Servant-figure, both of whom

were called to go to the 'nations' A concomitant of this call is the necessity of suffering

5 A major difference between Luke and Paul is that the latter equates his vision of the Risen Lord with the post-Resurrection appearances, whereas Luke does not

6 A further difference is that we miss in Luke the profound reflection on the meaning of his conversion which Paul himself gives in his doctrines of righteousness, justification and predestination This suggests a difference between the two writers, a difference which will become clearer as we study the rest of Acts, namely that while Paul is a theologian', Luke is not

CHAPTER XTHE CONVERSION OF CORNELIUS AND THE APOSTOLIC COUNCIL

Before discussing the Cornelius incident, we must first consider the story of the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8 26-40). The word $\epsilon\upsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma$ can mean a 'treasurer' or a 'castrated man'¹ In the LXX it can, like the Hebrew ס'רָף ², refer to a castrated man or to a man who holds high political or military office. If by $\epsilon\upsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma$ ³ Luke means a castrated man, then it is said that he cannot have been a Jew, for according to Dt 23 1-2 no castrated man can become a Jew or part of the Jewish community. Thus it is said that Luke must have understood the man to be a God-fearing Gentile.⁴ However, it is not clear that Dt 23 1-2 does refer to eunuchs, though this is often assumed. Moreover, if it does and Luke was aware of it, then it may be that he thought that its restrictions had been overstepped by the fulfilment of Is 56 3f in Christ, so that eunuchs could now become Jews as well as members of the Church. A more probable suggestion is that Luke took the title to refer to the man's high office in the Ethiopian court and not to his castration.⁵ For Luke, the man was a proselyte rather than a God-fearer, a Jew rather than a Gentile, for Acts 10-11 make it clear that he saw Cornelius as the first Gentile convert.

1 B C IV, p96

2 It is not clear what is the primary reference of ס'רָף - to a man's castration or to his courtly office. Most of the texts do not specifically refer to castration (Is 56 3-4 is the clearest) and could simply mean 'courtier' or 'chamberlain' - though both meanings may be intended in some passages.

3 Conzelmann, p56

4 Stählin, p126, Wikenhauser, p106

5 The fact that he is an Ethiopian probably implies that he is a proselyte rather than a Jew by birth, though the fact that he reads Isaiah and is returning from worship in Jerusalem could be used to argue either way.

Conzelmann and Haenchen think that the original narrative came from Hellenistic-Christian circles and that it was their equivalent to the Cornelius narrative, namely the story of the conversion of the first Gentile Luke, therefore, intentionally leaves the man's religious status obscure he could not call him a proselyte, because his source said he was a Gentile, and he could not call him a Gentile without anticipating the theme of Acts 10-11 Also, in this way Luke could give the impression that the Church's mission had taken a step beyond the Jews and Samaritans, but not quite to the Gentiles, with all the problems which that involves It may well be that Haenchen and Conzelmann are right in thinking that the original version made it clear that the

eunuch was a Gentile But it is unlikely that Luke knew this and deliberately covered it up, for it would have been a simple enough matter to position this narrative at a later point, after ch 10-11, as he has done with 11 19f It is more likely that Luke did not realize that the eunuch was a Gentile, maybe because the tradition he received did not make this clear If the eunuch was a Gentile, then this narrative affords yet one more example of the way in which Luke's idealistic picture of the extension of the Church's mission is betrayed by stories which he himself relates For Luke the narrative has significance as the story of the conversion of a semi-Jew, a conversion in which God is the main actor

1 Conzelmann, p26, Haenchen, pp264-5

2 Though Haenchen is not necessarily correct when he says that the Church would not have been interested in the conversion stories of Jews and proselytes Hahn, p51 n2, thinks this story came from the Antioch source and was an account of the conversion of a Jew, since according to the Antioch source the first Gentiles were reached in 11 19 This argument only has force if one accepts that it was part of the Antioch source and that this source has not misplaced or misinterpreted it

M Dibelius has done more than any other scholar to draw our attention to the problems and significance of the Cornelius episode. He attempts to isolate the narrative underlying Luke's stylized version, and concludes that Luke used a simple, straightforward legend of the conversion of a godly Gentile, Cornelius. He likens this legend to that of the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch and thinks that both were originally simple conversion legends, unconcerned with matters of principle. He argues that they both reflect the actual conditions in the Church before the Antioch dispute (Gal 2 11f), when individual Gentiles were occasionally accepted into the Church without its raising any difficulties.² Haenchen has challenged this conclusion.³ He argues that a community expecting an imminent End would not preserve such traditions and that all the evidence we have points to the reluctance or indifference of the 'Urgemeinde' when faced with Gentile converts. Moreover, if Peter had won a Gentile convert, Paul would have known of this and used it in his arguments with the Judaizers. But none of these are strong objections to Dibelius' case. Expectation of an imminent End was prevalent throughout the 1st century A.D., and the fact is that we know, if only from the Gospels, that the communities did preserve legends and stories which they believed to be significant. Nor is it necessary to believe that Paul must have known about this incident or, if he had known about it, that he would have used it. The original story was probably more obscure and less important than Luke makes it out to be.

1 Dibelius, pp109-22

2 Dibelius, pp120f, Conzelmann, pp61-2

3 Haenchen, pp306f

and it may be that Peter's involvement in Cornelius' conversion is a¹ Lukan addition. Certainly, the 'Urgemeinde' were reluctant to accept Gentile converts, but this does not mean that there were no Gentile converts before the more organized mission of Paul. A few isolated cases of pious Gentiles becoming Christians would not have aroused the same opposition as the wholesale, Law-free Gentile mission of Paul. There is no reason, therefore, to suppose that Dibelius has not given us a valuable clue to the nature of the pre-Lukan version of Cornelius' conversion.

We must ask, therefore, what Luke has added to this simple legend. The criterion which Dibelius and later Conzelmann use, is that all the² parts which make the story a matter of principle are Lukan. For this reason the whole of ch 11 is seen as Luke's construction. It is a³ repetition, with minor variations, of ch 10 and makes a universal example out of a single case. The principle of the acceptance of Gentiles is applied to the whole Church, as represented by the leaders of the Church in Jerusalem. Moreover, the problem of table-fellowship, which sparks off the speech of justification in 11 3f, is only a minor detail of the narrative in ch 10. Thus ch 11 is probably Luke's repetition of ch 10 by which he both emphasizes the immense significance of the event and uses it to express a principle, thus preparing the way for the use he will make of it in Acts 15.

Peter's vision (Acts 10 9-16) may be an addition of Luke though, as

1 On the other hand Peter may have been involved in Cornelius' conversion, and this may be what lies behind Paul's comment in Gal 2 18.

2 Dibelius, pp109f, Conzelmann, p61.

3 Ch 11 is less dramatic and tense in atmosphere. The main difference of details is that in ch 10 the Spirit comes after Peter's speech, whereas in ch 11 he comes at the beginning of it.

Dibelius says, it could reflect a true experience of Peter in some other context, perhaps the Antioch controversy. Luke found it and, not knowing the original context, uses it here. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that this vision came to Luke as an original part of the narrative. The most obvious reference of the vision is to the question of foods. Whereas Luke clearly means it to be understood as a reference to the problem of clean and unclean men (10:28). This has led some to think that the original reference was only to foods and that Luke has used it to refer to the problem of unclean men.² But apart from the fact that the problems of unclean foods and men are closely related, this notion ignores the nature of visions. A vision which is aimed at teaching something does not necessarily have the same content as the problem to which it refers. That is, visions can have parabolic significance. The vision of foods and the twofold command and refusal may originally have been intended to teach Peter something about clean and unclean men. Because Peter's vision is to do with eating, this does not narrow its terms of reference to the problem of foods. It may be a parable whose terms of reference are much wider. Thus it is possible that the vision is in the right context and does not need to be repositioned to the Antioch controversy.

1 Dibelius, pp111-112, Conzelmann, p61. Haenchen (p306) argues against this because (a) Peter's objection is to eating unclean animals, but he could have eaten a clean one. But if clean and unclean animals are implied, their mixing may have caused all to become unclean. The vision itself mentions only unclean animals. (b) If one applies the meaning of the vision to foods then it means that 'all foods are clean' - and we have no evidence that Peter or the 'Urgemeinde' abandoned the Jewish food laws. But if the vision is a parable referring to men, this problem does not arise.

2 Dibelius, *ibid*, Conzelmann, *ibid*, Wikenhauser, p120. Cf 11:3f, where the vision is used as a defence against the charge that Peter ate with the uncircumcised.

Peter's speech is the other main part of ch 10 which is usually ascribed to Luke¹ Like the other speeches in Acts it betrays Lukan features and is too long to have been passed on as part of a legend² There are certain odd features, such as the phrase "You know the word which he sent to Israel"(10 36) and the fact that it does not resemble the other speeches to the Gentiles in Acts 14 and 17 But these do not show that the speech is largely pre-Lukan,³ rather, they show that Luke was writing the speech on the basis of a stereotyped pattern and consequently some parts of it are not well suited to the particular situation Some scholars think that the whole speech is irrelevant to the situation into which it is inserted,⁴ though U Wilckens has argued that both the framework and the content of the speech are entirely appropriate to their context⁵ The truth lies between these two extremes some parts are ill-fitting as we have seen, but there are points at which Peter's words bear directly on the question of the Gentiles' admission to the Church Acts 10 35, the reference to Jesus as $\kappa\alpha\tau\omega\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\kappa\upsilon\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (10 36), and the phrase $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ (10 43) all refer to the universality of the gospel, though these hints are not prominent and they are counterbalanced by more particularist references in 10 36f, 42 The most likely explanation of these two factors - appropriateness and yet irrelevance - is that Luke has constructed the speech with

1 Dibelius,p113 and Conzelmann,p61 argue that vv27-9 are also Lukan, since they refer to the vision and because vv26 and 30 link up neatly They also think the reference to Peter's companions is Lukan They function as witnesses and in 10 47-8 the impression is given that they agree with Peter's assessment of the situation In 11 12f their witness helps to convince the leaders of the Jerusalem Church

2 Dibelius and Conzelmann,ibid, Haenchen,p304, Wilckens,pp49f

3 Contra Hanson,p124

4 Dibelius,pp110-111

5 Wilckens,ibid He explains the phrase "You know" (10 36) in two ways

one eye on the context and the other on the stereotyped pattern of the speeches in the early part of Acts

It is often asserted that there are two distinct problems underlying the Cornelius narrative first, the problem of table-fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians, second, the question of Gentile circumcision Luke, it is argued, has superimposed the one upon the other and got them both hopelessly muddled ¹ Peter's vision and the Jerusalem leaders' objections are concerned with table-fellowship, whereas the central point of ch 10 is that Cornelius was an uncircumcised Gentile who became a Christian It is true that these were two distinct problems, but false to treat them as if they were wholly unrelated Both are closely connected with the problem of admitting Gentiles into the Church and it is quite conceivable that not only were the two themes fused ² when Luke wrote, but that they also arose simultaneously when the Church first faced the problem of Gentile converts As Hanson says "The subject of table-fellowship was involved with the subject of food regulations and both with the subject of circumcision When therefore Luke introduces into his story of the acceptance into the Church of an uncircumcised Gentile a sub-plot describing a vision about clean and unclean food, it may well be that he is combining two different traditions, two different pieces of material, but they are not incompatible Ultimately

(cont) first, it may include Peter's companions, and this would justify the opening phrase, second, one has to assume that the hearers are already proleptically believers before the first word is spoken The substitution of a theory of repentance based on an O T quotation for the usual call to repentance is explained by the fact that, having received the Spirit, Cornelius and his friends were already converted (vv42-3, 11 15)

1 Wikenhauser, p125, Williams, p134, Haenchen, p306, Dibelius, p112, Conzelmann, p61

2 Conzelmann, ibid

they are both concerned with the same subject, and Luke knows this " ¹

The narrative of Cornelius' conversion is important for Luke in a number of ways. One of the striking themes of these chapters is the emphasis placed on the piety of Cornelius. He is portrayed as the classic example of the godly and devout Gentile, a fact which Luke highlights in his usual manner, by repetition (Acts 10 2,4,22,30, and cf Lk 7 1-10). Luke may have thought of Cornelius as a God-fearer, but his description ² is not only to show this. Haenchen thinks that Cornelius is seen as the representative of all God-fearers and that the emphasis on his piety is to show that the Church did not accept all Gentiles, but only the devout ones whom the Jews would accept too. This may be so, or it may be that Luke has another motive in mind, namely to show that the Gentiles were not such a bad crowd after all. By making Cornelius a typical example of a Gentile, Luke may be trying to say that, all things considered, there is not much to choose between a Jew and a Gentile. There is no need for Jews to look down their noses at Gentiles as if they were an inferior breed, for God has shown that the pious centurion is subject to his guidance and blessing as much as any thoroughbred Jew. As in Lk 7 1-10, Luke seems to be introducing a thoroughly pragmatic justification of the Gentile mission alongside the more 'theological' justifications found both here and elsewhere.

No other narrative in Acts is given quite such epic treatment as the Cornelius episode. Not only is it dealt with in ch 10-11, but ch 15

¹ Hanson, p120

² Haenchen, pp302-3

repeats the whole narrative again in a shortened form. Sheer length and repetition are Luke's way of impressing upon his readers the immense significance which this event had for him. It is for Luke the test-case 'par excellence' for the admission of the Gentiles into the Church. God has made it clear that the Gentiles need no circumcision before entering the Church, since he has poured out his Spirit on them freely, as at Pentecost (Acts 10 44, 11 15f). Nor is there need for food regulations in the common meals of Jews and Gentiles (Acts 11 3f). Henceforth there can be no doubt that it is God's will that the Gentiles should become equal members of the Church.

This leads us to note the dominant role which God plays in ch 10-11, as contrasted with the relatively passive role of men. The references to angels (10 22,30 11 13), Peter's vision (10 9-16) with its threefold command, the vision of Cornelius (10 3f), and Peter's ignorance of the meaning of and blind obedience to God's commands all emphasize the dominant role of God. The Gentile mission is from the beginning seen not as the work of men, even if they are apostles, but of God. In fact, both Peter and the Jerusalem leaders are suspicious of and reluctant to obey God's command, but despite this his will is fulfilled. Yet although Peter and the Apostles resisted the will of God temporarily, it is important for Luke to emphasize that the first Gentile convert was won through Peter who, up to this point, has been seen as the leader of the Twelve. Thus the Gentile mission is not only authorized, but actually begun, by one of the Apostles, and at last we have at least a partial fulfilment of Acts 1 8. Luke has done his best to connect the Apostles with the Gentile mission, and thereby he

makes it clear how important this was for him - as we shall see in ch 15. Finally, we note one other main theme which here, as elsewhere in Acts, is connected with the Gentile mission, namely the Holy Spirit (Acts 10 44f, 11 15f). There is no reference to the guidance of the Spirit, but it is the fact that God creates a new, Gentile Pentecost - an unforeseen fulfilment of Jesus' promise (Acts 1 5) - which convinces Peter, his companions and the Jerusalem leaders that God really was at work in the conversion of Cornelius.

The Apostolic Council Acts 15

This chapter is of central importance both for Luke's attitude to the Gentiles and for assessing his reliability as a historian. For here, Luke says, the problem of the Gentiles and the Gentile mission is once and for all decided at a meeting in Jerusalem of all the main figures in the early Church.

The first question we must ask is whether Acts 15 = Gal 2 1-10, that is, can we use Gal 2 as a means of checking the reliability¹ of Luke's account? Any attempt to harmonize the chronologies of Luke and Paul is beset with notorious difficulties. All but the most absurd computations have been seriously defended, with varying degrees of success.¹ We shall take a brief look at the main theories, but without becoming involved in detailed discussion which would go beyond the scope of this thesis.

1 For a summary of the main views see Nickle, pp51f, Caird "Apostolic Age", pp200f, Williams, pp22f, Haenchen, pp396f

The two accounts of the relevant visits of Paul to Jerusalem are as follows Acts 9 26-30, 11 27-30, 15 1-30, 18 22, Gal 1 18-24,¹ and 2 1-10. Although it has been disputed, there is little reason to doubt that the complex of events described in Acts 9 19-30 is the same as those described in Gal 1 15-25. Despite marked differences in the² dating and details of the two versions, they seem to refer to the same events.

The problem now is to fix the correct parallel to Gal 2. According to the chronology of Acts it should be Acts 11 27-30 (12 25)³, but this raises serious problems, the most important of which is that there are so few essential points of contact between the two versions. The initial impetus for the journey and the reference to the Collection are the⁴ only links, and even these have been disputed. There is a chronological

1 For example, Schlatter, "Galater", pp66-78, considers Acts 9 26-30 to be a creation of Luke. He then takes Gal 1 18f to equal Acts 11 27f and Gal 2 1f to equal Acts 15. Similarly Parker (J B L, 86, 1967, pp175f) thinks Luke constructed Acts 9 26f on the basis of parallels with Acts 11, 15 and 21. Equating Acts 11 with Gal 1 eases the chronological difficulties, but it seems impossible to equate the motivation for and details of the journey in Acts 11 with Gal 1, for the only common factor is that Paul goes to Jerusalem.

2 According to Acts (9 19, 23) Paul's visit was 'several days' after his conversion, whereas according to Gal 1 18 it was after three years. According to Acts Paul is introduced to the Twelve by Barnabas, whereas in Galatians there is no mention of Barnabas and Paul sees only Peter and James.

3 Ramsay, pp54f, Bruce, pp214f, Knox, "Jerusalem", pp181f, "Acts", pp49f, Geyser, "Apostolic decree", pp124f, Williams, pp22-30, Sanders, N T S, 2, 1955/6, pp133f, Emmett, B C, II, pp265f, Caird, "Apostolic Age", p204, also seems to favour this view.

4 The reference to 'revelation' is often seen as a close parallel to Agabus' prophecy, but Nickle (p42) argues that Paul never uses the word of communication through another person. Gal 2 10 could be translated 'go on remembering the poor' and could be seen as a reference to Acts 11 27f, but it could also mean simply 'remember the poor' and refer forward to the great collection of the third journey.

inconsistency in the time-span between Paul's conversion and this visit,¹
 and it is odd that a public session (Acts 15) was later needed to
 ratify what had already been decided in private. Further, unless one
 dates Galatians before the Council,² some explanation must be found for
 Paul's silence about this later trip.³ Taken together, these difficulties
 militate decisively against a straightforward identification of Gal 2
 and Acts 11.

Apart from the rather eccentric equation of Gal 2 with Acts 18
⁴ we are left with the conclusion that Acts 15 is the true parallel
 to Gal 2.⁵ There is a sufficient number of parallels between the two to
 confirm this view, although it does raise almost as many problems as
 it solves. Acts 15:2 mentions companions of Paul and Barnabas, which
 could include Titus (Gal 2:4-5), in both Acts 15 and Gal 2 the problem
 of circumcision of Gentiles is raised and the decision reached that
 circumcision is not to be forced on Gentiles who become Christians.⁶

-
- 1 It is very unlikely that Luke thought that 13-16 years (Gal 1:18,
 2:1) elapsed between Acts 9 and 11.
- 2 So Ramsay and Knox, *ibid*. But it is almost certain that Galatians
 was a later rather than an earlier epistle (Buck, J B L, 70, 1951, pp113-22).
- 3 Caird, *ibid*, suggests it is because Paul wanted to defend only the
 gospel he preached at Galatia, he therefore includes only those events
 prior to the Galatian trip, for he could scarcely have been accused of
 getting his gospel from a council which met two years later.
- 4 J Knox, "Paul", pp68f, who thinks Acts 15 and 18:22 are duplicate ac-
 counts of Gal 2:1f, and that they are to be dated at the time of Acts 18.
- D F Robinson (J B L, 63, 1944, pp407-9) thinks Acts 15 is fictitious,
 Acts 9 and 11 = Gal 1 and Acts 18 = Gal 2.
- 5 Lightfoot, "Galatians", p123, Dibelius, pp93f, Filson, "Decades", p107,
 Burton, "Galatians", pp115f, Wikenhauser, pp178f. See also notes 3 and 4
 on p352.
- 6 Gal 2:3 makes it clear that Titus was not compelled to be circumcised.
 In Gal 2:5 the reading which omits *οὐς οὐδε* is secondary, since it
 is difficult to think that a scribe would alter the reading to the un-
 grammatical and incomplete sentence which has *οὐς οὐδε*. Even so, 2:5
 could still mean "we did yield in fact, but not abjectly". O'Neill (p103)
 thinks that whereas in Acts it is always clear that circumcision of the

Finally, in both instances Paul's mission to the Gentiles is recognized and agreement is reached (Acts 15 25-6, Gal 2 7-9)

The major problem which the above equation poses is the visit of Acts 11, since according to Galatians the visit of 2 1f is Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, whereas Acts 15 is his third. Paul could scarcely have omitted to mention a visit to Jerusalem, since this would have imperilled his whole argument in Gal 1-2, where he tries to show that his apostleship and gospel did not originate in Jerusalem. The most common solution is to conclude that Acts 11 and 15 are duplicate accounts from two different sources of the one event described in Gal 2. Luke, not realizing that they referred to the same visit, made two separate journeys of them. Some who accept this explanation date the council to coincide with Acts 11 and others to coincide with Acts 15. More recently it has

(cont) Gentiles is out of the question, Paul has to use negative arguments in Gal 2 i.e. that Titus was not compelled to be circumcised and that the Pillars added nothing to him. Circumcision is a live issue in Paul's later letters and it is unlikely, O'Neill thinks, that an authoritative statement was made, otherwise Paul would have used it. But assuming that Titus was not circumcised, as seems most probable, then this was an authoritative decision which Paul quotes. Whoever they were, it is clear that the Judaizers were not commissioned by the Twelve (though they may have made spurious claims in this direction), so that even after such a decision the Judaizers would not automatically cease to function.

1 This is Lightfoot's explanation (ibid.)

2 Benoit (Bib, 40, 1959, pp 778-92) thinks Acts 11 and 15 are both from an Antioch source, and that the former was originally the introduction to the latter (15 1-2 being redactional). Luke divides them for chronological reasons, i.e. Agabus' prophecy was before Claudius' reign (before A.D. 41) and ch 12 clearly set in A.D. 44. But if Luke thought the council occurred after ch 12, he could also have included the fulfilment of the prophecy and the subsequent visit at a later date. Also, 11 27f and 15 3f do not link very well.

3 Lietzmann, "Galater", p9, Stählin, p209, Hahn (p85) dates Acts 15 between Acts 9 27f and 11 27f and places Acts 11 27f after this, between the Apostolic council and the later council which issued the decree.

4 Oepke, "Galater", pp 51-5, Jeremias, Z.N.W., 27, 1936, p101, Haenchen, pp 396f, Conzelmann, p87, Wikenhauser, pp 178f, O'Neill, pp 94f, Lake, B.C.V., pp 195f, Reicke, "Apostelkonzils", pp 172-87, Filson, "Decades", pp 107f.

been argued that Acts 11 27f is not a parallel to Acts 15, but a creation of Luke's for specifically theological purposes, though containing a residue of historical material¹ G Strecker bases his argument on the consistently Lukan language of this section, on Luke's distinctive view of the Collection, and on the noticeable Lukan motifs, such as the leading of the community by the Spirit, the mention of elders and the centrality of Jerusalem He thinks there is a historical kernel, namely Agabus' prophecy, Paul and Barnabas' visit to Jerusalem and the Collection,² but he thinks that Luke has got them all hopelessly muddled He thinks that although Acts 11 27f is a mistake of Luke's, it is a meaningful one, since it fulfils a theological purpose In his overall attempt to preserve the continuity of "heilsgeschichte" between Jerusalem and Antioch, Luke gives expression to two theological motifs first, the unity of the Church, as expressed in the Collection, second, the legitimacy of the Gentile mission, effected by the connection of the journey (Acts 11 27f) with the events in Jerusalem (Acts 12) and, through Acts 12 25, the further link with the mission in Asia Minor (Acts 13 1f), which shows that the latter was authorized by Jerusalem'

1 Strecker, Z N W , 53, 1962, pp67-77

2 Strecker summarizes the historical elements in Acts 11 as follows Agabus' prophecy is a historical element, but the account of its fulfilment is Lukan It is difficult to connect with a historical event, since there was no universal famine in Claudius' reign References to an apocalyptic event (Mk 13 8 pars) do not enlighten us at this point Luke may have seen its fulfilment in a Judean famine (Haenchen, pp50f) That Paul and Barnabas went together to Jerusalem is historically true, but at this point misplaced, it has been transferred from Acts 15 to Acts 11 by Luke The Collection as *διακονία* is common to Luke and Paul (cf Rom 15 31, II Cor 8 4, 9 1, 12), but in Paul the motive is not world famine, but 'thinking on the poor' In Paul the Collection is from all the Churches and not just from Antioch, Barnabas is not present when the Collection is delivered in Jerusalem, and the delivery comes at the end of Paul's missionary work and not, as in Acts, before the Apostolic council

Strecker has highlighted the major problem of the traditional assertion that Acts 11 and 15 are duplicate versions of the same event, namely that apart from the reference to Paul and Barnabas going to Jerusalem there is no connection at all between the two accounts. This, in turn, makes it clear that if Luke was using sources at this point, as seems most probable, he can hardly be blamed for failing to realize that they were duplicate accounts. No-one, lacking the knowledge of Paul's epistles, would have guessed that they were even remotely connected. Luke has made a mistake, but it is an understandable and excusable one. Further, it does seem more likely that Luke was misled by his sources than that he deliberately constructed an extra journey in order to demonstrate the continuity of the "Heilsgeschichte". Many of the so-called Lukan motifs and much of the so-called Lukan language are misinterpreted by Strecker,¹ at the most this evidence shows that Luke has rewritten and reconstructed his sources. As Strecker makes clear, the traditional material Luke did have was probably confused and obscure and Luke, as usual, tried to rationalize and clarify it. The theological motives which Strecker ascribes to Luke are ambiguous.

1 For example *ὀνοματι* , *σημαίνω* , *οἰκουμένη* , *διακονία* , *κατοικέω* , *ἀδελφοί* , *ἀποστέλλω* are not exclusively or even specially Lukan terms. On the other hand, *ἐν ταύταις ἡμέραις* , *κατερχομαι* , the pleonastic *ἀναστὰς* , *μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι* , *ὀρίζω* and *διὰ χειρὸς* are characteristically Lukan. The localization in Antioch and the backward look to Jerusalem are not particularly significant. The inspiration of prophecy by the Spirit is not exclusive to Luke. Common charity is a phenomenon of the early chapters of Acts, but it is not a true parallel to the Collection, for the one is an internal arrangement of the Jerusalem community and the other a gift of the predominantly Gentile Churches outside Jerusalem to the poor in Jerusalem. Thus very little of this is convincing evidence for a specifically Lukan origin of the narrative, even though Luke has undoubtedly got confused.

The rather torturous attempt to show that the mission in 13 1f is, by a series of connections, legitimized by Jerusalem is highly improbable. Nothing in 11 27-13 4 suggests that this is the case, the only legitimizer is the Spirit, not the Jerusalem Church. The second motive, Church unity, probably was in the forefront of Luke's mind, but this may simply reflect the historical facts, since Paul himself sees the Collection in this way. At the least, it does not exclude the theory of dual sources, which Luke has justifiably got muddled.

Having reached tentative conclusions on the chief problem of the chronology and identification of Paul's visits to Jerusalem, we turn now to the details of Luke's narrative. There are a few obvious points of contrast between Acts 15 and Gal 2 that are not of decisive significance. Titus plays an important role in Paul's version, whereas he is not mentioned by Luke, but the problem of Gentile circumcision, for which Titus is the test-case, is quite clearly dealt with in Acts 15. It is often claimed that Luke portrays the council as a public meeting of the whole Church, whereas Paul describes it as a private consultation between himself and the Pillars.¹ However, it may be that Luke implies that there were two meetings: the first (15 4) was a general gathering of the Church to welcome the Antioch delegation, and the second was the council meeting with the Apostles and elders alone (15 6f), when the real business was decided.² This certainly implies more than the small Jerusalem

1 Nickle, pp51f, Haenchen, pp384-5

2 Wikenhauser, p178, Stählin, p102. Haenchen, ibid, claims that v4 and the use of *πλήθος* in v12 implies a meeting of the whole Church. But v4 could refer to a welcoming party and *πλήθος* could refer to the Apostles and elders alone. Even if Luke implies that Paul met with the leaders alone, v22 makes it clear that the whole Church was fully in support of

delegation in Paul's account (Gal 2 2), but both emphasize that the discussions took place with the leaders of the Jerusalem Church. Being ignorant of Galatians and knowing only that it was with the leaders that Paul met, Luke uses the stylized phrase 'Apostles and elders'¹ to describe them. But this does not amount to a serious contradiction.

However, there are more serious problems, the first of which is the motivation for Paul's journey to the council. In Gal 2 2 Paul claims that it was a result of 'revelation'. It is probable that Agabus' prophecy² is to be seen as a parallel to this, but many find it difficult to square up with Luke's view that Paul was sent by the Church in Antioch. This is because many see Gal 2 2 as part of Paul's defence of his independence from the Jerusalem Church, so that it implies that Paul was not delegated by any Church, neither Jerusalem nor Antioch. But while Paul's intention probably is to exclude the notion of constraint from Jerusalem, there is no reason why Paul's revelation should not have coincided with the decision of the Antioch Church, indeed, the decision itself may have been a result of this revelation. Nor does Gal 2 2 exclude the notion that the factor which necessitated this decision or revelation³ was a disturbance in Antioch caused by Judaizers, even though

(cont) them. Even Gal 2 2 is not clear on this point. The syntax is ambiguous. *αὐτοῖς* refers most naturally to the whole community, whereas *καὶ Ἰσάκ δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν* refers to Peter, James and John. Some (Burton, Oepke, ad loc) take this to imply two meetings, while others (Schlier, ad loc) think that only one meeting is in view, since the latter phrase limits the former.

1 This phrase (15 2,4,6,22,23, 16 4) may have been in Luke's source. The way in which sometimes Paul and sometimes Barnabas is mentioned first is not due to sources or to an attempt to belittle Paul (Klein, pp167f), but is simply an example of Luke's fondness for varying his turn of phrase (Haenchen, p388 n2).

2 Hahn, p78 n3

3 Schmithals, "James", argues in a confused way against this view. He thinks that Gal 2 2 shows that it was the Jerusalem Church in particular

Antioch is not mentioned in Gal 2 1f and Paul clearly " does not intend to give a historical lecture on the reasons which led to the meeting in Jerusalem being arranged "

When in Jerusalem, Paul meets with opposition from an extremist faction Luke describes them as Christian Pharisees (Acts 15 5), whereas Paul simply calls them 'false brethren' In both cases they appear to be a different group from the Judaizers in Antioch, arriving unexpectedly to complicate the business of the council, but it is possible that both Luke and Paul thought that the two groups were connected in some way The only difference is that whereas Luke sees them as Christians (15 5 *κεπιστευκοτες*), however misguided, Paul's description (Gal 2 4 *ψευδαδελφους*) implies that they were 'counterfeit Christians', that is, in Paul's view they were not simply Christians

(cont) who were eager for this discussion and that the cause did not lie in the circumstances of Paul's work If it had, then even Paul's opponents would not have thought that the Jerusalem Church had summoned Paul and his need for a discussion would have been so urgent that Gal 2 2 would be quite incomprehensible The last point is meaningless and further, if the trouble was in Paul's Churches it is perfectly possible that the Jerusalem leaders could have summoned him or that his opponents could have claimed that this was so Schmithals argues further (p.39f) that it is improbable that after 15 years of successful missionary work Paul would have met with opposition on matters of principle from Jerusalem This is true, but then Schmithals asks 'If the Judaizers were a separatist group, why the need for an agreement with the Jerusalem leaders ?' But if, as some think, the Judaizers claimed authorization from Jerusalem, then it would be natural for Paul to consult with Jerusalem to clear the matter up In the face of strenuous opposition Paul would at any rate feel the need to retain and confirm the link with the original disciples of Jesus, who were the prime witnesses of the Resurrection - lest he should 'run in vain' (Gal 2 2b) Cf Barrett, "Pillar", p18

1 Schmithals, "James", p42

2 Munk, p232, thinks the Judaizers were Gentile Christians from Pauline Churches, whom Luke has misplaced in Jerusalem Haenchen (p393) comments succinctly, "höchst unwarscheinlich" Schmithals ("James", p40) is right to reject Schlier's suggestion ("Galater", p35) that Paul went to Jerusalem because, not satisfied with his apostleship from God, he felt the need for the final authority of the Jerusalem Church to confirm his gospel

3 Acts 15 1 and 5 seem to distinguish the two groups There is no evidence

in error, but in reality not Christians at all

A more obvious discrepancy between the two versions is that Luke minimizes the role of Paul and Barnabas in the discussion while emphasizing the decisive influence of Peter and James. The minor role of Paul and Barnabas is evident from Acts 15:12 - their sole contribution to the discussion - which merely recounts the successes of their previous missionary journey, but without any detail. While Dibelius is correct in saying that the brevity of 15:12 is explicable on literary grounds,² since Luke's readers already know the facts from ch 13-14, this does not lessen the contradiction by much. The extensive speeches by Peter and James are almost certainly Luke's construction. The reference back to Cornelius by both speakers is intelligible only on literary grounds.³ The readers of Acts alone would catch the allusion, the speakers' audience would not have understood a reference to an obscure and distant event which achieved prominence only under the hand of Luke. At least we can only assume that this was so, because if the Cornelius episode had had the importance which Luke attaches to it, the Apostolic council should not have been necessary, since such a momentous decision could scarcely have been forgotten so quickly. The quotation from Am 9:11-13 (Acts 15:16-18) is taken from the LXX, the Hebrew cannot bear the interpretation which James gives to it. This would scarcely have been

(cont) that the false brethren of Gal 2 were active in Antioch or other Gentile communities (Nickle, p46), but it is possible that Paul did connect them with the Judaizers in Antioch (O'Neill, p98, Hahn, p78 n1)

1 Nickle, pp47f. He argues this on the basis of the other uses of the prefix *ψαυδο* - in Paul and elsewhere in the NT

2 Dibelius, pp95-7, Haenchen, p388

3 Dibelius, p95, Haenchen, ibid, Hanson, p160

James' way of using the Old Testament and must be ascribed to Luke. Further, in neither speech is reference made to the missionary work of Paul and Barnabas which, according to Gal 2, was the main factor in persuading the Jerusalem leaders of the legitimacy of Paul's apostleship and gospel. We must conclude, therefore, that the minor role assigned to Paul and Barnabas and the speeches of Peter and James are the work of Luke. In reality, the Antioch delegation took a much more active and equal part in the council's deliberations. Luke wants to show that the Gentile mission was affirmed and actively supported by the Jerusalem Church, in particular by the leading figures Peter and James, and in the process of showing this he underplays the role of Paul and Barnabas, though without intentionally degrading them.

The agreement reached and formularized in Gal 2 9, that Paul should preach to the Gentiles and Peter to the Jews, has no parallel in Acts. Moreover, while Paul certainly is the Gentile missionary 'par excellence' after ch 15, he also preaches to the Jews. And although there is in Acts a Jewish mission after the council, neither Peter nor the other Apostles take part in it. The agreement in Gal 2 9 is itself a problem, because whether it is understood geographically or ethnographically it seems to be impractical and unrealistic. Haenchen, therefore, thinks it

1 Haenchen, p389, Conzelmann, p34, Nickle, p36 n78, Stählin, p204, Knox, "Acts", pp45f, B C, V, pp426, Cullmann, "Peter", pp52f. Attempts to deny this are unconvincing. Thus Bruce (p298) thinks James had learned Greek and, because of the presence of Paul and Barnabas, used the LXX. Filson, "Decades", p79, thinks it natural that Luke should write up James' speech in Greek and, therefore, use the LXX. He also makes the dubious suggestion that the Hebrew text mentions the inclusion of the Gentiles.

2 Cf Conzelmann, p87, "Hinter seiner (Paul's) passiven Rolle in den Act steht freilich nicht die Absicht, ihn zu degradieren."

3 Haenchen, pp408-9

must be taken to mean simply that Jerusalem recognized the Law-free Gentile mission of Paul, and Hahn thinks it " indicates the main emphasis and purpose of the missionary activity " ¹ More recently it has been argued that Gal 2 9 must be taken at its face value and not ² watered down in this way Schmithals, in particular, has insisted on an ethnographical interpretation of this verse and believes that it was an agreement which both Paul and the Jerusalem leaders upheld for the rest of their careers ³ Paul's antinomian gospel could easily have become an embarrassment to the Jerusalem Church As the Law was the basis of Jewish national existence, any connection with antinomianism ⁴ would, in a time of increasing national fanaticism, endanger the existence of the Jerusalem Church Thus it is for this practical, political reason that Paul and the Jerusalem leaders agree to a strict ethnographical division of labour According to Schmithals, this agreement did not create any essentially fresh situations, but merely clarified and confirmed what had already been found to be practicable However, throughout his argument Schmithals simplifies things far too much For example, Paul's attitude to the Law is far more complex than Schmithals would have us believe There is no evidence that Paul ever encouraged Jews to abandon the Law, in fact, all the evidence points in the opposite

1 Haenchen, p409, Hahn, p81

2 O'Neill, p104, Schmithals, "James", pp45f

3 Schmithals, "James", pp43-62 Munck, pp275f argues that the difference between Paul and the Jerusalem Church was in their assessment of the place of the Gentile mission Paul believed that it was only through the success of the Gentile mission that the Jews would eventually be saved, whereas the Jerusalem leaders believed the opposite

4 Reicke, "Apostelkonzils", pp172f

direction (I Cor 7 17f, 9 19f, Gal 5 6 6 15) Further, there is evidence which probably implies that after the council Peter worked among Gentiles in Corinth (I Cor 1 12, 9 5)¹ and at least a hint that Paul continued to work with Jews (I Cor 9 19f, Gal 5 11)² Nor can we abandon out of hand the evidence of Acts, which says that Paul continued to approach Jews as well as Gentiles after the council³ Moreover, if Gal 2 9 was merely a formal confirmation of an already existing agreement, what made this confirmation necessary? Schmithals suggests that the cause was Paul's extension of his mission from the coastal lands of the Eastern Mediterranean to the lands further West But this does not really explain the sudden need for a formal agreement to confirm the Church's existing practice The mere fact of Paul's extension of his mission would scarcely have given rise to suspicions that Paul would suddenly change the missionary strategy which had served him so well for fifteen years It seems, therefore, that the evidence of Acts and the epistles combines to show that whatever was the original meaning and intention of the agreement in Gal 2 9, it soon fell by the wayside A few years later Peter and Paul were probably acting in contradiction to the terms of the agreement From this we must conclude either that Paul has made

1 It could, of course, be argued that Peter worked only among the Jews in Corinth

2 I Cor 9 19f does not say that Paul preached to the Jews, though this might seem a natural implication Gal 5 11f, where Paul seems to be defending himself against a charge of inconsistency over circumcision, may be a result of his preaching that Jews may keep the Law, whereas Gentiles need not But it may not imply preaching to Jews so much as a recognition of circumcision as valid for Jewish Christians

3 Schmithals, "James", p60, argues that the synagogues would, for the antinomian Paul, be the last place he would preach in, for he would meet immediate opposition However, this objection is valid only if Paul preached a clear-cut antinomian gospel indiscriminately to Jews and Gentiles, for which there is no evidence

the agreement sound much more precise than it really was, or that the agreement was overtaken by events and soon forgotten. This in turn makes it not at all surprising that Luke does not mention it. Taking into account his ignorance of Galatians and the date at which he was writing, we should be astounded if the reverse had been true and Luke had included it.

The letter which accompanies the decree (Acts 15 23-9) has some¹ odd features which suggest that it may be pre-Lukan. It is addressed to a limited number of Gentile Churches - Antioch, Syria and Cilicia (15 23) and up to this point in Acts Luke has not related a mission in Cilicia.² If it were Lukan, we would expect a wider destination, such as Luke adds in 16 4. Also, the mention of Judas and Silas is odd, for Judas is not mentioned elsewhere in Acts. One might have expected Luke^{2a} to have made more of the role of Paul and Barnabas. Haenchen has argued that the letter is a literary construction of Luke's. Certain features, such as the 'ecclesiastical' style, 15 28 which betrays Luke's concept of the Church and the Spirit, and the phrase 'Apostles and brethren' which Haenchen thinks Luke copied from the similar phrase 'men and brethren', betray Luke's hand at work. But this evidence is not strong, for an ecclesiastical style is not entirely unexpected in an ecclesiastical letter and other Lukan features show only that Luke has at points written up the letter in his own language. Lukan features here, as else-

1 Hanson, pp156-7

2 Conzelmann, p86, points to 15 41 where Cilicia is mentioned in such a way that it is clear that although he has not related it Luke believed that there had been a mission there. But this verse may have been constructed under the influence of 15 23. In Acts 9 30 Paul returns to Tarsus, but it is not said that he preached there.

2a Haenchen, pp401-2

-where in Acts, do not exclude pre-Lukan sources¹ Thus we can conclude that a pre-Lukan version of the letter is probable, though not provable

We turn our attention finally to the problems which surround the Apostolic decree (Acts 15 20,29, 21 25) Despite manuscript variations, modern scholars are unanimous in their acceptance of the so-called
² 'neutral' text of the decree The omission of *κορυελας* in P45 is an accidental error rather than a deliberate variant The Western text substitutes the negative form of the 'golden rule' for *κνικτόν* , which in turn makes possible an ethical interpretation of the other
³ three demands It is agreed that the cultic version of the neutral text is the more original first, a development from the cultic to the ethical is easier to understand than the reverse process, and second, the Western version consists of such widely accepted ethical norms that a decree to this effect would be superfluous The four demands of the decree are based on the Pentateuchal laws for non-Israelites living
⁴ amongst Jews (Lev 17-18) They were the minimum demands made on non-Jews to enable them to mix with Jews, and they are a partial parallel
⁵ to the better known Noachian precepts which fulfilled a similar purpose They remained valid in Palestine until the Rabbinic period and were
⁶ probably kept by God-fearers in the Diaspora

1 As Conzelmann, p87, says (contra Haenchen and Dibelius) when one has proved Luke's hand at work in ch 15, one has not automatically excluded the notion of pre-Lukan sources

2 See the list in Haenchen, pp390-1

3 An earlier dissenter from this view was Clarke, "Acts", pp360f

4 Waitz, Z K G , 55, 1936, pp227f

5 S B , II, pp722f, Moore, "Judaism", I, pp274-5, 339

6 S B , II, ibid , Schoeps, "Paul", pp232f

Some see the decree as an attempt to regulate table-fellowship between Jews and Gentiles. However, this is improbable. First, the rules are too limited for table-fellowship, for they do not even guarantee that no forbidden meat or wine (for example, pork, or wine from libations) is used, and second, Lev 17f does not play any part in Rabbinic rules for table-fellowship. Rather, they appear to be minimal rules which made contact possible between Jews and Gentiles, perhaps for common worship in the synagogue or Church.

The origin of the decree is as disputed as its meaning. Several factors point to a date after the Apostolic council. Most important is Paul's statement in Gal 2 6 that the Pillars added nothing to him, which contradicts the very notion of a decree. Nor does the decree bear on the main business of the council, namely the problem of Gentile circumcision. Further, Peter's behaviour in Gal 2 11f becomes inexplicable if the decree was promulgated at the council. Also, Paul does not mention the decree in any of his epistles, and its absence from I Corinthians and Galatians is particularly striking. Also, in Acts 21 25

1 Conzelmann, pp84-6, Stählin, pp206f, Williams, p32

2 Schmithals, "James", pp100-1, Haenchen, p411, O'Neill, pp102f, Wikenhauser, p175

3 Filson, "Decades", p110 (cf Stählin, p205) argues that the majority of Gentiles kept these rules long before the council, in deference to Jewish scruples. The decree was merely a diplomatic arrangement, confirming an already accepted practice. Since Paul had previously encouraged the practice, Gal 2 6 does not contradict the decree. But this makes the decree redundant, and why formularize an accepted practice in this way? Also, even if the decree was not 'new', Paul would have had to mention it in Galatians, if only to show that it was not 'new', otherwise he would have endangered the whole argument of Gal 1-2.

4 Unless with Stählin (p210) we date Gal 2 11f before Gal 2 1f. Reicke, "Apostelkonzils", explains Gal 2 11f by reference to changed historical circumstances. But he does not specifically include the decree in the original council, so his view is not an explanation at this point in our discussion.

5 Though some, like Hurd, think that Paul did encourage the Corinthian

Paul is told of the decree as if he had not heard of it before, which is a further hint that the decree was not promulgated at the Apostolic council

When we abandon the view that the decree originated at the council, several other theories become possible. One of the most common is to date the decree at a second council which met, in the absence of Paul, after the Antioch dispute. Thus the decree is seen to have arisen directly out of the Antioch controversy. This would account for all the objections raised to dating it at the Acts 15 - Gal 2 council. Often this theory is based on Acts 21:25 which, it is claimed, gives an indirect hint of the real origin of the decree. However, it has been argued that we cannot imagine that Luke would allow Paul to be told of the decree twice for the first time, so that Acts 21:25 should be read as a conscious repetition by Luke, addressed primarily to his readers, emphasizing the importance of the decree. Yet when we consider the frequent internal inconsistencies in Acts, the notion that 21:25 may be yet another becomes quite feasible. Therefore, this evidence is ambiguous and there

(cont) Church to keep the requirements of the decree

6 (from p364) T W Manson (B J R L, 24, 1940, pp69f) thinks Paul dropped the decree after a while because his opponents used it as a sign of his dependence on Jerusalem. But in Galatians Paul would need specifically to refute this false interpretation, so Manson's explanation would only cover the silence of I Corinthians

1 Hirsch, Z N W, 29, 1930, pp63f, B C, V, pp204f, Hanson, pp157f, Wikenhauser, pp179f, Kümmel, "Aposteldekrets", pp83f, Cullmann, "Peter", pp50f

2 Schmithals, "James", pp98f, Haenchen, p412. Some think that 21:25 is Luke's way of emphasizing the requirements for Gentiles, having just mentioned that Jews must keep the whole Law (Schmithals, "James", p98), others think Luke is showing how Paul's mission was within the Jewish Law (Haenchen, ibid), and yet others think the decree is quoted to show that only Gentiles need not keep the Law, thereby guaranteeing the right of Jewish-Christians to keep the Law if they so wish (O'Neill, p108)

is no other evidence which conclusively shows that the decree is early¹ or pre-A D 70, though we cannot exclude this possibility

If we do not take the latter view, then various theories of a later origin are possible. The 2nd century evidence for similar prohibitions is not, as Schmithals notes, to be directly related to the decree.² They are incidental parallels to the decree and the motives for following the various prohibitions do not elucidate the decree in its present context.³ Schmithals thinks the decree may have originated outside the Christian Church, in the Jewish Diaspora. Luke, noticing that the behaviour of the sub-Apostolic Church coincided with Lev 17f, declared the rules to be Apostolic, thus affording an example of the Jewishness of the Apostolic Church.⁴ More probable is the suggestion⁵ that Luke took the decree from a Christian source. O'Neill, for example,

1 Hanson, p155, argues for a pre-A D 70 date because first, at least two of the prohibitions were still being observed much later (Rev 2 14,20), second, the decree is based on the O T and, therefore, the substance is not Lukan, third, the decree is clearly a concession made by Jewish Christians and, therefore, presupposes a Jewish-dominated Church, where the Jews were in a position to lay down the law. However, the first point proves nothing about an early origin of the decree (see above), the second point may be true, but it only shows a pre-Lukan and not a pre-A D 70 date of origin. With regard to the third point, it may be that the decree originated in a Jewish-dominated synagogue, which does not help much in dating it, also, O'Neill (pp108f) thinks the decree implies a Jewish-Christian minority who were eager to get guarantees for the preservation of their own practices from a Gentile-dominated Church.

2 Schmithals, "James", pp99-100

3 They are followed either (a) because they fitted in with the Roman law of the time (Schmithals, "James", p99) or (b) to combat libertarian Gnostics (Just Dial 34 8, Iren Haer I 6 3, 24 5, 26 3, Tert Haer 33) or (c) as a defence against the accusation that the Church murders and eats Children (Tert Apol 9 13, Euseb Ecc Hist ,V 1 26)

4 Schmithals, "James", pp101f

5 O'Neill, pp109-115

thinks Luke found the decree in an 'old source', which represented a specific Jewish-Christian proposal that Gentiles should observe the Levitical requirements for 'strangers within the gates' Luke uses the decree because it seemed to justify the customs prevalent in the Church and because it buttressed the tolerant relationship which he wished to see between Jewish and Gentile Christians Haenchen thinks the source of the decree was the Church of Luke's day Luke, therefore, reflects a living tradition, which probably already projected the decree back into the Apostolic period Luke used the decree in the hope of securing Jew-Gentile harmony in the Church " Die Verbote waren in einer stark gemischten Diasporagemeinde zur Geltung gekommen sein, wo die jüdischen Anforderungen gemässiger waren und man sich mit jenen vier von Mose selbst den Heiden gegebenen Geboten zufrieden gab "

2

3

To conclude it seems clear that both the decree and the accompanying letter were not promulgated at the Apostolic council It is possible, though not certain, that both were given at a later council at which Paul was not present If we think the letter shows signs of a pre-Lukan origin and take it closely together with decree - since without the decree the letter is a torso - then the theory of a later council is probably the most satisfactory explanation In view of the facts we have discussed, this is still the best overall explanation However, if we think the letter is Lukan then it is open to us to date

1 O'Neill, perhaps wisely, does not define this further Dibelius (pp99-100) proposes a similar explanation, namely that Luke found the decree in an old document

2 Haenchen, pp410f

3 Haenchen, p413

the decree much later, though one cannot be more precise than to say that it was probably pre-Lukan and that it was probably lifted from a Christian source. Whatever this source was, Luke understood it to imply that the decree was early and had Apostolic sanction and, accordingly, he worked it into the rest of his knowledge about the Apostolic council.

We turn now to a discussion of the significance of this chapter and its relationship to the rest of Acts. Our first problem is to discover if and how Luke saw ch 15 in relation to ch 10-11. Luke does not appear to be reopening the question of table-fellowship which is implicit in Acts 10:17f and 11:3f, since this is a topic which does not arise in ch 15, unless one interprets the decree in this way. But in ch 10-11 the problem of the entry of Gentiles into the Church is apparently settled in principle once and for all. God has shown that the Gentiles are to be part of the Church as Gentiles, that is, they need not become Jews first. Yet in ch 15 this problem arises once again both in Antioch and Jerusalem, despite the previous agreement between Peter and the other Jerusalem leaders. This problem is heightened by Luke's insisting that Peter and James justified Paul's mission by reference to the Cornelius episode at the council, a mere mention of which was enough to silence all opposition.¹ Perhaps the reference to Christian Pharisees (Acts 15:5) is important and we must assume that, owing to their increasing influence, they began to make their demands felt more strongly. This does not necessarily explain the trouble at Antioch, but it is possible that Luke saw this as a partial explanation

¹ Stählin, p199

of the change of attitude in Jerusalem Or maybe Haenchen is right when he suggests that Luke intends us to think that the Church had simply forgotten about the Cornelius incident The phrase "God has, in olden days" (15 7) is not only a rather exaggerated way of saying that the event was long ago, but may also be partially an explanation of why the Church had forgotten - precisely because it was so long ago' Clearly, as Haenchen sees, if the Cornelius episode had been as epoch-making as Luke makes out, the Church could not have forgotten it so quickly Perhaps we must assume that Luke did not notice the contradiction and therefore did not try to explain it at all Either way, it is the reliability of Luke's account of the Cornelius episode rather than his account of the council, which is thrown into doubt This is not to say that the whole incident was a myth, but that " - it is wholly unlikely that this obscure and isolated episode would have had the prominence and the publicity which Luke attributes to it " ² Apart from the historical question, Luke clearly sees the Apostolic council as a confirmation of the momentous turning-point in ch 10-11, when Gentiles are accepted as equal members of the Church The use of the Cornelius episode in ch 15 confirms the immense significance, already evident from ch 10-11, which Luke attached to it

Ch 15 forms a watershed in the book of Acts It is a, if not the, turning-point of the whole narrative ³ It concludes and justifies past events and makes possible all future developments Before ch 15

1 Haenchen, pp404f

2 Hanson, p160

3 Ph Menoud, N T S , I, 1954/5, pp44f, Haenchen, pp402f, Conzelmann, p87, Hanson, p155

Jerusalem dominates the scene and all Churches are under her influence and direction (Acts 8 14f, 9 31f, 10-11, 11 27f) After ch 15 the Jerusalem Church fades in importance, though it does not disappear, the Church moves out and heads for Rome Together with Jerusalem go Peter and the Twelve, who dominate most of the events up to the council After Acts 16 4 they are no longer mentioned, James and the elders take their place in Jerusalem and Paul and his Gentile mission becomes the dominant theme From this point on the question of Gentile circumcision does not arise, since it has been settled once and for all Paul gains official approval over against the Judaizers and this recognition becomes "die Gründung der europäischen Heidenkirche"¹

At various points we meet familiar themes connected with the Gentile mission—Emphasis is placed on the work of God in planning and provoking the Law-free Gentile mission This is done in many ways Peter's speech is dominated by references to God's activity in the Cornelius episode (15 7-10), God chose to speak first through Peter to the Gentiles (15 7, 14f), God has 'cleansed the hearts' of the Gentiles (15 9), Paul and Barnabas justify their work by reference to the 'signs and wonders' God has wrought (15 12), and finally, God's word in the Old Testament confirms his action with Cornelius (15 16-18)² This use of Scriptural proof to justify the Gentile mission is a theme we have met before and will meet again It emphasizes that it was part of God's eternal will and plan that Gentiles should be accepted as equal members of the Church That the Gentiles need not keep the whole Law is justified

1 Haenchen, p404

2 We shall consider these verses in detail in a later chapter

negatively by reference to the inability of the Jews themselves to keep it (15 10), but it is made clear that the Law-free Gentile mission stands in full harmony with the Mosaic Law (15 21)¹ ² As well as the references to Old Testament promises, there is also the passing reference to Jesus' promise (15 8), as in the Cornelius episode

Yet another theme occasionally peeps through, namely the connection between the Gentile mission and the Spirit - by way of reference back to Cornelius (15 8) and through the phrase 'It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us' (15 28) The authorization of Paul's mission by the Twelve is yet another familiar theme Despite Acts 1 8, Luke finds it difficult to make them actively participate in the Gentile mission, but it is Peter who takes the first and all-important move, and here in ch 15 the Apostles are solidly united behind Paul They finally authorize and set their seal on Paul's work In this way too, Luke makes it clear that the Church was united, it is only a minority which causes the trouble, and they are utterly repudiated by the Jerusalem leaders

Finally, we can draw a few tentative conclusions about Luke the historian in ch 15 Are we to regard the whole of Acts 15 as Luke's imaginative construction, devoid of both sources and historical worth?³

1 Conzelmann, p85, "das Dekret stellt die Kontinuität zwischen Israel und der gesetzfreien Kirche dar"

2 Dibelius calls this verse "one of the most difficult in the New Testament" (p97) Munck (p235) thinks it shows that James believes that Israel will convert the Gentiles the decree is necessary to make all synagogues missionary centres for Christ's gospel B C IV, pp177f, think it is a sort of midrash on Amos 9 11f Haenchen (p391 Cf O'Neill, p102) thinks the regulations of the decree are necessary because the Law, which is preached throughout the world, contains them Hanson (p163) thinks it may mean that Jewish-Christians need no special care because the synagogues take care of them Trocmé (p160f) thinks it may mean that no

Or, when we take into account the different motives of Luke and Paul, can we say, "lassen sich die beiden Berichte ungezwungen miteinander in Einklang bringen, da sie in den Hauptpunkten sich decken und die Differenzen nicht von der Art sind, dass sie entweder die geschichtliche Treue der Apg gefährden oder zu einer früheren Ansetzung des Gal nütigen?"¹ There is, of course, no simple answer to this question. We have rejected several attempts to defend the total reliability of Acts 15 and we have found that in parts Luke was mistaken. He got the number of Paul's journeys to Jerusalem muddled, he has added the decree and letter where they do not belong, and he has ascribed to Peter and James speeches which, at least in their Lukan form, they did not make. These differences are considerable and they show that the early controversies have been to some extent glossed over. But there is nothing to suggest that Luke is being deliberately polemical. There is no room for the Tübingen-School view that Acts 15 is the 'locus classicus' for Luke's cold-blooded perversion of the facts as he knew them. Rather, they have the appearance of genuine mistakes, which Luke made as a result of his ignorance of Galatians and of the details of the council, and because of the vagueness of his sources. Writing a considerable time after the event, Luke's perspective was bound to be different from Paul's, whose version was written passionately, in the heat of controversy. Also, Gal 2 is not straight history. It is at times

(cont) Judaizers are to be sent to Gentile communities, because the synagogues are enough to make the Law known

3 (from p371) Haenchen, pp404f, Dibelius, pp99f, O'Neill, pp94f, Schmithals, "James", p28. Dibelius sums this view up "Luke's treatment of the event is only literary-theological and can make no claim to historical worth."

1 Wikenhauser, p178

¹
 a simplification and it mixes historical report with references to
²
 the contemporary situation in Galatia. When Luke wrote many of the
 original controversies were forgotten. He knew of the controversy over
 circumcision and he knew that, despite strong pressure, the Jerusalem
 leaders accepted the Gentiles without circumcision, and, looking back,
 this was the significant result of the council. Therefore, the fact
 that he relates this, together with some other correct details, shows
 that Luke's account cannot be abandoned altogether as historically
 worthless. Certainly, Luke has written up the event and used it to
 express some of his main themes, and to this extent Haenchen and Dibelius
 are justified in emphasizing Luke's role. But this does not exclude
 'a priori' that Luke had access to sources which, in some points, were
 reliable. Nor does it mean that he attempted to alter the facts as he
 knew them. When his facts ran out, Luke sometimes guessed, but his
 guesswork was aimed at producing a reliable, rounded and intelligible
 account and not a tendentious perversion of history.

1 Haenchen, pp406f

2 Hahn, p80 n1

CHAPTER XITHE SPEECHES TO THE GENTILES

In this chapter we shall concentrate on the famous speech to the Gentiles at Athens (Acts 17 22f) The speech at Lystra (Acts 14 15-17), like the Areopagus speech, is addressed to 'pure' Gentiles, that is, those who have had no previous contact with Judaism The speech at Lystra is considerably shorter than the Areopagus speech Also, it raises fewer exegetical problems and its language is more clearly dependent on the LXX Consequently, it will be dealt with mainly insofar as it throws light on Acts 17 22f As well as a detailed discussion of Acts 17 22f, we shall try to discover clues both to Luke's understanding of the religious status of Gentiles over against Jews and Christians, and to his views on the methods to be used by Christian missionaries to the Gentiles.

A The Context of the Speech

1

It appears that for Luke Athens was the symbol of Greek culture He is not concerned simply with the mission at Athens, but also with the way in which this signifies the overall approach of the Church to the pagan world Similarly, though he singles out the Stoics and Epicureans for special mention, this does not mean that the speech's appeal is limited to them, rather they represent the two main views held in Greece at that time Luke is not concentrating solely on the propagation of the gospel to the intellectual aristocracy of the pagan world, rather,

1 Haenchen, p466, sees Acts 17 as an 'ideal' scene " Paulus spricht dem Sinne nach zu ganz Athen, und Athen wiederum repräsentiert die gesamte griechische Kultur und Frömmigkeit "

he is addressing himself to the popular philosophies, the 'Volks Glaube' of the average Greek. The philosophers, like Athens itself, are used as symbols of a wider reality.

In the 1st century A.D. Athens was the centre of Greek life and piety. Luke's description of the city is vivid and realistic, but whether it is the result of a visit there or whether it is based on literature and popular belief, is difficult to say. ¹ Paul's immediate reaction on seeing the various idols is one of perplexity, but however distasteful they appeared to him, when he begins to speak with the philosophers his rebuke of their idolatry and polytheism is relatively mild (cf vv16,22). This is chiefly because the preamble to the main speech (vv22-3) is a ² 'captatio benevolentiae', an attempt to establish some rapport with his audience rather than antagonize them at the outset with a violent attack on the falsity of their religious faith and practices.

His audience at first misconstrue Paul's reference to Jesus and his Resurrection, possibly imagining that he was the envoy of a new pair ³ of deities. Paul responds to the Athenians' legendary curiosity ⁴ and takes ⁵ as his starting point an altar 'To an unknown god'. Examination of both literary and archeological evidence has brought to light no parallel to

1 Cf Nock (Gnomon, 25, 1953, p506), "brilliant as is the picture of Athens, it makes on me the impression of being based on literature, which was easy to find, rather than on personal observation" (Quoted, in agreement, by Haenchen, pp457,465).

2 Conzelmann, p97, and "Areopagus", p220, Haenchen, p458, Hommel, 4 N W, 46, 1955, pp145-78, here p159, the word *θεολογικὸν νεώτερον* is to be understood 'sensu bono', as meaning 'religious' rather than 'superstitious' (contra Hanson, p178 Gärtner, p239).

3 They may have taken 'Anastasis' to be a female deity, the consort of Jesus.

4 Thucydides, III, 38 4f, Aristophanes, Equ 1260f.

5 Dibelius, pp39f, Conzelmann, p98, and the detailed treatment by Gärtner, pp242-7.

this inscription. The closest we get to it are inscriptions to 'unknown gods', which were probably made through fear that, in ignorance, a deity might be denied the homage due to him, such inscriptions would placate the wrath which might otherwise be inflicted on men. There are three possible explanations open to us: first, it may be that there was such an altar, which has not yet been unearthed, and that Luke's reference to it is correct; second, Luke may have made a genuine mistake, that is, knowing there were altars to 'unknown gods' in Athens, he assumed that individual altars were to single deities, or third, Luke may have made a deliberate alteration in order to create a convenient jumping-off point for Paul's rebuke of pagan idolatry and pantheism.

B The Content of the Speech

Studies of Acts 17:22f fall broadly into two camps. For some, the whole speech is foreign to both Old and New Testaments, an isolated outcrop of Stoic philosophy in a Jewish-Christian landscape. Dibelius is the most consistent advocate of this view, though his views, in a modified form, have been accepted by many since. The other main stream of scholars have rejected Dibelius' philosophical interpretation and insisted that, although the language of Acts 17 may have a Stoic-philosophical ring, the ideas behind it are wholly based on the Old Testament.

1 For example, Pausanias, I 1:4f, Philostratus, Apoll VI 3

2 It is unclear exactly where Paul gave his speech. Luke does not seem to be thinking of a trial before the Athens court (despite the possible echoes of Socrates' trial - Haenchen, p455, and the ambiguous

ΕΠΙΛΑΒΟΜΕΝΟΙ 17:19). When Luke is describing a trial he is quite unambiguous, so that if one thinks of Paul facing an official enquiry, one has to postulate that it was "only an informal interrogation by the Education Commission of the Areopagus court" (Gärtner, p64). Luke probably thought that Paul spoke on Mars Hill. Haenchen (p456) thinks there would be no room there for a crowd. If this is so, Luke may have been unaware of it.

3 Dibelius, pp26f, Pohlenz, Z N W, 42, 1949, pp66-98, Lietzner, pp202-27, and

and Judaism Gärtner has argued this view at the greatest length and many have since followed his interpretation¹ Before either of these extreme views were propagated, Norden proposed that the speech was predominantly based on Jewish-Christian thought, but has a secondary Stoic element He was thus the precursor of those recent scholars who avoid the extreme views of Dibelius and Gärtner and point to the parallel ideas in both Jewish and Greek thought² This mediating position will be confirmed in the following study, but the question will be raised again after a look at the details of the speech

vv24-5 God the Creator The phrase ο θεος ο ποιησας τον κόσμον και παντα τα εν αυτω , ουτος ουρανου και γης υπαρχων Κύριος is a mixture of Jewish and Greek thought The language used takes advantage of the convergence of Jewish and Greek thought and language, particularly in Hellenistic Judaism ποιεω is used by both Greek and Jewish writers about creation³ κόσμος is not a typically Old Testament word, but it was used by Philo and Josephus and here it is clarified by the use of the typically Old Testament phrase ουρανού και γης⁴ The fundamental ideas behind v24 are Jewish, possibly based on Is 42 5, with echoes of Gen 1 1f, but the language seems

(cont) Vielhauer, "Paulinism", pp36-7

1 Gärtner, pp146f, Williams, pp200f, Hanson, pp176f, cf Wikenhauser, pp196f

2 Norden, pp3-83, Conzelmann, pp96f, Haenchen, pp454f, Hauck, Z T K , 53, 1956, pp11-52

3 Cf Gen 1 1, 3 14, Is 42 5, II Macc 7 28, Plato, Tim 28c, 76c Epicetus, IV 7 6

4 Gärtner, pp171f κόσμος does not have the pejorative sense here that it sometimes has in the NT (cf Jn 12 31, 14 30, 16 11) The use of the two expressions 'cosmos' and 'heaven and earth' is probably only a linguistic variation (of which Luke is fond), using language familiar to both Jews and Greeks Gärtner (p174) thinks the phrase παντα τα εν αυτω is an 'explanatory rider' to stop the audience from misinterpreting the familiar terminology with an alien mode of thought

deliberately chosen to be intelligible also to Greeks The opening phrase of the speech at Lystra (*Θεὸν ᾧ ὄντα*) also has a Biblical ring to it , and on the whole the language and style follow those of the LXX more closely than Acts 17 The opening phrase of the Areopagus speech sets the pattern for what follows The language is sometimes typically Jewish and sometimes typically Greek, frequently it is ambiguous and open to both interpretations Also, we shall find that the Greek elements in Acts 17 often appear not to be directly dependent on Greek thought, but to have been mediated through the usage of hellenistic Judaism

Three conclusions are drawn from the assertion about God in v24a First, he *οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ, οὐδὲ ὑπο χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων θεραπύεται* The general tenor of this statement is Jewish the false localization of God in the temple (Is 66 1-2, Sib Or 4 8, cf Acts 7 48), and the attack on idols as things made by men's hands (Dt 4 28, Is 2 8, 31 7, 37 19, II Chron 32 19, Philo, De Dec ,51, De Post Cain 166, Spec Leg I 22) But such attacks on false religion¹ were common among the Greeks too and, in particular, the application of *χειροποιήτος* to the Temple is more characteristic of Greek² than of Jewish and Christian thought Luke is using ideas familiar to both Jews and Greeks, though the grounds for the condemnation of v24b are Jewish rather than Greek, namely that as Lord and Creator of the

1 Gärtner, pp201f

2 Gärtner (p211) claims that Dibelius (p41) is wrong when he says that *χειροποιήτος* used of the Temple is not an O T idea But Gärtner can point only to one example in the O T (Is 16 12 LXX) and that is not applied to the Temple but to Moab's sanctuary Gärtner thinks Mk 14 58 is the source of both Stephen and Paul's attacks on the Temple, this may be so, but it is also likely that the pair *χειροποιήτος* and *ἀχειροποιήτος* were added to the original saying at a later date

universe God cannot be confined to one building or represented by idols

Secondly, God is self-sufficient - οὐδὲ ¹προσδεόμενός
 ΤΙΝΟΣ Dibelius claims that this is part of the Greek attempt to
 describe God in a series of negative statements. Certainly, straight-
 forward claims of God's αὐτάρκεια ² are frequent in and typical of
 Greek literature. But there is also a Jewish tradition which speaks of
 the self-sufficiency of God, from which it is concluded that God needs
 neither sacrifice nor prayer ³. Probably there are echoes of both notions
 in Acts 17:25, since it is not an exact replica of either. It is not
 an independent, straightforward statement of God's self-sufficiency and,
 although the general context is one of worship, it is not concluded, as
 it is in the Jewish parallels, that God does not require sacrifice and
 prayer.

Finally, in contrast to God's self-sufficiency, it is said that
 αὐτός δίδους πᾶσι ζωὴν καὶ κτῆνη καὶ τὰ πάντα. The
 phrase ζωὴν καὶ κτῆνη recalls Gen 2:7, Wisd 1:7,14, but again
 it is language which would be familiar to Greeks.

vv26-27a God and the Nations or Natural revelation ? Of all the verses
 in the Areopagus speech none is more important, more obscure, or provokes
 more diverse interpretations than v26. The syntax is obscure and the
 vocabulary ambiguous, nor is it clear now the verse should be related to
 what precedes and follows it. It is the crux for both the 'Jewish' and

1 Dibelius, pp43f, Hommel, art cit, p160 Norden, pp13f

2 Plutarch, Moral 1052d, Plato, Tim 33d,34b, Seneca, Epist 95:47, and
 the lists in Dibelius and Norden ibid

3 Ps 50:8-13, II Macc 14:35, III Macc 2:9f, Jos Ant VII 111, Philo,
 De Spec Leg I 271 Gärtner (pp216f, cf Hanson, p179, Wikenhauser, p293)
 thinks these passages are the true background to Acts 17:25

'Greek' interpretations of the whole speech

The relationship between ¹ἐποίησεν, κατοικεῖν and ζητεῖν is unclear Dibelius translates, "he created both to dwell and to seek", that is, both infinitives are infinitives of purpose standing parallel to each other ²Pohlenz objects that it is extremely harsh to have two parallel, final infinitives standing side by side and that as parallels they have no inner connection, also, God did not create man to live and seek, but to seek and therefore to dwell He prefers, therefore, to translate ἐποίησεν in a 'neutral' manner ("he caused to dwell"), ζητεῖν being the sole infinitive of purpose But although Dibelius' interpretation is harsh, it is still possible Greek and, since ποιῆσαι in v24 means 'created', it is probable that ἐποίησεν in v26 also means 'create' And if there is a reference to Adam in the phrase ἐξ ἑνός, this would further confirm Dibelius' interpretation by giving another link with the Genesis narratives Thus we can read κατοικεῖν and ζητεῖν as both being dependent on ἐποίησεν ³—, expressing a dual purpose in the creation of men

The phrase ἐξ ἑνός πάντων ἔθνων ἀνθρώπων is equally ambiguous ⁴There may be a reference to Adam in ἐξ ἑνός, but the Jews were not alone in possessing theories of an 'Urmensch' and Luke has probably deliberately left the phrase vague to allow for Greek ideas

1 Dibelius, pp28f, Conzelmann, p99, Gärtner, p153

2 Pohlenz, art cit, pp84f, Eltester, p211 n13

3 Gärtner (p154) calls them the 'material' and 'spiritual' sides of Creation

4 Gärtner (pp151f, 230f) makes much of the implied Adam-Christ parallel in Acts 17 But if Luke had intended this he would surely have made the reference to Adam less ambiguous Gärtner compares Acts 17 with Rom 5, but in Acts 17 no mention is made of the connection between Adam and sin, which is the basis of the treatment of Adam in Rom 5

as well. Some take $\pi\alpha\nu \epsilon\theta\nu\omicron\varsigma \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\nu$ to mean 'all nations of men', while others translate it 'mankind', 'the whole human race'. The end result of both translations is the same, but the former is said to have a more 'Biblical' ring, whereas the latter is 'neutral' and therefore more suited to the philosophical interpretation of the whole verse. If the difference is real, which is doubtful, it is too slight to help prove one or the other interpretation, rather, it is itself dependent on this interpretation.

The two most difficult words in v26 are $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ and $\omicron\rho\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$ in the phrase $\omicron\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\chi\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\alpha\varsigma \omicron\rho\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$. Several interpretations have been proposed.

³ a Gärtner argues in detail that $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ means 'epochs of history' and $\omicron\rho\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$ - 'national boundaries'. God is Lord not only of Creation, but also of history, and not just the history of the Jews, but the history of all men. This idea of God is based on the Old Testament and can best be illustrated from Daniel (cf Dt 32 8, I Enoch 89-90, Lk 21 24), where the history of nations is seen as divided into Divinely ordained epochs. This view emphasizes that v26 is a proclamation of God's character and not a proof of his existence, it is about the relation of God to history and not about his control of nature. ⁴ Pohlenz argues for this interpretation also, but he believes that there is a proof of God's existence here, which uses the familiar Greek argument 'e consensu

1 Nock, art cit ,p507f

2 Dibelius,p28, Nauck, art cit ,p21, Haenchen,p462, Pohlenz,art cit ,p86

3 Gärtner,pp147f, Lake,B C ,IV,p216, Williams,p204, Hanson,p179f, Wikenhauser,p204, Owen, N T S ,5,1958/9,pp133-43, here p135

4 Pohlenz,art cit ,pp86f

gentium' This was, briefly, that despite the variety of nationality, culture and religion in the human race, they all shared in a common belief, namely that God exists, and that this consensus of opinion¹ constituted a proof of God's existence²

b Dibelius challenges this historical interpretation and offers in its place a philosophical one, which he believes amounts to a proof of God's existence from Nature He translates *καρπούς* as 'the seasons of the year' and *ὀροθεσίας* as 'zones' By the latter he means the notion that the universe consists of five zones, only two of which were fit for human habitation By some this fact was observed gratefully, since the Deity had made these two zones differ favourably from the others (Vergil, Georg I 237f, Cicero, Iusc Disp I 28 68f)

c Eltester, finding neither of these views satisfactory, offers yet another explanation of the two words He agrees with Dibelius that *καρπούς* refers to the seasons of the year and produces evidence which he thinks shows that, in the Koine, *καρποι* could be a synonym for *ὥραι* - the more usual word for 'seasons' He rejects Dibelius' interpretation of *ὀροθεσίας*, however, and argues that the reference is to the boundaries between the sea and the dry land which God has clearly fixed This idea ultimately reaches back to the ancient Creation myth, where God struggles with and overcomes the watery Chaos Thus God has

1 Cadbury, J B L, 44, 1925, pp219f, argues for a temporal translation of the whole phrase under discussion, rather than one category being interpreted spatially and the other temporally

2 Dibelius, pp28f

3 Eltester, pp206f, and in N T S, 3, 1956/7, pp100-1, his view has met with wide approval - Nauck, art cit, pp15f, Hommel, art cit, p162, Stählin, pp234-5, Haenchen, p461

made a habitable earth, which he has separated by boundaries from the watery Chaos. By giving fruitful seasons (Acts 14 16) and dry land God has given all that is essential for men to live. For proof, Eltester points to Old Testament material (Ps 73 12-4, 88 9-11, Prov 8 28-9, Jer 5 22, and especially Ps 73 16-7 and Jer 38 36, where the two motifs are combined) and to similar ideas in post-Apostolic literature (I Clem 20 1-12, 33 3, Ap Const 8 12, 7 34). He also points to Lk 21 25 where, in the picture of the End time, Chaos has a brief return to power.

¹
d. Conzelmann rejects all these views and argues that the 'historical'-
'philosophical' alternative has been overplayed. On the basis of some
²
Qumran texts collected by I. Mussner, he argues that Acts 17 26 presents an abstract view which is neither popular-Greek nor Jewish, but is based on a tradition where the events of both the natural universe and history are fused.

After this brief summary of the main interpretations of v26 we must now consider the evidence. *καλπος* is the crucial word, since *οροθεσίας* is so rare that it is difficult to pin it down to a specific meaning. *καλπος* clearly is ambiguous and needs further definition. The attachment to *προσεταιρμενους* is not much help, for the idea of fixation would fit with the translation 'seasons' or with the idea of epochs. The strongest support for the translation 'seasons' is the parallel in Acts 14 17, where *καλπος καρποφορους* clearly refers to the seasons of the year. None of the other uses of

¹ Conzelmann, pp99-100, "Areopagus", pp222-3

² Mussner, B Z, 1, 1957, pp125-50. Cf IQh 1 13f, IQm 12 7, IQp Hab 7 12

the plural of *καρπός* in Luke-Acts are of much help in elucidating Acts 17 26 Lk 21 24, Acts 1 7, 3 19 are all used in an eschatological context, which does not seem relevant to Acts 17 26 The objection to using Acts 14 17 as a parallel is that it is only the *καρποφόρους* which clarifies the meaning of *καρπούς*, on its own, *καρπούς*¹ would not necessarily mean 'seasons' Similar objections have been raised to the evidence which Dibelius adduces where *καρποί* means 'seasons' this is made clear either by an adjective or by the general context, on its own, no-one without the help of Dibelius would take it to mean 'seasons' Moreover, some of Dibelius' examples have *ῥαυ* and not *καρποί* Can we assume, with Eltester, that the two are synonymous?² The evidence he produces is far from convincing Philo Op Mund 59 is the clearest example, where in his comments on Gen 1 14 Philo interprets *καρπούς* to mean *ῥαυ*, which is his usual word for 'seasons' (cf Spec Leg I 210) The LXX of Gen 1 14 and Wisd 7 18 are both ambiguous, they may not mean 'seasons', but simply 'periods of time' In Ep Diogn 4 5 and Apost Const VII 34 2,4 *καρποί* is used of 'seasons', but it is the context in both cases which makes this clear It is true that *καρποί* is used for divisions of the natural (Ps 103 19) and cultic³ (Ex 23 14,17, Lev 23 4, Gal 4 10, and I Clem 40 4,) year and it is but a small step to use it for the 'seasons' But the question is, was this step ever taken in popular usage? On the evidence available, the

1 Ponlenz, art cit, pp86f, Gärtner, pp149f

2 The main lexicons (Liddell Scott, p859, Moulton-Milligan, p315, Arndt-Gingrich, p395) give 'seasons' as only a 'minor' meaning of *καρπούς*, and the evidence they produce is slight At all times the immediate or general context makes the meaning 'seasons' clear Delling, art *καρπός* 1 W N F, IV, p461, translates *καρπούς* in Acts 17 26 as 'historical epochs'

3 I Clem 40 4 gives the closest parallel to Acts 17 26 - *κροῖς τεταγμένους καρπούς*

answer must be that it was a rare usage , always made clear by the context, and that it was not the meaning that would spring most readily to mind when the word was used without clarifying circumstances. Thus we must conclude that *καίρους* means 'periods of time' or 'epochs of history'.

As we have already noted, *ὁροθεσία* occurs so rarely that it is difficult to define it from extant parallels. Dibelius' interpretation of 'zones' has correctly been criticized. The fact that two of the zones were made habitable is a dubious proof of God's existence, for it could be used equally well to argue the opposite case. Moreover, Dibelius' view is contradicted by v26 itself, which says that God created men 'to live on all the face of the earth'. Eltester's view has¹ much to recommend it, since he can point to a complex of Old Testament ideas which are widely evidenced. Particularly striking are the LXX of Ps 73 16-7 and Jer 38 36, where the ideas of 'seasons' and 'boundaries' are linked. But apart from Lk 21 25, which is in an apocalyptic context, Luke does not elsewhere see the sea as an element of Chaos, but simply as a part of God's creation (Acts 4 24, 14 15). Also, the Old Testament parallels, when they mention the notion of 'boundaries', generally speak of the 'boundaries of the land' or the 'bounds of the sea' and not, as in Acts 17 26, the 'boundaries of their habitations'. Moreover, what little evidence we have shows that *ὁροθεσία*² most naturally refers to the boundaries that divide nations. Finally, the translation 'national

1 It is insufficient for Gärtner to dismiss Eltester's view as meaningless in the context of 17 24f, for by 'context' he seems to mean his own interpretation of the speech (p148).

2 The one inscription we have seems to mean this (Inscr v Priene, 42, II, 8" *δικαίαν εἶναι ἐκρίναν τὴν Ῥωδίων κρίσιν τε καὶ ὁροθεσίαν* ") Eusebius (Demonstr. Evang. 4 9) also uses *ὁροθεσία* of national

boundaries' fits better with our conclusions with regard to *καιρούς*

What then is v26 saying ? A proof of God's existence from Nature is ruled out by our translation of *καιρούς* and *οροθεσίας*. This is also seen by Haenchen and Conzelmann even though they favour, as a whole or in part, the views of Eltester. The use of *καταγγέλλω*¹ in 17 23 also gives the speech a tone of pronouncement rather than proof. There is considerable truth in Stählin's assertion that Paul " steht nicht als Philosoph unter den Philosophen, sondern als Prophet " Pohlenz's² idea of an argument 'e consensu gentium' reads into the text something that is not there. It implies that God implanted searching in all men in spite of their differentiation^{2a}, and the text does not say that. The parallels drawn from Qumran, while interesting, give one no reason to suppose that they have influenced the language or content of Acts 17 26. Conzelmann is uncharacteristically vague when he concludes that v26 expresses an 'abstract idea' equivalent to neither Jewish nor popular-Greek thought and maybe combining 'historical' and 'natural' elements. 'Abstract idea' is too vague to be of use, and presumably Luke did not mean both 'seasons-land/sea boundaries' and 'epochs-national boundaries' when he wrote *καιρούς* and *οροθεσίας*. Therefore, we take the reference to be a historical one, expressing the ideas of the creation and control of men and nations by God. This idea of a God who is active in the events of history is fundamentally, though not exclusively a

(cont) boundaries. Hippolytus, De Theoph 2, uses it to mean 'riverbank', ie the boundary between the water and the land.

1 Gärtner, p152

2 Stählin p232

2a Conzelmann, "Areopagus", p222

Biblical idea The Greeks also thought of history as occurring in a series of epochs (Dionysius of Hal I 2, cf Preface to Appian's Roman History), but the basis for and style of their pronouncements are very different from the Biblical notion of a God who actively participates in and plans the course of history

The purpose of God's creation of men and nations is that they should $\chi\eta\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$ This phrase has also sparked off very different interpretations Dibelius claims that in the context of Acts 17 $\chi\eta\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ does not have its typical Old Testament meaning of an act of will, trusting and obeying God, but rather its characteristic Greek meaning of seeking-out and examining what is true It is difficult to choose between these two interpretations Luke may have been thinking of both views or, more probably, he did not think about the matter systematically at all, but simply used a word familiar to both Jewish and Greek religious speculations Two factors give marginal support for the view that the Old Testament-Jewish idea dominates here First, the object $\tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$ is more often connected with $\chi\eta\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in the LXX than elsewhere, and means 'to turn to', 'to cleave to', or even 'to enquire about' God (which comes close to the Greek idea) Second, since the Stoics believed that God could easily be inferred from Nature, the phrase $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\ \gamma\epsilon\ \psi\eta\lambda\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu\ \alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\nu$, which

1 Dibelius, pp32f

2 Eg Dt 4 29, II Sam 21 1, Hos 5 15, Jer 8 1f, cf Gärtner, pp155f, Hanson, p180, Williams, p204, Stählin, p235, Wikenhauser, p206

3 Eg Plato, Apol 19b, 23b, Rep 449a, and Dibelius' evidence, ibid, cf Pohlenz, art cit, pp86f

4 Owen, art cit, p135, thinks Luke means an intellectual search culminating in a living encounter

5 Haenonen, pp461-2, thinks neither the OT idea of obedience to God and the Torah nor the Greek idea of 'intellectual speculation' lie behind Acts 17 26, but rather a vague idea of 'intuition'

expresses an uncertainty about the end result of the seeking, would be foreign to Stoic thinking. Thus while God may have left clues in his Creation, it does not follow that men will automatically recognize and correctly interpret them. The rare $\epsilon\lambda$ + optative, which hints at uncertainty, is strengthened if we interpret $\psi\eta\lambda\alpha\phi\acute{\omega}$ ₁ to mean 'grope' or 'fumble', for which there is some evidence. However, the word may have its more usual meaning of 'grasp with the hands' or 'touch', which₂ Norden takes to be a Stoic term.

vv27b-28 The Proximity of God and Man We come now to the section which Norden thought to be the Stoic core of the Areopagus speech. Before analysing the individual statements it is worth noting that, in contrast to the material we have already discussed, the total atmosphere and 'Weltanschauung' of vv27b-28 is that of Greek (Stoic) philosophy rather than of the Old Testament and Judaism. This is made clear by the quotation of Aratus, but is also true of the rest of the material.

$\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\alpha\kappa\rho\alpha\nu\ \alpha\pi\omicron\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\ \upsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ has close₃ parallels in Greek writings, the closest being in Dio Chrysostom's Olympic Oration (Discourses, XII 27-8, cf Seneca, Ep 41 1, 120 14, Jos⁴ Ant VIII 108f). There is an overlapping idea found in the Old Testament (Dt 4 7, 30 11, Ps 139 7f), but there the emphasis is on God's readiness₅ to help. Conzelmann may be right when he interprets the emphasis on God's nearness to man to mean that man's groping, fumbling and lack of

1 Gärtner, pp160f

2 Norden, pp15-17

3 Dibelius, pp47f, Haenchen, p462, Conzelmann, p100, "Areopagus", p224, Hommel, art cit, p164, Pohlenz, art cit, p89

4 Gärtner, pp162-3, Hanson, p180, Wikenhauser, p205, and Williams¹, p204, who thinks the connection with Stoic thought is accidental

5 Conzelmann, p104

faith cannot be blamed on God's distance from man. He has left clues in his Creation and those that follow them find that God is near.

The phrase *ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ὧμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμεν*, is unparalleled in the New Testament *ὧμεν*, *ἐσμεν* and, in particular, *κινούμεθα*¹ recall Stoic ideas. Many interpret the phrase as an expression of the well-known cosmological concept of the close relation between God, man and the world.² Most of the examples from Greek literature speak of the Deity as permeating all things and not of men living *ἐν αὐτῷ*. But since they believed that God and man were virtually identical, one cannot make much of this distinction. The phrase as a whole is open to a monotheistic as well as a pantheistic interpretation, and any Jew hearing it would probably interpret it monotheistically, along the lines of Ps 139.³ But the Old Testament and Jewish notion of God's omnipresence is not the real background to this phrase. The closest parallels to *ἐν αὐτῷ* are found in the Hermetic literature (eg 5.11), in Paul's phrase *ἐν Χριστῷ*, and above all in I Jn 4.13,15, though it must be said that Paul's phrase is regularly *ἐν Χριστῷ* and not *ἐν Θεῷ*.⁴ The language of this phrase is basically Stoic, but it is improbable that Luke intended it to be

1 Hommel (Z N W, 48, 1957, pp193f) has shown that it is unlikely that this phrase is a quotation of a Greek poet (contra Dibelius, p48, Stählin, p236). He thinks this triad is based on Plato, and that the Greek evidence shows that "in *ὧμεν* das physische, in *ἐσμεν* dagegen das seelisch-geistige Leben steckt, während das dritte, *κινούμεθα*, beides in Kosmische Überhölzt" (p198, cf Plato, Tim 37c, Plutarch, Moral 477c,d).

2 Cf Norden, pp21f, Gärtner, pp105f, 177f.

3 Gärtner's attempt (pp189f) to see the three verbs as synonymous and based on the O T is unconvincing, particularly his comments on *κινούμεθα*.

4 Dibelius (pp60-1) makes much of this point.

understood pantheistically The beginning of the speech (vv23f), which is monotheistic in tone, excludes this, but it is clearly an accommodation to the language of the audience The language was probably so familiar to Luke that he did not give it systematic thought

Similar conclusions arise from a consideration of the quotation from Aratus $\tau\omicron\upsilon \gamma\alpha\rho \kappa\alpha\iota \gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ (Phaenomena 5) Of all the statements in Acts 17 this is the one which is most readily interpreted pantheistically not least because it is a direct quotation from a Stoic poet The 'philosophical' element, if only linguistic, cannot be denied at this point Strictly speaking, the notion that men are God's $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ contradicts the Biblical creation narratives But the fact that Aristobolus (Eusebius, Praep Ev XII 12 3f) uses the same quotation from Aratus to expound and maintain the Biblical creation narrative shows that the phrase was open to a more Jewish, monotheistic interpretation On hearing this quotation, a Christian or Jew would immediately associate the 'Gottebenbildlichkeit' of Genesis with the 'Gottverwandschaft' of Aratus' $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, though strictly speaking the two¹ do not converge It is probable that Luke understood the phrase Biblically, though how far he was aware of its pantheistic connotations is difficult to say Certainly, it was not uncommon to quote an author out of context and use the quotation to support a view different from² or even opposed to its original meaning

The point of the quotation from Aratus is to decry the representation of God by man-made idols, the $\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ of v29 makes this clear

1 Nauck, art cit ,pp22f Haenchen,p462, thinks v28 must be interpreted in the same way as Lk 3 28, where Adam is called God's son, ie God created him

2 Gärtner,p193 n1

Thus the Aratus-quote is not used primarily, if at all, to reproduce Aratus' ideas on the relationship between God and man, but to attack idolatry and the false conception of God which underlies it. Exactly how the quotation proves its point is unclear. The argument may be that because we are related to God we ought to know better than to think him adequately represented in stone or wood, or it may be that the common factor between God and man is that both have 'life', a quality conspicuously lacking in idols, and that it is therefore as absurd to portray God, as it is to portray man, in images. The attack on images is, as we saw earlier, both a Jewish and a Greek phenomenon, and here, as in vv24-5, the basis for this attack on idolatry is a mixture of both elements. The difference is that in vv24-5 the Old Testament notion of the one God, Lord and Creator, is the chief motivation of the attack, whereas here the Greek idea of the relatedness of God and man dominates the scene. In this context it is also worth noting the impersonal designation for God in v29 (Τὸ Θεῖον) and the neuter locution in v23, both of which are more Greek than Jewish, though both Philo and Josephus use Τὸ Θεῖον.

vv30-1 Resurrection and Judgement We come finally to the only 'Christian' part of the Areopagus speech, and even here Christ is mentioned only indirectly in v31 (ἐν ἀνόψει) The mention of the 'ignorance' (τῆς ἀγνοίας) of the Gentiles, which God has 'overlooked'

1 Thus Conzelmann (p101) is correct when he says that Luke is not interested in ontology in vv28-9, but in the origin of true service of God.
 2 Gärtner, pp166f. Conzelmann (p101, "Areopagus", pp224f) thinks that there is a confusion between Jewish and Greek thought in v29 - the Jewish idea that the Creator should not be portrayed by his creatures and the Greek critique of images on the grounds that living things cannot be represented by the non-living.

(ὑπερδῶν) recalls other passages in Acts where the same motif is used with reference to both Jews and Gentiles (3 17, 13 27, 14 16)¹ The significance of τῆς ἀγνοίας is unclear for Dibelius the word means primarily intellectual ignorance and involves a positive assessment of the Greek's religiosity, but for Gärtner the word is loaded with Old Testament connotations, making it almost equivalent to the word 'sin' and implies not tolerance, but positive condemnation of Greek idolatry and religion. Moreover, on the one view μετανοεῖν means primarily a turning from ignorance to knowledge and on the other view it means a turning from sin to grace. Gärtner is justified in noting the implied condemnation of the Greek's previous existence in μετανοεῖν and κρῖναι³, but this does not mean that we can interpret 'ignorance' as equivalent to 'sin'. One cannot offload onto Acts 17 30 the total connotations of the Old Testament idea of ignorance, if Luke had meant 'sin', there is a perfectly good Greek word he could have used. Moreover, v30 (and v23) lacks both a catalogue and condemnation of the vices of the Gentiles such as we find in parallel passages (cf Rom 1 18f), to this extent v30 is mild and conciliatory. Even so, the very use of whichever interpretation we give to it, implies some form of condemnation. The clue seems to lie in v23 here it is said that the Greeks worship God but do not know him, while in the following verses the expression of their worship - the idols and images - are shown to be false. There is both a positive assessment of their religiosity and worship and a

1 Dibelius, pp53f, 60f, Pohlenz, art cit, pp95-6, Norden, p129, Nauck, art cit, pp33-4

2 Gärtner, pp233f

3 Gärtner (p237) " μετανοεῖν and κρῖναι show clearly the spirit in which ἀγνοία should be interpreted "

positive condemnation of their idolatry. There is a mixture of both tolerance and reproof, conciliation and rebuke. The Gentiles have been misguided, but their ignorance is an excuse. But now ($\tau\alpha\ \nu\upsilon\nu$), after the coming of Christ, a new era has dawned, at the close of which God will judge the world. The world and mankind are no longer regarded as to their being, but as to their end. The course of world history is now seen to be heading for the final Resurrection and Judgement, which have been confirmed by Jesus' Resurrection. Judgement is indisputably on its way though, as in the rest of Acts, it is not said to be near. Although the transition from vv24f to vv30-1 is abrupt, this does not mean that vv28-9 form the climax of the speech and that vv30-1 are an anti-climactic addition. The reference to Judgement is the motif which underlies the Gentiles' urgent need to turn from ignorance to worship of the one true God. And while the earlier parts of the speech do have independent value, they also serve to underline and explain the parenetic¹ ending.

C The Origin of the Speech

It is clear from what has been said above and from most modern studies that Acts 17 (and to some extent Acts 14 15-7) is closely connected with, if not directly dependent on, the amalgam of Jewish and Greek thought found in Hellenistic Judaism. Almost all the more 'Greek' elements in Acts 17 are paralleled in the writings of Hellenistic Judaism² and in other Christian writers dependent on Hellenistic Judaism.

1 Nauck, art cit p31 "Die Aussagen über Schöpfung und Weltregiment Gottes haben dienende Funktion und zielen auf den paränetischen Schluss der Rede hin, wo der Weg zur Rettung in der Ermahnung zur Umkehr angedeutet wird." Contrast Hommel, art cit, pp158-9

2 Cf especially Nauck, art cit. Conzelmann (p103) notes that many of

It is likely, therefore, that Acts 17 is dependent not directly on Greek thought, but on that thought as mediated through Hellenistic Judaism

Norden compared Acts 17 with a broad type of literary mission-speech (cf Ps Clem Hom 1 7, Sib Or I.150f, Corp Herm 1 27f, 8 1f) and believed it to be a literary imitation of a speech of Apollonius of Tyana, which originated in the 2nd century A D and was interpolated into Acts. The latter notion has rightly found no general assent, but his comparison with some of the Jewish and early Christian writings was the first step towards later, more detailed studies. Many of Norden's parallels are too vague and he does not allow sufficiently for the differences between Acts 17 and the parallel literature, also, it has become clear that Acts 17 must be treated as a whole unit and not as a jumble of individual ideas. This approach has been followed through most exhaustively by W Nauck. He sees a basic threefold structure underlying both early post-Apostolic literature (I Clem, Epist Apost, and Apost Const) and Jewish missionary literature (Sib Or and Aristobolus). This threefold pattern of God's 'creatio', 'conservatio' and 'salvatio', is thought by Nauck to be the basic structure of Acts 17 22f. Thus he believes that "Lukas hat die wichtigsten Motive, die in der jüdischen und christlichen Heidenmissionspredigt verwendet werden, auf kleinstmöglichem Raum zusammengedrängt, und hat damit ein 'illustrative excerpt'¹ einer vorbildlichen Heidenpredigt gegeben"² But the threefold pattern which Nauck sees in Jewish and Christian propaganda is not a consistent pattern which thoroughly pervades these writings. Often it seems that

(cont) the central Stoic themes are missing from Acts 17, which makes direct dependence less likely

1 Cadbury, B C, V, p407

2 Nauck, art cit, p36

the pattern does not emerge naturally from the text itself, but is imposed on it by Nauck. Moreover, as Conzelmann notes,¹ the analogy breaks down at the middle point, for none of the parallel texts have the theme of the proximity of God and man (Acts 17 27-9) as their central section. The placing of this anthropological section in the centre is an innovation: the ideas are not new, but nowhere else is this viewpoint bracketed between two other basic themes as in Acts 17.

However, Nauck's valuable study has shown that the ideas and literature current in Hellenistic Judaism and post-Apostolic Christianity give the closest parallels we have to the structure and ideas of Acts 17. This is what we would expect from our study of the details of the speech. For it became clear that the fundamental motif of the speech is Jewish-Christian,² whereas the Stoic element is secondary. The beginning and end of the speech is basically Jewish-Christian, but the language used would have been intelligible to Greeks as well. The middle section (vv27b-29a) is basically Stoic, but the language used is sufficiently ambiguous for a Jew or Christian to give it a monotheistic, Biblical interpretation. Moreover, the bracketing of these Stoic motifs within a monotheistic pattern of belief means that these motifs undergo a shift of meaning, since they cannot be interpreted in isolation.

However, this view is largely dependent on the acceptance of Acts 17 as a literary work of Luke's rather than as a speech of Paul. For if we consider Acts 17 to be a genuine record of a speech by Paul to pagans, the question is further complicated by having to imagine the

1 Conzelmann, "Areopagus", pp226-7

2 Norden, pp3f, Haenchen, pp460f, Conzelmann, p103, Nauck, art cit, pp31-2

response of his audience Although we can analyse Acts 17 for its Jewish and Greek elements, arguing for the primacy of one or the other, if the language is often capable of a Stoic interpretation, then presumably that is the way Paul's audience would have understood it (until they got to v31), and Paul would know this It is to this problem of the Pauline origins of Acts 17 that we must now turn

1

Between them, Gärtner and Nauck have made the best possible case for the Pauline origins of Acts 17 Gärtner lists the reasons why he thinks that a speech very much like Acts 17 22f was spoken by Paul at Athens our knowledge of Paul is limited and Acts 17 does not contradict what we do know of Paul's teaching, Acts 17 has pre-Lukan elements - the setting, context and altar inscription, the theme of natural revelation is the same in Acts 17 and Rom 1, that is, it is shown to be untrustworthy and often leads to ignorance and idolatry, the critique of idolatry is the same as in the Old Testament, Judaism and Romans 1, and finally, the universalism of Acts 17, with its parallelism between Adam and Christ, is thoroughly Pauline Most defenders of the Pauline origin of Acts 17 admit that the language is not Pauline, but they explain this as a result partially of Paul's accommodation to the language of his audience and partially of Luke's influence Also, those who recognize that the polemic against idolatry in Acts 17 is milder than Rom 1 explain it as the result of a missionary situation, where the aim is not to antagonize, but to establish rapport with, the audience Nauck adds to these arguments a further interesting suggestion, namely that

1 Gärtner, pp248f, Nauck, art cit, pp36f, Williams, p201, Hanson, p182, Wikenhauser, p211 Stählin (pp239f) is less sure and merely points out the possible parallels with Paul Lilester (p227) is also non-committal, but he does not exclude the possibility of Pauline origins

where in details and emphasis Luke differs from Paul, this is because he was influenced more by 'liberal' Jewish-Christian propaganda, whereas Paul was more in line with the 'conservative' element. The 'liberal' view is found in Aristobolus and the 'conservative' view in the ¹ Sibylline Oracles.

Most of the arguments which Gärtner offers are convincing only to those who accept his overall interpretation of the speech. As we shall see, it is debatable whether Acts 17 does not contradict Rom 1, or whether the assessment of Gentiles' pre-Christian religion is the same. And although the setting of the speech may be pre-Lukan, this is no argument for the pre-Lukan, even less the Pauline, origin of the speech itself. Frequently Luke seems to have had reliable tradition about the setting of events, but has constructed a speech which he thinks fits the situation. Also, Gärtner's emphasis on an Adam-Christ parallel in Acts 17 is unwarranted, if Luke had intended this he would presumably have made an unambiguous reference to Adam.

Moreover, there are several differences between Acts 17 and Paul's writings which suggest that Paul was not the author of the Areopagus ² speech. First, the use of the knowledge of God implied in Nature is used differently in Luke and Paul. Paul does not expound this knowledge as if to construct a natural theology. It has no independent value for him, but is merely one stage in his total argument. It is adduced to justify God's condemnation of all men: the Jews are without excuse, since they have the Law, the Gentiles are equally culpable, as they have had the

1 Nauck, art cit, pp41f

2 Cf Dibelius, pp58f

revelation of God in Nature Paul can conclude, therefore, that "All who have sinned without the Law will also perish without the Law, and all who have sinned under the Law will be judged by the Law" (Rom 2 12) The Gentiles could have responded to this revelation, but they did not respond, they worshipped the creature rather than the Creator As a result, *παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός* (Rom 1 24, 26, 28), and Paul underscores his point with a lengthy catalogue of Gentile vices Luke also concludes that the Gentiles have not correctly interpreted this natural revelation, but the tone and emphasis are completely different There is no castigation of Gentile immorality in Acts 17 and the interpretation of the Gentiles' response to the natural revelation is different from Paul's For whereas Paul claims that the Gentiles knew God but did not honour him,—Luke claims that they worship God but do not know him The one view emphasizes the Gentiles' culpability, while the other interprets their basic response as correct but misguided Paul's is a passionate condemnation, while Luke's is a combination of magnanimity and admonition Nor does Luke have any notion of God 'handing over' the Gentiles, which recurs like a refrain in Rom 1 18f, and the tone of the rebuke of idolatry is not, as it is in Rom 1, indignant, but mild and conciliatory

Second, the relationship between God and man, their proximity and relatedness, described in Acts 17 27-9, is not typical of Paul He can speak of Christians being 'in Christ', but when speaking of pagans he is deeply concerned to emphasize their estrangement from God (Rom 1-3, 5 10, II Cor 5 20-1)

Third, the two epochs, before and after Jesus, are characterized in Acts 17 as 'ignorance-knowledge', whereas for Paul they are characteristically described as 'sin-grace' Nor does Acts 17 show any traces

of the characteristic Pauline themes of justification, the wrath of God,
 Law, faith and works, and a 'theologia crucis' Further, while Rom 3 25¹
 is a parallel idea to Acts 17 30, in Paul it is a passing reference,
 whereas Luke emphasizes it by repeating it elsewhere²

What then can we say about the question of the Pauline nature of Acts 17 ? The question is complicated by unknown factors We are limited in our knowledge of Paul, in particular, his epistles are written mainly for Christians and it may be that he spoke differently when addressing pagans Also, our assessment of the Pauline nature of Acts 17 will depend on the amount of Greek influence we find in the speech, for on the whole those who defend the Pauline origin of Acts 17 interpret it along Jewish-Christian rather than Stoic lines But even when allowance is made for these factors, it does seem improbable that Paul would have spoken in the way Luke says he did The differences between Acts 17 and Rom 1-3 are too great, and there is a limit to which the missionary situation can be used as an explanation of this The language and style of Acts 17 are, not surprisingly, Lukan, but the divergence between the ideas of Acts 17 and Rom 1-3 and the absence of Pauline themes militates against a specifically Pauline origin This is not to say that there are no common ideas in the two sections Luke and Paul stand in a common Christian tradition and share the same basic creed, so that we would expect some similarities It is also true, as Nauck shows, that Luke and Paul stand in a common tradition influenced by Hellenistic-Jewish missionary practice

1 In Acts 17 31 $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ means 'proof', 'assurance' which is not a Pauline usage

2 So Dibelius, pp58f, Haenchen, pp466f, Pohlenz, art cit, pp95-6, Hommel, art cit, pp160f, Vielhauer, "Paulinism", pp36-7 - all of whom argue against the Pauline origin of the Areopagus speech

But this does not mean that Luke and Paul say the same things, for tradition develops and changes. And when Nauck, probably correctly, claims that Luke and Paul were influenced by different schools of thought in Hellenistic-Jewish missionary propaganda, it is not enough simply to call this a difference of emphasis, for there is also a difference of facts and ideas. Thus it seems that we must conclude that the Areopagus speech is a Lukan and not a Pauline product and that when he composed the speech, Luke was considerably influenced by the ideas and missionary methods of Hellenistic-Judaism and the post-Apostolic Church.

D The Speeches to the Gentiles and the Gentile mission in Acts

Acts 14 15-7 and 17 22f are of immense value in assessing how Luke believed the preaching to the Gentiles should take place. Certainly, the Areopagus speech was for Luke an account of a unique historical occasion, when Paul took the gospel to the heart of Greek culture, Athens. It shows how, at one time, Paul dealt with Greek philosophers.¹ But the significance of the speech does not end there, the event has a broader implication too. It is more than an individual event, for it also gives an example of missionary preaching to the Gentiles. It is as much an answer to the question 'how is one to speak?' as to the question 'how did Paul speak on that occasion?'² As Stählin says, " wollte er mit ihr das klassische Beispiel eine Rede geben, in der der Versuch gemacht wird die biblische Botschaft von Gott an Menschen heranzubringen, die ihr völlig fremd und verständnislos gegenüberstehen."³ The fact that Paul's

1 Conzelmann, "Areopagus", p227, thinks Luke is addressing his readers. If Greek intellectuals were not converted by a sermon of Paul, they will not respond today. Thus the Church finds its own experience substantiated, for they too found that intellectuals would not accept the gospel.

2 Dibelius, pp70-1, Haenchen, pp467-8, Nauck, art cit, p36

3 Stählin, p241

success at Athens was small does not stop Luke from using a golden opportunity to give the classic pattern for a Gentile mission sermon¹ When Luke was writing, the Church was no longer recruiting steadily from Gentiles already connected with the synagogues, as in Paul's day, but from thoroughbred Gentiles. The starting point for missionary preaching, therefore, could not be that Gentile hearers have the same monotheistic presuppositions as the Jews, and Old Testament proof-texts would be irrelevant. Thus the speech begins at the point of natural revelation and, instead of quoting the Old Testament, uses a quotation from a Greek poet. Luke saw that Greek wisdom was open to a Christian interpretation, but he does not go to extremes. For the harmony of Old Testament and Stoic ideas does not extend as far as the centre of the Christian faith, namely the Resurrection, which is the contradiction of Greek wisdom.

"The view of revelation expressed in the Areopagus speech bears a pronounced universalistic stamp. No limits to the universal revelation are mentioned. God is presented as the God of the whole world."² This is made clear from the start, when the natural revelation of God is seen to be based on the act of Creation. God is creator of the whole world and exerts his Rule over both Nature and history (vv24-6). The purpose of God's Creation, that men should seek him, is universal, because it is based on Creation (v26). Corresponding to this is the emphasis on the revelation through Christ as being of universal validity. This is made abundantly

1 The fact that the response to Paul's sermon was small does not mean Luke saw it as a failure. It is not so much a failure of Paul as a refusal of the Greeks. If he had thought it a failure, Luke would not have described it in such detail. Nor is there room for Williams' suggestion (p206) that we should connect this failure with Paul going to Corinth 'in fear and trembling' and falling back on the central fact of Christ crucified (I Cor 1 20-5, 2 2).

2 Gärtner, p229

clear in v30, " τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πάντας πανταχοῦ ", which corresponds to πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων in v26. The revelation of Christ is as universal as the act of Creation. This universalism is expressed in the frequent use of πᾶς and related ideas. God made the world and all that is in it - πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ v24, he gives τὰ πάντα to all men - πᾶσι v25, he creates from one all men (πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων) to dwell on the whole earth (ἐπὶ πάντος προσώπου τῆς γῆς) v26, he is never far from each one of us - ἑνὸς ἐκάστου ἡμῶν v27, the gospel is proclaimed to all men everywhere - τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πάντας πανταχοῦ v30, because Christ will judge the whole world - τὴν οἰκουμένην v31. In contrast to this pronounced universalism there is no mention at all of the Old Testament "Heilsgeschichte" or of Israel as the chosen people of God - themes which are prominent in the speeches to the Jews. Instead, the past history of the Gentiles is evaluated as a pre-history of Christianity, and although it is made clear that the Gentiles have been ignorant and misguided, as is seen in their idolatry, this is no worse than the frequent lapses of the Jews in the Old Testament and at the time of Jesus and the early Church.

Luke's liberal and magnanimous assessment of the Gentiles' pre-Christian religiosity can be connected with his pragmatic justification of the Gentile mission which we have found elsewhere, particularly in the healing of the Centurion's servant (Lk 7 1-10) and the conversion of Cornelius (Acts 10-11). While the Gentiles have been misguided and ignorant in their idolatry, this is no different from the comparable blindness and disobedience of the Jews. The Gentiles, although they

lack the Law and the advantages of being part of the chosen people of God, have a religious attitude which can be positively evaluated. The average Gentile's response to God is no worse, though neither is it any better, than that of the average Jew. Also, Luke's generous assessment of the Gentiles' worship of God is very different from Paul's use of natural revelation in his total theological framework, where the themes of the righteousness of God and the justification of man predominate. While both have a theory of natural revelation, they use it in very different ways. Luke treats it as a theme of independent value and approaches it in a liberal, almost non-theological way, Paul uses it, in passing, as one point in the total argument of his massive and complex theological structure. Luke's assessment is positive and Paul's is negative. For Luke, the Gentiles' religiosity is the first stage on the way to salvation, for Paul, it is the basis of their condemnation by God.

CHAPTER XIIPROGRAMMATIC STATEMENTS ABOUT THE GENTILE MISSION

1

In this section we shall look in detail at a number of passages Acts 2 39, 3 25-6, 13 46-7, 15 14-17, 18 6, 28 26-8. In all of these the problem of the relationship between the Jewish and Gentile missions is raised. At this stage we are concerned in particular with Luke's view, although a comparison with Paul at a later stage will attempt to show how near to or far from the historical facts Luke is. In dealing with these programmatic statements in Acts, in particular 28 26-8, we shall also need to discuss the various theories concerning the ending of Acts.

Acts 2 39

The phrase $\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\omega\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\kappa\rho\alpha\nu$ is ambiguous. It could refer to the Gentiles, but in the context of Acts 2 probably refers to the Jews. $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\kappa\rho\alpha\nu$ is best understood spatially (cf Acts 22 21, Is 57 19, Sir 24 32), as a reference to Diaspora Jews contemporary with those being addressed, rather than as a reference to the future descendants of Peter's audience.

Acts 3 25-6

This is one of the most important verses for understanding Luke's view of the relationship between the Jewish and Gentile missions,

1 It would be impossible to include in this thesis a detailed study of all the journeys of Paul where he preaches to the Gentiles, since this would involve a full-scale study of almost the whole of Acts 13-28. Apart from the passages already discussed, therefore, we will limit ourselves to the programmatic statements about the Gentile mission and the general picture of Paul as a missionary to Jews and Gentiles.

2 Wikenhauser, p49

3 Williams, pp70f

4 Conzelmann, p31, Haenchen, p147

5 Stählin, p54

unfortunately, its exact meaning is obscure. It is generally agreed that there is a reference to the future Gentile mission in the phrase $\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\iota\ \alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ and an allusion to it implied in the use of $\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\nu$ v26¹. The problem is to discover the exact meaning of $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\hat{\omega}\ \sigma\acute{\kappa}\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ ². The reference could be to Israel³. Jervell takes it in this way, interprets $\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ to mean the Gentiles, and argues that the meaning of the verse is that through Israel, or at least the repentant part of Israel, blessing will come to the Gentiles "Das Hinzukommen der Heiden gehört zur Wiederaufrichtung Israels"⁴. This view, he claims, fits best both with the immediate context and with Luke's other uses of $\sigma\acute{\kappa}\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha$ ⁵, all of which refer to Israel (Lk 1 55, Acts 7 5-6, 13 23). This latter point has some validity, but apart from this he offers no compelling evidence for his view. Moreover, two things, in particular, give support to the view that $\sigma\acute{\kappa}\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ ⁶ refers to Christ and not Israel. First, Luke's version of the blessing-of-Abraham saying does not accord exactly with any of those in the LXX. Gen 22 18, 26 4 are the closest parallels, but

1 Wilckens (p43 n1), like most commentators, takes $\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\nu$ together with $\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ and sees a hint of the future Gentile mission. The time-reference of $\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\nu$ would presumably include Jesus' ministry as well as the early mission of the Church (cf Haenchen, p169, who takes $\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota$ in v26 to refer to the Incarnation and not the Resurrection).

2 Wikenhauser, p62, Dahl, N T S, 4, 1957/8, p327.

3 Jervell, pp86-7.

4 Jervell, p87.

5 Jervell (ibid) argues that to take $\sigma\acute{\kappa}\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ to mean Christ does not fit the immediate context because (a) v26a then has no natural contact with v26bf, (b) the Gentiles appear suddenly and solely in v26 and then only by implication via $\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\nu$, (c) Christ is called a descendant of Abraham when shortly before the Jews are called the same v25a. The second point is not valid, because the Gentiles would also be included in $\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$, and the other two raise no serious objections to the interpretation of $\sigma\acute{\kappa}\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ = Christ.

6 Hanson, p75, Stählin, pp68-9, Conzelmann, p35, Haenchen, p169. Dahl, "Abraham", p149, also takes 'seed' to mean Christ, thereby going back on his earlier view (n2 supra).

in place of their πάντα τα ἔθνη τῆς γῆς Luke has πᾶσαι

αἱ πατρίαι τῆς γῆς

Exactly where Luke's version originated is difficult to say, but if he had wanted to show that by σπέρματι he meant Israel, then the use of πάντα τα ἔθνη, as in Gen 22 18 LXX, would have made his point clear. By using the ambiguous αἱ

πατρίαι τῆς γῆς² he has merely obscured the point. In fact, Haenchen

thinks that the use of αἱ πατρίαι τῆς γῆς is deliberate,

since the use of the LXX of Gen 22 18 would have anticipated the themes

of ch 10-11. On the assumption that Luke knew the LXX of Gen 22 18,

therefore, his alteration of it appears to emphasize that both the

Gentiles and the Jews will be recipients of the blessing which will come

in Abraham's 'seed'. That is, αἱ πατρίαι τῆς γῆς refers to both

Jews and Gentiles and σπέρματι to someone else - presumably Christ.

The second point in support of this view is the close connection between

v25 and 26, in particular the echo of ἐνευλογηθήσονται v25 in

the εὐλογοῦντα of v26. Since the 'blessing' of v26 clearly comes

through Christ, one could argue that the same is true of v25. Thus on

the assumption that Luke did consider the exact meaning of every word he

wrote, it seems probable that he saw σπέρματι as a reference to

Christ and αἱ πατρίαι τῆς γῆς as including both Jews and Gentiles

1 The use of πατρίαι may be influenced by the LXX of Ps 21 28, 95 7 where πατρίαι τῶν ἔθνων is used. Gen 12 3, 28 14 LXX use πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαί rather than Luke's πᾶσαι αἱ πατρίαι. Holtz, pp 74-6, thinks Luke received the saying from the oral tradition of the Church and made his version up without knowing the exact wording of the LXX. He thinks Luke's version is in content the same as Gen 22 18 LXX, but this is partly because he does not consider the possibility of taking 'seed' to mean Christ.

2 Haenchen, p169

3 Cf. Dahl, "Abraham", p150, commenting on Lk 13 16, 19 9 - "Both stories illustrate how God's promise to Abraham was fulfilled to his children through the ministry of Jesus."

On the other hand, if Luke was ignorant of the exact wording of the LXX versions of the saying, then Jervell's interpretation cannot be ruled out. Yet we may be building on a false assumption altogether, namely that Luke did consider the exact meaning of each word of the quotation. For Luke may have used it solely because it was a universalistic promise. He may have been interested only in the phrase $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ and, consequently, may not have stopped to consider the precise meaning of $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi\mu\alpha\tau\iota$. He may simply have wanted to ascribe to Peter an allusion to the future Gentile mission, which he then qualifies by making it clear that the order is to be Jews first and then Gentiles (cf Acts 1:8, 13:46, Rom 1:16).

Acts 13:46-8

1

It is almost universally agreed among commentators that these verses state that because the Jews rejected the gospel, the Church turned to the Gentiles. While the prior claim of the Jews had been recognized, their refusal of the gospel became a contributory, though not the primary (cf ch 10-11), cause of the Gentile mission. Verses 46-7, therefore, give the principle which forms the basis of the following scenes in Acts 2

3

Against this view Jervell raises two objections

a. Since in v47 the Gentile mission is justified from Old Testament prophecy, the Church must have known of the need for a Gentile mission long before the events of Acts 13, therefore the motivation for the Gentile mission was not the rejection of the gospel by the Jews. In v47

1 Williams, p167, Hanson, p146, Wikenhauser, p158, Stählin, p186, Conzelmann, p78, Haenchen, pp356, 359-60

2 Dupont, "Gentils", pp140-1

3 Jervell pp88-90

Is 49 6 is applied to the work of Paul and Barnabas the $\sigma\epsilon$, Jervell argues, means 'Israel' - as represented by the Apostles, Paul and Barnabas

b After the pronouncement of 13 46-7 Paul and his fellow missionaries still go to the Jews (14 1, 17 1,10,17, 18 4, 19 3,26, 28 28) The response of the Jews is typically divided (vv43,46), since not all of them reject the gospel Only the unrepentant part of Israel are shut out, those who believe the gospel are gathered in Luke is not saying that the Gentiles have been chosen to take the place of the unrepentant part of Israel, but that the influx of the Gentiles will occur because the promises to Israel are being fulfilled in the gathering in of repentant Jews Moreover, the judgement of 13 46-7 refers only to Pisidian Antioch and is not universally applicable

However, neither of these objections carries much conviction The fact that the Gentile mission could be justified from the Old Testament does not exclude either the prior proclamation of the gospel to the Jews or the possibility that Jewish obduracy could become an immediate cause of the Gentile mission Both Luke and Paul see the order 'Jew first, then Greek' as fundamental in the practice of the early Church, but equally, they both see an organic connection between the Jews' refusal and the influx of the Gentiles That Luke saw no contradiction between the idea that the Gentile mission was foretold in the Old Testament and that in practical terms the turning to the Gentiles was frequently a result of Jewish obduracy, is made clear by the fact that both themes are prominent throughout Acts and not just in ch 13 Luke himself makes it clear that the Jews' refusal was not the primary motive of the Gentile mission (ch 10-11), but it was nevertheless a major factor in later

developments Thinking back to the historical situation it might seem odd that the Church, aware of these Old Testament prophecies of a Gentile mission, should wait for the Jews' refusal before obeying them But for the early Church and for Luke these prophecies were not causes of the Gentile mission so much as a justification of this mission after it had begun

Jervell's second point is even less convincing While he is correct in noting both that the Jews show a divided response and that after ch13 the missionaries still go to the Jews, neither of these observations justify his interpretation of the passage as a whole In effect, his interpretation is that Paul and Barnabas turn to the Gentiles as a result not of the Jews' rejection, but of their acceptance, of the gospel, whereas the plain meaning of vv46-7 is the exact opposite of this' Even if his forced interpretation of $\sigma\epsilon$ in v47 were valid - which is improbable, since Luke surely sees Paul and Barnabas as representatives of Christ and the Church (13 1f) and not of Israel - it would scarcely justify reversing the plain meaning of vv46-7

There is a partial truth in Jervell's assertion that 13 46-7 is limited to Pisidian Antioch, for this is its primary reference, as the subsequent narrative shows But this does not exhaust the significance of the passage, for as Haenchen notes, it is also an ideal, typical scene which sums up the whole of the Pauline mission It is a proleptic statement of the end-result of Paul's missionary endeavours (23 26-8) This helps to explain the apparent contradiction between v46 and the later mission to the Jews "Die Juden, welche in Antiochia auf die Christen neidlich werden, sind zugleich die Juden überhaupt, und die $\epsilon\theta\nu\eta$,

welche zur Synagoge von Antiochia kommen sind τα ἔθνη ,
 alle jene heidnischen Massen, die in die Christliche Kirche strömen
 und den eifersüchtigen Grolle der Juden wecken ¹ "

Acts 15 14-17

The quotation from Am 9 11f in Acts 15 16-7 may give another clue to Luke's understanding of the relationship between the Jewish and Gentile missions. The main problem is the interpretation of the phrase
 και ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυιδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν v16
 Some take the reference to be to the Resurrection, the event which causes
 Gentiles to seek the Lord ² However, it is equally possible, and perhaps more natural, to take the phrase as a reference to the reconstitution or
 salvation of Israel which will precede the influx of the Gentiles ³ v17
 The Gentiles are grafted onto the root which is Israel the presupposition of the salvation of the Gentiles is the salvation of the Jews. This latter interpretation would be strengthened if we accepted Dahl's interpretation of 15 14 ⁴ He takes the phrase ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ to mean that the new, Gentile λαός are not a new people of God, but are grafted onto the old people of God, namely Israel. That is, the Church, which includes the Gentiles, is not thought of as a new Israel. This notion that the conversion of the Gentiles is a fulfilment of God's promises to Israel may be paralleled elsewhere in Acts, for

1 Haenchen, p360

2. Haenchen, p389

3 Munck, p235, Wikenhauser, p172, Jervell, pp79-82 Stählin says this verse shows " dass Israel den Grundstock des neuen Gottesvolkes bildet, dass also die Wahl der Heiden im Sinne der Zuwahl gemeint ist " (p204)

4 Dahl, art cit, pp319-27 Cf Dupont (N T S, 3, 1956/7, pp47f) who takes ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν to be a conscious paradox. The basis of both views is that in Acts λαός always means Jews except in 15 14, 18 10. Dahl thinks 15 14 reflects a Targum idiom, whereas Dupont thinks it reflects the LXX

example in Acts 3 25-6 It could be that at this point Luke reflects the early Jewish-Christian view of the Church and mission, for we have seen that at other points Luke's material betrays primitive Christian views - even if Luke misunderstood them Certainly, Haenchen's interpretation of v16 as a reference to the Resurrection is scarcely warranted either¹ by the content or context of the verse However, one has to beware of ascribing to Luke views which may not have occurred to him The two exceptional uses of λαός may simply be due to Luke's carelessness At other points Luke uses terms loosely and with no obvious theological subtleties in mind² What for us may seem to be a conscious paradox may for Luke simply have been linguistic imprecision It would be dangerous to build on Luke's use of λαός, whether we are claiming deliberate or unconscious motives to be at work Moreover, the use of Am 9 11f may not be as significant as the above interpretation supposes Luke may have seen the fulfilment of 15 16 in the coming of the Messiah or in the role of the Twelve Or, what is more probable, Luke may have used Am 9 11f³ solely because it contains a reference to the inclusion of the Gentiles

1 Haenchen (ibid) argues against the Jew-Gentile interpretation because it contradicts Luke's pattern of the "Heilsgeschichte" But Luke may unwittingly reflect a viewpoint different from his own and, furthermore, it is not certain that he had a clear or consistent view of the relation between the Church and Israel

2 Cf the earlier treatment of the Kingdom of God and 'Apostles' in Acts 3 Holtz, pp25-6, points out that whereas 15 17 reproduces the LXX exactly, 15 16 does not He suggests that Am 9 11 (Acts 15 16) circulated alone, without v12, amongst those who believed in a restitution of Israel in a Davidic form It may have been used by Jewish-Christians to express their hope for the final conversion of all Jews Luke probably got it from these Christians, placed it appropriately in James' speech, but adds to it a fact which he himself had observed about it, namely that its continuation in Am 9 12 LXX contains a universal promise "Eine dem jüdischen Volk zugewandte Prophetie wird zur Legitimation der Heidenmission und das ohne jede Veränderung oder Gewaltanwendung, einfach durch ihre Fortsetzung" The basis of Holtz's view is that apart from 15 16 all Luke's other quotes from the Twelve prophets follow the LXX exactly

he may want to show only that the Gentile mission is grounded in the Old Testament and therefore in the will of God, the reference to the relationship between Jews and Gentiles in this scene may have been purely incidental and may have escaped Luke's notice. For this reason one has reservations about building much on this verse.

Acts 18 6

This verse repeats the judgement pronounced in 13 46-7. Paul leaves the Jews of Corinth with a symbolic act (cf II Sam 1 16, Matt 27 25), which makes it clear that the Jews are themselves responsible for the judgement which will follow on their unbelief, and that Paul considers that he can now turn to the Gentiles with a clear conscience. Here, as in 13 46f, 28 26f, the language is vivid and the tone severe.

Acts 28 26-8

First in Asia Minor (13 46), then in Greece (18 6) and now finally in Italy we meet the same solemn judgement that, as a result of the Jews' refusal, Paul turns to the Gentiles. Thus in each of the main areas where, according to Luke, Paul carried out his missionary work, the same sombre pronouncement is made. Here Is 6 9-10 is used, it was probably one of the best-known testimonia for the Jews' rejection of the gospel (cf Mk 4 12f pars, Jn 12 39f, Just Dial 12 2, 33 1, 69 4). Here, as in ch 13, not all the Jews reject the gospel, ¹ἐκείθοντο v24 shows that some were persuaded. But the accent does not lie here, as the subsequent verses

1 Jervell (p77 n21) is right to criticize Haenchen at this point. There is no warrant for Haenchen's statement that "bei ἐκείθοντο wird nicht an einer wirkliche Bekehrung gedacht, ebensowenig wie in der gleichartigen Szene 23 9. Theoretisch sind die Juden nicht einig, aber dennoch entscheidet sich keine der beiden Gruppen praktisch für das Christentum" (p646). Conzelmann (p149) is nearer the mark when he says that v24 gives the usual picture of a divided Israel, but that "Der Akzent liegt nicht darauf, dass sich immerhin ein Teil bekehrt haben. Die Szene ist gerade

show This third explanation of the turning from the Jews to the Gentiles is final,¹ it is Luke's overall assessment of the Jews' position. Its appearance at the end of the book gives it, and the parallel passages in 13 46-7, 18 6, a certain prominence, which emphasizes their importance for Luke.² The threefold repetition does not mean that each has a purely local reference, such an interpretation misunderstands Luke's technique. For when Luke wishes to impress on his readers something he considers of prime importance he uses the simple but effective method of repetition, as we have already seen in the accounts of the conversions of Cornelius and Paul. Haenchen's summary cannot be bettered "Mit Apg 28 28 tritt also nicht wieder die Anfangssituation vor 13 46 ein, so dass das Evangelium weiterhin zuerst den Juden gesagt werden muss. Vielmehr macht diese dritte Absage am Ende des Buches, mit dem Hinweis auf Jes 6 9f, den Schriftbeweis gebend, deutlich, dass Lukas eine endgültige Verwerfung Israels und seine Ersetzung durch die Heiden darstellen will."³

Having studied the details of these verses we now turn to the overall picture which they convey. The usual, almost universal, view is that to a greater or lesser extent Luke saw the reception of the Gentiles and the Gentile mission as being a result of the Jews' rejection of the gospel.⁴ It is this view in particular which Jervell sets out to

(cont) entworfen um den Eindruck zu erwecken, dass es mit den Juden hoffnungslos steht "Jervell's own view, that Luke's tradition at this point spoke of a total rejection by the Jews and that Luke has deliberately weakened this by the insertion of v24, is pure speculation. 4 Commentaries ad loc on 13 46, 18 6 and 28 28 O'Neill, pp81-2, Cadbury, p255, Wilckens, pp50f, 70f, Haenchen's comment (pp90-1) is typical "Erst wenn sie es mit der Lästerung Jesu ablehnten, haben sich die christlichen Sendboten an die Heiden gewandt."

1 Commentaries ad loc, Jervell, pp91f

2 Emphasized by Dupont, "Gentils", pp136-8

3 Haenchen, Z N W, 54, 1963, p185

disprove, for he believes it is a fundamental misunderstanding of Luke's view for whereas "Gewöhnlich versteht man die Lage so Erst wenn die Juden das Evangelium abgelehnt haben, ist der Weg zu den Heiden frei Richtiger ist es zu sagen Erst wenn Israel das Evangelium angenommen hat, kann der Weg zu den Heiden beschritten werden " ¹ That is to say, it is not the Jews' rejection but their acceptance, of the gospel which is the presupposition of the Gentile mission Jervell's evidence can be summarized as follows

a There are frequent references in Acts to the success of the mission to the Jews (2 41,47, 4 4, 5 14, 6 1,7, 9 42, 12 24, 13 43, 14 1, 17 10f, 21 20), while there are few parallel references to mass conversions of the Gentiles (only 11 21,24, 14 1, 17 4, 18 8, and often these are God-fearing' Gentiles) The references to Jewish conversions before Cornelius' conversion show a steady increase (2 41, 4 4, 5 15 6 7) and all the references to mass conversions of the Jews show them as having occurred in Jerusalem Whereas in Acts 1-12 opposition to the Church comes mainly from the Jewish leaders (4 1f, 5 17f, 6 8f) and the ordinary folk are receptive (2 47, 4 21, 5 14, 6 17), in ch 13f a larger proportion of the Jews are portrayed as opponents of the Church On the basis of these observations Jervell asserts that Luke is at pains to show that the mission to the Jews was successful, particularly in Jerusalem and before Cornelius' conversion Luke does not think that the vast majority of the Jews rejected the gospel or that this was a primary cause of the Gentile mission "Lukas zeichnet nicht ein Bild des jüdischen Volkes da

1 Jervell, p83 also in Nov Test ,10,1968,pp164-90, here p170

'en bloc , qua Volk, das Evangelium verwirft, was seinerseits die
 Heidenmission veranlassen sollte Israel verwirft nicht das Evange-
 lium, sondern Israel ist auf Grund der Botschaft in sich gespalten " ¹

b Luke thought of the Church, including the Gentiles, as an integral
 part of the old, empirical Israel "Das altkirchliche frühkatholische ^h
 Verständnis der Kirche als 'tertium genus' im Verhältnis zu Juden und
 Heiden, eventuell als das neue Israel, das aus dem Heiden und Juden
 besteht, findet man in Acta nicht " ² Thus Acts emphasizes the Jewishness
 of the early Church and makes it clear that God's promises were fulfilled
 in the old and not in the new Israel The Gentiles share in salvation by
 participating in the promises given to and now being fulfilled in em-
 pirical Israel (15 16-7) The presupposition of the Gentiles' partici-
 pation in Israel's salvation is that the promises should first have been
 fulfilled in Israel herself (3 25-6, 13 16f, 28 26f) In fact, it is
 only through Israel that salvation reaches the whole world This explains
 the fact that the Apostles are so slow to obey Jesus' commission in 1 8,
 for by preaching to the Jews they are, in effect, reaching out to the
 Gentiles It also explains why in their mission to the Jews the Apostles
 mention their mission to the Gentiles (2 39, 3 25-6) and in their mission
 to the Gentiles speak of salvation coming to the Jews (10 34-43)

c One problem which Jervell notes is the Cornelius episode If the
 Twelve acknowledged that salvation would come to the Gentiles (2 39,
 3 25-6) why then the need for so much prompting from God in the Cornelius
 episode ? Jervell solves the problem by arguing that in Acts 10-11, 15,

1 Jervell, p76

2 Jervell, p77

the question at stake is not the Gentile mission as such, but a Gentile mission free from circumcision. A special Divine revelation was needed not to decide whether or not the Gentile mission should take place, but to clarify what form it should take.

Insofar as he has highlighted the extent and success of the Jewish mission in Acts, Jervell has provided a useful corrective to those who tend to emphasize only Luke's interest in the Gentiles. He has also drawn attention to the tension between the programmatic statements in 13:46, 18:6 and 28:28 which, despite Jervell, seem to imply a rejection of the Jews as a whole, and those passages which speak of Jews believing (cf especially 13:43, 46, 28:24, 28). Novel and stimulating as his argument is, and despite the fact that he has broken some new ground, Jervell's overall conclusions must remain in doubt, because

a. Luke's portrayal of the Jewishness of the early Church does not necessarily have the theological implications which Jervell gives it. Various theological tendencies have been ascribed to Luke, but in essentials he is merely expressing a historical fact, namely that the early Christians were Jews and remained Jews after accepting the gospel. There was conflict with the Jewish authorities, but the Church did not at first form a breakaway movement. Luke is more concerned to relate this historical fact than the theological theme of the priority of Israel.

b. Likewise, the success of the Jewish mission in Jerusalem does not imply, as Jervell supposes, that this success was a presupposition of the Gentile mission. The temporally prior claim to the gospel of the Jews is a presupposition of the Gentile mission, but its success or failure is incidental - although both in reality and according to Luke,

the failure of the Jewish mission gave an immediate impetus to the Gentile mission. The prior claim of Israel is recognized by Luke from the start (Lk 24 47, Acts 1 8, 3 25-6) and due respect is paid to this up to the end of Acts. In this respect, too, Luke reflects the actual course of events, even though his account is schematized. Moreover, when due weight is given to the repeated statements that it was the failure of the Jewish mission which was an important immediate cause of the Gentile mission (13 46, 18 6, 28 28), Jervell's thesis becomes even less credible, and it must be said that throughout, Jervell undervalues the importance of these three passages.

c. Jervell's argument that Luke believed that salvation would come to the Gentiles only through the Jews is based ultimately on two passages, 3 25-6 and 15 16-7. Certainly, we cannot avoid these verses by claiming that they reflect the views of the speakers, Peter and James, and not the views of Luke, for it is almost certain that Luke composed the speeches himself. On the other hand, both passages are Old Testament quotations and, as we argued above, it is not certain how far Luke considered the exact meaning of either verse, except insofar as they both contain a clear universalistic reference. This alone may have been why Luke used them. If Acts 3 25 means that the Gentiles will receive salvation only through the efforts of the Jews, then it stands alone in Acts. Acts 15 16-7 does not imply any outreach of the Jews to the Gentiles, though it may mean that the conversion of the Gentiles is a fulfilment of a promise to Israel.

A decisive objection to Jervell's interpretation of 3 25 and 15 16 is that at other points Luke seems to betray a very different view

Acts 13 46, 18 6 and 28 28 are obvious examples, but they do not stand alone. J C O'Neill¹ has argued out a view diametrically opposed to that of Jervell, namely that a, if not the, main theme of Acts is the picture of Christianity's progressive disentanglement from Judaism. Acts does not simply tell how the gospel went from Jerusalem to Rome, but how the Church increasingly discovered its identity as an entity distinct from Judaism. "Luke's thesis is that the gospel is free to travel to the ends of the earth only when it is freed from the false form which the Jewish religion has taken."² Thus Luke is telling his educated Roman readers that it is the Church which is the only true Israel, she alone can interpret the Old Testament correctly and is the true representative of Judaism. O'Neill's view is based, a little precariously, chiefly on Acts 19 8-10 (cf 18 6-7), where Paul begins separatist activities. Because of opposition from the Jews, he takes the Christians of Ephesus out of the synagogue and sets them up as an independent Church. As an interpretation of the whole of Acts, O'Neill's view is based on surprisingly little evidence, like Jervell's view, it suffers from trying to force on Luke a uniform overall viewpoint which is precisely and logically thought out and it ignores part of the evidence. Nevertheless, it is not wholly unfounded, and Acts 19 8-10 is an important strand of evidence against Jervell's view. Another important passage is Acts 10 34-5 to which, as one of the bases of Luke's justification of the Gentile mission, Haenchen³ gives special emphasis. The fundamental idea is that God is not partisan (*προσωπολήμπτης*), he has no special love for one race over

1 O'Neill, pp81-2, 170f

2 O'Neill, p82

3 Haenchen, p90, art cit, p168

against another. This implies a radical challenge to and even denial of the idea that Israel has a privileged relationship with God. Certainly, Luke does not expand and develop the full implications of this idea as he might have done, but then the same can be said for 3:25 and 15:16-7.

When scholars such as these come to such different conclusions, it is frequently the case that each has selected his evidence to suit his conclusions, albeit unintentionally. The evidence used by Haenchen and O'Neill is quite valid, and the same can be said for Jervell, particularly if one can go the whole way with his interpretation of 3:25-6 and 15:16-7. Both strands of evidence are important and it is false to isolate one and make it the basis of an interpretation of the whole of Acts. This is not to say that we are dealing here with subtle paradox, simple confusion, or uncertain oscillation between two viewpoints, rather, the evidence reveals that Luke did not consider the question at all, at least not in our modern terms with our fondness for nice definitions. Certainly, Luke considered the general question of the relationship between Christianity and Judaism, in particular from a practical viewpoint, but not in the theological terms of whether the Church is a 'new' or a 'renewed' Israel, or to what extent it formed a 'tertium genus'. Luke looked at the question more pragmatically from a historical angle, in answer to the question of how the Gentiles became part of the Church and how the Jews reacted, and, from a pastoral angle, to see how far these historical events contained a message for the Churches of his own day.

d. The Cornelius narrative is not so easily dispensed with as Jervell imagines. He thinks that Luke says that Peter and the Apostles were quite prepared to participate in a Gentile mission, provided that the

Gentiles were first circumcised. They did not object to a Gentile mission on principle, but only to a Gentile mission without circumcision. Yet surely this means that they were prepared to approach not Gentiles, but only those Gentiles who, as proselytes, were prepared to become Jews. The Gentiles were to be saved not as Gentiles but as Jews. In other words, they were prepared to participate in a Jewish-Christian proselyte mission, but not in a Gentile mission. Circumcision was not a minor factor; it meant the difference between a man being a Jew or a pagan. The Church's objection, on the basis of the Gentiles' lack of circumcision, was fundamental and not simply a detail of missionary tactics.

e. Jervell is right to point out the tension between 13:46, 18:6 and 28:28 and the continuing mission to the Jews. The reaction to Paul's preaching makes it quite clear that the gospel was a divisive force, not all Jews rejected the gospel and not all Gentiles accepted it. One problem is that Luke seems to use the word 'Jews' loosely; the implication of 13:46, 18:6 and 28:28 is that all Jews are meant, whereas 13:43 and 28:24 show that this cannot be so. Yet the answer to this difficulty is not to devalue 13:46, 18:6 and 28:28, and overemphasize the references to the conversion of the Jews. It is generally agreed that the programmatic statements in 13:46, 18:6 and 28:28 are Luke's own summary of the events in the Church's mission. If they represent Luke's own interpretation of the Jew-Gentile question, then they cannot be so lightly dismissed as Jervell supposes.

It seems that the most satisfactory explanation of this tension lies in taking full account of the situation of the Church in Luke's day. It was almost certainly a predominantly Gentile Church. The influx

of Jews had ceased long before, and the enmity between the Church and Judaism had grown more bitter and the gulf wider after A D 70. It was the experience of the Church in Luke's day that, almost without exception, the Jews were totally unresponsive to the gospel. This rift between Christians and Jews and the Jews' obduracy in face of the gospel probably influenced Luke's interpretation and summaries of the events in the Apostolic era (13 46, 18 6, 28 28). On the other hand, Luke knew full well that the gospel had been proclaimed to the Jews first and that many had accepted it, it is this which accounts for his references to the conversion of the Jews. As a historian Luke is not always successful, but he has good intentions. He would not, therefore, suppress the historical fact of Jewish conversions, however convenient that may have been for a neat, straightforward theory of the Jews' response to the gospel. Thus Luke was torn between historical and parennetic motives: he wished to be true to the historical facts as far as they could be surmised, but he also wished to interpret these facts for the Church of his day, a Church whose circumstances and experiences were not the same as those of the Apostolic age. Here as at other points, Luke's view of history is influenced by the beliefs and experiences of the Church at the end of the 1st century A D. If this is the correct explanation of the tension between 13 46, 18 6, 28 28 and the rest of Acts, then the significant fact and the one which for Luke is most important in the Jews' response to the gospel is not that some accepted, but that many rejected it. And if this is so, then Jervell, in his attempt to characterize Luke's attitude, has got hold of the wrong end of the stick.

1 The numbers are, of course, exaggerated (2 41, 4 4, 5 15, 6 7) - a simple technique of Luke's to emphasize God's blessing of the Church.

The above discussion of the programmatic statements about the Gentile mission, in particular 28 26f, leads us immediately to the problem of the ending of Acts. The abrupt and uninformative way in which Luke ends his narrative has always been a puzzle for scholars. Paul is pictured as living under a very lenient form of house arrest in Rome, preaching the gospel *μετα πάσης παρηγοίας ἀκωλύτως*. Why Luke ends his narrative here is a mystery to which there is no fully satisfactory answer. In particular, after the detailed and lengthy accounts of Paul's earlier trials (ch 21f), it is odd that we hear nothing about either his trial in Rome or his ultimate fate. This uncertainty has opened the way for a myriad of explanations.

1 It could be argued that Luke's knowledge of events ceased with Paul's arrival in Rome. If Luke was writing towards the end of the 1st century A.D. this is scarcely conceivable, so the usual form this argument takes is to assert that he was writing much earlier (circa A.D. 65)¹ and that the narrative has caught up with the events. Some would go on to argue that Acts was specifically written to influence the outcome of Paul's trial,² although on this view one has difficulty explaining the purpose of Acts 1-12. But Luke's use of Mark and the dating of Lk 19 41-42 20-4 after A.D. 70 are a stumbling block to this view. Also, Acts 20 25,28 imply that Luke was aware of the outcome of Paul's trial, rather than that the result was still in balance.

2 Some argue that Luke planned or even began to write a third volume, which picked up the narrative from Acts 28 31. Thus Ramsay interprets

1 Clarke, "Acts", p389, Harnack, "Beiträge", IV, p31f

2 D Plooij, Exp VIII/8, 1914, pp511-23, Sahlin, pp30f

Acts 28 31 as a magna charta of religious freedom and suggests that the third volume was planned to include the use Paul made of this freedom his second trial and eventual martyrdom¹ There is no positive evidence for this view, it ignores what roundness and completeness^e there is in the total structure of Acts, and it does not explain why, if Paul was acquitted at his first trial, Luke does not mention his acquittal, for it would have formed a grand climax to the narrative of Acts

²
3 A Ehrhardt suggests that we have no account of a conversation between Paul and Nero in Acts, because in the Acts of the pagan martyrs much buffoonery was written at this point, and Luke wishes to avoid this He also suggests that we have no account of Paul's martyrdom because Luke wanted to avoid too close an analogy with Jesus' death But other writers' buffoonery would not stop Luke giving a sober, serious account and, if Luke was avoiding a parallel with Jesus' death, now does one explain his account of Stephen's martyrdom?

³
4 O'Neill suggests that the primary interest of Luke and his readers was not biographical, but theological We may desire to know Paul's fate, but Luke's readers would not have shared this desire They would have been interested in more theological questions, such as the relationship between Christianity and Judaism This would explain why Acts contains nothing about Peter's death and only a brief mention of James' (12 2)

⁴
Also, Cadbury has found some parallels to the uninformative ending of Acts in Philostratus and II Maccabes⁵ But Hanson is surely right to

1 Ramsay, op308f, Knox, "Acts", p59

2 Ehrhardt, pp80-1

3 O'Neill, pp69f, cf Evans, J T W, ns7, 1956, pp25f

4 Cadbury, pp29-30, 33

5 Hanson, pp33-4

reject this view. Biographical interest is seen in the Gospels, Pastoral epistles and apocryphal Gospels and Acts from the end of the 1st century A D onwards, and in Classical literature the biography was a popular and recognized literary genre. It is likely, therefore, that Luke's readers would have been as curious to know the outcome of Paul's stay in Rome as we are.

5 It has been suggested that Acts 28 31 implies that at the end of two years in prison Paul was automatically released.¹ It is argued that the Romans had a custom whereby a prisoner was automatically freed after two years if his accusers failed to turn up within eighteen months. However, there is no evidence that such a law was in force at this time. The two parallels usually quoted - Pliny, Ep X 56, Philo, In Flac 128f -² do not demand this interpretation and Jos Vit 13f speaks against it. Moreover, it is not clear why Paul's accusers should have defaulted. The cost of a journey to Rome was great, but the Jerusalem Jews were not poor and Paul was their implacable enemy. It is never hinted in Acts or elsewhere that the case against Paul was dropped, and Acts 28 30-1 emphasizes only Paul's freedom to preach, not his freedom from a trial.

It could be argued that Paul was freed, on the basis of information in the Pastorals and I Clement, which seems to imply that Paul underwent two trials in Rome. At the first he was acquitted and at the second condemned and executed (cf II Tim 4 6, 11, 16-8). Often it is assumed that between these two trials Paul fulfilled his intention to visit Spain (Rom 15 24, 28, I Clem 1 5) and also paid a return visit to the Aegean.

1 B C , V, pp 326f

2 Conzelmann, p150, Haenchen, p647 n2

littoral The problem with this view is the uncertainty of the evidence I Clem 1 5 is ambiguous and may not refer to a visit to Spain, Rom 15 24,28 speak only of Paul's intentions, and the evidence of the Pastorals is late and not easy to evaluate historically Moreover, if this view were true, it is odd that Luke omits to mention Paul's acquittal after the first trial It would have been a golden opportunity to illustrate and summarize his overall view of the impartiality and friendliness of the Romans towards Christianity, and would have been a good formal ending to the book

1

6 Haenchen thinks Luke implies that Paul was executed at the end of his two years under arrest Luke never implies that Paul's trial will have a happy end, in fact he implies the exact opposite (20 25,28) He does say that Paul deserves neither death nor imprisonment, but that is a different thing from saying he got what he deserved Thus Luke presupposes the martyrdom of Paul, but does not describe it for fear of reviving 'martyr-pietty' "Er wollte nicht, wie die Offenbarung Johannis, die Christen für das Martyrium rüssten, sondern die Kirche nach Möglichkeit das Martyrium ersparen " But if this were so, it is odd that Luke gives such a detailed description of Stephen's martyrdom, which is a close parallel to Jesus' death and seems to be Luke's ideal picture of the pattern of Christian martyrdom It might also be objected to Haenchen's view that if Paul was killed by the Romans and this was well-known, it would destroy Luke's case for Rome's friendliness and impartiality But as Haenchen points out, if Paul was executed on the orders of Nero this

1 Haenchen, pp649f

2 Haenchen, p655

would not be the case For Nero was an aberration, a man whose memory was rapidly disgraced after his death even by his fellow Romans Death at Nero's hands, therefore, would not have seemed a disgrace and would not have been considered incompatible with Luke's account of the impartiality and fairness of Rome¹

7 The explanation which comes nearest to solving this perplexing riddle is twofold

a We must assume that Luke's silence about Paul's trial and its outcome is because his readers were already well acquainted with the facts Whether he was executed after two years or acquitted and later martyred in Rome is difficult to say, since the evidence is so scanty But whichever is true, Luke's readers must have known what had happened They needed to be told not what happened to Paul in Rome, but how he got there² This is not a wholly satisfactory answer, but it is the best we can offer³

b Together with the above point, it is necessary to realize that for Luke Acts 28 summarizes and rounds off the rest of his narrative The theme of Jewish obduracy (vv26-8) pervades the previous narrative, despite the fact that some Jews were converted Moreover, the picture of Paul actively preaching in Rome, presumably chiefly to Gentiles, fulfils Jesus' commission in Acts 1 8, the gospel has now reached the 'ends of the earth' While Acts may be incomplete biographically, in its main theme of the triumphant and irresistible progress of the

1 Both Hanson (pp31f) and Haenchen (p655) think Paul was executed under Nero

2 Cf Hanson, p35, who thinks Acts was written for readers in Rome This may also explain why Luke's interest in personal and geographical details tails off in the last few chapters (Cadbury, pp241-2) ie Luke did not

gospel it is complete. In principle, the gospel had been preached to all the Gentiles. Paul's arrival in Rome and unhindered preaching there probably seemed to Luke not only " to fulfil the scope of Jesus' commission, but also to make a true, triumphant and effective conclusion to his own narrative " ¹ As in his Gospel, Luke brings the narrative to a triumphant close and, from a literary-artistic viewpoint, Acts 28 must have seemed to him to be a fine conclusion to the preceding story.

As well as this retrospective reference, in fulfilment of 1 8, ² these last few verses of Acts may well have a prospective purpose. Because the gospel has reached Rome and Jesus' commission has in principle been fulfilled, this does not mean that the Church can sit back and relax. The emphasis on the open and unhindered proclamation of the gospel to the Gentiles, the finality of the rejection of the Jews, and the ending of the story in Rome all point in the same direction: the future of the Church lay among the Gentiles, Christianity was to be a universal religion. Luke looks forward to the time when Christianity will be the religion of the Empire and wants to prepare the Church for this role.

In concluding his narrative in this way Luke has to pay a price: he has virtually to ignore the presence of a Christian community in

(cont) think it necessary to give details which were already well known to his readers.

3 (from p426) On this view it is perhaps more likely that Haenchen is right in thinking Paul was killed after two years in Rome. Had there been an acquittal and further activity of Paul, unless it was all confined to Rome, one would expect Luke to have included it.

1 Cadbury, p323, cf Haenchen, p654, Stählin, p9, Conzelmann, p150

2 This point is particularly well made by O'Neill, pp175-7 and Jervell, pp71-2, though they both tend to neglect the element of fulfilment of Acts 1 8.

Rome before Paul's arrival. It is mentioned briefly in 28 15, but not again. Paul's dealings in Rome are chiefly with the Jews, although the implication of vv30-1 is that afterwards he preached mainly to Gentiles. Clearly, Paul's arrival in Rome is not that of the first Christian missionary. The origins of the Church in Rome remains a mystery, it is one of the many Christian communities whose existence Luke assumes but does not explain (Damascus 9 10f, Lydda and Joppa 9 32,36, Ephesus 18 19,26, and Puteoli 28 13). These references form one of the many lacunae in Luke's account. But if Paul's arrival in Rome is not the first, it is the definitive one, since he was in full fellowship with the Twelve and was personally commissioned by Christ to preach to the Gentiles. And it is Paul in Rome who, in pronouncing the final judgement on the Jews, at the same time points to the future direction of the Church.

1 Ph. Menoud, N T S ,1,1954/5, pp44-51, especially p50. O'Neill's objections to this view (p69) that (a) the arrival of Paul in Rome is not enough to fulfil Acts 1 8 and (b) Acts is based on a geographical movement which depends on others besides Paul, do not seem to be decisive. Point (a) is a matter of opinion, and while point (b) is true, one can nevertheless scarcely overemphasize the centrality of Paul's role in Luke's account.

CHAPTER XIIICONCLUSIONS

In this final section two major tasks will be undertaken, namely a consideration of the Gentile mission in Luke-Acts from both a theological and a historical viewpoint. The first section will be a summary of the 'theology' of the Gentiles in Luke-Acts, including a comparison with Paul's epistles. The second will consist of a drawing-together of the varied results which, on the question of historical reliability, have been reached in the detailed study of those sections of Acts which concerned us, and the use of these to guide us in our assessment of Luke as a historian.

I The Theology of the Gentiles

The word 'theology' is used here as the most convenient way of distinguishing this section from the next, which is concerned chiefly with the historical question. As will become apparent, the description of Luke's approach to the Gentiles as 'theological' is misleading, for the most striking characteristic of Luke-Acts is precisely the lack of any consistent theology of the Gentiles.

A Associated Themes

At various points in earlier chapters we have noted how certain themes are frequently associated with the Gentile mission, either directly or by implication. They are not always related to it in a systematic way, but the fact that they arise in related contexts shows that there is some connection between them in Luke's mind.

The first is the connection, albeit indirect, with Jerusalem. As we have noted earlier, several writers have worked out the role which

Jerusalem plays in Luke-Acts. It acts as one of the essential links which binds together the two volumes. It is the goal of the Gospel narrative, all events point to and find their climax in the events in Jerusalem. There is no room for Galilean traditions of the Resurrection, Jerusalem dominates. But as well as being the goal of the first volume it is the starting point of the second. Jerusalem is the home of the Apostles and the base for the Church's mission, which eventually reaches the Gentiles. The gospel has first to be preached in Jerusalem (Lk 24 47, Acts 1 8, 2-8) and even Paul begins his work by preaching in Damascus and Jerusalem (Acts 9 20f, 26 20). Moreover, as the mission widens its scope, reaching out to Samaritans and Gentiles, the Jerusalem Church is always close on its heels, enquiring after and checking each new development (Acts 8 14f, 11 1f, 22f). And it is in Jerusalem that the Apostolic council convenes (Acts 15) to decide once and for all the exact requirements to be made of Gentile converts.

There is no doubt that Luke's account of Jerusalem's role is to some extent schematized, in particular the way in which the Jerusalem Church regularly checks each new development of the mission. Luke himself has left hints which show that Jerusalem did not enjoy such a ubiquitous role as overseer of all missionary developments as his overall scheme implies (Acts 9 10f, 9 32, 36, 18 19, 26, 28 13). It is not easy to know how to label Luke's presentation of Jerusalem. To many it is best described as theological, since they see Jerusalem's role as essential to Luke's concept of "Heilsgeschichte". However, true as that may be, one should not overlook the purely historical-geographical element in Luke's account. It is a historical fact that Jerusalem was the home of the

early post-Resurrection Church and that the gospel was preached there first, so that all later developments could ultimately be traced back there. It is also highly probable that the Twelve and the Jerusalem Church were inquisitive and a little suspicious when large numbers of non-Jews were converted and as far as possible, they probably checked what was going on. So that while it may be claimed, with some justice, that Jerusalem has a special role in Luke's writings, one should not 'theologize' it unduly to the neglect of purely historical and geographical factors.

Closely intertwined with Jerusalem as a missionary centre is the role of the Twelve (Lk 24 47, Acts 1 8, 10-11, 15). While there is no real fulfilment of Acts 1 8 in the later work of the Apostles, Luke does the best he can by making Peter's dealings with Cornelius the first and decisive approach to the Gentiles. And even if they do not, as a group, fulfil Jesus' commission, after an initial hesitation (11 1f) they take their stand firmly beside Paul and Barnabas (15), who do fulfil the commission of 1 8. Thus Luke makes it abundantly clear that the Gentile mission was in no way an illegitimate offshoot of the Church's proclamation to the Jews, perpetrated by a handful of renegade Christians. The Apostles not only gave full support to Paul and Barnabas, but one of their number, Peter, was the man whom God chose to initiate the Gentile mission. Paul is portrayed as being in full harmony with the Apostles and the Jerusalem Church, he is not the leader of a breakaway group in conflict with the early leaders. In this way Luke legitimizes the Gentile mission, though he does this not from ecclesiastical but from historical motives. It is not so much a theology of the Church or a theory of Apostolic succession which inspires Luke's account, rather it is a desire

to trace the Gentile mission back to the primary witnesses of Jesus' life death and resurrection, namely the Apostles, and ultimately therefore to Jesus himself

Luke's treatment of the Gentiles is frequently connected with the theme of the Holy Spirit (Lk 2 27f, 4 16f, 24 47f, Acts 1 4-8, 2 1-10, 17, 21, 8 26, 39, 10 44f, 11 15f, 13 2, 15 8, 28, 16 6, 28 25) We have already,¹ in an earlier chapter, discussed the relationship between the Spirit, eschatology and the Gentile mission We suggested there that Luke's treatment of these themes is more an attempt to reconstruct and make intelligible the experience of the early Church, at the same time reflecting the experience of the Church of his day, than it is an attempt to produce a systematic and logical theology of the Spirit His presentation of the theme of the Spirit in Acts confirms this suggestion

The work of the Spirit permeates the story of the Gentile mission, guiding and prompting the Church at every stage and confirming the most important turning points, in particular, Cornelius' conversion (10 44, 11 15, 15 8) According to Jesus' commands in Lk 24 47f and Acts 1 4-8 the Spirit is a necessary presupposition for all the missionary preaching, both to Jews and Gentiles alike, for the Apostles are commanded to stay in Jerusalem until they have received the Spirit and they do not begin their work until this happens The point of all these references is clear they show that the extension of the Church's mission was at every point both inspired and confirmed by manifestations of the Spirit By implication, therefore, it was not solely or even chiefly the work of

¹ Supra, pp133f

men, however important or revered they were or had become by Luke's day. Closely associated with this theme is the role which God or the Risen Christ play at the crucial turning points of the narrative, frequently through the medium of angels and visions. This is particularly evident in the accounts of the conversion of Paul and Cornelius (9 1f, 22 17f, 10-11). In both, the chief actors are not men but God. Peter and Paul are both reluctant, but have no choice but to obey the clear and irresistible will of God. The Apostles and Paul did not naturally abandon their Jewish past and set out on a Gentile mission, they clung to the Temple and Jewish food laws, but God forced them out to the Gentile mission. As Haenchen says, "Dass diese Männer zur Heidenmission kommen, ist nur möglich, indem Gott sie gegen ihren Willen dazu nötigt" ¹

Closely connected with the themes of Divine intervention and the Spirit is the role which miracles play (10 41f, 15 12), for miracles and signs are only another way of talking about the direct intervention of God in events. They show that God favours a particular turn of events and that the Church, therefore, is on the right road. The regular appearance of God, Christ, the Spirit, angels and visions all point in the same direction. Luke's understanding of history is theocentric. Indeed it could be claimed, with some justification, that Luke has gone too far and that in his eagerness to emphasize the role of God he has reduced the human participants to mere puppets - a problem which is probably more noticeable to men of the 20th century than it was to those of the 1st century A.D. Divine intervention nevertheless makes clear that the development of the Church's mission, in particular the switch from a

¹ Haenchen, p90

Jewish to a Gentile dominated Church, is not only the will, but also the work of God. But because Luke's understanding of history is theocentric it is not necessarily theological. Rather, it is a simple and, in 1st century terms, effective justification of the Gentile mission in terms of Divine intervention. What to us may seem a naive approach to theology and history was probably to Luke and, more importantly, to his readers a far more effective means of emphasizing the essential motivation of the Gentile mission than an intricate theological system such as we find in Paul.

Historically, Luke places the origins of the Gentile mission in the words and actions of Jesus. In his lifetime Jesus did, in exceptional cases, deal favourably with Gentiles (Lk 7 1f), but more importantly - after the Resurrection he commissioned his Apostles to embark on a mission that would be universal in scope (Lk 24 47f, Acts 1 3). However dubious this may be historically and however much it may create tensions with the later narrative of Acts, this commission was fundamental to Luke's way of thinking. It was the necessary continuation and fulfilment of Jesus' own ministry. And not only the Apostles, but also Paul - the man who proved to be the Gentile missionary 'par excellence' - was commissioned directly by the Risen Christ (Acts 9 1f, 22 6f, 17f, 26 12f). The Gentile mission did not originate as a bright idea of the early Church, nor did it occur unexpectedly or by accident, it was rooted in the words of Jesus, as a promise in his earthly ministry and as a command after the Resurrection.

The idea that God is not partisan (10 34, 15 9) is yet another motif which underlies Luke's justification of the Gentile mission. As we suggested in an earlier section, this notion could have formed the

basis for a far-reaching and radical theological justification for the Gentile mission, especially when allied to Luke's liberal assessment of the pre-Christian history of the Gentiles (Acts 14 15-7, 17 22f) Yet Luke never makes full use of it by drawing out all its implications It is momentarily picked up and then immediately dropped Here, where there was the potential for developing a theology of the Gentile mission, he was content merely to mention it in passing

The proof-from-prophecy theme is one of the most widespread phenomena in Luke's version of the Gentile mission Throughout the Gospel and Acts quotations of (Lk 3 6, Acts 2 17, 3 25, 13 47, 15 17) and allusions to (Lk 2 32, 4 25-7, 24 46, Acts 1 8, 2 39, 10 34, 15 14, 26 17f 28 26f) the Old Testament are used to prophesy, explain and justify the proclamation to the Gentiles It is significant too, that Luke is careful to use passages which actually do refer to Gentiles It is improbable that the Gentile mission was, in the first instance, inspired by these passages, rather, as Luke himself implies, they were used to justify it 'post eventum' The purpose of these frequent references is undoubtedly to legitimize both the original Gentile mission and the subsequent Gentile Churches, to show that this major turning point in the Church's development was, from the beginning, part of the will of God God did not have a sudden change of mind, nor was he caught unawares by an unexpected turn of events, for he had planned and willed it from the beginning The Gentile mission was not a novel element in the teaching of Jesus, nor did it occur simply as a result of the obduracy of the chosen people, its roots went back far deeper - to the eternal will of God Of all the various methods Luke uses to justify the turning to the Gentiles, this

appeal to the Old Testament and, by implication, to the eternal will of God, is the most profound and fundamental. It is the closest Luke gets to constructing a 'theology' of the Gentiles and the Gentile mission. It reaches beyond the simple reference to miracles, visions and other modes of Divine intervention, the work of the Apostles, and even the command of Jesus - although he himself claims the same Old Testament precedent for his commission. Together with the notion mentioned in 10:34 it could have been worked into an overall theological structure, but Luke fails to do this.

Closely allied to this use of the Old Testament is the appeal to Scripture in explaining the obduracy of the Jews which, in an immediate and practical way, was an important impetus to the Gentile mission. Luke makes it clear that the prior claim of Israel to the gospel has been respected. Despite their rejection of Jesus, the gospel was proclaimed to them first in no uncertain terms, giving them a second chance to repent. The responsibility for their refusal and the consequent loss of salvation rested not on God, who had given them repeated chances, nor on the Church, who had made continual efforts to break through their obdurate shell, rather, the responsibility was their own. The fact that so many Jews reject the gospel may seem at first to jeopardize the idea of proof-from-prophecy, but even this rejection was foretold in the Old Testament. The Jews' refusal to hear and obey God's will was no new phenomenon, rather, it conformed to the regular pattern of Old Testament history (Lk 1:34, 4:25-7, 6:22-3, 26, 8:10, 11:47-51, 13:23-30, 34, 14:24, 19:41-6, 20:19f, 21:20f, Acts 3:23, 4:25f, 7:35f, 13:40f, 28:25f). Whether the Jews refuse or accept the gospel, the Old Testament, inclu-

-ding God's promise to the Gentiles, is fulfilled The Jews rejection of the gospel is not a fundamental motivation of the Gentile mission, for the decisive move was taken not as a result of the Jews' refusal, but as a result of God's prompting (10-11) Yet in a practical way the Jews' obduracy influenced Paul's decisions at several points The impression Luke leaves is that Paul's whole ministry was characterized by Jewish opposition and that it was only after his attempts to persuade the Jews were frustrated that he turned his attention to the Gentiles

Finally, we recall one more theme which crops up in Luke's narrative in connection with the Gentiles, namely that which we have called his pragmatic approach to the Gentiles (Lk 7 1-10, Acts 10 1f, 14 15-7, 17 22f) That is, the way in which Luke, by his description of the Centurion and Cornelius and by his assessment of the religious status of the Gentiles in the Areopagus speech, tries to show that the Gentiles are, in their own way, as devout and as likeable as the Jews The Jews have no cause to be arrogant, thinking that their position as God's chosen people gives them a monopoly of religious devotion or an exclusive claim on God The Gentiles may not belong to the chosen race and they may lack the religious insights of the Jews, but within the limits set for them they prove to^{be} neither more nor less responsive to God's revelation of his character and will The Jews may mock the Gentiles for the primitive conception of God expressed in their idolatry, but then the Jews' own past is chequered with lapses into a similar degradation of true worship In fact, with their less ambiguous revelation, they could well be considered more culpable The Gentiles may be ignorant, but the only result of a full revelation to the Jews seems to have been a more deliberate

disobedience Luke seems to be saying that an unbiased look at the past and the present shows the Gentiles to be in every way as good as the Jews And if this is so, then there is no good reason why the gospel should not be preached to them and the Church welcome them Apart from the Jews' temporal priority, the Gentile has as great a claim on the gospel as the Jew the response of the one is as valid as that of the other

How then are we to assess Luke's varied approach ? At the beginning of his article, Jervell mentions a number of the points made above and notes that if taken together they are not always logical For example, if the Church or Luke thought that the motivation for the Gentile mission lay in the Old Testament prophecies and in the non-partisan character of God, why the hesitation and reluctance as regards this mission ? Why was it necessary to wait for the intervention of God or the refusal of the Jews ? Jervell's answer is to deny that all these motives lie behind the Gentile mission in Acts and to find an overall pattern into which all the parts logically fit And this is precisely where he goes wrong For a characteristic of Luke's writings at this and at other points is that Luke has no apparent logic His account of the motivations for the Gentile mission is neither logical nor theological There is no single underlying theme, but rather a jumble of miscellaneous themes, none of which is fully developed in itself or in relation to the others Sometimes ideas are used which have the potential for forming the basis of a systematic and more logical justification, but their potential is never realized

In his overall account of the Gentiles and the Gentile mission

Luke clearly has a historical and practical rather than a theological interest at heart. From the historical angle, he was genuinely concerned to show how the Church expanded to allow for a Gentile influx. The fact that his attempt may be judged historically worthless does not destroy the intention. The primary inspiration lay far back in the Old Testament promises, which Jesus takes up in his commission to the Apostles. Here lay the historical roots of the Gentile mission. But in practical terms the Church needed a lot of persuading and this was done, according to Luke, by a combination of the direct intervention of God and the refusal of the Jews to accept the gospel. On both these scores there is no doubt that Luke's account contains a considerable amount of truth. The Church was, or believed it was, prompted by God, though Luke may have underplayed the role of men, likewise, Jewish obduracy probably was an important cause of the Gentile mission, and although Luke has probably over-schematized this pattern, the essential idea is not in doubt.

However, there is more than a straightforward historical interest in Luke's approach, he was also addressing the Church of his day. At the time Luke wrote, it is generally agreed that Jewish Christianity was largely a spent force. There were still Jews who were also Christians, but the enmity between the Church and Judaism was so great that there was scarcely a Jewish mission at all. As we saw in our study of 13:46, 18:6 and 28:28, Luke gives the impression that these passages reflect the situation of his own time rather than that of the Apostolic era. In Luke's day the Jews, almost without exception, refused the gospel, and consequently the Church was dominated by the Gentile element. Yet Luke's

1 Dahl ("Abraham", p151) "The priority of Israel is regarded as a matter

contemporaries knew that this state of affairs had not always been so. Both they and Luke knew that the early Church had sprung up from Jewish roots and that the Jews had not always rejected the gospel 'en bloc'. Thus to some extent Luke may be explaining and justifying how the Church had become both an independent entity separate from Judaism and dominated by the Gentiles. This turn of events, Luke says, was not the result of a deliberate, uninstigated separatist movement in the early Church led by the Apostles or Paul. The fault lay not with the Church but with the Jews, for they had openly and persistently refused the gospel. Paul did not reject the Jews, rather they rejected him. Unremitting efforts had been made to convert the Jews, but after an initial success they met with increasing opposition. At the end, in Rome, Paul gives a final summary of the Church's Jewish mission of the past and, by implication, points to the hopelessness of continuing this mission in the future: the Jews will no longer hear the gospel, but the Gentiles will. As Jervell says, the ending of Acts shows that, "Überall in der Welt, von Jerusalem bis Rom, wo die Juden wohnten, wurde das Evangelium verkündigt und die Ausrottung der unbussfertigen Juden proklamiert. Das Weltweite Judentum kennt das Evangelium und mit dem Abschluss der Acta ist auch der Abschluss der Judenmission da. Eigentlich hat Lukas der Kirche seiner Zeit die Möglichkeit einer weiteren Judenmission genommen, weil die Entscheidung von und über die Juden unwiderruflich getroffen ist."¹

(cont) of history, it is no longer a present reality for Luke and for the Churches like those in Corinth and Rome" Haenchen (p91)" die christlicher Mission seiner Zeit wendet sich nur noch an die Heiden " O'Neill (p90) "Acts presents a theology in which the Church has abandoned the People and appropriated the Book "

¹ Jervell, pp91-2

Exactly what circumstances Luke's account presupposes and how far they have influenced his narrative is not easy to say. It is unlikely that the Church spontaneously got a conscience over the lack of any Jewish mission in their time. ¹ Left to their own devices, it is unlikely that such a problem would have arisen at such a distance from the Apostolic age. To some, the important fact in Luke's account is the continued efforts of the Church to convert the Jews and the emphasis on the Jews' own responsibility for their rejection, for this is part of Luke's attempt to show that Christianity was a Jewish *ἐπίσκοπος* and, therefore, a 'religio licita'. ² But as has often been said, this view neglects much of the evidence of Acts and it is unlikely that Roman readers would have been either capable of or interested in drawing such conclusions from a narrative which is largely irrelevant to this theme. ³ Eltester suggests that the Church of Luke's day had begun to have doubts about its right to use the Old Testament, the book of the Jews, as the basis of their faith. ⁴ But again, he does not explain why the Church suddenly began to have such doubts.

The most likely explanation is that Luke's Church was involved in disputes with their Jewish contemporaries and that it was these which sparked off the Church's interest in and defence of her historical roots. ⁵

1 Jervell, p95, Haenchen (pp478, 680f) has a similar view, but never makes it clear why the Church should be wrestling with the problem of the Jews' rejection.

2 Haenchen, p560, Wetter, art cit, p414.

3 Schmithals, "James", pp57-60, rejects all the usual explanations for Luke's account, but fails to offer any alternative.

4 Eltester, "Lukas", pp1f.

5 In Nov Test, 10, 1968, pp187-90, Jervell gives a more detailed description of the circumstances in which Luke's Church existed than in his former article, a description to which the paragraph above is much indebted.

It is possible that the Jews accused the Church of being an illegitimate offspring of Judaism, an aberration in the true course of the history of God's people. This kind of accusation was probably accompanied by personal attacks on Paul, the founder of so many Gentile Churches. It was probably said that Paul was an apostate Jew and that this stigma remained on all the Churches which had descended from him. This would explain why Luke's defence of the Gentile mission is bound up with his more personal defence of Paul. The way in which Luke emphasizes the faithfulness of the Apostles and Paul to their Jewish origins and their continued efforts to convert the Jews, may be in part a defence of the legitimacy of the Gentile Churches in the form of a defence of their co-founders. The emphasis Luke places both on the Old Testament prophecies of the Gentile mission and on the Jews' wilful rejection of the gospel may be his response to Jewish calumny. Such a defence may imply that while Luke's Church was predominantly Gentile, it lived in a predominantly Jewish milieu.

In emphasizing this apologetic motive in Luke's account of the Gentile mission, the element of simple historical curiosity should not be overlooked. Apart from Jewish accusations, it would be natural for a Gentile, or for that matter a Jewish, Church to be inquisitive about its origins, the men involved in them, and how it had reached its present form. How far this, and the attempt to prove the legitimacy of the Gentile Churches, can be described as Luke's desire to preserve the continuity of the "Heilsgeschichte" is uncertain. Such a description may be too grand and a little misleading for describing Luke's practical and historical purpose. As we have seen, the word "Heilsgeschichte" is often

used with pejorative undertones, also, although it may seem to us satisfactorily to describe what Luke is doing, it is unlikely that he was thinking in such theological terms as its modern usage implies, so that if we do use it, it must be carefully defined

B A Comparison with Paul

Having concluded our investigation of Luke's approach to the Gentiles and the Gentile mission, a brief comparison with Paul will serve to emphasize some of the distinctive elements in Luke

1 One of the most noticeable characteristics of Luke's portrait of Paul is that he spends as much if not more, of his time preaching to the Jews as to the Gentiles. At each point in his itineraries Paul begins his work in the synagogues (9 20, 13 5, 14, 14 1, 17 1-2, 10, 17, 18 4, 19, 19 8) and, though frequently frustrated, his efforts continue up to the very end of Acts (28 23f). While he is the Gentile missionary 'par excellence', he also does more than any other figure in the early Church to promote the mission to the Jews. The historical reliability of this portrait has been radically questioned by Schmithals,¹ while others stoutly defend it.² Schmithals' view is based on a total mistrust of the historical reliability of Acts, the evidence of Paul's epistles, and practical considerations as to Paul's most 'natural' missionary methods. However, while Acts must be handled with care, we cannot reject its evidence out of hand. It is true that many of Paul's extant epistles are addressed to predominantly Gentile Churches and that Paul designates himself as the

1 Schmithals, "James", pp 54-62

2 Haenchen, p 445, Bornkamm, "Missionary Stance", pp 194-207, here p 200

apostle to the Gentiles (Rom 11 13, 15 16, 18, Gal 1 16, 2 2, 9, I Thess 2 16), but one cannot ignore passages like I Cor 9 20 and II Cor 11 24, which imply that Paul did, at least early in his ministry, preach to Jews as well as Gentiles. It is nowhere said in the epistles that he did not approach Jews, for although Rom 9-11 say that Paul's method of reaching the Jews was through the Gentiles, these are the ideas of a man reflecting on something like twenty-five years of missionary experience and not the notions which inspired him when he set out on his endeavours. Schmithals rejects as 'unthinkable' Haenchen's claim that the synagogues were the natural starting places for Paul's work. But it is only 'unthinkable' when one believes, with Schmithals, that Paul preached a radically anti-nomian gospel to both Jews and Gentiles. But since there is no evidence that Paul did encourage Jews to abandon the Law, Schmithals' objection has little force. The synagogues, with their numbers of God-fearing Gentiles who accepted the basic tenets of the Jewish faith, would have been the ideal place for Paul to begin his missionary work. Certainly, Luke's account is stylized and follows a rigid pattern which does not always do justice to the complexity of the actual events, but its essential reliability is not to be doubted.

1

2 Bornkamm argues that whereas Paul views the Jewish and Gentile missions as occurring simultaneously, Luke sees them as occurring in succession - first the Jewish and then the Gentile mission. But such a bald statement does not do justice either to Luke or to Paul. For while we have argued that Paul did participate in a Jewish and a Gentile mission,

1 Bornkamm, "Missionary Stance", p201

presumably simultaneously, when he gives his bird's-eye view of the pattern of history in Rom 9-11, he sees the pattern as Jews first, then the Gentiles, and finally once again the Jews. The first approach to the Jews met with refusal, therefore Paul suggests that when the next stage - the Gentile mission - reaches its climax, the Jews will be moved by jealousy to accept the gospel. Also, while Luke makes it clear that the gospel went to the Jews first, and while the end of Acts seems to indicate the end of the Jewish mission and usher in the era of Gentile Christianity, throughout the narrative of Acts from ch10 onwards the missions to the Jews and the Gentiles are carried on simultaneously (14 1, 17 4, 18 6, 19 10, 26 20). Thus it seems that Bornkamm has created a false contrast. In essentials Luke and Paul agree: the gospel went first to the Jews, then the Gentile mission began and for a while ran concurrently with the Jewish mission, finally, the Jewish mission ground¹ to a halt and the Church turned its attention exclusively to Gentiles.

More to the point in contrasting Luke and Paul is the fact that Luke appears to lack Paul's final stage in the development. For whereas² Paul clearly hopes for the ultimate salvation of Israel, the overall³ impression left by Luke is that the Jews are lost for ever. If this was⁴ not Luke's view, he has left no clear indication to this effect. Here

1 On the general question of "Heilsgeschichte" in Luke and Paul see Borgen, St Th, 20, 1966, pp140-57

2 I Thess 2 14-6 may seem to belie this, but O'Neill (p91) is correct in saying they are either (a) not Paul's words, (b) one side of a paradox which is explained more fully in Rom 9-11, or (c) a momentary outburst of anger with no serious theological implications - the last being perhaps the most likely explanation

3 Haenchen, p91, Jervell, p92, Conzelmann, p149

4 O'Neill (p82) thinks Luke does believe in the future salvation of the Jews, but Acts 1 6f and 3 20-1 do not seem clear or sufficient evidence for this view

then is one point of contrast between Luke and Paul, which probably results from the fact that Luke was writing at a much later time than Paul, when the Jews' rejection had been accepted as a matter of course, and because unlike Paul, Luke was not personally and emotionally involved in the fate of the Jews

1

3 Haenchen has noted three aspects in which Luke has misrepresented Paul. First, Luke sees Paul as a great miracle-worker (13 6f, 14 8f, 19 12f, 20 7f, 28 3f) and, although the real Paul did perform miracles (II Cor 12 12), they did not play a central role either in his work or in his concept of apostleship. But Haenchen exaggerates the difference. ² one should not underestimate the reference in II Cor 12 12, especially in the light of Rom 15 18-9 - which Haenchen ignores - from which it appears that miracles are a regular feature of Paul's missionary work. Paul, according to both the epistles and Acts, sees miracles not as a ground for boasting, but as signs of the work of God (Acts 15 9, Rom 15 18). Luke's penchant for the miraculous may have led him to exaggerate a little, but his account is based on sound historical fact, even if influenced by the heroic proportions which the figure of Paul had reached in some post-Apostolic Church tradition.

Second, whereas Paul saw himself as an apostle on equal standing with Peter and the other Apostles and as having a direct commission from God, Luke does not portray Paul as an apostle and emphasizes his dependence on the Twelve in Jerusalem. There is certainly an element of truth

1 Haenchen, pp99-103

2 Schmithals, pp26-7, thinks that in II Cor 12 12 Paul is either using a well-known formula without thinking what it really meant, or he is thinking of speaking the word in Spirit and power.

in what Haenchen says here, but again he has to exaggerate to make his point. We have already suggested in an earlier section that Acts 14:14 cannot be lightly dismissed and that they reveal that Luke did not deliberately deny Paul the title 'apostle'. He uses it more frequently of the Twelve because it was a convenient nomenclature, which saved him from listing them all each time they appear. Also, in the section on Paul's conversion, we have suggested that Luke's account is closely parallel to Paul's own versions, at least on the question of his direct commission from God and his dealings with the Jerusalem Church.

Finally, Haenchen notes that Luke portrays Paul as a persuasive orator (24:1f, 40f, 22:1f) before Jews (13:16f, 23:1f), Gentiles (17:22f) and magistrates (13:9-11, 24:10f), whereas the real Paul was a weak and unimpressive speaker (II Cor 10:10). Haenchen is correct in emphasizing at this point how Luke's picture is affected by the ideas of a later generation than that of Paul, when the legendary figure of Paul had been idealized and the memory of the real man blurred.

4. The most striking and important difference between Luke and Paul is that whereas Paul has a theology of the Gentiles, Luke has not. Even allowing for the fact that Acts and the epistles belong to different literary genres, the contrast is still marked. Paul explains and justifies the turning to the Gentiles within the total structure of his theological ideas.¹ To give a full explication of Paul's theology of the Gentiles would be impossible, since his view of the mission is inseparable from his entire theological thought, it therefore leads us into almost all the problems of his theology.² Also, the fact that Paul has

1 This is not meant to imply that Paul's theology can be forced into a systematic framework, but simply that it comes a lot nearer to being systematic than Luke's.

2. Hahn, p97

a theology of the Gentiles and that it is an integral part of his total theological outlook is not in dispute, and, for the purposes of this thesis, this is enough to allow for a comparison with Luke. A few brief comparisons will serve to confirm our conclusions. First, we can refer back to the chapter on the Areopagus speech and the contrast drawn there between Luke and Paul. Luke's assessment of the Gentiles' pre-Christian religiosity is positive, magnanimous and non-theological compared with the way Paul handles the same theme in Rom 1-3. In accord with this is¹ their treatment of the question of the Law. Paul's doctrine of Law and grace, that is, his theology of justification, is the basis of his total theological outlook, including his attitude to the Gentiles. For Paul, the Law leads not to salvation but to sin (Gal 3 19, Rom 4 13-6, II Cor 3 6) and in this way serves God's purpose by preparing men for the revelation of his righteousness in Christ, which puts an end to the Law as a way of salvation (Rom 10 4). For Gentiles to turn to the Law as a means of salvation would be equivalent to returning to their previous slavery to the elemental cosmic powers (Gal 4 8-10). This new revelation in Christ is universal, it both condemns and reaches out to all men (Rom 1 14), for as all men were condemned in Adam so all are saved in Christ (Rom 5 12f). Thus on the basis of the work of Christ alone, Paul can claim that there is no distinction between Jew and Greek (Rom 3 22f, 10 12, Gal 3 28, I Cor 12 13). Jews and Gentiles are united in the one epochal event of salvation, which is rooted in Christ's death and resurrection.

In Luke's account, justification plays no part at all. It is alluded

1 Haenchen, pp102-3, Vielhauer, "Paulinism", pp37f, Bornkamm, "Missionary Stance", pp194f

to in Acts 13 38-9, but it is differently understood, it is equated with the idea of forgiveness and it is not expressly based on Christ's death. Also, there is but a faint echo (Acts 15 10) of Paul's account of the insufficiency of the Law and nothing of his contrast between Law and grace. Luke does not see the Law as a way of salvation, it is insufficient, but it is not brought to an end in Christ. "Luke speaks of the inadequacy¹ of the Law, whereas Paul speaks of the end of the Law, which is Christ." Moreover, Luke repeatedly refers to the Law in a positive way: the Gentiles are encouraged to follow the requirements applicable to them (15 21,28) and Paul is portrayed as one who does not speak against the Law (21 21,28), but positively fulfils its requirements (16 3, 18 18, 21 20f). For Luke, the Law is no longer a burning issue concerning the fundamentals of belief, rather, it is an ecclesiastical-historical problem. Even in his account of Paul's conflict with the Jews, he suggests that the cause of these was belief in the Resurrection (4 2, 28 23, cf 23 6, 24 5,21, 26 6f,27, 28 20), while one of the real reasons, his teaching on the Law,² lies obscurely in the background (15 5, 21 21,28). Luke has lost Paul's insight into the solidarity of the human race expressed in the Law-grace, Adam-Christ contrasts, and in place of Paul's understanding of the equality of all men in Christ, he resorts to a pragmatic understanding of the equality of Jews and Gentiles.

Luke has lost completely Paul's logical and theological justification of the Gentiles and the Gentile mission, in its place he offers a collection of unconnected, miscellaneous themes. Certainly, the problem

¹ Vielhauer, "Paulinism", p42

² Haenchen, pp102-3, Smith, "Paul", pp261-8

and the right of the Gentile mission is as important to Luke as to Paul, but in their approach to the problem they could not be more different. Paul's approach is that of the theologian, Luke's that of the pragmatist, and while the end result in Paul is logical and integrated - the result of profound theological reflection, in Luke it is varied, at times confused, and altogether more naive.

In recent years we have been offered several attempts to portray Luke as a theologian. In his own right, he is no longer seen as a man who simply passed on tradition as he received it and as a writer of dramatic stories, but as a man who has a theological axe to grind. He is said to have produced a "Heilsgeschichtliche" theology which is both broad in outline and precise in detail. The various individual theological themes are thought to fit logically into the overall pattern. Scholars differ in their assessment of which particular theme dominates Luke's theology, but they all agree that he is a theologian. However, our studies have led us to precisely the opposite conclusion. We have found that the one thing Luke is not, is a theologian. Insofar as he writes about God, Luke can properly be called a theologian. But this is probably better expressed by saying that Luke's writings are theocentric, rather than by calling him a theologian. For in comparison with the profound, logical and complex theology of Paul, Luke cannot be said to have produced a theology at all. His main interests were historical and practical. He was far more concerned to produce an intelligible history, which at the same time spoke to the practical, pastoral problems of the Church of his day, than he was to produce what we would call a theology. We found this to be true at several points, in particular in his treatment of

eschatology and in his presentation of the Gentile mission. It would perhaps be more exciting to offer a new and original presentation of the theology of Luke, but the facts force us to conclude that he was a pastor and a historian rather than a theologian.

II The Question of Historical Reliability

At the beginning of our study of Acts a short summary was given of the main views on the reliability of Luke's account. It is now time to draw together the various strands of evidence which have been studied and, while being aware that only select passages have been considered and not the whole of Acts, to propose some tentative conclusions on this broad and complex question.

In the section on Luke's Gospel it was concluded that while Luke had mistakenly placed the command for a Gentile mission on the lips of Jesus in the immediate post-Resurrection period, he did not anachronistically place the origins of this mission within the ministry of Jesus. While Jesus prophesied the future inclusion of the Gentiles in the Kingdom of God and responded positively on the rare occasions he met a Gentile, he does not begin the Gentile mission himself. In view of Luke's interest in the Gentiles, it might have been tempting for him to make Jesus into the first Gentile missionary, but instead he follows in all essentials the pattern laid down in Mark's Gospel. With his knowledge both of Mark and of the fact that the Gentile mission had taken place, it would have been virtually impossible for Luke to probe behind the Gospel traditions and discover that Jesus did not authorize a historical Gentile mission.

In our studies of the first few chapters of Acts, we examined the

origins of the mission in the earliest years of the Church. Luke's view, that the Gentile mission was commissioned by Jesus, was found to be historically unreliable. If it were true, then it makes inexplicable the fact both that the mission was so slow in starting and that the Apostles raised objections when this mission first came to their notice - not to mention Peter's reluctance to approach Cornelius until God had directly intervened. Moreover, in the midst of the intense eschatological expectations of the earliest Christians, which is still detectable beneath the early chapters of Acts, it is improbable that the Church expected to complete a gradual, planned mission such as is envisaged in Acts 1:8. Also, if the conclusions of the first part of this thesis are correct and Jesus did not foresee a historical Gentile mission, then it is unlikely that the Church would have suddenly and spontaneously discovered that such a mission was to be pre-condition of the End. The tension between Luke's view and the historical facts is still discernible in the narrative of Acts, despite Luke's attempt to impose on it his own interpretation of events. The confinement of the Apostles to Jerusalem, their suspicion when the mission moves out of this locale (8:1, 14f, 11:1f), and Peter's reluctance to approach Cornelius (10:9f), are all inconsistent with the explicit command given to them by Jesus in 1:8.

The reluctance of the early Christians to embark on a Gentile mission is to be explained not simply by reference to their disobedience or their Jewish scruples, but by acknowledging a far more fundamental factor, namely that in all probability they shared the same view as Jesus. He did not expect a historical, but an apocalyptic, proclamation to the Gentiles. Therefore, the early Christians, like Jesus, believed that the

Gentiles would participate in the future Kingdom, but they did not expect this participation to begin before the End and did not, therefore, see the Gentile mission as a task they had to fulfil. It was not that they were disobeying God's will, rather, as far as they knew, it was not part of his will for the present. But as their hope for an imminent End was steadily disappointed, and as the Church increasingly broke free from the bounds of Judaism and found sympathetic Gentile hearers, it gradually dawned on the early Christians that history had taken a new turn, a turn which was then justified and firmly grounded by placing a universal missionary command on the lips of Jesus. This in no way implies that Luke was deliberately perverting the facts as he knew them. Long before he wrote, Jesus' teaching on the Gentiles had been either altered, forgotten or misunderstood, so that already in Mk 13:10 the universal mission is seen as a pre-condition rather than as a result of the End. And although the critical eye may detect the eschatological fervour of the primitive Church beneath the first few chapters of Acts, this does not mean that Luke was aware of it and sought deliberately to cover it up. Writing at a time when the Gentile mission was a well-established fact, some of the early traditions of the primitive Church would have been extremely difficult for Luke to comprehend, apart from the fact that they were probably obscure and fragmentary when they reached him. In the light of events in the intervening years, Luke attempts to unravel and make intelligible the minds of the early Christians. The intention is laudable even if the result is not

The next main problem we encountered was the origin and influence of Stephen and the Hellenists. Here, too, it was discovered that Luke's own analysis of the events often misses the historical truth. This is a

result partly of the confusion of the material he was dealing with and partly of his own view of the development of the Gentile mission. Luke believed it was a planned, schematic advance, begun by the leading Apostle and followed up above all in the work of Paul. According to Luke, Cornelius was the first and decisive convert from the Gentile world. As a result of his conversion, the question of the admission of Gentiles into the Church was, in principle, settled. Before this the problem had not arisen, since no Gentiles were converted before Cornelius. Not only is this ideal, schematic account intrinsically improbable, but also Luke himself uses material which suggests a rather different picture. It is improbable that the problem of the Gentile mission was introduced and solved in and around the person of the first Gentile convert. It is more probable that Gentiles were converted simultaneously, a few in one Church centre and a few in another, rather than that the expansion of the Church followed the concentric pattern envisaged in 1.8. Jerusalem held a pre-eminent position in the early Church, but Luke has exaggerated this fact. The early Church was never focused on Jerusalem to the extent which Luke implies, except perhaps in the first few months. Luke may have left a hint of this in the Pentecost narrative. He does not interpret it as a miracle directly affecting the Gentiles, they have their own 'Pentecost' in ch. 10. But if there was some exceptional event witnessed on that first Christian Pentecost by numerous visitors to the city from the Diaspora^o, then one would presume that, on returning to their own country, those who had been impressed or even converted by this event and its aftermath would pass on the message as they went. This would imply a sort of 'Wandermission', unplanned and unauthorized, where the message was passed spontaneously

from one to another, both Jews and Gentiles alike Presumably this is how the otherwise unexplained Christian community at Damascus arose A further hint that this was so we found in Acts 11 19f, which is very significant - the more so if we link it together with Acts 8 4 as part of a common source In the latter case, if the source reached Luke in one piece, he has split it up and inserted Acts 8 5-11 18 between the persecution of the Hellenists and their flight to distant lands which resulted in preaching to the Gentiles The corollary of this would be that Luke has consciously imposed his own understanding on the material, reserving the Hellenists' Gentile mission for the period after the test-case, Cornelius, has been approved Apart from any source theory, the natural time-reference of Acts 11 19f is to events which occur either before or simultaneously with those of Acts 8 5-11 18, so that a succession of events different from that which Luke offers seems to be implied The Hellenists' mission also has an air of spontaneity about it, it is unplanned, unauthorized, and results not from a conscious decision of the Church to embark on a Gentile mission, but from ferocious persecution of the Hellenists by the Jews

This leads us immediately to the narrative in Acts 10-11 As we have already implied, Luke has magnified and schematized the account of Cornelius' conversion What was originally a simple, straightforward legend about the conversion of a godly Gentile, has been transformed into a type or pattern for all Gentile converts Cornelius is singled out as the test-case around which all the problems of Gentile converts are settled once and for all That Luke has magnified it out of all proportion is clear from the fact that a few years later a council convenes in

Jerusalem to settle these problems once again, when ostensibly they had already been settled earlier. Since the main elements of Acts 15 are supported by Paul's account (Gal 2 1f), the narrative in Acts 10-11 is not, as it stands, the historical truth. Certainly, it has a historical core, but this core has been embellished, probably both in pre-Lukan tradition and by Luke himself.

Much the same can be said about Luke's account of the Apostolic council. The outline of the narrative accords with what we find in Galatians, but at several points Luke betrays the presuppositions of a later age. The conflict between Paul and the Jerusalem Church is treated lightly and it is the Apostles Peter and James who, rather idealistically, are the chief defenders of the right of the Gentile mission. The Apostles and Paul are in perfect harmony over the question of the Gentiles. Luke has also misplaced the Apostolic decree, and he assumes wrongly that Paul assented to it. Clearly, Luke is not aware of the depth or the extent of the conflict over the Law in Paul's teaching. It might appear that the extent of the harmonizing and idealizing process in Acts 15 is so great that it betrays more than a simple misunderstanding, namely a deliberate distortion of the facts. If this is so, then we cannot impute the whole of this process to Luke, for he rarely, if ever, gives the impression that he distorts facts which he knew to be true, rather, it is the facts which were available to him and his own understanding of them which are deficient. In the tradition which Luke uses in Acts 15, it is possible that at one or more stages the account was deliberately recast. Or it may be that Luke or his tradition were unwittingly influenced by traditions which stemmed from Paul's opponents. In either case, being both ignorant

of Paul's epistles and influenced by the ideal picture of Paul in Christian tradition, and living at a time when the heated disputes of the Apostolic era had faded in importance, it was almost inevitable that Luke would accept the tradition as he found it. Even if he was not the man to perpetrate deliberate falsehoods, neither was he exactly looking for evidence of disharmony in the primitive Church.

In general, Luke's account of the origins and early development of the Gentile mission follows a broad and ideal pattern. Haenchen's comment is both judicious and fully justified: "Der Historiker Lukas zeichnet nicht die vielfach gebrochene Linie der wirklichen Entwicklung der christlichen Mission, sondern ihre ideale Kurve".¹ Whereas in reality it was spontaneous, unplanned, unauthorized and unorganized, the result of a 'Wandermission' which was not based on a single geographical or ecclesiastical centre, in Acts it is a planned, gradual progression which follows a strict pattern. Where in reality there was, after this ragged start, a series of sharp disputes between various factions in the Church, Luke gives a picture of almost complete harmony. The details of historical reality are lost in the broad sweep and schematic lines of Luke's own interpretation.

How then are we to assess Luke's presentation of Paul? In general, a rather different judgement from that on the first part of Acts is required, for Luke is closer to historical actuality more frequently than in the earlier chapters. There is similar evidence for idealization and schematization, but its role is less important than before. Luke's

¹ Haenchen, p93

account of Paul's conversion is, as we have seen essentially in accord with Paul's own evidence in the epistles. Luke lacks Paul's profound theological reflection on the event and has a different evaluation of the Resurrection appearances, but apart from this his threefold account is a close parallel, and at times an additional source of material, to the facts which Paul himself gives. The overall picture of Paul in the second part of Acts as a missionary to Jews and Gentiles, a miracle worker, and as an apostle seems to be a reasonably reliable guide to the real Paul. There are, of course, differences of emphasis and sometimes of fact: the rigid scheme of Paul's prior mission to the Jews in each new area, the lack of any emphatic application of the title 'apostle' to Paul, and the frequent references to Paul's miracles are all differences of emphasis, the picture of Paul as a persuasive orator and the lack of any ultimate hope for the Jews in his preaching are differences of fact. But despite this, the main outlines of Luke's sketch are reliable.

In his account of Paul's preaching to the Gentiles, Luke goes a little more astray (Acts 14, 17). He is correct in supposing that Paul did use arguments from Nature and more general philosophical notions, but the use Paul makes of these arguments and the conclusions he draws from them are very different in Acts and Romans. In Acts 17, Gentile religiosity is assessed positively and independently of any overall theological framework, it is seen as the first stage on the way to salvation. In Romans, it is used negatively and is integrated into Paul's total theological complex, it is seen as the basis of the Gentiles' condemnation. Luke seems to have allowed his picture of Paul's preaching to be influenced by the sort of Gentile missionary sermon common in his own day.

One final fact to be noted is the unexpected and unexplained appearance of Christian communities in the narrative of Acts, about whose origins Luke is either ignorant or deliberately silent. The appearance of these communities (9 10f, 32-6, 18 19, 26, 28 13, 15) makes it clear that Luke's concentration on the figure of Paul can easily lead to misconceptions. Undoubtedly, Paul was the most important and active Gentile missionary in the early Church - a fact witnessed by himself and others - but he was not the only one involved in this work, as he himself is aware (Rom 15 20). Were it not for the occasional lacunae noted above, one might suppose from Acts that apart from Barnabas, virtually all the missionary preaching to the Gentiles was the work of Paul (though cf 11 19). The fact that Luke includes these occasional lacunae is a mark in favour of his honesty. That he uses here, as at other points, material which is not homogeneous, shows that even though he had his own view of how events developed, this did not lead to the suppression of material which contradicted his own interpretation.

Luke's portrait of Paul betrays no elements of a deliberate degrading of Paul, as Klein supposes. In fact, if anything it is the opposite which is true. Luke magnifies and idealizes Paul, making him into a heroic figure. When the facts may seem to be wide of the mark (15), there is no reason to suppose that this is Luke's own work, but rather that he used traditions whose historical worth he could not easily assess. Luke's account of Paul has been influenced by a variety of factors: the historical facts, the Church's traditions about Paul, his ignorance of Paul's epistles and finally, both his ignorance of the disputes in the early Church and the consequent tendency to reflect the settled opinions of his day and to project these back into what were originally burning

and divisive issues

On the basis of the material we have examined we can now draw some tentative conclusions about the reliability of Acts. They must remain tentative, since there are so many major fields we have left untouched, such as the speeches in the early part of Acts, the 'We' source, and both the general outline and the minor details of the missionary journeys of Paul.

First, our conclusions exclude any simple answers to this problem, one-word definitions of Luke's reliability will not cover the whole of Acts. Sometimes Luke is very close to the truth, at other times far from it, but most of the time he is somewhere between the two. For the same reason any extreme conclusions are out of the question. It would be as false to claim that Acts is reliable down to the smallest detail in every case as it would be to claim that it is a wholly tendentious work and utterly lacking in historical worth. Each extreme can account for but a few of the facts. As Cadbury wisely says, "Our alternatives are not to take it or leave it, to accept it 'from cover to cover' or to reject it 'in toto'." We shall prefer to form our verdict about its contents piece by piece.¹

Second, we have found no evidence to suppose that Luke cold-bloodedly perverted the facts as he knew them. As we have seen, the frequent tensions and contradictions in his account militate against such a view. A man who was intent on imposing a strict and uniform view on his material would have suppressed far more of the material than

¹ Cadbury, p365

Luke has As Sanders says, " it is a kind of tribute to his fundamental honest, that he leaves so many loose ends and so many clues for the ingenious critic who wants to unpick and refashion the complicated patchwork of his narrative "¹ This does not mean that Luke did not have his own interpretation of events and that at times this led him to reshuffle the material he had But this is a very different picture of Luke the writer from that which the Tübingen School, Brandon and Klein would have us accept

Third, when Luke does go wrong and gets things a bit muddled, this is normally due to a combination of several factors In many parts of Acts, particularly the early chapters, Luke seems to have been faced with the task of unravelling incomplete and obscure tradition The fact that his attempt to sort it out and present a readable continuous narrative is at times historically unreliable is, therefore, hardly surprising Not only were the traditions he built on obscure, but at times the tradition itself had developed over the decades to give a picture, for example of Paul, which did not always conform to sober historical reality Moreover, the importance of Luke's ignorance of Paul's writings can scarcely be overemphasized, for much of our modern criticism of Acts is based on our knowledge of Paul's extant writings This lack was a serious handicap to Luke in his attempt to reconstruct the events of the Apostolic age A further factor is the way in which Luke allows the conditions of his own time to influence his description of events which occurred some sixty years before Lacking some of the

¹ Sanders, art cit ,p143

knowledge we have and not possessing our modern overriding desire for 'the facts as they, actually happened', it may not have seemed so naive to Luke - when he drew a blank in his historical enquiries or was left with a vague and obscure impression - to assume that the conditions in the Church of his day were also those of the Apostolic age. This is not the place to enter into a discussion of the limits of the historian, but it is worth observing that even the modern, historiographically-conscious historian frequently betrays the presuppositions of his own time. A man can look at the past only through the spectacles of his own environment. This cannot be used as an excuse for a rank mishandling of known facts, but it goes part of the way towards explaining what Luke has done. And although Luke reflects the conditions and attitudes of his day, one does not get the impression that this was the result of an irresponsible imposition of these views on material which would not bear them. This, in turn, leads us to another motivating force in Luke, namely his desire to show that the events of the Apostolic age had a direct, relevant message for his contemporaries. This led him to look for and emphasize those facts which were most pertinent to the problems which his fellow Christians faced. Luke's history is not a bare chronicle of the facts, it is history with a message. In order to find such a message he does not normally create new facts or falsify known ones, rather, he takes as his starting point a relevant fact or event in the Apostolic era and then isolates it for special attention. Thus we saw that his account of the Jews' refusal of the gospel, while reflecting an indisputable experience of the early Church, is also influenced by the experience of his contemporaries and his desire to address himself to them.

This last point raises a major issue in Acts, namely the purpose of Luke's composition and the extent to which this purpose has influenced the end-result. It would be impossible and inappropriate to launch into a full discussion of the diverse theories on the purpose of Acts. Our main task is to summarize our own findings in this sphere and compare them with other theories.

Recent studies of Acts have shown that it is almost always unsatisfactory to isolate any one theme as representing Luke's total purpose, because to do so fails to do justice to the whole book. To claim that Acts is aimed solely at providing a defence or a degrading of Paul, a defence of Christianity as a 'religio licita', an answer to the problem of disillusioned 'Naherwartung', an anti-gnostic tract, or a manifesto of the centrality and power of the Holy Spirit, is to neglect in each case a considerable amount of the material. Each of these claims may contain some, but none contains all, of the truth. Nor does the claim that Luke's purpose was wholly historical or wholly theological fit the facts as we have interpreted them. The need is for some sort of 'umbrella' term or terms which at the same time correctly characterize the motivating-force behind the composition of Acts and leaves room for a variety

1 Either at his trial (Flooy, *ibid*) or against Jewish calumnies (Schneckenburger, pp244f, Harnack, pp41-3, 129)

2 Klein, pp213f

3 Easton, pp33f, Haenchen, pp89f

4 Conzelmann, "Luke", pp95f, Conzelmann, pp9f, Grässer, pp204f

5 Klein, *ibid*, who thinks Luke is reclaiming Paul for the Church from the Gnostics, or Talbert, pp1f, who thinks the whole of Acts is an anti-gnostic tract

6 Ehrhardt, pp64f, cf Luck, Z T K, 57, 1960, pp51f

7 Ramsay, pp309f

8 This is the main drift of the commentaries of Haenchen and Conzelmann, though it would be unfair to restrict their views to this one line of interpretation

of main themes O'Neill has, with a certain amount of credibility, tried to do this under the general description of Luke's purpose as 'evangelical', that is, at all points Luke is trying to convince and convert¹ educated Roman readers. But from our studies a different description is required. The most convenient is to say that Luke's purpose was a combination of historical and practical elements. He wanted to write history, but history that had a message for his contemporaries. Such an emphasis on the practical, pastoral motivation of Luke's writing leaves ample room for distinguishing various themes within this general description and, at the same time, shows where the centre of gravity of Luke's interests lies. He was interested primarily in practical and not in 'theological' problems.² Of course, these problems and their answers had theological implications, and one might justifiably claim that the man who deals with practical issues from a Christian viewpoint is as much a theologian as the man whose interests lie in the more systematic and philosophical fields. But if this is done, then it must be made clear that they are theologians of a very different type, both in the motivation and in the focusing of their interests. The contrast between Luke and Paul is sufficiently sharp to make this differentiation clear.

To conclude Luke is neither totally reliable nor is he a wholly tendentious writer. He intends to write good history even if he is not always successful. When he fails it is due to a variety of motives and

1 O'Neill, pp166f

2 Some writers have emphasized Luke's attempt to speak to the Church of his day (Dibelius, pp165f, Haenchen, pp93f, Braumann, Z N W 54, 1963, pp117f, Winn, Interp, 13, 1959, pp144f), but on the whole this has been a neglected factor in recent studies of Luke. O'Neill (ibid) thinks Luke's pastoral interest is secondary to his evangelistic aim, and Cadbury (p302) suggests that Luke was not concerned with the problems of his Christian contemporaries at all.

not simply because he uses his history to speak to his own generation. Luke has undoubtedly made clear his own interpretation of events, but he has also left a sufficient number of lacunae and loose ends for us to be able to construct our own interpretation - and this says a lot for his basic honesty. While it would be naive to accept uncritically everything Luke says, it remains true that for the careful and critical reader Acts contains an immense amount that is of great historical value.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alt, "Stätten" = A. Alt, "Die Stätten des Wirkens Jesu in Galiläa territorialgeschichtlich betrachtet" In "Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte Israels", II, Munich, 1953, pp436f
- Alt, A "Die Deutung der Weltgeschichte im Alten Testament", Z T K , 56, 1959, pp129f
- Altheus, "Gal" = P Altheus, and others "Die kleineren Briefe des Apostel Paulus", Göttingen, 1955
- Anderson, "Jesus" = H. Anderson, "Jesus and Christian Origins", New York, 1964
- Argyle, A. W "The Ascension", E T , 66, 1955, pp240f
- Bacon, B W "The Ascension in Luke-Acts", Exp , 1909, pp254f
- Baird, "Justice" = J A Baird, "The Justice of God in the Teaching of Jesus", London, 1963.
- Bammel, E "Matthäus 10 23", St Th , 15, 1961, pp79f
- Barnard, L W "St. Stephen and early Alexandrian Christianity", N T S , 7, 1960/1, pp31f
- Barr, "Semantics" = J Barr, "The Semantics of Biblical Language", London, 1961
- Barrett, "Spirit", = C K. Barrett, "The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition", London, 1954
- Barrett, "Mark 10 45" = C K Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10 45", in "New Testament Essays", pp2f
- Barrett, "Luke" = C K Barrett, "Luke the Historian in Recent Study", London, 1961
- Barrett, "Stephen" = C K Barrett, "Stephen and the Son of Man", in "Apophoreta", Festschrift für E. Haenchen, Berlin, 1964, pp32f
- Barrett, "Pillar" = C K Barrett, "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles", in "Studia Paulina", pp1f
- Barrett, C K "New Testament Eschatology", S J T , 6, 1953, pp163f, 225f
- Barth, C D = K Barth, "Church Dogmatics", Vol. I.1 , Edinburgh, 1936
- G Barth = "Matthew's Understanding of the Law", in "Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew", London, 1963, pp58f
- Bauer = F C Bauer, "Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ", I, London, 1873.
- Bauernfeind = O Bauernfeind, "Die Apostelgeschichte", Leipzig, 1939
- Baumgarten = M. Baumgarten, "The Acts of the Apostles, on the History of the Church in the Apostolic Age", Vols I and II, Edinburgh, 1854
- Beardslee, W A "The Casting of Lots at Qumran and in the Book of Acts", St. Th , 4, 1960, pp245f
- Beasley-Murray = G R Beasley-Murray, "Jesus and the Future", London, 1954
- Benoit, P "La deuxième visite de St Paul à Jérusalem", Bib , 40, 1959, pp778f
- Black = M. Black, "An Aramaic approach to the Gospels and Acts", Oxford, 1954
- Black, M. "The Kingdom of God has come", E T , 63, 1951, pp289f
- Blackmann, E C. "The Hellenists of Acts 6 1", E T , 48, 1937, pp524f
- Blinzler, "Reiseberichte" = J Blinzler, "Die literarische Eigenart des sog Reiseberichtes im Lukas-Evangelium", in "Synoptische Studien", Festschrift für A. Wikenhauser, Munich, 1953, pp45f
- Boobyer, G H "The Miracle of the Loaves and the Gentiles in St Mark's Gospel", S J T ., 6, 1953, pp80f
- Boobyer, G H "Galilee and the Galileans in St Mark", B J R L , 25, 1952/3, pp340f

- Borgen, P. "Von Lukas zu Paulus Beobachtungen zu Erhellung der Theologie der Lukasschriften", St Th , 20, 1966, pp140f
- Bornkamm, "Matt" = G Bornkamm, "End-expectation and the Church in Matthew", in "Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew", London, 1963, pp15f
- Bornkamm, "Jesus" = G Bornkamm, "Jesus of Nazareth", London, 1960
- Bornkamm, "Missionary Stance" = G Bornkamm, "The Missionary Stance of Paul in I Cor. 9 and in Acts", in "Studies in Luke-Acts", pp194f
- Bornkamm, "Parusie" = G Bornkamm, "Die Verzögerung der Parusie", in "In Memoriam", pp116f
- Bornkamm, G. "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus", Z T K , 53, 1956, pp327f
- Bosch = D Bosch, "Die Heidenmission in der Zukunftschau Jesu", Zurich, 1959
- Bousset = W. Bousset, "Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter", Tübingen, 1926
- Brandon, "Jerusalem" = S G F Brandon, "The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church", London, 1951.
- Braumann, G. "Das Mittel der Zeit", Z N W , 54, 1963, pp117f.
- Bruce = F F Bruce, "The Acts of the Apostles", London, 1962
- Buck, C H "The Date of Galatians", J B L , 70, 1951, pp113f
- Bultmann = R Bultmann, "The History of the Synoptic Tradition", Oxford, 1963.
- Bultmann, "Theol " = R Bultmann, "Theology of the New Testament", London, Vol. I (1952), Vol II (1955)
- Bultmann, "Word" = R Bultmann, "Jesus and the Word", London, 1958.
- Bultmann, "Quellen" = R Bultmann, "Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apg ", in "New Testament Essays", pp68f
- Burton, "Galatians" = E D Burton, "The Epistle to the Galatians", Edinburgh, 1921
- Cadbury = H J Cadbury, "The Making of Luke-Acts", London, 1961
- Cadbury, "Eschatology" = H J Cadbury, "The Eschatology of Acts" in "The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology" in honour of C H Dodd, Cambridge, 1956, pp300f
- Cadbury, H J "Lexical notes on Luke-Acts", J B L , 44, 1925, pp219f.
- Cadbury, H J "The Odour of the Spirit at Pentecost", J B L , 47, 1928, pp237f
- Cadoux = C J Cadoux, "The Historic Mission of Jesus", London, 1943.
- A T Cadoux, "Parables" = "The Parables of Jesus, their Art and Use", New York, 1931.
- Caird = G B Caird, "St. Luke", London, 1963
- Caird, "Apostolic Age" = G B Caird, "The Apostolic Age", London, 1955.
- Chadwick, H "The Shorter text of Lk. 22 15-20", H T R , 50, 1957, pp249f
- Clark, K W "Realized Eschatology", J B L , 59, 1940, 367f
- Clarke, "Acts" = A. C Clarke, "The Acts of the Apostles", Oxford, 1933
- Conybeare, F C "The Eusebian form of the text of Matt 28 16-20", Z N W , 2, 1901, pp275f
- Conzelmann = H Conzelmann, "Die Apostelgeschichte", Tübingen, 1963
- Conzelmann, "Luke" = H Conzelmann, "The Theology of St Luke", London, 1961.
- Conzelmann, "Areopagus" = H Conzelmann, "The Address of Paul on the Areopagus", in "Studies in Luke-Acts", pp217f
- Conzelmann, H "Geschichte und Eschaton nach Mk 13", Z N W , 50, 1959, pp210f
- Cranfield = C E B Cranfield, "St. Mark", Cambridge, 1959
- Cranfield, C E B "The Parable of the Unjust Judge and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts", S J T , 16, 1963, pp297f.

- Creed = J M Creed, "The Gospel according to St Luke", London, 1930
- Cullmann, "Christology" = O Cullmann, "The Christology of the New Testament", London, 1963.
- Cullmann, "Time" = O Cullmann, "Christ and Time", London, 1951
- Cullmann, "Church" = O Cullmann, "The Early Church", London, 1956
- Cullmann, "Peter" = O Cullmann, "Peter, Disciple, Apostle and Martyr", London, 1962.
- Cullmann, O "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity", J B L , 74, 1955, pp213f
- Cullmann, O. "L'opposition contre le Temple de Jérusalem, motif commun de la theologie johannique et du monde ambiant", N T S , 1958/9, pp157f
- Dahl, "Abraham" = N A Dahl, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts", in "Studies in Luke-Acts", pp139f
- Dahl, "Volk" = N A Dahl, "Das Volk Gottes", Oslo, 1941.
- Dahl, N A "A People for His Name", N T S , 4, 1957/8, pp319f
- Daube = D Daube, "The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism", London, 1956
- Davidson, R "Universalism in Second Isaiah", S J T , 16, 1963, pp166f
- Davies, J G "The Prefiguration of the Ascension in the Third Gospel" J T S , ns6, 1955, pp229f
- Davies, J G "Pentecost and Glossolalia", J T S , ns3, 1952, pp228f
- Davies, "Sermon" = W D Davies, "The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount", Cambridge, 1964
- Davies, "Paul" = W D Davies, "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism", London, 1962
- Deissmann, "Paul" = A Deissmann, "Paul", London, 1926
- Delling, G "Das Gleichnis vom gottlosen Richter", Z N W , 53, 1962, pp1f
- Delling, G " βαπτισμα, βαπτισθηαι ", Nov Test , 2, 1958, pp92f.
- Derrett, J Duncan M "Fresh light on Lk 16 1f The Parable of the Unjust Steward", N T S , 7, 1960/1, pp198f
- Dibelius = M Dibelius, "Studies in the Acts of the Apostles", London, 1956
- Dibelius, "Paul" = M. Dibelius (and W G Kümmel) "Paul", London, 1962.
- Dodd = C H Dodd, "The Parables of the Kingdom", London, 1961
- Dodd, "Preaching" = C H Dodd, "The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments" London, 1963
- Dodd, "Studies" = C H Dodd, "New Testament Studies", Manchester, 1954.
- Dodd, "Scriptures" = C H Dodd, "According to the Scriptures The sub-structure of New Testament Theology", London, 1953
- Dodd, C, H "The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation'" Journal of Roman Studies, 37, 1947, pp47f
- Dupont, "Sources" = J Dupont, "The Sources of Acts", London, 1964
- Dupont, "Gentils" = J Dupont, "Le salut des Gentils et le livre des Actes", N T S , 6, 1959/60, pp132f
- Dupont, J "ΛΟΙ 'ΕΞ ΕΘΝΩΝ Acts 15 14", N T S , 3, 1956/7, pp47f.
- Easton, "Early Christianity" = B S Easton, "Early Christianity", London, 1955
- Ehrhardt = A Ehrhardt, "The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles", in "The Framework of the New Testament Stories", Manchester, 1964, pp64f
- Ehrhardt, "Succession" = A Ehrhardt, "The Apostolic Succession", London, 1953
- Eissfeldt, O "Kreter und Araber", T L Z , 12, 1947, pp207f
- Ellis = E Earle Ellis, "St Luke", London, 1966
- Eltester, "Lukas" = W Eltester, "Lukas und Paulus", in "Eranion", Festschrift für H Hommel, Tübingen, 1961, pp1f
- Eltester, W "Gott und die Natur in der Areopagrede", in "Neutestamentliche Studien für R Bultmann", Berlin, 1954, pp202f

- Eltester, W "Schöpfungsoffenbarung und natürliche Theologie im frühen Christentum", N T S ,3, 1956/7, pp93f
- Enslin, M S "A Notable Contribution to Acts", J B L ,72, 1953, pp230f
- Evans, C F "I will go before you into Galilee", J T S ,ns5, 1954, pp3f
- Evans, C F "The Kerygma", J T S ,ns7, 1956, pp25f
- Evans, C F "Central Section" = "The Central Section of St Luke's Gospel", in "Studies in the Gospels", pp37f
- Farrer, A "An Examination of Mk 13 10", J T S ,ns7, 1956, pp75f
- Farrer, "Ministry" = A Farrer, "The Apostolic Ministry", ed K E Kirk, London, 1946, pp138f
- Feuillet, A "Les Origines et la signification de Matt 10 23 Contribution a l'etude du probleme Eschatologique", C B Q ,23, 1961, pp182f
- Filson, "Matt" = F V Filson, "The Gospel according to St Matthew", London, 1960.
- Filson, "Decades" = F V Filson, "Three Crucial Decades", London, 1964
- Flender, = H Flender, "Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas", Munich, 1965
- Fridrichson, "Apostle" = A Fridrichson, "The Apostle and his Message", Uppsala, 1947
- Fuchs, H "Zum Pfingstwunder, Act 2 9-11", T Z ,5, 1959, pp233f
- Gärtner = B Gärtner, "The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation", Uppsala, 1955
- Gasse, W "Zum Reisebericht des Lukas", Z N W ,34, 1935, pp293f
- Geldenhuys = N Geldenhuys, "Commentary on the Gospel of St Luke", London, 1950
- Gelin, = A Gelin, "L'idée missionnaire dans la Bible", Supplement to "Union missionnaire du clerge de France", No 14, 1956
- Gewiess = J G Gewiess, "Die urapostolische Heilsverkündigung nach der Apostelgeschichte", Breslau, 1939
- Geyser "Apostolic decree" = A Geyser, "Paul, the Apostolic decree and the liberals at Corinth", in "Studia Paulina", pp124f
- Glasson = T F Glasson, "The Second Advent The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine " London, 1947.
- Glombitza, O "Das Zeichen des Jona Zum Verständnis von Matt 12 38-42", N T S ,8, 1962/3, pp359f
- Glombitza, O "Zur Charakterisierung des Stephanus in Act 6&7", Z N W ,53, 1962, pp238f
- Goppelt = L Goppelt, "Die Apostolische und Nachapostolische Zeit", Göttingen, 1962
- Gore, "Church" = C Gore, "The Church and the Ministry", London, 1921
- Grässer = E Grässer, "Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte", Berlin, 1959
- Grundmann = W Grundmann, "Das Evangelium nach Lukas", Berlin, 1966.
- Grundmann, W "Fragen der Komposition des lukanischen Reiseberichtes", Z N W ,50, 1959, pp252f
- Grundmann, W. "Die Apostel zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia", Z N W ,38, 1939, pp110f
- Guy = H A Guy, "The New Testament Doctrine of the 'Last Things'", London, 1948
- Haenchen = E Haenchen, "Die Apostelgeschichte", Göttingen, 1965
- Haenchen, "Weg" = E Haenchen, "Der Weg Jesu", Berlin, 1966
- Haenchen, E "Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte", Z N W ,54, 1963, pp155f
- Hahn = F Hahn, "Mission in the New Testament", London, 1965

- Hanson = R P C Hanson, "The Acts of the Apostles", Oxford, 1967
- Hanson, R P C "Stephen's Speech", Theol , 50, 1947, pp142f
- Hare = D R A Hare, "The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St Matthew", Cambridge, 1967
- Harder, G "Das eschatologische Geschichtsbild der sogenannten kleinen Apokalypse Mk 13", Th Viat , 4, 1952, pp78f
- Harnack, "Mission" = A Harnack, "The Mission and Expansion of Christianity", Vols. I and II, London, 1908
- Harnack, "Acts" = A Harnack, "The Acts of the Apostles", London, 1909.
- Held = H J Held, "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories", in "Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew", London, 1963, pp165f
- Higgins = A. J B Higgins, "Jesus and the Son of Man", London, 1964
- Hirsch, "Frühgeschichte" = E Hirsch, "Die Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums", Vols I and II, Tübingen, 1941
- Hirsch, E "Die drei Berichte der Apg über die Bekehrung des Paulus", Z N W , 28, 1929, pp305f
- Hirsch, E "Petrus und Paulus", Z N W , 29, 1930, pp63f
- Holtz = T Holtz, "Untersuchungen über die Alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas", T U , 104, Berlin, 1968
- Hooker = M D Hooker, "Jesus and the Servant", London, 1959
- Howton, J "The Sign of Jonah", S J T , 15, 1962, pp288f
- Hurd = J C Hurd, "The Origins of I Corinthians", London, 1965
- Hommel, H "Neue Forschungen zur Areopagrede", Z N W , 46, 1955, pp145f
- Hommel, H "Platonisches bei Lukas Zu Acta 17 27a", Z N W , 48, 1957, pp193f
- In Memoriam = "In Memoriam E Lohmeyer", Stuttgart, 1951
- Jacob = E Jacob, "Theology of the Old Testament", London, 1958
- Jellicoe, S "St Luke and the Letter of Aristeas", N T S , 6, 1959/60, pp319f
- Jeremias = J Jeremias, "Jesus' Promise to the Nations", London, 1958
- Jeremias, "Words" = J Jeremias, "The Eucharistic Words of Jesus", London, 1966
- Jeremias, "Parables" = J Jeremias, "The Parables of Jesus", London, 1963
- Jeremias, "Jerusalem" = J Jeremias, "Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu", I, Göttingen, 1937
- Jeremias, J "Untersuchungen zum Quellen-Problem der Apostelgeschichte", Z N W , 36, 1937, pp205f
- Jeremias, J "Mc 14 9", Z N W , 44, 1952/3, pp103f
- Jeremias, J "Sabbathjahr und Neutestamentliche Chronologie", Z N W , 27, 1936, pp98f
- Jervell = J Jervell, "Das gespaltene Israel und die Heidenvölker", St Th , 19, 1965, pp68f
- Jervell, J "Paulus -der Lehrer Israel Zu der apologetischen Paulusrede in der Apostelgeschichte", Nov Test , 10, 1968, pp164f
- Jüngel = E Jüngel, "Paulus und Jesus", Tübingen, 1964
- Käsemann, "Jesus" = E Käsemann, "The problem of the Historical Jesus", in "Essays on New Testament Themes", London, 1964, pp15f
- Käsemann, "Ephesus" = E Käsemann, "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus", in "Essays on New Testament Themes", London, 1964, pp136f
- Käsemann, "Legitimität" = E Käsemann, "Die Legitimität des Apostels", Z N W , 41, 1942, pp33f
- Käsemann, E , "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie", Z T K , 57, 1960, pp162f
- Kiddle, M , "The Death of Jesus and the Admission of the Gentiles in St Mark", J T S , 35, 1934, pp45f

- Kilpatrick, "Matthew" = G D Kilpatrick, "The Origins of the Gospel according to St Matthew", Oxford, 1946
- Kilpatrick, G D "AAOI at Lk 2 31 and Acts 4 25, 27", J T S , ns16, 1965, p127
- Kilpatrick, G D "Mark 13 10", J T S , ns9, 1958, pp81f
- Kilpatrick, "Gentiles" = G D Kilpatrick, "The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Mark Mk 13 10", in "Studies in the Gospels", pp145f.
- King = N Q King, "Universalism in the Third Gospel", T U , 73, 1959, pp199f
- Klein = G Klein, "Die Zwölf Apostel", Göttingen, 1961.
- Klein, G "Die Prüfung der Zeit Lukas 12 54-6", Z T K , 61, 1964, pp374f
- Klein, G "Besprechung von E Haenchen, 'Die Apostelgeschichte'", Z K G , 68, 1957, pp362f
- Klijn, "Search" = A. J Klijn, "In Search of the Original Text of Acts", in "Studies in Luke-Acts", pp103f
- Klijn, A J "Stephen's Speech Acts 7 2-53", N T S , 4, 1957/8, pp25f
- Klostermann, "Mk" = E Klostermann, "Das Markusevangelium", Tübingen, 1926
- Klostermann, "Matt" = E Klostermann, "Das Matthäusevangelium", Tübingen, 1927
- Knox, J. "Paul" = "Some Chapters in the Life of Paul", Nashville, 1950
- Knox, "Acts" = W L Knox, "The Acts of the Apostles", Cambridge, 1948
- Knox, Jerusalem = W L Knox, "St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem", Cambridge, 1925
- Kretschmar, G "Himmelfahrt und Pfingsten", Z K G , 66, 1954, pp217f
- Kümmel = W G Kümmel, "Promise and Fulfilment", London, 1961
- Kümmel, "Bekehrung" = W G Kümmel, "Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus", Uppsala, 1929
- Kümmel, W G "Jesus und der jüdische Traditions-gedanke", Z N W , 33, 1934, pp65f
- Kümmel, W G "Das Urchristentum", Th Rund , 22 1954, pp208f
- Kümmel, W G "Kirchenbegriffe und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus", S B U , 1943, pp1f
- Kümmel, "Aposteldekrets" = W G Kümmel, "Die älteste Form des Aposteldekrets" in "Spiritus et Veritas", for K Kundzins, San Francisco, 1953, pp83f 11,
- Kuhn, K G "Das Problem der Mission in der Urchristenheit", E M Z , 1954, pp163f
- Lagrange, "Mc" = M J Lagrange, "Evangile selon St Marc", Paris, 1929
- Lampe, "Spirit" = G W H Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Lukan Writings", in "Studies in the Gospels", pp159f
- Lampe, G W H "The Lucan portrait of Christ", N T S , 2, 1955/6, pp160f
- Leaney = A R C Leaney, "The Gospel according to St Luke", London, 1958
- Lekebusch = E Lekebusch, "Die Komposition und Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte", Göttingen, 1854
- Lechler = G V Lechler, "The Apostolic and post-Apostolic Times", Edinburgh, 1886
- Liechtenhahn = R Liechtenhahn, "Die urchristliche Mission, Voraussetzungen, Motive und Methoden", Zürich, 1946
- Lietzmann, "Galater" = H Lietzmann, "An die Galater", Tübingen, 1932
- Lightfoot, "Mark" = R H Lightfoot, "The Gospel Message of St Mark", Oxford, 1950
- Lightfoot, "Galatians" = J B Lightfoot, "The Epistle to the Galatians", London, 1892
- Linton, O "The Third Aspect A Neglected Point of View", St Th , 3, 1950/1, pp79f

- Ljungvik, H "Zur Erklärung einer Lukas-Stelle Lk 18 7", N T S , 10, 1963/4, pp293f
- Lohse, "Lukas" = E Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte", Ev Th , 14, 1954, pp256f
- Lohse, "Pfingstberichtes" = E Lohse, "Die Bedeutung des Pfingstberichtes im Rahmen des luk Geschichtswerkes", Ev Th , 13, 1953, pp422f
- Lohse, E "Ursprung und Prägung des Christlichen Apostelats", T Z , 9, 1953, pp259f
- Lohse, E "Missionarisches Handeln Jesu nach dem Evangelium des Lukas", T Z , 10, 1954, pp1f
- Lohmeyer, "Galiläa" = E Lohmeyer, "Galiläa und Jerusalem", Göttingen, 1936
- Lohmeyer, "Kultus" = E Lohmeyer, "Kultus und Evangelium", Göttingen, 1942
- Lohmeyer, "Matt" = E Lohmeyer, "Das Evangelium des Matthäus", (ed W Schmauch) Göttingen, 1958
- Lohmeyer, "Mk" = E Lohmeyer, "Das Evangelium des Markus", Göttingen, 1951
- Lohmeyer, "Gewalt" = E Lohmeyer, "Mir ist gegeben alle Gewalt", in "In Memoriam", pp22f
- Lohmeyer, E "Das Abendmahl in der Urgemeinde", J B L , 56, 1937, pp235f
- Loisy = A Loisy, "L'Evangile selon St Luc", Paris, 1924
- Loisy, "Actes" = A Loisy, "Les Actes des Apôtres", Paris, 1920
- Luck, U "Kerygma, Tradition und Geschichte bei Lukas", Z T K , 57, 1960, pp51f
- Manson = T W Manson, "The Sayings of Jesus", London, 1950
- Manson, "Jesus" = T W Manson, "Jesus and the non-Jews", London, 1955.
- Manson, "Teaching" = T W Manson, "The Teaching of Jesus", Cambridge, 1963
- Manson, T W "St Paul in Ephesus 2. The problem of the Epistle to the Galatians", B J R L , 24, 1940, pp59f
- W Manson = "The Gospel of Luke", London, 1930
- W Manson, "Hebrews" = "The Epistle to the Hebrews", London, 1951
- Marxsen = W Marxsen, "Der Evangelist Markus Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums", Göttingen, 1959
- Martin-Achard = R Martin-Achard, "A Light to the Nations", London, 1962
- Matill = J Matill, "Luke as a historian in Criticism since 1840", unpublished dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1959
- Meinertz = "M Meinertz", "Jesu und die Heidenmission", Münster, 1925
- Menoud, "Remarques" = Ph Menoud, "Remarques sur les textes de l'ascension dans Luc-Actes", in "Neutestamentliche Studien", pp148f
- Menoud, Ph "Pendant quarante jours (Actes 1 3)", in "Neotestamentica et Patristica", Fest für O Cullmann, Leiden, 1962, pp148f
- Menoud, Ph "Le Plan des Actes des Apôtres", N T S , 1, 1954/5, pp44f
- Metzger, B "70 or 72 Disciples?", N T S , 5, 1958/9, pp299f
- Micheal, J A. "The Sign of John", J T S , 21, 1920, pp146f
- Michaelis = W Michaelis, "Der Herr verzieht nicht die Verheissung Die Aussagen Jesu über die Nähe des Jüngsten Tages", Bern, 1942
- Michel, O "Der Abschluss des Matthäusevangeliums", Ev Th , 10, 1950/1, pp16f
- Minear, P S. "A Note on Lk 22 36", Nov Test , 7, 1964, pp128f
- Minear, "Birth Stories" = P S Minear, "Luke's use of the Birth Stories", in "Studies in Luke-Acts", pp111f
- Moltmann = J Moltmann, "Theology of Hope", London, 1967
- Moore = A L Moore, "The Parousia in the New Testament", Leiden, 1966
- Moore, "Judaism" = "G F Moore, "Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era", Vols I-III, Cambridge, 1927-30

- Mosbech, H "'Apostolos' in the New Testament", St Th ,2,1949/50, pp166f
- Moule, C F D "Review of 'Studies in the Gospels'", J T S ,ns7,1956, pp281f
- Moule, C F D "The Ascension", E T ,68,1957, pp205f
- Moule, C F D "From Defendant to Judge - and Deliverer An Enquiry into the use and limitations of the theme of Vindication in the New Testament", S N T S ,3,1952, pp40f
- Moule, C F D "Once more, who were the Hellenists?", E T ,70,1959, pp100f
- Munck = J Munck, "Paul and the Salvation of Mankind", London, 1959
- Munck, J "Paul, the Apostles and the Twelve", St Th ,3,1950/1, pp96f
- Mundle, W "Die Stephanusrede Apg 7 eine Märtyrerapologie", Z N W ,20,1921, pp133f
- Mussner, F "Einige Parallelen aus den Qumran texten zur Areopagrede", B Z ,1,1957, pp125f
- Nauck, W "Die Tradition und Komposition der Areopagrede", Z T K ,53,1956, pp11f
- "New Testament Essays" Studies in memory of T W Manson", ed A J B Higgins, Manchester, 1959
- "Neutestamentliche Studien" = "Neutestamentliche Studien für R Bultmann", Berlin, 1957
- Nickle = K Nickle, "The Collection", London, 1966
- Noack, "Gottesreich" = B Noack, "Das Gottesreich bei Lukas", Uppsala, 1948
- Nock, "Paul" = A D Nock, "St Paul", Oxford, 1955
- Nock, A D in "Gnomon", 25,1953, p506 - quoted in Haenchen, p457 n5
- Norden = E Norden, "Agnostos Theos", Leipzig-Berlin, 1913
- Nygren, "Romans", = A Nygren, "Commentary on Romans", London, 1952
- Oepke, "Galater" = A Oepke, "Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater", Berlin, 1957
- Oliver, H H "The Lukan Birth-stories and the purpose of Luke-Acts", N T S ,10,1963/4, pp202f
- O'Neill = J C O'Neill, "The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting", London, 1961
- Ott = W Ott, "Gebet und Heil, die Bedeutung der Gebetsparänese in der lukanischen Theologie", Munich, 1965
- Owen, H P "The Scope of Natural Revelation in Rom 1 and Acts 17", N T S ,5,1958/9, pp133f
- Owen, H P "Stephen's Vision in Acts 7 55-6", N T S ,1,1954/5, pp224f
- Owen, H P "The Parousia of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels", S J T ,12,1959, pp171f
- Parker, P, "Once More, Acts and Galatians", J B L ,86,1967, pp175f
- Percy = E Percy, "Die Botschaft Jesu", Lund, 1953
- Perrin = N Perrin, "Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus", London, 1967
- Pfleiderer = O Pfleiderer, "Primitive Christianity", London, 1909
- Pieper, J "Über die Hoffnung", 1949, - quoted in Moltmann, p23
- Plooij, D "The Work of St Luke a Historical Apology for Pauline preaching before the Roman Court", Exp VIII/8, 1914, pp511f
- Pohlenz, M "Paulus und die Stoa", Z N W ,42,1949, pp66f
- Preiss = T Preiss, "Life in Christ", London, 1954
- Prentice, W "St Paul's journey to Damascus", Z N W ,46,1955, pp250f
- Ramsay = W Ramsay, "St Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen", London, 1903
- Ramsey, "Ascension" = A M Ramsey, "The Ascension", S N T S ,2,1951, pp49f
- Ramsey, "Resurrection" = A M Ramsey, "The Resurrection of Christ", London, 1961

- Reicke, B "Die Verfassung der Urgemeinde im Lichte jüdischen Dokumente"
T Z ,10,1954,pp95f
- Reicke, "Glaube" = B Reicke, "Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde", Zürich, 1957
- Reicke, B , "Studia Evangelica", ed K Aland, Berlin, 1961, pp216f - quoted
in Ellis, pp146f
- Reicke, "Apostelkonzils" = B Reicke, "Der geschichtliche Hintergrund des
Apostelkonzils und der Antiochia Episode", in
"Studia Paulina", pp172f
- Rengstorff = K H Rengstorff, "Das Evangelium nach Lukas", Göttingen, 1966
- Rengstorff, "Matthias" = K H Rengstorff, "The Election of Matthias", in
"Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation",
for O Piper, ed W Klasson and G F Snyder, London,
1962, pp178f (also "Die Zuwahl des Matthias",
St Th ,11,1962,pp35f)
- Robinson, D F "A Note on Acts 11 27-30", J B L ,63,1944,pp179f
- J Robinson, "Mark" = J M Robinson, "The Problem of History in Mark",
London, 1957
- Robinson = J A T Robinson, "Jesus and His Coming", London, 1957
- Robinson, J A T "Elijah, John and Jesus an essay in detection "N T S ,
4, 1957/8, pp263f
- Robinson, J A T "The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats", N T S , 2,
1955/6, pp228f
- W C Robinson, Jr = "Der Weg des Herrn, Studien zur Geschichte und
Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium", Hamburg, 1964
- Rössler, "Gesetz" = D Rössler, "Gesetz und Geschichte Eine Untersuchung zur
Theologie der jüdischen Apokalyptik und die
Pharisäischen Orthodoxie", Neukirchen, 1960
- Rowley, "Faith" = H H Rowley, "The Faith of Israel", London, 1956
- Sahlén = H Sahlén, "Der Messias und das Gottesvolk", Uppsala, 1945
- Sanders, J N. "Peter and Paul in Acts", N T S , 2, 1955/6, pp133f
- Sass, "Apostel" = G Sass, "Die Apostel in der Didache", in "In Memoriam",
pp233f
- Schille, G. "Die Himmelfahrt", Z N W , 57, 1966, pp183f
- Schlatter = A Schlatter, "Das Evangelium des Lukas", Stuttgart, 1960
- Schlief, "Galater" = H Schlief, "Der Brief an die Galater", Göttingen, 1962
- Schlief, "Heidenmission" = H Schlief, "Die Entscheidung für die Heiden-
mission in der Urchristenheit", in "Die Zeit
die Kirche", Freiburg, 1956, pp90f
- Schmithals = W Schmithals, "Das kirchliche Apostelamt", Göttingen, 1961
- Schmithals, "James" = W Schmithals, "Paul and James", London, 1965
- Schnackenburg = R Schnackenburg, "God's Rule and Kingdom", Freiburg, 1963
- Scheckenburger = M Schneckenburger, "Über den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte",
Bern, 1841
- Schneider, "Reiseberichtes" = J Schneider, "Zur Analyse des lukanischen
Reiseberichtes", in "Synoptische Studien",
Festschrift für A Wikenhauser, Munich, 1953,
pp207f
- Schniewind, "Matt" = J Schniewind, "Das Evangelium nach Matthäus",
Göttingen, 1950
- Schniewind, "Mk" = J Schniewind, "Das Evangelium nach Markus", Göttingen, 1949
- Schoeps = H J Schoeps, "Paul", London, 1961

- Schubert = P Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Lk 24", in "Neutestamentliche Studien", pp165f
- Schurmann, H "Zur Tradition und Redaktionsgeschichte von Matt 10 23f" B Z , NF3, 1959, pp82f
- Schurmann, H "Lu 22 19-20 als ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung", Bib , 32, 1951, pp364f, 522f
- Schurmann, "Matt 10 5-6" = H Schurmann, "Matt 10 5-6", in "Neutestamentliche Aufsätze", for J Schmid, Regensburg, 1963, pp270f
- Schweitzer = A Schweitzer, "The Quest of the Historical Jesus", London, 1954
- Schweitzer, "Mystery" = A Schweitzer, "The Mystery of the Kingdom of God", London, 1925
- Schweitzer, "Mysticism" = A Schweitzer, "The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle", London, 1931.
- Schweizer, E "Die Heilung des Königlischen, Jn 4 46-53", Ev Th , 11, 1951/2, pp64f
- Schweizer, E "Der Menschensohn", Z N W , 50, 1959, pp191f
- Schweizer, E. "Zu Apg 1 16-20", T Z , 14, 1958, p46
- Schweizer, "Spirit" = E Schweizer, "The Spirit of God", London, 1961
- Schweizer, "Church Order" = E Schweizer, "Church Order in the New Testament", London, 1961
- Seidelin, P "Das Jonaszeichen", St Th , 5, 1951, pp119f
- Sharman = H Sharman, "Son of Man and Kingdom of God", London, 1944
- Sidebottom, E M "The Christ of the Fourth Gospel", London, 1961
- Simon = M Simon, "St Stephen and the Hellenists", London, 1956
- Sleeper, C. "Pentecost and Resurrection", J B L , 84, 1965, pp389f
- Snaith = N Snaith, "The Servant of the Lord in Deutero Isaiah", in "Studies in Old Testament Prophecy", presented to T H Robinson, Edinburgh, 1950, pp186f
- Smith, "Paul" = M Smith, "The reasons for the persecution of Paul and the Obscurity of Acts," in "Studies in Mysticism and Religion", presented to G G Scholem, Jerusalem, 1967, pp261f
- Sneed, R J "The Kingdom of God is within you", C B Q , 24, 1962, pp363f
- Spitta = F Spitta, "Jesus und die Heidenmission", Giessen, 1909
- Stählin = G Stählin, "Die Apostelgeschichte", Göttingen, 1966
- Stauffer, E "Jüdisches Erbe im urchristlichen Kirchenrecht", T L Z, 77, 1952, pp201f
- Strecker, G "Die sogenannte zweite Jerusalemreise des Paulus, Apg 11 27-30", Z N W , 53, 1962, pp67f
- Streeter, = B Streeter, "The Four Gospels A Study of Origins", London, 1924
- Strobel, A "Die Passaerwartung als urchristliches Problem in Luc 17 20f" Z N W , 49, 1958, pp157f
- Strobel, A. "Zu Lk 17 20", B Z , 7, 1963, pp111f
- "Studia Paulina" = "Studia Paulina in honorem J de Zwaan", Haarlem, 1953
- "Studies in Luke-Acts" = "Studies in Luke-Acts", Essays presented in honour of P Schubert, London, 1968
- "Studies in the Gospels" = "Studies in the Gospels Essays in Memory of R H Lightfoot", Oxford, 1955
- Sundkler, B "Jésus et les Païens", R H Ph R , 16, 1936, pp491f
- Talbert = C H Talbert, "Luke and the Gnostics", New York, 1966
- Taylor = V Taylor, "The Gospel according to St Mark", London, 1952.

- Taylor, "Names" = V Taylor, "The Names of Jesus", London, 1953
- Taylor, "Life" = V Taylor, "The Life and Ministry of Jesus", London, 1954
- Tödt = H Tödt, "The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition", London, 1965
- Torrey = C C Torrey, "The Four Gospels", London, 1935
- Trilling = W Trilling, "Das Wahre Israel Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus Evangelium " Leipzig, 1959
- Trocme = E Trocme, "Le 'Livre des Actes' et l'histoire", Paris, 1957
- Van Stempvoort P A "The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke-Acts", N T S , 5, 1958/9, pp30f
- Vielhauer, "Paulinism" = Ph Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts", in "Studies in Luke-Acts", pp33f
- Vielhauer, "Gottesreich" = Ph Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu", in the Festschrift für G Gehr, Neukirchen, 1957, pp51f
- Violet, B "Zum rechten Verständnis der Nazarethperikope, Lk 4 16f", Z N W , 37, 1938, pp251f
- Volz = P Volz, "Jesaja II", Leipzig, 1932
- Von Baer = H von Baer, "Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften", Stuttgart, 1926
- Von Campenhausen, H "Der urchristliche Apostelbegriff", St Th , 1, 1948, pp96f
- Waltz, H "Das Problem des sogenannten Aposteldekrets", Z K G , 55, 1936, pp227f
- J Weiss, "Christianity" = "Earliest Christianity", I, New York, 1959
- J Weiss, "Absicht" = "Über die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte", Göttingen, 1896
- Wellhausen, "Mk" = J Wellhausen, "Das Evangelium Marci", Berlin, 1909
- Wellhausen = J Wellhausen, "Das Evangelium Lucae", Berlin, 1904
- Wellhausen, "App" = J Wellhausen, "Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte", Berlin, 1914
- Wetter, G P "Das Älteste hellenistische Christentum nach der Apostelgeschichte", A R W , 21, 1922, pp397f
- Wikenhauser = A Wikenhauser, "Die Apostelgeschichte", Regensburg, 1961
- Wilckens = U Wilckens, "Die Missionsreden in der Apostelgeschichte", Neukirchen, 1963
- Wilckens, "Interpreting Luke-Acts" = U Wilckens, "Interpreting Luke-Acts in a period of Existentialist Theology", in "Studies in Luke-Acts", pp60f
- Wilckens, U "Die Bekehrung des Paulus als religionsgeschichtliches Problem", Z T K , 56, 1959, pp273f
- Wilder = A N Wilder, "Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus", New York, 1950
- Wilder, A N "Variant Traditions of the Resurrection in Luke-Acts", J B L , 62, 1943, pp307f
- Williams = C S C Williams, "A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles", London, 1964
- Windisch, H "Die Christophanie von Damaskus (Act 9, 22, 26) und ihre religionsgeschichtlichen Parallelen", Z N W , 31, 1932, pp1f
- Winn, A C "Elusive Mystery the Purpose of Acts", Interp , 13, 1959, pp144f

- Winter, "Trial" = P Winter, "On the Trial of Jesus", Berlin, 1961
- Winter, P "The Treatment of his Sources by the Third Evangelist in Lk 21-24", St Th , 8, 1954, pp138f
- Wood, H G "The Conversion of Paul, its nature, antecedants and consequences", N T S , 1, 1954/5, pp176f
- Zeller = E Zeller, "The Content and Origins of the Acts of the Apostles Critically Investigated", Vols I and II, London, 1875