



# Durham E-Theses

---

## *The continuation of Mark*

Moore, David

### How to cite:

---

Moore, David (1974) *The continuation of Mark*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9944/>

### 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.

T H E      C O N T I N U A T I O N

of

M A R K

---

Source Analysis of Acts with reference  
to the Marcan Gospel.

---

David Moore.

---

M. A.  
October, 1974

## PREFACE

In undertaking the present task, there is a twofold danger, of presenting the hypothesis either too vaguely, or as a fait accompli. In opting for an approach veering towards the former pit, I have been guided by the belief that the author of Acts must first be understood, before we can grasp his attitude towards any source material. The most that can be achieved with a source theory such as that here presented is to throw out many suggestions - some with more conviction than others - but which, taken as a whole, give the theory (I hope) a ring of credibility.

This thesis was presented for the degree of M. Litt. in September 1971. The following is a revised presentation of that work. The revision has followed suggestions made by the M. Litt. examiners.

## ABSTRACT

The study commences with a review of the many isolated suggestions advanced in support of a Marcan source underlying part of Acts. Whilst these are seen to have little coherence, the opposite theory recently propounded by Parker that Acts is ignorant of the Marcan Gospel is also found to be wanting in probability.

Following a brief general survey of prevalent attitudes to source criticism of Acts today, it is demonstrated how the present study has a certain advantage in this field, by being able to provide some objective control on the evidence: for in knowing something of Mark's own language and method, and Luke's treatment of it, we have some guidance as to the nature of one source in Acts, had Mark ever been used in the formation of Acts by Luke. As a partial check against a 'freak' result, vocabulary of Matthew and John is also tested: this in effect heightening the connections between Mark and part of Acts.

Armed with a knowledge of Mark's distinctive vocabulary, the thesis develops the two major issues involved: firstly, does Mark's Gospel bear any evidence that its author intended to continue with an 'Acts' of any description? - after examination of key passages this possibility is left open. Secondly, assuming the hypothesis, the text of those passages in Acts which appear from statistical evidence to most possibly have Marcan affinities are analysed in detail, using the material gained from the examination of Marcan language as the basis for all discussion. At the same time the author's own attitudes to his material has constantly to be evaluated, and although the final conclusion remains necessarily speculative, the probability of a Marcan source underlying at least Ac. 3:1-11, 10:9-16 and 12:5-10 seems unavoidable.

The work concludes with three Appendices, a Bibliography and an Index.

(299 words)



C O N T E N T S

1. SOURCE CRITICISM OF ACTS	...	...	Page 1.
2. TESTING THE HYPOTHESIS	...	...	30.
3. MARK	...	...	62.
4. ACTS	...	...	106.
5. CONCLUSION	...	...	312.
Appendices	...	...	315.

-----ooo000ooo-----

## 1. SOURCE CRITICISM OF ACTS

---

### (1) A REVIEW OF MARCAN HYPOTHESES

---

In his investigation of 1898 into what he called the 'double text' of Luke/Acts, Blass faced the obstacle of explaining why, in both works, the 'second edition' Luke on this theory is said to have issued does not always seek to improve on the rough style of the original. Blass' answer was that Luke is using a source which he feels obliged to follow closely. "Suppose", he continued, "that Mark was the author who had written a continuation to his Gospel, and that this continuation fell into Luke's hands... .."<sup>1</sup> The tell-tale word here is 'suppose'- although it would not be an unreasonable a priori hypothesis, since we know that Mark forms one important, and indeed written, source for Luke's Gospel. But there the evidence can be sifted through, for the source is extant. Acts, by contrast, stands as our unique record of the Early Church.

Despite this difficulty, there has not been a want of writers prepared to advance the supposition that Mark may have contributed some of the material that is now contained in The Acts. Discussing the ending of Mark's Gospel in 1872/

---

1. F. Blass: Philology of the Gospels (1898) p. 141. His basic premise of a double text has found little favour, but see p. 320.

1872, Weiss suggested that Mark might have written a history of the Early Church, but he never followed up his idea. It was Blass who was the first to attempt to establish a definite relationship between Acts and a Marcan source. Initial soundings came in 1895 in his commentary where he comments on the appearance of the name John Mark in Acts 12.12 "as if to distinguish him as the author of the narrative".<sup>2</sup> The vivid writing in this chapter combined with the name of Mark has prompted numerous scholars to follow Blass' suggestion without discussing the implications or even committing themselves always, as Blass later did, to the hypothesis of a written source.

Browne,<sup>3</sup> Burnside,<sup>4</sup> Bickwell,<sup>5</sup> Dessain,<sup>6</sup> Jeremias,<sup>7</sup> and Taylor,<sup>8</sup> all mention this possibility as regards Acts 12 in apparent approval. Clark even quotes the above of/

2. F. Blass: Acta Apostolorum (1895) p. 11
3. L. Browne: Acts (1925) p. 206
4. W. Burnside: Acts (1916) p. 153
5. E. Bickwell: Acts (1928) p. 352
6. C. Dessain: Acts (Catholic Commentary on Scripture) (1953)  
p. 1033
7. J. Jeremias: ZNW 36 (1937) p. 217
8. V. Taylor: Behind the Third Gospel (1926) p. 200.

of Blass and believes "John Mark would have known all about the seven steps leading up to the prison."<sup>9</sup> Bruce extends the idea in claiming Mark as Luke's "informant for this and other narratives."<sup>10</sup>

More cautiously in favour of a written source for Acts 12 is Cerfaux<sup>11</sup> - but if this possibility is acknowledged, the question can be raised whether any of the previous chapters of Acts are likewise linked with Mark. Blunt considered this possible.<sup>12</sup>

Blass himself assembled some proofs: but he concluded that if Mark did write a history of the earliest church in Jerusalem and Judaea, it would have been in Aramaic. This in turn leads to the requirement of an Aramaic Gospel of Mark and the hypothesis flounders under Blass' attempted proof of the same.<sup>13</sup>

About the same time, and apparently in ignorance of Blass' arguments, Erbt in 1896, whilst discussing the Petrine material in the New Testament noted that Mark's Gospel begins/

9. A. Clark: Acts (1933) p. 349: referring to Acts 12.10 D. On D in Acts and justification for its use here, see App. 2.
10. F.F. Bruce: Acts (Greek) (1951) p. 247. Also BC 2 p. 146.
11. L. Cerfaux: ETL 13 (1936) p. 689. (cp M. Albertz p. 262f)
12. A. Blunt: St. Mark (1929) p. 269.
13. Blass: Philology pp 193 ff. Burkitt: Sources (1926) 79f also approved of a written Marcan account - Carrington: According to Mark pp 160f, 336, 345 says "possibly".

begins with a very emphatic  $\frac{2\rho}{\chi}$  and that it contains the promise that the Gospel is to be preached to all the Gentiles.<sup>14</sup> Erbt cannot conceive of Mark writing such words unless he intended to show their accomplishment, and he thus posits that most of the material found in Acts 1-15 rests upon an account by Mark which concluded with Peter's death, after he had brought the good news to the Gentiles. He presents little evidence, apart from pointing to the parallels between for example, the life of Stephen and Christ.<sup>15</sup> The use of the name Saul, he also says, (Luke prefers Paul) is likewise indicative of a Marcan source.

Erbt's approach is very undetailed. Nevertheless, these suggestions received some half-hearted support. In 1897 Pease could claim that the "Acts of Peter" had a "close affinity" with Mark's Gospel<sup>16</sup> and Findlay says of the two Peter/

14. Mk. 1:1, 13;10. W. Erbt: Von Jerusalem nach Rom p. 24 (my references to a 1912 edition). On the Marcan verses see pp. 64ff. and 83f..
15. Note the false witnesses and the theme of Stephen's (abbreviated" p. 27) speech: "Der Umstürzler und Erneuerer und .. Verurteilter," themes in Mark's passion narrative but not Luke's.
16. T. Pease JBL 16 (1897) p. 16.

Peter miracle stories in Acts 9:32-43: "I should like to associate Mark with both stories."<sup>17</sup> These contributions, though not envisaging a written Marcan source, remove one major difficulty: namely the improbability of a single source underlying all the diverse material in the first half of Acts.<sup>18</sup>

Another isolated argument adduced in favour of the hypothesis came in 1918 from Whitley. He notes that Mark's Gospel is smaller in the ratio of approximately 14 to 23 to other historical works in both Old and New Testaments. Hence if we think of a Lost Ending to the Gospel, its contents might be as long as (say!) Acts 1-12.<sup>19</sup>

The only detailed presentation of the case has come from Léon Dieu who produced his case in 1920 in successive volumes of *Revue Biblique*. There are two general criticisms of his approach:

1. He assumes Mark intended to write a history of the early community. He does not discuss the possibility that/

17. J. Findlay: *Acts* (1934) p. 50.
18. i.e. Acts 1-12. Others prefer the designation of Torrey &c. as Acts 1-15.
19. W. Whitley *ET* 29 (1918) p. 331f. T. Zahn: *Introduction*, Vol. 2 (1909) p. 487n.10 had already made this observation, limiting his figures to the N.T.

that Mark's Gospel was intended to end at 16:8. When this theory came into a certain amount of fashion a few years later, it brought into disrepute his whole hypothesis.

2. Whilst aware of Harnack's source analysis of Acts (see below), Dieu follows the theory of Torrey, though without accepting the necessity of an Aramaic source, that behind Acts 1-15 is a single source. But the evidence that is supplied for a Marcan source in connection with Paul's conversion in Acts 9 is non-existent and Dieu would have better concentrated his attention upon those sub-sections of Acts which yielded some support for his hypothesis.

For convenience we list now the proofs evoked by Dieu: few of these are convincing, important ones are discussed fully later:

1. Ac. 1:5. Like Mark, Acts begins with a contrast between the baptism of John and the baptism of the Spirit. True, Luke contains this passage, but Mark (1:8) and Acts-unlike "Q" - omit the reference to fire.

2. Ac. 1:7 echoes Mk. 13:32. Other commentators suggest that Luke omitted the Marcan phrase because he wished/

wished to employ it here.<sup>20</sup> This excuse seems most unlikely. "Would Luke omit in his Gospel what he was merely planning to use in Acts?"<sup>21</sup> This is an important issue.

3. Dieu claims that the mention of the temple visits of the Christians<sup>22</sup> is more consistent with Mark's outlook, for Luke is alleged to omit some of these references. But it is the Third Gospel which concludes "in the temple"<sup>23</sup> - so that this argument is worthless.

4. Acts 6:13 has verbal parallels with Mk 14:58<sup>24</sup>. Why has Luke omitted this episode from Jesus' trial? Had he been alive to the parallel between Stephen's martyrdom and/

20. So BC 4 p. 8. CSC. Williams ET64 (1953) p. 283 who also cites Mk 5:40 = Ac 9:40, Mk 14:2 = Ac 12:3 and Mk 14:58 (above). G. Kilpatrick in *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (1969) pp. 168-171 also adds Mk 1:24a, 34a = Ac 16:17f, Mk 1:27 = Ac 17:19. His reference Mk 2:12 = Ac 4:25 is mysterious.
21. H. Russell HTR 48 (1956) p. 173.
22. Ac 2:46, 3:1, 5:12 D, 20f, 25, 42.
23. Lk 24:53 - cp also Lk 21:38.
24. See also Erbt p. 26f and K. Lincke ZNW5 (1904) p. 200 who calls Stephen "the friend of the Galileans" and assigns Acts 6, 7 and 12 to a Marcan source. For Mark: "Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte war ihm ein Ganzes".



and Jesus' own fate, would he not have been quick to reproduce the Marcan episode?<sup>25</sup> The reference to (Ac. 7:48) also recalls this Marcan passage.

5. Ac 12:18-23: the death of Herod is told with an eye for detail; compare the story of an earlier Herod's execution of John the Baptist (Mk 6:17-29, not Luke).

6. Ac 12:2: "James the brother of John" is an unique description of James. Dieu claims that Luke's Gospel omits references to the blood relationship of these two: Lk 6:16 omits from Mk 3:17 and Lk 8:51 from Mk 5:37. These are, however, Mark's only descriptions, apart from 10:35 where Luke contains no parallel, and Mk 1:19, where Luke 5:10 sets down that they are Zebedee's sons.<sup>26</sup>

7. Ac 3:26 has a similar understanding of the Gentile mission to that of Mk 7:27 (cp Rom 1:16).

25. M. Simon: St. Stephen (1958) pp. 23f discusses Luke's omission of Mk 14:58, but draws no conclusions.

26. Also discussed in Lincke p. 201.

8. The role of Barnabas also calls for comment. Dieu notes his mention before the better-known Paul in Ac. 11:30, 12:25 &c. - but this tendency may be no more than Lucan stylistic variation, not a pointer to use of sources. According to Col. 4:10, however, Mark was cousin of Barnabas, so, could Mark be the source of information for the Barnabas stories?

Dieu also notes some common stylistic points:

9. Typical of Mark is the repetition of amazement or bewilderment on the part of onlookers.<sup>27</sup> This is also a feature of some of the stories in Acts.<sup>28</sup>

10. A most striking Marcan habit is the delaying of information (often numbers) until the close of a story. Dieu cites Mk. 6:44<sup>29</sup> which Luke rearranges to a more appropriate position earlier in the story. In Acts Dieu refers to the remarkable indication at 4:22 of the lame man's age, long after the controversy has been generalised upon the authority of Peter and John. Why does not Luke place/

27. see A. Graham SE 4 Pt. 1 (1968) p. 413.

28. Ac. 3:10, 5:24E, 8:11 and 13, 13:12DE.

29. Other examples: Mk. 5:40 - also 4:38a, 5:8.

place this detail at the start of the story in consistency with his method in the Gospel?<sup>30</sup>

11. A curious, verbal coincidence occurs in the raising of Tabitha:

Ac. 9:40

Ταβιθά

ἀνάστηθι.

Mk. 5:41

Ταλιθά κουμ...

Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω  
ἔγειρε.

Mk. 5:41W(e)

Ταβιθά κουμ...

Dieu concludes with some word studies which are too sketchy and lacking in detail to bestow any life upon the theory. A more thorough analysis is required.

These views were soon forgotten, particularly under the influence of the thesis which claimed Mk. 16:8 as the final word of the Evangelist. But more recently, notwithstanding the predominant stress being laid upon oral tradition,<sup>31</sup> a revival of interest in the Marcan source hypothesis for Acts has been evident.

Haefner in 1958, labelling his attempt as "yet another guess" argues that Mk. 16:8 was originally followed/

30. For further examples in Acts, see pp. 55f.

31. On which see below pp. 26ff.

32. A. Haefner JBL 77 (1958) p. 67.

followed by Acts 3:1ff, with Acts 1:13-14 acting as a 'bridge passage'.<sup>33</sup> The miracle in Acts 3 was the first hint to the disciples that Jesus might be alive, hence, we may add, the lengthy account of this healing. However there are objections to this reconstruction.

1. In his Gospel, Luke employs his Marcan material in blocks. Would he, on Haefner's argument, insert two verses (i.e. Ac. 1:13f) into a non-Markan context? But note the repetition of stories in Acts (Paul's conversion is narrated thrice, Peter's vision twice) where in the Gospel Luke has only one miraculous feeding against Mark's two and only one healing of a blind man. Note too Luke has not, in Acts, avoided the technique of 'delayed information',<sup>34</sup> and he has written down Aramaic words,<sup>35</sup> where previously Mark's use of the same had been shunned. Luke's approach to his material is different in Acts. This will make any source reconstruction difficult.

2. The names of the disciples are surely repeated in Acts 1:13, since a new book has begun. The point of this list/

33. Independently. Morton and MacGregor: Structure of Luke and Acts (1964) p. 42 assign to their Proto-Acts: 1:12-24, 3:1ff.

34. See above p. 9.

35. Notably in Acts 1:19 cp too 4:36, 9:36.

list after Mark 16:8 is not evident.

3. Does this theory make any better sense of Mk. 16:1-8? Would the apostles still be in Jerusalem awaiting persecution? Peter's visit to the Temple (Ac. 3:1) is a very bold move, unless he was aware Jesus was alive.

4. Matthew displays no knowledge of such an ending to Mark's Gospel.

Thus, although Haefner's views, in such details as he provides is to be dismissed, the material in Acts 1 is, a priori, the most likely chapter of any in Acts to furnish us with material that might once have been part of the Marcan Ending. In 1970 Strobel stated that the Ascension story of Acts 1 may provide the solution to the riddle, without entering into discussion on the point.<sup>36</sup>

But also in 1970 there appeared an article by Pierson Parker, which although not directed specifically against the Marcan source theory of Acts, would if correct, invalidate our investigation, for, says Parker "Acts reads, not as though its author sought to refute Mark or go beyond it, but as though he had never seen it."<sup>37</sup> We will deal/

36. A. Strobel in *Verborum Veritas* p. 138 n 22: "Stehen wir damit nicht auch bei dem abgebrochenen Mk - Schluss?"

37. P. Parker *NTS* 16 (1970) p. 303. His purpose is to support the thesis of Williams (see n. 20) and Russell (n. 21) that Acts was written before Luke.

deal now with Parker's essentially negative proofs, produced to support his thesis, although during the course of our own investigation it will become clear that there are passages in Acts, which, if we do not accept the possibility of a direct Marcan source, at least show knowledge of the Marcan Gospel.<sup>38</sup> But to carry off his tour de force Parker has to make the following assumptions:

1. The validity of the Proto - Luke hypothesis.

Should any firm theories be built on such a hypothesis?<sup>39</sup>

2. An early date for Acts, so early as to be ignorant of Mark. The proof for this is derived from silence:

"There was a host of matters from 64 onwards that every intelligent person, and a fortiori every careful historian, ought to have known about".<sup>40</sup> But was Luke primarily a historian?<sup>41</sup>

3. Proto - Luke and Acts emanate from Jerusalemite Christians, whilst Mark is reflective of the beliefs of Galilean Christians.

38. A good example is Acts 5:15. cp also n 20.

39. Parker does vindicate the complaint of Vincent Taylor that "undoubtedly (there is) a hesitation to use it in constructive work" (ET 67, 1955 p. 12) although Taylor's definitive study, Behind the Third Gospel, itself betrays just such reluctance: see page 231 of that work.

40. Parker, JBL 84 (1965) p. 53.

41. cp e.g. E. Haenchen: Aposelgeschichte (1956) p. 92.

A first group of Parker's proofs derives from the silence of either Mark or Acts upon a particular topic. Here it is as well to prelude discussion with a reminder of A.C. Clark's investigation of the literary minutiae of Acts, which led him to conclude that this book was not from the same hand as the Third Gospel.<sup>42</sup> In his critique, W. Knox rightly criticised Clark for not taking into account the differences in subject matter between the two volumes, and the influence of source material.<sup>43</sup> Parker must face these same charges. For would we expect Acts to refer to Jesus' baptism, Peter's denial, the jeering before Jesus' execution, or the dating of his death? Should we expect Acts to record teaching on blasphemy or divorce? Mark, on the contrary, says Parker, has no concern for almsgiving, grace or righteousness and no mention of circumcision, but whilst all this is true, neither does Mark refer to Paul, or even John Mark by name! These facts hardly strike us as exceptional since we know Mark would not have occasion to mention Paul in his Gospel. We do not know why, apart perhaps for reasons of space, a writer will not touch upon a certain subject - but it is dangerous/

42. Clark op. cit. pp. 393-408.

43. Knox: Acts (1948) pp. lff. It must be said, however, that many of Knox's figures are wrong.

dangerous to draw from the silence any positive significance.

In the same way, it seems an unnecessary deduction that because Acts refers to "only brothers"<sup>44</sup> of Jesus, we see an actual ignorance by Acts of Mark. Here another stumbling block may be laid at Parker's door: for Acts is depicting a confessedly later historical situation. That therefore John's disciples were not numerous (according to Mark 2:18, 6:29) but were widespread by the time of Ac. 18:24ff. is not evidence for two fundamentally different traditions. On the contrary, the fact that both Mark and Acts are able to provide information on this sect suggests the opposite. Thus Mark depicts their pro-Jewish tendencies (Mk. 2:18) whilst we read in Ac. 18:26 of Apollos waxing bold in the synagogue.

It is difficult to see a conflict in eschatology either. Although "much"<sup>45</sup> of Mark's eschatology is future in outlook, this feature is put into relief in Acts by the present activity of the Spirit. Also, Parker minimises the futurist eschatology of Acts, pointing only to 1:11, 3:20f, 17:31 and 23:6, without perceiving that the opening paragraph contains a final rebuke by Jesus on all such speculations (Ac. 1:6): the time has now come for it to be subdued/

44. Parker NTS Art, Cit. p. 295. Mark mentions sisters at 3:32AD, 6:3. Swete (Mark p. 113) suggests they were "scarcely touched by the course of events."

45. NTS art. cit p. 297.



subdued. Nor does Parker mention the summary of Peter's speech (2:40), which begins with an adaptation<sup>46</sup> of Joel's words at Ac. 2:17. Luke further provides a theological explanation to the reader in the remarkable use of 'we' in Ac 14:22. Acts portrays the activity of a church still expecting an eventual Parousia. It is unremarkable therefore that Acts has more numerous references to the Spirit.

Mark, says Parker, does not record any prophetic testimony to the Resurrection, only Jesus foretells this event. Acts, of course, in its short, concise statements would not refer to this latter as part of the Kerygma. But is Mark quite silent on prophecy? Elijah is recalled (Mk. 9:12) albeit in a context difficult to determine, and Mk. 12:10f quotes in extenso Ps. 118 possibly with the connotation of Resurrection (cp. Ac. 4:11). The same may be true of the enigmatic usage by Jesus (Mk. 12:37 cp Ac. 2:34f) of Ps. 110.

Parker also states that Acts (like Luke) uses the term 'the eleven', whilst Mark never does.<sup>47</sup> but ~~is it~~ certain that Mark ended at 16:8 after which point he might have had/

46. On this see pp.

47. Lk. 24:9, 33, Ac. 1:26 (not D), 2:14 but this refers to "Peter with the eleven", hence D reads "ten". Also in (Mk) 16:14.

had opportunity to use the term? Another 'proof' on this basis is that the fullest detail found in any New Testament book upon the Ascension is furnished by Acts. It is difficult to take this evidence very seriously.

Parker also claims Mark never uses the formula "it is written" of the Law, but the sole instance in Acts 23:5 is in the mouth of Paul. Furthermore the verb is used at Mk. 10:4f, 12:19 to introduce a quotation from the Torah.

A more interesting case for the purposes of our present study concerns the Acts' account of Judas' death (Ac. 1:18-20). The silence of Mark is only puzzling because Matthew, who is even "farther from Acts"<sup>48</sup> deals with this episode. Is it possible that Matthew knew this story from Mark? We will return to this passage later.

We deal now with the alleged contradictions between the two works. Mark's Jesus is *ὁ Ναζαρηθός*, Acts' is *ὁ Ναζωραῖος*<sup>49</sup>. But is not this latter a usage gleaned from the LXX (cp Mt. 2:23), which would argue for, pace Parker, a later more developed Christology? Parker also claims that Mark and Acts apply Ps. 2:7 to different events. But this is not necessarily contradictory - it suggests/

48. Parker NTS art. cit. p. 301.

49. Also in Acts at 26:15 (614). But Mk. 10:47 NA also reads *Ναζωραῖος*.

suggests both works are the product of a community which attached a singular importance to this Psalm.

Parker also finds severe differences in the accounts of Jesus' ministry. "Despite its interest in surnames" the list of the apostles in Acts 1:13 employs such identification hardly at all - in contrast to the Gospel lists. But if Luke is prior to Acts, the necessity for a repetition of this kind is obviated.<sup>50</sup> Further Mark places most of Jesus' ministry in the North, whereas Acts only recounts a "beginning" from Galilee (10:37, 13:31). But is the Kerygma recorded in Acts concerned with the situation of Jesus' ministry? Mark depicts their Galilean calling, Acts "implies that he had them in Judaea".<sup>51</sup> But even Acts recognises their humble origins: ἄνδρες Γαλιλαίου (1:11, 2:7) and Acts 1:21 refers to the crowd of 120, most of whom could claim to have witnessed events "from the Baptism of John". Note how in Acts witness to Jesus begins at his Baptism, as in Mark and perhaps Proto-Luke. Another important "contradiction" concerns Mark's silence upon the Jerusalem resurrection appearances.<sup>52</sup> Here we return to that/

50. According to Vincent Taylor (op. cit. p. 82) Luke's list in his Gospel is also independent of Mark.

51. Parker NTS art. cit. p. 295. He refers to Ac. 1:21f.

52. Parker p. 296.

that equivocal Marcan ending - can we limit Mark in absentia in such a way? He may expect at least the Parousia in Zion itself (14:62).

More importantly, although Acts, like Luke, records only the Jerusalem appearances, the words of Ac. 1:4 suggest that the author of Acts is aware of another Resurrection tradition, which he is at pains to refute. If this is so,<sup>53</sup> Luke would have been only too aware of the Galilean stories!

As to love, for Mark it is higher than the Law (12:28-34) - Acts however tells us of Jerusalem Christians zealous for the Law (21:20). But silence need not be taken as meaning that love held a second place with this body. What was the Community of Goods, if not founded upon this principle?<sup>54</sup> So too, Paul claims to have been zealous for the Law (Ac. 22:3, Gal. 1:14), yet himself enumerates love as the highest gift. Should we therefore conclude that the writer of Acts "was rather unemotional and had an ascetic outlook"?<sup>55</sup> This hardly befits the writer of the Third Gospel!

The most revealing of Parker's negative witnesses concerns Peter's vision to go to the Gentiles, after he is shown all foods/

53. This interpretation is examined in detail below pp.

54. cp. p. 220 n. 245.

55. The description is Clark's op. cit. p. 405.

foods are clean. This, says Parker,<sup>56</sup> betrays ignorance of Jesus' discourse in Mark 7, not featured therefore in Luke's Gospel. But does this conclusion take into consideration the fact that Mark depicts the disciples as extremely slow to comprehend these principles?<sup>56</sup> In fact both passages share the same sequence of events: Jesus is remarkably reluctant to translate into practical terms what he has just taught (see Mk. 7:27) and the protest of Peter (Ac. 10:14) is similarly vehement in its defence of orthodox Jewish laws of cultic impurity.<sup>57</sup>

From the instances gathered above, it will be clear that Parker's case is far from proven. In 1898 Blass had hopefully tried to improve on the hypothesis which had already been put forward "as a conjecture, not as a certainty"<sup>58</sup> that Mark contributed to the material in Acts. In attempting to disprove Parker's thesis, we will not achieve the ambition of Blass for certainty in the matter. Blass/

56. So Mk. 7:18. A fuller discussion on pp. 78ff.

57. A word might be said here about Peter. In John, Parker claims that "Peter is mentioned about as often per page as Acts". (NTS Art. cit. p. 300) - the occurrences are Mk. 26 times, Lk. 29, Jn. 38, Ac. 58 - per 100 pages of Nestle text this would give an appearance in Mk. of 41, Lk. 26, Jn. 48 and Ac. 46. This, though worth very little, brings Acts closer to Mark than Luke.

58. Blass: Philology p. 141.

Blass fell short of his goal, not from any improbability inherent in his thesis, but from the difficulty of producing enough circumstantial evidence to support it. The present attempt, I would like to hope, at least will have the merit of being more thorough in analysing the Marcan features of Acts. Much will remain on the level of supposition and our examination of Acts will assume that argument in essaying to show its probability. But firstly Mark's extant work must be visited to see if the author shows us there, any intention on his part to continue with an outline of the early days of the first followers of Jesus.

(ii) The Present State of the Question of  
Sources in Acts

We must now discuss, very briefly, present attitudes to the material Luke used in composing Acts. It is unnecessary to review the numerous theories that have been propounded upon the Sources of Acts as these are reviewed in Dupont's definitive study of the same name.

Mention must be made of the Aramaic theory, popularised by Torrey, which he extended to a source underlying all of Acts 1-15. But alleged Aramaisms are not evenly spread over these chapters, and the later portions of Acts contain similar difficulties in the text, which cannot be explained from/

from this standpoint. Accordingly, some have limited the theory to a portion of Acts.<sup>59</sup> Recently Wilcox has scrutinised the subject in detail, and whilst rightly hesitant, suspects Aramaic influence particularly where Harnack found his "Antiochene" source.<sup>60</sup>

Harnack's whole thesis has won widespread approbation. The basis of his differentiation of sources is made through a distinguishing of people and places. Thus, for example, Philip is the source of information for 8:4-40 and other stories. Harnack discounts literary data, for "in no part of Acts can the use of sources be proved on the basis of linguistic investigation."<sup>61</sup> Yet the position as regards our alleged Marcan source is a little different, for although we do not have such a source extant, we do have material from Mark's hand which reveals to us something of that writer's literary tastes. We also know how Luke deals/

59. BC 2 p. 48 suggests Ac. 1-5:16 and 9:13 - 11:18. Dodd: *Apostolic Preaching* (1936) p.35 n.1 and Knox op. cit. pp. 18ff, 31 follow this modification, though Knox accepts only 1-5:16.

60. M. Wilcox: *Semitisms of Acts* esp. pp. 157-179. Earlier little was found in the investigation to justify this point of view.

61. A. Harnack: *Acts* (ET 1909) p. 163.

deals with that Marcan material. In our situation a linguistic examination of Acts is essential. Emerging from Harnack's analysis is the fact that chapters 2 and 5:17-42 form a doublet to 3:1 - 5:16, the former of which, moreover, is "worthless".<sup>62</sup> Now, let us here test Harnack's above statement on the uselessness of linguistic examination in Acts: we will take words in some way typical or peculiar to Acts<sup>63</sup> and see if any one of the sections which Harnack sets down, reveal themselves as notably a compilation by the editor of Acts:

Harnack's suggested sources.	Words only in Acts in NT.	Rare NT words in Acts	Rare NT verbs in Acts	Characteristic adverbs/particles	Char. <sup>c</sup> Phrases	TOT-AL
"B" 2, 5:17-42	1.25%	1.60%	2.49%	0.89%	2.58%	8.81%
"A" 3:1-5:16, 8, 12	0.12%	0.67%	2.54%	0.67%	1.82%	5.83%
13-28	0.31%	0.66%	2.76%	0.69%	1.31%	5.73%
9:31 - 11:30	0.24%	0.99%	2.55%	0.68%	1.24%	5.70%
6:1 - 8:3	0.22%	0.72%	2.52%	0.79%	1.44%	5.69%
9:1-30	0.75%	0.56%	1.87%	0.38%	2.06%	5.62%
Chapter 1	0.41%	1.03%	1.44%	1.03%	1.44%	5.35%
Words in the sample:	66	138	473	129	271	1077 (6.03%)

62. A. Harnack op. cit. p.194.

63. These are listed in S. Davidson: Introduction to the New Testament pp. 138-142.



(In this table the actual number of instances in any section is expressed in terms of the frequency had that section consisted of 100 words, i.e. given a sample of sufficient size, the figures of each section are directly comparable. This method will be used in subsequent linguistic tests although the size of the word samples, limited by the available data, are not always of an adequate size to permit anything more than very generalised conclusions. In the above, Chs. 13-28 are not analysed in detail, as they will not form much part of our investigation.)

The above evidence strongly highlights the composite character of chapters 2 and 5:17-42. Though we must beware of building major deductions upon any single statistical foundation, we may note:

1. If Luke has compiled the material found in Harnack's "B" source, his method is now contrary to that of the Gospel, where he consciously removes doublets.<sup>64</sup>
2. The fact that Luke uses doublets suggests either/

64. See p; 11. For the view of Jeremias that there are no doublets in Acts 1-5 see p.204 n. 219 - but, that the writer of Acts is not averse to conscious repetition can be seen in Acts 10,11.

either

(i) he had little available information on the Early Church.

or (ii) he had a high regard for the importance of Jerusalem (cp. 1:4).

or (iii) he had a deliberate purpose in amplifying an account of the gift of the Spirit: (cp. 10:44-48, 11:17f) and the imprisonment of the apostles.

These possibilities are not mutually exclusive.

But as regards Harnack's theory, as well as those of his elaborators, the results which can be attained are too vague, or else too tentative, to merit any permanent place in New Testament Scholarship. Thus Dupont concludes his survey into Theories of Parallel Sources with the statement that "the attempts made up to the present.....have not led to convincing results."<sup>65</sup>

It is the general abortiveness of such source analysis that has led to a present eclipse behind a method labelled Style-Criticism,<sup>66</sup> which itself avoids the subjectivity inherent in the old method of Harnack, proclaiming no committed view on the scope of the material which would have been available to Luke. We might say that it was because the source analytical school could not sustain any/

65. J. Dupont: Sources of Acts (ET 1964) p.50. Similar judgements on pp. 29, 32, 61.

66. See Dibelius' Essay employing this technique in Studies in Acts pp. 1-25.

any convincing theory demonstrating a written source, that modern scholars have arrived at the view that Luke must have been relying largely (and not merely partially) upon oral traditions. Now a writer who uses oral traditions has to exercise a greater degree of literary freedom and this, it is claimed, is demonstrable in Luke's case: for he has selected and adapted the stories available according to their relevance for his contemporaries. Why has Luke done this? Because the Church's realisation that Jesus was delaying his return meant that exhortations based on an imminent eschatology had lost their edge - what was needed was more day to day guidance in the practicalities of faith. The assumption of this school of thought is that Luke has remodelled any older written material that did cover the history of the early community (and there would be little enough of this with Jesus about to return<sup>67</sup>) so that the composition of Acts is so Lucan that little of his informant's contributions can be traced.

We may agree with some confidence that there are certain themes Luke has desired to emphasise but that he was restricted by available information seems indicated by/

67. cp. Haenchen op. cit. pp. 312f: "Menschen die das Ende der Welt für nahe halten...haben kein Interesse daran die Bekehrung eines Centurio zu erzählen".

by the very opening sentence of Acts which spans five verses, full of obscurity, and by Ac. 2:22-24 which the Western text, and Torrey as usual, wish to patch up. But not only is he restricted, but, as we have seen,<sup>68</sup> he also will retain some imminent eschatology.<sup>69</sup> So, even if we accept the theory of a Delay of the Parousia, we cannot let ourselves off looking at the question as to whether at such points Luke is permitting us a glimpse of a source.

In this connection the situation has been reanimated by a brief article by Bultmann who attacks the inadequate treatment of the matter of sources in the commentary of Haenchen.<sup>70</sup> Bultmann attempts to establish a written "Antiochene" source,<sup>71</sup> but, laudably, Haenchen has replied: he examines Acts 15 in detail, and concludes its composition is Lucan through and through.<sup>71</sup> We will however restrict our discussion to the general position held by these two/

68.v. pp. 15f.

69.So. S. Wilson: ZNW 59 (1968) p. 280 talks of Luke/Acts' "via media", although he cannot find any imminent eschatology in Acts (NTS 16, 1970 pp. 336-344).

70.R. Bultmann in T.W. Manson Memorial Essays p. 74: "Man vermisst bei Haenchen eine zusammenhängende Untersuchung dieser Frage." Also n. 12.

71.Haenchen BZNW 26 (1960) pp. 154ff.

two writers.

Haenchen claims that the recovery of sources is important,<sup>72</sup> but because this is impossible, it is better to think in terms of oral sources. But this argument, as Bultmann insists, is dangerously circular as the difficulty of recovering sources leads to the premise that the sources must be oral - but the understanding that Luke's sources were mainly oral should not be used to support the argument that Luke had to write with little written material to hand, because until the delay of the Parousia was realised it meant that no one until then would have been concerned to write anything. If we accept the thesis of a Delay of the Parousia, would there not be a need of written material even during this period? A useful critique on this subject is made by Jervell<sup>73</sup> who notes that Paul, who could write at length on pastoral matters at this time, was interested in the deeds of/

72. Haenchen art. cit. pp. 154f: "Tatsächlich leugnet niemand dass die Evangelien und die Apg. irgendwelche Überlieferung benutzen und dass es sehr wichtig wäre, das Bild der christlichen Urgeschichte zu kennen, das diese (Quellen) ähnen lassen."
73. J. Jervell ST 16, 1963 - who also refers to Rom. 1:8, 2 Cor. 3:1-3.

of the Early Church as early as 1 Thess. 1:8f..

We may say that with the rapid expansion of Christianity, mere oral information would be sadly inadequate to tell even of the impending end of the world. Literary men could convey the news of Jesus quicker, giving the itinerant preacher time to give an outline of the gospel before passing on elsewhere. Such a literary activity would thus mainly cover the life of Jesus, but also events current at Jerusalem headquarters may have merited attention when of particular importance. This activity would require the services of many copyists - thus, for example Mark is designated  $\Sigma\eta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\nu$ <sup>74</sup> a word used in Luke 1:2, 4:20 of a document carrier or handler. When the admitted Delay of the Parousia was realised, such writings could, where available, have been used in the compositions of the Evangelists.

Thus it is important to examine each story in detail "asking precisely to what kind of tradition it belongs".<sup>75</sup> Some of these tales, we believe, can be shown - as regards Acts - to have affinities with Mark's Gospel.

74. Acts 13:5 $\Sigma$ AB

75. So Bultmann p. 71, who claims this is exactly what Haenchen fails to do. In studies in Luke/Acts (1966) p. 270 Haenchen regrettably has to say "the space allotted does not permit the discussion of all the short narrative units" - which leads to the omission of any reference to Acts 12 - a focal point in the present study.

## 2. TESTING THE HYPOTHESIS

We have already recorded the doubts of Harnack as to the value of precise linguistic investigation in Acts (p. 22). But even if Luke were dependent upon mere oral transmission, he would, as any human would, lapse into the language of his material from time to time, if only as a result of the sheer physical effort of writing. We are talking of a writer, not a computer. An author's style will vary if he is tired, or will be influenced by extraneous data, once he has lost the freshness of his original inspiration. We can measure these variations - but we can never be certain what causes them. One of several explanations - and we know it applies to Luke's Gospel - will be the use of written material.<sup>1</sup>

The tests on which we wish to lay most stress will be based on word usage, for in this field a writer will exercise a choice, which is for the most part unconscious, to describe/

1. Measurement of style, however, is always less conclusive as evidence, than word analysis - thus, v. Y. Radday JBL 89 (1970) p. 319.

describe a given object or action. Further, his choices will often be influenced by the words used in the story as handed down to him, and his elaborations - something every artist cannot resist once in a while - will also reveal some of his own particular literary predilections.

The measurement of these data form an indispensable basis for our analysis of the text of Acts. We are only limited by the amount of the material available. We would know more of Luke's vocabulary, although in the New Testament it is distinctive, and more, particularly for our present purposes, of Mark's. Because we are to measure these features in very small sections in Acts, we are not warranted in drawing any far-reaching conclusions, except with the corroboration of a literary examination, which can be used to enlarge upon the sparse indications of our statistics.

Firstly, then, we turn to the distinctive vocabulary of the author. For Luke a long list is provided by Hawkins,<sup>2</sup> the value of which is proven since the words are seen to be distributed evenly in Acts 1-12, 13-28 and the "We" sections. When we break down these figures, and analyse individual/

2. J.C. Hawkins: *Horae Synopticae* (1899) pp. 14-20.



individual sections of Acts - there are places which yield a wild variation from the average figure. Places where this figure is low (e.g. Peter's vision: Ac. 10:9-16) will suggest further investigation, the possibility being that here Luke has submitted his material to minimal editorial treatment. Places where this figure is high (e.g. Ac. 10:1-8) suggest the possibility that Luke has considerably overworked his material: perhaps even himself composed it.<sup>3</sup>

For Mark, also, Hawkins provides a useful list, though it is small. It is important to recognise that here we are moving beyond previous source criticism of Acts - since if a work of Mark does underly part of the material in our Acts, some words used by the alleged source will be known to us, and, furthermore, we will know how Luke treated these in his Gospel. Is it not a reasonable supposition that as Luke used Mark for parts of Volume One, so Volume Two would have likewise incorporated Marcan material if that was available? However it is the claim of Haenchen that as "Mark cannot be reconstructed from Luke"<sup>4</sup> so also it is impossible to disentangle the sources/

3. All these results are tabulated in Appendix 1. On the justification for including Western Readings see Appendix 2 and notes there. On possible criticism about the size of the sample see pp. 36, 49.
4. Haenchen BZNW art. cit. p.157.

sources used in the book of Acts . This argument is stated even more positively by Cadbury who upholds that "an actual count of the occurrence in Lucan writings of words impartially chosen as characteristic of Mark (i.e. by Hawkins and Swete) shows that these occur as often or oftener in the parts of Luke and Acts not derived from Mark."<sup>5</sup> If these opinions are correct, then our task for Acts will be the more futile. But Cadbury does not justify the statement with any figures; and so let us sound out the supposition:<sup>6</sup>

5. In BC 2 p. 163.

6. As required by Cadbury I include Marcan characteristics as defined in Hawkins pp. 10f, and Swete (Mark p. xlix) - though these latter are not scientifically selected. The definition of where Luke is dependent upon Mark is, of course, open to dispute, but for the sake of objectivity I have adopted the delineation of Taylor op. cit. pp. 126-128 - which allows minimal dependence. A more liberal allowance of Marcan influence in Luke increases the Marcan tally, of course; thus by taking as Marcan Lk. 3:3-6, 15f, 21f, 4:14f, 31-44, 5:12-6:19, 8:4-9:50, 10:24-28, 11:14-23, 13:18-21, 18:15-43, 19:29-38, 45-21:4, 22:1-30, 39-23:5, 23:18-25, 50-24:11, which might be regarded as virtually a maximum sample; we have 85 (D = 99) Marcan words in Marcan Sections, whilst the remainder of Luke yields 54 (D = 62). All word counts below are my own and omit LXX quotations, which although requiring analysis, do not bear upon evidence for the vocabulary of the author.

## 1. Marcan Portions of Luke's Gospel.

---

<u>Lk.</u>	<u>Number of Marcan Characteristics</u>	<u>Frequency per 100 words.</u>
4: 31-44	13	4.94
5: 12-39	7	1.28
6: 1-11	3	1.45
8: 4-56	12	1.25
9: 1-50	11	1.15
18: 15-43	12	2.92
19: 29-36, 45f.	2	1.43
20: 1-21:4	12	1.72
Passion fragments	6	0.74

## 2. Non-Marcan Portions of Luke.

---

<u>Lk.</u>	<u>Number of Marcan Characteristics.</u>	<u>Frequency per 100 words.</u>
1: 1-2:52	6	0.31
3: 1-4:30	7	0.71
5: 1-11	0	-
6: 12-19	1	0.72
6:20-8:3	8	0.53
9:51-10:42	3	0.16
11: 1-54	3	0.31
12: 1-59	4	0.39
13: 1-14:35	2	0.16
15:1-16:31	4	0.35
17:1-18:14	6	0.73

Non-Marcian Portions of Luke (cont'd)

<u>Ek.</u>	<u>Number of Marcian Characteristics</u>	<u>Frequency per 100 words.</u>
19:I-28,37-44,47f	6	1.00
21:I2-38(except Passion fragments)	0	-
22:I4-7I "	3	0.46
23:I-56 "	6	0.86
24:I-9,II-53	3	0.40

The results obtained may be summarised:

Marcian parts of Luke:78 Marcian Characteristics(Frequency 1.56)

Non-Marcian parts of Luke:6I " " (Frequency 0.43)

We see then that,in general, Luke is 3 times more likely to reproduce a Marcian "characteristic" in a Marcian section than elsewhere. The main doubts refer, and we need not be surprised, to the Passion narrative. There are three limitations which we must impose upon these results:

1. We have been able to discern the principle that Luke does not obliterate such material as comes from his source. We see that his fidelity to his Marcian account is variable. But in all cases, excepting the Passion "fragments", the proportionate yield of Marcianisms is higher in the Marcian derived passages. (Yet if Mark 1:16-20 did form the basis of Luke 5:1-11, we, like many others, would never have guessed).

2. In the above we started from a known quantity - viz. the Marcian section of Luke and saw that the figures corroborate/

corroborate the evidence - in Acts we shall have to work from the figures to deduce the sections which could conceivably be Marcan.<sup>7</sup> For this, paragraphs as small as possible are required; but smaller samples lead to larger deviations. If we attempt the same with Luke's Gospel of the 74 sections/stories, the following reveal themselves as clearly Marcan:

<u>Section of Luke</u>	<u>Number of Marcanisms</u>	<u>Section of Luke</u>	<u>Number of Marcanisms</u>
4:31-37	9	18:31-43	7
5:17-26	6	20:1-18	6

and as probably Marcan:

3:7-14	3	8:40-56	4
4:38-44	4	9:7-17	5
6:6-11	2(D:5)	18:15-17	3
7:18-23	2	19:28-40	4
8:22-25	2	20:27-40	3
8:26-39	3		

From this complex we have arguably achieved:

Marcan sections correctly revealed.....12

Therefore: Marcan sections NOT revealed.....15

7. The overall figures for Hawkins' and Swete's Marcan words are:

In Luke.....139	words appear,	frequency	0.73
In Acts 1-12.....53	do.		0.69
In Acts 13-28.....59	do.		0.58.

Sections revealed incorrectly.....2<sup>8</sup>.

It is said that half a loaf is better than none, and our conclusion here should be that we have positively managed, by this method, to identify some Marcan stories - though we must not expect the figures to point infallibly to the use of a Marcan source.

3. The position is complicated, because although Hawkins has selected his words with care, Luke is not averse himself to using these same words and expressions. Two-thirds of the 78 Marcanisms found in Marcan sections are taken directly from that source, yet the remainder are in fact Luke's own insertions: i.e. 0.50% of all words. This frequency tallies closely with the figure for Lucan activity in the non-Marcan sections of Luke (0.43%). Thus, mathematically speaking, were we to delete those places where we know Luke has been influenced by Mark, his use of "Marcan characteristics" remains fairly constant; also, regarding his use of Mark, it must be emphasised (as corrective to these figures) that Luke does remove many of the Marcan characteristics found in his source, in all retaining/

8. or 3, if Luke 19:28-40 be taken as from a Marcan source.

retaining 49 out of 244, about one-fifth.

Before passing onto Acts with this first test, it seems clear that some words (even though all are "characteristic") will provide a more reliable guide to Marcan vocabulary than others - although the general reliability of those words selected by Hawkins as "characteristic" is demonstrated in a study by Grobel<sup>9</sup> who has examined the passages in Mark which most probably betray the hand of the final editor. He takes the seven words that Hawkins marks as the most distinctive of Mark's "characteristics" and finds that they are Marcan, and not from a pre-Marcan source. Only two of these words come in Acts however - but there are in addition some other characteristics of Hawkins upon which we will lay particular stress:

(i) ἀκάρτος - Luke 4:33, 36, 8:29, 9:42 (from Mark). Luke 6:18 may have been suggested by Mark 6:7 (cp. Mk 3:<sup>11</sup>~~7~~), and Luke 11:24 (=Mark 12:43) from Q. Nowhere does Luke add this word. The word is thus significantly Marcan - and it recurs in Acts five times.

(ii) δίδωμι - only once in Luke where it is taken from Mark 1:22. As to other instances in Mark, <sup>Luke avoids</sup> the word in Mark 1:27, finds Mark 4:2's usage redundant and changes the nouns in Mark 11:18 and 12:38 into verbs. The appearances/

9. K. Grobel JBL 59(1940) pp. 407f..

appearances in Acts may suggest it was a termus technicus for the Apostolic preaching (Acts 2:42, 5:28, 17:19 also 13:12).

(iii) εὐαγγέλιον - never appears in Luke's Gospel - it is deleted from Mark 8:35, and possibly Mark 1:14f., 13:10, 14:9. For our purposes the word may be called 'distinctively' Marcan, as it is obviously not Lucan. The occurrences in Acts <sup>are</sup> 15:7, in Peter's last speech<sup>10</sup> and 20:24 in a Pauline speech. Also in Acts 1:2, Western Texts, repeating Mark 3:14D.

(iv) κράβαττος - deleted four times by Luke from Mark 2. Luke obviously dislikes this vulgar word. (Hawkins however does not think it "distinctive"), so that the appearance of the word in Acts 5:15, 9:33 has left commentators silent. Moreover, Luke's deletions, although they can be partially explained as due to a desire to avoid repetition, are especially remarkable as the tendency of the Synoptists is to agree on points of spoken words<sup>11</sup>. The usages in Acts of this word must surely therefore indicate a pre-Lucan tradition.<sup>12</sup>

(v) κρατῆν - Luke 8:54 (from Mark 5:41) and Luke 24:16: the latter use means that we cannot be quite certain/

10. cp. 1 Peter 4:17.

11. A look at a synopsis of the Gospels is sufficient to confirm this point.

12. Thus we cannot agree with A.Q. Morton in Authorship and Integrity of the New Testament (1965) who states that Luke "would not accept from any of his sources words which he would not have used". (p. 59)



certain that Luke deliberately avoided this word, though he does alter Mark 1:31, 9:27, 12:12. Acts has no especial leanings towards this verb, surprising in view of the opportunities, and it comes at Acts 2:24, 3:11, 24:6, 27:13.

(vi)  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\upsilon$  - is deleted from Mark ten times, occurring however in Luke 6:43 (not Q), 13:20 where it is clearly editorial, and 23:20, possibly from Mark. Five times in Acts.

(vii)  $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\iota\upsilon$  - is deleted by Luke eight times from Mark<sup>13</sup> and is very distinctive of Mark. Despite Luke's tendency to avoid it in his Gospel, it is used ten times in Acts! And finally

(viii)  $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$  <sup>14</sup> - which Luke removes from Mark on 26 occasions, and found only at Luke 6:49 NAB and Acts 10:16.

The probability is that, given a free hand, Luke would have used the above words rarely, if at all. Yet they/

13. Details and discussion in C.H. Turner JTS 26 (1925) pp. 12ff.
14. Although Hawkins, p. 10, also includes  $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ , this has not been included in any of our statistics, as it is not typical of Mark: Mark....0 Luke....6 Acts....9! The reason for this "blunder" is that Hawkins' list was compiled with the aid of Bruder's concordance, which lists numerous Western Readings. In Bezae the figures for  $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$  are Mark....28 Luke....7 Acts....11.

they occur in Acts, (some of the occurrences are mutually dependent<sup>15</sup>) in chapters 1-12 twenty times, in chapters 13-28 thirteen times. And in the stories involving Peter<sup>16</sup> there are sixteen such words, appearing in these sections in the ratio of  $3\frac{1}{2}:1$  in relation to the remainder of Acts. If Mark was "the interpreter of Peter"<sup>17</sup> it will be in these stories of Acts that our investigation would seem to suggest most promise of a positive result.

The yield for Marcan characteristics (†) in Acts is tabulated in the appendix, though only Hawkins' words are used, and not Swete's, since the latter's are not, on Hawkins' definition, in fact "characteristic" at all : i.e. words occurring in Mark "more often than in Matthew and Luke together".<sup>18</sup> However, our concern is to distinguish Mark's vocabulary from that of Luke, and thus we will provide a further list of words, which will be termed Common/

15. ~~ἐκείνους~~ - Acts 5:16 cp. 8:7, Acts 10:14 is repeated in 10:28 and 11:8.  $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu$  - Acts 10:15 (16D) = 11:10.  $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\iota\nu$  - Ac 2:42, same verb in the similar summary: Acts 4:34.
16. Taken as Acts 1:13-26, 2:14-41, 3:1 - 4:22, 5:1-11, 15-33, 8:14-25, 9:32-43, 10:9 - 11:18, 12:1-17, 15:7-12 - i.e. all passages in which Peter plays an active role. See Appendix 3.
17. In Eusebius H.E. 3:39:15, and see p. 62.
18. Hawkins op. cit. p. 9.

Common Marcanisms (‡), which appear less frequently in Luke's Gospel. Of these words, the most distinctive are:

	Mk.	Lk.	Removed from Mk.	Retained from Mk.	Added to the Marcan Parallel.
ἀκολούθειν	19	17	4	8	1
ἀφιέναι	37	32	10	10	0
ἄξιον	8	2	3	1	0
δυνατός	5	4	1	1	0
ἐγείρειν	18	18	6	8	1
ἐμβλέπειν	4	2	2	1	0
θύρα	6	4	3	0	0
κηρύσσειν	12	7	3	3	0
κράζειν	12	3	8	1	0
ἔπειθ	15	5	8	1	0
ἕσος	14	10	4	5	1
περιπατεῖν	10	5	2	2	0
προαγγεῖν	5	1	1	1	0
ὥστε	13	5	9	0	1
Ἰακώβος (Ζ)	10	5	2	2	0

Occurrences in Acts are listed in the Appendix. All these words appear more times in Mark - and it should be remembered that this Gospel is only two-thirds the size of Luke - and in the above I have tried to include only those words which Luke rarely inserts into his material, and often avoids. There are other words, more numerous in Mark, which have not been included (e.g. γραμματεῖς, πρεσβύτερος) as these are particularly liable to appear frequently in certain/

certain situations - and a few others have also been excluded as they occur so frequently that they would dominate the statistics. Some other words also merit a mention, although they have not been "counted in":

(i)  $\delta\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$  - (Mk. 17, Lk. 17): Luke removes ten of Mark's very generalised references (e.g. Mk. 1:22, 2:13, 4:1, 6:30,34).

(ii)  $\delta\acute{\iota}\ \delta\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$  - (Mk.9, Lk. 6): Luke deletes the expression thrice: but the appearance in, for example, Luke 8:1 suggests Luke also knew and used the term.<sup>19</sup>

(iii)  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\tau\omega\tau\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  - (Mk.26, Lk.18): Luke adds this word three times to Marcan material, although he removes it on eight occasions.

(iv)  $\pi\rho\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  - (Mk.9, Lk.4) - not included in the statistics as, as the expression 'calling upon' God, accounts for a number of the usages of this verb in Acts.

Of the words included as Common (†) these occur as follows:

	Luke - (not following Mark)	Luke - (when following Mark)	In Acts	'Peter' sections of Acts
Number of times.	66	54	108	39
Frequency.	0.47%	1.08%	0.60%	0.98%

<sup>19</sup> cp.  $\delta\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$  - see p. 16 and n. 47.

If we were to remove these Peter sections from the Acts figures (i.e. as places where, as in the different case of the Gospel, we might suspect Marcan influence), the non-Petrine sections of Acts have 69 Marcan words, appearing at a frequency of 0.50%, a ratio similar to that of the non-Markan portions of the Lucan Gospel. This suggests that (as with the Marcan characteristics) Luke's use of the words which we have singled out - remains at a given constant. Also the frequency of these words in 'Peter' sections is, as with the case of the Marcan portions of Luke's Gospel, about twice that of the remainder of the book. The equation of Peter stories of Acts and a Marcan source is very reasonable on this basis.

We stated above that some words, if included, would overbalance the statistics, as they are so common. These are:

	Mk.	Lk.	Removed from Mk.	Retained from Mk.	Added to the Marcan Parallel.
2λλεί	42	35	15	8	2
2λλος	23	10	10	4	1
2τιτοχονδι	22	20	14	2	5
δύναμι	33	26	13	4	4
Θαλασσα	19	3	11	0	0
Υνα	58	37	20	14	0
πλοζον	16	8	6	2	0
Ποκυσ	58	48	33	9	1

None of these words can properly be considered for inclusion/

inclusion, as Luke uses these words freely in non-Marcian contexts.<sup>20</sup>

A third word test also presents itself. There are words not found in Luke but in some or all of the other Gospels. Although at first sight this appears an eminently useful test, it is inferior to the two previous, since the words in question are, almost by definition rare, and cannot, on any criterion be adjudged as characteristic of any Gospel. The only useful ones will be those which Luke can be seen to have avoided - though since, in the majority of cases, this only happens once, little stress should be attached to the list. Below are listed words found in Mark, but not in Luke, and which Luke has definitely avoided:

20. ~~ὄλος~~ is replaced by ~~ὅλος~~<sup>ὅλος</sup> thrice, but Luke has no obvious dislike of the word. ~~ἀποκάλυψις~~<sup>ἀποκάλυψις</sup> is added by Luke too often to be of value here. ~~ἐκείνη~~ is precluded as Luke avoids the word in his Gospel for technical reasons. The other cases are interesting, but too common elsewhere in non-Marcian parts of Luke to be of use.

≠ WORD <sup>21</sup>	Mark	Acts	Other Gospels
ἀληθής	12:4	12:9	Mt. Jn.
ἀναθεματίζειν	14:71	23:12, 14,21	
διαγίνεσθαι	16:1	25:13,27:9	
διακόσιοι	6:37	23:23(bis) 27:37	Jn.
διαλέγεσθαι	9:34	ten times (D=11)	
διαστάν	5:4	23:10	

21. Doubtful cases are bracketed - words included in previous lists are also excluded from the overall statistic. The following words are also not in Luke, but in Mark and Acts (again, cases which are textually doubtful, are bracketed):

[αἶψά]	[ἄμα]	[ἀναγγέλλειν]	[ἀναλαμβάνειν]	ἀναχωρεῖν
ἀποκόπτειν	ἀπώλεια	ἀσφαλῶς	αὐτόματος	ἀρροσκεῖν
βοηθεῖν	γένος	γυμνός	δέσμιος	διακρίνειν
[διαπονέομαι]	δόλος	ἐγκαταλείπειν	εἰ ἄρα	[ἐκχέειν]
ἐνικυτός	ἐξαυτῆς	ἐπαύριον	ἐπιγράφειν	ἐπιλύειν
εὖ	εὐώνυμος	θηρίον	[κακείθεν]	κατακυριεύειν
[καταστρέφειν]	[κινεῖν]	κοινός	καινού	λοιπόν
μεθερμηνεύεσθαι	[μελετᾶν]	μνημεύομαι	σπειρά	πιπρασκεῖν
πορνεία	πραιτώριον	[παραβάλλειν]	προεγγίζειν	προλαμβάνεσθαι
προσμένειν	πρύμνα	προσκατερεῖν	τέτρακισχίλιοι	στυρίς
συναναβαίνειν	τέρας	[σέβισθαι]	φρονεῖν	τηρεῖν
ὑμνεῖν	φανερῶς	τέταρτος	χειμών	χειροποίητος
χιλίαρχος	χωρίζειν			

≠ Word	Mark	Acts	Other Gospels
† δικοτέλλισθαι	5:43,7:36(bis), 8:15,9:9	15:24	(Mt.)
διωγμός	4:17,10:30	8:1,13:50,14:2D	(Mt.)
† ἐκθαμβείσθαι	9:15,14:33,16:5,6	3:11	
ἐκτινάσσειν	6:11	13:51,18:6	(Mt.)
ἐπαγγέλλισθαι	14:11	7:5,17D,E	
ἐπίσταναι	14:68	ten times (D=11)	(Mt.)
ἔσω	14:54(not D),15:16	5:22D,23	(Mt.,Jn.)
* [εὐαγγέλιον	eight (D=9) times	1:2D,15:7,20:24	Mt.
εὐκαρτεῖν	6:31 (not D)	17:21	
εὐσχημῶν	15:43	13:50,17:12,34D	
ζώνη	1:6,6:8	21:11(bis)	Mt.
ἡδέως	6:20,12:37	13:8DE,14:9h	
† θαμβάσσειν	1:27,9:15D,10;24, 32,16:5D	3:11D,9:6h	
θλίψις	4:17,13:19,24	five (D=7) times	Mt.,Jn.
θορυβεῖν	5:39,13:7D	17:5,20:10,21:13D	Mt.
θόρυβος	5:38,14:2	20:1,21:34,24:18	Mt.
κακῆ	1:35,38D	five times	Mt.,Jn.
κακολογεῖν	7:10,9:39	19:9	(Mt.)
καταλαμβάνειν	9:18	4:13,10:34,25:25	Jn.
* κλάστρος	2:4,9,11,12,6:55	5:15,9:33	Jn.
κτῆμα	10:22	2:45,5:1	Mt.
μανθάνειν	13:28	23:27	Mt.,Jn.
μηκέτι	1:45,2:2,9:25, 11:14	4:17,13:34,25:24	Mt.,Jn.

Cont'd



Word	Mark	Acts	Other Gospels
ὄριον	5:17, 7:24, 31(bis), 8:10D, 10:1	13:50	Mt.
ὀρκίζεῖν	5:7	19:13	
παράδειξιθαι	4:20	15:4, 16:21, 22:18	
[παρρησία	8:32	five times (D=7)	Jn.
[περιλαβεῖν	6:6	13:11	Mt.
περισσῶς	10:26, 15:14	26:11	Mt., Jn.
πολλάκις	5:4, 9:22	26:11	Mt., Jn.
προστρέχειν	9:15, 10:17	8:30, 10:25D	
πρωί	1:35, 11:20, 13:35, 15:1, 16:2, 9	5:21D, 28:23	Mt., Jn.
σανδαλίον	6:9	12:8	
σπᾶσθαι	14:47	16:27	
συγκαθῆσθαι	14:54	26:30	
συμβούλιον	3:6, 15:1	25:12	Mt.
συντρέχειν	6:33	3:11(not D)	
ὑγιής	3:50, 5:34	4:10	Mt., Jn.
ὑποδείξιθαι	6:9	12:8	
χωρίον	14:32	1:18f, 4:34, 37D, 5:3, 8, 28:7	Mt., Jn.
ὠδίν	13:8	2:24	Mt.

All the above words are reduced to statistics in the appendix: the figures include also the words - where not textually doubtful - in footnote 21. Of those in the main list, we may add that they occur in the ratio of 3:2 in the 'Peter' /

'Peter' stories in relation to the rest of Acts.

With this we attain the limits of word testing as regards Mark and Acts. However, there may be the suspicion that there have been unknown factors at work which have caused a high number of Marcan words in any given paragraph: and certainly we will have to admit that:

(i) the repetition of one word, perhaps several times inside one section, will influence the result.

(ii) some of our sub-sections are very small, and therefore no formal stress should be laid upon any one result. But taken together, we have a sizeable selection of Characteristic (†), Common (‡) and Rare (§) words, which although not entirely satisfactory as a sample, is the best which conditions will permit.

To provide some kind of check on this situation, we may usefully take the remaining two Gospels and tabulate their special characteristics as they appear in Acts. Assuming that these books have no source connection, as well we may<sup>22</sup>, with Acts, they can be conveniently used as the closest available type of literature, to both illustrate the maximum/

22. A Johannine source for Acts 1-5 was posited by Rackham: Acts (3rd. Edit.) p. xiii, a Matthaen source for Acts 1:18ff. by Renié RB 55 (1948) p. 48.

maximum variance of statistic we should expect, and highlight those sections where a high figure should be inevitable as a result of similarities with the Gospel narratives.

With Matthew, for 'characteristic' words, Hawkins<sup>23</sup> was again recalled, whilst for John the Concordance was pressed into service, whereby twenty-four words were selected which occur at least four times in that Gospel and which are found at least 25% more often there than in the Synoptics.<sup>24</sup> For 'common' words a less severe criterion was adopted<sup>25</sup> and finally words not in Luke were counted. The total figures are not strictly comparable to the Marcan ones - for Matthew there are 501 such words in Acts, for John 364 whilst Mark has 406 such words; but allowing for/

23. Hawkins, op. cit. pp.4-7.

24. 

αἰώνος	ἀλήθεια	ἀληθής	ἀνωθεν	ἄσθενεῖν	δοξάζειν
ἔγγος	ἐλκύειν	ἐνικυτός	ἐρπάζεσθαι	ἔργον	ζωή
θεωρεῖν	κἀγώ	κόσμος	κραυγάζειν	κρίνειν	μαρτυρεῖν
μαρτυρία	νῦν	πίεσις	πιστεύειν	τελειῶν	ὁπηρετής

25. Matthew. 

βάλλειν	γεννᾶν	ἐκεῖθεν	λαμβάνειν	παραλαμβάνειν
φάναι				

John. 

ἀποθνήσκειν	γεννᾶν	ἐμαυτοῦ	μένειν	ὄπου
πάλιν	περιπατεῖν	προσκυβεῖν	τηρεῖν	

for internal adjustment, certain conclusions follow. (We would however expect less of a deviation the larger the sample, hence with the Lucan figures, but not apparently the Matthaen). From the appendix, where are summarised the results, we take those paragraphs in Acts where the appearance of words belonging to any one Gospel is at least 2/3 above average. Listing each of the 'test' Gospels in turn, we state first of all the percentage frequency of words above the expected norm, then comparing the result with the other Gospels, to check whether the result is exceptionable. The most telling case will be that which shows a predominance of words peculiar to one Gospel - and if our Marcan hypothesis is to be sustained, it will be these results that will exhibit such symptoms. At the same time the cross-check with Matthew and John will illustrate an approximate number of 'freak' results that ought to be expected.

Mark's Gospel

Acts' Paragraph	Marcan words above the norm	Lucan words +or- the norm	Matthaen words	Johan- nine words
1:13-14	66%	-59%	nil	nil
1:18-20	185%	-37%	+312%	+113%
2:42-47	213%	+34%	+46%	+50%
3:1-11	123%	+49%	-9%	+49%
4:32-37	218%	+58%	+62%	+78%
5:15-16	318%	+5%	nil	+15%

Cont'd

Acts' Paragraph	Marcan words above the norm	Lucan words +or- the norm	Matthaen words	Johannine words
10:9-16	130%	-32%	-37%	+30%
10:23b-33	79%	+56%	+64%	+25%
12:5-10	274%	-43%	-7%	+59%
15:7-12 <sup>26</sup>	83%	-17%	+14%	+72%
19:8-20	108%	-13%	+15%	-4%
23:31-35	74%	+18%	+180%	+29%

The sections 2/3 above average as regards Matthew are  
Acts 1:18-20, 8:14-25, 9:31, 23:31-35, 25:1-27.

And as regards John:

Acts 1:18-20, 4:32-37, 5:12-14, 9:36-43, 14:1-7, 14:19-28,  
15:1-12, 25:1-27.

The first consideration to be drawn from these figures is that the Marcan figures show the widest range of deviation.<sup>27</sup> Can this be coincidental? Of the Marcan 'high deviation' passages in Acts, eight out of the twelve are 'Peter' sections, whilst Matthew produces only two Peter sections out of his five 'high deviation' sections and John three out of eight.<sup>28</sup>

26. Figures of Mt. and Jn. refer to Ac.15:1-12.
27. The results from the smaller sections must, of course, be read with caution.
28. This would be the approximate expected result as Peter sections we have selected in Acts total 26 out of a possible 81 - i.e. about 1/3 of the whole.

The total words appearing in Peter sections are:

	of Luke	of Mark	of Matthew	of John
No. of words	282	108	90	85
Frequency	7.13	2.73	2.28	2.15
+or- the norm	+5%	+20%	-19%	+5%

Herein lies a basis for a detailed analysis of the text - which will have for its focus the 'Peter' stories, although allied sections will also receive consideration, where the situation warrants. Of the sections above, which exhibit Marcan affinities in abundance: the most significant are -

(i) 10:9-16 - Peter's vision, where Lucan 'characteristics' are less frequent than usual. Three of Mark's distinctive (\*) characteristic words occur here: including the only usage in Acts of *εἰσὺς*, "a suggestive fact in a section of the book in which the pen or the language of St. Peter may fairly be traced."<sup>29</sup>

(ii) 12:5-10 - Peter's escape from prison: along with the vision, one of the most vivid tales in the book. Again, Lucan characteristics are below average.

29. R. Knowling: Acts (1920) p.255.

Of less significance are:

(iii) 3:1-11: important because this is a long section - but the high Marcan figure is partly due to the repetition of  $\kappa\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\alpha\tau\tilde{\iota}\nu$ , and Lucan activity is also marked.

(iv) 5:15-16: a very short section, but nevertheless containing three distinctive (\*) Marcanisms in this summary similar in language and content to Mk. 6:55f..

As to the other 'high deviation' sections, 1:13f. is too small to be of much value, the story of Judas' death as well as the two summary passages dealing with the Community of Goods also yield a high number of words in the Matthaen and Johannine lists, although the Judas episode may come from a non-Lucan source. And the same may be said for 10:23b-33, 23:31-35 and perhaps 15:7-12. The story of the sons of Sceva is the only paragraph which has an inexplicably high Marcan figure in Acts 13-28. But there are none of Hawkins' Marcan characteristics in 19:8-20 (except one in the Western Text) - but the result may act as a timely reminder that 'freak' results are inevitable. Nevertheless Marcan words do come more freely in the 'Peter' sections of Acts.

We turn now to the secondary question of style. These are the features which particularly distinguish Mark from Luke.<sup>30</sup>

1. Use of the Historic Present, over 150 times in Mark, only four times in Luke. More frequent in Acts (about 13 uses).

2. Impersonal Plural (indicative of original 'we'?) in Acts 1:23 (not D), 3:2 and 19:19, perhaps also 5:12, 7:57.

3. ὄχι recitative and interrogative. In Acts 2:13, 3:22, 5:23,25, 6:11, 7:6, 11:13, 13:34, 15:1,5, 16:36, 19:21, 23:20, 24:21, 25:8.

4. ἄλλος in the singular rather than plural (in Mark, 36 times against one in the plural). Acts uses the singular on 15 occasions, the plural on 7: the word only comes once, however, in a Peter story (Ac. 1:15).

5. ἀκλουθεῖν in a literal - that is not obviously figurative - sense. So in Acts 12:8f., 13:43, 21:36.

6. Parenthetical clauses: 'sidelines',<sup>31</sup> information which, though appropriate to the story, is placed by Mark at a point at which its relevance is untimely. Luke thus inserts the clause at a more suitable point. The Marcan 'sideline'/'

30. A good discussion by C.H. Turner JTS 25-29 (1924-28) and summarising V. Taylor: St. Mark (1952) pp. 44-54. For Luke's treatment of Mark: H. Cadbury: The Style and Literary Method of Luke.

31. See pp. 9f..



'sideline' recurs in Acts 1:12 where the detail that 'they' returned to Jerusalem is strange, since we have been told in 1:4 that 'they' are in Jerusalem. Acts 11:12 suddenly tells us of 'six' brethren and Acts 12:3 with its obtrusive note concerning the Passover are other examples. Acts 1:12,15, 9:11, 10:6(32) may furnish possible instances.<sup>32</sup>

7. Aramaic words - followed by a Greek translation: Luke in his Gospel always provides only the translation, yet in Acts he is not so meticulous.<sup>33</sup>

Negatively:

8. The rarity of  $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$  - but Luke adds this particle to Marcan material.

9. Absence of  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$ <sup>34</sup> - in Peter sections of Acts only on four occasions, whilst elsewhere in Acts, 33 times. But in his Gospel, Luke freely writes the word when copying from Mark.

Of less determinate value are the following:

10. Parataxis - particularly frequent in D.<sup>35</sup>

32. also Acts 4:22 (v. supra) - these points are discussed in detail in ch. 4.

33. see p. 11.

34. only in Mk. 9:30 BD and the Marcan appendix.

35. v. M. Black: Aramaic Approach (1946) p. 49.

11. Asyndeton - difficult however to assess because of frequent textual uncertainty. (e.g. Acts 1:7B)

12. Anacoluthon - in Acts perhaps at 7:40, 24:18.

13. Use of Diminutives: here the problem is to determine what constitutes a diminutive:<sup>36</sup> in form, several with an ending  $\text{-ov}$  come in Acts 5:15, 12:8, 27:16,32, and some with forms  $\text{-ovkos}$  also occur.

14.  $\text{ὅτι}$  with the indicative - in Acts 2:45, 4:35, 7:7BD.

Finally we append other stylistic points:

15.  $\text{οἶκος}$  with owner unidentified (Mk. 2:1, 3:20, 7:17, 9:28) - so in Acts 2:1.

16.  $\text{γίνομαι}$  with the dative (Mk.5:16,33, 9:21) - in Acts 7:40 (LXX), 20:16, 24:3 and 11:1D, 15:20D, 15:29D 614.

17. Double Negatives - so in Acts 4:12,17f.,20f.,32DE, 8:16,39.

18.  $\text{ὡς}$  used in a main clause - not as a conjunction.<sup>37</sup>

19. The secrecy motif: Jesus, in Mark, commands silence until his resurrection - (in Acts the apostles' opponents urge a similar restraint Acts 4:17f.).

36.cp. D.C. Swanson: JBL 77 (1958) pp. 140ff..

37.See G.D. Kilpatrick: BT 7 (1956) No. 4.

20. The stupidity of the disciples (Mk. 4:40, 6:52, 7:18, 8:17ff,33, 9:28,32, 10:13, 14:50) - perhaps it is recalled in Acts 4:13.

21. The frequency of the mention of amazement.<sup>38</sup>

22. The construction  $\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\phi\lambda\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\kappa$  in Acts 7:4, 16:13, 39D,40, 17:33, 28:3.<sup>39</sup>

23. Repetition, even amounting to whole stories: "that Luke deliberately avoided repetition seems almost demonstrated by his use of Mark".<sup>40</sup> Yet this is not true of Acts, where a number of stories are repeated without apology.<sup>41</sup>

It is difficult to provide a statistical table of these stylistic features, as they occur in Acts, because with many of them there are textual doubts and a few (e.g. Parataxis) are so common that they would dominate the statistic. Thus we will simply list, in our analysis of the sections/

38. v. p. 9.

39. Luke avoids this - see Cadbury op. cit. pp. 168,202. In these lists, cross references are only provided where those cited in note 30 have no discussion on the point in question. Marcan references are only added to the more unfamiliar points.

40. H. Cadbury in Studies in Luke/Acts p. 93. But: Luke 8:39.

41. Of the repetition in Acts, Kilpatrick remarks that now Luke "is usually insensitive to this". (JTS ns. 16 (1965) p. 127).

sections of Acts, those features characteristic of Mark's style.

However there remains one important further stylistic test: the use of  $\kappa\alpha\iota/\delta\epsilon$ . Mark's exuberance over the former is well-known. Unfortunately, however, Luke's practice in his Gospel shows us that he uses  $\delta\epsilon$  more often in Marcan than non-Marcan sections: was he determined to correct Mark's  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ -complex? It appears from Acts that Luke is not consistent in this matter<sup>42</sup> and we may point with some confidence to two contrasting groups of sections:

1. Acts 1:1-2:4 -  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  ...44 times,  $\delta\epsilon$  ...1 time.
2. "We" sections of Acts<sup>43</sup>  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  ..73 times,  $\delta\epsilon$  ..74 times.

This variation is striking, particularly remarkable is the actual predominance in the "we" sections of  $\delta\epsilon$  over  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ , even though these passages are spread intermittently/

42. So also: R. Martin NTS 11 (1964) p. 59 and Cadbury: Style p.144 - although this test does not adapt well to small samples (H. McArthur NTS 15 (1968) pp. 34lf.) Morton and McLennan claim that "the rate of using  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  for works of the same literary form is consistent over long periods of time and wide ranges of subject matter." (Paul, 1966 p. 78).
43. Details and full results in the Appendix.

intermittently over the pages of Acts. In contrast the near absence of  $\delta\acute{\iota}$  in the opening verses is most suggestive, at a point which, if anywhere, might most logically be expected to be the continuation of the Marcan narrative. The total figures for  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$  and  $\delta\acute{\iota}$  in the works in question are:

	Mark	Luke	Acts 1-12	Acts 13-28	'Peter' stories
$\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$	1078	1435	523	538	251
$\delta\acute{\iota}$	160	543	237	318	118
$\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} : \delta\acute{\iota}$	$6\frac{3}{4}:1$	$2\frac{2}{3}:1$	$2\frac{1}{4}:1$	$1\frac{2}{3}:1$	$2\frac{1}{8}:1$

Before we close this survey, a final word test must be appended: one which involves the writer's use of synonyms. In certain conditions this test can be eminently helpful<sup>44</sup> but for our purposes the only major point of difference between Mark and Luke, sufficient in size to test, concerns the use of the verbs of 'saying',<sup>45</sup> - Mark's choice lies unreservedly with  $\lambda\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ .

44. See A. Ellegard: A Statistical Method of Determining Authorship (1962) p. 45 and M.P. Brown: The Authentic Writings of Ignatius (1963) passim.

45. Some synonymous words have already been discussed - another less significant comparison can be made with  $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu/\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\iota$ , the figures for each respectively being Mark 3/6, Luke 8/3, Acts 3/7.

	Mark	Luke	Acts 1-12	Acts 13-28	'Peter' sections
λέγειν	202	224	43	62	20
εἰπεῖν	84	298	58	78	30
λαλεῖν	18	30	33	30	14
φάσαι	2	6	6	21	4

Here the 'Peter' portions of Acts produce no outstanding result. This is inexplicable in the light of Lucan usage, which, in this instance, remains constant in Luke/Acts :

(i) Following Mark, Luke uses λέγειν 71 times, εἰπεῖν 94, ratio  $1:1\frac{1}{3}$ ,

(ii) not following Mark, he uses λέγειν 153 times, εἰπεῖν 204, ratio  $1:1\frac{1}{3}$ .

This test, therefore, for our case, yields a verdict of 'no result'.

From this survey we have gained several pointers to possible uses of Mark in Acts - and the scope of our analysis of Acts will thus extend to those areas in which the statistics most strongly indicate Marcan influence. These are the 'Peter' sections of Acts, to which we will add some of the material in the immediate context of these paragraphs (including 1:1-12 where we saw the predominance of καί).

## 3 - M A R K

The statement of Papias that Mark was "the interpreter of Peter"<sup>1</sup> is of doubtful historical value as a testimony, although as a defensive supposition it may nevertheless be correct. We certainly must not build too great reliance upon Papias' words - but the examination just concluded has pointed us to certain Marcan features in the stories of Peter in Acts. We will not use this to confirm Papias' view, but we will mention the evidence (on which, of course, Papias may have laid his theory) that indicates that Mark and Peter were, at the least, acquaintances.

1 Peter 5:13 - if this epistle be by Peter - mentions Mark with Peter<sup>2</sup> and more importantly in Acts 12:12, Luke himself presents us with proof that Peter knew the house of Mary, mother of John Mark. In this passage, although Mark is not apparently present in person, Peter "narrates"<sup>3</sup> his story to the assembled as a preliminary to what is tantamount to a disappearance. It may be that here is an acknowledgement/

1. Eusebius H.E. 3:39:15.
2. and sufficiently on intimate terms to be designated "my son".
3. Acts 12:16.

acknowledgement of Peter's contribution to the whole: he "signs off" with the name of John Mark appended as implicit recognition of his services. This may be Luke's way of indicating one of his sources for parts of Luke and Acts 1-12.

It could however be objected that this Mark is not to be equated with the Mark who is traditionally held to be author of the Second Gospel. The John Mark of Acts dwells in Jerusalem (though he need not have been born there) whilst the Gospel of Mark, it is alleged,<sup>4</sup> shows ignorance both of the geography and customs of Palestine. The focus upon Galilee is also surprising. But although the name Mark was common enough, the equation: Mark of Acts 12-15 = the writer of the Second Gospel can be assumed in the absence of evidence as to any other prominent "Mark" in the Early Church.

Much has been expended upon understanding the purpose of Mark's Gospel, such views however are based on the available/

4. by e.g. K. Niederwimmer ZNW 58 (1967) pp. 172-188. The view is criticised by T.A. Burkill ZNW 57 (1966) pp. 24f., 28 and Nov T 9 (1967) pp. 166f..



available data. Our task will be to take hold of those verses in Mark in which might be found a hint of anything to come in Acts. We will not say of any given verse: that it requires a verse in Acts in order to make sense of it, but we will point to certain verses which foretell or anticipate<sup>e</sup> specific events in Acts. Some of these Acts 'fulfillments' will be due to chance, others more probably accounted for, with the explanation that Luke is unconsciously echoing a phrase in Mark - yet the cumulative number of such verses will suggest the additional probability: namely that Mark is writing, as every writer must do, with one eye on the future dénouement, which, we suggest, involved post-Resurrection stories showing how the power of the Risen Lord changed the incomprehension of the twelve into a bold witness to a new way of life.

The following passages in Mark are significant in this respect:

1. Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ  
(Mk. 1:1)<sup>5</sup> - this opening phrase can be interpreted variously. We could say that if the Gospel is to begin with the preaching of the Baptist, then it is also going/

5. cp. the opening of Acts (1:1f.) in D.

going to continue in other hands: i.e. in the apostolic witness. Hence  $\epsilon\rho\chi\acute{\iota}$  "implies a continuation of the Gospel in another and concluding writing"<sup>6</sup> and so we may compare the use of this noun in Heb. 2:3, which Wikgren thinks points to the fact that in Mk. 1:1 "Mark has in mind (the gospel's) subsequent manifestation in the Christian mission, as did Luke in introducing his Gospel as a protos logos"<sup>7</sup>. Thus could not Mark also have written a two-volume work? For although it is widely assumed, Luke makes no claim to be innovating in his formula of a Gospel plus an Acts. Might he have borrowed the idea from Mark? Whilst this is wanting in demonstration, it must be admitted that Luke's preface, grandiose though it be, does not refer to a subsequent volume by any obvious token. The "many" of Luke 1:1 have already taken in hand the task that Luke himself has in mind! One of these "many" known to Luke at some stage during the composition was Mark, so, we ask again, how far/

6. C.A. Briggs: *New Light on the Life of Jesus* (1904) p. 112.
7. A. Wikgren *JBL* 71 (1942) p. 16. The connection was made earlier by Erbt *op. cit.* p. 25 n. 1. *cp.* also Ac. 10:37.

far did Mark extend his material? If the Lucan Prologue is taken to tacitly assume a second work, then the same assumption must not be dismissed with respect to the opening sentence of Mark. The irony of our present day situation is that even though Mark begins with a decisive "beginning", his conclusion is a matter of considerable ambiguity.<sup>8</sup>

## 2. Mark 1:1-20.

Parallels between Luke and Acts are often used to strengthen the bond of common authorship.<sup>9</sup> Yet there is a more immediate similarity noticeable between the opening scenes of Mark and Acts, than of Luke and Acts.<sup>10</sup> If it is admitted that Luke rearranged some of the stories in the earlier part of Acts in order to give theological emphasis to Pentecost and Ascension - then it is possible that this parallelism was once even more/

8. E. Von Dobschitz: *Das Kerygma Petri* (Leipzig 1893) p. 73 also posits a deuterios logos to the Marcan Gospel. He believes the Kerygma-Petri was written as this second volume. On the scope of the Lucan prologue (Luke 1:1-4): A.J.B. Higgins in *Apostolic History and the Gospel* (1970) pp. 78-83.
9. e.g. by Rackham op. cit. p. xlvii.
10. Despite the claim of A. Ehrhardt (*Acts* (1970) p. 12f.) that there is a "clear parallelism" on this point between Luke/Acts. Compare his improbable suggestions with those below.

more obvious:

(a) Beginning - Mk. 1:1, Ac. 1:1. see above.

(b) Preaching - Mk. 1:(4),15:

κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον

Ac. 1:2D:

κηρύσσεν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον<sup>11</sup>

(c) Baptism - Mk. 1:8, Ac. 1:5 (cp. 11:16). It may be noted that Acts, like Mark (and against Luke 3:16), omits the reference to fire, despite the imminent Pentecost. Here however we are concerned with the parallelism of event: as Jesus now gives instructions to his disciples for 40 days so once <sup>he</sup> had spent 40 days preparing for his ministry (Mk. 1:13 cp. Lk. 4:2). The Baptist had forecast (Mk. 1:8) the one who would baptise with the Spirit - now, at the beginning of this second volume, we are reminded he is about to come.<sup>12</sup>

Thus we may say that the openings of both Mark and Acts are guided by a theological standpoint: they prepare the reader/

11. For this as a genuine part of the original text of Acts, v. pp. 115f..

12. The motif is accentuated in the Western Text: Ac. 1:5D cop<sup>G67</sup> add ἕως τῆς πανηγύρεως also see Ac. 1:8a. If we allow the possibility of συναλ. ἕσθαι as meaning 'eating together with' - the minor motif of eating also links Ac. 1:4 with Mk. 1:6 (Not Luke's parallel).

reader for the revelation of the divine will - for in Mark, John predicts the Messiah is to come. Then the Spirit descends on Jesus whilst in Acts Jesus prophesies, before his ascension, the descent of the Spirit upon his followers. This complex theological motivation results in "an extreme brevity and compression almost at times to the point of unintelligibility."<sup>13</sup> That was written of Mark's opening words - but is it not equally true of the first sentence of Acts (Ac. 1:1-5)?

(d) The Coming Kingdom - Mk. 1:15, Ac. 1:6-8. Next in Mark, Jesus announces the Kingdom is about to come. In Acts, Jesus gives his disciples instructions, revealing the true nature of that Kingdom.

(e) Choosing of a Follower - Mk. 1:16ff., Ac. 1:15ff..

We will not overstress these parallels of event: for in a sense they form part of the primitive tradition, John's Gospel sharing in particular the same general features. Luke's Gospel, whilst borrowing many of the above motifs from Mark, does not make the explicit comparison on the points noted above - for the material neither comes at the beginning of the Gospel (though Proto-Luke commences, it is alleged, at Lk. 3:1 and so would/

13. C.F. Evans: The Beginning of the Gospel (1968) p. 12.

would remedy this situation) nor is it recorded in the same order or with the same details as that in Mark. Although the final form of the Prologue (Ac. 1:1-5)<sup>14</sup> comes from the editor, therefore, the obscurities contained therein may be caused by the use of a source. Such a source would have similarities with Mark's Gospel. If there was a Second Volume of Mark, or even if that Gospel simply continued with a story or stories after Mk. 16:8, the material in Acts 1 is the most probable point where evidence of Luke using this Marcan matter could be found.

### 3. Mark 2:1-16.

There are some verbal parallels - which seem to be coincidental between this section and the story of Peter's vision (Ac. 10:9-16).

<u>Mark</u>	<u>Acts</u>	<u>Luke</u>
2:3 ὑπὸ τῶσδεων	10:11 (11:5) τῶσδεων, ἀρχαῖς	-
2:10 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	10:11 (cp. 11:6) καθὶ μένον	5:19 καθῆκαν
2:16 ἐσθίει	10:11 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	5:24 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
2:12 οὐδέποτε	10:11 (11:5) μεγάλην	5:29 μεγάλην
2:2, 8, 12 εἰθὺς	10:14 φάγε	5:30 εἰθὺς
(cp. 2:3 προσεγγίσει )	10:14 οὐδέποτε	-
	10:16 εἰθὺς	-
	10:9 (614) προσεγγίζοντων	-
	[cp 10:35B]	

14. On this delineation of the Acts Prologue: p. 113.

These parallels can be explained as a subconscious reminiscence by Luke of the Marcan paragraph, after he has described Paul being 'lowered' (Ac. 9:25, Mk. 2:4) and the paralytic on his mattress (Ac. 9:33, Mk. 2:4) being healed. But why should he remember the Marcan rather than the Lucan details? Is there a deliberate attempt in Acts to recall the story in which a charge was directed against Jesus?:

ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἑμπορευτῶν εἰσθίει.

Against Peter they formulate the following: λέγοντες  
ὅτι εἰσῆλθες πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστίων ἔχοντας  
καὶ συνέφαγες σὺν αὐτοῖς

By parallelling the situations, the truth of Peter's vision and correctness of his action is underlined. Note that Luke in Luke 5:30 adds to the charge against Jesus καὶ πίνεις thereby missing this comparison.<sup>15</sup>

4. Mk. 2:20 - "on the day"<sup>16</sup> that the bridegroom is taken away (ἀπαρθῆ = Lk. 5:35), the disciples will fast. This Marcan reference appears, as against Luke/

15. But cp. Ac. 10:41.

16. Luke generalises this reference, by using the plural.

Luke, to be envisaging a specific event (ἐν ἑκσίην  
 τῆ ἡμέρᾳ) though it is to be doubted whether this  
 could be Jesus' death as<sup>17</sup>

(i) it is the bridegroom, not his guests, who is made to depart. If the allegory is unavoidable, then it is not an illustration of Christ's death, since at the Passion, it is the disciples who leave, fleeing from him.

(ii) the metaphor of Christ as bridegroom is surely inappropriate if the 'death' of the bridegroom is intended. Elsewhere this joyful image belongs, more appropriately, to the period of the Church (cp. Rev. 19:7).

Hence the period of fasting in Mk. 2:20 could cover the period after the 'departure' of Christ - perhaps until the gift of the spirit is received. When he comes then the disciples are filled with 'new' wine. (Ac. 2:13f., Mk. 2:22<sup>18</sup>) and therefore the ἀπαρθῆ of Mk. 2:20 would refer to the Ascension, a point made explicit in the Western Text of Acts:

καὶ ἀπαρθῆ ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν (Ac. 1:9D).

Thus Mk. 2:20 may be anticipating the Ascension of Jesus, after which, for a period (ἡμέραι) the disciples will have to fast.

17. Despite Cranfield: Mark (1966) p. 110f, Taylor, Mark p. 211.

18. Cp. Luke 5:37, heedless of the parallelism!



## 5. Mk. 4:17.

When persecution is rife a falling away is prophesied. There is no hint of this in Acts, though the editor of Acts may have avoided recording such facts in the interests of presenting an idealised picture. But compare:

διεφέρετο δὲ ὁ λόγος ..... καὶ ἐπήγαραν  
 θλίψιν (μεγάλην) καὶ διωγμὸν.....  
 (Ac. 13:50 DE)<sup>19</sup>

However the picture in Mark, unlike 2:20, is very generalised, and is thus reflective of the widespread experiences of the Early Church. It does not therefore anticipate a specific situation.

6. Mk. 4:22,28,32 - this series of pictures depicts the growth and splendour of the Kingdom. It may be that the spread of the Gospel to the Gentiles is here included in that broad horizon - the issue will be discussed in Mk. 7:1ff., 13:10.

19. also cp. Ac. 8:1D.

7. Mk. 5:38-42.

We have already noticed in passing<sup>20</sup> that the story of Acts 9 depicts Peter as imitating his Master's actions - those, moreover, particularly recorded by Mark:

<u>Mark</u>	<u>Acts</u>	<u>Luke</u>
5:39 κλαίειτε	9:39 κλαίουσιν	8:52 ἔκλαιον
5:40 ἐκβαλὼν πάντας	9:40 ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἑξῆς	8:54 ἔβη δὲ
5:41 καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς...	9:41 δούσ δὲ αὐτῆ χείρα	8:54 κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς...
5:42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνίστη	9:41 ἀνίστησεν	8:55 καὶ ἀνίστη παραχρῆμα <sup>21</sup>

Difficult to explain away is the detail of 'sending out' - thus although the other parallels belong to the miracle story format, this echo of Mark in Acts is usually accounted for by the unlikely explanation that Luke omitted the words in his Gospel, because he wished to include them in Acts.<sup>22</sup> Besides it being psychologically most improbable that Luke would so have reasoned - it would also imply that Luke was exceptionally short of material for Acts if he had to keep in reserve some of his Gospel material! The phrase in Acts implies at least a reminiscence of the Marcan story (Mk. 5:21ff.) by Luke/

20. p. 7 n. 20, see also p. 10.

21. in Ac. 9:40: E: adds παραχρῆμα.

22. BC4 p. 8 and Bruce op. cit. p. 213.

Luke - although if he were merely borrowing motifs from that episode, the new motifs of 'opening the eyes' and 'kneeling' to pray would surely not have been introduced. These motifs argue that Luke had to hand a written account about the Tabitha episode,<sup>23</sup> (one which perhaps already matched the actions of Peter with Jesus) - belonging to a possible collection of "Stories of Peter", compiled by Mark.

8. Mk. 6:2-6 - the story of Jesus' rejection by his kinsfolk has verbal echoes in the account of Paul's "rejection" (Ac. 9:20-22). Luke has none of these parallels:

<u>Mark</u>	<u>Acts</u>
..διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ	..ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς
συναγωγῇ καὶ οὐ	ἐκηρύσσεν ... ἐξίσταντο δὲ
πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες ἐξ-	πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες
εἰπήσονται λέγοντες..	καὶ εἰλεγον· οὐχ
οὐχ οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ	οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ προφήτης
τέκτων... καὶ ἀδελφεὸς..	..καὶ ἡμεῖς...

23. The interpretation of her name in 9:36 suggests Luke has been obliged to use her Aramaic name, because this was found in the body of the story (9:40) - although he himself normally avoids such Aramaisms (v. p. 11). This again points to a written source.

αὐτοῦ ὥστε...καὶ ! καὶ πάντες  
 ἐσκανδαλίζονται ἐν αὐτῷ! ἐφοβούνται αὐτόν,  
 διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν! μὴ πιστεύοντες

Form critically these stories are both shaped in the same mould:

Mark 6

Acts 9

(i) in the synagogue	in the synagogue
(ii) teaching	preaching
(iii) amazement of all who hear	amazement of all who hear
(iv) their doubt	their doubt
(v) people who should have believed do not accept him.	disciples who should have believed do not accept him.

Here we are faced with the alternatives: either Luke is not drawing a parallel with a story from Mark (but why should he do this when his own story of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth is even more detailed than Mark's?) or he has used a source in Acts 9:20-22 which knew a story in similar words to that in Mark 6. Yet it could be that the similarity of the incidents has led to these parallels - but are not the verbal points of contact too strong?

9. Mark 6:9 ἄλλα ὑποδεσμένους σανδάλια which is repeated to Peter ἤσασαι καὶ ὑπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλια σου.

Is this verbal echo another instance of a motif in Mark which/

which ~~Mark~~ was omitted by Luke in his Gospel, only to be included here? This argument cannot be sustained, for there is no reason in the context of Ac. 12:8 why this command should be inserted to an escaping prisoner. Now if such a source as Mark used the words at Ac. 12:8, the reader would have been recalled to Mark's earlier use of the command and understand the purpose of the angelic intervention. All Jesus requires of a follower, before he goes on a Mission is for him to have his footgear on!<sup>24</sup> The angel is telling Peter that he is to prepare for another mission.<sup>25</sup>

10. Mk. 6:55f.. Again, as with the story of Tabitha, there is a parallelism between Peter's healing and Jesus' healing activity: the similarity between Ac. 5:15f. and the present Marcan verses has often been noted, but rarely with comment adequate to explain the rapport. Thus Lake and Cadbury, discussing Ac. 5:15, point to "Mk. 6:56... ..which may be the source of this verse."<sup>26</sup>

24. cp. Ephn. 6:15.

25. Referring to 9:32 - 11:18, For this interpretation in full detail see p. 243.

26. BC 4p 54f, similarly: J.V. Bartlet: Acts (1902) p. 176, R. Hanson: Acts (1967) p. 84, Knowling op. cit. p. 147, Rackham op. cit. p. 69, C.S.C. Williams: Acts (1957) p. 89: "Luke perhaps later to avoid repeating Mark" (assuming Acts is before Luke's Gospel) and D.M. McIntyre ET 33 (1922) p. 311.

Yet if this is merely an amalgam of strata in the Gospel summary narratives is it not strange that:

- (i) the picture in Ac. 5:15f. is not clearer.<sup>27</sup>
- (ii) the vulgar κρέβετος shunned in Luke's Gospel is repeated from Mk. 6:55: yet it is redundant after a mention of κληρονομία.
- (iii) new features even amounting to the superstition surrounding Peter's shadow are introduced.

The other similar healing summaries in Acts, do not contain such difficulties (Ac. 8:7, 19:12f.).

There is a definite inter-dependence of these passages, and it could be argued that 'reminiscence' is a sufficient explanation for the parallels with Mk. 6:55f. Yet note the κρέβετος to which Luke is so averse and the construction ἔνα... κείν which suggest that Luke had the page of Mark's Gospel open in front of him, or some similar written source.

27. on this see p. 191.

11. Mk. 7:1-31. Peter's vision (Ac. 10:9-16) "is parallel to the Marcan scene where Jesus abolishes all distinctions of meats."<sup>28</sup> Luke has omitted the Marcan episode, perhaps because the story in Acts does not know of any pronouncement of Jesus on the subject of table fellowship with Gentiles.<sup>29</sup> But Jesus' actions towards the outcast were too well known to have been forgotten - and it is more likely that the disciples had simply failed to understand Jesus' discourse at the time (So Mk. 7:18, despite 7:14), so that the lesson has to be reiterated to Peter. Mark's Gospel constantly shows the twelve as having a singular lack of understanding<sup>30</sup> about Jesus' mission - so that we would expect a Marcan source when returning later to the same subject, to stress the Lord's way in the matter - The restatement of the divine/

28. B.W. Bacon JBL 26 (1907) p. 148.

29. Bacon art. cit. p. 150 argues that Acts is the substitute for Mk. 7/8.

30. See p. 58, Section 20.

divine will reminds the reader that Jesus had himself authorised and - as we shall see - instituted a fellowship with the Gentiles. Once more, Peter follows his Master's footsteps. Luke, since he has not included Mk. 7 in his Gospel, is obliged to append an elaborate apologetic to Peter's vision, in order to emphasise the worthiness of Cornelius. Mk. 7 may anticipate this crisis in Peter's ministry - both passages convey the same lesson: in Mk. 7:19 the inference is drawn by the editor<sup>31</sup> *καθαρίσων πάντα τὰ βρώματα* whilst in Ac. 10:15 (11:19) the lesson is repeated: *ὃ ὁ Θεὸς ἠκαθάρισεν σὺ μὴ κοῖνῶν.*

It might seem arbitrary to say that Acts 10 merely restates Mk. 7 - why should any writer wish to repeat himself? Yet, even if we are not convinced that the issue of Gentile fellowship was a vital one for the editor of Acts or his source, the internal evidence of Acts furnishes proof enough of the extreme apologetic of the editor as regards the problem. Cornelius' vision is told thrice (Ac. 10:3-6, 22,30-32) and again (11:13f.), and Peter's vision is repeated/

31. or perhaps even Peter himself - see F.W. Farrar E Series, 1, 3 (1876) pp. 315f..



repeated in Acts 11. If the editor could indulge in such repetition, so could his source! Let us now return to examine the parallelism we have supposed to exist between Jesus and Peter in these stories.<sup>32</sup>

(i) Discussion leads to the miracle - in Mk. 7:24-31 a Gentile's request is answered - in Acts 10 Gentiles receive the Spirit.

(ii) Jesus is at first reluctant to perform the miracle (see Mk. 7:27), as is Peter (Ac. 10:14).<sup>33</sup>

(iii) Peter eventually repudiates the old laws (Ac. 10:28) as Jesus too, has declared all meats clean. (Mk. 7:19).

(iv) Peter continues by proclaiming Jesus as Lord of all (Ac. 10:36) - compare his confession soon after the incidents of Mk. 7 in Mk. 8:29.

Is this parallelism of word and action fortuitous? Might it not point to a Marcan source being used for parts of Acts 10?

12. Mk. 9:2 - καὶ ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸ οὐρανόν ...this same verb is used of the Ascension only in the New Testament at Luke (24:51)<sup>34</sup>. It is often dangerous to see/

32. For the points below: see Burkill ZNW art. cit. p. 29.

33. Acts shares the same approach to the Gentile mission as Mark (see p. 8 Section 7).

34. om.  $\lambda^{\times}D$ .

see too much typology, but if Luke does himself anticipate Jesus' Ascension in the Transfiguration,<sup>35</sup> then could not Mark have done similarly? If Mark did contain an Ascension narrative, this parallel indicates it may have taken place upon a mountain, although this is not clear in the Acts account until 1:12.

13. Mk. 9:28f. Even though the apostles have cured many (Mk. 6:13), they now raise the question as to why the epileptic boy proved beyond their healing ability. Jesus points them back to the necessity of prayer (a requirement Luke oddly omits) and so, in Acts we find Peter engaged in prayer, preparatory to some miracles being effected (Ac. 3:1,10:9). As a devout Jew, prayer was a requirement, but in the context of the miracle story, it illustrates that Peter has 'learned his lesson'.

14. Mk. 10:17,23. This whole section in Mark is very generalised - and no specific reference should be understood to the Community of Goods as described in Acts. But Mark may have remembered the abuse of Ananias/

35. So J.G. Davies: JTS ns 6 (1955) pp. 229ff..

Ananias and Sapphira as he penned Jesus' utterance in Mk. 10:23.

15. Mk. 10:39. Jesus prophesies the martyrdom of James and John. Did Luke omit this reference because he knew that only James had been executed (Ac. 12:2<sup>36</sup>)? But it is not very probable that this Marcan reference is inserted because Mark was going to later describe the event; the reference in its context is almost incidental to the lesson, which Jesus draws, of humility.

16. Mk. 11:17 - Lk. 19:46 drops the  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \dot{\iota}\theta\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$  of Isaiah 56:7 (cp. too his omission of Mk. 12:11a), despite his universalist tendency, seen for example in his extension of Isaiah 40:5, in Luke 3:5. In the present verse, Luke's severe abbreviation of the parallel Marcan passage may explain the deletion, but here, nevertheless, is evidence of Mark's view of the Christian mission. The temple is the place where the Spirit descends at Pentecost (Ac. 2:1); at that time foreigners do participate in the miraculous events - but this/

36. On the possibility that the Acts account originally described the death of both, see p. 240. See now: O. Cullmann RScR 60, 1972, pp. 55ff.. S. Légasse NTS 20 (1974) p. 177 states Mark has not been influenced by his knowledge of James' martyrdom.

this motif (Ac. 2:5ff.) is the work of the editor<sup>37</sup> and it is probable that the source of this chapter saw the place as a private house.<sup>38</sup>

17. Mk. 12:33 - the final words (only in Mark) contain a strong anti-Jewish polemic that is characteristic of this entire chapter. In the same vein Mk. 12:9 depicts the rejection of Israel (and so Luke), Mk. 12:27 contains an indictment of the Sadducees, and Mk. 12:40 of the scribes.<sup>39</sup> Mk. 12:33 is essentially anti-temple, as is the attitude of Stephen in Acts 7. Also we may add that if Jesus condemned the Jewish authorities for their lack of piety, then, conversely, this attitude would surely lead him to include the Gentiles in his outreach.

18. Mk. 13:6 could be a reference to the story of Simon Magus - though it is too generalised to press such an inference.

19. Mk. 13:10. (We cannot enter into a lengthy discussion over the punctuation here). The evidence of other Marcan passages indicates that Jesus, or at least/

37. on this v. p. 155.

38. see below paragraph 20 and pp. 132f..

39. cp. too Mk. 10:5 of the Pharisees.

least we may say the editor, was prepared to make Jesus consider the possibility of a Gentile outreach (see 7:27 and 11:17 and paragraph 17 above). If this is so, then did Mark intend showing the fulfillment of these words?<sup>40</sup> Probably not their literal accomplishment, but we may compare the similar use of *καί* adverbially in these two sentences:

*καί εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* (Mk. 13:10)

*ἄρα καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* (Ac. 11:18).

This latter comes at the conclusion of the story of the descent of the Spirit and baptism of the first Gentiles - an appropriate conclusion, perhaps, for a Marcan source.

20. Mk. 13:11. The modest scale of the bestowal of the Spirit in Ac. 4:31 "is noticeably nearer to the point of view represented by Mk. 13:11."<sup>41</sup> This Marcan chapter contains many details, some of which are fulfilled in the Passion narrative, and some others in Acts. In Mk. 13:9 Jesus predicts they will stand before Kings (as do James and Peter in Acts 12) and Mk. 13:11 also provides apt encouragement to Peter and John as they face the Sanhedrin.

21. Mk. 13:15a has some further curious verbal parallels with the vision of Peter (compare paragraph 3 above): *δῶμα*, *καταβάτω* and *οἰκία* which is the word/

40. so Erbt (see p. 4).

41. Cadbury in BC 2 p. 145 n. 1.

word used of the house of Peter's lodging.<sup>42</sup> These details are surely coincidental.

22. Mk. 13:22 is omitted in Luke, only to appear at Ac. 1:7.<sup>43</sup> The parallelism is one of idea, not language; in its context in Acts, the legion is made<sup>2</sup> reply to the disciples' narrow-minded nationalism, which leads to the premise of Ac. 1:8. It is not possible to decide whether 1:7 has been inserted by Luke, borrowing from Mk. 13:32 or whether the polemic was already interwoven in a source. We have suggested the former alternative lacks psychological probability and thus the whole episode, which Luke turns to announce the scope of the volume, is an illustration of the continued perversity of the disciples. It is hard to imagine that Luke would deliberately heighten this motif for he avoids the harshness of Mark's Gospel frequently in this respect.<sup>44</sup>

23. Mk. 14:27f. - Jesus predicts the scattering of his followers - the words are repeated in 16:7.<sup>45</sup> If we knew where exactly the disciples were when this statement was repeated, the problem as to the meaning of these/

42. On this see p. 296 n. 380.

43. See pp. 6f..

44. Is this why he omits the central section of Mark's Gospel?

45. C.F. Evans JTS ns5 (1954) p. 13 believes Jesus is predicting the Gentile outreach.

these words might be clearer, John's prediction on the matter (Jn. 16:32) refers to a dispersal εἰς τὰ ἴδια, which implies they will flee to their homes<sup>46</sup> in Galilee, though these words are ambiguous, and complicated by the appearance of at least one disciple (Jn. 19:25f) at the cross. But Mark too may have supposed they had left Jerusalem as apart from the story of Peter's denial, there is no mention of the Disciples after Jesus' arrest.<sup>47</sup> We return to the problem below.

24. Mk. 14:57f. - this most clear-cut connection between Mark and the Stephen episode (cp. paragraph 17) prompted Rendel Harris to claim: "there is a literary dependence of the Acts upon Mark, ever and above the general theory of an imitatio Christi:"<sup>48</sup>.

Mark 14:57f.

ἔψευδομαρτύρουν....  
ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος  
ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω  
τὸν ναὸν τούτου.

Ac. 6:13f.

μάρτυρας ψευδῆς...  
ἐκηκόαμεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος  
ὅτι Ἰησοῦς....καταλύσει  
τὸν ναὸν τούτου<sup>49</sup>.

Mark 14:60:

καὶ ἀναστὰς...εἰς μέσον

Ac. 6:15 (cop<sup>G67</sup>)

ἑστῶτος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν

46. on the phrase, see p. 205 n. 221.

47. A little surprising if Mark had witnessed the events of the Passion.

48. J. Rendel Harris ET 39 (1928) p. 456.

49. cp. Mk. 13:2 also for this.

Why has Luke in his Gospel not drawn out these features? The fact that Christ could not be condemned on such charges would surely have been of interest to Luke. Alternative explanations are:

- (i) Luke was following his own Passion story.
- (ii) Luke did not know Mark's story (not excluding the point above)<sup>50</sup>.
- (iii) Luke omitted the passage because he knew he wished to use it in Acts.
- (iv) Luke was copying from a source in Acts which paralleled the story of Stephen and Jesus.

We have already discounted the two middle theories, and so it might be thought that (iv) is the most plausible. But on examination of the literary features of Acts 6, 7 (see the appendix) there is little to suggest a Marcan source. It is not impossible, of course, that a Marcan source behind Acts could contain (as does the Gospel) diverse traditions, but the probability is that either Luke was using an independent source in Acts<sup>56</sup> or that (i) above is correct.

50. i.e. Acts was written before Luke read Mark (see p. 12 n. 37) - the points we have made above however suggest the opposite, and we may add here, that the eschatology of Acts (pp. 15f.) is manifestly of a later date than Mark.



25. Mk. 14:66-72. Streeter doubts if "Peter's denial would have been so emphasised in the Gospel (Mark) unless as a foil to a subsequent story, the point of which lay in cancelling a former weakness of the apostle."<sup>51</sup> This phrasing aptly directs us to John 21 - but how well does Acts succeed in vindicating the first of the apostles! Indeed, would Mark have preserved such a narrative without later making any attempt to mitigate the apostle's action, or with no reference to his later importance? Thus Matthew (16:18) draws our attention to this, where in Mark, Peter is merely rebuked (Mk. 8:30).<sup>52</sup> Mark's Gospel is the only one that leaves Peter in disgrace!

26. Mk. 15:34. At Pentecost, Peter explains these harsh words: Jesus was not left forsaken in Hades (Ac. 2:27,31). Perhaps Luke knew this saying of Jesus on the cross and so was here explaining it. But would the last recorded words of Jesus according to Mark be these? Would Mark not have wished to counterbalance them with such words as Acts 2:31?

Of the above paragraphs I would like to lay most stress on : 1, 2, 9, 10 and 25, as well as that below.

51. B.H. Streeter: The Four Gospels (1924) p. 356. Cp. Mk. 16:7 also.

52. Although it is broadened into a rebuke to all the disciples.

The Ending of Mark.

None of the facts gathered above can prove that Mark had to continue his story to include some of the material now found in Ac. 1-12, but they do prove ~~that~~ the possibility must be considered. The form of this continuation would be either:

- (i) A second volume,<sup>53</sup>
- or (ii) A series of notes - perhaps an un-edited account which was lent to Luke,
- or (iii) A continuation of the story, which ends abruptly at Mk. 16:8.

This last view implies that those who see Mk. 16:8 as the conclusion of the work are wrong. It should be noted, however, that if theory (i) is adopted, it is not necessary to show that those who claim that  $\xi\phi\beta\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  is Mark's end in his book are wrong, since the words would, on this interpretation, form only the finish to the first volume. Although I would incline towards acceptance of (i), it is nevertheless most hypothetical, and we cannot avoid looking at the arguments of those who claim that Mark never wrote anything after 16:8. But mostly we will be concerned with the purpose of the complete section, Mk. 16:1-8.

53. See pp. 65f..

As early as Wellhausen, 1903, the hypothesis of a 'lost ending' of Mark was being brought into question. R.H. Lightfoot<sup>54</sup> provides a list of passages where *γ&ρ* is used at the end of sentences and even paragraphs and the theory, as a novelty, won a certain following, even though it meant admitting Mark wrote no Resurrection stories about the Risen Jesus. Farrer admired Mark's resultant poetic symbolism, even though he later had to modify his view to the extent of adding a sentence to Mk. 16:8, a little like that preserved in k.<sup>55</sup> This however is as good as confessing that Mark has been mutilated or in some way tampered with - and Farrer's conclusion is symptomatic of the unease that was felt with Lightfoot's case - for ultimately it had to be agreed that no book could ever end with only a *γ&ρ*.<sup>56</sup> So, in 1952, Vincent Taylor, writing after the heat/

54. Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels (1938) pp. 1-23 qv.. See this work and Taylor, Mark p. 609 for a list of the main articles for the Theory.
55. A. Farrer: St. Matthew and St. Mark (1954) p. 150 - independently, a similar view in C. Moule NTS 2 (1955) pp. 58f..
56. cp. W. Knox. HTR 35 (1942) pp. 13-23: the simple style of Mark hardly admits of such a sophisticated technique.

heat of the debate could state that "the view that ἐφωβόοντο γὰρ is not the intended ending stands."<sup>57</sup>

But let us accept, for a moment, Lightfoot's theory: do we make better sense of Mk. 16:1-8? On any account 16:8 is a disappointing anti-climax - even if it were designed to explain why the legend of the Empty Tomb was not earlier in circulation. Mk. 16:7 is a much more effective conclusion (if we require one) to the book - with an announcement which implicitly fulfills Jesus' prophecy, of 14:28. As it is, we require more, for, unless the story be complete fiction, the women must have told someone at a later date, or the story would never have been recorded at all.<sup>58</sup> Why end on a note of inaccuracy? The fact is that Mark himself knows that after the Resurrection the time for silence is well nigh past, as he tells us in the important verse Mk. 9:9...

καὶ... διποτύλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἰ εἶδον  
διηγήσωνται, εἰ μὴ ὅταν ὁ ἦτος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  
ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆ.

57. Taylor, Mark p. 609.

58. Unless the 'young man' of Mk. 16:5 is himself the author of the account: J. McIndoe ET 80 (1969) p. 125 identifies him with Mark - and also see J. Knox in The Joy of Study (1951) p. 28 (a book I have not seen) and, in detail for this view: H. Waetjen ASTI 4 (1965) pp. 116f.. But Mark clearly names the women as the witnesses (Mk. 15:47). In Luke (24:9, 23) these tell the others.

However, Lightfoot is correct when he says that Marcan usage of  $\phi\theta\beta\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , does not require  $\mu\eta$ -clause, or even for the cause of this fear to be revealed. Mk. 10:32 is a parallel case.<sup>59</sup> But let us examine the context of these usages: Mk. 11:32, 12:12 refer to fear of the crowd, and so may be ignored here. A story ends with the note of fear at Mk. 4:41 and 11:18, though in each case the following story concerns a miraculous event. Mk. 6:20 refers to Herod's fear of John and 5:15 refers to fear after a miracle. Mk. 10:32 picks up 9:32, and here Jesus (who is going ahead of the twelve) teaches them what must happen. Similarly in Mk. 5:33 the woman who is afraid, has these fears dispelled by Jesus' actions: her faith, even though she is afraid, is commended. Similarly, in Mk. 5:36  $\mu\eta \phi\theta\beta\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon, \mu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron \pi\iota\sigma\tau\omega\iota$  and at 6:50 - where Jesus comes to the fearful/

59. See Lightfoot (from Enslin) op. cit. pp. 16f. - in the New Testament the exact parallels to 16:8 suggest that the phrase  $\phi\theta\beta\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon \tau\omicron \gamma\alpha\rho$  usually takes an object: So Mk. 11:18, Lk. 19:21, Lk. 22:2 and Ac. 5:26. The LXX usages are Gen. 19:30, 20:2, 26:7 and follow this rule. The only exception (and one which Lightfoot stresses, pp. 12f., 17f.) is Gen. 18:15.

fearful disciples.<sup>60</sup> Human fear means that - in some cases in Mark - Jesus must take the initiative. Is this so in 16:8? Let us point to a parallel situation of the glory of the Transfiguration scene. Here, too, there is the clumsy repetition of γάρ and where ἐκφοβοῖ γὰρ ἐγένοντο<sup>61</sup> may be a parenthetical explanation, which like 16:8, is one of those typical Marcan afterthoughts. The Transfiguration story then continues with the overshadowing of the Cloud - with which we compare the events in Acts at the Ascension.

The facts thus suggest that Mark could have ended with ἐκφοβοῦντο γάρ but he need not have done so. The evidence cannot prove that Mark never wrote more. It must rest, and this is its virtue, on the existing facts. But let us examine those 'existing facts', the section 16:1-8, to see if it is at all likely - though we may already note that the early scribes soon found that more needed to be added, and various endings were appended. We must consider, as a passing conjecture, whether the verses 9-20 could possibly have replaced some lost material. This seems unlikely, for, even if it was designed/

60. Also Mk. 16:6D: μὴ φοβησθε is followed by the news of Jesus' Resurrection.

61. Mk. 9:6.

designed to heal 'that gaping wound',<sup>62</sup> the anonymous composer<sup>63</sup> makes no grammatical connection with 16:8 and thoughtlessly writes in total ignorance of the preceding paragraph.<sup>64</sup>

62. The phrase in Streeter's (op. cit. p. 336) with regard to the Shorter Conclusion.

63. The ascription to Aristion is unhelpful.

64. The thesis of E. Linnemann (ZTK 66, 1969 pp. 255ff.) ingeniously avoids the difficulties by suggesting vv. 15-20 are Marcan and that a tradition such as Matthew uses in Mt. 28:16f., recording an appearance to Peter was replaced by the present summary in vv. 9-14. This also resolves Matthew's treatment of Mark but the vocabulary is placed under considerable strain;  $\pi\rho\omega\theta\iota\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$  (16:15), found in the Matthew parallel, is definitely not Marcan (see p. 56 section 9), although the  $\omicron\upsilon\nu$  in Matt. 28:19 is dropped - a word which Mark also rarely uses (p. 56 section 8). Note too the Lucan favourite  $\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$   $\delta\upsilon\nu$  in Mk. 16:19; if Mk. 16:15-20 were written by Mark, there would be numerous anticipations of the stories in Acts (see below). But the present state of the texts makes the theory dubious (K. Aland ZTK 67, 1970 pp. 1-13). Farrer (see note 55) provides also a conclusion similar to 16:15 - and a textual point in favour of this reconstruction (though here, ironically, it probably is a case of a mutilated manuscript) is that D ends at 16:15. G.W. Trompf (NTS 18, 1972 p. 328) argues that a second edition totally replaced Mark's earlier conclusion.

It seems as though our writer has condensed as much edifying material as he could,<sup>65</sup> completing the Gospel from available stories as best he could, but perhaps even summarising in particular the ending of Mark as it was known to him (and if it was known to him). He talks of speaking in tongues,<sup>66</sup> casting out demons,<sup>67</sup> picking up serpents (a curious feat to single out)<sup>68</sup> and drinking, without hurt, any poisonous thing.<sup>69</sup> Such anticipations of events recorded in Acts are too specific to suggest anything other than that the writer of these words knew the stories recorded in books like Acts. If he was completing Mark's Gospel from memory - and this must remain as complete conjecture - then he may have known that the extent of that conclusion contained stories such as those found in Acts.<sup>70</sup>

65. Typical is the view of B.W. Bacon: Mark (1925) "it adjusts to the Lucan tradition" (p. 189).

66. Mk. 16:17, Ac. 2:4, 10:46.

67. Mk. 16:17 cp. Ac. 8:7.

68. Mk. 16:8, Ac. 28:3-6.

69. Mk. 16:18 - no equivalent in Acts, but Eusebius (H.E. 3:39:9) records that Papias spoke of Justus Barabbas, who was "after the ascensioꝝ" presented as a candidate for the apostolate (Ac. 1:23), experiencing just such a miracle.

70. For a conjectural reason for the situation which raised the need for this longer ending see p. 105.



To return however to Mk. 16:1-8 all the Synoptics agree with Mark in giving pride of place to the story of the Empty Tomb<sup>71</sup> - though the purpose of the women's visit is obscure.<sup>72</sup> For the Evangelists, however, it was essential to first establish that Jesus' tomb was empty, if they wished to show Jesus alive with his friends - otherwise it might be objected that their Resurrection stories were merely those of someone passing himself off as the Christ. This does not prove that Mark had to continue in this way, but if Mark was faced with the choice (for whatever reason)<sup>73</sup> of only being able to write one story of the post-Crucifixion era, which incident would he choose?

71. Though it is not certain that Luke was using Mark for this tradition - cp. p. 33 v. 6.
72. Matthew (28:1), deliberately changes the reason given in Mk. 16:1 (=Lk. 24:1). John has no explanation.
73. Probably this would be lack of space. Mark's ad hoc style makes it improbable that he used the Transfiguration story as a subtle indication of the Resurrection (he might have seen some connection). But if it is "immoral to invoke accident" as the reason for a lost ending (Farrer p. 144), it is surely equally wrong to excuse Mark (on circumstantial evidence) from writing anything about Jesus as Resurrected Lord among his followers. Mk. 14:28 knows that this actually happened.

As it stands, the purpose of this pericope of Mark is to announce that Jesus is risen<sup>74</sup> and that the women must tell 'the disciples and Peter' (Mk. 16:7a) that in Galilee:

ἔκτισ' αὐτῶν ὄψεσθαι —

this promise being an effective conclusion to the Gospel, were it not for the silence of the women in 16:8, which not only strikes a sour note alien to the glorious news<sup>75</sup>, but also renders the promise as meaningless. Mark's readers may have known that Jesus did appear to his followers, but to me, Mark seems the kind of writer who likes to state even the obvious in order to make his point.<sup>76</sup> Matthew (28:7) who relates a Resurrection appearance therefore includes the above promise of Mark, on this understanding. He removes the special reference to Peter because he has no appearance to Peter to record. Luke omits the reference altogether. It is reasonable to suppose/

74. Mk. 16:6 (where Jesus is "the Nazarene" (not D), a description not in the parallels, and perhaps slight support for an eyewitness tradition).
75. As the conclusion to the book we may quote Knox (art. cit. p. 22) who argues that "it suits the technique of a highly sophisticated type of modern literature".
76. cp. for example, the exact fulfillment of Jesus' words seen in Mk. 11:1-6, 14:12-16. Whilst some of this may be inherent in the pre-Markan tradition, the laboured repetition concerning the Fig Tree indicates this is a Marcan trait. The whole point of the Three Passion Predictions lies in Mark's showing their fulfillment.

suppose that Matthew's copy of Mark had no Peter appearance - for would not Matthew have copied this, had it been to hand? However we cannot answer this decisively in the affirmative, for it is scarcely credible that there were no oral traditions circulating, known to Matthew, on this subject. The only one preserved for us in the Gospels is appended in John 21, but whether this was originally a post-Resurrection story is open to some doubt.<sup>77</sup>

But it is probable that Matthew, although he himself continues with material after Mk. 16:8 in his parallel, knew no more of that Gospel than *καὶ οὐδὲν οὐδὲν εἶπεν· ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.* for although he naturally wants to alter this decisive statement, he only replaces it with a note as to the women's intention of announcing the news (Mt. 28:8), endorsing it with a similar command from the Risen Jesus (28:10): in this section, the actual moment of revelation is assumed. This does not, of course, prove that Mark himself ended at 16:8, but it demonstrates that, at the time of Matthew, such an ending was probably in circulation. If a first volume, thus concluded, then we may say that the second volume did not come into Matthew's possession.

77. cp. also Jn. 20:3ff. (Lk. 24:12).

Mk. 16:7 then repeats the promise of 14:28, which the women,, not being present at that occasion, could not be expected to understand; hence this might be a legitimate cause for their fear,<sup>78</sup> but they do not confide in anybody. This notice keeps up the theme of human perversity<sup>79</sup> which so characterises Mark's Gospel for earlier, just when silence had been commanded, the news has spread (1:44f.) and, in fact, the more Jesus charged them, the more widely they published it, (Mk.7:36).<sup>80</sup>

78. despite R. Bultmann: History of the Synoptic Tradition (ET 1963) p. 283 who claims 16:7 is secondary: the news of the Resurrection thus causing fear. But unless 16:7 is non-Marcan (but compare  $\sigma\tau\iota$ , recit and  $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ , Marcan words) the thought of Mark links the fear with the announcement of 16:7. We may argue that if 16:8 followed on from 16:6 the Gospel would conclude more satisfactorily - 16:7 would then come after this reading: 'but Jesus went before them into Galilee as he had told them.' As it is, Mk. 16:8, coming after the promise of 16:7, effectively marks the end of one stage in the story - in itself Mk. 16:1-8 is complete (so Bultmann, p. 285 v. 2).
79. The phrase is from A. Farrer: The Glass of Vision (1948) p. 143.
80. Thus the command in 16:7 is essential to the balancing note of silence; without it, the women might have told someone! Now Jesus has to take the lead.

What then does Mark intend by 16:8?

Firstly the  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  and although we must not build upon Mark's use of  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  too much, we may note:

(i) that he has not used  $\circ\tilde{\nu}$  so that  
 (ii) the last half of verse 8 is to be taken separately from the first, therefore, (iii) a later period of time is indicated i.e. after they come into contact with someone to whom they could (though they did not, Mark tells us) have proclaimed the message. Thus it forms the generalised conclusion to the story and the section is at an end. The length of time that is presupposed cannot naturally be determined, but it may be significant that Mark (unless, as I think unlikely, this is pre-Marcian tradition<sup>81</sup>) shows himself aware of something beyond the Empty Tomb story. He knows enough to say that the women were silent. This does not prove that Mark could not have finished the whole Gospel at 16:8, but why does he, on this premise, make it all so awkward by suggesting silence: why not merely indicate their disbelief?

81. Besides this motif of perversity, cp. the double negative, typical of Mark (Taylor, Mark p. 46).

Turning to a question we can answer precisely, the most obvious question pressing after  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota$   $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota$  is, why? This is explained in the last words of 16:8. The reason for the fear, however, being characteristically not given, we are none the wiser! It is more puzzling when we recall that, according to Mark, silence after the Resurrection is misplaced.<sup>82</sup>

It is just possible that Mark has some person or persons in mind when he states that  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota$  were told. Does it mean the disciples were not informed? But were they still in Jerusalem?<sup>83</sup> Again the evidence is ambiguous but if we use the argument from silence the answer (from Mark) is no - for they are not mentioned after their flight (14:50) except for Peter, who does no more than deny Jesus. If Mark was a native of Jerusalem, he might have been expected to throw some incidental light upon their sojourn in Jerusalem, which was in hiding according to Luke (24:33,49). He is unable to appeal to the disciples as witnesses to the Crucifixion so had they fled because they were aware of the traitorous defection of Judas?<sup>84</sup> He knew the haunts of the twelve. (Jn. 18:2)

82. Mk. 9:9 - see p. 91.

83. See pp. 85ff. also.

84. Would the upper room be booked for more than a night or two?

Jn. 21 - though earlier John asserts their continuation in the upper room (Jn. 20:19) - asserts their presence in Galilee, as a presupposition of the manifestation of Jesus.<sup>85</sup> Would it not be natural for them to flee, despite their concern for the Master, in the face of Jesus' arrest? A hideout in the vicinity of their own Galilee, if not their actual homes, would be safer. Such a reconstruction would explain Mark's narrative for the disciples would be returning to Galilee,<sup>86</sup> so that the women could not tell them of the good news, even if their fear could be conquered.

We must also ask why Luke shows that Jerusalem was the only place of the Resurrection appearances.<sup>87</sup> He certainly knows the disciples did not stay inside the city precincts (Lk. 24:13ff., Ac. 1:12) but his presentation is essentially a theological one. His account of the empty tomb is dull, even lifeless, beside the vivid parallels: Luke shows that/

85. Despite Mt. 28:16 which has assumed the apostles were elsewhere than Galilee before the appearance, cp. Gospel of Peter 14:58 "many were returning to their homes", and 14:60 which portrays Peter resuming his former trade, cp. also Briggs op. cit. pp. 117f.: "It is unlikely that the disciples would remain in Jerusalem more than a week after Passover..... they would naturally go to their homes in Galilee."

86. cp. Lk. 24:13 - Huffmann JBL 64 (1945) derives the whole Emmaus Road story from the lost Marcan ending.

87. cp. p. 19. The problem is discussed on pp. 120-122.

that the prophetic event has been fulfilled in Jerusalem. For this reason he may have not reported the Galilean stories of the Resurrection - or he may have thought the return to Galilee, and then back to Jerusalem, a pointless extravagance. Once the Gospel had arrived in Jerusalem, the first stage of its outreach to Rome, "there was no turning back" to Galilee.<sup>88</sup>

Thus  $\delta\upsilon\delta\omega\iota$  may refer only to the followers who remained in Jerusalem, the women (of Mk. 15:41) who went to the tomb, did not tell the others.

$\epsilon\pi\omicron\beta\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\omicron \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  explains this silence, albeit most tantalisingly. The intention may be to illustrate the women's fear of spreading this news to witnesses, who might 'leak' the information so that it reaches the ears of the authorities. They tell no-one, also, because the message is for the disciples.

To sum up; is it sufficient to close the whole work on a note of promise? -  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\iota\grave{\nu} \alpha\acute{\nu}\tau\omicron\nu \delta\psi\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota$  highlights not only the fact of 'seeing' Jesus but the place. In Mk. 14:15 there is a similar prophetic use of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\iota\grave{\nu}$  where there is an immediate fulfillment. If Mark now relates after these words, the silence of the women, is it not to avoid such an indirect announcement/

88. M.S. Enslin ZNW 61 (1970) p. 261.



announcement of the Resurrection to his disciples? The characteristic silence removes the women from the stage in order to present the Risen Jesus in direct confrontation with the disciples. The women's neglect, means that again Jesus will take the initiative.

The evidence that Mk. 16:8 is the ending is not conclusive; therefore the way is open for us to analyse Acts to see if Mark could have continued with some such material. What we have established is that, if Mark did continue, some meeting in Galilee is a requirement, though the form in which this continuation was written must remain speculative. For myself, I find the idea of a Lost Ending not a little unsatisfactory; the 'accident' theory has so many difficulties for it must have been very early (to one of the first copies), but then could not Mark or someone else have rewritten it from memory?

But if we grant that a Resurrection appearance is a necessity, can we not imagine the compiler of Mark hitting upon the novel idea, which Luke followed, of dividing up his good news into The Ministry of Jesus and The Ministry of the Church? The distinction between two volumes is not so decisive as those titles imply, yet we must beware of ascribing to the genius of Luke the Two Volumes Format for Christian writing. If Mark himself continued in this fashion  $\xi\phi\upsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\delta\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\gamma$  may have been the right point to stop the first stage/

stage of the proceedings, for any ordinary reader, if not every theologian, would immediately perceive more was to come! Hence we may, only tentatively, suggest a sequence of events:

1. Mark writes Part One and Part Two.
2. Luke incorporates Part One in his Gospel and Part Two in the Acts, as one of his sources.
3. Mark becomes redundant. But an interest in the Gospel stories secures the preservation of Part One - but even Luke's "Acts" is little used, and Mark's Part Two is of no great interest, and disappears.
4. With renewed interest in Mark as a canonical entity its contents are found to conclude at 16:8. The reason for this has now been obscured.

4 - A C T S

In order to keep the present study within reasonable limits, our analysis of Acts will mostly be confined to those passages where we expect to be most likely to achieve some positive conclusions; the basis of selection of passages for discussion being the word counts summarised in the Appendix. The outcome of these initial soundings was that some of the Peter stories in Acts deserve further investigation<sup>1</sup> for the figures we obtained were too exceptional to be a freak result. Nevertheless we did not exclude such a possibility:<sup>2</sup> - either such a result may be seen positively, in the incorrect highlighting of a section as Marcan where in reality there is no Marcan source, or negatively, in the failure to indicate by a high statistic somewhere where there is (assuming the argument) a Marcan source. This last is important for there may be, in fact, there must be, sections of Acts in which the statistics, which by nature are precise, fail to help/

1. See pp. 53f., summarising earlier results and p. 61.
2. See p. 54 for possible freak results, and below for justification for the exclusion from discussion of these passages.

help us where they ought, because we are dealing with a hypothesis and not examining an argument for direct authorship, but a source held to underlie the book in question.

The first kind of freak result may partially be detected by scrutiny of the total result - where a section occurs in isolation (e.g. 19:8-20) the chances are that it has no Marcan connection. We may illustrate this from the results obtained from Matthew and John; there is no obvious connecting link between those paragraphs which have a high yield of such words, in the same way as we found with the Marcan figures some correlation in the Peter sections. Thus the present study will not deal with the passages in the later chapters of Acts - 19:8-20, 23:31-35.<sup>3</sup>

The other type of freak result cannot of course be measured statistically - we can partly compensate for this position by extending our study to those passages, which show some affinity to passages which have produced a high Marcan count.

3. i.e. we will only be concerned with Acts 1-15 (or parts thereof). It might be argued that there is something wrong with our methodology, since in delineating sections of Acts, most small sections come in Acts 1-12 and, as we have said, smaller sections produce more erratic figures (cp. pp. 24, 31, 52) - and so it is not surprising that we have been able to exclude later chapters of Acts from discussion. But notice the figures of Matthew and John produce as many 'high-deviation' sections in Acts 13-28 as Acts 1-12.

Thus we should discuss all the 'Peter' sections. We should also include those paragraphs which have, on other grounds, given the impression to us or to others of being possibly Marcan. Foremost here is the opening chapter, which not only would be the most probable place, a priori, of finding a trace of any 'lost' Marcan Ending, but also may be included into the study on the basis of its characteristically Marcan (i.e. rather than Lukan) preference for  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  against  $\delta\epsilon$  .

Other passages which have grounds for inclusion are Acts 6/7<sup>4</sup> and 9:19b-30<sup>5</sup> as well as other passages with 'high' Marcan deviation figures: 2:42-47, 4:32-~~37~~<sup>37</sup>.

In effect we are now proposing to discuss nearly the whole of Acts 1-12<sup>6</sup>, plus some material in 13-15.

But from the statistics (if we may return there as our working basis) we see that the overall figures for Acts suggest no greater Marcan influence in the first than the last half of the Acts. I therefore propose/

4. See pp: 7f., 83, 86f..
5. See pp. 74f..
6. only excluding 2:5-13, 4:23-31, 5:12-14, 34-42, 8:4-13 but since these passages are surrounded by, and even integral to the adjacent Peter sections I have included them in discussion - if only briefly. Excluded also are 8:26 - 9:19. 11:19-30, 12:18-25.

propose to discuss briefly now those places where our "impressions" (see above) are probably wrong and the statistics reliable. Inevitably this has the danger of being subjective (this is unavoidable in any analysis of sources of Acts) but this is only because the basis of the choice of that section was in the first place subjective, rather than based on any statistical information and this is the one element in this present study which, though not always reliable, has the merit of being objective.<sup>7</sup> I do not rule out "impressions", but it will be profitable, although it is always a rash writer who dulls his reader with a negative opening, to first discard from discussion passages which we ought to investigate, but whose results will yield no positive support for our thesis. This does not mean that all the remaining passages requiring discussion will comprise our proposed Marcan source - but the sequence of thought will be clearer if we remove certain passages at this point.

Firstly the Stephen story (Acts 6:1 - 8:3) which is independent of the Peter stories, having some believe, affinities with the later Antioch stories (11:19ff.)<sup>8</sup>. The only reason that has prompted suppositions of a Marcan source is the episode of the false/

7. See pp. 22.

8. So 11:19 continues from the notice in 8:3.

false witnesses (6:11-15), the whole complex being very un-Marcan in vocabulary. Marcan words in this portion (6:11-15) are the characteristic  $\xi\tau$  recitative (6:11,14)<sup>9</sup>. It is also possible to distinguish two accounts of Stephen's martyrdom.<sup>10</sup> This may be an example of Luke fusing together, and rather badly, two sources but, whether one of these was a Marcan source is more doubtful. There is little that is specifically Marcan in either of these accounts:—except for (7:57,60) which occurs in both of the alleged sources and which thus does not facilitate the tracing of a Marcan outline. And, although this is not decisive, it will be seen that this story does not fit into our reconstruction of a Marcan source. It is more probable that it comes from an independent tradition which possibly already knew of the traditions of the false witnesses that Mark relates, drawing out this parallel with Stephen's own martyrdom.

The second, and last set of passages requiring treatment here is the material concerning John Mark in Acts. We will lay some stress on his mention at 12:12 - but, as far as statistics are concerned, there is little Marcan influence to be traced in most of these passages.

9. These may be examples of the expression being used in legal or semi-legal formulations; see also Mk. 2:16, 14:69, Jn. 10:36, Ac. 11:3.
10. See refs. in Dupont op. cit. p. 39.

Mark is referred to:

(i) at 12:12 - only one Marcan word in the story (12:11-17).

(ii) at 12:25 a summary passage, preparing for 13:5.<sup>11</sup>

(iii) at 13:5<sup>12</sup> - as accompanist to Paul and Barnabas.

In this section (13:4-12) there are Marcan words, even

above the average:  $\mu\sigma\theta\iota\sigma\mu\eta\nu\acute{\iota}\nu\sigma\mu\alpha\iota\tau$ ,  $\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma(\theta\epsilon)\ddagger$  (13:8),

$\delta\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma \ddagger$  (13:10),  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu \ddagger$  (13:11),

$\delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta\ast$  (13:12). Mark does not actually do much,

and he is only mentioned to prepare for

(iv) 13:13 where he leaves the company of the two.

This prepares us for the point of his inclusion into the Acts narrative:

(v) 15:37,39 where Paul and Barnabas quarrel over Mark's reliability - 15:38 referring back to Mark's earlier defection at 13:13. In this section (15:36-41) there is again a minimum of support for a Marcan source,  $\omega\sigma\tau\iota$  being the only Marcan word of note.

Thus, while it would seem surprising, and perhaps even disappointing, the evidence for a Marcan source in these paragraphs is negative. With the possible exception of 12:12<sup>13</sup> all the references to John Mark are requisite/

11. The omission of Mark's name at 13:1 is probably not "remarkable" (pace P. Schmiedel in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (1899) p. 44), if he was so unreliable (v. below).
12. See also p. 29.
13. against the view of Haenchen op. cit. p. 341 that his name is here editorial, see p. 235.



requisite for our understanding of the quarrel that arose between Barnabas and Paul. Whether this was the real cause of the dispute is doubtful (cp. Gal. 2:13). This may explain the prominence given by Luke to John Mark in these chapters: a minor disagreement over his reliability is made to cover a more serious friction over Gentile fellowship. But it is still interesting that Luke selects Mark for this role, and there may be intended an implicit recognition of his value as a writer in 13:5, perhaps even extending to an acknowledgement of the information Mark has supplied for material in Luke and the first part of Acts. But that a Marcan source should not have related a story which discredited John Mark need not surprise us..

This brings us back to our Marcan source hypothesis. Each of the sub-sections discussed will be headed by a list of the words which have comprised the statistic (where applicable) which prompted the suspicion of Marcan influence. We also list, in parallel, Lucan characteristic words (as outlined on pp. 31f.), so that where a concentration of such words appears, it will be clear that Luke has rewritten his material, if not freely composed it. On the other hand, a concentration of Marcan words will be equally helpful in determining with more particular confidence, the original intent of the Marcan source. Words from Matthew and John are also included to act as a check on too much speculation.

Acts 1:1-5 Prologue

Verse    Lucan Words.    Marcan Words.    Matthaen Words.    Johannine<sup>14</sup> Words.

---

1. εἰς τῆ			
2. ἀπόστολος, ἁγίου	κηρύσσειν ≠ ἐὺ ἀγγέλιον* (D Cop 867)	2	0
3. τὰ ...		(D=5)	
4.	χωρίζειν ≠		
5.			

Unlike the prologue to Luke's Gospel, the one in Acts is not sharply distinguished from the following contents.<sup>15</sup> After a brief introductory notice, and in a way not dissimilar from Mk. 1:1ff., the writer looks back: in the case of Acts to the Gospel story, and in particular the apostolic commission.<sup>16</sup> In this way, the characters of the opening story are established, although Luke has already described the fellowship of Jesus with his followers/

14. Future lists at the head of Acts' sections will also consist of four columns, the left one being a list of Lucan characteristics (see pp. 31f.) and then from left to right: Marcan words (see p. 50) and Matthaen/Johannine words (see p. 50).

15. On verses 1-5 as the whole of the actual prologue Bruce ad loc., G. Stahlin, *Apostelgeschichte* (1966) p. 15, Williams op. cit. pp. 54f., BC 4 p. 2, BC5 pp. 1ff. The scribe of D also marks Ac. 1:6 as the start of a new paragraph.

16. Ac. 1:2 (non-western) covers the story to the Ascension.

followers (Lk. 24:43, Ac. 1:4) and the Ascension (Lk. 24:51<sup>17</sup>, Ac. 1:9-11). It is interesting that the characters are introduced in this indirect way because the Ascension story in verses 6-11 does not identify any of the witnesses specifically. Yet is there any positive indication in the content of Ac. 1:1-5 to support the possibility which we discussed above,<sup>18</sup> that the passage has been influenced by the opening of Mark's Gospel?

Verse One opens with a  $\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$  clause without a subsequent  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ . This <sup>is</sup> ~~is~~ in character with Acts<sup>19</sup> - yet the absence of the complementary particle might indicate that Luke was almost immediately (in 1:1b) beginning to use some source.<sup>20</sup> It is difficult to imagine Luke freely composing this introductory section (1:1-5). As punctuated in Tischendorf, for example/

17. om.  $\lambda^*\Delta$  (see p. 120 n. 37).

18. pp. 64-69.

19. Luke one, Acts nine times (including  $\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$   $\acute{\omicron}\nu\upsilon$  without  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  ).

20. It is improbable that Acts 1:1a was added as a frontispiece (Clark p. 408) for why did not this improver revise the whole of 1:1-5? (P. Menoud BZNW 21 (1954) argues that 1:1-5 is non-Lucan).

example it consists of one sentence, long and with an awkward transition from indirect to direct speech. This may be a classical usage,<sup>21</sup> but it is most inelegant when set aside the Gospel preface.

The language has some connection with Mk. 1:1 ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is echoed in ἤρξατο Ἰησοῦς (Ac. 1:1), and the construction of ἄρχειν with two infinitives (only here in Acts) comes in Mark's Gospel six times, but in Luke's only twice.<sup>22</sup> Ἄρχειν + ποιεῖν is not found in Luke but comes once in Mark,<sup>23</sup> ἄρχειν with διδάσκειν is similarly absent from Luke but is employed four times in Mark.<sup>24</sup>

In verse two the Western text, besides omitting the Ascension reference,<sup>25</sup> has in addition: καὶ ἐκέλευσε κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (D sy<sup>hmg</sup> cop<sup>G67</sup> g. t) which is dismissed by many as a gloss,<sup>26</sup> but which nevertheless/

21. See E. Jacquier: Acts (1926) p. 13 who cites Luke 5:14. See also Mk. 6:8f..
22. Mk. 1:45, 10:47, 14:19, 33, 65, 71. Lk. 11:53, 13:25.
23. Mk. 2:23. ἄρχειν.
24. Mk. 4:1, 6:2, 34, 8:31.
25. i.e. in its reconstructed form (from some of Augustine's citations): for its originality: Ropes BC 3 pp. 256ff., Clark op. cit. p. 336.
26. So Ropes BC3 p. 256 repeated by Haenchen op. cit. p. 109. E.J. Epp: Codex Bezae (1966) p. 66 believes it an allusion to Lk. 24:47.

nevertheless yields two Marcan words. In fact it is probably part of the original Lucan text, for, as the Gospel of Luke commences with a framework set in the temple precincts (Lk. 1:9), there it concludes (Lk. 24:53). Acts' final words mention

Paul:

κηρύσσω τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ διδάσκων  
(Ac. 28:31)

which, according to the pattern in Luke, we would expect to be likewise balanced in the opening verses. Thus the theme of the Kingdom comes in Acts 1:3, the teaching in verse 1 and the preaching in the theme of the Western text of verse 2.

The Western Reading therefore may be from Luke's pen - and if also Ropes<sup>27</sup> is correct in claiming this whole verse in its original Western guise was Lucan, then it may be that the command to preach was dropped, for, whilst verses 3f. announce subsidiary features of the Ascension story, 1:2D was seen to announce the fact of the Ascension insufficiently clearly.

But could Luke have gleaned these words from a source?<sup>28</sup> Ephrem's commentary makes the statement (most surprising in view of Luke's stress upon Jerusalem):<sup>29</sup>

"in qua die iussit apostolos in Galilaea annuntiare evangelium."

27. BC3 pp. 259-261.

28. Also Lucan is κηρύσσειν - not in Mark but 18 times in Acts. (om. g t).

29. See BC3 p. 384 - a latin translation of the original.

The reference points us back to Jesus' original calling and commission of the apostles where the Bezae text of Mk. 3:14 ends:

ἵνα ἀποστείλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.<sup>30</sup>

This last word, which Luke never uses in his Gospel<sup>31</sup> is a 'distinctive' Marcan characteristic - and the whole of the last phrase is found in Mark also at 1:14, 13:10 and also (16:15) which is exactly where Codex Bezae, primo manu, concludes. This fact might suggest a repetition (or even dittography<sup>32</sup>) from Mk. 16:15<sup>33</sup> - but the original reconstructed Western Text would defy this, with its glance back to "the day in which" Jesus chose the apostles in Galilee. But if this explanation is thought improbable, it remains interesting that we have here a reference to Galilee. Could it be the remains of a pre-Lucan tradition which describes an Ascension in Galilee?

30. Mk. 3:14D - other texts omit the final two words.

31. See p. 39 - But Luke will use it twice in Acts.

32. i.e. if Mark ever concluded at 16:15 (cp. Farrer's theory see p. 90 n. 55 and p. 94 n. 64). Even though 3 John intervenes (the hand may be later) Acts follows Mark in D.

33. The gloss could not be from Mt. 28:20 which reads διδάσκοντες.

But if the awkwardness of the construction in Acts 1:1-5 can be seen to indicate the possibility that Luke was dependent upon earlier material, what models were there to follow, unless Mark or some other had attempted already a similar task? We can point to some Marcan features in these verses:

ἤρξατο Ἰησοῦς ... διδάσκειν ... τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ... καὶ  
 ἐκέλευσεν κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (λίγων) ὅτι  
 Ἰωάννης μὲν βάπτισεν ὕδατι 34 ...

Luke has added necessary references to Theophilus and Jesus' teaching that 'they' must remain in Jerusalem.

This theory still does not explain the very unrefined style of this opening, which affords some confirmation of Williams' suggestion that our copy of Acts is an early draft copy which Luke intended to revise.<sup>35</sup> If this theory does not satisfy (most authors usually take particular care over their first lines) it remains possible that some of the inelegance of verses 1-5 may be due to Luke expanding an original to emphasise the command/

34. i.e. ὅτι in 1:5 (on which see pp. 67f.) is ὅτι recit.

This very tentative reconstruction avoids the transition from indirect to direct speech - a surprising feature of this prologue.

35. See Williams, op. cit. pp. 12f..

command to stay in Jerusalem. Perhaps he did this because a Second Volume by Mark now came into his possession - and one which told of Jesus' appearances in Galilee. A polemic against the Galilean tradition might be suspected and the repetition after Lk. 24:47 of Ac. 1:4 may indicate the renewal of that polemic, perhaps as a result of Luke's reception of such a Marcan story. This cannot be proved, principally because we do not know just how Mark's Gospel did continue. But if it was used by Luke as source material for Acts 1, we may all agree that Luke would have had to recast the Galilean setting. It is more than likely that he omitted some story or stories,<sup>36</sup> but is the one he chooses to narrate of Marcan origin?

Acts 1:6-12: Ascension.

6. ἐρωτᾶν [not DE 614]		
7. πρὸς		
8. τὲ, Ἱερουσαλήμ		
9. ἐπαίρειν [not Δ]		2
10. καὶ ἀποθ., ὡς, ἀνὴρ		1
11. ἀνὴρ		
12. ὑποστρέφειν, καλούμενος, Ἱερουσαλήμ [bis, exc E]	παρίστημι ἐμβλέπειν (L <sup>c</sup> ACB)	

36. Notably, perhaps, the account of the flight to Galilee, but cp. p. 102 n. 86.



- Marcan style: (i) Asyndeton (1:7B)  
 (ii) "Sideline" (1:12)

Luke has been reminding us of the events of the pre-Ascension period, elaborating the themes of Lk. 24, but instead of also informing us again that the scene was enacted *ἐως πρὸς βηθσαϊαν* <sup>37</sup> our knowledge of the venue is assumed.<sup>38</sup> We are however told at Acts 1:12 that the return to Jerusalem is from the mount called Olives, which is near to Jerusalem. Conzelmann believes that this "flatly contradicts" Luke 24<sup>39</sup> - but although it is true that the site is not exactly the same, it is clear Luke has in mind the same vicinity: (in a paraphrase of 1:12b) it was still in the environs of Jerusalem. In other words Luke has reformed this verse/

37. I have assumed the omission of the Ascension reference in Luke to be a harmonising attempt. (If correct, the book of Luke ends as an amazing anticlimax as Mark). Acceptance of the Western reading here is too often regarded as a concession which has no implication for the general alleged unreliability of D. ( *λ\** also supports the omission in Lk. 24:51) H. Conzelmann: *Theology* (ET 1960) p. 203 n. 4 appears to note these textual implications.
38. Unless S. Wilson (ZNW art. cit. p. 271 n. 13) we allow that Luke may have forgotten what he had written in Lk. 24 - but then a reference to the place would needs be more imperative especially if "in Acts Luke is forced to think more about the order and timing of the post-Resurrection events."
39. Conzelmann op. cit. p. 94 cp. W.J. Wilson HTR 11 (1918) says Ac. 1:12 "comes peculiarly and unexpectedly" (p. 85). The technique is Johannine: Jn. 1:28, 6:59, 8:20.

verse to demonstrate that the command of Jesus (Ac. 1:4) had not been technically transgressed though would Luke's readers have comprehended v. 12b? Here there is the uncharacteristic repetition of the same form of 'Jerusalem' which highlights Luke's Zion theology, but which only prompts our enquiry of why such an 'insistence'?. Let us return for a moment to that early glimpse of the Ascension in the Transfiguration,<sup>40</sup> which Luke transforms out of its Galilean setting to anticipate the 'exodus' of Jesus in Jerusalem (Lk. 9:31). Following this clue, Strobel turns to Luke's treatment of Mark's Galilean prophecy (Mk. 14:27f.) and argues that Luke has followed up the prophecy derived from Zechariah in Mk. 14:27 with another from Zech. 14:4, words which are fulfilled as Jesus reaches the Mount of Olives (Lk. 22:39, Ac. 1:12)<sup>41</sup>; thereby he suppresses the Galilean tradition. Similarly, Luke avoids the the intention of Mk. 16:7 whilst still referring to Galilee (Lk. 24:6); and thus the promise  $\text{ὁ ἅγιος πνεῦμα}$  (Ac. 1:11) might reflect a further adaptation by Luke of the Galilean tradition.<sup>42</sup>

40. See pp. 80f..

41. Strobel art. cit. p. 144.

42. So, in general Strobel, *ibid* pp. 138f..

Another hint of a Galilean setting may be seen in 1:11 where the apostles are addressed as *ἀδελφοί Γαλιλαῖοι*, no doubt a correct description of most of them, but the formula, although typical of Acts,<sup>43</sup> might be more explicable if an original was set in Galilee. 1:8 lends some support to the contention. This important statement of Luke's intention<sup>44</sup> emphasises that the witnesses of the event will, in time, be witnesses of Jesus firstly "in Jerusalem" then to the ends of the earth. These words, another example of Luke's Zion focus, surely imply a setting anywhere but in Jerusalem. Quite possibly Luke has adapted his material which indicated that the disciples were to return to Jerusalem and from there they will be led to all Judaea and Samaria. There is no mention of Galilee - but this is because that place is the setting of these words.<sup>45</sup>

43. The phrase comes also at Ac. 2:7 where it is editorial, but as at Mk. 14:70 there it is a question of dialect.
44. cp. B. Gerhardsson: *Memory and Manuscript* (1961) p. 216.
45. In similar vein K. Rengstorf *ST* 15 (1961) p. 54. This supposition is made as early as A. Clarke: *Acts* (1836) p. 707 and J.B. Lightfoot *Horae Hebraicae* 4 (1859) pp. 8f. (only of Ac. 1:4f.). E. Lohmeyer says "it would not be named because it is already a terra christiana." (*Galilaea* 1936 p. 52) - but this fails to allow for Luke's pro-Jerusalem tendency, which results in the playing down of Galilean Christianity.

Having established the possibility that Galilee could have been the original setting for this scene, we will return to the commencement of the paragraph at 1:6, marked as so often by the editor with  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\circ\acute{\upsilon}\nu$  46.  $\Sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\lambda\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  after  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\lambda\iota\zeta\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  is unnecessary<sup>47</sup> and redundant<sup>48</sup>, not merely repetitive<sup>49</sup>, since the editor has not yet indicated (what he intends) that a change of setting has occurred. The implication of 1:6 is that the scene is the same as the vague one mentioned at 1:4, and from that verse we already know they are together.

If Luke was therefore beginning to incorporate a source from this point (i.e. rather than from 1:1 as we posited above), who, we may ask, were the "they", whom Luke carelessly fails to identify? The editor refers back, in most clumsy fashion, to  $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  in verse 2. But if our Galilean supposition is correct, then a source may have envisaged a crowd more like the 500 of 1 Cor. 15:5. On this premise, the sudden introduction of about/

46. Thus also: Ac. 8:4, 9:31, 11:19 and perhaps 2:41, 8:25, 15:3 - against Cerfaux art. cit. p. 671 who claims it is used to contrast v. 5.

47. Hence  $\lambda^*$  reads  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ .

48. So: G. Schille ZNW 57 (1966) p. 186.

49. despite S. Wilson ZNW art. cit. p. 273. The exact meaning of the word is irrelevant here, as almost certainly the basic idea is the togetherness of Jesus with his apostles.

about 120 people in Ac. 1:15 is explicable, since Luke's original depicted just such a generalised appearance. Luke, in the interests of providing a specific commission to the Eleven, has adapted the tradition to this end by a clever use of ambiguity.

The postulated Marcan account requires the prominence of Peter (cp. Mk. 16:7), but he is not specifically singled out in the story of Ac. 1:6-12. When however he becomes the spokesman of the apostles (1:15)<sup>50</sup>, this is not substantiated in any way. The reader of Mark has been prepared for Peter's post-Resurrection leadership,<sup>51</sup> but the Lukan student, although told of Peter's willingness to follow Jesus to death (Lk. 22:33) has last heard of Peter in connection with his defection (Lk. 22:61f.). Later scribes felt obliged to remove this discrepancy and the following attempts are made:

- (i) Lk. 22:62 is omitted<sup>52</sup>
- (ii) Lk. 24:12 is added from Jn. 20:3ff..<sup>53</sup>

50. Now he is "the unchallenged leader" (Parker NTS art. cit. p. 296). See p. 144.

51. He is singled out in Mk. 16:7.

52. Om. 0171 and some Latin mss..

53. by ABW<sup>o</sup> 0124 f1 f13.

(iii) Lk. 24:34 is interpreted as a reference to an appearance to Peter.<sup>54</sup>

Peter's dominance in the early chapters of Acts is easily explained on the assumption that a 'Peter' source is being employed, which material would be forgiven for not justifying Peter's sudden and continued position as head of the Twelve.

Returning to Ac. 1:6, the question posed is entirely in accord with the tradition that Mark gives, that up to the very end the disciples and crowd were mostly unaware of the significance of Jesus' words and actions, they had constantly misunderstood him. Luke uses the question to reaffirm the theological viewpoint of the mission that he is about to describe, but at the expense of making "the disciples appear incredibly foolish;"<sup>55</sup> for has not Luke himself just described/

54. So O. Cullmann: Peter (1962) pp. 60f., Streeter op. cit. p. 344 etc.; but the variant reading of D: ~~ἀκούει~~ makes for a much smoother sense, for why should Cleopas and his friend now be told of the News? The pericope is concerned with their good news, so v. 35 (confirmed by Mk. 16:13), and they would hardly tell the eleven (Lk. 24:33) that Jesus had appeared to Simon (Peter). Simon, the unnamed companion of Lk. 24:13 might be the Tanner (Ac. 9:43) whose house in Joppa may have been the goal of the journey in Lk. 24:13f.. The avoidance of naming Simon directly (parallel to the ambiguity over the 'they' in Acts 1) is understandable: cp. p. 143.

55. Haenchen, Studies p. 260.

described Jesus as instructing them about the Kingdom? It is unlikely that Luke deliberately created such a foolish question therefore, but from a Marcan account such a remark would have been quite in character: "the hardness of the disciples' hearts is apparent here as in Mark's Gospel."<sup>56</sup>

The form of their question<sup>57</sup> has already been eagerly put forward (not however by Luke)

Ἡλείαν δεῖ εἰθῆν πρῶτον; <sup>58</sup>  
 Ἡλείας μὲν εἰθῶν πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα, <sup>59</sup>  
 being Jesus' reply. The same type of selfish request is made in Mk. 10:37 (a story Luke omits) and again in Mk 10:26 whereas the amazed query of the disciples in Luke now issues from the mouths of the hearers (Lk. 18:26).<sup>60</sup> And in the same way, Jesus now tacitly corrects the notion, just as he generalises Peter's personal complaint (see Mk. 10:28f.) in Ac. 1:7. Jesus does not reject their/

56. Williams op. cit. p. 56.

57. Ἐπηρώτων : (Ac. 1:6 DE614) = Mk. 9:11.

58. Mk. 9:11 = Mt. 17:10.

59. Mk. 9:12 cp. Mt. 17:11. On this connection see J. García EB 8 (1949) pp. 112-114. This strengthens the link we have already forged between Transfiguration and Ascension.

60. This suggests it is improbable that Luke omitted the Marcan story in Mk. 9:9ff. merely to include it in Acts.

their nationalist fervour,<sup>61</sup> instead he points back to the time factor mentioned in verse 5 and urges restraint. Suspicions of a Marcan source must be strengthened by the echo of Mk. 13:32 in Ac. 1:7.

Their question shows that "they had not yet perceived that their position had fundamentally changed"<sup>62</sup> as Jesus had risen (cp. the attitude of the women in Mk. 16:8). The time was now ready for preaching (cp. Mk. 9:9) not to ask the time of arrival of their preconceived idea of the Kingdom. Luke does not hide this factor, yet his picture of the apostles in Acts certainly idealises their role in similar fashion as Luke alters in his Gospel some of the 'hard' remarks of and about the disciples.

↔ Jesus' reply in 1:8 announces the theme of Acts.

Van Unnik has examined the LXX background to the expression *ἕως ἰσχύου τῆς γῆς* and has concluded that the plural would have been used had Rome been intended.<sup>63</sup>

61. which shows itself at several points in the source - v. below.
62. K. Rengstorf: in *Current Issues* (1962) p. 186.
63. Van Unnik in *Biblica et Semitica* esp. p. 348, but cp. Ps. Sol. 8:15 which suggests that Luke does have in mind the Gentile mission (thus cp. Lk. 24:47) - but it remains possible that Luke's source understood the words in the more restricted sense. Van Unnik is criticised in C. Burchard *ZNW* 61 (1970) pp. 161-3.



He thus talks of this verses Palestinian horizon.<sup>64</sup> Such an understanding on the part of the disciples is demonstrated by the following story of the choice of a twelfth apostle appointed by the old Jewish custom of casting lots. It is psychologically probable that it was only slowly and then partly by force of circumstances,<sup>65</sup> that the wider implications of Jesus' words came to be realised and applied. This, as we will see, is the situation which Luke's source describes, whilst Luke himself heightens the emphasis on the divine guidance behind those events.

Verse 8, then, explains the nature of the forthcoming gift. The formulation is Lucan: note the ἐπιλθόντος used not only of the Spirit (Lk. 1:35) but also of the Last Day (Lk. 21:26, 35A), and the ἁγίου before Πνεύματος, a feature of Luke's style.<sup>66</sup> But the whole incident (v. 6-8) has been adapted by Luke, rather than freely composed, for why should Luke otherwise not have avoided the difficult question in 1:6, and so have been more specific as to Jesus' intention in 1:8?

64. Van Unnik NT 4 (1960) pp. 39f., Rengstorff ST 15 (1961) pp. 53-56.

65. i.e. persecution, explicitly seen in 11:19ff. where where persecution results in Greeks hearing the news. So also 12:1ff. (on this see pp. 76, 231). God uses suffering to further the news of the Kingdom.

66. Luke twice, Acts 7 (D = 8) times. Elsewhere in the N.T. only at Mt. 28:19, 1 Cor. 6:19, 2 Cor. 13:13.

When we reach the Ascension story (vv. 9-11), we discover a tale most briefly told. Jesus' name is assumed to be the singular subject of the event, although we have to refer to v. 1 to find it written down. The singular in v. 4 keeps him in view, but he is not named again until v. 11, and then only in reported speech.<sup>67</sup> This form which does create an element of suspense, is paralleled in Mk. 16:1-8 where Jesus' name first appears in 16:6 on the lips of the young man, whereas Luke's story introduces it earlier at Lk. 24:3.<sup>68</sup>

The Lucan introductory formula in Ac. 1:9 may possibly indicate that some material (obviously with a Galilean flavour) has been dropped. The brevity of the event is surprising. Nothing dramatic in this event, nothing heightened.<sup>69</sup> Luke is very repetitive so as to emphasise two main points:

1. The disciples are the witnesses of this event. It is to them that the promises are earlier made, and to them that a final promise is added in 1:11. Their presence is thus emphasised:

67. cp. Schille art. cit. p. 189.

68. Though D omits it here.

69. A similar judgement on Luke 24:1ff. on pp. 102f..

1:9 βλέποντων αὐτῶν  
 1:10 ὡς ἀτενίζοντες  
 1:11 ἐμβλέποντες [βλέποντες ΝΒΕ]

2. They will nevertheless see (1:11) Jesus again. His presence in heaven is repeated as an assurance of this fact and it is he who will be guiding their future:

1:10 εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν  
 1:11 εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν;  
 1:11 εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (om. D g t)  
 1:11 εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.

It is unusual for Luke to so obviously use this repetitive language, it is much more typical of Mark's own style. It would suggest that though the story may have been adapted by Luke to accommodate his Jerusalemite focus, he has kept the framework of his source's story intact. This is confirmed by the continual use of καί<sup>70</sup>, itself so unusual that it suggests a close dependence by Luke upon a written, not oral, source. A Marcan account, continuing on from 16:8 must be a strong contender for recognition, even if few of the words are Marcan, and some of the original has been obliterated, for the ideas and the viewpoint perfectly match what we would have expected from the author of the Second Gospel.

70. δὲ only at 1:7 ΝΑC.

ACTS 1:13-14: At Home.

13. | Ἰερουσόλαμοι | 0 | 0  
 14. σὺν, σὺν(BE) | προσκερταρῶν | 0 | 0

Luke's story of the Ascension concluded with the detail of the return to Jerusalem though possibly the source described the journey back from Galilee. 1:12b is added to cover up any such idea. The present verses describe the arrival in Jerusalem, setting the scene of the next chapters as well as rounding off the opening story.<sup>71</sup>

The difficulty surrounding the Galilean hypothesis above is that it is so laborious. The disciples, if indeed they did go back to Galilee would be unlikely to return once more to Jerusalem without good reason. Whether a command of Jesus to this effect was sufficient motivation for this exhausting sequence of events must be an open question. What can be said, is that the theory above explains the foundation of the Galilean Resurrection stories, which Luke in both his volumes has sought to simplify by their omission or adaptation.<sup>72</sup>

71. It is not a summary passage, despite Dibelius in *Eucharistion* 2 (1934) p. 34.
72. As we suggest with the Ascension story. A similar case of adaptation may be Lk. 5:1ff. out of Jn. 21:1ff. - on which see pp. 263-266.

The incident in v. 13f. is told with some detail. This might indicate an original eye-witness account. To establish this, it is first necessary to show that verse 13 refers to a specific house, already indicated in the text by the article before ὑπερῶν which implies the reader is already familiar with the place.<sup>73</sup> This must be the place (Mk. 14:14, Lk. 22:11) where Jesus had held his last supper.<sup>74</sup> In our support here, is the usage of the words καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθον which could refer to the city previously mentioned or to the house where was the upper room. Now the construction εἰσέλθωμαι without a following preposition is comparatively rare, but when it does occur in Acts it refers always to the entering of houses: Ac. 5:7,10, 9:12, 10:27, 12:16D.<sup>75</sup> An exact parallel to these words also comes in Mk. 14:14:

καὶ ὅπου εὐν εἰσέλθη εἴπατε...

where Luke makes Mark's words sound explicit:

... εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰς ἣν εἰσπορεύεται (Lk. 22:10)<sup>76</sup>

73. so, note the absence of the article at Ac. 9:37. (AC however add τὸ...)
74. The temple is not intended, despite B. Thurston ET 80 (1968) pp. 21f. (his evidence is derived from verses in 1 Chr.).
75. Similarly Mk. 5:39, 7:25N and Lk. 7:45, 8:51 (=Mk.), 11:26, 13:24, 15:28 all of which understand οἰκίαν. At Ac. 10:27 MS. 323 clarifies by adding εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν. In this kind of construction πόνον is never understood in Lk./Acts. (cf. Ac. 9:6).
76. cp. also p. 250 n. 309 for what follows.

The loose reference to a house in Ac. 1:13 accords well with Mark's own carefree but undetailed references to the same in his Gospel.<sup>77</sup>

Thus the picture of Ac. 1:13 is of "them" entering the house, and climbing up to the upper room,<sup>78</sup> a slight detail which any editor could write but would surely hardly bother to do so in this instance, since he has not yet expressed his subjects. Three verbs precede their mention.

If we are right in thinking that a special house was intended, we may further cite Ac. 2:2 and 12:12, where the same formula is used.<sup>79</sup> Is this the same house, the centre of activity of those Jerusalem followers? If it is, it provides a certain continuity in the Action of Acts 1-12. Ac. 12:12 has every appearance of being such a centre for Peter's arrival there as well as his hurried departure (12:17) and James' absence during this time of persecution are explicable in this light, for it would be dangerous to remain in a house probably known to the authorities.

77. See p. 57 section 15.

78.  $\mathcal{N}^*$  omits  $\delta\upsilon\beta\eta\sigma\alpha\upsilon$  but this is an attempted improvement. (similarly of  $\mathcal{N}$  in 1:6 - see p. 123 n. 47) resulting from the careless style of the writing. (cp. also Haefner art. cit. p. 69 and below).

79. Significantly also this comes in Lk. 22:10D of the Last Supper house. Also Ac. 20:8.

The link between Ac. 12:12 and 1:13 is often proposed,<sup>80</sup> and this verbal connection strengthens the hypothesis. A late tradition from Theodosius (c. 525) states:

"ipse fuit domus sancti marci".

Against this identification Lagrange argued that "at passover, why are not James, bishop of Jerusalem, and the brethren not at the official meeting place of the community? This testifies to the fact that John Mark's house was not the usual place of assembly".<sup>81</sup> But the circumstances in chapter 12 are exceptional,<sup>82</sup> persecution has driven James away from Jerusalem pro tempore.

We have now revealed the reason for the unnecessary detail in 1:13a, for if an account from Mark had described the return of the apostles to his house the use of το before ὑπάρχον (and perhaps τοῦ before οἶκον in 2:2) may have originally meant "our" house. Zahn adds the further conjecture, though it is incapable of substantiation, "and then what is there to prevent the son of a Christian household who in 44 was perhaps 30 or 35 years of age, from having witnessed some of the scenes in Jesus' life in the year 30 without his having been at the time one of those who heard and believed Jesus' preaching?"<sup>83</sup>

80. Originally by Zahn but less positively nowadays, e.g. Haenchen op. cit. p. 123 n. 2.

81. M. Lagrange RB 8 (1899) p. 595.

82. Similarly J. Lumby: Acts (1890) p. 150.

83. Zahn op. cit. pp. 428f. - cp. Harnack: Luke (ET 1907) p. 160.

The reading of D in 1:14 (not at present supported by other witnesses<sup>84</sup>), may provide some additional corroboration:

The inappropriateness of a mention of children among such a company may have led to the deletion of the phrase in other manuscripts and it is one of those Marcan details that could so easily be discarded,<sup>85</sup> for it is hard to see the point of such an inopportune embellishment.<sup>86</sup> There may be intended here 'the children/

84. But some latin support is found in a heading: "cum altricibus suis mulieribus" - see W. Thiele ZNW 53 (1962) p. 111.

85. cp. Streeter: the Bezan additions "are more often than not of the same character as the words and sentences in Mark which Matthew and Luke deem superfluous when they incorporate passages from that Gospel." (JTS 34 (1933) p. 235).

86. Ropes (BC 3 p. ccxxxiv) attributes the reading to an anti-feminist bias in D - this is based on passages such as Ac. 17:4,12. P. Menoud, however, has to admit that it is a "tendency more or less general in the last decades of the first century." (SNTS 2 (1951) p. 31) - does he mean then that the D. tradition emanates from this period? Commentators from Calvin onwards (e.g. Bruce op. cit. p. 74, B. Weiss: Der Codex D (1897) p. 54, BC4 p. 11) see in both textual traditions a reference to the wives (and children) of the apostles; but it is not at all certain that D's meaning can bear this interpretation: At Ac. 21:5 - whence some take this gloss (Clark op. cit. p. 4, Haenchen op. cit. p. 123 n. 6, Thiele art. cit. p. 110) - the latin (d) renders "mulier", which word may of course mean women or wives - but with regard to the usage in d, mulier is used at Ac. 5:14, 8:3,12, 17:12 and in the vulgate also at 9:2, 22:4 accompanied by "viri" - whilst when Acts clearly understands  $\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\eta$  in the sense of a married woman d always uses "uxor" - thus Ac. 5:1,2,7, 18:12 - "mulier" being left for indeterminate/  
(continued on next page)



children of the house' - and hence here is a passing reference to Mark, Mary's son. The D. reading implies that the writer could, if required, have mentioned them by name. The omission of the article in  $\mathcal{N}$ ABE may be preparatory to the abrupt mention of 120 in verse 15, therefore 1:14 in this version already attempts to give the impression of a larger group.<sup>87</sup>

86. indeterminate cases: Ac. 13:50, 16:1,13f., 17:4 also (cont)17:34h, 24:24 (Cass.) - and this rule is followed throughout the New Testament text of d (the only exceptions being Mt. 19:5,10). If the Bezan text understood the wives of the apostles to be meant at 1:14, it had the facility so to indicate - thus it seems more probable that it understands the meaning as "the women and children of the house".

Possibly the verse can be seen as a partial fulfillment of Mk. 10:30 (not in Luke) ...

D's reading in Ac. 1:14 strengthens the fulfillment. Cp. also the addition at Ac. 8:3 in Aeth 26: "young and children", just possibly gleaned from Ac. 1:14D.

87. Note the parallelism in D.

$\sigma\upsilon\upsilon$  τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τέκνων  
καὶ Μαρίας... καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ:

this furthers the parallelism in D at 1:13 (see Ropes, BC3 p. 6).

We come back now to the first list, that of the apostles in v. 13. This comes from a tradition independent of any in the Gospels, although Lucan features can be seen in the references to Simon as a Zealot and Judas James. For the first four names the list is closer to the Marcan one in that the relationship of Peter and Andrew is not recorded:

<u>Mark</u>	<u>Acts</u>	<u>Luke</u>
Πέτρον... Ἰακώβον.	Πέτρος... Ἰωάννης...	Πέτρον... Ἀνδρέαν...
Ἰωάννην... Ἀνδρέαν	Ἰακώβον... Ἀνδρέαν.	Ἰακώβον... Ἰωάννην.

The only difference between Mark and Acts here is the order of John and James. In Acts John is mentioned first because of his appearance in some of the Peter stories.<sup>88</sup> In Codex 614 the Acts order is exactly the same as that of Mark, though the reason/

88. Usually only as a sleeping partner, being mentioned by name at Ac. 3:1,3,4,11, 4:13,19, 8:14. Also in cop<sup>67</sup> at 4:15 (and h) 8:18,23.

reason for this slight change (unless it be original) cannot have been deliberate.<sup>89</sup>

As it occurs at this particular point in the narrative, it might seem that the list is a Lucan composition refreshing the reader's mind at the commencement of Volume Two. This same technique appears to be employed in miniature at Lk. 24:10, where the women's names are given only after they have come back from the place of the Empty Tomb. But in Luke 'they' had been briefly introduced at Lk. 23:49 so that their identity is not in doubt. And the situation in Acts is slightly different for had the apostles alone (i.e. and not the women of v. 14) been present at the Ascension they would have been mentioned after 1:11. As it stands now, the list may well have been derived from a 'guest list'. The positioning of the names at v. 13 hints that this group was not necessarily identical with that which had witnessed the Ascension.

89. Not apparently pointed out in A. Valentine-Richards: *The Text of Acts in Codex 614* (1934) p. 1. The reading is also found in MSS 383 and Syr(phil). Codex E. has the Lucan order for the first four names.

The claim of P. Van Stemp-Voort NTS 5 (1958) p. 39 that here the apostles are seen as "the twelve names of the patriarchs" would aid our quest for a Jewish-orientated source, but the classification fails as only eleven names are supplied!

Luke has overworked verse 14 with the reference to their prayer,<sup>90</sup> but despite Luke's renowned interest in women, it is Mark who makes more of the fact that the women were with Jesus at his death (Mk. 15:40f.) by repeating their names (Mk. 15:47). And if they were now staying in Mark's house, their mention at 1:14 would be part of the Marcan story, which Luke has abbreviated, perhaps, to a mere list. For Luke, the focus has been so much upon Jesus that, in Conzelmann's words "Mary disappears to a greater extent in Luke than in Mark."<sup>91</sup> Inevitably this is very circumstantial evidence, but our explanation of a Marcan source helps to remove some of the difficulties of this bridge passage and to explain the reason for some of the incidental detail of these two verses.<sup>92</sup>

90. BC4 pp. 10f. see this as a reference to the Place of Prayer in the Temple, and so compare Ac. 3:1, but we know the disciples did meet at home (Ac. 2:46, 5:42) and this provides a more natural interpretation of 1:14, so Origen Contra Celsum 8:22 and J. Jeremias: Jerusalem (ET 1969) p. 131 n. 20 - This is confirmed by the reference to prayer in Ac. 12:12 'at home'. Some texts add a reference to "supplication", which may indicate the mood of expectancy among the primitive Community.

91. Conzelmann op. cit. p. 170n - which leads to the conclusion that "it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that Ac. 1:14 is an interpolation".

92. On the original place of vv. 13f. see p. 159.

ACTS 1:15-26 Choosing of Matthias.

(i) Peter's speeches:

15. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις  
ἀναστὰς, τς,  
ὡς [LAC]  
16. ἀνὴρ, συλλαμβάνειν  
17. σὺν [614]

(ii) Judas' deaths:

18. ἀδικία  
19. Ἱερουσαλήμ  
20. [ἔσθρος LXX]
- Χωρίον ≠  
ὡστὶ ≠, Χωρίον ≠  
(bis)

6 2

(iii) Peter's speech/election:

21. ἀνὴρ  
22. ὅς attrac., σὺν  
23. καλούμενος  
24.  
25.  
26. ἀπίστοκος

Marcan Style: ὄχλος in the singular (1:15),  
also ὧς with a number (1:15).

Aramaic translated into Greek (1:19).

Impersonal plural (1:23 not D).

The continued use of καί in this section encourages us to look for traces of a Marcan source, notwithstanding the absence of special Marcan words. It is improbable that Luke deliberately invented/

invented the story,<sup>93</sup> out of no traditional material whatsoever, for would he not then have made Jesus himself choose some one of his followers? As it is, Jesus is gone, the Spirit has not yet come, and lots are cast over two candidates.

The word analysis also shows little Lucan activity in the story proper of the Election (1:23-26), although the following are common enough in Acts: *ὄς*, *ἐπικληθῆναι*, *προστυξάμενα*, *καρδολογῶσιν* (only here and Ac. 15:8 in the NT) and *ἀναδριξῶν* (only here and Lk. 10:1 *ΝΑΒ* in the NT); but since the choice of Matthias is made without any hint of Paul's later prominence in Acts, it would seem probable that this tradition is independent of the later Pauline stories. We thus agree with Dodd that "the early days of perplexity seem the best milieu for this episode."<sup>94</sup>

The theme of the episode is the necessity for an immediate return to the twelvefold apostolate. It is Mark, moreover, who stresses that Jesus' followers are *οἱ δώδεκα* the expression occurring as follows in

Matthew	- 3 times,	Luke	- 6,	Acts 1-12	- 1,
Mark	- 9,	John	- 4,	Acts 13-28	- 0 <sup>95</sup>

93. Despite A. Loisy: Acts (1925) p. 171f., M. Goguel: Introduction (1922) p. 182.

94. C.H. Dodd: According to the Scriptures (1952) p. 59n, cp. Rengstorf art. cit. p. 42.

95. cp. Mt. 28:16, Mk. 16:14, Lk. 24:9,33, Lk. 6:12f., Ac. 1:26, 2:14.

Throughout the Gospels, no explicit significance is attached to the number until the Passion narrative, where a Q saying (Lk. 22:30, Mt. 19:28) refers to the Twelve judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Significantly now, Judas (cp. Jn. 6:71) is 'one of the twelve',<sup>96</sup> a fact clearly presupposed by the present Acts story (cp. 1:17), but it is only Mark who records the fact that 'one of the twelve' was foreknown by Jesus as a traitor (Mk. 14:20).

The story thus confirms our picture of the disciples' attitude seen in Ac. 1:6ff.<sup>97</sup> for they have not as yet lost the Jewishness of their faith. Luke may have placed the story here in the narrative because he is aware of this fact, and so that the later outreach to the Gentiles will be the work of the newly given Spirit.<sup>98</sup> We note the following pointers to a primitive source:

1. No setting is provided; it is assumed to be the same as that for 1:14 but a crowd of 120 are now said to be at the house!

96. Mt. 26:14,47, Mk. 14:10,43, Lk. 22:3,47.

97. See pp. 126-128.

98. So Rengstorf op. cit. p. 180.

2. The crowd (1:15) is introduced by means of a very clumsy parenthesis (cp. Mk. 2:15) - the exactness of their number suggests a certain precision deriving from a written document.<sup>99</sup>

3. Those present at the Ascension are not specifically identified in the source and only indirectly by Luke. The kerygma of Ac. 1:22 repeats again what has been stated in the Prologue. The message begins with John's baptism and continues up to the Ascension,<sup>100</sup> although having referred to this event, Peter then states that they are witnesses of the Resurrection, implying that Resurrection and Ascension are one and the same event. This confusion (from our later standpoint) of these events would be natural if these moments had only recently passed, and a clear-cut distinction between the two had not yet been recognised. Note that in Ac. 2:32ff. Peter is able to distinguish two stages.

Thus it might be that Ac. 1:15ff. followed immediately on from the Resurrection story, its setting being Galilean if from a Marcan account, and in support/

99. Cerfaux, art. cit. p. 672.

100. cp. Mk. 1:2 and Ac. 1:2,5 the similarity here was already noticed by Findlay op. cit. p. 62.



support of this theory we see a link between 1:6 (of...σουχεθούρις ) and 1:21 ( τῶν συνεθεστωντων ). The implication of this latter verse is that a choice must be made from those gathered, despite the fact that all have been with Jesus from the beginning until the Ascension. It implies that the number of witnesses was not limited to the apostles, as Luke would have us believe. Also in favour of this reconstruction is the lead taken by Peter just where we most expect it (according to Mark) at a 'Resurrection' story. In the Western text Peter's prominence is emphasised for he it is who presents the candidates,<sup>101</sup> and in the text of Augustine it is he who prays.<sup>102</sup>

If this is correct, verses 12-14 of Acts 1 have been inserted into the continuous sequence 1:6-11,15ff.<sup>103</sup>, perhaps in order to provide the implied Jerusalem setting for the Election story, or, more probably, to place the list of apostles at the top of the volume and thus by implication show that it is only they who are witnesses of the Ascension.

101. καὶ ἑτοίμασεν δὲ 1:23 Dg. Haenchen op. cit. p. 130 n. 1 sees this as a reflexion of the later episcopal claims of Peter. This is a good example of the ambivalence of D: does the reading reflect a later enhancing of Petrine status or an early source tendency?
102. "et precatus dixit". 1:24 Aug..
103. Codex 1518 reads to commence 1:12, (though 1:13 according to von Soden p. 492): ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις with which cp. 1:15 - but the reading is valueless.

The account of Judas' denial (1:18-20) comes as something of an aside into Peter's speech and has every appearance of being an editorial insertion. It may emanate from an independent tradition (Lucan characteristics are below average) perhaps of Aramaic origin. It serves to strengthen Luke's picture of this series of events as happening inside Jerusalem. The election story proper (1:23-26) has a reference to Judas 'going to his own place' (1:25) a mysterious point which the editor may have wished to clarify by adding 1:18-20.<sup>104</sup> As a result of this insertion, Luke postpones the citation of Ps. 109:8 introduced in 1:16f., but works back to the same via a quotation of Ps. 69:25, which rounds off the Judas' story with scriptural justification of his fate. The use of Ps. 109 is much more appropriate to the election story.<sup>105</sup> Thus the first mention of Judas (in verse 16 cp. v. 20) is concerned with his position as one of the apostles. Having described the election of the new apostle, the story would only then most naturally refer to Judas' death (1:25). The fact that this is mentioned twice suggests Luke was using two traditions. But it is equally possible that Luke/

104. So Haenchen op. cit. pp. 131ff..

105. Against Menoud RHPR 6 (1957) pp. 71ff..

Luke has, in this instance, simply transferred 1:18-19 from its original position after 1:25 so that he could show a twelfth apostle was not appointed while Judas was still alive. But if we accept that this election did take place soon after the Ascension, then chronologically it would be more likely that Judas' death did occur later than the election of a new faithful apostle. Thus in the original source, the account of Judas' 'departure',<sup>106</sup> would provide a connection<sup>107</sup> back to the cycle of stories to be related in Jerusalem (1:13f., 2:1ff.).<sup>108</sup>

106. This notice is Lucan; for this euphemistic sense of *πορεύσθαι* see pp. 255f..

107. The reading in 1:25 *NE614* of Judas' receiving his *κλήρον* may have prompted the editor to connect this story with the *κλήρον* of 1:17.

108. Matthew's placing of Judas' death before that of even Jesus need not be taken seriously, since Matthew, as he was writing no history of the church, was obliged to bring forward this story, if he was to use it at all. The divergent traditions may possibly be explained if Matthew knew of a story (from Mark?) and expanded it with reference to prophetic fulfillment of Jeremiah and Zechariah, whilst Luke understands the 'Field of Blood' in quite a different sense. But I think it equally possible that Luke may have read Matthew, in which case he may have had vague recollections of Matthew's account. But if Mark had continued his story, a word as to Judas' fate would be in order.

But, as usual, Luke has certainly left his own vocabulary in this section, even though to a lesser extent than usual. Note the  $\gamma\omega\tau\acute{o}\nu$  and the reference to  $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ <sup>109</sup>. Traces of an original can, however, be seen in the Aramaic Akeldama, a term Luke would not be expected to use, had he not been influenced by traditional material. It may be true that Luke has conformed the account to a pattern, enumerating the fate of the persecutor<sup>110</sup> - but this does not suffice to explain the presence of the Aramaic term.<sup>111</sup>

We now return to the Election story which begins with a brief oration by Peter. Verse 15 sets the scene for the action, and as so often, the introduction yields a number of Lucan characteristics. However the Western text avoids some of these - and so we must/

109. Rennie RB55 (1948) studying 1:15-26 concludes 72% of the rarer words are Lucan. To 1:18-20 we may add the use of  $\gamma\iota\nu\acute{o}\mu\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$  in a semi-medical sense: Lk. 22:44  $\aleph^* \delta \theta$ , Ac. 10:10 (not p45), 12:11, 23, 16:29  $\aleph \text{AB}$  (v F. Ely JTS 13 (1912) p. 280, H. Hoskier: Codex B (1914) p. 408).
110. Cp. Williams op. cit. p. 60 who points to 2 Macc 9. Papias' version of Judas' death has also been influenced by 2 Macc 9.
111. Clark op. cit. p. 338 (following Blass) accepts the reading of Augustine in 1:18 "et collum sibi alligavit et dejectus in faciem diruptus est": if this was originally from a Marcan account, it may have provided a fulfillment of Mk. 9:42 (not in Luke). The ordinary reading is indeed "very mysterious".

must consider the possibility of whether it could be representing a more primitive pre-Lucan text.

The main variants are:

(i) μαθητῶν (DE 614) → ἀδελφῶν (L<sup>AB</sup>)

This Western reading avoids the conflict with the ἀδελφός of 1:14. But it is a more general term, appropriately preparing for the mention of 120 people, and it may later have been altered to avoid the notion that any of the μαθητῶν were eligible for the apostolate. The term is more frequent in Mark than Luke.

(ii) γὰρ (D) for τε (C=δέ) - avoids the Lucan characteristic.

(iii) ὡς (BD) → ὥστί (L<sup>AE</sup>) - again avoiding the Lucanism .

Also (iv) ἀνδρῶν (E) - easing the difficulty of this unusual use of > δνοματων.<sup>112</sup>

On the whole, these appear to be improvements, but behind some Western readings may be evidence of the original Lucan, or even a pre-Lucan text.

Verses 16-17, 21-22 form the brief speech by Peter, introduced with the usual formula for Acts: ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί . Technically this presupposes the women of v. 14 are absent, explicable however if this verse has been inserted into the Ascension context, but the usage is not precise and should not be pressed.

As with the Ascension, the narrative is short, and thus details about the candidates remain obscure. The reading of Codex Bezae may be explained by the desire to identify Joseph with a more familiar figure:

Ἰωσήφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρνάβαν

But why alter the man's name from Barsabbas to the better known Barnabas, why should anyone wish to identify the losing candidate with a well-known preacher? Moreover D's (unsupported) reading cannot be a slip of a pen<sup>113</sup> for not only has a Nu been introduced but a Beta deleted. It must be a deliberate alteration, unless it is original.<sup>114</sup> But on the other hand, it can be retorted, why alter Barnabas' name to an obscure name? - though the surname Barsabbas is known from Ac. 15:22 ABE. We may readily account for this, if the writer of Acts wished to hide the fact that the character of Barnabas (who is to appear in later events) had not won election to the apostolate after the Ascension. If this/

113. Or even a slip of the mind - for would not it have been later corrected by the scribe or one of the many annotators of D? - on these v. Clark, pp. 173-178.

114. Epp, op. cit. p. 167 n. 7 however notes places where D's reading (often standing alone) of names deviates from the received text.

this is a possibility,<sup>115</sup> we may explain how Luke (via Mark) may have obtained information upon this episode, for Mark was cousin of Barnabas (Col. 4:10). The fuller detail about this Joseph,<sup>116</sup> rather than the winning Matthias, argues for the fact that the writer knew more about the former candidate. Neither is introduced by the typical Acts formula of τῆς which further points to a story which Luke has incorporated without overdue editorial treatment. The outcome confirms this attitude: had Luke been composing freely and had he known Barnabas was a possibility for selection, it might have been expected that the outcome would be the appointment of Barnabas. If the D. reading is accepted, then we may observe:

1. Although Barnabas is reintroduced at 4:36, this is not out of keeping with the author's method - for Agabus is presented, as though for the first time, at 21:10, despite his earlier appearance in 11:28. Philip, too, reappears before the reader at 21:8, as though we had never before met the man.

115. The case of Paul does not disprove this. Saul's early persecution of the Church was too well known (Gal. 1:13) to suppress but note how the writer of Acts, following Paul himself makes Paul's eventual conversion an occasion for great glorying.

116. Note, too, that he is introduced first although he loses. Is he not so mentioned because he is (as Barnabas) to play the more important role in the subsequent spreading of the good news?

2. The story may then have come to Luke through an account of Mark from Barnabas. If this is so we will not be content with seeing only an "Acts of Peter" behind the supposed Marcan source.

For the present, we see in this incident only a glimpse of Peter's forthcoming prominence, but the very obscurity of the event testifies to its genuineness. However it is not easy to show with great conviction that this particular passage is of Marcan origin, unless our general thesis be accepted. If we can see Mark's writing behind part of Acts, then this story must press for inclusion into the framework.

Acts 2:1-4 Pentecost

1. ἐν τῷ (not D), ἐγένετο (D)	(not D)		
2.	φέρτιν *	1	0
3. ὥστε			
4. πίμπλημι, ἕτερος			

We have suggested above that Luke may have slightly rearranged his material to suit his own needs. This tendency becomes more apparent with the account of the promised gift of the Spirit. In Ac. 4:31 there is a repetition on a small scale of the event. It is only however in 2:5-13 that we receive any hint/



hint that this first Pentecost has such wide scale significance for up until this point the mention of the "house" has provided the picture of a modestly sized gathering, as at 4:31. Let us set down the common ground between the two accounts:

1. τὸν οἶκον (2:2) this points us back to 1:13 - note again the article, as though we are all familiar with the place. This kind of assumption is very familiar from Mark. The background to 4:31 is not so clear, but at 4:23 we read that Peter and John return πρὸς τοὺς ἰδίους, which may once more include the thought of Mary's house of 1:14.<sup>117</sup>

2. Those who receive the gift are 'together' ὁμοῦ (Ac. 2:1)<sup>118</sup>, and in Ac. 4:24 they pray ὁμοθυμαδόν.

117. So Jacquier, op. cit. p. 137 - if the families of these men were staying there. But it is only a vague contact between the two accounts.

118. E 614 read ὁμοθυμαδόν. ὁμοῦ is only here in the NT and in John (also Lk. 23:33D, Ac. 20:18A). The repetition of the idea in ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ might indicate the start of a scribal gloss from the similar words in 1:14 - which is interesting as it demonstrates that one mind, at least, connected these two scenes.

3. The coming of the Spirit is accompanied by a physical phenomenon:

τὸν οἶκον οὗ ἦσαν καθήμενοι (2:2)

ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἦσαν συνηγμένοι (4:31)

In this respect Ac. 4:31 is much more restrained (cp. Mk. 13:11) whilst Ac. 2:2f. dwells upon the miraculous nature of the gift.

4. The Spirit descends upon all those present:

καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες Πνεύματος Ἁγίου (2:4)

καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες Ἁγίου Πνεύματος (4:31)

5. Finally the effects are, of course, identical:

καὶ ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν (2:4)

καὶ ἐλάλουν (4:31)

The addition in 4:31 DE cop<sup>G67</sup> of παντὶ τῷ

θέλοντι strengthens the bond with the story in Ac. 2, for there too the editor concludes his account proper with the sudden introduction of wayfaring foreigners into the blessings of Pentecost.

As regards 2:1-4 we might at first be tempted to suspect that Luke has thoroughly adapted his material, and we can unearth little in these verses that is notably Marcan. But, as with the account of Judas' death, Luke may have transferred a story of the Spirit's/

119.  $\mathcal{N}^* \rho^8$  read πάντες agreeing with 2:4.

Spirit's bestowal (i.e. now found in part at 4:31) and brought it to the head of the book, to announce the theme of his work. Again Luke has not lost the outline of his source, note the continued <sup>and</sup> in 2:1-4 as at 4:31.

The argument is that Luke has seen the significance of the event in 4:31 and made the point more obviously illustrative of the divine action by describing it in 'black and white'. Just how much he added from his own experiences of 'speaking with tongues' can be partially resolved by (i) noting the parallels with 4:31 (above) and (ii) pointing to possible Marcan features which may also have stood in the original account in 4:31 which has now been reduced, we might say if we were conversing mathematically, to its lowest terms - that is, only the essential points remain.

In 2:1 we read that "all" are together, and yet Luke, if not the source, presupposes some onlookers who do not receive the gift (2:5ff.) despite the mention of them "all" as the recipients in 2:4. The plurals in verses 2 and 3 may, therefore, be intended more loosely, - we may recall the similar kind of difficulty in 1:24, though in this case the obscurity may be caused by Luke himself.

The tongues  $\omega\sigma\tau\iota$   $\pi\upsilon\sigma\sigma$  may fulfil the Q baptismal saying (for note how Luke at Jesus' baptism similarly makes the event a more physical experience) - but Mark may perhaps have anticipated it also in Mk. 9:49.<sup>120</sup>

We will not dwell on the editor's understanding of this gift as a speaking in other tongues (Ac. 2:4b). In so describing the phenomenon he has misunderstood the nature of the event, but his purpose is revealed in verses 5ff.: the Spirit will speak not only to Jews but also to all men. Thereby Luke anticipates the logical need for a mission to the Gentiles. In these verses the Spirit is not yet given to the Gentiles though already they can hear his voice. Now this may or may not be reflective of a later theological interpretation of the role of the Spirit, what is of importance to us is that if we are right in maintaining that the Marcan material that was available depicted the orthodox Jewish attitude of the Twelve immediately after the Resurrection, then a concept/

120. so Burkitt: Christian Beginnings (1924) p. 17.

concept as that outlined in 2:4b ff. could not possibly be Marcan. The transition from their Jewish-orientated faith is too sudden.

We see then in 2:1-4 an editorial account of the promised baptism of the Spirit, very vital for our understanding of Luke's method, but for our purposes yielding only a possible shaft of Marcan light. It may have been derived from 4:31, where once a longer account had stood.<sup>121</sup>

vv. 5-13 Effect of Pentecost

5. Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἀνῆρ			
6. φωνή, πλῆθος			
7. δὲ καὶ, πρὸς (C <sup>3</sup> DE)	(C <sup>3</sup> DE)		
8.			
9. τε (om. D)		2	1
10. τε (bis)			
11.			
<u>Further Results:</u>			
12. πρὸς, ἀν (E 614)			
13. ἕτερος	ὅτι recit. †		

<sup>121</sup>. See pp. 214ff..

Δε at last begins to appear regularly in Acts! Whereas vv. 1-4 are set in the house, it is hard to imagine this of vv. 5ff. unless by 'house' was meant the temple. The scene is best set in the "open air".<sup>122</sup> The only Marcan feature is that of the use of two verbs to illustrate the amazement (2:7) but the usage is paralleled in v. 12 whence this feature may have been gleaned.

This becomes more evident if we accept that two traditions have been incorporated in 2:1-13. For this, we have to return to the identity of those involved in the incident for there is this definitive ambiguity over

1. πάντων (2:1) the total of those present (the 120 of Ac. 1:15?),
2. πάντες (2:4) receive the Spirit,
3. ἄπαντες (2:7) who speak are Galileans.

Whilst all this is plausible, we continue -

4. πάντες (2:12) are amazed,
5. ἑτίπου (2:13) mock. A discrepancy resulting from the editor's desire to increase the numbers of those present. Haacker thus distinguishes two traditions,<sup>123</sup> one concerned with the speaking and one/

122. Goguel: Introduction, p. 176. If it had been in the temple, we might have expected trouble similar to that in Ac. 4:1, 5:25f..

123. K. Haacker in Verborum Veritas pp. 215ff..

one with the reactions of those who heard: vv. 6-11,13. This seems the simplest way of explaining the paragraph.

The proper conclusion to the episode begun in verse 1-4 has been obscured by the speech - v. 13 acting as a link passage - and it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that Peter's speech is, in its context, secondary, when we arrive at 2:40:

Σωθητε ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκοτεινῆς ταύτης

This eschatological rejoinder comes as an anti-climax to the long oration, and its brevity, may have suited the context of the short 'Pentecost' story better. 2:40f. acts as a suitable rounding off of the event and as at Mk. 6:44, 8:9 there is a footnote pronouncing the number of those present.<sup>124</sup>

Having thus distinguished signs of Luke's editorial method as regards his rearranging of his material to emphasise particular aspects of the post-Resurrection community, we will list the possible order/

124. The number must be large after 2:5ff.. Though compare Farrer: St. Mark (1951), who, discussing the Feedings in St. Mark, says (p. 297) "there are three thousands still to be fed". So Ac. 2:41.

order of events that was found by Luke in his source.

Ac. 1:6-11	4:1ff. (?)	4:32-35
1:15-17/21-26	4:23-31	(=2:42-47)
(1:18-20)	(including after v. 31	and perhaps
1:12-14	material now reused in	4:36ff..
3:1-11	2:1-4, 40-41)	

These sections have not, of course, been utilised without alteration, but it becomes evident now why 4:32ff. repeats, with variations, 2:42ff., since Luke in using his source wishes to describe the Spirit's descent after the Twelve have reassembled. Thus he goes to what is now Ac. 4:31 and takes and amplifies the story now found in chapter 2, including an account of the Community of Goods. He then goes back to his source's order, where he left it off, i.e. continuing with Ac. 3:1ff.. Upon rereading 4:31 he abbreviates the story of the Spirit and continues with the repetition which is perhaps deliberate, of the story of the Community of Goods.

From this table has been set aside the major speeches of Peter. Dodd has pointed to the parallels between this kerygma (the formulation of the Jerusalemite church) and that set forth particularly in the Gospel of Mark.<sup>125</sup>

125. Dodd: *Apostolic Preaching* pp. 45, 105ff.. It effectively combats Parker's thesis (v. pp. 12-21).



Ac. 2:14-36 Peter's First Speech.<sup>129</sup>

14. σύ, ἐνδεδυκός (D), ἐπιποτότος (A), ἑταίρειν, ἀνὴρ, Ἱερουσαλήμ, δῆμα	(D)		
15.			
16.			
22. ἀνὴρ (bis), εἶς (not D) τέρας, ὄσος (A)			
23. τοῦτον			
24.	ἰδίαι, δυνατῶν, κρατῶν *	6	3
29. ἀνὴρ, πρὸς, ἀγαί	παρρησία	[8 →	Western
30. ὑπάρχειν			
31.	[ἐγκαταλείπειν <sup>130</sup> ]		
32. ἑψοῦν			
33. ἴε (not D), ῥῶν (E614)			
36. οἶκος	ἀσφαλῶς		

As regards examples of Marcan style - there is a continued preference for καί. This however is a feature of all the Peter speeches in Acts for inside the actual speeches εἶ appears only in chapter 3. Nevertheless this would seem to lend some weight to the possibility of Marcan influence, more especially/

129. I omit from this list (and all others) the verses which quote the LXX text, even though there are some deviations. It is not possible to measure these statistically (cp. p. 33 n. 6 (end)).
130. Not counted in the statistics, as it appears in Mk. 15:34 as a quotation only.

especially if the kerygma assumes a knowledge of the Gospel story.<sup>131</sup>

As with all the Acts' speeches, it is not specifically related to its context:<sup>132</sup> the editor<sup>133</sup> has provided the opportunity for a speech by introducing the, very appropriate, theme of new wine. For this reason we may accept, as I think is generally agreed, that this is not an actual historical speech of Peter delivered at Pentecost.<sup>134</sup> The number of speeches in Acts witnesses to Luke's theological and pastoral intention and whilst scholarship has naturally centred on these sections in essaying to comprehend the structure of the work, our examination will be comparatively brief. For if we accept that these orations have been inserted (not at random, though often rather unimaginatively) into the story, then our concern will be only in what/

131. in particular that of Mark: cp. Carrington op. cit. p. 338: "Mark's Gospel provides this necessary supplementary information."
132. so Dibelius: Studies pp. 174f., 182. Is this true of the later speeches of Paul?
133. n.b. the editorial features in 2:14, to which may be added the typical Acts' words  $\gamma\upsilon\omega\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$ ,  $\text{ὁ } \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$ .
134. Attempts have been made to show verbal parallels between this speech and 1 Peter (always assuming this to be by Peter): e.g.  $\mu\omicron\upsilon\chi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\iota$  (Ac. 2:33 = 1 Peter 1:2,20 and Ac. 2:33a = 1 Pet. 3:22: see Lumby: E Series, 1,4 (1896) pp. 113ff. and Jacquier op. cit. pp. ccl xivf..) Relating this to Mark: M. Karnetzki ZNW 52/1961. p. 271, E. Scharfe: Petrinische Strömung (1899) passim.

what kind of milieu they arose. The Jerusalemite church perhaps. This would explain their general agreement with Mark's Gospel. But because there is so little 'local colour', because style and language is so thoroughly Lucan, the impression is that they are expressions,<sup>135</sup> of Luke's own belief.

To illustrate this fact, we may cite Ac. 11:15 where Peter says it is as he was beginning to speak that the Spirit fell. In the account to which he refers, he has delivered the whole of the Kerygma before  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota\ \lambda\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \Pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omicron\upsilon$ <sup>136</sup> the Spirit fell.

Turning now to Ac 2:14ff. we may consider whether there is anything Marcan in the material upon which Luke built. We will not be concerned with the basic Kerygma (Dodd has already examined the parallels) because the similarities are mostly of outline and idea, not verbal. Indeed it is difficult to determine much from this Section on the basis of sheer linguistics, since there is no parallel to this long speech/

135. though not necessarily 'formulations' devoid of tradition.

136. Ac. 10:44.

speech in Mark (perhaps excluding Mk. 13). But if Mark does not mention, we may even say on purpose, the context of Jesus' teaching very frequently, is this perhaps because he knew Peter's speeches at first hand and was already, when writing his Gospel, intending to include most of his 'preaching and teaching' in a second volume?

But if it is Dodd's claim that the Acts' kerygma is closely related to that of Mark, it is also clear, on analysis of Acts 2, that this thesis does not apply to anything more than general detail. The cornerstone of the oration is exposition of LXX texts to prove the fulfillment of prophecy in Jesus,<sup>137</sup> and as in Ac. 4:25ff. the argument is developed out of the language of the Psalm (so Ac. 2:25-33). Around this section are added two other texts and there are some important deviations from the LXX text (i.e. that known to us) which may be significant in the first quotation, that from Joel:

1. ἐν ταῖς ἰσχυραῖς ἡμέραις → μετὰ ταῦτα<sup>138</sup>  
 setting the note of crisis underlining the urgency of a response (cp. Ac. 2:40) from hearer and reader alike.

137. So Haenchen op. cit. p. 152.

138. despite Haenchen ZTK 51 (1954) p. 162, B's reading (unsupported) which agrees with the LXX text is unlikely to be original. A glance at the table in BC 3 p. 16 shows that B has been conformed to the LXX text.

2. καὶ προφητεύουσιν (2:18 om. D) again adapts to the situation.

3. The addition of σημεῖα (2:19) to τέρατα is clearly editorial. The two used together are a favourite expression of the author's: Jesus performed these (Ac. 2:22) and so later will the apostles (5:12, 14:3, 15:12).

This long prophecy being concluded, 2:22-24 retells the story of Jesus' life, death and culminating with the resurrection. There are a number of Marcan features in 2:24 as Peter relates at the end of a sentence as complex as 1:1-5, how even death could not hold Jesus, this statement being justified by Ps. 16:8-11, from which is singled out for further comment

οὕτως ἐγκατελείθη εἰς ἄδην (2:31).

This remarkable repetition of the same motif may possibly be intended as an apologetic refrain to the words on the cross uttered by Jesus, as reported by Mark (not Luke):

Ὁ θεός μου, ὁ θεός μου,  
εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με ;<sup>139</sup>

139. Mk. 15:34 where however D reads ὡνείδισάς.

The point of this central portion of the speech is the Resurrection and the disciples' witness to it. The gift of the Spirit is briefly recalled (2:33b), but the subsequent LXX quotation evidently belongs with 2:33a and the news of the Ascension. The context is therefore better suited to a post-Resurrection speech, perhaps prior even to the Spirit's bestowal.

In the last resort however we must doubt whether Mark would have written such long speeches which so hinder the action. Even if he did this, and the Gospel gives us little justification for the idea, the difficulty lies in discovering what was the original context which prompted the oration. The most we can say is that Luke may have used a Marcan framework, but so familiar should we have been with the outline of the good news that it is unlikely that these speeches are formed of anything more than the oral traditions that had been handed down to Luke. These he moulds to his own ends, so in 2:14ff. he develops the thought of 1:22 that the disciples are witnesses to the Resurrection. With stories of action however, ones which require a concrete setting and some knowledge of the facts, with these stories Luke would more definitely require written material to supply information. It is less easy for us to see in these reported kerygmatic formulations anything of value for written source criticism.

## 2:37-41: The results of the Speech.

37. ΤΞ (not ΝΕ614) πρός, ἀποστολος, ἀνὴρ			
38. πρὸς			
39.	ῥσος †		
40. ἕτερος, τΞ (not D)			
41. προστιθέναι, ὡς [not Ν]	(not →)		
		2 (Δ=3)	1 (Δ=2)

We have suggested above (p. 158) that Luke may have used the conclusion to the Pentecost event as part of the material after Peter's speech. The relevant verses here were 40f.. But verses 37-39 also refer to the gift of the Spirit<sup>140</sup> and may be inserted if Luke thought that Peter was addressing non-Jews.<sup>141</sup> Here Luke makes explicit his universalist message, but not without the expense of a logical contradiction, for whilst Peter had declared the promise of the spirit (1:5,8) now fulfilled (2:33), he then declares that the promise is to those who have not yet received the gift.<sup>142</sup> The same link with 1:5 is maintained in Ac. 11:17. Thus this whole section may have formed the responsive outcome to the outpouring of the Spirit.

140. cp. 2:33 E (cop<sup>G67</sup>).

141. So Clark pp. 338f., Ropes BC 3 p. 12, BC 5 pp. 112ff.. Against the view: Haenchen op. cit. p. 135 n. 9.

142. Though 2:38 could also refer to a future outpouring, another event.

This is not to say that Luke has not, as ever, overworked his material.<sup>143</sup> But because he has already inserted a long speech, the eschatological warning in v. 40 has to appear as a generalised summary of Peter's oratory. In fact it continues the thought of v. 39 where the typically Rabbinic method of fusion of the two texts has included a reminder of Joel 2:32:

ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται Κύριος...

In 2:40b Peter continues with *ζώθητι* (from Joel 2:32) and warns about this present evil generation (cp. Lk. 3:7). Thus 2:40a is a Lucan composition; *ἔστος, τε* being Lucan characteristics and *διαμαρτύρησθαι* occurring only in Luke of the Gospels and nine times in Acts.

Verse 41 refers to the numbers of those saved; and we have noted that this reference at the end of a story would be in keeping with Marcan style - although the *ψυχαί* (of persons) is typical of the writer of Acts (2:43, 3:23 LXX, 27:37).

The only other possible indication of a Marcan source concerns the formula in 2:38 of Baptism which concurs with that of John the Baptist, Mk. 1:4 = Lk. 3:3.

143.so (e.g.) *τί ποιῶμεν*; 2:37 - cp. Lk. 3:10, 14. Normally Luke has little use for this kind of question - see Cadbury, *Style* pp. 81f..



Therefore the evidence for a Marcan outline in 2:1-4, 37-41 is not strong, but the evidence does point to the use of some source or sources, into which Luke has inserted a list of names and a long address; but only if a probability of a Marcan outline can be established for other surrounding parts of Acts.<sup>144</sup> can Marcan possibilities here be entertained.<sup>145</sup>

Luke himself continues by illustrating a fruit of Pentecost: the Community of Goods. We will postpone discussion of this paragraph until 4:32ff.. (pp. 215ff.).

### 3:1-11 Peter's First Miracle.

The number of Marcan words in this story is over twice that of the average for Acts, it has nearly as many Marcanisms as any page of Mark's Gospel.<sup>146</sup> This is a remarkable record for a long section such as this.

144. For the similar judgement on Ac. 1:15ff. - see p. 151.
145. Western variants with Marcan features are  $\sigma\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota$   $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$  (2:37 DE sy<sup>hmg</sup> cop G67); a redundant question though possibly borrowed from Lk. 3:7. Also in 2:41  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$  (E614 cop G67), a word only here and at Ac. 21:17 in the NT, may be an eyewitness detail.
146. Where the relative frequency of Marcan words of the type we have listed is 5.95%.

1. ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις (D cop <sup>G67</sup> ) δὲ καί(not D)		
2. τις, ἀνὴρ, κοιλία, ὑπάρχειν(not D), καθ' ἡμέραν, τοῦ + inf.	θύρα(not E#), εἰσπορεύομαι †	
3. ἐρωτᾶν	ἐμβλέπειν (Dh)#	
4. οὐν		
5. προσδοκᾶν		
6. εἶπεν δὲ, ὑπάρχειν	ἐγείρειν (ACEP) ≠ περιπατεῖν ≠ κρατεῖν (499, 2143) *	4 6
7. σταραχρήμα	ἐτίθειν ≠	
8. σὺν, χαίρειν (AE)	περιστατεῖν † (bis [D=I])	
9. πᾶς + λαός	σταραχτεῖν ≠	
10. πῖρασλαι	θαμβεῖν (hp) ≠	
11. ἰσθθαί(P614), πᾶς + λαός, (not b), καλούμενος (om. 1838)	ἐκπορεύομαι (Dh)# κρατεῖν *, συντρέχειν (not D) ≠, θαμβεῖν (D) †, ἐκθαμβεῖν ≠.	

Marcan Style: 3:2 Impersonal Plural  $\delta\upsilon\upsilon$   $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\upsilon\nu$   
3:10 Repetition of 'amazement'

καί continues its repetitive course in the body of the story (nine times in vv. 7-9) although the presence of conversational exchanges has led to the inclusion of more  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ 's.<sup>147</sup> The absence of  $\tau\acute{\iota}$  (only in this chapter at 3:10 DE) may further indicate that the framework of the story has been preserved by Luke, his activity, as so often, being concentrated in the introduction (v. 2).

147.i.e. Ac. 3:5f..

Repetition is a feature of the whole story

(cp. 1:9-11):

in verses 1-3:

> εἰς τὸ ἱερόν... <  
 - τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἱεροῦ... <  
 > εἰς τὸ ἱερόν... <  
 > εἰς τὸ ἱερόν... <

in verses 3-5:

> ἀκτινίσας (D)... ἰδῶν... ἀκτινίσας (not D)	εὐχαρίστας (D)... βαλέψον (Δ=ἀκτινίσον)... ἠκτινίσεν, <
--	---

in verses 6-8: περιπατεῖν is used four times  
 (v. supra)

and in verses 8-9 εὐαλλόμενος (χαίρων E(D))<sup>148</sup>....

.. εὐαλλόμενος (om. D)..... αἰνῶν ... αἰνούντες -

such enthusiasm suggests an eyewitness account. Joy is a feature of the Primitive Community (cp. 2:41E, 2:46.)

The similarity of this type of story with that in the Synoptics may mean that the yield of special words will be on the high side, but the data for Matthew and John do not bear marked confirmation of this suspicion, even though Lucan, as well as Marcan, activity is above average. The repetition of περιπατεῖν has caused our Marcan figures to swell, but it would be erroneous to delete from our statistics all occurrences after the first of such words, for we know from Luke's Gospel, that that writer is not in the habit of indulging in this monotonous style. There is no parallel/

148. h overdoes the motif with "gaudens et exultans".

parallel in the Synoptics to a lame man being healed, but we may compare the similar story in Ac. 14 where the verb in question appears only twice.<sup>149</sup> Nevertheless, even if we did count only the different Marcanisms in 3:1-11, the figure would come to 7, well over the average for Acts.

From our tentative source reconstruction,<sup>150</sup> we have placed this story as the sequel to the Return to Jerusalem<sup>151</sup> (1:12ff.). This 'bridge' passage explains the disciples' presence in Jerusalem. It has been severed from its position before 3:1 by the editor, who wishes to record the list of the Eleven before details of the choice of Matthias.

One final introductory question remains. Who is the John in the story, and is his silent presence the mark of the editor's desire for a two-fold witness to the event?<sup>152</sup> To consider the latter point/

149. Thrice in D. On the whole problem of repetition see p. 58, section 23 and Cadbury, *Style* pp. 83ff..

150. p. 159.

151. Similarly Haefner who notes 1:13-14 nullifies the complaint in BC 2 p. 145 that, if Harnack's source analysis be accepted Ac. 3 is an "acephalus source."

152. See R. Morgenthaler: *Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung* (1948) vol. 1 p. 36.

point first, John nowhere speaks as an individual, although with Peter he does so at 4:19,<sup>153</sup> and at 4:1 we read λαλούντων δὲ αὐτῶν, apparently in contradiction to 3:12<sup>154</sup> and implying that John had also spoken. However, the tendency may have been to add John's name<sup>155</sup> - and passages such as 3:4 ἀτινίσκας δὲ Πέτρος εἰς αὐτόν, σὺν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ εἶπεν... 4:13 ... τὴν τοῦ Πέτρου παρρησίαν καὶ Ἰωάννου... appear to testify to John's secondary role. It would seem that Luke had additional information, or perhaps greater interest in naming these two than Mark, for already we find their names combined in Lk. 22:8 replacing Mark's (14:13) δύο. But Mark also has some, albeit vague tales concerning John not in Luke (Mk. 9:38ff., 10:35ff.). However in Ac. 3:1ff. it is assumed that this John is the brother of Zebedee (Ac. 1:13 linking Peter and John implies this identification), whereas we must not reject the possibility, although "the verdict/

153. D however reads ἀποκριθεὶς, Epp op. cit. pp. 154-164 does not mention this as an example of the alleged heightening of Peter's status in D.

154. This is another indication that the speeches are inserted into the context.

155. See p. 137 n. 88. Notice too how h tries to avoid the inherent difficulties of the singulars of 3:11 D: D... ἐκπορευόμενα δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου συνεξιπορεύθη h... "exsuntibus autem Petro et Johanne simul in ipse prodibat."

verdict of non liquet be inevitable"<sup>156</sup>, that John Mark is the shadowy friend of Peter. How well this would aid our explanation of Mark's own witness to these early scenes! Certainly Mark's abrupt appearance in Chapter Twelve is eased on this basis - and Haenchen<sup>157</sup> remarks on a feature of Lucan style, whereby a character is subtly introduced by Luke before his first major appearance.<sup>158</sup> This may be the case with the John in Acts 3, 4 and 8. The vivid details in 3:1ff. are now explicable, although some of these are part and parcel of the miracle story format.<sup>159</sup>

156. BC 2 p. 146. On the existence of two prominent Johns in the Early Church, see Eusebius HE 3:39:5.

157. Haenchen op. cit. p. 341. Also see p. 234.

158. So Barnabas at Ac. 9:27. Also perhaps Saul at 7:58, and Barnabas again in 1:23D.

159. "We have such a description as a painter would desire: the scene is brought vividly before us and all the characters are in lively action... the narrative of this chapter is derived... from St. Peter... On the contrary the story of the cure wrought at Lystra by St. Paul is told in the fewest possible words." (Lumby: Acts (1904) p. 112) But compare the cure of Aeneas (Ac. 9:32ff.) which may however have suffered abbreviation at the editor's hands - v. pp. 272ff..

The parallels with the account in Ac. 14 are helpful in that we can see (assuming no source has radically shaped that account) what interests Luke stresses, and it may be that Luke has later returned, as with several other stories in the early part of Acts<sup>160</sup>, to the original Peter story to parallel the event in Paul's ministry.<sup>161</sup> We set aside the two narratives:

Acts 3	Acts 14
Peter and John enter temple (v 2)	- Paul and Barnabas enter synagogue (v 1)
τις ἀνὴρ χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ (v2)	- χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ (v8)
οὗτος ἀτενίσας (D)(v3)- ὅς [καὶ] ἰδὼν (v3)	ὅς ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ (v9) - καὶ ἰδὼν (v9)
ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου (v6)	- ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (D <sup>67</sup> B <sup>67</sup> C <sup>67</sup> sy <sup>67</sup> mg)(v10)
περιπάτει (v6)	- περιπάτει (D <sup>67</sup> C <sup>67</sup> sy <sup>67</sup> mg)(v10)
καὶ ἐξ αλλομηνῶς ἔστη καὶ περιπάτει (v8)	- καὶ ἤλατο καὶ περιπάτει (v11)

Results: (i) Crowd amazed (v. 10)-(i) Crowd amazed (v11)

(ii) Crowd try and take hold of Peter (v. 11) - (ii) Crowd wish to make them gods (vv. 11ff.)

(iii) Story concludes with a recital of Ex.20:11 (Ac. 4:24) - (iii) Story concludes with a reference to Ex.20:11 (Ac. 14:15)

160. See on Ac. 5:15f. (cp. Ac. 19:11f.) and 11:1ff. (cp. 15:1ff.).

161. On Miracles: J. Fenton ET 77 (1966) pp. 381-3 and in the general, see now A.J. Mattill Jr. in *Apostolic History and the Gospel* pp. 108-122.

The major difference is that after Ac. 3:11 a long trial scene is inserted. The table shows that both stories follow a basic pattern (perhaps imposed by Luke in the interests of a Peter/Paul parallelism, but probably, already inherent in the traditions Luke was incorporating). It is largely to the incidental details that we must look, to discover the outline of any original.

Ac. 3:1f. set the scene for this first recorded apostolic healing. In most stories the details of the one to be cured are supplied first, where they will not delay the progress of the narrative,<sup>162</sup> and although this is not a definite rule, the mention of Peter and John first at 3:1 may suggest a story originally centred on Peter. The first verse emphasises once again the Jewish-centred faith of the apostles for they are keeping the regular hours of prayer and D states that this occurred at the time of evening sacrifice.<sup>163</sup> In the context it is redundant and it may have originated from the Jewish background of the source.

162. thus Mk. 7:2 and in Acts: 9:36, 14:8.

163. Cp. Ex. 20:39,41, Lev. 6:20, 1 Esdras 5:50. Cp. 3 Ki. 18:29.



It is clear from the six Lucan characteristics to be found in 3:2 that Luke has been busy, yet he may not have obliterated every Marcan feature in the original introduction:

(i) the impersonal plural ἐτίθουν.

(ii) ἐβαστάζειτο, which verb may in turn be a rendering of Mark's favourite φέρειν.

(iii) καθ' ἡμέραν in fact a Lucanism, but a time note found similarly in Mk. 5:5 (not Lk.), emphasising the permanence of the malady.

(iv) The cripple is laid at the θύραν - a minor detail for which Luke in his Gospel has shown little concern. He omits this word from Mk. 1:33, 2:2, 11:3 cp. 13:29, 15:46, 16:3. This information is not essential to the story and argues for the fact that Luke is not only using a source with some fidelity, but also that he regards it sufficiently highly to reproduce even incidental points of information. Was this because, in the case of the temple, it was no longer standing and Luke desired to show that his information was of sufficient accuracy to supply such detail?

Verse 3 becomes an obvious statement of fact. It 'spells out' the request for alms that Luke, if writing freely, might normally have been expected to omit as otiose,<sup>164</sup> not meaning that he considered almsgiving in this light, but that the context supplies the fact stated in verse 3.<sup>165</sup> The subject of almsgiving occurs in later stories connected with Peter, those of Tabitha and Cornelius.

The picture having been set with some care, Peter now gazes at the man, in imitation of his Master (Mk. 8:24, 10:21,27)<sup>166</sup> with John beside him. John's presence is certainly minimal!<sup>167</sup> Yet he need not be an editorial device. It may be a case of a source highlighting Peter, a possibility that becomes more evident at 5:15 where, after a section introducing the miracles of the apostles, the shadow of Peter is signalled out for mention.

164. Cp. especially Luke's removal of Mk. 10:49, 11:6b in his parallels.
165. Cp. p. 167 n. 143.
166. the last two passages using *ἐμβλέσκειν* in agreement with Ac. 3:4D.
167. Cullmann op. cit. p. 35 for the view that the name is editorial. He claims it is typical of the Johannine tendency to introduce a disciple "into a certain competition with Peter" (p. 28). What competition here!

Another link which binds together the Peter stories is the occasional touch of humour that lightens the dark scenes of trials and troubles. Thus in verse 5 we are told the cripple sits up, expecting a monetary offering from the apostles. Verse 6a spells out the point as Peter's gift is far greater than money.<sup>168</sup> Traces of humour have been found in the story of Tabitha by Cadbury,<sup>169</sup> and a further example can be found in the scene where Peter stands outside the door of Mary's house (Ac. 12:12ff.), Rhoda forgets to open the door and so Peter has to go on knocking (12:16) whilst those inside think Rhoda has lost her senses (12:15).<sup>170</sup> As with 3:5f. the humour is used to underline a useful practical point: in 12:12ff. prayer must be offered in the belief that it will be answered, in 3:5f. that the gift of Jesus is greater than any other gift. These features bind our tales together and perhaps strengthen the possibility that there once existed independent of our Acts, a collection of stories centred upon Peter.

168. cp. Ac. 8:19. The whole issue of money was one of great importance.
169. see H. Cadbury: *The Making of Luke (Acts 1927)* p. 263.
170. Other possible examples in Peter stories: 10:25f. where Cornelius' worship of Peter is scoffed, 12:9 and perhaps even the catch question in 5:8. See also Van Unnik *Nov T art. cit.* p. 51.

Peter's reply that he has no silver or gold (Ac. 3:6) discloses his obedience to the Lord's command (Lk. 9:3). It was money also that had led to Jesus' betrayal and perhaps for this reason the Community of Goods renounced worldly wealth! The phrase here may illustrate that Peter and John are still adhering to Jewish tradition.<sup>171</sup> Peter's words of healing incite the ensuing controversy, the outcome of which is that a command is issued that no more teaching shall be uttered 'in the name of Jesus' (4:17f.).<sup>172</sup> These clashes with the authorities may have led to the conviction that was soon to be put into effect, that the message of Jesus was to all men, not merely to Jews.

Peter's action (3:7) καὶ ἵστασθαι imitates Jesus' action recorded in Mk. 5:41 (=Lk. 8:54) and is repeated at Ac. 9:41. The detail in 3:7a could refer to Peter stretching forth his right hand, although the miracle story usually focusses upon the limbs of the afflicted,<sup>173</sup> and if this episode was part of an Acts of Peter, it is possible that this/

171. See J. Lightfoot op. cit. p. 39.

172. In Tosephta Chullin 2:22,24 a Galilean Christian heals and teaches in the name of (Π'ΨΩ) Jesus. Cp. too Eusebius' quotation of Mt. 28:19 (H.E. 3:5:2) and Mk. 9:38 = Lk. 9:49.

173. So in Lk. 6:6, 22:50 it is the right limb of the one to be cured that is recorded.

this was the intended meaning, even if the phrase as it now stands is ambiguous. The details of the restoration may imply some medical interest,<sup>174</sup> but this need not be seen as a reflection of Luke the Doctor, as Mark also displays considerable technical medical knowledge (so, e.g. Mk. 9:14ff).<sup>175</sup> But 3:7b may be an editorial attempt to soften the harsh transition from he (Peter) ἤγειρεν (αὐτόν) and he (the lame man) ἕστη.<sup>176</sup>

The tale now becomes most repetitive. In verse 8 our cripple is alive with joy, then in verse 9 the crowd suddenly come on stage and the exuberance is renewed. The editor or his source must have regarded this miracle as of some matter! The introduction of the crowd is typical of Mark's manner of narration for he mentioned onlookers as the situation demands whilst Luke better prepares us for their presence. Illustrating this are Lk. 5:17 aside Mk. 2:6 and Lk. 6:7 aside Mk. 3:6. They recognise that this is the man who once was lame (Ac. 3:10a) in a way not dissimilar to Mk. 5:14-17 where likewise the crowd hark back to the former state/

174. so the rare  $\sigma\phi\upsilon\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}$   $\leftarrow$  not DE 614.
175. See J. Wilkinson ET 79 (1967) pp. 39-42 cp. Mk. 7:35 also. Whether the terms in Mk. 9 are of pre-Markan origin is another question.
176. Similar difficulties over the subject of verbs in Ac. 4:10f..

state of the man. This recognition signals a fresh outburst of rejoicing. 3:11 might be explained as an editorial introduction to the speech, but 3:9 has already in fact mentioned the audience to be, and 3:11 contains so many exegetical difficulties<sup>177</sup> that it looks rather as though it has been borrowed from a source by Luke, and in support of this are the several Marcanisms that appear in our table above.

There are two accounts of the event in 3:11:

(i) in  $\mathcal{NABE}$  &c..

(ii) in D with partial support from h.<sup>178</sup>

Both versions contain Marcan features.

$\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\tilde{\iota}\nu$  is often used after a description of a miracle by Mark (1:31, 5:41) but the verb has the stronger meaning of "seize" in Mk. 3:21, 6:17, 12:12, 14:44 and Acts 24:6.

177. Complicated by the problem of whether one type of text (see below) has been corrected on the basis of the archaeological facts: J. Duplacy REA 2 (1956) pp. 231-41 concludes B. Harmonises with Jn. 10:23. A number of other commentators (BC 5 p. 484) accept the Bezan reading without following through the implications of this view. J. Wilson Acts (1923) p. 45, conflates both readings, Epp cannot classify this variant, Haenchen's commentary does not even mention it.

178. h corrects D (cp. p. 172 n. 155), it does not conflate the two text types.

This may be the meaning in Ac. 3:11, for on the miracle-story analogy the action of κρατῆν is on the part of the healer and not, as at 3:11, of the healed one. But why should the lame man "seize" Peter? It may be that the αὐτοῦ in v. 11 refers to some of the λαός. In this context, we note also the verb συνῆδραμεν which is used with connotations of violence in Ps. 50:18, 1Pet. 4:4 and Judith 6:16 where the sense is "run together in battle."<sup>179</sup> The situation (which Luke tries to tone down) in 3:11 appears to hint at a popular uprising for Peter and John, occasioned by the mighty deed.

This fact supplies sufficient motive for the interruption of the Jewish officials which follows almost immediately in 4:1,<sup>180</sup> despite the hour since they should have been at prayer if the notice in 3:1 is correct! There is a danger that the crowd will/

179. Note especially Mk. 6:33 (see H. Montefiore NTS 8 (1961) p. 136) where however the motif of violence lies beneath the surface of the narrative, as it may well do in the source used here. Cp. too Mk. 9:25 where Jesus sees a crowd ἐπισυντρέχει which causes him to rebuke the spirit. The connotation of popular rebellion is not far away (Black op. cit. p. 82 n. 3).

180. Taking 3:12-26 as an editorial insertion.

will turn against the authorities if this healing "in Jesus' name" continues. We will again note some parallel scenes in Paul's life which support our contention. The editor himself appears to draw out the connection:

Acts 3:1ff.

Acts 21:15ff.

3:3	μέλλοντας εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν...	21:26	εἰσῆει εἰς τὸ ἱερόν
3:11	συνέδραμεν πᾶς ὁ λαός...	21:30	καὶ ἐγένετο συνδρομὴ τοῦ λαοῦ
3:12	ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλιταί	21:28	ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλιταί
4:3	ἐπέβαλον αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας	21:27	καὶ ἐπέβαλαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας

(cp. Mk. 14:46)

also part of the scene is: (for this, see below)

5:16	συνήρχετο δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν περὶ τὰς πόλεις	21:22	κα(D)E δὲ πλῆθος συνελευθῆν... <sup>181</sup>
------	---	-------	--

By inserting the speech in 3:12-26 Luke has avoided the accusation that might have been raised: that the apostles were in any way involved in public demonstrations.

181. Note too how Paul is interrogated (Ac. 21:38) as though an insurrectionist. The Western text misses the parallelism of συνέδραμεν in 3:11 and also at 21:26 varies the verb, so we cannot use such readings (as 5:15D) where D does create a parallelism to prove its secondary character (despite J. Crehan TS 18 (1957) pp. 596ff.).



It is possible that the same use is made of a Peter speech in Acts 2. But if the speech in 3:12ff. is an insertion, the original charge for Peter and John's arrest could not have been their teaching but their healing which had caused a general disturbance of the peace. We can now begin to make sense of λαλούντων δὲ αὐτῶν (4:1), which none of the manuscripts alter despite its impossibility as a reference to the preceding speech, since only Peter has delivered this. Luke probably found the words in his source but by adding πρὸς τὸν λαόν has awkwardly referred them to Peter's speech.<sup>182</sup> A source continuing on from 3:11 would understand the words as those of the popular demands of the crowd, and this interpretation is substantiated by the curious remark in 3:12

ὁ Πέτρος ἀπεκρίνατο πρὸς τὸν λαόν

which, as a "reply", has no *raison d'être*, but is made to the crowd as though they were already shouting at Peter. Latin texts thus alter to (εἶπεν) (g, p) and in similar cases where the verb "reply" is used without obvious cause D removes this apparent discrepancy.<sup>183</sup>

182. 33 omits these words. Perhaps Luke derived the phrase from 3:12.

183. Ac. 5:8, 10:46, 21:13 cp. Mk. 9:5 (which Luke's parallel changes). R. Mackenzie: *Codex Bezae* (1962) p. 89 explains Ac. 5:8D as due to Bezan familiarity with εἶπεν πρὸς... without taking into account this broader tendency.

The picture of 3:11 is thus of the crowd clamouring for more miracles - one which Luke has carefully reworked to his own end, by providing Peter both with an opportunity to preach to the crowd and through the arrest of Peter and John an opening for a testimony as to their innocence in the eyes of the law. To achieve this he has had to avoid a detailed account of the disturbance; but on examination of our text of Acts, it may be that all Luke has done is to transfer such an account to a different context. Hence 5:15f. (which has become generalised in the course of the transition) may be part of the continuation from 3:11, for here too the crowd desire to see more of Peter's power, more of his healings. Their hope is nothing more than superstition. From the Gospels we know how fickle were the crowd and there had always been these anxious clamourings of the sick for attention (Mk. 1:33, 6:56). Yet their healing, however important, is only one aspect of the good news which it is the task of the apostles to publish.<sup>184</sup>

184. Their commission is to heal as well as to preach (Mk. 3:15, 6:13) but the details of their missions indicate only spasmodic ability to heal (Mk. 6:30, Lk. 9:10 cf. Mk. 9:18).

The stories in Ac. 1-5 deliberately avoid any idea of implicating the apostles in any disturbance (contrast later chapters!) and this apologetic can be seen in the insistence:

Τότε... ὁ στρατηγὸς... ἤγειν αὐτούς, οὐ μετὰ βίας (Ac. 5:26).<sup>185</sup>

We have argued above for the connection between 3:11 and 5:15f., which latter paragraph begins in 5:12 with a setting once more in Solomon's Porch (3:11). We thus deal with 5:12-16 now.

185. D however (as at Ac. 7:25) omits the οὐ. An obvious (unsupported) error it would seem, for the litotes is typical of Acts, although the manuscripts do show a tendency to add the construction: Ac. 1:5, 2:43E, 5:13D, 26(not D), 19:11, 20:12, 21:39(om. D), 26:19, 27:14, 28:2. But what is surprising is that D (and E 614) add an οὐ at 5:28. In the parallel in Paul's story (21:35) we have διὰ τὴν βίαν τοῦ λαοῦ (cp. also 24:7 ψ 614 μετὰ πολλῆς βίας): illustrating the danger of the crowd. Whichever reading in 5:26 be accepted as correct, this aspect is heightened if the reading of AP rightly brings out the sense in adding a ἴνα, dependent on (οὐ) μετὰ βίας -; now ἐφοβούντο γὰρ... is in parenthesis (as at Mk. 16:8) and the sense is (as may be intended by all the versions): "and they (the officers) - for they feared the people - led them (the apostles) away (not) by force, lest they should be stoned." The final "they" is ambiguous in its terms of reference. A more specific pointer to the hostility of the crowd can be seen at 7:57h "tunc populus exclamavit." It suggests that it was to avoid public disturbance that the apostles were arrested. This would accentuate the rift of the new faith with the old order as well as acting as a challenge to the apostles' faith. Cp. the phrase ἐν τηρήσει δημοσίων (5:18) which may, on analogy with the meaning in Demosthenes Ep. 21:50, indicate that they were placed in gaol "by public consent."

5:12-14: The Faithful

12. ἀπιστολος, λαός	τέρας ≠		
13. λαός		1	3
14. προστίθεναι, (πλήθος) ἀνήρ, τς			

5:15-16: Healings

15.	ὥστε ≠, κράβατος *		
16. δὲ καί, πλήθος Ἱερουσαλήμ	φάρσιν * ἀκόθαρτος *	0	1

Though 5:15f. is a short passage, like 3:1-11 it has an above average yield of Marcanisms. The editor has attempted to generalise this section (5:12-16) by prefixing it with the information that all the apostles worked wonders.<sup>186</sup> 5:15 however singles out Peter, and his introduction is made in such a way that it is as though he were the subject in the foreground all the time.

186. On this aspect of Luke's method see p. 192 and p. 193 n. 198.

5:12b recalls the scene at 3:11, but the meaning of the present passage (assuming 5:12b-16 continued on from 3:11) depends upon the reading followed at 3:11. Taking firstly the non-Bezan reading the sequence of events is:

- (1) Peter, John and the healed man are in Solomon's Porch.
- (2) The crowd rush to the place amazed.
- (3) 5:13b: they (see number one) are in the porch.
- (4) 5:13: the crowd, however, do not join the apostles but they nevertheless magnify them because of the miracle.
- (5) 5:14 Summary: as a result many do join the faithful.

Accepting the D reading in 3:11, the meaning becomes

- (1) Peter, John and the healed one leave Solomon's porch.
- (2) The crowd watch amazed from Solomon's porch.
- (3) 5:12b they (the crowd) are in Solomon's porch; restating 3:11.
- (4) 5:13; the crowd however do not join the apostles who have left: yet they still magnify them.
- (5) 5:14: Nevertheless many do join the faithful.

It will be seen that D makes the results of the miracle even more obvious, as the erstwhile cripple is seen to leave the temple: this explains the amazement/

amazement of the onlookers. D also links the scene with 5:15f. better, for Peter (and John) are now outside the temple, passing through the streets, and the people, hearing the extraordinary news, rush to tell their sick kinsfolk!

Nevertheless it is difficult to adequately follow through this interpretation because (i) the editor has obscured the connection with 3:11 by generalising the scene in 5:12a. However he appears to have incorporated elements of a source from 5:12b onwards: the reference to Solomon's Porch in 5:12b is otherwise most odd, and 5:13 and 15 may include elements of an earlier account. (ii) the text has undergone some unknown corruption. (iii) Our understanding of the passage partly depends on whether any technical meaning is to be attached to  $\kappa\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  in 5:13:<sup>187</sup> the whole verse is a crux, it may have lain at the top of an early codex which became mutilated.<sup>188</sup>

187. Cp. Ac. 9:26, 10:18. See now C. Burchard art. cit. pp. 159f..
188. Though just possibly Luke has indulged in an old LXX trick of transliterating an obscure Aramaic word; if we reverse this process,  $\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\lambda\ \mu\omicron\iota = \text{ܐܦܫܩܐ}$  oppress (cp. Aeth. 26 which reads  $s\ h\ a\ t\ a$  which probably translates  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$ ) and  $\kappa\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  may come from  $\text{ܕܠܟ}$ ; but all this assumes an Aramaic source. And if the words admitted of no easy understanding for Luke, neither will we be able to trace any Aramaic original with any probability. This is not to say no such attempt should be endeavoured. The same construction as 5:13 is found in 4:32  $\text{οὐδὲ εἰς... ἀλλ'...}$  (cp. 5:12E  $\acute{\iota}\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \nu\alpha\omega\ \sigma\omega\eta\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$  providing a further verbal link with 4:31) and so the construction may not be so unique in 5:13 after all and Torrey's conjectural emendation of either Levites for  $\lambda\omicron\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  or retranslation on the basis of the peshitta, of the verb as "antagonise" are superfluous.

Turning to 5:15f., the popular superstition conveyed confirms the thought implicit in 3:10f.. We have already listed the parallels with Mk. 6:55f..<sup>189</sup>

We take v. 15 which begins with a  $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$  clause, to connect with v. 13.<sup>190</sup> An examination of the uses of this word shows that it is used often after mention of a crowd,<sup>191</sup> and very frequently at the end of the Marcan miracle story format.<sup>192</sup> Thus this word provides additional evidence of the link with 3:11. However the expression at 5:15 is  $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$ .... which is repeated in the summary of Pauline healings at Ac. 19:12. And here we must record the first of several textual variants in 5:15f., since the Western texts here do not make this point of parallelism, which is all the odder because later in the verse it is clear that 5:15D and Ac. 19:12 have a close point of contact, and there, it is claimed, D must be secondary. If it is claimed that  $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$ ... repeats 5:15 the same should be said for  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\iota\nu$  in 19:12, that it has been borrowed/

189. v. pp. 76-78.

190. so F. Blass: NT Grammar (1898) p. 281, W. Bieder TZ 16 (1960) p. 408, against the majority view which takes 5:12b-14 as an editorial insertion (see e.g. BC 4 p. 53).

191. Mk. 1:27, 2:2,13, 3:10,20, 4:1 cp. Lk. 4:29.

192. Mk. 1:27,45, 2:12, 8:25D cp. also Mk. 2:28, 9:26 and Lk. 4:39D.

borrowed from 5:15D. The reading of D in 5:15 is  
 ὥστε κατὰ πλατείας<sup>193</sup> "a harsh phrase"<sup>194</sup> which  
 other texts may have felt obliged to smooth down.

Ἐκφέρειν appears only elsewhere in Acts in  
 5:6-10, where it is a technical term connected with  
 burial.<sup>195</sup> The usage here in 5:15 has been influenced  
 by the story of Ananias, and the presence of this  
 verb makes τιθίνα redundant. This latter occurs in  
 Mk. 6:56, and thus by employing the additional  
 ἐκφέρειν the editor makes nonsense of the scene:  
 Stage One: The sick are brought out of their houses.  
 Stage Two: They are put on beds, as though the beds  
 were already lying outside.

ἵνα is dependent upon τιθίνα so technically  
 speaking the verse states that they are placed on  
 their beds in order that Peter's shadow might fall  
 upon them!

All this is probably no more than another example  
 of the slightly inconclusive style of the author.  
 But why does Luke introduce ἐκφέρειν? The suggestion  
 might/

193. PS 614 add τας. E reads ὥστε καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις  
 (cp. Mk. 6:56D). Also cp. κατὰ πλατείας (Lk. 13:22),  
 and Ac. 17:26D, Iren. (Haer 3:18:19). Also cp. Mk. 13:11.

194. BC 4 p. 55.

195. Josephus: Ant. 15:46.



might be that Luke wishes to imply Peter was expected to perform raisings from the dead. We may compare 9:38 where messengers arrive for Peter, fully confident of his ability to help.<sup>196</sup> If then it is the Sadducees who arrest the apostles (5:17) it is because they believe people are being brought back to life by Peter and his friends! Thereby the editor provides a link with the following scene and a reason for the arrest. Though the connection is by no means obvious, Luke may have thus been subconsciously led to write ἐκτίρειν at 5:15.

The ἄσθενῆς who are the object of this verb, may likewise be a Lucan editorial feature - cp. Lk. 10:9

Ἰσχυρεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἄσθενῆς:

i.e. the apostles are seen to be fulfilling Jesus' command.<sup>197</sup> Mark himself prefers to use more cumbersome expressions to describe the sick, but at Mk. 6:56 (as well as Ac. 19:12) the participle of ἄσθενῆς is employed. If however the claim is laid that Ac. 5:15f. has only borrowed from Mk. 6:55ff. we may/

196. On this aspect, see also the Western variant at the end of 5:15.

197. cp. too Ac. 5:16 ἰσχυρεύοντο (NABE). & ἄσθενῆς as a noun elsewhere in the Gospels only at Lk. 9:2 N.D.

may ask why the assimilation that has taken place in the mind of the editor, or the borrowing he has effected from there (with *κράβατος* and perhaps *πλατείας*) has not been extended to *ἰσθινίς*. It is a more likely supposition that Luke is here either imitating<sup>198</sup> Mk. 6:55f. or following a source here, similar in character to those verses. D reads at 5:15 *ἰσθινίς αὐτῶν* at first sight a dittography from *πρὸ αὐτῶν*. This latter refers to the sick, but D's *αὐτῶν* refers to the people who brought out their sick and who are thus otherwise anonymous. Here then is a relic of the impersonal (typical Marcan) construction: the reading does have some support in E (*τιθέναι ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν*) which relates this last word to the apostles. This is a manifest improvement. But have the other versions not also dropped this impersonal usage to create a smoother reading?

198. Haenchen op. cit. pp. 203-5 sees the whole of 5:12-16 as an editorial bridge passage, but his analysis fails to cover the difficulties in 5:13 nor does he explain the presense of Peter in 5:15 if (as is correct) 5:12-42 is intended by the editor to be a section whose subject is all the apostles. It looks rather as though Luke is using and moulding a source.

> κλιναρίων, κρεβάτων < are two words for beds and the repetition captures the infectious enthusiasm of the gathering crowds. Is the first word an apology for the vulgar > κρεβάτων <, but then why write the latter at all? "It is strange that... Luke employs a word for 'beds' which he laboriously avoids in Lk. 5:18ff.." <sup>199</sup> There he substitutes an alternative, but now the inclusion of the Marcan term is all the more extraordinary. Is this a place where, in Wilfred Knox's words, the source comes 'shining through'? <sup>200</sup>

ἵνα ἐρχομένου Πέτρου singles out Peter from the apostles of 5:12 and the construction appears to be that of the Genitive Absolute, though the use of Peter's name goes against such an explanation for "the simplest example (of the construction) is the repetition of the pronoun in the same case." <sup>201</sup> It may be that it is a genitive absolute dependent upon 'shadow', <sup>202</sup> though it is most clumsy for it not only interrupts the clause > ἵνα... καὶ < but also reintroduces/

199. Findlay op. cit. p. 84.

200. Note too the τῶν before > κλιναρίων (A) < which depicts the scene even more vividly, though the reading may be an assimilation from Mk. 6:55 (> τοῖς κρεβάτοις <) but the article is striking when used in the plural in such contexts (so cp. e.g. Amos 6:4). Κλινῶν (EP 614) is an obvious attempt to delete the rarer word.

201. A. Robertson: Grammar (1914) p. 514 - examples using a name are rare (Mt. 2:1).

202. so Bruce op. cit. p. 138.

reintroduces Peter into the story<sup>203</sup> (cp. of Jesus in Ac. 1:1) via the genitive case. An interesting parallel to this feature presents itself at Mk. 6:22 where Herod's daughter makes our acquaintance in this same way.

The > ἰνα... καὶ < is imitative of Mk. 6:56 "but this usage is not employed again by either author,"<sup>204</sup> although Mk. 5:28 uses καὶ,<sup>205</sup> a motif from which verse reappears in the Matthaen counterpart of Mk. 6:56 (Mt. 14:36). Perhaps this sort of idea was in Luke's mind as he adds the new feature (as compared with Mk. 6:56) of Peter's shadow.<sup>206</sup> But if, as we argue is probable, Luke was copying a source, it is more likely that such a motif was already found in the pre-Lucan material. This special healing propensity which is attributed to Peter, whether by popular superstition or no, is surely indicative of a Peter source, and one moreover, which centres/

203. Although the usage may not be pressed, the absence of the article before Peter's name implies a new scene, i.e. the editor wishes to prepare for his introduction before v. 29.

204. BC 5 p. 399 n. 1.

205. Nowhere else is this word used in the Gospels (or LXX) in narrative (as opposed to speech).

206. It goes "beyond anything in the Gospels" (BC 5 p. 399).

centres particularly on his miracles (cp. 3:1ff., 9:32ff. and perhaps 5:1ff.).<sup>207</sup>

Having arrived at this majestic climax, we are told that Peter's shadow might come upon  $\tau\upsilon\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$  i.e. they are expecting only one of them will be healed.<sup>208</sup> Luke surely uses the words as meaning "each of them" but New Testament usage does not supply any examples of the singular  $\tau\upsilon\iota$  with this sense.<sup>209</sup> Is it for this reason that Western texts record further information?

$\alpha\iota\ \pi\eta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$   $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$   $\alpha\pi\omicron$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\varsigma$   
 $\alpha\iota\ \theta\iota\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$   $\omega\varsigma$   $\epsilon\iota\chi\epsilon\upsilon$   $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$ .<sup>210</sup>

The first verb also comes in Lk. 12:58, and with medical connotations, at Lk. 9:40D, Ac. 19:12. Now we have stated that it is erroneous to maintain that because/

207. Other stories relate God working a miracle through Peter's agency (10:9ff.) and working a miracle for Peter (12:5ff.).

208. Cp. Jn. 5:4A. ~~28~~

209.  $\tau\upsilon\iota$  + genitive = "one" in Lk. 7:36, 11:1, 11:45, 14:15, 1 Cor. 6:1, though none of these provide exact parallels. For the use of "each" cp. Simil. Hermas 8:2.  $\text{cop}^{\text{G}67}$  appears to omit  $\tau\upsilon\iota$  therefore.

210. E reads  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\delta\upsilon\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\iota\upsilon$   $\alpha\pi\omicron$   $\dots$   $\tau\upsilon\iota$   $\epsilon\iota\chi\omicron\upsilon$ . In D the medical sense of the first word is unique in the NT (cp. Herodotus Hist. 3:132) and so is probably secondary, though it indicates the loosing of the hold of evil cp. Mt. 6:13, 2 Cor. 1:10. The reading of  $\text{cop}^{\text{G}67}$  approximates to both D and E, but until the text of this manuscript is published, we can only say that it confirms these words as a definite Western Reading.

because D contains the parallelism, it must be secondary,<sup>211</sup> even though it serves to enhance the status of Peter:-<sup>212</sup>

(i) the clause contains one of those Mark-like pictures which so easily could have been removed, particularly because it might imply that the superstition of the people was rewarded.

(ii) the variants of D and E suggest a derivation from a common, and thus much older, original - note that E commences this variant with *καί* (D = *γάρ*), apparently not connecting the scene so closely with the preceding words, but by adding *δὲ* (5:16E) attempts to make the whole scene more of a unity. These different explanations point to an original text, part of a Lucan writing which had been taken from a Marcan source, evidence of which can further be seen in the redundant clause so typical of Mark *ἦς εἰχόν* (5:15E (D)).<sup>213</sup>

Verse 16 now sums up the picture in even more generalised terms. Perhaps this once formed the original concluding summary of 3:1-11/5:12-16. Even if Luke's stamp has been imprinted on this verse (*δὲ καί, >δχλουμείνουσσ* (Lk. 6:18D) and perhaps *ἰθὺς κτεύοντο*<sup>214</sup>) there/

211. so F. Chase: Old Syriac Element (1893) pp. 51f..

212. Epp op. cit. pp. 156ff..

213. But a similar phrase in Ac. 16:19D.

214. D: *ἰθὺς* (Lk. 11 times) - possibly enhancing the apostles' status if it means "cured" (see J. Wilson op. cit. pp. 20f.) but this is unnecessarily fussy.

there are still two distinctive Marcan words, which might be expected in a summary so similar to that in the Gospels. But can we explain the above average number in 5:15f. on this basis?<sup>215</sup>

Let us now turn to Luke's use of his source in these chapters. We suggested (p. 159) that the repetition of the Community of Goods summary resulted from Luke's transposition of the "Pentecost" story. The same has happened in 3:11ff. for he has interrupted the healing narrative to provide a sermon, following which he continues with details of an arrest and trial (4:1-22). He then uses the material which was broken off from 3:11 in 5:15f. (and perhaps parts of 5:12-14) to provide a climax to the account of the activity of the Jerusalem church, and continues with the account of an arrest (5:17ff.). Luke makes various suggestions as to the reason for this arrest,<sup>216</sup> whilst attempting to put the apostles as the subject of the whole section (5:12-42), but by divorcing 5:15f. from 3:11 the original point has been obliterated//

215. Neither  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\nu$  or  $\alpha\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\tau\eta\varsigma$  (Ac. 5:16) come from Mk. 6:55f. (except in D).

216. On  $\epsilon\kappa\phi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\sigma\iota\nu$  as a link, see p. 191. Scribes later felt obliged to reduce the lacuna between 5:16 and 17; E p. vg (Ard): "Annas". Cop<sup>67</sup> (which also reads Annas) and syr pesh explain their response as an immediate one:

$\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega\ \tau\acute{o}\sigma\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  .

obliterated and the picture becomes that of the apostles reassembling (5:12) at the scene of their former "crime", courting arrest. This in effect means that 4:1ff. is a doublet, although Luke has used the second story to develop the ideas inherent in the first. If they both derive from a common source, we can see the extent to which Luke has revised his material:

(i) the stories which we have reported (4:1ff., 5:17ff., like the Community of Goods passages) will represent the maximum divergence from a common source.

(ii) Lucan apologetic will however be especially strong in the trial scenes. This is partly confirmed by his own repetition of the events, and partly by the length of these scenes in proportion to, for example, the healing narratives. Luke's remodelling of his material will not necessarily have been uniform throughout Luke-Acts, and so, even if we do claim that a single source has led to the creation of the trial scenes in Ac. 4 and 5, this must not deter us from further source analysis, merely because Luke here thoroughly rewords his material.<sup>217</sup> But firstly we must/

217. Acts 10 and 11 are another possible example of a single source which has led to two stories in Luke's account. But here the source is repeated almost verbatim and maximum divergence is negligible (10:19-16, 11:5-10). There Luke's method appears to be to add a separate source (10:1-8 &c.) which more closely reflects his standpoint, only occasionally re-writing the Marcan source in any detail. Here in Acts 4 and 5 Luke seems to have had no corroborative source.



must turn briefly to 3:12ff.:

3:12-26. Peter's speech.

12.	πρός λαός (not D), ἀνὴρ, θαυμάζειν ἐπί, τῷ + inf.	περιπατεῖν † (om. cop <sup>G67</sup> ) 218	
13.			( ) 6 6 5=7
14.	ἀνὴρ		
15.		ἐγείρειν †	
16.	τοῦτον, ἴδομαι (sy <sup>pesh</sup> )		
17.	νῦν, ἀνὴρ (DE cop <sup>G67</sup> ), πράττειν, ἀρχόντες	ἐπίσταμαι (D) †	
18.			
19.			( )
20.			
21.	ὅς ἄχρι		
22.	πρός (DE 614 cop <sup>G67</sup> ) πρός	ὅτι recit. †	
23.	λαός		
24.		ἕσος (ABC*) †	
25.	ὅς, πρὸς		
26.	ἐν τῷ, ἐξαποστῆλαι (D), ὑποσφίσειν (ψ)		

This speech furnishes minimal evidence of a Marcan source, much less than 2:14ff.. There are some/

218. See Texte und Untersuchungen Vol. 109 (1970) p. 22 for this reading. This work gives some readings of cop<sup>G67</sup> not noted in the earlier essays of Petersen (CBQ 26 (1964) or Haenchen/Weingandt (NTS 14, 1968).

some primitive features, notably the expectation of an early restoration (3:21 cp. 1:6), which is related to a prophetic utterance of Moses. It may be that Luke had before him a written source, but the non-Marcian character of this section relieves us of more detailed enquiry.

4:1-22. The Trial.

1. στρέψ, λαός, ῥήμα(D), ἐφιστάνασι	ὥστε †	4 6 (D)
2. λαός		
3.	κρατῶν(h) * ἐπαύριω(D)†	
4. ἀνὴρ, ὥσει (E)		
5. ἐγένετο, ἀρχόντες, Ἰερουσαλήμ		

Trial and Speech.

6.	ἕσσοσ†, γένος †
7.	
8. πῖμ πλημι, πρῶς, ἀρχόντες, λαός	
9.	
10. λαός, ἐνώπιον	ἐγέρειν †, παρῆστημι †, ὕγις †
11.	
12. σωτηρία (om. D) ἐτέρος	

Conclusion.

13. σύν, τς (not D)

παρρησικ ≠,  
καταλαμβάνειν ≠

14. τς (om. D), σύν

15.

16. Ἰερουσαλήμ

17. λάος, ῥῆμα (E: sy<sup>hmg</sup>)

μηκίτι ≠

18.

19. πρὸς, ἐνώπιον

20.

21. τότε inf., λάος

22. ἕτος

Style of Mark: Anacoluthon (v. 6)

Double Negatives (vv. 12,17,18,20)

The Stupidity of the Disciples (v. 13):

ῥιῶται is not very disparaging, and yet D feels the difficulty and omits the word.

Asyndeton (vv. 14D, 15 and 17D)

Pleonasm (v. 16) - a redundant

question.

Repetition (vv. 17-18). A little surprising is Luke's repetition here. It reflects his desire to stress the decision of the Sanhedrin. If a Marcan source described this scene, there might have been intended an echo of the secrecy motif, to which, now, the disciples are no longer bound (cp. Mk. 9:9).

"Sideline" (v. 22) - as if the age of the man was of any interest at this juncture!.

Thus there is some evidence of Marcan material from the stylistic features, though the word counts exhibit no strong Marcan affinities. To these facts we set aside 5:17ff..

5:17-42. Another Trial.

17	ἐναστᾶς, σύν, πῆμπλημι			
18	ἀπόστολος			
19	τε	Θύρα ≠		
20	λαός, ῥήμα			
21	παραγίνομαι, σύν, συνκαλεῖν	ἐγείρειν (D) ≠		
22	παραγίνομαι	πρωί (D) ≠		
23		ἔσω (D) ≠		
		ὅτι recit. T, ἔσω ≠		
24	ὡς, τε, τι, ἀν + opt. (not D*)			
25	παραγίνομαι, ἀνήρ, λαός	ὅτι. recit. T	5 (D=11)	7 (D=9)
26	σύν, λαός			
27				
28	Ἰερουσαλήμ	διδαχή *		
29	ἀπόστολος (om. Δ), πρὸς			
30		ἐγείρειν ≠		
31	τούτον, ὃ ψ οὖν			
32	ῥήμα			
33	ῥήμα (614h)			
34	ἐναστᾶς, ὄνομα, πᾶς + λαός, ἀπόστολος (ΔΕ614)	ἄσος ≠		

35. τε, πρὸς, ἄρχοντας(D), ἀνήρ, πράσσειν	δοσος †
36. ἀνήρ, ὡσεὶ(α)	
37. τοῦτον, ἀφιστάναί, λαός	ἀφίτω(NAAB) †
38. νῦν, ἀφιστάναί	
39. ἀνήρ(614)	
40. ἀπόστολος	
41. ἀπόστολος(D 614 cop <sup>G67</sup> ), χαίρσιν	
42. τε, εὐαγγελίζομαι	

Marcan Style: Repetition of 'amazement' (5:24E).

The word analyses are a useful pointer in determining which of these two stories above may be closer to an original. Lucan activity is average in chapter 4, in chapter 5 it is above average, considerably so in Gamaliel's speech. Marcan activity is also average in chapter 4 (excluding the speech) and above average in 5:17-28. The Lucan figures might corroborate the general impressions which critics have voiced, that of the accounts, the second is the most legendary in character.<sup>219</sup> It is thus most probable/

219. Despite Jeremias art. cit. pp. 208-213 who claims that the procedure of two trials accords with the legal stipulation of the Sanhedrin though the narrative is too vague about any such legal technicalities and is designed to show that the Sanhedrin have no case against the apostles, all they can conjure up are vague threats.

probable that the brief summary of the apostles' escape (5:19) is based on the passage in Acts 12 for all the details in 5:19 are found there:<sup>220</sup>

1. The right setting (5:19 = 12:6)
2. The angelic deliverance (5:19 = 12:17ff.)
3. The angel leads ( $\xi\lambda\theta\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ ) the escape (5:19 = 12:17).<sup>221</sup>

220. cp. too 12:1. The fact that Herod seized 'some of the church' may have prompted an account of the arrest of the apostles in ch. 5. Nowhere in that chapter is their presence as a body felt, they are mentioned only at 5:18 and 5:29 (not D.h).

221.  $\kappa\alpha\iota \xi\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\theta\eta \xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma \xi\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\alpha \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha$  (5:18D cop. G67) cp. 14:18 (C614) 21:6, (Jn.) 7:53. This is claimed by Epp as a heightening of the miracle (Epp pp. 129f.) as it emphasises each apostle is locked in his own cell. However the usual LXX meaning refers this phrase to  $\sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  (Esther 5:10, 6:12, 3 Macc. 6:27) and thus this cannot be used as an example of the legendary narrative, for at 5:21<sup>D</sup>, D has  $\xi\gamma\epsilon\rho\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma \tau\omicron \pi\omicron\omega\iota$  ( $\tau\omicron \pi\omicron\omega\iota$  only here and Mk. 15:1A in the NT); a reading which illustrates the logicity of it all: if they have gone home, then they also have to come back again the next day! Another example of this logicity comes at 12:17D which balances the  $\xi\lambda\theta\omega\upsilon\upsilon$  <with>  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\theta\epsilon\omega$  (cp. too Ac. 28:14f.L): but since this is also a feature of the non-Western text of Acts (see Ac. 14:20) it cannot be used to prove the secondary character of the Bezan text. MacKenzie (op. cit. p. 201) on 5:18D, whilst using our interpretation above of the phrase, confirms Epp's thesis that D heightens the role of the apostles for 5:18D "implies the loneliness of the apostles."

Thus 5:19 is no more than a summary of the event found in chapter 12 designed to lead up to a situation similar to that in chapter 4.<sup>222</sup> The story of chapter twelve is told so much more vividly and in much more human terms as Peter finds the fact too miraculous to believe (12:9), hardly testifying to his earlier experience where the account remarks upon the boldness of the disciples (cp. 5:25)! We record one further pointer to the dependence of chapter 5 on the story in chapter 12:

ἐφοβούντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν

(Ac. 5:26 - D has

the participle) which is paralleled in the Lucan story of the events prior to Jesus' arrest (Lk. 22:2):

ἐφοβούντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν,

This passage is a rewording of Mk. 14:2. The final piece in this detective's jigsaw is found in Ac. 12:4 which is "one of several cases where a motif in the Gospel of Mark is omitted by the parallel in the Gospel of Luke only to reappear in Acts,"<sup>223</sup> and the motif in question is the Passover. The argument is: that if Luke omits the reference found in Mark in his/

222. see below p. 208.

223. BC 4 p. 134. Cp. Williams: op. cit. p. 148.

his Gospel, has he done likewise when borrowing in Acts 5 from a Marcan account in Acts 12? This might be more convincing if it could be shown that in chapter 12 Luke has allowed his material to come 'shining through'. Certainly, the word analysis strongly hints at a Marcan source for part of this chapter. To conclude this introductory material therefore, we may say that of the two trial scenes in Ac. 4:1 - 5:42, the second appears to be further from any original source, its legendary embellishments however perhaps concealing some material relevant to our inquiry. We begin again then at 4:1.

A Marcan narrative, like the present Lucan one, described in considerable detail the healing and its after-effects so<sup>224</sup> that it is probable that it also fully discussed the resulting trial. The editor however has broken into his source's description of the repercussions (3:11, 5:12ff.) inserting a speech, which becomes the cue for the arrest of Peter and John. Verses one and two of chapter four will, on this understanding be a Lucan introductory section.

224. Cp. Haefner art. cit. p. 70. "From the fact that the name of Jesus had proved to be alive....Peter may have inferred that Jesus was alive."



Verse 3 (= 5:18a) describes the arrest. Here, it is just credible that h preserves the Western text by reading "et tenuerunt eos",<sup>225</sup> which verb translates in Ac. 2:24, 3:11 the Greek κρατῆν, a Marcan distinctive characteristic. The phrase is redundant after ἐπιβάντων ... τὰς χεῖρας and might be a relic of a Marcan source.

Verse 4 provides an example of anacoluthon with sudden news as to the numbers of believers.<sup>226</sup> The following verses contain another sermon from Peter, in the context of the trial. In chapter 5 the editor also provides the setting for another brief speech by recording the angel's command to preach (5:20) which results in the apostles being rearrested on a concrete charge: that of teaching (5:25,28). Thus by the escape interlude of 5:19 we have been brought back to the same situation as that of 4:2. Luke has created the whole incident (5:19-26) in order to provide an opportunity for stressing that the apostles, although forbidden to preach the name of Jesus, now found that this ban made an impossible demand upon their/

225. so also Clark op. cit. p. 21, and others: see Jacquier op. cit. p. 121.

226. In E this prefixed by the Lucan ὡσεύ. Harnack: Acts p. 180 n. 1 remarks: "Have we not here one cipher too many? Vide 1 Cor. 15:6". (The London Polyglott (Aeth) here reads "500" although its evidence is worthless). But the Pauline passage refers to a Resurrection appearance and is better associated with 1:6ff. (thus see p. 123).

their faith. Some such indication he may have found in his source, but he has built upon it, and also closed the discussion with Gamaliel's pronouncement (5:34-40). The high yield of Lucanisms in this speech argues again for the secondary character of this trial<sup>227</sup> so that it will be in chapter 4, if anywhere, that traces of a Marcan source will most easily be found.

The key to understanding this first trial lies in 4:22 and the subsequent verses. 4:22 conveys the news, in which no reader could be interested at this stage of the debate, as to the age of the cured man. This typical Marcan sideline may indicate that this once lame man played a more important part in the proceedings than Luke, whose insistence on the preaching we have noted, has stressed. In the 'trial' the impotent man is summoned as a witness (vv. 9f.), but not without confusion for he is  $\epsilon\omega\tau\alpha\varsigma$  in vv. 9f. whilst  $\epsilon\omega\tau\alpha\varsigma$  in v. 11 refers to Christ. Verse 11 must/

227. Williams op. cit. p. 94 on Ac. 5:38 points to Lk. 20:4 as partial proof of the Lucan quality of the language here, but the phrase to which it refers in Luke ( $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ) is taken directly from Mk. 11:30. The reference to Lk. 23:51 is hardly more convincing.

must therefore be regarded as an anacoluthon, for, grammatically speaking, the reference of Ps. 118:22 is applied to the cured man!<sup>228</sup>

The opening of this speech, in which Peter refers to the ex-cripple, contains a wealth of names which suggests either Luke or a source was well-informed about the event (cp. Lk. 3:2, Ac. 13:1 for other lists). But it is not possible to assert with any confidence the probability of a Marcan source. All the material has been redirected to the editor's end. The Sanhedrin are improbably perplexed over the speaking in the Name (4:17 cp. 3:16) and this apologetic has resulted in the obliteration of any source that might have been utilised. But we have already seen that 4:22 goes back to the lame man with no evident motive, for the part he has played in the present account of the trial is inconsiderable. This seems sufficient to suggest that there was some source being used (if very freely) for this chapter. This becomes yet more apparent in the story that is intimately linked with the trial, 4:23-31. In this view we are supported by the word counts, which show that Lucan characteristics are below normal and Marcan/

228. The quotation is not from the LXX - it may be a translation of the Hebrew (BC 4 p. 43) but the play on *שָׁמַע* (vv. 9, 12) must argue against an Aramaic original despite Martin who assigns 4:5-12 to one of his translation Greek sections. Ps. 118 is quoted also in Mk. 12:10 (= Lk. 20:17) and 1 Pet. 2:7.

Marcan ones above average, though not to the extent exhibited in Ac. 3:1-11. And once again  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  slips out of prominence. This is encouraging for further analysis.

4:23-31. A Prayer of Thanksgiving.

23	διέρχομαι(917), πρὸς	ὅσος ≠		
24	τὰ + prep. (ex. LXX)			
25				
27	τε, σύν, λαός			
28		ὅσος ≠		
29	νῦν	παρρησία ≠		
30	ἐν τῷ	τέρας ≠		
31	δοξαί, πῦμπλημι	παρρησία ≠	3	4 5 (DE)

The close connection of this paragraph with the earlier (Marcan) section concluding at 3:11, 5:12-16 can be seen

1. In the return to an almost exclusive use of καί as against  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ,
2. by comparing the parallel healing story in Acts 14,<sup>229</sup> which concludes with a reference to Ex. 20:11 (= Ac. 4:24). If Luke did indulge in any paralleling of Peter and Paul stories, we may cite this evidence,

229. see pp. 174f..

3. in the unity of place. In 4:23 the apostles return  $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \eta\delta\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  and a reference here may be included "perhaps (to) the house of Mary, mother of John Mark".<sup>230</sup> This would then be the site for the little Pentecost, the size of which, suggests a house gathering.<sup>231</sup>

Lucan activity is less noticeable than usual, and this strengthens the case which sees in this passage part of an early Christian prayer.<sup>232</sup> The reference to Herod however, warns us not to deny any Lucan editing, although the mention of Pontius Pilate is not merely a Lucan reference, as it appears also in the credo of 1 Tim. 6:13.<sup>233</sup> Luke has taken over a prayer which is based on the catchword principle and one which is, as in Peter's first speech,<sup>234</sup> developed out of the quotation of scripture.

230. cited from Jacquier p. 137.

231. cp. the house in 1:13 (implied) and 2:2.

232. so (e.g.) M. Dibelius ZNW 16 (1915) p. 124 - and also for what follows.

233. also Mt. 27:2 AWΘ. The addressing of God as  $\Delta\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$  (as in Lk. 2:29) also argues for a primitive Jewish-Christian prayer.

234. see p. 163.

4:24	τὴν γῆν (Ex. 20:11)	recurs in	4:26	τῆς γῆς (Ps. 2:1)
4:25	ἁγίου	"	"	4:27,30
4:25	ἐθνη (Ps. 2:1)	"	"	4:27 ἐθνησιν
4:25	λαοὶ (Ps. 2:1)	"	"	4:28 λαοὶ Ἰσραὴλ <sup>235</sup>
4:26	συνήθησαν (Ps. 2:2)	"	"	4:27 συνήθησαν (cp4:31)
4:27	παιδῶν	"	"	4:30 Παιδῶν (cp4:25)
4:28	χεῖρ	"	"	4:30 χεῖρᾶ
4:29	μετὰ παρρησίας	"	"	4:31 μετὰ παρρησίας (cp4:13) <sup>236</sup>

With this we may compare Mk. 9:38ff. where catchwords furnish the basis of a commentary on Jesus' second Passion prediction.<sup>237</sup> The picture in Acts shows the community still adhering to their familiar Jewish ways<sup>238</sup> and in this we see the continuity with those earlier stories in which could also be detected a nationalistic Jewish element in the primitive faith. It was only gradually, as a natural consequence of their growing separation from the traditional religious assembly, that the meaning of Christ was understood, and prayer was/

235. Israel is equated with the raging heathen of Ps. 2:1! Cp. Bruce op. cit. p. 123 n. 1.
236. also, ἔλασι (4:22,30) and δημῶν (4:22,30). Also πνίγησαι (4:24 cp. 28). Less convincing is Cerfaux (art. cit. p. 678) whose only example is τοὺς ἄλλοις (4:23) and ἴδιον (4:32).
237. so also D. Nineham: Mark (1968) p. 251.
238. Δεδοτῶς: cp. Job 5:8, Jonah 4:3, Wis. 6:7, Judith 9:12 as an address of God.

was directed to Him. Luke's dramatised outline has largely obscured this picture with its account of the miraculous revelation of the Spirit in 2:1ff., who, as indeed promised, changes the nationalistic outlook of the disciples, so that it extends to all men (2:5ff). The way of God permits such marvels, but man's way is infinitely slower. Thus it may have been, as our source suggests, through practical necessities that vital truths were discovered.

Certainly, in 4:31 there is a very primitive account of the gift of the Spirit, wherein is extant none of the glory of 2:1ff., nevertheless the gift is received and the word still spoken.<sup>239</sup> It is very possible that Luke has broken short the story at 4:31 and hence the break with 4:32 is harsh.<sup>240</sup> Originally it may have been the intention of the pre-Lucan material to show that the Community of Goods resulted from the bestowal of the Spirit, creating a community continually in contact with the Spirit. Marcan features/

239. On the parallels see pp. 152f..

240. DE cop<sup>G67</sup> link 4:31f. (see p. 153) easing this transition. Epp needlessly classifies the variant as anti-Judaic (p. 166) for even though it may reflect a universalistic outlook (Epp p. 82) its *raison d'être* is a purely linguistic one. Haenchen op. cit. p. 193 notes however that Luke does prepare for the summary by concluding 4:31 with an imperfect.

features in both 2:42ff., 4:32ff. are above thrice the expected number, although the comparative data for Matthew and John are similarly high, and Lucan activity is also much in evidence:

2:42-47

42	ἀπόστολος	προσκύπτειν †, διδαχή *		
43	Ἱερουσαλήμ (NAE) ἀπόστολος	τέρως †		
44		κοινός †		
45		ἄσος †, κτήρα †, πύρασκιν †		
46	καθ' ἡμέραν, τς (bis)	προσκύπτειν †	4	3
47	χάρις, λαός (not D) προστίθειναι, καθ' ἡμέραν		5 (DE)	4 (D)

4:32-35

32	πληθός, ᾧ + dat.	κοινός †		
33	ἀπόστολος, χάρις, τς			
34	ὑπάρχειν, (p <sup>s</sup> DE) ὑπάρχειν	ἄσος †, χυρίον †, φύειν *, πιπρεσκιν †	2	3
35				

Barnabas' Example

36	ἀπόστολος,	μισθωμηνεύσομαι †, γένος †	2	2
37	ὑπάρχειν, παρὰ τῆς πύρας (not X), ἀπόστολος	φύειν *, χυρίον † (D)	3 (D)	3 (D)



5:1-11. The Story of Ananias and Sapphira.

1	ἀνὴρ, τις, ὀνόματι, σὺν	κτῆμα †		
2	τι, παρὰ τοὺς πόδας, ἀποστόλου	φύσει *		
3	εἶπεν δέ, πρὸς (E)	χωρίον †		
4	ὑπαρχεῖν	πιπρασκῆ †		
5	παράχρημα (D)		8	6
6	παράχρημα (E)		(D)	
7	ἐγένετο --- κεί, ὡσεὶ (323)			
8	εἶπεν δέ (D), πρὸς (not PS)	χωρίον †		
9	πρὸς (not D), ἀνὴρ	θύρα †		
10	παράχρημα, ἀποστόλου (sy <sup>phil</sup> )			
11	ἀνὴρ			

Marcan style:  $\sqrt{v}$  + indicative (2:45 = 4:35).<sup>241</sup>

Double negative (4:32D)

Many of the words which comprise the high Marcan statistic are those classed as "rare" - some of these are used in Mark's Gospel in a sense different from that in Acts - such are:

κοινός (2:44, 4:32) - cp. Mk. 7:2,5.

προσκαρτερεῖν (2:42,46) - cp. Mk. 3:4.

and Τίρας (2:43) - cp. Mk. 13:22 "evil portents".

241. The sense however in which this is found in Acts is different from the usage of Mark: Mk. 3:11, 6:56, 11:19,25, 15:6D.

Yet even ignoring these words the relative frequency of Marcan terms, especially in 4:32-37, is still high.

But if our hypothesis concerning Luke's treatment of his material be correct, it will be true to say that neither section can approximate exactly to the original. In chapter two the references to prayer (v. 42) and phrases as  $\xi\pi\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \omega\upsilon\tau\omicron$  (2:43,47), the use of  $\tau\epsilon\iota$  and the substitution of  $\delta\iota\epsilon\mu\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon$  (2:45) for the rarer  $\delta\iota\ \delta\iota\delta\iota\tau\omicron$  (4:35) point to Luke's activity there, the general theological rearrangement of material in the second chapter affording some confirmation of this viewpoint. But this is not to imply chapter 4 is any the less Lucan in quality for both 2:42ff. and 4:32ff. show statistically a high average of Lucan characteristics. Thus we cannot expect to be able to go back to Luke's source word for word (we will never know what he has omitted), but the presence of two, and we believe interdependent, reports, issuing from the same original will provide a strong indication of the nature of any source and Luke's peculiar attitude to it. A convenient table may be found in BC 5 pp. 144f., whence it emerges that the common material in these verses accounts for the following:

2:43a = 5:11	2:45a repeats 4:34b
2:43b = 5:12	2:45b = 4:35a verbatim
2:44a = 4:32a and 2:47a approximates to 4:33b	
2:44b = 4:32b	2:47b echoes 5:14.

The new material in 2:42-47 (not covered by the above) is thus found in vv. 42, 46, both verses dealing with similar emphasis on the fellowship of the newly converted. The absence of this motif in 4:32ff adds some plausibility to the view that it is part of the Lucan apologetic. But even though 2:42-47 is the more obviously composite section, it is possible that Luke has been more faithful to his source in certain details, than in the counterpart in Acts 4: this is so of 2:44 which in 4:32, coming at the head of the story, has suffered the usual Lucan revision. 4:32 more precisely announces the correct subject heading of the Community, and in the context it is this section which has the better *raison d'être* in that it leads into the story of Barnabas. This character is heralded in with such grandeur (in the whole of 4:36) that the brief episode of 4:37 must be a summary of an incident with a greater wealth of detail. The introduction in 4:36<sup>242</sup> hints at a source which knew more about Barnabas. As his cousin, Mark could, a little better than most, have provided this information.

242. Its length may of course be due to Barnabas' later appearances, but see below and on 1:23 (pp. 149-151).

In effect 4:32-35 contains no fresh information<sup>243</sup> whilst dealing with the same situation as 2:42-47. It might possibly have been generalised by the editor out of an actual story (perhaps that of Barnabas), but while evidence is wanting, the concentration of Lucan features indicates that Luke has not borrowed unquestioningly from a source. The result is to reduce our source criticism to such a hypothetical position that the most that can be concluded from this examination is that there is some a priori value in an assumption that Mark may have recorded a story about Barnabas. The linguistic data support the supposition: in the very short section 4:36f. we have three<sup>244</sup> Marcan words. But whatever the source may have contained has been reworked by Luke for the purpose of facing the reader with the ideal of the primitive Community. We may conjecture with some plausibility that in practical terms this ideal was only realised once the challenge of forming a community in Jerusalem had been realised and ties with old homes in Galilee severed. In practice this ideal/

243. apart from 4:33 which is usually regarded as editorial (e.g. by Haenchen op. cit. p. 193).

244. Four in D.

ideal was followed less flexibly than is suggested by 5:1-11, for Mary retains her house (Ac. 12:12) whilst opening it for fellowship. The source, if it touched upon these subjects, may therefore have, at this point, depicted the continued consolidation of the Christian community as a natural outcome of the Spirit's presence.<sup>245</sup>

5:1-11, being a Peter miracle story, would appear to have some prior claim as a contender for inclusion in our Marcan hypothesis. Marcan words are above average. Yet the harshness of Peter's action and his inflexible condemnation of Ananias and Sapphira have led many to the conclusion that this is an "isolated tradition".<sup>246</sup> Menoud believes that this story arose to explain the first deaths in the Christian church. This has the merit of explaining a phenomenon that we have observed in the Marcan outline, that of a gradual process of thought and action of the Church as a natural cause and effect. The possibility must be left open as to whether it belonged/

245. B. Gerhardson: ST 24 (1970) claims this pre-Lucan tradition arose from an anti-Sadducean circle (pp. 146f.). The Community was established as a result of a reinforced conviction of God's love (Dt 6:5).

246. P. Menoud: Goguel Mélanges (1950) p. 147 - so, in general, Haenchen op. cit. p. 200 who sees in vv. 6ff. a later development of the legend.

belonged with the preceding Barnabas story to which we have tentatively assigned a Marcan origin. On balance, this must be rejected, and not only because of the inner inconsistencies with 4:32-35 which the drama of Ananias reveals (so especially 5:4<sup>247</sup>). Luke has grouped these stories together in order to provide an overall unity to the whole section 4:23 - 5:42. The verses are painted on a broader canvas in comparison with the earlier Peter and John section (3:1 - 4:22). After their trial, these two apostles return to the community, who now become the subjects of the ensuing prayer and "all" (4:31) receive the Spirit. In 4:32ff. Luke describes the *ἐκκλησία* and the *ἐκκλησία* (5:11) and now the apostles are seen to be leaders of the group (4:33,35,37, 5:12,18) and Peter's role, even in 5:1-11, is nominal. The sin is against God (5:4,9) and Peter acts as the agent for the community, rather than, in the healing stories, as servant of Jesus. As in several other stories (e.g. Ac. 12) Jesus Christ is not mentioned by name.<sup>248</sup> The more generalised footing of 4:23 - 5:42 can be seen in the final trial scene, where, in contrast to chapter 4, the apostles are now, rather/

247. see Haenchen op. cit. p. 197, Menoud art. cit. (above) p. 146.

248. 5:9 is ambiguous.

rather improbably, all in the dock. But granted that the responsibility for this collection of stories is Luke's, the material which he has assembled is diverse and several traditions (emanating from several communities) appear to be represented. 5:1-11 shows little common esprit with the earlier miracle of Peter (3:1-11), its affinities lying rather with another composite section: 8:4-25. Inside this Philip cycle, we hear of Peter's encounter with Simon Magnus. Peter's attitude (even though he now offers hope of repentance) is in contrast to that of Philip, for whom Simon's belief is sufficient to permit his baptism. We will examine 8:4ff. therefore, as Peter is involved therein, even though the tradition appears to belong with the non-Marcan story in Ac. 5:1-11.

8:4-13. Philip Receives Simon.

4	διέρχουθαί, εὐαγγελίζουσαί,		
5		κηρύσσειν †	
6	ἐν τῷ		
7		ἀκάθαρτος*	- 3
8			
9	2 ἄνθρωποι, τῆς, ἄνομα, τῆς		
10	καλούμενος		
11			

12 εὐαγγελίζεῖν,  
 τὰ, περί, (614 383)

13 καὶ αὐτὸς

προσκαρτεροῦν †

8:14-25. Interference by Jerusalem.

14 ἀπόστολος

15

16 ὑπαρχεῖν

|| H

17

18 ἀπόστολος

19

20 πρὸς, σὺν,  
 εἰη

ἀπώλεια †

21 ἔστιν ---, σύνωπω (E 383)

22 δέομαι

ἀφίεναι †

23 ἀδικία

24 δέομαι, ὅς

πολλά (D cop<sup>G67</sup> (?)) †

25 συποστρέφειν, τε,  
 εὐαγγελίζεῖν

As with 5:1-11 the statistics reveal a certain affinity of 8:14ff. with Matthaen language. Perhaps the Community which issued that Gospel had also bred the original writer of these two Peter stories.<sup>249</sup> The only possible Marcan influence may occur in the summary/

249. perhaps cp. Mt. 16:19.



summary section (8:6f.) which heads the paragraph, but this is almost certainly coincidental as compared with 5:15f., where imitation or reminiscence of Marcan style was ruled out. At 8:7 the details are too generalised to allow the same minute investigation. The only other point of contact with any of the Peter stories is the reference to money (8:20) (cp. 3:6), in a reply made by Peter to Simon, John remaining in his favourite non-speaking part. But we saw in chapter four that Luke was capable of expanding, perhaps even creating Peter (and John) stories and this judgement must be laid upon the present passage, although it may remain possible that Luke has fused two traditions,<sup>250</sup> one of which had Marcan roots. But this is not demonstrable, as the present story breathes a climate of opinion different from our Jerusalem-based stories of earlier chapters, and even implicitly critical of that tradition, for the action is described from the vantage of the community represented by Philip, and Peter and John merely come (8:14) and go (8:25) whilst the 'hero' of the section (8:4-40) is Philip, the evangelist from Caesarea (8:40 cp. 21:8). Quite independent of these traditions is that in Ac. 10 which/

250. So F. Hahn: *Mission* (1965 ET) p. 49n, who also attributes to Lucan editing vv. 14-17, 25.

which even implies Peter is the founder of the Caesarean community whilst never even alluding to Philip. 8:14ff. might be intended to forestall this silence, but (to anticipate) we will see two independent traditions being utilised in Ac. 10, one of which is Marcan in character. The other is full of Lucan language, and has either been thoroughly rewritten or has come to Luke at first hand (perhaps via Philip). It is with this latter tradition that the present passage has elements in common, the theme of baptism and the elaborate apologetic connected with it. It serves -

1. to show th<sup>e</sup> apostles are fulfilling Jesus' command (1:8)

2. to demonstrate that real baptism is performed only by authority of the original eyewitnesses.<sup>251</sup> Here the editor faces the problems facing later generations who wished to know the validity of their baptism. Such a problem would not have occurred to the primitive church! In the same way 5:1-11 may possibly be seen to answer another pressing difficulty, the authority of the church to punish its members, and the (exceptional) effectiveness of her power.

251. Thus the Seven are appointed in Ac. 6:5 by apostolic authority.

But unlike 5:1-11, 8:14ff. appears to be based on no early tradition. It is essentially (perhaps like the latter tradition of Ac. 10 mentioned above) a creation of Luke designed to answer contemporary issues.<sup>252</sup> It has no obvious Marcan sympathies.

The next section that falls for comment is 9:19 ff., which tells the story of Paul's reception in Jerusalem. The account of Paul's conversion shows little Marcan affinity, but in the story of his Jerusalem visit there are some Marcan features, and it might seem a possibility worthy of consideration, that a Marcan source would have recalled some of the notable events that took place in the Jerusalem church. The story in 9:26ff. is told from the point of view of the brethren of that city, and the vividness and repetitiveness read as of the surprise of those receiving such breathtaking news for the first time. We have already suggested that Barnabas may have figured in these Marcan memoirs. The whole of 9:19ff. will be discussed, as we have also noted a parallel in the scene of Paul's rejection with Mk. 6.<sup>253</sup>

252. Subsidiary motives are (i) a polemic against the later Gnostic followers of the Magus. Simon is converted in v. 13 but vv. 14-24 depict him more unfavourably as the Pharoah of old (Ex. 8:28) (cp. 8:24D cop<sup>G67</sup> refer to his repentance, but pace BC 4 p. 94 cannot be Lucan as (a)  $\mu\lambda\lambda\alpha$  is never used by Luke (v. Hawkins, p. 11) and (b)  $\delta\iota\epsilon\lambda\eta\mu\pi\alpha\rho\kappa\upsilon$  is in the NT only here and 17:13D, 20:27g. - the Western text evidently liked the word!) (ii) a description of the expanding church. News is now brought by messengers, which class of people form an important part of the action in the next chapters.

253. V. pp. 74f..

9:19b-30.Saul's Preaching.19 τις (not p<sup>45</sup> h)

20:

21 Ἰερουσαλήμ

22

Saul's Escape.

23 ὡς

24 τε, δὲ καὶ

25

Saul Comes to Jerusalem.26 παραγίνομαι  
Ἰερουσαλήμ27 ἐπιλαβάνειν  
ἀποστόλους

28 Ἰερουσαλήμ

29 τε

30 ἐξ αποστέλλων

κηρύσσιν ≠  
παρηγοσι (p) ≠  
δῶσιν ≠

σπῆς ≠

3

1

Before embarking on an account of Paul's missionary zeal, Luke needs to insist on both the genuineness of the conversion and his common purpose with the other apostles. This transition passage provides a testimony, in general terms, of Paul's faith (9:19b-22), which Luke may himself have composed, using the model of Mk. 6:2ff.. If this is sufficient/

sufficient to account for the parallels, then the verdict must go to those who see in this section a Lucan composition with little connection with the historical event.<sup>254</sup> Galatians 1 suggests both an immediate retreat into Arabia and a more delayed visit to Peter and James (not Barnabas) in Jerusalem. Yet those who have emphasised the different intentions of Acts and Galatians are right. But, as regards Acts, why should Luke borrow material from Mk. 6 so obviously? Was this unconscious, or was he using material, perhaps the official record of the Jerusalem church, which already made these parallels? This mediation of Barnabas also calls for comment, for why should Acts show him as taking up the case of Paul?<sup>255</sup> This favourable portrayal of Barnabas might again be most explicable if his kinsman Mark had recorded the story. These two were evidently on good terms (Ac. 15:39).

If a Marcan source is a possibility here, then the difficulty in 9:20 over  $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  disappears. This word which so seems to contradict the  $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  of Gal. 1:16<sup>256</sup> (only there in Paul) represents the Marcan use of  $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  which is so often only a loose indication of/

254. so Goguel: op. cit. p. 125, Haenchen: Studies Luke-Acts p. 268.

255. Haenchen: Apg. p. 290 finds this 'inside knowledge' incomprehensible.

256.  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  also occurs only in the NT at Gal. 1:13,23 and Ac. 9:21. 9:23-25(not discussed here) likewise contains what appears to be only vague reminiscences of 2 Cor. 11:32f..

of the passage of time.<sup>257</sup> But the only place where evidence of a Marcan source is concentrated is in 9:28f. where are found three of Hawkins' Marcan characteristics. But Lucan activity is also in evidence here - notably in 9:30 (which prepares for 11:25) but also throughout the story so that the issue of a Marcan source cannot be pressed.

9:32 - 12:17.

Introduction.

Luke sets aside the development of Paul's history, to describe more Peter miracle stories. Artistically these chapters are the finest in the book, wherein Luke achieves practically, that which the title of the work proclaims; an Acts of the Apostles. By interweaving Petrine and Pauline material, gradually fading out the character of Peter with the climax of his achievement, Luke suggests a unity of opinion over the Gentile question amongst the two leaders. The 'trial' of Peter in Ac. 11 becomes a confirmation of the Spirit's guidance in the matter. The effect is produced in the simplest of ways: insertion of blocks of Peter and Paul (with Barnabas) stories. Luke, as ever, rewrites his material, yet in 9:32 - ~~12:17~~ 12:17, this/

257. A lapse of time is implied also in the plot of the Jews to kill Paul. Only after an interval would they realise Paul's defection.

this is done in more piecemeal fashion. We can see from the appendix that Lucan features are very much above average in 10:1-8, 17-33 but equally 10:9-16, 12:5-10, 18-25 have been subjected to minimal editorial treatment. Of these latter, 10:9ff. and 12:5ff. also furnish very strong evidence for a Marcan source. Thus Luke's method in these chapters is, generally speaking, to allow his source to 'have its say', whilst Luke himself adapts the material to his own end by the use of either a second tradition which he rewrites, or by providing an introductory section himself: so 10:1-8.

Unlike the previous Saul cycle (9:1: <sup>2</sup>τὴν ...), the return to the subject of Peter in 9:32 is made without warning. Though the present form of this verse is the editor's,<sup>258</sup> the disjointed effect produced by these summary verses is remarkable after the care which has been lavished on other link verses so 9:30 (above) and 8:25 where Peter is taken back to Jerusalem. This is obviously not to prepare for 9:32! The purpose of 8:25 is simply to remove Peter from the scene/

258. δὲ λαθόν ... κατελάθων also can be found at 8:4f. (not  $\lambda^*$ ), 19:1 $\lambda^A$  and Lk. 4:30f..

scene to return to the 'hero' of that section: Philip. Now without John, Peter is διελθόμενον διὰ πάντων (9:32); and as BC 4 p. 108 remarks, perhaps a new source is here adopted, wherein this difficult phrase was explained. Ac. 12:17 contains another ambiguous note, this time as to Peter's fate after leaving Mary's house: ἐπεὶ ἦν σιωπῆς ἐπιπέσει τῶν - a phrase which implies the silence already enjoined upon the witnesses to this scene, lest Peter should be recaptured by Herod's soldiers. As BC 4 p. 138 and others<sup>259</sup> have attractively conjectured, the 'wandering' of Peter in 9:32 is the natural sequel to 12:17. In other words, 12:1ff. headed the section 9:32 - 11:18, and thus we find Peter in Jerusalem where we had left him at 8:25, or as regards our Marcan source, at 5:16. The guiding motive behind this rearrangement will be unfolded in our analysis. Subsidiary reasons may be noted now:

(i) Chapter 12 shows that Peter is still on good terms with the Jerusalem Church - even though the controversy over the Gentile question has according to Luke's arrangement taken place.<sup>260</sup>

(ii) A greater unity with the Caesarean section in 8:4ff. is established.

259. Williams op. cit. p. 147 citing MacGregor in The Interpreter's Bible .

260. Ac. 15:7-12 only serves to confirm this interpretation of Luke's method.



(iii) Luke concludes his Peter section with a dramatic escape (cp. also Paul in Ac. 27) - using the name of Mark as the link between the Peter traditions and the saga of Paul which commences in earnest in Ac. 13. And it is the appearance of John Mark's name in chapter 12 that has prompted the numerous suggestions that Mark it was who conveyed, either orally or in writing, this story to Luke.<sup>261</sup>

12:1-4. Herod's Persecution.

1			
2		Ἰκκῶπις †	
3	προτιθέναι, τῶ + inf (E) συλλαμβάνειν.		
4	τοῦτον (Δg), λαός, φυλάσσειν		1 2

vv. 5-10. Peter, in Prison, Escapes.

5		τηρῶν †, στήρα † (cop <sup>67</sup> sy <sup>ms</sup> )	
6	τε (NABE)	<sup>262</sup> πράξει (ADE) †, δύνει † θύρα †, τηρῶν † ἑγείρειν †	
7	τε (NA), ἐφίστασθαι		
8	ἄπειν δέ (not NA) πρός	ὑποδοῦσαι †, σενδάλιον †, ἑκολουθεῖν (bis) †	
9		ἀληθῆ †	4 5
10	ἐφίστημι διέφραστοθαί (not ψ)	φῆσει, * ὑποκίετι †	(5)

261. see pp. 2f..

262. The reading of B is an assimilation from Ac. 16:20 - though it is equally possible that the above has been taken from Ac. 16:30.

vv. 11-17. Peter Flees to Mary's House.

11	νῦν, ἐξῆπουτέλλεν λαβὲς			
12	κ (NBE)		2	2
13	ὄνομα	Θύρα F	(not N)	
14		Θύρα (E) F		
15	εἶπεν πρὸς			
16	δὲ καί (D)			
17	τὲ (NABE), ἐπεὶ			

Features of Marcan Style:

a "sideline" (12:3) - the note concerning the Passover appears abruptly.

Repetition (12:5) - ἔθροτο εἰς φυλακὴν ....  
ἐτηροτο ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ.

Redundant fulfillment of a request (12:7g<sup>263</sup>).

Diminutive form (12:8) - σανδαλίον.

Common Parataxis in a command (12:8).

Historic present (12:8) - ἔχει.

Redundant fulfillment of a request (12:8,9) -

ἐποίησεν δὲ οὕτως --- καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἠκολούθει.

Redundant verb (12:17) - ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη<sup>264</sup>,

also καί in D is very much more common than in the B text.

263. On this as a genuine part of the Western text, see below p. 244.

264. Although untypical of Luke's alleged economy of style, this however appears to be a Lucan expression (cp. Ac. 20:1, 21:5).

Marcan features are concentrated particularly upon verses 5-10. It is a little surprising that where such words might be expected to exist in abundance, namely in the scene where Peter comes to the house of Mary mother of Mark, the statistics are almost negligible in support of a Marcan source theory.<sup>265</sup> This might be taken to support Haenchen's thesis, that Mark's name in Ac. 12:12 is an editorial device designed to prepare for his appearance from 12:25ff.. But 12:12 is a matter of identification of the house that shelters Peter and Mark's name was indispensable to that tradition.<sup>266</sup> Haenchen however claims that this is one example of a Lucan trait, whereby a character is subtly introduced before his first main appearance.<sup>267</sup> On this reasoning, does it mean therefore that the 'John' who accompanies Peter must be John Mark!

265. Yet if it can be demonstrated that the escape story has a Marcan origin then the sections (vv. 11-17) indicating the source of that story as Peter himself (v. 17) must have an a priori probability of being from the same source.
266. Cp. Mk. 14:50 and perhaps Mk. 16:5, Ac. 1:14D for other places where Mark may have quietly slipped in to the action.
267. see Haenchen p. 241. He cites Ac. 9:27, Barnabas, without recalling 1:23D or 4:36. (p. 173).

A more important question is why Luke introduces Mark at this stage in Acts. He does nothing in 12:12 and in Acts 13 he appears only to disappear! We are given only some information as to his literary ability.<sup>268</sup> Harnack is puzzled why the sole note of discord in Acts relates to a quarrel over John Mark.<sup>269</sup> Is it possible that in 12:12 Luke is explicitly acknowledging Mark as a source of information, and perhaps not for this episode alone, but for his earlier contributions in the Gospel and, we suggest, in some earlier portions of Acts? It is true that any of the witnesses that memorable night would have had reason to recall the event vividly,<sup>270</sup> and if we were dealing with a question of an oral tradition transmitted to Luke, then the supposition of a contribution from Mark would be no more or less probable than any other. But as soon as we think of a written/

268. Ac. 13:5 - see p. 29.

269. Harnack: Luke p. 134 n. 1, p. 150. On this see pp. 111f.

270. W. Ramsay: Bearing (1915) pp. 209-221 suggests Rhoda. The honour of mentioning a slave girl by name (if such she was) is quite remarkable. Cp. too Cerfaux p. 689 who says of Mark: "celui - ci savait à raconter", thereby summing up the mood of the narrative very precisely.

written source, Mark must be the strongest contender for recognition. Haenchen's outlook however is distinctly inconsistent, for as Bultmann pertinently questions: "how is it possible to distinguish any editorial touches, if the story was so firmly fixed in oral tradition?"<sup>271</sup>

Nevertheless (on the assumption of a written source) we are able, as Bultmann observes, to trace with confidence certain editorial touches, because alongside the numerous minutiae of observation in chapter 12, wherein is a precision which oral tradition would long since have glossed, there is found a curious vagueness of equally important detail.<sup>272</sup> "Nowhere else in Luke's writings can be found such an abundance of picturesque details,"<sup>273</sup> and, this being so, is not the explanation for this/

271. Bultmann p. 75. Haenchen's picture is governed by the view that "with his (Paul's) conversion the persecution of the Christians is immediately over" (Studies, pp. 264f.) but cp. 9:23ff. and Ac. 12:2!
272. Well noticed by Goguel: Introduction pp.222f.: "il y a là un curieux mélange de notices sèches à force d'être précises, de développements légendaires et de détails topographiques." (cp. Taylor: Behind the Third Gospel p. 251 who speaks of Proto-Luke's "curious combination of simplicity and directness with a certain vagueness of outline").
271. J. Dupont AS 84, 1967 p. 15. I am indebted to Dom. Dupont for making this article available to me.

this unique narrative to be found in positing a Marcan source? For vividness in narrative is a characteristic of Mark's style,<sup>274</sup> and claiming our attention in this respect in Acts 12 are

κοιμώμενος (12:6)<sup>275</sup>  
 πατίξας δε τὴν πύλιν... (12:7)  
 τὴν πύλιν τὴν σιδηρᾶν (12:10)  
 τοὺς 5 βαθμοὺς... (12:10D),

besides the whole drama created by prolonging Peter's waiting outside the door. The precision extends to the naming of Mary, Mark and Rhoda.<sup>276</sup>

274. See e.g. Streeter: Four Gospels p. 357, W. Barclay: The N.T. vol. 1 (1968) p. 11.
275. Scharfe, p. 67, "das ist derselben Detailmaler, dem wir die Schilderungen des Marcusevangeliums verdanken" - cp. Mk. 4:38.
276. Cop<sup>G67</sup> has entered into the spirit of this narrative: παραβιάζωνος δε ὡτιον (καί) ἤρουμένος ὡτιον ἐξήγαγεν... so that "imperceptibly" (Haenchen/Weigandt/art. cit. p. 474) a new feature of Peter's 'hesitation' (cp. Mt. 14:30) is added. An abrupt reading explaining οὐκ ᾔδει, it is the kind of detail later scribes might find unimportant, but it interrupts the passive role of Peter (on this, see below) and is thus probably secondary in this instance.

These pointed observations are offset by the cryptic conclusion:

ἐπιρῶθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον (12:17).

Equally vague is 12:1f., where we are told that Herod afflicted τινῶς of the church, although only the death of James is recorded. Thus "the brevity of the notice concerning the martyrdom of James is best explained on the assumption that the source contained stories about St. Peter."<sup>277</sup> Nor is the place of the events recorded, and though we answer 'obviously in Jerusalem', would Luke's readers be expected to know that Mark's house was situated there? A story from Mark would assume the point.

Verses 1-4 form the introduction and there is little here that is clearly Marcan, though it may be the case that Luke has, as ever, merely rewritten the introduction most thoroughly. 12:1 (cp. 19:23), a vague time note out of character amidst the wealth of detail, seeks to link the events with 11:30.<sup>278</sup> And despite his usual attempts to root/

277. Harnack: Acts p. 242. Note also that whilst a new Mary is identified with some precision, another James appears without warning (perhaps cp. 1:14) and without credentials.

278. See Tornos EE 33 (1959) pp. 411ff..

root himself in an historical background, Luke declines to identify Agrippa by name;<sup>279</sup> he is designated simply as ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης (12:14A) as is another of the Herods in Mk. 6:14. Verses 18-23, however, appear to belong to an independent tradition (perhaps a popular legend) for it is told with a tasteless pleasure attributing Herod's death to his failure to pray to God. There is no connection made with the persecution instigated by him in 12:1ff.. This might, incidentally, support the view that Luke has not overworked these traditions in Acts 12 to any extent.

James is executed, in fulfillment of Jesus' prophecy (Mk. 10:39<sup>280</sup>), and like another victim of a Herod, John the Baptist, death is by the sword. This news is conveyed in a tantalisingly brief statement, so that its purpose appears to emphasise the menace Peter is to encounter. But we do not know whether Luke has himself abbreviated a longer account of the episode or whether a source was here already more concerned to use the story of James only as introductory matter to the Peter story. The unique/

279. This is incredible if the supposition of J. Wilson (pp. 11-13) and Bruce (p. 253) is correct - that Luke relied upon several of Herod's house for information.

280. See p. 82.



unique identification τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου may be a relic of a lost source. Chapman however hereby infers that John is still alive as "Zebedee was dead and forgotten",<sup>281</sup> yet John's name is mentioned surely because he has been in the reader's eye. Zebedee in contrast has not been seen. However Mk. 10:39 refers to the death of both brothers, though it does not explicitly state, as some have assumed, that they are necessarily to die simultaneously. It is thus a needless conjecture to suppose that John was similarly martyred at this time although since the shadowy accompanist of Peter now also disappears from view, it remains possible.<sup>282</sup>

En 12:3 the Western text attempts to expand the reference to ἀδελφὸν in v. 1 but the 'expansion' is so awkward that it might be original, later scribes dropping the reference. Also clumsy is the incidental time reference in v. 3b for this clarification could easily have been incorporated into the opening words. As it is, it interrupts the clause ἵππον ... ὄν. The point of this insertion (which will be seen to be from the editor) will be outlined below. Commentators refer/

281. J. Chapman *J.T.S.* 7 (1906) pp. 413f..

282. Jacquier p. 300 for refs... see pp. 171ff., and cp. R. Mackintosh *ET* 23 (1911) pp. 93f.. If we are right in re-arranging 12:1ff. before 9:32ff., then the absence of even a mention of John in these latter verses is explicable.

refer the Passover reference to Mk. 14:2, omitted by Luke in his parallel, only to be included here.<sup>283</sup>

The implication of this argument is that Luke is drawing a parallel between this episode and Jesus' passion. See p. 253 further.

> Verses 4 and 5 are repetitive:

συλλαβέν (12:3) - πιάσας (12:4)  
 (12:3) ἡμέραι τῶν ἑσπέρων - μετὰ τὸ πάσχα (12:4)  
 (12:4) ἔθροιστο εἰς φυλακὴν - ἐσηρώθη ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ (12:5)  
 (12:4) παραδόντος τούτου πρὸς τῶν πραιποσίτων - τῆς σκευῆς τοῦ βασιλέως (12:5) (West)

This may be caused by Luke writing (a trifle laboriously) an introduction to this episode. Verse 5 is marked out as the start proper (n.b. μὲν οὖν<sup>284</sup>) to the central section of the chapter.

Verse 6 restates, for the third time, that Peter was securely locked and guarded in prison. This repetitive parallelism which recurs in the following sentences is typical of the story, serving not only to heighten the miracle, but also to emphasise Peter's passive obedience to the divine will.<sup>285</sup> Burkitt however conjectures that "some human sympathiser was at/

283. BC 4 p. 8.

284. See p. 123 and n. 46. Similarly here: Dibelius, Studies p. 23.

285. Haenchen op. cit. p. 340 talks of Peter's "passive" role: also. See too Dupont art. cit. p. 22.

at work, who had drugged the guards and bribed the turnkey:"<sup>286</sup> this is more improbable even than the miracle, for it strikes against the theme of supernatural intervention.<sup>287</sup>

This motif of angelic deliverance, moreover, is evidently of pre-Lucan origin. This is partly testified by the manifest dependence of 5:19 upon the present tale.<sup>288</sup> And the angel's action is so integral to the story that if it were argued that an original source did describe the event in the more human way suggested by Burkitt, then it would have to be assumed that Luke has completely rewritten the story. The statistical evidence strongly counters this however and it will be seen that a more convincing explanation is that Luke has recorded this story as it was delivered to him (almost verbatim) not fully comprehending its purpose.

The angel's appearance is marked by a bright light,<sup>289</sup> but instead of a dramatic proclamation, Peter/

286. Burkitt: Christian Beginnings p. 103.

287. This is explicitly recognised by Peter in verses 11 and 17.

288. See pp. 205f..

289. As on the Damascus road: Ac. 22:9, 26:18. Is Ac. 12 the equivalent line in Peter stories?

Peter is commanded only to tie up his sandals! The intention of this anti-climax becomes apparent once our rearrangement of Ac. 12 before 9:32ff. is adopted. The meaning of ἐσπόδῆσαι τὰ σκεδάκια σου, as we have argued,<sup>290</sup> can be found in Jesus' charge to the apostles before their mission. This is the purpose of God's intervention: Peter, as we see from 9:32ff., fulfils this call to mission. For reasons which will become evident, the editor's story fails to make specific this issue. Incidentally, this interpretation now clarifies the point of the angel's deliverance in 5:20 for there also Peter is ordered to preach. If Luke modelled the escape in Ac. 5 on Ac. 12, may he not have taken 5:20 from 12:8?

In 12:8 Peter is also told to ἰσθῆσαι, a verb that occurs only here in the New Testament, apart from Jn. 21:18 of Peter's earthly mission, and of a girding in old age.<sup>291</sup> To this charge, Peter obeys, and as in vv. 4f. there is a repetitive parallelism:

290. See p. 76.

291. In Ac. 12:8 E reads παρ' ἰσθῆσαι perhaps from Lk. 12:35. (but perhaps ἰσθῆσαι is an intentional reminiscence of Christ's passion (on this see below): ἰσθῆσαι ἐν ἰσθῆσαι (Mk. 15:31) - there is certainly a play on the verb in Jn. 21:18).

Ἀνάστα ἐν τάχει..... καὶ ἀνέστη (g)<sup>292</sup>  
 ὑπόδησαι ---- ἐποίησεν δὲ οὕτως  
 καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ μοι ... καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἠκολούθει,<sup>293</sup>

this serves to emphasise Peter's passive readiness, despite the fact that he is still naturally doubtful in v. 9, a trait according with Mark's portrayal of his character:

οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῆ (Mk. 9:6)

which Luke renders less conspicuously as:

μη εἰδώς ὁ λέγει

Verse 11 however intentionally rectifies the situation, for as a result of the miracle Peter is assured:

12:9

καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει  
 ὅτι ἀληθὲς ἔστιν τὸ  
 γινόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου

12:11

νῦν οἶδεν  
 ἀληθῶς ἐξακρίβειν  
 (ὁ) κύριος τὸν ἀγγέλου.

Here the repetition may be due to Luke as verse 11 exhibits several Lucan features.

Returning to the angel's role, verse 10 shows the release of Peter is effected entirely by the angel. In contrast, the angel's role in 25:19 is quite nominal/

292. The effect of parallelism created by this reading suggests it belongs to the Lucan text (cp. 9:34).

293. om. p.

nominal as regards the escape for his presence was necessary to convey~~th~~ the message of 5:20. But now in 12:10 the angel disappears, having left Peter with some orders (12:8) that are hardly relevant to a fugitive from justice! Divine guidance normally involves an outline of the immediate future too,<sup>294</sup> but here it is absent and Peter is left alone on a street. If Luke included this story for edification of the church in times of distress, fuller guidance from the angel might have been expected. The story makes no such concessions and the summary in v. 11 limits itself to the theme of deliverance.<sup>295</sup> If this is Luke's own comment upon the story then we may detect a different nuance to his understanding of the situation: he stresses Peter's safe delivery from his enemies, whilst the original was concerned with Peter's escape in order to preach the good news.

The details of the escape in v. 10 are told in full. It would require a very bold editor to invent this detailed account. It must originate from one of those who either knew the prison, or who had heard this breathless/

294. Cp. Lk. 2:12, Mt. 2:13.

295. But cp. Ac. 4:25-27 (so Dupont art. cit. p. 21).

breathless story for themselves from Peter (12:17).  
12:10 is either complete fiction or comes, at least indirectly, by Peter's own testimony. The tension which is achieved suggests this was the climax of the original story. The first three stages lead Peter to the final barrier that separates him from the outside world:

1. διελθόντες δὲ πρῶτην φυλακὴν
2. καὶ δευτέραν
3. ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην τὴν σιδηρᾶν

Now: a dramatic pause as we take our bearings:

[τὴν φέρουσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν]

so that the next most miraculous moment can be emphasised:

4. ἥτις αὐτομάτῃ ἠνοίγη αὐτοῖς.

There is, of course, in this miraculous element, a similarity with other prison dramas, but here the > αὐτομάτῃ < is used to underline the lesson of the divine purpose.<sup>296</sup> BC 4 p. 136 compares the miracle of the rolling away of the stone at Jesus' tomb (Mk. 16:3f., and more staidly Lk. 24:2) on which analogy, see below.

296. in Euripides: Bacchae 447, for example, the same word is used, but without this connotation.

Now we rush out of the prison in the final stages of the escape:

5. καὶ ἐξεληθόντες  
 6. κατέβησαν τοὺς 5 βαθμοὺς [D]  
 7. (καὶ) προήλθον σύμην μίαν.

The famous Western edition has entered into the spirit of the story so well, that, even if we cannot be sure that seven steps actually existed, the unlikelihood of such a detail being invented, gives it ground for authenticity.<sup>297</sup>

297. On its connection with Mark, see p. 3 and cp. Petersen art. cit. p. 239 "recorded only by a sojourner in Jerusalem". p and cop<sup>67</sup> omit '5' and this might support Williams: Alterations p. 63 who turns Clark's suggestion on Ac. 19:14 to 12:10 by positing ζ = ζῆτα. But note D makes a deliberate parallelism, (see below p. 261) between Peter and Herod in the use of κατὰ βῆμας (12:10D, 23D). Others (Weiss Codex D. p. 110, Chase op. cit. p. 86, Dupont art. cit. p. 20 n. 16) cite Ezek. 40:22 as the source of the gloss - but the word in 12:10 is the rarer βῆμας. Ac. 21:35, 40 which also (like Ezekiel) use βῆμας are accordingly also unhelpful. This variant obstinately refuses any explanation (Epp's study never even refers to it) and doubts as to its genuineness spring from a reluctance to claim any superior value to the D text. Perhaps it was removed as "ill-adapted to foreign readers" (Zahn op. cit. p. 29 n. 7) perhaps by Luke: it is the kind of detail Mark himself might have supplied.



Peter is abandoned in a street,<sup>298</sup> the force of  $\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon$  not being clear. Torrey's conjecture of  $\tau\eta$  (i.e. =  $\tau\iota\varsigma$ ) still does not explain why the editor goes against his practice of adding  $\tau\iota\varsigma$ <sup>299</sup> — is a specific location intended, but as at 12:17 it has been suppressed? But Peter at least, knows the street, and the real force of  $\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon$  is now plain for it accommodates itself to Peter's viewpoint. If it was the house of Mary to which Peter and John were given directions in Lk. 22:8, then Peter would now know the way, and the angel's presence less requisite.<sup>300</sup>

Verses 12-16 act as a light relief to the drama. It contrasts the easy escape by divine means with the obstinacy of human recognition of the miraculous. The gate of the prison may yield of its own accord, yet the gate at which Peter knocks remains closed by doubt.

298. D reads  $\eta\sigma\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\omega\upsilon$  which completes the sequence decisively, but it may be an assimilation from 12:13. The text of  $\lambda$  exhibits the opposite process.
299. This may be further evidence of Luke's close dependence upon his source for this episode. On  $\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon$  cp. Lk. 21:2 which deletes the word found in Mk. 12:42.
300. Just possibly however  $\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon$  was an oral confusion of  $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$  i.e. "our street", reflecting Mark's witness. Or perhaps it was the name of the street (cp. 9:11).

> Συυιδών δὲ (12:12A<sup>301</sup>) is difficult and appears to be an editorial link. A similar expression is used in connection with fleeing in 14:6 and Lucan embroidering in this verse is evidenced further by > ἱκανοὶ , συνηθροισμένοι<sup>302</sup> and the reference to prayer.<sup>303</sup> Yet this is no ordinary prayer session,<sup>304</sup> but one (cp. v. 5) which answers to the time of crisis, and here we note how it is Mark's Gospel which lays weight upon prayer particularly in such situations.<sup>305</sup> But their doubt in 12:15 when confronted with the glad tidings of Peter's escape, would certainly not have been invented by the editor. For their concern even though gratifying, is a little sceptical if they had recalled the dramatic escape of the twelve in 5:19. This latter verse must therefore belong to an independent stratum of tradition, unless, as we suggest, it is the editor's invention.

301. NB: συυιδών π. D avoids the difficulty with καὶ συυιδών, Guillemard suggests συυιδώς (Hebraisms (1879) p. 42).

302. Lk. 24:33A, Ac. 19:25.

303. om. g. Note the καὶ before the verb.

304. Dupont art. cit. pp. 24f. sees here a reference to a paschal gathering.

305. see Montefiore art. cit. p. 138.

A slight but attractive theory suggests that those at Mary's house were all women, the men having escaped to avoid persecution (cp. v. 17). The masculine words need not deter us from this suggestion,<sup>306</sup> and in this case Rhoda will have been one of the Christians - παιδίσκη meaning simply 'damsel',<sup>307</sup> and ὑπακούειν though used as a technical term for a porter's opening the door<sup>308</sup> need not be pressed in this way.<sup>309</sup> Confirmation of this can be seen in Rhoda's behaviour, which is not that of any conscientious doorkeeper. The presence of women at prayer recalls the scenes of Mk. 15:40, 47 and Ac. 1:14.

306. H. Burton E2 vol. 1 (1881) p. 318 cp. λούσαντις (9237) for λούσασαι; though at 12:12 sy<sup>h</sup> 614 add ἀδελφοί. Had Luke intended such a group he could have made his point plainer. But what of the source? If we are correct, then Mark himself only heard this story indirectly.
307. In d 'puella' is used for παιδίσκη but elsewhere in the NT 'ancilla' is correctly written.
308. e.g. 2 Ki. 22:42 - see Lady W. Ramsay ET 27 (1915) pp. 217f..
309. p<sup>74</sup> reads for ὑπακούσαι - ὑπαγίγειν a word associated with (Mary's) house also at Lk. 22:10 CL. The verb is used in the technical sense in e.g. Plato Phaed 59E, but in such passages the word appears in conjunction with the proper term for a porter (in Plato ὁ θυρωρῆς). The sense of doorkeeping is unique in the N.T. with this verb.

We have already commented upon the dramatic irony of the scene at the door. This kind of tale might, it is true, be told to provide proof of the Lord's power (so we may classify many of the miracles) but some stories deserve, though the distinction is not exclusive, classification into a category of more personal legends; to these belong the healing of Peter's mother-in-law (Mk. 1:29ff.) and the present account. In 12:17 we may perhaps see the relic of an original 'we': διηγῆσθε ὡς τοῖς.

The story concludes abruptly - and on this occasion there is no connecting link with Peter's final appearance at the Jerusalem Council (15:7ff.) as Peter

ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον. 310

310. Cp. Lk. 9:56 ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς ἕτερον κώμην - perhaps such was meant in the source of Ac. 12:17 as a marker for the mission of Peter (9:32ff.) - but see below for Luke's understanding of the clause. According to Spitta (in B. Weiss: Neutestamentliche Studien Georg. Heinrici (1944) p. 106) three miniscules of Mk. 1:35 record that Jesus ἀπέλυσε εἰς ἕτερον τόπον, but this evidence is not in von Soden for confirmation.

The quickness of the transition after the prolonged hesitation of the believers, the absence even of details of hospitality which Luke might well have urged on us, suggest that this last part of the incident has been abbreviated by the editor, who wished to concentrate (so 12:17a) on the theme of Peter's deliverance. But why should Luke relate with such emphasis this escape of Peter, if he is after this, to all intents and purposes to disappear from the history?

This is an important issue for although we are informed of the whereabouts of the goal of Peter's escape (i.e. Mark's house), and even told the trite detail in 12:19 that Herod εἰς καισάρπειν δίστασεν the final flight of Peter is, we are told, to 'another place'. Surely Luke is deliberately concealing the place.<sup>311</sup>

Following up the clue that the escape is the focal point of the chapter (note that Peter reflects on it, v. 11, and then retells it to others, v. 17), some have stressed the significance of the Passover, mentioned in 12:3:

311. It remains possible, Mark himself knew no more of Peter's story, after Peter had left. But our interpretation of 12:8 argues against this.

"St. Peter experiences a new passover and that at the close of the Paschal feast."<sup>312</sup> The parallels with the Passover narrative in Exodus 12 have been fully drawn out by Strobel:

ACTS 12EXODUS 12

6	τῆ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ	12	ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ τεύτη
7	ἐν τάχει	11	μετὰ σπουδῆς
8	ζῶσαι [Περὶ ἡώσων εἶ] καὶ ὑπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλια σου	11	Περὶ ἡώσων ἐκείνῃ καὶ τὰ ὑπόδηματά ἐν τοῖς ποσίν [ὑμῶν.]
17	ἐξήγαγεν	Ac. 13:17	ἐξήγαγεν Egyptian deliverance. <sup>313</sup>

Strobel admits these parallels are not very convincing, but this is because Luke has only incorporated, piecemeal, parallels which were more deeply imprinted in the source: "the Jewish Christian account seems to have been endowed with a deeper symbolism which it has now largely lost as a result of the editor's historicising of events."<sup>314</sup> Less wholeheartedly Huber claims that these allusions are/

312.T. Walker: Acts (1919) p. 268.

313.The same verb (unnoticed by Strobel) is used in Ac. 7:36, 40.

314.A. Strobel NTS 4 (1958) p. 213.

are "simply due to the Septuagintal style, which Luke adopted from his source."<sup>315</sup> These suppositions have the interesting effect of strengthening our earlier case for a source with a Jewish Christian background. But such an ethos is self-evident from a reading of Ac. 12 and does not of necessity require this Passover thesis. And our examination above suggested that the interest of the editor has lain in drawing out the escape motif, so if we hold Strobel to his comparison with Ac. 13:17, is it not the editor who has provided the deeper interpretation? But Luke has not developed this typological connection. The clue, we have argued, to his understanding of the story lies in the words of 12:11, where Peter gives thanks for his "deliverance"<sup>316</sup> from τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.<sup>317</sup>

315. W. Huber BZNW 35 (1969) p. 46. He is however dissatisfied with Strobel's treatment (pp. 46, 216). More cautiously favourable is Dupont (art. cit. pp. 20f.) as he points to the midrash on Ex. 12:42 (yielding a prayer of deliverance) and he points to a Second Century Tradition which dates Peter's deliverance also at Passover time. (p. 24 n. 25)
316. Ἐξαιρέσειν of Egyptian deliverance: Jer. 41:13 - but the phrase with ἐκ χερσῶν is frequent elsewhere in the LXX.
317. We have already commented on the Lucan language of v. 11 - cp. also προσδοκῆ only here and Lk. 21:26 in the N.T..

The parallelism of these words with Christ's own position at his Passion could hardly be better expressed. Note that Rhoda recognises Peter's voice ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς (Ac. 12:14 = Lk. 24:41) just as the disbelieving disciples meet the Risen Lord.

Though this parallelism is not pressed, a moderation of this view will explain why Luke has transferred this Peter story to the present point in his narrative, and here we return to the enigmatic announcement in 12:17:

ἐπερεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον.

Schmalz (JBL 71 (1952)) compares this with 1 Clem. 5:4 where Peter

ἐπερεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης,

and thus believes this reference in Acts is euphemistic for his 'dying' (cp. the similar double meaning in English which may be applied to 'he departed'). Now we know that Luke employs this sense in Acts 1:25 of Judas' death.<sup>318</sup> Most significant of all, this same verb is used in a 'prophecy' /

318. also to be found in Lk. 22:22 ὁ υἱὸς... προεὐτεταί (rendering the ὑπάγει in Mk. and Mt.). Cp. Gill's interesting observation on this verb: "he (Luke) wants to make something special of it" (HTR 63, 1970 p. 201). In the LXX ἴσθι = die in Ps. 39:14 and (probably) Gen. 15:2.



'prophecy' of Peter, recorded only by Luke:

ἔτοιμος εἶμι καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν  
καὶ εἰς θάνατον προσιῆσθαι (Lk. 22:33).

In other words Ac. 12:17 shows Peter 'going' to his appointed reward in heaven, and from this it is clear that such a motif will belong to the editor, this Peter story being so positioned in Acts to conclude Peter's history with an account of his 'death' in prison and his 'resurrection'.<sup>319</sup>

The principle difficulty facing this tour de force is that Peter reappears briefly in Ac. 15! Here his role is limited for he is, as Schmalz notes, mentioned but once (15:7) whilst at 15:14 he is designated by the unique title Συμῶν.<sup>320</sup> Schmalz argues that James' speech is original and that he was originally replying to the Symeon of Ac. 13:1, and an early scribe, misunderstanding this/

319. The surprising silence in the N.T. upon the death of Christians is explained by Menoud: Goguel *Mélanges* pp. 150-153 to result from embarrassment felt at the Delay of the Parousia (p. 220).

320. cp. 2 Pet. 1:1 NA.

this reference, erroneously inserted Peter's name at the head of 15:7. But this does not remove the objection: for the editor, by his phrasing of the speech in 15:8-11 clearly understands it to have been delivered by Peter, for he refers back to his earlier experiences with Cornelius.<sup>321</sup>

Nevertheless let us play with the idea and see if Luke does provide any further indications as to his alleged scheme of Peter's 'death' and 'resurrection':

1. The escape of Peter occurs in the context of James' martyrdom (12:2) and the smiting of Herod (12:23); death surrounds the episode. Peter himself is 'smitten' (12:7).<sup>322</sup>

2. Peter no longer plays anything but a nominal and untypically subordinate role in Acts. Acts 12 may be designed by Luke to illustrate the passing leadership to James.

321. D. Robinson JBL 64 (1945) p. 265, points to the incompatibility of Peter's attitude in Acts 15 with Gal. 2:7-9 and thus designates Ac. 15 as "a desperate attempt by the Jerusalem church to undo the damage done by its earlier anti-gentile stand". It does not ease the difficulties if we suppose, with some, that historically this incident is to be equated with the events depicted in 11:27-30, for we are concerned with the editor's treatment. For a possible interpretation of his understanding of Ac. 15:7ff. see p. 270.

322. On this verb see p. 261.

3. Peter's prophecy, which Jesus immediately modifies though not repudiates (Lk. 22:33), refers both to imprisonment and death, but why does Luke refer to death as well as imprisonment unless he intends showing fulfillment of the event, i.e. in Ac. 12?<sup>323</sup>

Thus, if we accept this possibility, that the prison in which Peter is kept is seen by Luke as a symbol for his 'death' and his escape equivalent to his 'resurrection', the τόπον of Ac. 12:17 (as in 1 Clement 5:4) is heaven. We cannot press this metaphor any more than Luke allows, but we may admit that the equation of φυλακή = Hades is found in 1 Pet. 3:19 (perhaps) and Rev. 20:7.<sup>324</sup> Armed with this suggestion we may now see further places where Luke has modified his original story though in every case this has been done with the greatest economy. In essence the original has been permitted to come 'shining through' and indeed Luke may have found such unintentional symbolism already in embryo in his source. This symbolism is expressed in the following expressions:

323. The same might be said in connection with Mk. 10:39.

324. also cp. Rev. 2:10.

1. ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν λίθων· Ἀνάστα 325 (12:7) -

words which, in miracle-story contexts, can indicate a raising from the dead (cp. 9:40) or simply a 'getting up' (cp. 9:34). Luke may intend a double sense.

2. Peter is κοιμώμενος (12:6). In Acts, the only other instances of this verb are at 7:60 which refers to Stephen's martyrdom and 13:36, used of David's death. The figurative sense could therefore be intended here also.

325. Goulder (Type and History 1964) has expanded this general thesis into fantastic proportions. Often his typology becomes very forced: "before the power of God stones are rolled away (this only in the Gospel) and iron gates open of their own accord (only Acts)", often very precarious "ἐκτενής (i.e. the adverb?) is only found twice in the Gospels and Acts in these two contexts - of passions"; (the references being Lk. 22:44  $\lambda^*D\theta$  and Ac. 12:5 (not A<sup>2</sup>D), and sometimes he is quite optimistic:) "it may be that the guards... correspond to the Matthæan guards outside Jesus' tomb (!)." (My comment always in brackets above).

καθύδεν by contrast is reserved mainly for the literal meaning of sleep,<sup>326</sup> as can be seen from the accompanying chart:

N.T. appearances	LITERAL SLEEP	METAPHORICAL for DEATH	DOUBTFUL CASES
κοιμάσθαι	3	14	1
καθύδεν	16	1	3 <sup>327</sup>

Of these uses, the most interesting is 2 Pet. 3:4 which may include a reference to the deaths of the first generations of Christians<sup>328</sup> and the evidence suggests we must be on the alert for a possible metaphorical understanding.

326. In Mk. 5:39 Jesus' use is ambiguous: see R. Ker: ET 63 (1954) pp. 315f., ET 66 (1954) p. 125.

327. LXX LITERAL: DEATH DOUBTFUL METAPHORICAL: OTHERS  
FIGURES SEXUAL

κοιμάσθαι	35	53	13	72	28
καθύδεν	23	2	1	5	2

Again καθύδεν emerges with the predominantly literal sense, metaphorical of death only at Dan. 12:2 and Ps. 87:6 (not A).

In the N.T. table, Ac. 12:6, to avoid bias, is included as a reference to literal sleep. The only instance of καθύδεν being used of death is the quotation in Eph. 5:14. The present participle in Ac. 12:6 may mitigate against our suggestion, though according to N. Turner: Grammar (1963) p. 79, AB reads the aorist participle. I cannot find his evidence for this.

328. So Bo Reicke: 2 Peter (1964) p. 174.

3. Of slight significance is the note that Peter is δεδεμένος ἐλεύσειν δυσίν (cp. 21:33 of Paul). Rev 9:14 reads λουσιν τοὺς τέσσαρας ἀγγέλους τοὺς δεδεμένους.... which squad (perhaps cp. Ac. 12:4) are bound until the day they kill a third of mankind. Also the angel who holds the keys of Hades has on his hands ἐλεύσειν μεγάλην (Rev. 20:1).

4. The most important pointer is Ac. 12:7: πατάξας ἐπὶ τὴν πλάγαν (not D)... the verb being also used of Herod's death by an angel at 12:23, and also of killing in Mk. 14:27, Lk. 22:49, Ac. 7:24 &c..<sup>329</sup> If a weaker sense is intended in the above passage, it would be unique to this verb in the New Testament. Some may therefore shelter in D's reading of νύξας, perhaps gleaned from 3 Macc. 5:14 where the context is of a deep sleep.<sup>330</sup> But evidently the gloss came from Jn. 19:34:

329. This sense is very common in the LXX.

330. But just possibly it is a corruption from the parallel in Ac. 5:19 where >διὰ νυκτός< is read -- but see below.

Αὐτοῦ τὴν πλεωρὰν ἐνύξεν. 331

Even if this text of 12:7 (D g Luc) is secondary, it furnishes evidence that at least one early scribe saw a distinct connection between Peter's imprisonment and the death of Jesus.

But why should Luke wrap the story with such an obscure meaning? Two possibilities may be considered together:

(i) Luke, like everyone else, did not have information to hand concerning Peter's demise.<sup>332</sup>

(ii) He therefore incorporated an actual Peter story to illustrate Peter's passing to glory. If Peter had died soon after these events, then those who had witnessed the aftermath of the escape (12:12ff.), would have had reason to recall the story with especial clarity. The source however was/

331. Similarly Chase op. cit. p. 88. Cp. Mt. 27:49 NB. We may compare Ac. 5:38D where *μὴ μανέντις* was perhaps derived from Jn. 18:28 - here in Ac. 12:7D is another instance where the Western text has been influenced by John's passion narrative.

332. So A. Fridrichsen: Sprachliches und Stilistisches (1943) pp. 28ff., O. Cullmann op. cit. p. 81: "If anywhere in our ancient sources, we should expect a report concerning the end of Peter's life in the Book of Acts."

was once a simple tale<sup>333</sup> of Peter's escape from Jerusalem in order to spread the good news elsewhere.

These allusions, cryptic as they are, must seem slight to the modern reader. If Luke had wanted to say Peter died, why not affirm this in black and white? The author had no interest in recording the deaths of his heroes although if it is legitimate to see the outlines of a 'passion' in Paul's shipwreck, then we might expect to be provided with a parallel phenomenon in Peter's history. Yet there was no purpose in recording the death of a disciple unless it was notably glorious (Ac. 7:60, 12:2) and the fact is that few, even of the second generation of Christians, knew or cared to tell anything specific about Peter's death, although by this time he was apparently no longer here on earth:

ΤΟΥΤΟ ΔΕ ΕΊΠΕΝ ΣΗΜΑΙΝΩΝ ΠΟΛΥ ΘΑΝΑΤΩ ΔΟΞΑΣΙ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ,  
 says Jesus in Jn. 21:19. The themes of this verse are Peter's mission and later his suffering and death. In a similar way we have seen these two motifs underlying the material in Ac. 12 so has Luke developed his story as an explanation of some such difficult saying? For he certainly knew a form of the traditions/

333. So B. Weiss: *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 162, characterises it as "naive".



traditions found in Jn. 21, though the relationship of this chapter with Lk. 5:1ff. is not plain. Yet who is the ἄλλος<sup>334</sup> of Jn. 21:18 but the ἄγγελος of Ac. 12? And as the prophecy records, Peter in Ac. 12 is shown as passive: οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι ἀληθὲς ἐστίν.<sup>335</sup> Armed with this clue, let us see if Luke has borrowed anything (to suggest the death motif) from Jn. 21:

1. Acts 12:3 Herod seizes Peter.

John 21:3 The disciples try to seize fish.<sup>336</sup>

2. Acts 12:4 ὁ καὶ πιάσας

John 21:3,10 ὧν ἐπιάσαντε

3. Acts 12:6 τῆ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ

John 21:3 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῆ νυκτὶ ...

4. Acts 12:8 ζῶσει

John 21:18 ἐζώνυες σκαυτὸν ... ζῶσει σὶ.

A Marcan source in Ac. 12:8 would have testified that Peter is not to die (cp. Jn. 21:23 also) but to accomplish a further mission. Luke has ignored this motif both from his source in Ac. 12 and from Jn. 21.

334. λ\*DW read ἄλλου, perhaps thinking of persecutors.

335. Ac. 12:9 - see p. 241 n. 285.

336. cp. too Lk. 5:9.

5. Acts 12:8 Peter is bid to get dressed.

John 21:7 Peter dons his coat, for he is wearing nothing.

6. Acts 12:8 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ... Ἀκολουθεῖ μοι.  
John 21:19 καὶ τοῦτο εἶπεν λέγει αὐτῷ Ἀκολουθεῖ μοι.

The use of the historic present in both examples is striking.

7. Acts 12:9 καὶ ... ἠκολούθει  
John 21:23 σὺ μοι ἀκολουθεῖ

The repetition of ἀκολουθεῖν is a feature of Mark's style (see Mk. 2:14).

8. Acts 12:9 καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι ἀληθὲς ἐστίν  
John 21:4 οὐ μὲντοι ᾔδεισαν ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστίν.

9. Acts 12:15

John 21:12

cp. Mt. 14:28.

10. Acts 12:17 )  
John 21:13 ) The Meeting.

11. Acts 12:17 ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον

cp. Jn. 21:18f., 23 and the discussion about Peter's death.

The beloved disciple is ὁ μαθητὴς ἑκείνος οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει. <sup>337</sup>

In its present form, the Acts story is "obviously legendary", <sup>338</sup> but if we remove these editorial motifs then we may be able to see the point of the original story more clearly. But already in his Gospel, Luke has recounted a tradition with some similarities to Jn. 21 - has he employed the roots of this account again in Ac. 12? If so, Luke's reorientation is very drastic, and in fact, as we have/

337. To these parallels may be added some further very minor details:

- > (i) Ac. 12:6 δύο  
Jn. 21:2 δύο
- (ii) Ac. 12:9, 10, 17 ἐξηλθῶν  
Jn. 21:3 ἐξηλθόν
- (iii) Ac. 12:8 ἐπιήσθη δὲ οὕτως  
Jn. 21:1 ἐφανερώσεν δὲ οὕτως
- (iv) Ac. 12:10D κατήβησαν τοὺς ἑβδόμους  
Jn. 21:9 κατήβησαν εἰς τὴν γῆν (cp Mt. 14:29)
- (v) Ac. 12:14 ἀπὸ τῆς χροῆς  
Jn. 21:8D ἤλαστο
- (vi) Ac. 12:15 Μαίνη  
Jn. 21:22A (23A) μαίνεῖν <

The similarity here is due entirely to the orthography of the scribe of A.

338. BC 4 p. 135.

have seen, Acts 12:5ff. exhibits a marked Marcan quality. The most we can say, then, is that Luke shares a common purpose with the tradition found in John 21 which is to account for the mystery surrounding the occasion of Peter's death. Neither writer appears to have known about this event, John 21 suggesting that (appropriately) Peter was martyred like his Lord. If however that writer had definite information upon this, he would have drawn the parallel with Jesus' death, just as the Three Affirmations of Loyalty are intended as a parallel to the Denials.

"We wonder again - what became of Peter?"<sup>339</sup>

Luke provides his solution by using a factual story as a parable. The story he chose to employ may already have contained the ideas of the angel and the knocking at the doors, which motifs suggest an opportune eschatological parallel.<sup>340</sup> Moreover the original already showed Peter's arrival at Mary's house/

339. C. Nesbitt JBR 27 (1959) p. 13.

340. E. Kahler: Studien (1958) p. 53 refers to Apoc. Peter 17 in this context, which gives to ἄγγελος πύλας of Ps. 24:7 an eschatological sense. The angel's eschatological function can also be seen in Ac. 12:23.

house as so unexpected that the people act as though he were not there!<sup>341</sup> Such features of the source may have been repeated by St. Luke to convey the deeper meaning. Luke has certainly abbreviated this episode at the door to this end for 12:14 presupposes a challenge from Rhoda answered by Peter. This technique highlights Luke's main purpose: to hint that Peter is as good as dead in the eyes of his friends so Luke's vision thereby reveals a certain lessening of the vividness that characterised the source. This is a natural phenomenon, from one who had not himself witnessed the event. Luke however concentrates on the reaction of those at prayer: they are amazed (καὶ ἐξέστησαν) just as are the women at the tomb (γυναικὲς τινὲς ... ἐξέστησαν Lk. 24:22).

At last, Peter is admitted and he tells his story. Have we not here the source indicating the first hand testimony of the narrative? Finally, he concludes with words whose format may indicate that Peter's authority has now passed to James:

341. So Lincke art. cit. p. 194: "den sie für hielten". They proclaim: "It's his angel." (12:15).

Ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰακώβῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς (12:17)

whereas earlier Jesus had indicated Peter to be head of the brethren: εἶπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ (Μκ. 16:7). The mode of expression is very similar. The Marcan source is interested in the theme of leadership although this episode in Ac. 12 may have concluded with a series of stories which culminate in Ac. 11 with a defence and vindication of the position taken by Peter as first Leader of the Jerusalem Church. It looks also in Acts 11 as though Peter is no longer the leader of that community but Luke cannot of course name James as Peter's opponent yet, because he has transposed the events described in his source.

But before turning to this final section, we may conjecture on the editor's understanding of Peter's 'reappearance' in Ac. 15:7. It is interesting that it is the Western text which correctly understands the editor's view, when it describes Peter's presence at the Council:

Ἀνέστησεν ἐν πνεύματι Πέτρος (15:7D<sup>342</sup>)

On this we observe:

342. Supported by 614 sy<sup>hmg</sup> which add ἄνω however.

(i) The D text prefers the term "Holy Spirit".<sup>343</sup>

(ii) This is the only NT instance of someone 'rising' in the Spirit; for the words do not refer to Peter's 'speaking' in the Spirit, the term familiar in Acts: Ac. 6:10, 8:29, 11:12, 13:2, 23:9.<sup>344</sup>

(iii) The phrase 'in (the) spirit' is thus ambiguous. It could hint that Peter's presence at 15:7 is not necessarily physical.

Whilst this may appear improbable, it is, at least, a possibility. For in attempting a quest concerning Peter's end, we have been following a trail that is alien to the writer's mind. Our curiosity to know more may have been shared by Luke with regard to the chief of the apostles, though lesser characters like Barnabas and Mark disappear without remark from the narrative. Even so, we are treated to a biographical note of James' death. Would not Luke have needed to show Peter's passing/

343. See Epp op. cit. p. 116 - but  $\tau\omicron\ \mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$  is used where the meaning is self-evident: Ac. 19:1D, 20:3D.

344. A different interpretation in Epp p. 104, perceptively criticised by Y. Tissot RB 77 (1970) p. 336 - if James was defending the freedom of the Gentiles, then the parallelism which is alleged to be his disadvantage in D is pointless.

passing from prominence, if he is now to describe the mission of Paul? Is not this the point of Acts 12, but is not this virtually saying that Peter 'died' to all intents after this episode? The problem hinges on whether Luke was interested in providing a solution to the riddle of Peter's death.

If our understanding of the editor's purpose is correct, then we may conclude that those vivid details (and there are many) which do not serve the editor's express purpose will have been used as the framework of a Marcan story, which we may not be able to construct in all its detail (particularly the latter portion which has suffered some curtailment) but which we can assert with certainty, did once exist in its own right.

#### 9:32-43

These two healing stories add nothing to our knowledge of Peter. We do, it is true, encounter a Raising from the Dead, but this makes the legend of Aeneas the more pallid. For this reason perhaps, the editor has severely abbreviated this first healing. These 'further adventures of Peter' exalt Peter to the heights before he humbles himself to turn to the Gentiles. The editor, we have argued, has rearranged these stories, <sup>and</sup> as in chapter twelve, has deeper/



deeper motives by which he makes the stories more of a unity within themselves and in relation to the rest of the book.<sup>345</sup>

9:32-35. Healing of Aeneas.

32	ἐγένετο +inf, διέρχασθαι		
33	τις, ὄνομα, ἔτος	κατακείμεθαί, κράβατος *	0   1
34	ἴασθαι		
35			

Marcan Style: Parataxis (v. 34).

Redundant Fulfillment of Command (v. 34)

Verse 32 sets the scene, whilst the introduction to the healing proper is lengthy (v. 33); we are given

1. the name,
2. the length of the illness,<sup>346</sup>

345. Further different suggestions that Ac. 12 (and 15) were (historically) prior to the events of 9:32ff. can be found in AJT 22 (1918) p. 9 n. 1. Examples of Luke transposing his material can be seen in Lk. 4:1-13 (where it is probably he who changed the order of the temptations), and also Lk. 8:19-21. Note too the prominence given to Lk. 4:16-30.

346. Cp. Mk. 9:21 i.e. the sense may be "since he was 8 years old" (cp. too Lk. 23:8) - but the usage in Ac. 24:10 tends to favour the usual interpretation.

3. news of what he does all day long (sits on his mattress) and
4. the nature of his malady.

In comparison, the cure is described so briefly, that the point of the above list appears a needless extravagance. We must assume some editorial condensation. Further Lucan terms in this section, in addition to those recorded already, are  $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\epsilon\nu$ ,  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\rho\epsilon\chi\epsilon\nu$ . However if, as we have conjectured, Peter was on the run, then the incident may have been of necessity very hurried.

Codex B understands the words of healing as Perfect:  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ <sup>347</sup> thus giving further strength to the likelihood of some material having been omitted before Peter was able to proclaim "Jesus has healed you!" A similar case of the perfect occurs at Mk. 5:29 when Jesus' hem is touched. Did we have once here at 9:34 a reference to Peter's shadow effecting the wonder?<sup>348</sup> If once all had come to Jerusalem to be treated, now Peter, by force of circumstances, is reciprocating the act.

347. See H. Cadbury JTS 49 (1948) pp. 57f.. He does not refer to Aeth 26 which supports this reading.

348. See Ac. 5:15 and cp. p. 195.

Of the four introductory features above, numbers 2 and 3 are Marcan whilst the method of introducing Aeneas and the reference to παραλελυμένος are obviously Lucan.<sup>349</sup>

A comparison with Luke and Mark in the Gospel story of the paralytic's healing affords valuable light on Luke's treatment of Mark - for there too he abbreviates his material:

Lk. 5:18	Mk. 2:3
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες φέροντες	καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες
ἐπὶ κλίνης ἀνθρώπου ὃς	πρὸς αὐτὸν παράλυτικὸν...
ἦν παραλελυμένος ...σὺν	καὶ... χαλῶσαι <sup>350</sup> τὸν
τῷ κλινιδίῳ.	κράβαττον αὐτοῦ ὃ
	παράλυτικὸς κατέκειτο.

349. e however reads PARALYTIKOVS for E's ΠΑΡΑΛΕΛΥΜΕΝΟΣ. In a Bilingual manuscript, some such copying errors are inevitable, but is there any other instance where the wrong Greek letters are copied? In the case of 'e', it would be exceptional, if Clark (pp. 234f.) is right in claiming 'e' as a translation of E. It is true that at 8:7 e reads "par(ra)lytici", this being the normal latin word, but 9:33 is an occasion where Greek letters are evidently present in the latin column. It is possible that the scribe is here correcting the Greek from an older manuscript - the form being that used by St. Mark, and not Luke in his Gospel.
350. Also at Ac. 9:25. Did that story remind the editor of these stories?

We note from this:

(i) Luke expunges ~~κατέκλιτο~~<sup>351</sup> - in Acts 9:33 this verb however makes an appearance: its insertion is hardly warranted in such a short story.

(ii) As in Lk. 5:18 the detail 'on a bed' in Ac. 9:33 is mentioned before the description of the illness and as in Luke, the formula begins ~~ἐπι~~<sup>352</sup>.

The cure is described using the typically Lucan ~~ἰαθεῖ~~ though if these words are the pronouncement by which the story was remembered, then we need not assign them to the final editor.

Now the result of these bold words are described: ~~καὶ ἰωθῆναι~~ perhaps Marcan, and which occurs several times in the surrounding tales (9:18,20, 12:10) lending a slight contribution to the unity of these chapters.

351. Also deleted by Luke from Mk. 1:30.

352. Lk. 5:18 is an instructive passage for revealing Luke's method: it is scarcely recognisable as anything other than Lucan, with the deletion of the impersonal plurals and the unpleasant sounding ~~καταβῆναι~~, but the Marcan ~~φασματίζε~~ is retained as if to testify that no artist is ever completely independent of his source material.

Ἀνάστη is repeated, surprisingly in view of the evident economy of style. Although it serves to illustrate the effectiveness of the cure - the repetition of this verb (or ἐγένετο) is typical of miracle stories (cp. Ac. 3:6 ACE). The repetition may be due to the style of an original Marcan story.

The summary of v. 35 describes the effect but its purpose is to underline not only the conversion of many, but to record the locality in which Peter now moves. This provides the link with the next of Peter's Acts, and the verse is, therefore, editorial.

9:36-43. Tabitha.

36 τις, ὀνομαζών

37 ἐγένετο + inf.

38 ἀνὴρ, διερχόμεθα

39 ἀνάστα, παραγίνεσθαι,  
χήρα, κλαίειν

40

41 τε(Α), χήρα

42

43 ἐγένετο + inf., τις

παρίστημι τ,  
δοσφ

0 7

Marcan Style: Aramaic name translated (9:36).

ὅτι may just possibly be recitative (9:38).

There are a notable number of Johannine words though none in the body of the story, the healing: (vv. 40f.).

By this time Peter's fame is not only assumed, but also his ability to raise the dead. Nowhere (in contrast to Mk. 5:23) is there doubt that Peter will effect the cure. The important element is time so any delay, such as that caused by the haemophiliac woman, could prove fatal. The parallels with the pericope of Jairus' daughter are self-evident,<sup>353</sup> yet they are rarely verbal, the only common ground being:

> κλαίωσαι (9:39) = Mk. 5:38, Lk. 8:52.

ἐκβαλὼν δὲ (9:40) = Mk. 5:40.

ἀνίστησεν (9:41) = Lk. 8:55.<sup>354</sup> <

This, I think removes the suggestion that this incident is based entirely on the Gospel story. Yet the parallels in idea are obvious enough. We may further note the role of the garment in Mk. 5:28,30 and Dorcas' coats which are shown to Peter. In both instances/

353. see p. 10.

354. also Ac. 9:40 E cop G67 add παραχρημα = Lk. 8:55.

instances, delay is caused. However the evidence for a Marcan source here is minimal although this fact is partly mitigated when we assign the long introduction to this story (vv. 36-38) to the editor. Then the account of the miracle becomes hardly more protracted than the Aeneas interlude.

This introductory material serves to link the stories in 9:32-43. Verse 36 first clarifies certain allusions in the narrative of the healing: the name had to be included here as the phrase which effected the cure was remembered to contain this Aramaic word (v. 40b); so Luke has to introduce her Greek name here. This however is not done by the formula found in Ac. 4:36, 13:8, but by *διεβήθη ἡ ὀνομασία* (as in Lk. 24:27 NABE). The latter half of 9:36 prepares us for the scene that greets Peter at Tabitha's room (v. 39) and even repeats the *καὶ* used in the actual story. But Luke forges a subtler link for all that, as later (in 10:2) we meet another almsgiver (cp. also 3:2) and by implication we are presented with the dilemma: should not Cornelius be received by Peter as he had earlier received the almsgiver Dorcas, even though Cornelius is a Gentile, whilst Dorcas has lived a strict Jewish/

Jewish life (this theme is emphasised by the references in 9:37 to <sup>λοῦσαντις</sup> )? Verse 37, finally, prepares us for the scene of the miracle, the upper room.

After this curtain raiser, the return to the subject of Peter is effected by means of two messengers. In using these as 'link' men, Luke may have been influenced by the use that is made of messengers in the dealings between Cornelius and Peter, and which serve to symbolise the diplomacy that Peter employs in bridging the separation of Jew and Gentile. Luke introduces this theme into the Dorcas story to bond these events closely together. Another motive for the messengers' appearance is the echo it creates in the reader's mind with Jesus' encounter with the centurion:

	Ac. 9:38		Lk. 7:3
>	ἀκούσαντες... ἀπέστειλαν -- πρὸς αὐτόν.		ἀκούσας... ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτόν... <

Again, Luke is anticipating the solution to Peter's dilemma when he is called to go to Cornelius: Jesus himself, we are reminded, had accepted a Gentile.

But the whole theme of messengers may have been influenced by the Septuagint story of Balaam, "a man whose word...was regarded as endowed with an infallibly/



infallibly effective 'power' (cp. Num. 22:6b) and who was therefore summoned from afar."<sup>355</sup> How well this describes the role of Peter in our story! And as Peter shows himself doubtful about turning his back on the old Israelite customs, so we meet a similar reluctance on the part of Balaam. Some verbal parallels strengthen the connection of these stories, the most obvious being:  $\mu\eta\ \delta\kappa\eta\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \delta\iota\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$  (Ac. 9:38)<sup>356</sup> which repeats Num. 22:16  $\mu\eta\ \delta\kappa\eta\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \xi\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$ . Other points are:

Acts 9.

Numbers 22.

>	38	ἀποστείλαν	δύο ἀνδρας	15	ἀποστείλαι	ἄρχοντας
	39	ἀναστάς	δὲ Πέτρος	21	καὶ ἀναστάς	βαλάμ
	40	ἡ δὲ ἤνοιξεν	τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς	31	ἀπέκάλυψε	δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς
	43	μῆναι	ἐν Ἰσραήλ	19	νῦν	ὑπομείνατε αὐτοῦ. <

355. M. Noth: Numbers (1968) p. 173. That the tale formed a part of Israel's folklore can be seen from Mic. 6:5, 2 Pet. 2:15. It has often been remarked that Luke is well versed in the LXX and it is probable that he would have known this story, perhaps the reference in Num. 22:18 (ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον) may have recalled a link with the Peter stories (cp. Ac. 3:6, 8:20).

356. also cp. Lk. 8:49  $\mu\eta\ \kappa\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota$  in Jairus' story. In Ac. 9:38 C<sup>3</sup> HLP read  $\delta\kappa\eta\sigma\eta\iota$  grammatically better, but a dissimilation from Num. 22:16. The awkward Acts form may well be actuated by the Numbers account, therefore.

It is clear therefore that this messenger motif must be assigned to the editor and allied to this theme is that of hospitality,<sup>357</sup> which leads naturally to the motif of food encountered in chapter 10.<sup>358</sup> But unlike the lengthy wanderings of the messengers in that chapter, here the motif is characterised by its extreme brevity.<sup>359</sup> Peter is not even told why he is to come! So also *μη δεικνύσας* is telescoped as it could refer to the message the men are to convey or its moment of delivery to Peter.<sup>360</sup> Such is a good example of Luke's economy of style, his avoidance of the obvious.

But what of a pre-Lucan tradition? It may be asserted with some confidence that Luke had some written material from which he constructed his own story for had he been involved only with some oral 'scraps', the long and complicated linking of a Peter 'itinerary', which/

357. v. E. Haulotte RSR 58 (1970) p. 72.
358. Just possibly already anticipated in 9:34 (see BC 4 p. 109), but against this see Haenchen: Apg. p. 292 n. 6: the command in question more probably means "make your bed", i.e. a reference to *κρῖβατος* is understood.
359. Perhaps Luke is now anxious to reach the climax in the Cornelius episode.
360. The difficulties are felt by some of the versions, e.g. 6948 adds *οὐδὲν*.

which anticipates <sup>some</sup> of the fascination of travel later in Acts, could have been avoided. Marcan features do not abound in the remaining section, the episode in the upper room, but there are some pointers which we may record:

1. Who are 'the disciples' of 9:38 (cp. 9:25)? Their mention does belong to the editorial section, but they are intended also in the source at 9:39 as the subjects of *παρόυστηναι* - this must be so, for although the Lucan editing in verse 39 has led to a situation where it is the *δύο ἄνδρες* who make the presentation, this would mean that Luke has needlessly introduced the characters of the *μαθηταί* .. creating a logical ambiguity in 9:39.<sup>361</sup> Thus these characters must have been taken over from Luke's source, the editorial messenger motif intruding into a once simpler scene.

2. Μετ' αὐτῶν (9:39) with *ἐγώ* is an expression used six times in Mark's Gospel, though also common in Luke.

3. Ἐκβαλῶν δὲ ἔξω is the most obvious Marcan feature. Why should Luke leave out this action from/

361. Hence HLP omit *δύο ἄνδρες*. The word is commoner in Mark than in Luke.

from Mk. 5:40 and now use it? Why should he remember he had omitted such an insignificant detail in his Gospel story? It is an easier explanation that Luke was here incorporating a story which used the same phrase as that in Mark's account of the healing of Jairus' daughter, such a source thereby illustrating Peter's conscious imitation of his Master. Such a parallel would likely have been drawn by a Marcan account of the raising of Tabitha.

Yet any such Marcan source is now beyond recovery in its outline, as it has been overworked by the editor who

1. Echoes the story of Balaam. This prepares us for the vision Peter is to receive.

2. Echoes the incident of the Centurion's son.<sup>362</sup>

362. see above p. 279. Also  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\kappa\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  (9:40) repeats Lk. 7:15  $\lambda\alpha\delta\epsilon$ . Further, many have noted the influence of Lk. 7 upon the description of Cornelius as an  $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  (Ac. 10:1): Stählin p. 149, Goguel: Birth p. 93, F. Bovon TZ 26 (1970) p. 29. A fundamental difference is that Jesus does not enter the house of the centurion: "the word is the substitute for the presence" (L. Marin RSR 58 (1970) p. 51); similarly J. Maenicol SJT 5 (1952) p. 243: "The centurion says to Jesus  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\lambda\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omega$  just as God says to Peter  $\mu\eta\ \kappa\omicron\iota\ \nu\omicron\upsilon$  ; in both cases the word is the Deed." But also cp. p. 80 and Mk. 7:13 in which "words become deeds" - so Burkhill ZNW art. cit. p. 29 = Nov T art. cit. p. 174 = SE 4 (1968) p. 168.

What we may conclude is, that as a raising from the dead it is appropriate as the last of the miracles recorded of Peter. The final denouement is an even greater miracle, wrought through the agency of Peter. Now he is in Joppa, perhaps in hiding at the tanner's, for who, except one on the run would stay there?<sup>363</sup>

10:1 - 11:18. Peter and the Gentiles.

This is the last extant Peter story of our source. As an effective conclusion to the Marcan memoirs, who can doubt its suitability? We may question the historical character of the whole, but its intention to exalt the hero Peter as the first apostle to the Gentiles is manifest.

We will expect the feature of the messengers to be a linking effect of the editor, but although these chapters/

363. As a fisherman, Peter might have been drawn to Simon. But this Simon is of sufficient means to afford servants (see remarks on 10:10,18).

chapters are "peculiarly rich in Lucan words and idioms,"<sup>364</sup> our word analysis shows that this extensive number of Lucanisms come in blocks the first of which is 10:1-8. In contrast 10:9-16 has under half as many. This provides some indication that this Peter story was originally the primary source of these events, but in stating this, we will be running counter to the classic analysis of these verses given by Dibelius, who believes the story was once "a straight forward legend of a conversion."<sup>365</sup> We may discount this theory on four general grounds:

1. For Dibelius, the original story was one similar to the conversion of the Ethiopian (8:26ff.)<sup>366</sup> But why then was not that story chosen in preference to this? The preface of 9:32ff., suggests that we are dealing with a block of Peter material, and as in Ac. 9:32ff., he is the central character in Ac. 10. In 8:26ff., Philip is the main actor (and surely the source of the story), why should Cornelius have figured/

364. W. Knox op. cit. p. 13f. - similarly F. Hahn: *Mission* (1965) p. 52.

365. Dibelius op. cit. p. 120, followed by many, e.g. Conzelmann p. 61f.. Haenchen pp. 312f., is, as ever, more cautious.

366. Some parallels with Ac. 10 are drawn by Haulotte art. cit. p. 67.

figured so prominently? Is it not because Luke's focus has shifted on to the principle at stake (not that the source has avoided the issue), and in so doing, Luke has been obliged to provide a picture of the convert as a sober, good-living Gentile.

2. If we are correct in stating that the messenger motif is editorial, then it is inherently more probable that Luke has inserted this effect (as in 9:32ff.) into Peter material.

3. Peter, on Dibelius' analysis, has emerged so fully as the central character that he has been credited with a long speech. In previous chapters, it was the principal actor who delivered the oration.

4. The report of chapter 11 does not mention Cornelius by name and his role has now been pushed to the periphery. On Dibelius' understanding Ac. 11 becomes a huge literary fabrication. Bovon, too, criticises Dibelius for his inadequate discussion on the significance of 11:1-18. He notes that Dibelius is self-contradictory over Peter's vision (is it a real experience of Peter or not?), and shows that the argument is based on the assumption that the question of eating was only raised after the event.

Thus although we must not assume that the editor has not remodelled his Peter story here, it is Cornelius' /

Cornelius' contribution that excites suspicion. Yet it is a priori probable that if Luke had borrowed what we may label a 'Caesarean' tradition from Philip, this might have included the story of a devout Gentile, upon which Luke modelled his Cornelius.

A pressing question, to which Haenchen metes some justice, is the often very laboured repetition in these paragraphs. Why is Luke so uninventive in this respect, for Cornelius' vision (10:3-6) is related in 10:30ff. and also, more briefly in 10:22 and 11:13f. Peter's contact with the Gentiles is thus made a very gradually paced step, and, it is emphasised, guided by God for not only does the Spirit move upon Peter but even Cornelius receives a vision.

Nevertheless, need Luke have been so repetitive?

10:1-8. Cornelius.

1	τις, ὄνομα, καλούμενος	σπίρα ≠		
2	ὄνομα, οἶκος, λαός, ὄνομα			
3	ὡς (not ὡς)	φανερώς ≠		
4	εἶπεν δέ, ἐνώπιον (CE614)	μημβουνον ≠		
5	τις, πρέσβεις, ἀνὴρ, τις			
6	τις, εἶμι + dat.			
7	ὡς = when	προσκλιθεῖν ≠		
8				
				3 3



This editorial section is designed to emphasise that Cornelius is a good proselyte for "God treats Cornelius as though a Jew."<sup>367</sup> This introduction serves to justify Peter the more. Cornelius' vision, like that of Ananias,<sup>368</sup> serves to confirm the soundness of Peter's own experience. It also underlines the fact that, at their meeting, Cornelius is speaking the truth (10:30). By referring to Simon the Tanner in 10:6 (cp. 9:43), the abrupt mention of him at 10:17 (perhaps for the first time by our source?) is alleviated,<sup>369</sup> and indeed the apparently stark picture which our source presented, of Peter entering Cornelius' house almost heedless of the consequences, is also partially avoided. One has to insert "apparently", for we cannot recover any lost information which may have been contained in the source but the complaint raised by the Jerusalem Church (11:3) suggests that Peter's apostolic reputation had been clouded by some such action, which appeared at least to an outsider as a hastily conceived action. It is difficult to reconcile/

367. Bovon art. cit. p. 29 citing Van Unnik; similarly J. Jervell HTR 64 (1971) p. 26.

368. 9:12 (om. h) - see A. Wikenhauser B: 29 (1948) p. 111.

369. cp. the introduction of Tabitha by Luke in 9:36.

reconcile this charge with the theme of Ac. 10 which so insists upon the divine will which has initiated these events, so that if the story of Cornelius (as it is now presented to us by Luke) was originally the property of the same Peter source, one wonders why Peter does not produce a spirited defence of Cornelius' spirituality in chapter 11. Because he did not do this, certainly not to the satisfaction of the Jerusalem council, he may have been forced to back down.<sup>370</sup> But we are not told this by Luke, and it is improbable that the source itself was prepared to discuss this result.

10:9-16. Peter's Vision.

9		ἐπαύριον ≠		
10				
11	τι			
12	ὑπάρχειν			
13	φωνῆ, ἀναστάς, θυσίαν <sup>371</sup>			
14		ἀκαθάρτος*, κοινός ≠		
15		παλιν*, κοινόν ≠	2	3
16		εὐθὺς* (not D), παλιν(D)*		(D)

370. Gal. 2:12.

371. Hawkins brackets this word as it is of little significance.

Marcan Style:  $\theta\epsilon\omega\pi\epsilon\iota$  (10:11) historic present.

Evidence for a Marcan source is here comparatively strong. The difficulty of assigning the core of this story to a Peter tradition rests upon the apparent conflict with Gal. 2. Yet any memoirs of Peter will have tended to exalt Peter, and if its author was Mark, the dating of the original composition of this passage may have been at that time when Mark was not on the most favourable of terms with Paul (Ac. 15:37-39): this would imply an original document written virtually contemporaneous with the events. This is not so improbable, if, as will be argued, the report in Acts 11 also derives from an account of the actual debate, the official record kept by the Jerusalemite church. The interconnection of this paragraph (10:9-16) with 11:5-10 is obvious, but the inevitable textual assimilations render a final judgement on the priority of one account or the other impossible.  $\delta$  (Greek D is wanting) and  $\text{cop}^{\text{G67}}$  represent a Western text which shows a dissimilation of 10:11 from 11:5 and could be original.<sup>372</sup> But even when/

372. i.e. B et alia have been assimilated; other exx. in these verses:  $\tau\alpha \theta\eta\pi\alpha$  added in 10:12E,  $\eta$  for  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  in 10:14 CDE and in 11:6 D omits the plural articles.

when allowance has been made for these possibilities both sections do exhibit substantial verbal agreement, confirming their interdependence. This can be illustrated by the choice of words for 'again':

παλιν ἐκ δευτέρου (10:15)

in the counterpart in 11:9 is

ἐκ δευτέρου

and in 11:10 'again' is

παλιν

This latter, in the first account is found to be εὐθύς (10:16) which has accordingly been rendered by assimilation as παλιν in 10:16D (p<sup>45</sup> omits altogether). The version in chapter 10 might seem therefore to deserve a greater claim to originality: the use of εὐθύς (only here in Acts) is "a suggestive fact"<sup>373</sup>.

Another instance which supports the possible priority of the first account in Ac. 10 is the vivid θεωρεῖ (10:11) which tamely appears on Peter's mouth as εἶδον (11:5). This vividness is often manifest in the style of Mark, for he often will describe the situation in the eyes/

373. Knowling, see p. 53.

eyes of his hero; thus Mk. 5:38 (cp. 12:41) uses *θεωρεῖ θόρυβον* which Luke renders factually as *ἐκλαίον δὲ πάντες* (Lk. 8:52). Therefore, although there are no particularly Marcan words in this earlier portion of the vision (we have recorded some vague parallels with Mk. 2<sup>374</sup>) we agree with the verdict of Cerfaux, who acknowledges in the "minute details" a kinship with Mark.<sup>375</sup>

The context with which the story began in the source is obscure. As it now stands Peter first appears in 9b: *ἀνέβη Πέτρος ἐπὶ τὸ δώμα*<sup>376</sup> - words which imply some previous reference to the house (cp. 9:43 but in more detail than that verse). The probability that Luke has omitted some such information is strengthened by v. 10: *παροκκωλύοντων δὲ αὐτῶν*, an incidental detail which provides just the kind of authenticity with which the construction of Cornelius' vision is wanting. But who are these unnamed people<sup>377</sup> who never reappear, unless they be/

374. see pp. 69f..

375. Cerfaux art. cit. p. 686.

376. cp. 11:2 (om. D) .

377. The words are another example of the impersonal plural (see p. 55 section 2).

be the  $\alpha^3 \lambda \phi \sigma$  of verse 23?<sup>378</sup> It may be that this sort of obscurity can be explained if Peter was relating his experiences: such slips are inevitable in the process of storytelling. If verse 18 is part of the same source, then there is further indication of servants there.<sup>379</sup> Yet it seems inherently improbable that a tanner would keep one servant, let alone the several that  $\alpha^3 \tau \omega \nu$  requires. The phrase implies a previous introduction, now lost, which may have hinted at further people in Simon's house. Luke has, as ever, restructured the commencement of the story perhaps because he wished to avoid the detail of Peter's intercourse with a tanner. Such would take the edge off the encounter with Cornelius.

378. 10:23 however uses  $\tau \iota \varsigma$ , suggesting their first appearance.

The reference in 10:10 is clearly to those who made the meal though it is used by Luke to anticipate the vision. A similar case of the impersonal construction in this complex of stories comes at 11:2D perhaps supporting the authenticity of that text.

379. Jacquier, p. 320, comments on this verse: "Après avoir appelé le gardien de la porte..." Rhoda may also be another example of a servant being mentioned in the source (but see p. 250).

10:17-23a. Peter's Invitation.

17:	ὡς, τι, ἄν, εἴη ἀνὴρ, εἰς φίστημι	μανθάνειν ≠ (in some miniscules)		
18				
19	ἀνὴρ			
20:	δυναστίας, σὺν	διακρίνειν ≠	3	1
21	ἀνὴρ.		(Δ4)	
22	πρὸς (D), τις (D) ἀνὴρ, τῆ, ῥήμα			
23				

There is little here that is Marcan. 11:11f. contains a compressed version with all the essential details of this account. It has been written up in Luke's style and language, emphasising the lead given by the Spirit along every step of the road that will join Peter and Cornelius.

Verses 17b and 18 recount the arrival of the messengers, who act as if they were ignorant, despite verse 8, of any vision of their master as they (a) ask the way to Simon's house and (b) having arrived ask if Peter is lodging there! Thus, again can be seen traces of an earlier account in which the prominence of visions was less obvious, and this picture of the men at the door, recalls the scene at Mary's house where Peter also stood outside τὸν πυλῶνα (12:14). 10:19a now repeats 10:17a so that the vision of Peter can/

can be set down and eventually Peter comes downstairs and does receive the messengers. It is not possible to say, in view of the elaboration by the editor, whether this second vision (the first is more strongly an  $\Sigma$ ΚΟΤΑΩΙΣ) had any part in the original story.

10:23b-33. Peter's Reception.

23	ἀναστὰς, οὖν	ἑπαύριον $\neq$		
24	προσδοκῆν (not D), συγκλησῖν, συγγενεῖς, φίλος, προσδέξασθαι (D)	ἑπαύριον $\neq$		
25	ἰδὼν $\neq$ inf (not D), ὡς (not Δ) παράγινωμι (D)	προσῆγγίσειν $\neq$ προστρέχειν (Δ cap <sup>657</sup> ) $\neq$		
26		ἔχειρσειν $\neq$		
27				
28	τε, πρὸς, ἀνὴρ, ἀνὴρ (Δ)	ἀκλόθατος * κοινὸς $\neq$ , ἑπίσταμαι $\neq$	9	5
29			(11)	(6)
30	ἀνὴρ, ἐνώπιον	τέταρτος $\neq$		
31	μνῶμαι, ἐνώπιον			
32	πέμπειν, τε (γ ε α), παράγινωμι (bis CDE), πέμπειν			
33	οὖν, ἐνώπιον	ἑξαυτῆ $\neq$		

Marcant Style: Historic Presents (vv. 27, 31).



Editorial activity is again so strong, that it is very difficult to recover any source material. Luke has knitted the section into a unity. Five compound  $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon$ -verbs in verses 23-27 are however offset by a certain awkwardness in the repetition of  $\tau\eta\ \delta\epsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\upsilon$ , and the meeting of the servant and Peter (v. 25). It is not clear whether this event occurs before Peter enters the house (as the B text implies<sup>380</sup>) or whether the apologetic has extended as far as the Western text allows where Peter is met outside the city! This elaboration has "the appearance of giving the account of an eyewitness"<sup>381</sup> and accords with the complicated apologetic/

380. Haenchen p. 302 n. 1 - cp. p. 132 and Ac. 21:8 supporting the B text here and possibly revealing the source of some of Luke's information about Caesarea. If Luke had to hand an account (perhaps from Philip) as well as the written account we postulate, then the double focus (laws concerning food, intercourse with Gentiles) becomes more explicable.

A careful distinction is maintained in these chapters between the  $\sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\kappa\alpha$  of Simon (10:6,17,32, 11:11) and the  $\sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\kappa\alpha$  of Cornelius (10:2,30, 11:12,13,14). Elsewhere Luke uses these words indiscriminately of the same house, e.g. Lk. 7:6,10 and 8:41,51 and Ac. 16:31,32 (34).

381. Petersen art. cit, p. 238 n. 25.

apologetic of the chapter,<sup>382</sup> which even extends as far as:  $\delta \delta \epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \rho \omicron \varsigma \eta \gamma \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon \nu \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \nu \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu$ .  $\text{Ἀνάοτηθι}$  (10:26). This exaltation of Peter is designed to emphasise the essential equality of the two men.  $\text{ἤγειρεν}$  is not properly required before  $\text{ἀνάοτηθι}$ , and it is curious that the use of these verbs recalls the miracle story format.<sup>383</sup> This symbolic "raising"<sup>384</sup> may deliberately be intended to prelude the union of Jew and Gentile.

10:28-33 sees a further recital of the visions. It may be that the contents of this passage have formed the basis for the introduction in 10:1-8 (notice the use of  $\text{ἀνῆρ}$  probably more primitive than the  $\text{ἀγγελος}$  of v. 3). A Marcan source presents itself most obviously in v. 28<sup>385</sup> as Peter protests (cp. Mk. 8:32) against those who seek to create an exclusive/

382. The language is Lucan (see the chart above) and  $\text{ἐκκηδέν}$  also comes only here and at Ac. 14:14 in the NT, but equally Lucan is the language of the B text. But perhaps the D text derives from the (lost) source of this chapter.

383. p. 276.

384. Similar symbolism in Ac. 12:7 - cp. also Rev. 19:10, 22:8.

385. Particularly important is the alteration of  $\text{πάν κοινόν}$  in 10:14 to  $\text{μηδένα κοινόν} \dots \text{ἀνθρώπων}$  - words perhaps motivated by the attempted worship of Peter.

exclusive God. The use of ἐπίσταμαι, if it is from the source,<sup>386</sup> is reminiscent of Peter's denial (Mk. 14:68). Now he can state positively (also in Ac. 15:7) the will of his Master. Bovon further regards 10:28b as a figurative explanation of Peter's vision, and he compares the similar use of interpretation found in Mk. 4:13ff..<sup>387</sup>

10:29 is a peculiarly naive question after the divine visions that have been received. It serves however as a cue for Cornelius to repeat his story, emphasising the divine guidance and heightening the tension. This may be assigned to craftsmanship of Luke. He continues with a long oration by Peter, only adapted to the situation at 10:41 and is again evidently secondary.<sup>388</sup> By inserting the speech Luke contradicts the statement of 11:15 that it was while Peter was commencing his speech that the Spirit fell.<sup>389</sup> The source probably originally depicted exactly this in its version of Ac. 10: Peter is beginning to speak (in 10:28), and as soon as he has affirmed the vital principle, then the Spirit descends.

386. Though Paul uses this word in Ac. 20:18.

387. Bovon art. cit. p. 34. Cp. also Mk. 7 and notes thereon.

388. On the Lucan character Bowen ZNW 13 (1912) p. 259 remarks: "The larger context of Ac. 10:39-43 reproduces very closely, even to details of expression Lk. 24:44-48".

389. See p. 162.

10:34-43. Peter Speaks.

34	καταλαμβάνειν ≠	
35		
36	ὅς (om AB, 614), εὐαγγελίσαιν, εἰρηνη	
37	ρήμα (not D), ὅς (D)	κηρύσσειν (om. sy <sup>k</sup> ) ≠
38	διερχεσθαι, ἰδοῦθαι	
39	ὅς, τς, Ἰερουσαλήμ	
40	τούτου	ἐγείρειν ≠
41	πᾶς + λαός	
42	λαός, κριτής	κηρύσσειν ≠
43		

57

10:44-48. Peter Baptises.

44	ῥήμα	
45		ὅσος (#) (NAD)
46	εἶπεν δέ, ἕτερος(d)	
47	του+inf	
48	ῥημάτων (not: D), τς, τς (A)	

The conclusion of the narrative contains a surprise.  
As proof of the divine approval upon Peter's action,  
the/

the Spirit is given, and under His influence Peter even orders Gentiles to be baptised. Needless to say, faithful Jews murmur against this move (v. 45), but these people have not previously been mentioned. By their introduction, Luke is reflecting the continued protest in his day by some groups about the giving of the Spirit's Baptism to the Gentiles.<sup>390</sup> It is difficult to know what the source contained at this point. The issue in Acts 11 is evidently over table-fellowship and Gal. 2:12 suggests this was the original ground of the controversy. From that passage we learn of Peter's liberal attitude which had been modified under pressure from James.<sup>391</sup> That the source and the editor do not mention this regressive/

390. The baptism is commanded but not actually narrated. This might be an extreme example of Luke's tendency never to state the fulfillment of commands (also 8:36 not E). The baptism of Gentiles was, in Luke's day, probably a more immediate issue than that of uncleanness of foods and Luke may thus have elaborated the former motif. 10:45-48 thus contrasts the attitude of Jewish Christians with Peter's divinely inspired action.
391. Cp. p. 269 as to why James does not appear in Ac. 11.

regressive action, may be the result of embarrassment on the part of the latter, although both Luke and Mark have earlier recorded Peter's other failings with unashamed frankness. Yet if the source did conclude with this story, a little of its great theological climax would have been lost had the narrative ended with Peter's backing down from his position. Instead there is a positive statement, affirming the marvel of the gift of the Spirit, even to Gentiles as to Jews. The interrelation with Chapter 11 is evident:

Acts 10:44-47.

ἐπέπεσον τὸ πνεῦμα  
τὸ ἅγιον ἐπὶ πάντας  
ἢ δωρεὰ  
δύναται κωλύσαι  
ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς

Acts 11:15-17.

ἐπέπεσον τὸ πνεῦμα  
τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτούς  
τὴν ἴσην δωρεὰν  
δύνατος κωλύσαι  
ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς.

11:1-18.

The theme of these chapters as regards our source, is precisely elaborated in the charge made against

Peter:

ἐπισηλθεις πρὸς ἀνδρας ἀκροβυστίων ἔχοντας  
καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς.

Now in Acts 11 (cp. 12:17) we hear Peter's own voice, at/

at a point which we believe to be the conclusion of his story, as recorded by Mark. It is the summary of 11:3 however that must form the basis for our delineation of the source.<sup>392</sup>

11:1-3. Introduction.

1	ἀπόστολος	
2	προσφωνῶν (Δ), Χρῖς (Δ), Τε (ρ)	διακρίνειν ≠
3	ἀνὴρ, σὺν (Δ)	ὅτι recit. † [?]

11:4-10. Peter's Vision (Repeated).

4			
5	Χρῖ (not Δ), π	τέταρτος (Δ) ≠	
6	κατανοῶσιν	θηρίον ≠	
7	ἀναστάς, θύειν, δεῖ καί (not Δ)	κοινός ≠, ἀκάθαρτα *	
8			5 6
9	πρός (Δ)	κοινῶν ≠	
10		πάλιν *	

11:11-15. The Gift of the Spirit.

11	ἐπίσημοι, ἀνὴρ, ἐπίσκοπος (ρ)	ἐξ αὐτῆς ≠
12	εἶπεν δεῖ, σὺν, δεῖ καί, ἀνὴρ	διακρίνειν (not Δ) ≠
13	τε (Ε), ἀνὴρ (Εβ14)	
14	ῥῆμα, πρὸς, οἶκος, τε (Δ)	
15	ἐν τῷ + ἰσ.	

392. L. Gaston: No Stone on Another (Leiden 1970) p. 306.  
In basic agreement Porter JTS 47 (1946) pp. 169-174.

11:16-18. Conclusion.16  $\delta\eta\mu\alpha$  (om. 255), $\mu\nu\alpha\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ 17  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$  + inf. (A) $\delta\omega\upsilon\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \neq$ 18  $\gamma\epsilon$  (E614)

We have already<sup>393</sup> drawn attention to the similarity of 11:3 with the charge laid against Jesus. If Christ ate with publicans and sinners, should not his followers extend his example? Early in his Gospel Mark had raised this problem of table fellowship, and the theme has been a determining factor in the material underlying Ac. 10. In general, Luke's revision of his source has not been so drastic in chapter 11; perhaps the long composition was losing some of its freshness so that some details in Ac. 11 come in apparent contradiction to earlier information. We now hear of six brethren (11:12) and of three messengers (11:11).<sup>394</sup> These may however be cases of new information, /

393. p. 70.

394.  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta$  by nearly all Mss. in Ac. 11:11. In 10:19  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta$   $\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon$  in view of the variants must be a correction. B's  $\delta\omega\upsilon$  is unsupported and thus may be an inference drawn from 10:7 (so BC 3 p. 94) and 9:38. DHLP omit the number, and in view of the similar omission of the number in 10:24 which is then stated in 11:12, is probably the correct reading.



information, for in 11:6 there is an addition of  $\tau\alpha \theta\eta\rho\alpha$ <sup>395</sup> to Peter's trance and it is possible that it was this chapter (where Peter is much more central) that formed the basis of Luke's elaboration, in Ac. 10, in collaboration with a second 'Caesarean' source, of the role of Cornelius.

11:1 reads almost like the commencement of the report of the 'trial', as recorded by the Jerusalem church. The formal style of the Western text in this verse is unmistakable:

ἀκουσάτων δὲ ἐγένετο  
τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.<sup>396</sup>

But the story soon becomes more personalised. In verse 2 stands the most important of the Western Readings in our chapters, a long, disjointed account of Peter's trip to Jerusalem. He can "take his time and finish his work, for this Gentile problem could wait until Peter himself decided to go to Jerusalem."<sup>397</sup> It is usually judged as another example/

395. Cp. Mk. 1:13 (not in Mt., Lk.).

396. Ropes (BC3 p. 102) prefers this reading.

397. Epp op. cit. p. 106. The variant is "somewhat repetitious"! It is found in D cop G67 with partial latin support and from syh.

example of the Western text's attempt to heighten Peter's role, but in favour of its Lucan origin and thus the possibility that it derives from a pre-Lucan source are:

1. It contains two Lucan characteristic words.
2. Also Lucan are μέν οὖν at the opening of a paragraph, ἱκανός, <sup>398</sup> ἐπιστηρίξειν, <sup>399</sup> καταγταν, <sup>400</sup> and ἐπαγγελσειν. <sup>401</sup>
3. Another Lucan feature is the mention of Peter's wish to go to Jerusalem. <sup>402</sup> Here, as at 10:41,48, the actual event is not recorded, it is assumed. <sup>403</sup>
4. It is clumsy; (i) διὰ τῶν χωρῶν διδάσκων αὐτοῖς after πολλὸν λόγον ποιούμενος leads to several improvements in supporting versions of D: sy<sup>h</sup> adds a particle and reads καὶ ἐδίδασκων and Clark (p. 347) also attempts a rearrangement.

398. v. Hawkins op. cit. p. 21.

399. only in Acts - thrice (D five times) - out of all NT books.

400. Acts nine times (D twelve): never in the Gospels.

401. Mt. 8 times, Mk. 1, Lk. 11, Jn. 2, Ac. 15 (D 17).

402. Note the Marcan ἑπροσδύμα in all texts.

403. Nor are we informed of the content of the preaching. Similarly Mark (Luke does this to a much lesser degree) often refers to Jesus' teaching in general terms (Mk. 6:2, 34&c.).

(ii) cop<sup>G67</sup> also alters the following lines of D:

ὅς καὶ κατήντησεν αὐτοῖς  
καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς...

Apart from being repetitive, who are the αὐτοῖς ?  
The sentence is intended to mark the arrival of  
Peter in Jerusalem,<sup>404</sup> but those who meet him are  
not identified until the following verse. This could  
easily have led to the excision of the passage and  
we find a similar phenomenon in 10:10 where αὐτῶν  
was introduced without explanation. There, the  
solution posited was that a source had been grafted  
in incomplete form to suit the editor's purpose. Can  
we say less for the present verse? It fits in  
admirably with the picture of Peter wandering  
διὰ πάντων (9:32).

The clumsiness of this Western reading, notably  
in D, is not found in the B text where "there is no  
apparent exegetical difficulty in the immediate  
context,/"

404. Without referring to this occasion specifically,  
Jacquier (p. 337) wrongly tries to credit D with  
reading: κατήντησεν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα here.

context, but the 'Western' addition creates one."<sup>405</sup>  
 D is evidently a witness to a Lucan text,<sup>406</sup> and  
 one, which, in its detail, has been derived from an  
 eyewitness source, perhaps Peter's Marcan memoirs.

The charge directed against Peter can be viewed  
 as a direct interrogative introduced by  $\delta\tau\iota$ , a  
 construction common in Mark (2:7, 8:12, 9:11,28) and  
 found in a passage we have already considered in  
 connection with Ac. 11:3, Mk. 2:16B.<sup>407</sup>  $\Lambda\zeta\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$   
 $\delta\tau\iota$  is also found at Ac. 15:5 (cp. similarly  
 Mk. 14:58-60) and may thus be part of the formulation  
 of a legal charge: the above comparison raises the  
 complex question of the relationship between the  
 events portrayed in Ac. 15 and the present  
 proceedings. There is an attempt by the editor  
 (which is more marked in the Western text) to  
 parallel the events, but for our purposes we will  
 limit ourselves to a few general observations,  
 taking this opportunity to discuss the significance  
 of Peter's final speech in Acts (15:7-12):

405. Bacon HTR (1928) p. 135.

406. This was recognised as early as 1836 by Clarke:  
 "this is the very style of St. Luke." (p. 795).

407. BC 4 p. 124 make Ac. 11:3  $\delta\tau\iota$  interrogative, whilst  
 recognising this as the only instance of the construc-  
 tion to be found in Luke. See p. 70.

15:7-12. Peter's Defence of His Action.

7	ἀναστάς (not Δ), πρὸς, ἀνῆλθ	ἐβόησεν ἰσχυρῶς * ἐπίσταμαι †	4   5
8			
9	τῆ	διακρίνειν †	
10	ἡ		
11	χάρις		
12	πληθὺς	τῶν †, ὅσοι †	

A number of words repeat those found in Ac. 10 and 11: καθὼς καὶ ἡμῶν (15:8 cp. 10:47, 11:17) and the use of καθιερῶν in 15:9 can be compared with Ac. 11:9 (cp. Mk. 7:19), and on οὐδὲν δεικνύειν (Ac. 15:9) there is the comparison with Ac. 11:12.

Some of the words also link up with previous Peter stories: ἐπίσταμαι (15:7 = 10:28), καρδιογνώστης (15:8 cp. 1:24) and τί περιέζητε (15:10) recalls Mk. 12:15 (not Lk.).

This speech is the only occasion in Ac. 15 where Peter makes his presence felt. The material for this chapter, thus, as a whole, is unlikely to derive from a Peter source. It is possibly a separate account of the story in Ac. 11: but this observation is blunted by the textual obscurities surrounding the pronouncement of the council in 15:20,29. If the variants led by D and p. 45 are ignored, the issue at stake seems/

seems to have been a renewal of the food law problem. But even if this is so, the matter could have been raised again at a Second Council. Peter's speech may have been borrowed from the earlier report and the reference back to the Cornelius incident might support this, for certainly the statistics do not suggest that 15:7-12 is a free Lucan composition. If he did 'borrow' it from Ac. 11 we may refer to p. 270 for one motive. In that chapter, it may have formed the source's concluding defence by Peter, though this solution cannot be pressed.

To return to Ac. 11, the repetition of Peter's vision demonstrates that Luke also regarded it as of considerable importance. Yet it is told with so little variation that if the label 'artist' is applied to Luke, then we must ignore the dull repetition of 10:9ff. and 11:5ff.. It is not as though Luke has even reworded the material here, the evidence has suggested the copious use of a source. If this source is Mark, then here is evidence of first hand material from Peter being transmitted through the writer of the Second Gospel.

This Gospel began with the Baptism of John in preparation for the Christ. Now the Christ has come, and the fullness of his revelation, even to the Gentiles, /

Gentiles, has been realised so the work draws to its close with a reminiscence of the words of Mk. 1:8 (already repeated by Ac. 1:5): the promised Spirit of Christ has now been fully comprehended! Verses 15-18 read not as though the conclusion of an episode has been reached, but as the climax of a great wonder. Thus our source concludes:

1. With a recollection of the Gospel's prologue:

(ἐρχῆ) τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) as Peter reminds the community of the gift of the Spirit which has now descended ὡςπερ καὶ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν ἐρχῆ (11:15)<sup>408</sup>

2. With a refrain recalling the promise of Jesus - and just as Mk. 16:7 rounded off the first portion with a promise of fulfillment of Mk. 14:28, so too we end here with a reminder that

Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι,  
ὕμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (11:16).

This verse is the pivot of the story<sup>409</sup> as the reader/

408. The "We" is of course the Pentecostal Church of Jerusalem (so Noack ASTI 1 (1962) p. 93) - but a verbal connection with Mk. 1:1 remains open - cp. too p. 84.

409. L. Marin art. cit. = pp. 93f..

reader is confronted with the power of the Spirit which knows no barriers and which brings life to all who recognise this power. "Peter's task as it is presented in Acts is fulfilled":<sup>410</sup> for the Gentile Pentecost is come.

410. Hahn op. cit. p. 133. Similarly Haulotte art. cit. p. 83 = "Après 11:18 son rôle proprement missionnaire est achevé...11:18 marque donc un sommet et un terme:" thus chapter 12 is "hors-cadre" (n. 42).



## 5. CONCLUSION

In the analysis of Acts it has proved necessary to examine Luke's<sup>1</sup> own motives regarding the basic composition of Acts, and inevitably this has in some cases dominated the discussion, most noticeably where it has subsequently been felt difficult, if not impossible, to see exactly the principles upon which Luke has constructed his story. But more often than not it has been clear that some source material has been influencing Luke's narration of a particular episode and in certain cases this factor can plausibly be labelled a Marcan influence. In advancing this hypothesis, nothing very new is being propounded, but the attempt has been made to follow through this thesis a little more completely than in previous studies. I cannot have hoped to cover all the possibilities that the material presents and the need must be, when such delicately subjective source questions are involved, for others to take up the idea, sorting through the suggestions and bringing together their own subjective/

1. Throughout it has been an essential assumption that the writer of the Third Gospel and that of Acts are one and the same person.

subjective impressions. Only with such a consensus will the possibility of a Marcan source for the first part of Acts be acceptably established with any reasonable degree of confidence. Not that the present thesis is concluded with a lack of conviction, nor that the arguments are evolved here without any objective backing, for the would-be objector to this thesis must not merely dismiss the textual analysis presented above, but also the statistics which form the basis of the detailed discussion, and which are summarised below. These figures may be faulted methodologically (and certainly there will be some errors despite many checks) but basically they present a case which, stated briefly, is that a few passages in Acts bear a strong affinity with Mark's Gospel.<sup>2</sup> If, after further investigation, it is now felt that such a relationship cannot be accidental, then it is not so impertinent to extend the hypothesis to include some of the other stories in Acts which also concern Peter. Thus we suggest that this source which Luke utilised once appeared in approximately the following form:

2. v. pp. 53f..

Galilean Stories:

Acts 1:6-11

15-17/21-26.

(18-20).

The Return to Jerusalem:

1:12-14

3:1-11/5:15-16.

The Community:

4:23-31

4:32-35 (36ff.?)

The Community Spreads, even to Gentiles:

12:5-17

9:32-43

10:9 ~ 11:18 (parts)

Such an outline has a distinct coherence, even though in its detail it can never be inevitable - but if it is open for consideration, then the value of the book of Acts as a reliable witness to the primitive days of the Church and its authority as a document recounting the power the community experienced enabling it to spread the good news of Jesus Christ as the saving Lord of all men, must be greatly enhanced, if indeed Acts did incorporate the erstwhile work of the first of the Evangelists.

APPENDIX I : WORD COUNTS IN PARAGRAPHS OF ACTS.

The text is close to that represented by B.

No.	Passage Words in Acts	LUCAN		MARCAN		MATTHEAN		JOHANNINE		Ratio: 100:85
		Character- istics	TOTAL FREQUENCY	words	TOTAL FREQUENCY	words	TOTAL FREQUENCY	words	TOTAL FREQUENCY	
086	I:1-5	5	5.8	1	1.2	1	1.2	0		4:1
I43	I:6-12	13	9.1	2	1.4	2	1.4	1	0.7	9:0
053	I:13-14	2	3.8	2	3.8	0		0		10:0
I57	I:15-26	11	7.0	0		4	2.5	0		10:0
046	I:18-20	2	4.4	3	6.5	4	8.7	2	4.4	4:0
062	2:I-4	4	6.5	1	1.6	1	1.6	0		7:0
I32	2:5-13	10	7.6	1	0.8	2	1.5	1	0.8	14:5
255	2:14-36	16	6.3	6	2.4	6	2.4	3	1.2	13:2
099	2:37-41	9	9.1	1	1.0	1	1.0	1	1.0	7:3
098	2:42-47	9	9.2	7	7.1	4	4.1	3	3.1	7:4
I97	3:I-II	20	10.1	10	5.1	5	2.5	6	3.1	16:8
298	3:12-26	17	5.7	5	1.5	6	2.0	6	2.0	16:6
271	4:I-22	19	7.0	6	2.2	4	1.5	6	2.2	20:7
II5	4:7-12	8	7.0	3	2.6	2	1.7	1	0.9	4:0
I59	4:23-31	9	5.7	5	3.2	3	1.9	4	2.5	16:2
III	4:32-37	12	10.8	8	7.2	5	4.5	4	3.6	5:3
206	5:I-II	15	7.3	6	2.9	8	3.9	6	2.9	13:10
045	5:12-14	7	15.6	1	2.2	1	2.2	3	6.7	3:3
042	5:15-16	3	7.1	4	9.5	0		1	2.4	5:1
230	5:17-28	21	9.1	6	2.6	4	1.7	6	2.6	14:10
071	5:29-33	5	7.0	1	1.4	0		0		6:2
I78	5:34-42	18	10.1	3	1.7	1	0.6	1	0.6	11:3
279	6	20	7.5	5	1.8	8	2.9	3	1.1	30:6
III0	7:I-8:3	46	4.1	13	1.2	23	2.1	16	1.4	83:29
I54	8:4-13	13	8.5	3	1.9	0		3	1.9	8:8
I99	8:14-25	14	7.0	2	1.0	11	5.5	4	2.0	5:5
230	8:26-40	19	7.9	2	0.8	9	3.8	0		15:11
I44	9:I-9	8	5.6	2	1.4	4	2.8	1	0.7	7:9
I87	9:10-19	21	11.2	3	1.6	6	3.2	0		12:6
203	9:19-30	12	5.9	6	3.0	3	1.5	1	0.5	13:11
028	9:31	1	3.6	0		2	7.1	0		4:0
062	9:32-35	6	9.7	2	3.2	0		1	1.6	6:2
I60	9:36-43	13	8.1	2	1.3	0		7	4.3	9:11
I32	10:I-8	17	12.9	4	3.0	3	2.3	3	2.3	9:4
II3	10:9-16	5	4.4	6	5.3	2	1.8	3	2.6	11:5
I25	10:17-23	13	10.4	1	0.8	3	2.4	1	0.8	4:4
I96	10:23-33	21	10.7	8	4.1	9	4.6	5	2.6	11:5
I85	10:34-43	13	7.0	4	2.2	3	1.6	5	2.7	11:1
086	10:44-48	4	4.7	1	1.2	3	3.5	2	2.3	4:1
311	11:I-18	20	6.4	10	3.2	5	1.6	6	1.9	22:14
I51	11:19-26	12	8.0	2	1.3	6	4.0	3	2.0	14:4
064	11:27-30	5	7.8	0		0		1	1.6	2:3
060	12:I-4	4	6.7	1	1.7	1	1.7	2	2.3	2:4
I53	12:5-10	6	3.9	13	8.5	4	2.6	5	3.3	11:7
I44	12:11-17	8	5.5	1	0.7	2	1.4	2	1.4	8:8
I31	12:18-25	6	4.6	0		4	3.1	4	3.1	8:9

(CONTINUED OVER)

Words	Acts passage	Lucan words	Marcan words	Matthean words	Johannine words	Ratio: Kx1.81
066	I3:I-3	3 4.5	0	2 3.0	I 1.5	8:2
I62	I3:4-I2	I3 8.0	4 2.5	7 4.3	5 3.1	9:5
64I	I3:I3-52	4I 6.4	I4 2.2	I0 1.6	I2 1.9	35:18
II5	I4:I-7	I0 8.7	3 2.6	) I3 2.6	6 5.2	9:5
200	I4:8-I8	I6 8.0	6 3.0		4 2.0	I4:2
I57	I4:I9-28	I0 6.4	4 2.5	) 8 3.1	8 5.1	I2:5
I35	I5:I-6	I2 8.9	5 3.7		) 7 2.4	) 9 3.5
I2I	I5:7-I2	7 5.8	5 4.1	) 4 1.3		
083	I5:I3-2I	3 3.6	I 1.2		) 2 2.2	I 1.1
2I3	I5:22-35	22 10.3	3 1.4	2 2.2		
093	I5:36-4I	8 8.6	I 1.1	5 3.2	I 1.1	3:6
I58	I6:I-9	I4 8.9	I 0.6	2 1.2	2 1.3	I2:6
I63	I6:I0-I7	I2 7.4	I 0.6	I6 4.1	3 1.8	5:6
393	I6:I8-40	I8 4.6	I3 3.3	) 2I 3.1	9 2.3	26:18
304	I7:I-15	I8 5.9	8 2.6		) I3 1.9	) I3 1.9
269	I7:I6-34	27 7.4	9 2.4	I4 4.5		
3II	I8:I-17	24 7.7	7 2.2	9 2.9	5 1.6	I8:10
309	I8:I8-17	26 8.4	8 2.6	7 3.0	5 2.0	I4:13
254	I9:8-20	I5 5.9	I2 4.7	I0 2.6	I 0.2	I6:9
390	I9:2I-4I	22 5.6	6 1.5	I 1.9	0	20:12
053	20:I-3	5 9.4	I 1.9	7 3.3	4 1.9	2:2
2I2	20:4-I5	II 5.2	4 1.9	I0 2.4	I2 2.9	I0:15
4II	20:I6-38	22 5.4	8 1.9	7 2.2	5 1.5	I9:4
324	2I:I-18	22 6.8	6 1.9	I6 3.4	II 2.3	I6:16
473	2I:I9-40	37 7.8	I3 2.7	I7 3.0	I4 2.1	22:13
567	22	42 7.4	I0 1.8	20 4.1	I3 2.6	35:22
49I	23:I-25	27 5.5	II 2.2	I 1.3	I 1.3	I5:18
074	23:26-30	7 10.0	I 1.3	6 7.9	2 2.6	2:2
076	23:3I-35	6 7.9	3 3.9	I6 3.5	9 2.0	5:2
457	24	34 7.4	9 2.0	3I 5.8	22 4.1	22:12
532	25	35 6.6	I4 2.6	22 3.9	I8 3.0	I8:14
59I	26	34 5.8	9 1.5	23 3.1	I8 2.1	30:8
753	27	45 6.0	2I 2.8	9 3.1	5 1.7	29:28
289	28:I-I6	22 7.6	4 1.4	6 2.8	2 2.2	I3:9
252	28:I7-3I	I3 5.2	8 3.1			6:8
Totals						
Acts I-12	539 7.03	I73 2.26	I77 2.3I	I33 1.73	523:237	
Acts I3-28	683 6.70	233 2.29	326 3.20	23I 2.27	538:318	
-----						
PeterStories (p.4I n.I6)	282 7.13	I08 2.73	90 2.28	85 2.15		
"We"Sections (i.e. I6:I0ff., 20:4ff., 2I:Iff., and 27:I-28:I6)	II2 6.43	36 2.07	48 2.75	33 1.87	73:74	

Note: All word counts omit LXX quotations. (P.33 n.6).

APPENDIX 2 : A TABLE COMPARING THE INCIDENCE OF LUCAN AND MARCAN WORDS IN THE WESTERN AND NON-WESTERN TEXTS.

In view of the wide divergence in these two textual traditions in the book of Acts, a separate table is here given listing the words measured in Appendix One, as they are found in Codex Bezae. This manuscript unfortunately does not contain all the readings which might reasonably be labelled 'Western', and itself includes many gross blunders: but it is still the most complete extant witness to this tradition, and is here employed to indicate as best as possible, the nature of the Western tradition. It has the advantage - as against the difficulties inherent in using a reconstructed text - of providing an objective standard by which we can measure the two traditions.<sup>1</sup> But why use this text at all? On scrutiny of the word analysis, I hope justification will be found (see p. 320). It can be argued that I have considered almost any and every variant reading, where it helps my case, but I believe this to be justified by the evidence presented below.

1.  $\tau$  is excluded from the figures below as (i) it is only one of Hawkins' Lucan characteristics (defined by him on p. 13) if some variant readings are ignored, (ii) the excessive use of  $\tau$  in Acts is contrasted by its comparative rarity in the Third Gospel (Clark pp. 396f.), (iii) Such a minute particle can easily be altered by the careless scribe, and that of D was particularly unaccomplished (Clark, p. xliii, Ropes BC 3, pp. lxixff.). Taking the text of B, which has 137 examples of  $\tau$  as the norm:

<u>Manuscript</u>	<u>Total Uses</u>	<u>Added (as against B)</u>	<u>Removed</u>
$\tau$	137	9	9
A	141	9	5
614	117	8	28
383	127	10	20
(and the following which do not present a complete Acts text:)			
C	78	6	8
D	52	20	57
E	120	15	18

It will be seen that D's record is very erratic.

The table sets down (a) Lucan characteristics: firstly as they appear in D, then as they appear in the parallel passage in the non-Western text (lacunae in D being appropriately compensated for in all cases)

(b) Marcan words of all types, firstly as they come in D, then in the non-Western text.

(c) Ratio of  $K_{\delta 1} : \delta \frac{1}{2}$  in D.

Words in D	Acts section	Lucan in D	Characteristics in B text	All Marcan words:		$K_{\delta 1} : \delta \frac{1}{2}$
				in D	in B	
103	1:1-5	4	4	3	1	6:1
138	1:6-12	10(-2)	12	2	2	9:0
55	1:13-14	2	2	2	2	9:0
159	1:15-26	10	10	0	0	8:1
48	1:18-20	2	2	3	3	4:0
68	2:1-4	5(+1)	4	2	2	7:0
134	2:5-13	8(+1)	7	0	0	15:4
258	2:14-36	17(+2)	15	7	6	15:1
108	2:37-41	7	7	1	1	9:2
109	2:42-47	8(+2 -1)	7	8	7	10:2
207	3:1-11	18(+2 -4)	20	10	10	18:7
414	3:12-26	19(+3 -1)	17	3	3	17:5
270	4:1-22	18(+1)	17	6	5	17:8
115	4:7-12	8	8	2	2	4:0
171	4:23-31	8	8	5	5	17:2
120	4:32-37	12(+1)	11	9	8	7:3
210	5:1-11	17(+3 -1)	15	6	6	14:9
49	5:12-14	6	6	1	1	4:2
49	5:15-16	4(+1)	3	4	4	4:1
242	5:17-28	18(-1)	19	9	6	17:8
72	5:29-33	4(-1)	5	0	0	5:3
207	5:34-42	18(+3 -1)	16	2	3	12:3
323	6:1-15	19(+2)	17	5	5	29:5
1166	7:1-8:3	52(+8)	44	17	13	94:23
157	8:4-13	13(+1)	12	3	3	7:6
213	8:14-25	16(+3)	13	3	2	6:6
63	8:26-29a	7(+2)	5	0	0	2:2
31	10:14b-16	0	0	3	3	1:2
135	10:17-23a	14(+2)	12	1	1	5:3
225	10:23b-33	21(+5 -3)	19	9	8	12:7
188	10:34-43	13(+2 -1)	12	3	3	12:1
91	10:44-48	5(+2 -1)	4	2	1	4:1
344	11:1-18	22(+5 -2)	19	10	10	26:11
153	11:19-26	14(+3)	11	2	2	12:4
69	11:27-30	4(-1)	5	0	0	2:4

		Luke		Mark		Kol: 8/2
		D	B	D	B	
68	12:1-4	5 (+1 )	4	1	1	3:2
164	12:5-10	4	4	13	13	12:7
148	12:11-17	7 (+2 -1)	6	1	1	12:9
148	12:18-25	5 ( -1)	6	0	0	10:9
65	13:1-3	0 ( -1)	1	0	0	9:2
178	13:4-12	12 (+2 -2)	12	6	5	13:7
683	13:13-52	46 (+8 )	38	16	12	42:16
160	14:1-7	13 (+4 )	9	5	3	13:7
214	14:8-18	16 (+5 )	11	7	6	15:6
167	14:19-28	10 (+1 )	9	4	4	12:7
159	15:1-6	11 (+3 )	8	6	5	12:6
133	15:7-12	5 ( -1)	6	5	5	8:3
91	15:13-21	5 (+2 )	3	2	1	4:1
244	15:22-35	24 (+3 )	21	5	3	20:6
103	15:36-41	8 (+2 -1)	7	1	1	2:6
168	16:1-9	15 (+3 -2)	14	3	1	12:6
174	16:10-17	12 (+1 )	11	2	1	8:5
470	16:18-40	29 (+14-2)	17	17	13	33:16
314	17:1-15	13	13	9	8	28:11
374	17:16-34	25 (+5 -6)	26	11	9	20:9
353	18:1-17	23 (+3 -2)	22	7	7	22:12
357	18:18-19:7	25 (+5-2)	22	9	8	20:16
292	19:8-20	11 (+2 -1)	10	13	12	19:7
396	19:21-41	18 (+3 -5)	20	6	6	23:10
54	20:1-3	4 (+1 -1)	4	1	1	3:4
222	20:4-15	10 (+2 -1)	9	4	4	13:12
428	20:16-38	20 (+2 -2)	20	7	8	21:5
201	21:1-18	11 (+3 -5)	13	6	5	11:12
473	21:19-40	32 (+4 -3)	31	16	13	23:13
343	22:1-29	24 (+1 -1)	24	4	4	20:14

903:383

Summary

## Lucan Characteristics in

	D		B	
	TOTAL	FREQUENCY	TOTAL	FREQUENCY
"We" sections	37	5.61	38	6.18
Acts 1-12	444	6.35	408	6.28
Acts 13-22	422	6.19	381	6.05

## Marcan Characteristics:

"We" sections	12	1.82	10	1.61
Acts 1-12	158	2.26	143	2.20
Acts 13-22	172	2.52	145	2.30

Notes: "We" sections: 11:27-30, 16:10-17, 20:4-15, 21:1-18.

Lacunae in D: from 8:29 - 10:14 and in the sections: 21:1-18 and 22:1-29.



Conclusion.

The Bezan text, as our best representative of the Western tradition, emerges from this analysis as being as Lucan as the B-type text. This is a remarkable record and lends some credence to the view that Luke himself issued two editions of Acts. However the results obtained in the Marcan word study are also high, and thus it may be concluded that the Western tradition has been influenced to some degree by knowledge of the language of the Gospels. If the bulk of these readings were compiled by a single writer (and this is, I think, an inescapable conclusion) then we may say of him that he was a man well versed in the Gospels.

Nevertheless, these statistics allow the possibility that behind the Western text may lie traces of a Lucan original, and which moreover may once have derived, in some instances, from a Marcan original. The readings which merit most consideration under this heading are: I:2, 3:11, II:2—these are discussed in detail in the chapter on Acts. Other cases where there is less ample textual support are I:14D, 23D, 4:3h, 5:15 (where texts vary considerably), IO:11d, p45C, I2:5sy<sup>h</sup> cop<sup>G67</sup>(D), I2:10Dcop<sup>G67</sup>. The cases where the Western text reflects a Lucan original are more numerous, but for our present investigation it will suffice to remark that it is surely wrong to dismiss or even ignore "Western" variants in Acts without a discussion of each instance, considered on its own merits.

APPENDIX:3- Distinctive Vocabulary in the Peter Sections.

(For contents of Peter sections see p 4I n I6)

Although our proposed Marcan source does not contain all these paragraphs, the general Marcan influence herein exhibited is evident. Hawkins' Marcan Characteristics, as they appear in Acts, are tabulated:

## DISTINCTIVE MARCAN

CHARACTERISTIC \* IN PETER STORIES IN REST OF ACTS

CHARACTERISTIC *	IN PETER STORIES	IN REST OF ACTS
ἐκκαθάριος	4	I
διδάχη <sup>1</sup>	I	3
ἐναγγελίον <sup>2</sup>	I	I
ἐϋθός	I	
κράβαττος	2	
κρατῆν <sup>3</sup>	2	2
πάλιν <sup>4</sup>	2	3
φέρειν	2	7
Hawkins' Charac. †		
διαστέλλομαι		I
ἱστορεύομαι <sup>5</sup>	I	3
ἐκθαμβέομαι	I	
ἐκπρᾶύομαι		/3
κατακείμεαι	I	I
μάστιξ		I
μεθερμηνεύομαι		2
οἶκος (unidentified)		I
ὅτι recit. <sup>6</sup>	4	I2
δύκειν		3
παρίστημι	2	5
πρῶτ <sup>7</sup>		I
σιωπᾶν		I
συζητῆν		2
τοιοῦτος <sup>8</sup>		4

I also I4:7DE, I7:4D

2 also I:2D

3 also 4:3h

4 also IO:I6D, I3:39D, I4:5cop<sup>G67</sup>,

5 also I8:4D

6 also I4:I9C (I6:39D.

7 also 5:2ID

8 also I9:4D, 2I:25CDE.

NB also: θαμβέομαι 9:6h, πάλιν 8:24D, 20:ID.

Result: 25 Hawkins' Marcan Characteristics in Peter stories.

57 " " " in Rest of Acts.

Frequency in Peter sections therefore = 0.63.

Frequency in Rest of Acts = 0.41.

Listed below are words which occur at least four times in Acts and appear to be particularly frequent in the Peter sections of Acts.

	<u>'Peter'</u> Stories	<u>Rest</u> of Acts	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Luke</u>
ἀκάθαρτος	4	I	II	6
διακρίνειν	4	0	I	0
δώριον	4	0	0	0
ἐγείρειν	7	5	17	18
ἐκφέρειν	4	0	0	I
ἐλεημοσύνη	5	3	0	2
θύρα	6	4	6	3
κλήρος	4	I	4	4
προσέχουσαι	7	9	II	19
προσευχή	4	5	2	3
σημα	8	6	2	19
στόμα	6	5	0	9
τιθέναι	II	II	10	15
στρεψών	3	I	0	0

Throughout this comparison, it must be recalled the Peter sections form only approximately  $\frac{1}{4}$  of Acts.

To these words we may add those which occur seldom in the Peter stories, and at least eight times elsewhere in Acts. Words confined exclusively, or nearly so, to the later chapters of Acts are not reckoned:

ἄγειν	3	23	3	13
ἀναγινώσκειν	0	8	4	3
βασιλεία	0	8	19	45
γεννᾶν	0	6	I	4
γινώσκειν	I	16	12	28
ἱκανός	2	16	3	9
ἵπτασθαι	0	12	4	7
ὄχλος	I	21	37	41
πλήθος	2	15	2	8
ἵπτα	I	7	2	6.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I - Major Studies consulted:

- F. BLASS: Philology of the Gospels (London 1898).  
Acta Apostolorum (Göttingen 1895).
- F. F. BRUCE: Acts of the Apostles-Greek Text (London 1951).
- R. BULTMANN: Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apg.-(in)  
New Testament Essays in Memory of TW Manson  
(ed. AJB Higgins) (Manchester 1959).
- H. Cadbury: The Style and Literary Method of Luke  
(HTR Studies 6 1920).
- A. C. CLARK: Acts of the Apostles (Oxford 1933).
- M. DIBELIUS: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles  
(London ET 1956).
- L. DIEU: Marc, Source des Actes? (RBI 7 1920, RB 18 1921).
- J. Dupont: The Sources of Acts (London ET 1964).
- M. GOGUEL: Introduction au NT Vol. 3 (Paris 1922).
- A. HAEFNER: The Bridge Between Mark and Acts (JBL 77, 1958).
- E. Haenchen: Die Apostelgeschichte (Göttingen 1956)  
(The English Translation of this came too late to hand)
- A. HARNACK: The Acts of the Apostles (London ET 1909).  
Luke the Physician (London ET 1907).
- E. JACQUIER: Les Actes des Apôtres (Paris 1926).
- K. LAKE/F. FOAKES-JACKSON: The Beginnings of Christianity  
( = BC ), 5 vols., (London 1920-33).
- K. LINCKE: Simon Petrus und Johannes Marcus (ZNW 5, 1904).
- P. PARKER: Mark, Acts and Galilean Christianity (NTS 16, 1970).
- C. S. C. WILLIAMS: Acts of the Apostles (London 1957).
- 2-Other writings on Acts of importance for this study:
- B. W. BACON: More Philological Criticism of Acts (AJT 22, 1918).  
Some Western Variants in the Text of Acts
- J. V. BARTLET: The Acts (London 1902). (HTR 21, 1928).
- E. BICKWELL: Acts (London 1928).
- L. BROWNE: Acts (London 1925).
- F. C. BURKITT: Christian Beginnings (London 1924).
- W. BURNSIDE: Acts (Cambridge 1916).
- A. CLARKE: Acts (in his NT Commentary) (Cambridge 1836).
- H. CONZELMANN: Theology of St. Luke (London ET 1960).
- J. CREHAN: Peter According to the D Text of Acts (TS 18, 1957).
- C. DESSAIN: Acts (In Catholic Commentary) (London 1953).
- C. H. DODD: The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments  
(London 1936).

- A. EHRHARDT: *The Acts of the Apostles* (Manchester 1970).
- E. J. EPP: *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (Cambridge 1966).
- J. FINDLAY: *The Acts of the Apostles* (London 1934).
- E. HAENCHEN: *Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity: (in) Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds. Keck/Martyn) (New York 1966).  
(and P. WEIGANDT): *The Original Text of Acts ?* (NTS 14, 1968).
- R. P. C. HANSON: *The Acts* (Oxford 1967).
- J. JEREMIAS: *Untersuchungen der Apg.* (ZNW 36, 1937).
- J. JERVELL: *Zur Frage der Traditionsgrundlage der Apg.* (ST 16, 1963).
- R. KNOWLING: *The Acts of the Apostles* (London 1900).
- W. L. KNOX: *The Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge 1948).
- J. LUMBY: *Acts (English) (Cambridge 1890); (Greek) (1904)*.
- R. S. MACKENZIE: *The Text of Codex Bezae in Acts* (St. Andrew's PhD Thesis 1962).
- T. PETERSEN: *An Early Coptic Manuscript of Acts* (CBQ 26 1964).
- R. RACKHAM: *The Acts of the Apostles 3rd edit.* (London 1906).
- E. SCHARFE: *Die Petrinische Strömung der NT Literatur* (Berlin 1899).
- G. STÄHLIN: *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen 1966).
- W. C. VAN UNNIK: *The Book of Acts, the Confirmation of the Gospel* (Nov T 4, 1960).
- B. WEISS: *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Leipzig 1893).  
*Der Codex D in der Apg.* (Leipzig 1897).
- M. WILCOX: *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford 1965).
- J. WILSON: *Acts of the Apostles from Codex Bezae* (London 1923).
- 3-Main works on General Related Topics:
- M. BLACK: *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts 1st edit.* (Oxford 1946).
- C. A. BRIGGS: *New Light on the Life of Jesus* (Edinburgh 1904).
- F. C. BURKITT: *Sources of the Life of Jesus* (London 1920).
- H. CADBURY: *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York 1927).
- O. CULLMANN: *Peter, Disciple Apostles and Martyr -2nd edit.* (London ET 1962).
- J. C. HAWKINS: *Horae Synopticae* (Oxford 1899).
- R. H. LIGHTFOOT: *Gospel Message of St. Mark* (Oxford 1950).
- B. H. STREETER: *The Four Gospels* (London 1924).
- V. TAYLOR: *Behind the Third Gospel* (Oxford 1926).  
*St. Mark* (London 1952).

- C.H. TURNER: MARCAN Usage (JTS 25-29, 1924-28).
- A. WIKGREN: Arche tou Euaggeliou (JBL 61, 1946).
- T. ZAHN: Introduction to the New Testament 2 (Edinburgh 1909).
- 4 - Important Relevant Studies on Individual Passages  
in Acts not listed in Mattill's Dictionary.
- O. BETZ: The Dichotomised Servant and the End of Judas  
Iscariot (RQ 15, 1964). Ac. I: 18-20.
- W. BIEDER: Der Petruschatten (TZ 16, 1960). Ac. 5: 15.
- A. BÖHLING: Zum Martyrium des Jakobus (NovT 5 1962). Ac. 12: 2.
- F. BOVON: Tradition et Rédaction en Actes 10: I-II: 18 (TZ 26 1970).
- H. BURTON: The House of Mary (E 2 Vol. I 1881). Ac. 12: 12.
- J. DUPONT: L'Épître (Ac. 12: I-II): Pierre délivré de Prison  
(AS 84, 1967).
- J.R. GARCÍA: La Restauracion de Israel (EB 8 1949). Ac. I: 6.
- B. GERHARDSSOHN: Einige Bemerkungen zu ApG. 4: 32 (ST 24, 1970).
- K. HAAKER: Der Pfingstwunder Als Exegetisches Problem: (in)  
Verborum Veritas. (Wuppertal 1970). Ac. 2: I-13.
- E. HAULOTTE: Fondation d'une Communauté de Type Universel  
(RSR 58 1970). Ac. 10: I-II: 18.
- W. HUBER: Passa und Ostern (ZNW Beiheft 35, 1969). Refs: Ac. 12: 3.
- M. LAGRANGE: La Dormition de la Sainte Vierge at la  
Maison de Jean-Marc (RBS 1899). Ac. I: 13, 12: 12.
- S. LEGASSE: Ac. 12: 2 (NTS 20, 1974).
- L. MARIN: Essai d'Analyse Structurale de Actes 10: I-II: 18.  
(RSR 58, 1970).
- PH. MENOUD: La Mort d'Ananias et de Sapphira: (in) Mélanges  
Offerts à M. Goguel (Neuchâtel 1950). Ac. 5: I-II.  
: Les Additions au Groupe des Douze Apôtres d'Après  
Le Livre d'Actes (RHPR 6, 1957). Ac. 1: 15-26.
- J. RENDEL HARRIS: A Lost Verse in the Gospel of Mark  
(ET 39 1928). Ac. 6: 15D.
- K. RENGSTORF: Die Zuwahl des Matthias (ST 15 1961) (also:)  
: The Election of Matthias : (in) Current Issues  
in NT Interpretation (London 1962). Ac. I: 15-26.
- A. SEROBEI: Passa-Symbolik und Passa-Wunder in Ac. 12: 3ff.  
(NTS 4 1958).  
: Der Berg der Offenbarung (Verborum Veritas) Ac. I: 9.
- W. THIELE: Eine Bemerkung zu Act. I: 14. (ZNW 53 1962).
- B. THURSTON: To Huperoon in Act. I: 13. (ET 80 1968).
- A.M. TORNOS: Kat' ekeinon de ton kairon en Ac. 12: I. (EE 33 1959).
- W.C. VAN UNNIK: Der Ausdruck Heos ApG. I: 8: (in) Studia Biblica  
et Semitica (Wageningen 1966).

- 5- Other important works to which reference is made:  
**K.ALAND**: Der wiedergefundene Marcusschluss? (ZTK 67, 1970).  
**T.A.BURKILL**: The Syrophenician Woman: the Congruence  
of Mk. 7:24-31. (ZNW 57 1966).  
: The historical development of the story  
of the Syrophenician Woman (SE 4/2 1968).  
**S.DAVIDSON**: Introduction to Study of NT, 2 (London 1882 2ed).  
**A.ELLEGAARD**: A Statistical Method of Determining  
Authorship (Goteborg 1962).  
**C.F.EVANS**: The Beginning of the Gospel (London 1968).  
**A.GRAHAM**: Mark and Hebrews (SE 4/I 1968).  
**E.LINNEMANN**: Der (wiedergefundene) Marcusschluss (ZTK 66 1969)  
**E.LOHMEYER**: Galiläa und Jerusalem (Göttingen 1936).  
**J.RENIE**: L' Election de Matthias (RB 55 1948).  
**W.WHITLEY**: The Scope of Mark's Work (ET 29 1918).

#### JOURNALS: ABBREVIATIONS

AJT	American Journal of Theology
AS	Assemblées du Seigneur (Bruges)
ASTI	Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute
B	Biblica
BT	Bible Translator (London)
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
E	Expositor
EB	Estudios Biblicos
EE	Estudios Eclesiásticos
ET	Expository Times
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
HJ	Hibbert Journal
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JBR	Journal of Bible and Religion (Wolcott N.Y.)
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NTS	New Testament Studies
RB	Revue Biblique
REA	Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes
RHPR	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses
RQ	Revue de Qmran
RSR	Revue des Sciences Religieuses
SE	Studia Evangelica (Berlin)
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
SNTS	Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas
ST	Studia Theologica
T	Theology
TS	Theological Studies
TZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.

---

SUBJECT INDEX

- Almsgiving..I77 278
- Aramaisms..3 6 2If 56 74  
I45 I47 I88 2I0 248  
278
- Barnabas..9 IIIIf I49(F)  
I73f 2I8f 228 234  
270
- Frequency defined.. 24
- Galilee:traces of Resur-  
rection Events there  
..I3 I9 97 I02 I04  
II7 II9 I2If I29 I3I  
I43
- Gentile Mission..8 I9f  
79 83 85 I27 I55 I79  
278 287 30I 3II
- Humour.. I78
- James, Jesus' Brother..  
I33f 238 257 268f
- Jewish orientated faith  
of Early Community..  
I5 8I 85 I26(F) I38  
I42 I55f I75 I79 2I3f  
253f
- John in Acts..I52 I7I(F)  
I75 I77 23I 234 240
- Lists in Acts:Columns  
explained..II3
- Luke attitude to repet-  
ition..7 II 24 58 80  
I70 28I
- Luke:written allegedly  
before Acts..7 I2 I8  
76
- XXX, use of, in Acts..I6f  
I45 I60 I63(F) I67  
2I0 2I3 220 280
- Manuscripts:Readings in  
Acts where noted(ex-  
cept in Word Lists )  
N ..I23 I30 I33 I53  
I66 230 248 303
- cop<sup>G67</sup> ..67 86 II5 I37 I53  
I66 I68 I74 I96 I98  
200 205 2I4 226 237  
247 277 290 304 306
- D..3 9 I6 39(F) 54(F) 64  
67 69 7If 86 II3 II5(F)  
I26 I28(F) I32 I34(F)  
I40f I44 I48f I53 I64  
I68 I70 I72 I74f I77  
I80f I83f I86 I88 I90f  
I93 I96f 205 2I4 2I9  
226 233 237 240f 247F  
26If 266 269f 293(F)  
296f 303(F) 308. Also  
Appendix 2.
- E..9 I26 I30 I38 I46 I48  
I55 I66 I68 I70 I74  
I80 I86 I89 I93f I96F  
204 208 2I4 243 274  
277 290 300 303
- g..II5f I30 I44 I84 I86  
I96 226 233 244 249  
262
- h..I36f I70 I8I I86 205  
207f 288
- 6I4..I7 69 I26 I37f I46  
I48 I68 I74 I80 I86  
I9I I94 269
- Messengers..I92 226 279  
28If 284 286
- Money..8If I79 224 280
- Oral Tradition..28(F) 74  
I65 236
- Paul..4 28 70 74f IIIIf  
I4I I73f I86 226(F)  
27I 290
- Peter:Death..4 I24 255F  
:/Paul parallelism..  
I83 I90 2II 229 263  
307
- Peter:Prominence in D..  
I44 I72 I97 305
- Philip..22 I5I 222 224f  
23I 285 287
- Simon the Tanner..I25  
284 288 293f 296.

f = Reference on next page also.

F = Reference extends to next pages.



LXX

<u>Genesis</u>	
15:2	255
18:15	92
19:30	92
20:2	92
<u>Exodus</u>	
12:11/12	253
12:42	254
20:11	174 211
	213
29:39/41	175
<u>Leviticus</u>	
6:20	175
<u>Numbers</u>	
22:6/15/	
16/18/19/	
21/31	280
<u>Deuteronomy</u>	
6:5	220
<u>2 Kings</u>	
22:42	250
<u>3 Kings</u>	
18:29	175
<u>1 Esdras</u>	
5:50	175

New Testament

Matthew

2:1	194
2:13	245
2:23	17
6:13	196
12:43	38
14:28	265
14:29	266
14:30	237
14:36	195
16:18	88
16:19	223
17:10	126
17:11	126
19:5/10	136
19:28	142
26:14	142
26:47	142
27:2	212
27:49	262
28:1	96
28:7	97
28:8	98
28:10	98
28:16	81 94
	102 141
28:19	94 128
	179
28:20	117

<u>Judith</u>	
6:16	182
9:12	213
<u>2 Maccabees</u>	
9	147
<u>3 Maccabees</u>	
5:14	261
6:27	205
<u>Esther</u>	
5:10/6:12	205
<u>Psalms</u>	
2:1/2	213
2:7	17
15:8-11	164
23:7	267
38:14	255
49:18	182
68:26	145
87:6	260
108:8	145
109	16
117:22	16
	210
<u>Job</u>	
5:8	213

<u>Wisdom</u>	
6:7	213
<u>Psalms of Solomon</u>	
8:15	127
<u>Micah</u>	
6:5	280
<u>Joel</u>	
3:5	167
<u>Jonah</u>	
4:3	213
<u>Isaiah</u>	
40:5/56:7	82
<u>Jeremiah</u>	
41:13	254
<u>Ezekiel</u>	
40:22	247
<u>Daniel</u>	
12:2	260

Mark

<u>1:1-20</u>	66-69
	113
1:1	4 64f
	115 310
1:2	143
1:4	167
1:6	47
1:8	6 310
1:13	304
1:14	39 117
1:16-20	35
1:19	8
1:22	38 43
1:24	7
1:27	7 38
	47 190
1:29ff	251
1:30	275
1:31	40 181
1:33	176
1:34	7
1:35	47f 251
1:38	47
1:44f	99
1:45	47 115
	190
2:1-16	39 69-
	70 292

2:1	57
2:2	47 176
	190
2:3	274
2:4	47
2:6	180
2:7	307
2:9/11	47
2:12	7 190
2:13	43
2:14	265
2:15	143 307
2:16	110 307
2:18	15
2:20	70-72
2:22	71
2:23	115
2:28	190
3:5	48
3:6	48 180
3:9	216
3:10	190
3:11	38 216
3:14	39 117
3:15	185
3:17	8
3:20	57 190
3:21	181
3:32	15

Mark (continued)		6:50	92	9:49	155
4:1	43 115	6:52	58	10:1	48
	190	6:55f	54 76	10:4f	17
4:2	38		78 190	10:5	83
4:13ff	298		192f 198	10:13	58
4:17	47 71	6:55	47 194	10:17	48 81f
	179	6:56	185 191f	10:21	177
4:20	48		195 216	10:22	47
4:22/28/		7	20 72	10:23	81f
32	72		78-80	10:24	47 126
4:38	9 237	7:2/5	216	10:26	48 126
4:40	58	7:10	47	10:27	177
5:4	46 48	7:13	284	10:28f	126
5:5	176	7:17	57	10:30	47 136
5:7	48	7:18	20 58	10:32	47 92
5:8	9	7:19	308	10:35ff	172
5:14-17	180	7:24	48	10:35	8
5:16	57	7:25	132	10:37	126
5:17	48	7:27	8 20	10:39	82 239f
5:21ff	76		84		258
5:23/28	277	7:31	48	10:46	176
5:29	273	7:35	180	10:47	17 115
5:30	277	7:36	47 99	10:49	177
5:33	57 92	8:9	158	11:1-6	97
5:34	48	8:10	48	11:4	176
5:36	92	8:12	307	11:6	177
5:37	8	8:15	47	11:14	41
5:38-42	73-74	8:17ff	58	11:17	82 84
5:38	47 277	8:24	177	11:18	92
	292	8:25	190	11:19	216
5:39	47 132	8:29	30	11:20	248
	260	8:30	88	11:25	216
5:40	7 9	8:31	115	11:30	209
	277	8:32	48 297	11:32	92
5:41	10 39	8:33	58	12:4	46
	179 181	8:35	39	12:9	83
5:43	47	9:2	80-81	12:10f	16 210
6:2-6	74-75	9:5	184	12:11	82
	227	9:6	93 244	12:12	40 92
6:2	115 305	9:9ff	126		181
6:3	15	9:9	47 91	12:15	308
6:6	48		101 127	12:19	17
6:7	38	9:11	126 307	12:27	83
6:8	47 115	9:12	16 126	12:28-34	19
6:9	48 75-76	9:14ff	180	12:33	83
6:11	47	9:15	47f	12:37	16 47
6:13	81 185	9:18	47 185	12:38	38
6:14	239	9:21	57 272	12:40	83
6:17-29	8	9:22	48	12:41	292
6:17	181	9:25	47 182	12:42	248
6:18	197	9:26	190	13	163
6:20	47	9:27	40	13:6	83
6:22	195	9:28	57f 81	13:7	47
6:29	15		307	13:8	48
6:30	43 185	9:30	56	13:9	84
6:31	47	9:32	58 92	13:10	4 39
6:33	48 182	9:34	46		72 83-
6:34	43 115	9:38ff	172 213		84 117
	305	9:38	179	13:11	84 153
6:37	46	9:39	47		191
6:44	9 158	9:42	147	13:15	84-85

13:19	47	16:6	47 93	5:29	69
13:22	216		97 99	5:30	69f
13:24	47		129	5:33	72
13:28	47	16:7	88 91	5:35	70
13:29	176		96 99	5:37	71
13:32	6 85		121 124	6:1-11	34
	127		269 310	6:6-11	36
13:35	48	16:8	10 12	6:6	179
14:2	7 47		16 69	6:7	180
	206 241		89 91-	6:12-19	34 141
14:9	39		94 98-	6:16	8
14:10	142		100 104f	6:20-8:3	34
14:11	47		127 130	6:43	40
14:12-16	97		186	6:49	40
14:13	172	16:9-20	93	7:2	175
14:14	132	16:9	48	7:3	279
14:15	103	16:13	125	7:6/10	296
14:19	115	16:14	16 141	7:15	283
14:27f	85-86	16:15	94 117	7:18-23	36
	121 261	16:17	95	7:36	196
14:28	91 96	16:18	95	7:45	132
	99 310	16:19	94	8:4-9:50	33f
14:32	48			8:19-21	271
14:33	47 115	Luke		8:22-56	36
14:43	142	1-2:52	34	8:29	58
14:44	181	1:1-4	66	8:39	58
14:47	48	1:2	29	8:41	296
14:50	58 101	1:4	168	8:49	280
	234	1:9	116	8:51	8 132 296
14:54	47f	1:35	128	8:52	73 277 292
14:57f	86-88	2:12	245	8:54	39 73 179
14:58	78 307	2:29	212	8:55	73 277
14:62	19	3:1-4:30	34	9:2	192
14:65	115	3:2	210	9:3	179
14:66-72	88	3:3-6	33	9:7-17	36
14:68	47 298	3:3	167	9:10	185
14:69	110	3:5	82	9:31	121
14:70	122	3:7-14	36	9:40	196
14:71	46 115	3:7	167	9:42	38
15:1	48 205	3:10/14	167	9:49	179
15:14	48	3:15f/21f	33	9:51-	
15:16	47	3:16	67	10:42	34
15:31	243	4:1-13	272	9:56	251
15:34	88 160	4:2	67	10:1	141
	164	4:14f	33	10:9	192
15:40	139 250	4:16-30	272	10:24-28	33
15:41	103	4:20	29	11:1-54	34
15:43	47	4:29	190	11:1	196
15:46	176	5:1-11	34f 131	11:14-23	33
15:47	91 139		264	11:24	38
	150	5:9	264	11:26	132
16:1-8	89 91	5:10	8	11:45	196
	93 96	5:12ff	33f	11:53	115
	129	5:14	115	12:1-59	34
16:1	46 96	5:17	180	12:35	243
16:2	48	5:18	274f	12:58	196
16:3	176 246	5:19	69	13:1-	
16:5	47 234	5:24	69	14:35	34

Luke (continued)  
 13:11 191  
 13:18-21 33  
 13:20 40  
 13:25 115  
 14:15 196  
 15:1-  
 16:31 34  
 15:28 132  
 17:1-  
 18:14 34  
 18:15-43 33f  
 18:15-17 36  
 18:26 126  
 18:35 176  
 19:1-28 35  
 19:21 92  
 19:28-40 36f  
 19:29-38 33  
 19:29-36 34  
 19:37-44 35  
 19:45-  
 21:4 33f  
 19:46 82  
 20:1-18 36  
 20:4 209  
 20:17 210  
 20:27-40 36  
 21:2 248  
 21:12-38 35  
 21:26 128 254  
 21:35 128  
 21:38 7  
 22:1-30 33  
 22:2 92 206  
 22:3 142  
 22:8 172 248  
 22:10 132f 250  
 22:11 132  
 22:14-71 35  
 22:22 255  
 22:30 142  
 22:33 124 256  
 258  
 22:39-23:5 38  
 22:39 121  
 22:44 147 259  
 22:47 142  
 22:49 261  
 22:50 179  
 22:61f 124  
 23:1-56 35  
 23:8 272  
 23:18-25 33  
 23:20 40  
 23:33 152  
 23:50-  
 24:11 33

23:49 138  
 23:51 209  
 24:1-9 35 120 129  
 24:1 96  
 24:2 246  
 24:3 129  
 24:6 121  
 24:7 129  
 24:9 16 91 141  
 24:10 138  
 24:11-53 35  
 24:12 98  
 24:13ff 102 125  
 24:13 102 125  
 24:16 39  
 24:22 268  
 24:23 91  
 24:27 278  
 24:33 16 101 141  
 249  
 24:34f 125  
 24:41 255  
 24:43 114  
 24:44-48 298  
 24:47 115 119 127  
 24:49 101  
 24:50 120  
 24:51 80 114 121  
 24:53 7 116  
 John  
 1:28 120  
 6:59 120  
 6:71 142  
 7:53 205  
 8:20 120  
 10:36 110  
 16:32 86  
 18:2 101  
 18:28 262  
 19:25 86  
 19:34 261  
 20:3ff 98 123  
 20:19 102  
 21 88 98 101  
 131  
 21:1/2 266  
 21:3 264 266  
 21:4/7 265  
 21:8/9 266  
 21:10 264  
 21:12/13 265  
 21:18 243 264f  
 21:19 263 265  
 21:22 266  
 21:23 264 265 266

Acts  
 References to a detailed discussion on a passage is given first.  
 1-15 4 5 6 21  
 1-12 5 31 36 41  
 61 63 89 107  
 108 133 141  
 1-5 8 22 24 186  
 1-2:4 59  
 1:1-12 61  
 1:1-5 68f 113-119 164  
 1:1f 64  
 1:1 67 129 195  
 1:2 39 47 67 123  
 143  
 1:3 67 126  
 1:4 19 25 67 121  
 122 123  
 1:5 6 67 143 166  
 186 310  
 1:6-12 119-130  
 1:6-11 117 142 144 158  
 208  
 1:6-8 68 114  
 1:6 15 113 133 144  
 201  
 1:7 6 57 85  
 1:8 67 85 166 225  
 1:9-11 114  
 1:9 71  
 1:11 15 18  
 1:12-14 11 144 158 171  
 1:12 56 102 131 144  
 1:13-14 131-139 11 51  
 54 146  
 1:13 11 18 144 212  
 1:14 71 142 152 234  
 238 250  
 1:15-26 140-151 68 158  
 1:15 55f 124  
 1:18-20 17 48 51f  
 1:19 11  
 1:21 18  
 1:22 165  
 1:23 55 95 173 218  
 234  
 1:24 154 308  
 1:25 255  
 1:26 16  
 2 24 146  
 2:1-4 151-156 157f  
 168 214  
 2:1 57 83 157  
 2:2 133f 212  
 2:4 95 157  
 2:5-13 156-159 83 108  
 152 154f 214

Acts (continued)		4:15	136	5:26	92
2:7	18 122	4:17	47 57		186
2:13	55 71	4:18	57	5:28	39
2:14-36	<u>160-165</u> 184	4:19	136 172		186
	200	4:20	57	5:34-42	108
2:14	16 71 141	4:21	57	5:38	262
2:17	16	4:22	9 56 213	5:42	7
2:21	167	4:23-			139
2:22-24	27	5:42	221	6	7 8
2:24	40 48 208	4:23-31	<u>211-215</u> 108		87
2:27/31	88		210		108f
2:32f	143	4:23	152	6:5	225
2:33	166	4:24	152 174	6:10	270
2:34f	16	4:25ff	163 245	6:11-15	109f
2:37-41	<u>166-168</u>	4:25	7	6:11	55
2:40	16 158 164	4:31	84 151ff		110
2:41	123 158 170		156 159 189	6:13	7
2:42-47	<u>215-222</u> 108	4:32-37	<u>215-222</u> 51f		86
	158		108 159	6:14	110
2:42	39 41	4:32	57 189 213f	6:15	86
2:43	167 186	4:34	48	7	7 8
2:45	47 57	4:35	57		83 87
2:46	7 139 170	4:36	9 11 150		108
2:47	51		234 278	7:4	58
3-5:16	22	4:37	48	7:5	47
3-4:22	41	5:1-11	<u>215-222</u> 41	7:6	55
3:1-11	<u>168-187</u> 11		196 225	7:7	57
	51 54 158	5:1	47 136	7:17	47
	195 211 222	5:2	136	7:24	261
3:1	7 12 81	5:3	48	7:25	186
	136 139	5:6-10	191	7:36	253
3:2	53 278	5:7	132 136	7:40	57
3:3	136	5:10	132		253
3:6	12 224 276	5:8	48 178 184	7:48	8
	280	5:12-16	<u>187-199</u> 207	7:57	55
3:10	9 190		211		110
3:11ff	198	5:12-14	52		186
3:11	40 47f 136	5:12	7 55 164		240
	187 190 198		221	7:58	173
	207f 211	5:13	186	7:60	110
3:12-26	<u>200-201</u> 182ff	5:14	136		259
	199	5:15-33	41		263
3:12	172 184	5:15f	51 54 174	8	173
3:16	210		185	8:1	47 71
3:20f	15	5:15	13 39 47	8:3	109
3:22	55		57 177 183		136
3:23	167		273	8:4-40	22
3:26	8	5:16	41 183 231	8:4-25	<u>222-226</u>
4	158 173	5:17-42	<u>201-211</u> 23f	8:4-13	108
4:1-22	<u>201-211</u> 198f		198f	8:4	123
4:1	157 172 182	5:17	192 198		230
	184	5:18	186 221	8:7	41 77
4:2	183	5:19	242 245 249		95
4:10	48 180		261		274
4:11	16	5:20	7 243 245	8:11	9
4:12	57	5:21	48	8:12	136
4:13	47 58 136	5:22	47	8:13	9
		5:23	47 55	8:14-25	41 52
		5:24	9	8:14	136
		5:25	55 157	8:16	57

Acts (continued)				10:6	56 296	11:13	79 296
8:18	136			10:7	303	11:14	79 296
8:19	178			10:9	69 81	11:15	162 298
8:20	280			10:9-11:18	41 196	11:16	67
8:25	123 136			10:9-16	<u>289-293</u>	11:17	25 166
	230f				31 52f	11:18	84
8:26-					77 199	11:19-30	108f 128
9:19	108				309	11:19	109 123
8:26-40	285			10:10	147 306	11:25	229
8:29	270			10:11	69	11:27-30	257
8:30	48			10:14	20 41	11:28	151
8:36	300				69 297	11:30	9 238
8:39	57			10:15	41	12-15	63
8:40	224			10:16	40f 69	12	2 3 7
9	6			10:17-23	<u>294-295</u>		29 41 84
9:1	230			10:17	288 296		128 134 221
9:2	136			10:18	293		<u>232-271</u> 311
9:3	242			10:19	303	12:1	205
9:6	132			10:22	79 287	12:2	8 82
9:11	56 248			10:23-33	<u>295-299</u>	12:3	7 56
9:12	132 288				52 54	12:4	206
9:18	275			10:23	293	12:5-10	52f 196
9:19-30	<u>227-229</u> 108			10:24	303	12:6	205
	226			10:25	48 69	12:7	205 297
9:20-22	74f				178	12:8	48 55 57
9:20	275			10:27	132		75f
9:21	186			10:28	41 80	12:9	46 55 178
9:23ff	236				189 308		206
9:25	69 274 282			10:30-32	79 287	12:10	3 275
9:26	189			10:32	56	12:11	147
9:27	173 234			10:34-48	<u>299-301</u>	12:12ff	178
9:30	230			10:34	47	12:12	2 62
9:31	52 123			10:36	80		110f 133 220
9:32-				10:37	18 65	12:13	294
12:17	<u>229-232</u>			10:39-43	298	12:16	62 132
9:32-	22 76			10:41	305	12:17	133 205 301
11:18	243 251			10:42	15	12:18-25	8 108
9:32-43	5 41 196			10:44-48	25	12:18	186
	271 285f			10:44	162	12:23	147
9:32-35	<u>272-276</u> 173			10:46	95 184	12:25	9 111
9:32	306			10:47	308	13-28	24 31 36
9:33	39 47 69			10:48	305		41 61 107
9:34	244 259 281			11	24 174	13-15	232 235
9:36-43	<u>276-284</u> 52				269 286	13:1	111 210 256
9:36	11 175 288				300	13:2	270
9:37	250			11:1-18	<u>301-311</u>	13:4-13	111
9:38	192 303			11:1	57	13:5	29 111f
9:39	73			11:2	292		235
9:40	7 10 73			11:3	55 69	13:8	111 278
	259				110 288	13:10	111
9:41	73 179			11:5-10	199 290	13:11	48 111
9:43	125 288 292			11:5	69 290f	13:12	9 39 111
10	<u>284-287</u> 24			11:6	69 290	13:13	111
	224f 303			11:7	69	13:17	253f
10:1-8	<u>287-289</u> 31			11:8	41 69	13:31	18
	199 297			11:9	79 290	13:34	47 55
10:1	283			11:10	41 290	13:36	259
10:2	278 296			11:11	291 296	13:43	55
10:3-6	79			11:12	56 296	13:50	47f 71 136

Acts (continued)

13:51 47  
 14 171  
 14:1-7 52  
 14:1 174  
 14:2 47  
 14:3 164  
 14:6 249  
 14:8 174f  
 14:9/10/  
 11 174  
 14:14 297  
 14:15 174  
 14:18 205  
 14:19-28 52  
 14:20 205  
 14:28 186  
 15 27 52 174  
 15:1 55  
 15:3 123  
 15:4 48  
 15:5 55 307  
 15:6 216  
 15:7-12 308-309 41  
 52 54 231  
 251 257 307  
 15:7 39 47 256  
 269 270 298  
 15:8 141  
 15:12 164  
 15:14 256  
 15:20 57 308  
 15:22 149  
 15:24 47  
 15:29 57 308  
 15:36-41 111  
 15:37-39 290  
 15:37/38 111  
 15:39 111 228  
 16:1 136  
 16:13f 136  
 16:13 58  
 16:19 197  
 16:21/27 48  
 16:31f/  
 34 296  
 16:36/39f 58  
 17:4/12 135f 186  
 17:13 226  
 17:19 39  
 17:21 47  
 17:26 191  
 17:29 147  
 17:31 15  
 17:33 58  
 17:34 136  
 18:6 47  
 18:12 136  
 18:24ff 15  
 19:1 230 270  
 19:8-20 52 54 107  
 19:9 47  
 19:11 174 186  
 19:12 77 190 192  
 196

19:13 48  
 19:14 247  
 19:19/21 55  
 19:23 238  
 19:25 249  
 20:1 47 233  
 20:3 270  
 20:10 47  
 20:12 186  
 20:16 57  
 20:18 152 298  
 20:24 39 47  
 20:27 276  
 21:5 135 233  
 21:6 205  
 21:8 133 151  
 224 296  
 21:10 150  
 21:13 47 184  
 21:17 168  
 21:20 19 183  
 21:26/27/  
 28/30 183  
 21:33 261  
 21:34 47  
 21:35 186 247  
 21:36 55  
 21:38 183  
 21:39 186  
 21:40 247  
 22:3 19  
 22:4 136  
 22:9 242  
 22:18 48  
 23:5 17  
 23:6 15  
 23:9 270  
 23:10 46  
 23:12/14 46  
 23:20 55  
 23:21/23 46  
 23:27 47  
 23:31-35 52 54  
 107  
 24:3 57  
 24:6 40 181  
 24:7 186  
 24:10 270  
 24:18 47 57  
 24:21 55  
 24:24 136  
 25 52  
 25:8 55  
 25:12 48  
 25:13 46  
 25:24/25 47  
 26:11 48  
 26:15 17  
 26:18 242  
 26:19 186  
 26:30 48  
 27 232  
 27:9 46  
 27:13 40  
 27:14 186

334.  
 27:16/32 57  
 27:37 46 167  
 28:2 186  
 28:3-6 95  
 28:3 58  
 28:7 48  
 28:14f 205  
 28:23 48  
 28:31 116  
 Romans  
 1:8 28  
 1:16 8  
 1 Corinthians  
 6:1 196  
 6:19 128  
 15:5 123  
 15:6 208  
 2 Corinthians  
 1:10 196  
 3:1-3 28  
 11:32f 228  
 13:13 128  
 Galatians  
 1:13 228  
 1:14 19  
 1:16/23 228  
 2:7-9 257  
 2:12 289 300  
 2:13 112  
 Ephesians  
 5:14 260  
 6:15 76  
 1 Thessalonians  
 1:8f 28  
 Colossians  
 4:10 9 150  
 1 Timothy  
 6:13 212  
 Philemon  
 24 9  
 Hebrews  
 2:3 65  
 3 John 117  
 1 Peter  
 1:2/20 161  
 2:7 210  
 3:19 258  
 3:22 161  
 4:4 182  
 4:17 39  
 5:13 62  
 2 Peter  
 1:1 256  
 2:15 280  
 3:4 260  
 Revelation  
 2:10 258  
 3:4 148  
 9:14 261  
 11:13 148  
 19:7 71  
 19:10 297  
 20:1 261  
 20:7 258  
 22:8 297

Early Christian

Apoc. Peter		Gospel of Peter	
17	267	14:58/60	102
1 Clement		Irenaeus Heresies	
5:4	255 258	3:18:9	191
Eusebius: History		Origen: Contra Celsum	
3:5:2	179	8:22	139
3:39:5	173		
3:39:9	95		
3:39:15	62		

Others

Demosthenes: Ep. 21:50	186
Euripedes: Bacchae 447	246
Herodotus: Hist. 3:132	196
Josephus: Ant. 15:46	191
Plato: Phaed. 59E	250
Tosefta Chullin 2:22,24	179

N.B. Where a passage reference in Acts includes a page number or numbers underlined (hence 3:1-11 168-187) detailed discussion of individual verses included in that section are not listed above, but the reader is referred to the whole passage.

-----000-----

Appendices: Contents

Appendix 1: Word Counts in Paragraphs of Acts.....	315
Appendix 2: Word Counts in the Western Text of Acts	317
Appendix 3: Vocabulary of the 'Peter' Sections.....	321
Bibliography.....	324
Subject Index.....	329
Index of Scriptural and other Passages .....	330

-----000000-----