SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

1974 SEMINAR PAPERS VOL. 2

ONE HUNDRED TENTH ANNUAL MEETING

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

1974 SEMINAR PAPERS

One Hundred Tenth Annual Meeting

24-27 October 1974

Washington Hilton, Washington, D.C.

George MacRae, Editor

VOLUME II

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 74-14210

ISBN 0-88414-046-6

Copyright © 1974 by the Society of Biblical Literature
Cambridge, Massachusetts

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The two volumes of *1974 Seminar Papers* contain copies of those papers received at the Executive Secretary's office before 7 August 1974. They have been photographically reproduced from the typescripts supplied by the authors. The Editor is responsible for assembling the volumes and preparing them for the printer; in some cases he has done minor copy editing. It should be remembered that these papers represent only working documents submitted for discussion at the Seminars of the Society of Biblical Literature, One Hundred Tenth Annual Meeting, 24-27 October 1974; they are not finished copy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume II

S 91 *Peter in Gnostic Revelation*, Pheme Perkins 1

S 98 *Determining Variations by Computer*, Vinton A. Dearing 14

S 99 *Variants for Whom? Some Proposed Classifications*, James T. Clemons 37

S 102 *The Apocalypse as Christian Prophecy*, M. Eugene Boring 43

S 168 *A Spectrum of Opinion on the Value of Acts as a Source for the Reconstruction of the Life and Thought of Paul*, A. J. Mattill, Jr. 63

S 169 *The Title* Kyrios *in Luke-Acts*, Donald L. Jones 85

S 170 *Précis of Eckhard Plümacher*, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller, Schuyler Brown 103

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I

S 53 *Mortal and Miserable Man: A Form-Critical Investigation of Psalm 90*, William J. Urbrock 1

S 82 *Structure and Meaning in the Testament of Job*, John J. Collins 35

S 83 *Satan, Magic, and Salvation in the Testament of Job*, Howard C. Kee 53

S 119 *A Form-Critical Consideration of Ecclesiastes VII*, Roland E. Murphy 77

S 122 *Primitive History: Form Criticism*, John L. McKenzie 87

S 173 *Prophetic Oracles in the Ancient Near East*, Herbert B. Huffmon 101

S 188 *The Understanding of "Sitz im Leben" in Form Criticism*, Douglas A. Knight 105

S 91

PETER IN GNOSTIC REVELATION

Pheme Perkins
Boston College

The wealth of pseudonymous and apocryphal literature associated with the apostle Peter testifies to his significance in Christian circles.[1] The Nag-Hammadi corpus has provided several additions to the apocryphal Peter literature. They suggest that a much more complex picture of Peter may have existed in Gnostic circles than we might have supposed on the basis of patristic sources. The latter contain few suggestions that any Gnostic would cast Peter in a favorable light. Clement of Alexandria reports that Basilides claimed that his teaching came from Peter's interpreter, Glacias.[2] But this claim is not repeated in any other accounts of Basilides.[3] One fragment appeals to the "teaching of Peter" to prove an exegetical point.[4] Ireneus, on the other hand, reports that, while some Gnostics claim secret teaching passed from Jesus to the apostles[5], others consider their gnosis superior to that of the apostles.[6] Heracleon's commentary on John 4:33 may also reflect this attitude of superiority.[7]

We would not have to rely on the heresiologists' reports to realize that Gnostics often cast Peter in a negative light. Several of the better known Gnostic works provide clear examples of the tactics employed. One line of tradition shows Peter to be hostile to Mary, who possesses a Gnosis superior to that of the apostle.

The most detailed treatment of this conflict occurs in the Gospel of Mary.[8] Mary shows her superiority to the apostles at the outset. She is the one to encourage the disciples, when they are afraid to undertake the mission of preaching given to them by the risen Lord.[9] Peter, then, asks her to share with them a vision she had had of the Savior.[10] But after she is finished, Andrew and Peter raise objections to her account. Andrew protests that such strange teaching could not have come from the Savior.[11] Peter objects that the Lord would not have spoken privately to a woman rather than speaking openly to the disciples.[12] Both arguments are common features of the heresiological discussion of Gnosticism. Gnostics teach strange doctrine on the basis of private revelation, while the true teaching was given to all the apostles in common.[13] Peter and Andrew, then, represent the type of opposition the Gnostic might expect from his orthodox opponents. Although the beginning of GMary suggests that Peter had heard some Gnostic teaching from the risen Lord, Peter refuses to accept Mary's revelation. Mary, for her part, weeps as she insists that she has not fabricated her revelation and is not lying about the Savior.[14] Levi calls Peter down for his hot temper and contentiousness. He appeals to the Lord's love for Mary to encourage the disciples not to reject the one the Lord has made worthy but to get on with their commission to preach.[15] Thus, the Gnostic insists that anyone who accepts the orthodox position is simply rejecting the choice and commission of the Savior.

The concluding logion of the Gospel of Thomas represents another version of this conflict.[16] Peter attempts to have Mary sent away as unworthy of life, but he is overruled by Jesus, who promises to make her male so that she will be eligible to enter the kingdom. Our final witness to the tradition of conflict between Peter and Mary is Pistis Sophia. There, Mary is the major character in questioning Jesus and giving interpretations.

Books I and IV report instances in which Peter insists that Mary stop doing all the talking so that he can have a chance.[17] Books II and III narrate incidents which more explicitly condemn Peter's attitude toward Mary. In the first account, Mary says that she can give the interpretation of what has been said by the First Mystery but is afraid to speak because Peter, who hates women, had threatened her. The First Mystery commands anyone who has gnosis to speak so Mary goes ahead with the interpretation.[18] While this episode merely implies that it is necessary for Peter to accept Mary's gnosis, a later scene shows him changing his attitude. There, in order to test Peter's forgiveness, Jesus orders him to cut off a woman who has not done anything worthy of the mysteries after three baptisms. Peter gives her another chance. Mary then provides the interpretation of the incident.[19] This episode seems to be a variant of the GTh logion in which Peter had asked that Mary be cut off from the kingdom.

All the stories about Peter and Mary in Gnostic texts portray Peter as the irascible opponent of gnosis, who can only be silenced by firm assertions that he is going against the Savior's will. Since his objection in GMary shows him to be a representative of orthodox polemic, it is reasonable to suppose that his hostility toward women also belongs to the polemical debate. Ireneus argues, for instance, that the Gnostics make most of their converts among senseless women.[20] The Gnostics can appeal to Jesus' praise for Mary's insight (Lk. 10:38ff.) as Levi does in GMary. But, more sarcastically, they portray Peter as one who picks out women as his adversaries[21] and cannot even win against them.

The Peter against Mary stories were not the only weapon used against the authority of the apostle. Another tactic was to portray him in a position subordinate to some lesser-known disciple of Jesus. GTh gives two examples of this subordination. In logion 12, the disciples are told that after Jesus' departure they are to go to James the Just. Logion 13 then provides a parallel to the Synoptic "Confession of Peter".[22] In this instance, Thomas is the one who has true insight into what Jesus is like. And he is both commended and given a private revelation by Jesus. Peter, on the other hand, had answered first with an insufficient comparison. We might, of course, attribute this variation to a more general, regional veneration of Thomas[23] rather than to a Gnostic redaction of a Synoptic type story. But since GTh also preserves other Gnostic tradition hostile to the apostle, we may suggest that this story would have been understood in that vein by a Gnostic.

Several other Gnostic works may reflect similar tendencies. The Apocryphon of James presents James as "chief" among the disciples after the resurrection, a move paralleled in GTh 12. The epistolary introduction to the work asserts that James had been the recipient of a private revelation.[24] He is now sending a revelation made to himself and Peter. Peter plays a minor role in the account. The answer to one of his two questions is even addressed to James.[25] James is the only one of the disciples who returns to Jerusalem.[26] Though this work is not overtly hostile to Peter, he is clearly not the leading apostle. Similarly he does not even appear in other Gnostic dialogues between the risen Lord and his disciples, Dialogue of the Savior, Sophia of Jesus Christ, and the Books of Jeu.[27]

Thus some Gnostic works support the patristic view that the Gnostics claim to be superior to Peter. This claim is manifest in the appeal to revelations made to other, lesser-known apostles. Or, in the Peter and Mary tradition it is part of an explicit polemic against orthodox arguments. But the Nag-Hammadi

collection also provides us with the other side of the picture: Gnostic works which present a positive picture of Peter.

Two of these works use literary models provided by the canonical and apocryphal "acts" of apostles. The first treatise in Codex VI is entitled The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles.[28] The other apostles accompany Peter, who is the narrator and who asks most of the questions. The work describes two incidents in which the disciples meet Christ, whom they do not recognize. As the story opens, they are shipwrecked in a strange city. While looking for lodging, the disciples meet a man, Lithargoel (= Christ), who is crying out, "Pearls,pearls." They ask him for lodging only to learn that he is also a stranger. The rich of the city, seeing that Lithargoel does not have a wallet, decide that he is mocking them. The poor ask him to show them a pearl so that they can tell their friends about it. Lithargoel tells them that if they come to his city, he will give them pearls free, but that the way to that city is very difficult. Peter then asks the man's name and the directions to his city. These involve severe asceticism but Lithargoel encourages Peter by saying that the name "Jesus" will give them the necessary strength for the journey.[29] The second episode takes place in Lithargoel's city. When they arrive there, the disciples meet him as a physician and again fail to recognize him. He reveals that he is Jesus Christ and sends them back to the city from which they had just come with his medicine chest. They are to avoid the rich and to heal the bodies and souls of the poor who believe in him.[30]

Martin Krause has suggested that although this work could be read either as a Gnostic or as a non-gnostic composition, its emphasis on a central figure (= Christ) who must reveal everything to the disciples should tip the scales in favor of Gnostic authorship.[31] This work differs from our other acts of Peter because it does not center on the miraculous powers of the apostle. Krause even suggests that the following lines -- spoken after Peter has asked where they are to find the things Christ has commanded them to give to the poor -- are intended as a critique of Peter:[32]

ⲱ ⲡⲓⲉⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲥⲙⲡⲛⲩⲁ ⲡⲉ		O Peter, it was fitting
ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲕⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲟⲗⲏ		that you understood the parable (παραβολή)
ⲉⲧⲁⲓϩⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲕⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ	25	which I told you. Do you not understand
ⲭⲉ ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲕⲧⲥⲃⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ		that my name which you teach
ⲩⲟⲩⲟⲧⲃ ⲉⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲣ̄ⲙⲙⲁⲟ ⲛⲓⲙ		surpasses all riches?[33]

However, this passage seems to be concerned with the distinction made throughout the work between literal understanding of what is said and its true, symbolic interpretation. This distinction first appears when Peter hails Lithargoel as brother and comrade, although he thinks that Lithargoel is a native of that city. Lithargoel tells him that he has spoken correctly, since he too is a stranger to the place.[34] Such symbolic interpretation is central to the dominant metaphors of pearl and physician. The passage just quoted provides the proper interpretation of the free pearls to be given to the poor, the powerful name of Jesus.[35] It hardly implies a critical attitude toward Peter and the other disciples. Rather they are told that Lithargoel is not revealed to everyone.[36] Thus this work would seem to be favorable toward Peter. As the result of their journey to Lithargoel's city, the disciples are able to bring back to the poor the treasures of spiritual healing that they could not obtain for themselves. Presumably the Gnostic reader would understand these treasures to be gnosis.

The second "acts" type treatment of Peter occurs in the second treatise of Codex VIII, The Letter of Peter to Philip.[37] Many of the narrative details of this work are drawn from the opening chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. The risen Jesus gives his Gnostic revelation to the apostles and then ascends from the Mount of Olives. Following that revelation, the disciples return to the temple where they preach, teach and heal. Unlike Acts 1:8, the ascension from the Mount of Olives does not bring the appearances of the risen Lord to an end. He speaks to the disciples from heaven and reappears to them after their ministry of teaching and healing in order to wish them grace, peace and power; to command them not to be afraid, and to promise that he will always be with them.[38] PetPhil concludes with the apostles separating to go out and preach.

Throughout PetPhil, Peter is clearly the leader of the apostolic group. It opens with a letter from Peter to Philip, requesting that the latter come together with the other apostles so that they can know how to locate themselves in order to preach.[39] After Philip's arrival, Peter gathers the other apostles, and they proceed to the Mount of Olives where the first revelation occurs.[40] There they ask Jesus a number of questions, which he will answer by summarizing a Gnostic myth of the deficiency of the pleroma, the creation of man, the redemption brought by Christ, and the hostility between the disciples and the "powers".[41] But before he launches into his lengthy answer, Jesus insists that he had already told the disciples all these things but will repeat them because of their unbelief.[42] He concludes the revelation with a similar allusion to what he had already told the disciples when he was in the body.[43] Thus, while some Gnostic works suggest that the apostles only achieved gnosis after the resurrection (e.g. GMary), PetPhil stresses the fact that Jesus must repeat what he had taught during the ministry due to the lack of faith of the apostles. They should have possessed this gnosis all along.

Not only is Peter clearly the leader of the group, but he displays his own attainment of gnosis in the rest of the narrative. As they journey back to Jerusalem the other disciples wonder if they must suffer. Peter insists that they must indeed suffer because of their smallness. His opinion is immediately confirmed by a voice from heaven (Jesus) quoting Mt. 10:17f.[44] Further, Peter's "Pentecost sermon" in PetPhil provides a suitable Gnostic interpretation of the crucifixion: Jesus did not suffer. Men suffer because of the transgression of the Mother, while Jesus did everything according to a likeness.[45] Although Peter falls under the same condemnation as the other disciples in that the risen Lord has to repeat what he should have known, Peter is unambigiously in possession of gnosis after that revelation. He has demonstrated his insight in instructing the other apostles and delivering a Gnostic Pentecost sermon. The author of PetPhil would surely have us see the preaching of Peter as an important source for the Gnostic understanding of Christ.

In the Apocalypse of Peter, the positive portrayal of Peter that we find in PetPhil recurs but in a context of ecclesiastical strife. He must resist the attempts that the "children of this age" will make to lord it over the Gnostics. ApocPet seems to be a revelation Jesus makes to Peter just before the passion.[46] A similar pre-crucifixion discussion between Jesus and a disciple forms the first part of I ApocJas.[47] But there the major Gnostic theologoumena are deferred for the post-resurrection revelation which makes up the rest of the text. Like ApocPet, that revelation is aimed at the Gnostics who will be heirs of James's teaching.[48] Rather than defer part of its

revelation until after the crucifixion, ApocPet uses a combination of discourses and visions to enlighten Peter as to the hostility and opposition he must face and to expound the true, Gnostic teaching about the crucifixion.[49]

I would tentatively suggest the following major divisions in the work:

i. Description of the "blessed" Gnostics and the revealer (70,14-71,15)

ii. Command to Peter to attain perfection (71,5-72,4)

iii. Visions and auditions: the blindness of the children of this age (72,4-73,18)

iv. Discourse on the children of this age (73,18-75,26)

v. Discourse on immortal souls (75,26-76,20)

vi. Discourse on those who lead people astray (76,20-78,6)

vii. Discourse on the types to be revealed at the parousia (78,6-79,31)

viii. Prediction of the future overthrow of those hostile to the Gnostics (79,32-81,3)

ix. Vision of the Crucifixion and its interpretation (81,3-82,3)

x. Vision of the glorified Savior and his commission to Peter (82,4-84,6)

xi. Concluding encouragement to Peter (84,7-13).

Though lacking the visionary element, the closest canonical model for such a pre-crucifixion, revelation discourse would seem to be the farewell discourses of Jesus in John 13:31-16:33. The Johannine narrative is also ambiguous as to whether Jesus has been or is about to be glorified. There too he predicts a dualistic division between those who belong to him and a hostile world; condemns that world; promises his ultimate victory, and concludes with a call to the disciples not to be fearful but to have courage and peace.[50] Of course, the specific content of the discourses is quite different in each case. John's enemies are the "Jews" while ApocPet suggests sectarian strife among Christians.

The introductory call to Peter to become perfect[51] summarizes both aspects of the revelation in ApocPet. Peter is to become the foundation of the Gnostic "remnant"[52] -- presumably in opposition to those who lead others astray. He must also come to know the truth about the crucifixion.[53] PetPhil had simply appropriated the picture in Acts to present Peter as the leader of the apostolic group. Here, the author of ApocPet seems to wish to delineate Peter's commission by Jesus in such a way that Peter becomes the champion of the Gnostics against developing church structures. True understanding of the "mixed" composition of Christian communities and the error of their leaders[54] have become the subject of detailed revelation and constitute part of Peter's gnosis.

The discussion of the impending opposition between the "immortal souls" and the "children of this age" belongs to the discourse material. Allusions to Matthew scattered throughout that material may indicate that the exegesis of Matthew played an important part in the controversy over authority to which the author of ApocPet is addressing himself. Perhaps the image of Peter held by his adversaries was formulated in Matthean terms.

Jesus praises the Gnostics as those who are built on what is strong so that they hear his word.[55] This phraseology suggests the image of the man who builds his house on stone in Mt. 7:24ff. The suggestion to Peter that he become perfect in accord with his name and the Lord's desire to make him the foundation (ἀρχή) of the Gnostic remnant[56] might well be a Gnostic version of Mt. 16:18f. Perhaps the use of the term

"little ones" for Gnostics at 78,22; 79,19; and 80,11 stems from Matthean usage.

Some of the language used to describe the opponents of the Gnostics seems to reapply Matthean images which were also used in polemical and judgmental contexts in the gospel. The dualistic division between the "dead" souls of this age and the immortal souls[57] is bolstered by appeal to the saying that an evil tree cannot produce good fruit (Mt. 7:18). Slightly later Mt. 7:16 is cited to take a similar point.[58] Though these citations might be to another gospel, the third quotation used in a later discussion of the same contrast:

ⲉⲧⲃⲉ

ⲡⲓ̈ ⲇⲉⲓⲭⲟⲩⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ	For this reason I said: Everyone
ⲉⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ ⲥⲛⲁϯ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲩ	who has, (it) will be given to him
ⲱ ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲁⲣ̄ ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ	and he will have plenty.[59]

must be from Mt. 15:29a, since the parallels in Lk. and GTh 41 lack the expression kai perisseuthesetai. It is likely, then, that the earlier citations are from Matthew as well. Mt. 25:30 is probably the passage the author has in mind when he says of those who lead the "little ones" (= Gnostics) astray:

ⲛ̀ⲟⲓ

ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲓⲣⲏⲧⲉ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲓⲉⲣⲅⲁ̀ⲧⲏⲥ	But those of this type are the workers (ἐργάτης),
ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲛⲟⲭⲟⲩ ⲉⲡⲓⲕⲁⲕⲉ ⲉⲧ	who will be cast into outer
ⲥⲁⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓϣⲏⲣⲉ	darkness, away from the sons
ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ	of light.[60]

The further condemnation of the same individuals for neither entering nor allowing others to may be intended to remind the reader of the condemnation of the Pharisees in Mt. 23:13. Mt. 23:6 chides them for loving seats of honor in the synagogue (πρωτοκαθεδρίας). ApocPet castigates those called bishops and deacons for thinking that their power (ἐξουσία) comes from God[61] and says of them:

ⲉⲩⲣⲓⲕⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲁⲡⲓ	they bend under the
ϩⲁⲡ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲛⲓϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲙ̀ⲙⲁ ⲛ̄	judgment of the "first
ϩⲙⲟⲟⲥ	seats."[62]

Perhaps not all of these allusions are to Mt., but the combination certainly suggests that that gospel was an important part of the debate between ApocPet and his opponents. Another "Petrine" work, II Peter, has also provided the characterization of the bishops and deacons that follows the passage just cited. CG VII 79,30f. describes them as: ⲛⲓⲟⲟⲣ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲟⲟⲩ (waterless canals), which is apparently a reference to the pegai anudroi of II Pt. 2:17.[63] Thus the New Testament Peter literature -- and probably its use among his orthodox opponents -- has played an important role in the language used in the discourse material to degrade those who are opposed to the Gnostics. Perhaps these same people had already forged the weapons that ApocPet uses against them and were employing the same texts in their efforts to lead the "little ones" astray. In his argument against Marcion, Ireneus appeals to Jesus' statement in Mt. 16:17 that the Father had revealed Jesus' identity to Peter to argue that Peter could not have been ignorant of the truth.[64] But the passages that seem most important in ApocPet do not figure in his polemic.

The conflict over leadership and authority among the Christians seems to have been extremely important to the author of ApocPet, since he predicts a time when the situation will be reversed. The "little ones" will obtain power with the coming of "the Ageless One of Immortal Understanding".[65] ApocPet protests that the opponents "set up their error and law (νομός)".[66] In GMary, the apostles are directed not to lay down any rules

beyond what Jesus has appointed. Nor are they to lay down a law (νομος).[67] At the conclusion of that work they reiterate the fact that they will not lay down any other rule or law.[68] We have already seen that GMary represents a Gnostic tradition that "plays down" the importance of Peter. Perhaps Petrine authority and the establishment of a law by ecclesiastical authorities were closely linked in the arguments deployed against the Gnostics. Both ApocPet and GMary have Jesus declare that such a development is against his wishes. But while GMary also downgrades the figure of Peter, ApocPet has Peter himself commissioned as the one to stand up against the hostle authorities.[69]

However, the conflict between ApocPet and his opponents is not merely one over leadership and authority. They are also embroiled in a dispute over Christology. ApocPet accuses those who imprison others of: ⲉⲣⲛⲟⲧⲱⲃⲉ ⲉⲓⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲣⲁⲛ ⲛ̀ⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲣⲉⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧ (putting forth the name of a dead man).[70] Preaching a "dead man" seems to have been a typically Gnostic way of referring to the orthodox doctrine of the crucifixion. The Second Logos of the Great Seth (CG VII 2) chides the Christians who are persecuting the Gnostics for "having proclaimed teaching of a dead man."[71] In PetPhil, the Lord mentions that the powers, who failed to recognize him, thought him a "dead man".[72] And the account of Basilides in Ireneus contains lengthy polemic arguing that those who "confess the crucified" are still in slavery to the powers of this world.[73]

The concluding visions and their interpretations provide ApocPet the opportunity to expound the true, Gnostic teaching about the crucifixion. Peter both sees what actually happens at the crucifixion and has Jesus to explain the significance of his visions. Accounts of the crucifixion which insist that the Savior did not suffer are common in Gnostic works.[74] All the items which appear in the ApocPet version are also found in other Gnostic accounts of the crucifixion. Part of the mechanics of crucifixion in ApocPet requires a distinction between "bodies" of the Savior. His fleshly(sarkikon) part, the "substitute", is crucified.[75] The Savior then describes the one who is released as "my bodiless body".[76] Similar distinctions between a "fleshly" part that suffers and other "bodies" (psychic, spiritual) are found in Basilides[77], among the Valentinians,[78] and in a work attributed to the Sethian-Ophites.[79]

In order to explain the "deception" carried off in the crucifixion, we are told that the "substitute" came into being in the Savior's form.[80] Similar arrangements are made in the crucifixion accounts of I ApocJas[81], Ireneus' Basilides[82], and GrSeth.[83] They all apparently hold as ApocPet does that the powers have been tricked into crucifying the "son of their glory" instead of the Savior.[84] Ireneus' Basilides, GrSeth and ApocPet all recount the story that the Savior laughed at the ignorance of the archons.[85] Finally, the identity between the savior and an "inner", spiritual part of Jesus that leaves him before the crucifixion is suggested in ApocPet.[86] This departure technique occurs frequently in other Gnostic accounts of the crucifixion.[87] Thus, the revelation about the crucifixion which Peter receives and is to transmit employs the usual Gnostic explanations of that event. In PetPhil, part of Peter's gnosis was his realization that Jesus was a stranger to the suffering of the crucifixion.[88] Here he receives that understanding as part of the revelation made to him. There can be little doubt that the author of ApocPet sees Peter as the Gnostic leader and teacher par excellence.

It is unlikely that the Gnostic attempts to claim the apostle by means of such private revelations went unnoticed by their

opponents. Hornschuh has suggested that the orthodox argued against such private revelations by insisting that revelation was made to the whole group of the apostles.[89] Perhaps the careful gathering of all the disciples in the introduction to PetPhil was formulated with such an objection in view. From the orthodox side, the Epistula Apostolorum even uses one of the favorite Gnostic media, the post-resurrection dialogue, to have Jesus expound orthodox teaching about resurrection and eschatology to all the apostles.[90] Ireneus uses a long account of Peter's activity based on Acts to demonstrate that the apostles were not taught any Gnostic doctrine.[91] He insists that Peter's Pentecost sermon clearly proves: (1) that the apostles did not teach another God; (2) that there is no division between the Christ who rose and suffered and the impassible one who flew off to heaven, and (3) that God fulfilled what the prophets predicted about the death of Jesus. ApocPet assumes the truth of the first proposition; disagrees with the second, as we have already seen; and explicitly denies that the prophets know anything about the Savior.[92] PetPhil even goes so far as to have Peter preach a properly Gnostic Pentecost sermon.

Whether they exalt the apostle or degrade him for lack of gnosis, the specifically Gnostic accounts of Peter seem to have been drawn in the midst of controversy. ApocPet provides the most clearly ecclesiastical reading of that controversy, which seems to have involved debate over specifically Petrine texts. Further research may be able to tell us more about that debate. Howevermuch Ireneus may insist that the Gnostics are not disciples of the apostles but of their own opinions[93], at least some of the Gnostic Peter literature shows that they made considerable efforts to portray Peter as the true Gnostic.

4 July 1974

NOTES

1. See the list by W. Bauer in E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. II (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 45f.

2. Strom. VII 17 = § 106,4 (Stählin III, p. 75).

3. Hipp. Ref. VII 20,1 gives secret words of Matthias as Basilides' source (Wendland III, p. 195).

4. Fr. 21 on Jn. 4:22; Origen In Joh. XIII, 17 (Preuschen IV, p. 241,4).

5. Adv. Haer. I 25,5 (Harvey I, 209f.).

6. E.g. Adv. Haer. I 13,6 (Harvey I, 123); I 25,1 (Harvey I, 205); III 12,1ff. (Harvey II, 52ff.).

7. Fr. 30 on Jn. 4:33; Orig. In Joh. XIII, 35 (Preuschen IV, 260,16). Though the claim made by E. Pagels in The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis (Nashville: Abingdon, 1973): "They (= Valentinians) point out how often Christ rebukes the disciples for taking his symbolic statements literally (cf. AH 3.12.1f; CJ 13.35). They see Peter as, perhaps, the worst offender, the most persistent in the attitude of stubborn literal-mindedness (AH 3.12.9) " (p. 13) is surely excessive. The reference to AH 3.12.9 must also be incorrect, as Peter is not mentioned in that passage.

8. Published in W. C. Till, Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 (TU 60), (Berlin: Akademie - Verlag, 1955), 62-78.

9. BG 9,5-24.

10. BG 10,1-6.

11. BG 17,10-15.

12. BG 17,16-22.

13. See below.

14. BG 18,1-5.

15. BG 18,6-21.

16. GTh 114.

17. From Carl Schmidt, Koptisch - Gnostische Schriften: Erster Band (GCS 45), Bearb. W. Till, (Berlin: Akademie - Verlag, 1954). C. 36 (Schmidt - Till, 36,3-25); c. 146 (Schmidt - Till, 248,37 - 249,2).

18. C. 72 (Schmidt - Till, 104,17-32).

19. C. 122 (Schmidt - Till, 202,13-28).

20. Adv. Haer. I 6,3 (Harvey I, 56).

21. Undoubtedly the point of Levi's rebuke in GMary, BG 18, 8-10.

22. See Robert M. Grant, The Secret Sayings of Jesus (New York: Doubleday, 1960), 129f.

23. See the discussion of Christianity in Ed essa by Helmut Koester in J. M. Robinson and H. Koester, Trajectories through Early Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 126-43.

24. CG I 1,29-35, published in M. Malinine, et.al., Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha: Codex Jung F I^r - F $VIII^v$ (Zürich: Rascher, 1968).

25. CG I 13,25 - 14,1. The answer to Peter's first question (CG I 4,3ff.) is addressed to both disciples.

26. Quispel, Ep.Iac., 89, suggests that the other apostles are sent away to have them avoid persecution. It seems at least as likely that this detail enhances James' position as guardian of secret Gnostic traditions.

27. The Berlin Codex version of SJC has been published in Till, Die gnostischen Schriften, 194-295. Dial Sav is still unpublished but see the remarks of H-Ch. Puech in Hennecke - Schneemelcher I, 249f. and M. Krause, "Die Petrusakten in Codex VI von Nag - Hammadi," in Krause ed., Essays in the Nag - Hammadi Texts in Honor of Alexander Böhlig (NHS III), (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), 45f. K. considers Peter's role in Pistis Sophia minor and his role in ApocryJas major. His role in ApocryJas really seems to serve only to enhance James' stature, since James is the guardian of the secret revelations. He is also the one who gives the other disciples their final instructions (CG I 16,5-11).

28. The plates of CG VI 1 have been published in The Facsimile Edition of the Nag - Hammadi Codices: Codex VI (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 5-16. M. Krause and P. Labib have published a text and translation in Gnostische und Hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und Codex VI (ADAIK, Koptische Reihe, Bd. II), (Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1971), 107-21.

29. CG VI 1,1 - 8,6.

30. CG VI 8,7 - 12,19. See the preliminary analysis by M. Krause, "Die Petrusakten," 46-48. Several points in K.'s analysis -- none crucial to our discussion -- require scrutiny. (1) K. suggests an elaborate theory of sources and editing in CG VI 1. His theory depends on: (a) "conflicts" between the major divisions of the text 1,3 - 1,29; 1,29 - 7,23 and 8,13 - 12,9 (pp. 48-51). (b) the claim that the identification of the pearl in the first section with the name of Jesus in the last part represents part of a Christianizing process. That process added the name of Peter in the first part and the shorter passages 5,10-14; 6,11-12, 16-19 (50f.). It is not clear why a symbolic interpretation of the pearl demands two separate sources. Each of his other suggested contradictions must be evaluated in terms of the shifts of scene and plot characteristic of this genre of literature. K.'s observations do seem to support a more modest suggestion regarding two Gnostic (?)

allegories about Jesus. In the first, he is a stranger in the world "selling pearls." [See K. (op. cit., 53f.) for a brief treatment of the "pearl" image in ancient literature.] In the second, he is the physician, the healer of souls (op. cit., 58). (2) K. throws his rigor in looking for sources, when he claims that CG VI 1 represent the lost beginning of the Berlin Codex "Acts of Peter"! Two points oppose such a thesis. (1) In the "Acts of Peter," Peter is the central hero, and motifs typical of this genre (e.g. virginity, slighted lovers, miraculous cures) appear. K. himself observes (p. 55) that in these respects CG VI 1 is not typical of apocryphal acts. (2) CG VI 1 concludes with a commission to the disciples to go preach. As that is common to Gnostic revelation dialogues (e.g. GMary, SJC, PetPhil, PistS), one would not expect CG VI 1 to have had a continuation.

31. "Die Petrusakten," 55.

32. Ibid., 54. K. also suggests that CG VI 11,14-19 is an implicit criticism of John, an even less likely hypothesis.

33. CG VI 10,23-27 [Transcription (from the facsimile edition) and translation are the author's.].

34. CG VI 2,35 - 3,11.

35. See also Krause, "Die Petrusakten," 50.

36. CG VI 8,30-32.

37. Unfortunately this interesting work has not been published. But see Krause's lengthy summary, "Die Petrusakten," 42-45.

38. CG VIII 140,16-23.

39. CG VIII 132,12 - 133,8.

40. CG VIII 133,8-15.

41. CG VIII 135,8 - 138,3.

42. CG VIII 135,5-8.

43. CG VIII 138,2-3.

44. CG VIII 138,14-27.

45. CG VIII 139,14-30. Cp. Ptolemy's argument that the canonical passion account is a "type" of the sufferings of Achamoth, Adv. Haer. I 8,2 (Harvey I, 68-70).

46. Cf. the reference to the impending "betrayal" of Peter in CG VII 72,2-4. Plates of ApocPet have been published in Facsimile Edition of the Nag - Hammadi Codices: Codex VII (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 76-90. M. Krause and V. Girgis have published a text and translation in J. Irmscher et.al. eds., Christentum am Roten Meer Vol. II (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973), 152-179.

47. CG V 24,10 - 30,13.

48. Cf. CG V 29,19-27.

49. Both topics also occur in I ApocJas, but there opposition is attributed to the "powers" rather than to a series of ecclesiastical adversaries.

50. Cp. the conclusion of ApocPet (CG VII 84,7-13) with Jn 16:33.

51. Perhaps the command "become perfect in accord with your name" (CG VII 71,16f) is an allusion to Peter as "rock" in Mt. 16. CG VII 70,26f. describes the Gnostics as those built on what is strong, and Peter is to become the foundation of the Gnostic remnant.

52. CG VII 71,19-21.

53. CG VII 71,25 - 72,4.

54. For example, see the discussion of those led astray in CG VII 73,32 - 74,22.

55. CG VII 70,26-28.

56. CG VII 71,16-19.

57. CG VII 75,7-9.

58. CG VII 76,4-8.

59. CG VII 83,26-29.

60. CG VII 78,22-25.

61. CG VII 79,21-31.

62. CG VII 79,28-30.

63. I owe this observation to G. W. MacRae. II Pt. has rewritten his source, Jd. 12. Jd. has νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι.

64. Adv. Haer. III 13,2 (Harvey II, 73).

65. CG VII 80,8-23.

66. CG VII 77,25-29.

67. BG 8,22 - 9,4. Reading in 8,22 "ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲛⲁⲗⲁⲁⲩ" and in 9,2 "ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲧ" rather than Till's "ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲕⲁ" and "ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲧ", as suggested by G. W. MacRae.

68. BG 18,15-21.

69. CG VII 80,31 - 81,3.

70. CG VII 75,13f.

71. CG VII 60,20.

72. CG VIII 136,20.

73. Adv. Haer. I 24,4 (Harvey I, 119).

74. ApocryJas CG I 5,33-35 and 6,2-9 where the Lord calls upon the disciples to remember his cross; insists that no one can enter the kingdom; and asserts that Jesus suffered, is very peculiar. Perhaps the work is not a specifically Gnostic composition.

75. CG VII 81,20-23.

76. CG VII 83,6-8.

77. Hipp. Ref. VII 27,9-12 (Wendland III, 207f), Basilides.

78. Adv. Haer. I 7,2 (Harvey I, 60ff.); Exc. Th. 61,6f.; 62,1 (Stählin III, 127f.).

79. Adv. Haer. I 30,13 (Harvey I, 239).

80. CG VII 81,21-23.

81. I Apoc. Jas. 31,14-26.

82. Adv. Haer. I 24,4 (Harvey I, 119).

83. CG VII 55,17 - 56,14.

84. CG VII 82,1-3; 20-26.

85. CG VII 81,10-23; 82,4-6; Adv. Haer. I 24,4 (Harvey I, 119); CG VII 56,15-23 (GrSeth).

86. CG VII 82,28-31.

87. Basilides: Adv. Haer. I 24,4 (Harvey I, 119); I ApocJas: CG V 31,14-26; TriProt: CG XIII 50,9-12; Cerinthus: Adv. Haer. I 26,1 (Harvey I, 211); Valentinian: Adv. Haer. I 7,2 (Harvey I, 60ff.); Exc. Th. 61,6 (Stählin III, 127); Sethian-Ophite: Adv. Haer. I 30,13 (Harvey I, 239).

88. CG VIII 139,9-25.

89. Hornschuh, Hennecke - Schneemelcher II, 75f.

90. Hornschuh, Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum (PTS 5), (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965), 92-96, thinks that EpAp is written against the Basilideans.

91. Adv.Haer. III 12,1-7 (Harvey II, 52-62).

92. CG VII 71,7-9.

93. Adv. Haer. III 12,7 (Harvey II, 60ff.).

S 98

DETERMINING VARIATIONS BY COMPUTER

Vinton A. Dearing
University of California, Los Angeles

I

Textual critics who use computers have felt for some time that "machine readable" transcripts of their texts should include the kind of information that would allow a computer-controlled composing machine to set type for a diplomatic transcript. With modern works, when permission can be obtained from the holders of the copyrights, the computer tape used in composing a book can be used again to prepare a concordance or an index or to compare with the tape used in composing another edition. Linotype and similar tapes can be transcribed onto computer tape also. Older works, then, it is felt, ought to be transcribed in similar detail, because the critic is thus in possession of all the information that is conveyed by letterpress (or handwriting) and layout. If this is more information than he needs he can ignore some of it. It can never be less information than he needs about these matters, because it is all the information there is.

The last generalization needs some qualification. The computer tape for a phototypeset book may not, for example, have page numbers and will normally not have line numbers, yet these are basic reference data for the textual critic. But such information can be abstracted from the tape in various ways and inserted in a transcript of it, because the typesetting tape will have indicators of page and line ends. The textual critic may prefer to use tape-editing equipment when supplying occasional page numbers or when moving them from page foot to page head; he will certainly prefer to use a computer routine for supplying line numbers. Similarly, if he is normalizing his texts, he will normally have to adjust spelling using tape-editing equipment; he will use a computer routine for normalizing the spacing between words.

Transcribing Greek with a keyboard designed for English presents some problems that various scholars using computers have solved in various ways. The system illustrated in this paper uses the English pronunciational equivalents of the Greek letters with the exception of H (eta), Q (theta), Y (psi), and W (omega). Another widely used system represents xi by C and chi by X instead of the other way round. Neither system will serve for sigla when we need both G and gamma, and so on. The system for representing sigla illustrated in this paper uses two characters for the non-English letters: AL for aleph, GA for gamma, TH for theta, and so on.

The problems of comparing texts by computer are essentially the same whether or not the transcripts are diplomatic and regardless of the system of transcription adopted. Suppose we have stripped out of our texts all diacritics, punctuation, and iota subscripts, and have normalized the spelling and the spacing between words. Suppose we are comparing Sinaiticus and Bezae in Luke. Suppose we cause the computer to mark every character it finds in one of the two texts but not in the other as it proceeds through both character by character. It will mark nothing in 1:1, but the next words are KAQWS in Sinaiticus and KAQA in Bezae, so after the first three letters of 1:2 the computer will

mark every character until it reaches PASAIS in 1:6. By that time it will have found ENANTION in Sinaiticus and ENWPION in Bezae, so that the texts are two letters out of step, and the computer will match the first A of PASAIS in Sinaiticus with the second A of PASAIS in Bezae and will not mark a difference. And so on. Obviously what the computer will be reporting as differences will not be what we wish to consider as variations, and obviously the problem would be much compounded if we had not stripped and normalized the texts or if we were comparing more than two texts at once.

We can improve matters by causing the computer to test for spaces between words and to advance no farther in one text, when it finds a space there, until it finds a space in the other. The computer will then mark the last two letters of KAQWS as differing from the last letter of KAQA but nothing else until it marks the last six letters of ENANTION as differing from the last five letters of ENWPION and nothing else after that for some time. When it reaches 1:13, however, where Sinaiticus has UION SOI KAI KALESEIS and Bezae has UION KAI KALESEIS, the computer will once more begin marking every character, with random exceptions as when it matches KA of KAI in Sinaiticus with KA of KALESEIS in Bezae.

We can improve matters further by editing the verse numbers into the text and causing the computer to respond to them as to spaces. It will then stop marking after the six or seven words remaining in 1:13 and proceed as before. Bezae omits the last three words of 1:26 as compared with Sinaiticus, but the computer will recover itself with the beginning of 1:27, and continue in this way until 3:23. Here Bezae has its own version of the genealogy in Matthew, so that its contents cannot be equated verse by verse with 3:23-31 in Sinaiticus, and the computer will begin once more to mark every character, with random exceptions.

We can improve matters still further by causing the computer to test the verse numbers and to search around in the texts until it finds matching numbers before it restarts its normal comparison routine. We can also cause the computer to search around when it finds spaces until it finds matching words following the spaces. And we can cause the computer to search around for the resumption of identical spelling within words, so that it will mark only the ANT in ENANTION and the WP in ENWPION. In fact, if we have not standardized the spelling of the texts we cannot cause the computer to search for corresponding words as a human would unless we cause it to be sensitive to letter sequences and give it some rules for distinguishing between sequences that make different words and those that make different spellings or spelling errors.

Suddenly, instead of dealing with very simple matters, we find ourselves dealing with very complex matters indeed. How can we teach a computer to spell? Fortunately, the problem is not so difficult if we are willing to let the computer make occasional mistakes and to correct them ourselves later. We must, however, insure that somehow the mistakes will call attention to themselves. Otherwise we shall have to repeat all the computer's work in order to check it.

Let me now describe two computer programs that I use in comparing texts. The first is very simple, for it was devised to compare two transcripts of the same text, that is, as a way

of proofreading the transcripts. The second is more complicated, partly because it was devised to compare as many as fifty texts at once.

Input data for digital computers (analogue computers are not used for textual criticism) is divided into "records," of which the best known examples are punched cards. Output data is similarly divided, the best known examples being printed lines. A series of records may be referred to as a file. A file may be an input or an output file, or now one and now the other. When two transcripts of a text are to be compared by the first program, the input file consists of the records of one transcript followed by two separator records and then by the records of the other transcript. The computer reads the file until it finds the first separator record, transferring the other records to an output file. When it finds the first separator record, it reads the second, from which it learns if it is to ignore any columns in the other records. Then it turns the output file into another input file and goes on with the reading, one record from each file at a time, comparing them left to right, column by column. If two records match in the columns the computer is not to ignore, it continues with the next pair of records. Otherwise it prepares an output file for printing before it reads the next pair of records. The printed output consists of the two differing records, one above the other, with the differences in the columns not to be ignored marked below the second record.

The following represents comparison of stripped and normalized transcripts of Sinaiticus and Washingtonianus, rather than two transcripts of either, in which the columns reserved for the sigla of the texts have been marked on the second separator record as to be ignored:

```
AL   LK0502A KAI EIDEN DUO PLOIAIRA ESTWTA PARA THN LIMNHN
W    LK0502A KAI EIDEN PLOIARIA DUO ESTWTA PARA THN LIMNHN
                       XXXXXXXXXXXX

AL   LK0502B OI DE ALEEIS AP AUTWN APOBANTES EPLUNON TA DIKTUA
W    LK0502B OI DE ALEEIS AP AUTWN APOBANTES APEPLUNON TA DIKTUA
                                            X XXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX
```

The second example shows how when the records do not have the same number of letters the comparison process may result in unwanted differences being marked to the ends of the records. If the texts are not divided into the same number of records with generally corresponding contents--for example, when one of the texts omits a verse and no dummy records have been inserted in its place, or when transcripts of the same text are being compared and a record has fallen out of one of the transcripts--the comparison process will result in unwanted differences being marked to the ends of the files. Generally speaking, however, any unwanted differences cease to be marked at the end of each record. To mitigate the effect when whole records get out of step, texts may be compared in segments, say of 100 records each, and if the records are punched cards they may be counted with a card sorter to be sure that each segment of each text has the proper number.

When texts are compared by the second program, the computer prints out the first line by line and the variant parts of the others, the first variant word in each line of the other texts under the word from which it differs and any other variant words

as much so as possible. Any invariant words between the first and last variants will be printed, but none beyond unless the line has a different number of letters than in the first text; in that case an invariant word beyond the last variant will be printed unless the last variant is the last word in the line; any such invariant word will be followed by a left parenthesis unless it is the last in the line and has had a line-end marker appended to it by the computer. The computer reads and stores a number of records from each text and when it finds a very bad match between records searches the other stored records for a better. In this way it identifies large transpositions, omissions, additions, and substitutions in the texts. Yet even with this program, if the texts are so numerous and long that they must be input in segments the user must insure that the segments begin with comparable words in each text. And if a text is interrupted by a very large lacuna, then all texts must be segmented at the point where the interrupted text begins again.

The second program might have been written so that the computer would print only the variant parts of all but the first text. The output would then necessarily have been arranged in columns, the first text spaced out where the others had additions, and with omissions marked by asterisks or similar characters. Such output would require more storage to prepare and a more complicated program, but may prove desirable. At present the output is like the following, which represents a comparison of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Bezae, Boreelianus, and Washingtonianus with the Textus Receptus, all in stripped and normalized transcriptions.

TEXT	VERSE	LINE OF TEXT WITH VARIATIONS
TR	14:17	ERCESQE OTI HDH ETOIMA ESTIN PANTA/
F		
AL		EISIN/
A		ESTIN/
W		
D		PANTA ESTIN/

Boreelianus agrees exactly with the Textus Receptus, so its siglum is printed immediately below that of the base text. Sinaiticus has EISIN instead of PANTA ESTIN. Alexandrinus omits PANTA, and Washingtonianus agrees with Alexandrinus. Bezae has PANTA ESTIN instead of ESTIN PANTA.

The example also happens to illustrate very well the columnar arrangement mentioned above, in which the rows for Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus would have had asterisks or similar characters under PANTA in the Textus Receptus, and no line-end markers would be necessary.

Diplomatic texts have more effect on the number of unwanted differences marked by the first program than by the second. Besides its more complex scanning procedures, the second program normalizes spacing between words. It could easily be modified to strip away diacritics and punctuation from the texts, and iota subscripts if they were represented by a special character. It was at one time modified by the embodiment of some simple spelling rules, which caused not

the omission but the underlining of words that, according to the rules, were probably different only in spelling. I feel myself, however, that all differences between diplomatic transcripts should be made explicit, because one cannot foresee the uses to which the comparisons may be put.

II

A textual critic may turn to a computer for help in analyzing variations as well as for help in identifying them. The adequacy of his analysis will depend partly upon the adequacy of the computer programs used, partly upon the adequacy of the theory of analysis the programs embody, and partly--our next subject--on the adequacy of the theory of variations that determines the input data.

The differences among the texts that are revealed by comparing them are not necessarily in any direct sense the variations that the critic must analyze. To turn back to the last example above, Sinaiticus has EISIN, Alexandrinus and Washingtonianus have ESTIN, Bezae has PANTA ESTIN, and Boreelianus has ESTIN PANTA. Is this one variation (AL:A W:D:F) or more than one? If more than one, what are the variations? Are they EISIN:ESTIN:PANTA (AL:A F W:D) followed by --:PANTA:ESTIN (AL A W:F:D)? Or are they EISIN:ESTIN (AL:A D F W) and --:PANTA (AL A W:F D)? Or are they EISIN:ESTIN PANTA:ESTIN:PANTA ESTIN (AL: F:A W:D) and agreement in PANTA against diversity (D F:AL:A W)? In making our decision should we consider the way the variations came into being? Should we consider the semantics of the variant readings?

Generally speaking, it is impossible to determine the causes of variations. Variations are basically of three types: add-omissions, substitutions, and transpositions. Continuing with our most recent example, the variation between Alexandrinus and Boreelianus, ESTIN:ESTIN PANTA, is an add-omission. We cannot tell whether Alexandrinus has omitted PANTA or Boreelianus has added it, we cannot tell whether the change was voluntary or involuntary, and if voluntary we cannot tell whether the motive was theological, stylistic, or something else. The variation between Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus, EISIN: ESTIN, is a substitution. We cannot tell whether EISIN replaced ESTIN or the reverse, and in neither case can we tell whether the replacement was accidental or deliberate, or if deliberate the reason. The variation between Boreelianus and Bezae, ESTIN PANTA:PANTA ESTIN, is a transposition. We cannot tell which word order is original and we cannot tell whether the reversal was intended or not; if not intended we cannot tell whether the scribe mixed up the words in his mind or omitted the first and repaired the omission by writing it after the second instead of above the line or in the margin.

Our uncertainties are multiplied by the fact that we often cannot tell how many causal steps produced the variations. In the case of ESTIN PANTA:PANTA ESTIN, one scribe may have written the omitted word above the line or in the margin and a second scribe may have copied it into his text in the wrong place. Sinaiticus is older than Alexandrinus, but the reading in Alexandrinus may be older than the reading in Sinaiticus, having been correctly copied into Alexandrinus from a lost manuscript older than Sinaiticus. If so, the variation has come about through two copying processes, one correct, one not.

Our uncertainties are further multiplied by the fact that more than one cause may have the same effect. In Luke 10:27 most manuscripts have ISCUI SOU KAI EN OLH TH DIANOIA SOU KAI TON, but Bezae has ISCUI SOU KAI TON. Is this an omission of SOU . . . DIANOIA, of KAI . . . SOU, or of EN . . . KAI? Causally speaking, these different possibilities are three different variations, but even the scribe who made the error could not say which words he skipped. A few other texts agree with Bezae. One scribe might have omitted SOU . . . DIANOIA, another KAI . . . SOU, a third EN . . . KAI, and a fourth might have copied the work of any of the others. The results being the same in any case, the cause or causes are indeterminable. The corrector of a manuscript reading ISCUI SOU KAI TON might make the necessary insertion before any of the last three words. Different editors might then make different insertions. And of course two scribes might both omit SOU . . . DIANOIA, which one corrector would repair by an insertion before KAI and another by an insertion before TON, and so on. When different correctors produce the same reading in different ways, however, we do not have different variations as variations are usually understood.

And our uncertainties are still further multiplied by the fact that we sometimes cannot tell how many variations there are from the causal point of view. In Luke 17:10 we find DOULOI ACREIOI ESMEN in most manuscripts, but ESMEN ACREIOI DOULOI in manuscript 990. The copyist who brought about the change--assuming that no corrector shared the labor--may equally well have scrambled the whole phrase in his mind, in which case the difference is causally one variation, or omitted two words and made good the omission by inserting them later, in which case the difference is two variations.

All this is not to say that the causes of variations are never to be considered. On the contrary, when we can identify causes we do. But while we can always observe the effects of failure to copy exactly, we can seldom identify the causes. And so, if we try to determine variations in terms of causes, we shall find that for the most part we are unable to do so.

But can variations considered as the results of inexact copying be determined any more certainly? Not if we judge by the semantic boundaries in the texts. One kind of semantic boundary is established by synonymity between variant readings, another by syntax. But generally speaking variations refuse to confine themselves to either kind. The readings of add-omissions can seldom be synonymous, for one "reading" is the absence of the other, and it is seldom that a word has no meaning, so that its absence is synonymous with its presence. The readings of substitutions often have completely different meanings. In Luke 23:37, where Sinaiticus has SWSON SEAUTON, Bezae has PERITIQENTES AUTW KAI AKANQINON STEFANON. And even the readings of transpositions, while often synonymous, are not necessarily so. In Luke 21:11, where Alexandrinus has FOBHTRA TE KAI AP OURANOU SHMEIA MEGALA, Bezae has FOBHTRA TE AP OURANOU KAI SHMEIA MEGALA. Nor is the situation improved when there is comparatively little synonymity between variant readings. In Luke 23:37, Sinaiticus has KAI LEGONTES EI SU EI O BASILEUS TWN IUDAIWN SWSON SEAUTON, Bezae LEGONTES CAIRE O BASILEUS TWN IUDAIWN PERITIQENTES AUTW KAI AKANQINON STEFANON. Is this one variation, in which the words LEGONTES and O BASILEUS TWN IUDAIWN occur by chance in both readings? Is it two variations, separated by the words O BASILEUS TWN IUDAIWN, in

one of which LEGONTES appears by chance in both readings? Or is it three variations, separated by the words LEGONTES and O BASILEUS TWN IUDAIWN? In what we have just called the transposition in Luke 21:11, KAI marks a semantic boundary in each reading. Does this mean that we do not have a substitution but two add-omissions of AP OURANOU? In short, semantic determination of variations is as uncertain as causal.

We are left with determination by position and by agreement. Determination by agreement I shall leave till later. Determination by position is easier to illustrate than to define. Texts that can be compared at all in the way that textual critics compare them sooner or later have sequences of words that can be matched fairly exactly. The longer the sequences and the exacter the match, the firmer the establishment of position in the texts. For example, Luke 20:1 begins KAI EGENETO EN MIA TWN HMERWN in most texts listed in the preliminary form of the International New Testament Project's apparatus for chapter 20, which I have had the privilege of using. Bezae, however, has EGENETO DE EN MIA TWN HMERWN and manuscript 1352 has EGENETO EN MIA TWN HMERWN. With a bit of juggling we arrive at the following positions for the words:

```
KAI EGENETO     EN MIA TWN HMERWN
    EGENETO DE  EN MIA TWN HMERWN
    EGENETO     EN MIA TWN HMERWN
```

Clearly the phrase EN MIA TWN HMERWN occupies the same position in each text and determines the position of the other words. But are not the positions of KAI EGENETO AND EGENETO DE rather as follows:

```
KAI EGENETO EN MIA TWN HMERWN
EGENETO DE  EN MIA TWN HMERWN
```

for KAI EGENETO and EGENETO are synonyms in the sense that both can be translated "and it came to pass"? We have seen that semantic determination of variations is far from a certain guide, and here it leaves us in doubt about the relationship of the remaining reading to the other two:

```
KAI EGENETO       KAI EGENETO       KAI EGENETO
EGENETO DE        EGENETO DE        EGENETO DE
EGENETO             EGENETO             EGENETO
```

Causal determination, also an uncertain guide, would not lead to the second of the foregoing, but cannot help us to decide between the others. Thus consistent positional determination of variations gives us one set; anything else gives us several alternate sets:

```
KAI EGENETO       KAI] om. D 1352
    EGENETO DE    EGENETO] + DE D
    EGENETO

KAI EGENETO       KAI] EGENETO D 1352
EGENETO DE        EGENETO] DE D; om. 1352
EGENETO

KAI EGENETO       KAI EGENETO] EGENETO DE
EGENETO DE          D; EGENETO 1352
  EGENETO
```

KAI EGENETO EGENETO DE EGENETO	KAI] EGENETO D; om. 1352 EGENETO] DE D

"He who takes one doctrine, firm in faith, has the Holy Ghost dwelling in him," perhaps, but mere consistency in determining variations, at least, is not a guarantee that the determination will be correct--it may equally well guarantee that the determination will be uniformly incorrect. On the other hand, "mutable truth" has been too long a watchword among textual critics. The statement "truth is inconsistent" seems obviously wrong, but the point is usually made in a different way. For example, because language may always be metaphorical, because the same words may always be used for more than one purpose, it is impossible to determine the originating purpose of any literary form by the rules of cause and effect; yet a first-rate scholar, having proved this in exemplary fashion, has then proposed to determine originating purposes by "a framework in which the rules of cause and effect can be applied flexibly." In other words, instead of "asking his belly what's o'clock," the form-critic is to ask it, "What's the truth?" Katakoilialatheia!

"Flexible application" of rules is also called "the exercise of critical judgment." Those far gone in pride of judgment speak of those who are "inflexible" as fools and their rules as mechanical. The advent of the computer, however, has taught us that to be reasonable is to be mechanical, and that the opposite of mechanical is not alert, sensitive, skilful, or wise, but random. Granted that consistency in error will never arrive at truth, randomness will arrive at truth only occasionally, by accident, and unawares. Religion may have "truths that never can be proved," but text-critical questions are seldom to be decided by church councils. In every-day textual criticism, truth requires proof, and mutable proof is as unsatisfactory as mutable truth. Truth in textual criticism is then to be sought in consistency, and inconsistency to be rejected as error. Among the various consistencies, truth in textual criticism is to be sought in consistency with what is self-evidently true, or provably true without resort to argument from consistency.

Consistent determination of variations by position meets these standards of truth. That variations have positions is self-evidently true. Without some sense of position we cannot make any meaningful statements about variations. It follows that the correct understanding of KAI EGENETO, EGENETO DE, and EGENETO is the one with which we started:

KAI EGENETO	
EGENETO DE	D
EGENETO	1352

according to which the variations are two add-omissions, one in which D and 1352 agree and one in which D stands alone.

It is not always easy to recognize variations from the way they are expressed in apparatuses. For example, in the preliminary form of the International New Testament Project's apparatus, the foregoing variations are given as:

KAI EGENETO] EGENETO DE D
KAI] om. 1352

We have here two variations, just as positional determination indicates, but the texts are not grouped in the second as positional determination indicates, and the first variation appears as a substitution, which positional determination does not indicate. Positional determination of variations from an apparatus requires constant rewriting of the variations in columnar form, and the results are often quite different from what the apparatus might suggest.

Add-omissions are the most common type of variation, it would seem. For instance, thirty-seven of the manuscripts collated by the International New Testament Project lack the whole of Luke 20, six more lack 20:1, and so on. Within these lacunae, the first two variations in 20:1 are add-omissions, as we have just said. So is the third: most manuscripts have EKEINWN after EN MIA TWN HMERWN, but Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Bezae, and twenty-three others omit it. The fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh variations are likewise add-omissions:

DIDASKONTOS	AUTOU	TON LAON	
DIDASKONTOS TOU IHSOU	AUTOU	TON LAON	267
DIDASKONTOS TOU IHSOU		TON LAON	1200^{c}
DIDASKONTOS	AUTOU PROS	TON LAON	716
DIDASKONTOS		TON LAON	N 349

Here we have examples of both nested and contiguous add-omissions. The smaller variations are nested within the omission of any words between DIDASKONTOS and TON LAON in N and 349. The omission of PROS in 267 and the unspecified manuscripts is nested within the omission of AUTOU PROS in 1200^{c}. The omission of TOU IHSOU in 716 and the unspecified manuscripts is contiguous to the omission of AUTOU PROS in 1200^{c}. The term "omission" here is only a convenience: some or all of what we have called omissions may in fact be additions. Whether omissions or additions, the positions of the variations are the same, and how we speak of them will not affect our determination of them by position.

Other considerations are more fundamental. How shall we think of the outermost variation? Do N and 349 agree against unity or against diversity? Which of the following is correct?

TOU IHSOU AUTOU PROS] om. N 349
AUTOU] om. N 349; TOU IHSOU AUTOU 267; TOU IHSOU 1200^{c};
+ PROS 716

At first glance, the former variation seems wrong: no text has TOU IHSOU AUTOU PROS. But what we are faced with here is a difficulty in our system of writing variations. We do not mind writing, for example,

1-12 KAI EGENETO . . . PEMYAI TRITON] om. F

even though we know that the passage in lacking in F is not the same in all the manuscripts that have it. Consistency demands that we treat all add-omissions alike, whatever the difficulties of representing them. Therefore, as we never demand absolute uniformity in the texts having a long passage when crediting an omission to the text or texts lacking it, so we do not demand it when shorter passages are in question. The former variation is then correct in the way it groups the texts, if awkward in its expression. In fact, awkwardnesses of this kind occur so often that the textual critic does better to write his variations in

columns and proceed directly from them to a simple grouping of his texts without the variant readings. If he must prepare a critical apparatus, of course, he expresses the variations in the most convenient way, and hopes that those who use the apparatus will rewrite the variations in columns as necessary.

We must also note that 1200c omits AUTOU PROS, it does not agree with all except 716 in omitting PROS and with N and 349 in omitting AUTOU. As Archibald Hill has pointed out, an omission is a unit; nothing cannot be divided. On the other hand, 716 does agree with the unspecified texts in omitting TOU IHSOU, and 267 agrees with the unspecified texts in omitting PROS. But what texts do they agree against? We cannot say that the unspecified texts and 716 agree against all the other texts in the matter of TOU IHSOU, because N and 349 omit more than TOU IHSOU, and, as we have just said, an omission is a unit.

We solve the problem by working through nested variations from the outermost to the innermost. Texts which stand against the rest in the outer variations stand alone in the inner.

(enveloping omission)	N 349:the rest
(omission of TOU IHSOU)	N 349:267 1200c:the rest
(omission of AUTOU PROS)	N 349:1200c:the rest
(omission of PROS)	N 349:1200c:716:the rest

To keep the discussion simple, we have been ignoring the fact that the omission in N and 349 is itself nested in a whole series of larger omissions in other texts, reaching back into chapter 19 and spreading out over chapter 20 until eventually they swallow chapter 20 completely. These texts must not be counted among "the rest." The complexities of the larger nests of add-omissions that result are very great; not so great that they cannot be determined, but so great that the variations cannot be genealogically analyzed without the help of a computer. In fact, when the lacunae are so large that texts can only be described as fragmentary, even the user of a computer may feel justified in working out the family tree of the better-preserved texts before seeing what he can make of the fragments.

Finally, how can we say that TOU IHSOU is contiguous to AUTOU PROS when no text has TOU IHSOU AUTOU PROS? We say that when the position of a word or words is established as between two texts, that position holds for all the other occurrences of the word or words in other texts unless a contrary position is established for it or them as between two of these other texts. Thus the first two readings above establish the position of TOU IHSOU to the left of AUTOU, the first and fourth establish the position of PROS to the right. The position of TOU IHSOU in the third reading is then to be accepted as the same as in the second, contiguous to AUTOU PROS in the fourth, even though the contiguity cannot be established by comparing the third and fourth readings. The foregoing reasoning is not dependent upon the fact that an unrecorded or fragmentary or lost text may have or have had TOU IHSOU AUTOU PROS, but it is not contradicted by the possibility either.

Add-omissions can not only be nested and contiguous, they may overlap. Overlapping add-omissions are treated as independent, even though they agree in a sense in omitting some of the text. To recognize such an agreement would be to divide nothing. Thus we accept both and only

1-21 KAI EGENETO . . . LEGEIS KAI DIDASKEIS] om. P
17-34 ESTIN . . . O IHSOUS KAI] om. Q

When we work with other texts where the omissions in P and Q overlap, we keep P and Q separated from themselves and the other texts. The apparatus may read

20 AUTOU] om. LA

but we know that the variation is really

P:Q:LA:the rest

The next variations we meet in Luke 20:1 are contiguous to the foregoing:

TON LAON EN TW IERW KAI EUAGGELIZOMENOU	
EN TW IERW TON LAON KAI EUAGGELIZOMENOU	D
TON LAON KAI EUAGGELIZOMENOU EN TW IERW	1365
TON LAON KAI EUAGGELIZOMENOU	K and 11 others
TON LAON EN IERW KAI EUAGGELIZOMENOU	544
TON LAON EN TW IERW KAI EUAGGELIZOMENOI	AL*

Here we have overlapping transpositions, which have the effect of combining into a single larger variation. The transposed elements retain their identity, however, so that a variation nested in an element in one position is treated as though all the elements were in the same position. But when a whole element is absent there is no way to position its absence, and the effect is that of a substitution for the arrangements of all the elements. Consequently the outer variation here is

D:1365:K and 11 others:the rest

The omission of TW has a position in all texts except K and 11 others. The variation is therefore

544:K and 11 others:the rest

The substitution of EUAGGELIZOMENOI for EUAGGELIZOMENOU (or the reverse) has a position in all texts. The variation is then

AL*:the rest

Of course, all these variations are nested within the series of larger omissions discussed above, so that full statements of them would require that the texts omitting the whole passage be separated from "the rest."

Positional determination of the variations here is now at an end, but one variation remains. All texts except K and 11 others have EN and IERW. We therefore supplement determination of variations by position with determination by the agreements in the wording within the differences. In equiverbal determination of variations, the texts that agree are grouped together, and the other texts are grouped as in the columnar positional arrangement. Only one group in the columnar arrangement above lacks EN and IERW, so the variation is

K and 11 others:the rest

As before, a full statement of the variation would separate the texts omitting the whole passage from "the rest."

We let one variation represent agreement in both EN and IERW in the same way that we let one variation represent a large omission, even though, if there are enough variations nested within the omission, the texts not having the large omission may all agree several times in intervals between the smaller variations.

Equiverbal determination of variations must not begin until positional determination has been exhausted. To return to the nested add-omissions, if we shift over to equiverbal determination as soon as we recognize the omission in N and 349, we shall suppose we have recognized that because 267 and 1200^c have TOU IHSOU we have a variation

N 349:267 1200^c:716:the rest

because 716 has a separate line in the columnar arrangement.

Equiverbal determination does not embrace the absence of words, only their presence. Again using the nested add-omissions as an example, if we shift over to equiverbal determination too soon and assume it embraces omissions as well, we shall suppose we have a variation

N 349:267:1200^c:716 the rest

because 267 and 1200^c have separate lines in the columnar arrangement and 716 and the unspecified manuscripts omit TOU IHSOU.

Equiverbal determination does embrace sequences of words. One set of texts may agree in a sequence of words, a somewhat different set may agree in a word within the sequence. One set of texts may agree in a sequence, another set may agree in a different sequence that has a word or more in common with the first sequence. In either case, each agreement makes a variation. Careful examination of the columnar arrangement may then be necessary to detect all the equiverbal variations.

Just as transpositions may be contiguous to add-omissions, so they may be contiguous to other transpositions or to substitutions. And just as transpositions can be nested within add-omissions, so they can be nested within other transpositions or within substitutions.

Contiguous to the foregoing variations in Luke 20:1 is another add-omission:

EUAGGELIZOMENOU] + AUTOU GA

Then after an interval of one word comes a small nest of add-omissions:

EPESTHSAN OI	
EPESTHSAN AUTW OI	W and 5 others
EPESTHSAN	66*

The omission in the unspecified texts nests in the omission in 66*, giving us two variations (in less than the full form):

66*:the rest
66*:W and 5 others:the rest

Yet if "the rest" are to supply the lemmas, the easiest way to express the variations in an apparatus will make them seem like one:

OI] AUTW OI W [etc.]; om. 66*

Or we may find, as in the preliminary form of the International New Testament Project's apparatus:

EPESTHSAN] + AUTW W [etc.]
OI] om. 66*

So we see once more the wisdom of writing the variations in column as part of determining what they are.

Contiguous to the foregoing we find the following:

ARCIEREIS	KAI OI	GRAMMATEIS	
GRAMMATEIS	KAI OI	ARCIEREIS	13 and 8 others
IEREIS	KAI OI	GRAMMATEIS	E and 80 others
IEREIS	KAI	GRAMMATEIS	A and 14 others
ARCIEREIS	KAI	GRAMMATEIS	475

Here we have three variations, the first separated from the second by KAI and the last two contiguous. Because the columnar arrangement includes so many variations it is not the clearest possible representation of any one, and must either be rewritten for each or used with care. This is not to say that the arrangement is itself bad. On the contrary, it may not be until we have made it that we shall recognize that GRAMMATEIS KAI OI ARCIEREIS is not a transposition of ARCIEREIS KAI OI GRAMMATEIS, as might appear from an apparatus, but two substitutions separated by KAI OI. The first variation, then, reading the columns carefully, is a substitution:

ARCIEREIS] GRAMMATEIS 13 [etc.]; IEREIS A [etc.] E [etc.]

The second is another add-omission:

OI] om. A [etc.] 475

The third is another substitution:

GRAMMATEIS] ARCIEREIS 13 [etc.]

Substitutions may be contiguous to one another or to transpositions as well as to add-omissions. They may also be nested within one another as well as within transpositions or add-omissions. The vagaries of Bezae result in a number of nests within substitutions, as for instance when Bezae has its own genealogy in Luke. Bezae will then be separated from "the rest" when the inner variations are determined, exactly as if it had omitted the genealogy. In the event that texts divide into two generally agreeing groups of more than one text each, variations may be nested within each of the larger variant readings. If so, each larger group is separated from "the rest" in the variations nested within the reading of the other.

A substitution with several variant readings results when a substitution and an add-omission, or a substitution and a transposition, or a substitution and an add-omission and a transposition all have the same position. There is no limit to the complexities of such substitutions, but any variations

within them may be determined in the usual way, positionally as long as positions can be determined and equiverbally when they cannot.

When substitutions overlap, the result is a larger variation, just as when transpositions overlap. Consequently the overlap of a substitution and a transposition makes a larger variation. Add-omissions, however, maintain their identities not only when they overlap one another but also when they overlap transpositions or substitutions. The non-overlapped part of the transposition or substitution in the text with the omission is then in effect the reading of that text in the transposition or substitution, except that if a whole element of a transposition is overlapped the effect is the same as a simple omission of the element.

No variations except in spelling are found in the last three words of Luke 20:1 in the manuscripts collated by the International New Testament Project. Thus the verse closes without an example of a variation that is partly defined positionally and partly defined equiverbally. There is one such in 20:6:

PAS O LAOS	
O LAOS APAS	A and 15 others
APAS O LAOS	R
PAS O OCLOS	1424

The four variant readings give us a positionally defined variation:

A and 15 others:R:1424:the rest

PAS and APAS are in the same position in the first and third readings, and the words are found in the others as well, so we have a variation defined partly positionally and partly equiverbally:

A and 15 others R:the rest

LAOS and OCLOS are in the same position in the first and fourth readings, and LAOS is found in the others as well, so we have another variation defined partly positionally and partly equiverbally:

1424:the rest

Neither does Luke 20:1 provide us with an example of a sequence of variations that can be divided in more than one way. There is one such in 20:19:

ARCIEREIS KAI OI GRAMMATEIS		
GRAMMATEIS KAI H ARCIEREIS		1009
GRAMMATEIS KAI OI FARISAIOI		C
GRAMMATEIS KAI OI ARCIEREIS		A [etc.]
GRAMMATEIS KAI OI FARISAIOI	SUN TOIS ARCIEREUSIN	716 2613
GRAMMATEIS KAI ARCIEREIS		27 71
GRAMMATEIS KAI OI FARISAIOI	KAI OI ARCIEREIS	443 1195
ARCIEREIS KAI OI PRESBUTEROI	KAI OI GRAMMATEIS	69
ARCIEREIS KAI OI GRAMMATEIS	KAI OI ARCIEREIS	1220*

Here we might match the second KAI in the last three readings with the KAI in the others, but it seems more natural to match

the first KAI with it instead, because that is the first possible match we come to in normal left-to-right scanning.

Nor does Luke 20:1 provide us with an example of a reading that can be positioned in more than one way. There is one such in 20:31:

```
WSAUTWS          DE KAI OI
        EWS TWN                 1241
WSAUTWS WSAUTWS DE KAI OI       A and 50 others
WSAUTWS    APEQANON             1005 1365 2372
WSAUTWS                 OI      D
WSAUTWS             KAI OI      PS 5 1223 3396
WSAUTWS WSAUTWS     KAI OI      174 1242* 1338
WSAUTWS WSAUTWS DE      OI      V
```

Here EWS TWN is a substitution for the other readings, and within this variation APEQANON is a substitution for the other readings following WSAUTWS. We could position single occurrences of WSAUTWS with either occurrence in the double occurrences. By positioning them with the first, we get one add-omission instead of two in a number of the readings. Homoeoteleuta allow the same kind of alternate positions as dittographies. It seems reasonable to position the omissions in such cases wherever they will make for fewer and simpler variations when the other readings are taken into account.

Two other decisions in which what seems natural or reasonable may be allowed to govern are whether words only slightly differing, such as different verb forms with unaltered roots, may be treated as the same in determining position, and whether a transposition in which one element is much longer than the other can be treated as two add-omissions, the longer element of what is strictly a transposition being treated as being in the same position in the two readings rather than in different positions. Decisions on the basis of naturalness or reasonableness cannot be proved wrong, whatever their results. The results are simply alternates.

The beginner in textual criticism like the beginner in arithmetic, the old hand like the parent faced with homework in "new math," should not be discouraged if he first undertakes to solve difficult problems by the foregoing rules. Thorough knowledge of the rules and practice in solving simple problems must precede mastery. Patient and consistent application of the rules will then bring the critic through all the bogs and quagmires that the biblical texts place in his way--until he comes to the problem of determining what are called directional variations, which have rules of their own.

In a directional variation, one reading is the result of an identifiable operation on another. The best known and most easily identifiable of these are the homeoteleuta, in which the shorter readings have resulted from eyeskips. If directional variations have more than two readings, they provide critics of the genealogical school with still another type of variation, which may be called synthetic. Two readings with a cause-and-effect relationship have a genealogical bond that can be represented by putting all the texts having the two readings into one group in a variation in which the other group or groups are left as before. Synthetic variations can be marked with asterisks to distinguish them from the others.

As explained in my Principles and Practice of Textual Analysis, critics of the bibliographical school have slightly different rules than other critics for determining directional variations. Also they will wish to formulate what may be called latent variations to take into account the dates of their manuscripts:

Before cent. V] Sinaiticus Vaticanus
Before cent. VI] Sinaiticus Vaticanus Alexandrinus

The form reflects the fact that sequence in dating is at issue. The form

Cent. VI] Bezae

groups earlier and later manuscripts together, which is not what is desired. The form

Cent. V] Alexandrinus; IV Sinaiticus Vaticanus; VI Bezae

will not group the manuscripts into progressively inclusive or exclusive divisions no matter in what order the groups are written.

Let us now examine Luke 20:30, which for most textual critics would be a real mare's nest, but for a biblical scholar is just run of the mine. The variations as initially given follow the listing in the preliminary form of the International New Testament Project's apparatus (the list of texts lacking the chapter and the verse are omitted, as are all citations of lectionaries). The lemmas are drawn from the Textus Receptus, which in stripped and normalized form reads as follows:

KAI ELABEN O DEUTEROS THN GUNAIKA KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS

N expl E[LABEN 0266 inc DEUT]EROS 161 expl THN
1. KAI (1) . . . ATEKNOS] KAI O DEUTEROS 157 1012; om. 349
2. KAI ELABEN] ELABEN DE 2542
3. KAI (1)] om. 69 2766
4. ELABEN O DEUTEROS THN GUNAIKA] 2 3 AUTHN 5 1 716*; OTEROS AUTHN GUNAIKA ELABEN 716^{c}; O DEUTEROS ELABEN AUTHN 2757; om. 2766
5. ELABEN O DEUTEROS] 2 3 1 TH 579 827
6. ELABEN] om. AL B D L 213 892 1241; + KAI 158 2487
7. O . . . APEQANEN] om. 346
8. THN . . . ATEKNOS] om. AL B D L 0266^{vid} 213 892 1241 2096*
9. THN] AUTHN 174^{c}
10. GUNAIKA] + AUTOU 1009
11. OUTOS] OUTWS 21 579 903
12. APEQANEN ATEKNOS] 2 1 U 579 1675

As is usual in apparatuses, the foregoing are convenient ways of recording the variations, and must be carefully examined to determine what the variations really are. We may begin at the list of explicits and incipits for the manuscripts with very large omissions. N has only KAI; the E following is not necessarily the first letter of ELABEN: whatever the other manuscripts may have, N may have had here any word beginning with E. Similarly 0266 has no part of this verse: EROS is not necessarily the end of DEUTEROS, and variation 8 indicates that the manuscript has no other words identifiable with this verse. Because 0266 is so fragmentary, we might set it aside until we had analyzed the completer manuscripts, but we shall treat it

Luke 20:30

KAI ELABEN O DEUTEROS THN GUNAIKA		KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	
KAI			N
KAI ELABEN O DEUTEROS THN			161
KAI O DEUTEROS			AL B D L 157 213 892 1012 1241
ELABE DE O DEUTEROS THN GUNAIKA		KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	2542
ELABEN O DEUTEROS THN GUNAIKA		KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	69
KAI O DEUTEROS AUTHN GUNAIKA ELABEN		KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	716*
KAI OTEROS AUTHN GUNAIKA ELABEN		KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	716^{c}
		KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	2766
KAI O DEUTEROS ELABEN AUTHN		KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	2757
KAI O DEUTEROS ELABEN THN GUNAIKA		KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	TH 827
KAI ELABEN KAI O DEUTEROS THN GUNAIKA		KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	158 2487
KAI ELABEN		ATEKNOS	346
KAI ELABEN O DEUTEROS			2096*
KAI ELABEN O DEUTEROS AUTHN GUNAIKA		KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	174^{c}
KAI ELABEN O DEUTEROS THN GUNAIKA	AUTOU	KAI OUTOS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	1009
KAI ELABEN O DEUTEROS THN GUNAIKA		KAI OUTWS APEQANEN ATEKNOS	21 903
KAI O DEUTEROS ELABEN THN GUNAIKA		KAI OUTWS ATEKNOS APEQANEN	579
KAI ELABEN O DEUTEROS THN GUNAIKA		KAI OUTOS ATEKNOS APEQANEN	U 1675

Figure 1

as having a large omission, including the whole of 20:30, that overlaps the omissions in N and 161. We have no information about N from KAI, or about 161 from THN, to the end of the chapter. If 161 begins again sooner than or at the same place as N, its omission is nested in N's; otherwise the omissions overlap. In any case, N, 0266, and 161 are to be grouped separately in all the variations confined to 20:30.

The lemma in variation 1 is the whole verse, so 349 omits the whole. Variation 1 gives the same information about 157 and 1012 as variations 6 and 8 give about AL, B, D, L, 213, 892, and 1241: all have KAI O DEUTEROS and nothing else. The lemmas in variations 3 and 4 are contiguous in the text, so the variations indicate a single omission in 2766.

Arranged in columns, the variations appear as in Figure 1 (the omission of the whole verse by 349 is not shown, but must not be forgotten). Writing out the whole verse together makes some of the variations seem more complicated than they are, but has its advantages as a first step. For example, it draws our attention to the fact that we cannot be sure the KAI in N is the first KAI in the verse; we cannot even be sure that it is in this verse. But to take it as the first KAI simplifies our view of the variations. Similarly, we cannot be sure that the KAI in 2766 is the second KAI in most manuscripts (the third in 158 and 2487), but accepting it as such simplifies our view of the variations. The other uncertainties of position require equiverbal determination of the variations.

The variations are given below in the input format of one of my computer programs for deriving textual family trees. A slash must precede the first siglum in a group, a comma must separate sigla, a semicolon groups, a period variations. The sigla of any one group in a variation may be omitted; the reading of the group may be retained or not as desired, and if retained must be followed by a slash. An alternate way of writing a series of single-text groups is to put an asterisk instead of a slash in front of the sigla and separate them by commas.

The variations are then as follows. The omission in 0266:

/ 0266.

The omission in N, overlapping the omission in 0266, and so an independent variation:

/ N.

The omission in 161, overlapping the omissions in 0266 and AL, etc., and 2096*, assuming it is nested in the omission in N:

/ 161; / N.

The omission of the whole verse in 349, nested in the omission in 0266:

/ 349; / 0266.

The omission at the beginning of the verse in 2766, nested in the omissions in 0266 and 349, but overlapping the others:

/ 2766; * 0266, 349.

The omission in the middle of the verse in 346, nested in the omissions in N, 0266, and 349, but overlapping the others:

/ 346; * N, 0266, 349.

The omission at the end of the verse in AL, etc., and 0296*, nested in the omissions in N, 0266, and 349, but overlapping the others:

/ AL, B, D, L, 157, 213, 892, 1012, 1241, 2096*; * N, 0266, 349.

Nested within or overlapped by these omissions are the following: an add-omission (the first KAI); a very complex substitution, with several other variations nested within it; another add-omission (AUTOU); an invariant word (the second KAI in most texts, the third in 158 and 2487); a substitution (OUTOS:OUTWS); and another complex substitution, with another variation nested within it.

The add-omission of the first KAI, nested in the omissions in 0266, 349, and 2766:

/ 69, 2542; * 0266, 349, 2766.

The complex substitution nested in the omissions in N, 0266, 349, and 2766:

ELABEN . . . THN/ 161; O DEUTEROS/ AL, B, D, L, 157, 213, 892, 1012, 1241; ELABE DE O DEUTEROS THN GUNAIKA/ 2542; O DEUTEROS AUTHN GUNAIKA ELABEN/ 716*; OTEROS AUTHN GUNAIKA ELABEN/ 716^{c}; O DEUTEROS ELABEN AUTHN/ 2727; O DEUTEROS ELABEN THN GUNAIKA/ TH, 579, 827; ELABEN KAI O DEUTEROS THN GUNAIKA/ 158, 2457; ELABEN/ 346; ELABEN O DEUTEROS/ 2096*; ELABEN O DEUTEROS AUTHN GUNAIKA/ 174^{c}; * N, 0266, 349, 2766.

Within this variation are five others. In each, the texts not newly grouped are grouped as in the outer variation. Sigla are omitted for the largest group in each case.

One variation is determined positionally:

ELABEN O/; ELABE DE O/ 2542; ELABEN KAI O/ 158, 2487; / AL, B, D, L, 157, 213, 892, 1012, 1241; / 716*; / 716^{c}; / 2757; / TH, 579, 827; * N, 0266, 349, 2766.

Two are determined partly positionally and partly equiverbally. O DEUTEROS and OTEROS have the same position in 716* and 716^{c}. THN and AUTHN have the same position in 174^{c} and 1009, etc.

O DEUTEROS/; OTEROS/ 716^{c}; / 346; * N, 0266, 349, 3766.

THN/; AUTHN/ 174^{c}, 716*, 716^{c}, 2757; / AL, B, D, L, 157, 213, 892, 1012, 1241; / 346; / 2096*; * N, 0266, 349, 2766.

The other two are determined equiverbally, grouping the texts having ELABEN and those having GUNAIKA.

ELABEN/;/AL, B, D, L, 157, 213, 892, 1012, 1241; * N, 0266, 349, 2766.

GUNAIKA/; / 161;/AL, B, D, L, 157, 213, 892, 1012, 1241; / 2757; / 2096*; * N, 349, 2766.

The add-omission of AUTOU, nested in the omissions in N,

0266, 161, 346, 349, AL, etc., 2766, and 2096* (the add-omission in AL, etc., cannot be arranged after the asterisk because the group has more than one text):

AUTOU/ 1009; / AL, B, D, L, 157, 213, 892, 1012, 1241; * N, 0266, 161, 346, 349, 2096*, 2766.

The substitution OUTOS:OUTWS, nested in the omissions in N, 0266, 161, 346, 349, AL, etc., and 2096*:

OUTWS/ 21, 579, 903; / AL, B, D, L, 157, 213, 892, 1012, 1241; * N, 0266, 161, 346, 349, 2096*.

The substitution APEQANEN ATEKNOS: ATEKNOS: ATEKNOS APEQANEN, nested in the omissions in N, 0266, 161, 349, AL, etc., and 2096*:

ATEKNOS/ 346; ATEKNOS APEQANEN/ U, 579, 1675; / AL, B, D, L, 157, 213, 892, 1012, 1241; * N, 0266, 161, 349, 2096*.

Within the foregoing one other can be determined equiverbally. It groups the texts having APEQANEN (all texts having the passage at all have ATEKNOS, so there is no variation among them with respect to it):

APEQANEN/; / 346; / AL, B, D, L, 157, 213, 892, 1012, 1241; * N, 0266, 161, 349, 2096*.

As we examine the variations we see that the reading of 2766 is pretty certainly the result of homoeoteleuton, so that we have a directional variation from which we can obtain a synthetic variation in which 2766 is grouped with all the texts having KAI at least twice. Texts not having the verse at all are grouped separately, as before:

/AL, B, D, L, 157, 213, 892, 1012, 1241;/N;/69;/161;/346;/2542; * 0266, 349.

The omission of the whole verse by 349 is also pretty certainly an eyeskip and gives a synthetic variation in which 349 is grouped with all texts beginning both 20:30 and 20:31 with KAI.

Insofar as the rules for determining variations can be made unequivocal, they can be written into computer programs for determining variations. Such programs could also cause the computer to report out problems identifiable but not soluble by the rules embodied in the programs, with recommendations for their solution. The principal difficulties in solution would be presented by the directional variations, where certainty of identification shades off fairly rapidly in the scale of types. Most scholars would probably not like to be limited to the types that are so clearly identifiable as to be easily identifiable by computer. The computer could, however, be programmed to warn the scholar that certain types of variation are not directional.

For example, the so-called "conflated readings," so commonly cited as directional, are not in fact proof of conflation, and so are not directional. Thus in Luke 20:19, the reading GRAMMATEIS KAI OI FARISAIOI KAI OI ARCIEREIS was not necessarily produced by a scribe who did not wish to decide between the readings GRAMMATEIS KAI OI FARISAIOI and GRAMMATEIS KAI OI ARCIEREIS. The shorter readings may equally well have been

produced from the longer by scribes who dropped out different parts of it.

Again, nothing is more common than the scholar who is afflicted with what we may call Q syndrome. Such a scholar will suppose, for example, that because Mark and John have some contents in common they have a common source comprised of their common contents (the intersection of their individual contents, to use the mathematical term). In fact, Mark and John might equally well have a common source of which they are only different selections (the source would then be the union of their individual contents, or even have additional contents of its own). Or the contents of the source might be represented by any point along the continuum between intersection and union. Nor need they have a common source. They may equally well have an intermediary between them, the descendant of one and the ancestor of the other, the contents of which may be represented by any point along the continuum from their intersection to beyond their union. Finally, John may equally well be a selection of Mark with additions, or the reverse. True directional readings can at least indicate whether Mark is the source of John or John of Mark or whether they have a common source, but in the former two cases variations can provide almost no evidence as to whether they had an intermediary between them, and in the latter case no information as to whether their common source was more nearly an intersection or a union of their individual contents.

Use of a computer is not an infallible protection against Q syndrome, but it is at least likely to prevent arguments based on Mark and John to the exclusion of Matthew and Luke, for it is so much easier to compare texts by computer than otherwise that the computer user is more likely to compare all four Gospels.

III

Just as the variations between the four Gospels require different inferences than can be drawn from the variations between any two, so the variations found in a whole Gospel require different inferences than can be drawn from the variations in a part of a Gospel, and, equally importantly, the variations between many manuscripts require different inferences than can be drawn from the variations between a few manuscripts. Clearly, where the inferences differ, those drawn from four Gospels are truer than those drawn from just two, those drawn from a whole Gospel are truer than those drawn from only a part. Inferences drawn from all extant manuscripts copied before the tenth century are more complete than those drawn from all those copied before the ninth century, and truer than those drawn from a selection of manuscripts before the tenth century. The user of a computer, therefore, since he can so much more easily collect and analyze the variations in his manuscripts, is more likely than other textual critics to make true and complete inferences, unless they work much longer and harder than he.

Note

The computer programs mentioned in this paper have been published in small editions for copyright purposes under the author's name and may be reproduced from copies deposited in

the University Research Library, University of California, Los Angeles, 90024. The programs are titled PRUFREAD, COLLATER, PRELIMDI, and ARCHETYP. No programs exist as yet for determining variations either positionally or equiverbally.

S 99 VARIANTS FOR WHOM? SOME PROPOSED CLASSIFICATIONS

James T. Clemons
Wesley Theological Seminary

I

The ways in which variant readings have been listed, that is, the formats of the apparatus critici, have been determined on the basis of two general assumptions: 1) that those who were to use the information would be qualified to do so by their knowledge of textual criticism, and, more recently, 2) that the information would be used for some specific purpose.

The ideal format has been envisioned as including the preferred text followed by all the variants therefrom, with each reading supported by a complete listing of all witnesses from every known source. The aims of the International Greek New Testament Project approximate this ideal. That the initial volume of the project (Luke) is yet to be published, after more than twenty-five years of effort bears witness to the virtually unimaginable amount of human resources required to complete such a monumental task.[1]

The discovery and collation of additional witnesses has made it very nearly impossible for editors to list the vast amount of information available. They have been forced to limit both the number of variants and the number of witnesses cited. A modified form of presenting the variants is represented by the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (GNT).[2]

Prepared specifically for translators, its critical apparatus was "restricted for the most part to variant readings significant for translators or for the establishing of the text." The restriction resulted in "an appreciable reduction in the number of variants in the apparatus."

It is important to note that in this process of modification an important principle is operative: the purpose for which a text and apparatus are prepared affects the way in which the variants are presented.[3] Thus the ideal apparatus would be prepared exclusively for those thoroughly trained in all aspects of textual criticism and would be of little use to anyone else, whereas the modified apparatus prepared for a specific group would either be largely confined to that group or else would be used by those outside the group who would obviously be handicapped by an apparatus not prepared with their specific purposes in mind.

We have seen this last situation in the wide distribution of GNT among many interpreters and students. In its preface and introduction GNT consistently used the term "translators" as those for whom this work was prepared. However, the term was not defined. One might assume that the work was for those who would be making translations for or under the guidance of the United Bible Societies. A pre-publication pamphlet specified that it was to be for "the student, pastor, scholar, and translator."[4] Markham, one of those who worked closely with the editors, said it was for "translators and exegetes."[5] Later, Metzger said the text was for "translators and students."[6] If the original purpose was to serve such a wide range of "translators," it was a most commendable goal. But a better apparatus along the lines suggested here would increase the value of such an edition for many students, preachers, historians, and theologians.

II

The value of textual criticism for history and theology has been proclaimed for more than twenty years. In 1956 Clark de-

scribed "The Effect of Recent Textual Criticism upon New Testament Studies."

> This interest, in which the textual critic turns historian and theologian, has been increasing in criticism and may faithfully be extended in future textual studies. It presents a direct challenge especially to the historical theologian to collaborate with the textual specialist to produce the most trustworthy conclusions.[7]

Epp made a more detailed study to demonstrate "the significance and relevance of a theological approach to texts and textual variants." He affirmed that textual criticism "had ceased to be merely a search for the original text and has become also a historical discipline."[8]

Colwell concurred, but he noted a problem arising from the theological naivete of textual critics and the textual incompetence of theologians.[9] Grant and Oliver in different ways noted the relationships between textual criticism and some of the more recent types of New Testament criticism.[10] D. W. Riddle, Merrill M. Parvis, and Erich Fascher are among others whose works have underscored the changing and more broadly conceived responsibility of textual criticism.[11]

III

Unfortunately those opinions (pleas?) by textual critics have not caused other New Testament interpreters, e. g., historians and theologians, to come rushing to their sides. Far from the utopian dream of having scholars in other disciplines avail themselves of the textual data, we have seen the material itself become a formidable barrier rather than an inviting bridge.[12] The situation is hardly less problematical and discouraging when we try to acquaint students with the value of textual criticism.

I suggest that one reason for this impasse is the way in which variants have been classified and listed in the apparatus critici. The basic question is then, Can the listing of variants by some new but equally valid classifications make the results of textual criticism more readily available to theologians, commentators, preachers, and teachers? Related questions are, On what basis shall the classifications be made?, and Who shall assume responsibility for making them? There also remains the problem of who would see that the results were made available to a wide range of interpreters who did not have the technical grasp of a specialist in textual criticism.

I believe that the goal is desirable, that the primary responsibility for attaining it falls to textual critics, that textual critics are capable, without raising the question of their own historical or theological competence (!), of providing a more useful tool specifically for scholars in other fields, that such a goal can be reached without sacrificing in any way the highest standards of biblical scholarship, and that the results can and should be made available in some inexpensive publication, by the Society if no major publisher, such as the American Bible Society, can be pursuaded to do so. I believe further that in initiating such a project, the Seminar could easily justify its existence to any who might question its "relevance" to the Society as a whole.[13]

IV

As a step in this direction I propose three classifications of variants not now being used by editors who prepare apparatus critici. Because 1) these new classifications are based on readings with at least <u>possible</u> theological differences, whether those variants be in orthography, punctuation, word order, omis-

sion, or addition, and because 2) they are conceived specifically for historians, theologians, preachers, and students, they should be more helpful to non-textual critics than those currently available.[14] The new format for providing the basic evidence of textual criticism may possibly be a way not only of enabling other specialists to work more effectively in their own fields but also of enticing those whose assistance is needed to come into closer alliance with textual critics.

The proposed classifications are:

Class I: Meaningless (or Insignificant) Variants: Those which in no way change the meaning of the text.

Example: Gal 1.6

εν χαριτι Χριστου
εν χαριτι Ιησου Χριστου
εν χαριτι Χριστου Ιησου

For interpreting the thought of Galatians there are no meaningful distinctions among these three readings. Other examples might be found in Jn 11.29 which has three "variation-units" according to Colwell and Tune.[15] We must ask if any of the three in any way changes the meaning of the text. This will of course be a judgment call, but if the editor or textual critic says No, then all three go into Class I.

Class II: Ambiguous (or Equivocal) Variants: Those which could conceivably change the meaning of the text, but which might not do so, depending on how the final reading was finally interpreted.

Example: Gal 1.6

εν χαριτι

Given our knowledge of the letter from its undisputed passages, this reading without a name or title in the genitive may mean precisely the same grace as that specified by the several variants listed in Class I, but as it stands, it could have a quite different meaning, i. e., grace apart from that which is specifically identified with Christ, Jesus Christ, or Christ Jesus.

Class III: Positive (or Definite) Variants: Those which unquestionably represent a different meaning from the text.

Example: Gal 3.21

κατα των επαγγελιων του θεου
κατα των επαγγελιων του Χριστου
κατα των επαγγελιων

Although the promises may be presumed to be the same in each reading, the differences among them are clear for those concerned with Christology.

Class I would be presented in an appendix, where the "meaningless" (or insignificant) variants would be accessible to those who wanted to deal with such matters as orthography, dating and relationships of manuscripts, history of the text, and other matters requiring highly specialized skills. The appendix would also hold all "non-sense" readings which might someday become "sensical" or significant. This appendix would presumably be used more and more as Classes II and III were utilized by a wider range of interpreters.

Variants in Class II and Class III would be listed separately. Each reading would be identified as coming from a general text-type, rather than by a list of individual witnesses which are not only confusing but often entirely misleading to the non-textual interpreter. The introductory statements of Metzger in his Textual Commentary point toward the kind of model needed to clarify the types of text, to indicate the major manuscripts which support them, and to show their relative importance to history and theology.

But another problem is yet to be resolved: the necessity for distinguishing between readings in the same manuscript. This necessity was stressed by Metzger but it was not provided for in the apparatus of GNT.

> It will be observed that in some cases different sections of the New Testament within the same witness belong to different text-types.[17]

I hope to provide a more detailed listing of variants according to these classifications before the Seminar's October meeting. I would be most pleased if others would make a similar effort. Most apparatus critici are still in need of some tidying up regarding individual manuscripts and support from the versions, and such a reclassification might go a long way toward alleviating another regrettable situation, at least so far as cluttering up the apparatus for non-textual specialists is concerned.[17]

V

In textual discussions, though not to my knowledge in any critical apparatus, variant readings have been classified primarily according to the reasons for their occurrence: a) accidental, or, less accurately, scribal, (e. g., dittography, homoeoteleuton, etc.), and b) intentional. But as useful as these discussions are, their greatest value lies in the help they provide in determining which reading lies closest to the original. Such discussions as to why the variants occurred would not affect the classifications proposed here, although they remain an essential source for the ongoing tasks of textual critics.

An apparatus based on these three proposed classifications of variants would be a more useful tool for New Testament study and interpretation than those now available. At the same time, it would maintain the high standards of scholarly research. No one would expect a committee to agree completely on the evaluation of a variant before presenting some judgment in the form of a preferred text and apparatus. What they can agree on, in most instances, is what variants a manuscript actually contains. It would be equally unreasonable to expect a committee to agree on the theological significance of every known variant. But what they can show is precisely where different theological meanings might (Class II) or in fact do (Class III) occur.

If the research conducted by textual critics "plays its part at the very center of the church's doctrine,"[18] then textual critics of the New Testament should be concerned that the results of their research be made available to those who also labor in that particular vineyard, as well as to any other scholars in related fields and disciplines. An existential question is now before us: Shall this Seminar assume responsibility for producing a record of variants specifically for historians, theologians, students, and preachers?

NOTES

1. The desirability of an ideal text is still with us. Ernest C. Colwell observed that the United Bible Societies' edition "has 1/5 as many variants as Nestle^{25}, and less than 1/3 as many as Kilpatrick^{2}." He then said, "A dependable apparatus criticus would dwarf Nestle and Kilpatrick as they dwarf UBS." See Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament, volume IX of New Testament Tools and Studies, ed. by Bruce M. Metzger, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1969, 154. However, Colwell had earlier said (p 100) that the full or ideal apparatus was necessary only for the first phases of manuscript study. Thus he called for a modification of the apparatus whenever there is a change in the goals for which the apparatus was intended.

2. Second edition, 1968, ed. by Kurt Aland, et al. For a critical review of this edition and its apparatus see, among others, J. K. Elliott, "The United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament: An Evaluation," Novum Testamentum 15 (1973) 278-300.

3. In ways not directly related to the thesis of this paper, at least two others have noted this principle. See Paul Maas, Textual Criticism, tr. by Barbara Flower, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1958, 24, and Eldon Jay Epp, The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts, Society of New Testament Studies, Monograph 3, Cambridge University Press, 1966, 35f.

4. "A New Edition of the Greek New Testament," printed without date by Princeton University Press.

5. Robert P. Markham, "The Critical Apparatus," part of "The Bible Societies' Greek New Testament: A Symposium," The Bible Translator 18 (1967) 3-11, esp. 3.

6. Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, based on the forthcoming third edition, New York and London, United Bible Societies, 1971, vi.

7. Kenneth W. Clark, in The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: Studies in honour of C. H. Dood, ed. by W. D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge University Press, 1956, 27-51, esp. 45. See also Clark's "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," in Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan Septuagenarii, Haarlem, Bohn, 1953, 52-65.

8. Op. cit., 18.

9. Ernest C. Colwell, "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program," presented as a paper at the 100th anniverary of the Divinity School, Univ. of Chicago, before appearing in his Studies, 148-171.

10. See Frederick C. Grant, "Where Form Criticism and Textual Criticism Overlap," Journal of Biblical Literature 59 (1940) 11-21, and Harold H. Oliver, "Importance of Redaktionsgeschichte for the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," first presented as a paper to this Seminar before appearing in Journal of the American Academy of Religion 36 (1968) 41-45.

11. Epp, op. cit., 12-21. For a brief critique of Fascher's view see Colwell, op. cit., 151f.

12. The concern of Bishop Stephen C. Neill seems to have been justified. In a review of GNT he said

> Translators...simply have not time for extensive divagations. In this book we are provided with a marvellous range of textual evidence. I wonder whether the work may not defeat its own objectby the very elaboration of the material that it presents. Few translators have extensive theological education. Not one in a hundred is an expert in textual matters. Yet it is hardly possible to use this book, unless one is an expert.

He goes on to suggest that the editors were a little less than clear as to precisely what they were attempting to do for translators. See The Bible Translator 18 (1967) 12-15, esp. 13.

13. A general discussion of the Textual Criticism Seminar's relationship to the parent body was presented in a paper by the Chairman, Eldon Jay Epp, in December, 1967. A final decision on this matter is yet to be made.

14. Some of the individual terms have been cited in other discussions, but the three classes suggested here, when taken together, are to my knowledge original. See for example, Ernest C. Colwell and Ernest W. Tune, "Methods in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings," which contains much information that would be immensely helpful in reaching the goals expressed here, in Colwell's Studies, 96-105.

Colwell would reject the singular reading as significant, presumably relegating it to Class I in my proposed apparatus. But for the purposes here given, I would offer, with some explanation as to why caution should be used, such readings as the Freer Logion after Mk 16.14 and the insertion at Luke 6.5 in Codex Bezae.

15. Defined in Colwell's Studies, 97ff. This creative classification tries to obviate any dichotomy between a text and "variants." For practical purposes, that is, for getting much useful information to a wider group of scholars more quickly, I would not object to using some preferred text, such as GNT, as a base for my classifications.

16. Op. cit., xiii-xxxi, esp. xxix.

17. To cite but one discussion of each type of problem, see Daniel B. Johnson, "A Neglected Variant in Gregory 33: (John V.8)," New Testament Studies 18 (1971-72) 231-232, and James T. Clemons, "Some Questions on the Syriac Support of Variant Greek Readings," Novum Testamentum 10 (1968) 26-30, both of which were first read as papers before the Seminar.

18. Kenneth W. Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," 55.

S 102

THE APOCALYPSE AS CHRISTIAN PROPHECY: A DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES RAISED BY THE BOOK OF REVELATION FOR THE STUDY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN PROPHECY

M. Eugene Boring
Phillips University

We are badly in need of a comprehensive study of prophecy in early Christianity. The only such attempt known to me is too old, too brief, and too uncritical to be of much help.[1] Like its OT counterparts, such an investigation would be illuminated by a study of *religionsgeschichtlich* "parallels" within its environment, but must be based on the study of the Christian texts themselves. For the first century, this limits our sources almost entirely to NT documents.

Where should be the first beachhead for such an attack upon the unsolved problems of early Christian prophecy? The choice would seem to be from Paul, Acts, and Revelation. All are valuable sources, but none is unproblematical. Paul is the earliest, describes the phenomenon as it appeared to him in Asia Minor churches of the fifties, and functioned as a prophet himself. But since the latter feature is ambiguous and disputed, and since without it Paul is only a secondary source--and a not unbiased one--his value as the beginning point for a full scale study of early Christian prophecy is reduced. Acts is our only narrative source which describes early Christian prophets, but the difficulty in determining what is reliable historical tradition and what is Lukan *Tendenz* poses problems for Acts as a beginning point. Revelation is not without its problems in this regard either (to be discussed below), but still commends itself as the best beginning point for our study, for it is the earliest extant Christian book, and the only NT document, which is written with the explicit claim to be Christian prophecy.

Our first question must ask *whether*, in fact, this claim is to be accepted: Is the Apocalypse in fact to be regarded as Christian prophecy? An affirmative answer leads us to ask *what* Revelation can tell us about Christian prophecy in its time and place. How this data might then best be used in reconstructing our picture of early Christian prophecy must then engage us.

Part One: Is Revelation Christian Prophecy?

Perhaps most of us will be inclined to agree without further ado with George Johnston's statement that Revelation is "the longest and most obvious example of prophecy in the NT."[2] What profit is there in laboring the obvious? How could anyone possibly see Revelation as anything else? One way: defining apocalyptic and prophecy in mutually exclusive terms, à la von Rad,[3] excludes Revelation from being prophecy, since it is so obviously apocalyptic--unless one defines apocalyptic in such a way that Revelation is excluded.[4] Everything depends, of course, on what one means by such terms. A proper working definition is very important, as is an awareness of what a definition is and how it functions.

My present working definition of "prophet" is: "A prophet is an immediately-inspired spokesman for the (or a) deity of a particular community, who receives intelligible revelations which he

is impelled to deliver to the community." This definition is intended to be phenomenological (i.e. truth-claims are bracketed out) and may thus be used for studying prophecy in any religious setting in the Hellenistic world. My working definition of "Christian prophet" is thus: A Christian prophet is a Christian who functions within the Church as an immediately-inspired spokesman for the exalted Jesus Christ, who receives intelligible revelations which he is impelled to deliver to the Christian community.[5]

In terms of this definition, John is certainly to be accounted a Christian prophet (although he never directly uses this term of himself), and the Apocalypse is to be considered προφητεία which it claims to be. The presence or absence of the words προφήτης, προφητεύω, προφητεία, are almost incidental, however. We are interested in Revelation because it is an example of the phenomenon defined above, not only because it is labeled προφητεία.

This also means that the question of whether the visions of the Apocalypse are "real" visions, "literary conventions," or something in between, is irrelevant as to whether Revelation is considered prophecy or not. The question is important for understanding the nature of this particular writing and for interpreting the book, but we will regard the book as an example of prophecy because it fits the criteria of our working definition, not on the basis of how the claim to be reporting visions is regarded.

Part Two: What Does Revelation Tell Us about Prophecy?

We must now exclude from our concern the question of how Revelation might be used as a source for reconstructing a picture of the phenomenon of early Christian prophecy, whether and how one might generalize from Revelation, how "typical" John might or might not be. We will return to these questions in Part Three below, but first we must ask the question, and press it rigorously, of just what Revelation has to tell us about Christian prophecy in its own time and place. The following list of numbered theses, now arranged somewhat topically, represents a reading of Revelation with this one question in mind: what would we know of Christian prophecy if Revelation were our only source? Some are only impressions, almost casual; others are the result of deeper probing. Some are listed primarily for purposes of discussion; others are supported with some argument and evidence. (They too, of course, are still open for discussion!) Although there is some overlapping, I have divided the theses into those more concerned with the product, προφητεία, and those more concerned with the προφήτης himself and his function.

I. ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΙΑ

A. *Form*

#1. Prophecy can assume a written form. (1:3, 11, 19; 2:1, 8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14; 14:13; 19:9; 21:5; 22:18-19)

#2. Prophecy can be included in a letter form. The beginning and ending of John's writing makes use of usual letter formulae expanded and stylized in an apocalyptic manner. The book thus differs in its overall form from the typical book of OT prophecy, where a number of specific oracles were gathered into

an anthology by the prophet's successors. The Apocalypse is not an anthology of specific oracles, each of which once has its own intentionality, addressing its own particular situation, but is itself, as a whole, one oracle addressing one particular situation. But because of the prophet's absence from the situation he wishes to address, the Apocalypse is in the form of a circular letter to a particular time, place, and problem, which *contains* prophetic materials. (Of course, most of the book is comprised of prophetic materials, but no one would claim, e.g., that 1:4-5 is a part of the revelation received by the prophet ἐν πνεύματι. In this it is different only in degree from Paul's letters.

#3. Within this overall form, the prophet makes use of numerous formal elements which seem to be characteristic of prophetic speech. This includes a characteristic vocabulary. The following list of words and phrases may be considered characteristic of John's prophetic mode of speech on the basis of repetition, occurrence in key locations, adaptation of OT prophetic forms, or particular appropriateness to the prophetic function as defined above.[7]

τάδε λέγει (2:1, 8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14) Each letter begins with this form, found nowhere else in the NT except Acts 21:11 (by Agabus!), but frequent in the LXX as a translation of כה אמר יהוה.

οἶδα (2:2, 9, 13, 19; 3:1, 8, 15) While of course the common word οἶδα is of itself no indicator of prophetic speech, the solemnly-recurring οἶδα...in each of the seven letters (5x οἶδα σου τὰ ἔργα) seems to be used in a formularizing manner. The prophet speaks for the risen Christ who knows the hearts and life-situations of those addressed.

ἰδού (1:7, 18; 2:10, 22; 3:8, 9, 20; 4:1 etc.) Used frequently in the body of the book to introduce a new vision, and 6x in the letters in a way which introduces "ein spezifisch prophetisches Offenbarungswort" in letters 2, 4, 6, and 7, this common word likewise seems to be used in a particularly characteristic way (Hahn). See further note by Minear below.

ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι Used at key junctures in the book (1:1; 4:1; 22:6), this phrase from Dan 2:28 is likely, as W. C. van Unnik argues, "a formula describing prophecy."[8]

λόγος, λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ Except for the single occurrence of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ as the name of the triumphant Jesus at his parousia in 19:13, John uses this phrase in only two ways, both of which are peculiar to him in the NT. (1) In combination with μαρτυρία (6:9) or μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1:2, 9; 20:4). The καί in each case, if not strictly epexegetical, at least places the two phrases in such close parallelism that λόγος θεοῦ cannot be said without binding it to μαρτυρία (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). In terms of traditional subjective genitive/objective genitive choices, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ here is to be understood more as a subjective genitive, in parallel to λόγος θεοῦ and in view of ὁ μάρτυς (1:5; 3:14) as a christological title. But David Hill has well argued for an understanding of the phrase which, while mostly subjective genitive, has objective genitive connotations: "the divine word, in the sense of God's declared plan or purpose, and Jesus Christ's attestation or confirmation of it, primarily in his utterances in the visions of this book, but also (for there is no discontinuity between them) in the witness of his life and death."[9] Since μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ thus refers principally to the testimony of the Jesus-event as it is re-presented in the oracles of Christian prophets, the phrase λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, bound so closely with it, has the same meaning for the

author. λόγος alone was used in the sense of an oracular revelation in pagan Greek, the LXX, and in the NT,[10] and τοῦ θεοῦ only makes this more specific and certain. The plural λόγοι τοῦ θεοῦ (17:17; 19:19) thus is the equivalent of דברי האלהים or דברי יהוה, and refers to the individual oracles of the prophets, both those of the OT and the Christian prophets who see themselves in continuity with them: a meaning which fits the contexts and illuminates the texts. In view of John's consistent use of λόγος (λόγοι) τοῦ θεοῦ in reference to prophetic utterance, we might well ask if the title in 19:13 does not also have a prophetic connotation: the exalted Christ is called λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ specifically as the mediator of the divine word to the prophets of the Christian community.

It is a striking fact that every remaining occurrence of λόγος in Revelation is probably related to Christian prophecy. λόγος/λόγοι are specifically described as προφητεία in 1:3; 22:7; 10, 18, 19. 22:9 is to be included here as well because of its parallel to v.10. The repeated οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί of 21:5; 22:6 is an asseveration formula intended to assert that the oracles are genuine oracles from God--as the addition of τοῦ θεοῦ in 19:9 makes clear. The only remaining instances of λόγος are in 3:8, 10, which in the light of the above and such sentences as 1:3 probably mean "you have obeyed my word of exhortation spoken through the prophets to be steadfast."[11] John thus seems to do consistently what the LXX did occasionally: use λόγος for λόγιον and λόγοι for λόγια .[12]

μαρτύς, μαρτυρέω, μαρτυρία The first occurrence of μαρτυρέω in 1:2 gives the clue to how John uses this cluster of words. The object of John's μαρτυρεῖν is τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (that is, Christian prophetic oracles, as above), and its content is ὅσα εἶδεν, that is, the content of John's λόγοι τῆς προφητείας. In 1:2, μαρτυρέω is used as a synonym for προφητεύω. This is by no means consistent throughout the book, but the close connection in Revelation between this word group and prophecy can be seen, for example, not only in the above discussion of λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, but in such equations as

προφητεία = μαρτυρία in 11:6, 7
προφῆται = μάρτυρες in 11:3, 10
μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ = πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας in 19:10
τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τῶν μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ = προφήτων καὶ ἁγίων (17:6; 18:24)

εἶδον, ἤκουσα John uses some form of εἶδον 56x, all except 2 (12:13; 18:7) in the sense of prophetic vision. By far the most common form is εἶδον, John's own report of visionary material (45 of 54x), the others being ἰδών (17:6), εἶδεν in the title, and εἶδες (7x in 1:19-20 and 17:6-18), used by the interpreting angel or Jesus referring to John's visions.

Forms of βλέπω are used only 13x (excluding 6:1, 3, 5, 7 with all modern critical texts), but only 3x of prophetic vision (1:11; 28:8[2x]).

ὁράω (ὄψομαι) is used 4x but not in the prophetic sense, though the passive ὤφθη is used in 11:19; 12:1, 3 apparently as the equivalent of εἶδον. (Though cf. Michaelis in *TDNT* V, 352, 354.) θεωρέω is used 2x, but not in the prophetic sense. Ὀπτάνομαι, θεάομαι are not used at all. Ὅραμα, ὀπτασία are also completely missing; ὅρασις is used 3x, but only in 9:17 to mean a prophetic vision. This data confirms εἶδον as a formula-like indicator of prophetic vision for John.

Although the words for seeing are more numerous, and their formulaic character is more sharply defined, the words for hearing are probably more important, since the εἶδον terminology is a part of the apocalyptic framework adopted by John, but hearing is more related to prophetic experience as we know it from the OT.[13] John uses ἀκούω 46x, 29 of them to refer to the reception of prophetic revelation, all but 2 (11:12; 22:8) of these are the formula-like ἤκουσα. The importance of hearing in the prophetic experience is further emphasized by the 7x repeated ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις in chapters 2-3, plus 13:9 εἴ τις ἔχει οὖς ἀκουσάτω, besides several other exhortations for the recipients to hear: 1:3; 3:3, 20; 22:17, 18 (which, with the above, accounts for almost every occurrence of ἀκούω in the book). There is no corresponding appeal for them to "see" what the author has seen.[14]

A characteristic combination of εἶδον καὶ ἤκουσα can be found in 5:11; 6:1, 2-3, 5, 7-8; 8:13; 14:1-2; 21:2-3, tied together as characteristic of the προφήτης John by his closing self-description in 22:8, κἀγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀκούων καὶ ὁ βλέπων ταῦτα.

ἀποκάλυψις This is a synonym for προφητεία for John, though he obviously prefers the latter term. Ἀποκάλυψις is found as a noun only in the title of the book, and the verb not at all, though we know both noun and verb are used elsewhere as expressions for Christian prophecy (e.g. *Hermas*, I Cor 14).

δοῦλος As prophets are called God's עבדים (LXX δοῦλοι) in the OT (Jer 25:4; Amos 3:7; Dan 9:6, 10), so John uses δοῦλος of Christian prophets in 1:1; 10:7 (the latter probably in union with OT prophets), and 11:18. John also uses δοῦλος, of course, as a term for Christians in general, and as embracing both general and specific references in one term, as in 19:2 (cf. 18:24).

σημαίνω Like ἀποκάλυψις, John uses it only once, in the title, but its function as the key word expressing the revelatory function of the angel indicates it is a word with prophetic overtones--as does its use in four of the other five times it is used in the NT: Jn 12:33; 18:32; 21:19; Acts 11:28 (plus Acts 25:27, its only non-prophetic use). Plutarch's description of the oracle at Delphi: οὔτε λέγει, οὔτε κρύπτει, ἀλλὰ σημαίνει.

μακάριος/οὐαί That John consciously works with blessings and curses is seen from their number: 7 beatitudes (1:3; 14:13; 16:15; 19:9; 20:6; 22:7; 22:14) and 7 sentences announcing woes (8:13; 9:12; 11:14; 12:13; 18:10, 16, 19). None are expressions of common-sense wisdom; all are revealed oracles.

μυστήριον Except for one passage in the synoptics (Mark 4:11/Matt 13:11/Luke 8:10), Revelation is the only NT book outside the Pauline stream to use μυστήριον. John uses it not only in the apocalyptic sense (the "symbolic meaning" of some element of a vision--1:20; 17:5, 7), but in the prophetic sense of the mysterious plan of God for history, including how he will end it (10:7).[15] His book claims to reveal the hidden purpose of God in history, for which μυστήριον is the characteristic expression.

ἀμήν John uses ἀμήν 9x, more than any other NT book outside the gospels. Some of this is doubtless due to the liturgical coloring of the materials, but some instances may reflect the peculiar use of ἀμήν as a revelation formula first introduced by Jesus and adopted by Christian prophets.

πνεῦμα, ἐν πνεύματι (1:10; 4:2; 17:3; 21:10) Since John identifies what the spirit says to the churches with what the risen Christ speaking through the prophets says to them (2:7 etc,) it is natural that πνεῦμα-terminology would be characteristic of his vocabulary. John specifically calls the spirit τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας (19:10, adopting a common Jewish term for the spirit of God), refers to God as ὁ θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν προφητῶν (22:6), and refers to the state in which he receives revelations as ἐν πνεύματι (1:10; 4:2; 17:3; 21:10).

ἰδού (Used 26x). "The introductory word 'There' (ἰδού) is always used in this book to signal a special divine intervention. The speaker is either God (21:3, 5) or Christ (1:18; 2:10, 22; 3:8, 9; 9:20; 16:15; 22:7, 12) or the angel (5:5) or the prophet speaking in the Spirit and calling attention to his vision of heaven (4:1, 2; 6:2, 5, 8; 7:9)."[16]

Although it would be possible to function as a prophet as defined above without using the προφητ- group of words (cf. II Isaiah and the נבא group), John does in fact denominate his function as προφητεύειν (10:11, cf. 11:3), his product as προφητεία (1:3; 19:20; 22:7, 10, 18, 19; cf. 11:6), and, though he does not directly use προφήτης of himself, he does speak of prophets within his church and considers himself a member of this group (10:7; 11:10, 18; 16:6; 18:20, 24; 22:6, 9). John is also concerned that there are others in his churches, claiming to be προφῆται, whom he does not acknowledge as such, so that ψευδοπροφήτης is also a characteristic word (16:13; 19:20; 20:10), described also in symbolic language as (οἱ) κρατοῦντες τὴν διδαχὴν Βαλααμ (2:14), ἡ γύνη Ἰεζάβελ, ἡ λέγουσα ἑαυτὴν προφῆτιν (2:20), perhaps also by (οἱ) κρατοῦντες τὴν διδαχὴν τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν (2:6, 15), and by the ἄλλο θηρίονof 13:11-17. Prophets were especially sensitive to the claims of others to have prophetic gifts, and this is reflected in their vocabulary.

The above is by no means an exhaustive list. It is suggested as a beginning point for the development of a list of formal indicators of prophetic speech. I have attempted to limit the list to "form" and "function" words, and not list words which occur with unusual frequency only because of the particular apocalyptic content of Revelation, e.g. ἄβυσσος, ἄρνιον, ἄστηρ, βιβλίον, βροντή, δράκων, δρέπανον, ζῷον, θεῖον, θηρίον, ἵππος, πληγή, σεισμός, φιάλη, χάραγμα, χιλίας, χίλιοι.

It should be noted that some terms which we might have expected to be more frequent because of their purported connection with Christian prophecy are absent, or play only a very minor role, in Revelation, e.g. υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (found only in 1:13 and 14:14, each time preceded by ὅμοιον as in Dan 7:13.

In addition to a characteristic vocabulary, Revelation utilizes other, more extended formal elements characteristic of prophetic speech. In the first place there belongs, of course, a careful form-critical analysis of the visionary material itself. No such comprehensive treatment is known to me, though it is sorely needed. Standard manuals of *Formgeschichte*, if they deal with the Apocalypse at all, tend to deal with the apocalyptic form as a whole and ignore the form of individual units within the Apocalypse. Although John apparently couches his oracles for the most part in traditional OT and apocalyptic forms, just what these are, where they come from, and how John may have modified them, as well as characteristic new forms devised by him,

is a matter awaiting investigation. Even preliminary observations cannot be attempted here. We can, however, point out some formal elements which seem to characterize Christian prophecy which John does use.

Sätze heiligen Rechts--Ernst Käsemann has made us familiar with the form "sentences of holy law" as an indication of prophetic speech.[17] The form seems to have survived the attack by Klaus Berger.[18] Is the form found in Revelation? Käsemann points only to 22:18-19.[19] Perhaps 13:10 should be considered an example of this form, but the text and meaning are both doubtful. F. Hahn discusses the form of the repeated *Überwinderspruch* at the conclusion of each of the seven letters and says it corresponds exactly to what Käsemann calls *Sätze heiligen Rechts*,[20] but this correspondence is difficult for me to see--although there are elements of the *Sätze* present in the *Überwindersprüche*. It is in fact the *elements* of this form which are present occasionally as the contents of John's oracles (eschatological *lex talionis*), as in 14:8-10; 16:5-6; 18:6, but only in 22:18-19 are these drawn together into the taughtly-formed chiasmus described by Käsemann. The seer is thus acquainted with the form and makes use of its elements, but it is not a dominant or noticeable characteristic of his prophetic speech.

First-person speech for the Deity--Although John can of course speak in his own person (1:9; 5:4 etc.), and can speak in the third person of Jesus (1:1, 5-6 etc.) he repeatedly speaks in the person of God, Jesus (cf. ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς 22:16) or the angel which represents them both, using ἐγώ (6x) or ἐγώ εἰμι + predicate (4x). The Apocalypse does not contain the revelation formula ἐγώ εἰμι in the absolute, but only with predicates: ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος (1:17 etc.).

This speaking in the first person was integral to the Ancient Near Eastern messenger formula in which the messenger "completely submerged his own ego and spoke as if he were his master himself speaking to the other."[21] This formula was adopted by the OT prophets,[22] whence it comes to the NT prophets and to Revelation. The striking feature in comparison to OT prophecy is that the ἐγώ with which the prophet speaks belongs almost exclusively not to God but to the exalted Jesus.[23] The formal corollary of the first-person speech in the person of the deity is that the hearer-reader is addressed directly in the second person. Here the Apocalypse is more like OT prophecy than later apocalyptic.

Report of call visions--Just as in the preceding case, here also the place usually filled by God in the revelatory experience is in Christian prophecy filled by the exalted Jesus. In words which John borrowed from several OT passages and combined in his own way--which to analyze too carefully is to unweave the rainbow--[24] he describes the call vision which was the beginning of this particular prophetic experience (1:10-20). Since there is nothing in the vision which indicates this is when John first received a prophetic call, and since he receives a second such call in 10:8-11, we should not necessarily see this as his initial call which constitutes him as a prophet. But from Revelation we might well regard the recounting of or alluding to such call-scenes as a characteristic form of Christian prophecy.

Additional formal features of prophetic speech of which John makes us aware, which will be discussed below under their respective headings, are: (1) the constant taking-up of OT images and language, re-combining, re-coining, and re-issuing them as

the medium of his own revelation, without ever quoting directly or citing the OT scriptures as an authority from the past. (2) The adoption and adaption of liturgical forms, including an extensive liturgical vocabulary.

B. Content

#4. Christian prophecy is eschatological-apocalyptic in orientation and content. In terms of content the most obvious characteristic of the Apocalypse is that its main body, 4:1--22:5, is a series of visions in more or less traditional apocalyptic forms. This apocalyptic content is transformed by being re-interpreted in terms of the Jesus Christ event, i.e. its Christology is determined by the destiny of the historical Jesus at the hands of Rome, but it is still more like traditional Jewish apocalyptic than the framework of the book, 1:1--3:22 and 22:6-21. It is these sections, which enclose the traditional apocalyptic forms, where most of the distinctive Christian prophetic elements are to be found. It is nonetheless important to note that the Christian prophet's message is dominated by materials which refer to the eschaton, an eschaton conceived in an apocalyptic way. The prophet speaks of and to the present in the light of the ultimate End which he sees rapidly approaching. He does not speak of the mundane, non-eschatologically determined present, nor does he predict events in the historical future, but speaks only of that which pertains to the End. For the faithful community, in a situation of threat and oppression, the prophet's message does not deal with the future in a speculative way but presents it as an existential message of hope.

#5. Christian prophecy is characterized by the rebuke of immorality and unfaithfulness, and a call to repent. These elements form most of the material in the letters to the seven churches, but are also found throughout, implicitly and explicitly. Such passages as 9:20-21; 16:9, 11, show that all the preceding pictures of judgment on the unfaithful are intended as a call to repentance. Since the book is directed to the "insider," the community of faith, and since the author does not anticipate large-scale conversions to the Christian faith before the advent of Christ, but considers the die already cast (3:5; 13:8; 17:8; 20:12, 15; 22:11), and since evangelistic appeals to the outsider to convert to Christianity are practically non-existent (22:17 is probably not to be taken as an evangelistic invitation to the non-Christian), the rebukes for unfaithfulness and calls to repentance should be seen as directed toward the church. Judging from Revelation, the Christian prophet speaks his message to the community of faith. Though it concerns the outside world, the message is not addressed directly to those outside the church. This feature is also seen in the next characteristic of Christian prophecy:

#6. Christian prophecy is characterized by the pronouncement of (proleptic) eschatological judgment. These pronouncements of judgment fall both on unrepentant unfaithful Christians and on the non-Christian enemies of the faithful community, the persecuting powers and institutions outside the church. While there are explicit pronouncements of judgment already accomplished (e.g. 14:8; 18:1-24), the majority of such pronouncements announce the judgment which is soon to come: on unfaithful Christians (2:5, 16, 22; 3:3, 16-19; 14:9-12; 20:11-15; 21:8, 27) and on non-Christians (6:1-17; 8:1--9:19; 16:4-7, 17-21; 19:2-3; 20:11-15). There is a sense in which all the visions of the future judgment have a *fait accompli* aspect, for in the visions they are seen as already accomplished. There is thus a combination of

"already" and "not yet" in the pronouncements of judgment: the whole is cast in a "not yet" (but soon!) framework, within which there are declarations that judgment is already accomplished.

#7. Christian prophecy contains exhortations and encouragement to believers to remain faithful. These are direct appeals and indirect encouragement, consisting principally of promises of a glorious future to the faithful and threats of terrible judgment to the unfaithful, both expressed in eschatological terms. The eschatological imagery of the Christian prophet's message functions not as speculation, but as parenesis.

C. Relation to Tradition

Did the early Christian prophet receive much of the content of his oracles from the tradition, which he re-presented as the word of the exalted Lord? Did the early Christian prophet contribute oracles to the tradition which were sometimes later taken as pre-Easter words of Jesus? These two questions, each of which has been affirmed and denied with equal vigor by NT scholars, are really two aspects of one problem: the relation of Christian prophecy to the tradition. The problem cannot be solved in general terms. We can only ask what each source of information about Christian prophecy indicates as to the relation between prophecy and the tradition in its particular time and place. What is the relation of the Apocalypse to the tradition which was handed on in its community?

We begin withthe question of whether Revelation takes up older materials and re-asserts them as the present word of the risen Jesus.[25] Such materials would include:

1. OT materials
2. traditional apocalyptic materials, oral or written
3. oracles of earlier Christian prophets, oral or written
4. the prophet's own previous oracles
5. earlier Christian writings not specifically prophetic
6. sayings from, and purported to be from, the historical Jesus

Obviously, the seer takes up OT materials and re-presents them in Jesus' name. It is almost as obvious that John was acquainted with other apocalyptic writings, as almost all critical work on the Apocalypse since R. H. Charles has assumed.[26] Any sort of source analysis is out of the question here, but that John made use of previous apocalyptic traditions seems clear.[27] We cannot of course be nearly so clear as was Charles that every expression in the Apocalypse similar to a phrase in another NT book points to literary dependance, but it is likely that the seer was familiar with some of the letters of Paul.[28] In the light of the probability of a developing Johannine "school," it is also likely that we should expect to find in the Apocalypse oracles of earlier Christian prophets in the same stream of tradition as is John.[29] For example, the oracle which contains 17: 9ff, so notoriously difficult to fit into the time of the final edition of the book (here assumed to be the last days of Domitian), may be an oracle of an earlier prophet in John's "school" in the time of Vespasian. This may be a better approach than attempting to talk about successive editions and redactors of the book itself.

John probably (in some cases certainly) made use of the first five of our six categories of traditional material, which would suggest he also made use of category six: traditional sayings of Jesus. This is certainly the case. There are in fact sayings which circulated in the tradition and are reported in our Gospels as words of the historical Jesus which John takes up and re-presents as words of the exalted Lord. But the issue is far from settled when the question is answered in the affirmative. The real question is, *to what extent* does John use traditional words of Jesus? The issue is similar to that of Paul's use of traditional sayings of Jesus: that he knew and used at least a few words of Jesus is clear, but whether this use is only occasional and tangential, or frequent and theologically fundamental, is the significant question in each case.

Several scholars[30] have argued that John's writing frequently reflects the sayings of Jesus known to us from the synoptic tradition. If the manner in which the author uses the OT is any indication, we should not expect explicit verbal quotes, but recognizable allusions. There are in fact no verbatim quotations of material known to us from the synoptic gospels. The following list comprises all those instances listed by both Charles and Vos, except where the statement in question seems to be more dependent on the OT in both the Apocalypse and the synoptics, than a case of the Apocalypse's dependence on the synoptic tradition.

1:3/Luke 11:28
1:3b/Matt. 26:18
2:7 etc. (7x)/Matt. 11:15 etc.
3:3 & 16:15/Matt. 24:43 par.
3:5/Matt. 10:32 par.
13:11 (16:13, 19:20)/Matt. 7:15
18:24/Luke 11:50 par.
19:7/Matt. 5:12 par.

This list would seem to me to represent the maximum possibility, the agreements between two scholars who suppose John made frequent use of the synoptic tradition. Although I think it is possible--even likely--that the list should be expanded if it were intended to include every passage in which John was somehow influenced by his knowledge of traditions found in the synoptics, the list must be reduced if it is to indicate only those places where John has taken up a logion from the synoptic tradition and re-presented it as a saying of the risen Lord. Only 1:3; 2:7 etc. (7x); 3:3 and 3:5 would qualify as sayings of Jesus, the others being John's own words as he reports what he sees in a vision, or an angelic or other heavenly voice which is a part of the visionary scene. And of this latter group only 2:7 etc (7x); 3:3 (16:15) and 3:5 seem to me to represent clear examples of synoptic sayings being re-presented in the Apocalypse as a logion of the heavenly Jesus. Thus though the synoptic tradition of Jesus' words may have had a strong influence on John's presentation, it serves as a source (in the way the OT serves as a source) only to a very minimal extent. The role which the tradition from Jesus played for John was somewhat minor in comparison with the kerygma *about* Jesus the crucified and risen one, which was the dominant influence on shaping John's apocalyptic into a Christian form. Like Paul, John's message has only a minor place for the words and deeds of the historical Jesus. *That* he was, that he was *crucified by Rome*, and that *God had exalted him as the Christ*, were the crucial elements in the Christ event for John.

We must now reverse the question and ask what the Apocalypse contains that could have been included in the synoptic tradition (if it had had been written at an earlier date). The sayings in the preceding section, of course, could have first originated as Christian prophecy, whence they were taken into the synoptic tradiiton. Thus 16:15 has been a key example for advocates of both points of view.[31] Besides 16:15, once one has listed 1:17-20 and 22:12ff as possibilities,[32] what else can one imagine as being taken up in the synoptic tradition and included in the Gospels as a pre-Easter word of Jesus? Perhaps one or two of Revelation's seven beatitudes, but little else, can be thought of as fitting into a pre-Easter Gospel framework.

All the above questions need to be examined more closely, but we seem justified in concluding that the Apocalypse *can* both receive material from the synoptic tradition of Jesus' words and contribute material to it, but that in fact neither of these takes place to any considerable extent in the Apocalypse. In the time and place of the Apocalypse, traditional sayings of the earthly Jesus and words of the risen lord through his prophets seem to have found two different literary expressions, which inhibit the free interchange of material between them, or confusing one for the other. Whether this was the case earlier and elsewhere is another question.

The preceding discussion can be summarized in the following theses:

#8. Christian prophecy makes use of tradition, including OT, traditional apocalyptic materials, previous oracles of Christian prophets, Christian writings, not specifically prophetic, and traditional words of Jesus.

#9. Christian prophecy can take up a traditional word of Jesus and re-present it as the word of the exalted Lord (though this is not the case in the Apocalypse to any great extent).

#10. Christian prophecy can coin sayings of the risen lord which could be taken into the tradition of Jesus' words and later considered a saying of the historical Jesus (though this is not the case in the Apocalypse to any great extent).

II. ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ

A. The prophet's setting

We now ask what Revelation can tell us of the figure of the prophet himself, what he was like and in what relationships he stood.

#11. The prophet is a figure who speaks with an assumed authority within the congregation and groups of congregations.

John speaks as one known to his readers, with the assumption that his word is authoritative. He does not have to authenticate himself, appeals to no official authority to give his message weight, does not struggle to establish his authority. There is no consensus on how John's prophetic authority was related to that of other ministries in the churches to which he was writing, if there were such. Two areas which need to be explored if we are to get beyond the present impasses are: (1) Does John belong to a distinct order, office, "estate," or identifiable group to which Christians in general in his

congregations do not belong? (2) Are there more "official" ministries than John's (πρεσβύτεροι, διάκονοι, ἐπίσκοποι) present in his churches? While both questions must remain open pending further research, the series of references which sees to speak of the church as composed of ἅγιοι καὶ προφῆται (1:18; 16:6; 18:24) would seem to place the burden of proof on those who deny the former and on those who affirm the latter.

What is clear is that the prophet functions as one who has authority, and that he exercises this authority as a constituent member of the community. John is no solitary figure, no loner. His precise position within the structure of the cummunity remains unclear, but whatever it was John would not have been what he was apart from his relationship to the community.

#12. The Christian prophet exercises his function primarily in the setting of congregational worship.

Although involuntarily separated from the community, it is when the congregation gathers for worship that the revelation comes to him ἐν πνεύματι (1:10; cf. 8:3f). The book contains worship materials such as the doxology of 1:5b-6 and the hymns of 4:11 and 5:9b-10. Descriptions of heavenly worship scenes abound (chs. 4-5; 7:9-17; 15:1-4; 19:1-5). The allusions to Christians as ἱερεῖς (1:6; 5:10; 20:6) reinforce the impression that the Apocalypse is a worship-oriented book, written not to be read in private but to be heard as it is read by the lector in congregational worship (1:3).[33]

#13. The Christian prophet is the one through whom the risen Christ (and the Spirit) come to speech in the congregation.

John speaks not in his own behalf but as the voice of the πνεῦμα which is identified with the risen Christ (2:7 etc.). The risen Christ is present with his church in its crisis (1:13, 20), and "in Revelation the Spirit is related to the community rather than the individual inasmuch as He always speaks to the community...."[34] The central figure in the God→ Jesus→ Angel→ prophet→ church revelatory chain is Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. John begins here and goes both ways in 1:1-3. The risen Christ is not just a replaceable link in this chain, but its constituting element: he is the one who mediates God and represents him, on the one hand, and who can absorb and eliminate the traditional figure of the angel, on the other.[35] The original revelatory chain θεός→ Ἰησοῦς→ἄγγελος→προφήτης→ἐκκλησία is thus reduced functionally to Χριστός→προφήτης→ἐκκλησία The prophet is the one who stands between the risen Christ and the church, giving voice to the church's lord who is already present as πνεῦμα but would be mute without his prophet. In that the prophet does not offer words *about* Jesus as though spoken by a third party, he functions as a middle term between the historical Jesus as the proclaimer and the one who is proclaimed after Easter by the church: Christ the self-proclaimed. In an earlier period this christological *Zwischenstufe* function may have provided an important transition from the proclaimer to the proclaimed.

#14. The Christian prophet functions as an interpreter of events.

The prophet does not speak speculatively, abstractly, nor in general, but in relation to concrete events in the contemporary history of the church he addresses. The concrete realities of history are mute surds until they are given an interpretation, and this is done by the prophet not in terms of a national philosophy of general history or by empirical observation, but

charismatically as he understands the spirit to be interpreting what is going on in the community's history as seen from the divine point of view. Just as was the case with Old Testament prophecy,[36] meaningless surd-like events are placed within a meaningful theological frame of reference by prophetic speech. The threatened or actual persecution by Domitian was interpreted by John to be not a meaningless tragedy but the beginning of the eschatological events. Christians could face it with hope and good courage by virtue of the prophetic word, a word which only a prophet with his πνεῦμα-given insight could give.

The prophet thus gives voice to the word of Jesus for *this* historical situation, answering existential problems created for the community by a new situation for which the tradition gave no direct answer. The prophet keeps the tradition relevant, not by constantly developing new "applications" of it, but by standing within it and delivering the "new" word of the risen Jesus occasioned precisely by this moment in history.

#15. The Christian prophet functions by reinterpreting the Old Testament in the light of the Christ event.

The Old Testament forms the substructure of Christian prophecy, as it does of apocalyptic.[37] That which differentiates Christian prophecy from other apocalyptic (e.g. II Esdras) is that the Christ event is the major new factor which gives the key to what the old scriptures say to our time. The Old Testament is the locus of the seer's prophetic gaze; what he sees there is reformed by the historical act of God in Christ, but it is characteristic of the Christian prophet that he sets forth his oracles as based on, and re-presenting, the prophetic word of the Old Testament. The prophet does not operate deductively, quoting the Old Testament and then giving the Christian meaning, but by inspiration, operating in an almost organic union with the Old Testament text which he does not perceive as an object of his reflection, but the vehicle which forms a living unity with his own message.

#16. The Christian prophet is associated with miracles and signs.

There is nothing in the book to indicate that supernatural signs accompanied John's own prophetic ministry. Rather, the disdain with which he attributes σημεῖα μεγάλα to the false prophets (13:13-14; 19:20) and the demonic spirits (16:14) would suggest that he has an anti-miracle point of view which put the naked prophetic word of the one who conquered by suffering over against the false witness of signs and wonders. Yet, his picture of the two prophets in 11:3-13 portrays them as filled with miracle-working power (13:6) even though they die at the hands of their persecutors. This is of course a notoriously difficult passage, and we cannot easily determine what is part of the Old Testament imagery and what if anything in this section characterizes the activities of prophets in John's churches. In any case, John ministers in a church where miracles occur, and references to them are found in his prophecy. The prophetic phenomenon does not occur in isolation from other miraculous gifts of the spirit.

Part Three: How May This Material Be Used?

The above list of fifteen theses, while not exhaustive, represents some of the items that can be affirmed about Christian prophecy *as it is manifest in the Apocalypse.* But problems arise when we attempt to use this material to make statements about

other Christian prophets, or Christian prophetism in general. There is even some problem in using Revelation to reconstruct the picture of prophetism in John's own situation. For example, how the seer fits into the *Gemeindeordnung* of the Asia Minor churches he addresses, and whether and to what extent he is "typical" of the other prophets in these churches are two problems which for the present are still unsolved. David Hill[38] rightly emphasizes the latter problem, and issues a proper warning concerning an uncritical extrapolation from John's prophecy to that of other prophets in his churches, picturing the relation of John to other Asia Minor prophets as analogous to that of the Teacher of Righteousness to the other teachers at Qumran. While we should acknowledge that John has some differences when compared to the other Christian prophets in his setting, I think Hill may be too pessimistic about what we might learn about them from studying the Apocalypse. Hill apparently assumes that we already know a good bit about them, because they are "typical" and John must be set off from them because he does not correspond to this presumed "typical" picture. On what I think is the fallacy of this approach, see below. There are certainly instances where John is different from the other Christian prophets of Asia Minor (e.g. he wrote a book later adjudged to be canonical, and none of them did), but I think some of these differences may be accounted for precisely because John *wrote* his message (and was forced to do so by the distance separating him from the community to which he belonged and in which he normally was present). Also, it seems Hill had made a good case that John seems to be the leader of a prophetic group and not simply one of its members. But this would more likely point to differences in degree than in kind, so that the Apocalypse might still serve as a source of information on prophetism in some Asia Minor churches in the nineties and not just for a single untypical prophet. But we may learn from Hill's essay that we cannot too easily generalize from the Apocalypse to the other prophets in his churches.

So much the less, then, can we use Revelation to speak uncritically about "early Christian prophecy" in general. The fact alone that Revelation is written while most of the other first century Christian prophets apparently delivered their message orally precludes this possibility, for it may be that the transition into a literary mode was as significant for prophecy as was the transition of εὐαγγέλιον into Gospels and oral apostolic word into letters. This transition and its significance for the study of the history of early Christian prophecy awaits a thorough investigation. But the presumed differences between Revelation and other NT prophecy should not make us too pessimistic about the value of Revelation as a source for reconstructing the picture of the prophetic phenomenon in early Christianity. We can talk with some confidence about prophecy in eighth century Israel, though we have less primary source material from prophets of that time and place than we have in the Apocalypse. We talk about prophecy in ninth century Israel, for which we have no primary sources at all. So the justified hesitancy about rushing to construct pictures of first century prophecy on the basis of Revelation need not cause us to withdraw into a pessimistic historical positivism. Revelation can be used to recreate the picture of prophecy in early Christianity. But how?

The data from Revelation cannot be uncritically combined with all our other data from disparate sources of diverse times and places, to make a composite figure called "the early Christian prophet." What is needed is a comprehensive critical history of prophecy in the NT age, just as we have for OT prophecy.

The first task is to look at each source carefully, from Q to II Peter, and ask what each might reveal concerning Christian prophecy in its time, place, and situation.[39] I have above attempted an outline of what this might be for the Apocalypse. The next step would be to press the question of how each source could be used to illuminate the picture of Christian prophecy beyond its own particular setting, if this is possible at all. For instance, it has long been commonly recognized that the Apocalypse represents some kind of Palestinian Jewish tradition of prophecy. This would have to be true even if Satake's particular thesis turns out to be wrong. Further, it is being increasingly recognized that Revelation did not appear full grown, like Minerva sprung from the head of Zeus, without antecedents in some kind of Christian prophetic tradition--whether this be thought of as a "Johannine school" or however. The combining of these insights might well enable us to use Revelation as one way of gaining access to a Palestinian Christian prophecy earlier than the Apocalypse itself. Another example: Paul apparently views the Corinthian pneumatic phenomena with eyes forcused on a view of prophecy which he did not derive from Corinth, so what he writes in I Cor 14 might be used not only for portraying prophecy in Corinth in the 50's but earlier and elsewhere as well. (Not just any "elsewhere" or any time, of course. Pauline data would have to be probed to determine, if possible, just where his ideas of what Christian prophets do, or should do, come from, and whether any distortions or misunderstandings occur in Paul's own perception and representation.)

The data gleaned from this approach to each source, both data about prophecy in its own setting and what light each may shed on prophecy beyond its immediate situation, should be examined carefully to see if enough common traits emerge to enable us to make a list of general characteristics of early Christian prophecy. When such a characterization emerges, supported by critically-evaluated data, we might be justified in speaking of "typical" Christian prophets. And we would have in addition a valuable history of the prophetic phenomenon in early Christianity. I believe this is the task to which this Seminar should set itself.

NOTES

1. H. A. Guy, *New Testament Prophecy: Its Origin and Significance* (London: Epworth Press, 1947).

2. George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 139.

3. Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology II* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 301-308.

4. As does James Kallas, "The Apocalypse-An Apocalyptic Book?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* (March 1967) 69-80.

5. In the SBL *1973 Seminar Papers*, vol. II, pp. 142-154, I proposed the following as a working definition of "prophet" within the Hellenistic world: "A prophet is an immediately-inspired spokesman for the (or a) deity of a particular community, who receives revelations which he is impelled to deliver to the community." Each term was elaborated and a rationale for the necessity of a working definition and for this definition in particular was given. The definition was thoroughly criticized by the Seminar. There was general agreement that the function of receiving and delivering oracles was the essential element in prophecy, but no consensus on how best to state this. A revised definition was proposed by David Aune:

> The Christian who functions in the prophetic role (whether regularly, occasionally, or temporarily) believes that he receives divine revelations in propositional form which he customarily delivers in oral or written form to Christian individuals and/or groups.

Since there is nothing in his revision with which I disagree, a brief explanation of the differences in the two statements may be in order.

(1) Aune's is a definition of Christian prophecy; I was attempting first to define prophecy per se in neutral terms, then move to a Christian understanding of it. This is of course a significant shift, and the differences between prophecy when defined in general and in Christian terms should not be minimized. But if there is to be any illumination of Christian prophecy from the study of parallel or analogous phenomena in the Hellenistic world--as both Aune and I believe--there is some value in trying to get the "prophecy" part of the phenomena in focus without introducing the "Christian" part. Otherwise there is no way to determine what use Christian phenomena might cast light on Christian prophecy.

(2) "Regularly, occasionally, or temporarily" is to be assumed as part of the definition. Perhaps this should be explicitly stated, as Aune has done. My paragraph (1), p. 146, in the *1973 Seminar Papers* intended to try to avoid dealing with the question of whether the prophet functioned "regularly" in this role in the summary definition. The intent was to say that however "officially" and however "regularly" the prophet functioned, when he performed the function stated in the definition he was functioning as a *prophet*.

(3) That the revelations are understand to be "in propositional form" is a good clarifying point, in view of the need to distinguish prophecy from glossolalia. I have thus added

the word "intelligible" to my definition.

(4) "Customarily delivers in oral or written form" is to be assumed as understood in the term "spokesman," as I made explicit on p. 148 of the 1973 essay.

(5) "To Christian individuals and/or groups" is what I intended by "to the community." I would exclude "to individuals" if this is intended in some non-community setting, since I think relationship to the community is of the *esse* of Christian Prophets. Delivering purported messages from the deity to an individual which have no bearing on the community life is a function beyond the bounds of prophecy as I think we should define it.

Incidentally, in response to Aune's point 2 above, I should like to explain that I am not using "community" in the sense of "individual congregation gathered for worship," as he apparently assumes, but of the whole Christian community as it is manifest in particular congregation. I was not claiming an exclusively cultic setting for Christian prophecy (though I think this was in fact primarily the use), but binding the prophet to the community and rejecting an individualistic understanding of prophecy.

J. Ramsey Michaels responded in the following way to my distinguishing Christian prophecy from the general "prophetic" character of the early πνεῦμα-filled community:

> Re. pp. 149f. On the distinction between early Christian prophecy as a function of special individuals and the general "prophetic" character of the early Christian community (see n. 14); does this apply to the Apocalypse? What if we discover that the Apocalypse is assuming the "prophethood of all believers"? Would the definition have to be changed, or could we assume that a prior definition of prophecy as the function of a specific group is being reinterpreted and universalized? In what sense are we to understand that "The witness of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy"?

To this I would reply that my definition does not intend to affirm or deny a rigid clan or order of prophets, or even a semi-class or semi-order, but to have the question open. In some communities, all may have been considered (potentially) prophets, as seems to have been the case with Paul. But clearly all do not always function as prophets. The definition is intended to apply to any member of the community who *so* functions, whenever he does it, whether regarded as having such an office or not.

7. Most of the prophetic formulae in Rev. 2-3 were first pointed out to me by Ferdinand Hahn, "Die Sendschreiben der Johannesapokalypse: Ein Beitrag zur Bestimmung prophetischer Redeformen," in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt: Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Gert Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn, and Hartmut Stegemann (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), pp. 362-390, and the unpublished papers by Walter Hofheinz read at the national meeting of the SBL, Atlanta 1971, and the Southwest regional meeting of SBL, New Orleans, 1972.

8. "A Formula Describing Prophecy," *NTS* IX (1963) 86-94.

9. David Hill, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Revelation of St. John," *NTS* (July 1972) 412.

10. See Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, λόγος, in *A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, 1957), p. 479.

11. This meaning is supported on other grounds by G. Kittel, *TDNT* IV, 124.

12. See for example Psalms 119 (LXX 118), where λόγος and λόγιον are repeatedly used interchangeably as translation for דבר.

13. See Michaelis, *TDNT* V, 352, and Kittel, *TDNT* I, 217, R. Bultmann, *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting* (New York: Meridian Books, 1956), pp. 22-23.

14. On the repeated ἰδού, which is not to be taken as an imperative form of εἶδον, see below.

15. R. Brown, *The Semitic Background of the Term 'Mystery' in the NT* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), pp. 36-38.

16. Paul Minear, *I saw a New Earth* (Washington: Corpus Books, 1968), p. 17. He inexplicably fails to list 1:7; 9:12; 11:14; 12:3; 14:1, 14; 19:11, all of which fit into his categories.

17. E. Käsemann, "Sentences of Holy Law in the NT" and "The Beginnings of Christian Theology" in *New Testament Questions of Today* (London: SCM, 1969), pp. 66-107.

18. Klaus Berger, "Zu den sogenannten Sätzen Heiligen Rechts," *NTS* (October 1970) 10-40. But E. Schweizer had already anticipated Berger's arguments (which were anticipated in an unpublished paper by Georg-Christoph Kähler) and responded to them in "Law Observance and Charisma in Matt.," *NTS* (April 1970) 226-227. While David Hill's charge that Käsemann tended to establish his case primarily by assertion (*NTS* [April 1974] 272) has a considerable element of truth, it seems that the form discovered by him remains an indication of prophetic speech.

19. Käsemann, *NT Questions*, p. 76.

20. Hahn, "Sendschreiben," p. 382.

21. Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology II*, p. 37.

22. Cf. K. Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition* (New York: Scribners, 1969), pp. 189ff.

23. The visions contain the words of numerous speakers reported by John (the living creatures, angels, throne, eagles, etc.), but of the llX John uses ἐγώ in the person of the divine revealer, all except 1:8 and 22:6 clearly refer to the exalted Jesus as the speaker (cf. ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς, 22:16). The bulk of direct address material in the book, the letters to the 7 churches, are spoken in the person of the risen Jesus.

24. G. B. Caird, *A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine* (New York: Harper, 1966), p. 25.

25. Ultimately, of course, no purported oracle could be absolutely original. All such oracles are only new combinations of materials of which the seer was in some sense already aware, even if subconsciously so. This mostly subconscious process of the appropriation of images, words, concepts,

and materials is not what is in view here. I have in mind the more or less conscious taking up of materials somewhat firmly fixed in traditional forms, either oral or written, and sometimes with modification to make them more relevant to the author's purpose, then re-presentation of them as the present tense, direct address word of the Risen Lord speaking through the prophet. The line which separates these two kinds of materials is not sharp, but the distinction is nonetheless helpful.

26. To my knowledge there has been no comprehensive, thoroughly critical source analysis of the Apocalypse since Charles, who has too much scissors-and-paste in his approaches to Revelation as to other apocalyptic material, in which he was a pioneer scholar. We are presently much in need of an examination of the whole text of Revelation with our post-Charles insights in the disciplines of form criticism and redaction criticism, including the new perspective source analysis has when combined with these two disciplines. I have not seen Heinrich Kraft's new Kommentar in HNT series, nor Josephine Ford's work in AB. Hopefully they will fill a gap here.

27. Most of the parallels to the Gospels listed by Charles on pp. lxxxiv-lxxxvi we would now explain as similar derivations from the OT and/or early Christian testimonia, and/or awareness of the same oral traditions, rather than as literary dependence.

28. For example, 11:1-2 is frequently pointed to as an example of a Jewish apocalyptic oracle uttered during the last days of Jerusalem, e.g. by Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (New York: Scribners, 1971), p. 126.

29. To my knowledge no study of Revelation from this point of view exists. For suggestions in that direction see F. Hahn, "Sendschreiben," pp. 357ff, and P. T. Carrington, *The Early Christian Church*, Vol. I, p. 73.

30. R. H. Charles, G. B. Caird, Louis Vos, Hans Lilje.

31. R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York: Harper, 1964), p. 163.

32. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, p. 2.

33. E. Schweizer, *TDNT* VI, 449.

34. For elaboration, see L. Thompson, "Cult and Eschatology in the Gospel of John," *Journal of Religion* 49 (1969) 330-350. Cullmann is probably too enthusiastic about a valid point when he writes, "Hence the whole book of Revelation from the greeting of grace and peace in 1.4 to the closing prayer Come Lord Jesus in 22.20, and the benediction in the last verse, is full of allusions to the liturgical usages of the early community" (*Early Christian Worship* [London: SCM, 1953], p. 7).

35. Note how the angel "fades into" the exalted Christ and forms no independent link in the chain in the series 22:8 (angel) to v. 12 (ἐγώ = ὁ ἐρχόμενος ταχύ) to v. 16 (ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς).

36. B. W. Anderson's *Understanding the Old Testament* constantly points this out.

37. Studies of "The OT in the Apocalypse" which point out the extent and manner of John's use of scripture are numerous and well known. A representative bibliography to 1965 is given by Louis A. Vos, *The Synoptic Tradition in the Apocalypse* (Kampen, 1965). Heinrich Kraft's new *Kommentar*, which I have not yet seen, undoubtedly represents the view he expressed in an earlier article "dass die Johannesapokalypse nichts sein will als Auslegung des Alten Testaments" ("Zur Offenbarung des Johannes," *Theologische Rundschau* NS 38 [1973] 85).

38. David Hill, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Revelation of St. John," *NTS* (July 1972).

39. Every source which sheds any light on the prophetic phenomena as defined in the working definition should be utilized. This approach will bring together sources which embrace a variety of figures, functions, and characteristics, but no one of them will be the norm for the others, i.e. by defining what a prophet "really" or "typically" is. Once a source qualifies as a source of information about prophecy as defined above, it has an equal right with every other source to tell us about prophecy in its own time, place, and situation.

S 168

A SPECTRUM OF OPINION ON THE VALUE OF ACTS AS A SOURCE FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE LIFE AND THOUGHT OF PAUL: TRADITION AND REDACTION IN THE PAULINE PORTIONS OF ACTS

A. J. Mattill, Jr.

Winebrenner Theological Seminary, Findlay, Ohio 45840

Of what value is Acts in the study of Paul's life and work? To what extent can Acts be used in the reconstruction of Paul's thought? Or should Acts be used at all? To approach the real Paul should we disregard the Paul of Acts and restrict ourselves to the Pauline Epistles?

In the history of criticism, four major answers have been given to these questions. Each of these four solutions has necessarily entailed a study of Luke's composition, sources, traditions, and tendencies (the name "Luke" is used without prejudice as to authorship). We shall describe each of these positions generally and methodologically (A, B) and then show what valid information this methodology lays bare in Acts on the chief aspects of Paul's life and thought (C, D, E, F):

A. GENERAL DESCRIPTION, including methodology in respect to the use of Acts and Epistles and their relative value in the reconstruction of the historical Paul.

B. METHODOLOGY used to distinguish tradition from redaction in the Pauline portions of Acts.

C. CURSUS VITAE: place of birth (9:11; 21:39; 22:3; cf. 9:30; 11:25); the name "Saul" (7:58; 13:9); Roman citizenship 16:37-38; 22:25-29; 23:27; 25:10-12); Gamaliel's pupil (22:3); letters of extradition (9:2; 22:5; 26:10,12); locale of Paul's persecution of the church (9:13; 26:10); site of conversion (9:3; 22:6; 26:13); apostleship (14:4,14); journeys (9:26-30; 11:25-30; 12:25; 13:1-14:28; 15:36-18:22; 18:23-21:17; 23:31-35; 27:1-28:16); appeal to the Emperor (25:10-12,21,25; 26:32; 28:19); personality.

D. THE SUPERNATURAL: miracles which happen to Paul (9:1-9; 22:5-16; 26:12-18; 16:23-24; 28:3-6); miracles which Paul performs (13:6-12; 14:8-14; 15:12; 16:16-18; 19:6; 19:11-12; 20:9-12; 28:8-10); visions which Paul sees (16:9-10; 18:9-10; 22:17-21; 23:11; 27:23-24); visions which others see about Paul (9:10-17); prophecies uttered by Paul (20:23,25,29-30; 27:10,22); prophecies involving Paul (11:27-28; 21:4; 21:10-11); divine guidance (13:2,4; 16:6,7; 17:15D; 19:1D).

E. PRACTICES AND PRINCIPLES: Paul's custom of preaching first to Jews and when rejected to Gentiles (13:5,14,46; 14:1; 17:1-2,10,17; 18:4,6,19; 19:8-9; 28:28); Jewish rites (16:3; 18:18; 18:21D; 20:6; 20:16; 21:17-26); the Apostolic Decree (15:20,29; 16:4; 21:25); Paul's relationship to the Jerusalem church (9:27-30; 15:1-35).

F. DOCTRINE: Paul the Pharisee (23:1-10); Paul's speeches (13:10-11,16-41,46-47; 14:15-17; 17:22-31; 20:18-35; 22:1-21; 23:1-6; 24:10-21; 26:2-29; 28:17-20,25-28); one-verse summaries of Paul's speeches (9:20,22; 14:22,27; 15:12; 16:31; 17:18; 24:25; 28:31).

I. THE ONE-PAUL VIEW OF THE SCHOOL OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH[1]

A. GENERAL DESCRIPTION. In Acts and Epistles there is only one Paul, for the Paul of Acts is basically consistent with the Paul of the Epistles in principle and practice. The Paul of Acts is the Paul of the Epistles in attitude to the Law, the Jews, and manual labor, and in respect to divine calling and adaptability to all sorts and conditions of men and situations.

Acts and Epistles are reliable and sufficient sources for the study of Paul and they mutually illuminate one another. For knowledge of Paul's thought, Acts may be said to be secondary to Epistles, since Acts is at best one step removed from Paul's mind. Yet it is Acts which gives us the perspective for Paul. In fact, for Paul's external history, Acts is the leading and most productive source. It enables us to sketch his life-history in that it gives us a connected (but not complete) representation of his life from the stoning of Stephen until his Roman imprisonment. Without Acts the Epistles are incomplete. Thus to obtain a historically accurate picture of Paul we must combine the narratives of Acts and Epistles, determining as exactly as possible the order of events and the proper light in which to view them. Acts and Epistles are to be used simultaneously, not successively.

Undesigned coincidences between Acts and Epistles, similarities in thought and diction between Paul's speeches in Acts and Paul's Epistles, and confirmation from studies in geographical, historical, and archeological sources so establish the substantial truthfulness of Acts that Acts may be regarded as a witness of the first rank which is not in any significant degree unhistorical. The agreements between Acts and Epistles are so numerous that when Luke gives data which cannot be checked by the Epistles we may have confidence in these data, which, after all, come from Paul's own traveling companion, Luke the physician. Hence we may from the outset approach Acts with confidence in its picture of Paul.

If any discrepancies between Acts and Epistles do exist, they are simply due to gaps in Luke's knowledge. Tradition and redaction do not basically distort Acts' picture of Paul, for Luke as Paul's friend had reliable traditions, and his own editorial work and composition were checked by his desire to give an accurate historical report. Therefore both Luke's traditions and redaction are dependable and are indispensable for the study of Paul. Hence the task of separating tradition from redaction is not an urgent one when it comes to getting back to the real Paul.

B. METHODOLOGY. The linguistic character of Acts is so uniform that the linguistic criterion for the separation of sources is not decisive. Also of only limited value is the criterion of roughnesses, hiatuses, seams, clumsy or artificial transitions, and disharmonies, for these are found in all parts of Acts, and what may be impossible for a modern author is not

---

[1] J. R. Oertel, Paulus in der Apostelgeschichte (Halle: Schwabe, 1868); R. B. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles (London: Methuen, 1901); A. Wikenhauser, Die Apostelgeschichte und ihr Geschichtswert (NTAbh 8/3-5; Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1921); F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles. The Greek Text (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951); W. W. Gasque, A History of the Criticism of Acts (forthcoming).

necessarily true of an ancient one. Many unevennesses, moreover, may be traced to Luke's negligence and to scribal tampering with the text.

The most important datum of Acts, so far as tradition, redaction, and historical reliability of the Pauline portions are concerned, is the "we" of the "we-sections," which is best explained as Luke's announcement of his own eye- and ear-witnessship. Thus in Acts 16-28 Luke was in a favorable position to obtain information and was not forced to free composition or even to written sources but was able to rely almost exclusively upon oral tradition which he gathered during his own experiences and contacts with Paul and other witnesses and participants.

At the basis of the earlier Pauline units where Luke was not present, such as Paul's conversion, first missionary journey, and apostolic council (9:1-31; 13-14; 15:1-35), lie oral traditions from eyewitnesses. The uniformity of accounts (Paul's arrival, preaching to Jews, turning to Gentiles, success of his activity, and reason for departure; 9:19-25; 13:14-52; 17:1-10; 18:1-18) indicates Luke's absence, whereas the thoroughness, exactness, and diary-like nature of the we-sections suggest Luke's presence.

Clues as to the existence and identity of Luke's informants are found in references to such persons as Barnabas, James, Manaen, Mark, Mnason, Philip, Rhoda, Silas, Sopater, and Timothy. Details scattered throughout Luke-Acts point to oral information about the Herod family (Luke 3:1; 8:3; 9:9; 13:31-33; 23:6-12,15; Acts 4:27; 13:1; 25:13-26:32). The data of the Epistles (Rom 1:8; 1 Thes 1:2-8; 2 Cor 3:1-3, etc.) indicate that Luke did have access to traditions about the Apostles and early churches.[2]

This School, then, minimizes, if not denies, Luke's use of written sources in the Pauline parts of Acts. This extensive oral tradition, however, may have been fixed rather than fluid. But in either case, it is reliable material, for it is based on first-hand reports, is colored by transmission only in secondary points, and has not been distorted by Luke's interests and redaction. That Luke did not invent details is indicated by the fact that only twice does he disclose the definite number of the faithful (2:41; 4:4) but otherwise is indefinite in the absence of exact numbers in the tradition (13:43; 14:1,21; 16:5, etc.).

Yet Luke, though not using large written sources which themselves were intended for publication, such as the supposed "Acts of Paul," very probably used his own written notes of a non-literary nature, which he would have needed as memory-aids when writing in Rome: notes of speeches, lists of names (13:1), chronological notices, numbers, names of lesser persons, and such a wealth of details which would exclude total reliance upon memory. Luke expanded these notes with information from other trustworthy witnesses.

As for the Pauline speeches, difficult features, such as 23:5, point to reliable tradition which none would have invented. The proximity of several speeches to the we-sections implies earwitness tradition. The Pauline echoes in vocabulary, style, and thought do the same. Moreover, just as Luke in his Gospel is not unfaithful to sayings and speeches in his Markan source, so also we may suppose he has been no less faithful to

---

[2]J. Jervell, "The Problem of Tradition in Acts," in his Luke and the People of God (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972).

his speech sources in Acts.

On the other hand, the brevity of the speeches and their Lukan style indicates Lukan redaction. Yet Luke's omission of speeches at such appropriate occasions as 28:16 suggests he had no tradition for such speeches and freely composed none.

The isolation of tradition in Acts is complicated by the lack of any parallel to Acts comparable to the Synoptic parallels. Yet within Acts itself there are parallel reports. When these are compared, signs of tradition and redaction emerge:

(1) According to 9:26-30, Paul leaves Jerusalem because of a threat from Hellenists; according to 22:17-21 because Christ sends him to the Gentiles. 9:26-30 reflects a source which knew only of the murder attempt. Luke either heard Paul speaking at 22:17-21 or obtained his information from an earwitness. Hence Luke passes on both traditions without showing that the two can be reconciled.

(2) When Agabus' prophecy (21:11) is compared with 21:31-33, it is seen that events did not turn out exactly as prophesied: Paul was bound by Romans, not by Jews; he was not handed over by Jews but was taken from them by force. An inexact prophecy thus indicates reliable tradition reported accurately by Luke without conforming the source to later events also reported by him. He remained true to the wording of the prophecy which he himself heard or which was transmitted to him (so also 11:28, for the famine involved only Judea, not the whole world).

(3) Likewise Claudius Lysias' letter (23:26-30) contains two falsifications: Lysias' knowledge of Paul's Roman citizenship was a later discovery, not the cause of his rescue of Paul (23:27; 21:38; 22:29), and Lysias, because of secrecy surrounding Paul's removal to Caesarea, had not yet given the instructions of 23:30 to Paul's accusers (23:12-15,20-24). Here again Luke has faithfully reproduced his sources.

(4) For Felix, Paul must have spoken about the proceedings before the Sanhedrin in detail for Felix to understand, but Luke can shorten Paul's statement (24:20-21) because the reader already knows the situation (23:1-10). In other words, redaction is indicated when a brief summary (which is intelligible to the reader because he has already read the earlier parallel account) replaces what must have been a detailed explanation if the original audience was to understand.

(5) Similarly, at 28:17-20 Luke has summarized Paul's remarks for the sake of readers, who already are oriented about the course of events. The brevity shows that the wording is Luke's (note the similarity between 28:17b and 21:11). Actually, Paul was not delivered by the Jews to the Romans (Felix and Festus) but was snatched by the Roman soldiers from the Jews who wanted to lynch him and was secretly sent by Lysias to Caesarea. Nor did the Romans show willingness to release Paul before his appeal to Caesar (25:11) but only after it (25:18,25; 26:32). Thus Luke's hand is revealed when a later parallel account is a summary in Luke's style and is not in strict harmony with the earlier detailed accounts.

(6) There is at least one parallel between Gospel and Acts (Luke 23:50-53; Acts 13:27-29). According to the former, Joseph of Arimathea took Jesus down from the cross and buried him, whereas according to the latter, it was those living in Jerusalem and their rulers. Here Luke can report unchanged his tradition of Paul's speech because Luke knows his readers are more precisely informed of events.

In short, comparison with parallel accounts in Luke-Acts, relevant portions of the Pauline Epistles, and secular historical sources shows that Luke has faithfully reproduced an abundance of oral, eyewitness, reliable reports about Paul's life

and thought.

C. CURSUS VITAE. With this dependence upon the reliability of Luke's tradition and composition, the School of Historical Research finds no sufficient reason to doubt the data of Acts on such matters as Paul's birthplace, Roman citizenship, rabbinic education under Gamaliel, persecution of the church in Jerusalem, and appeal to the Emperor. The name "Saul" is undoubtedly correct, for papyrii indicate that double names were common, and according to Rom 11:1 and Phil 3:5 Paul was from the tribe of Benjamin, the tribe of King Saul. Gal 1:17 suggests that Paul's conversion was in or near Damascus. Paul did receive letters of extradition from the high priest, for in a certain sense the Sanhedrin exercised judicial authority over all Jewish congregations in the world, though direct authority only in Judea. How far a congregation would follow the direction of the Sanhedrin depended upon the good will of that particular congregation.

For Luke, Paul is not merely equal to the other Apostles (14:4,14), but he is the greatest of the Apostles, the church-planting missionary par excellence. According to the evidence of the Epistles, Acts sets forth accurately the itinerary and sequence of Paul's journeys.[3] Research shows that Luke is well-nigh without error in topographical, political, historical, and nautical details of these journeys, a precision which could be obtained only by an eyewitness.[4] So far as the course of Paul's mission, his missionary work, and the founding of churches are concerned, Acts surpasses Epistles in abundance of materials.

In respect to Paul's personality, the question is not, "Does Acts portray Paul in all his greatness?" but, "Is that which Luke reports true, or does he give a false picture of Paul?" Acts in fact is a marvellous illustration of Paul's self-knowledge as set forth in 1 Cor 15:10. " . . . the Paul of Acts is the Paul that appears to us in his own letters, in his ways and his thoughts, in his educated tone of polished courtesy, in his quick and vehement temper, in the extraordinary versatility and adaptability which made him at home in every society, moving at ease in all surroundings, and everywhere the centre of interest, whether he is the Socratic dialectician in the agora of Athens, or the rhetorician in its University, or conversing with kings and proconsuls, or advising in the council on shipboard, or cheering a broken-spirited crew to make one more effort for life. Wherever Paul is, no one present has eyes for any but him."[5]

In Acts the figure of Paul rises clearly above that of other persons. Paul is sketched much sharper and more individually than Peter. The reader receives a rather clear, concrete picture of Paul. Acts vividly portrays the fanatical hate of

---

[3]T. H. Campbell, "Paul's 'Missionary Journeys' as Reflected in His Letters," JBL 74 (1955) 80-87. "Certainly Paul's letters are our primary sources for a reconstruction of his career, whereas Acts is at best a secondary source except at those points where the author is writing as an eye-witness or using the journal of an eye-witness" (81). This School frequently identifies Acts 11:27-30 with Gal 2:1-10.

[4]See A. N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963).

[5]W. M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895) 22.

Paul the persecutor, and more concretely than do the Epistles. Against this dark background is contrasted the enthusiastic, sacrificial love of Paul for Christ and his work after his conversion. One sees clearly Paul's towering significance, his inexhaustible zeal, and his no mean success as a missionary. In the Miletus address is the deepest revelation of the secret of Paul's soul: the indefatigable pastor living only for his flock. 20:36-38 is "a picture drawn with S. Luke's inimitable command of pathos, which reveals the apostle's wonderful power in attracting personal affection and devotion." Hints of Paul's frequent depression (2 Cor 1:8-9; 2:12-13) are found at Acts 17:15; 18:4; 20:1; 23:11; 28:15.[6]

D. THE SUPERNATURAL. Paul's supernatural experiences are possible and credible, else Paul could not have appealed to them himself (Rom 15:17-19; 1 Cor 12:9-10,28; 16:7; 2 Cor 11:21-12:12; Gal 2:2; 3:5). A great religion does not establish itself in Asia without marvellous preliminaries. Luke as a physician was especially qualified to apply the correct standard to the miracle accounts which he received and to seek out trustworthy authorities.

E. PRACTICES AND PRINCIPLES. Paul's preaching in synagogues is in line with Gal 2:8-10 (geographically interpreted); Rom 1:16; 9:3; 1 Cor 9:20; and 2 Cor 11:24 (Paul's submission to synagogue punishment, which suggests that Paul not only preached in synagogues but also submitted to the Law), and provided him contact with Gentiles who frequented synagogues. Acts 16:13 (we-section) indicates that the missionaries had sought in vain for a synagogue.

Because of Jewish and Christian strains in his own thought and because of his law of liberty and love, Paul could permit Jewish Christians, including himself, to observe the Law (freely without the intent of winning divine favor) and yet he could defend freedom from the Law for Gentile Christians. Gal 5:11 suggests that there must have been something in Paul's preaching and/or practice which gave rise to the charge that he was preaching circumcision.

Paul did approve, circulate, and enforce the Apostolic Decree, for it was only temporary and localized for a special emergency. Since it was not permanent and universal Paul did not mention it in his Epistles. Some members of the Historical School would contend that the Decree is not mentioned in Galatians because Galatians was written before the Council of Acts 15.

The harmony pictured in Acts between Paul and the original Apostles and James is in accord with the Epistles, which also show Paul and the Twelve at one in faith, love, and proclamation. The conflict over the Law was between Paul and the Judaizers. Neither Acts nor Epistles depict Paul as subservient to Jerusalem but rather as in brotherly communion with one another.

F. DOCTRINE. In saying, "I am a Pharisee" (23:6), Paul is as little untrue as in Phil 3:5. Paul reduces the formal charge of blaspheming the Law to the great principle at issue, the resurrection of Christ (23:6). Although the Pharisees (23:9) granted that a spirit had appeared to Paul, they would not

---

[6]Wikenhauser, Apostelgeschichte, 285-86; Rackham, Acts, 300-301, 324, 360, 370-71, 396, 435, 498.

have acknowledged that spirit to have been the Messiah.

The speeches of Paul in Acts are not verbatim reports but are based upon reliable tradition (I. B.), summaries of speeches given by Paul on the occasions indicated, compressed into Luke's style but Pauline in subject matter and line of thought, trustworthy reproductions of what Paul actually said. In Acts, as in Epistles, Jesus' atoning death appropriated through faith is the center of the Gospel (13:28-39; 20:28).

Luke's dependable tradition and redaction, then, immeasurably enrich our knowledge of the course of Paul's life, the role of the supernatural in his experience, his participation in Jewish rites, and his theology.

II. THE LOPSIDED-PAUL VIEW OF THE SCHOOL OF RESTRAINED CRITICISM[7]

A. GENERAL DESCRIPTION. Although there is no absolute divergence between the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the Epistles, each alone is a one-sided Paul. Since the complete Paul is to be found neither in Epistles nor Acts, Paul ought no longer to be judged so exclusively by his own writings. Acts fills the gaps left by the Epistles, and there are dozens of places where Acts stands the test of the Epistles. Often we can learn more clearly from Acts than from the Epistles, though the facts in Acts may be frequently deduced from the Epistles. No one yet has been able to draw a convincing portrait of Paul from his Epistles alone.

Since Paul was a party-man in conflict, there is a possibility that Acts is correct when it contradicts the Epistles.[8] The Epistles, however, are the primary source, a control and check on Acts, and are to be preferred, when rightly interpreted, if they stand over against Acts, which is a secondary, generally lest trustworthy source, yet containing much valuable material, which is especially useful when corroborated by the Epistles or when found in the we-sections of Acts. If we pos-

---

[7]M. Schneckenburger, Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte (Bern: Fischer, 1841); A. Harnack, Luke the Physician (New York: Putnam, 1908); The Acts of the Apostles (New York: Putnam, 1909); The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels (New York: Putnam, 1911); G. H. C. McGregor, The Acts of the Apostles (Interpreter's Bible; Nashville: Abingdon, 1954); J. Munck, The Acts of the Apostles (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1967).

[8]E. Meyer (Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums [Berlin: Cotta, 1921-23]; cited by McGregor, Acts, 15) feels that "even when there is conflict with the Pauline epistles, Luke must sometimes be preferred. On theological grounds it has been judged that Paul must always be right. But historically speaking--well, what sort of a portrait could be painted on the basis of preferring, let us say, Napoleon's ideal picture of himself to that drawn by an intelligent onlooker?" More recently, J. Parkes (Judaism and Christianity [Chicago: University of Chicago, 1948] 85) contends that the Epistles are of primary importance, yet, accepting the general accuracy of Paul's defense speeches in Acts, we shall not rightly understand the Epistles "until we have found an interpretation consistent with Paul's own belief that he was throughout a loyal and observant Jew."

sessed only Acts we would be essentially worse off than if we had only the Epistles.

Acts' lopsided picture of Paul is grounded in Acts' apologetic purposes (such as making Paul acceptable to Jewish Christians) and Paul's own defective self-portrait grows out of his polemics (such as proving Gentiles free from the Law, when he naturally omits or tones down his own Jewishness). Yet Luke's picture of Paul is disfigured by no unworthy trait.

Luke had many good traditions available, traditions close to events, traditions which he on the whole transmitted faithfully. But his selection from them and his redaction of them have been affected by his purposes, and he used his artistic licence to adapt them, rearrange them, and touch them up. Hence both tradition and redaction must be used cautiously. We must avoid contempt for what Acts does offer us and also shun forced harmonization of Acts and Epistles.

B. METHODOLOGY. Luke's prologue (Luke 1:1-4), plus his use of Mark, make it a priori probable that written sources lie behind Acts. But since vocabulary and style are everywhere the same, they are not a criterion for distinguishing these sources. Discrepancies, inaccuracies, imprecisions, and gaps are also an inadequate criterion, for they are found in all parts of Acts and indicate Luke's negligence. Thus it is impossible to analyze the unit of 15:36-28:31 into sources. But it is probably not based upon written sources, for Luke as Paul's companion had access to oral reports of himself and others, such as Aristarchus, Gaius, James, Mark, Paul, Philip and family, Silas, Timothy, and Titus, reports which Luke himself first reduced to writing. References to obscure persons are hints of sources. Luke used personal notes or his own travel journal for events when he was with Paul and completed these notes with information from other witnesses.

The we-sections are the key to the source analysis of the Pauline portions of Acts. Detailed linguistic studies show that the we-sections are the most Lukan parts of Luke-Acts, which means that here Luke is writing in his own style, reporting his own experiences, whereas in the rest of Acts he is dependent on oral and written tradition, which markedly influences his style and vocabulary. As expected, then, the nearest in style to the we-sections are those parts of the last half of Acts in which "we" does not occur, for here Luke had neither written sources nor fixed oral tradition and hence could let himself go. Luke's interests, such as medicine and Paul's practice of going first to synagogues, also appear in the we-sections. Thus on the basis of style and interests it is plain that Luke did not edit and incorporate an original document from someone else into his work.

9:1-30 appears to be a separate Pauline source, based upon the criterion of person (in contrast to setting). Or possibly since 26:12-18 is more easily harmonized with Galatians 1 (for the commission of 26:16-18 is given directly to Paul by Christ and not through Ananias) it approximates most nearly the story in Luke's source and constitutes the original out of which Luke built up the other two accounts (9:1-9; 22:5-16).

According to the criterion of setting, 12:25-15:35 may be part of a Jerusalem-Antiochean source, partially, if not wholly, stemming from Silas.

Chs. 13-14 may be another special Pauline source, a written document, as indicated by the fullness and accuracy of detail, the register of names (13:1), the mention of Barnabas and Saul as if for the first time (13:1), and the change of Saul's

name to Paul (13:9).

The letter of 15:23-29 is Lukan in style, but some such encyclical may have been issued and Luke followed the outline of the original. Since Luke thinks of the Decree as applicable to all Gentile Christians (16:4; 21:25), the fact that he limited the address of the letter to Syria and Cilicia (15:23) proves he was influenced by a fixed tradition.

Since Luke loves nothing better than to relate wonders, he would certainly include miracles described in his sources. Thus proof that Luke kept close to his sources is found in the fact that the most sober narratives in Acts are not in the we-sections but in Paul's visits to Thessalonica-Berea (17:1-15), Athens (17:16-34), Corinth (18:1-17), and Jerusalem (21:19-40), where Luke did not add miracles.

An example of Luke's own share in composition is seen in Acts 21:25, which gives the impression that Paul hears of the Decree for the first time, an erroneous impression gained because the statement is not James' but Luke's to the reader to exonerate Paul from any suggestion he is implicating Gentile Christians in the minutiae of Jewish ceremonial.

Felix' question about the province to which Paul belongs (21:34) is an example of good tradition. Luke can have had no possible reason for recording this detail unless he was himself present (oral tradition) or had access to the papers in the case (written tradition). Similarly, the letter of 23:26-30 was perhaps heard by Luke in court. It is in Luke's style, for the original was in Latin, but Luke gives the general tenor, just what we would expect from a subordinate (Claudius Lysias) seeking to place his own conduct in the best light.

28:30-31 is Lukan redaction, for it has the appearance of a postscript and is in Luke's style, agreeing in construction with Luke's other statements concerning the duration and character of Paul's ministry in large centers (11:26; 18:11; 19:9,10; 24:23,27).

C. CURSUS VITAE. With its methodological confidence in Luke's general trustworthiness, the School of Restrained Criticism finds no difficulty with Acts' data on the place of Paul's birth, his Roman citizenship, the locale of Paul's persecution of the church, and the site of his conversion (on 9:1-9; 22:5-16; and 26:12-18 see II. B.). Hellenistic Jews had two names and often these two were as much alike as Saul and Paul; a Roman citizen was even more likely to have two names. Paul was Gamaliel's pupil but Paul did not mention him in his letters because the name would have meant nothing to Gentile Christians. 1 Mac 15:15 shows that the Romans had granted to the high priest the right of extraditing to Jerusalem Jewish malefactors who had fled abroad; this would cover Christians who had fled from Jerusalem to Damascus; certainly not enough is known about the matter of such letters of authority to reject Luke's account.

As for Paul's apostleship, Luke wrote to defend Paul's apostolic claims, and to place him on an equality with the Twelve. Paul is an apostle not only in the sense of one sent out as a missionary (14:4,14) but also in the sense of one who has seen the Lord and has been commissioned directly by him (22:21; 26:17-18). Luke, like Paul (Rom 15:19; 2 Cor 12:12; Gal 3:5) regards Paul's signs and wonders as a part of his legitimation as an apostle.

The general outline of Paul's missionary career in Acts is confirmed by coincidences between Acts and Epistles. Yet certain readjustments may have to be made (11:27-30 and 15:1-35 may be doublets of one visit, or 11:27-30 may equal Gal 2:1-10).

That Luke stuck to tradition and did not invent Pauline trips is suggested by Luke's silence about the period between Paul's conversion and the first missionary journey (see also II.B.).

Paul appealed to the Emperor because he feared imminent conviction by Festus and because he desired not to be handed back to Jewish jurisdiction.

Although Acts is not a mirror enabling us to gaze into the very soul of Paul, the Paul of Acts is not a colorless personality but drawn from life by an intimate friend (II. B.). Paul's frankness and self-assertion, for example, crop out in 15:36-41; 16:37; 22:28; 23:3; 27:21. His love of his churches is shown in 20:18-35, and throughout Paul's story we see his peculiar combination of mystical and practical elements.

D. THE SUPERNATURAL. An a priori denial of miracles is refuted by Paul himself (2 Cor 12:12). Moreover, the we-passages of Acts manifest interest in the miraculous as does the rest of Luke-Acts (on Luke's restraint in reporting miracles see II. B.). In a favorable environment the growth of legend may begin with the earliest reports of what happened. We cannot expect a credulous physician endowed with spiritual gifts of healing to draw a clear line between science and magic. Cures by suggestion are recorded at all times. Since Luke is as likely to have believed in miracles as a later redactor, the presence of the supernatural in the narrative is no proof it is not primitive and authentic. We may distinguish differing degrees of credibility, from miracles of the first degree (the less spectacular miracles of the we-sections) to those of the second degree (chs. 1-15).

E. PRACTICES AND PRINCIPLES. Acts' description of Paul's relations with Judaism is in essential agreement with Paul's Epistles. As for preaching first to Jews, there is no basis for rejecting this feature of Acts nor of limiting Paul's ministry to Gentiles (Rom 1:16; 9:1-3; 10:1; 1 Cor 9:19-23). Paul's Jewish practices in Acts do not go beyond what is consistent with Paul's principles (1 Cor 9:20). In indifferent matters, considerations of practical wisdom disposed Paul to a practical accommodation to the adherents of the Law. Since Paul with his doctrine of the status quo (1 Cor 7:18-24) did not contend for freedom from the Law for Jewish Christians, he could perform Jewish functions with a clear conscience. A person of so many sides as Paul could combine a number of attitudes and practices which to us seem irreconcilable.

Since the Decree was not a new imposition upon Gentile Christians (for most of Paul's Gentile converts were "God-fearers" who were already observing these rules from Lev 17-18), but the charter of liberty for Gentile Christians against the demands of the Judaizers, Paul circulated the Decree among his churches because he hoped it would be a more effective defense against the Judaizers than his own authority. Some of this School find that the obstacles clustered around the Decree are removed if the moral interpretation of Codex D is accepted. (On 15:23-29; 16:4; and 21:25 see II. B.)

Acts' picture of Paul's peaceful but subordinate relationships with the primitive Jerusalem church is substantially correct. There was basic harmony between Paul and the Twelve, who should not be identified with the "false brethren" (Gal 2:4). The struggle was not between Paul and his followers and Peter and his followers, but between the Judaizers, on the one hand, and Paul and the Gentile Christians, on the other. Paul in Galatians exaggerated his independence of Jerusalem, for all

Christendom, including Paul, recognized the authority of the Mother Church; Paul went up to Jerusalem, not Jerusalem down to Antioch to meet Paul (Gal 2:1-10). A balanced concept of Paul's independence includes Jerusalem as the court of ultimate appeal for all Christians.

F. DOCTRINE. As for Paul and the Pharisees (23:1-10), historical fact has been altered only slightly because of Luke's tendency of making Paul inoffensive to Jewish Christians. It is possible that Paul spoke as here indicated, for he could claim to be a Pharisee just as he could represent himself as a worshiper of the unknown God, and he could say that he was charged concerning the resurrection even as Luther declared he was questioned concerning Christ. Paul and his fellow Jewish Christians were the only true Pharisees, because they recognized Jesus as Messiah, who alone was able to effect the resurrection. This minimization of Paul's divergence from the Pharisees, if unauthentic, must have come from a later time, when there was a rapprochement between Christianity and Pharisaism. But as time passed there was a mutual desire to stress the gulf between Jews and Christians. Hence the probability is that Paul himself used this line of defense.

Although Paul's speeches are designed to show Paul as a pious Israelite, they are not Luke's free inventions, for he had heard Paul speak, not with full comprehension, but well enough to ensure a relative Paulinism. The Epistles indicate Paul would have spoken to Jews, Gentiles, and converts in substance as in the discourses at Antioch, Athens, and Miletus, and the speeches of chs. 22-28 must be based upon a tradition that seemed trustworthy to Luke, else one speech would have sufficed. Paul was not so "Pauline" as is often supposed.[9]

This abundant data of Acts, which is anchored in good traditions and on the whole faithfully transmitted, enables us, when we properly check it by the Epistles, cautiously to round out the lopsided Paul found in Acts or Epistles alone and to construct a well-proportioned Apostle.

III. THE TWO-PAUL VIEW OF THE SCHOOL OF CREATIVE EDIFICATION[10]

A. GENERAL DESCRIPTION. In Acts and Epistles there are two Pauls, the historical Paul of the authentic Epistles and the legendary Paul of Acts. These two different figures are basically inconsistent with each other, and all attempts at reconciliation are futile. Acts annihilates Paul's peculiar Gospel and gives us a new sketch of a new Paul, so that for Paul's ideas, personality, journeys, and chronology, the Epistles constitute our only primary, reliable source.

---

[9]For similarities, especially in eschatology, between Paul in Acts and Epistles, see P. Borgen, "From Paul to Luke . . . ," CBQ 31 (1969) 168-82; and my "Naherwartung . . . ," CBQ 34 (1972) 276-93.

[10]E. Zeller, The Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles (2 vols.; Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1875-76); J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul (Nashville: Abingdon, 1950); P. Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts" (1950), Studies in Luke-Acts (SLA) (eds. L. Keck and J. Martyn; Nashville:

The credibility of Acts must be judged by the Epistles, and when so judged Acts yields no weighty, reliable information about Paul. We can by no means be certain that a report in Acts about Paul corresponds to the facts, even if such a report is in itself consistent and seems to offer a precise report. Even a clear hint in the Epistles is of more value than the most explicit statement in Acts which contradicts it. Acts is so remote from Paul in theology and chronology that it cannot be used to correct the Epistles. Acts even incorporates anti-Pauline traditions. Hence Acts can be trusted only at such points as are directly confirmed by the Epistles.

The historical Paul can be found only by disregarding the Lukan Paul. Paul must be redeemed from Acts by examining the Epistles entirely apart from Acts, that is, Epistles and Acts are to be used successively, not simultaneously, and are not to be synthesized. No one in Galatia or Corinth would have recognized in Acts the Paul they had heard or read. Insofar as attempts to enhance the historical reputation of Acts are successful, there inevitably follows a corresponding depreciation of the historical value of the Pauline Epistles, as is illustrated by the School of Advanced Criticism (IV.).

The reason for the unhistorical nature of the Lukan Paul is found in (a) Luke's conscious tendency to Petrinize or to neutralize the real Paul, or (b) in Luke's non-tendentious attitude toward tradition and composition, whereby he, upon the basis of fragmentary traditions, uses his imagination to create a fictional Paul after the image of his own epoch for the edification of the church, for what is historical cannot be edifying.

In short, Luke's own creativity in structure and content is so great that Acts is of little or no use in the study of Paul. Tradition and redaction in Acts have produced a legendary Paul in opposition to the historical Paul of the Epistles. Tradition is at a minimum and redaction at a maximum, and both are historically unreliable.

B. METHODOLOGY. The basic methodological principle of this School was set forth by Zeller, who, after noting that vocabulary and style are insecure evidence for sources in view of the linguistic unity of Acts, continues:

> Similarly, little can be proved by the connection, or want of connection, of individual paragraphs with those preceding and following, because on [the] one hand a fixed plan pervades the whole; on the other, the abruptness of a narrative may be owing, not only to the use of a fresh source, but quite as likely to omissions in the material derived from it, or from the intervention of free fiction in the midst of traditional material. The surest index is still the purport and tendency of the individual paragraphs. The more conspicuously a

---

Abingdon, 1966) 33-50; E. Haenchen, "Tradition und Komposition in der Apostelgeschichte," ZTK 52 (1955) 205-25; "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity," SLA 258-78; The Acts of the Apostles (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971); J. C. Hurd, Jr., The Origin of 1 Corinthians (New York: Seabury, 1965); "Pauline Chronology and Pauline Theology," Christian History and Interpretation (eds. W. Farmer et al.; Cambridge: University Press, 1967) 225-48; M. S. Enslin, Reapproaching Paul (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972).

> speech or a story represents our author's peculiar standpoint and serves the peculiar object of his book, and the slighter the probability of its historically faithful transmission, so much the more is there to recommend the hypothesis that it proceeds from our author himself; the less it can be explained from these points of view, the more are we obliged to fall back on extraneous sources. But neither in this way is a certain result always to be attained, for it is also possible that the author metamorphosed traditional material from his own standpoint, and employed it for his own object; hence the results so obtained must always be very uncertain in detail.[11]

As applied to the we-sections by Zeller, this principle means that the exactness of description and incomparable picturesqueness of the narrative cannot be explained by the object of Acts and therefore the we-sections are a record in the first person (by Luke) incorporated into Acts by the final author, with the following additions and revisions which cannot be traced to an eyewitness: the expulsion of the demon (16:16), questionable because of its connection with the miracle of 16:25-34; the raising of Eutychus (20:9-12), which too much resembles OT restorations; 20:16, which is open to suspicion of unhistorical pragmatism; 27:21-26, which can be omitted without interrupting the context and which appears to be a tendentious vaticinium ex eventu; similarly 27:34, which is in suspicious affinity with Luke 21:18; the incredible miracles at Melita (28:8-10); and the improbable saying of the aborigines (28:6).[12] Pointers to tradition and redaction, then, are the presence of the miraculous, pragmatism, interruption of the context, post eventum prophecies, and parallels to other OT and NT accounts.

Others of this School have found the word "we" in itself insufficient to determine a we-source and have posited an itinerary-document which contained names of stations where Paul stopped on his journeys, notes of his journeyings and activities in evangelizing, a document which served as a framework for 13:1-14:28; 15:35-21:16. Still others reject the itinerary theory, for the "we" is the author's attempt to give the reader the impression he himself is sharing in the events.

Zeller's basic principle has issued in what we may term the "spin-off" theory of composition: from his theological ideas, interests, data of Paul's Epistles, and fragmentary traditions of various dates and origins, Luke spins off new details, stories, speeches, scenes, and successions of scenes, indeed, an apostolic history, for the edification of the church. This theory is, of course, opposed to the view that Luke's composition was based on personal experience or was limited to uniting extensive traditions (written or oral) which were really "mini-Acts" before Acts. Since the Apostles and other Christian preachers did not proclaim their own words and deeds there were no synoptic-like traditions about the Apostles and early churches.[13]

A corollary of this spin-off theory is that Lukan redaction and composition are found where we can identify a spin-off,

---

[11]Zeller, Acts, II 302-3.

[12]Zeller, Acts, II 318-19.

[13]Haenchen, Acts, 84, rejects Bultmann's 1959 theory of an extensive Antiochene source.

at the basis of which may be a reliable tradition, if this basis agrees with the Epistles, or an unreliable (or even anti-Pauline) tradition, if it disagrees with the Epistles. Clues as to the existence of spin-offs are found where one detects Luke's ideas and interests, especially in conjunction with disagreements with Epistles or where Acts supplements Epistles, or where there are variations between parallel accounts in Acts.

Some general results of the spin-off theory follow:

There is no detail in Acts of Paul's pre-Damascus days which Luke could not have spun off from the Epistles (this approach is simpler than the quest for sources). Luke's fertile imagination discovers answers to his questions by making explicit what was at best implicit in the Epistles (Enslin).

Acts' pattern of three missionary journeys, each of which has its beginning and ending in Antioch or Jerusalem, is a spin-off from Luke's concept that Paul works under the authority of the Twelve, a spin-off which distorts Luke's sources (Knox).

Luke's statements about travel in his itinerary are reliable, but the episodes attached to this itinerary are of lesser value, their connection to a particular city of still less value, and their connection with a particular visit to a particular city of the lowest value of all (Hurd). Redaction is indicated by artificiality: adventures (which may be based upon traditions of questionable historicity) occur on Paul's first visit to a city.

Paul's miracles are spin-offs from Luke's idea that Paul was a holy man who must have performed wonders.

Paul's speeches, with their striking resemblances to the speeches of Peter and Stephen, their contradictions to Paul's theology, and their absence of Pauline peculiarities of doctrine and language, are spin-offs from Luke's own tendency and theology, occasionally incorporating kerygmatic and liturgical formulae.

In connection with the speeches, we especially see Lukan composition expressed through three literary devices:

(1) Luke imparts information to his readers, not by his own didactic exposition, but by putting it into the mouths of his protagonists. Pointers to this technique of composition are (a) the probability that the information is directed toward the reader, not the original audience; (b) the improbability that the speaker would have spoken thus; and (c) variations in parallel accounts. Examples: the exchange between the Lord and Ananias (9:10-16) is a spin-off from Luke's desire to inform readers of the sudden change in Paul's life; 22:17-21 is a spin-off from Luke's wish to tell readers that Paul's Gentile mission is not of human but of divine origin.

(2) Interruptions (17:32; 22:22; 23:7; 26:24): Luke leaves what is important until his intended end of the speech and emphasizes it by means of the contradiction of the listeners.

(3) A Greek proverb in Jesus' mouth (26:14), which is a spin-off from Luke's intention to show the reader how completely Paul is in Jesus' power.

We now list some results of the spin-off theory in reference to specific passages:

9:1-9; 22:5-16; 26:12-18.--The three accounts of Paul's conversion are so similar that they cannot be traced back to different sources but are spin-offs from Gal 1:13-16; 2 Cor 11:32, and ecclesiastical tradition that Paul was healed of blindness caused by Christ's appearance at Damascus and was baptized by Ananias.

9:3; 22:6; 26:13.--Luke's statements about the site of Paul's conversion and the locale of his persecution of the

church (9:13; 26:10) are spin-offs from Luke's conception of Paul's life as centered in Jerusalem, spin-offs which distort Luke's sources (Knox).

11:27-30.--This journey is not based on history or legend but is a spin-off from the following: Luke's interest in appeasing Jewish Christians by interrupting Paul's years of absence from the center of the theocracy; similarities to other accounts (ch. 15, visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem; collection visit; 21:10, Agabus; knowledge of famine under Claudius). Hence arises the principle:

> When a record is thus related to other accounts, it justifies the suspicion that it arose by doubling the same event; and if this same record, by its inconsistency with a better accredited one (that of the Epistle to the Galatians), bears the negative mark of inaccuracy on its front, the suspicion is raised by such coincidence to a high degree of probability.[14]

13:1-14:28.--As judged by Lukan style and resemblances to other passages in Acts, this unit originally "must have been separate notes, perhaps taken from a more comprehensive work, from which he [Luke] spun out the record before us."[15]

15:1-35.--Luke's account of the Council is a spin-off from Gal 2:1-10, in Luke's language, with Luke's speeches and Luke's resolutions.

16:9.--Paul's vision at Troas is a spin-off from Luke's theory that the spread of Christianity was controlled by revelation.

16:19-40.--This prison narrative was spun out of a general notice like 1 Thes 2:2.

18:19a.--"And he left them there" points to a written source, which originally read, "and he left them there, but he himself sailed away from Ephesus" (19a,21b). Thus 19b-21a stands out as a spin-off from Luke's aim to make Paul the founder of the church at Ephesus. Hence a roughness in the text may point to a written tradition, and a Lukan interest (such as magnifying Paul) in conjunction with that roughness may indicate redaction.

25:14-26:32.--This scene is not an eyewitness report of Paul's companion but Luke's free spin-off, untrammelled by tradition, from Luke's desire to prove that Roman authorities treated Christian missionaries kindly and acknowledged them to be politically harmless.

We have noted that the School of Creative Edification finds anti-Pauline traditions in Acts. These include: The story of Ananias (9:10-19) is the kind of story against which Paul protests in his Epistles. 9:20-22 is directed against Galatians ("straightway" of 9:20 is aimed at Gal 1:16; "destroyed" of 9:21 is influenced by Gal 1:23). 9:26-30; 26:20 is a tradition of Paul's opponents in Galatia, who held Paul was dependent upon Jerusalem in his preaching, that all that Paul taught correctly he owed to the Apostles in Jerusalem, and thus was not a true apostle, but from the start was under the moral protection of the original Apostles. Luke does not think of Paul as a witness of the resurrection but places in his mouth words which Paul himself would have repudiated (13:31). 15:1-35 represents an

---

[14]Zeller, Acts, II 15.
[15]Zeller, Acts, II 321.

understanding of Paul's relationship to the Jerusalem apostolate which Paul himself corrects in Gal 2:1-10. 16:3 is a slanderous rumor, perhaps the very one referred to in Gal 5:11 (thus Luke hardly invented 16:3 but naively received a tradition from Paul's Judaistic opponents). In Acts Paul preaches the child-like milk of a non-sacramental Jewish Christianity calling men to repent, to be baptized, to believe Jesus has risen, and to await his return, whereas the genuine Paul put a curse upon anyone who should preach such a Gospel (Gal 1:6-9). The entire Acts is the kind of letter of recommendation which Paul scorned (2 Cor 3:1).

We have observed that the School of Historical Research and, to a lesser extent, the School of Restrained Criticism stress the historical study of antiquities (geography, history, archeology), whereas the School of Creative Edification is characterized more by critical speculation. Possibly the clearest example of this methodological contrast is Ramsay's defense of the account of Paul's release from prison (16:19-34) upon the basis of his (Ramsay's) knowledge of Aegean earthquakes, Turkish prisons, and the Oriental mind, as compared with Haenchen's conclusion that "an earthquake able to shake off a prisoner's chains has never yet occurred. On the other hand, the quaking of a house as a divine response to prayer had been told frequently in pagan Hellenism."[16]

C. CURSUS VITAE. Further implications of this School's methodology surface as we look at the various aspects of Paul's life. Tarsus as the place of Paul's birth and Saul as his other name are historical, for Luke had no reason on the basis of his interests in Jerusalem, the Twelve, and the political innocence of Christianity to invent them, nor had Paul any need to mention them (Knox). We may infer, then, that these references to Tarsus and Saul are based on reliable tradition and not upon Luke's unreliable imagination. When details in Acts are not found in the Epistles and do not conflict with the Epistles and did not grow out of Luke's interests, and when there is no reason why Paul should have mentioned them, then we have reliable tradition.

On the other hand, Tarsus as the place of Paul's birth may be regarded as Luke's invention based on Gal 1:21 and the name Saul as deduced from Phil 3:5; Rom 11:1 (Enslin; see III. B.).

Paul's Roman citizenship is doubted or denied on the grounds that Paul does not mention it (cf. 2 Cor 11:25), it fits Luke's conception of the political inocuousness of Christianity and the cosmopolitan character of Paul, and it would mean that this tentmaker came from one of the greatest families in the East.

Paul's study at the feet of Gamaliel is suspected or denied because it serves Luke's interests; Paul would be expected to mention it; Paul thinks differently from the Tannaim; and it is simply Luke's explanation of why the Tarsan Jew was in Jerusalem at the time of Stephen's death. The historicity of the letters of extradition is improbable, being Luke's conjecture to explain why Paul was in Damascus at the time of his conversion. Paul did not persecute the church in Jerusalem and Judea, and his conversion occurred in Damascus, not as he approached Damascus. Here there is a clear conflict between Acts and Galatians

---

[16]Ramsay, Paul, 222-23; Haenchen, "Acts as Source Material," 273.

(1:22-23) and therefore Acts must be rejected out of hand.

Acts has either removed Paul's apostolic office altogether or does not regard him as an apostle of equal standing with the Twelve. He could not meet the requirements of 1:21, and is not called an apostle except in 14:4,14, which probably means that Paul was a missionary sent out by the church at Antioch (13:1-3), not by Christ himself.

As spin-offs (III. B.), Paul's journeys as depicted in Acts must either be radically rearranged, so as to eliminate doublets, or be declared largely unhistorical (there may be a historical fact lying behind this or that event, but the narratives are Luke's conscious creations).

Although we cannot be entirely certain about Paul's appeal to the Emperor, there is no reason to distrust this detail.

The Paul of Acts is only a generalized apostolic figure, lacking the distinctive features of the real Paul. Without Acts we would know as much about the personality and thought of Paul as with Acts. For any knowledge we can gain of Paul's ideas and inward aspects of his personality his Epistles constitute our only reliable source. The informed student simply disregards Acts as a source for Paul's inner life. The Paul of Acts is quite a different man from the Paul of the Epistles.

> If the Acts of the Apostles is really correct in its portraiture of St Paul, if this colourless rhetorical representative of average Christianity is the genuine Paul, then I can no longer resist the baleful attraction of the hypothesis proclaimed by the school of Leyden: that Paul the great epistolary writer is a later fiction, an ideal form, which an unknown artist has elevated upon eagle's wings out of the lowly circumstances of the real Paul into heavenly heights . . . Those, however, for whom the Paul of the four great epistles abides the most certain, the most unimpeachable thing in the whole New Testament, must describe the portraiture of St Paul in the Acts as woefully deficient and poor, just because it preserves absolutely nothing of the peculiar characteristics of the man: and if one who for many years was a companion, a friend, indeed a fellow-worker of St Paul--as was St Luke--in spite of the multitude of reminiscences which even in unimportant matters stood at his disposal, and in a writing where a picture of the genuine Paul was above all things called for--if such a one could not introduce into his portrait even one of the grand and noble characteristics of the Apostle, then indeed it is altogether vain to expect, or even to cherish a modest hope, that the Gospel historians, who depend entirely upon the testimony of others, present us with anything more than notices concerning external events in the life of our Lord and an artificial scheme of His ministry: how can we expect to receive from them genuine words from the lips of Jesus, or to feel through them the breath of His spirit pass upon us! If one of St Paul's most intimate friends tells us (Acts xxi. 20 ff.), without the slightest hesitation, that the Apostle when in Jerusalem was ready, merely for the sake of peace and by a premeditated and elaborate act of hypocrisy, to convince the Jews that he walked now as before in strict observance of the Law; and if this piece of information, alleged to be given by a friend who must have known St Paul's real attitude towards the Law,

> deserves to be described as good tradition, then all trust in an intelligent transmission of actual history in the Primitive Church sinks to nothing, and we can no longer oppose with confidence the negation even of the best-attested statements.[17]

D. THE SUPERNATURAL. Since miracles are impossible and incredible, the accounts in Acts are either legendary or free compositions (inventions, spin-offs; III. B.). The religious dialectician of the Epistles who battles only with words, who accomplishes his work through sufferings and temptations, and who boasts only in his weakness, is supplanted in Acts by the miracle worker and magician who blinds his opponents and heals at a distance through handkerchiefs which had been in contact with his body. Paul in Acts no longer lives in the sphere of the cross but of glory.

E. PRACTICES AND PRINCIPLES. In Acts, where Paul preaches first to the Jews, he is primarily Apostle of the Jews, only secondarily Apostle of the Gentiles. Paul could never have followed the principle of not turning to Gentiles until Jewish unbelief had entitled him to do so. Paul's Jewish practices belong to the incredible side of Acts, for Paul held external ceremony to be absolutely irreconcilable with salvation. Paul neither observed the Law himself nor permitted his Jewish or Gentile converts to do so. The motives which Acts gives him for these compromising actions impugn Paul's character; the actions themselves violate his principles; and both together involve him in reprehensible hypocrisy. In the face of arguments to the contrary, Luke's tendency is to prove Paul loyal to the Law. Without violating his principles, Paul could not have approved nor executed the Decree nor remained silent about it if it had ever existed (on 15:1-35 see III. B.).

Contrary to Acts' idyllic picture of harmony between Paul and Jerusalem, the Epistles reveal two hostile parties, preach-two hostile Gospels, promoting two hostile missions, headed by to hostile apostles, Peter and Paul. There was a rude antagonism between the universalism of Paul and the narrow Judaizing views of the Twelve. Paul's independence of Jerusalem in Galatians contradicts his dependence in Acts (III. B.), for the real Paul from his conversion on went his own independent way, avoiding all contacts with the older Apostles.

F. DOCTRINE. 23:1-10 is a fictitious account composed by Luke to place Paul in as close a relation as possible to Judaism, thereby distorting Paul's character, involving him in duplicity, and reducing him to a mendacious quibbler.

As suggested by the practice of ancient historians and borne out by other considerations (III. B.), the speeches attributed to Paul in Acts are Luke's free compositions, dramatic messages for the readers, serving Luke's apologetic purpose of Petrinizing Paul or naively reflecting the deutero-Paulinism of an age theologically distant from Paul. The Paul of Acts is pre-Pauline in his Christology and post-Pauline in his natural theology, concept of the Law, and eschatology. From Acts, specifically Pauline ideas are missing, as justification and the atoning power of Jesus' death. Hence we cannot cite any of Paul's words in Acts as if they were Paul's own. The Paul whose

---

[17] A. Jülicher, 1906, quoted by Harnack, Date, 36-37.

speech was "contemptible" (2 Cor 10:10) has been transformed by Luke into an eloquent orator. We can use Paul's speeches in Acts only if they agree with the Epistles, and in that case they are superfluous. We must not allow Paul's speeches composed by Luke to obscure the Epistles composed by Paul. It is necessary to erase the picture of the Paul of the speeches of Acts if the value of the underlying itinerary document is to be rightly estimated.

In sum, when we stress Luke's free creativity and use various pointers to tradition and redaction, we find that the Pauline portions of Acts generally represent Luke's standpoint, serve Luke's interests, and consequently picture Luke's Paul.

IV. THE THREE-PAUL VIEW OF THE SCHOOL OF ADVANCED CRITICISM[18]

A. GENERAL DESCRIPTION. In Acts and Epistles there are three Pauls: (1) The historical Paul, the missionary of the travel narrative, a wandering Jew who preaches in many regions "the things concerning Jesus"; a disciple among disciples, with no essential difference in faith and life from them. (2) The legendary Paul, the hero of the "Acts of Paul" (IV. B.), who as a Christian reformer expouses the new principles of a universal religion emancipated from Judaism, who in a special sense is guided by the Holy Spirit, who is entrusted with "the gospel of the grace of God" (20:24), and whose life is full of supernatural events. This legendary Paul was further developed in the Epistles into the advocate of justification by faith. (3) Luke's (the final, mid-second-century redactor of Acts) Paul, the Paul, who, next to Peter is the founder of the Catholic Church, and who combines the principles of the primitive disciples ("the things concerning Jesus") with those of the Christians ("the Gospel of God's mercy"). For Luke there were no differences between Peter and Paul. By giving to Peter "Pauline touches" and to Paul Petrine "words and tints," Luke put Peter and Paul even closer together than they already were in the "Acts of Peter" and the "Acts of Paul."

It is the reliable tradition of the travel narrative which gives us the historical Paul in contrast to the redactional and legendary Paul. Van Manen tried to answer the question, "What does Acts teach us about Paul and Paulinism apart from the Epistles?" And he found that the representation of the historical Paul in the we-sections of Acts is nearer to the real Paul than the legendary Paul in the Epistles, for in the latter, "Paulinists" worked up the material of Acts under the influence of a tendency. All of the Paulines are pseudepigrapha, literary weapons aimed at anti-Pauline disciples.

It is arbitrary to assume the genuineness and reliability of the principal Epistles and that Acts accordingly must be tested by them. Rather we must estimate the value of what has come down to us through Acts and Epistles, compare them, arrange them, bring them into consistent and orderly connection, and thus see how the figure of Paul was repeatedly recast. The Epistles, which are patched, interpolated, and incomprehensible, set forth a much more unnatural picture of relationships within

---

[18] W. C. van Manen, "Paul," Encyclopaedia Biblica 3 (1902) 3603-6, 3620-38; and my Luke as a Historian in Criticism since 1840 (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1959) 207-36.

the church than does Acts. Confusing is the representation in Galatians of Paul's separation from the original Apostles so that he receives his Gospel entirely from supernatural revelation and comes forth at once with all that was great and new in his preaching. But how natural is the picture of Acts, where Paul begins as an assistant to Barnabas and maintains a harmonious relationship to the Twelve, finally establishing his independence by force of his personality. Both the picture of Paul's missionary journeys and of his relations to his churches is unintelligible in Galatians. Equally confusing is the character of the Paul of the Epistles: radical, conservative; bold, weak; firm in small things, yielding in great things. The most natural view is that Acts gives what is historically most authentic, whereas the Epistles draw an imaginary picture. Hence the investigation of Acts must be carried on independently of the Epistles and vice versa.

B. METHODOLOGY. Acts is no loose stringing together of fragments derived from various sources. Yet in spite of the over-all unity there appear interruptions of the continuity, contradictions, and various conceptions of one and the same event which betray the fact that the author only with effort and his own interpretation arranged the reports lying before him. We must "distinguish between the original historical datum, the valuable substance of a trustworthy tradition, and the one-fold, two-fold, threefold or it may be manifold clothing with which this has been invested by later views and opinions, and in too many cases, unfortunately, concealed them, in such a manner that it is not always possible . . . to discriminate . . . between truth and fiction."

Using these criteria, van Manen isolated these sources: the travel narrative (the oldest foundation of Acts), the Acts of Paul, the Acts of Peter, oral tradition, Josephus, and a few details from the Pauline Epistles. According to the original form of the journey narrative (which was completely revised by the author of the Acts of Paul), Paul traveled to Rome as a free man, for he is treated as such on ship, not as a prisoner. Furthermore, at least part of those who accompanied Paul to Jerusalem (20:4; 21:16) set out with him for Rome (27:2), which fact suggests a short stay at Caesarea, not a two years' imprisonment. Luke used details from Josephus to invent unhistorical scenes in Acts. Luke's mention of the Egyptian (21:28) and of Felix, Drusilla, Festus, Agrippa, and Bernice is explained by the fact that Luke knew the works of Josephus and did not scruple to use them in his description of Paul's life.

C. CURSUS VITAE. The historical Paul was a younger contemporary of Jesus' disciples, and probably a Jew and native of Tarsus, a tentmaker. Originally hostile toward the disciples, he later joined them and spent the remainder of his life as a wandering preacher in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. He may have been one of the first to preach to Jews and Gentiles outside of Palestine (11:19-20). He seldom or never came into contact with the disciples in Palestine, and on a visit to Jerusalem narrowly escaped death for contempt of the Temple. There is reasonable certainty about only one great journey of Paul, and that toward the end of his life, the external conditions of which are dryly and exactly set forth in the we-source: Troas-Philippi-Troas-Assos-Mitylene-Samos-Miletus-Rhodes-Patara-Tyre-Ptolemais-Caesarea-Jerusalem-Caesarea-Sidon-Myra-Fair Havens-Melita-Syracuse-Rhegium-Puteoli-Rome (16:10-17; 20:5-15; 21:1-18; 27:1-28:16). Acts provides no certain knowledge about the

details of this journey. Paul reckons according to the Jewish calendar (20:6; 27:9), and is taken up as one of their own by the disciples in Tyre (21:3), Ptolemais and Caesarea (21:7-8), Jerusalem (21:17), Sidon (27:3), Puteoli (28:14), and Rome (28:15).

D. THE SUPERNATURAL. All of the supernatural elements in Acts' account of Paul are legendary, being a good distance along the road toward the apocryphal Acts.

E. PRACTICES AND PRINCIPLES. The real Paul engaged in Jewish practices, remaining in his own consciousness a Jew, a faithful attender of Temple and synagogue, who had not outgrown the Law any more than other Jewish Christians. Paul, Peter, and the original Apostles were scarcely distinguishable from Jews. Paul in Acts is not too Jewish but too Gentile. The historical Paul stood in a peaceful relationship to the Jerusalem church. Any struggles would have broken out after Paul's lifetime (20:29-30), for while he lived it is impossible to guess what a quarrel could have been about.

F. DOCTRINE. Luke's creative activity is seen in the speeches of Paul, for Paul, like all other speakers in Acts, expresses Luke's own ideas as he pleads the cause of Christianity in the same fashion as the other speakers. The preaching of the real Paul was virtually identical with that of the Twelve, who also preached "the things concerning Jesus."

This, then, is the real Paul whom we discover by regarding the travel narrative of Acts as the primary source for the reconstruction of Paul's life and thought.[19]

CONCLUSION. This survey reveals that the evaluation of Acts as a source for the study of Paul depends largely on the estimation of the we-sections. The traditional view of the we-sections results in a high regard for Acts' data (Schools I and II). Non-traditional views lead to distrust or rejection of this data (School III) or to a use of only a fraction of it (School IV).

---

[19] In contrast to these four schools which use Acts and Epistles together or place the Epistles above Acts or vice versa, B. Bauer (Die Apostelgeschichte [Berlin: Hempel, 1850]) regards both Acts and Epistles as unhistorical, so that the real Paul is to be found in neither. In a similar vein, A. Loisy (Les Actes des Apôtres [Paris: Nourry, 1920]) finds that the redactor of Acts has turned the original historical Acts into legend; neither can Paul's Epistles be trusted, for they too are tendentious, and Paul did not necessarily conform to all the theories of his own writings.

Our spectrum would be incomplete without reference to H. H. Evans (St. Paul, the Author of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Third Gospel. 2 vols. [London: Wyman, 1884-86]), for whom both Acts and Epistles are primary sources, the work of one and the same mind, Paul. Evans points out that with any person there are three distinct individualities: the objective A, as he appears to B; the subjective A, as he appears to himself, A; and the real A, as he truly is. In Acts and Epistles we have the subjective Paul, as he appeared to himself (208).

S 169

THE TITLE KYRIOS IN LUKE-ACTS

DONALD L. JONES
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COLUMBIA

In a recent article dealing with method in determining the christology of Acts, Stephen S. Smalley[1] points to the care with which Luke, especially in the speeches, has taken over various titles from his sources and used them to illustrate different aspects of Christ's person. While admitting that the speeches' christological content cannot be fully delineated by an isolated analysis of these designations, Smalley does see in them a "vital framework" for Lucan christology.[2] On the other hand, Charles H. Talbert[3] has argued that any who would find Luke's christology must begin, not with titles, but with "the overall structure of the Lucan picture of Christ," including the birth stories (Luke 1-2); the entire public ministry, particularly the journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:27); and the resurrection and ascension narratives (Luke 24; Acts 1).[4]

There is merit in each approach: title research permits one to observe Luke's adoption and integration of traditional christological designations into his own theological conception, but such analysis is incomplete unless it is related to Luke's use of his sources, the wider christology of Luke-Acts, and, ultimately, NT christology as a whole. This paper attempts to combine both methods, using as focal point the title kyrios, "Lord." But before turning to Luke's utilization of this predicate in his gospel and Acts, we must consider how, when, and where kyrios found its way into Christianity.

I. THE EVOLUTION OF THE TITLE KYRIOS

A. Kyrios in the Graeco-Roman World

In its absolute form kyrios was a divine title given to Hellenistic mystery cult deities.[5] But was this designation current in the first century A. D.? Paul acknowledges "many 'gods' and many 'lords' (kyrioi)" (1 Cor 8:5, NEB) in the pagan world of his day. Generally, while the mystery religions do not provide the immediate context for the Christian use of kyrios, in NT times the title was appearing with increasing frequency, and a few NT passages reflect this development.

Moreover, kyrios may be found in the imperial cult.[6] First applied to Augustus in 12 B. C., it was widely attested around the middle of the first century A. D. In a Greek inscription from A. D. 66 cited by Adolf Deissmann,[7] Nero is hailed "Lord of the whole world," and Festus refers to him as kyrios in Acts 25:26. By the end of the century, Domitian has been accorded the official title: Dominus et Deus noster. Deissmann's theory that kyrios as a title for Jesus developed only through a sense of contrast with the emperor cult, however, is quite improbable, and he overstates the prevalence of the term when he says: "At the time when Christianity originated 'Lord' was a divine predicate intelligible to the whole Eastern world."[8]

The least one can say is that kyrios as a title in both Hellenistic mystery religions and the imperial cult left its imprint on the first century A. D., and the early Christian proclamation of Jesus as Lord would doubtless have confronted it.

B. Kyrios in the OT

In time the tetragrammaton Yahweh was avoided and the Qere 'adonāy took its place. When the LXX translators rendered Yahweh by kyrios,[9] it became the specific term for God in the post-LXX period. But in the LXX kyrios was not restricted to God, and could be used where 'adonāy referred to an earthly figure, e.g., a king. The two meanings stand side by side in Ps 110:1a: "The Lord said to my lord." While in the MT the first "Lord" is Yahweh and the second (the king) 'adonāy, the LXX has kyrios for both words. This led to the application of Ps 110:1 to Jesus, and once kyrios was estab-

lished as a title, the way was cleared for the transference to Jesus of certain LXX passages which in the MT had referred only to Yahweh. Yet generally there seemed to be no confusion between the two "Lords"; nor was Jesus claimed to be divine because he was so called.

The distinct possibility that the early Aramaic-speaking community could have applied the title "Lord" (mar) to Jesus has been suggested by the discovery of 1QapGen.[10] In this embroidered repetition of Genesis in Aramaic from the first Christian century not only do we find persons of authority, e.g., rulers, teachers, etc., addressed as "my Lord," but also, without linguistic distinction, God is designated as "Lord of the worlds," "Lord of heaven and earth," etc. Above all, God is addressed in prayer as "my Lord God" or simply "my Lord." Thus, Aramaic-speaking Jews in Jesus' time addressed God as "my Lord" (marî) and transferred to him the respectful address used of high-ranking men. So the precondition was established, from a purely linguistic point of view, for the first Christians to transfer the address "my Lord" to Jesus.[11] Whether Jesus was actually so addressed, and, if so, in what capacity he merited being called Lord, will receive full treatment later.

C. Kyrios in Early Christianity

Inasmuch as the synoptic evidence will be presented in Part II and that from Acts in Part III, we will discuss here only the use of kyrios in Paul and John.

1. Kyrios in the Pauline Epistles

Kyrios is one of the most comprehensive Pauline titles.[12] He applies it not only to the exalted Lord, but to the earthly Jesus as well, e.g., references to "brothers of the Lord" (1 Cor 9:5; Gal 1:19) and "words of the Lord" (1 Cor 7:10, 12, 25; 9:14; 1 Thes 4:15). Moreover, behind the much-debated sentence in his eucharist account: "For the tradition which I handed on to you came to me from the Lord himself" (1 Cor 11:23), stands the authority of the earthly Jesus.

There remains the maranatha controversy.[13] In 1913 Wilhelm Bousset produced his classic Kyrios Christos[14] in which he denied that the early Aramaic-speaking Christian church worshipped Jesus as Lord. Kyrios as a title, rather, had its provenance in Hellenistic Christianity, and would have been inconceivable at any earlier stage. The Aramaic mar could not be used absolutely as ho kyrios — only could it appear in combination with a pronominal suffix, e.g., marî, "my Lord," or māran, "our Lord."[15] In its essentials, Bousset's theory is followed by Rudolf Bultmann.[16]

But the weight of the evidence falls against all who would attribute the derivation of kyrios to Hellenistic Christianity. Conclusive proof that the early Palestinian Christians did worship Jesus as Lord (and thus the "Achilles heel" of Bousset's argument) is preserved by Paul in the Aramaic invocation maranatha, "Come, O Lord," of 1 Cor 16:22.[17] From the protracted debate evoked by Bousset, it may now be taken for granted that the phrase comes from primitive Palestinian Christianity and that its Sitz im Leben was the eucharist. According to Hahn, only the imperative "Come, O Lord" properly emphasizes the eschatological element in the early eucharistic liturgy.[18] The church gathered for worship implores the final coming of its Lord.

2. Kyrios in the Gospel of John

In the first nineteen chs. of the Fourth Gospel are to be found several instances of the vocative kyrie[19] as well as three occurrences of the absolute ho kyrios,[20] while in the resurrection narrative and the post-resurrection sayings of chs. 20-21 the title is used nine times.[21] A pre-Johannine tradition is probable at 13:13: "You call me 'Master' and 'Lord' (ho didaskalos kai ho kyrios), and rightly so, for that is what I am." The alteration "your Lord and Master" in the following vs. may indicate

the roughly synonymous character of the titles as Jesus used them, in addition to supporting the Pauline evidence that in the early Palestinian Christian community kyrios was applied to the earthly Jesus as well as the resurrected Lord.

Having surveyed the development of the predicate kyrios through the Graeco-Roman world, the OT usage, and early Christianity (Paul and John), we are now ready to observe Luke's use of the title — first in his gospel.

II. THE TITLE KYRIOS IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

A. Didaskalos, Hrabbei, and Kyrios in the Synoptic Tradition

Over fifty years ago F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake produced an essay on Lucan christology[22] which, in some respects, has not been supplanted. It will be helpful at the outset of this section to reproduce two of their tables — one listing the Marcan passages where Jesus is called didaskale, hrabbei, or kyrie;[23] the other providing similar statistics from Q — and to follow generally their observations on the data.[24]

Table I: In Mark

(1) didaskale, or case of didaskalos

Mark 4:38 =	Matt 8:25	= Luke 8:24
5:35 =	no parallel in Matt	= Luke 8:49
9:17 =	in Matt 17:15	= Luke 9:38
9:38 =	no parallel in Matt	= Luke 9:49
10:17 =	Matt 19:16	= Luke 18:18
10:20 =	omitted in Matt	= omitted in Luke
10:35 =	omitted in Matt	= no parallel in Luke
12:14 =	Matt 22:16	= Luke 20:21
12:19 =	Matt 22:24	= Luke 20:28
12:32 =	no parallel in Matt	= no parallel in Luke
13:1 =	omitted in Matt	= omitted in Luke
14:14 =	Matt 26:18	= Luke 22:11

(2) hrabbei

Mark 9:5 =	kyrie in Matt 17:4	= epistata in Luke 9:33
10:51 =	no parallel in Matt	= kyrie in Luke 18:41
11:21 =	omitted in Matt	= no parallel in Luke
14:45 =	Matt 26:49	= no parallel in Luke

(3) kyrie

Mark 7:28 =	Matt 15:27	= no parallel in Luke
11:3 =	Matt 21:3	= Luke 19:31

Table II: In Passages Common to Matt and Luke (Q)

(1) didaskalos

Matt 8:19 =	omitted in Luke 9:57	
12:38 =	omitted in Luke	
10:24 =	Luke 6:40	

(2) hrabbei

Not found in any passage common to Matt and Luke

(3) kyrios

Matt 7:21 =	Luke 6:46	
7:22 =	paraphrased otherwise in Luke 13:26	
Luke 7:19 =	omitted in Matt 11:3	
Matt 8:6 =	Luke 7:2 otherwise paraphrased	
8:8 =	Luke 7:6	
8:21 =	omitted in Luke 8:59, but the text is doubtful	

Didaskalos (=rabbi) apparently was the usual title applied to Jesus. Kyrios seems to be better represented in Q than in Mark, where it is almost completely absent. Kyrios appears seven times (all in the vocative) in passages peculiar to Matt,[25] and in thirty-two places unique to Luke, many of them redactional additions to Mark or Q.[26] In four passages Luke inserts kyrie (kyrios) when it is not found in Mark,[27] and in 7:19 kyrios is

added to the parallel Q passage in Matt. The evidence indicates that kyrios (kyrie) is characteristic, not of their sources, but of the redactors of Matt and Luke, and much more markedly so in the latter than the former.

This observation is supported by the data on didaskalos and hrabbei. In Matt didaskalos appears only once (17:24) — a passage with no parallel in either Mark or Luke. In Luke, although didaskalos appears five times with no Marcan or Matthean parallels,[28] in none of them does a disciple speak. Furthermore, of the ten Marcan passages in which didaskalos might have been expected to reappear in Luke, it does so only in six, five of which have strangers speaking to Jesus[29] and in the other (22:11) Jesus gives instructions regarding a message to a stranger. Of the four Marcan passages where disciples address Jesus as didaskalos, Luke omits the word twice (Mark 10:35; 13:1) and twice (Luke 8:24; 9:49) changes it to epistata.[30] It is also striking that hrabbei, used three (four)[31] times in Mark, is not found at all in Luke, and in the two passages where Mark is represented, Luke replaces one by epistata (9:33) and the other by kyrie (18:41).

These facts reveal that Luke disliked didaskalos and hrabbei about as much as he obviously preferred kyrios. It is to this preference that we now turn our attention.

B. Kyrios in the Gospel of Luke

Of the 101 instances cited by Moulton and Geden where Luke uses kyrios in his gospel,[32] nineteen occur in absolute form and clearly refer to Jesus.[33] In view of the infrequent use of kyrios for Jesus elsewhere in the synoptics, this fact offers an important clue to Luke's total theological perspective. In an attempt to articulate this relationship, we proceed now to an examination of these nineteen passages (along with relevant vocative forms) in the birth stories; the public ministry, subdivided into the work in Galilee, the journey to Jerusalem, and the last days in Jerusalem; and the resurrection narrative.

1. The Birth Narratives: Luke 1-2

C. F. D. Moule has argued that, with two (possibly three) exceptions, kyrios is not applied to Jesus in Luke's gospel by human performers in the drama until the resurrection.[34] Two of Moule's exceptions[35] occur in the birth stories: 1:43 and 76. In 1:43 Elizabeth says: "Who am I, that the mother of my Lord (tou kyriou mou) should visit me?" Moule, claiming that Luke was following a reliable, historical source here, speculates on "the type of Aramaic used by Elizabeth."[36] Yet notwithstanding this and other attempts to ascribe elements of Luke 1-2 to Semitic sources, a strong case has been made for regarding these chs. as Lucan compositions illustrating "how the author conforms to the customs of his literary inheritance."[37] Luke could write in a Semitic style when it would serve his purpose.

In the Benedictus (1:76) Zechariah offers these words on the birth of his son, John: "And you, my child, you shall be called Prophet of the Highest, for you will be the Lord's forerunner (enōpion kyriou), to prepare his way." Elsewhere Moule[38] has suggested the possibility of a genuine original in John the Baptist's traditions in which kyrios meant God, but we maintain that Luke intended here a Christian interpretation — i.e., Jesus is the kyrios — which he confirmed a few vss. later (2:11) in the angel's words: "Today in the city of David a deliverer has been born to you — the Messiah, the Lord (kyrios)."

We see, then, in this three-fold reading back of kyrios into the birth narratives, Luke's attempt to show that the title's roots lay not only in Jesus' earthly ministry but even in events which preceeded his birth.

2. The Public Ministry: Luke 4:14-23:56

a. In Galilee: 4:14-9:50

In this section the absolute kyrios is twice used in narrative of the earthly Jesus: 7:13 and 19. In the L account of the raising up of the widow's son at Nain, when the Lord (ho kyrios) saw her his heart went out to her (vs. 13), and in an alteration of the Q logion at vs. 19 John sends two of his disciples to the Lord (ton kyrion) with the message: "Are you the one who is to come or are we to expect some other?"

Three instances of the vocative — 5:12; 7:6; and 6:46 — are also instructive. The first is a good example of Luke's redactional method. In Mark 1:40 there is no address and the leper is described as gonupetōn, "begging for help." Matt 8:2 inserts kyrie and, by converting gonupetōn to prosekunei, "knelt before him" (RSV), uses it as a title of divinity.[39] Luke also adds kyrie, but merely intensifies Mark's gonupetōn to pesōn epi prosōpon edeēthē, "fell on his face and besought him" (RSV). Further evidence that for Luke kyrie was not a divine title is found in 7:6 (par. Matt 8:8 Q) where the Capernaum centurion uses it to express authority and dependence.

Finally, there is the Q saying at Luke 6:46: "Why do you keep calling me 'Lord, Lord' — and never do what I tell you?" which we accept as original with Kümmel[40] against Hahn[41] who opts for the Matthean version (7:21) "Not everyone who calls me 'Lord, Lord' will enter into the kingdom of Heaven, but only those who do the will of my heavenly Father." The Lucan saying, where the respectful address is contrasted with the disobedient behavior of the hearers, could quite well go back to Jesus himself. But in Matt the saying, interpreted in vss. 22-23, has become an invocation of the Judge of the world. No longer an everyday title of courtesy, kyrie has been transformed into the reverent address of the heavenly Lord.[42]

b. The Journey to Jerusalem: 9:51-19:28[43]

The fact that eleven of the nineteen absolute occurrences of kyrios appear in the travel narrative makes it by far the most important section for understanding Luke's use of the title in his gospel. The relevant passages will be discussed as follows: (1) two instances of the vocative: 9:61 and 13:25; (2) two uses of the absolute kyrios: 11:39 and 13:15; (3) four passages in which a special relationship exists between vocative and absolute forms: 10:1, 17; 10:39-41; 12:41-42; 19:8a, 8b; (4) two eschatological parables: 16:8 and 18:6; and (5) a passage dealing with faith: 17:5-6.

(1) There are three sayings in Luke 9:57-62, but only two in its parallel Matt 8:19-22. While Matt has didaskale in vs. 19 and kyrie in vs. 21, there is no address in Luke's first two sayings. He does use kyrie in the third (9:61), however, — a passage with no parallel in Matt: "I will follow you, sir; but let me first say good-bye to my people at home." Hahn has suggested that Matt and Luke did not know the Q source in exactly the same form. Luke found it in his version; it was lacking in Matt's.[44] Luke 13:25 describes an eschatological crisis. The door has been locked by the master of the house, and the cry, "Sir, let us in!" is rejected on the basis: "I do not know where you come from." Those who followed Jesus in his lifetime but not after his death, may not stand when the kyrios returns as Judge.

(2) The absolute kyrios appears at 11:39 Q and 13:15 L. To the Pharisee who noticed with surprise that Jesus had not washed before the meal, the Lord (ho kyrios) said, "You Pharisees! You clean the outside of cup and plate; but inside you there is nothing but greed and wickedness" (11:39). And at 13:15, when the president of the synagogue became indignant with Jesus for healing a crippled woman on the sabbath, the Lord (ho kyrios) answered him, "What hypocrites you are! Is there a single one of you who does not loose his ox or his donkey from the manger and take it out to water on the Sabbath?"

(3) A development in kyrie is seen as Luke places it in emphatic relation to the absolute ho kyrios in the following passages. In 10:1 the Lord (ho kyrios) appoints seventy(-two) and sends them on ahead; in vs. 17 they come back jubilant: "In your name, Lord (kyrie), even the devils submit to us." Later in ch. 10 Mary seats herself at the Lord's feet (tou kyriou)

and listens to his words (vs. 39 L). Martha says to Jesus (vs. 40), "Lord (kyrie), do you not care that my sister has left me to get on with the work by myself?" But the Lord (ho kyrios) answered (vs. 41): "The part that Mary has chosen is best; and it shall not be taken away from her." At 12:41 (par. Matt 24:45-51 Q) Peter says, "Lord (kyrie), do you intend this parable specially for us, or is it for everyone?" The Lord (ho kyrios) responds (vs. 42): "Well, who is the trusty and sensible man whom his master will appoint as his steward." And in 19:8a L Zacchaeus says to the Lord (ton kyrion), "Here and now, sir (kyrie), I give half my possessions to charity" (vs. 8b). In all these, the juxtaposition of the vocative and absolute forms by Luke shows that for him kyrie is no longer a mere title of courtesy, but has become an address of subordination to the earthly Jesus.[45]

(4) Two parables with eschatological meaning found only in Luke may be taken together: 16:8 and 18:6. In 16:8 the master (ho kyrios), i.e., Jesus, praises the dishonest steward for acting so astutely. Vs. 8b — "For the worldly are more astute than the other-worldly in dealing with their own kind" — is only intelligible if spoken by Jesus, and must belong to the ancient core of tradition.[46] The Lord (ho kyrios), at 18:6, refers to the words of the unjust judge. The parable takes on eschatological significance with Luke's addition of vs. 8b: "But when the Son of Man comes, will he find faith on earth?" In both parables the church, called to vigilance, invokes the exalted Lord with the express authority of the earthly Jesus.[47]

(5) Thus far, Luke seems to be making no distinction between the earthly and the exalted Lord. Flender,[48] however, points out that strong faith is required to see the latter in the former. In 17:5 the apostles say to the Lord (tō kyriō), "Increase our faith," and the Lord (ho kyrios) replies (vs. 6): "If you had faith no bigger even than a mustard-seed, you could say to this mulberry-tree, 'Be rooted up and replanted in the sea'; and it would at once obey you." To this Q saying (par. Matt 17:20) Luke adds the parable of the servant's reward (vss. 7-10) emphasizing the absolute superiority of God in Master/servant relationships. When viewed in connection with 17:5-6 this parable is a warning not to take faith as a human achievement, but as an indicator of the path along which the Christian must follow his Master.[49]

c. In Jerusalem: 19:29-23:56

We begin with the two previously-mentioned exceptions to Luke's unique use of kyrios in his gospel: 19:31, 34 and 20:41-44. The Lucan version of the days in Jerusalem opens with a parallel of Mark's account of the entry (Luke 19:29-38; Mark 11:1-10;[50] cf. Matt 21:1-9). Jesus instructs two of his disciples to say, when asked about untying the colt (vs. 31), "Our Master (ho kyrios autou) needs it" (repeated with emphasis in vs. 34). Having recognized the special authority of the earthly Jesus, the disciples express unconditional subordination by refering to him as kyrios. At Luke 20:41-44 the Son of David passage from Mark 12:35-37a is adopted without modification. Ps 110:1 is interpreted as nesessitating the replacement of "David's son" by kyrios as the equivalent of Messiah — by which means Luke calls attention once again to the earthly Jesus.

In the accounts of Peter's denial and the arrest Luke has added kyrios four times — twice each in vocative and absolute forms — to his Marcan source, again revealing his strong predilection for the term: 22:33 (cf. Mark 14:29) — Peter replies, "Lord (kyrie), I am ready to go with you to prison and death"; 22:49 (cf. Mark 14:46) — Jesus' followers say, "Lord (kyrie), shall we use our swords?"; and 22:61a and b (cf. Mark 14:72) — "The Lord (ho kyrios) turned and looked at Peter. And Peter remembered the Lord's words (tou kyriou), 'Tonight before the cock crows you will disown me three times.'"

3. The Resurrection Narrative: Luke 24

Earlier we alluded to the frequent use of kyrios in John 20-21. Twice

in ch. 20 Mary Magdalene uses the title of Jesus before she knows he is risen: (vs. 2) "They have taken the Lord out of his tomb," and (vs. 13) "They have taken my Lord away, and I do not know where they have laid him." The earthly Jesus is also described as kyrios in John 20:19-23, 25; 20:18; and 21:7. Only at 20:28, where Thomas confesses, "My Lord and my God!", are resurrection and exaltation presupposed.

Mark and Matt make no use of kyrios in their resurrection accounts. Only Luke of the synoptics has it — and in two places: 24:3 and 34. 24:3: But when the women went inside the tomb "they did not find the body (of the Lord Jesus [tou kyriou Iēsou])" (RSV). Although the phrase is omitted in D and the Old Latin, Potterie argues for its authenticity and reports that the single brackets will be removed from the third edition of the UBS text.[51] 24:34: "It is true: the Lord (ho kyrios) has risen." Hahn[52] sees the emphasis on the fact of the resurrection here as indicating that kyrios must be a title of the earthly Jesus. Luke's narrative has now reached the post-resurrection period and human performers (here the disciples) apply kyrios to Jesus. But, as we have demonstrated (against Moule),[53] they do so before his resurrection — even before his birth.

We have completed our study of Luke's use of kyrios in his gospel, and have seen not only that he has a special fondness for the title as applied to the earthly Jesus, but also that he makes no distinction between the earthly and the exalted Lord. We turn now to Luke's second volume to see if these findings are corroborated there.

III. THE TITLE KYRIOS IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

According to Moulton and Geden kyrios occurs 110 times in Acts. To that figure, J. C. O'Neill[54] adds thirty-one other instances which should be considered in a "maximum" list,[55] and classifies each occurrence under one of three headings: a) behind the title kyrios stands Yahweh, the name of Israel's God;[56] b) kyrios used as a title of religious significance, but some ambiguity as to whether it applies to Yahweh or Jesus or both; and c) behind the title kyrios stands Jesus. The first two headings are not relevant to our purpose and are omitted. We will concentrate only on those passages where kyrios clearly refers to Jesus.[57] Our analysis has two major parts: kyrios in the first three chs. of Acts; and the use of the title in conventional phrases.

A. Kyrios in Acts 1-3

Three subsections will be presented here: (1) the predicate in relation to ascension, exaltation, and parousia; (2) kyrios, Ps 110:1, and the Holy Spirit; and (3) the title in Acts 2:36.

1. Kyrios in Relation to Ascension, Exaltation, and Parousia

In Acts 1:6 (the apostles asked him, "Lord [kyrie], is this the time when you are to establish once again the sovereignty of Israel?") kyrios is applied to Jesus after his death but before the ascension — further evidence that Luke, in his use of the title, does not distinguish between the earthly and the exalted Lord. Hahn[58] has made an important differentiation between exaltation in the sense of enthronization at the ascension followed by an active rule until the parousia and assumption where Jesus is taken up to heaven and waits in a state of inactivity until his return (3:20-21). He regards the ascension (1:9-11) as an assumption looking forward to the parousia. Luke attaches particular significance to his juxtaposition of enthronement and parousia at 1:11 ("This Jesus, who has been taken away from you up to heaven, will come in the same way as you have seen him go") and the transfer of functions from the returning Lord to the exalted one. In Hahn's terms, according to Flender, Luke 24 deals with Jesus' assumption; Acts 1 with his exaltation.[59]

When it became apparent that the interval between the ascension and the parousia was to last longer, the early church had to adjust to the

latter's delay. One of the adjustments it made was to adopt for the exalted Jesus the title "Lord" from the second kyrios in the LXX of Ps 110:1. This vs. deserves separate treatment as does the connection between kyrios and the Holy Spirit.

2. Kyrios, Ps 110:1, and the Holy Spirit

The utilization of Ps 110 in the primitive Christian community has recently been investigated by David M. Hay.[60] In a ch. entitled "Ps 110:1 as Support for Christological Titles" Hay discusses the link between this vs. and the predicate kyrios.[61] The title appears near references to Ps 110:1 in Pol Phil 2:1; "Mark" 16:19; Mark 12:35-37 par.; Acts 7:55 (if the original reading is that attested by D: Iēsoun ton kyrion); and, most importantly, Acts 2:33-36. C. H. Dodd has maintained that the church's use of kyrios for Jesus is ultimately based on this vs.[62] Hahn,[63] while denying that it inspired the first Christian use of the title, does see Ps 110:1 as a major factor in that development. Hay's own conclusion is that while many early Christians found support for kyrios in Ps 110:1 the vs. itself played only a modest part in encouraging such usage.

The conclusion in Acts 2:36 that Jesus is both Lord and Messiah immediately follows a quotation of Ps 110:1 in vss. 34-35: "The Lord said to my Lord, 'Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool.'" Since kyrios is used of Jesus in vss. 20-21 where Joel's prophecy of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is quoted (". . . the day of the Lord, shall come. And then, everyone who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved") and since the Spirit is brought into connection with the exalted Jesus at vs. 33 ("Exalted thus with God's right hand, he received the Holy Spirit from the Father, as was promised"), Joel's prophecy together with Ps 110:1 provide the key for interpreting the entire speech: the close association between Jesus' exaltation as Lord and the coming of the Holy Spirit.[64]

The meaning of Ps 110:1 is clearly defined at 2:36, wherein is found the most important use of kyrios in Acts. To this crucial vs. we now turn our attention.

3. Kyrios and Acts 2:36

Acts 2:36 ("Let all Israel then accept as certain that God has made this Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Messiah") contains one of only two undisputed anarthrous references to Jesus as kyrios in Luke's second volume.[65] "Lord" is joined with "Messiah" through a kind of parallelism with Ps 2:2 (LXX): "against the Lord and his Messiah," cited at 4:26.[66] Since vs. 36 is universally recognized as the climax of Peter's address to the Jews in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, it will be helpful first to observe the movement of thought in that discourse. This will be followed by a consideration of whether the christology expressed in 2:36 is "adoptionist" or "subordinationist."

a. The Progression of the Argument in the Pentecost Sermon[67]

2:14-21: The strange behavior of the Twelve may be attributed to the outpouring of God's Spirit. The prophet Joel had foretold this as one of the signs which would herald the coming of "the day of the Lord." Formerly only kings, prophets, and specially-gifted people had the Spirit poured upon them. But now it is to fall upon all alike, young and old, slaves and slavegirls. Acts makes a distinction between "the last days" (vs. 17) and "the day of the Lord" (vs. 20). The phrase "the last days" does not occur in Joel's prophecy, but is inserted by Peter as interpretation. The prediction of Joel 2:30-31 (cf. 3:14-15) of the sun turning to darkness and the moon to blood (vs. 20) is typical OT language describing the apocalyptic visitation of God to bring judgment. The "last days" have already come, the eschatological gift of the Spirit has been given, while "the day of the Lord" waits in the future. What the Jerusalem crowd has witnessed is the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy.

vss. 22-24: All hearers of the sermon would be familiar with the main events of Jesus' ministry as well as the circumstances which surrounded his death. God has set his seal of approval upon Jesus' life for the miracles, portents, and signs which God performed through him among the Jews. Conversely, God's stamp of disapproval falls upon the Jews who have handed Jesus over to Gentiles to be crucified. But even this was foreordained by God who, instead of allowing death to hold Jesus prisoner, has raised him up.

vss. 25-31: Peter asserts that the resurrection predicted in Ps 16 is that of Christ, not of David himself who had died, was buried, and whose grave is known to the hearers. God had sworn to David that he would set one of his descendants upon his throne. In the role of prophet, then, David had spoken of the resurrection of Christ whose body is incorruptible.

vss. 32-35: Peter and his company are witnesses that only Christ has been raised up and exalted to God's right hand. David did not ascend into heaven. Having received the Holy Spirit as the Father's promised gift, Jesus has poured it out in visible manifestations.

vs. 36: This vs. summarizes both the meaning of Jesus' exaltation to the right hand of God and the entire sermon. From the beginning God has acted in Christ — in his birth, earthly ministry, death, and resurrection. But, as this comment reflects only one of two major interpretations of this vs., further discussion is necessary.

b. Acts 2:36: Adoptionism or Subordinationism?

In the opinion of not a few interpreters Jesus became kyrios only at the resurrection.[68] He had been specially chosen ("adopted") by God because he had proven himself worthy by his miracles, portents, and signs (2:22). One of the favorite texts adduced as evidence for the "adoptionist" point of view is 2:36, which summarizes the meaning of Jesus' exaltation as related in the preceding four vss. Only by means of his ascent to God's right hand has Jesus been made "both Lord and Messiah." Through his death on the cross he has been radically transformed — metamorphosed, as it were — into the kyrios. An "adoptionistic" interpretation of "Lord" here, Zehnle maintains, is in complete harmony with its general usage throughout Luke-Acts, and explains what for Luke was "the most important and most current title of Jesus."[69] Zehnle also alludes to the possibility that Luke has reproduced an earlier christology which is not his own. According to J. A. T. Robinson,[70] 2:36 contradicts the point of view of the third gospel where "the application of 'Christ' and 'Lord' is pushed back, not merely behind the Resurrection, but behind the Baptism, to the birth of Jesus."

There is a more tenable position, however. That Jesus became kyrios only as the result of a transformation wrought by the resurrection is denied; he was in fact Lord before his death.[71] According to Luke, there was no interval in Jesus' life when he was not kyrios — and the title was applied even before his birth. Jesus was "subordinate" to and totally dependent upon God in all things. An "adoptionist" interpretation of 2:36 finds its rebuttal in the body of Peter's speech. The vs. contains no specific mention of the resurrection-exaltation motif. It stands as the concluding statement, not principally for the vss. which immediately precede, but for the entire sermon. All of the facets of the christological-kerygma (vss. 22b-24) are correlated and summarized in "God has made this Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Messiah." God has acted in Christ from the beginning — in his mighty works, in his death at the hands of the Jews, and in his resurrection and exaltation. Jesus could not be conquered by death. For Luke, he was kyrios in his lifetime; the resurrection only confirmed and vindicated him in that role.

At 2:36 Luke uses kyrios of the exalted Jesus — further evidence that he applied the title freely to both the earthly and the exalted Lord in his gospel and in Acts. Kyrios also appears in several conventional phrases in Acts, the examination of which may shed further light on Luke's use of the title.

B. Kyrios in Conventional Phrases

Phrases to be discussed in this section include: (1) "the word of the Lord;" (2) a group of phrases where Luke speaks of men being added to, turning to, or believing in the Lord; and (3) "the name of the Lord."

1. "The Word of the Lord"

The phrase ho logos tou kyriou occurs possibly thirteen times in Acts:[72] 6:7(D); 8:25; 12:24(B); 13:5(D), 44(p74ℵA), 48(ℵAC), 49; 14:25(ℵAC); 15:35, 36; 16:32(p45,74ACD); 19:10(Bcf.D), 20(BℵAC). In six of these (6:7; 12:24; 13:5, 44, 48; 16:32) textual evidence favors theos over kyrios, and in 14:25 kyrios should be omitted for the same reason. In 19:20 D has a much harder reading, but even if B is accepted, the translation "the word of the Lord" must be questioned. Thus eight of the thirteen readings are rejected, leaving five where kyrios apparently refers to Jesus:[73]

8:25. The apostles, having visited Samaria, return to Jerusalem "after giving their testimony and speaking the word of the Lord." Oscar Cullmann regards proclaiming the word of Jesus in a new situation as one of the apostolic functions.[74]

In 13:49 — "So the word of the Lord spread far and wide through the region" — "word" probably means "message" or "fame" (cf. Luke 7:17) which diephereto as opposed to "the word of God" which, like a seed or child, ēuxanen (cf. 6:7; 12:24; Luke 1:80; 13:19).

15:35. At Antioch Paul and Barnabas "taught and preached the word of the Lord," and in vs. 36 Paul suggests to Barnabas that they go back to the towns "where we proclaimed the word of the Lord." As the substance of both "teaching" and "preaching" is Christ himself, Jesus here is probably both Lord and the Word.[75] This hypothesis has been confirmed by other examples of logos christology in Acts and other non-Johannine writings. "The word of the Lord" is a rare Pauline phrase,[76] but, since it is common in the editorial sections of Acts, vs. 36 probably should be credited to the editor.

In 19:10 — "the whole population of the province of Asia, both Jews and Gentiles, heard the word of the Lord" — the harder D reading ("words") should be accepted in the light of Paul's admonition to the Ephesian elders at Miletus to "keep in mind the words of the Lord Jesus" (20:35).

2. "Added to, Turning to, or Believing in the Lord"

Luke frequently speaks of men being added to (prostithēmi), turning to (epistrephō), or believing in (pisteuō) the Lord.[77] Since most of these occurrences appear in accounts of proclamation to Jews, the Lord must refer to Jesus rather than to their God:

5:14. "Numbers of men and women were added to their ranks as believers in the Lord."
9:35. "All who lived in Lydda and Sharon saw him; and they turned to the Lord."
9:42. "The news spread all over Joppa, and many came to believe in the Lord"
11:17. "If then God gave the same gift to them as he gave to us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could withstand God" (RSV)
11:21b.[78] "A great many became believers and turned to the Lord."
11:23. "He exhorted them all to remain faithful to the Lord with steadfast purpose." (RSV)
11:24. "And a large company was added to the Lord." (RSV)
13:12. "When the Governor saw what had happened he became a believer, deeply impressed by what he learned about the Lord."
14:23. "They committed them to the Lord in whom they believed." (RSV)
16:15. "If you have judged me to be a believer in the Lord."
16:31. "believe in the Lord Jesus." (RSV)[79]
18:8. "Crispus, who held office in the synagogue, now became a believer in the Lord."
20:21. "I did not shrink from. . .testifying both to Jews and to Greeks of repentance to God and of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ."

3. "The Name of the Lord"

There are also several instances where the title is brought into close association with "the name."[80] Throughout Acts calling upon "the name of the Lord" identifies the followers of Jesus (9:14, 21; 22:16). At 2:21 Peter quotes the LXX of Joel 3:5 (MT = 2:32): "Everyone who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved."[81] The original reference to Yahweh (kyrios) has been transferred to Jesus, and "there is no other name under heaven granted to men, by which we may receive salvation" (4:12). The following passages contain the phrase to onoma tou kyriou:
9:29. Saul "spoke out boldly and openly in the name of the Lord."
15:26. Barnabas and Paul, "men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (KJV).
19:13. "Some strolling Jewish exorcists tried their hand at using the name of the Lord Jesus on those possessed by evil spirits."
19:17. "And the name of the Lord Jesus gained in honour."
21:13. Paul answered, "I am ready not merely to be bound but even to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus."
D texts of 6:8; 14:10; 18:4 and 8. Special emphasis is placed on being "baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus:" 8:16; 19:5; and the D readings of 2:38 and 10:48.

Among other uses of "the name" Philip preaches about it (8:12); Paul, who once opposed the name (26:9), is called upon to suffer for it (9:16) as the apostles do (5:41); Paul and the apostles preach in the name (4:17-18; 9:27); they work cures and exorcisms in the name (3:6; 16:18); and, in Peter's speech to Cornelius, the forgiveness of sins is mediated by the name (10:43; cf. 5:31). A close connection exists between 10:43 and the only other undisputed anarthrous reading of kyrios in Acts, 10:36 — a vs. which, like 2:36, deserves special attention.

a. Kyrios and Acts 10:36

The prophets knew only one name in which forgiveness dwelt, Yahweh (kyrios) — 10:43. In Jeremiah 31:34 knowing the Lord is linked with the forgiveness of sins. Peter's speech is addressed to an audience familiar with worship of Yahweh (kyrios). The hearers knew there was a "Lord of all." Peter's new revelation is that Jesus is the name in which lies forgiveness and hence the Lord to whom the prophets testify. He is Lord of all (houtos estin pantōn kyrios) — 10:36.

Basing his argument on supposed "suspended construction," C. C. Torrey posited an Aramaic original behind this vs.[82] He would translate: "As for the word which the Lord of All sent to the children of Israel." Max Wilcox, however, disagrees, noting that at least two other contexts (Acts 8:26b and 9:36b) reveal a construction similar to houtos estin pantōn kyrios.[83] Further, in Luke-Acts houtos used in the absolute sense is common.

The explanation which best fits the passage as a whole is to regard the abrupt expression "he is Lord of all" as "parenthetical and ejaculatory" and to accept Jesus as the antecedent of houtos.[84] Since there is no article, it is uncertain whether pantōn kyrios is an actual title,[85] but coming as it does after "Jesus Christ" it may well reflect a confessional formula current in Luke's day.[86] Undoubtedly, Luke was influenced to some extent by what was probably the most primitive Christian confession: "Jesus is Lord."[87] One final matter remains concerning the correlation of kyrios and "the name," i.e., Paul's Damascus road experience.

b. Kyrios and the Conversion of Paul

In the three accounts of the conversion Paul asks of the voice "Who are you, Lord (kyrie)?" to which the Lord (ho) replies, "I am Jesus whom you are persecuting."[88] The antecedent is ambiguous, but if it does not mean Yahweh, why would Paul ask the identity of the Lord he has just recognized?

One suggestion is prompted by the significance for a Jew of the Hebrew idiom "Who are you?" It is a question directed to the name or soul of the person addressed.[89] When Ruth returned from Boaz's threshing floor, Naomi asks her, "Who are you, my daughter?" — 3:16 (meaning "How did things go with you?" — NEB). When seen in this light, Paul's question of the Lord whom he believed he knew and was serving might mean: "What has happened to you, Lord, when you regard my efforts to serve you as persecution?"

Luke has Paul call Jesus "Lord" at the conversion simply because Luke was accustomed to calling Jesus "Lord" and felt it appropriate for Paul to do the same.[90] This is also apparent in the address to the Ephesian elders at Miletus where Luke thrice puts kyrios on Paul's lips for the earthly Jesus (20:19, 24, 28).

We have been concerned with how Luke has adopted and integrated the title kyrios into his own theological perspective. The evolution of the predicate was traced through the Graeco-Roman world, the OT usage, and early Christianity. We found that, unlike the other synoptics, Luke frequently uses ho kyrios for Jesus in his gospel. His emphatic juxtaposition of vocative and absolute forms reveals that for him kyrie is no longer a title of courtesy, but an address of subordination to the earthly Jesus. Kyrios in Acts has been discussed in relation to ascension, exaltation, parousia, and Holy Spirit, with particular emphasis on the only two undisputed anarthrous readings at 2:36 and 10:36, and the wide-ranging utilization of the title in several conventional phrases.

Against the view that Luke, in his use of kyrios in both volumes, deliberately makes a distinction with resurrection as the christological watershed, we have concluded that for him there is no distinction between the earthly and the exalted Lord. Not only is the predicate applied to the historical as well as the resurrected Jesus; he is Lord even before his birth. Since Jesus is already kyrios on earth, Luke, both in his gospel and in Acts, can use the title freely, unconsciously, and indiscriminately.

NOTES

[1] "The Christology of Acts Again," Christ and Spirit in the NT: In Honour of C. F. D. Moule (eds. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley; Cambridge: University Press, 1973) 81.

[2] Similarly, D. L. Jones, "The Title Christos in Luke-Acts," CBQ 32 (1970) 69-76.

[3] "An Anti-Gnostic Tendency in Lucan Christology," NTS 14 (1967-68) 259-71.

[4] Concurring that Lucan christology must be viewed in its totality is E. Krämkl, Jesus der Knecht Gottes: Die heilsgeschichtliche Stellung Jesu in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte (Biblische Untersuchungen 8; Regensburg: Pustet, 1972) who announces in his Introduction (xiii) his intention to forego analysis of the christological titles in the speeches believing that for Luke they were not as decisive as the overall structure of his portrait of Christ; see my review of Krämkl's work in JBL 93/2 (1974).

[5] See W. Foerster, "Kyrios," TDNT 3 (1965) 1047-54.

[6] Cf. R. H. Fuller, The Foundations of NT Christology (New York: Scribner's, 1965) 87-89; 231.

[7] Light from the Ancient East: The NT Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World (New York: Doran, 1927) 354 n. 4.

[8] Ibid., 350.

[9] It has been argued that the LXX may in fact not have translated Yahweh by kyrios. P. Vielhauer ("Ein Weg zur NT Christologie? Prüfung der Thesen F. Hahns," EvT 25 [1965] 24-72) notes that kyrios occurs only in LXX codices copied by Christian scribes, while in Jewish ones Yahweh was left unchanged. No longer tenable is the theory that in Hellenistic Jewry Yahweh and "Lord" were synonymous. The Christian use of kyrios cannot be derived from the LXX; rather, the opposite is true. When the title began to be used, it was rediscovered in the Bible.

[10] J. A. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I (2d ed.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1971).

[11] See W. G. Kümmel, The Theology of the NT: According to Its Major Witnesses, Jesus — Paul — John (London: SCM, 1974) 114.

[12] The most important work here is W. Kramer's, Christ, Lord, Son of God (SBT 50; London: SCM, 1966) 65-107; 151-82; 215-22.

[13] We cannot discuss this fully here; cf. F. Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity (London: Lutterworth, 1969) 93-99.

[14] Subtitle: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginning of Christianity to Irenaeus (Nashville: Abingdon, 1970). H. Boers ("Jesus and the Christian Faith: NT Christology since Bousset's Kyrios Christos," JBL 89 [1970] 450-56) submits that this work still remains unchallenged with regard to its conception of the origin, development, methodology, and presentation of NT christology.

[15] Bousset, ibid., 121-29.

[16] Theology of the NT (2 vols.; New York: Scribner's, 1951) 1. 51-52; 121-28, esp. 124.

17 The formula is translated at Rev 22:20: amēn, erchou kyrie, of which A. Richardson (An Introduction to the Theology of the NT [New York: Harper, 1958] 153) has said: "This verse alone is sufficient to prove that the title 'Lord' was not an invention of the Hellenistic community." The same expression also occurs in Didache 10:6.

18 Titles of Jesus, 96-97.

19 E.g., 4:11, 15, 19, 49; 5:7; and frequently throughout ch. 11.

20 4:1; 6:23; 11:2.

21 20:2, 13, 18, 20, 25, 28; 21:7a, 7b, 12. We will return to these in our discussion of Luke's resurrection narrative.

22 "Christology," The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles (eds. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake; 5 vols.; London: Macmillan, 1920-33) 1. 345-418.

23 Didaskale translates the Aramaic rabbî — a title surely given to Jesus in his lifetime, although it was mainly used of Jewish teachers of the Law. As the disciples began to appreciate the authority of Jesus' teaching, rabbî, as applied to him, acquired higher meaning. The Aramaic mārî is translated by kyrie, and it too took on added meaning as Jesus' authority was recognized. But never did mārî/kyrie connote divinity, and only gradually was it stamped with christological significance.

24 Ibid., 412-15.

25 9:28; 14:28, 30; 15:22, 25; 17:15; 18:21.

26 In passages marked with * the vocative is used: 1:43, 76; 2:11, 26; 5:8*; 7:13; 9:54*, 61*; 10:1, 17*, 39, 40*, 41; 11:1*, 39; 12:41*, 42; 13:15, 23*; 16:8; 17:5, 6, 37*; 18:6; 19:8a, 8b*; 22:33*, 38*, 49*, 61; 24:3, 34. Foakes-Jackson and Lake list only twenty-five; their omission of 1:43, 76; 13:15; 16:8; 19:8a, 8b*; and 24:3 is surprising.

27 5:12*; 7:6*; 18:41*; and 22:61. Each will be discussed later.

28 7:40; 11:45; 12:13; 19:39; 20:39.

29 8:49; 9:38; 18:18; 20:21, 28.

30 Why Luke uses epistata remains a mystery. Some have assumed an "epistata redaction" which affected the tradition before the final editor who preferred kyrios. Others believe Luke simply found epistata a more fitting title than didaskale; see A. Oepke, "Epistatēs," TDNT 2 (1964) 622-23.

31 Mark 10:51 has the form hrabbouni.

32 Those passages in which kyrios appears as a title for God are not relevant to our concern and are omitted.

33 1:43; 2:11; 7:13, 19; 10:1, 39, 41; 11:39; 12:42; 13:15; 16:8; 17:5, 6; 18:6; 19:8; 22:61 (twice); 24:3, 34. (This list excludes 19:31, 34 which depends on Mark 11:3; and 20:41-44 related to Jesus' Davidic sonship. Both passages, however, are discussed below.) Especially helpful on this point are I. de la Potterie, "Le titre Kyrios appliqué a Jésus dans l'évangile de Luc," Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux (eds. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux; Gembloux: Duculot, 1970) 117-46; and H. Flender, St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967) 52-53.

[34] "The Christology of Acts," Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of P. Schubert (eds. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1966) 160.

[35] The other is Christ's own phrase at Luke 19:31, cf. 34.

[36] Ibid., 172.

[37] H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (London: SPCK, 1958) 192-93.

[38] The Phenomenon of the NT: An Inquiry into the Implications of Certain Features of the NT (SBT 2/1; London: SCM, 1967) 58.

[39] On Matt's use of kyrios as a divine title, see G. Bornkamm, "End-Expectation and Church in Matt," in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, H. J. Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matt (NT Library; London: SCM, 1963) 42-43.

[40] Theology of the NT, 113-14.

[41] Titles of Jesus, 91.

[42] Hahn, ibid., 74-88, argues that the vocative kyrie paved the way to the absolute ho kyrios in the same way "rabbi/teacher" led to "the teacher."

[43] There is little agreement on where the so-called "travel section" ends. We accept 19:28 with G. Ogg, "The Central Section of the Gospel According to St. Luke," NTS 18 (1971-72) 39-53; but at least four other options have been supported: 18:14; 19:27; 19:44; and 19:46.

[44] Titles of Jesus, 80-81, esp. n. 99.

[45] Ibid., 82.

[46] J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus (Rev. ed.; New York: Scribner's, 1963) 45-48.

[47] Hahn, Titles of Jesus, 84-85.

[48] St. Luke, 52-53.

[49] Ibid., 79-80.

[50] Vs. 3 is the only instance in Mark's gospel where ho kyrios is used of Jesus. E. Trocmé ("Is There a Markan Christology?", Christ and Spirit in the NT, 7, 12) has recently argued that kyrios has no christological significance for Mark, who is but a forerunner of later first-century exponents of kyrios christologies.

[51] "Le titre Kyrios," 118 n. 3; the combination kyrios Iēsous is unique in the gospels (save for "Mark" 16:19), but appears frequently in Acts.

[52] Titles of Jesus, 112.

[53] "Christology of Acts," 161.

[54] "The Use of Kyrios in the Book of Acts," SJT 8 (1955) 157-59.

[55] Twenty-one of these are from D, on which see E. J. Epp, The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts (NTSMS 3; Cambridge: University Press, 1966).

[56] Luke applies kyrios to God in Acts almost as often as he does to Jesus; see O'Neill's helpful table, ibid., 171.

[57] There are several occurrences, with good textual support, which are not discussed elsewhere in this paper: 4:33; 9:1, 31?; 11:20; 13:2, 33(D); 14:3; 16:4(D); 18:9, 25; 21:14; 23:11; and 28:31. Rejected readings of kyrios (not discussed elsewhere) include: 14:2(D); 16:7(C); 20:32(B); and 21:20(D).

[58] Titles of Jesus, 129.

[59] St. Luke, 12 n. 2.

[60] Glory at the Right Hand: Ps 110 in Early Christianity (SBLMS 18; Nashville: Abingdon, 1973).

[61] Ibid., 104-8; we gladly acknowledge our indebtedness to his analysis.

[62] According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of NT Theology (London: Nisbet, 1952) 121.

[63] Titles of Jesus, 103-14.

[64] Cf. Peter's words at 11:16: "Then I recalled what the Lord had said: 'John baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit.'" On the importance of the Spirit in Acts, see G. W. MacRae, "'Whom Heaven Must Receive Until the Time': Reflections on the Christology of Acts," Int 27 (1973) 160-61. For Paul, calling upon the Lord is itself an act brought about by the Spirit: 1 Cor 12:3.

[65] The other, 10:36, will be discussed later.

[66] So H. Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke (New York: Harper and Row, 1960) 174 n. 3; against Hahn, Titles of Jesus, 106, who insists that recourse to Ps 2 is of no value for the explanation of 2:36.

[67] An excellent critical-exegetical analysis of this speech may be found in U. Wilckens, Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen (WMANT 5; Neukirchen: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1961) 32-37. On the argument, see R. F. Zehnle, Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3 (SBLMS 15; Nashville: Abingdon, 1971) 27-28. We regard the speech as a Lucan composition; cf. D. L. Jones, "The Christology of the Missionary Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1966) 33-59.

[68] Representative of others is Hahn, Titles of Jesus, 107.

[69] Peter's Pentecost Discourse, 66-68.

[70] "The Most Primitive Christology of All?", JTS, n.s., 7 (1956) 180; we have dealt with Robinson's argument in "The Title Christos in Luke-Acts," 71-73.

[71] Among others, see here: Conzelmann, Theology of St. Luke, 174, esp. n. 3.

[72] We are indebted here to O'Neill's discussion of this phrase, "Kyrios in Acts," 167-70.

[73] Support for this is found at Luke 22:61, the only occurrance of the phrase in the synoptics (see our discussion above). It is unlikely that Luke would use "the word of the Lord" as an equivalent for "the word of God."

74 "'Kyrios' as Designation for the Oral Tradition Concerning Jesus (Paradosis and Kyrios)," SJT 3 (1950) 180-97.

75 J. D. A. Macnicol, "Word and Deed in the NT," SJT 5 (1952) 237-48.

76 See Col 3:16; 1 Thes 1:8; 4:15; 2 Thes 3:1 — where kyrios is always Jesus.

77 Cf. O'Neill, "Kyrios in Acts," 170.

78 The letter denotes the second use of kyrios in the vs.

79 The phrase "Lord Jesus" occurs frequently in Acts, including 1:21 and 7:59 which are not discussed elsewhere. Also Jesus may be the object of prayer at 1:24 and 7:60, but this is not certain; see O'Neill, ibid., 168.

80 Among others who discuss this point is R. N. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity (SBT 2/17; Naperville: Allenson, 1970) 44, 128.

81 Paul quotes the same vs. at Rom 10:13; cf. vs. 9. Christians are those "who invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor 1:2). Of course, the clearest correlation of "Lord" and "name" is Phil 2:9-11: "Therefore God raised him to the heights and bestowed on him the name above all names, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow — in heaven, on earth and in the depths — and every tongue confess, 'Jesus Christ is Lord,' to the glory of God the Father." From the vast literature on this passage, one might single out the work of R. P. Martin, Carmen Christi: Phil. 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship (NTSMS 4; Cambridge: University Press, 1967).

82 The Composition and Date of Acts (HTS 1; Cambridge: Harvard, 1916) 35.

83 The Semitisms of Acts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965) 152.

84 H. J. Cadbury, "The Titles of Jesus in Acts," Beginnings of Christianity, 5, 361.

85 For Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal examples of similar expressions applied to God, see ibid., 362.

86 V. H. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions (NTTS 5; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963) 119.

87 Cf. O. Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions (London: Lutterworth, 1949) 41, 55-62.

88 Acts 9:5b; 22:10a and b, 19; 26:15b; see O'Neill's full treatment in The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting (London: SPCK, 1961) 131-33; and "Kyrios in Acts," 163.

89 A similar question about the name is found in Luke 8:30 where Jesus asks the unclean spirit, "What is your name?"; see M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946) 219.

90 Ananias seems to be addressing the Lord God of Israel in 9:10a and b, 11, 13, 15, but cf. 17.

S 170

PRECIS OF ECKHARD PLÜMACHER, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller*[1]

Schuyler Brown

General Theological Seminary

I. The literary appearance of Acts as a function of the Lucan picture of Christianity

1. The author of Acts stands at the beginning of that series of early Christian writers who, in consequence of the disappearance of an imminent expectation of the parousia, adapted themselves to this present world. This is expressed literarily by the use of the literary techniques, forms and motifs of Hellenistic literature. Cf. Acts 1:1 with Artemidorus, Oneirocr II Prooemium.

2. Following the practice of Hellenistic historians, Luke has composed speeches which do not suit the situations in which they supposedly were delivered but rather give the reader, at important turning points in the story, an insight into the suprahistorical significance of what is being narrated.

3. Luke uses language suitable to the situation which he describes (e.g. in 17:16-21) and themes calculated to excite the popular imagination (e.g. Queen Candace in 8:27 and the description of the storm and shipwreck in chapter 27).

4. Luke's desire to satisfy contemporary literary tastes could be only partially fulfilled, because of his limited literary ability. Cf. his efforts in 17:22-31 and 26:2-27 to make Paul speak like an educated Greek.

5. Luke's idealized picture of the Christian communism of the Jerusalem church (2:44f., 4:32) utilizes expressions derived from the political utopias of Greek philosophy, in order to suggest that what Greek philosophy strove for had actually been achieved by the Christian church. Cf. Iamblichus, Vit Pyth 30, 168; Plato, Resp V 462c.

6. Luke represents the apostles as imitators of Socrates. Cf. 5:29 with Plato, Ap 29d. Paul, like Socrates, preaches in the agora (17:17) and is accused of introducing strange deities (17:18.20). Apollos is called "an eloquent man" (18:24), and the reference to Paul having been "educated" (22:3) suggests that he had the paideia which distinguished Greek from barbarian. Cf. 28:2-7 with Apollonius of Tyana, Ep 34.

7. Luke has a sense of pride in the social standing of the converts to Christianity: the Asiarchs in Ephesus, the royal treasurer from Ethiopia, a member of Herod's court, the proconsul Sergius Paulus, etc. He represents the Christ-event in its relation to world history (Lk 3:1-3). He uses the literary fiction of a world-wide famine (11:27f.) to give cosmopolitan significance to a local occurrence. The intent of such passages is summed up in Paul's programmatic statement: "This was not done in a corner" (26:26).

---

1) Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

8. According to the Hellenistic principle of "stylistic gradation," the description of a phenomenon of such world-wide importance as Luke represents the origins of Christianity to be, had to be written in a cultivated style. Cf. the fragment from a mime (P. Giss. 3) in which the celebration in honor of Hadrian's enthronement is proclaimed from heaven in solemn, poetic fashion. It is in accordance with this principle of the relationship between form and content that the speech in which Paul underlines the world-wide significance of Christianity (chapter 26) is one of the stylistic high-points in Acts.

9. The fact that such elevated language was used in popular theater shows that the readers of Acts did not have to be educated persons to appreciate Luke's literary efforts. A certain measure of literary culture had penetrated to the middle and lower classes of Hellenistic society, from which Christianity made its converts.

II. The missionary speeches of Acts in their relationship to Hellenistic literature

Dibelius thought that these particular speeches had nothing to do with ancient historiography but exhibited a stereotyped structure based on the traditional preaching practice of Luke's own day. Wilckens, however, has shown that such a preaching tradition never existed in early Christian literature. Consequently, the missionary speeches must be understood in terms of Luke's theological conception. But if Luke is responsible for the composition of these speeches, then we may investigate anew their relationship to Hellenistic historiography.

1. The function of the missionary discourses in Acts and the function of the speeches in Hellenistic historiography

a. Dibelius' reason for considering the missionary discourses separately from the other speeches in Acts lies in the special subject matter of the former: the Christian gospel. Wilckens, however, maintains that in these speeches Luke represents the apostolic proclamation as the force behind the crucial turning points in church history, e.g. Pentecost, the baptism of Cornelius, rather than as a direct appeal to the reader.

b. If this is so, then Luke stands in close relationship to Hellenistic historiography, a point which Wilckens overlooked. Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Livy follow the same procedure of representing through speeches what they consider to be the motive forces behind crucial historical events. Cf. Ant Rom VII; Ab urbe condita V, VII, XXI, XXXIII, XXXV. The missionary discourses are distinct from the other speeches in Acts in that the speeches themselves are represented as the motive force behind crucial events. Luke's representation of the word of God as directing the course of history through the apostolic kerygma is derived from the Hellenistic conception of the decisive historical influence of the spoken word of prominent political and military men.

2. The imitation of the Septuagint in the missionary discourses and classicist mimesis

a. The "Semitisms" in the first half of Acts led Torrey and others to the hypothesis of an Aramaic original or source. This hypothesis is refuted both by the independence that Luke shows in this same half of Acts and by the fact that the so-called "Semitisms" prove, on closer inspection, to be "Septuagintisms." The fact that these "Septuagintisms" are limited to a clearly defined section of Acts shows that we have here the deliberate borrowing of a particular literary style.

b. In determining the instances of Septuagintal style we must exclude all express citations of the Old Testament, since the use of scriptural proofs is found in all Christian literature of this period and therefore cannot be considered of primary importance in describing an author's individual style. We must also exclude all clear allusions to the Old Testament.

c. Of the material which is left, the two speeches of Peter in 2:14-39 and 3:12-26 are particularly impressive. In the former speech it is Luke's purpose to present Peter speaking in solemnly Biblical style, by liberal use of expressions taken from the Greek Old Testament. In the second speech the influence of the Septuagint is also clear, although Haenchen sees here reminiscences of Greek rhetoric as well.

d. The Biblical style of the Septuagint also occurs occasionally in the second half of Acts, but its use there is not so extensive or pointed as in chapters 1-15. It does not go beyond what one would expect to find in any Christian writer of the period.

e. When we do find a pointed use of Septuagintisms in the second half of Acts, there are special reasons for their occurrence. In 22:6-22 and 26:14-18 we have the second and third versions of Paul's conversion. The exalted Lord and other heavenly messengers are made to speak in Septuagintal style.

f. The exception which proves the rule is Paul's farewell speech in Miletus (20:18-35). Here Luke imitates farewell speeches held in similar situations in the Old Testament, especially the speech of Samuel (1 Sam 12). The farewell discourse of an important personality before his death is well-known in the Old Testament and in later Jewish literature, and such discourses sometimes include prophecies of the difficult times which will follow the death of the speaker (cf. 20:29f).

g. The use of literary models is characteristic of Hellenistic historiography and finds its clearest expression in the classicist movement. The conscious imitation of Attic authors such as Thucydides, Xenophon and Demosthenes appears to have influenced Luke's imitation of the Septuagint in the speeches in Acts. Cf. Dionysius, Ant Rom III 7f; VI 6ff. In such passages the author is less interested in the thought of his model than in the form in which the thought is clothed. He wishes to offer his readers the same type of experience which they would enjoy in reading the classical authors.

h. The practice of mimesis was not limited to small literary circles. It penetrated to the common levels of society, as a study of the ancient novel reveals. Cf. Charito of Aphrodisias, Chaireas and Callirhoe (1st cent. B.C. or A.D.) and Achilles Tatius, Cleitophon and Leucippe (2nd cent. A.D.). The latter author is especially fond of imitating Plato.

i. It is significant that Achilles Tatius, despite his imitation of Attic style, could not avoid crude vulgarisms and solecisms. The same phenomenon appears in Charito and could be explained by his never having learned systematically how to write Attic Greek.

j. If classicism had an important influence on the literary productions of middle and lower class people, then it is highly probable that Luke had at least a superficial knowledge of classicist mimesis, since he belongs to the same half-educated middle class to which belonged the authors and readers of the novels just mentioned.

k. Even Josephus in his Jewish Antiquities manifests the influence of classicism in his allusions to Thucydides and Herodotus.

l. In view of Luke's conscious use of Hellenistic models, it seems only logical to explain his use of mimesis by the influence that this literature had on him. What is remarkable is Luke's insight that the technique of mimesis could be separated from its traditional object, i.e. the classic Attic authors, and fruitfully applied to the Septuagint.

m. However, Luke is not alone in this. There are Latin authors who applied the technique of mimesis to Latin models. Sallust, for example, imitates not only Thucydides but also ancient Latin authors like Cato and Ennius. The latter served as a model for Vergil and Livy as well, and the practice of imitating earlier Latin authors became extremely widespread in silver Latin.

n. Luke's purpose in imitating the Septuagint was certainly not to give an individual characterization of the manner of speaking of Peter or Paul. Peter was a Palestinian Jew, not a Diaspora Jew, yet Luke lets him and even James (15:14-21) speak in Septuagintisms. Where Luke is concerned to represent Paul's individual manner of speaking, he does so not by the use of Septuagintisms but by the use of concepts taken from Pauline theology (13:38f and 20:24).

o. For Luke the beginnings of Christianity had a quite special aura. The time of the archē (cf. 11:15) was an epoch sui generis, which could not be repeated and which exhibited factors in the life of the church which subsequently disappeared. The apostolic church is a Jewish church which keeps the Law and regards the temple as the center of Christian life and preaching. In this period there took place the decisive transition to the Gentile mission which determined the character of the church of Luke's own day.

p. Conzelmann has shown that this Lucan conception of the apostolic church finds expression in his adoption of the traditional terminology of the "people" in the first fifteen chapters of Acts. Now these are the very chapters where we find Luke's mimesis of the Septuagint. Furthermore, in chapter 15 we have the precise point which separates the church of the archē from the church of Luke's day: the "apostolic council." It seems obvious, therefore, to connect Luke's use of mimesis with his description of the archē. Nothing could better characterize this period as a "holy"age than the use of a "holy" language, the language of the Septuagint. The reader's reverence for the language of the Bible would be transferred to the word of the apostles which is proclaimed in this same language.

q. Luke's apparently exceptional use of Septuagintal Greek in Paul's farewell speech in Miletus (20:18-35) is explained by his desire to show the end of a second epoch in the church's history, the age of the disciples of the apostles. Here too the transition to the church of Luke's day is represented, as the "one heart and one soul"of the apostolic church give way to the inroads of heresy. At this point of transition the ideal character of the period of the archē is underscored by the use of the "holy" language of the Septuagint.

r. Luke's imitation of the Septuagint, then, is not an end in itself. It serves to characterize a particular period in the church's history. In this too Luke is following Hellenistic models. Dionysius imitated classical authors not simply in order to propagate classicism but also to counter the view that the Romans were a pack of barbarians. He does this not only by representing the ancient Romans as true Greeks and by showing the relationship of Roman institutions to Greek prototypes, but also by having the Romans speak in the Attic style or, at least, in conformity with Greek models. Romulus addresses the assembly of the people as did Demosthenes; Tullus calls to mind Pericles' funeral oration; Postumus encourages his soldiers like the general in Xenophon's Anabasis.

3. The use of archaism

a. Besides mimesis Luke uses a second stylistic device to characterize the period of the church's beginnings as a holy period: archaism.

b. Dibelius explained the presence of archaic traits in the speeches in Acts by the thesis that Luke had taken them over together with a primitive sermon outline.

c. These archaisms include:

i. Christological titles: pais theou, ho hagios, etc.

ii. ancient kerygmatic formulas: 3:20f, 5:31f, etc.

d. Wilckens' refutation of Dibelius' thesis of a primitive sermon outline requires us to reject the assumption that the sermons of Acts give us direct access to ancient forms of Christian proclamation. Luke may indeed have preserved certain ancient traditions, but these are of such fragmentary

and disparate character that they do not permit us to draw conclusions about pre-Lucan theology in the sermons in Acts.

e. Wilckens has further shown that when Luke uses such traditional titles and formulas he does so for his own theological purposes. For example, his use in Acts of anistanai must depend on traditional language, since he otherwise prefers to use egeirein in resurrection affirmations. However, the passion summaries used by Luke contained not anistanai but anastēnai. Since this latter form did not suit Luke's resurrection theology, he changed it to anistanai (e.g. 2:24a). In the same way Luke uses traditional Christological titles without thereby giving expression to any specific Christological affirmation.

f. Luke's reason for using these titles and formulas must be deliberate archaism: the old-fashioned linguistic aura makes a holy, "apostolic" impression. The reader makes associations not with a particular literature, as in the case of Luke's imitation of the Septuagint, but with the "good old days" of the apostolic community. This difference is the reason for distinguishing mimesis and archaism as separate literary techniques.

g. Livy offers a parallel for this use of archaism. In the first books of his history he does not try to modernize ancient Roman history, as do Dionysius and Plutarch, but rather to awaken in the reader the impression of time long ago. He creates this impression not only by emphasizing the uncertainty of the tradition and the completely different character of the period but also by the use of archaic expressions, which give his narrative a poetic, epic aura.

h. Both Luke and Livy use archaisms to characterize the ancient period which they are describing. Just as Livy wants to create in the reader a sense of distance from the events which he narrates, so Luke wants to represent the age of the primitive church as unique and unrepeatable, and not to make an immediate appeal to the reader. The purpose of Luke, as of Livy, is to edify the reader.

i. Luke's use of archaism can also be seen, then, as an imitation of Hellenistic literature. However, his dependence here is less evident than in the case of his use of mimesis, since it is not possible to adduce clear examples of Greek authors who, like Livy, use archaism as a distinct literary technique.

j. If Luke's use of archaism is to be viewed as a literary device, then the very thing which, in Dibelius' view, distinguished the missionary discourses from the other speeches in Acts and excluded them from consideration in connection with Hellenistic historiography would, in fact, be a reason in favor of viewing them precisely in this connection.

k. In any case, Luke's use of archaism is no guarantee for the antiquity of the tradition which he uses but has to do with the author's literary skill.

l. Luke's use of mimesis and archaism is not simply a capitulation to the literary requirements of his day, as in the case of his adoption of the principle of stylistic gradation. Rather, he is using the stylistic techniques offered by Hellenistic historiography without compulsion in order to further his own literary purposes.

m. In both cases it was Luke's view of the object of his narrative, the primitive church, which led him to adopt certain Hellenistic literary forms and techniques.

III. The use of the dramatic episode in Acts and in Hellenistic literature

1. The dramatic episode in Acts

a. In 21:27 - 26:32 Luke presents in a series of scenes an account of Paul's trial. The hearing before Festus (25:1-12) concludes the Palestinian section of this trial, about which alone Luke gives us a detailed report: Paul, in appealing to Caesar, takes his case out of the hands of the Roman procurator. It would be in keeping with the logical course of events for Luke to begin Paul's voyage to Rome immediately at this point. Instead, we have an intervening section (25:13 - 26:32) which contributes nothing to the progress of the story. What is the reason for this insertion?

b. Luke has already shown his concern to represent the relationship between Christianity and the state as a friendly one, in which the state declares its incompetence in religious matters (cf. 18:14f).

c. This view is compromised by the decision of Festus not only to judge Paul but actually to condemn him or cause him to be condemned by the Jews (25:9). By siding with the Jews Festus raises doubts in the reader's mind concerning the principle of non-interference by the state in religious controversies.

d. The insertion of 25:13 - 26:32 seems to be an attempt to uphold in the reader's mind the credibility of the principle of non-interference by the state in the face of a palpable violation of this very principle.

e. Luke answers the doubts in the reader's mind by reasserting the principle: despite Festus' attempt to assume jurisdiction, the question at issue is a religious one which a state tribunal is incapable of understanding, let alone of deciding. Luke has the Roman authorities declare this principle by acknowledging Paul's innocence. His acquittal is obstructed only by his appeal to Caesar.

f. Luke offers this answer not in the form of a theoretical disquisition but rather in the form of two dramatic episodes.

i. 25:13-22: The perplexed (v.20) procurator, in discussing Paul's case with King Agrippa, makes clear to the reader what Luke could not otherwise have made so convincing: Paul is innocent (v.18). The matter at issue is nothing

other than religious controversy (v.19), which Festus is not competent to resolve (v.20), as his own remarks concerning the resurrection make abundantly clear (v.19).

ii. 25:23 - 26:32: Once again Festus declares Paul innocent (25:25). He reveals his incompetence in the case by acknowledging that he has nothing to pass on to Caesar concerning Paul (25:26). Festus' interruption (26:24) of Paul's speech in his own defence reveals once again his incompetence in religious matters. Luke sums up the result of the hearing not in a dry resume but in dramatic fashion: a conversation between Festus and Agrippa (vv. 30-32), in which Paul's innocence is once again affirmed. The acquittal which should normally follow such a declaration of innocence is prevented only by Paul's appeal to Caesar. The reader's doubts are answered not by the author but by the narrative itself.

g. Having solved for the reader in this way the juridical question of Paul's trial and the status of Christianity, Luke can now proceed to a description of Paul's journey to Rome.

h. Does Luke's procedure here have the status of a stylistic method or is it a more or less accidental result of the embarrassment in which he found himself through 25:9?

i. The former alternative is suggested by 18:12-17, where, once again, although no narrative necessity requires it in this case, Luke formulates his thesis of the state's incompetence in religious matters not in an abstract presentation but in a dramatic scene. Here Gallio takes the place of Festus, as he asserts that he is competent to judge crimes but not religious controversies (v.14f). Luke does not simply have Gallio affirm this. He represents Gallio's stance dramatically (v.17): the crowd beats up the leader of the synagogue in Gallio's presence without the Roman procurator intervening in any way. The danger which had threatened the Christian missionaries now befalls the Jewish accusers, in consequence of the position taken by the Roman authorities.

j. Just as 25:13 - 26:32 was without any connection with the surrounding context, so too 18:12-17 could be omitted without any gap in the narrative arising.

k. The alternative method which Luke could have chosen, i.e. abstract argumentation, is exemplified by Christian apologists like Justin and Tertullian.

l. Other examples of dramatic episodes in Acts are found in 10:1 - 11:18 and 22:17-21, where Luke presents his theory of the mission to the Gentiles. This mission is represented as being the result not of any human decision but of God's direct intervention.

m. Once again, Luke inculcates this theory not by abstract argumentation but by a dramatic episode which is entirely unconnected with its context.

n. In the portrayal of Cornelius Luke shows us what conditions a Gentile must fulfil to be converted to Christianity: he must be a pious monotheist (10:2). God's special providence in Cornelius' conversion is shown by the angel's visit (vv.3-6), by Peter's vision (vv.10-16) and by the spirit's command (vv.19f). The human agent is a mere instrument in God's hand.

o. The turning-point of the episode is reached as the spirit falls upon Cornelius' household (v.44b) while Peter is still talking (v.44a), so that all human responsibility for the event is excluded.

p. In Peter's defence of his action before the Jerusalem community the emphasis lies entirely on the divine initiative. Any objection is excluded by the impossibility of man contending with God (11:17; cf. 10:47).

q. The problem of the mission to the Gentiles is solved not by theological argumentation but by a dramatic narrative, which translates Luke's theory into a concrete happening.

r. Paul too is represented as tracing the mission to the Gentiles back to God's providence (22:17-21), not in an abstract disquisition but in an account of a vision which he received from the Lord, directly commissioning him for the Gentile mission.

s. 8:26-40 represents the first step in the direction of the Gentile mission, and here too God's special providence is represented concretely and visually, through the action of the story itself: the command of the angel (v.26) and of the spirit (v.29), the appearance of water in the desert (v.36), Philip's disappearance (v.39). Once again, the episode is only loosely connected with the context.

t. We may compare Luke's use of the dramatic episode to illustrate his thesis concerning the Gentile mission with Justin's discussion of fatalism or Athenagoras' disquisition on the resurrection or even Heb 11, which Windisch has called a "tractatus de fide."

u. Luke's use of the dramatic episode extends to his account of Paul's missionary journeys. His descriptions of the events in Lystra (14:8-18), Philippi (16:16-40), Athens (17:16-33) and Ephesus (19:23-40) may be cited as examples. Through individual episodes an impression of the marvelous success of the missionaries is communicated to the reader which a continuous narrative, necessarily including mention of negative events, could not support.

v. The dramatic episode was the only way in which Luke could impress upon the reader his thesis concerning the triumphant advance of the Christian mission. Presented abstractly, this thesis was so totally at variance with the reality of continuing hostility to Christianity that it would convince no one. But expressed in a particular dramatic episode, this thesis did not come into conflict with either the contrary evidence of the narrative or the contrary experience of the reader.

w. Through such episodes Luke sought to instil in the reader the hope that the existing situation of Christianity in relation to state and society might change for the better. Such hope became all the more necessary in view of the extinction of expectation of the Lord's imminent return.

x. Luke's dramatic representation of his theory of the divinely willed mission to the Gentiles served to spur his community to missionary effort at a time when external pressures made such effort extraordinarily difficult.

y. Luke's use of the dramatic episode is not restricted to the illustration of his political and apologetic theses or his theological ideas. He also uses it simply to represent the high points of the action in dramatic fashion, i.e. to turn history into stories. In either case his concern is to enable the reader to understand history as a factor in his present situation.

2. Hellenistic parallels I: Livy

a. Did Luke invent the use of the dramatic episode or was it an already existing stylistic form, which he made use of as he made use of classicist mimesis?

b. By comparing Livy with Polybius and his other sources we see how he has created individual narratives out of a continuous historical report. Cf. Liv XXXIX 34 and Pol XXII 13f; Liv XXXVI 28 and Pol XX 10; Liv XXXI 17 and Pol XVI 29-33; Liv XXXXV 12 and Pol XXIX 27; Liv II 40 and Dionysius VIII 44-54.

c. Livy and Luke both use the same narrative technique. Both employ self-contained narrative units which can be understood apart from their context. In both cases the isolation of the dramatic episodes from their context can be shown to result from conscious literary intent and not from accident. Where Luke transforms history into stories, Livy transposes history into the deeds of prominent men.

d. Both Luke and Livy eliminate from their dramatic episodes all unessential detail, retaining only what is necessary to understand the scene.

e. Both Luke and Livy are interested in dramatic effect, which is achieved above all by increasing the dramatic tension just before the denouement of the episode in question.

3. Hellenistic parallels II: Cleitarchus, Duris, Curtius Rufus

a. Obviously Luke was not influenced directly by the Roman historian. But other Hellenistic authors seem to have used the dramatic episode.

b. In Cleitarchus' History of Alexander, preserved by Diodore of Sicily, we see an inclination to individual narrative units. Cf. Diodore XVII 26f; 98f.

c. Diodore has also excerpted the History of Agathocles by Duris of Samos, who also makes use of the dramatic episode. Cf. XIX 108f; XX 33f.

d. These two Hellenistic historians exhibit deliberate separation of the episodes from their context and the use of dramatic effects, with the denouement occurring at the very last moment. The role of the main actors, with whom the reader readily identifies, is deliberately exaggerated.

e. A final example of the use of the narrative unit is found in the description by Q. Curtius Rufus of the siege of Tyre by Alexander (IV 1,38 - 4,18[21]).

f. These examples suffice to show that the use of the dramatic episode by Luke and Livy belong to a widespread narrative style, so that the similarities between the two authors are easily explained without direct dependence. Both depend on Hellenistic stylistic tradition.

IV. Luke as a Hellenistic writer

a. The first chapter of this study has shown that Luke viewed the book of Acts as a work which could meet the requirements of the educated Hellenistic reader.

b. Luke's attempt to meet these requirements was prompted not by personal literary ambition but by the importance that he attributed to his subject matter. Hellenistic readers would find ridiculous Luke's claim for Christianity of world-wide significance (26:26) if the origins of the movement were not presented in the appropriate literary form.

c. Luke was no slavish imitator of Greek style, as his application of mimesis to the Septuagint shows. Through his use of the classicist technique he enabled the word of the apostles to share in the authority of sacred scripture. Once again, Luke's use of a Hellenistic technique is motivated by what he wants to say. To realize his objective he imitates a style which an educated Greek would certainly not recognize as literary.

d. Luke's conception of the missionary discourses as the motive force at crucial turning points in the history of the infant church is derived from Hellenistic historiography, as the speeches in Livy and Dionysius clearly show.

e. Luke uses the dramatic episode, also derived from Hellenistic historiography, not for its own sake but for the sake of the reader's edification and for the inculcation of the author's programmatic theses.

f. Luke wrote as a Hellenistic writer not in order to be fashionable but in order to achieve his purposes.