Short Abstract

ESCHATOLOGY, HISTORY AND MISSION IN THE SOCIAL EXPERIENCE OF LUCAN CHRISTIANS: A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IDEAS AND SOCIAL REALITIES IN LUKE-ACTS

Thomas William Martin
St. Peter's College
Submitted for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree
Hilary Term 1986

The subject of this thesis is the relationship between eschatology and history in the Christian community for which Luke-Acts was written. Chapter 1 formulates the problem in terms of Luke's eschatology. It argues that Luke and his community thought of the End as 'near' and that Luke's historical perspective affected his eschatology. Luke-Acts represents a community that held a relevant eschatological hope and was aware of continuing history. This is the interpretive problem this thesis seeks to enlighten.

The perspective to be used in approaching this problem is that of sociological analysis. Chapter 2 explores the use of sociological perspectives in New Testament study and the benefits to be achieved by the use of the sociology of knowledge.

Chapter 3 is a sociological analysis of the community in terms of date, location, stratification, racial composition, boundaries, social institutions, and charismatic roles and functions. This material suggests that mission was an important community task.

Chapter 4 establishes a sociology of mission for the community, investigating commitment as the mechanism that motivated community members to pursue mission, the importance of mission to the community, the motivation of converts, and the problems encountered in mission.

Chapter 5 investigates the social functions of eschatology in the community and finds that it functioned in legitimating numerous aspects of the community's mission experience.

Chapter 6 investigates the social functions of history in the community and finds that it functioned in legitimating various aspects of the community's mission experience.

In the conclusion it is shown that history and eschatology were functionally related to one another in legitimating aspects of the community's mission experience. This functionality also provided a meaningful relationship in helping the community to make sense of its world. This further prepares us to try and understand these ideas theologically by placing them in a social context.

ESCHATOLOGY, HISTORY AND MISSION IN THE SOCIAL EXPERIENCE OF LUCAN CHRISTIANS: A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IDEAS AND SOCIAL REALITIES IN LUKE-ACTS

Thomas William Martin
St. Peter's College
Submitted for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree
Hilary Term 1986

Abstract

The subject of this thesis is the relationship of history and eschatology in the Christian community for which Luke-Acts was written. The opening chapter formulates the problem in terms of Luke's eschatology. After introductory remarks about the use of the term 'eschatology', redaction and composition criticism, and the terms used to describe the temporal aspects of eschatological hope it is argued in the exegesis that Luke and his community thought of the End as 'near', i.e. as expected within their lifetime or that of their children, i.e. in the foreseeable future. This means that eschatological teaching was relevant to community members. This is demonstrated by examining selected passages.

Acts 2.17 and Lk. 4.21 demonstrate that Luke thought of his community's present time as 'eschatological'. Both passages emphasize realized aspects of eschatology and show the influence of Luke's historical perspective on his eschatology. It is demonstrated in the exegesis of Lk. 21, especially vv. 24, 32, that Luke thought of the End as near. This passage also shows a sense of historical awareness on Luke's part. In Lk. 17.20-18.8 it is shown that an atemporal eschatological discourse in 17.20-37 is given a temporal reference in 18.8 which says that God would 'soon' vindicate his people.

The importance of the Last Judgment in the community's preaching is investigated and it is found that the Judgment functions as a temporal sanction in the call for repentance. It is therefore inappropriate to

try and substitute the idea of 'suddenness' for temporal nearness in Lucan eschatology.

Other problem passages are investigated and it is shown that they do not indicate that Luke projected the parousia into the far distant future.

It is also shown that the existence of Acts and its historical perspective do not contradict the idea that the community held a lively eschatological hope.

In conclusion it is shown that Luke-Acts represents a community which held a relevant eschatological hope and was also aware of continuing history. How were these two ideas held together in a meaningful manner for the community? This is the interpretive problem to be addressed in this thesis.

The interpretive perspective to be used in approaching this problem is that of sociological analysis and, specifically, the perspective of the sociology of knowledge. Chapter 2 offers a justification for the use of sociology in New Testament study. The major benefit is to be found in the larger historical picture sociology provides to help us understand the life of early Christian communities.

An eclectic approach is necessitated in appropriating and choosing among the multiplicity of sociological perspectives available for use in New Testament study. But some guidelines are established in this chapter. These include: viewing the sociological task as one of human interpretation, a critical awareness of the use of sociological models, and an awareness of the necessity for and difficulties inherent in comparative study.

The major perspective used in this thesis is that of the sociology of knowledge. The theoretical formulation of this perspective selected for use is that of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann. The

advantages of their theoretical formulation over earlier theories is shown by outlining the main concepts used in the construction of the theory and by answering objections which have been raised against the sociology of knowledge. It is concluded that the sociology of knowledge offers an objective perspective for use in historical inquiry.

The chapter closes by examining how this perspective can help in the investigation of the ideas 'history' and 'eschatology' in an ancient community. The interpretive problem which we face is the relativity of thought. The effort to understand these ideas within the framework of the history of ideas inevitably means that our interpretation must be arrived at in terms relevant to our own historically conditioned meaning structures. Thus we cannot be certain that our understanding of 'history' and 'eschatology' corresponds to that of the early Christian community under study. The sociology of knowledge can help by allowing us to bypass efforts to establish the logical coherence of these ideas and instead to investigate their functional utility. This investigation will give us greater insight into the original historical situation and further prepare us for the ongoing task of trying to understand the logical coherence of such ideas in a theological system.

Chapter 3 offers a sociological analysis of the community which is drawn upon in the following chapters. It has two main goals: 1) the establishment of a comparative social world within which to understand the community, and 2) a preliminary suggestion that mission was a primary community experience. The period of the community's developing life-world as reflected in Luke-Acts is established as A.D. 70-90. There is no evidence to establish an exact location, but it can be shown that the community existed in a major cosmopolitan centre in the N.E. Mediterranean.

An outline of the social stratification of the Graeco-Roman

world is given and it is established that Luke's community drew its members predominantly from the middle classes. Although there is some evidence of the existence of a Christian proletariat in the community their numbers and importance to the community are difficult to establish.

The community's social boundaries are examined and it is found that while having a strong sense of Christian identity the community did not isolate itself from its wider social environment. Social structures and institutions are examined and it is found that many of these reflect the importance of mission in the community. Finally charismatic roles and functions are investigated and it is suggested that the community can be described as an enthusiastic group.

Chapter 4 investigates the sociology of mission in the Lucan community. After showing the inadequacy of John Gager's use of cognitive dissonance theory to explain the motivation for proselytism in early Christianity the commitment process is put forward as an alternative theoretical perspective which can be used to explain proselytism. After discussing commitment theory, various commitment mechanisms which can be seen to have been operative in the Lucan community are explored. It is found that the mechanisms most prevalent were of a non-radical nature. These mechanisms, e.g. investment in community goals, shared rituals and in-group language, gave the community members a strong sense of commitment to the group and its task but did not disrupt former social contexts in a radical manner as other mechanisms might have done, e.g. the renunciation of the economic culture or the renunciation of family. This made mission an easier task than if the community achieved commitment by isolating mechanisms.

It is suggested that for commitment to result in proselytism, proselytism must be an established group task that can be expected of the committed individual. The place of mission in the community's

symbolic universe is examined and found to be a major symbolic configuration.

The motivation of converts is examined and while there is little evidence for some of the many factors which must have motivated converts there is some evidence for the existence of relative status deprivation among community members. This was probably a contributing factor in motivating their conversions.

Finally it is asked if the community was experiencing marked numerical success in its mission. It is established that the notices of mass conversions in Acts serve other polemical needs and do not indicate that Luke's church experienced mass conversions. It is shown that Luke expected mission preaching to be frequently rejected and that he and his community redefined success to encompass failure. The rejection of mission preaching was preempted by including the threat of judgment in preaching. The community's failure in its mission task and other aspects of mission experience needed symbolic explanation.

In Chapter 5 the social functions of eschatology in the community are investigated. It is shown that the 'kingdom of God' was a major community symbol. Its functional utility can therefore be extrapolated to indicate the function of eschatology for the community. The symbols associated with the kingdom as a future event and as a present transcendent reality are set out. At the eschaton the community expected mankind to be divided into two groups, the just and the unjust, destined for opposite fates in relation to their acceptance or rejection of Jesus. They also expected salvation to be fully realized in spiritual and physical senses. Sociologically, the most important aspect of the kingdom as a symbol of a present transcendent reality is its non-falsifiable nature. This provided a symbolically secure victory for the community. The present ambiguity of the transcendent kingdom also

explained the failure of those who reject the Gospel to see its reality.

Luke's use of the phrase 'the kingdom of God' in relation to Jesus' ministry is examined. The section Lk. 4.14-44 is investigated as a Lucan programme. It is found that in this passage Jesus is accepted and rejected (Capernaum and Nazareth) and that salvation is realized in the forgiveness of sins and healing. Other passages are examined and confirm that Luke associated these concepts with the kingdom in connection with Jesus' ministry.

The phrase is examined in Acts and it is found that its association with other kerygmatic phrases means that the symbols connected with the kingdom in this book must be drawn from the broad presentation of apostolic ministry in general. The exegesis finds that Luke associated the acceptance and rejection of the message of the early church and Paul, and the realization of salvation in their ministries in healing and the forgiveness of sins with the kingdom.

These concepts associated with the kingdom correspond to the community's own mission experience and from a sociological perspective it can be seen that the symbols Luke associates with the kingdom of God are projections of his community's own mission experience.

Chapter 6 investigates the social functions of history in the community. The genre of Luke-Acts as a history is clarified and the uses of history in late antiquity explored. It is found that in Luke's milieu it was accepted that history be related to contemporary needs. This use of history is explored sociologically and found to be inherent in our retelling of the past. History inevitably lends itself to being used to justify the present. Thus it can be seen that history has served as a major form of legitimation.

Luke used history in three different ways to apply it to the problems his community was facing. These are: the use of ancient

prophecy in a pattern of promise and fulfilment, the use of historical personages as role models, and the presentation of God as a causal agent in history. These methods of historical legitimation are applied to two major aspects of the community's mission experience. These are the justification of the gentile mission (which was a problem because of the Jewish section of his community) and the issue of Jew-gentile table fellowship. It is also found that historical legitimation was used in relation to the justification of the realization of salvation in healing and the forgiveness of sins and the experience of mixed response in mission preaching. Thus it can be seen that Luke used history to legitimate his own church's mission experience.

In the conclusion it is shown that history and eschatology were functionally related to one another in that both were used in legitimating the community's main task: mission. Both were used to help the community make sense of the experiences it faced in the mission. When interpreted sociologically the community can be seen to have projected into the future and into the past symbols which corresponded to their own experiences. Once projected and reified these symbols acquired an ontological status independent of their human origins and could thus provide a secure and non-falsifiable explanation of the community's experiences. The functional relationship of eschatology and history in the social context of mission can also be interpreted to indicate that they were meaningfully related to one another in terms of their ability to make sense of community experiences. But meaning in this sense is only apparent in relation to group experience. The question of the logical coherence of these ideas in Luke's theological system remains open, but the establishment of a social context within which each was functionally meaningful will further prepare us to pursue that question.

The University of Oxford

ESCHATOLOGY, HISTORY AND MISSION IN THE SOCIAL EXPERIENCE OF LUCAN CHRISTIANS: A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IDEAS AND SOCIAL REALITIES IN LUKE-ACTS



A Doctor of Philosophy Thesis Submitted to
The Faculty of Theology

By
Thomas William Martin

St. Peter's College
Oxford
Hilary Term 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS v

CHAPTER I THE PROBLEM OF LUCAN ESCHATOLOGY 1

A. Introduction 1
B. A Definition of Eschatology 3
C. Introductory Remarks to the Discussion of Luke's Eschatology 7
D. Acts 2.17 13
E. Luke 4.21 21
F. Luke 21 23
G. Luke 17.20-18.8 35
H. The Question of 'Suddenness' in Luke's Eschatology . . 39
I. Other Problem Passages 45
J. The Problem of Acts 48
K. Conclusion 50

CHAPTER II SOCIOLOGY AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDY 51

A. The Justification for the Use of Sociology in New Testament Study 51
B. Guidelines for the Use of Sociological Methods and Perspectives 55
C. The Use of the Sociology of Knowledge 65
D. The Sociology of Knowledge and the Study of History and Eschatology 81

CHAPTER III TOWARDS A SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE LUCAN COMMUNITY 87

A. Date 87
B. Location 90
C. Stratification 92
D. Racial Composition 113
E. Boundary Definition 140
F. Social Structures and Institutions 156
G. Charismatic Roles and Functions 165

CHAPTER IV A SOCIOLOGY OF MISSION IN THE COMMUNITY OF LUKE-ACTS 174

A. Introduction 174
B. Commitment in the Lucan Community 179
C. Mission in the Community's Symbolic Universe 186
D. The Motivation of Converts 203
E. The Mission's Level of Success 209

CHAPTER V A FUNCTIONALIST APPROACH TO THE 'KINGDOM OF GOD' IN LUKE-ACTS 218

A. Goals 218
B. The Kingdom as a Lucan Motif 219
C. The Content of the Future Kingdom of God 220
D. The Symbolic Value of the Kingdom as a Transcendent Reality 222
E. 'Preaching the Kingdom' in Luke's Gospel 224
F. 'Preaching the Kingdom' in Acts 239
G. Sociological Analysis 255

Appendix: The Kingdom of God and Jew-Gentile Table Fellowship 260

CHAPTER VI THE SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OF HISTORY IN THE COMMUNITY OF LUKE-ACTS 262

A. Introduction and the Question of the Genre of Luke-Acts 262
B. Uses of History in Antiquity 264
C. A Sociological Perspective on Historical Knowledge . 266
D. History as a Form of Legitimation 269
E. Forms of Historical Legitimation and the Gentile Mission 271
F. Historical Legitimation and Jew-Gentile Relations . . 285
G. Other Aspects of Mission Experience Given Historical Legitimation 291
H. Conclusion 301

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 304

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The opportunity to live in Oxford and to undertake the research for this thesis was made possible by the financial contributions of numerous groups and individuals. I received an Overseas Research Student Award from the committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of the Universities of the United Kingdom from 1981 to 1984. During that same period I was given the E. Craig Brandenburg Graduate Award by the Board of Higher Education and Ministry of the United Methodist Church. And in the autumn of 1985 I was awarded a grant in aid of research from the Hall-Houghton Trust of Oxford University. My thanks to all of these groups.

I would also like to thank Dr. James Buskirk, Mr. and Mrs. Gail Runnels, Dr. and Mrs. David Dyson, and Mr. and Mrs. Michael Orsillo for their faithful and generous support, both financial and spiritual. I am also indebted to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Martin, and to my wife's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Sandfort, for their loving care and financial support. Last, but certainly not least, I will always be thankful for the support of the congregation of First United Methodist Church, Tulsa, Oklahoma, and their senior minister, the late L.D. Thomas, whose constant encouragement and friendship were a great help.

Money alone cannot produce a thesis and I owe a great deal to the Revd. Robert Morgan of Linacre College for his patience and direction in supervising the work. His insight into the problems of modern thought, his competent criticisms, and his meticulous care over the final copy have provided a role model in teaching which I hope to emulate. Thanks is also due to Prof. E.P. Sanders. His contributions to the thesis,

particularly those aspects touching on the Judaism of the 1st century, are of inestimable value.

Thanks is due to Betty Ho Sang for her efforts in turning the 'rough' draft into the final copy. But it is doubtful that any amount of thanks or payment will be sufficient to compensate for that task. Thanks is also due to Tonie Thomas for her help in proofreading. There are also many friends and colleagues, too numerous to mention, who have helped in countless ways. To them my hearty thanks.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Carol, not only for her help in the physical production of the thesis but for her constant care, love, support, and understanding given selflessly over the last four and a half years. To her, and to my four young sons, Nathan, Aaron, Joshua, and Benjamin, who have grown up in England while their father was 'doing the thesis', this work is dedicated.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AO	Acta Orientalia
BAG	A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, A translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, 4th ed., by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich
BC	The Beginnings of Christianity, 5 vols., eds. F.J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake
BiLeb	Bibel und Leben
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Ryland's University Library
BR	Biblical Research
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin
BW	Biblical World
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
Cassidy	Political Issues in Luke-Acts, eds. Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper
Catacombs	The Catacombs and the Colosseum, eds. Stephen Benko and John O'Rourke
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CQR	Church Quarterly Review
CR	Classical Review
CTM	Concordia Theological Monthly
ER	Epworth Review
ET	Expository Times
EvM	Evangelische Missionszeitschrift
EvT	Evangelische Theologie
Gardiner	Theories of History, ed. Patrick Gardiner
HTR	Harvard Theological Review

Interp	Interpretation
ITS	Indian Theological Studies
JAAR	Journal of the American Academy of Religion
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JHI	Journal of the History of Ideas
JR	Journal of Religion
JRH	Journal of Religious History
JRomS	Journal of Roman Studies
JRS	Journal of Religious Studies
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
LJT	Lutheran Journal of Theology
Martin	Sociology and Theology: Alliance and Conflict, eds. David Martin, John O. Mills and W.S.F. Pickering
Meyer & Sanders	Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol. 3, eds. Ben F. Meyer and E.P. Sanders
NBf	New Blackfriars
NeoTest	Neotestamentica
Neusner	Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults, Pts. I-IV, ed. Jacob Neusner
NovTest	Novum Testamentum
NRM	New Religious Movements, ed. Eileen Barker
NTS	New Testament Studies
PerspRelStud	Perspectives in Religious Studies
PLA	Perspectives in Luke-Acts, ed. C.H. Talbert
PR	Psychological Review
PS	Philosophy of Science
RivistBib	Rivista Biblica
RQ	Restoration Quarterly

RS	Religious Studies
RSR	Religious Studies Review
RTR	Reformed Theological Review
Sanders	Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol. I, ed. E.P. Sanders; vol. II, eds. E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson
SJRS	Scottish Journal of Religious Studies
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
SKR	The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader, eds. James E. Curtis and John W. Petras
SLA	Studies in Luke-Acts, eds. L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn
ST	Studia Theologica
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich
TS	Theological Studies
TZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM OF LUCAN ESCHATOLOGY

A. Introduction

It has been asserted that the major issue facing Luke's[1] generation was the question of time,[2] i.e. the continued existence of the church in history[3] in contrast to the expected parousia; in other words, the relationship of history and eschatology.[4] That issue is the subject of this thesis. How were the concepts 'history' and 'eschatology' related to one another for the Christian community[5] for which Luke-Acts[6] was written? This topic has been

---

[1]The author of Luke-Acts will be referred to as 'Luke' for convenience and without prejudicing the question of authorship.

[2]Josef Ernst, Herr der Geschichte: Perspektiven der lukanischen Eschatologie (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1978), p. 11.

[3]Leonhard Goppelt, "The Existence of the Church in History According to Apostolic and Early Catholic Thought," in Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in honor of Otto A. Piper, eds. William Klassen & Graydon Snyder (London: SCM, 1962), p. 193; cf. E. Earle Ellis, "Die Funktion der Eschatologie im Lukas-evangelium," ZTK 66 (1969), p. 392; Gerhard Lohfink, Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas (München: Kösel, 1971), p. 259.

[4]Josef Zmijewski, Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas-Evangeliums. Eine traditions- und redactionsgeschichte Untersuchung zu Lk. 21:5-36 und Lk. 17:20-37 (Bonn: 1972), p. 95; idem., "Die Eschatologiereden Lk. 21 und Lk. 17: Überlegungen zum Verständnis und zur Einordnung der lukanischen Eschatologie," BiLeb 14 (1973), p. 32.

[5]The most convincing evidence that Luke-Acts was intended for a Christian audience is the pervasive theological nature of the work. The strongly intra-Christian nature of several aspects of the work will be made evident in Chapter 3. Robert Maddox, The Purpose of Luke-Acts (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982), pp. 12ff.; and Philip Francis Esler, "Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology," Unpublished D.Phil. Thesis,

chosen not because the relationship of history and eschatology was necessarily an explicit issue in the 1st century,[7] but because it is manifestly a major interpretive problem in our own time.

This opening chapter will formulate the problem in relation to Luke's eschatology. The idea that Luke's solution to the problem of the delay of the parousia was to postpone the End indefinitely is no longer the dominant view of most English and American specialist literature on Luke-Acts. However, the same cannot be said of German specialist literature and this first chapter will argue that Luke and his community thought of the End as near. It will also be shown that Luke's historical perspective has affected his eschatological thought. Thus one is faced in Luke-Acts with the evidence of a community that held a relevant eschatological hope and was aware of continuing history.[8] This is the interpretive problem with which we are faced. How did these two seemingly contradictory emphases fit together in a meaningful way for the community?

The University of Oxford, 1984, pp. 38ff.; have offered concise statements of the evidence for a Christian audience which include: 1) the inconclusive nature of Lk. 1.1-4 for establishing the audience, 2) Luke's use of the LXX presumes that his readers are well versed in that book, 3) the Old Testament atmosphere of the opening chapters assumes that the reader is familiar with the Jewish antecedents of Christianity, 4) Luke assumes Christian knowledge of his reader in failing to offer explanations of specifically Christian terms.

[6]The almost universally accepted opinion that both books stem from the same author is accepted here. For objections see A.C. Clark, The Acts of the Apostles (Oxford: Blackwells, 1933), pp. 393-408; and A.W. Argyle, "The Greek of Luke and Acts," NTS 20 (1973-74):441-45.

[7]For cogent doubts, see E. Earle Ellis, The Gospel of Luke (Greenwood, South Carolina: The Attic Press, 1977), pp. 239ff.; idem., "Eschatologie," p. 400; C.F.D. Moule, "The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Eschatological Terms," JTS 15 (1964):1-15; Werner Georg Kümmel, "Lukas in der Anklage heutigen Theologie," ZNW 63 (1972):157f.

[8]The specifics of Luke's view of history are generally less problematic than those of eschatology and will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

Having brought the problem into focus we can move on in Chapter 2 to discuss the use of sociological methods and perspectives in New Testament study and the ways in which the use of sociology can help in enlightening our understanding of the relationship of history and eschatology in Luke's community. The goal of this thesis will be to show that a sociological approach to the problem of the relationship of history and eschatology in Luke-Acts can offer a significant advance in our understanding of Luke's history and eschatology by establishing a social matrix within which both concepts were functionally significant in the community's experience of its life-world. Chapter 3 will offer a sociological analysis of the community which will then be drawn upon in Chapters 4-6. Chapter 4 will discuss the sociological factors involved in the community's mission, establishing that mission was a major group task with specific social-ideological problems that required theoretical legitimation. Chapter 5 will relate the social functions of eschatology, and Chapter 6 the social functions of history, in the Lucan community to its experience of mission. We will then be in a position to show in the conclusion that the concepts 'history' and 'eschatology' were functionally related to one another in a meaningful way in the community's experience of its group task, mission.

B. A Definition of Eschatology

The major methodological problem in dealing with the relationship of history and eschatology is the construction of an adequate framework within which to understand eschatology. There is, however, an even more basic question. It is whether or not one ought to talk about 'eschatology' at all. The plea of Jean Carmignac that the word 'eschatology' should be stricken from theological

discussion because of its ambiguity[9] is destined to be ignored. Theology, as a discipline, is not the 'science' Carmignac's French rationalism desires and therefore cannot operate with the precision of language he wishes.[10] If the word 'science' is applied to theology in the latter half of the 20th century it should be qualified by the adjective 'human' to distinguish it from the 'hard' sciences which deal with the quantifiable and material aspects of our existence. As a human science, theology, in common with the other social sciences, is involved in a quest for the meaning and significance of human existence.[11] (It is true that most theological traditions would wish ultimately to account for that meaning in terms of a transcendent reality which is supra-human. But to do so the theologian must work from a humanly transmitted tradition and thus the application of the adjective 'human' to his conceptual task is still justified.) The keynote for this quest in the latter 20th century is relativity.[12] An Archimedean point for the study of man and his religions does not exist (at least not one on which all parties can agree). All points of reference are themselves part of the flux in question. Thus any effort to advance the understanding of any human religion must grapple with the semantic ambiguity and socio-historical conditioning inherent in the way in which we use religious concepts. One cannot shy away from 'eschatology' simply because it lacks the precision of a

---

[9]Jean Carmignac, "Les dangers de l'eschatologie," NTS 17 (1971): 381ff.

[10]Ibid. In any event the 'ology' of 'eschatology' is no longer significant as Carmignac acknowledges, p. 370. Also I. Howard Marshall, "Slippery Words: I. Eschatology," ET 89 (1977-78):264f.

[11]See Ch. 2, pp. 55ff.

[12]See Stephen Toulmin, Human Understanding, vol. I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), esp. pp. 1-29 for a discussion of the relative historicality of the human situation; cf. Rodney Needham, Belief, Language, and Experience (Oxford: Blackwells, 1972), pp. 243ff.

mathematical symbol. The lack of such precision is in the nature of theological words.

Secondly, even if Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider's coinage of the term 'eschatology' in 1804[13] did open a 'Pandora's box', the point of that story is that such an event cannot be revoked. The word is in use and we shall have to learn to deal with it.[14]

The word is, in any case, useful. First, and perhaps most important, its function as a cover word for various Biblical concepts[15] has, as the result of nearly a century of debate, served to bring out the importance of futurity in Biblical thought.[16] Secondly, the very ambiguity of the word makes it attractive for theological discussion. It is a word about which we can agree to disagree; provided that all parties are careful in the definition of their own perspective.[17] The word's usefulness in this manner can be seen if one examines the programme Carmignac would have us substitute for 'eschatology'. He suggests that the various concepts now grouped under the umbrella of 'eschatology' could be similarly grouped under the Biblical concept 'the kingdom of God'.[18] But his programme does not end here. It also includes a specific understanding of the kingdom of God as a present reality, inaugurated by Jesus, moving towards a temporal

---

[13]Carmignac, p. 365.

[14]Marshall, "Eschatology," p. 268.

[15]Ibid., p. 267; cf. Carmignac, pp. 379f.; David Edward Aune, The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), p. 1.

[16]Marshall, "Eschatology," p. 267; cf. Christopher Rowland, Christian Origins (London: SPCK, 1985), pp. 113ff.

[17]Marshall, "Eschatology," p. 268; cf. Aune, p. 1. Carmignac considers this possibility but deems it a poor second to a ban on the word, pp. 380f.

[18]Carmignac, pp. 385ff.

fulfilment, and with both individual and corporate aspects.[19] At this point many exegetes would choose to disagree and it is at this point that 'eschatology' can emerge as a useful and specifically non-Biblical cover word. If adequate definition is given and if there is an understanding of the historical development of the term and the resultant range of meanings it can have,[20] then it can function as a cover word for a family of Biblical ideas about which it is agreed there will be disagreement as to the individual family members and even the basic nature of the family itself. 'Eschatology', without further definition, calls to mind an ongoing theological debate about the interpretation of an open-ended set of Biblical concepts related to the fulfilment of salvation, the End of the world, and the nature and destiny of man.[21]

Since the methodology to be used in this thesis will be socio-historical as opposed to theological (see Chapter 2) the definition of eschatology will be similarly historical. "The terms 'eschatology' or 'eschatological' as used here refer to the conception of the events associated in first century Jewish and Christian thought with the anticipated end of the present age, or world, and the coming, or beginning, on earth of the kingdom of God or the messianic age."[22]

---

[19]Ibid. The theological stiltedness of his programme is further evident in his claim that dropping the word 'eschatology' and replacing it with the 'kingdom of God' would finally solve the debate about the latter's present or future nature.

[20]Carmignac is most thorough; idem., "Rectification d'une erreur concernant l'eschatologie," NTS 26 (1980):252-58; see also G.B. Caird, The Language and Imagery of the Bible (London: Duckworth, 1980), pp. 243ff.; Marshall, "Eschatology," pp. 264-67; Aune, pp. 1-5: Richard H. Hiers, The Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Tradition (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1970), pp. 7-21.

[21]Cf. Caird, Language, p. 243; Marshall, "Eschatology," p. 265; William Manson, "Eschatology in the New Testament," in Eschatology, eds. W. Manson, et al., SJT Occasional Papers, no. 2 (London: Oliver & Boyd, 1957), p. 1.

[22]Hiers, Kingdom, p. 1, n. 2.

C. Introductory Remarks to the Discussion of Luke's Eschatology

More than 30 years after its publication, Hans Conzelmann's Die Mitte der Zeit (1954)[23] continues to exert a major influence in the study of Luke's eschatology. This is evident not only in the exceptionally large number of reviews it has generated in the course of its German and English editions,[24] but also in the fact that monographs published in the last 10 years continue to be structured by categories and questions set out in Conzelmann's treatment of Luke. Eric Franklin's Christ the Lord (1975) is largely structured by debate with Conzelmann.[25] Ruthild Geiger's Die lukanischen Endzeitreden (1976) begins with the discussion of the two basic positions she thinks available for the study of Luke's eschatology, those of Conzelmann and H.-W. Bartsch.[26] Josef Ernst in his book Herr der Geschichte (1978) sets the context of his discussion vis à vis Conzelmann.[27] A.J. Mattill, Jr. in his monograph Luke and the Last Things (1979) makes repeated reference to Conzelmann's works as embodying the position against which he will argue.[28] Robert Maddox in The Purpose of Luke-Acts (1982) has termed Conzelmann's work on Luke "the 'classic' theory of Lukan eschatology" and as such it

---

[23]References are from the ET, The Theology of St. Luke, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (London: Faber & Faber, 1960). Conzelmann's programme in Luke was outlined by Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol. 2 (New York: Scribner's, 1955), pp. 116-18; and anticipated by Philipp Vielhauer, "Zum 'Paulinismus' der Apostelgeschichte," EvT 10 (1950-51):1-15.

[24]H.H. Oliver, "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," NTS 10 (1963-64):202 lists 32 reviews spanning 10 years.

[25](London: SPCK), e.g. his chapter on eschatology, pp. 9-47.

[26]P. 8.

[27]Pp. 12ff.

[28](Dillsboro, North Carolina: Western North Carolina Press, 1979), passim.

influences the structure of and questions addressed in his chapter on this topic.[29]

The essence of Conzelmann's theory is to be found in his claim that the "delay of the parousia" is the motivating factor in Luke's theology.[30] Luke's generation was faced with the embarrassment that the early church's expectation of Jesus' swift return had not been fulfilled. Luke set out to produce a permanent solution to this problem by relegating the parousia to the indefinite future, denying contemporary events eschatological significance, and viewing the gift of the Holy Spirit as a solution to the problem of the delay of the parousia. The object of this section is not to attempt a complete explanation of Luke's eschatology. That would require a substantial monograph in itself and this thesis, as a whole, is conceived of as only a preliminary step in such a task (Ch. 2, D). The goal of this section is to question one aspect of this classic theory. Has Luke in fact relegated the parousia to an 'endlessly remote' future and thus provided a permanent solution to the problem of its non-appearance?

There are two preliminary remarks which should be made prior to beginning the exegetical task. One relates to the terminology used to describe eschatological expectation and the other is methodological.

It will be argued in the exegesis that Luke and his community expected the End to occur 'soon'. But what does one mean in using such temporal adjectives to describe an eschatological expectation?

---

[29] P. 100; see also numerous references to Conzelmann in the notes, pp. 145ff. Other recent articles structured vis à vis Conzelmann are Kevin Giles,"Present-Future Eschatology in the Book of Acts (I)," RTR 40 (1981):65-71; idem., "Present-Future Eschatology in the Book of Acts (II)," RTR 40 (1982):11-18; Leopold Sabourin, "The Eschatology of Luke," BTB 12 (1982):73-76.

[30] Maddox, p. 100.

It has become common to speak of the earliest community's eschatological expectation as 'imminent'. 'Naherwartung' is often used in German. These terms usually function to describe the impact of eschatology on the community's quality of life and precise temporal implications are generally left undefined. But one infers from the usage that such a hope could not have a long period of temporal viability. Still, what does it mean in terms of days, months, and years to describe an eschatological expectation as 'imminent' or 'near'? How far into the future can the expected End be projected before 'Naherwartung' ceases to be an adequate description? The working assumption seems to be that statements attributed to Jesus in Mk. 9.1 (Lk.9.27, Mt. 16.28) and Mk. 13.30 (Lk. 21.32, Mt. 24.34) indicate that the earliest community expected the parousia before the end of their generation. A definition of the viable temporal extent of an 'imminent' expectation as limited to one generation seems to lie behind Conzelmann's assertion that an imminent eschatological expectation cannot, by nature, be handed down by tradition (i.e. across a shift in generations?).[31] But the use of a 'generation' as a temporal definition is still not very precise. Does one mean a traditional 40 years, or the more realistic experience of 50 or 60 years? Is an expectation of the End as 40 or 50 years away still adequately described as 'near'? It is arguable that Paul's letters indicate that there may have been development in the eschatological expectation of the earliest community itself. Their expectations of the End may have changed within their generation (cf. I Thess. with the concerns of later letters). The current terminology is not pliant enough to deal with these changes and nuances.

---

[31]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 97; also by Otto Merk, "Das Reich Gottes in den lukanischen Schriften," in Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), p. 203.

A.J. Mattill has used some suggestive terms which may offer a way forward. He uses the term 'Nächsterwartung' to describe an expectation which is immediate.[32] By 'Naherwartung' he appears to mean an expectation of the End as something which will occur within the experience of the living community or its immediate descendants.[33] By 'Fernerwartung' Mattill refers to Conzelmann's theory of Lucan eschatology. The End has been indefinitely postponed.[34] What is helpful in Mattill's usage, regardless of whether or not one wishes to use his still vaguely defined terms, is the concept of a third category. Perhaps one can combine Mattill's attempt at an objective temporal definition of the viable limits of different types of expectation with the existing emphasis on the impact of eschatological expectation on the community's quality of life. The resulting three categories allow for development in early Christian eschatological expectation from the earliest community, which may have expected the End as very soon and eschatological events associated with the End were seen as directly relevant to faith and practice, to a middling phase in which the delay of the parousia had begun to affect expectation so that the End was expected at the fringes of the living community's lifetime or even in the lifetime of their children in whom they had an existential stake. Thus the events described in eschatological traditions continued to be relevant for faith and practice even if in a manner somewhat removed from that of the

---

[32]Mattill, Last Things, p. 110.

[33]One must compare passages in Luke and the Last Things where Mattill describes the Lucan alternative to 'Nächsterwartung' but does use the term 'Naherwartung', e.g. pp. 110ff., with his article "Naherwartung, Fernerwartung and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: Weymouth Reconsidered," CBQ 34 (1972):276-93 where he describes Luke's eschatological hope as 'Naherwartung' but does not contrast this with 'Nächsterwartung'.

[34]Mattill, "Naherwartung," passim.

earlier phase. The final category represents a phase when the events of the End have ceased to have direct relevance for those of the living community or their direct descendants. This is the level of a permanent solution to the non-arrival of the parousia. The adoption of a middling category avoids the Procrustean handling of eschatological materials imposed by the 'either, or' choice between 'Naherwartung' and 'Fernerwartung'. It will be argued in the exegesis that Luke's eschatology is best classified in this middling category. At several points he can be seen to alter materials so as to avoid the eschatological immediacy of an earlier time.[35] Nevertheless, Luke and his community expected the End to occur within their or their children's lifetime. Thus the events associated with the End in eschatological traditions can still be thought of as being 'existentially relevant', i.e. important in preparing the community for events it is expected to experience at some time in the foreseeable future, as opposed to irrelevant, i.e. describing events which will certainly not be experienced by the community.

This study is concerned with Luke and his community and the meaning of his writings in that context. It is redaction critical. Redaction criticism as a tool in New Testament research is one of the major disciplinary advances to have been made in this century and no study of the gospels can ignore it. But if redaction critical technique is used in a narrow manner it can obscure the mind of the final author it is meant to disclose. If one limits insight into the author's intention to those portions of his work at which he has altered sources or to those sections which cannot be traced to a source, one has excluded a priori both the possibility that material

---

[35]Cf. H.J. Cadbury, "Acts and Eschatology," in The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, eds. W.D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), pp. 316, 320.

which has been taken over unchanged may also reflect the author's intention and the possibility that changes in relation to an extant source, or portions not related to any known source, may not be the product of the author's free composition but may have been derived from a tradition which has not been preserved in any other form.[36] The very fact that an author has taken over material makes it in some sense his own. Once cannot assume that pre-Lucan material is non-Lucan.[37] Redaction criticism is useful in helping to highlight the significance of differences which come to light in comparative synoptic study but unhelpful if what has been identified as traditional elements are not also used to understand the author's intention. Secondly, redaction criticism has operated on the basis of source critical assumptions which are no longer secure.[38] The current state of flux among synoptic specialists indicates that redaction critical edifices built on the traditional two source hypothesis now appear to have been constructed on a shaky foundation. One means of compensating and still doing 'redactional' study is to regard the comparative step as comparison between families of traditions rather than with previously existing hard documents. This is the procedure which will be followed here in regard to 'Q'. 'Q' will always appear in inverted commas to signify its use as a symbol for a group of related traditions and to indicate the dubiousness of its existence as a hard document. Without adequate space to devote to a source critical study, it still seems

---

[36]Charles H. Talbert, "Shifting Sands: The Recent Study of the Gospel of Luke," Interp. 30 (1976):392; E. Earle Ellis, "Eschatologie," p. 388; cf. Charles H. Talbert, Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974), pp. 4ff.; A.L. Moore, The Parousia in the New Testament (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966), p. 86.

[37]Ellis, "Eschatologie," p. 388.

[38]Talbert, "Shifting Sands," pp. 392-94; cf. his book reviews in JBL 102 (1983):342f.; and JBL 98 (1979):151-53.

that the most reasonable means of accounting for Luke's relationship to Mark is that Mark was in his hands in hard copy. The check that will be used in this instance against a one-sided redaction critical technique will be to take account of differences between Luke and Mark in terms of Luke's whole composition.[39] Redaction criticism should be used in tandem with composition criticism. The method used throughout this thesis will be to undertake redactional comparative analysis with other traditions, Mark as a hard source and 'Q' as a loose family of traditions, noting differences and similarities and assessing their significance. This step will be balanced by analysis of Luke's two-volume composition as a whole, taking care to note how redactional and traditional materials congeal to form a meaningful whole.

D. Acts 2.17

Acts 2.17a is of vital importance in understanding Luke's eschatology whether one accepts the Western text's reading of ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις or B's μετὰ ταῦτα. However, the implications to be drawn from each reading for Luke's eschatology can be radically different. Ernst Haenchen, who adopts the B reading, finds that the passage suggests an eschatology of delay.[40] Fred Francis and C.H. Talbert, who follow the D reading, argue that the passage indicates a relevant and lively eschatological hope.[41]

Haenchen approaches the problem in consonance with the low esteem given in general to the Western text by critics. In his

---

[39]Ellis, "Eschatologie," p. 388; Charles H. Talbert, "An Anti-Gnostic Tendency in Lucan Christology," NTS 14 (1967-68):260.

[40]Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles (Oxford: Blackwells, 1971), p. 179.

[41]Fred O. Francis, "Eschatology and History in Luke-Acts," JAAR 37 (1969):51f.; Charles H. Talbert, "The Redaction Critical Quest for Luke the Theologian," in Jesus and Man's Hope, vol. 1 (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970), pp.176ff.

opinion in none of the three categories of variants in the Western text of Acts is one faced with "the original text of that book".[42] Bruce Metzger is favourably disposed to Haenchen's analysis of D.[43] Nevertheless, in formulating his own approach to the question he writes,

> Since no hypothesis thus far proposed to explain the relationship of the Western and Alexandrian texts of Acts has gained anything like general assent, in its work on that book the Bible Societies Committee proceeded in an eclectic fashion holding that neither the Alexandrian nor the Western group of witnesses always preserve the original text, but that in order to attain the earliest text one must compare the two divergent traditions point by point and in each case select the reading which commends itself in light of transcriptional and intrinsic probabilities.[44]

Even though the Alexandrian family has traditionally been regarded as preserving the more original text of Acts one should treat each variant on its individual merits.[45]

The Western text contains several variants in the larger context of the total quotation in Acts 2.17-21. Most have been seen as efforts of the Western reviser to better adapt the text to the narrative situation.[46] The B text is, in large measure, highly conformed to the LXX of Joel. There are two possibilities in each case of a variant. The first is that the Western text may be original, the author having altered the quotation to fit his purposes. In this case B's agreement with the LXX would be due to the work of a later editor who sought to bring the text into conformity with the source

---

[42] Haenchen, Acts, p. 56.

[43] Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 271.

[44] Ibid., pp. 271f.; cf. Donald Guthrie, New Testament Introduction (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970), p. 378.

[45] G.D. Kilpatrick, "An Eclectic Study of the Text to Acts " in Biblical and Patristic Studies, ed. J.N. Birdsall (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), p. 64; cf. Metzger, p. 259.

[46] BC IV, p. 21; cf. Metzger, pp. 295ff.

of the quotation. The second is that the author may have copied nearly exactly from the LXX. In this case the changes in D would have been introduced by the Western reviser.[47] These possibilities have been recognized at least since J.H. Ropes' analysis of the text (1926).[48]

In general Luke is careful in his quotation of Old Testament texts.[49] This appears to favour the B reading. However, he also regularly conflates quotations. In this light it could be suggested that he may have found the phrase ἔσται ἐν ταῖς εσχάταις ἡμέραις in Isaiah 2.2 (cf. Mic. 4.1). This possibility does not appear to have been explored.[50] Among those who adopt the B reading the phrase's origin is generally believed to have come from a transposition with alteration of ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείνας from v. 18.[51] This phrase is duly absent from D.[52]

The strongest evidence in favour of the Western reading is that the variant in 2.17a is not of one piece with the other variants in the quotation. Most of the variants in the larger context appear to reflect the Western reviser's 'gentile interest'.[53] This is amply demonstrated by both E.J. Epp and Haenchen. The Western text changes ὑμῶν 4x: twice to αὐτων and twice by omitting it. The effect is to

---

[47] Metzger, p. 295.

[48] BC III, pp. 16f.; cf. Ernst Haenchen, "Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte," ZTK 51 (1954):161.

[49] BC III, p. 17; Metzger, p. 295; Earl Richard, "The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts," NovTest 24 (1982):52.

[50] F.F. Bruce, The Book of the Acts (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), p. 68, merely notes the correspondence.

[51] Eldon Jay Epp, The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), p. 67; BC III, p. 17.

[52] BC III, p. 16.

[53] Metzger, p. 295.

cause the gift of the Spirit to apply not to Jews but to Christians.[54] The D text changes πᾶσαν σάρκα to the plural which makes it more universalistic.[55] These changes, plus the omission of μου after δούλος in v.18 to indicate that the Jews are not God's favoured servants, "make allowance for the universality of the Christian mission, which is not just devoted to the people of Israel, but to all mankind".[56]

Epp summarizes his findings on the Western text under three broad headings: 1) D makes the Jews and their leaders more hostile to Jesus, 2) D minimizes positive responses by the Jews to Christianity, and 3) the Jews are more hostile to the apostles in D.[57] The variants discussed above fit this 'anti-Judaic' tendency in the Western reviser and one may credit their origin with him.

But the change in 2.17a is not part and parcel with these changes and it is its uniqueness which offers a way forward.[58] Of all the possible theological motivations in the Western reviser which Epp discusses, eschatology is not one of them.[59] He does suggest that the D text may have ended in an eschatological rather than an apologetic note.[60] But this is a tentative hypothesis and his study gives no indication that this is a tendency in D as a whole. It does not seem that the Western reviser had a distinctive eschatology.

Cadbury and Lake have said that in the case of Acts 2.17a there are two unknown quantities: the text and its meaning. Since

---

[54]Epp, p. 68; Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," p. 162.

[55]Epp, p. 69.

[56]Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," p. 162.

[57]Epp, pp. 165f.; for criticisms of Epp's work see R.P.C. Hanson, "The Ideology of Codex Bezae in Acts," NTS 14 (1967-68):282-86.

[58]Thus one need not succumb to Lake and Cadbury's scepticism regarding a solution, BC IV, p. 22.

[59]Epp, pp. 22f., 165f. [60]Ibid., note p. 67.

they could see no conclusive evidence either way the only solution they could offer was that if one was assumed, the other could be found.[61] This, as they pointed out, is methodologically unacceptable. What Haenchen does is to approach the problem via Luke's theological meaning and thus be able to find the text. His choice of the B reading is not made on textual grounds but on the basis of his own reconstruction of Lucan eschatology.[62] This is evident throughout his ZTK article. This alteration in D stands, "in tension with Luke's position".[63] This reading cannot be original because it is not Luke's opinion, "that the End times have broken in with Pentecost".[64] For Luke, the church, begun at Pentecost, is not an entity of an eschatological quality but the harbinger of a new epoch in world history.[65] These are his reasons for denying the D reading.

There is, of course, some circularity in all arguments about variants. This is evident in Haenchen's case for the B reading. But if one can provide a rational argument of a textual nature the circularity can be reduced over an argument of a theological nature. One need not agree with Cadbury and Lake that the text must remain an unknown quantity since a reasonable explanation can be put forward based on our knowledge of the theological nature of the Western reviser's alterations. The phrase in question can be explained as a theologically motivated change, or as an effort to conform the text more closely to the LXX. The latter can be reasonably explained as the effort of a later editor.[66] The former can most reasonably be

---

[61] BC IV, p. 22. [62] Cf. Metzger, note pp. 295f.

[63] Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," p. 162.

[64] Ibid.; idem., Acts, p. 179.

[65] Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," p. 162.

[66] Kilpatrick, "Text," p. 65. Also the witnesses for the D reading are mixed: ℵ A D E I P S 462 vg syr Ireneaus Hilary Macarius Chrysostom Augustine.

explained as originating with the author since no tendency towards a specific eschatology can be found in known revisers of Acts.

Thus one finds in Acts 2.17 an explicit statement by Luke that the church about which he writes and, by extension, his own church, are living in the 'last days'.[67] Conzelmann objected that Luke found this phrase in his source and that its eschatological meaning in the source is lost in its Lucan context where it now refers to the last expansive epoch of world history.[68] The reason that Conzelmann had to resort to such a hypothesis is that he began his inquiry into Luke-Acts with a pre-definition of eschatology which excluded history.[69] Thus having rightly discovered Luke's historical perspective he was forced to explain away the eschatological reference of this text. The reasons for rejecting his hypothesis can be briefly stated. First, the source is hypothetical and there is little hope of objectively isolating it.[70] Second, other extended quotations are characteristically from Luke's own hand (e.g. Lk. 3.4-6; 4.18f.; Acts 28.26f.). Third, Dibelius' arguments that the speeches of Acts derive largely from Luke's hand remain convincing.[71] Fourth, if

---

[67]Francis, p. 51; I. Howard Marshall, The Acts of the Apostles (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), p. 73; William Neil, The Acts of the Apostles (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1973), p. 75; Gerhard Krodel, Acts (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), p. 21; Bruce, Book, p. 68.

[68]Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 95f.; Similarly Ulrich Wilckens, Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte (The Netherlands: Neukirche, 1963), p. 33 argues that the context, church history, precludes an eschatological understanding of the phrase; cf. James D.G. Dunn, Jesus and the Spirit (London: SCM, 1975), p. 160.

[69]Francis, pp. 50f.

[70]The arguments of Jacques Dupont, The Sources of Acts, trans. Kathleen Pond (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964), as to the ultimate uncertainty of precise source critical research in Acts remain convincing.

[71]Martin Dibelius, "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography," (1949) in Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ed. Heinrich Greeven (London: SCM, 1956), pp. 138ff.; see Eduard Schweizer,

Luke had a different conception of the 'last days' than his source he could have indicated this in altering the source rather than taking over unchanged such a blatantly eschatological phrase. It seems most likely that this eschatological statement is due to Luke's own initiative.[72]

It is also significant that this eschatological designation occurs in a passage which serves a programmatic function in Acts similar to that of Lk. 4.16-30 in the gospel.[73] These passages open the ministries of Jesus and the church respectively with an inaugural sermon; both begin with a solemn Old Testament quotation and both announce an eschatological fulfilment.[74] There are several programmatic elements in Acts 2.17-21 which can be traced throughout the book. The first is the gift of the Spirit to all men (v.17). This is fulfilled among the Jews on Pentecost, the Samaritans by the hands of Peter and John (8.14ff.), and the gentiles by Peter (10.44). The outpouring of the Spirit can also be seen in its association with miracles throughout Acts.[75] The second is found in v.19 in the phrase . . . τέρατα . . . καὶ σημεῖα. This phrase is repeated in 2.22; 4.30; 5.12; 6.8; 7.36; and 14.3. All but 2.22 and 7.36 refer to miracles wrought by the early church

---

"Concerning the Speeches in Acts," in SLA, pp. 208ff., for supporting arguments; and F.F. Bruce, The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles, The Tyndale New Testament Lecture, 1942 (London: Tyndale Press, n.d.); Max Wilcox, "A Foreword to the Study of the Speeches in Acts," in Neusner, pp. 206-25 for dissenting opinions.

[72]Maddox, p. 137.

[73]This was suggested by Nils Dahl in his criticisms of R. Bultmann's Theology of the New Testament, asserted by Fred Francis, pp. 51f.; and given some argumentation by Krodel, Acts, p. 17; cf. Richard F. Zehnle, Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Redaction in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3 (Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press, 1971), pp. 61ff.; Otto Betz, "The Kerygma of Luke," Interp. 22 (1968):133. On Lk. 4.16ff. see note 40, Ch. 3, pp. 96f.

[74]Krodel, Acts, p. 17.

[75]Cf. Giles, "Eschatology II," p. 12.

as part of its ministry. This makes it seem evident that the phrase in 2.19, καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, in which Luke has added σημεῖα and κάτω to the original, refers to the programme of miracles prominent throughtout Acts as a sign of the presence of salvation (Ch. 5, pp. 239ff.) much the same as the miracles described in Lk. 4. 18ff. are worked out concretely and programmatically in Jesus' ministry (Ch. 5, pp. 228ff.). The reference of . . . τέρατα . . . ἄνω is less easily established. Suggestions include: the cosmic signs of the End mentioned in Lk. 21.25f.,[76] Jesus' exaltation,[77] and the cosmic events Luke connects with the Crucifixion (Lk. 23.44f.).[78] C.H. Talbert is probably correct in noting this sequence in the passage: 1) the gift of the Spirit and miracles done by the church, 2) cosmic signs prior to the End, 3) the Day of the Lord.[79] In any event the miracles found throughout Acts are programmatically established as eschatological signs.[80] Third, as has been frequently noted, the speeches of Acts share a similar structure and content.[81] In this light the Pentecost sermon can be seen as programmatically rehearsing the kerygma of Acts.[82] And finally the intimation of the universality of the Gospel in vv. 17, 21, and 39 provides an introduction to this key Lucan motif in Acts.

---

[76]Talbert, "Quest," p. 184; Francis, p. 55; Marshall, Acts, p. 74.

[77]Cf. Giles, "Eschatology II," p. 12.

[78]Bruce, Book, p. 69; cf. idem., The Acts of the Apostles, 2nd ed., 1952 (London: Tyndale, 1962), p. 90.

[79]Talbert, "Quest," p. 184.

[80]Giles, "Eschatology II," p. 12.

[81]Schweizer, "Speeches," pp. 208ff.

[82]Betz, p. 133. This is particularly evident in the offer of salvation (v.21) and the call to repentance and offer of the forgiveness of sins (v.38); see 3.19; 4.12; 5.31; 10.43; 11.18; 13.38, 47.

It should also be noted that there is a distinction between the 'last days' (v.17) and the 'Day of the Lord' (v.20).[83] This corresponds to a similar distinction between the 'days of the Son of Man' and the 'day of the Son of Man' in Lk. 17.26, 31.[84] Both passages indicate by this distinction that Luke has historicized his eschatology by establishing a sequence of events, some of which are already history (e.g. Pentecost), which lead up to the End. But distinguishing between the End and historical events does not imply the 'remoteness' of the former, especially when the latter are said to take place within the 'last days' and thus are given an eschatological character.

Acts 2.17ff. establishes that Luke thought of the time in which his community lived as eschatological. And this eschatological statement provides a programmatic introduction to Acts. There is also an emphasis on realized aspects of eschatology. The eschatological realities of the Spirit and salvation are now being experienced.[85] But at present what is important for our purposes is Luke's comment on the eschatological nature of his church's existence.

E. Luke 4.21

The eschatological nature of Luke's present is confirmed in Lk. 4.21 in Jesus' pronouncement of the fulfilment of Isa. 61.1f. in his person. Conzelmann is correct in helping us to see that Luke's opening scene for Jesus' ministry is much more historically specific than Mark's. As such it offers an important insight into Luke's historical perspective.[86] Luke points to a specific time and place

---

[83]Talbert, "Quest," p. 176; Giles, "Eschatology II," p. 11.

[84]Zmijewski, p. 460; Geiger, p. 146. See below, pp. 36ff.

[85]Maddox, pp. 137ff.

[86]Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke, 2 vols. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981 and 1985), p. 533.

at which this fulfilment happened. That day was the day.[87] However, Conzelmann's conclusion that Luke's historical perspective marks off this era of fulfilment as a unique historical epoch, "the centre of history", qualitatively unlike Luke's own time,[88] does not follow from the evidence. It will be argued in detail in Chapter 5 that the characteristic elements of Luke's programme for Jesus' ministry, the offer of salvation in the proclamation of repentance, forgiveness of sins, and healing and deliverance, are also characteristic of Luke's programme for the church of Acts. The time of Jesus is qualitatively identical to that of Luke because salvation is present for his church in the same objective categories that it was in Jesus' ministry. The fulfilment may have taken place on that day but that day was the inauguration of an era of eschatological fulfilment, the year of the Lord's favour (v.19), which continues into Luke's own time.[89]

Conzelmann's analysis of Lk. 4.21 is also dependent on his belief that Luke has abandoned Mark's more strongly eschatological opening to Jesus' ministry (Mk. 1.14f.). This is to be seen in Luke's omission of ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. But if one views Mk. 1.15 as, 1) a statement of fulfilment, and 2) a proclamation of futurist eschatology then Luke has included the first in 4.21.[90] The kingdom is associated with the opening programme in 4.43 in a Lucan summary covering Jesus' ministry at Nazareth and Capernaum (see Ch. 5, pp. 224ff. for a full discussion). The difference between Luke's opening statement about the kingdom from that which he found in Mark is that

---

[87]Cf. I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), p. 185.

[88]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 170, cf. pp. 36, 187.

[89]Marshall, Luke, p. 185; cf. Heinz Schürmann, Das Lukas-evangelium (Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1969), pp. 231ff.

[90]Schürmann, p. 231.

he has emphasized realized aspects of eschatology over Mark's futurist statement.[91]

One finds in Lk. 4.21 and Acts 2.17 two programmatic statements of an eschatological nature. Luke and his community understood themselves to be living in the time of eschatological fulfilment, the 'last days'. There is in both of these passages a strong emphasis on the realized aspects of eschatological fulfilment experienced presently in the community. Neither of these passages indicates that the community expected the End as 'near'. Both have some indication that Luke sought to tone down earlier viewpoints as too immediate. But the fact that they understood themselves to be living in the last days and not in the last great epoch of world history certainly does not lead one to suspect that they had projected the parousia into the far distant future.

F. Luke 21

Luke 21 and 17 have been the subject of numerous, and often lengthy, studies in recent years.[92] The purpose of this section is not to contribute yet another detailed study but to examine the central questions which have been raised by these studies.

Conzelmann has been correct to emphasize the historical nature of Lk. 21.[93] This basic position has been borne out in subsequent research by both those favourably and those unfavourably disposed

---

[91]Maddox, p. 140; Francis, p. 60; cf. William Manson, The Gospel of Luke (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1945, '1930), p. 42; Betz, p. 132.

[92]See those by Zmijewski, Geiger, Maddox, pp. 115-28; Franklin, Christ the Lord, pp. 12-21; Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Der Eschatologische Abschnitt Lk. 17, 20-37," in Melanges Bibliques, ed. A. Descamps (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), pp. 213-33; W. Nicol, "Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21," Neotest 7 (1973):61-71, Essays on the Gospel of Luke and Acts, Proceedings of the ninth meeting of the New Testament Society of South Africa.

[93]Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 125ff.

towards Conzelmann's theory.[94] Luke, when compared with Mark, has described historical events as history and something worth discussion in their own right.[95] This is particularly evident in his treatment of Jerusalem in vv. 20-24. Having dropped Mark's apocalyptic imagery and signification Luke instead used traditions which called to mind the past military and political events of A.D. 70. The historicizing of the Jerusalem theme is confirmed when one notes that Luke has made Jerusalem and its fall the subject of historical prophecies unrelated to the End (e.g. 19.41-44). The question is whether or not the admission of Luke's historical perspective leads to the conclusion that the End described in vv. 25-31 has been indefinitely postponed.

An answer can be found, in part, by examining vv. 12-19. Conzelmann took these verses to indicate that Luke's church was experiencing persecution. It was the "ecclesia pressa".[96] The

---

[94]E.g. Geiger, pp. 169f.; Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 13; Maddox, p. 115.

[95]Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 13.

[96]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 129; followed also by Geiger, pp. 164, 187; cf. Franklin, Christ the Lord, pp. 14, 15; and Georg Braumann, "Die lukanische Interpretation der Zerstörung Jerusalems," NovTest 6 (1963):122f. There are other passages said to reflect a setting of persecution for Luke's community; Lk. 6.22f.; 11.49-51; 22.28, 35f.; 17.25, 22; Schnackenburg, "Lk. 17,20-37," p. 231. Cf. Acts 14.22; 5.41; 9.16; 20.23f.; 20.29f. However, Lk. 11.49-51 is related to Luke's thematic concern with the fate of Jerusalem. Jerusalem is the city which persecutes the prophets and apostles, Braumann, p. 123. But what Braumann misses, is that this theme is played out in Acts. Jerusalem has not only rejected its messiah but his apostles as well. Acts closes just prior to the outbreak of the Jewish war described in Lk. 21.20-24. There is no necessary connection between the persecution of the apostles by the Jerusalem authorities, God's judgment of the city, and Luke's own situation. Similarly Acts 5.41 can be seen in this light as well as Acts 9.16 and 20.23f. which extend this theme to Paul. Lk. 17.25 fits Luke's thematic interest in Jesus' fate as a prophet, not the persecution of his own community. And Lk. 22.28 again refers specifically to the Twelve and is not general enough to hypothesize its application for the church in general. Paul S. Minear, "A Note on Luke 22.36," NovTest 7 (1964):128-34, has demonstrated that Lk. 22.35ff. are historically specific to the passion narrative and not intended by Luke to reflect mission practice in his own time. And Acts 20.29f. refer to internal conflict, not external persecution. This leaves only obscure statements in Lk. 17.22 and Acts 14.22 and

extended period of persecution he found described in these verses was supposed to fill the hiatus between v.24 and the events immediately prior to the End described in vv. 25ff. But one must ask if Conzelmann did not stop short in his analysis of Luke's historicizing in Lk. 21. Agreeing with him that Luke has separated the period of persecution from the immediate setting of the End (cf. v.19 with Mk. 13.13b),[97] do these verses refer to the situation of his own church or the church he describes in Acts?

The first indication that vv. 12-19 refer to events described in Acts and not to the present experience of Luke's church is to be found in Luke's introduction to the section, πρὸ δὲ τούτων πάντων, v.12a. This phrase indicates that the time of persecution precedes events described in vv. 8-11. Luke has emphasized the disassociation of the events described in vv.8f. from the End by dropping Mark's reference to the beginning of the birth pangs (ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα v.8c) and writing, ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐθέως τὸ τέλος (v.9c). Vv. 8f. produce this sequence. First there is a time during which false messiahs appear. This is followed by a time of wars and insurrections. There is then a statement that these events are not directly connected with the End. In vv. 10f. there are no events described which correspond to the period of false messiahs. But a period of international conflict corresponds with the wars and insurrections described in vv. 8f. The description of this period is then amplified by reference to natural catastrophes and heavenly signs. The connecting links between the various elements of vv. 10f. are not sequential prepositions (cf. πρό

---

the traditional reference in Lk. 6.22f., which in Luke's account seems to reflect synagogue expulsions (again see Acts) rather than persecution. This is a narrow basis on which to establish, outside of Lk. 21.12-19, a persecution Sitz im Leben for Luke's community. It will be demonstrated in Chapter 4 that Luke expected missionaries to be rejected. But the rejection of missionaries is not active persecution against the community.

[97] Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 128f.; cf. Maddox, p. 116.

v.12; τότε v.27) but a string of future verbs which do not clearly indicate any definite temporal sequence (ἐγερθήσεται, ἔσονται, ἔσται). Thus it appears that vv. 10f. describe one complex of events rather than a sequence. It is not stated that these events are connected with the End. The persecution is said to take place before all of these events.

It seems that vv. 8f. and 10f. refer to events connected with the Jewish war, A.D. 66-74,[98] which was preceded by the appearance of messianic pretenders (cf. Acts 5.36f., 21.28) and resulted in local pestilence and famine as the war turned against the Jews. Josephus even writes of heavenly signs which presaged the destruction of the city (BJ 6.258-60; 288-98).[99] Luke begins a new section in v.20 which describes in detail the events of A.D. 70 and brings the account up to his own time, the καιροὶ ἐθνῶν.[100] It appears that vv. 12-19 together with vv. 8-11 and 20ff. form the answer to the disciples' question in v.7 as to when the Temple will be destroyed and the signs which will precede this. The persecution of the early church was one sign that the destruction of Jerusalem was near.

A further indication that vv. 12-19 refer to Acts can be found in the rough parallels which exist between these verses and several passages in Acts (cf. Acts 9.2; 12.1; 22.4f.; 26.10f.; 4.3-18),[101] and in their general fulfilment in the experiences of Paul,

---

[98]Fitzmyer, p. 1334.

[99]Howard Clark Kee, Miracle in the Early Christian World: A Study in Sociohistorical Method (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 174ff., has a discussion of the significance and general acceptance of such heavenly signs in Luke's milieu.

[100]David L. Tiede, Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), pp. 91ff.; Maddox, p. 120; Geiger, p. 209; contra. Conzelmann, Theology, p. 130.

[101]Maddox, p. 116; Fitzmyer, pp. 1338ff.

who was imprisoned (16.23; 21.33) and testified before kings and governors (24.1ff.; 25.22ff.), Peter, who was imprisoned (12.3ff.), and Stephen and James, who were martyred (7.58ff.; 12.2). There is also a parallel between the significance Luke attributes to this time of persecution, a time of testimony (μαρτύριον v.13), and the emphasis placed on the results of arrests in Acts (Acts 4.7ff.; 5.27ff.; 24.10ff.; 26.4ff.).

Finally the economic situation of Luke's church does not lead one to suspect that it was a persecuted community. It will be demonstrated in Chapter 3,C that Luke's community was composed of people who were successful and prosperous and well-integrated in the economic life of their larger community. It does not appear that their economic position in the community was threatened by persecution. Instead it appears that they continued to be successful, so much so that their wealth posed a problem for the community's spirituality.

Vv. 12-19 are not a reference to the Lucan community's present situation, but to a time Luke already looks upon as belonging to the past.[102] This is his reason for dropping Mk. 13.13b and the direct connection made there between the persecution and the End.[103] From Luke's later perspective neither the persecutions experienced by the first generation nor the fall of Jerusalem had brought the End.[104] Therefore he modifies Mark to make this point clear. But it does not follow that in breaking the direct connection of these events with the End he understood the End as indefinitely postponed or that these events themselves had ceased to have an eschatological significance.[105]

---

[102]Fitzmyer, p. 1334.

[103]Maddox, pp. 116f. makes this same point but arrives at it by different evidence than has been used here.

[104]Erich Klostermann, Das Lukasevangelium (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1929), p. 198.

[105]Zmijewski, pp. 120f., argues persuasively that the Jewish

One of the key elements in Conzelmann's interpretation of Lk. 21 is a supposed hiatus between vv. 24 and 25.[106] But outside the fact that Luke's connecting καί (v.25) connotes a less radical break than Mark's adversative ἀλλὰ . . . μετὰ . . . (v.24)[107] there are two means by which Luke has connected v.24 and vv. 25ff. and which indicate that he expected the End relatively soon. The first is the phrase καιροὶ ἐθνῶν (v.24) and the second is the phrase ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη (v.32).

There are two possible meanings[108] for the phrase, 'the times of the gentiles' (v.24): 1) the period of Roman sovereignty over Jerusalem after A.D. 70,[109] and 2) the time of the gentile mission.[110] It is also possible that both meanings are in some manner combined.[111] This seems likely in view of Luke's general thematic interest in the 'gentile' mission and because the phrase ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν (v.24b) seems to refer to the military domination of Jerusalem by a foreign power (cf. Rev. 11.2; Dan. 7.25, 8.13; Ps. of Sol. 2.20-28). It may be that a connection can be found in the use of the Jewish war as a symbol of

---

war, even though separated from the End by Luke, remains eschatologically significant; cf. Francis, pp. 56f.

[106]E.g. Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 128f.

[107]Nicol, p. 70; Maddox, p. 120.

[108]Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke, 4th ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906), p. 483 lists 6 possible meanings, but these can all be related to the two given here.

[109]Eduard Schweizer, The Good News According to Luke, trans. David E. Green (London: SPCK, 1984), p. 317; E. Earle Ellis, The Gospel of Luke (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic Press, 1977), p. 245; Adolf Schlatter, Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1961), p. 371; H. Balmforth, The Gospel According to Saint Luke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), p. 285; Manson, Lk., p. 234; Fitzmyer, p. 1347; Klostermann, p. 198.

[110]Maddox, p. 120.

[111]Frederick W. Danker, Jesus and the New Age According to St. Luke (St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1972), p. 213; Mattill, Last Things, pp. 135f.; Zmijewski, pp. 205, 220.

the transfer of the church's mission to the gentiles.[112] But it must be remembered that Luke knew that the mission to the gentiles had begun well before these events,[113] and that his own community, which had a significant Jewish segment (see Ch. 3, Section D), is evidence that he knew that the mission to the Jews had not completely ended in A.D. 70. It seems more probable that the Roman domination of Palestine, symbolically secure while the Flavians who accomplished it held the imperium, and the divine judgment Luke saw to have been meted out in Rome's wrath (19.41-44) also symbolized the strength of the pax Romana in which his church's mission had flourished.

In the case of the first meaning, the period of Roman domination over Jerusalem, a connection is indicated between v.24 and vv. 25ff. by the implication of a restoration of Jerusalem to Israel.[114] This connection can be seen in Luke's use of ἀπολύτρωσις (v.28). This is the only occurrence of this form in Luke-Acts. But λύτρωσις is used in Lk. 1.68 and 2.38 and the verb λυτρόω in Lk. 24.21. All of these instances refer to the 'redemption' of Israel or Jerusalem. Thus it seems likely that Luke used this word group in a specialized sense to refer to Israel's national redemption.[115] In this light v.28 which speaks of 'your' (ὑμῶν) redemption being near as a result of the signs

---

[112] Zmijewski, p. 220.

[113] E.g. Acts 10; Marshall, Luke, p. 774.

[114] Ellis, Luke, p. 245.

[115] Arthur W. Wainwright, "Luke and the Restoration of the Kingdom to Israel," ET 89 (1977-78):76; Maddox, p. 149, argues that this word group cannot refer to Israel's national salvation because Luke rejects this idea and replaces Israel with the church. In light of our findings in Ch. 3, D this seems incorrect. Maddox expressly states that his decision on this matter is dependent on his solution to the Jew-gentile question in Luke-Acts. Our reasons for differing with him are similar.

which precede the parousia, refers back to Jerusalem in vv. 20-24. It is the city's redemption which is near.[117] This connecting link between vv. 20-24 and 25-28 does not support the idea of an indeterminate hiatus between vv. 24 and 25.

Similarly if one examines the other meaning for 'the times of the gentiles', i.e. the gentile mission, the connection between vv. 24 and 25 is again close. Luke understood the gentile mission to be well advanced. By bringing his narrative to a close with Paul openly preaching in Rome, Luke has emphasized that as much as twenty years before he writes his great hero had spread the Gospel over the eastern half of the empire. Since then his own church and others had been further advancing the Gospel. The times of the gentiles were surely nearing completion. This can be seen in the conjunction of two factors. One, Luke's community defined success in the missionary task to include both the acceptance and the rejection of the Gospel (this is argued in full in Ch. 4,E). Preaching the Gospel in an area was successful whether or not it produced converts. If it did not then its success was to be found in having marked those who had rejected the Gospel for judgment. Second, in this light Luke's frequent statements that all the residents of certain districts had 'heard the word' are significant in marking these areas as places where the mission had been completed (9.35, 42; 13.49; cf. 14.6f.; 19.10). In this manner these statements serve as indicators of the forward progress of the mission. Luke understood the 'times of the gentiles' in this sense as well advanced.

There is one final phrase which indicates that Luke did not consider the parousia to be an event of the remote future. This is his retention of the traditional saying in Lk. 21.32, "this generation

---

[117] Wainwright, pp. 77f.

will not pass away until everything has happened" (cf. Mk. 13.30). 'This generation' has been variously interpreted. 'The Jewish people' has been suggested,[118] as has 'mankind'.[119] Both of these interpretations depend upon, 1) a sense that a temporal delimitation of the End to 'one generation' is inappropriate in the Lucan context,[120] and 2) the sense γενεά can have in classical Greek of 'race'.[121] There are several considerations that have been raised which militate against an atemporal interpretation.

First, the passage itself is inherently temporal and chronological. A temporal meaning seems to be required by the urgency of οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ and ἕως ἄν πάντα γένηται.[122] Further, the structure of vv. 8f., 10f., 12-19, 20-24, 25-27 provides a temporal sequential framework to the whole of the chapter.[123] This temporal sequence, encompassing events from the Jewish war to the parousia, is alluded to by πάντα (vv. 32 and 36).[124]

---

[118]M. Meinertz, "'Dieses Geschlecht' im Neuen Testament," BZ 1 (1957):283-89.

[119]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 131; Merk, p. 218, 'mankind or the church'; Zmijewski, pp. 281f.; W.C. Robinson, Jr., Der Weg des Herrn (Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1964), p. 65, 'non-Christian humanity'; Jean-Daniel Kaestli, L'Eschatologie dans l'oeuvre de Luc (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1969), pp. 53f.; A.R.C. Leaney, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958), p. 263; Danker, St. Luke, p. 216.

[120]Maddox, p. 113.

[121]Ibid., p. 111; Mattill, Last Things, p. 97; Liddel & Scott, s.v.; BAG, s.v.

[122]Cf. Ellis, Luke, p. 246; Maddox, p. 113.

[123]Talbert, "Quest," pp. 180ff.; idem., Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel (New York: Crossroad, 1984, '1982), p. 204.

[124]Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 14; Marshall, Luke, p. 780; Merk, p. 218, argues that Luke's deletion of ταυτα makes παντα less specific and more general. It does not refer to the specific events described in Ch. 21 but to all history. Therefore γενεά must similarly be interpreted in a general manner

Secondly, it is lexically more probable that γενεά is to be understood temporally as a 'generation'. In the rare examples in classical Greek where γενεά means 'mankind' the meaning is made explicit by the addition of an adjective.[125] No evidence for this meaning in Hellenistic Greek has yet been found.[126] And it seems evident that the other occurrences of γενεά in the synoptics have the meaning of a temporal 'generation'.[127]

It has also been suggested that ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη can have a quasi-technical designation as the eschatological 'last generation' which may be of several lifetimes in length.[128] This interpretation has the advantage of attempting to take the temporal designation of the passage seriously but the disadvantage of neglecting the temporal urgency implied.[129] It appears to be an effort to achieve the indeterminancy of an atemporal interpretation while still paying lip service to the temporal factors. Even if the Qumran pesher which contains this phrase does have this meaning, it is a very narrow comparative basis upon which to establish Luke's meaning.[130]

The most obvious reading is to understand γενεά to refer to the generation of Jesus' contemporaries and that Luke did not think that they would all die before the End.[131] This seems to be

---

as 'mankind'. Cf. Danker, St. Luke, p. 216. But it is redundant to interpret the phrase as meaning "all history will take place before history ends".

[125]Maddox, p. 113. [126]Ibid.

[127]See Mattill, Last Things, pp. 97-100; and Maddox, p. 112, for exegetical arguments; contra Zmijewski, pp. 281f.

[128]See 1QpHab 2.7, 7.2; Ellis, Luke, p. 246; Schweizer, Luke, p. 322.

[129]Maddox, p. 114. [130]Ibid.

[131]Maddox, p. 115; cf. Richard H. Hiers, "The Problem of the Delay of the Parousia in Luke-Acts," NTS 20 (1973-74):152; S.G. Wilson, Gentile Mission, p. 77; Sabourin, p. 75.

necessitated by the fact that there has been no change of audience since v.7, and that there is no overt indication that the time reference is meant to be taken ambiguously.[132] But it is possible that Luke may have been referring to his own generation.[133] This theory has been revived as an effort to deal with, "the puzzle thrown up by the fact that Luke seems to repeat the prophecy of Jesus that the End would come within a generation, yet when Luke wrote the generation of Jesus . . . was past . . . ."[134] Maddox feels that the text offers no support for this adjustment in meaning but that "the exegesis of Lk. 21.5-36 (may) force us to take seriously some such suggestion as this, but it will only be at the cost of imposing great strain on the text".[135] In the end he accepts this cost.[136] There is, however, support elsewhere in the gospel for the idea that Luke may have understood Jesus to be addressing his own generation prophetically. This is to be found in his interpretation of the saying in 9.27.

In 9.18-27 Luke follows Mark with only minor deviations.[137] From the labyrinth of opinions about the difficult logion in 9.27 two points emerge with clarity and one need not succumb to Maddox's scepticism regarding a solution.[138] First, all three synoptists agree in placing the saying next to the account of the Transfiguration, regardless of whether or not it was originally a detached logion.

---

[132]Maddox, pp. 113f., 115.

[133]Geiger, p. 237; Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 14; Talbert, "Quest," p. 184.

[134]Maddox, p. 113. [135]Ibid., p. 114.

[136]Ibid., p. 122.

[137]Klostermann, p. 105.

[138]Maddox, p. 110; for surveys of the debate see Plummer, pp. 249f.; Marshall, Luke, pp. 377f.; and Conzelmann, Theology, p. 104, n. 1.

Luke has strengthened this connection by his alteration of Mk. 8.38. He adds that the Son of Man will come in his own glory as well as that of the Father and the angels. Luke's use of δόξα serves as a pointed connection with the Transfiguration because of his addition of δόξα two times in that pericope (vv. 31f.).

The use of νεφέλη in v.34 also serves to connect vv. 28-36 to 26f. Franklin has pointed out that Luke's use of the singular rather than the plural links the transfiguration, parousia, and ascension and describes the former two in terms of the latter.[139] In this manner the transfiguration has been more closely connected with the parousia and kingdom logion of vv. 26f. (cf. 21.27, Acts 1.9) than it is in Mark.

The strengthened connection of vv. 26f. with the transfiguration can only be explained as an effort on Luke's part to indicate at least a partial fulfilment of the logion contained in v.27 in the following events.[140] Faced with a very difficult logion he has sought to interpret it by strengthening the connection with the transfiguration which he found in the tradition. This indicates that Luke has sought, in some manner, to ease the tension created by this verse by disassociating Jesus' generation from the End. Having seen that Luke interprets this verse in this manner there are fewer objections to his reapplication of 21.32 to his own generation.

One finds in 21.32 a statement that Luke expected the End 'soon'. But what does this mean? His readers may have understood precisely what was meant by 'this' generation, but it is less clear

---

[139] Franklin, Christ the Lord, pp. 29ff.; idem., "The Ascension and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts," SJT 23 (1970):191-200.

[140] Fitzmyer, p. 786, makes the same point on different grounds. Cf. Ellis, Luke, p. 141. This connection must be maintained in spite of the difficulties which Mattill, Last Things, pp. 59ff., has raised against a fulfilment separated from the initial promise by only eight days.

for us because generations are not neatly consecutive. In actual experience three generations overlap at any one time. Did Luke understand the generation referred to as that of his young adult readers? Or perhaps he meant their children's generation? If he himself was an old man did he mean his contemporaries or a younger generation? If he understood 'this generation' to be that of his children, or grandchildren, the time period envisaged could be as much as 50 or 60 years. Yet the content of Lk. 21 would remain existentially relevant for the community as something which would either affect them directly or affect their children toward whom they had an existential commitment.

In summary, one finds that Luke encountered in Mark an eschatological speech in which the events of A.D. 70 were closely connected to the parousia. This relationship struck Luke as too close since he looked back on these events by 10 to 15 years and the End had not yet come. Therefore he severed this direct connection yet without indefinitely postponing the End. He still expected it to affect his community.

G. Luke 17.20-18.8

Luke preserved another eschatological discourse, largely related to 'Q' materials,[141] in 17.20-18.8 where it appears that he himself is largely responsible for the form of the opening (17.20-24)[142] and closing (18.1-8)[143] sections. The inclusion of 18.1-8 in this discourse has been disputed.[144] But the thematic

---

[141]For detailed studies see Zmijewski, pp. 379ff.; Geiger, pp. 24ff.; Maddox, p. 125; Marshall, Luke, pp. 656f., 670f.

[142]Marshall, Luke, p. 653. [143]Ibid., pp. 670f.

[144]Ellis, Luke, p. 212, sees a break because of the introduction in v.1. Erich Grässer, Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1957), pp. 37f., feels that Luke has emphasized the

connection Luke has created from 17.5 to 18.8 on the question of faith[145] and his addition of vv. 6-8 as an explanation of the parable, which causes an original parable about prayer to function as a call to be ready for the parousia,[146] indicate that 18.1-8 functions as a conclusion to the eschatological discourse.

The most significant aspect of 17.20-37 is that there are no temporal statements which indicate that the parousia was thought of as either near or far.[147] Vv. 20-21 do not portray a denial of a temporal imminent hope.[148] They are a denial that the date of the parousia can be calculated[149] and that it will occur secretly.[150] The temporal question is simply not addressed as it was in Lk. 21.31f. Instead one finds an emphasis on realized aspects of eschatology in v.21b similar to that found in Acts 2.17ff. and Lk. 4.16ff. The denial of a calculable End does not logically lead to the denial of a near hope.

V.22 could be interpreted as reflecting a concern with the delay. The disciples are said to want to see 'one of the days of the Son of Man', yet this will be denied them. In v.26 the phrase ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is paralleled with the phrases ταῖς

---

connection of 18.1-8 with 18.9ff. in the theme of prayer; cf. Fitzmyer, pp. 1175ff.

[145]Geiger, pp. 13-25; Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 16.

[146]Marshall, Luke, p. 670.

[147]Maddox, p. 126.

[148]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 121; cf. Fitzmyer, p. 232. This remains true even if one agrees with Schnackenburg, "Luke 17. 20-37," pp. 229f., that the tenor of the underlying traditions expressed a strong Naherwartung.

[149]Geiger, p. 38. Conzelmann is also correct in this, p. 121.

[150]Talbert, "Quest," p. 179.

ἡμέραις Νῶε (v.26) and ταῖς ἡμέραις Λώτ (v.27).[152] In this case it indicates the period prior to the Day of Judgment when men will be pursuing normal material goals rather than thinking about their future encounter with Judgment.[153] The believer is to be like Noah and Lot who were ready to sever their economic ties with mundane existence.[154] In v.26 the days of the Son of Man represent the present situation of the community during the time of Jesus' exaltation as the Son of Man before his return and the threat posed to its spiritual preparedness by material acquisitions and pursuits (cf. Ch. 3, pp. 92ff.). This is confirmed if one examines the parallels between the use of the singular of ἡμέρα in vv. 30, 27, and 29. Here the Day of the Son of Man is the day of final judgment (cf. 17.24).[155] This is borne out by the similar distinction in Acts 2.17ff. between the 'last days', in which the community exists, and the Day of the Lord, which is still future.

But to take the plural phrase in v.22 as referring to the community's present, the time that Jesus reigns as the exalted Lord,[156] seems to be contradicted by the statement that they will want to see one of these days but not be able to do so. In this case it seems that the plural phrase (v.22) is the same as the singular in v.24b, the day of the parousia-judgment.[157] There does then seem to

---

[152]Zmijewski, pp. 460f.

[153]Ibid., pp. 461f. Schnackenburg, "Lk. 17.20-37," p. 226.

[154]Zmijewski, p. 462; cf. Geiger, p. 145.

[155]Zmijewski, pp. 460-62.

[156]Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 18, it is the post-ascension period; Zmijewski, p. 428, it is the time of Jesus' exaltation.

[157]Zmijewski's 2nd choice, p. 428. However, Marshall, Luke, pp. 658 and Danker, St. Luke, p. 182, suggest that the plural phrase refers to the period after the parousia. This is a good possibility. See esp. their literary parallels. The only point against it is that Luke nowhere else describes or speaks of the period after the parousia.

be a hint of delay in v.22.[158] But this is not accentuated, as Conzelmann thinks, by an emphasis on 'the suddenness' of the parousia in vv. 23f. He is incorrect to stress only 'suddenness' in the image of lightening[159] in this case. This one-sided emphasis is inappropriate because in the contrast between vv. 23 and 24 the first part (v.23) emphasizes secrecy or ambiguity.[160] The meaning of v.24 is the universality and unambiguous nature of the parousia.[161] There is an emphasis on suddenness in vv. 25ff.[162] The significance of 'suddenness' in Luke's eschatology will be discussed below. At this point what should be noted is that the parousia in v.24 is put forward as a real event which will dispel current false claims, not as something which does not offer a real hope for the believer. The significance of 'suddenness' in vv. 25ff. is yet to be decided.

Since there are no unambiguous temporal statements in 17.20-37 one is left with the phrase ἐν τάχει in 18.8a. Both C.E.B. Cranfield and A.J. Mattill are correct in their assessment of the lexical evidence. The phrase should be translated temporally as 'soon', 'quickly', or 'swiftly'.[163] One finds in vv. 7f. a concise eschatological comment by Luke which sets the atemporal discourse of 17.20-37 in temporal perspective. The Lord has delayed his coming

---

[158]Maddox, p. 126; but contra. Fitzmyer, p. 1169.

[159]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 124.

[160]Talbert, "Quest," p. 179.

[161]Cf. Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 18. Fitzmyer, p. 1167 is of course correct to combine 'suddenness' with this.

[162]Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 18.

[163]C.E.B. Cranfield, "The Parable of the Unjust Judge and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts," SJT 16 (1963):298; and Mattill's more extensive discussion, Last Things, pp. 91-93; cf. Marshall, Luke, p. 676; Francis, p. 59; Wilson, Gentile Mission, p. 73; idem., "Lucan Eschatology," NTS 16 (1969-70):340; Fitzmyer, pp. 233f., 1180f.

(καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς v.7).[164] But the answer to the situation in which the community is placed because of this is not to indefinitely postpone the parousia but to affirm that it will be 'soon'.

H. The Question of 'Suddenness' in Luke's Eschatology

Returning to the question of 'suddenness' raised in 17.25ff., it will be demonstrated in Chapters 4 and 5 that the preaching of judgment formed an integral part of the Lucan community's kerygma and this has important implications for understanding the community's plausibility structures and efforts at self-legitimation. But 'suddenness' is also an issue in this context.

In the gospel the threat of divine judgment, i.e. the threat of exclusion from the salvation of God for having rejected Jesus, is normally directed against Israel (Lk. 2.34; 3.9, 17; 4.24-27; 7.29f.; 10.10-15; 13.25-30; 14.15-24). This threat of judgment is either actively expressed or passively implied. In the Nazareth pericope the threat of judgment is only implied. Active threats of judgment are usually couched in eschatological language, e.g. Lk. 3.9, 17; 9.26.[165] The temporal value of these eschatological images of judgment, when applied to Israel, is hard to assess because of the importance of the fall of Jerusalem in Luke's thought. These threats may have been considered as having been fulfilled in the Jewish war.

However, in at least five instances the group towards which the threat is directed is ambiguous (8.18; 9.5, 26; 10.1ff.; 11.29f.). On the redactional level Luke may have intended the motif to extend to a wider group than that indicated by the strict historical reference of the text. Lk. 9.1-6 is ostensibly set in the historical

---

[164] Wilson, Gentile Mission, p. 73; idem., "Eschatology," p. 340.

[165] Ellis, Luke, p. 91; Marshall, Luke, p. 148; Fitzmyer, pp. 469, 474; cf. Lk. 11.29f.; 13.28-30; 14.15ff.

context of the mission of Jesus. But it will be shown in Ch. 5 that in terms of objective criteria their mission is identical to that undertaken by Luke's own church. This implies that Luke felt that this pericope had some relevance for the mission of his own community. There is some evidence that the tradition itself had undergone changes which indicate a concern to apply it to the life of the church. E. Schweizer thinks that the Marcan form of the commission emerged from a collection of sayings, ". . . to form a kind of missionary code which the church needed for the instruction of its missionaries".[166] An ambiguity in the story's historical reference, i.e. "Is it for the time of Jesus or the church?", is inherent in the formation of the traditions behind it. Luke's story maintains this ambiguity. It is Matthew who has historicized the material by additions which reflect the difference between the mission of the Twelve in the time of Jesus and the situation of his own church (Mt. 10.5f.). Luke's account may reflect traditional elements of local palestinian mission, but its connection with the time of Jesus remains loose enough to have application to his own situation.[167]

Conzelmann thinks that the change of instructions for missionaries in Lk. 22.36 places an historical limitation on those of Lk. 9 and 10.[168] But P.S. Minear has demonstrated that ἀλλὰ νῦν in 22.36 does not indicate a shift of epochs in salvation history but an historical limitation of the instructions given at the Last Supper to the immediately following events of the passion.[169] In

---

[166]Eduard Schweizer, The Good News According to Mark, trans. Donald H. Madvig (London: SPCK, 1971), p. 129.

[167]Marshall, Luke, p. 351.

[168]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 82.

[169]Minear, "Luke 22.36," pp. 128-34.

Acts there is no indication that missionaries carried swords. And Luke is seemingly uninterested in the question of their baggage or lack of baggage. But the command of Lk. 9.5 is carried out in Acts (13.51). It is also implied that the instructions of Lk. 9.4 (cf. 10.7) were used in Luke's time. The relevance of these instructions about the lodging of missionaries may be reflected in the frequent naming of those who boarded missionaries (Acts 10.48; 9.43; 18.3; 16.15). These details are in addition to the general applicability of the commission to preach and heal for Luke's community. Thus one may suspect that the instructions in Lk. 9.1-6 and 10.1-12, in regard to the rejection of the Gospel, may also have been relevant to later missionaries.

In most passages which contain a threat of judgment, the threat functions as a sanction for repentance. Lk. 13.5 is characteristic: ". . . but unless you repent you will all likewise perish".

In the sermons of the early church in Acts threats of judgment are again directed at Israel and often specifically at the leadership of Israel (2.23; 3.14, 19; 4.10f.; 5.30). These threats could be seen as having been fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem.

But the threat motif is also a part of Luke's presentation of the gentile mission. Here there can be no question of an historical fulfilment. The major reference is in Paul's speech on the Aereopagus, Acts 17.30f. This reference to future judgment functions as a sanction for his call to repentance.[170] Both Haenchen and Conzelmann accept this analysis of the relationship between the call for repentance and the threat of judgment. However, as a dynamic for the manner in which this threat impinges upon present experience so

---

[170] Cf. Marshall, Acts, p. 290. He does not use the word 'sanction'. Cf. also H.A. Guy, The New Testament Doctrine of the Last Things (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 90.

that it enforces the call to repent, they substitute factuality for imminence. "The command to repent corresponds to the fact (καθότι) that God has set a judgment day -- that this is close at hand the speaker does not of course assert."[171] But one must question how 'factuality' can function as a real sanction in a temporal scheme.

Conzelmann thinks that Luke has removed all relevance from the End except its factualness -- it will come. And to solve the problem of the Delay, Luke has had to make this End endlessly remote. How then can one use the parousia-judgment as a sanction which threatens a contemporary audience of gentiles,[172] when it has been intentionally defused to solve the problem of the Delay? Why should one repent because of a judgment which he knows will come only in a remote future?

Of course one can repent even if the End is conceived of as far away. Numerous social, psychological, and biographical factors will have been operative in the motivation for conversion of community members and some of these factors will be examined in Chapter 4. The point here is that four times in Acts (17.30f.; 10.42f.; 24.15, 25; see below) Luke used future judgment as a temporal sanction for repentance. Our point is not the exclusion of other factors in conversion but that the community felt it necessary to use the threat of a judgment which was temporally related to the call for repentance in its mission preaching. From the missionary's perspective this threat becomes hollow if he believes that the End with which he threatens his audience is temporally far away.

Conzelmann seeks to alleviate this difficulty by his emphasis

---

[171] Haenchen, Acts, p. 526; cf. Neil, p. 192; and Hans Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1963), p. 102; idem., Theology, pp. 102, 111.

[172] Haenchen, Acts, p. 660, attests to the importance of this theme.

on 'suddenness' in Lucan eschatology. 'Suddenness' now supplies the dynamic urgency of the Gospel message.[173] But how can 'suddenness' dynamically impinge itself upon a hearer who knows that this End which comes suddenly also comes in an "endlessly remote"[174] future? How can a temporal End devoid of practical impingement upon one's existence serve as a sanction? Why should one repent because of an End which no longer directly threatens him? What Conzelmann has done is to place all of the semantic value of 'imminence' in the word 'sudden'. He wants to have his cake and eat it too. Only a 'sudden' End which is also coming quickly can serve as a temporal sanction for the call to repentance.

J. Dupont's revival of 'individual eschatology' in Luke-Acts is another possible answer to the relationship of judgment to the call to repent.[175] It is of course feasible that Luke adopted an individual eschatology from ideas current in his environment.[176] And there are passages which represent the presence of such ideas in Luke-Acts, at least to a small extent (Lk. 12.16-21; 16.19-31; 23.43; Acts 7.59). The question is how representative this is of Luke's thought and how it affects his statements of a general future judgment. In the story of the rich farmer (12.16-21) Luke's emphasis is on the proper use of possessions (vv. 20f.; 33f.; cf. Ch. 3, p. 109). It is not even stated that he met his judgment at his death,[177] but only that

---

[173] Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 109, 124, 132.

[174] Ibid., p. 132.

[175] Jacques Dupont, "Die individuelle Eschatologie im Lukas-evangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte," in Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker für Josef Schmid, ed. Paul Hoffmann (Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1973), pp. 37-47.

[176] Maddox, p. 103; S. Aalen, "St. Luke's Gospel and the Last Chapters of I Enoch," NTS 13 (1966-67):1-13.

[177] Maddox, p. 103.

he died and lost his acquisitions. The point of the story about Dives and Lazarus is double-edged. On the one hand Luke again emphasized the proper use of possessions (Ch. 3, note 91) and on the other the missionary application in vv. 29f.[178] The story is not original to Luke[179] and, although he has used this elaborate description of individual existence after death, this is not the reason he used the story. The emphasis in 23.43 seems to be on Jesus' prompt forgiveness of a penitent expressed in a logion which conflicted with its surrounding context.[180] This leaves Acts 7.59. But if Maddox is correct in seeing the primary symbolic reference of the Son of Man as his role in judgment, then the emphasis here is less on his reception of Stephen at his death[181] than it is on his confirmation of judgment against his killers.[182] There is a small amount of individual eschatology in Luke.[183] But,

> It is not a matter of Luke's having adapted traditional eschatological language in the direction of individual eschatology, but rather that he has accepted, to a quite small extent, an alternative way of thinking that is set beside his statement of the traditional, apocalyptic eschatology.[184]

> He (Luke) expects it (the End) to impinge upon the lives of his contemporaries to give them the ultimate inducement to that urgency which the Christian life demands. It is not suggested that they were to live as though this would happen, even though they knew in their hearts it would not.[185]

---

[178] Ibid. See also Chapter 4, p. 215.

[179] John Martin Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London: Macmillan, 1942), pp. 209f.

[180] Lohfink, Himmelfahrt, p. 237.

[181] C. Kingsley Barrett, "Stephen and the Son of Man," in Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), BZNW 30 (1964):32-38.

[182] Robert Maddox, "The Function of the Son of Man According to the Synoptic Gospels," NTS 15 (1968-69):45-74; idem., Purpose, pp. 103f.

[183] Ernst, p. 87. [184] Maddox, p. 104.

[185] Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 14.

In other words, repent "because God has set a day on which he will soon judge the world in righteousness" (Acts 17.31[186]). (Cf. Acts 10.42f.[187]; 24.15[188]; 24.25.[189])

I. Other Problem Passages

There are a few remaining passages which have been supposed to indicate Luke's concern to deal with the problem of the Delay and to reflect his placing of the parousia in the indefinite future.

One is Luke's omission of Mk. 1.14f.[190] This has been dealt with in part in the discussion of Lk. 4.16ff. Lk. 4.21 contains Mark's statement of fulfilment and it appears that Luke has opted for a realized statement about the kingdom over Mark's futurist statement. There is then some justification for Fred Francis' view that Lk. 4.16ff. is an extended comment on Mk. 1.15,[191] rather than a stark 'omission'.

Also, Luke is not afraid of using the phrase in question elsewhere (10.9, 11). Conzelmann objected that the mission of the 70 was meant by Luke to describe the church of the indefinite future just before the parousia. Then and only then would it be appropriate to say "the kingdom has come near".[192] But there is no justification for this view. The historical setting is in Jesus' ministry and it seems likely that the symbolic reference of '70' is to the gentile mission,[193] which was a major concern of Luke. As has been noted and

---

[186] See Mattill, "Naherwartung," pp. 283ff. for this translation.

[187] Neil, p. 140; Conzelmann, Apg, p. 65.

[188] See Neil, p. 234.

[189] See Haenchen, Acts, p. 660.

[190] Fitzmyer, p. 232.

[191] Francis, p. 60.

[192] Conzelmann, Theology, p. 114.

[193] William Manson, Luke, p. 123; Marshall, Luke, p. 415; cf.

will be argued in detail in Chapter 5, the quality of the mission in Lk. 10.1-12 is identical to the quality of the mission in Luke's own time. This is the factor which is most telling against Conzelmann's interpretation.

Lk. 19.11 has been interpreted as a denial of an imminent eschatological expectation and the following parable as indicating an extensive period before the parousia in which the church must prove fruitful.[194] But there are objections which have been raised that cast doubt on the idea that Luke's intent was to teach an indefinite delay of the parousia.

First, if one compares the introduction Luke has constructed in 19.11 for the following parable with that in 12.41, one finds he has made clear the application of the latter for his own time but that the former remains linked with its historical setting. "This introduction gives the parable a definite historical setting in the light of which it is intended to be understood . . . ."[195] It is the earliest followers of Jesus who misunderstood the significance of events and thought that the kingdom was to appear immediately (cf. Lk. 24.21; Acts 1.6). What Luke denies is a connection made by earlier Christians between the resurrection and ascension and the immediate expectation of the End. This is similar to his denial of a direct connection between the fall of Jerusalem and the End in Lk. 21. Further, the parable itself moves with great dispatch. The return has already taken place in v.15 and the rest of the parable is taken up with the settling of accounts. Luke does not, as Matthew

---

Ellis, Luke, pp. 155f.; Danker, St. Luke, pp. 125f.; Norval Geldenhuys, Commentary on the Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), p. 303.

[194]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 113; Grässer, Parusieverzögerung, pp. 115-17; Kaestli, pp. 38-40.

[195]Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 26.

does in 25.19, state that it will be a long time before the return. The emphasis in 19.11 seems to be a correction of earlier expectations rather than an indefinite delay of the parousia.

In Lk. 9.27 Luke has omitted Mark's reference to the kingdom ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει (Mk. 9.1). This, in Conzelmann's view, reflects the replacement of the concept of the coming of the kingdom with a timeless concept of the kingdom.[196] But if, as argued above, the difficulty Luke saw in this passage was the connection of a parousia saying with the first Christian generation (and he has sought to alleviate this difficulty by weakening this connection), then his omission of this phrase can be seen as a further effort to smooth the way for seeing a partial fulfilment of Jesus' promise in the Transfiguration.

Finally, the problem of the Delay is also dealt with in Lk. 12.35-48.[197] V.38 speaks of the master coming in the second or third watch, i.e. late into the night as opposed to early. V.45 speaks of a servant, representative of the elders of Luke's day,[198] who is tempted to abuse his charge because of his master's delay in returning. However v.46 makes it clear that the servant's attitude is dangerous. One cannot count on the master delaying further.[199] He will return sooner rather than later and the servant will find himself called to make an account of his actions. The point of the parable runs against teaching a further delay of the parousia.

---

[196] Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 104f.

[197] Fitzmyer, p. 232.

[198] Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 26.

[199] Fitzmyer, pp. 232f., 986.

J. The Problem of Acts

Another objection which has been raised against the possibility that Luke could have thought of the End as near is the fact that he wrote a history of the early church in Acts. Its literary form as a 'history' and its preoccupation with mission are seen to militate against the possibility that Luke and his readers hoped that the End was near. In this context one thinks of Ernst Käsemann's oft quoted remark that one does not write a history of the church if one is daily expecting the end of the world.[200] The most obvious fault with this position is that its basis of comparison is inadequate. It is quite possible to write a history without expecting history to continue indefinitely.[201] There are examples of histories which have been written to serve the immediate polemical or political needs of a given audience and in contexts in which history was not expected to continue for a very long time. Relevant examples can be found in the histories of Sir Walter Raleigh and Thomas Beard, whose writings are set in the context of the rise of Puritan apocalypticism in late 16th and early 17th century England. (See further Ch. 6, pp. 266ff.) The evidence which indicates that Acts was intended as an historical tract for its own time and not as a dispassionate address to unborn generations means that the genre of Acts as a history does not preclude the possibility that its author and his audience may also have held the belief that the End was near.

But it is possible to view Acts' preoccupation with mission as edging out a relevant eschatological hope.[202] Here space allows

---

[200]Ernst Käsemann, "The Problem of the Historical Jesus," in Essays on New Testament Themes (London: SCM, 1965), p. 28; similarly Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," SLA, p. 47.

[201]Maddox, p. 132.

[202]Cf. Stephen G. Wilson, The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), pp. 77ff.;

only a brief sketch of a response, which also anticipates the conclusions of Ch. 5. First, several themes which are important to Luke's understanding of the mission are also important aspects of his eschatology. Eric Franklin has taught us to see the importance of the resurrection/ascension in Luke's eschatology. In Acts 26.23 and Lk. 24.46f. Luke states that the resurrection is connected with the origins of the gentile mission. The eschatological Spirit (Acts 2.17) directs the mission (e.g. Acts 1.8; 2.10; 13.2). And the Spirit's manifestation is itself closely linked to the resurrection/ascension (Acts 2.33; 5.31f.).[203] Second, as will be shown in Ch. 5, key factors of the mission were seen as eschatological. These include the proclamation of salvation, healing and deliverance, and the division of men into believing and unbelieving groups. Third, it is possible to view the mission as a witness to the power of the ascended Jesus and, by confirming his power, as a guarantee of his return.[204] This means that rather than contradicting the eschatological perspective of the gospel, Acts dovetails with that perspective. The schema of Lk. 21 progresses through four periods:

---

idem., Luke and the Pastoral Epistles (London: SPCK, 1979), pp. 12f., who argues that Luke changed his views on eschatology between the publication of his gospel, in which eschatological material is plentiful, and Acts, in which it is rare. But there are two factors which make Wilson's hypothesis of a Lucan retraction seem untenable. First, there are four references in Acts (17.30f.; 10:42f.; 24.15, 25) which portray the future Day of Judgment as a part of the early church's proclamation. If one is to hypothesize, as is common, that there is a connection between mission practices in Acts and Luke's own church, then at the time Luke wrote Acts, the proclamation of the Day of the Lord continued to be an important element of community belief. Second, there is a broad theological unity between Luke's gospel and Acts. This makes it seem unlikely that Luke saw himself to be correcting in the latter ideas expressed in the former. Specifically Wilson's position assumes that the content of Acts is somehow incompatible with the eschatological sections of the gospel. (This point is further developed in the text.)

[203]Kurt Stalder, "Der Heilige Geist in der lukanischen Ekklesiologie," Una Sancta 30 (1975):288, 290.

[204]Cf. Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 27f.

1) Pentecost to A.D. 66, 2) the Jewish war, 3) Luke's own time, the καιροὶ ἐθνῶν, and 4) the End. Acts deals with the first period, showing how the experiences of the first generation fit eschatological expectations. It highlights the importance of the church's mission, and brings Luke's readers up to date.

K. Conclusion

We may now summarize the results of this brief examination of representative passages. On the one hand Luke has added an historical dimension to his eschatological materials. He is aware of past events as history which did not lead to the End but nevertheless remain significant. He appears to be aware of the historical development of Christian eschatological expectations. He deals historically, in terms of changed situations and perspectives, with the problem of the first generation's imminent expectation. He is aware of historical causality, development, and periods of church development, as the very existence of Acts demonstrates. He was aware of all this and yet, on the other hand, did not abandon a 'relevant' eschatological expectation. He did not relegate the parousia to the indefinite future. He still expected it to come 'soon'. It can thus be seen that Luke was able to write a history of the early church and at the same time to hold a relevant eschatological hope. His eschatology itself embraces historical development and change. The question which remains is how Luke's history and eschatology were held together in a meaningful fashion for himself and his community. Our approach to this question is to be sociological. It is to the questions of the use of sociology in New Testament study and the illumination it can offer for our understanding of this question that we now turn.

CHAPTER II

SOCIOLOGY AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDY

A. The Justification for the Use of Sociology in New Testament Study

The explanation of religion in society was integral to classical sociological theory and since the early 1960's religion has again emerged as a major, and central, theoretical concern in sociological thought.[1] However, first the Barthian revolution and then the existentialist approach of the Bultmannians served as major impediments to serious sociological analysis of the New Testament.[2] As a result the study of early Christianity has only recently reaped benefits such as those which have been achieved over the past century in the sociological analysis of non-Christian religions and Christian groups in contemporary and other periods. Even the work of the 'Chicago School' of Shirley Jackson Case in the social background of

---

[1]Michael Hill, A Sociology of Religion (London: Heinemann, 1973), pp. 1-5; cf. W.S.F. Pickering, "Theodicy and Social Theory: An Exploration of the Limits of Collaboration Between Sociologist and Theologian," in Martin, pp. 59-75; Warren Lewis, "Coming Again: How Society Functions Through Its New Religions," in NRM, pp. 206f.; Peter L. Berger and Hansfried Kellner, Sociology Reinterpreted (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982), p. 91; Thomas Luckmann, The Invisible Religion (London: Macmillan, 1967), p. 26; Susan Budd, Sociologists and Religion (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1973), pp. 1-5.

[2]John H. Schütz, the Introduction to The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity, by Gerd Theissen, trans. John Schütz (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982), p. 8; for a brief defence of the 'sociological' aspect of Bultmann's form critical work see Dietfried Gewalt, "Neutestamentliche Exegese und Soziologie," EvT 31 (1971):87-90; see further note 17.

the New Testament was largely without impact.[3] But with the general abandonment of the Barthian dichotomy between Christianity and religion,[4] Christianity can no longer claim special immunity from sociological analysis.[5] For whatever Christianity may be in terms of ontological ultimacy it is at least the religious experience and practice of groups of human beings and, as such, fair game for the sociologist.

Recent justification of the application of sociological theories, models, and methods to New Testament materials has been frequently and well done.[6] A detailed discussion of the benefits to

---

[3]Cf. Thomas F. Best, "The Sociological Study of the New Testament: Promise and Peril of a New Discipline," SJT 36 (1983):185; see further William Hynes, Shirley Jackson Case and the Chicago School: The Socio-Historical Method (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1981).

[4]See Barth's essay on Feuerbach which was printed as the introduction to Ludwig Feuerbach, The Essence of Christianity (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), pp. XXIXff.

[5]See Peter Berger's retraction, The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1969), pp. 180ff., of his earlier attempt to maintain this dichotomy, The Precarious Vision: A Sociologist Looks at Social Fictions and Christian Faith (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1961), pp. 161ff.; cf. Van A. Harvey, "Religious Faith and the Sociology of of Knowledge: The Unburdening of Peter Berger," RSR 5 (1979), p. 4.

[6]E.g. Wayne A. Meeks, The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul (London/New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 1-8; Robin Gill, The Social Context of Theology: A Methodological Enquiry (London/Oxford: Mowbrays, 1975), pp. 4-13; John G. Gager, Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975), pp. 2-14; idem., "Shall We Marry Our Enemies?: Sociology and the New Testament," Interp. 36 (1982):256-65; Best, pp. 181f.; Robin Scroggs, "The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament: The Present State of Research," NTS 26 (1980):164-79; Dennis Nineham, "A Partner for Cinderella?," in What About the New Testament?, eds. M.D. Hooker and Colin Hickling (London: SCM, 1975), pp. 143ff.; L.E. Keck, "On the Ethos of Early Christians," JAAR 42 (1974):437f.; Derek Tidball, An Introduction to the Sociology of the New Testament (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1983), pp. 11-22; Timothy Radcliffe, "Relativizing the Relativizers: A Theologian's Assessment of the Role of Sociological Explanation of Religious Phenomena and Theology Today," in Martin, pp. 151-54; Klaus Berger, "Wissenssoziologie und Exegese des Neuen Testaments," Kairos 19 (1977):124f.; Howard Clark Kee, Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective (London: SCM, 1980), pp. 18-26; Abraham J. Malherbe, Social Aspects of Early Christianity (Baton Rouge/London: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), p. 11;

be achieved by the use of sociological perspectives at this point would be repetitive. The major benefits can be briefly stated. Most obviously sociological study of the New Testament is a new perspective which will supplement traditional methods of study by helping to reconstruct a larger and more pervasive picture of the historical situation within which early Christianity must be understood.[7] It is at least this. But at a deeper level sociological analysis of early Christianity offers a corrective to an isolating idealism which has often affected New Testament study.[8] It can provide, "an antidote to the abstractions of the history of ideas and to the subjective individualism of existentialist hermeneutics".[9] It promises to reclothe in flesh and bones the docetic spectre created by theological explanation which has all too often operated under the fallacy of idealism, that "the determining factors of the historical process are ideas . . . and that all developments, conflicts, and influences are at bottom developments of, and conflicts and influences between ideas".[10] In other words, theologians have tended to operate with the assumption that in the beginning God created ideas, which have since

---

Amos Wilder, "Social Factors in Early Christian Eschatology," in Early Christian Origins, ed. Allen Wikgren (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961), pp. 67f.; Robert Morgan, "On Marrying If Not Loving One's Enemies: Theology and the Social Sciences," a paper read before the seminar in the sociology of religion, All Souls College, Oxford, 24 January 1985; John H. Elliott, A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of I Peter, Its Situation and Strategy (London: SCM, 1982), pp. 1ff.

[7]Meeks, p. 2; Malherbe, p. 11; Robin Scroggs, "The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement," in Neusner, Pt. 2, p. 3; cf. Norman K. Gottwald, The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E. (London: SCM, 1980), p. 8, in relation to Old Testament study.

[8]Cf. Meeks, p. 1. [9]Ibid., p. 2.

[10]Bengt Holmberg, Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1978), p. 205; cf. Scroggs, "Interpretation," pp. 165f.

created human history.[11] Instead one should examine concrete social groups in relation to their thought rather than the thought itself in isolation. Christian ideas came into being in the context of empirically existing social groups which one must understand in order to understand their thought.[12] As Ernest Gellner has said, "Concepts and beliefs do not exist in isolation, in texts or individual minds, but in the life of man and societies."[13] Sociology offers tools and perspectives indispensable for the understanding of man and his societies. In short, any theology, ancient or modern, is written by humans living in a social context. Sociologists can enlighten the relationship between that context and the theology which has been produced.[14] They can in turn investigate the influence of these socially constructed ideas upon subsequent social developments.[15] Put differently, any formulation or communication of religious ideas takes place within a given nexus of social structures, which are the investigative speciality of the sociologist.[16] The theologian is driven to make bedfellows with the sociologist. The use of sociology in New Testament research promises at last to provide the elusive Sitz im Leben, promised but never delivered by form criticism.[17] Its

---

[11] Cf. Elliott, Homeless, pp. 3f.

[12] Keck, "Ethos," p. 437; Meeks, p. 2; cf. E.A. Judge, The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century (London: Tyndale, 1960), pp. 9f.

[13] "Concepts and Society," in Sociological Theory and Philosophical Analysis, eds. Dorothy Emmet and Alasdair MacIntyre (London: Macmillan, 1970), p. 119.

[14] Gill, pp. 7f.

[15] Ibid., p. 9.

[16] Ibid., p. 13.

[17] Gottwald, p. 14; Elliott, Homeless, pp. 2f.; Gager, "Marry Our Enemies," p. 260; Esler, p. 4.

fresh theoretical perspectives might also invigorate the discipline's traditional historical-critical tools.[18]

The main conceptual difficulty in using sociology for New Testament research is on what basis theories, models, and methods are to be selected. Gerd Theissen has remarked that the basic problem which confronts any attempt at a sociology of early Christianity is which sociology of religion theory one will choose as a basis for analysis.[19] Because of the multiplicity of approaches available and the lack of concensus regarding methods[20] one cannot uncritically accept any one theory and proceed to analyse the New Testament. An eclectic approach is necessitated with decisions on several theoretical and methodological issues being required in specific cases of inquiry. The discussion of these decisions is undertaken at the appropriate place in the following chapters. Some general guidelines, however, are appropriate here.

B. Guidelines for the Use of Sociological Methods and Perspectives

The aim in using sociological theories, models, and methods is what Clifford Geertz, borrowing from Gilbert Ryle, has called "thick description".[21] In Geertz's view the study of man does not seek regulatory laws, as would a physical science. It is an

---

[18]The discipline's other alternative is the ahistorical route of structuralism, Best, p. 183, or the wider perspectives of literary criticism in general.

[19]Gerd Theissen, "Theoretische Probleme religionssoziologischer Forschung und die Analyse der Urchristentums," Neue Zeitschrift für Systematic Theologie und Religionsphilosophie 16 (1974):35; cf. Gottwald, p. 8 of O.T. study.

[20]Ross S. Kraemer, A review of The Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity, by Gerd Theissen and Social Aspects of Early Christianity, by Abraham J. Malherbe, JBL 98 (1979):436. Cf. Best, pp. 190f.; Jonathan Z. Smith, "The Social Description of Early Christianity," RSR 1 (1975):19.

[21]Clifford Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures (London: Hutchinson, 1975), p. 6.

interpretive science which seeks understanding.[22] This is to move away from reductionism towards sympathetic inquiry. The study of man and his religions ought to be a discursive discipline which seeks to increase communication and human understanding between the researcher and groups of human beings from which he is separated by culture, language, class, religion, or time. In this model the study of socio-descriptive factors such as status, income, race, and institutions provides a backdrop for the investigation of structures of meaning and signification which achieve a central importance in what is conceived as an interpretive task.[23] One seeks to rescue the 'said' of a perishing human situation and to fix it in perusable terms.[24] Models, theories, and methods must be selected according to their ability under critical examination to illuminate the social realities of the group in question and to enable one to move towards such a 'thick description' of human meaning and signification.

On the face of it this model of the sociological task appears to conflict with a sociological model based on an analogy with physics[25] which defines the goal of sociological inquiry as arriving at explanatory laws.[26] But the conflict is not absolute if one recognizes that scientific 'laws' are, at base, explanatory hypotheses of observed regularities which are, at present, considered as valid in

---

[22]Ibid., p. 5.

[23]Ibid., pp. 13f.; Berger and Kellner, pp. 17, 22f.; Peter L. Berger, Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective (New York: Penguin Books, 1979, '1963), p. 15; cf. Kee, Origins, pp. 18ff.

[24]Geertz, p. 20; cf. Ninian Smart, The Phenomenon of Religion (London: Macmillan, 1973), pp. 34f.

[25]John Rex, Key Problems of Sociological Theory (London/Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980, '1961), pp. 15ff.

[26]This model has recently been defended for use in New Testament research by Esler, p. 8.

explaining most of the empirical data to which they relate.[27] Falsifiability is central to the study of scientific law so that empirical phenomena stand as a check against its reification.[28] In any event hypotheses are needed to help make sense of phenomena and can be seen as aids for recovering human meaning. In any event this study is, by definition, restricted in scope to one Christian community and therefore cannot provide a sufficient comparative base for the establishment of laws.

A closely related issue is the interrelation of theory and method in the retrieval of data. Sociology is in the business of moving from the investigation of the particular to making statements about the general, the typical, and the abstract.[29] In the study of antiquity this goal acutely focuses the question of the relationship between the retrieval of data and its theoretical interpretation. Two schools of thought can be found among those currently practising the social analysis of early Christianity.

Some hold that the first step in analysis is description. E.A. Judge, a classical historian, rightly emphasizes that theory must be based on fact. In his view the first job is the description of social facts after which one may theorize. In the instance of early Christianity too few facts have yet been established, in his opinion, to allow one to theorize properly.[30]

---

[27] Rex, pp. 17f.

[28] Ibid., p. 42.

[29] Best, p. 185; Gerd Theissen, "Die soziologische Auswertung religiöser Überlieferungen," Kairos 17 (1975):285.

[30] E.A. Judge, "The Sociological Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History," JRH 11 (1980): 206, 210f.; Kee, Origins, p. 18; and Malherbe, p. 20 make a similar methodological distinction as does Best, p. 185, but he acknowledges that such a distinction will not be generally accepted.

The idea of separating description from theory is forthright and logical and would be commendable were it not for the fact that there are no facts without implicit theoretical interpretation.[31] This is particularly true in the case of the social sciences because of the complex nature of social facts.[32] Clarity of distinction between these two logically distinct steps is muddled because of the necessary application of theory in the retrieval of data. A pure description could only achieve a meaningless impressionism.[33]

However, an emphasis on facts offers a healthy corrective to an approach such as that used by John G. Gager in his Kingdom and Community (1975). In it he makes a great deal of the paucity of materials available to do sociological analysis of early Christian groups. He suggests that in this light it is a valid methodological step to use theoretical models, drawn from other studies and applied to early Christian groups, to generate data to fill in the gaps in our knowledge.[34] The results he arrives at are far from satisfactory.[35]

---

[31]Meeks, p. 5; cf. Vernon K. Robbins, A review of Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel, by Howard Clark Kee, JBL 98 (1979):148. Judge himself acknowledges this elsewhere, Social Pattern, p. 49.

[32]Berger and Kellner, pp. 43ff.; cf. Berger, Invitation, pp. 34, 43. Social facts are complex because they are multi-perspectival and multi-layered. For further complexities, see Emile Durkheim, The Rules of Sociological Method, 8th ed. (New York and London: The Free Press and Macmillan, 1964, '1938), pp. 1-13; also Kraemer, p. 437.

[33]Meeks, p. 5.

[34]Gager, Kingdom, pp. 3f.

[35]See David L. Bartlett, "John G. Gager's 'Kingdom and Community': A Summary and Response," Zygon 13 (1978):109-22; Jonathan Z. Smith, "Too Much Kingdom, Too Little Community," Zygon 13 (1978): 123-30; G.S.R. Thomas' review in JRH 10 (1978):95f.; Judge, "Sociological Identity," p. 207; Best, pp. 189f.; Daniel J. Harrington, "Sociological Concepts and the Early Church: A Decade of Research," TS 41(1980):182ff.; Robert M. Grant, "The Social Setting of Second-Century Christianity," in Sanders I, pp. 19f.; Cyril S. Rodd, "On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies," JSOT 19 (1981): 98-100; for criticisms.

This is due largely to the fact that in attempting to paint a picture of early Christianity in broad sweeps he has neglected facts.[36]

First, Gager has not asked critical and historical questions of the models he has used. Does the body of data from which the model was derived bear any relation to the new data it is being asked to illuminate? What are the points of comparison at which the model is applicable? At what points does historical particularity cause the model to malfunction?[37] Models are abstract descriptions of empirical phenomena. They are derived from concrete communities which must be located and described. As such the models generated by a specific study or studies are never without their own context of meaning.[38] It is all too possible for models, which are abstract human projections, to become reified and invested with an ultimate reality independent of their origin. When this happens they can easily become the vehicles of an "epistemological imperialism".[39]

The specific empirical data being examined must remain more important than the model in use.[40] This data must stand as a critical check judging the model's validity. A model used in historical analysis must stand before the bar of critical history. A further caution against the possible imperialistic use of models is the microscopic nature of anthropological study.[41] One cannot empirically study the

---

[36] Cf. Thomas' review, pp. 95f.

[37] Cf. Bartlett, p. 120; Best, pp. 189f.

[38] J.Z. Smith, "Too Much Kingdom," p. 127.

[39] Best, p. 190; cf. Gregory Baum, "Peter L. Berger's Unfinished Symphony," Commonweal, 9 May 1980, p. 266. He argues that paradigms have a research guiding power to create sensitivity to some data while causing insensitivity to other data. Cf. Thomas' review of Gager's Kingdom and Community, p. 95.

[40] Bartlett, p. 121.

[41] Geertz, p. 21.

human race; one can only examine minute and disjointed segments of it. Broad theoretical considerations are generated from a very narrow empirical base. The narrow speaks to the broad only because it is made to do so. This situation poses a serious problem for sociological theory and should generate caution in study which seeks to compare isolated cases. It is difficult enough to jump from one culture to another within the 20th century using a specific theoretical model,[42] let alone from the 20th century to the 1st.

Secondly, Gager fails to use adequate historical method in outlining the data he does use. Specifically, he fails to acknowledge the diversity of early Christianity. Christianity in the 1st to the 4th centuries existed only in diverse concrete communities. Historically there was no abstract and monolithic entity called 'the Church'. Gager does not distinguish between different communities and too often assumes the existence of a homogenous entity called 'early Christianity'.[43]

We learn from Gager that theory and models must be critically appropriated and used. It cannot be assumed that they possess superhuman power -- able to leap long millenia in a single bound. From Judge we learn that one cannot hide the necessary use of theory behind neutral description. Rather, theories and models must be stated plainly, as used both in the retrieval of data and in the interpretation of that data, so that they can be verified or falsified in critical inquiry.[44]

---

[42]See Bryan Wilson's discussion of the use of 'sect' as an analytical model, Religion in Sociological Perspective (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 101f.

[43]J.Z. Smith, "Too Much Kingdom," p. 125; Bartlett, p. 119. For examples see Gager, Kingdom, pp. 20-26.

[44]Meeks, p. 5.

The first methodological step in the sociological analysis of an ancient group is the abstraction of relevant data, a step in which the necessary use of theory must be acknowledged. At this point the sociologist of the New Testament is dependent upon historical methods.[45] In the contemporary study of living groups sociologists are able to collect their own data using their own methods for their own purposes. Such freedom is not possible in the study of defunct groups. The sociologist of early Christianity is dependent upon the historian to supply and verify data.[46] In the case of New Testament communities the use of traditional critical tools is part of the necessary groundwork. However, it must be recognized that the admission of sociological perspectives will strain the traditional use of these tools. They will be forced to stretch beyond their ordinary uses to answer a new set of questions and illuminate a broader perspective not restricted to the history of ideas. A larger historical picture, informed by the larger view of human life implicit in sociological study, must be reconstructed. After the basic picture of the community has been reconstructed the analytical tools of sociology can be used to comment on its meaning.

Closely related to the question of the critical assessment of theoretical models is the larger question of the comparative step in general. In spite of Geertz's cautions about the microscopic nature of anthropological study, comparison of individual cases is a necessary and accepted goal. It is required in the case of early Christianity, not simply on account of the fragmentary nature of the sources,[47] but because the direction of sociology is towards synthetic

---

[45] Berger, Invitation, pp. 31f.

[46] Scroggs, "Interpretation," p. 167.

[47] Theissen, "Soziologische Auswertung," p. 297.

statement about human groups as part of a larger whole. Sociology is, as Peter Berger has said, "cosmopolitan" by its very nature.[48] Comparison is also necessary in sociology in order to provide understanding. Comparison offers bridges from the analysis of one particular group to the analysis of other groups in order that a larger human picture may be developed and the understanding of the analyst be increased by this broader perspective.

Turning to the microscopic perspective of Gerd Theissen's rationale for comparison, comparison is required to build an adequate historical picture of the social world of the 1st century. To borrow Theissen's example, and assuming for the moment that Luke is correct in describing Crispus (Acts 18.8) as a synagogue ruler, his description can be expanded by non-Biblical references to rulers of synagogues even though no details of his life are given by Luke.[49] It is known that rulers of synagogues appear as men of substantial wealth and this can be assumed (but not proven) as also true of Crispus. This is simply good historical method used to flesh out prosopographic pictures rather than the traditional political ones.

Comparative study falls into two emphases: one seeking out similarities and the other differences. In comparing groups which share the same historical and social setting, their common cultural milieu provides a constant against which the variable responses of different groups can be examined. In this instance the similarities of groups are less important than their differences.[50] One seeks to discover why divergent responses to shared influences have emerged from the common cultural milieu. (It is, as noted above, important

---

[48]Berger and Kellner, p. 16.

[49]Theissen, "soziologische Auswertung," p. 297.

[50]Ibid., p. 298.

on another level to note the similarities because of the fragmentary nature of the sources. Thus one can learn about Christian households from accounts of pagan households. However, the point here is that the distinctively Christian element will only emerge by noting the differences between Christian and non-Christian households.)

Sociology also compares similar groups originating in diverse times and places. In these cases the social world is variable but certain aspects of these groups' responses to different situations are constant -- at least enough so to note a family resemblance. In this instance the ways in which groups are similar take precedence over their differences.[51] One seeks for the constant elements of human response in diverse cultural situations. Thus one can expect to illumine early Christian eschatology as a dynamic in community experience by the study of millenarian groups throughout the history of the Church. However, as noted in the criticisms of Gager, no two human phenomena correspond completely, and comparison can proceed only with the recognition that awareness of contrast is its prerequisite.[52]

Another general problem is the assessment of sociographic and prosopographic statements. Where such statements occur in the Pauline letters, the inferences which can be made are, on the whole, unproblematic. The mention of a person of wealth or high status can be assumed to indicate that this person is being referred to as a real person who is a member of the community being addressed. The chief problem in such a case is determining whether such a person is representative of the community.[53] In the case of narrative accounts such as the gospels and Acts it is the reliability of the

---

[51] Ibid., pp. 298f.

[52] Ibid., pp. 297f.

[53] Ibid., p. 287.

statement which is in question.[54] It cannot be assumed that the mention of a wealthy man in the traditions received by a community indicates that wealthy men were, in fact, members of that community. Thus, it cannot be thought that the Lucan community achieved the conversion of people of proconsular rank because of the reported conversion of Sergius Paulus (Acts 13.6ff.). But such a report does, at least, indicate the type of thing that Lucan Christians dreamt about.[55] It is at least an attractive fiction Luke used in his portrait of Christianity because it would appeal to his readers. He, no less than any other Christian writer, was engaged in a process of world-building. The pictures he paints of the social levels of converts in Acts are part of the symbolic universe he was helping to construct. As such these pictures serve to legitimate that universe and must be seen to reflect real social aspects of his community. It is this connection between social realities and the symbols used in legitimating and constructing a symbolic universe which makes the sociology of knowledge a suitable perspective for the analysis of Lucan Christianity (see below). In recognizing the gospel and Acts as efforts at world-building they can be used to reconstruct the social world in which they were produced.[56] Given that the life of Luke's community serves as a social determinant for the ideal world he wishes to construct,[57] the indirect nature of socio- and prosopographic statements is less of an obstacle.

---

[54] Ibid., p. 286.

[55] R.M. Grant, "Social Setting," p. 22.

[56] Cf. Gager, Kingdom, pp. 8ff.

[57] Cf. Berger, Invitation, p. 78.

C. The Use of the Sociology of Knowledge

The major sociological perspective which will be used to unite and explain the conclusions of this thesis (see Ch. 6, F) and which is used as the theoretical basis for the analysis undertaken in parts of Chapters 3 and 4, and used in Chapters 5 and 6, is that of the sociology of knowledge, itself a diverse theoretical field.[58] Yet even though most theological circles now recognize the value of the use of sociological perspectives in New Testament study and specific sociological analyses of New Testament groups have proliferated over the last 10 years, Klaus Berger's claim, made in 1977, that the sociology of knowledge had not yet been used in a specific New Testament study, is still largely true.[59]

In order to overcome the problem of diversity of theoretical formulation within the sociology of knowledge, one recent formulation has been selected for use: that of Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann.[60]

---

[58]Robert K. Merton, "Paradigm for the Sociology of Knowledge," in SKR, p. 342.

[59]Klaus Berger, p. 125. He is formally incorrect in that Gager's Kingdom and Community is put forward as using the sociology of knowledge, pp. 9-15, but he is substantially correct because in spite of Gager's talk about 'world-building' as an investigative model very little of the book actually uses this perspective. Chapter 2 uses studies of millenarian movements as an investigative model. Chapter 3 uses cognitive dissonance theory. Chapter 4 deals with legitimation and consolidation, but the perspective used is Weber's theory of charisma and routinization. Chapter 5 is a stratification study. Chapter 6 is a comparative study with Judaism in the Hellenistic millieu. H.C. Kee claims that his book, Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective, pp. 24ff., is an investigation of early Christian 'life-worlds', a concept from the sociology of knowledge. His second chapter does employ the concept of 'world-building' but is dominated by the concepts of 'secularization' and 'sacralization'. His other chapters are, typically for Kee, less sociological than critical historical informed by social questions. Cf. V.K. Robbins' review of Kee's Community of the New Age, p. 148. Philip Esler's Oxford thesis represents the first study extensively to use the concept of legitimation as an explanatory and investigative tool; see also Elliott, Homeless.

[60]The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge (London: Allen Lane, 1967).

The Berger-Luckmann formulation of the sociology of knowledge represents a major theoretical advance because of its ability to overcome several difficulties endemic in earlier approaches. The first regards the theoretical breadth of the sociology of knowledge. What types of knowledge fall within its purview? Second, what is the relationship of its findings to the question of the truth or ultimate validity of propositions? Third, how should the relationship of knowledge to its existential basis be explained? Fourth, what is the anthropological basis of the theory? The means by which the Berger-Luckmann formulation of the sociology of knowledge accounts for these difficulties will become evident by first sketching their theory and second by assessing objections which have been raised against the sociology of knowledge.

Berger and Luckmann began their task with a sweeping redefinition of the scope of the sociology of knowledge which far surpassed what had been the traditional conception of its task. "The sociology of knowledge must concern itself with everything that passes for 'knowledge' in society."[61] Earlier theorists had primarily been concerned with theoretical knowledge or the problem of ideology.[62] Berger and Luckmann have realized that for the sociology of knowledge to lay any claim to validity in its findings it must be universal in breadth, encompassing all knowledge from daily common sense to the physical sciences and mathematics. However, they focus their analysis on daily common sense, preferring to view the sciences as secondary

---

[61] Ibid., pp. 26f.; cf. p. 15; cf. Peter L. Berger, "Identity as a Problem in the Sociology of Knowledge," in SKR, p. 374.

[62] Berger and Luckmann, p. 24; Peter L. Berger and Brigitte Berger, Sociology: A Biographical Approach (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1981, '1972), pp. 376f.; Berger, "Identity," p. 377; cf. Merton's discussion of the historical development, passim. The exception is of course Alfred Schutz (see note 63) to whom Berger and Luckmann are indebted for pioneering the sociological study of knowledge in the context of daily life.

constructs based on daily experience.[63]

The anthropological basis of their theory is to be found in three empirical aspects of human nature. First, man is by nature 'homo socius'.[64] He exists only in collectivities and cannot become human in isolation nor remain human in isolation except as he carries into hermitage previous social definitions.[65]

Secondly, man is by nature 'world-open' at birth.[66] This means that in contrast with other animals man's world is not instinctually defined at birth. Man is instinctually underdeveloped. E.g. when compared with the world of a horse, which is rigidly delimited by its instinctual structure so as to form a pre-given "horse-world", there is no correspondingly pre-given "man-world".67 Man must make his own 'world'. The vast historical variety of human 'worlds' which have been produced are evidence of this.

Third, man externalizes his subjective being. This externalization of subjective meaning and experience can be seen in the production of artifacts, language, and habituated actions.[68] These externalized products coalesce to form an intersubjectively shared 'world' which strikes man as an objective construction external to himself. 'Objectivation' is a key concept in the Berger-Luckmann theory which signifies the process by which things originating in

---

[63]Cf. Berger and Luckmann, pp. 33, 26f.; cf. Alfred Schutz and Thomas Luckmann, The Structures of Life-World, trans. Richard M. Zaner and H. Tristam Engelhardt, Jr. (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973), pp. 3ff. Berger and Luckmann, p. 26, acknowledge their indebtedness to Schutz's main works, The Problem of Social Reality (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1962); and Studies in Social Theory (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1964); for this insight.

[64]Berger and Luckmann, p. 69; Berger, Sacred Canopy, p. 7.

[65]Cf. Berger, Invitation, p. 118.

[66]Berger and Luckmann, p. 65.

[67]Ibid. [68]Ibid., p. 70.

subjective human consciousness and externalized by man come to have an intersubjectively acknowledged existence of their own.[69]

A further key concept is 'internalization'. This is the process by which an externally objectivated 'world' is retrojected back into human consciousness in primary socialization and the educational process.[70] Internalization can be considered complete when a close correspondence has come into being between internal meaning structures, or self-identity,[71] and those meaning structures objectivated in society. The circle has been completed. The world which man has made has now made man. However, socialization is never perfect. There is always a discrepancy between the self as subjectively experienced and the self as defined by society.[72]

At this point the importance of the dialectical process which lies behind all that has been said becomes manifest. Man and society cannot be understood as a one-way causality.[73] Man both produces a world and is in turn created by that world. The world which our ancestors produced acts back upon us, their offspring, with a stark coercive reality. But the dialectic is not limited to the production of worlds, so that the first generation is a free partner in the dialectic but all subsequent generations are predetermined. Because socialization is never perfect the dialectic continues in the

---

[69]Ibid., pp. 76ff.; Berger, Sacred Canopy, pp. 8f.; objectivated realities are social factors one cannot 'wish away'; cf. Durkheim, pp. 2f., 7, 10, 13.

[70]Berger and Luckmann, pp. 149ff.; Berger, Sacred Canopy, p. 13; Berger, Invitation, pp. 111-41.

[71]Berger's emphasis on the social formation of the self derives from George Herbert Mead, Mind, Self and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934). See Berger and Berger, pp. 48, 56ff.; cf. Luckmann, pp. 45ff.

[72]Berger and Luckmann, pp. 154f.; Berger, Sacred Canopy, p. 18; Berger and Kellner, p. 95.

[73]Berger and Luckmann, p. 78; cf. Berger, Sacred Canopy, p. 7.

maintenance of worlds (also because new situations continue to arise which had not confronted the original generation). Men continue to influence the development of their 'world' by externalizing themselves into it and struggling against it. This newly influenced 'world' in turn acts back upon the men who are trying to direct or change it.[74] (This is also the way in which the Berger-Luckmann theory answers the claim of idealist historians that society does appear to be shaped by ideas. They do not deny that ideas obtain a 'reality' and influence of their own independent of man, but they draw our attention to the fact that they do so only when externalized and, what Berger calls, 'objectivated'.)

Another anthropological constant which undergirds the Berger-Luckmann theory is that man is, by nature, an ordering or nomic creature. He must have his biographical experience congeal into a meaningful whole.[75] Meaning and order are also aspects which are first subjectively experienced and then externalized and objectivated to become part of our 'world'. The basic manner in which human social and cognitive order are secured is to understand these aspects of our existence as resting in 'the nature of things'.[76] We come to accept 'the meaning of life', 'our social order', 'ethics and morals' because we have been socialized to understand our particular cultural answer to these questions as 'the way things are'.

---

[74]Berger and Luckmann, p. 78.

[75]Berger, Sacred Canopy, p. 22; cf. Berger and Luckmann, pp. 115, 82f., 110; Robert N. Bellah, Beyond Belief: Essays on Religion in a Post-Traditional World (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), p. 206; Wilfred Cantwell Smith, Faith and Belief (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), p. 13; Geertz, pp. 140f.; Berger and Kellner, p. 24.

[76]Berger, Sacred Canopy, pp. 24f.; cf. Geertz, p. 127, a world view is the way things "in sheer actuality are"; cf. Michael Argyle and Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, The Social Psychology of Religion (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975, '1958 as Religious Behaviour), pp. 181, 203.

At this point 'reification' is a key term in the Berger-Luckmann theory. By it they mean the process by which institutions, defined as the coalescence of habituated actions and typified roles and embodying the perceived order,[77] come to be endued with an ontological status independent of their human origins. Man forgets that he has produced his world and it appears to exist a priori. Human meanings and relations come to be seen as 'true' because they are perceived as part of the facticity of the universe.

Nevertheless, human worlds are, by nature, precarious.[78] Our socially produced worlds are constantly changing. This is one fact among many which threatens to reveal their inherent instability. Or they are in danger of contamination from foreign 'worlds', or, worse still, in danger of collapse as the result of foreign invasion.

Therefore social 'worlds' must be legitimated; i.e. explanations of the perceived order must be given which can account for contingencies. Legitimation takes place on various levels, from the simple presuppositions of facticity which lie behind language to the bodies of knowledge produced by professional castes of theorists.[79] At its highest level legitimation produces a complete overarching canopy of meaning which is capable (at least theoretically) of explaining and uniting all human experience within one unified system of thought.[80] Examples of such 'worlds' can be seen in medieval Christendom, or in Aztec culture before its 'world' was destroyed by a more powerful 'world' imposed in the Spanish conquest. Historically the most effective means of legitimation has been the construction of religious worlds, or what

---

[77] Berger and Luckmann, pp. 70ff.

[78] Berger, Sacred Canopy, p. 29.

[79] Berger and Luckmann, pp. 110ff.; Berger and Berger, p. 29.

[80] Berger, "Identity," p. 375.

Berger calls a 'sacred canopy'.[81] A sacred world justifies human existence and meaning at the highest possible level. Human life and knowledge are what they are, not just because they rest on the nature of the universe, but because they reflect the will of the gods.

This brief sketch of the Berger-Luckmann theory is not intended as an exhaustive or critical exposé, but only to highlight the major concepts out of which the theory is composed. We are now in a position to state the applicability of the theory for the study of Luke-Acts. It seems evident that Luke was engaged in a process of world-building. Of course he himself would not have recognized this. But we can see him as a theorist, dealing with the social context of his community and providing legitimation in the form of a sacred cosmos for its emerging life-world. That life-world served as a social determinant for the ideal world constructed in his text and particularly as a determinant for the symbols by which he was able to communicate the ideal world of the text. His communication had to take place via structures of meaning which were socially determined. It is at this point that the methodological advantage of the theory for study of the New Testament becomes apparent. Gager is certainly correct in arguing that the paucity of materials available for sociological study of the New Testament is a major impediment.[82] If one wishes to analyse the class or economic stratification of an early Christian community hard statistical income and property data is simply lacking. One cannot circulate a questionnaire or examine tax returns. But large sections of the New Testament, and in particular Luke's gospel, are devoted to paraenetic material on possessions, or have, e.g. in Acts, brief descriptions of individuals

---

[81] E.g. Berger, Sacred Canopy, passim.

[82] Gager, Kingdom, pp. 3f.

with class or economic indicators. If one adopts the perspective of the sociology of knowledge and asks, "To what class meaning structures do the symbols used in this material correspond?", then this material can be used as evidence for a stratification study. This procedure will be used in Chapter 3, Section C. Also, working from the concept of legitimation, one can ask functionalist questions of blocks of ideas in the text. "What set of social experiences, or institutional aspects of community life, is this set of theological ideas serving to legitimate?" This perspective will be used in Chapters 5 and 6.

There are, however, objections which have been raised against the sociology of knowledge which, if valid, would cast doubt on its validity as a tool for historical research.[83]

---

[83]For objections to Berger's interpretation of the religious history of man and modern man's situation see David Cairns, "The Thought of Peter Berger," SJT 27 (1974):187ff.; and Robin Gill, "Berger's Plausibility Structures: A Response to Professor Cairns," SJT 27 (1974):206f. But the type of objections raised tend to be on the empirical level rather than the theoretical level and thus do not directly affect Berger's theory, cf. Ian Oswald Guinness, "Towards a Reappraisal of Christian Apologetics: Peter L. Berger's Sociology of Knowledge as the Sociological Prolegomenon to Christian Apologetics," unpublished D.Phil., the University of Oxford, 1981, pp. 59, 84-98. Much early opposition to Berger revolved around Berger's use of the concept of 'secularization', e.g. Daniel Bell, Sociological Journeys (London: Heinemann, 1980), pp. 328ff. Berger has since shifted away from this towards 'modernization' and 'pluralization', Guinness, pp. 60-65. E.g. Berger and Kellner, pp. 143ff.; cf. Marie Augusta Neal, "Facing up to Modernity: Excursions in Society, Politics, and Religion," RSR 5 (1979):12. Similarly many of the objections raised by Van A. Harvey in his review of Berger's work in RSR 5 (1979), and idem., "Some Problematic Aspects of Peter Berger's Theory of Religion," JAAR 41 (1973):75-93 are appropriate criticisms to direct against Berger when he wears the hat of philosopher-theologian. Berger has made forays into the camps of both, see especially A Rumour of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural (London: Allen Lane, 1970) and The Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1979). But the judgment that he does bad theology or philosophy has no necessary implications for his sociology. For a positive appraisal of Berger's theology, see Charles A. Corr, "Peter Berger's Angels and Philosophy of Religion," JR 52 (1972):426-37.

The major objection against the sociology of knowledge has to do with the question of objective truth or fact and the ultimate validity of propositions. This objection has been focused in four different areas of knowledge: science, philosophy, ethics, and religion.

Berger and Luckmann do not directly address the question of the validity of scientific knowledge in The Social Construction of Reality, even though it is clear from their definition that they do include it within the purview of the sociology of knowledge.[84] Elsewhere, Berger intimates one possible means of dealing with this question. In his discussion of mathematics he uses the truth of mathematics as an analogy for the manner in which religion might also be true. Mathematics is a humanly constructed body of knowledge which, nevertheless, also corresponds to ultimate reality and religion might similarly correspond to an ultimate reality.[85] He does not address the question of the nature of this 'correspondence'. His analogy sounds strangely like two parallel universes made to cohere, somewhat like Descartes' problem of the isolated mind and the physical universe which he solved by positing a God who made the two correspond. One is justified in seeking a better answer. But Berger may have intended his analogy with mathematics as a phenomenological analogy.[86] And since in the book he wrote with Luckmann it appears that they consider the problem of scientific knowledge to be a subcategory of the problem of philosophical knowledge,[87] this is probably the case. However, in view of the fact that earlier theorists distinguished between science and philosophy it will be well to treat them separately here.

---

[84] See note 61.

[85] Berger, Sacred Canopy, pp. 181ff.

[86] See Berger and Luckmann, p. 34.

[87] Ibid., pp. 13-30.

Earlier theorists accounted for the apparent independence of scientific thought from social determination either by exempting it from social causation,[88] or by limiting the social influence on science to the 'selection' of its interests rather than the content of its findings.[89] It seems evident that Berger and Luckmann are correct in seeing the necessity of extending the scope of the sociology of knowledge to include all knowledge. If certain enclaves of knowledge are to be exempted it casts doubt on the ability of the theory to explain any knowledge. It also seems evident that the 'bracketing' procedure in their methodology is capable of handling this objection. Berger and Luckmann strictly bracket any ontological claims.[90] Or, in other words, they insist on a rigid distinction between the phenomenological task of the sociology of knowledge and the ontological task of philosophy.[91] In questions of the validity of scientific findings the sociologist of knowledge is uninterested, for example, in the validity of Galileo's discovery of the moons of Jupiter. But he is interested in the social forces which caused this discovery to be perceived as a threat to the Christian view of creation. The sociologist cannot comment upon the validity of a scientific fact, but he can determine whether or not that fact will be accepted as plausible by the non-scientific sections of the population.[92] The

---

[88] See examples in Merton, p. 351.

[89] E.g. Max Scheler, "The Sociology of Knowledge: Formal Problems," in SKR, p. 175.

[90] Berger and Luckmann, pp. 13-30.

[91] Ibid., p. 34; cf. Van A. Harvey, "Berger's Theory of Religion," p. 76, who credits Berger with having drawn "the logical boundary lines between sociological, philosophical, and theological perspectives".

[92] Gerard De Grè, "The Sociology of Knowledge and the Problem of Truth," in SKR, p. 666.

question of the ontological status of science is for philosophers and theologians to debate. The sociologist gladly abstains.

The Bergerian bracketing procedure is an open declaration of self-limitation on the part of the sociologist.[93] Objectors who accuse it on this account are guilty of confusing the phenomenological empirical task of the sociology of knowledge with the epistemological claims of a sociological theory of knowledge. Sociologists themselves have confused these tasks and may be of the opinion that the former has inescapable conclusions for the latter,[94] but, nevertheless, they are logically distinct.[95]

The bracketing procedure also answers the philosophical objection that the sociology of knowledge offers no criteria by which one can determine the validity of propositions and that it reduces all statements to a morass of relativity.

It is incorrect to accuse sociologists of having decided the question of 'the one or the many' in favour of 'the many'.[96] The sociology of knowledge as a discipline is unconcerned with the ultimate answer to this debate. But it is concerned to establish that any philosopher who wishes to approach this question must do so on the basis of an existing empirical plurality and relativity in human societies. The sociology of knowledge is not concerned with what philosophical statements tell us about ultimate reality, but with what they tell us about the person who makes them.[97] What the sociologist

---

[93]Cf. Berger and Kellner, p. 22.

[94]Karl Mannheim, "The Sociology of Knowledge," in SKR, p. 127ff.

[95]Ibid., p. 111; cf. Joachim Wach, Sociology of Religion (London: University of Chicago Press, 1964, '1944), p. 7; De Grè, p. 661.

[96]As does Ernest Gellner, Legitimation of Belief (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974), pp. 1-23.

[97]De Grè, pp. 662, 664.

contributes to philosophical debate is ancillary data about the human situation which philosophers will need to take into account.[98]

In the field of ethics it is the sociologist's refusal to make value judgments which has raised objections.[99] The belief that sociology should be value free is a long established goal.[100] And the charge that the relegation of value decisions in society to volition[101] reduces the basis of ethics (or thought) to irrational forces[102] is again to confuse the phenomenological character of sociology with the ontological aspect of the ethical task. Max Weber's value free sociologist is simply a man who cannot, qua sociologist, help people make decisions of an ethical nature. The Weberian sociologist cannot use sociology to establish societal 'oughts', but he can help those who must make such decisions to discover what the societal results might be.[103] This is not to deny that rational considerations from other disciplines should help to inform the ethical dimension of such decisions. The sociology of knowledge does not attempt to answer questions of ontology or morals. It is incapable of doing so.[104] Such questions must be formulated and answered by other more competent disciplines. What sociology can contribute to

---

[98]Berger and Luckmann, p. 25 speak of the sociology of knowledge feeding 'problems' into philosophical debate but it seems evident that its findings are also important.

[99]E.g. Alasdair MacIntyre, After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory (London: Duckworths, 1981), pp. 22ff.

[100]Max Weber, The Methodology of the Social Sciences, trans. and eds. Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949), pp. 5-55.

[101]MacIntyre charges Weber with emotivism, pp. 22ff.

[102]Karl Popper, "The Sociology of Knowledge," in SKR, pp. 650-52; Frank E. Hartung, "Problems of the Sociology of Knowledge," in SKR, pp. 690f.

[103]Weber, p. 53; Berger and Kellner, pp. 18f.

[104]Berger and Luckmann, p. 14.

the ethical task is the ability to make the ethicist sensitive to his own "location in space and time".[105]

In the study of religion this issue is focused on the methodological atheism of Berger's position. It is argued that the word 'atheism' contravenes the goal of ontological neutrality and prevents an adequate understanding of Christianity[106] or of any religion.[107] It has been objected that Berger's methodological atheism represents an easy way of avoiding the difficult task of sympathetic understanding.[108]

One must begin by agreeing with Ninian Smart's contention that the gods of a given religion must be treated as 'real' because regardless of their ultimate ontological status they 'exist' for their devotees.[109] But such a position can easily be taken within Berger's framework and the admission of such a dubious form of 'existence' is surely not far from atheism. If by 'sympathetic understanding' one means the granting of ultimate ontological status to a religion's gods then one has ceased to be a scientific investigator and has become a convert.[110] The acceptance of Smart's position, which seems to understand a religion's gods as reified human projections, and is a statement completely compatible with Berger's, is adequate for sympathetic understanding.

---

[105] Berger and Kellner, p. 85.

[106] Best, p. 192; Cf. Eileen Stevenson, "Some Insights from the Sociology of Religion into the Origin and Development of the Early Christian Church," ET 90 (1979):302.

[107] Smart, Phenomenon of Religion, pp. 58ff.; G. Richard, "Dogmatic Atheism in the Sociology of Religion," in Durkheim On Religion, ed. W.S.F. Pickering (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), pp. 189ff.

[108] Robert Towler, Homo Religiosus: Sociological Problems in the Study of Religion (London: Constable, 1974), p. 2.

[109] Ninian Smart, The Science of Religion and the Sociology of Knowledge (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), pp. 52-54.

[110] Berger and Kellner, p. 90.

But this objection can be rephrased. Does not methodological atheism by its reduction of all religious phenomena to social causation violate ontological neutrality by giving an exhaustive social explanation which denies a priori the possibility of supra-human causation? Berger meets the charge of reductionism head on. On the one hand he fully embraces Feuerbach's view that religion is a human projection.[111] Yet, on the other hand, by disclaiming any ontological implications for this view he arrives at a theory which is methodologically and phenomenologically reductionist[112] but ontologically neutral.[113] Any religion can be explained in terms of the social construction of reality. As far as is open to the sociologist in empirical investigation religion is the product of a humanly projected view of reality which has been reified and reinternalized in the social formation of the self. What Berger brackets is the possibility that this projected reality might also be reflective of an ultimate ontic reality.[114] The adoption of Berger's position need only imply that from the position of the sociologist, itself socio-historically conditioned,[115] religion is at least a human social construction. Whatever else it is beyond that surpasses the ability of the sociologist qua sociologist to evaluate. An adequate sociological theory must repudiate the genetic fallacy that an explanation of a religion's origins is equivalent to a judgment on its validity.[116]

---

[111] Berger, The Heretical Imperative, p. 52.

[112] Berger, Invitation, pp. 142ff.

[113] Berger and Kellner, p. 98.

[114] Berger, Sacred Canopy, p. 180.

[115] Berger and Kellner, p. 65.

[116] Gill, Social Context, p. 20. It must be admitted that certain types of genetic explanation will be more compatible with certain ideas of ultimate reality than others, cf. Radcliffe, p. 153;

The New Testament may, from certain theological perspectives, contain the self-disclosure of God; but he has kindly limited this self-disclosure to the modes of normal human communication which are socially determined.[117] The charge of reductionism can be met by accepting reductionism as a methodological necessity for the sociologist, but by stating that having given a social explanation one has not exhausted what can be said about religious phenomena. Berger's methodologically atheistic sociology is thus poly-methodic[118] and collaborative and not imperialistic.[119]

All of these objections can be recast and framed as one penetrating and all-embracing set of questions. Since the sociology of knowledge posits relativity as an anthropological necessity is it not, itself, also subject to relativity?[120] And if this perspective is itself subject to relativity are not also its findings? And if so, how can they be valid? Is not the sociology of knowledge self-destructive?[121] How can one tell when its findings are socio-historically conditioned and when they are objective?[122] Berger has been accused of evasiveness on this issue. He is said to use arguments of socio-historical relativity when it suits him to debunk his opponents but

---

contra Alasdair MacInytre, "Is Understanding Religion Compatable with Believing?," Faith and the Philosophers, ed. John Hick (London: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 115ff.

[117] See Klaus Berger, p. 124.

[118] Berger, Invitation, pp. 31f. Cf. Smart's call, Science of Religion, p. 8, for a poly-methodic approach; and Geertz's call, p. 87, for a broad philosophic-methodic scope; cf. Robert Morgan's review of The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity, by Gerd Theissen, SJRS 5 (1984):59.

[119] Cf. Guinness, p. 32.

[120] Berger and Kellner, p. 65. Any effort to exempt a sociologically enlightened elite is rightly doomed to fail, Popper, p. 652.

[121] Popper, p. 653; Harvey, "The Unburdening of Berger," pp. 8f.

[122] Baum, pp. 264-69; cf. Smart, Science of Religion, pp. 76, 81.

also to claim a value-free objectivity for his own arguments.[123] This is a false accusation. Berger is quite clear that sociology requires its own socio-historically constructed plausibility structures for its existence.[124] It is possible to do a debunking sociology of sociology.[125] And it is not reasonable for the sociology of knowledge to claim to offer access to ultimate realms of reality untouched by human relativity.[126] However it is reasonable for the sociologist to claim that when he does research, qua sociologist, he works within the specific relevance structures of empirical science. One aspect of the definition of this relevance structure is objectivity.[127] As a tool in empirical research the sociology of knowledge claims nothing more for its findings than those of any other empirical science. With the collapse of the Christian cosmos in the West and the realization that science is incapable of providing, as a replacement, a similar all inclusive canopy of meaning, the findings of any science cannot be granted ultimate validity. Science is one restricted relevance structure among many in our pluralistic world. Its findings are subject to change by further research and to reinterpretation by successive explanatory hypotheses.[128] Since the sociology of knowledge claims to deal with human meaning in an empirical manner its findings are open, as a check on their objectivity, to inter-subjective validation; as are the findings of any science.[129] Its findings are scientifically

---

[123] Harvey, "The Unburdening of Berger," p. 4.

[124] Berger and Kellner, p. 64.

[125] Ibid., p. 65.

[126] Karl Mannheim, "The Sociology of Knowledge," in Theories of History, ed. Patrick Gardiner (New York: The Free Press, 1965), pp. 245f.

[127] Berger and Kellner, p. 65.

[128] Rex, pp. 16ff.

[129] Popper, pp. 653f., uses this as an attack on the sociology of

public, open to falsification, and subject to revision in the light of new hypotheses.

One may thus expect to find in the sociology of knowledge a valid empirical tool for historical research.

D. The Sociology of Knowledge and the Study of History and Eschatology

We are now in a position to comment on the advantages of using a sociological and historical methodology to investigate history and eschatology in preference to an historical inquiry oriented to theological ideas.

The basic problem one encounters in trying to understand how ideas were meaningful for people in other times and cultures is that all thought is historically conditioned. This problem has been recognized by many theologians but few have articulated and followed a method to deal with it.

The sociology of knowledge offers a solution. It sees relativity as an anthropological necessity which is embodied in the historical variation of human cultures. It seeks to study this historical relativity in an empirical manner.[130] The extent to which all thought is historically conditioned is always an issue in the study of ideas. And it is especially problematic in the historical study of history and eschatology. People's thought about the nature of historical existence has varied widely from culture to culture and era to era. Similarly their thought about the end of history or what lies beyond history has been equally varied. Further, the highly symbolic manner in which we express our ideas about history and eschatology makes it

---

knowledge, but Berger's empiricism makes it evident that the discipline shares this basic scientific characteristic. Cf. Berger, Invitation, pp. 23f.

[130]See above, pp. 75f. It must be remembered that the sociologist posits relativity as an empirical and phenomenological datum and not as an ontological and philosophical necessity.

even more difficult to be certain that people standing in one historically defined point in time can fully understand statements about these issues made by those standing in another.

Part of the goal of the historical study of ideas has been to penetrate their meaning. Traditionally the attempt has been made to discover in the statements of a given person or people points of contact with the unchanging structures of human reason and understanding. The sociologist cannot, qua sociologist, say that this is an invalid or an impossible task. One empirical aspect of our human existence is our ability to translate meaning and apparently to understand one another in the process. What the sociologist can say is that his discipline once again calls our attention to the methodological and conceptual difficulties of this task. Sociology heightens our awareness of the difficulty inherent in understanding other human beings. The difficulty is that the meaning structures of the world within which the modern interpreter lives, and within which he must of necessity acquire his understanding of the ideas of others, are different from those of his subjects for whom these ideas were originally meaningful.

The problem of eschatology has been recognized in theological circles at least since Johannes Weiss' attack on the 19th century liberal interpretation of the kingdom of God. Weiss demonstrated that liberal theology could not appeal to Jesus' eschatology for historical legitimation of its position. The message of the historical Jesus was being interpreted in ideas which were at odds with what he was saying. Nevertheless, modern theological and philosophical ideas are still sometimes imported into the historical understanding of early Christian eschatology. E.g. while Zmijewski correctly identifies both historical and eschatological aspects in Luke's eschatological texts, he nevertheless cannot see a temporal relationship between events of history and the End as possible for Luke and therefore

imports the idea of a 'material' (sachlich) relationship. He sees this as Luke's solution to the problem rather than his own solution to a problem with which we are confronted in Luke-Acts. The interpretive problem is finding concepts which are meaningful to the interpreter and also fit the author's thought-world.

R.H. Hiers has suggested that this interpretive problem can be avoided by making a rigid distinction between the task of historical investigation and theological interpretation.[131] This, however, is no help because one must use meaningful interpretive perspectives in the historical task (see Ch. 6, pp. 266ff. for a detailed discussion). The historian cannot simply describe what an archaic man thought because bound up in the task of historical description is the whole issue of meaning and significance which must be addressed in categories and structures which are significant within the historian's own frame of reference. The problem will not go away. Neither the historian nor the theologian can escape the task of trying to make sense out of archaic ideas, and to do so both must translate those ideas into a frame of reference in which they can be seen to be meaningful by the interpreter himself.

Ernest Gellner has highlighted this problem in relation to anthropological study. He indicates that in the study of cultural phenomena efforts to maintain logical coherence have sometimes led interpreters to misunderstand the societal phenomena. This is because the concepts and actions involved fit together by means of a logic internal to the society itself which is not readily accessible to the interpreter without a wider investigation of the society's symbols.[132]

---

[131] Hiers, Kingdom, p. 21.

[132] Gellner, "Concepts and Society," pp. 125-45; "To make sense of the concept is to make non-sense of the social situation."

Paul S. Minear has seen the problem quite clearly in relation to the study of early Christian eschatology.[133] Modern critical methods of understanding are indispensable in recovering the various eschatologies of the New Testament. But these methods and perspectives are incapable of making sense out of them because in order to do so one would have to dismember the conception of history upon which these methods are based.[134] The eschatologies of the New Testament pose an interpretive problem because the symbolic universe within which they were originally meaningful can only be partially recovered and is different from the modern symbolic universe within which the interpreter must try to understand them.

Our purpose here is simply to state the problem. This is not to say that advances cannot be made in our understanding of early Christian eschatology working within the history of ideas. Indeed, since our goal is to understand the meaning of the ideas of these early Christians we remain committed to that enterprise. But this type of approach might be made more fruitful by being made more broadly comparative and self-critical, and by developing a model which embraces conceptual and cultural relativity.

One way of supplementing our understanding of early Christianity is by the use of sociological methods and perspectives. Sociology has developed in the context of the social sciences' efforts to achieve methods and perspectives which can be used in cross-cultural studies without imposing the cognitive norms of one culture on another. It can supplement the theological investigation of early Christianity by showing

---

[133]Paul S. Minear, "Christian Eschatology and Historical Method," in Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann, BZNW 21 (1954):15-23; see also idem., To Heal and To Reveal: The Prophetic Vocation According to Luke (New York: Seabury, 1976), pp. 3ff.; cf. Gottwald, pp. 9ff., who briefly touches on the problem of the social forces which shape Biblical studies.

[134]Minear, "Christian Eschatology," p. 20.

how eschatological and historical ideas gave meaning and significance to early Christians. It can do so in terms which have relevance in our system of meaning and yet do not impose modern logic, solutions, or cognitive frames of reference and significance upon these ideas.

The sociology of knowledge can help in our understanding of early Christian ideas in at least four ways. 1) It provides a means of understanding which is significant within our meaning structures. Sociology provides a way in which we most naturally understand ourselves today.[135] It provides a way in which we find meaning in our human situation. Thus we can use it as a means of understanding the human situation of others. An investigation of the functional aspects of elements of a symbolic universe provides a frame of reference which we can understand and which can help to make a symbolic universe, different from our own, meaningful to us. 2) Socio-historical inquiry works within the accepted cognitive standards of critical historical investigation. It satisfies the scientific standards of our meaning structures. 3) The findings of a sociological-historical investigation are neither ultimate nor imperialistic. They are open to scientific revision and are polymethodic in scope. 4) Most importantly for the study of archaic ideas there is no necessity to establish a logical coherence between the various elements of a given symbolic universe. Working within the history of ideas one feels a methodological necessity to bring coherence to the various concepts under study. But to do so one must inevitably cross over into one's own symbolic universe to find this. If one limits one's investigation to the functions of ideas there is no compulsion to try and arrive at a meaningful coherence of ideas which may be, in terms of our own meaning structures, logically

---

[135] Cf. Theissen, "soziologische Auswertung," p. 284; and C. Wright Mills, The Sociological Imagination (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975, '1959), pp. 21f.

disparate. The sociology of knowledge offers us a means of investigating ideas which can bypass the question of their logical relationship. As such it can provide a means of understanding how history and eschatology functioned in the community of Luke-Acts.

CHAPTER III

TOWARDS A SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE LUCAN COMMUNITY

A. Date

The sociological analysis of a community requires that it be 'located' as precisely as possible within a concrete socio-historical context.[1] Analysis must begin with the empirical realities of the social situation as limited by the particularities of time and space. The goal is the delineation of a comparative social world. The fact that, for the Lucan corpus, one can with confidence arrive at only approximate chronological parameters encompassing a span of perhaps 5-20 years is not in itself a limiting factor. The gospels, and presumably Acts as well, have a considerable pre-publication history. The last phases of that history reflect and are shaped by the experience of the author in relation to the evolving ethos of his community.[2] Luke's gospel and the Acts do not reveal a static moment in his community's life but the social situations and theological responses of a community lifestyle developed over a period of time. Even if a precise date of publication were known, for the purposes of sociological comparison, the time period of the community would have to be found.

If Luke's formulation of the prophecies of the destruction of Jerusalem is compared with Mark 13.14ff. then it seems that the most reasonable explanation for Luke's selection of his form over against

---

[1] J.Z. Smith, "Too Much Kingdom," p. 125; Harrington, "Sociological Concepts," p. 182.

[2] Cf. Hejne Simonsen, "The Gospel Literature as a Source for the History of Primitive Christianity," Studia Theologica 37 (1983):3.

Mark's is that Luke looked back on the holocaust of A.D. 70.[3] This establishes the Fall of Jerusalem as the terminus a quo for Luke's two volumes.

The terminus ad quem can reasonably be set in the period A.D. 85-90. This period is indicated by Luke's lack of knowledge of the Pauline corpus,[4] his distance from Early Catholicism,[5] and his, perhaps ambivalent but not strongly negative, view of the Roman state.[6] It seems unlikely that Luke's attitude towards Rome would have been possible during the rapid, and increasingly vicious, degeneration of Domitian's character which began in 85 and continued until his death in 96.

There is doubt as to the extent, intensity, or even the existence of the Domitian 'persecution'.[7] But the evidence, nevertheless, suggests

---

[3]C.H. Dodd, "The Fall of Jerusalem and the Abomination of Desolation," in More New Testament Studies (Manchester: The University Press, 1968), pp. 69ff., was correct to argue that taken in isolation Luke's oracles cannot be said to have been formulated after the event. But the problem with using Dodd's insight to argue for a pre-70 date for the gospel;[Bo Reicke, The Gospel of Luke (London: SPCK, 1965), p. 27; idem., "Synoptic Prophecies on the Destruction of Jerusalem," Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature, ed. D.E. Aune (Leiden: Brill, 1972), pp. 121ff.; Johannes Munck, The Acts of the Apostles (Garden City: Doubleday, 1967), p. xlvii; J.A.T. Robinson, Redating the New Testament (London: SCM, 1976), pp. 26ff.; cf. Adolf Harnack, The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels (London: Williams & Norgate, 1911), p. 123]; is that what needs explanation is not the origin of Luke's traditions but his reasons for choosing them over against Mark's. For our assessment of the evidence see J.C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1970), p. 3; Hans Conzelmann, "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity," in SLA, p. 298; F.F. Bruce now supports a date post A.D. 70, "The Picture of Paul in Acts," a paper read before A Fellowship of Students in Theology, Latimer House, Oxford, 15 November 1984; Tiede, pp. 92ff.; Kümmel, Intro.,p. 150; Fitzmyer, p. 54.

[4]Creed, p. xxiii; Bruce, Acts, p. 11; Fitzmyer, p. 57.

[5]Marshall, Acts, p. 47; Conzelmann, "Luke's Place," p. 304.

[6]One may disagree with the conclusion of Paul W. Walaskay, "And So We Came to Rome: The Political Perspective of St. Luke (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); idem., "The Trial and Death of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke," JBL 94 (1975):81-93, that Luke was seeking to reconcile Christians with the idea of life in the Roman state and accept his basic exegetical work which indicates a less negative view of Rome in Luke-Acts than in Mt. or Mk.

[7]E.T. Merrill, Essays in Early Christian History (London: Macmillan, 1924), pp. 148ff.; Hugh M. Last, "The Study of the

that his rage was, on occasion directed against individual Christians and that Christians, at least in Rome, may have suffered from his vagaries.[8] The 'travelled' picture Luke presents of the church[9] indicates that even

---

'Persecutions'," JRomS 27 (1937):89f.; Bernard W. Henderson, Five Roman Emperors (Cambridge: The University Press, 1927), pp. 42ff.

[8]P. Keresztes, "The Imperial Roman Government and the Christian Church I. From Nero to the Severi," in Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, eds. H. Temporini und W. Hasse, band 23.1 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1979), pp. 257-72; Creed, p. xxiii; L.W. Barnard, "Clement of Rome and the Persecution of Domitian," NTS 10 (1963-64):251-60; Richard J. Cassidy, Jesus, Politics, and Society (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1978), p. 5; Helmut Koester, History, Culture and Religion of the Hellenistic Age (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), p. 316.

[9]Luke presents extensive travel as normal for Christians:

Acts	2.5	Jewish pilgrims from all over the empire
	4.36	Barnabas of Cyprus found in Jerusalem
	6.5	Nicolaus of Antioch found in Jerusalem
	7.58	Saul of Tarsus found in Jerusalem
	9.2	Saul travels on business to Damascus
	9.30	Saul travels to Tarsus via Caesarea
	11.22	Barnabas travels from Jerusalem to Antioch
	11.25	Barnabas travels to Tarsus
	11.27	Prophets travel from Jerusalem to Antioch
	11.30	Saul and Barnabas travel to Jerusalem

Travel with mission as its purpose:

Acts	8.5	Philip in Samaria
	8.26	Philip to Gaza
	8.40	Philip to Caesarea
	9.32	Peter to Lydda
	9.38	Peter to Joppa
	10.1ff.	Peter to Caesarea
	11.19	Many to Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch
	11.20	Men of Cyrene and Cyprus in Antioch
	12.19	Peter to Caesarea from Jerusalem
	12.25	Saul, Barnabas, and John Mark to Antioch
	13.4-14.26	Saul and Barnabas -- 1st mission journey
	15.39	Barnabas and Mark to Cyprus
	15.40-18.22	Paul and Silas -- 2nd mission journey
	19.1-12.17	Paul and Silas -- 3rd mission journey
	27.1-28.16	The journey to Rome

Other Christian travellers:

Acts	13.1	Lucius of Cyrene in Antioch
		Manaen of Herod's court in Antioch
	13.13	John Mark from Perga to Jerusalem
	15.1	Judaizers outside of Palestine
	15.3	Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem
	15.22f.	A party from Jerusalem to Antioch
		A communique to all Syria and Cilicia
	16.14	Lydia from Thyatira in Philippi
	18.2	Aquila and Priscilla, natives of Pontus, lately of Rome, now living in Corinth
	18.18	They travel with Paul

a local adversity in Rome would have affected attitudes among provincial Christians. Perhaps more to the point is Luke's studied silence in regard to Nero, when both he and his readers must have known that this emperor was responsible for Paul's death. It is as if he passes over Nero as an aberration of Roman sensibility, something not to be expected from the Flavian dynasty; that is until Domitian's aberrant character began increasingly to manifest itself after A.D. 85.

It can thus be established that the comparative social world for the Lucan community can be drawn from the latter 1/3 of the 1st century A.D. with particular emphasis on the years 70-90.

B. Location

It would be ideal if a precise geographical location for Luke's community could be found but such precision is beyond the evidence afforded either by tradition or the Lucan corpus itself.[10] Nevertheless, there are certain statements that can be made which will allow a comparative social world to be further defined.

First, the Lucan corpus was not produced for readers in Palestine, North Africa, Egypt, or west of Rome. This leaves as a possible location any place between Rome and Antioch.

Acts 18.24	Apollos of Alexandria is found in Ephesus
19.1	He travels to Corinth
20.4	Numerous companions of Paul from various places
20.17f.	Ephesian elders travel to Miletus
21.16	Mnason of Cyprus living in Caesarea
21.27	Jews from Asia in Jerusalem
21.29	Trophimus from Ephesus in Jerusalem
27.2	Aristachus of Thessalonica in Caesarea

Cf. R.F. O'Toole, "Parallels in Luke-Acts," BZ 27 (1983):197; and Adolf Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, vol. 2, trans. J. Moffatt (London: Williams & Norgate, 1904), pp. 462ff. of a slightly later period.

[10]Cf. Fitzmyer, p. 57, "As for the place of composition of the Lucan Gospel, it is really anyone's guess." This appraisal is typical, cf. Ellis, Luke, p. 62; Marshall, Acts, p. 48; idem., Lk., p. 35; Geldenhuys, p. 35; Plummer, p. xxxii; A.F.J. Klijn, An Introduction to the New Testament, trans. M. van der Vathorst-Smit (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980, '1967), p. 41; and Manson, Luke, p. xxix; Donald Juel, Luke-Acts (London: SCM, 1984), p. 8.

It was produced for urban dwellers.[11] Acts has no reference to agricultural life or outlying villages. There are only summary statements of mission work in outlying districts (14.6; 18:23).[12] The action of the narrative takes place in important regional cities,[13] on sea voyages,[14] or in travel from city to city. In the gospel Luke frequently locates Jesus' actions and teaching in an urban environment as opposed to Mark's vague or unspecified location (see Lk. 4.16, 31; 5.12; 7.37; 9.10). The world Luke moves in is that of the city.[15] In Acts Luke shows a knowledge of and interest in the relative rankings of cities, urban politics, assembly procedures, the names and titles of city and imperial officials, the political position and power of urban Jews, Roman administration and army affairs, trade unions, urban economic cause and effect, riots, jailers, and royal appearances and addresses. The Lucan parables are also urban affairs. He retains only a few of Mark's nature parables and takes a few more from 'Q' but the world of his own parables is that of the town, ". . . debtors and builders and robbers and travellers, midnight visitors, the wealthy and their guests, their stewards and their beggars, tower-builders and kings at war, a father and his sons, a judge and a widow, a Pharisee and a Publican. There is no new nature-parable."[16] In particular his knowledge of and interest in politics and Roman administration make sense only in a

---

[11] H.J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (London: SPCK, 1961, '1927), p. 245.

[12] The use of χώρα in 10:39; 26:20 may indicate the evangelization of rural areas, Adolf Harnack, The Acts of the Apostles (London: William & Norgate, 1909), pp. 57f.

[13] Cadbury, Making, pp. 246f.

[14] H. Klein, p. 468, thinks the intimacy of the author with maritime terminology could indicate that his community was located in a coastal city. It may indicate that the author was at one time connected with the sea but one need not live on the coast to enjoy reading (or writing) sea stories.

[15] Cadbury, Making, pp. 245ff.

[16] M.D. Goulder, "Characteristics of the Parables in the Several Gospels," JTS n.s. xix (1968):53.

cosmopolitan environment where one would brush shoulders with Roman political figures and administrators.[17] The literary appeal of Luke's preface, the apologetic thrust of several of his motifs, and the educational level envinced by his work all point to an urban centre as the location of his writing and readers.

Luke-Acts was intended for a group of urban Christians located in a major cosmopolitan centre somewhere between Rome and Antioch between A.D. 70 and 90.

C. Stratification

The prerequisite to a study of the stratification of an early Christian group is an adequate grasp of the complexities of the socio-economic stratification of Graeco-Roman society. Here one finds at the apex the Roman class system which was superimposed on local and provincial systems.[18] It is significant that one's socio-economic level could be assessed on local, regional, and trans-regional levels, giving relatively different results in each case. In addition there were official 'class' factors, defined by law, and unofficial 'status' factors, defined by cultural convention.[19] One's 'level' was thus a relative factor depending upon the perspective from which it was being assessed within a complex multi-grided system.[20]

At the apex of Luke's world stood the Roman Senatorial and Equestrian Orders, defined by law and with minimum property requirements. But both of these orders combined accounted for approximately only 1% of

---

[17] H. Klein, p. 468; Cadbury, Making, p. 240; idem., Acts in History, pp. 40f.

[18] M.I. Finley, The Ancient Economy (London: Chatto & Windus, 1979, '1973), pp. 47f.; Ramsay MacMullen, Roman Social Relations, 50 B.C. to A.D. 284 (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1974), p. 94.

[19] MacMullen, pp. 100-110; cf. Finley, pp. 49-51; Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation," pp. 170f.

[20] Meeks, p. 54.

the Empire's total population.[21] It does not appear that in the 1st century Christianity made significant inroads into these strata.[22] In addition it is unreasonable to think that the whole of the remaining population represented inferior classes or that non-Romans even aspired to Roman social status.[23] Hence the need and functional utility of local systems.

Still within the Roman system but reaching into the provinces were the decurions, a legal 'Ordo' comprised of municipal senators who were required to own property worth 25,000 denarii (1/10 that of a Senator).[24] Outside of Italy these people would have been found in eastern cities modelled by Italian influence.[25] When viewed from within the Roman system these people comprised what Ramsay MacMullen has called "the statistical middle-class", but when viewed from the local system they represent the apex of society.[26] Together with local aristocrats and the landed or mercantile oligarchical families of Greek-modelled cities[27] they comprised the upper class of the provinces. Yet even within this group there was substantial variation in wealth and status depending on the relative wealth and importance of the individual city and its environs.[28]

---

[21] Ibid. p. 53; Esler, p. 247; MacMullen, p. 88.

[22] Meeks, p. 73.

[23] Judge, "Sociological Identity," p. 207, n. 18. This makes Gager's attempt; pp. 93ff. and idem., "Religion and Social Class in the Early Roman Empire," in Catacombs, pp. 106ff.; cf. Clarence L. Lee, "Social Unrest and Primitive Christianity," in Catacombs, p. 126; to maintain the traditional proletarian picture of early Hellenistic Christianity based on the social-dissonance caused by exclusion from Roman social status highly questionable. Locally based assessments are much more important.

[24] MacMullen, p. 90; J. Gagé, Les Classes sociales dans l'empire (Paris: Payot, 1971), p. 40.

[25] MacMullen, p. 90. [26] Ibid., p. 89.

[27] Koester, p. 57.

[28] Cf. MacMullen, p. 108.

Beneath this stratum were what one may call the 'service' or 'support' strata. Here one should class lower public servants, soldiers, 'middling' land owners, farmers, scholars, physicians, lawyers, merchants, manufacturers, skilled craftsmen, and other members of the various technitai[29] together with caterers[30] and successful freedmen. There was of course a great deal of variation among these people. E.g. the difference between a successful craftsmen who was a householder with slaves, or employing other craftsmen, or letting shop space to others, with whom he had a clientele relationship, and his tenants or employees is obvious. At the bottom of society one finds slaves[31] and the free urban poor, i.e. daily wage earners, along with petty farmers and small plot tenants.[32]

The following diagram will indicate the labels that will be used in this study to refer to these various strata.

1.	Senatorial and Equestrian Orders	= upper class
2.	Decurions and local oligarchs	= lower upper class
3.	Highly successful Technitai (merchants, manufacturers, etc.) with aspirations to achieve decurion status[33]	= upper middle class
4.	Moderately successful Technitai, etc., i.e. average householders	= middle class
5.	Employed or tenant Technitai, etc.	= lower middle class
6.	Slaves	
7.	Daily wage labourers	= lower classes
8.	Beggars	

[29] Koester, pp. 57, 63; MacMullen, p. 99.

[30] Finley, p. 42.

[31] Although it must be remembered that the relative socio-economic position of a slave depended on the rank of his owner. Imperial slaves on official business could rank well above local decurions, and slaves given managerial duties by wealthy owners could, on an incentive scheme, attain a high degree of economic success, MacMullen, p. 92. Slavery could be used as a means of social upward mobility, Lee, p. 131; contra. F.C. Grant, "The Economic Background of the New Testament," in The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, eds. W.D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: The University Press, 1956), p. 106.

[32] MacMullen, pp. 92f.; Koester, pp. 57, 63.

[33] That this was possible, provided one was not a freedman, see MacMullen, p. 99.

There is a great deal of economic and status related material in Luke-Acts. Money, labour relations, rents, taxes, wages, luxuries, poverty, begging, social welfare, servants, property, and investment all figure prominently throughout the gospel and Acts either as illustrations for other interests or in statements directed to people's attitude toward and use of wealth.[34] Statements noting the status, class, occupational level, income, or property ownership of individuals or groups are also numerous.[35] This is the material which must be evaluated in order to ascertain the stratification of Lucan Christianity.

---

[34] See:

Luke 1.51-53; 3.10-14; 4.18; 5.11, 28; 6.20, 30, 34f., 38; 7.22, 25, 41f.; 8.14; 9.3f., 25; 10.4, 7, 21, 35, 41f.; 11.21f., 42, 47; 12.6, 13f., 15, 16-21, 22-31, 32-34, 42-48, 59; 13.6f.; 14.8-11, 12-14, 16-24, 28-33; 15.3, 8f., 11-31; 16.1-13, 19-31; 17.7-9, 28, 31f.; 18.18-30; 19.8f., 12-27; 20.9-16, 22-25, 45-47; 21.1-4; 22.5f.; 23.2

Acts 1.18-20; 2.44-46; 4.32-37; 5.1-11; 8.18-24; 9.36; 10.2; 11.29; 14.17; 17.25; 19.19, 25; 20.33-35; 24.17

[35] Prosopographic and Sociographic statements:

Luke 1.3; 2.1, 7, 24; 4.38; 5.3, 10, 27, 29; 7.2, 5, 29f., 34, 36; 8.3, 41; 9.12f.; 10.38; 11.37; 14.1; 16.14; 18.35; 19.2; 23.50

Acts 1.1; 3.2, 6; 4.13, 37; 6.1, 7; 8.10, 27f.; 9.43; 10.1f., 7, 25-27; 12.12, 13; 13.1, 7, 50; 16.14, 16, 32-34, 37f.; 17.4f., 12, 34; 18.3, 7, 8; 19.9; 21.8, 24, 26; 22.3, 28; 24.26; 28.7, 30

L.T. Johnson has demonstrated that wealth and poverty function as symbols of one's response to God in the story world of Luke-Acts.[36] He methodologically brackets questions of historical setting and comparative social analysis in order to concentrate on the narrative or story world of the text itself.[37] He saw this restriction as a preliminary step to wider historical and comparative questions.[38] It will become apparent that we are in basic agreement with his identification of the symbolic value of poverty and wealth in Luke-Acts. But it is our purpose to go beyond the internal story world of the text to the real world of Luke's readers. It may be agreed that Luke was writing a story but it was a story for his readers in which implicit and explicit statements of an economic nature were significant to the relevance structures of the social world of those readers. On the basis of these statements one is justified in seeking to reconstruct the stratification of the Lucan community in its Sitz im Leben.[39]

Lk. 4.16-30, the inaugural sermon at Nazareth, is programmatic for Luke's presentation of Jesus' ministry.[40] This is particularly so

---

[36]Luke Timothy Johnson, The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 138-67; It is important that Luke-Acts be treated as one unit. D.B. Kraybill and D.M. Sweetland, "Possessions in Luke-Acts: A Sociological Perspective," Persp Rel Stud 10 (1983):215-39 argue that Luke used Acts to relativize the economic teaching of the gospel. They fail to see that such a contradiction would have undermined Luke's supposed purpose in legitimating the practices of Acts if they conflict with those of Jesus.

[37]Johnson, Possessions, pp. 19ff., esp. 25f.

[38]Ibid., pp. 27f.

[39]The reconstruction of the Lucan Sitz im Leben in terms of rich and poor is the goal of Robert J. Karris, "Poor and Rich: The Lucan Sitz im Leben," in PLA, p. 112, but he is not thinking specifically of a sociological reconstruction. That this material opens a door into the social world of Luke see Fitzmyer, p. 248 and I. Howard Marshall, Luke: Historian and Theologian (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970), p. 142.

[40]Termed programmatic by Conzelmann, Theology, p. 191; F.W. Danker, Luke (PA.: Fortress, 1976), pp. 73f.; Talbert, Reading Luke, p. 57; Betz, p. 132; Wilson, Gentiles, p. 40; Francis, pp. 51f., 60f.; Maddox, pp. 139-42; Tiede, pp. 19ff.; Fitzmyer, p. 529; Marshall, Luke, pp. 177f.; Jacques Dupont, The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles,

for the Lucan motifs of acceptance/rejection and Jesus' prophetic vocation.[41] However, the structural elements of the quotation from Isa. 61.1f.; healing, deliverance, forgiveness of sins, and the proclamation of good news to the poor; form a specific programme of actions which influences the structural formation of the gospel to at least 7.23.[42] The formative concept is the manifestation of the kingdom in Jesus through specific words and actions.[43]

The first occurrence of πτωχός in Luke's gospel stands out in this quotation from Isaiah. Its presence in the programme cannot be dismissed as "not important".[44] It also occurs in two other significant passages in the Galilean ministry (6.20; 7.22), both of which are linked to the opening programme.[45] This section (4.16-7.23) forms a self-

---

trans. J.R. Keating (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), p. 21; James A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," in Neusner, pp. 103f.; Robert C. Tannehill, "The Mission of Jesus According to Luke IV 16-30," in Jesus in Nazareth, Walter Eltester, et al. (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972), BZNW 40, p. 51; Eduard Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte," EvT 14 (1954):260; cf. J. Massyngbaerde Ford, "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Luke's Gospel," in Cassidy, p. 80; Ellis, Lk., p. 96; Plummer, p. 118; Geldenhuys, p. 166; Wm. Manson, Lk., p. 41; Leaney, p. 66; G.B. Caird, Saint Luke (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1981), p. 86; Morris, p. 105; Juel, p. 27.

[41]Wilson, Gentiles, pp. 40f. and Tiede, pp. 19ff., 35-55.

[42]Its influence probably extends to 9.51 and the programmatic shift which takes place at that point directing the rest of the gospel towards Jerusalem.

[43]On the 'kingdom' see Chapter 5. The connection of 4.18f. with 7.22f. demonstrates that Luke did not intend the elements of Isa. 61.1f. in a figurative sense, as Marshall, Lk., p. 184, thinks. Cf. Wm. Manson, p. 42. In 7.22 specific actions are pointed to as fulfilling the prophecy. Kee, Miracles, pp. 202f.

[44]Ernst Bammel, TDNT VI, p. 907.

[45]Cf. Johnson, Possessions, p. 132, who thinks the occurrences of ταπείνωσιν, 1.48; ταπεινούς, 1.52; and πτωχός in 14.13, 21 are equally significant. All of the other occurrences of πτωχός -- 14.13, 21; 16.20, 22; 18.22; 19.8; 21.3 -- can be treated secondarily. Lk. 4.18 and 7.22 are linked by the phrases: εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς (πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται - 7.22), Fitzmyer, p. 668, and τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν (τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν - 7.22). Lk. 6.20 is linked to both by "the poor" and to 4.18 via 4.43 by the "kingdom of God".

contained unit in which the identity of 'the poor' is a major question and which also offers a large context from which to determine that identity.

Technically πτωχός refers to one who is reduced to begging, i.e. one who is totally destitute.[46] But in the LXX (e.g. Ps. 85.1; 11.5; Ps. Sol. 10.6; 5.2, 11; 15.1; 18.2) at Qumran (e.g. 4QpPs 37; 1.8f.; 1QH 5.13f.) and in other literature (Eth. En. 96.5, 8; Sir. 13.15-19) it can acquire a figurative sense of an inner spiritual quality or even be interfused in meaning with 'pious' or 'righteous'.[47] It is still an open question whether Luke uses it to signify an economic class or as a spiritually figurative term.[48]

There are two sets of data which can help in the identification. 1) The Beatitudes, in common with Mt., are addressed to the disciples.[49] It is the disciples who are 'the poor', 'the hungry', 'those in need of

---

[46] BAG, p. 735; Bammel, TDNT VI, p. 886; Marshall, Lk., p. 249; Finley, p. 41.

[47] Bammel, TDNT, p. 895f.; Marshall, Lk., p. 249; BAG, p. 735; Martin Hengel, Property and Riches in the Early Church: Aspects of a Social History of Early Christianity, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), p. 19.

[48] Fitzmyer, pp. 248, 532; Henry Wansbrough, "St. Luke and Christian Ideals in an Affluent Society," New Blackfriars 49 (1967-68): 584; Leander E. Keck, "The Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament," ZNW 56 (1965):110; Juel, pp. 21, 28; Esler, pp. 239, 257; Robert F. O'Toole, "Luke's Position on Politics and Society in Luke-Acts," in Cassidy, p. 11; and Brian E. Beck, "Christian Character in the Gospel of Luke - II," Epworth Review 6 (1979):86; G. Dietrich, "The Role of Class Contradiction in Luke's Theology," COELI 33 (1985):12-17; think in terms of a class consciousness on Luke's part. Ellis, Lk., pp. 97, 113; Caird, Lk., p. 102; Leaney, p. 135; Marshall, LHT, p. 142; Manson, Lk., p. 41; Morris, pp. 126f.; Creed, p. 91; and Geldenhuys, p. 170, spiritualize the term. Plummer, p. 179; Marshall, Lk., p. 249; and Minear, To Heal and to Reveal, pp. 64-66; try to keep a foot in both worlds.

[49] Joachim Jeremias, New Testament Theology, Part I, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1971), p. 112; Manson, Lk., p. 64; Marshall, Lk., p. 247; (cf. Leaney, p. 135); Schlatter, p. 221; Geldenhuys, p. 210; Fitzmyer, p. 627; Plummer, p. 179; Schürmann, p. 326; and Morris, p. 126 (cf. Ellis, Lk., p. 111), all emphasize that the editorial specification of the disciples as the audience influences the understanding of 'the poor'.

consolation', and 'those rejected by men'. One is justified in examining: a) the prosopographic descriptions of disciples, and b) teaching on discipleship in relation to possessions in order to ascertain what this identification means in terms of social stratification. 2) The programme of Lk. 4.18f. (cf. 7.22) is worked out in a series of healing and preaching pericopes in which the kingdom of God (cf. 6.20; 4.43) is brought to the people of Israel. What are the prosopographic and sociographic descriptions of these people? To whom does the kingdom of God come? Who are those who hear the good news? Who are those that Jesus heals, delivers, and forgives? (All of these questions can also be asked of the disciples' ministry in Acts.)

There are four prosopographic statements about the Twelve (4.38; 5.3, 10; 5.27ff.). Peter is described as a householder and a self-employed businessman who owns a fishing boat. Luke gets Peter's home ownership from Mark (1.29) but the call of the first disciples (Lk. 5. 1-11) is largely from Luke's own hand based on a framework supplied by Mk. 1.16-20, using the setting of Mk. 4.1-2, with material independently parallel to Jn. 21.1-11.[50] In Mark's terse account Peter and his brother Andrew are poor fishermen.[51] They fish from the shore throwing in a net because they do not own a boat. Luke has expanded Peter's enterprise by adding a boat to his holdings and business partners (5.10, James and John)[52]; a solid middle class description. Luke portrays Peter, James, and John as having the economic security and prosperity of small independent businessmen but they are not in a position of much social prestige. Levi is the only other member of the Twelve who is

---

[50]Fitzmyer, pp. 560f.

[51]Schweizer, Mark, pp. 47f.

[52]Luke deletes the statement in Mk. 1.20 that James and John had their own prosperous family business with hired servants and boats.

given a socio-economic profile. He is a collector of customs duties (a τελώνης working in a τελώνιον) and capable of putting on a 'great' feast in Jesus' honour (5.29ff.).[53] He was economically well off but socially inferior because of his occupation. This is true both for the position of the historical Levi in the late 20's of the 1st century and the impression gained by Luke's readers circa A.D. 80. These men did not become disciples because they were poor but became poor because they became disciples (5.11, 28).

Since Peter, James, John, and Levi were members of the Twelve, a set group with special significance for Luke, their example may not have been as relevant to his readers as was the larger circle of disciples he describes.

The disciples, as distinct from the Twelve, serve as a model for Luke's own community. They are a reference point in the story with which the reader can identify.[54] Since the first Beatitude is addressed to the disciples and identifies them as 'the poor' it is a designation Luke intends his readers to assimilate for themselves.[55] However, the evidence of Acts, i.e. the absence of πτωχός, makes it clear that he did not consider it a formal titular designation[56]; as for example was the case with the Qumran covenanters and the later Ebionite Christians.

The crowds and larger group of disciples who follow Jesus remain, on the whole, anonymous and nondescript. Sociographic statements are

---

[53]Luke may have seen Levi as the employee of a chief-tax collector (Lk. 19.1f.), Fitmyer, p. 470. If so the man with the real capital would not have been Levi but his employer. But it was possible for individual toll booths to be farmed out to individual bidders, O. Michel, TDNT VIII, p. 98. In this case he would have been a petty capitalist with sufficient funds to guarantee the receipts for one toll booth. In either case he was economically secure and, in varying measures, prosperous.

[54]This has been demonstrated by K.N. Giles, "The Church in the Gospel of Luke," SJT 34 (1981):121-46.

[55]Cf. Karris, "Poor and Rich," p. 118.

[56]Keck, "Poor," pp. 103-11.

few but where they do occur they suggest a picture of Christianity comprising a cross section of socio-economic strata with the middling segments predominating. In Lk. 5.30 the disciples as a group share in the ostracism Jesus experienced by having social intercourse with tax collectors and sinners. In the case of the former group this indicates social contact with those economically prosperous but socially inferior. The latter group has no necessary economic implications[57] but is a social classification for those lacking status. In Lk. 20.45-47 the disciples are warned not to seek the status indicators of Pharisaism and to eschew economic oppression but there is no hint that they should do this by living in poverty. In Acts the social welfare system described in 6.1f. implies a cross section including those who are economically dependent and those capable of providing for them (cf. 2.45; 4.32-34). The collection mentioned in Acts 11.29 for the Jerusalem church implies a cross section of believers in Antioch. They determined to give according to their relative prosperity (καθώς εὐπορεῖτό τις).

In the gospel there is only one socio-economic description of the larger group of itinerant disciples; it is about the women who followed Jesus and provided for him and the Twelve from their own property, "i.e. they were persons of substance".[58] The mention of Joanna's husband, Herod Antipas' ἐπίτροπος, Chuza, indicates that she had high social status as well as wealth.[59] There is no indication that these women renounced their property to follow Jesus, only that they used it to support him and his inner circle of disciples. It is Luke who emphasizes

---

[57] It can refer to those who cannot properly keep the Law because of economic disability or to those who are well off but engage in proscribed professions. Michel, TDNT VIII, pp. 99 n. 116, 100f.; Jeremias, Theology, p. 109. Cf. Bammel, TDNT VI, p. 902.

[58] Plummer, p. 216.

[59] Ἐπίτροπος could be 'manager', 'foreman', or 'steward'; Fitzmyer, p. 698; Marshall, Lk., p. 317; aristocratic connections are implied in any case.

their property ownership (ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς, cf. Mk. 15.41).[60]

There is a larger group of prosopographic statements which inform us about those to whom Luke saw Jesus to have proclaimed the Gospel or who experienced the kingdom of God through the healing or deliverance Jesus brought them. Here on the lower level one finds beggars, demoniacs, lepers, paralytics, and the chronically ill receiving the benefits of the kingdom. These people are, in many instances, not only social outcasts but economically disabled as well.[61] They represent a stratum which could be described as economically poor. But these people rarely emerge from the masses to become individuals. Frequently it is to a great mass of afflicted humanity that Jesus brings the healing power of the kingdom depicted in passages stylistically similar to the famous Lucan summaries of Acts (see Lk. 4.40f.; 5.15; 6.17-19; 9.11; cf. Acts 5.15f.; 8.7; 28.9). Where such people emerge as individuals they remain nameless and faceless (e.g. "a man with a demon", 4.33; "a man full of leprosy", 5.12; "a paralytic", 5.18; "a man with a withered hand", 6.6; the Gerasene demoniac, 8.26; "a woman . . . ", 8.43; "a man . . .", 9.38; cf. Acts 3.2[62]; 14.8).

Those who emerge as named or more fully described individuals present a different picture. Here one finds a centurion with at least one slave and capable of providing capital to finance the construction of a synagogue (Lk. 7.2ff.). He is a man of substantial wealth and with some status. There is Jairus (8.40-42, 49-56), a synagogue ruler and therefore presumably wealthy. From the text it emerges that he is a householder who may also have servants (v.49, ἔρχεταί τις παρα τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου). He,too,is a man of wealth with local status. Martha

---

[60] Plummer, p. 217; Fitzmyer, pp. 698; Marshall, Lk., p. 317.

[61] Cf. Johnson, Possessions, pp. 133f.

[62] Aeneas (Acts 9.33) is an exception.

(10.38ff.) is a householder but unable to have slaves to help with household duties. She is on the lower fringes of economic security and lacking in status indicators. Zacchaeus (19.2-9) is a very wealthy ἀρχιτελώνης capable of repaying with interest anyone he had defrauded. He gave half of his remaining goods to the poor but kept the rest. He has little, if any, status. Finally, there is Joseph of Arimathea, a member of the Sanhedrin. His wealth would presumably be equivalent to an entrepreneur such as Zacchaeus but he is also in a position of great social prestige.

In Acts one finds descriptions of propertied Christians (Barnabas, 4.36; Ananias and Sapphira, 5.1ff.) and numerous Christian householders (Cornelius, 10.1; Mary, 12.12; Lydia, 16.14; the Philippian jailer, 16.31; Jason, who is also able to post bail for himself, 17.5; Aquila and Priscilla, 18.2f.; Titus Justus, 18.7; Crispus, 18.8; Philip, 21.8; and Mnason, 21.15). Most are capable of providing hospitality for Paul and his entourage. Mary is prosperous enough tohave at least one servant (12.13). Lydia is the local representative of an internationally famous textile firm manufacturing luxury goods (16.14).[63] Dorcas is notable for her capacity to give alms to the poor (9.36). Aquila and Priscilla are self-employed business owners. Cornelius draws a substantial military salary and commands local respect. Crispus is a synagogue ruler, a position which implies wealth and locally recognized status. All of these people have economic prosperity but there are no indicators of membership in the upper class.

At the top of the social scale in Acts is the converted proconsul Sergius Paulus, a Roman of the Senatorial ordo.[64] Rivalling him for

---

[63]Haenchen, Acts, p. 494 n. 8; BC IV, p. 191; Hanson, Acts, p. 170; Bruce, Acts, p. 314.

[64]He is described as an ἀνθύπατος (Acts 13.7), an office held by senators in pacified provinces, Koester, p. 325; BAG, p. 68.

social status and wealth is Dionysius the Areopagite.[65] In Acts one finds a cabinet minister from Ethiopia who has made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (8.27ff.). There is Herod Antipas' friend Manaen (13.1) who, whatever the realities of his current status,[66] was at one time a local aristocrat, this being the impression which is left with the reader. There is Paul who, although only a hand textile worker, has, at least in Luke's eyes, the citizenship of both Tarsus and Rome and the best Jewish education. He is pictured as having "a privileged status".[67] Finally, there is the complex question of Theophilus' identity.[68] But regardless of his personal or figurative identity he is addressed with a word which is a status indicator (κράτιστε, Lk. 1.3).[69]

The examples of the upper Hellenistic classes which Luke uses in his picture of Christianity are few and when broken down into typifications, less impressive. There is one Roman of senatorial rank; a local aristocrat, possibly out of favour; a member of the Athenian upper class; the shadowy figure of Theophilus, who may be no more than local gentry; and a missionary who because of his citizenship enjoys a certain status in the provinces.[70] This evidence may indicate that there

---

[65]Bruce, Acts, p. 341; Hanson, Acts, p. 183.

[66]Antipas had fallen from favour and been banished to Lyon. It may be that Manaen had been entangled in his fate. It can only be said with certainty that at one time in the past he had enjoyed aristocratic status. Theissen, "soziologische Auswertung," p. 287.

[67]Ibid.

[68]For summaries of the debate see Bruce, Book, p. 31; Haenchen, Acts, p. 136 n. 4; Fitzmyer, pp. 299f.; Marshall, Lk., p. 43.

[69]If it is used as an official title he is a Roman of equestrian rank (Bruce, Book, p. 31; Haenchen, p. 136 n. 4) but if not, "At most it would imply that Theophilus was socially respected and probably well off, or highly placed in the society to which Luke had access". Fitzmyer, p. 300.

[70]There is also the mention of Greek men and women τῶν εὐσχημόνων who became believers at Boroea (17.12; cf. 17.4). But the term is not

was a very small minority of upper class adherents of Christianity in the Lucan community. But while such an interpretation may suggest itself, it should be noted that these pictures may also perform a very real function for the next social level Luke describes.

The largest group of Christians Luke describes are middle to upper middle class. They have successful small businesses, are householders, may own property, and frequently have servants. They are people capable of outstanding acts of charity and devotion and are often local community leaders. But they do not have status indicators signifying membership in the upper classes of Graeco-Roman society. They do have economic success, perhaps even equivalent to those who belong to the upper classes, but they do not have status to accompany their economic position. In several instances they are engaged in professions with low social status. We may typify them as being in positions of social dissonance.[71] For these people the picture of a senatorial Roman becoming a believer, a local aristocrat as a leading Christian teacher, and the friendship of high ranking city, regional, and Imperial officials are things they would like to see happen. These events are what they dream of.[72] The hope of such people becoming Christians is part of their quest for social legitimation.

The situation of social dissonance can be more clearly seen if one identifies 'the rich' and contrasts them with 'the poor'. The rich, like the lowest levels of society, remain anonymous.[73] What is notable

---

precise and the incident functions to counteract the opposition of the upper classes against Paul in other places (13.50; 14.5). It is an unusual occurrence. It is true that Paul constantly brushes shoulders with nobility, local aristocrats and high Roman officials (the Asiarchs of Ephesus are his friends, 19.31) but these people are always distinguished from believers. The story of the Ethiopian eunuch comes to Luke in his traditions (Haenchen, p. 315) and is not part of Luke's normal social world.

[71] Some are even displaced persons, 18.2.

[72] R.M. Grant, "Social Setting," p. 22.

[73] Notable exceptions are such people as Felix, Festus, and Agrippa but they are important because of the part they play in Paul's trials.

in the descriptions of these people is that they occupy positions of status as well as wealth.[74] Luke cannot have envisaged a great economic gulf between Zacchaeus and the rich ruler but a gulf in social status is readily apparent. The Pharisees who invited Jesus into their homes, in the eyes of Luke's readers, shared a rough economic equality with the Christian householders he describes but their party position within Judaism meant that they had significant status as well. This can be illustrated by brief reference to several paraenetic statements. In the 'Warning' against Pharisees and lawyers (11.37-52) the Lucan Jesus attacks the misuse of wealth (v.42) and oppression (v.46) but also obsessive concern with status indicators (vv. 43, 47). In the context of dinner at a Pharisee's home this same Jesus speaks out against undue concern with status (14.7-14). It is only in Luke that the Pharisees are called "lovers of money" (16.14). But the rebuke they receive in this context is not about money but self-exaltation, i.e. self-concern with status (16.15). The differences between the rich and the poor as Luke describes them are not economic but status related. There is of course also the difference in their respective responses to God.[75] This indicates that Luke's middle class community members in their quest for social legitimation were in danger of emulating the rich by being unduly concerned with status.[76] Luke uses the authority of dominical sayings as a reprimand for this but does not attack their economic success per se.

At the lower end of the social scale Luke is aware of those who are lower class. But they are not important to him as a class in themselves but as a means by which economically independent Christians can ensure that their wealth is not a danger to their own salvation. This

---

[74] See Lk. 7.30, 36; 10:25; 11:37, 45: 14:1; 15:2; 16:14; 18:18; 21:1; Acts 4.1; 13:50; 14.5; 25.1ff.

[75] Per Johnson, Possessions.

[76] Cf. O'Toole, "Politics and Society," p. 10; Esler, p. 248.

will become clear in the analysis of Luke's teaching on possessions.

In summary, on the basis of sociographic and prosopographic statements and given the theoretical perspective of the sociology of knowledge, i.e. that the picture Luke paints of Christianity corresponds to the relevance structures of his readers, one is led to envisage the Lucan community as a predominantly middle to upper middle class group[77] whose members are experiencing social dissonance. There is perhaps a very small minority of upper class adherents and at least some awareness of an economically dependent Christian proletariat.

In the teaching material Luke presents on wealth and poverty there are three predominant themes: a) the danger of riches to eternal life, b) the necessity of giving alms, and c) koinonia.

The Lucan emphasis on the threat riches pose to one's entrance into the kingdom of God is well-known.[78] It was recognized some time

---

[77]A body of data closely related to prosopographic statements is found in the economic world of Luke's parables. Cf. Goulder, "Parables," p. 54f. Luke's parables breathe with the reality of middle class life. This is especially evident when amounts of money and descriptions of individuals are compared with the extravagance of Mt.'s story-world. Luke's two forgiven debtors (7.41) owe 2 yrs.' and 50 days' wages respectively. He drastically scales down the parable of the talents (19.11ff.). Mt.'s astronomical sums of 5, 2, and 1 talents become a mere 3 months' wages given to each servant. (The total distributed, 10 minas, and the 10 minas the first servant earns with his investment are large sums when compared with the economic world of Mk. Cf. Mk. 14.5, Wansbrough, p. 583.) In Luke the Great Supper (Lk. 14.15ff.) is not a royal banquet as in Mt. where there is a long guest list and many servants; it is a commoner's affair with few invited guests and one servant. It is Luke who tells us of a woman who throws a party because she recovered one day's wage (15.8ff.) (cf. Mt.'s Pearl of Great Price and Hidden Treasure, 13.44-46). It is in Luke that one finds a one-servant estate described where the slave must be fieldhand, shepherd, and domestic staff combined. This is not to deny that Luke has used some material which reflects a lower socio-economic level, e.g. Lk. 21. 1-5; the widow of 18.2ff. (George W.E. Nickelsburg, "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in I Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel According to Luke," NTS 25 (1978-79), p. 339), and esp. the birth narratives. But these pictures are rare and not consistently developed. In the birth narratives the poverty of Jesus' parents and relatives is meant to emphasize their piety and the contrast between rich and poor in the Magnificat is subject to the same application that we found in Luke's Beatitudes.

[78]See Lk. 6.24ff.; 8.14, (Keck, "Poor," p. 109); 9.25;

ago by H.J. Cadbury that such passages betokened, "a concern for the oppressor rather than pity for the oppressed . . ." and an ". . . appeal to the conscience and sense of duty in the privileged classes rather than an appeal to the discontent and to the rights . . . of the under-privileged".[79] The manner in which possessions are a threat can be their capacity to sate one's spiritual senses (6.24ff.).[80] Concern with possessions can also cause a blindness to one's situation before God (12.16ff.).[81] Riches can occasion greed and acquisitiveness which stem from what is pragmatically a materialist view of life.[82] To such an attitude Luke responds that life does not consist in possessions (12.15; cf. 9.25). Alternately possessions threaten one's entry into the kingdom by competing with Jesus' call (18.18ff.).[83] Or possessions can be an idol which competes with God's demand on human life (16.13).[84]

A lack of perception occasioned by indulgence can only be a threat to people who have enough possessions with which to be sated. The temptation to acquisitiveness can only be experienced by those who

---

10.41; 12.15, 22ff.; 18.18ff.; Schuyler Brown, Apostacy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), p. 107; Marshall, LHT, p. 143; Wansbrough, p. 586; Karris, "Poor and Rich," p. 120; Robert Koch, "Die Wertung des Besitzes im Lukasevangelium," Biblica 38 (1957):155-57; Nickelsburg, p. 333ff.

[79]Cadbury, Making, p. 263.

[80]These 'woes' presuppose satiation in the areas of appetite, happiness, and status (cf. 16.25).

[81]Koch, p. 155.

[82]Marshall, Lk., p. 521; cf. Johnson, Possessions, p. 146 on Lk. 14.15-24; S. Brown, Apostacy, pp. 85f. discusses this theme in terms of seeking security in material acquisitions as opposed to spiritual security found in God.

[83]The traditional saying which states the impossibility of a rich man entering the kingdom of God was already mediated in the development of the tradition before it came to Luke. This impossibility can be overcome by God's miraculous power. The tradition has been modified to account for the presence of prosperous Christians in the church.

[84]Koch, pp. 156f.; cf. Lk. 10.41 where the point is the distraction of activities.

already have possessions. A poor man may worship Mammon in his dreams but only a man of some prosperity can be asked to make an active choice between his possessions and God. "These passages show that Luke is concerned with actual situations in which abundance leads to profligacy; these are not the typical dangers of 'the poor'."[85] Warnings on the dangers of possessions are directed to people who have possessions.

So,too,is Luke's solution to the problem: the giving of alms. Total renunciation of property and wealth is not always the answer (cf. 18.18ff. with 19.9ff.) but the giving of alms is. "Possessions are meant to be given in alms to those in need."[86] This can be clearly seen in Lk. 12. Luke uses the parable of the rich fool to introduce a section of 'Q' material on possessions and cares.[87] The rich fool is illustrative of one who has acquired treasure (θησαυρίζω) for himself but has acquired nothing in relation to God (12.21).[88] This is a diagnosis of the rich fool's failure. The cure is related in vv. 33f. Here the positive use of treasure (θησαυρός) is outlined. One is to sell it and give alms to the poor,[89] in order to have treasure toward God in heaven; for, as the story of the rich fool illustrates, where one's treasure is there one's heart is also. The theme is picked up again in 14.12ff. in terms of offering hospitality. One ought not to invite to dinner anyone capable of repaying him in this life for fear of losing his reward in heaven. The point of Luke's story about the dishonest steward (16.1-9) is the use of possessions to secure a place

---

[85]Keck, "Poor," pp. 109f.

[86]Karris, "Poor and Rich," p. 120. Cf. Koch, p. 167; Wansbrough, p. 586; Juel, p. 36; Nickelsburg, p. 337.

[87]It is part of the Great Sermon material Luke has transposed to other contexts and different settings.

[88]Koch, p. 158.

[89]Luke has added the emphasis on alms.

in heaven.[90] The reader already knows that the only way this can be done is by giving alms. The theme recurs in the example of the rich ruler (18.18ff.) and alms are one of the signs that salvation has come to the house of Zacchaeus (19.8f.).[91]

In consonance with Cadbury's judgment it must be noted that the emphasis is not on the poor man's right to receive alms but on the rich man's duty to give them. Such admonitions are addressed to those Christians in Luke's community who are prosperous. These people are told that the only sure means of avoiding the danger which their possessions pose to their salvation is to give alms.

R.J. Karris has suggested that the Lucan emphasis on alms provides evidence of the presence in the community of a Christian stratum which was experiencing real need.[92] The teaching on alms, given his perspective, is two-sided. On the one hand it guards against the threat possessions pose to the rich man's salvation and on the other it secures provision for the needy Christians in the community. However, the second emphasis is lacking in all of the teaching on alms. Evidence of an appeal for Christians to help one another across class lines must be sought elsewhere.

The third emphasis in the Lucan teaching on possessions is community solidarity: koinonia. Luke constructs the descriptions of community life among the earliest believers in Acts 2.44f. and 4.32-35 to imply "by his choice of words that this first community of Christians fulfilled both the Greek ideal of friendship and the Jewish longing for a land free from need".[93] There are three points in both passages

---

[90] Johnson, Possessions, pp. 156f.

[91] The parable of the rich man and Lazarus with its emphasis on the rich man's failure to repent (16.30f.), i.e. to have put his wealth to proper use, i.e. to have given alms to Lazarus, also fits this theme. Marshall, LHT, p. 142.

[92] Karris, "Poor and Rich," p. 117; cf. Krodel, Acts, p. 25.

[93] Johnson, Possessions, p. 5; cf. Karris, "Poor and Rich," p. 117.

which are important to a sociological analysis of Luke's community: unity, commonality, and the eradication of need. H. Conzelmann has correctly noted that Luke does not use these passages to foster an ideal of poverty.[94] Possessions are ancillary to something more fundamental: the unity of the early believers. But he is incorrect to think that as an idealization of the past this picture has no relevance to the Lucan community circa A.D. 80. Working from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge such an idealization is made because it legitimates something relevant to the meaning structures of the readers. To a Greek reader it was the three emphases outlined above which related these pictures to his own social world.[95] The reader learned that Christians ought to treat one another according to the Hellenistic 'topos' of friendship[96] which is exemplified by the sharing of goods for the purpose of eradicating need among those who are friends. But in its Hellenistic setting this 'topos' was normally restricted to function within rather than across class divisions.[97] Luke has made it plain that this 'friendship' among Christians is to cross class lines (see esp. Lk. 14. 12ff.). The community of goods is subservient to two goals: unity and the eradication of want among Christians; both of which, Luke emphasizes, ought to cross class barriers.

Luke uses the stories of Barnabas and Ananias and Sapphira to illustrate positively and negatively the importance of possessions in fulfilling these two goals.[98] Barnabas' honest and faithful disposition of his possessions promote these goals while the fraud and acquisitiveness

---

[94]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 233.

[95]Dupont, Essays, pp. 85-99. Cf. Hengel, Property, pp. 3-11, 31-34; Johnson, Possessions, pp. 1-5; Karris, "Poor and Rich," pp. 116f.

[96]Dupont, Essays, p. 90; Hengel, Property, p. 31; Karris, "Poor and Rich," p. 116; Johnson, p. 2.

[97]Karris, "Poor and Rich," pp. 116f.

[98]S. Brown, Apostacy, p. 99.

of Ananias and Sapphira threaten the community's solidarity.[99] The latter's fate starkly illustrates the mortal danger inherent in possessions[100] while the former by his subsequent life illustrates the blessings inherent in the proper use of wealth, i.e. the giving of alms.

These passages suggest that Luke is presenting a polemic which presupposes actual poverty among Christians and that not all of those who are economically secure are eager to help them. It is a polemic which seeks to foster Christian unity and charity across class lines.

'The poor' and 'the rich' in the world of Lucan Christianity are not classifications based solely on economic criteria. The economic distinctions between those who may identify with the blessed 'poor' and those identified as 'the rich' are insignificant. The major difference is in accompanying status indicators.

Lucan Christians are predominantly middle to upper middle class. They are economically successful, so much so that their wealth poses a serious problem to the spirituality of the community. They are also tempted to neglect the poor members of that community and to carry the class distinctions of the Hellenistic world into their Christian relationships.

These same Christians are also in a situation of status inconsistency. They are aware that in spite of their economic success they do not belong to the social elite. They are aware that they are separated from those whose status entitles them to membership in the upper classes. They are warned by Luke not to seek social prestige. There is some evidence which might indicate that the community had a few members from the upper classes. There is also evidence to suggest that there were Christians of the urban proletariat in the community. The size of this group and its importance to the community is difficult to assess.

---

[99] Ibid., p. 106. [100] Ibid., p. 107.

D. Racial Composition

It is certain that gentiles comprised a significant component in the Lucan community. But there is little hope of moving beyond the general description 'gentiles' to more specific racial categories. Several factors had worked together since the Seleucid period to bring about the amalgamation of different racial groups in Greek cities into the homogenous entity which was Hellenistic civilization.[101] Greek economic mobility could be taken advantage of by indigenous racial groups only if individual members were willing to merge with Greeks in Hellenistic urban structures.[102] Greek and Roman colonization displaced local populations and spread Greek and Roman populations in new areas. Romans in the east remained racially distinct in the 1st century.[103] And if it could be demonstrated that Luke's church was located in a Roman colony, it may have had a Latin element. But the granting of citizenship to freedmen and veterans, both of which were used to plant colonies, means that Roman citizenship was becoming more of a political than a racial identity (e.g. the Paul of Acts). The significant fact about the racial composition of the socio-economic groups which were predominant in the urban Christianity of Luke's church is that throughout the Hellenistic period Greek culture and education had served to level out racial distinctions among gentiles.[104]

In the Hellenistic cities of the northeast Mediterranean there was also a large Jewish population.[105] This makes it probable that there

---

[101]Koester, p. 57. [102]Ibid.

[103]Cf. Hennecke Gülzow, "Soziale Gegenbenheiten der altkirchlichen Mission," in Kirchengeschichte als Missionsgeschichte Band I: Die Alte Kirche, eds. H. Frohnes und U. Knorr (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1974), p. 220.

[104]Koester, p. 58. Admission to the middle and upper middle classes in Greek cities required a Greek education in the professions or technitai, i.e. the adoption of Greek culture.

[105]Ibid., pp. 225f.; Robert A. Kraft, "Judaism on the World Scene," Catacombs, pp. 82f.; Meeks, p. 34; Martin Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism:

may have been some Jews and Jewish Christians among Luke's readers.[106] The purpose of this section is to determine whether or not this probability can be demonstrated to have been an actuality and if these Jewish Christians were numerous enough to constitute a separate sociological grouping within the Lucan church.

There are two attitudes in Luke's view of Judaism: one positive and one negative.[107] It is with the analysis of these opposing viewpoints that studies normally begin in order to demonstrate the Jewish or non-Jewish character of Lucan Christianity. However, this practice appears methodologically suspect if, on the one hand this evidence is examined against the background of the general dissemination of Jewish ideas in the ancient world[108] and on the other against the newly emergent picture of the pluralistic nature of Judaism in the 1st century. It will be shown that the use of this type of material to determine whether or not there were Jews among Lucan Christians indicates nothing one way or the other.[109]

The work of G.D. Kilpatrick and Jacob Jervell is representative of approaches which interpret Luke's positive orientation toward Judaism

---

Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1981, '1974), p. 56; Harnack, Expansion, I, pp. 2-11.

[106]Fitzmyer, p. 59; cf. Richard J. Cassidy, "Luke's Audience, the Chief Priests, and the Motive for Jesus' Death"; Cassidy, p. 146.

[107]Maddox, pp. 32-52; cf. J.L. Houlden, "The Purpose of Luke," JSNT 21 (1984):60.

[108]See John G. Gager, The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 35-88.

[109]A preliminary methodological step is to distinguish between evidence of the author's racial identity and that of his readers'; Fitzmyer, p. 45. Kümmel, Intro., pp. 149f. and Reicke, Luke, pp. 20-23 represent examples of approaches which fail to make this distinction. The arguments advanced by Fitzmyer, p. 58 for the gentile nature of Luke's church confuse evidence of a non-Palestinian setting with a non-Jewish setting or incorrectly deny certain interests (esp. universalist perspectives) to Jews.

as indicating a real connection with Judaism or Jewish Christianity.[110] Both men have correctly emphasized aspects of Luke-Acts of a pro-Jewish nature which must be taken into account in any interpretation of Lucan Christianity, but it is questionable that this data necessarily leads to the conclusion that Lucan Christianity was a predominantly Jewish affair.[111] In the first place Jervell's 'Jewish' Lucan church is really much less Jewish than it is often represented. In his eyes the Lucan church is not Jewish but gentile.[112] And the mission to the Jews is a thing of the past.[113] Jervell's Lucan Christians, like those of Haenchen and Conzelmann, legitimate themselves and express their self-identity in terms of continuity with an Israel of Messianic Jews who existed during the Apostolic age. The difference between their positions is twofold. First, Jervell's Lucan Christians do not identify themselves over and against Jews but on the basis of believing Jews.[114] Second, in a recent article, Jervell has argued that even late in the 1st century the Jewish Christians of Palestine continued to exert a considerable theological influence over the gentile churches of the Diaspora which

---

[110]George Dunbar Kilpatrick, "On γραμματεύς and νομικός," JTS n.s. 1 (1950); "Λαοί at Luke 2.31 and Acts 4.25, 27," JTS n.s. 16 (1965): 127; "Kyrios in the Gospels," L'Evangile, Hier et Aujourd'hui, Melanges offerts au Prof. F.-J. Leenhardt (Geneve: 1968), pp. 60-70; "The Gentiles and the Strata of Luke," Verborum Veritas, Festschrift für Gustav Stählin, eds. O. Böcher & K. Haacker (Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970), pp. 83-88; and "Luke, Not a Gentile Gospel," an unpublished paper read before The Origen Society of Oxford University, 14 Feb. 1984. W.R. Hanford, "Deutero-Isaiah and Luke-Acts: Straightforward Universalism?", CQR 168 (1967):141-52, defends Kilpatrick's assessment of the ambiguous nature of Lucan universalism. Jacob Jervell, Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), "The Mighty Minority," ST 34 (1980):13-38; "The Acts of the Apostles and the History of Early Christianity," ST 37 (1983); The Unknown Paul (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984).

[111]Maddox, p. 35; Houlden, p. 61.

[112]Jervell, "The Divided People of God," LPG, p. 68.

[113]Ibid.

[114]Ibid., pp. 56-63.

far exceeded their numerical importance.[115] In Jervell's eyes Lucan Christians are gentiles who are positive toward Judaism, imitate some Jewish attitudes and practices, are in contact with Jewish Christians, and have Jewish Christian rather than Pauline attitudes toward the Law. All of his other arguments are designed to illustrate this central idea of a gentile church which conceives its praxis and self-identity in terms of Judaism.[116]

The idea that Jewish influence continued in the gentile churches long after viable contacts with Jews and Jewish Christianity had been severed has found increasing favour recently.[117] But such arguments add nothing to the question of whether or not real Jews comprised a power block in the dynamics of Luke's own church. The presence of Jewish ideas in a community does not necessarily lead one to conclude the presence of Jews in that same community without some additional evidence. Jervell's data can at best indicate that Luke's gentiles owed their self-identity as Christians to Judaism.

Kilpatrick's data does not demonstrate a Jewish racial component in the Lucan community either. In his unpublished lecture, "Luke -- Not a Gentile Gospel," the main thrust of his analysis of selected passages in Luke's gospel is to show that nowhere is there a clear universalism which includes the gentiles in the benefits of Jesus' ministry. This plus the strong Jewish flavour of several passages and

---

[115] Jervell, "The Mighty Minority," cf. "Acts and History," pp. 23ff. where he says that there were some Jewish Christians in Luke's churches.

[116] In this regard Maddox's otherwise able criticisms of Jervell, pp. 32-39, miss the heart of Jervell's argument.

[117] See Peder Borgen, "The Early Church and the Hellenistic Synagogue," ST 37 (1983):55-78; W.H.C. Frend, "Early Christianity and Society: A Jewish Legacy in the Pre-Constantinian Era," HTR 76 (1983), pp. 53-71; cf. G.W.H. Lampe, "'Grievous Wolves' (Acts 20.29)," Christ and Spirit in the New Testament, eds. B. Lindars & S. Smalley (Cambridge: The University Press, 1973), p. 254. Also Gager, Anti-Semitism, pp. 117f.

the intimate knowledge of some Jewish practices Luke displays cause Kilpatrick to doubt that this gospel was written for gentiles. Only at the end of Luke (24.47) does one find a clearly universalist passage and its universalism is much less pronounced than its parallel in Matthew. Similarly he finds little to do with gentiles in the first eight chapters of Acts. Here Christianity is represented as having been born into a Jewish world unconcerned with gentiles.

But it has long been recognized that Luke restricted Jesus' ministry to Israel more strongly than Mark or Matthew. Presumably he did so because he could show the inclusion of the gentiles in his second volume and because of his theological programme, 'to the Jew first' (Acts 3.26; 13.46). Similarly the first eight chapters of Acts are 'Jewish' because of Luke's need to establish a believing Jewish community which would demonstrate the continuity of salvation history. The lack of universalist tendencies in Luke's gospel and the early chapters of Acts can be explained as the theological programme of a gentile concerned with the continuity of Christianity and Judaism. It does not necessarily imply a Jewish Christian Sitz im Leben. The other Jewish elements and attitudes Kilpatrick points out could also be explained as interests and viewpoints acquired by a gentile or gentiles who had been in close contact with the Hellenistic synagogues.[118] If it is correct to argue that the gentiles of Luke's community were primarily former synagogue attached God-fearers,[119] then the positive

---

[118] Cf. Simonsen, p. 14; Gager, Anti-Semitism, pp. 117f.

[119] Esler, pp. 52ff.; cf. Nils Dahl, "The Purpose of Luke-Acts," in Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976), p. 97. The existence of gentile 'sympathizers' seems evident. Again, see Gager, pp. 35-88. Also Esler, pp. 53ff. To cite only one example, Juvenal's well known comment about the father who adopts Jewish customs and the son who becomes a proselyte (Satire XIV, 96-106) was possible only on the supposition that this was a frequent enough event to be a recognizable stereo-type. Gager is surely correct to argue that negative references to Jewish proselytism in pagan literature presuppose the adoption of Jewish customs by enough gentiles for the process to

aspects of Luke's portrayal of Judaism are readily explicable in view of these people's original attraction to Judaism. Thus Kilpatrick's arguments illustrate more about the theological and cultural indebtedness of Lucan Christians to Judaism than their racial identity.[120]

The second type of argument emphasizes Luke's negative portrayal of Judaism. In this context it will be helpful to offer a brief sketch of the nature and evolution of Judaism in the latter 1st century.

From the continuing debate about the nature of 1st century Judaism two points are particularly relevant to the study of the racial composition of Lucan Christianity. First, Judaism, both before and after the catastrophe of A.D. 70, was pluralistic.[121] If one wishes to

---

have been seen as a threat to pagan culture. The evidence of Acts for the existence of such a class of gentiles is of course crucial; A.T. Kraabel, "The Disappearance of the 'God-Fearers'," Numen 28 (1981):115. In this published version Kraabel's arguments against the use of Acts as evidence for their existence are little more than an argument from silence (Esler, p. 53). But in another version of the same article entitled, "The 'God-Fearers', Once More and Finally," read before the Jewish Studies Seminar, Oxford University, 10 Nov. 1981 he used a literary explanation of 'God-fearers' in Acts in which he saw them as a fictional plot device to move the story's action from the Jewish world to the gentile world. For this idea he is indebted to Norman R. Peterson, Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), pp. 81ff. Kraabel's arguments against the use of Acts as evidence of the existence of God-fearers are shipwrecked between the Scylla of strained plot structures (his plot doesn't exist in the text, see below, pp. 123ff.) and the Charybdis of historical probability. (The events Luke narrates may be fictional, but it doesn't follow that his categories are fictional. Historical fiction depends on recognizable and real categories to succeed; Fergus Millar, "Gentile 'God-Fearers' in the Diaspora Synagogue under the Roman Empire," a paper read before the New Testament Seminar, Oxford University, 24 October 1985.) Since pagan, Jewish, and Christian literature indicates that such people did exist the remaining question is whether or not Luke's terms, φοβούμενοι τὸν θέον and σεβόμενοι τὸν θέον were technical or semi-technical terms. In this case it seems that Kirsopp Lake's judgment, BCV, p. 88, is correct. What makes a person such as Cornelius a recognizable member of a class is his description rather than the precise terms used to refer to him. (Max Wilcox, "The 'God-Fearers' in Acts -- A Reconsideration," JSNT 13 (1981):102-22; argued that Luke's terms were non-technical but made the mistake of reasoning that 'non-technical' was evidence of the 'non-existence' of such people.)

[120] Cf. Cadbury, Acts in History, pp. 93-104.

[121] R. Kraft, p. 82; Robert Murray, "Jews, Hebrews, and Christians: Some Needed Distinctions," NovTest 24 (1982):196; Jacob Neusner, First-

relate the various streams of 1st century Christianity to 1st century Judaism one must first ask which Judaism will serve as the basis of comparison.[122] There are multiple answers to this question and it is purely arbitrary to select one over another as 'normative' Judaism.[123] It is not until well into the 2nd century that one can begin to speak of rabbinic Judaism as constituting normative Judaism.[124] In the period of primary importance for the development of the Lucan community, A.D. 70-90, Judaism was engaged in the formative stages of a struggle to achieve a cohesive self-definition.[125] During this period the basis of the rabbinic answer for the reconstruction of Judaism without the Temple was being laid[126] but during that same period the final triumph of the rabbinic answer was still in question.[127] From A.D. 70-90 Christianity was still one Jewish movement in competition with others seeking to define what it would come to mean to be Jewish.[128] One may

---

Century Judaism in Crisis: Yohanan ben Zakkai and the Renaissance of Torah (Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press, 1975), p. 38; Meeks, p. 32; Marcel Simon, Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus, trans. J.H. Farley (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 1; Hengel, Judaism, p. 252.

[122] Meeks, p. 32.

[123] Cf. Rowland, p. 9. Meeks, p. 33, offers rabbinics, apocalyptic, mysticism, and gnosticism as a few of the available Jewish types in the 1st century. Others in the period after A.D. 70 include the priests, who did survive as a party, Neusner, ben Zakkai, pp. 176ff., the Zealots, who emerged again to lead the nation to disaster in the Bar Kochba Revolt, and numerous syncretistic fringe groups, Simon, Sects, p. 109; Hengel, Judaism, p. 308.

[124] Koester, p. 225; Meeks, p. 33; Neusner, ben Zakkai, pp. 176-96; Hengel, Judaism, p. 252.

[125] R. Kraft, pp. 84f.; Neusner, ben Zakkai, p. 38; cf. Kilpatrick, "Luke, Not a Gentile Gospel," who terms it a struggle for survival.

[126] Neusner, ben Zakkai, p. 157 gives the foundational period as A.D. 70-80, during the latter years of ben Zakkai's life. Samuel Sandmel, Judaism and Christian Beginnings, p. 241, thinks that ben Zakkai lived until A.D. 95 and extends the length of this foundational period accordingly.

[127] Cf. Neusner, ben Zakkai, p. 38.

[128] Neusner, ben Zakkai, p. 38. Christianity from very early on

tentatively describe Judaism in the first quarter century after the fall of Jersualem as a family of perspectives on the meaning and praxis of scriptural revelation.[129] The concern to arrive at the meaning of Judaism through the interpretation of Mosaic revelation and its attendant secondary literature is a basic characteristic. But it must be remembered that although Jews agreed on the acceptance of Moses as the core of their self-definition what this in turn meant was an open question.[130] There was also a recognition that this acceptance of Moses implied that some sort of boundaries separating the People of God from the outside world had to be maintained,[131] again an idea open to various interpretations.

Secondly, during this same period Judaism was self-critical.[132] Numerous answers were taking shape to the universal question, "Why has God forsaken Jerusalem and judged his People?".[133] And while all Jewish

---

contained tendencies which would render it ultimately unacceptable for Jews because of its decision to include gentiles, Gerd Theissen, The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1978), pp. 113f. The decision to include gentiles eradicated boundaries between Jews and gentiles, a distinction which had always been necessary for Judaism's survival, Samuel Sandmel, Anti-Semitism in the New Testament? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 126; at a time when boundary definition was of primary importance for Jews (Meeks, pp. 36f.; Theissen, First Followers, pp. 113f.). However, during the period in question, the nature and importance of distinctions between Jews and gentiles were in the process of being decided. They were not an accomplished fact (R. Kraft, pp. 84f.).

[129]Cf. Tiede, pp. 4f.; Rowland, p. 10.

[130]Neusner, ben Zakkai, p. 38, "The acceptance of Mosaic revelation could mean whatever one wanted it to mean." John J. Collins, Between Athens and Jerusalem (New York: Crossroad, 1983), pp. 11-13, emphasizes two points: 1) the O.T. provides the parameters of diaspora Judaism, 2) interpretation was diverse. Cf. Hengel, Judaism, p. 305 who indicates that internal debate in Judaism was concerned with the meaning of Torah.

[131]Meeks, pp. 36f.; and Sandmel, Anti-Semitism, p. 126.

[132]Josephus, BJ 5.399-412; 6.333-46. II Baruch 1.1-4; 7.1-8.2: 41.3-5; 42.5f.; 48.38-40. Baruch 2.6-10; 3.10-14; IV Ezra 3.20-30; 4.30; 5.30. Tiede, p. 6; Neusner, ben Zakkai, pp. 157-64, 24f.; cf. Hengel, Judaism, p. 306 of an earlier period.

[133]Cf. Tiede, p. 2.

parties agreed that the sin of the nation was the root cause[134] there were sharp disagreements over the identification of that sin and the manner in which it could be extirpated. The Jewish loyalists, represented by Josephus, identified the nation's sin as consisting in having engaged in armed rebellion against the divine agent of peace, the Roman imperium. The Christians saw the reason for God's judgment in the rejection by many Jews of the crucified Messiah. The apocalypticists deplored the human tendency to sin (IV Ezra3.4ff.;7.46-48, 68, 118-20), often singling out the neglect of Torah (II Baruch 41.3-5; 44.7; 48.38-40; IV Ezra 7.24, 72, 79-82), but looked forward to a certain redemption, in part, brought about by the redemptive quality of their own suffering (II Baruch 13.10; 68.3-7; IV Ezra 6.25-29).[135] The emphasis in Rabbinic literature falls on the need for present repentance and a restored national life based on the observance of Torah. It was a time when Jews of different persuasions strove to lay the blame for the Humiliation of Israel at one another's doorsteps.

In this light two categories of arguments used to establish the gentile character of Lucan Christianity need to be reexamined.

On the one hand it has been thought that an analysis of Luke's understanding of Torah could reveal his relationship to Judaism. Stephen Wilson's monograph Luke and the Law (1983) represents the most recent and comprehensive study of Luke's relationship to Jewish Law which arrives at the conclusion that Luke had little or no connection with Judaism.[136] The general results of Wilson's arguments are that Luke subordinated legal theory to praxis,[137] or christology,[138] and that he

---

[134]Neusner, ben Zakkai, pp. 161f.; Tiede, p. 6.

[135]Neusner, ben Zakkai, pp. 161-64; Tiede, pp. 6f.

[136]Stephen G. Wilson, Luke and the Law (Cambridge: The University Press, 1983). See also Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 147f.; and Maddox, pp. 36-42.

[137]Wilson, Law, pp. 13-27. [138]Ibid., pp. 27-54.

considered Law irrelevant to salvation.[139] Beyond this he feels that Luke had no consistent position in regard to Jewish Law.[140]

Space does not allow discussion of the fine points of Wilson's exegesis but the general outline of his analysis may be accepted as adequate. What is debatable are the conclusions Wilson draws from his findings.

He summarizes Luke's readers by saying that they were indifferent to the issue of Law as an institution. Law was simply not a problem for them.[141] This he thinks makes it probable that Luke's readers were gentiles.[142] But all it really indicates is that Lucan Christianity existed at some distance from rabbinic Judaism which is the basis of comparison used by Wilson.[143] He himself admits that Luke's readers could have been Jewish Christians with roots in the Diaspora and with a different approach to the Law from that used in rabbinic circles, but his guess is that they were predominantly gentiles.[144] However, throughout his discussion Wilson frequently hints at the existence of non-rabbinic Jewish contexts in which Luke's studied ambiguity may have been perfectly at home.[145]

The implication of an open-ended definition of Judaism in the period A.D. 70-100 is that rabbinic evidence can only be used as evidence of one stream of Jewish development. The ability to demonstrate that

---

[139] Ibid., pp. 102, 106. [140] Ibid., p. 57.

[141] Ibid. [142] Ibid., p. 58, cf. pp. 53, 39.

[143] Ibid., p. 57, cf. p. 39. [144] Ibid., p. 58.

[145] 1) Luke's use of ἔθνος is at home in the context of diaspora apologetics, pp. 1-11. 2) Luke's emphasis on the prophetic function of the Law (p. 26) fits a diaspora context. 3) Lk. 16.18 is not totally without Jewish parallels, p. 46. 4) The issue of Jew-gentile relations in Acts 10-11 may reflect local or party customs within Judaism, pp. 69f. 5) Acts 10.35 has points of contact with the liberal Diaspora attitude which summed up the Law in terms of monotheism and ethics, pp. 70f. Still, possible connections with various strains of Jewish thought do not prove any connection with actual Jews. All of these aspects could have been mediated by Christian traditions, p. 104.

Luke had little contact with this stream does not imply that he had no contact with others.[146] The use of rabbinic theology as a basis of comparison for Lucan Christianity is helpful so long as it is not used as an exclusive definition of what can and cannot be Jewish in this period. The analysis of Luke's attitude toward the Law provides no certainty of his connections with Judaism.

Robert Maddox has recently investigated the negative appraisal of Judaism in Luke-Acts. His arguments can be reduced to three main points. First, on the basis of the three 'programmatic' turning-to-the-gentiles passages (Acts 13.46f.; 18.6; 28.25-28) he sees Luke to emphasize not only the inclusion of the gentiles in the salvation of God but the exclusion of the Jews as a whole.[147] Secondly, he thinks that Luke was intent on demonstrating that it was not the Christians' fault that the gentiles had come to God while the Jews were rejected, i.e. that the separation of the church from Judaism, a basic fact for Luke's community, was not the fault of the Christians but had been forced upon them by unbelieving Jews.[148] And finally, although Luke does in places set the unbelieving leadership of Israel over against a believing (or at least open-minded) Jewish populace, Maddox thinks that Luke is not consistent in this and at numerous places directs a strong prophetic invective against the Jews as a whole.[149] The conclusion he draws is that only a gentile church which identifies itself over against Judaism could have held these positions. There are serious difficulties with all of these findings.

Maddox's exegesis of the turning-to-the-gentiles passages turns on the establishment of a binary opposition between Jew and gentile in

---

[146] Cf. O'Neill, p. 97. The significance of Philo's terse comment about Jews who interpreted the Law in a wholly symbolic manner cannot be overlooked as an evidence of liberal Diaspora attitudes (De confusione linguarum 2f).

[147] Maddox, pp. 43f. [148] Cf. ibid. [149] Ibid., pp. 45ff.

the schema of salvation which is not clearly present. In the case of the first two passages it is possible that there is no freighted theological intention and that a socio-historical explanation may best explain these events. Prior to the establishment of hegemony by the rabbinic schools the Judaism of the Diaspora had no single juridical authority to solve its disputes. Each Jewish community decided its own disputes locally, a process which was the right of all religious associations.[150] A decision by the Jews in one locality did not constitute a decision for those in another. Decisions such as those at Pisidian Antioch, Corinth and Rome on the part of local Jewish leaders in regard to Christian missionaries must have been common prior to the establishment of rabbinic hegemony in Jewish affairs. Thus the repetition of 'three' decisions to 'turn to the gentiles', often taken with mystic intensity by commentators to indicate a Lucan theological programme,[151] may simply be an historical accident. This does not mean that Luke could not have also used such accidents in a theological manner but it does mean that the theological significance of these passages must be set in a larger context.

The major difficulty with Maddox's use of these passages is that they do not contain the causal sequence he attributes to them. On a grammatical level he is technically correct (ἐπειδή, 13.46) that Paul's turning to the gentiles at Pisidian Antioch is causally linked with the decision of the Jews to oppose the Gospel.[152] But when Paul's statement and use of Isaiah to bolster his decision are placed in the context of the story of his conversion a different picture emerges. In this light (see esp. 9.15; 22.21; 26.17f., 20, 23) it is clear that

---

[150] Koester, p. 225; cf. Rowland, p. 82.

[151] E.g. Ernst Haenchen, "Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte," ZNW 54 (1963):185.

[152] Maddox, p. 62 n.95; cf. Haenchen, "Judentum und Christentum," pp. 175f., the Pauline mission is driven forward by Jewish opposition.

Paul's decision to go to the gentiles is independent of any decision on the part of local Jews. The antecedent of his decision is to be found in God's plan revealed in the Old Testament.[153] Local Jewish rejection provides only a secondary context within which to work out the programme of Paul's mission. This, together with the fact that Jewish rejection of the Gospel and Paul's reaction to that rejection (as is evident from subsequent events) were seen by Luke as only local events, indicates that Acts 13.46 and 18.6 cannot mean that the Jews as a whole were rejected by God in favour of the gentiles.

The final passage, Acts 28.25-28, certainly has the characteristics Maddox ascribes to it: a final solemnity evident in a formal quotation of scripture and a negative appraisal ". . . addressed to the Jews as a whole . . ." which seemingly overrides the positive response of some Jews noted in v.24.[154] But at this point Maddox's logic falls prey to a methodological difficulty. He presumes throughout his treatment of Luke's attitude toward Judaism that a consistent picture must emerge in the end. However, if one examines Luke's use of Ἰουδαῖος and the actual narrative events regarding their response to the Gospel a rather confused picture emerges.[155] An uncertainty and an ambiguity cloud all

---

[153] M. Kiddle, "The Admission of the Gentiles in St. Luke's Gospel and Acts," JTS 36 (1935):162; Nils Dahl, "Abraham in Luke-Acts," SLA, p. 151.

[154] Maddox, p.43f.;cf. Haenchen, "Judentum und Christentum," pp. 184f.

[155] Luke uses Ἰουδαῖος 79x in Acts (+ 5x in Lk. which do not affect this discussion), cf. John, 71x. Most, 35x, are negative (Acts 9.22, 23; 12.3, 11; 13.45, 50; 14.2, 4, 5, 19; 17.5, 13; 18.12, 28; 20.3, 19; 21.11, 27; 22.30; 23.12, 20, 27; 24.9, 18, 27; 25.2, 7, 9, 10, 15, 24; 26.2, 7, 21; 28.19: again cf. Johannine usage, Gutbrod, TDNT III, p. 379). It is used 26x in a positive sense (Acts 2.5, 10, 14; 11.19; 13.5; 14.1; 17.1, 10, 17; 18.5, 19; 19.10, 17; 20.21; 24.24; 28.17). In these instances Jews are a positive, open, and responsive audience for the Gospel. In Acts 13.43; 14.1; 16.1; 18.2, 4, 24; 21.20, 39; 22.3, 12 it indicates Jews who are believers. It is used 10x as a neutral national/religious designation (10.22, 28, 39; 16.20; 18.2, 14; 19.13, 14; 24.5) and 8x its use is ambiguous (16.3: 19.33, 34; 21.21; 25.8; 26.3, 4; 28.29).

of Luke's references to Jews. He is never quite sure how he should classify them in relation to the Gospel. Peter, who in Acts 2.29 refers to Jews indiscriminately as his brothers and is represented as having a stong sense of his own identity as a Jew (Acts 10), in 12.11 sets himself over against the Jewish nation. In Acts 14.2 Luke felt it necessary to qualify the use of Ἰουδαῖος with ἀπειθήσαντες while in 16.1 he reversed the direction of qualification by the addition of πιστῆς to the description of Timothy's mother. The Jerusalem Jew Agabus (11.27) prophesied to Paul (21.11) that the Jews of Jerusalem, of which he is himself one, would deliver up Paul to the gentiles. Yet when Paul arrived at Jerusalem he met zealous Law-abiding Jews who were believers and welcomed him (21.20). It was Jews, qualified as being from Asia, who incited the riot which led to his arrest (21.27; cf. 24.18). Throughout his trial Paul was aware that it was the Jews who opposed him. Yet Luke had Paul identify himself as a Jew and refer to Jews as his brothers (22.1, 3; cf. 22.12; 21.39). In the events Luke narrates at Corinth the connotations of Ἰουδαῖος change frequently. The first usage is positive, 'Jews' respond to Paul's preaching (18.4). But in v.6 the 'Jews' opposed Paul and he turned to the gentiles. However, the first convert mentioned by Luke was Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue and a 'Jew'.

When one attempts to ascertain what Luke meant by statements directed to 'Jews' one must first ask which 'Jews' Luke has in mind. The connotations surrounding his references to the Jewish people, whether Ἰουδαῖος is used explicitly or only implied as in 28.25, are multifarious. There is simply not enough evidence to suggest that the 'Jews' to whom Paul directed this final solemn quotation are the 'Jews' as a whole.

Part of Maddox's understanding of Acts 28 depends on the idea that Luke implies ". . . the Christian message is being heard and

accepted more by gentiles than by Jews".[156] This is simply not true of the narrative action of the text. Luke depicts large numbers of Jewish believers not only in the opening chapters (Acts 2.41, 47; 4.4; 5.14; 6.1, 7) but throughout Acts (9.35, 42; 13.43; 14.1; 17.12; 21.20). Gentile conversions are described as large in only three passages (11.21; 14.1, where they equal Jewish conversions; and 17.4). There are two passages where the numbers indicated are uncertain (13.48; 17.12). In most mission activity there is no indication of the numbers of gentiles involved. It is not true of the narrative action in Acts to say that Luke represents the gentiles coming to faith in large numbers while the Jews reject the Gospel in large numbers.[157] It is therefore difficult to see how the evidence of the narrative demonstrates that part of Luke's purpose was to clear Christians of the responsibility for the emergence of a gentile church set over against Judaism.

This is further confirmed if one examines Luke's descriptions of those who oppose the Gospel in the Pauline mission. Here one finds that the 'Jews', i.e. those who did not respond favourably to the Gospel, are accredited by Luke with responsibility for opposing Paul's preaching in most instances (13.50; 14.5; 14.19; 17.5, 13; 18.12; 19.9). In four of these instances the Jews are responsible for instigating gentile riots. This places the major burden of guilt with the Jews but it does not relieve the gentiles of culpability nor does it paint a picture of open-armed gentile response to the Gospel. Only twice do the Jews alone oppose Paul (18.6 ; 19.9). Both of these instances are synagogue expulsions. In 14.5 the Jews and gentiles share equal responsibility for opposing Paul and in two instances (16.19; 19.23) the gentiles oppose

---

[156] Maddox, p. 43; cf. Haenchen, "Judentum und Christentum," p. 176.

[157] This is also true of the Pauline mission in isolation, contra. Maddox, p. 44.

Paul without Jewish instigation. This evidence does not support Maddox's interpretation.

Several of the arguments advanced by Gerhard Krodel against this interpretation of Acts 28 are relevant at this point. First, it is incorrect to brush aside the reference to a positive response on the part of some Jews in v.24. A divided response among Jews is thematic throughout Acts and cannot be cast aside as irrelevant here.[158] Whoever Luke may have been addressing in this final solemn quotation it cannot be thought that he intended it to convey the rejection of all Jews en masse when he has just said that some[159] Jews were being persuaded by Paul's preaching. Second, Luke never accuses the Jews of the Diaspora with having killed Jesus.[160] The blame for Jesus' death rests with his own generation and the Jews of Jerusalem. By the time Luke wrote they had paid for their folly. But even in this instance Luke felt Jewish repentance was possible (Acts 3.17).[161] This open-ended offer of repentance in the face of Jewish responsibility for Jesus' death makes a final and irrevocable rejection seem unlikely. Finally, the structure of Acts 28 is open-ended, like Lk. 24, anticipating further development of the themes portrayed in the book.[162] Since a major thrust of Luke-Acts is to portray the origins and development of a universal Gospel, i.e. universal in applying to all men both Jew and gentile, it seems unlikely that the end of Acts is meant to contradict this by making salvation the exclusive possession of gentiles.[163]

---

[158] Krodel, Acts, p. 86.

[159] Note the μεν . . . δε construction and the use of plural participles. This seems to indicate a 50-50 split.

[160] Krodel, Acts, p. 86.

[161] Houlden, pp. 57f.

[162] Krodel, Acts, pp. 87f. [163] Ibid.

As a transition to his last line of argument Maddox attacks the idea that Luke sets the Jewish people, who are favourably disposed to Jesus and the apostles, over against the Jewish leaders who oppose Jesus and the apostles. This generalized picture is, in his estimation, complicated by the fact that the attitude of the people changes in Lk. 23.1-5, 13-25. Here they share in the responsibility for Jesus' death with the leaders of Israel.[164] However, in Lk. 23.4 Luke uses ὄχλος and not λαός. The former term is often equivalent in meaning to λαός,[165] especially when it is used to represent the crowds which responded to Jesus' teaching, followed him, and received healing.[166] But it is often used in contrast with μαθητής. In these instances the 'crowd' failed to perceive the significance of Jesus[167] or received condemnation from Jesus for its perversity.[168] In this light it is not surprising to find the ὄχλου mentioned in conjunction with the chief priests in 23.4 opposing Jesus. But in 23.13 Luke does use λαός, which usually signifies the Old Testament people of God, the common people of the nation of Israel, who are favourably responsive to Jesus and the apostles.[169] In this case their culpability is emphasized by Luke's deletion of traditions which give the priests the responsibility for inciting the crowds (Mk. 15.11; Mt. 27.20). Maddox is correct in stating that Luke has done this in order to prepare for Acts 2.23 and 3.14 where the

---

[164]Maddox, p. 45; recently supported by Joseph B. Tyson, "The Jewish Public in Luke-Acts," NTS 30 (1984):579.

[165]Jerome Kodell, "Luke's Use of λαός, 'People' Especially in the Jerusalem Narrative (Lk. 19.28-24.53)," CBQ 31 (1969):327; Nils Dahl, "A People for His Name," NTS 4 (1958):324.

[166]E.g. Lk. 4.42; 5.1, 3, 15; 6.17, 19; 7.9, 11; Acts 6.7; 8.6; 11.24, 26.

[167]Lk. 8.4; cf. 8.10; 9.18; 11.27; 12.13.

[168]Lk. 9.37f.; cf. 9.41; 11.29; 12.54.

[169]Kodell, pp. 327f.; Paul S. Minear, "Jesus' Audiences, According to Luke," NovTest 16 (1974):82.

Jewish community as a whole is made responsible for Jesus' death.[170] What he fails to take into account is that in Acts this guilt is mediated by the people's repentance (2.37; 4.4) and the idea that they acted in ignorance (3.17). This, plus the fact that in Acts Luke reintroduces a strong opposition between the people and the leadership of Israel (4.1, cf. 4.4; 4.17; 5.12-16, cf. 5.17-18, 20f., 26, 28), means that Luke has used λαός in such a way as to bring Israel through the difficulties of the passion story in order to be in a position of positive response to the Gospel in Acts.[171]

Joseph Tyson has sought to defend a similar line of argument by pointing out that at the end of Acts Luke again makes statements which seem to portray the Jewish populace as a whole rejecting the Gospel, i.e. rejecting Paul, and therefore as having finally rejected salvation.[172] He cites Acts 25.24 but one could also mention 24.5. However, it does not appear that he has adequately examined the larger context within which Luke has placed these statements. 1) Paul's accusers charge him with teaching against the people of God (λάος), the Law and the Temple (21.28). Luke regarded these accusations as false (22.12, 17; 24.14f., 17f.; 25.8; 26.5-7, 22; 28.17). Since both of the passages which mention the Jewish people as a whole opposing Paul refer to charges made by his accusers, this claim also appears false. 2) It is not clear that the mob which attempts to lynch Paul is representative of Israel as the people of God. Luke used both ὄχλος (21.27, 34f.) and λάος (vv. 30, 31, 36, 39f.) to describe those involved in the riot. The initial description refers to Asian Jews who incite the crowd (ὄχλος). This emphasizes

---

[170] Maddox, p. 45.

[171] Kodell, p. 340. The people are guilty but ignorant, the real criminals are the nation's leaders; cf. Minear, "Audiences," p. 83. After the largely favourable response of the people (λαός) in Acts 1-5 negative references do again emerge (6.12; 12.4, 11; 21.36), cf. Zehnle, Peter's Pentecost Discourse, p. 65.

[172] Tyson, "Jewish Public," p. 581.

the party nature of the riot and contrasts both with the description of a believing party which received Paul (21.17ff.) and with the false charge that Paul speaks against the people of God (21.28, the only reference in this passage in which λάος clearly has this meaning). This contrast makes it seem unlikely that the secondary references to the crowd using λάος are meant to indicate that the Jewish populace as a whole has turned against the Gospel. 3) The use of the phrases ἡ πολις ὅλη (v.30) and ὅλη . . . Ιερουσαλήμ (v.31) in conjunction with λάος in vv. 30 and 36 makes it seem likely that those two occurrences are a general reference to the population of Jerusalem and not to Israel as the people of God.[173] Similarly, vv. 39f. have a reference to the immediate crowd and do not readily imply a broader theological meaning. The mob cannot be said to indicate that the Jewish people as a whole supported Paul's accusers. 4) In Paul's trials Luke emphasized that certain Jewish parties opposed Paul (23.6, 12[174]; 24.1; 25.2). This heightens the falsity of their claim for popular support against Paul in 24.5 and 25.24. 5) The reference in 24.5 is to Paul's mission in the Diaspora, but from the narrative one knows that all Jews did not reject Paul. Thus the claim of Paul's accusers again appears false.

We can now summarize the results of this brief criticism of Maddox's position. The exegetical basis for his contention that Lucan Christianity is a gentile affair depends on the demonstration of a binary opposition between Jews and gentiles in the economy of salvation, with God rejecting the former in favour of the latter. Without this basis he is left with one body of uncontested evidence, i.e. that Luke does in numerous places direct a strong prophetic rebuke against Israel.[175]

---

[173] BAG, p. 467; cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 616; Strathmann, TDNT IV, p. 51.

[174] Here the 'Jews' refers to just over 40 people, v.13.

[175] Maddox, pp. 45-54.

The question is how this prophetic invective ought to be interpreted.

The importance of the prophetic rebuke of Judaism in Luke-Acts is more acutely focused in the work of James A. Sanders[176] and David Tiede under the ruberic of 'prophetic critique'.[177]

Sanders defines 'prophetic critique' as a challenge to the ethos and self-understanding of a community from the perspective of an insider who does not at the same time reject that community.[178] Sanders bases his analysis on an examination of the hermeneutical axioms used at Qumran and those used by Jesus. The Qumran community interpreted scripture on the basis of two premises: 1) prophetic scripture refers to the End times which are the community's present, and 2) scriptural curses are directed to those outside the community while blessings are reserved exclusively for those inside.[179] He feels that Jesus agreed with the first premise but reversed the second so that the threats of scripture were caused to stand over against the self-certainty of the believing community as a challenge.[180] He identifies two pericopes in Luke where prophetic critique is operative: Lk. 4.16-30,[181] 14.15-24.[182] But did Luke understand this prophetic critique and apply it as Jesus did or did he change its meaning by statically transferring the tradition?

---

[176] J.A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4"; "The Ethic of Election in Luke's Great Banquet Parable," in Essays in Old Testament Ethics, eds. J.L. Crenshaw and J.T. Willis (New York: KTAV, 1974); "Isaiah in Luke," Interp. 36 (1982):145-55.

[177] Cf. Gager, Anti-Semitism, pp. 8f.

[178] J.A. Sanders, "Is. 61 to Lk. 4," p. 95.

[179] J.A. Sanders, "Is. 61 to Lk. 4," pp. 94f.; "Luke's Great Banquet," p. 253.

[180] J.A. Sanders, "Is. 61 to Lk. 4," pp. 96f.

[181] Ibid.

[182] J.A. Sanders, "Luke's Great Banquet," pp. 258ff.

In Sanders' method the identification of the audience is the key.[183] In Jesus' ministry prophetic critique was genuine because it was uttered by a Jew and directed to Jews. But in the church, post-70, he believes that prophetic critique was lost since it no longer functioned as a challenge among insiders but, because it was used by gentiles in their struggle with unbelieving Jews, functioned constitutively, i.e. as a self-legitimation directing the blessings of scripture to insiders, i.e. gentile Christians, and the curses of scripture to outsiders, i.e. Jews.[184] But it must be noted that the evidence for the audience must be distinguished from the evidence of prophetic critique. The same words can have two opposite meanings depending upon the audience to which they are addressed, but they themselves cannot supply the identification of the audience.

Although Sanders feels that Luke did not understand Jesus' prophetic critique he expresses this judgment in a tentative manner which leaves it an open question.[185] David Tiede argues throughout his work that there is in Luke-Acts the genuine prophetic critique of someone positively aligned with Judaism. In favour of Tiede's judgment is the evidence of Luke's redactional hand in the prophetic critique which runs throughout his gospel.[186] But again the meaning of these passages depends on the identification of the audience and the passages themselves cannot supply that identification. At most Tiede's arguments can demonstrate that Luke's negative appraisal of Judaism could have been internal prophetic critique. It does not demonstrate that it was.

---

[183] Ibid., p. 250.

[184] J.A. Sanders, "Luke's Great Banquet," pp. 250f.; "Is. 61 to Lk. 4," p. 98.

[185] J.A. Sanders, "Is. 61 to Lk. 4," pp. 101-4; "Luke's Great Banquet," p. 266.

[186] Lk. 2.34; 4.16-30; 9.5, 26, 41; 10.10-16; 11.29-32, 39-52; 12.54-59; 13.1-9, 24-30, 34-35; 14.15-24; 16.31; 19.12-27, 41-44; 20.16-18; 21.20-24.

Without being able to establish the identity of Luke's audience on other grounds the existence of a strong prophetic invective against Judaism indicates little about the racial makeup of that audience.

There remains one possible means of breaking the impasse. If it can be demonstrated that Luke used a polemic designed to achieve practical unity and fellowship between Jewish and gentile Christians then it can be assumed that the former existed as a distinct group in his community and in sufficient numbers to threaten the community's unity if they were to refrain from fellowship with gentiles.

Larrimore C. Crockett has sought to find such an emphasis in Luke-Acts.[187] In his JBL article Crockett begins by accepting the universally acknowledged programmatic character of Lk. 4.16-30.[188] But in addition to the motif of acceptance/rejection which dominates the whole of this passage he seeks to find in vv. 25-27 an additional introductory theme: Jew-gentile relations.[189] This theme is more easily found in the fuller contexts of I Kg. 17 and II Kg. 5 than it is in Luke's use of these stories about Elijah and Elisha. Luke's terse account draws out only the bare fact that these prophets extended their ministries to non-Israelites. And it is this issue, the inclusion of non-Israelites in the salvation of God, which causes Jesus' rejection at Nazareth.

There are only two other passages in Luke's portrayal of Jesus' ministry which hint at the inclusion of gentiles with Jews in the kingdom: Lk. 13.28 (which also contains a threat of exclusion for Jews) and 14.15ff. Both of these passages support Crockett's thesis and

---

[187] Larrimore C. Crockett, "Luke 4.25-27 and Jewish-Gentile Relations in Luke-Acts," JBL 88 (1969):177-83; and The Old Testament in the Gospel of Luke, Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1966 (University Microfilms, 1984).

[188] Crockett, "Jewish-Gentile Relations," p. 177.

[189] Ibid., p. 180; O.T. in Luke, pp. 318ff.

will be dealt with in the appendix to Chapter 5. But they are a very narrow basis from which to establish Jew-gentile relations as a major Lucan theme. A second possibility is to argue that the Lucan emphasis on Jesus' table fellowship with outcasts is an attack on Jewish exclusivism which implies a freer attitude in Jew-gentile relations.[190] Many such passages do reflect an attack on Jewish exclusivism but the dominant theme they reflect is again acceptance/rejection and the links connecting 'outcast' to 'gentile' are insecure.

It is methodologically more secure to begin with Acts.[191] When Crockett turns his attention to this volume his arguments are more convincing. In Acts 10 and 11 Luke explicitly deals with the issue of relations between Jewish and gentile Christians. There are difficulties in unravelling the historical traditions out of which Luke has constructed these episodes,[192] but the final form of the story of Cornelius' conversion emphasizes two cognate issues: 1) the admission to the church of gentiles without circumcision and 2) social intercourse between Jews and gentiles.[193] It is the second issue which Luke emphasizes as the point of Peter's vision (10.20) and is the point at issue with the conservative party of Jewish Christians at Jerusalem (11.3). This point is reiterated again as the meaning of Peter's vision in 11.12, but the example drawn from the whole affair is the

---

[190] Juel, pp. 37ff.; Crockett, O.T. in Luke, p. 300.

[191] Because of Luke's marked restriction of Jesus' ministry to Israel and his theological programme of progressing from Jew to gentile one should not expect to find this theme developed in the gospel. Krodel, Acts, p. 6; calls Jew-gentile relations, "the basic theological problem of Acts. . .".

[192] Dibelius, pp. 109-23; see Haenchen's, Acts, survey of opinions, pp. 355-57 and his own, pp. 360-63. For contrasting arguments, see Marshall, Acts, pp. 182f.; and Hanson, Acts, pp. 119f.

[193] S.G. Wilson, Gentiles, pp. 173f., 176; BC IV, p. 112; Bruce, Book, p. 215; Neil, Acts, p. 139; Hanson, Acts, p. 120; Marshall, Acts, p. 181; Dibelius, p. 118f., thought these two emphases pointed to two different sources. Cf. C.K. Barrett, New Testament Essays (London: SPCK, 1972), p. 112, who says that Luke confused two separate issues.

inclusion of gentiles, as gentiles, in the salvation of God (11.18), illustrating the manner in which both issues were inextricably bound together.[194] To underscore the importance of these principles Luke immediately describes the founding of the first mixed congregation at Antioch (11.20-26). Peter's experience is again referred to in Acts 15 as justification for Paul's practices in the Diaspora mission. Here the issue which comes to the fore is the admission of the gentiles without circumcision (15.1, 5). But having granted that it is God's will to save the gentiles without circumcision the Council issued a letter designed to facilitate freer contact between Jews and gentiles,[195] again indicating that circumcision and table fellowship could not be separated in Luke's mind.[196]

It is clear that Luke has directed the application of these stories to the problem of Jew-gentile relations. However, one must ask if Luke designed this polemic for problems in the daily inter-personal relationships of his own church or as an historical picture of pristine unity among early Christian groups which would illustrate the continuity of Christianity with Judaism and provide an historical legitimacy for his gentile church. There are several factors which indicate the former.

---

[194]Domestic interpersonal contact between Jews and gentiles thematically pervades Acts 10 and 11. In Acts 10.23 Peter lodges gentiles; v.28, in spite of prohibitions against contact, Peter, under divine compulsion, associates intimately with (κολλάω) gentiles; v.48 he is house guest of Cornelius for some days. That all of these instances imply table fellowship is made clear by 11.3. Interpersonal contact is again the issue in 11.12. Cf. Esler, pp. 140f.; Johannes Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind (London: SCM, 1959, '1954), p. 228.

[195]Regardless of the relationship of these 'courtesy concessions' to what is known of contemporary Jewish debate (Maddox, pp. 38f. says none) or their relationship to Mosaic Law (Wilson, Law, pp. 81ff. says there is little) Luke considered them to have a Mosaic basis and the closest connection is with Levitical legislation governing sojourners (Wilson, Law, p. 92). Cf. Esler, p. 147.

[196]Esler, pp. 116f., 140ff.; cf. S.G. Wilson, Gentiles, pp. 173f.; John Drury, Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study

First, it is true that one lesson Luke drew from the Cornelius episode was that it was God's will to include the gentiles in his salvation.[198] This emphasis is particularly strong in 11.18 and 15.7-18. But as we have seen the cognate emphasis on practical Jew-gentile relationships cannot be removed from Luke's purpose. Not only does the Cornelius episode provide a proto-typical precedent for gentile conversions, it also provides an example of Jew-gentile relations for the founding of the community at Antioch and is carried out programmatically in the Pauline mission. If Luke lived in a world of predominantly gentile churches it is strange that no such church is ever described in Acts. Beginning with Antioch Acts is dominated by mixed congregations.[199] In this context Peter and Cornelius are not

---

in Early Christian Historiography (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976), p. 16 puts forward Ephesians as evidence of the importance of the issue of table fellowship in a comparable time and theological milieu.

[198] Haenchen, Acts, pp. 357ff.; S.G. Wilson, Gentiles, pp. 173-94.

[199] Antioch: 11.20, 22, 25, 27; 13.1
Pisidian Antioch: 13.43, 48; The Jews of v.43 are believers who form the nucleus of the community; Franklin, Christ the Lord, p. 110; Jervell, LPG, p. 44; Haenchen, Acts, p. 413; Jervell, "History and Acts," pp. 19f.
Iconium: 14.1
Lystra: 15.19 strongly implies that there were Jewish as well as gentile believers, a fact confirmed in 16.1-3.
Philippi: 16.13 implies Jewish response to the Gospel. Munck, Acts, p. 161, thinks that προσευχή indicates a synagogue as the location of Paul's preaching; also Greeven, TDNT II, p. 808. Cadbury and Lake, BC IV, pp. 190f., understand it as "nearly synonymous" with συναγωγή; cf. R.J. Knowling, "The Acts of the Apostles," in The Expositor's Greek Testament, vol. II, ed. W.R. Nicoll (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), pp. 344f. F.J. Foakes-Jackson, The Acts of the Apostles (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931), p. 153, writes, ". . . and finding no Jewish community they waited till the sabbath, and went to the river, where they might expect to find any local Jews at prayer." Bruce, Acts, p. 314, thinks that since only women are mentioned that προσευχή here cannot be a synonym for συναγωγή or refer to a building, but is simply 'prayer'; cf. Bruce, Book, p. 331, where he indicates that a Jewish Sabbath prayer service is meant. Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 494; Marshall, Acts, p. 264.
Thessalonica: 17.4
Beroea: 17.12
Athens: This is an exception. Paul argues with Jews here (v.17) but there is no indication of their response.
Corinth: 18.2, 4, 8, 15
Ephesus: 19.9f.

only an example of how to convert a gentile but also serve as a paradigm for fellowship between Jews and gentiles in a mixed church (a strikingly different paradigmatic use of Peter than that presented by Paul in Gal. 2.11-15). The example of Cornelius cannot be reduced to his conversion by Peter under the direction of God -- a picture which could function to provide roots for a gentile church cut off from Jews and questioning its legitimacy. Similarly the Lucan Paul does not just baptize gentiles, he also eats with them.[200] Luke emphasizes that the inclusion of gentiles in the salvation of God means that they should be free to associate with Jews. Such a strong emphasis is most reasonably explained as resulting from the issue's importance in his own community setting.[201]

Secondly, this emphasis on fellowship does not fit with the idea that Luke's polemic was designed to highlight the unanimity of the early church on the issue of the admission of the gentiles. He does not gloss over the division of opinion on this issue. The opposing viewpoints are starkly contrasted in 11.2f. and even though Luke represents a general acknowledgement of God's will in the matter (11.18) the opposition was not converted but only silenced in their opposition.[202] Luke does not try to soften the friction evident in the issue's reemergence in 15.1-5. Luke represents the achievement of a consensus on the basis of James' pronouncement, but this did not solve the problem. The issue of Jews relating to gentiles and the latter's admission to the church is an open issue throughout Acts. It is found in the Pauline mission (13.45, 50; 16.3; 17.4f., 12f.; 18.6; 19.9), as intra-Christian debate (21.17-26, 28f.), and as a major issue in the Pauline trial sequence (21.21f.; 26.17-23 both of which are connected

---

[200] Esler, p. 144. [201] Ibid.

[202] ἡσύχασαν; cf. Lk. 14.4 and Acts 21.14.

to 23.6 and 24.14f., 21 by the connection of the gentile mission with the resurrection). Thus even though Luke claims that the issue has been decided by God, approved by the Apostles and elders of Jerusalem, and given theoretical formulation, he does not indicate that a practical working resolution had been implemented in the church. It was a live issue for his readers.

Finally, if Luke's picture of gentiles in Acts functioned to provide continuity with the Jewish beginnings of Christianity but at the same time did not reflect actual attitudes Luke wished to instill in his own gentile readers the resultant tension would function to emphasize discontinuity rather than continuity.[203] The gentiles of Acts are designed to placate conservatively-minded Jewish Christians. They lead exemplary lives as 'God-fearers' and friends of Israel who readily accept the courtesy agreement of the Apostolic Council. Frictions with the Jews are not the fault of those engaged in the mission to the gentiles nor of their converts.[204] It is this picture of gentiles eager to maintain good relations with Jews which serves as the basis for Luke's picture of the unity of the early church. If Luke's own gentiles have none of these attitudes then they have no basis on which to relate to their forebearers in Acts. If Luke's own gentiles are not seeking to achieve practical fellowship with Jewish Christians then the tension between their own situation and that of the paradigmatic church of Acts would create a sense of discontinuity rather than continuity.

Relations between Jewish and gentile Christians were a problem for Luke and his readers. This problem was to be resolved by a mutual give-and-take. Jewish Christians must admit God's intention to save

---

[203] Cf. Esler, pp. 67f.

[204] Maddox, pp. 43ff.

gentiles free from the Law and circumcision. The gentiles must on their part make concessions which will ease Jewish consciences.[205] It was hoped that the two groups would engage in table fellowship demonstrating the unity of the church. It may be concluded that Jewish Christians comprised a sociologically significant segment in the Lucan community.

E. Boundary Definition

No collectivity of human beings can persist as a distinct social organism without establishing boundaries between itself and the outside world.[206] One must be able to distinguish members from non-members in order for a social grouping to maintain its functions and to be identifiable to both insiders and outsiders. If a group does not establish boundaries and internal cohesion,[207] its members will be reabsorbed by other bounded groups in the environment and it will cease to exist.[208] There are five categories of boundary definition which can be seen to have been operative in the Lucan community: 1) Ritual Boundaries, 2) Specialized Language, 3) The Construction of a New Cosmos, 4) Boundaries imposed by External Forces, and 5) Cohesion achieved by Internal Conflicts.

One means by which groups establish and maintain boundaries is by the use of initiatory rites, rituals which mark the separation of

---

[205]Cf. Wilson, Law, p. 81, who sees this as relevant for Christians in Luke's own day.

[206]Martin E. Olsen, The Process of Social Organization: Power in Social Systems, 2nd ed. (New York & London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1978, '1968), p. 56; Meeks, p. 84; Morton Deutsch, "Group Behaviour," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, vol. 6, ed. David L. Sills (New York: Macmillan & Co. & The Free Press, 1968), p. 271.

[207]". . . the resultant of all the forces acting on the members to remain in the group." Leon Festinger, "Informal Social Communication," PR 57 (1950):274.

[208]Cf. Olsen, p. 59.

an individual from his former environment or status and cover his transition to and incorporation into a new environment or status.[209] In the Lucan community several concepts and actions served to mark one's initiation into the Christian community and thereby his separation from other groups. These were repentance,[210] baptism, and the reception of the Spirit.[211]

Repentance is a strongly Lucan concept.[212] In the gospel it usually signifies an ethical-religious decision understood in Jewish prophetic-moral categories, i.e. a turning away from sin to return to the God of Israel and a life in congruence with his revealed will.[213]

---

[209]Victor W. Turner, The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 94; cf. Olsen, p. 57.

[210]See Acts 2.38. Alternately Luke speaks of 'believing' as the initial step toward becoming a Christian, Acts 4.4; 5.14; 8.12; 9.42; 13.12, 48; 14.1; 15.7; 17.12, 34. Cf. Fitzmyer, p. 235f. It is clear from several of these contexts that Luke uses forms of πιστεύω as 'cover words' for the entire conversion process. In 2.44 πιστεύοντες is used to summarize the repentance and baptism described in 2.38-41. In 11.18 μετάνοια is used to give content to πιστεύσασιν (v.17) which is a cover word for the whole conversion process as experienced by Jews and gentiles with specific reference to Cornelius' conversion in 10.43-48 which included repentance (implied in v.43), baptism and the reception of the Spirit. In 13.38f. forgiveness of sins, implying repentance, is linked with 'believing'. In 15.19 ἐπιστρέφω (closely related to μετανοέω in Luke, Fitzmyer, pp. 237f.) is used to sum up the conversion of the gentiles in Paul's ministry, an act which Luke has described with the use of πιστεύω (13.48; 14.1, 23). Finally, in 19.1-7 Paul progresses from a general question about 'believing' (v.2) to a more specific question about baptism (v.3).

[211]On the importance of all three aspects in the Lucan initiation process see Fitzmyer, pp. 235-41; Marshall, LHT, pp. 193-98; G.W.H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," Studies in the Gospels, ed. D.E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), p. 186; J.K. Parratt, "The Holy Spirit and Baptism: Part I, The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles," ET 82 (1970-72):235; F.F. Bruce, "The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles," Interp. 27 (1973):176; Conzelmann, Theology, p. 229.

[212]μετανοέω: Mt. 5x; Mk. 2x; Lk. 9x; Acts 5x.
μετάνοια: Mt. 2x; Mk. 1x; Lk. 5x; Acts 6x.

[213]Lk. 5.32; 15.7; 10.13; 11.32; 13.3, 5; 15.10; 16.30; 17.3, 4. On the ethical connotations of repentance see Conzelmann, Theology, p. 229; Marshall, LHT, p. 194; Fitzmyer, p. 237.

But the conjunction of the call to repentance with the person and ministry of Jesus (e.g. Lk. 5.32; 10.13; 11.32; 16.30f.) and the occurrence of the theme in a Christian gospel indicates that the functional importance of repentance involved far more than a mere decision for a change in moral life style made within the confines of one system of meaning. Repentance was, in effect, a decision to adopt a new system of meaning, i.e. a new symbolic universe. This is clear in Lk. 24.47. Here the preaching of repentance is set in the context of the cornerstone of the Christian cosmos: Christology. The preaching of repentance and forgiveness of sins (linking purity to repentance as a boundary marker) in the name of the Christ indicates that a shift in moral universes must take place in repentance. This connection is frequently made in Acts.[214] Repentance functioned in the Lucan community to indicate a shift in the moral universe toward which one was oriented and thereby a shift in the ethical/religious basis by which self-identification was made. Those inside the community were 'repentant', i.e. they had made a decision to orient their ethical lives and their self-identity toward a Christ-centred symbolic universe. Those outside the community were 'unrepentant', i.e. they were oriented toward a different ethical universe, either that of Hellenistic-Roman culture or of Judaism.

Baptism is closely linked to repentance as a ritual symbol of the purity achieved by the forgiveness of sins which is granted to those who have repented.[215] The origins of Christian baptism and their relationship to their Hellenistic-Judaic environment are not a problem which affects this investigation. Luke inherited baptism as a firmly Christian ritual in his traditions. In its larger Hellenistic environment baptism was known as a rite signifying

---

[214] Acts 2.38; 3.19-20; 5.31; 17.30f.; 19.4; 20.21.

[215] Acts 2.38.

repeated ritual purification or as an initiatory rite which also involved purification.[216] Lucan Christians recognized elements of purification and initiation in baptism. This is most clearly seen in the debate represented in Acts 11. Here issues of purity and Peter's ritual recognition of God's fait accompli, i.e. his baptism of Cornelius and his household, are intermingled in a debate which ends with the acknowledgement that the gentiles must be admitted to the community on the basis of their purification by God.

Anthropological studies indicate two means by which such initiatory rites serve to promote group boundaries and internal cohesion. Victor Turner in his study of initiatory rites characterizes the state of the initiate during the rite as 'liminal'.[217] The initiate exists in an inter-structural situation, detached from the structures of his previous existence but not yet a part of the new structures into which he is being initiated.[218] He uses the term 'communitas' to refer to the social relationship between initiates during this limited period.[219] 'Communitas' is essentially an experience of social levelling and resultant heightened intimacy. If the initiation is an integration into the dominant societal culture this sense of 'communitas' among initiates will, in many instances, be lost. But if one is initiated into a group which is marginal to the dominant culture the group may continue to exhibit features of 'communitas'.[220] It may be assumed that the experience of Christian baptism functioned to provide such a continuing sense of 'communitas' among initiates not only in the

---

[216] A. Oepke, TDNT I, pp. 529-38.

[217] Victor W. Turner, The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Nbembu Ritual (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1967), p. 93.

[218] Ibid.

[219] Turner, The Ritual Process, pp. 94ff.

[220] Ibid.

Lucan community but in early Christianity, in general, owing to its marginal character.[221]

Concepts of purity are a powerful force in establishing group boundaries.[222] The Lucan community stood in a tradition which had repudiated Jewish dietary customs as a means of establishing purity (Acts 11.9, 12, 18). As a replacement Luke did not develop a strong purity vocabulary. But one can establish that he and his community had redefined purity in terms of their christology. Luke used the ἅγιος word group only 6x to refer to the 'saints' as those sanctified by God (Acts 9.13, 32, 41; 26.10; 20.32; 26.18). Acts 26.18 is instructive in that here Luke connects the use of ἁγιάζω with the forgiveness of sins. If one follows this concept through Acts 10, 11, and 15 one finds that Peter's proclamation of the forgiveness of sins in Jesus' name (10.43) was interrupted by the reception of the Spirit by Cornelius and his household. That the interruption of Peter's sermon by the Spirit at this point was not fortuitous on Luke's part can be seen in Acts 11.15-18. Here the gift of the Spirit to the gentiles is seen as evidence that they had been granted repentance (μετανοία). The connection of 'repentance' with the 'forgiveness of sins' is strongly Lucan (Lk. 3.3; 24.47; Acts 5.31). Further, in 15.8f. the gift of the Spirit to the gentiles is linkedwith the concept of their having been cleansed (καθαρίζω) by God; connecting 'purity', 'repentance' and the 'forgiveness of sins'. The connection of these concepts with the community's christology is made in Lk. 24.47 and followed up in Acts 13.38 and 22.16. The association of repentance

---

[221] Cf. Meeks, pp. 88f.

[222] See esp. Mary Douglas, Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966), pp. 2-5, 41-57, 114-24; see also idem., Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology (London: Barrie & Rockliff; The Cresset Press, 1970).

and the forgiveness of sins with purity in the context of the community's christology is, in part, an effort to establish a functional boundary by redefining purity in terms of a Christian symbolic universe.

As stated, baptism marked the ritual boundary of the community. Closely associated with baptism, yet without a formal or consistent connection, is the reception of the Spirit by the believer.[223] It is the reception of the Spirit which is the evidence par excellence that demonstrates one's membership in the community.[224] At this point we wish to postpone the question of enthusiastic manifestations of the Spirit's presence and centre on the presence of the Spirit, however defined, as the marker of the community's boundaries. This can be seen in three examples: Acts 8.12ff.; 5.31f.; and 10.44-11.18. In Acts 8.14f. it is significant that Luke connects the reception of the word of God by the Samaritans with the necessity of the reception of the Spirit. When Peter and John go to Samaria in order for the Samaritans to receive the Spirit this serves to legitimate the Samaritans' place in the church and their connection with the original Jerusalem community. The importance of the Spirit in legitimating one's place in the church can be further seen in Acts 10 and 11. Here the normal Lucan pattern of acceptance by the community representative, baptism, and the reception of the Spirit,[225] is modified for the inclusion of the first gentiles. Cornelius and his household are first filled with the Spirit, then baptized, and finally, only after an open community debate, accepted fully into the community. It is God's gift of the Spirit to the gentiles which is proof of their

---

[223] Cf. Bruce, "Spirit," p. 176.

[224] Cf. Käsemann, Essays, p. 141.

[225] Bruce, "Spirit," p. 175; Acts 2.38; 8.12-17. Cf. 9.17f. where the order is acceptance, Spirit, baptism.

salvation and that they must be accepted into the church (Acts 10.47; 11.15-17). The argument is repeated in Acts 15. In both cases it is the Spirit which determines who is in and who is out. The Spirit has a similar functional utility in Acts 5.31f. where the apostles, to whom God has given the Spirit, stand over against the Sanhedrin who Luke assumes do not have the Spirit.

It is also significant that nearly all examples of the reception of the Spirit are set in the context of apostolic preaching and traditions.[226] References to the Spirit in Acts 1.8 and 9.17 are both set in the context of apostolic commissions. The one in 1.8 is also linked to Lk. 24.46-49 and the emphasis on apostolic traditions of Old Testament interpretation found there. In Acts 2 the manifestation of the Spirit in the apostolic community and its promise to Peter's audience are, on the one hand, explained in the context of an apostolic sermon and, on the other, presuppose the acceptance of the traditions contained in that sermon. In Acts 4.31 the Spirit is mentioned in connection with a further empowering of the apostles in order to 'speak the word with boldness'. In 5.32 the Spirit is introduced to legitimate the leadership and message of the apostles over against the Sanhedrin. In 8.14 the Spirit functions to connect the new Samaritan community with the apostolic Urgemeinde.[227] In Acts 10 the Spirit falls in the midst of Peter's sermon and from the narrative it is clear that his presentation of apostolic traditions was the prerequisite for the gentiles' reception of the Spirit. God could not just give the Spirit to the gentiles in vacuo, it required

---

[226] Cf. the remarks of J.A. Ziesler, "The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles," JSNT 4 (1979):34, about Luke's having "gospelized" the context of healing manifestations. See further, L. Legrand, "The Structure of Acts 2: The Integral Dimensions of the Charismatic Movement According to Luke," ITS 19 (1982):193-209 who shows that Luke redactionally relates charismatic phenomena with the spread of the word and Christian koinonia.

[227] Bruce, "Spirit," pp. 174f.

divine machinations to move Peter to Cornelius' house to preach in order that there would be a context for the Spirit's coming. And Barnabas, a man full of the Spirit and a representative of the Jerusalem community, was sent to Antioch in a move which served to legitimate that community by firmly connecting it with the Urgemeinde.[228] All of this corresponds with the emphasis on the handing down of traditions in Lk. 1.1-4. It is the Spirit, present in the context of apostolic teaching, which unites believers to one another and creates a practicable social boundary which can serve to make the church a distinguishable entity.[229]

A second manner in which groups establish boundaries is the development of specialized language. This is a use of words and phrases which acquire nuances of meaning cogent to insiders but not readily accessible to outsiders.[230] Or it can be language which serves to construct emotional bonding among those in the group or the use of set phrases expressing binary oppositions which emphasize the group's separation from the world.[231] The constant repetition of such phrases by those in the group tends to reinforce group identity.

Luke's characteristic use of the participial forms of πιστεύω as a self-designation of the Christian community is an example of

---

[228]This leaves two examples unaccounted for. Acts 19.1-8, whatever its historical kernel, is for Luke most probably an example of neophytes or heterodox Christians coming into the apostolic fold. Stephen (Acts 6.5), is the great champion of Hellenist theology and serves to trace its roots to apostolic connections.

[229]Cf. G.W.H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1951), p. 51; Käsemann, Essays, p. 141; Bruce, "Spirit," pp. 173-75; Marshall, LHT, pp. 201ff.

[230]See the discussion of specialized meaning structures in Mary Cathrine Bateson, "Ritualization: A Study in Texture and Texture Change," in Religious Movements in Contemporary America, eds. Irving I. Zaretsky and Mark P. Leone (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), pp. 150-65; and Berger and Luckmann, pp. 49-59, 82-90.

[231]Meeks, pp. 85, 94.

language which had meanings relevant to insiders but not accessible to outsiders. Cadbury may be correct in stating that irregularities in Luke's usage indicate that this was not a fixed or formal term,[232] but we have already seen that Luke used forms of πιστεύω as 'catch words' symbolizing the specific content of the Christian conversion/initiation process (see note 210). It is this specialized context conjoined with the loose but repeated description of Christians as 'believers' which indicates that it functioned as part of a specialized in-group vocabulary. One would have had to have been a 'believer' himself or to have received detailed instruction from a 'believer' about Christian conversion and its relationship to apostolic traditions in order to catch the full significance of the simple symbol expressed by a participle of πιστεύω. Its specialized meanings were obvious to those who stood within the meaning structure of the Christian community but were not readily apparent to those who stood outside of this meaning structure.

The use of familial language, reinforcing interpersonal bonding, was an important aspect of group boundary definition among early Christians.[233] This seemingly universal Christian practice of referring to one another as 'brothers', which was taken over from Judaism,[234] was also taken for granted among Lucan Christians.[235] The relative lack of such language in Luke-Acts in comparison with Paul has two causes. The first is that Luke does not develop theological categories based on family analogies.[236] The second is his use of a narrative

---

[232] BC V, p. 382; cf. S. Brown, Apostacy, p. 41.

[233] Meeks, pp. 86-88.

[234] Edwin Hatch, The Organization of the Early Christian Churches, The Bampton Lectures of 1880 (London: Rivingtons, 1881), p. 44. The practice was not unknown among Greeks and Romans, Meeks, p. 87; note 73, p. 225.

[235] E.g. Acts 1.15f.; 9.17; 14.2; 15.3, 23, 32, 36; 16.40; 17.10, 14; 21.7, 20; 28.15. Fitzmyer, p. 252, speaks of Luke's use of ἀδέλφος as a term implying a close knit community.

[236] Paul uses 'adoption' as a soteriological category and 'the household of God' as an ecclesiological category.

genre rather than epistles to express himself. At the one point in the narrative where Luke shifts into an epistolary mode the language of emotional bonding is more evident (Acts 15.23-29). Strong emotional bonds among Christians are evident at several points in Acts, especially in the offering of hospitality to one another.[237] It is interesting that Luke seeks to translate the significance of Christian familial bonding into terms understandable in his larger Hellenistic milieu.[238] This illustrates a tendency in the Lucan community to maintain gaps in its boundaries which allow communication and understanding with its larger social environment.

Luke inherited the use of ἐκκλησία as a Christian self-designation. Even though this usage is probably derived from Judaism via the LXX,[239] in a Hellenistic context it is still significant that, rather than referring to themselves as a religious association the Lucan community, in common with other Christian communities, chose to refer to itself as an ἐκκλησία, a term which would signify to the uninitiate the voting assembly of citizens of a free Greek city.[240] Luke used it to indicate the organized local Christian community.[241] It indicates a distinct self-awareness on the part of the Christian community.

There is little evidence in Luke-Acts of regular terms to refer to outsiders or of developed soteriological contrasts, both of

---

[237] Acts 16.15, cf. v.40; 20.37f.; 21.4f., 7, 11-13; 28.15.

[238] See Acts 2.42ff. & 4.32ff., which are structured to associate Christian community with the Hellenistic 'topos' of friendship; see p. 111.

[239] Hans Conzelmann, An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1969), p. 35.

[240] Meeks, pp. 93f.; Robert Wilken, The Christians as the Romans Saw Them (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1984), p. 33.

[241] Fitzmyer, p. 252; K.N. Giles, "Luke's Use of the Term 'ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ' with Special Reference to Acts 20.28 and 9.31," NTS 31 (1985):135-42. Exceptions are: Acts 7.38; 19.32, 39, 41.

which would indicate a strong sense of separation from the world.[242] Luke's acceptance/rejection motif could have lent itself to the development of an insider/outsider language contrast, but while the first half of the contrast was developed in numerous Christian self-designations, e.g. 'believers', 'disciples', etc., the latter half is lacking. There are passages in the gospel which contrast the 'poor' and the 'rich', but it has already been demonstrated that the use of these terms was neither absolute nor consistently carried out and that these were not terms of self-designation in use in the community (Ch. 3, pp. 97ff.). Nor is there a contrast between 'Jews' and 'gentiles' in Acts. The Jews as a class stand neither wholly outside the community nor wholly inside it (see above pp. 125ff.) and 'gentile' is hardly a designation which would identify one as a community member. Similarly, the contrast in the gospel between 'sinners' and the 'righteous' (e.g. Lk. 5.32) is part of Luke's acceptance/rejection motif and does not represent terms in use in the community for insiders and outsiders. Similarly there are few examples of language expressing soteriological contrasts. The father of Luke's Prodigal speaks of his son as having been 'dead but now alive' and 'lost but now found' (15.32), but these contrasts do not appear elsewhere. Peter exhorts the crowds at Pentecost to save themselves from 'this crooked generation' (Acts 2.40), a characterization which corresponds to several contrasts made in the gospel (Lk. 7.31; 10.13-15; 11.29-32, 50), but it is not reinforced in a formal stylization nor further developed in Acts. It may be concluded that the language of Luke-Acts indicates that the Lucan community had a strong sense of self-identity which stemmed from their self-awareness as Christians and interrelation with one another. This self-identity was not however,

---

[242] Both categories are suggested by Meeks' formative study, pp. 94-96.

dependent on a reciprocal deprecation of those outside the community. Lucan Christians were world-open, their own self-identity did not require the application of negative designations to those outside the community, a process which would have erected inflexible social barriers.

A third means by which groups establish boundaries is in the construction of a shared system of culture, values, and norms.[243] This process can occur on several levels from the construction of a specialized sub-culture within a total cultural system of meaning to the construction of a new symbolic universe.[244] Social reality as experienced by a given group requires a basis, i.e. a group of referents who think and feel alike and share similar beliefs.[245] Luke, like other early Christians, was engaged in a process of 'world-building',[246] i.e. based on Christian traditions and experience of the Spirit he was constructing a new picture ". . . of the way things in sheer actuality are".[247] It has already been indicated above that Christology was the cornerstone of this new sacred cosmos. But there were two means by which this functioned to provide distinct boundaries for Lucan Christians.

In relation to its pagan environment the Lucan community distinguished itself on the basis of the Christian adaptation of exclusive monotheism and the avoidance of immorality.[248] Monotheism was a distinguishing factor in Judaism which functioned with Torah

---

[243]Olsen, p. 57.

[244]Berger and Luckmann, pp. 90-121.

[245]Festinger, "Social Communication," pp. 272f.; Deutsch, pp. 269, 273.

[246]Gager, Kingdom, pp. 2-10.

[247]Geertz, p. 127.

[248]Acts 15.20; 21.25 adapt a Jewish definition of immorality to a Christian context.

observance, circumcision, food laws, and sabbath to establish a marked boundary between Jews and non-Jews.[249] The Christian adoption of exclusive monotheism was, "For them as for the Jews in a Greek city, . . . the focus of their differences from others and . . . the basis for unity among believers".[250] The difference for Lucan Christians was that their redefinition of purity on the basis of a Christology which eradicated the need for circumcision and strict Torah observance as distinguishing marks for adherents of the One True God allowed an open acceptance of gentiles. This does not imply that ethical boundaries were not also functional. Adherence to the God of Israel on the basis of faith in Christ required repentance. This meant the acceptance of high ethical standards in sexual mores (Lk. 7.37, cf. v.48; Acts 15.20, 29), social justice (see above p. 106), use of money (Lk. 16.13, Acts 5.1-11, Lk. 18.22) and the repudiation of pride (Lk. 20.46f.) and magic (Acts 8.19-24; 19.18-20). The use of exclusive monotheism as a distinguishing characteristic can be seen in the anti-idolatry polemics which form the basis of events narrated at Lystra (Acts 14.8-18), Athens (17.16-34) and Ephesus (19.23-41).

A christological definition of ultimate reality was also a factor which distinguished Christians, both Jewish and gentile, from non-Christian Jews. This is most clearly evident in that when Luke talks about sin in a Jewish context it is preeminently the sin of having rejected the Messiah (Lk. 2.34; 9.5; 10.10-15; 11.29-32; 13.1-5; 16.30f.; Acts 2.17-38, esp. v.36; 3.17-21; 5.30-32; 7.51-53). It is the new picture of ontic reality in a christologically-defined universe which distinguished the Lucan Christian from both Jew and

---

[249] Meeks, pp. 91f.; cf. Michael Green, Evangelism in the Early Church (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1978, '1970), pp. 156f.; Borgen, p. 56; Robert L. Wilken, "The Christians as the Romans (and Greeks) Saw Them"; Sanders, p. 104.

[250] Meeks, p. 92.

Pagan and established an ultimate group boundary which could be crossed only by repentance, baptism, and the reception of the Spirit.

Closely related to the construction of a distinctive cosmos is the idea of a special revelation which is the private property of the group and thereby gives them a monopoly on the 'Truth' and accentuates boundaries with those outside the group who are not privileged in this manner.[251] There is one 'Q' passage in Luke (10.21-24, cf. Mt. 11.25-30, 13.16-17) which could be interpreted in this manner. However, Luke's consistent emphasis on the public and rational nature of Christian revelation (Acts 6.9f.; 9.22, 29; 17.3, 11, 17; 18.4, 28) and its positive relation to world events (Lk. 1.5; 2.1f.; 3.1f.; Acts 18.2; 9.15; and esp. 26.26) argue against making much of this isolated passage. Lucan Christians, in contrast with Johannine,[252] did not perceive the boundaries between themselves and the world in an isolationist manner.

A fourth manner in which group boundaries may be established is by factors external to the group. The erection of such boundaries is one of the functions of social conflict.[253] Conflicts between groups serve to promote group cohesion and identity and to intensify the awareness of 'we'-'they' distinctions.[254] It has also been demonstrated that a common expectation among group members of being treated alike by others or associated together in others' minds increase group cohesion and identity.[255] "If a sect expects the

---

[251] Ibid.; cf. B. Wilson, Religion, p. 91.

[252] Wayne A. Meeks, "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism," JBL 91 (1972):44-72.

[253] Lewis A. Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956), pp. 33-38, 87ff.

[254] Cf. Harnack, Expansion I, pp. 66f.

[255] Deutsch, p. 270.

larger society to be hostile toward it, and if society obliges by attacking the sect, the experience is a strong reinforcement of group boundaries."[256] The Lucan community conflicted with both its Jewish and Pagan environments.

In Acts Jews attack Christians on two main issues: 1) the threat to Jewish identity represented in attitudes toward the Torah (Acts 6.11, 14; cf. 11.3; cf. 15.1; 18.13; 21.21), the Temple (Acts 6.14; 24.6), and association with gentiles (22.21f., cf. 11.3 and 15.1) and 2) jealousy over Christian missionary success among gentiles (13.45; 17.5). This was because the Christian mission allowed gentiles access to the Jewish God in a manner which inherently eradicated the Jewish monopoly on monotheism and thus eroded the social power they could wield from that monopoly.[257] Attacks against Christians in these areas would have reinforced their sense of group identity and cohesion based on the shared christology which underlay their actions in these areas.

It is of course difficult to move from the historical narrative of Acts to the assumption that identical attacks were taking place against the Lucan community. One major difference, as argued in Chapter 1, is that Luke's community was not experiencing overt persecution but a time of relative peace. But the absence of 'persecution' does not imply that there were not areas of friction or conflict. The point here is that the issues Luke portrays as underlying the persecution of

---

[256] Meeks, p. 96.

[257] Gülzow, p. 196. There are two other issues raised by Jews. Political charges are made by Jews against Christians (Lk. 23.2, Acts 17.7), which indicate that Jews felt that Christians could upset the delicate political balance they had achieved with the Imperium. Christology is also a repeated bone of contention (Acts 18.5f.; 18.28). This is probably a 'cover issue' for the specifics of Torah observance and the inclusion of gentiles, both of which depended on a christological basis. There is evidence from Lk. 6.22; 12.11; and 21.12 (confirmed in Acts 18.6f. and 19.9) that community members expected to be expelled from the synagogues. In 6.22 Luke's use of ἀφορίζω probably refers to synagogue expulsion (Fitzmyer, p. 635; contra. Marshall, Luke, p. 252).

the early church were still recognizable to his readers. These issues were perceived as points of contention which defined the differences between Christians, both Jewish and gentile, and non-Christian Jews.

Pagans are normally represented by Luke as opposing Christians under Jewish instigation (see above pp. 127f.). But pagan opposition free from Jewish interference arose over the issues of the proselytism of Roman citizens to a non-Roman religion (16.21), political subversion (17.7), intellectual prejudice (17.32), and the charge of instigating social upheaval and atheism by neglecting the gods (19.23ff.). Luke's report of such conflicts as occuring in the 50's and evidence from the 2nd and 3rd centuries indicate that these issues were a source of perennial conflict between pagans and Christians. This makes it seem reasonable that, although not producing overt persecution, such issues were recognizable areas of tension between Lucan Christians and their pagan neighbours which will have helped to reinforce group identity and cohesion.

A fifth manner in which group boundaries are defined is in the process of internal conflict. Any form of disloyalty threatens group unity and identity.[258] But among the forms of potential disloyalty heresy is perceived as a greater threat than apostasy because heretics incipiently errode the basis of the group's identity in the symbolic universe while apostates are merely deserters.[259] However, the actions of both heretics and apostates put pressure on those remaining in the group to draw together in order to strengthen the group.[260] The only direct evidence of such internal conflict in the Lucan church is in Acts 20.29f. There is no indication of the nature of these

---

[258] Coser, p. 69. [259] Ibid.

[260] Ibid.; cf. Olsen, p. 57; Stanley Schachter, "Social Cohesion," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, vol. 1, ed. David L. Sills (New York: Macmillan & The Free Press, 1968), p. 543.

subversives. C.H. Talbert's contention that some elements of Lucan theology are designed as an anti-gnostic polemic is still far from proven.[261] The most that can be said with certainty is that some elements of Luke's portrayal of Jesus could also have been put to ready use against gnostics, if one could be sure of their existence on other grounds. Nevertheless, Paul's farewell address to the Ephesian elders is sufficient evidence that such a dynamic was at work in the Lucan church to promote group cohesion and boundaries.

F. Social Structures and Institutions[262]

All social groups which exist over time, order and structure their existence by the development of formal roles and institutions.[263] This happens when repeated social actions become habitual and as habitual are typified and associated with typified actors.[264] Roles also develop in the process of habitualization and by their representation of the institutionalized order of life enable an actor to become a part of his social world.[265] In this section we will seek to sketch, for the Lucan community, what Leander Keck has called the "ethos" of early Christianity, those actions and relationships which have become customary for a group,[266] i.e. the regularized and familiar patterns of actions, roles, and institutions which form the structural fabric for the ordering of daily existence.

---

[261] See R.F. O'Toole, "Why Did Luke Write Acts (Lk.-Acts)?", BTB 7 (1977):68f., for criticisms.

[262] The related theological question of Luke's relationship to Early Catholicism is discussed in Chapter 6, note 38.

[263] Berger & Luckmann, pp. 70ff., 90f.; Deutsch, p. 265.

[264] Berger & Luckmann, pp. 71f.

[265] Ibid., pp. 90ff.

[266] Keck, "Ethos," p. 440.

Along with baptism[267] Lucan Christianity practised the universal Christian ritual of the Lord's Supper. The single most notable fact about the Lord's Supper in Luke-Acts is that it is so rarely and so ambiguously mentioned. However, it is certain that the phrase τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου (Acts 2.42; Lk. 24.35 and related verbal phrases, Acts 2.46; 20.7, 11) is at least a reference to the Lord's Supper, although this is probably understood to have taken place in the context of a common meal.[268] The only exception is Acts 27.35 which cannot be understood as the Christian eucharist.[269] Additional evidence can be found in Lk. 24.30-35[270] and in Lk. 22.14-38. From these brief

---

[267]Baptism has already been discussed above, pp. 142ff., and will not be mentioned again here.

[268]Behm, TDNT III, pp. 729ff.; Conzelmann, Apg., p. 37; Bruce, Book, p. 79, thinks the phrase refers to the eucharist because it is by nature trivial and the emphasis Luke places on it is explicable only in light of its significance since Jesus' death (he follows R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, pp. 312ff., on this point). Bruce, Acts, p. 100, thinks that the incorporation of the eucharist in a common meal (2.42) is indicated by v.46, where the meal is placed in the context of households eating together. For similar opinions see Hans-Josef Klauck, Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981), p. 50; Hanson, Acts, p. 70; Haenchen, Acts, p. 191; Marshall, Acts, p. 83; Neil, Acts, p. 81. On Acts 20.7, 11 which also give evidence of the Christian institution of meeting on the first day of the week, see Neil, Acts, p. 211; Haenchen, Acts, p. 584; Marshall, Acts, pp. 325, 327; idem., LHT, p. 213; Bruce, Book, p. 408; idem., Acts, p. 372. For a tentative but opposite opinion see BC IV, pp. 28, 255f.

[269]Phillippe H. Menoud, "The Acts of the Apostles and the Eucharist," in Jesus Christ and the Faith, trans. E.M. Paul (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1978), pp. 96f. argues that the eucharist is to be understood here; also Krodel, Acts, pp. 81f. Hanson, Acts, p. 250, thinks this possible but improbable; Marshall, Acts, pp. 413f., acknowledges the possibility but rightly indicates that the mixed company who share in the meal militates against this. Flat denials are given by BC IV, p. 336; Haenchen, Acts, p. 707; Bruce, Acts, p. 465; idem., Book, p. 517.

[270]Luke and his readers would have gleaned from this story expectations for their own eucharistic meals (Caird, Luke, p. 259; Marshall, Lk., pp. 898ff.; BC IV, p. 28; Manson, Luke, p. 268; Kee, Miracle , p. 207; R.F. O'Toole, "Activity of the Risen Jesus in Luke-Acts," Biblica 62 (1981):483); regardless of the historical improbability that this meal was actually a celebration of the Lord's Supper. Commentators who deny a reference to the eucharist on these grounds, Morris, p. 340; Plummer, pp. 556f.,have missed its significance for its Christian readers. B.P. Robinson, "The Place of the Emmaus Story in Luke-Acts,"

references several social functions can be outlined.

First, the eucharistic meal is represented in its origins in conjunction with the most sacred and all encompassing symbol of the Christian universe. It has dominical status and sanction. The meal and the need to participate in it are legitimated on the highest possible level. Further it is a legitimation which encompasses the existence of the church. The sanctions for its legitimacy rest not only in the historical past of the Last Supper but also in the eschatological future of the coming kingdom (Lk. 22.16, 18), thus bounding the existence of the church. Secondly, the eucharist relates the believer to the Christian symbolic universe. It functions to integrate the believer with the meaning structures of that universe. This can be seen in Lk. 24.30-35. Here it is expected that the Lord, though unseen, will be recognizable in the eucharist so that the table fellowship between disciple and Lord, common to Jesus' pre-Easter ministry, is not interrupted by his death and resurrection. Third, this integration is accomplished in the context of a fellowship meal (Acts 2.42, 46; 20.7, 11). Personal integration within the Christian symbolic universe is connected with integration into the community. In the context of the shared intimacy of eating together these Christians added a ritual acknowledgement of shared meaning structures and resultant interdependence.[271]

NTS 30 (1984):481-97, has argued that there are no references to the Lord's Supper as a repetitive institutional remembrance of Christ's death. He argues instead that Luke understands the 'breaking of bread' as an eschatological prefigurement of the messianic banquet. The basis of his argument is a questionable use of the 'short text' at Lk. 22.17-19ab. (Against this see Fitzmyer, pp. 1388f.) Also behind his analysis lays an unspoken, probably unconscious, and incorrect assumption that Luke's church existed in a sort of vacuum untouched by the practice of the eucharist in other Christian communities.

[271]The importance of the commonality of the meal is heightened if one acknowledges the importance of referents for personal identity in the ancient world. See Bruce Malina, "The Individual and the Community: Personality in the Social World of Early Christianity,"

Luke reports the 'commissioning', for a specific task or to a certain status, of numerous individuals and groups. These events are narrated in a fixed literary form[272] derived from the LXX[273] which may be termed a 'commission form'. The actors and actions of these commission forms can be schematically reduced to: 1) an Actor-Initiator who selects, 2) an agent, and 3) the action undertaken by the agent or a status conferred on the agent.

BTB 9 (1979):126-38. Cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, The Church in the New Testament, trans. W.J. O'Hara (London & Freiburg: Burns & Oates and Herder, 1965), p. 67.

[272]Terrence Y. Mullins, "New Testament Commission Forms, Especially in Luke-Acts," JBL 95 (1976):603-14. Benjamin J. Hubbard, "Commissioning Stories in Luke-Acts: A Study of Their Antecedents, Form and Content," Semeia 8 (1977):103-26. Mullins lists 27 examples; Hubbard, 16. In any event the form is far more recurrent in Luke-Acts than any other New Testament document. Of the 27 examples Mullins lists there are several which are questionable, Benjamin J. Hubbard, "The Role of Commissioning Accounts in Acts," PLA, p. 191. These examples tend to conform to the technical requirements of the form, although this is stretched on occasion, but their content is incongruous with the nomenclature 'commission form' (e.g. Lk. 7.20-28; 15.11-31; Acts 12.6-10). Four examples have been selected for this study which are not listed by Mullins or Hubbard. They conform to their criteria as follows:

	Intro	Confront	React	Comm	Protest	Reassur	Conclusion
Lk. 6	12	13a	-	13b-16	-	-	-
Lk. 9	-	1a	-	1b-5	-	-	6
Acts 1	15-20	21-22	23-26a	26b	-	-	26c
Acts 6	1	2-4	-	5-6	-	-	7

Mullins feels that for the form to be present the elements of confrontation, commission, and reassurance are essential. These examples lack only reassurance. It is, however, their content more than their form which gives them a family resemblance to the commission form. Hubbard feels that an epiphany is essential to the form and presumably would leave out these examples because they lack this aspect.

[273]N. Habel, "The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives," ZAW 77 (1965):297-323; Klaus Baltzer, "Considerations Regarding the Office and Calling of the Prophet," HTR 61 (1968):567-81; Hubbard, "Commissioning Stories," p. 114.

	Actor/Initiator	Agent	Action/Status
Lk. 5.1-11	Jesus	Peter	Missionary
Acts 10.9-23 repeated Acts 11.1-17	the Spirit, v.19	Peter	Mission
Lk. 6.12-16	Jesus	the Twelve	Apostles
Lk. 9.1-6	Jesus	the Twelve	Mission
Lk. 10.1-20	Jesus	the Seventy	Mission
Lk. 24.36-53	Jesus	many disciples	Mission/Witnesses
Acts 1.1-11	Jesus	many disciples	Mission/Witnesses
Acts 1.15-26	the Lord, v.24	Matthias	Apostle & Witness v.22
Acts 6.1-7	the Twelve	the Seven	Administrators
Acts 9.1-8 repeated 21.6-11 & 26.12-20	Jesus	Paul	Mission
Acts 9.10-19 repeated 21.12-16	Jesus	Ananias (both function to support Paul's commission)	to heal & baptize Paul
Acts 10.1-8 repeated vv. 30-33	Angel	Cornelius (both function to support Peter's commission)	to send for Peter
Acts 13.1-3	Spirit	Barnabas & Paul	Mission

On the level of the story world of Luke-Acts these commission forms serve to legitimate the agent's action or status (both of which are controversial) at the highest possible level. In relation to Luke's readers an important aspect of the community's self-identity, the church's mission (17x) or the status of the apostolic witness as the basis of the church's traditions (4x), receives legitimation by being related to an historical actor of the apostolic period who received his authority to act directly from Jesus or the Spirit. This fact is often attested by supernatural manifestations as proof. The need to anchor the community's mission so firmly in the Christian

sacred cosmos as initiated directly and repeatedly by the Lord himself indicates the supreme importance mission held in the Christian identity of these people.

Secondly, these commissioning stories provide a prototype for 'ordinations' in the Lucan community. There is no evidence in the Pauline letters that Paul appointed elders in his churches.[274] Yet Luke represents Paul and Barnabas as appointing elders in every church (Acts 14.23, cf. 20.17; 11.30; 15.2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16.4; 21.18). "It seems then, that Luke has attributed to Paul the structure of the community with which he was familiar in his own day."[275] From Acts 14.23 we can learn that the Lucan community used prayer and fasting as part of the ritual in the selection and appointment of elders. Prayer and fasting are also elements in the commissioning of Barnabas and Paul (Acts 13.1-3). Prayer is a prominent element in the selection of the Twelve (Lk. 6.12ff.), Matthias (Acts 1.15ff.), and the Seven (Acts 6.1-6) where it is also conjoined with the 'laying on of hands' as in the case of Barnabas and Paul (see also Acts 9.11; 10.3, 9, 30 for the importance of prayer and selection by God for specific tasks). The thread of consistency in all of this is too slim to reconstruct a Lucan form of ordination. This is reinforced by the lack of a consistent vocabulary to connect his use of the 'commission form'. Nevertheless it is evident that the Lucan community was structured by a role differentiation reinforced by the 'ordination' of those set apart for ministry roles. The examples Luke uses of the 'commissioning' of the great heroes of the early church will have served as models for the 'ordination' of those in his own community to specific tasks. Their selection by prayer and fasting will have represented the activity

---

[274] Käsemann, Essays, p. 86.

[275] Fitzmyer, p. 253; cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 436; cf. Marshall, Acts, p. 241; Hanson, Acts, p. 152.

of the Spirit in their appointment to the church's mission. By analogy these Lucan ordinands received the same legitimacy and anchoring in the Christian sacred cosmos for their continuation of the church's mission as Peter, Paul, and others had received for the initiation of the mission. This can be clearly seen in Lk. 9.1-6, 10.1-17 which function as concise models for missionary activity and commissioning.[276]

Very little can be said with certainty about the actual functions of differentiated roles in the Lucan community. This is because there is a lack of detail in the description of various positions, ambiguity in the description which is given, and overlap in the functions ascribed to various people in various roles.[277] It is clear, however, that the elders represent the apex of the community's structure. They had oversight of the church in Luke's day (Acts 20.17), a fact borne out by the manner in which they gradually, throughout Acts, replaced the apostles in judicial authority (cf. 6.2 with 15.6 and 21.18). It also appears from Acts 20 that they are in the vanguard of the fight against heresy. Little more can be said about their functions.

It appears from Acts 6.1-6 that Luke understood the Seven to have been appointed to an administrative office. But he has no interest in their function as administrators and uses this story as a means to introduce Stephen and Philip to the reader. They are not important as administrators but as preachers (6.10), evangelists (8.12) and miracle workers (6.8, 8.6). This causes one to doubt that administration was the only formal role associated with 'deacons',[278]

---

[276] On the use of these pericopes by Luke's own community see Ellis, Luke, pp. 134f.; Giles, "Church in Luke," pp. 126f.; Klauck, p. 57; Fitzmyer, p. 254.

[277] Fitzmyer, pp. 253-56; cf. E. Earle Ellis, "The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts," Apostolic History and the Gospel, eds. W.W. Gasque & R.P. Martin (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970), pp. 56ff.

[278] 'Deacon' is used here as a convenient cover word for the seven's role as servers of tables, recognizing that διακονία is not used by Luke to represent a typified role.

but there is not sufficient evidence to be able to ascertain whether or not the additional roles Philip and Stephen fulfilled were integral parts of their status as 'deacons'[279] or even if 'deacons' were part of the structures of Luke's own church.

Luke also knows of a class specified as prophets and teachers (13.1).[280] But beyond their capacity to provide dominical legitimation to current community problems by the deliverance of an inspired word or the exposition of scripture, little can be determined of their place in the structure of the Lucan church.

As to the manner in which these roles were fulfilled by individuals it is probable that there was a tendency for those in leadership positions to misuse their power by taking advantage of their social position in the church for their own advancement at the expense of those they were to serve (Lk. 6.39-45; 12.35-48; 22.24-27).[281]

Luke restricts the use of ἀπόστολος to the Twelve, with the exception of Acts 14.4, 14. It is not a term used for a currently active role in the Lucan church. The Twelve function as proto-typical missionaries[282] and in this sense they function as a part of the symbolic universe providing an arch of meaning over the community. However, the two exceptions to this usage in 14.4, 14 may indicate that Luke was aware of the use of ἀπόστολος in a less absolute sense associated with the 'sending' of missionaries. The verb ἀποστέλλω is frequently associated with this type of activity (Lk. 9.2; 10.1, 3; Acts 8.14; 9.17; 15.27, 33; 19.22; 22.21; 26.17), but not consistently (Acts 13.3, 4; 15.22). It is therefore not possible to see here a technical

---

[279] Fitzmyer, p. 255.

[280] Ellis, "Prophets," pp. 57ff. has shown that there is overlap in the roles of prophets and teachers in Acts.

[281] Cf. Schnackenburg, Church in N.T., pp. 68f.

[282] Fitzmyer, p. 254.

vocabulary for the sending of missionaries even though the use of verbs of sending is predominantly Lucan.[283] What these verses do indicate is that Lucan Christians frequently sent and received delegations and missionaries as part of the normal fabric of life. As soon as the church breaks out of the confines of Jerusalem Luke assumes that frequent intercommunication via delegations and individuals was to be a normal part of church life (Acts 8.14; 10.23; 11.22, 27, 30; 15.1, 2f., 22, 30-33, 36-41; 18.23, 27; 20.17; 21.10, 16). The Lucan church existed in close connection with other churches as part of a larger whole, knit together by its common commitment to the Risen Lord.

The churches of the story world of Acts are structured by households. Luke provides several concise idealizations of the life of these households (e.g. Acts 2.46; 5.42; 12.12ff.; 20.7ff.).[284] From these examples it emerges that the activities of Christian teaching, prayer, and the Lord's Supper were centred in Christian households. Luke also provides numerous examples of the function of households in the sending and receiving of delegations and missionaries. In this context they function not only as centres of hospitality (e.g. 21.8, 16) but also as mission bases (9.43; 10.48; 16.15; 18.3, 7; 28.30 and cf. 17.5).

There are some indications that by Luke's time the structure of the church in household communities had given way to communities defined by their locality rather than a single household.[285] It is

---

283 Behm, TDNT I, pp. 403f., thinks that the Lucan usage of verbs of sending is on the border between the LXX usage in which ἀποστέλλω is a technical word and Hellenistic usage in which it is used synonymously with other verbs of sending.

284 Cf. Klauck, pp. 48-51.

285 There are several examples where Paul visits churches with no reference to a chief household, Acts 16.1-5; 21.4, and churches which lack households as centres of origin, Antioch 11.20, Athens 17.34,

therefore possible that the stories of these primal households serve as aetiologies for the later communities of Luke's own time which had developed from them.[286] It is certainly true that one cannot conceive of the churches of Luke's day as being confined to a single household. In this sense the Lucan community must certainly be thought of as a locally based community. But this designation is unhelpful if by it one glosses over the fact that at this time a local community can only mean a community structured around several households rather than a single household.[287] The Lucan church was still structured around households and these households were given proto-types in Acts which serve as mission bases and centres of Christian hospitality.

Only the barest outlines of the social institutions and roles of the Lucan community can be determined. It cannot be determined who, in terms of class, race, educational level, etc., fulfilled specific institutional roles because Luke gives only a typified and idealized portrait of the early church and not names and descriptions of his own readers. What the outline does indicate is the predominance of mission in the formation of the structures of the Lucan church.

G. Charismatic Roles and Functions

Luke did not face a situation such as that confronting Paul in Corinth which required him to specify the proper ordering and use of

---

Ephesus 18.19, and the Ephesian elders are not connected with a household, 20.17.

[286] Klauck, p. 56.

[287] Floyd V. Filson, "The Significance of the Early House Churches," JBL 58 (1939):107f. This judgment is not invalidated by Filson's misuse of the evidence from Dura-Europa. See C.H. Kraeling, The Christian Building in the Excavation at Dura-Europas Final Report VIII, Pt. II, ed. C.B. Welles (New Haven: Dura-Europa Publications, 1967) and A. von Gerkan, "Hauskirche von Dura-Europas," Mullus, Festschrift Theodor Klausner, Reallexicon zur byzantinische Kunst Ergänzungs band 1, 1964, pp. 143-49. Even though this building was probably a sacred structure circa A.D. 240, in the 1st century Christians were still meeting in domestic homes.

charismatic manifestations in the community's regular meetings. He did not leave us with lists of functionaries and rules for worship which would allow inferences to be drawn as to the social nature of the community's spiritual life. Thus these types of questions cannot usefully be asked. The only specifically charismatic role highlighted by Luke is that of the prophet. These people are, in part, itinerants (Acts 11.27; 15.22, 32; 21.10) but have 'home' communities (11.27 Jerusalem,;13.1 Antioch; 15.32 Jerusalem; 21.9 Caesarea; 21.10 Judea) which indicates that they functioned as connecting links between communities (esp. 15.22, 32) rather than as 'homeless' wandering charismatics. The specific roles they fulfilled as charismatics included direct inspiration by God (11.27; 21.11) and symbolic actions (21.11), but also included less 'enthusiastic' roles such as teaching (13.1) and exhortation (15.32).[288] Their role in the regular meetings of the community is not specified. Beyond this single charismatic role there is no evidence that Lucan Christians knew of further divisions of labour among those with charismatic gifts into 'speakers in various tongues', 'healers', 'workers of miracles', etc. (I Cor. 12.4-11, 27-30). One is left with four broad categories of evidence: prophecy, tongues, healing, and visions,[289] which are all connected with the Spirit's action among believers in general; and with the importance of the summarization 'signs and wonders'[290] from which to draw the overall functional importance of such manifestations.

---

[288] Ellis, "Prophets," pp. 58ff.

[289] Prophecy, 11.27f.; 13.1; 15.32; 19.6.
Tongues, 2.4; 10.46; 19.6.
Healing/Deliverance, 3.7; 5.15f.; 8.7; 9.17f., 34, 40; 14.9f.; 19.11f.; 20.10.
Visions/Auditory & Sensory Experiences, 2.3; 4.31; 9.1ff.; 10.3, 10ff., 19; 12.7ff.; 16.6ff.; 23.11; 27.23; 18.8f.
Peter's insight into the sin of Ananias and Saphira (5.1-11) may correspond to Paul's 'word of knowledge' (cf. 27.10). There are miracles of judgment in 13.9f. and 5.1-11.

[290] 2.22, 43; 5.12; 6.8; 8.6; 14.3.

Luke presents Jesus as the Spirit-filled prophet (Lk. 4.1, 14, 18). But he is not content to allow the evidence for this to remain on an ethereal plane. The facticity of the Spirit-filled nature of Jesus' ministry is supported by tangible evidence. The Spirit descends on him in 'bodily' form (Lk. 3.22) and the programme of his ministry (4.18f.) is carefully worked out in a series of concrete words and actions, i.e. healings, exorcisms, and open teaching, which are available as public knowledge and rational empirical evidence (cf. Acts 2.22; 10.38).[291]

The same emphasis on the tangibility of the Spirit's presence is maintained in Acts.[292] The empirical nature of the Spirit's manifestation at Pentecost is integral to the context of Peter's sermon and serves to validate what he is saying (2.16, 33).[293] The entire sermon works on the assumption that the audience can 'see and hear' (v.33) the action of God. They only need Peter to explain it and call them to repentance in order to be able to participate in the Spirit's outpouring for themselves (v.38). In Acts 10 it is speaking in tongues, tangible ecstatic behaviour, which convinces Peter that the Spirit has come to the gentiles (10.44-48, cf. 11.15).[294] Ecstatic speech is an evidence of the Spirit's presence.

Jesus began his ministry in the power (δύναμις Lk 4.14) of the Spirit, a power expressed in tangible miracles (5.17) and conceived of

---

[291] See above, pp. 96f., notes 40-43.

[292] Cf. Helmut Flender, "Die Kirche in den Lukas-Schriften als Frage an ihre heutige Gestalt," in Das Lukas-Evangelium, ed. George Braumann (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchesellschaft, 1974), pp. 275f.

[293] See Chapter 5, p. 241.

[294] Simon's reaction in Acts 8.18 implies that a visible manifestation of the Spirit accompanied Peter and John's actions (v.17); Bruce, Book, pp. 181-83; Haenchen, Acts, p. 304; Neil, Acts, pp. 122f. The tongues and prophecy of 19.6 serve as evidence that the Ephesian disciples are now indeed true Christians.

in quasi-material terms in itself (8.46). This same power of the Spirit was promised to the disciples (Lk. 24.49; Acts 1.8; cf. Lk. 9.1) and manifested in equally public and tangible miracles (Acts 3.12).

The importance of spiritual manifestations for Luke can be seen in the consistent connection he draws between Spirit filled men and the ability to work signs and wonders. Jesus is the Spirit filled man par excellence who worked signs and wonders (Acts 2.22) anointed by the Spirit (Acts 10.38). The apostles specifically ask for signs and wonders to accompany their preaching (Acts 4.31f.). This prayer is fulfilled in Acts 5.12ff. Stephen, a man full of the Spirit, faith (Acts 6.5), grace and power (δύναμις 6.8), worked signs and wonders. Philip, again a Spirit filled man (6.3), worked signs in Samaria (8.6f.). Finally, even against the general silence of his traditions, Luke felt it necessary to portray the Spirit filled Paul (Acts 9.17, 13.9) as a miracle worker performing signs and wonders (14.3).[295] In all of these instances the ability to work miracles serves as a validation of the person's ministry.[296]

The Marcan tradition was critically aware of the danger signs and wonders could pose to the faithful (Mk. 13.22). And Paul, while careful not to disparage spiritual experiences in themselves, nevertheless tried to inculcate in the Corinthian congregation a critical awareness of the place such manifestations have in relation to the larger issues of faith, hope, and love (I Cor. 13). Matthew applied the saying, "Not everyone saying to me, 'Lord, Lord', will enter into the Kingdom of heaven, but the one doing the will of my father who is

---

[295] See Ch. 5, pp. 250ff.

[296] If Flender, "Kirche in Lukas," p. 280, is correct in arguing that Apollos, Stephen, and Paul are role models for how Spirit filled men ought to act then the relevance of these pictures for Luke's own community is increased.

in heaven" (7.21), to false prophets, exorcists, and miracle workers (vv. 22f.).[297] Luke removes any critical awareness of supernatural manifestations from his variant of the saying (Lk. 6.46, cf. 13.25-27), and speaks instead of 'hearing' and 'doing' the word, which means to repent. It is those who have failed to respond to Jesus who will be excluded from the kingdom, not false miracle workers. Luke's attitude toward enthusiastic manifestations is one of positive and uncritical acceptance.[298] Miracles are a direct incentive to faith (Lk. 5.25; 7.16; 9.43; 13.13; 17.15, cf. v.18; 18.43)[299] and a direct cause of conversions in the church's mission (Acts 3.9-12 and 4.4; 5.12-14; 8.6; 9.34f., 40-42).

Finally, Luke expects visionary experiences to be commonly understood by his readers. Of the Synoptists he alone includes the one clearly ecstatic experience of Jesus (Lk. 10.18).[300] Angels effect mysterious prison breaks (Acts 5.19, cf. v.23; 12.7-11). Supranormal auditory and physical effects are accepted as evidence of the Spirit's actions (2.2, 4.31). It is expected that the Spirit can 'teleport' men (8.39f.). Stephen experiences a vision at the moment of his martyrdom (7.55f.). Saul was converted by a heavenly vision (9.3-6), the tangible nature of which is emphasized by the reactions of his companions (9.7, cf. 22.6-11; 26.13-18). And visions provide authoritative and crucial direction to the church's mission (10.1-22, cf. 11.5-12; 16.9f.; 18.9f.; 23.11; 27.23f.).[301]

---

[297] Ulrich Luz, "Erwägungen zur Entstehung des 'Frühkatholizismus'. Eine Skizze," ZNW 65 (1974):103f.; James D.G. Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity (London: SCM, 1977), p. 180.

[298] Dunn, Unity and Diversity, p. 180.

[299] Paul J. Achtemeier, "The Lucan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch," PLA, pp. 159f.

[300] Dunn, Unity and Diversity, p. 180.

[301] Ibid., p. 181.

If it is the possession of the Spirit which is the main evidence of being a Christian (above, pp. 145f.) it is supernatural manifestations of the Spirit which are the evidence that one has the Spirit and its guidance and direction. Such manifestations function to legitimate the believer and the church's position vis à vis the Christian cosmos. Christians who have such experiences can rest assured that they do in fact have the Spirit as promised by Jesus and share in the kingdom of God. However, it must again be asked if these manifestations serve as an historical basis for the Lucan community which validate Jesus and the founding generation and thus validate a community which stands in continuity with the traditions of the founding generation, or if they reflect the practice of such manifestations in the Lucan church itself.

It could be argued that while Paul is positive about the utility of spiritual gifts in the Christian community, they are not an essential factor in the legitimation of Christian existence. The essential legitimation for Christian experience is instead the inner witness of the Spirit (Rom. 8.14-17; Gal. 4.6). There is no evidence that Luke knew of this doctrine. The content of Luke-Acts indicates that the only means by which Lucan Christians could be sure of their participation in the Spirit was through the experience of the ecstatic features of the Spirit's manifestations. The tangibility of the Spirit was necessary, not as an historical legitimation, but as an ongoing legitimation of the community's existence. One is secure in describing the Lucan community as an 'enthusiastic' community, i.e. one in which the intensity and frequency of such experiences were characteristic of a community which based its continuance and sense of direction upon them.[302] Such experiences were a primary vehicle for the community's self-legitimation, both in its existence and in its direction.

---

[302]Ibid., p. 178.

However, it could be objected that other Christian communities roughly contemporary with Luke's, e.g. those represented by the Pastorals and I Clement, do not appear to have had a strongly charismatic element or to have known Paul's concept of an inner witness of the Spirit. If these communities in a time and context similar to Luke's did not depend on enthusiastic manifestations of the Spirit for the legitimation of their Christian faith is it correct to interpret the evidence given above as indicating that Luke's community did? The question which must be pressed is whether or not these communities offer an adequate comparison.

Both of these communities developed a similar solution to the problem of spiritual legitimation. They did so in a strongly Early Catholic vein. There is a strong emphasis on apostolic succession (I Clement 40-44; I Tim. 1.18, 4.14; II Tim. 2.2), the hierarchy of church office (I Clement 42; I Tim. 3.1-15), and the voice of the Spirit in church tradition (I Clement 43, 63; II Tim. 3.16f.). In these communities one could be certain of the Spirit's presence by the presence of a bishop or other duly constituted church official who transmitted the authentic voice of the Spirit. The community gathered around these officials who stood in apostolic succession knew that it and it alone was anointed by the Spirit. The Spirit was, by definition, to be found where the One True Church was.

The Spirit was not institutionalized in the Lucan community[303] as it came to be in its Early Catholic contemporaries and successors. For Luke the Spirit remained a free gift from the church's transcendent

---

[303] O. Betz, "The Kerygma of Luke," Interp. 22 (1968):145; Dunn, Unity and Diversity, pp. 356f.; H. Flender, St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History (London: SPCK, 1967), p. 141; Jacob Jervell, "Sons of the Prophets: The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles," in The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Church History (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), p. 103; cf. Parratt, pp. 234f.

Lord (Acts 2.33, 38; 8.20; 10.45; cf. 5.32).[304] The Spirit's freedom over and above the church is evident in the number of instances where it sovereignly directs the church's policy, development, and mission (Acts 8.39f.; 10 and 11; 13.1ff.; 16.6f.; cf. 19.21). Even in instances where Luke has an ecclesiastical point to make (e.g. Acts 8.14ff.) he nevertheless emphasizes that the Spirit is God's gift (8.20). This is perhaps most clear in Acts 10 and 11 where the Spirit sovereignly directs Peter, the Jerusalem community's representative, as to who will be part of the church of God. For Luke, in contradistinction to Early Catholicism, the church is, by definition, to be found where the Spirit is manifest.

Käsemann is correct in pointing out that for Luke the Spirit is the seal of incorporation into the organized church.[305] The Spirit is given in the context of apostolic succession and the validation of apostolic traditions (see above, pp. 145f.). But is Käsemann correct in the assertion that succession motifs represent a stark opposition of tradition vs. enthusiasm?[306] If this dichotomy is absolute then Luke's succession motif[307] would preclude the characterization of his community as 'enthusiastic'. In light of the fact that enthusiastic manifestations did continue in orthodox circles into the 2nd and 3rd centuries[308] it seems more likely that the opposition should be described as enthusiasm in service to tradition vs. enthusiasm against

---

[304] Betz, "Kerygma," p. 145; Jervell, "Sons of the Prophets," p. 103; Kurt Stalder, "Der Heilige Geist in der Lukanischen Ekklesiologie," Una Sancta 30 (1975):288; F.F. Bruce, "The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles," Interp. 27 (1973):170; Lampe, "Spirit in Luke's Writings," p. 133.

[305] Käsemann, Essays, p. 141; cf. Fitzmyer, pp. 256f.

[306] Käsemann, Essays, pp. 89, 91.

[307] See esp. Talbert, Literary Patterns, pp. 104ff.

[308] See e.g. in Green, pp. 227ff. and 241ff.

tradition.[309] Luke would have agreed with this (see above, pp. 146f.). Succession motifs in themselves do not rule out the presence of enthusiastic phenomena in a community when these phenomena are politically aligned with the traditions of the community.[310] There seems to be no reason why the strong Lucan emphasis on enthusiastic manifestations of the Spirit[311] should not be taken to indicate that such phenomena were a part of his community's experience.

---

[309] Cf. Luz, pp. 104f.

[310] Also see Minear's theory, To Heal and Reveal, pp. 84, 146ff.; of a Lucan emphasis on a prophetic succession motif of a charismatic nature.

[311] See Dunn, Unity and Diversity, pp. 177-83; cf. Schweizer, TDNT VI, pp. 407-14.

CHAPTER IV

A SOCIOLOGY OF MISSION IN THE COMMUNITY OF LUKE-ACTS

A. Introduction

The object of this chapter is to examine the social forces involved in the motivation and actions of converts and missionaries and the social mechanisms by which these motives and actions were secured in the community of Luke-Acts. These factors will be viewed against a theoretical framework which encompasses both the specific social phenomena and the means by which they were legitimated. Finally, it will be asked whether or not the community was experiencing success in its mission endeavour.

As a preliminary step the question of a sociology of mission in the Lucan community must be disentangled from questions about the Lucan theology of mission. The latter is an important preliminary question, especially if one is committed to a Bergerian framework in which ideas are positively related to social realities, but it remains beyond the scope of this inquiry. Here the broad contours of Luke's theological thought about mission will serve as a backdrop for sociological questions. Isolated exegesis of key passages will be undertaken where a sharper focus on specifics is necessary. In addition it must be noted that much of the theological literature about mission in Luke-Acts is irrelevant to the question of the social configurations of mission in Luke's own church.

On the one hand some literature focuses on the Jew-gentile question. In these instances Luke is assumed to be justifying a

prior historical development, i.e. the cessation of mission to Jews and the exclusive preoccupation of mission with gentiles. This literature tends to focus on the historical event rather than the context within which Luke narrates it. On the other hand some literature focuses on the historical development of the church's mission, treating Acts as an historical source for the period of the earliest church through Paul rather than as a source for Luke's own time.[1]

Finally, because it is the only attempt to deal with the motivation of the early Christian mission from a sociologically theoretical and comparative perspective, one must deal with John G. Gager's use of Leon Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance in the explanation of the early Christian mission.[2] The applicability of Festinger's theory in the context of the data it was formulated to explain and the possibility of its helpfulness in explaining other historical phenomena is not, here, in question. We are concerned primarily with Gager's attempt to apply it to early Christianity.

The theory of Cognitive Dissonance suggests that when, as the result of the disconfirmation of their beliefs, a group experiences a cognitive gap between themselves and their larger society, proselytism results as an effort to reduce this dissonance by gaining additional

---

[1]E.g. Wilson, Gentiles; James W. Thompson, "The Gentile Mission as an Eschatological Necessity," RQ 14 (1971):18-27; Gottfried Schille, "Anfänge der christlichen Mission," Kerygma und Dogma 15-16 (1969-70): 320-39; Martin Hengel,"Die Ursprünge der christlichen Mission," NTS 18 (1971-72):15-38; Joachim Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, trans. S.H. Hooke (London: SCM, 1958); Eduard Lohse, "Missionarisches Handeln Jesu nach dem Evangelium des Lukas," TZ 10 (1954):1-13; Ferdinand Hahn, Mission in The New Testament, trans. Frank Clarke (London: SCM, 1981, German 1963); Günther Bornkamm, "The Missionary Stance of Paul in 1 Cor. 9 and in Acts," in SLA. Some studies are wholly apologetic, e.g. Johannes Blauw, The Missionary Nature of the Church: A Survey of the Biblical Theology of Mission (London: Lutterworth Press, 1962).

[2]Gager, Kingdom, pp. 37ff.

social support.[3] The disconfirmation of belief can result from, 1) a conflict of the group's belief system with that of the general society, 2) a conflict of the group's value system with that of the general society, 3) a contradiction of group belief by empirical events, or 4) a rejection by the group of basic societal cognitive assumptions.[4] Festinger repeatedly emphasizes in his formulation of the theory that for disconfirmation to occur and result in the experienced dissonance, which can be interpreted as a motivating factor for group activity, the group must recognize that its beliefs have been disproven.[5] Gager applies the third situation of disconfirmation to early Christianity. He interprets the death of Jesus and/or the non-arrival of the Parousia as disconfirmations of Christian belief which resulted in increased efforts at proselytism.[6]

In regard to the non-appearance of the Parousia, even if one grants that the earliest community expected little intervening time between Jesus' resurrection and his second coming (a point some New Testament interpreters would contest), and if one accepts that there is evidence that the non-event of the Parousia did pose a cognitive problem for some communities (2 Peter 3.3-10), none of the extant traditions indicate that an empirical date for the Lord's return was ever fixed. This means that its non-occurrence could never be proven, was always adjustable, and, by nature, non-falsifiable. It was not the sort of thing which was given adequate specification to be open to precise disconfirmation. Such specification and empirical disproof

---

[3]Leon Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (New York: Row, Peterson, 1957), pp. 2f.; Leon Festinger, Henry W. Riecken, Stanley Schachter, When Prophecy Fails (New York: Harper & Row, 1956), pp. 25-28.

[4]Festinger, Theory, pp. 4, 11-14.

[5]Festinger, Riecken, Schachter, pp. 4, 5.

[6]Gager, Kingdom, pp. 39-43.

are required for the theory to be applicable. In any event Luke's presentation of eschatological expectation was of sufficient ambiguity to provide elasticity for his eschatological hope and to remove it from the realm of possible disproof (e.g. Lk. 17.30-35; 21.22, 24c, 28, 31; Acts 1.7; 3.21; 17.31a). Phrases such as 'the times of the gentiles' (Lk. 21.24c), 'this generation' (21.31f), and 'until the time to establish all that the prophets have said' (Acts 3.21) are open-ended, non-specific ways of speaking about eschatological events. They were open to various interpretations among Luke's contemporaries and do not give the specification necessary for their disproof. Predictions including such typical material as wars and cosmic signs (Lk. 21.25ff.) and coming judgment (Acts 17.31) are similarly non-specific.

The traditions enshrined in the Passion and Easter narratives make it clear that the death of Jesus was seen by the inner circle of his disciples as a disconfirmation of their belief (e.g. Mk. 14.50; Mt. 26.56b; Jn. 20.9; Lk. 24.21; and the stories of Peter's denials). But none of these traditions relate the origin of the post-Easter mission to the experience of Jesus' death. That mission is instead related to the experience of Jesus' resurrection.[7] Easter followed so hard upon the cross that from within the Christian community, i.e. from an insider's perspective, the latter could not be viewed as a disconfirmation but rather came to be seen as a divine necessity in the mission of Jesus. Gager cites 1 Cor. 1.23 as evidence of the continuing disconfirmatory nature of the death of Christ for Christians. But this passage does not indicate that the cross disconfirmed Christian belief. It confirmed Christian belief (v.24). What this passage does indicate is that the cross was a disconfirmation for

---

[7]Cf. Bartlett, "Gager's Kingdom," pp. 119f.

those who stood outside Christian meaning structures and thus held no belief in the resurrection.[8] For the believer the cross, when interpreted in light of the resurrection, could not be seen as a disconfirmation. Thus it became a problem for apologetics but not for the cognitive structures of the believer in his own universe. Again the vital evidence that the Christians themselves saw the cross as disproving their belief is lacking. In any event Lucan Christians were so far removed from the time of Jesus' death that any potential it had for cognitive disruption had been completely absorbed by traditions which expressed the reason for its occurrence in divine necessity (the Lucan δεῖ). For the Lucan Christians Jesus' death was a confirmation of his prophetic calling (Lk. 13.33) and was cognitively integrated into an all embracing explanation in light of the resurrection and exaltation (Lk. 24.25f.).[9] The third situation of disconfirmation in Festinger's theory is unhelpful in discovering the motivation for mission in the community of Luke-Acts.

There is a further difficulty in the cognitive dissonance theory which also makes the other situations of disconfirmation unhelpful in explaining early Christian proselytism. Too frequently disconfirmation can only be said to have occurred if one judges the situation from an outside perspective. In many instances the conflict observable by an outsider is imperceptible to an insider because it is filtered out by a series of ideological defence mechanisms which neutralize hostility and apparent failure.[10] For example the

---

[8] Ibid., p. 119.

[9] If Talbert, Literary Patterns, pp. 125ff., is correct in his relation of Luke-Acts to Hellenistic literary genre then Jesus' death becomes a most important legitimation of his mission and message. See idem., "Martyrdom in Luke-Acts and the Lukan Social Ethic," in Cassidy, pp. 103-5.

[10] Luther P. Gerlach and Virginia H. Hine, People, Power, Change: Movements of Social Transformation (New York & Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1970), p. 96.

positivist disproof of the miraculous is disproof only because the positivist stands outside the believer's universe of meaning.[11] Thus, even though certain aspects of the Lucan community's ideology did conflict with the values and beliefs of the surrounding Graeco-Roman world, cognitive dissonance is unhelpful in explaining their motivation for proselytism because of the presence of defence mechanisms in their symbolic universe (see Section E) which neutralized cognitive conflict and turned apparent failure into success.

These remarks should be sufficient to show the inadequacy of Gager's use of this theory. Our own approach will follow a completely different theoretical line and use evidence of a kind unrelated to that of which someone using Festinger's theory might try to employ.

B. Commitment in the Lucan Community

Another possible starting point for the theoretical discussion of proselytism can be found in theories about the commitment process.[12] In the experience of committing oneself to a group an individual comes to see his own self-identity and self-interest as defined by or identical to the self-identity and self-interest of the group.[13] This process is closely related to what is known about the role of 'significant others' as a reference group in the social formation of the self.[14] In this instance it is applied to a re-socialization

---

[11] Ibid.

[12] This is suggested by Gerlach & Hine, p. 96, but their discussion of commitment, pp. 100ff., does not make clear why commitment should necessarily result in proselytism. Cf. Bert Hardin and Gunter Kehrer, "Some Social Factors Affecting the Rejection of New Belief Systems," in New Religious Movements, ed. Eileen Barker (New York: Edwin Mellen, 1982), p. 267, who indicate that the amount of commitment required by a group, when it surpasses societal acceptability, is a factor in discouraging conversion.

[13] R.M. Kanter, Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972), pp. 65f.

[14] See Berger & Luckmann, pp. 150ff.

process which can be summed up under the religious word "conversion".[15] In this process an individual has a subjective experience which results in "cognitive restructuring" or an "alteration of identity"[16] which ends in the adoption of a new set of 'significant others' with whom the individual now feels an identity of definition, interest, and will. The individual's meaningful existence comes to depend upon a dyadic relationship to the group consensus and definition.[17] At the end of the commitment process, as re-socialization is completed, comes a point of "cognitive closure" when the individual attains "certitude" of the group's beliefs which now appear as a reified whole and thus a basis for action in accordance with group ideology.[18]

In terms of group tasks and goals this means that a principle of reciprocity comes into play.[19] What the individual is asked to contribute to the group task or goal is seen by him as corresponding to what he receives from the group. The maintenance of his own being is seen to require his active support of the group's social order and economy of action.[20] From this perspective commitment can be defined as the willingness of people to do what will maintain group existence because doing so provides what they need to maintain themselves as individuals.[21] In such an approach to the commitment process there is an 'operational' aspect to the definition which centres on the mechanisms

---

[15] B. Wilson, Religion, p. 119; cf. Gerlach & Hine, p. 116.

[16] Gerlach & Hine, pp. 135f., 158; cf. B. Wilson, Religion, p. 119.

[17] See Malina, "Individual and Community," pp. 126-38, for the importance of an understanding of dyadic personalities for early Christianity.

[18] Gerlach & Hine, p. 161.

[19] Kanter, p. 65.

[20] Ibid., p. 66; Gerlach & Hine, p. 136.

[21] Kanter, p. 66.

of a subjective experience which entails an alteration of identity and a symbolic or literal act of 'bridge-burning'.[22]

Rosabeth M. Kanter's study of 19th century utopian communities in the United States identifies numerous social mechanisms by which commitment can be secured in a group. These include: self-sacrifice, investment, irreversibility, renunciation, communion, homogeneity of background, communal sharing, communal work, regularized group contact, and shared rituals.[23] These categories, when taken in conjunction with suggestions from Luther Gerlach and Virginia Hine's study of U.S. Pentecostalism and the Black Panther Movement, will provide a useful basis for the investigation of commitment mechanisms in the Lucan community.

However, in Kanter's study recruitment was found to have a negative relationship to commitment because bringing in new members tended to disrupt group cohesion, goals, and tasks in the highly specialized communities she studies.[24] Gerlach and Hine's study makes a positive connection between commitment and proselytism[25] but fails to indicate adequately why this should be so. However, they do suggest a fruitful area of inquiry: the relationship of commitment to group ideology.[26] Both studies, by their interrelation of group task and commitment in a theory of commitment based on observable actions, suggest that for task-specific actions to result from commitment, corresponding ideological-specific concepts must be present in the symbolic universe of the group into which the individual is assimilated. For commitment to result in motivation for proselytism, proselytism must first be

---

[22]Gerlach & Hine, p. 158.

[23]Kanter, pp. 76-99.

[24]Ibid., pp. 146f., 155, 156f.

[25]Gerlach & Hine, p. 136.

[26]Ibid., p. 96.

present as an accepted group task which can be demanded of the committed individual. The community of Luke-Acts provides an example of a group in which the proper configuration of commitment mechanisms and ideological factors conjoined to give rise to a mission community.

One means of strengthening an individual's commitment to a group and its tasks is to place a sense of value on group membership. This can be done by means of a sacrifice required for membership which places a relative value on membership,[27] or by eliciting the investment of an individual's time or money in other community members, the community's goals, or its organization which gives the individual a stake in the success of the community.[28] The Lucan church did not levy a membership fee as did many contemporary Graeco-Roman associations.[29] Nor did it require a waiver of property rights in favour of the community upon entrance as had been done at Qumran. Isolated individuals may have practised the voluntary renunciation of goods upon entrance into the community. The idealized presentation of the practice in Acts 2.42ff. and 4.32ff. and the dominical sanction given to it in Lk. 18.22 would have made it an acceptable and worthy action. There is also some possibility that group members who worked exclusively as missionaries may have renounced their possessions (Lk. 9.3; 10.4). But the actions of Luke's Paul, who is portrayed as a proto-typical Christian missionary and was, at times, self-supporting (Acts 18.3; 20. 33f.), militate against accepting this as a hard community rule (cf. Lk. 22.35). It must be emphasized that cases of the total renunciation of possessions by members were atypical. Radical self-sacrifice to achieve membership in a group produces a rigid break with one's former social context by severing economic ties. The Lucan church, which

---

[27] Kanter, p. 76. [28] Ibid., p. 80.

[29] Wilken, Christians, pp. 31-47.

reaffirmed the economic success of its middle class members (see Ch. 3, pp.106ff.), did not encourage its members to abandon their economic culture for the community.

Investment, as a mechanism in securing commitment, can be seen to have been more prominent. It has already been shown in the discussion of the social significance of Luke's paraenetic material on alms (Ch. 3, pp. 107ff.) that it was an accepted group norm that those members of the community who were prosperous should contribute to the maintenance of those who were less prosperous. In the giving of alms the prosperous member of the community developed a bond with the poorer member and a stake in the success of the community as a whole. The material investment of prosperous members was not limited to the financial support of poor members. Those who were householders were expected to provide their homes as meeting places for house churches. This is the significance for the meaning structures of the reader of the numerous examples of house churches given in Acts (e.g. 12.12; 16.15, 40; 18.7).[30] It was also assumed that community members would provide hospitality for visiting Christian missionaries and delegations (Acts 9.43; 10.48; 18.3; 21.8, 16). All of these activities represent a substantial investment of time and resources by the prosperous Lucan Christian toward the success of the community's goals. Investment is one means by which these Christians achieved a stake in the success of their community.

A second group of mechanisms for securing commitment can be grouped under the term 'bridge burning'. Such actions achieve a note of finality in one's relationship with a group by severing links to one's former social existence. This can be achieved in a radical manner by the establishment of irreversible economic ties which make it impossible for a member to reclaim the investment he has made

---

[30] Klauck, pp. 47-56.

in the community[31] or by the renunciation of relationships which are potentially disruptive to group cohesion thus placing one in a position of greater emotional dependence for relationships in the group.[32]

As stated above it does not appear that the Lucan community instituted manditory or irreversible economic strictures with its members. But there is some evidence (Lk. 12.49-53)[33] which indicates that decisions to renounce ties with non-believing family members may have occurred (cf. Lk. 14.26).[34] However, Luke's reports of household conversions in Acts, which take place free from division or dissension, make it appear that this was not a frequent community experience (contrast Paul, I Cor. 7.12-16; Philemon 10-18).

But 'bridge burning' can be achieved by a whole range of less radical actions, e.g. symbolic subjective experiences with physical manifestations, such as speaking in tongues or acknowledged ritual acts.[35] Such experiences and actions mark the crossing of an invisible boundary which is significant to the individual and recognizable by his social contemporaries. One may expect that the mechanisms operative in group boundary definition discussed in Ch. 3 will also have been significant aspects of the commitment process.[36] Actions and symbolic experiences which marked the crossing of the community's boundary will have also been important in a convert's shift in self-identity from pagan or Jew to Christian. These experiences and actions constituted a visible (e.g. baptism) break with the convert's former social context. It is the aspect of an inner subjective experience

---

[31] Kanter, p. 81. [32] Ibid., p. 82.

[33] A Lucan collection of originally independent sayings, Talbert, Reading Lk., p. 144.

[34] Ibid.; cf. Danker, St. Luke, p. 156; Ellis, Luke, p. 182.

[35] Gerlach & Hine, pp. 122-35.

[36] Cf. ibid., p. 110.

with attendant external actions such as baptism and charismatic phenomena that caused one to cease to identify himself with his former social context and instead to identify himself as a 'Christian' community member. This is the normal manner in which persons became committed Lucan Christians. It must be noted that these mechanisms left the individual's former social relationships intact in a way that the function of radical disruption of economic and social relationships to achieve commitment would not.

It must also be stressed that commitment is an open-ended process which requires the ongoing support of group activities if it is not to reverse itself.[37] It is important that negative mechanisms which delineate separation from former social bonds are balanced by positive mechanisms which integrate the individual into a new social nexus.

There is evidence of the operation of several positive commitment mechanisms in the Lucan community. Perhaps the most important of these is the fraternal bonding presupposed behind numerous narratives in Acts and discussed in Ch. 3. Such interpersonal bonding is a function Christian communities in general shared with Hellenistic-Roman associations[38] and a social presupposition of the benefits to be accrued by membership in such a group. Other recognizable mechanisms of positive group commitment include the common urban background[39] of community members (see Ch. 3, pp. 207-9); communal sharing ,[40] reflected in the community's practice of giving alms (Ch. 3, pp. 107ff.); and shared communal work in the church's mission (the only exception to 'team ministry' in Acts are Philip (8.5) and Peter (9.32)), and internal

---

[37] Ibid., p. 137.

[38] Arthur Darby Nock, "The Historical Importance of Cult-Associations," CR 38 (1924):105.

[39] Kanter, p. 93. [40] Ibid., p. 94.

functions (e.g. 13.1f.). Several of the institutional structures discussed in Ch. 3 will also have functioned to undergird group commitment and bonding. Regular meetings (Acts 20.7) and rituals (e.g. the Lord's Supper) will have been especially useful in this regard.[41]

All of these social mechanisms and resultant group bonding were hedged round with dominical legitimation (e.g. Lk. 10.29-37; 21.12; 12.33; 18.22; 19.8f.; 9.25, 57-62; 14.8-11). Commitment, defined as the willingness of an individual to undertake actions which support the group and fulfil its goals, was the result of social experiences which had conceptual symbols that were rooted in the shared symbolic universe of the group and which the committed individual came to see as defining his own self-interest and being.

C. Mission in the Community's Symbolic Universe

This same symbolic universe defined mission as an important group task which outlined the purpose of the community's existence, and it contained in symbolic form the community's expectation that its members would contribute to the fulfilment of that mission.

This can be seen in several Lucan motifs. First, Luke has presented Jesus as a model for Christian missionaries.[42] He uses three principle verbs to describe Jesus' ministry: κηρύσσειν, διδάσκειν, and εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (see esp. Lk. 4.15, 18, 19, 43f.; 5.17; 6.6; 8.1). All three of these verbs were used as self-designations for Christian missionary activity in Luke's own church. The first two verbs are also prominently used in connection with Jesus' ministry in other

---

[41] Ibid., pp. 98f.

[42] See esp. Lohse, "Theologe der Heilsgeschichte," pp. 271ff. The most important connections between Jesus and the church are to be found in the use of the phrase πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου (Lk. 4.1; Acts 7.55; 11.24); cf. Helmut Flender, St. Luke Theologian of Redemptive History, trans. Reginald H. & Ilse Fuller (London: SPCK, 1967), p. 137; δυναμις in Lk. 9.1, cf. 4.14; the nature of Jesus' kerygma and that of the church, see Ch. 5; and the parallel between Lk. 2.32 and Acts 13.47. See also Conzelmann, Theology, p. 185 and Drury, p. 17.

traditions (e.g. Mt. 4.17, 23; 9.35; Mk. 1.14, 21) but the use of εὐαγγελίζεσθαι is Luke's own.[43] Perhaps it is part of his Pauline heritage (e.g. 1 Cor. 1.17) but more likely it has been taken over from the LXX of Isaiah. Regardless, Luke uses all three verbs in a parallel manner in his descriptions of the work of Jesus and Christian missionaries. Peter, John, and the rest of the apostles 'taught' the people of Israel (Acts 2.42; 4.2, 18; 5.21, 25, 28, 42) just as Jesus had done (Lk. 4.15; 5.3, 17; 6.6; 13.10, 22; 19.47; 20.1; 21.37). Διδάσκειν is also used to describe the activities of Barnabas and Paul (Acts 15.35; 18.11; 20.20; 28.31)[44] and Apollos (18.25) in Hellenistic contexts. The actions of both Philip (8.5) and Paul (9.20; 28.31) are also described using the verb κηρύσσειν. It is also used to describe Jesus' ministry. It is part of the Isaianic programme laid out in Lk. 4.18f. and appears in two Lucan summaries (Lk. 4.44[45] and 8.1[46]). Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι is the verb par excellence that Luke uses to describe Jesus' mission. It is prominent in the announcement of the messianic era in the birth narratives (1.19, 2.10) and is present in the programmatic quotation of Isa. 61.1-2 (4.18 and alluded to again in 7.22).

---

[43] Werner Georg Kümmel,"'Das Gesetz und die Propheten gehen bis Johannes' - Lukas 16.16 im zusammenhang der heilgeschichtlichen Theologie der Lukasschriften," in Verborum Veritas, eds. O. Böcher und Klaus Haacker (Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970), p. 95.

[44] In Acts 11.26 (cf. 2.42) διδάσκειν takes on connotations of intra-Christian pastoral ministry, but in each of the instances listed here it is either parallel with an explicitly missionary verb (15.35 εὐαγγελίζεσθαι; 20.20, cf. v.21, διαμαρτύρομαι; 28.31 κηρύσσειν) or the context indicates that missionary activity is understood (18.11, cf. vv.9f.).

[45] See Ch. 5, pp. 225f.

[46] Fitzmyer, p. 695, terms it a 'Lucan Summary'. The evidence is in its Lucan vocabulary and its functional position in the composition (ibid., pp. 695f.). It is not derived from 'Q' (Mt. 9. 35, 11.1) because the vocabulary is too diverse (ibid. and Schweizer, Luke, p. 141). Marshall, Lk., pp. 315f., sees it as a combination of 'Q' and 'L'.

It appears in a Lucan summary (8.1) and is added by Luke to the introduction to the Question about Authority (Lk. 20.1, cf. Mk. 11.27 and Mt. 21.23), where it serves to inform the reader in a summary manner of Jesus' activity in the temple. Most importantly, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι as an activity in Jesus' ministry is ascribed to divine necessity (Lk. 4.44, εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεῖ). In Acts it is used to summarize the activity of the apostles (5.42) and of those scattered after Stephen's death (8.4 and 11.20). It appears in Paul's speeches as a self-description of his activity (13.32; 14.15), is used by Peter to describe Jesus' ministry (10.36), and is frequently used of Philip (8.12, 35, 40). The use of the verb in summaries and in general descriptions of Christian ministry (Acts 14.7, 21; 16.10; 17.18) which do not have a direct explanation of the verb's meaning ready at hand, together with the fact that this verb's theological definition (and those of the other two verbs) requires an extensive unpacking, revealing it to be an 'in group' word with specialized meaning not readily accessible to outsiders, lead one to conclude that it was a term current in Luke's own church which was used to describe its missionary endeavours.

These patterns of parallelism between Jesus' actions and those of prominent individuals and the church in general in Acts correspond to the architectonic principle of balance in Luke's literary technique which has been discussed by C.H. Talbert.[47] Talbert finds that the balances and parallels between Jesus and other actors correspond to a Hellenistic literary genre, which he terms 'lives of philosophers', in which the legitimacy of a philosophical school was accredited by showing that its disciples imitated the founder's way of life and thus were shown to be his true successors.[48] The social function of such

---

[47] Talbert, Literary Patterns, pp. 67ff.

[48] Ibid., and pp. 92-110.

ideological configurations is that the practices of a current group are being legitimated in an aetiological manner by being traced back to an historical figure who has acquired symbolic placement in a sacred cosmos and thus enough ontological credibility to serve as an adequate prop for the group's activities. Luke is undergirding the mission practices of his own church by finding a model for them in the activity of Jesus.[49]

The legitimacy and importance of the church's mission activities are also reinforced by the use of other models. By using the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (Lk. 3.18) to summarize the activity of John the Baptist Luke has heightened a tendency in the Christian traditions about the Baptist to portray him as a proto-typical Christian missionary.[50] Paul, too, is portrayed as a model for Christian missionaries. He preaches, performs miracles, and experiences a mixed response from his audiences (see Ch. 5, pp. 250ff.). But how can one determine if the use of Jesus, Paul, and John the Baptist as proto-types of Christian missionaries is intended to provide models for the average community member?

That this was so can be seen in Luke's use of a fourth model. In Acts 8.1-4 Luke describes the persecution which arose against the Jerusalem church in the wake of Stephen's martyrdom. Most commentators think that this persecution was directed against only a specific group of Christians and left the other groups of the Christian community untouched, as Luke himself may intimate.[51] Still, Luke has stated

---

[49]Cf. Ellis, Lk., p. 124; Talbert, Reading Lk., p. 90; William C. Robinson, Jr., "On Preaching the Word of God (Luke 8.4-21)," in SLA, pp. 131ff.; for the missionary application of Lk. 8.1.

[50]Walter Wink, John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition (Cambridge: The University Press, 1968), pp. 52f.; Talbert, Reading Lk., pp. 27ff.

[51]See Haenchen, Acts, pp. 82f., 293, 297; Neil, Acts, p. 119; Bruce, Book, pp. 174f. In 11.2; 12.1ff., 12; 11.27; 15.2, 5, 6 Luke reintroduces a fully developed Jerusalem community with several different parties without ever having told of its reinstitution.

that the entire Christian community except for its leaders had been scattered. In this manner he gives a picture of the activity of the average nameless Christian independent of his leaders. These common Christians went about proclaiming the good news of the word (εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον). Philip, who is introduced in v.5, functions to provide a specific example of the activity of one of these Christians and as such is a model of what is expected of the average Christian in a mission context. He preaches (εὐαγγελίζω, 8.5, 12, 35, 40), performs signs and wonders (8.6f.), and expounds the scriptures (8.35).

In Mt. and Mk. the paradigmatic applicability of the Mission of the Twelve for the average Christian remains ambiguous because one is never certain how the average believer is intended to relate to the specialized symbolic functions of the Twelve. On the one hand Luke further specialized the symbolic function of the Twelve. They are more firmly linked to Israel by Luke's salvation history perspective. This is evident in his restriction of the term 'apostle' to the Twelve (with the exceptions of Acts 14.4, 14 which demonstrate that he did know of a wider use of the term, which makes his restraint in using it even more significant), who function as witnesses to the resurrection, thus serving as guarantors of the church's traditions,[52] their eschatological function in relation to Israel (Lk. 22.28ff.), and the conflict between the apostles (Acts 5.18, 29) and the Sanhedrin for the legitimate leadership of Israel.[53] Luke does not specifically connect the Twelve as a body with any missionary activity outside of Jerusalem.[54] And when Peter emerges as a 'missionary' (Acts 9.32-

---

[52]Acts 1.14ff.; Marshall, Acts, p. 63; Haenchen, Acts, p. 164; Neil, Acts, pp. 69f.

[53]See below, pp. 210f.

[54]Hengel, "Ursprünge der Mission," p. 25; Krodel, Acts, pp. 7f.

10.48) he is no longer specifically designated as the spokesman of the Twelve (cf. Acts 5.29). Given these specialized functions of the Twelve the idea that Luke's readers would have readily found in the report of their mission (Lk. 9.1-6) activities that they as readers should emulate could be seen as suspect. But on the other hand Luke has removed any possible doubt or ambiguity as to the need for all Christians to be involved in mission by reporting an additional mission undertaken by seventy of the larger group of disciples.[55] The direct lesson is that just as the Twelve had followed Jesus as a model for mission and shared directly in his proclamation of the kingdom and its demonstration in acts of healing and deliverance, so, too, this model can be followed by any disciple who will also share in the extension of Jesus' mission. There are also several other means by which Luke makes a point of telling his readers that it was not the Twelve who were used by God to spread the church's mission throughout the world but a much broader spectrum of common Christians to whom his readers can readily relate and thus be put in a situation of seeing mission as an activity in which they should be involved.

In his account of the Ascension in Lk. 24 he has emphasized that a larger group of disciples than just the Eleven were present and shared in receiving the risen Lord's commission (Lk. 24.33 and the repetition of plural pronouns in vv. 36-51, cf. Mt. 28.16 and Mk. 16.14). The account in Acts is more strongly directed to emphasize the participation of the Eleven, but Acts 1.14f. again makes it clear that Luke had in mind a large circle of followers who shared in this commission and thus illustrates its applicability for all Christians.

---

[55] In Ch. 5 it will be demonstrated that the activities undertaken by both the Twelve and the 70 in their missions are identical to those that Luke expects Christian missionaries to do. Given this parallelism it seems evident that Luke intended that these examples of mission serve as models for that of his own day.

There is also the paradigmatic [56] example of the healed Gerasene demoniac. From the missionary application of the story in the final two verses (8.38f.) the reader learns three important points: 1) conversion ends in the call to evangelize[57] whether or not one belongs to the inner circle of the Twelve,[58] 2) that every Christian has a place of mission in his own home and city,[59] and 3) every Christian has as a means of evangelism his own testimony.[60] There is also the Emmaus story which is designed to present Jesus as a proto-type of the itinerant missionary who carries the Word (Lk. 24.25-27, cf. Acts 8.35; 17.3; 18.28; 26.22),[61] accepts hospitality (Lk. 24.29, cf. Lk. 9.4; 10.5-7; Acts 10.48; 16.15; 18.3),[62] and breaks bread (Lk. 24.30, cf. Acts 20.11).[63] This story, by its presentation of Jesus' contact with two of the larger circle of disciples, legitimates missionary activity by persons who are not members of the Twelve.[64] And finally Luke presents a general picture of the church as a group which grows numerically as a matter of course. The unquestioning and constant portrayal of numerical church growth indicates that it was an assumed group value that the church ought to grow as a result of missionary endeavour.

---

[56] Marshall, Lk., p. 341.

[57] Ibid.; Talbert, Reading Lk., p. 99.

[58] Danker, St. Luke, p. 108.

[59] Talbert, Reading Lk., p. 99.

[60] Ibid.

[61] L. Legrand, "Christ the Fellow Traveller: The Emmaus Story in Luke 24.13-35," ITS 19 (1982):37; Richard J. Dillon, From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), pp. 104-8.

[62] Legrand, "Emmaus," p. 37f.

[63] Dillon, pp. 104-8.

[64] Clayton Raymond Bowen, "The Emmaus Disciples and the Purposes of Luke," The Biblical World 35 (1910):234-45.

This is, of course, evident from the summaries of church growth scattered throughout Acts. From their placement in the interstices of the narrative, where they open, close, and summarize[65] varied and diverse missionary stories, one learns that the church grows regardless of the type or strength of opposition it receives and even in the face of apparent failure (e.g. Acts 2.41, 47; 4.4; 5.14; 6.7; 9.31; 11.21, 24; 12.24; 13.48; 15.3; 16.5; 19.20).[66]

Mission was an accepted group task with the commitment process supplying the necessary motivation for the involvement of group members in its fulfilment. However, the ongoing commitment required for a protracted group task such as world mission also requires that group members find the group task to be a cognitively secure undertaking.[67] Luke used both eschatology and history as points of anchorage in his symbolic universe for the legitimation of the church's mission. These will be discussed in Chapters 5 and 6. Here we shall investigate two additional cognitive props which can be seen to have made the community's missionary task a legitimate goal. These are universalism and exclusivism. The significance of these two ideological factors in the motivation of community members can be seen by a brief comparison with other religious groups in their environment.

Luke inherited the concept of a personal, ethical, and universal God from Judaism. One can roughly trace the development of the Israelite

---

[65] Cadbury, BC V, pp. 395ff.

[66] Cf. ibid., pp. 396f., where most of these examples are discussed. Two of these examples do not speak directly of numerical growth but of the growth (αὐξάνω, 12.24 and 19.20), increase (πληθύνω, 12.24), and efficacy (ἰσχύω) of the Word. But in 6.7 a similar phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ηὔξανεν is given explication by the notation of a multiplication, ἐπληθύνετο, of disciples. In 13.49 a related phrase, διεφέρετο δὲ ὁ λόγος, is explicated in v.48 as a numerical increase. However see below, pp. 209ff. for a qualification.

[67] Cf. Roy Wallis, Salvation and Protest: Studies of Social and Religious Movements (London: Frances Pinter, 1979), pp. 20f. The political movement he studied failed because its task failed to achieve legitimacy.

experience of God as a progression from a local tribal deity, to henotheism, to a universal creator God who judges all men and controls all nations.[68] In this light some Old Testament traditions accepted that the gentiles would have a share in the salvation of God. These universalist tendencies in Judaism were enhanced by the experience of the Diaspora. In the context of the Dispersion the situation of being a cultural minority necessitated the exchange of ideas with pagans and apologetic defence of Jewish customs.[69] These exchanges offered a context in which conversions to Judaism were a frequent enough occurrence to be noted not only in Jewish literature but by classical writers as well.[70]

It seems that Gager is correct in assessing the Diaspora synagogues of the late pre-Christian era and the first Christian century as representing an expansive and aggressive Jewish religion.[71] The existence of proselytes, God-fearers,[72] and the threat to classical values which pagan authors perceived in Judaism all point to this conclusion. There is also the existence of a vast apologetic literature designed for consumption in the Hellenistic world and serving to

---

[68]See Ferdinand Hahn, Mission in the New Testament (London: SCM, 1981), p. 18.

[69]K.G. Kuhn, TDNT VI, p. 730; Kirsopp Lake, BC V, p. 75; cf. Heinrich Kraft, "Voraussetzungen und Motive der Mission im Urchristentum und in der frühen Kirche," Die Spur 4 (1966):18.

[70]Kuhn, TDNT VI, p. 730; J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations (London: SCM, 1958), p. 11; Green, pp. 29f. Evidence is found in inscriptions mentioning proselytes, classical references (e.g. Horace Satires 1.4.142f.; Juvenal Satires 14.96-106), Jewish missionary/propaganda literature (e.g. Philo Apologia; Sybilline Oracles; Joseph & Asenath; Josephus Contra Apion), and the discussion of proselytism in other Jewish literature (e.g. M. Aboth 1.12; b. Pes. 87b; Philo Spec. Log. I 308). For Jewish attitudes towards gentiles see E.P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism (London: SCM, 1985), pp. 213ff.; idem., Paul and Palestinian Judaism (London: SCM, 1981), pp. 206ff.

[71]Gager, Anti-Semitism, pp. 35-88.

[72]See Ch. 3, note 119.

disseminate Jewish ideas in a favourable form.[73] However, in spite of these signs of vigour and expansion, it does not appear that Jews commissioned individuals to the task specific function of winning proselytes. Thus one may regard the Jewish 'mission' as 'passive',[74] and agree with G.F. Moore's qualification of the use of the word 'mission' to describe Jewish proselytism. "The Jews did not send out missionaries into the partes infidelium expressly to proselyte among the heathen."[75] Taking this in mind, Judaism can be called a missionary religion in the sense that the permeation of gentile regions by Jewish settlements and attendant synagogues provided a place of instruction for interested gentiles who may also have been encouraged to convert.[76] This is similar to Luke's view of the influence of Diaspora synagogues expressed by James in Acts 15.21.

In light of the presence of universalist concepts in the Jewish sacred cosmos the outstanding question is why Jewish missionary activity remained passive or at best only ambiguously active.[77] There are

---

[73]It seems that Collins, pp. 8-10, is correct in arguing that one need not make an 'either-or' choice between identifying this literature as 'mission' literature [see M. Friedländer, Geschichte der jüdischen Apologetik (Zurich: Schmidt, 1903); P. Dalbert, Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus (Hamburg: Reich, 1954); and D. Georgi, Die Gegner der Paulus im 2 Korintherbrief (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukircher Verlag, 1964), pp. 51-53, for the origins of this perspective] or as literature for a Jewish audience [see V. Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered," Eos 48 (1956):169-93]. From a sociological perspective it will have been functional both for 'outsiders', in portraying Judaism in an attractive manner, and for 'insiders', in helping them to understand their Jewishness in terms compatible with their Hellenistic environment.

[74]Lake, BC V, pp. 74f.; Schille, "Anfänge," pp. 321f.; contra. Green, pp. 29f.; Jeremias, Promise, pp. 11-16; Kuhn, TDNT VI, p. 730; Hahn, p. 22.

[75]Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, vol. I, (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1927), p. 324; endorsed by Lake, BC V, p. 75.

[76]Lake, BC V, pp. 75f.

[77]The only contemporary literary evidence of active Jewish

several socio-ideological factors which can be identified as having retarded missionary activity. The most important is the nature of Jewish exclusivism which was not limited to the idea that only their God offered salvation but that this God could only be known by becoming one of them. Conversion was primarily naturalization as a Jewish citizen in the theocratic commonwealth of Israel.[78] Salvation was to be achieved by membership in the Israelite covenant.[79] This meant that in order to convert to Judaism the recruit had to abandon his national and ethnic identity and join the Jewish nation and ethnic community.[80]

In the Hellenistic context with which we are primarily concerned the universalist aspects of Judaism, made all the more attractive to gentiles by being wrapped in religio-philosophical dress emphasizing monotheism and morals,[81] only served to compound the basic social problem facing the Jews of the Diaspora: the problem of the maintenance of their identity.[82] This problem had been solved by earlier generations by the erection of distinct social barriers between Jew and non-Jew. Circumcision, food laws, Sabbath, and a separate calendar, served to produce distinct group boundaries which protected

---

proselytism remains Mt. 23.15 and the actions here could be interpreted as that of zeal to instruct and bring to circumcision a gentile who by synagogue attendance or some other indication of interest has made the first move. References by Green, p. 30; Kuhn, TDNT VI, pp. 736f. could also be interpreted in this way. Cf. Schille, p. 322 who emphasizes the etymology of 'proselyte': 'one who draws near'.

[78] Hahn, p. 24; Jeremias, Promise, p. 17.

[79] E.P. Sanders, "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism," in Jews, Greeks, and Christians, eds. Hamerton-Kelly and Scroggs (Leiden: Brill, 1976), p. 41.

[80] Borgen, p. 56.

[81] Jeremias, Promise, p. 15; Hahn, p. 22.

[82] See note 128, p. 119.

Jewish identity by providing isolation from the surrounding Hellenistic culture.[83] Jewish universalism, founded in a theological comprehension of the universe, was restricted by a group exclusivism necessitated by the maintenance of group identity and effected by the erection of social barriers.

The erection of these social barriers produced a reciprocal socio-ideological factor on the part of gentiles which also worked to retard the Jewish mission. Jewish theocratic universalism and group exclusivism confronted a Hellenistic universalism based on an anthropological view of the universe which required few exclusivist barriers. This ideological confrontation when combined with numerous other contributing factors produced a climate in which anti-semitism developed on the part of some pagans who came to perceive Judaism (and later, Christianity) as anti-social. This climate of suspicion was as much a factor in discouraging converts as were peculiar Jewish customs such as circumcision.[84] Confronted by a potentially destructive Hellenistic universalism Jews tended to focus on the aspects of their religion which enhanced or protected their religious and ethnic identity and to interpret their universalist traditions in light of their national identity.[85]

In Chapter 3 it was argued that the mechanisms of group boundary definition which can be seen to have been operative in separating the Lucan community from its environment were of a non-radical nature.

---

[83]Esler, pp. 123ff., lists the classical evidence that such boundaries were functionally operative in the first century and the major means by which pagans identified Jews.

[84]Gülzow, p. 195. Hardin & Kehrer, pp. 267ff., discuss the place of socially unacceptable behavioural modifications in the rejection of belief systems.

[85]Cf. F.C. Baur, The Church History of the First Three Centuries, 2 vols, 3rd ed., trans. Allan Menzies (London: Williams & Norgate, 1878), p. 18. Cf. Hengel, Judaism, p. 313.

Boundaries were clear enough to facilitate ready identification of members and non-members but did not require radical disruption of some aspects of the Lucan Christian's former social context. The non-radical nature of the community's boundaries and its reinterpretation of Jewish circumcision and food laws enabled the community to see the universalist ideas it inherited from Judaism in a manner which made active world mission seem a legitimate task for community members. (The nature of the Lucan community's exclusivism, expressed in its limitation of salvation to repentance and faith in Christ, is also important to an understanding of its mission and will be discussed below. At this point we wish to focus on the nature of its universalism in legitimating active world mission.)

The universalist aspects of Lucan ideology were very similar to those of its Jewish parent. In common with the synagogues of the Dispersion the Lucan church confessed only one God who is Creator and Lord of all men (Acts 14.15; 17.24, 26), stressed the antiquity of their religious roots, and expected that all men would be judged by a universal moral standard (Acts 10.35; 14.16; 17.30f.). The main difference is that the Lucan community did not understand that the salvation offered by the Jewish God in Christ necessitated that gentiles become Jews in order to receive it. Instead it required repentance and faith in Christ, something which could be done by Jews as Jews and gentiles as gentiles. It is, of course, common place to say this and that one of Luke's purposes was to legitimate the inclusion of the gentiles qua gentiles in the salvation of God is even more so (e.g. Acts 10.34-48; 11.18; 13.47; 15.14ff.). The point here is the manner in which this understanding of the universal nature of the Jewish God and his offer of salvation affected the community's perception of world mission. The indication is that the community's relativizing of Jewish food laws, circumcision, and Sabbath, which acquired a niche in

the community's symbolic universe separate from the community's sense of identity[86] and were allowed to impede neither the church's mission (Lk. 10.7) or contact among Christians (Acts 11.1-18; 15.1-21), meant that the national-ethnic boundary a gentile had to cross in order to achieve salvation as a Jew was replaced by a moral-religious boundary which could be crossed in ways more socially acceptable in Hellenistic culture.[87] The community's understanding of universalism as meaning the inclusion of gentiles qua gentiles in the salvation of God meant that mission was made easier by offering salvation to gentiles in a manner that bypassed the objective actions and social consequences which most frequently kept gentiles from accepting the demands of full Jewish proselytism.

The Lucan sacred cosmos also provided a relevant focus for mission. The cornerstone of the Lucan symbolic universe was Jesus Christ (Acts 4.11). Jesus served as the focal point for the universalist tendencies of Old Testament prohecy and through his fulfilment of these prophecies and the development of his symbolic functions in an inclusive sense became the direct agent and effective power of world mission (Lk. 2.30-32; 24.44-47; Acts 3.25f.; 10.43; 26.18-23). Jesus also served as the focal point for the universal applicability of the power of God to heal and deliver, which was an important aspect of Luke's sense of mission (Ch. 5, E and F). Luke emphasized by his addition of the phrase ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντιπέρα τῆς ταλιλαίας (Lk. 8. 26b) to the introduction of his story of the Gerasene demoniac that this event, which took place in non-Jewish territory,[88] is to be

---

[86]Krodel, Acts, p. 58. That is instead of functioning soteriologically they were established as norms for the life of Jewish believers.

[87]Cf. Hardin & Kehrer, pp. 267ff.

[88]Note also the disappearance of the crowd after 8.21 and its reappearance in v.40. Since ὄχλος in the gospel and early chapters of Acts signifies a Jewish group, this also indicates that this excursion was to a non-Jewish area.

related to the general geographical scheme of the Galilean ministry.[89] As such this event demonstrates that Jesus' power to heal was not limited to Jewish areas and serves as a precedent for the extension of divine power in Jesus' name to gentiles in the church's mission as presented in Acts.[90] And we have already seen that Luke presented Jesus as a model for Christian missionaries, a function which would have enhanced his qualities as a focal point for the above mentioned ideological constructs and served to relate these concepts more closely still to the world of the reader.

The use of Jesus as a religious-ideological focal point also functioned in an exclusivist sense (Acts 4.12). The universal offer of salvation was available only by one means: repentance and faith in Christ. One still had to transverse a specified boundary into a concrete community in order to realize the relationship with the Jewish God offered by Christians. In this manner exclusivist aspects of the community's christology functioned to protect group identity. What the universalist aspects of that christology did was to make this transverse easier than it had been in Judaism by defining the objective actions and attendant social consequences of conversion in ways which were more socially acceptable in Hellenistic culture.

The Lucan Christian was committed to an all embracing explanation of the universe which was open to all men.[91] Universalist tendencies and a divine imperative for mission[92] received an exclusive

---

[89]Fitzmyer, pp. 735, 737; Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 49f.; Danker, St. Luke, pp. 106f.; Talbert, Reading Lk., p. 97; contra. Schweizer, Luke, p. 149.

[90]Ibid., Fitzmyer, Conzelmann, Danker, and Talbert.

[91]Cf. Tidball, p. 75, for a general statement of the importance of this for early Christianity.

[92]See Donald Anderson McGavran, How Churches Grow (London: World Dominion Press, 1959), p. 58 for the importance of an appreciation of divine imperative in modern mission.

focus in the community's christology. This group saw themselves to possess the one all embracing explanation of the universe which could save mankind.[93] The reality of this belief was confirmed by their religious experience. The importance of this exclusivist aspect for mission in a Hellenistic context can be highlighted by a comparison with Greek religious groups.

The Greek world did have itinerant missionaries of various types. These were principally wandering philosophers[94] but there may also have been devotees of Eastern mysteries who practised active proselytism.[95] However, the ethos of missionary activity in Hellenism was based on a pluralistic and cosmopolitan sense of world religion.[96] The thought of religious intolerance or an exclusive means of salvation was foreign in a system based, in practice, on the idea that the ultimate Divinity was manifested in multiple and diverse cults throughout the world and that these different cults all ought to be observed lest somehow a god or God be overlooked.[97] Rome remained indifferent to the cultural multiplicity of religion provided that public decency (hence the prohibitions against the Bacchanalians) and public recognition of the state religion (and thereby affirmation of the social order, hence prohibitions against Christianity in the 2nd century) were maintained.[98]

---

[93] Cf. ibid.; idem., Church Growth and Christian Mission (New York & London: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 13 for a discussion of the importance of exclusivist claims in modern mission; and Tidball, p. 75 of early Christianity.

[94] See C.H. Moore, BC I, pp. 236ff., 251f.; Green, p. 19; A.D. Nock, Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964), p. 11.

[95] C.H. Moore, BC I, pp. 258f.

[96] See ibid., pp. 218f.; Tidball, p. 72; Nock, Hellenistic Background, p. 17; Donald Winslow, "Religion and the Early Roman Empire," in Catacombs, p. 243.

[97] Cf. Acts 17.22f.; Nock, Hellenistic Background, pp. 8f.; C.H. Moore, BC I, p. 234; Winslow, p. 243; Hengel, Judaism, p. 261.

[98] Gülzow, p. 192; cf. Tidball, p. 71; Green, pp. 38-41.

The wandering philosophers, the offspring of the philosophical schools, were the primary source of Hellenistic proselytism but do not represent an adequate comparative model for early Christianity. It does not appear that those few philosophical schools which did develop a sense of community[99] ever evolved a mission ideology as a part of the definition of their group identity and task as had been the case with the Lucan church. Nor do the collegia represent an adequate comparative model.[100] Their sense of group identity, size, and goals (sometimes defined by imperial decree) were restrictedly local, small, and task specific (e.g. proper burial).[101] Luke knew of the existence of collegia as a social grouping in his society (Acts 19.23-25).[102] Yet his community did not choose to identify itself as a collegium or hetaeria[103] but as an ἐκκλησία (cf. Ch. 3, p. 149). The political overtones of the use of this term[104] indicate a broader and a translocal (Acts 9.31) sense of identity which went far beyond that of the associations.

The non-exclusivist nature of Greek universalism appears to have impeded the development of mission communities, i.e. communities which had in their self-definition concepts which lead to the conversion of all men to the specific form of salvation offered by only their

---

[99]The Pythagoreans; Walter Burket, "Craft Versus Sect: The Problem of Orphics and Pythagoreans," in Meyer & Sanders, p. 19.

[100]Meeks, pp. 78f.

[101]See Meeks, p. 78; Kee, Christian Origins, p. 82; Robert L. Wilken, "Collegia, Philosophical Schools and Theology," in Catacombs, p. 279; cf. Tidball, pp. 86ff.

[102]He also uses the term σχολή (19.9) which can be used of the meeting place of an association (Malherbe, Social Aspects, pp. 89f.; cf. Haenchen, Acts, n. 2 p. 559). R.P.C. Hanson, The Acts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 191 and Marshall, Acts, p. 309; suggest that it might be possible that Luke thought of Paul as a wandering philosopher in these verses but Malherbe's arguments are more persuasive.

[103]As Pliny referred to Christians slightly later, Wilken, Christians, p. 33.

[104]Ibid. Meeks, pp. 93f.

community. Thus while Lucan Christians used Greek universalist ideas in relating their religious concepts to the Hellenistic world (e.g. Acts 17)[105] their form of exclusivism aided in being able to go beyond Greek religious models in developing a sense of world mission. In their religious experience Lucan Christians found an exclusive yet universal explanation of life which contrasted with pagan pluralism.

D. The Motivation of Converts

A sociology of mission must also examine the motives and actions of converts. In this area theories of relative deprivation and social disorganization and disruption have frequently been used to explain the motivation for conversion. Broadly such theories posit that persons who are adequately socialized into existing social structures and secure in their self-identity, social status, and relationships and happy with the social rewards they receive do not demonstrate a propensity to join new religious movements. On the other hand persons who have experienced social disruption, live in a socially disorganized situation, or experience relative deprivation, all of which remove social security or excite dissatisfaction with present situations, are supposed to be susceptible to the propaganda of religious movements. Religious movements are seen to function in society by providing compensation in terms of social bonding and support for those who are not given this bonding and support in their experience of the larger society. The idea of relative deprivation as a factor in sectarian conversions stems back to Ernst Troeltsch, who tended to view poverty as a primary factor in predisposing people to join religious sects.[106] But the limitation of relative deprivation to economics has serious

---

[105]Cf. Harnack, Expansion, p. 21.

[106]Ernst Troeltsch, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches 3 vols., trans. Olive Wyon (London: Allen & Unwin, 1931), e.g. p. 331.

difficulties.[107] The theory has accordingly been widened to include not only 1) economics but 2) social power, prestige, status, and participation; 3) physical and mental parity; 4) values; and 5) psychic rewards.[108] These categories could also cover the results of social disruption and disorganization. In this broader form the theory is frequently used in explaining early Christian conversions, especially in terms of relative economic and status deprivation.[109] The theory, while helpful, is not unproblematic and it cannot be used as a total explanation of early Christian conversions.[110]

However, if one uses relative deprivation as a theory of social motivation in a weak non-reductionist sense to be supplemented by other perspectives it can be helpful. A convert must have in his background experiences which render him sensitive to a given religious movement.

---

[107] B. Wilson, Religion, pp. 113f. In studies of European sectarianism, sects have not been common in the poorest countries and in a given society have not been characteristic of the poorest segments of that society. By definition a sect is a minority but until quite recently the poor have been a preponderant majority. Why sects should attract only a small portion of their prospective clientele is a major difficulty for the theory.

[108] Charles Y. Glock, "The Role of Deprivation in the Origin and Evolution of Religious Groups," in Religion and Social Conflict, eds. Robert Lee and Martin Marty (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 27-29; see also Charles Y. Glock, Benjamin B. Ringer, and Earl R. Babbie, To Comfort and to Challenge: A Dilemma of the Contemporary Church (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967).

[109] E.g. Meeks, pp. 72f.; John G. Gager, "Religion and Social Class in the Early Roman Empire," in Catacombs, pp. 106ff.; idem., Kingdom, pp. 93-96; Tidball, pp. 46f.

[110] For criticisms see B. Wilson, Religion, pp. 117f.; idem., "Becoming a Sectarian: Motivation and Commitment," in Religious Motivation, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford: Blackwell, 1978), pp. 499-502; Wallis, pp. 4f.; Gerlach and Hine, pp. 82, 84. These include: 1) that the theory is reductionist in making religion a variable dependent on economic and status inequalities in society and in failing to account for participant explanations; 2) relative deprivation can be identified only ex post facto; 3) it cannot explain alternative methods of the resolution of inequalities; 4) it cannot explain diversity of religious response within a given social stratum; 5) the theory confuses objective and subjective criteria; 6) some empirical studies contradict it.

Relative deprivation can be useful in helping to explain this predisposition on the part of the convert.[111] We have already seen that there is evidence (Ch. 3, pp. 105ff.) which indicates that Lucan Christians were in a situation which Wayne Meeks has called "low status crystallization" or alternately "high status inconsistency".[112] In the multi-grided system of status assessment in the ancient world these Christians tended to rank well in economic indicators but low in other status indicators such as birth, legal standing, occupational status, and privilege (see Ch. 3, pp. 105ff.). They experienced a gulf between the status they might have expected as a result of the economic success they had achieved in the expanding economy of the 1st century and the actual status accorded them by society. It must be supposed that this situation of relative deprivation existed prior to their conversions as well as after and that it was a factor in predisposing them toward Christianity.[113]

There are studies which suggest that pre-existing significant relationships are an important aspect of the conversion process.[114] Regardless of the theoretical considerations regarding factors which may govern the origin of predispositions among converts a first level empirical explanation must examine the importance of inter-personal

---

[111] B. Wilson, Religion, p. 118; Gerlach & Hine, p. 82.

[112] Meeks, pp. 21f., 72f.

[113] As B. Wilson, "Becoming a Sectarian," pp. 502ff., notes, multiple factors are involved in the motivation of conversion. The role of status inconsistency is put forward here as only one factor among many. Unfortunately, while some evidence for this factor can be gleaned from Luke-Acts, evidence for the numerous other factors we would like to know about is not available.

[114] See Gerlach & Hine, pp. 79-97; Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Social Evaluation Theory: Convergences and Applications," in Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, ed. David Levine (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), pp. 252f.; Robert Currie, Alan Gilbert, and Lee Horsley, Churches and Churchgoers: Patterns of Church Growth in the British Isles since 1700 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), pp. 5ff.; D.A. McGavran, How Churches Grow, p. 56; idem., The Bridges of God: A Study in the Strategy of Mission (London: World Dominion Press, 1955), passim.

contacts.[115] A convert to a movement must first come into contact with a member of the movement, and studies suggest that among contemporary groups recruitment proceeds most naturally along pre-existing positive significant relationships. Therefore these encounters between real people are of vital importance in understanding conversion.[116] Alternately, mission can be viewed as a communicative event which requires effective messengers of high quality with a relevant message.[117] This model underlines the importance of communication in interpersonal contact. The mechanical understanding of the theory can be given a scenario as follows: a group/individual within a given social nexus accepts a new religious teaching and joins a movement to which they/he are/is predisposed. This often happens through the development of a positive significant relationship with someone new to the community. From this point the movement spreads along the lines of pre-existing significant relationships by which the community is structured. These are people who know one another intimately, share common background and experiences, and think and feel similarly about common issues. They share a common predisposition and move toward a new religious experience in the company of significant others who have already converted or are similarly considering it.

It has already been shown that the boundaries of the Lucan community, while providing a distinct and well defined group identity, were nevertheless open and non-rigid (Ch. 3, E). The community did not maintain its identity through the use of isolating mechanisms which disrupted contacts with their former social environment.

---

[115] Gerlach & Hine, p. 82.

[116] Ibid., pp. 79, 85f.

[117] Eugene A. Nida, "Culture and Church Growth," in Church Growth and Christian Mission, eds. D.A. McGavran and others (New York & London: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 87-108.

Lucan Christians maintained an identity as 'Christians' and at the same time remained positively related to their wider social environment. Similarly, the commitment mechanisms which can be seen to have been operative most strongly in the community are those which did not emphasize radical dislocation with one's former social context (see above). Also the physical-cultural situation of the church's urban environment will have made pre-existing significant relationships the most natural medium available for the dissemination of the Gospel. Taken together these factors make it likely that such relationships were a prime factor in the achievement of conversions by the community.

The only one of these factors not previously discussed is the church's urban environment. To this we will now turn.

The Lucan church probably existed in an urban environment of a high population density.[118] This physical environment made it difficult for people to remain isolated and for events of a personal or civic nature to pass unnoticed as news spread rapidly along lines of personal contact. In addition the cities of late antiquity were knit together by overlapping webs of relationships. The basic structural unit of the city was the household[119] composed of the nuclear and extended family together with slaves, business associates, hired labourers, renters, and clientèle [120] (e.g. Acts 10.24). In addition to the various series of vertical relationships which existed within a household there were horizontal significant relationships with other households on the basis of kinship and friendship.[121] The second structural aspect of the Hellenistic city which is important to the study of the early church's mission is that of the collegia. Associations of various types provided

---

[118] Meeks, p. 29. [119] Ibid., pp. 29f.

[120] Judge, Social Patterns, p. 31; Meeks, p. 30.

[121] Meeks, p. 30.

webs of significant relationships which spread throughout a city by drawing together from various households those who shared a common profession, trade, interest, or religious devotion. These overlapping structural units provided webs of significant relationships which interlaced urban life and offered a nexus within which new ideas and experiences could be communicated.[122]

The importance of these structural webs of significant relationships for the community of Luke-Acts is evident in the fact that they serve as a presupposed cultural backdrop to numerous narratives.

In Acts 2.42ff. Luke presupposes that households[123] serve as the basic unit of the Jerusalem community and that the daily Christian activity of these households was a factor in the numerical growth of the church. In the construction of the passage both Temple service and the breaking of bread by households (v.46) are factors which contribute to the church's increasing favour with all the people and its numerical growth (v.47). Both the organization of an urban church in households and the connection of church growth with Christian household functions must be seen to reflect Luke's experiences in his own community regardless of their basis or lack of basis in the historical facts surrounding the Jerusalem community.

Luke relates the establishment of Christian communities in Philippi (16.15ff., 32ff., 40ff.), and Corinth (18.7, 8) [cf. Thessalonica (17.5)] to the successful conversion of individual households. In 16.40 Luke has assumed that the mention of the conversion of only two households (16.15, 31) provides an adequate basis to introduce a house church which evidently meets in Lydia's house and consists not only of the members of her household but additional 'brothers' who seem to be distinguished from her household.[124]

---

[122] Cf. ibid. [123] BC IV, p. 29.

[124] Marshall, Acts, p. 275; Neil, Acts, p. 186; cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 499; Bruce, Book, p. 341.

Luke shares the common synoptic mission instruction regulating the stay of missionaries in one worthy household (Lk. 9.4; 10.5; cf. Mk. 6.10; Mt. 10.11). But by reporting a second mission with an expanded set of regulations for household mission activity he shows a greater awareness of the importance of households in the church's mission.[125] And he draws a connection between the conversion of a household and its later use as a mission base in the evangelization of the rest of the city (Acts 16.15; cf. Lk. 10.7f.).[126] Lk. 8.39 contains (see above) specific instruction that Christian conversion ought to progress to proselytism among one's own household and from there to his own city.[127]

E. The Mission's Level of Success

The question still remains as to whether or not the community of Luke-Acts was experiencing success in its mission endeavour. From our outside perspective we shall define success as marked numerical growth and this will be the standard of judgment even though, as will be demonstrated, the community itself defined success by different criteria. As stated above Luke presumed that the church ought to grow in numbers. This point is sufficiently emphasized to encourage the reader in his mission efforts. But how are we to assume that these statements regarding church growth relate to the actual experience of Luke's church? There are several indications that the community itself, in contrast to the way in which Luke has presented the history of the church's mission, was not experiencing a marked success in numerical growth. There are several symbolic means by which the community sought to account for this.

---

[125] On the mission context of these verses for Luke's church, see Ellis, Lk., pp. 154f.; Marshall, Lk., p. 413; Danker, St. Luke, pp. 125f.

[126] Klauck, p. 57; cf. Gülzow, p. 198.

[127] Talbert, Reading Lk., p. 99; Marshall, Lk., p. 341.

The early chapters of Acts record a phenomenal numerical growth by the Jerusalem community (2.41, 47; 4.4; 5.14; 6.7). However, it is arguable that the literary function of these numbers is to support the Twelve in their struggle against the Sanhedrin for the legitimate control of Israel. This appears to be the larger structural theme of Acts 1-5.32. In these chapters Luke can be seen to work out his application of the parable of the Vineyard (Lk. 20.9-19). In the parable, the tenants, whom Luke clearly identifies as the priestly rulers of Israel (v.19), are guilty of failing to render the fruit of the Vineyard (the people of Israel) to God.[128] As a result God will come and destroy those tenants and give the Vineyard to 'others'. In light of the two trials of the apostles before the Sanhedrin (Acts 4.1-12; 5.17-32) these 'others' must be understood to be the Twelve as the legitimate leaders of Israel (cf. Lk. 22.30). In these trials the Twelve are the ones who are ostensibly in the dock. But in the larger literary context Luke has portrayed the situation so that the tables are turned and the reader understands that in reality it is the priestly rulers of Israel who are on trial. A key passage is Acts 3.22f. (cf. 7.37), which identifies Jesus as the prophet like Moses and states that those who do not obey him will be cut off from the people. The reader knows that the Twelve have been obedient to Jesus, a fact reaffirmed in 4.19 and 5.20f. He also knows that God himself has borne witness to their obedience by giving them the Spirit (5.32) and by granting miracles in the name of Jesus (4.30f.; 4.9;

---

[128] In Isaiah 5.1-7, where the image of Israel as God's vineyard is most dramatically developed, the vineyard as a whole, i.e. the whole nation, is on trial before God for failing to produce fruit. In Luke the vineyard's fruit is not in question. Israel is fruitful. Lk. 1 and 2 are predicated on the assumption of a faithful and fruitful response by Israel to God and full of examples of faithful Jews. Acts 1-6 portray the fruitful response of thousands of Jews to the Gospel. What Luke questions is the actions of Israel's leaders who seek to withhold this response from God. Cf. Lk. 11.45-52.

3.13). It is the priests who are disobedient to the Prophet and who reject the witness God has borne to the apostles and to Jesus. This theme comes to a climax in 5.32f. where Peter states that God by the Spirit witnesses to the validity of the apostles' preaching and leadership and that it is they who are obedient to God. The priests themselves respond with utter rejection of the apostles and thus both Jesus and God (Lk. 10.16). The verdict is that the priests are to be cut off from Israel (A.D. 70?) and that the Twelve now constitute the valid leadership of Israel. The large numbers of converts function to support this claim by indicating that large segments of the Jewish people did follow the apostles. This picture cannot be taken to indicate that the Lucan community experienced similar mass conversions without further evidence. The huge successes of Philip in Samaria and Peter in Lydda, Joppa, and in the plain of Sharon probably serve a similar purpose as the early successes in Jerusalem.[129]

Notices of marked numerical success in Paul's mission are less prominent (occurring only at 14.1, 21; 16.5; 17.12;18.8). In the success notice at 16.5 the mention of increases in numbers is designed to support Paul's obedience to the Council in promulgating its decree (μεν οὖν v.5). Luke's point is to promote the solidarity of the church and he does this by saying that when the church is unified it experiences numerical growth.[130]

In 17.12 the notice of success among the Beroean Jews is related to their scriptural fidelity (μεν οὖν v.17). This corresponds

---

[129]Luke takes care to relate these missions, especially that of Philip, to the authority of the Jerusalem church. See Jacob Jervell, "The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel: The Understanding of the Samaritans in Luke-Acts," in LPG, pp. 114ff.

[130]This sounds much more as if Luke is presenting an explanation of current experiences of lack of numerical growth. This reason is to be found in a lack of solidarity.
Additional notices of success at 11.21 and 24 serve to legitimate Barnabas as a worthy person to bring Paul onto the stage.

to Luke's apologetic theme that a proper reading of the Old Testament will lead one to acknowledge Jesus as the Christ (Lk. 24.25, 44; Acts 17.2f.; 18.28). It is directed to non-believing Jews and accuses them of a lack of Biblical fidelity. In this light the passage looks more like a symbolic mechanism for dealing with missionary failure among Jews (see below) than an indication that Luke's community experienced mass conversions in the context of debates about scripture.

Notices in 14.1 and 21 are designed to support the outcome of Paul's first mission which 'opened a door to the gentiles' (14.27). The success Luke is interested in is the inclusion of gentiles in the salvation of God. The numbers are there to give this validity. Other notices of success are more guarded in their tone (13.48, ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον and 17.4, καί τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν).

What Luke and his community have done is to redefine success in terms of the 'spread of the Word'. It is true that Luke indicates that this often entails numerical success, but this is not a necessary connection. In 8.25,40, Philip, after his successes in Samaria and with the Ethiopian official, respectively, goes through many villages and towns preaching the Gospel. There is no indication of numerical success given. The mere fact of the Gospel's proclamation is portrayed here as a success. This is confirmed by success notices involving Paul and Apollos. Paul after his conversion immediately becomes a successful preacher (9.22, 29). But there is no indication that his preaching produced numbers of converts. Rather, the tone of both notices emphasizes the negative response given to his preaching (9.23, 29b). And it is this negative success which sets the stage for the Lucan summary of 9.31 which ends in what must be considered a mandatory reference to numerical growth wholly at odds with what he has just reported. Other success notices given to Paul by Luke have little to do with the addition of numbers of converts (18.4, 11; 19.10,

20). Apollos is similarly portrayed by Luke (18.28).[131] He, too, is successful despite a failure to gain converts.

Many of the notices of church growth given in Acts, both those in Lucan summaries and those given in the course of individual narratives, are linked together by the concept of the spread of the Word. This occurs either by a direct or indirect reference to 'the Word', 'the Word of the Lord', or 'the Word of God' (4.4; 6.7; 8.25; 10.44; 12.24; 2.41; 13.48; 15.35; 17.12; 18.11; 19.10; 19.20); by the use of verbs of proclamation or persuasion which presuppose kerygmatic content (8.40; 9.22; 9.29; 9.31; 11.20f.; 14.1; 14.21; 18.28); or by the use of a verb of hearing which again implies kerygmatic content (8.6). (Growth statements which have no connection with this concept occur at 2.47; 5.14; 9.35, 42; 16.5.) Luke connects the concept of 'the Word' with that of 'the kingdom of God' and other kerygmatic phrases (Ch. 5, pp. 231ff., 239ff.). In this manner he can use 'the kingdom of God' as a summary of Christian missionary proclamation. One of the functions of missionary proclamation of the kingdom is to divide those who hear the message into two groups: those ordained to eternal life and those not (Ch. 5, passim). In this way Luke can tell his reader that success is achieved in Christian proclamation of the Gospel regardless of the audience's response. The proclamation of the kingdom of God functions to explain both acceptance and rejection because division is inherent in its God-intended purpose. A negative response, by marking those who have rejected the Gospel for judgment, has achieved as much success as a positive response (Lk. 9.5; 10.10-16). This is one symbolic means by which the community dealt with failure. They turned it into success.

---

[131] This has a positive value of encouraging those who have already believed (v.27) but no one is said to have converted because of his preaching. His success remains in the negative value of his preaching to place those who have rejected the church's message in a position where they have no excuse.

Another symbolic means of dealing with failure was to remove responsibility for conversion from the missionary and ascribe it either to the audience or God. In Luke's view God is the author of mission, both to Jews and gentiles. Each example he gives of missionary preaching to Jews in the early chapters of Acts is prefaced by a miraculous action of God which thrusts the apostles into a situation which requires that they proclaim its meaning (2.21, 16f.; 3.16; 4.9; 5.20). For God's direction of and responsibility for the gentile mission one need only look at Acts 11.17f. and 15.14.[132]

In terms of conversion the audience is most frequently saddled with responsibility for its decision (Acts 2.38; 2.40; 4.4; 8.6, 12; 9.35, 42; 13.12; 14.1; 16.30f., 34; 17.4, 12, 34; 18.8). This is done by making the hearer the subject of an active verb such as πιστεύω or a passive form of a verb of persuasion (e.g. πείθω, 17.4) which imply cognitive or volitional action on the part of the hearer which accomplishes acceptance or rejection of the missionary's message. In other passages God is made the subject of verbs of conversion and the believer a passive object (2.47; 9.31; 13.48; 16.14; or a similar determinism is evident in events rather than grammar as in 10.44). Only twice is the missionary made actively responsible for conversion (14.21 and 26.18). But Acts 26.18 must be read in light of v.29 where God is given final responsibility for conversion (cf. v.17). And 14.21 must be taken in the context of God's initiative in the inception of Paul's first mission (13.1, 4) and the fact that God is credited with the success of the mission in 14.27.[133] The point here is not to attempt a resolution of conflicts between determinism and free will in

---

[132] Jens-W. Taeger, Der Mensch und sein Heil: Studien zum Bild des Menschen und zur sicht der Bekehrung bei Lukas (Gutersoloh: Gerd Mohn, 1982), p. 163.

[133] Cf. Taeger, pp. 162f.

Lucan theology but to indicate that in both formulations of responsibility for conversion the missionary is relieved of accountability. His task is to act as a faithful vehicle for the proclamation.[134]

A similar lesson is contained in the second part of the story of Dives and Lazarus (Lk. 16.27-31). Once Dives has accepted his fate Luke causes him to ask Abraham a further question which moves the parable to a missionary application.[135] Someone should be sent back from the dead to warn his brothers of their fate. Abraham replies that Moses and the prophets are sufficient warning and if they will not hear them nothing else will avail. This reference to Moses and the prophets touches on a strongly Lucan theme (Lk. 18.31; 24.25, 44; Acts 8.35; 17.2f.; 18.28; 24.14; 26.22). Part of the activity of Christian missionaries is to proclaim or prove Jesus to be the Christ on the basis of Old Testament scripture (see esp. Acts 17.2f.).[136] The message for the missionary is plain. If his audience refuses to see the truth of his scriptural arguments he need not fault himself; nothing more he could do would bring about a positive response. The logion of Lk. 10.6 reflects a similar theme and the whole structure of Luke's report of the Mission of the Seventy presupposes in its instructions that missionaries meet with failure at least as often as they meet with success. Luke heightens this impression by his addition of "woe" sayings to the story of the mission (10.13-15). In all cases of both acceptance and rejection , the missionary has fulfilled his commission in proclaiming the kingdom of God to have come near (10.9, 11).

---

[134]Ibid.; cf. B.R. Gaventa, "'You Will Be My Witnesses': Aspects of Mission in the Acts of the Apostles," Missiology 10 (1982): 413-25; G. Frizzi, "La 'missione' in Luca-Atti. semantica critica e apologia lucana," Rivist Bib 32 (1984):395-423.

[135]Danker, St. Luke, p. 177.

[136]Cf. Bowen, p. 242; Dillon, pp. 104-8; Joseph A. Grassi, "Emmaus Revisited (Luke 24.13-35 and Acts 8.26-40)," CBQ 26 (1964):465.

One final means by which the community dealt in a symbolic manner with failure was in the prophetic imagery used in its christology. Luke presents Jesus as the Prophet like Moses (Acts 3.22, 7.37). He also has a very clear idea as to the fate of a prophet in Israel. It is rejection and suffering. The rejection of God's agents is the dominant theme of Luke's rehearsal of Israel's history in Acts 7. And it is stated as the inevitable reaction of Israel to her prophets in Lk. 4.24, 13.33 and 20.10-12. Luke frequently refers to the rejection of Jesus' prophetic ministry as stemming from scriptural necessity (Lk. 18.31f.; 24.26; Acts 8.32-35; 10.43; 17.2; etc.).[137] In this manner rejection receives a divinely legitimated model in Jesus. Failure is legitimated by being portrayed as the way of Jesus. Since Jesus also functions for the community as a model for the Christian missionary it follows that the community's missionaries must expect to experience public rejection just as Jesus had done.

The sheer preponderance of these mechanisms in the community's symbolic universe, legitimating failure as an expected part of Christian missionary experience and turning failure into a symbolic success when seen from inside the Lucan sacred cosmos, leads one to conclude that the community did not experience marked numerical success in its mission.

In summary, the community of Luke-Acts was motivated to pursue active proselytism by the commitment of its members to a symbolic universe which expected their active support of a divinely mandated mission. The Lucan convert was, in part, predisposed towards the Christian message by feelings of relative deprivation. But more importantly he was moved towards his own commitment by contact with

---

[137] Cf. Dillon, p. 139. Eduard Lohse, "Missionarisches Handeln Jesu nach Lukas," TZ 10 (1954):9ff., speaks of the Way of the Cross as a Way of Rejection. In his view Luke portrays the Christian missionary as following the way of the cross and experiencing public rejection over which he will nevertheless triumph.

significant others who were already members of the community. Finally, the community experienced failure in its missionary task at least as often as it experienced success.

The experiences of a mixed response, i.e. acceptance and rejection of the community's mission, was a problem which required legitimation. This was accomplished, in part, by redefining success so that it would encompass failure. But eschatology and history were major ideas also used to legitimate this aspect, and others, of the community's mission experience. The social functions of eschatology and history in relation to the community's mission will be discussed in the next two chapters.

CHAPTER V

A FUNCTIONALIST APPROACH TO 'THE KINGDOM OF GOD' IN LUKE-ACTS

A. Goals

The object of this chapter is to investigate Luke's use of the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in view of the social functions this concept performed in his community. In order to do this it must be assumed that 'the kingdom of God' held a significant place in the community's symbolic universe. The importance of this phrase for Luke himself can be shown redactionally (see below). And if one is to assume that he was able to communicate with his community on this level then the phrase must be assumed to have been a major symbol within the meaning structures of the community as well. Thus if one examines the cluster of symbols and symbolic actions which surround this phrase in the text it can be shown that these symbols and symbolic actions relate to various aspects of the community's mission experience which have been outlined in Chapter 4 and parts of Chapter 3. It will be shown that this relationship between the cluster of symbols and actions surrounding 'the kingdom of God' in the text and the real life experiences of the community functioned in some instances to legitimate these experiences and in some instances to provide a defence mechanism against adverse reactions by the outside world. The body of the chapter is exegetical in order to determine the symbols and actions Luke associated with the kingdom of God. The sociological analysis is confined to the conclusion.

B. The Kingdom as a Lucan Motif

The use of ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ as the direct object of verbs of speech is typically Lucan (13x, cf. 2x in Mt.).[1] This Lucan usage prompted Hans Conzelmann to remark that Luke had substituted the timeless message of the kingdom for the early proclamation of its nearness.[2] However, this type of construction is not the only manner in which Luke used the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. He also added it to other contexts which indicates a wider interest in the concept than simply its 'preaching'.

Luke had special materials which he used in his story of the Passion that speak frequently of the 'kingdom' as a future event (Lk. 22.16, 18, 29f.; 23.42). His form of the synoptic eschatological discourse contains a reference to the future advent of the 'kingdom' which is not found in Mark (21.31, cf. Mk. 13.29 and Mt. 24.33).[3] A question about the 'kingdom' and the enigmatic answer ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν (17.20f.) were drawn by Luke from special materials to introduce a second eschatological discourse (17.20-18.8).[4] In relation to Mark and Matthew's development of traditions parallel to Lk. 18.29f. (Mk. 10.29; Mt. 19.29), Luke has added the 'kingdom'

---

[1]Merk, p. 204, has recently highlighted the importance of this; cf. Martin Völkel, "Zur Deutung des Reiches Gottes bei Lukas," ZNW 64-65 (1973-74):62. The uses are:

εὐαγγελίζεσθαι	Lk. 4.43; 8.1; 16.16; Acts 8.12
κηρύσσειν	Lk. 8.1; 9.2; Acts 20.25; 28.31
διαμαρτύρεσθαι	Acts 28.23
διαγγέλειν	Lk. 9.60
λέγειν	Acts 1.3
λαλεῖν	Lk. 9.11
πείθειν	Acts 19.8

Mt. twice uses the phrase κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, 4.23 and 9.35. The second is parallel to Lk. 8.1.

[2]Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 114, 122.

[3]Luke has changed Mk.'s ambiguous ἐγγύς ἐστιν, "he" or "it" is near, to specify the subject of ἐστιν as the kingdom.

[4]Marshall, Lk., p. 633.

in a manner which associates it with the Age to come. A passage peculiar to Luke in 14.15 speaks of the future kingdom as a banquet, a theme which is found in Lk. 13.28f. (cf. 22.16, 18, 29f.). It seems evident then that Luke was also concerned with the future advent of the 'kingdom'. The question which emerges is the relationship of this interest with his interest in the 'preaching of the kingdom'.

The frequency of these references and their location in important eschatological passages mark the 'kingdom' as a key eschatological concept in the Lucan community. It is something which is expected on the last day and as such is associated with other events Luke and his community expected on that day (see below). Therefore it can be taken as methodologically useful to isolate the 'kingdom' as a representative concept of Lucan eschatology. The findings of an investigation of its functional aspects can then reasonably be extrapolated to cover Lucan eschatology in general.

C. The Content of the Future Kingdom of God

Our first task is to describe the symbolic events and concepts associated with the kingdom's advent at the eschaton.

The most prominent concept Luke associates with the eschaton is the resurrection of the just and the unjust (Acts 24.15) for judgment (Acts 24.25; 17.31; Lk. 19.27; 17.29f.; 11.32) before the Son of Man (Lk. 21.36, cf. Acts 17.31). The unjust are destined for exclusion from the kingdom (Lk. 13.28) in either Gehenna (Lk. 12.5) or Hades (16.23). The righteous are destined for a positive mode of existence described as a banquet (Lk. 13.28f.; 22.30), times of refreshment (Acts 3.19), or as an inheritance (Acts 20.32). At the advent of the kingdom on the last day the Lucan community expected humanity to be divided into two groups; the righteous (defined in reference to Jesus Christ) and the unrighteous, each destined for [illegible] fates.

The positive mode of existence of the righteous can be further unpacked. Luke was aware that σώζω could be applied in both a physical and a spiritual sense (cf. the word play in Acts 4.9 and 12). In this light he often emphasized the realized aspects of salvation (cf. his repetition, Lk. 7.50; 8.48; 17.19; 18.42, of the traditional phrase ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε, cf. Mk. 5.34 and 10.52, see also Acts 2.47; 4.12; 14.9; 15.11; 16.30). But salvation is also thought of as a future event which comes to full actualization at the eschaton. There is only one case of a future passive of σώζω in Luke-Acts which clearly refers to the future consummation of salvation at the last day, Acts 2.21.[5] But since this is a quotation of Joel 3.5 it could be objected that it is not a typically Lucan concept. There is however a future (σώσαι) in Lk. 9.24 (cf. Mk. 8.35) which in common with Mark is linked to sayings about the future advents of the Son of Man and the kingdom of God. Similar connections between other forms of σώζω and references to the future consummation of the kingdom (Lk. 13.23ff.; 18.26ff.; 19.10ff.[6]) make it probable that full salvation was expected with the advent of the kingdom.[7]

The relationship of the future consummation of the kingdom to the present experience of healing is made clear in Lk. 10.9. Here healings done by the disciples are a sign that ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. The question is whether ἤγγικεν means "has arrived" or "has come near". The verse's parallel structure with v.11 can help in this regard. In v.11 those who reject the disciples' preaching

---

[5]The contexts of Lk. 8.50, Acts 11.14, and 16.31 make it clear that future salvation is not Luke's major concern in these instances.

[6]Lk. 19.10ff. is particularly instructive. Here the statement that salvation has come to Zacchaeus' house is linked to the following misunderstanding about the time of the kingdom's advent (ἀκουόντων δε αὐτῶν ταυτα . . ., v.11).

[7]Also Lk. 18.30 relates eternal life to the future advent of the kingdom. On Lk. 21.28 which speaks of 'redemption' as future, see Ch. 1, pp. 29f.

are given a sign of judgment and similarly told that the kingdom ἤγγικεν. In this instance ἤγγικεν must mean "has come near" because the judgment specified in v.12 has not yet arrived. To say to these people "the kingdom has arrived" would make no sense because the arrival of the kingdom for them means judgment and the realization of that judgment is still in the future. The parallel structure with v.9 means that ἤγγικεν most likely means the same in both instances. Healing is a sign that the kingdom is near and it represents a foretaste of something which will be fully realized with the advent of the kingdom.

There are then two aspects to the symbolic content of 'the kingdom of God' as a future consummation of God's reign for the Lucan community: 1) a universal resurrection of the dead at which humanity will be divided into two groups, 2) a future and full realization of salvation, in both physical and spiritual aspects.

D. The Symbolic Value of the Kingdom as a Transcendent Reality

Luke inherited from Judaism and his Christian traditions the belief in a transcendent heavenly realm. It is the abode of God (e.g. 11.13; Acts 7.55) and the angels (e.g. Lk. 2.15) and most importantly it is where Jesus is enthroned at the right hand of God as Lord and Christ (Acts 2.30, 36; 7.56).

There is one passage, taken over from Mk. 10.17-25, which juxtaposes heaven and the kingdom as present transcendent realities (Lk. 18.18-25). But stronger evidence of the kingdom as a present transcendent reality in Luke's conception is to be found in his christology. First, in Luke's form of the parable of the pounds (19.11ff., cf. Mt. 25.14ff.) the thematic interest in the kingdom is part of the framework he has supplied for the parable.[8] The sequence

---

[8]Vv. 11, 12, 15. There is some question as to whether or not

in vv. 12 and 15 makes it clear that Jesus receives his βασιλεία before his return.[9] And if Flender is correct in identifying this aspect of the parable as an allegory of the exaltation,[10] then in Luke's view he received the kingdom at the Ascension. Second, Luke associates the kingdom with his use of δύναμις by his juxtaposition of 21.27, 31.[11] But he emphasizes that the power the Son of Man will have at his parousia was already to be seen in Jesus' ministry (e.g. Lk. 4.14; 5.17) and that as exalted Lord he now manifests it in his church (e.g. Acts 6.8; 8.13). This may also be one of the reasons for his deletion of the phrase ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει (Mk. 9.1) at 9.27. He wanted to emphasize that the parousia will not be the beginning of the kingdom's power. It is now active in the world.[12] Third, 21.27, 31 also identify the coming of the kingdom with the coming of the Son of Man in glory. At the Ascension Luke emphasizes (24.26, Acts 7.55) that Jesus entered into his glory. This is further accentuated by Luke's alteration of Mk. 8.38 (9.26), by which he indicated that the Son of Man comes in his own glory rather than receiving glory from the Father at the parousia.[13] The glory with which the kingdom will appear in conjunction with the parousia of the Son of Man is the glory Jesus now has as the exalted Lord.

---

the 'kingdom' theme in vv. 12 and 15 was supplied by Luke or found by him in a source (Marshall, Lk., pp. 701, 704; however, he, Caird, Lk., p. 210; and Schweizer, Lk., pp. 293f., think of this theme in vv. 12a & 15a as preLucan; Danker, St. Lk., pp. 193f.; and Fitzmyer, p. 1231, think of it as Lucan. But since there is general agreement that Luke constructed v.11 as an introduction to the parable (Marshall, p. 703; Klosterman, p. 186; Caird, p. 209; Fitzmyer, p. 1231; Schweizer, p. 293; Ellis, p. 222), it is he who has made a connection with vv. 12 & 15 by the use of βασιλεία. Thus 'pre-Lucan' (if this is what these verses are) cannot mean non-Lucan. The kingdom motif remains his own.

[9] See esp. Danker, St. Lk., pp. 193f.; cf. Flender, Redemptive History, pp. 91f.

[10] Flender, Redemptive History, pp. 91f.

[11] Contra. Hiers, Kingdom, pp. 30ff.

[12] Franklin, Christ the Lord, pp. 21-23.

[13] Ibid., p. 23.

Two further aspects of the concept of the kingdom as a transcendent reality are important in regard to its functional utility in the community's social situation. First, the transcendent kingdom is a hidden reality. No man can see into heaven.[14] The sole exception, Stephen, required that heaven be specially opened for him at the point of death in order for him to see Jesus in his glory. Elsewhere heaven is shut away from human access by a cloud (Acts 1.9),[15] or signifies a place of removal from human perception. The angels go away into heaven (Lk. 2.15). In Peter's vision the sheet full of unclean foods was taken away up into heaven (Acts 10.16). Second, the transcendent kingdom guarantees the church's ultimate victory. Even though the struggle with demonic powers continues on earth the victory has been secured in heaven (Lk. 10.18).

From a sociological perspective the transcendent reality of the kingdom is important as a non-falsifiable hidden realm where the social conflicts the church is engaged in are already symbolically overcome, where its head exists in glory, and from which its power in the struggle with socially defined demonic forces is said to come.

E. 'Preaching the Kingdom' in Luke's Gospel

The full phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ first occurs in the gospel in 4.43. Fitzmyer says of this that it is surpising, ". . . no attempt is made at this first occurrence of the expression in the Lucan gospel to define what 'the Kingdom of God' is".[16] He is able to say this only because his form critical analysis of 4.42-44 as a pronouncement story causes him to overlook its connections with the rest of Ch. 4.[17] The fact that these verses are a reworking of Mk. 1.35-39[18] is not

---

[14] Cf. ibid., p. 32. [15] Ibid.

[16] Fitzmyer, p. 557. [17] Ibid., p. 555.

[18] Ibid., see also Marshall, Lk., p. 197; Shürmann, p. 254.

sufficient warrant to overlook the function they have come to play in the Lucan composition. In terms of the subsection Lk. 4.14-44 this first occurrence of the phrase has been given a careful definition.

When Luke uses the phrase 'the kingdom of God' as the direct object of a verb of speech it is usually in a passage which is by nature and structure a summary (e.g. Lk. 8.1; 9.11; Acts 1.3; 8.12; 20.25; 28.23, 31). As a result one must search out a larger context from which to draw the meaning of the phrase.[19] It is not given a definition in its immediate context because it was an idea which was so much a part of community jargon that it had no need of explicit definition. Lk. 4.42-44, regardless of source-or form-critical assessments, has come to function in the Lucan composition as a concluding summary to the subsection beginning at 4.14.[20]

Both Otto Merk and Martin Völkel have emphasized the importance of this section of Luke's gospel in arriving at an understanding of his conception of the kingdom.[21] Merk has done this by understanding Lk. 4.42-44 as a Lucan summary.[22] Völkel did so by working back from Acts 28.23, 31 where in both instances the 'kingdom' is qualified by references to Jesus (v.23, περὶ τοῦ Ιησοῦ, v.31, τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ιησου χριστοῦ). This leads him back to the first occurrence of βασιλεία in conjunction with Jesus' ministry, i.e. Lk. 4.43 and its preceding context.[23]

---

[19] Cf. Merk, pp. 205f.

[20] Ibid., cf. p. 208, "Nach dem Aufriss in Lk. 4 ist in Jesus Wort und Tat der Inhalt seiner Predigt, das Reich Gottes gegeben". Cf. Plummer, p. 141, "This statement (v.44) forms a conclusion to the section (14-44)"; cf. p. 116. However, following Godet (p. 116) he seeks the unity of the whole of 4.14-9.50 in developments concerning the disciples and misses synagogue preaching (see below) as the unifying factor.

[21] Merk, p. 205; Völkel, pp. 62f., 57.

[22] Merk, p. 205. [23] Völkel, pp. 62f.

One may go beyond Merk and Völkel in noting the close literary structure of Lk. 4.14-44. The section opens and closes with strong affirmations of Jesus' mission (vv. 15, 44). It also opens and closes with generalizations of Jesus' synagogue activity (vv. 15, 44).[24] The intervening stories give examples of this synagogue activity -- at Nazareth Jesus preaches and at Capernaum he performs exorcisms and healings. One is now in a position to unpack the symbols and symbolic actions associated with 'the kingdom' in this subsection. We will begin with the Nazareth pericope.

As background to the discussion of Lk. 4.14-30 it is important to note that from Acts 28.23, 31 it seems evident that Luke connects his conception of the kingdom with christology.[25] One can also point to the overlap of Lk. 24 with Acts 1 for a similar connection. Only Luke and John have strong traditions of post-resurrection instruction by the Lord. Luke alone gives the period as 40 days and says that the instruction was about 'the kingdom of God' (Acts 1.3). Examples of this post-resurrection teaching are given in two sections: Lk. 24.25f. and 44-49.[26] Here one finds an emphasis on fulfilled prophecy[27] and on the passion, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus. In v.47 instructions about the preaching of repentance and forgiveness of sins to all nations are added. (Salvation is defined, in part, as forgiveness of sins in Lk. 1.77.[28])

---

[24] In Galilee and Judea respectively. If the minority reading of Γαλαλαίας in v.44 is accepted the unity is even more striking.

[25] Völkel, p. 63.

[26] Bruce, Book, pp. 34f.; idem., Acts, pp. 67f.; cf. Neil, Acts, p. 64.

[27] Paul Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, BZNW XXI (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), p. 176.

[28] Fitzmyer, pp. 222f., 386.

Instructions about Christian mission and the Holy Spirit (24.48f.) are repeated in Acts 1. From these associations it seems evident that 'preaching the kingdom' involves preaching about the suffering, dying, and rising Jesus, and the implications this has for world mission.[29]

A christological focus is also present in Lk. 4. Luke's own emphasis can be seen by a comparison with Mk. 6.1-6. Mark, too, focuses his version on the issue of christology.[30] But he gives no specific content to Jesus' teaching. And although the teaching is still causally linked to the rejection,[31] the fact that one does not know what Jesus taught reduces the confrontation to one about Jesus' person. The error of the people of Nazareth is their rejection of a correct christology. This is evident in Mark's conclusion. Unbelief, the failure to recognize Jesus' person, results in an absence of miracles.

Luke's much expanded account gives a finer focus to the christological issue. First, he has softened Mark's question about Jesus' parentage. This question is no longer the point of confrontation.[32] It is de-emphasized in relation to Mark's extended version. Luke places the question about parentage in the context of the wonderment (ἐθαύμαζον) produced by Jesus' statement in 4.21. Mark placed the motivation for the question in a negative context (καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ) which, by indicating that it is their failure to recognize his true parentage that caused their rejection of him, focuses the passage on the issue of Jesus' person. But for Luke, Jesus' parentage produced puzzlement, not opposition,[33] in the

---

[29]Völkel, pp. 63-68; cf. A.L. Moore, The Parousia in the New Testament (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966), p. 104.

[30]Tiede, p. 38.

[31]Schweizer, Mark, p. 123. [32]Cf. Tannehill, p. 53.

[33]Cf. J.A. Sanders, "Isaiah 61 to Lk. 4," p. 93, "They were initially both pleased and puzzled".

congregation's initial approbation of his message. In contrast with Mark, Luke has structured his account so that the turning point in the congregation's response is Jesus' interpretation of Isaiah 61 by using I and II Kings.[34] For Luke the issue behind the congregation's rejection of Jesus is focused less on his person than on his teaching. And the specific element of his teaching which causes such an adverse response is his understanding of salvation. The Lucan Jesus has challenged the accepted canons of election held by the Nazareth congregation.[35] Using stories of Elijah and Elisha to interpret the reading from Isaiah, Jesus told the congregation that the salvation he had just proclaimed as fulfilled would go to people outside Israel, and thus he implies their own exclusion. James Sanders' identification of this element of the story as 'prophetic critique' was discussed in Ch. 3, pp.132ff. And it was said that the general acknowledgement of Luke's hand in the formation of these elements indicates that he did understand what Sanders has termed 'prophetic critique' and that he has emphasized it in his composition. In terms of Luke's larger theme of acceptance/rejection (see Lk. 2.32; 7.29f.; 8.18, 37; 9.5; 10.9-11, 16; 11.29f.; 13.6-9, 33-35; 14.15-24; 19.44; etc.) the Nazareth pericope illustrates that the offer of salvation can have a negative response and that those who respond negatively are threatened with exclusion from that salvation.

The programmatic significance of Lk. 4.16-30 is widely recognized.[36] In particular, vv. 18-21 offer a programme of salvation which Luke followed closely in structuring his gospel at least as far as 7.23. The fulfilment of the Isaianic programme is worked out

---

[34] Ibid., p. 102. Cf. David Hill, "The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth," NovTest 13 (1971):169; Tannehill, p. 62.

[35] J.A. Sanders, "Isaiah 61 to Lk. 4," p. 95; Tiede, pp.47f.

[36] See Ch. 3, note 40.

in a series of progressively intensified healings and exorcisms. In Capernaum Jesus performed an exorcism and healed Simon's mother-in-law. His mission there is closed with a summary report of multiple healings and exorcisms. In 5.12ff. a leper is healed, followed by further multiple healings. In the healing of the paralytic (5.17-26) a word-play on the dual connotation of ἄφεσις (cf. 2x in 4.18f.), to mean both forgiveness and healing, is developed. Healing and forgiveness are part of the same 'release' and together constitute the fulfilment of salvation (cf. 1.77). In 6.15 there is again a summary of multiple healings. The raising of the widow's son at Nain is the climactic miracle of the section. It is an allusion to the same Elijah story which was used to interpret the programme in its initiation (1 Kings 17.8-24). In 7.22f. the entire programme is rehearsed.[37] There are direct verbal connections between 4.18f. and 7.22 in the use of εὐαγγελίζω, πτωχός, and ἀναβλέπω. And of the eight individual elements which can be found by conflating 4.18f. and 7.22 (1. preaching to the poor, εὐαγγελίζω; 2. preaching, κηρύσσω; 3. deliverance, ἄφεσις; 4. healing the blind; 5. healing the lame; 6. healing lepers; 7. healing the deaf; and 8. raising the dead) only two (4 and 7) are not given a specific example. Healing and deliverance are essential symbols which are associated with Jesus' mission in this section of the gospel.

Running concurrently with the promise of release from sin and disease in 4.18f. is the emphasis on the proclamation of good news. In 5.15 the crowds came to hear and to be healed. In 5.17 while Jesus was teaching, the power of the Lord to heal was also with him. In the synagogue scene, 6.6f., Jesus came to teach and the Pharisees watched to see if he would heal on the sabbath. The summary of 6.17 repeats the complementary concepts of 'hear and be healed'.

---

[37] Conzelmann, Theology, p. 191; Schürmann, p. 411.

It can be seen then that the Lucan Jesus in his ministry proclaimed the realization (4.21) of salvation which was manifested in both physical and spiritual aspects (e.g. 5.23). Secondly, his offer of salvation met a mixed response. Some rejected salvation and some accepted salvation. This mixed response is exemplified in the contrasting responses to Jesus at Nazareth and Capernaum. These are the symbols and actions which are associated with the kingdom in the summary in 4.42-44 which closes the opening presentation of the programme of Jesus' ministry.

It must be investigated as to whether or not other references to the 'kingdom' in the gospel have similar symbolic content.

Discussion of Lk. 7.28 often centres on the inclusion or exclusion of John the Baptist from the present realization of the 'kingdom' in Jesus' ministry.[38] John's exclusion from the kingdom is usually made on the grounds that this verse reflects a periodization of salvation history similar to that which Conzelmann has extracted from Lk. 16.16.[39] However, since Luke makes it clear that the patriarchs and prophets (Lk. 13.28) will be present in the 'kingdom' (if John is to be classed with the prophets, then presumably he, too, will be there) and since the overlap of Jesus and John in the birth narratives demonstrates the artificiality of attempts to separate John from the fulfilment which had come in Jesus[40] the direction of the question in this manner only hides the help which can be gleaned from the larger context within which Luke has placed the saying.

---

[38] Cf. Marshall, Lk. p. 296; Mattill, Last Things, pp. 159-64; Hiers, Kingdom, pp. 57-64.

[39] Friedrich, TDNT VI, pp. 840f.
Conzelmann himself makes little use of this verse, index, p. 249.

[40] Paul S. Minear, "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories," SLA, eds. L.E. Keck & J.L. Martyn (London: SPCK, 1968); S.G. Wilson, "Lukan Eschatology," NTS 16 (1969-70):330-47.

Particularly, one must note Luke's addition of vv. 29-30.[41] It is this comment by Luke as the narrator which offers a clue to the symbolic content of the kingdom in v.28. In these verses one finds 'mixed response' associated with the kingdom. It is implied that the people and tax collectors have a place in the 'kingdom', having been baptized by John. The reason for their delight in Jesus' statement is that it promises them a reward in the kingdom in view of their positive response to John (provided, of course, that they also become Christians, Acts 19.1-7). But the equally strong implication is that the Pharisees and lawyers have opted themselves out of the kingdom. In rejecting John (and from Luke's perspective, his witness to Christ) they have rejected God. Here people are divided into two groups in connection with a saying about the 'kingdom'.

Conzelmann focuses his discussion of Lk. 8.10a on Luke's use of the plural μυστήρια as against Mark's singular. He understands that in Mark the secret is the 'kingdom' itself which is about to be revealed at the parousia.[42] Luke's plural indicates a shift from Mark's

---

[41]It has been objected that vv. 29-30 are traditional. Morris, p. 144, argues this on the basis that Luke usually gives clear editorial indications when he is inserting his own comments. This is also the opinion of Geldenhuys, p. 230. Leaney, p. 145, thinks that these verses could be traditional but that a comment by Luke is more likely. Cf. Creed, p. 108. Plummer, pp. 205f., also stated that one would expect clearer editorial indications of a comment by Luke and added that the οὖν of v.31 demonstrated the unity of the whole passage. Another possible opinion is that vv. 29-30 are traditional words of Jesus improperly inserted at this point by Luke, Klostermann, p. 91 and Manson, Lk., p. 82. However a source critical examination of the passage indicates that these verses did not come to Luke in an identifiable tradition. Lk. 7.24-28 is closely parallel to Mt. 11.1-11 and the parallel is again close in Lk. 7.31-35 and Mt. 11.16-19. The material Mt. used in 11.12-15 is found in Lk. 16.16 with major alterations. Lk.'s material in 7.29-30 is roughly similar to material found in Mt. 21.31-32. This suggests a 'Q' passage of which one or both evangelists have altered the central section, cf. Marshall, Lk., p. 297. It is the shift from fluid first person speech to third person past narrative between vv. 28 & 29 which is the most telling alteration, Klostermann, p. 91, and without better source critical evidence, indicates the insertion of a comment by the narrator, Marshall, Lk., p. 297.

[42]Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 103f.

interest to concern for the "timeless mysteries" about the 'kingdom' and its transcendent nature. One knows secrets 'about' the 'kingdom' rather than the 'kingdom' itself.[43]

There is no evidence in the immediate context for Conzelmann's interpretation apart from the shift from singular to plural.[44] And again if one examines the larger context a different meaning emerges. Lk. 8.10a is part of a structural unit which begins with an opening summary in 8.1-3 and ends at 8.21.[45] This indicates that 8.10a should be read in light of the larger Lucan theme, 'hearing and not hearing' which is present in this section.[46]

The opening summary in 8.1-3 prefaces and qualifies the parable of the sower as part of Jesus' proclamation of the 'kingdom'. The material through 8.18 is based on Mark 4.1-25 which is part of a larger Marcan section concerned with the parabolic teaching of Jesus. From the Marcan material Luke selected the parable itself, the partial quotation of Isa. 6.9a (v.10b), the explanation of the parable, and the attendant sayings from Mk. 4.21-25, which are connected to the main parable by the theme, the word of God. He omitted all the other parables which Mark included in the section. From a section constructed around Jesus' practice of teaching parables, Luke has built a section united around one theological theme. Even vv. 19-21, taken from Mk. 3.31-35, have been redacted to fit the same theme as the parable. Luke has focused the parable on the issue of hearing and responding

---

[43]Ibid. [44]Fitzmyer, p. 708.

[45]Leaney, p. 149; Cf. Manson, Lk., pp. 86-91. Ellis, Lk., p. 122, extends the section to 8.56, but the theme, preaching the kingdom, which he thinks unifies the section, continues in 9.2, 6, 11. Teaching about the kingdom continues through 9.27 and through the connection of this verse with the transfiguration on to 9.51. Fitzmyer, pp. 695-99, takes 8.1 as the conclusion of Chapter 7.

[46]Cf. Tiede, p. 42.

to the word of God,[47] not the transcendent nature of the 'kingdom'.

The summary statement in 8.1 also connects the concepts 'word of God' and 'kingdom of God'. The two ideas were already connected by Luke in the close juxtaposition of 4.43 and 5.1. There the announcement of Jesus' intention to preach the good news of the kingdom in other cities is immediately followed by the statement that some of the people of these cities pressed upon him to 'hear the word of God'.

The parable of the sower is, in Luke, a summons to take care as to how one 'hears' the word of God,[48] *i.e.* Jesus' preaching of the kingdom. Luke was aware that 'words' from God could be 'heard' in two different senses. Luke intended that the Gospel be heard with an open and receptive heart (8.15). The hearer in whom the word bears fruit is the one who recognizes and comprehends the significance of what is being said and openly embraces it for himself. But frequently the proclamation of the 'kingdom' was heard by people whose hearts were neither receptive nor perceptive. They either rejected the word in outright hostility or it was made void by the means described in the parable. To be in the situation of having prided oneself in understanding what he has, in reality, totally miscomprehended is dangerous (v.18). The word of God, and by association the kingdom of God, divides humanity into two groups. On the one hand are those in whom the word bears fruit and on the other are those in whom it proves unfruitful.

Lk. 9.1-6 is important as a preliminary to the discussion of Acts. First, one must note that the Twelve participate in an extension of Jesus' mission. They do the same things that Jesus

---

[47] Marshall, Lk., pp. 317f.; cf. Fitzmyer, p. 700.

[48] Marshall, Lk., p. 318.

himself does: preach, heal, and exorcise demons.[49] Salvation is to be realized in their mission in the same ways in which it was realized in Jesus' mission.

This can be further seen in Luke's addition of δύναμις to v.1. He has a predilection to add δύναμις in certain contexts.[50] It is added most frequently in contexts involving healing. "Power" is first connected with Jesus' mission in Lk. 4.14. It is connected with the action of the Spirit in his life. This is taken up in the quotation from Isa. 61 in 4.18f. where the Spirit's anointing is related to Jesus' ministry of healing and forgiveness. Another connection between the Spirit, power, and salvation is made in 5.17. The emphasis on the presence of God's power is a way of stating his present concern to heal, deliver, and forgive, i.e. to save. The presence of this power is confirmed in miracles. Now the Twelve go out with this same power and this is confirmed in the miracles they perform.

The words of instruction are largely traditional. Luke has added vv. 1-2 to provide a context and v.6 as a conclusion. Even though some context to the commissioning in v.1f. must have been present in the tradition, the materials as they now stand are largely Lucan.[51] The emphasis on 'power' and 'preaching' are clearly Luke's.

Fitzmyer identifies five constituent elements in the Lucan form of the instructions: 1) a conferral of power and authority, 2) a commission, 3) rules about the journey, 4) rules about lodging, and 5) rules about the rejection of their message.[52] These form an

---

[49] Morris, p. 163; Geldenhuys, p. 264.

[50] Lk. 4.14, 36; 5.17; 6.19; 8.46; 9.1; 19.37.

[51] See Hahn, pp. 41-46, for source critical analysis.

[52] Fitzmyer, p. 752. Hahn, p. 43, gives 4 elements which can be traced to the base tradition: 1) the sending out, 2) a rule about equipment, 3) instructions for behaviour in houses, 4) instructions

intensifying progression which culminates in the negative fifth point. The presence of God in power with the Twelve, in both preaching and healing, is both promising and foreboding. Each village they visit is confronted by the saving power of God manifest in their miracles and preaching. In this instance little is said about those who responded positively, but the implication is positive. However, if the message of the kingdom is rejected, the instruction to shake the dust off their feet as a sign of judgment against the town, illustrates, with sombre eschatological finality, the seriousness of their refusal.[53] The Twelve's preaching of the kingdom divides those who hear; and while it is implied that those who receive the message will share in the kingdom, it is explicitly stated that those who reject the message will not.

The occurrence of βασιλεία in Lk. 9.27 was discussed in part in Ch. 1 (pp. 33f.). Debate centres on the present or future value of the kingdom in this verse but this can be bypassed in the present context. It should be noted that this reference to the kingdom again occurs in the context of sayings about the division of humanity in view of the decision forced by Jesus' demand (vv. 24-26).

References to the kingdom in Lk. 10.9 and 11 have been discussed in part, on pp. 221f. and 39ff. It seems evident that the 70, just as the Twelve, participate in an extension of Jesus' ministry. They preach and heal just as he had done. And their message divides humanity, promising salvation to some (v.5) and judgment to others (vv. 10-12). The real question concerning these verses is whether or not Luke intended them to apply to the church of his own day. A comparison of their actions

---

for behaviour in towns. Hahn's fourth point is neutral rather than negative because he is combining Lk. 9.1-6 with 10.1-12 to recover the base tradition. The latter lists both positive and negative responses.

[53]Geldenhuys, p. 266, note 10; Marshall, Lk., p. 354; Caird, Lk., p. 126.

which are associated with the kingdom with those associated with the kingdom in Acts will shed some light on this problem.

The debate about the meaning of ἔφθασεν, Lk. 11.20, cannot be decided on lexical grounds alone. (It must be emphasized that we are interested in its meaning for Luke. Much of the literature is involved in investigating its meaning in a Sitz im Leben Jesu, although it must be doubted that this Greek word was ever spoken by Jesus.[54] But findings in this context can, in some instances, be extrapolated to a Lucan context.) In spite of R.F. Berkey's 1963 JBL article which demonstrated the stalemate between future and present interpretations,[55] A.J. Mattill has recently argued, on the basis of K.W. Clark's 1940 JBL article,[56] that φθάνω means, "arrival upon the threshold of fulfilment and possible experience but not the entrance into that experience".[57] And I.H. Marshall has argued that Clark was "splitting hairs" and φθάνω and ἐγγίζω are synonymous and have a realized meaning.[58] G. Fitzer's TDNT article offers a methodological suggestion which may help to solve the impasse. (Fitzer is primarily concerned with the meaning of this word in a Sitz im Leben Jesu, but the methodology he proposes could be applied at any level in the tradition.) He suggests that technical translation makes little difference, "for the material understanding of the statement in which φθάνω occurs depends upon theological exegesis of the concept of the kingdom of God and upon exegesis of the conditional clause, namely,

---

[54]E.P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, pp. 134, 137.

[55]"Εγγιζειν, Φθανειν, and Realized Eschatology," pp. 177-87; cf. E.P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, p. 134.

[56]"Realized Eschatology," pp. 367-83.

[57]Mattill, Last Things, pp. 169-75; also Hiers, Kingdom, p. 31.

[58]Marshall, Lk., pp. 422, 476.

upon interpretation of the connection of expelling demons with the figure of Jesus and its significance for the Lordship of God".[59] In response to these exegetical questions the significance of the exorcism for Luke in Lk. 11.14 is that it demonstrates that God is present in power to save. In this manner the kingdom 'has come'. But its presence is not in the unambiguous manner expected at the parousia. The present manifestation of the kingdom in Jesus' mission and evidenced in the deliverance of the possessed person, was not comprehended by those who accused him of using the power of Beelzebub to accomplish it. In this instance Luke has preserved a connection made in his traditions between the manifestation of the power of the kingdom in Jesus and the refusal of some people to recognize this. Luke also retains the warning against neutrality (v.23). One must take special care in deciding how to respond to the power of God manifest in Jesus.

The connection of the two traditional kingdom parables (Lk. 13.18-21, The Mustard Seed and The Leaven) with the preceding story, unique to Luke, of a sabbath healing (13.10-17) is evident in Luke's editorial οὖν, connecting vv. 17 and 18.[60] But the significance of this connection is infrequently and often poorly drawn.[61] Within the approximate bounds of 12.49-13.35 it appears that Luke has united several disparate traditions, some more successfully than others, around the issue of the election and judgment of Israel. Jesus has come to bring division and fire upon the earth (12.49-53). This is connected with sayings about judgment and the signs of the time

---

[59] Gottfried Fitzer, TDNT IX, pp. 91f.

[60] See Geldenhuys, p. 378; Plummer, p. 344; Marshall, Lk., p. 560.

[61] E.g. Marshall, Lk., p. 556, "The connection of thought at this point . . . is far from clear".

(12.54-59) which lead to a warning of judgment against Jerusalem (13.1-5). This is followed by a parable which illustrates Jerusalem's situation. It has not produced any fruit and is in danger of destruction (13.6-9). This is followed by the story of the sabbath healing which divides the people (cf. 12.49-53) and introduces the kingdom parables (13.18-21). These are followed by further warnings of judgment (13.22-30). The section comes to a close with Jesus' first lament over Jerusalem (13.31-35). It is within these diverse statements of judgment, division, and the coming kingdom (13.28) that one must attempt to understand Luke's interpretation of these two parables.

Lk. 13.10-17 is a sabbath confrontation, a theme Luke inherited from Mark (Mk. 6.1-6, cf. Lk. 4.16-30; Mk. 2.23-28, cf. Lk. 6.1-5; Mk. 3.1-6, cf. Lk. 6.6-11; Lk. 13.10-17 and 14.1-6 are unique to Luke). These stories begin with some sort of demonstration of authority or power on the part of Jesus which provokes a negative reaction on the part of his antagonists and thus produces a situation in which Jesus can demonstrate the superiority of his position. In this light Luke's addition of v.17 in this instance is significant. The bulk of the story either came to Luke in a tradition or was built up by him from a traditional composite. But one may assume that v.17 stems from his own hand because of his thematic interest in the opposite responses given to Jesus and the apostles by the people and their rulers.

Ellis identifies "opposition to Jesus" as the key element in the sabbath story. Thus the following parables would teach, "The victory of the impending Kingdom over the opposition of men and Satan."[62] But this overlooks the emphasis on two responses which Luke has imported to the story. And it misses the fact that v.17 ends the

---

[62]Ellis, Lk., p. 186.

story on a positive note, "all his adversaries were put to shame", while "all the people" were rejoicing. The emphasis in the sabbath story is not opposition or its apparent triumph, but the division of the people. The kingdom parables are thought by Luke to explain the mystery of the two possible responses in regard to the manifestation of God's power as stemming from the nature of the kingdom itself.

In summary, from an examination of the programmatic opening to Jesus' ministry in Lk. 4.14-44 and from examples of other occurrences of βασιλεία, one finds that Luke consistently connects aspects of the symbolic content of the kingdom as a future and transcendent reality, i.e. the present manifestation of God's power to heal and save and the division of people into two groups on the basis of their response to these manifestations and Jesus' proclamation, with references to Jesus' preaching of the kingdom and to other occurrences of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in the context of his ministry.

F. 'Preaching the Kingdom' in Acts

Direct references to the kingdom of God in Acts are few (8x). Six of these references are in summary statements with minimal explication. This is probably because the meaning of the phrase is an unconscious presupposition behind the narrative and Luke felt no pressing need to provide explanation. Therefore, it is necessary to establish a basis in the larger framework of Acts from which the understanding of the kingdom used in Acts may be recovered.

Beginning with Acts 8.12 and 28.23, 31 a series of verbal associations can be constructed. In 8.12 εὐαγγελιζομένῳ is followed by both the kingdom of God and the phrase, "the name of Jesus Christ". Preaching the good news of the kingdom is parallel with preaching the name of Jesus Christ.[63] In Acts 28.23, "bearing witness to the

---

[63]Merk, p. 205. Also Bruce, Book, pp. 179, 34f.; Williams, Acts, p. 116; Marshall, Acts, p. 156; contra. Haenchen, Acts, p. 303.

kingdom" (διαμαρτυρόμενος) is parallel with "convincing (πείθων) them concerning things about Jesus from the Old Testament".[64] In Acts 28.31 "preaching (κηρύσσων) the kingdom" is parallel to "teaching (διδάσκων) things about Jesus".[65] All of these verbs and concepts appear in diverse places as descriptions of the early church's mission and preaching.

The list of associated concepts can be expanded. In 8.12 it is said that the Samaritans 'believed' Philip's preaching of the kingdom. In 8.14 this action is described as having received the word of God. In Acts 19.8 Paul argued (διαλέγω) and tried to persuade (πείθω) the Jews about the kingdom of God. As a result of these actions it is said that the residents of Asia had heard the word of the Lord (19.10).[66] This is similar to the connection made between the kingdom and the word of God in Lk. 4.43-5.1 and 8.1-21 (see above). In Acts 20.21 Paul describes his ministry as one of bearing witness to Jews and Greeks of 'repentance' toward God and 'faith' in the Lord Jesus. He alternatively describes his ministry in v.25 as "preaching the kingdom". Paul carried out this ministry because he had received a commission from the Lord to testify of the "gospel of the grace of God" (v.24). Thus these concepts are also connected with the kingdom of God.[67]

All of these associations lead to the larger context of Luke's general portrayal of apostolic and Pauline ministry. Particularly, one is directed to the speeches of Acts. It is well established that

---

[64]Merk, p. 205; Bruce, Acts, pp. 480f.; Haenchen, Acts, p. 723; Marshall, Acts, p. 424; Williams, Acts, p. 278; Conzelmann, Apg., p. 149.

[65]Merk, p. 205; Bruce, Acts, pp. 480f.; Bernhard Weiss, Die Apostelgeschichte (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche, 1893), p. 313.

[66]Cf. Marshall, Acts, pp. 308f.

[67]Bruce, Acts, pp. 379f.; Williams, Acts, p. 233; Neil, Acts, p. 214; the last phrase is also linked to v.21 in the use of verbs, Weiss, p. 242.

the speeches in their present form represent Lucan theological comment on the narrative regardless of their basis or lack of basis in tradition. Because the speeches give comment on the development of the church they are, of necessity, linked with the narrative framework.[68] This connection between the speeches and the narrative events must also be examined to provide evidence of the understanding of the kingdom contained in Acts.

The first point to note is the emphasis on the miraculous as evidence of the actualization of salvation. In the Pentecost sermon Peter refers to the outpouring of the Spirit at the opening of the sermon (2.14f.), in the middle (v.33), and at the end (v.38). This miracle provides an occasion for the sermon, serves as a descriptive 'visual aid' which verifies Peter's claims about Jesus (2.33), and illustrates what those who repent will also receive (v.38). The sermon provides an answer to the question of 2.12 in terms of a christological argument based on scripture and validated by a visible miracle. The miracle means that God is at work, through Jesus the exalted Messiah, in pouring out the Spirit.[69] The miraculous as a manifestation of God's power also figures in the christological portion of the sermon proper. Peter accepts 'signs and wonders' as a validation by God of Jesus' mission (2.22).[70]

It is this Jesus, exalted by God, who is now the effective agent of the miracle they are seeing (v.33).[71] The Spirit is also linked with the offer of present salvation in 2.17, 21, and 38.

The healing of the lame man at the Temple gate (3.1-10) is a manifestation of Jesus' power (vv. 13-16) which Peter must clarify by

---

[68] See esp. Wilckens, Missionsreden, p. 71; passim.

[69] Marshall, Acts, pp.71f.

[70] Haenchen, Acts, p. 186; Marshall, Acts, p. 74.

[71] Haenchen, Acts, p. 187.

preaching. The healing done in Jesus' name provides an opportunity for a fuller explanation of the significance of the Christ event (vv. 17-26). The same miracle is causally linked with the speech given before the Council (4.5-12). Luke makes it plain that the miracle could be explained on no other grounds than the present action of God and that this was generally acknowledged (4.21). The connection of the miracle with salvation in terms of health and wholeness is made in 3.16 (cf. 4.10).

In the apostolic prayer (4.24-31) 'signs and wonders' are again linked with preaching as a confirmation.[72] The following reaffirmation of the Spirit's presence (4.31) is intended to convey God's intent to answer the prayer.[73]

The phrase σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα is used to open the section 5.12-16. This describes a partial fulfilment of the prayer in 4.24ff.[74] This passage is also the third Lucan summary of life in the early church.[75] Haenchen's analysis of the literary origins of the passage and the difficulties of transition which Luke was trying to smooth out may be accepted as adequate.[76] Two points should be noted in the manner in which Luke has joined the disparate trends tugging at his narrative. The 'signs and wonders' cause both the reverenced awe of the non-Christian Jews and the unparalleled expansion of the church.[77] Secondly, Luke has used this summary as an introduction to the arrest in 5.17f. It is the miraculous power of the apostles, creating a following among the people, which gives rise to the jealousy of the

---

[72] Ibid., p. 227.

[73] Ibid., p. 228; Marshall, Acts, p. 107.

[74] Haenchen, Acts, p. 242, note 2; Marshall, Acts, p. 114.

[75] Haenchen, Acts, p. 243; Bruce, Book, p. 117.

[76] Haenchen, Acts, pp. 243ff.

[77] Ibid., pp. 244f.

Sadducees[78] and creates still another opportunity to witness.

In the miracles associated with Philip's mission to Samaria one finds a close resonance with the miracles of Jesus. Here the note of Messianic joy sounds clearly in the healing and deliverance which Philip brings (8.12). The kingdom (v.12) is linked to preaching and healing (v.6).

In Peter's mission to Lydda and Joppa (9.32-43) miracles function as a self-contained kerygma. They sufficiently reveal God's saving intent and directly cause faith without the need for preaching.

The actualization of salvation in a physical sense, particularly in miracles of healing, is an aspect of the mission of the early Jerusalem church which Luke stresses and which can be seen to have been associated with their preaching of the kingdom. There is also an emphasis on the realization of salvation in the forgiveness of sins.

'Forgiveness of sins' is a concept which occurs frequently in the apostolic preaching of Acts as a realized aspect of salvation (Acts 2.38; 3.19; 5.31; 10.43; 13.38; 22.16; 26.18). The concept is less prevalent in the gospel,[79] owing to the fact that the major passage which deals with the theme (5.17-26) has been taken over from Mark with only minor alterations which makes it difficult to assess Luke's understanding of the passage. Equally hard to assess is the fact that the second passage which deals with the issue (7.36-50) is thematically a doublet of 5.17ff. References in 3.3 and 11.4 are also traditional. Lk. 24.47 is a post-resurrection saying designed to look forward to Acts and should be classed with the references in Acts. This leaves only Lk. 1.77 which defines salvation in Christ

---

[78] Ibid., p. 245.

[79] Cf. Fitzmyer, p. 224, who indicates that the phrase 'forgiveness of sins' is a Lucan retrospective summation of the whole of Jesus' life and death even though Jesus himself did 'forgive sins'.

as the forgiveness of sins[80] and a possible intimation in 4.18f.[81] It appears that Luke understood the forgiveness of sins as something which could only be fully proclaimed after the passion and resurrection. It is something which characterizes the mission of the church.

Both Matthew and Mark open Jesus' ministry with similar summaries of his preaching as a call to repent (Mt. 4.17; Mk. 1.15). But Mark never again places the verb on Jesus' lips and uses the noun only once in reference to John the Baptist (1.4). Similarly, Matthew uses the noun only to describe John's preaching (3.8, 11), places the verb on Jesus' lips only twice (11.21; 12.41), and uses it once in an editorial comment (11.20). On the other hand Luke understands the preaching of repentance as scripturally necessitated (Lk. 24.46f.) and uses the word group in connection not only with John (4x) but frequently of Jesus (Lk. 5.32; 15.7; Acts 5.31; Lk. 10.13; 11.32; 13.3, 5; 15.7, 10; 16.30; 17.3, 4), Peter (Acts 2.38; 3.19; 8.22), and Paul (Acts 17.30; 26.20; 20.21; 26.20). The sheer preponderance of the theme in his writings and the theological importance he attaches to it (Lk. 24.46f.; cf. Acts 5.31; 11.18; 17.30) indicate that it was a motif of major importance in his eyes and that it probably reflects a key aspect of his community's kerygma.

Thus when one turns to the preaching of forgiveness in the early Jerusalem church, Luke's presentation very likely reflects the practices and understanding of his own community. The understanding of 'the forgiveness of sins' as a realized aspect of salvation can be seen in the connection of Peter's offer of forgiveness at Pentecost (2.38) with Luke's use of forms of σώζω in the passage. Those who respond to Peter's preaching are offered the forgiveness of their sins.

---

[80] Ibid., pp. 386, 222ff.; Marshall, Lk., p. 93.

[81] Fitzmyer, p. 224.

The summary in v.47 describes these people as "those being saved" (σῳζομένους). Σώζω first occurs in this passage in v.21 in the quotation from Joel where it most naturally refers to future salvation (see above, p. 221). However, this passage is alluded to in the repetition of the verb in vv. 40 and 47.[82] This repetition of the verb is used by Luke to provide a transition from the formal quotation of Joel to the present realization of salvation in the community and to set the stage for the salvific healing (see below) of the cripple at the temple gate.[83] Cadbury considered the meaning of οἱ σωζόμενοι in 2.47 to be beyond competent English translation due to the lack of a real present passive in English.[84] But he made it clear in his commentary that even though the context indicates that these people were saved from future judgment (v.40), they "were not being gradually saved".[85] Their salvation was presently realized in terms of forgiveness of sins, the gift of the Spirit, and healing.

The connection between healing and the forgiveness of sins (see above, pp. 229f.) is made in 4.1-12.[86] The verb σώζω is used to describe the man's healing in v.9 (σέσωται) and is used again to describe full salvation in v.12 (σωθῆναι). There is a progression from σέσωται to ὑγιής (v.10) to σωθῆναι, the latter encompassing and surpassing the healing described by the former two.[87]

Further evidence for a realized understanding of salvation in the community can be found in the use of ὄνομα in these opening

---

[82] Bruce, Acts, p. 102; BC IV, p. 30.

[83] Cf. BC IV, p. 30.

[84] Cadbury, BC V, p. 383.

[85] BC IV, p. 30.

[86] W.C. van Unnik, "The Book of Acts, The Confirmation of the Gospel," NovTest 4 (1960):50.

[87] Cf. ibid.; and Marshall, Acts, p. 100.

passages. The phrase ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου (Acts 2.21) was part of pre-Lucan tradition (see Rom. 10. 13; I Cor. 1.2; cf. II Tim. 2.22). Luke himself uses the phrase as a designation for Christians (Acts 9.14, 21) and links it with the forgiveness of sins (22.16) as well as the offer of salvation. In the speeches of Acts 3 and 4, "There is no distinction between the ὄνομα which saves from God's judgment and the ὄνομα which dispenses healing . . .".[88] The easy transition from healing in Jesus' name (4.10) to ultimate salvation in the same name (4.12) illustrates the fullness of salvation which was offered by the apostles in their mission.

Salvation was seen by Luke to have been present in its fullest sense in the mission of the early church and in the mission of his own church. It encompassed the forgiveness of sins, healing, and deliverance, all experienced as presently realized. Salvation was present in the kerygmatic proclamation and in confirmatory demonstration of the power of the Spirit. It can be seen then that Luke's presentation of the salvation offered in the church's mission contains those elements he expected to be fully actualized at the eschaton, i.e. physical and spiritual salvation, and reflects the present power of the kingdom which is related to its transcendence. The direct connection of this understanding of present salvation to the kingdom was shown in the association of statements about the 'preaching' of the kingdom with the apostolic kerygma in general which was outlined in the beginning of this section (pp. 239 f.).

It can also be shown that Luke expected the church's mission to divide humanity into two opposite groups.

Luke makes it clear that the power of the Spirit seen in Jesus' mission and now in the disciples' mission is an attestation

---

[88] Haenchen, Acts, p. 217; cf. Bruce, Book, p. 101; idem., Acts, p. 121.

by God of the former's messianic status and the latter's messianic mission (Acts 2.22, 10.38). It is God himself who bears witness to Jesus in the miracles and outpouring of the Spirit.[89] In Jesus' and the disciples' proclamation one is confronted by God. A decision is forced and it is a decision which divides men.[90] In the first four kerygmatic speeches of Acts[91] the basis of this division is laid out in christological arguments.

All four of these speeches are addressed to Jews and a basic function of the christological arguments is to establish the guilt of the Jews of Jerusalem for killing their Messiah. This is most clearly expressed in 2.36: "Let all the house of Israel know definitely that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified". These Jews have killed the only one who can save them.[92] This accusation of guilt for the murder of Jesus is related to the audience's response in v.37. They had been penetrated by the accusation and saw the seriousness of their position. This leads directly to their repentance.

However, since Luke was eager to put believing Jews in a positive position the introduction of the motif of 'ignorance' in 3.17 helps to lessen their guilt in relation to the death of Jesus. This verse also introduces the 'rulers' as a separate category from the 'people' and intimates the development of a special role for them in Jesus' death. This role is developed in the next two speeches (4.8-12;

---

[89] van Unnik, "Confirmation," p. 57.

[90] Ibid., p. 58.

[91] 1) Pentecost, 2.14-40; 2) Peter at Solomon's Portico, 3.12-26; 3) Peter before the Sanhedrin A, 4.8-12; 4) Peter before the Sanhedrin B, 5.29-32.

[92] Regardless of who Luke intended by the phrase, χειρὸς ἀνόμων (v.23), (most likely the Romans, Haenchen, Acts, p. 180; Bruce, Acts, p. 91), ultimate responsibility rests with Peter's audience.

5.29-32) where direct responsibility for the death of Jesus is placed with the rulers who are contrasted with the large numbers of the people who have affirmed the apostles' teaching. The christological affirmation of a dying and rising Messiah has divided the nation of Israel (cf. 3.22f.).

Guilt for the murder of the Messiah is set in a theological view of Israel's history in Stephen's speech. There are three soteriological figures used in the speech: Joseph, Moses, and 'The Righteous One' (v.52 = Jesus, v.55). A common pattern is used in the stories of all three, although in the case of the latter the final portions of the pattern are present only by implication.

Joseph and Moses were both chosen by God to effect the deliverance of their people: the former from famine and the latter from Egyptian bondage. But the patriarchs opposed Joseph out of jealousy (7.9) and the fathers stubbornly refused to obey Moses (vv. 25, 39). Nevertheless, God did effect deliverance for Israel by the hands of both men. But the results of both were imperfect. Joseph's deliverance of the people led to bondage in Egypt. Moses' deliverance, because of the people's rebellion and in spite of his construction of the 'tent of witness' (which it seems was intended in the theology of the speech as a fulfilment of God's original injunction to Abraham to worship him in the land), failed to achieve a purity of worship. First, there was open idolatry in the wilderness and second, the temple replaced the tent.

The Righteous One came from God, as had been foretold by the prophets (v.52). The people opposed him and killed him. Yet the reader knows that the deliverance God intended has been achieved (cf. 4.12). It is implied that The Righteous One is the one who will fulfil the command given to Abraham. The point remains that the history of Israel is one of confrontation with God. In Joseph, in

Moses, in the prophets, and now in Jesus, God has confronted Israel with his will to save, but they, as a people, have resisted him and continue to do so. At this point it appears that Luke may have inadequately edited a source which conflicted with his basic position vis à vis the Jewish people. The speech ends on a very negative appraisal of Jewish response to God in Christ, but Luke has been eager to show throughout these opening chapters that many Jews had believed (see Ch. 3, p. 127). It seems reasonable then that Luke did not intend for the reader to have at this point the opinion that all Jews reject Jesus, which would seem the logical conclusion of the speech, but that some do reject him while others accept him. The speech in this manner supports the idea that the history of God's dealing with Israel is one of division between those who follow him and those who do not.

Another christological figure Luke used was the 'prophet like Moses' (3.22). The point he makes is again one of prophetic confrontation with the people which balances on the issue of obedience. It is quite clear that the people are divided into those destined to be included in the 'times of refreshment' (v.19) and those destined for judgment on the basis of their response to the prophet.

A third figure, the stone rejected (4.11f.), again relates the division of the people into those who are to be saved and those who are not to God's confrontation with them in Christ. In this instance the rulers are threatened with destruction by the stone upon which the new nation is being built. The 'stone' divides the people.

It can be seen then that Luke has constructed his christology so that the division of the people into two groups, the saved and the lost, stems from the very nature of God's dealings with his people. Christ by nature elicits acceptance and rejection which have eternal

consequences. The relationship of christology to the kingdom has already been noted (pp. 222f., 225).

The presentation of Paul's mission

It has been noted that the miraculous demonstration of God's power was an essential aspect needed to illustrate the present realization of salvation. The same is true of Luke's presentation of Paul's mission. However, the miracles Luke associates with Paul often protrude awkwardly into the text and appear to contain 'legendary' elements. Sometimes they are not concerned with any proclamation of the Gospel and do not cause conversions. At least once the connection with a Pauline sermon is achieved only by editorial work of poor quality (see below). One suspects that few traditions were available to Luke which corresponded to his earlier emphases and portrayed Paul as a miracle worker. However, since he was to present Paul as 'preaching the kingdom of God', miracle stories were required. Thus he was compelled to compose fitting summaries and to use stories of legendary character in order to conform his presentation of Paul to his understanding of the kingdom, even though his traditions presented a Paul who was essentially a mission preacher.[93]

The statements about healings and exorcisms, and signs and wonders in 19.11 and 14.3 respectively, are Lucan summaries introduced into the narrative.[94] The statement in 19.11 introduces a series of

---

[93]Paul himself claims to have worked miracles; 2 Cor. 12.12, cf. I Cor. 2.4, Rom. 15.18f., I Thess. 1.5; E.P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, p. 450. This makes it probable that miracle stories about Paul were available.

[94]On 19.11 see Conzelmann, Apg., p. 111; Haenchen, Acts, p. 562; and Cadbury, BC V, p. 399. For 14.3 cf. the verbal parallels with 5.12; cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 420. Acts 14.3 has the main characteristics Cadbury uses to discern summaries: parallelism and generalization (BC V, pp. 392-402). It fails to meet his specification of being located at one of the 'interstices' of the narrative, "both connecting and dividing the pannels of the story".

Luke's description of events at Iconium appears to be an expansion

three stories linked by reference to magical and thaumaturgic beliefs and practices. These stories are added to round out the account of Paul's ministry in Ephesus which had already been concluded once in 19.10. The generalization in 14.3 also serves to associate signs and wonders with the Pauline mission. It introduces an emphasis on divine power which heralds the coming of the kingdom.[96] Because it is a summary rather than a description of specific miracles, Luke is able to conform it more closely to his earlier emphasis on miracles.

The account of the deliverance of the slave girl at Philippi, like the miracles at Ephesus, is dissonant with the earlier Lucan emphasis on miracles. It does demonstrate the power of God to deliver those bound by Satan. But the motivation Luke attributes to Paul, irritation rather than compassion,[97] is totally at odds with the context of messianic joy given to miracles in Lk. 4.18f. Similarly, the blinding of Elymas Bar-Jesus (13.11), a retributive miracle,[98] has little in common with Luke's Jesus or with the mission of the early church. Marshall's suggestion that it was meant as ". . . a stimulus to conversion . . .", reads too much into the account.[99] The miracle is related to the conversion of the proconsul Sergius and

---

of one of the 'stops' M. Dibelius isolated in his famous 'mission itinerary' source. From little more than the name, Luke has built a story out of generalizations rather than to invent specifics. All the elements of the story are typical stereotypes of Pauline mission activity. Preaching in synagogues (14.1) is a recurrent theme. A positive response by both Jews and gentiles to Paul's ministry is found in 17.4, 12; 18.4; 19.10. Unbelieving Jews stirring up the gentiles to oppose Paul is also typical (13.50; 14.19; 17.5, 13). Luke frequently mentions a 'lengthy' stay by Paul (18.11, 18; 19.8, 10; cf. 14.3). Other themes, the division of the people (14.4), attempted stoning (14.5), and escape, are all found in other stories and recounted in more specific detail. It seems then that Luke has constructed this account by putting together a series of typical incidents which he saw as standard to the Pauline mission. It is significant that he felt it necessary to include miracles in this series.

[96] Bruce, Acts, pp. 278, 91.

[97] Neil, Acts, p. 183. [98] Ibid., p. 156.

[99] Marshall, Acts, p. 219.

it is his conversion in which Luke is interested.[100] In this sense it fits well with the general function of miracles to produce and confirm faith.[101] But it does little to mediate the harshness of the retributive action. It still contrasts with miracles as the positive power of God to heal, deliver, and bring salvation. Miracles in Jesus' and the early church's missions produce negative responses in some who witnessed them, but were, with the exception of Ananias and Sapphira, the experience of God's grace to those who received them.

The miracle at Lystra is designed to serve as an introduction to the narrative.[102] It is presumed as the background for events through 14.18. In this sense it serves the same function as miracles associated with Peter in 3.1; 4.22; 5.12ff.; 9.33ff., 36ff. Luke also associates the cripple's healing with Paul's preaching (14.9).[103] This is consistent with the missions of Jesus and the early church. However, there are several differences which portray compositional difficulties in the passage.

Although the miracle provides the situation for Paul's sermon it is not mentioned or alluded to in the sermon itself as evidence of God's present action. This has led some to see in the passage an imperfect conflation of two different sources, i.e. a miracle story

---

[100] See Williams, Acts, p. 158. The statement that he 'believed' implies baptism and full conversion. Cf. Acts 13.48; 14.1; 17.34; 18.8. It does not mean that he took a first step toward becoming a Christian, but did not come to fruition of faith. This answers Bruce's reservations, Book, p. 265, concerning Sergius' conversion. Marshall, Acts, p. 220; Neil, Acts, p. 156; Haenchen, Acts, p. 400; all think Luke's intention was to portray his conversion. Cf. Weiss, pp. 168ff. and Richard Belward Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, 6th ed. (London: Methuen, 1912, '1901), p. 201.

[101] See Achtemeier, pp. 159ff. BC IV, p. 147, points out the difficulty in deciding whether ἐκπλησσόμενος is meant to express astonishment at the miracle or the teaching of the Lord. They are probably correct in their final suggestion, ". . . διδαχή is, in one sense, inclusive of the miraculous element".

[102] Haenchen, Acts, p. 425. [103] Ibid., p. 430.

and a sermon.[104] Secondly, the miracle does not result in the conversion of any of the Lystrans or in their recognition of the action of the true God. (Only the cripple is said to have faith and that in a very indirect manner.) Haenchen describes Luke's purpose in his presentation of Paul's miracles as a desire to portray Paul as a miracle worker with great power and authority.[105] This is without doubt one way of explaining this phenomenon, but the analysis can go further. One must ask why it is that miracles are such an important point. What is it that this power and authority represent which must be connected with Paul? Luke's understanding of the kingdom seems to provide an adequate explanation. This understanding of the kingdom made it necessary for Luke to conjoin the story of the miracle with Paul's sermon, however imperfectly. And the story shows that the Lystrans understood the miracle as a divine visitation[106] even if they got the god involved wrong.

It seems that Luke intended to present the raising of Eutychus (20.9f.) as a major miracle.[107] The similarities of the story with 1 Kg. 17.21f. and 2 Kg. 4.34 make this more probable.[108] The ambiguities in the story, noted by Cadbury, arise because the traditions behind the story are at variance with Luke's theological interest in miracles. There is no positive connection with the proclamation of

---

[104] Ibid.

[105] Ibid., p. 433. This thesis runs throughout Haenchen's analysis of all the Pauline miracles, see pp. 404, 585, 714, 716. See also Neil, Acts, p. 163.

[106] Bruce, Book, p. 291.

[107] Marshall, Acts, p. 326; Bruce, Acts, p. 373; Haenchen, Acts, p. 585.

[108] Haenchen, Acts, p. 585. Both passages from Kings were the basis for Lk. 7.11ff.

the Gospel. The people are already Christians, so there can be no conversions because of it. Any reference to God's action in a saving deliverance is absent. Paul simply demonstrates power and helps his friends.

No more miracles, apart from cognition, are recorded of Paul until his arrival at Malta (28.8-9). These are miracles of compassion and positive deliverance from disease, but there is no preaching and there are no conversions.[109] Paul performs mighty acts as one who helps his friends and rescues them.[110] In this instance he secures their favourable reception and send off by the natives (28.10). Again Luke has used a story which presents Paul as a miracle worker, but lacks the results he emphasizes elsewhere.

Paul performs miracles only at Cyprus, Iconium, Lystra, Philippi, Ephesus, Troas, and Malta out of at least twenty cities and regions where Luke describes him as having active ministry. Of these seven stories only the Lucan summary at 14.3 fits harmoniously with his overall interest in miracles. The other six stories have legendary and magical accretions, impure motivation, or are poorly edited into their context. Miracles pale into total insignificance in the trial section (Acts 21-26) where Luke draws out his main interest in the Pauline mission. It does not appear that Luke had traditions of miracles by Paul which conformed to his own thelogical interest in miracles as seen in the gospel and early chapters of Acts. Yet when faced with the need to portray Paul as preaching the kingdom of God in continuity with those before him, Luke had to include the miraculous as a demonstration of the present realization of physical salvation.

---

[109] Marshall, Acts, p. 418.

[110] Ibid.

Luke also presents the spiritual aspects of salvation as realized in the Pauline mission. The Lucan Paul in his preaching reflects the Lucan theme of repentance (13.47; 17.30; 20.21) and perhaps, most important, it is his specific mission to bring 'salvation' to the gentiles (13.47; 28.28).

Paul's mission also divides men into two groups, those who are saved and those who have excluded themselves from salvation (13.46). It is frequently asserted that Jews characteristically respond in a negative manner to Paul. But Luke often takes pain to show that Jews also responded favourably (13.43; 14.1; 17.4, 12; 18.4; cf. 19.9). It is also frequently stated that the gentiles in Acts characteristically respond positively to Paul's Gospel. But Luke takes pain to show that numbers of gentiles also respond negatively (13.50; 14.5, 19; 16.19; 17.5, 13, 32). Paul's proclamation of the kingdom produces a division among both Jews and gentiles into those who, through repentance, enter into salvation and those who, by rejecting the Gospel, bring upon themselves the threat of judgment.

G. Sociological Analysis

The kingdom of God was a major symbol in the sacred cosmos of the Lucan community's life-world. It was seen by Luke to exist as a present transcendent reality and as a future ultimate event. He consistently connects references to the kingdom in the context of the ministries of Jesus, the early church, and Paul with symbols associated with the transcendent and future aspects of the kingdom. The object of this section is to explicate the functional significance of this major symbol for the community's social situation. Since there is no one functionalist theory, but rather a family of perspectives which emphasize the consequences of social actions over the intentionality which participants may ascribe to those

actions,[112] the perspective selected here for use in analysis is the concept of legitimation as used by Peter Berger (see Ch. 2,C). Legitimation is a viable analytical tool because in Berger's formulation it is designed to account for the relationship of a symbolic universe to the social life of those for whom that universe is meaningful. Secondly, since in Berger's conception legitimation deals with the functionality of human meaning, it is by nature sympathetic to and more able to account for the 'manifest functions' of human symbols (i.e. the intentionality ascribed by participants to actions and beliefs which result from a given symbol) as well as offering suggestions as to the latent functions of these symbols. This overcomes a major fault in older functionalist theory which failed to integrate manifest and latent function.[113]

A further difficulty in functionalist theory should be noted. It has most successfully explicated social stasis and less successfully dealt with social change. In this respect Gerd Theissen's synthesis of functionalist perspectives, which lays out a theoretical scheme that integrates static and innovative functions, is helpful.[114] An example of innovative function in the community of Luke-Acts will be explored in an appendix to this chapter.

As part of the final goal of the community's sacred cosmos, the kingdom of God was endued with an unassailable ontological status and as such it could provide a secure foundation for various aspects of community life and belief. Most notably there are numerous aspects of the community's mission experience which are given legitimation by reference to the kingdom. It is obvious that nearly all positive

---

[112]Colin Campbell, Toward a Sociology of Irreligion (London: Macmillan, 1971), p. 128; cf. Meeks, p. 6.

[113]See B. Wilson, Religion, pp. 34ff.

[114]Gerd Theissen, "Theoretische Probleme," pp. 42ff.

aspects of the community's kerygma and mission practice are related to the kingdom. Its connection with the broad scope of kerygmatic word and action via the phrase, "preaching the kingdom of God", means that the offer of realized salvation, seen in the experience of the forgiveness of sins, and in release from disease and demonic possession, are in part legitimated by reference to this ultimate symbol.

But perhaps more significantly the kingdom can be seen to legitimate community failure and to provide a cognitive defence mechanism for the adversity experienced by this marginal religious group. In this respect it can be seen that the community's experience of mission failure appears to be a legitimate experience by being related to the symbolic expectation of a division of mankind into two groups, the saved and the damned, at the advent of the kingdom. An inherent feature of the kingdom in Luke's conception is that it provokes rejection as well as acceptance. The community and its missionaries are thus relieved of responsibility for mission failure and need not feel that their explanation of the universe is threatened by the non-acceptance of their message.

The kingdom was also an effective means of dealing with another community problem: the ambiguity of the salvation they proclaimed. Jesus as exalted Lord was not empirically available to validate the community's statements. He had been executed as a common criminal and his resurrection and ascension were beliefs held only by community members. The struggle with sin, death, and demonic forces continued in spite of the claim of Jesus' exaltation as Lord. In this respect the non-falsifiable nature of the kingdom's transcendence was useful in providing an explanation which was meaningful within the believer's frame of reference. The kingdom was seen as a present heavenly reality, not empirically available to human perception.[115] Thus the

---

[115]It is possible to define the presence of the kingdom as the

ambiguity of the present experience of certain symbols associated with the kingdom, e.g. the power to heal, was readily explicable. The believer should not expect everyone to interpret present divine power in the same way. The kingdom and the exalted Jesus are hidden realities requiring faith to perceive them.

The logical sequence of thought for the community member would have been, "At the Parousia the Kingdom will appear and men will be divided in virtue of their response to our preaching. The hidden Kingdom will be universally manifest. Therefore it is appropriate that we now see men being divided into two groups even as we preach and that we endure the present ambiguity concerning the ultimate reality of our message as we await the return of our Lord from heaven." Sociologically this statement must be turned on its head. Such ideas may have predated the founding of the community and may have been enshrined in the symbolic universe of a previous group. Such ideas may even contain a valid explanation of the universe. But their development by Luke as part of a second level theoretical enterprise, the impulse to search out previous traditions for such ideas, and the decision to employ them in his own gospel must be seen as dependent upon his community's previous experience of its own salvation, its mission failure, and the ambiguity inherent in its kerygmatic claims. These experiences needed explanation and that was provided by Luke through his conception of the kingdom of God. In the light of present

---

presence of salvation (so Merk, p. 210). If this is done then by definition the kingdom was present on earth in Jesus and (contra. Merk) also in the ministry of the church in so far as salvation was realized by its members. But even if one grants this definition one must still distinguish between the present ambiguity of the kingdom's presence and the future unmistakable nature of its appearance at the parousia. One cannot deny that certain symbols associated with the kingdom wereseen by Luke to have been present in the church's experience. But the kingdom was not unambiguously present. Therefore it seems better to define the kingdom as a fully glorious and powerful reality associated with the exalted Lord in heaven and at his return and that some of its features are now experienced by the church.

experience the community projected into the future, and into heaven, religious ideas which corresponded to these experiences. At this level these ideas were unassailably secure and capable of providing a defence of the community's own experiences. Eschatology, as represented in the kingdom of God, functioned to legitimate the community's mission experience by allowing them to say, "This is what will happen; therefore it is right that we see it happening now".

APPENDIX: THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND JEW-GENTILE TABLE FELLOWSHIP, The Innovative Function of Eschatology

In Chapter 3 it was argued that a major social problem facing the Lucan community was inter-racial table fellowship between Jewish and gentile Christians. In regard to this problem the community was able to provide a new social solution in which social barriers were removed and Jew and gentile could eat together. This was done by redefining the utility of the Law in Jewish-Christian life, asking gentile-Christians to observe some aspects of the Law, and defining purity in christological terms equally available to both factions. This innovative solution was also given eschatological legitimation in the symbol, 'the kingdom of God'.

Luke used a 'Q' tradition (cf. Mt. 8.11f.) in 13.28f. which places Jews (the patriarchs and prophets) together with gentiles at the messianic banquet in the kingdom of God. However, his form of the parable of the Great Banquet (14.15-24) (also a 'Q' tradition, cf. Mt. 22.1-14) illustrates a redactional concern with this idea. Matthew's form of the parable excludes the Jews from the banquet and includes the gentiles. Vv. 2-8 are allegorical. God sent servants (the prophets) to call those invited (the Jews) to the feast. These servants were treated shamefully and some were killed. As a result God sent armies and destroyed these people and burned their city (Jerusalem, A.D. 70?). The servants are then sent out to gather in others (the gentiles) to the feast. The Lucan servant after reporting the refusal of the invited guests (non-believing Jews) is sent out into the city (v.21, Jerusalem during the early apostolic ministry?) to collect the poor and maimed and blind and lame (the dispossessed of Israel and believing Jews). These, however, are not enough to fill the feast so the servant is sent further out to bring others (the gentiles). In Luke's parable both Jews and gentiles share the feast.

This indicates that Luke was probably aware of the point being made in the tradition behind 13.28f. Both passages together provide a firm eschatological legitimation for table fellowship between Jews and gentiles.

There may be further support for this in Lk. 22.14ff., the Lucan form of the institution of the Lord's Supper. It can be assumed that this passage was important for both the Jewish and gentile sections of the community and that it formed the basis for their common participation in the Lord's Supper. One finds in Luke's form a strong emphasis on the future kingdom as a banquet. It is reasonable to suppose that the Jewish and gentile Christians of the community hoped to share in that future banquet together with their common Lord.

It also seems likely that Luke expected both Jews and gentiles who rejected the Gospel to stand together at the judgment (Lk. 10.12-15; 11.31f.). Putting both lines of argument together, it seems that he expected all forms of segregation to break down at the eschaton and if then, why not now.

CHAPTER VI

THE SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OF HISTORY IN THE COMMUNITY OF LUKE-ACTS

A. Introduction and the Question of the Genre of Luke-Acts

The object of this chapter is to investigate the social functions of history in Luke's community. This will be done with particular reference to the manner in which Luke used historical arguments to provide legitimation for various aspects of his community's mission experience. This task will require (A) a partial clarification of the genre of Luke-Acts, (B) a discussion of the uses of history in Luke's milieu, (C) an outline of how these uses of history appear from a sociological perspective, and (D) a brief discussion of history as a form of legitimation. We will then be able to turn (E-G) to the specific types of historical arguments that Luke used and the social issues which arose out of the community's mission towards which he applied them. This investigation of Luke's use of history will be primarily exegetical. (H) The results of this investigation will be analysed sociologically in the final section and lead to the conclusion of the thesis.

It is generally acknowledged that Luke intended that his two volumes be understood as one literary work.[1] There are partial and

---

[1]E.g. Ellis, Lk., p. 2; Kümmel, Intro., p. 156; Marshall, Acts, pp. 18f.; Fitzmyer, p. 8; Guthrie, p. 350; Munck, Acts, p. xv; van Unnik, "Confirmation," p. 29; Balmforth, pp. 1ff.; Danker, St. Lk., p. xii; Morris, p. 13; Bruce, Book, p. 15; Krodel, Acts, p. 1; Juel, p. 1; Maddox, pp. 3ff.; Kee, Miracle, p. 190; Conzelmann, Theology, p. 9. This means that one cannot put a primary emphasis on the identification of Luke as a 'gospel' and see Acts in only a subordinate role, as Guthrie, p. 350; E. Trocmé, Le 'Livre des Actes et l'Historie,

more extensive parallels between Luke-Acts and several Hellenistic literary genres: the romance/novel,[2] praxeis,[3] aretalogy,[4] the symposium,[5] memorabilia,[6] biography,[7] and narrative history; both Hellenistic and Jewish.[8] The most helpful way of sorting out these parallels is to argue that some are remote and partial, providing only a loose cultural backdrop,[9] while others are more extensive and can be

---

1957, pp. 42ff.; A. Ehrhardt, "The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles," ST 12 (1958):55. The 'gospels' have been invested with a generic unity artificially fostered upon them by later generations. Luke wrote his story of Jesus and his early followers in a genre for which Mark's gospel, the only Christian book we can be certain Luke possessed, can be seen as only a partial literary model. Therefore to insist on beginning with the identification of Luke as a gospel for the question of the genre of Luke-Acts only confuses the issue.

[2]C.K. Barrett, Luke the Historian in Recent Study (London: Epworth, 1961), p. 15; Drury, p. 27.

[3]Krodel, Acts, p. 1.

[4]Martin Hengel, Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1979), pp. 29ff.; Krodel, Acts, p. 1; Drury, p. 27.

[5]E. Springs Steele, "Luke 11.37-54 -- A Modified Hellenistic Symposium?" JBL 103 (1984):379-94.

[6]Cadbury, "The Greek and Jewish Traditions of Writing History," BC II, pp. 9ff.; Krodel, Acts, p. 1; Hengel, Acts & History, pp. 27f.

[7]Drury, pp. 27f.; Hengel, Acts & History, pp. 15f.; Krodel, Acts, p. 1; Talbert, Literary Patterns, pp. 125ff., argues that it is a sub-genre of biography, cf. idem., Reading Luke, pp. 2f.

[8]BC II, p. 15; Krodel, Acts, p. 2; Fitzmyer, pp. 173f.; Drury, pp. 1ff.; Barrett, Historian, p. 17; Ellis, Lk., p. 4; Kee, Miracle, pp. 174ff.; Marshall, LHT, p. 37f.; Siegfried Schulz, "Gottes Vorsehung bei Lukas," ZNW 54 (1963):107f., 112f. On Luke's relationship to the literary forms and styles of history in his environment see Eckhard Plümacher, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), Chapters 2 & 3; W.C. van Unnik, "Luke's Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography," in Les Actes des Apotres, par J. Kremer (Grembloux: Leuven University Press, 1979), pp. 37-60; idem., "Once More Luke's Prologue," NovTest, pp. 7ff.; BC II, pp. 1-30; Hengel, Acts & History, pp. 13-34; Kee, Miracle, pp. 174ff.; for Jewish comparisons, see Drury, pp. 1ff.; BC II, pp. 1-30.

[9]E.g. romance, Hengel, Acts & History, p. 12; aretalogy, idem., pp. 29ff.

seen to offer direct compositional models.[10] Thus Luke-Acts can be seen as a "hybrid"[11] literary product, something which is not surprising in the cultural melting pot of its Hellenistic environment. What can be said with some confidence is that of the numerous parallels the strongest relationship exists with those genres which can be loosely classed under the title 'historiography': i.e. biography and narrative history. Thus if we are to approach the question of the function of this two-volume work in the life-world of its readers the genre of history provides an adequate starting point.[12]

B. Uses of History in Antiquity

In attempting to understand the functional use of history in Luke-Acts it is of primary importance that in both Luke's Jewish and Hellenistic milieux history was viewed as a mine of materials for use in the present. It was widely accepted that stories from the past would be related and redacted in view of their application to contemporary situations.[13]

---

[10]E.g. history, Fitzmyer, pp. 173f.; Drury, pp. 1ff.; Barrett, Historian, p. 17; Marshall, LHT, p. 38; Ellis, Lk., p. 4; biography, Talbert, Literary Patterns, pp. 125ff.

[11]Drury, p. 36; cf. Kee, Miracle, p. 195.

[12]It should not be argued that Luke-Acts is not a history because Luke's theological concerns distort the historicity of his account, as does Robert Morgenthaler, Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, vol. 2 (Zurich: Zeingli, 1949), pp. 25ff. Cf. Kümmel, Intro., pp. 161f.; Shürmann, pp. 16f.; note also van Unnik's change of mind from 1960, "Confirmation," when he argued that Luke-Acts was not usefully understood as history because Luke's theology distorted events and 1973, "Once More Luke's Prologue". Even tendentious history must still be understood, in the context within which it was produced, as history.

[13]Barrett, Historian, pp. 11, 18; Ellis, Lk., pp. 6f.; Hengel, Acts, pp. 13f.; BC II, pp. 10f.; R.L.P. Milburn, Early Christian Interpretations of History (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1954), pp. 28f.; Harry Elmer Barnes, A History of Historical Writing, 2nd ed. (New York: Dover Publications, 1963, '1937), pp. 31, 33; Leonhard Goppelt, Theology of the New Testament, vol. 2, trans. J.E. Alsup (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, '1976), p. 279; van Unnik, "Once More Luke's Prologue," p. 12.

If one defines history broadly to include the myths and legends of people's origins and past, and the retelling of these stories, then much Biblical material and secondary Jewish literature can be seen to have a 'history like' character.[14] There is a broad expanse of Jewish literature, e.g. The Book of Jubilees or Joseph and Aseneth, which retells Biblical narratives, with redaction and expansion, and thus uses these narratives to account for contemporary problems not encountered in the original text.[15] Josephus, more closely related to formal history as we understand it, also redacted and retold Biblical stories with a view to the manner in which they could be used to influence his readers.

Graeco-Roman historians also accepted that stories from the past could be retold with a view to their usefulness in contemporary situations. Lucian of Samosata in How to Write History enjoined objectivity on the historian (9, 61, 63) but also said that if historical writing was to succeed it must be important, essential, personal, or useful (53).[16] Polybius saw history as the proper education and training for contemporary political life (i.1, cf. iii.4, v.75, ix.2).[17] This emphasis on the didactic usefulness of history stems from Greek philosophical ideas about the cyclical nature of history.[18] Since events will repeat themselves the study of history can provide relevant lessons for the present and future. In relation to biographical histories, works such as Plutarch's Lives or Diogenes

---

[14]Collins, p. 25. [15]Drury, p. 4.

[16]Hengel, Acts & History, p. 13.

[17]BC II, p. 10; cf. Thucydides' historical typology which sought in history the recurring types which had eternal validity, W. den Boer, "Greco-Roman Historiography in its Relation to Biblical and Modern Thinking," in On the Meaning of History (Geneva: Oikumene, n.d.), pp. 37f.

[18]den Boer, p. 32.

Laertius' Lives provided types and models for contemporary life.[19] Also the emphasis on rhetorical form in historical writing reflects an interest in the manner in which the presentation of past events could have optimal effect on an audience and unfortunately this emphasis frequently caused efforts to achieve contemporary applicability and relevance to overshadow care for historical accuracy.[20] Even a writer such as Tacitus, who in one breath claimed that the historian should not narrate the deeds of persons on the basis of subjective judgments of favour or hate (Ann. 1.1), in the next breath allowed hatred to rule his presentation of Tiberius.[21]

Luke himself may have stressed his own commitment to a view of history as having didactic relevance for the present in his use of the perfect passive of πληροφορέω (Lk. 1.1) in his formal preface, signifying the continued efficacy of past events.[22]

We may expect to find Luke as an historian, shaping and retelling the stories of Christian origins which came to him in his traditions so that they would be applicable to his community's contemporary situation.

C. A Sociological Perspective on Historical Knowledge

From a sociological perspective it is inevitable that human beings, in retelling stories from their past, should reshape and interpret those stories and understand the reality of their past in light of their present situation. What we hold to be 'historical knowledge' can be seen to pass through the three phases in the construction of knowledge outlined by Berger and Luckmann: 1) the externalization of subjective understanding, 2) objectification and

---

[19] Hengel, Acts & History, pp. 15f.; Drury, p. 30.

[20] BC II, pp. 11ff.

[21] Hengel, Acts & History, p. 22.

[22] Lohse, "Theologe Heilsgeschichte," pp. 261, 264.

reification, and 3) internalization.[23]

Since the past must of necessity be viewed from humanly relative vantage-points in the present, all historical inquiry is tinged with subjectivism to a greater or lesser degree.[24] Thus it is unhelpful to try and construct a positivistic model of history based on the natural sciences and to limit its subject matter to empirical facts.[25] Our understanding of history is primarily an interpretive task. In that task historical facts constitute the building blocks of history rather than history itself.[26] In relation to these blocks historical method is, in the first instance, selective. Certain blocks of material are selected to fit together because of their ability to produce a meaningful whole for the historian.[27] Out of the mass of human experiences available certain ones are chosen to become 'history'. The events historians choose to relate are selected not because they are different from other similar human experiences in an empirically varifiable manner but because of the significance they possess in a complex web of inter-human relationships and meanings. It can be seen that selection in

---

[23]Berger & Luckmann, p. 78.

[24]E.g. Herbert Butterfield, Man on His Past: The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 12; Benedetto Croce, History: Its Theory and Practice, trans. Douglas Ainslie (New York: Russell & Russell, 1960), pp. 11-19; R.G. Collingwood, The Idea of History (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), passim.; Edward Hallett Carr, What is History? (New York: Random House, 1961), pp. 8ff.; Alan Richardson, History, Sacred and Profane (London: SCM, 1964), pp. 250ff.; Eric C. Rust, Towards a Theological Understanding of History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 7ff.; Paul Tillich, The Protestant Era, abridged ed., trans. J.L. Adams (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 16.

[25]Rust, pp. 7, 18.

[26]Carr, p. 8.

[27]Cf. Norman R. Peterson's discussion, Rediscovering Paul (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), pp. 10-14, of history as 'story'. History is always 'constructed' because ". . . [it is] a [selective] story about events, not the events themselves. . .".

historical method, as in evolutionary theory, presupposes a high attrition rate among historical facts; only those judged meaningfully fit survive. And it seems evident that the humanly relative framework within which we interpret our past is of prime importance in the origins of historical knowledge. In this light history can be seen as a set of accepted judgments about the meaning and significance of events and not simply the events themselves.[28] And historical revisionism is, in part, the selection of different sets of data or the rearrangement of existing data from a different interpretive framework to form new configurations of meaning and to challenge existing orthodoxies. It seems evident that our knowledge of the past begins in the process of subjective understanding.[29]

Our understanding of the past does not remain subjective. We externalize it in various forms of communication. In this manner historical knowledge can be seen to pass through a process of reification. It seems evident that the records of previous generations, and their artefacts which have survived, strike us with a quality of 'givenness'. The incontrovertible nature of certain past events, such as an important battle or the assassination of an important person, coalesces with an individual's own experience of events he would like to change but cannot, to produce in him a view of the past as existing independently of his own existence and his interpretation of it. This process extends not only to the 'facts' of history but to its interpretation as well. This is the manner in which history becomes socially relevant. The incontrovertible events of the past coalesce with their interpretation to form grand historical traditions. These

---

[28]Carr, p. 13.

[29]Cf. Berger & Luckmann's description of reality, p. 30, as a union of Durkheim's emphasis on the facticity, objectivity, or 'thingness' of social facts and Weber's emphasis on interpretation. The equation reads, things + interpretation = reality.

traditions are often enshrined in a sacred cosmos. The tradition, events and interpretation, comes to be seen as existing independently of the human situation within which it arose.

Internalization is the process in which such reified traditions are retrojected back into subjective human consciousness in the process of education or socialization.[30]

The recognition that such forces are operative in the process of handing down historical knowledge offers us a doorway into the life-world of historians and their publics by making it possible for us to examine the contemporary uses they make of historical materials. This doorway will be less open in an age, such as our own, where the subjective nature of the historical enterprise is recognized and historians consciously seek to achieve methodologies which will, as far as possible, lead to disinterested objectivity. But it will be more open in an age, such as Luke's, in which historiography is widely recognized as didactic and accepted as serving the present. Berger and Luckmann's theory is a useful key to this doorway because it opens up the possibility of tracing the connections of humanly constructed knowledge to its social origins.

D. History as a Form of Legitimation

Since history, as it is retold and passed down, lends itself to being reinterpreted in the light of contemporary situations and to being applied to these, it has served as a major form of legitimation in human societies. Stories of a people's past are retold in support of current practices. "We do this because our fathers had such and such an experience." The past, if properly redacted, can even be used to legitimate social and political innovations, e.g. Josiah's

---

[30]Berger & Luckmann, pp. 78, 149ff., call this internalization or socialization.

deuteronomic reforms carried out in the name of Moses. In this regard it is the reification of history which is of key importance, for it is only history presented as objectively real in its own right which can provide the necessary stability to prop up other human institutions.[31] At this point it is theoretically clear that Karl Mannheim's implication, that not only the form of historical knowledge but also its content relate to concrete social experience,[32] is correct and this gives us a theoretical basis from which to explore Luke-Acts. But empirical examples can also be found which support Mannheim's insight and demonstrate that the related claim of Benedetto Croce, that all history is related to the present,[33] is at least partially correct.

For example, American history's preoccupation with its white European actors was challenged in the early 1960's by a new emphasis on 'Black history'. This search for the contributions of black Americans to their nation's history was carried out under accepted canons of critical research but the impetus for that research is not to be found in disinterested academic thoroughness. Rather, it originated in the social pressures of America's black communities which, in the 1950's, began to seek a greater share of the nation's wealth and social life and needed historical justification for this. We may deplore this type of historiographic impulse with Herbert Butterfield[34] or laud it with Friedrich Nietzsche[35] but it is and has been done and it

---

[31] Ibid., pp. 106ff.

[32] Mannheim, "The Sociology of Knowledge," Gardiner, pp. 243ff.; Berger & Luckmann, p. 21.

[33] Croce, pp. 12f.

[34] Herbert Butterfield, The Whig Interpretation of History (London: Bell & Sons, 1931), pp. 11, 22, 64f., 73, 75.

[35] Friedrich Nietzsche, "On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life," in Untimely Meditations, trans. R.J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 59, 63-67.

is the kind of thing we can see Luke to have been doing.

In helping to construct a Christian world Luke has used his historical traditions to provide legitimation for the life-world of his readers. This level of legitimation in Luke's writing will be taken here as a starting point. It has been well discussed by John Drury[36] and in general it is not controversial to say that Luke used the past to legitimate his church.[37] It is our purpose to press beyond this general affirmation to some specific social phenomena given legitimation by Luke in his history of Jesus and the early church.[38]

E. Forms of Historical Legitimation and the Gentile Mission

Luke used history in three different ways to legitimate various aspects of his community's experience: 1) the fulfilment of ancient prophecy, 2) the use of past actors as role models,[39] 3) the presentation

---

[36]Drury, pp. 1-38; cf. Esler, pp. 300ff.

[37]Dibelius, pp. 125f.; John Navone, "Three Aspects of the Lucan Theology of History," BTB 3 (1973):123; such a perspective was used as an investigative method as far back as F.C. Baur, Church History, p. 81.

[38]An issue related to Luke's understanding of history but for which there is no space to discuss is the Early Catholic question. In this regard the most important aspect of the debate which relates to our discussion of history in Luke-Acts is Luz's, pp. 88-111, confirmation that at the heart of Early Catholicism is a shift in the functional utility of history in a community's ethos. Cf. Käsemann, Essays, pp. 28f., 89, 92, 146, 148; idem., "Ephesians & Acts," pp. 289f.; and Conzelmann, Outline, pp. 290ff.; see the bibliography for further literature.

[39]The understanding of Jesus, Paul, and others in Luke-Acts as sociologically relevant 'role models' is closely related to perspectives which can be found in the discussion of 'parallelism' in Luke-Acts. Modern debate seems to have begun with Karl Schrader, Der Apostel Paulus (Leipzig: 1836), pp. 568-74 who argued that the parallels between Peter and Paul were designed to show that Paul had the same status as Peter. Most of the 19th century debate was concerned with how these parallels related to Luke's Pauline apologetic [F.C. Baur, Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi, vol. I (Stuttgart: 1845), pp. 104-15, 179, 188f., 218-20; Albert Schwegler, Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung, vol. II (Tübingen: 1846), pp. 76f.; Franz Overbeck, Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte (Leipzig: 1870), pp. 189-211, 312-32; and H.J. Holtzmann, Die Synoptiker - Die Apostelgeschichte (Freiburg: 1889), pp. 305-427]. Occasionally parallels between Jesus, Paul, and Peter were mentioned but again in

of God as a causal agent in history whose direction of events and will are evidenced in supernatural portents, dreams, visions, prophecies, appearances of angels, and direction by the Spirit.[40]

---

the context of the debate about Paul [Eduard Zeller, Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht (Stuttgart: 1854), pp. 145ff., cf. 320-22; Bruno Bauer, Die Apostelgeschichte (Berlin: 1850), pp. 9-12]. Rackham, p. li, added a new aspect when he used the parallels to argue for an early date for Acts [recently revived by A.J. Mattill, "The Date and Purpose of Luke-Acts: Rackham Reconsidered," CBQ 40 (1978):335-50]. More recent treatments fall into two groups. One group has turned away from questions about Paul and has sought to find in these parallels Luke's philosophy of history. [E.g. H.E. Trompf, The Idea of Historical Recurrence in Western Thought (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: 1979), pp. 116-78, 315; M.D. Goulder, Type and History in Acts (London: SPCK, 1964), pp. 15ff.; Flender, Theologian of Redemptive History, pp. 34, 46, 165ff.] Another group has sought to examine the relationship of these parallels to the needs of Luke's community. [E.g. W. Radl, Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk. Untersuchungen zu Parallelmotiven im Lukas-evangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte (Bern/Frankfurt a.M.: 1975); V. Stolle, Der Zeuge als Angeklagter. Untersuchungen zum Paulusbild des Lukas (Stuttgart: 1973); Talbert, Literary Patterns; O'Toole, "Parallels," pp. 195-212.] These approaches stress the function of the parallelism in Luke-Acts to illustrate the continuity that exists between Jesus, the apostles, Paul, and finally Luke's church, e.g. Talbert, pp. 99f. There are difficulties with the strongly typological approaches of Goulder, Stolle, and Radl, see Maddox, pp. 79ff. But while Luke may not have viewed the history of Jesus as a 'type' which repeated itself in the life of the church, Lk. 9.23 and 6.40 make it clear that he did expect that there should be a correlation between the life of a disciple and his master. Lk. 6.39f. is particularly instructive in that when it is related to Luke's Hellenistic environment, it stresses the pupil's relation to his teacher as a life model, A.J. Mattill, "The Jesus-Paul Parallels and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: H.H. Evans Reconsidered," NovTest 17 (1965):41; cf. Marshall, Lk., pp. 269ff. One may at least see Jesus, Peter and Paul as role models, if not types.

[40]There are two basic positions on the interpretation of Luke's theological understanding of divine necessity. Sigfried Schulz, "Gottes Vorsehung," relates Luke's thought to Hellenistic concepts of fate. Erich Fascher, "Theologische Beobachtungen zu δεῖ," Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann, ed. W. Eltester (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954), pp. 228-54 and W. Grundmann, TDNT II, 22ff., have stressed Luke's O.T. background for this concept and stress its relationship to divine election and the need for obedience in response. A recent article by Charles H. Cosgrove, "The Divine ΔEI in Luke-Acts: Investigations into the Lukan Understanding of God's Providence," NovTest 26 (1984):168-90 has demonstrated the basic correctness of Fascher and Grundmann's position. He demonstrates that Luke's use of δεῖ, related words, and related concepts occur in the context of divine mandates to Jesus and others. This means that obedience and choice are required on their part to fulfil God's plan. There is no blind determinism. For our part we will accept Cosgrove's treatment. It is not our purpose to focus on this aspect of the theological debate, but rather to focus

In common with the other canonical gospels Luke used technical phrases to introduce scripture quotations. These include phrases using verbs of speech,[41] perfect forms of γράφω,[42] and forms of ἀναγινώσκω.[43] In the other synoptics and John these phrases introduce aspects of scripture which are seen to have been fulfilled in Jesus and thus represent a pattern of promise and fulfilment. In each gospel this implies a temporal separation between the time of promise and the time of fulfilment. Matthew stressed this separation more strongly than either John or Mark.[44] But Luke, moving far beyond the panorama of his fellow Christian writers, made of the antiquity of Jewish scripture an historical and legitimating panoply constructed of an ancient and sacred past which was populated by great heroes and prophets who as spokesmen of God lent their time-honoured credibility to the newly emergent Christian movement.

That Luke's use of the Old Testament reflects an understanding of it as a sacred era of great antiquity and not just a sacred book can be seen in several of the speeches in Acts. In Acts 2 Luke not only had Peter make jumps between the divine oracles of past personages and his own present (2.16, 25) but caused him to argue that, at least in the case of David, this oracle was valid for the present because it could not possibly have been fulfilled in David's own lifetime which was now long past (v.29, David is referred to as a πατριάρχης). Paul is made to use a similar argument before the Jews of Pisidian

---

on the use Luke has made of arguments from divine necessity however he may conceive of that necessity theologically.

[41] E.g., Mt. 1.22; 2.17; 3.3; 4.14; Mk. 7.10; 12.36; Jn. 1.23; 12.39; 19.37; Lk. 2.24; Acts 2.16, 25, 34; 3.22; 4.25.

[42] E.g., Mt. 2.5; 4.4; 11.10; 26.31; Mk. 1.2; 7.6; 11.17; 14.27; Jn. 2.17; 12.14; Lk. 4.4; 7.27 ;3.4; 20.17.

[43] Mt. 21.16; 21.42; 22.31; Mk. 2.25; 12.10; cf. Lk. 6.3.

[44] See Mt. 5.21; cf. 26.54, 56.

Antioch. David's whole generation is dead and sleeps in the sacral aura of the ancestral past (again see the reference to the fathers, v.36), therefore his oracle could not have been written for his own time, but only for that of Paul's audience (13.33-36).[45]

Luke also made several characteristic references to 'Moses and the Prophets' (Lk. 16.29, 31; 24.27, 44; Acts 26.22; 28.23). Again it is clear that he understood this phrase to indicate a past historical era of great antiquity, rather than a set of atemporal sacred writings. Luke, in common with Jewish apologists, stressed the antiquity of Judaism.[46] In his development of the birth narratives he stressed the ancestral nature of Judaism by referring to ancient prophecy (1.70, ἀπ' αἰῶνος), giving a brief account of Israel's history reaching back to Abraham (1.67-73), and creating numerous allusions to Old Testament stories in the portrayal of his characters.[47] By way of contrast Matthew in his account used the Old Testament in a flat one-dimensional manner. In his use of prophecy he shows little sense of its historical origin. In Lk. 9.8 Luke used ἀρχαῖος (cf. Mk. 6.15) to attribute antiquity to the prophets. He did the same at 9.19 in a passage derived from Mk. 8.24 (cf. Mt.16.14). And at 13.28 he added the prophets to the ancestral aura of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (cf. Mt. 8.11). The ascription of antiquity to the prophets and to Moses also occurs in Acts (3.21; 15.21). And perhaps most important in indicating the historical perspective in Luke's use of the prophets is Acts 3.24. Here he speaks of a chronological succession (καθεξῆς) of prophets beginning with Samuel. When this

---

[45]The hermeneutical assumption that scripture was intended for the reader's present time was common in the 1st century, see J.A. Sanders, "Luke's Great Banquet Parable," p. 257; idem., "Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," pp. 93ff.

[46]Cf. Esler, p. 297; and efforts to portray Jews as an ancient race of philosophers, Gager, Anti-Semitism, p. 39.

[47]Drury, pp. 46ff. See Fitzmyer, pp. 303-447 and R.E. Brown, The Birth of the Messiah (London: Chapman, 1977), pp. 260ff. for full catalogues of O.T. quotations and allusions.

portrayal of historical sequence is linked with the grand sweeps of patriarchal and Davidic history given in Acts 7 and 13, which include references to Moses and others, one finds that the phrase "Moses and the Prophets" reflects an understanding of these figures as enshrined in the vast antiquity of Israel's past which is stressed as being some hundreds of years in duration (13.18f.).

This emphasis on the antiquity of Judaism is designed to relate to the religious awe of a sacral past common in the religious expectations of the Hellenistic and Roman members of Luke's community.[48] By emphasizing the links of Christianity to its Jewish parent, the parent's sacral past is made to lend legitimacy to its offspring. In this manner Luke initiated an apologetic argument which, when fully developed in the latter 2nd century, attempted to understand the Old Testament as an exclusively Christian possession. But this was not Luke's purpose and he was not content to stop at providing the Christian movement with an aura of antiquity. He applied the culturally powerful force of a sacred and ancient past to legitimate specific social problems his community was facing.

One problem to which Luke applied an argument of promise and fulfilment was the inclusion of gentiles in the church. The problematic nature of this issue for Luke's community can be seen in the prominence it is given in Acts 10-20 and in its importance as an issue in the narrative of Paul's trials (21.25; 22.21; 26.17f., 22f.; 28.28). Interpreters in the tradition of Conzelmann and Haenchen see the importance of the legitimacy of the gentile mission for Luke's community as arising from the need for his gentile congregation to account for

---

[48] On its appeal to Romans see Esler, pp. 300ff. Greeks, perhaps because of I Cor. 1.22, have been viewed as being concerned with the philosophy of religion rather than its antiquity. But the existence of a body of Jewish apologetic literature, produced for consumption in Hellenistic contexts, in which the antiquity of Judaism was a theme, suggests that Greeks, too, were susceptible to this ploy.

its separation from Judaism while still claiming access to the Jewish God. But it has been shown (Ch. 3,D) that Luke's community was not comprised only of gentiles. It also had a significant section of Jews. And one major problem facing the community was relations between its Jewish and gentile sections. It seems likely that this issue will also have affected the execution of the community's mission. Jewish members who were uneasy about contact with Christian gentiles were probably not enthusiastic about actively proselytizing among pagans. And they probably found the admission of gentiles to their community an embarassment when trying to convert non-Christian Jews. Luke's gentile Christians probably encountered difficulties in explaining to newly converted pagans the need to make concesssions to Jewish believers on matters of food. And they will have needed convincing arguments, at least for themselves, to explain to non-Christian Jews their relationship to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It therefore seems likely that the legitimacy of the gentile mission and the issue of Jew-gentile table fellowship were issues directly related to the community's mission experience.

Isaiah 42.6 and 49.6 are alluded to in Lk. 2.32, and Isaiah 40.5 is quoted in Lk. 3.6. Both passages give intimation to a line of promise which includes the gentiles in the salvation of God and will come to fruition in the story of the early church. In Lk. 24.47 the argument is made explicit. Here the ancestral aura of scripture (γέγραπται v.46, cf. v.44) is directly connected with the gentile mission. This theme continues in Acts with a probable application of prophecy to the gentile mission in 2.17.[49] The theme again becomes explicit in Acts 10.43 where the prophets are brought in to legitimate

---

[49]The objections of Kilpatrick, "Luke, Not a Gentile Gospel," against a universalist reading of this passage and others in Luke's gospel are well taken. But passages such as Lk. 24.47 make it clear that he understood the Old Testament to foretell the gentile mission.

Peter's offer of repentance to Cornelius. Isaiah is used again to justify Paul's preaching to gentiles in 13.47. And Amos is so used in 15.15f. Finally, the thrust of Paul's defence in Acts 24.14 and 26.22f. is that he, in his preaching of repentance to gentiles, has not contravened the ancestral traditions of Israel but has only done what those traditions demand. Moses and the Prophets are used to bring the full weight of Israel's ancient past to support the gentile mission.[50]

Secondly, Luke used historical role models to legitimate the gentile mission. These models, in general, do not derive from the ancient past but the recent past. Two exceptions to this are Elijah and Elisha who are portrayed in Lk. 4.25ff. as examples for the extension of divine salvation beyond the boundaries of Israel.[51] In this sense their individual actions lend credence to the gentile mission.

Although Luke de-emphasized Jesus' contacts with gentiles in comparison with Mark (e.g. his deletion of ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Mk. 3.8; Mk. 7.24-30; Mk. 7.31) he nevertheless intimated that the origins of the gentile mission could be traced to Jesus. Luke compared Jesus' mission with those of Elijah and Elisha (4.23-27). Even though the context indicates that the extension of salvation beyond Israel is a result of Jesus' mission (24.46f.) rather than something which occurred during Jesus' mission this passage does link Jesus with that mission. Luke retained the story of the Gerasene demoniac from Mark and like Mark emphasized that this event took place in gentile territory. In Luke's eyes this man who became a disciple and missionary was probably a gentile.[52] Luke also used the 'Q'

---

[50] Schulz, p. 111.

[51] Fitzmyer, p. 537; Talbert, Reading Luke, p. 56; Marshall, Lk., p. 188; Geldenhuys, p. 168; cf. Balmforth, p. 144; Schweizer, Lk., p. 94.

[52] See Ch. 4, pp. 199f. and notes 88-90. Cf. Hugh Anderson, The Gospel of Mark (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981), p. 150;

tradition regarding a centurion who had faith in Jesus (7.1-10). Thus he represents Jesus as having converted gentiles and in this manner uses him as a relevant model for mission in his own community.

The other major role models connected with the gentile mission are Peter and Paul. Peter was a key figure in early Christian tradition. He came to Luke already enshrined in gospel tradition as the leading member of the Twelve (Lk. 6.14; 5.3ff.; 9.28; 9.20; cf. Mk. 16.13-20; and esp. Lk. 22.31ff.; 24.34). We also know that Luke saw Peter as the major spokesman and leader of the early Jerusalem community (Acts 1.15; 2.14; 3.12; 4.8; 5.3, 15, 29; 8.14). And we know that he thought of him as an exemplary Jewish Christian who prayed in the Temple (3.1), had great honour among the people of Jerusalem (5.13), and scrupulously observed Jewish dietary and social customs until compelled by God to do otherwise (10.14, 23, 28). Thus when one turns to Acts 10 and 11 he finds Peter, the first great Christian leader and a model of devout Jewish belief, led by God to preach to gentiles and portrayed as a defender of the gentile mission (Acts 11.1-18; 15.7f.). It is as a model of virtue and Jewish piety and as the primal leader of Christianity that Peter stands as an historical figure who validates the gentile mission.

The origins of this presentation of Peter should not be sought in a conscious falsification of history on Luke's part. If he were contradicting well known facts this would only ensure the failure of his presentation of Peter. If he had a private source which told him that Peter had not converted gentiles but still chose to portray him as having done so, we know nothing of this source. In all probability this use of Peter stems from the conjunction of several factors in Luke's understanding which were also reflective of the life-world of

---

D.E. Nineham, The Gospel of St. Mark (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1981), p. 151.

his community and thus contributed to the success of this presentation of Peter in dealing with the social issues to which it was applied.

Several elements of the story came from tradition and experience. It can only be assumed that Luke received a story about Peter converting a gentile household.[53] In addition his traditions indicated that the earliest community did not proselytize among gentiles and that when this did begin to happen some segments within the Jewish church opposed it. These traditions appear to have provided the raw material with which Luke had to work. Other aspects of Luke's story about Peter and Cornelius correspond to a pattern which can be found in Luke's other representations of faithful Jewish believers and in his understanding of his scripture. Jewish believers were faithful to their ancestral traditions and to the Torah (Lk. 1.6; 16.17; Acts 21.20). This explains Peter's hesitation to go to the gentiles with the Gospel. But Luke also understood his scripture to mean that a mission to the gentiles in the name of the ascended Jesus was God's will (see above). And since Luke thought that scripture also enjoined Jewish believers to obey their ascended Lord (Acts 3.22f.; 7.37; Lk. 1.17; Acts 5.29) it can be seen that all the elements of the Cornelius episode correspond either to major theological motifs in Luke-Acts or to a basic story we must assume he inherited. The need to explain the origins of the gentile mission as taking place some years after the resurrection, Peter's involvement, and Jewish opposition all came to him in his traditions. The motivation for Peter's recalcitrance, his response to a divine command to overcome this, and the divine necessity of this event reflect his understanding of Jewish Christian piety and his reading of the Old Testament.[54]

---

[53]Dibelius, pp. 109, 114.

[54]Even though some elements of the vision and God's direction may have been present in his traditions, again see Dibelius.

Paul, the second great figure of the early church, was used in a similar manner. He, too, was an exemplary Jewish Christian. This is seen in his promulgation of the apostolic decree (16.4), his circumcision of Timothy (16.3), his Temple purification (21.26), his vow (18.18), his synagogue activity, and his claims of innocence in his court proceedings (24.21ff.; 25.8; 26.22ff.). He too, under divine guidance (13.2; 26.19) and scriptural necessity (13.47), preached repentance to gentiles. What Luke has done has been to arrange the historical actions of the two most significant early Christian heroes both on the side of the gentile mission.

The third type of argument Luke used to legitimate the gentile mission was that of the divine direction of events.[55] Howard Clark Kee has recently illustrated the importance of this aspect of Roman historiography in understanding Luke-Acts.[56] In his treatment of Roman historians Kee makes two points. 1) That they accepted the divine control of events and that this control was evidenced in the coincidence of portents, cosmic signs, dreams, visions, and prophecies with events of major importance such as the birth and ascension of an emperor, major political watersheds, and the death of an emperor.[57] 2) By performing miracles and experiencing personal revelations important personages demonstrated a personal relationship with the divine.[58] Kee's analysis is confined to examples of Roman historiography, principally Suetonius, Tacitus and Dio Cassius, but similar concerns can be found in Greek historians,[59] thus providing a complete

---

[55]This emphasis may also be intimated in Luke's prologue, I.I. Du Plessis, "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue," NovTest 16 (1974):263.

[56]Kee, Miracle, pp. 174ff.

[57]Ibid., pp. 174-180. [58]Ibid., pp. 180-183.

[59]See Polybius' criticisms of Timaeus in this respect, 12.24.6; C.J. Hemer, "Luke the Historian," BJRL 60 (1977-78):30; Schulz, p. 114;

Graeco-Roman backdrop for Luke's writings. And Josephus, whom Kee treats as a Roman historiographer, is, as an eastern Jew writing in Greek for a Roman patron, thoroughly Hellenistic and, like Luke, represents a bridge between Judaism and the Hellenistic world. Josephus, too, tells of events confirmed as being in the divine will by portents, dreams, visions, and prophecies.[60]

The use of such supernatural phenomena to indicate the divine control and direction of events and to portray God as a causal agent in history is evident throughout Luke-Acts.

Luke portrays the events of Jesus' life as standing under divine necessity. This divine necessity is related both to the specific programme of Jesus' ministry (Lk. 4.43) and to its culmination in the Passion (Lk. 9.22; 13.33; 9.31, 44, μέλλειν; 17.25; 24.26, 44). In both instances the divine necessity and direction of Jesus' personal history is validated by supernatural events. In the case of the programme of his ministry this is evident in the importance of miracles in the gospel sub-section Lk. 4.14-7.23. It was shown in Chapter 5 that Luke saw a necessary connection between the proclamation of the kingdom and the realization of salvation in signs and wonders. Thus the necessity the Lucan Jesus expresses in regard to his proclamation of the kingdom (4.43) is also extended to the miraculous signs of the kingdom.[61] In terms of the historiographic themes highlighted by Kee, Jesus' ability to perform such signs would have been regarded as evidence of his relationship to God and as a mark of divine approval on his mission. In this light it is important that twice in this section (5.26; 7.16) miracles result in the acknowledgement of the divine nature of Jesus' mission.

---

den Boer, pp. 31, 43; Barnes, p. 29, on Herodatus.

[60]See Kee, Miracle, pp. 178ff.

[61]Cf. ibid., p. 204.

In the case of Jesus' passion the proof of the divine direction of events is most clearly expressed in Luke's account of the Transfiguration. It is directly linked to a passion prediction expressed with the verb δεῖ (9.22). The altered appearance of Jesus, the appearance of Moses and Elijah, the cloud, and God's voice all serve as evidence that Jesus' fate at Jerusalem is in accordance with God's will and not the result of human efforts (cf. 13.31f.).

This perspective is confirmed in Acts in relation to both the programme of Jesus' ministry and his passion. In Peter's Pentecost sermon Luke speaks of Jesus as having been attested (ἀποδεδειγμένον) by God in relation to his ministry (2.22) and crucified according to God's set will (ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ) and foreknowledge (προγνώσει, v.23; cf. Acts 10.38).

God is also portrayed as an active historical agent in the rehearsal of Israelite history in Acts 7 and 13.[62] Further, Paul's personal history is controlled by divine necessity (δεῖ; Acts 9.16; 19.21; 23.11; 27.24). Several supernatural phenomena are combined to confirm the divine direction of his actions. Chief among these is the story of his conversion which, in its threefold repetition, stresses the divine initiation in and causation of Paul's life as a Christian (9.3ff., esp. v.6 and vv. 15f., δεῖ; 22.6ff., esp. v.10, τέτακταί σοι ποιῆσαι; 26.12ff., esp. v.14[63] and v.16). The appearance of an angel to Paul (27.23) demonstrates that adverse weather will not thwart God's direction of his personal history. Paul received direction for his work from a visionary dream (16.9) and express

---

[62]On Acts 7 see Kee, Miracle, p. 197; on Acts 13 see C.A. Joachim-Pillai, Early Missionary Preaching: A Study of Luke's Report in Acts 13 (Hicksville, N.Y.: Exposition Press, 1979); idem., Apostolic Interpretation of History: A Commentary on Acts 13.16-41 (Hicksville: Exposition Press, 1980).

[63]See Schulz, pp. 108f. on the significance of this phrase in its Hellenistic setting.

commands by the Spirit (16.6f.).[64] Luke also tells us that Paul embarked on active mission only at the command of the Spirit (13.2, 4). He reports three other visionary experiences by Paul. His vision of the Lord in 18.9 validates his actions in the face of Jewish opposition. The one in 22.17-21, which is said to have taken place in the Temple, underlines Paul's Jewish piety and the inevitability of his conflict with the Jews of Jerusalem. And his vision of the Lord in 23.11 indicates the divine necessity (δεῖ) of the direction of his life toward Rome. Thus this type of historical legitimation can be seen throughout both volumes. It is one manner in which Luke has argued ". . . that Divine Providence wills only just this and not something else".[65]

It has long been recognized that the angel, visions, enthusiastic phenomena, and direction by the Spirit in Acts 10 serve to promote the gentile mission as directly initiated and willed by God.[66] What has not been stressed is that this is a historiographic manner of argument in which God is treated as a causal agent in history. The historical nature of this argument is evident in Acts 11 where the events of Acts 10 are recounted as past events with an ontology independent of human origin or interpretation. Here Peter's vision and command by the Spirit are recounted as evidence and it becomes clear that Luke thought of Peter's experiences and Cornelius' by extension, not as subjective encounters as we would, but as objective encounters which could be treated as empirical events which legitimated Peter's course of action. The sovereign action of God in giving the gentiles of Cornelius' household the Spirit was the final and ultimate confirmation (11.15ff.). This experience is again treated as an empirical phenomenon which offers proof of the divine legitimacy of Peter's actions (10.44ff.).

---

[64] Ibid., p. 114. [65] Ibid.

[66] E.g., Dibelius, p. 117.

Luke did not understand enthusiastic phenomena as originating in a causal nexus of human social and psychological forces but as objectively divine in origin with an ontological status independent of the human actors involved. As such these phenomena could offer empirical evidence of the divine will. Peter's vision and the Spirit baptism of Cornelius' household are again referred to in Acts 15 as a set of historical data available as evidence (15.7ff., . . . ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων . . .).

Arguments of divine causation in history continue in the story of Paul. They are particularly evident in the accounts of his conversion. Two of these accounts are set in the context of Paul's imprisonment and refer to his conversion as a past historical fact of an empirical nature.[67] There were witnesses who shared in some aspects[68] of the experience and there was a third party who also received divine communications (9.7f.; 22.9; 26.13f.; and 9.10, cf. 22.12). All of Paul's missionary activity is made to rest on this and related supernatural events (9.15; 22.21; and esp. 26.17f.). These experiences of Paul function in two ways. First they establish the fact that God and God alone was the causal agent in regard to Paul's mission. Second, they establish Paul's personal relationship to God.[69]

---

[67] If one compares the amount of interpretive comment and the content of that comment in each account, then Acts 9.1-19 appears as an introductory account which centres on the narrative description of events. Comment on the significance of these events is confined to vv. 15f. Acts 22.6-21 repeats the narration of these events for the sake of the Jerusalem audience. Comment on the significance of Paul's experience is again confined to two verses (vv. 6-16, see vv. 14f.). But in this account Luke has added vv. 17-21 as a means of accenting the point made in vv. 14f. Paul is to take his ministry to all men and it is this which causes his rejection in Jerusalem (21f.). In Acts 26.12-23 the narration of events has been reduced to a bare minimum, vv. 12-14, the remainder is interpretive comment which centres on the gentile mission, which was mentioned only in embryonic form in the other two accounts.

[68] The contradiction between 9.7 and 22.9 need not concern us, for a possible resolution see C.W. Hedrick, "Paul's Conversion/Call: A Comparative Analysis of the Three Reports in Acts," JBL 100 (1981): 415-32.

[69] See note 58.

That Luke was interested in Paul as a missionary seems clear. The story of Paul's involvement in the gentile mission dominates the middle third of Acts even though Luke knew of other aspects of Paul's ministry which could have been developed (e.g. 11.25; 13.1). Mission is also the focal point of the latter third of Acts which relates the story of Paul's trials. Of the five accounts of different defences by Paul (22.6-21; 23,1-10; 24.1-21; 25.6-12; 26.1-23), two turn on the gentile mission as the key issue in the charges against him (22.21f. and 26.19-23). Two relate the central issue to the resurrection of the dead (23.6 and 24.21). The fifth is related to the other four by Paul's plea of innocence (25.8) that he has not done anything against the Law, the Temple, or Caesar (cf. 22.3, 12, 17; 24.12-14; 26,4f., 22). That Paul's statements about being on trial with respect to the resurrection are related to the gentile mission can be seen in 26.23. Here Luke speaks of Christ as the first to rise from the dead as being the basis for preaching to gentiles. In this light the repetitions of Paul's conversion serve to relate his mission to divine causation. By legitimating Paul's actions in this manner Luke has made the divine manifestations of his conversion lend legitimacy to the gentile mission. By making it evident that Paul's actions could have been only what they were and nothing else Luke has made it clear that God willed the salvation of the gentiles.

F. Historical Legitimation and Jew-Gentile Relations

A second area of social experience given historical legitimation by Luke was that of mixed table fellowship among Jews and gentiles. As we have seen (Ch. 3, D) this issue was, in Luke's experience, inseparable from the issue of salvation for gentiles. The experience of salvation by any group meant the establishment of relations and fellowship with preexisting communities (e.g. Acts 8.14, 25; 11.22, 25ff.). Segregation was denied in principle with the acknowledgement

that gentiles were to be part of the People of God (Acts 15.15ff.). Therefore the Old Testament prophecies Luke used to legitimate the mission to the gentiles also extend to the issue of table fellowship.

It appears that Luke used an argument based on the antiquity and provisions of the Old Testament in regard to the issue of table fellowship in Acts 15.20f. Here, having just argued on the basis of Amos 9.11-12 (LXX with possible conflations from Jer. 12.15 and Isa. 45.21[70]) that the gentiles could become part of the People of God (v.14), James goes on to place four restrictions on these gentiles which would have helped to facilitate the social contact of Jews with gentiles, and which Luke believed derived from the Old Testament. That Luke believed these restrictions to be based on Mosaic Law is clear from the reference to Moses in v.21. Many commentators find the line of thought in these two verses obscure.[71] But Haenchen's line of reasoning is correct. The γάρ of v.21 can only refer to the stipulations in v.20 because there is no logical connection of thought between vv. 19 and 21 and vv. 16-18 are spoken of as οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν (v.15) and thus inappropriately related to 'Moses' in v.21.[72] This eliminates J.H. Ropes' otherwise attractive theory that the mention of the Diaspora in v.21 interprets the exclusivist prophecy of Amos in a universalist manner.[73] V.21 is the justification for the four stipulations of v.20. The gentiles are required to keep only those aspects of the Mosaic Law which apply to them as gentiles.[74] The

---

[70]Bruce, Book, p. 310; idem., Acts, p. 297.

[71]Hanson, Acts, p. 163; BC IV, p. 177; Marshall, Acts, p. 254; cf. Bruce's indecision, Acts, pp. 300f.

[72]Haenchen, Acts, p. 450, cf. Neil, Acts, pp. 174f.

[73]J.H. Ropes, "Acts XV.21," JBL 15 (1896):75-81.

[74]Haenchen, Acts, pp. 469f.; Krodel, Acts, p. 58.

reason is that because of the existence of Diaspora synagogues these requirements for gentiles to live in contact with Jews have been preached everywhere. Therefore gentiles should not find it difficult to comply. It is typically Lucan to surround this pervasive leaven of synagogue preaching with an aura of antiquity (ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων).

The Nunc Dimittis (Lk. 2.29-32) may be pre-Lucan in form.[75] But the manner in which its final distich relates to Luke's interest in the gentile mission indicates that it is not non-Lucan.[76] These words are put forward as an inspired prophecy and as such are related to the third category of historical argument, the divine direction of events. But the close verbal association of this passage with several Old Testament passages indicates that Luke probably used Simeon's prophecy as an interpretive comment on the Old Testament passages to which it alluded. There are eight passages from Isaiah which are quoted or alluded to in Lk. 2.25-28.[77] Each of these passages deals with the salvation of God to be revealed in the last days. Two divergent traditions in regard to the place of the gentiles in these events are evident in these passages. On the one hand, Isa. 52.7-12, used in part for vv. 29-32, is a Zion song and reflects an exclusivist tradition. In it the gentiles function as witnesses to the salvation God has revealed in restoring the fortunes of Zion. They see the mighty deliverance but are left outside of it. In Isa. 46.13, again part of a Zion song and alluded to in vv. 29-32, the 'nations' are

---

[75]Stephen Farris, The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), JSNT Supplement Series 9, pp. 14-30, esp. p. 30; R. Brown, Birth Narratives, p. 454ff.

[76]See Fitzmyer, p. 420-22, who also argues that the whole of vv. 21-40 closely parallels I Sam. 1-2 and thus represents a conscious Lucan imitation of the Samuel story; cf. Farris, pp. 151ff.

[77]
2.25	Isa. 40.1; 49.13
2.29-32	Isa. 52.9f.; 49.6; 46.13; 40.5
2.34	Isa. 8.14f., 28
	(Ez. 14.17; 5.1f.; 6.8f.; Sib.Or. 3.316)
2.38	Isa. 52.9f. (cf. Lk. 1.68)

conspicuously absent from God's salvation. But in Isa. 49.6 and 42.6, from which the φῶς metaphor is drawn, the 'nations' are full participants in a universal salvation and on an equal footing with the sons of Abraham. Luke has used a tradition which skillfully conflated both traditions. This is evident not only in the allusion to both but also in the alteration Luke made[78] to the second stich of Isa. 52.10 (πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν to πάντων τῶν λαῶν). Luke normally uses λαός in the singular to refer to Israel (see Ch. 3, pp. 129f.). By shifting it to the plural in this instance he has caused it to function as a universalist term without a specific national connotation. Here it signifies all the peoples (of the world), i.e. both Jews and gentiles. In v.32 both ἐθνῶν and λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ are envisaged as one conjoint people in God's redemption.[79] This is why the alteration to Isa. 52.10 was necessary, in order to provide a neutral phrase which could encompass both groups mentioned in v.32.[80] The result is an interpretation of Israel's ancient scriptures which supports the integration of Jews and gentiles.

It seems clear then that Luke felt that the antiquity of Jewish scripture could be used to legitimate the salvation of gentiles and their integration with Jewish believers.

Again, since issues of salvation for gentiles and table fellowship were inseparable, the supernatural phenomena which gave evidence of the divine causation of the former also extend to the latter. In Acts 10 and 11 it is the issue of table fellowship which at first predominates. The immediate lesson Peter drew from his visions was that social contact with gentiles was to be permitted (10.28).

---

[78] Marshall, Lk., p. 120.

[79] S.G. Wilson, Gentile Mission, pp. 36-38.

[80] R. Brown, Birth Narratives, pp. 439f.

And the Spirit's words to him dealt explicitly with social contact (10.20, 23). Finally, it was not until the gentiles had received the Spirit that Peter understood his visions to mean that he should not only have contact with them but also extend to them a place in the church. In Jerusalem Peter repeated both the content of his vision and the Spirit's command in answer to the question of his critics as to why he had eaten with uncircumcised men (11.3-12). It is clear that God willed Jews and gentiles to eat together just as much as he willed gentiles to be saved. And his direction of Peter's life effected both.

Luke also used historical role models to legitimate social contact between Jews and gentiles. From what has just been said it seems obvious that Peter functions as one such model. He is the exemplary Jewish Christian who had gentiles as his house guests and who stayed in a gentile home himself. Peter is not only a model for how to convert a gentile but also a model for how a Jew can enter into table fellowship with a gentile under the direction of God. Luke underscored this lesson by immediately following the example of Peter with an account of the first of several mixed communities. Antioch stands as the primal Hellenistic church, racially mixed, fruitful (11.24), and generous (11.29f.). Every church Luke described in Acts was either explicitly or implicitly racially mixed (Ch. 3, note 199). And if we are to presume that Luke's own church saw itself to stand in continuity with the churches of Acts it, too, must have been racially mixed. Or if this is stated in a sociological manner, we can tell from this picture of the churches of Acts that Luke's own community was struggling with racial integration between Jews and gentiles and these historical examples were produced to support this process (again see Ch. 3, D, for a full treatment).

If, in this regard, Luke's picture of Peter exaggerates his activities among gentiles, his picture of Paul similarly exaggerates his activities among Jews.[81] Luke went out of his way to emphasize Paul's activities among the Jews of the Dispersion. Paul converted, confronted, or it is intimated that he had contact with Jews at every place where Luke described his missionary activity (Ch. 3, note 199). At this juncture what is important are the number of places where it is emphasized that Paul's ministry affected both Jews and gentiles. (These are 13.43, 48; 14.1; 17.4, 12; 18.4; 19.9f.; i.e. 6 out of the 15 mission stops described by Luke. In the remaining 9 instances only 2 do not at least imply contact with both groups, 14.20, 24.) Several of these instances give indication that believing Jews and gentiles united to form a Christian community (17.10, 14; esp. 18.7f.; 19.9f.). At Thessalonica and Beroea Luke described Paul's converts at the time of their conversion as 'Jews and Greeks' (17.4, 12). A few verses later he referred to them conjointly as 'brethren' (vv. 10 and 14), a technical intra-Christian self-designation (Ch. 3, pp. 148f.). At Corinth Luke described how Paul departed from the synagogue to take up residence with a gentile (18.7). But then Luke goes on to describe the conversion of Crispus the synagogue ruler. It seems likely that Luke and his readers thought that this Jewish Christian became a part of the mixed community Luke supposed Paul to have founded there. (Again we find converts described as 'Jews and Greeks', v.4, and later referred to as 'brethren', v. 18.) The staccato effect of the rapid transitions from Jewish to gentile people and contexts in 18.1-18 seems to reflect Luke's belief that a mixed community was founded there.

---

[81] E.P. Sanders, Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), pp. 179-90. See also Johannes Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind (London: SCM, 1959, '1954), pp. 119f., 200-206; and Walther Schmithals, Paul and James (London: SCM, 1965), pp. 16-62. Contra. Günther Bornkamm, "The Missionary Stance of Paul in I Cor. 9 and in Acts," SLA, pp. 194ff.; Vielhauer, "Paulinism," p. 38; W.D. Davies, review of Galations, by H.D. Betz, RSR 7 (1981):311.

At Ephesus Luke first narrated Paul's break with the synagogue (19.9) and emphasized that the believing Jews (μαθηται) went with him. This is followed by a statement that all Jews and Greeks in Asia heard the word of the Lord (v.10). This emphasis on the fact that both Jews and Greeks heard the word implies that the believing Jews who left the synagogue with Paul came together with the believing Greeks to form the united community Paul left at Ephesus (20.1).

Luke presented Paul's missionary activity as an enterprise which brought Jews and Greeks together in Christian communities and himself as a man who accepted hospitality (and therefore food) in both Jewish (18.2f.) and gentile (16.34; 18.7) homes. Since Luke also presented him as having promulgated the apostolic decree among the Dispersion (16.4) it seems likely that Luke saw in Paul a proponent of compromise on the part of gentile believers in order to facilitate integration with Jewish believers. Paul, the great missionary among the gentiles, brought gentiles into contact with Jews. And Peter, the great leader of early Jewish Christianity, brought Jews into contact with gentiles. Both function as role models which pull extreme positions toward the moderate compromise Luke saw to be embedded in the apostolic decree.

G. Other Aspects of Mission Experience Given Historical Legitimation

The major aspects of the community's mission experience which were legitimated by reference to historical events and personages were the gentile mission itself and Jew-gentile table fellowship. But there are other aspects of the community's mission experience which can be seen to have been legitimated by the use of history.

In Chapter 5 aspects of the Lucan community's mission experience were analysed in connection with the functional utility of the kingdom of God as a means of eschatological legitimation. Those aspects of the community's mission experience which were examined included:

1) the community's kerygma in a positive sense as the proclamation of salvation and the realization of salvation in repentance, the forgiveness of sins, deliverance from disease and demonic possession; 2) the community's kerygma in a negative sense as a threat of divine judgment against those who rejected its preaching; and 3) the community's experience of a mixed response in its efforts at proselytism. Each of these experiences also received historical legitimation.

Luke related Jesus' public ministry to a set prophetic programme which was characterized by the preaching of repentance and the forgiveness of sins and the rescue of those diseased and possessed. But prior to the grand statement of this programme in Lk. 4.18f., Luke carefully set up an historical argument consisting of appearances of angels, inspired prophecies, and statements of direction by the Spirit in order to indicate that God was the causal agent behind the inception of this programme in Jesus' ministry.

Both Luke and Josephus condemned as false the Jewish apocalyptic prophets of their time (Acts 5.36f.; Lk. 21.8; BJ 6.258-60, 185) but both also accepted that prophecy could be genuine and give foreknowledge of the course of events predestined by God (BJ 6.300-305).[82] Luke used Zechariah and Simeon's prophecies and the Magnificat (Lk. 1.68-79; 2.29-35; 1.46-55) to rehearse in advance the major contours of Jesus' ministry. Themes of salvation, the forgiveness of sins, acceptance and rejection, and the reversal of fortunes figure prominently in them. The messages of Gabriel to Zechariah and Mary foretell John's ministry and Jesus' divine status. The appearance of Gabriel has parallels in Judges 13.1-25 and 1 Sam. 1.1-27. In both of these instances angels appear to announce the birth of sons (Samson and Samuel) and to explain what they will do as men and its significance in the divine plan. And one should also compare Suetonius' reports of the miracles that

---

[82]Kee, Miracle, p. 179.

surrounded the birth of Augustus which functioned to portray the divine approval of his rule and career.[83] Luke, by combining inspired prophecy with angelic messages, has made it clear that the programme of Jesus' ministry to bring forgiveness and healing is in accord with God's plan and that its inception at this time happened under divine guidance.

The theme is reinforced in Lk. 3.21f. and 4.1-18ff. The Lucan emphasis on the Spirit forms a connecting thread which binds these passages together.[84] Luke's addition of σωματικός to the account of Jesus' baptism (cf. Mk. 1.10) stresses the empirical nature of the event and the reality of the Spirit's presence with Jesus which is again picked up in Lk. 4. In Lk. 4.1 Mark's ἐκβάλλω has been softened to ἄγω, but Luke has redoubled the emphasis on the Spirit's activity by adding the phrase πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου. Luke again emphasizes Jesus' dependence on the Spirit in 4.14 and 18. Jesus, anointed by the Spirit (3.22), full of the Spirit (4.1), led by the Spirit (4.1), and in the power of the Spirit (4.14), comes to the inception of his programme of salvific ministry; not in his own authority or by human causation but with the Spirit as the one acting through him (4.18). The story of Jesus' ministry of salvation has the highest form of legitimation possible, i.e. divine causation evidenced by angels, prophecies, and the Spirit's direction. His ministry of preaching and healing stems from God's direct intervention in history.

A similar line of argument butresses the ministry of the apostles as they preach repentance and the forgiveness of sins. First, the emphasis on the Spirit reemerges. The apostles are not allowed to embark on their ministry until empowered by God to do so (Lk. 24.49;

---

[83]Ibid., p. 175.

[84]See Talbert, Literary Patterns, pp. 116f.

Acts 1.8). Second, the earliest apostolic sermons were delivered at times and places which were not chosen by the apostles but by God. Peter's sermon at Pentecost was forced on him by the need to explain what had happened as a result of God's initiative in sending the Spirit (2.12). His sermon in Solomon's Portico was occasioned by the healing of a lame man in Jesus' name (3.1-16ff.). And in 5.20 Luke reported that they went to preach at the command of an angel. Just as in his account of Jesus' ministry, so here Luke has emphasized that the apostles did not undertake the preaching of repentance and forgiveness of sins in Jesus' name by their own initiative. God was the causal agent behind events.

Two additional motifs underline this. 1) Luke stresses obedience as a key apostolic virtue. This virtue has a basis in Luke's understanding of the Old Testament. Moses prophesied that God would raise up a prophet like he had him (Deut. 18.15f.). This prophet must be obeyed or one would perish (Deut. 18.19; Lev. 23.29; Acts 3.22f.). Luke tells us twice that the apostles can only obey God (4.19f.; 5.29-32). Both instances are replies to commands to desist preaching in Jesus' name. As a reply to these commands the apostles' insistence that they will continue to obey God functions to indicate that they have undertaken their preaching with the highest possible authority, God's. 2) The divine direction of the apostles' ministry is confirmed by 'signs and wonders'. Luke's perspective on 'signs and wonders' is made clear in Acts 2.22 where they are referred to as proof of God's attestation of Jesus. Thus when one reads that the apostles also performed 'signs and wonders' these miracles are also proof of their divine attestation.

Paul, too, preaches repentance under divine necessity. There is, of course, an emphasis on the Spirit as the initiator of Paul's mission activity (13.2, 4). But the strongest statement of divine predestination

in connection with the actual programme of Paul's preaching is to be found in Acts 26.12-19ff. Here several statements express the divine purpose (εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὤφθην σοι. . ., v.16) in regard to Paul. Among these is the statement that he is to be sent under divine constraint (ἀποστέλλω, v.17) in order that the gentiles might receive forgiveness of sins. Of course Luke is not unique in this belief. Paul himself would have agreed with this description of his motivation (1 Cor. 9.16). The point here is that Luke has used this idea as a unifying theme which pervades his narrative.

Luke also used an argument of promise and fulfilment to legitimate the positive aspects of his community's kerygma. In two places he related the preaching of repentance to the Old Testament in general without making a specific reference (Lk. 24.46f. and Acts 10.43). This reflects his belief that the Christian message was prefigured and foretold in the Old Testament in such a pervasive manner that such cover statements proved sufficient to indicate that the ancient scriptures of the Jews supported Christian preaching (cf. Acts 24.14f.; 26.22f.).

The quotation of Isa. 61.1f. in Lk. 4.18f. serves indirectly to legitimate the Christian proclamation of forgiveness. The word μετάνοια does not occur but ἄφεσις does. The sense of ἄφεσις here is 'release', understood as deliverance from disease, infirmity, and demonic possession. However, Luke frequently used ἄφεσις with ἁμαρτία as a modifier and in such instances it means 'forgiveness of sins'.[85] (Lk. 1.77; 3.3; 24.47; Acts 2.38; 5.31; 10.43; 13.38; 26.18). That he was capable of making a wordplay on the possible dual connotations of ἄφεσις to mean either 'release' or 'forgiveness' is evident from his retention

---

[85]Fitzmyer, p. 533; see Lk. 1.77; 3.3; Acts 2.38; 5.31; 10.43; 13.38; 26.18; and further Fitzmyer, pp. 223f.

of a healing story found in Mk. 2.1-12 (Lk. 5.17-26) where such a word-play is essential to the story's meaning. This means that the dual connotation may also colour the word's use in 4.18f. and thus indicates a use of Isaiah's ancient prophecy to support the community's preaching programme (cf. Acts 13.47).

It was demonstrated in Chapter 4 that a major factor in the community's social experience was the failure of its preaching to produce results. Some believed but more did not. This experience of a mixed response by the community in regard to its proclamation was given eschatological explanation (Ch. 5) and provision was made to preempt this response by including as an integral part of the proclamation of salvation the threat of divine judgment for those who rejected it. This issue was also given historical legitimation, primarily in the use of historical role models. However since this evidence has been discussed in Chapter 4 we shall simply reiterate here by saying that 1) Luke has qualified the notices of success found in Acts so that it is evident that the successes of the early church and Paul were less than total. 2) This theme is carried back into the time of Jesus by Luke's emphasis on the acceptance/rejection motif. Not everyone accepted him either. 3) Threats of divine judgment were given a prominent place in Luke's portrayal of early Christian preaching. (See Acts 2.36f.; 3.22f.; 17.31; 24.25; and 13.40[86] and 46.) From these models Lucan Christians learned that they must expect their message to be rejected frequently and to preempt this by including warnings of divine judgment in their preaching.

Both Matthew and Mark projected current mission practices back into the time of Jesus (e.g. baptism in the threefold name, Mt. 28.19; the conversion of gentiles, Mk. 5.18ff.). One major block of synoptic mission instruction is to be found in the accounts of the commissioning

---

[86]Bruce, Book, p. 279.

of the Twelve (Mt. 10.1-11.1; Mk. 6.7-12; Lk. 9.1-6). But while the average Christian may have wondered whether or not instructions given to the Twelve were applicable to him, Luke, by reporting a further commissioning of 70 of the larger group of disciples, makes it clear that these instructions are applicable for his own community (Ch. 4, pp. 190f., Ch. 5, pp. 233ff.).

Warnings of judgment are prominent in all three synoptic gospels (Mt. 10.14f.; Mk. 6.11; Lk. 9.5; 10.10f.). Matthew stressed his community's experience of persecution in his account (10.16-39). But Luke, by his association of a collection of 'Woes' from the 'Q' tradition (Lk. 10.13ff.) with the mission of the 70 and by his addition of 10.16b, has emphasized the place of these warnings in the church's kerygma. (Matthew associated these sayings with the mission of Jesus, 11.20ff.). The mission of the 70 was portrayed by Luke as an historical example which posited the origins of his community's current mission practices, with warnings of judgment being quite evident, as lying in the sacral time of Jesus' ministry.

It should also be noted that Lk. 10.16b, ". . . and the one who rejects you, rejects me, and the one who rejects me, rejects the one who sent me. . .", has no direct synoptic parallel (but cf. Jn. 12.45). But it is the negative image of sayings found in Mt. 10.40; Mk. 9.37; and Lk. 9.48. What Luke has done by adding this starkly negative saying has been to preempt the rejection of his community's mission preaching by positing its occurrence and explaining the significance of this before it happens. By placing this warning on the lips of Jesus he has firmly rooted it in his community's sacred cosmos as originating in the sacred time of his ministry.

Luke's Jesus, like Matthew and Mark's, preached strong warnings of judgment. In Luke this type of saying falls into two categories. The first includes those sayings which threaten divine judgment on

moral grounds and could be applied to Jew and gentile alike (e.g. 6.49; 9.26; 10.16; 12.20). The second includes threats of divine judgment against Judaism for its rejection of Jesus (11.32ff.; 13.28; 14.24; 20.16ff.). It is the second category with which we are concerned.

Threats of judgment given by Jesus against Judaism and Jerusalem are a major theme in Luke. We have seen (Ch. 3) that these passages are usually interpreted to refer to the rejection of the Jews in favour of the gentiles in God's economy of salvation. And we have also seen that this line of argument is incorrect.

The acceptance/rejection motif in regard to Israel first appears in the form of a prophecy (2.27) in Lk. 2.34. The offer of salvation has a dark side.[87] It spells destruction for those who reject it. The theme is picked up again in the programmatic opening of Jesus' ministry in Nazareth. Here, as Tiede has demonstrated, themes of acceptance and rejection are played out in a rehearsal of the end of the gospel at its beginning.[88] Israel will reject its Messiah (Acts 2.36) just as Nazareth did and as a result the message of forgiveness of sins in Christ will be spread throughout the world (Lk. 24.47) just as Elijah and Elisha took God's help beyond the boundaries of Israel. What Tiede and others have demonstrated is that the interpretation of this Lucan motif to mean the wholesale rejection of the Jews is wrong. Instead it appears that Luke has honed the application of this threat of rejection by God to a finer and finer point until the cutting edge of his acceptance/rejection motif was laid squarely against the city of Jerusalem.

This can be seen if one traces the dominical warnings of judgment against Israel through the rest of Luke's gospel. Lk. 11.37-52 provides

---

[87] Cf. Tiede, p. 26.

[88] Ibid., pp. 19ff., 35ff., 54.

an exemplary starting point. It is a 'Q' tradition (cf. Mt. 23.25-36), although there are scattered points of comparison with Marcan traditions.[89] Thus the saying in vv. 49f. about God sending prophets and apostles to be killed or persecuted in order that (ἵνα) this generation may be held responsible for all prophets murdered since the beginning of time came to Luke in a traditional form. Matthew interpreted this saying by applying it to Jerusalem (Mt. 23.37ff.). Luke did the same via his understanding of the fate of a prophet. Luke clearly understood that all prophets, if they are to die, must perish in Jerusalem (Lk. 13.33). That he understood Jesus' ministry as a prophetic ministry is clear from several passages. The sign of Jonah, interpreted by Matthew as a prefigurement of the resurrection (Mt. 12.40), was interpreted by Luke in the context of Jonah's vocation as a prophet (11.30) and thus typologically related to Jesus' ministry as a prophet. The sign given to this generation is that of a prophet in their midst (Lk. 7.16; Acts 3.22), a prophet whose ministry will come to a climax in Jerusalem. Other warnings delivered by Jesus to Israel similarly focus on his vocation as a prophet and via that vocation on Jerusalem (e.g. 12.54ff.; 11.32ff.; 13.28; 14.24).[90]

Jerusalem then functions as the focal point for the Jewish rejection of Jesus and for the divine judgment prophesied by Jesus. This is made clear if one examines several of the speeches in Acts. In Acts 2.23, 36; 3.13f.; 4.11; and 5.30 the Jews and Jewish leaders of Jerusalem are charged with responsibility for having rejected Jesus and for his death. However, once one steps outside of Jerusalem into the Diaspora this theme is no longer a part of apostolic preaching.

---

[89] E.g. Mk. 7.1-9; see further Aland, Synopsis, pp. 276ff. and Sparks, Synopsis, pp. 133ff.

[90] Cf. C. van der Waal, "The Temple in the Gospel According to Luke," Neotest 7 (1973):55.

Paul mentions it in 13.27f. But the charge is not directed against his audience, it is simply an historical fact. Only Jerusalem and its leadership are guilty of having rejected and killed their Messiah.

Luke presented four prophecies of the destruction of Jerusalem (Lk. 13.1-9; 13.34f.; 19.41-44; 21.20-24). Since the destruction of Jerusalem was a past event for Luke this means that its function as a focal point for divine judgment is an historical motif.[91] The distant and now scattered Jews of Jerusalem served his community as an historical example of divine judgment.[92] It is important to note that as such it is an impersonal example. His community has or had no real contact with Jerusalem. It no longer existed as it had before A.D. 70. Its negative assessment need not threaten the real Jews with whom Luke's community had contact. But at the same time it stands as an historical example of divine judgment, widely interpreted as such throughout the Hellenistic world (Ch. 3, pp. 120f.). In this manner the fate of Jerusalem functions as a sanction for the negative element of the community's kerygma. The judgment they proclaim as coming on all men (Acts 17.31) has already happened in a proleptic manner in regard to Jerusalem.[93] The fate of Jerusalem functions as a final historical legitimation for the preaching of judgment.[94]

In summary it can be seen that Luke legitimated several of the social experiences of his community: the conversion of gentiles, mixed table fellowship, the community's offer of forgiveness of sins in its

---

[91]Zmijewski, p. 205, speaks of Jerusalem as having a function in salvation history as a place of judgment.

[92]Cf. ibid., p. 206.

[93]Ibid., p. 224.

[94]It should also be noted that this use of Jerusalem clears Luke of any charges of anti-Semitism, J.R. Wilch, "Jewish Guilt for the Death of Jesus -- Anti-Judaism in the Acts of the Apostles?" LTJ 18 (1984):49-58. All Jews are not responsible for Jesus' death and those who were responsible have paid their penalty. And even they were offered repentance, Houlden, pp. 57f.

preaching, the threat of divine judgment against those who rejected that offer, and the mixed response they encountered in their preaching. He did this by means of historical arguments from promise and fulfilment, role models, and evidence of divine causation in history in supernatural phenomena. In this manner he used the sacral character of Israel's long history, and what he considered the historical actions of Jesus and the early church, to authorize his own community's mission.

H. Conclusion

The members of Luke's community lived beneath a sacred canopy constructed of rich and varied symbols which ordered their lives in a meaningful fashion. In this thesis we have investigated three major clusters of symbols used in the construction of that sacred canopy.

One cluster of symbols related to the community's mission was primarily christological and expressed the universalism and also the exclusivism of the group's mission task (see Ch. 4, pp. 193ff.; Ch. 3, E). A dominical commission by the risen Jesus (Lk. 24.46ff.; Acts 1.8) affirmed the divine origins of the mission in a symbolic manner.

The dominical commission is one example of many historical narratives which were used in the construction of the community's sacred canopy. Others formed a second cluster of symbols and included many of the events surrounding the life of Jesus and that of the early Christians and the actions they performed. These specific historical accounts functioned as symbols which legitimated the community's mission. For the purpose of sociological analysis these accounts can be grouped together and generalized as 'history'. In this sense we may speak of the symbolic function of 'history' in Luke's community (Ch. 6).

The third major cluster of symbols in the community's sacred canopy was its eschatological expectations (Ch. 5). Eschatological symbols were also used in Luke's community to legitimate its mission.

In the course of its mission the community was regularly exposed to a diversity of experiences. These included the relationships between Jews and gentiles (Ch. 3, D; Ch. 6, F), the subjective experience of salvation (see esp. Ch. 5 and Ch. 3, E), the problems of caring for missionaries (Ch. 3, F), and the task of expressing the community's kerygma to a variety of audiences (pagans, God-Fearers, and Jews; Ch. 3, D and p. 117, note 119). There was also the memory of the gradual development of the gentile mission (Ch. 6, pp. 275ff.); the rejection of mission preaching (Ch. 4, E); healing, deliverance, and other charismatic phenomena (Ch. 3, G; Ch. 5). This great variety of factors required a correspondingly varied symbolic legitimation.

It seems plain that mission was absolutely central to the community's life and purpose. It influenced the formation of roles and institutions in the community (Ch. 3, F). Both the community's mission and these roles and institutions will have required justification at the symbolic level in a sacred canopy.

The need for varied symbolic legitimation in a sacred canopy was met, in part, by using reified historical and eschatological symbols from the community's sacred past and future to legitimate these diverse experiences. It has been argued that both history and eschatology functioned to provide legitimation for various aspects of the community's mission experience. Thus it can be seen that these ideas were functionally related to one another by their common use in relation to this. Both ideas were integral parts of the community's symbolic universe and both were essential for maintaining the credibility of its main task.

Luke has made history a major component in his community's symbolic universe together with eschatology, whereas earlier communities probably depended almost solely on eschatological symbols. This may signal the beginning of the process which led to 'eschatology being

swallowed up by history' in Early Catholicism. But that was not yet the case for the Lucan community. History and eschatology functioned symbolically for the community on an equal footing (Ch. 1).

If history and eschatology were functionally related to one another in relation to the community's mission experience then they were meaningfully related to one another. This meaning can be found in the symbolic function they fulfilled for the community. Both ideas were meaningful for the individual believer in explaining and justifying his support of the group's mission task. History and eschatology helped the believer make sense of his life in the community. That both could provide meaning for the individual and the group stems from their capacity to provide legitimation of group experiences. But it is only in their relationship to group experience that they appear meaningful in this sense. We have discovered that history and eschatology can be seen as meaningfully related to one another in view of what they <u>do</u> for the community and its members rather than in view of how they logically cohere.

Such a statement is not a repudiation of the theological task of seeking to understand how such ideas could have been, or are, related to one another in a theological system. What we have done is to establish the social matrix within which these ideas were functionally meaningful for this community. The examination of these ideas from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge provides a broader historical understanding of the situation within which this group of Christians lived and formulated their ideas. If a sociological approach has established that history and eschatology were functionally coherent in a given social context then this provides us with additional insight into the world of these early Christians and further prepares us for the ongoing task of trying to establish the logical coherence of these ideas within a theological system.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aalen, Sverre. "'Reign' and 'House' in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels." NTS 8 (1961-62):215-40.

_____. "St. Luke's Gospel and the Last Chapters of I Enoch." NTS 13 (1966-67):1-13.

Abrams, Philip. Historical Sociology. Shepton Mallet, Somerset: Open Books, 1982.

Achtemeier, Paul J. "The Lukan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch." In Perspectives on Luke-Acts, pp. 153ff. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Aland, Kurt, edidit. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1976.

Aland, Kurt; Black, Matthew; Martini, Carlo M.; Metzger, Bruce M.; and Wikgren, Allen, eds. The Greek New Testament. 3rd ed. New York: United Bible Society, 1975.

Anderson, Hugh. "Broadening Horizons: The Rejection at Nazareth Pericope of Luke 4:16-30 in Light of Recent Critical Trends." Interpretation 18 (1964):259-75.

_____. The Gospel of Mark. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981, '1976.

Argyle, A.W. "The Greek of Luke and Acts." NTS 20 (1973-74):441-45.

Argyle, Michael and Beit-Hallahmi, Benjamin. The Social Psychology of Religion. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975, '1958 as Religious Behaviour.

Arndt, William F. and Gingrich, William F. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. 4th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Aune, David Edward. The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XXVIII. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972.

_____. Review of The Limits of the Religious Community: Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran Sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity, by Göran Forkman and trans. Pearl Sjölander. Interpretation 17 (1973): 237ff.

Bailey, Kenneth Ewing. Poet and Peasant: A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

Bailey, Kenneth Ewing. Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Balmforth, H. The Gospel According to Saint Luke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.

Baltzer, Klaus. "Consideration Regarding the Office and Calling of the Prophet." HTR 61 (1968):567-81.

_____. "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lukan Writings." HTR 58 (1965):263-77.

Barclay, William. The Gospels and Acts. 2 vols. London: SCM Press, ²1976, '1966.

Barker, Eileen, ed. New Religious Movements: A Perspective for Understanding Society. New York & Toronto: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1982.

Barker, Margaret. "Slippery Words: III. Apocalyptic." ET 89 (1977-78): 324-29.

Barnard, L.W. "Clement of Rome and the Persecution of Domitian." NTS 10 (1963/64):241-60.

Barnes, Harry Elmer. A History of Historical Writing. 2nd ed. New York: Dover Publications, 1963 [1st, 1937].

Barrett, C.K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London: SPCK, 1947.

_____. "Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius." In Jews, Greeks and Christians, pp. 220ff. Edited by Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

_____. Luke the Historian in Recent Study. London: Epworth Press, 1961.

_____. New Testament Essays. London: SPCK, 1972.

_____. "Stephen and the Son of Man." In Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1964. [BZNW 30 (1964): 32-38].

Barthes, Roland. "A Structural Analysis of a Narrative from Acts X-XI." In Structuralism and Biblical Hermeneutics. Edited by Alfred M. Johnson, Jr. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1979.

Bartlett, David L. "John G. Gager's 'Kingdom and Community': A Summary and Response." Zygon 13 (1978):109-22.

Bartsch, Hans-Werner. "Early Christian Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels." NTS 11 (1965):387-97.

Bateson, Mary Cathrine. "Ritualization: A Study in Texture and Texture Change." In Religious Movements in Contemporary America, pp. 150-65. Edited by Irving I. Zaretsky and Mark P. Leone. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Bauer, Bruno. Die Apostelgeschichte. Berlin, 1850.

Baum, Gregory. "Peter L. Berger's Unfinished Symphony." Commonweal (9 May 1980):264-70.

_____. Review of The Analogical Imagination, by David Tracy. RSR 7 (October 1981):286-88.

Baur, Ferdinand Christian. The Church History of the First Three Centuries. 2 vols. 3rd ed. Trans. Allan Menzies. London: William & Norgate, 1878.

_____. Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Vol. I. Stuttgart, 1845.

Beare, Francis Wright. The Gospel According to Matthew. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.

Beck, Brian E. "Christian Character in the Gospel of Luke - I." ER 6 (1979):70ff.

_____. "Christian Character in the Gospel of Luke - II." ER 6 (1979):86ff.

Bell, Daniel. Sociological Journeys: Essays 1960-1980. London: Heinemann, 1980.

Bellah, Robert N. Beyond Belief: Essays on Religion in a Post-Traditional World. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Benko, Stephen and O'Rourke, John J., eds. The Catacombs and the Colosseum: The Roman Empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1971.

Berdyaev, Nicolas. The Meaning of History. Trans. George Reavey. London: Geoffrey Less, Centenary Press, 1936.

Berger, Klaus. "Wissenssoziologie und Exegese des Neuen Testaments." Kairos 19 (1977):124-33.

Berger, Peter L. The Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1979.

_____. "Identity as a Problem in the Sociology of Knowledge." In The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader, pp. 373-84. Edited by James E. Curtis and John W. Petras. London: Duckworths, 1970. [1st, JS 7 (1966):105-15].

_____. Invitation to Sociology, A Humanistic Perspective. New York: Penguin Books, 1979, '1963.

_____. The Precarious Vision: A Sociologist Looks at Social Fictions and Christian Faith. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1976.

_____. A Rumour of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural. London: Allen Lane, 1970.

_____. The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1969.

Berger, Peter L. The Social Reality of Religion. London: Faber & Faber, 1969.

Berger, Peter L. and Berger, Brigitte. Sociology: A Biographical Approach. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1981, '1972.

Berger, Peter L. and Kellner, Hansfried. Sociology Reinterpreted: An Essay on Method and Vocation. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1981.

Berger, Peter L. and Luckmann, Thomas. The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Allen Lane, 1967.

Berkey, Robert F. "ΕΓΓΙΖΕΙΝ, ΦΘΑΝΕΙΝ, and Realized Eschatology." JBL 82 (1963):177-87.

Best, E. "The Revelation to Evangelize the Gentiles." JTS 35 n.s. (1984):1-30.

Best, Thomas F. "The Sociological Study of the New Testament: Promise and Peril of a New Discipline." SJT 36 (1983):181-94.

Betz, Otto. "The Kerygma of Luke." Interpretation 22 (1968):131-46.

Blaiklock, E.M. "The Acts of the Apostles as a Document of First Century History." In Apostolic History and the Gospel, pp. 41-54. Edited by W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

Blauw, Johannes. The Missionary Nature of the Church: A Survey of the Biblical Theology of Mission. London: Lutterworth Press, 1962.

Blunt, A.W.F. The Acts of the Apostles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, '1923, 1936.

Boer, W. den. "Greco-Roman Historiography in its Relation to Biblical and Modern Thinking." In On The Meaning of History, pp. 20ff. Geneva: Oikumene, n.d.

Boers, Hendrikus. "The Realia of History and the Historical Task." A review of The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical, Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions, vol. I., eds. S. Safrai and M. Stern. Interpretation 30 (1976):74-77.

Borgen, Peder. "The Early Church and the Hellenistic Synagogue." ST 37 (1983):55-78.

Bornkamm, Günther. "The Missionary Stance of Paul in I Cor. 9 and in Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 194ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

Bowen, Clayton Raymond. "The Emmaus Disciples and the Purposes of Luke." BW 35 (1910):234-45.

Braithwaite, R.B. "An Empiricist's View of the Nature of Religious Belief." In A Reader in Contemporary Theology, pp. 130ff. Edited by John Bowden and James Richmond. London: SCM Press, 1971.

Brandon, S.G.F. The Judgement of the Dead: An Historical and Comparative Study of the Idea of a Post-Mortem Judgement in the Major Religions. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1967.

_____. Time and Mankind: An Historical and Philosophical Study of Mankind's Attitude to the Phenomena of Change. London: Hutchinson & Co., 1951.

Braumann, Georg. "Das Mittel Der Zeit: Erwägungen zur Theologie des Lukasevangeliums." ZNW 54 (1963):118-45.

_____. "Die lukanische Interpretation der Zerstörung Jerusalems." NovTest 6 (1963):120-27.

Brown, Raymond E. The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1977.

_____. The Gospel According to John. 2 vols. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966, 1970.

Brown, Schuyler. Apostacy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.

_____. Review of Das Evangelium nach Lukas, by Josef Ernst. JBL 98 (1979):149-51.

_____. Review of Die lukanischen Endzeitreden, by Ruthild Geiger. JBL 94 (1975):613-16.

_____. "Role of the Prologues in Determining the Purpose of Luke-Acts." In Perspectives on Luke-Acts, pp. 99f. Edited by C.H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Bruce, Alexander Balmain. "The Synoptic Gospels." Vol. 1. In The Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Bruce, F.F. The Acts of the Apostles. 2nd ed. London: Tyndale Press, 1962.

_____. The Book of the Acts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

_____. "The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles." Interpretation 27 (1973):166-83.

_____. "The Picture of Paul in Acts." A Paper Read before A Fellowship of Students in Theology. Latimer House, Oxford, 15 November 1984.

_____. The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles. The Tyndale New Testament Lecture, 1942. London: Tyndale Press, n.d.

_____. "True Apostolic Succession: Recent Study of the Book of Acts." Interpretation 13 (1959):131-43.

Budd, Susan. Sociologists and Religion. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1973.

Bultmann, Rudolf. Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann. Edited by Schubert M. Ogden. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1961.

_____. "History and Eschatology in the New Testament." NTS 1 (1954-55):5-16.

_____. History and Eschatology: The Presence of Eternity. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

_____. Jesus and the Word. Trans. L.P. Smith and E.H. Lantero. New York: Scribner's, 1958.

_____. Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting. Trans. R.H. Fuller. London: Thames and Hudson, 1966.

_____. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. Trans. Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951 and 1955.

Burge, Gary M. Review of Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, Their Culture and Style, by Kenneth E. Bailey. JBL 102 (1983):341f.

Burke, Peter. The Renaissance Sense of the Past. London: Edward Arnold, 1969.

Burkert, Walter. "Craft versus Sect: The Problem of Orphics and Pythagoreans." In Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol. III: Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World. Edited by B.F. Meyer and E.P. Sanders. London: SCM, 1982.

Burkitt, F.C. Christian Beginnings. London: University of London Press, 1924.

Butterfield, Herbert. Christianity and History. London: G. Bell & Sons, 1949.

_____. History and Man's Attitude to the Past: Their Role in the Story of Civilization. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, The University of London, 1961.

_____. Man on His Past: The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

_____. The Whig Interpretation of History. London: G. Bell & Sons, 1931.

Cadbury, H.J. "Acts and Eschatology." In The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, pp. 300ff. Edited by W.D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

_____. The Book of Acts in History. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1955.

_____. "Four Features of Lucan Style." In Studies in Lk.-Acts, pp. 87ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1966, 1978.

_____. "The Hellenists." In The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. 5, pp. 59-74. Edited by Kirsopp Lake and H.J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

_____. The Making of Luke-Acts. London: SPCK, 1961, '1927.

Cadbury, H.J. "Names for Christians and Christianity in Acts." In The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. 5, pp. 375-92. Edited by Kirsopp Lake and H.J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

_____. Review of The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting, by J.C. O'Neill. JBL 81 (1962):197f.

_____. Review of The Theology of Luke, by Hans Conzelmann. JBL 80 (1961):304f.

_____. "The Summaries in Acts." In The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. 5, pp. 392-402. Edited by Kirsopp Lake and H.J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Caird, G.B. The Apostolic Age. London: Duckworth, 1955.

_____. The Language and Imagery of the Bible. London: Duckworth, 1980.

_____. Saint Luke. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1981.

Cairns, David. "The Thought of Peter Berger." SJT 27 (1974):181-97.

Calloud, Jean. Structural Analysis of Narrative. Trans. Daniel Patte. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

Campbell, Colin. Toward a Sociology of Irreligion. London: Macmillan, 1971.

Carmignac, Jean. "Les Dangers de l'Eschatologie." NTS 17 (1971):365-90.

_____. "Rectification d'une Erreur Concernant l'Eschatologie." NTS 26 (1980):252-58.

Carpenter, S.C. Christianity According to S. Luke. London: SPCK, 1919.

Carr, Edward Hallett. What is History? New York: Random House, 1961.

Case, Shirley Jackson. The Social Triumph of the Ancient Church. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1934.

Cassidy, Richard J. Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1978.

_____. "Luke's Audience, the Chief Priests, and the Motive for Jesus' Death." In Political Issues in Luke-Acts, pp. 146ff. Edited by Cassidy and Scharper. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1983.

Cassidy, Richard J. and Scharper, Philip J., eds. Political Issues in Luke-Acts. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1983.

Cave, C.H. "Lazarus and the Lukan Deuteronomy." NTS 15 (1968-69):319ff.

Charles, R.H., ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Clark, Kenneth W. "Realized Eschatology." JBL 59 (1940):367-83.

Cobb, John B., Jr. Review of The Analogical Imagination, by David Tracy. RSR 4, vol. 7 (October 1981):281-84.

Cochrane, Charles Norris. Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Coggins, R.J. "The Samaritans and Acts." NTS 28 (July 1982): 423-34.

Collingwood, R.G. The Idea of History. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Collins, John J. Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora. New York: Crossroad, 1983.

Combrink, H.J.B. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 4:16-30." Neotest 7 (1973):27-47.

Comstock, W. Richard. "A Behavioral Approach to the Sacred: Category Formation in Religious Studies." JAAR XLIX (December 1981):625-43.

Conzelmann, Hans. "The Address of Paul on the Areopagus." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 217ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978.

_____. Die Apostelgeschichte. Handbuch zum Neuen Testment. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1963.

_____. "Geschichte und Eschaton nach Mc 13." ZNW 50 (1959):210-21.

_____. "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 298ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978.

_____. An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1969.

_____. The Theology of St. Luke. Trans. Geoffrey Buswell. London: Faber & Faber, 1960.

Corr, Charles A. "Peter Berger's Angels and Philosophy of Religion." JR 52 (1972):426-37.

Coser, Lewis A. The Functions of Social Conflict. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956.

Cosgrove, Charles H. "The Divine ΔEI in Luke-Acts: Investigations into the Lucan Understanding of God's Providence." NovTest 26 (1984): 168-90.

Cranfield, C.E.B. "The Parable of the Unjust Judge and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts." SJT 16 (1963):297-301.

Creed, John Martin. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Macmillan & Co., 1930.

Cribbs, F. Lamar. "The Agreements that Exist between John and Acts." In Perspectives on Luke-Acts, pp. 40ff. Edited by C.H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Croce, Benedetto. History: Its Theory and Practice. Trans. Douglas Ainslie. New York: Russell & Russell, 1960.

Crockett, Larrimore Clyde. "Luke 4.25-27 and Jewish-Gentile Relations in Luke-Acts." JBL 88 (1969):177-83.

_____. "The Old Testament in the Gospel of Luke; with Emphasis on the Interpretation of Isaiah 61.1-2." 2 vols. Ph.D. dissertation. Brown University, 1966. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1984.

Cullman, Oscar. Christ and Time. Trans. Floyd V. Filson. London: SCM Press, 1957.

_____. "Eschatology and Missions in the New Testament." In The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, pp. 409ff. Edited by W.D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

_____. The Johannine Circle: Its place in Judaism, among the disciples of Jesus and in early Christianity. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1976.

_____. Salvation in History. Trans. Sidney G. Sowers. London: SCM Press, 1967.

Culpepper, R. Alan. "The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-school Hypothesis based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools." Ph.D. dissertation. Drew University, 1974. Missoula: Scholar's Press, 1975.

Currie, Robert; Gilbert, Alan; and Horsley, Lee. Churches and Churchgoers: Patterns of Church Growth in the British Isles since 1700. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

Dahl, Nils A. "Christ, Creation and the Church." In The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, pp. 422ff. Edited by W.D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

_____. Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976.

_____. "'A People for His Name' (Acts XV.14)." NTS 4 (1957-58): 319-27.

_____. "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 139ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978.

Dana, H.E. and Mantey, Julius R. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: Macmillan Co., 1957.

Danker, Frederick W. Jesus and the New Age According to St. Luke. St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1972.

Danker, Frederick W. Luke. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

_____. "Reciprocity in the Ancient World and in Acts 15:23-29." In Political Issues in Luke-Acts, pp. 49ff. Edited by R.J. Cassidy and P.J. Scharper. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983.

_____. Review of Die Sprache des Lukas Evangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums, by Joachim Jeremias. JBL 102 (1983):338-41.

Daube, David. "A Reform in Acts and Its Models." In Jews, Greeks and Christians, pp. 151ff. Edited by R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

Davies, J.G. "The Genesis of Belief in an Imminent Parousia." JTS n.s. XIV (1963):104-7.

Davies, W.D. "From Schweitzer to Scholem: Reflections on Sabbatai Svi." JBL 95 (1976):529-58.

Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Luke's Perspective on Tribute to Caesar." In Political Issues in Luke-Acts, pp. 38ff. Edited by R.J. Cassidy and P.J. Scharper. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983.

Detweiler, Robert. Story, Sign, and Self: Phenomenology and Structuralism as Literary Critical Methods. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

Deutsch, Morton. "Group Behaviour." In International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, vol. 6, pp. 265-76. Edited by David L. Sills. New York: Macmillan & Co. and The Free Press, 1968.

Dewey, John. "Interpretation of the Savage Mind." In The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader, pp. 244-54. Edited by James E. Curtis and John W. Petras. London: Duckworth, 1970. [1st published, PR IX (May 1902):217-30].

Dibelius, Martin. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. Edited by Heinrich Greeven. London: SCM Press, 1956.

Dietrich, G. "The Role of Class Contradiction in Luke's Theology." COELI 33 (1985):12-17.

Dillon, Richard J. From Eye-witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.

Dodd, C.H. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments. London: Hodder & Stoughton, ²1944, '1936.

_____. More New Testament Studies. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968.

_____. The Parables of the Kingdom. New York: Scribner's, 1936.

Douglas, Mary. Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology. London: Barrie & Rockliff; The Cresset Press, 1970.

Douglas, Mary. Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.

Downing, F.G. "Common Ground with Pagans in Luke and Josephus." NTS 28 (1982):546-59.

Drane, John W. "Eschatology, Ecclesiology, and Catholicity in the New Testament." ET 83 (1971-72):180-84.

Drury, John. Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976.

Dunn, James D.G. Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament. London: SCM Press, 1975.

_____. "Spirit and Kingdom." ET 82 (1970-71):36-40.

_____. Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity. London: SCM Press, 1977.

Du Plessis, I.I. "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Lk I 1-4)." NovTest 16 (1974):259-71.

Dupont, Jacques. "Die individuelle Eschatologie im Lukasevangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte." In Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker für Josef Schmid, pp. 37-47. Edited by Paul Hoffman. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1973.

_____. The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles. Trans. John R. Keating. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.

_____. The Sources of Acts. Trans. Kathleen Pond. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964.

Durkheim, Emile. The Rules of Sociological Method. 8th ed. Trans. Sarah Solovay & John Mueller and Edited by George Catlin. New York & London: The Free Press and Macmillan, 1964, '1938.

Easton, Burton Scott. Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers. Edited by Frederick C. Grant. London: SPCK, 1955.

_____. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1926.

Ebeling, Gerhard. The Nature of Faith. Trans. Ronald Gregor Smith. London: Collins, 1961.

_____. Word and Faith. Trans. James W. Leitch. London: SCM Press, 1963.

Ecumenical Institute, Papers of the. On the Meaning of History. Papers presented in 1949 at the Study Conference on the Meaning of History. Geneva: Oikumene.

Ehrhardt, Arnold. The Acts of the Apostles. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969.

Ehrhardt, Arnold. "The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles." ST 12 (1958):54ff.

_____. "The Disciples of Emmaus." NTS 10 (1963-64):182-201.

Eliade, Mircea. A History of Religious Ideas, vol. 2. Trans. Willard R. Trask. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

_____. Images and Symbols: Studies in Religious Symbolism. Trans. Philip Mairet. London: Harvill Press, 1961.

_____. The Myth of the Eternal Return. Trans. Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

_____. Myths, Dreams, and Mysteries: The Encounter Between Contemporary Faiths and Archaic Realities. Trans. Philip Mairet. London: Harvill Press, 1960.

_____. Patterns in Comparative Religion. Trans. Rosemary Sheed. London: Sheed & Wand, 1958.

_____. The Two and the One. Trans. J.M. Cohen. London: Harvill Press, 1965.

Elliott, John H. "A Catholic Gospel: Reflections on 'Early Catholicism' in the New Testament." CBQ 31 (1969):213-23.

_____. A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy. London: SCM Press, 1982.

_____. "Jerusalem in Acts and the Gospels." NTS 23 (1976-77):462-69.

Ellis, E. Earle. "Die Funktion der Eschatologie in Lukasevangelium." ZTK 66 (1969):387-402.

_____. The Gospel of Luke. Greenwood, South Carolina: Attic Press, 1977.

_____. "Midrashic Features in the Speeches of Acts." In Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R.P. Béda Rigaux, pp. 303-12. Edited by A. Descamps. Gembloux: Duchulot, 1970.

_____. "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke." NTS 12 (1965): 27-41.

_____. "The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts." In Apostolic History and the Gospel, pp. 56ff. Edited by W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

Ellison, H.L. "Paul and the Law - 'All Things to All Men'." In Apostolic History and the Gospel, pp. 195-202. Edited by W.W. Gasque and R.P Martin. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

Epp, Eldon Jay. The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Ernst, Josef. Herr der Geschichte: Perspektiven der lukanischen Eschatologie. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1978.

Eschatology. By W. Manson; G.W.H. Lampe; T.F. Torrance; and W.A. Whitehouse. Four Papers Read to The Society for the Study of Theology. SJT Occasional Papers, no. 2. London: Oliver & Boyd, 1957.

Esler, Philip Francis. "Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology." Unpublished D.Phil. Thesis. University of Oxford, 1984.

Evans, Craig A. "'He Set His Face': A Note on Luke 9,51." Biblica 63 (1982):545-48.

Evans, C.F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." In Studies in the Gospels, pp. 37ff. Edited by D.E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

_____. "'Speeches' in Acts." In Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R.P. Béda Rigaux, pp. 287-302. Edited by A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duchulot, 1970.

Farris, Stephen. The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narrative: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985. JSNT Supplement Series 9.

Fascher, Erich. "Theologische Beobachtungen zu δεῖ." In Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann, pp. 228-54. Edited by W. Eltester. BZNW 21. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954.

Festinger, Leon. "Informal Social Communication." PR 57 (1950):271-82.

_____. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. New York: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Festinger, Leon; Riecken, Henry W.; and Schachter, Stanley. When Prophecy Fails: A Social and Psychological Study of a Modern Group that Predicted the Destruction of the World. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.

Festinger, Leon; and others. Conflict, Decision, and Dissonance. London: Tavistock Publications, 1964.

Festugière, Andre-Jean. Personal Religion Among the Greeks. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1960.

Filson, Floyd V. "The Journey Motif in Luke-Acts." In Apostolic History and the Gospel, pp. 68ff. Edited by W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

_____. "The Significance of the Early House Churches." JBL 58 (1939):105-12.

Finkel, Asher. "Jesus' Sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4,16-30)." In Abraham Unser Vater: Festschrift für Otto Michel, pp. 106-15. Edited by Otto Betz; Martin Hengel; and Peter Schmidt. Leiden/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1963.

Finley, M.I. The Ancient Economy. London: Chatto & Windus, 1979, '1973.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Gospel According to Luke. 2 vols. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1981, 1984.

_____. "Jewish Christianity in Acts in Light of the Qumran Scrolls." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 233ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978.

Flender, Helmut. "Die Kirche in den Lukas-Schriften als Frage an ihre heutigegestalt." In Das Lukas-Evangelium: Die redaktions - und kompositionsgeschichtliche Forschung, pp. 261-86. Edited by Georg Braumann. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchesellschaft, 1974.

_____. St. Luke Theologian of Redemptive History. Trans. Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller. London: SPCK, 1967.

Foakes-Jackson, F.J. The Acts of the Apostles. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931.

Foakes-Jackson, F.J. and Lake, Kirsopp, eds. The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. London: Macmillan & Co., 1933.

Forbes, Duncan. The Liberal Anglican Idea of History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.

Ford, J. Massyngbaerde. My Enemy is My Guest: Jesus and Violence in Luke. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1984.

_____. "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Luke's Gospel." In Political Issues in Luke-Acts, pp. 80ff. Edited by R.J. Cassidy & P.J. Scharper. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983.

Franklin, Eric. "The Ascension and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts." SJT 23 (1970):191-200.

_____. Christ the Lord. London: SPCK, 1975.

Francis, Fred O. "Eschatology and History in Luke-Acts." JAAR 37 (1969): 49-63.

Frend, W.H.C. "Early Christianity and Society: A Jewish Legacy in the Pre-Constantinian Era." HTR 76 (1983):53-71.

Frizzi, G. "La 'missione' in Luca-Atti. Semantica critica e apologia lucana." Rivist Bib 32 (1984):395-423.

Fuchs, Ernst. Studies of the Historical Jesus. Trans. Andrew Scobie. London: SCM Press, 1964.

Fuller, Daniel P. Easter Faith and History. London: Tyndale Press, 1968.

Gager, John G. Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

_____. The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

_____. "Religion and Social Class in the Early Roman Empire." In The Catacombs and the Colosseum, pp. 99ff. Edited by Stephen Benko and John J. O'Rourke. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1971.

_____. Review of Early Christianity and Society, by Robert M. Grant; Social Aspects of Early Christianity, by Abraham J. Malherbe; and Sociology of Early Palestinean Christianity, by Gerd Theissen. RSR 5 (1979):174-80.

Gager, John G. "Shall We Marry Our Enemies?: Sociology and the New Testament." Interpretation 36 (1982):256-65.

Gardiner, Patrick. Theories of History. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Gärtner, Bertil. The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation. Trans. Carolyn Hannay King. Uppsala: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1955.

Gasque, W. Ward. A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Gasque, W. Ward and Martin, R.P., eds. Apostolic History and the Gospel. Exeter: Paternoster, 1970.

Gaster, Theodor H. The Dead Sea Scriptures. 3rd ed. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1976.

Gaston, Lloyd. No Stone on Another. Supplements to Novum Testamentum. Vol. XXIII. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970.

Gaventa, B.R. "'You Will Be My Witnesses': Aspects of Mission in the Acts of the Apostles." Missiology 10 (1982):413-25.

Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures. London: Hutchinson, 1975.

Geiger, Ruthild. Die Lukanischen Endzeitreden: Studien zur Eschatologie des Lukas-Evangeliums. Frankfurt, Bern: Peter Lang, Hebert Lang, 1976.

Geldenhuys, Norval. The Gospel of Luke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

Gellner, Ernest. "Concepts and Society." In Sociological Theory and Philosophical Analysis, pp. 105-49. Edited by Dorothy Emmet and Alasdair MacIntyre. London: Macmillan, 1970.

_____. Legitimation of Belief. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

_____. Spectacles and Predicaments: Essays in Social Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Gerkan, A. von. "Hauskirche von Dura-Europas." Mullus, Festschrift Theodor Klausner, Reallexicon zur byzantinische Kunst. Ergängzungs band 1 (1964):143-49.

Gerlach, Luther P. and Hine, Virginia H. People, Power, Change: Movements of Social Transformation. New York & Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1970.

Gewalt, Dietfried. "Neutestamentliche Exegese und Soziologie." EvT 31 (1971):87-99.

Giblin, Charles H. Review of Acts 6:1-8:4: The Author's Method of Composition, by Earl Richard. JBL 100 (1981):134.

Giles, Kevin. "Present-Future Eschatology in the Book of Acts (I)." RTR XL (1981):65-71.

_____. "Present- Future Eschatology in the Book of Acts (II)." RTR 40 (1982):11-18.

Giles, K.N. "The Church in the Gospel of Luke." SJT 34 (1981):121-46.

_____. "Luke's Use of the Term 'ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ' with Special Reference to Acts 20.28 and 9.31." NTS 31 (1985):135-42.

Gilkey, Langdon. "A Theological Voyage with Wilfred Cantwell Smith." RSR 7 (October 1981):298-306.

Gill, Robin. "Berger's Plausibility Structures: A Response to Professor Cairns." SJT 27 (1974):198-207.

_____. The Social Context of Theology: A Methodological Enquiry. London & Oxford: Mowbrays, 1975.

Gilmour, S. MacLean. The Gospel According to St. Luke: Introduction and Exegesis. The Interpreter's Bible, vol. VIII. Edited by G.A. Buttrick and others. New York: Abingdon Press, 1952.

Glock, Charles Y. "The Role of Deprivation in the Origin and Evolution of Religious Groups." In Religion and Social Conflict, pp. 24-36. Edited by Robert Lee and Martin E. Marty. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Glock, Charles Y.; Ringer, Benjamin B.; and Bobbie, Earl R. To Comfort and to Challenge: A Dilemma of the Contemporary Church. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.

Glover, Richard. "'Luke the Antiochene' and Acts." NTS 11 (1964-65): 97-106.

Goodenough, Erwin R. "The Perspective of Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 51ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. The Apocrypha: An American Translation. New York: Random House, 1959.

_____. An Introduction to the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

Goppelt, Leonhard. "The Existence of the Church in History According to Apostolic and Early Catholic Thought." In Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper, pp. 193-209. Edited by William Klassen and Graydon Snyder. London: SCM, 1962.

_____. Theology of the New Testament. Vol. 2: The Variety and Unity of the Apostolic Witness to Christ. Trans. John E. Alsup and edited by Jürgen Roloff. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

Gottwald, Norman K. The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E. London: SCM, 1980.

Goudoever, J. van "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel." NovTest 8 (1966):111-23.

Goulder, M.D. "Characteristics of the Parables in the Several Gospels." JTS XIX (1968):51-69.

_____. Type and History in Acts. London: SPCK, 1964.

Grant, F.C. "The Economic Background of the New Testament." In The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, pp. 98ff. Edited W.D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.

_____. Roman Hellenism and the New Testament. Edinburgh & London: Oliver & Boyd, 1962.

Grant, Robert M. Early Christianity and Society. London: Harper & Row, 1977.

_____. Miracle and Natural Law in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Thought. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1952.

_____. "The Social Setting of Second-Century Christianity." In Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol. 1, pp. 16ff. Edited E.P. Sanders. London: SCM, 1980.

Grässer, Erich. Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1960.

_____. "Zum Verständnis der Gottesherrschaft." ZNW 64-65 (1973-74): 1-26.

Grassi, Joseph A. "Emmaus Revisited (Luke 24.13-35 and Acts 8.26-40)." CBQ 26 (1964):463-67.

Gré, Gerard de. "The Sociology of Knowledge and the Problem of Truth." In The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader, pp. 661-67. Edited by James E. Curtis and John W. Petras. London: Gerald Duckworth, 1970 [1st published, JHI II (1941):110-15].

Green, Michael. Evangelism in the Early Church. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1978, '1970.

Greenlee, J. Harold. Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

Greimas, A.J. "Structure and History." In Structuralism and Biblical Hermeneutics. Edited Alfred M. Johnson, Jr. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1979.

Grogan, Geoffrey W. "The Light and the Stone: A Christological Study in Luke and Isaiah." In Christ the Lord, pp. 154ff. Edited by Harold H. Rowden. Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1982.

Gruenler, Royce Gordon. Review of Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism, by John Riches. JBL 102 (1983):334-36.

Guinness, Ian Oswald. "Towards a Reappraisal of Christian Apologetics: Peter L. Berger's Sociology of Knowledge as the Sociological Prolegomenon to Christian Apologetics." D.Phil. Thesis. University of Oxford, 1981.

Gülzow, Henneke. "Soziale Gegebenheiten der altkirchlichen Mission." In Kirchengeschichte als Missionsgeschichte. Band I: Die Alte Kirche, pp. 189-226. Edited H. Frohnes und U. Knorr. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1974.

Guthrie, Donald. New Testament Introduction. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1970.

Guy, H.A. The New Testament Doctrine of the "Last Things": A Study of Eschatology. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.

Habel, N. "The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives." ZAW 77 (1965):297-323.

Haenchen, Ernst. The Acts of the Apostles. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

_____. "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 258ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978.

_____. "Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte." ZNW 54 (1963):155-87.

_____. "Schriftzitate und Text überlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte." ZTK 51 (1954):153-67.

Haenchen, Ernst and Weigandt, Peter. "The Original Text of Acts." NTS 14 (1967-68):469-81.

Hahn, Ferdinand. Mission in the New Testament. Trans. Frank Clarke. London: SCM, 1981, '1963.

Hall, S.G. Review of Early Christianity and Society, by Robert M. Grant. RS 15 (1979):575-77.

Hamerton-Kelly, Robert and Scroggs, Robin, eds. Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honor of William David Davies. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

Hanford, W.R. "Deutero-Isaiah and Luke-Acts: Straightforward Universalism?" CQR 168 (1967):141-52.

Hanson, R.P.C. The Acts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

_____. "The Ideology of Codex Bezae in Acts." NTS 14 (1967-68): 282-86.

_____. "The Provenance of the Interpolator in the 'Western' Text of Acts and of Acts Itself." NTS 12 (1965-66):211-30.

Hardin, Bert and Kehrer, Günter. "Some Social Factors Affecting the Rejection of New Belief Systems." In New Religious Movements, pp. 267ff. Edited by Eileen Barker. New York: Edwin Mellen, 1982.

Hardy, Sir Alister. The Spiritual Nature of Man: A Study of Contemporary Religious Experience. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Harnack, Adolf. The Acts of the Apostles. Trans. J.R. Wilkinson. London: Williams & Norgate, 1909.

_____. The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels. London: Williams & Norgate, 1911.

Harnack, Adolf. The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. 2 vols. Trans. James Moffatt. London: Williams & Norgate, 1904.

Harrington, Daniel J. "The 'Early Catholic' Writings of the New Testament: The Church Adjusting to World-History." In The Word in the World: Essays in Honor of Frederick L. Moriarty, pp. 97ff. Cambridge, MA: Weston College Press, 1973.

_____. "Sociological Concepts and the Early Church: A Decade of Research." TS 41 (1980):181-90.

Harrison, E.F. Introduction to the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Hartung, Frank E. "Problems of the Sociology of Knowledge." In The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader, pp. 686-705. Edited by James E. Curtis and John W. Petras. London: G. Duckworth, 1970. [1st published, PS XIX (January 1952):17-32].

Harvey, Van Austin. The Historian and the Believer. London: SCM, 1967. 1967.

_____. "Religious Faith and the Sociology of Knowledge: The Unburdening of Peter Berger." RSR 5 (1979):1-10.

_____. "Some Problematic Aspects of Peter Berger's Theory of Religion." JAAR 41 (1973):75-93.

Hatch, Edwin. The Organization of the Early Christian Churches. The Bampton Lectures of 1880. London: Rivingtons, 1881.

Hatch, Edwin and Redpath, Henry A. A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. 3 vols. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck, 1975.

Hauerwas, Stanley, "The Politics of Charity." Interpretation 31 (1977): 251-62.

Hedrick, C.W. "Paul's Conversion/Call: A Comparative Analysis of the Three Reports in Acts." JBL 100 (1981):415-32.

Hemer, C.J. "Luke the Historian." BJRL 60 (1977-78):28-51.

Henderson, Bernard W. Five Roman Emperors. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927.

Hengel, Martin. Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1979.

_____. "Die Ursprünge der Christlichen Mission." NTS 18 (1971/72): 15-38.

_____. Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period. 2 vols. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM, 1981, '1974.

_____. Property and Riches in the Early Church: Aspects of a Social History of Early Christianity. Trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Hick, John. Christianity at the Centre. London: Macmillan, 1968.

Hick, John. Death and Eternal Life. London: Collins, 1976.

_____. Faith and Knowledge. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1957.

_____, ed. Faith and the Philosophers. London: Macmillan & Co., 1964.

Hiers, Richard H. "Friends by Unrighteous Mammon: The Eschatological Proletariat (Luke 16:9)." JAAR 38 (1970):31-36.

_____. The Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Tradition. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1970.

_____. "The Problem of the Delay of the Parousia in Luke-Acts." NTS 20 (1973-74):145-55.

_____. "Why Will They Not Say, 'Lo, here!' Or 'There!'?." JAAR 35 (1967):379-84.

Higgins, A.J.B. "The Preface to Luke and the Kerygma in Acts." In Apostolic History and the Gospel, pp. 79ff. Edited W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

Hill, David. "The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth." NovTest 13 (1971): 161-80.

Hill, Michael. A Sociology of Religion. London: Heinemann, 1973.

Hocking, R. "Some Types of Historical Consciousness in Chinese and Indian Thought." In On the Meaning of History, pp. 19ff. Papers of the Ecumenical Institute. Geneva: Oikumene, n.d.

Holland, David Larrimore. "History, Theology and the Kingdom of God: A Contribution of Johannes Weiss to 20th Century Theology." BR 13 (1968):54-66.

Hollenbach, Paul W. "Jesus, Demoniacs, and Public Authorities: A Socio-Historical Study." JAAR XLIX (December 1981):567-88.

Holmberg, Bengt. Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1978.

Holtzmann, H.J. Die Synoptiker - Die Apostelgeschichte. Freiburg: 1889.

Hopkins, Clark. The Discovery of Dura-Europas. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Hopkins, Keith. "Economic Growth and Towns in Classical Antiquity." In Towns in Societies: Essays in Economic History and Historical Sociology, pp. 35-77. Edited by Philip Abrams and E.A. Wrigley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Horst, P.W. van der. "The Hellenistic Parallels to the Acts of the Apostles 1.1-26." ZNW 74 (1983):17-26.

Houlden, J.L. "The Purpose of Luke." JSNT 21 (1984):53-65.

Hubbard, Benjamin J. "Commissioning Stories in Luke-Acts: A Study of Their Antecedents, Form and Content." Semeia 8 (1977):103-26.

Hubbard, Benjamin J. "The Role of Commissioning Accounts in Acts." In Perspectives on Luke-Acts, pp. 187ff. Edited by C.H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Hull, J.H.E. The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles. London: Lutterworth Press, 1967.

Hultgren, Arland J. "Interpreting the Gospel of Luke." Interpretation 30 (1976):353-65.

Hynes, William. Shirley Jackson Case and the Chicago School: The Socio-Historical Method. Chico, California: Scholar's Press, 1981.

James, Montague Rhodes. The Aprocryphal New Testament: Being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983, '1924.

James, William. The Varieties of Religious Experience. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1906.

_____. The Will to Believe. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1902.

Jeremias, Joachim. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. Trans. S.H. Hooke. London: SCM, 1958.

_____. New Testament Theology; Pt. 1: The Proclamation of Jesus. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM, 1971.

_____. The Parables of Jesus. Trans. S.H. Hooke. London: SCM, 1958, '1954.

_____. Rediscovering the Parables. New York: Scribner's, 1966.

Jervell, Jacob. "The Acts of the Apostles and the History of Early Christianity." ST 37 (1983):17-27.

_____. Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972.

_____. "The Mighty Minority." ST 34 (1980):13-38.

_____. The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984.

Johnson, Alfred M., Jr., ed. and trans. Structuralism and Biblical Hermeneutics: A Collection of Essays. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1979.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977.

_____. "The Lukan Kingship Parable (Lk. 19:11-27)." NovTest XXIV (April 1982):139-59.

Jones, C.P.M. "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Lucan Writings." In Studies in the Gospels, pp. 113ff. Edited by D.E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

Judge, E.A. The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century. London: Tyndale Press, 1960.

Judge, E.A. "The Sociological Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History." JRH 11 (1980):201-13.

Juel, Donald. Luke-Acts. London: SCM, 1984.

Kähler, Martin. The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic Biblical Christ. Trans. and ed. Carl E. Broaten. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964, '1896.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Karris, Robert J. "Missionary Communities: A New Paradigm for the Study of Luke-Acts." CBQ 41 (1979):80-97.

_____. "Poor and Rich: The Lucan 'Sitz im Leben'." In Perspectives on Luke-Acts, pp. 112ff. Edited by C.H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Käsemann, Ernst. "Ephesians and Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 288ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

_____. Essays on New Testament Themes. Trans. W.J. Montague. London: SCM Press, 1965.

_____. New Testament Questions of Today. Trans. W.J. Montague. London: SCM Press, 1969.

Keck. L.E. "On the Ethos of Early Christians." JAAR 42 (1974): 435-52.

_____. "The Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament." ZNW 56 (1965):100-29.

Keck, Leander E. and Martyn, J. Louis, eds. Studies in Luke-Acts. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

Kee, Howard C. Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective. London: SCM Press, 1980.

_____. Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel. London: SCM, 1977.

_____. Miracle in the Early Christian World: A Study in Socio-historical Method. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1983.

_____. The Origins of Christianity: Sources and Documents. London: SPCK, 1980.

Keresztes, P. "The Imperial Roman Government and the Christian Church, I. From Nero to the Severi." In Aufstieg and Niedergang der römischen Welt, Geschichte und Kultur, Roms im Spiegel der Neueren Forschung, Band 23.1, pp. 247-315. Edited by H. Temporin und W. Haase. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1979.

Kermode, John Frank. The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Kiddle, M. "The Admission of the Gentiles in St. Luke's Gospel and Acts." JTS 36 (1935):160-73.

Kilpatrick, G.D. "An Eclectic Study of the Text of Acts." In Biblical and Patristic Studies, pp. 64ff. Edited by J. Neville Birdsall and Robert W. Thomson. Freiburg/Basel: Herder, 1963.

_____. "The Gentiles and the Strata of Luke." In Verborum Veritas: Festschrift für Gustav Stählin, pp. 83-88. Edited by Otto Böcher and Klaus Haacker. Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970.

_____. "Luke, Not a Gentile Gospel." An Unpublished Paper, Read before the Origen Society of Oxford University, 14 February 1984.

_____. "The Spirit, God, and Jesus in Acts." JTS 15 (1964):63.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean. Review of The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke, by Raymond E. Brown. JBL 98 (1979):442-44.

Kittel, Gerhard and Friedrich, Gerhard, eds. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 20 vols. Trans. and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 1978.

Kittel, Rud., edidit. Biblia Hebraica. Editio sexta Decima Emendata typis Editionis Septimae Expressa. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1973.

Klauck, Hans-Josef. Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981.

Klein, Günter. "Reich Gottes als biblisher Zentralbegriff." EvT 12 (1970):642-70.

Klein, Hans. "Zur Frage nach dem Abfassungsort der Lukasschriften." EvT 32(1972):467-77.

Klijn, A.F.J. An Introduction to the New Testament. Trans. Mrs. M. van der Vathorst-Smit. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980, '1967.

Klostermann, Erich. Das Lukasevangelium. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1929.

Knowling, R.J. "The Acts of the Apostles." Vol.II. The Expositor's Greek Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Knox, John. "Acts and the Pauline Letter Corpus." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 279ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978.

_____. The Early Church and the Coming Great Church. London: Epworth Press, 1957.

_____. Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Koch, Robert. "Die Wertung des Besitzes im Lukasevangelium." Biblica 38 (1957):151-69.

Kodell, Jerome. "Luke's use of λαος, 'People' Especially in the Jerusalem Narrative (Lk 19.28-24.53)." CBQ 31 (1969):327-43.

Koester, Helmut. History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age. In Einführung in das Neue Testament, Chapters 1-6 (1980). Trans. Helmut Köster. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

Koh, Roland. The Writings of St. Luke. Hong Kong: The Diocesan Literature Committee, 1953.

Kraabel, A.T. "The Disappearance of the 'God-Fearers'." Numen 28 (1981):113-26.

_____. "The 'Godfearers', Once More and Finally." Paper Read before the Jewish Studies Seminar at the University of Oxford, 10 November 1981.

Kraeling, C.H. "The Christian Building." In The Excavation at Dura-Europas, Final Report VIII, pt. II. Edited by C.B. Welles. New Haven: Dura-Europa Publications, 1967.

Kraemer, Ross S. Review of Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity, Gerd Theissen and Social Aspects of Early Christianity, by Abraham J. Malherbe. JBL 98 (1979):436-38.

Kraft, Heinrich. "Voraussetzungen und Motive der Mission im Urchristentum und in der frühen Kirche." Die Spur 4 (1964):18-26.

Kraft, Robert A. "Judaism on the World Scene." In The Catacombs and the Colosseum, pp. 82ff. Edited by Stephen Benko and John J. O'Rourke. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1971.

Kraybill, D.B. and Sweetland, D.M. "Possessions in Luke-Acts: A Sociological Perspective." Persp. Rel. Stud. 10 (1983):215-39.

Krodel, Gerhard. Acts. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.

_____. "Persecution and Toleration of Christianity Until Hadrian." In The Catacombs and the Colosseum, pp. 255ff. Edited by S. Benko and J. O'Rourke. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1971.

Kuhn, K.G. "Der Problem der Mission in Urchristenheit." EvM 11 (1954): 161ff.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. "'Das Gesetz und die Propheten gehen bis Johannes' - Lukas 16.16 im zusammenhang der heilsgeschichtlichen Theologie der Lukasschriften." In Verborum Veritas: Festschrift für Gustav Stählin, pp. 89-102. Edited by O. Böcher and K. Haacker. Wuppertal: Theologischer Verlag Rolf Brockhaus, 1970.

_____. "Heilsgeschichte im Neuen Testament?" In Neues Testament und Kirches (Festschrift für Rudolf Schnackenburg), pp. 434-57. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1974.

_____. Introduction to the New Testament. 17th revised ed. Trans. A.J. Mattill, Jr. London: SCM Press, 1982 [1st, 1975].

_____. "Lukas in der Anklage der heutigen Theologie." ZNW 63 (1972):149-65.

_____. Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus. Trans. Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM, 1957.

Küng, Hans. On Being a Christian. Trans. Edward Quinn. London:

Kurz, William S. "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts." CBQ 42 (1980):171-95.

Ladd, George Eldon. The Gospel of the Kingdom. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981, '1959.

_____. Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism. London: SPCK, 1966.

_____. "The Kingdom of God - Reign or Realm?" JBL 81 (1962):230-238.

_____. "Revelation and Tradition in Paul." In Apostolic History and the Gospel, pp. 223-30. Edited by W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

_____. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

_____. "Why Not Prophetic-Apocalyptic?" JBL 76 (1957):192-200.

Lake, Kirsopp. "The Communism of Acts II. and IV-VI. and the Appointment of the Seven." In The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. V, pp. 140-151. Edited by Kirsopp Lake and H.J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Lake, Kirsopp and Cadbury, H.J. The Beginnings of Christianity. Vol. IV, English Translation and Commentary. London: Macmillan & Co., 1933.

Lampe, G.W.H. "Early Patristic Eschatology." In Eschatology. Edited by William Manson, et al. SJT Occasional Papers, no. 2. London: Oliver & Boyd, 1957.

_____. "'Grievous Wolves' (Acts 20:29)." In Christ and Spirit in the New Testament, pp. 253ff. Edited by Barnabas Lindars and Stephen Smalley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

_____. "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke." In Studies in the Gospels. Edited by D.E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

_____. The Seal of the Spirit. London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1951.

La Sor, William Sandford. Handbook of New Testament Greek. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Last, Hugh M. "The Study of the 'Persecutions'." JRomS 27 (1937):80-92.

Leaney, A.R.C. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958.

Lee, Clarence L. "Social Unrest and Primitive Christianity." In The Catacombs and the Colosseum, pp. 121ff. Edited by S. Benko and J. O'Rourke. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1971.

Legrand, L. "Christ the Fellow Traveller: The Emmaus Story in Lk. 24:13-35." ITS 19 (1982):33-44.

Legrand, L. "The Structure of Acts 2: The Integral Dimensions of the Charismatic Movement According to Luke." ITS 19 (1982): 193-209.

Lessa, William A. and Vogt, Evon Z., eds. Reader in Comparative Religion: An Anthropological Approach. 4th ed. London: Harper & Row, 1979.

Lewis, Warren. "Coming Again: How Society Functions Through Its New Religions." In New Religious Movements, pp. 192ff. Edited by Eileen Barker. New York & Toronto: Edwin Mellen, 1982.

Ling, Trevor. Review of Towards a World Theology: Faith and the Comparative History of Religion, by Wilfred Cantwell Smith. JAAR L (September 1982).

Lofthouse, W.F. "The Holy Spirit in the Acts and the Fourth Gospel." ET 52 (1940-41):334-36.

Lohfink, Gerhard. Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas. München: Kösel, 1971.

Lohse, Eduard. "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte." EvTh 14 (1954):256-75.

_____. "Missionarisches Handeln Jesu nach dem Evangelium des Lukas." TZ 10 (1954):1-13.

_____. The New Testament Environment. Trans. John E. Steely. London: SCM Press, 1976.

Luckmann, Thomas. The Invisible Religion: The Problem of Religion in Modern Society. London: Macmillan, 1967.

Lundström, Gösta. The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus: A History of Interpretation from the Last Decades of the Nineteenth Century to the Present Day. Trans. Joan Bulman. London & Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1963.

Luz, Ulrich. "Erwägungen zur Entstehung des 'Frühkatholizismus': Eine Skizze." ZNW 65 (1974):88-111.

McGavran, Donald Anderson. The Bridges of God: A Study in the Strategy of Mission. London: World Dominion Press, 1955.

_____. How Churches Grow. London: World Dominion Press, 1959.

_____. Understanding Church Growth. Revised ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, '1970.

McGavran, Donald Anderson and others, eds. Church Growth and Christian Mission. New York & London: Harper & Row, 1965.

Macgregor, G.H.C. "The Acts of the Apostles." Introduction and Exegesis. In The Interpreter's Bible, vol. 9. Edited by G.A. Buttrick and others. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory. London: Duckworths, 1981.

_____. "Is Understanding Religion Compatible with Believing?" In Faith and the Philosophers, pp. 115ff. Edited by John Hick. London: Macmillan, 1964.

MacMullen, Ramsay. Roman Social Relations: 50 B.C. to A.D. 284. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1974.

McNeile, A.H. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. 2nd ed., revised by C.S.C. Williams. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953, '1927.

MacRae, George W. "Whom Heaven Must Receive Until the Time." Interpretation 27 (1973):151-65.

Maddox, Robert. "The Function of the Son of Man According to the Synoptic Gospels." NTS 15 (1968-69)45-74.

_____. The Purpose of Luke-Acts. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982.

Malherbe, Abraham J. "Self-Definition Among Epicureans and Cynics." In Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, Vol. 3: Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World, pp. 46ff. Edited by Ben F. Meyer and E.P. Sanders. London: SCM, 1982.

_____. Social Aspects of Early Christianity. Baton Rouge & London: Louisiana State University Press, 1977.

Malina, Bruce. "The Individual and the Community: Personality in the Social World of Early Christianity." BTB 9 (1979):126-38.

_____. "The Literary Structure and Form of Matt. XXVIII.16-20." NTS 17 (1970):87-103.

Mánek, Jindrich. "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke." NovTest 2 (1957):8-23.

Mannheim, Karl. "The Sociology of Knowledge." In The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader, pp. 109-30. Edited by James E. Curtis and John W. Petras. London: Duckworths, 1970. [Taken from Ideology and Utopia, pp. 264-90. New York: Harvest Books, 1936].

Manson, T.W. Studies in the Gospels and Epistles. Edited by Matthew Black. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962.

Manson, William. "Eschatology in the New Testament." In Eschatology Edited by William Manson, et. al. SJT Occasional Papers, no. 2 London: Oliver & Boyd, 1957.

_____. The Gospel of Luke. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1945, '1930.

Marett, R.R. Faith, Hope, and Charity in Primitive Religions. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932.

Markus, R.A. Christianity in the Roman World. London: Thames & Hudson, 1974.

Markus, R.A. "The Problem of Self-Definition: From Sect to Church." In Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol. 1, pp. 1ff. Edited by E.P. Sanders. London: SCM, 1980.

Marshall, I. Howard. The Acts of the Apostles. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980.

_____. "'Early Catholicism' in the New Testament." In New Dimensions in New Testament Study, pp. 222ff. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.

_____. Eschatology and the Parables. London: Tyndale Press, 1963.

_____. The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

_____. I Believe in the Historical Jesus. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

_____. Luke: Historian and Theologian. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

_____. "Preaching the Kingdom of God." ET 89 (1977-78):13-16.

_____. "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles." In Apostolic History and the Gospel, pp. 92-107. Edited by W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

_____. "Slippery Words: I. Eschatology." ET 89 (1977-78):264-69.

Martin, David. The Breaking of the Image: A Sociology of Christian Theory and Practice. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980.

Martin, David; Mills, John Orme; and Pickering, W.S.F., eds. Sociology and Theology: Alliance and Conflict. Brighton, Sussex: Harvestor Press, 1980.

Martin, Ralph P. New Testament Foundations. 2 vols. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1975.

_____. "Salvation and Discipleship in Luke's Gospel." Interpretation 30 (1976):366-80.

Mascall, E.L. The Importance of Being Human. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

_____. Whatever Happened to the Human Mind? London: SPCK, 1980.

Mattill, A.J., Jr. "The Date and Purpose of Luke-Acts: Rackham Reconsidered." CBQ 40 (1978):335-50.

_____. "The Jesus-Paul Parallels and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: H.H. Evans Reconsidered." NovTest 17 (1965):15-46.

_____. Luke and the Last Things: A Perspective for Understanding Lucan Thought. Dillsboro, N.C.: Western North Carolina Press, 1979.

Mattill, A.J., Jr. "Naherwartung, Fernerwartung and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: Weymouth Reconsidered." CBQ 34 (1972):276-93.

_____. "The Purpose of Acts: Schneckenburger Reconsidered." In Apostolic History and the Gospel, pp. 109-22. Edited by W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

Meeks, Wayne A. The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul. London/New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

_____. "From Sacred Space to Christology." A Review of The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine, by W.D. Davies. Interpretation 30 (1976):77-79.

_____. "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism." JBL 91 (1972):44-72.

Meeks, Wayne A. and Wilken, Robert L. Jews and Christians in Antioch: In the First Four Centuries of the Common Era. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978.

Mehl, Roger. The Sociology of Protestantism. Trans. James H. Farley. London: SCM, 1970, '1965.

Menoud, Philippe H. Jesus Christ and the Faith: A Collection of Studies. Trans. Eunice M. Paul. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, ed. D.Y. Hadidian. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1978.

Merk, Otto. "Das Reich Gottes in den lukanischen Schriften." In Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag, pp. 201-20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Merrill, Elmer Truesdell. Essays in Early Christian History. London: Macmillan, 1924.

Merton, Robert K. "Paradigm for the Sociology of Knowledge." In The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader, pp. 342-72. Edited by J.E. Curtis and J.W. Petras. [Extracted from Social Theory and Social Structure, pp. 460-88, by R.K. Merton. The Free Press, 1957]. London: Duckworths, 1970.

Metzger, Bruce M. Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek. Princeton: Bruce M. Metzger, 1976.

_____. The Text of the New Testament. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

_____. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Meyer, Ben F. and Sanders, E.P. Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. Vol. 3: Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World. London: SCM, 1982.

Michaelis, John David. Introduction to the New Testament. Vol. III, pt. 1. Trans. from the 4th German ed. by Herbert Marsh. London: F.C. and J. Rivington, 1823.

Mickelsen, A. Berkeley. Interpreting the Bible. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

Miesner, Donald R. "The Missionary Journeys Narrative: Patterns and Implications." In Perspectives in Luke-Acts, pp. 199ff. Edited by C.H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Milburn, R.L.P. Early Christian Interpretations of History. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1954.

Millar, Fergus. "Gentile 'God-Fearers' in the Diaspora Synagogue under the Roman Empire." A Paper Read before the New Testament Seminar, The Faculty of Theology, in the University of Oxford, 24 October 1985.

Miller, Donald E. "Sectarianism and Secularization: The Work of Bryan Wilson." RSR 5 (1979):161-74.

Mills, C. Wright. The Sociological Imagination. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975, '1959.

Minear, Paul S. "Christian Eschatology and Historical Method." In Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, pp. 15-23. Edited by W. Eltester. BZNW 21 (1954):15-23.

_____. "Dear Theo: The Kerygmatic Intention and Claim of the Book of Acts." Interpretation 27 (1973):131-50.

_____. "Jesus' Audiences, According to Luke." NovTest 16 (1974): 81-109.

_____. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 111ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

_____. "A Note on Luke 22.36." NovTest 7 (1964):128-34.

_____. To Heal and To Reveal: The Prophetic Vocation According to Luke. New York: Seabury, 1976.

Moessner, David P. "Luke 9:1-50: Luke's Preview of the Journey of the Prophet Like Moses of Deuteronomy." JBL 102 (1983):575-603.

Moore, A.L. The Parousia in the New Testament. Supplements to Novum Testamentum XIII. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. Vol. I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Moorman, John R.H. The Path to Glory: Studies in the Gospel According to Saint Luke. London: SPCK, 1960.

Morgan, Robert C. "F.C. Baur's Lectures on New Testament Theology." ET 88 (1976-77):202-6.

_____. The Nature of New Testament Theology. London: SCM, 1973.

_____. "On Marrying If Not Loving One's Enemies: Theology and the Social Sciences." A Paper Read before the Seminar in the Sociology of Religion, All Souls College, Oxford, 24 January 1985.

Morgan, Robert. Review of The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity, by Gerd Theissen. SJRS 5 (1984):58-60.

_____. "A Straussian Question to 'New Testament Theology'." NTS 23 (1976-77):244-48.

Morgenthaler, Robert. Die lukanische Geschichtsschreiburg als Zeugnis: Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas, zwei Teile. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949.

Morris, Leon. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

Morton, A.Q. and Macgregor, G.H.C. The Structure of Luke and Acts. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1964.

Mosley, A.W. "Jesus' Audiences in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke." NTS 10 (1963/64):139-49.

Moule, C.F.D. The Birth of the New Testament. 3rd ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1981, '1962.

_____. "The Christology of Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 159ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

_____. "The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Eschatological Terms." JTS 15 (1964):1-15.

_____. "Jesus in New Testament Kerygma." In Verborum Veritas. Edited by Böcher & K. Haaker. Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970.

_____. The Phenomenon of the New Testament. London: SCM, 1981, '(1967).

Moulton, W.F. and Geden, A.S., eds. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1953.

Mouroux, Jean. The Christian Experience. Trans. George Lamb. London: Sheed & Ward, 1955.

Mullins, Terence Y. "New Testament Commission Forms, Especially in Luke-Acts." JBL 95 (1976):603-14.

Munck, Johannes. The Acts of the Apostles. Revised by W.F. Albright and C.S. Mann. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1967.

_____. Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. London: SCM, 1959, '1954.

Murray, Robert. "Jews, Hebrews, and Christians: Some Needed Distinctions." NovTest XXIV (July 1982):195-206.

Navone, John. "Three Aspects of the Lucan Theology of History." BTB 3 (1973):115-32.

Neal, Marie Augusta. "Facing Up to Modernity: Excursions in Society, Politics, and Religion." RSR 5 (1979):10-15.

Needham, Rodney. Belief, Language, and Experience. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972.

Neil, William. The Acts of the Apostles. London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1973.

Neill, Stephen. The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1961. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Neirynck, Frans. "The Miracles in the Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction." In Les Actes des Apotres, par Jacob Kremer, pp. 169-213. Gembloux: Leuven University Press, 1979.

Nestle, Eberhard. Novum Testamentum Graece cum apparatu critico curavit. Editio vicesima quinta. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Neusner, Jacob, ed. Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Pts I-IV. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

_____. First-Century Judaism in Crisis: Yohanan ben Zakkai and the Renaissance of Torah. Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press, 1975.

Nickelsburg, George W.E. "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in I Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel According to Luke." NTS 25 (1978-79): 324-44.

Nicol, W. "Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21." Neotest 7 (1973):61-71. Essays on the Gospel of Luke and Acts. Proceedings of the Ninth Meeting of the New Testament Society of South Africa.

Nida, Eugene A. "Culture and Church Growth." In Church Growth and Christian Mission, pp. 87-108. Edited by D.A. McGavran and others. New York & London: Harper & Row, 1965.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. Faith and History: A Comparison of Christian and Modern Views of History. London: Nisbet & Co., 1949.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. Untimely Meditations. Trans. R.J. Hollingdale and Introduction by J.P. Stern. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Nineham, Dennis. "A Partner for Cinderella?" In What About the New Testament?, pp. 143ff. Edited by M.D. Hooker and Colin Hickling. London: SCM, 1975.

_____. Saint Mark. Pelican New Testament Commentaries. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1981, '1963.

_____, ed. Studies in the Gospels. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

Nock, A.D. Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background. New York: Harper Torch Books, 1964 [1st in Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation, ed. A.E.J. Rawlinson. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1928].

Nock, A.D. "The Historical Importance of Cult-Associations." CR 38 (1924):105-9.

Nolland, John L. "A Fresh Look at Acts 15.10." NTS 27 (1980-8):105-15.

_____. "Impressed Unbelievers as Witnesses to Christ (Luke 4:22a)." JBL 98 (1979):219-29.

O'Connor, Edward D. Faith in the Synoptic Gospels. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.

O'Dea, Thomas F. The Sociology of Religion. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Oliver, H.H. "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts." NTS 10 (1963-64):202-26.

Olsen, Marvin E. The Process of Social Organization: Power in Social Systems. 2nd ed. New York & London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1978, '1968.

O'Neill, J.C. The Theology of Acts. 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1970.

O'Toole, Robert F. "Activity of the Risen Jesus in Luke-Acts." Biblica 62 (1981):471-98.

_____. "Luke's Position on Politics and Society in Luke-Acts." In Political Issues in Luke-Acts. pp. 1ff. Edited by R.J. Cassidy and P.J. Scharper. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1983.

_____. "Parallels in Luke-Acts." BZ 27 (1983):195-212.

_____. "Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts VIII 25-40)." JSNT 17 (1983):25-34.

_____. "Why Did Luke Write Acts (Lk.-Acts)?" BTB 7 (1977):66-76.

Otto, Rudolf. The Idea of the Holy. Trans. John W. Harvey. London: Oxford University Press, 1952.

_____. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion. Trans. Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Woolf. London: Lutterworth Press, 1938.

Overbeck, Franz. Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte. Leipzig, 1870.

Owen, H.P. "Stephen's Vision in Acts VII 55-6." NTS 1 (1954-55): 224-26.

Packer, J.W. The Acts of the Apostles. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Pannenberg, Wolfhart. "Appearance as the Arrival of the Future." JAAR 35 (June 1967):107-18.

_____. Basic Questions in Theology. Vol. 2. Trans. George H. Kehm. London: SCM Press, 1971.

_____, ed. Revelation as History. Trans. David Granskou and Edward Quinn. London: Sheed & Ward, 1969.

Parker, Pierson. "The 'Former Treatise' and the Date of Acts." JBL 84 (1965):52-28.

Parratt, J.K. "The Holy Spirit and Baptism. Part I. The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles." ET 82 (1970-72):231-35.

Parsons, Talcott. "An Approach to the Sociology of Knowledge." In The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader, pp. 282-306. Edited by J.E. Curtis and J.W. Petras. London: Duckworths, 1970. [1st published, Transactions of the Fourth World Congress of Sociology, IV (Louvain: International Sociological Association, 1959), pp. 25-49].

_____. "The Theoretical Development of the Sociology of Religion." In Readings in the Sociology of Religion, pp. 74ff. Edited by John Brothers. London: Pergamon Press, 1967.

Patte, Daniel. What Is Structural Exegesis? Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

Patte, Daniel and Patte, Aline. Structural Exegesis: From Theory To Practice. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

Perrin, Norman. The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1975.

Peter, James. "Salvation History as a Model for Theological Thought." SJT 23 (1970):1-12.

Petersen, Norman R. Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

_____. Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. "Social Evaluation Theory: Convergences and Applications." In Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, pp. 241-315. Edited by David Levine. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1963, '1949.

Pickering, W.S.F., ed. Durkheim on Religion: A Selection of Readings with Bibliographies. London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

_____. "A Durkheimian Interpretation of Pentecost." Read before the Origen Society of The University of Oxford, 20 November 1984.

_____. "Theodicy and Social Theory: An exploration of the limits of collaboration between sociologists and theologian." In Sociology and Theology: Alliance and Conflict, pp. 59ff. Edited by David Martin and others. Brighton, Sussex: Harvestor Press, 1980.

Pillai, C.A. Joachim. Apostolic Interpretation of History: A Commentary on Acts 13.16-41. Hicksville, New York: Exposition Press, 1980.

_____. Early Missionary Preaching: A Study of Luke's Report in Acts 13. Hicksville, New York: Exposition Press, 1979.

Plümacher, Eckhard. Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.

Polzin, Robert M. Biblical Structuralism: Method and Subjectivity in the Study of Ancient Texts. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Popper, Karl. "The Sociology of Knowledge." In The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader, pp. 649-60. Edited by J.E. Curtis and J.W. Petras. London: Gerald Duckworth, 1970. [Taken from The Open Society and Its Enemies, 2 vols, by Karl Popper. 4th rev. ed. (Princeton University Press, 1963 and 5th ed. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966)].

Preiss, Th. "The Vision of History in the New Testament." In On the Meaning of History, pp. 48ff. Ecumenical Institute. Geneva: Oikumene, n.d.

Price, H.H. "Faith and Belief." In Faith and the Philosophers, pp. 7ff. Edited by John Hick. London: Macmillan & Co., 1964.

Quinn, Jerome D. "The Last Volume of Luke: The Relation of Luke-Acts to the Pastoral Epistles." In Perspectives on Luke-Acts, pp. 62ff. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Rackham, Richard Belward. The Acts of the Apostles. 6th ed. London: Methuen & Co., 1912, '1901.

Radcliffe, Timothy. "Relativizing the Relativizers: A theologian's assessment of the role of sociological explanation of religious phenomena and theology today." In Sociology and Theology: Alliance and Conflict, pp. 151ff. Edited by David Martin and others. Brighton, Sussex: Harvestor Press, 1980.

Radl, W. Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk. Untersuchungen zu Parallelmotiven im Lukas-evangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte. Bern/Frankfurt a.M.: 1975.

Ragg, Lonsdale. St. Luke. London: Methuen & Co., 1922.

Rahlfs, Alfred, edidit. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Editio nona. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, n.d.

Ramsay, W.M. Luke the Physician. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1908.

_____. St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1896.

Reicke, Bo. The Gospel of Luke. Trans. Ross MacKenzie. London: SPCK, 1965.

_____. "The Risen Lord and His Church: The Theology of Acts." Interpretation 13 (1959):157-69.

Reicke, Bo. "Synoptic Prophecies on the Destruction of Jerusalem." In Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren, pp. 121ff. Edited by David Edward Aune. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972. [Supplements to Novum Testamentum vol. XXXIII].

Remus, H.E. "Sociology of Knowledge and the Study of Early Christianity." StudRel/SciRel 11 (1982):45-56.

Rese, Martin. "Die Aussagen über Jesu Tod und Auferstehung in der Apostelgeschichte - ältestes Kerygma oder lukanische Theologumena?" NTS 30 (1984):335-53.

Rex, John. Key Problems of Sociological Theory. London & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980, '1961.

Richard, Earl. "The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts." NovTest 24 (1982):37-53.

_____. "The Polemical Character of the Joseph Episode in Acts 7." JBL 98 (1979):255-67.

Richard, G. "Dogmatic Atheism in the Sociology of Religion." In Durkheim on Religion. Edited by W.S.F. Pickering. London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Richardson, Alan. History Sacred and Profane. London: SCM, 1964.

Richardson, Neil. The Panorama of Luke: An Introduction to the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles. London: Epworth Press, 1982.

Riches, John. Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1980.

Ridderbos, Herman. The Coming of the Kingdom. Trans. H. de Jongste and Edited by Raymond O. Zorn. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1962.

Riegel, Stanley K. "Jewish Christianity: Definitions and Terminology." NTS 24 (1977-78):410-15.

Robbins, Vernon K. "By Land and By Sea: The We-Passages and Ancient Sea Voyages." In Perspectives on Luke-Acts, pp. 215ff. Edited by C.H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

_____. Review of Acts 26: The Christological Climax of Paul's Defense, by R.F. O'Toole. JBL 100 (1981):653-55.

_____. Review of Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel, by Howard Clark Kee. JBL 98 (1979):147-49.

Robertson, A.T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.

Robinson, B.P. "The Place of the Emmaus Story in Luke-Acts." NTS 30 (1984):481-97.

Robinson, John A.T. Redating the New Testament. London: SCM Press, 1976.

Robinson, William C., Jr. Der Weg des Herrn: Studien zur Geschichte und Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium. Hamburg-Bergstedt: H. Reich, 1964.

_____. "On Preaching the Word of God (Luke 8.4-21)." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 131ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

Rodd, C.S. "Implications of the Sociological Study of Religion." ET 83 (1972):68-73.

_____. "On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies." JSOT 19 (1981):95-106.

Rohde, Joachim. Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists. Trans. Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM Press, 1968.

Ropes, James Hardy. "Acts xv.21." JBL 15 (1896):75-81.

_____, ed. The Text of Acts. Vol. III of The Beginnings of Christianity. Edited by F.J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan & Co., 1926.

Rowland, Christopher. Christian Origins. London: SPCK, 1985.

Russell, Henry G. "Which Was Written First, Luke or Acts?" HTR 48 (1955):167-74.

Rust, Eric C. Towards a Theological Understanding of History. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Sabourin, Leopold. "The Eschatology of Luke." BTB 12 (1982):73-76.

Sanders, E.P. "The Argument from Order and the Relationship between Matthew and Luke." NTS 15 (1968-69):249ff.

_____. "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism." In Jews, Greeks and Christians, pp. 11ff. Edited by R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

_____. Jesus and Judaism. London: SCM, 1985.

_____, ed. Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. Vol. 1: The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries. London: SCM, 1980.

_____. Paul and Palestinian Judaism. London: SCM, 1977.

_____. Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

Sanders, E.P.; Baumgarten, A.I.; and Mendelson, Alan, eds. Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. Vol. 2: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period. London: SCM, 1981.

Sanders, Jack T. "Tradition and Redaction in Luke XV.11-32." NTS 15 (1968-69):433ff.

Sanders, James A. Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Sanders, James A. "The Ethic of Election in Luke's Great Banquet Parable." In Essays in Old Testament Ethics, pp. 248ff. Edited by J.L. Crenshaw and J.T. Willis. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1974.

_____. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4." In Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults, pp. 75ff. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

_____. "Isaiah in Luke." Interpretation XXXVI (April 1982):145-55.

Sandmel, Samuel. Anti-Semitism in the New Testament? Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

_____. Judaism and Christian Beginnings. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

_____. "Parallelomania." JBL 81 (1962):1-13.

Schachter, Stanley. "Social Cohesion." In International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, vol. 2, pp. 542-46. Edited by David L. Sills. New York: Macmillan & Co., and The Free Press, 1968.

Scheler, Max. "On the Positivistic Philosophy of the History of Knowledge and Its Law of Three Stages." In The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader, pp. 161-69. Edited by J.E. Curtis and J.W. Petras. London: Duckworths, 1970. [Trans. from Schriften zur Soziologie und Weltanschauungslehre (Bern: Francke, 1963), pp. 27-35 by Rainer Koehne].

_____. "The Sociology of Knowledge: Formal Problems." In The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader, pp. 170ff. Edited by J.E. Curtis and J.W. Petras. London: Duckworths, 1970. [Trans. from Die Wissensformen und die Gesellschaft (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1960), pp. 52-69 by Rainer Koehne].

Schille, Gottfried. "Anfänge der christlichen Mission." Kerygma und Dogma 15-16 (1969-70):320-39.

Schillebeeckx, Edward. The Understanding of Faith. Trans. N.D. Smith. London: Sheed and Ward, 1974.

Schlatter, Adolf. Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1961.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. The Christian Faith. Edited by H.R. MacKintosh and J.S. Stewart. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1960 (from 2nd German ed., 1928, '1830).

Schmidt, Daryl. "Luke's 'Innocent' Jesus: A Scriptural Apologetic." In Political Issues in Luke-Acts, pp. 111ff. Edited by R.J. Cassidy and P.J. Scharper. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983.

Schmithals, Walther. Paul and James. London: SCM, 1965.

Schnackenburg, R. "Apostles Before and During Paul's Time." In Apostolic History and the Gospel, pp. 287-303. Edited by W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. The Church in the New Testament. Trans. W.J. O'Hara. London: Burns & Oates; Freiburg: Herder; 1965.

_____. "Der Eschatologische Abschnitt: Lk. 17,20-37." In Mélanges Bibliques, pp. 213-33. Edited by A. Descamps. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.

_____. God's Rule and Kingdom. Trans. John Murry. London: Nelson, 1963.

_____. The Moral Teaching of the New Testament. Trans. J. Holland-Smith and W.J. O'Hara. 2nd rev. German ed. 1962. London: Burns & Oates; Freiburg: Herder; 1964.

Schneckenberger, Matthias. Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte. Bern, 1841.

Schrader, Karl. Der Apostel Paulus. Leipzig, 1836.

Schubert, Paul. "The Final Cycle of Speeches in the Book of Acts." JBL 87 (1968):1-16.

_____. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24." In Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, pp. 166ff. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft XXI. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954.

Schulz, Siegfried. "Gottes Vorsehung Bei Lukas." ZNW 54 (1963):104-16.

Schürmann, Heinz. Das Lukasevangelium. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1969.

Schutz, Alfred and Luckmann, Thomas. The Structures of the Life-World. Trans. Richard M. Zaner, H. Tristam Engelhardt, Jr. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Schütz, John Howard. "Charisma and Social Reality in Primitive Christianity." JR 54 (1974):51-70.

Schwegler, Albert. Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung. Vol. II. Tübingen, 1846.

Schweizer, Eduard. "The Concept of the Davidic 'Son of God' in Acts and Its Old Testament Background." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 186ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

_____. "Concerning the Speeches in Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 208ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

_____. The Good News According to Luke. Trans. David E. Green. London: SPCK, 1984.

_____. The Good News According to Mark. Trans. Donald H. Madvig. London: SPCK, 1971.

_____. The Good News According to Matthew. Trans. David Greene. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975.

Schweizer, Eduard. Luke: A Challenge to Present Theology. London: SPCK, 1982.

Scroggs, Robin. "The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement." In Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults, Pt. 2 : Early Christianity, pp. 3ff. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

_____. "The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament: The Present State of Research." NTS 26 (1980):164-79.

Sherwin-White, A.N. Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Simon, Marcel. Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus. Trans. James H. Farley. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

_____. St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1958.

Simonsen, Hejne. "The Gospel Literature as a Source for the History of Primitive Christianity." ST 37 (1983):3-16.

Smalley, Stephen S. "The Christology of Acts Again." In Christ and Spirit in the New Testament, pp. 79ff. Edited by Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

_____. "Spirit, Kingdom, and Prayer in Luke-Acts." NovTest 15 (1973):59-71.

Smart, Ninian. The Phenomenon of Religion. London: Macmillan, 1973.

_____. The Religious Experience of Mankind. London: Collins, 1971.

_____. The Science of Religion and the Sociology of Knowledge: Some Methodological Questions. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Smith, Huston. "Faith and Its Study: What Wilfred Smith's Against, and For." RSR 7 (October 1981).

Smith, Jonathan Z. "The Social Description of Early Christianity." RSR 1 (1975):19-22.

_____. "Too Much Kingdom, Too Little Community." Zygon 13 (1978): 123-30.

Smith, Page. The Historian and History. New York: Random House, 1966.

Smith, Robert H. "The Eschatology of Acts and Contemporary Exegesis." CTM 29 (1958):641-63.

_____. "History and Eschatology in Luke-Acts." CTM 29 (1958): 881-901.

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell. Belief and History. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977.

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell. Faith and Belief. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

_____. Towards a World Theology. London: Macmillan, 1981.

Sparks, H.F.D. Review of The Theology of St. Luke, by Hans Conzelmann. JTS XIV (1963):454-57.

_____. Review of The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting, by J.C. O'Neill. JTS XIV (1963):457-66.

_____. A Synopsis of the Gospels. 2 parts. London: A. & C. Black, 1976, ('1964).

Spinks, G. Stephens. The Fundamentals of Religious Belief. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1961.

_____. Psychology and Religion. London: Methuen & Co., 1963.

Stalder, Kurt. "Der Heilige Geist in der lukanischen Ekklesiologie." Una Sancta 30 (1975):287-93.

Stanton, G.N. Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Steele, E. Springs. "Luke 11.37-54 - A Modified Hellenistic Symposium?" JBL 103 (1984):379-94.

Stempvoort, P.A. van. "The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts." NTS 5 (1958-59):30-42.

Stendahl, Krister. The School of St. Matthew. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup; Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard; 1954.

Stern, Fritz, ed. The Varieties of History: From Voltaire to the Present. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1970.

Stevenson, Eileen. "Some Insights from the Sociology of Religion into the Origin and Development of the Early Christian Church." ET 90 (1979):300-305.

Stolle, V. Der Zeuge als Angeklagter. Untersuchungen zum Paulusbild des Lukas. Stuttgart: 1973.

Stonehouse, N.B. The Witness of Luke to Christ. London: Tyndale Press, 1951.

Strecker, Georg. "The Concept of History in Matthew." JAAR 35 (September 1967):219-30.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman. The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins. 4th impression, revised. London: Macmillan & Co., 1930.

Strobel, August. "Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristlichen Problem in Lc 17 20f." ZNW 49 (1958):157-96.

_____. "Lukas der Antiochener." ZNW 49 (1958):131-34.

Summers, Ray. Essentials of New Testament Greek. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1950.

Swartley, Willard M. "Politics or Peace (Eirēnē) in Luke's Gospel." In Political Issues in Luke-Acts, pp. 18ff. Edited by R.J. Cassidy and P.J. Scharper. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983.

Taeger, Jens-W. Der Mensch und sein Heil: Studien zum Bild des Menschen und zur Sicht der Bekehrung bei Lukas. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1982.

Talbert, Charles H. "An Anti-Gnostic Tendency in Lucan Christology." NTS 14 (1967-68):259-71.

_____. Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974.

_____. "Martyrdom in Luke-Acts and the Lukan Social Ethic." In Political Issues in Luke-Acts, pp. 99ff. Edited by R.J. Cassidy & P.J. Scharper. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983.

_____,ed. Perspectives on Luke-Acts. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

_____. Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel. New York: Crossroad, 1984 (1982).

_____. "The Redaction Critical Quest for Luke the Theologian." In vol. I. of Jesus and Man's Hope, pp. 171-222. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970.

_____. Review of Kreuzweg und Kreuzigung Jesu: Ein Beitrag zur lukanischen Redaktionsgeschichte und zur Frage nach der lukanischen 'Kreuzestheologie'." JBL 102 (1983):342-43.

_____. Review of Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller, by Eckhard Plümacher. JBL 92 (1973):302f.

_____. Review of Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography, by John Drury. JBL 98 (1979):151-53.

_____. "Shifting Sands: The Recent Study of the Gospel of Luke." Interpretation 30 (1976):381-95.

Tannehill, Robert C. "The Mission of Jesus According to Luke IV 16-30." In Jesus in Nazareth, pp. 51-75. Edited by Walther Eltester, et al. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972 [BZNW 40].

Tatum, W. Barnes. "The Epoch of Israel: Luke I-II and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts." NTS 13 (1966-67):184-95.

Taylor, Vincent. Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.

Theissen, Gerd. "Die soziologische Auswertung religiöser Überlieferungen." Kairos 17 (1975):284-99.

_____. The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM, 1978.

Theissen, Gerd. The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity. Trans. John H. Schütz. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982.

_____. Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.

_____. "Theoretische Probleme Religionssoziologischer Forschung und die Analyse der Urchristentums." NZSTR 16 (1974):35-56.

Thiering, B.E. "The Three and a Half Years of Elijah." NovTest 23 (1981):41-55.

Thomas, G.S.R. A Review of Kingdom and Community, by John G. Gager. JRH 10 (1978):95f.

Thomas, J.C. "Faith and History: A Critique of Recent Dogmatics." RS 18 (September 1982):327-36.

Thompson, James W. "The Gentile Mission as an Eschatological Necessity." RQ 14 (1971):18-27.

Thouless, Robert H. An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Tidball, Derek. An Introduction to the Sociology of the New Testament. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1983.

Tiede, David L. Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

_____. Review of The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts, by Luke Timothy Johnson. JBL 98 (1979):445f.

Tillich, Paul. The Protestant Era. Abridged ed. Trans. James Luther Adams. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Toulmin, Stephen. Human Understanding. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Towler, Robert. Homo Religiosus: Sociological Problems in the Study Religion. London: Constable, 1974.

Toynbee, Arnold J. A Study of History. Vol. I. London: Oxford University Press, 1945.

Tracy, David. The Analogical Imagination. London: SCM, 1981.

_____. "A Theological Response to 'Kingdom and Community'." Zygon 13 (1978):131-35.

Trites, Allison A. "The Prayer Motif in Luke-Acts." In Perspectives on Luke-Acts, pp. 168ff. Edited by C.H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1978.

Troeltsch, Ernst. The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches. Vol. I. Trans. Olive Wyon. London/New York: Allen & Unwin/Macmillan, 1956, '1931.

Trompf, H.E. The Idea of Historical Recurrence in Western Thought. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: 1979.

Turlington, H.E. Review of Die Mitte der Zeit, by Hans Conzelmann. JBL 76 (1957):319-22.

Turner, Victor W. The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1967.

_____. The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Tyson, Joseph B. "The Jewish Public in Luke-Acts." NTS 30 (1984): 574-83.

Unnik, W.C. van. "The Book of Acts the Confirmation of the Gospel." NovTest 4 (1960):26-59.

_____. "Die Motivierung der Feindesliebe in Lukas VI 32-35." NovTest 8 (1966):284-300.

_____. "Luke-Acts, A Storm Centre in Contemporary Scholarship." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 15ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

_____. "Luke's Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography." In Les Actes des Apotres, par J. Kremer, pp. 37-60. Gembloux: Leuven University Press, 1979.

_____. "Once More St. Luke's Prologue." In Essays on the Gospel of Luke and Acts. NeoTest 7 (1973):7-26.

Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. 2nd ed. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1982, ²1975, '1962.

Vielhauer, Philipp. "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts." In Studies on Luke-Acts, pp. 33ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

Völkel, Martin. "Zur Deutung des Reiches Gottes bei Lukas." ZNW 64-65 (1973-74):57-70.

Vööbus, Arthur. "A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke." NTS 15 (1968-69):457ff.

Vrijhof, P.H. "What Is the Sociology of Religion?" In Readings in the Sociology of Religion, pp. 29ff. Edited by John Brothers. London: Pergamon Press, 1967.

Waal, C. van der. "The Temple in the Gospel according to Luke." Neotest 7 (1973):49-59. [Essays on the Gospel of Luke and Acts, Proceedings of the Ninth Meeting of the New Testament Society of South Africa].

Wach, Joachim. Sociology of Religion. London: University of Chicago Press, 1964, '1944.

Waetjen, Herman C. Review of Der Weg des Herrn: Studie zur Geschichte und Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium, Ein Gespräch mit Hans Conzelmann, by W.C. Robinson, Jr. JBL 84 (1965):300-301.

Wagner, Helmut R. "The Scope of Phenomenological Sociology: Considerations and Suggestions." In Phenomenological Sociology: Issues and Applications, pp. 61-87. Edited by George Psathas. New York/London/Sydney/Toronto: John Wiley & Son, 1973.

Wainwright, Arthur W. "Luke and the Restoration of the Kingdom to Israel." ET 89 (1977-78):76-79.

Walaskay, Paul W. "And So We Came To Rome": The Political Perspective of St. Luke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

_____. "The Trial and Death of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke." JBL 94 (1975):81-93.

Wallis, Roy. "The New Religions as Social Indicators." In New Religious Movements, pp. 216ff. Edited by Eileen Barker. New York: Edwin Mellen, 1982.

_____. Salvation and Protest: Studies of Social and Religious Movements. London: Frances Pinter, 1979.

Wansbrough, Henry. "St. Luke and Christian Ideals in an Affluent Society." NBf 49 (1967-68):582-87.

Weber, Max. The Methodology of the Social Sciences. Trans. and Edited by Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949.

_____. The Sociology of Religion. Trans. Ephraim Fischoff and Introduction by Talcott Parsons. London: Methuen & Co., 1965.

Weiss, Bernhard. Die Apostelgeschichte. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche, 1893.

Wenham, David. "A Note on Mark 9:33-42/Mt. 18:1-6/Luke 9:46-50." JSNT 14 (February 1982):113-18.

_____. "'This Generation Will Not Pass...': A Study of Jesus' Future Expectation in Mark 13." In Christ the Lord, pp. 127-50. Edited by Harold H. Rowdon. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1982.

Wenham, John W. "Synoptic Independence and the Origin of Luke's Travel Narrative." NTS 27 (1981-82):507-15.

_____. "Why Do You Ask Me About the Good?: A Study of the Relation Between Text and Source Criticism." NTS 28 (1982-83):116-25.

Wensinck, A.J. "The Semitic New Year and the Origin of Eschatology." AO I (1923):158-99.

Wilch, J.R. "Jewish Guilt for the Death of Jesus - Anti-Judaism in the Acts of the Apostles?" LTJ 18 (1984):49-58.

Wilckens, Ulrich. Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. The Netherlands: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1963.

_____. "Interpreting Luke-Acts in a Period of Existentialist Theology." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 60ff. Edited by L.E. Keck and L.J. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1978, '1966.

Wilckens, Ulrich. "The Understanding of Revelation within Primitive Christianity." In Revelation as History, pp. 57ff. Edited by W. Pannenberg. London: Sheed & Ward, 1969.

Wilcox, Max. "A Foreword to the Study of the Speeches in Acts." In Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults, Pt. I, pp. 206ff. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

_____. "The 'God-Fearers' in Acts - A Reconsideration." JSNT 13 (1981):102-22.

Wilder, Amos N. "Social Factors in Early Christian Eschatology." In Early Christian Origins, pp. 67-76. Edited by Allen Wikgren. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961.

Wilken, Robert L. The Christians as the Romans Saw Them. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1984.

_____. "The Christians as the Romans (and Greeks) Saw Them." In Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol. 1, pp. 100ff. Edited by E.P. Sanders. London: SCM, 1980.

_____. "Collegia, Philosophical Schools, and Theology." In The Catacombs and the Colosseum, pp. 268ff. Edited by Stephen Benko and John O'Rourke. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1971.

Willer, Judith. The Social Determination of Knowledge. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Williams, C.S.C. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957.

_____. "The Date of Luke-Acts." ET 64 (1952-53):283f.

_____. "Luke-Acts in Recent Study." ET 73 (1961-62):133-36.

Wilshire, Leland Edward. "Was Canonical Luke Written in the Second Century? - A Continuing Discussion." NTS 20 (1973-74):246-53.

Wilson, Bryan R. "Becoming a Sectarian: Motivation and Commitment." In Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian, pp. 481-506. Edited by Derek Baker. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978.

_____. Magic and the Millenium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest Among Tribal and Third-World Peoples. London: Heinemann, 1973.

_____. "The New Religions: Preliminary Considerations." In New Religious Movements: A Perspective for Understanding Society. Edited by Eileen Barker. New York & Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1982.

_____. Religion in Sociological Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Wilson, R. McL. "Nag Hammadi and the New Testament." NTS 28 (July 1982):291-95.

Wilson, R. McL. "The Spirit in Gnostic Literature." In Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament, pp. 348ff. Edited by Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Wilson, S.G. "The Ascension: A Critique and an Interpretation." ZNW 59 (1968):269-81.

_____. The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

_____. "Lukan Eschatology." NTS XVI (1969-70):330-47.

_____. Luke and the Law. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

_____. Luke and the Pastoral Epistles. London: SPCK, 1979.

Wink, Walter. John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Winn, Albert C. "Elusive Mystery: The Purpose of Acts." Interpretation 13 (1959):144-56.

Winslow, Donald. "Religion and the Early Roman Empire." In The Catacombs and the Colosseum, pp. 237ff. Edited by Stephen Benko and John O'Rourke. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1971.

Wuthnow, Robert. "World Order and Religous Movements." In New Religious Movements: A Perspective for Understanding Society, pp. 47ff. Edited by Eileen Barker. New York & Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1982.

Yamauchi, Edwin M. Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the Proposed Evidences. London: Tyndale Press, 1973.

Yoder, John H. The Politics of Jesus. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

Zahn, Theodor. Introduction to the New Testament. Vol. III. Trans. M.W. Jacobus and others. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.

Zehnle, Richard F. Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Redaction in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3. Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1971.

_____. "The Salvific Character of Jesus' Death in Lucan Soteriology." TS 30 (1969):420-44.

Zeller, Eduard. Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht. Stuttgart: 1854.

Ziesler, J.A. "Luke and the Pharisees." NTS 25 (1978-79):146-57.

_____. "The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles." JSNT 4 (1979):28-41.

Zmijewski, J. Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas-Evangeliums. Eine traditions- und redactionsgeschichteliche Untersuchung zu Lk. 21: 5-36 und Lk 17:20-37. Bonn: 1972.

Zmijewski, Josef. "Die Eschatologiereden Lk 21 and Lk 17 Überlegungen zum Verständnis und zur Einordnung der lukanischen Eschatologie." BiLeb 14 (1973):30-40.

Zwi Werblowsky, R.J. "Religions New and Not So New: Fragments of an Agenda." In New Religious Movements: A Perpsective for Understanding Society, pp. 34ff. Edited by Eileen Barker. New York & Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1982.