

Luke's Account of Peter in his Strategy of Proclaiming a Gospel for all People

**David T. N. Parry
Linacre College,
University of Oxford**

Submitted for the degree of D. Phil., Hilary Term, 2014

**Luke's Account of Peter in his Strategy of
Proclaiming a Gospel for all People**

David T. N. Parry

Linacre College, Oxford

Submitted for the degree of D. Phil., Hilary Term, 2014

(Abstract)

In his two-volume account of Christian beginnings Luke fills out for already instructed Theophilus Mark's account of Jesus, and extends it to tell of the bringing of 'good news' for all people, offering a tested alternative to the pagan world-view, worthy to be adopted by citizens of the Roman empire. Primarily employing 'redaction-critical' methods and seeking narrative patterns with variations within the whole text, we analyse the roles of Peter in the first half of Acts and the influences upon Luke in their making. They portray the pattern of apostolic witness in message, deed and life, and anticipate the extending of the mission to Gentiles, which is taken up in a heroic way by Paul in the second half of Acts. Then analysing Luke's reshaping of the account of Peter before Easter in his first volume, we show it is done with an eye to how it will be completed in Acts, how Peter will repent from denying Jesus to strengthen his brother apostles and urge repentance on his fellow-Jews. Luke's captivating narrative is persuasive for its implied reader in the context of the post-apostolic age, that the apostolic *kerygma* proclaims the divine gift of salvation expected by Israel's prophets, despite its rejection by much of Judaism. The missions of Paul are to be received as being in harmony with Peter's. A foundation has been established which will outface Christian rivalries and strengthen believers under persecution. The influence of Luke's account on other early Christian writers is tested where evidence is available. Luke's success is that his account became, almost without rival, the canonical New Testament account of Christian beginnings.

**Luke's Account of Peter in his Strategy of
Proclaiming a Gospel for all People**

David T. N. Parry

Linacre College, Oxford

Submitted for the degree of D. Phil., Hilary Term, 2014

(Longer Abstract)

The New Testament Gospels proclaim their Christian message by telling the story of Jesus, but Luke is alone in continuing that story (his *πρῶτος λόγος*) with an account for Theophilus of the Spirit-empowered spread of the Christian message and belief “to the end of the earth”. The success of Luke’s endeavours is evident in the absence of rival narrative accounts of Christian beginnings and the eventual adoption of both parts of Luke’s account into the NT canon.

Within contemporary Lukan studies this present thesis examines the roles of the apostle Peter in Luke’s double narrative, as a believer in Jesus, as spokesman of the Twelve, and as bearer of a unique role in relation to other characters in Acts, asking how they cohere and how they are crafted not only to chronicle the history but more to carry forward Luke’s strategy of proclaiming a Gospel for all people. His purpose is to persuade the implied reader Theophilus, who has already had some instruction (Lk 1:4), that divine power is working through this movement and that Christianity, with its deep roots in the religion and hopes of Israel, is worthy of being adopted as a way of life and belief beyond Israel by citizens within the Roman empire.

While the complex nature of the Lukan narrative justifies an unashamedly eclectic use of the insights of a variety of critical tools and approaches, and a synthesis of recent scholarly studies, my own approach towards the interpretation of Luke is primarily to employ ‘redaction critical’ methods both in the narrow sense of identifying sources and examining changes made to them, and in the broader sense of analysing the author’s

architecture of his whole narrative, identifying patterns with variations and giving due weight to Luke's creative inventiveness. The argument proceeds with a cumulative series of studies of the various aspects of Peter's role in Acts. We describe and analyse each passage, identifying possible traditional material and any Lukan narrative traits or theological emphases which echo his first volume. My treatment explores the influences upon Luke's formation of the Peter narratives, from the norms of current Hellenistic literature, and even more from the Greek Bible. While my concern is not to assess the historical value of Luke's account or to draw a comprehensive map of Peter traditions, I do note where Luke's presentation of Peter overlaps with theological and narrative concerns, both within the NT (especially John, the Pauline, deuterio-Pauline and Petrine epistles), and beyond. We speculate on the influence of particular texts upon the early readers of Luke's narratives, qualifying and testing this where it is possible to do so in the literature of the second century. While there is a scarcity of evidence, I argue that there is enough to confirm that part of Luke's purpose is to bring the legacy of Paul's missions into harmony with the apostolic foundation, making this the norm for Christianity's account of itself thereafter. After the survey of Acts we then examine material in Luke's Gospel that has to do with Peter, asking how it has been shaped and how it prepares for the continuation of the Gospel in the second volume.

Chapter One: *Setting the Stage* (pages 1-41)

The thesis builds on a range of Lukan studies over the past sixty years, with a critical survey of studies of Peter in the New Testament and beyond, and especially of the two monographs on Peter in Luke-Acts by Dietrich (1972) and Mathieu (2004). We argue that Luke's overall plan is to present an account of the spread of the Gospel; we go beyond Mathieu in showing how the account of Peter contributes to Luke's grander context and purpose as a bridge between the ministry of Jesus, the proclamation of the earliest

Christians and extending the missionary outreach to Gentiles, the particular work of Paul. There is an extensive discussion of the recent debate about the unity of Luke and Acts, with the conclusion that this is a reasonable working-hypothesis, which will receive testing and confirmation in dealing with the account of Peter and especially of his denials. Discussion of author, audience and date, of the prefaces and *genre* prepare us to understand how this shaping of the history can convince Theophilus of the reliable foundation of Christianity. In the introductory part of his first volume (Lk 1:5 – 4:30) Luke sets the stage for his account of the ministry of Jesus and the designation of a mission for Peter; also it is the prelude for his account of the earliest community in the second volume, overseen by Peter; it also models parallelism with variations which is an important characteristic of the whole narrative, determining especially our perception of the Jesus-Peter-Paul pattern.

Chapter Two: *Strengthening his Brothers* (pages 42-62)

In Ac 1 Peter is the focus of the disciples of Jesus in Jerusalem after the ascension. He encourages their formation as a distinct community with a piety focussed for the time being upon the Temple that echoes the opening chapters of Luke, and of which Peter is the exemplar. Peter takes the initiative in reconstituting the apostolic witness of the Twelve as the core of this community, by replacing Judas. He illustrates the practice of applying specific OT texts to interpret the new time. Links are made to the apostolic supper in Lk 22, which brings together teaching about discipleship, the Twelve, the betrayal by Judas and the future role of Peter as strengthening his brothers, the classic instance of which is his initiative here. Links are made with other summaries of the community's life and with other 'punishment' miracles. Contrast is drawn between apostleship as Luke here defines

it and that in the Pauline epistles. Comparison is made with other Church decisions in Acts, revealing the emergence of a common pattern.

Chapter Three: *Peter Preaches Christ* (pages 63-102)

Peter shares in the endowment of the Spirit at Pentecost and is spokesman for the Twelve in the apostolic role of evangelist. He articulates the *kerygma* which calls on his hearers to repent and be baptised. Peter's success fulfils his calling symbolised by the great catch of fish in Lk 5. A comparison with other speeches of Peter to a Jewish audience in the Temple and before the Sanhedrin, and to a God-fearing Gentile audience in Cornelius' house, with the similar kerygmatic speech of Paul in Ac 13, and with other summaries of the *kerygma* in the NT and beyond, will be part of our argument that Luke, through Peter, is responsible for formulating the creed as a series of events and adding to the stock of OT 'proof' texts for a scripturally literate audience. With regard to each of the speeches we examine their setting and content, especially their Christological and soteriological terms. We demonstrate a Petrine thread of the Messianic Suffering Servant which links Acts with 1 Peter and *Kerygma Petrou*. There are extended notes on the Name of Jesus and on the text of some of the supporting citations.

Chapter Four: *The Mighty Works of Peter* (pages 103-132)

The raising of the lame beggar at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, the healing of Aeneas and the raising of Tabitha, together with summaries of healings, recall the healing miracles of Jesus and, like them, are illustrative of the total salvation brought by Jesus. Peter declares this to the crowd and to the Sanhedrin after the first healing. Jesus' commission to his disciples is thus re-activated. Parallels between healings by Peter, by Paul and by Jesus and the Prophets (especially parallel healings by Elijah and Elisha), are noted. Exorcisms (5:16) are specifically included in the summary of this healing ministry, though

no such exorcism by Peter is described. We assert that Peter becomes involved in the serious confrontation with Satan, of which the exorcisms of Jesus had been a potent sign (cf Lk 10:18, comments on the return of the Seventy), when he unmasks the deception of Ananias and Sapphira as a lie to the Holy Spirit and when he opposes Simon Magus' attempt to buy the power to bestow the Spirit. The evidence of parallels and resurrection symbolism most clearly show Peter as a bridge between Jesus and Paul.

Chapter Five: *Across New Thresholds* (pages 133-172)

Peter's journeys to Samaria, Joppa and Caesarea, crossing thresholds of the tanner and a Gentile's home, reflect the geographic pattern of Jesus' commissioning of the apostles (Ac 1:8). With the Twelve Peter sanctions the developments of the Hellenists and, with John, confirms Philip's evangelising in Samaria. Thrice reported visions converting Paul are in counterpoint with those drawing Peter to his prior acceptance of Gentiles. Peter's argument for the Gentiles' cleansing by faith, not the 'yoke' of the Law, anticipates Paul's mission to Gentiles as well as Diaspora Jews. With regard to Luke's account of how the Gentile mission began, and of the Jerusalem assembly, comparison is made with Galatians, of which, along with its reported incident at Antioch, I argue, Luke was ignorant. Luke's ascribing the origins of the Gentile mission to the founder apostle Peter, and his presentation of Paul as the heroic executor of that mission, serve *inter alia* to introduce Paul to readers of the next generation, for whom Paul's reputation was suspect. I conclude that Luke's Peter exercises a style of leadership, which responds to divine nudging to learn a more inclusive scope for the Gospel, and is not dependent upon the power of office, or particular personal or charismatic gifts.

Chapter Six: *Peter's personal story illustrates the Gospel* (pages 173-205)

Observing that Peter's denials of Jesus receive no mention in Acts, we examine Luke's redaction of the denials and conclude that Peter's repentance and assuming the role of strengthening his brothers that Jesus gave him, begins in Luke's first volume. Examination of Luke's terms 'deny' and 'turn', and exploration of a motif of 'ignorance' lead to our claim that the experience of denial and repentance provide the basis for Peter's offering his audience in Acts the mitigation of ignorance and the further opportunity to repent of their rejection of Jesus and come to believe in him. In contrast with his earlier denials, Peter is now ready to carry out his pledge to go with Jesus to prison and death (Lk 22:33f). With his fellow apostles he suffers flogging and imprisonment. Again, after James is executed by Herod, Peter is imprisoned awaiting a similar fate. The paschal deliverance of Peter is told with enough echoes of the Easter narratives that it becomes a powerful illustration of salvation and is the climax of Peter's story in Acts. The deliverance from shipwreck of Paul, the converted persecutor, is a parallel similitude of sharing with Jesus in his dying and rising. Stephen's trial, transfiguration, vision of the Son of Man, martyrdom and burial also echo the passion of Jesus. Deliverance from prison and shipwreck draw on popular themes in non-Biblical literature, but are also shown to be rooted in OT and Gospel imagery. After his miraculous deliverance Peter leaves the stage, with James the Lord's brother leading the still Temple-focussed church in Jerusalem.

Chapter Seven: *Luke reshapes the pre-Easter story of Peter* (pages 206-259)

Having analysed various aspects of the portrayal of Peter in Acts, I proceed to examine Luke's first volume, in which Peter has a much smaller but nevertheless significant role. I argue that Luke has redacted his sources, or composed new material to prepare the reader

for Peter's future role after Easter. I accept Markan priority over Luke, but argue that where John has a parallel to Luke this is secondary, sometimes offering a development of Luke. Luke presents two major pieces on Peter. The miracle of the fish convicts Simon (Peter) of his state as a sinner, and gives substance to the call to leave all, to follow Jesus as a disciple and to catch people – which is only fulfilled in a substantial way after Pentecost. Luke has gathered much of the teaching about discipleship into the farewell apostolic supper, which he makes the setting for Jesus' key word to Peter, the pivot of Luke's account (Lk 22:31f); we complete a detailed discussion of it. Attention is also given to the redaction of Peter's witness to the teaching and healings of Jesus, to his being renamed as the first of the twelve apostles, and their being sent on the mission of the kingdom, as well as to Peter's recognition of Jesus as the Messiah and his being the principal witness of the Transfiguration. We analyse Peter's initiative in visiting the tomb (and have an extended text-critical note on 24:12), and the resurrection appearance to him. We trace possible influence of Luke's Peter, especially on 1 Peter 5.

Chapter Eight: *Summary and Conclusions* (pages 260-274)

More than an archive of the beginnings of Christianity or a manual for its mission, Luke-Acts is persuasive for Theophilus of salvation through trusting the proclamation as set out by Peter; of the shift in salvation-history from a Jewish sect to a universal and mainly Gentile faith, from Aramaic to Greek, from Jerusalem to Rome. Restoring continuity of reading the account of Peter between Luke and Acts, with Peter as the human character who bridges the two volumes and pioneers the way for these historical developments, confirms their unity of composition. Problems of rival Christian teachings, a need for apologetics and dialogue in controversy, the varied patterns of Christian spirituality and ministry and the growth of narratives about apostles and accounts of the post-resurrection

teachings of Jesus that all flourished in the second century already had their seeds in the first. The ultimate success of Luke's unique work is to be measured in the challenge to the pagan world-view by the emergence of the distinct Christian Way. It is his account of Peter that gives this its narrative substance.

Abbreviations and Bibliography of works consulted (pages 275 – 308)

Luke's Account of Peter in his Strategy of Proclaiming a Gospel for all People

David T. N. Parry

Linacre College, Oxford

Submitted for the degree of D. Phil., Hilary Term, 2014

Chapter One *Setting the Stage*

The New Testament Gospels proclaim their Christian message by telling the story of Jesus, but Luke is alone in continuing that story (his *πρῶτος λόγος*) with an account for Theophilus of the Spirit-empowered spread of the Christian message and belief ‘to the end of the earth’. The success of Luke’s endeavours is evident in the absence of rival narrative accounts of Christian beginnings and the eventual adoption of both parts of Luke’s account into the NT canon.

Within contemporary Lukan studies this present thesis examines the roles of the apostle Peter in Luke’s double narrative, as a believer in Jesus, as spokesman of the Twelve, and as bearer of a unique role in relation to other characters in Acts, asking how they cohere and how they are crafted not only to chronicle the history but more to carry forward Luke’s strategy of proclaiming a Gospel for all people. His purpose is to persuade the implied reader Theophilus, who has already had some instruction (Lk 1:4), that divine power is working through this movement and that Christianity, with its deep roots in the religion and hopes of Israel, is worthy of being adopted as a way of faith beyond Israel for citizens within the Roman empire. While my concern is not to assess the historical value of Luke’s account or to draw a comprehensive map of Peter traditions, I do note where Luke’s presentation of Peter overlaps with theological and narrative concerns, both within the NT (especially John, the Pauline, deuterio-Pauline and Petrine epistles), and beyond. With regard to particular aspects of Luke’s presentation, I test their probable impact on Theophilus with reference to any evidence from early readers of Luke and Acts in the ‘tunnel’ period before Irenaeus, and in later Patristic writers.

I argue that Luke's account of Peter establishes an apostolic foundation of witness to Jesus, one that is without personal succession (Chapter Two); that it formulates the apostolic *kerygma* (Chapter Three); that the Gospel is demonstrated in the mighty works of Peter, which parallel those of Jesus (Chapter Four); that Luke's account brings the initiatives and apologetics of the Hellenists within apostolic sanction; that it introduces the missions of Paul as being in continuity and harmony with Peter's (Chapter Five); that it demonstrates the impact of the Gospel on Peter individually, a forgiven sinner who is inspired to give bold expression to the *kerygma*, and who, in experiencing persecution and deliverance from it, presents a similitude of sharing in the dying and rising of Jesus (Chapter Six). Luke's Peter demonstrates a model of leadership that eschews headship over the church but is, rather, one of response, sometimes reluctant, to promptings human or divine. A study of the Peter incidents in Luke's first volume shows how Luke's redaction prepares the reader for Peter's roles in Acts (Chapter Seven).

Previous Studies

For as much as there have been several studies of the figure of Peter in the New Testament and post-apostolic literature in recent decades of Biblical scholarship, it is good to introduce some of them here, indicating their approach and usefulness for this study built upon their foundation. These studies have been motivated in part by a wish to establish the historical worth of the story of Peter, including the veracity of his martyrdom in Rome, and by theological and ecumenical discussions about the validity and exercise of a universal primacy by the Roman papacy.

We begin with studies of Peter, in the NT and beyond. Foundational for these is Oscar Cullmann's *Petrus, Jünger – Apostel – Märtyrer*¹ and his article Πέτρος in

¹ 1952, 2nd edition 1960, Zürich/Stuttgart, English translation by Floyd V. Filson, SCM, London, 1962.

*TDNT*², a protestant contribution to the ecumenical debate. His study is divided into two parts, “The Historical Question” and “The Exegetical and Theological Question”, which is mainly concerned with Mt 16:16-19 and its ecclesiastical application. He relates this dominical saying to those of Lk 22:31-34 and Jn 21:15-23, all of which give a special role to Peter. He argues that the “original (historical?) setting” for the saying is that of the Last Supper, Lk 22:31f, a saying which he describes as “an exact parallel to Mt. 16:17-19”³. Such a view could only go along with the hypothesis of a history of traditions behind the Gospels, and predate a line of research in which each author’s own theology and creativity moves to the centre of the stage. Cullmann regards the Acts picture of Peter presiding over the first group of believers as historical, and supported by Gal. 1:18, where Paul says that it is Peter that he went to Jerusalem to consult, ἱστορήσαι Κηφᾶν.⁴ Cullmann gives Peter and the Twelve a “mediating position between Judaizers and Hellenists”⁵, *i.e.* he regards the Acts picture as historical and gives James a more factional role (shades of Baur’s Tübingen hypothesis). Cullmann regards Ac 12:17 as Peter’s “transfer to exclusively missionary activity”⁶. On the basis of Peter’s speeches and 1 Peter, he ascribes to Peter, the earliest solution of the Christological question, a suffering Servant, παῖς Θεοῦ.⁷ We will discuss this in Chapter Three dealing with Peter’s *kerygma* in Acts, and Luke’s own contribution to it. Much of Cullmann’s study concerns whether Peter went to Rome and was martyred and buried there.

The small Oxford study by John Lowe⁸ follows a similar line of interest, with chapters on Peter as Apostle, as Martyr and the issue of primacy. He regards Lk

² 6.100-112.

³ *TDNT*, 6.105.

⁴ *Peter*, pp 34, 40.

⁵ p.37.

⁶ p.42.

⁷ p.67.

⁸ *Saint Peter*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1956.

22:31f as the “Lucan parallel to Mt 16:18” which also recalls Mk 8:33. In his reconstruction of history Lowe prefers to date Cornelius’ conversion after the incident at Antioch which itself precedes the Assembly in Jerusalem and the Apostolic Decrees. He regards Peter’s going to another place (Ac 12:17) as missionary work over a wide area. The more recent study by Martin Hengel⁹ also is an attempt to build on various NT traditions to construct the historical role of Peter in the early decades. Like Cullmann, he begins with Mt 16:18ff. He regards Mark as the disciple of Peter. His reconstruction of the history attributes the conflict with Paul which is reflected in Galatians to Peter’s becoming a missionary after the Assembly of Ac 15¹⁰. He observes that Peter plays no independent role in the Jesus tradition of Q¹¹.

The volume *St Peter in the New Testament*, edited by R. E. Brown, K. P. Donfried and J. Reumann¹² arose out of a ‘task force’ of Roman Catholic and Lutheran Biblical scholars, assessing the evidence of varying attitudes to Peter in the different authors of the NT. The Pauline epistles are followed by a chapter on Acts, offering a “Christian view of Peter some thirty years later”.¹³ It summarizes Peter’s role as being listed first among the Eleven, playing a significant role in the election of Matthias, as a preacher, miracle worker, and the object of miraculous divine care.¹⁴ Attention is then given to Peter’s role with regard to the conversion of the Gentiles, and the historical worth of this, and to teasing out the relationship of the Jerusalem Church, Peter and James, as a question of historical development as well as Lukan narrative – whether Jerusalem with

⁹ *Saint Peter, The Underestimated Apostle*, translated by T. H. Trapp, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, & Cambridge, UK, 2006.

¹⁰ p. 52.

¹¹ p. 81.

¹² Cerf, Paris, 1973.

¹³ p.39.

¹⁴ pp 40-42.

James as leader, operated a ‘province’¹⁵, and whether Peter was more than a local leader, but a universal leader, with some idea of succession. In this regard the discussion of Ac 15 becomes crucial, with an emphasis on ὁμοθυμαδόν¹⁶ and the viability of various historical reconstructions.

There follow chapters on the canonical Gospels. That on Luke supposes a similar dating to Matthew, “some twenty years” after Mark, but independently and for a more Hellenized audience. It presents the evidence of Lukan redaction in passages where Mark is the *Vorlage*, arguing for a ‘softening’¹⁷ of Mark’s picture, and the removal of “any of the polemic against Peter that some exegetes... find in Mark”¹⁸. Three passages introduce Peter into a Markan or ‘Q’ pericope – 22:8, ‘Peter and John’, which prepares for their ‘prominent’ partnership in Acts; Lk 8:45, “a somewhat patronizing reply”¹⁹; Lk 12:41 in a Q setting, which is regarded as LkR, without explanation, but compared with Mt 18:21 where Matthew also introduces Peter into Q material.²⁰ There follow detailed studies of “three Petrine scenes peculiar to Luke”, 5:1-11, 22:31f, and 24:34.²¹ We shall refer to these when we discuss these texts in later chapters. This chapter concludes,

“we see that Luke has presented a very favorable portrait of Peter to the (Gentile?) Christian community for which he writes toward the end of the century...From his first call by Jesus he is uniquely destined to be a catcher of men....If his denials are narrated as the only blemish on his career, Luke takes pains to remind the reader that these denials were forgiven, for the risen Lord appeared to Simon. It is probably no accident that Peter is the last of the Twelve to be mentioned by name in the Gospel and the first of the Twelve to be mentioned by name in the Book of Acts. If for Luke the Twelve apostles are the bridge between the historical Jesus and the church, Simon or Peter plays that role par excellence.”²²

¹⁵ p.47.

¹⁶ Ac 15:25 and 10x in Acts; *St Peter in the NT*. p.50.

¹⁷ p.112.

¹⁸ p.113.

¹⁹ Some MSS harmonize with Mark.

²⁰ *St Peter in the NT*, pp 113f.

²¹ pp 114-127.

²² pp 127f.

PHEME PERKINS' *Peter, Apostle for the Whole Church*²³ provides a useful and critical survey of the NT, patristic and apocryphal evidence for constructing 'a life of Peter', and the ecclesiastical importance attached to some of the texts. Her interests are showing how the variety of treatments of the figure of Peter can contribute to an understanding of "a Petrine ministry for the Christian churches of the twenty-first century", especially his "learning on the job",²⁴ for example, "The Cornelius episode in Acts 10 provides a dramatic image of the divine interventions required to reform Peter's convictions about the Gentiles."²⁵ Chapters 2 and 3 give attention to the portrayal of Peter in NT narratives, Mark and Matthew in Chapter 2, then Luke and John in Chapter 3. The account of Luke's Gospel continues into Acts. Luke, she argues, "is not primarily interested in describing Peter as a historical figure...Luke's readers can look back to the earliest community and its leaders as an inspiration for the future",²⁶ a fairly bland conclusion. That the section on John is followed by an Excursus "Peter and the Twelve", because "Ecumenical discussions of the papacy have focused on the relationship between Peter's role and that of the Twelve as a group",²⁷ shows where the interests of this study ultimately lie.

The study of Peter Dschulnigg, *Petrus im Neuen Testament*²⁸ provides a useful description and examination of all the literature to do with Peter in the NT canon, concentrating on the literary and theological aspects of the portrayal of Peter in the final form of the text, rather than historical questions. In spite of this expressed intention,

²³ University of South Carolina Press, 1994, reprinted for Augsburg Fortress Press by T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 2000.

²⁴ p.186.

²⁵ p.186.

²⁶ p.95.

²⁷ p.101.

²⁸ Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, Stuttgart, 1996.

Mathieu²⁹ accuses him of too readily slipping into historical-critical questions, and assessing the authenticity of particular passages. So in two successive chapters³⁰ he treats all the scenes involving Simon/Peter in Luke and Acts, and we will make reference to his comments in our own study of these passages. In his conclusions with regard to the “Petrusbild und Petrusdienst” that he has described, Dschulnigg writes, “Im lukanischen Doppelwerk ist Petrus unter den zwölf Aposteln der erste und *der* Apostel schlechthin”.³¹ He ties Luke’s two volumes together, finding Peter fulfilling his calling to strengthen his brothers (Lk 22:31f), “als erste Zeuge des Auferstandenen und als Initiator und Verkünder in der Mission unter den Juden, bei seiner Legitimierung der Mission in Samarien und besonders der Mission unter den Völkern.”³² With this assessment we largely agree.

In his study, *Peter in the Gospels, Pattern, Personality and Relationship*, Timothy Wiarda³³ seeks to find a pattern of reversed expectation in incidents in the Gospels involving Peter, of which he finds twelve examples.³⁴ He draws out from the incidents in each Gospel, distinctive elements in ‘the characterization of Peter’, then the depiction of the ‘Peter-Jesus relationship’, and then the ‘functions of the Reversal Pattern’. There will be value in considering Wiarda’s comments on the particular incidents in Luke’s Gospel at the relevant points, but his approach of comparing parallel incidents in each Gospel is the opposite of our approach which gives priority to considering a narrative as a whole. Because the focus of his study is the Gospels, Acts is treated in a very brief way and not as the continuation of Luke’s Gospel, despite the acknowledgement that “the

²⁹ *La Figure de Pierre dans L’Œuvre de Luc*, J Gabalda, Paris, 2004, pp 44ff.

³⁰ Dschulnigg, *Petrus im NT*, pp 68-116.

³¹ p.204, with perhaps a reminiscence of Dietrich, *Das Petrusbild der lukanischen Schriften*, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, Mainz, 1972, p.329, “der Apostel Jesu schlechthin”, with emphasis added.

³² p.204.

³³ Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2000.

³⁴ pp 34, 36ff.

most extensive portrayal of Peter the apostle is offered in Acts³⁵. He finds one instance of “a reversal structure similar to the pattern³⁶ observed in the Gospels”, namely in Peter’s vision of unclean animals (Ac 10:9-16). He does not find the post-resurrection transformation of Peter deliberately contrasted with the ‘weaknesses’ of Peter as portrayed in the Gospels.

In the field of NT studies there has been a renewed interest in the after-history of many of the canonical documents and the plotting of trajectories of possible influence or development into the concerns and writings of the second century. The plausibility of what we say about Luke’s account of Peter will need to be tested against what influence it may have had on extra-canonical writings. Of particular note in this field are three books, Terence V. Smith’s *Petrine Controversies in Early Christianity*,³⁷ Christian Grappe’s *Images de Pierre aux deux premiers siècles*,³⁸ and, more recently, Markus Bockmuehl’s *The Remembered Peter – in Ancient Reception and Modern Debate*.³⁹ These studies will stimulate our discussion of the effect of Luke’s Peter on other writers and on Christian practice.

Most important for our study are two monographs devoted to the figure of Peter in Luke-Acts. Wolfgang Dietrich’s *Das Petrusbild der lukanischen Schriften*⁴⁰ was published in 1972. It represents a major, pioneering and detailed attempt to use the techniques of redaction-criticism and the history of traditions, to draw from Luke’s two volumes a consistent and integrated picture of the role of Peter. It was a contribution to Lukan studies at the time when the distinctiveness of each author was becoming the focus

³⁵ p.222.

³⁶ p.223.

³⁷ Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 1985.

³⁸ Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1995.

³⁹ Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2010.

⁴⁰ Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, Mainz, 1972, (hereafter Dietrich).

of much NT scholarship⁴¹, and in this way offers a contrasting approach to that of Cullmann some twenty years earlier, as well as to “eine psychologisierende Betrachtung des Petrus”⁴² which he finds fanciful. Yet Dietrich is confident of being able to distinguish layers of underlying tradition from the finished text, including the influence of “sogenannten ‘Sonderguts’”⁴³ in the Gospel, and sources in Acts, an approach which Mathieu’s monograph will explicitly reject.

Dietrich’s detailed treatment of each Peter episode in Luke and Acts will engage our attention in the appropriate chapters, though we may be wary of a tendency to over-interpret some data in the search for a consciously consistent picture. For example, C. F. D. Moule in his review of Dietrich⁴⁴ questions whether the contrast he draws between ἐπιστάτα, understood as ascribing a superior skill to Jesus in the business of fishing, with κύριε as ‘Lord’, a more appropriate designation of Jesus, leaves us with seeing Peter’s use of ἐπιστάτα at the Transfiguration as a “gaff” – Moule is not convinced! In Acts Moule questions Dietrich’s interpretation of a rift between Peter and the Jerusalem leadership under James.

The picture that emerges for Dietrich is that Peter is *the* Apostle, prime witness to Jesus, who through the gift of the Spirit⁴⁵, experienced in the triple ‘Pentecosts’ of Jerusalem, Samaria and Cornelius’ Gentile household, gives Luke’s story pattern and sanction, “... der Bildung des vorösterlichen und der Reorganisation des nachösterlichen Jüngerkreises Begegnungen zwischen Jesus und Petrus vorausgehen.”⁴⁶ “Petrus ist nicht nur Jüngersprecher, nicht nur Repräsentant der Apostel, sondern er ist mit Blick auf seine

⁴¹ Dietrich refers to H. Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, Tübingen, 1964.

⁴² Dietrich, p. 10.

⁴³ p. 12.

⁴⁴ *JTS* 25 (1974), 170-173.

⁴⁵ Ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, an expression which is confined to Peter contexts in Acts 2:38, 8:20, 10:45, 11:17.

⁴⁶ Dietrich, p. 329.

Ausnahmeposition in dezidiierter Weise Apostel, der Apostel Jesu schlechthin.”⁴⁷ “Das Wirken des Petrus der Apostelgeschichte steht unter dem Aspekt der Erfahrung eines dreimaligen Pfingsten, nämlich jenes der Juden, der Samaritaner und der Heiden.”⁴⁸

The second and more recent monograph on Peter in the Lukan writings is Yvan Mathieu’s *La Figure de Pierre dans L’Œuvre de Luc*⁴⁹. Its subtitle, *une approche synchronique*, separates it from a diachronic treatment, which would seek to interpret Luke’s picture in relation to that of others. In contrast to the work of Dietrich, Mathieu does not approach the material as a redaction critic, who might interpret the Gospel material in relation to parallels in Mark, Q, possibly Matthew, or even John, and who in Acts, where the question of sources is itself problematic or hypothetical, would not avoid some diachronic study, for example with the Pauline letters, especially if one’s prime motivation were an account of the historic Peter or of the earliest Christianity, a concern that Mathieu’s study rules out.

Mathieu’s synchronic approach has the merit of starting with a given text, the whole of Luke-Acts as a unit and the text in its ‘final’ form (despite textual critical uncertainties in some of the Peter material, *e.g.* Lk 24:12). The interpretation of the given text is, of course, open to discussion. His acknowledged method is that of “la critique narrative”⁵⁰, which he regards as a new form of redaction-criticism. Aware that the term narrative criticism is open to a variety of interpretations, Mathieu does offer some signposts towards his meaning. He says that “la critique narrative distingue entre auteur réel et auteur implicite, lecteur réel et lecteur implicite” and the aim of the critic is “de lire le texte en s’identifiant au lecteur implicite”. The critic, he says, seeks to analyse

⁴⁷ p.329.

⁴⁸ p. 331.

⁴⁹ J. Gabalda, Paris, 2004, (hereafter ‘Mathieu’).

⁵⁰ pp 48-52.

‘characterisation’, ‘plot’ and ‘gaps’ in the plot, seeking to trace developments in the picture of Peter, to determine “la fonction de Pierre dans l’évolution du macro-récit”. He cites as mentors of this method, R. A. Culpepper⁵¹, M.A. Powell⁵², J-L. Ska⁵³ and Y. Bourquin & D. Marguerat⁵⁴, and as exemplars in Lukan studies, R. C. Tannehill⁵⁵, J-N. Aletti⁵⁶ and W. S. Kurz⁵⁷. Luke certainly is a better narrator than he is theological disputant. If Luke has any distinctive theological bias, it is likely discovered as implicit within his narratives. In his analysis of the figure of Peter in Luke-Acts, Mathieu is not concerned to suggest a context where this particular characterization and role would have merited the resources put into this longest NT composition; nor is he concerned to arrive at a biography of Peter, historical or fictional. He finds in Luke’s Peter three role models⁵⁸ - that of (any) disciple following Christ; that of a disciple entrusted with the ministry of responsibility (to be like Christ, one who serves); and then, also, as holder of a unique mandate to “strengthen his brothers”. In his conclusion⁵⁹ Mathieu does venture to draw some consequences for today’s Christian community. He believes that Luke’s Peter is a useful model for discipleship and for those exercising leadership and responsibility, though we should not rush too quickly to the ‘petrine’ ministry of the papacy, - “une invitation à ne pas enfermer trop vite la figure de Pierre dans nos débats contemporains au sujet du rôle de l’évêque de Rome.”

To the details of Mathieu’s analysis and interpretation, we will refer where appropriate in our own analysis. In assessing his synchronic approach as a contribution to

⁵¹ *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1983.

⁵² *What is Narrative Criticism?*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1990.

⁵³ *Our Fathers Have Told Us*, Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, 1990.

⁵⁴ *Pour lire les récits bibliques*, Cerf, Paris, Genève, Montréal, 1998; English translation by John Bowden, *How to Read Bible Stories*, SCM Press, London, 1999.

⁵⁵ *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, two volumes, 1986, 1990.

⁵⁶ *L’art de raconter Jésus Christ*, Seuil, Paris, 1989.

⁵⁷ *Reading Luke-Acts*, Westminster/John Knox, Louisville, 1993.

⁵⁸ Mathieu, pp 346f.

⁵⁹ pp 349-351.

Lukan studies we may agree with C. K. Barrett⁶⁰ who in his review of Mathieu most regrets the book's "limitations". While Barrett would like to see the Pauline epistles included in order to present a more complete "account of Peter's role in the first decades of Christianity" (and thereby devaluing Mathieu's approach which is literary rather than historical), I agree that it is a limitation that he does not attempt an answer to the question of why this presentation of Peter should have been made by Luke. Of what is the 'implied reader'⁶¹ of Luke-Acts being persuaded by Luke's account of Peter? Could we correctly interpret the text without suggesting an answer, leaving the text hanging in the air? This text, of all NT narratives, is the one where the real author and implied reader, Theophilus, are present, at least in the Prefaces. It is therefore surprising that Mathieu's monograph has no discussion of Lk 1:1-4 and only a brief reference to Ac 1:1-2⁶². While the content of the Prefaces can be dismissed as merely rhetorical convention with exaggerated claims, if the content is taken seriously, the Prefaces do open a chink for a more historical and diachronic approach, in discovering the significance of Peter in the Lukan writings. I am not persuaded that Mathieu succeeds in his objective of placing the development of the figure of Peter in the "macro-récit" of the total narrative of Luke-Acts. I think he gives too little attention to the significance of Peter/Paul parallels and to Peter's speeches in Acts.

There is, then, a contribution to be made in the multiplicity of contemporary Lukan studies in reviewing Luke's account of Peter and asking how it contributes to the grander context and purpose of Luke's two volumes. Luke follows the precedent of Mark in preaching a gospel of salvation which dawns in the Jewish Messiah, heralded by John the Baptist, and doing so by presenting a βίος⁶³ of Jesus. Luke understands this gospel and

⁶⁰ *JTS*, 57 (2006), 654-5.

⁶¹ Mathieu, pp 49f.

⁶² p.173; I cannot find his reference to Ac 1:1 on p.222, as listed on p. 414.

⁶³ Cf Richard A. Burridge, *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan and CUP, 1992, 2nd edition (from which citations are made) 2004.

the work of Jesus to include the post-resurrection spread of that gospel by Jesus' followers, and so added a narrative of that mission "to the ends of the earth", suggesting the pattern of how this came about. Luke shows that this happens through the intention, directive and empowerment of God. Peter is a bridge within this purpose, the principal earthly character with a significant role in both volumes, who is witness to the first volume's account of the ministry of Jesus and becomes the agent for the spread of the gospel in the second. The interplay of parallel lives, especially of Peter and Paul provides apostolic sanction for and continuity with Paul's Gentile missions. Key questions in our research have been Luke's treatment of Peter's denials of Jesus and how this has contributed to the presentation of the Christian message in Acts, and how Luke's account of the beginnings of mission to Gentiles squares with the different account of Paul. Our analysis of the role of Peter, unlike Dietrich's or Mathieu's, begins with Acts and then shows how material in the Gospel is shaped towards its fulfillment in Acts. While the complex nature of the Lukan narrative justifies an unashamedly eclectic use of the insights of a variety of critical tools and approaches,⁶⁴ and a synthesis of recent scholarly studies, my own approach is primarily to employ 'redaction critical' methods both in the narrow sense of examining changes made to sources, and in the broader sense of analysing the author's architecture of his whole narrative, identifying patterns and variations⁶⁵ and giving due weight to Luke's creative inventiveness. When applied to the Gospel, redaction-criticism involves a careful examination of the use Luke makes of the written source, Mark (whose priority is assumed as established), both affirming and changing what Mark wrote. It is probable that Luke also had as a written source the 'Q' material held in common with Matthew or derived from his reading of Matthew. More controversial is the question (especially in 5:1-11 and

⁶⁴ Cf. Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, p.31.

⁶⁵ Cf. Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, Scholars Press, University of Montana, 1974; M. D. Goulder, *Type and History in Acts*, S.P.C.K., London, 1964.

24:12, 36ff) of the relationship of Luke and John, whether John could be the source of Luke, or *vice versa*, or whether there is a common tradition behind both. In the broader sense of redaction-criticism, the OT was a major influence in the shaping of the narratives of Lk 1-2, whether or not any of the infancy narratives derived from a written source.

To apply a redaction-critical method in the narrower sense to Acts is altogether more speculative because there is no agreement about the nature of Luke's sources of information, oral, written, tradition or creation. While he appears well-informed about the Pauline missions, as a result of his own investigations or the use of a participant's account (the 'we' sections, if not by Luke himself), the account in the first half of Acts, including all the Peter episodes, is much more piecemeal. Barrett⁶⁶ in discussing Dibelius' work on Acts, argues that what he describes as *Formgeschichte* is not as concerned as in his work on the Gospels, with the form of units as it is with distinguishing traditional material and Luke's editorial redaction of it. Barrett regards "redaction-criticism, much used since his time", as "a better term for what Dibelius himself practised". We may with confidence describe as written sources of Acts (I prefer to call them 'influences'), the LXX – whether any of the citations of OT texts derive from a *testimonia* collection will be discussed in Chapter Three; Luke's Gospel and Mark's are also written sources. It will be observed several times in the course of our argument that in Acts Luke is influenced by material in Mark that he has not used in his parallel in the Gospel, most notably the transfer of evidence at the trial of Jesus in Mk 14:55-60, 63f, omitted at Lk 22:66-71, to the trial of Stephen in Ac 6:11-14, 7:1. Pervo⁶⁷ argues that "parallelism [between Acts and Mark] results not from the mere 'tweaking' of sources, but

⁶⁶C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 2 volumes, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1994, 2. lxxv.

⁶⁷ Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts – Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*, Polebridge Press, Santa Rosa, California, 2006, p.47.

from outright composition.” Some⁶⁸ would add the works of Josephus to the list of Luke’s sources. This relates especially to Luke’s historical errors with regard to the census (Lk 2:1ff, Ac 5:37), the anachronistic mentioning of Theudas in the same breath as Judas the Galilean (Ac 5:36ff), the famine (Ac 11:28), and the account of the death of Agrippa I (Ac 12:20ff, Josephus *Ant.* 19.343-50). If Luke had read, or heard read, some of the *Antiquities*, completed in c. 93, then this would provide a *terminus a quo* for the dating of Luke-Acts, but even an older scholar like Streeter who locates Luke in Rome⁶⁹, argues that “there is not the slightest improbability in the supposition that Luke had heard Josephus lecture in Rome” before the publication of *Antiquities*.

Other suggestions for Luke’s sources in Acts include lines of tradition collected by Luke from Philip the Evangelist⁷⁰, or from particular places, *e.g.* Caesarea or Antioch⁷¹. Whether the speeches, in many ways parallel to each other, derive from a common pre-Lukan source, possibly originally in Aramaic, will receive some attention in Chapter Three.

Most contentious is the claim by Pervo and others that Luke knew and used Paul’s letters – “It is almost impossible to claim that the author of Acts had not heard of (Paul’s) epistles”.⁷² The later we date Acts (and Pervo settles for a date around 115 CE) the more improbable it is, we may agree, because a keen interest in the writing, receiving and sharing of letters is demonstrated by the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch, but an earlier date would make it not at all ‘impossible’, and the existence of documents like the Christian homily known as 2 *Clement* from the second century, which cites many OT and

⁶⁸ *E.g.* Richard I. Pervo, *Acts, a Commentary*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 2009, p.12.

⁶⁹ B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, Macmillan, London, 1964, pp 557f.

⁷⁰ Barrett, *Acts*, I p. 51.

⁷¹ The case for an Antioch source was made by R. Bultmann, “Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apostelgeschichte” in J. B. Higgins (Ed.), *NT Essays in Memory of T. W. Manson*, Manchester University Press, 1959, 68-80.

⁷² Pervo, *Acts*, p.12.

Gospel texts but has no reference to Paul⁷³ makes a later ignorance of Paul not ‘impossible’. Evidence for the knowledge of a Pauline corpus of letters is hard to find. The author of *1 Clement* (95 CE?) had clearly read 1 Corinthians, but Metzger⁷⁴ in claiming Clement’s knowledge of Romans, Galatians, Philippians and Ephesians provides as evidence only *1 Clem* 35.5f as being like Rom 1:29-32. Lindemann⁷⁵ agrees that *1 Clement* provides evidence that 1 Corinthians was available in Rome and Corinth (47.1), and finds allusions to Pauline thought and language in Romans (especially δικαίουν in 1 Clem 31.1 – 32.4, and the image of the body in 37.5 – 38.1). Metzger also claims that Ignatius “certainly knew a collection of Paul’s Epistles, including (in order of frequency of his use of them) 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, Romans, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians and 1 Thessalonians.”⁷⁶ However, Ignatius’ allusions to Pauline letters other than 1 Corinthians which Metzger lists, are found only in the longer (and later) editions of Ignatius’ letters, with the exception that *Smyrnaeans* 1 could allude to Rom 1:3, (or, alternatively, both be regarded as traditional). On Ignatius’ letters, which he dates to the thirties of the second century, Lindemann⁷⁷ argues that *Eph.* 18-20 is in “literary dependence on 1 Cor 1:18-25” and he suggests some influences of Pauline language, but he concludes that “Neither *1 Clement* nor Ignatius show explicit use of Paul’s letters or theology”⁷⁸. The case for a widespread knowledge of a Pauline corpus at the end of the first century is unproven. In asking the question “Did Luke know any of the Pauline Letters?” M. D. Goulder⁷⁹ regards it as “futile to take up Acts again in any direct sense;

⁷³ *2 Clem* 11 seems to allude to the same unidentified text cited by Paul at 1 Cor 2:9.

⁷⁴ Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament, Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1987, pp 40ff.

⁷⁵ “Paul’s Influence on ‘Clement’ and Ignatius”, in Gregory & Tuckett (Edd), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, OUP, 2005, 3-18, p.12.

⁷⁶ *Canon of the NT*, pp 43ff.

⁷⁷ p. 19.

⁷⁸ p. 24.

⁷⁹ *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 13 (1986), 97-112.

our argument will have to depend largely on the Gospel.”⁸⁰ He goes on to argue that 1 Corinthians has influenced Luke at a number of points – the imagery of the πιστὸς οἰκονόμος rather than the πιστὸς δοῦλος of Mt 18:45 in the reply to Peter’s question (Lk 12:42), was influenced by 1 Cor 4:1ff; Luke introduces the laying of a foundation into the parable of the builder of a tower (Lk 14:29) from 1 Cor 3:10f⁸¹.

In presenting his argument that Luke did know and use the Pauline Epistles, Pervo presents a cumulative series of examples, beginning with Paul’s escape from Damascus (Ac 9:23-25), which he argues is based on 2 Cor 11:32-3, noting the common vocabulary διὰ τοῦ τείχους ... χαλάσαντες / ἐχαλάσθην διὰ τοῦ τείχους.⁸² Unsurprisingly, most of Pervo’s examples do concern Luke’s account of Paul. He does, however, regard the account of Peter’s challenging Ananias and Sapphira (Ac 5:1-11) as influenced by 1 Cor 5:3-5,13, as well as by Josh 7:1ff⁸³, altogether a much weaker example, because the only verbal connection with 1 Corinthians is the reference to Satan⁸⁴. It does indicate that Pervo’s view of the use Luke made of the Pauline letters is as an inspiration for his own creativity (Goulder-esque, one might say!), rather than as the redaction of a document. Another example would be Pervo’s argument that the account of the circumcision of Timothy, a companion of Paul (Ac 16:1-3) ‘replaces’ the non-circumcision of Titus, a companion of Paul in Gal 2:3-5.⁸⁵ Luke’s knowledge or ignorance of Galatians is the part of Pervo’s thesis that will particularly affect my interpretation of the beginning of Gentile mission and the Jerusalem Assembly. If he knew Galatians, then Luke must be judged at the least to have suppressed the incident in Antioch from his account of Peter. An intertextual examination of the accounts of Galatians and Acts will be undertaken in

⁸⁰ p. 98.

⁸¹ p.100.

⁸² Pervo, *Dating*, pp 60ff.

⁸³ pp 72f.

⁸⁴ See discussion in Chapter Four.

⁸⁵ pp 86ff.

Chapter Five but our initial supposition is that evidence is not forthcoming of a widespread knowledge of a collection of Pauline letters at the end of the first century, or for the account of Acts being secondary to Paul's own first-hand evidence. Acts makes no reference to Paul as a letter-writer, though letters of others are included (Ac 28:21, 23:23ff), and the deliverers of the letter from the Jerusalem Assembly were accompanied by Paul and Barnabas. Nowhere does Acts quote an extant letter of Paul.

The argument of our thesis proceeds with a cumulative series of studies of the various aspects of Peter's role in Acts. We describe and analyse each passage, identifying possible traditional material and any Lukan narrative traits or theological emphases which echo his first volume. My treatment explores the influences upon Luke's formation of the Peter narratives, from the expectations of current Hellenistic literature, and even more from the Greek Bible, especially the prophetic history narratives like Samuel-Kings, and the 'novels' like Tobit. Then we explore the contribution to the strategy and plan of Acts, especially where Peter's role will find parallels in Paul's, and compare any particular elements with other NT documents. We seek evidence for the influence of particular texts upon the early readers of Luke's narratives, in the literature of the second century. While there is a scarcity of evidence, I argue that there is enough to confirm that part of Luke's purpose is to bring the legacy of Paul's missions into harmony with the apostolic foundation, making this "the normative story of Christian origins"⁸⁶. After the survey of Acts we shall then examine material in Luke's Gospel that has to do with Peter, asking how it has been shaped and how it prepares for the continuation of the Gospel in the second volume.

⁸⁶ Pervo, *Acts*, p.18; also Luke T. Johnson, *The Writings of the NT*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1986, p.204.

Before embarking on a study of the discrete parts of Luke's picture of Peter, I need to establish the reasonableness of this hypothesis about the over-all intention of Luke, that is persuasively to describe a mission to all people as part of the Gospel, and not just a chronicle of history, or hagiography of particular leaders, or apologetic for Christianity, or case-notes for the defence of Paul, or even a manual for missionaries, though there is much in Luke's writings to inspire a devout life, to encourage believers in the face of opposition and suggestive of an emerging ecclesial structure. Essential to an evaluation of Luke's overall purpose are his beginnings and ends. The end of Acts reveals Paul geographically in the new centre, Rome, openly proclaiming the kingdom of God (Ac 28:23, 31; *cf* 1:3, Lk 4:43) and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ from Moses and the Prophets (Ac 28:23, 31; *cf* Lk 24:27) with boldness and without hindrance. He declares that this fulfills "the hope of Israel" (Ac 28:20) but because of the deafness of his Jewish audience to this message, adds that "this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles" (28:28). The readers' expectation of an account of Paul's trial and execution is displaced by an open-ended conclusion in which are held in tension the salvation sent to the Gentiles with the un-annulled promises to Israel.⁸⁷ What eventually happens to Paul, like what happens to Peter, is not the subject of Acts – rather it is the account of the spread of the apostolic Gospel (*cf.* 5:42, 8:4, 14, 40, 11:19f, 12:24 *etc.*). That Luke has this same goal also in his first volume is shown by the charge of Jesus in its closing episode "that repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in [the messiah's] name to all nations beginning from Jerusalem" (Lk 24:47); it is also seen in Luke's redaction of Mark's accounts of contacts with Gentiles and journeys outside of Israel, effectively postponing such for Acts; and it is seen in the shaping of the introductory section of the

⁸⁷ So Daniel Marguerat, "The Enigma of the Silent Closing of Acts (28:16-31)", in David P. Moessner (Ed.), *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel – Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*, Trinity Press International, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1999, pp 284ff.

Gospel which celebrates the fulfilment of the promises to Israel and anticipates the revelation to the Gentiles.

We need also to engage with discussions of the *genre(s)* and prefaces of Luke and Acts, with their implications for reading Luke whether as historiography, biography or fiction⁸⁸. In these writings we do see seeds of major developments in Christian literature which will blossom to meet the challenges and needs of subsequent generations – apologetics, combating heresy, the apocryphal *Acts* and *Gospels*, including the infancy gospels. Crucial to our case is the argument for the unity of Luke's two volumes, which both Dietrich and Mathieu assume, but has been re-opened from the perspectives of reception history and canonical criticism.

The Unity and Genre of Luke-Acts

It is to Henry Cadbury's *The Making of Luke-Acts*⁸⁹ that is attributed "the debut of this hyphenated title".⁹⁰ The importance of whether we see the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles as a two-volume work can hardly be underestimated for subsequent NT studies. What is meant by postulating the unity of Luke and Acts? A common authorship of the two volumes is accepted by most scholars, but a number of studies have questioned this, mostly on linguistic grounds. This view is taken by A. C. Clark⁹¹, by A. W. Argyle⁹² and most recently by Patricia Walters⁹³. John C. Hawkins⁹⁴

⁸⁸ With regard to *genre*, I am attracted by the thesis of Gregory E. Sterling, [*Historiography and Self-Definition – Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*, Brill, Leiden/ New York/ Köln, 1992]; with regard to biography, reference is made to Andrew C. Clark's study of Acts in relation to Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* [*Parallel Lives*, Paternoster Press, Carlisle, 2001]; Richard Pervo draws attention to features of Acts that have the appeal of a novel's entertaining power [*Profit with Delight*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1987; *Acts, a Commentary*, Fortress Press, 2009]; cf also the collected essays of Loveday Alexander, *Acts in its Ancient Literary Context*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 2006. Luke's subject is not Peter or Paul, but the Gospel!

⁸⁹ MacMillan, London, 1927.

⁹⁰ Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I Pervo *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*, Augsburg Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1993, p. 3.

⁹¹ *The Acts of the Apostles*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1933.

identified vocabulary differences between Luke and Acts⁹⁵. Sturdy thought conclusive was the use of κράβατ(τ)ος at Ac 5:15, 9:33, having avoided it in the Gospel.⁹⁶ Stephen Levinsohn's work *Textual Connections in Acts*⁹⁷ is referred to by Parsons and Pervo⁹⁸ and in particular the use in Acts of τε *solitarium*, some 75 times, but which is "not used in Luke's Gospel"⁹⁹. He appears to overlook Lk 24:20, but nevertheless identifies a feature of Acts style which at least advises caution in regarding the more episodic Luke and the more tightly woven Acts as from the same hand at the same time.

Walters' study is a thorough challenge to the presumption of authorial unity with a careful analysis of stylistic differences between Luke and Acts. She identifies sections in both works which are least likely to be influenced by sources used, namely 'seams and summaries'. In the light of prose compositional conventions from antiquity she offers a stylometric analysis, word-frequency, sentence length, rhythms, *etc.* Allowing for a normal degree of variation in accordance with statistical theory, she argues that "it is confirmed with a high degree of confidence and beyond reasonable doubt that the

⁹² "The Greek of Luke and Acts", *NTS* 20 (1973), 441-445; this is also the view of John Sturdy (in unpublished lectures at Salisbury & Wells Theological College, Holy Week 1976), arguing that the author of Acts was a pupil of Luke, writing pseudonymously to Theophilus.

⁹³ *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts – A Reassessment of the Evidence*, CUP 2009.

⁹⁴ *Horae Synopticae*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1909.

⁹⁵ He lists words and phrases characteristic of Luke in contrast to the other synoptic gospels, but in Acts three times as often as in Luke (13 items); words and phrases never in Luke but frequent in Acts (20 items); words and phrases rare in Luke but frequent in Acts (12 items); words and phrases frequent in Luke but never in Acts (6 items, including ἀγαπάω and ἀμαρτωλός); words and phrases frequent in Luke but rare in Acts (8 items).

⁹⁶ The term that is used by Mark for the paralytic's stretcher (2:4,9,11,12) and also at 6:55. This last verse has no parallel in Luke but Luke seems to avoid Mark's κράβατος at the parallel in Lk 5 – preferring first ἐπὶ κλίνης (v. 18), a 'minor' agreement with Matthew, and then, a full bedstead being unsuitable, κλινίδιον at 5:19, 24, omitting Mark's καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου at v. 23 (another 'minor' agreement with Matthew) and finally substituting ἐφ' ὃ κατέκειτο at v. 25. Κράβατος was a Macedonian rather than Attic term (Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, Macmillan, London, 1955, p.194) and regarded with distaste by Luke (so Sturdy) as a 'low' term (M. Goulder, *Luke, a New Paradigm*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1989, p. 331). Its use twice in Acts is evidence for Sturdy of a non-Lukan authorship, but for Goulder of the influence of Matthew on Luke's Gospel text rather than Luke's distaste.

⁹⁷ Scholars' Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1987.

⁹⁸ *Rethinking the Unity*, pp 54-7.

⁹⁹ Levinsohn, *Textual Connections*, p.174, cited by Parsons & Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity*, p. 56.

compositional elements analyzed herein actually differentiate Luke and Acts.”¹⁰⁰ Her thesis, if accepted, would require many contemporary studies in Luke-Acts, including this one, to be redone. While Hawkins’ recognition of differences might argue for a time lapse between Luke and Acts, the lapse for Walters can exceed the life-span of a single author. If we are persuaded by her thesis – and those whose delight is in the content and compositional structure of Luke and Acts might admit to an inner reluctance to give due weight to a statistical analysis which lists the pedigree of the trees but provides no help in comprehending or admiring the forest – then we would have to account for the similarities between Luke and Acts and especially for theological continuity in another way. The author of the opening sentence of Acts clearly intended it to be read as a sequel to Luke, and this Pseudo-Luke would be the author of much of what we present in this thesis as Luke’s purpose and strategy, drawn from a reading of Luke and imposed on his account of the earliest church. But we would offer as a counter question the evidence (in Chapter Seven especially) of Luke’s Gospel being shaped in expectation of Acts, and the author of Acts’ use of material from Mark left over from Luke’s redaction of Mark but used in Acts.

Drawing attention to the differences between Luke and Acts, does appear to rule out Luke-Acts as a single composition broken into two simply for convenience, probably because of the lengths of scrolls (assuming the codex had not yet come into general use). Analogous would be Josephus’ *Against Apion* in two books. The first book ends, “This book, however, having already run to a suitable length, I propose at this point to begin a second...”. Book 2 then begins, “In the first volume of this work, my most esteemed Epaphroditus...”¹⁰¹, reminiscent of Ac 1:1. Philo’s *On the Life of Moses* is also in two books, with the first ending with a summary of the reflection so far and anticipating what is to come (I:334). The second book begins by referring to the first and its contents

¹⁰⁰ Walters, *Assumed Authorial Unity*, p.191.

¹⁰¹ Josephus, *Against Apion*, I.320, 2.1, Loeb translation.

and introduces the sequel “to the affairs which follow those others in due order.”¹⁰² In contrast to Josephus and Philo there are differences of subject matter and style between Luke and Acts. The presentation of teaching material in Luke through sayings and parables gives way in Acts to extensive and structured speeches, though the Nazareth sermon in Lk 4 could count as a similar speech. With regard to style, the fine craftsmanship of the story-teller’s art that we see in the Prodigal Son, the Good Samaritan and the walk to Emmaus in Luke, is to be found in Acts in the narratives of the Ethiopian eunuch, Peter’s release from prison and Paul’s shipwreck. Luke can be read as complete in itself, with the possible exception of 24:49. There is the striking *inclusio* of beginning and ending the narrative in the temple (1:8, 24:52). Acts, too, can be read as complete in itself. Yet difference of style does not necessarily imply disjuncture of composition. Luke was able to switch styles within the single text of the Gospel – from the preface to the birth narratives to the main body of the text. If Luke were aiming to tell the story of Christian origins, a progress which he believed to be under divine control, then he had models enough in the Biblical histories, Samuel and Kings, Esdras and Maccabees, which writings have no problem in incorporating a variety of styles and literary forms.

The question of the unity of Luke and Acts is tied up with the vexed and slippery discussion of *genre(s)*. Luke’s Gospel forms a parallel of type to Matthew in that it revises Mark (whose priority we assume in this thesis), offering a more complete picture of Jesus, including his birth, his teaching and resurrection appearances. It can be classed as biography.¹⁰³ Acts is some sort of historiography, though it would align itself more with OT historiography because of the theological or prophetic stance of the ‘omniscient

¹⁰² Yonge’s translation.

¹⁰³ Burridge, *What are the Gospels?*, p.212 “while [the synoptic gospels] may well form their own sub-genre because of their shared content, the synoptic gospels belong within the overall genre of βίολι.” “Ancient βίολι was a flexible genre, having strong relationships with history, encomium and rhetoric, moral philosophy and the concern for character” (p.67).

narrator', than with Hellenistic learned historiography. It could be linked to a βίος by being an account of the followers of the one who was subject of the biography, or as itself a βίος of the church (analogous to Dikaiarchus' biographical work on Greece).¹⁰⁴ Acts belongs to the world of 'popular' literature, and in places overlaps with the 'entertainment' value of the novel¹⁰⁵. Yet Acts has about it a seriousness of commitment, to persuade the reader of the importance and legitimacy of what is narrated, even if that story is shaped by the author's bias. Gregory E. Sterling persuasively links it with the *genre* of a history of a minority people that seeks to define itself in terms of the majority culture. "I would not go so far," he concludes, "as to call (Luke-Acts) an *Antiquitates Christianae*. The author would have to retell the OT from a Christian perspective to be considered a full equivalent of Josephus' *magnum opus*. It does, however, use the same conventions to relate the full story of a new group."¹⁰⁶ Richard Pervo¹⁰⁷ judges that "apologetic history is not an inappropriate label for the author's aims", but he argues for the term "legitimizing narrative", primarily because he rightly sees Luke and Acts as addressed to those already sympathetic to the Christian movement. Though Luke's work is not on the scale of Josephus', we should note that Luke does retell some of the OT story christologically (Ac 7, 13:16-25) as well as finding the OT prophetic hopes fulfilled in Jesus. Josephus in his later works is offering a Greek-speaking audience an account of the Jewish people, the antiquity and superiority of their scriptures in a way alert to a supernatural hand guiding, rewarding and punishing, and (in *Against Apion*) engaging in a defence of Judaism and its history. While not explicitly evangelising, Josephus' hope could be that readers might become 'God-fearers', proselytes, or at least better informed about and admirers of the

¹⁰⁴ Burridge, *What are the Gospels?*, p.238; Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts*, Crossroad, New York, 1997, pp 6-17, 255-258.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Richard Pervo, *Profit with Delight*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1987.

¹⁰⁶ Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, p. 387.

¹⁰⁷ "Israel's Heritage and Claims upon the Genre(s) of Luke and Acts", in David P. Moessner (Ed), *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel*, 127-143, pp 135f.

Jewish faith. In this there is an analogy with the intention of Luke's work, to draw followers to 'the Way'. Streeter¹⁰⁸ describes the aim of Acts as "to trace the transition of Christianity from a sect of Judaism into a *world religion*".

The easiest way to account for the differences of language and style between Luke and Acts, while recognising so much similarity, is to see Acts as indeed written as a sequel to Luke, perhaps after some years. The opening words of Acts look back to Luke, and there is so much that is reminiscent of the Gospel, or knowledge of it assumed. The Pentecost Spirit-baptism stands structurally as a parallel to the Baptist's ministry and the baptism of Jesus (1:5). The restored Twelve are commissioned and then the Seven, perhaps echoing the appointment by Jesus of the Twelve and then a further Seventy (or seventy-two). Acts ends with the trials, shipwreck and miraculous survival of Paul and his ministry, in a way that may parallel the trials, passion and resurrection of Jesus. Even if we were to reject common authorship, a commentary on Acts would have to interpret it inter-textually with Luke, as a pseudo-sequel. More interesting, however, is the question of whether Luke's Gospel is written to create the expectation of that sequel, so that it may be described, *inter alia*, as the preface to Acts.¹⁰⁹ The expectation of 'power from on high' on the disciples (Lk 24:49) and the commission to witness beginning from Jerusalem (v.48), is carried out programmatically in Acts (1:8). Also Luke, like the other Gospels, predicts persecution for the followers of Jesus, from synagogue and civil powers; Lk 21:12 adds prisons to the predictions, which are fulfilled several times in Acts (4:3, 5:18, 12, 16:24, 22:4, 23:10 onwards). The reference to 'kings and governors' before whom testimony shall be given, is fulfilled in Acts in Paul's speeches before Agrippa, Felix and Festus, as well as being the pattern of Luke's passion, recalled in Ac 4:27. The

¹⁰⁸ Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p.531, emphasis added.

¹⁰⁹ Cf C. K. Barrett, "The Third Gospel as a Preface to Acts: Some Reflections", in Edd F. Van Segbroeck *et al.*, *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, Louvain University Press, 1992, 2.1451-66.

charge of false witnesses at the trial of Stephen (Ac 6:13f) would seem to reflect those details in Mark's passion which Luke's passion does not include. The issues of the food laws as discussed in Mk 7:14ff, a section of Mark that Luke omits, may be the background of Ac 10 – Mk 7:19 καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα, Ac 10:15 ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν. Arguably the Markan material has been 'kept over' for use in Acts. In Ac 1:5 the baptism with the Holy Spirit foretold by John the Baptist (Lk 3:16) is explicitly linked to the Pentecost event. At Lk 3:16 it is also called a baptism with fire (as also Matthew, but not Mark). From the following words the natural interpretation would be the fire of judgement or purgation. But the fact that the Pentecost story involves fire may well lead us to interpret the baptism of fire as fulfilled in Pentecost. The fire which Jesus says he is bringing to the earth along with his baptism (Lk 12:49) could also then be interpreted with reference to Pentecost. Marguerat calls the three fire references 'une chaîne pentecostale'.¹¹⁰

The strongest evidence that Luke intended from the beginning to add Acts to Luke, has to do with Gentiles. It is a well-known feature of Luke that the expeditions into Gentile territory that we find in Mark (to the region of Tyre, 7:24, Decapolis v. 31, Caesarea Philippi 8:27) are omitted in Luke. The Gentile centurion of Capernaum who wants Jesus to heal his servant, in contrast to Matthew, is portrayed as a lover of the synagogue and does not come into direct contact with Jesus but sends to him a deputation of Jewish elders. If this is redactional work then it is surprising in the light of the hope of 13:29, unless Luke *intended* to go on to tell how the Gentiles came to be included in the Gospel, *i.e.* in Acts. A key text in this regard is Simeon's¹¹¹ prophecy in Lk 2:32. If Jesus is to be, in words reminiscent of Deutero-Isaiah, especially Is 49:6 which Paul cites at Ac

¹¹⁰ "Luc-Actes: une unité à construire," in J. Verheyden (Ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, Leuven University Press, 1999, p. 69.

¹¹¹ In using the transliteration of this name that is usual in the English versions, one might enter a plea for the alternative transliteration 'Symeon', which draws attention to the upsilon in this name, as distinct from the iota in Simon.

13:47, “a light for revelation to the Gentiles”, as well as “for glory to your people Israel”, it is hard to see how this will be the case without the story of Acts. When one adds to Simeon’s words the evidence of Luke’s use of other OT texts, then the case for the Acts sequel conceived from the beginning is much strengthened. At Lk 3:5f, Luke extends the citation of Is 40 beyond Mark’s, apparently to include the line that “all flesh shall see the salvation of God”. In the text for the programmatic Nazareth sermon (4:16ff) there is no specific indication of the Lord’s favour going beyond Israel, but in the sermon Jesus emphasises, much to the displeasure of his audience, the help that the prophets Elijah and Elisha brought to two foreigners. The parable of the two sons (15:11ff) in which the elder son echoes the attitude of the Pharisees (15:2) is open to an interpretation that suggests the openness of the Gentiles to the Gospel. In the parable of the feast, the second extension of the invitation (14:23) may implicitly suggest Gentiles. The conclusion of the parable of the vineyard (20:16) is almost explicit.

In the pattern of Acts it is divine initiative that leads Peter to preach the gospel to Cornelius’ household, and the repeated pattern for Paul is to preach first to the synagogue, and then, when repulsed, to the Gentiles. The concluding scenes of Acts see Paul justifying his mission to Jews in terms of ‘the hope of Israel’ (28:20). It is here that Luke cites the text from Is 6 with regard to the deafness of Israel to the gospel, with the conclusion that salvation has now been sent to the Gentiles (28:28). Luke has shortened the reference to Is 6 that he found in Mk 4:12 (Lk 8:10), in contrast to Matthew who expands it, but arguably “has been saving up this quotation as the climax to the repeated theme that Paul was opposed by the Jews but found a better hearing among the Gentiles.”¹¹² The enlightening of the Gentiles which Acts describes does not mean that the

¹¹² B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, SCM Press, London, 1961, p.164, quoted with approval by L. Alexander, “Reading Luke-Acts from Back to Front”, in J. Verheyden (Ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, pp 429f

hope of Israel's glory and salvation has been abandoned. The hope of the promises to David and the Abrahamic covenant feature strongly in the birth narratives. James, concluding the Assembly of Jerusalem (Ac 15:13ff) acknowledges that God, through Peter (whom, strikingly, he calls Simeon), Barnabas and Paul, has taken a people from among the Gentiles, and, citing Amos, interprets this as part of the restoration of the Davidic tabernacle. I Howard Marshall¹¹³ detects five theological themes overlapping Luke and Acts, namely Jesus as proclaimer and proclaimed; the sending out of apostles and witnesses; the Kingdom and the Messiah; discipleship; salvation offered to all. He argues that Luke "conceived of the two books right from the beginning as complementary parts of one, unified work."¹¹⁴ It is my thesis that the total picture of Peter requires a continuous reading, and that the first volume was already shaped with that continuity in mind, and so contributes evidence for the view of the two volumes as a literary whole.

Much of the recent questioning of the unity of Luke and Acts has arisen from the reception history of the two volumes¹¹⁵, and the consequent canonical¹¹⁶ way of reading them. It is a fact that Acts is never found in the manuscript tradition with Luke alone, and rarely with Gospels alone – the third century Chester Beatty p⁴⁵ has sections of

Cf also Patrick E. Spencer, "The Unity of Luke-Acts: A Four-Bolted Hermeneutical Hinge", *Currents in Biblical Research*, 5 (2007), 341-366, p. 353.

¹¹³ "'Israel' and the Story of Salvation: One Theme in Two Parts", in Moessner, (ed.), *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel*, pp 340-357.

¹¹⁴ p. 341.

¹¹⁵ E.g. C. Kevin Rowe, "Literary Unity and Reception History: Reading Luke-Acts as Luke and Acts", *JSNT*, 29 (2007), 449-457; Andrew F. Gregory & C. Kevin Rowe (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, University of South Carolina Press, 2010.

¹¹⁶ Robert Wall, "A Canonical Approach to the Unity of Acts and Luke's Gospel", in Gregory & Rowe (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity*, 172-191. If Acts is with the Pauline corpus, it has the effect of appropriating Paul to the apostolic rule of faith; if with the catholic epistles the effect is to form an *Apostolos* for the Eastern Church to correct a misguided use of the Pauline canon. However this is hardly an argument for the original purpose of Acts, whose publication could have been the stimulus for the collecting of the Pauline letters. This is to argue the opposite of David Trobisch, "Acts as Narrative Commentary on the Letters of the NT", in Gregory & Rowe (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity*, 119-127, which argues the letters were widely known before Acts was penned.

Acts after sections of all four Gospels¹¹⁷. It is never next to Luke. The third century papyrus p⁵³ has a fragment of Matthew with a fragment of Acts. Acts is more usually found with the Pauline or Catholic epistles, and in the case of the list of books in Codex Claromontanus, after Revelation, although here Luke is the fourth gospel. In the Muratorian Canon the Acts of all the Apostles is described after John's Gospel. Justin's *First Apology* 50.12 refers to Jesus after Easter teaching apostles from the prophecies, and being seen by them ascending into heaven, and their receiving 'power' sent to them and their going to teach every race. While this could be said to be a summary of the end of Luke and the beginning of Acts, by no means is it either a quotation or a clear reference to either book or a continuous reading of them¹¹⁸. Irenaeus' great treatise *Against Heresies* makes use of the NT writings to refute the various heresies, and he cites extensive parts of the Gospels and of Acts, as well as some of the epistles. He argues for the four-fold Gospel¹¹⁹ and the testimony of the apostles, particularly citing Peter and Paul in Acts, as a double source of true doctrine. Arguing against Marcionites, on the one hand, and Ebionites on the other, Irenaeus is keen to argue for a united doctrine, based partly on the use made of both Luke and Acts, which have a common authorship.

“God set forth very many Gospel truths through Luke's instrumentality, which all should esteem it necessary to use, in order that all persons, following his subsequent testimony, which treats upon the acts and doctrine of the apostles, and holding the unadulterated rule of truth, may be saved.”¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ N-A²⁷ p.686; cf Markus Bockmuehl, “Why not let Acts be Acts? In Conversation with C. Kavin Rowe”, *JSNT* 28 (2005) pp163-166.

¹¹⁸ Barrett, *Acts* 1.42 says that the Ascension was becoming part of the Baptismal creed by the time of Justin, though more from supposition than from evidence.

¹¹⁹ 3.8 argues for four Gospels, neither more nor less, on the grounds of “four zones of the world”, and the four living creatures before God's throne in Rev. 4:7.

¹²⁰ 3.15.

David E. Smith's study *The Canonical Function of Acts*¹²¹ makes a strong case for the pivotal role of Acts in the emerging NT canon of scripture, not because of its association with Luke's Gospel but because it linked "the OT texts with the teaching of Jesus, the Jerusalem apostles and Paul, and by legitimizing a form of post-apostolic authority – and all by means of its pneumatology"¹²² against various heresies. Smith exaggerates the extent to which Acts provides a link with the catholic epistles (before which it is located in some canonical lists), comparable with the Pauline epistles. If Smith is right that the catholic bishops in 'apostolic' succession could "claim the exclusive right of biblical interpretation *vis-à-vis* their opponents"¹²³, then we might accuse them of claiming too much from Acts which recognises successors only to the apostolic mission, not to the apostles themselves. I do feel that Smith's assertion that Acts gave claim on the Spirit to the catholics rather than, say, to the Montanists, is drawing attention to the way that experience of the Spirit in Acts is infrequent, and always confirming the apostolic mission. Smith's thesis looks at Acts from the position of its reception and usefulness for the emerging canon of scripture. I want to argue that much of what he (and the Fathers like Irenaeus) found useful is indeed part of the *intention* of Acts in its writing, to display the harmony of OT texts, the Gospel of Jesus, Peter, Paul and James, united by the Holy Spirit.

It is clear that Irenaeus accepted both Luke and Acts as having a common authorship, but he does not appear to have read them as a single continuous narrative. He quotes from Lk 24:25ff in 3.16.5 and from Ac 1 in 3.12.1, but not as a continuous narrative. As with most patristic writers, he accepts the NT documents as true, both

¹²¹ Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 2002.

¹²² p.15.

¹²³ p.18.

factually and in terms of teaching, and reads them inter-textually. Mikeal Parsons¹²⁴ argues for “Hearing Acts as a Sequel to a Multiform Gospel” rather than Luke alone. Evidence for Acts developing material in Mark that is omitted in Luke agrees with similar observations I make in this thesis, but only requires a Markan *Vorlage* to Luke; Parsons’ attempt to treat the Acts account of the demise of Judas as a corrective explanation of Matthew’s is hardly persuasive. Andrew Gregory¹²⁵ recognises that “(t)he modern scholarly approach to Luke-Acts, which reads each volume in the light of the other and consciously excludes reference to other texts, is ... something of a novelty in the reception of Luke and Acts.”¹²⁶ Because he acknowledges a pattern of correspondences between the two volumes, he thinks the author already intended to write the second volume as he wrote the first,¹²⁷ and he argues for a two-reading strategy, like Irenaeus’, of Luke canonically one of the Gospels, and Acts with the apostolic writings, yet also reading Luke-Acts as a unity. While there is no evidence internal or external for the publication of Luke and Acts as a single work, the possibility of their being heard together by the first hearers of Luke and Acts, without knowledge of other NT writings, is proposed by Luke Timothy Johnson,¹²⁸ with the result that the modern construct Luke-Acts is the recovery of a unity lost long ago. It is my intention in this thesis about Peter in Luke and Acts, to add weight to the view that we are indeed reading the two volumes as Theophilus would have heard them, the first volume preparing for the second, the second echoing and completing the first, towards a presentation of the whole Gospel of Jesus which includes its proclamation to the ends of the earth. The continuity of the two volumes is especially important in

¹²⁴ “Historical and Hermeneutical Reflections on Acts, Luke and the ΠΟΛΛΟΙ”, Gregory & Rowe (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity*, 128-152.

¹²⁵ “The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts”, *JSNT* 29.4 (2007), 459-72.

¹²⁶ p. 446.

¹²⁷ p. 467.

¹²⁸ “Literary Criticism of Luke-Acts: Is Reception-History Pertinent?” *JSNT* 28.2 (2005), 159-162; also in Gregory & Rowe (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity*, 66-69.

respect of Luke's treatment of Peter's denials and repentance, as well as determining the long-term role of Peter as securing the proclamation of the apostolic gospel world-wide.

Author, Audience and Date

We have attempted to demonstrate that the unity of Luke and Acts, a unity of authorship, purpose and narrative design, is a reasonable supposition. This is first suggested by the prefaces of Luke and Acts (Lk 1:1-4, Ac 1:1f), in which the author writes in the first person, and the addressee is named, Theophilus, who, according to Lk1:4, has already had some instruction (κατηχήθης as a catechumen?) with regard to the subject matter of at least the first volume. The authorial first person has parallels in Greek literature, though it is less common in historians (like Herodotus or Thucydides).¹²⁹ The author is anonymous in both volumes. By convention we are calling him Luke, without necessarily wishing to identify him with the Luke of the Pauline epistles, or as included in the 'we' passages in Acts. While the author draws on some knowledge of Paul and his journeys, and no biographer of Paul manages completely to dispense with Acts, his understanding of Paul's theology seems uncertain¹³⁰ and we have already argued that his acquaintance with Paul's letters is nil or possibly limited to 1 Corinthians. If we date Acts at the end of the first century, it is just possible for the author as a young man to have known Paul. Dating NT documents is notoriously difficult, an exercise in building on moving sands. Most would date Luke-Acts later than Mark (pre-70?), though few would regard Acts as up-to-date in its account, written soon after Paul's arrival and house-arrest in Rome, the latest event it narrates. Knowledge of Acts is uncertain to prove before

¹²⁹ Loveday C. A. Alexander, "The Preface to Acts and the Historians", in Ben Witherington III (Ed.), *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, CUP, 1996, p.84; in the preface to Ecclesiasticus the translator, the grandson of the author, uses the first person.

¹³⁰ E.g. Ac 13:39.

Irenaeus.¹³¹ *1 Clement* 2.1 may refer to what Ac 20:35 regards as a saying of Jesus. At 18.1, Clement's composite quotation of Ps 89:21 and 1 Sam 13:14 could be drawn from Ac 13:22 or from a *testimonia* collection. Ignatius *To Smyrnaeans* 3.3 (c. 107?; Ignatius died c. 115) refers to the risen Jesus eating and drinking with the disciples, like Lk 24: 24ff and Ac 10:41, but this is not a citation. Polycarp's *Philippians* 1.2 (c. 108?; Polycarp died c. 155) has a phrase ὃν ἡγείρεν ὁ θεός λύσας τὰς ὥδιναις τοῦ ἔδου, strikingly similar to Ac 2:24 ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν λύσας τὰς ὥδιναις τοῦ θανάτου, in the rendering of Ps 16(17):6; it may rely on Acts or both on a *testimonia* collection. The use of the term ἔλευσις for the first coming of Jesus in Polycarp *Phil* 6.3 and *1 Clement* 17.1 may betray knowledge of Ac 7:52. The Longer Ending of Mark has several similarities to Luke-Acts but is of uncertain date. We shall argue in Chapter Three that Justin (c. 150) shows knowledge of Acts, but would not wish to follow O'Neill¹³² into dating Acts as late as the early Apologists. Marcion (c. 145?) used Luke's Gospel or an early version of it, but shows no knowledge of Acts. The usefulness of Acts in challenging Marcionism accounts for the little use of Acts before then (so Barrett), or provides the occasion for Acts to be written (so Tyson¹³³). Pervo, as the sub-title of his monograph suggests, dates Acts *Between Evangelists and Apologists*, around 115. In arguing for the unity of Luke and Acts we have already regarded Acts as part of the Gospel and so with the 'Evangelists'. We have argued that Luke may show some acquaintance with the works of Josephus and so give an earliest date in the 90s, but are proposing a different relation to the Pauline epistles than Pervo does. We regard Luke's work as belonging in the post-apostolic era before the apologists and before heresy had become a major concern. In type Luke's Gospel is closer to Matthew than to the Apocryphal Gospels. Acts' presentation of Paul

¹³¹ Barrett, *Acts*, I pp 34ff examines possible references.

¹³² John C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*, SPCK, London, 1961.

¹³³ Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*, University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, 2006.

fits with Ephesians and the Pastorals. The recent substantial commentary on Acts by Keener¹³⁴ engages with Pervo's arguments and finds a date in the first century more fitting the evidence.

Luke's Greek is competent and his vocabulary richer than most of the NT authors. He probably had received some formal education, perhaps in the techniques of the rhetorical handbooks, the *Progymnasmata*, and he cites two Greek poets¹³⁵ but it is the literature of the Bible, rather than the Greek classics which are his cultural *lingua franca*. His greatest skill is as a story-teller. His genius is that characteristically Lukan narratives which seem complete within themselves, nevertheless tessellate in the grander narrative.

A named dedication is "not common in historical writing", but the first extant example is Josephus' *Antiquities* dedicated to Epaphroditus.¹³⁶ Theophilus was a real name in the Hellenistic world, used by both Gentiles and Jews,¹³⁷ but could also for Luke have carried its meaning to stand for all potential readers of his work – 'lover of God/ Godfearer' or 'loved by God'.¹³⁸ That he is called *κράτιστε* (Lk 1:3), just as the Procurators are politely addressed in Ac 23:26; 24:3; 26:25, would indicate a high social status – it was later used for a Roman *eques*.¹³⁹ Luke assumes some familiarity with the Greek OT and the Preface suggests that Theophilus has had some instruction in the events of the Gospel. I regard him as a real person, a God-fearer drawn towards Christianity;

¹³⁴ Craig S. Keener, *Acts, an Exegetical Commentary*, Volume 1, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2012, pp 383-401.

¹³⁵ Aratus, *Phaenomena* 5, (possibly known to Luke through the Hellenistic Jew Aristobulus, fragment 4) at Ac 17:28b; also 17:28a from Epimenides, though this is disputed – see Barrett, *Acts*, p. 847; Pervo, *Acts*, p. 438; Lake in *Beginnings*, 5.246-251.

¹³⁶ Alexander, *The Preface to Acts and the Historians*, p.85.

¹³⁷ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, Doubleday, New York, 1981 I p. 299.

¹³⁸ Cf. note by Nicholas King in his translation of the NT, Kevin Mayhew, Stowmarket, 2004, pp 135, 273. The latter interpretation would provide a parallel with the (idealised?) beloved disciple of the Fourth Gospel.

¹³⁹ I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, Paternoster Press, Exeter, 1978p.43.

within the narrative I suggest the character that is drawn most like the real Theophilus in his status and sympathies is Cornelius¹⁴⁰.

The Prefaces

While the structure of the Preface to Luke is a formal classical period, the syntax of the resumptive Preface to Acts has a hanging μέν without a subsequent δέ, and so is not detached from the narrative. Alexander's comment is "I know of no parallel which can match the oddity of Luke's opening sentence: even in the closest parallels, the distinction between authorial comment and narration is matched by a clear syntactical break."¹⁴¹ Her persuasive research on the prefaces identified them as more suited to a 'scientific' or technical work than a history or biography but as being appropriate for a 'historical monograph' with limited scope.¹⁴² The Preface to Luke acknowledges the work of "many" predecessors, and before them the oral tradition of eye-witnesses and preachers or teachers. This is demonstrably true of the Gospel (use of Mark, Q or Matthew); whether this claim applies also to Acts involves us in speculation about the nature of the sources Luke may have used. Luke expresses his intention to set down a narrative, διήγησις, of events "that have been fulfilled among us" πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν; this rather solemn expression may well indicate that God has now brought to pass the hopes and prophecies of the OT in the life and death of Jesus¹⁴³ and, furthermore, the 'us' can include subsequent believers like Luke and his readers, effectively making this the Preface to the two volumes, with only an imperfect resumptive preface at the beginning of Acts. The

¹⁴⁰ Barrett, *Acts*, II pp lxxixf, refers to J. B. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*, (Columbia, South Carolina, 1992) that the implied reader is "similar to those characters in Acts that are called 'Godfearers'" (p. 36), and Barrett adds "The two centurions (of Luke 7 and Acts 10, 11) serve as good examples".

¹⁴¹ *The Preface to Acts and the Historian*, p.94.

¹⁴² pp 95ff, 101; cf her doctoral thesis, Oxford, 1977, published as *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1*, CUP, 1993; cf also her "Formal Elements and Genre: Which Greco-Roman Prologues Most Closely Parallel the Lukan Prologues?", in Moessner (Ed.), *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel*, pp 9ff.

¹⁴³ Marshall, *Luke*, p.41; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, pp 293f; Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1996, p 34; Alexander however, regards this as "a *locus classicus* for theological over interpretation".

Preface to Acts describes the content of the first volume as being what Jesus began to do and teach, ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν. While this use of ἄρχομαι may be no more than as auxiliary verb, if its meaning is pressed, then the contents of Acts constitute the continuing deeds and teaching of Jesus after the Ascension,¹⁴⁴ through eye-witnesses (like Peter) and those who followed them (like Paul) all the way to Rome. Much in the Prefaces merits attention, but I would finally comment on the term καθεξῆς in Lk 1:3. All five NT uses of this term are in Luke-Acts, and of particular interest to us is the use of the term as a narratological referent in Ac 11:4, where Peter is stating the way he came to understand the significance of what had happened in Cornelius' house. David Moessner¹⁴⁵ relates this to Peter's mention of beginning(s) in 11:15 (cf 15:7), where Peter refers to Pentecost, but immediately goes on to cite the promise of Jesus in the words of the Baptist, (Ac 1:5, Lk 3:16). "The narrator has Peter take the reader back not only to Pentecost as the origin of his behavior with Cornelius, but to an even more fundamental beginning for the fruition of Pentecost – to the beginning of the first volume."

Luke sets the stage

Whether or not the Preface to the Gospel can be treated as the preface to both volumes, I want to argue that the introductory part of the Gospel prepares Theophilus both to receive Jesus as the fulfilment of the OT promise but also sets the stage for him to receive Acts as the continuation of that narrative¹⁴⁶. The introductory part of the Gospel

¹⁴⁴ Barrett, *Acts*, p.66.

¹⁴⁵ "The Appeal and Power of Poetics (Luke 1:1-4)", in Moessner (Ed.), *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel*, pp 100-103.

¹⁴⁶ F. Gerald Downing's essay, "Theophilus's First Reading of Luke-Acts", in C. M. Tuckett (Ed), *Luke's Literary Achievement*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, pp 91-109, imagines such a hearing, possibly at a symposium, against a hellenistic background.

leads into the designation of a mission to Peter; the continuation of the narrative in Acts is presided over by Peter.

After the fine period that is the Preface (Lk 1:1-4), as always noticed, the narrative itself changes dramatically into a Septuagintal style, depicting an archaic world, the best of Israel's piety in an idealised way. Luke's audience is plunged into a world of the temple, its priests, worship and pilgrim feasts. We are told of visions of angels who give detailed information and instruction; there is prophesying and a widow prophetess; there are prayers, canticles, nazirite vows. There are echoes of unexpected or miraculous births in the OT, of Isaac to Sarah and Samuel to Hannah, and of the dedication of the child Samuel in the sanctuary. The pious poor speak of Israel's hopes, or the work of Elijah *redivivus* (1:17), the renewal of the Davidic monarchy (1:32f, 69), the inversion of the present order (1:52f), the redemption and consolation of Israel and Jerusalem (2:25, 38) and the coming of a saviour (1:69, 2:11), the bringing of good news of peace (2:10, 14, 29, 1:79) – terms that question the *Pax Romana* that the empire had brought, but convert the Abrahamic covenant (1:55, 73) into a matter, not of land, but of serving God in holiness and righteousness (*cf.* Wisdom 9:3) every day. Indeed, so other-worldly is the atmosphere of Lk 1-2, that the entrance onto the stage of a major player of world history who was feted by Virgil and others as the *quasi* messianic bringer of that *pax*, Caesar Augustus, comes as a surprise. Luke's masterly stroke makes the emperor's decree for a world-wide census (almost certainly the historiographer's error at 2:1f, as also the dating of the rising of Judas the Galilean, Ac 5:17) ensure that the parents of the true messianic child are in the Biblically right place for his birth.

Theophilus' imagination would have stirred with the idealised picture of pious Israelites, rekindling the OT's history of patriarchs, priests, prophets, judges, and from the LXX, too, the fictional piety of Tobit, Judith and Daniel. The ancient and deep roots of

Jewish religion were part of its appeal in the Hellenistic world where new-fangled religion may be despised, and Jewish historians were keen, so Sterling argues, to offer 'apologetic historiography' for their people; so Luke is claiming by his depiction of Christian origins, "continuity with a tradition recognised for its antiquity"¹⁴⁷. But Luke is already doing more in Lk 1-2; he is already attuning the ears of Theophilus to the religious community he will later describe in Acts, where, much more than in the bulk of the Gospel's narratives, visions, auditions and angelic interventions are found. Visions convey detailed information; angels take action as well as communicate messages – freeing the apostles (5:19) and Peter (12) from prison. In the early chapters of Acts, where the Church is identified with the Jerusalem community of believers in Jesus, the Temple is the venue for prayer (3:1), like the crowd waiting for Zachariah's priestly blessing after the offering of incense, and for teaching (like Jesus as listener and questioner [Lk 2:46f] and teacher, [21:37]).

In their structure, the infancy narratives of Lk 1-2 are a balance of parallels with variations. The miraculous births of John and Jesus are each announced by an angelic vision; the two mothers-to-be are related and meet with the pre-natal John leaping with life and joy at the coming of the pre-natal Lord for whom John will be herald. The parallel continues with both John and Jesus as teachers and with their martyr executions by the authorities. This technique of parallels with variations is a marked feature of the Acts narrative too, especially with regard to Peter and Paul and they with Jesus. This narrative feature is a clue to the pattern and purpose of Peter's role in Acts.

¹⁴⁷ Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, p.387. Downing, "Theophilus' First Reading", pp 100f acknowledges the appeal of sacred tradition and faithful observance, and asks then how that fits with Ac 10, where in Peter's vision sacred tradition is abrogated, and concludes that it would have been with relief that Theophilus and his friends would have heard that God had "insisted that the most obnoxious and exclusive and notorious Jewish customs do not have to be imposed on non-Jews".

What is most striking about Lk 1-2 is the frequency of references to the (Holy) Spirit¹⁴⁸, as agent of God, and this is also the case in Acts (about 43 times, mostly in chapters 1-12). The Holy Spirit will inspire John, overshadows Mary for the conception of Jesus, inspires Elizabeth, Zachariah and Simeon. The messianic times, which come to birth in Lk 1-2 are the times of the eschatological renewing of the Spirit, manifest in the old prophets, but not much evidenced in the present¹⁴⁹, but the Spirit which becomes universally available in the Pentecost community described in the early chapters of Acts. The Baptist predicts that the coming mighty One will baptize in (holy) spirit and fire (as Mt 3:11), but in the total context of Luke-Acts, the fire, like the spirit/wind, is not the fire of destruction (Lk 3:17), but the Pentecostal fire, explicitly the baptism with Holy Spirit, “not many days hence” (Ac 1:5). When baptised and praying (LkR), the Holy Spirit descends on Jesus (Lk 3:21f); full of Holy Spirit he returns from the Jordan and is led in the wilderness (4:1); then filled with the power of the Spirit he returns to Galilee (4:14); coming to Nazareth he announces that the prophecy of Isaiah 61 is fulfilled “today” – the Spirit is upon him anointing him to bring good news to the poor, *etc.* (Lk 4:15ff, Ac 10:18). This Nazareth sermon is the closest we come to the kerygmatic speeches of Acts, and is notable for its examples of prophets helping and healing Gentiles, rousing the anger of the people of the city where he had grown up, and so anticipating the thrust of the story of Acts, “the rejection of the gospel by the leaders of Judaism and its proclamation to the ends of the earth”¹⁵⁰. Jesus’ mysterious escape from lynching anticipates his actual death and the miraculous deliverances from death of Peter and Paul in Acts. Lampe sees the operation of the Spirit of God as the “connecting thread” which runs through both parts of

¹⁴⁸ See, *e.g.*, G.W.H. Lampe, “The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke”, in D. E. Nineham (Ed.), *Studies in the Gospels – Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1955, pp 159-200; also the article on πνεῦμα mainly by Eduard Schweizer in *TDNT*, 6. 332ff, especially pp 404-415.

¹⁴⁹ For evidence of the extent to which Jewish opinion thought of the Spirit as available in the past and future but not the present, see *TDNT* 6. 382ff.

¹⁵⁰ Lampe, *The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St Luke*, p.159.

Luke's work – the two programmatic discourses, of Jesus in Lk 4 and of Peter in Ac 2 are both offered as exegesis of Prophetic texts about the Spirit, in Isaiah 61 and Joel 3.

We are suggesting ways in which the hearing of the opening narratives of Luke prepares Theophilus and his circle for the continuing story of Acts. Setting of the scene in the Gospel, includes the nativity and childhood narratives and goes on to the sermon at Nazareth. There is abundant evidence for what Raymond Brown¹⁵¹ calls “the atmosphere of the period of the Church in the (Lukan) infancy narrative”. He regards Lk 1-2 as an important transitional section between the OT and the Gospel, anticipating many of its themes, and Acts 1-2 as a transition between the ministry of Jesus and the story of the Church, in which the apostles are the “principal connecting element”¹⁵², rather as John the Baptist is the bridge from the OT hopes to the period of Jesus. This is a radical revision of Conzelmann's scheme, in which the infancy narratives, whose authenticity he regards as “questionable”¹⁵³, are not given any consideration in his discussion of Luke's eschatology. Brown admits to a “certain vagueness” in separating out Ac 1-2 as the transitional narrative, because the depiction of the Church continues, with its marks of the outpouring of the prophetic Spirit and angelic appearances to which the evidence above has pointed. Also, I have argued that the introductory part of Luke's Gospel does not stop at the end of Lk 2 but continues through to Jesus' sermon at Nazareth, which is a match to Peter's speech at Pentecost. This is the view ascribed to Morgenthauer by Fitzmyer¹⁵⁴ and dismissed as “impossible” primarily because “it seems obvious that 3:1-2 was at one time a formal introduction to the work”. He argues that the infancy narrative has been

¹⁵¹ *The Birth of the Messiah*, Doubleday, New York, 1977, p.243.

¹⁵² p.242.

¹⁵³ Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of Saint Luke*, Faber and Faber, London, 1960, p. 118.

¹⁵⁴ *Luke*, pp. 310f. W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, (translated by A. J. Mattill), SCM, London, 1966, p.87 and others have argued that Lk 1:5-4:14 constitutes the first part, the “early history and preparation for Jesus' appearance”, but this which regards the sermon at Nazareth as heading “Jesus' activity in Galilee”, does injustice to the programmatic importance of the sermon for Luke-Acts.

composed with hindsight. Be that as it may, whatever the pre-history of the Lukan Gospel¹⁵⁵, it remains the case that the text for which we have evidence, is that Theophilus is plunged right away into the world of temple piety with roots in the OT, and which he will find reborn in the apostolic community, exemplified in the person of Peter, and through the outpouring of the Spirit, made available for all. This certainly is the shape of Luke's work, at least in its final edition. That it affected even his redaction of the traditions he was using, like Mark's Gospel, is shown by his extending at 3:4-6 of Mark's citation from Isaiah 40 to include the key phrase, καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, which is echoed at the end of the second volume and applied to the Gentiles (Ac 28:28). If we are persuaded that the prelude of Luke-Acts extends to Lk 4:30, then we should note how it then proceeds, with Jesus' dramatic ministry of teaching and healings, including the healing of Peter's own mother-in-law, and his God-sent mission to "proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God" (4:43) there and in other cities. To join him in this mission, Jesus proceeds to call Peter and others, and symbolizes it - and its ultimate success - in the miraculous catch of fish (5:1-11). So the stage is indeed set for the proclamation of the Gospel and for Peter's role within it.

¹⁵⁵ And Fitzmyer, *Luke*, p.311, refers us to Marcion's gospel in which Lk 3:1 follows on 1:4, and to Ephraem of Syria's commentary on Tatian's *Diatessaron* referred to in an article by F. C. Conybeare "Ein Zeugnis Ephräms über das Fehlen von c.1 und 2 im Texte des Lucas", *ZNTW* 3 (1902) pp 192-197.

Chapter Two *Strengthening his Brothers*

Our detailed study of Peter in Luke-Acts begins with his role in the second volume. Though the risen Jesus is present in Acts before his Ascension (1:9), and continues to act from heaven, Peter is the principal human character who plays significant parts in both of Luke's volumes. The apostles act as a group, with Peter as spokesman; when he is coupled with John, John seems to have no independent role or speech. The other apostles are named but only James, the brother of John is mentioned specifically, at the time of his martyrdom (12:2). That leaves from the friendly characters of the first volume who appear in the second, only the 'women', including Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brothers (Ac 1:14), of whom James will later take a major role in Acts in the leadership of the Jerusalem church, but who had no significant role in the first volume, and where indeed he is not named (Lk 8:19ff). Peter, then, bridges the two volumes, with a significant role in each.

The beginning of Acts overlaps with the final parts of Luke's first volume, telling of the appearance of the risen Jesus to the "Eleven and their companions" (Lk 24:33), his interpreting of Scripture about the Messiah and his suffering, his instructing of them to wait in Jerusalem until he sends, according to the Father's promise, "power from on high", with which they will be witnesses to him, proclaiming repentance and forgiveness "to all nations"¹ (24:47) or "to the end of the earth" (Ac 1:8). There are differences between the accounts – the timing of the final appearance of Jesus (and his ascension)², on an (extended) Easter Day, or after forty days of his instruction; the

¹ So *NRSV* for ζῆλον, though the hint of future *Gentile* mission is probably intended in the light of Simeon's prophecy in 2:32; cf Marshall, *Luke*, p.906, and see Chapter Six.

² Whether or not the words ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν at Lk 24:51 are accepted as the original reading, with P⁷⁵ and most manuscripts, it is a final appearance that the narrator intends to describe. Including the

location, though Bethany (Lk 24:50) or the “mount called Olivet” (Ac 1:12) are not significantly apart; after their return to Jerusalem, according to Lk 24:52, they were always in the temple, while in Ac 1:13 they go to the “upper room” where they were staying, and their presence in the temple is first mentioned at 2:46. These differences seem to me consistent with an authorial pressure to compress the end of the first volume, perhaps as the end of his scroll is being reached, and the intention that similar material should be expanded as the setting the stage and agenda for the second volume.

Peter Encourages the Formation of a Community

Ac 1:12-14 relates, then, to Lk 24:52 and is a summary of the believers’ life in the period of waiting between the Ascension and Pentecost. They return from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem, to the ὑπερῶον where they were staying; maybe the narrator intends this as the same ἀνάγαιον (Lk 22:12 // Mk 14:15) where the Apostolic Supper had taken place. The eleven apostles are then listed by name, headed by Peter. The list is very similar to the previous list at Lk 6:13-16, less Judas Iscariot. Andrew and John have exchanged places, possibly because Peter and John will later act together, though it leaves Andrew then before Philip, as in Mk 3:18. Peter is called just that rather than “Simon whom he named Peter”; Thomas is listed before Bartholomew rather than after Matthew. There is a tendency in the Acts list to make pairs of apostles³. Of the eleven and eventual twelve apostles, it is only of the witness of Peter and John that much is told, as Biguzzi⁴ observes, and goes on to find that the same is true of the Seven appointed in Ac 6, of which we only have detailed reports of two, Stephen and Philip, the first named pair (Ac 6:5), and then of the five of Antioch of whose missions we only learn further of Barnabas

words ensures the parallel with Acts, a physical removal of the body of Jesus; to omit them, as do uncorrected Bezae and Sy⁵ may be to bring the chronology into line with Acts.

³ Cf Mk 6:7, δύο δύο; J. Jeremias “Paarweise Sendung im Neuen Testament”, in A.J.B. Higgins, Ed., *New Testament Essays – Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson*, Manchester University Press, 1959, 136-143.

⁴ G. Biguzzi, “Witnessing Two by Two in the Acts of the Apostles”, *Biblica*, 92 (2011), 1-20.

and Saul (Ac 13:1); of the representatives of the Pauline churches in 20:4, likewise, we only have more information about Trophimus (21:27-31) and Aristarchus (27:1-3). Biguzzi finds the implication of this pattern to be that Luke is consciously telling of only part of the mission of the Twelve, the Seven and others.

Also mentioned with the Eleven Apostles are the women (*cf* Lk 8:2f), unless they are understood as the wives of the apostles⁵, and the mother and brothers of Jesus. Jesus (Lk 8:21, 11:27f) had defined his mother and brothers as those who hear and do the word of God. Mary in the Nativity story had accepted the angelic call to be the mother of the messiah, through the Spirit. Her presence in this upper room now, while the believers wait for a new beginning in the power of the Spirit, is a reminder of that obedience. The family in Luke are not hostile to Jesus. This whole assembly is said to be προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν⁶ τῇ προσευχῇ.

Following the conversions on the day of Pentecost, there is another summary of the life of this group of believers (Ac 2:42ff). They are said to be προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδασκίᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς. These four marks are then amplified, as having possessions in common, selling goods to provide for all in need, breaking bread “from house to house”, and καθ’ ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. Almost immediately this statement is followed by the example of Peter and John going to the Temple at the time of the afternoon prayer (3:1). This echoes the beginning of the first volume (Lk 1:5-22), and anticipates other references to prayer, like that of the devout Gentile Cornelius (Ac 10:2f), and Peter praying on the roof (10:9), itself reminiscent of Daniel (6:10ff). Prayer⁷ was one of the special interests of Luke’s Gospel; we note how the disciples requested Jesus to

⁵ Bezae adds to the company with “children”.

⁶ Apart from Rom 15:6, this term is confined in the NT to Acts (10 X); see above p.5 n16.

⁷ Προσευχή Luke 3X, Acts 9X; προσεύχομαι Luke 17X, Acts 16X.

teach them to pray, as the Baptist's disciples had been by him, and Jesus taught them to pray καθ' ἡμέραν on their mission (Lk 11:1ff). The piety ascribed to the first Christian community echoes the piety of Lk 1–2, an idealized picture of Judaism, which we also find (*e.g.*) in Daniel, Judith and Tobit. It is attractive to God-fearing Cornelius (and Theophilus?). For Luke's readers the Temple was no longer standing, and could for Gentile Christians only have a symbolic meaning, as it could also for Jewish piety after 70 C.E.⁸. Paul's conversion included (according to his account in Ac 22:17f), a visionary experience in the Temple in which he was sent away from Jerusalem. Stephen's speech in Ac 7 interprets scripture as suggesting that the temple building and the sacrificial system had always been an act of disobedience, and that God had revealed himself to Abraham and Moses, and been worshipped outside the land of Israel. But for the first Jerusalem community, the Temple is a place of daily prayer (and teaching), and this is illustrated especially by Peter, and prayer is identified as a key apostolic task (Ac 6:4). We note that in the parable of Lk 18:9ff, the two characters go to the temple *to pray*. Jesus clears the Temple as a “house of prayer” (19:45f, though not as in Mark “for all peoples”), and Luke goes on immediately to tell of Jesus teaching daily in the Temple (*cf.* Ac 3:11ff, the apostles gathering and teaching in Solomon's Stoa in the Temple, 5:12, renewed specifically by the angel's instruction in vv 20, 42). The practice of the apostles, led by Peter, renews the practice of Jesus anticipated in his own childhood (Lk 2:46f). Teaching in Solomon's Stoa was suggestive for Luke of Stoic practice, and was then, perhaps, for him a Jewish parallel to Areopagus, the one addressed by Peter and the other by Paul (Ac 17:19ff). For Luke's audience (at the end of the first century?), Jerusalem with its now destroyed Temple was a recognized place. If they were in Rome – and the details in Luke's account of Paul's arrival there, Ac 28:15, do suggest local knowledge – then

⁸ *Cf.* *The Mishnah* and the works of Philo; this tendency is already anticipated in the Prayer of Azariah, LXX Daniel 3:38f, where confession and forgiveness replace sacrifice.

familiarity with the triumphal Arch of Titus with its graphic display of Temple treasures like the Menorah, together with coins bearing the motto *Iudaea Capta*, indicative of the Roman view of the significance of the Jewish War, the question would be the connection of this new Jerusalem faith with the old. Luke takes “every opportunity to stress both the connection of Christianity to the ancient Jewish traditions and setting, as well as the superiority of the new leaders (the apostles) over the old (temple priests and Jerusalem leaders)”⁹. When later Christians were forming a pattern of spiritual practice, a calendar, hours of prayer, etc., it was largely to Luke-Acts that they turned.

Christian Grappe¹⁰ indicates the importance of the Temple for the primitive community but exaggerates when he describes it as “envisagé comme le nouveau Temple”¹¹. In seeking a substitute for the sacrificial cult in Petrine tradition he has to refer us to 1 Peter 2, and writings such as Hebrews. He does note similarities between the primitive church and the Qumran community – common sharing of property, a spiritual or symbolic substitute for the Jerusalem cultus, and he likens Peter’s role¹² to that of the Guardian of the Camp, המבקר למחנה according to the *Damascus Document* CD 13.7-10, “He shall love them as a father loves his children, and shall carry them in all their distress like a shepherd his sheep. He shall loosen all the fetters which bind them that in his Congregation there may be none that are oppressed or broken.”¹³ This ideal would be rather another exaggeration of what we find in Acts!

A third summary of the life of the first Christian community, Ac 4:32ff, concentrates on the sharing of goods, with the positive example of Barnabas, and the negative of Ananias and Sapphira. We return to this in Chapter Four.

⁹ Milton Moreland, “The Jerusalem Community in Acts, Mythmaking and the Socio-rhetorical Functions of a Lukan Setting”, in Todd Penner & Caroline Vander Stichele (Edd), *Contextualizing Acts, Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, Brill, Leiden and Boston, 2004, 285-310, p.306.

¹⁰ *D’un Temple à l’Autre – Pierre et l’Église primitive de Jérusalem*, Presses Universitaires de France, 1992.

¹¹ p. 148.

¹² p. 221.

¹³ Translation of Geza Vermeš.

Peter's Initiative

The first Summary is the setting for the only specific event in those days between the Ascension and Pentecost, and it is the initiative of Peter (Ac 1:15-26). In the growing assembly of believers, numbered, or, rather, 'named', ὄχλος ὀνομάτων, perhaps under the influence of Num 1:18, the naming the descendants of the Twelve Patriarchs, about 120 (12 X 10?), Peter draws attention to the vacant position in the apostolic college which has arisen because of the treachery and death of Judas Iscariot. They are one short of the designated number twelve, like the number of the Twelve Tribes or Patriarchs of Israel (Ac 7:8). Peter's first speech invites them to consider the end of Judas, the definition of apostleship that the Lukan Peter promulgates, and Peter's use of scripture to account for what had happened and to provide guidance as to what should now happen.

Peter opens the meeting and establishes its agenda. He addresses the assembly as ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, which, in spite of its masculinity, was probably intended to include the women just mentioned. It is debated whether the account of Judas' death (vv 18f) is to be regarded as part of Peter's speech, or the narrator's parenthesis to inform his readers. Certainly for his narrative audience it carries information redundant to them, as is the translation of their Aramaic Hakeldama. In any case, however, it is integral to the purpose of Peter's speech and by no means an aside. Judas' action and the retribution he suffered might serve as a warning to any other believers or apostles. Unbelievers might challenge the credibility of a Gospel preached by a band of followers, one of whom had ensured their leader's demise¹⁴. The attentive reader will recall what the first volume had said, how Satan had entered one of the Twelve (Lk 22:3), and he had been promised money to betray Jesus to the temple authorities. During the subsequent apostolic supper, immediately after Jesus had broken the bread, his 'body', he had warned that his betrayer was present there.

¹⁴ As Celsus apparently did, Origen *Against Celsus* 2.9.

Then, to those who had stayed with him in his ‘trials’, Jesus promises a kingdom, and judgement thrones for the twelve tribes of Israel (22:28ff). That Luke’s version of this Q saying does not explicitly match the number of thrones to the number of the tribes (contrast Mt 19:28), has been taken by some to imply that Judas is not included, though there is no indication, as there is in Jn 13:30, that Judas had already left the supper. Now in Acts, Peter tells us that Judas, indeed one of the Twelve (1:17), and who ἔλαχεν τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης,¹⁵ with the money he received had acquired a χωρίον. In contrast with Peter and the other apostles who had left behind τὰ ἴδια (Lk 18:29, LkR for Mark’s πάντα), Judas had gone from τὸν τόπον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς (Ac 1:25) to go εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον, with studied ambiguity whether this was to his χωρίον or to *post-mortem* condemnation. A refinement of the latter possibility is offered by Schuyler Brown¹⁶, namely that Judas goes to his own place, into partnership with religious authorities under Satan’s control and purpose. He relates the παρέβη¹⁷ of Ac 1:25 to the ἀπελθὼν of Lk 22:4, when Judas, under the influence of Satan, enters into an agreement¹⁸ with the priests, in apostasy from his discipleship. While Brown’s estimate of the gravity of Judas’ offence is fair, reliance on the vocabulary is stretched – he would not wish to interpret the plural ἀπελθόντες at Lk 22:13, of Peter and John, in the same way as the singular of Judas! Judas’ action in purchasing his field also anticipates the opposite action of Barnabas and others, who sell property and bring the proceeds and lay them at the apostles’ feet; Luke’s imagery has more to do with possessions than with movement.

¹⁵ Cf also Zacharias’ ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιᾶσαι (Lk 1:9).

¹⁶ *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*, Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, 1969, p.84.

¹⁷ Cf Ex 32:8 LXX for παρέβησαν with the sense of apostasy.

¹⁸ The use of ἐξωμολόγησεν in the active voice at Lk 22:6 is said by Marshall, *Luke*, p. 789, to be “unparalleled”; the more usual use of the word in the middle voice especially in later ecclesiastical usage, for ‘acknowledge/confess’, Brown, *Apostasy and Perseverance*, p. 85, treats as additional evidence of a pact with the powers of evil (priests, Satan).

The cause of Judas' death¹⁹ is not entirely clear. Like the man who excuses himself from the feast (Lk 14:18), Judas goes to see the field he has bought; he becomes prone/ falls headlong; he bursts open; his entrails spill out. Judas' fate could appear then to fit his offence; "his loyalty to self is the opposite of true loyalty, and so Judas literally turns inside out".²⁰ Robert L. Brawley²¹ colourfully describes the evisceration of Judas on his homestead as "deadly serious absurdity", where "habitation becomes uninhabitable, the livable becomes unlivable, Judas bursts open and his bowels gush out". Mathieu²², keeping closer to Luke's text, refers to the brutal punishment promised to the slave who abuses his master's trust διχοτομήσει αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων θήσει, (Lk 12:46), and relates it to Judas' physically bursting in the middle. This is part of Jesus' answer to Peter's question in Lk 12:41ff, which uses the metaphor of slaves and their faithfulness in their stewardship for the calling of the disciples of Jesus.

The rare term πρηνής (Ac 1:18) is "clearly influenced"²³ by Wisdom 4:19, which describes the fate of the unrighteous, "God will shatter them, render them prostrate and speechless".²⁴ In the Old Latin, πρηνείς is represented by *inflatos*, and so is an argument in favour of πρηνής being from πρήθω, 'to swell' (cf the NRSV marginal alternative translation at Ac 1:18, "swelling up"). Lake finds the Latin translators "capable of quite extraordinary blunders", and the (unnecessary) addition of ἐπὶ πρόσωπον in Codex Vaticanus suggests that its scribe of Wisdom understood it to mean "prone". The Vulgate's rendering of πρηνής γενόμενος at Ac 1:18 by *suspensus crepuit* (with an

¹⁹ The various accounts of the death of Judas, in Matthew, Acts and Papias, as reported in Apollinaris of Laodicea, receive extensive discussion in Kirsopp Lake, *Beginnings*, 5. 22-30; in R.E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1994 2. 1404-1410; in Arie W. Zwiep, *Judas and the Choice of Matthias*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2004, Chapter 4.

²⁰ Pervo, *Acts*, p.53.

²¹ *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech – Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1995, p.62.

²² Mathieu, p.136.

²³ Lake, *Beginnings* 5.29.

²⁴ The rendering of Nicholas King's translation of the Septuagint, vol 3, Kevin Mayhew, Stowmarket, Suffolk, 2008, p.228.

implication of noise) is evidence of attempts to reconcile the different accounts of Judas' death, hanging in Matthew, gigantic swelling in Papias, and bursting open in Acts. The two canonical accounts have little in common – the purchase of land (by priests in Matthew or by Judas in Acts), and its name 'Ακελδαμάχ, τοῦτ' ἔστιν χωρίον αἵματος, in Acts; ἀγρὸς αἵματος, Mt 27:8. This suggests their independence of each other, and a paucity of tradition²⁵. Scholars who wish to economise on the number of hypothetical traditions, might feel obliged to explain why Luke has not apparently used Matthew with regard to Judas' death. In his early work, *Type and History in Acts*,²⁶ Michael Goulder argued that in Matthew's account, Judas' suicide is a type of Ahithophel's (2 Sam 17:23), filled out with scriptural texts, Jer 39 and Zech 11:12f. Luke, he speculates, found "suicide too mild" and decided that Christ's betrayer should be "struck down by God", but there is no conclusive dependence on Matthew's account, and so this view is mere speculation.

A repulsive death for the wicked is described both in the Bible and in other contemporary literature. So Josephus describes the death of Herod the Great (*Antiquities* 17.6.5) and of the governor of Cyrene, near the end of *War* 7.11.4. The terminal disease of Antiochus in 2 Macc. 9:5-12 is also instructive. Joab's revenge on Amasa (2 Sam 20:9f) involves both a kiss²⁷ (cf Lk 22:47f) and a blow that empties his entrails (LXX κοιλία; cf Ac 1:18 σπλάγχνα). The death of Jehoram (2 Chron 21) includes a long painful disease and his bowels coming out. Zwiep²⁸ concludes that Luke was couching Judas' death in terms of the death of a wicked man in the Jewish and Greco-Roman literary tradition, and that Luke is responsible for the detailed narrative structure and for most of the wording. Pervo²⁹ finds a reverse *inclusio* of punitive miracles in Acts, Judas in chapter

²⁵ So concludes Gerd Lüdemann, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts*, SCM Press, London, 1989, p.34.

²⁶ SPCK, London, 1964, pp 89f.

²⁷ Cf also Prov. 27:6.

²⁸ Zwiep, *Judas and the Choice of Matthias*, p. 125.

²⁹ Pervo, *Acts*, p. 52.

1, and the deliverance of Paul, 28:1-6. Pervo's case would be strengthened if *πρηνής* could be given a meaning of swelling up, to match the people's expectation that Paul would swell up, *πίμπρασθαι*, (NT *hapax*.) but the meaning of 'becoming prone' seems now to be accepted.

Luke takes the view that the Apostles are the Twelve. In the first volume, he uses the term six times, the first of which (Lk 6:13) could be taken from the parallel in Mk 3:14, if with N-A²⁷ we adopt the reading of *ⲥ B etc.* The second (Lk 9:10), the return of the Twelve, is parallel to the only other Markan use (6:30), where it could mean simply 'those who had been sent', if we adopted the shorter reading at 3:14. In Acts the term is used for others than the Twelve only at 14:4,14, referring to Barnabas and Paul. Paul's own epistles use the term apostle for a wider circle than the Twelve, and he had no doubts about his own credentials as an apostle. Luke's use in Ac 14 could be a 'lapse', recognizing a tradition of including Paul and others among the apostles, or, in this context it could simply imply that they were missionaries, sent by the church in Antioch (*cf* also, perhaps, 2 Cor. 8:23).³⁰ It is Luke's confining of the term to the Twelve, that necessitates the replacement of Judas, to ensure the foundational witness, the prime function of the apostles, which the Lukan Peter asserts without discussion. "In seiner numerischen Integrität liegt die Garantie für seine Kontinuität über den Einschnitt, den Ostern bedeutet, hinweg."³¹ For Luke, the collapse of Judas' faith threatened the hinge which binds together the two halves of his work and necessitated the appointment of a replacement apostle.³² An apostle needs to be a witness not just to the resurrection of Jesus, but to his

³⁰ A classic treatment of *ἀπόστολος* is provided by Rengstorff in *TDNT* 1. 398-447. He also discusses any relationship with the philosopher-missionaries of the Stoic or Cynic schools, and with the Rabbinic concept of *שליח*. The Biblical Theology nature of *TDNT* does not allow scope for discussion of Luke's specific understanding of the apostle as trustworthy witness to the historical Jesus.

³¹ Günter Klein *Die zwölf Apostel*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1961, p.206.

³² *Cf* Brown, *Apostasy and Perseverance*, p.87.

whole³³ historic ministry, from the baptism of John³⁴ to the Ascension (Ac 1:21f). Two qualified candidates for the vacant position are nominated, a unison prayer is made by the assembly, lots are cast, and the lot falls on Matthias. The casting of lots was used for priestly and Levitical duties (1 Chron. 25:8f, 26:13f), as was known to Luke - ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιάσαι (Lk 1:9, cf Ac 1:17 of Judas ἔλαχεν τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης). Decision by lot is also a feature of the Jonah story (1:7), also known to Luke. Decisions using lots (הגורל) seem also to have been a feature at Qumran (1QS 5.3, 6.16ff, though Vermeš' translation conceals this).

Peter interprets scripture

Peter assumes that there must be twelve apostolic witnesses, because Jesus had called twelve apostles. The seemingly inexplicable defection and treachery of Judas, he argues, came under the necessity (ἔδει 1:16) of the fulfilment of scripture. The scriptures were inspired by the Holy Spirit (*id.*), and offered both a prophecy of what would happen, and also, in this case, what the believers should consequently do, namely appoint someone else (also δεῖ v.21). At the Apostolic Supper Jesus had said that the hand of the one who would hand him over was on the table, (possibly alluding to Ps 41:9 [40:10]³⁵); his individual role was cursed, but still part of the fore-ordained path for the Son of Man (Lk 22:21f). Applying specific OT texts to the circumstances of the Gospel narrative, has its parallel in Qumran's *peshar* practice. According to Luke, the risen Jesus instructed his disciples in these particulars (Lk 24:27, 44f).

³³ C.F.D. Moule, *Idiom Book of NT Greek*, CUP 1963, pp 94f, argues that ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ means "during the whole time" not "on every occasion".

³⁴ If strictly applied, this criterion might exclude some or all of the Twelve, clearly called well after Jesus' Baptism! Does Luke suppose that some of those called had already been disciples of John the Baptist, as does the Johannine tradition?

³⁵ ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου ; the possibility of an allusion here would be strengthened if we take the shorter reading in which Lk 22:21 follows immediately upon v. 19a, the broken bread; the allusion is dramatised in Jn 13:21-26.

The two texts which Peter then cites are from (David's) Psalms, part of the scriptures interpreted by Jesus in Lk 24:44f., along with the Torah and the Prophets³⁶. It is likely that of all the OT scriptures the Psalms were best known and used devotionally, as is evidenced by the scroll remains at Qumran. The two texts are from Ps 69 (68):26 and 109 (108):8. N-A²⁷ correctly treats the second καί as a recognition that we have two citations here, from two psalms, although καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν is the LXX reading in the second, (but not the MT – the verse has not survived well enough in any of the Qumran Psalm scrolls to know whether the conjunction was read). Note that Acts has made the αὐτῶν of Ps 69 (68) singular, αὐτοῦ, in keeping with Ps 109 (108), to make it apply to Judas, and “their tents” becomes “in it” *i.e.* ‘in his homestead’. In Acts, the LXX optative λάβοι is replaced by the imperative λαβέτω, more because of the decline in use of the optative, we suspect, than a desire for a firmer mood of instruction; alternatively it may be to bring it in line with the first citation, γενηθήτω³⁷. Tzvi Novick³⁸ argues that the first citation is used not with reference to Judas' field, rendered uninhabitable by his gory death, but (metaphorically) to his office, so providing an apparent contradiction with the second citation. He argues that Peter is using a rabbinic procedure to resolve the contradiction, choosing one active in the apostolic group but not yet part of the circle. This seems to me too subtle for either the narrative audience before Pentecost or Theophilus' circle, and is in any case unnecessary because the concern of the author is to make up the place of Judas among the twelve apostles, and so to be ready for the beginning of the mission after the promised clothing with power from on high.

³⁶ We are probably intended to understand the Psalms here to be the Book of Psalms only, though it is the first book of the third section, the כתובים which along with the Mosaic תורה and the נביאים make up the Hebrew Bible – there is no citation in Acts of any of the other Writings; the Septuagint, the version in which Luke seems to quote the scripture, does not have the same order of books and the canon of Jewish scripture was far from settled in Luke's day. Cf Joseph A. Fitzmyer *To Advance the Gospel, New Testament Studies* 2nd edition, Eerdmanns, Grand Rapids, Michigan and Cambridge UK, and Dove, Livonia, Michigan, 1998, p. 304.

³⁷ So Pervo, *Acts*, p.54.

³⁸ “Succeeding Judas: Exegesis in Acts 1:15-26”, *JBL* 129 (2010), 795-799.

Psalm 69 was the source of several citations and allusions with regard to the Gospel passion narratives. Although this specific verse is not cited elsewhere, the condemnation of the persecutors of the psalmist might well be felt to be applicable to Judas, whose action in the passion was the subject of some puzzlement and legends, and cried out for text(s)³⁹ which showed that even this was part of the scriptural prophecy – Ac 1:16 ἔδει πληρωθῆναι τὴν γραφήν. Peter speaking here, finds authority for action in the second citation, from the long and colourful imprecation of the righteous sufferer (often bracketed in modern liturgical psalmody!), but chosen for the keyword ἐπισκοπήν which was destined for a special place in ecclesiastical terminology, and whose cognate ἐπισκοποί is used by Acts for leaders at 20:28.

To Peter, then, in the steps of his risen Lord, is given “the role as the primitive church’s exegete of Israel’s Scriptures”.⁴⁰ In his next speech we will encounter more. A significant number of the citations, like the two here, do not have parallels in other NT authors. That they are based on the Greek suggests that they are the work of Luke or his immediate sources, rather than the historical Peter. If, as Lindars⁴¹ argues, Ac 2:37 κατενύγησαν τὴν καρδίαν is an allusion to Ps 109,(108):16, κατανευγμένον τῇ καρδίᾳ then because this is in the narrator’s work, rather than the speech, it would be extra evidence that the use of the psalm should be ascribed to Luke. Did Ps 109 become the source of the citation and possible allusion because the following psalm was already in use for Christology by the early church (*e.g.* Ac 2:34)? If so, it may be evidence of direct use of a written psalter by this author or his source. The complex nature of the scriptural interpretations also suggests the habit of some years rather than the immediate days after

³⁹ *cf.* Mt. 27:9f, Jn.13:18, 17:12.

⁴⁰ Joshua W. Jipp, “Luke’s Scriptural Suffering Messiah: A Search for Precedent, a Search for Identity”, *CBQ* 72 (2010), 255-274, p. 267.

⁴¹ B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, SCM Press, London, 1961, p.109.

the Ascension. We concur with the conclusion of Zwiep⁴² that “Luke is to be held responsible for the choice of the two present psalm citations”.

Peter’s Role

In this scene, the first assembly of the believers, during the days awaiting the promised Spirit, Peter takes the initiative, and this is neither questioned nor discussed in the narrative, and so, in the view of the narrator, had general approval. Pervo⁴³ accuses Peter of acting “like a later *monepiskopos* in promulgating the criteria and nominating the candidates” for the vacant apostolic place. But Luke’s own writing has prepared a special role for Peter, especially in this immediate post-Easter period. At the Apostolic Supper in Lk 22, as already noted, there is a focus upon Judas, acting under the influence of Satan to hand over Jesus to his enemies, and upon the importance of the Twelve. There is also the warning and prayer of Jesus for Peter, that though Satan will sift all, he will be saved from total eclipse of his faith, (so that) he may turn and “strengthen his brothers” (Lk 22:31f). Who are Peter’s brothers? We look beyond Andrew (Lk. 6:14) and any other unknown blood brothers, to the frequent use of the terms ἀδελφοί and the vocative ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί of the Christian community in the parts of Acts where Peter is present. There are about a hundred and twenty ἀδελφοί (1:15)⁴⁴ gathered after the Ascension. The Christian community are also called ἀδελφοί at 6:3, 11:29, 12:17, 15:1,3,7, etc. However, Peter also addresses the wider Jewish community of Jerusalem as ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί (2:29, and the apostles are in turn also so addressed, 2:37), and as ἀδελφοί at 3:17,22. The use of ἀδελφοί in Lk. 22:32 is the first such description of Jesus’ followers; for Peter it will not only mean the other ten remaining apostles, but the growing post-Easter company of believers and the

⁴² Zwiep, *Judas and the Choice of Matthias*, p.101.

⁴³ Pervo, *Acts*, p.55.

⁴⁴ Variant readings, μαθητῶν, including Bezae, perhaps to avoid confusion with the brothers of Jesus just mentioned, and ἀποστόλων, seemingly in p⁷⁴ perhaps in carelessness, thinking of Peter in the centre of the apostles, before the scribe has copied the number assembled.

whole company of Israel who are being called to believe the resurrection and fulfill their vocation as God's family⁴⁵. In the narrative Peter's initiating the choosing of a twelfth apostle is the classic instance of Peter's fulfilling this charge and 'strengthening his brothers'. This is especially so if the sense of *στηρίζω* has a nuance of structural strengthening⁴⁶ more than pastoral, as we will argue in Chapter Seven. Certainly Peter's initiatives after Easter (and the aorist imperative at Lk 22:32 may point towards specific actions), verifying the report of the women about the tomb (24:12, omitted by Bezae), and especially his assembling the brothers together after the Ascension to make up the place of Judas in the apostolic Twelve (Ac 1:15ff)⁴⁷ are of this kind of strengthening. It is strongly supported by Dietrich⁴⁸, by Mathieu⁴⁹, by L.T. Johnson⁵⁰, by Zwiep⁵¹, and indeed, anciently, by Chrysostom⁵². Pervo⁵³, however, disputes this interpretation, accusing Peter of assuming "leadership without a hint of authorization from above or below." He acknowledges that Lk 22:32 "suggests a role, but in the balance of the Gospel, Peter's faith does appear to fail (22:54-62) and he neither formally repents nor strengthens others (24:12, 34)." Whether Peter's denials constitute a failure of Peter's faith akin to Judas' apostasy, and so also a failure of Jesus' prayer for him, we will discuss in Chapter Six. There I will contend that Peter's tears after his denials, when the Lord had turned and looked at him at cockcrow, do suggest remorse and repentance. The primacy of the

⁴⁵ So Mathieu, p. 210 "Les frères que Pierre doit affermir (Lc 22,32) sont donc d'abord ces Juifs qui, avec lui, ont suivi Jésus avant sa mort et qui l'ont vu mourir. Pierre les affermit en les amenant à croire 'que réellement le Seigneur s'est réveillé des morts' (24,34), et en les invitant à choisir Matthias pour prendre la place de Judas (Ac 1,16-22). Mais les frères de Pierre sont aussi ces Juifs qui n'ont pas été disciples de Jésus avant sa mort, ces Juifs qui ont réclamé à Pilate que Jésus soit crucifié. Cette deuxième catégorie de frères, Pierre les affermit en les invitant au repentir, au baptême (2,38) et à la conversion(3,19)."

⁴⁶ Harder in *TDNT* 7. 655f; Dietrich, p.174 "seine ursprüngliche konkrete (Bauwesen) Bedeutung"; Mathieu, p.210 "les concepts de fermeté et de stabilité".

⁴⁷ cf Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1996, pp 320f; contra Marshall, *Luke*, p. 822, who regards it as "very speculative".

⁴⁸ Dietrich, pp 175, 194, "die Reorganisation des Jüngerkreises nach Ostern".

⁴⁹ Mathieu, p. 222 "Pierre commence déjà, avant même d'avoir reçu l'Esprit, à affermir ses frères".

⁵⁰ Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1992, p.38.

⁵¹ Zwiep, *Judas and the Choice of Matthias*, p. 130.

⁵² *Homilies on Acts* 3.3.

⁵³ Pervo, *Acts* p.50.

resurrection appearance to Peter (Lk 24:24) could well be regarded as some sort of authorization, which is reflected in his position in the apostolic list. His following up the report of the women who had found the tomb empty (Lk 24:12, some texts) is an initiative that provides reliable witness for the Easter proclamation, and so is the start of his strengthening that we see properly for the first time in Ac 1. Pervo is too keen to drive a wedge of discontinuity between the Gospel and Acts! In Luke's account, Judas, in contrast with Peter, shows no sign of remorse and uses the money given him for his own ends, rather than returning to his apostolic calling and community. The one has been the tool of Satan, the other protected by the intercession of Jesus.

Peter's initiative strengthens the structure of this first Christian community. Along with his fellow apostles and the wider group of disciples he helps to create a pattern of life for that community which will be ready to receive the Spirit and become the instrument of growth in their belief. In the view of Luke's readers it will replace Israel as God's λαός, and be called ἡ ἐκκλησία (Ac 5:11). When Jesus gave the name Peter to Simon (Lk 6:14) there was no explanation offered. The following address of Jesus to the gathered disciples, the sermon on the plain, concludes with the similitude of building a house⁵⁴ with the foundation on rock, θεμέλιον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν (6:48), illustrating those who hear the words of Jesus and do them. This could provide some explanation of Peter's name, and a metaphor for what he carries out in Acts⁵⁵. The deutero-Pauline Eph 2:19f speaks of the household of God built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets; Paul uses the image of building on the foundation which is Jesus Christ for his own missionary work and that of others, and of the Christian community being God's temple (1 Cor 3:10ff). Such imagery may have become commonplace for Luke and other writers. I

⁵⁴ Οἰκία, meaning, no doubt, a home, but the synonym οἶκος is used of the Temple at Lk 13:35, 19:46.

⁵⁵ Cf. R. L. Brawley, *Centering on God – Method and Message in Luke-Acts*, Westminster/ John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 1990, pp 141f.

think he could have read or known the tradition in Mt 16:18 where Jesus gives Peter his name with the intention to build his church upon this rock. Evidence for Luke's knowledge of any Pauline epistle is slight but strongest for 1 Corinthians (see Chapter One).

Peter's first speech is of a kind with few parallels, being his address to an assembly of believers called to make decisions. The specific circumstances of that decision, before the Spirit's coming, and the nature of the decision itself, are, as Luke sees them, not to recur. The martyrdom of James does not lead to his replacement among the Twelve. Yet a general pattern of procedure is established, which is reflected in other assemblies. Where Peter is subsequently involved, these are the appointing of the Seven to deal with the problems of relief for the widows (Ac. 6:1-6); the ratifying of the Gentile conversions (11:1-18), and again with regard to the status of Gentile converts, the assembly in Jerusalem (15:6ff). This pattern consists of:-

- a) the description of the context requiring decision [Judas' betrayal and death; the neglect of Hellenist widows; the report of Gentile conversions; further issues to do with Gentile Christians and the Law of Moses];
- b) interpreting and applying Scripture [1:20, 15:15ff; the appointing of the Seven may have a typological analogy in Moses' appointment of Seventy elders; in 11:16 a word of Jesus is cited; at 15:16f James cites Amos];
- c) community prayer [1:24, 6:6; 11:18, glorifying God, perhaps; not explicitly there in 15];
- d) immediate guidance by vision or the Spirit [1:26, lots, before the outpouring of the Spirit; the Spirit inspires Scripture, 1:16; those chosen for the Seven must be 'full of the

Spirit'; Peter's vision and the testimony of the Spirit's falling on Cornelius' household, 11:5ff, 15, repeated in 15:8; also 15:28];

e) consensus, decision and action [1:26; 6:6; 11:18; 15:22ff].

Presiding over the assembly in Jerusalem (Ac 15:6ff) is James, the brother of Jesus, rather than Peter who reappears in Jerusalem for this last time, and addresses it rather as the elder statesman, giving his testimony with regard to the inclusion of Gentiles in mission. Peter appears comfortable with James' leadership of the Jerusalem church (12:17), though James' style contrasts with what Peter's has been. James much more than Peter is the patriarch or Ignatius' *mon-episkopos* that drew Pervo's criticism. James "answers" the debate, states its conclusions and decisions. In the rest of Acts James exercises a controlling role which includes guardianship for the Jewish Christians of the practice of the Law (21:20ff) and the rituals of the Temple, rather than the Temple as venue for prayer and teaching. Outside the NT James is exalted in some texts as a princely or high-priestly figure for the church, rather than Peter⁵⁶. Acts does not suggest any disharmony between the leadership of Peter and James; for the next generation Luke presents an irenic view of Christian beginnings, which traditions preserved elsewhere may suggest was not entirely historical.

Luke, through Peter, in this first assembly defines his perception of apostleship, limiting the foundation group to Twelve, according to dominical choice, and finding their function to be witnesses (Ac 1:22, cf Lk 1:2, οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται) to the resurrection of Jesus, μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ (Ac 1:22), but not only to the resurrection, but also as companions of his ministry (1:21 τῶν συνελθόντων ἡμῖν). Their function as witnesses leads them to their prime task as initial ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου (Lk 1:2),

⁵⁶ E.g. *Gospel of Thomas* saying 12; the *Gospel of the Hebrews* makes James rather than Peter the first witness of the resurrection according to Jerome, *De viri illust.*, 2.

devoted to τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου (Ac 6:4). In Acts this role is taken by the apostles acting together, or with Peter as their spokesman, or by Peter alone, with or without John as his silent companion. That the Twelve have a current role as well as the apparently eschatological role given them in Lk 22:30, suggests the eschatological kingdom is already inaugurated in the post-Easter apostolic witness, as it was in the pre-Easter apostolic mission (Lk 9:1-2), and as may be the implication of the answer to the question in Ac 1:6-8.

The Effect of Luke's Account

What impression did this opening description of Luke's second volume have on Theophilus and subsequent readers? He might warm to the unity, sense of purpose and prayerfulness of the nascent Christian community. He might welcome the care given to ensuring that witnesses to a barely credible story of Jesus and his resurrection are in place. He might be encouraged that Peter has indeed 'turned' (Lk 22:32) and is taking a decisive lead. He would be mindful that the continuing success of the Christian mission at the end of the century when Jerusalem was no more, had been able to grow because of such a good beginning. The people who had risen against Rome and whose Temple had been destroyed by Vespasian and Titus had a worthy replacement for their religion in the Church's Gospel of a crucified Saviour. In it all Theophilus was encouraged to see the hand of God. Luke may have been aware how some of his vocabulary would resonate among his contemporaries, so as to see the appointment of Matthias as like an ordination of a minister⁵⁷, though all the emphasis in Acts is not on the office of apostle, but on their function as reliable witnesses. Indeed vv 15-26 have a number of terms which in post-apostolic time came to have a more specific reference in terms of Christian ministry, – διακονία (vv 17, 25; elsewhere in Acts, 6:1,4, 11:29, 12:25, 20:24, 21:19, though the noun

⁵⁷ E.g. Chrysostom; Cyprian *Epistle* 67.4.

διάκονος is not in Luke-Acts). The term κληρὸς (vv 17, 26, also at Ac 8:21, 26:18, and cf 1 Peter 5:3) is itself the root of the term ‘clergy’. J. B. Lightfoot⁵⁸ argued from our passage for a sequence of meaning, (i) the lot by which the office was assigned; (ii) the office thus assigned by lot; (iii) the body of persons holding the office. The earliest instance of the Latinised *clerus* meaning clergy seems to occur in Tertullian (e.g. *De Monog.* 12). If Lightfoot’s argument is correct, it is evidence for the influence of this specific passage on the language of the later Church, but with regard to this term, it surely goes beyond Luke’s own intention. The number of apostles as Twelve, even in Acts, has more of a symbolic significance, than a narrative import for the mission. It belongs to the past, the laying of a foundation; the apostles have no successors. As a specific group they are mentioned in the tradition of 1 Cor. 15:5, though presumably not there identified with τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν (v.7), and by Rev. 21:14, and in the title of the *Didache*, in the *Apostolic Church Order*, and *Epistula Apostolorum*; where there are lists of their names there is considerable variation. That Luke distinguishes between the Twelve apostles, and subsequent missionaries like the Seven, Paul and Barnabas, is not because he regards their mission as secondary or inferior, but in order to emphasise a continuity of witness to what he describes in the first volume of his Gospel. The Lukan Paul is explicit about this (Ac 13:30ff).

The grotesque or carnivalesque⁵⁹ end of Judas, like that of other tyrants or villains, would seem just, and also serve as a warning. “Leadership failures, such as apostasy and financial misconduct, were not just theoretical possibilities for Luke’s readers.”⁶⁰ The various accounts of Judas’ end cross-fertilise in the tradition⁶¹. *The Martyrdom of Polycarp* 6 describes Polycarp as betrayed by those of his own household

⁵⁸ *Philippians*, Macmillan, London, 1900, pp 247f.

⁵⁹ So Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech*, Chapter 5.

⁶⁰ Pervo, *Acts*, p.50.

⁶¹ E.g. the combination of hanging and bursting asunder in *Apostolic Constitutions* 7.2.

and so meriting “the punishment of Judas” (unspecified). “Luke’s portrayal of Peter’s role as the primitive Church’s exegete of Israel’s scriptures”⁶² set the precedent for the use of scripture, (including eventually the NT) to develop the theological work of the Church, which quickly became the norm for patristic writers.

⁶² Jipp, *“Luke’s Scriptural Suffering Messiah”*, p.267.

Chapter Three – *Peter Preaches Christ*

In Chapter Two, we identified Peter's role of re-establishing the apostolic Twelve for the purposes of witnessing to the ministry of Jesus, his resurrection and ascension just as soon as they have received the promised enabling power from on high, the Holy Spirit. Peter's first speech (Ac 1:15ff) defined their apostleship and exemplified the application of scripture to these times of fulfilment. In this chapter, we are examining the preaching of Peter, and its contribution in Luke's strategy of proclaiming a Gospel for all people. In the narrative of Luke-Acts, it is Peter who is first to set the content of the *kerygma* and how it is used to call on the hearers to repent and convert to the new movement which the followers of Jesus are forming. Jesus had preached God's Kingdom and, according to Luke, the disciples had joined in this mission, both the Twelve (Lk 9:1) and the wider mission of the Seventy or Seventy-two (Lk 10:1ff); now the proclaimer, Jesus, has become the proclaimed, the bearer of the message become its essential content, a point well made by Bultmann¹. Peter's proclamation includes a sketch of the life of Jesus, an evaluation of the significance of that life, both christologically and soteriologically, and identifies the support of specific OT texts.

The speeches of Acts are a major vehicle for its argument and Peter has five kerygmatic speeches². It is most unlikely that any speech represents a (translated)

¹ *Theology of the New Testament*, translated by K. Grobel, SCM Press, London, 1952, p.33.

² Among studies of the speeches in Acts, are: Martin Dibelius, "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography", Chapter 9 in his *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, SCM Press, London, 1956; C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Development*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1936; Jacques Dupont, "Les Discours de Pierre", in *Nouvelles Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, Cerf, Paris, 1984, pp 58-111; W. Ward Gasque, "The Speeches of Acts: Dibelius Reconsidered", in Richard N. Longenecker & Merrill C. Tenney (Edd), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974, pp 232-250; F. Neirynck, "Luke 4,16-30 and the Unity of Luke-Acts", in J. Verheyden (Ed) *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, Leuven UP, 1999, pp 357-395; Marion L. Soards, *The Speeches in Acts – their Content, Context and Concerns*, Westminster/ John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 1994; Robert C. Tannehill, "The Functions of Peter's

verbatim account of what was actually said, and it is argued that it was a convention of ancient historiography to compose speeches appropriate for the speaker and occasion, as a dramatised way of commenting on the significance of the events. Dibelius³ cites examples of where Josephus has composed speeches not in his Biblical source. Comments by Lucian and Thucydides⁴ are scrutinised as to what was expected of Hellenistic historians. Witherington⁵ notes that the speeches in Acts are much shorter than in the historians, and do not represent a variety of viewpoints. Rather they are a feature of the action, namely, spreading the Gospel. About Luke's sources some speculate on possible Aramaisms (as distinct from Septuagintalisms). Others note the different style between Peter's speeches in Acts 2 and 3, the former polished while the latter seems less finished. A debate whether the speeches express (merely) Luke's own message would need to note the extent to which he does differentiate between different speakers⁶. Bowker⁷ tried to show that Paul's synagogue address in Ac 13 may have originated as a genuine synagogue sermon based on a *seder* reading Dt 4:25-46, and that Peter's speech in Ac 2 "can certainly be analysed as a proem homily on Joel 2:32 [MT 3:5], with a *seder* Dt 29:1-21 and *haftarah* Is. 63:9-19".⁸ The Synagogue's lectionary in the first century is entirely speculative, and in any case, I would argue that Paul's summary of OT history is not governed by Bowker's lections, but by Luke's desire to complement the summary in Stephen's speech (Ac 7).

Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts", *NTS* 37(1991), 400-414; Ulrich Wilckens *Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte*, Neukirchener Verlag, 3rd ed., 1974.

³ Dibelius, *Studies*, p.139.

⁴ Lucian, *How to Write History*, 58; Thucydides 1.22; cf W.J.McCoy, "In the Shadow of Thucydides", in B. Witherington III (Ed), *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, CUP, 1996, pp 3-23, with an Addendum by the editor, pp 23-32.

⁵ p.23.

⁶ C. M. Tuckett, "The Christology of Luke-Acts", in J. Verheyden (Ed), *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, 133-164, pp 140f.

⁷ J. W. Bowker, "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and *Yellammedenu* Form", *NTS* 14 (1967), 96-110.

⁸ p.105.

The Settings of Peter's Speeches

Peter's first speech, in Ac 2:14-40, addresses the crowd on the day of Pentecost, the foundational event for the whole apostolic mission, and the speech is a polished statement of the Gospel that Jesus has been raised by God as Lord and Christ. The reception of the Spirit is the fulfilment of the promise of Jesus before he ascends (1:8, cf. Lk 24:49) that the disciples would receive power to be his witnesses by the coming of the Holy Spirit, and this would also constitute their being baptised in 'holy spirit' as foretold by John the Baptist (1:5, 11:16; cf. Lk 3:16). Pentecost, originally an agricultural festival, was later 'historicised' as the feast of the theophany and giving of Torah at Sinai, a development possibly already happening in the Judaism of Luke's time⁹. The crowd which gathers at the noise and commotion are said at first to be all devout Jews from among the population who had settled in¹⁰ Jerusalem from all the dispersion, and so could be said to represent all peoples ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν (Ac 2:5). However in v. 11 some are revealed as proselytes as well as Jews – are these the same as the Romans (or those with Roman citizenship?) who have settled, or are visitors (so NRSV)? There may be confusion here, or a deliberate hint that the ultimate mission to the end of the earth (which will in the course of the Acts narrative find its new centre in

⁹ From the second century there is evidence that the Torah lection for Pentecost in the synagogue was the giving of the Law at Sinai, but because this association is not made by Philo or Josephus, it may only have become common after their time. However Philo (*On the Decalogue* 33, 46) does regard the fire of Sinai as the voice and language that was understood by the assembly. The curious phrase of Exodus 20:18 אֶת-הַקּוֹלֹת וְכָל-הָעָם רָאִים speaking of seeing voices in the plural, invited speculative exegesis – Rabbi Johanan from the mid third century said, "The (divine) voice issued forth and divided into seventy voices, seventy tongues, so that all peoples might hear it, and each people heard the voice in its own tongue"; (cited by Jacques Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles*, [English translation of *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, Cerf, Paris, 1967], Paulist Press, New York, 1979, p.42). If such an interpretation were current as early as Luke's time, then it would constitute a striking similarity to his Pentecost story. In any case, the Sinai theophany's fire, sounds and winds lend themselves to the imagery of Luke's Pentecost.

¹⁰ Εἰς if so read, in the sense of ἐν, a common 'misuse' in Koine according to Barrett, *Acts*, I, p.117.

Rome), will include a crossing of the boundaries of Jews and Gentiles.¹¹ The list of the nations (2:9-11) from which the crowd of devout Jews have come and whose first languages they hear the apostles speaking, is a symbol of the universal mission to come¹².

Peter and the rest of the Twelve receive the gift of the Spirit and so are empowered to turn their function as witnesses to Jesus into articulating the Gospel. Luke imagines the signs of the Spirit's coming to be observable, and to mark a particular new step in the progress of the Gospel. In Ac 4:31, prayer for the gift of boldness, *παρρησία*,¹³ leads to the Spirit's coming with a shaking of the place where they were. Following on Philip's evangelizing of Samaria, the laying on of the apostolic hands of Peter and John ensures that the Samaritan converts also receive the Spirit, in an observable though unspecified way (8:15ff). The Spirit falls upon Cornelius' household and they speak in tongues and extol God (10:44f), which Peter likens to the apostles' own Pentecost experience (11:15) as well as fulfilling John's prophecy of baptism in holy spirit (v.16 and referring to 1:5). So, associated with Peter's ministry, there are experiences of the Spirit

¹¹ see also below on v. 21, Joel 3:5.

¹² The details of the list bear a little resemblance to the astrological list matching the constellations of the zodiac to nations, which is quoted by Paulus Alexandrinus in the 4th century CE [Richard F. Zehnle, *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, New York, 1971], but may well reflect earlier tradition. There are many overlaps, and sometimes in the same order; the astrological list may help to explain the variants for 'Judaea' which always seems an odd member of the Acts' list, namely 'Syria' and 'Armenia', both of which are in the astrological list. Loveday Alexander ["'In Journeyings Often': Voyaging in the Acts of the Apostles and in Greek Romance", in C. M. Tuckett, (Ed), *Luke's Literary Achievement*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, p. 30] agrees with Richard Bauckham ["James and the Jerusalem Church", in Richard Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting, vol.4: Palestinian Setting* (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1995), pp.415-80] that there is a 'mental map' with Jerusalem (Judaea) at the centre, looking first east, then north, south-west, west and south. In any case, the list of the nations does seem to represent the world.

¹³ Openness and freedom of speech, with an absence of fear in speaking out, is an important gift in Acts (of Peter 2:29, 4:13; of apostles, 4:31; of Paul 28:31), and was a quality especially prized in Luke's time as the ideal of Cynic philosophers. The use of the term in Acts builds a bridge into the culture of the Hellenistic philosophical missionary, though in Acts it comes as charisma not as philosophical achievement. See Johnson, *Acts* p.78; Stanley B. Marrow, "Parrhēsia and the New Testament", *CBQ* 44 (1982), 431-446; Schlier, *TDNT* 5.882.

for Jerusalem, Samaria and Judaea, and for Gentiles, which justifies Dietrich's description as having the "Aspekt eines dreifachen Pfingstfestes".¹⁴ Later in Paul's ministry (19:1-7) when he arrives at Ephesus, he finds believers, baptized into John's baptism who had not received the Holy Spirit; he rebaptizes them in the name of Jesus and lays hands on them, and the Holy Spirit's coming upon them is manifest in the phenomena of tongues and prophecy, where the apostolic number, "about twelve" is a further reminder of the Pentecost event. While this incident raises many questions, historical and theological, some parallel with Peter is bound to be heard. It is not clear what Luke's own experience of the Spirit's *charismata* may have been; they are not presented as a regular or weekly feature of the Christian assembly, as in Paul's Corinth, but they certainly had an observable aspect. I suggest Luke may have been influenced by phenomena described in Judges or 1 Samuel (e.g. 1 Sam 10:10f). In any case it is the receiving of the Spirit which is an essential sign of Christian discipleship and the premise and power of the apostolic proclamation. Luke anticipates this by references to the Spirit already experienced in the opening of his double narrative (Lk 1:15, 17, 35, 41, 67, 80, 2:25ff, 3:22, 4:1, 14, 18).

Peter's sermon, which goes on to interpret this Pentecost happening, can be regarded as the keynote speech for the Christian proclamation in Jerusalem. In the structure of Luke-Acts it can be compared with the opening synagogue sermon of Jesus at Nazareth (Lk 4:16ff), which interprets the Isaiah lection as having its fulfilment in the mission of Jesus upon whom the Spirit has come down and rested¹⁵. Both speeches cite the Prophets which the preachers say are being fulfilled in the present; both carry hints of future mission beyond Israel (Lk 4:25-27, Ac 2:21, 39). However the parallels should not

¹⁴ Dietrich, p.332.

¹⁵ Cf Neiryck, "Luke 4,16-30 and the Unity of Luke-Acts", pp 376-8

be exaggerated. While both have a mixed reception, that of Jesus is mainly hostile with an attempted lynching that prefigures the passion, while Peter has overwhelming success (Ac 2:41), enacting the symbolism of the miraculously large catch of fish when Peter was called into discipleship (Lk 5:1-11).

Beginning with the observed phenomena Peter interprets them as the fulfilment of Joel. Craig Evans¹⁶ argues that much of the language is taken from Joel; most note-worthy is the image of being drunk on new wine in Joel 1:5. Peter goes on to speak briefly about the ministry and death of Jesus, how he was raised and exalted by God, to justify Peter's declaration that καὶ κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε (v.36). Peter concludes by calling on his hearers to repent and be baptized, to receive the benefits both of forgiveness and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The healing of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate is the occasion for Peter's second address to a Jewish audience in the Stoa of Solomon in the Temple, Ac 3:12-26, interpreting the healing as a sign of salvation and challenging them to repent of their rejection of Jesus. Peter's mighty works will be the subject of the next chapter. In contrast with the Pentecost speech this Temple speech shows a "tangled state of syntax ... and uncertain connection of ideas"¹⁷. Together with the use of some uncommon terms and titles, this has been regarded by some as evidence for the speech's dependence on primitive tradition, but can equally be evidence of Luke's skill in utilising a variety of styles and terminology, both for the sake of variation and to sound archaic.

Ac 4:8-12 is the apostles' defence before the Sanhedrin of the healing as a sign of the Gospel, and though a defence speech it turns into a kerygmatic challenge to reverse their rejection of Jesus. Ac 5:29-32 is a concise statement of the apostolic *kerygma*, again

¹⁶ "The Prophetic Setting of the Pentecost Sermon", *ZNTW*, 74 (1983), 148-50.

¹⁷ Johnson, *Acts*, p. 72; also Pervo, *Acts*, p.104.

before the Sanhedrin, in the context of their growing hostility towards the Christian movement. The warning of Gamaliel that they may find themselves fighting against God leads to the release of the apostles after a flogging and warning, but they are not deterred from continuing their teaching both in the Temple and homes.

In Ac 10:34-43 Peter's speech is before the Gentile household of Cornelius; it has no citations of OT scripture, though several clear allusions; it has the fullest summary of the life of Jesus. In the strategy of Acts Peter's proclamation to these Gentiles, persuaded to do so by vision and the Spirit, plays a pivotal part (see Chapter Five). Again, the clumsiness of its opening sentences is puzzling¹⁸ - Fitzmyer regards the "miserable Greek" as part of an "echo" of primitive preaching, which is "undoubtedly derived from Palestinian tradition"¹⁹! I rather favour the suggestion that the poor grammar and syntax are deliberate verisimilitude for an unaccustomed speaker in a second language²⁰, perhaps socially overawed by his context. Peter is presented as a respecter of persons, but his starting point now is that οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήπτης ὁ θεός.

Each of Peter's speeches has a beginning appropriate to its narrative setting, a *captatio benevolentiae*, but, as the table below shows, there is much common and complementary material in the content of these speeches. How do they relate to the speeches of others in Acts? The sermon of Paul in the Antioch synagogue is also listed in the table to show how the pattern established by Peter forms the pattern for Paul's²¹

¹⁸ The text is discussed in Barrett, *Acts*, pp 521-3.

¹⁹ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Doubleday, New York, 1998, p.40

²⁰ cf. Nicholas King's comment in his translation of the New Testament, Kevin Mayhew, Stowmarket, 2004, p. 296, "Luke is trying to catch Peter's awkward diction (or a style of speaking appropriate to the character)".

²¹ Andrew C. Clark, *Parallel Lives*, Paternoster Press, Carlisle, 2001, p. 332.

proclamation to Jews. However Paul's *kerygma* to Gentiles (Ac 14:15-18; 17:22-31) does not follow Peter's to God-fearing Cornelius, in that it begins with teaching Jewish monotheism and the doctrine of creation, cites Greek poets rather than the Jewish scriptures for authority and concludes with only the briefest and unnamed reference to Jesus and his resurrection. Stephen's speech before the Sanhedrin (Ac 7) like Peter's, challenges their rejection of Jesus, and does so on the basis of OT scriptures – and some of the texts are the same as those cited by Peter, namely Dt 18:15 and Gen 12:3 - but the shape of Stephen's speech is not *kerygmatic* and it condemns the Council rather than offering a chance of repentance.

	Ac 2:14-40	Ac 3:12-26	Ac 4:8-12	Ac 5:29-32	Ac 10:34-43	Ac 13:16-41 (Paul)
The Jesus story	Deeds of power; handed over; crucified by those outside the Law; God raised; exalted; sent Spirit;	Sent first to Israel; handed over; rejected before Pilate; asked for murderer; killed; God raised; glorified; in heaven until...	you' crucified; God raised;	Killed by hanging on tree; God raised & exalted;	Began in Galilee after baptism announced by John; doing good/healing/exorcisms; in Judea & Jerusalem death on tree; God raised on 3 rd day; appearances; meals; command to preach; to be judge	After John's preaching; Asked Pilate to execute; taken from Tree; tomb; God raised; appeared for many days;
Christology	The Nazorean Holy One (son of ?) Father Lord Messiah (Davidic)	Ἰαῶν Holy & Righteous One; ἀρχηγός τῆς ζωῆς ; Messiah; Prophet (like Moses); Messiah-designate;	Messiah Nazorean	Ἀρχηγός Saviour Messiah (v42)	Messiah; Lord of all; anointed with spirit; ordained as judge;	Saviour; Davidic Son; Holy One;
Salvation	Repentance & Baptism → forgiveness, Holy Spirit	Faith in Name → healing, salvation; repent → forgiveness, time of refreshing/restoration; all be blessed;	Healing/salvation by Name of Jesus alone;	Repentance for Israel; forgiveness; Holy Spirit;	Peace; forgiveness through name; receive Holy Spirit; baptism;	Forgiveness; inc. what Torah could not deal with;
Citations	Isa 53:1-5 Ps 15:8-11 Ps 109:1	Gen 22:18, 26: 4 Lev 23:29 Dt 18:15-20				Ps 2:7 Is 55:3; Ps 15:10 Hab 1:5
Allusions	Ps 132:11, 89:4	Ex 3:6	Ps 118:22	Ex 3:15 Dt 21:22	Prophets testify Is 52:7, 61:1; Dt 21:22 Ps 106:20	

What does Peter preach?

(a) The life of Jesus

There is some account of the mission and life of Jesus²², along with the suggestion that his narrative audiences in Jerusalem are aware of at least some of the story, (the second person plural in the verbs 2:22, 3:13ff, and at 4:10, and compare Lk 24:18ff), as well as Cornelius' household in Caesarea, (10:36), who, perhaps, stand for the real audience of Acts who have already heard Luke's account of Jesus in his first volume²³. Later Paul in Caesarea assumes that Agrippa cannot be ignorant of the story, although not converted to faith (26:26). The accounts of the ministry of Jesus in the speeches complement each other²⁴, each contributing at least one detail; repetition reinforces the hearers' memory²⁵. Ac 2 emphasises that those to whom Jesus was handed over for crucifixion, were ἄνομοι. Pilate is named in 3:13²⁶ and Peter also alludes to the choice of Barabbas (Lk 23:19, 25 // Mk 15:7), who is also there described as a murderer²⁷. Ac 2 regards the exalted Christ's sending of the Spirit as part of the *Heilsgeschichte*; this may also be implied by 5:32. Ac 3 looks forward in the story to "times of refreshing" when God will send the Messiah, Jesus. The speech to Cornelius' Gentile household has the fullest summary of the Jesus story, and includes the prior proclamation by John the Baptist of a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins, who prepared the way so that all flesh might see the salvation of God²⁸ (Lk 3:3f). The ministry of Jesus includes healings and exorcisms, and moves from Galilee to Judea. As in Ac 5 Peter describes the

²² Cf G. N. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*, CUP, 1974.

²³ p.22.

²⁴ Rather as the OT narrative recounted in Stephen's speech in Ac 7 is complemented by Paul's speech in Ac 13.

²⁵ Tannehill, "The Functions of Peter's Mission Speeches", p.400.

²⁶ also by Paul in Ac 13; elsewhere in the NT outside of the Gospels and Acts, only 1 Tim 6:13.

²⁷ Wilckens, *Die Missionreden*, p. 127 draws attention to Luke's tendency to make Pilate less guilty.

²⁸ Note Luke's extension of the citation from Isaiah, compared with his Markan *Vorlage*, and the allusion to it in Paul's and Luke's closing words [Ac 28:28].

crucifixion as hanging on a tree²⁹; the phrase itself echoes the curse of Dt 21:22f, which is made explicit in Paul's theology in Galatians, but not here; it is an element from tradition. The resurrection is followed by multiple appearances which include meals and the command to proclaim and witness to "the people". Jesus has the future role of judge of the living and the dead. Cumulatively then, the speeches do contain a bare summary of the Gospel account of Jesus, with the exception of the birth and infancy narratives, to which the apostles are not witnesses. If we add the details from the community's prayer in Ac 4:27f³⁰, which include the action of Herod against Jesus, then we may think specifically of *Luke's* narrative. It accords well with the role of apostles as witnesses (see Chapter Two), and is followed as well by the Pauline speeches, relying upon the apostolic witness (Ac 13:31). Whether or not the inclusion of a summary of the Gospel story was a *traditional* part of evangelistic preaching, it is certainly *Luke's* concern to place the past ministry of Jesus and the apostolic witness to it and in continuity with it, at the centre of the preaching. By way of contrast, the Pauline epistles contain very little of the biography of Jesus, even when apparently citing traditional material. The opening words of Mark suggest that he intends to tell the Good News by recounting the story of Jesus, a purpose continued in the other Gospels, and by Luke, I contend, carried through into the Acts as well.

The purpose of the Acts mission speeches in Luke's narrative is to convert the hearers, bringing them salvation through their faith in Jesus as proclaimed. They could also have served as models for preachers in Luke's own day. If we can show the influence

²⁹ Max Wilcox, "'Upon the Tree' Deuteronomy 21:22-3 in the New Testament", *JBL* 96 (1977), 85-99. Martin C. Albl, *"And Scripture Cannot be Broken": The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, Brill, Leiden; Boston; Köln, 1999, p. 155, refers to collections of wood/tree/cross texts in patristic literature.

³⁰ The dative plural λαοῖς 'peoples [of] Israel' is surprising here, and there is a little textual support for a singular nominative. However it reflects the plural λαοί in v. 25, citing Ps 2:1 LXX, which in the prayer is interpreted not as parallel to ἔθνη, Gentiles, but as Israel.

of **Luke's kerygma** on the creeds in formation, this would strengthen the case that the speeches were useful as a handbook in Luke's day. So we attend now to the explicit or implicit teaching of these speeches in terms of their christologies and soteriologies.

(b) Christological terms

Peter's first statement about Jesus is that he is ἀνὴρ³¹ and ὁ Ναζωραῖος (2:22; also by Peter at 3:6 and 4:20)³². The question is whether for Luke Ναζωραῖος means anything more than ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ (Ac 10:38, Peter speaking)³³. At Lk 18:37 Luke has substituted it for Mark's Ναζαρηνός a term he also employs at 4:34, 24:19, but not at all in Acts. It is part of Jesus' human biography.

The climax of Peter's proclamation in his Pentecost speech is the certain knowledge (ἀσφαλῶς ... γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ, cf. in the preface Lk 1:4, ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς τὴν ἀσφάλειαν) because of the resurrection and exaltation of the crucified Jesus, that God had made him καὶ κύριον ... καὶ χριστὸν (Ac 2:36). To ascribe messiahship to Jesus is a commonplace in the NT and is used in all the speeches of Peter here being considered (3:18, 20, 4:10, 5:42, 10:36). Peter's confession of Jesus in Lk 9:20 had said the same. Jesus had commanded silence at that time and there is no reference to Jesus as Christ between 9:20 and the charges brought against Jesus in his trial, 23:2. His messiahship would not be understood or appropriately referred to until after the passion when Jesus had taught them the scriptural necessity for messianic suffering. Peter's

³¹ Paul agrees, (17:31).

³² And by false witnesses against Stephen at 6:14, to Paul (22:8), by Paul (26:9), and as a description of the Christian sect (24:5).

³³ Thorough discussions in Schaeder, *TDNT*, 4.874-9; R. E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 1977, pp 209-213, 223-5; J. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, pp 1215f. It has been suggested on the basis of the מָשִׁיחַ of Is. 11:1 that it is a messianic title. Alternatively it may be based on the word for a Nazirite, נָזִיר. The Alexandrinus text of Jgs 16:17 about Samson has ναζειραῖος but Vaticanus ἅγιος θεοῦ (which is a title used of Jesus). However the omega of Ναζωραῖος remains problematic. There is no indication that Luke was aware of these possible nuances, and even if he were, the term would have the same significance as the (Davidic) Messiah, or the 'Holy One', both of which are applied to Jesus in these speeches.

address to Cornelius expresses an understanding of the messiahship, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει, (Ac 10:38), which is linked to his baptism and has a strong allusion to Is. 61:1, the text cited by Jesus in the Nazareth synagogue and declared to be fulfilled (Lk 4:18). That it is as royal, Davidic Messiah that the term is applied to Jesus, is made clear in the Infancy narratives, Lk 1:12f, 2:11, as well as 19:38. Yet in the total narrative and in the Psalm citations yet to be considered, it is clear that the Messiah's reign is heavenly. Ac 2:36 is open to the interpretation that the reign of Jesus as Messiah begins at the resurrection/ascension and is the divine reversing of the human action against him. If pressed, the implication of the phrase in Ac 3:20, that Jesus is designated as the Messiah yet to come, τὸν προκεχειρισμένον ... χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, would in terms of logical Christological development be "The Most Primitive Christology of All", as argued by J. A. T. Robinson³⁴. However, Luke and Luke's Peter do not hesitate to put it alongside texts that give a messianic role to the exalted Jesus in the present. We do not find, and should not expect to find, seamless consistency in the statements. Whether Luke's use of archaic phrases is evidence of primitive tradition here, or of the historian's attempt at verisimilitude, remains open to debate, though I would incline towards the latter.

What is a distinctive note in Luke's view of the Messiah is that the exaltation follows his suffering, which has about it a scriptural necessity. The risen Jesus teaches this on the Emmaus Road (Lk 24:26f) and repeats it to the assembled disciples in Jerusalem (vv 46f). Peter's speech in Ac 3:18 asserts the same as the expectation of the prophets, as does the Lukan Paul at 26:23. A suffering messiah is not the explicit expectation of any of the OT royal or Davidic messianic texts, though persecution of prophets and others is common in the OT and part of the Gospel's background – see, for

³⁴ *Twelve New Testament Studies*, SCM, London, 1962, pp 139-153, reprinted from *JTS* 7 (1956), 177-89.

example, the sayings in Lk 13:34f(Q) and 11:49f³⁵, and the way Joseph and Moses are treated as types of Christ in Stephen's speech (Ac 7:9f, 25, 35). If the Psalter is treated as by or about David, then the psalms of the righteous sufferer are also relevant to the discussion, as is the persecuted righteous sufferer of Wisdom 2 and 3 - he is termed παῖς Κυρίου (2:13) as well as υἱὸς θεοῦ (v.18). Joshua W. Jipp³⁶ argues that the Psalms depict David's sufferings, and so the Messiah's sufferings at the hands of the messiah's enemies. Strauss³⁷ reasonably argues that Luke read Isaiah as a unity and considered both the prophet-herald of Is 61 (cited in Jesus' sermon at Nazareth) and the Servant (παῖς) of Is 40-55 to represent an expanding Isaianic description of the Davidic messiah introduced in Is 9 and 11. In Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, his opponent concedes that scripture did expect the Messiah to suffer (36.1, 39.7, 89.2, 90.1), an improbable concession for Trypho to make if that interpretation were a Christian innovation. It had become part of teaching particularly associated with Peter in that 1 Pet 2:21 makes Χριστός the subject of ἔπαθεν, with a citation of Is 53:7 (see below).

The conjunction of the title χριστός with the title κύριος at Ac 2:36 clearly gives to the latter a meaning more than 'sir', if not the full equivalence of the Tetragrammaton which it represents in the LXX. In the Nativity narrative (Lk 2:11) the angel tells the shepherds that a saviour has been born who is χριστὸς κύριος. Peter's speech proclaims that God's action confirms Jesus' identity already announced to the

³⁵ Also Q; we note the differences of those sent along with prophets, namely sages and scribes in Matthew, but prophets and apostles in Luke. The rare similar use of ἀπόστολος outside the NT (LXX 3 Kgdms 14:6 Alexandrinus, of Ahijah the prophet), and the frequency of the term in Lk-Acts, (1/1 or 2/6+28/1), might suggest it is LkR here; it serves well to prepare the Gospel reader for the persecution of Christian disciples and especially the apostles, in Acts, where their sufferings recapitulate those of Jesus.

³⁶ Jipp, "Luke's Scriptural Suffering Messiah".

³⁷ Mark L. Strauss *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, p.244.

shepherds, in what constitutes an “epistemological shift”³⁸ - ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω (Ac 2:36; cf Lk1:4), rather than an adoptionist action by God. In his speech in the house of Cornelius, Peter says οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος, (10:36). If this is understood as a parenthesis adding to the description of Jesus Christ, the messenger of good news of peace as announced to the shepherds, then οὗτος will be emphatic, and ascribe universal lordship over peoples (understanding πάντων as masculine; if it is neuter then there is a cosmic lordship too) to Jesus rather than to any political leader or pagan deity. This is especially appropriate at the moment in the narrative when Peter has come to realize the acceptability to God of righteous people in every nation.

Peter had addressed Jesus as κύριε in the Gospel, (Lk 12:41, 22:33) and at 5:8 Peter changes his address of Jesus from ἐπιστάτα (v.5) to κύριε. We postpone discussion of how significant this is until Chapter Seven.

Whereas the titles κύριος and χριστός are given to Jesus almost universally by the NT authors, so that their specific meanings may be diluted, and they almost become part of his proper name, even for Gentile Christianity, Peter’s speech in Ac 3 does employ several Christological terms which are infrequent in the NT and are potentially evidence of more varied and primitive attempts to describe Jesus’ role, or, at least, are Luke’s way of making Peter’s speech sound archaic.

The Holy and Righteous One (ὁ ἅγιος καὶ δίκαιος 3:14) describes Jesus in contrast to the people’s choice before Pilate of a murderer. At the crucifixion, the centurion’s verdict is that Jesus is δίκαιος (Lk 23:47 LkR). Ὁ ἅγιος is combined with παῖς at Ac 4:27, 30; all the prophets are regarded as ἄγιοι (3:21, Lk 1:70). As a possible

³⁸ C. Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin & New York, 2006, pp189ff.

messianic title, Haenchen³⁹ refers to Mk 1:24, Lk 4:34, Jn 6:69. In Isaiah the ‘Holy One’ is not the Servant, but rather God who is the ‘Holy One of Israel’. Barrett⁴⁰ thinks it “is probably a term of Christian origin, resting upon the moral character of Jesus and the conviction that he was the one set apart by God”, and that δίκαιος (a title perhaps in 7:52, 22:14) emphasises the moral quality of Jesus in contrast to φονεύς. According to Mk 6:20 Herod knew that John the Baptist was ‘holy and righteous’, morally upright, but also in right standing before God. Ὁσιος which is interpreted as the messiah/ Jesus in the citation from Ps 16(15) at Ac 2:27 and 13:39, can be regarded as a synonym for ἅγιος - ὁσιότης is combined with δικαιοσύνη in Zechariah’s song (Lk 1:75; also Wisd. 9:3), where it describes the state of fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise.

Ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς (Ac 3:15) also underlines the contrast of the people’s choice of a murderer with Jesus, though the meaning of the genitive is unclear, – ‘leader to life’, ‘author of life’. In context there is intended a strong contrast between life and bringing life, and death and bringing death. Ἀρχηγός is used by Peter again at 5:31, where he combines it with σωτήρ (which is itself in apposition to χριστὸς κύριος in Lk 2:11), the saviour founder-hero. George Johnston⁴¹ argues that Biblical meaning almost always denotes leadership, *e.g.* 1 Macc 9:61, 10:47.⁴² The term is not as developed Christologically in Acts as in Hebrews, though we note that Heb 2:10 states that ὁ ἀρχηγός τῆς σωτηρίας is made perfect through sufferings, like Luke’s interpretation of messiahship.

³⁹Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1971, p.206.

⁴⁰Barrett, *Acts* p.196.

⁴¹“Christ as Archegos”, *NTS* 27 (1980-1), 381-385.

⁴² He cites Ezek 34:24, 37:25, 44:3 as being examples of the term being used for the ‘prince’, the Davidic messiah, נשיא or נשיא, though the LXX does not have ἀρχηγός there. He also cites CD 7.20, where כל העדה the prince of all the congregation, is said to be the fulfilment of the oracle of Numbers 24:17; he also cites 1QSb 5.20, 4QpGen 49.10 and Mur. 24 which gives the title prince of Israel to Simeon ben Koseba. Would the Greek term necessarily bring associations of the Semitic equivalent, let alone a particular office in the Qumran community’s organisation or hopes?

The most interesting term that Peter applies to Jesus is *παῖς* (child/servant/‘boy’). It is also used for both Jesus and David in the prayer of Ac 4:25ff and the prayer in *Didache* 9, and for David in Lk 1:69, as well as for Israel in Lk 1:54. That it is the LXX’s chosen translation in Isaiah for *עֶבֶד יְהוָה* raises questions whether there is not only a royal Christology here (*cf* David), but also a conscious Suffering Servant Christology developed by Luke. Luke himself is drawn towards the Servant Songs; Is 53:7 is cited at Ac 8:32f, where it is interpreted by Philip, and Jesus also cites Is 53:12 at Lk 22:37. As noted above, it is probable that Luke would have included Is 61 among the Servant Songs of Isaiah. Peter’s speech in Ac 3 begins and concludes with possible allusions to Isaiah’s Servant – v. 13 ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ κτλ ... ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν combines a clear allusion, if not citation of Ex.3:6, with a possible allusion to Is 52:13, ὁ παῖς μου καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα, in the fourth Servant Song. Barrett⁴³ asserts, “There can be no question that the figure [of the Suffering Servant] is to be seen here, and the context makes it clear that he is thought of not only as exalted but also as suffering”. The case is strengthened if we allow the Davidic/messianic use of *παῖς* in the prayer of chapter 4 to reflect a messianic interpretation of the Servant of Is. 52-3. The final words of Peter’s speech (Ac 3:26) may also allude to the Servant’s pattern of suffering being followed by glorification – ἀναστήσας ὁ θεὸς τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ, though the more natural sense of the participle ἀναστήσας is that it precedes in time the main verb ἀπέστειλεν, and is an allusion to the raising up of a prophet like Moses in v. 22, rather than a reference to Jesus’ resurrection. Nevertheless we are left with another reference to Jesus as Servant.

Peter’s speeches, then, do voice for Luke the content of the Christian proclamation, and provide a basic Christological assessment of the significance of Jesus.

⁴³Barrett, *Acts*, p. 194.

Peter provides an understanding of Christhood as anointing with the Spirit, and links it with Isaiah's suffering Servant. His statement that Jesus is Lord of all opens the way for a universal allegiance to the exalted Jesus. If Peter has a contribution distinct from Luke's, then it is to be found in this link and feeding it into a wider Petrine trajectory (1 Peter, *Kerygma Petrou*). Jesus as Servant overlaps with the soteriological elements, to which we now turn.

(c) The soteriology of Peter's speeches

Peter's proclamation of the *kerygma* invites the hearers to repentance (μετανοέω, a change of mind, [5/2/9+5/0]) and conversion (ἐπιστρέφω, a turnabout of direction, [4/4/7+11/1]) which is expressed in being baptised, bringing both forgiveness of sins ἄφεσις των ἁμαρτιῶν, (Ac 2:38, 5:31, 10:43, 13:38, 26:18; also Lk 1:77, 3:3, 24:7, and note the metaphor of release in 4:18 ἄφεσις 1/2/5+5/0) and the gift of the Spirit. Ac 3:19 has an alternative expression, the wiping away of sin, ἐξαλειφθῆναι, with a possible allusion to Ps 51(50):1. In the speech of Ac 10:36, this is termed 'peace', εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 'Peace' was the angelic summary of what the Messiah's birth meant (Lk 2:14), echoed in the shouts when Jesus entered into Jerusalem (19:38, LkR) and heralded in the ministry of John the Baptist, according to his father (1:79), the peace of heaven and earth, but also, as is made explicit in the context of Cornelius' household, the acceptability of believers from any nation (Ac 10:34f)⁴⁴. There is a probable allusion to Is 52:7 πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης. Another way of speaking of salvation, (σωτηρία, σώζω), also has the sense of healing, so that the healing

⁴⁴ There is a similar understanding of 'peace' in the deutero-Pauline Eph. 2:14,17, εὐηγγελίσαστο εἰρήνην.

of the lame beggar at the Beautiful Gate is an illustration of a ‘whole’ salvation and the occasion of the proclamation of salvation (Ac 4:9-12)⁴⁵.

The speech of Chapter 3 again furnishes us with a cluster of uncommon terms which express salvation. 3:20 speaks of “times of refreshing”, καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως, which precede the sending of the Messiah⁴⁶, rather than being identical with, the eschatological χρόνοι ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων (v.21).

All happens according to the necessity (δεῖ) of the divine plan (βουλή) as set out by the prophets, in the inversion of things, the resurrection and exaltation of the crucified. Little, however, is said of the transactions by which salvation comes about. The Lukan Peter does assert that it is through the Name of Jesus that salvation is given. Within the Biblical culture, a person’s name⁴⁷ does carry a sense of that person’s character or significance or authority. So Peter answers his audience’s question on the day of Pentecost, “What should we do?” by telling them each to be baptized in⁴⁸ the name of Jesus Christ, so that their sins may be forgiven and they might receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (2:38). At the hearing before the Sanhedrin after the healing of the lame beggar, to their question, ἐν ποίᾳ δυνάμει ἢ ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι ἐποιήσατε τοῦτο ὑμεῖς;, Peter, inspired by the Spirit, asserts that the sole and exclusive route for salvation is the name of Jesus, crucified and raised, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἢ σωτηρία, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον

⁴⁵ See further in Chapter Four.

⁴⁶ Pervo, *Acts*, p.107 “It is difficult to establish sequential and consequential relations... Are (the times of refreshment and the era of universal restoration) essentially synonymous? Luke has almost certainly made use of some traditional material here.”

⁴⁷ See the article on ὄνομα by Bietenhard in *TDNT*, 5.242-283; J. A. Ziesler, “The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles”, *JSNT* 4 (1979), 28-41.

⁴⁸ Note the different prepositions ἐπὶ (Ac 2:38); ἐν (2:38 v.l., 10:48); εἰς (8:16, 19:5).

ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς (4:7, 12)⁴⁹. Then it is, perhaps, to avoid any suggestion that the magic of the name or formula in itself (cf. 19:13ff) is effective in healing or salvation, which results in the rather clumsy expression of 3:16. What Peter clumsily⁵⁰ says, is that it was Jesus, not Peter and John who had healed, and that the Name is not to be thought effective *ex opere operato* but only in the context of personal faith. The ‘faith’ clarification is inserted to dispel any superstitious notions, but leaves then a sentence in which the subject varies between the name and faith. It was ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου that Peter had bidden the beggar to walk (3:6). In Luke’s first volume, the Seventy(-two) sent out by Jesus reported that in his name even the demons submitted (Lk 10:17). John is rebuked by Jesus for trying to prevent someone who was not a disciple of Jesus from exorcising in his name (Lk 9:49 // Mk 9:38). So Peter’s practice (accompanied by John) was in keeping with the pre-Easter practice described by Luke.

Luke’s account of the naming of Jesus (Lk 2:21) emphasizes that this was according to the instruction of Gabriel (1:31), but the possible meaning of the name as having to do with salvation is absent from Luke-Acts (contrast Mt 1:21). In seeing the Lord’s Messiah, Simeon has ‘seen salvation’ (2:30) but he does not link it with his name. In prophecies of the birth of a royal (messianic?) child, the name is regarded as enshrining his significance (Is. 9:6, also? 7:14; Jer. 33:16). In second temple Judaism, the divine Name was increasingly treated with reverence, eventually uttered only by the High Priest, and effective as God himself when the Name is used in the priestly blessing (Num. 6:27); for others to utter it could be blasphemy, or sometimes effective in a miracle. In the reading of scripture, the Tetragrammaton was read as *Adonai* or אֲדֹנָי and by the Samaritans as אֲדֹנָי ; in the LXX it is represented by ὁ Κύριος. Can we suppose that the apostolic use

⁴⁹ Jaroslav Pelikan, *Acts*, SCM Press, London, 2006, pp 66-68, finds an unresolved contradiction between universal restoration (3:21) and salvation only by the name of Jesus, but neither Luke nor the Lukan Peter were attempting so systematic a theology!

⁵⁰ See Barrett, *Acts*, pp 198ff; also “Faith and Eschatology in Acts 3”, in Erich Grässer & Otto Merk (Edd), *Glaube und Eschatologie, Festschrift für W.G.Kümmel zum 80 Geburtstag*, Mohr, Tübingen. 1985, 1-17.

of the name of Jesus had something of the sense of the divine Name? In the hymnic Phil 2:9ff, the exalted Jesus is given τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα, and worshipped in terms the phraseology of which strongly alludes to Is 45:23 where it applies to God. In Peter's speech, the seeds for such a development are sown but have not yet blossomed. Luke, I conclude, is preserving an early stage in this development.

Supporting Citations

Luke's narrative of the unrecognized risen Jesus interpreting to two disciples walking to Emmaus, how the scriptures showed that it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and so enter into his glory (Lk. 24:25), in a manner that set their hearts on fire (24:32), is a paradigm of the work of scriptural interpretation that was part of the theological enterprise of (at least) Luke's, and possibly all the earliest Christian communities' life, the results of which we now have in Acts and more widely in other NT documents. Jesus himself gives the lead and Luke pictures the forty days between the first resurrection appearance and the Ascension as including further teaching about the kingdom of God (Ac 1:3). Then in the speeches of Acts the general statement that the Gospel story fulfils what the prophets foretold, is fleshed out with reference to specific texts. Our purpose now is to examine the speeches of Peter for the OT citations, asking how they have been applied and whether the same texts have been cited or alluded to elsewhere in Luke-Acts or other NT documents. While some is part of a shared work of interpretation, I argue that much is the contribution of Luke himself. Intended citations are indicated by some formula, *e.g.* γέγραπται, Ac 1:20; alleged allusions are less clearly identified as intended, especially if they consist of only one or two words – I restrict discussion to phrases where we can be fairly sure of an intended allusion. Where the same text is cited by a number of NT authors there is evidence for an oral or written collection

of useful texts. The discovery of such collections at Qumran⁵¹ together with Hellenistic anthologies (possibly the source of the poets' quotations in Ac 17) and Patristic collections of texts are offered in support of the use of such *testimonia* collections by NT authors. In Justin's use of OT texts, longer citations usually agree with LXX, while shorter texts often differ from LXX, again suggestive of an anthology of short texts but first hand quoting in longer texts. We need to recognize that some texts would become well-known from their use in worship or private devotion; this may especially apply to the Psalms, and we recognize that citations are not from the whole range of the OT. Dodd's⁵² argument that we find clusters of near-by quotes suggests that once a particular text has proven useful then further first-hand study of the text in its location leads to further useful texts coming into play. I will suggest that Luke's use of Joel for his account of Pentecost is an example of this. We postulate that at least parts of the OT, and for Luke that means parts of the LXX, were available for individual research, by the private ownership by some wealthy individuals, or through the synagogue. The sophisticated scriptural work of the Qumran scrolls, of the first Christian author, Paul, of Josephus and others do suggest the possibility of research by educated people.

Peter's speech on the Day of Pentecost (2:14-41) has three citations, used as proof texts for three essential elements in this apostolic *kerygma* – the resurrection and ascension of Jesus and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The long citation of Joel⁵³ is offered as an explanation of what the crowd is observing.

⁵¹ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament", *NTS* 7 (1960-61), 297-333; reprinted in his *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, Geoffrey Chapman, London 1971, pp 3-58; "'4Q Testimonia' and the New Testament" in the same volume pp 59-89; see also his "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts" in *To Advance the Gospel*, 2nd edition, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan and Cambridge, UK, 1998, pp 295-313.

⁵² C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, James Nisbet & Co., London, 1952; Collins, Fontana Books, 1965.

⁵³ Bezae does not name the prophet.

The Acts text mostly agrees with LXX. The order of ‘old and young’ in v.17 is inverted; whereas the LXX and MT follow the gender inclusive sons and daughters and age-inclusive, old men and young, with the status inclusiveness of slaves and slave-girls, Acts describes these as ‘my’⁵⁴ slaves, *i.e.* God’s slaves – a common enough expression for devotees of a god. In v.18 the addition of καὶ προφητεύουσιν (not in D) is a strong hint of how Luke understands the gift of the Spirit as being a renewal of the inspiration of the OT prophets, and the mention of visions (such as experienced later in Acts by Saul/Paul) and dreams (like later of Peter) should be understood as having the same quality. The additions to the following phrase, portents in the heaven *above* and signs on the earth *below*, link the cosmic events expected at the end⁵⁵ with ‘signs and wonders’ done by Jesus and the apostles (*cf.* vv 22,43 – a combination occurring nine times in Acts). The cosmic signs described, which became the stuff of apocalyptic imagery, are as yet only fulfilled with regard to the sun’s eclipse at the crucifixion (Lk 23:45), and possibly the tongues of fire on the apostles’ heads. The chief reason, however, for extending the citation to v.5a is because it offers salvation to all who invoke ‘the name of the Lord’; the name of the Lord or of Jesus will be an important expression in the rest of Acts (19X), as noted above. One may wonder, then, why the citation does not continue with v.5b εὐαγγελιζόμενοι οὗς κύριος προσκέκληται (allusion in Ac 2:39 at the conclusion of the speech⁵⁶?), where LXX seems to have read וּמְבַשְׂרִים [MT וּבְשָׂרִים – the Qumran scroll is no help here]. The most notable difference, however, between LXX and Acts is in the opening phrase of the citation – LXX μετὰ ταῦτα, Acts ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός.⁵⁷ While this could be merely interpretive in keeping with a general understanding of Joel’s prophecy as being eschatological, it does imply that the outpouring of the Spirit, prophesied by Joel and fulfilled, Peter claims, at Pentecost, is at least the beginning of the end-time. Does this square with Luke’s overall tendency, at least as interpreted by Conzelmann⁵⁸, to see the Christ event as the mid-point of salvation-history, with Acts itself as an indication of it starting the period of the Church? It could do so, if the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost is regarded as “the substitute in the meantime for the possession of ultimate salvation”, but while this may be in keeping with Paul’s theology (Rom. 8:23), it is not demonstrably Luke’s. Haenchen⁵⁹ goes so far as to argue from the premise that the outpouring of the Spirit does not inaugurate the last days, that the reading of Vaticanus and 076, following the LXX, should be read here! This is a

⁵⁴ also the correctors of Sinaiticus in Joel 2:29 (MT 3:2), possibly under the influence of Acts?

⁵⁵ καὶ ἐπιφανῆ in LXX and Acts (Omitted by D) is probably a misunderstanding of the Hebrew נִרְאָה as from רָאָה (‘see’) rather than יָרָא (‘fear’).

⁵⁶ So Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, p.36.

⁵⁷ Μετὰ ταῦτα is read by B and 076, a 5th or 6th century fragment of Ac 2:11-22.

⁵⁸ *Theology of Saint Luke*, Faber & Faber, London, 1960, pp. 95f.

⁵⁹ Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 179.

‘manifestly circular’ argument, as recognized by Leo O’Reilly⁶⁰, who suggests that the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἑσχαταῖς ἡμέραις is an allusion to Is. 2:1, the only other place where this phrase is found in the Greek Bible, and which itself, he argues, is of significance “for the interpretation of the Lucan Pentecost”.

In a series of citations at Rom. 10:13 Paul also cites Joel 3:5a (2:32): πᾶς ...⁶¹ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται. That Paul’s citation is then identical with Acts and LXX over eight words, stopping short of the second half of the Joel verse, is evidence that this citation at least, was in a collection of texts, for Christian argument for the potential inclusion of all, and not only Jews, within the net of salvation. That only this phrase of Joel 3:1-5 is cited in the NT outside of Ac 2, might indicate that this text in a collection of texts had sparked in Luke or his source a detailed memory of, or a new personal reading of the whole Joel passage, which so eminently served as a prophecy of the dramatic events on the day of Pentecost, though the verse in the collection was not about this at all. If the whole passage had been familiar to Paul, might he not have made use of it in his own argument about spiritual gifts in 1 Cor. 12-14?

If Joel has provided the Lukan Peter with a proof text for the outpouring of the Spirit in the earliest days of the Christian experience, then we should expect there also to be a proof text of the resurrection of Jesus, a specific text for which seems to have eluded the Christian community. Peter finds it in a citation of Psalm 16 (15): 8-11⁶². An assumption that Peter can share with his narrative audience is that David is the speaker of the psalm. There is evidence that the rabbis later did argue from the text that it “proves that neither corruption nor worms had power over David’s flesh”⁶³, but Peter’s address refers to David as himself dead and buried, but who, as a prophet, refers in this psalm to the Messiah and his resurrection (v.30). He does this by referring to the promise of God to

⁶⁰ *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles*, Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, 1987, p.24.

⁶¹ Paul’s γὰρ is rightly interpreted by NA²⁷ as indicating a further citation.

⁶² Note Peter Doble “The Psalms in Luke-Acts,” in S. Moyise & Maarten J.J. Menken (Edd) *The Psalms in the New Testament*, T & T Clarke International, London & New York, 2004, pp 83-117.

⁶³ W. Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1959, I, p.201, cited by Donald Juel, “The Social Dimensions of Exegesis: The Use of Psalm 16 in Acts 2”, *CBQ*, 43 (1981), 543-556, p.545.

David of a royal descendant, Ac 2:30, ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ καθίσαι ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ, having clear allusions to Ps. 132(131):11, ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς κοιλίας⁶⁴ σου θήσομαι ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον σου, and Ps. 89(88):4(5), ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐτοιμάσω τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ οἰκοδομήσω εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν τὸν θρόνον σου. So Peter argues, without fear of his audience's contradiction, that David in Psalm 16 is referring not to himself but to the Messiah (εἰς αὐτὸν v.25). This is strengthened by supposing that τὸν ὄσιόν σου = תְּיָיִשׁוֹ⁶⁵ would be readily understood as referring to the Messiah, both here and at Ps. 86(85):2, φύλαξον τὴν ψυχὴν μου ὅτι ὄσιός εἰμι. Peter's argument is that Psalm 16 refers literally to the resurrection of the Messiah, and that Jesus was raised from the tomb proves him to be the Messiah. While the psalm originally may have thought of deliverance *from* death, Peter's audience needs no persuasion that in the psalm David is speaking prophetically and about the messiah as someone other than himself. That David's tomb is in Jerusalem⁶⁶ shows that David cannot have been speaking of himself, and the apostolic testimony of Jesus raised from the dead, his flesh uncorrupt, is another plank in Peter's argument that Jesus is the Messiah (2:36).

Part of the same text, οὗ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν is cited (λέγει) in Paul's kerygmatic sermon in the Pisidian Antioch synagogue (Ac 13:35), with

⁶⁴ For Ps. 132's κοιλίας Acts has ὀσφύς which the parallel text in 2 Chron. 6:9 also has; there are a few variant readings in Acts apparently of κοιλίας, while Bezae reads καρδίας! - Traugott Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1968, gives several examples of scribal confusion between ΚΟΙΛΙΑ and ΚΑΡΔΙΑ. Alternatively, the scribe of D may have made a faulty reversion into Greek of the Latin page (*it d*), 'praecordis'. Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, OUP, 1993, p.61, prefers an explanation that the scribe knew that Jesus was physically from the Virgin and so not literally from the loins of David.

⁶⁵ for the plural reading תְּיָיִשׁוֹ in the Ben Chayyim text see the note by Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, p. 41.

⁶⁶ The traditional site of the tomb of David on Mount Zion revered by Jews and Christians, near the Cenacle, traditionally the site of the upper room of the Last Supper and of Pentecost, does not go back to the 1st century CE, so cannot account for the reference to the tomb in Peter's Pentecost speech. Rather the dependence is the reverse and the location of the tomb the work of Christian pilgrims – see Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *The Holy Land, an Archaeological Guide*, 3rd Edition, OUP, 1992, pp 111f.

the same logic. Paul again is set in parallel to Peter. There are no other citations or allusions to Ps 16 in the NT, though Clement of Alexandria does cite it soon after citing the *Kerygma Petrou* (see below).

Why is the final phrase of Ps 16:11, *τερπνότητες ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ σου εἰς τέλος* not cited in Ac 2:28? Assuming that it was known to the author, it already suggested the next necessary step in the argument and the next citation – that the Messiah’s path to life was, literally, to the right hand of God. Lindars⁶⁷ argues that in v.33 Peter does refer to this unquoted line, interpreted as the location, not the instrument of Jesus’s exaltation, repeated by Peter at Ac 5:31. The ascension does call for scriptural attestation. Peter provides Ps 110(109):1. This text is cited by Jesus himself in the Gospel, Lk 20:42f and parallels, where, as here, it is assumed that the speaker is David, and that God, ὁ⁶⁸ Κύριος = יהוה, says *τῷ κυρίῳ μου (= לַאֲדֹנָי) κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου*, where the indirect object must be someone other than David, and so be the Messiah⁶⁹. Peter’s argument again is that David (whose tomb was in Jerusalem) had not (note the emphatic position of οὐ in v. 34) ascended to God’s right hand, but he and the other apostles had witnessed Jesus, risen from the tomb, ascending to heaven. The Acts citation is concerned with the heavenly session of Christ. The same verse is cited at Hebrews 1:13, where it is used to contrast the

⁶⁷ *NT Apologetic*, pp 42f. Lindars’ argument appears to have influenced the *NRSV* translation in both places.

⁶⁸ A reading with the article at Ac 2:34 is accepted by N-A²⁷, on the basis of its presence in p74 and A, though absent from the original readings of $\aleph$, B and D.

⁶⁹ David M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand- Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1973, presents evidence of Jewish interpretations of Ps 110 that were not strictly confined to the Davidic Messiah. In the *Testament of Job* 33.3 Job as a king looks forward to a throne “at the right hand of God”; Justin Martyr, *Dialogue* 32 cites Ps 110 in full and then goes on in 33 and 83 to argue against Trypho’s interpretation of it as applying to Hezekiah. The Hasmonaeen priests had used phrases from Ps 110 and Gen. 14 about Melchizedek, ‘Priest of God Most High’, ‘Priest for ever’ as applying to them (1 Macc. 14:41; *Assumption of Moses* 6:1; Josephus, *Ant* 16.6.2).

Son with mere angels⁷⁰. An allusion at 1 Cor. 15:25 is concerned with the length of the heavenly reign and the nature of the final enemy to be overcome.

The form of the citation in Acts is identical with that in Luke and LXX (with textual variants in all whether the article should be read with the first κύριος). They all read ὑποπόδιον whereas Mt. 22:44 // Mk. 12:36 have ὑποκάτω⁷¹, which is suggestive of Luke's checking the text directly, rather than merely copying Mark. Luke indicates the source of the citation, ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν, not because he doubts Mark's description of David speaking ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ, but indicating his own research; perhaps this also accounts for his unusual replacing of Mark's aorist εἶπεν with the historic present (but real present for the reader!) λέγει.

Peter's speech in Acts 3, has two or three citations from the Torah, namely, 3:22f, citing Dt. 18:15-20⁷² and possibly Lev. 23:29, and Ac 3:25, citing the covenant promise to Abraham, Gen. 22:18 or 26:4. Ac 3:13, the opening of the speech, is also a clear allusion to Ex 3:6, which is a specific citation ascribed to Jesus when teaching in the Temple at Lk. 20:37. Thus Peter roots his proclamation in the hopes of Israel for a Prophet and a new age of salvation. He issues a call to repent of their recent rejection of Jesus, allowing for their 'ignorance' and redefining messiahship in terms of the Servant.

In the citation of Dt. 18:15, it is not clear that the LXX is the source, or only source. The most note-worthy differences are the second person plurals, contrasting with LXX and MT singulars, and λαλήσῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς for LXX ἡγήσω ..., though one might suppose a scribe's eye might have moved on to LXX v.19, ὅσα ἐὰν λαλήσῃ which goes on to express a thought similar to Ac 3:23. The wording of Ac 3:23, however, is much closer to Lev. 23:29, which is not about listening to the prophet, but humbling oneself on the Day of Atonement. ἔσται δὲ at the beginning of Acts 3:23 is not represented in LXX either at Dt. 18 or Lev. 23, but could translate הָיָה MT Dt. 18:19. In arguing for a *testimonia* source for Ac 3:22-25, Albl⁷³ draws on the Day of Atonement setting of Lev 23:29, links it with the Jewish *Akedah* traditions with regard to Isaac and also then

⁷⁰ Later in the epistle v.4 of the same Psalm with regard to Melchizedek will provide a text for argument about Christ's priesthood.

⁷¹ With variants ὑποπόδιον in both.

⁷² Note Dietrich Rusam, "Deuteronomy in Luke-Acts", in S. Moyise & Maarten J. J. Menken, (Edd), *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*, T & T Clarke International, London and New York, 2007, pp 63-81.

⁷³ "And Scripture Cannot be Broken", pp 191, 193.

with the following texts cited by Peter with regard to the Abrahamic covenant. All this seems to me to be asserted rather than proven!

Dt. 18:15 is also cited by Stephen at Ac 7:37, in a form identical to 3:22, except for the omission of κύριος before ὁ θεός. Though there are no other citations in the NT, there are probable allusions to it wherever Moses typology with regard to Jesus or ‘prophet (like Moses)’ expectation is present – note the heavenly command at the Transfiguration αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε (Lk. 9:35 and //s, though the Lukan order of these words, in keeping with Acts and LXX, is redactional); also Jn. 1:21, 6:14. F.F. Bruce calls Dt .18:15 a “favourite proof-text in the early Church”, taken “no doubt (from) one of the (collection of) ‘Testimonies’”⁷⁴, in spite of the fact that it is only cited twice in the NT and these by the same author. Dt. 18:18-19 is cited in a short collection of texts usually called *Testimonia*, found at Qumran, 4Q175⁷⁵. The text is cited with regard to Jesus in *Clementine Recognitions* 1:36, though this could as well have been suggested by the Acts citations as by a Christian *testimonia* collection. Whether Luke was using a Christian Greek collection whose version of Dt. 18 had been affected by Leviticus, or whether he was quoting a familiar text from memory, and not doing so quite accurately, seem to me possibilities of equal weight.

Peter concludes his speech in Ac 3 by reference to the prediction of all the prophets culminating in the present time, God’s sending his παῖς first to their descendants (3:26, emphatic order ὑμῖν πρῶτον) with the chance to repent. He then speaks to them as not only υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν but also καὶ τῆς διαθήκης , and cites the covenant with

⁷⁴ *The Acts of the Apostles*, London, 1951, p. 113.

⁷⁵ Line 7 of 4Q175 reads ידבר הנבי בשמי which is supportive of a Hebrew *Vorlage* for LXX v.19 including ὁ προφητης.

Abraham⁷⁶. The form of the Abrahamic covenant cited is closest to the LXX of Gen. 22:18 and 26:4, which are identical in the relevant phrases. The order of Acts differs, bringing into prominence the phrase ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου. I doubt whether this indicates more than the special opportunity given to this particular generation of Abraham's descendants, though some have found a reference to Jesus, along the lines of Paul's exegesis of the singular 'seed' in Gal. 3:16, but without having read Galatians, Peter's audience and Luke's audience could not be expected to make this connection.

The textual tradition in Acts leaves it uncertain whether ἐνευλογηθήσονται should be read along with 74, D etc. as well as LXX, or without ἐν- as A, B, Y etc. The major difference, however, is πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς in contrast to LXX τὰ ἔθνη. So we might bring into consideration the form of the covenant in Gen. 12:3 ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, where, arguably, πατριαί would be a better translation of the Hebrew אֲבוֹתָם than the LXX φυλαί. This is the only place where Luke-Acts cites the promise to Abraham, and so it is perhaps surprising that opportunity is not taken to emphasise, (as the Pauline epistles do), that τὰ ἔθνη are blessed in Abraham, because Acts will go on to show that salvation will come to the Gentiles after the heirs of the covenant, the Jews, have had the opportunity to receive it. Perhaps Luke feels that a reminiscence of Gen. 12:3, is more fitting in the mouth of Peter here, when he is addressing a Jewish audience at a point in the narrative before Peter himself is surprised by the rightness of Gentile inclusion (chap. 10). Perhaps, in any case, the citation is from Luke's memory, rather than consulting the texts.

Alongside our synoptic table of Peter's kerygmatic speeches we also placed Paul's speech in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch. In many ways it does parallel Peter's speeches and we examine it here for any light shed on Luke's treatment. Paul begins with a brief summary of OT history from Egyptian bondage to the prophet Samuel. More emphasis is given to the appointment of Saul as king and his replacement by David, and testimony about David and then the assertion that it is from David's descendants that God

⁷⁶ We may note that there is a similar sequence of ideas here as in the canticles of Luke's nativity narratives – David as παῖς, prophets, fathers, covenant, Abraham (Lk. 1:69-73); 'all generations', Israel as παῖς, fathers, Abraham and his seed (1:54f).

has fulfilled his promise of a saviour in Jesus, ratified by the testimony of John the Baptist. I disagree with Albl's⁷⁷ judgement that "It is difficult to suppose that the historical summary and its concluding quotation are Luke's creations. The details of the summary have no connection with Luke's overall interests". I would argue that this historical summary continues the extensive historical summary in Stephen's speech (Ac 7) to add messianic expectation to Stephen's Moses-like prophet expectation. The reference to Saul alludes to the speaker's own name and tribal identity. The 'quotation' is an amalgam of phrases from 1 Sam. 13:14, Ps 89 (88):29(21) and Is 44:28 (which refers to the commission of Cyrus); N-A²⁷ does not print it as a citation. A similar amalgam is found at *1 Clement* 18:1, introducing David as an example of humility. Like Acts Clement adds the description 'son of Jesse', but Clement adds the phrase from the Psalm about anointing and omits the final phrase in Acts from Isaiah. Albl's⁷⁸ verdict that both Clement and Acts are here drawing on tradition, a collection with a messianic thread, is reasonable.

In testimony of Jesus as the promised saviour and of his resurrection uncorrupt, Paul cites Ps 2:7, Is 55:3 and Ps 16:10. As noted above Ps 2:1f is cited in the corporate prayer of Ac 4:27f and v. 7 probably provides language for the heavenly voice in the Gospel's Baptism and Transfiguration narratives; indeed the Bezan text of Lk 3:22 presents Ps 2:7 as the heavenly word and here in Ac 13:33 adds the next verse of the Psalm. It is striking that Luke distinguishes Paul's Christology here by the title *υἱός* which Peter does not use. The second citation (Is 55:3), by common consent,⁷⁹ presents problems for the interpreter. It is close to the LXX, the only NT citation of this verse, and presumably through *δίδωμι* and *τὰ ὅσια / τὸν ὅσιόν* meant to provide a link with the third citation. At least it provides a bridge between the messianic promise and the physical

⁷⁷ "And Scripture Cannot be Broken", p. 197.

⁷⁸ p.197.

⁷⁹ Barrett, *Acts*, 1, p.647; Pervo, *Acts*, p. 339.

resurrection of Jesus, the thrust of the third citation, Ps 16:10, the only other NT citation of which, as we have already observed, is by Peter in Ac 2:27. While Pervo⁸⁰ deduces a “*pre-Lukan medley of texts*” emphasis added), I would argue that it is Luke who adds Ps 16:10 to the exegetical tradition; Ps 2 was already an established source of Christological language.

Paul’s proclamation of the Gospel announces the “forgiveness of sins” which is equated with justification for believers not available through the law of Moses. This is a rather muddled expression of genuine Pauline theology, with which Luke must have been acquainted, and which Luke’s *Peter* expresses better in 15:8-11. Whether Luke was aware of Paul’s key text for justification by faith, namely Hab. 2:4, it is striking that Paul’s address ends with a warning from Hab. 1:5 against (Jewish) rejection of the Gospel. The application of Habakkuk may stem from pre-Christian exegesis, as evidenced in the Qumran *Habakkuk Commentary*⁸¹.

The following Sabbath when ‘the whole city’ gathers to hear Paul preach, there is heated dispute with Paul and Barnabas and they deliberately turn to the Gentiles, citing a key text for Luke-Acts, Is 49:6, “a light for the Gentiles”, to which Simeon’s prophecy in Lk 2:32 makes strong allusion.

Already noted are places where there is an apparent allusion to an OT text, rather than a specific citation. Sometimes Luke alludes to a text that elsewhere he cites. A clear example of this is the allusion to Ps 118 (117):22 at Ac 4:11, which is cited by Jesus at Lk 20:17 and //s. Barrett⁸² argues that the rewording of the Psalm’s text in the Acts

⁸⁰Pervo, *Acts*, p. 339.

⁸¹ Over against the MT reading ‘gentiles’, the LXX cited in Acts ‘scoffers’ may be restored from the fragmentary *1QpHab* 1:16, Pervo, *Acts* p.341 n.97.

⁸² Barrett, *Acts*, p. 230.

speech – it is cast into the second person plural, not the third, has οἰκοδόμων rather than the participle οἰκοδομοῦντων of the LXX and Lk 20:17, and especially the substituting of the passive ἐξουθενεῖν for ἀποδοκιμάζειν, making the ‘stone’ clearly personal – came to Luke by tradition and “the tradition was not simply that Ps 118:22 was a ‘Christian text’, for if it had been so its text would have been given in the form used in the gospel; the tradition therefore was in all probability a tradition of a speech, or at least was contained in a preaching context.”⁸³ Interesting as these observations are, they seem to me too flimsy to support a case that a speech in Acts could be based on tradition of a real speech, perhaps delivered by the historical Peter. The citation in the Synoptic Gospels is at the conclusion to the parable of the vineyard and the suggestion of others (= Gentiles?) being given charge of the vineyard. Luke’s redaction voices the hearers’ response μὴ γένοιτο, omits the second part of the citation and adds two further sayings about the ‘stone’ – all who fall on it being broken and anyone on whom it falls being crushed, which may embody allusions to Is 8:14f and Dan. 2:34f, 49f (Theodotion). The great stone is interpreted of a future Zion in 2 Esd. 13:36 and a future threat to the empire by Josephus (*Ant.* 10.10.4). Lindars⁸⁴ suggests that the Jesus mission, originally intended for the whole Jewish nation became more sectarian, leading to a theory of rejection of the Jews. So Ps 118:22 which served as a text of death and resurrection becomes more a text of rejection, as here with the addition of the verses from Daniel. The allusion to Ps 118 by Peter in Ac 4 virtually identifies the stone with Jesus, rejected by the builders (Jewish leaders) but now exalted.

⁸³ Other connections between 1 Peter and the speeches of Acts, as listed by E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St Peter*, Macmillan, London, 1955, pp 33-36, are that the cross of Jesus is termed τὸ ξύλον in Ac 5:30, 10:39, 1 Pet 2:24, but also in Acts 13:29 by Paul as in Gal. 3:13, citing Deut. 21:23; God as προσωπολήμπτης Acts 10:34 cf 1 Pet 1:17 ἀπροσωπολήμπτως; κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν Ac 10:42 cf 1 Pet 4:5 κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, but also 2 Tim. 4:1, a phrase that sounds creedal or liturgical.

⁸⁴ *NT Apopgetic*, pp 187f.

The catchword of ‘stone’ brings together several OT texts used in a development of applications to changing apologetics. This conjunction is strong evidence for a pre-Lukan collection of texts which became part of the apparatus for developing thought and apologetic. 1 Pet. 2:6-8 quotes in order Is 28:16 (precious corner-stone)⁸⁵, Ps 118 (117):22 (rejected stone becoming head of corner) and Is 8:14 (stumbling-block), and applies them to the (new) people of God. Rom. 9:32ff brings together phrases from Is 28:16 and 8:14. That Romans conflates passages which 1 Peter deals with separately suggests the prior existence of stone-texts, rather than 1 Peter’s use of Romans⁸⁶. Romans continues from citing Is 28:16 at 9:33 to consider those who do stumble and those who do not, Jews and Gentiles alike, requoting the final phrase from Is 28:16 at 10:11, and adding positively for the opening of salvation to all, Joel 3:5, the conclusion of the text Peter cites in Ac 2:21, already discussed. Apart from the Gospels, Ps 118:22 is only cited in the NT at 1 Pet. 2:7, which could support a link based mainly on the Servant Christology between the Acts speeches and 1 Peter with some underlying Petrine tradition, especially if we speculate about the attractiveness to Peter of the rock imagery because of the name given to him by Jesus (Lk 6:14), and by which he was known in the Church. However, the strong evidence for a gathering of ‘stone’ texts diminishes a direct link here between Acts and 1 Peter.

The considerable and sophisticated interpretation of OT texts in the early church, from its earliest writings (Paul) is an impressive phenomenon. That there was a heritage of interpretation upon which they could draw, and evidence of gathering texts useful to them in countering challenges, would appear to be established where the same texts are cited by different authors, Luke among them. But it is also remarkable that once

⁸⁵ 1QS 8.5-9 interprets of the Qumran community; the *Targum* of Is 28 interpret the stone as the king, but the Targum is probably later than NT; *Barnabas* 6:2-4 adds further ‘stone’ texts.

⁸⁶ So Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, pp 42f.

a text was established for ‘Christian’ use, then the wider context of some of them led to the application of near-by texts. This suggests that at least some of the NT writers had access to some of the scriptures beyond their own memories or notes, including the Greek scriptures and especially the Psalms. I have argued that Luke was able to bring into the arena and place on the lips of Peter texts not previously used for the Christian proclamation, especially for the Gospel events of resurrection, exaltation and the coming of the Holy Spirit.

The influence of the Lukan Peter’s *kerygma*

All in all, we have demonstrated that Luke’s composition of Peter’s speeches makes significant contribution to the selection and use of OT texts to support the key elements in the *kerygma*. We are arguing here that the Lukan presentation of the *kerygma* as a series of events is distinctive within the NT. In 1 Cor. 15:3ff Paul records the Gospel as he had preached it in Corinth, and this is a series of events of which Christ is the subject, his death, burial and resurrection on the third day, according to (unspecified) scriptures, and a list of his appearances; the list begins with Cephas (*cf* Lk 24:34), then the Twelve (*cf* the Eleven in Lk 24:33, 36, after the appearance to the two walking to Emmaus), and going on to the last in his list, Paul himself, which Acts by contrast regards as post-Ascension and visionary. Rom 1:3 with some archaic(?) phrases, describes the Gospel as being about God’s Son, of Davidic descent, who is declared υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγίωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. In Philipp. 2:6ff the crucifixion of the human Jesus is followed by God’s highly exalting him as Lord, without a specific mention of resurrection. In Ephesians 1:20 Christ is raised from the dead and seated at God’s right hand – possibly as a single event (?), and

this is the model for those who are in Christ (2:5f). For Ephesians, Christ as peace and making peace between Jew and Gentile is important (2:11ff *cf* Ac 10:36). For Hebrews the exaltation of Christ is fundamental, as are his sufferings and temptations (2:10, 4:15, 5:7-9; *cf* Lk 22:28, 42-44, 24:26); in 12:2 exaltation to God's right hand follows the cross for our ἀρχηγός. The μυστήριον as described in 1 Tim 3:16 is tantalizingly obscure, because of the uncertain subject and text of the first word and the sequence of aorist verbs, but it does seem to have a contrast of earthly and heavenly events, to include preaching among Gentiles and a global belief in (?) Christ, which are the themes of Luke-Acts. The final phrase, ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ, describes ascension, using the same verb as in Ac 1:2,11, 22, of the ascension of Jesus (also the longer ending of Mark 16:19; Ac 10:16 also uses it of the vessel in Peter's vision)⁸⁷. The cognate noun ἀνάληψις is used at Lk 9:51 to describe the whole of Jesus' work of salvation in Jerusalem, including his ascension. The Fourth Gospel does describe a post-Easter giving of the Spirit (Jn 20:22) and an uncertainly timed ascension (20:17), but they are not the same as either Luke's Ascension or Pentecost accounts. The longer ending of Mark already referred to offers us the closest parallel to Luke's list of saving events – the appearance to Mary Magdalene (John, not Luke); the appearance to two walking in the country (*cf* Emmaus); the appearance to the Eleven at table; the commission to go and proclaim the Gospel; the expectation that their mission will be accompanied by miraculous signs of healing, and tongues; the ascension and heavenly session of Jesus⁸⁸ – and appears to be dependent upon Luke's account at least in part. The tradition in 1 Peter 1:10-12 speaks of prophets prophesying of the sufferings of Christ and his subsequent glory, as announced to the readers by those who

⁸⁷ For discussions of the Lukan authorship of the Pastorals, see Jean-Daniel Kaestli, "Luke-Acts and the Pastoral Epistles: The Thesis of a Common Authorship", in C.M. Tuckett (Ed), *Luke's Literary Achievement*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, 110-126.

⁸⁸ "No writer before (the Longer Ending of Mark) combined the ascension and heavenly session in a single passage", James A. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2000, p.228.

brought the good news by the Holy Spirit sent from heaven. A link could be made with the Lukan *kerygma* as put in the mouth of Peter, but it is not a strong link.

The statement of apostolic belief and the repetition with variations leading up to accounts of conversions and baptisms, would serve the purpose for the readers of Acts of stating what the creed was, and inviting them also to convert. “This type of Christian sermon certainly seems to have been customary in the author’s day (about A.D. 90). This is how the gospel is preached and ought to be preached! This gospel is to be proclaimed to the readers in the same way as the apostles once preached to their listeners” – such is the assertion of Dibelius⁸⁹, unbacked by any evidence of other missionary speeches, but it may be a reasonable supposition. Was there a traditional kerygmatic summary for missionary preachers, such as was argued by Dodd⁹⁰ and was it a form in its own right which existed alongside the traditions that have come into the Gospels, as asserted (rather than proven) by Richard Bauckham⁹¹ and others. The inclusion in the Acts speeches of more of the Jesus tradition than is in the Pauline kerygmatic summaries, suggests that Luke at least has brought the two strands together. Are there kerygmatic summaries outside the NT with which comparison may be made?

Ignatius’ letters include preaching summaries that list Jesus’ descent from David, being son of Mary, truly human, crucified under Pontius Pilate and raised from the dead by the Father⁹². *To the Smyrnaeans* 1:1-2, like Acts, adds baptism by John, and adds Herod the tetrarch to Pilate; there is no reference to the ascension or gift of the Spirit, and so no Lukan influence can be proven here. *Barnabas* 5:13, 12:1 refers to the cross as the Tree. Justin’s *First Apology* 31:7 speaks of the prophets telling of “the coming of Jesus

⁸⁹ Dibelius, *Studies*, pp165f.

⁹⁰ C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Development*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1936.

⁹¹ “Kerygmatic Summaries in the Speeches of Acts”, in Ben Witherington III (Ed), *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, CUP, 1996, 185-217, p.203.

⁹² *To the Trallians* 9.

our Christ, born of a virgin, ... healing every disease and every sickness, ...crucified and dying and rising again and ascending into heaven and being called the Son of God ... and that certain persons should be sent by him into every nation to publish these things". At 39:3 they are said to be "twelve men sent out from Jerusalem into all the world", who were ἰδιῶται (cf Ac 4:13). Though the commission of Jesus was to the ends of the earth, the Twelve in Acts do not carry out this mission. 50:12 is most Lukan when it says, "After he was crucified, even all his acquaintances forsook him, having denied him; and afterwards, when he had risen from the dead and appeared to them, and had taught them to read the prophecies in which all these things were foretold as coming to pass, and when they had seen him ascending into heaven, and had believed and had received power sent thence by him upon them, and went to every race of men, they taught these things and were called apostles." Although the Twelve do not forsake Jesus in Luke's passion (23:49), Justin here does seem to be influenced by Luke-Acts. Barrett's claim⁹³ that the ascension was "well on the way to becoming an established part of the baptismal creed, which every Christian must have known" is asserted rather than proven, and falls short of a dismissal of Justin's knowledge of Luke-Acts here. O'Neill's comment⁹⁴ is apposite – "The first writer apart from Luke to assume that the world mission of the apostles should be told in the same breath as the history of Jesus' death, resurrection and ascension is Justin Martyr." The Trinitarian formula of Baptism in Justin's *First Apology* 61 makes no reference to the Ascension. The first that does so would appear to be that in Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* 21, in phrases that became part of the *Apostles' Creed*⁹⁵ and represent the baptismal creed at Rome about 200 CE. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.10.1 also

⁹³ Barrett, *Acts*, p.42.

⁹⁴ *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*, p.10; we do not conclude from this that O'Neill's dating of Acts about the time of Justin is correct.

⁹⁵ Paul Bradshaw, Charles Whitaker and Geoffrey Cumming (Edd), *Essays on Hippolytus*, Grove Books, Bramcote, Nottinghamshire, 1978, p.57.

includes the physical ascension (ἀνάληψις) in his summary of universal belief. Bauckham⁹⁶ draws attention to the *Ascension of Isaiah*. In this Christian document or Christianised edition, Isaiah foresees the Beloved descending from the seventh heaven, his likeness to a man, his twelve disciples, and crucifixion with wicked men upon the tree, his burial and the opening of the tomb by named angels, including ‘the angel of the Holy Spirit’, his ascension to the seventh heaven and the disciples teaching all nations and languages (3:13-18); between resurrection and ascension to the right hand of Glory there are 545 days and the twelve apostles are then sent out (9:16, 11:22, 32). The *Ascension of Isaiah* is clearly here drawing on a tradition of Jesus that has ascension as a separate event after resurrection, but there is so much at variance from Luke-Acts that Luke cannot be the only or primary source. It is also unclear whether this text belongs to Christian preaching or constitutes what Bauckham calls a “kerygmatic summary”. A much better example for our purposes is the writing *Kerygma Petrou* parts of which are cited by Clement of Alexandria, apparently believing the work to be genuine tradition from Peter. As Schneemelcher⁹⁷ acknowledges, there are clear contacts with Luke and Acts.

Peter says that the Lord said to the apostles: “If any one of Israel, then, wishes to repent, and by my name to believe in God, his sins shall be forgiven him, after twelve years. Go forth into the world, that no one may say, We have not heard” [*Stromata* 6.5.43].

In the *Preaching of Peter*, the Lord says to the disciples after the resurrection, “I have chosen you twelve disciples, judging you worthy of me,” whom the Lord wished to be apostles, having judged them faithful, sending them into the world to the men on the earth, that they may know that there is one God ...; that they who heard and believed should be saved; and that those who believed not, after having heard, should bear witness, not having the excuse to allege, We have not heard. [6.6.48] ... Did not the same dispensation obtain in Hades, so that even there, all the souls on hearing the proclamation, might either exhibit repentance or confess that their punishment was just? ... But to all rational souls it was said from above, “Whatever one of you has done in ignorance, without clearly knowing God, if... he repent, all his sins will be forgiven him.”[*id.*] Peter in his *Preaching* speaking of the apostles, says: “But we, unrolling the books of the prophets which we possess, who name Jesus Christ, partly in parables, partly in enigmas, partly expressed

⁹⁶ “Kerygmatic Summaries”, pp 190ff.

⁹⁷ E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, edited by W. Schneemelcher, & R. McL. Wilson, vol.2, SCM Press, London, 1965, 1974, pp 96f.

in so many words, find his coming and death, and cross, and all the rest of the tortures which the Jews inflicted on him, and his resurrection and assumption (ἀνάληψιν) to heaven previous to the founding [emend ? to 'capture'] of Jerusalem. As it is written, *These things are all that he behoves to suffer, and what should be after him.*" [6.15.128]⁹⁸

With Luke-Acts the *Kerygma Petrou* as cited includes the Ascension as a saving event, the sending of twelve apostles to proclaim the gospel of repentance and forgiveness, the possible plea of ignorance as an excuse prior to their proclamation (cf Ac 3:17, 17:30), and that the scriptures expected Christ to suffer before exaltation. Jewish torturing of Jesus could depend on Lk 23:25 if not on a growing Christian prejudiced reading of the passion. Clement in 6.6 goes on to cite Ps 16:9-11, the only NT citation of which is in Peter's speech Ac 2:26-28. In Clement there also seem to be allusions to 1 Pet 1:10-12 with regard to the prophetic expectation of suffering and subsequent glory, and the subject of the whole of 6.6 is Christ's evangelizing of Hades as in 1 Pet 3:19f. All in all there is sufficient evidence of a trajectory linking Luke-Acts, the *kerygma* as preached by the Lukan Peter, 1 Peter and *Kerygma Petrou*.

The kerygmatic speeches of Peter and Paul in Acts have much in common with each other and are an expression of the *kerygma* as Luke presents it, and, as we have been arguing, much influenced the formation of the creed of the early Church. However there are differences between the Lukan Peter and Lukan Paul. To establish a Petrine trajectory, we have to highlight these differences. Paul calls Jesus ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Ac 9:20; cf 13:33), which Peter does not, although he had heard Jesus so described at the Transfiguration (Lk 9:35) and although he once calls God 'the Father' (Ac 2:33); Paul alone ascribes atoning or sacrificial significance to the death of Jesus (Ac 20:28); Peter, but not Paul, describes Jesus as God's παῖς. 1 Peter is particularly rich in citations or

⁹⁸ The translation is that of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol 2, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, and Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1994.

allusions to the Servant of Isaiah (2:22-25); along with the speeches of Acts, it could provide evidence for a trajectory of a Servant Christology associated with Peter⁹⁹.

In this chapter we have shown how Luke uses Peter's speeches in Acts to present the Christian message as a sequence of 'saving' events to Jews and also to instructed Gentiles, leading to their conversion to join the disciples of Jesus, to experience forgiveness of sins and gifts of the Spirit. A variety of terms are used, most of which will have come from pre-Lukan tradition. Luke's presentation gives to some of them a particular association with Peter which we can also trace in 1 Peter. Peter's own story in Luke-Acts (yet to be considered), also encourages him to offer another chance for Israel to repent. Peter's Gospel is subsequently preached by Paul both in synagogues and in an intellectual pagan environment. In support of the *kerygma* Luke makes a significant contribution to the application of OT texts to the Christ-events, but we found it hard to prove here that he was drawing upon any Petrine tradition. Luke's over-all scheme subsequently became the basic creed of the Church and was called 'apostolic'.

⁹⁹ Cf C. M. Tuckett, "The Christology of Luke-Acts", in J. Verheyden (Ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, pp 140f.

Chapter Four *The Mighty Works of Peter*

Peter proclaims the Gospel, not just by word but also in mighty deeds, healings which are effective signs and symbols of the salvation the apostles proclaimed through Jesus. “Luc est le seul évangéliste à évoquer explicitement les miracles des prophètes de l’A.T., puis à présenter, après ceux de Jésus, ceux de l’Église naissante. Sa typologie et sa topique marquent la constance du miracle tout au long de l’histoire du salut.”¹ In this they recapitulate the works of Jesus, “a prophet, mighty in deed and word” (Lk 24:19)², who “went about doing good and healing all who were oppressed by the devil” (Ac 10:38), fulfilling the Prophets and sometimes echoing the deeds of Elijah and Elisha, especially in reviving the dead. Signs of healing, including making the lame walk and raising the dead, are regarded both for John the Baptist and Jesus as a mark of the messianic age (Lk 7:18ff). Jesus’ reply to John’s enquiry alludes to Is 61:1f, the text for Jesus’ sermon in Nazareth (Lk 4:18f) as well as Is 29:18f, 35:5f. In the narrative of Acts Peter continues (or activates) the apostolic commission to heal and exorcise as a sign of the Kingdom (Lk 9:1f); the Seventy (10:1ff) also are commanded to heal the sick and when they report that even the demons submit, Jesus tells of their authority to “tread on snakes and scorpions” (10:19), to which Paul’s suffering no harm from the viper (Ac 28:5) alludes. Later at the

¹ Augustin George, *Études sur L’Œuvre de Luc*, Gabalda, Paris, 1978, p.148.

² Miracle and teaching are balanced in both Luke and Acts, and they both have a mixed response. Marilyn McCord Adams, “The Role of Miracles in the Structure of Luke-Acts” in Eleonore Stump & Thomas P. Flint (Eds), *Hermes and Athena: Biblical Exegesis and Philosophical Theology*, University of Notre Dame, Indiana, 1993, pp 237f. She has some useful lists of parallels between Jesus and Peter and Paul, and of miracles which are accompanied by teaching (e.g. Ac 3:1-26) and of miracles without teaching (e.g. 9:32-43). Also G. W. H. Lampe, “Miracles in the Acts of the Apostles”, in C. F. D. Moule (ed.), *Miracles*, Mowbray, London, 1965, pp 163-178; F. Neirynck, “The Miracle Stories in the Acts of the Apostles – an Introduction”, in Jacob Kremer (Ed), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, rédaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris- Gembloux et Leuven University Press, 1979, pp 169-213.

apostolic supper (Lk 22:35ff) Jesus refers back to the mission of the Twelve (though the details more closely match the mission of the Seventy!), with the warning that the mission from there on will be fraught with need and hostility. I do not detect, however, any suggestion that the mission is over or that signs of healing should not accompany the message, as they had done during the halcyon days of Jesus. That buying a sword is not a symbol of the ending of the mission with its healing commission is confirmed by Luke's redaction of the severing of the ear of the high priest's slave at the time of Jesus' arrest – Jesus promptly heals the ear (Lk 22:51).

Peter shares the commissioning of the Twelve, and is a witness to the miracles done by Jesus, specifically of the woman with haemorrhages (Lk 8:45, LkR), the raising of Jairus' daughter (v.51) and the healing of his own mother-in-law from fever (4:38f – compare Paul's healing of Publius' father from fever, among the final healings of Luke's narrative, Ac 28:8). So Peter serves as a superlative example of what was happening among the early believers and in particular prepares for the parallel works recorded for Paul. It is with regard to miracles that it is easiest to detect parallels between Jesus, Peter and Paul, without being accused of parallelomania³. These parallels demonstrate that the

³ Studies of the parallels include: Andrew C. Clark, *Parallel Lives – the Relation of Paul to the Apostles in the Lucan Perspective*, Paternoster, Carlisle and Waynesboro, Georgia, 2001, especially Chapter 6; M.D. Goulder, *Type and History in Acts*, SPCK, London, 1964; A. J. Mattill Jr., "The Jesus-Paul Parallels and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: H.H.Evans Reconsidered", *Nov. Test.* XVII (1975), 15-46; David P. Moessner, "'The Christ must suffer': New Light on the Jesus-Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts", *Nov. Test.* XXVIII (1986), 219-256; Robert F. O'Toole, "Parallels between Jesus and His Disciples in Luke-Acts", *BZ* 27 (1983) pp 195ff; Susan Marie Praeder, "Jesus-Paul, Peter-Paul and Jesus-Peter Parallelisms in Luke-Acts: A History of Reader Response", in Kent Harold Richards (Ed), *SBL Seminar Papers* Number 23, 1984, Scholars Press, Chico, Calif., pp 23-39; Walter Radl, *Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk*, Herbert Lang, Bern & Peter Lang, Frankfurt, 1975.

* (So N-A²⁷; even if omit with N-A²⁵ then the longer text points to scribal reminiscence of Lk 5:23)	*[ἔγειρε καὶ] περιπάτει in the name of Jesus Christ Peter takes by right hand περιπατῶν καὶ ἀλλόμενος καὶ αἰνῶν τὸν θεόν	5:18-26 ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει hand cf 8:54 δοξάζων τὸν θεόν (LkR)	ἀτεινίσας αὐτῷ ἀνάστηθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου ὀρθός. variants of 14:10 add reference to name of Lord Jesus Christ ἤλατο καὶ περιεπάτει	Is 35:6 τότε ἀλείται ὡς ἔλαφος ὁ χωλός
	Ac 9:32-35 ἐξ ἐτῶν ὀκτῶ κατακείμενον ἐπὶ κραβάττου, ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος 'Jesus heals' ἰάομαι ἀνάστηθι καὶ στῶσον σεαυτῷ	Lk 9:28 (eight)? Lk 5:18-26 ἐπὶ κλίνης ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος (LkR) Ac 10:38 Jn 5:5-9 τριᾶκοντα [καὶ] ὀκτῶ ἔτη ἔχων ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ αὐτοῦ ἦρεν τὸν κράβαττον αὐτοῦ καὶ περιεπάτει	Philip in Ac 8:7 πολλοὶ δὲ παραλελυμένοι καὶ χωλοὶ 14:10 ἀνάστηθι Ac 28:8	Is 35:3-6 γόνατα παραλελυμένα Sir. 25:23, Job 4:3f, Heb 12:12 knees/hands/ feet literal & metaphorical?
Reviving the dead *some mss add "in name of our Lord Jesus Christ"	Ac 9:36-42 Tabitha became weak, died, washed, laid ἐν ὑπερώῳ. widows weep; Peter excludes, knelt/prayed Ταβιθά, ἀνάστηθι*. ἡ δὲ ἤνοιξεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον ἀνεκάθισεν Peter gives her his hand, raises her up; ἀνέστησεν shows her alive	Lk 8:51-56 Peter, John & James and parents included; Jesus takes girl's hand ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε. καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα [Mk 5:41 ταλιθα κουμ] Lk 7:11-17 widow νεανίσκε, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγέρθητι ἀνεκάθισεν ὁ νεκρὸς Mk 5:39 τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε;	Ac 20:9-12 ἐν τῷ ὑπερώῳ νεανίας, παις, ὁ Παῦλος ἐπέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ Συμπεριλαβὼν εἶπεν· μὴ θορυβεῖσθε	1 Kings 17:17-24 Elijah εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶον ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης αὐτοῦ, ἐνεφύσησεν τῷ παιδαρίῳ τρὶς 2 Kings 4:21ff Elisha ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην αὐτοῦ Elisha, alone, prays ἤνοιξεν τὸ παιδάριον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ

Summaries⁵

In the structure of Acts, the healing of the cripple at the Beautiful Gate, with its sequels, falls between summaries of the apostolic community's growth, which allow for some passing of time and are filled with generalisations where details are not available. The first summary, following the Pentecost events (2:43-47) tells of 'wonders and signs', the practice of common-ownership, the daily attendance at the Temple, as well as house prayers and the breaking of bread, and the daily growth in the numbers of the believers. The next summary (4:32-37) picks up the theme of common-ownership and illustrates it positively by the example of Barnabas, and negatively by that of Ananias and Sapphira. This narrative, which we will treat separately, provides an interlude before the summary of signs and wonders, healings and teaching which extend the reputation of the apostles even beyond Jerusalem, a summary which includes for the first time, those in need of exorcism (5:12-16). This provides the Jewish authorities with cause to pick up the warning given earlier (4:18, 21), to arrest and eventually flog all the apostles. A final verse (5:42) concludes this section with the apostles, far from silenced or intimidated, continuing their proclamation in the Temple of Jesus as Messiah. The previous report of Peter (and John) preaching in Solomon's Portico has now become a regular activity of all the apostles, and the healing ministry has also become frequent and famous. Yet within this general apostolic ministry, it is Peter and his shadow that is especially sought; later in Acts, a parallel in Paul's ministry will be "the handkerchiefs and aprons" that had been in contact with his skin (19:12). Luke seems not embarrassed by the quasi-magical or superstitious

⁵ On the summaries and their function see Henry J. Cadbury, *Beginnings*, 5. 392-402, and *The Making of Luke-Acts*, Macmillan, London, 1927 (2nd edition, 1958), pp 58f; Dibelius, *Studies*, pp 9f; S.J. Noorda, "Scene and Summary, a Proposal for Reading Acts 4,32 – 5,16", in Kremer (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres*, pp 475-483.

implications here, though in this case of Paul, as in Peter's encounter with Simon Magus in Samaria (8:18-24), the application of a technique or Name without personal faith or conversion is found to be disastrous. With regard to the healing effect of Peter's shadow (5:15), Van der Horst⁶ explores the background in ancient cultures, where someone's shadow may embody their soul and be a good or bad influence. The *Mishnah*⁷ forbids sitting in the shadow of a tree that could be defined as an idolatrous *asherah*. The shadow of an Egyptian god had the power of seminal emission, which Van der Horst⁸ regards as the background of the virginal conception in Lk 1:35(!). At least the verbal play of Ac 5:15, ἡ σκιά ἐπισκιάσθη should allow us to hear echoes of Luke's use of ἐπισκιάζω, - the cloud at the Transfiguration, (Lk 9:34, along with the parallels in Matthew and Mark); the δύναμις overshadowing Mary at Lk 1:35, where it seems to be synonymous with the Holy Spirit, though the metaphor is that of the *shekinah*, the presence of God in the cloud over the tabernacle (Ex 40:35), and the sense of God or God's wings covering his people protectively⁹ (Ps. 91(90):4, 140:7 (139:8)), a more convincing background than the sense of a god's shadow actually impregnating a woman. So, while Luke uses the popular concept of a shadow to extol Peter's healing power, the Biblical background of the term suggests that Peter's physical shadow is like the powerful presence of God as the source of Peter's healings.

The apostolic reputation for healing parallels that of Jesus – for example the summary of healings, by laying on of hands (LkR) and exorcisms at sunset in Lk 4:40f // Mk 1:32-4.

⁶ P. W. Van der Horst, "Peter's Shadow – the Religio-historical Background of Acts V.15", *NTS* 23 (1976-7), pp 204-212.

⁷ *Abodah Zarah* 3.8, in Danby's translation p.441.

⁸ "Peter's Shadow", p.211.

⁹ So Marshall, *Luke* pp 70f; Schulz in *TDNT*, 7. 399f.

Yet a better parallel would be the summary of healings at Gennesaret, Mk 6:54-56¹⁰, the bringing of the sick on mats (κραβάττοι cf Ac 5:15), from villages around, hoping to touch the fringe of Jesus's cloak (cf Peter's shadow). This Markan summary, of course, lies within Luke's 'great omission' of Markan material. That Luke knew the material in the 'great omission' and kept some of it in reserve for use elsewhere in his narrative, finds evidence in the making all foods clean (Mk 7:19, followed by the healing of a Gentile, "crumbs from the children's table"), which appears in Peter's vision at Joppa (Ac 10) and leads to the first Gentile conversions; the request for a sign (Mk 8:11ff) appears in the non-Markan section of Luke's Travel Narrative (Lk 11:29) and the description of the bad influence of the Pharisees as 'yeast' (Mk 8:15) in Lk 12:1.

Specific Healings

The narration of the healing of the crippled beggar at the Beautiful Gate (3:1-10) is finely dramatised; the first detailed miracle in Acts combines an example of the apostolic τέρατα και σημεῖα (2:43) with an illustration of the piety of that earliest community in joining the daily prayers at the Temple, the time of the evening oblation. Peter is joined by John, making a pair of witnesses and reminding a careful reader of the narrative when Jesus had sent Peter and John to prepare for the apostolic supper (Lk 22:8). John has no role in Acts independent of Peter's.

This healing, the raising up by word and hand of the beggar, crippled from birth, forms an obvious parallel with Jesus' healing of the paralytic in Lk 5:18ff and with the second of Paul's healing miracles¹¹ (Ac 14:8), also of a man χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς

¹⁰ Clark, *Parallel Lives*, p.211, n. 13 .

¹¹ John Fenton, "The Order of the Miracles Performed by Peter and Paul in Acts", *Expository Times* 77 (1965-66), pp 381-383, argues for three pairs of parallels between Peter and Paul's miracles, with the Pauline order reversed in each pair. He admits the parallels could sometimes be clearer!

αὐτοῦ. Not only is the healing a wonder, but also a sign of being in the times of the fulfilment foretold by the prophets – Ac 3:8, ἐξαλλόμενος, a NT *hapax* (except for the variant E at Ac 14:11) and rare in the LXX, alludes to Is. 35:6 τότε ἀλείται ὡς ἔλαφος ὁ χωλός; the Targum - “even as swift harts which cannot be restrained, their tongue which was dumb shall ring with praises”¹² - would provide an even better allusion, if already known in Luke’s time, which is unlikely. The cripple is enabled to do what the Law had previously forbidden, and enters into the Temple¹³. Luke contrasts the cripple’s disfigurement with the location of his begging, the “Beautiful Gate”, the identification of which is uncertain¹⁴, and his immediate hope for “gold and silver”, like the precious metals of the shining gate, with what he is truly offered, namely healing, identified with salvation (4:12), given by the apostles through the name of Jesus. It is characteristic of Luke to use material things and their use as a symbol of a spiritual reality. It is not uncommon in any age for a person’s physical appearance to influence how people view them and, sadly, for those handicapped to be ridiculed or made the subject of entertainment. Parsons gives examples from the Hellenistic world, quoting Plutarch and, by implication, from the

¹² Dennis Hamm, S.J., “Acts 3, The Healing of the Temple Beggar as Lucan Theology”, *Biblica* 67 (1986) 305-319, p.312.

¹³ For the evidence see Barrett, *Acts*, p. 180. Mt. 21:14 tells of Jesus healing the ‘blind and lame’ in the Temple, an inversion of the ban of 2 Sam 5:6-8. The blind and the lame working together could overcome the handicap of each, as in a parable quoted in *The Apocryphon of Ezekiel*, cited by Epiphanius (*Panarion* 64, 70.5-17), c.374 CE, though written in the 1st century CE – cf Marc Bregman “The Parable of the Lame and the Blind: Epiphanius’ Quotation from an Apocryphon of Ezekiel”, *JTS* 42 (1991), 125-138; cf Richard Bauckham, “The Parable of the Royal Wedding Feast (Matthew 22:1-14) and the Parable of the Lame Man and the Blind Man (*Apocryphon of Ezekiel*)”, *JBL*, 115 (1996), 471-88. Luke’s similar parable of the feast specifically invites the lame and the blind (Lk 14:21). I doubt whether the parable justifies Mikeal Parson’s deduction that a lame man was regarded as half a man (*Body and Character in Luke and Acts*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2006, p. 115).

¹⁴ Christopher J. Cowton, “The Alms Trade: a Note on Identifying the beautiful Gate of Acts 3:2”, *NTS* 42 (1996), 475f, with the eye of an economist, finds fault with Luke’s argument that it could not have been the Shushan Gate, of Corinthian bronze, because it would only have been the entrance for a minority of worshippers, approaching from the Mount of Olives – he thinks there would have been beggars at all entrances and in the competition for alms, a quieter gate may have attracted an individual beggar.

Biblical world, citing 4 Ezra (2 Esdras) 4:21¹⁵. Parsons argues that strong feet and ankles in popular physiognomy would indicate a robust character, while lameness would indicate weak character as well as physique – Peter refers to him as ἄνθρωπος ἄσθενής (Ac 4:9) and his healing is described παραχρήμα δὲ ἐστερεώθησαν αἱ βάσεις αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ σφυδρά, (3:7). The healed cripple proves his healing not only by walking and leaping, but also by clinging to Peter and John (3:11), and going with them into the Temple. He is still with them the next day after they have been a night in custody and are brought before the Sanhedrin (4:10) and so he shares in the apostles' παρρησία (4:13f)¹⁶. At 4:22, the age of the man crippled from birth is given as “more than forty”, *i.e.* beyond the prime of life. While this may only emphasise the greatness of the healing, it may be that the ‘forty’ carries a numerological symbolism of the years of Israel’s wanderings before entering the promised land,¹⁷ and so be another hint that physical healing is sacramental of salvation. This initial work of healing itself illustrates salvation through the name of Jesus and provides opportunity for the apostles to proclaim the Gospel in the Temple and before the Sanhedrin¹⁸. “The lame man becomes a paradigm of salvation through the name of the

¹⁵ *Body and Character*, p.114.

¹⁶ As noted by Chrysostom, *Acts, Homily 10*.

¹⁷ So Parsons, *Body and Character*, p. 91, referring to F. Scott Spencer, *Acts*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, p. 52.

¹⁸ Cf Chapter Three. For a healing by **Jesus** which illustrates salvation and discipleship and which leads to persecution and is interpreted in the following teaching and dialogue, we might compare Jn 9, the healing of the man born blind. In the Synoptic Gospels healings also illustrate salvation, but not usually in so allegorical a way; nor are they expounded by the following teaching. However the raising of the paralytic (Lk 5:17ff) encapsulates teaching about forgiveness; the raising of the Widow of Nain’s son is followed by multiple healings at the hour that disciples of John the Baptist arrive (Lk 7:21, LkR). Jesus regards them as evidence that he is the expected one, fulfilling the prophecies (7:22, with allusions to Is. 29:18f, 35:5f, 61:1, as also at Lk 4:18, the Nazareth sermon). George, *Études sur L’Œuvre de Luc*, p.148, says “La valeur suprême n’est pas le miracle mais le salut.” **Paul’s** healing of the cripple at Lystra leads to his proclamation of the one God who is creator, and this leads on to the stoning of Paul (Ac 14:8-19).

Lord in fulfilment of the scriptural promise quoted in 2:21 and the promised salvation then passes to others, through the missions of the apostles, of Philip and Paul.”¹⁹

Following Philip’s mission to Samaria, a mission accompanied by σημεῖα (8:6f), among which were noisy exorcisms and the healing of πολλοὶ ... παραλελυμένοι καὶ χωλοὶ, the two apostles were sent, ensuring that they received the Holy Spirit. The two apostles also preached and evangelised in many Samaritan villages as they returned to Jerusalem (8:25).

The next we hear of Peter is at 9:32, διερχόμενον διὰ πάντων (villages?, congregations?) and coming to Lydda, thence to Joppa, and thence to Caesarea, the ‘capital’ of the Roman province of Judea. Philip too had evangelized in all towns from Azotus to Caesarea (8:40). It is not stated whether those at Lydda and Joppa who are termed ἄγιοι (9:32), and μαθηταί (9:36,38), were such as a result of the mission of Philip or of others (8:1), but it is clear that Peter is not seen as the primary evangelist in these places; nor is he there, as earlier in Samaria, to affirm or complete the initiation of new converts, though his miracles, preaching and his presence there did result in new conversions (9:35). So, how does Luke expect the reader to think of Peter’s role here? Διέρχομαι is a favourite word for Luke (2/2/10+20/3). All uses in Acts are from chapter 8 onwards, when the narrative tells of the increasing circles of ripples spreading the Gospel to the ends of the earth. “The image of Peter as circuit rider, visiting churches in a regular round is memorable”, comments Johnson²⁰. Mathieu²¹ draws attention to the combination of διέρχομαι with εὐαγγελίζομαι, notably of Philip at 8:40, in the mission of the Twelve in Lk 9:6, where

¹⁹ Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 2. 49.

²⁰ Johnson, *Acts*, p. 179.

²¹ Mathieu, p. 243.

healing is also included, and of Jesus' own ministry (Lk 4:43). Mathieu²² also shows it as a characteristic term of Paul's later ministry (Ac 15:41, 18:23) where he notes its combination with ἐπιστηρίζω a verb cognate with that used in Jesus' charge to Peter at Lk. 22:32. He concludes that "le voyage de Pierre est à la fois pastoral et missionnaire"²³. Barrett's²⁴ description of Peter "apparently engaged on a missionary tour or on an inspection of Christian centres" is perhaps too precise, but an impression of purposeful oversight rather than casual journeying is certainly created and does give Peter a special role beyond that of other Christian preachers and healers.

So 9:32 – 11:18 forms a section of the narrative of Acts that describes the work of Peter alone, not as a spokesman or agent of the Twelve. It is placed between two summary statements of how the Christian movement is progressing. 11:19 looks back to the scattering after Stephen's martyrdom (8:4) and introduces the new staging-post, Antioch. The death of Stephen and the persecution of the "church in Jerusalem" provide a backdrop for the narrator to weave in the dramatic account of the conversion of Saul the persecutor, who will be the principal agent of the Gospel in the second half of Acts. His conversion involves a temporary blinding (analogous, perhaps, to Zechariah's dumbness in Lk 1), and subsequent healing and baptism by Ananias in Damascus (Ac 9:8, 17-19); the lost disciple is found, the blind brought to faith and sight, the dead one raised to life (*cf* the language of Lk 15, and of Eph 5:8)²⁵. Saul's conversion leads to the summary of 9:31 – the church²⁶ in

²² p. 244.

²³ p. 245.

²⁴ Barrett, *Acts*, p. 477; also Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, Baker Academic Press, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2007, p.376, "apparently on a church preaching and visitation tour".

²⁵ *Cf* Pervo, *Acts*, pp 240, 242, 244.

²⁶ the singular reading of π⁷⁴ ⲛ ABC etc. rather than the plurals of the Received Text. It is a term first used of the Christian movement at 5:11.

Judaea, Galilee²⁷ and Samaria having ‘peace’ and being ‘built up’. It is clear that this ‘Peter’ section of Acts is primarily concerned with the strategic importance of the Cornelius story, an importance underlined by repetition and discussion both within this section and later at the Assembly in Jerusalem (15:6ff). But on the way to Caesarea and the conversion of the first Gentile, are narrated two accounts of healings, the bed-ridden, paralysed Aeneas at Lydda and the raising of Tabitha (Dorcas) in Joppa, where Peter then stays on for some time.

The raising of someone to walk thus happens in all the main sections of Acts – by the apostles in Jerusalem (3:2), by one of the Seven in Samaria, πολλοὶ δὲ παραλελυμένοι καὶ χωλοὶ (8:7), by Peter in Lydda ἐξ ἐτῶν ὀκτὼ κατακείμενον ἐπὶ κραβάττου, ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος (9:33), and then by Paul and Barnabas at Lystra ἀνὴρ ἀδύνατος ἐν Λύστροις τοῖς ποσὶν ἐκάθητο, χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ὃς οὐδέποτε περιεπάτησεν (14:8). Explicitly or implicitly the healings are done in the name of Jesus, and this is the case here with Aeneas - Αἰνέα, ἰᾷται²⁸ σε Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (9:34); the healing works of Jesus (10:38) “are reproduced in the apostles’ (sic) mission”.²⁹ An attentive Theophilus may well recall Jesus’ healing of the παραλελυμένος in Lk 5:18 [Matthew and Mark παραλυτικός]. Whereas that paralytic’s healing and forgiveness was demonstrated in his carrying the stretcher on which his friends had carried him, Aeneas (presumably at home, though the εἶπεν of v.33 is vague) is invited to do something for himself that he had not

²⁷ The church in Galilee receives no other mention in Acts.

²⁸ Barrett, *Acts*, p.481 discusses the tense here, a present with an aoristic, punctiliar, sense or a perfect. F.F.Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of Acts*, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London, 1972, p.210, hears a possible play on words, in which Ἰησοῦς sounds as cognate with ἰάομαι. ἰάομαι is a Lukan word (4/1/11+4/3) and is used in Acts of the works of Peter (9:34) , of Jesus (10:38) and of Paul (28:8); cf Bock, *Acts*, p.377.

²⁹ G. W. H. Lampe, “Miracles in the Acts of the Apostles”, p. 176.

been able to do during the previous eight bed-ridden³⁰ years, namely spread (the bed?) for himself, ἀνάστηθι καὶ στρώσον σεαυτῷ. To name someone healed is not common in the NT, though in this pair of healings ascribed to Peter both are named. Aeneas carries a name of legendary importance in Roman history, and so perhaps a paralysed Aeneas is a somewhat unexpected character on the verge of a narrative which will tell of the Gospel's spread across the Mediterranean world over which the epic hero travelled. His healing begins with the command to rise up, using the word often associated with Jesus' resurrection, Αἰνέα, ... ἀνάστηθι. I suggest there could also be an aural play between the name and the Lukan raising of the widow of Nain's son, νεανίσκε, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγέρθητι (Lk 7:14). The case for considering the raising of Aeneas as a similitude of resurrection will be strengthened by parallels with the raising with which it is paired, and also by a symbolic significance that could attach to the number of years during which Aeneas has been paralysed. The eighth day, after the Sabbath, could be seen as the day of resurrection, the first day of the new world³¹.

Paired with the healing of Aeneas is the raising from death of Tabitha (Dorcas); a totally disabled man is paired with a woman who had been very busy as a dress-maker (9:39)³². She is a disciple who was full of good works and almsgiving, a model Christian

³⁰ Luke seems to have avoided Mark's term κράβατος preferring κλίνη (5:18), κλινίδιον (5:19, 24), and finally even ἐφ' ὃ κατέκειτο (5:25), but uses it here in Ac 9:33 of Aeneas' (more substantial ?) bed.

³¹ François Bovon, "Names and Numbers in Early Christianity", *NTS* 47(2001), 283, citing *Sybilline Oracles* 7.139f, though a reference here to Ogdoad is barely a reference to Jesus' resurrection. He could have made a more apt reference to *Barnabas* 15.8f "... the eighth day, that is the beginning of another world. Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead. And when He had manifested Himself, He ascended into the heavens." It is notable that *Barnabas* here regards the resurrection and ascension of Jesus as being on the same day, like the longer text of Lk 24:51. Whether one regards a link between Aeneas' eight years and the resurrection of Jesus as far-fetched or not, may be influenced by one's explanation for Luke's redaction of Mark's 'six' days between Peter's confession and the Transfiguration into 'about eight' in Lk 9:28.

³² The name Dorcas, a deer with large round eyes, such as would be useful for her craft, may be another allusion to Is 35:6, though LXX uses ἑλάφος; 3 Kgdms 4:23 LXX does list δορκάδων alongside ἐλάφων in Solomon's fare. I find, however, Mathieu's interpretation rather forced – "Elle avait l'agilité et la rapidité

woman; though it is not said that she is a widow, the grief of the widows (v. 39) and their mention alongside the ἁγίοι³³ (v. 41) may suggest that she too was a widow, a model for a group that came to play a role like a ‘sisterhood’ in the early Church³⁴. Within Acts, Lydia, the dealer in purple cloth, the devout God-fearer (?), who is the first to be baptized in Macedonia (16:14), forms a Gentile counterpart to Tabitha. When we seek parallels for the raising of the dead, then we may recall Luke’s story of the raising of a widow of Nain’s only son (Lk 7:12), and the reference to the widow of Sarepta, mentioned in Jesus’ sermon at Nazareth (Lk. 4:26); her son became ill and died and was carried by Elijah to an upper room (ὑπερῶον 3 Kgs 17:19, cf. Ac 9:37, 39). Parallels with the prophet Elisha’s raising of the Shunammite’s son are the need to bring the prophet from some distance away, the roof-chamber where the dead boy is laid, Elisha’s excluding of everyone from the room, his prayer, and the child’s opening his eyes as one of the signs of revival – ἤνοιξεν τὸ παιδάριον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ (4 Kgdms 4:35). A parallel in Acts will be found with Paul’s raising of Eutychus (20:7ff) after a fall from the third story. The widow of Nain’s son provides a closer parallel in terms of the lapse of time between (apparent) death and being raised, though the time envisaged by the narrator for the disciples in Joppa to dispatch two of their number to Lydda, about ten miles away, to bring Peter, together with the time for their return journey, is surely greater, and more like that envisaged by the story of the Shunammite’s son. The sending of messengers to bring Peter, as well as providing a narrative link with the following story of Cornelius, also echoes the raising by

d’une gazelle car elle ‘était pleine des bonnes œuvres et des aumônes qu’elle faisait’” (p.246). Dorcas is a common subject for 19th century stained-glass windows in churches in the Lancashire textile towns.

³³ Christian disciples are described in Acts as ἁγίοι only in this pair of healings (9:32, 41) and earlier of Saul’s persecution of them (9:13, recalled in 26:10).

³⁴ E.g. 1 Tim. 5; also consider Anna, Lk 2:36-38, as a type. The widow is a Lukan interest (1/ 3/ 9+3/ 0). Cyprian, *Treatise VIII.6* comments, “She who had conferred upon the suffering widows the help needed to live, deserved to be recalled to life by the widows’ petition.”

Jesus of Jairus' daughter (Lk 8:49-55) – the female subject; the grieving women; their exclusion from the actual miracle (except for her parents, and the trio of disciples, Peter, James and John, though Peter, like the two prophets, excludes everyone from the raising of Dorcas, Ac 9:40); Peter's word of healing Ταβιθά, ἀνάστηθι echoes Jesus' ἡ παῖς ἔγειρε (Lk 8:54). Though there is no explicit invocation of Jesus³⁵, unlike in the preceding miracle, Peter is not understood to be doing this in his own power, as is indicated by Peter's kneeling in prayer, as Elisha had done³⁶. Anyway, Tabitha is emphatically ζῶσαν (v. 41) and her being raised brings many in Joppa to faith, and Peter stays on for some time there.

Before considering the significance of Joppa, we pause to evaluate speculation that the parallels between Tabitha and the raising of Jairus' daughter have generated. Luke's account we take to be dependent upon Mark's, and Mark has ταλιθα κουμ,³⁷ ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνεύμενον· τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέστη (5:41f). It is not surprising that Luke does not repeat the transliterated Aramaic of his *Vorlage*, because other Aramaic phrases in Mark are also not copied into Luke. Nevertheless there is the fascinating, if not provable, speculation that at some point in the tradition–history, ταλιθα and ταβιθα were confused by those who did not know Aramaic. Indeed at Mk 5:41 the Washington Freer Codex reads ταβιθα and Codex Bezae reads ραββι θαβιτα³⁸. Εὐθέως ἀνέστη is how Ac 9:34 describes the healing of Aeneas, possibly echoing Mk 5:42 –

³⁵ The Old Latin and some Syriac versions supply it here, and it is echoed in the words to Cleopatra in *Acts of John* 22 (Hennecke, *NT Apocrypha*, 2. 218).

³⁶ Kneeling in prayer may be said to be Lukan – see Ac 7:60 (Stephen), 20:36, 21:5 (Paul). Cf Dietrich, pp 266f. Jesus also had knelt on the Mount of Olives, where he had asked the disciples to pray, (note καὶ θεὸς τὰ γόνατα προσήγατο Ac 9:40; καὶ θεὸς τὰ γόνατα προσήγατο Lk 22:41) .

³⁷ The variant κουμι would represent the correct feminine in Aramaic being transliterated here, but may well then be a correction. Cf. Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, Macmillan, London, 1955, p. 296.

³⁸ Wellhausen had conjectured that this was a corruption of ραβιθα = 'girl' (Taylor, *St Mark*, p.296). Why not regard it, rather, as a suitably foreign sounding 'magic' word like *abracadabra*?

ἐυθέως is Luke's preferred form (12 /0 /6+9 /3), while Mark prefers ἐυθύς (7 /42 /1+1 /3 - for both of Luke's uses, Lk 6:49 and Ac 10:16, there are variant readings). Anyway the use of ἀνίστημι for both Aeneas and Dorcas links the two healings as raisings and hints at their symbolic association with the resurrection of Jesus. Barrett regards the similarity of ταλιθα and ταβιθα as coincidental, "If Luke had been intending to evoke memories of words which in his gospel he does not use he would have done so more effectively."³⁹ However, we have noted other places where details from Mark, unused in Luke's Gospel are apparently reworked in Acts; e.g. the apparent use of Mark's summary of the healings of Jesus (Mk 6:54ff) in the summary of apostolic healings (Ac 5:12ff) already discussed.

It was concern for Tabitha that had prompted the Christian believers in Joppa to send for Peter, whom they knew to be in Lydda. I doubt whether the NT *hapax* ὀκνέω (9:38) which should suggest some hesitation or reluctance, is anything more than a reverential recognition of Peter's importance in the Church. There is no implied suggestion of a possible reluctance because Joppa was a mainly Gentile city, or because Peter would have to interrupt whatever his tour was about. What is remarkable is the faith of the messengers on their twenty mile round trip (akin to the Shunnamite's) that Peter would be able to raise one clearly dead!⁴⁰ His coming to Joppa encouraged them there, and he stayed there with another Simon, distinguished from Peter as being a tanner, a worker with leather. It is not clear that Luke knew, or expected his readers to know that tanners were despised within Judaism, at least according to the later *Mishnah*⁴¹, no doubt because their trade was a continual involvement with animal hides, was dirty and smelly even when not ritually

³⁹ Barrett, *Acts*, p.485.

⁴⁰ Barrett, *Acts*., p.484 poses the questions without resolving them.

⁴¹ *Ketuboth* 7:10 (Danby's translation p. 255) regards being a tanner as a defect that leads to the opinion that the husband is compelled to divorce a wife. In a case of two brothers who were tanners in Sidon, the Sages take the view that the widow of one of them is not obliged then to marry the other.

defiling. A location near the sea with its supply of salt water and sea breezes would then be good for a tannery, but would not have made it an estate agent's 'fashionable' area even for those quite unaware of Mishnaic scruples. So Peter's lodging here does not necessarily imply that he is sitting lightly to the Law, but that he, like Luke's Jesus, is shown to be comfortable among the poorer folk, and the despised fringe, tax-collectors, prostitutes and 'sinners'. Anyway, Peter now settles for a while on the margins of respectable practice, on the margin of sea and land, in a place associated with the story of Jonah, reluctant prophet to Nineveh, who sailed from Joppa to escape this mission – details of Jonah's voyage have probably coloured the account of the great storm at sea narrated in Ac 27 – but Jonah was finally more than successful in bringing that great, evil (and Gentile) city to repentance (Lk 11:32). Simon Peter, lodging with Simon the tanner by the sea in Joppa is soon to be persuaded that "God has given even to the Gentiles the repentance that leads to life" (Ac 11:18).

The story of two healings, then, sets the stage for the structurally critical and long account of the conversion of Cornelius and his household. As literary technique, we may compare Lk 15, two short parables about a man and a woman, leading into the multifaceted and long parable of a father and his two sons. The second healing is mightier than the first, and prepares for "das noch größere Wunder der Bekehrung eines Heiden"⁴². These two miracles on this journey that will bring Peter to Caesarea, have been shown to be full of echoes of healings in the Gospels and the Elijah-Elisha narratives of the Deuteronomic history. They anticipate miracles of Paul. Peter's apostolic role is less precise than, say, the Ignatian bishop, but is a source of encouragement to existing collections of Jewish followers of the Christian movement. He continues the ministry of

⁴² Dschulnigg, *Petrus im NT*, p. 104.

Jesus in healing and raising the dead. These two linked narratives have the form of other healing stories, but are marked out by details that are interesting for the reader, and which are not obviously variations on the Gospel miracle themes. The locating in Lydda and Joppa (though remember Jonah!); the proper names, Aeneas and Dorcas (though remember the speculation about *ταλιθα / ταβιθα*!), her trade, and the length of Aeneas' paralysis (though see footnote 31!), and lodging with Simon the tanner, do not have obvious symbolic significance; they may be from historical tradition or be part of the narrator's artistry providing human interest and verisimilitude. "It is almost as if Luke wanted, for historical or literary reasons to root the unlikely developments to follow in the soil of the every-day and verifiable", comments Johnson⁴³ and goes on to conclude that Luke "shaped general traditions about Peter as wonderworker into these specific narratives in this specific place". Gerd Lüdemann⁴⁴ adopting an approach of maximum doubt, would agree that the historicity of any of the details in these two stories can be no more than a possibility. Yet his claim that proper names could well be invented by Luke, after the manner of Lk 8:41 where Luke has named "the person who remains anonymous in Mk 5:22"⁴⁵ would seem to be an over-stating of the textual evidence. The name Jairus is not in the Western text of Mark, nor its Matthean parallel, and so may have been suggested by the Lukan parallel, but N-A²⁷ does not regard it as a doubtful reading in Mark.

Judgement miracles?

Having examined the specific accounts of healings ascribed to Peter, there remains the question of exorcisms, noted in the summary of Ac 5:16, and whether these relate at all to the negative or destructive mighty works that are recorded.

⁴³Johnson, *Acts*, p. 179.

⁴⁴ *Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts*, pp 120-123 .

⁴⁵ p. 123 .

The story of Ananias and Sapphira (5:1-11) is a negative example set alongside the positive example of Barnabas with regard to the acts of generosity that provided for the church. It is carefully balanced. Luke elsewhere couples together a man and a woman – *e.g.* Simeon and Anna (Lk 2:25ff, 36ff); the parable of the shepherd and the lost sheep, with the woman and the lost coin (15:3ff, 8ff); the gardener and the cook (13:18f, 20f); the healings of Aeneas and Dorcas; perhaps also two parables about persistence in prayer, though not adjacent to each other, the friend at midnight and the widow (Lk 11:5ff, 18:1ff). Both parts of the narrative, or ‘diptych’ as O’Toole calls it⁴⁶, vv 1-6, 7-11, begin with Peter asking a question (vv 3,8). The deaths of each are instant and the same νεώτεροι / νεανίσκοι bury the bodies alongside each other without ceremony or funeral rites. The apostles’ feet are where the gifts are placed (4:35, 37, 5:2) and it is at Peter’s feet that Sapphira (5:10) and presumably Ananias fall dead. The reaction to the death of Ananias, reported prematurely, καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας, is repeated after Sapphira’s death, καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας ... ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας ταῦτα, with the additional, more precise definition, ἐφ’ ὅλην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, which is the first time that the apostolic community is described in Luke-Acts as ‘the Church’⁴⁷. Presumably their deaths were seen as a serious warning, and perhaps, also a sign of the

⁴⁶ Robert F. O’Toole “‘You Did Not Lie to Us but to God’ (Acts 5,4c)”, *Biblica* 76 (1995), pp 182-209.

⁴⁷ The term will be used a total of 23x in Acts, once of Israel in the wilderness (7:38); in the singular of the whole Church – especially notable is 9:31, where the singular church extends beyond Jerusalem; once specifically of the church in Antioch (13:1) – in the plural of local churches following the missionary expeditions of Paul. Some MSS also have ἐκκλησία at 2:47, probably in explanation of the phrase ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. See the discussion in Barrett, *Acts*, pp 172f.

supernatural power of punishment⁴⁸ exercised by the apostles (*cf* the implications of 1 Cor. 5:4f)⁴⁹.

What was the offence of Ananias and Sapphira? It is clear that they were neither obliged to sell the property, nor to donate the proceeds to the church (5:4), though the example of Barnabas would have encouraged other property owners to do the same. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has invited speculation that the sharing of property within the apostolic community of believers is similar to the Qumran *Community Rule*. Those joining that community were to hand over their property, which after a two-year probationary period would ‘be merged’, but then, ‘If one has lied deliberately in matters of property, he shall be excluded... for one year and do penance’ (1QS 6, Vermeš’ translation). We may note that this is the rule for all, not a voluntary offering as in Acts, and that the punishment for deception is less severe! Harrill⁵⁰ has recently argued that everyone took an oath to hand over their possessions, so that their offence was perjury amounting to practical atheism, but there is no mention of such an oath and the natural reading of the account is that their offence was to conspire together to keep back part of the proceeds while giving the impression of donating the whole. This is effectively described as ψεύσασθαί τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (v.3), as οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ (v.4) and πειράσαι τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου (v.9; *cf* Dt 6:16, cited at Lk 4:12). Their offence is one of conspiracy to deceive, and so gain the esteem that Barnabas and others were enjoying. The offence is judged by Peter to be not only deceiving the church but the

⁴⁸ Henriette Havelaar, “Hellenistic Parallels to Acts 5,1-11 and the Problem of Conflicting Interpretations”, *JSNT* 67 (1997), 63-82, uses a term of G. Theissen, ‘Rule miracles of punishment’. Also Clark, *Parallel Lives*, pp 217f.

⁴⁹ Tertullian *On Modesty* 21, writing of the apostle’s power to bind and loose, says that Peter “bound Ananias in accordance with the bond of death, and the weak in his feet (the cripple at the Beautiful Gate) he ‘absolved’ from his defect of health”.

⁵⁰ J. Albert Harrill, “Divine Judgement against Ananias and Sapphira: A Stock Scene of Perjury and Death”, *JBL* 130 (2011), 351-369.

Holy Spirit they had received, and so threatening the primitive unity, τοῦ δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων ἦν ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία (4:32). “The Ananias story reveals an important side of (the primitive) κοινωνία : it is not just a community of friends, but an enterprise of divine character.”⁵¹ This is in stark contrast with the bold witness of all who are full of the Spirit (4:31)⁵², and so may be said to constitute the blasphemy against the Spirit which has no forgiveness (Lk 12:10f). It is in hearing his deception described by Peter as against God, that Ananias, who has remained silent throughout, implying his guilt, collapses and dies. Peter has not brought this about as punishment, though it is Peter’s words that have exposed the deceit of Ananias. However, Peter’s subsequent words to Sapphira, when his questioning has exposed that she is party to the deception, at the least predict, and may effect, her death like her husband’s. If modern interpreters find this treatment extreme and offering little opportunity for repentance and reform from an offence that seems less than capital, then there may be cited the verdict of Paul in 1 Cor. 5:3-5, which has something more extreme in mind than excommunication.⁵³ Is there any background in the Bible or Hellenistic literature that might help us rightly to hear Luke’s story?

Havelaar⁵⁴ seeks parallel ‘rule miracles of punishment’, and highlights the example of Glaucus in Herodotus 6.86 – he lies about money, which is interpreted as tempting the god, and he dies without offspring – not quite as immediate a punishment as for our Acts couple! She also refers to candidates joining Pythagorean communities who did not live

⁵¹ S. J. Noorda, “Scene and Summary”, p. 481.

⁵² Cf Mathieu, p. 213.

⁵³ Cf also the ancient question put by bishop Archelaus to the heretic Manes in a fragment of the *Disputation* preserved by Cyril of Jerusalem, with regard to the identity of the God of the OT and the NT – “If you find fault with one who says, ‘The Lord killeth and maketh alive,’ why do you honour Peter, who raised Tabitha to life, but also put Sapphira to death?” *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 6.234.

⁵⁴ Havelaar, “Hellenistic Parallels to Acts 5,1-11”, pp 67f.

up to the standards and were excommunicated and *treated* as dead, with a tomb erected to them⁵⁵.

The deceit of Achan after the fall of Jericho in Josh. 7, had to do with material wealth (v.21) and threatened the success of the community of the conquest; once exposed it was punished by execution. The verb νοσφίζεσθαι with ἀπό is used at both Josh 7:1 LXX and Ac 5:2f; the only other uses in the Bible are 2 Macc. 4:32 and Tit. 2:10. The LXX of Josh 7:1 counts Achan's deed as part of Israel's πλημμέλειαν μεγάλην (MT and NRSV different –'broke faith'). So there are good grounds for linking these two stories. Pervo⁵⁶ attempts to make the case for Josh 7 and 1 Cor 5:3-5 being the "leading sources" of Ac 5:1-11. He notes that in Acts the apostle has a more active role than Paul's 'presence in spirit' in 1 Corinthians, and likens it to the tendency of the author-apostle's role in 1 Tim. 1:20. Pervo seems not to be entirely convinced that 1 Cor 5 has alleviated the need to account for a piece of "floating tradition" behind Ac 5! The only verbal connection is the reference to Satan.

Pervo also⁵⁷ notes that the story of Susanna (LXX Daniel 13) involves the element of conspiracy between the two elders, thwarted in their desire for Susanna, to offer false testimony against her, a deceit which is exposed by the young Daniel's cross-examination as to the species of tree in the garden under which they claimed she had committed the immorality for which she should be stoned. This is comparable with Peter's exposure of the conspiracy element in the Ac 5 story, asking a particular detail, the price for which the land was sold. Both the conspirators are sentenced to death. As Susanna also has echoes

⁵⁵ pp 77f, referring to Iamblichus' *Life of Pythagoras*, 17.72.8 – 73.3 and 74.11-16.

⁵⁶ Pervo, *Dating*, p.73.

⁵⁷ Pervo, *Acts*, p.130.

of the Eden story of the Fall, Marguerat⁵⁸ has argued that Eden is in the background of Ac 5. We have a married couple, tempted by the serpent (= Satan), involving each other in their sin and blaming each other. Ananias and Sapphira could be seen as destroying the innocence of the primal Christian community, “une rupture dans la presentation de l’âge d’or de la chrétienté”⁵⁹, but the echoes are not especially impressive.

Goulder⁶⁰ finds the ‘only’ place outside Ac 5 where ‘the word of a man of God’ is effectual ‘in the striking dead of a false disciple’ is in Jer. 28 (LXX 35, though Goulder has 34), *Ανανίας υἱὸς Αζωρ ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης* (LXX 35:1, MT different). He dies a couple of months after Jeremiah’s verdict. His name is the same as the false disciple of Ac 5, but also the good Ananias of 9:1! In view of the influence of the Elijah-Elisha cycle of stories on the Gospels and especially on Luke, I would advocate as background Elisha’s prophetic awareness of Gehazi’s deception and greed, and his prediction that Gehazi and his descendants would be lepers, a sentence with immediate effect (2 Kings 5:25ff)⁶¹. The Lukan Jesus (Lk 4:27) makes the only specific NT reference to Elisha and the Naaman story.

While these alleged backgrounds to Ac 5:1-11 may have some light to shed, none is sufficiently close as to be an unmistakable allusion. So we had better give prime consideration to any parallels in the total Lukan context. The narrative of Ac 3-5 well illustrates the sayings of Lk 12. There the promise of the Spirit’s instruction of disciples what to say when answering authorities and rulers (12:12) is followed immediately by a squabble about property and inheritance, to which Jesus responds with a warning about all kinds of greed (vv 13ff). The sayings are *pre*-ceded by Jesus’ warning against the yeast of

⁵⁸ Daniel Marguerat, “La Mort d’Ananias et Sapphira (Ac 5, 1-11) dans la Stratégie narrative de Luc”, *NTS* 39 (1993), pp 209-226.

⁵⁹ p.209.

⁶⁰ Goulder, *Type & History*, p.174.

⁶¹ This comparison is made by Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures*, 16.17.

the Pharisees, that is, their hypocrisy (12:1) – because what is whispered behind closed doors (like the conspiracy of Ananias and Sapphira) will be proclaimed from the housetops (v.3). The Pharisees are later said to be “lovers of money” (Lk 16:14).⁶²

As Ananias and Sapphira engage with Peter, so do, first, Judas, and later, Simon Magus. Before the apostolic supper, Satan enters Judas Iscariot, who speaks with the priests and temple authorities, and agrees a sum of money to hand Jesus over (Lk 22:3-6). Jesus’ words about and to Judas (vv 21f, 48) indicate a supernatural insight (paralleled by Peter’s insight into what Ananias and his wife have done). Satan has also demanded to sift all the apostles (v.31), but Jesus’ prayer for Peter will ensure that he can turn and strengthen his brother apostles. With the money Judas bought a field (Ac 1:18 χωρίον, like the property Ananias sold, 5:3) and was struck with a messy end. It is Peter that interprets these events as both according to Scripture and requiring a replacement for Judas’ *episcopo* (1:15-20). It is Satan too, says Peter, that has filled Ananias’ heart (5:3), so that he has lied to the Holy Spirit and conspired with Sapphira to tempt the Spirit of the Lord. Their offence, like Judas’, is to put themselves on the wrong side in the conflict between Satan and God’s Spirit, the conflict in which Jesus, full of the Spirit, had been engaged in the wilderness (Lk 4).

Peter is also the key figure, along with John, in confronting Simon Magus in Samaria. His offence is to imagine that he can buy the apostolic power of the Holy Spirit (Ac 8:18ff). Peter calls on him to repent, so that he may be forgiven and spared the fate threatened. Simon asks the apostles to intercede for him to be so spared. The reader is left to assume that such repentance happened and left Simon alive, especially so if the readers

⁶² Goulder, *Type & History*, pp 90f.

were aware of later accounts of Simon as arch-heretic and his teaching and contests with apostles including Peter⁶³.

If we look for a parallel to the narrative of Ananias and Sapphira in the part of Acts that is dominated by Paul, then we find a figure like Simon Magus in Elymas Magus, or Bar-Jesus, also described as ψευδοπροφήτης Ἰουδαῖος, confronted by Paul and Barnabas (13:6ff). Elymas tries to oppose “the word of God” which is converting the pro-consul, Sergius Paulus. Saul, also known as Paul and called such from here on, is filled with the Holy Spirit (*cf* Ac 4:8), looks intently (*cf* 3:4) at this “son of the devil, enemy of all righteousness” and tells him he will be blinded by the hand of the Lord – no recovery is recorded! In Luke’s account of the Pauline mission, we may also note the incident of the sons of Sceva (19:13-17), which has the comedy of an exorcism in reverse as a warning against playing with the demonic for power. We may note the proximity of this incident to the note of the healing effect of Paul’s handkerchiefs (v.12), which we have treated as a parallel to the power of Peter’s shadow (5:15), which is itself reported soon after the account of Ananias and Sapphira. We may also note the *inclusio* of the name of the Lord Jesus (19:13, 17), which features prominently in Peter’s proclamation in Ac 3-5. We may also note the exorcising in the name of Jesus Christ of the pythoness, παιδίσκην τινὰ ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα πύθωνα, (16:16ff), who had made her owners rich by her fortune-telling. The exorcism is followed by the flogging and imprisonment of Paul and Silas (*cf* the imprisonment and beating of Peter and the other apostles, 5:17-40).

⁶³ *Cf* Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil – Magic and the Demonic in Luke’s Writings*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1989, p.72; it is surprising that her monograph has very little discussion of Lk 22:31. Also G. Klein, (cited by Dietrich, pp 253ff) finds in Peter’s final words an offer to the later Simon sect to repent and convert. The Bezan text adds much weeping to Simon’s urging of their intercession for him. These tears are understood by PsClem, *Hom* 20.21, *Rec* 10.63, as tears of anger rather than repentance, but if, as Pervo, *Acts*, p.215 suggests, Simon’s tears in D may reflect Peter’s tears in Lk 22:62 (// Mt 26:75, a ‘minor agreement’) they are most clearly tears of repentance.

We may also note Luke's account of the death of Herod Agrippa I (12:21-23)⁶⁴. Herod accepts the acclaim of the crowd as a god not man, in contrast to Peter, (10:27), or Paul, (14:14f) – the Hellenistic and imperial notion of divine kingship may also be targeted. Herod is immediately struck down by an angel of the Lord, “eaten with worms”, σκωληκόβρωτος, (the fate of the tyrant Antiochus according to 2 Macc. 9:9), and dies. The context suggests this is not only a punishment for not giving glory to the true God, but also for his executing the apostle James and imprisoning Peter, with the intention of executing him also. These popularist accounts of God *versus* Evil seem to be the narrator's variations on a theme, but amount to significant engagements in the cosmic battle on the part of the apostles, like Jesus himself in his ministry of the Kingdom.

What then is the role of Peter in Ac 5:1-11? Peter shows extraordinary insight to perceive what the ‘omniscient’ narrator has told the reader, namely that Ananias has kept back from the apostles some of the proceeds from the sale of his real estate. Peter challenges this and interprets it as lying to the Holy Spirit, because his heart is filled with Satan. The sharp tone of Peter's words matches his later words to Simon Magus (8:23)⁶⁵. The silence of Ananias implies his guilt, just as Judas makes no response to Jesus at Lk 22:48⁶⁶. With Peter's interpretation, in accordance with the solemn warning of Lk 12:10, Ananias knows he is guilty of a sin without forgiveness, and so drops down dead, in shock or despair. In this reaction which does not even ask about the possibility of repentance, Ananias aligns himself with Judas, rather than with Simon Magus, or, indeed, Peter himself. Peter's inspired discernment is parallel to that of Jesus as shown at the apostolic

⁶⁴ Josephus' account, *Antiquities* 19.8.2, shares many similarities – located in Caesarea, Herod is dressed in a silver robe which reflects the sun; he is acclaimed as a god, but is struck down with violent pain.

⁶⁵ Dietrich, p.237.

⁶⁶ As noted by Mathieu, p.216.

supper with regard to Judas (22:21) and Peter (v.34), as well as in other encounters, like his perceiving the character of the woman of 7:36ff. When Sapphira arrives, Peter initiates the questioning that exposes her collusion in her husband's deception. His rhetorical question serves as verdict on her symphony with Ananias in testing the Spirit of the Lord. At that dramatic moment, the young men who have buried Ananias arrive back and Peter predicts that they will carry her out as well, to unite them in death and burial, as in offence. Peter's role is not absolutely clear. He has "some judgmental function"⁶⁷, but only predicts her fate. However, if we are right in understanding Peter as acting here like an inspired prophet, on the model of Elisha or Jeremiah discussed above, then the spoken word is expected to be effective in event or deed⁶⁸, and so may be counted among the σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα done through the apostles (Ac 5:12)⁶⁹. "Sa parole – comme son ombre! – est une parole d'autorité"⁷⁰; it is not the shadow of Peter *as such* that heals the sick; nor is it Peter's word *as such* that sentences Ananias and Sapphira; rather both are agents of the name of Jesus raised and glorified. So specific a prophecy of doom is without parallel in the Gospel. The consequence of the sudden deaths is φόβος μέγας (5:5,11), specifically for the whole ἐκκλησία, as well as for all who hear about these events. Satan within the believing community is as great a danger as conflict or persecution without. Peter strengthens the brothers against the sifting of Satan. The effect of his word maintains the κοινωνία of the infant ἐκκλησία.

The Broader Context of the Healing Miracles

Among other NT texts that reflect the experience or expectation of supernatural healings, parallel to those by Jesus, to accompany the Christian proclamation, pride of

⁶⁷ Havelaar, "Hellenistic Parallels to Acts 5,1-11", p.80.

⁶⁸ Cf Is. 55:11.

⁶⁹ So Mathieu, p.212.

⁷⁰ p.220.

place should be given to the ‘longer ending’ of Mark [16:9-20], which may be regarded as a summary of the *Lukan* Easter narrative⁷¹. It lists the casting-out of demons by the name of Jesus, speaking in new tongues, picking up snakes⁷², drinking poison without harm and laying hands on the sick as signs that accompany and confirm the Gospel message - ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου συνεργούντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιούντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων.

1 Cor. 12:9f lists as Pneumatic gifts, χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ πνεύματι, ἄλλω δὲ ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων. Jn 14:12f expects the believers to do the same (though unspecified) works that Jesus had done⁷³, and greater, because he was going to the Father. James 5:14f advocates as normal practice the sick to be prayed for and anointed *in the name of the Lord* by the ‘elders of the church’, which will lead to the sick person being *raised up* by the Lord and forgiven their sins. The anointing of the sick, which is part of the mission of the Twelve in Mk 6:12, is omitted in the *Lukan* parallel. Heb. 12:12 uses physical weakness and its healing as a metaphor for the spiritual state of its readers. Paul (2 Cor 12:12) argues that the “signs of the⁷⁴ apostle” had been performed among the Corinthians in his ministry and seems to identify them with σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν. Paul asserts that miraculous works had accompanied his mission, though he is not specific about them (Rom 15:19, Gal 3:5) and does not present them in a triumphalist

⁷¹ Cf the reference to Mary Magdalen as a healed disciple, the resurrection appearance to two disciples walking in the country, the appearance to the Eleven at table, the world-wide commission, the ascension and heavenly session; M. D. Hooker, *Mark*, A & C Black, London, 1991, p. 389; A. E. J. Rawlinson, *Mark*, Methuen, London, 1925, p.246. However, A. Gregory in his discussion of the Longer Ending of Mark (*The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2003, pp 86ff) is at pains to argue that “Luke-like material need not provide evidence of knowledge and use of Luke” (p.74), preferring to postulate hypothetical tradition or “almost creedal references” (p.86).

⁷² A closer description of what Paul does at Ac 28:5 than the commission of Lk 10:19, though both fall short of snake-handling as a charismatic gift!

⁷³ Cf Haenchen, *Acts.*, p.341.

⁷⁴ C. K. Barrett, *2 Corinthians*, A & C Black, London, 1973, p. 320, rightly regards this as a ‘generic’ use of the definite article, ‘an apostle’; *NRSV* ‘a true apostle’.

or evidential way. Barrett⁷⁵ places the phrase “signs of an apostle” in inverted commas as a phrase used by Paul’s opponents, while his own description of authentic apostleship is to endure suffering with Christ⁷⁶.

The world in which Luke wrote was ready to believe in miraculous deeds, a characteristic shared by Jewish⁷⁷, pagan⁷⁸ and Christian writers. Besides Acts there seem not to be any first century Christian narratives describing Christians performing miraculous healings. It is hard to identify influence of Peter’s deeds in Acts on the accounts of miracles in the apocryphal Acts which blossomed in the second and third centuries. As in the canonical Acts as we have noted, there is a fusing of details from the healing miracles of Jesus in the Gospels, so the apocryphal Acts add in echoes from Acts of which they are evidently aware. *Acts of Peter* 27f reports Peter as raising to life a widow’s son, saying “Young man, arise and walk” (cf Lk 7:14 but also perhaps Ac 9:34) and “Do not look at me, as though by my own power I were doing what I do; the power is of my Lord Jesus Christ’s” (cf Ac 3:12); *AcPet* 31 has a summary of sick people cured by Peter on the Sabbath, including paralytics⁷⁹. In Rome Peter contends with the heresiarch Simon Magus; sometimes this seems to be a competition of miraculous powers. Whether this and other flourishing of apostolic conflicts with Simon Magus, stem from the encounter of Peter and Simon in Samaria (Ac 8:18-24) is suggested as a possibility in the next chapter. The *Pseudo-Clementines* also have disputations of Peter with Simon the

⁷⁵ Barrett, *2 Corinthians*, p.320.

⁷⁶ As brilliantly and profoundly expounded by Barrett in his Cato Lecture, 1969 which he entitled *The Signs of an Apostle*, Epworth Press, London, 1970.

⁷⁷ E.g. *Tobit*; healings ascribed to Ḥanina ben Dosa, *Talmud b. Ber.* 34b.

⁷⁸ E.g. Plutarch *Life of Pyrrhus* 3,4-5 describes the healing power of Pyrrhus’ right toe; Suetonius, *Vespasian* 8,7 describes how Vespasian healed a blind man and a lame man in Alexandria; Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 4,45 describes how the philosopher raises a dead girl; traditions and inscriptions at Epidauros, a sanctuary associated with healing. For these and others see Francis Martin, *Narrative Parallels to the New Testament*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1988.

⁷⁹ Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2. 309f, 314.

Samaritan *magus*, in Caesarea and elsewhere. Peter goes on missions which include healing many sick people as well as teaching⁸⁰. The questioning of Thomas “by what power thou dost perform these things” and similarly of Judas (*Acts of Thomas* 106, 140⁸¹) allude to Ac 4:7. Like canonical Peter’s, miracles are done in the name of Jesus in apocryphal Acts, e.g. *Acts of Philip* 11.3-4. The tendency of the apocryphal Acts, as is the tendency of the apocryphal *Infancy Gospels* with regard to Jesus⁸², is to increase the miraculous for its own sake, and to loosen their figurative symbolizing of the Gospel of salvation/resurrection/conversion, which we have noted to be so strong in Peter’s works of healing in Acts. Bovon⁸³ comments, “Miracles ... abound in the apocryphal acts.... (their) hero looks like a miracle-performing machine.”

In this chapter we have shown how Peter’s works of healing reinstate the apostolic commission in the Gospel and parallel the healings of Jesus, with the difference that for Peter they are not done in his own power but in the Name of Jesus. While miraculous healings were done by many of the believers, they appear to have become associated especially with the apostles and a few other prominent individuals. Peter’s reputation made him especially sought after among the Twelve and in his own right (in Ac 9). While the specific healings may have served as a manual for later healers, we are left with an impression that Peter excelled in this gift and this was more typical of the first Christian generation than later. The healings, like those by Jesus, are signs of more than a cure; they symbolize salvation, being raised up and given new life. The healings proclaim by deed what Peter’s *kerygma* proclaimed by word. Parallels between the healings of Peter and

⁸⁰ p.561.

⁸¹ pp 497, 516.

⁸² E.g., *The Infancy Story of Thomas the Israelite*, Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 1. 392ff.

⁸³ François Bovon, “Canonical and Apocryphal Acts of Apostles”, *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11 (2003), 165-194, pp 171f.

Paul are cumulatively strong, so that Peter's healings of Jews prepares for the salvation of Gentiles in the missions of Paul. The judgement miracle which brings about the death of Ananias and Sapphira shows Peter engaged in conflict with Satan in a way that is untypical of the Twelve or Christian community. He has inspired insight and a uniquely effective word, an authority that at this key moment could be termed *primatial*.

After the conversion of Saul/Paul and his healing from physical and spiritual blindness in order "to bring [Jesus'] name before Gentiles" (9:15), Luke's structure makes the couple of healings at Lydda and Joppa serve as connecting links which bring Peter on his own to new territory, from Jerusalem to the Mediterranean shore, and ready for the vision which will convert *him* to accept that the Gospel is for Gentiles as well as the people of Israel. "The 'instrument' [namely Paul] is ready. Now the mission to the Gentiles must get under way."⁸⁴

⁸⁴ H. Conzelmann, *Acts*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1987, p.76.

Chapter Five: Across New Thresholds

Previous chapters have shown how Peter in Acts has pioneered the proclamation of the Gospel and demonstrated its effective power in works of healing, both in Jerusalem and beyond, during journeys encouraging the believers (Ac 9:32). The ascending Jesus had given the apostles the commission to witness to him “in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends¹ of the earth” (1:8). This sets out a geographic programme, which is mirrored in the shape of the Acts narrative, but it also raises the question whether the mission will not only be to diaspora Jews but also to Gentiles. Within OT texts that proclaim the universal sovereignty of Israel’s God there is some ambiguity whether “the ends of the earth” are brought into subservience or converted to belief in the one God. *E.g.* Ps 98(97):3 says, εἰδοσαν πάντα τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, leaving it unclear whether they only see Israel’s salvation or see and participate in salvation. The same is true of the similar phrase in Is 52:10, the conclusion of the oracle (vv 7-10) from which the vocabulary of ‘gospel’ probably derives, ὁψονται πάντα τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. In Is 49:6 the scope of the task of Yahweh’s servant is extended beyond Israel - μέγα σοί ἐστιν τοῦ κληθῆναί σε παῖδά μου τοῦ στήσαι τὰς φυλάς Ιακωβ καὶ τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ Ισραηλ ἐπιστρέψαι ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς. Paul cites this text at Ac 13:47 in justification of his turning from synagogue to the Gentiles, and there is a clear allusion to it in Simeon’s prophecy (Lk 2:32). The vocabulary of ἔθνη / עַמִּים is ambiguous, applying to ‘nations’, ‘peoples’ or ‘Gentiles’, though from the citation it is clear that Luke interprets it as

¹ NRSV uses a plural to translate the original singular, ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

‘Gentiles’. However the apostles as the narrative hearers of the Ascension commission still need to discover that Gentiles are included.

The specific inclusion of Samaria in the programme suggests that the extension of the mission may include crossing thresholds of religious pedigree. The initiative of a mission in Samaria, however, is ascribed by Luke first to Philip, one of the Seven. The role of the Hellenists in Luke’s account provides another strand of development which interacts with a direct line of mission beginning with the Ascension and the apostles. Luke’s account of the spread of the Christian message beyond Jerusalem ascribes it directly to the dispersing of believers from Jerusalem as part of the διωγμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, (Ac 8:1), which began with the stoning of Stephen and continued in the systematic action of Saul against men and women. The main exceptions to this dispersion are the twelve apostles who stay in Jerusalem. They have appointed the Hellenist Seven to deal with a fair daily distribution to the widows, while they devote themselves to “prayer and to serving the word” (Ac 6:4). The appointment of the Seven is a significant initiative of the whole community, presided over by the Twelve (6:2f), who then appoint them with prayer and the laying on of hands (6:6). By implication Peter plays his part here as one of the Twelve, but there is no hint that Peter is leading this initiative. Peter’s role is at one with the rest of the Twelve. “L’omniprésence de Pierre lors de la comparution du chapitre 4 cède donc la place à une présence très discrete de celui-ci de la comparution du chapitre 5. Au chapitre 6 des Actes, on passe de la présence très discrete à la quasi-absence.”² Luke’s narrative makes the Hellenists, in contrast to the Twelve, prime initiators of apologetics and evangelism, as well as attracting earlier persecution. The role of the Seven may well be part of the historical tradition Luke has received, but he threads it into a more complex narrative pattern. It may be compared

² Mathieu, p.224.

with the mission of the Seventy or Seventy-two disciples (Lk 10), in addition to the mission of the Twelve. There may be a typological reference in both to Moses' appointment of the seventy Elders to assist in his work (Numbers 11), who, along with Eldad and Medad receive the spirit of prophecy³. Alertness to the symbolism of numbers may find in 7 or 70 a hint of the wider world when compared with the 12 tribes of Israel – there are 70 nations according to Genesis; the Greek OT was translated by 70, the Septuagint.

The Seven appointed for the service of tables – again we note a Lukan attraction to the symbolic value of meeting human need - are men full of faith and the Holy Spirit and Wisdom, who do great wonders and signs, engage in cutting-edge apologetic and argument with Greek-speaking Diaspora Jewish synagogues in Jerusalem, and include Nicolaus, a proselyte from Antioch (6:5). After Stephen's martyrdom, it is Philip, the next named among the Seven, who is among those scattered throughout “Judea and Samaria” (the same combination as at 1:8), and who embarks on an evangelistic mission in a (or, *the*⁴) city of Samaria, which is accompanied by signs and healings of the paralysed, the lame and the possessed⁵. In the architecture of Acts, then, we find from the Apostles' choosing of the Seven which leads to the great persecution and dispersion of believers, through to the conversion of the chief persecutor to become part of the same mission, thereby bringing peace to the church throughout Judea, Galilee and Samaria (9:31), that Peter and the Twelve are absent from the action, with the exception of the visit of Peter and John to Samaria after Philip's first evangelism (8:14-25). When the apostles

³ Cf. Goulder, *Type and History*, pp 56f.

⁴ Ac 8:5; Johnson, *Acts* p.145 argues from v.8 ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐκεῖνῃ that Luke intended the anarthrous reading; in any case according to the geographical scheme, the whole of the Samaritan territory is in mind, v.14 ἡ Σαμάρεια.

⁵ The first exorcisms mentioned in Acts – were the Samaritans especially thought of as open to demonic possession (cf Jn 8:48)?

are there, Philip has slipped into the silent background⁶. So determining the role of Peter in Ac 8 is to ask why he is there at all! He is there, in this first extension of the Christian mission, to give it apostolic sanction and because of the importance of Samaria in the mission charge of the Ascending Jesus. It also brings (Simon) Peter, up against Simon Magus.

Peter in Samaria

The initiative in 8:14 is that of the Apostles collectively; they have heard⁷ of the conversion of the Samaritans and delegate Peter and John to go to Samaria. A pair of messengers is a common NT feature⁸, and this particular pair had been dispatched by Jesus in preparation for the Apostolic Passover (Lk 22:8). Their commission now is not explicit, but what they do is in keeping with the apostolic task of prayer (Ac 6:4). Explicitly they pray for the newly baptised converts to receive Holy Spirit, which Jesus had told them was the assured good gift of the heavenly Father to his praying children (Lk 11:13). The episode closes with Simon Magus asking the two apostles to intercede for him (Ac 8:24). The laying on of the apostles' hands after their prayer, ensures that the Holy Spirit is received, in a powerful though unspecified way, enough for Simon to want to acquire that power. The Spirit is a sign that the mission has indeed reached beyond Jerusalem into Samaria. Dietrich calls it the Pentecost of the Samaritans⁹. Is there significance in the fact that the Samaritans have not received the Spirit at the same time as they had been baptised into the name of the Lord Jesus? Does it suggest that only the Apostles can be channels of

⁶ F. Scott Spencer, *Acts*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, sees Philip as the baptising forerunner of the apostles just as John the Baptist had been the forerunner of Jesus before disappearing from the scene. Dietrich writes of Peter "eingeschmuggelt" into Philip's story (p.247).

⁷ I think that Mathieu's (pp 228f) deducing from the lack of any explicit mention of a human source of information, that supernaturally the apostles have been "attentifs aux échos de la Parole" in Samaria is absurd.

⁸ Cf. Joachim Jeremias, "Paarweise Sendung im Neuen Testament", pp136ff; also G. Biguzzi, "Witnessing Two by Two in the Acts of the Apostles", *Biblica*, 92 (2011), 1-20.

⁹ p.256.

the Spirit? There is no suggestion that the baptism Philip had administered was inadequate, and in fact we find with regard to baptism and the Spirit a variety of orders in Acts. For Cornelius' household, their prior experience of the Spirit convinces Peter that baptism should not be withheld from these Gentiles (10:47). At Ephesus (19:1ff) Paul finds believers baptised into John's baptism, who need both to be baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus and to receive the Spirit through Paul's hands. The variations in practice defy attempts to force the narratives into particular doctrinal or sacramental norms about the reception of the Spirit. Whether or not Luke is combining two traditions about the conversion of Samaria, one focussing upon Philip and the other on Peter and John, there is no doubt that in Luke's scheme, we are at a turning point in the mission, where, so Lampe argues, "it had to be demonstrated to the Samaritans beyond any shadow of doubt that they had really become members of the Church in fellowship with its original 'pillars'"¹⁰. Hence the gift of the Spirit was withheld until the apostolic mission had approved this new step in the mission, rather as Barnabas was later sent to inspect what was reported to be happening in Antioch (11:22), again after the dispersion of believers following the death of Stephen.

In the architecture of Luke-Acts, the conversion of Samaritans by Philip, Peter and John, should be read alongside the incident at the beginning of the Lukan Travel Narrative (Lk 9:51ff), the failure of a Samaritan village to receive (οὐκ ἐδέξαντο) Jesus, because his face was set towards Jerusalem. This note presumes that the reader has some knowledge of the religious division between Jews and Samaritans. James and John had wanted to call down fire from heaven to consume them (as Elijah had done¹¹). The Lukan

¹⁰ G.W.H. Lampe *The Seal of the Spirit*, 2nd Edition, SPCK, London, 1967, pp.66ff; Dschulnigg, *Petrus im NT*, p.102; Barrett, *Acts*, pp 397ff.

¹¹ 2 Kgs 1:10, 12, an allusion made clear by the variant reading at Lk 9:54.

Jesus will have none of that. This Gospel incident is reversed by Philip's mission¹² δέδεκται ἡ Σαμάρεια τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, (Ac 8:14), and John along with Peter (why not James for a better recapitulation?) is dispatched by the Apostles to affirm the Samaritans' conversion and to pray (not for fire to destroy them) but for them to receive Holy Spirit (which they had experienced as tongues of fire at Pentecost). The choice of Peter, then, delegated by the Apostles, rather than James, would appear to be part of Luke's strategy of having Peter as the main player in putting the Lord's mission charge into effect and crossing this particular threshold. This is the last episode that gives Peter a companion apostle. Samaritans as schismatic Jews are, so to speak, half way between the Jews of Jerusalem and the Gentiles. They rejected the Temple for their own sanctuary on Mount Gerizim. It is then noteworthy that the Lukan Jesus makes a Samaritan the model of being a loving neighbour, and of faith expressed in gratitude which brings the healed Samaritan leper salvation (Lk 10:25ff, 17:11ff), and is himself willing to enter a Samaritan village and to journey through the borderlands of Galilee with Samaria (9:52, 17:11). The speech of Stephen in Ac 7 with its selective reading of OT history, and conclusion that God does not dwell in buildings, has confused at 7:16 the cave that Abraham had bought (Gen 23) and the land bought at Shechem by Jacob for an altar (Gen 33:19)¹³, with the consequence that the only part of the promised land possessed by Abraham was the tomb he bought in Shechem, i.e. in what became Samaritan territory. Stephen's 'error' can be read as a pro-

¹² Whether, as Spencer (*Acts*, p.86) suggests, the Jerusalem-fleeing Philip is intended to contrast with Jesus face set on Jerusalem, may be too subtle for Theophilus to hear, nevertheless the ἀγγέλοι sent by Jesus to prepare for his coming, like Philip, are not of the Twelve. More persuasive is a paper by V. J. Samkutty, "The Lukan Portrait of the Samaritan Mission: A Structural-Functional Reversalism", who shows how the Acts mission consciously reverses the rejection of Jesus in Lk 9; now *The Samaritan Mission in Acts*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 2006.

¹³ According to Gen 50:13, Joseph buried Jacob in Abraham's cave; according to Josh 24:32 Joseph was buried at Shechem in Jacob's land. Earl Richard, "Acts 7: an Investigation of the Samaritan Evidence", *CBQ* 39 (1977), 190-208, examines the case for sectarian Samaritan influence, but finds it unnecessary. We should also note that Jn 4:5 refers to this same piece of land, again in anticipation of the evangelising of Samaria; the old Syriac reads Συχεμ for Σιχαμ as the city's name. The Fourth Gospel describes a successful mission of Samaria as part of the ministry of Jesus, while Luke leaves this until Acts. Similarly if Jn 12:20ff describes the coming of God-fearing Gentiles to see Jesus, this too brings to the climax of the ministry of Jesus what Luke leaves until Cornelius in Acts.

Samaritan bias and anticipation of his fellow-hellenist Philip's evangelism in Samaria.

Undoubtedly the most interest in Luke's account of this mission is the particular Samaritan, Simon Magus. First, at 8:9ff there is a retrospect of Simon as an amazing practitioner of magic, and his claiming to have, or rather to be, ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη. Simon's reaction to Philip's mighty deeds is an amazement similar to the populace's amazement at his own. Simon is converted and baptised and stays close to Philip. When the apostolic delegation of Peter and John arrives, their prayers and laying on of hands which leads to the baptised converts receiving Holy Spirit impresses Simon as a power he would like himself to have, and in the original act of Simony, seeks to buy¹⁴. In the larger narrative, Simon is to be put alongside Judas who bought land with tainted money obtained at Satan's instigation (Ac 1:18, Lk 22:3)¹⁵, and Ananias and Sapphira who sell land and under Satan's influence fraudulently withhold some of the proceeds (Ac 5:3). Simon's previous claim to be something great, (like Theudas, 5:36) or to divine power, puts him alongside the devil (Lk 4:6) and Capernaum (10:15, alluding to Is. 14:11-15)¹⁶ and anticipates Herod's self-exaltation (Ac 12:23). Peter condemns Simon's perishable silver, along with his wrong-headedness in imagining that what is the gift of God can be bought. He tells Simon ἡ γὰρ καρδία σου οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθεία ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ (8:21), that ἡ ἐπίνοια τῆς καρδίας σου needs to be forgiven (v.22), because he is εἰς χολὴν πικρίας καὶ σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας (v.23). Peter challenges him to repent of this evil, and pray for forgiveness. Luke makes several inter-textual allusions here; first seeing Simon's offence as illustrating the *Magnificat's* prophetic rejoicing that the Mighty One has scattered the proud διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν (Lk 1:51); then, possibly,

¹⁴ I do not find Spencer's interpretation of this demand for a share in Spirit-brokering in terms of reclaiming some of the honour which the apostles had taken from him, (*Acts*, p. 88) according to "honor-shame socio-cultural codes" (84f) particularly illuminating here.

¹⁵ p.57; note that κληρὸς is used at 1:17 and 8:21.

¹⁶ Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil*, pp. 46, 50.

to Deuteronomy 29:18 (LXX v.17), which speaks of idolatry as ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ¹⁷; thirdly to the phrase σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας in Is. 58:6 – a later phrase in this same verse is inserted into the citation of Is. 61:1f at Lk 4:18f, the sermon at Nazareth¹⁸, which at the least suggests Luke's familiarity with this text and an openness to its influence on him here; the allusions could well be consciously made by Luke.

Simon's response is to ask the two apostles (ὁμεις) to intercede on his behalf; their prayers would then have a parallel in Jesus' own prayer for Peter in Lk 22:32. In contrast with the ends of Judas, Ananias, Sapphira and Herod, the narrator leaves open the question whether this intercession is successful and Simon's repentance genuine; the genuineness of the prodigal son's repentance in Lk 15:11-24 is equally uncertain. The Bezan text modifies the uncertainty by adding a note on Simon's tears, presumably of repentance¹⁹; I do not regard D as more original here, but its reading is evidence of how Peter's own tears (Lk 22:62) were interpreted as being in repentance and so a model for Simon. I think the open ending is to be attributed less to "a slight softening of discipline as the church expands into new areas"²⁰, as an awareness by author and, possibly, readers that Simon had a role in wider history, and in later Christian traditions. Luke's portrayal of Simon is clearly not that of the arch-heretic, the father of Gnosticism, in argument and miracle contests with Peter and others in Rome, roles that he plays in 2nd century texts like the *Acts of Peter*²¹. The narrative of Ac 8 itself seems to me to be one - but only one - of the seeds of this development and itself to be drawing upon tradition of a known Samaritan false-teacher. It would be anachronistic to interpret Acts, if written around the

¹⁷ p.71.

¹⁸ p.71.

¹⁹ If the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions* 10.63 show knowledge of the Bezan text here – which is by no means certain – then Simon's tears are interpreted as tears of anger.

²⁰ So Spencer, *Acts*, p.89.

²¹ See, for example, the Note on "Simon Magus" by Robert P. Casey in *Beginnings*, 5. 151-163; also Tamás Adamik, "The Image of Simon Magus in the Christian Tradition", in Jan N. Bremmer (Ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter: Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism*, Peeters, Leuven, 1998, pp 52-84.

end of the first century, as demoting a 'Gnostic Redeemer' figure to a mere magician²², and his heretical teaching to the sin of greed. On the other hand, dating Acts well into the second century, would make Luke's portrait of Simon to be wholly inadequate. Justin, himself from Shechem in Samaria, tells us that Simon lived in Samaria before going to Rome, where he performed miracles and had a statue inscribed *Simoni deo sancto*²³. Irenaeus by his extensive citation of Acts identifies the Simon of Acts with the Gnostic arch-heretic. The Tübingen school identified Simon Magus in the *Pseudo-Clementines* as a disguise for Paul and Pauline Christianity at odds with Peter; this has no basis in Acts, where Peter and Paul preach the same Gospel and have parallel conflicts with magic! That the Peter of Acts had already exposed Simon's material greed and personal *hubris* of which he needed to repent, would give ammunition for readers in the 2nd century in the battle of apostolic faith against Gnosticism with which Simon came to be identified.

After the Samaritan Mission

The conclusion of this narrative (Ac 8:25) presents Peter and John returning to Jerusalem from their visit to Samaria, evangelizing many Samaritan villages on the way. Peter has himself thus confirmed the prior work of Philip, ensured that the Samaritan converts share in the Pentecost experience, and become actively engaged himself in preaching among Samaritans, so fulfilling the commission of Jesus (Ac 1:8) thus far. We may then expect the next stage of the narrative to tell of the apostolic preaching in the rest of Judea and to the ends of the earth. Indeed the focus of Acts does move towards a world-wide mission, which includes the preaching to Gentiles as well as Jews. However the immediate sequel to Philip's mission in Samaria, tells of Philip's being sent by a vision

²² Agreeing here with Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil*, p.62, referring to the views of Haenchen, *Acts*, pp 305ff.

²³ *First Apology*, 26; whether Justin had confused a statue to a god *Semoni Sanco...*, an inscription that was found in 1574, is still debated.

to teach and convert an Ethiopian eunuch (Ac 8:26-39). R. F. O'Toole²⁴ argues for a sequence of four conversion stories, in Samaria, the Ethiopian, Saul and Cornelius, each longer than the former, and each involving divine intervention and baptism. The second and third of these conversion stories form a long interlude during which Peter plays almost no part. The only exception is that Peter was presumably included among the Jerusalem apostles to whom Barnabas introduced the converted Saul (9:27). We will show below how parallels between the accounts of the conversion of Saul and Peter's conversion of the Gentile household of Cornelius, both the result of specific multiple divine interventions, underline the strategic importance of these narratives in Luke's proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles – the conversion of the first Gentiles and the conversion of the persecutor who will be the principal agent of the Gentile mission.

The gem of a narrative which prefaces the account of the mission to the Gentiles, the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch, does not involve any apostolic confirmation or support. It is located in a world separated from the rest of the narrative threads of both Saul and Peter, on a desert road, away from Jerusalem; it happens “in a time-warp, out of synch with the ordinary rhythms of life”²⁵. Whatever traditions may lie behind the story, its structure is similar to that other gem of Lukan narrative, the journey to Emmaus (Lk 24). The context is a journey; some of the actors are otherwise unknown; the OT scriptures are interpreted in terms of Christ suffering, and the narrative concludes with a sacramental act, the breaking of bread, or baptism, after which the teacher (Jesus or Philip) miraculously disappears. “This pattern exhibits Lucan theology in a nutshell expressed in Lucan fashion; faith kindled in a conversation that includes ‘word and sacrament’ and is developed in the course of a journey.”²⁶ The sequence of events, from which it is apart, is resumed when Philip is miraculously translated back to the towns of Judea. The royal official from the

²⁴ “Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch”, *JSNT* 17 (1983), 25-34.

²⁵ F. Scott Spencer, “The Ethiopian Eunuch and His Bible: A Social-Science Analysis”, *Bib. Theol. Bulletin*, 22 (1992), 155-165, p.161.

²⁶ Pervo, *Acts*, p.219.

ends of the earth is a foreigner but on the margins of Judaism, not, as far as Luke is concerned, the first Gentile Christian. The eunuch would be “understood by Luke’s readers to be a social outcast, liminal in terms of his sexual identity, his religious identification, and his socio-economic status”²⁷. Just as important as popular prejudices, however, are allusions to the OT, to Is. 56 where the foreigner who joins God’s people and the eunuch who keeps Sabbath are made part of the covenant people, and the temple becomes a “house of prayer for all peoples”²⁸, and to Ebed-Melech (Jer. 38:7ff). His desert encounter with Philip does serve as a brief encapsulation of the missionary expansion that lies ahead. The thread of proclaiming the Gospel, Luke’s primary theme, continues through these collected incidents, together with an accumulation of place names – Peter and John evangelise many Samaritan towns (8:25); Philip proclaims the good news of Jesus to the Ethiopian on the road from Jerusalem to Gaza (8:35); Philip preaches in all the cities from Azotus to Caesarea (v.40); Saul proclaims Jesus in the Damascus synagogues (9:20); Saul debates with Hellenistic Jews in Jerusalem until plots against him lead to his going to Caesarea and Tarsus (9:29); the church throughout Judea, Galilee (the only mention in Acts, despite the awareness of the Galilean origins both of Jesus and the apostles, 1:11, 2:7, 10:37, 13:31) and Samaria (9:31); Peter’s tour which includes preaching and healing in Lydda, Sharon, Joppa (9:32ff) and ultimately in Caesarea.

Before this section of the mission under the initiative of the Seven is concluded, the theme of persecution and dispersion (8:1) is resumed, with a portrait of Saul, who was introduced to the reader at the stoning of Stephen, carrying out a systematic and extensive persecution of the Way. The dramatic conversion of Saul brings the first phase of persecution to a close - “the church throughout Judea, Galilee and Samaria had

²⁷ Mikeal C. Parsons, *Body and Character in Luke and Acts*, p.135.

²⁸ At Lk 19:46, Luke has not included the reference to the Gentiles that he found in the citation of Is.56:7 in his Markan *Vorlage*, presumably because his strategy for the extension of the Gospel to Gentiles was reserved until Acts and would no longer then be focussed upon the Temple.

peace” (9:31) - as well as providing the Christian movement with its most zealous missionary. This narrator is anxious, then, to underline Saul’s role as a persecutor before his conversion, and introduces Saul into the narrative as a *νεανίας* looking after the cloaks of those stoning Stephen, the Way’s first martyr, and consenting to their action (7:58, 8:1). In the great persecution that followed, Saul is said to have imprisoned many men and women (8:3), though this is only by way of summary, without names or details. Then Saul’s requesting authority from the chief priest to pursue the Way to synagogues in Damascus (9:1), sets the scene for Saul’s vision on that road. Paul’s own words affirm this account (22:4f), and add the suggestion that Saul had participated in the trials of martyrs and the pursuit to many synagogues. Details cannot be verified and may lack credibility, but the picture of the major persecutor of the Church is variously reinforced. His conversion, pivotal though it is for the whole narrative of Acts, is interwoven first with the accounts of Philip’s mission to Samaria, and his divine-sent mission to the Ethiopian eunuch, and then by way of Peter’s healing of Aeneas in Lydda, and the raising of Dorcas in Joppa, with the conversion of the centurion Cornelius in Caesarea. It is only at 11:19 that the dispersion of believers after the death of Stephen is recalled and Antioch is set to be the new centre of Christian missionary expansion and Barnabas brings Saul there from Tarsus to help. Yet before that gets properly underway (13:1ff) there is a famine-relief visit back to Jerusalem (13:27ff), the martyrdom of James and the miraculous deliverance of Peter from prison (12)²⁹. This interweaving of the account of different players and missions is partly for literary effect, maintaining the hearers’ interest, and creating suspense. It also allows the hearing, and so interpreting, of separate stories alongside each other – the successive conversions of Samaritans (heretical/schismatic Jews and including Simon the greedy magician), the Ethiopian returning from pilgrimage to the Temple, from

²⁹ There is insufficient data to argue for a chronological sequence – indeed the impression that the famine in the reign of Claudius (11:28f) preceded the death of Herod Agrippa I (12:23) is improbable.

which the eunuch was excluded, reading the Prophets, Saul the persecutor of the Way and then the devout, God-fearing but ‘unclean’ Gentile³⁰; the visions of Saul and Peter, the chief characters of the first and second half of Acts, with their momentous consequences, are similarly inter-woven. “The question that intrigues me,” writes Gregory E. Sterling,³¹ “is why Luke chose to situate the call of Paul prior to Peter’s mission to Cornelius.” Their juxtaposition helps to define and authorise the role that Saul is now set to play.

From 9:32 to 11:18 Acts is focused upon Peter, not now as a representative of the apostolic Twelve, but on his own, engaged on a pastoral visitation. It involves answering requests for help and healing in Lydda and Joppa, as described in Chapter 4. Peter’s coming to Joppa encouraged them there, and he stayed with Simon, a tanner. It was argued there that lodging with a tanner would be in keeping with Jesus’ own reputation of being comfortable among the poorer folk, and the despised fringe, tax-collectors, prostitutes and ‘sinners’³². We also noted there Joppa’s association with the prophet Jonah, fleeing from his mission to Gentile Nineveh. Anyway, Peter now settles for a while on the margins of respectable practice, on the margin of sea and land. He is soon to be persuaded that “God has given even to the Gentiles the repentance that leads to life” (Ac 11:18).

PETER and CORNELIUS

The conversion of Cornelius, and the nudging of Peter towards that event is the key narrative for Luke in his account of how a mission to Gentiles might be authorised

³⁰ Daniel Marguerat, “Saul’s Conversion (Acts 9, 22, 26) and the Multiplication of Narrative in Acts”, in C. M. Tuckett (ed.), *Luke’s Literary Achievement*, 127-155, pp 139f.

³¹ “From Apostle to the Gentiles to Apostle of the Church – Images of Paul at the End of the First Century”, *ZNTW* 99, (2008), 74-98; p.89.

³² That the historical Peter could have been predisposed towards a wide degree of social interaction because of his origins in Bethsaida is suggested by Markus Bockmuehl, “Simon Peter and Bethsaida – the Variable Influence of Hellenistic Culture and Language within Galilee”, in Chilton & Evans (Edd), *The Missions of James, Peter and Paul*, Brill, Leiden and Boston, 2005, pp 83f; also Oscar Cullmann, *Peter, Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*, 2nd Edition, SCM, London, 1962, p.24.

and begun. The positioning of the Cornelius episode in the structure of Acts as counterpoint to the account of the conversion of Saul invites us to see how the parallels here function³³. There are structural parallels between Saul's vision and Peter's. Both involve a double vision/audition, which reinforce each other and contain specific information. Saul's conversion is backed by the vision of Ananias who is instructed where he will find Saul, and in what state – Ananias' instructions are expressed also as what Saul is seeing in a second vision. Ananias protests to God about what he is told about Saul, just as Peter protests against the command in his own vision. Peter's vision is preceded by the vision to Cornelius, who is told where his messengers will find Simon Peter, and Peter's puzzling vision is followed by a second supernatural instruction from the Spirit to go with Cornelius' messengers, who arrive at that moment (10:17ff). We learn later that Saul's vision has happened at about noon (22:6, 26:13), like Peter's (10:9). Saul's conversion is concluded by healing his temporary blindness, his receiving the Holy Spirit and baptism (9:17f); Cornelius' by the manifestation of the Spirit in the gift of tongues, removing any impediment to their baptism (10:46f). Both conversions are subsequently reported to, and affirmed by the apostles in Jerusalem – Saul is introduced by Barnabas (9:27); Peter's accepting of Gentile hospitality and their conversion is defended in Jerusalem (11:1-18).

Both visions are reinforced by being retold more than once. Differences in the details have sometimes been treated as evidence of multiple sources³⁴, but Dibelius himself and later literary critics have preferred to seek different nuances in the different accounts. Saul's vision is retold by himself in two major apologetic speeches, in Hebrew/Aramaic before the Jerusalem crowd in chapter 22, and before King Agrippa in chapter 26. In his study of the three accounts, Marguerat³⁵ argues that in the first, the

³³ For studies of parallels in Luke-Acts see p. 104 above.

³⁴ Dibelius, *Studies*, p. 110, refers to Bauernfeind.

³⁵ "Saul's Conversion", pp 141ff.

narrator's account, the author stresses (especially by the use of passive verbs) that Saul is reduced to nothingness as his planned persecution is thwarted and his identity is being refashioned; Ananias, whose vision is 'a prophetic call account' enacts the role of 'ecclesial mediation' in the transformation of Saul. The first person account in chapter 22 emphasises Paul's Jewishness and faithfulness to the Law, a pupil indeed of the famous Gamaliel; Ananias, too, is described as "devout according to the law and well spoken of by all the Jews living there". Continuity between Paul's past and present is established, but this account reaches its climax in Paul's visit then to Jerusalem. When praying in the Temple, ἐν ἐκστάσει (22:17 – cf. Peter at 10:10)³⁶, a vision of the Lord sends him far away to the Gentiles - Πορεύου, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰς ἔθνη μακρὰν ἐξαποστελῶ σε (22:21), this role for Paul being transferred from Ananias' vision in the narrator's earlier account. In the third account of Paul's conversion, in the first person before Agrippa (fulfilling the commission revealed to Ananias in 9:15), presumably in Greek, and including the non-Semitic proverb of 26:14b, the vision of Christ on the Damascus Road includes the commission to the Gentiles with the Gospel of forgiveness of sins and sanctification by faith in Christ (26:17ff).

By various means, then, the conversion of Paul and the ascribing to him the imperative mission to the Gentiles, is shown to be the result of the divine initiative. The vision to Peter and the conversion of the Gentile Cornelius with his household, is also repeated in a way that underlines that the earthly apostles are cajoled by heavenly initiatives into accepting the rightness of Gentile conversions and mission. The narrator synchronises his story by telling first of the angelic vision to Cornelius in Caesarea.

³⁶ Rebecca Dean's paper "The Vision of the Vessel", 2008 (unpublished) suggests that ἐκστάσις is not necessarily a prophet-like frenzy or trance. In Gen 2:21 LXX it is used of Adam's deep sleep for the creation of Woman, and 15:12 LXX for Abram's sleep during which God speaks of his covenant with his descendants. The parallel between Peter and Paul's visions is certainly most significant; both are in the context of prayer and are parallel in this respect also with Jesus' moments of heightened awareness.

Cornelius is described as devout, fearing God, giving alms, and praying constantly (10:2), and it is at the hour of prayer (as observed by Peter and John in Jerusalem 3:1) that Cornelius has his vision. Thus Cornelius is the classic ‘God-fearer’³⁷; that he is the model Roman also is emphasized by his Roman patrician name, his rank, his abode in the administrative centre for Judea especially under the procurators, and by ascribing him to the Italian Cohort³⁸. He was just the sort of Gentile with whom Theophilus would readily identify.³⁹ Centurions play an exemplary role in the Gospel tradition, and provide for an attentive hearer of Luke-Acts a thread that joins Jesus, Peter and Paul. We recall the centurion of Capernaum (Lk 7), whose slave (Lk 7:2 δοῦλος, Mt 8:6 παῖς) is healed by Jesus at a distance. In Luke this centurion is described by Jewish elders as loving their nation and as having built their synagogue; in this he is similar to God-fearing Cornelius. In Luke, unlike Matthew, the centurion of Capernaum, never meets Jesus⁴⁰, but messengers report his words in *oratio recta*, explaining his understanding of Jesus’ authority to command in his sphere, which Jesus commends as ‘faith’, the like of which he had failed to find in ‘Israel’ (Lk 7:9). According to Mark, the centurion on duty at the crucifixion declares that Jesus is υἱὸς θεοῦ (15:39); in Luke (23:47) the ἑκατοντάρχης (for Mark’s Latinism κεντυρίων) is among those who testify to

³⁷ There is no mention here of synagogue-attendance, which for some is a key to understanding God-fearers as a specific class of people; it could be omitted from the picture of Cornelius because it would be an unnecessary diversion; so Geoffrey Moore in a paper, “Fearers of God and Worshipers of God in Acts”, (unpublished?) p.5.

³⁸ a cohort certainly in Syria before CE 69, but some suspect a Lukan anachronism here – see Barrett, *Acts*, p 499; Lüdemann, *Early Christianity*, p.126.

³⁹ Barrett, *Acts*, 2. lxxixf.

⁴⁰ This is in keeping with Luke’s redaction of Mark, in which encounters of Jesus with Gentiles and journeys outside Jewish territory seem to be avoided, (the Syro-Phoenician woman; Caesarea-Philippi), presumably reserving such travels and encounters with the gospel for Acts, of which then the casting of Cornelius as the first Gentile convert, seems especially apposite. Christopher M. Tuckett (*Q and the History of Early Christianity*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1996, pp. 395-7) discusses the ‘Q’ centurion of Capernaum, and Catchpole’s contention that he is not necessarily to be thought of as a Gentile, and generously concludes, “In any case it seems most likely that both Matthew and Luke, as the earliest ‘interpreters’ of Q, both interpreted the story as referring to a Gentile. The clear parallel between this centurion and the non-Jewish Cornelius of Acts 12 (*sic*) at the level of Luke’s understanding is universally recognised.”

Jesus' innocence, declaring him to be δίκαιος. He also rather surprisingly responds to the way Jesus has died by glorifying God (LkR); most uses of this Lukan phrase (2/1/8+3/1) are in response to a wonder of healing, but they include the shepherds of Bethlehem (Lk 2:20), the response of the Jerusalem believers to Peter's account of the conversion of Cornelius (Ac 11:18) and again when Paul reports to James and the elders what God had done among Gentiles (21:20). Later in Acts centurions play their part in upholding the Roman system of justice, which Luke wishes to be seen in a favourable light (21:32, 22:25f, 23:17, 23, 24:23). One, Julius, (27:1,6) is named as treating the prisoner Paul with unexpected kindness, but the centurion in charge of the ship paid more heed to the professional mariners than to Paul (27:11); however, by 27:31 they were acting on Paul's advice, and at 27:43, it is the centurion's wish to 'save Paul' that alone frustrates the soldiers' plan to kill all the prisoners before the wrecked ship is abandoned, and so all on board make it safely to shore. This is to say that the will of God that Paul should proclaim the Kingdom and teach about the Lord Jesus Christ in Rome, in spite of his opponents, and the elements, hangs at this moment on the pro-active whim of a single centurion!

Peter's Vision

Cornelius' vision is to send to Joppa for Simon Peter, lodging with Simon the tanner whose house is by the sea. He sends two slaves and a devout soldier to Joppa, and their report also includes the expectation that Peter, if he comes, will have something important to say (10:22). Cornelius' account when Peter arrives (vv 30-33) adds nothing of substance. Peter's vision at Joppa, about noon, when he has gone up to the roof to pray (following, perhaps, the kind of pious practice to which Daniel was loyal (Dan. 6:10)), and being hungry falls, not asleep to dream of food, but into a trance, ἐκστάσις,⁴¹ and sees heaven opened, the preliminary of many visions, including the Spirit's descent at Jesus'

⁴¹ See note 36 above.

baptism (Lk. 3:21), and the vessel, σκεῦος⁴² like a sheet with ‘clean’ and ‘unclean’ animals within it, though the fact that it descends from heaven may be “an indication that all the creatures contained in it are acceptable to God”⁴³. There do not seem to be any strict parallels to Peter’s vision here.⁴⁴ The sheet (ὀθόνη, suggested by the square sails⁴⁵ of ships on the sea, or, indeed, the historical Peter’s personal memory of Galilee?) with the animals upon it is suggestive of creation (Gen. 1:24), clean and unclean animals saved together in Noah’s ark⁴⁶; this is reinforced by the recurrence of the number four – the four corners of the earth/sheet, tetrapods⁴⁷, the four branches of the river watering Eden; Ezekiel’s vision of the chariot throne, a contraption that comes down from heaven, also has a recurrence of the number four in describing the living creatures (Ezek. 1:5ff) and the directions in which the chariot might move (v. 17)⁴⁸. Peter’s argument against the instruction of the vision to rise, kill and eat, Μηδαμῶς, κύριε, ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον, is reminiscent of Ezekiel 4:14 about eating and cleanness⁴⁹. The voice in Peter’s vision responds to his objection - “Α ὁ θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν, σὺ μὴ κοίνου (10:15) - using terms reminiscent of Mark 7, which Luke’s Gospel had left largely unused,

⁴² Ananias had been told that Saul would be a ‘chosen vessel’ (9:15).

⁴³ Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, SPCK, London, 1982, p. 372.

⁴⁴ Dennis R. MacDonald, *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2003, argues that Luke created stories (including the visions of Cornelius and Peter, “as fictions to emulate famous stories of the *Iliad*”, (p.146) and finds these visions as sharing several unusual traits with *Iliad* 2, namely their location near the sea, the identification of animals with ethnic groups, and nearly verbatim repetitions of the visions to others (p.148). I find the alleged parallels as listed by MacDonald, pp 156-158, wholly unconvincing for his case that Luke was consciously or unconsciously imitating Homer.

⁴⁵ Cf. *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 15:2, *Testament of Zebulon* 6:2.

⁴⁶ J. Duncan M. Derrett, “Clean and Unclean Animals (Acts 10:15, 11:9): Peter’s Pronouncing Power Observed”, *The Heythrop Journal* 29 (1988), 205-221. Chrysostom (*Homilies on Acts*, 22), regards the vessel as “a symbol of the whole world”.

⁴⁷ The report in 11:6 adds θηρία, and so has four kinds of animals, as noted by David Lertis Matson, *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts – Pattern and Interpretation*, JSNT Supplement 123, Sheffield, 1996.

⁴⁸ François Bovon, *De Vocatione Gentium, Histoire dell’interpretation d’Act. 10,1 - 11,18 dans les six premiers siècles*, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1967, refers to Chrysostom for ‘creation’ symbolism, and to Origen for the more allegorical interpretation where the sheet represents faith and the four corners the four evangelists.

⁴⁹ καὶ εἶπα μηδαμῶς κύριε θεὸ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἰδοὺ ἡ ψυχὴ μου οὐ μεμΐανται ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ θηρισμαῖον καὶ θηριαλώτον οὐ βέβρωκα ἀπὸ γενέσεώς μου ἕως τοῦ νῦν οὐδὲ εἰσελήλυθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα μου πᾶν κρέας ἔωλον.

especially the (evangelist's ?) comment, Mk 7:19, καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα. Such allusions may indicate that the details of Peter's vision are the work of Luke rather than the report first hand of the historical Peter. This would accord with Luke's account of Paul's conversion vision; Paul's own accounts are brief (Gal 1:15, 1 Cor 9:1), compared with Luke's account in Ac 9, the details of which accord with other Biblical visions.

The meaning or application of Peter's three-fold vision is not immediately clear to him (10:17). "Has Peter," Pervo⁵⁰ asks, "like Jesus, thrice rebuffed Satanic temptation, or has he once more thrice denied his Lord? Gentile readers may sense the dilemma, but they pray for Peter to change his mind." Its application to Gentiles and table-hospitality with them emerges for Peter as the story unfolds; it does not apply instantly to the issue of beginning a mission to Gentiles, and some think that Luke may have placed here the vision, originating in dispute about table-fellowship (like Gal.2:11ff), to "stress the divine initiative in the Gentile mission"⁵¹. Peter gives hospitality to Cornelius' messengers (v.23) – this is unproblematic, because a Jewish household would be able to determine the food and its source. More problematic for a Jew would be accepting hospitality in a Gentile home, even a God-fearing Gentile's home, because purity rules may not be observed, the origin of meat may have association with pagan temples, and a centurion such as Cornelius may have had a professional obligation to ceremonies involving idolatry, military standards, or the imperial cult. Luke's understanding (at least) is clear (10:28), that it is unlawful (ἀθέμιτον⁵²) for a Jew to associate with or to visit an ἄλλόφυλος (NT *hapax.*, usually in LXX for 'Philistine'). Peter reveals that he has now understood his vision to mean that no person (in emphatic position) is profane or unclean, καὶ μοι ὁ θεὸς ἔδειξεν μηδέναι κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν

⁵⁰ Richard I. Pervo, *Luke's Story of Paul*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1990, p.38.

⁵¹ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, pp 371f.

⁵² elsewhere in NT used only by Peter at 1 Pet.4:3, where it is associated with idolatry.

ἄνθρωπον(10:28). What seems to be at issue is not so much notions of Jewish ritual impurity, such as contact with a corpse would bring, as the moral impurity of idolatrous practice, from the influence of which a Jew should separate; this is persuasively argued by Richard Bauckham⁵³. Peter carries what he has learnt into practice by crossing this threshold⁵⁴ and staying in Cornelius' house for some days (10:48), along with the Jewish Christians that have accompanied him (11:12). It is also a point to be noted that in entering the Gentile's house, they are following the precedent of God's angel who appeared to Cornelius at the time of the evening sacrifice and prayer, ἄγγελον τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθόντα πρὸς αὐτὸν (10:3, and compare Gabriel's appearance in the temple to Zechariah, Lk 1:10f, and his coming into Mary's home, 1:26). Cornelius' messengers describe the angel as 'holy' (Ac 10:22); Cornelius' own description is ἄνθρωπος ἕστη ἐνώπιόν μου ἐν ἑσθῇτι λαμπρῇ (v.30, cf 1:10 and, perhaps, Herod's robing of Jesus Lk 23:11), and the angel forms part of Peter's report (11:13). "L'entrée dans une maison païenne avait un précédent divin : l'entrée de l'ange chez Corneille."⁵⁵

A parallel with the account of Paul's conversion that we have already noted is how Peter has to justify what has happened to the apostles and others in Jerusalem. It is his willingness to go to "uncircumcised men and eat with them" (11:3) that he has to explain, which Peter does καθεξῆς. He begins with an account of the vision and his excursion to Caesarea, what had been revealed to Cornelius, and what happened when Peter spoke, namely that they experienced the Holy Spirit, just as (the original apostles) had at the beginning. Peter repeats that it was the "same gift that (God) gave 'us' when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ" (11:17). That he means by this gift, the Holy Spirit is

⁵³ "James, Peter, and the Gentiles" in Bruce Chilton & Craig Evans (Edd), *The Missions of James, Peter and Paul – Tensions in Early Christianity*, Brill, Leiden and Boston, 2005, 91-142, pp 109-114.

⁵⁴ Matson, *Household Conversion Narratives*, p.115 notes the three entries (εἰσέρχεται) of Peter in 10:24-7.

⁵⁵ Mathieu, p. 273.

confirmed by his verbatim citation of the promise of Jesus before his Ascension (11:16, citing 1:5). The Jerusalem Christians are persuaded and draw the general conclusion that God had given καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν “repentance unto life” (v.18). It is divine action, manifest in the bestowal of the Spirit, evidenced in hearing their glossolalia (probably not meant to imply intelligible foreign languages as at Pentecost) and extolling⁵⁶ God (10:46), even prior to baptism, that persuades them, as it had persuaded Peter. It is the view of Philip Esler⁵⁷ that Acts 10:44-8, not only is Luke’s dramatic presentation of this development, but that it is also “historically accurate in revealing a fact of fundamental importance for the beginnings of Christianity”⁵⁸; others find the whole Cornelius story so Lukan as to lack evidence of tradition.⁵⁹

There are two differences between the report in chapter 11 and the account in chapter 10 that merit comment. In 10:20, the Spirit’s instruction is to go with Cornelius’ messengers, without hesitation, μηδὲν διακρινόμενος ; in 11:12, this is μηδὲν διακρίναντα. This active rather than middle voice, would mean ‘making no distinction’ as it does at 15:9⁶⁰. The other, and more substantial difference, is that the speech of Peter is omitted; indeed as soon as Peter begins to speak the Holy Spirit fell on the gathering (11:15), ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄρξασθαί με λαλεῖν . While from this it could be argued that the speech in chapter 10 has been inserted into the narrative there, the report in chapter 11 is concerned to emphasise that the conversion of the Gentiles was not the result of human persuasion but divine action, to which Peter had been (at first) reluctant to respond. But it would rather undermine Peter’s account of what had happened as καθεξῆς, if we pressed the meaning of

⁵⁶ Μεγαλύνω as in the Magnificat, Lk 1:46, (as the Lord also magnifies his mercy, v.58), and Ac 19:17.

⁵⁷ Philip F. Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds*, Routledge, London and New York, 1994, Chapter 3, “Glossolalia and the Admission of Gentiles into the Early Christian Community”.

⁵⁸ p. 51.

⁵⁹ E.g. Pervo, *Acts*, p.265.

⁶⁰ so Barrett , *Acts* p.540; also *NRSV*.

ἄρχομαι. “Did Peter Actually Fail to Get a Word in?” asks John Kilgallen⁶¹, and argues that examples in Lk. 7:24, 12:1, 20:9, allow for a speech at least as long as in Ac 10:34-43, without regarding the verb merely as a semitising redundant auxiliary. Peter’s narrative hearers in chapter 11 would have been familiar enough with his outline *kerygma*. The D version of v.2⁶² ascribes to Peter a long desire to return to Jerusalem, a teaching mission along the way (contrast the evangelizing mission as he and John returned from Samaria) and offers an application of the charge to Peter to strengthen the brethren (Lk 22:32) to his work with the converts where he currently is⁶³, τοὺς ἀδελφούς ... ἐπιστηρίζας, effectively providing a further parallel with Paul, ἐπιστηρίζων τὰς ἐκκλησίας (Ac 15:41)⁶⁴.

Peter’s speech in the household of Cornelius⁶⁵ is his proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles and was discussed alongside Peter’s other speeches in Chapter Three. Peter by means of the poor grammar and syntax is presented as a nervous respecter of persons, but his starting point now is that οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήπτης ὁ θεός,⁶⁶ Peter declares that “in every nation, those who fear (God) and do right are accepted”, and more especially, that “everyone who believes in (Jesus) receives forgiveness of sins through his name” (v.43), because “he is Lord of all”(v. 36)⁶⁷. This understanding of salvation is almost Pauline! Indeed it is more Pauline than what is placed on Paul’s lips at

⁶¹ *Biblica* 71 (1990), 404-410.

⁶² Cf. É. Delebecque, “La Montée de Pierre de Césarée à Jérusalem selon le *Codex Bezae* au Chapitre 11 des *Actes des Apôtres*”, *ETL* 58 (1982), 106-110.

⁶³ Did they include Mnason (Ac 21:16)?

⁶⁴ Joseph Crehan SJ, “Peter According to the D-Text of Acts”, *Theological Studies* 18 (1957), 596ff; p.598

⁶⁵ See Gerhard Schneider, “Die Petrusrede vor Kornelius – Das Verhältniss von Tradition und Komposition in Apg 10,34-43” in his *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte*, Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1985, pp 253-79; Alfons Weiser, “Tradition und Lukanische Komposition in Apg 10,36-43” in *À Cause de l’Évangile – Mélanges offerts à Dom Jacques Dupont*, Cerf / Publication de Saint André, Paris, 1985, pp 757-767.

⁶⁶ The wording here is very similar to Rom 2:11, where Paul asserts the impartiality of God towards human behaviour whether of Jew or Greek. If on other grounds we concluded that Luke had read Romans, it would be reasonable to suggest as Pervo does (*Acts*, p. 277) that Romans is Luke’s source here. I continue to argue for Luke’s ignorance of Paul’s letters, and regard this phrase as a common-place of theology, based on Hebrew idiom (Barrett, *Acts*, p. 519).

⁶⁷ Pervo, *Luke’s Story of Paul*, p.39 “His cosmic role over creation has missionary and dietary implications” –πάντων is masculine or neuter.

13:38f which seems to preach salvation through faith in Christ rather than the Law of Moses, but leaves the impression that there are some sins from which the Law *can* free you! The proclamation to Cornelius is summarized in the phrase, “preaching peace by Jesus Christ”, εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, reminiscent of the angelic message at Lk 2:10ff. Together with the assertion that Jesus, οὐτός, is “Lord of all”, this challenges the Roman imperium to which Cornelius had been bound⁶⁸.

Peter in Acts 15

At the Jerusalem assembly, called to settle the question of whether Gentile converts had also to become Jewish, whether they should be “circumcised and ordered to keep the Law of Moses”, a view upheld by some Pharisaic Christians (15:5), Peter again tells of the conversion of Cornelius’ household. This marks Peter’s final appearance in Luke-Acts, yet it is not his grand finale, which for Luke has been in Chapter 12, but gives him the role of presenting, as an ‘elder statesman’ of the Church, the decisive evidence in the discussion.

The Jerusalem assembly is at a key moment in Luke’s narrative, “the centre of Acts”⁶⁹. Paul and Barnabas have returned to Antioch from their (first) missionary journey, marked by the opening of a door of faith for the Gentiles (14:27). Some individuals from Judea insist that salvation depends upon circumcision and keeping Mosaic customs. The church in Antioch delegates⁷⁰ Paul, Barnabas and some others to go to Jerusalem to settle the matter with the apostles and elders (a newly identified group, possibly including

⁶⁸ C. Kavin Rowe, *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age*, OUP, 2009, pp 103ff; also his “Luke-Acts and the Imperial Cult: a Way through the Conundrum”, *JSNT*, 27 (2005), 279-300; p. 291. Justin R. Howell, “The Imperial Authority and Benefaction of Centurions and Acts 10:34-43: A Response to C. Kavin Rowe”, *JSNT* 31 (2008), 25-51, presents ample evidence that the imperial authority was exercised through others, including centurions, whose characters were often the opposite of that ascribed to Cornelius (cf Lk 22:25, and with regard to soldiers in general, 3:12).

⁶⁹ Barrett, *Acts*, pp 696, 709.

⁷⁰ D has the Jerusalem church *summoning* Paul and Barnabas; this reading is surely secondary to the A text.

James). They are welcomed in Jerusalem but some Pharisaic Christians insist that (Gentile) converts need to be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses, *i.e.* to be converts to Judaism. “After much debate” Peter rises and his speech is given in *oratio recta*, a distinction he shares with James. He claims that ἀφ’ ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων⁷¹ God had chosen him to be the one who would speak the word of the Gospel for τὰ ἔθνη to hear and become believers (15:8). God, furthermore, had underlined this by making no distinction between Gentile and Jewish converts by giving the Holy Spirit to *them* ‘just as to *us*’, by faith (emphatic position) having purified their hearts. That Peter is alluding back to his vision and the summons from Cornelius, and the Spirit’s inspiring glossolalia, much to the surprise of Peter and his Jewish companions (10:45ff), as “irrefutable legitimation” for accepting Gentiles⁷², would be clear to readers of Acts, but elusive to the narrative audience, as would be James’ later allusion to the Cornelius incident, a point well made by Dibelius⁷³. However the word ἀρχαίων is a pointer further back to Pentecost itself, as are the glossolalia. Then the Jews ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους (2:5) represent all peoples and include προσήλυτοι as well as Ἰουδαῖοί (v.11); they are addressed by Peter on behalf of all the apostles, beginning with the prophecy of Joel that God will pour out his Spirit on ‘all flesh’ (v.17) and concluding by saying that “everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved” (v. 21). The full significance of this is not learnt by Peter until he witnesses Cornelius’ conversion, nor by the others until Peter persuades them that it was indeed God’s hand that had been guiding events towards acceptance of Gentiles on an equal footing with Jews. Peter goes on to say that keeping the Law was a heavy ‘yoke’ that Jews had not been able to carry, and should not be imposed on the necks of Gentile converts, because all, both Jews and Gentiles are “saved through the grace of our Lord

⁷¹ It is possible that a contrast is intended with Saul described as νεανίας (7:58).

⁷² Philip E. Esler, “Glossolalia and the Admission of Gentiles into the Early Christian Community”, *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 22 (1992), 136-142, p.136.

⁷³ Dibelius, *Studies*, pp 94f, 97.

Jesus”(15:11). So Peter’s final words express the Gospel in terms that sound (from his epistles) Pauline. There are small differences – Paul did not regard the Law as an unbearable yoke, but as failing to bring salvation, and Paul spoke of justification by faith rather than salvation by grace (but note the expression of the deutero-Pauline Eph 2:5). The Q saying about imposing unrelieved burdens (Lk 11:46) is presented in Luke as addressed to νομικοί, which makes clear that the burdens are the Law and its legal applications. While Luke never has the subtlety or complexity of the Pauline letters with regard to the Law and salvation, in Acts Paul’s distinctive doctrine, which finds a rather garbled expression in Paul’s speech 13:38f is more clearly uttered by Peter! There is no disagreement intended in the soteriologies of Peter and Paul, and so Peter’s speech is followed by the report of Barnabas and Paul of the wonders God had done through them among the Gentiles, a summary statement (like 14:3); the only specific wonder that Acts has so far related is the healing of the cripple at Lystra (14:8ff). Then James responds to the discussion, over which we presume that he has been presiding. He refers to Peter’s speech, calling him Simeon, and how God had taken a people from among Gentiles, and he finds that this agrees with scripture (Amos 9:11f, LXX). He decides (ἐγὼ κρίνω) that Gentile converts should not be ‘troubled’, presumably by imposing circumcision or the Mosaic Law in general, but that the assembly should write to them prescribing certain abstinences (usually termed the ‘apostolic decree’).

The assembly decides to send this letter from the whole church (in Jerusalem) to Gentile believers in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia, carried by Paul, Barnabas, Judas and Silas, who are later identified as prophets (v. 32). The letter denies that those who had unsettled them had come from James and claims the Spirit’s authority to impose no other burden than the instruction to abstain from certain things. The letter together with the oral testimony of Judas and Silas were received in Antioch with joy as παρακλήσις and a

strengthening (ἐπεστήριξαν) of the ‘brothers’ (cf. the language of *Peter’s* commissioning by Jesus, Lk 22:32). They return to Jerusalem but Paul and Barnabas stay in Antioch teaching and evangelizing. They are set ready there for the second missionary expedition, on which Silas⁷⁴ accompanies Paul.

In this dissertation our concern has not been a reconstruction of the history of earliest Christianity. Rather it is how the narrative is shaped to show how Peter contributed to Luke’s overall purpose, the proclamation of the Gospel for all peoples. Luke sees the Jerusalem assembly as setting the seal upon Gentile mission, initiated by Peter and now clarified as not requiring a prior conversion to Judaism, enabling a major extension of the Gospel, the story of the rest of Acts. The ‘apostolic decree’ provided a minimum of regulation necessary as James sees it – he does not say whether this is to maintain table-fellowship of Jewish and Gentile Christians, or rather because they represent parts of the Law explicitly imposed on resident aliens (see below), but subsequently in Chapter 21, James clarifies that he expects Jewish believers to continue to live by the Law. The Jerusalem assembly marks a major step towards Christianity’s being practised independently of its Jewish matrix. The importance of the assembly’s decisions continued; *e.g.* Irenaeus draws upon it to demonstrate both “the divine origin of the Mosaic Law *and* the decision not to require Gentiles to obey it ... because of the evidence of the Spirit manifested on the Gentile believers.”⁷⁵

Acts and Galatians

While we have argued in general that Luke has used such traditions or sources as may have been available to him and has shaped them into his purpose, with Ac 15 there

⁷⁴ Variants which include v.34 smooth out the apparent contradiction about Silas returning to Jerusalem and then accompanying Paul from Antioch.

⁷⁵ David E. Smith, *The Canonical Function of Acts*, p. 63.

is the possibility at least that we have Paul's own first-hand account of the Jerusalem assembly, in Gal 2:1-10, and so a tangible source with which the redaction-critic may make comparison. There are hints of other sources too, in the letter sent from the assembly to Antioch, Syria and Cilicia. It is conceivable that this letter is not a Lukan invention but was kept in the Antioch church's archives and used as a source by Luke, as Bultmann⁷⁶ argued. Some have found a tension between a council called to settle the question of circumcision with a conclusion that issues the apostolic decree. So Dibelius⁷⁷ argued Ac 15 is largely Luke's literary construction into which he has introduced from another source the four-fold apostolic decree as a concession by the Jerusalem church to maintain fellowship with Gentiles. James' speech, it is maintained, cannot be historical, because his exegesis of Amos depends on the LXX not the MT⁷⁸; was the citation from a collection of texts? It is readily granted that most of the language and phraseology of Ac 15 is Lukan⁷⁹ and so any source has been subject to Lukan redaction.

How does the account of Acts compare with Galatians? Gal 2:1-10 describes Paul's second visit to Jerusalem after his conversion; Acts tells of visits at 9:26, 11:29 and possibly 12:25 before the visit of Ac 15. Paul goes up with Barnabas and also Titus (not named among the 'others' of Ac 15:2), not as a delegate from the Antioch church but 'by revelation' for a private meeting with the leaders with regard to the Gospel he preached among the Gentiles. There is mention of false brothers who wish to 'enslave' us. Circumcision was at least part of the issue; hence the statement that Titus, though a Greek was not compelled to be circumcised. Galatians describes a harmonious agreement with the Jerusalem 'pillars', James, Cephas and John, namely of two missions sealed with "the

⁷⁶ "Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apostelgeschichte", in A.J.B. Higgins (Ed.), *New Testament Essays, in Memory of T. W. Manson*, Manchester University Press, 1959, 68-80.

⁷⁷ *Studies*, pp 96-99.

⁷⁸ Barrett, *Acts*, 727f.

⁷⁹ Lüdemann, *Early Christianity*, pp166ff.

right-hand of fellowship”, that Paul had received the Gospel (here meaning as much the activity of evangelization as its content) of the uncircumcised, just as Peter had the Gospel of the circumcised – εὐαγγέλιον and ἀποστολήν are treated as parallel terms in 2:7ff. Paul never doubts that he is an apostle and at Rom. 11:13 calls himself ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος (no articles). The distinction between circumcised and uncircumcised, Jews and Gentiles in terms of mission responsibility, is absent from Acts where Paul’s missions habitually begin with Jews before turning to Gentiles. Galatians makes no mention of the apostolic decree, but only the additional request that they should remember the poor – this rather rules out an equating of Gal 2:1-10 with the famine relief visit of Ac 11:29f. It is clear that what seems to be at issue in Galatians - the Gospel, circumcision, table-fellowship, the Gentile mission, apostleship - and some of the *dramatis personae*, Paul, Peter, James, Barnabas - are the same as in Ac 15. The Jerusalem visitors to Antioch in Acts are before the assembly; in Galatians visitors from James to Jewish Christians in Antioch, including Peter and Barnabas, are later than the assembly, though Lüdemann⁸⁰ makes a good case not only on logical grounds but also on form-critical grounds, that the Antioch incident is reported in Galatians not in chronological but in rhetorical sequence. Against Lüdemann here, Jewett⁸¹ argues that the natural antithetical sense of ὅτε δὲ (Gal 2:11) does not denote a historical flash-back. Barrett⁸² concludes, “It would be difficult to maintain ... that Acts and Paul are describing different events; *equally difficult to think that Luke had read Galatians*”.

Yet this last, that Luke’s source is not just the same tradition as underlies Galatians, but that Galatians is Luke’s source, is what Pervo proposes. Here we have to acknowledge that Pervo’s hypothesis of how Luke makes use of Galatians is not on a par

⁸⁰ *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles - Studies in Chronology*, SCM Press, London, 1984, pp 58, 75f.

⁸¹ Robert Jewett, *Dating Paul’s Life*, SCM Press, London, 1979, pp 83f.

⁸² *Acts*, p.711, emphasis added.

with his use of Mark as a literary source. For example, not only is Titus air-brushed from the account of Ac 15, but the issue of his circumcision (whether he was left uncircumcised, or, not *compelled* to be but voluntarily was circumcised, Gal 2:3), is allegedly⁸³ transferred to Timothy, whom Paul circumcised, his father being a Greek but his mother Jewish (Ac 16:3f). It is generally recognized that at the Assembly Peter expresses Pauline theology; Pervo argues that Peter's image of the yoke (Ac 15:10) is from Gal 5:1, the 'yoke of slavery', a metaphor in Galatians, but literal slavery in 1 Tim 6:1. But ζυγός as a metaphor is common enough in the LXX and rabbinic writings (for human obligation to Wisdom or God's will or the Torah)⁸⁴ to be familiar to Luke. Alternatively he could have taken it from the 'messianic' prophecy of Is 9:4 or the imagery of Is 58:6,9 or from Mt 11:29 (which I think he could have read, even if we accept the Q hypothesis). The sequel to the Jerusalem assembly, the incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11-14), where Paul disagrees with Peter and Barnabas, would be replaced in Acts, on Pervo's hypothesis, by the sharp disagreement between Paul and Barnabas about taking Mark (Ac 15:37ff), of which there is no mention in Paul. If however Luke knew from Galatians about the incident at Antioch, then so might his readers who would find his suppression of this in his account of Peter inexcusable.

A key factor, I would argue, in assessing Pervo's thesis that Galatians is a source of Acts, has to do with the apostolic decree, of which Paul makes no mention, but of which Luke makes Paul a bearer and implementer (Ac 15:25, 16:5). Many think it hard to credit that Paul would have been a party to them. However the concerns of two of the abstinences could overlap with the concerns of 1 Corinthians, eating meat offered to idols and πορνεία, and 1 Corinthians, we argued in Chapter One, was the letter of Paul's most

⁸³ Pervo, *Dating*, pp 86f.

⁸⁴ *TDNT* 2.900.

likely to have been seen by Luke⁸⁵. Hurd's⁸⁶ elaborate account of Paul's dialogue with the Corinthian church argues that imposing the Apostolic Decree was the hidden agenda in part of Paul's 'previous letter' to them. Galatians was not Luke's source for the decrees, and 1 Corinthians would only help with two of them, as might Rev. 2:14, so what was their source? While Luke could have found them in the letter sent from Jerusalem, Haenchen⁸⁷ regards them as drawn up quite separately from the Jerusalem assembly to cement the (table-) fellowship of Gentile and Jewish Christians. But the decrees are for Gentiles only, while James expected Jewish Christians to continue to adhere to full Jewish purity (*cf.* Ac 15:23, Gal 2:12). It is reasonable to think that the decree had its ultimate origin in the parts of Torah that applied to resident aliens, *i.e.* Gentiles. From Lev. 17-18 we can draw the prohibition of eating blood (17:10). 17:15 prohibits eating what dies of itself or is savaged by wild animals or in hunting, which may be covered by *πνικτόν*⁸⁸. The pollution of idolatry is a concern of 17:1-7, 18:24ff and *πορνεία* would include, but not be exhausted by, the forbidden sexual relationships of 18:1-23 [*cf.* 1 Cor 5:1 which describes the incestuous relationship as *πορνεία*]. These abstinences according to Luke are drawn up by James at the assembly, accepting Peter's argument that the Gentile converts have "already been saved as Gentiles ... and simply spells out the halakhic consequences,"⁸⁹ especially so if Antioch and Syria could have been considered within the bounds of the holy land.⁹⁰ That the decree continued to inform Christian behaviour well beyond the holy land and beyond the first century, is evidenced by Luke's threefold reference to them (Ac 15:20, 29, 16:4, 21:25), by the textual variants of the decrees, at

⁸⁵ M.D. Goulder, "Did Luke Know any of the Pauline Letters?", *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 13 (1986), 97-112, pp 104ff.

⁸⁶ John C. Hurd Jr., *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*, SPCK, London, 1965.

⁸⁷ Haenchen, *Acts*, pp 470f.

⁸⁸ Barrett, *Acts*, pp 732f.

⁸⁹ Markus Bockmuehl, *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches – Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 2000, pp 164f.

⁹⁰ pp 61ff.

least opening them as a wider moral code in which ‘blood’ can be ‘bloodshed’, the pollution of idols be eating meat offered in pagan sacrifices, and adding the Golden Rule, as does *Codex Bezae*. Abstinence from consuming blood and idol meat continued to be common among Christians (e.g. *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions* 4.36; Tertullian *On Modesty* 12).

In discussing the apostolic decree, we have highlighted a significant difference between the Acts and the Galatians accounts of the Jerusalem assembly and argued that Galatians was not the source of Luke’s account. In Chapter One we presented a case for Luke’s ignorance of Galatians, an ignorance shared with his readers. The importance of this matter in the interpretation of Acts is put succinctly in Pervo’s⁹¹ comment, “Luke’s decision to terminate the career of Peter before fully launching that of Paul is the result of a literary (and theological) plan that lies at a considerable remove from the truth, for the facts overlooked are both unpleasant and important.” In a footnote he identifies these “facts” as relating “to the conflict between Peter and Paul in Antioch and Peter’s loss of power at Jerusalem”. I reply that presenting a picture of harmony if Luke knew that picture to be quite false would not fulfill Luke’s strategy and the claim of his preface. A wholly fictitious picture of Peter’s role in the mission would not do the job we have ascribed to him and would so easily be discredited. I do not find evidence of a power struggle between Peter and James in Jerusalem. Whether Luke has suppressed the incident at Antioch where Paul records a difference of practice and dissension between himself and Peter (and Barnabas), (Gal. 2:11- 14, and possibly going on into vv 15ff, though this looks like Paul’s continuing of his theological argument, rather than his words to Peter) is of some importance in assessing his account of Peter. Of course, we cannot take Galatians and Paul’s account of this incident at face-value. Paul adopts “an ironic

⁹¹ Pervo, *Acts*, pp 309f.

tone towards James, Peter and John, the reputed pillars (2:9). His picture of Peter in particular is truculent and discourteous,⁹² adopting the high ground in reporting what he had said to Peter, and not reporting anything that Peter may have replied in answer to Paul's outburst; nor does he inform his readers of the outcome of the scene, presumably because it was not to his liking! What seemed to Paul a betrayal of the Gospel itself, may not have seemed so crucial to Peter and Barnabas. "Peter and Barnabas presumed that kosher regulations were no longer important, *one way or the other*."⁹³ The concern of 'those from James' to the Jewish Christians in Antioch may not have been about table-fellowship as such between Jews and Gentiles, but to ensure the purity of Israel and the credibility in Jewish eyes of James' leadership in Jerusalem and the holy land.⁹⁴ The letter to the Galatians has many puzzles; perhaps one is how Paul expresses such passion for the communication of the Gospel and profound understanding of the significance of the crucified Son of God, yet finds himself unable to accept any variation from his own understanding and his vision-appointed apostleship. "We must allow, of course, that Paul 'cooled down' somewhat after the Antioch incident and the Galatian letter"⁹⁵ and consider the attitude he commends for the 'weaker' brethren in Romans, says Dunn in his attempt to explain the incident at Antioch, drawing on contemporary history and Jewish sources about the significance of table-fellowship. Esler⁹⁶ in his discussion of Dunn's article argues that what was at issue was the full table fellowship including the Eucharistic bread and cup, though there is no mention of such in Galatians. Paul, who is trying to persuade his Galatian churches not to fall into a trap that was in some way similar to that which he

⁹² Graham Shaw, *The Cost of Authority, Manipulation and Freedom in the New Testament*, SCM Press, London, 1983, pp 43f.

⁹³ Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately after the Execution of Jesus*, Harper, San Francisco, 1998, p. 466, cited by Markus Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2010, p.44.

⁹⁴ Bockmuehl, *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches*, p.80.

⁹⁵ James D. G. Dunn, "The Incident at Antioch (Gal.2:11-18)", *JSNT* 18 (1983), 3-57, p.30.

⁹⁶ Esler, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds*, Chapter 4, "Sectarianism and the Conflict at Antioch".

thought Peter and Barnabas had fallen in Antioch, does not need to continue the history of Antioch. We do not know how the letter was received in Galatia. Paul's silence about the outcome is taken to be that Peter remained the dominant apostolic figure in Antioch after Paul's outburst. "If we are to associate the outlook of Antioch – the first capital of Gentile Christianity – with the name of any Apostle it will be with that of Peter".⁹⁷ "With pardonable exaggeration, the Church of Antioch claimed Peter as its first Bishop; and does so to this day."⁹⁸

It is with regard to the Incident at Antioch that it has been important for my thesis to assert Luke's ignorance of Galatians. There are other points of overlapping material which historians or those arguing that Galatians is a source of Acts would also have to consider. Although Peter and Paul have no reported conversation in Acts, they meet by implication at 9:27, and explicitly at the Jerusalem assembly. Matching the two visits to Jerusalem which Paul describes in Galatians with the visits in Acts⁹⁹ is an old exercise which may ultimately be futile. Luke's chronology may be at fault, and even Paul's first-hand account will be subject to the failings and compressions of memory. Paul's purpose is to demonstrate the independence of his Gospel and apostleship from the Jerusalem apostles. His first visit (Gal 1:18) happened three years after his conversion, after time in Arabia and a return to Damascus. The timing of Ac 9:26ff is uncertain, as is the length of the visit, when he is introduced to the apostles by Barnabas, whereas in Galatians he spends a fortnight with Cephas and otherwise only sees James (Gal 1:18) – it is not clear why Peter is designated by his Aramaic name here, but in Greek at 2:8. The use of the NT *hapax*. ἱστορέω, should carry some implication of 'enquiry' or 'consultation', and so F. Büchsel, without much discussion, suggests it has "the common Hellenistic sense of 'visit in order to get to know'"¹⁰⁰. The following phrase in Paul's letter, admitting that he had seen (ἰδεῖν) James, if strictly parallel, would accept, as the Latin Vulgate ('videre') does, that ἱστορήσαι means much the same as ἰδεῖν. G. D. Kilpatrick¹⁰¹ argues that Paul did gain from Peter "information about Jesus' teaching and ministry", and that the claim in v.12 that το εὐαγγέλιον that Paul preaches did not have a human origin, nor was he taught it, is not necessarily in contradiction with a meaning of ἱστορήσαι as

⁹⁷ B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, MacMillan, London, 1929, p. 45.

⁹⁸ p.58.

⁹⁹ In Appendix A (pp 202-209), of his little book *The Apostolic Age*, Duckworth, London, 1955, G. B. Caird provides a good summary of various possibilities.

¹⁰⁰ *TDNT*, 3. 396.

¹⁰¹ "Galatians 1:18 ἸΣΤΟΡΗΣΑΙ ΚΗΦΑΝ" in A.J.B. Higgins (Ed.), *New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, Manchester University Press, 1958, pp 144-149.

getting information about Jesus, because the Gospel is more about perceiving and preaching Jesus as the good news of salvation.¹⁰² A discussion of what exactly Paul received ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου and handed on to the Corinthians in 1 Cor. 11:23 and 15:3ff might help to distinguish information from interpretation, but it is strange that Paul does not clarify that distinction in Gal. 1:11ff, where it would be pertinent to his argument. Chrysostom, noting the unusual term ἱστορῆσαι, says that Paul came to honour Peter as his elder and pay him respect¹⁰³; this rather smacks of a later view of ecclesiastical office and the various patriarchates, though Chrysostom may also be anxious to modify the impression of “an arrogant spirit... foreign to the Apostolic temper”¹⁰⁴ which he admits could be deduced from Paul’s attitude. Paul’s second visit to Jerusalem in Galatians has already been discussed and equated with the visit of Ac 15. Acts also has a visit from Antioch in 11:27ff for famine relief after the prophecy of Agabus, and possibly another at 12:25 if we adopt the reading εἰς [B etc.] rather than ἐξ [P⁷⁴ A etc.] or ἀπο [D E Ψ etc.]¹⁰⁵. After the Jerusalem assembly, Paul also visits Jerusalem (implicitly) in Ac 18:22 to greet the church after his second missionary journey and on his way to Antioch. This maintains Luke’s pattern of mission rippling out from Jerusalem, but looks like an editorial insertion to do just that¹⁰⁶. Lüdemann¹⁰⁷ argues that Ac 18:22 corresponds to Paul’s second trip to Jerusalem and the occasion of the assembly, and regards the visits of Ac 11:27ff and 15:1ff as the work of Lukan redaction. Ac 21:17 marks Paul’s final journey to Jerusalem together with delegates (?) from his churches, and again it is preceded by a prophecy from Agabus. This would accord with the collection visit of the Pauline epistles, though Luke only refers to personal alms (24:17). Luke through James raises again the issues of Jewish Christians and the Law and Gentile Christians and the apostolic decree (21:19-25) in a re-run of Ac 15. Rather than interpreting these as a major and largely fictional revision of data from Paul, I would argue that Luke has indeed given structure to the episodic traditions he has learnt, to meet *his* purpose. He deliberately tells of Paul’s conversion as an interlude between the conversion of Samaritans and the Ethiopian eunuch and Peter’s ministry in Judea and the conversion of the first Gentile. Then Luke tells of the Jerusalem assembly after Paul’s first successful missionary journey, before his second, removing any obstacle to Gentile mission by the assembly’s unanimous decision.

Luke thus presents Peter as himself persuaded by vision and audition and by the Pentecost-like experience in Cornelius’ house, of the rightness of crossing over this

¹⁰² p. 148.

¹⁰³ *Commentary on Galatians, ad. loc.*, translated in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 13, pp 12f.

¹⁰⁴ on v. 17, p. 11.

¹⁰⁵ See footnote 53 on page 193.

¹⁰⁶ So Jewett, *Dating Paul’s Life*, p. 83.

¹⁰⁷ *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles*, p.199.

threshold just as he had crossed the threshold of the Samaritans and the tanner. Peter is nudged towards this point of view, rather than having it as a blinding flash, yet it is a conversion just as crucial as Saul's for the Christian mission to the ends of the earth, and may reflect historical reality. The Apostles and Elders affirm Peter's conviction, and the Jerusalem assembly agrees that there can be no reversal. So Simeon's vision of Christ being salvation for all, a light to enlighten the Gentiles, as well as being glory for Israel (Lk. 2:32), can be fulfilled. While Cornelius is not strictly the first Gentile Christian – Nicolas of Antioch was a proselyte and so already Jewish in faith and practice, and the Ethiopian's conversion which happens in a context apart, is not treated as a precedent, and he was not necessarily a Gentile at all, rather than an excluded foreign Jew – it is now possible for a deliberate pattern of mission to emerge which includes both Jews and Gentiles. Acts will go on to tell of the initiative from Antioch and pursued especially by Paul to fulfill this mission. Paul at 13:47 cites Is 49:6, which text is the basis of Simeon's words, and James' use of the archaic form of Peter's Hebrew name at the Jerusalem assembly, is a further reminder of the prophecy which overarches Luke's two volumes. The proclamation that begins in Jerusalem spreads its ripples to the ends of the earth, or at least in the narrative, to Rome.¹⁰⁸ We have noted many parallels between Peter and Paul in Luke's account. There is no disharmony of mission or message. The Gentile mission, is affirmed warmly both by the Apostles and the Jerusalem assembly, and suspicions by Jewish Christians of Paul's Gentile missions abated, at least for a time. Suspicions resurface in 21:21ff and the Lukan Paul expects suspicion to have reached Rome (28:20f).

¹⁰⁸ Cf Henry Chadwick, *The Circle and the Ellipse – Rival Concepts of Authority in the Early Church*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1959.

The Influence of Luke's Account

The Jerusalem assembly marks the end of an account of the apostles' and Peter's ministry. Thereafter James and the elders minister in Jerusalem, among Jews, while Paul proceeds with a mission among Gentiles. Acts by the structuring of its narrative not merely gives Theophilus an account of what happened, but more specifically affirms the legacy of Paul, by writing it into what was built upon secure apostolic foundations. Clare K. Rothschild¹⁰⁹ acknowledges the parallels or imitation between Peter and Paul in Acts, but does not wish to see this as a Petrine validation of Pauline mission – she does not really say why; does she fear a hierarchy of validation, when she wishes to emphasise that both are equally parallel to Jesus? - “The purpose of this imitation, however, is not to legitimize Paul as the only rightful successor to the earlier Petrine movement, but rather to authenticate the author's version of both movements through correspondences to the depiction of the life of Jesus in Luke *and* to each other”. My thesis is that Luke's picture of Paul alongside Peter serves to introduce the achievements of Paul's mission for the next generation among whom his legacy was suspect. In making a hero of Paul Luke presents a picture that is altogether more irenic than the historical actuality, but does help the second and third Christian generations to accept the fiery Paul as furthering the story that goes back to the earliest days of Pentecost, and to see Paul's missions as indeed the continuing towards the ends of the earth the Gospel that Jesus began. In Chapter One we noted a paucity of clear references either to Acts or to Galatians or other Pauline letters in writers before Irenaeus. When the Pauline letters emerge as scripture worthy of commentary or homily (Origen, Chrysostom), then we notice embarrassment caused by Paul's attitude to Peter in Galatians.¹¹⁰ Clement of Alexandria, who calls Paul “the divine

¹⁰⁹ *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2004, p.129.

¹¹⁰ Margaret Mitchell, “Peter's ‘Hypocrisy’ and Paul's: Two ‘Hypocrites’ at the Foundation of Earliest Christianity?”, *NTS* 58 (2012), 213-234, draws attention to a solution proposed by Chrysostom, that the

apostle”, thinks that the ‘Cephas’ in Galatians must be another disciple, perhaps one of the Seventy(-Two) of the Gospel¹¹¹. Tertullian (*Adv. Marcion*, 1.20.2-3¹¹²) explains “because in the eagerness of his zeal against Judaism, as a neophyte, he thought there was something to be blamed in the conduct (of those who were apostles before him)... but afterwards was himself to become in his practice all things to all men (1 Cor. 9:20f).” Maurice Wiles¹¹³ likewise thinks “It may well be that Peter’s action at Antioch was based on this self-same principle of accommodation which Paul later came to adopt”. Marcion’s adoption of Paul as patron of his own message¹¹⁴ led in turn to Irenaeus’ argument¹¹⁵ that Paul and Acts (which he quotes extensively) have the same message, and that Acts firmly belongs with the Gospel of Luke – this unity of record confutes the Marcionites on the one hand and the Ebionites (who rejected Paul) on the other. Christopher Mount¹¹⁶ argues that “the importance of the Pauline letters alongside the narrative of Acts for understanding early Christianity is ... a late second-century construction of Christian origins intended to establish a normative interpretation of apostolic tradition against perceived heresy.” “Paul’s role in the origin of Christianity is a literary construct of the author (of Acts) that gained prominence only toward the end of the second century.”¹¹⁷

The phenomenon of canonical deutero-Pauline letters is evidence of the need for the voice, example and theology of Paul to speak to a later generation. Overlaps

conflict at Antioch was staged by Peter in collusion with Paul to persuade those come from James of the true gospel position.

¹¹¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* I.12.2; The *Epistula Apostolorum* and the *Apostolic Church Order* list as apostles Cephas in addition to Peter, though this may be more a sign of ignorance than of distinction.

¹¹² *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3, p.285.

¹¹³ *The Divine Apostle*, CUP, 1967, p.19.

¹¹⁴ Tertullian calls Paul ‘haereticorum apostolus’ *Adv. Marcion* 3.5.

¹¹⁵ *Against Heresies* 3.12-15; Irenaeus demonstrates the unity of the God of the OT and NT, referring to Peter’s vision, the conversion of Cornelius and the conversion of the Ethiopian. Similarly, Origen, *Against Celsus*, 2.1-4, is keen to demonstrate a coherence of Peter’s faithfulness to the Law with the new revelation of the inclusion of the Gentiles, by referring to Peter’s vision and to Galatians. See also Smith, *The Canonical Function of Acts*, pp 50ff.

¹¹⁶ *Pauline Christianity – Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul*, Brill, Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2002, p.7.

¹¹⁷ p.9.

particularly between the Pastorals and Acts have been well-noted, in terms of vocabulary (like συνείδησις, εὐσέβεια and its cognates), and details (like ‘Antioch, Iconium and Lystra’ 2 Tim. 3:11), enough to suggest more than a similar context, even a common authorship or editing¹¹⁸. Writing on Ephesians, Sterling¹¹⁹ notes that Eph.6:21-24 (close in language to Col.4:7-18) has Paul, a prisoner, continuing to preach, just like the end of Acts. He sees Acts as giving its readers a hero in Paul, whereas Ephesians had given them a theologian. Ephesians identifies the ‘mystery of Christ’ as being the peace between circumcision and uncircumcision, revealed to Apostles and prophets who are the foundation for the Church.

If we consider pseudo-Petrine literature, 1 Peter has been interpreted as addressed to Jewish Diaspora Christians in the same areas where Paul had evangelized the Gentiles¹²⁰ or to Gentile Christians understood now to have become God’s people (2:10)¹²¹. 2 Peter does not seem hostile to ‘brother’ Paul (3:15f), and is testimony both to a corpus of Pauline letters being treated like Scripture, and to controversy about their interpretation. The blossoming apocryphal literature of the second and third centuries¹²² make heroes of Paul or Peter or Mary Magdalene, or James, etc., but do not seem to me to offer evidence that Peter was always to be identified with Jewish Christianity, or that there were only two missions. If Paul stood for radical Gentile Christianity and James for conservative Jewish Christianity, then Peter, at least the Peter of Acts, would look like a middle way, claimed by all, open to new possibilities, pushed to cross new social and religious thresholds. “*Peter was probably in fact and effect the bridge-man (pontifex*

¹¹⁸ C.F.D. Moule, “The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: a Reappraisal”, *BJRL* 47(1965), pp 430-52; *The Birth of the New Testament*, A&C Black, London, 1962, 1966, Excursus 2, pp 220-221; Jean-Daniel Kaestli, “Luke-Acts and the Pastoral Epistles: the Thesis of a Common Authorship”, in C.M.Tuckett (ed.), *Luke’s Literary Achievement*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, pp 110-126.

¹¹⁹ Gregory E. Sterling, “From Apostle to the Gentiles to Apostle of the Church – Images of Paul at the End of the First Century”, *ZNTW* 99 (2008), 74-98; pp 96f.

¹²⁰ F. Lapham, *Peter: the Myth, the Man and the Writings*, Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

¹²¹ e.g. J.N.D. Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, A&C Black, London, 1969.

¹²² Cf Terence V. Smith, *Petrine Controversies in Early Christianity*, Mohr, Tübingen, 1985.

maximus!) who did more than any other to hold together the diversity of first-century Christianity. James and Paul, the two other most prominent leading figures ... were too much identified with their respective ‘brands’ of Christianity... But Peter, as shown particularly by the Antioch episode in Gal 2, had a care to hold firm to his Jewish heritage which Paul lacked, and an openness to the demands of developing Christianity which James lacked.”¹²³

Luke’s making a hero of Paul and devoting half of his story in Acts to Paul’s missions, a chosen vessel in God’s intentions from the beginning, serves to introduce Paul to any who do not know him, and to counteract any suspicion or memory of Paul as a fiery, arrogant upstart. All the major initiatives have the precedence of the earliest apostolic witness, and the approval of the original Church. As the preaching of the Gospel itself benefitted from the presenting of that Gospel as a narrative account of Jesus, by Mark and his successors, so in narrating the story (as best he could) of how the message of the Kingdom spread to the ends of the earth, Luke was proclaiming the Christ’s Gospel of peace and forgiveness, the fulfilment of Israel’s vocation and hopes. For a generation of Christians, vulnerable to persecution, tending to be swept away by new teachings or teachers, tending to be factional, and for a wider Hellenistic readership of Theophiloi, people like Cornelius, anxious about the credentials of a movement that lacked deep philosophical roots, whose founder was crucified and whose principal missionary in the Roman world had also suffered from Roman justice, Luke-Acts offered challenging examples of response to the Christian message, and stimulated interest in the Gentile churches Paul had founded, and in the legacy of his letters. Elizabeth Templeton in a

¹²³ James D. G. Dunn, “Has the Canon a Continuing Function?”, in McDonald & Saunders (Edd.), *The Canon Debate*, 2002, p.577, cited by Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter*, p. 8 (emphasis original); also in Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, 2nd Edition, SCM Press, London, and Trinity Press International, Philadelphia, 1990, p.385.

study of Acts 15¹²⁴ writes, “We face this central question of whether Acts is a deliberately irenic harmonizing of a fierce debate, told for the sake of future generations moving into a new situation, or whether it’s an unfortunate closing of a fluidity and flexibility which had marked the earliest Christian community.” On the contrary, I believe it is able to inspire future generations by modeling the testing of that ‘flexibility’ in the portrait of Peter, responding both to the experience of Jesus entrusted to him, and to the nudges and promptings of the Spirit towards crossing new boundaries, only to become the firm advocate of them when challenged, or in testimony to the Jerusalem assembly. In this way Luke’s presentation of Peter’s style of leadership is distinctive. While taking the initiative among the Twelve after the Ascension, he does not seek to prolong that leadership. When the initiative of appointing the Seven happens, Peter’s voice is not distinguished from the Twelve’s; when he goes to Samaria, he goes with John on behalf of the Twelve. Peter is content that James takes over the leadership of the Church in Jerusalem, and presides at the Jerusalem assembly. After his deliverance from prison, Peter expressly requests that news of this be reported to James (12:17), which suggests Peter’s own acceptance of James’ role and authority. There is no power struggle between them. Peter is persuaded by vision and the direction and experience of the Spirit in the household of Cornelius that Gentiles can be included in the scope of mission. He later persuades both his fellow apostles and the assembly that this is indeed so. “Luke recasts events in the early community so that Peter’s response to God’s directive initiates the mission to the nations.”¹²⁵

¹²⁴ “Reflecting on Acts: two Bible Studies”, *One in Christ*, 28 (1992), 97-105; p.104.

¹²⁵ Pheme Perkins, *Peter, Apostle for the Whole Church*, pp 93f and especially p.186, the final paragraph of her book.

Chapter Six – Peter’s Personal Story Illustrates the Gospel

Previous chapters have explored ways in which Peter expresses the Gospel in what he preached and in what he did by way of healings in the name of Jesus and also by the steps through which Peter was persuaded to affirm new fields in missionary endeavour. In this chapter we wish to explore how aspects of Peter’s life itself become an illustration or embodiment of the Gospel. Firstly this is shown in the transformation of Peter’s courage as a public witness to Jesus between the apostolic supper and Pentecost. Then his willingness to face suffering and persecution leads to a symbolic embodiment of the death and resurrection of Jesus in Peter’s angelic deliverance from prison.

Peter’s Denials

The transformation from the night of Jesus’ arrest, betrayed by Judas and denied by Peter, which the experience of Easter and Pentecost made on the boldness of the apostles in then proclaiming Jesus, has been a theme of Christian preachers at least since Chrysostom. Peter on the day of Pentecost “spoke with great confidence, that they might perceive the grace of the Spirit. He who had not endured the questioning of a poor girl, now in the midst of the people, all breathing murder, discourses with such confidence, that this very thing becomes an unquestionable proof of the Resurrection.”¹ This transformation, however, is only implicit in Luke-Acts and would in any case rely on a sequential reading of Luke and Acts, because nowhere in Acts are Peter’s denials of Jesus explicitly mentioned. In earlier chapters we have noted many parallels in Acts between Peter and Paul, and this chapter will not be an exception. However, in the treatment of previous failure we have a marked contrast between Paul and Peter. Paul makes his activity as a persecutor of the Way a part of his own testimony when he gives an account

¹ Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles*, Homily 4.

of his conversion (Ac 22:4f; 26:9-11). Luke as narrator introduces Saul as one involved in the lynching of Stephen (7:58–8:1), which is the prelude to a general description of Saul as systematic persecutor of the church (8:3), which in turn prepares for the authorised journey of the persecutor to Damascus. Peter, however, makes no mention of his having denied Jesus. This is in contrast to *Acts of Peter* 7, which tells of Peter’s first preaching at Rome, citing the forgiving of his three denials as the basis for his call to repentance in that city, and which shows acquaintance from Luke’s Passion both with the Lord’s turning to Peter and Peter’s bitter tears. Even when Peter recounts the treachery of Judas (Ac 1:15ff) there is no mention by Peter or the others of his own lesser failure that same night. In Chapter Two we argued for a continuity here which supposes that as a result of the intercession of Jesus, Peter has repented of his failure, been forgiven by the Lord and his fellow apostles, and that his failure of faith is not reckoned as being of the same degree of gravity as that of Judas who acted under possession by Satan, and that having now ‘turned’ he is fulfilling the dominical commission to “strengthen (his) brothers” (Lk 22:31f).

An alternative approach might suppose that the absence from Acts of any mention of Peter’s denials is because the ‘legend’ of the denials arose in the tradition only after Easter, possibly as a counter-weight to the tendency to glorify Peter². Peter’s denials form a part of Luke’s Passion Narrative, as they do in the other NT Gospels, but in seeking the pre-history of the Lukan text, there is evidence of some dislocation – most notably, the αὐτόν of Lk 22:63 which ought to refer back to Peter, whose denials have just been recounted, whereas it clearly means Jesus; Jesus’ prediction of Peter’s denials (Lk 22:34) calls him by the name Peter, whereas in v. 31 he has called him Simon. Vincent Taylor³ argued for an L passion narrative, to which Luke added Mark’s, and this L source lacks

² Günter Klein, “Die Verleugnung des Petrus – Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung”, *ZThK*, 58 (1961), 285- 328 ; Eta Linnemann, “Die Verleugnung des Petrus”, *ZThK*, 63 (1966), 1-32.

³ Vincent Taylor (edited by Owen E. Evans), *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, CUP, 1972.

both Peter's denials and Jesus' prediction of them. While this would fit with an Acts that also does not have any reference to the denials, this current thesis is based on the text of Luke, without speculating about any pre-history or proto-Luke, and argues that Acts is to be read as the sequel to the Gospel. Within the narrative of Acts, the Sanhedrin does testify to their amazement at the boldness of Peter and John, although they were ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοί καὶ ἰδιῶται (4:13), and recognises ὅτι σὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἦσαν. For a careful reader of Luke-Acts this is a reversal of Peter's denial that he was with Jesus (Lk 22:56f, 59f). We do then regard the denial scene as part of Luke's completed Gospel taken from Luke's knowledge of Mark, and possibly other sources, and proceed now to see how Luke has redacted and shaped them. Doing so at this point ahead of our study of Peter in Luke's Gospel, the subject of our next chapter, is necessary because of how the denials implicitly lie in the background of Peter's preaching in Acts, as we are arguing here.

The warning by Jesus that Peter will deny him three times before cockcrow, τρίς με ἀπανήση is common to all the Gospels. Luke (22:34) is identical with Mark; Matthew and John have a different word order. In Luke and Jn 13:38 it follows Peter's profession of readiness to go with Jesus to prison (Luke only) and to death; in Matthew and Mark it precedes. In Luke this is Peter's response to Jesus' particular word to him at the apostolic supper (Lk 22:31f). Jesus has spoken of all the apostles as sharers in his πειρασμοί and bequeathed to them places at the kingdom's table and judgement seats over the tribes of Israel. Jesus says he has prayed for Peter in the sifting by Satan of all the apostles, so that his faith will not fail and that he might then turn and strengthen his brothers. It is then that Peter asserts his readiness to go with Jesus to death; "pour la première fois .. un des disciples comprend que Jésus est sur le point de mourir"⁴, says

⁴ Mathieu, p. 152.

Mathieu, though I am not sure that Peter or the others are presented as all that ready to embrace the imminence of danger for Jesus. Peter's response brings from Jesus the solemn prophecy of his imminent denials before cockcrow, and this in turn is met by silence, rather than any further reassertion of his loyalty and courage. How are we to understand this silence? Mathieu rightly observes that in the future Peter's declaration will indeed be fulfilled, going to prison and death for his loyalty to Jesus, so that it is the timing of this that Jesus corrects rather than his sincerity,⁵ but this attempt to soften the imminent failure of Peter calls for more argument than Mathieu's sacramental allusions provide if we are to see this as Luke's interpretation. What in fact meets Peter's silence is the colourful warning for the disciples of how their circumstances are changing, as Jesus himself becomes numbered with the outlaws (22:35-38). Peter, no more than the others is ready for more than a scrap, ready for the Satanic sifting.

Yet Luke's account overall does spare the disciples. He alone qualifies Peter's three denials as μη εἰδέναι, making them "moins graves"⁶ than in Mark. The behaviour of the disciples following the Supper is told more gently by Luke than by Matthew or Mark; their sleeping on the Mount of Olives is told only once, and excused as ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης (22:45); when Jesus is arrested a disciple does cut off the ear of the high priest's slave, specified in Luke and John as his right ear, implying a cowardly blow from behind – on any reckoning this would be a criminal act, but in Luke's account it is ameliorated or redeemed by Jesus' immediately healing the severed ear and so saving the offender from arrest (22:51). In Luke's account the disciples do not flee, and so are able to

⁵ Mathieu, p.154; he links the imagery of Jesus giving his body as bread (22:19) with the charge to Peter as a faithful steward who will give the servants their allowance of food at the proper time (12:42) and with the warning that Satan will sift them all like wheat (22:31); "Jésus est le blé que Pierre aura à donner. Ce faisant, il se donnera aussi lui-même... le blé que sont Pierre et les autres apôtres, criblé à l'heure de la passion, devienne de la farine, de la pâte et du pain. La reste de la trame de l'œuvre de Luc nous permettra de voir comment cela se réalisera et comment Pierre offrira sa vie tout comme son maître."

⁶ Mathieu, p.153.

witness the crucifixion from a distance (23:49), which is important for their subsequent testimony in Acts.

Before we continue with Luke's account of Peter's denials, we pause to analyse some of the terms being used. The verb ἀρνέομαι (4/2/4+4/4) and the form with the prefix, but without any apparent difference of meaning, ἀπαρνέομαι (4/4/4+0/0), in the Gospels are particularly associated with Peter's denials, accounting for 16 of the occurrences. When the Lukan Peter uses the same verb in his speech in Ac 3:13f, are we intended to hear an echo of this Gospel usage? Very influential has been the short essay of Biblical theology by Schlier⁷. He argues, uncontroversially, that the basic sense of saying No, denying, occurs in Lk 8:45, in response to Jesus' question "Who touched me?", and in Ac 4:16, where the Sanhedrin cannot deny that a notable sign has been done. Where the verb has a personal object, like Jesus, Schlier argues that there are different senses implied. The verb, he argues can mean 'refuse', 'reject', and that this is the meaning in Ac 3:13f, where Peter says that his audience in the Temple had denied Jesus in the presence of Pilate, and at 7:35, where the Hebrew slaves had denied Moses as their ruler or judge. The NRSV translates 'rejected' at both places; the RSV by 'denied' at Ac 3:13, but by 'refused' at 7:35. However Schlier argues that a third sense emerges, where denying a person "implies a previous relationship of obedience and fidelity. It can take place only where there has first been acknowledgement and commitment". The term is beginning to move towards its use in later Christian writings, where it means apostasy (*cf* 2 Tim 2:12f, where ἀρνεῖσθαι is used in parallel with ἀπιστεῖν). "In the strict sense, therefore," Schlier concludes, "we cannot use the word of the Jews as we can of Peter". It seems to me that this argument, certainly with regard to Luke-Acts, lacks linguistic support, but is,

⁷ TDNT, 1. 469-471.

rather, a piece of theological assertion. The study of Harald Riesenfeld⁸ pays attention to developments during the Hellenistic age when the verb acquired the nuance of ‘denying being interested in something’; ‘not wanting to have anything to do with’; ‘denying all knowledge of’; ‘leaving in the lurch’⁹. He argues, “We are now able to state that the formal difference between οὐκ οἶδα and ἀρνοῦμαι εἰδέναι consists of the fact that the latter phrase more clearly underlines the subjective decision: ‘not wanting to know’”.¹⁰ So he argues that the people’s answer before Pilate in Ac 3:13f carries the sense of refusing to recognise Jesus as their Messiah.

Help towards understanding Luke’s mind on ‘denial’ is provided by the sequence of *logia* of Jesus in Lk 12:8-12. The sayings are not unique to Luke, having parallels in Matthew or Mark, and two of them corresponding to similar sayings elsewhere in Luke (9:26, 21:14f). The introductory λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν (Mt different) to the first saying, Lk 12:8f, suggests a new paragraph. It draws a heavenly consequence for those who either acknowledge (ὁμολογέω)¹¹ or deny (ἀρνέομαι) ‘me’ before men, in that they will be acknowledged or denied by ‘the Son of Man’ (Mt καὶ γὰρ). The similar saying at Lk 9:26 // Mk 8:38, in Jesus’ teaching about discipleship following Peter’s acknowledgement of him as Messiah, includes denying self, ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν, and daily taking up a cross, but uses the verb ἐπαισχύνομαι for the disciples’ behaviour and consequent heavenly response. In the narrative of Acts, the heavenly Son of Man does acknowledge his confessor on earth, Stephen (7:55f), which suggests an application of the *logion* to Christian believers on trial

⁸ “The Meaning of the Verb ἀρνεῖσθαι”, *Coniectanea Neotestamentica XI in honorem Antonii Findrichsen*, Glerup, Lund and Munksgaard, København, 1947, pp 207-219.

⁹ He cites 4 *Macc.* 8:7, 10:15 and Wisdom 12:27 (where it is used with εἰδέναι), 16:15f.

¹⁰ p.213.

¹¹ The use of this verb + εἶν + dative occurs in the NT only here and at the parallel Mt 10:32. About the construction C.F.D. Moule (*Idiom Book of NT Greek*, CUP, 1963, p.183) comments that “the corresponding Aramaic (but not Hebrew) is apparently as natural as the Greek is odd”.

before their persecutors, but the sayings themselves are probably more a warning to “wavering ‘Christians’”¹² than to their opponents.

The second saying, Lk 12:10, contrasts speaking against the Son of Man, which can be forgiven, with blaspheming against the Holy Spirit, which will not be forgiven. The choice of the verb βλασφημέω in the second part of this saying (Mt 12:32 different), may be influenced by the similar saying in Mk 3:28f // Mt 12:31, which is part of the Beelzebub controversy. It is a saying always difficult to interpret. Luke’s placing of it here in the context of fearless confession, suggests how he may have understood it. The difference between speaking against the Son of Man and against the Holy Spirit, may be temporal, contrasting the pre-Easter and post-Easter phases of salvation–history, when the Holy Spirit will become part of the disciples’ experience, “a contrast between sin committed during the ministry of Jesus, when men might speak *ignorantly* [emphasis added] against the Son of Man, and sin during the period of the early church, when it would be a *witting* [emphasis added] sin to speak against the manifest work of the Spirit.”¹³ Alternatively the difference may relate to different stages in an individual’s life of faith, pre- and post- conversion. Marshall¹⁴ claims this as the patristic interpretation, “the pre-Baptismal sin of the heathen committed *in ignorance* [emphasis added], whereas blasphemy against the Spirit was a *witting* [emphasis added] act of apostasy by the baptized”. The emphases added here indicate Marshall’s finding an implicit excuse of ignorance to which there is no reference in the text, but suggestive of a Lukan theme which we are tracing here, a theme furthermore which is in the parable that is a response to Peter’s question (12:41), the difference between the slave who knows the master’s will and

¹² So C. M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1996, pp 291f.

¹³ Marshall, *Luke*, p.517, referring to A. Friedrichsen as cited by R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, p.138 n1. Also Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*. p. 108.

¹⁴ Marshall, *Luke*, p.517; also C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, London, S.P.C.K., 1958, p.106.

the one who does not (12:47f). The third saying, Lk 12:11f, is the promise that in the mounting of a defence before “synagogues, rulers and authorities”, the disciples will be taught at that time what to say by the Holy Spirit. The locating of this *logion* here may be a clue to Luke’s understanding of blaspheming the Spirit as not relying upon the Spirit’s inspiration when giving testimony, making it equivalent to denying Jesus, the unforgiveable sin, with the consequence of being rejected eschatologically. The warnings of Jesus against denying him, together with the helpful comments of Marshall quoted above, do suggest how Luke could understand Peter’s denying knowing Jesus before Easter as something that could be forgiven, and not as total and final apostasy.

At the apostolic supper Jesus tells them that the hand of his betrayer is on the table (22:21), and the reader of the Gospel has been told by the omniscient narrator of the arrangements made by Judas under the influence of Satan (22:3ff), but Jesus does not identify Judas. It is only Simon Peter that he names as about to fail under Satan’s permitted sifting. The prayer of Jesus ἵνα μὴ ἐκλίπη ἡ πίστις σου (v.32) will allow Peter to ‘turn’ and strengthen his brothers. It could hardly be Luke’s message that the prayer of Jesus would not triumph over the sifting of Satan, which would arguably be the case if the denials which Jesus predicts represent something close to apostasy. Klein’s solution to this, as we noted above, was to argue that the denial tradition is added to a tradition that knew nothing of the denials. Some support for his position can be found in the term ἐπιστρέφω, the sense of which is much debated. If it is used transitively, as at Lk. 1:16f (with allusions to Malachi 3:1), then the sense would be, “And you, when you have converted your brothers, strengthen them”¹⁵. The intransitive sense of turning around, literally, or metaphorically of moral or spiritual reform, is more frequent in Luke-Acts (Lk. 2:39, 8:55, 17:4,31 literal; Ac 9:40, 15:36, 16:18, literal; Ac 3:19, 9:35, 11:21, 14:15,

¹⁵ R.E. Lee, “Luke xxii.32”, *Expository Times*, 38 (1927), pp 233f.

15:19, 26:18,20, 28:27, metaphorical). Another possibility is that it is a Hebraism, the LXX frequently using it to render שׁוּב or the equivalent Aramaic חוּב, with an adverbial sense of ‘again’ (cf. possibly, Ac 7:42, ‘God in turn gave them over ...’) – “Strengthen your brothers again [as you did at Capernaum, Jn. 6:68 (!!)]¹⁶. There is a striking similarity of phrase between our verse and David’s words to Ittai when he is fleeing Jerusalem from Absalom, and crossing the Kidron, [a type which some believe influenced the Passion narratives where Jesus makes the same journey (Jn. 18:1¹⁷), and Judas hangs himself, like Ahithophel (2 Sam. 17:23, Mt. 27:5¹⁸); David’s ascending the Mount of Olives, weeping (2 Sam 15:50) is inversed at Lk 19:37, 41 for Jesus descending the Mount of Olives, weeping]:-¹⁹

2 Sam. 15:20f ἐπιστρέφου καὶ ἐπίστρεψον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου μετὰ σοῦ ἐὰν εἰς θάνατον καὶ ἐὰν εἰς ζωὴν ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ δοῦλός σου.

I am unconvinced of the allusion here, but Marshall²⁰ uses it to support an intransitive understanding. I do think the intransitive, metaphorical sense is the most plausible. It would imply some failure on Peter’s part, from which he must turn and find forgiveness²¹. Dietrich²² notes Luke’s choice of the verb ἐκλείπω rather than the common Lukan word for ceasing, the middle παύεσθαι, which he argues carries a punctiliar, final sense, whereas ἐκλείπειν has a more linear sense of weakening, like the dwindling of Mammon (16:9) or

¹⁶ U. Holzmeister, (my exclamations added), as quoted by E. F. Sutcliffe, “ ‘Et tu aliquando conversus’, St Luke 22,32”, *CBQ* 15(1953), pp. 305 –310. Note that the article of the same title attributed to O’Callaghan in Fitzmyer, *Luke*, p. 1428, is an error; O’Callaghan is the author of the article following Sutcliffe’s. See also Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, Revised edition, SCM Press, London, 1963, p. 216; Klein, “*Die Verleugnung des Petrus*”, p.298 - “Jesus hat für Petrus gebetet daß sein Glaube durchhalte”.

¹⁷ cf. R.E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Geoffrey Chapman, London, Dublin & Melbourne, 1972, p. 806.

¹⁸ cf. M. D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*, SPCK, London, 1974, p. 446.

¹⁹ W. K. Lowther Clark, “The Use of the Septuagint in Acts”, in *Beginnings*, 2.104.

²⁰ Marshall, *Luke*, p. 822.

²¹ Jerome Neyrey SJ, *The Passion According to Luke, A Redaction Study of Luke’s Soteriology*, Paulist Press, New York & Ramsey, Toronto, 1985, p. 34.

²² Dietrich, pp 131f.

the darkening of the sun's light at the crucifixion (23:45). Peter's faith will not cease and become unbelief; it will rather, because of the counter-intercession of Jesus, be a partial diminishment of his faith – "Satan möge bei Petrus nur teilweise Erfolg haben".

Luke's Account of Peter's Denials

After the arrest of Jesus, apart from the notice of their collective presence at the crucifixion, we hear no more of the apostles until Easter, with the exception of Peter. Like the witness of all Jesus' γνωστοί ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, (23:49), Peter follows the arresting party to the household of the high priest μακρόθεν, at least symbolically continuing²³ his discipleship. However in the courtyard where a fire has been lit, Peter is no longer following Jesus but sitting in the middle of the gathered servants around the fire - καὶ συγκαθισάντων ἐκάθητο ὁ Πέτρος μέσος αὐτῶν, with the final phrase in an emphatic position (22:55). "Ce faisant, Pierre vient pratiquement de changer de camp. Le mouvement s'est arrêté et Pierre a donc cessé de suivre Jésus."²⁴ In Luke the three denials follow here, during the hours when Jesus is in custody before the hearing before the priests. The Gospels differ as to Peter's three accusers – Luke has a female servant and two men. The first and third accusations are in the third person, about Peter, leaving him to answer each directly; the second is briefest and most direct. The three denials of Peter (22:57, 58, 60) "do not mount in intensity"²⁵. The Lukan Peter's words of denial, namely,

v. 57 οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν, γύναι

v. 58 ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ εἰμί (ἐξ αὐτῶν)

v. 60 ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ οἶδα ὃ λέγεις

²³ Note the imperfect tense ἠκολούθει for Mark's aorist (Marshall, *Luke*, p.841); Luke here is in 'minor agreement' with Matthew.

²⁴ Mathieu, p.157.

²⁵ R. E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1994, p. 605. In Matthew the second denial is with an oath, and the third in Matthew and Mark involves a curse and swearing not to know Jesus.

all notably include a vocative; the first and third deny knowledge - of Jesus, and perhaps, of understanding the accusation of being μετ' αὐτοῦ, because he is a Galilean, possibly a convenient pretence of dialect incomprehension. The third is closest to Matthew's first, οὐκ οἶδα τί λεγεις, with the sense, perhaps, of Mark's οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι σὺ τί λέγεις. Peter's denials of knowing Jesus are, of course, lies. They accord with Jesus' prediction but are not made before a court and the suggestion of the total narrative as argued above, is that they do not amount to apostasy.

When the cock crows, heralding the dawn, the Lord, whom we now understand also to have been in the αὐλή where the fire was, and in sight, if not earshot of Peter, turns and looks at Peter, who then recalls Jesus' warning of the denials (22:61, cf v.34), though this time without the qualification μὴ εἰδέναι. The response is Peter's going out and weeping bitterly, which I understand to be in shame and regret. The text of Lk 22:62 is uncertain²⁶. In the wider Lukan narrative, we note Luke's fondness for tears, including sorrow for sin as evidenced in the woman of 7:36-50, and possibly Simon Magus in the Bezan reading at Ac 8:24 – I do not regard this as the original reading, but evidence for *Peter's* tears serving as a model for an act of contrition. However, most references to weeping are in distress at the circumstances, not necessarily in repentance. It is the distinctiveness of the Lukan narrative that provides the best clues for interpreting Peter's

²⁶ This verse is included in the vast majority of manuscripts, including p⁷⁵, א, A, B and D. It is omitted, it would seem from calculating the space available (D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, CUP, 1997, p.117) by the fragmentary Greek uncial 0171, which has the text of Lk. 22:44-56, 61-64, and is dated by NA²⁷ to circa 300. The verse is also omitted by some Old Latin manuscripts, namely a (4th century), b (4th century), e (5th century), ff² (5th century), i (5th century), l uncorrected (8th century) r¹ (7th century). If the shorter reading were original it is easy to see how the longer reading came about – a feeling that the story of Peter's denials is incomplete (so Parker, *Living Text*, p.160), and the words from Mt. 26:75 sufficiently embedded in a scribe's mind that they are readily added here. If, however, the longer text is original, how do we account for the rise of the shorter reading in 0171 and the Old Latin? Could the copyist's eye have strayed from ΤΡΙΣΚΑΙ to ΠΙΚΡΩΣΚΑΙ? The variant here would not have attracted so much attention if it were not for the fact that the longer reading presents us with a 'minor agreement' of Luke with Matthew in the triple tradition, covering five words in sequence (or four if we discount the initial και which Mk 14:72 could be said to have). We are dispensed from resolving the difficulties of the Synoptic Problem, and accept the longer reading which includes Peter's tears.

tears. The action of v.61, the Lord's turning to look at Peter is unique to Luke's account. Jesus is also in the courtyard, or in view of the courtyard, where he remains for the mocking and beating (vv 63-5), which along with Peter's denials are placed before the Sanhedrin hearing in Luke, rather than after it as in Matthew and Mark. Without v.62 Peter would be left in the courtyard, a witness to the mockery, as Jesus has been a witness to his denials. Recalling Jesus' words to him at the supper (v.34), Peter is filled with remorse, so that he goes out of the courtyard and weeps bitterly. The look of Jesus²⁷, however, not only communicates a reminder of his earlier warning, but suggests the possibility of forgiveness. Peter begins to turn back to the path of faithful discipleship in which he will strengthen his brother apostles (v.32). Jesus has turned, στραφείς towards Peter, and Peter's penitence commences his turning again (ἐπιστρέψας, v.32). Peter's turning back is effected by the Lord's first turning to him, leading to his bitter tears. Further evidence for Peter's repentance, forgiveness and reinstatement as complete within the narrative of Luke's first volume, is Peter's action of confirming the evidence of the women's visit to the tomb of Jesus, finding it empty (24:12, longer reading), so beginning the commission to strengthen the brothers, and by the first appearance of the risen Jesus to Peter (24:34), as well as the absence of any reference to the denials in Acts.

A motif of ignorance?

We have noted the vocabulary of ignorance within the denials and the prediction of the denials, not so much as an excuse, as a softening of their gravity. Ignorance, or a failure of understanding, is also this narrator's comment on, or excuse for, Peter's declaration at the Transfiguration, μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει (9:33, LkR for Mark's οὐ γὰρ

²⁷ Marion L. Soards, "'And the Lord Turned and Looked Straight at Peter' – Understanding Luke 22,61", *Biblica* 67 (1986), 518-519, argues that in the Passion Narrative Luke's Jesus takes more initiatives and that Luke composed this verse "to show Jesus as acting in an authoritative manner". Yes, but surely it has a bigger role than that in the narrative of Lk-Acts, as we have argued!

ἤδεια τί ἀποκριθῇ). This observation adds to the other pointers in Luke's redaction of the Transfiguration that look towards the Passion – the conversation about Jesus' exodus; the sleepy Peter, James and John, and the impression that it is night-time. In NT usage, the verbs οἶδα and γινώσκω are virtually synonyms, both used in LXX for יָדַע.²⁸ The Gnostic or pre-Gnostic use of γινώσις seems to be absent from Luke. Lack of knowledge is the mitigation pleaded by Jesus' prayer for forgiveness as he is crucified (Lk 23:34), πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν. This raises another of the major text-critical questions that affect the Lukan narrative of the Passion and Resurrection²⁹. The second word from the cross in Luke is a particular act of mercy for a self-confessed sinner. In the wider Lukan context, the martyrdom of Stephen records two prayers, both addressed to κύριε (Ἰησοῦ), one to receive his spirit (*cf* Jesus' final prayer, Lk 23:46) and the second not to hold this sin against his stoners. So Stephen, with a vision of the Son of Man standing in heaven for his own on earth, dies the model death of a martyr, seeking the forgiveness of his killers and commending his own spirit (Ac 7:59f)³⁰. This is so evidently in parallel to the death of Jesus, that to deny Lk 23:34 to the original Gospel, would imply that the disciple was more faithful than the teacher to the teaching of Lk 6:28! Stephen's prayer for forgiveness of his persecutors, however, does not include the excuse of ignorance which is in the prayer of Jesus. The parallel to this is found rather, in Peter's speech in Ac 3:17, where he is calling on the Jewish people and their rulers to repent and so receive forgiveness, οἶδα ὅτι κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν. It is repeated by Paul to a Gentile audience in Athens (17:30), God's overlooking the χρόνους τῆς

²⁸ Seesemann in *TDNT*, 5. 116-119, Bultmann *TDNT*, 1. 697ff.

²⁹ The prayer is absent from the third century ρ^{75} along with $\aleph^1$ B and D, but is part of the text in the original $\aleph$ and $\aleph^2$, in the corrector of Bezae, etc. N-A²⁷ places it in brackets, as does *NRSV*; the *REB* treats it as text.

³⁰ According to Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 2.23.16, Hegesippus wrote that James the Lord's brother used to pray for the forgiveness of the people before he was martyred. Prayer for forgiveness does not seem to be part of the hagiographical account of the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, or indeed of the Maccabean martyrs.

ἀγνοίας, that was common to humanity before the gospel. The first of the three *logia* of Lk 12:8-12, with the key word ‘denial’, we have argued, receives some mitigation, or the offer of a second chance, by means of the motif of ignorance, which we find in Peter’s denials of Jesus, and in Peter’s own offering the opportunity to repent in his initial preaching in Jerusalem, as well as classically in the first word of Jesus from the cross. The forgiveness which Peter himself has experienced allows him to make misunderstanding an opportunity to proclaim salvation through the forgiveness of sins.

Suffering for the Name of Jesus

In Lk 21:12ff, which is Luke’s redaction of Mk 13:9f, Jesus had warned that *before* (LkR) the eschatological events his followers would face persecution, being handed-over (betrayed?) to synagogues and prisons (LkR for Mark’s beatings in synagogues), and brought before governors and kings to witness to the faith. Luke omits Mark’s prior preaching of the Gospel to all nations – Luke understands the persecutions to be part of the preaching the Gospel to all nations, which is his theme in Acts. Certainly Luke’s addition of the promise of protection so that not a hair will be lost (21:18) is repeated by Paul before the shipwreck on his journey to witness in Rome (Ac 27:34). At the apostolic supper (Lk 22:33) Peter had told Jesus that he was ready to go with him to prison and death. Beyond his turning after denying Jesus, Peter is then ready, within Luke’s total narrative, to fulfil his pledge. In Acts persecution becomes a mark of the disciples’ experience and a stimulus for the growth of the mission. We have already noted in Luke’s redaction an interest in imprisonment, the addition at 21:12 and in Peter’s pledge at 22:33. Luke, in common with the other Gospels, mentions the imprisonment of John the Baptist (3:20); he alone mentions prison with regard to Barabbas (23:19, 25). When we turn to Acts, imprisonment becomes a part of the pattern of persecution. We may view the releases from prison that are described in Acts as both literal fulfilments, and also symbolic of release from spiritual and metaphorical bondage that forms part of the

programmatic citation of Isa. 61.1f in the opening Nazareth sermon of Lk 4:18 κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν (as LXX), just as the following καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν is fulfilled both metaphorically and literally (7.21; 18.35-43) in the Gospel.

In Ac 4 Peter and John who have been teaching and preaching in the Temple are approached by οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι. This forms a parallel with Jesus who taught and proclaimed the Gospel in the Temple and was approached by chief-priests, scribes and elders, and by the Sadducees (Lk 20:1, 27), and later was arrested on the Mount of Olives by ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ στρατηγοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρους (Lk 22:52). Peter and John are arrested and held in custody overnight εἰς τήρησιν (Ac 4:3). The next day they face the assembly of rulers, elders, and the whole high-priestly family, naming four including Annas and Caiaphas previously named at Lk 3:2, before whom Peter and John make bold testimony, παρρησία. Again there is a parallel with the hearing of Jesus before the presbytery of the people, chief-priests, scribes and the Sanhedrin (Lk 22:66). In Acts the omniscient narrator allows us to overhear the deliberations of the Council and their decision to issue an injunction against speaking or teaching in the name of Jesus (Ac 4:18). This evokes from the apostles the brazen response to obey God rather than the court's verdict. Upon their release they joined their fellow believers, τοὺς ἰδίους, (Ac 4:23), whose prayer recalls the action ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου Ἰησοῦν ὃν ἔχρισας, by Herod and Pilate with the Gentiles and peoples of Israel, in terms of Ps 2, and understands the current threats against them to be parallel to the hostility faced by Jesus (v. 29)³¹. They pray not for security from persecution but for

³¹ Scott Cunningham, *'Through Many Tribulations': The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, pp 189f.

boldness (παρρησία) in speaking the word and in healings, signs and wonders. Their prayer is answered with an earth tremor and their being filled with the Holy Spirit.

The next action taken by the High Priest and the Sadducees (5:17) is to arrest all the apostles and put them ἐν τηρήσει δημοσίᾳ.³² This follows further teaching in the Temple and many healings and a great growth in the number of converts (vv 12-16). During the night an angel opens the doors and tells them to go and continue to teach in the Temple, which at daybreak they do. The divine/angelic reason for the release is so that the apostolic teaching in the Temple may be resumed, unhindered. The angel's description of this teaching, πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης, (v.20), carries some ambiguity, suggestive of the details of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, or the way of life being practised and proclaimed by the apostles. The emphasis on vitality and liberation carries hints of the exodus from bondage in Egypt and prepares the reader for hearing their release as a type of resurrection, a hint which will be much clearer in Ac 12³³. There follows in Luke's account a moment of comic relief at the expense of the authorities, as the prison is found locked and guarded but empty of its prisoners. When it is reported that the apostles are teaching in the Temple, ὁ στρατηγὸς σὺν τοῖς ὑπηρέταις (5:26) bring them to court, without violence (*cf* the fear of the authorities to act against Jesus because of his popular support, Lk 20:19, 22:2). Despite Gamaliel's sage warning that the Sanhedrin might find themselves θεομάχοι³⁴ (5:39), the apostles are flogged, δέιραντες, the same term that was used for the guards' mocking and insulting of Jesus (Lk 22:63)³⁵. It is also the term used at Lk 12:47f in Jesus' response to Peter's question, for differential beatings, the slave who is ignorant of his master's will receiving the less severe beating, but a beating none the

³² Barrett, *Acts*, p.283, treats this term as an adverb rather than an adjective.

³³ Pervo, *Acts*, pp 142f.

³⁴ A term first used in Euripides' *Bacchae*, 45 – see Dibelius, *Studies*, p.190.

³⁵ J. Duncan M. Derrett, *New Resolutions of Old Conundrums*, Drinkwater, Shipston-on-Stour, 1986, p. 94.

less. Pilate had suggested to the crowd that he would chastise (παιδεύω) Jesus and then release him, though in Luke there is no suggestion that this or, indeed, a scourging was carried out before the crucifixion. The apostles are glad to have been counted worthy to suffer shame for the name (of Jesus). This fulfills the warning prophecies of Jesus in the Gospel that they will be arrested (Lk 21:12 LkR, Ac 4:3, 5:18); that they will be imprisoned (Lk 21:12 LkR, Ac 4:3, 5:18ff); that they will suffer on account of the name of Jesus (Lk 21:12 LkR, Ac 4:7ff, 5:28, 40f); that their opponents will not be able speak against them (Lk 21:15, Ac 4:14, the only uses of ἀντειπεῖν in the NT)³⁶.

There are two more cases in Acts of miraculous release of believers from prison³⁷. Peter is released by an angel from Herod's custody the night before he was due to be executed (Ac 12) and in Ac 16 Paul and Silas are given a Roman flogging with rods in Philippi and then imprisoned overnight, with feet secured (*cf.* 12:7). During the night, Paul and Silas are not asleep, but praying and praising God, and this time, rather than an angel, there is an earthquake which opens the prison doors. Escape is not the consequence; rather there is the opportunity to witness to the jailer and fellow-prisoners (*cf.* the purpose of the release of the apostles in 5:20). So it becomes a night of conversion, of baptism, washing wounds and fellowship meal. In several ways, then, the three imprisonment incidents are variations on a theme and all embody an aspect of the Gospel. Weaver comments, "It is the epiphanic quality of the Lukan prison escapes that distinguishes them."³⁸ The leadership of the mission in Acts is divided roughly into four phases, by the

³⁶ Cunningham, *Through Many Tribulations*, pp 194f; Cunningham does not comment on the redaction of Mk 13:9 at Lk 21:12 with regard to Luke's **omission** of συνέδρια and δαρήσεσθε – perhaps another instance of details in Mark being kept over for Acts?

³⁷ Some of the material in the next ten pages is recast and updated from my essay, "Release of the Captives", in Christopher M. Tuckett (ed.), *Luke's Literary Achievement*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, 156-164, used by permission of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

³⁸ John B. Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany – Prison-Escape in the Acts of the Apostles*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, 2004, p.18.

Twelve (2.1-6.7), by the Hellenists (6.8-8.40), by Peter (9.31-11.18), by (Barnabas and) Paul (13-end). One thing that is striking is that in three of these four phases there occurs a miraculous deliverance from prison. The second release, of Peter in Ac 12, may be considered the climax of the "Peter" phase and will receive most of our attention here. There is no prison escape story in the Hellenist section; Stephen's trial is followed immediately by execution, but is narrated in such a way that parallels with the death of Jesus are unmistakable – the false accusations (transferred by Luke from Jesus [in Mark] to Stephen); Stephen's transfiguration (Ac 6:15); the two prayers of Stephen; his burial by devout men.

Peter's Deliverance from Prison

Escape stories, whether historical or fictional, are popular in modern as in ancient times. In part they have the value of entertainment or light relief. We have already drawn attention to the comic aspect of the priests' police discovering the prison without its prisoners (5:22ff). Stephen Sheeley³⁹ draws attention to the entertainment value of the story of Ac 12. We are inclined to laugh at Peter who has to be roughly awakened from deep sleep, and at the maid leaving Peter standing outside. Pervo⁴⁰ classifies the story as one of the "burlesque and rowdy episodes" of Acts. Harrill⁴¹ sees Rhoda's function as intensifying the anticipation of the reader, developing irony and providing comic relief. There are many escape stories in the ancient world with which comparison can be made. Joachim Jeremias in his article on θύρα⁴² provides references. Most noteworthy are the

³⁹ *Narrative Asides in Luke-Acts* JSNT Supplement 72, (Sheffield, 1992), pp. 133f.

⁴⁰ R.T. Pervo, *Profit with Delight--The Literary Genre of Acts*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1987, pp 62f.

⁴¹ J. Albert Harrill, "The Dramatic Function of the Running Slave Rhoda (Acts 12:13-16); A Piece of Greco-Roman Comedy", *NTS*, 46 (2000), 150-157, p.151.

⁴² *TDNT*, 3.175.

miraculous freeing from his chains of Apollonius of Tyana⁴³ and various liberations in the Dionysus myth and the Bacchantes, made especially popular in Euripides⁴⁴. One of the examples that Dennis R. MacDonald⁴⁵ gives for Luke's imitation of Homer is the miraculous release of Peter in Ac 12, which he compares with the moving account in the last book of the *Iliad* where Priam is divinely helped to enter the Greek camp to retrieve the body of his fallen son Hector (24.443ff, 673-706). If the argument is that Luke was consciously imitating and replacing Homer, we might expect the plots to have more in common; if the argument is for unconscious imitation, then we might have expected some tell-tale phrases, like people use phrases from the Bible or Shakespeare, often without an awareness of their original context. None of the alleged parallels that MacDonald offers⁴⁶ is persuasive, and I conclude that his case is at best unproven.⁴⁷ Closer to the Biblical world is the elaboration of the account of the exodus by the historian Artapanos in *Concerning the Jews*,⁴⁸ by telling of Moses' miraculous release from imprisonment by the king when the doors open αὐτομάτως (as in Ac 12:10), and the subsequent punishment of Pharaoh. This could have been known to Luke. While the OT does not seem to have any accounts of a miraculous deliverance from prison, deliverance by God from captivity or bondage is a dominant image. Release from prison is a good picture of salvation, and is found, for example, in the Psalms and Prophets:

“Let the groaning of the captives reach your presence
and in your great might save those under sentence of death” (Ps. 79:11);

⁴³ Philostratus, *Vit. Ap.* 8.30.

⁴⁴ *Bacchae*, 443ff, 576ff – “Chains fell off their feet, ... Keys opened doors not turned by human hands” (translation of Ian Johnston, 2003). Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 2.34 compares the *Bacchae* with the escapes of Peter and Paul in Acts.

⁴⁵ *Does the NT Imitate Homer?*

⁴⁶ pp 163-5.

⁴⁷ Cf also comments by Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*, p.153.

⁴⁸ Fragment in Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.*, 9.27.23-27. Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 1.23) also refers to this account of the escape of Moses, though this account speaks of “the prison being opened by night, by the interposition of God”; cf Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*, 70f.

“he brought them out of the dark, and the shadow of death
and burst their chains.” (Ps. 107:14⁴⁹ *cf.* also 102:20; 142:7; 146:7);

“I have given you as a covenant to the people, a light to the nations,
to open the eyes that are blind,
to bring captives out of prison
out of the dungeon where they lie in darkness.”
(Isa. 42:6f, a text prominent in Luke’s mind – see Chapter Five).

The return from Exile could also be viewed as such a release, a renewing of the Exodus from the "house of bondage". The release of King Jehoiachin (2 Kgs 25:27) enables the deuteronomic history to conclude on a note of hope. The imprisonments of Jeremiah are typical of the persecution of God's messengers, and Luke may have had in mind Jeremiah's rescue by the Ethiopian eunuch, and his release from chains by Nebuchadnezzar, after which, like Peter, he goes elsewhere (Jer. 40:4). He certainly had in mind (Ac 7:10) Joseph's release from the prison, where he had proved by wisdom in small things his readiness to govern Egypt. More significant, I think, are the tales of persecution that we find in Daniel, the Burning Fiery Furnace and the Lions' Den. In Dan 3, King Nebuchadnezzar sees a fourth being in the furnace who "looks like a god" (v.25 [92]) and who is interpreted as God's angel sent to save his servants (v. 28 [95]).⁵⁰

Dan. 3.95 (Theodotion)

ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Σεδραχ Μισαχ Αβδεναβω
ὃς ἀπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐξείλατο τοὺς παῖδας αὐτοῦ

Acts 12.11

ἐξαπέστειλεν [ὁ] κύριος τὸν ἄγγελον
αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξείλατό με ἐκ χειρὸς
Ἑρώδου

In Dan. 6 the King Darius tries to find a way out of sentencing Daniel (*cf.* Pilate). A stone is placed over the mouth of the lion pit (*cf.* Jesus' tomb) and it is sealed (*cf.* Mt 27:66); sleep eludes the King (*cf.* Pilate's wife in Matthew's passion narrative) and Daniel ascribes his safety to the fact that "God sent his angel to shut the lions' mouths", ὁ θεός μου

⁴⁹ Of this psalm's four illustrations of salvation--feeding those wandering in the desert, releasing prisoners, healing the sick and calming the storm--three could be said to find fulfilment in the Gospel, leaving the release of prisoners for Acts.

⁵⁰ Pseudo-Philo, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 6 tells the Jewish legend of Abraham's escape from the fiery furnace.

ἀπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνέφραξεν τὰ στόματα τῶν λεόντων (6:22[23 Theodotion]).

The ancient popularity of escape stories suggests at least one reason why Luke has chosen to include the account of Ac 12, and to have taken the trouble to make it such a dramatic and polished story, comparable, say, to Paul's shipwreck, and eliciting from Martin Dibelius⁵¹ the verdict: "The story itself . . . is a special gem among the legends of Acts: for purity of style it is comparable only with the stories of Tabitha and of the eunuch, and it is superior to them in the beautiful way in which it is presented." Pervo⁵² comments, "The narrator wishes to remove Peter from the stage once he has completed his primary task, inauguration of the gentile mission, but he will not send him into the wings without a thrilling and memorable exit." Peter's release from prison is presented as a sequel to the execution of "James the brother of John" (12:2). The opening events of the chapter are loosely fitted into the famine relief visit to Jerusalem from Antioch of Barnabas and Saul (11.29-12.1), and the chapter forms a literary interlude before they return from Jerusalem to Antioch (12:25⁵³). A similar interlude occurs between the sending out of the Twelve and their return between Lk. 9:6 and 9:10 // Mk 6:12 and 6:30, where the subject matter is again about (another) Herod and a beheading (at much greater length in Mark than Luke), and about the spread of the apostolic Word (cf. Ac 12:24). Historically, Luke may not be correct, to place Herod's death in 44 CE after the famine in Claudius' reign and the famine relief visit of Barnabas and Saul.⁵⁴ Peter is in Jerusalem from 11:2, and appears there in 15:6, but chapter 12 provides a fitting final Acts story about Peter (except for 15.6) and prepares us for the leadership of the Jerusalem

⁵¹ Dibelius, *Studies*, p. 22.

⁵² Pervo, *Acts*, p.310.

⁵³ assuming that the reading ἐξ' Ἱερουσαλήμ is correct, rather than the difficult εἰς of $\aleph$, B etc., which is adopted by N-A²⁷, and treating ΕΙΣ as a misreading of ΕΞ or reading εἰς and understanding it in the force of ἐν 'having completed service in (or unto) Jerusalem, (they returned) . . .' [Richard J. Dillon in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1989, p. 748; Jacques Dupont. 'La Mission de Paul "À Jérusalem" (Acts XII.25)' in *Nov Test* 1 (1956), pp. 275-303; Barrett, *Acts*, 595-7.] Pervo, *Acts*, pp 316f, emends the text.

⁵⁴ Jacques Dupont "Pierre délivré de prison (Ac 12,1-11)" in his *Nouvelles Études sur les Acts des Apôtres*, (Cerf, Paris, 1984) pp. 329ff.

church passing to James (12:17, the first named reference *cf.* 1:14), and for the momentum of the mission to move to Antioch - John Mark is introduced (12:12) and returns with Barnabas and Saul (v.25) and joins them in their mission to Cyprus (13:5). The church in Antioch had begun because of earlier persecution of Hellenists in Jerusalem (11:19ff); so now the attack on the apostles reinforces that outreach. And the account of the mission becomes more weighted towards Gentiles, a move already started by Peter in his conversion of Cornelius.

Thus the setting of the chapter has several threads, but it is given unity by the person of "Herod the King", *i.e.* Agrippa I, though he was not known as Herod; his being called Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς here links him to the Herod family, Herod the Great, Ἡρώδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας (Lk 1:5), and especially with the Tetrarch Herod Antipas responsible for the beheading of John the Baptist and involved in the trials of Jesus (23:6ff; also 9:9; 13:31f; Ac 4:27). Jack Sanders⁵⁵ argues for a Herodian pattern of behaviour - first of persecution (of the Baptist and then of the apostles) and then an acquittal (of Jesus along with Pilate's declaration of Jesus' innocence, and then Agrippa II's of Paul) – "[i]n this sense, there is only one Herod in Luke's account." He has James, brother of John killed with a sword. That this was also a beheading is assumed by most commentators⁵⁶. Luke's brief reference to the beheading of the Baptist, and only as part of an anticipation of Herod's meeting Jesus at the trial, and his omission of Mark's detailed flash-back to John's beheading, finds parallel in the surprisingly terse account of James' execution here (when compared with Stephen's in Ac 7). It serves only as prelude to the arrest of Peter; the beheadings of John/James are forerunners to the arrests of Jesus//Peter.⁵⁷ Because the execution of James has "pleased the Jews", Herod proceeds to arrest Peter, intending the

⁵⁵ Jack T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts*, SCM Press, London, 1987, pp 21, 258.

⁵⁶ *Mishnah, Sanhedrin 7.3* discusses beheading with the sword, the victim standing, (like the Roman government practice) as compared with the axe with the victim's head on the block.

⁵⁷ so Richard B. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles: an Exposition*, (Methuen, London, 1906) pp.176f; Cunningham, *'Through Many Tribulations'*, p. 235 .

same fate for him. The tyrant acts almost without intermediary.⁵⁸ When Peter's escape is discovered, he searches for him, questions the guards and orders them to be taken away, ἀπαχθῆναι, to execution or to prison⁵⁹. The episode is rounded off with an account of how Herod the persecutor receives appropriate⁶⁰ retribution both because of his treatment of the apostles, and also for accepting the crowd's acclamation of him as a god (contrast Barnabas and Paul, 14:14f, and Peter and John, 3:12f). As in the *Magnificat*, "he has brought down monarchs from their thrones, and raised on high the lowly" (Lk. 1:52). This is one of Luke's attempts to locate his Christian history within more widely known events (or pseudo-events),⁶¹ (e.g. Lk. 2:1; 13:1; Ac 5:36f; 11:28). The Herods being partly-Jewish, and Agrippa I indeed historically being of Hasmonean descent and sympathetic to Jewish religion,⁶² they are able to represent Jewish hostility to the Christian mission (12:3,11).

We have noted before the strong motif in Acts, that what the church and its leaders do, and what happens to them, re-enacts with variations the story of the Gospel. Paul makes a final journey to Jerusalem and undergoes trials, like Jesus, before the Sanhedrin, Roman Procurators and a Herod. So here in Ac 12, Peter is imprisoned at the festival of Passover and Unleavened Bread,⁶³ the feast of freedom from bondage, the time of the crucifixion of Jesus, and the intention is that public action should take place after the festival is over (vv.3f). This is another detail from the account of Jesus' passion in Mk 14:2, which Luke omits in his parallel, 22:2. It is not fanciful, then, to ask whether Luke intends us to see the Paschal action against Peter and his miraculous deliverance from the

⁵⁸ O. Wesley Allen, Jr., *The Death of Herod – the Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1997, p.78.

⁵⁹ Execution (Barrett, *Acts*, p.588; Allen, *The Death of Herod*, p.85); prison (Haenchen, *Acts*, p.386).

⁶⁰ Cf. the worms of 12:23 and 2 Macc. 9:5ff of Antiochus IV. Walter Radl, 'Befreiung aus dem Gefängnis', *BZ* 27 (1983), pp. 81-96, regards this element as typical of a punishment miracle story, and suggests its *Sitz-im-Leben* is in polemic against the imperial cult. Allen, *The Death of Herod*, pp 35ff, provides a long list of examples.

⁶¹ Josephus, *Ant.* 19.8.2.

⁶² *Mishna Soṭa* 7.8.

⁶³ regarded as synonymous by Luke (see Lk. 22.1).

prison, as a symbolic recapitulation, in the experience of the apostle, of the passion and resurrection of Jesus.⁶⁴

The prayer of the assembled church for Peter ἐκτείνῳς (v.5) parallels Jesus' prayer of agony (Lk 22:44 ἐκτενέστερον). Peter was awakened from sleep in the garden (Lk 22:45f) and now is raised from sleep (*cf.* death),⁶⁵ by a dazzling angel (*cf.* the angels at the tomb of Jesus); it needs a violent strike in Peter's side to awaken him⁶⁶, πατάξας δὲ τὴν πλευρὰν τοῦ Πέτρου, comparable with the angel's striking Herod with disease (12:23). The angel's awakening call uses both the standard NT words for resurrection - ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν λέγων· ἀνάστα.⁶⁷ Peter's chains fall off, and his guards are helpless (*cf.* the guards at the tomb of Jesus in Mt. 28:4, but not in Luke's resurrection narrative)⁶⁸ and the door of the prison (*cf.* the entrance to the tomb) is opened. The sudden disappearance of the angel (v.10) perhaps recalls the sudden ending of the resurrection appearances of Jesus. Peter's knocking at the house of Mary, and Rhoda's running to tell others, and her message being disbelieved⁶⁹, or the suggestion that Peter's presence is unreal, and then the church's joy, recast several features of resurrection appearance stories, especially Lk. 24:36f. They are also suggestive of the 'door' imagery of Lk. 13:25ff and its inversion, to apply to the risen Christ as the one who knocks, that we find in Rev. 3:20. Rhoda is described as παιδίσκη, a reminder of Peter's encounter with another when he denied Jesus (Lk 22:56). The only NT uses of the verb διῴσχυρίζομαι, Lk 22:59 and Ac 12:15, also link these two Peter stories.⁷⁰ Weaver⁷¹ finds a closer parallel between the angel of the Lord who appears in

⁶⁴ *cf.* Goulder, *Type and History*, pp. 45f.

⁶⁵ *cf.* the use of rising from sleep as a type of resurrection from death in the (baptismal?) hymn Eph. 5:14 - ἔγειρε, ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ Χριστός.

⁶⁶ Rather than the 'tap' of *NRSV*, or the variant νύξας of D; a violent strike at Peter's side might suggest a parallel with the Johannine Passion, (Jn 19:34), but hardly with Luke's.

⁶⁷ Mathieu, p.296.

⁶⁸ the earthquake in Mt. 28:2 has its equivalent at the Philippi prison (Ac 16:26), σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας in both places. Walter Radl, 'Befreiung aus dem Gefängnis', p. 83 refers to Matthew's Easter Narrative. Could Luke have known Matthew here? For the large number of guards at 12:4, suggestive of an important rather than dangerous prisoner, compare Ac 23:23ff of Paul and Jn 18:3 of Jesus.

⁶⁹ Harrill, "The Dramatic Function of the Running Slave Rhoda", p.157; Cunningham, *Through Many Tribulations*, p.237.

⁷⁰ Mathieu, p.299.

⁷¹ *Plots of Epiphany*, pp 172ff.

Peter's prison cell and of Peter, understood as 'his angel' at Mary's gate, and regards them as parallel 'epiphanies', although the latter is not accompanied by any thaumaturgical display.

Another feature of the deliverance of Peter, the instructions to dress, when combined with the Passover setting, suggest more to August Strobel,⁷² namely the eschatological expectations that had come to be associated with Passover. He draws attention to the girding imagery of the eschatological parable of Lk 12:35 (*cf* also 1 Pet. 1:13). He notes verbal parallels between Acts and the LXX of the Exod. 12 Passover law:

Acts	Exodus
12:6 τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ	12:12 ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ
12:7 ἀνάστα ἐν τάχει	12:11 μετὰ σπουδῆς
12:8 ζῶσαι καὶ ὑπόδησαι	12:11 περιεζωσμέναι καὶ τὰ ὑποδήματα ἐν τοῖς ποσίν

He cites *Midrash Ex R* 18(81a) which interprets the Passover night of watching as being the night also in which Hezekiah was delivered, when the three youths were delivered from the furnace and when Daniel was rescued from the lions (Dan. 3:26; 6:23) and when Elijah and the Messiah would come. If Strobel is correct, Ac 12 with the dressing imagery suggests that the deliverance of Peter enacts the meaning of Jesus' resurrection as a realisation or inauguration of the eschatological deliverance, whose ante-type was the Passover and of which Isaiah's phrase "release of the captives" is an appropriate symbol. Radl⁷³ identifies ἐξάγω (Ac 12:17) as a technical term or *Stichwort* for the exodus (Ex 32:1; Dt 5:6; Lev 23:43).

We are presenting a cumulative case for reading Peter's deliverance from prison as a dramatic type or illustrative proclamation of the Gospel of the death and resurrection of Jesus in what happens to his apostle. Though this is not recognised as a parallel between

⁷² "Passa-Symbolik und Passa-Wunder in Act XII.3ff", *NTS* 4 (1957-8), pp. 210-5. Also Dupont, "Pierre délivré de prison", pp. 329ff.

⁷³ 'Befreiung aus dem Gefängnis', pp 89-91.

Peter and Paul in Clark's *Parallel Lives*⁷⁴, within Acts there is the even more dramatic proclamation of the Gospel in the survival from shipwreck of Paul and those who were with him⁷⁵. The shipwreck is at a position in the narrative of Acts that is parallel with the passion and resurrection narrative in the Gospel. The strengthening angel (27:23), the quasi-eucharistic breaking of bread (v.35), and the language of grace and salvation would add support for this interpretation. Already in Jonah, salvation from drowning after a sea storm, is a type of death and resurrection, specifically applied to Jesus in Mt 12:40, though not at the parallel in Lk 11:29f. Since I made this case with regard to the release of Peter in Ac 12 in my article "Release of the Captives"⁷⁶ this kind of interpretation has become more widespread, if not common-place. It is supported by Pervo's commentary on Acts⁷⁷, by Susan Garrett,⁷⁸ by Mathieu⁷⁹, by Grappe⁸⁰, by Wall,⁸¹ as well as the older authors referred to in my article⁸².

Peter's own reaction to his deliverance is given by the author in a rare insight into his inner mind and the awareness of reality rather than a vision - νῦν οἶδα ἀληθῶς ὅτι ἐξαπέστειλεν [ὁ] κύριος τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξείλατό με ἐκ χειρὸς Ἡρώδου καὶ πάσης τῆς προσδοκίας τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, (12:11). There are allusions to the LXX of Ex 18:4 with Herod replacing Pharaoh, and also to Daniel 3:95, 6:23 (Theodotion). Peter clearly separates himself now from the Jewish people, whom he links with Herod; this marks a stage in the definition of the λαός, separating the Christian movement from the

⁷⁴ Andrew C. Clark, *Parallel Lives – The Relation of Paul to the Apostles in the Lucan Perspective*, Paternoster Press, Carlisle, 2001.

⁷⁵ See e.g. Pervo, *Acts*, pp 648ff; Goulder, *Type and History*, p.39; discussed but rejected by Johnson, *Acts*, p.457.

⁷⁶ Note 37 above.

⁷⁷ pp 308f.

⁷⁸ "Exodus from Bondage: Luke 9:31 and Acts 12:1-24", *CBQ* 52 (1990), 656-680, pp 670ff.

⁷⁹ pp 306f.

⁸⁰ C. Grappe, *Images de Pierre aux deux premiers siècles*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1995, pp 44-46.

⁸¹ Robert W. Wall, "Successors to 'the Twelve' According to Acts 12:1-17", *CBQ* 53 (1991), 628-643.

⁸² M. D. Goulder, *Type and History*; J. Dupont, "Pierre délivré de prison"; R. B. Rackham, *Acts of the Apostles*; W. Radl, 'Befreiung aus dem Gefängnis'.

increasingly hostile people of Israel, as Luke depicts them. “The Lucan Peter no longer thinks of himself as truly Jewish, for ‘The Jews’ seek his death. Christianity is now distinct from Judaism,” comments Sanders.⁸³ This contributes to Peter’s seeing the Law as a yoke from the past, as in Ac 15, and establishes a pattern for Paul who increasingly finds the Jewish reception hostile. But is Jewish προσδοκία more than a desire to see Peter executed? Because the only other use of this term in the NT is at Lk 21:26, Dietrich⁸⁴, followed by Mathieu⁸⁵ and others have noted the inclusive ‘all’, πάντα, and wondered whether it refers to Jewish eschatological expectation, including their messianic expectations, from which Peter is here distancing himself. The cognate verb προσδοκάω is used by Luke in such contexts – Lk 3:15, 7:19f, 12:46, [but not 1:21, 8:40, or any of the Acts references, except possibly 27:33]. This seems to me to be too systematic and refined an interpretation of a single expression and I agree with Barrett⁸⁶ that the expectation from which Peter is delivered is the satisfaction of seeing him executed.

When Peter is finally admitted to the house of Mark’s mother where the Church is gathered in prayer, he tells them that the Lord had brought him out of the prison. He instructs them to announce this news to “James and the brothers”. This is the first time James the Lord’s brother is named in Acts; the author supposes there is no need of further introduction. Peter’s singling of him out suggests that at least he has become the leader of the Jerusalem Church and of specifically Jewish Christianity. This is the role which we find James playing at the Jerusalem Council and subsequently in Acts. Peter’s message gives James implicit apostolic recognition if not authorisation⁸⁷. Peter himself had led the apostolic witness in Jerusalem in the earliest days, and in Ac 1 convened the assembly

⁸³*The Jews in Luke-Acts*, pp 258f.

⁸⁴Dietrich, pp 302ff.

⁸⁵Mathieu, pp 304f.

⁸⁶Barrett, *Acts*, p.582.

⁸⁷Robert W. Wall, “Successors to ‘the Twelve’ According to Acts 12:1-17”, *CBQ* 53 (1991), 628-643, p.634.

which appointed Matthias, but after the initial persecutions was no longer the figurehead, becoming, rather, as Luke presents him, a missionary outside Jerusalem. Now, freed from Herod's prison, Peter cannot safely stay in Jerusalem. The account says simply καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον (Ac 12:17). The phrase has invited much speculation. Similarity to what Luke's Peter says about Judas is noted – seeking God's guidance in the choosing of one to fill the position (τόπος) of ministry and apostleship from which Judas had turned aside to go εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον, (Ac 1:25). If the second use of the term τόπος means something like Judas' destiny or hell, then might the term in Ac 12:17 imply Peter's going to his destiny, in heaven? This would mean that we could have a further typological parallel for Peter with Jesus' death, resurrection and ascension. “Comme Jésus ressuscité ‘fut séparé d’eux et était emporté au ciel’ (Lc 24,51), Pierre ‘étant sorti, partit pour un autre lieu’ (Ac 12,17).”⁸⁸ This seems to me to read rather a lot into an imprecise phrase, and is rather belied by Peter's appearance, not from heaven (!), at the Jerusalem Assembly, by which time it is presumably safe for him to be in Jerusalem again. It does have the merit of seeing the ‘exodus’ about which Jesus conversed with Moses and Elijah at the Transfiguration (Lk 9:31) as death-resurrection-assumption in Luke's narrative, and so providing a more perfect analogy for Peter's exodus. It is, perhaps, supported by *1 Clement* 5, which says that Peter “when he had at length suffered martyrdom departed to the place of glory due to him”, οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. We then would have to rearrange the episodes as Luke narrates them so that Ac 12 would be the absolutely final appearance of Peter. But we prefer to seek an interpretation altogether more earthly, even if vague. Some think that the phrase indicates Peter's own missionary excursions, such as are described in Ac 8-11, in apocryphal accounts, and by implication in 1 Cor 9:5, and 1 Peter 1:1. More specifically

⁸⁸ Mathieu, p.307.

some would suggest the “other place” is Antioch, where Paul met him (Gal 2:11), and where tradition remembered him as their bishop. Others find in the phrase a hint of Peter’s journeying to Rome. If it is part of Luke’s narrative intention that Peter after his denials should yet fulfill his pledge to go with Jesus to prison and death, having accounted for imprisonment, should at least leave a door open for Peter’s eventual martyrdom. It is probable that Luke knew the traditions of Peter’s martyrdom as of Paul’s. To narrate *them* rather than the spread of the Gospel, is not his intention. He leaves the eventual outcome of Paul’s journey to Rome open and the only apostle whose death he records is James’.

The Influence of Peter’s Story

Can we trace the influence of Luke’s account of Peter’s own story or place it on a trajectory in the development of Christian traditions?

An account of Peter’s denials has a prominent place in all the canonical accounts of the passion of Jesus. That he repented of this failure and received forgiveness and reinstatement among the apostles with the commission of risen Jesus, is the understanding of Luke’s account, as I argued above, and it is implied or explicit in the other accounts too – in Mk 16:7, the messenger of the resurrection who charges the women to take the message to the disciples, singles out Peter. In Jn 21, Peter is asked by Jesus three times about his love for him, matching the three denials (?), and Peter is charged with the care of Christ’s sheep and warned that he will be bound, taken where he does not wish to go, and suffer martyrdom, as he resumes his following of Jesus. The recitation of Peter’s denials would serve as encouragement for any Christians who themselves failed in their witness, that they too could repent and be forgiven and resume their discipleship, in contrast, say, to Heb. 6:4ff, where there is no possibility of repentance after conversion and baptism. *Acts of Peter* 10 records the confession of Marcellus before Peter, his request of Peter’s prayers and his receiving Peter’s absolution. He speaks of Peter’s own loss of faith

“when upon the water”, presumably a reference to Mt 14:30f, rather than specifically to Peter’s denials and restoration. Matthew’s Gospel has its own picture of Peter being raised up by Christ, from the depths, (rather than prison) in the extension to the account of the walking on the water (14.28-33). The walking on the water has much of the character of a christophany, or resurrection appearance - the ambiguous physicality, the suspicion of a phantom, the divine ἐγώ εἰμι, the worship of the Son of God. Peter’s request to share in this experience is granted, and successful until he looks, not at Jesus, but at the storm: sinking he cries to Jesus for salvation and is lifted by the hand. This could portray, by way of anticipation, Peter’s denials and subsequent restoration to faith and apostleship⁸⁹, and there might lie behind it the same kind of imaginative enactment of “resurrection” by and with Christ that we find in Ac 12. Both incidentally happen deep in the night-time and φυλακή, in the sense of ‘watch’ is used in Mt 14:25, but there is no provable connection between these two developments. It was argued earlier that the tears of Simon Magus in the Bezan reading at Ac 8:24 are evidence for *Peter’s* tears serving as a model for an act of contrition. The cock which is mentioned in all of the canonical accounts of the passion, as marking the moment when Peter acknowledges that he has denied Jesus, becomes a visual symbol of the denials in Christian art both ancient and modern⁹⁰. That cockcrow heralds the dawning of a new day is suggestive of repentance after failure. Bockmuehl also refers to the Ambrosian hymn at cockcrow, *Aeterne rerum conditor*, with the lines “It was at cockcrow that the very rock of the church washed white his sin....Look on us, Jesus,... for if you look on us our sins leave us and our guilt is washed away in tears.”

⁸⁹ J. C. Fenton, *Saint Matthew*, Penguin Books, 1963, p.246; Margaret Davies, *Matthew*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1993, p.111.

⁹⁰ Markus Bockmuehl *The Remembered Peter in Ancient Reception and Modern Debate*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2010, pp196ff.

The accounts of persecution in Acts, as we have noted, suggest ways in which the sufferings of Jesus are recapitulated among his followers. When the *Acts of Peter* 34 ff comes to tell of Peter's martyrdom in Rome, the legend of Peter's meeting Jesus entering the city to be crucified is interpreted as what is about to happen to Peter. Peter asks to be crucified upside down. When he has handed over his spirit at death, Marcellus performs for Peter the burial modelled upon the role of Joseph of Arimathea in the canonical accounts. The Acts accounts would encourage bold confession of faith in the face of trial and persecution. Accounts of martyrdoms increasingly emphasised the martyr's eagerness for a martyr's death (*e.g.* Ignatius of Antioch), and like the Books of Maccabees, glorified the gory details of torture, in a way which Luke's account does not.

When we ask the influence of the account of Peter's deliverance from prison, we have already noted the influence upon the account both of Passover and death-resurrection, light-and-darkness imagery. Building especially upon the imagery of getting dressed in Ac 12 before Peter goes forth from 'death' into a new life and new day, Pervo argues also for allusions to baptism, so making "the story of Peter applicable to all believers."⁹¹ Certainly the imagery of stripping off the old clothes (the former way of life) and putting on the new, is a prevailing metaphor for conversion and becomes part of the ritual of baptism (*cf.* Col. 3:9f, Gal 3:27, *The Hymn of the Pearl* 72-78 in *Acts of Thomas* 110-113). However the more specific baptismal imagery of washing is not part of Ac 12, and no account of baptism in Acts mentions clothing or unclothing. The Pauline theology which understands baptism as into the death and resurrection of Jesus (Rom 6:3f) is not immediately established as Luke's understanding. He recasts Mark's linking of baptism and suffering at Mk 10:39 into the *logion* of Lk 12:50, where it is joined with the imagery of fire, the fire of destruction reminiscent of the Baptist's preaching (Lk 3:9) and his

⁹¹ Pervo, *Acts*, pp 310ff.

prophecy that his successor would baptise with fire and Holy Spirit (3:16f). 12:50 points us towards Pentecost, transforming destructive images into those of new power and communication, baptism in Holy Spirit (Ac 1:5). The aorist imperative which the angel addresses to Peter awakening him (Ac 12:7), ἀνάστα, also occurs in the hymn quoted in Ephesians 5:14, ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, combining the imagery of arousal from sleep, resurrection from the dead and coming into the light of Christ. If the hymn is a baptismal hymn, then the imperative could be described as a ‘baptismal’ aorist. Grappe⁹² notes that the imperative is found only in the NT in these two verses and argues for a baptismal allusion. If looking for parallels in Acts between Peter and Paul, we may note that Paul’s conversion combines use of ἀνίστημι with baptism and the healing of Paul’s temporary blindness (Ac 9:18; 22:16; 26:16). In any case the release from prison serves as a powerful metaphor for the salvation of believers from sin and death, perhaps most eloquently in the hymn of Charles Wesley:-

Long my imprisoned spirit lay,
Fast bound in sin and nature’s night;
Thine eye diffused a quickening ray—
I woke, the dungeon flamed with light;
My chains fell off, my heart was free,
I rose, went forth, and followed Thee.

We noted earlier parallels between Peter’s deliverance in Ac 12 and the resurrection narratives of the Gospels. Matthew also tells of an earthquake, which opens the tombs of "the saints who had fallen asleep", at the time of the death of Jesus, and their appearances after Jesus' resurrection (27.51f). Sometimes in connection with this, reference is made to the ancient notion of the Descent of Christ into Hell, as part of the drama of salvation, and via this doctrine with the description in 1 Peter (with its strong paschal themes) of Christ's saving work as going to preach τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν

⁹² Grappe, *Images de Pierre*, p.46.

πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, (3:19), where it is also linked via Noah with baptism⁹³. While this is on a Petrine trajectory, I do not think the Peter of Acts can be shown to be on the same trajectory.

Finally, mention might be made of the second century (?) *Epistula Apostolorum*, which takes the form of a post-resurrection discourse of Jesus reported by the apostles which shows familiarity both with NT traditions and with Gnosticism, and in this section presents something of an amalgam of themes that we have brought together in this chapter - Passover, Peter's imprisonment and deliverance, and his denial, and the renewing in the disciples of the passion and resurrection of Jesus and the eschatological hope. In the Coptic version it reads:⁹⁴

"... And you remember my death. If now the passover takes place, then will one of you be thrown into prison for my name's sake, and he will [be] in sorrow and care that you celebrate the passover while he is in prison and [far] from you; for he will sorrow that he does not celebrate the passover [with] you. I will send my power in the [form] of the angel Gabriel, and the doors of the prison will be opened. He will go out and come to you; he will spend a night of watch with [you] and stay with you till the cock crows. But when you complete the remembrance that is for me and the Agape he will again be thrown into prison for a testimony until he comes out from there and preaches what I have delivered to you". And we said to him, "O Lord, is it perhaps necessary again that we take the cup and drink?" He said to us, "Yes, it is necessary until the day when I come with those who were killed for my sake".

⁹³ For discussion of the ancient connecting of Mt. 27:51f and 1 Pet. 3:18-19; 4:6 and reference to modern authors who continue to make the connection, see Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2.1127f.

⁹⁴ translated by H. Duensing in E. Hennecke, (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha*, 1.199f.

Chapter Seven – Luke Reshapes the Pre-Easter Story of Peter

In Luke's account of how the Gospel of Jesus became a message for all people, with the focus upon Jerusalem moving to share its focus with Rome, the apostle Peter has played a series of roles in the first half of Acts, and these have been the substance of our studies in Chapters Two – Six. Peter is the character with a substantial part in Acts who has previously been a major character in Luke's first volume. By comparison, others who have roles in the Gospel, like John, the other apostles, Mary and the chief priests are minor characters in Acts. Jesus himself, about whom the Gospel is proclaimed, at the beginning of Acts ascends to heaven to become one with the major supernatural influence upon the course of events Luke narrates. Thus Peter is the only earthly character who bridges the Gospel and Acts. Luke's account of Peter in his first volume is the subject in this chapter, and our thesis is that Luke shapes it with regard to how it will continue in Acts. Our assumption throughout this thesis is that Luke knew and used Mark as a primary source, with the consequence that where Mark is his *Vorlage* we can detect with some confidence Luke's redactional activity with regard to verbal changes or changes of order, additions or omissions. With regard to Lk 5:1-11 and 24:12 we will also have to consider the more problematical issues of the relationship between Luke and John.

In Chapter One we argued that the introductory part of the Gospel, Lk 1:5 – 4:30, sets the stage not only for Luke's account of the ministry of Jesus, but also for the early community of believers in Acts, focussed on the temple as a place of teaching. This introduction announces a salvation for all which includes "revelation to the Gentiles" as well as "glory to Israel"; the Holy Spirit is the driving force; the Gospel is proclaimed to shepherds at Bethlehem, by John at the Jordan and by Jesus programmatically in the synagogue at Nazareth; Luke's pattern of shaping lives parallel to each other but with variations begins with the nativities of John the Baptist and Jesus; engagement with Satan

and the testings of Jesus begin; that the coming of salvation will bring opposition and persecution for John and for Jesus and his followers is also anticipated. This introductory section continues into the public ministry of Jesus, teaching and proclaiming “the gospel of the kingdom of God” (4:43, LkR) in the synagogues of Galilee (4:15), Capernaum (v.31) and Judea (v.44). It is in Capernaum that **Simon (Peter) enters Luke’s story.**

Luke’s first mention of Simon (4:38) is with regard to Jesus coming to his house in Capernaum, immediately after the teaching and exorcism in the synagogue. This exorcism, the healing of Simon’s mother-in-law, the healings of the sick at sunset and the departure from Capernaum (Lk 4:31-44) are parallel to the same sequence in Mk 1:21-39, but in Mark they follow Jesus’ call into discipleship of Simon and Andrew, James and John, whereas in Luke this sequence is itself the introduction to Simon. The narrative implies, rather than states, that Jesus has met Simon in the synagogue and been invited back to his home¹ for hospitality, a common feature of Luke’s narrative (*cf.* Levi’s 5:19; a pharisee’s 7:36, 11:37, 14:1; Martha and Mary 10:38). Mark regards the house as the home of Andrew as well, and they are accompanied there by James and John, *i.e.* all the disciples that Jesus has so far called according to Mark. The same four in Mk 13:3 ask Jesus the question which prompts the apocalyptic discourse, but the Lukan parallel there has an indefinite third person plural. We notice already Luke’s focus on Peter.

In Simon’s house his mother-in-law is suffering (συνεχομένη LkR) from a great² (μεγάλω LkR) fever and an indefinite “they”, who presumably include Simon, request Jesus (to help), whereas in Mark they merely tell Jesus about her. Marshall³

¹ Mt 8:14 also makes it the house of Peter only – are there traces here of a tradition which knew that the house of Peter in Capernaum had served as a house-church? For the support of archaeological evidence see Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *The Holy Land*, OUP, 1992, p. 225.

² Possibly a medical distinction; *cf.* J. M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St Luke*, Macmillan, London, 1942, pp xx, 71, where he cites Galen.

³ *Luke*, p.195.

suggests that the change implies that they “had faith in what Jesus could do as a result of the preceding incident.” Dietrich⁴ links ἠρώτησαν (4:38) with ἠρώτησεν (5:3), when Jesus, having got onto Simon’s boat, asks him to position it a little way from the shore; having met Simon’s request for help for his mother-in-law, Jesus can expect Simon to reciprocate by lending his boat for a pulpit. In answering Simon’s request, Jesus stood over the sick woman, ἐπιστάς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς (LkR), and heals her not by taking her hand, as in Mark, but by his commanding word rebuking the fever, the same term as in the preceding exorcism (v. 35), ἐπετίμησεν. There is an aural wordplay here - ἐπιστάς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς ἐπετίμησεν. Mathieu⁵ suggests an echo of the Lukan word ἐπιστάς (from ἐφίστημι, used only by Luke among the Gospels, 0/0/7+11/0, the first use being about the angel at Bethlehem [2:9]) in the vocative from the same root with which Peter and the others address Jesus, ἐπιστάτα (5:5 and 5x), literally ‘one who stands near or over’, suggestive of skilled leadership⁶. At the word of Jesus she immediately arose and began to serve them (presumably with refreshment), ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς. This not only proves the sudden recovery from the fever, but also fits into the imagery of hospitality favoured by Luke – cf. the cured women of 8:2f who provide for the needs of Jesus and his disciples (διηκόνουν). The employment of the verb ἀνίστημι, used frequently of the resurrection, may suggest here and not for the only time, “une résurrection symbolique”⁷ in the healings of Jesus and later the apostles⁸.

So Simon has witnessed the sudden healing in his own house, and probably the exorcism in the synagogue, a man and a woman balanced here in juxtaposition. At sunset, when the Sabbath is over, many sick people were brought to Jesus and he was healing each

⁴ p. 22; Timothy Wiarda, *Peter in the Gospels – Pattern, Personality, Relationship*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2000, p.133 emphasises that Jesus is the recipient of Peter’s hospitality in his home and then his boat.

⁵ Mathieu, p.65.

⁶ Liddell & Scott, p. 554.

⁷ Mathieu, p.63.

⁸ Cf. above Chapter Four pp 114ff.

by the laying on of hands (LkR). Within the narrative we may suppose that Simon has heard Jesus called by the demon-possessed ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (v.34; cf Peter speaking in Ac 3:14); ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ⁹ and to be τὸν χριστὸν (v.41 LkR). Peter calls Jesus τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ at 9:20 (also in an accusative and infinitive construction like 4:41), but does not call him Son of God, which Paul does in Acts. The following morning Jesus went to a deserted place (Mark says “to pray”, a puzzling omission by Luke, though prayer is part of Jesus’ retreats at 5:16, 6:12), but the crowds (LkR for Mark’s “Simon and those [disciples ?] with him”) search for him, but Jesus will not be held back from continuing his evangelizing mission.

Once Simon has been called into discipleship we may suppose that he is a witness to most if not all of the healing miracles of Jesus. Specifically he is present in the crowd when the woman with haemorrhages touches Jesus’ clothes and is cured. It is Peter who protests that the crowds were pressing on him (8:45, for Mark’s οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ). It is apparent that Peter is unaware of the healing that has taken place or that power has gone from Jesus. Though Peter’s statement is less dismissive of Jesus’ question than the response which the disciples collectively make in Mark, Peter does show himself here as one whose eyes are not yet open to the possibilities of faith in Jesus, such as this woman shows. Mathieu¹⁰ finds confirmation of Peter’s speaking with the “all” who “deny” that they have touched Jesus (ἀρνούμενων δὲ πάντων 8:45 LkR) in the use of the verb which will be used later of Peter’s denials of Jesus, and Peter’s here addressing Jesus only as ἐπιστάτα rather than as κύριε, an absolute distinction which we will question later in discussion of 5:1-11. Then Peter with James, John and the child’s parents is present when Jesus raises Jairus’ daughter (8:51), a model for Peter’s own raising of Tabitha in Ac 9:39ff. Within the total narrative of Luke’s two volumes, Paul’s healing of Publius’ father,

⁹ Cf Lk 1:35, 3:22, 4:3,9, 8:28, 9:35, 22:70, Ac 8:37 v.l., 9:20 (Paul speaking).

¹⁰ Mathieu, p.99.

πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίῳ συνεχόμενον (Ac 28:8) by the laying on of hands, followed by a general healing of the sick and diseased of the island, forms an *inclusio* with the healing of Peter's mother-in-law.

Peter is to catch people

Jesus' ministry of teaching (4:15, 31), preaching (4:44) and healing (4:31-41) has begun, and Simon has been quietly introduced. Luke now marks a new section of his narrative with ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ plus an accusative and infinitive construction (5:1), in imitation of the style of Septuagintal historians¹¹. This story falls into three parts. First there is the situation of Jesus proclaiming the "word of God"¹² to the crowd on the Lakeside. To ease this he asks Simon for use of his boat as a sort of pulpit. Simon is present to hear the public teaching of Jesus. In the second part, Jesus persuades the tired fisherman, who has had a fruitless night, to go again into the deep water and let down the net for a catch. It is clear from Simon's plural reply that he is not pictured as alone with Jesus on the boat. He addresses Jesus as ἐπιστάτα, a surprising recognition of his being in charge¹³, even where he has no obvious expertise. I do not agree with Wiarda that the statement about a fruitless night's fishing constitutes any objection or doubt.¹⁴ Compliance with τῷ ῥήματι σου (v. 5) links Simon with Mary (1:38) and Simeon (2:29); the link is more than verbal, because on a second reading of the Gospel, the parallel with other vocation or commissioning stories will be apparent to the reader, who will understand that each σου refers to God or his agent. The result of Simon's compliance is an astounding catch of fish, which puts strain on the nets to breaking-point. They call for help to their

¹¹ Dietrich, p.28.

¹² an expression which Luke likes – 8:11 (LkR), 8:21, 11:28; also 13x in Acts. Its use reinforces the sense of Jesus as a prophet, the predominant emphasis in the interpretation of L. T. Johnson, *Luke*.

¹³ Oepke in *TDNT*, 2.622-3, gives some secular Greek examples of practical charge, but he himself regards it as a translation of רָבִי, with only the evidence of the synoptic parallels.

¹⁴ Wiarda, *Peter in the Gospels*, pp 100f – he thinks Peter is portrayed at this point as "an early-stage disciple".

fellow-workers, μετόχοις, in the second boat (mentioned in v.2 but only now becoming involved in the action). The size of the catch is now emphasised in that the weight begins to cause the boats to sink. This overwhelming catch is a result of Simon's implementation of Jesus the master's instruction, in spite of his own greater fishing skills, together with Jesus' extraordinary or supernatural insight as to where the fish were. Such a command over the natural world arouses a proper response of θάμβος (v. 9), like the exorcism in 4:36 (and also like Peter and John's healing of the man at the Beautiful Gate in Ac 3:10).

The reader may ask why this wonder has happened. At 9:12ff, a miracle of provision, the multiplication of the loaves and fish, meets a stated need, and perhaps echoes the miracles of provision done by the prophets¹⁵ Elijah and Elisha (1 Kings 17; 2 Kings 4:1ff, 42ff) . Are we here to understand the catch of fish as a compensation for Simon's time and boat?¹⁶ This is not indicated by the text. There are no Biblical or Hellenistic precedents for a miraculous catch of fish – the miracle ascribed to Pythagoras¹⁷ consists in knowing the number of fish caught (appropriate for one of theorem fame!) and their staying alive until counted. Rather, the sequel here suggests the purpose of the miracle or sign is to create a sense of wonder at “the overwhelming abundance of Jesus' gift”.¹⁸ Wonder and fear (cf v.10), φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν is how the stilling of the storm is greeted (8:25). Whether there is also some symbolic or metaphorical significance in the catch of fish we have to consider in relation to the third part of this narrative.

When Simon, who is now prematurely (see 6:14) also called Peter, the name by which he will subsequently be known in the Gospel (16x), except at 22:31 and 24:34, sees

¹⁵ Johnson, *Luke*, p. 89.

¹⁶ And parallel, perhaps, then to Mt. 17:27, if Jesus' instruction there to Peter to catch a fish with a coin in its mouth is a colourful way of suggesting he earns enough from fishing to pay their temple tax.

¹⁷ Iamblichus, *On the Pythagorean Life*, 36, translated by Gillian Clark, Liverpool University Press, 1989.

¹⁸ Wilhelm H. Wuellner, *The Meaning of "Fishers of Men"*, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1967, p.216.

the wonderful catch, he falls down at Jesus' knees. The 'knees' rather than the feet¹⁹ serve to remind us that they are still on the boat, and that Jesus is still seated as in v. 3. Simon's action expresses wonder but his words are a surprise and invite attention and reflection – ἔξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι κύριε. Those who witnessed or learnt of the healing of the demoniac would similarly ask that Jesus leaves them, because of their fear about the supernatural power encountered in Jesus (8:17). Simon's awareness of being a sinner can be compared with Isaiah's feeling of being "a man of unclean lips" when he receives his vision of God and call to be a prophet (Is. 6:5). The manifestation of the divine leads to a sense of unworthiness in the observer or recipient. With Jn. 21 in mind, some find here a vestige of the post-Easter restoration and forgiveness of Peter following his denials of Jesus, but this is to introduce an interpretation from another text. We can, however, properly ask whether in the assertion by Simon that he is a sinner, there could be an anticipation of the narrative's eventual telling of his denials. That Peter is characterised as a self-acknowledged sinner is in keeping with Luke's presentation of the mission of Jesus as being to sinners, with whom, along with the tax-collectors Jesus is presented as eating (5:32; cf. 19:10; 5:30, 15:1). The individual sinner in parable and in life (7:37, 18:13, 23:40-3) is presented as a model of how to come before God or Jesus, and it is over the single sinner's repentance that heaven rejoices (15:7,10). In Luke's narrative, the second account of Jesus' call of a disciple, is of Levi, a tax-collector; in between the two call stories, there are two healings which demonstrate Jesus' cleansing of the unclean (leper), and the forgiveness of (the paralytic's) sin. A reader is left in no doubt that Jesus' call is to those who know that they are sinners and is equivalent to a declaration of their

¹⁹ D reads ποσσιν; A. R. C. Leaney would like to take Ἰησοῦ as a dative rather than a genitive, and the phrase then as equivalent to the semitic כרע על ברכים followed by ל or לפני so that the reference is to Peter's knees. ("Jesus and Peter: the Call and Post-resurrection Appearance" – *Expository Times* 65 (1953-4), 381-2).

forgiveness.²⁰ Simon's words express the condition of all humanity; "tief erlebt er vor ihm seine kreatürliche Nichtigkeit"²¹.

The reaction to the catch of fish is a sense of wonder, θάμβος (v. 9), fear (v. 10), a humble sense of unworthiness, and one of witnessing an action of God or his agent. The incident has taken on the character of an epiphany²² which elicits an appropriate response. Verse 8 has four pointers to this – the falling down of Simon before Jesus, as if in worship; Simon's recognition that he, a sinner, does not belong with Jesus; the object-less ἰδών is also suggestive of seeing more than a catch of fish; and the change of address from ἐπιστάτα to κύριε may also indicate that he is now seeing in Jesus more than a chief or master, even the exalted Lord, which is what the evangelist seems to imply when, as narrator, he calls Jesus ὁ Κύριος (7:13,19; 10:1,39, 41; 11:39 etc.). Dietrich²³ asserts "Kyrios-Sein Jesu und Sünder-Sein Simons sind demnach sachliche Korrelate". However κύριε need not carry such Christological weight. Is the reader to understand its use by the leper in the very next pericope (5:12 LkR) as having more weight than a 'Sir'? When the disciples address Jesus as κύριε in 9:54, 61; 10:17, 40; 11:1; 13:23 etc., this could well be seen as a synonym for ἐπιστάτα. However, the occurrence of τὸν κύριον...κύριε at 19:8 would suggest that the vocative too can be more than a respectful human address, and have some of its post-Easter implications for which the narrator prepares us.²⁴ Already in the introductory part of the Gospel κύριος has been used frequently as a term for God/YHWH, and also apparently for the human messiah – Elizabeth calls expectant Mary "the mother

²⁰ Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 1. 1986, p.204.

²¹ H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, Herder, Freiburg, 1969, p. 270.

²² Dietrich, p.53.

²³ p.51.

²⁴ See C. F. D. Moule, "The Christology of Acts" in Leander E. Keck & J. Louis Martyn (Edd), *Studies in Luke-Acts*, S.P.C.K., London, 1968, pp 159-185, esp. pp 160f. Moule in his review of Dietrich's book [*JTS*, 25, (1974), pp 170-173] questions his certainty that Peter's change from ἐπιστάτα to κύριε here implies so much – are we convinced that ἐπιστάτα in the transfiguration story (9:33) should be understood as Peter's 'gaff'?

of my Lord”(1:43); the angel calls the saviour born *χριστὸς κύριος* (2:11); the promise to Simeon was that he would see *τὸν χριστὸν κυρίου* (2:26); and in the light of 1:43, 1:76 about the future role of John, the referent of *κύριος* becomes ambiguous. 5:8 is the first use in the Gospel of the vocative *κύριε* and it is addressed to Jesus by Simon. While it does not necessarily carry any more weight than its use by the leper, how the absolute term has been used especially in the infancy narrative makes the vocative too an ambiguous term with much potential for development in Christological awareness and expression.²⁵

The reply of Jesus to what Simon has seen or perceived is *μὴ φοβοῦ* (v.10). This is a characteristic reassurance in an experience of epiphany – 1:13, 30; 2:10; 8:50. Its Hebrew equivalent occurs 75 times in the OT, sometimes in reassurance to a human experience of theophany, *e.g.* Ex. 20:20, Ju. 6:23, Dan. 10:12. So here Creed comments, “The Divine Lord reassures his awestruck follower”²⁶. The sense of wonder is shared by all those with Simon, presumably those in both boats. And the wonder is also shared by James and John, sons of Zebedee, who are here introduced into the Gospel. They are described as *κοινωνοί τῷ Σίμωνι*, but are presumably distinguished by Luke from the *μετόχοις ἐν τῷ ἐτέρῳ πλοίῳ* (v. 7), and from the *πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ* (v. 9), by the *ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ* which introduces v. 10. If James and John are not in one or other of the boats, it is hard to see how they could have witnessed the amazing catch until it is brought ashore; this remains one of the uncertainties of the narration that is readily attributed to a clumsy use of Mark as one source among others. James and John will play further parts in the Gospel story (8:51, 9:28,54) and John will form a duo with Peter at Lk. 22:8 (LkR) and in Ac 3:1,3,4,11; 4:13,19; 8:14. Dictionaries do not offer a clear distinction between *μέτοχος* and *κοινωνός* both of which appear here for the only time in Luke-Acts; that they

²⁵ C. Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke*, pp 82ff.

²⁶ J. M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St Luke*, p.75.

are distinguished here suggests a different kind of partnership between Simon, James and John. After a long discussion, Dietrich²⁷ concludes with Plummer²⁸ - “As distinguished from κοινωνός ... which suggests the idea of personal fellowship, μέτοχος describes participation in some common blessing or privilege, or the like. The bond of union lies in that which is shared and not in the persons themselves” – and with Campbell²⁹ “to render μέτοχοι by a word expressing less intimate association than that used to translate κοινωνοί”. One may then see an anticipation here in the relationship of Simon, James and John of the κοινωνία which Luke will describe as one of the distinguishing marks of the life of the earliest Christian community (Ac 2:42).

The incident concludes with the call of Simon to become ἄνθρώπους ζωγρῶν. The response of (all?) the fishermen is to land their boats, leave everything behind and follow Jesus. In leaving everything behind, they present a model of what is required in 14:26, 33; it is recalled by Peter at 18:28, whether or not πάντα is accepted as the reading there.³⁰ Luke’s redaction of Jesus’ reply to Peter at 18:29 includes his οἰκία as Mark does, omits Mark’s ἄγροί, because none of the Twelve had fields, and this kind of sacrifice was transferred in Luke’s narrative to Ac 4:34-37, and adds, especially appropriately for Peter, γυναικα. The catching of people alive is in contrast to fishing, but this change in Peter’s calling suggests that the catch of fish at the instruction of Jesus does serve as a symbol of his future task of evangelism. The Gospel has no indication of outstanding success for the apostles (9:10), but Peter’s preaching in Acts does bring an amazing number of converts (2:41, 4:4), a small indication that the story of Acts was part

²⁷ Dietrich, p.71.

²⁸ A. Plummer, *International Critical Commentary, Luke*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1901, pp 143f.

²⁹ J. Y. Campbell, “KOINΩΝΙΑ and its Cognates in the New Testament”, in *Three New Testament Studies*, Brill, Leiden, 1965, 1-28, p. 10.

³⁰ Manuscripts that have πάντα in place of ἰδία are probably influenced by the parallels in Mark and Matthew; a few manuscripts have both.

of the author's intention when writing the Gospel³¹. Is the choice of the verb ζωγρέω appropriate not only because those 'caught' are alive, but because 'life' is an appropriate term for the salvation the Gospel offers? Pesch³² says that in the LXX ζωγρέω is used only of humans, not animals, and owes to Grollenberg reference to the striking phrase in Joshua 6:25 LXX about Rahab, ἐζώγησεν Ἰησοῦς. Jean Delorme's interpretation, "il s'agit d'arracher les hommes à l'empire de la mort"³³, may be regarded as an over-interpretation. Catching fish is also taking them alive; indeed it is an aspect of the Pythagorean miracle referred to above that the fish remain alive in the air once caught for long enough to be counted and returned to the water. There is, then, a danger here of the etymological fallacy, assuming that the presence of ζωή in ζωγρέω is uppermost in the user's mind – the only other use in the NT is 2 Tim. 2:26, where it refers to the devil's capturing people to do his will – they are indeed alive but that life is hardly salvation! Ζωή as a description of salvation is characteristic of Johannine vocabulary (e.g. Jn 10:10); does Luke use it similarly? He repeats the phrase ζωὴν αἰώνιον from Mark (10:25; 18:18,30) and employs it as our desired destiny in Ac 13:46, 48. Closer to meaning the redeemed state itself, not subsequent on death, is the phrase μετάνοιαν εἰς ζωὴν (Ac 11:18). Most notable is the unique Christological title put on Peter's lips at Ac 3:15, ἀρχηγός τῆς ζωῆς though the sense here depends on the interpretation of the whole phrase, 'Leader to life', 'Source of life', (in creation or redemption?)³⁴.

The call of Simon is more strictly a statement in the future tense. So it would better be described as an annunciation like that to Zechariah (1:13) and to Mary

³¹ Cf Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures* 17.21 - Peter "captured in the spiritual net of his words about three thousand souls".

³² "La rédaction lucanienne du logion des pêcheurs d'hommes", in F. Neirynck (ed.), *L'évangile de Luc*, Gembloux, 1973, pp 225-244.

³³ "Luc V.1-11: Analyse structural et histoire de la rédaction", *NTS*, 18 (1971-2), 331-350, p. 340.

³⁴ See p.78.

(1:31), noting again the use by Peter of the same phrase as Mary's³⁵. The call of Levi (5:27f) is formally different, an imperative, "Follow me". The phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, favoured by Luke (1:48 [Mary again]; 12:52; 22:18, 69; Ac 18:6), marks a significant turning-point in the story.³⁶

Having established that the catch of fish is a symbol of future missionary activity, catching people, the question is raised whether some of the details of the narrative also have symbolic or allegorical meaning. Wuellner³⁷ argues that the initial fruitless fishing close to the shore, like Jesus' preaching to the crowd on the shore, represents the later futile Christian mission to Jews, that launching out into the deep is the Gentile mission, and that the breaking of nets represents controversies between Jewish and Gentile Christians! Can we be sure the fruitless night's fishing was close to the shore? The interpretation of the nets seems to owe more to Jn. 21 and its treatment of the net, than to what we can find in Luke's text. Mánek³⁸ understands the deep water against an OT and mythological background. The catch is made in the deep during the daylight, and represents Christians above the water in the light, rescued from the depths of sin and darkness, but always in danger of themselves sinking (*cf.* Mt. 14:28ff). Again, this imaginative interpretation has little indication in the text. Zillesen³⁹ thinks that the history of Acts and the mission of Paul legitimised as additional to the mission of Peter (as at Ac 15:7ff) is allegorised in the two boats. The second boat is not to be understood, he rightly says, as belonging to James and John, whose presence in the text is a recollection of the original call of the disciples as related by Mark. But we have to comment that neither

³⁵ See above, p. 210.

³⁶ Dietrich, p. 58.

³⁷ *The Meaning of "Fishers of Men"*, p. 217.

³⁸ "Fishers of Men", *Nov Test* 2 (1957-8), pp 138-41.

³⁹ "Das Schiff des Petrus und die Gefährten vom andern Schiff", *ZNTW*, 57 (1966), pp 137-9.

ships nor fishing provide metaphors for the Church or the Christian missions in Acts. All these interpretations are over-interpretation.

The call of Simon to mission, subsequently confirmed in his being named as one of the twelve apostles (Lk. 6:13f [LkR]), goes back to the early days of Jesus' mission⁴⁰. This is in keeping with the view of apostleship expressed by Peter in Ac 1:21f. There may be a polemical note here, contradicting a view of apostleship to be found in Paul's letters, that regards it as dependent upon an Easter or a post-Easter commissioning. Leaney⁴¹ suggests that the prominence given by Luke to the call of Peter and the meagre reference to the resurrection appearance to Peter (Lk. 24:34), relates to the Pseudo-Clementine despising of apostolicity based on vision, and stresses that Peter's apostolic authority is from the beginning and not just post-Easter. However, Luke's 'meagre' reference to the appearance to Peter is much more than the other gospels, which do not mention it at all (unless it were in a lost ending of Mark, or unless Jn. 21 is a total recasting of it)!

So, to conclude, the wonder of the catch of fish moves Simon's understanding of Jesus up a gear, from itinerant healer and teacher to a sense that here he is agent of the divine. He is ready, along with others to leave everything behind and go with Jesus, becoming a catcher of people. The future activity and success of Peter is anticipated here, but at this critical point we are reminded that even he, and all who are called into discipleship, are sinners in need of the mission of Jesus to save sinners.

⁴⁰ H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, p. 264, agrees in seeing this as part of the *function* of Lk. 5:1-11, but adds to "apostolische Sendung" Peter's "Primatialgewalt".

⁴¹ "Jesus and Peter".

The source(s) of Luke's narrative

There is every indication that Luke has known and used Mark's account of the call of the fishermen (1:16-20), together with his setting of the teaching of chapter 4, namely to a large crowd (ὄχλος πλείστος v.1; Lk. ὄχλος) by the lakeside (Mk. θάλασσαν; Luke more aptly, like Josephus, calling it λίμνην), where he got into a boat (Mk. πλοῖον Lk. δύο πλοιάρια or πλοῖα [v.l.] but then ἐν τῶν πλοίων) and sat to teach. The case for Mk. 1:16-20 also being part of Luke's *Vorlage* for Lk. 5:1-11 is that this passage replaces Mark's in the narrative, though not at the same point. The setting is the Sea of Galilee (Lk. the lake of Gennesaret), where there are fishermen, a boat (Lk. boats), the mending (Lk. washing) of nets; the same *personae*, Simon, James and John, except that Luke makes no mention here of Andrew, who has no individual role in the Gospel or Acts. Above all, Luke's narrative owes to Mark the contrast of Simon's old vocation and his new. In Mark it is a summons, joint with Andrew δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλεῖς ἀνθρώπων, for which Luke's ἀνθρώπους ἐση ζωγρῶν may be regarded as a redaction. We have established that Luke sees the fishing as a metaphor for mission. This could also be what Mark's phrase meant by "fishers of men". However in Biblical imagery, fishing is often a symbol for judgement⁴² - Amos 4:2, Hab. 1:14f, Jer. 16:16, Ezek. 29:4; also 1QH XIII (formerly V) 7-8 and Mt. 13:47-50. So the call to the fishermen could well have been understood as a summons to the eschatological task of judgement, carrying out what the Baptist had fore-warned. If that were so, Luke's rewriting of the summons effects a change of understanding, making it now refer to mission. Or, it may be that the Jesus tradition itself had given the metaphor of fishing, like the metaphor of leaven, a good sense

⁴² Charles W. F. Smith, "Fishers of Men – Footnotes on Gospel Figures", *HTR*, 52 (1959), 187-203; Wuellner, *The Meaning of "Fishers of Men"*; Mánek, "Fishers of Men".

rather than bad. “The Lukan narrative reflects the conversion of the eschatological call into a form more congenial to the post-pentecostal Church.”⁴³ Establishing that Mark is part of Luke’s *Vorlage*, we have confirmation in his redaction of Mark that he wishes to give prominence to Simon, rather than equal attention to two sets of brothers. He makes Simon a boat-owner, which is not clearly the case in Mark. He increases what is given up to follow Jesus to πάντα in keeping with the radical demands made later in the Gospel, whereas Mark’s James and John leave father, boat and hired men, effectively the family business. Luke creates a relationship between miracle and discipleship⁴⁴, the call to which follows miracle, as in the call of the Twelve, 9:1.

More tricky to assess is the relationship between Lk. 5:1-11 and Jn. 21. It is generally agreed that Jn. 21 forms a supplement or second ending to the Fourth Gospel. It contains a variant account of a wonderful catch of fish, by seven disciples headed by Simon Peter and including the unnamed sons of Zebedee. The setting is post-resurrection, and described as the third appearance of the risen Jesus to his disciples. There is a night’s fishing without a catch. Then Jesus is seen on the shore but unrecognised. He tells them to cast the net on the right side and then the catch is so big they cannot haul it in. The Beloved Disciple now recognises “the Lord” and naked⁴⁵ Peter dresses and jumps into the water. The rest bring the boat and net of fish to shore. On the shore there is a charcoal fire burning – ἀνθρακιά, just as at 18:18, the fire at which Peter warmed himself and denied Jesus. Jesus tells them to bring fish and Peter single-handedly hauls the net ashore. After breakfast with the Lord, there is a threefold question and commission to Peter, presumably

⁴³ Smith, “Fishers of Men”, p.202.

⁴⁴ Paul J. Achtemeier, “The Lukan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: a Preliminary Sketch”, *JBL*, 94 (1975), 547-562, p.550.

⁴⁵ Raymond E. Brown *The Gospel According to John*, Chapman, London, 1972, p. 1072 argues rightly that γυμνός need not mean total nudity; he thinks it absurd that Peter should have put on more clothing before swimming ashore, and suggests that he tucks διεζώσατο his ‘fishing smock’ into his cincture to avoid taking it off to swim. This seems too wooden an interpretation. Surely γυμνός should alert the reader to the symbolism of similar behaviour by Adam in the garden when he encounters God.

reinstating his call after his threefold denials. He warns Peter of martyrdom in old age, reissues the call “Follow me”, and finally there is a question about the future of the Beloved Disciple, which itself could well be a major reason for the addition of this supplement. The interplay of Peter and the Beloved Disciple is a strong feature of Jn. 20:1-10, as it is here, with the Beloved Disciple being the first to recognise Jesus but Peter the first to reach Jesus.

The relationship between Lk 5:1-11 and Jn. 21:1-14 could be one of three – that John is dependent on Luke; that Luke is dependent on John; that both Luke and John are dependent upon a common oral or written tradition. Evidence for a literary relationship is slender. The strongest point of identity is the joint naming Σίμων Πέτρος (Lk. 5:8, Jn. 21:2,7), unique in Luke and Acts but 17 times in John. Elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels, this formulation is found only in that passage with a strong Petrine interest, Mt. 16:16, but this does provide evidence that the formulation is not uniquely Johannine. The identifying of Simon here as Peter, in anticipation of Luke’s own notice in 6:13 of Jesus so naming him, could be a deliberate underlining of the significance of the epiphany of v. 8 for the whole future of the Christian mission and Simon’s role in it; the apostolic mission is grounded in the pre-Easter will of Jesus, and his calling of Peter and others, from the beginning.⁴⁶

Is there other evidence for a literary relationship? Jesus is called ὁ Κύριος at Jn. 21:7 and addressed κύριε at Lk. 5:8. The “definitely Christological” use of κύριε here is quoted by Barbara Shellard⁴⁷ in her thesis that Luke used John, though we have found grounds for qualifying her “definitely”. Otherwise there is in common the vocabulary of boat, net and fish; the presence of the sons of Zebedee, and the similar

⁴⁶ See Heinz Schürmann, “Die Verheißung an Simon Petrus – Auslegung von Lk 5,1-11” in *Ursprung und Gestalt*, Patmos-Verlag, Düsseldorf, 1970, pp 268-273; Dietrich, pp 44f.

⁴⁷ *New Light on Luke- its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context*, Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, p. 239.

statements - δι' ὅλης νυκτὸς κοπιάσαντες οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν (Lk. 5:5); ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἐπίασαν οὐδέν (Jn. 21:3). Jn. 21:19 has ἀκολουθεῖ μοι which may be compared with Lk. 5:11, Mk. 1:18 ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ; Mk. 1:17 expresses the command δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου. I do not think these agreements amount to making Luke secondary to John. "The differences between the two accounts are more striking than the similarities."⁴⁸

The big question, however, is whether or not John preserves the original setting of a tradition of a wonderful catch of fish, namely post-Easter. Some, as we have said, find traces of such in Luke's use of κύριε, in the sense of awe and fear and especially in Simon's sense of being a sinner, (*ex hypothesi* because of his denials). Luke, it is argued, has moved this tradition to the pre-Easter ministry of Jesus because all of his resurrection narrative is located in or around Jerusalem, and the fishing narrative clearly requires a location at the Sea of Galilee. He has also moved it to make the point that the apostolic call goes back to the beginnings of Jesus' public life and not just to the Easter experience. In so doing, *ex hypothesi*, Luke would have had to remove most of the features of the form of a resurrection appearance story as identified by Dodd⁴⁹ -

For supposing the story to have referred in the original tradition to the period after the resurrection, practically every *formal* feature of post-resurrection narratives has been eliminated. There is no initial separation between Christ and his disciples, no unexpected appearance, no recognition: only the commission to Peter remains as representing the word of command with which such narratives commonly close. The features which are common to Lk. 5 and Jn. 21 (with this one exception) are those which, even as they occur in John, are not *characteristic* of post-resurrection appearances.⁵⁰

Thus substantial evidence for Luke's dependence upon Jn. 21 or something very like Jn. 21 is lacking. So the remaining question is whether there was in the tradition

⁴⁸ S.O.Abogunrin, "The Three Variant Accounts of Peter's Call: A Critical and Theological Examination of the Texts", *NTS*, 31 (1985), 587-602, pp 593f.

⁴⁹ C.H.Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels", in D.E. Nineham (Ed.), *Studies in the Gospels – Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*, Oxford, 1955, pp 9-35.

⁵⁰ p. 23.

about Jesus an account of a catch of fish, in which Peter plays a prominent rôle, which is put to use by Luke and John in their different contexts, or whether the story could be a Lukan creation building on the Markan texts, and which was subsequently known and adapted by the author of Jn. 21. In support of the case that Luke has brought together parts of his Markan *Vorlage* together with a tradition about the catch of fish, it is argued that the unevenness of the narrative, the mixture of singulars and plurals, the second boat and uncertainty who is in it, and who leave everything to follow Jesus, are signs of a clumsy mixing of sources. Alternatively they can be seen as unimportant uncertainties about which the narrator was making assumptions not expecting a police cross-examination. In arguing for Luke's creativity here, Goulder⁵¹ shows that the vocabulary of the non-Markan verses is sufficiently 'Lukan' as not to necessitate another source. So a reasonable case can be made for Luke's creative shaping in 5:1-11, introducing a dramatic wonder story to undergird Simon's commission to fish for people, which is subsequently developed by the author of the supplement to John's Gospel. Jn 21 thus serves as evidence for the development of the fishing miracle as symbolic of the mission of the church, and the refiguring with regard to Peter his following of Jesus to involve a pastoral role as well as an evangelistic role.

Simon is Named Peter and an Apostle

Luke marks a new series of events by ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις⁵² with an accusative and infinitive construction (6:12). The temporal reference is joined by the location reference – “the mountain”, which for Luke is a place of prayer and

⁵¹ *A New Paradigm*, pp 322, 326-8; cf also John C. Hawkins *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd edition, Clarendon, Oxford, 1909, pp 16ff.

⁵² Dietrich, p.84 comments, “(nicht: ἐκεῖναις !), die wir in einem späteren, mit dem Auftreten des Petrus selbst gegebenen Zusammenhang (Apg. 1,15ff.) eingehender untersuchen müssen.” *NRSV* translates “those” in both places!

revelation⁵³. After a whole night in prayer⁵⁴, indicative of the solemn decisions about to happen, Jesus calls all his disciples together and chooses twelve of them whom he named apostles.⁵⁵ Whereas Mark explains that the purpose of the Twelve is to be “with” Jesus and to be sent to preach and have authority to cast out demons (3:14f), Luke does not explain the purpose of the Twelve at this point. Nevertheless the night of prayer and the following sermon on the plain to all the disciples suggest that they have a major significance in his strategy. The Twelve are named beginning with Simon “whom he also named Peter”, a name not explained by Luke here or anywhere else, though it is the preferred way that Luke refers to him in the rest of Luke-Acts, and it is taken over from Mark⁵⁶. This deliberate naming Σίμωνα ὃν καὶ ὠνόμασεν Πέτρον, (contrast v.15 Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον ζηλωτὴν) suggests a sense that the first-called occupies a role of stability in the apostolic college. Peter is the only one who is given a name by Jesus, in contrast to Mk 3:17, where James and John are nick-named Boanerges.⁵⁷ That the number of apostles relates symbolically to the “twelve tribes of Israel” is confirmed by Lk 22:30. One can properly speak of “le fondement d’un nouveau peuple de Dieu”.⁵⁸ The names of the Twelve are the same as in Mark, except that Thaddeus is replaced by Judas of James; the order too is the same, except that Andrew, Peter’s brother comes second in Luke and the

⁵³ Cf. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, p. 44; Mathieu, p. 89, thinks of the section between 6:12 and the Transfiguration as “D’une montagne à l’autre”.

⁵⁴ Dietrich, p. 85, argues that the genitive in the phrase ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ is unique.

⁵⁵ LkR unless we adopt the longer text of Mk 3:14. Ἀποστολοὶ (1/1 or 2/ 6+28/1) is Luke’s preferred way of speaking of the Twelve – Lk 6:13, 9:10, 17:5, 22:14, 24:10.

⁵⁶ Jn 1:42 also offers no explanation of this name for Simon. The naming and mission of the Twelve in Mt 10:1ff notes Simon’s additional name without explanation. Mt 16:18 interprets the name as the rock upon which Jesus will build his church. A metaphor of apostolic foundation is also found in 1 Cor 3:10ff and the deuterio-Pauline Eph 2:20. In the OT ‘Rock’ is occasionally a name for God, e.g. 2 Sam (2 Kgdms) 22:2, κύριε πέτρα μου, though the LXX version at the equivalent Ps 18 (17):2 does not translate the metaphor but interprets it, as in most of the OT uses of this image, as noted by Cullmann, *TDNT*, 7.95 note 9. That the Aramaic כִּפְא could be a personal name has been established by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Kepha’ and Peter’s Name in the New Testament”, in his *To Advance the Gospel*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Cambridge UK, 2nd edition, 1998, 112-124, while admitting that “the meaning of his name and the significance attached to the change of it” remain problematical. For Luke we can only comment as we do in the next sentences.

⁵⁷ P. Dschulnigg, *Petrus im NT*, p.72.

⁵⁸ Mathieu, p. 83.

second Judas precedes Judas Iscariot. The list in Ac 1 is the same as in Luke, without Iscariot, and the order is the same except that John precedes James immediately after Peter, and Andrew moves to follow James.⁵⁹

The Mission of the Twelve

The Twelve Apostles with Peter the first-named have been appointed and addressed by Jesus. In 9:1 they are commissioned with power and authority over demons to cure disease and are sent to proclaim the Kingdom of God and to heal. Thus they extend the ministry of Jesus who sends them (ἀπέστειλεν). They are instructed to travel light, conditions recalled by Jesus at the apostolic supper (22:35), though the details (“no sandals”) are closer to the charge of the Seventy-two (10:4). Authorised, charged and sent the Twelve go on their mission, travelling through the villages, announcing the good news and healing everywhere (9:6, which is a re-write of Mk 6:13, omitting exorcisms and anointing for healing). This experience is rekindled when Peter and John preach the good news through the Samaritan villages (Ac 8:25) and when Peter goes on a tour of the saints (διερχόμενον 9:32), which includes healing miracles as well as preaching.

The interlude of the mission is filled with a report of speculation about who Jesus is, and the anxiety of Herod the Tetrarch about such reports. Herod states that he has beheaded John, Luke’s only reference to this which in Mark’s account is told in detail as a flash-back during this interlude in the mission. Luke’s brevity is echoed in the equally brief notice of the beheading of James the apostle by another Herod (Ac 12). Luke adds to his Markan *Vorlage* a note that Herod sought to see Jesus (Lk 9:9), anticipating their meeting during the Lukan Passion (23:8ff).

The apostles return from their mission and recount to Jesus what they had done; he then withdraws them to the city of Bethsaida. Luke omits Mark’s fuller version

⁵⁹ See above pp 43f.

of Jesus's invitation to come aside from the crowds for rest and renewal, but his choice of the verb ὑποχωρέω reminds us of the only other NT use of this verb at 5:16, where Luke uses it for Jesus' withdrawal for prayer. However, the crowds follow him and Jesus preaches the kingdom and heals the sick. Towards evening it is the Twelve (LkR) who suggest that the crowd should be sent away to get provisions, but Jesus tells them (emphasized) to feed them. Using what little they have, Jesus blessed, broke and gave to the disciples (as Mark; for Luke this is either a lapse or a deliberate recalling that the Twelve are a select group among his disciples) to distribute to the five thousand strong crowd. When all are fed, they collect up twelve baskets of broken pieces, that is one for each of the apostles, so as to enable them to continue to feed others (?), either literally or "symboliquement la nourriture spirituelle que les Douze, avec Pierre à leur tête distribueront à tout le peuple, ce à quoi ils ne seront toutefois habilités qu'après avoir reçu l'Esprit promis dans le livre des Actes."⁶⁰ Anyway, Peter's role in witnessing the miraculous feeding is only as one of the Twelve. The feeding miracle is enclosed with the two speculations of who Jesus is and by the mission of the Twelve and Peter's recognition of who Jesus is. Luke may be implying that, along with the other miracles that Peter has witnessed, the feeding has played its part in his development of perception, just as the miracle of provision may have encouraged more general speculation with regard to Jesus' role, mindful of Elijah's miracles of provision and more especially his successor Elisha, who fed a hundred with a few loaves (2 Kgs 4:42-44).

Tertullian in his treatise *Against Marcion*, in seeking to mock the heretic's separation of the creator God of the OT from the God of the NT, offers a running commentary on this part of Luke's Gospel (Book 4 chaps 21-22), tracing the thread of the Twelve being sent on their mission, without material provision; then the multitude is fed in

⁶⁰ Mathieu, p. 102; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1. 217.

the manner of the OT, referring to Moses, Elijah and Elisha; he then relates this to Peter's being a witness of the feeding, and so able to acknowledge "the Creator's Christ"; Peter has yet to learn that the Creator's Christ has to suffer, as the OT foretold; then it is the servants of the OT God, Moses and Elijah who are seen in glory with Jesus. Tertullian's thread sounds surprisingly like the narrative thread that the modern critics find!

Peter Recognises the Messiah

Following the feeding of the five thousand, Luke omits all of Mark's sequence from 6:45 to 8:27, including all of Jesus' excursions outside Israel. As we have noted before, Luke reserves the spread of the Gospel beyond Israel to the ordered developments of Acts. There are hints that Luke did know this section of Mark – *e.g.* Peter's vision in Ac 10, we have argued, alludes to Mk 7:19 – so his omission is deliberate, and not because he had a defective copy of Mark, as Streeter⁶¹ argued. So in Luke's account, the feeding of the five thousand is followed by Peter's confession, and this also takes place, presumably, in the vicinity of Bethsaida. However he marks the beginning of a new section with ἐγένετο with the accusative and infinitive (Lk 9:18), telling again of Jesus' praying alone, κατὰ μόνας, but with the disciples present. If this seems self-contradictory, it anticipates the similar situation of Jesus' prayer on the Mount of Olives (22:40ff). Jesus asks them who the crowds (LkR) say he is. Their answers echo the speculation of Herod, reported in the interlude while the Twelve were on their mission, that he is John the Baptist, Elijah, or one of the ancient prophets arisen (from the dead). Jesus then asks the disciples who they say he is. Peter alone⁶² (in an emphatic position in the sentence) replies τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. This is a rare formulation⁶³. It recurs in the rulers' mockery at the Crucifixion (23:35), where it is joined with ὁ ἐκλεκτός (*cf* the divine

⁶¹ B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp 176f.

⁶² Mathieu, p.107, argues on the basis of the use of first person plural in Acts where Peter is 'porte-parole' that here he is **not** speaking on behalf of the others.

⁶³ Dietrich, p.97, regards it as unique, arguing that at 23:35 the genitive belongs with ὁ ἐκλεκτός.

Voice at 9:35). It is implied in Ac 3:18 τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ and 4:26 in the citation of Ps 2:2. In Luke's infancy narratives Simeon is told that he would not die until he had seen τὸν χριστὸν κυρίου (2:26), and there is a variant reading in the message to the shepherds at 2:11 χριστὸς κυρίου⁶⁴ rather than the overwhelming majority reading χριστὸς κύριος. What significance are we to find in this particular formulation that Peter uses? Of course the Messiah was thought of as *God's* Messiah. Could we argue that for Gentile readers Luke is making it clear that 'Anointed' is in relation to God? This would fit with the Nazareth sermon where the anointing by the Lord (*i.e.* YHWH) is described and seen as fulfilled in Jesus (4:18, echoed by Peter in Ac 10:38). However Luke has already used χριστός without explanation for non-Jews – as well as in the Birth narratives, where at 2:26, at least, a reader could get a hint of Jewish messianic expectations, ὁ χριστός is used absolutely at 3:15, in speculation about the role of John, and at 4:41 in the evangelist's comment about the demons' recognition of Jesus; incidentally this is when Peter is present. Peter, then, in his confession is describing Jesus as the Messiah of Jewish expectation⁶⁵, which some had wanted to identify with John, but the Lukan narrative consistently identifies with Jesus.

Luke's usage elsewhere makes it inconceivable that he thinks Peter's identification of Jesus as God's Anointed is wrong. Yet Jesus in strong terms doubly commands the disciples collectively not to say this to anyone, and goes on immediately, in the same sentence, εἰπὼν, to speak of the rejection, suffering, death and resurrection of the Son of Man (a phrase or title used already at 5:24, 6:5, 22, 7:34 – that Jesus himself is intended by Luke is beyond doubt, proven by the identification in Ac 7:55f). The reason for the disciples' silence then is that ὁ χριστός without the qualification of the divine destiny of suffering (δεῖ v.22), which the disciples are now having to learn, would be a

⁶⁴ apparently the Old Latin 7th century β and r1, the Palestinian Syriac, and the text known to Ephrem the Syrian. If the manuscript evidence were a lot stronger we could speculate that this was the original reading, with a variant making Christ 'Lord', *i.e.* God, a textual error adopted for its 'higher' Christology.

⁶⁵ Dietrich's argument (pp 99ff) that the title already for Peter does not have any such political implication, but implies suffering, death and resurrection, is hard to sustain.

seriously flawed understanding of that messiahship. The Acts will show Peter and the rest after Pentecost openly proclaiming Jesus, crucified and raised, as Lord and Messiah (2:36 *etc.*).

For the present the disciples have to learn a pattern of life, paradoxically described as ‘losing life’ and so ‘saving’ it. Their attitude to Jesus and his teaching will determine their destiny when he comes as Son of Man in glory. This pattern for daily living (9:23) is described as “taking up their cross”. This is the Gospel’s first mention of a cross or crucifixion; it hints of the manner of death the Son of Man will suffer (v.22), both for the disciples in this narrative and for any of Luke’s readers who have no prior knowledge of what lies ahead for Jesus. The prior instruction of Theophilus (1:4) almost certainly would have included something about the crucifixion. This description of discipleship will be repeated at 14:27. In the Roman world, the cross as metaphor would not only suggest pain but shame.

In the first prediction of the Passion following immediately after Peter’s recognition of the Messiah, Luke has omitted from Mark (8:32f) Peter’s rebuke of Jesus’ prediction and Jesus’ rebuke of Peter as Satan. This could be interpreted as Luke’s softening of what he sees as a harsh treatment of the apostles. Alternatively, Conzelmann advances the theory that Satan in Luke had departed at 4:13 for the special period of Jesus’ ministry, to reappear at 22:3⁶⁶. More radically we could regard Lk 22:31 as a total recasting of Mark’s saying with regard to Peter and Satan in a way which avoids any suggestion that Peter is Satan by way of metaphor, role or possession.

The sayings speak of the future *glory* of the Son of Man, who is associated with the glory of the Father and the angels (9:26) and give the solemn assurance that some of them will not die before they have *seen* the kingdom of God. In the next episode which is temporally tied as being a week⁶⁷ later, three disciples do *see* Jesus in *glory* (9:32) along with Moses and Elijah also in glory (v.31), both of whom (?) had been assumed to heaven.

⁶⁶ *The Theology of St Luke*, p.16; unfortunately for his theory, action with regard to Satan happens also at 10:18, 11:18, 13:16 or the devil (8:12), and 4:13 does not specifically identify the devil as Satan.

⁶⁷ ‘About eight days’ – ὥσεύ is fairly common in Luke with times and numbers (6x), whereas 2:21 marks precisely eight days; however we note its use at Acts 19:7 with ‘twelve’, where twelve would seem to be a precise and symbolic number. That this appears to be a deliberate redaction of Mark’s precise ‘six’, some symbolic sense has been sought for ‘about eight’ here – an allusion to the feast of Booths (Lev 23:36), there being another more probable allusion in the booths Peter later offers to make; or eight as the number of

John's Gospel, has an equivalent to Peter's Confession (6:68ff) but none to the Transfiguration; for John the whole incarnate life of the Word is a manifestation of God's glory. It is striking that both Luke and John, unlike Matthew and Mark, place Peter's Confession soon after the Feeding of the Five Thousand and near the Sea of Galilee. Neither Luke nor John has a rebuke for Peter, let alone as Satan; John regards Judas as a devil. Peter acclaims Jesus as the one who has the words of eternal life, as ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ (6:69), and does so at a critical moment when many disciples are turning away from Jesus. Brad Blaine⁶⁸ defends the portrait of Peter here against those who find an anti-Petrine motif in John, which seeks to cast him in a poor light and who belittle his Christological title here⁶⁹. It is a title that incidentally is given to Jesus by a demon at Lk 4:34 – whether it has a very different significance from another demon's 'Son of God' (4:41) which Luke equates with Messiah, is doubtful.

Peter sees Jesus in Glory

Luke's redaction of the Transfiguration has many distinctive features. Again it is described as a time of prayer on the mountain – cf 6:12, 22:39f. The conversation between Jesus, Moses and Elijah is about his ἔξοδος to be accomplished in Jerusalem. The heavenly voice like at his baptism (3:22) proclaims Jesus as ὁ υἱός μου, ὁ ἐκλεκτός (v.l. as Mark, ἀγαπητός), and also as the prophet like Moses, ὁ αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε is an allusion to Dt 18:15. Peter, along with James and John is taken by Jesus up on the mountain. It is to be thought of as a night of prayer, and the disciples are weighed down in sleep, and awaking they see Jesus' glory and the two men, Moses and Elijah standing with him. At least this would be the sense if the *hapax-legomenon* διαγρηγορήσαντες in v.32 means 'to become fully awake', but it properly means 'to stay awake' – in spite of being very sleepy.⁷⁰ If the latter is meant, then Peter and his companions, as the three are

the new week, resurrection day and so of the new world (cf Ac 9:33, *Barn.* 15). Luke has not made any such allusions clear to the reader.

⁶⁸ in a seminar paper "Peter's Call and Confession in the Gospel of John", incorporated into his D. Phil. thesis (Oxford) and published as *Peter in the Gospel of John: the making of an authentic disciple*, Brill, 2007.

⁶⁹ e.g. Goulder, *St Paul Versus St Peter*, SCM, London, 1994, p.21.

⁷⁰ Luke's use is the first in Greek literature. Liddell & Scott, p. 343, cite 3rd Century CE Herodian for a meaning to 'keep awake' and a Byzantine meaning 'to awake out of sleep'. This latter reference is given more fully in Arndt & Gingrich, p. 181. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 385, noting the two possibilities, finds little difference of meaning because even if they have remained awake, they have been too sleepy to take in the conversation of Jesus with Moses and Elijah, and are not witnesses to it. C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, SCM Press, London and Trinity Press International, Philadelphia, 1990, p. 418, argues that the aorist participle would indicate a change in their state of wakefulness. He sees the sleep as a conventional feature of visionary

described in v. 32, may be thought of as having seen the transfigured Jesus and heard the conversation (though the *NRSV* translation of ἰδοὺ in v.30 as “Suddenly they saw” is misleading). If however we are to think as the disciples as really asleep, suddenly awakening to the sight, and then, because the two men (or is it all three, including the glorified Jesus?) are withdrawing from him, ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ – note that the focus is all on Peter – Peter blurts out to Jesus his delight to be there and suggests they make three tents or booths⁷¹, one for each, to prolong their presence or indeed to make it permanent.

I think that Luke intends that the disciples are really asleep because this scene will be recalled by the reader when Jesus prays on another mountain, the Mount of Olives (22:39ff), a prayer of agony about his approaching death, when (in some texts) another heavenly being appears to strengthen him. Jesus then finds the disciples sleeping and arouses them, but the evangelist excuses their sleep as being ‘because of grief’. These echoes of the Transfiguration scene would appear to be deliberate⁷². If the same three disciples had been singled out as in the Markan parallel then the connection would be closer. If the prayer of agony echoes the Transfiguration, then in Luke’s compositional plan, the Transfiguration anticipates that prayer – certainly the death of Jesus and its purpose is the subject of both. A link could also be made with Ac 12:6ff, where Peter is asleep and has to be awakened by the angel that has come to release him from prison.

Peter addresses Jesus as ἐπιστάτα, (Lk 9:33 for Mark’s ῥαββί) which Dietrich⁷³ regards as inadequate for a glorious figure, and so, along with his suggestion of making booths, a lapse both from his recognition of Jesus as Messiah and from his change of address to κύριε in 5:1-11. There we questioned the weight Dietrich gives to the change. Feuillet⁷⁴ likens Peter’s suggestion of booths to the ‘homely’ invitation of the disciples at Emmaus “Stay with us” (24:29) – Peter is saying that Jesus’ presence is good for us. The evangelist excuses his inappropriate suggestion by commenting μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει. He

experience, citing 2 *Enoch* I. 3-6, where Enoch is asleep, sees two men in burning light, but then awakens to find the vision real and rises to worship.

⁷¹ Cf the Tabernacle in the Wilderness period, also the eschatological hope for God’s dwelling with his people (Ezek. 37:27, also *Enoch* 41:2, 71:16); the shelters made at the Feast of Booths; the use of the imagery of the incarnation in Jn 1:14, and for the human body at 2 Pet 1:13f in a context which goes on to recount the transfiguration.

⁷² cf A. Kenny, “The Transfiguration and the Agony in the Garden”, *CBQ*, 19 (1957), 444-452; also Conzelmann *The Theology of St Luke*, pp 58f; however C.F. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 418, denies this link.

⁷³ Dietrich, pp 114f.

⁷⁴ A. Feuillet, “Les perspectives propres à chaque évangéliste dans les récits de la transfiguration”, *Biblica* 39(1958), 281-301.

owes this to his Markan *Vorlage*, and we would not have thought it important if it were not for the somewhat ambiguous motif of ignorance which we traced in Chapter Six. Then a cloud overshadows the disciples and they are full of fear as they go into the cloud⁷⁵. From the cloud they hear the divine voice. After that Jesus is alone with them and the scene ends by stressing that they talked about this to no one at that time, bringing their experience and learning on the mountain into the silence commanded after Peter's Confession (9:21). Peter had a correct recognition of Jesus as God's Anointed, but these new Christological terms that God's Voice proclaimed went beyond this or anything the crowd's assessments suggested; seeing the glory of Jesus leaves him in a stunned silence that disables the experience from being useful for the disciples for the rest of the ministry of Jesus⁷⁶. 'Son of God' is not used by Peter as a Christological title in his proclamation in Acts.

There is a smaller degree of identity between Luke and Mark in the Transfiguration than in the previous paragraph. As previously noted, Luke changes Mark's 'six days' to 'about eight'. He inverts the order of James and John (as at 8:51), perhaps reflecting the greater importance of the role of John in the Luke-Acts narrative. In describing the Transfiguration he avoids the term *metamorphosis*, possibly because of its pagan associations, and omits Mark's simile of the fuller. He transfers the disciples' fear, from being an excuse for the suggestion of making shelters, to the moment of entering the cloud, which in Mark only overshadows them. The heavenly Voice calls Jesus ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος rather than Mark's ὁ ἀγαπητός; in the words at the Baptism (Lk 3:22), Luke had been happy to keep Mark's ἀγαπητός (most texts) or chosen to substitute a fuller citation of Psalm 2:7 (Bezae and others). Goulder calls Luke's change here "a minor mystery"⁷⁷! The conversation on the way down the mountain after the Transfiguration is omitted by Luke, replaced by the note about their silence (v.36b) "in those days". This note is vaguer than Mark's silence until after the Resurrection. It also avoids the question of Elijah's coming, raised by his appearance on the mountain, and leading to the conclusion that

⁷⁵ "As for the disciples, they are more than spectators, for perhaps by describing *their* entry into the cloud and the accompanying fear which they experience, Saint Luke is picturing them as plunging after their Master into the new and dread stage of their calling." So A.M. Ramsey, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*, Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, Toronto, 1949, p.122; Ramsey does not comment on whether or not the disciples were asleep.

⁷⁶ cf Dietrich, p.116, "Petrus versteht einerseits Jesu Messianität durchaus korrekt, andererseits entbehrt sein Wissen der Vollständigkeit, sofern ihm und den beiden Begleitern die 'topographische' Bestimmung des Endes Jesu vorerst noch verborgen bleibt."

⁷⁷ *A New Paradigm*, p. 442.

Elijah has come in the person of John the Baptist (explicit in Matthew, but correctly interpreting Mark). Conzelmann's view that this is part of relegating Elijah and Moses to the past, never as precursors of the Kingdom,⁷⁸ needs qualification. John the Baptist is not explicitly identified by Luke with the role of Elijah (note the omission at Lk 3:4 of the Malachi citation from Mk 1:2, and the omission of John's Elijah-like dress from Mk 1:6), but Lk 1:17, 76 do give John an Elijah-like role. Jesus himself is described with Elijah typology, especially at the beginning of the Travel Narrative and in the Ascension story, as well as being identified as the prophet like Moses, explicitly by Peter at Ac 3:22. Either Luke's divergencies from Mark are Luke's own work, "rewriting his Marcan source freely"⁷⁹, or there can be postulated another source or sources of tradition. This is argued by T. Schramm⁸⁰, who lists the large number of Semitisms found here⁸¹, and uses the large number of 'minor agreements' with Matthew⁸² as evidence. I do not find his argument persuasive.

The Transfiguration anticipates both the prayer of Jesus on the Mount of Olives and his ascension to glory, and so all of his *exodus* about which he had spoken with Moses and Elijah. Peter has witnessed the glory and heard the heavenly Voice, even if in his slumber he has not heard the conversation. Peter has other visionary experiences – the resurrection appearances of Jesus and his eating and drinking with them (if these had any of the quality of visions), the ascension to heaven, and his own vision of the sheet on the roof-top in Joppa where he had gone to pray, and the real deliverance from prison by the angel. In Acts Stephen and Paul also receive visions. However, the Transfiguration is not referred to by Peter in Acts, as it is in 2 Peter 1:16-18. There the eye-witness testimony is contrasted with "cleverly devised myths" in support of the teaching given about the δύνανμιν καὶ παρουσίαν of Christ. The words of the heavenly Voice match those in Matthew's account rather than Luke's, and there is no reference to Moses and Elijah or to Peter's proposed booths. Peter does refer to his own death as his *exodus*. Accounts of the Transfiguration have coloured the vision in the Ethiopic version of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, 15-end, a work which develops the characterisation of Peter as a visionary. That the

⁷⁸ *The Theology of St Luke*, p.25.

⁷⁹ Ramsey, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*, p.121.

⁸⁰ *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, CUP, 1971.

⁸¹ He lists the ἐγένετο construction, 9:28,29, 33; ἐν τῷ + infinitive 9:29,33,34,36; καὶ ἰδοὺ 9:30; the periphrastic conjugation 9:32; καὶ αὐτοὶ 9:36; and the parataxis at 9:34,36.

⁸² Cf. F. Neirynck "Minor Agreements Matthew-Luke in the Transfiguration Story" in Paul Hoffmann, Norbert Brox and Wilhelm Pesch (Eds), *Orientierung an Jesus Zur Theologie der Synoptiker für Josef Schmid*, Herder, Freiburg, 1973, pp 253-266.

disciples are praying with Jesus is owed to Luke; that it is called the “holy mountain” to 2 Peter. The two men who shine with glory are identified to Peter as Moses and Elijah. It is Peter’s suggestion of making three tabernacles that brings Christ’s wrath against Peter, calling him Satan, because he has not understood about the heavenly glory. The words of the heavenly Voice are closer to Matthew and Mark than Luke. Then a white cloud takes the three figures away into heaven, like at the ascension of Jesus. Tertullian continuing his polemic *Against Marcion* (4.22), explains Peter’s ignorance in suggesting three tabernacles on the principles of “the new prophecy” (Montanism); because he was genuinely in the ecstasy of the Spirit, Peter could recognize Moses and Elijah.

Between the Transfiguration and the beginning of the Passion narrative, Luke has two more specific references to Peter, 12:41 and 18:28. 18:28 was discussed above. In addition to the parallel to Lk 18:28, Mark has two, 11:21 and 13:3. 11:21 concerns the withered fig-tree, an incident omitted by Luke or replaced by a parable (Lk 13:6-9) in which an unfruiting fig tree is reprieved for another chance; if both fig trees in some way represent Israel, the parable offers them another chance to accept Jesus, much as does Peter in his preaching in Acts. Mk 13:3 is the question from Peter, James, John and Andrew which instigates the Apocalyptic Discourse. Luke’s redaction here gives the initial question to an indefinite third person plural. Luke has also kept the location still in the Temple, where Jesus teaches, as Peter and the apostles will later in Acts, rather than Mark’s Mount of Olives which for Luke is a place of prayer, not teaching.

Peter’s question at Lk 12:41 (along with 5:1-11 and 22:31f) is a distinct Lukan contribution to the figure of Peter. His question is in response to the parable of the slaves awaiting the return of their master from a wedding banquet who are themselves then served dinner by the master (Lk 12:35ff). He asks whether the Lord is telling this parable for “us or for everyone”. Jesus’ reply is in terms of a faithful steward who is put in charge of the other slaves to give them food at the proper time. The implication is that Peter and the other apostles are given greater responsibility and so from them more is required, both in the current time of the mission of Jesus but even more so in the post-Easter time of the church’s mission.⁸³ Making better arrangements for the distribution of food to ‘lesser’ slaves is what the apostles do in Ac 6. The image of ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος is

⁸³ So Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1.217.

singular in response to Peter's individual question and so suggests that Peter among the Twelve may have this responsibility.

Stewardship as a metaphor for ministry and leadership is found at 1 Cor 4:1f, 9:17, Tit 1:7; also at Ignatius *Ephesians* 6:1, though the different vocabulary, πέμπει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης εἰς ἰδίαν οἰκονομίαν, is against it being an allusion to Luke; also in Cranmer's *Ordinal*. Goulder⁸⁴ argues that Luke could have taken this image from a reading of 1 Corinthians. Jesus' answer to Peter goes on to contrast a faithful steward with one who abuses his charge, a contrast which could reflect Shebna and Eliakim in Is 22:15ff, a text important enough to have produced many variants and corrections by the Christian editors of Sinaiticus, and a principal source of the 'keys' imagery in the charge to Peter in Mt 16:19. As a Christian image we find it also in Rev 3:7. That Luke did have in mind the contrast of Eliakim (= Peter) and Shebna (= Judas) receives support from the punishment of the unfaithful steward, διχοτομήσει αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων θήσει, which Mathieu⁸⁵ relates to Judas' physically bursting in the middle, as noted in Chapter Two. After these Q sayings, Luke continues to answer Peter's question with the sayings on differential beatings (12:47f). Those who know (noting again this Lukan motif) their master's will are beaten (δέρω, used of the apostles at Ac 5:40) more severely than those who do not. According to Goulder,⁸⁶ Luke has interpreted διχοτομήσει as a colourful hyperbole for flogging, letting off "the ordinary Christian" who has acted in ignorance, with a less severe punishment.

The Apostolic Supper

The context of Jesus' word to Peter in Lk 22:31f, which is the hinge for the whole of Luke's account of Peter, is the fellowship of a meal. This is reminiscent of the Lukan interest in a meal as the setting for teaching (e.g. 7:36ff, 14:1-24), and inviting the suggestion of his having as model the Greek symposium⁸⁷. Because this is the last supper of Jesus with his disciples, it can also be regarded as a farewell discourse, and invites comparison with the farewell speeches of leaders before their deaths in Biblical and

⁸⁴ "Did Luke know any of the Pauline Letters?", *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 13 (1986), 97-112, p.99.

⁸⁵ Mathieu, p.136.

⁸⁶ *A New Paradigm*, p. 551.

⁸⁷ E.g. E. Springs Steele, "Luke 11:37-54 – A Modified Hellenistic Symposium?", *JBL*, 103 (1984), 379-394.

Hellenistic literature. Kurz⁸⁸ identifies up to twenty common features in the Biblical, Jewish⁸⁹ and Greco-Roman⁹⁰ examples he cites, though none of them occur in all his examples. Those that he finds in Lk. 22 are references to the leader's own mission or example, his impending death, exhortations, warnings, tasks for his successors, revealing the future, promises, future change for the worse, renewing covenant, care for those left, and consolation of an inner circle. We might ask whether other farewell discourses are set, like Lk. 22, within the context of a meal. The Biblical examples that Kurz cites are not. Marion Soards⁹¹, referring to Léon-Dufour's article, calls the Last Supper a 'testamentary banquet', which offers "a mini-course for the reader in Christology, eschatology and ecclesiology"⁹². *The Testament of Naphtali* does set the testament within a feast, (1.2, 9.2). Stauffer⁹³ also refers to Gen. 27:25,33, *Jubilees* 35:27, 36:17 (all concerning Isaac). Most of all, the farewell meal of Lk 22 is identified as the Passover, the meal commemorating salvation. The farewell address of Jesus in Luke invites comparison with the long Last Supper discourse of John 13-17. There is much common ground – the prophecy of Judas' betrayal under the influence of the devil (Jn. 13:2) or Satan (13:27, Lk. 22:3); Judas who is sharing in the meal (Jn. 13:26f, Lk. 22:21); the prophecy of Peter's denials, located at the supper (Jn.13:38, Lk. 22:34), rather than on the way to Gethsemane (Matthew and Mark); the expectation of trouble and persecution (Jn. 15:18, 16:1f, 33); concern and prayer about the future of the disciples and the care and growth of the Church

⁸⁸ William S. Kurz, "Luke 22:14-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses", *JBL*, 104 (1985), 251-268.

⁸⁹ 1 Macc. 2:49-70; 1 Kgs 2:1-10; Dt. 31-34; Josh 23-24; 1 Sam. 12:1-25; 1 Chron. 28-29; Tobit 14:3-11, Philo, *Vita Mosis* 2.288-92; Josephus, *Antiquities* 4.8.45-49 §§ 309-31, 12.6.3 §§ 279-84. Kurz could also have referred to *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*; Xavier Léon-Dufour, "Das letzte Mahl Jesu und die testamentarische Tradition nach Lk 22", *ZKT* 103 (1981), pp 33-55, argues that Luke is closest to the *Testament of Naphtali*.

⁹⁰ Plato, *Phaedo*; Plutarch, *Cato Minor* 66-70; *Otho* 15-17; *Anthony* 75; *Pericles* 38-9; *Alexander* 73,76; Diogenes Laertius, *Epicurus* 10:16-18; Dio, *Oratio* 30; Tacitus, *Annals* 15:62-3 (Seneca); *Agricola* 45

⁹¹ Marion L. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke – The Special Material of Luke 22*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.

⁹² p. 57.

⁹³ Ethelbert Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, SCM Press, London, 1955 – Appendix VI, pp 344-7, "Valedictions and Farewell Speeches".

(Jn. 15:1-11, 17:1ff, Lk. 22:28-34); teaching about how the disciples should relate to each other (Jn. 13:14, 34, Lk. 22:24-7). Above all, the image of Jesus as table-servant in Lk. 22:27 finds a counterpart in the action of foot-washing in Jn. 13. John and Luke reveal a parallel tendency to develop the Last Supper into a farewell address to the disciples. John's is the more developed; a case can be made for his being inspired by Luke's.

The prelude to the Passover meal is the beginning of the account of the betrayal of Jesus by Judas at the instigation of Satan (22:3), and Jesus' arrangements for the preparation of the meal, instructing Peter and John (22:8 LkR; Mark has two unnamed disciples), who will appear again in a combined rôle in Acts 3, 4 and 8. The solemn setting is described as Jesus reclining for the meal with 'the apostles' (LkR), and so it is appropriate to call this the Apostolic Supper. His discourse begins with the pathos of describing his desire to share this Passover with them before he suffers, and his declaration, however, that he will not eat it⁹⁴ before it finds its eschatological fulfilment in the Kingdom of God, which also lies beyond his suffering. So he gives thanks over one of the Passover cups and passes it to the apostles, with a vow of abstinence until the Kingdom comes. He does likewise with the broken bread, adding the enigmatic words which reinforce the expectation of his suffering, "This is my body"⁹⁵. Having done this, Jesus abruptly warns that an unnamed apostle will hand him over, an abruptness which is not diminished even if we decide on the longer reading with the second cup. The contrast of the prediction about a betrayer and the Son of Man's course determined by scripture (v.22) baffles the apostles. Nevertheless, and rather shockingly⁹⁶ they then go into a dispute

⁹⁴ i.e. not reading οὐκ ἐτι which would save Jesus his desire of v. 15 being unfulfilled, but detract from the vow of abstinence which follows.

⁹⁵ i.e. reading the shorter text of vv 19-20, as the harder reading and that which fits most closely with the 'breaking of bread' in the rest of Luke-Acts.

⁹⁶ I think that Luke intends this to be read as more than the friendly banter of social competition as is suggested by Peter K. Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship, A Study of Luke 22:24-30*, SBL Dissertation Series 138, Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1994 – a study which surprisingly stops short of verses 31-4!

about their own ranking. The re-locating of this dispute here heavily underlines the failure of the disciples to learn the way of Jesus. He uses metaphors from the meal context, which he has used earlier in the Gospel – *e.g.* 14:7ff about humility; 17:7ff, the expectations of a slave to serve his master; and 12:35ff where, in an astonishing reversal of rôles, the returning master waits on his slaves. Here at the Supper it leads up to one of those first person declarations so pregnant of Christological significance⁹⁷ ἐγὼ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. This dispute about greatness is largely transferred from Mk 10:41-45, with v. 27 being a Lukan redaction of Mk. 10:45, elaborating the image of διακονία, unconfused with the accompanying image of λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

In spite of the apostles' quarrel and Judas' planned betrayal, Jesus continues on a note of commendation by saying that they have stood by him in his πειρασμοί – they had not been present when Jesus was undergoing his πειρασμοί from the devil in the wilderness (4:1-13), but those are to be understood as prelude for the conflicts during the ministry (*e.g.* 11:16); the apostles were an example of those in whom the seed of the gospel had taken root and who had not fallen away ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ (8:13, LkR) – Luke's redaction of the interpretation of the parable of the sower moves the application up a gear, with explicit mention of faith and salvation (v. 12), and replacing Mark's σκανδαλίζονται, 'stumbling', with ἀφίστανται, the more radical break of 'defection'⁹⁸. In their time of sharing the mission of Jesus, they had been taught to pray, μὴ εἰσευέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν (11:4), a prayer that they will be urged to pray again after this supper (22:40). In another first person declaration, Jesus bequeaths to them what his Father has

⁹⁷ The first such in this Gospel is 2:49.

⁹⁸ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, p. 714; Dietrich, p.128.

covenanted to him, namely, a kingdom. This is described both as a feast⁹⁹, a renewing of the table fellowship he has had with them, and as their having thrones making decisions for the twelve tribes of Israel. It would take us far beyond the scope of this dissertation to discuss the whole of Luke's eschatology or his understanding of the Kingdom. However, if we ask *when* this prophecy is fulfilled, then the answer is that it is at least partially fulfilled in the post-Easter experience. Jesus shares table fellowship with them again (24:30,42f, Ac 10:41, and "the breaking of bread" in Acts); this would break his vow of abstinence at the Supper, if the time of fulfilment had not come, unless we were to understand that he continued to abstain from wine but not food, and to stress that the post-Easter meals, of course, were not Passover. In the account of Acts, the story of Judas is completed and his apostolic place among the Twelve is filled by Matthias. The apostles make decisions and judgements for the course of the Church in this matter and others (*e.g.* Ac 6), and also about individuals (*e.g.* Ac 5). It is not clear for Luke, in contrast, say, to Paul (Gal. 6:16), or 1 Peter (1:1), that the Church has become the "twelve tribes of Israel". Nor is it clear that the commissioning of the world-wide Christian mission (Ac 1:8) is to be understood as an answer to the apostles' prior question about the "restoration of the kingdom to Israel" (1:6). Yet such an understanding is not ruled out – the promises at the supper have at least begun to find fulfilment.

Following this promise to the apostles in the farewell discourse, there is the specific word to Peter and the prediction that he will deny Jesus, and this is our main focus. Following it, the address concludes with a warning about how the conditions of the apostles' mission are changing. Jesus refers back to his instructions to those he was sending out – in fact the details refer more closely to the sending out of the Seventy-two

⁹⁹ The idea of an eschatological feast expressed at 14:15 is common in Jewish literature; *cf* Is. 25:6-8, 34:6ff, 65:13f and references given by Behm in *TDNT* 2. pp 34f, 691. The banquet is linked to eschatological judgement in *Mishnah, Aboth* 3.17.

(10:4) rather than the Twelve (9:3), though the two are clearly meant to be in tandem. Times when they could depend on hospitality are giving way to times when they will need provisions and defence against hostility, just as Jesus himself is now to be “counted among the outlaws”, fulfilling the role of Isaiah’s Servant (Is 53:12)¹⁰⁰. The apostles reveal themselves as already beyond the law, by having to hand two swords. Yet again they have misunderstood the way of Jesus by taking his reference to a sword (v. 36) as a literal instruction to be armed, rather than a figurative description of the new dangerous circumstances for Jesus and his followers. At the arrest of Jesus they raise the question with Jesus, whether to use these swords (v. 49 LkR), and one of them impetuously cuts off the right ear (so from behind?) of one of the high priest’s slave before Jesus is able to reply. Jesus heals the ear, thereby removing the offence. Jesus’ final words in his farewell address, ἱκανόν ἐστιν, break off the dialogue, which has largely been concerned with the disciples’ roles, with them still not understanding¹⁰¹.

We now return to examine more closely the word to Peter in vv 31f, picking up the discussion in our previous chapter where we were examining Peter’s denials. Σίμων Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σοῦ ἵνα μὴ ἐκλίπη ἡ πίστις σου· καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.

We comment on some of the terms:-

Σίμων, Σίμων : so he is called both before his call to discipleship (4:38, 5:1-10) and after Easter (24:34) and in Ac 15:14, Συμεών ; often he is called ‘Peter’ (17x in Lk, including vv 8 and 34 here, 51x in Acts); sometimes there is a combination of Simon and Peter (Lk 5:8,

¹⁰⁰ Actual citations of Is. 53, as distinct from possible allusions, are surprisingly infrequent in the NT – Jn. 12:38, Rom 10:16, Mt. 8:17, 1 Pet. 2:22ff, Ac 8:32 – it is noteworthy that Luke is responsible for two of them.

¹⁰¹ “This short dialogue throws a brilliant light on the tragedy of the Ministry” is the verdict of T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, SCM Press, London, 1949, p. 341.

6:14, discussed earlier, and in Acts 4x, all within the Cornelius story, “Simon, called Peter”, distinguishing him from Simon the Tanner). The doubling of the proper noun in the vocative is Lukan – 10:41, Martha, 13:34, Jerusalem (also the // Mt. 23:37), Ac 9:4, Saul – and may be compared with 1 Sam. 3:10, Samuel; all are by Jesus or God. Wiarda¹⁰² regards all three of the double vocatives of the Gospel as Jesus “pointing out error or wrong in one for whom he feels affection”.

Σατανᾶς: Satan had entered Judas (v.3), and now threatens all the apostles. Here Satan’s role is similar to his role in Job 1-2 and Zech. 3:1ff; he wants to test the apostles’ faithfulness. This, however, is questioned by Neyrey¹⁰³ who argues that what is envisaged is a warlike attack by Satan. This would be more in keeping with the earlier reference to Satan and Judas. Might there be a variation here, that for Judas Satan is the implanter of an evil thought, like in 1 Chron. 21:1, while in sifting the Twelve his role is more like that in Job, prosecutor in the heavenly court? I am not arguing that Luke does not identify Satan with the devil – at 8:12 he replaces Mark’s ὁ σατανᾶς with ὁ διάβολος, and possibly also at 4:2, along with Matthew. However, Luke may have been aware that *satan* is originally a common noun, as indeed is the Greek διάβολος, ‘slanderer’, so that neither term necessarily implies a total metaphysical dualism, or should always be treated as a proper noun. Even if Luke knew the OT only in Greek, as is usually supposed, he would have read σαταν apparently as a common noun transliterating the Hebrew of 1 Kings 11:14 (and 23 transposed). We may note that σατανᾶς in Lk. 22:3 is anarthrous, whereas in v.31 it is ὁ σατανᾶς, like the Hebrew of Job 1:6 שָׁטָן; the LXX by and large translates *satan* by ὁ διάβολος, though at Job 2:3 Alexandrinus reads τὸν σατανᾶν. In any case as v. 31 continues, the role of the adversary in Job is in the background. The menacing

¹⁰² Wiarda, *Peter in the Gospels*, p. 135. Fitzmyer (*Luke*, p.894) says, “The repeated name gently chides.”

¹⁰³ Jerome Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke, a Redaction Study of Luke’s Soteriology*, Paulist Press, New York, Ramsey and Toronto, 1985.

accumulation of twelve sibilants¹⁰⁴ may also have influenced Luke's choice of the term *satan* in this verse.

Ἐξητήσατο : this is the only use of ἐξαίτέω in the NT, but Luke uses αἰτέω 12X (plus 10X in Acts), αἵτημα at 23:24 and ἀπαιτέω at 6:30 and 12:20. Stählin¹⁰⁵ argues that it means 'to demand the surrender of'. Plummer¹⁰⁶ argues that the "aorist of a compound verb necessarily implies *success* in the petition". There is an interesting parallel to the expression here in the *Testament of Benjamin* 3.3, "even though the spirits of Beliar claim you to afflict you with every evil...", ἐὰν τὰ πνεύματα τοῦ Βελίαρ εἰς πᾶσαν πονηρίαν τοῦ θλίψεως ἐξαιτήσωνται ὑμᾶς. A. W. Argyle¹⁰⁷ argued that the plural ὑμᾶς in our text was an 'echo' of the *Testament*, but F. J. Botha¹⁰⁸ rightly replied that often an individual is addressed about the whole group, offering examples at Lk. 11:59 and Ac 5:9. What Satan here demands is to sift all the apostles like wheat; the imagery is similar to that used in the Gospel by John the Baptist (3:17 // Mt. 3:12), the separation of the good wheat from the useless chaff (cf. also Amos 9:9). Σινιάζω is a rare term; its use here is the first cited use in Liddell & Scott¹⁰⁹.

If there is an intended contrast between ὑμᾶς and περὶ σοῦ, then there is a prior contrast between ὁ σατανᾶς and ἐγώ. The forensic character of the reference to Satan continues with the intercession of Jesus which outweighs the demand of Satan¹¹⁰. This prayer is for Simon that his πίστις will not fail. I take πίστις here to be his faithfulness

¹⁰⁴ As noted by Nicholas King's translation of *The New Testament*, Kevin Mayhew, Stowmarket, 2004, p.206.

¹⁰⁵ *TDNT*, I. 194, citing Josephus, *Antiquities* 5.152; 16.272.

¹⁰⁶ Plummer, *Luke*, p.503.

¹⁰⁷ "The Influence of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs upon the New Testament", *Expository Times* 63, (1952) pp 256-7.

¹⁰⁸ "Umās in Luke 22:31", *Expository Times* 64 (1952-3), p. 125. Argyle replied on p. 222 that he still found Luke "if not ungrammatical, at any rate (offering) a violent and ungraceful use of grammar"!

¹⁰⁹ p. 1389; also Fuchs in *TDNT*, 7. 291.

¹¹⁰ Dietrich, p.124.

under trial (*cf* Ac 14:22). 'εκλείπω is used twice more by Luke – 16:19 of mammon and 23:45 of the sun at the crucifixion. The prayer of Jesus is that Peter's faith may not give out (entirely). The following prediction of denial suggests that it is *only* because of Jesus' effective prayer that faith will not be totally eclipsed and that the denials will not be of a degree that equals apostasy. It is inconceivable that the prayer of Jesus should fail to outbalance the effectiveness of Satan's sifting, and so Luke must have understood the denials to be only a partial or temporary eclipsing of Simon's faith. The purpose of the prayer of Jesus, in Luke's view, is not some special favour for Peter, but for the sake of strengthening others, as the next phrase makes clear.

Ἐπιστρέφω : the sense of this word was discussed in Chapter Six, where I argued that it would imply some failure on Peter's part, from which he must turn and find forgiveness¹¹¹. What this temporary (but not total, because of Jesus' prayer) failing might be, is about to be spelled out. For the moment it is sufficiently enigmatic that it evokes a declaration of loyalty from Peter. But, before that, we have the brief word of commission for Peter's future role, the reason for Jesus' counteracting Satan's demand – στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.

The use of ἀδελφοί in Lk. 22:32 is the first such description of Jesus' followers; for Peter it will not only mean the other ten remaining apostles, but the growing post-Easter company of believers and the whole company of Israel who are being called to believe the resurrection and fulfill their vocation as God's family¹¹². This was the conclusion of our exploration of the term in Chapter Two (pp 55f).

¹¹¹ Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, p. 34.

¹¹² Cf. Mathieu, p. 210.

στήριζω: this term, with a literal meaning of fixing in place, or giving physical support, is so used at Lk. 16:26; also for the strengthening of ankles, Ac 3:7, 16¹¹³. The LXX phrase στήριζειν τὸ πρόσωπόν (Jer. 21:10, Ezek. 6:2, etc.) is used by Luke in the key verse 9:51, at the beginning of the Travel Narrative. It (Ac 18:23) and the compound ἐπιστηρίζω (Ac 14:22, 15:32, 41) are used in Acts to describe the activity of Christian leaders (though surprisingly never Peter) in confirming and upbuilding the Church's life and faith. The word is used of divine strengthening at 1 Pet 5:10. At Ac 15:32 the ministry of Judas and Silas is described παρεκάλεσαν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἐπεστήριξαν. Παρακαλέω, the parallel to ἐπιστήριζω is a favourite term for ministry in Acts, and is exemplified by Barnabas whose name it interprets. It would have been a good choice of verb for Lk. 22:32. Luke's choice of στήριζω here points more to the strengthening of the brothers by way of decision and structure, "les concepts de fermeté et de stabilité",¹¹⁴ as much as by personal encouragement. Certainly Peter's initiatives after Easter (and the aorist imperative may point towards specific actions), verifying the report of the women about the tomb (24:12), and his assembling the brothers together after the Ascension to make up the place of Judas in the apostolic Twelve (Ac 1:15ff)¹¹⁵ are of this kind of strengthening.

Peter's reply of loyalty to Jesus, and Jesus' foretelling Peter's denials were expounded in Chapter Six, along with their relationship to Mark. But the words of Jesus to Simon in 22:31f are unique to Luke, and of the greatest importance in ascertaining Luke's account of Peter, set as they are in this farewell discourse at the Apostolic Supper. The presence of much material within Luke's Passion narrative led Vincent Taylor¹¹⁶ and others to the hypothesis of a coherent pre-Lukan passion narrative which was distinct from

¹¹³ 1 Clement 33.3 uses it of the Creator's establishing of the world.

¹¹⁴ Mathieu, p. 210; Harder, *TDNT*, 7. 653-7; also see above pp 55ff.

¹¹⁵ cf Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1996, pp 320f; contra Marshall, *Luke*, p.822.

¹¹⁶ Vincent Taylor (edited by Owen E. Evans), *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, C.U.P., 1972.

Mark and John and was used by Luke. In Chapter Six we were not convinced that Luke's primary source did not have an account of Peter's denials, and so we are invited now to examine the possibility that the whole of Lk. 22:31-34 is a rewrite of his Markan *Vorlage*, with vv 31-3 replacing Jesus' prophecy of offence, of the disciples being scattered when the shepherd is struck, and his instruction to them to go after his resurrection to Galilee. The story that Luke tells does not suggest a flight of disciples when Jesus is arrested; rather they are among οἱ γνωστοί who watch the crucifixion from afar (23:49). Evidence that Luke has introduced the masculine γνωστοί here (probably under the influence of Ps 38:11 [37:12 LXX], οἱ ἔγγιστά μου ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔστησαν) and regards them as additional to the γυναῖκες of Matthew and Mark, is suggested by the feminine participle ὁρῶσαι where an inclusive masculine may have been expected¹¹⁷, though a feminine by attraction to the nearer noun, is not impossible. If Luke has replaced Mark's imagery of attack on the flock with a no less vigorous image of the sifting of wheat, the citation of Zech. 13:7, the only specified scriptural citation by Jesus in Mark's passion, is perhaps then replaced by Is. 53:12 at Lk. 22:37.

If, however, Lk. 22:31-4 is all a rewrite of Mk. 14:27-31, then we have to come back to the specific focus upon Peter which Mark does not have. A specific future role for Peter is also to be found in Mt. 16:17-20, an insertion into the account of Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, and in the post-Easter story of Jn. 21:15-19, all reflecting or advocating the prominence of Peter in the early years of the Church. Cullmann¹¹⁸, whose prime interest was the interpretation of Mt. 16 and its application to the Roman papacy, observes some connections of content between the three texts and also with the

¹¹⁷ Ann Graham Brock, *Mary Magdalene, the First Apostle: the Struggle for Authority*, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2003, p.34, sees this as evidence of Luke's downgrading the witness of the women and upgrading that of the apostles.

¹¹⁸ Oscar Cullmann, *Peter, Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*; also his "L'Apôtre Pierre Instrument du Diable et Instrument du Dieu. La place de Matt.16:16-19 dans la Tradition Primitive", in A.J.B. Higgins (Ed.), *New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, Manchester University Press, 1959, pp 94-105.

Johannine version of Peter's 'confession', Jn. 6:66ff. Cullmann¹¹⁹ distinguishes three elements in our Lukan text (22:31-34) – "(1) The vow of Peter that he will go with his Lord to prison and to death" [which, he argues, is to be compared with Jn. 6:66f, Peter's commitment to stay with Jesus, and with Jn 21:18ff, the prediction of Peter's martyrdom]; "(2) The prediction of Peter's denial" [which is also located in the other Gospels at (Jn. 13:36ff) or after (Mt. 26:34ff; Mk. 14:30ff) the Last Supper – the three-fold questioning of Peter about his love for Jesus in Jn. 21 echoes the three-fold denial]; "(3) The command of Jesus to strengthen his brothers after his conversion" [a specific commissioning of Peter with regard to his responsibility in the community of believers, is also found in Mt. 16 using the imagery of building and the power of the keys like the steward of a large household, and in Jn. 21 using the imagery of shepherding Christ's flock]. Cullmann argues that there was a "*common source*"¹²⁰ for Mt. 16:17ff, Lk. 22:31ff and Jn. 6:66ff, which was also known to the author of Jn. 21, and that its original setting is preserved not by Jn. 21, post-Easter, but by Luke, namely, the Last Supper.

That the Petrine commissions in Mt. 16, Lk. 22 and Jn. 21 are somehow related seems clear to me. Cullmann's hypothesis of a common source underlying them involves bringing the texts of Peter's confession also into the equation. I think that in terms of identifying tradition Jn. 6:66ff merits separate discussion alongside Mark's account of Peter's confession. Cullmann¹²¹ finds support for the Last Supper being the original context for the tradition placed at Mt. 16 in the reference to Satan in Lk. 22:31, and the reference to Judas as devil in Jn. 6:70; Matthew has placed his commission of Peter in the context where his Markan *Vorlage* has called Peter Satan Mk 9:33 // Mt. 16:23, omitted by Luke, who agrees with John that Judas is Satan, but not Peter! This is

¹¹⁹ *Peter*, p.189.

¹²⁰ p. 191, emphasis his.

¹²¹ p.189.

sufficiently confusing, that in place of Cullmann's hypothesis of a common source I would want to argue for a looser inter-relatedness Mark → Matthew → Luke → John 21. Luke has chosen the Last Supper as the context to *create* a discourse about discipleship which looks to the immediate and to the eschatological future, and has, we argued, brought material from other contexts to do so, namely Mk. 10:42ff. The rock image, implicit in the name Peter, and explicit in Matthew, may also have influenced Luke's use of στηρίζω, being a firm physical support. It is worthy of note that the name and nick-name are both used in all three of these forms of a charge to Peter – Mt. 16:17f, Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ ... Πέτρος ; Jn. 21:15ff, Σίμων Ἰωάννου ... ὁ Πέτρος ; Lk 22:31ff, Σίμων ... Πέτρε. Peter's confession as related by Mark, which became the setting for Matthew's version of the charge to Peter, may also be a source for the language of Lk. 22:31f. Luke omits at 9:22 the rebuke of Peter as σατανᾶ (Mk 8:33), but refers to Satan at 22:31f. The use of the word ἐπιστρέψας was possibly suggested by Mk. 8:33 ἐπιστραφείς. In John we have indeed what Shellard¹²² calls a "re-commissioning"; i.e. it presupposes a commissioning whose validity might be called into question by the fact of Peter's denials. It seems to me that the author of Jn. 21 has known some version of Jesus' special commission to Peter, and something very like Luke's account of the catch of fish, which he has understood in the way that Luke also does, as a symbol of the apostolic call to mission after Easter, and that in a masterly narrative he has combined them with a setting of the post-Easter meal and the imagery of shepherding from Jn. 10.

Evidence of the influence of Lk 22:31-34 on other writers is scant. The distinctive term here, στηρίζω is used in another Petrine context, alongside other terms which have both a literal and physical as well as a metaphorical sense, 1 Peter 5:10 - καταρτίσει, στηρίζει, σθενώσει, θεμελιώσει. 'Peter' is writing of God's strengthening of

¹²² *New Light on Luke*, p. 225.

the suffering believer, but is doing so in a context where he is addressing (he uses the verb παρακαλῶ) the elders of the churches, as their fellow-elder (5:1). The four terms can all relate to physical structures but are used as metaphors of spiritual support, here of God, but possibly with a hint that this is how the elders should be with each other. The first of them is used of James and John mending their fishing nets at Mk. 1:19 (Lk. 5:2 has fishermen washing nets); the second is used of Peter's special ministry at Lk. 22:32, and by 'Peter' also at 2 Pet. 1:12; the third term is a *hapax*. and the fourth, literally 'laying a foundation', might echo the metaphor of Mt. 16:18. When one adds the pastoral imagery for ministry (5:2, ποιμάνετε) which is the imagery of the commission of Peter in Jn. 21:16 (ποιμαίνει) and of Paul (not Peter) in Ac 20:28, then it may not be fanciful to suggest that the Petrine texts of the Gospels or the traditions they represent, lie behind the language of 1 Pet. 5. There are further connections with Lk. 22:31ff to be observed. 1 Pet. 5:8 warns the readers about ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος reminiscent of a forensic adversary, like Satan in Lk.22:31, Job, *etc.*, though ἀντίδικος is not used in the LXX to translate שָׂטָן. The readers are to resist στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει. Peter's faith was the subject of Jesus' prayer against Satan in Lk. 22:32. Though the dictionaries do not explicitly support this, I suggest there is a relationship between the roots of στερεόω and στηρίζω in that both have the same meaning physically and metaphorically. The same verse, 1 Pet. 5:9 goes on to speak of the church as ἀδελφότητι, a term used also at 2:17 and nowhere else in the NT. Silvanus is called τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ at 5:12. Could this term too be influenced by Lk. 22:32? All in all I think that there is a case that 1 Pet. 5 represents the earliest application of Lk. 22:31f, or of the tradition behind it. The case would depend upon a dating of 1 Peter after Luke-Acts, say, around the turn of the first century, but that in any case seems plausible to many scholars.

If the previous paragraph seems wildly speculative, then we may next draw attention to what is undoubtedly a reference to our passage, namely Ignatius of Antioch's

Letter to the Smyrnaeans 7, which refers to the apostles being sifted and the prayer of Jesus that their faith not fail – applied to all, not just Peter. Unfortunately this is in the longer, interpolated version of Ignatius, dated to the fourth century, and has no equivalent in the shorter and more original text. Coming from a similar, if not the same, provenance as Ignatius’ interpolator, in the *Apostolic Constitutions* 5, the Apostles in the first person warn heretics and schismatics of the devil’s attack, by referring to Jesus’ prayer for them (plural) to save them from the devil’s sifting of their faith. It is the prayer of Jesus that is the interest also in other patristic citations. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 4.9, “Satan has desired to sift you; but I have prayed”; Tertullian, *De Fuga in Persecutione* 2, citing Satan’s request to sift them and the prayer of Jesus for Peter, “that the devil should not have power granted to him sufficient to endanger his faith”; Cyprian, *Treatise* 4, *On the Lord’s Prayer* 30, cites Lk. 22:31 as evidence that the frequent prayers of Jesus were not for himself “for why should he who was guiltless pray on his own behalf? – but for our sins”; similarly in Cyprian’s *Epistles* 7.5, urging frequent and earnest prayer. Cyprian also confirms our suspicion that the potentials of our Lukan text were not exploited by those arguing about the authority of bishops or of a primacy amongst bishops deriving from the special commission to Peter; in his treatise *On the Unity of the Church* 4, Cyprian cites and comments on Mt. 16:18f and Jn. 21:15, but makes no reference to Luke. Tertullian likewise in *On Modesty* 21, discusses what is the power of the “keys” given to Peter in Mt. 16:18, without any reference to Luke. Apollinaris of Laodicea¹²³ does link Lk 22:31 with Jn 21.

Peter in Luke’s Resurrection Narrative

Having denied Jesus, Peter goes out weeping bitterly (Lk 22:62). We may deduce that in some sense he was later a witness of the crucifixion, unnamed among Jesus’

¹²³ *Frag. In Joh.* 155, referred to by M. Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter*, p.203.

acquaintances, watching from a distance (23:49). On the Sunday morning, the women who had witnessed the burial of Jesus visit the tomb, find the stone rolled away and witness an angelophany. The two men in dazzling clothes tell them that Jesus has risen, and remind them what he had taught them in Galilee, namely that the Son of Man must be handed over to sinners, be crucified and rise again on the third day. This is a summary rather than citation of the three passion predictions (9:22, 9:44 and 18:31f). The women are not given any instruction or charge by the angels, but report it all to the Eleven (the Twelve minus Judas?) and “all the rest” (24:9); the women’s names are then given and they are said to have reported to “the apostles” (v.10), to whom it seemed an idle tale, nonsense, ὥστε λῆρος,¹²⁴ and they did not believe the women. Peter, however, stepping outside of this consensus, takes the initiative of arising and running urgently to the tomb, and so comes as a male witness to confirm the women’s story. Note the emphatic position of Peter - Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν. He comes away amazed, already edging towards faith in the resurrection. In terms of 22:32, Peter may be said to have already begun to turn and to be taking the action which will lead to the strengthening of his brothers.

This first episode in Luke’s Easter narrative would appear to be loosely based on Mark 16:1-8. Luke has two angelic figures for Mark’s one (*cf* the Ascension and Transfiguration), and the women, told of the resurrection are not instructed to go and tell the news to the disciples. The instruction in Mark that they are to go to Galilee to see Jesus there becomes in Luke, who confines the resurrection appearances to the environs of Jerusalem, a reminder of what they had been taught in Galilee. The singling out of Peter in Mk 16:7 is perhaps a kernel that is developed into Lk 24:12. Luke’s redaction effectively downgrades or even derides the women’s role as first messengers of the resurrection

¹²⁴ A NT *hapax* and uncommon elsewhere; Liddell & Scott, pp 890f; Arndt & Gingrich p. 474.

Gospel and replaces it with an emphasis on Peter¹²⁵. It prepares us for the first appearance of the risen Jesus to Peter, which in Luke's narrative occurs some time between 24:12 and 24:34. To confirm this reading of Luke's narrative, we have first to deal with **the text-critical question of the verse 24:12**.

This verse is not in Bezae or the majority of Old Latin witnesses. The vast majority of manuscripts have it, including p⁷⁵ (3rd century), itself sufficient to tip the balance of preference between NA²⁵ where it is in the apparatus and NA²⁷ where it is the main text. Its absence from Bezae makes it one of Westcott and Hort's 'Western non-interpolations' of which there are several in the passion and resurrection narrative of Luke, which they were persuaded preserved the original reading. Within the longer reading, there are additional variants¹²⁶. There are obvious similarities between this verse and Jn. 20:3-10, including vocabulary – ὁ Πέτρος (v.3), ἔδραμεν (ἔτρεχον ... προέδραμεν, v.4), τὸ μνημεῖον (v.4), καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει (v.5), ὀθόνια (κείμενα τὰ ὀθόνια v.5; τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα v.6), ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν (ἀπῆλθον... πρὸς αὐτοὺς v.10). If the shorter text of Luke is original, then v.12 could arguably be composed on the basis of John, by someone so familiar with the Johannine story that they felt the Lukan text deficient without it, and to provide a narrative antecedent to Lk. 24:24 (where the plural τινες is reminiscent of John's story which includes the Beloved Disciple as well as Peter). Ehrman¹²⁷ suggests that the verse is an orthodox anti-docetic corruption, which stresses the physical nature of the resurrection body of Jesus, and claims Peter as the first to embrace this view. But is not Luke, in any case, the evangelist who most stresses the physicality of the resurrection – 24:39-43, Ac 2:24ff, and the Ascension story explained as necessary to remove the physical body? If the longer text is original, it is easy to conceive how it might have been developed by John into his more elaborate and carefully nuanced interplay of Peter and the Beloved Disciple. The repetition of πρὸς in John 20:2 and the singular verb ἐξῆλθεν (20:3) before a double subject could be evidence of a form of the tradition to which the Beloved

¹²⁵ Brock, *Mary Magdalene, the First Apostle*, pp 34f; Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, SCM Press, London, 1983, p. 51. Evidence of later rivalry in the tradition with regard to the authority of Mary and Peter is found in *Gospel of Thomas* 51:18-25; *Gospel of Mary* 17:18-22, 18:7-15.

¹²⁶ τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα (Alexandrinus, etc.); τὰ ὀθόνια μονα (p⁷⁵, Sinaiticus as corrected, Vaticanus, etc.); τὰ ὀθόνια (Sinaiticus original); τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα μονα (ΘΨ 079, etc., *textus receptus*); τὰ ὀθόνια μονα κείμενα (L). In place of ἑαυτὸν a few manuscripts, including Vaticanus, read αὐτὸν, with the same meaning. It is likely that κείμενα is an assimilation to Jn. 20:5. K.P.G.Curtis, "Luke xxiv.12 and John xx.3-10", *JTS*, 22 (1971), 512-515, also regards Luke's μόνα as influenced by Jn. 20:7, the description of the head-cloth being separated from the rest of the ὀθόνια, and being 'pointless' in Lk. 24:12. This however is to misunderstand the purpose of the μόνα in Luke – it is the grave-cloths alone and not the body that Peter sees in the grave; it is not 'pointless'!

¹²⁷ *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, pp 212-217.

Disciple has been added.¹²⁸ It is not so easy to explain how the verse came to be omitted by Bezae.¹²⁹ The longer text shows evidence, as we have seen, of other variants influenced by Jn. 20, which we may suppose was better known to the scribes than Lk. 24. It could well be that some scribes found Lk. 24:12 so inadequate an account of the apostles' visit to the tomb, when compared with Jn. 20, that they opted to omit it all together. Some conjecture that Luke and John were drawing independently on a common source.¹³⁰

Is the issue then helped by a consideration of whether the language and style of the verse is Lukan or Johannine, or neither?

Ἀναστας: as a participle plus a main verb is characteristic of Luke (2/6/17+19/0), but the position of the subject before the participle is said to be untypical. There are only two other instances where Luke specifies the subject – 1:39 ἀναστᾶσα δὲ Μαριάμ; 23:1 ἀναστὰν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος. Frans Neirynck¹³¹ argues that rather than being a lapse from Luke's usual style, the placing of the subject, Peter, in 24:12 is to give the subject emphasis, a feature of Luke's redaction we have already noted elsewhere in Lk 9:20, another participial construction, again involving Peter, where the subject is put into an emphatic position – Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς (Mk. 8:29 ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος): he agrees with the interpretation of John Muddiman¹³² that "the second corroborating visit to the tomb was conducted by none other than Peter himself."

Μνημεῖον: this term is favoured by John (16x). It is used by Luke 7x +1, but μνήμα is also used (3x +2). Muddiman argues that μνήμα in the Gospel is always in dependence upon Mark (8:27, 23:53, 24:1), but, if the *v.l.* of 24:1 μνημεῖον is correct (p⁷⁵ ⲬC), Muddiman argues that Luke prefers this term for the tomb of *Jesus*, as at Ac 13:29 (contrast 2:29).

Παρακύψας: παρακύπτω is only used in the Gospels here and in Jn. 20:5,11. The etymology of the word should imply a stooping, and this would be an appropriate meaning for Jn 20:5 where the Beloved Disciple explicitly does not enter the tomb. But the word, even in classical usage came also to mean 'peep' or 'peer' through a door or window¹³³, and this is the meaning in the Greek Bible – James 1:25, 1 Pet. 1:12, Gen. 26:8, Prov. 7:6, Sir. 21:23 – and John 20:11 of Mary looking into the tomb. Either sense could arguably fit Lk. 24:12, but the prevailing sense of 'peering' is appropriate for all uses. Nevertheless, the sequence of identical words between Lk. 24:12 and Jn. 20:5 is striking – καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια¹³⁴. It is the historic present βλέπει that has

¹²⁸ Shellard *New Light on Luke*, pp 254-8.

¹²⁹ Marshall *Luke*, p.888.

¹³⁰ Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, UBS, 1971, p.184; also Fitzmyer, *Luke*, p.1547.

¹³¹ "Lc. xxiv 12: Les témoins du texte occidental", T. Baarda *et al.* (edd), *Miscellanea neotestamentica*, Nov Test Sup 47-8, Brill, Leiden, 1978, I. 45-60.

¹³² "A Note on Reading Luke xxiv.12", *ETL* 48, 1972, pp 542-8.

¹³³ Liddell & Scott, p. 1133.

¹³⁴ Though noting the variants in the footnote above.

evoked most comment. Luke makes little use of the historic present, while John is fond of it – there are another seven examples in Jn. 20:1-10.¹³⁵ Muddiman¹³⁶ is fair to argue against Curtis’ theory that 24:12 is an interpolation by a redactor, imitating Luke’s style – “He was, it seems, a close enough student of Luke’s style to know that ἀναστὰς, θαυμάζων and τὸ γεγονός in the same sentence would give it an authentic ring, but he had not noticed the so much more obvious stylistic aversion to the historic present.”

Ὁθόνια: this term only here in Luke, is used four times in John of the gravecloths of Jesus, including 19:40; in his account of the burial Lk 23:53 follows Mark in using σινδών, which Ehrman¹³⁷ regards as being at odds with the plural ὀθόνια. John uses κειρία for Lazarus’ burial strips and Luke uses ὀθόνη (of which ὀθόνιον is a diminutive) for the ‘sail-cloth’ of Peter’s vision (Ac 10:11, 11:5). So the evidence is not so strong that ὀθόνια at 24:12 is ‘Johannine’.

Ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν: this at first sight is similar to the ἀπῆλθον πρὸς αὐτοὺς of Jn. 20:10. Muddiman remarks that the expression is “no less exceptional in John than in Luke”. Barnabas Lindars¹³⁸ commenting on the RSV translation “to their homes”, says it is “an unusual idiom... foreign to John’s style”. Alternatively the πρὸς αὐτοὺς / αὐτὸν might be treated as representing the Aramaic ethic dative לְהוֹן / לֵה ¹³⁹ - ‘took himself/ themselves off’. C. K. Barrett¹⁴⁰ refers us to Num 24:25, הָלַךְ לְדַרְכּוֹ rendered in the LXX as ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτόν, and to Josephus *Antiquities* 8.124. Reference might also be made to Ezek.17:12, where the LXX πρὸς ἑαυτὸν renders אֶלְיוֹ. In Lk.24:12 πρὸς ἑαυτὸν could be read with θαυμάζων rather than with ἀπῆλθεν and this is how Jerome understood it, *secum mirans*, and the English AV, “wondering in himself”. Neiryneck¹⁴¹ argues for taking it with ἀπῆλθεν, which, he says, if John is dependent on Luke here, is how he must have understood it. He wishes not to argue for the sense of an ethic dative, but something much more like ‘to their home’. He does so on the basis of several places in Josephus’ *Antiquities*, where he says πρὸς ἑαυτὸν renders לְמִקְמוֹ or אֶל־בֵּיתוֹ or the like. Additionally he supports his argument that πρὸς ἑαυτὸν should be understood as a designation of place, on the basis of Luke’s narrative style in concluding some episodes – 24:33, the Emmaus supper concludes

¹³⁵ Luke is not averse to keeping a historic present in his source; e.g. 8:49 which is not a slavish copying of Mark because Luke changes Mark’s plurals into singulars, ἔρχεται. Luke also uses the historic present in a Q setting at 19:22, where Matthew has an aorist - Goulder, *A New Paradigm*, p.684, notes the “uncommon Lucan historic present” but offers no explanation of why, according to Goulder’s hypothesis of Luke’s dependence on Matthew, he should have replaced Matthew’s aorist here. There are historic presents in parables at Lk. 13:8, 16:7,23,29; also at 7:40, 11:37, 45, 17:37 and 24:36 v.l.

¹³⁶ p.545.

¹³⁷ *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, p.214.

¹³⁸ *The New Century Bible Commentary – The Gospel of John*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1972, p.603.

¹³⁹ Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, Oxford, 1946, p.77.

¹⁴⁰ *The Gospel according to St John*, S.P.C.K., London, 1958, p.469.

¹⁴¹ “ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΕΑΥΤΟΝ Lc 24,12 et Jn 20,10”, *ETL* 54 (1978), 104-118; Wiarda, *Peter in the Gospels*, p.105, also argues on the basis of Jn 20:10 that it should be taken with the verb rather than the participle, without any discussion of the relationship between Luke and John here.

with a journey to Jerusalem; v.52, the Ascension story similarly; 1:56, Mary returns home after her visit to Elizabeth – but none of these use πρὸς! Neirynck’s case is not overwhelming, and to take πρὸς ἑαυτὸν with θαυμάζων fits the dramatic stage of the narrative better – what is to be emphasized here is not where Peter went next, but his state of mind, as he moves towards faith in the resurrection. This interpretation goes along with the argument for the authenticity of this verse, interpreted or misunderstood by John. If we decided that an interpolator has used John for the basis of this verse, then ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν would need to be rendered in the same way one renders John’s equivalent phrase.

Θαυμάζων: this is part of Lukan vocabulary (7/4/13+5/6). Τὸ γεγονός: this is a Lukan expression which falls under Hawkins’ criteria (0/1/4+3/0)¹⁴². So the verse begins and ends with a Lukanism. Our survey of the language of Lk 24:12 leaves us concluding that it is not necessarily the work of an interpolator, nor dependent upon John.

So, the first episode in Luke’s resurrection narrative is mainly a redaction of Mark’s. Peter reacts differently from his fellow-apostles to the report of the women, runs to the tomb to confirm the women’s story, and begins the movement towards faith in the resurrection. There follows the long masterpiece of the walk to Emmaus which involves movement away from Jerusalem to Emmaus and back again, with two otherwise unknown disciples, who meet the risen Jesus both as a fellow traveler on the road, interpreting to them the scriptures, and in the breaking of bread when they give him hospitality. They immediately arise and return to Jerusalem where they find the Eleven and those with them gathered together in one place, saying “The Lord has risen indeed, and he has appeared to Simon” (24:34). Bezae has a variant, nominative λέγοντες for the accusative λέγοντας, ascribing these declarations to the two returning disciples rather than the assembled Eleven, leaving a puzzle as to how they had learnt this¹⁴³. To treat the declarations as

¹⁴² Goulder, *A New Paradigm*, p.802; Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, p.17.

¹⁴³ Origen also read the nominative and deduced that Cleopas’ unnamed companion must therefore have been a Simon.

questions rather than statements¹⁴⁴ would be equally puzzling especially for the second of them, regardless of which reading were adopted. The assembled disciples have begun to move from unbelief towards belief in the resurrection as a result of (i) Peter's testing out of the women's report of the empty tomb, and (ii) the report of the appearance to Simon, which they are declaring prior to hearing the report of the two disciples from Emmaus. They have apparently not yet reached the point where they can receive their own appearance of Jesus without terror or doubt (v. 41), but they have moved on considerably from their dismissal of the women's report as nonsense. Now they say ὅντως ἡγήθη ὁ κύριος, in a deduction from the evidence presented by Peter which reminds us of Luke's only other use of ὅντως, namely, 23:47, where the centurion who has witnessed the crucifixion and death of Jesus, praises God and declares ὅντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν.¹⁴⁵ They are then convinced by the physical presence of Jesus, his sharing their food, his instructing them about messianic suffering, his commissioning of them, for which he promises power from on high, his blessing them and then withdrawing from them.

Luke's crafting of his narrative has given to Peter two key moments in the development of apostolic kerygma, testing the women's story, and inserting the brief acclamation of the appearance to Peter before the returning disciples from Emmaus can speak. That this is something of an insertion of a tradition into a Lukan account that could otherwise have stood alone, is shown by the fact of this appearance being acclaimed in the third person, though Peter is himself there as one of the Eleven, and has himself nothing more to say within this volume. The singling out of Peter for an appearance prior to the one which will take place among the assembled disciples, is marked by the use of his name Simon, used in the warning of Jesus (22:31), and after the miraculous catch of fish,

¹⁴⁴ Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke – Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1991, p. 135.

¹⁴⁵ Dietrich, pp 159f; the position of ὅντως in the phrase in 24:34 varies in the textual tradition – last in Alexandrinus etc., first in p⁷⁵ etc., as in the centurion's words also.

although others are present and respond to Jesus' call to follow him, it is to Simon in the singular that Jesus has given the role of catching people (5:10). Although there is no description in the Gospels of an appearance to Peter, and the only Gospel report of such is here, the early tradition of the first appearance being to Peter is handed on by Paul, 1 Cor. 15:5, ὅτι ὡφθῇ Κηφᾶ εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα. The subject of the tradition quoted by Paul and given in four ὅτι clauses dealing with the death, burial, resurrection and appearances, is the anarthrous Χριστός (v.3). The subject of the acclamation in Luke is ὁ κύριος. The first appearance is to Peter in the Aramaic form of this name, Cephas, while in Luke it is to Simon. The following appearance in 1 Corinthians is to the Twelve; in Luke, after telling of the appearance to Simon, Jesus appears to the Eleven and those with them. While pre-Pauline tradition knows of the betrayal of Jesus (1 Cor 11:23), it is the Gospels that name Judas and remove him from the company of the Twelve – explicitly in Mt 27:5, 28:16 by Judas' suicide; in Luke by referring to the Eleven at 24:9, 33, the naming of the Eleven at Ac 1:13, and Peter's speech at 1:16ff which tells of the defection of Judas and his death; in John it is implicit though Thomas is still called "one of the Twelve" (20:24). The first resurrection appearance in Matthew is to Mary Magdalene and another Mary (the mother of James and Joseph?) (28:9). In John the first appearance is to Mary Magdalene. Paul's sequence of Peter and then the Twelve is interrupted by Luke with the appearance to the two on the road to Emmaus before the appearance in the room to the Eleven and those with them. John records the second appearance to the Ten (?) in the room, which is then repeated a week later for the Eleven(?) including Thomas.

The appearance to Peter prior to that on the road to Emmaus, though known from pre-Pauline tradition, is reported only as acclamation. Luke had all the skills to have developed the appearance to Peter into a narrative worthy of its place in his theology and strategy of Peter's role in spreading the Gospel of the resurrection. The question then is

why Luke was content with so brief a report. We have already shown that the witness and calling of the apostles and of Peter in particular goes back to the earliest days of Jesus' ministry. In the Easter narrative they are recommissioned to be witnesses and to proclaim repentance and the forgiveness of sins to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem (24:47f). There is a renewal and extension of their commission, but it does not begin at Easter, as is also made clear in the qualifications necessary for a replacement for Judas in the number of the Twelve (Ac 1:21f). This is in contrast to Paul's calling and commissioning (as an apostle as he understands it), which is dependent only on the appearance of the risen Lord to him. This is true both of Paul's own account (1 Cor 9:1, 15:8, Gal 1:15f) and of Luke's account of Paul (Ac 9, 22, 26). Peter's checking the women's report of the empty tomb, and then receiving the first appearance of the risen Lord, serve to confirm that Peter has turned (22:32), has come to faith in the resurrection and is already strengthening his brother apostles in their movement from unbelief to belief.

Is there evidence for the influence of Luke's account of Peter in his Easter narrative? We have already argued that the relationship of Lk 24:12 and Jn 20:1-10 is not one of Luke's dependence on John and that John's account is developed with regard to the interplay of the roles of Peter and the Beloved Disciple. John's account of two appearances in the room shows similarities with Lk 24:36ff, namely Jesus' greeting of "Peace" (omitted by D); the showing of hands and feet (Luke) or side (John); a commissioning for mission which includes the forgiveness of sins; the promise of empowerment (Luke) or the immediate empowering (John) with Holy Spirit. Luke's account has its distinct Lukan theology of the path to glory through the messianic suffering, while John's is finely nuanced with his theological emphases. Probably they are both independent developments of tradition or John is again secondary to Luke. The Shorter Ending of Mark compensates for the women's silence in Mk 16:8 with their report

to “those around Peter” – this is not the phrasing of Lk 24:9 or 33. They are then sent to east and west with the *kerygma* of eternal salvation; this accords with Luke’s strategy but not at all with his expression. The Longer Ending of Mark records a first appearance to Mary Magdalene, who then tells this to the disciples who do not believe her. There follows a report of an appearance to two “walking in the country” (like Luke’s walk to Emmaus); they return and again are not believed (contrast Luke). The third appearance is to the Eleven at table and they are commissioned to go into all the world with the good news. Jesus is then taken up into heaven. This could be a summary of Luke, but we note that Peter is not singled out either from the general disbelief of the others or for an appearance to himself alone, or given any particular future role.

We have now completed our survey of episodes in Luke’s first volume which have to do with Peter. We have examined possible redaction by Luke of the accounts of his “many” (Lk 1:1) predecessors. In practice this has meant Mark’s Gospel, demonstrably used by Luke, together with discussion of overlaps between Luke and John’s Gospel, in every case of which our conclusion has been that John’s more complex, developed and nuanced narratives have been influenced by Luke, rather than *vice versa*. Luke’s account of the appointment of the twelve apostles to share in Jesus’ mission of the Kingdom of God focuses upon Peter. His call and future role stems from his giving hospitality to Jesus after synagogue service, and later receives parabolic illustration in the miraculous catch of fish. Pivotal in Luke’s presentation is his gathering of teaching about the nature of discipleship into the Passover supper of Jesus with his apostles, where Peter is singled out for the future role of giving strength and structure to his fellow believers and their proclamation, beyond the ‘sifting’ which the crisis of the arrest and execution of Jesus will mean, and despite Peter’s own cowardice in denying that he knows Jesus. That

Peter is given this role, not because of his own natural abilities or insights, but simply by the gracious gift of Jesus, is shown by the catch of fish being the achievement of Jesus' instruction, over Peter's fisherman's skills; by Peter's acknowledgement that he is a sinner, as much in need of Jesus' mission of forgiveness as anyone else; by insisting that the failure of Peter's loyalty does not totally fail in the 'sifting' because of the prior intercession of Jesus; by prefacing Peter's repentance after his denials by the prior turning of Jesus at cock-crow to look at him. We have argued that the roles for which Jesus has chosen Peter are carried out after the resurrection and recounted mostly in Luke's second volume. Peter's story has shown that he is able to 'turn' back from failure, to grow in understanding of the way of Jesus, to be nudged towards a fuller and fearless proclamation of Jesus as the Christ, meant as the good news for all peoples to the ends of the earth.

Chapter Eight – Summary and Conclusions

Having completed our survey of all the texts in Luke and Acts which are relevant, we now summarise Luke's account of Peter.

Luke's account of Peter

In Luke's account of the earliest days of the Christian community, Peter is given the prime role in establishing that community, exemplifying its manner of corporate living and spiritual practice. He takes the initiative in completing the apostolic college of witness to the historic ministry of Jesus and its aftermath and he becomes their spokesman in the articulation of their Gospel, the centrality of the resurrection and exaltation of the crucified Jesus as the basis upon which salvation, identified as the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit, may be offered. It is in Peter's speeches that Luke presents this as the church's *kerygma* and the fulfilment and redefinition of Israel's own messianic hopes, undergirded by the church's theological work of a christo-centric interpretation and application of the OT scriptures. We demonstrated that Luke has added to the stock of key proof texts. We argued that the development of the *kerygma* as a sequence of saving events, which is summarised in the early creeds and resulted in the shape of the Christian calendar, is primarily the work of Luke, building on whatever traditions he has learnt both from the material he has used in his own account of Jesus and in other kerygmatic summaries which have survived. The use by Luke's Peter of *παῖς*, the Servant of the LORD in Isaiah, as a Christological title, with the ambiguity of meaning it has once expressed in Greek, is also part of a distinctly Petrine emphasis and trajectory as expressed also in 1 Peter 2:21ff. The addition of the one God who is creator in the *kerygma* to Gentiles in Paul's speeches

moves Luke's intended audience beyond the Jewish matrix. This is already hinted in Peter's "Lord of all" to God-fearing Cornelius.

Though Peter takes the initiative in establishing a rudimentary structure for the earliest community in readiness for the task which is its *raison d'être*, he is not presented by Luke as permanently presiding over the Jerusalem community. He is hidden within the collective decision of the apostles in organizing the distribution of aid to the widows and the appointment of the Seven. With John he is delegated by the Twelve together to go to Samaria after reports of their conversion by Philip reach Jerusalem. Later Peter is expected to render an account to Jerusalem justifying his entry and preaching in Cornelius' house. That Peter after release from Herod's prison, instructs them to inform James, the brother of Jesus, suggests that, in Luke's view, James is already the president of the Jerusalem church with Peter's approval, and already exercising the kind of leadership he displays at the Jerusalem Assembly.

The apostolic Twelve strictly have no successors, because their eye-witness testimony to the ministry and resurrection of Jesus is the basis for the continuing mission. The mission itself does pass to others, and especially within the pages of Acts to Paul, who proclaims a parallel Gospel and acknowledges its basis in apostolic witness (Ac 13:31). The power of the Gospel is expressed in works of healing, but again this is not confined to the apostles. It is in the healing miracles that parallels between Peter and Paul are readily drawn. Such works are recounted not to glorify the apostles or merely to entertain the reader (as not infrequently appears the case in the apocryphal *Acts*), but to demonstrate salvation in the name of Jesus, in the same way that the miracles of Jesus in Luke's first volume also effectively illustrate a whole salvation. Among the Twelve, detailed accounts of such mighty works, as distinct from general summaries, occur only for Peter, with or

without John. That the ministry of Paul is also accompanied by such mighty works demonstrates that there is no diminution of this effect of the Gospel, and that Paul's mission is on an even footing with others' and equally empowered, even though Paul cannot claim to have the same span of witness to Jesus which has been their qualification as apostles.

The effect of the proclamation of the Gospel by word and deed is a rapid growth in the numbers and type of believers; it also brings hostility from others, from the priestly and civil powers; Peter speaks boldly before the Sanhedrin and suffers joyfully at their hands and later from the action of King Herod. Persecution has the effect of strengthening their witness and identifying their cause with that of Jesus. It gives Peter the opportunity to fulfil the pledge he made to Jesus at the apostolic supper, and so the personal story of Peter also becomes an expression of the Gospel. Peter is more than a cipher for the Twelve; he has particular unique experiences. While it is just about possible that Luke had met Peter (just as it is a possible implication of the "We" passages of Acts that he had met Paul), I consider this unlikely because personal traits are hard to detect in Luke's account. Peter's story begins with a redaction of Mark's account of Jesus' healing of his mother-in-law, and later borrowing his fishing boat for a pulpit and the unique wonder of the miraculous catch of fish as the backdrop for his call into discipleship and symbolising Peter's future role. That he falls at Jesus' knees aware of his own sinful unworthiness, is evidence, not for an originally post-Easter setting for this pericope, but rather an indication of Luke's emphasis on salvation as forgiveness and what Hengel¹ calls "the *missionary* motif of the justification of the sinner". We have shown how Luke has brought several strands of tradition together to create the apostolic supper as pivotal for teaching about apostleship

¹ Martin Hengel, *Saint Peter*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan and Cambridge, UK, 2006, p.44, emphasis added.

and Peter's future role. Though Peter will deny knowledge of Jesus after his arrest, he is saved from total loss of faith in the testing of the disciples by the prevenient intercession of Jesus, and brought to tears of repentance by the look of Jesus. Peter is then favoured with the first resurrection appearance, by receiving with the other ten apostles the commission of Jesus and their Pentecost experience of power from on high, and with a visionary experience which re-educates his mind to the possibility of their mission including the Gentiles. He displays an extraordinary insight into how even believers might have fallen to the wiles of Satan (Ac 5:3ff). The angel's kick rouses Peter from deep sleep (perhaps an actual trait of Peter, Ac 12:7; cf Lk 9:32, 22:45 ?) to lead him out of prison. It may be that Luke is using knowledge rather than just his imagination about Peter's marked Galilean accent (Lk 22:59, Ac 2:7) or social awkwardness reflected in his speech (Ac 10:36-38,43), but evidence for personal traits in Peter's characterisation is scant. We have shown how Peter's own experience is used by Luke to urge repentance on those who had been responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus, and how his own miraculous release offers an analogy of 'resurrection' from 'death' to continue his mission.

.... in his strategy of proclaiming a Gospel for all peoples

In revising the accounts of predecessors in drawing up a narrative of Gospel origins Luke adds to it an account of the spread of the Word after the Ascension. At least a part of Luke's intention in so doing is to affirm that what Jesus proclaimed is to become good news for all people. Early in Luke's first volume Simeon had heralded the baby Jesus as God's "salvation, prepared in the presence of all peoples, a light for revelation to the Gentiles and for glory to (his) people Israel" (2:31f). In Acts this is mapped as being "in Jerusalem and all Judea and Samaria and unto the end of the earth" (1:8). Especially in Chapter Five we showed how the Peter of Acts is guided or cajoled into pioneering this

trail of mission. He is not himself solely responsible for it, even in Jerusalem where Luke tells of Stephen's witness and disputes with Hellenist Jews. In Luke's design, Peter, with John, confirmed the effective mission of Philip in Samaria and he himself evangelises and does mighty works both in Samaria and in towns of the province of Judea in whose capital, Caesarea, Peter under divine direction converts the first Gentile household. Due weight should be given to the description of Cornelius for Luke's intention – a civilised, God-fearing Roman of standing, whose first inclination is to worship Peter but who then responds to Peter's message that Jesus (not Caesar) is 'Lord of all'. This step Peter later persuasively defends before his fellow-apostles in Jerusalem, and then presents as the decisive evidence at the Jerusalem Assembly for Gentiles to share in salvation without prior submission to the Mosaic Law. In Luke's account Peter argues that no distinction is to be made between Jewish and Gentile believers, and that salvation for all is by grace (Ac 15:11), but the initiatives of missionary expeditions to spread the Gospel beyond Judea and Samaria, lie with the Hellenist-influenced church in Antioch. To this Paul, the persecutor converted to belief in the exalted Jesus, and, according to Luke, God's chosen instrument to bring Jesus' name before Gentiles as well as the people of Israel (9:15), devotes his life and energy, and Luke devotes the second half of his second volume. In Luke's scheme it is in the figure of Paul (through the legal process of his appeal to Caesar and the providence of deliverance from shipwreck), that the Gospel is presented in the Imperial capital without hindrance. While Rome does not literally constitute "the ends of the earth", the addition of the focus of Rome to that of Jerusalem, changes a circle to an ellipse, to borrow Henry Chadwick's image², and brings the whole empire and the west beyond Rome into the scope of mission. I have argued that Luke's deliberate parallels between Peter and Paul and the intercalating of the narratives of Paul's conversion and

² *The Circle and the Ellipse – Rival Concepts of Authority in the Early Church*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1959.

Peter's persuasion towards Gentile mission, serve the purpose of unifying the Pauline with the apostolic mission, which results in the conception of a universal church, united in its message and mission, rather than by its structures or governance.

That Luke's account became adopted as the standard account of Christian beginnings is no mean achievement, even if it were at the cost of placing Acts with other apostolic writings in the Canon of NT scripture, rather than as the sequel to Luke's Gospel. "Acts functioned simultaneously for the Fathers as the unifier of the biblical canon and as a justification for the episcopal hermeneutical claim ... as successors of the apostles ... that (Acts linked) Old Testament texts with the teaching of Jesus, the Jerusalem apostles, and Paul."³ It was the theological genius of Luke to have written Acts as the continuation of his first volume, understanding the heralding of good news of salvation in Jesus as including the Spirit-empowered mission and *kerygma* of his followers. In Chapter One we argued the case for the unity of Luke and Acts conceived as a single account. Our study of Peter has added weight to the argument for this unity, with incidents in the ministry of Jesus prefiguring his apostolic mission in the post-Easter church. I postulated that Peter's silence about his denials of Jesus in Acts presupposes that he has already 'turned', been forgiven and assumed the role Jesus had given him, within the pages of the first volume. The first volume had told of a hostile reception in Samaria and postponed journeys outside Israel and encounters between Jesus and Gentiles; Acts recounts how Samaria "accepts the word of God" and models the first Gentile convert on the centurion of Capernaum. The prophecy of Simeon echoes through both volumes.

The subject of Acts is the spread of the Gospel. It does offer, of course, only a selective rather than a comprehensive account, with hints of there being much more – the

³ David E. Smith, *The Canonical Function of Acts*, p.15.

list of peoples on the day of Pentecost, the Ethiopian Eunuch, the church in Galilee, disciples of John the Baptist in Asia, Christians in Rome before Paul's arrival there. However much Luke tells us about Peter or Paul or anyone else, it is still clear that it is the Gospel and not individuals that constitute Luke's story. He tantalisingly leaves us ignorant of Paul's fate in Rome and of where Peter went after his release from Herod's prison, and what he did and whether he was destined to fulfil his pledge to go with Jesus not only to prison but also to death. It is likely that Luke, writing about the end of the first century, knew, and assumed his readers also knew, traditions that both Paul and Peter had suffered martyrdom in Rome. Luke has no need to tell us and so shift his spotlight from his subject which is the Gospel and its spread. So the usual title by which Luke's second volume is known, Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων, even without the addition of articles, is hardly appropriate, as it tells of acts of at most two or three apostles in any detail and more of the acts of those not considered by Luke to be apostles at all, especially Paul.

Identified Influences on Luke's Account

Luke has crafted his account of Peter to facilitate an overall strategy of his work to proclaim the Gospel to all peoples. In his first volume he relies for his account of Peter on others who have written before him, especially Mark, but at every point within that volume there is redaction of his Markan *Vorlage*, often to focus on Peter's future roles in the post-Easter life of the community. The healing of his mother-in-law precedes his call into discipleship and focuses on Peter alone among other future disciples. The call of disciples becomes an enacted parable of Peter's later success in the catching of people. In choosing the Twelve, Jesus makes them apostles and Simon heads the list, renamed Peter. Acclaiming Jesus as God's Messiah develops into Peter's proclaiming the risen and exalted Christ. Luke omits from Mark the rebuking of Peter as Satan, allowing it to

become one of the sources of the discourse at the apostolic supper. The account of Peter's denials of knowledge of Jesus has the prior protection of the intercession of Jesus so that he can turn in repentance, strengthen his fellow apostles and give his fellow Jews a second chance to find faith in the Jesus that they had crucified⁴. We argued that Mark has also influenced some of the accounts of Peter's healing miracles in Acts.

The miraculous catch of fish in Lk 5, has its counterpart in Jn 21. We argued that the two rely upon a common source, or (more likely in my view), that John is secondary to Luke. I made a similar argument with regard to the incident of Peter's visiting the empty tomb of Jesus (Lk 24:12, Jn 20:1-10). Luke's Cornelius is partly modelled upon the centurion of Capernaum whose slave Jesus healed (Lk 7:1-10), and the description of this centurion has been redacted in comparison with Mt 8:5ff, to anticipate Cornelius. The Q sayings of Lk 12:42ff are introduced by Luke with Peter's question, providing a picture for the future of a faithful and prudent steward (of the church).

We have noted OT texts which have influenced Luke's account – the typological influence of the twelve patriarchs and tribes towards Peter's insistence of the body of twelve apostles, and the symbolic number of seven(ty) who receive some of Moses' prophetic spirit to assist him in his workload, reflected both in the mission of the Seventy and the appointment by the apostles of the Seven. Texts from the Prophets, especially Isaiah, and the Psalms are a major influence on the speeches of Jesus at Nazareth and of Peter in Jerusalem. Luke provides OT texts to underpin the major events of salvation, the resurrection, ascension and gift of the Spirit. Narratives about prophets, Elijah, Elisha and Jonah, and Ezekiel's visions have influenced the recounting of Peter's mighty works and his crossing of new thresholds in mission. The piety of Daniel, Tobit and Judith are

⁴ Cf Luke's conversion of Mark's cursing of the unfruitful fig tree into a parable which spares the fig tree for another year, Lk 13:6ff.

models for Luke's description of the piety of the earliest Christian community, as they are also of the nativity stories of the Gospel. Though Luke was influenced by the popularity of extra-biblical prison-escape stories to tell of Peter's miraculous deliverance from prison, his account is also much coloured by allusions to the miraculous deliverances in Daniel and by texts which herald salvation as the release of captives, renewing the paschal deliverance from Egypt. In describing the fate of Herod and of Judas, Luke is as much under the influence of scriptural precedents as he is, say, of Josephus.

Seeking the Influence of Luke's Account on Others

Demonstrating specific knowledge of Luke's account of Peter before Irenaeus is not easy, but I have shone some torches into this tunnel period of Christian beginnings. We argued that John's account of Jesus in Samaria, the arrival of Greeks to see Jesus and the instruction of Jesus resulting in a huge catch of fish as a symbol of mission, are, at least, parallel developments to Luke's account of mission. The speeches of Peter establish a kerygmatic pattern that becomes the pattern of the creeds and develops as well into the Christian calendar. Peter's preaching a Servant Christology is shared by the pseudo-Petrine 1 Peter; in this we postulated that both may be drawing on tradition of the historical Peter, though we also speculated about the influence of Luke's portrait of Peter and his account of the apostolic supper on 1 Peter 4:12 – 5:11. Peter's speeches illustrate the way of doing theology by scriptural exegesis, which will become the norm in the Fathers. Though Acts provides something of a precedent for the later apocryphal *Acts*, especially those of *Peter*, *Paul* and *John*, while they have some of the same features of journeys, disputes and miracles, they consist much less of comprehensive narratives of Christian beginnings and verge more towards novelistic and hagiographical demonstrations of their titular apostles' superiority.

The canonical Acts is a remarkable work, apparently without parallel. Though snippets of historical tradition from the post-Easter church can be gleaned from Paul and Revelation, extra-canonical Christian works, and even Josephus and rabbinic writings, these are snippets, and no historian of Christian beginnings can avoid using Acts, assessing its evidence and speculating about its sources. Our task has not been the evaluation of Luke-Acts as history, but the prior task of testing the effect of the flow of the narrative. Whether or not Luke foresaw the implications of receiving his message in the challenge it presents beyond Judaism to the empire's assumed world view, we should recognise what the ultimate consequences were. So Streeter⁵ judged the aim of Acts "to trace the transition of Christianity from a sect of Judaism into a world religion." A more recent historian⁶ not only recognises the historical accuracy of many details in Acts⁷, and the same basic picture of the Jerusalem Church as is given by Paul, but is sympathetic to the ideological thrust of Luke's history – "The author had a thesis to present. He saw the hand of providence in the extension of the Church from its cradle in Jerusalem to the great world of Rome. ... Apparently Luke transmitted the eschatological expectation of the return of the glorified risen Lord into a hope of the extension of God's Kingdom to the entire inhabited world." Chadwick also agrees with my thesis that "anti-Pauline feelings (that were) current ... were no doubt an oblique target in the work." Relevant here is the thesis of Kavin Rowe's *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Greco-Roman Age*⁸,

⁵ *The Four Gospels*, Macmillan, London, 1964, p. 531.

⁶ Henry Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society – From Galilee to Gregory the Great*, in *The Oxford History of the Christian Church*, Volume 1, OUP, 2001, p. 45.

⁷ Cf., e.g., A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*, Clarendon, Oxford, 1963.

⁸ OUP, 2009.

along with the discussion of it in *JSNT* 33 (2011).⁹ He argues that Christianity as presented by Luke was not insurrectionist against Roman power because Roman law properly practised would find believers innocent, but it was culturally destabilising, in so far as paganism could not conceive of the end of the practice of polytheism, and the Gospel mission, unlike Judaism, was engaged in a conscious effort to draw pagans away from their cultic practice.¹⁰ Most of the passages Rowe examines are to do with Paul's encounters with Roman law and pagan religious culture, including its economics, but Peter's "This One (Jesus) is Lord of all" (Ac 10:16), previously discussed, is again pertinent. Barclay argues that Rowe exaggerates the tension with pagan culture, finding "paganism" a vague term; "what we call 'religion' ... is conducted in quite contrary discourses – some philosophical, ...some mythical (in literature and art) and some cultic (religious practices)".¹¹ Luke's Paul uses the term *θησκαία* (Ac 26:5) to speak of Judaism's way of worship or 'religion' (*NRSV*); it is not so portmanteau an expression as we might like to include equal emphasis on cultic practice, creedal world-view and ethics. Luke is content to call Christianity 'the Way', while acknowledging the term, perhaps originally pejorative, given its adherents by outsiders, *χριστιανός* (Ac 11:26, 26:28; also 1 Pet 4:16). History tells as much of the 'christening' of pagan practice as its subversion. While earlier discussions of MacDonald's thesis that the NT may imitate Homer proved unconvincing with regard to Peter and Cornelius' visions and Peter's escape from prison, we may return to his conclusion that Luke created "stories as alternatives to the dominant religious narratives of his culture. Ancient evangelism was, to a large extent, a *mythomachia*, a battle among competing fictions. Luke was engaged in a literary battle on

⁹ Steve Walton, "World Upside Down? A Conversation with C. Kevin Rowe", pp 317-319; John Barclay, "Pushing Back: Some Questions for Discussion", pp 321-326; Matthew Sleeman, "The Vision of Acts: World Right Way Up", pp 327-333; Rowe's response, pp 335-345.

¹⁰ Rowe, response, pp 339f.

¹¹ p. 322.

at least two fronts: Jewish scriptures in the rear, and Greek poetry up ahead.”¹² Our assessment of Luke’s narrative as intended to be a historical rather than purely fictional account parts company with Macdonald, but that he presented a narrative which in the long term challenged and replaced prevailing narratives and fulfilled OT expectations, is in line with our thesis. Comparison can be made with the more substantial historiography of Josephus, telling and updating the Jewish story in language and style to inform non-Jewish readers of the ancient roots of Jewish monotheism and higher morality deserving of respect and admiration despite the uprising of the Jewish War. There does not appear to be in Josephus an explicit missionary intention to convert pagan readers to become Jewish proselytes, but he would not have been averse to such a response. Luke-Acts is addressed to believers or enquirers, rather than as apologetic to unbelievers, but in offering an account of Christian beginnings it does seek to persuade readers of the authenticity of the salvation it announces and maps.

The ultimate reception of Luke’s account of beginnings is indeed to replace the prevailing polytheistic world view and make it possible for the empire itself to adopt the Christian way. Eusebius’ *Church History* when writing of the earliest period appears not to draw on major sources other than Acts and Josephus, Philo and the Roman historians.¹³ Eusebius regards himself as doing what had not been done before, and though covering a much longer period of time than Acts, has a similar view with regard to providential steering of the course of events, succession to the apostolic witness, and the final triumph over persecution, paganism and heresy. The ultimate fruit of Luke’s persuasion of

¹² Macdonald, *Does the NT Imitate Homer?*, p. 151.

¹³ Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, Book 2; also Alanna Nobbs, “Acts and Subsequent Ecclesiastical Histories”, in Bruce W. Winter & Andrew D. Clarke, (Edd), *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, Eerdmans Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, 153-162.

Theophilus may be seen in the conversion of the emperor Constantine, which is the climax of Eusebius' work.

Features of Christian life which flourish in the second century have their seeds in Luke's account of the church in the first century. Paul warns of the future problem of rival teaching and teachers (Ac 20:29f), and Peter is earlier presented as in conflict with Simon Magus, a conflict which is magnified in the pseudo-Clementine literature. Luke's view of the early days from a perspective of the next generation is memorably irenic, so that there is harmony and agreement between Peter, Paul and James, their respective missions and messages. I argued that this itself was polemical on Luke's part. There is little evidence that Paul's letters (with the possible exception of 1 Corinthians) were known to Luke and the Pauline corpus also was either not yet collected or not widely known. The composition of pseudo-Pauline letters in the sub-apostolic era suggests that the reputation of Paul, the achievement of his missions and veneration for his teaching as the first major Christian theologian, were, at best, insecure. What Acts does is to bring Paul's legacy into harmony with the apostolic foundation of the church. Luke's account may also have stimulated a renewed interest in Paul and the collecting of his letters. We may agree with Robert Morgan that Luke "helped save Paul for catholic Christianity by writing Acts, and possibly even collected the epistles. ... One might even call him 'the third founder of Christianity'"¹⁴ (after Jesus and Paul).

Paul had suffered for his faith and warned of fiercer persecutions to come; Peter had already suffered persecution from Sanhedrin and Herod. Though Acts makes no attempt to complete the story of Peter, *1 Clement* 5.4 reports, Πέτρον ὃς διὰ ζήλον ἄδικον οὐχ ἓνα οὐδὲ δύο ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκεν πόρους καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς

¹⁴ "Which was the Fourth Gospel? The Order of the Gospels and the Unity of Scripture", *JSNT* 54 (1994), 3-28, p. 27.

τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. The aorist participle μαρτυρήσας suggests it speaks of martyrdom rather than ongoing witness, and feeds into that development which sees Peter and Paul as twin pillars and martyrs in the empire's capital, which will become of major importance for the history of the patriarchates and the papacy, and replace Castor and Pollux in Greco-Roman art¹⁵. J. C. O'Neill¹⁶ and others have argued for locating Acts among the early Apologists like Justin, and Pervo a little earlier. I have argued, rather, that in the speeches of Acts Luke modestly anticipates in length and depth the kind of debate to be engaged by the Apologists, but does initiate the scriptural exegesis that demonstrates the basis of the Christian mission in the death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus. Acts presents the Christian life as a fellowship built on prayer and sharing of resources, much like the mission of Jesus and his disciples in Lk 10-11. Peter does provide some of the structure at the very beginning but does not himself either 'found' churches outside Jerusalem or impose on any churches even a rudimentary uniformity, such as Paul does among his churches in Acts. The life of the primitive church is marked by the baptism of converts, by the apostles' teaching, by prayers and the breaking of bread (Ac 2:41f) but these marks do not lead to a singular pattern or anything approaching 'liturgy'. It would then be misleading to speak of Acts as 'early catholicism', as if there were a single thread from Luke's (and Peter's) Jerusalem to Ignatius' Antioch, but there is manifest similarity between Acts and what we find in the *Didache*. The charismatic experience of the Spirit accompanies Luke's strategy with Peter and then Paul, in Jerusalem, Samaria and the home of Cornelius and the churches Paul establishes. He gives it the thrust of mission when he interprets the 'tongues' of Pentecost as recognizable languages of the gathered pilgrims, and fresh outpourings of the Pentecost Spirit mark new stages in the mission.

¹⁵ Cf. Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter*, p.66.

¹⁶ J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*.

The charismatic and visionary experience do guide and affirm the mission, but do not substitute for the apostolic witness and proclamation; they are an occasional feature rather than the source of authority as they later become in Montanism.

I have contended that Theophilus' reading of Luke's double volume account of Jesus and the continuing mission of his followers and theirs, would have persuaded him that the hand of God was behind a unified mission, transforming the election and hopes of Israel into a Gospel for all the peoples, the seed with the potential harvest of a humanity united in creed and worship. Luke's success should not be underestimated or taken for granted in the history of the development of Christianity. We have traced Peter's essential part in this divine plan as Luke narrates it, ensuring that his strengthened brothers become the foundation of a church both apostolic and finally catholic. His inspired account of Peter gives it narrative substance.

Abbreviations, Conventions and Short Titles

- Arndt & Gingrich W. BAUER, W.F. ARNDT, & F. Wilbur GINGRICH, A
*Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early
Christian Literature*, CUP and Chicago University Press, 1957
- Barrett, *Acts* C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles*, (2 volumes), T. & T.
Clark, Edinburgh, 1994
- Beginnings* F. J. Foakes Jackson & K. Lake (Edd), *The Beginnings of Christianity:
The Acts of the Apostles* (5 volumes); Macmillan, London, 1920-1933
- Bib* *Biblica*
- BJRL* *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, University of Manchester
- BZ* *Biblische Zeitschrift*
- CBQ* *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
- CBR* *Currents in Biblical Research*
- Cf.* *confer*
- CUP Cambridge University Press
- Dibelius, *Studies* Martin DIBELIUS, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, edited by
Heinrich Greeven ; translated by Mary Ling and Paul Schubert, SCM
Press, London, 1956
- Dietrich Wolfgang Dietrich, *Das Petrusbild der lukanischen Schriften*,
Kohlhammer, Stuttgart/ Berlin/ Köln/ Mainz, 1972
- Ed. / Edd Editor/ Editors
- ETL* *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses*
- Fitzmyer, *Acts* Joseph A. FITZMYER, *The Acts of the Apostles*, The Anchor Bible,
volume 31, Doubleday, New York, 1998
- Fitzmyer, *Luke* Joseph A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke*, The Anchor
Bible Volumes 28-28A, Doubleday, New York, 1981
- Goulder, *Type & History* M. D. GOULDER, *Type and History in Acts*, SPCK,
London, 1964
- Goulder, *New Paradigm* M. D. Goulder, *Luke, A New Paradigm*, 2 volumes,
Sheffield Academic Press, 1989
- Haenchen, *Acts* Ernst HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1971

Hennecke, <i>NT Apocrypha</i>	HENNECKE, E., edited by W. Schneemelcher; translated and edited by R. McL. Wilson, <i>New Testament Apocrypha</i> , 2 Volumes, SCM Press, London, 1963
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
Johnson, <i>Acts</i>	Luke Timothy JOHNSON, <i>The Acts of the Apostles</i> , Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1992
Johnson, <i>Luke</i>	Luke Timothy JOHNSON, <i>The Gospel of Luke</i> , Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1991
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
Liddell & Scott	H. G. LIDDELL & R. SCOTT, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 8 th edition, OUP, 1897
LkR	Lukan redaction
Lüdemann, <i>Early Christianity</i>	Gerd Lüdemann, <i>Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts</i> , SCM Press, London, 1989
LXX	The Septuagint / <i>Septuaginta</i> , edited by Alfred Rahlfs, Stuttgart, 1935; electronic version as <i>Bible Works 7</i> , 2006
MT	Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible / <i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> (Edd A. Alt, O. Eißfeldt, P. Kahle, R. Kittel), 1967/77; electronic version as <i>Bible Works 7</i> , 2006
Marshall, <i>Luke</i>	I. Howard MARSHALL, <i>The Gospel of Luke</i> , (The New International Greek Testament Commentary), Paternoster Press, 1978
Mathieu	Yvan Mathieu, <i>La Figure de Pierre dans L'Œuvre de Luc (Évangile et Actes des Apôtres)- Une Approche Synchronique</i> , Gabalda, Paris, 2004
N-A ²⁷	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> (after Eberhard & Erwin Nestle), 27 th revision, edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini and Bruce M. Metzger, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, 1993; electronic version as <i>Bible Works 7</i> , 2006
<i>NRSV</i>	<i>New Revised Standard Version</i>
NT	The New Testament

<i>Nov Test</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
OT	The Old Testament
OUP	Oxford University Press
p. / pp	page / pages
Pervo, <i>Dating</i>	Richard I. PERVO, <i>Dating Acts – Between the Evangelists and the Apologists</i> , Polebridge Press, Santa Rosa, California, 2006
Pervo, <i>Acts</i>	Richard I. PERVO, <i>Acts, a Commentary</i> , Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 2009
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
REB	<i>Revised English Bible</i>
RSV	<i>Revised Standard Version</i>
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 10 volumes, Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1963-1976
v. / vv	verse / verses
v.l.	<i>varia lectio</i>
ZKT	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>
ZNTW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

Translations of the Fathers are from:-

The Ante-Nicene Fathers, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson *et al.*, 10 volumes;

The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, edited by Philip Schaff *et al.*, First Series, 14 volumes;

The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, edited by Philip Schaff, Henry Wace *et al.*, Second Series, 14 volumes;

T & T Clark, Edinburgh and Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Reprinted 1994-1997

Vocabulary statistics are given as a numeral with X= times.

Comparative statistics for the Gospels are given in the order:-

Matthew/ Mark/ Luke + Acts/ John

Bibliography of Works Consulted

ABBOTT-SMITH G. *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 3rd edition, 1937

ACHTEMEIER Paul J. “The Lukan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch”, *JBL* 94 (1975), 547-562

ADAMIK, T., “The Image of Simon Magus in the Christian Tradition”, in BREMMER, Jan N., *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter: Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism*, Peeters, Leuven, 1998, 52-64

ADAMS, Marilyn McCord, “The Role of Miracles in the Structure of Luke-Acts”, in STUMP, Eleonore and FLINT, Thomas P., (edd), *Hermes and Athena: Biblical Exegesis and Philosophical Theology*, University of Notre Dame, Indiana, 1993, pp 235-265

ALAND, Kurt and ALAND, Barbara, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edition translated by Erroll F. Rhodes, W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1989

ALBL, Martin C. “*And Scripture Cannot be Broken*” – *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, Brill, Leiden-Boston-Köln, 1999

ALEXANDER, Loveday C. A., *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1*, Society for New Testament Studies Monographs series 78; CUP, 1993

ALEXANDER, Loveday C. A., “Acts and Ancient Intellectual Biography” in WINTER, Bruce W. & CLARKE, Andrew D. (edd), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. 1 The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*, Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1993, pp 31-63

ALEXANDER, Loveday C. A., “ ‘In Journeyings Often’: Voyaging in the Acts of the Apostles and in Greek Romance”, in Christopher M. TUCKETT, (Ed), *Luke's Literary Achievement*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, 17-49

ALEXANDER, Loveday C. A., “Fact, Fiction and the Genre of Acts”, *NTS* 44 (1998), 380-399

ALEXANDER, Loveday C. A., *Acts in its Ancient Literary Context*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 2006

ALLEN, O. Wesley, Jr., *The Death of Herod: The Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1997

ARNOLD, Bill T., "Luke's Characterising Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Acts", in WITHERINGTON, Ben, III (Ed), *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, CUP, 1996, pp 300-323

ASCOUGH, Richard S., "Rejection and Repentance: Peter and the People in Luke's Passion Narrative", *Biblica* 74 (1993), 349-365

BAILEY, John Amedee, *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1963

BAMMEL, Ernst, "Jewish Activity against Christians in Palestine according to Acts", in BAUCKHAM, Richard (Ed.), *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, Eerdmans Publishing, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1995, 357-364

BARRETT, Charles Kingsley, "Light on the Holy Spirit from Simon Magus (Acts 8,4-25)", in KREMER, Jacob (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, redaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris – Gembloux & Leuven University Press, 1979, 281-295

BARRETT, Charles Kingsley, "Faith and Eschatology in Acts 3", in Erich Grässer & Otto Merk (Edd), *Glaube und Eschatologie: Festschrift für W. G. Kümmel zum 80. Geburtstag*", Mohr, Tübingen, 1985, 1-17

BARRETT, Charles Kingsley, "The Third Gospel as a Preface to Acts? Some Reflections", in F. Van Segbroek et al., (Edd), *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, Vol. 2, Peeters, Leuven, 1992, 1451-66

BARRETT, Charles Kingsley, *The Acts of the Apostles*, T.&T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1994

BARRETT, Charles Kingsley, Review of MATHIEU, *La Figure de Pierre*, *JTS* 57 (2006), 654-5

BARTHES, Roland, "L'Analyse structural du Récit à propos d'Actes X-XI", *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 58 (1970), 17-37

BARTON, John & MUDDIMAN, John, Edd, *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, OUP, 2000

BAUCKHAM, Richard, *Jude and 2 Peter*, Word Biblical Commentary, Vol 50, Word Books Publisher, Waco, Texas, 1983

BAUCKHAM, Richard, "The Acts of Paul as a Sequel to Acts", in WINTER, Bruce W. and CLARKE, Andrew D. (edd), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. 1 The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*, Wm B./ Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1993, 105-152

BAUCKHAM, Richard (Ed.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting, Vol. 4 The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, Eerdmans Publishing, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1995

BAUCKHAM, Richard, “James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)”, in WITHERINGTON, Ben, III (Ed), *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, CUP, 1996, 154-184

BAUCKHAM, Richard, “Kerygmatic Summaries in the Speeches of Acts”, in WITHERINGTON, Ben, III (Ed), *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, CUP, 1996, 185-217

BAUCKHAM, Richard, *The Gospels for all Christians – Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1998

BAUER, W., ARNDT, W.F., & GINGRICH, F. Wilbur, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, CUP and Chicago University Press, 1957

BAUERNFEIND, Otto, “Tradition und Komposition in dem Apokatastasispruch Apostelgeschichte 3,20f”, in BETZ, Otto, HENGEL Martin and SCHMIDT, Peter, (Edd), *Abraham unser Vater - Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel; Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60. Geburtstag*, E. J. Brill, Leiden/ Köln, 1963, pp 13-23

BIBLIA PATRISTICA – Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique, Vol. 1 Des origins à Clément d’Alexandrie et Tertullien, Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, Paris, 1975

BIGUZZI, G., “Witnessing Two by Two in the Acts of the Apostles”, *Biblica* 92 (2011), 1-20

BIRD, Michael F., “The Unity of Luke-Acts in Recent Discussion”, *JSNT* 29 (2007), 425-448

BOCK, Darrell L., *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1987

BOCK, Darrell L., *Acts*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, Baker Academic Press, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2007

BOCKMUEHL, Markus, *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches – Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 2000

BOCKMUEHL, Markus, “Simon Peter and Bethsaida – the variable influence of Hellenistic culture and language within Galilee”, in CHILTON, Bruce & EVANS,

- Craig, (Edd), *The Missions of James, Peter and Paul – Tensions in Early Christianity*, Brill, Leiden and Boston, 2005,
- BOCKMUEHL, Markus, “Why Not Let Acts Be Acts? In Conversation with C. Kevin Rowe”, *JSNT* 28 (2005), 163-166
- BOCKMUEHL, Markus, *The Remembered Peter in Ancient Reception and Modern Debate*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2010
- BONZ, Marianne Palmer, *The Past as Legacy – Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 2000
- BORING, M. Eugene, *1 Peter*, *Abingdon New Testament Commentaries*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee, 1999
- BOVON, François, *De Vocatione Gentium – Histoire de l’interprétation d’Act. 10,1 – 11,18 dans les six premiers siècles*, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1967
- BOVON, François, “Names and Numbers in Early Christianity”, *NTS* 47(2001), 267-288
- BOVON, François, “Canonical and Apocryphal Acts of Apostles”, *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11 (2003), 165-194
- BOWKER, J. W., “Speeches in Acts: a Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form”, *NTS* 14 (1967), 96-111
- BRAWLEY, Robert L., *Centering on God: Method and Message in Luke-Acts*, Westminster/ John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 1990
- BRAWLEY, Robert L., *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech – Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1995
- BREMMER, Jan N., *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter: Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism*, Peeters, Leuven, 1998
- BROCK, Ann Graham, *Mary Magdalene, the First Apostle: the Struggle for Authority*, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass., 2003
- BRODIE, T.L., “Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37: A Study in Luke’s Use of Rhetorical Imitation”. *Biblica* 64 (1983), 457-485
- BRODIE, T. L., “Towards Unraveling Luke’s Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7.11-17 as *imitatio* of 1 Kings 17.17-24”, *NTS* 32(1986), 247-267
- BRODIE, T. L., “Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Imitation of Sources in Acts: 2 Kings 5 as One Component of Acts 8,9-40”, *Biblica* 67 (1986), 41-67

- BROWN, Schuyler, *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*, Analecta Biblica 36, Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, 1969
- BROWN, R.E., DONFRIED, K.P., and REUMANN, J. (Edd), *St Peter in the New Testament*, Cerf, Paris, 1973
- BROWN, Raymond E., *The Birth of the Messiah – A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke*, Doubleday & Co., New York, 1977
- BROWN, Raymond E., *The Death of the Messiah*, 2 Volumes, Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1994
- BROWN, Raymond E., FITZMYER, Joseph A., & MURPHY, Roland E., (Edd), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1990
- BRUCE, F. F., *The Book of Acts*, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London, 1954
- BRUCE, F. F., *Men and Movements in the Primitive Church*, Paternoster Press, Carlisle, 1979
- BUCKWALTER, H. Douglas, *The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology*, CUP, 1996
- BURRIDGE, Richard A., *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, 2nd edition, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan and CUP, 2004 (1st edition 1992)
- CADBURY, Henry J., *The Making of Luke-Acts*, Macmillan, London, 1927
- CADBURY, Henry J., "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts: V. Luke and the Horse Doctors", *JBL* 52 (1933), 55-65
- CAMPBELL, J.Y., *Three New Testament Studies*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1965, reprinting "KOINΩNIA and its Cognates", *JBL* 51 (1932), 352ff; "The Origin of the Term Son of Man", *JTS* 48 (1947), 145ff; "The Origin and Meaning of ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ", *JTS*, 49 (1948), 130ff
- CAIRD, G. B., *The Apostolic Age*, Gerald Duckworth & Co., London, 1955
- CAIRD, G. B., *The Gospel of St Luke*, Penguin Books, London, 1963
- CASSIDY, Richard J., *Society and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles*, Orbis Books, Maryknoll, New York, 1987
- CHADWICK, Henry, "The Shorter Text of Luke XXII.15-20", *HTR* 50 (1957), 249-258
- CHADWICK, Henry, *The Circle and the Ellipse – Rival Concepts of Authority in the Early Church*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1959

- CHADWICK, Henry, *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great*, OUP, 2001
- CHILTON, Bruce & EVANS, Craig, (Edd), *The Missions of James, Peter and Paul – Tensions in Early Christianity*, Brill, Leiden and Boston, 2005
- CLARK, Andrew C., *Parallel Lives – The Relation of Paul to the Apostles in the Lucan Perspective*, Paternoster Press, Carlisle, 2001
- CLIVAZ, Claire, “Luke, Acts and the Ancient Readership: The Cultures of Author, Scribes and Readers in New Testament Exegesis”, in GREGORY, Andrew F., and ROWE, C. Kavin, (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, University of South Carolina Press, 2010, 153-171
- COHEN, Shaye J. D., “Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew”, *HTR*, 82 (1989), 13-33
- CONZELMANN, Hans, *The Theology of St Luke*, (Translated by Geoffrey Buswell from the German *Die Mitte der Zeit*, Mohr, Siebeck, Tübingen, 1953 and 1957), Faber & Faber, London, 1960
- CONZELMANN, Hans, *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, (Translated by James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel), Hermeneia, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1987
- COPPENS, J., “L’imposition des mains dans les Actes des Apôtres”, in KREMER, Jacob (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, rédaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris – Gembloux & Leuven University Press, 1979, 405-438
- COWTON, Christopher J., “The Alms Trade: A Note on Identifying the Beautiful Gate of Acts 3:2”, *NTS*, 42 (1996), 475-476
- CREED, J. M., *The Gospel According to Saint Luke*, Macmillan, London, 1942
- CREHAN, Joseph, “Peter According to the D-Text of Acts”, *Theological Studies* 18 (1957), 596ff
- CULLMANN, Oscar, *Peter, Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*, translated from German by Floyd V. Filson, 2nd Edition, SCM Press, London, 1962 (1st Edition 1953)
- CULLMANN, Oscar, *Prayer in the New Testament*, translated by John Bowden, SCM Press, London, 1995
- CUNNINGHAM, Scott, *‘Through Many Tribulations’: The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997
- CURTIS, K.P.G., “Luke xxiv.12 and John xx.3-10”, *JTS*, 22 (1971) pp 512-515

DAHL, Nils A., “The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts”, in KECK, Leander & MARTYN, J. Louis (Edd), *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, Abingdon, Nashville, 1966, pp 139ff

DARR, John A., *On Character Building – The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts*, Westminster/ John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 1992

DELEBECQUE, É., “La Montée de Pierre de Césarée à Jérusalem selon le *Codex Bezae* au Chapitre 11 des *Actes des Apôtres*”, *Ephemerides theologicae Louvanienses*, 58 (1982), 106-110

DERRETT, J. Duncan M., *New Resolutions of Old Conundrums – A Fresh Insight into Luke’s Gospel*, Peter I. Drinkwater, Shipston-on-Stour, UK, 1986

DERRETT, J. Duncan M., “Clean and Unclean Animals (Acts 10:15, 11:9): Peter’s Pronouncing Power Observed”, *The Heythrop Journal* 29 (1988), 205-221

DIBELIUS, Martin, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, edited by Heinrich Greeven ; translated by Mary Ling and Paul Schubert, SCM Press, London, 1956

DIETRICH, Wolfgang, *Das Petrusbild der lukanischen Schriften*, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart/ Berlin/ Köln/ Mainz, 1972

DOBLE, Peter, “The Psalms in Luke-Acts”, in MOYISE, Steve and MENKEN, Maarten J. J., (Edd), *The Psalms in the New Testament*, T. & T. Clark International, London and New York, 2004, pp 83-117

DOEVE, J. W., *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, Assen, Netherlands, 1953

DOWNING, F. Gerald, “Common Ground with Paganism in Luke and Josephus”, *NTS* 28 (1982), 546-559

DOWNING, F. Gerald, “Theophilus’s First Reading of Luke-Acts”, in TUCKETT, Christopher M., (Ed), *Luke’s Literary Achievement*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, 91-109

DSCHULNIGG, Peter, *Petrus im Neuen Testament*, Verlag – Katholisches Bibelwerk, Gmb H, Stuttgart, 1996

DUNN, James D. G., “The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2:11-18)”, *JSNT* 18 (1983), 3-57

DUPONT, Jacques, *The Sources of Acts – The Present Position*, (translated by Kathleen Pond), Dartman, Longman & Todd, London, 1964

DUPONT, Jacques, (translated by John Keating), *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, Paulist Press, New York/ Ramsey/ Toronto, 1979

- DUPONT, Jacques, “La Conclusion des Actes et son Rapport à l’ensemble de l’ouvrage de Luc”, in KREMER, Jacob (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, rédaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris – Gembloux & Leuven University Press, 1979, 359-404
- DUPONT, Jacques, “Les Discours de Pierre”, in his *Nouvelles Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, Cerf, Paris, 1984, 58-111
- DUPONT, Jacques, “Pierre délivré de Prison (Ac 12, 1-11)”, in his *Nouvelles Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, Cerf, Paris, 1984, pp 329ff
- EHRHARDT, Arnold, *The Apostolic Ministry*, Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh and London, 1958
- EHRHARDT, Arnold, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Manchester University Press, 1969
- EHRMAN, Bart D., *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, OUP, 1993
- EHRMAN, Bart D., *Peter, Paul and Mary Magdalene: the Followers of Jesus in History and Legend*, OUP, 2006
- EPP, Eldon Jay, “The ‘Ignorance Motif’ in Acts and Anti-Judaeo Tendencies in Codex Bezae”, *HTR* 55 (1962), 52-62
- EPP, Eldon Jay, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*, CUP, 1966
- ESLER, Philip E., “Glossolalia and the Admission of Gentiles into the Early Christian Community”, *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 22 (1992), 136-142; also in Philip E. ESLER, *The First Christians in their Social Worlds*, Routledge, London and New York, 1994, Chapter 3
- ESTRADA, Nelson P., *From Followers to Leaders: The Apostles in the Ritual of Status Transformation in Acts 1-2*, T. & T. Clark International, 2004
- EVANS, Christopher F., *Saint Luke*, SCM Press, London & Trinity Press International, Philadelphia, 1990
- EVANS, Craig A., “Luke’s Use of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethic of Election”, *JBL* 106 (1987), 75-83
- EVANS, Craig A. and SANDERS, James A., (Edd), *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1993
- FARRIS, Stephen, *The Hymns of Luke’s Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance*, JSOT Press, Sheffield, 1985

- FENTON, John, "The Order of the Miracles Performed by Peter and Paul in Acts", *Expository Times* 77 (1965-66), 381-383
- FEUILLET, A., "Les Perspectives propres à chaque évangéliste dans les récits de la transfiguration", *Biblica* 39 (1958), 281-301
- FILSON, Floyd V., "The Journey Motif in Luke-Acts", in GASQUE, W. W. & MARTIN, Ralph P., (Edd), *Apostolic History and the Gospel – Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday*, Paternoster Press, 1970, pp 68-77
- FITZMYER, Joseph A., *Essays on the Semitic Background to the New Testament*, Chapman, London, 1971
- FITZMYER, Joseph A., "The Composition of Luke Chapter 9", in TALBERT, Charles H., (ed), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1978, pp 139-152
- FITZMYER, Joseph A., *The Gospel According to Luke*, The Anchor Bible Volumes 28-28A, Doubleday, New York, 1981
- FITZMYER, Joseph A., *The Acts of the Apostles*, The Anchor Bible volume 31, Doubleday, New York, 1998
- FLETCHER-LOUIS, Crispin H. T., *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 1997
- FRANKLIN, Eric, *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1994
- GARRETT, Susan R., *The Demise of the Devil – Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1989
- GARRETT, Susan R., "Exodus from Bondage: Luke 9:31 and Acts 12:1-24", *CBQ* 52 (1990), 656-680
- GASQUE, W. Ward, "The Speeches of Acts: Dibelius Reconsidered", in LONGENECKER, Richard N. & TENNEY, Merrill C., (Edd), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974, pp 232-250
- GEORGE, Augustin, *Études sur L'œuvre de Luc*, Gabalda, Paris, 1978
- GIBERT, Pierre, *Les premiers chrétiens découvrent Pierre, Comment ils inventent l'Église. Une lecture du Nouveau Testament, la Vie, l'Esprit, le Texte*, Croire aujourd'hui, Desdée de Brouwer, Paris, 1976
- GOULDER, M. D., *Type and History in Acts*, SPCK, London, 1964
- GOULDER, Michael D., "Did Luke know any of the Pauline Letters?", *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 13 (1986), 97-112

- GOULDER, Michael D., *Luke, A New Paradigm*, 2 volumes, Sheffield Academic Press, 1989
- GOULDER, Michael D., *St. Paul versus St. Peter – A Tale of Two Missions*, SCM Press, London, 1994 and Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 1995
- GRAPPE, Christian, *D'Un Temple À L'Autre: Pierre et l'Église primitive de Jérusalem*, Presse Universitaires de France, Paris, 1992
- GRAPPE, Christian, *Images de Pierre aux deux premiers siècles*, Presse Universitaires de France, Paris, 1995
- GREEN, Joel B., *The Gospel of Luke*, W. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Cambridge, UK, 1997
- GREEN, Joel B., "Internal Repetition in Luke-acts: contemporary narratology and Lucan historiography", in WITHERINGTON, Ben, III (Ed), *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, CUP, 1996, pp 283-299
- GREGORY, Andrew, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2003
- GREGORY Andrew F., and TUCKETT, Christopher M. (Edd), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, OUP, 2005
- GREGORY, Andrew, "The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts", *JSNT* 29 (2007), 459-472
- GREGORY, Andrew F., & ROWE, C. Kevin, (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, University of South Carolina Press, 2010
- GRIFFITH-JONES, Robin, *The Four Witnesses*, Harper, San Francisco, 2000
- HAENCHEN, Ernst, "Petrus-Probleme", *NTS* 7 (1961), 187-197
- HAENCHEN, Ernst, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1971
- HAMM, Dennis, "Acts 3 – The Healing of the Temple Beggar as Lucan Theology", *Biblica* 67 (1986), 305-319
- HARRILL, J. Albert, "The Dramatic Function of the Running Slave Rhoda (Acts 12:13-16): A Piece of Greco-Roman Comedy", *NTS* 46 (2000), 150-157
- HARRILL, J. Albert, "Divine Judgement against Ananias and Sapphira (Ac 5:1-11): A Stock Scene of Perjury and Death", *JBL* 130 (2011), 351-369
- HAULOTTE, Edgar, "Foundation d'une communauté de type universal: Actes 10,1-11,18", *Recherches de Science Religieuses* 58 (1970), 63-100

- HAVELAAR, Henriette, "Hellenistic Parallels to Acts 5.1-11 and the Problem of Conflicting Interpretations", *JSNT* 67 (1997), 63-82
- HAWKINS, John C., *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd Edition, Clarendon, Oxford, 1909
- HAY, David M., *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*, Abingdon Press, Nashville and New York, 1973
- HEAD, Peter, "Acts and the Problem of its Texts", in WINTER, Bruce W. and CLARKE, Andrew D. (edd), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. 1 The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*, Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1993, pp 145ff
- HEIMERDINGER, Jenny, "Unintentional Sins in Peter's Speech: Acts 3:12-26", *Revista Catalana de Teologia*, XX/2, 1995, pp 269-276
- HEIN, Kenneth, "Judas Iscariot: Key to the Last Supper Narratives?", *NTS* 17 (1970-71), 227-232
- HENGEL, Martin, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*, translated by John Bowden, SCM Press, London, 1979
- HENGEL, Martin, "The Geography of Palestine in Acts", in BAUCKHAM, Richard (Ed.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting, Vol. 4 The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, Eerdmans Publishing, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1995, 27-78
- HENGEL, Martin, *Saint Peter, The Underestimated Apostle*, translated by T. H. Trapp, Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan and Cambridge, UK, 2006
- HENNECKE, E., edited by W. Schneemelcher; translated and edited by R. McL. Wilson, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2 Volumes, SCM Press, London, 1963
- HOLTZ, Traugott, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1968
- HORST, Pieter W. van der, "Peter's Shadow – the Religio-historical Background of Acts V.15", *NTS* 23 (1976-7), pp 204-212
- HORST, Pieter W. van der, "Hellenistic Parallels to the Acts of the Apostles (2.1-47)", *JSNT*, 25 (1985), 49-60
- HORST, Pieter W. van der, "Hellenistic Parallels to Acts (Chapters 3 and 4)", *JSNT* 35 (1989), 37-46
- HOULDEN, J. L., "A Response to J. D. G. Dunn", *JSNT* 18 (1983), 58-67

- HOULDEN, J. L., "The Purpose of Luke", *JSNT* 21 (1984), 53-65
- HOWELL, Justin R., "The Imperial Authority and Benefaction of Centurions and Acts 10:34-43 : A Response to C. Kavin Rowe", *JSNT* 31 (2008), 25-51
- HUBBARD, Benjamin J., "Commissioning Stories in Luke-Acts: A Study of their Antecedents, Form and Content", *Semeia* 8 (1977), 103-126
- HUCK, A., *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels*, 9th Edition revised by Hans Lietzmann; English Edition by F. L. Cross, Blackwell, Oxford, 1963
- HUMPHREY, Edith M., "Collision of Modes? – Vision and Determining Argument in Acts 10:1 – 11:18", *Semeia* 71 (1995), 65-84
- JACKSON, F. J. Foakes and LAKE, Kirsopp, (Edd), *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 5 Volumes, Macmillan & Co., London, 1920-1933
- JEREMIAS, Joachim, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1980
- JERVELL, Jacob, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*, Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1972
- JERVELL, Jacob, *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*, Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1984
- JERVELL, Jacob, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*, CUP, 1996
- JEWETT, Robert, *Dating Paul's Life*, SCM Press, London, 1979
- JIPP, Joshua W., "Luke's Scriptural Suffering Messiah: A Search for Precedent, a Search for Identity", *CBQ* 72 (2010), 255-274
- JOHNSON, Luke Timothy, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, Scholars Press Missoula, Montana, 1977
- JOHNSON, Luke Timothy, *The Gospel of Luke*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1991
- JOHNSON, Luke Timothy, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1992
- JOHNSON, Luke Timothy, *Septuagintal Midrash in the Speeches of Acts*, The Père Marquette Lecture in Theology, 2002, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, 2002
- JOHNSON, Luke Timothy, "Literary Criticism of Luke-Acts: Is Reception History Pertinent?", *JSNT* 28 (2005), 159-162; also in GREGORY, Andrew F., & ROWE, C. Kavin, (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, University of South Carolina Press, 2010, pp 66-69

- JOHNSTON, George, "Christ as Archegos", *NTS* 27 (1980-81), 381-385
- JUEL, Donald, "The Social Dimensions of Exegesis: The use of Psalm 16 in Acts 2", *CBQ* 43 (1981), 543-556
- JUEL, Donald, *Luke-Acts*, SCM Press, London, 1984
- KARRIS, Robert J., "Missionary Communities: A New Paradigm for the Study of Luke-Acts", *CBQ* 41 (1979), 80-97
- KEE, Howard Clark, *Good News to the Ends of the Earth: The Theology of Acts*, SCM Press, London & Trinity Press, Philadelphia, 1990
- KELHOFFER, James A., *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2000
- KILGALLEN, John J., "Did Peter Actually Fail to Get a Word in? (Acts 11,15)", *Biblica* 71 (1990), 405-410
- KILPATRICK, G.D., "Some Quotations in Acts", in KREMER, Jacob (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, rédaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris – Gembloux & Leuven University Press, 1979, pp 81-97
- KIM, Kyoung-Jin, *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1998
- KIMBALL, Charles A., *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, JSOT Press, Sheffield, 1994
- KINGSBURY, Jack Dean, *Conflict in Luke – Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1991
- KITTEL, Gerhard (Ed.), translated and edited by Geoffrey W. BROMILEY, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 volumes, Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1963-1976
- KLEIN, Günter, "Die Verleugnung des Petrus – Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung", *ZThK* 58 (1961), pp 285ff
- KLEIN, Günter, "Lukas 1,1-4 als theologisches Programm", in BRAUMANN, Georg (Ed), *Das Lukas-Evangelium – Die Redaktions-und-Kompositionsgeschichtliche Forschung*, Darmstadt, 1974, pp 170-203
- KOET, B. J., *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, Leuven University Press, 1989
- KREMER, Jacob, *Pfingstbericht und Pfingstgeschehen – Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Apg 2,1-13*, KBW Verlag, Stuttgart, 1973

- KREMER, Jacob (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, rédaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris – Gembloux & Leuven University Press, 1979,
- KURZ, William S., “Luke 22:14-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses”, *JBL*, 104 (1985), 251-268
- KURZ, William S., *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*, Westminster/John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 1993
- KURZ, William S., “Effects of Variant Narrators in Acts 10-11”, *NTS* 43 (1997), 570-586
- LAMPE, G.W.H., “The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke”, in *Studies in the Gospels – Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, D. E. Nineham (Ed), Blackwell, Oxford, 1955, pp 159-200
- LAMPE, G.W. H., *The Seal of the Spirit*, 2nd Edition, SPCK, London, 1967
- LAPHAM, F., *Peter: The Myth, the Man and the Writings*, Sheffield Academic Press, 2003
- LAYTON, Bentley, *The Gnostic Scriptures*, SCM Press, London, 1987
- LEANNEY, A. R. C., “Jesus and Peter: the Call and Post-resurrection Appearance”, *Expository Times* 65 (1953-4), pp 381-2.
- LEE, R.E., “Luke xxii.32”, *Expository Times*, 38/5 (February, 1927), 233f
- LÉON-DUFOUR, Xavier, “Das Letzte Mahl Jesu und die Testamentarische Tradition nach Lk 22”, *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, 103 (1981), 25-55
- LENTZ, John C., Jr., *Luke’s Portrait of Paul*, CUP, 1993
- LIDDELL, H. G. & SCOTT, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 8th edition, OUP, 1897
- LIEFELD, Walter L., *Interpreting the Book of Acts*, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1995
- LIENHARD, Joseph T., “Acts 6:1-6: A Redactional View”, *CBQ* 37 (1975), 288-236
- LIEU, Judith, *The Gospel of Luke*, Epworth Press, Peterborough, 1997
- LINDARS, Barnabas, *New Testament Apologetic*, SCM Press, London, 1961
- LINDEMANN, Andreas, “Paul’s Influence on ‘Clement’ and Ignatius”, in Andrew F. GREGORY and Christopher M. TUCKETT (Edd), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, OUP, 2005, pp 3-18
- LINNEMANN, Eta, “Die Verleugnung des Petrus”, *ZThK* 63 (1966), 1-32

- LINNEMANN, Eta, *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1970
- LONGENECKER, Richard N. & TENNEY, Merrill C., (Edd), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974
- LONGENECKER, Richard N., “Taking Up the Cross Daily: Discipleship in Luke-Acts”, in *Id.* (ed.), *Patterns of Discipleship in the New Testament*, Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Cambridge, UK, 1996, pp 50-76
- LÖVESTAM, Evald, “Son and Saviour: A Study of Acts 13,32-37, with an Appendix ‘Son of God’ in the Synoptic Gospels”, *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* 18, Copenhagen, 1961
- LÜDEMANN, Gerd, *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles – Studies in Chronology*, Translated from the German (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1980) by F. Stanley Jones, SCM Press, London, 1984
- LÜDEMANN, Gerd, *Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts*, (translated from the German by John Bowden), SCM Press, London, 1989
- LÜDEMANN, Gerd, (assisted by Tom HALL), *The Acts of the Apostles – What Really Happened in the Earliest Days of the Church*, Prometheus Books, New York, 2005
- MADDOX, Robert, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, T. & T.Clark, Edinburgh, 1982
- MALINA Bruce J. & NEYREY Jerome H., “Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts”, in NEYREY Jerome H., (Ed), *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, Hendrickson, Peabody, Massachusetts, 1991, pp 25ff
- MALINA Bruce J. & NEYREY Jerome H., “First-Century Personality: Dyadic, not Individual”, in NEYREY Jerome H., (Ed), *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, Hendrickson, Peabody, Massachusetts, 1991, pp 67ff
- McDERMOTT, J. M., “Luke XII, 8-9 : Stone of Scandal”, *RB* 84 (1977), 523-537
- MacDONALD, Dennis Ronald, *The Legend and the Apostle – The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon*, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1983
- MacDONALD, Dennis R., *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? – Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles*, Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, and London, UK, 2003
- MÁNEK, J., “Fishers of Men”, *Nov Test* 2 (1957-8), pp 138-41
- MARGUERAT, Daniel, “La Mort d’Ananias et Saphira (Ac 5,1-11) dans la Stratégie Narrative de Luc”, *NTS* 39 (1993), 209-226

- MARGUERAT, Daniel, "Saul's Conversion (Acts 9, 22, 26) and the Multiplication of Narrative in Acts", in TUCKETT, Christopher M., (Ed), *Luke's Literary Achievement*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, 127-155
- MARGUERAT, Daniel, "Luc-Actes: une unité à construire", in VERHEYDEN, J., (Ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, Leuven University Press, 1999,
- MARGUERAT, Daniel, (translated by Ken McKinney, Gregory I. Laughery and Richard Bauckham), *The First Christian Historian – Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'*, CUP, 2002
- MARGUERAT Daniel & BOURQUIN Yvan, (translated by John Bowden), *How to Read Bible Stories: An Introduction to Narrative Criticism*, SCM Press, London, 1999
- MARIN, Louis, "Essai d'analyse structurale d'Actes 10,1 – 11,18", *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 58 (1970), 39-61
- MARROW, Stanley B., "Parrhēsia and the New Testament", *CBQ* 44 (1982), 431-446
- MARSHALL, I. Howard, *The Gospel of Luke*, (The New International Greek Testament Commentary), Paternoster Press, 1978
- MARSHALL, I. Howard, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Inter-Varsity Press, 1990
- MARSHALL, I. Howard, "Acts and the 'Former Treatise'", in WINTER, Bruce W. and CLARKE, Andrew D. (Edd), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. 1 The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*, Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1993, pp 163-182
- MARSHALL, I. Howard, article on Acts in BEALE, G.K. & CARSON, D.A., (Edd), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, Baker Academic Press, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2007
- MARTINI, Carlo M., "La Tradition textuelle des Actes des Apôtres et les tendances de l'Église ancienne" in KREMER, Jacob (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, rédaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris – Gembloux & Leuven University Press, 1979, 21-35
- MASON, Steve, "Chief Priests, Sadducees, Pharisees and Sanhedrin in Acts", in BAUCKHAM, Richard (Ed.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting, Vol. 4 The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, Eerdmans Publishing, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1995, pp 115ff
- MATERA, Frank J., "Responsibility for the Death of Jesus According to the Acts of the Apostles", *JSNT* 39 (1990), 77-93
- MATHIEU, Yvan, *La Figure de Pierre dans L'Œuvre de Luc (Évangile et Actes des Apôtres) Une Approche Synchronique*, Gabalda, Paris, 2004

- MATSON, David Lertis, *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts – Pattern and Interpretation*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1996
- MEALAND, David L., *Poverty and Expectation in the Gospels*, SPCK, London, 1980
- METZGER, Bruce M., *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edition, OUP, 1968
- METZGER, Bruce M., *The Canon of the New Testament, Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1987
- METZGER, Bruce M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, United Bible Society, London, 1971
- MINEAR, Paul S., “Dear Theo – The Kerygmatic Intention and Claim of the Book of Acts”, *Interpretation* 27 (1973), 131-150
- MITCHELL, Margaret M., “Peter’s ‘Hypocrisy’ and Paul’s: Two ‘Hypocrites’ at the Foundation of Earliest Christianity?”, *NTS* 58 (2012), 213-234
- MOESSNER, David P., “ ‘The Christ must suffer’ – New Light on the Jesus- Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts”, *Nov. Test.*, 28 (1986), 220-256
- MOESSNER, David P., “The ‘Script’ of the Scriptures in Acts: Suffering as God’s ‘plan’ (βουλή) for the World for the ‘Release of Sins’”, in WITHERINGTON, Ben, III (Ed), *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, CUP, 1996, pp 218-250
- MOESSNER, David P., (Ed), *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel – Luke’s Narrative Claim upon Israel’s Legacy*, Trinity Press International, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1999
- MOORE, Stephen, “The Gospel of the Look”, *Semeia* 54 (1992), 159-196
- MORELAND, Milton, “The Jerusalem Community in Acts: Mythmaking and the Socio-rhetorical Functions of a Lukan Setting”, in PENNER, Todd & STICHELE, Caroline Vander, (Edd), *Contextualising Acts – Lucan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, Brill, Leiden and Boston, 2004, pp 285-310
- MORGAN, Robert, “Which was the Fourth Gospel? The Order of the Gospels and the unity of Scripture”, *JSNT* 54 (1994), 3-28
- MORRIS, Leon, “The Saints and the Synagogue”, in WILKINS, Michael J. and PAIGE, Terence, (Edd), *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church – Essays in Honor of Ralph P. Martin*, JSOT Press, Sheffield Academic Press, 1992,
- MOULE, C.F.D., “Once More, Who were the Hellenists?”, *Expository Times*, LXX (1958-59), 100-102

MOULE, C.F.D., *The Birth of the New Testament*, A. & C. Black, London, 2nd edition, 1966 (1st Edition 1962)

MOULE, C.F.D., Review of Wolfgang Dietrich's *Das Petrusbild der Lukanischen Schriften*, *JTS* XXV (1974), 170-173

MOULE, C.F.D., "The Influence of Circumstance on the use of Christological Terms", in MOULE, C.F.D., *Essays in New Testament Interpretation*, CUP, 1982

MOULTON, W.F., GEDEN, A.S., & MOULTON, H.K., *Concordance to the Greek Testament*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 5th Edition, 1978

MOUNT, Christopher, *Pauline Christianity – Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul*, Brill, Leiden, Boston and Köln, 2002

MUDDIMAN, John, "A Note on Reading Luke XXIV.12", *ETL* 48 (1972), 542-548

MUDDIMAN, John and NEIRYNCK, F., "The Uncorrected Historic Present in Luke XXIV.12", *ETL* 48 (1972), 548-553

MUNCK, Johannes, "Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la littérature biblique", in *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne: mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel*, Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel, Switzerland, 1950, 155-170

MUNCK, Johannes, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Doubleday & Co., Garden City, New York, 1967

MUßNER, Franz, *Petrus und Paulus – Pole der Einheit eine Hilfe für die Kirchen*, Herder, Freiburg, Basel & Wien, 1976

NAVE, Guy D. Jr., *The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts*, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, Georgia, 2002

NEIRYNCK, F., "The Miracle Stories in the Acts of the Apostles – an Introduction", in KREMER, Jacob (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, rédaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris – Gembloux & Leuven University Press, 1979, pp 169-213

NEIRYNCK, F., "Luke 4,16-30 and the Unity of Luke-Acts", in VERHEYDEN, J., (Ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, Leuven University Press, 1999, pp 357-395

NEIRYNCK, F., "ΠΑΡΑΚΥΨΑΣ ΒΛΕΠΕΙ Lc 24,12 et Jn 20,5", *ETL* 53 (1977), 111-152

NEIRYNCK, Frans, "Luke 24,12 – An Anti-Docetic Interpolation?" in DENAUX, A., (Ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, Festschrift J. Delobel, Leuven University Press, 2002, pp 145-158

- NEIRYNCK, F., “ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΕΑΥΤΟΝ – Lc 24,12 et Jn 20,10”, *ETL* 54 (1978), 104-118
- NEIRYNCK, Frans, “John and the Synoptics – The Empty Tomb Stories”, *NTS* 30 (1984), 161-187
- NELSON, Peter K., *Leadership and Discipleship – A Study of Luke 22:24-30*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1994
- NEYREY, Jerome H., *The Passion According to Luke – A Redaction Study of Luke’s Soteriology*, Paulist Press, New York, Ramsey and Toronto, 1985
- NEYREY, Jerome H., (Ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts – Models for Interpretation*, Hendrickson, Peabody, Massachusetts, 1991
- NOBBS, Alanna, “Acts and Subsequent Ecclesiastical Histories” in WINTER, Bruce W. and CLARKE, Andrew D. (Eds), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. 1 The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1993, pp 153-162
- NOORDA, S. J., “Scene and Summary – A Proposal for Reading Acts 4,32 – 5,16”, in KREMER, Jacob (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, rédaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris – Gembloux & Leuven University Press, 1979, pp 475-483
- NOVICK, Tzvi, “Succeeding Judas: Exegesis in Acts 1:15-26”, *JBL*, 129 (2010), 795-799
- O’NEILL, John C., *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting*, SPCK, London, 1961
- O’REILLY, Leo, “The First Sign of Healing: Acts 3,1 – 4,22”, in *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles – A Study in Lukan Theology*, Pontifical University, Rome, 1987, pp 122-190
- O’TOOLE, Robert F., “Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts VIII. 25-40)”, *JSNT* 17 (1983), 25-34
- O’TOOLE, Robert F., “Parallels between Jesus and His Disciples in Luke-Acts”, *BZ* 27 (1983), 195-212
- O’TOOLE, Robert F., *The Unity of Luke’s Theology*, Michael Glazier Inc., Wilmington, Delaware, 1984
- O’TOOLE, Robert F., “‘You Did not Lie to Us (Human Beings) but to God’, (Acts 5,4c)”, *Biblica* 76 (1995), 182-209

O'TOOLE, Robert F., "Εἰρήνη, an Underlying Theme in Acts 10,34-43", *Biblica* 77 (1996), 461-476

PALMER, Darryl W., "Acts and the Ancient Historical Monograph", in WINTER, Bruce W. and CLARKE, Andrew D. (Edd), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. 1 The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1993, pp 1-29

PARKER, D. C., *The Living Text of the Gospels*, CUP, 1997

PARRY, David T. N., "Release of the Captives: Reflections on Acts 12", in TUCKETT, Christopher M., (Ed), *Luke's Literary Achievement*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995, 156-164

PARSONS, Mikeal C. and PERVO, Richard I., *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*, Augsburg Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1993

PARSONS, Mikeal C., *Body and Character in Luke and Acts – The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity*, Baker Academic Press, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2006

PARSONS, Mikeal C., *Acts (IIAIEIA Commentaries on the New Testament)*, Baker Academic Press, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2008

PARSONS, Mikeal C., "Hearing Acts as a Sequel to a Multiform Gospel: Historical and Hermeneutical Reflections on Acts, Luke and the ΠΟΛΛΟΙ", in GREGORY, Andrew F., & ROWE, C. Kavin, (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, University of South Carolina Press, 2010, pp 128-152

PATHRAPANKAL, J., "Christianity as a 'Way' according to the Acts of the Apostles", in KREMER, Jacob (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, rédaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris – Gembloux & Leuven University Press, 1979, pp 533-539

PELIKAN, Jaroslav, *Acts*, SCM Press, London, 2006

PENNER, Todd and STICHELE, Caroline Vander, (Edd), *Contextualising Acts – Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, Brill, Leiden & Boston, 2004

PERKINS, PHEME, *Peter, Apostle for the Whole Church*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1994

PERVO, Richard I., *Profit with Delight – The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1987

PERVO, Richard I., *Luke's Story of Paul*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1990

PERVO, Richard I., "Israel's Heritage and Claims upon the Genre(s) of Luke and Acts – The Problems of a History", in MOESSNER, David P., (Ed), *Jesus and the Heritage*

of Israel – Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy, Trinity Press International, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1999, pp 127-143

PERVO, Richard I., *Dating Acts – Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*, Polebridge Press, Santa Rosa, California, 2006

PERVO, Richard I., *Acts, a Commentary*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 2009

PERVO, Richard I., “Fourteen Years After: Revisiting *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*”, in GREGORY, Andrew F., & ROWE, C. Kevin, (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, University of South Carolina Press, 2010, pp 23-40

PESCH, Rudolf, “Die Verleugnung des Petrus – Eine Studie zu Mk 14,54.66-72 (und Mk 14,26-31)” in GNILKA, Joachim (Ed.), *Neues Testament und Kirche – für Rudolf Schnackenburg*, Herder, Freiburg, Basel & Wien, 1974, pp 42-62

PETERSEN, Norman R., *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1978

PETERSON, David, “The Motif of Fulfilment and the Purpose of Luke-Acts”, in WINTER, Bruce W. and CLARKE, Andrew D. (Edd), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. 1 The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1993, pp 83-104

PILCH, John J., “Sickness and Healing in Luke-Acts”, in NEYREY, Jerome H., (Ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts – Models for Interpretation*, Hendrickson, Peabody, Massachusetts, 1991, pp 181ff

PLUMMER, Alfred, *Luke – International Critical Commentary*, 4th Edition, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1901

PLYMALE, Steven F., *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts*, Peter Lang, New York, 1991

PORTER, Stanley E., (Ed.), *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, Brill, 1997

PORTER, Stanley E., “Scripture Justifies Mission: The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts”, in PORTER, Stanley E., (Ed.), *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2006, pp 104-126

PRAEDER, Susan Marie, “Acts 27:1 – 28:16 : Sea Voyages in Ancient Literature and the Theology of Luke-Acts”, *CBQ* 46 (1984), 683-706

PRAEDER, Susan Marie, “Jesus-Paul, Peter-Paul and Jesus-Peter Parallelisms in Luke-Acts. A History of Reader Response”, in RICHARDS, Kent Harold (Ed), *SBL Seminar Papers Number 23*, 1984, Scholars Press, Chico, California, pp 23-39

- PUMMER, Reinhard, "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the New Testament", *NTS* 22 (1976), 441-443
- RACKHAM, Richard B., *The Acts of the Apostles*, Methuen, London, 1904
- RADL, Walter, *Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk (Untersuchungen zu Parallelmotiven im Lukasevangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte)*, Herbert Lang, Bern and Peter Lang, Frankfurt, 1975
- RADL, Walter, "Befreiung aus dem Gefängnis: Die Darstellung eines biblischen Grundthemas in Apg 12", *BZ* 27 (1983), 81-96
- RAMSEY, A.M. *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*, Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, Toronto, 1949
- RASTOIN, Marc, "Simon-Pierre entre Jésus et Satan: La theologie lucanienne à l'œuvre en Lc 22,31-32", *Biblica* 89 (2008), 153-172
- REHKOPF, Friedrich, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle – Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*, JCB Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1959
- RESE, Martin, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*, Mohn, Gütersloh, 1969
- RESE, M., "Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte", in KREMER, Jacob (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, rédaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris – Gembloux & Leuven University Press, 1979, pp 61-79
- RESSEGUIE, James L., *The Strange Gospel – Narrative Design and Point of View in John*, Brill, 2001
- RICHARD, Earl, "Acts 7: An Investigation of the Samaritan Evidence", *CBQ* 39 (1977), 190-208
- RICHARD, Earl, (Ed.), *New Views on Luke and Acts*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1990
- ROBERTS, Alexander, & DONALDSON, James, (Edd), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (10 volumes); *The Ante-Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, (First Series 14 volumes; Second Series 14 volumes), T& T Clark, Edinburgh, and Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1996-7
- ROBINSON, James M., (Ed), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, New York, København, Köln, 1988
- ROSNER, Brian S., "Acts and Biblical History", in WINTER, Bruce W. and CLARKE, Andrew D. (Edd), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. 1 The Book of Acts*

in its Ancient Literary Setting, Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1993, pp 65-82

ROTHSCHILD, Clare K., *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2004

ROWE, C. Kavin, "Luke-Acts and the Imperial Cult: a Way through the Conundrum", *JSNT* 27 (2005), 279-300

ROWE, C. Kavin, "History, Hermeneutics and the Unity of Luke-Acts", *JSNT* 28 (2005), 131ff

ROWE, C. Kavin, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, 2006

ROWE, C. Kavin, "Literary Unity and Reception History: Reading Luke-Acts as Luke and Acts", *JSNT* 29 (2007), 449-457

ROWE, C. Kavin, *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Greco-Roman Age*, OUP, 2009

RYKEN, Leland (Ed.), *The New Testament in Literary Criticism*, Ungar, New York, 1984

SAMKUTTY, V. J., *The Samaritan Mission in Acts*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 2006

SANDERS, J. N., "Peter and Paul in the Acts", *NTS* 2 (1955), 133-143

SANDERS, Jack T., *The Jews in Luke-Acts*, SCM Press, London, 1987

SANDERS, James A., "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4", in NEUSNER, Jacob (Ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults – Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, Brill, Leiden, 1975, pp 75-106

SANDERS, James A., "Isaiah in Luke", *Interpretation* 1982, 144-155

SANDT, Hunb Van De, "An Explanation of Acts 15.6-21 in the Light of Deuteronomy 4.29-35 (LXX)", *JSNT* 46 (1992), 73-97

SCHNEIDER, Gerhard, *Verleugnung, Verspottung und Verhör Jesus nach Lukas* 22,54-71, Kösel-Verlag, München, 1969

SCHNEIDER, Gerhard, "Die Petrusrede vor Kornelius – Das Verhältnis von Tradition und Komposition in Apg 10,34-43", in SCHNEIDER, Gerhard, *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte*, Peter Hanstein Verlag, Königsstein T/s, 1985, pp 253-279

SCHRAMM, Tim, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, CUP, 1971

- SCHÜRMANN, Heinz, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien*, Patmos-Verlag, Düsseldorf, 1968
- SCHÜRMANN, Heinz, *Das Lukasevangelium; erster Teil*, Herder, Freiburg, Basel & Wien, 1969
- SCHÜRMANN, Heinz, “Die Verheißung an Simon Petrus – Auslegung von Lk 5,1-11” in *Ursprung und Gestalt*, Patmos-Verlag, Düsseldorf, 1970, pp 268-273
- SCHWARTZ, Joshua, “Peter and Ben Stada in Lydda”, in BAUCKHAM, Richard (Ed.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting, Vol. 4 The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*, Eerdmans Publishing, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1995, pp 391ff
- SCOBIE, Charles H. H., “The Origins and Development of Samaritan Christianity”, *NTS* 19 (1972-3), 390-414
- SCOBIE, Charles H. H., “The Use of Source Material in the Speeches of Acts III and VII”, *NTS* 25 (1978-9), 399-421
- SECCOMBE, David Peter, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*, Albert Fuchs, Linz, 1982
- SEITZ, Christopher and GREENE-McCREIGHT, Kathryn, (Edd), *Theological Exegesis – Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan and Cambridge, UK, 1999
- SHEELEY, Steven M., *Narrative Asides in Luke-Acts*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1992
- SHELLARD, Barbara, *New Light on Luke – Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context*, Sheffield Academic Press, 2002
- SHAW, Graham, *The Cost of Authority – Manipulation and Freedom in the New Testament*, SCM Press, London, 1983
- SMALLEY, S.S., “The Christology of Acts Again”, in LINDARS, Barnabas and SMALLEY, Stephen S., (Edd), *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament – in honour of C.F.D.Moule*, CUP, 1973, pp 79-93
- SMALLEY, Stephen S., “Spirit, Kingdom and Prayer in Luke-Acts”, *Nov. Test.* XV (1973), 59-71
- SMITH, David E., *The Canonical Function of Acts, A Comparative Analysis*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 2002
- SMITH, Dennis E., “Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke”, *JBL* 106 (1987), 613-638

- SMITH, Terence V., *Petrine Controversies in Early Christianity – Attitudes towards Peter in Christian Writings of the First Two Centuries*, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1985
- SNODGRASS Klyne, “Western Non-Interpolations”, *JBL* 91 (1972), 369-379
- SOARDS, Marion L., “ ‘And the Lord Turned and Looked Straight at Peter’ – Understanding Luke 22,61”, *Biblica* 67 (1986), 518-519
- SOARDS, Marion L., *The Passion According to Luke – The Special Material of Luke 22*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1987
- SOARDS, Marion L., *The Speeches in Acts – Their Content, Context and Concerns*, Westminster/ John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 1994
- SPARKS, H.F.D. (Ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1984
- SPENCER, F. Scott, *Acts*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997
- SPENCER, F. Scott, “The Ethiopian Eunuch and His Bible: A Social-Science Analysis”, *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 22 (1992), 155-165
- SPENCER, F. Scott, “Acts and Modern Literary Approaches”, in WINTER, Bruce W. and CLARKE, Andrew D. (Edd), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. 1 The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*, Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1993, pp 381-414
- SPENCER, F. Scott, *The Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, 2008
- SPENCER, Patrick E., “The Unity of Luke-Acts – A Four-Bolted Hermeneutical Hinge”, *CBR* 5 (2007), 341-366
- SQUIRES, John T., *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*, CUP, 1993
- STANTON, Graham N., *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*, CUP, 1974
- STANTON, Graham N., “Aspects of Early Christian and Jewish Worship: Pliny and the KERYGMATA PETROU”, in WILKINS, Michael J. and PAIGE, Terence, (Edd), *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Ralph P. Martin*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1992, pp 84-98
- STAUFFER, Ethelbert, translated from the German by John Marsh, *New Testament Theology*, Appendix VI, “Valedictions and Farewell Speeches”, SCM Press, London, 1955, pp 344-347

- STERLING, Gregory E., *Historiography and Self-Definition – Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, New York and Köln, 1992
- STERLING, Gregory E., “From Apostle to the Gentiles to Apostle of the Church – Images of Paul at the End of the First Century”, *ZNTW* 99 (2008), 74-98
- STRANGE, W. A., *The Problem of the Text of Acts*, CUP, 1992
- STRAUSS, Mark L., *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995
- STREETER, B. H., *The Four Gospels*, Macmillan, London, 1st Edition 1924, Revised 1930
- STREETER, B. H., *The Primitive Church*, Macmillan, London, 1929
- STROM, Mark R., “An Old Testament Background to Acts 12:20-23”, *NTS* 32 (1986), 289-292
- STROUP, George W., *The Promise of Narrative Theology*, SCM Press, London, 1984
- SWAIN, Lionel, “The Bible and the People – The Meaning of the Acts of the Apostles”, *Clergy Review* 51 (1966), 535-40
- SWEETLAND, Dennis M., “Discipleship and Persecution: A Study of Luke 12:1-12”, *Biblica* 65 (1984), 61-79
- SWETE H. B., *The Old Testament in Greek*, 3 volumes, CUP 1st Edition 1887; 4th edition 1909
- TALBERT, Charles H., *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, Scholars Press, Missoula, University of Montana, 1974
- TALBERT, Charles H., (Ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1978
- TALBERT, Charles H., “Discipleship in Luke-Acts”, in SEGOVIA, Fernando F., (Ed.), *Discipleship in the New Testament*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1985, pp 62-75
- TALBERT Charles H., *Reading Acts – A Literary and Theological Commentary*, The Crossroad Publishing Company, New York, 1997
- TALBERT, Charles H., *Reading Luke-Acts in its Mediterranean Milieu*, Brill, Leiden & Boston, 2003
- TANNEHILL, Robert C., “The Composition of Acts 3-5: Narrative Development and Echo Effect”, in RICHARDS, Kent Harold, (Ed.), *SBL 1984 Seminar Papers*, Scholars Press, Chico, California, 1984, pp 217-240

TANNEHILL, Robert C., *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts – A Literary Interpretation. Volume 1 The Gospel According to Luke; Volume 2 The Acts*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, Volume 1 1986; Volume 2 1990

TANNEHILL, Robert C., “The Functions of Peter’s Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts”, *NTS* 37 (1991), 400-414

TANNEHILL, Robert C., *Luke*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee, 1996

TAYLOR, Justin, “The Jerusalem Decrees (Acts 15.20, 29 and 21.25) and the Incident at Antioch (Gal 2.11-14)”, *NTS* 47 (2001), 372-380

TAYLOR, Vincent, (edited by Owen E. Evans), *The Passion Narrative of St Luke*, CUP, 1972

TEEPLE, Howard M., *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, JBL Monograph Series X, Philadelphia, 1957

TEMPLETON, Elizabeth, “Reflecting on Acts: Two Biblical Studies”, *One in Christ* 28 (1992), 97-105

THIEDE, Carsten P., *Simon Peter – From Galilee to Rome*, Paternoster Press, Exeter, 1986

THOMAS, Christine M., *The Acts of Peter, Gospel, Literature and the Ancient Novel – Rewriting the Past*, OUP, 2003

THURSTON, Bonnie, *Spiritual Life in the Early Church – the Witness of Acts and Ephesians*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1993

TIEDE, David L., *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1980

TRÉMEL, Bernard, “À Propos D’Actes 20,7-12: Puissance du Thaumaturge ou du Témoin?”, *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*, 112 (1980), 359-369

TROBISCH, David, “The Council of Jerusalem in Acts 15 and Paul’s Letter to the Galatians”, in SEITZ, Christopher and GREENE-McCREIGHT, Kathryn, (Edd), *Theological Exegesis – Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan and Cambridge, UK, 1999, pp 331-338

TROBISCH, D., *Paul’s Letter Collection*, Quiet Water Publications, Bolivar, Missouri, 2001

TROBISCH, David “The Book of Acts as a Narrative Commentary on the Letters of the New Testament: A Programmatic Essay”, in GREGORY, Andrew F., & ROWE, C. Kavin, (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, University of South Carolina Press, 2010, pp 119-127

- TUCKETT, Christopher M., "On the Relationship between Matthew and Luke", *NTS* 30 (1984), 130-142
- TUCKETT, Christopher M., (Ed.), *Luke's Literary Achievement*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995
- TUCKETT, Christopher M., *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1996
- TUCKETT, Christopher M., "The Christology of Luke-Acts", in VERHEYDEN, J., (Ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, Leuven University Press, 1999, pp 133-164
- TUCKETT, Christopher M., *Christology and the New Testament*, Edinburgh University Press, 2001
- TURNER, Max, "The Spirit and the Power of Jesus' - Miracles in the Lucan Conception", *Nov. Test.* XXXIII, 2 (1991), pp 124-152
- UNNIK, W.C. van, "Luke's Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography", in KREMER, Jacob (Ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres – traditions, rédaction, théologie*, Editions Duculot, Paris – Gembloux & Leuven University Press, 1979, pp 37-60
- VERHEYDEN, J., (Ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, Leuven University Press, 1999
- VERHEYDEN, Joseph, "Luke and Acts – The Early Years: Some Comments in the Margin of a Recent Monograph", in GREGORY, Andrew F., & ROWE, C. Kevin, (Eds.), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, University of South Carolina Press, 2010, pp 97-118
- VERMES, Geza, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Penguin Books, London, 1998
- VÖÖBUS, Arthur, "A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke", *NTS* 15 (1968-9), 457-463
- WAHLEN, Clinton, "Peter's Vision and Conflicting Definitions of Purity", *NTS* 51 (2005), 505-518
- WALL, Robert W., "Successors to 'the Twelve' According to Acts 12:1-17", *CBQ* 53 (1991), 628-643

- WALL, Robert, “A Canonical Approach to the Unity of Acts and Luke’s Gospel” in GREGORY, Andrew F., & ROWE, C. Kevin, (Edd), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, University of South Carolina Press, 2010, pp 172-191
- WALTERS, Patricia, *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts – A Reassessment of the Evidence*, CUP, 2009
- WEAVER, John B., *Plots of Epiphany – Prison-Escape in the Acts of the Apostles*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin & New York, 2004
- WEISER, Alfons, “Tradition und Lukanische Komposition in Apg. 10,36-43”, in *À Cause de l’Évangile – mélanges offerts à Dom Jacques Dupont*, Cerf/ Publication de Saint-André, 1985, pp 757-767
- WIARDA, Timothy, *Peter in the Gospels - Pattern, Personality, Relationship*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2000
- WILCKENS, Ulrich, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte – Form- und traditionsgegeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Neukirchener Verlag, 3rd edition 1974 (1st edition 1961)
- WILCOX, Max, “ ‘Upon the Tree’ – Dt 21:22-23 in the New Testament”, *JBL* 46 (1977), 85-99
- WILES, Maurice, *The Divine Apostle*, CUP, 1967
- WILLIMON, William H., “ ‘Eyewitnesses and Ministers of the Word’ – Preaching in Acts”, *Interpretation* XLII (1988), 158-170
- WILSON, Stephen G., *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*, CUP, 1973
- WILSON, Walter T., “Urban Legends: Acts 10:1 – 11:18 and the Strategies of Greco-Roman Foundation Narratives”, *JBL* 120 (2001), 77-99
- WINTER, Bruce W. & CLARKE, Andrew D. (Edd), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. 1 The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*, Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Paternoster Press, Carlisle, UK, 1993

WITHERINGTON, Ben III, (Ed.), *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, CUP, 1996

WITHERINGTON, Ben III, *The Acts of the Apostles, A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Cambridge, UK, and Paternoster Press, Carlisle, 1998

WITHERUPP, Ronald D., “Functional Redundancy in the Acts of the Apostles: A Case Study”, *JSNT* 48 (1992), 67-86

WITHERUPP, Ronald D., “Cornelius Over and Over and Over Again: ‘Functional Redundancy’ in the Acts of the Apostles 2”, *JSNT* 49 (1993), 45-66

WUELLNER, Wilhelm H., *The Meaning of “Fishers of Men”*, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1967

ZEHNLE, Richard F., *Peter’s Pentecost Discourse – Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter’s Speeches of Acts 2 and 3*, SBL Monograph 15, Abingdon Press, Nashville, New York, 1971

ZIESLER, J. A., “The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles”, *JSNT* 4 (1979), 28-41

ZILLESSEN, Klaus, “Das Schiff des Petrus und die Gefährten vom andern Schiff - (Zur Exegese von Luc 5.1-11)”, *ZNTW* LVII (1966), 137-139

ZWIEP, Arie W., *Judas and the Choice of Matthias*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 2.Reihe, 187, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2004