

The Acts of the Apostles as a Witness to Early Palestinian Christianity

Richard N. Longenecker

The question regarding the value of the Acts of the Apostles as a witness to the life and thought of early Palestinian Christianity is of primary importance in today's discussions concerning the circumstances and convictions of the earliest Christians. Interpretation, be it ever so acute, has no hope of success if it bases itself upon wrong materials or fails to consider relevant data.

EARLIER CRITICISM

Nineteenth-century criticism leveled a very adverse judgment on the book's historical accuracy. The investigations of William Ramsay on matters historical and geographical, and the studies of Adolf Harnack on literary relationships and sources, to a large extent, however, reversed this opinion.¹ As a result of their work, the basic reliability of the Acts account was considered by most at the turn of the century to be adequately established. What doubts there

were continued to be focused on the presentation of the character and activities of Paul. Where the Paul of Acts could be more or less compared with the Paul of the apostle's own letters, serious discrepancies seemed evident. And there was a common feeling that in this regard "Acts does not place the narrative above suspicion of inaccuracy."² Yet this suspicion, while nagging, was not able to displace the general attitude of confidence in the record engendered by the demonstrable historical correlations such as Ramsay had brought forward.

The first half of the twentieth century, in the wake of Harnack's suggestion of sources behind Acts, witnessed a vigorous debate regarding Luke's dependence in writing. Was his work based on an earlier source or sources, written or in part oral, which can still be ascertained in certain linguistic peculiarities ("semitisms") and stylistic alterations in the text?³ Or are we to consider his production a free composition after the order

of certain contemporary historians, with the "semitisms" to be understood as "septuagintisms" wherein Luke consciously or unconsciously modeled his language after patterns of the Greek Old Testament?⁴ In the main, scholars who favored a semitic source or sources emphasized Luke's faithfulness to his material and the general authenticity of the record. Those who viewed the work as a free composition with semitic styling viewed innovations in the basic content as inevitable.

MODERN CRITICISM

Modern criticism, to a great extent, disclaims the relevancy of the question of historical reliability and has given up the quest for source material, concentrating on the author's intent in writing and his theological concerns. "Form-criticism" or "style-criticism" as it is called in respect to Acts, works from two postulates: (1) that Acts must be judged either as a volume setting forth basic Christian proclamation *or* as a historical treatise setting forth certain events, and that if adjudged the one it cannot also be considered the other; and (2) that, joining hands with Schweitzer's "consistent eschatology" at this point, the futurist hope of the earliest believers preempted a historical interest on their part.⁵ Thus Acts (together, of course, with the Third Gospel), since it presents itself in historical guise, cannot be early. Its kerygmatic nature prohibits our asking if the sermonic illustrations used to make a point are really historically authentic. And further, the criticism of the nineteenth century is still pertinent in demonstrating that as a matter of fact the work is quite historically inaccurate. It probably preserves only a few names from the earlier tradition. Perhaps also some factual remembrances

lie behind the episode of Stephen and the Hellenists of Acts 6:1-8:3, since that section seems so out of harmony with the conciliatory purpose of the works as a whole. But on the whole, the Book of Acts must be classed a late first century production engaged in the task of historicizing the primitive futuristic Gospel in an endeavor to counter the disillusionment that set in because of the *parousia's* delay and the rise of gnostic speculation.⁶ And in the first fifteen chapters particularly, the author is judged as producing an edifying sketch rather than anything that could be identified as history: sources are at a bare minimum, the narrative and speeches reflect his interests and not those of the early community, and the semitizing style indicates something of the fabricated nature of the whole. But though the decibel pitch is high and confidence unflinching in the assertion that Acts provides historical information only for the post-apostolic period, there are reasons to think otherwise.

To speak only negatively at first, it must be asked whether Martin Dibelius, Ernst Haenchen, Hans Conzelmann, and even the more conciliatory C.K. Barrett, to name only the most prominent commentators on Acts representative of this position, have not superimposed their own reactions and desires on the outlook of the early church in explaining how the earliest Christians responded in their situation. That futurist hopes were strong among the earliest believers must never be denied. But need we therefore declare the impossibility of "realized eschatology" co-existing with a futurist emphasis, or that an understanding of eschatology as in some sense fulfilled could only have arisen with the abandonment of the futurist orientation? Is so-called "inaugurated eschatology" to be relegated to the post-apostolic stratum simply because the critic

cannot accommodate both futurist and present elements within his system? Professor W.C. van Unnik has aptly expressed his reservation with this monolithic interpretation of early Christian eschatology in saying:

I cannot help confessing that the exegetical basis for many statements in the modern approach to Luke-Acts is often far from convincing, at least highly dubious in my judgment... Has the delay of the *parousia* really wrought that havoc that it is sometimes supposed to have done, or did the early Christians react differently from the way modern scholars would have done? In the light of the history of early Christianity this effect of the *Parousieverzögerung* is highly overrated. The faith of the early Christians did not rest on a date, but on the work of Christ.⁷

Similarly, contemporary “kerygmatic criticism” can rightly be faulted on (1) its too hasty separation of proclamation and a historical interest, (2) its too stringent conditions set down for the credibility of a narrative, and (3) its readiness to see gnosticism lurking everywhere behind the New Testament. While it is popular in today’s climate to effect a divorce between *kerygma* and history, it is a *non sequitur* to argue from the undoubted fact of an apostolic interest in the proclamation of the Gospel to an apostolic disinterest in the historical data upon which that Gospel is based. On the matter of stringency of conditions imposed, the statements of H.E.W. Turner and W.C. van Unnik are pertinent:

The fact that a number of questions which we should wish to put to the documents are unanswerable does not by itself cast doubt on their veracity as historical documents. It may merely imply that we are selecting the wrong criteria to get the best out of our sub-

ject-matter or framing the wrong questions to put to our sources. However legitimate its methods and aims, criticism can easily and imperceptibly turn into hypercriticism and become in the process as ham-fisted as literalism.⁸

Would it not be wise to be somewhat more moderate in the questions we ask of Luke? Because he was not omniscient on all events of the apostolic age, it does not follow that he was unreliable in what he does tell us, or that he is a pious but untrustworthy preacher. We must grant him the liberty of not being interested in all matters that interest us. I am sure that if the same tests to which Luke has often been subjected were applied to historians of our own time, e.g. about World War II, they would not stand the test. It would be very wholesome to many a N.T. scholar to read a good many sources of secular history—and not only theological books. Then it would appear that sometimes a single story may be really significant for a great development, and that summaries as such are not a sign of lack of information.⁹

And if gnosticism was really a factor in motivating the author of the Third Gospel and Acts, why did he not mention or allude to this threat? Neither Conzelmann nor Haenchen adequately deals with this difficulty; and all Barrett can suggest in admitting that “Luke studiously avoids gnostic thought and language”¹⁰ is that Luke-Acts counters its antagonist in killing it by silence. But on this basis, almost any ideology of which we personally disapprove, ancient or modern, can be claimed to be known by and countered by Luke. Barrett finds himself at the end of his *Luke the Historian* in the unenviable dilemma of arguing on the one hand that the Lucan writings are a “vehicle of the

spirit of the age"¹¹—an age when the church was “defending itself against gnostic corruption and redefining its eschatology in view of the lengthening period between the resurrection and the *parousia*”¹²—and yet having to admit that “it was another Spirit that enabled him (Luke) to address to his age a message differing far more sharply than might have been expected from current Christian opinion as this is revealed to us outside the New Testament,” for the atmosphere and methodology of Luke’s works are not comparable to those of his (supposed) contemporaries, Clement of Rome, Ignatius and Justin Martyr.¹³ Only by dating both the tradition and the composition of John’s Gospel and First Epistle at the end of the first century can Barrett find a parallel to Luke’s “different spirit”—but that is begging the issues of Johannine gnosticism, eschatology and provenance.

SOURCES

While there is common agreement today that the structure of C.C. Torrey’s “unified Aramaic source” theory was larger than his foundations warranted, there is also widespread acknowledgment of a “markedly Semitic cast and coloring”¹⁴ in the Book of Acts generally. Is this “cast and coloring” to be credited to translation phenomena, underlying sources, an imitation of septuagintal language, or in some sense to a combination of these factors? Matthew Black rightly warns us that precise determination of such a question on a linguistic basis “is only very rarely possible.”¹⁵ Yet this warning must not be taken to mean that investigations along this line are worthless. Both Black and Max Wilcox, on the basis of their own linguistic analyses, conclude that the semitisms of Acts have resulted from the interaction of LXX influence and

Aramaic (perhaps also Hebrew) sources; and that while the Lucan “septuagintisms” are readily explicable, the “hard-core” non-LXX semitisms—found particularly in Acts 1-15—require some theory of documentary background.¹⁶

Taking a different tack on the basis of statistical analysis, and dealing with such unconscious syntactical traits as the frequency and positioning of conjunctions, prepositions, and articles, R.A. Martin has substantially agreed with Black and Wilcox. Martin concludes that while certain phrases and idioms in Acts show LXX influence,

there are, however, a number of Semitic syntactical features particularly which are more common in the first half of Acts, *indeed in certain subsections* of the first part of Acts. This phenomenon is difficult, if not impossible, to explain on the basis of conscious or unconscious influence of the Septuagint on the writer, and most naturally to be explained as the result of Semitic sources underlying these subsections.¹⁷

We need not assert that such “hard-core” non-LXX semitisms are translation phenomena entirely, as Martin, Paul Winter, and W.F. Albright tend to consider them.¹⁸ Black is probably right in speaking of Luke’s use of sources as being in a more literary than slavishly literal manner,¹⁹ and Nigel Turner should probably be heeded to some extent in his insistence that we consider Lucan sources in more an ultimate than an immediate sense.²⁰ Max Wilcox’s suggestion of previously prepared blocks of semitized Greek Old Testament material after the order of the Qumran testimonia is a fruitful possibility as well.²¹ But with these qualifications, it must be insisted that the fact “that such primitive elements have been preserved is ‘a rather strong indication of the general authenticity.’”²²

NARRATIVE

But confidence in the reliability of the record is not adequately fostered simply in the recognition of earlier Semitic materials underlying certain portions of Acts. Matters of factual accuracy must be considered as well. And in this regard, Professor Cadbury's early article on "The Greek and Jewish Traditions of Writing History" set the tone for much of the interpretation of Acts since World War I. There he asserted:

It must be constantly remembered that the modern criticism of sources, tests of historical probability, and insistence on first-hand evidence was not customary in antiquity even among those writers who in their criticism of others and in their conventional claims for their own work seem most nearly to have understood modern criteria.

Instead of accuracy the purpose of ancient historians tended to make the form the chief point of emphasis.²³

That this statement was extreme has been shown by A.W. Mosley in his study of the historiographical intent of such writers as Lucian, Dionysius, Polybius, Ephorus, Cicero, Josephus and Tacitus. The ancients, according to Mosley's study, did ask the question, "Did it happen in this way?" and though many were slovenly and uninformed in their reporting, others "tried to be as accurate as possible and to get information from eyewitnesses."²⁴

Luke claims accuracy of narration based upon eyewitness accounts for his Gospel,²⁵ and there is no reason *a priori* to deny a similar intent for his Acts. In comparing Luke's Gospel with that of Matthew, assuming a common use of Mark and "Q", it is possible more or less to check Luke's degree of variation from his sources. And while there are obvious differences between the Third Gospel and the First, all of which pro-

bably can be accounted for better on thematic and circumstantial grounds than on those of *Parousieverzögerung*, no charge of rank innovation can be laid. So, too, no similar charge ought easily to be considered against his work in Acts, though we have no comparable "Matthew" by which to judge his handling of materials. I have argued elsewhere that where we can test Acts by the letters of Paul, the portrait of Paul has not been despoiled nor the narrative of Acts discredited.²⁶ I can only refer those interested to that presentation. But though Haenchen decries the "astounding liberty" which he believes the author of Acts has taken in matters of facticity,²⁷ it must be said that the vast majority of his difficulties arise from his own lack of sympathetic understanding of what Luke is trying to say, his impatience with a selective writing of history, and the scarcity of contemporary first century data.

Luke, it is true, varies considerably from the modern historian. There is no citing of authorities, no striving for completeness, and no interaction with competing viewpoints. He presents his material in dramatic vignettes, which "present not so much a single picture as a series of glimpses."²⁸ He is more interested in impressions than the establishment of cause and effect nexuses. And what he does tell us often leaves us grasping for the indigeneous thesis that will unify the whole, as witness the continuing debate on the purpose of Luke in writing. But the fact that he has styled his presentation in a unique manner, is uninterested in some issues that preoccupy modern theological historiography, and is primarily concerned to proclaim the continuing activity of the ascended Christ in His Church and the world, does not necessitate the relegation of the narrative to the historically unreliable.²⁹ Perhaps only in such a manner could his

history have been significant and compelling. We may prefer to deride the historicity of Acts on the basis of our understanding of a “kerygmatic” witness, or because our picture of the early Church differs. But in so doing we shall be near the position of those who proceed *per ignotum ad ignotius*. It is noteworthy “the extra-ordinary darkness which comes over us as students of history when rather abruptly this guide leaves us with Paul a prisoner in Rome.”³⁰ To discredit the history of Acts is to extend the darkness, not to illuminate. Even “so far as the sequence of events is concerned we can accept or reject the narrative; (but) we cannot supplement it, for there is no other.”³¹

SPEECHES

As with the narrative, Professor Cadbury’s early claim that “from Thucydides downwards, speeches reported by the historians are confessedly pure imagination”³² set the tone for most of the recent scholarly responses to the speeches recorded in Acts. But critical study of the sermons and defenses of Peter, Stephen and Paul has not moved in only one direction, and many have come to feel such a judgment on the speeches of Acts to be extreme.

That there is a “far-reaching identity of structure” in the speeches may be acknowledged without necessary denigration of the authenticity of content. At best, they are paraphrastic summaries of what Luke himself was convinced has been said; certainly the original delivery contained more detail of argument and illustration than presently included, as poor Eutychus could testify.³³ Stenographic reports they are not. And probably few ever so considered them. They have been styled, as is required of every paraphrase; and, further, styled in accor-

dance with the narrative. But the recognition of a styling that produces speeches compatible to the narrative in which they are found need not be interpreted as a necessary declaration of inaccuracy of reporting or lack of traditional material, especially when the same man reports both.

In the Third Gospel, again by comparison with Matthew, Luke did not invent sayings for Jesus. On the contrary, he seems to have been more literally exact in the transmission of the words of Jesus than in the recording of the events of His life. Martin Dibelius insisted that this comparison should not be taken as presumptive evidence for similarity of treatment in Acts, for:

When he wrote the Gospel, Luke had to fit in with a tradition which already had its own stamp upon it, so that he had not the same literary freedom as when he composed the Acts of the Apostles. On the other hand, unless we are completely deceived, he was the first to employ the material available for the Acts of the Apostles, and so was able to develop the book according to the point of view of a historian writing literature.³⁴

And C.F. Evans has asserted that the discourses of Jesus and the speeches of Acts are two entirely different literary genre and thus not able to be compared, since the Gospel presents independent *logia* whereas Acts contains more rounded and carefully constructed sermons.³⁵ But, as S.S. Smalley points out, the differences of structure which Evans has underscored, while impressive, are not surprising “if the teaching method of Jesus is taken properly into account.”³⁶ And further, contra Dibelius, “because we are not able to confirm the reliability of Luke’s use of sources in his second volume (in that we have no ‘Matthew’ for Acts) there is no *prima facie* reason why it should be assumed to differ wide-

ly from its character in the first.”³⁷ There is, it must still be insisted, a presumption in favor of similarity of treatment in Luke’s handling of the words of Jesus and his recording of the addresses of Peter, Stephen and Paul. And though his respect for the latter undoubtedly never rivaled his veneration of the former, it is difficult to believe that this difference of regard appreciably affected the desire for accuracy of content which he evidenced in his Gospel.

That Luke strove for accuracy of content—or at least has not imposed his own theology on the speeches he recorded to the perverting of their original character—has been indicated in significant articles by H.N. Ridderbos and C.F.D. Moule.³⁸ Ridderbos points to the lack of developed theology in the speeches of Peter as a mark of reliable historiography, and not inventive genius. And Moule convincingly argues that the Christology of Acts is not uniform, either between the personages represented or between Luke and his characters: that there are a “number of seemingly undesigned coincidences and subtle nuances” which indicate a retention of the essential character of the content presented.³⁹

The problem as to why, in accurately representing earlier sermons and defenses that for the most part had their origin in an Aramaic speaking community, Luke consistently used the LXX in quoting from the Old Testament is a difficulty without ready resolution. It may be, as Torrey suggested, that he altered the material at this point in order to use the text that “was familiar to those for whom he wrote,”⁴⁰ or Wilcox’s suggestion of previously prepared Greek *testimonia* circulating within the early Church and used by Luke may advance the discussion.⁴¹ But in view of the uncertainties regarding language in first century Palestine,⁴² and the inability to

specify the exact nature of the Old Testament text used by bi- and tri-lingual Jewish Christians of Palestine,⁴³ it becomes precarious to employ the LXX quotations in the speeches to demonstrate invention.

The Book of Acts should therefore be considered of major importance as a source for the study of early Palestinian Christianity, for, as Bo Reicke says: “Luke may be assumed to have taken over material that was originally Jewish-Christian. This, accordingly, can for good reasons be traced back to the Jerusalem congregation.”⁴⁴

Notes

¹ W. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1897); *idem*, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1915); A. Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, trans. J.R. Wilkinson (London: Williams & Norgate, 1907); *idem*, *The Acts of the Apostles*, trans. J.R. Wilkinson (London: Williams & Norgate, 1909); *idem*, *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels* (London: 1911).

² Cf. F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1920—1933), I, 311.

³ To trace briefly the development of source criticism up to 1950, confining it to Acts 1-15 which is principally at issue here: A. Harnack proposed a number of Greek sources and resultant doublets of narrative (*Acts of the Apostles*); C.C. Torrey argued for one Aramaic source which Luke faithfully and somewhat mechanically translated (*The Composition and Date of Acts* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916]); H.J. Cadbury, F.J. Foakes Jackson, and K. Lake combined the linguistic arguments for an Aramaic background with the thesis of varied sources and doublets, also recognizing septuagintal influence (*Beginnings*, II, esp. 9—10, 129—130, 145); J. Jeremias rejected a theory of doublets in the narrative, insisted upon only one recognizable Antiochian written source, and view-

ed Acts 2-5 as based upon a Jerusalemite oral tradition ("Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte," *Z.N.W.*, XXXVI [3—4, 1937], 205—221); and M. Black proposed an Aramaic substructure to Acts 1—15, sources of both a written and an oral nature being used in a literary fashion (*An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1946]).

⁴ At the end of the nineteenth century, E. Hatch maintained the importance of the LXX in the language of the New Testament (*Essays in Biblical Greek* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1889]), though his work was labeled as exaggerated by T.K. Abbott, H.A.A. Kennedy, and A. Deissmann. In reaction to Torrey's thesis, J. de Zwaan and W.K.L. Clarke developed a cautious apologetic for semitized Greek on the pattern of the LXX though still recognizing the possibility of scattered sources (*Beginnings*, II, 30—105); M. Dibelius argued in his 1923 article for a septuagintal styling of the language of Acts ("Style Criticism of the Book of Acts," *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. H. Greeven, trans. M. Ling [London: SCM, 1956]); H.F.D. Sparks strongly affirmed conscious septuagintisms ("The Semitisms of Acts," *J.T.S.*, I [1, 1950], 16—28); N. Turner favored a conscious septuagintal flourish in the writing of Acts, though allowed the possibility of some semitic source materials ultimately, though not immediately, underlying the composition ("The Relation of Luke I and II to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts," *N.T.S.*, II [2, 1956], 100—109).

⁵ See E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), esp. pp. 30—41, 90—102; H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. G. Buswell (New York: Harper & Row; London: Faber & Faber, 1961), esp. pp. 12—15, 210—211; C.K. Barrett, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* (London: Epworth, 1961), *passim*.

⁶ In his revision of P. Feine and J. Behm's *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. A.J. Mattill, Jr. (London: SCM, 1965), W.G. Kümmel rightly questions these as motives in the writing of Acts (pp. 114, 120—122).

⁷ W.C. van Unnik, "Luke-Acts, A Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship," *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), p. 28.

⁸ H.E.W. Turner, *Historicity and the Gospels* (London: Mowbray, 1963), pp. 1—2.

⁹ W.C. van Unnik, "Luke-Acts, A Storm Center," *op. cit.*, p. 29. For a brief account of factors having to do with incompleteness and selectivity that have occasioned the judgment that the author of Acts lacked a historical interest, see W.G. Kümmel, *Intro. to the N.T.*, pp. 116—117.

¹⁰ C.K. Barrett, *Luke the Historian*, p. 62.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 70.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 76. J.C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), attempts to establish a date between A.D. 115 and 130 for Acts on the basis that "Luke" and Justin Martyr "held common theological positions without being dependent on each other" (p. 21). But I believe the distinctive parallels cited by O'Neill are better explained along the lines of a common set of conceptual images and expressions held by Jewish Christians of both the first and second centuries, and reported or reflected by two different Gentile authors.

¹⁴ M. Black, "Second Thoughts — X. The Semitic Element in the New Testament," *E.T.*, LXXVII (1, 1965), 20.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 20—23. See also *idem*, *Aramaic Approach*, and M. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965).

¹⁷ R.A. Martin, "Syntactical Evidence of Aramaic Sources in Acts I—XV," *N.T.S.*, XI (1, 1964), 38—39.

¹⁸ P. Winter, "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel," *N.T.S.*, I (2, 1955), 111—121; *idem*, "The Proto-Source of Luke 1," *Novum Testamentum*, I (3, 1956), 184—199; W.F. Albright, *New Horizons in Biblical Research* (London: Oxford, 1966), p. 50.

¹⁹ M. Black, *Aramaic Approach*, pp. 209—210. Cf. F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake: "The truth seems to be that although there is a *prima facie* probability for the use of written sources in Acts, and especially for Aramaic sources in the earlier chapters, the writer wrote too well to allow us to distinguish with certainty either the boundaries of his sources or the extent of his own editorial work" (*Beginnings*, II, 133).

²⁰ N. Turner, "The Relation of Luke I and II to Hebraic Sources," *op. cit.*, p. 102.

²¹ M. Wilcox, *Semitisms of Acts*, pp. 181—182.

²² M. Black, "Semitic Element in the N.T.," *op. cit.*, p. 22, quoting M. Wilcox, *Semitisms of Acts*, p. 181.

²³ H.J. Cadbury, *Beginnings*, II, 11.

²⁴ A.W. Mosley, "Historical Reporting in the Ancient World," *N.T.S.*, XII (1, 1967), 26. It must be noted, however, that the implication of Cadbury's statement has been modified by Cadbury himself in his later works.

²⁵ Lk. 1:2-4.

²⁶ R.N. Longenecker, *Paul, Apostle of Liberty* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), pp. 245—263.

²⁷ E. Haenchen, "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity," *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), p. 260.

²⁸ F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, *Beginnings*, I, 301.

²⁹ Cf. B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, trans. E.J. Sharpe (Lund: Gleerup; Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1961), pp. 208—210, where it is pointed out that though Luke was “an extremely purposeful theologian and writer,” this does not exclude the possibility of his faithfulness to the historical tradition. Certainly to discredit the historical worth of Acts for the reason that “we do not learn the historically significant things about Paul” (W.G. Kümmel, *Intro. to the N.T.*, p. 117) is unjust. All such a statement really says is that the critic’s idea of what was significant in apostolic history and Luke’s are quite different. But that has little importance as an argument against the facticity of Luke’s account in following out his own interests.

³⁰ H.J. Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (London: Black, 1955), p. 3.

³¹ F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, *Beginnings*, I, 313. Similarly, and in a more positive vein, G. Dix, *Jew and Greek*, pp. 38—40.

³² H.J. Cadbury, *Beginnings*, II, 13.

³³ Acts 20:7-12.

³⁴ M. Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, p. 185. Cf. also W.G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 116.

³⁵ C. F. Evans, “The Kerygma,” *J.T.S.*, VII (1, 1956), 27.

³⁶ S.S. Smalley, “The Christology of Acts,” *E.T.*, LXXVIII (12, 1962), 358.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 359.

³⁸ H.N. Ridderbos, *The Speeches of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles* (London: Tyndale, 1962); C.F.D. Moule, “The Christology of Acts,” *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L. E. Keck and J.L. Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 159—185.

³⁹ C.F.D. Moule, *ibid.*, pp. 181—182.

⁴⁰ C.C. Torrey, *Composition and Date of Acts*, p. 58.

⁴¹ M. Wilcox, *Semitisms of Acts*, pp. 181—182.

⁴² Cf. R.H. Gundry, “The Language Milieu of First-Century Palestine,” *J.B.L.*, LXXXIII (4, 1964), 404—408.

⁴³ On the impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on the question of the form of the quotations in Acts (esp. of Amos 9:11 in Acts 15:16), see J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), esp. pp. 78—79.

⁴⁴ Bo Reicke, “Incarnation and Exaltation,” *Interpretation*, XVI (2, 1962), 161; see also *idem*, *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1957), pp. 5—8.

No man of brains denyeth that man hath a will that’s Naturally free; . . . But it is not free from evil Dispositions. It is Habitually averse to God . . . It is enslaved by a sinful byas . . . You have not this Spiritual Moral Free-will, which is but your right Inclination . . . If you had a will that were freed from wicked Inclinations, I had no need to write such Books as this.

From Richard Baxter,
A Call to the Unconverted (1658)