

Title

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WITNESS MOTIF  
IN LUKE-ACTS

by

David J. Kelly

Ph. D.

Religious Studies

David J. Kelly

The Development of the Witness Motif  
in Luke-Acts

In the speeches of Peter in Acts there can be found a theory of the witness which is eschatological and oriented toward Israel; the martys is one who is an eyewitness of Jesus' activities and is a member of an inner circle, the Twelve, and is given the title, "witness of his resurrection." But this is only one witness theory, for the author of Luke-Acts has provided another which may be seen as a "correction" of the early "Petrine witness theory." This Lucan viewpoint is anticipated in the Gospel and developed in Acts. It is teleological in emphasis and international, having as its major representative, Paul. This is a "democratized" theory based on the author's experience with the Holy Spirit. The preferred title is "witness of Jesus" and the background for the development of the theme is Isaiah 43:10-13.

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WITNESS MOTIF**

**IN LUKE-ACTS**

**by**

**DAVID J. KELLY**

**A DISSERTATION**

**SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**Faculty of Religious Studies**

**June, 1972**

**McGill University**

**Montreal**

**© David J. Kelly 1973**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                        |    |
|------------------------|----|
| PREFACE . . . . .      | ii |
| INTRODUCTION . . . . . | 1  |

### PART I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WITNESS THEORY

#### Chapter

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| I. WITNESS LANGUAGE IN LUKE'S GOSPEL . . . . .  | 11  |
| The Eyewitnesses<br>Non-special Usage<br>The Time to Witness<br>Witnesses of These Things |     |
| II. THE RISEN LORD AND THE LUCAN WITNESS . . . . .  | 41  |
| The Risen Lord<br>'Editorial Comments'  |     |
| III. THE PETRINE WITNESS . . . . .  | 72  |
| The Witness in Peter's Speeches<br>Peter and the Lucan Witness                            |     |
| IV. THE PAULINE WITNESS . . . . .   | 106 |
| The Speeches<br>Paul and the Lucan Witness  |     |



## PART II. THE WITNESS THEOLOGY

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| V. WHO SPEAKS FOR JESUS? . . . . .            | 144 |
| The Power and the Witness                     |     |
| The Matthias Election Reconsidered            |     |
| Who Speaks for Jesus?                         |     |
| VI. "THE THINGS CONCERNING ME" . . . . .      | 164 |
| VII. DEUTERO-ISAIAH AND THE LUCAN WITNESS . . | 179 |
| The Plan of Acts and the Trial Speech         |     |
| The Nature of the Μάρτυς                      |     |
| The 'Εγὼ Μάρτυς                               |     |
| 'Απωλύτως                                     |     |
| CONCLUSION . . . . .                          | 200 |
| APPENDIX . . . . .                            | 206 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .                        | 210 |

C

PART II. THE WITNESS THEOLOGY

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| V. WHO SPEAKS FOR JESUS? . . . . .            | 144 |
| The Power and the Witness                     |     |
| The Matthias Election Reconsidered            |     |
| Who Speaks for Jesus?                         |     |
| VI. "THE THINGS CONCERNING ME" . . . . .      | 164 |
| VII. DEUTERO-ISAIAH AND THE LUCAN WITNESS . . | 179 |
| The Plan of Acts and the Trial Speech         |     |
| The Nature of the Μάρτυς                      |     |
| The 'Εγὼ Μάρτυς                               |     |
| 'Ανωλύτως                                     |     |
| CONCLUSION . . . . .                          | 200 |
| APPENDIX . . . . .                            | 206 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .                        | 210 |

## PREFACE

This study began simply as a matter of curiosity. It seemed odd that, in the first chapter of Acts, Jesus should be found commissioning his followers and promising them power to become witnesses and then that Peter should call for the election of a witness even though nothing had happened. It is from this simple beginning that the following work has moved, first to the problem of the witness theory (or theories) and, second, to the witness theme as the basis for Lucan theology.

I must express appreciation for both of my thesis advisors. Prof. Charles H. H. Scobie had seen most of the work before leaving McGill in April. I am grateful for the time he spent discussing the material with me, especially for the helpful criticisms he offered, and for Prof. George Johnston's kindly assuming this task after Prof. Scobie's departure.

Thanks is due the staff of McGill Religious Studies Library for their service and for the use of

the library's Greek typewriter. Special thanks go to my wife, Judy, who (as a librarian herself) gave invaluable help both in the procurement of books and in the hours spent typing. Also, I wish to thank Miss Irene Sendek (head reference librarian at Loyola) for services rendered by her department, including the photoduplication of this thesis and other inconveniences.

## INTRODUCTION

One of the themes which dominate the book of Acts is that of witness.<sup>1</sup> An expectation of a time for witness for the church is part of the synoptic tradition (Luke 21:12ff. and par.) but it plays a special role in the two-part work known as Luke-Acts whose author we call Luke. That Luke intends a fuller development of the theme than is found in the gospel traditions is evident by the conclusion to his first volume. There in Luke 24 is found material that is peculiar to Luke; there too is found a "commissioning" of witnesses. Acts 1:8 picks up the witness theme and the book of Acts develops it. There are questions raised by this development, however, and this study is an attempt both to show what these questions are and

---

<sup>1</sup>Perhaps this is not so obvious. Daniel P. Fuller, Easter Faith and History (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965), p. 201, lists the "five great themes of Acts"; the witness theme is not mentioned. If Fuller intends it to be included under the heading, "the spread of the Gospel," this may mean that he has not seen the theological significance of μαρτυς.

to provide an alternative to the answers which have been given to some of them.

The method of arranging the material will be seen to diverge somewhat from the usual and reasons will be given shortly for this. The usual method is followed, however, to the extent that attention will be focused on Luke's witness terminology. Primarily, this includes ὁ μάρτυς and its cognates, τὸ μαρτύριον, ἡ μαρτυρία, μαρτύρομαι, μαρτυρέω, διαμαρτύρομαι. An exception to this word group is the single use in Luke 1:2 of αὐτόπτης (eyewitness).

We are, then, concerned initially with a word (μάρτυς) and its cognates. The first part of this study (The Development of the Witness Theory) is exegetical and focuses upon those passages in Luke-Acts in which this witness terminology appears. No distinction will be made in the ordering of the material, as is done in Strathmann's theological dictionary approach, between one cognate and the others.<sup>2</sup> No attempt will be made to trace, for example, a distinctive use of

---

<sup>2</sup>H. Strathmann, "Μάρτυς, κτλ.," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. by Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967), IV, pp. 474-514.

μαρτυρέω throughout Luke-Acts. Acts 23:11 shows the weakness of this method. There Jesus appears to Paul and says, "As (ὥς) you witnessed (διεμαρτύρω) concerning me in Jerusalem, in the same way (οὕτω) must you also witness (μαρτυρῆσαι) in Rome." The two verbs are used here in a Lucan stylistic variation and are hardly distinguishable in nuance.

Perhaps the legitimacy of the arrangement of the material to be found here will not at first be self-evident to the reader, and it may require of him a certain degree of patience. Attention is given first to the language in the Gospel and then to that in Acts. In the latter, the material is further divided three ways: (a) the witness sayings of Jesus and the language as it is found in what is called "editorial comments" (use of the terminology outside the speeches of Acts); (b) the witness terminology as it appears in the speeches of Peter; (c) the terminology as it appears in the speeches of Paul. It will be seen from this that we are opting for a different method also from that which discusses the language simply as it appears (which, of course, is valuable as a preliminary exercise). In defense of this arrangement of the material, several things must be said.

1. The form-critical studies of M. Dibelius yielded the result that the speeches in Acts have Luke as their author and that they represent, not the preaching of the early church in the persons of Peter, Paul, Stephen, but the preaching of Luke and the church in his day (about A. D. 90).<sup>3</sup> Rather than a conclusion, this position is becoming a presupposition of scholarship. When this is applied as a canon to the witness material in Luke-Acts, however, certain problems develop. They develop first of all because, if Luke is to be considered the creator of the speeches (where the major portion of the witness language occurs), we should be able to expect some degree of consistency. But once the material is laid out in a preliminary consecutive fashion it becomes apparent that no consistency exists within the broader framework.

2. Once the inconsistencies are recognized, a way of explaining them becomes necessary. The first question to be asked is, What are they and where do they exist? If, on the whole, there is not a single line of witness thought, an effort must be made to

---

<sup>3</sup>Martin Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ed. by Heinrich Greeven, trans. by Mary Ling (London: SCM Press, 1956), pp. 183-85.



find if there are smaller groups of material which can be shown to maintain degrees of internal consistency. One must establish, in other words, where the differences lie and separate (radically, if necessary) the material along these lines. Thus we are involved in a method of isolating smaller units in which witness language appears and examining them independently. Once isolated, the single units must be grouped. In our presentation of the material, therefore, the witness language is arranged under the speaker; hence, treated in different chapters are the witness statements of Peter and then of Paul. Once this is done, however, there remains a body of material which lies outside these two sets of speeches. As indicated above, the sayings of the risen Lord (Acts 1:8 and 23:11) must further be separated from the language as it appears outside the speeches (added comments made by the author or editor of Acts). Once this is done, some rule must be established by which to measure the material. The most obvious and therefore the one we shall use, is to treat the Jesus logia and the "editorial comments" as primary. The material as it appears in the Gospel is treated in a separate section (chapter 1), and it, too, is useful as a determiner of the Lucan

standpoint, especially since the passages which point toward the development of the witness motif in Acts are also in the form of speeches by Jesus. In adopting this approach, the importance of the form-critical method is assumed but its results are not.

3. The second major question follows readily: Why do the differences exist, and what purpose does their inclusion in the Lucan narrative serve? The very occurrence of discernible differences suggests that we are dealing with more than one witness theory. If there remains any doubt that Luke has created the idea of the witness in its entirety, this in itself not only justifies, but necessitates, a new and systematic study in order to give adequate account for the apparently diverse "traditions." In asking the question, Why? however, we are pushing the inquiry into the area of Lucan theology.

One may wish to explain the diversity which exists by speaking of "a fine distinction"<sup>4</sup> which Luke is making between Peter as witness and Paul as witness. Strathmann's explanation is that there are two types

---

<sup>4</sup>Robert Koch, "Zeugnis," Bibeltheologisches Wörterbuch, hrsg. von Johannes B. Bauer (2 Bds.; 2. Aufl.; Graz: Verlag Styria, 1962), II, p. 1250.

of witness, both Lucan, in Acts: (a) the witness to facts (the Twelve), and (b) the evangelistic witness (Paul).<sup>5</sup> Or one may say (as probably the majority do) that Paul is made a witness like the apostles by means of a vision of the risen Lord; thus all go by the title, "witnesses of the resurrection." Or, again, one may find it necessary to dismiss Paul as witness, since μάρτυς is for Luke a "technical term" for the Twelve, who are eyewitnesses of Jesus' activities.

The above summarizes the three main interpretations of Luke's use of μάρτυς and the witness terminology. It is with these positions that much of the argumentation of the present study will deal as our examination of the material proceeds. The results of the exegesis will then be presented in a theological synthesis (Part II, The Witness Theology).

4. The principal interest in μάρτυς as R. P. Casey points out, has been to explain how the word "gradually lost its usual sense of a witness at a trial and came to mean one who testified to the truth of Christianity by sacrificing his life."<sup>6</sup> The bounds

---

<sup>5</sup>Strathmann, "Μάρτυς," pp. 492-94.

<sup>6</sup>Robert P. Casey, "Note V. Μάρτυς," in The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. by F. J. Foakes

of the present study, however, are so strictly defined that much of the literature on the *πάπτος* theme was not found to be pertinent.<sup>7</sup> Our investigation concerns the witness motif as it appears in a particular literature, the two volumes written by an author known as Luke. Within these two volumes it can be shown that there is a conscious development of the witness theme, and our task is to find out how it is developed and why. Although occasional reference will be made, especially in the section on the Gospel of Luke, to other literature within the New Testament (e. g., to the Fourth Gospel, the Pauline letters), this is deliberately avoided as much as possible in order both not to be influenced by possible differences or similarities and to adhere strictly to our purpose of investigating Luke's method and thought.

The main thesis, therefore, falls into two parts and may be stated as follows: 1. The Lucan

---

Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (5 vols.; London: Macmillan and Co., 1920-1933), V, pp. 30-31 (Hereinafter referred to as BC).

<sup>7</sup>But see the wealth of material cited in Strathmann, "*Μάρκος*," p. 474; and Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Christian Literature, trans. and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (4th rev. and augm. ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 495-96.

development of the concept of witness moves consciously away from an early restricted theory (which requires an eyewitness) toward a more democratic theory, from an eschatological to a teleological concept of witness.

2. Luke's "corrected" theory is founded on (a) his experience with the Holy Spirit and (b) his reading of the Old Testament, particularly Isa. 43:8-13.

**PART I**

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WITNESS THEORY**

## CHAPTER I

### WITNESS LANGUAGE IN LUKE'S GOSPEL

It is the book of Acts which employs the motif of witness to its fullest. Since Acts is the second of a two-part work, however, we should expect that there had been indicators in the first part, signposts pointing toward this phenomenon. This chapter is intended as a search for, and evaluation of, these signposts. The search itself is restricted at this point to occurrences of witness language, as defined in the introduction. The language will be discussed as it appears in the text. We begin with Luke 1:2.

#### The Eyewitnesses

Luke 1:2: The author declares his intention to write, following the example of others and using narratives καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου.

The first four verses of Luke's Gospel are probably to be taken as a Preface to the whole work, Luke-

Acts.<sup>1</sup> The author speaks of "the things" which "were delivered" (παρέδωσαν) to the Christian community by those who were, right from the beginning (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς), "eyewitnesses and ministers of the word."

Our attention focuses upon "eyewitnesses" (αὐτόπται).<sup>2</sup> It is clear that Luke is here citing his sources, though in an inexact way.<sup>3</sup> If the αὐτόπται and the ὑπηρέται are to be held together,<sup>4</sup> then the suggestion is that Luke has personally examined life-time companions of Jesus whose qualifications as sources are that they both observed the events and are actively

---

<sup>1</sup>John Martin Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London: Macmillan and Co., 1930), p. 1. See also his citation of similar prefaces from other works, such as Josephus' C. Apion and Diodorus Siculus (pp. 1-2).

<sup>2</sup>I find it difficult to make sense of C. S. Mann's appendix to the Anchor Bible (Johannes Munck, The Acts of the Apostles, rev. by William F. Albright and C. S. Mann, The Anchor Bible, 31 (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1967), pp. 268-70). Mann's criticism of the "usual" English translation of huperetai as "eyewitnesses" is pointless. No translation I know has made this mistake. "Eyewitnesses" not only is the usual, but is also the accurate translation of autoptai in the same phrase.

<sup>3</sup>Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke, p. 4: "Unlike a modern historian, an ancient historian is not always careful to name his sources, but he is naturally anxious to assure his readers that he is well informed."

<sup>4</sup>N. B. Stonehouse, The Witness of Luke to Christ (London: Tyndale Press, 1951), p. 28.



sympathetic to the meaning of them.<sup>5</sup>

When we ask about the relationship to the witness motif, it is significant that Luke here refers to the αὐτόνται as those comprising his source of information rather than the μάρτυρες who become so important in Acts. This is probably deliberate, for μάρτυς takes on a different meaning for Luke than that of an eyewitness, despite efforts to make one dependent upon the other.<sup>6</sup> This is true in spite of Acts 1:21-22,<sup>7</sup> a passage usually considered to contain Lucan qualifications. This argument will be developed later.

---

<sup>5</sup>Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Teilbd. III (9., durchgesehene und ergänzte Aufl.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), p. 15: "Seine Quellen sind zuverlässige; denn sie stammen von Männern, die ihre einstige persönliche Gemeinschaft mit Jesus seitdem durch den Dienst für ihn bewährt haben."

<sup>6</sup>So D. E. Nineham, "Eye-witness Testimony and the Gospel Tradition," Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., IX (1958), p. 14, n. 1; Charles H. Talbert, Luke and the Gnostics (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 23; A. J. B. Higgins, "The Preface to Luke and the Kerygma in Acts," in Apostolic History and the Gospel, ed. by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970), pp. 78-91.

<sup>7</sup>The by-election of Matthias, and the qualifications stated by Peter: "So one of the men who have accompanied us during all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John until the day when he was taken up from us--one of these men must become with us a witness to his resurrection" (RSV).

C. H. Talbert's attempt to equate the αὐτόπται with the μάρτυρες in support of his "legitimate witness," which is an "anti-Gnostic device," and to adduce further support from 2 Peter 1:16 will not stand.<sup>8</sup> The word used in 2 Peter 1:16 is ἐπόπτης, which means one who watches over something, or one who has been initiated into the "mysteries."<sup>9</sup> The phrase, "eyewitnesses (ἐπόπται) of his majesty," appears as an attestation of the truth of the Transfiguration and is in opposition to "cleverly devised myths," probably, as Talbert insists, of a Gnostic sort.<sup>10</sup> But in 2 Peter it is part of a personal claim, whereas the αὐτόπται in Luke 1:2 are sources for a work with some historical intent who can be examined as to their firsthand knowledge of events.<sup>11</sup> It is not to be denied that there are ele-

---

<sup>8</sup>Talbert, Luke and the Gnostics, pp. 67-69, 90.

<sup>9</sup>And therefore having seen the theophanies. This is probably the picture intended in 2 Peter 1:16: E. M. Sidebottom, James, Jude and 2 Peter, The Century Bible, New Edition (London: Nelson, 1967), p. 109; Michael Green, The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude, The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (London: Tyndale Press, 1968), p. 83.

<sup>10</sup>For a recent different interpretation, cf. Bo Reicke, The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude, The Anchor Bible, 37 (2d ed.; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1964), pp. 160-61.

<sup>11</sup>It is probably not the case that Luke places

ments in Luke-Acts which may well be anti-Gnostic in purpose, but the relationship of Luke-Acts to Gnosticism is not so certain as Talbert thinks. That W. Schmithals can also argue for a Gnostic source for the idea of the apostolate should warn us of this.<sup>12</sup>

Although he may have also been an eyewitness, the μάρτυς plays a different and more significant role than a historical source.<sup>13</sup> We must continue our search.

#### Non-special Usage

There are a number of witness-passages in Luke's Gospel that seem to have no direct bearing on our problem. These will be discussed briefly, mainly to see if stray usage will help us in defining Luke's special witness.

1. In 4:22, the comment is made that "they all witnessed (ἐμαρτύρουν) to him." They also "mar-

---

himself among the eyewitnesses; cf. Henry J. Cadbury, "Commentary on the Preface of Luke," BC, II, p. 502.

<sup>12</sup>Walter Schmithals, The Office of Apostle in the Early Church, trans. by John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969), pp. 96-265.

<sup>13</sup>The important distinction by Cadbury should be noted: "μάρτυς emphasises the evidence to be borne, αὐτόπτης the actual presence of the person testifying" (BC, II, p. 499).

velled at his gracious words." This is followed by the skeptical question, "Is not this Joseph's son?" All this follows Jesus' announcement at Nazareth of his mission. Mark 6:1-6 reflects the same incident (cf. Matt. 13:53-58), though Luke's version betrays no verbal dependence and probably is an independently transmitted narrative.<sup>14</sup>

RSV translates, "all spoke well of him," but the subsequent derisive question makes this too positive and therefore improbable. We should probably see here simply a scene of recognition (however unenthusiastic) of the truth of things which were being said about Jesus.<sup>15</sup> The similar testimony from Stephen's opponents (Acts 6:15) likewise does not imply favor.

Luke 4:22 is here included among the incidental instances of witness language for convenience. It should be pointed out, however, that there are parallels, possibly significant, to Acts 14:3. This discussion

---

<sup>14</sup>Francis Wright Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964), pp. 45-46. Beare thinks Luke has probably conflated the stories of the mission of Jesus in Nazareth (p. 46).

<sup>15</sup>Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke, International Critical Commentary (5th ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922), p. 124 (Hereinafter referred to as St. Luke).

will be reserved for the exegesis of the Acts passage.<sup>16</sup>

2. In the story of the healing of the leper (Luke 5:12-16; Matt. 6:1-4; Mark 1:40-45), Jesus instructs the leper (5:14) to tell no one about it, but to show himself to the priest and make the prescribed ceremonial offering (Lev. 13:49; 14:2-32) εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. In Luke's account, Mark's picture of Jesus' embarrassment over the resulting unhealthy popularity is subdued.<sup>17</sup>

Although the significance of εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς is not immediately clear, the story seems to be related to the question of obedience to the Law, and the theory of the "messianic secret" should not be pressed in connection with the command to silence.<sup>18</sup> Plummer thinks the μαρτύριον is the sacrifice,<sup>19</sup> but it is not clear whether the testimony is to the people (αὐτοῖς), indicating ritual cleanness, or to the priests, indicating that Jesus had not disowned the

---

<sup>16</sup>See below, ch. 2, pp. 64-66.

<sup>17</sup>Beare, Earliest Records of Jesus, p. 72.

<sup>18</sup>Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (2d ed.; London: Macmillan, 1966; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966), pp. 185-86.

<sup>19</sup>Plummer, St. Luke, p. 150.

Law.<sup>20</sup> Perhaps it is both, or else simply means a "proof of cleansing."

3. In 9:5 Jesus instructs the Twelve, upon leaving a town where they are not received, to shake off the dust from their feet εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς (cf. Mark 6:7-12; Matt. 10:1, 5, 7-11, 14). Similar instruction is given in the Sending of the Seventy (10:11). This shaking off the dust from feet was a typical act of a Pharisee upon re-entering Judea from a heathen country. Paul and Barnabas perform the symbolic act at Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13:51). The μαρτύριον is a token, or symbolic evidence, of judgment upon a town or its people.

4. A rather obscure saying is 11:48: ἄρα μάρτυρές ἐστε καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν (Q). Here Jesus accuses the lawyers of being "witnesses" (μάρτυρες) and of consenting<sup>21</sup> to the deeds of their fathers against the prophets, "for they killed them, and you build their tombs." The intention of

---

<sup>20</sup>Floyd V. Filson, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew, Black's New Testament Commentaries (2d ed.; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1971), p. 110.

<sup>21</sup>Cf. Acts 8:1, where Saul was συνευδοκῶν to Stephen's death.

Matthew 23:29-32 seems clearer: in building and adorning the tombs of prophets and in professing themselves superior to their murderous fathers, the religious leaders only witness against themselves, i. e., inadvertently offer proof that they are true sons of their fathers.<sup>22</sup> Matt. 23:31 has the verb μαρτυρεῖτε, which in some texts (P75, A C D) has been introduced in Luke 11:48 instead of the noun. What seems to be suggested is that because of their actions they are living proofs of a tacit approval of the misdeeds of their fathers.

5. The story of Dives and Lazarus (16:19-31) is peculiar to Luke. 16:28 gives Dives' reason for requesting Lazarus' return from the grave: ὅπως διαμαρτύρηται αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μὴ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλθωσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον τῆς βασάνου ("so that he may witness to them his five brothers, lest they also come to this place of torment"). διαμαρτύρομαι appears only here

---

<sup>22</sup>The suggestion has been made that behind Luke's "you build" (11:47) and Matthew's (23:31) "you are sons" there may have been an Aramaic word-play in which the two sounded much the same. Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (3rd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 12-13; A. R. C. Leaney, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958), p. 194.

in the Gospel, but in the Acts it occurs nine times<sup>23</sup> (out of only 15 times in the N. T.). It is a strengthened form of the verb "to witness" which means "to declare emphatically," here in the sense of a warning.<sup>24</sup> "To warn"<sup>25</sup> is also the natural significance of Acts 2: 40, 10:42 and 20:23. It may also indicate a method of presenting evidence, i. e., basing an earnest appeal on what is known or strongly believed to be true.

Abraham replies that Moses and the prophets have already given the necessary witness or warning; all that is needed is belief. This reply moves the parable away from a concern with the reversal of fortunes in the life to come to the problem of disbelief. Also involved is the very serious problem of the careless rejection of scriptural witness.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>Acts 2:40; 8:25; 10:42; 18:5; 20:21, 23, 24; 23:11; 28:23.

<sup>24</sup>Strathmann, "Μάρτυς," p. 512.

<sup>25</sup>Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Bd. II: Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte (5., unveränderte Aufl.; München: C. H. Beck, 1969), p. 233 (Hereinafter referred to as S.-B.).

<sup>26</sup>Beare, Earliest Records of Jesus, pp. 182-83; cf. Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, trans. by S. H. Hooke (rev. ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), pp. 182-87.



It would be too much to suggest that all this consciously anticipates the motif of witness which is to be developed so strongly later, but a similarity of pattern does emerge. In Acts the witness argues from the basis of scriptural testimony; he sees his message as continuous with the "witness" of the scriptures (see Acts 10:42-43 and 26:22, where Peter and Paul respectively explain their mission; cf. 28:23), a cue taken by Luke from the stories of Jesus' appearances (Luke 24:44; cf. 18:31; 24:25, 27).

6. During the trial before the Sanhedrin (22:66-71), Jesus is asked, "Are you the son of God?" To this he gives the vague reply, 'Ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι. Thereupon, in 22:71, they said, Τί ἔτι ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας χρείαν; αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἠκούσαμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ("Of what further witness do we have need? We heard it ourselves from his mouth!"). His own words will serve as evidence.

Luke has done considerable reworking of the trial tradition(s). Matt. 26:57-66 and Mark 14:53-64 provide scenes in which false witnesses are made to testify against Jesus. Beare thinks the Lucan version more probable, given the difficulties of the Marcan

nocturnal trial scenes.<sup>27</sup> It may be, however, that Luke has conflated Mark's two trials for the sake of a more orderly narrative.<sup>28</sup>

This is the only scene in Luke's Gospel where a witness word appears specifically in a trial scene. The μαρτυρία refers to the words of Jesus. The μαρτυρία of Paul which will not be accepted (Acts 22: 18) also refers to his words. In neither case does the "witness" imply physical observation.

Summary: Up till now nothing has been uncovered which seems to point toward a developing theme of witness. Only one thing needs to be said: There is no pattern in this language which suggests that "eye-witness testimony" is the usual thought behind its usage. In the one occurrence of μάρτυς, 11:48, this is clearly impossible. We should probably expect this point to be maintained.

We must move on now to examine two very impor-

---

<sup>27</sup>Beare, Earliest Records of Jesus, p. 233.

<sup>28</sup>W. R. F. Browning, The Gospel According to Saint Luke, Torch Bible Commentaries (London: SCM Press, 1960), p. 161. Dibelius sees the Lucan version as "a witness to the further development of the Passion and Easter stories in the church"; Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, trans. by Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), pp. 199-200.

tant passages.

### The Time to Witness

Luke 21:13 reads as follows: ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον. Lit., "it will turn out to you for a testimony."

1. We cannot decide what this means until we have looked at the context. The immediate context, 21:12-19, will suffice at this point (cf. Matt. 10:17-20; Mark 13:9-11). Verses 10 and 11 warn of international strife and natural calamities which are to come. Speaking directly to his followers, Jesus says that, before all this, they will be seized and persecuted, delivered up "to the synagogues and prisons, and . . . brought before kings and governors for my name's sake." Here Luke injects ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον, which is an expanded version of Mark's εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς (Mark 13:9). Matthew's version omits reference to a "witness" where it appears in the charge to the Twelve (10:17-20), but in the greatly altered version in ch. 24, μαρτύριον is used in precisely the way it should be understood in Luke 21:13. Matt. 24:14 reads, καὶ κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,

inverting and clarifying Mark 13:9-10 (. . . εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον).

If Luke 21:13 is to be understood in this way, then μαρτύριον is to be equated with the kerygma.<sup>29</sup> Inferring from the picture of persecution presented in verses 11-12, Plummer paraphrases: "The result to you will be that your sufferings will be for a testimony."<sup>30</sup> This would make possible the "apocalyptic witness" which E. Günther traces through the Lucan writings.<sup>31</sup> The RSV translation, "This will be a time for you to bear testimony," is to be preferred, however, and this

---

<sup>29</sup>See C. Spicq, Saint Paul; les Épîtres pastorales, Études bibliques (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1947), p. clxxxi, n. 11: "μαρτύριον est synonyme de κήρυγμα, διδασκαλία, εὐαγγέλιον; c'est une designation technique du message chrétien." So also Norbert Brox, Zeuge und Märtyrer, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, Bd. V (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1961), p. 45. Cf. André Retif, "Témoignage et prédication missionnaire dans les Actes des Apôtres," Nouvelle Revue Théologique, LXXIII (1951), pp. 152-65, and the discussion there of Lucien Cerfaux, whose article also see: "Témoins du Christ d'après le Livre des Actes," Angelicum, XX (1943), pp. 166-83, reprinted in Recueil Lucien Cerfaux, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Louvaniensium, Vol. VI-VII (2 vols; Gemblous: Éditions J. Duculot, 1954), II, pp. 157-74.

<sup>30</sup>Plummer, St. Luke, p. 479.

<sup>31</sup>Ernst Günther, "Zeuge und Märtyrer," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVII (1956), 153-57.

is borne out in all the accounts, which stress the promise of instant provision for adequate utterance in such cases. Luke's interpretation is especially significant in light of what he is to narrate later concerning the activities of the Christian evangelists, e. g., Paul before Festus, Felix, Agrippa.<sup>32</sup> The παρ'όπου is not the suffering of the persecuted disciple; it is the spoken message he bears.

In the main Luke follows his L source in the description of persecution. Why does he omit Mark's prediction that the gospel must be preached to all nations (cf. 24:47f)? It is strange that he should do so,<sup>33</sup> unless the Marcan account was not available to him.

2. Another point is raised by the wording of verses 14 and 15: "Settle it therefore in your minds, not to meditate beforehand how to answer; for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which none of your adversaries will be able to withstand or contradict" (RSV).

---

<sup>32</sup>S. Maclean Gilmour, "Introduction and Exegesis: the Gospel According to Luke," The Interpreter's Bible, ed. by George Arthur Buttrick (12 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957), VIII, p. 93.

<sup>33</sup>G. B. Caird, The Gospel of St. Luke, Pelican Gospel Commentaries (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963), p. 230.

How is the spoken μαρτύριον to be provided? In Mark 13:11 and Matt. 10:20 it is the Holy Spirit who speaks through them. In Luke, Jesus promises personally to give them "a mouth and wisdom." In what is probably the Q version of the teaching,<sup>34</sup> Luke 12:11-12, "the Holy Spirit will teach you in that same hour what you ought to say." The effect of these verses is to transform the "unpardonable sin" (Matt. 12:31-32; Mark 3:28-29). In the accounts of Matthew and Mark "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit" is the attribution to demons of the work of the Spirit. Luke places it in the context of the future possibilities of the witnessing church.<sup>35</sup> "It would be blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," says Browning, "if believers were brought before the authorities to testify to Christ and then, rejecting the Spirit's help, denied their Lord."<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup>Leaney, The Gospel According to St. Luke, p. 260.

<sup>35</sup>E. Earle Ellis, The Gospel of Luke, Century Bible, New Edition (London: Nelson, 1966), p. 175.

<sup>36</sup>Browning, The Gospel According to Saint Luke, p. 119; this is also the patristic interpretation, adopted by C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1947), p. 106.

What does this indicate? It is possible that Luke had at his disposal two sources, one a "spirit"-source (Q?) and the other a "wisdom"-source. Both came to him in "witnessing" contexts (cf. the entirely different context in Matt. 10). Having already used the "Spirit"-source to warn about "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit"--which he interprets as rejection of the Spirit's aid--he now turns to his alternate, and just as appropriate, "wisdom"-source to express the promise of inspired  $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$  in times of persecution.

This makes explicit the equation of wisdom with the Holy Spirit. This equation Luke is perfectly capable of, as in 11:49, "Therefore also the Wisdom of God said . . .," which is a variant of the normal rabbinic, "The Holy Spirit says," or "The righteousness of God says" (i. e., "God says").<sup>37</sup> Luke 21:14-15, therefore, should be considered a promise of the Holy Spirit as a provision for the "witness." The role of the Spirit will be discussed more fully later.

On the latter part of v. 15 (" . . . which none

---

<sup>37</sup>S.-B., II, p. 189; Ellis, The Gospel of Luke, pp. 170-73. Cf., however, Acts 6:10, where "wisdom" and "spirit" seem to be two different things. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, p. 130, considers the Lucan passage, because of its strong Semitic flavor, to be the oldest form.

of your adversaries will be able to withstand or contradict"), two notes: (1) ἀντεπεῖν ("contradict") is used only here and in Acts 4:14 in the New Testament. In the Acts passage the astonished people "have nothing with which to contradict." (2) The "wisdom and Spirit" with which Stephen spoke (Acts 6:10) are such that his opponents cannot "withstand" (ἀντιστῆναι). Elymas "withstood" Paul (13:8), but the attempt was an abysmal failure when Paul, "filled with the Holy Spirit" (v. 9), rebuked him. These appear to be more than unconscious parallels in Luke's narratives.

3. A final question which arises at this point has to do with Luke's evaluation of eschatology. The "little apocalypse" theory--that a Jewish apocalyptic handbill predicting the end of the world was wrongly attributed to Jesus--has been questioned by some scholars.<sup>38</sup> Whatever may continue to be said about Mark's version, Luke's is decidedly non-apocalyptic, though perhaps Ellis is right that no adequate interpretation will emerge from either "apocalyptic" or "anti-apoca-

---

<sup>38</sup>In particular, G. R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future (London: Macmillan & Co., 1954); Werner Georg Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, trans. by Dorothea M. Barton, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 23 (2d English ed.; London: SCM Press, 1961), pp. 98-99.



lyptic" reconstructions (Luke 21:20-24 regarded as Jesus' original meaning).<sup>39</sup>

Several observations can be made. In the first place, Luke's setting outside the discourse of the warning against false messiahs who declare the advent of the  $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\acute{o}\varsigma$  (v. 8) is a correction of the order found in Mark 13. This is joined with the reference to the "end," which will not immediately come, to provide an introductory adumbration of the discourse to follow. It is significant, furthermore, that the time to witness begins "before all this" (v. 12), i. e., the events of verses 11 and 12. This suffices at the beginning to extend the "eschatological" expectation into the indefinite future.

"Eschatological" is deliberately placed in quotation marks because of the wording of the discourse. The word Luke uses for "end" is  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ . Obviously, Luke has kept the word found in his source, but makes fuller use of it than Mark or Matthew. This may indicate that the original version, like Luke's, contemplated not so much a final break in time, i. e., the end of the world, as a completion of all things in God's his-

---

<sup>39</sup>Ellis, The Gospel of Luke, p. 241.

torical purpose. Luke's version is therefore more specifically teleological than Mark's. That is to say, Luke expected an end in history rather than of history. The necessity of preaching the Gospel to all nations (Mark 13:10, with which Luke would have agreed) becomes a theology of the fulfillment of the καιρός of the Gentiles (21:24). The Jerusalem catastrophe, which must precede this, is only a part of the fulfillment theme; verse 22: "for these are days of vengeance, to fulfill all that is written." The necessity of fulfillment of scriptures plays a role of ever-increasing importance in Lucan theology. The words πλησθῆναι and τέλος are parts of the language of fulfillment. The τέλος toward which Jesus' hearers are pointed is the ἀπολύτρωσις (v. 28), which is "drawing near,"<sup>40</sup> and therefore to be expected.

This latter, the hope of redemption, is Luke's revision (unless, of course, Luke's version is the original) of the tradition represented in Mark 13:27 and Matt. 24:31, both of which expect a "gathering of the elect." The coming of the Son of Man on the clouds is retained, and the account of Acts 1:10-11 may

---

<sup>40</sup>On ἐγγύς and ἐγγίξειν, see Kümmel, Promise and Fulfillment, pp. 19-25.

explain why. But in the discourse of Luke 21, it is shorn of its apocalyptic trappings. Nor do verses 31-33 expect an "end of the world." Again, like "redemption" (v. 28), the kingdom of God (v. 31) is near (ἐγγύς). But when Jesus declares that "this generation will not pass away till all has taken place" (v. 32), this can hardly be understood by Luke chronologically. When he placed these words in his account he was certainly aware that that generation had in fact passed away for the most part.<sup>41</sup> Verse 32, therefore, is conditioned by this consideration and "this generation" may mean humanity in general.<sup>42</sup> The extreme statement (v. 33) about heaven and earth passing away while "my words" remain is meant to emphasize the authoritative permanence of his utterances.

We may suggest, then, that the μαρτύριον is a teleological witness rather than an eschatological one, the content of which includes the hope of redemption.

---

<sup>41</sup>Ellis, The Gospel of Luke, p. 246; points out that in the Qumran writings the term, "last generation" (1QpHab 2.7; 7.2), apparently included several lifetimes and thinks this indicates that "this generation" in the New Testament "means only the last phase in the history of redemption."

<sup>42</sup>Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), p. 131.

Conzelmann thinks that the ἡγγικεν is not part of the preaching, but only of the secret instruction of the disciples.<sup>43</sup> The ἡγγικεν is too closely connected with "redemption," however, and this is not to be differentiated from the "salvation of God," which in Luke's mind is at the very heart of the preaching (Luke 3:6; Acts 28:28; cf. Acts 13:46-47, where the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ becomes a virtual equivalent), and is the very purpose of God.

#### Witnesses of These Things

Luke 24:48: ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων ("you are witnesses of these things").

The whole continuous narrative of Luke 24:13-53, which reaches its climax in the words, "You are witnesses of these things" (v. 48), is without parallel in the Synoptic Gospels. The action, which occurs on the first day of the week (v. 1), begins at the tomb and ends with the excitement of the disciples after Jesus' departure. The problem of time (cf. the 40 days of Acts 1:3) does not concern us here. What does concern us are the questions raised, focusing on 24:48, in connection with the development of the wit-

---

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. 114.

ness motif.

1. Who are the witnesses? Although each alone--the Emmaus Road story (vss. 13-35) and the story of the appearance to the assembled disciples (vss. 36-49)--would constitute a "concise" narrative,<sup>44</sup> they are here too consciously connected to permit the idea, expressed by Easton, that Luke "forgets that the apostles are not the only auditors."<sup>45</sup> To be counted among the witnesses, therefore, are (a) the Eleven, (b) those with them (v. 33)<sup>46</sup> and, in particular, (c) the two Emmaus disciples. The number of identifiable witnesses already tallies thirteen plus an indefinite number. Since the Emmaus Road appearance is supposed to have happened after the report of the women, it is not certain whether these women (three plus others, v. 10) should be counted.

Two basic facts must be kept in mind: (a)

---

<sup>44</sup>C. H. Dodd, More New Testament Studies (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 107-108, 111-13.

<sup>45</sup>Burton Scott Easton, The Gospel According to St. Luke (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1926), p. 365. To argue this from the change of construction to direct form makes no sense.

<sup>46</sup>Cf. verse 9: "the eleven and all the rest."

Luke-Acts was written by a single author;<sup>47</sup> (b) the ending of Luke and the beginning of Acts are so "intimately related and mutually enlightening" that they must be interpreted together.<sup>48</sup> This is true despite the differences between the two. Right from the beginning, therefore, we must deny any attempt at restricting  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\upsilon\varsigma$  too readily. This is especially significant against the consideration that Acts is an elaboration of the points outlined in Luke 24:46-49.<sup>49</sup>

It is therefore surprising that I. H. Marshall, who purports to do justice to the whole of Luke-Acts, overlooks this count of witnesses in Luke 24 in favor of Acts 1:21-22, thereby restricting the title to the Twelve.<sup>50</sup> Conzelmann is at least more realistic when

---

<sup>47</sup>The consensus of scholarly opinion, but a rare challenge, based mainly on the particle  $\tau\epsilon$ , can be found in Albert C. Clark, The Acts of the Apostles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), pp. 393-408.

<sup>48</sup>Jacques Dupont, Études sur les Actes des Apôtres, *Lectio divina*, 45 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1967), pp. 401-404. (One might also add, "and mutually confusing.")

<sup>49</sup>Paul Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 21 (2. berichtigte Aufl.; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1957), pp. 176-77.

<sup>50</sup>I. Howard Marshall, Luke: Historian and Theologian (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970), pp. 41-44.

he posits a "Galilean" form of the witness motif, which refers to the "Galileans" in Jerusalem (24:49, 55; Acts 1:11; 13:31).<sup>51</sup>

2. Witnesses of what? We emphasize that μάρτυς should not be forced to draw its definition from Luke 1:2 (ἀυτόπται). The μάρτυρες cannot be called "eyewitnesses" of the Resurrection. First of all, the Resurrection itself was not seen<sup>52</sup> and, secondly, the μαρτύριον/κήρυγμα includes more than this. It is true that the appearances are presented as historical events.<sup>53</sup> The reality of the Resurrection is the confirmation of Jesus by God, and for this to be historically verified the Risen Lord would have to be seen. But the Resurrection-μάρτυς assumes a larger

---

<sup>51</sup>Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, p. 203 and n. 2. See also p. 17, where he divides Jesus' ministry (as unfolded in Luke) into three phases. The first of these phases is "the period of the gathering of 'witnesses' in Galilee," a scheme which is uncritically accepted in the textbook by Robert A. Spivey and D. Moody Smith, Jr., Anatomy of the New Testament (New York: Macmillan Co., 1969), pp. 148-55.

<sup>52</sup>Neville Clark, Interpreting the Resurrection (London: SCM Press, 1967), p. 86.

<sup>53</sup>See the remark by Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, pp. 199-200: "Everything which serves the purpose of historization holds good as the work of the evangelist in the Passion story as elsewhere, i.e., the presentation of a graphic and comprehensible historical connection."

role than that of an eyewitness.<sup>54</sup> He is one who recognizes the significance of God's activity.<sup>55</sup> The τούτων, therefore, refers also to the exposition offered by Jesus, not only to the events in verse 46.<sup>56</sup> The "witness" includes three distinct elements: (a) the fulfillment of scripture (οὕτως γέγραπται points back to verses 44 and 45);<sup>57</sup> (b) the suffering and resurrection of the Christ from the dead; (c) repentance and forgiveness of sins (which is to be preached in his name εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη; cf. Acts 1:8).

---

<sup>54</sup>Pierre Benoit, The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, trans. by Benet Weatherhead (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), p. 328: "Real witnesses are those who have seen by faith."

<sup>55</sup>Rengstorf, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, p. 286: The witnesses in 24:48 are those who have grasped the meaning of what has happened "in its eternal truth."

All this does not lead us to accept the comment made by E. J. Tinsley, The Gospel According to Luke, Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1965), p. 208: "Perhaps the suggestion of the whole passage is that the normal place for full realization of the presence of the risen Christ is at the eucharistic assembly when scripture is expounded." Whatever may have been the original significance of his source, Luke's version of it in a historicized form precludes this view.

<sup>56</sup>Against Easton, The Gospel According to St. Luke, p. 365.

<sup>57</sup>On the importance of γραφαί in relation to the πάπτως, Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, Die Auferstehung Jesu (4. neu bearbeitete Aufl.; Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1960), pp. 136-45.



3. The position of the Spirit is the same as that in 21:13-15 (cf. 12:11-12; Acts 1:8). The Spirit is not here part of the preaching itself, but the preaching is made dependent upon the Spirit. Just as wisdom in 21:15 was understood as "Spirit," so the "promise of my father" (v. 49) here is to be similarly understood. Plummer points out that "here first in the Gospels have we ἐπαγγελία in the technical sense of the 'promise of God to his people.'"<sup>58</sup> The clue to its identification is found not only in Peter's Pentecost sermon, which describes the outpouring of the Spirit as the fulfillment of a "promise" in Joel 3:1-5 (cf. Isa. 44:3; Ezek. 36:27; Joel 2:28; Zech. 12:10), but also in the command to remain in the city until they receive ἐξ ὑψους δύναμιν, following Isa. 32:15 (LXX: πνεῦμα ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ).<sup>59</sup>

In verse 49 D omits τοῦ Πατρὸς. It may be that the D-text knew of no ἐπαγγελία τοῦ Πατρὸς prior to 24:49, but did know of Jesus' own promise (12:11-12; 21:14-15).

4. It is difficult at this point not to see a

---

<sup>58</sup>Plummer, St. Luke, p. 563.

<sup>59</sup>S.-B., II, pp. 230-301.

common tradition behind John 15:25a, 26-27 and Luke 24:44, 48-49a.<sup>60</sup> The verbal differences do not suggest influence of either author upon the other,<sup>61</sup> and the disparate contexts support this conclusion. The role of the Spirit in the Johannine passage, however, is the same as that which we will be arguing for Luke. There the witness of the disciples is not in addition to that of the Spirit.<sup>62</sup> The witness of the Spirit and the witness of the disciples are parts of the parallelism of the Johannine poetic passage.

Of special interest is the Johannine context, which sees the witness theme in relation to expected persecution (John 15:18-24). The similarity of con-

---

<sup>60</sup>Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel According to John, XIII-XXI, Anchor Bible, 29A (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1970), see synoptic chart, p. 694.

<sup>61</sup>Note the examination of Boismard's theory of Lucan interpolation in John by George Johnston, The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 12 (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1970), pp. 61-79. See especially pp. 64-65, where both the similarities and important differences are noted with the conclusion that "John does not use the noun 'witness' nor the full title 'the holy spirit'. . . . Lucan influence is uncertain."

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 79, conclusions iii and iv; Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, ed. by Francis Noel Davey (2d ed., rev.; London: Faber and Faber, 1947), pp. 481-82; Brown, Gospel According to John, XIII-XXI, pp. 698-701; Henri Tardif, "De la notion de témoignage dans l'écriture," Masses ouvrières, CXXIV (1956), p. 50.

texts with Luke 21:13-15 (cf. 12:11-12) and parallels is striking. As a conclusion to his Gospel, Luke has provided an entirely new context (without reference to persecution), one which appropriately looks toward his second volume.

Luke does not retain the qualifying, "because you were with me from the beginning" (John 15:27). It may not have been part of the original tradition. But if it was, Luke has deliberately expunged it and allows it to crop up only in two of Peter's speeches (Acts 1:21-22; cf. 10:39).

Summary: What can be concluded at this point is that the Gospel of Luke (21:13) looks toward a "time to witness," and the μαρτύριον will be provided by the Holy Spirit. In 24:48 Jesus says ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τοῦτων (the verb is omitted), but it is clear that they are not yet witnesses in any active sense. They are told (24:49) to remain in the city until they are granted "power from on high," by which is meant the Spirit.

Those who are so designated, i. e., as witnesses (μάρτυρες), constitute an ill-defined circle, but the message, the μαρτύριον, includes not only the suffering and resurrection of Christ, but also fulfill-

ment of scripture, as well as the present meaning of  
the events--repentance and forgiveness of sins for all  
nations.

## CHAPTER II

### THE RISEN LORD AND THE LUCAN WITNESS

The following three chapters will concentrate on the witness language as it occurs in Acts. Since most of the occurrences are found in the speeches, the chapter divisions will be determined by the speaker, each speaker thus being represented separately--the Risen Lord, Peter and Paul, in that order. While attention will thus necessarily be focused upon speaker and speeches in Acts, the chapter dealing with the words of the Risen Lord (found in only two speeches) will include discussion of what may be called "editorial comments," i. e., instances where the author of Acts uses witness language (μάρτυς cognates) apart from the speeches. These editorial comments combined with the Words of the Risen Lord must be assumed to be in some way normative for our understanding of the witness motif. This method, it is hoped, will reveal the attitude our author has taken.

The Risen Lord

1. 1:8: ἀλλὰ λήμψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντες τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες ἐν τε Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς. ("But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you, and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth.")

Almost immediately in the book of Acts the witness is placed over against the "imminent expectation" (v. 7). Haenchen, expressing the view of a host of commentators, thinks that the logion of Jesus (a holdover from Mark 13:32; Matt. 24:36) in verse 7 ("It is not for you to know the times or seasons . . .") is used by Luke to forbid the asking of questions concerning the Parousia; Luke "has decisively renounced all expectations of an imminent end."<sup>1</sup> Yet it seems obvious that the disciples were wondering if this were already the time for which they had been waiting, the time of the messianic restoration of the political kingdom to Israel. The problem of whether the "king-

---

<sup>1</sup>Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, trans. from the 14th German edition by Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn and rev. by R. McL. Wilson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), p. 143.

dom" is restricted to Israel is part of the same political question, not, as Haenchen thinks,<sup>2</sup> a second problem along with the "eschatological near expectation" of the end of the world. Luke assuredly does not envisage such an imminent end, but neither the Parousia, as scholars understand it, nor its delay is in question.<sup>3</sup>

That it is the question of Israel that is being discussed will become more apparent as we go deeper into the problem of the witness. Here only the question of political power is settled. The displacement of politics by a new theological stance, however, did not resolve the racial phase of the problem; and because it did not, a peculiar question of the interpretation of verse 8 is raised.

It is frequently suggested that 1:8 provides a sort of "content summary" which may indicate the plan of Acts. Such a plan would be developed approximately

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>What B. Reicke has to say about Luke's thought in his Gospel applies as well here: "Luke has nothing to say about the delay of the parousia which many commentators make the mistake of emphasizing in order to explain the direction taken by early Christian thought." Bo Reicke, The Gospel of Luke, trans. by Ross Mackenzie (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1964), p. 58.

thus:

chs. 1-7, Jerusalem  
8-9, Judea and Samaria  
10-28, to the ends of the earth.

But J. C. O'Neill points out that few have made use of this possibility to indicate the divisions of Acts.<sup>4</sup>

The verse thus reads like a forthright commission, unmistakeable in its intention of world evangelization. But when it is compared with Luke 24:46-49 (of which Acts 1:4-5 is meant to be a recapitulation), several important differences are noticeable in the two forms of the "commission."

(a) The most obvious, and probably the most significant, comparison is the extent of the witness

---

<sup>4</sup>J. C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting (2d ed., rev. and suppl.; London: S. P. C. K., 1970), p. 65. It should be added that most recent commentators note the possibilities of such a method (following R. J. Knowling, "The Acts of the Apostles," in The Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. by W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967), II, pp. 11-12, 57), but have not used it to any extent in their treatment of the work. A couple of exceptions are the popular commentaries by Albert C. Winn, The Acts of the Apostles, The Layman's Bible Commentary, Vol. XX (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1960); and, with some variations, Jean Cantinat, Les Actes des Apôtres, Paroles de vie (Tours: Mame, 1966). Cf. the negative view of E. M. Blaiklock, The Acts of the Apostles, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (London: Tyndale Press, 1959), p. 50: "such geographical development does not determine the plan of Luke's narrative."



commission.

Acts 1:8, ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες  
in Jerusalem and in all Judea  
and Samaria,  
and ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

Luke 24:47f., εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,  
beginning from Jerusalem.  
ὁμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων.

Both forms agree that the witness activity begins at Jerusalem.<sup>5</sup> But ~~do~~ they agree on the farthest reaches of the mission? We would be justified in supposing that for Luke they agree; but the alteration in phrasing may have a purpose. J. Dupont, noting that ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς is less clear than εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, thinks it has the advantage of being "theological."<sup>6</sup> But the real significance of the former may lie in its ambiguity, for ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς can be understood in more than one way.

In Psalms of Solomon 8:16, ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς means "from Rome," and some interpreters have taken their cue from that.<sup>7</sup> Lake and Cadbury, on the other

---

<sup>5</sup>Perhaps on the basis of an Old Testament reading--"out of Zion shall go forth Law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isa. 2:3; Micah 4:3); Beare, Earliest Records of Jesus, p. 245.

<sup>6</sup>Dupont, Études sur les Actes des Apôtres, p. 404.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., pp. 402-404; Knowling, "The Acts of

hand--probably rightly--reject this as having no bearing on our verse.<sup>8</sup>

An alternative is to recognize a play on Isa. 49:6.<sup>9</sup> This is the text Paul uses in Acts 13:47 to justify his Gentile mission. Luke has a penchant for the LXX, which is revealed by constant quotation and allusion, and his theology cannot be understood apart from it. The phrase, "the end(s) of the earth," however, is almost commonplace in the prophetic literature (cf. Isa. 45:22, 62:11; Jer. 6:22, 10:13, 16:19, 28:16, 32:32, 38:8), and has reference to God's activity on behalf of his people, Israel. Paul's interpretation of it as pointing toward Gentiles is innovative.<sup>10</sup> ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς naturally would be interpreted racially by a nationalistic Jew (cf. the question in 1:

---

the Apostles," p. 57; O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting, pp. 59-76; Richard Belward Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, Limited Editions Library (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964), p. 8.

<sup>8</sup>Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, BC, IV, p. 9.

<sup>9</sup>Alfred Wikenhauser, Die Apostelgeschichte, Regensburger Neues Testament, Bd. V (4. Aufl.; Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1961), p. 27.

<sup>10</sup>See Yehezkel Kaufmann, The Babylonian Captivity and Deutero-Isaiah, trans. by C. W. Efroymson (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1970), p. 199: "Scripture knows nothing of any prophetic mission to the gentiles." But what about Jonah?

6), as indicating a mission to a dispersed Israel. That this was the attitude of the earliest Jewish Christians is shown readily enough in Luke's presentation of the controversy over Gentile Christians and the law, but more explicitly in Peter's speech in Cornelius' house (10:42). The Ebionite Christians seem never to have admitted a Gentile mission.<sup>11</sup> This tends to confirm Bultmann's conclusion that "we can indeed hardly conceive of an earlier form of such a charge for the primitive Church as that of a mission to the Jews."<sup>12</sup>

We are left then with two possible interpretations of ἕως ἑαυτάτου τῆς γῆς: (1) it equals εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, or (2) it refers to Dispersion Judaism. The significance of this possibility of a dual interpretation will be clearer as more material is examined.

(b) The Holy Spirit is explicitly connected with the witness in 1:8; cf. the circumlocutions in

---

<sup>11</sup>The issue of the religion of the Ebionites, who were physical descendants of the original Jerusalem community, was reformation of the law; see H. J. Schoeps, "Ebionite Christianity," The Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., IV (1953), pp. 219-24.

<sup>12</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. by John Marsh (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968), p. 289.

Luke 24:49 and 21:15. This must be taken as a constant in our interpretation of the witness. "You will receive power . . . and you will be my witnesses" makes it clear that there is no witness apart from the Holy Spirit. The mission of the Spirit is precisely the mission of the μάρτυς (see 5:32).<sup>13</sup>

This helps to clarify Luke 24:48-49. While in Acts 1:8 the designation is future (ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες), Luke 24:48 lacks the verb (ὕμεῖς μάρτυρες), and is most easily translated in the present. Nevertheless, the command leaves a not-yet impression, which is explained by Acts 1:8.

(c) μου μάρτυρες appears to be a new element. Luke 24:48 has the designation μάρτυρες τούτων. As we have seen, the latter refers to the content of the witness message. The possessive μου of 1:8 indicates personal representation. The title, "my witness," then, necessitates a look back through the material either for an equivalent of or a reason for it. In

---

<sup>13</sup>Alfred Loisy, Les Actes des Apôtres (Paris: Émile Nourry, 1920), p. 159; G. W. H. Lampe, "Acts," in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley (London: Nelson, 1962), p. 886: "The Spirit, whose work is to testify to Jesus (cf. Lk. 12:12) will bear witness in the apostolic mission which he inspires and directs."

Luke 24:47 appears the phrase, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ; the preaching εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is done "in his name." Similarly, the discourse of chapter 21 portrays Jesus as warning of persecution "for my name's sake" (ἐνεκεν τοῦ ὀνοματός μου, v. 12) and "because of my name" (διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, v. 17). The διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου Luke has taken from his source (cf. Mark 13:13; Matt. 10:22, 24:9), but himself has added "my name" in verse 12.

So the title "my witness" is related to the Name terminology which in Acts carries authority.<sup>14</sup> ἔσοσθέ μου μάρτυρες is to be understood as a proper authorization. Witnesses speak "in the name" and are therefore "witnesses of Jesus." The early anticipation of a time to bear witness (Luke 21:11f.), however, leads us to expect that the name carries not only authority but a stigma.

This does not, to be sure, explain the use in Acts 1:8 of μου μάρτυρες. Luke obviously did not originate the Name terminology himself. But for him it probably took on new meaning because it underlined his reading of the Old Testament, where one finds the

---

<sup>14</sup>See on this, Silva New, "Note XI. The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands," in EC, V, pp. 121-40 (on Acts, pp. 132-34).

title "my witnesses" in Isa. 43:10. This verse should be kept in mind. Though there is no room for the discussion here, it will be seen later that Luke's development of the witness theme cannot be understood apart from the Isaiah passage.<sup>15</sup>

(d) Is there an indication of the number of witnesses? Previously it was shown (Luke 24:33) that those to whom Jesus originally said, "You are?, witnesses," included an indefinite number. In Acts 1:1-5 there are additional considerations: (i) 1:2 refers to "the apostles whom he had chosen," evidently the Eleven. οἱς (v. 3) connects with τοῖς ἀποστόλοις (v. 2) and αὐτοῖς (v. 4). Verses 4 and 5 appear to be a recapitulation of Luke 24:49, in which case the wider circle was present. (ii) It is to the "men of Galilee" (Ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι) that the angel in verses 10 and 11 addresses himself. This would exclude the Jerusalem disciples; but it would not necessarily exclude the women and the brothers of the Lord (including especially James, of whom Paul in 1 Cor. 15:7 makes mention as being one of those receiving a manifestation). The one chosen as Judas' successor would almost cer-

---

<sup>15</sup>See below, ch. 7, pp. 179-99.

tainly have been a Galilean (and who are the hundred and twenty, v. 15?).

The apparent preoccupation with the eleven seems to suggest that there exists a contradiction between the witness count in Luke 24 and that in Acts 1. But 1:6, οἱ μὲν οὖν συνεληθόντες, may be translated two ways: "So when they had come together," or, "So they who had come together." The latter rendering, Dillon and Fitzmyer point out, "means a continuation of the scene of vv. 4-5; it would imply a wider circle than those 'whom he had chosen' (1:2), especially if it alludes to Lk 24:33."<sup>16</sup> The by-election also presupposes a wider circle.<sup>17</sup>

The picture we are meant to see surely is that within the very early community there existed an inner group (the apostles) who were especially chosen by Jesus. This, of course, is what is presented in the Gospel stories. Because of the uniqueness of their position, however, it was open to misunderstanding.

---

<sup>16</sup>Richard J. Dillon and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Acts of the Apostles," in The Jerome Biblical Commentary, ed. by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968), p. 169.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

That many others also accompanied them throughout the ministry of Jesus right up to the time of the ascension is admitted by Peter (1:21). The Eleven still "knew who they were," and anything that appears to be a title in the community must become their property, so that if Jesus had designated "witnesses" this would naturally be taken as their prerogative. The problem inherent in this tendency (as Luke would consider it) is that it is an exclusiveness which tends to perpetuate itself. That is, in every other situation this becomes the basic stance; this, as we shall see, is one of the early obstacles to what Luke considers the community's mission and underlines what was said about the tension involved in ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

2. The words of the Risen Lord to Paul in 23:11 are strategically located following the turbulent session before the Sanhedrin, from which he has to be extracted for safety. The Lord "stood by him" and said, θάρσει, ὥς γὰρ διεμαρτύρω τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ οὕτω σε δεῖ καὶ εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρῆσαι. ("Have courage, for as you testified about me in Jerusalem, so you must witness also in Rome.")

As at other times in a moment of crisis Paul has a reassuring vision. Haenchen (following Wendt)



points out the similarity of the vision to those of 16:9, 18:9f., 27:23f., and takes this as evidence of Lucan creation.<sup>18</sup> Though Haenchen takes this to mean that Paul is to preach at Rome as well as at Jerusalem,<sup>19</sup> J. Munck shows that the context points in another direction: Paul would testify in the same way in Rome.<sup>20</sup> It is already Paul's intention to go to Rome (19:21). With this verse we are provided with an official approval of Paul as witness (though the title *μάρτυς* does not appear; note the similarity of this appearance with Paul's account in 26:16 of his initial vision).

Several observations can be made:

(a) Note the interchange of cognates: "as you witnessed (*διδεμαρτύρω*) in Jerusalem, so must you witness (*μαρτυρήσαι*) in Rome." The *ὡς . . . οὕτω* indicates that the witness is the same; Munck's conclusion above applies.

(b) *τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ* indicates the substance of Paul's witness and therefore shows that Paul's teaching

---

<sup>18</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 639:  
"Tradition is not visible in these verses."

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Munck, Acts of the Apostles, pp. 225-26.

concerning the Lord has met with approval.<sup>21</sup> τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ can, in fact, be taken as the equivalent of a combination of Luke 24:48 (ὅτι ἐγὼ μάρτυρες τοῦτων) and Acts 1:8 (μεν μάρτυρες) in the indication of the content of Paul's preaching.

(c) θάρσει, "Take courage," can be compared with Luke 21:14, where the future witnesses are admonished to "settle it therefore in your hearts," i. e., "do not be anxious" (Mark 13:11; Matt. 10:19), about what to say. Here, of course, the witness is already in a crisis and in need of divine assistance. The fact that the Lord himself appears to Paul in this way is in line with Luke's earlier expressed belief that Jesus personally grants the στόμα καὶ σοφίαν (Luke 21:15).

Summary: The two witness logia of the Risen Lord in Acts 1:8 and 23:11 are shown to be for the most part consistent with what we were led to expect from the anticipatory sayings in Luke's Gospel. The number of witnesses, already shown to be indefinite, needs revision so far in only one respect: Paul is included among the witnesses. The accepted title is

---

<sup>21</sup>E. Jacquier, Les Actes des Apôtres, Études bibliques (Paris: G. Gabalda, 1926), p. 663.

μου μάρτυς, i. e., witness of Jesus. The μαρτύριον content is τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ in the case of Paul's preaching, which for Luke certainly must be consistent with the "these things" of Luke 24:44f (cf. Acts 28:23, 31, the latter using διδάσκων). The witness is thus authorized by Jesus in his name to give witness on his behalf and about him. But one is not a μάρτυς apart from the gift of the Spirit.

In 23:11 Paul is assured that he will be able to give the same testimony in Rome as he did in Jerusalem. This moves the witness activity outside of Palestine (as, of course, is already obvious from the narrative), and it is consistent with the commission to witness ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς. This phrase is ambiguous (as we have noted), though in our method of isolation we have yet to find out to what extent this ambiguity is important.

#### 'Editorial Comments'

The following passages occur outside the speeches of Acts and are important in their own right as indicators provided by the author. They must be taken, therefore, alongside the sayings of the Risen Lord.

1. 2:40 (following Peter's Pentecost sermon):

ἑτέροις τε λόγοις πλείοσιν διεμαρτύρατο, καὶ παρεκάλει  
αὐτοὺς λέγων, Σώθητε ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς ταύτης.

("With many other words he testified, and exhorted  
them, saying, 'save yourselves from this perverse gen-  
eration.'")

The witness cognate verb used here is διαμαρ-  
τύρομαι. In Luke 16:28 the natural sense was "to warn,"  
and that would be the case here if the concluding  
exhortation to "save yourselves from this perverse gen-  
eration" were the whole content of the witnessing.  
The "many words," however, appear to be a continuation  
of Peter's Pentecost discourse.<sup>22</sup> In Septuagintal  
usage διαμαρτύρομαι can often be translated "protest  
solemnly," and Knowling thinks Peter here is not acting  
merely as a witness (μαρτυρεῖν) but is protesting the  
false views of his hearers.<sup>23</sup> What the false views are  
is not clear. 23:11 shows that Luke makes little dis-  
tinction between the two forms, both signifying emphatic  
affirmation of the things about Jesus (τὰ περὶ ἑμοῦ).<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 184.

<sup>23</sup>Knowling, "Acts of the Apostles," p. 93.

<sup>24</sup>Strathmann, "Μάρτυς," p. 512.

Of 15 occurrences in the New Testament of this strengthened form of the verb "to witness," 10 are in the Lucan writings, 9 in Acts. It is a favorite word of Luke's in describing the activity of the witness, and this tells us something about the Lucan idea. Jesus' witness testifies for him by arguing his case, seeking a verdict in his name.<sup>25</sup> Thus, whatever argument Luke may have with Peter over details of his presentation, his sermon at Pentecost is nevertheless an authentic witness.

2. 4:33: καὶ δυνάμει μεγάλη ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, χάρις τε μεγάλη ἦν ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς. ("And with great power the apostles gave the witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus.")

μαρτύριον is used technically as kerygma (see exegesis of Luke 21:31; cf. 4:2). It is said to be concerning "the resurrection of the Lord Jesus," which indicates the basis of existence for the Church and is the starting point, or presupposition, for Christian

---

<sup>25</sup>So also John Calvin saw "something important" underlying the word "to testify." The Acts of the Apostles, 1-13, trans. by John W. Fraser and W. J. G. McDonald, Calvin's New Testament Commentaries, Vol. VI (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965), p. 314.

preaching. N. Brox rightly equates ἀποδιδόνται τὸ μαρτύριον with διαμαρτύρεσθαι.<sup>26</sup>

That we have here to do primarily with preaching, and not with the working of miracles (following 5:12),<sup>27</sup> stands with the interpretation of the δύναμις as the strength of conviction with which the witness is given, i. e., in the "power of the Spirit" (following 4:31; cf. 1:8 and Luke 24:49).<sup>28</sup> Haenchen supposes that the prayer of the congregation (4:24-30) was for the power to perform miracles (following v. 30),<sup>29</sup> but this is certainly wrong. The prayer of the congregation was for the power "to speak your word with all

---

<sup>26</sup>Brox, Zeuge und Märtyrer, p. 45.

<sup>27</sup>As in Loisy, Actes des Apôtres, p. 259; Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 231; Lake and Cadbury, BC, IV, p. 48; F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952), p. 130, but combining preaching and miracles in Commentary on the Book of the Acts, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), p. 109; Wikenhauser, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 69.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. R. P. C. Hanson, The Acts, The New Clarendon Bible, New Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 81: "The testimony to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus did not so much lie in their producing historical proofs of the event as in the impression made by the apostles' behaviour and character (power), which convinced their hearers that their testimony to the Resurrection was true."

<sup>29</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 231.

boldness" (v. 29), a prayer which is emphatically answered in verse 31: "and they all were filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke the word of God with boldness."

The apostles (the Twelve?) are singled out for specific mention as giving witness. This may indicate only their leadership in the preaching activity; it is, however, a position which becomes less and less clear. A wider circle is included under the "all" upon whom was "great grace."

3. Having stirred up the people, the enemies of Stephen seized him and brought him before the council; in 6:13 it is stated, ἔστησαν τε μάρτυρες ψευδεῖς ("they set up false witnesses"). These pseudo-witnesses said, "This man never ceases to speak words against this holy place and the law, etc."

The account of Stephen sounds suspiciously like the Synoptic stories of Jesus' trial and death, though in Luke's account of Jesus' trial (22:66ff.), false witnesses are conspicuously omitted (though they appear in Mark 14:55-59; Matt. 20:59-61). The falsity of the witnesses is shown to consist, primarily, not in the lack of factual evidence, but in the intent with which their testimony is delivered (cf. v. 11).

Stephen's witness is true because he spoke with "wisdom and the Spirit" (v. 10), being "full of grace and power" (v. 8). See 22:20, where Paul calls Stephen a "witness."

4. The μάρτυρες who in 7:58 lay their clothes at the feet of the young man Saul are those who are participating in the stoning of Stephen. They are also false witnesses.

5. Our next "editorial comment" follows the evangelization of Samaria under Philip and the dispatch of Peter and John to that area with the resultant giving of the Spirit and encounter with Simon Magus. The return trip to Jerusalem is recorded in 8:25: Οἱ μὲν οὖν διαμαρτυράμενοι καὶ λαλήσαντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου ὑπέστρεφον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, πολλὰς τε κώμας τῶν Σαμαριτῶν εὐηγγελίζοντο. ("So after they had testified and spoken the word of the Lord, they returned to Jerusalem, evangelizing many villages of Samaria.")

μὲν οὖν is transitional, so that the return trip to Jerusalem is in view of the whole Samaritan adventure--not just Peter's encounter with Simon Magus, 8:14-24--and should be read with verse 26. Philip also returns to Jerusalem; that this is Luke's intention is clearly shown by verse 26, which also (in typ-



ical Lucan fashion) makes Jerusalem the center of the missionary radius (ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ).<sup>30</sup> This means that Philip must be considered among those to whom Lucan witness-language is applied.

"Testifying" is not to be carefully distinguished from "speaking the word," and not at all from "evangelizing."<sup>31</sup> The imperfect εὐαγγελίζοντο continues the activity done in the city of Samaria. Similar Lucan variations of language occur in verses 4 and 5: the scattered disciples went about εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον, and one of them, Philip, went to the city of Samaria ἐκήρυσσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστόν. διαμαρτύρομαι also adequately describes the "gospel argumentation" Philip is to employ with the Ethiopian eunuch. Though not explicitly named as such, Philip is a μάρτυς who speaks in the name of Jesus. This is clear from verse 12, where his activity is emphasized as "evangelizing about the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus" (the

---

<sup>30</sup>Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts, p. 189; Lake and Cadbury, BC, IV, pp. 94-95; Frank Stagg, The Book of Acts (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1955), p. 106. Perhaps also Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 309, n. 2.

<sup>31</sup>Cf., however, Brox, Zeuge und Märtyrer, p. 48; but see also p. 65, where he says, "Man könnte auch so fragen: ist Philippus ebenfalls ein Zeuge?"

τὰ περὶ ἑμοῦ of 23:11?).<sup>32</sup> It is also significant that Luke places Philip in Samaria first.

6. We pass, then, to a different sort of comment in 14:3, where it is said that Paul and Barnabas continued at Iconium for a long time, despite opposition, παρρησιαζόμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ μαρτυροῦντι [ἐπὶ] τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, διδόντι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν. ("speaking boldly for the Lord, who bore witness to the word of his grace, granting signs and wonders to be done by their hands.")

ἐπὶ after μαρτυροῦντι in **N**\*. A pesh bo is held by Ropes to be authentic because it is so unusual.<sup>33</sup> Luke usually constructs μαρτυρέω with the dative, however, and it may have been prompted by the preceding ἐπὶ.<sup>34</sup>

It is not certain whether κύριος here refers to God or Christ. It is doubtful that the distinction is important, since the Christ at the time of writing was surely thought of as sharing the divine godhead.

---

<sup>32</sup>See below, ch. 6, pp. 164-78.

<sup>33</sup>James Hardy Ropes, BC, III, p. 130.

<sup>34</sup>Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 420, n. 8.

At any rate, a new element is introduced directly into the witness theme, that of a witness by the divine.

The witness of the divine takes the form of "signs and wonders," which though granted "by the hands" of his historical messengers, are nevertheless the work of the Lord himself. This is the Lucan view of the miraculous. The early community does not pray for powers to perform miracles, but for God to work in miraculous ways "in the name of Jesus" (see especially 4:30). Even Peter disclaims credit for healing the lame man (3:12-13, 16). Barnabas and Paul relate to the Jerusalem Council the "signs and wonders" performed by God through them (15:12), and God continues to do "extraordinary miracles by the hands of Paul" (19:11). See also 2:22, which may reflect an early view that not even Jesus had independent powers of miracle working. These miraculous performances in Acts are to be seen as the Lord's confirmation of the preaching.

The preaching itself is the λόγος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ. This they "boldly speak." Haenchen points out that "Luke readily uses παρρησιάζομαι to describe the Christian missionaries' confidence in a dangerous situation."<sup>35</sup> Such situations are referred to at 9:27,

---

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 420, n. 6.

13:46, 18:26, 19:8, 26:26. This is, in fact, what we were earlier led to expect as a "typical" situation in which the witness would find himself (Luke 21:12-15). The use of παρρησιάζομαι and λόγος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ to describe the preaching and its content again illustrates Luke's tendency to repeat a phrase with variations.<sup>36</sup> See especially 20:24, where Paul, making use of Luke's favorite witness cognate verb, describes his mission as being διαμαρτύρασθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ (cf. 20:32). In view of this tendency to vary language, we may infer that Barnabas too is among the witnesses.<sup>37</sup>

An important conclusion may be drawn from this: a dual level of witnessing is at work. On the one hand, there is the human witness who preaches the Gospel. Then there is the divine witness, who by performing "signs and wonders" witnesses to the word, i. e., confirms what is preached.

An additional observation concerning the possible relationship of 14:3 to Luke 4:22 deserves attention.

---

<sup>36</sup>Lake and Cadbury, BC, IV, p. 162.

<sup>37</sup>See Floyd V. Filson, Three Crucial Decades (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1963), pp. 36-37, where Barnabas is included as "witness" because he is called "apostle" (14:4, 14).

tion here. Particularly striking is the similarity of wording.

Luke 4:22

καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ  
καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς  
λόγοις τῆς χάριτος  
τοῖς ἐκπορευμένοις ἐκ τοῦ  
στόματος αὐτοῦ,  
καὶ ἔλεγον,  
Οὐχὶ υἱὸς ἐστὶν Ἰωσήφ οὗτος;

Acts 14:3

ἰκανὸν μὲν οὖν χρόνον διέ-  
τριψαν παρρησιαζόμενοι  
ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ  
τῷ μαρτυροῦντι [ἐπὶ] τῷ  
λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ  
διδόντι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα  
γίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν χειρῶν  
αὐτῶν.

But the similarities extend beyond the wording to the circumstances. In Luke 4:22 the Lord speaks in the synagogue; his own words are witnessed to; opposition develops. In Acts Jesus' witnesses speak in the synagogue; the Lord witnesses to the words about himself; opposition develops.

Is one event patterned after another in a deliberate antithesis? If so, then we are not wrong in seeing the idea of false witnesses at play. They are pitted against the true witnesses and the divine witness actively confirms the latter. In Luke's Gospel the pseudo-witnesses recognize religious authority in Jesus' words but, in refusing to accept it, attempt to cast doubt on its validity; the false witness is negative. In the Acts passage the situation is reversed. The Lord himself witnesses to the preaching of his wit-

nesses in the face of attempts to discredit "the word of his grace"; the divine witness is emphatically positive. This same witness-versus-pseudo-witness theme we have seen to be at work in the Stephen affair.

7. In 18:5 Silas and Timothy arrive at Corinth where Paul has argued (διελέγετο) every Sabbath. Upon their arrival, συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ ὁ Παῦλος, διαμαρτυρόμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν, Ἰησοῦν. ("Paul was pressed to the word, witnessing to the Jews that the Christ was Jesus.")

This verse abounds in textual problems. No reason is given for the introduction of Silas and Timothy here, but this does not particularly concern us.

συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ is difficult. H L P S 383 minn arm geo sy<sup>hmg</sup> Chrysostom TR read τῷ πνεύματι, which Rackham thinks is the right sense.<sup>38</sup> (Cf. v. 25, where Apollos is ζέων τῷ πνεύματι). But the comment clearly has to do with Paul's activity, the intensity of his witnessing. D has rewritten the text with this idea in mind.<sup>39</sup> If, following Ropes and

---

<sup>38</sup>Rackham, Acts of the Apostles, p. 325.

<sup>39</sup>As to the textual problems relating to the D text, see Ropes, BC, III, p. 172; Eldon Jay Epp, The

Haenchen,<sup>40</sup> συνέιχετο . . . Ἰησοῦν (omitted by h) is conflated from B, the omission of the sentence leaves us with rather striking substitutions. Verse 4b (D) reads, ἐντιθεὶς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐπιθεν δὲ οὐ μόνον Ἰουδαίους ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἕλληνας. The latter clause is consistent with D's obsessive insistence on the universality of the Gospel. The former is a substitute for the more conventional διαμαρτυρόμενος . . . Ἰησοῦν, and is an attractive reading.<sup>41</sup> It emphasizes even more than B the importance of "the name," and is certainly compatible with the Lucan idea of witness. This is also true of the elaboration of Paul's method of arguing, verse 5, πολλοῦ δὲ λόγου γεινομένου καὶ γραφῶν διερμηνευομένων. The stress both on the name and on scripture may suggest that D has grasped the meaning of the Lucan witness; there may be a conscious conformity to the pattern of Luke 24:44ff. Jesus himself interprets (διερμήνευσεν) the scriptures to the Emmaus disciples (Luke 24:27). διαμαρτύρομαι, however,

---

Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 3 (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1966), pp. 84-86.

<sup>40</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 535, n. 7.

<sup>41</sup>Ropes, BC, III, p. 172.

is a favorite word which Luke continues to find serviceable.<sup>42</sup> That Paul argues that the Christ (Messiah) for whom the Jews were looking is Jesus shows his reliance on scriptural testimony. The idea of fulfillment is more than implicit here. It is the pattern of Paul's method right from the beginning (9:22; cf. the capsule of the witness-message and method in 17:2-3).

8. One final editorial comment refers to Paul's activity in Rome at the time agreed upon by the Jews at Rome to hear him. 28:23, they came in great numbers, οἷς ἐξετίθετο διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τε τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν ἀπὸ πρωῒ ἕως ἑσπέρας. ("to whom he expounded, from morning till evening, testifying to the kingdom of God, persuading them about Jesus from the law of Moses and from the prophets.")

Again, Luke uses his favorite witness word for the Christian proclamation. Instead of διαμαρτυρόμενος A has παρατιθέμενος, "expounding" (cf. Matt. 13:24, 31).

ἐξετίθετο is the main verb, and the participles, διαμαρτυρόμενος and πείθων, depend on it. By this

---

<sup>42</sup>Rackham, Acts of the Apostles, p. 325: "a special word for the apostolic witness."



time Luke's kerygmatic references have assumed a recognizably stock pattern. A comparison with verse 31 is instructive:

23. ἐξετίθετο  
 (a) διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ  
 (b) πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ  
 ἀπὸ τε τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσεως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν.
31. (a) κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ  
 (b) διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Χριστοῦ, 31.b, sums up theologically the line in 23.b, ἀπὸ . . . προφητῶν. Luke has carried through right to the last his theme of scriptural fulfillment in Jesus. It is obvious that he feels it necessary to underline repeatedly the μάρτυς-method of chapter 24 in his Gospel. Thus he shows himself faithful to the intention of Jesus as he there presented it. Haenchen rightly points out that βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ describes the entire Christian proclamation and the designation for the Jesus-event as attested in Scriptures, τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, properly stands with it.<sup>43</sup> It is Jesus himself who, in Luke's conclusion to his Gospel and the introduction to Acts, establishes this. In Luke 24:27, beginning with Moses and the prophets, the Risen Lord διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς

---

<sup>43</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 723.

τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ (cf. vss. 44ff.), and in Acts 1:3 during the days of manifestation he had spoken τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ.

This "kingdom of God" may be taken to be more than the expression of eschatology in Christian preaching. As part of Luke's witness theology, it serves to express the sovereign purpose of God in history. This is readily seen as consistent with the exegesis of Luke 21:10ff.<sup>44</sup> It is only "futuristic" inasmuch as it moves toward the τέλος, the fulfillment of all things in God's historical purpose.<sup>45</sup> The teleological witness is caught up in the wisdom of God as the personal representative of Jesus, preaching in the name of him through whom God will accomplish his purpose. The "kingdom of God" is inextricably bound to the message which has Jesus as its subject.

Summary: Eight editorial comments containing witness words have been examined. In none of these does Luke use the word μάρτυς in reference to one of

---

<sup>44</sup>See above, ch. 1, pp. 29-32.

<sup>45</sup>The "futuristic" meaning of 14:22 must be explained in this way also (contra: Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 723). There Paul is exhorting the Christians in the light of his own experience of 14:19. He is simply saying that they must expect tribulation when they commit themselves to Christ.

the missionaries. He does call those implicated in Stephen's death "witnesses," but they are μάρτυρες ψευδεῖς (6:13). Once he mentions the powerfully delivered μαρτύριον (4:33). Otherwise, the witness is presented in terms of his activity, the use of the verb διαμαρτύρομαι (2:40, 8:25, 18:5, 28:23) being Luke's favorite method of describing this.

From this we conclude that Luke does not think of the μάρτυς as one who holds a particular office in the Church, but as one who engages in a particular activity, that of speaking τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, which are "the things" outlined in Luke 24:44ff. As shown by Luke 24:47, this activity is done in the name of Jesus; and Acts 1:8 shows the μάρτυς to be a "Witness of Jesus." To create his witness, Jesus grants "power from on high," (Luke 24:49), i. e., the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8), which is set in opposition to earthly authority (1:6).

An additional phase of the witness theme is presented in 14:3. This is the divine witness seen in "signs and wonders" as confirmation of the human witness.

## CHAPTER III

### THE PETRINE WITNESS

Attention in this chapter will focus upon the witness language as it appears in the speeches attributed by the author of Acts to Peter. There are six speeches in which Peter makes a witness declaration. Our primary concern is to see if, in these speeches, a pattern of witness thinking emerges, and if so, to isolate the elements. Only after this is done can we answer the question whether the position thus detected can be called "Lucan."

#### The Witness in Peter's Speeches

1. In 1:21-22 (the conclusion of the call for the election of Judas' successor), Peter lays down the qualifications of a witness: δεῖ οὖν τῶν συνελθόντων ἡμῖν ἀνδρῶν ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ ᾧ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ κυρίος Ἰησοῦς, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἀνελήμφθη ἀφ' ἡμῶν, μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ σὺν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι ἕνα τούτων.

("So, of the men who accompanied us during all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us--beginning from the baptism of John until the day when he was taken up from us--one of these must become with us a witness to his resurrection.")

The by-election of Matthias (1:13-26) is the only event narrated between the Ascension and Pentecost. Haenchen regards the whole passage as a "test case" for Lucan compositional method.<sup>1</sup> So also, R. Dillon and J. Fitzmyer write: "The illustrative role of Peter's discourse, i. e., its editorial origin, becomes clear in the speaker's recounting of the Judas affair with its scriptural proofs and etiological corollary."<sup>2</sup> The obscurity of the candidates for the vacant office, however, and the subsequent insignificance of the election argue for a pre-Lucan tradition. Not denying this, E. Trocmé thinks the story is placed here as a result of Lucan design; "le récit lui-même ne contient rien qui impose une datation aussi précise: il se

---

<sup>1</sup>Ernst Haenchen, "Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte," Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LIV (1963), p. 161.

<sup>2</sup>Dillon and Fitzmyer, "Acts of the Apostles," p. 169.

situe seulement après la mort de Judas."<sup>3</sup> ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ("in those days") is a vague indication of time. It suggests either that Luke did not know the length of the interval between events,<sup>4</sup> or, following Trocmé, that the imprecision is due to Lucan design.

Whether or not Luke created the story and/or the present setting, what is the purpose of the account? Macgregor, noting Peter's role of leadership, sees in it an account of a literal fulfillment of Jesus' own words, i. e., that "upon this rock" he would build his church (Matt. 16:18).<sup>5</sup> But that is a Matthean tradition which Luke seems to know nothing about. The Catholic Jerome Biblical Commentary finds here "a theology of apostleship and of the Church's foundations, which is, in fact, a first principle of Lucan interpretation."<sup>6</sup> E. Käsemann similarly sees

---

<sup>3</sup>Étienne Trocmé, Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire, Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, No. 45 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957), p. 199.

<sup>4</sup>Hanson, The Acts, p. 59.

<sup>5</sup>G. H. C. Macgregor, "The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction and Exegesis," in Interpreter's Bible, IX, p. 33.

<sup>6</sup>Dillon and Fitzmyer, "Acts of the Apostles," p. 170.

this account as a prime example of Lucan "early Catholicism." "So far as we can see, then, it was Luke who was the first to propagate the theories of tradition and legitimate succession which mark the advent of early Catholicism."<sup>7</sup> This leaves open, however, the question why the supposed organizational concern of Luke was not more clearly developed. Haenchen therefore rightly denies that Luke had any thought for information as to the constitution of the primitive Church.<sup>8</sup>

Although it is commonly assumed that the qualifications for apostleship are here enunciated, the suggestion of this study is that what is really involved for Luke is the question of the πάπτος. It is true that in v. 25 Peter equates the official position of witness with that of apostleship. This means

---

<sup>7</sup>Ernst Käsemann, Essays on New Testament Themes, trans. by W. J. Montague, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 41 (London: SCM Press, 1964), p. 91; so also F. J. Foakes-Jackson, The Acts of the Apostles, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York: Harper and Bros., n. d.), p. 9: "The selection of Matthias may be intended to show that the infant Church possessed the power alike of organization and continuance." But, of course, the Church thus established proved to have little importance for Luke, and its continuance was not dependent upon it.

<sup>8</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 164.

that in Peter's view the two are the same office. Also in verse 25 Peter refers to "this ministry" (διακονία), but it is hardly possible to make much of the usage. "Ministry" seems to be a general word which in chapter 6 is used both in reference to the assignment of the "deacons" (6:1; cf. 6:2) and to the apostolic ministry (6:4).

What, therefore, is the view of the witness in Acts 1:21-22? Only after this question is answered can we return to Luke's purpose relative to the account of Matthias' election.

(a) First of all, 1:22 describes the witness as a μάρτυς τῆς ἀναστάσεως. Käsemann thinks this is probably left over from a pre-Pauline tradition, that Luke is not satisfied with such a view.<sup>9</sup> It is not corrected here, however, and must stand as is; the μάρτυς is "witness to the resurrection."

(b) To qualify as a witness, the candidate must have been in company with Jesus and his disciples from the time of John's baptism right up to the ascension. This emphasis on companionship with the histori-

---

<sup>9</sup>Käsemann, Essays on New Testament Themes, p. 89.



cal Jesus Käsemann assumes to be Lucan.<sup>10</sup> The μάρ-  
τυρες, therefore, are αὐτόπται (eye-witnesses), as in  
Luke 1:2.<sup>11</sup>

(c) As a witness (assumed to be chosen  
finally by God, v. 24), the candidate elected joins an  
inner group. Only one of those qualified and nominated  
may be elected (v. 22), and he is enrolled with the  
Eleven. We have, then, the remarkable designation of  
witness as one of the Twelve, which presumably means  
he is to be recognized as one holding the office of  
witness. μάρτυς, therefore, is a technical term here  
for one of the Twelve.<sup>12</sup>

2. From the definitive statement in 1:21-22,  
we move to Peter's witness declaration in his Pentecost  
sermon (2:14-36); 2:32 reads, τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν  
ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός, οὗ πάντες ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν μάρτυρες.  
("This Jesus God raised up, of which we all are wit-

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>So the strong insistence by Talbert, Luke and the Gnostics, pp. 17-32; Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 163. Even at that, however, μάρτυς cannot mean simply "eyewitness," even to Peter; cf. Brox, Zeuge und Märtyrer, pp. 44-45. Being an eyewitness is a requirement for the official μάρτυς.

<sup>12</sup>Brox, Zeuge und Märtyrer, pp. 50-52, thinks that for Luke μάρτυς (τῆς ἀναστάσεως) is a synonym for ἀπόστολος (and that Paul is "apostle" because he is "witness").

nesses.")

Appearing toward the end of Peter's Pentecost discourse, 2:32 is the first of what may be called "witness declarations." In this declaration Peter makes a claim: "we are witnesses." Other witness declarations make similar claims to either a position or a function (cf. 10:34-43, where the two are combined, though the one implies the other always), though not always personal claims (13:31). The witness logia of Jesus (1:8, 23:11) do not belong in this category, for they are forms of a commission. 1:21-22, above, likewise does not fit the description of "witness declaration."

It is on this witness declaration that we must concentrate for the moment. The Pentecost discourse must not become a major distraction. Whether the sermon is a *παρρησία* in the fullest sense we need not ask at this point. To anticipate a later discussion it need only be said that there are details of the speech which make it controversial in Luke's thinking and that we are apt to overlook this. At this point attention is centered on 2:32, with which we have to compare only the basic statement of 1:21-22. The following observations are relevant:

(a) οὗ is taken to be neuter rather than masculine, referring to the resurrection, not to Jesus. This is shown by verses 30 and 31, which discuss the resurrection in prophecy. This also fits the description in 1:22 of the μάρτυς τῆς ἀναστάσεως. If this is part of the pre-Pauline tradition (Käsemann), Luke at least has let it remain.

(b) πάντες ἡμεῖς ("we all") can only refer to the Twelve. In 2:14 Peter stands with the "eleven," i. e., the rest of the apostles. This is consistent with the explicitly stated position in the account of Matthias' election.

(c) τοῦτον links with the historical references to "Jesus of Nazareth" (v. 22) and to "this Jesus" (v. 23). The companionship with the historical Jesus is thus assumed. No new qualifications are given.

3. Peter's discourse in Acts 3 is occasioned by the astonishment of the people over the healing of the lame man. The witness declaration appears in 3:15: τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνετε, ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν. οὗ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρές ἐσμεν. ("And you killed the author of life, whom God raised from the dead--of which we are witnesses.")

What was said concerning the Pentecost dis-

course as an authentic μαρτύριον holds true here. There is a slight shift in attitude; the oblique reference to "lawless men" in 2:23 is sharpened into a direct condemnation of the Jewish listeners for the death of Jesus (3:14-15), which receives a rhetorical softening (3:17) as being due to ignorance.

Nothing new is added in this declaration. οὐ again refers to the raising of Jesus by God and reference to verses 13 and 14 again reveals a special interest in the life of Jesus. ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες ἐσμεν is a specific reference to Peter and John, both members of the Twelve. The "name" assumes importance in 3:16 and also in 4:10, 12 (spoken through the filling of the Spirit); but it is not connected directly with the μάρτυς.

4. The declaration of 5:32 is striking in more than one way. It concludes the answer given to the high priest, who rebukes their refusal to obey his injunction not to teach "this name." 5:32, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν αὐτῷ. ("And we are witnesses of these things--so is the Holy Spirit which God has given to those who obey him.")

ὃ is omitted by B, probably by accident.

The simpler reading, ἔσμεν μάρτυρες (P75 & D (A), several minuscules, it vg sah boh arm Didymus), is probably to be preferred to those which add αὐτοῦ (E P Ψ, a number of minuscules, it<sup>e</sup> syr<sup>h</sup> eth geo) or ἐν αὐτῷ (B, a few minuscules, cop<sup>bo</sup> mg Irenaeus). "We are his witnesses" would be unique in a Petrine speech. The usual assertion is "we are witnesses." 5:32 does, however, vary from the previous declarations.

(a) ἡμεῖς ἔσμεν μάρτυρες is actually said to be spoken by Peter and the apostles, though the singling out of Peter probably means he is their spokesman. The construction, Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, cannot mean that Peter is excluded from apostleship.

(b) The addition of τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων sounds more like Luke 24:48 than Acts 1:21-22. It is explained by the brief μαρτύριον of verses 30-31 and this contains a significant departure from Luke 24:44ff.

The God of our fathers raised Jesus,  
whom you killed "hanging him on a tree";  
This one God exalted to his right hand as Leader  
and Savior  
to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of  
sins.

Here, then, the μάρτυς τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων explicitly limits himself to a mission to Israel. The reason

for the ambiguity of ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς is now apparent. We shall expect that this phase of the Petrine witness thinking will be more sharply developed later.

(c) The Holy Spirit is also witness. If by this is meant the same thing as 2:33 (which also contains the exaltation theme of 5:31), where Jesus is said to have "received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit," and to have "poured out this which you see and hear," i. e., the Pentecostal outpouring, then Conzelmann correctly notes that the juxtaposition of the witness of the apostles and of the Spirit is clarified by 2:32f. and Luke 24:48f.<sup>13</sup> In Luke 24:48f. (and Acts 1:8) it is the promised power, and in Acts 2:32f. it is the power of promise poured out upon the apostles. In both 5:32 and the Pentecost speech, however, the Spirit is also promised to others. No further implication is drawn, either by Conzelmann or by Peter.

The Spirit is given by God "to all who obey him." "All who obey him," however, is limited along with μάρτυς by τῷ Ἰσραήλ and cannot imply a Gentile

---

<sup>13</sup>Hans Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, VII (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1963), p. 42.

mission.<sup>14</sup>

5. Peter's speech before Cornelius' household, 10:34-43, is a crucial one, especially the expanded witness declaration in verses 39-43: καὶ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες πάντων ὧν ἐποίησεν ἐν τε τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ· ὃν καὶ ἀνεῖλαν κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου. τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι, οὐ παντὶ πᾶσι ἀλλὰ μάρτυσιν τοῖς προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡμῖν, οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν· καὶ παρήγγειλεν ἡμῖν κηρύττειν πᾶσι καὶ διαμαρτύρασθαι ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ὠρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν. τούτῳ πάντες οἱ προφητῆται μαρτυροῦσιν, ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν. ("And we are witnesses of all that he did both in the country of the Jews and in Jerusalem; him indeed they put to death 'hanging him on a tree.' God raised him on the third day and gave him to be manifest, not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen beforehand by God, to us, who ate and drank with him after he arose from the

---

<sup>14</sup>Contra Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 251 who thinks it means "every believer." But this is too broad, since Peter does not yet see that a Gentile can really qualify.

dead. And he commanded us to preach to the people and to witness that he is the one ordained by God to be Judge of the living and of the dead. To this one all the prophets bear witness, that all who believe in him may receive forgiveness of sins through his name.")

This expanded form of the witness declaration must be considered the lōcus classicus of witness thinking as it is presented in Peter's speeches. The speech before Cornelius' household is in difficult Greek, and therefore not wholly a Lucan composition. Torrey shows that verses 36ff. can be translated into grammatical Aramaic,<sup>15</sup> which suggests that the speech was preserved in an Aramaic document<sup>16</sup> and Luke has been careful to follow his source closely with only minor revisions. From this we may conclude that it represents an early tradition which is understood by Luke to be an authentic "statement" of Peter's position.<sup>17</sup> We can ask, therefore, what is the concept of

---

<sup>15</sup>Reading ὁν after τὸν λόγον with  $\aleph$  C D E Byz e pesh hcl\*; Charles Cutler Torrey, The Composition and Date of Acts, Harvard Theological Studies, I (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916), pp. 27, 35-36.

<sup>16</sup>Bruce, Acts of the Apostles, p. 225.

<sup>17</sup>Cf., however, Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 110-11.



witness contained in the declaration. There are four parts to the declaration.

(a) Verse 39. ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες is the recognizably Petrine declaration, though without the verb (cf. 2:32, 3:15, 5:32), and therefore should be read as "we, the Twelve" rather than "we (Peter and his companions from among the circumcision)." This is required by reference to the previous declarations and by 1:21-22. The use of ἡμεῖς to refer to a group other than the immediate party may also indicate--though not necessarily--that either this section (vss. 39-43) or the whole speech had a different context (possibly to a Jewish audience) than that in which we find it (in slightly revised form).

Also consistent with the requirements of 1:21-22 is the emphasis on companionship with Jesus right from the beginning (a requirement which the brethren from Joppa would not likely have met). The baptism of John again marks the beginning (v. 37).

κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου as a reference to Jesus' death appears also in the brief statement by Peter and the apostles before the high priest (5:30), alluding to Deut. 21:22f.

(b) Verses 40-41. There is a heightened sense

of chosenness in these verses. Two levels are discernible. First, reference back to verse 36 shows that the underlying assumption is that "the word" was sent to Israel. Second, from among the people, i. e., the Jews, a small group was specially elected by God as witnesses to whom the resurrected Lord was made manifest (μάρτυσιν τοῖς προεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ). The chosen witnesses are the Twelve, now reconstituted with Matthias. This means that the witness occupies a position in the Church which is understood to be instituted by God. If there is a vacancy, it must be filled in the same way; so the place vacated by Judas must be filled, and Matthias was chosen, the early community thought, by God (1:24f.).

The qualification of a witness as one who ate and drank with Jesus after his resurrection is meant only as one requirement for a witness;<sup>18</sup> it does not mean that all who ate and drank with him were enrolled among the witnesses. These verses imply the title of 1:22, μάρτυς τῆς ἀναστάσεως. The addition to verse 41

---

<sup>18</sup>Cf. Macgregor, "Acts of the Apostles," p. 140: "The reference to eating and drinking is no doubt to meet the objection that the risen Jesus was merely a 'ghost.'" Such an objection, however, was not raised here.

by E of δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα (ἡμέρας μ' in D) from 1:3 may be intended to bring the verse more strictly into line with 1:21-22, the "forty days" being the time up to the ascension.

(c) Verse 42. The witnesses are charged with a particular task: "to preach to the people and to testify that he is the one ordained by God to be judge of the living and the dead." The task of testifying (διαμαρτύρασθαι) to Jesus Christ as Judge is not really a new development. Both judgment and repentance imply the necessity of the other, and repentance is also a constant in Peter's preaching (2:38, 3:19-23, 5:31). This becomes obvious when our attention is focused on the more general κηρύξαι τῷ λαῷ. A glance at the similar, though more compact, statement of 5:30-32 shows that Jesus is exalted in order to give repentance to Israel.

This, then, makes explicit what was already obvious in 5:30-32. The Petrine view of the charge to be a witness ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς is that it is a world-wide mission to Israel. κηρύξαι τῷ λαῷ can only mean, "preach to the people of Israel."

(d) Verse 43. τούτῳ πάντες οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν means that the witness Peter and his fellows

offer is continuous with that of the prophets. The desired end of the witness activity, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν, must be seen as conditioned by the command κηρύξαι τῷ λαῷ. It is through faith in Jesus and through his name that forgiveness of sins is possible-- but only for Israel.

At this point Peter's speech is interrupted. But before the interruption, a developed witness concept is presented, the points of which are outlined above. This may be taken as a full summary of Petrine witness thinking. What, then, can be said of the purpose of Peter's discourse? W. Baird thinks the whole speech clears the way for the Gentile mission.<sup>19</sup> Haenchen, on the other hand, thinks πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα (v. 43) "crashes through the barrier" which he rightly sees is still intact in the preceding verse.<sup>20</sup> Nowhere in the whole speech is a mission to the Gentiles admitted or even suggested. Point (c) above, furthermore, is actually consistent with Peter's

---

<sup>19</sup>William Baird, "The Acts of the Apostles," in The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible, ed. by Charles M. Laymon (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971), p. 742.

<sup>20</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 353.

attitude all along, for he never seems to have thought of "everyone" as including Gentiles, except possibly on the basis of verse 35, which may have been conceded even by Pharisees in the case of proselytes (cf. Matt. 23:15).<sup>21</sup> The "God-fearers" were not new, and neither was Peter's finding a basis of acceptability for them in doing "what is right." His statement of "non-partiality," therefore, cannot easily be taken as a kerygmatic declaration; δεικναι το σὺν ᾧ as commonly used among Jews (cf. Matt. 6:1) denotes little more than almsgiving.<sup>22</sup>

Dibelius in his study of this account concludes that "Luke wanted to show how the will of God was made known to Peter in the conversion of Cornelius."<sup>23</sup> The will of God concerning what? For Dibelius, "it shows the revelation of God's will that the Gentiles should be received into the Church without obligations to the law."<sup>24</sup> It is to be admitted that the Cornelius story was concerned with the problem of the possibility of

---

<sup>21</sup>S.-B., II, pp. 703-704.

<sup>22</sup>Bruce, Acts of the Apostles, p. 224.

<sup>23</sup>Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 117.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

Gentiles becoming Christians and the questions this raised about their relation to the law. But we must insist that Luke has more than one purpose in mind and that the revelation of God's will must be seen in connection with the assumptions of the speech itself. Peter assumes that the Word was sent only to Israel; this is shown immediately to be wrong. He also enunciates a position--and fully half the speech is consumed in it--regarding the *πάπτος*. How acceptable is this position?

Again, therefore, we are faced with the theological problem of the witness. When the question is posed in this way it becomes clear that Peter's "sermon" is not a sermon at all, and therefore Luke does not (as in U. Wilckens' judgment) intend it to be a synopsis of his gospel.<sup>25</sup> It is rather an apologia

---

<sup>25</sup>Ulrich Wilckens, Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 5. Bd. (2., durchgesehene Aufl.; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1963), p. 70 (for a useful discussion of Wilckens' method with special attention to the speech in Acts 10, see Joachim Rohde, Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists, trans. by Dorothea M. Barton, New Testament Library (London: SCM Press, 1968), pp. 202-217); Bruce, Acts of the Apostles, p. 224 ("The summary of Peter's address gives the Apostolic kerygma in a nutshell"); Eduard Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts," in Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (London: S. P. C. K., 1968), p. 209, con-

for Peter's own preaching, an explanation of his witness/apostleship--which he does not see as including preaching to Gentiles. A full half of this apology, as just noted, outlines the Petrine theory of "the witness." Peter's apology nevertheless contains the substance of his preaching.

The suggestion this encourages, therefore, is that Peter's apologetic intent is shown to be a failure, but that "the word" which found its way into his speech was used by God anyway. This explains the amazement of Peter's party at the outpouring of the Holy Spirit "even on the Gentiles" (v. 45). They were taken completely by surprise. In Peter's subsequent defense of his association with Gentiles, he declares that the Holy Spirit fell "as I began to speak" (11: 15). Dibelius sees a major discrepancy between this--the Spirit's outpouring as Peter began to speak--and the account in ch. 10, where it happened at the end of the speech.<sup>26</sup> It should be recalled, however, that in 10:44 the Spirit fell on them "while Peter was still

---

siders the speech to be a "regular missionary address of Peter."

<sup>26</sup>Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 110.

saying this." At what point in the speech this is to be understood as happening is neither certain nor useful to know. The point Luke is making probably is that Peter meant to say much more (as was Peter's habit; cf. 2:40) but he was cut short by the activity of the Spirit. Only at that point does the surprised Peter begin to realize what is happening. The inference drawn from this by the Jerusalem Christians is that the Gentiles have also been granted "repentance unto life" (11:18), which Peter neither calls for nor apparently expects. It is, after all, the Spirit who does the work, through Peter but in spite of him.

6. The final witness saying in a speech attributed to Peter is 15:8-9: καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς δοῦς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν, καὶ οὐθὲν διέκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν. ("And God who knows the heart witnessed to them, giving them the Holy Spirit even as to us; and he did not distinguish between us and them, but cleansed their hearts by faith.")

This statement stands at the beginning of Peter's speech to the Apostolic Council (15:7-11), which is, in fact, both his last speech and his last



appearance. From 15:36 on Peter and the Jerusalem apostles have no further part to play in Luke's narrative. 15:36-41 tells of the separation of Paul and Barnabas, and ch. 16 begins the succession of adventures of Paul which is to occupy the remainder of Acts.

The saying of 15:8-9 is different from any of Peter's other sayings and on it we make three observations:

(a) It is God who does the witnessing. The closest a saying attributed to Peter has come to this is 5:32, where the Holy Spirit is witness. The relationship between the two sayings is imprecise. It may well be found, however, in the conviction that God both is Spirit and sends the Spirit. Note the similarity of language:

5:32. 'we are witnesses . . . and so is the  
Holy Spirit,  
which God has given to those who obey  
him.'

15:8. 'and God . . . witnessed to them,  
giving them the Holy Spirit even as  
to us.'

When viewed in proximity, the two appear to be saying the same thing. This version of the divine witness, furthermore, has affinities with that in the "editorial comment," 14:2. In both cases the verb is μαρτυρεῖν.

In both acts of the divine witness, a "wonder" occurs which has a confirming significance.

(b) It is clear from the above that Peter has undergone a reversal of opinion. Hanson finds it odd that Peter, the apostle to the Jews, should express himself in Pauline language.<sup>27</sup> The language, however, is only part of Luke's method of showing Peter's change of mind. To show that it is the same Peter with a radically different view of the Christian mission, he is made to introduce his speech with the all too familiar pomposity (cf. 1:15ff.; 10:28;. and 34ff.): "You know that in the early days God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word."

This statement, however, provides a clue to the present state of Peter's witness-thinking in relation to himself and to the other apostles. First of all, Peter is citing an exceptional situation in the apostolic missionary activity, i. e., a case where Gentiles were converted through the ministry of one of them. Secondly, it implies that no further Gentile mission has been attempted by Peter or the others. We

---

<sup>27</sup>"Though Paul never speaks of anyone actually cleansing his heart by faith"; the impossibility of keeping the whole law was a Pauline conviction (Hanson, The Acts, pp. 160-61).

can fairly conclude, therefore, that Peter's basic witness position has not changed; he still considers himself a witness to Israel. Evidently, Luke will have to make some sort of accommodation to this view.

(c) The human witness is not explicitly mentioned. This means that the precise connection between the divine witness as described above and Luke's over-all witness theology is yet to be determined.<sup>28</sup>

#### Peter and the Lucan Witness

The results of our exegesis of the Petrine witness declarations reveals a peculiar witness point of view. The tentative conclusion is that this point of view is not Lucan, but this conclusion must be allowed to collapse if it does not find clear confirmation in the preaching of Peter. Peter's Pentecost discourse is primary.

It may be recalled that, while Christology is not the concern of the present study, in 1956 J. A. T. Robinson thought he had found two incompatible Christologies in the speeches of Acts 2 and 3, neither of

---

<sup>28</sup>But see below, ch. 7, pp. 194-96.

which was Lucan.<sup>29</sup> Such a "discovery" was emphatically rejected by J. C. O'Neill in the first edition of his book; while O'Neill admitted that Acts 3 "may be passing on primitive material," Acts 2 is definitely not pre-Lucan.<sup>30</sup> In the second edition he seems to have modified his position to hold that Luke was using written sources throughout.<sup>31</sup> It is important for our study that O'Neill is aware of a development in the materials, though this is "primarily in the movement of his history," and even allows for differences in theological emphasis,<sup>32</sup> finally rejecting the idea that the theology of Acts consists in the doctrines which are put into the mouths of the preachers.<sup>33</sup>

In German scholarship the suggestion of

---

<sup>29</sup>John A. T. Robinson, "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., VII (1956), pp. 177-89.

<sup>30</sup>O'Neill, Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting, 1st ed., pp. 124-27.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., 2d ed.; see especially the rewritten chapter, "Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians," pp. 100-138.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 100.

Bauernfeind<sup>34</sup> and then of Dibelius<sup>35</sup> that Luke in his composition of the speeches was following the typical practice of preaching in his age, seems to be the increasing emphasis. More recently in America, R. F. Zehnle maintains "that this speech of Acts 2 is the 'keynote address' of Acts, a summary statement of the theological viewpoint of the author from which the subsequent unfolding of the book is to be understood."<sup>36</sup> In this he is following the lead of the German scholars, who, he claims, have established "beyond doubt the originality and force of the proper theological conceptions of the author of Acts."<sup>37</sup>

One cannot help but feel that Zehnle has grossly overstated the case. First of all, Peter's speech is not the "keynote address" of Acts; the keynote appears as a speech of the risen Lord, especially

---

<sup>34</sup>Otto Bauernfeind, Die Apostelgeschichte, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, V (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939), p. 46.

<sup>35</sup>Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 165.

<sup>36</sup>Richard F. Zehnle, Peter's Pentecost Discourse, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 15 (Nashville: Abingdon Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1971), p. 17.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

1:8.<sup>38</sup> Further, few today would insist that Luke has incorporated speeches with no reworking at all. Especially related to the following discussion is the fact that the use of the Greek Old Testament indicates Lucan handling of the material. Certainly Peter would not have used the Greek translation, when his native tongue was Aramaic and his speech was delivered in Jerusalem. Haenchen,<sup>39</sup> however, too quickly rules out Dodd's contention that Peter's speeches in the first part of Acts "represent the kerygma of the Church at Jerusalem at an early period."<sup>40</sup> If there is a conscious movement in the material, as O'Neill argues, then the question may be legitimately asked, what is the movement? From what point to what point does it move? This question must be asked of the speeches as well as of the "history" (O'Neill). Thus we claim that we have isolated an early position which Luke has described through the speeches, but does not himself hold. Even if he has worked over the speeches them-

---

<sup>38</sup>James Maurice Wilson, The Origin and Aim of the Acts of the Apostles (London: Macmillan and Co., 1912), p. 80.

<sup>39</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 185.

<sup>40</sup>C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 21.

selves, perhaps in a way deliberately accentuating "offensive" elements, the probability remains that he believed he was reproducing the essentials of the earliest preaching.

When the Pentecost sermon is held up to the light, therefore, two elements come into clear focus. These act as indicators of the tension found between Lucan theology and the early speeches. Attention is centered on the quotation in 2:17ff. of the prophecy of Joel 2:28-32 concerning the pouring out of the Spirit.

(a) The eschatological strain in the speech is strong. In 2:17, where Peter begins the citation of Joel, he does not use the original reading of Joel 3:1 (LXX), καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα. What does appear in Acts 2:17 can only be called an eschatologizing intrusion: καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός. If this is added by Luke, it is significant that it appears in a speech by Peter as an obvious misquotation. If it is Luke alone who is composing a speech and supplying proof texts, his familiarity with his Greek Old Testament indicates that he would have known better. His own theology, as an earlier discus-

sion has tried to show,<sup>41</sup> is not eschatological, but teleological.

(b) A second observation is even more to the point. A. Ehrhardt<sup>42</sup> points to the curious discrepancy between the promise in Joel 2:28 (3:1, LXX), "then I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh," and Peter's answer to the repentant Jews (Acts 2:39): "For the promise is to you and to all that are far off, everyone whom the Lord our God calls to himself." Ehrhardt notes that this answer is not a quotation, but a conflation of Isa. 57:19 (LXX), "peace upon peace to those who are far off and those who are near," and the end of Joel 2:32 (omitted in the sermon), "for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem will be those who escape . . . whom the Lord calls to himself." Joel's prophecy was to "all flesh," a technical Jewish term for "all mankind"; the Isaiah reference is ambiguous and may only refer to the Jews of the Dispersion. It is this for which Peter opts. The ambiguity of ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς (1:8), therefore, comes into full focus. This

---

<sup>41</sup>See above ch. 1, pp. 29-32; also below, ch. 7, pp.

<sup>42</sup>Arnold Ehrhardt, The Acts of the Apostles (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969), p. 15.



shows, Ehrhardt rightly concludes, "that the first public statement of St Peter's strictly followed the line laid down by the question of the Twelve (Acts 1:6), 'Lord is this the time you are going to restore the Realm to Israel?'"<sup>43</sup>

It seems fairly well established, then, that the early witness tradition was one that concerned an eschatological witness to Israel. That it is to Israel is shown by the contexts of the witness declarations: 2:32 appears in the Pentecost discourse, which admits no promise save that to Israel;<sup>44</sup> 3:15 may be associated with the possibility in 3:25f. of a Gentile "blessing," but this idea is part of the Jewish tradition and is seen as only possible through Israel; 5:32 is explicitly a witness to Israel (τῷ Ἰσραήλ, v. 31); and 10:42 strengthens this as a witness "to the people" (τῷ λαῷ).<sup>45</sup> It is as a historical accommodation to this view of the early disciples that Paul in

---

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.

<sup>44</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 188, admits that Peter's sermon gives no hint of a Gentile mission, but does not think it excludes one.

<sup>45</sup>George Johnston, The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1943), p. 60: "This loyally Judaistic attitude is visible in all the sources."

13:31 refers to the witness πρὸς τὸν λαόν.

The word, ὁ λαός occurs 48 times in Acts, 24 times in the first seven chapters; following closely the idiom of the Septuagint,<sup>46</sup> "usually it retains its particularist connotation as a technical term for Israel!"<sup>47</sup> Only in two instances does it not. The first is the striking oxymoron of 15:14, ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαός. If P. Richardson is right that it is an allusion to Gentiles participating with the "people,"<sup>48</sup> it may not yet constitute an admission of a general Gentile mission. It is meant, however, to show that a new and official openness to the reception of Gentiles exists, and that it is on a different basis from that of Jews. It does not mean that the Jerusalem community has to relax the idea of the μάρτυς πρὸς τὸν λαόν. In 18:10,

---

<sup>46</sup>See Adolf Harnack, The Acts of the Apostles, trans. by J. R. Wilkinson, New Testament Studies, III (London: Williams & Norgate, 1909), pp. 50-51. For a full discussion, see H. Strathmann, "Λαός," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, IV, pp. 29-57; cf. N. A. Dahl, "'A People for his Name' (Acts XV.14)," New Testament Studies, IV (1957-1958), pp. 324-25, who criticizes Strathmann for overstressing the difference between a "vulgar" and a "specific" usage.

<sup>47</sup>Peter Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 10 (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1969), p. 161.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.; cf., Dahl, "'A People for his Name' (Acts XV.14)," pp. 319-27.

διότι λαός ἐστί μοι πολὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, Jews are certainly included, but λαός has taken on a different connotation.<sup>49</sup>

The question remains to be answered, how historical is this picture which Luke has presented of the "eschatological witness to Israel"? There is no certainty concerning either the fate of all the apostles or their missionary activities. There is a legend contained in the Acts of Thomas which portrays the apostles casting lots and dividing the world up into mission fields.<sup>50</sup> Eusebius also refers to the individual fields of labor assigned to the apostles. Of Peter he says that the chief apostle "appears to have preached in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappodocia and Asia to the Jews of the Dispersion."<sup>51</sup> The list here is suggested by 1 Pet. 1:4. Paul's letter to the Galatians (2:9) also describes an arrangement in which

---

<sup>49</sup>Harnack, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 51, thinks it can here "scarcely be regarded" as signifying Christians.

<sup>50</sup>See Burnett Hillman Streeter, The Primitive Church, The Hewett Lectures, 1928 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1929), pp. 29-65, for a discussion of this.

<sup>51</sup>Quoted in Edgar J. Goodspeed, The Twelve (New York: Collier Books, 1962), p. 99; see also discussion, pp. 99-104.

Peter is the apostle to the circumcised. Streeter thinks it improbable that such a picture would have survived had it not been the case.<sup>52</sup>

There is also a witness tradition retained among Ebionite Christianity which approximates that which we have described. These Ebionite Christians, as H. J. Schoeps has gathered material to show,<sup>53</sup> were physical descendants of the Jerusalem Church. In the Ebionite Gospel, cited by Epiphanius (Haer. 30.13), a note appears to the effect that the Twelve were appointed to be witnesses to Israel: 'Υμᾶς οὖν βοῦλομαι εἶναι δεκαδύο ἀποστόλους εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ 'Ισραήλ; also in Barnabas 8.3, . . . εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν φυλῶν (ὅτι δεκαδύο φυλαὶ τοῦ 'Ισραήλ).<sup>54</sup>

The historical probability is that this was a matter of discussion at the time of the writing of Acts. It is not certain exactly what things Theophilus

---

<sup>52</sup>Streeter, The Primitive Church, p. 35. For a full discussion of Peter's missionary activity, see Oscar Cullmann, Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, trans. by Floyd V. Filson, Library of History and Doctrine (2d rev. and expanded ed.; London: SCM Press, 1962), pp. 36-70.

<sup>53</sup>See the summary of his work, H. J. Schoeps, "Ebionite Christianity," pp. 219-24.

<sup>54</sup>Quoted in Markus Barth, Der Augenzeuge (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1946), p. 322, n. 218.

had been told concerning which Luke felt obligated to tell the truth (Luke 1:4),<sup>55</sup> but the picture in Acts strongly suggests that this is one of them. It is a witness theory which Luke does not accept as he finds it, though he faithfully reproduces it in order to show its inadequacy.

---

<sup>55</sup>So also, Henry J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (London: S. P. C. K., 1961), p. 315: "It is quite probable that Luke's avowed purpose so far as his preface expresses it, 'that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed,' is to correct misinformation about Christianity rather than, as is so often supposed, to confirm the historical basis of Theophilus's religious faith."

## CHAPTER IV

### THE PAULINE WITNESS

In the composition of his Gospel, Luke had before him examples from which he could work. The shape of his work, therefore, was more a matter of interpretative rearrangement and supplementation in order to form an "orderly account" than that of free composition. Acts is different; Luke was necessarily involved more deeply as author, and, as Vielhauer points out, this is especially the case in the sections which narrate Paul's activities.<sup>1</sup> This raises the general question whether one can speak of anything other than Luke's own theology (rather than Pauline theology) in those portions of Acts,<sup>2</sup> and the more specific question whether it is right to speak of a "Pauline theory of the witness" as we are about to do. These

---

<sup>1</sup>Philip Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," in Studies in Luke-Acts, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 33-50; T. E. Bleiben, "The Gospel of Luke and the Gospel of Paul," Journal of Theological Studies, XLV (1944), pp. 134-40.

questions may be raised legitimately, but for the moment we cannot allow ourselves to enter into this discussion. The fact that a "Petrine point of view," which could not be called Lucan, was discovered, obligates us to see if the same is true of Paul's speeches. An account must be given, therefore, of the witness theme as it appears in the speeches of Paul. Only then, as in the case of Peter, can we decide whether or not it is Lucan.

#### The Speeches

1. A form of the divine witness is found in Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch; in 13:22, God is said to have "witnessed" (μαρτυρήσας) to David. This seems to be in the sense of a confirmation, approximating (minus the miraculous element) what was seen in 14:3 (the confirmation of preaching) and 15:8 (the confirmation of Gentiles), where the same verb is used. David is an approved person, qualified for a particular task ("a man after my heart, who will do all my will"). This may take on more significance if it is recalled that in Deutero-Isaiah Yahweh speaks of David and calls him a "witness" (LXX, 55:4, ἰδοὺ μαρτύριον ἐν ἔθνεσιν δέδωκα αὐτόν).

The witness here is in scripture and is a conflation of several proof-texts: Ps. 89:20; 1 Sam. 13:14; II Sam. 23:1 (cf. Ps. 72:20); and Isa. 44:28. Perhaps also we have here the idea of the Spirit witnessing through inspired scripture (cf. Acts 28:25, where the Holy Spirit speaks through scripture).

2. Also in the speech in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch (13:16-41) appears Paul's first witness declaration 13:30-31, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. ὃς ὤφθη ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους τοῖς συναναβᾶσιν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, οἵτινες [νῦν] εἰσὶν μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν. ("But God raised him from the dead who appeared many days to those who came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, those who are now his witnesses to the people.")

νῦν, though bracketed in the Bible Society edition, is nevertheless well-attested, appearing in P45, A  $\aleph$  (omitted in B E). D has ἀχρι νῦν.

There is a historical-theological parallelism between the raising of David and the raising of Jesus.

ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυεὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα (v. 22).

ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν (v. 30).

To both scripture witnesses or, more exactly, God witnesses through inspired scriptures; God "raises"



(ἡγείσθην) both. It follows in verse 32ff. that what was left incomplete in the prototype (David) was fulfilled in Jesus. Thus the witness of the divine is active throughout.

The statement, "God raised him from the dead," climaxes an account of God's activity in history, which points toward the event of Jesus as fulfillment of scripture (v. 29). This is followed by the witness declaration (v. 31), and this by further exposition of scripture beginning with Jesus as fulfillment. The approach is so compatible with Luke 24:44ff. that one expects the speaker to declare himself a "witness of these things." He does not, however, and this makes his witness statement all the more noteworthy.

(a) Paul refers to "those who came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem" as "witnesses." These are the ones to whom the risen Lord appeared "many days." This would fit Peter's own qualifications of a witness (1:21-22); 1:11 also refers to the "men of Galilee." Paul does not mention his own vision,<sup>3</sup> nor

---

<sup>3</sup>Munck, Acts of the Apostles, p. 123, takes this to mean that the author forgets that it is Paul speaking.

does he refer to himself as witness.<sup>4</sup> The statement itself, however, seems to imply a wider circle of witnesses than the Twelve (Luke 24; Acts 1:1ff.).<sup>5</sup>

Many have held that verse 31 is intended to exclude Paul as a witness.<sup>6</sup> This would mean that Paul's preaching depends entirely on the testimony of others.<sup>7</sup> G. Lohfink thinks this is established by the wording, ". . . those who are now his witnesses . . . and we preach to you . . ." "Er gründet seine Verkündigung allein und ausschliesslich auf die Autorität

---

<sup>4</sup>Macgregor, "Acts of the Apostles," p. 179, thinks that if the speech were actually Paul's he would have referred to himself as such, as in 1 Cor. 9:1.

<sup>5</sup>Hanson, Acts, p. 144; Conzelmann, Apostelgeschichte, p. 77. Against Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 411.

<sup>6</sup>So also Hanson, Acts, p. 144; Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 411; Baird, "The Acts of the Apostles," p. 746.

<sup>7</sup>Loisy, Les Actes des Apôtres, p. 531; Dillon and Fitzmyer, "Acts of the Apostles," p. 193; cf. also Burton Scott Easton, Early Christianity, ed. by Frederick C. Grant (Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1954), pp. 61-62, who thinks verse 31 is a direct assertion by Luke of Paul's inferiority to the original disciples. So also Günter Klein, Die zwölf Apostel, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 77 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), esp. pp. 210-16. The subsequent narration of events does not support this assertion.

der Zeugen, die Jesus von Galiläa an gefolgt waren."<sup>8</sup>

(b) A different approach is allowed by the wording of the witness statement. Paul may well be referring to a certain group of witnesses, μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν, without prejudice to his own position. πρὸς τὸν λαόν denotes the object of the witness mission, but can only mean "to the Jews." Since this coincides with Peter's apology to Cornelius (10:39-43), πρὸς τὸν λαόν points toward a group of original witnesses with a limited sphere of activity.

Does this suggest a contrast between these witnesses πρὸς τὸν λαόν and Paul?<sup>9</sup> Haenchen objects that the statement that the Twelve (his interpretation of μάρτυρες) are witnesses to the Jewish people does not imply that Paul is now witness to the Gentiles. He makes three points: (1) "Luke did not accept the agreement of Gal. 2.9 into his presentation;" (2) "Paul himself is here speaking to the λαός (13:17);" and (3) "the break did not come until later (13.45ff.)-- and even then only so far as Pisidian Antioch is con-

---

<sup>8</sup>Gerhard Lohfink, Paulus vor Damaskus, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 4 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966), p. 24; following Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 411, n. 2.

<sup>9</sup>Lake and Cadbury, BC, IV, p. 154.

cerned."<sup>10</sup>

A reply to Haenchen at this point necessarily anticipates later discussion. Nevertheless, it can be stated that the scheme of Paul's address, following as it does Luke 24:44ff., suggests that Luke meant it to be an authentic μαρτύριον.<sup>11</sup> Haenchen is quite right, that this does not make Paul the "witness to the Gentiles." It is true, as he says, that Luke does not accept the "agreement" of Gal. 2:9 (Peter to the circumcised, Paul to the uncircumcised) into his presentation, and that Paul is here speaking to the λαός. On the other hand, it should be remembered that Paul's audience includes more than the λαός (vss. 16, 26). That which makes his mixed audience significant, furthermore, is that Luke never presents Paul as the "witness to the Gentiles." C. Burchard carefully points out that for Luke Paul is sent to preach to "all people." "Paulus ist nach Lukas weder Heidenprediger, der die Synagoge als Sprungbrett benutzt, noch verhinderter Judenprediger, sondern Prediger für 'alle

---

<sup>10</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 411, n. 2.

<sup>11</sup>Adolf Schlatter, Die Apostelgeschichte, Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament, Bd. IV (neu durchgesehen; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1962), p. 165.

Völker."<sup>12</sup> This was already shown in the account of Paul's calling, for it is revealed in the vision to Ananias that "he is a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles and kings and sons of Israel" (9:15). This obvious allusion to Luke 21:12 has a purpose, which only becomes clear later in the narrative. As we have seen in the section on Peter, furthermore, even in his final appearance there is an implication of a division of missions.<sup>13</sup>

(c) μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ as a witness title did not occur in the speeches of Peter. μάρτυς τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ (cf. 1:22) is the typical title in the Petrine declarations. "His witness" is simpler, more personal, and is what one would expect from Luke (following the personal title of 1:8, μου μάρτυρες). It is significant that this form of the witness title appears first

---

<sup>12</sup>Christoph Burchard, Der dreizehnte Zeuge, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 103 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), pp. 165-68. See also Walter Schmithals, Paul and James, trans. by Dorothea M. Barton, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 46 (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1965), p. 57: "Even at his call he was sent both to the Gentiles and to the Jews. It is generally agreed that behind the stereotyped accounts in the Acts, which regard Paul as constantly making contact with the synagogues and being driven then to the Gentiles, a Lucan bias is to be sought."

<sup>13</sup>See above, ch. 3, pp. 94-95.

in a speech by Paul. πρὸς τὸν λαόν is not part of the title.

(d) Any argument based on the statement that they are "now" (νῦν) witnesses to the people would be at best tenuous,<sup>14</sup> if only because of its textual uncertainty.

3. The most unusual of the witness sayings occurs in the brief speech by Paul to the people of Lystra (14:15-17). Paul hopes to forestall their worshipping him and Barnabas as gods, telling them that they also are men and bring good news concerning the "living God." In verse 17 he declares that though in the past God allowed nations to walk in their own ways (v. 16), καίτοι οὐκ ἁμάρτυρον αὐτὸν ἀφῆκεν ἀγαθοουργῶν. οὐρανόθεν ὑμῖν ὑετοὺς διδοὺς καὶ καιροὺς καρποφόρους, ἐμπιπλῶν τροφῆς καὶ εὐφροσύνης τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. ("Yet he did not leave himself without witness, doing good, giving you heavenly rains and fruitful seasons, satisfying your hearts with nourishment and joy.")

---

<sup>14</sup>Cf. J. Rawson Lumby, The Acts of the Apostles, Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1937), p. 247: "St. Paul has not mentioned the Ascension of Jesus, but when he says that now men are His witnesses, it is implied that Christ was no longer on earth for men to see Him."

The speech at Lystra is a remarkable one.

Here for the first time is an address to a purely pagan audience. Did Luke invent the argument? Torrey thinks he finds (in ἐμπιπλῶν τροφῆς) evidence of a mistranslation of an Aramaic source,<sup>15</sup> which W. L. Knox thinks unlikely; Knox himself suggests a "careless paraphrase" of Xenophon (Memorabilia IV. iii. 5f.).<sup>16</sup> The Lystra speech is paralleled by the Areopagus speech (17:22-31), which develops along the same line of natural revelation. The similarity of thought with Rom. 1:20 suggests a Pauline origin, though the tone here is not as harsh as Rom. 1:18ff. and the language is not Pauline.

The emphasis in the speech is on the revelation of God through his benevolent activity in the natural order.<sup>17</sup> The idea of natural revelation is not

---

<sup>15</sup>Torrey, Composition and Date of Acts, p. 38.

<sup>16</sup>Wilfred L. Knox, The Acts of the Apostles (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1948), p. 70, n. 2; cf. Henry J. Cadbury, The Book of Acts in History (New York: Harper & Bros., 1955), p. 50: "Speaking again of God's relation to men he says, 'yet . . . seasons' (14:17). I have often wondered whether a lost Greek poem is echoed here. There are certainly poetical expressions."

<sup>17</sup>The fact that the speech does not contain the whole Christian kerygma led Loisy (Actes des Apôtres, p. 556) to suggest that the speech was a waste of breath.

foreign to Luke's theological textbook, the Old Testament.<sup>18</sup> The divine witness is nevertheless thought of in terms of history; the implication may be that the witness in nature was a sort of compensation for the Gentiles. This idea has its clearest formulation in Deut. 4:19: "Nor must you raise your eyes to the heavens and look up to the sun, the moon, and the stars, all the host of heaven, . . . the Lord your God assigned these for the worship of the various peoples under heaven" (NEB). This is, however, clearly in contrast with the new witness, which is "good news, that you should turn from these vain things to a living God." (Note that the "editorial comment" on the divine witness appears in 14:3. Is the healing of the cripple at Lystra (vss. 8-10) to be understood within the framework of just such a contrast?)

4. It is not until the speech before the Ephesian elders at Miletus (20:18-35) that a specific statement is made by Paul concerning his position as witness. The section of the speech which contains this statement comprises 8 verses, 20:20-27, and is printed

---

<sup>18</sup>On this see Bertil Gärtner, The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation, trans. by Carolyn Hannay King, Acta seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, XXI (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1955), pp. 85-97.



here in full: οὐδὲν ὑπεστειλάμην τῶν συμφερόντων τοῦ  
μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν καὶ διδάξαι ὑμᾶς δημοσίᾳ καὶ κατ'  
οἴκους, διαμαρτυρόμενος Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἑλλήσιν  
τὴν εἰς Θεὸν μετάνοιαν καὶ πίστιν εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν  
Ἰησοῦν. καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ δεδεμένος ἐγὼ τῷ πνεύματι  
πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ συναντήσοντά μοι  
μὴ εἰδώς, πλην ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κατὰ πόλιν  
διαμαρτύρεταί μοι λέγον ὅτι δεσμὰ καὶ θλίψεις με  
μένουσιν. ἀλλ' οὐδενὸς λόγου ποιεῖται τὴν ψυχὴν  
τιμίαν ἐμαυτῷ ὥς τελειώσω τὸν δρόμον μου καὶ τὴν  
διακονίαν ἣν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, δια-  
μαρτύρασθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ.  
καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ οἶδα ὅτι οὐκέτι ὄψεσθε τὸ πρόσωπόν  
μου ὑμεῖς πάντες ἐν οἷς διήλθον κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν.  
διότι μαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ ὅτι καθα-  
ρός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος πάντων, οὐ γὰρ ὑπεστειλάμην  
τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῖν. ("I  
did not shrink from declaring to you that which is  
profitable and from teaching you publicly and from  
house to house, witnessing to both Jews and Greeks of  
repentance to God and faith in our Lord Jesus. And  
now, behold, bound in the spirit, I am going to  
Jerusalem not knowing what things shall encounter me  
in this, except that the Holy Spirit testifies to me

that in every city imprisonment and afflictions await me. But my life I make of no account, as though precious to myself, if I may finish my course and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, to witness (solemnly) to the gospel of the grace of God. And now, behold, I know that no more will you see my face, all you among whom I went about preaching the Kingdom. Therefore I witness to you this day that I am innocent of the blood of all; for I did not shrink from declaring to you the whole counsel of God.")

Paul's Miletus discourse is his third great speech and the only one in Acts in which he addresses Christians. The first thing to be said about the speech is that it is not a sermon. It is cast in the form of a "farewell address," or "testament."<sup>19</sup> The speech is strongly defensive in tone, however, and Lampe finds in this the suggestion that, even if opposition at Ephesus had not necessitated an apologia by Paul to the elders, "Luke, at least, is concerned to give his readers a defense of his hero against all pos-

---

<sup>19</sup>Jacques Dupont, Le discours de Milet, *Lectio divina*, 32 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1962), pp. 12-21; Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 155-58.

sible detractors of his memory."<sup>20</sup> This suggestion has merit, but Luke's purpose seems to be more definite. Dibelius points out that the Miletus speech is not important to the sequence of events in Acts,<sup>21</sup> which helps to set it in relief. The suggestion we are making is that Paul's apology (vss. 18-27, after which follows the paraclesis, vss. 28ff.) is intended as a parallel to Peter's discourse before Cornelius' household. Effort has already been made to show that that famous discourse is also apologetic rather than sermonic.

Two considerations are relevant. First of all, that both situations consist of essentially apologetic material can be seen by the device which Luke usually employs to introduce an apology.<sup>22</sup>

Peter, 10:28. ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε . . .  
10:36. ὑμεῖς οἴδατε . . .

Paul, 20:18. ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε . . .  
20:34. αὐτοὶ γινώσκετε . . .

The device is employed also in 15:7, where Peter begins

---

<sup>20</sup>Lampe, "Acts," p. 918.

<sup>21</sup>Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 155.

<sup>22</sup>The speech in chapter 22 is a major exception, though 22:5 may be taken as an equivalent (cf. 22:19).

his apology on behalf of the Gentile Christians, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε . . . . To be compared with this is Paul's defense in chapter 26 (v. 26), ἐπίσταται γὰρ περὶ τούτων ὁ βασιλεὺς . . . (cf. also 22:19, αὐτοὶ ἐπίστανται . . .).

Secondly, the apology in both cases contains a subsection which turns out to be an extended witness declaration, or a witness apology. In Acts 10 Peter's witness apology is comprised of four balanced statements in five verses (39-43); in chapter 20 the expanded witness formula is made up of eight verses (20-27). The verses which constitute the witness apology are clearly marked off:

v. 20: οὐδὲν ὑπεστείλαμην τῶν συμφερόντων τοῦ  
μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν. . . .

v. 27: οὐ γὰρ ὑπεστείλαμην τοῦ ἀναγγεῖλαι  
πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῖν.

The Petrine counterpart was discussed in the last chapter. Here our task is to outline the points which appear in Paul's witness apology.

(a) Verse 21. διαμαρτύρομαι is Luke's favorite word for describing the witness activity. Paul's "testifying" (διαμαρτυρόμενος) serves to specify what in verse 20 he claims to be declaring (ἀναγγεῖλαι) and

teaching (διδάξαι).<sup>23</sup> Here his μαρτύριον concerns "repentance to God and of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." This is addressed to "both Jews and Greeks." We recall that the specific content for the preaching of the witness as outlined by the Risen Lord included preaching of repentance to all the nations (Luke 24:47). Indeed, Burchard says that the accent there is placed on the Metanoiapredigt,<sup>24</sup> and this emphasis is maintained in the preaching of Peter but restricted in its range of application to Israel (cf. 5:31, "God exalted him . . . to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins"). Paul's declaration here is consistent with 9:15, which restricts his ministry neither to Gentiles nor to Jews.

(b) Verse 23. It is the Holy Spirit who testifies (διαμαρτύρεται) to Paul, warning him constantly that misfortune awaits him. It has been suggested that this is a reference to the prophets through whom the Spirit has warned Paul.<sup>25</sup> If so, then 21:11 (the warning by Agabus) is a repetition of this constant

---

<sup>23</sup>So also for Conzelmann, Theology of St. Luke, p. 219, the three verbs are synonymous.

<sup>24</sup>Burchard, Der dreizehnte Zeuge, p. 132.

<sup>25</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 591.

"testifying" (cf. 21:4). This suggests that Paul rejects the guidance of the Spirit. Verse 22 ("bound in the spirit"), therefore, should probably mean that Paul is inwardly resolved<sup>26</sup> (rather than bound by the Holy Spirit) to go to Jerusalem.<sup>27</sup> This does not seem to affect his ministry.

(c) Verse 24. Here it is clear that Paul's ministry (διακονία, the same word Peter uses in 1:25) was personally received from the Lord Jesus. It is not dependent upon Jerusalem. His ministry is to witness (again, διαμαρτύρασθαι) "to the gospel of the grace of God" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ); P41 and D (characteristically) add "to Jews and Greeks." This is the same as "preaching the kingdom" in verse 25.<sup>28</sup> The statement about his going about among them preaching recalls verse 20, διδάξαι ὑμᾶς δημοσίᾳ καὶ κατ' οἴκους. These are further examples of Luke's fondness for varying expressions to say the same thing (cf. 27:23 and 31).

(d) Verse 26. For a different sort of witness,

---

<sup>26</sup>So also 19:12.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 591; Schlatter, Apostelgeschichte, p. 248.

<sup>28</sup>Bruce, Book of Acts, p. 415, n. 54.

Luke reverts to a cognate; διότι μαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν, Paul says, using it in a purely legal sense, thus absolving himself from any guilt. "If Paul had 'watered down' the gospel (cf. 2 Cor. ii.7), he would have been answerable to God for the lives or souls of the converts."<sup>29</sup> διότι links with κηρύσσων,<sup>30</sup> and it is his faithfulness in this that clears Paul.

We may leave the Miletus speech and its μάρτυς-apologia at this point.

5. Two passages in which the same witness verb and thought appear can be cited briefly. In 22:5 Paul says, "I persecuted this way . . . as the high priest and whole council of elders bear me witness (μαρτυρεῖ μοι)"; and in 26:5, "They have known for a long time, if they are willing to testify (εἰαν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν), that according to the strictest party of our religion I have lived as a Pharisee." In both cases he cites the ability of the Jews to give testimony as to his own character and sincerity, just as he

---

<sup>29</sup>C. S. C. Williams, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, Black's New Testament Commentaries (2d ed.; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1964), pp. 233-34.

<sup>30</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 592.

himself did in 20:26.<sup>31</sup>

The idea that was developed in relation to 14:3,<sup>32</sup> that of the false witness, is implied here. These pseudo-witnesses have the information necessary to clear Paul, but they are not willing to testify. Thus they tacitly agree to what Paul sees as a falsification of the case (a pseudo-testimony). This theme continues to work throughout the speech, especially where Stephen is called "witness" (v. 20). The allusion to the Stephen affair is a reminder that only in that account does Luke use the noun μάρτυς outside a speech, and then in reference to Stephen's opponents (6:13, μάρτυρες ψευδεις, and 7:58, μάρτυρες).

6. Besides 22:5 (above), Paul's speech before the Jerusalem crowd (22:3-21) contains three significant witness passages, 22:14-15, 18 and 20. These will be treated separately, since they are not all three part of an extended witness declaration or apology, such as Peter's in chapter 10 or Paul's in chapter 20. In fact, the speech contains no witness declaration.

---

<sup>31</sup>In several passages elsewhere in Acts, the verb is used in the sense of "a good report concerning someone," as in the cases of the Seven (6:3), Cornelius (10:22), Timothy (16:2) and Ananias (22:12).

<sup>32</sup>See above, ch. 2, pp. 64-66.



Rather, the witness theme is slipped into a speech which starts out as a defense of Paul's Jewishness. This is his first declaration: "I am a Jew" (v. 3). He has already addressed the crowd as ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, the same formula used to begin Stephen's address (7:2). His Jewishness is maintained throughout the speech; the violent reaction of the crowd--recalling again Stephen's speech--comes only with the announcement of the Gentile mission.

W. Baird thinks "the speech makes no contribution to the progress of the narrative."<sup>33</sup> Since Luke's purpose is not limited to a simple narration of events,<sup>34</sup> however, this conclusion is unjustified, at least in respect of one major theme. The passages discussed below show that it makes a definite contribution in the unfolding of Luke's witness theory and theology. Let us turn now to these passages.

(a) Verses 14-15: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, 'Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν

---

<sup>33</sup>Baird, "The Acts of the Apostles," p. 759.

<sup>34</sup>Cf. Hanson, Acts, pp. 213-14: "It is suitable to its context in a literary but not historical sense; that is to say, it is suitable to Luke's purpose that Paul should here defend himself against the hostility of the Jews by recounting his conversion, but it does not say a word to vindicate him against the charge, either of violating the Temple or starting a riot, for which he is presumably in custody."

πατέρων ἡμῶν προεχειρίσατό σε γνῶναι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ  
καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος  
αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἔση μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὧν  
έώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας. ("And he said, 'The God of our  
fathers destined you to know his will, to see the Just  
One and to hear a voice from his mouth; for you will  
be a witness for him to all men of what you have seen  
and heard.'")

Paul is quoting Ananias in the second of three  
accounts of his conversion. There are, of course, dif-  
ferences and even outright contradictions in the details  
of the three accounts. Here for the first time the  
title μάρτυς is applied to Paul. Paul does not call  
himself a witness directly, as Peter did himself, but  
places the title in another's mouth in reference to  
himself. The effect of this will be seen clearly when  
26:16 comes up for examination.

E. Trocmé sees the intervention of Luke in the  
addition of new details and the development of a gen-  
eral idea which commands the whole of the book, i. e.,  
Paul is "witness."<sup>35</sup> The speech does not appear to be

---

<sup>35</sup>Trocmé, Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire,  
p. 176. Trocmé asks whether the words of Ananias at  
22:13-16 are not also Lucan creation.

a translation from Aramaic, even though it is supposed to have been spoken in this language.<sup>36</sup> If, on the other hand, it is argued that the differences are accounted for by variations in actual speeches by Paul,<sup>37</sup> the end result is the same: Luke has used the speech and the account of Paul's conversion to show that Paul is to be counted as a witness. But in placing Paul firmly among the witnesses in this passage, Luke has not made our task easier.

What is it here that qualifies Paul to be a μάρτυς? ἑώρακας is interpreted by Blass-Debrunner as being that which gives him his consecration as Apostle, while the hearing is less essential;<sup>38</sup> following the same vein, R. P. Casey (followed by others) argues that it is Paul's vision of the risen Lord which makes him a witness.<sup>39</sup> On a casual reading, this appears to be the case. The ὅτι, however, does not make Paul's being a witness dependent upon the preceding statement.

---

<sup>36</sup>Hanson, Acts, p. 213.

<sup>37</sup>Foakes-Jackson, Acts of the Apostles, p. 202.

<sup>38</sup>F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, tr. and rev. by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), para. 342.

<sup>39</sup>Casey, "Μάρτυς," in BC, V, p. 32. The same is true of Stephen, verse 20.

It is causal, and therefore cannot be translated as "so that"; this means that because Paul will be a witness he was chosen "to know his will, to see the Just One and to hear a voice from his mouth" (v. 17). Furthermore, he quotes Ananias as speaking in the future tense--ἐσθὶ μάρτυς--which again does not make Paul's position as witness dependent upon his vision. Recall that in 1:8 Jesus himself says ἐσεσθὲ μου μάρτυρες (also future; cf. Luke 24:48 where the verb is omitted), which meant that they were not witnesses simply because they had seen the risen Lord.

It is quite possible that if Paul actually delivered such a speech, Luke's transposition of it became careless at this point (or, again, deliberately vague). The inclination here is to think that the ἐώρακας and ἤκουσας do not indeed refer simply to the vision and the voice, though this cannot be said on the basis of verses 14-15. Perhaps the statement at 26:16-18 is meant to be explanatory; it certainly takes a different twist.<sup>40</sup>

At any rate, it is difficult to see why the visionary aspect should be emphasized. It would natu-

---

<sup>40</sup>See discussion below, pp. 133-38.

rally be mentioned as an experience of personal significance, but not as the real basis of Paul's ministry. In his speech at Miletus the vision is not even mentioned. Paul's concern there had been with "the whole counsel of God" (20:27). If anything is to be stressed--and it certainly is--it is that Paul was chosen "to know his will" (γινῶναι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ). The vision and the voice may be seen as subordinate to this; they do not make Paul a witness.

The other details of verse 15 clearly fit into the Lucan plan for Paul. He is witness "for him" (αὐτῷ), dative, which is to be understood in the same sense as the genitive "his witness" (cf. 13:31; also "my witness," 1:8). Paul is seen as witness "to all men" (πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους), a constant in the Pauline concept of missions as shown by passages already cited (9:15, 20:21).<sup>41</sup>

(b) Verse 18. Paul recites an experience he had while in a trance in the Temple: καὶ ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν λέγοντά μοι, Σπεῦσον καὶ ἔξελθε ἐν τάχει ἐξ Ἱερουσαλὴμ,

---

<sup>41</sup>Cf. Dillon and Fitzmyer, "Acts of the Apostles," p. 206: "In 9:15 it was restricted to 'the Gentiles'; once again the exigencies of the situation call for a broader view." This conclusion is inexplicable. 9:15 ("the Gentiles and kings and the sons of Israel") is hardly restrictive.

διότι οὐ παραδέχονται σου μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ. ("And I saw him saying to me, 'Hurry, and get quickly out of Jerusalem, because they will not accept your testimony about me.")

The μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ is the human witness concerning Jesus. μαρτυρία is hardly to be distinguished from μαρτύριον (Luke 21:13; Acts 4:33). It is the favorite witness-word in John's Gospel,<sup>42</sup> but in Luke's writings is used only here and in Luke 22:71. Jesus is the subject of the witness; in no case can περὶ ἐμοῦ be construed here as meaning "facts about Jesus' life."

That Paul is told to leave Jerusalem because they will not accept his testimony tends to confirm the conclusion by some that 13:31 (πρὸς τὸν λαόν) refers to the Jews of Palestine.<sup>43</sup> In point of fact,

---

<sup>42</sup>On this see especially the relevant sections in the commentary now in English, by Rudolf Bultmann, The Gospel of John, trans. by G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), pp. 84-97 ("The Baptist is the μάρτυς." p. 97); 160-75, 262-68, 278-84. For a recent discussion of the witness theme in John's Gospel, see James Montgomery Boice, Witness and Revelation in the Gospel of John, Christian Student's Library (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970).

<sup>43</sup>Gustav Stählin, Die Apostelgeschichte, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Teilbd. 5 (12. Aufl.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), p. 183; Wikenhauser,

though Paul was previously anxious to get to Jerusalem, he is never allowed an active ministry there, so that the task of preaching in the Jewish homeland has to be left to others. It is true that 9:29 shows him preaching there, but this was quickly halted (though by opposition and his fellow Christians rather than a vision). It is not hard to see in Paul's return under risk to Jerusalem only to be sent away (23:11, the assurance that his mission would extend to Rome) the same theological pattern as in the case of Philip (8:25-26).

(c) Verse 20. καὶ ὅτε ἐξεχύνετο τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρός σου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤμην ἐφεστὼς καὶ συνευδοκῶν. . . . ("And when the blood of Stephen your witness was shed, I also was standing by and approving . . . .")

Once again in the speech we are reminded of the Stephen affair. Here Stephen is called "your witness" (μάρτυρός σου), which, as the personal form of the title, is Lucan. K. Holl thinks the expression is already (as in Rev. 2:13, 17:6) used here as a technical term for martyr.<sup>44</sup> H. F. von Campenhausen rightly

---

Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 155; Jacquier, Les Actes des Apôtres, p. 72.

<sup>44</sup>Karl Holl, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchen-

objects to this view, pointing to Lucan usage elsewhere.<sup>45</sup> The mention of the αἷμα is not necessarily a matter of emphasis, as Haenchen thinks.<sup>46</sup> It is true that the Church began to deny the title "martyr" to those who did not die for the faith. μαρτυρία and μαρτύριον likewise became words designating a martyr's death.<sup>47</sup> But on Luke's view of the witness there is no reason to deny the title to Stephen, just as verse 18 is not a reference to the Jews' refusal to accept Paul's martyrdom; they were in fact seeking to kill him (9:29). The "witness" Stephen gave was not his death, but his life and, especially, his message. Luke's idea is one of a living testimony, not a dying

testimony.

geschichte, Bd. II: Der Osten (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964), p. 71.

<sup>45</sup>Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen, Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936), p. 31, n. 7: "K. Holl . . . versteht den Ausdruck zu Unrecht als technisch für den Märtyrer; weder der lukanische Sprachgebrauch noch die Stelle für sich genommen weisen darauf hin."

<sup>46</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, pp. 627-28, n. 7. Would "the blood" of the Ephesian elders (20: 26) also be emphasized? Nor can we agree with Burchard, Der dreizehnte Zeuge, p. 130, n. 291, that "your witness" as applied to Stephen is "quasi-titular."

<sup>47</sup>Günther, "Zeuge und Märtyrer," pp. 152, 156-57 (the μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ as the passio Christi which the martyr takes upon himself); Bauer, Greek-English Lexicon, pp. 494-95.



one.

7. In the order of our examination, Paul's speech before Agrippa (26:2-23) contains the last of the witness passages (see ch. 2 for 28:23, an "editorial comment"). Two passages demand our attention, verses 16-18 and 22-23.

The historicity<sup>48</sup> of the scene need not detain us. What is important is that the defense before Agrippa closely parallels that before the mob at Jerusalem (22:3-21), "but along with the virtual identity of the subject-matter there are subtle divergences of style and presentation between the two speeches."<sup>49</sup> The twin speeches, plus the speech before Felix (24:10-21), fulfill the expectation of Luke 12:11-12, 21:12-16 (cf. Acts 9:15). The present task is to see how the speech before Agrippa furthers the development of the witness motif.

(a) Verses 16-18. Paul is quoting Jesus:

ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ στῆθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου· εἰς τοῦτο  
γὰρ ὤφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα

---

<sup>48</sup>Denied by Haenchen, following Overbeck, Wellhausen, Schwartz; see Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, pp. 690-91.

<sup>49</sup>Bruce, Book of Acts, p. 440.

ὧν τε εἶδές με ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι, ἐξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ  
τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν, εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε  
ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκοτόυς  
εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, τοῦ  
λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κληρὸν ἐν τοῖς  
ἡγιασμένοις πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ. ("But rise up and stand  
on your feet; for I appeared to you for this purpose,  
to destine you a minister and witness of the things in  
which you have seen me and of the things in which I  
shall appear to you, delivering you from the people and  
from the Gentiles, to whom I send you to open their  
eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light and  
from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive  
forgiveness of sins and a lot among those who are  
sanctified by faith in me.")

In verse 16, με is omitted in mss. P74 N A C<sup>2</sup>  
E P Ψ. It is a hard reading, but Ropes thinks the evi-  
dence from B C\* 614 minn syrP, <sup>h</sup> copsa arm geo Ambrose  
Augustine must be taken as decisive.<sup>50</sup> Dibelius, how-  
ever, thinks the text, μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδες με ὧν τε  
ὀφθήσομαί σοι, utterly impossible and therefore cor-

---

<sup>50</sup>Ropes, BC, III, p. 237.

rupted through the influence of the preceding ὥφθην.<sup>51</sup>

This is the third account of Paul's conversion. Unlike 9:10ff. and 22:12ff. the mediating Ananias is omitted. Here Paul receives his directions immediately from the Lord himself. His destiny as a μάρτυς is announced by Jesus himself, which gives it a ring of finality. The verb προχειρίσασθαι indicates the destiny which is intended for Paul; it does not indicate the point at which Paul becomes a witness. The future ἔσῃ μάρτυς of 22:15 agrees with this judgment. The same verb "to destine" in 22:14 is of the same nature. There Paul is destined "to know his will." The words of Paul's speeches avoid the restrictive claim to being fore-elected (προεχειροτονημένοις, 10:41) and specially favored by God that appears in Peter's witness apology before Cornelius. Paul is a "chosen vessel" (σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς, 9:15), one chosen for a task.

The phrase, "minister and witness," should not require us to find an allusion to Luke 1:2.

εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε as a reference to Gentiles and the Gentile mission is not meant to restrict the area of Paul's ministry, since οὓς refers

---

<sup>51</sup>Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 92.

also to Israel. Verse 18 summarizes the theological approach to the Gentile mission. The nations must be turned from darkness to light through the opening of their "eyes." The brief sermon to the pagans at Lystra attempts this approach, as does the Areopagus speech, though without the terminology of "turning from darkness to light." The verse must be seen as an allusion to Luke 1:79 (Isa. 9:2; 59:8) and 2:32 (Isa. 42:6, 49:6, 25:7, 46:13). "That they may receive forgiveness of sins and a lot among those who are sanctified by faith in me" is the conclusion to which the Jerusalem Church (11:18) and Peter (15:9) were forced concerning the Gentiles.

It may be that 22:15 (ἐσθὶ μάρτυς . . . ὧν ἐώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας) anticipates 26:16. Dibelius rightly says that the heavenly voice does not promise that Christ will appear again to Paul, but that much will be shown him.<sup>52</sup> Reading, therefore, "the things in which" the Lord is seen and will be seen, it becomes clear that the witness is an interpreter in a special sense. If it is true, as Hanson suggests, that this account is the one most modified by later

---

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 92; cf. Rackham, Acts of the Apostles, p. 469. Other appearances, however, do occur.

experience,<sup>53</sup> then it is fair to see it as revealing the "Pauline" πάτρις as being a heilsgeschichtlich concept; the witness discerns the activity of the Lord in an historical context.

But how is this to be understood? In a later chapter we will argue that Luke's development of the concept of witness is based in part on Isa. 43:8-13. This discussion must be anticipated at this point. In that passage, "blind and deaf" people are led out and God's witnesses are appointed to testify (on Luke's reading) to them. In Acts 26:16-18 Paul is commissioned "to open their eyes." F. F. Bruce points out that Paul recites his commission in terms which recall the calls of Jeremiah<sup>54</sup> and Ezekiel,<sup>55</sup> and that "the commission itself echoes the commission of the Servant of the Lord in Isa. 42:1ff."<sup>56</sup> There the Lord promises to put his spirit upon his servant (v. 1b; cf. Acts

---

<sup>53</sup>Hanson, Acts, p. 238.

<sup>54</sup>Jer. 1:7f.

<sup>55</sup>Ezek. 2:1, 3.

<sup>56</sup>Bruce, Book of Acts, p. 491; ". . . and very properly so, for the commission of Paul and of all Christian witnesses is the perpetuation of the Servant's commission, as has been made very plain already in Acts" (p. 492).

1:8) and charges him to proclaim what is made known to him (v. 9). It is evident from 42:18 ("Hear, you deaf; and look, you blind, that you may see!") that the servant is able to proclaim only when he "sees and hears." So we understand Acts 22:14-15. In Acts 26:16-18, however, only the "seeing" is emphasized, and this corresponds to the idea expressed here of "opening their eyes" (the inappropriateness of opening ears in order to give light is obvious).

μάρτυς anticipates μαρτυρόμενος of verse 22,<sup>57</sup> to which we now move.

(b) Verses 22-23. ἐπικουρίας οὖν τυχὼν τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης ἔστηκα μαρτυρόμενος μικρῷ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ, οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων ὧν τε οἱ προφηταὶ ἐλάλησαν μελλόντων γίνεσθαι καὶ Μωϋσῆς, εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλλειν τῷ λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

("Since I have obtained help from God, to this day I stand witnessing both to small and great, saying nothing except what the prophets and Moses said would come to pass, that the Christ should suffer, that as the first one resurrected from the dead he would proclaim

---

<sup>57</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 686, n. 2.

light to the people and to the Gentiles.")

With these two verses it becomes clear that Luke is trying to show, through Paul, what his witness theology really is. Verse 22 extends the scope of the *πάπτος*-mission to its limits--"to both small and great." Verse 23 reinforces the mission "to the people and to the Gentiles" (cf. v. 17 above). Notice, however, that it is the Christ himself who will proclaim "light" (a reference back to verse 18) to all men. According to Luke 21:12-15, Jesus will give his witnesses words and wisdom; according to the parallels (Mark 13:10-11; Matt. 10:19-20) and Luke 12:11-12, it is the Holy Spirit who teaches and, in fact, speaks through his witnesses. Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:8 promise power through the Spirit. The *ἐκτιμωρίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ* can only be a reference to the power of witness which was promised. It was given by God to his Christ to bestow upon his witnesses (Luke 24:49). And how does the resurrected and ascended Christ "proclaim light to the people and to the Gentiles" but through his Spirit-created and empowered witnesses? Again, it is clear that the witness-mission is an extension of the servant-mission.

Paul and the Lucan Witness

P. Menoud argues that after the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15), "Paul est haussé à la dignité nouvelle de témoin (μάρτυς)." <sup>58</sup> O'Neill points out, however, that in the speeches of Paul (22:15; 26:16) he was already a witness and that there is no indication that Luke elevates him to a new status. <sup>59</sup> The witness passages in the speech show beyond a doubt that Paul is for Luke a witness in the fullest sense. This is, as this chapter has been concerned to show, on the basis of his method and message rather than his vision. The speech before Agrippa represents the most complete development in Acts of what we have seen to be Luke's witness theology. On the basis of this speech a full synopsis, paralleled with the authoritative words of Jesus, can be provided.

Luke 21:12-15

Acts 26

v. 12. delivering you up  
to the synagogues  
and prisons, and

v. 21. the Jews seized me  
in the temple and  
tried to kill me. <sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup>Philippe H. Menoud, "Le Plan des Actes des Apôtres," New Testament Studies, I (1954-1955), p. 47.

<sup>59</sup>O'Neill, Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting, p. 67.

<sup>60</sup>Paul is at this point speaking before both king and governor.



you will be brought  
before kings and  
governors for my  
name's sake.

v. 13. This will be a time for you to bear testimony. v. 22b. so I stand here testifying both to small and great.

v. 15. I will give you a mouth and wisdom (24:49, I send the promise of the Father upon you; Acts 1:8a, you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you) v. 22a. To this day I have had the help that comes from God

24:44-49

v. 44. everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled. v. 22c. saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses said would come to pass

v. 46. Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead v. 23a. that the Christ must suffer, and . . . to rise from the dead

v. 47. and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations. v. 20b. (I declared) that they should repent and turn to God v. 18b. that they may receive forgiveness of sins v. 23b. both to the people and to the Gentiles.

v. 48. you are witnesses (Acts 1:8b, you shall be my witnesses; 23:11) v. 16. 'I have appeared to you, to destine you as a minister and a witness'

v. 49. see above, 21:15

Acts 1:8

v. 8a. see above, Luke 21:15

v. 8b. see above, Luke 24:48

|  |  |
|--|--|
| v. 8c. in Jerusalem and in<br>all Judea and<br>Samaria and to the<br>end of the earth. | v. 20a. at Damascus--then<br>at Jerusalem and<br>throughout all the<br>country of Judea,<br>and also to the<br>Gentiles. |
|--|--|

In 26:20 Damascus appears first as a matter of historical record. Samaria is omitted, but it is clear that this is intended as the same general witness scheme, which is certainly preserved.

The conclusion now is no longer avoidable that the Pauline witness theology is a Lucan creation. The above synoptic chart shows that the "Pauline" witness and the Lucan witness coincide. We can, therefore, no longer speak of a Pauline witness theory, but only of a Lucan witness theology which finds its typical representation in Paul.

PART II

THE WITNESS THEOLOGY

## CHAPTER V

### WHO SPEAKS FOR JESUS?

Reference back to Part I will show that two basic lines of witness thinking can be discerned in the book of Acts: (1) the Lucan view, which finds its primary representation in Paul, and (2) an early view of which Peter is the major representative. Following his speech calling for the election of Judas' successor in chapter 1, in which Peter lays down the qualifications for the witness (1:21-22), a form of witness declaration appears in the Petrine speeches with monotonous regularity. This has led T. F. Glasson to suggest that the apostle as witness should be added to the points of the kerygma.<sup>1</sup> There are four of these:

2:32, πάντες ἡμεῖς ἔσμεν μάρτυρες  
3:15, ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες ἔσμεν  
5:32, ἡμεῖς ἔσμεν μάρτυρες . . . καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον  
10:39, ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες

---

<sup>1</sup>T. F. Glasson, "The Kerygma: is Our Version Correct?" The Hibbert Journal, LI (October, 1952-July, 1953), pp. 129-32; Williams, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 56.

The expansion of the declaration in chapter 10 into a full-fledged "witness apology" confirms what is either explicit or implicit in the other declarations and in 1:21-22: (a) the full witness title is μάρτυς τῆς ἀναστάσεως; (b) the witness is one who enjoyed life-time companionship with Jesus, thus an eyewitness (Luke 1:2); (c) he is a member of an inner group, the Twelve, specially chosen by God; (d) his mission is to preach repentance to Israel.

This early view is, as said above, contrasted with another line of witness thinking which, though it is most fully developed in relation to Paul, nevertheless can only be called "Lucan."<sup>2</sup> In the speeches attributed to Paul, he never makes a direct claim to be a witness, but it appears as a matter of divine purpose (cf. especially 22:14-15 and 26:16). To decide what the Lucan position must be to begin with, two types of witness sayings were isolated. One of these is what has been termed "editorial comments" (because they occur outside the speeches in Acts), which for the most part make use of verbs (never of μάρτυς<sup>3</sup>), partic-

---

<sup>2</sup>See especially the synoptic chart above, ch. 4, pp. 140-42.

<sup>3</sup>Except in the case of the false-witnesses in the Stephen affair (6:13, 7:58).

ularly διαμαρτύρομαι, to describe the witness in his activity. Following this method enables us to include Philip as witness (8:25).<sup>4</sup> Especially significant for this as a Lucan method is that it is employed to develop Paul's first witness apology, the Miletus speech (20:20-27). It is also useful to remember that this verb, as the Miletus apology shows, is closely related to the idea of revelation.<sup>5</sup> The other type of witness saying, the witness logia of Jesus in 1:8 and 23:11 (and also Luke 24:46-49), must be seen as having particular authority when we ask, "who is qualified to speak for Jesus?" These reveal that the preferred title is "witness of Jesus," and that the mission is to preach repentance to all nations in the name of Jesus. But who is qualified to do so?

#### The Power and the Witness

Again it is necessary to turn directly to the witness sayings of Jesus to find the qualifications of

---

<sup>4</sup>See above, ch. 2, pp. 60-62.

<sup>5</sup>Ragnar Asting, Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1939), pp. 603-605. According to Burnier, the idea of witness throughout the New Testament is related to revelation; Edouard Burnier, La Notion de témoignage dans le Nouveau Testament (Lausanne: F. Roth & Cie., 1939).

his witness. Three sayings are pertinent:

1. Luke 21:13, 15. "It will turn out for you a testimony. . . . for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which none of your adversaries will be able to withstand or contradict" (cf. 12:12, "for the Holy Spirit will teach you").
2. Luke 24:48-49. "You are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but stay in the city until you have received power from on high."
3. Acts 1:8. "But you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth."

The progression, wisdom-promise-power-Holy Spirit, hardly needs pointing out at this point. Nevertheless, in each case the Holy Spirit is inseparably linked both with the μαρτύριον and with the ability of the μάρτυς to proclaim it. The conclusion is inevitable then that what qualifies one to be a μάρτυς is that he receives the Holy Spirit.

The tremendous importance of the operation of the Spirit of God in Luke's writings is obvious even to the casual reader.<sup>6</sup> The Holy Spirit is not, as

---

<sup>6</sup>See the important article by G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," in Studies in the Gospels, ed. by D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 159-200. Cf. the recent study by Dale Moody, Spirit of the Living God (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), especially pp. 49-81. Moody differs at many points from Lampe, but his own work appears to be nearly as much a discussion of cur-

many scholars have thought, Luke's "answer to the delay of the Parousia." The Spirit for Luke is a reality which he finds operative in the life of the church. The Spirit cannot be systematized or bound to a ritual.<sup>7</sup> The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God, and as such is free, active, creative. The Spirit is also the Spirit of witness. Peter's confession in 5:32 shows above all that, as witness, the Spirit is closely associated with both lines of witness thinking, though, as we shall see, the connection between the Spirit-witness and the human witness is viewed differently in the two lines of thought. For Luke it means that it is the Holy Spirit which, as the Spirit of Jesus (16:8), freely chooses the historical witnesses and provides them with understanding and utterance.

If we follow this principle of the witness as

---

rent Baptist thinking as it is a study of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. Reference should also be made to the older work by Henry Barclay Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament (London: Macmillan & Co., 1909).

<sup>7</sup>So that the remark by Hanson, Acts, p. 115, makes no sense; he says, "Notice how implicitly Luke identifies baptism with the gift of the Holy Spirit. . . . when we find divergences from this view, it is time to look for sources." On this as a historical-theological problem see the study by G. W. H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1951).



Spirit-formed, we may also say the Holy Spirit is the democratizing element in Luke's witness theology. This would be formulated thus: he through whom the Spirit-witness speaks must be regarded as a witness. This means, for example, that a prophet like Agabus could also be called "witness." This would especially be true if one interprets 20:23 ("The Holy Spirit testifies to me") as a reference by Paul to the warnings of the Christian prophets.<sup>8</sup> It is Agabus in 21:11 who functions in this manner: "Thus says the Holy Spirit." The disciples at Tyre also warn Paul "through the Spirit" (21:4). This is a possible function of the witness we have not hitherto discussed, and need not develop at length. It is most directly related to the guidance of the Spirit within the community itself, so that the Spirit who provides for the proclamation of the Gospel message also provides for the welfare of the proclaimers in much the same way, through his witnesses. The safety of Paul and his companions as a matter of revelation while on a stormy voyage (27:21-26) may be related to this.

It is not difficult to draw the conclusion of

---

<sup>8</sup>So Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 591.

the democratized Spirit of witness even from the Pentecost experience and Peter's discourse. In 2:4 the Holy Spirit "gave them utterance"; this can only be seen as the beginning of the fulfillment of Luke 21:12ff., 24:49, and Acts 1:8. Peter's citation in 2:17 from the prophet Joel,

I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh,  
and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy  
(Joel 2:28),

may be taken to mean that God intends that the Spirit should speak through other believers in the same way as he does through the Twelve (even women!). If 2:33 (the pouring out of the promise of the Father) is combined with 2:38-39 (the promise extended), the result is emphatically the same. It is also the natural inference from 5:32. Luke goes on to draw (so we are arguing) the conclusion of the democracy of the Spirit of witness. But Peter did not; why?

Before this question can be answered, it will be useful to see whether those who, in the course of our exegetical investigations, have been explicitly called "witness" meet this primary requirement.

1. The Twelve. Obviously, these do; 2:4 is evidence enough.

2. Paul. One of the significant elements in

the development of the witness theme with Paul as Luke's witness showcase is that, in Paul's speeches, no reference is made to his having received the Holy Spirit. Perhaps we should have expected Paul to make such a claim in relation to his position as witness. This stands, however, side-by-side with Luke's refusal to put an ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ in the mouth of Paul. In the account of his conversion in chapter 22, Paul quotes Ananias to the effect that Paul is to be a witness (v. 15); no mention of the Holy Spirit is made. In 9:17, however, Ananias makes no mention of Paul as witness, but does say that he was sent so that "you may regain your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit." This suggests that for Luke the two amount to the same thing. It is also the Spirit which sets Paul and Barnabas apart in 13:2; and Paul, "filled with the Holy Spirit," rebukes Elymas the magician. Other references (such as 16:7-8) show Paul's dependence on the Spirit.

3. Barnabas.<sup>9</sup> It is Barnabas who is set aside with Paul in 13:2. It is also Barnabas to whom Luke refers as "a good man, full of the Spirit and of faith" (11:24).

---

<sup>9</sup>See on 14:3 above, ch. 2, pp. 62-64.

4. Stephen. Paul in 22:20 refers to Stephen as "your witness," using the Lucan personal witness title. Stephen is one of the Seven, all of whom were to be "full of the Spirit and of wisdom" (16:3). Although these were chosen "to serve tables," this was obviously not their major concern; rather, they went about doing what Peter attempts to reserve for the Twelve (6:2, 4). In 6:5 Stephen is singled out as being "a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit." In 7:55 also he is described as being "full of the Holy Spirit." Stephen's enemies "could not withstand the wisdom and the Spirit with which he spoke" (6:10). This last is an extremely significant parallel to Luke 21:15 ("I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which none of your adversaries will be able to withstand or contradict").

The phrase "full of the Holy Spirit" (πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου), is first applied by Luke to Jesus (Luke 4:1). L. Keck points out that Luke is the only New Testament writer to use this phrase, "and he probably had in mind a particularly clear manifestation of God's power in the life of a holy man."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>Leander E. Keck, Mandate to Witness (Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson Press, 1964), pp. 41-42. It is

5. Philip. Philip the evangelist is also among the Seven who refused to tend to their own business. That Philip is also a man of the Spirit is clear from 8:29, where it is the Spirit who orders him to attach himself to the Ethiopian eunuch's chariot, and from 8:39, where it is said that "the Spirit of the Lord" transported him.

From the preceding discussion it can be seen that, just as the "witness" cannot be reserved for the Twelve and the "message" relegated to the others in the church, so the title, *μάρτυς*, cannot be restricted simply to those to whom it is directly applied in Acts.<sup>11</sup> It must be applied also to those to whom the Spirit gives utterance to speak in the name of Jesus.

The book of Acts may be styled, therefore, "the book of the witnesses." But it would be wrong to infer that it is the complete book of the witnesses. Will God leave himself without a witness' (cf. 14:17)? A major message of the book is that he will not. The witness, we have argued earlier, is a teleological wit-

---

probably not significant that it is never used in reference to Paul.

<sup>11</sup>Robert Koch, "Témoignage d'après les Actes," Masses ouvrières, CXXIX (1957), p. 16.

ness; that is, he preaches Jesus with the conviction that in this name God is fulfilling his purpose. When Luke presents the story of the Church in its beginnings, he shows it to be one that is historically oriented. The end of Acts reveals that Luke expects the message of Jesus to prevail in history, and this can only be done if he continues to have his historical witnesses to speak for him.

#### The Matthias Election Reconsidered

Why, then, does Peter not reach this conclusion? For the answer to this question we must reconsider Luke's purpose in including the by-election of Matthias. In the previous discussion of this account (1:15-26),<sup>12</sup> we concluded that Luke's interest in the incident did not lie in what it reveals about the organization of the early Christian community.<sup>13</sup> Our thesis is that it is the matter of the witness which gives the account real significance for Luke, and that it is within the scope of the development of the Lucan

---

<sup>12</sup>See above, ch. 3, pp. 72-77.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. Bo Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 32 (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1957), pp. 21-26.

concept of witness that the purpose for recounting the story should be sought.

E. M. Blaiklock notes that it is "commonly assumed" that Peter, in an actual historical situation, is shown to be acting too hastily, thus running ahead of God's purpose, since "Paul was destined for the vacant place."<sup>14</sup> This view is the result of a pious hermeneutic, and there is little to be said for it. In the first place, Peter equates his position as witness with that of apostle (1:25), and Luke seems to accept the early designation of the Twelve as the apostles (cf. the troublesome passages, 14:4, 14), but not as the witnesses. Then, again, Paul never really "joined" the apostles, but was always independent of them; nor was his home base Jerusalem, as in the case of the apostles, but Antioch (along with Barnabas, 13:1ff.).

Despite the fact that G. Klein,<sup>15</sup> as is usual among scholars, begins with the choice of Matthias for his reconstruction of the Lucan picture of an apostle, the increasing conviction here is that Luke is not

---

<sup>14</sup>Blaiklock, Acts of the Apostles, p. 53.

<sup>15</sup>Klein, Die zwölf Apostel, p. 204: 1:21f. is the Lucan Magna Carta of the apostolate of the Twelve.

really concerned with such a picture. The probability is that he "found" the apostolic office already in the church, and was content to leave it there as consisting of a particular group. While Paul in his letters makes much ado over his apostleship, Luke finds the idea of the witness more suitable for the missionary emphasis of the church. There is, therefore, without any attempt to denigrate the apostles, a conscious separation in Acts of the witness-ship from the apostleship (the apostles being those commissioned by the historical Jesus, Acts 1:2).<sup>16</sup>

The real problem has to do with Luke's attitude toward the tradition of witness thinking. Haenchen would make the election of Matthias the center of chapter 1, a reconstituting of the sacred number twelve which makes the group ready for the miracle of

---

<sup>16</sup>J. Rohde's criticism (Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists, pp. 219-29) of Klein also overlooks the Lucan separation of the two ideas when he insists that *μάρτυς* and *διακονία* shape Luke's picture of the apostle (p. 228). He thus wrongly sees Paul (on the basis of 22:15) as incorporated in the ranks of the *αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταί* of Luke 1:2, and thereby particularly connected with the twelve apostles (pp. 228-29). Rohde rightly rejects, however, Klein's insistence on Paul's subordination to the Twelve (p. 229).



Pentecost.<sup>17</sup> Haenchen accepts as Lucan Peter's witness definition. A way around this is offered by K. H. Rengstorf.<sup>18</sup> Rengstorf points out that while it is told objectively, the story betrays a grave misunderstanding on the part of Peter of the instruction given by the risen Lord.<sup>19</sup> Peter has misunderstood first of all the ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς to be a mission to the Jews of the Dispersion. The filling up of the twelfth number had eschatological significance, but this was significant only for Israel.

The idea of the Twelve, of course, was also based on Jesus' own choosing of an inner group. And had not Jesus himself at some point in his ministry issued a directive prohibiting his disciples from preaching to the Gentiles; did he not instruct them to go only to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10:5-6)?<sup>20</sup> In the light of this tradition con-

---

<sup>17</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, pp. 163-65.

<sup>18</sup>Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, "The Election of Matthias, Acts 1.15ff.," in Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation, ed. by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder (New York: Harper & Bros., 1962), pp. 178-92.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 187.

<sup>20</sup>On this problem of Jesus and the Gentile mission, see Joachim Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the

cerning Jesus' own policy, B. Reicke thinks "one has no right to criticize the Apostles" for their efforts "to keep up the contact with Israel."<sup>21</sup> It should be noted, however, that Luke in his Gospel makes no use of that tradition. It is, furthermore, closely associated with the verses (Matt. 10:17-22) which form a parallel to the very important witness passage in Luke 21:12-19. While Luke himself is not in fact critical of the continued contact with Israel, he does seek to correct the witness thinking represented in the Matthias story and is being at least mildly critical, if not of the apostles themselves, then of their assumptions. Acts 13:31 suggests that he was eventually forced to accommodate the Jerusalem Church at least regarding the area of their service as witnesses; but the force of the Cornelius story suggests that it was primarily a historical accommodation, that rightly seen the witness concept should have been more comprehensive theologically.

What makes us suspicious of the Matthias narra-

---

Nations, trans. by S. H. Hooke, *Studies in Biblical Theology*, No. 24 (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1958).

<sup>21</sup>Bo Reicke, "The Risen Lord and His Church," Interpretation, XIII (1959), p. 168.

tive and the witness definition it contains is a comparison with Jesus' own words in Luke 24:44-49 and Acts 1:8. It is, secondarily, the requirement that the witness must be an eyewitness, a companion of Jesus and of his followers during the whole time of his ministry until the day of his ascension (1:21-22). Such a requirement is not contained in Jesus' sayings and is at best inferential. If this is the essential requirement of a μάρτυς, Paul in no way qualifies; a vision is not physical companionship, so that the usual method of establishing on the basis of 1:21-22 the Augenzeugengesichtspunkt<sup>22</sup> throughout Acts fails to do justice to the material.

Primarily, however, Peter's statement is noticeable for what it omits, i. e., that which in 1:8 is essential--the reception of the Holy Spirit. Why does Peter's speech ~~omit~~ it? Or, the question may be turned around, why does Luke add the requirement of the Holy Spirit? Rengstorf says, "Thus it may be the fruit of wide experience of the Holy Spirit and his activity, but also it is the result of a long experience of well-intentioned human obstinacy that Luke relates,

---

<sup>22</sup>As does Asting, Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum, pp. 601-14.

before the Pentecost story, the by-election of Matthias with its almost too pompous air and then afterward lets the Twelve disappear so suddenly and so completely into the background."<sup>23</sup> The author of Acts wants to show, furthermore, that "even the most pious thoughts are not decisive for the way of the church--important and indispensable though they may be in a given hour; but the Holy Spirit calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian church on earth (Martin Luther)."<sup>24</sup>

Rengstorf rightly sees a tension between the Matthias account and the Pentecost outpouring, yet fails to see that it is an unresolved tension. His judgment that "the lesson which God himself gave the apostles at Pentecost is that he finds and forms the witnesses he wants to have,"<sup>25</sup> overlooks the simple fact that it is precisely this lesson which was not learned until the Cornelius event. At Pentecost Peter and the other apostles are witnesses, a point which Luke does not merely concede, but emphasizes.

---

<sup>23</sup>Rengstorf, "The Election of Matthias, Acts 1.15ff.," p. 191.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

They are witnesses and give their testimony powerfully (4:33), speaking as they do in the power of the Spirit. Luke knows nothing of the doctrine of infallibility, not even in the case of Spirit-inspired preaching. He finds it necessary to show that the early church failed to reckon with the realities of a new age. This is understandable, living as closely as they did to the actual events of Jesus' life, death and resurrection. It is understandable also in the light of their conviction that they were living "in the last days" (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις), and therefore that their apostleship entailed an eschatological witness. But it is precisely this that Luke finds insufficient in the radically new situation. By Peter's admission in 15:7 that God "bore witness" (ἐμαρτύρησεν) to the Gentiles by giving them the Holy Spirit, Luke is showing that the church has now begun officially to recognize the broader implications of the work of the Spirit. Jesus has ascended into heaven, but he is still present in his Spirit,<sup>26</sup> who works where he will and through whom he will.

---

<sup>26</sup>See Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, pp. 138-39.

Who Speaks for Jesus?

This, then, is Luke's method of correcting the witness tradition in the light of experience. His own thinking is epitomized in his preferred title, μάρτυς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. The title used by Peter and the early community, μάρτυς τῆς ἀναστάσεως,<sup>27</sup> expressed at least the conviction that Jesus had risen--the basis of the faith of the church. But the title, "Jesus' witness," serves, first of all, to express the conviction that the witness speaks on behalf, not simply of an event, but of a person; and that person was not merely one with whom a certain group ate and drank, but one in whom God has decisively acted so that he is associated directly with the will of God.<sup>28</sup> But it serves also to express the conviction that this Jesus, who is risen, is now active.

The historically verifiable fact remains, of course, that this Jesus is no longer physically present on earth. So how does he "proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles," as Paul is made to declare (26:23)? Who, after all, is this absentee

---

<sup>27</sup>Though αὐτοῦ is added in some texts at 5:32.

<sup>28</sup>Asting, Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum, p. 605.

- 163 -

Jesus and how does he make himself known? Luke's answer is that he sends his Spirit and by this means forms, and speaks through, his witnesses.

## CHAPTER VI

### "THE THINGS CONCERNING ME"

The preceding discussion stresses the importance of the Holy Spirit as the creative force in Luke's concept of the witness. The almost overwhelming emphasis on the Holy Spirit in Acts is easily recognized. To talk about Acts as the "Gospel of the Holy Spirit," however, is misleading. It is doubtful that Luke would have thought of his second volume as a "Gospel of the Holy Spirit."<sup>1</sup> Luke certainly knew of only one gospel, and that was the "Gospel of Jesus Christ." Despite the impression left by the sermons of Peter, the Holy Spirit is not the subject of the preaching of the church.

The term Luke uses to express the content of his gospel is τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. The use of this phrase begins early in the development of his witness

---

<sup>1</sup>Contra: Arnold Ehrhardt, "The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles," Studia Theologica, XII (1958), pp. 67-78.



theology. Indeed, we are prepared for it early in Luke's Gospel. The περί-phrase, while not used exclusively in Luke-Acts in reference to Jesus, nevertheless assumes a technical significance when it is so used. It may be seen as a thread which is entwined with others to bind together what now is more than merely a witness motif; it is, in fact, a witness theology.

Though it is often assumed that the expression, "the things concerning Jesus" (e. g., in Acts 18:25), refers to the historical ministry of Jesus, it involves much more than that, as we shall see, for it is used by Luke to signify the kerygma, or, in our terminology, the μαρτύριον. The life of Jesus is important in relation to this expression to the same degree that it is bound to the gospel message. Both Luke 1:1 and Acts 1:1 combine in the use of the περί-phrase the history of Jesus and the concern for its meaning, though in the framework of the narrative the emphasis on the historical aspect may tend to influence unduly one's subsequent interpretation of the περί-phrase as applied to Jesus. Be that as it may, Luke in this way is assuming the importance of his historical account.

Early in his Gospel the phrase, "the things

concerning Jesus," or its equivalent begins to denote something more than historical facts. It is used to express the significance of this Jesus, and it is particularly related to proclamation. In Luke 2:13f. heavenly messengers proclaim his birth. The shepherds who hear it repeat (v. 17) their proclamation by making known the words (περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος) which were spoken to them "concerning this child" (περὶ τοῦ παιδίου τούτου). The proclamation (περὶ τῶν λαληθέντων) causes amazement (v. 18). This is true again in 2:33, where the amazement follows the proclamation περὶ αὐτοῦ by Simeon. This proclamation is particularly important because, in a conflation of several Isaianic passages (40:5; 52:10; 42:6; 49:6; 25:7; 46:13), the speaker actually touches the heart of Luke's witness theology (cf. Acts. 26:22-23):

. . . your salvation,  
which you have prepared in the presence of all  
peoples,  
light for revelation to the nations,  
and glory for your people Israel.  
(vss. 30b-32)

This was spoken through the prompting of the Holy Spirit (v. 27). Likewise, in 2:38, Anna the prophetess "spoke concerning him (περὶ αὐτοῦ) to all who expected the redemption of Jerusalem."

In 7:24 Jesus himself testifies concerning John (περὶ Ἰωάννου), and this, combined with the citation of scripture (περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, v. 27), turns out to be a theological assessment of John rather than a statement of historical fact. Jesus is also speaking theologically when he speaks "concerning the kingdom of God" (περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, Luke 9:11; τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, Acts 1:3).

We are prepared, then, for the phraseology when it appears as part of Luke's witness theology. Significant use is made of it in chapter 24 of Luke's Gospel, where the Emmaus road travelers are found discussing the things that had happened (περὶ πάντων τῶν συμβεβηκότων τούτων, v. 14). The things the two are discussing appear to be historical events, but it quickly becomes clear that what Luke is concerned with is the meaning of these events. So in verse 19, when the concealed Jesus asks about what they are speaking, they reply, τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ. They then continue to give a theological assessment of him and to relate it to their hopes, which are also theological: "a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people . . . But we had hoped that he was the one to redeem Israel." By this statement they

are placed in the category of those to whom Anna the prophetess spoke περὶ αὐτοῦ, i. e., those who expect the redemption of Jerusalem (2:38).

Luke begins Jesus' theological self-assessment in chapter 24 with three thoughts in mind. First of all, verse 25 shows that the judgment of the travelers was inadequate ("O foolish ones, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets spoke!"). Secondly, it was in line with their hopes concerning him, but also (in the third place) in opposition to this hope. The tension is incipient already in Simeon's inspired utterance, where Jesus as the Salvation of God is prepared, to be sure, as glory for God's people--thus Jesus' self-assessment is in line with the hope of the redemption of Israel--but also for revelation to the nations. The latter is clearly not the hope of the Emmaus disciples. The tension is not resolved immediately, however, for it is Luke's method to allow the suspense to build, until in verse 47 the risen Lord declares that repentance and forgiveness of sins must be preached to all nations (εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη). This resolves the question for the reader, and consequently he tends to be unprepared for the literary renewal of it in Acts.

The reply Jesus gives to the Emmaus disciples

immediately anticipates verses 44-49 and the witness theology outlined there. "Was it not necessary," he asks in verse 20, "that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?" Then, from the entirety of the Old Testament (ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς) he expounds "the things concerning himself" (τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ). Thus also in verse 44 he reminds his disciples (an indefinite number) of what he had told them earlier in his ministry, i. e., "everything must be fulfilled that was written about me" (ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα . . . περὶ ἐμοῦ). All of this may be an allusion to 22:37, where again the followers of Jesus misunderstand his saying, which ends with the assertion that what is written "about me" (τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ) has its fulfillment. What was written concerning him? This is answered in verses 46 and 47.

The phraseology is carried through in Acts. Peter cites David as having spoken concerning the resurrection of the Christ (περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Acts 2:31). Here, though again we find a theological assessment, the historicity of the event stands prominently in the foreground. It is also consistent with Peter's title (of 1:22), μάρτυς τῆς ἀναστάσεως. We are therefore able to see how with the

use of the *περί*-phrase Luke switches the emphasis from an event to the person of Jesus in line with his preferred title, *μάρτυς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, yet in so doing always making primarily a statement of theological assessment. Stephen in 7:52 denounces those who murdered the prophets who announced the coming of the Righteous One (*περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ δικαίου*). In 8:34 the question is put to Philip by the Ethiopian court officer concerning the person about whom (*περὶ τίνος*) the prophet Isaiah speaks; was it about himself or about someone else (*περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἢ περὶ ἑτέρου τινός*)? The answer is that it is *περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*. Using the method of Luke 24, Philip then reveals the good news of Jesus (8:35). Paul in 13:29 continues the idea of Jesus as fulfilling scripture, "all that was written about him" (*πάντα τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα*).

In 18:25 Apollos, who certainly appears to be a witness,<sup>2</sup> is found teaching accurately "the things

---

<sup>2</sup>This is said on the basis of his method. This would presuppose his having received the Spirit, though this cannot be said with certainty on the basis of 18:25 (*ζέων τῷ πνεύματι*); it is, however, thought quite possible that this is a reference to the Spirit by J. H. E. Hull, The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles (London: Lutterworth Press, 1967), p. 192, and "Supplementary Note B: Apollos," pp. 181-84; so also Bauernfeind, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 229; for others, Dibelius, Käsemann, J. Weiss, Preisker, see

concerning Jesus" (τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ). This is often taken to refer to historical facts concerning Jesus. Luke, however, makes a point of mentioning Apollos' knowledge of scripture (v. 24), and the fact that he is speaking in the synagogue means that he is expounding scripture. He has been instructed in the Way of the Lord (v. 25). Again, therefore, it is not historical facts merely that are being recited, but a "theological assessment."

This, then, is the significance of the warning given to Paul (22:18) by Jesus that the Jews will not accept the "testimony concerning me" (μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ). In 23:11 too the περὶ-phrase and the witness language are merged (ὥς γὰρ διεμαρτύρω τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ . . . οὕτω σε δεῖ . . . μαρτυρῆσαι), and the remaining statements of this nature are more easily seen in their witness significance: Paul speaks to Felix concerning faith in Christ Jesus (περὶ τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν πίστεως, 24:24); Paul testifies to the kingdom of God, arguing from scripture concerning Jesus (περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, 28:23); he then continues to preach the kingdom and to teach "the things concerning the Lord Jesus

---

Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 550, n. 8.

Christ" (τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 28:31).

What has been set forth above underlines what Conzelmann says about "a feature of Luke's account" being his method of alluding to earlier passages without direct reference to them.<sup>3</sup> We have already seen this to be at work in Paul's witness apology in Acts 26.<sup>4</sup> It is also clearly the case with the ending of Acts; for example, "this salvation of God" (28:28) is an allusion to Luke 2:30 and 3:6. The final, and climactic, τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, therefore, is an allusion especially to Luke 24:20, 44, but also to the other instances of τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ and its equivalents. This fits in with the scheme of what H. Flender calls the "dialectical structure of Luke-Acts."<sup>5</sup>

Only when it is clear that this is a major part of Luke's method of theological discussion can his theology as such be discussed. His theology, as it

---

<sup>3</sup>Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, pp. 75-76, n. 4.

<sup>4</sup>See synoptic chart above, ch. 4, pp. 140-42.

<sup>5</sup>See the chapter by this title, Helmut Flender, St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History, trans. by Reginald H. and Ilsa Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 8-35. Luke's account is characterized by complementary, climactic and antithetic parallelism.



has been described in this study, is a "witness theology," which in its essentials is clearly defined in Luke 24:44ff. To this passage the whole of the development of the witness theme points back. The passage is also that which is in mind whenever Luke speaks of τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. It is to Luke 24:44-47 that we must go when it is asked, "what are 'the things concerning Jesus'?" P. Schubert shows how the points of Luke 24 are developed in Acts.<sup>6</sup> Here a brief attempt will be made only to point out the probable significance of these points for Lucan theology. There are three basic points: (1) the scriptures must be fulfilled; (2) the fulfilling event is that of the suffering and rising Christ; (3) repentance and forgiveness of sins must be preached in Jesus' name to all nations.

(1) The scriptures must be fulfilled. This is the first point of Luke's witness theology. M. Rese argues that Luke's use of scripture cannot be forced solely into a pattern of promise and fulfillment, that

---

<sup>6</sup>Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," pp. 165-86. It should be noted that I disagree with Schubert's assessment of Lucan theology: "The extraordinary emphasis on the Holy Spirit throughout Luke-Acts is but a part of his eschatological theology of history" (p. 178).

the prophecy and fulfillment pattern is an insufficient basis for assessing the use of the Old Testament; in only one instance, the use of Ps. 2:7 in Acts 13:33, does Rese think a quotation appears in this pattern.<sup>7</sup> It is true that Luke does not indicate here exactly which scriptures say what he says they say; where, for example, does one go to find the prophecy that the Christ must suffer and on the third day rise again? Such a scripture, or combination of scriptures, may be produced by means of hermeneutical contortion; or, and this is Luke's point, they may be readily understood once one's mind is opened to understand scripture (Luke 24:45). No doubt Luke has access to testimonia,<sup>8</sup> stock proofs from scripture, and the quotations in Acts indicate many of these. Quite often, however, as scriptural proofs, these are singularly unsatisfying; possibly even Luke felt that way about the quotation of Pss. 69:25 and 109:8 as prophecies concerning Judas (Acts 1:20). For Luke, the particular scriptures are

---

<sup>7</sup>Martin Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas; for a summary of Rese's argument, I am indebted to J. Rohde, Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists, pp. 217-19.

<sup>8</sup>On this in Acts see Rendel Harris and Vacher Burch, Testimonies (2 vols.; Cambridge, England: University Press, 1916-1920), II, pp. 77-83.

less important than the whole of scripture, the deeper meaning of which is revealed to the witness.

As part of Luke's witness scheme, perhaps it is best to say that the emphasis on fulfillment of scripture means for him two things: (a) the new witness, the witness of Jesus, necessarily sees himself in continuity with the old (Old Testament) witness. Both witness traditions in Acts maintain this. (b) But it also strengthens what we have said and will say about his theology as teleological in emphasis. The unanimous opinion of the church was that God's activity prior to Jesus is recorded in the Jewish scriptures--but that these scriptures are not complete because God's purpose is not yet completed. In Jesus, however, the scriptures find their completion. Jesus saw in himself the fulfillment of scripture. God's activity in history, therefore, has begun its process of completion, and this is being accomplished in (the name of) Jesus, concerning whom the witness testifies.

2. The fulfilling event is that of the suffering and rising Christ. That Jesus is the Christ is the culmination of Luke's "proof-from-prophecy theology."<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Schubert's terminology, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," p. 173.

This is maintained throughout Acts and is strongly reiterated in the final verse, 28:31 (τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). That Jesus is the Christ is more than merely a matter of proclamation, however, for that which fulfills the scripture is that the Christ suffers and on the third day rises from the dead (Luke 24:46). It is difficult to discuss this point without going on to discuss with it the third.

3. Repentance and forgiveness of sins must be preached in the Christ's name (Jesus) to all nations. This is part of the fulfillment of scripture and is in the order of presentation (Luke 24:46-47) inseparable from the suffering and resurrection of the Christ. The pattern is also explicit in the "Pauline" witness theology of Acts 26. There, Paul testifies to small and great, to the people and to the nations, "saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses said would come to pass: that the Christ must suffer" (vss. 22-23), which must mean that he also dies. Only in this way is he able to rise in order to proclaim, through his witnesses, "light to the people and to the Gentiles" (v. 23). The intended result is reconciliation (vss. 18, 19).

It is odd, in the light of this, that scholars

can insist so dogmatically that the death of Jesus has for Luke no atoning significance.<sup>10</sup> What is missing in Luke-Acts, of course, is a precise credal formulation such as those found in Rom. 4:25, 5:8, and 2 Cor. 5:14. But this is hardly a requirement for the narrative approach utilized by Luke.<sup>11</sup>

The witness preaches repentance and forgiveness of sins in a name. This name is Jesus, who in his person reveals the will of God. According to Asting, this is the significance of the use of διαπαρ-τύρομαι, i. e., the "Offenbarung von Gottes Willen."<sup>12</sup> The will of God is precisely that of which Jesus spoke, τὰ περὶ ἑμοῦ,<sup>13</sup> repentance and forgiveness of sins

---

<sup>10</sup>So Rese; see Rohde, Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists, p. 219.

<sup>11</sup>Cf. the discussion of Acts in Vincent Taylor, The Atonement in the New Testament Teaching (London: Epworth Press, 1958), pp. 17-21.

<sup>12</sup>Asting, Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum, pp. 603-608.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 605: "Wenn der Inhalt des Zeugnisses als 'τὰ περὶ ἑμοῦ' bezeichnet wird, so haben wir hier dasselbe Verhältnis zwischen dem Vorzeitigen und dem Aktuellen, wie wir es früher erwähnt haben: das Zeugnis handelt von Christus, aber es stellt ihn nicht als eine historische Person der Vergangenheit dar, sondern als eine Persönlichkeit, einen Willen, der sich in dem Augenblick der Verkündigung geltend macht, und der für das Schicksal des Menschen bestimmend wird."

7

- 178 -

made possible through the suffering and resurrection  
of the Christ of God, Jesus. This is that toward  
which all scripture points.

## CHAPTER VII

### DEUTERO-ISAIAH AND THE LUCAN WITNESS

At this point it becomes necessary to inquire into the theological background for the Lucan development of the witness theme. This should not be seen as an excursus, but as a further step in the investigation of Luke's theological method.

Such an inquiry pays attention first of all to the witness motif as it is developed in Luke-Acts, more especially in Acts. This has been done in a rigorous manner. Of the material before us, then, it must be asked what there is that suggests a background for what has been seen to be a "witness theology."

Three considerations provide a clue. (1) One needs to go no further than Luke 24 to discover that the witness theology is inseparable from the idea of fulfillment of scripture. In 24:27 Jesus interprets "in all the scriptures the things concerning himself," and this is repeated in 24:44: "everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the

psalms must be fulfilled." "Thus it is written" (24:40) underlines this as the first of the three points of the μαρτύριον. Peter (Acts 10:43) and Paul (Acts 26:22), the two major witness figures in Acts, both see their witness missions as continuous with that of the prophets. (2) The second consideration links closely with the first. This is Luke's love for the Greek Old Testament. This shows itself throughout Luke-Acts in the form of quotations, allusions and influence on style.<sup>1</sup> (3) We have already seen, furthermore, how Paul's speech in Acts 26 seems to echo the idea of the servant's mission, especially in Isa. 42. This is not far removed from Deutero-Isaiah's own "witness theology" in chapter 43. This will be discussed in a moment.

Two writers have sought to do justice to the Old Testament background for the Lucan witness development. The first of these is Robert Morgenthaler, who in his two-volume work, Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis,<sup>2</sup> considers first the form

---

<sup>1</sup>William Kemp Lowther Clarke, "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," BC, II, pp. 66-105.

<sup>2</sup>Robert Morgenthaler, Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 14, 15 (2 Bds.; Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949).



(Gestalt) and then the content (Gehalt) of the Lucan writings. Although Morgenthaler holds a high view of Luke as a historian, this does not prevent him from investigating Luke-Acts from the standpoint of Lucan art. He believes that Luke has developed his work artistically on the principle of two-foldedness (Zweigliedrigkeit). Luke works from the principle laid down in Deut. 19:15 (cf. Matt. 18:16ff.; 2 Cor. 13:1; 1 Tim. 5:19; Heb. 10:28; 1 John 5:6ff.), that at the mouth of two or three witnesses is testimony received.<sup>3</sup> This clue is derived from Luke's emphasis on witness and related to his method of doubling and sometimes tripling words, accounts, etc. When the principle is applied to the plan of Luke-Acts, that plan may be analyzed, broadly, thus:<sup>4</sup>

|                         |               |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| Scenes in Jerusalem I   | Luke 1:5-4:13 |
| Travel Narrative I      | 4:14-19:44    |
| Scenes in Jerusalem II  | 19:45-24:53   |
| Scenes in Jerusalem III | Acts 1:4-7:60 |
| Travel Narrative II     | 8:1-21:17     |
| Scenes in Jerusalem IV  | 21:18-26:32   |
| Travel Narrative III    | 27:1-28:31    |

---

<sup>3</sup>On the theme of the adoption of Deut. 19:15 into the New Testament, see H. van Vliet, No Single Testimony, Studia theologica Rheno-Traiectina, Vol. IV (Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon, 1958).

<sup>4</sup>For this and for a discussion and criticism of Morgenthaler, see C. K. Barrett, Luke the Historian in Recent Study, A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture, No. 6

Morgenthaler's evaluation (in volume 2) of the Lucan writings is that they are intended, on the same principle, to bear witness.

The thesis advanced below does not attempt to exclude Morgenthaler's conclusions. There remains the possibility that Luke is working from more than one frame of reference, so that Deut. 19:15 has also influenced his work. Luke's witness theme is more than the result of an artistic design, however, and this chapter attempts to do justice to the theological substructure of Acts both in its relation to the development of the witness theme and to its Old Testament background. For this, the idea of "two or three witnesses" does not appear to be adequate.

The other author referred to above is Adrian Hastings, in a book entitled, Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem.<sup>5</sup> As indicated by the title, the general thesis of this book is that the Old Testament office of the prophet emerges in the Acts of the Apostles as that of the witness. This thesis, of course, could possibly follow from Peter's quotation (Acts 2:17-21)

---

(London: Epworth Press, 1961), pp. 36-40.

<sup>5</sup>Adrian Hastings, Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958).

of Joel 2:28-32. In general, Hastings' thesis is correct, except that the Spirit in Acts is more democratic than in the case of the Old Testament prophets,<sup>6</sup> and that Paul is not a witness merely on the basis of his vision of Christ.<sup>7</sup> Hastings, unlike Morgenthaler, attempts no analysis of the structure of Luke's work. It is this task, especially for Acts, that is before us.

The suggestion about to be made is, despite Strathmann's assertion that there is no direct connection between Deutero-Isaiah's figure of the witness and the witness concept of the early church,<sup>8</sup> that Luke has in fact made use of a particular passage from Deutero-Isaiah (43:10-13) both to develop his witness theology and to provide a framework for the book of Acts. This we can call the "theological substructure" of Acts.

---

<sup>6</sup>See Ibid., p. 142, n. 2, where three types of witnesses are said to be "Lucan": One who gives evidence as to the facts of Christ's Resurrection (Peter, the earliest view); one who preaches Christ to the world (Paul); one who suffers and dies (Stephen).

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., pp. 141-42.

<sup>8</sup>Strathmann, "Μάρτυς," p. 485. Cf., for example, Ernst Lohmeyer, "Die Idee des Martyriums im Judentum und Urchristentum," Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie, V (1927/1928), pp. 233-36, who finds a "martyr theology" in Isa. 43:9f.

In commenting on Acts 1:8, Haenchen points to Isa. 43:10 as an instance of the use of *μάρτυς* in the Old Testament (LXX).<sup>9</sup> Bruce sees a more positive relationship between Isa. 43:10 (cf. 44:8) and Acts 1:8:

An OT prophet had called Israel to be God's witnesses in the world (Isa. 43:10; 44:8); the task which Israel as a nation had not fulfilled was taken up by Jesus, as the perfect Servant of the Lord, and passed on by Him to his disciples. The close relation between God's call to Israel in these Isaianic passages, "Ye are my witnesses," and Christ's words to his apostles, "ye shall be my witnesses," will be appreciated the more if we consider the implications of Paul's quotation of Isa. 49:6 in Acts 13:47.<sup>10</sup>

As indicated above, the possibility of a closer relation even than that which Bruce indicates may be claimed. Deutero-Isaiah 43:10-13 provides the theological framework for the book of Acts. This includes both the general physical structure and the development of what we have seen to be the witness theology of Luke-Acts. Here translation is given from the Greek text,<sup>11</sup> that being the one with which Luke

---

<sup>9</sup>Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, p. 148, n. 8.

<sup>10</sup>Bruce, Book of Acts, p. 39.

<sup>11</sup>I am using Rahlfs' text. Attention is also paid to the critical edition and notes of R. R. Ottley, The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (2 vols.; vol. 1, 2d ed.; Cambridge, England: University Press, 1906-1909).

was familiar.

10. "You be witnesses for me, and I am witness,"  
says the Lord God,  
"and the servant, whom I have chosen,  
that you may know and believe  
and understand that I am;  
previous to me there was no other god,  
and after me will be none.
11. I am God,  
and besides me there is no savior.
12. I declared and saved,  
I censured when there was no foreign (god)  
among you.  
You are witnesses for me and I am witness,"<sup>12</sup>  
says the Lord God,
13. "even from the beginning,  
and there is no one who plucks out of my hands.  
I will work,  
and who will turn it back?"

This is a trial speech. The trial speech as a prophetic form is a creation of Deutero-Isaiah and has as its background, not the criminal case, but the civil case which turns on a claim and its admission or dismissal.<sup>13</sup> The claim in this situation is that of the absoluteness of the God of Israel. He is God, and there never was nor ever will be another. He alone is savior. The importance of this for Acts is readily seen. In Acts the whole narrative turns on the claim of Jesus to be the Christ, the one designated by God

---

<sup>12</sup>  $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\varsigma$  omitted here in  $\aleph B$ .

<sup>13</sup> See for this Claus Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, trans. by David M. G. Stalker (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), p. 63.

as savior. The claim is advanced through the witnesses, and is most succinctly summarized by Peter in Acts 4:12:

"And there is salvation in none other; for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved."

The preparation for the trial, 43:8-9, is important in its own right, though Luke makes no structural use of it.

8. Now lead out the blind people,  
even those who have eyes, yet are as though blind,  
and those who have ears, yet are deaf.
9. All the nations are assembled together,  
and the rulers from them will be convened.  
Who will declare these things?  
or who will declare the former things?  
Let them produce their witnesses,  
and let them be approved and speak truth.

In these two verses two parties are called out: (1) Israel, the blind people (λαός, v. 8), who in verse 10 are nevertheless appointed witnesses, and (2) the nations (ἔθνη, v. 9). Although the Hebrew text presents a parallelism in verse 9 which stresses only the gathering of the nations,

Let all the nations gather together,  
and let all the peoples assemble,

the Greek version sets forth not only the nations, but, further, the rulers from among them.

Luke's further change in emphasis would be due

to a tradition he inherited concerning Jesus and the time of witness expectation. Whereas in both the Hebrew Bible and the LXX the λαός, blind though they are, eventually are called upon to become witnesses, Luke sees both the ἔθνη and the λαός as parties to whom the witnesses must testify. When we remember that there are then the people, the Gentiles and the Gentile rulers, it can be seen that precisely this situation is reflected in the words expressing Jesus' own expectation of a time to bear witness (Luke 21:12-13, especially verse 12): "they will lay their hands on you . . . delivering you up to synagogues and prisons, and you will be brought before kings and governors for my name's sake." The importance of the trial preparation for Luke is more directly suggested by the words of the Lord to Ananias concerning Saul in Acts 9:15, "he is a chosen vessel of mine to bear my name before the nations and kings and the sons of Israel."

All four Gospel traditions saw Israel as "blind and deaf" (Matt. 13:14-15; Mark 4:12, 8:18; Luke 8:10; John 12:39-40; Luke transfers it emphatically to the end of Acts, 28:26-27; cf. Isa. 6:9-10). In chapter 26 of Acts, Paul's speech about opening the eyes of the Gentiles implies blindness, but not deafness. It

may be that Luke thought of the Gentiles as blind because they could not detect God's benevolent activity in nature (as in 14:17), but not deaf because they had not heard; in Acts 28:28 the implication is that they will listen because they have the ability to hear.

#### The Plan of Acts and the Trial Speech

The trial speech of Isa. 43:10-13, we suggest, provides the theological framework of Acts. The structural development of the two coincide. This does not mean there can be provided, on the basis of the trial speech, a rigid outline for the book of Acts. It should be obvious that Luke was not working from an outline which contained so many points, etc. Thus we choose to speak of a "theological substructure." His was a general structure which enabled him both to treat his historical materials without unduly forcing them and to present an attitude toward his material. This attitude is a theological one, and this too we find in the Deutero-Isaianic trial speech.

At best, then, only an adumbration may be offered with indications of the significance of the speech for the plan of Acts. It must be emphasized that what we are here concerned with is a theological



movement within a broad framework. This is not meant to exclude possible detection of other movements.

Thus we are not offering an outline, simply a broad theological pattern. This pattern may be shown as follows:

1. Witness appointment--43:10a/Acts 1:8
2. Presentation of the claims--43:10b-12a/Acts 2-23
3. Witness confirmation--43:12b/Acts 23:11
4. Reiteration of the claim--43:13a/Acts 23-28
5. Affirmation of the divine and history--43:13b/Acts 28:31

First to be noticed is that twice God makes a witness statement, 43:10a and 12b. He appoints and then he confirms. Corresponding to this is the fact that twice the risen Lord utters a witness logion, Acts 1:8 and 23:11.

The Appointment--

"Be witnesses for me, and I am witness," says the Lord God" (43:10).

"You shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you, and you shall be my witnesses" (Acts 1:8).

The Confirmation--

"You are witnesses for me and I am witness," says the Lord God" (43:12).

"As you have testified about me in Jerusalem so must you also bear witness at Rome" (Acts 23:11).

That 23:11 is spoken to Paul alone is no longer important except to assure the reader that Paul is a witness on an equal basis with the others.

In between the appointment and the confirmation, the claims of God are presented in Deutero-Isaiah. In Acts it is the claim of his Christ, Jesus. The prophet seeks to approach history theologically, i. e., through theological pronouncement. It is to the same effect that, in his account of the new situation created by the Jesus-event, Luke seeks to approach theology historically, i. e., through historical narrative. The result approximates that of the Old Testament historians. The same sense of God's redemptive activity in history prevails. Of the verbs in verse 12, J. Muilenburg says, "The verbs are a history of Israel's religious faith, a summary of what God has done in history, prophecy, and salvation."<sup>14</sup> This is no less true of the Greek (ἀνῆγγεῖλα καὶ ἔσωσα, ὤνειδισα . . .). Deutero-Isaiah presents the divine claims through the Yahweh-word. Luke does it through the Spirit-filled witness. In Isa. 40:12 God says "I declared." The verb is ἀναγγέλλω (used twice to show what the opposing witnesses cannot do, v. 9), and it is used in Acts 20 both to open (v. 20) and to

---

<sup>14</sup>James Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66: Introduction and Exegesis," in Interpreter's Bible, V, p. 490.

close (v. 27) Paul's first witness apology in his farewell to the Ephesians elders.

In the reiteration of the absolute claims of God in the trial speech (v. 13a), heightened emphasis is placed on the sovereignty of God ("I, even from the beginning, and there is no one who plucks out of my hands"). This is, in fact, true also in Acts, particularly in chapter 28, where Paul is testifying to "the kingdom of God" (28:23, 31).

Both the trial speech and Acts close with an affirmation of history and of divine working in history. Yahweh's speech concludes with the challenge: "I will work, and who will turn it back" (ποιήσω, καὶ τίς ἀποστρέψει αὐτό)? Luke closes his theological-historical treatise with the answer: though efforts will be made, as in the case of Elymas, to turn away (διαστρέφω) both God's plan (Acts 13:10) and others from it (13:8), the kingdom of God and the things about Jesus are proclaimed openly and unhindered (ἀκωλύτως).<sup>15</sup>

This, then, is the theological structure for the book of Acts. Luke has utilized Isa. 43:10-13 in the drafting of his history of the beginning of God's

---

<sup>15</sup>See also below, pp. 196-99.

new witness, the time of the μαρτύριον περὶ Ἰησοῦ.

### The Nature of the Μάρτυς

On the basis of the Deutero-Isaianic passage we can decide finally what the nature of Luke's witness really is. This is by way of confirmation of what the exegesis has sought to establish.

(a) He is, first of all, a personal representative, authorized to speak for the divine appointer. The μοι μάρτυρες of Isa. 43:10 carries the same significance as "my witnesses" (μου μάρτυρες, Acts 1:8); an example of a similar usage in Acts is 22:15, where Paul is μάρτυς αὐτῷ (cf. 9:15, σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς μοι).

(b) The witness is someone who is "chosen," but this does not mean that he thereby obtains an official position in the church, although the Matthias election indicates that the early community thought it did. Peter describes himself as "foreordained" (Acts 10:41), but this attitude is corrected in Paul as the "destined" or "appointed" witness (22:14, 26:16). In the trial speech God chooses (ἐκλέγω) by calling his witnesses out. The church, likewise, became conscious of being the community of the "called out" (the ἐκκλησία). This chosenness, however, as Deutero-Isaiah

shows, is in terms of purpose, not position.

(c) A witness is not, therefore, one who testifies purely on the basis of physical observation, i. e., an eyewitness (αὐτόπτης). In Isa. 43:10b God calls his witnesses "in order that you may know and believe and understand that I am." This is precisely what the Evangelist portrays the risen Lord as doing in Luke 24. There Jesus opens his followers' minds so that they may understand the scriptures (v. 45) and the things concerning himself (v. 27). It is of what they "know and believe and understand" that they are able to witness (μάρτυρες τούτων, v. 48). This knowing and believing and understanding is made effective in the new age by the work of the Holy Spirit.

It is also the Spirit which awakens and heightens the believer's sensitivity to God's revelation. This means that on the historical level the witness discerns God's activity as well. "The witness," says J. D. Smart, "is the man whose ear is open to the word of God and whose eyes are open to what God is doing in the outer world because he has heard the word of God, and he makes faith possible for others by witnessing truth-

fully to what he has heard and seen."<sup>16</sup> See especially Acts 22:14-15 and 26:16.<sup>17</sup>

### The 'Εγὼ Μάρτυς

What the second Isaiah left out, his Greek translator supplied, evidently thinking it had to be the case that God would reserve the right to witness for himself. In the witness appointment, therefore, and in the confirmation in A Q, the Greek has the added "and I am witness" (καὶ ἐγὼ μάρτυς).<sup>18</sup> Thus is expressed the conviction that God appoints his historical witnesses but he does not abdicate his sovereign right to act on behalf of himself and, for that matter, on behalf of and parallel with his witnesses. At the Exodus when Moses became the witness for the true cultus, even he did not replace God who alone is the true witness.<sup>19</sup> In the wilderness Israel carried about the

---

<sup>16</sup>James D. Smart, History and Theology in Second Isaiah (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), pp. 100-101.

<sup>17</sup>See above, ch. 4, pp. 125-29, 133-38.

<sup>18</sup>Cf. Ottley, Isaiah According to the Septuagint, II, p. 311: "Probably they came from a wrong idea of the drift: interpreted it may be, in the light of John viii.18."

<sup>19</sup>Ulrich E. Simon, A Theology of Salvation (London: S. P. C. K., 1953), p. 104.

Tent of Witness, which is referred to in Stephen's speech (Acts 7:44).

The addition to the Greek text at Isa. 43:10 and 12, therefore, accounts for what has been described as the "divine witness" in Acts. Even in the new age God retains his witness prerogative. As he witnessed to David, confirming him as witness (Acts 13:22), so he witnesses "to the word of his grace," i. e., confirms the preaching of his historical witnesses (Acts 14:8). In the same way he witnesses to the Gentiles (Acts 15:8). Again, in the new age this is done through the Holy Spirit, that which is the prophetic promise of the Father (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4).

In Acts, furthermore, there is a conscious concern to show that God's witness was never limited to Israel. While Stephen refers to the Tent of Witness (Acts 7:44) as that which shows God's presence and will to Israel, Paul can declare (Acts 14:17) that God has never, not even among the heathen, left himself without a witness (*ἀπαύρωτος*). But now something new is ushered in, for God by his Spirit is calling out new witnesses who speak for him in the name of his son, Jesus; and these witnesses proclaim the fulfillment of the intention of God expressed in the Tent of

Witness and the natural witness. In every case, but in a unique and final way in the message of the witnesses of Jesus, redemption is the purpose of the witness.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>ἄκωλύτως</sup>

The final word of Acts epitomizes the theological attitude of Luke.<sup>21</sup> This becomes clear, as suggested earlier in this chapter, when it is seen as Luke's emphatic answer to the hypothetical question posed by Yahweh himself at the close of the trial speech. "I will work," declares God, "and who will turn it back?" No one, answers Luke, the Gospel will be preached "unhinderedly" (<sup>ἄκωλύτως</sup>, Acts 28:31).

This close connection of the answer to the question, a sort of catechetical relationship, suggests that the significance of <sup>ἄκωλύτως</sup> can therefore be seen only in relation to the philosophy, or more correctly, the theology of history found in Deutero-Isaiah and especially as formulated in 43:10-13. Its significance is further enhanced by its negative relationship to the apocalyptic view which Luke has already

---

<sup>20</sup>See Ibid., pp. 104-105.

<sup>21</sup>Stagg, Book of Acts, pp. 1-4.



rejected in Acts 1:6-8. In a recent article S. B. Frost suggests that the apocalyptic viewpoint "is best described neither as pioneering a philosophy of history nor as acting as interpreter of the view of history which had been expressed by the prophets, but rather as departing from that view as untenable, and turning to an expression of religious reality which, indeed, draws upon historical thinking but also upon prehistorical thinking, and offers a new and distinctive synthesis."<sup>22</sup> Apocalyptic thus "represents within the complex of biblical thought a rejection of history as the medium in which religious truth is to be sought and expressed."<sup>23</sup> In a footnote concerning the prophetic view, Frost adds, "Eschatology is in fact a misnomer as applied to preapocalyptic writers; teleology is the more correct term, seeing that an end was envis-

---

<sup>22</sup>Stanley Brice Frost, "Apocalyptic and History," in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. by James Philip Hyatt (London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1965), p. 99. This is a correction of his earlier view that the apocalyptists "were at least the first men to essay a philosophy of history"; Old Testament Apocalyptic (London: Epworth Press, 1952), p. 8. The opinion that they were interpreters, or middle men, rather than pioneers, is expressed (in reaction to R. H. Charles) by D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), p. 218.

<sup>23</sup>Frost, "Apocalyptic and History," p. 99.

aged in history rather than of history."<sup>24</sup>

The present writer concurs with this judgment. The teleological view of history and redemption as the one espoused by Luke is that for which argument has been advanced already in this study.<sup>25</sup> This means that, partly because of his love for the Old Testament prophets, Luke has been able to see more in the prophetic view of history than the apocalyptists could. When he rejects apocalypticism, he does not presume to offer an "original thesis." Rather, he seeks to revive in a new way the view he discovers in the prophets. In doing so, he naturally feels himself to be in accord not only with the prophets but also with the intention of Jesus. This is the "new thing," the message concerning Jesus. He is infinitely more optimistic than the apocalyptists, and his faith in the Gospel message, and indeed in the creative power of the Spirit of witness, enables him to envisage within history the τέλος, the completion of God's purpose.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 99, n. 4.

<sup>25</sup>See above, ch. 1, pp. 29-32.

<sup>26</sup>It is possible that Acts 1:10-11 presents an obstacle to the interpretation of Lucan theology as ~~basically~~ teleological. In that passage, the awe-struck disciples are awakened to reality by an angel

And if this is so, then no matter what may be in store,  
Jesus will not be without a witness and the Gospel  
μαρτύριον will be proclaimed ἀνωλύτως.

---

who announces that the one whom they have just seen ascend into heaven will in the same way return. This, of course, is the supposed promise of the Parousia. Luke does not comment on it; he does not argue with it; he merely lets it stand as part of the early tradition. Why?

Two things may be said of that account. First, it serves a purpose of narrative arrangement. Just as the initial presence (the real meaning of parousia) of the Christ was made known by angelic announcement (Luke 1:5f.), so must his final presence be made known by angelic announcement. That is to say, both the dawn and the completion, the beginning (ἀρχή) and the end (τέλος) - cf. Rev. 22:13, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος, of God's final redemptive activity in history must be announced by heavenly messengers. The difference, of course, in the announcements is that the one announces the now and the other the then.

But, second, is not this eschatological? I can only reply, not necessarily. It was probably pure apocalyptic before it entered into Luke's narrative. This means, of course, that there remains after all a residue of eschatological expectation; it must be allowed to remain. But although Luke seems to have refused to reject radically other views, his own preference is clear. In other words, like other bits of tradition, it is given finally by Luke a different turn in meaning. This point may be expressed in the form of a counter-question: How does one envisage an end in history? For Luke this certainly would require some form of divine "intervention," and both the beginning and the completion of God's "messianic purpose" are accomplished by the presence (παρουσία) of the Messiah Jesus.

## CONCLUSION

One question remains to be answered. Why, if our argument is correct, does Luke allow so much of his narrative to impress on the reader what must now be considered the "Petrine witness theory"? It is true that an impression is easily gained by the force of the declarations, so that one hesitates to call that view "non-Lucan." It should be pointed out, however, that the actual amount of space given to developing the witness theme in relation to Paul preponderates, even though Paul never makes a direct personal claim to be a witness. This is part of the Lucan method of presentation.

A telling suggestion is made by what takes place in Cornelius' house. It is here in Acts 10 that Peter's position is most forcibly presented; and the temptation is great to see it as "Lucan." But it must be noted that the moment at which Peter's witness theory appears in its most dogmatic form it immediately comes into conflict with the working of the Holy Spirit.

It is a surprised Peter who sees this, and one who, significantly, makes no further declaration of the sort to which the reader of Acts has become accustomed! In 13:31, certainly, Paul refers to the μάρτυρες πρὸς τὸν λαόν, but this, as has been shown, is best seen as a historical accommodation to what apparently continued to be the tradition in Jerusalem.

Thus we may sum up: In the Gospel of Luke there appears the expectation of a time for witness and in Acts 1:8 the witness commission is given as the "keynote" to the book of Acts; the witnesses are designated as "my witnesses," or "witnesses of Jesus." The idea so far is bound to the gift of the Spirit.

In Acts 1:21-22, however, Peter states the requirements for a successor to Judas; the position the nominee is to fill is that of witness (μάρτυς). In the speeches of Peter from 1:21 to 10:48, then, a position is enunciated in which the witness (called "witness of the resurrection") is an eschatological witness to the people of Israel, both in Jerusalem and throughout the world.

This position, which we have called the "Petrine witness theory," is shown to be in conflict with Luke's representation of Jesus' intention. His use of Paul

as witness shows the way in which the witness concept should have been conceived. He seems to have been willing to concede a division of labor. The apostles are witnesses "to the people" while Paul (and therefore the preachers of the larger church) is witness "to all men."

Our study has stopped short of trying to find how we should think of the witness of the early church in terms of religious authority for the present day.<sup>1</sup> It may be said, indeed, that the Lucan concept is finally a church theology of witness. It is not, as Käsemann assumes Luke's theology to be, a Frühkatholizismus which is primarily concerned to counteract a gnostic threat by insisting on official eyewitnesses and their legitimate successors. Quite to the contrary, Luke's vision of a world-wide mission in the name of Jesus, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, needs no such requirement. The position of the early Jewish Christian community might have been accepted had Luke been (or possibly remained) convinced that eschatology was the major thrust of the witness message. He was

---

<sup>1</sup>For such an attempt, see Wilhelm Andersen, "Die Autorität der apostolischen Zeugnisse!" Evangelische Theologie, XII (1952-1953), pp. 467-81.

not, however, for his experience with the activity of the Spirit in history and his dependence on the Old Testament and more especially the Book of Isaiah taught him to think teleologically.

In developing his witness theme around Isa. 43:10-13, Luke is in essence declaring that he is not developing a new theology, but "saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses said would come to pass" (Acts 26:22). It is only fair to conclude that for Luke originality is unimportant; what is important for him is faithfulness, if not to the actual words of the Lord, at least to what he conceives to have been his intention.

**APPENDIX**



## APPENDIX

### THE WITNESS IN QUMRAN AND THE ACTS

There are some apparent points of contact between the early chapters of Acts and the literature of the Qumran community.<sup>1</sup> Here we are interested only in a possible concept of witness comparable to what we have found in Acts.

As we have seen, Acts 1:21-22 sets forth the requirements for the official witnesses of the church (the Petrine view). There are twelve of these and they are called "witnesses of his resurrection." It is a coincidence that the passage in the Manual of Discipline which provides for the organization of the community also calls the leaders Witnesses. In 1 QS 8.1 the Council of the Community is made up of "twelve

---

<sup>1</sup>See especially Sherman E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXVI (1954), pp. 106-20; Oscar Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), pp. 213-26.

men and three priests," who in 8.6 are called Witnesses. This coincidence, however, should not be superficially viewed as a "basis" for the organization of the early church. The comparison below will show why.

1. As to the "twelve men and three priests" in 1 QS 8.1, we can do no better than quote A. R. C. Leaney:

Remarkable nonsense has been talked about these men; they cannot be directly parallel with the apostles, who might be regarded as twelve men within whom three were specially prominent, that is nine men and three leaders (Gal. 2.9), all of whom were certainly laymen. The last point is sufficient to establish an important difference, even if we interpret the present passage as meaning 'twelve men including three priests.'<sup>2</sup>

2. In 1 QS 8.6 the council members are described as "Witnesses to the truth at the Judgment." No such designation as "witness to the truth" is found in either witness theory represented in Acts; much less do the witnesses in Acts (in either theory) assume the responsibility of witnessing at the Judgment. That a (day of) judgment is expected is clear enough; the note appears both in the preaching of Peter (10:42) and that of Paul (17:31; 24:25). In neither case

---

<sup>2</sup>A. R. C. Leaney, The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning, The New Testament Library (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), p. 212.

does the witness (who is a proclaimer) hint that he will be a part of the Judgment.<sup>3</sup>

The Witness of truth will further have the responsibility of meting out the punishment for the wicked. This is foreign to Acts where all men are judged by one man so appointed by God--Jesus Christ.

3. These witnesses at Qumran are "the elect of Goodwill who shall atone for the Land." Peter in Acts 10:41 describes the Twelve as "chosen by God" (assumed in 1:21ff.) to be witnesses and the witness mission is clearly to Israel. "The Land" is also a reference to Israel. Thus the two theories appear to move closer together. Unlike the Petrine theory, however, the Qumran view assigns to the Witness the task of atoning for the ground itself, which has become polluted.<sup>4</sup>

4. The Qumran theory may be in part based on Isa. 27:16 (the witnesses are "the precious cornerstone"; 1 QS 8.7). This is related to the duty of the

---

<sup>3</sup>Only in 1 Cor. 6:2 is there in the New Testament a suggestion that the righteous will play a part in a judgment. In Acts it is not clear what form such a judgment will take.

<sup>4</sup>Leaney, The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning, p. 217 and references there to other literature of the sect.

members to separate themselves. The Lucan theory and theology are more directly the outgrowth of his reading of the Isaianic prophecies, but he knows of no such separation as existed at Qumran. Peter's exclusiveness is portrayed as part of his conscious Jewishness rather than any sense of special duty to separate himself.

We conclude, therefore, that only slight contact exists between Qumran and the Petrine witness theory and none between it and Luke's "corrected" version. The similarities between the Qumran idea and that of the early Jewish Christian community are limited to the official nature of the witness, its eschatological emphasis and its nationalistic orientation.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Commentaries on Luke and Acts

- Baird, William. "The Acts of the Apostles." The Interpreter's One-volume Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Charles M. Laymon. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971.
- Bauernfeind, Otto. Die Apostelgeschichte. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, V. Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939.
- Blaiklock, E. M. The Acts of the Apostles. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. London: Tyndale Press, 1959.
- Browning, W. R. F. The Gospel According to Saint Luke. Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Commentary on the Book of the Acts. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954.
- Caird, G. B. The Gospel of St. Luke. The Pelican Gospel Commentaries. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.
- Calvin, John. The Acts of the Apostles, 1-13. Translated by John W. Fraser and W. J. G. McDonald. Calvin's New Testament Commentaries, Vol. VI. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965.

- Cantinat, Jean. Les Actes des Apôtres. Paroles de vie. Tours: Mame, 1966.
- Clark, Albert C. The Acts of the Apostles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.
- Conzelmann, Hans. Die Apostelgeschichte. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, VII. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1963.
- Creed, John Martin. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Macmillan and Co., 1930.
- Dillon, Richard J., and Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Acts of the Apostles." The Jerome Biblical Commentary. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Easton, Burton Scott. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1926.
- Ellis, E. Earle. The Gospel of Luke. The Century Bible, New Edition. London: Nelson, 1966.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J. The Acts of the Apostles. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. New York: Harper and Bros., n. d.
- Gilmour, S. MacLean. "The Gospel According to St. Luke: Introduction and Exegesis." The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. VIII. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952.
- Haenchen, Ernst. The Acts of the Apostles. Translated from the 14th German edition by Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn, and rev. by R. McL. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.
- Hanson, R. P. C. The Acts. The New Clarendon Bible: New Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Jacquier, E. Les Actes des Apôtres. Études bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1926.
- Knowling, R. J. "The Acts of the Apostles." The

Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Vol. II. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967.

Lampe, G. W. H. "Acts." Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Nelson, 1962.

Leaney, A. R. C. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958.

Loisy, Alfred. Les Actes des Apôtres. Paris: Émile Nourry, 1920.

Lumby, J. Rawson. The Acts of the Apostles. Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1937.

Macgregor, G. H. C. "The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction and Exegesis." The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. IX. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.

Munck, Johannes. The Acts of the Apostles. Revised by William F. Albright and C. S. Mann. The Anchor Bible, 31. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1967.

Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke. The International Critical Commentary. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922.

Rackham, Richard Belward. The Acts of the Apostles. Limited Editions Library. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964.

Rengstorff, Karl Heinrich. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Teilbd. III. 9., durchgesehene und ergänzte Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Schlatter, Adolf. Die Apostelgeschichte. Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament, Bd. IV. Neu durchgesehen. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1962.



Stagg, Frank. The Book of Acts. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1955.

Stählin, Gustav. Die Apostelgeschichte. Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Teilbd. V. 12. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

Tinsley, E. J. The Gospel According to Luke. The Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1965.

Wikenhauser, Alfred. Die Apostelgeschichte. Regensburger Neues Testament, Bd. V. 4. Aufl. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1961.

Williams, C. S. C. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Black's New Testament Commentaries. 2d ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1964.

Winn, Albert C. The Acts of the Apostles. The Layman's Bible Commentary, Vol. XX. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1960.

#### Other Books

Asting, Ragnar. Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1939.

Barrett, C. K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1947.

\_\_\_\_\_. Luke the Historian in Recent Study. A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture, No. 6. London: Epworth Press, 1961.

Barth, Markus. Der Augenzeuge. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1946.

Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A translation and adaptation by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. 4th rev. and augm. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago

Press, 1957.

Beare, Francis Wright. The Earliest Records of Jesus.  
Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. Jesus and the Future. London:  
Macmillan & Co., 1954.

Benoit, Pierre. The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus  
Christ. Translated by Benet Weatherhead.  
New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.

Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels  
and Acts. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press,  
1967.

Blass, F., and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the  
New Testament. A translation and rev. by  
Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of  
Chicago Press, 1961.

Boice, James Montgomery. Witness and Revelation in  
the Gospel of John. The Christian Student's  
Library. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

Brown, Raymond E. The Gospel According to John,  
XIII-XXI. The Anchor Bible, 29A. Garden City:  
N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1970.

Brox, Norbert. Zeuge und Märtyrer. Studien zum Alten  
und Neuen Testament, Bd. V. München:  
Kösel-Verlag, 1961.

Bultmann, Rudolf. The Gospel of John. Translated by  
G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare and J. K.  
Riches. Philadelphia: Westminster Press,  
1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. The History of the Synoptic Tradition.  
Translated by John Marsh. 2d ed. Oxford:  
Basil Blackwell, 1968.

Burchard, Christoph. Der dreizehnte Zeuge.  
Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des  
Alten und Neuen Testaments, 103. Göttingen:  
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

- Burnier, Edouard. La Notion de témoignage dans le Nouveau Testament. Lausanne: F. Roth & Cie., 1939.
- Cadbury, Henry J. The Book of Acts in History. New York: Harper & Bros., 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Making of Luke-Acts. London: S. P. C. K., 1961.
- Campenhause, Hans Freiherr von. Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.
- Cerfaux, Lucien. Recueil Lucien Cerfaux. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Louvaniensium, Vol. VI-VII. 2 tomes. Gembloux: Éditions J. Duculot, 1954.
- Clark, Neville. Interpreting the Resurrection. London: SCM Press, 1967.
- Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. The Library of History and Doctrine. 2d rev. and expanded ed. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. Edited by Heinrich Greeven. Translated by Mary Ling. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Dodd, C. H. The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. More New Testament Studies. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968.
- Dupont, Jacques. Le discours de Milet. Lectio divina, 32. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1962.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Études sur les Actes des Apôtres. Lectio divina, 45. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1967.
- Easton, Burton Scott. Early Christianity. Edited by Frederick C. Grant. Greenwich Conn.: Seabury Press, 1954.
- Ehrhardt, Arnold. The Acts of the Apostles. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 3. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1966.
- Filson, Floyd V. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. Black's New Testament Commentaries. 2d ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Three Crucial Decades. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1963.
- Flender, Helmut. St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History. Translated by Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Foakes Jackson, F. J., and Lake, Kirsopp, eds. The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., 1920-1933.
- Frost, Stanley Brice. "Apocalyptic and History." The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Edited by James Philip Hyatt. London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Old Testament Apocalyptic. The Fernly-Hartley Lecture, 1952. London: Epworth Press, 1952.
- Fuller, Daniel P. Easter Faith and History. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965.
- Gärtner, Bertil. The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation. Translated by Carolyn Hannay King. Acta seminarii neotestamentici Upsaliensis,

XXI. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1955.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. The Twelve. New York: Collier Books, 1962.

Green, Michael. The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. London: Tyndale Press, 1968.

Harnack, Adolf. The Acts of the Apostles. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. New Testament Studies, III. London: Williams & Norgate, 1909.

Hastings, Adrian. Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958.

Higgins, A. J. B. "The Preface to Luke and the Kerygma in Acts." Apostolic History and the Gospel. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

Holl, Karl. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte. Bd. II: Der Osten. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.

Hoskyns, Edwyn Clement. The Fourth Gospel. Edited by Francis Noel Davey. 2d ed., rev. London: Faber and Faber, 1947.

Hull, J. H. E. The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles. London: Lutterworth Press, 1967.

Jeremias, Joachim. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. Translated by S. H. Hooke. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 24. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1958.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Parables of Jesus. Translated by S. H. Hooke. Revised ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.

Johnston, George. The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1943.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John.

Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 12. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1970.

Käsemann, Ernst. Essays on New Testament Themes. Translated by W. J. Montague. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 41. London: SCM Press, 1964.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel. The Babylonian Captivity and Deutero-Isaiah. Translated by C. W. Efraymson. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1970.

Keck, Leander E. Mandate to Witness. Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson Press, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_, and Martyn, J. Louis, eds. Studies in Luke-Acts. London: S. P. C. K., 1968.

Klein, Günter. Die zwölf Apostel. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 77. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.

Knox, Wilfred L. The Acts of the Apostles. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1948.

Kuhn, Karl Georg, ed. Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. Promise and Fulfilment. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 23. 2d English ed. London: SCM Press, 1961.

Lampe, G. W. H. "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke." Studies in the Gospels. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Seal of the Spirit. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1951.

Leaney, A. R. C. The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning. The New Testament Library. Philadelphia:

Westminster Press, 1966.

Lohfink, Gerhard. Paulus vor Damaskus. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 4. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966.

Marshall, I. Howard. Luke: Historian and Theologian. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970.

Moody, Dale. Spirit of the Living God. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.

Morgenthaler, Robert. Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 14, 15. 2 Bds. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1949.

Muilenburg, James. "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66: Introduction and Exegesis." The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Vol. V. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

O'Neill, J. C. The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting. 2d ed., rev. and suppl. London: S. P. C. K., 1970.

Ottley, R. R., tr. and ed. The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint. 2 vols.; vol. 1, 2d ed.; Cambridge, England: University Press, 1906-1909.

Reicke, Bo. The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude. The Anchor Bible, 37. 2d ed. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 32. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1957.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Gospel of Luke. Translated by Ross Mackenzie. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1964.

Rengstorff, Karl Heinrich. Die Auferstehung Jesu. 4. neu bearbeitete Aufl. Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1960.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Election of Matthias, Acts 1.15ff."  
Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation.  
Edited by William Klassen and Graydon F.  
Snyder. New York: Harper & Bros., 1962.

Richardson, Peter. Israel in the Apostolic Church.  
Society for New Testament Studies Monograph  
Series, 10. Cambridge, England: University  
Press, 1969.

Rohde, Joachim. Rediscovering the Teaching of the  
Evangelists. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton.  
The New Testament Library. London: SCM  
Press, 1968.

Russell, D. S. The Method & Message of Jewish  
Apocalyptic. The Old Testament Library.  
Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Schmithals, Walter. The Office of Apostle in the  
Early Church. Translated by John E. Steely.  
Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. Paul and James. Translated by Dorothea M.  
Barton. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 46.  
Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1965.

Schubert, Paul. "The Structure and Significance of  
Luke 24." Neutestamentliche Studien für  
Rudolf Bultmann. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für  
die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 21. 2.  
berichtigte Aufl. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann,  
1957.

Sidebottom, E. M. James, Jude and 2 Peter. The  
Century Bible, New Edition. London: Nelson,  
1967.

Simon, Ulrich E. A Theology of Salvation. London:  
S. P. C. K., 1953.

Smart, James D. History and Theology in Second Isaiah.  
Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.

Spicq, C. Saint Paul; les Épitres pastorales. Études  
bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1947.



- Spivey, Robert A., and Smith, D. Moody, Jr. Anatomy of the New Testament. New York: Macmillan Co., 1969.
- Stonehouse, N. B. The Witness of Luke to Christ. London: Tyndale Press, 1951.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Billerbeck, Paul. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Bd. II: Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte. 5., unveränderte Aufl. München: C. H. Beck, 1969.
- Strathmann, H. "Λόγος" and "Μάρτυς." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translator and editor: Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. IV. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. The Primitive Church. The Hewett Lectures, 1928. London: Macmillan and Co., 1929.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. London: Macmillan and Co., 1909.
- Talbert, Charles H. Luke and the Gnostics. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Atonement in New Testament Teaching. 3d ed. London: Epworth Press, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Gospel According to St. Mark. 2d ed. London: Macmillan, 1966.
- Torrey, Charles Cutler. The Composition and Date of Acts. Harvard Theological Studies, I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916.
- Trocmé, Étienne. Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire. Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, No. 45. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957.
- Vermes, Geza. The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: Heritage Press, 1967.

Vliet, H. Van. No Single Testimony. Studia theologica  
Reno-Traiectina, Vol. IV. Utrecht: Kemink  
& Zoon, 1958.

Westermann, Claus. Isaiah 40-66. Translated by David  
M. G. Stalker. The Old Testament Library.  
Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.

Wilckens, Ulrich. Die Missionsreden der Apostel-  
geschichte. Wissenschaftliche Monographien  
zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 5. Bd. 2.,  
durchgesehene Aufl. Neukirchen: Neukirchener  
Verlag, 1963.

Wilson, James Maurice. The Origin and Aim of the Acts  
of the Apostles. London: Macmillan and Co.,  
1912.

Zehnle, Richard F. Peter's Pentecost Discourse.  
Society of Biblical Literature Monograph  
Series, 15. Nashville: Abingdon Press for the  
Society of Biblical Literature, 1971.

#### Periodical Articles

Andersen, Wilhelm. "Die Autorität der apostolischen  
Zeugnisse!" Evangelische Theologie, XII (1952-  
1953), pp. 467-81.

Bleiben, T. E. "The Gospel of Luke and the Gospel of  
Paul." Journal of Theological Studies, XLV  
(1944), pp. 134-40.

Cullmann, Oscar. "The Significance of the Qumran  
Texts for Research into the Beginnings of  
Christianity." Journal of Biblical Literature,  
LXXIV (1955), pp. 213-26.

Dahl, N. A. "'A People for His Name' (Acts XV.14)."  
New Testament Studies, IV (1957-1958), pp. 319-  
27.

Ehrhardt, Arnold. "The Construction and Purpose of  
the Acts of the Apostles." Studia Theologica,  
XII (1958), pp. 45-79.

- Glasson, T. F. "The Kerygma: is our Version Correct?" The Hibbert Journal, LI (October, 1952-July, 1953), pp. 129-32.
- Günther, Ernst. "Zeuge und Märtyrer." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVII (1956), pp. 145-61.
- Haenchen, Ernst. "Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LIV (1963), pp. 155-87.
- Johnson, Sherman E. "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts." Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXVI (1954), pp. 106-20.
- Koch, Robert. "Témoignage d'après les Actes." Masses ouvrières, CXXIX (1957), pp. 16-36.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. "Die Idee des Martyriums im Judentum und Urchristentum." Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie, V (1927/1928), pp. 232-49.
- Menoud, Philippe H. "Le Plan des Actes des Apôtres." New Testament Studies, I (1954-1955), pp. 44-51.
- Nineham, D. E. "Eye-witness Testimony and the Gospel Tradition." Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., IX (1958), pp. 13-25, 243-52.
- Reicke, Bo. "The Risen Lord and His Church." Interpretation, XIII (1959), pp. 157-69.
- Rétif, André. "Témoignage et prédication missionnaire dans les Actes des Apôtres." Nouvelle Revue Théologique, LXXIII (1951), pp. 152-65.
- Robinson, John A. T. "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" The Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., VII (1956), pp. 177-89.
- Schoeps, H. J. "Ebionite Christianity." The Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., IV (1953), pp. 219-24.

C- Tardif, Henri. "De la notion de témoignage dans  
l'écriture." Masses ouvrières, CXXIV (1956),  
pp. 39-51.