Durham University

Durham E-Theses

Philip the evangelist in Lucan perspective.

Franklin Scott Spencer

How to cite:

Spencer, Franklin Scott (1989) Philip the evangelist in Lucan perspective. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1544/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

PHILIP THE EVANGELIST IN LUCAN PERSPECTIVE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

FRANKLIN SCOTT SPENCER

DURHAM, ENGLAND

APRIL 1989

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

- 9 MAR 1990

PHILIP THE EVANGELIST IN LUCAN PERSPECTIVE
PH.D. THESIS BY
FRANKLIN SCOTT SPENCER
APRIL, 1989

ABSTRACT

The thesis examines the role of Philip the evangelist within the narrative context of the two-volume New Testament work commonly referred to as Luke-Acts. Following the introduction, the main chapters (2-6) focus upon the Lucan presentation of Philip's relations, on the one hand, with key individuals or groups he evangelizes and, on the other hand, with important fellow-missionaries in the early church.

Chapter 2 explores the missionary breakthrough of Philip the evangelist to the Samaritans, as reported in Acts 8.5-13. Chapter 3 concentrates more narrowly upon Philip's encounter with a single, notorious Samaritan, Simon the magician. Chapter 4 probes the significance of Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch, a prominent "God-fearing" Gentile, featured in Acts 8.25-40.

Chapters 5 and 6 assess Philip's stature as a minister of the gospel in the early church in relation to Luke's two dominant heroes, Peter and Paul. Philip and Peter are compared in the contexts of their respective vocations within the primitive Jerusalem community (Acts 6.1-7) and missions to the Samaritans (Acts 8.5-25) and "God-fearing" Gentile officials (Acts 8.26-40; 10.1-11.18). Philip and Paul are correlated in the setting of their brief meeting in Philip's Caesarean home, reported in Acts 21.8-14.

The thesis concludes that Philip the evangelist functions in Luke-Acts as (1) a pioneering missionary whose missions to the Samaritans and the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8 mark trailblazing, not merely transitional, stages in the extension of the gospel to the ends of the earth; (2) a dynamic prophet molded in the image of Jesus and the classic biblical prophets, Moses, Elijah and Elisha; and (3) an agent of unity within the early church, illustrated in his cooperative partnership with other ministers (notably, Peter and Paul) and his flexible participation in a variety of ministries (proclamation, miracle-working, table-service and hospitality).

To

JANET

who understands

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements vi

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

§1 Why Study the Lucan Philip? 1
§2 Structural Overview 5
§3 Note on Method 7

CHAPTER 2: PHILIP AND THE SAMARITANS 14

§1 Introduction: A Literary Overview of Acts 8.4-25 14
§2 Philip's Ministry in Samaria 21
§3 Philip, Samaria/Samaritans and Luke-Acts 49

CHAPTER 3: PHILIP AND SIMON MAGUS 88

§1 Introduction 88
§2 Philip and Simon the "Great Power" 93
§3 Philip, Simon and the "Prophet Like Moses" 109
§4 Philip and Simon the "Apostate" 130
§5 Summary 135

CHAPTER 4: PHILIP AND THE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH 137

§1 Introduction 137
§2 Structure and Style of Acts 8.25-40 141
§3 Literary Analogues to Acts 8.25-40 147
§4 Geographical Elements in Acts 8.25-40 159
§5 The Theme of Supernatural Guidance in Acts 8.25-40 170
§6 The Social Status of the Ethiopian Eunuch 176
§7 Philip's Ministry to the Ethiopian Eunuch 194

CHAPTER 5: PHILIP AND PETER 210

§1 Introduction 210
§2 Philip, Peter and the Pastoral Care of the Jerusalem Community (Acts 6.1-7) 212
§3 Philip, Peter and the Spirit's Outpouring on Samaritan and Gentile Converts (Acts 8-11) 240
Excursus: *The Letter of Peter to Philip* 280

CHAPTER 6: PHILIP AND PAUL 285

§1 Introduction 285
§2 Philip's Role as Paul's Host 291

§3 Philip the "Evangelist" and Paul 306
§4 Conclusion 315

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION 317

§1 Philip the Pioneering Missionary 318
§2 Philip the Dynamic Prophet 321
§3 Philip the Agent of Unity 322
§4 Future Research 324

Notes 327

Bibliography 395

No part of the material contained in this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other university.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wrote the bulk of this thesis as a full-time research student at the University of Durham and a resident tutor at the College of St. Hild and St. Bede, 1984-88. I am grateful during these years for the financial assistance of an Overseas Research Scholarship from the British government (1984-87), a Theology Scholarship from the College of St. Hild and St. Bede (1984-88), and a Tyndale Research Grant from Tyndale House, Cambridge (1987-88). Since July, 1988, I have pastored a new church in Newtown, Pennsylvania, and I appreciate the understanding of the congregation in allowing me the time and freedom to prepare the thesis for final submission.

I am indebted to a number of people for their various contributions to my work, though, of course, I assume full responsibility for the final product. Special thanks goes to my supervisor, Professor James D. G. Dunn, for suggesting my thesis topic and carefully guiding my research and writing from start to finish. Also, his gracious hospitality and that of his wife, Meta, are deeply appreciated.

I am grateful for the assistance of the administrative staffs at the principal libraries where I studied: Durham University (Main, Palace Green and Oriental Sections), Cambridge University, Tyndale House (Cambridge), Newcastle University, College of St. Hild and St. Bede (Durham), St. John's College (Durham), and Princeton Theological Seminary. And I would also like to thank Professor C. K. Barrett for two stimulating discussions in his home and for his many valuable contributions to Lucan scholarship reflected in the bibliography.

Part of the material on the Samaritans in chap. 2 was aired in a paper given to the "Luke-Acts" Seminar of the British New Testament Conference in Durham, 1987.

Finally, words cannot adequately express the debt I owe my wife, Janet, for her continuing support and encouragement, even while she was writing her own Ph.D. thesis. And I must not forget Lauren Michael, our daughter, who was born in England and singlehandedly made the whole overseas experience worthwhile.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This study aims to uncover and describe in detail the distinctive portrayal of Philip the evangelist within the narrative context of the two-volume NT work commonly referred to as Luke-Acts. Our concern is not fundamentally with burrowing behind Luke's text in search of a so-called "historical" Philip; rather we intend to focus on the final form of Luke's presentation in a concerted effort to discover the Lucan *Philippusbild*, that is, the peculiar identity of Philip the evangelist in Lucan perspective.

What is the merit of such an investigation? How do we feasibly structure this analysis? And how do we proceed methodologically to realize most fully our particular research goal? This introductory chapter addresses these important preliminary questions.

§1. WHY STUDY THE LUCAN PHILIP?

Within a discipline which prides itself on exacting and comprehensive scholarship, the most obvious reason to pursue a full-scale examination of Luke's characterization of Philip the evangelist is that this figure has been virtually bypassed as a worthy object of research in his own right. No major contemporary monograph focuses entirely on the person and work of Philip the evangelist. Various articles may be found dealing with the Philip-material in Acts, but for the most part these are concerned with special topics of interest other than the character of Philip *per se*, such as tracing the origins of Simonian gnosticism[1] or sorting out the relationship between water-baptism and Spirit-reception[2]. The study of key personalities

has been a hallmark of recent *Actaforschung*, but the spotlight has fallen principally upon Peter and Paul (predictably) and Stephen,[3] while Philip has been left in the shadows.

Of course, it may be argued that Philip the evangelist has been largely ignored in Lucan scholarship because he is simply not a character of great significance. However, this is a puzzling assessment even from a surface-level point of view. For Philip patently appears as a principal actor within a large block of material in Acts 8, a pivotal chapter in Luke's account of the early church where the setting shifts to territories outside the Jewish capital of Jerusalem. Moreover, Philip clearly emerges as a successful missionary/evangelist within an overall narrative in which missionary achievement is prominently featured and highly valued. Philip also is associated on some level with all three of the Lucan heroes mentioned above who have received the lion's share of scholarly attention (cf. Acts 6.5 [Stephen]; 8.5-25 [Peter]; 21.8 [Paul]), and this keeping of noble company suggests at least the possibility of Philip's comparable importance. Finally, since Philip's ministry, as portrayed in Acts, is directly linked with a number of leading themes employed throughout Luke's two-volume work--such as outreach to Samaria/Samaritans, Christianity's confrontation with magic, the beginnings of the Gentile mission, supernatural guidance and the practice of hospitality--one would suspect Philip's role within the total Lucan story to be more than peripheral.

Taken together, these notable components of Philip's profile in the book of Acts would seem to certify and encourage a fuller investigation of Philip's honored place within Luke's account of early mission history. But

other elements of Philip's characterization may be construed as actually denigrating his status or stigmatizing his competency in some fashion: for example (1) his ostensibly mundane functions of waiting on tables (Acts 6.5) and providing hospitality (21.8) in addition to his more "spiritual" and spectacular pursuits of gospel-preaching and miracle-working and (2) his apparent failures to expose completely the chicanery of Simon Magus and to impart the Spirit to his Samaritan converts (8.5-24).

In my estimation, these potentially negative aspects of the Lucan *Philippusbild* are not as obvious or straightforward as the more positive dimensions, and, accordingly, they demand more extensive analysis before final judgment is passed on Luke's appraisal of Philip's character and ministry. In any event, they should not cause us to cast Philip aside as a lowly figure of little consequence in Luke's presentation. If in fact Philip does emerge within the Acts narrative as the object of some deliberate "smear" tactics, then he is certainly a character of some standing whom Luke treats seriously, even if critically. After all, there is no need to bother with undercutting the reputation of a person who has little or no stature in the first place.

In short, the juxtaposition of clearly commendable and possibly questionable facets of Philip's ministry in the book of Acts suggests that Philip's role in the Lucan narrative is both complex and significant, worthy of probing and clarifying in some detail. <u>It is a basic assumption of this thesis that Philip the evangelist deserves to be brought out of the shadows and given his day in the sun in Lucan scholarship</u>.

While modern research has reflected scant interest in Philip's literary

role within the Lucan narrative, it is interesting to note that various scholars, sensing something of the historical importance of Philip the evangelist within the first century Christian church, have speculated on his vital involvement in the composition of various NT books. Indeed Philip seems to be a favorite nominee for author of or source behind a number of anonymous NT documents whose precise origins remain largely a mystery. Alternately, Philip has been proposed as (1) a man of "both originality and enterprise" responsible for composing the first thirteen chapters of the Gospel of Mark ("the original Mark");[4] (2) a major source for the special material in Luke's Gospel, including the infancy stories, the Sermon on the Plain and the travel-narrative in the central section;[5] (3) a major source (along with his daughters) for presumed Samaritan traditions underlying the Fourth Gospel[6] and (4) the Paulinist author of the letter to the Hebrews, supposedly written from Caesarea to Jewish Christians in Jerusalem.[7]

After enumerating a similar (though longer) list of discrete roles within primitive Christian history which scholars have hypothetically assigned to Stephen the martyr (Philip's "Hellenist" associate), G. Stanton understandably quips: "One is tempted to say in desperation; will the real Stephen please stand up!"[8] He goes on to note that, despite this lively interest in the figure of Stephen, scholars too often have neglected to address the fundamental issue of Stephen's portrayal within the unified narrative of Luke-Acts before moving on to more dubious matters of Stephen's alleged relationship to other NT books and traditions in which his name never appears.[9] Likewise, I would suggest, insufficient attention has been paid to "Philip the Evangelist in Lucan Perspective"[10] before advancing

speculative theories concerning Philip's wider contribution to Christian origins. Ultimately, any sound assessment of Philip's historical role within early Christianity must be duly coordinated with a thorough study of Philip's literary role in the book of Acts, especially since Luke's presentation of Philip remains both the earliest and fullest account of this figure available to us.

§2. STRUCTURAL OVERVIEW

In organizing an investigation of Luke's portrayal of Philip the evangelist, one could feasibly utilize either a sequential or geographical schema. In the first case, one would simply begin with an analysis of the first Philip-reference in Acts 6.5 and then proceed in the order of Luke's narrative presentation through the remainder of the Philip-material, concluding with the final Philip-scene in Acts 21.8-14. This approach has the advantage of tracing step-by-step the reader's developing perceptions of the Philip-character delineated by Luke. In the second instance, primary focus would be placed on the significance of Philip's ministry in key locations, namely, Jerusalem (Acts 6.1-7), Samaria (8.4-25), the coastal plain (8.26-40) and Caesarea (21.8-9). At least since the work of Conzelmann, scholars have been alerted to the importance of geography as a medium of Luke's theology.[11]

The structure which we will follow, however, in examining the Lucan *Philippusbild*, while appreciative of both sequential and geographical factors, concentrates principally upon <u>relational</u> aspects of Philip's presentation. That is, we will focus upon Philip's interactions, on the one hand, with key

individuals or groups he evangelizes (Samaritans, Simon Magus, Ethiopian eunuch) and, on the other hand, with important fellow-ministers in the early church (Peter and Paul). Such an approach capitalizes on Luke's well-known interest in the boundary-breaking outreach of select missionaries to diverse segments of humankind and takes seriously a basic premise of both literary and sociological analysis which regards the individual person (within a story or society) as part of a network of relationships which profoundly shapes and defines his or her identity.[12]

In chapter 2 we will explore the missionary breakthrough of Philip the evangelist to the Samaritans, as reported in Acts 8.5-13. Though we will seek to understand this segment of the Lucan Philip's career from a variety of angles, our ultimate concern will be to pinpoint the significance of Philip's Samaritan outreach as the climax of a series of key scenes within Luke-Acts involving Samaritans (or Samaria).

Chapter 3 will continue to deal with Philip's Samaritan mission but will focus more narrowly upon Philip's encounter with a single, notorious Samaritan, namely, Simon the magician. Here special attention will be paid to Luke's estimation of Philip as a combatant of magical power (like Paul) and a model of true "greatness" (in contrast to Simon).

In chapter 4 we will turn to the episode in the second half of Acts 8 featuring Philip's witness to the Ethiopian eunuch. Again a variety of aspects related to this incident will be investigated against the narrative backdrop of Luke's two-volume work. But particular emphasis will be placed on uncovering Luke's understanding of the peculiar social identity of the Ethiopian eunuch and the precise nature of Philip's achievement in

evangelizing this unusual figure.

Chapters 5 and 6 will aim to determine Philip's stature as a minister of the gospel in the early church in relation to Luke's two dominant heroes, Peter and Paul. In the first case, Philip's association with Peter will be studied in terms of comparing their respective vocations within the primitive Jerusalem community (Acts 6.1-7) and in the context of their ministries to the Samaritans (8.5-25) and "God-fearing" Gentile officials (8.26-40; 10.1-11.18). Lastly, an examination of Philip's interaction with Paul will concentrate chiefly upon the brief meeting between these two figures in Philip's Caesarean home, reported in Acts 21.8-14, but will also bear in mind the implications of Paul's (Saul's) initial role in the Lucan narrative as the cruel persecutor of the church who forces a number of Jerusalem disciples--including Philip--to flee the city in fear of their lives.

§3. A NOTE ON METHOD

Within each chapter of this study various matters pertaining to methodology will be taken up, appropriate to the particular material under investigation at the time. Therefore, in this section we need only to discuss briefly the general methodological perspectives which will guide our research and to relate broadly our approach to major trends within the recent history of Lucan scholarship.

Post-war study of Luke-Acts was dominated for a number of years by a *redaktionsgeschichtlich* approach pioneered by such notable German scholars as Hans Conzelmann and Ernst Haenchen.[13] Particular attention was paid to Luke as a creative editor (redactor) who had shaped the various sources and

traditions at his disposal into an overall presentation supporting his peculiar theological bias (*Tendenz*). Accordingly, it was thought that Luke's theology could best be discovered by noting and examining the alterations which Luke made with respect to his received material. In particular, since it was assumed that Luke was directly dependent upon Mark in composing his Gospel, deviations of the Lucan text from Mark in parallel passages were regarded as especially revealing of Luke's theological interests. Concerning the book of Acts, certain so-called "breaks" and "seams" in the text were pinpointed as supposed indicators of editorial activity and deliberate modification of underlying traditions. Among the conclusions emerging from such analyses was the view that Luke was preoccupied with "early catholic" concerns of ecclesiastical institutionalization, appropriate to an age when the *parousia* was no longer imminently expected.

More recent German Lucan scholarship, while not always accepting of a thoroughgoing "early catholic" assessment of Luke's theology, is still heavily dependent upon Conzelmann and Haenchen in its basic methodology. Standard tradition-historical and redaction-critical questions still set the prevailing agenda for research. Even in *Actaforschung*, where source analysis is (admittedly) extremely problematic, attempts to uncover Luke's purpose by separating tradition from redaction continue to characterize most commentaries and special studies.[14] Likewise, segments of contemporary British, French and American scholarship reflect an ongoing commitment to historically-oriented, redaction-critical investigation of Luke-Acts, though again we would emphasize that specific interpretive conclusions now often run counter to the earlier opinions of Conzelmann and Haenchen.[15]

During the last fifteen years or so, however, numerous voices have been raised, especially on the American scene, calling for a new methodological approach to the study of Luke-Acts.[16] While most of these scholars acknowledge the continuing value of redaction criticism as a legitimate tool of NT research, they have also become increasingly aware of the limitations of redaction criticism as it has typically been practiced in Lucan scholarship. In particular, four limitations are worthy of mention.[17]

(1) Exclusive focus on Luke's alleged redaction of Mark ignores the reasonable possibility that, at certain times when Luke deviates from Mark in parallel passages, the Lucan account reflects dependence upon an independent tradition rather than deliberate alteration of a Marcan source (cf. Luke's well-known incorporation of "special material" [*Sondergut*] elsewhere in his Gospel).

(2) In determining Luke's theological purpose(s), consideration of traditional material which Luke has taken over <u>unchanged</u> may be just as vital as concentrating upon supposed revisions of sources. When Luke incorporated various traditions into his literary work, he made them his own and accorded them a significant function within his overall narrative presentation.[18]

(3) While the standard "two-source" theory predicated upon Marcan priority still represents the dominant approach to Gospel origins, its status as an "assured result" of NT criticism is no longer as secure as it once was. Important questions have been raised, refinements have been suggested, and other viable paradigms have been advanced.[19] As a result, interpretive schemes tied too closely to any single source hypothesis are increasingly

proving less convincing.

(4) Given the lack of extant parallel accounts of "Acts of the Apostles" contemporaneous with Luke's work, the identification of precise sources and traditions underlying the canonical Acts proves to be a highly speculative venture. Accordingly, efforts to determine at what points and to what extent Luke has edited the material at his disposal are prone to be equally dubious. Guesses may be made on the basis of presumed dislocations ("breaks" and "seams") in the text, but detecting these dislocations remains a considerably subjective enterprise, lacking sufficient controlling criteria.[20] Moreover, excessive concern with supposed breaks in the Acts narrative may cause one to slight the importance of numerous transparent links within the story as indicators of Luke's theology.[21]

In the face of these critical observations, American Lucan scholars are increasingly opting for an analytical approach which focuses upon Luke-Acts as a unified literary whole and seeks to discover Luke's theology principally through the study of interlocking narrative patterns and themes characterizing the final form of Luke's two-volume work. Accordingly, the Lucan text is being viewed not so much as a "window" into traditions and histories lying behind it as a "mirror" reflecting the dimensions of its own "narrative world."[22] Or put another way, concern for positioning the Lucan material within a diachronic stream of tradition history is giving way to mounting interest in more synchronic analyses of the numerous textual and thematic connections binding together Luke's entire work.[23] Comparing Luke's text with contemporary parallel texts may still prove useful in discerning what is distinctively Lucan, but the ultimate controlling context for

interpeting Luke's message must remain Luke's own overall presentation.

As representative examples of this methodological shift in Lucan studies, we may cite the following.

> Often scholars assume that when Luke wrote he had immediately before him those two earlier texts [Mark and "Q"] and that virtually every variation discloses a conscious alteration in the direction of rejecting a theological point made by the earlier writer in the interest of a contrary point which Luke wished to make. A comparative study of this kind has many merits, but I believe that in his own mind when Luke was writing the Gospel he was not so much revising earlier documents to conform to his own theological notions as composing the first of two volumes which would be read together by the same readers. The interdependence of these two volumes is such that the purposes of volume one can be most clearly discerned by observing the contents and sequences of volume two.[24]

> The purpose of the present study is to investigate the meaning that the death of Jesus has in the two-volume work, Luke-Acts. In this study the writings will be approached holistically. The assumption that one person wrote the two books. . . will be taken seriously. This is not to suggest that an individual named Luke composed his books without the benefit of previous traditions or sources, but it is to affirm that one person is responsible for Luke-Acts in its final written form. The way in which this narrative is organized, the treatment of recurrent themes, the various characterizations, though probably influenced by tradition or source, were finally the results of the literary activity of an individual. It is thus to be expected that one will gain insight into the theological thought of this person by paying special attention to his written work in its final form.[25]

> This study is part of an attempt to understand Luke-Acts as a unitary narrative in which the episodes receive their meaning through their function within the larger whole.[26]

> This paper intends to demonstrate that Lk. 13.10-17 is a story which the evangelist has made part and parcel of his narrative theology. Indeed, a careful analysis of the account's structure, diction, OT allusions, and its thematic interplay with both the immediate gospel context (12.49-13.35) and the full context of Luke-Acts shows it to be a vehicle of Lucan theology. . .[27]

> In analyzing these themes [related to table fellowship], I will be looking at Luke as a whole, as a work of literature in its own right, rather than seeking to identify the traditions that lie behind it. Although reference to source and redaction theories

> will be made from time to time to buttress the argument, my approach will be to identify and analyze this theme wherever it is found in Luke, regardless of arguments about which materials are traditional and which are redactional. Indeed, the widespread occurrence of this theme in all strata of material in Luke gives rise to new appreciation for the literary artistry of the third evangelist.[28]

In terms of its basic methodological orientation, our investigation of Philip the evangelist in Lucan perspective may be viewed as a companion to these recent studies. That is, we aim to discover the various dimensions of Philip's portrayal in the book of Acts and the significance of this portrayal for Luke's theology by correlating the Philip-material with the overall narrative presentation in Luke-Acts. The description of Philip's character and ministry will be carefully compared and contrasted with that of other key personalities featured throughout Luke's account, and notable terms, themes and structural patterns which emerge within the Philip-material will be analyzed as components within the coherent literary system of Luke's entire two-volume work.

Having declared, however, this basic adherence to what may loosely be called a "literary-critical" or "narrative-critical" methodology, we must add two points of clarification concerning our approach to Lucan study which distinguishes it from some (by no means all) modern literary or narrative analyses. First, our fundamental appreciation of the literary design of Luke-Acts and our principal focus on the figure of Philip the evangelist as a character within Luke's distinctive story of the early church's beginnings do not reflect an intention to interpret Luke's narrative apart from its historical context toward the end of the first century C.E. Quite the contrary, while we will give priority attention to discovering the contour of

Luke's "narrative world," we will also assume a considerable overlap between this "world" and the social and literary "worlds" reflected in other ancient documents and artifacts *circa* the period of primitive Christian history. Hence, to understand fully Luke's perspective, for example, on various groups related to Philip's ministry--such as Samaritans, magicians, Ethiopians, eunuchs and "God-fearers"--it will be useful not only to probe Luke's own commentary on these groups throughout his two-volume work but also to uncover from outside sources common perceptions of these groups within ancient society which Luke may have shared or deviated from.

Secondly, while we are shying away from most source analysis and reconstruction as conventionally practiced in earlier Lucan scholarship, we will be investigating Luke's possible dependence upon OT models and motifs in casting the Philip-material and other segments of his narrative. A number of creative recent studies have pursued this issue with profit, especially in relation to Luke's apparent adaptation of biblical materials surrounding the prophetic figures of Moses and Elijah/Elisha.[29] R. C. Tannehill succinctly states the basic assumption we are making at this point with respect to analyzing any Lucan figure, including Philip the evangelist: "Characters and actions may echo characters and actions in another part of the story, as well as characters and actions of the scriptural story which preceded Luke-Acts."[30]

CHAPTER 2: PHILIP AND THE SAMARITANS

§1. INTRODUCTION: A LITERARY OVERVIEW OF ACTS 8.4-25

Luke clearly cordons off Acts 8.4-25 as a single narrative unit by a favorite framing or *inclusio* technique[1] involving vv. 4-5 and 25.

<u>8.4-5</u>

οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες διῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον. Φίλιππος δὲ κατελθὼν εἰς [τὴν] πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας ἐκήρυσσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστόν.

<u>8.25</u>

οἱ μὲν οὖν διαμαρτυράμενοι καὶ λαλήσαντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου ὑπέστρεφον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, πολλάς τε κώμας τῶν Σαμαριτῶν εὐηγγελίζοντο.

Common features include: (1) commencing with a nominative participial construction incorporating μὲν οὖν, a frequent transitional and summary device in Acts;[2] (2) reference to preaching (εὐαγγελίζομαι) the word (τὸν λόγον), echoing a theme which emerges within the intervening narrative (εὐαγγελίζομαι, v. 12; λόγος, vv. 14, 21); and (3) localization in Samaritan territory (cf. v. 14).

However, in addition to these elements within the framing verses which hold Acts 8.4-25 together, there are also indications that this block of material contains two distinct scenes involving different actors. In vv. 4-5 the key missionary role is played by Philip, a representative of those scattered from Jerusalem after the persecution of Stephen (cf. 8.1). Philip's work in Samaria then becomes the focus of vv. 5-13. In v. 25 the witnesses to the word of the Lord in Samaria are preachers on their way back to Jerusalem. These could scarcely include Philip, who had just been expelled

from the Holy City and whose presence in the story has not been acknowledged since v. 13.[3] Rather they refer to Peter and John, apostles who had maintained their residence in Jerusalem despite the recent turmoil and who appear in the Samaria-scene in v. 14 and dominate the action through v. 24 (Peter in particular).[4] Thus Acts 8.4-25 may be viewed as one coherent section in Luke's narrative comprised of two parts: (1) Philip's ministry in Samaria (vv. 4-13, of which vv. 4-5 form the introduction) and (2) the Jerusalem apostles' ministry in Samaria (vv. 14-25, of which v. 25 forms the conclusion).

Such a structure may be confirmed by a closer analysis of Acts 8.5-24, the material enveloped by the bracketing verses. Verses 5-13 are interlocked by a juxtaposition of the ministries of Philip and Simon Magus among the Samaritans, signalled by the repetition of key words such as προσέχω (vv. 6, 10, 11), ἐξίστημι (vv. 9, 11, 13), πόλις (vv. 5, 8, 9), δύναμις (vv. 10, 13) and μεγάλη (vv. 7, 10, 13). Verses 14-24 are linked by an altercation between the Jerusalem apostles, chiefly Peter, and Simon Magus, focusing in the main upon the issue of receiving the Spirit (λαμβάνειν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, vv. 15, 17, 19) and one's relationship to the word (λόγος, vv. 14, 21).

Can we also detect clues to the overall unity of Acts 8.5-24, that is, to the interconnection between the two constituent scenes? The same Samaritan audience remains in view in the two sections, namely, those citizens of Samaria who embraced the message of Philip (vv. 5-7, 12, 14) and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ/the Lord Jesus (vv. 12, 16). One Samaritan figure in particular, Simon Magus, is featured in both halves of

8.5-24, with a special interest in his visual perception (θεωρέω/ὁράω, vv. 13, 18) and preoccupation with power (δύναμις/ἐξουσία, vv. 10, 13, 19).[5] A narrative pattern running throughout the entire passage may be envisaged which consistently alternates in focus between the Christian missionary protagonist and Simon the magician.[6]

Philip: vv. 6-8
Simon: vv. 9-11
Philip: v. 12
Simon: v. 13
Peter (and John): vv. 14-17
Simon: vv. 18-19
Peter: vv. 20-23
Simon: v. 24

It should be noted, however, that the Philip/Simon (vv. 6-13) and Peter/Simon (vv. 14-24) sequences are presented in different ways. The former is a purely third-person descriptive summary following no chronological order (vv. 9-11 represents a "flashback" to Simon's exploits before Philip's arrival), while the latter is organized around a dialogue-encounter mainly in second person.

Since the recipients of Philip's ministry carry over into the episode in Acts 8.14-24, it should not be thought that Philip has completely passed out of view in Luke's story, even though he has obviously yielded the spotlight to the apostle Peter. Indeed, the fact that Philip's converts receive a supplementary benefit (the Spirit) and, in the case of Simon, a stiff reprimand from a visiting missionary cannot help but reflect back on Philip's achievements in some fashion. Exactly how Luke's portrayal of Philip is colored by the events of 8.14-24 will occupy our close attention later in this investigation, but for now we simply observe that evaluating the

mission of Philip the evangelist in Samaria seems to represent another of the author's underlying concerns which unifies 8.4-25.

Generally scholars have recognized the heavy Lucan shaping of the material in Acts 8.4-25 and perceived a certain coherence, at least on the surface, in its structure. But motivated by a concern to probe behind the present form of the text to uncover the sources or traditions which Luke utilized, many have detected a number of "seams" or "breaks" in the account which supposedly betray a patching together of discrete materials. Resulting from such analyses are nagging impressions that actually Luke did not exercise the best of literary skill in composing Acts 8.4-25 and that whatever unity one might find in the structure of this passage is more illusory than real. One writer speaks explicitly of the "uneinheitlichen Gesamteindrucks, der sich in Act 8.5-25 bietet."[7]

Among the difficulties in the course of the narrative commonly exposed by source and redaction critics[8] are the following: (1) vv. 9-11 constitute an awkward "flashback" (*Rückblende*) which interrupts the natural flow from v. 8 to v. 12; (2) v. 13 provides the only direct connection between Philip and Simon Magus; and (3) vv. 14-17, by separating baptism and the reception of the Spirit, create an anomalous theological situation in the interest of exalting the authority of the Jerusalem apostles and break the transparent sequence of the Simon-story which runs from v. 13 to v. 18. Broadly speaking, explanations for these phenomena in Luke's account tend to take the line that either (1) vv. 14-17 constitute a redactional bridge joining two originally independent traditions--one disclosing the rivalry between Philip and Simon and the other reporting the conflict between Peter and Simon--

within a common Samaritan setting[9] or (2) only one of the missionary encounters with Simon has a traditional basis, the other being a Lucan construction with possible dependence on some isolated reports about both Philip's and Simon's activities in Samaria.[10]

Without engaging in a detailed critique of the various theories accounting for the tradition history of Acts 8.4-25, we do offer some general observations. In the first place, the speculative nature of these reconstructions of Luke's writing process must be duly appreciated. C. K. Barrett wisely prefaces his remarks regarding the composition of our passage with these cautionary words:

> What sources did Luke use? How did he combine them? What was their historical value, and how far was any historical value they may originally have possessed preserved and how far destroyed in the editorial process? These are not questions that can be answered with confidence, and those who discuss them should remember that they are usually guessing, even when their guesses are guided by observation and probability.[11]

We are severely hampered by the lack of contemporary comparative material with which to compare and contrast Luke's presentation in Acts 8. Ostensibly relevant traditions, such as those in the *Acts of Peter* or those related to Simonian gnosis, which are sometimes brought into the discussion, manifest only minimal correspondence with the data in Acts 8 and are too late to provide any definitive clues regarding the reports which might have been available to Luke.

Secondly, what appears to one reader as a <u>historical break</u> in the text might strike another as a <u>literary link</u>. For example, the observation that Acts 8.18 picks up the visual interest of Simon in miraculous manifestations with which v. 13 ended need not suggest some continuous underlying story

into which Luke has interpolated his own material. The recurrent emphasis on Simon's "seeing" may just as plausibly reflect a Lucan literary device whereby one part of a narrative unit echoes another and thereby creates a unified stylistic effect (see above). A lot depends on the degree to which one appreciates Luke as a literary artist. The more that one discerns the traces of Lucan design within a given passage or (put another way) the more one notices the prevalence of interlocking techniques--as in the case of Acts 8.4-25 (see above)--the less inclined one will be to judge various patterns in the text as indicators of a fractured source. This is not to deny that Luke made extensive use of traditional materials, only that he so masterfully shaped the final form of his work that precise delineation of sources becomes scarcely possible.

Thirdly, mention should be made of the view of R. Pesch in his recent commentary which evaluates Acts 8.4-25 "als eine--freilich von Lukas bearbeitete--ursprüngliche Überlieferungseinheit."[12] Pesch recognizes the coherence of the Lucan account and argues that its present form can best be accounted for as an adaptation of an equally coherent traditional report about the early church's Samaritan mission which essentially followed the same plot-line which Luke gives us.[13] Of course, Pesch's source hypothesis remains just as much an educated guess as its competitors, but it does illustrate that, as it stands, the text of Acts 8.4-25 by no means bears the marks in any self-evident sense of a multi-layered foundation. If we insist on peering <u>through</u> Luke's story in search of what lies behind it, we may only be able, given the story's careful design, to envisage an original model which more resembles than deviates from the final version.

Whatever the exact tradition history of Acts 8.4-25, our primary concern is to underscore that Luke has deftly shaped the existing form of the passage into a seamless literary whole. (In addition to matters of structure, the preponderant Lucan imprint on the account of the Samaritan mission is also evidenced by the prevalent occurrence of terms and themes characteristic of Luke-Acts, for example: ὁμοθυμαδόν [v. 6], χάρις [v. 8], dual ministry of proclamation and miracle-working [vv. 4-8, 12-13], Christian superiority over magic [vv. 6-13], the activity of the Spirit [vv. 15-20], financial matters [vv. 18-20], repentance [v. 22] and prayer [vv. 15, 22, 24]--all of which will be discussed in the course of our study.) This means that in our quest for the overriding Lucan purpose(s) behind the portrayal of Philip's ministry in Samaria, we are best advised to give priority attention to the place of Acts 8.4-25 within the overall presentation of Luke's two-volume work, not to some alleged reconstruction of Luke's redactional activity.[14] It is still incumbent upon us to investigate ancient background materials--such as those pertaining to Samaritan history and culture (see below)--but chiefly in order to illuminate Luke's thought-world generally, not to circumscribe the sources which he utilized.

From this bird's-eye view of Acts 8.4-25 we now turn to focus in detail upon the characterization of Philip's work in Samaria. For the sake of analysis this examination will be carried out in three stages. In the present chapter we will limit our view to Philip's ministry among the Samaritans at large. His interaction with Simon Magus in particular as well as his relationship with the Jerusalem apostles (especially Peter) will be treated in subsequent chapters. Despite this division of topics, however, we

shall endeavor at each stage not to lose sight of the narrative unity governing Luke's account.

§2. PHILIP'S MINISTRY IN SAMARIA

As scholars have commonly noticed, throughout the report of the Samaritan mission in Acts 8.4-25, Philip's ministry receives direct attention only in vv. 4-8, 12-13, and then only in a highly generalized, summary-like fashion.[15] The content of his preaching is encapsulated in a few brief statements by the narrator, unaccompanied by any extended Philip-speech as we find with other key characters in Acts. There are no developed stories unfolding individual miraculous incidents, only the bare mention that certain types of miracles occurred. Except for Simon, the Samaritan beneficiaries of Philip's labors are undistinguished, lumped together as "the multitudes" and "many who. . ." In short, the depiction of Philip's activity in Samaria reads like a concise overview.[16]

We should not be deceived, however, into thinking that, because it is painted in broad strokes on a small canvas, Philip's involvement in the Samaritan mission represents an essentially negligible aspect of Luke's presentation. As already suggested, the disclosure of Philip's missionary breakthrough in Samaria occupies a foundational position in Acts 8.4-25 on which the entire story builds. Also, the fact that a more detailed Philip-story immediately follows in Acts 8.26-40 demonstrates generally that Luke took more than a passing interest in Philip's pursuits. Thus, however summarily it might be described, Philip's role in evangelizing Samaria merits close examination.

2.1 *Introduction (Acts 8.4-5)*

Acts 8.4-5 clearly connects backward to 8.1b and forward to 11.19-20 through the common usage of διασπείρω (the only three instances of the verb in the NT) and other linking terms.

8.1b

> And on that day a great persecution (διωγμὸς) arose against the church in Jerusalem; and they were all scattered (διεσπάρησαν) throughout the region of Judea and Samaria (Σαμαρείας), except the apostles.

8.4-5

> Now those who were scattered (οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες) went about (διῆλθον) preaching (εὐαγγελιζόμενοι) the word (τὸν λόγον). Philip went down to a city of Samaria (Σαμαρείας), and proclaimed to them the Christ.

11.19-20

> Now those who were scattered (οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες) because of the persecution (τῆς θλίψεως) that arose over Stephen traveled (διῆλθον) as far as Phoenicia. . . speaking the word (τὸν λόγον) to none except Jews. But there were some of them. . . who on coming to Antioch spoke to the Greeks also, preaching (εὐαγγελιζόμενοι) the Lord Jesus.

Since the days of Harnack the close parallels between Acts 8.4 and 11.19-20 have been regarded as pointing to an underlying "Antioch" source into which Luke has spliced various blocks of material, including the Philip-cycle in 8.5-40.[17] Once again, however, the repetitious pattern may be viewed as characteristic of Luke's style, a means of interlocking various parts of his narrative.[18] The pervasive Lucan language (e.g. μὲν οὖν, διέρχομαι, εὐαγγελίζομαι, λόγος) confirms this perspective.

The backward link of Acts 8.4-5 to 8.1b establishes a larger context for understanding the Philip-material at a number of points which shall be

taken up more fully in due course:

(1) A bridge is provided between the Philip- and Stephen-stories, a not surprising phenomenon in light of the two characters' tight association in their first appearances in Acts (occupying the first two positions in the list of seven servants, 6.5).

(2) Philip's ministry is a direct result of persecution in Jerusalem and thereby slots into the prominent Lucan motif of Jewish rejection of the gospel which catalyzes the church's outreach beyond the boundaries of Judaism or, more generally, into "the theme of human opposition which does not stop the mission but contributes to its spread" (Luke 4.16-37; Acts 13.44-48; 18.6; 28.25-28).[19]

(3) In Acts 8.3 Saul emerges as the principal driving force behind the persecution,[20] a fact supported by similar language in 9.1-3. It is noteworthy that these references to Saul's vendetta against the church form the most immediate frame around the Philip-narratives in 8.4-40. Philip's evangelistic efforts are carried out as a whole under the threat of Saul's antagonism.

(4) In Acts 8.1 the region of Samaria is associated with Judea as a first point of departure beyond Jerusalem, a connection echoed in 1.8 and 9.31. Thus, Philip's Samaritan mission is linked geographically with his work along the coastal plain of Judea (8.26-40) and with Peter's ministry in the same area (9.32-10.48).

(5) Finally, the nexus between Acts 8.1 and 8.4-5 clearly demarcates the itinerant evangelist, Philip, from the company of Jerusalem apostles who remain in the Holy City. This distinction goes back to 6.1-7 and emerges as

a prominent factor in 8.14-25. Moreover, it eliminates any prospect of identifying Philip the evangelist with his apostolic namesake (Luke 6.14; Acts 1.13).[21]

The forward link of Acts 8.4-5 to 11.19-20 reinforces the relationship of the Philip-story to the persecution provoked by Stephen, and if we take into account the larger unit of 11.19-26, additional parallels surface in the intervention of a minister from Jerusalem (vv. 22-24) and the activity of Saul (now converted, vv. 25-26). Equally significant, however, is the new connection of Philip's mission with territories beyond Judea and people besides Jews (namely, Greeks), a correspondence substantiated by 15.3.[22]

Focusing specifically upon the vocabulary of Acts 8.4-5, we consider the significance of two verbs, διασπείρω and διέρχομαι,[23] which characterize the movements of Philip and the others expelled from Jerusalem. Though rare in the NT,[24] διασπείρω and its cognate, διασπορά, are widely circulated in the LXX where they most commonly refer to the dispersion of Jews from their Palestinian homeland to the Gentile nations (ἔθνη) of the world.[25] The context is typically one of disobedience and punishment, that is, Israel's disobedience to God's law and God's resultant act of judgment in scattering his people. This course of events has its primeval pattern in the Babel episode (διασπείρω: Gen 11.4, 8, 9), its legal basis in the warnings of the Pentateuch (Lev 26.33; Deut 4.27; 28.64; 32.26) and its fulfillment in Israel's experiences of exile in the days of the prophets (Jer 13.24; 15.7; 18.17; Bar 2.4, 13, 29; 3.8; Ezek 5.12; 12.14, 15; 22.15; cf. *Pss. Sol.* 9.1-2). When διασπείρω/διασπορά are used in a positive connection, the focus is on the Lord's gracious <u>restoration</u> of his scattered flock to the promised land,

often as a sign of eschatological blessing (Isa 11.12; 56.8; Jer 39[32]).37; Ezek 11.17; 34.12; Zeph 3.10; Ps 146[147].2; Jdt 5.19).

Luke's usage of διασπείρω coincides with the LXX in applying the term to the dispersion of Jews from Jerusalem into foreign territories. This sense certainly fits Acts 11.19-20, where the fugitives associated with Stephen settle among the Greeks outside of Palestine. In the case of Philip, while he physically stays within Israel's borders, his interaction with the Samaritan nation (ἔθνος, 8.10) and an Ethiopian traveller (8.26-39) locates the evangelist socially on the fringes of Judaism (if not beyond) and justifies his identity as one of the διασπαρέντες. Beyond this basic referential correspondence between Lucan and LXX usage of διασπείρω, however, we find a notable contrast in their broader contexts. Far from envisaging the flight from Jerusalem as retribution against a rebellious people, Luke regards it as fulfilling the church's responsibility, set forth by Christ, to bear witness--"beginning from Jerusalem"--of God's salvation to the nations (Luke 24.47; Acts 1.8). By and large the OT perspective on the redemption of the nations pictures a "centripetal" movement of Gentiles to Zion at the end of the age as a complement to the ingathering of dispersed Israelites from the four winds (e.g. Isa 2.2-4; 49.6; 56.6-8; Mic 4.1-3; Zech 2.10-12; 8.1-8, 20-23).[26] Luke, on the other hand, while happy to report the reception of the word by many who had assembled in Jerusalem at Pentecost "from every nation under heaven" (Acts 2.5, 41),[27] also supports a "centrifugal" mission in which the gospel is <u>carried from Jerualem and spread to every land</u>.[28] Philip and the other διασπαρέντες inaugurate such a mission. It is interesting that certain of these missionaries ("men of

Cypress and Cyrene," Acts 11.20) apparently came to Jerusalem in the first place (before their conversion to Christianity?) from the Diaspora.[29] However, according to Luke's story, rather than finding the kingdom of God permanently established in the Holy City, as the OT suggests, they find the Messiah they have embraced violently rejected by the Jewish religious authorities and are forced to disperse again, this time preaching the gospel of Christ as they go.

Διέρχομαι may be regarded as a characteristic Lucan verb of motion.[30] It emerges in a variety of contexts of coming and going, but most frequently in conjunction with missionary activity, as in Acts 8.4.[31] It can denote simply the passage from one place to another ("And when he wished to cross [διελθεῖν] to Achaia. . ." [Acts 18.27]) or a more general "passing through" or "travelling about" a region. This latter sense suits the absolute use of διέρχομαι in 8.4 and 11.19 and reinforces the notion of a "scattered" (διασπείρω) or itinerant mission. Philip's ministry in particular follows the pattern of a wandering evangelist (notice the parallel expressions διῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι [8.4]/διερχόμενος εὐηγγελίζετο [8.40] in verses which frame the Philip-cycle). In addition to Acts 11.19, the closest parallels involving διέρχομαι to Philip's roving mission include: (1) the first mission of the Twelve ("And they. . . went through [διήρχοντο] the villages, preaching the gospel [εὐαγγελιζόμενοι]. . ." [Luke 9.6 ≠ Mark 6.12]); (2) Peter's "inspection" tour along the Palestinian coast ("Now as Peter went here and there [διερχόμενον] among them all. . ." [Acts 9.32]); (3) Jesus' ministry as summarized by Peter (". . . how he went about [διῆλθεν] doing good. . ."

[Acts 10.38]); and (4) Paul's missionary journeys (". . . he. . . went from place to place [διερχόμενος καθεξῆς] through the region. . ." [Acts 18.23; cf. 13.6, 14; 14.24; 15.41; 16.6; 19.1, 21; 20.2, 25]). And so Philip's ministry mirrors that of all the main figures in Luke-Acts.

2.2 *Proclamation (Acts 8.4-5, 12)*

Since Philip is one of those scattered from Jerusalem after Stephen's martyrdom, his ministry may be broadly characterized as "preaching the word" (Acts 8.4). More specifically, however, his proclamation in Samaria is encapsulated in two terse phrases:

1. ἐκήρυσσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστόν (8.5)
2. εὐαγγελιζομένῳ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (8.12)

The two verbs, κηρύσσω and εὐαγγελίζομαι, both appear frequently in Luke-Acts as components of a rich vocabulary which the author employs when referring to what he deems a top priority Christian ministry: the act of preaching.[32] The two terms can take the same objects, such as "kingdom of God", "Christ" and "Jesus," and several times, as in Acts 8.5, 12, are utilized together in a single context as alternative expressions for the proclamation event (Luke 4.18-19; 4.43-44; 8.1; 9.2, 6; Acts 10.36-37). Thus κηρύσσω and εὐαγγελίζομαι may be generally regarded in Luke-Acts as stylistic variants with no appreciable semantic distinction.[33]

While Luke shares a predilection for κηρύσσω with Matthew and Mark, his employment of εὐαγγελίζομαι is virtually unique among the Synoptics (Matt 11.5 [par. Luke 7.22] is the only exception). Conversely, the cognate

noun, εὐαγγέλιον, which is relatively common in Matthew and Mark, surfaces in Luke's two-volume work only in Acts 15.7 and 20.24 (compared to 25 uses of the verb). Luke scatters his use of εὐαγγελίζομαι throughout both his Gospel and Acts in conjunction with the ministries of John the Baptist, Jesus, the Twelve and Paul.[34] However, the heaviest concentration of the verb may be found in the larger Philip-narrative in Acts 8.4-40, where it appears five times in the space of 37 verses.[35] These five references are couched in various constructions: twice with an accusative denoting the content of the message being proclaimed (τὸν λόγον, v. 4; τὸν Ἰησοῦν, v. 35), once with a prepositional phrase also disclosing what is being preached (περὶ τῆς βασιλείας. . ., v. 12) and twice with an accusative indicating the audience being addressed (vv. 25, 40).[36] In terms of its distribution in Acts 8, εὐαγγελίζομαι emerges at key structural points in the story (in connection with different subjects)--beginning (the dispersed ones, v. 4), transition (Peter and John, v. 25) and end (Philip, v. 40)--and designates the nature of Philip's vocation within each of the two main incidents where the missionary is featured (vv. 12, 35). On any reckoning, the ministry of the word characterized by εὐαγγελίζομαι represents a central theme of the Philip-story.

Concerning the substance of Philip's proclamation, we consider first the matter of his preaching Christ (v. 5). Used here with the definite article, Christ should no doubt be understood in a titular sense as designating "the Christ" or "the Messiah." This conforms generally with distinctive Lucan usage where (unlike Paul's letters) Χριστός is rarely employed as a proper name (always in combination with "Jesus" and mostly in formulaic

constructions involving ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, e.g. Acts 2.38; 3.6; 4.10; 10.48; 16.18; cf. 8.12) and predominantly refers to the anointed Messianic ruler of Jewish expectation.[37] Luke makes it plain that the awaited Christ has at last been manifested and is to be identified with Jesus of Nazareth. From his birth (Luke 2.11, 26) and throughout his earthly ministry (Luke 4.41; 9.20), Jesus fulfilled the Messianic role, but for Luke, it was especially through Jesus' death, resurrection and ascension that "God made him both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2.32). Luke particularly addresses himself to the problem, in relation to traditional Jewish understanding, of a <u>crucified</u> Christ and demonstrates by appeal to OT Scripture that it was indeed necessary for the Christ to suffer (ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν, Luke 24,26; cf. 24.44-46; Acts 3.18; 17.2-3; 26.22-23).[38]

The majority of instances in Acts where Christ is the focus of Christian proclamation are characterized by explicit identification of Christ with Jesus in the immediate context (e.g. εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν, Acts 5.42; cf. 2.31-32, 36; 3.20; 9.22; 17.2-3; 18.5, 28) and presuppose, naturally enough, a Jewish audience.[39] Philip's preaching of Christ *simpliciter* in Acts 8.5 without a direct tie-in to Jesus is unusual for Acts (though see 26.23), but the larger context of Philip's message in Acts 8 establishes clear links with <u>the name of Jesus Christ</u> (v. 12) and <u>the good news of Jesus</u> (v. 35). The Samaritan setting for Philip's Christ-centered message is noteworthy, as it discloses Luke's understanding that the Samaritans, whatever their social and religious distinctiveness *vis-à-vis* the Jews, still shared some common theological ground with the broad spectrum of Judaism in the form of a general Messianic consciousness.

Secondly, Philip proclaims the kingdom of God (Acts 8.12). The notion of the kingdom of God as the content of Christian preaching is a central and distinctive feature of Luke's presentation, emerging at critical junctures within his narrative.[40] Concluding the first major section in Luke's Gospel dealing with Jesus' public ministry are these words: "but he [Jesus] said to them, 'I must preach the good news of the kingdom of God (εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ) to the other cities also (καὶ), for I was sent (ἀπεστάλην) for this purpose.' And he was preaching (ἦν κηρύσσων) in the synagogues of Judea" (Luke 4.43-44). The "also" intimates that Jesus' ministry up to this point, in the cities of Nazareth and Capernaum (4.16-41), has likewise been characterized by preaching the kingdom of God. In particular, the use of the verbs, εὐαγγελίζομαι, κηρύσσω and ἀποστέλλω, is echoed in the Isaiah citation (Isa 61.1; 58.6) which Jesus claims to fulfill in the synagogue at Nazareth (4.18-21). It may be said that, for Luke, preaching good news to the poor, proclaiming release to the captives, etc., provides a commentary on what it means to preach the kingdom and sets forth the basic program of Jesus' entire mission.[41] The emphasis on Jesus' perception of preaching the kingdom of God as divinely mandated ("I must preach. . . . I was sent for this purpose") confirms how central this task is to Jesus' vocation in the Gospel of Luke.

Another Lucan summary statement regarding Jesus' itinerant mission repeats the focus on proclaiming the kingdom of God (Luke 8.1), and Luke alone of all the Gospel writers reports that Jesus spoke to the multitude about the kingdom of God before the miraculous feeding incident (9.11). Flanking this episode in Luke 9 are references to the fact that Jesus not

only preached the kingdom of God himself but also commissioned his disciples to do the same (v. 2 ≠ Mark 6.12; v. 60).

In Luke's second volume the priority of a kingdom-preaching ministry is sustained, as indicated by statements at the beginning and the end of Acts (1.3; 28.23, 31).[42] In the former case, we learn that, during his forty days on earth before his ascension, the characteristic activity of the risen Jesus is "speaking of the kingdom of God" (λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ) to his followers, thus establishing continuity with the earthly Jesus' ministry in Luke's Gospel. The closing verses of the book of Acts disclose Paul's proclamation of the kingdom of God and illustrate how the missionaries of the early church take up and carry on the work begun by Jesus.[43] In the body of the Acts narrative, we find further evidence of Paul's testimony regarding the kingdom, especially connected with his ministry at Ephesus (19.8; 20.25; cf. 14.22), but surprisingly, <u>the only other reference to preaching the kingdom of God is that associated with Philip's ministry in 8.12</u> (περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ = Acts 1.3; 19.8; cf. Luke 9.11). In light of Luke 9.2, it is particularly strange in Acts that the Twelve, including Peter, are not <u>explicitly</u> depicted as preachers of God's kingdom. This may have something to do with the implication in Acts 1.6 of the Twelve's persisting misunderstanding of the nature of the kingdom as too exclusively restricted to Israel's national interests.

What can be said about the meaning of Philip's and Paul's preaching of the kingdom in the book of Acts? No detailed explanation is offered, as all the references appear to function as brief summaries of the missionaries' message. What little elaboration we do find all points to instruction about

Jesus. Philip's kingdom-preaching is placed alongside his witness to the name of Jesus Christ (8.12), and Paul's promulgation of the kingdom of God is conjoined with convincing the Jews about Jesus (περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, 28.23) and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ (τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 28.31).[44] Thus, "there is little doubt that Luke uses βασιλεία as a shorthand way of referring to the entire Christian proclamation--and that includes reference to the life of Jesus."[45] The Jesus who is the "kingdom-preacher par excellence"[46] in Luke's Gospel now becomes the focus of the church's kingdom-proclamation in the book of Acts.[47]

As to the vexed question of whether the kingdom being announced is a present reality or future hope, the stress seems to fall in Acts primarily on the former, coincident with the fact that proclaiming the gospel of Christ (= preaching the kingdom of God) involves the offer of present benefits such as forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2.38; 10.43; cf. Luke 24.47).[48] The possibly futuristic focus in the exhortation to "enter the kingdom of God" in Acts 14.22 is a lone exception in Luke's account of the church's missionary preaching.[49]

Concerning the recipients of the message of the kingdom,[50] it is important to note that from Luke's perspective the kingdom of God belongs in a special way to "the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind" (those invited to the great banquet, Luke 14.13. 21; cf. 14.12-24; 6.20; 7.22; 18.22-25), tax collectors (Luke 7.28-29), children (Luke 18.15-17), those forced to leave home (Luke 18.28-30) and even the convicted criminal (Luke 23.42-43)--in other words, the outcasts and underprivileged of Jewish society. Even more radical is the forecast in Luke's Gospel that Israel as a people will

generally spurn the opportunity to enter God's kingdom and the door will be flung wide open to respondents from Gentile nations (Luke 4.25-27; 13.28-30). In Acts 1 the resurrected Jesus, who speaks of the kingdom of God (v. 3), responds to the disciples' query regarding Israel's possession of the kingdom (v. 6) with a slight rebuff (v. 7) and redirection of their attention to the world-wide kingdom which shall be established through their Spirit-inspired testimony (v. 8). This universal perspective on the kingdom is certainly evident in the ministry of Paul. At Ephesus he commences his preaching of the kingdom in the synagogue (Acts 19.8), but upon encountering opposition he moves to a private hall where he lectures daily for two years. As a result, "all the residents of Asia hear[ ] the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks" (19.9-10). Later, when recapitulating his Ephesian ministry, he reiterates his outreach "both to Jews and to Greeks" (20.21) and characterizes his overall mission as "preaching the kingdom" (20.25).[51] At the end of Acts Paul's kingdom-preaching begins yet again with the Jews (28.23), this time at Rome, but following their disbelief Paul announces that the "salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles" and expands his proclamation of the kingdom to "all who c[o]me to him" (28.28-31).

In short, Luke makes its plain that preaching the kingdom of God extends beyond the boundaries of Judaism, that the blessings of Christ's salvation are offered to all peoples. Obviously, then, Philip's declaration of the kingdom of God to a Samaritan populace after being driven from Jerusalem fits well the general Lucan pattern.

Finally we consider more directly the significance of Philip's preaching about <u>the name of Jesus Christ</u>. In simple terms, given the tendency in the

ancient world to associate a person's name with his character and personality,[52] preaching the name of Jesus Christ would be essentially synonymous with bearing testimony to the person and work of Jesus Christ. However, a more comprehensive understanding of Luke's meaning in Acts 8.12 may be gained by comparison with the many and varied references to the name of Jesus throughout Luke-Acts (especially Acts), even though we must bear in mind that the construction εὐαγγελιζομένω περὶ. . . τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is unique in Luke's writing.

(1) The name of Jesus Christ is the exclusive name whereby men and women experience salvation (Acts 4.12). All are invited to call upon the Lord's name in order to be saved (Acts 2.21; 9.14, 21) and to give evidence of their faith in and union with Christ by being baptized in his name (Acts 2.38; 8.16; 10.48; 19.5; 22.16).

(2) The blessings of salvation are imparted in the name of Jesus, including forgiveness of sins (Luke 24.47; Acts 10.43), physical healing (Acts 3.6, 16; 4.7, 10, 30) and release from demonic enslavement (Luke 9.49; 10.17; Acts 16.18; 19.13, 17). The "in the name" formula may imply something of Jesus' authorization to his disciples to perform salutary works, but predominantly it signifies "the living power of Jesus at work in the church."[53] Put another way, the efficacy of Jesus' name illustrates his continuing dynamic presence with his people.[54]

(3) The Jerusalem apostles and Paul are credited with speaking or teaching in Jesus' name. Such references typically occur in a context of attendant opposition and fit the general Lucan emphasis upon suffering for Jesus' name sake. For example, Luke reports that the Jewish authorities

summoned the apostles, "beat them and charged them not to speak in the name of Jesus. . . . Then they [the apostles] left the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the name" (Acts 5.40-41; cf. Luke 21.12, 17; Acts 4.17-18; 5.28; 9.15-16, 27, 29; 21.13; 26.9-10). The notion of speaking "in Jesus' name" may again suggest the backing of Jesus' authority (the disciples = Jesus' representatives), but this does not exhaust its meaning. Proclamation "in Jesus' name" is closely associated in the book of Acts with preaching about Jesus himself or the gospel of Jesus Christ.[55] Immediately following the words quoted above from Acts 5 we read: "And every day in the temple and at home they did not cease teaching and preaching Jesus as the Christ" (v. 42). When the religious officials object to Peter and John's speaking in Jesus' name, they are not so worried about the apostles' claiming to be Jesus' emissaries but about their announcing the power of Jesus' name, that is, the power of Jesus himself to heal and to save (Acts 3.16; 4.7-12). Describing Saul's witness in Damascus, Barnabas says that the former persecutor "preached boldly in the name of Jesus" (9.27); earlier, however, it is reported concerning the same event simply that Saul "proclaimed Jesus" (9.20). Clearly, in the book of Acts, preaching in Jesus' name is tantamount to declaring the message concerning Christ and his salvation.

The fact that Philip preaches about the name of Jesus Christ obviously relates most closely with the last item just presented regarded Lucan usage in general. Though Philip is portrayed as preaching good news περὶ. . . τοῦ ὀνόματος Jesus Christ, this is scarcely to be distinguished in any substantive way from the more common reference to proclamation ἐν τῷ

ὀνόματι Jesus. In both cases the accent falls on testifying to the Christian gospel. There is another instance in which a variant expression to preaching "in the name of Jesus" is employed to the same effect. Saul is commissioned by the risen Lord "to carry my name" (βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου) before the world (9.15), a task which appears identical to Saul's ministry in Damascus of preaching Jesus/in the name of Jesus, which immediately ensues (9.20. 27).

Though it is not explicitly said of Philip that he was forbidden to preach Jesus' name nor that he suffered for Jesus' name sake, it is interesting that his Samaritan mission which includes the proclamation of Jesus' name was a direct outgrowth of persecution, specifically that engineered by Saul. Later in the book of Acts Saul confesses that his violent campaign against the church was the response to his "opposing the name of Jesus of Nazareth" (26.9-11). In a sense, then, from the larger Lucan perspective, Philip was among those who suffered for his devotion to Jesus' name and who persisted to declare that name in spite of opposition.

Again, while Philip in Acts 8 does not actually utilize the "in the name of Jesus" formula when performing his miracles, his mighty works--exorcising unclean spirits and healing the lame--are among those which Luke characteristically attributes to the power of Jesus' name. And finally, the reference to the Samaritans' baptism "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (8.16) may be viewed as another feature of Philip' ministry conforming to Luke's overall presentation of the name of Jesus.

2.3 *Miracle-Working*

The display of miracle-working activity alongside the ministry of proclamation, the combination of word and deed, is a common phenomenon in Luke's story of Jesus and the early church.[56] In the important incident in the Nazareth synagogue, Jesus' identification with Isaianic prophecy characterizes his ministry as a preaching of good news which includes the miraculous announcement of sight restored to the blind (Luke 4.18-19; cf. 7.22). In the discussion which ensues between Jesus and the synagogue assembly, attention is directed both to Jesus' "gracious words" (4.22) and--more extensively--to his wonder-working activity (4.23-27).[57] The next episode, set in Capernaum, likewise features the authority of Jesus' teaching and his power to work miracles, in this case the driving out of an unclean spirit (4.31-37). After narrating the scene in which Jesus cures a leper, Luke appends the summary note that "great multitudes gathered to hear and to be healed of their infirmities" (Luke 5.15 ≠ Mark 1.45; cf. Luke 6.17). And, accordingly, Luke introduces the following pericope with the report that Jesus was teaching "and the power of the Lord was with him to heal" (5.17 ≠ Mark 2.1-2).

This two-fold ministry of word and miracle is, as we would expect, also carried out by Jesus' followers. In their inaugural mission the Twelve are scattered, "preaching the gospel and healing everywhere" (Luke 9.6; cf. 9.1-2; 10.9). In the book of Acts we encounter the primitive Jerusalem community gathered for prayer, beseeching the Lord to empower them "to speak thy word with all boldness, while thou stretchest out thy hand to heal, and signs and wonders are performed. . ." (4.29-30). The granting of this request is

evidenced in the subsequent ministries of the Jerusalem apostles and Stephen (5.12-13, 40-42; 6.8-10). In the second half of Acts, Paul's work is similarly depicted as a blend of powerful word and miraculous sign (e.g. 13.4-12; 14.3, 7-10; 19.10-12; 20.7-12).

In discerning the unmistakeable pairing of the proclamation of the word and the performance of miracles in Luke's presentation, questions naturally arise as to the relative importance of one form of ministry *vis-à-vis* the other and, in particular, the comparative abilities of preaching and wonder-working to evoke faith. These concerns will be taken up in our next section dealing with the response of the Samaritans to Philip's ministry. But for the present moment, the point to be considered is simply that, in Luke's view, the working of miracles--whatever its precise significance--features regularly and prominently alongside declaring the word as a critical component of the universal outreach of Christ and his church. Focusing on the Acts material, J. A. Hardon has concluded that "at every point where the Gospel was first established among a certain people, the foundation was made in a miraculous context, with manifest showing of signs and powers worked by the hands of the Apostles."[58] Philip's evangelistic breakthrough to the Samaritans, attended by mighty works, represents a case in point, though from Luke's perspective Philip was not an apostle in the strictest sense.

Concerning the nature of the miracles which Philip performs, we observe the familiar Lucan juxtaposition of exorcisms and healings (Acts 8.7; cf. Luke 4.33-40; 6.17-18; 8.26-55; 9.1; 10.9, 17; 13.32; Acts 5.16; 19.11-12). In the former case, the only elaboration is that the unclean spirits depart from their victims, "crying with a loud voice" (βοῶντα φωνῇ μεγάλῃ). This

manifestation is most reminiscent of Jesus' expulsion of a demon from a man in the synagogue at Capernaum (ἀνέκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, Luke 4.33 ≠ Mark 4.24).[59] As for Philip's acts of healing, the curing of those who are paralyzed (παραλελυμένοι) and lame (χωλοὶ) also parallels other incidents in Luke-Acts. Paralytics are raised up by Jesus and Peter in episodes where a form of the verb παραλυομαι is likewise used to designate the infirm party (Luke 5.17-26 ≠ παραλυτικός in Matt/Mark; Acts 9.32-35). Enabling the lame to walk is one of the special proofs of Jesus' unique vocation which he offers to John's disciples (Luke 7.22) and constitutes the focus of major miracle stories involving both Peter and Paul (Acts 3.1-10 [cf. 3.11-4.22]; 14.8-18).

While generally Philip's miraculous deeds mirror those of Jesus, Peter and Paul in Luke-Acts, it must be admitted, nonetheless, that the bare mention of Philip's exploits stands in contrast to the more extended miracle accounts associated with the other characters. This of course may simply reflect the fact that Luke had no detailed reports of Philip's miracles at his disposal. Whatever the underlying cause, the net effect on a narrative level of Luke's cursory report is that Philip's wonder-working ministry in Samaria appears somewhat less spectacular than the mighty demonstrations of Luke's principal figures. Counterbalancing, however, any diminished respect for Philip's achievements is the double emphasis in Acts 8.7 that <u>many</u> (πολλοὶ) demon-possessed and crippled Samaritans benefited from his powerful ministry.[60]

Apart from briefly describing the particular types of miracles which characterized Philip's Samaritan mission, Luke also employs specialized

vocabulary to denote Philip's mighty works in general, namely, σημεῖα καὶ δυνάμεις μεγάλας (Acts 8.13, cf. τὰ σημεῖα, 8.6). The significance of this language is related in part to Simon's reputation as the "Great Power" (8.10), which we will investigate fully in the next chapter. Also, however, the use of σημεῖον and δύναμις must be evaluated against the background of their repeated occurrences in the book of Acts, often in conjunction with a third term, τέρας. In Peter's speech at Pentecost, he announces that the last days prophesied by Joel have begun, evidenced in the Spirit's outpouring soon to be accompanied by prophetic utterances, dreams, visions, wonders (τέρατα) and signs (σημεῖα, an addition to the OT source) (Acts 2.17-19).[61] Such phenomena will represent a continuation of the new age, inaugurated by "Jesus of Nazareth, a man attested. . . by God with mighty works and wonders and signs" (δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις, 2.22). The use of a plural form of δύναμις to designate Jesus' "mighty works" echoes two references in Luke's Gospel (10.13; 19.37); in Acts a similar usage applies only to Philip (8.13) and to a single instance in Paul's ministry (19.11). Interestingly, these references to Philip's and Paul's δυνάμεις are both attended by intensive modifiers ("great" [μεγάλας]/"extraordinary" [τυχούσας]).[62]

The σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα anticipated in Peter's speech are indeed quickly manifested in Jerusalem through the agency of the twelve apostles (Acts 2.43). In particular, lively interest is aroused over the performance of a "notable sign" (γνωστὸν σημεῖον, 4.16, cf. 4.22) of healing a man lame from birth. Even though this incident sparks bitter opposition to the apostles' work, their ministry of signs and wonders continues and in fact

expands dramatically (4.29-30; 5.12-16). In addition to the Twelve, Stephen, Paul and Barnabas are also credited with working signs and wonders in the Acts account (6.8; 14.3; 15.12). The Stephen example is most instructive, given his association with Philip in the group of seven table servants. As in Philip's case, an explicit emphasis is placed on the greatness (μεγάλη) of Stephen's miracles, and though Stephen's works are not specifically labelled as δυνάμεις, they are characterized as the product of his being "full of. . . power (δυνάμεως)." The Stephen speech also draws attention to signs and wonders, namely, those performed by Moses in Egypt and the Sinai desert (7.36).[63] These miraculous acts effectively vindicated the prophet Moses, whom the Israelites had rejected, as God's chosen ruler and judge of his people (7.35-36).[64] Accordingly, in Luke's view, Moses now functions as a prototype (7.37; cf. 3.22) of the rejected Messianic prophet (Jesus) and his persecuted servants (such as Stephen and Philip),[65] whose ministries are divinely authenticated through the working of miracles, and the Exodus experience serves to prefigure the dynamic eschatological age of salvation which has dawned with Christ's arrival.[66] More uniquely related to Philip's signs and mighty works--which elicit amazement from the Samaritan magician, Simon (Acts 8.13)--is the possible typological association with Moses' wondrous deeds which overwhelm the competing magicians of Pharoah.[67]

From this brief survey of the evidence, it is clear that Luke consistently takes a positive stance toward the demonstration of signs and wonders as confirming the authority of God's ministers. While such a viewpoint is reflected occasionally in other parts of the NT (Rom 15.17-19; 2 Cor 12.12; Heb 2.4), there is also a more cautious line of thought which

recognizes signs and wonders as a part of the deceptive stock-in-trade of false prophets. For example, the only references to σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα in Matthew and Mark apply to the end-time activities of dangerous pseudo-Messiahs (Matt 24.24//Mark 13.22--no Lucan parallel; cf. 2 Thess 1.9-10).[68] Nevertheless, while Luke always links signs and wonders with authentic ministry, he is scarcely blind to the machinations of false wonder-working prophets. Witness the clear distinction between Philip the evangelist, whose mission is legitimated in part by the salutary performance of signs and wonders, and Simon Magus, whose wonder-working is ultimately exposed as wickedly motivated (Acts 8.18-24; cf. 13.4-12; 16.16-18; 19.11-20).[69]

2.4 *Response (Acts 8.6-8, 12)*

We now turn to examine the response of the Samaritans to the preaching and miracle-working ministry of Philip in their midst. Broadly considered, the response is manifestly favorable, leading to mass acceptance of the Christian message and baptism.[70] In other words, Philip's Samaritan mission is a glowing success. Probing the Samaritans' receptivity in more detail, the following items prove of interest.

(1) In accordance with the fact that both word and sign typify Philip's ministry, the Samaritans' response is described as both <u>hearing and seeing</u> (ἀκούειν. . . καὶ βλέπειν, Acts 8.6). This dual focus on aural and visual perception is common in Luke's writing. The disciples of John are instructed to report to their master concerning "what [they] have seen and heard" of Jesus' service to those suffering from disease and destitution (Luke 7.22). The manifestations of the Spirit's advent at Pentecost are

phenomena which the crowds "see and hear" (Acts 2.33). And again, the Jerusalem apostles as well as Paul ground their witness in those things which they "have seen and heard" concerning Christ (Acts 4.20; 22.14-15). Most directly pertinent, however, to the Samaritans' response to Philip's work is the case of the lowly shepherds who, after hearing the angel's joyous news of Christ's birth and seeing for themselves the confirming sign (σημεῖον) of the baby Jesus lying in a manger, return to their flocks "glorifying and praising God for all they had heard and seen" (Luke 2.10-20). It is striking that both Samaritans and shepherds would have ranked among the despised classes of Jewish society and that their openness to God's revelation about Christ stands in contrast to the prevailing posture of the Jewish people, whose "ears are heavy of hearing and. . . eyes. . . have closed, lest they should perceive with their eyes and hear with their ears" (Acts 28.27; cf. Luke 8.10).

Although hearing and seeing are frequently paired together in Luke-Acts, it should not be assumed that the two responses are always equally valued. In the case of Acts 8.6 the larger context of 8.4-13 makes plain that Luke gives priority to <u>hearing</u> as the prelude to the Samaritans' faith and baptism.[71] Before we learn about any performance of miracles, Philip's ministry of proclamation is highlighted along with the fact that the crowds "gave heed <u>to what was said</u>" by him (8.6a).[72] When the Samaritans' faith is explicitly mentioned, it is directly connected to Philip's "preach[ing] good news about the kingdom of God. . ." (8.12). The only indication of the Samaritans' attraction to Philip's mighty works is the βλέπειν-reference in 8.6. No mention is made of the Samaritans' being amazed (ἐξίστημι) over

Philip's miracles as they previously had been over Simon's magic (8.9).[73] This accent on faith's coming principally by hearing the word appears to be the dominant strain in the book of Acts (connected with the importance of the missionary speeches), although miracles still often play a vital supporting role (as in 8.6-8; cf. 3.1-26; 13.4-12; 16.25-34; 19.8-20) and even occasionally provide the sole spur to faith (9.35, 42).[74] In the Gospel of Luke, however, the seeing of Jesus' miraculous deeds occupies a position of equal, if not superior, importance to the hearing of his preaching and teaching. J. Roloff notes in particular the different balances between (a) "seeing and hearing" the products of Jesus' ministry in Luke 7.22 (reversed order--"hear and see" in Matthean parallel [11.4]), where, according to the context of 7.1-22, the emphasis falls squarely upon seeing Jesus' miraculous works, and (b) "hearing and seeing" what Philip says and does in Acts 8.6, where, as we have already indicated, hearing the gospel message receives "top billing" in the surrounding passage.[75] The major (but not exclusive) focus in Luke's Gospel on recognizing the <u>demonstration</u> of God's power in the person of Jesus shifts in the book of Acts to believing the <u>declaration</u> of Jesus' person and work by his witnesses.[76]

(2) Considering further this principal concentration on the Samaritans' response to Philip's word, we need to observe more carefully the particular language and grammar which is employed.

> προσεῖχον δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου ὁμοθυμαδὸν (8.6a)
>
> ὅτε δὲ ἐπίστευσαν τῷ Φιλίππῳ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ. . . (8.12a)

Ὁμοθυμαδὸν ("with one accord") is characteristic of Luke's vocabulary, appearing several times in the book of Acts and only once in the rest of the NT. It is used in contexts depicting the unified worship of the primitive Jerusalem community (Acts 1.14; 2.46; 4.24) and the harmonious decision of the "Apostolic Council" (15.25). More relevant, however, to the missionary setting of the Samaritans' response are those instances where ὁμοθυμαδὸν characterizes the cohesive reaction of audiences to Christian preaching. Notably, outside the Samaritan episode, those reactions are all negative. The Jews at Corinth "made a <u>united</u> attack upon Paul" (18.12), and the citizens of Ephesus "rushed <u>together</u>" to seize Paul's companions (19.29). Stephen's fate was sealed when his hearers "stopped their ears and rushed <u>together</u> upon him" (7.57). In marked contrast to these violent responses, the Samaritans <u>unanimously opened their ears and welcomed Philip's testimony</u>.

Προσέχω is used not only with reference to the Samaritans' attentiveness to Philip, but also to their prior attraction to Simon Magus (8.10, 11). This correspondence has prompted J. D. G. Dunn to conclude that the Samaritans' "reaction to Philip was for the same reasons and of the same quality and depth as their reaction to Simon"; in other words, it revealed "very little discernment and depth" and was the product more of "mass emotion" and "herd-instinct" than a solid faith-commitment.[77] In short, the Samaritans were not yet true believers.[78] What Dunn fails to recognize, however, is that Luke actually makes a clear distinction between the Samaritans' earlier response to Simon and their present response to Philip's ministry. We have already instanced their less enthralled preoccupation with Philip's miracles. But more than this, the respective προσέχω-expressions

are not the same. With respect to Philip the Samaritans' "gave heed to what was said"; in Simon's case, they "gave heed to him" (προσεῖχον δὲ αὐτῷ, v. 11; cf. v. 10). It was not Philip himself but Philip's message about Christ which arrested the Samaritans' attention; by contrast, the Samaritans' attachment to Simon was more of a personality fixation, an enchantment with a cult figure.[79] The closest Lucan parallel to the Samaritans' "heeding" of Philip's preaching is not their former devotion to Simon but rather the opening of Lydia's heart "to give heed to what was said by Paul" (προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου, Acts 16.14).[80]

The Samaritans' adherence to Philip's gospel is reinforced in the πιστεύω-phrase in Acts 8.12. However, Dunn also interprets this verse to support his contention that the Samaritans initially responded on a very superficial level to Philip's ministry. He builds his case on the use of πιστεύω with the dative, which supposedly signifies a mere "assent of the mind" to Philip's proclamation and not a heart-felt commitment to God's word.[81] In the first place, however, it can certainly be debated whether Luke cared anything for the more modern theological distinction between "trust" (*fiducia*) and "assent" (*adsensus*). But even assuming that he did, it is doubtful how much we can press the meaning of "intellectual assent" into the linguistic construction of Acts 8.12. The uses of πιστεύω with the dative τῷ κυρίῳ (Acts 5.14; 18.8) and τῷ θεῷ (16.34) clearly denote genuine faith. Just because the dative clause in 8.12 focuses on what was preached about Christ rather than on Christ personally seems to be an insignificant distinction (especially since 8.5 has already established that Philip indeed proclaimed Christ in Samaria). Believing the preached word of

the gospel, even though not regularly conveyed in a dative construction, is a familiar Lucan description of valid Christian faith (e.g. Acts 4.4; 15.7; 18.87; cf. 13.48-49).[62]

Publicly demonstrating their reception of the Christian gospel, the Samaritans, as is customary in Acts, submit to baptism in the name of Jesus. Surprisingly, however, this baptism is not accompanied by the outpouring of the Spirit which passages like Acts 2.38 would lead us to expect. This familiar conundrum in Luke's story surrounding the relationship between water-baptism and Spirit-reception will be carefully explored in a later chapter.[63]

(3) A natural by-product of the blessings received through Philip's ministry is the Samaritans' experience of πολλὴ χαρὰ ("much joy," Acts 8.8). In Acts 15.3 the Samaritan believers again are reported to possess "great joy" (χαρὰν μεγάλην), this time over the news of Paul's outreach to the Gentiles. Presumably in 8.8 the the Samaritans' rejoicing relates both to Philip's message and his mighty works.[64] Likewise, elsewhere in Luke-Acts, the ministries of both word and miracle inspire a joyful response. The angel announces (εὐαγγελίζομαι) to the shepherds "good news of a great joy which will come to all the people" (Luke 2.10). The Samaritans' rejoicing over Philip's proclamation of Christ may be viewed as part of the fulfillment of this promise. Philip's other convert, the Ethiopian eunuch, also exults (χαίρω, 8.39) over the evangelist's witness to Jesus, as does a group of Gentiles upon hearing God's word spoken by Paul and Barnabas in Pisidian Antioch (13.48). Joy is not the deepest level of response to the preached word, requiring as it does the complement of sincere faith and commitment

(cf. Luke 8.13-15), but it still represents for Luke an important indicator of basic receptivity to the gospel.

Illustrating the response of joyful praise to the working of miracles, we may cite the outcome of Jesus' healing of the crippled woman, when "all the people rejoiced at all the glorious things that were done by him" (Luke 13.17, cf. 19.37), and the demonstration in the temple precincts of the lame man restore to health (Acts 3.8-9).

2.5 *Conclusion*

Though not described in extended or elaborate fashion, the ministry of Philip the evangelist to the Samaritans in Acts 8.4-13 clearly reflects the principal hallmarks of authentic mission activity highlighted by Luke throughout his narrative. Philip proclaims the good news, focusing upon the kingdom of God established by and through the person and name of Jesus Christ. This message is complemented and confirmed by the performance of miraculous signs, healings and exorcisms in particular. And, ultimately, this dynamic double-barreled ministry of word and deed elicits from the Samaritan throng true Christian commitment, marked by faith, joy and baptism.

Such a pattern of outreach to marginalized persons beyond the pale of Jerusalem-centered Judaism emerges again and again in Luke-Acts, characterizing the vocations of all the principal figures, notably, Jesus, Peter and Paul. By association, then, the Lucan Philip must be accorded his own ranking as a successful and prominent missionary/evangelist within earliest Christian mission history.

§3. PHILIP, SAMARIA/SAMARITANS AND LUKE-ACTS

Having analyzed a number of particular features pertaining to Philip's ministry in Samaria against the background of Luke's overall presentation, we now proceed to consider in some detail what is probably from Luke's perspective the most important aspect of Philip's mission: its Samaria/Samaritan context. The Philip-material in the first half of Acts 8 forms the climax in Luke's two-volume work of a series of reports featuring Samaria/Samaritans. On three occasions in Luke's special Gospel material (*Sondergut*) the Samaritans figure prominently in relation to the ministry of Jesus (Luke 9.51-56; 10.25-27; 17.11-19), and, as is well known, in the programmatic statement of Acts 1.8 the region of Samaria marks a critical intermediate stage in the gospel's advance to the ends of the earth. In addition to these transparent references to Samaria/Samaritans in Luke's account prior to Acts 8, the speech in Acts 7, attributed to Philip's fellow-servant, Stephen, may reflect the use of Samaritan tradition, as several recent studies have maintained. Only by carefully probing each of these examples and charting the narrative progression in Luke's portrayal of Samaria/Samaritans up to Acts 8 can we hope to understand fully the significance of Philip's Samaritan mission from Luke's point of view.

Moreover, in seeking to ascertain the precise nature of Philip's achievement in evangelizing the Samaritans in Acts 8, we will need especially to delineate, as clearly as possible, Luke's understanding of the Samaritans' peculiar ethnico-religious identity in relation to the Jews. In pursuit of this goal, we will be aided not only by careful literary analysis of Luke's

text but also by comparative analysis of contemporary appraisals of the Samaritan people, notably that found in the writings of Josephus.

§3.1 *Jesus' Rejection by a Samaritan Village (Luke 9.51-56)*

The three pericopae in Luke's Gospel which deal with Jesus and the Samaritans are loosely held together by their inclusion in the so-called "Travel Narrative" (*Reisebericht*) or "Central Section" of the book (9.51-19.27). The first account in 9.51-56 particularly stands out as the introduction to this lengthy narrative sequence. This passage reports an altercation between Jesus and the inhabitants of a Samaritan village and reveals basic attitudes of both Jesus and his disciples toward the Samaritan populace, thus providing a useful gauge for evaluating Philip's outreach to the Samaritan multitudes in Acts 8.

A key transition in Jesus' itinerary is signalled in the brief note in Luke 9.51b: "he set his face to go to Jerusalem." Prior to this point in Luke's story, Jesus' public ministry has essentially been localized in the region of Galilee (4.14-9.50). Now the course of Jesus' career moves inexorably to its climax in Jerusalem (19.28-24.53) from where he will ultimately be "received up" into heaven following his death and resurrection (ἀνάλημψις/ἀναλαμβάνω; 9.51a; Acts 1.2, 11, 22).[85] Unlike Matthew and Mark which suggest that Jesus' final journey to Jerusalem takes him from Galilee directly to the territory east of Jordan (Perea) (Matt 19.1-2//Mark 10.1), Luke charts Jesus' initial movement southward into Samaria. More precisely, in Luke's report Jesus sends an advance party to prepare for his coming (and presumably lodging) in a village of the Samaritans (9.52). This

action of the Lucan Jesus goes directly against the stark mandate which Jesus issues his disciples in Matthew's Gospel to "enter no town of the Samaritans" (Matt 10.5b), but it coincides with Jesus' stopover at Sychar while *en route* from Judea to Galilee recorded in John 4. However, Luke and John portray the reaction to Jesus' foray into Samaritan territory very differently. The Johannine Jesus finds a warm reception in Sychar (John 4.39-42), whereas in Luke 9 the Samaritans flatly refuse to host Jesus, "because his face was set toward Jerusalem" (v. 53). Luke evidently takes it for granted that his readers are aware of the historic tensions between Jerusalem-honoring Jews and the Samaritans who looked to Mt. Gerizim as the only true place of worship for the people of God (see more below).[86]

As a further indication of the little love which was lost between Samaritans and Jews, James and John counter the Samaritans' rebuff with a request for Jesus' permission to destroy their village with heavenly fire (9.54). While the appended phrase, "as Elijah did," is not attested in the best manuscripts, it no doubt correctly identifies the source of inspiration for the two disciples' dramatic plea (cf. 2 Kgs 1.9-14; Sir 48.3).[87] Jesus, however, will have no part of such violent retribution. He delivers a general rebuke to James and John (9.55), punctuated according to some ancient witnesses by the explanatory statements: "You do not know what manner of spirit you are of; for the Son of Man came not to destroy men's lives but to save them." J. M. Ross has argued that, irrespective of the omission of these statements in the respected Alexandrian uncials, there are sufficient grounds for postulating their original status within Luke's text.[88] Whether or not Ross has made his case, the disputed expansions in Luke 9.55-56

accurately capture the salvific tenor of the Lucan Jesus' ministry (cf. Luke 19.10).

The scene in Luke 9.51-56 fits well with external reports regarding Samaritan-Jewish conflict in the first century C.E. For example, Josephus relates an episode during the governorship of Coponius (6-9 C.E.) in which a band of Samaritans expressed their contempt for Jewish worship by scattering human bones in the temple precincts at Jerusalem while the Passover festival was underway (*Ant.* 18.29-30). More pertinent, however, to the incident in Luke 9, is Josephus' account of an upheaval in Samaritan-Jewish relations while Cumanus was procurator of Judea, Samaria and Galilee (48-52 C.E.). As a company of Galilean pilgrims were making their way to the feast in Jerusalem, one of their number was murdered in the north Samarian border town of Gema (or Ginae, modern-day Jenin). Naturally this provoked Jewish retaliation. A large contingent of Galileans mobilized for war against the Samaritans, and representatives were dispatched to Cumanus, demanding retribution against those who had perpetrated the murder. Cumanus, however, downplayed the crisis and attended to other affairs. Meanwhile, when news of the Gema incident reached Jerusalem, a mob army quickly formed under the leadership of Eleazar and Alexander, and even though the festival was still in progress, they set out for an area in Samaria near Shechem where they duly "massacred the inhabitants without distinction of age and burned the villages." Both Roman and Jewish authorities eventually intervened in an attempt to quell the uprising. Some of the Jewish brigands were executed, but others continued to wreak havoc all over Samaria. Finally the matter was taken to Caesar who, on the urging of Herod Agrippa, condemned the

Samaritans for their murderous act, executed three of their leading citizens and banished Cumanus for his incompetent handling of the ordeal (*J.W.* 2.232-45; cf. *Ant.* 15.118-36).

The Galilean pilgrimage to Jerusalem through Samaria, the Samaritans' cool reception and the consequent Jewish reprisals--all of these elements are strikingly echoed in Luke 9.51-56. What appears most noteworthy, however, from this comparison is the remarkable moderating spirit of the Lucan Jesus in the face of a potentially explosive situation fuelled by ethnico-religious hatred.[29]

Turning now to consider the function of Luke 9.51-56 in the literary context of Luke's Gospel, we devote our main attention to the parallel which many scholars have observed with the Nazareth-episode in 4.16-30.[30] As Jesus' trek from Galilee to Jerusalem commences with rejection in a Samaritan village, so his earlier ministry within the region of Galilee began with a dismissal from his hometown of Nazareth. And both incidents conclude with the report of Jesus' moving on (πορεύομαι, 4.30; 9.56) to another locale. While most commentators are content to note this basic correspondence between the Samaritans' and Nazarenes' rejections of Jesus and leave it at that, J. T. Sanders has recently contended that there are two critical differences in Luke's treatment of these episodes which must not be minimized. In the first place, Luke acknowledges that the Samaritans had "a reasonable excuse" for their refusal to entertain Jesus, namely, his Jerusalem destination, whereas the Nazarenes are accorded no such alibi. Secondly, while "in Nazareth Jesus threw it in the teeth of his Jewish congregation that God's grace had always gone to Gentiles and not to

Israelites (Luke 4.24-27)," thereby inciting the crowd to kill him, in the case of the inhospitable Samaritan village, "Jesus turns the other cheek. . . . To put the matter as bluntly and plainly as possible, no charge is made against the Samaritans who reject Jesus."[91]

Does Luke in fact mitigate the gravity of the Samaritans' rejection of Jesus, as Sanders thinks? In response to Sanders' first point, it can scarcely be maintained that the Samaritans' snubbing of Jesus is somehow justified in Luke's eyes because, given Jesus' attachment to the Jewish capital, they could not be expected to have responded otherwise. Later in the "travel narrative," a Samaritan appears unperturbed that Jesus is still "on the way to Jerusalem" (17.11), at least not to the extent that it hinders him from receiving Jesus' ministry and worshipping at his feet in thankful praise (17.15-18). Moreover, in Luke's perspective, Jesus' going to Jerusalem is much more than a mere token of "his Jewish behaviour" which the Samaritans would understandably find offensive. As is well known, in Luke's geographical plan Jerusalem is the place of the Messiah's initial revelation (Luke 1-2) and ultimate vindication (Acts 1-2). It is where he is "to be received up" (Luke 9.51), the inevitable goal of his entire mission. Thus for the Samaritans to reject Jesus because his face was fixed toward Jerusalem would represent in Luke's view more than a predictable gesture of ethnic prejudice, but would symbolize as well a serious repudiation of Jesus' Messianic vocation.[92]

Regarding Sanders' second point, there is an apparent difference in intensity between the Nazarenes' and Samaritans' response to Jesus (the former seek to kill Jesus; the latter merely decline to accommodate him)

coupled with a different level of interaction on Jesus' part with his opponents (directly confronts the Nazarenes, never encounters the Samaritans personally). Still it is not true that the Samaritans who refuse to receive Jesus are let off scot-free in Luke's account while the poor Nazarenes are severely judged. To be sure, Jesus resists a violent and vindictive, Elijah-style reply to the Samaritans' action and leaves the door open for their subsequent repentance and salvation, but he does not condone their present behavior nor does he stay around to plead for reconciliation. Rather he turns away from the unfriendly Samaritan village and redirects his mission to other towns and places which may prove more receptive (9.56; 10.1-20).

Some have thought that Luke conceives of ἑτέραν κώμην in 9.56 as "another [Samaritan] village" and that he views the mission of the seventy (-two) in chap. 10--indeed all the events in the "central section" of his Gospel--as taking place in Samaritan territory.[93] But this is far from certain. The geographical data in Luke's "travel report" is sparse and fits together into no coherent itinerary.[94] Generally speaking, Luke seems intent from 9.51 onward simply to direct Jesus' movement toward Jerusalem (cf. 13.22; 17.11; 19.11, 28) without undue regard for plotting a precise course. There are the two pericopae which feature Samaritans in a positive light (10.25-37; 17.11-19) and the enigmatic note in 17.11 that Jesus "was passing along between (διὰ μέσον) Samaria and Galilee,"[95] but these are hardly sufficient grounds for positing a Samaritan setting for the entire account running from 9.51-19.27. As for the location of the villages and towns to which Jesus and his followers proceed immediately after the Samaritans' rejection, we can only speculate, but it would be surprising indeed in Luke's

story for Jesus so soon to court deliberately the disfavor of other Samaritan centers.[96] Moreover, the mention of Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum in 10.13-15, while not settling the matter, would seem to suggest the region around the Sea of Galilee as the principal target area for the itinerant mission of the seventy (-two) disciples. Whatever the locale, an important feature of this mission in Luke's presentation is its symbolic foreshadowing of the gospel's destined outreach to all the seventy (-two) nations of the world (cf. Genesis 10; *1 Enoch* 89.59).[97] Thus Luke appears to envisage the Samaritans' rejection of Jesus in 9.51-56 as a prelude to the eventual expansion of the boundaries of Christ's mission to include Gentiles.[98]

This pattern of rejecting those who reject Jesus and moving on to more receptive peoples <u>is exactly what we find in the Nazareth-episode</u>.[99] Jesus senses that, despite their admiring words, his own people do not fully grasp the significance of his prophetic mission and will ultimately find him unacceptable (Luke 4.22-24). He then associates (by implication) his ministry with events from the careers of Elijah and Elisha which demonstrate that God's prophets have often found truer acceptance outside their homeland among needy foreigners (4.25-27). This is clearly not a case of invoking Elijah as a precedent for harsh reprisals against the Nazarenes, as James and John are inclined to do against the Samaritans.[100] Jesus is no more disposed in Nazareth than in Samaria toward annihilating those who oppose him or barring the door to future conversion.[101] Even when the Nazarenes forcefully attempt to kill him, he quietly escapes without incident (4.28-30). What the Lucan Jesus <u>does</u> intend by the Elijah- (and Elisha-) illustration is

to prefigure the extension of his kingdom beyond the confines of hard-hearted Jews like those in his hometown to incorporate Gentiles who will gladly welcome his message.

In short, in Luke 9.51-56 the Samaritans, though distinguished as the enemies of Jerusalem-honoring Jews, are nonetheless closely identified with them--at least those Jews in Nazareth--as jointly antagonistic to Jesus' person and work. While the way is not irrevocably blocked to their own repentance and salvation, the Samaritans' and Jews' obstinancy has in fact opened the way for an active mission to be launched among the more receptive Gentiles.

Having focused on the Lucan context of Jesus' interaction with the Samaritans in Luke 9.51-56, we now consider briefly the significance of the disciples' role, especially that of James and John, in the same incident. The sending of messengers (ἄγγελοι) ahead of Jesus to make preparation (ἑτοιμάζω) for his arrival is a common phenomenon in Luke's Gospel (10.1; 19.29-30; 22.8), especially reminiscent of the forerunning ministry of John the Baptist (1.17, 76; 3.4; 7.27).[102] We are not told the identity of the messengers whom Jesus dispatches in 9.52, but it is possible that James and John should be included in their number.[103] At any rate, these two disciples are the ones singled out as appealing for fiery judgment against the unreceptive Samaritan village. In addition to recalling the example of Elijah, we should possibly also envisage the disciples' drastic request as a plea for Jesus to fulfill the prediction (of John the Baptist) that he would "baptize with fire" and "burn the chaff with unquenchable fire" (Luke 3.16-17).[104] What James and John fail to realize, however, is that such

activity points to a final, eschatological judgment against unrepentant rebels (cf. Luke 10.12-15, "at that day" [v. 12]) and does not license swift retribution in the present age of grace. This problem of the disciples' misunderstanding of Jesus' mission is scarcely limited to the single scene in 9.52-54. In fact it constitutes a major motif throughout the latter half of Luke 9, connecting the disciples' insensitive response to the Samaritan village with (1) their confusion over Jesus' transfiguration (9.32-36 [Peter, James and John, v. 28]), (2) their faithless inability to heal an afflicted child (9.37-43), (3) their misguided bickering over who was the greatest (9.46-48) and (4) their exclusion of any minister not a member of their circle (9.49-50).[105]

This rather negative profile of Jesus' disciples surrounding their hostile encounter with a group of Samaritans affords an interesting framework for comparing the characterization of Philip the evangelist in Acts 8, featuring his more congenial dealings with the Samaritan nation. Specific implications of such a comparison will be enumerated in the concluding section of this chapter.

3.2 *Two Model Samaritans (Luke 10.25-37; 17.11-19)*

In view of the Samaritans' clear-cut rejection of Jesus in Luke 9.51-56, we are surprised to find that later in the "travel report" two Samaritans--the "good" compassionate traveller in the classic parable (10.25-37) and the "grateful" faith-possessing leper in the well-known miracle story (17.11-19)--are now singled out as paragons of Christian discipleship. Moreover, in both accounts the Samaritan figure is now contrasted with Jews

whose conduct continues to prove deficient in some way. Obviously, then, in the remainder of the "central section" of his Gospel, Luke begins to pull apart the parallelism which he established in the opening scene between Jewish and Samaritan callousness to Jesus' mission and prepare the way for the Samaritans' eventual mass acceptance of Christ under Philip's ministry in Acts 8. At this stage, however, given the limited focus on two isolated, individual Samaritans, there can be no talk as of yet of any wholesale change in Samaritan disposition toward Jesus.

To fill out this general picture of the Samaritans' developing role in Luke's Gospel, we need to analyze the two stories which feature model Samaritans in more detail. In the parable of the Good Samaritan, the story revolves around the dramatic opposition between various responses to a severely wounded traveller lying helpless on the road. On the one hand, two Jewish religious officials negligently "pass by on the other side" (10.31-32); but on the other hand, a Samaritan goes out of his way to assist the victim and nurse him back to health (10.33-35). Though not explicitly stated, the well-known animosity between Samaritans and Jews undoubtedly forms a critical part of the parable's background, creating a "shock effect" on its Jewish hearers.[106] The respected Jewish clerics who would be most expected to fulfill the law of neighborly love fail miserably in their duty, whereas the despised Samaritan demonstrably pursues the righteous course of action. Small wonder that Jesus' interlocutor, a Jewish lawyer, cannot bring himself to admit directly that it was a Samaritan who proved to be the true neighbor. (Rather than say "Samaritan" in 10.37 he uses the circumlocution, "the one who showed mercy on him."[107])

If we can assume that the victim in the parable was a Jew (which seems likely since his identity is not specified beyond the fact that he was "a man" journeying "from Jerusalem to Jericho" [10.30]), then the Samaritan's ministry to him is all the more remarkable. A typical Jewish assessment of the Samaritans' involvement with the Jews may be found in Josephus:

> . . . they [the Samaritans] alter their attitude according to circumstance and, when they see the Jews prospering, call them their kinsmen, on the ground that they are descended from Joseph and are related to them through their origin from him, but, when they see the Jews in trouble, they say that they have nothing whatever in common with them nor do these have any claim of friendship or race, and they declare themselves to be aliens of another race (*Ant.* 9.291).

While this passage is clearly polemical and one-sided, it accurately captures something of the fluctuating nature of Samaritan-Jewish relations in the first century C.E.[108] Certainly it would have been the norm for Samaritans to keep their distance "when they [saw] the Jews in trouble." How radical then for the Lucan Jesus to spotlight a Samaritan who in fact reaches out to a Jew who had fallen into trouble, thus overcoming traditional ethnico-religious barriers.[109]

The apparent literary influence of 2 Chron 28.5-15 on the parable of the Good Samaritan[110] also brings into view the striking reversal of typical social patterns evidenced in the Samaritan's behavior. The basic context of the Chronicler's story was Israel's (Israel=northern kingdom=Samaria) devastating military defeat of her kinsmen in Judah. However, as Israel's triumphant army returned to Samaria with the spoils of war--including thousands of Judean captives--Oded the prophet met them and rebuked their harsh treatment of the people of Judah. Consequently, a Samarian delegation

"took the captives, and with the spoil they clothed all that were naked among them; they clothed them, gave them sandals, provided them with food and drink, and anointed them; and carrying all the feeble among them on asses, they brought them to their kinsfolk at Jericho. . ." (2 Chron 28.15). Thus the very Samarians who had attacked their Judean neighbors turned aboutface and became the agents of healing and restoration. Likewise, the Samaritan in the Lucan parable--though not the cause of the Jewish traveller's misfortune--resists what would have been considered the natural reaction of cold-heartedness on his part toward a bitter enemy and displays outstanding charity instead.

This exceptional nature of the Samaritan's activity in Jesus' parable in Luke 10 provides the key point of contrast with the Samaritan-incident in 9.51-56. In the earlier scene it is only Jesus who overturns conventional attitudes; otherwise, Samaritans and Jews (James and John) remain entrenched in their prejudice toward one another. In the parable, however, a lone Samaritan--sharply distinguished from Jewish personnel--now breaks with tradition and conforms to Jesus' avowed standard and personal example of neighborly love.[11] By so identifying with Jesus' way of life and by bearing, as it were, the marks of Christian discipleship, the "Good Samaritan" is proof positive that individual Samaritans may abandon their initially recalcitrant position toward Jesus and be "converted." And, accordingly, Jesus' merciful refusal to annihilate the Samaritans in 9.55 is thoroughly vindicated.[12]

In the story which recounts the cleansing of the ten lepers, another Samaritan stands out from his Jewish counterparts as one who responds with

sincere devotion to Jesus' mission. In this case the focus is on acknowledging the significance of Jesus' miraculous power rather than on following his teaching and example. At the beginning of the story the afflicted men cry out together, "Jesus, Master (ἐπιστάτα), have mercy on us" (17.13). Ἐπιστάτα is an exlusively Lucan title for Jesus in the New Testament (substituted for διδάσκολος in the Synoptic parallels) and normally is placed on the lips of Jesus' disciples (Luke 5.5; 8.24, 45; 9.33, 49). In the present instance it would seem to reflect a degree of recognition of Jesus' authority on the part of all ten lepers.[113] But as the story goes on it becomes clear that only the Samaritan experiences a deep change of heart as well as physical healing. He alone really "sees" (ἰδών, v. 15) the significance of what has happened to him and "turns back" (ἐπιστρέφω, v. 15) to worship Jesus. The uniqueness and importance of this "returning" is then reinforced in a series of rhetorical questions which Jesus poses to the grateful Samaritan (vv. 17-18, ἐπιστρέφω again in v. 18). Throughout Luke's two-volume work, ἐπιστρέφω customarily designates true repentance and conversion (Luke 1.16, 17; 22.32; Acts 3.19; 9.35; 11.21; 15.19; 26.18, 20; 28.27), and Luke no doubt intends for his readers to understand the Samaritan's experience in just such terms. Accordingly, the Samaritan's action is ultimately assessed as a response of <u>faith</u> (Luke 17.19).[114]

Apart from stressing the reality and depth of the Samaritan's discipleship, the narrative in Luke 17.11-19 also highlights the Samaritan's special ethnic status. The cured leper's thankful return to Jesus is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that "he was a Samaritan" (v. 16b)[115]

or, in other words, a "foreigner" (ἀλλογενής, v. 18). This is the only occurrence of ἀλλογενής (lit. "belonging to another race") in the NT, but the word was used in the famous temple inscription which warned non-Jews of the penalty of trespassing into the inner courts'[116] and appears frequently in the LXX to designate those "aliens" or "strangers" set apart from the people of Israel (e.g. Exod 12.43; 27.33; Joel 3 [4].17; Jer 28 [51].51; Ezek 44.7, 9; 1 Esdr 8.69-93; 9.7-36; 1 Macc 3.36, 45; Jdt 9.2).[117] Thus, from the perspective of early Judaism, an ἀλλογενής was a Gentile outsider.

Are we to conclude, then, along with J. Bowman, that for Luke the Samaritans "represent an essential part of the gentile world?"[118] Certainly the ἀλλογενής label would seem to wreck Jervell's case that in Luke-Acts the Samaritans are regarded as wholly within the Jewish/Israelite camp (though admittedly "they are Jews who have gone astray") and "there is no support in the text for understanding the Samaritans as Gentiles."[119] Jervell recognizes Luke's use of a related term, ἀλλόφυλος, to refer to non-Jews in Peter's speech to Cornelius (Acts 10.28) but thinks that ἀλλογενής is somehow "weaker" in its connotation of separateness from the nation of Israel.[120] However, in two places in the LXX ἀλλογενής and ἀλλόφυλος appear together in synonymous parallelism (Isa 61.5; Zech 9.6), and there is no reason to believe that Luke intends any subtle distinction between the terms.[121]

Also pointing to a Lucan association of the grateful Samaritan with Gentiles is the probable literary connection between the Samaritan leper cleansed by Jesus and the Syrian leper, Naaman, healed by Elisha in the OT story in 2 Kings 5.[122] Both sufferers are cured only as they obey the

prophetic command to "go" (πορεύομαι, Luke 17.14; 4 Kgdms 5.10) and perform some requisite act, and both respond to their healing by "returning" (ἐπιστρέφω, Luke 17.15, 18; 4 Kgdms 5.15; cf. v. 14) to their benefactors to give praise to God. Luke, of course, specifically cites the Naaman-incident in 4.27 as an illustration of Jesus' (and the early church's) projected missionary turn to the Gentiles as a consequence of Jewish resistance to the gospel. Jesus' ministry to the Naaman-like Samaritan ἀλλογενής in 17.11-19 may then represent a first-fruit of this Gentile harvest and may function as a prototype of the flourishing Gentile mission in the book of Acts.[123] If this is the case, a notable shift has occurred in the role of the Samaritans within Luke's narrative. In 9.51-56 the Samaritans mirrored the Jews in Nazareth as fellow-rejectors of Jesus' mission who by their rejection opened the way for a successful outreach to the Gentiles. Now in 17.11-19 a Samaritan switches sides, so to speak, and himself takes on the part of one of those anticipated Gentile converts.

Having acknowledged, however, this "Gentile"-identity of the grateful Samaritan in Luke's miracle story, we cannot leave the matter at that. For despite his "foreign" status the Samaritan leper still attends to Mosaic requirements of purification along with his nine Jewish companions,[124] just as the good Samaritan in the parable displayed outstanding obedience to the love-command from Leviticus 19. This persisting "Jewish"-characterization of the Samaritans alongside the ἀλλογενής-reference in 17.18 suggests that we should properly classify the Samaritans in Luke's presentation as a kind of median social group, a *tertium genus*, neither fully Jewish nor fully Gentile, but manifesting partial affinity with both peoples.[125] In this we

agree with J. T. Sanders who associates the Samaritans in Luke-Acts with other "twilight" figures on the periphery of Judaism, such as tax collectors, "sinners" and "God-fearers."[126] However, we would not follow Sanders in placing proselytes in this marginal realm (since they should be regarded as Gentiles who have become full Jews) nor would we so completely identify the Samaritans with other Jewish peripheral groups as to ignore prevailing distinctions between them in Luke's portrayal[127] (for example, the Samaritans initially reject Jesus, while the religious outcasts and "God-fearers" always prove receptive).

This ambiguous status of the Samaritans in Luke-Acts is consistent with certain early Jewish conceptions.[128] We have already cited Josephus' contention that the Samaritans could make themselves out to be either the Jews' "kinsmen" or "aliens of another race" (*Ant.* 9.291). Along the same vacillating lines, Josephus in another place conceives of the Samaritans as "apostates from the Jewish nation" who still "profess themselves Jews" when the situation is convenient (*Ant.* 11.340-41), but he also frequently identifies the Samaritans with the pagan "Cutheans" (cf. 2 Kgs 17.24) imported to settle the northern kingdom of Israel after the Assyrian conquest (*J. W.* 1.63; *Ant.* 9.288-90; 10.184; 11.19, 20, 88, 302; 13.225) and in one place calls them "the Sidonians in Shechem" who formally requested of Antiochus IV that their Gerizim temple be renamed Zeus Hellenios (*Ant* 12.257-64).[129]

In the Mishnah[130] we likewise encounter a consistent designation of the Samaritans as "Kuthim" (=Josephus' "Cutheans") and other pejorative intimations of their pagan pedigree. R. Eliezer, for example, refers in one

place to the Samaritans' "doubtful stock" (*m. Qidd.* 4.3) and in another compares anyone who eats their bread "to one who eats the flesh of swine" (*m. Seb.* 8.10). In a similar vein, the Samaritans are jointly categorized with the Gentiles as groups whose sin- and guilt-offerings as well as payments of the temple tax will flatly be refused (*m. Seqal.* 1.5). However, on other occasions the Samaritans are clearly associated with the people of Israel, as in a passage which stipulates that the practice of reciting the Common Grace when at least three Israelites eat together still applies when one member of the party is a Samaritan (*m. Ber.* 7.1; cf. 8.8; *m. Dem.* 3.4; *m. Ned.* 3.10). On the whole, this mixed evaluation of the Samaritans in the Mishnah is not far from what we find in the opening paragraph of *Masseket Kutim*, the later Talmudic tractate entirely given over to the Samaritan question: "The usages of the Samaritans are in part like those of the Gentiles, in part like those of Israel, but mostly like Israel."[131]

3.3 *Christ's Commission to Witness in Samaria (Acts 1.8)*

The next stage in Luke's presentation of Samaria/Samaritans comes in the opening chapter of Acts when the resurrected Christ commissions his apostles to bear witness to him throughout the province of Samaria (1.8). This commission, which obviously sets the stage for the successful Samaritan mission in Acts 8, also relates back and moves beyond the situation in Luke's Gospel at a number of points. Once again Jesus is sending his disciples into Samaritan territory, as in Luke 9.52, and once again the Elijah-motif figures prominently. The charge to preach in Samaria comes on the very day that Christ is "taken up" into heaven, as Elijah was (ἀναλαμβάνω, Acts 1.2, 11;

4 Kgdms 2.9, 10, 11; cf. ἀνάλημψις, Luke 9.51), and the apostles are promised a special endowment of the Spirit, just as Elisha received from the ascending Elijah (4 Kgdms 2.9-15), to enable them to carry out their mission effectively. At last James and John can look forward to wielding the power of Elijah in Samaria, but unto salvation rather than destruction. In comparison with the circumstance in Luke 17, where a lone Samaritan initially seeks out and then returns to Jesus, in Acts 1.8 Christ now authorizes an active mission <u>to</u> Samaria designed to reach <u>all</u> the region (ἐν πάσῃ. . . Σαμαρείᾳ).

The significance of Samaria--the land of the Samaritans[132]--continues to relate to its intermediate position between Jewish and Gentile areas, that is, between Judea--the land of the Jews[133]--and the ends of the earth. It is true that in Acts 1.8 Samaria is grammatically linked most closely with Judea, no doubt because of the geographical proximity of the two regions and their intertwined political histories. But in Luke's schema of the gospel's expansion beyond Jerusalem, "Judea and Samaria" should still be regarded as distinct entities and not simply lumped together as signifying Jewish Palestine. For in addition to its association with Judea (also 8.1 and 9.31 [including Galilee]), Samaria is also characterized in the book of Acts as a partner with Phoenicia in gladly approving Paul's Gentile mission at a time when some of the brethren in Judea were teaching otherwise (15.1-3).[134]

3.4 *Shechem in the Stephen Speech (Acts 7.15-16)*

In the last twenty years or so considerable attention has been devoted to the study of supposed Samaritan traditions within the Stephen speech.[135]

A number of scholars have detected widespread Samaritan influence within the Acts 7 discourse, leading to a variety of hypotheses concerning the origins of Stephen and the speech attributed to him. A. Spiro contends that Stephen actually was a Samaritan, following a tradition preserved by the fourteenth century Samaritan chronicler, Abul Fath.[136] M. H. Scharlemann thinks that Stephen was an idiosyncratic Jew "strongly influenced by an acquaintance with Samaritan concepts and expectations," possibly obtained at a place like Ephraim.[137] C. H. H. Scobie suggests that Stephen and his circle were "representatives of some type of Palestinian sectarian Judaism (Northern? Galilean?), with little use for the Jerusalem cult, and possibly with certain contacts with and sympathies for Samaritanism," and along with R. Scroggs views the Acts 7 speech as the product (in large measure) of the Christian mission in Samaria conducted by the Stephen-Philip group.[138] O. Cullmann identifies Stephen and his followers with the Hellenists of Acts 6.1 and regards them as "heterodox" Jews with theological links to both the Samaritans and the Qumran community.[139] Finally, and most eccentrically, L. Gaston speculates that Stephen was originally a member of a pre-Christian, Samaritan baptist sect known as the Nasarenes, some of whose ideas were later picked up by the Ebionites.[140]

Our concern is not to settle this debate regarding the pre-Lucan history of Stephen and his speech but to evaluate the validity of the basic thesis that the material in Acts 7--in its present form--reflects a pervasive Samaritan background and to determine the significance of any Samaritan associations upon Luke's overall presentation.[141] Our ultimate aim, of course, is specifically to correlate possible Samaritan elements

within the Stephen speech in Acts 7 with the adjoining portrayal of Philip's Samaritan mission in Acts 8.

We must be alert from the start to at least two major difficulties confronting any analysis of alleged Samaritanisms in the Stephen speech. First, there is the familiar religious-historical problem of dating. With the exception of the Samaritan Pentateuch (hereafter SP), finalized by the first century B.C.E., all extant Samaritan literature dates from no earlier than the fourth century C.E.[142] Thus the evidence with which to compare Samaritan thought and a first century literary piece like the Stephen speech is slim indeed. Secondly, we have the problem of distinctiveness. To prove a specifically Samaritan tendency within the Acts 7 discourse, we must isolate elements of unique Samaritan character not shared by other Jewish traditions. This "dissimilarity" criterion greatly weakens the claims of Samaritan influence based on several textual affinities between the Acts 7 usage of the OT and the SP against the MT and the LXX.[143] For instance, the peculiar chronology of the Abraham narrative shared by the SP and Acts 7.4 is also reflected in Philo (*Mig. Abr.* 177), who was scarcely dependent on Samaritan ideas, and the correspondence between the SP and Acts 7.37 in the use of the prophet-like-Moses motif from Deueronomy 18 is paralleled in the Qumran literature (4QTestim 175; 4QBibPara 158).[144] Moreover, modern text-critical studies in the light of the Dead Sea discoveries have shown the SP to be but one representative of an expansionist Palestinian (non-Masoretic) text-type which developed through the Persian and Hellenistic eras. This means that SP variants from the MT and LXX are not necessarily Samaritan glosses but may reflect readings shared by a number of other texts (Hebrew or Greek) within

the same "family." Only those passages which manifestly represent sectarian Samaritan additions stemming from the period of the final SP recension in the second/first century B.C.E. can lay claim to an unmistakeably Samaritan provenance.[145]

On the basis of these religious-historical and text-critical observations, much of the "cumulative"[146] evidence which has been marshalled for the Samaritan coloring of the Stephen speech proves suspect. But all is not lost. We are not completely in the dark regarding distinctive Samaritan theology in the first century. In particular, we know of one foundational tenet of earliest Samaritan belief at odds with the rest of Judaism which could have been exploited in the Acts 7 discourse: the veneration of Mt. Gerizim/Shechem as the one true sanctuary of Israel's God.

The rebuilding of the ancient site of Shechem as the new religious and cultural headquarters of Samaritan society and the construction of a Samaritan temple on nearby Mt. Gerizim date back to the late fourth century B.C.E.[147] At first this action need not have caused a serious rift with Jerusalem-based Judaism, since other Jewish worship centers were tolerated outside the Holy City. The Tobiads, for example, had their own temple and cult in Transjordan, as did the Egyptian Jews in Leontopolis under the leadership of the high priest, Onias IV, who had been forced to leave Jerusalem.[148] Eventually, however, as tensions between Jews and Samaritans heightened, the respective temples on Mt. Zion and Mt. Gerizim began to be viewed as rival places of Yahweh-worship. "In the presence of Ptolemy himself," so Josephus reports, a dispute erupted between the two religious parties concerning the validity of their temples, "the Jews asserting that it

was the temple at Jerusalem which had been built in accordance with the laws of Moses, and the Samaritans that it was the temple on Mt. Gerizim" (*Ant.* 13.74-79; cf. 12.6-10).

Certainly by the Hasmonean period, the temple issue was a bitter dividing point between Jews and Samaritans, sometimes precipitating violent action. In 128 B.C.E. John Hyrcanus razed the temple on Mt. Gerizim, and by the end of the century he had brutally destroyed the cities of Samaria and Shechem and brought the entire Samarian province under his authority. Around the same time, the Samaritans edited their peculiar version of the Pentateuch and included in this recension an important addition to the Decalogue material in Exodus (the so-called "Samaritan Tenth Commandment"), extolling Mt. Gerizim/Shechem as the only true place of worship ordained by God.

> And when the Lord your God brings you into the land of the Canaanites which you are entering to take possession of it [Deut 11.29], you shall set up these stones. . . . And when you have passed over the Jordan, you shall set up these stones, concerning which I command you this day, on Mt. Gerizim. And there you shall build an altar to the Lord your God [Deut 27.2-6]. . . . That mountain is beyond the Jordan. . . beside the oak of Moreh in front of Shechem [Deut 11.30].[149]

In the citations from Deuteronomy utilized in this expansion, there are significant divergences from the MT. The reference to Mt. Gerizim from Deut 27.4 marks a change from the MT's "Mt. Ebal," and the location of Moreh in proximity to Shechem is a pure addition to Deut 11.30. Such alterations are consistent with the SP's repeated tendency to read "the place which the Lord your God has chosen (*bhr*)"--meaning Shechem--instead of "the place which the Lord your God will choose (*ybhr*)" (MT)--meaning Jerusalem.[150]

That this jealousy for the primacy of their respective holy sites continued to characterize Jewish and Samaritan convictions in the first century C.E. is confirmed by the provocations at Jerusalem and Gema mentioned above in connection with the incident in Luke 9.51-56 and by the frank assessment of the Samaritan woman in the Fourth Gospel: "Our fathers worshiped on this mountain [Gerizim]; and you say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship" (John 4.20).

Granting the currency of a unique Samaritan devotion to Mt. Gerizim/Shechem in Luke's day, is there any evidence that Acts 7 reflects an awareness of such a belief? Scobie has advanced the thesis that in fact "the theme of Shechem as the site of the one true sanctuary. . . gives the historical section of Acts 7 a remarkable and hitherto underlying unity."[151] He finds a tendency to exalt Shechem associated with each of main historical figures from Israel's past featured in the Stephen speech: Abraham, Joseph and Moses. However, in the first and last of these examples, Scobie's case appears weak.

In the description of Abraham's encounters with God (7.2-8), an allusion to Exod 3.12 intrudes which originally concerned God's dealings with Moses.

Exod 3.12

> when you [Moses] have brought forth the people out of Egypt, you shall serve God upon this mountain (λατρεύσετε τῷ θεῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ)

Acts 7.7b

> and after that they shall come out and worship me in this place (λατρούσουσίν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ)

The shift in the Acts 7 text from Moses to Abraham and from "this mountain" to "this place" suggests to Scobie a further allusion to God's promise to Abraham revealed at "the place (τόπος) at Shechem" that his descendants would possess the land of Canaan (Gen 12.6-7). Through this conflation of OT texts the Stephen speech supposedly stresses the divinely ordained preeminence of Shechem for Abraham as the chief center of worship.[152]

While a Shechem allusion is possible here, it is not likely. Too great a burden falls on the lone lexical parallel (τόπος) between Acts 7.7b and Gen 12.6.[153] Moreover, in the Lucan context, "this place" seems to refer to the temple at Jerusalem (οὗτος τόπος, Acts 6.13, 14; 21.28 [2x]), not Shechem,[154] though in the Stephen speech the Jerusalem shrine is not the only or even primary τόπος where God manifests himself (7.33, 49). And finally, while there are echoes of Gen 12.1-7 in the Abraham section of the Acts 7 discourse, the principal OT source for vv. 6-7 (which include the allusion to Exod 3.12) is Gen 15.13-14, not Gen 12.6-7.[155]

From the lengthy Moses section of the Stephen speech (Acts 7.17-44), Scobie focuses upon the great prophet's role in constructing and transporting the tabernacle in the wilderness (7.44). The "tent" then becomes a major theme in the final verses of the discourse, forming the center of Israel's worship from the time of the conquest under Joshua up to "the days of David" (7.45), until it was tragically displaced by the idolatrous Solomonic temple, "made with hands" (7.47-48). Scobie contends that this pro-tabernacle/anti-temple position reflects Samaritan tradition exalting Shechem/Mt. Gerizim. More specifically, he thinks that the reference to Joshua's bringing of the tabernacle into the promised land (7.45) would trigger memories of the cultic

ceremony carried out on Mt. Ebal and Mt. Gerizim (Josh 8.30-35; cf. Deut 27.4-12) and that the hostile stance toward Solomon and the Jerusalem temple coincides with Samaritan commitment to the exclusivity of the Gerizim temple.[156]

But nothing in Acts 7.45 explicitly points to the Ebal/Gerizim ritual or to worship at all. If a worship setting is to be recalled, why not the ceremonies at Gilgal?[157] Most importantly, it must be appreciated that the anti-temple remarks of the Stephen speech apply to <u>all</u> man-made houses of worship, including the Gerizim temple. To solve this difficulty, Scobie resorts to a theory that the speech's radical spiritualizing of worship stems from Christian redaction of a Samaritan source, but unless one is already predisposed to seeing an underlying Samaritan source, no clear clues emerge from the speech as it stands to suggest any layering of different views toward sacrifice and temple. In any event, our concern is with the final Lucan form of Acts 7 where the accent falls on the universality of God's presence.

Considering now the <u>Joseph</u> material in Acts 7, we find Scobie's analysis more persuasive.[158] In 7.15-16 we encounter a double-reference to Shechem (the only explicit referrals to the place throughout the Stephen discourse) in an unusual context.

> and Jacob went down into Egypt. And he died, himself and our fathers, and they were carried back to <u>Shechem</u> and laid in the tomb that Abraham had bought for a sum of silver from the sons of Hamor in <u>Shechem</u>.

The subject of μετετέθησαν and ἐτέθησαν in 7.16 is ambiguous but would seem to refer to all who had died in Egypt according to v. 15, Jacob as well

as his sons ("our fathers").[159] These venerable patriarchs are all said to be buried at Shechem in a tomb originally purchased by Abraham from the Hamorites. Such information noticeably conflicts with other ancient Jewish reports concerning Israel's heroes of the past. Gen 50.13 locates Jacob's tomb in the cave of Machpelah in Hebron originally bought by Abraham from Ephron the Hittite after Sarah's death (cf. Genesis 23). In Gen 33.19 we read that it was Jacob who purchased the piece of ground in Shechem from the sons of Hamor, and Josh 24.32 discloses that the bones of Joseph were brought up from Egypt and buried in this plot. Regarding the burial place of Jacob's remaining eleven sons, the OT is silent, but extra-canonical accounts mention the Machpelah site in Hebron (*Jub.* 46.9; *T. Reub.* 7.2; *T. Levi* 19.5; *T. Judah* 26.4; Jos. *Ant.* 2.199; *J.W.* 4.532).

How then do we evaluate Acts 7.15-16 in relation to these mixed Jewish traditions? It seems impossible to harmonize the various accounts,[160] given their black-and-white differences in historical details, and the verdict that the Acts passage simply reflects an unwitting confusion of the evidence[161] seems unlikely, certainly on Luke's part, in view of his characteristically deft handling of a wide range of OT material in the Acts 7 discourse as a whole and throughout his two-volume work.[162] In short, at least on a Lucan level, we should expect that some conscious purpose lay behind the distinctive connection of Abraham, Jacob and all twelve of his sons with a piece of property in Shechem. And we can reasonably conclude that this purpose had something to do with the Samaritans, given Shechem's notorious reputation in early Judaism as the center of Samaritan life and Luke's general interest in the Samaritan people. Scobie and others have surmised

that Acts 7.15-16 was in fact dependent on a local Samaritan tradition.[163] This is a plausible assumption, but it must be admitted that the only external support for such a tradition derives exclusively from Christian witnesses which date from the third century.[164]

Accepting that in Acts 7.15-16 Luke intended to evoke familiar Samaritan resonances associated with Shechem, we have another piece to fit into the puzzle of the overall portrayal of the Samaritans in Luke-Acts. Once again we find Luke swimming against the tide of prevailing Jewish opinion on the Samaritan question. For not only does the exaltation of Shechem in Acts 7 as the hallowed patriarchal burial site not give Hebron its due, it also runs counter to an anti-Samaritan polemical strain within Hellenistic Jewish literature which vilifies the city of Shechem and its inhabitants. In what is commonly recognized as the earliest unequivocal reference to the Samaritans, ben Sira speaks opprobriously about "the foolish people that dwell in Shechem" who comprise "no nation (ἔθνος)" (Sir 50.25-26; cf. Deut 32.21).[165] Treatments of Genesis 34 in intertestamental literature portray the Shechemite defilers of Dinah, the daughter of Israel, in a particularly unfavorable light, intensifying the wickedness of their deeds, prohibiting Jewish intercourse with them and at times omitting all reference to their circumcision (T. Levi 5-7; Jdt 9.2-4; cf. 5.16; *Jub.* 30; Theodotus, Jos. *Ant.* 1.337-40). There is some doubt as to the intended contemporary targets of these anti-Shechemite references, but the Samaritans, with their historic attachment to Shechem, seem the most likely candidates.[166] Certainly the announcement--"for from this day forward Shechem be called a city of imbeciles" (*T. Levi* 7.2)--strikes one as an

obvious slur against the Samaritans along the lines of the Sirach-text cited above. Moreover, it hardly commends Shechem as a suitable final resting place for Israel's fathers, as Luke understands it. Criticism of the Samaritans' veneration of Shechem may also be glimpsed in Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*. H. Cadbury detects within this work "a varied and interesting anti-Samaritan technique. It abbreviates or re-locates the episodes which the Bible had placed in Shechem and other northern localities, or it reports them in speeches rather than in narrative, and thus escapes the necessity of any geographical location."[167] Interestingly, far from truncating and minimizing the OT's presentation of Shechem, Luke elaborates and accentuates it.

Apart from noting that Acts 7.15-16 provides another example of Luke's generally positive attitude toward the Samaritans, we can gain further insight into this passage's treatment of the Samaritans (Shechemites) by examining its function in the context of the entire Stephen speech. In the opening Abraham-section (7.2-8), which sets the tone for the rest of the discourse,[168] an emphasis falls on Abraham's loose connection to the promised land. He received his initial revelation of God "when he was in Mesopotamia, before he lived in Haran" (7.2).[169] He was eventually brought into "this land" of Canaan (7.4) and promised that his descendants would possess it and worship God within it (7.5, 7); "yet [God] gave him no inheritance in it, not even a foot's length" (7.5a) and announced that before settling in the promised land Abraham's "posterity would be aliens (πάροικον) in a land belonging to others" (7.6). Once established, this motif of the *Relativierung des heiligen Landes* runs throughout the balance of the Stephen speech[170] in

conjunction with the equally prominent theme of Israel's rejection of her prophets.[171] Joseph was rejected by "the patriarchs," his brothers, and sold into slavery in Egypt, but throughout all his afflictions in a foreign land, "God was with him" (7.9-10). Moses heard the call of God in Egypt to deliver his people from bondage, but his countrymen spurned his leadership and forced him into "exile (πάροικος) in the land of Midian" (7.29; cf. v. 35). Even here, however, Moses found himself on "holy ground" where God miraculously manifested his presence (7.30-33). After the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, God continued to direct Moses in the wilderness on the way to the promised land, and the people of Israel continued to resist his ministry (7.38-42). A movable "tent of witness" was established as the authorized "pattern" for the worship of the omnipresent God, but Israel eventually opted exclusively for a fixed, man-made sanctuary which served their narrow, nationalistic interests rather than the universal glory of the Most High God (7.44-50). Finally, at the climax of the Stephen speech, the contemporary relevance of this historical survey is made plain: as Israel in the past had repeatedly resisted the will of God revealed through his messengers, so Israel's descendants, the Jews, have recently betrayed and murdered the Righteous One, Jesus (7.51-52).

Slotting into this thematic pattern of the Acts 7 discourse, Shechem in v. 16 represents another piece of foreign territory (outside the Jewish promised land) where Israel's leaders were welcomed,[172] and the foreign residents of Shechem (the sons of Hamor) who received the bones of these men of God stand in contrast to the obstinate people of Israel. A certain pathos may mark Luke's presentation at this point: even in death Israel's

fathers found a home only among the alien Shechemites.[173] If we then regard the reception of God's prophets by Shechem/Shechemites as prototypical of the reception of Jesus and the gospel by Samaria/Samaritans and antitypical of the rejection of the same by Jerusalem/Jews, the following points may be made in relation to Luke's story thus far:

(1) The parallelism between the Jews and Samaritans in their repudiations of Jesus' mission in Luke 4.16-30 and 9.51-56 has been further broken apart.

(2) While in one sense affirming a Jewish heritage for the Samaritans going back to the days of Abraham and perpetuated in the gravesites of Jacob and the twelve patriarchs in Shechem, the material in Acts 7 primarily underscores the role of the Samaritans as exemplary ἀλλογενεῖς (cf. Luke 17.18), citizens of a foreign country who proved more receptive to God's prophets than their Jewish neighbors.

(3) Historical precedent is established for the fulfilling of Christ's world-wide mission announced in Acts 1.8. As God has never been bound to a single locale and as his witnesses have always been on the move beyond the confines of the promised land into foreign territories like Shechem, so the Spirit of Christ cannot be chained in one place but will empower Christ's witnesses to go out from Jerusalem and carry the gospel to all the nations of the earth, including Samaria.

3.5 *Conclusion: Philip's Samaritan Mission in Lucan Perspective*

Having sketched the main contours of Luke's depiction of Samaria/Samaritans up through Acts 7, we are at last in a position to

correlate this portrayal at a number of points with Philip's Samaritan mission in Acts 8.

(1) On several occasions we have compared and contrasted Luke's story of Samaria/Samaritans with external accounts in Jewish literature of the period, especially Josephus' *Antiquities*. Once again an interesting parallel may be drawn.[174] Concluding Josephus' report of Alexander the Great's conquest of Palestine, there is this snippet:

> When Alexander died, his empire was partitioned among his successors (the Diadochi); as for the temple on Mount Garizein, it remained. And, whenever anyone was accused by the people of Jerusalem of eating unclean food or violating the Sabbath or committing any other such sin, he would flee to the Shechemites, saying that he had been unjustly expelled (*Ant.* 11.346-47).

The historical reliability of this passage is admittedly uncertain. The association of the Samaritans with antinomian renegades from "orthodox" Judaism based in Jerusalem fits too closely with Josephus' polemical appraisal of the Samaritans as "apostates from the Jewish nation" (*Ant.* 11.340) and does not square with the Samaritans' reputation for conservative adherence to the Pentateuch (their only Scriptures).[175] Nevertheless, there likely were some examples continuing into Josephus' day of Jews ostracized from Jerusalem (for whatever reason) who found temporary refuge among the Samaritans, if only because Samaria was nearby and the Samaritans would have doubtless had some sympathy for anyone at odds with Jerusalem.

In any event, it is striking how the scenario in Acts 6-8 coincides with Josephus' report. On account of the persecution arising over Stephen's alleged invective against the Mosaic law and the temple (6.11-14), some members of the Jewish Christian community in Jerusalem are expelled from the

Holy City and flee to Samaria (8.1); notable among these is Philip the evangelist who receives an especially warm welcome from the Samaritan people (8.5-13). However, while recounting similar events pertaining to Jewish-Samaritan relations, Luke and Josephus once again stand at opposite poles in terms of their implicit commentary on these events. Far from effectively censuring the Samaritans for harboring fugitives from Jewish law, as Josephus does, Luke regards the Jerusalem authorities who oppose Stephen and force the exodus of Philip to Samaria as "stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, . . . always resist[ing] the Holy Spirit" and typical of those "who received the law as delivered by angels and did not keep it" (7.51, 53). Conversely, the Samaritans who "gave heed" to Philip and his ministry are commended as those who "received the word of God" (8.14).

(2) A well-known feature of Luke's two-volume work is the wide-ranging tendency to parallel the activities of Jesus of Nazareth before his death with those of his disciples in the book of Acts after his resurrection.[176] In this way the early church is presented as continuing the redemptive work which Jesus began. In our earlier analysis of Luke's portrayal of Philip's ministry in Samaria, we noticed several contact points with the words and deeds of the earthly Jesus in Luke's Gospel. But without question the most dramatic and significant illustration of the correspondence between Philip and Jesus pertains to their common interaction with the Samaritans.

An important aspect of this particular link between Philip and Jesus is its contrastive as well as comparative dimension. Recalling our discussion of Luke 9.51-56, we noted that Jesus was turned away when he endeavored to

enter a Samaritan village on his way to Jerusalem and that this episode mirrored Jesus' experience in his hometown of Nazareth where the Jews "put him out of the city" and sought to kill him (Luke 4.29). While Philip in Acts 8 identifies with Jesus' Nazareth-ordeal in that he is expelled from his city of residence on account of Jewish rejection of Christ and his messengers, Philip totally reverses Jesus' encounter with the Samaritans. For Philip, now moving away from Jerusalem, successfully enters a Samaritan city, indeed "the [τὴν][177] city of Samaria," and receives a grand reception from its multitude of citizens for his proclamation of the good news of Jesus Christ. Clearly the partnership initially established by Luke between Jews and Samaritans in their rejection of Jesus' mission, which already showed signs of breaking apart later in Luke's Gospel, is thoroughly shattered in Acts 8. For Philip's part, by returning to a people who had formerly wanted nothing to do with Jesus and winning them to faith in Christ as well as ministering to their physical and psychological needs, the evangelist to the Samaritans pursues a ministry of reconciliation and demonstrates a persevering commitment to seek and to save that which is lost.[178]

(3) In comparing the report of Philip's Samaritan mission with the two incidents featuring model Samaritans in Luke's Gospel, we notice a basic correspondence in their presentations of admirable Samaritan response to the person and message of Christ. In relation to the story of the grateful Samaritan in Luke 17.11-19, the affinity extends to various details. When the Samaritan leper "sees" that he has been miraculously healed of his infirmity by Jesus, he responds with heartfelt praise and thanksgiving to God, thereby giving evidence of his personal "faith" (πίστις). Likewise the

Samaritans in the Philip-story "see" the great signs of healing being performed in their midst (Acts 8.6-7), burst forth with "much joy" (8.8) and "believe" (πιστεύω) the message which Philip has proclaimed.

While affirming a fundamental parallel between the responses of the Samaritan disciples depicted in Luke's Gospel and Acts 8, we must also acknowledge a marked distinction in the extent of that response. In the case of the parable of the Good Samaritan and the story of the Samaritan leper's cleansing, we encounter only two isolated Samaritans in border areas around Samaria (near Jericho?/"between Samaria and Galilee"), whereas in Acts 8 we discover "the multitudes" in the heart of Samaritan territory embracing the gospel of Christ and "many" receiving miraculous healings and deliverances. The only exceptional Samaritan now is Simon Magus, who stands out from the crowd as the sole example of insincere, self-centered attraction to Christ. As such he provides something of an antitype to the two exceptional Samaritans in Luke's Gospel distinguished for their exemplary "Christian" behavior.[179]

(4) Philip's ministry to the Samaritans may be related in Luke's story not only to Jesus' interaction with the same people but also to the apostles' involvement. Philip's willingness to preach the gospel and work beneficent wonders among the Samaritans stands in obvious contrast to the rash request of James and John in Luke 9.54 that the Samaritans be destroyed. It is interesting, too, that Philip, who is not a member of the restricted apostolic circle in Luke's view and yet who exorcises unclean spirits and proclaims the name of Jesus Christ in Samaria, is typical of the independent missionary reprimanded by John immediately before the Samaritan episode in Luke 9.49:

"Master, we saw a man casting out demons in your name, and we forbade him, because he does not follow with us." The Lucan Jesus sharply rebukes this attitude (9.50), just as he does the following plea for the Samaritans' annihilation (9.55), and thus, in a sense, legitimates Philip's Samaritan mission in Acts 8.

Fulfilling the commission of the resurrected Christ in Acts 1.8 addressed to the eleven apostles, Peter and John eventually make their way to Samaria in 8.14-25 and make a significant contribution to the Samaritan mission. (John's presence on the scene to assist in calling down the "fire" of the Holy Spirit, not of judgment, upon the Samaritans marks a decided change in his attitude.) But in Luke's account it is still Philip the evangelist, not one of the apostles, who inaugurates the Samaritan mission and indeed makes the first missionary breakthrough beyond Jerusalem.

In short, alongside Luke's tendency to exalt the Jerusalem apostles, he allows them to be "upstaged" in some respects by an independent evangelist like Philip. A fuller assessment of the relationship between Philip and the apostles (especially Peter), as Luke conceives it, will be the focus of a subsequent chapter.

(5) While Philip's Samaritan mission generally fulfills the Lucan plan for the gospel's extension to the <u>region</u> (χώρα) of Samaria (cf. Acts 8.1, 14), more specifically the *locus* of Philip's work is "the <u>city</u> (πόλις) of Samaria" (8.5a). Exactly which city in Samaria Luke refers to here is difficult to determine, not least because the ancient city called "Samaria" no longer existed as such in Luke's day, having been rebuilt as a Hellenistic *polis* and renamed by Herod the Great as Sebaste in honor of Caesar Augustus.

Probably we should conclude, along with Hengel, that εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας simply reflects the setting of Philip's ministry within "a Samaritan 'capital' the name of which Luke either no longer knew or left out as being unimportant."[180]

At any rate, the allusion to a principal Samaritan center connected with Philip's ministry in Acts 8 recalls the mention of Shechem in the Stephen speech in the preceding chapter.[181] As noted in the discussion above, the Shechem-reference in the context of the larger Acts 7 discourse typifies foreign--in this case, Samaritan--territory where God's prophets of old were welcomed after suffering rejection from their own people. Now in Acts 8 the point is reinforced and brought up to date with the situation in the early church. Philip the evangelist, a contemporary prophet of the kingdom of God, is driven out of the Jewish capital on account of persecution and takes his message to the Samaritan capital where he finds an enthusiastic reception.[182]

(6) In order to evaluate properly the significance in Luke's estimation of Philip's achievement in evangelizing the Samaritans, we must ascertain the social status of this particular ethnico-religious group, as presented in Acts 8. We have observed thus far in Luke's narrative that the Samaritans occupy a kind of middle ground between Jews and Gentiles. They share part of the Jews' religious heritage but at the same time are at variance with the mainstream of Judaism based in Jerusalem and may even be conceived at times as pure outsiders, foreigners (ἀλλογενεῖς), on a par with the Gentiles. In Acts 8 the reference to the ἔθνος of Samaria (v. 9, in connection with Simon Magus) would seem to suggest a race of people distinct

from the Jews and constituent of the Gentile nationalities of the world to whom the gospel of Christ is to be preached (cf. Luke 24.47; ἔθνη=Gentiles in Luke 2.32; 12.30; 21.24; Acts 4.25, 27; 9.15; 10.45; 11.1, 18; 26.23; 28.28). Moreover, the fact that Philip's Samaritan mission comes as a direct result of the Jerusalem Jews' rejection of the Christian message suggests that it represents a move away from Judaism and in the direction of the Gentiles, following the pattern established in Luke-Acts as early as the Nazareth-pericope in Luke 4.24-27. Nevertheless, the persisting connection of Samaria with Judea in 8.1 and 9.31, the emphasis on Philip's preaching "the Christ" and the fact that the Samaritans' conversion, baptism and reception of the Spirit does not provoke an uproar in the Jerusalem Christian community--as does the Cornelius incident and Paul's Gentile mission later in the book of Acts (chaps. 11, 15)--restrain us from thinking that Luke fully equates the Samaritans with the Gentiles in Acts 8.

So once again the Samaritans must be viewed as slotting into an intermediate social category in Luke's presentation. The most, then, that can be said about Philip's missionary achievement at this stage is that it represents a breakthrough beyond the confines of Jerusalem-honoring Judaism but falls short of a clear-cut incursion into the ranks of the Gentiles. Further clarification of this ambiguous relationship between Philip's Samaritan mission and both the Jewish and Gentile missions of the early church will be offered in our chapter on Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch.

(7) Finally, as Jesus' sending of messengers into a Samaritan village in Luke 9.52 runs directly counter to Matt 10.5b, so does Philip's evangelization of the city of Samaria in Acts 8.5.[163] Whereas in the

Matthean reference, the disciples' receive Jesus' mandate--εἰς πόλιν Σαμαριτῶν μὴ εἰσέλθητε--in Luke's story of the early church's mission we find Philip--κατελθὼν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας. Moreover, the ministry which the disciples are commissioned to fulfill in Matthew 10 exclusively among the lost sheep of the house of Israel--preach the kingdom, heal the sick, cast out demons (Matt 10.7-8)--is precisely the ministry which Philip performs among the Samaritans (cf. Acts 8.5-8, 12-13).

It is possible that Luke was embroiled in some kind of controversy over the legitimacy of the early church's Samaritan mission with certain Jewish-Christian circles advocating a restrictive position like that which lay behind Matt 10.5b. (This position should not be equated with Matthew's overall theology, since by the end of his Gospel a universal Christian mission is envisaged [28.16-20; cf. 4.12-16; 8.10-12; 15.21-28].) If such were the case, a calculated apologetic purpose may underlie the association of Philip's outreach among the Samaritans in Luke's account with the authority of the earthly Jesus (both his teaching and example, Luke 9.51-56; 10.25-37; 17.11-19), the resurrected Christ (Acts 1.8), Israel's venerated patriarchs (Acts 7.15-16) and Christ's apostles (Acts 8.14-25).

CHAPTER 3: PHILIP AND SIMON MAGUS

§1. INTRODUCTION

The material pertaining to Simon Magus in Acts 8 is well known and has generated a great deal of scholarly discussion in recent years. For the most part, however, scholars have been preoccupied with mining Acts 8 for bits of information concerning the mysterious "historical" Simon and the relationship of this figure to the notorious Gnostic heretic denounced by the early church fathers.[1] Seldom has there been sufficient focus upon the Lucan portrayal of Simon Magus, particularly with respect to the presentation of Simon's interaction with Philip the evangelist. In this chapter our concern is precisely to probe this Philip-Simon encounter in Acts 8 with the aim of discerning more fully the significance of Philip's role in Luke's narrative.

On the surface it may appear that in fact Philip and Simon have very little to do with each other in Luke's account of the Samaritan mission. Explicitly they only intersect in Acts 8.13, and then the story quickly moves on to feature the clash between Simon Magus and Peter (vv. 18-24). But a closer examination of the structure of Acts 8.5-24, recalling some of the observations made in our previous chapter, reveals a more elaborately intertwined characterization of Philip and Simon with potentially important ramifications for our understanding of the Lucan *Philippusbild*. In particular, we should recognize that v. 13 is not an isolated statement but functions as the climax of an extended comparison between Philip and Simon which permeates the section beginning with v. 5.[2]

(1) Philip and Simon both minister in the same Samaritan city (πόλις, vv. 5, 8, 9).

(2) They both work wondrous deeds (signs/magic, vv. 6-7, 9, 11) and proclaim a message (λέγω, vv. 6, 9) among the Samaritans.

(3) They both attract the Samaritans' attention in great numbers (multitudes/least to the greatest, vv. 6-7, 9-10).[3]

(4) The Samaritans' response to both is described as "giving heed" (προσέχω, vv. 6, 10, 11).

(5) Simon is acclaimed as the δύναμις μεγάλη (v. 10) and evokes amazement (ἐξίστημι, vv. 9, 11) from the Samaritans; Philip works δυνάμεις μεγάλας among the Samaritans and thus elicits Simon's amazement (ἐξίστημι, v. 13).

In effect Luke sets up a competitive match between Philip and Simon for the affections of the Samaritan people. Given this narrative situation and our interest in Luke's presentation of Philip, we are led to ask generally: how does Philip fare in this competition with Simon? More specifically, what does Philip's direct encounter with Simon in v. 13 suggest regarding the outcome of their rivalry? And, in addition to those characteristics which Philip shares with Simon, are there other qualities which dramatically distinguish the Christian evangelist and give him precedence in Luke's view over the Samaritan magician?

Regarding the scene in Acts 8.18-24, even though Philip himself is no longer featured, his achievement in relation to Simon Magus still comes into question. For the same Simon who is baptized and keeps company with Philip in 8.13 is now poignantly exposed by Peter as a wicked power-monger

deserving of God's judgment, one who has "neither part nor lot" in the Christian community (8.20-23). We are driven then to ask: in what way does this "apostasy" on Simon's part reflect on the integrity of Philip's Samaritan mission? And is there any significance to the fact that a visiting apostle from Jerusalem must be brought in to chasten one of Philip's apparent converts? In short, does Luke intend by his disclosure of Simon's spurious faith to stigmatize Philip's ministry in any sense?

Before pursuing these various questions pertaining to Luke's portrayal of Philip and Simon, we offer a brief discussion regarding methodology. We shall continue in our quest for the Lucan aims behind Acts 8 to correlate this material with the larger narrative of Luke-Acts. For example, it is imperative that we understand the encounter between Philip and Simon as part of a series of confrontations in the book of Acts between Christian missionaries and opposing magicians and that we seek to integrate the report of Simon's peculiar religious experience with other Lucan examples of "apostates" from the Christian faith. Secondarily, attention will be paid to relevant traditions outside Luke-Acts for purposes of comparison and contrast with Luke's account. Of potential importance in this regard are the several appraisals of Simon Magus and the movement surrounding him within early Christian literature.

Concerning the use, however, of these extra-Lucan Simonian traditions[4] to illuminate Luke's presentation in Acts, caution must be exercised. In particular we should underscore the fact that <u>Acts 8 represents the earliest source of information regarding Simon</u> and thus be wary of reading later (patristic) characterizations of Simon back into Luke's account. Especially

problematic is the tendency among some scholars to judge that in Acts 8 Luke was polemically engaged against a Gnostic heresy--similar to that combatted by Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Hippolytus[5]--which venerated Simon as the Highest God and mythological redeemer-figure, attended by his female consort, Helena/Ennoia (the First Idea). These scholars frankly admit that a Gnostic profile of Simon is hardly self-evident in the text of Acts 8, but they insist, for various reasons, that anti-Gnostic interests still lie behind the passage. Haenchen and Lüdemann, for example, theorize that Luke deliberately and falsely cast Simon in the role of a Samaritan magician as a means of discrediting the successful Gnostic hero.[6] However, while it is true that early Christian apologists sometimes resorted to downgrading their religious opponents by branding them magicians and sorcerers and while Luke was clearly critical of Simon's claims and behavior, it by no means follows necessarily that Luke has distorted Simon's Gnostic identity. In the book of Acts another μάγος, Elymas/Bar-Jesus, is severely judged (13.5-12), and the Ephesian "magic arts" are destroyed (19.18-19), but there are no hints that these incidents were constructed with specific Gnostic targets in mind.[7] Moreover, if Luke wants to attack and expose more mythologically- and philosophically-oriented religious systems, he seems to do so directly (Acts 14.11-18; 17.16-31), without recourse to making his opponents appear as practitioners of magic for tendentious purposes.[8]

C. H. Talbert, who argues that the whole of Luke-Acts may be interpreted as a defence against Gnosticism, recognizes that in Acts 8 Simon Magus is not portrayed "in unambiguously Gnostic terms" and that, apparently, "if Luke is writing with an anti-Gnostic purpose in mind, he has missed his

best opportunity to make his point."[9] However, Talbert proceeds to account for this Lucan silence regarding Simon's Gnostic associations in a way which in fact bolsters Luke's alleged anti-gnostic agenda. Talbert thinks that one of Luke's polemical ploys against the Gnostics is to depict the primitive church as free from heresy and division, thus driving home the dictum that "truth precedes error" or, in other words, stressing that Gnosticism is a late aberration of the originally pure Christian faith. In Acts 8, then, Luke deliberately refrains from showing Simon's true Gnostic colors in order to preserve the harmony and orthodoxy of the apostolic age and to undercut any Gnostic claim to the heritage of primitive, authentic Christianity.[10]

Apart from the speculative nature of any argument from silence and the many questions which could be raised against Talbert's thoroughgoing "early catholic" and "anti-Gnostic" interpretation of Luke-Acts, Talbert's perspective on Luke's treatment of Simon Magus founders on the fact that, even without Gnostic overtones, the Simon of Acts 8 is still a rebellious, meddlesome figure who disrupts the smooth progress of the early church's Samaritan mission. Luke indeed does not cast Simon as a Gnostic heretic, but Simon--as a baptized believer who blasphemes, as it were, the gift of the Holy Spirit--surely appears in Luke's report as some kind of heretic. With this willingness to expose openly Simon's "apostasy" during the earliest period of the church's mission, Luke clearly does not view the apostolic era in such idyllic, error-free terms as Talbert supposes, and it becomes difficult to see why Luke would care to cover up any aspect of Simon's identity, Gnostic or otherwise.[11]

In conclusion, it seems best to regard the absence of a Gnostic

characterization of Simon in Acts 8 as indicative that Luke simply did not have Simonian Gnosis in view in this passage.[12] Hence, those reports of the early heresiologists which feature Simon as the arch-villain of the Gnostic movement prove largely irrelevant for our purposes. However, other accounts in early Christian literature--such as those in the Pseudo-Clementines and Origen--which focus in the main on Simon as a popular Samaritan magician, as does Acts 8, may spark some insights into Luke's treatment of Philip and Simon Magus (still bearing in mind, of course, that Acts 8 predates these other Simon-traditions) and shall be investigated below.[13]

§2. PHILIP AND SIMON, THE "GREAT POWER"

A certain emphasis in Acts 8.9-11 falls on Simon's reputation as a notably great and powerful figure in Samaria. According to Luke, Simon himself had claimed εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν (8.9) and inspired the Samaritan people *en masse* to believe and confess the same. "From the least to the greatest (ἕως μεγάλου)" they acclaimed Simon as ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη (8.10). In its Lucan context this description would seem to signify that Simon was venerated by the Samaritans as a "divine man," that is, a supernatural being in human form.[14] In Luke 22.69 "the power of God" functions as a circumlocution for the person of God himself, as is clear from a comparison with Acts 7.55-56.[15]

<u>Luke 22.69</u>: ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ

<u>Acts 7.55-56</u>: ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ

In the Synoptic parallels to Luke 22.69 "the Power" *simpliciter* is used to denote the person of God (Matt 26.64//Mark 14.62), and we should no doubt

follow most commentators in regarding Luke's τοῦ θεοῦ in this text and in Acts 8.10 as an explanatory expansion or genitive of apposition.[16] So in Simon's case Luke would have us understand that the Samaritan magician was honored as "the Power which is God called Great" or, more succinctly, as the "Great Power." That Luke intends "Great Power" to be taken as a formal title by which Simon was known is demonstrated by the several analogous examples in Luke-Acts where a double-name is introduced in a καλέω-construction (e.g. Συμεὼν ὁ καλούμενος Νίγερ, Acts 13.1).[17]

The likelihood that ἡ δύναμις μεγάλη in Acts 8.10 points to Simon's pretensions to deity is strengthened by the commonplace observation that notions of "greatness" and "power," taken separately or together, were frequently associated with divine beings and their activities in the ancient world in both Jewish and Greco-Roman contexts.[18] Given the range of options to choose from and the relative vagueness of qualities like "great" and "powerful" attributed to supernatural figures, it is virtually impossible to pinpoint any single religious-historical tradition as the source for Luke's identification of Simon Magus as the "Great Power." Yet, in view of the Samaritan setting of Acts 8, it is interesting to note that some recent studies have demonstrated a possible Samaritan background to the "Great Power" concept. H. G. Kippenberg has observed that the biblical translations in both the SP and ST (Samaritan Targum) periodically render the Hebrew אל ("God") with the Aramaic חילה ("Power") or חילין ("Powerful One"). Moreover, in early Samaritan liturgical traditions (from the *Durran* and *Memar Marqah*), חילה is exalted as רב ("great," רבה חילה = ἡ μεγάλη δύναμις). Such a doxology forms the appropriate response to the scriptural

testimony of God's mighty acts on behalf of his people--most notably, the miraculous deliverance from Egypt.[19] Building on Kippenberg's work, J. Fossum has recently argued:

> The divine name of the Great Power, which appears in the oldest account of Simon [i.e. Acts 8], is. . . a Samaritan name of YHWH. It is true that the epithet "great" was frequently applied to gods in Hellenistic times, and that also the "power" of the gods was praised as "great", but "the Great Power" is an authentically Samaritan divine name, and the encomium of "the Power" or even "the Great Power" as "great" is a Samaritan characteristic.[20]

Accepting that Luke has accentuated Simon's fame as no one less than the embodiment of divine energy, the "Great Power," we come to appreciate better the greatness of Philip's Samaritan mission from a Lucan perspective. For not only does Philip match Simon's accomplishments in Samaria at a number of points (enumerated above) in Luke's account, the Christian missionary also is clearly portrayed as surpassing and overwhelming the renowned Magus. Indeed, Luke's juxtaposition of Philip's and Simon's exploits in Samaria demonstrates not merely that both figures worked miracles and successfully attracted the attention of multitudes of Samaritans, but also that both were vying for the devotion of the <u>same</u> Samaritan throng and that Philip emerged as the clear-cut winner. The story in Acts 8 makes plain that Simon had been on the scene in Samaria prior to Philip's arrival (v. 9) and had forged his popular reputation over a "long time" (v. 11). Philip's Samaritan mission, then, takes on the character of a direct supplanting of Simon's long-standing favored position. Moreover, the narrative gives the impression that this capture of Samaritan hearts was swift and total and accomplished without a struggle.[21]

Of course, the crowning indication of Philip's victory is the remarkable

capitulation of Simon himself in Acts 8.13. Even he (καὶ αὐτὸς)--the self-confessed and much-adored δύναμις μεγάλη--could not help but be amazed by the obviously superior δυνάμεις μεγάλας which Philip performed,[22] and as a result, he believed Philip's message, was baptized and attached himself devotedly to the Christian evangelist (προσκαρτερῶν τῷ Φιλίππῳ).[23]

Not only does Philip best Simon in Acts 8 in terms of the sheer power of his ministry; he also outclasses the Samaritan magician in terms of the motivation behind the actions performed. The picture that one receives of Simon from Luke's report is of a thoroughly self-absorbed trickster willing to defraud others for his own ends. To the extent that he has a message, Simon proclaims himself and his own grandeur (8.9b). His miraculous displays, though not described in detail, are generally portrayed as sensational works of magic designed purely to court the crowd's amazed admiration (8.9-11). He even endeavors to traffic in the gift of the Spirit, presumably to exploit further a thrill-seeking public (8.18-24). By contrast, while Philip in no sense falls behind Simon as a channel of spiritual power, his ministerial aim is not to impress others and take advantage of them for the sake of elevating his own importance. As we saw in chap. 2, the priority of Philip's Samaritan ministry in Acts 8 is neither wonder-working nor self-proclamation, but the preaching of good news about Christ and the kingdom of God. His desire is not that the Samaritans worship him but that they honor the name of Jesus Christ. Miracles are performed by Philip, but these serve to help the afflicted at their most serious points of need (8.7) and to support the challenge to believe in Philip's preached word--not to evoke mere amazement at Philip's extraordinary abilities (ἐξίστημι is not used of the

Samaritan crowd's response to Philip's ministry).

The upshot of Luke's comparison of the careers of Philip and Simon among the Samaritans is that Philip, the messenger of Christ, proves himself dramatically to be greater than the great magician Simon. The Christian evangelist manifests a ministry of superior might and motivation, or, in other words, Philip appears as both the greater power and (in a deeper sense) the greater person than Simon. These two aspects of Philip's greatness merit further attention against the backdrop of Luke-Acts as a whole.

(1) The notion of the supremacy of Christian power (δύναμις) and authority (ἐξουσία)[24] over all competitive spiritual forces is a consistent theme running throughout Luke-Acts. Jesus, who in fact was conceived by the "power of the Most High" (δύναμις ὑψίστου, Luke 1.35) according to Luke, commences his public ministry in Luke's Gospel in "the power of the Spirit" (4.14) which had just been manifest and proven in a triumphant encounter with the devil (4.1-13). As he fulfills his vocation, Jesus inevitably builds a reputation among astonished audiences as one who manifestly teaches "with authority" (ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ, Luke 4.32) and "with authority and power (ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει) commands the unclean spirits and they come out" (4.36). Moreover, he imparts this amazing ability to his disciples in order that they might exercise "authority. . . over all the power of the enemy" (10.19; cf. 9.1). Similar to the other Synoptic authors, Luke envisages the climax of Jesus' work as his exaltation to "the right hand of the Power (of God)" (22.69//Matt 26.64//Mark 14.62), from where he will come again at the end of the age "in a cloud with power and great glory," shaking "the powers

of the heavens" in his train (21.26-27//Matt 24.29-30//Mark 13.25-26). Unique to Luke, however, is the emphasis that, from his exalted position, Jesus will pour out the Holy Spirit upon the disciples he has left behind, thereby enduing them with divine δύναμις for the purpose of effective witness and continued performance of mighty works (24.29; Acts 1.8; 4.33).

As a Spirit-empowered preacher of the gospel, exorciser of demons and worker of δυνάμεις μεγάλας, Philip the evangelist takes his place alongside Jesus and the apostles in Luke's presentation as a dynamic minister contributing to the conquest of all competing powers of darkness. But in terms of his particular confrontation with magical power in the person of Simon, Philip's career links most directly with the Pauline mission in the book of Acts.[25] In fact, at the beginning of each of the three so-called missionary journeys, Paul clashes victoriously with practicioners of magical arts.[26]

(i) After setting out from Antioch on the initial missionary tour, the first preaching stop for Paul and Barnabas is on the island of Cyprus where they encounter "a certain magician (μάγον), a Jewish false prophet, named Bar-Jesus" (Acts 13.6). The use of μάγος here and in 13.8 to designate Bar-Jesus clearly associates this figure with Simon in Acts 8, who was notorious in Samaria for μαγεύων ("doing the work of the μάγος," v. 9) or practicing μαγεία ("the activity of the μάγος," v. 11).[27] The characterization of Bar-Jesus, also known as Elymas, as the "enemy of all unrighteousness, full of all deceit and villainy," a perverter of "the straight paths of the Lord (τὰς ὁδοὺς [τοῦ] κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας)," together with the report of the Lord's dramatic judgment against him

(13.10-11), most readily recalls the account of Simon's clash with Peter, where the Magus is charged with "wickedness," being in the "bond of iniquity" and having a heart "not right (εὐθεῖα) before God" and, consequently, is threatened with severe punishment (8.20-23).[28] However, some indirect comparison may still be made between Paul's conflict with Elymas and Philip's interaction with Simon. Both encounters with magicians occur in the midst of an audience who "hears the word" (ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον) of the Christian missionary (8.4-6; 13.7), and both involve the factor of competition between the visiting Christian miracle-worker and the established resident sorcerer. Though this last point is less obvious in the Elymas-incident, we should take note of A. D. Nock's interesting hypothesis: "There may be in it [the scene in Acts 13.6-12] some suggestion of the outdoing of the magician at his own game: blinding is one of the things which his [Elymas'] type claimed to be able to do, and a demonstration of power before a personage in authority [Sergius Paulus] is also characteristic."[29]

(ii) The first major venue of the second missionary journey is Philippi. Here Paul and Silas are "met by a slave girl who had a spirit of divination (πνεῦμα πύθωνα) and brought her owners much gain by soothsaying (μαντευομένη)" (Acts 16.16). This characterization of the girl as a "pythoness" suggests a supernatural ability to speak as a "ventriloquist" (πύθων = ἐγγαστρίμυθος) for the gods,[30] and the use of μαντεύομαι intimates that this power was employed in the service of various clairvoyant activities, such as fortune-telling and necromancy. Thus, she may be compared generally with a figure like the witch (medium) of Endor whom King Saul consulted in the familiar OT story.[31]

According to initial outward appearances, the Philippian sorceress in Acts 16 supports Paul's efforts. She begins to follow the missionary party around, proclaiming them "servants of the Most High God" and "preachers of the way of salvation" (16.17). But Paul sees through this response as a taunting charade. So, becoming irritated with the situation, he exorcises the evil spirit within the girl and, as a result, angers her employers who sense their business being undermined (16.18-24).

The issue of financial profit for magical services ties in with Simon's greedy ambitions so sternly opposed by Peter in Acts 8, but the idea of the sorceress tagging along with the Lord's missionary especially parallels Simon's attachment to Philip. Moreover, the slave girl's obvious insincerity in contrast to the exemplary reception of Paul's message (προσέχω, 16.14) by Lydia (another businesswoman in Philippi) may be viewed as corresponding to an apparent deficiency in Simon's response relative to the Samaritan crowd who "gave heed" to Philip's word (προσέχω, 8.6).

(iii) Virtually the whole of the third missionary journey is taken up with the three year stay of Paul in Ephesus. After Paul performs some extraordinary feats (Acts 19.11-12), a group of wandering Jewish exorcists, the seven sons of Sceva, decide to exploit for themselves the evidently powerful name of Jesus. But their scheme meets with terrible disaster, proving that Jesus' authority is not to be presumptuously usurped. The effects of the exorcists' humiliation reverberate throughout Ephesian society. Many professing believers come forward and renounce similar occultic practices, demonstrating their repentance by burning their magic manuals and incurring great financial loss in the process (19.17-19).

But further conflict is in store for Paul in Ephesus, again on the economic front. The lucrative business dealing in shrines of the goddess Artemis is being decimated in the wake of Paul's successful conversion of "a considerable company (ἱκανὸν ὄχλον)" away from pagan worship (Acts 19.26). The significant victory for Paul and the Christian movement lies in stripping the power of the Great Artemis of the Ephesians (μεγάλη, 19.27, 28, 34, 35; μεγαλειότης, 19.27) "whom all Asia and the world worship" (19.27).

Apart from a connection once more with the Peter-Simon Magus encounter in Acts 8 in terms of the harsh treatment of magicians who tamper with the things of Christ, the Ephesus episode in Acts 19 also strikingly parallels the report of Philip's Samaritan mission. Just as Paul--"preaching the kingdom of God" (19.8), working "extraordinary miracles" (δυνάμεις, 19.11) and extolling "the name of the Lord Jesus" (19.17)--turns a number of Ephesian magic-devotees to true faith in Christ, so Philip the evangelist, conducting a similar ministry (8.5-8, 12-13), diverts the attention of a multitude of Samaritans away from Simon Magus to Christ. And just as Paul undercuts the appeal of the Great Goddess Artemis, venerated by all, so Philip deflates the Great Divine-Power, Simon Magus, adored by the whole Samaritan nation, from the least to the greatest.

These three episodes dealing with Paul's missionary activity clearly echo the main emphases of the Simon Magus narrative in Acts 8. The stress on dramatic punitive measures taken against wonder-working magicians[32] and on the draining of their fraudulently-obtained financial resources[33] both call to mind similar concerns in the exchange between Simon and Peter

(8.18-24). But the general conquest of magical power through effective preaching and superior miracle-working matches Paul's ministry most closely with Philip's. By featuring a similar subduing of magic-oriented religion in the beginnings, on the one hand, of the mission of the διασπαρέντες from Jerusalem and, on the other hand, of each principal phase of the Pauline mission, Luke has tightly paralleled these two streams of early Christian outreach and the central figures of Philip and Paul in his overall presentation.

(2) The evaluation of wonder-workers and magicians in the ancient world went beyond assessing who had the most power, who could effect the most impressive results. There was also deep concern over the motivation behind miraculous activity--was it altruistic or exploitive?--and the source of supernatural power--was it divine or demonic?[34] In short, the character of miracle-workers is closely scrutinized.

Philostratus, in his account of the spectacular career of the first century itinerant philosopher, Apollonius of Tyana, takes great pains to distance Apollonius from the many money-grubbing "wizards" and "old hags" who peddled their "quackeries" among gullible, "simple-minded" folk "addicted to magical art" (*Apollon.* 6.39).[35] It is true that Apollonius worked outstanding wonders, but only for the noblest purposes, as Philostratus makes clear in his record of Apollonius' *apologia* against charges of wizardry.

> And yet I have been much esteemed in the several cities which asked for my aid, whatever the objects were for which they asked it, and they were such as these: that their sick might be healed of their diseases, that both their initiations and their sacrifices might be rendered more holy, that insolence and pride might be extirpated, and the laws strengthened. And. . . the only reward which I obtained in all this was that men were made much better than they were before. . . (*Apollon.* 8.7)

Later, however, toward the end of the third century, when a Roman provincial governor named Hierocles began to compare and even exalt the ministry of Apollonius of Tyana in relation to that of Jesus of Nazareth, the Christian author Eusebius sought to set the record straight. Not surprisingly, Eusebius attacked the very character of Apollonius' works which Philostratus had defended. Regarding a particularly famous miracle attributed to Apollonius, Eusebius contended "that fraud and make-believe was in this case everything, and that if ever anything reeked of wizardry this did" (*Treat. of Eus.* 23).[36] Moreover, this instance was typical, in Eusebius' view, of a "whole series of miracles wrought by him [Apollonius], . . . accomplished through a ministry of demons" (*Treat. of Eus.* 31).

This heated debate among pagans and Christians in the early centuries of the Common Era over the legitimacy and integrity of revered miracle-workers may also be evidenced in the writings of Lucian and Origen. The second century pagan satirist, Lucian of Samosata, wrote an entire tract exposing the chicanery of a popular wonder-working prophet named Alexander[37] and in another work criticized the "charlatanism and notoriety-seeking" of the Cynic philosopher, Peregrinus (known more, however, for his piety and inspired teaching than his miracle-working). For a brief period in his career, Peregrinus professed the Christian faith and took advantage of fellow-believers, thus confirming Lucian's opinion regarding Christians that "if any charlatan and trickster, able to profit by occasions, comes among them, he quickly acquires sudden wealth by imposing upon simple folk" (*Pas. of Per.* 13).[38]

Celsus was another pagan who cast aspersions on the Christian movement

and, more explicitly than Lucian, directed his attack against the wonder-working reputation of Christian ministers. We know of Celsus' viewpoint only from the polemical treatise written against him by the renowned church father Origen. Celsus is quoted as going so far as to identify the works of Jesus himself "with the works of sorcerers who profess to do wonderful miracles, and the accomplishments of those who are taught by the Egyptians, who for a few obols make known their sacred lore in the middle of the market-place." Origen answers this charge by appealing forcefully to the unimpeachable rectitude of the behavior of Jesus in contrast to the evil conduct of greedy magicians.[39]

> . . . in fact no sorcerer uses his tricks to call the spectators to moral reformation, nor does he educate by the fear of God people who were astounded by what they saw, nor does he attempt to persuade the onlookers to live as men who will be judged by God. Sorcerers do none of these things, since they have neither the ability nor even the will to do so. Nor do they even want to have anything to do with reforming men, seeing that they themselves are filled with the most shameful and infamous sins. Is it not likely that one who used the miracles that he performed to call those who saw the happenings to moral reformation, would have shown himself as an example of the best life, not only to his genuine disciples but also to the rest? Jesus did this in order that his disciples might give themselves up to teaching men according to the will of God, and that the others, who have been taught as much by his doctrine as by his moral life and miracles the right way to live, might do every action by referring to the pleasure of the supreme God. If the life of Jesus was of this character, how could anyone reasonably compare him with the behaviour of sorcerers. . . ? (*Con. Cel.* 1.68; cf. 2.49)[40]

To give a final example of the early church's insistence on the moral uprightness of her miracle-performing ministers over against fraudulent magicians, we cite the following appraisal of the apostle Thomas:[41]

> . . . he goes about the towns and villages, and if he has anything he gives it all the poor, and he teaches a new God and heals the sick and drives out demons and does many other wonderful things; and we think he is a magician. But his works of compassion, and

> the healings which are wrought by him are without reward, and moreover his simplicity and kindness and the quality of his faith, show that he is righteous or an apostle of the new God whom he preaches (*Acts of Thom.* 20).

Though stemming from an earlier period than the various reports just cited, Luke-Acts manifests a very similar concern for distinguishing qualitatively the ministries of Christian miracle-workers from the enterprises of self-seeking magicians. We have already stressed how Philip is set apart from Simon Magus in Acts 8 as one who directs his power-displays toward alleviating human suffering rather than toward merely eliciting public admiration and who proclaims Christ's name and God's kingdom rather than his own importance. This last comparison, featuring the futility of all idolatrous pretensions to greatness and the self-effacing nature of Christian servants, is particularly important for Luke. He recalls that the movement launched by the "messianic" pretender Theudas, who, like Simon, "gave himself out to be somebody," ended in utter failure, that is, "came to nothing" (εἰς οὐδέν, Acts 5.36).[42] Likewise, Luke reports that the popular Judas the Galilean "perished" (ἀπώλετο), and his followers dispersed (5.37). The story is told of Herod that he basked in the acclaim of his audience as they shouted, "The voice of a god, and not of man!" and was promptly stricken dead "because he did not give God the glory" (12.22-23). And we learn that the justifiable fear among the Ephesian businessmen in the face of Christianity's remarkable progress in the city was that "the temple of the great goddess Artemis may count for nothing (εἰς οὐθέν) and that she may even be deposed from her magnificence" (19.27). As all other proponents of self-ascendancy and claimants of divine identity come to ruin in the book of

Acts, so Simon, the legendary "Great Power (of God)," loses his followers and finds himself on the road to destruction (τὸ ἀργύριόν σου σὺν σοὶ εἴη εἰς ἀπώλειαν, 8.20).

By contrast, the messengers of Christ shun the limelight in Luke's presentation. Jesus himself sets the standard that "he who is least among you all is the one who is great" (Luke 9.48), particularly the one who, like Jesus, serves others at the table (Luke 22.24-27). Moreover, Luke is happy to agree verbatim (against Matthew) with the humble response of Jesus found in Mark: "Why do you call me good? No one is good but God alone" (Luke 18.19//Mark 10.18). In the book of Acts both Peter and Paul remonstrate with exciteable crowds who want to deify them, vigorously declaring themselves to be mere men (Acts 3.11-12; 10.25-26; 14.11-18),[43] and Peter in particular makes it perfectly clear that miracles owe nothing to him but derive their power exclusively from the name of Jesus (Acts 3.12, 16; 4.7, 10).

Philip does not affirm his dependence and humble character in so many words, but the overall Lucan portrait inclines in this direction. Philip embarks on his successful Samaritan mission, according to Luke, as a former table servant and minister of poor-relief to needy widows (a group particularly vulnerable to exploitation within ancient society)[44] (Acts 6.1-6) who has just experienced the trauma of persecution and expulsion from his place of residence (8.1-4). However awkward it may appear both logically and historically (as many have supposed) for such a figure to become a mighty evangelist, Luke's literary intention seems obvious. Philip the <u>least</u>--friend of the poor, table-waiter, himself oppressed and homeless--becomes the <u>greatest</u>,[45] overwhelming the powerful Simon Magus, who had attracted "the

least to the greatest" (8.10c). As one scattered after the martyrdoms of both his Lord (Jesus) and his fellow table-servant (Stephen), Philip occupies the same wretched position as the followers of Theudas and Judas (cf. Acts 5.36-37); but unlike them, his perilous predicament becomes the occasion for heightened joy and victory (cf. Luke 6.22-23).

Himself lowly and outcast, Philip proves to be an exemplary communicator of the message of God's kingdom (Acts 8.12). As noted in the previous chapter, for Luke the kingdom of God belongs in a special way to the poor and infirm, the homeless and destitute (e.g. Luke 6.20; 14.13-21; 18.22-24). Moreover, the kingdom is a gracious gift from the Father, reorienting one's attitude toward possessions in its demand for sacrificial almsgiving and investment in heavenly treasure (Luke 12.32-34).[46] Whether charity officer in Jerusalem or healer of the possessed, paralyzed and lame in Samaria, Philip shows the signs of a true minister of the kingdom of God. On the other hand, Simon's attempt to buy what can only be received as a divine gift and his preoccupation with personal greatness mark him as woefully out of step with kingdom concerns. If the least in the kingdom of God is greater than the greatest born of woman (John the Baptist, Luke 7.28), how much more is the humble servant of the kingdom (Philip) greater than a false claimant to be someone great (Simon).

One additional clue to Luke's interest in the issue of true greatness in the Simon Magus narrative lies in the possible relationship to the OT story of Naaman's cleansing (2 Kings 5). In a stimulating article, T. L. Brodie presents the thesis that Acts 8.9-40 represents a Lucan "internalizing" of the 2 Kings 5 narrative.[47] His pointing to a familiar OT story as <u>one</u>

source[48] informing Luke's presentation marks a bold new step in the source-analysis of Acts and shall be evaluated more closely in our analysis of the Ethiopian-eunuch-incident in the next chapter. But presently we simply set forth Brodie's suggestions regarding Luke's characterization of Simon and explore the possibilities in relation to Philip. According to Brodie, "the figure of Simon, as now described in Acts 8, involves a fusing of two basic elements: Naaman's initial preoccupation with greatness; and Gehazi's money-mindedness."[49] More specifically concerning the first element, Brodie observes that Naaman matches up nicely with Simon as a "ruler of the *dynamis*. . . a <u>great man</u> [my emphasis] before his lord," one "regarded with wonder" and attended by supporters from a little maid to the king of Syria (2 Kgs 5.1-5).[50] Naaman's "implicit demand for a spectacular God, for a prophet who would call publicly on his God and who would command something great (2 Kgs 5,11-13). . . is balanced by the equally sensation-oriented religion proposed by Simon, by his pretension to be the great power of God."[51]

Though Brodie does not make the link in this particular case, logically extended, his perceived connection between the Naaman-story and the Simon-episode associates Philip with the prophet Elisha.[52] In a programmatic passage from his Gospel, Luke explicitly parallels the ministry of Jesus with Elisha's ministry to Naaman (Luke 4.27), so it would not be surprising to find a similar reflection of the great OT prophet in one of Jesus' ambassadors in Acts.[53] By not pandering to Naaman's desire for "some great thing," by ministering through a straightforward message (2 Kgs 5.10) and by refusing any praise or credit betokened by Naaman's proffered gift (2 Kgs

5.15ff.), Elisha provides an apt example of the truly commendable self-effacing "man of God" which, broadly speaking, may further color the Lucan portrayal of Philip in Samaria along the lines of the humble kingdom servant suggested above.

In conclusion, whether Luke was specifically motivated to challenge the problem of syncretistic compromise within the Christian community of his time[54] or to defend the church against charges of practicing an essentially magical religion raised by pagan polemicists, or by some other concern, it is obvious that he desired to portray the early church's missionaries as successful over yet separated from the activities of contemporary "divine-men."[55] In Luke's estimation, Christ's servants were eminent miracle-workers but also men and women of true spiritual character, working only for the glory of God and the good of others. Philip stands in the book of Acts as a prominent representative of such a Christian minister. It is important to pause here and take due account of Luke's thorough shaping of the material in Acts 8.5-13 to highlight Philip's genuine greatness. We are thus alerted already to the possibility that any supposed downgrading of Philip in the scene that follows may be more apparent than real.

§3. PHILIP, SIMON AND THE "PROPHET LIKE MOSES"

In the previous chapter we briefly noted the correspondence between the reference to Moses' "wonders and "signs" in Acts 7.36 and Philip's "signs and great miracles" in 8.6, 13 and suggested that, in Luke's schema, Philip may be functioning in the capacity of a "prophet like Moses" and his encounter with Simon Magus may be reminiscent of Moses' subduing of Pharoah's magicians.

In the present section, we aim to probe this Philip-Moses connection more fully against the background of Luke-Acts and certain external traditions pertaining to Moses, the "prophet like Moses" and Simon Magus.[56]

3.1 *Philip and the "Prophet like Moses" in Luke-Acts*

The only actual citations in the NT of the passage from Deuteronomy 18 which predicts the coming of a "prophet like Moses" occur in Acts 3.22 and 7.37. Since these isolated references both appear in the first quarter of the book of Acts, which deals with events related to the earliest period of the fledgling Jerusalem church, scholars have often assumed that Luke has simply transmitted the "prophet-like-Moses" concept from primitive Christological tradition.[57] While a traditional basis for the Deuteronomy 18 citations in Acts is certainly possible, we should not therefore conclude *ipso facto* that the "prophet-like-Moses" motif was somehow peripheral to or uncharacteristic of principal Lucan concerns. If Luke was not the first to promulgate the explicit identification of the promised "prophet like Moses" with Jesus in early Christian preaching, the fact remains that Luke chose to include this Christological conception in his literary work and, in so doing, made it his own. Moreover, a number of recent studies have demonstrated plausibly that, beyond his quotation of Deut 18.15, 18, Luke was widely influenced by the literary pattern of a "prophet like Moses" in his characterizations of Jesus and his disciples.

P. S. Minear remarks that, while Luke associates the ministry of Jesus with a variety of OT figures (Abraham, David, Elijah, Jonah, etc.), "in Luke's mind the most strategic among them is the link to Moses."[58] This primacy

for Luke of Mosaic typology is due to its rich store of powerful images applicable to a wide range of contexts connected with the vocation of Jesus. "The portraits in Luke's gallery of Jesus as prophet, revealer, teacher, servant, judge, ruler, Son of God, covenant-maker, deliverer, have too many points of contact with the portrait of Moses to be accidental. . . . For Luke no analogy to the redemptive work of Jesus could be more evocative or more far-reaching than this comparison to Moses."[59] To be more specific, Minear calls attention to the Moses-like activity of the Lucan Jesus in ascending to the mountain to commune with God all night before descending to announce to his followers "the promises and imperatives of the new dispensation" in the so-called "Sermon on the Plain" (Luke 6.12-7.1).[60] In addition, Minear focuses on the surrounding contexts of the Deuteronomy 18 references in Acts 3 and 7, where a transparent connection is made between the suffering/rejection and vindication of Jesus among the people of Israel and the similar experiences of Israel's great prophet of old, Moses (cf. Acts 3.13-15, 17-23; 7.23-27, 35, 39-41).[61]

The most detailed exploration of the use of the "prophet-like-Moses" model in Luke-Acts has been undertaken by D. P. Moessner in a series of recent articles.[62] Moessner argues that the whole of the "Central Section" of Luke's Gospel (9.51-19.44) has been constructed to set forth "the journey of the Prophet Jesus whose calling and fate both recapitulate and consummate the career of Moses in Deuteronomy. We have here nothing less than the prophet like Moses (Deut. 18:15-19) in a New Exodus unfolding with a dramatic tension all its own."[63] In Moessner's view, this narrative emphasis is strikingly adumbrated in Luke 9.1-50, especially in the watershed

Transfiguration scene where only Luke among the Synoptic writers stresses Jesus' Moses-like revelation "in glory" (ἐν δόξῃ, 9.31; cf. v. 32; Deut 5.24) on the mountain and specifies that the discussion between Jesus, Moses and Elijah centered on "his [Jesus'] departure ("exodus," τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ), which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem" (9.31).[64] Moessner also contends that the "prophet-like-Moses" pattern is employed in Luke's characterization of Christ's key witnesses in the book of Acts, namely, Peter, Stephen and Paul.[65] They, like Jesus in Luke's Gospel and Moses and succeeding prophets in the Deuteronomistic tradition, minister as prophets to the community of Israel and suffer rejection. Stephen, for example, whose speech is dominated by reference to the career of Moses--especially his theophanic experiences and repudiations by the people of Israel (Acts 7.17-44)--himself enjoys a beatific vision of God's glory (6.15; 7.55-56) which, in conjunction with his piercing prophetic challenge, provokes a violent persecution at the hands of a "stiff-necked people" (7.51-8.1).[66]

While disagreement is bound to exist over precise points of supposed comparison between Jesus/his messengers and Moses in Luke's presentation, the basic thesis seems established that the figure of a Moses-styled prophet is one of the principal literary models governing Luke's portrayal of his main characters. The question which naturally interests us, then, is whether the characterization of Philip the evangelist fits this pattern. Philip's close connection with Stephen leads us to answer in the affirmative. Philip's placement in the number two position following Stephen in the list of seven table servants (Acts 6.5) and the fact that Philip is the first fugitive from Jerusalem to feature in Luke's story directly after Stephen's

martyrdom suggest that Luke views Philip as a kind of successor to Stephen's ministry, one who takes up Stephen's mantle, one who functions as a "prophet like Stephen"--and hence, a "prophet like Moses" as well.[67] Philip, like Stephen and Moses (and, of course, Jesus) is a man of "wisdom" (6.3, 10; 7.22), a preacher whose message demands a serious hearing (ἀκούειν, 8.6; 3.22-23; 6.10-14; 7.54), a worker of "signs" and mighty works (8.6, 13; 6.8; 7.36) and one rejected by the people of Israel (8.1, 4-5; 7.27-28, 35, 39, 54, 57-59).

In some respects, Philip even appears more like Moses than Stephen. That is, Philip's mission parallels certain aspects of Moses' vocation featured in the Stephen speech which Stephen himself is unable to match because of his premature death. For example, Philip's dispersion to Samaria, precipitated by Jewish persecution, may be linked in Luke's narrative to the reference to Moses' flight to Midian, made necessary when fellow-Israelites spurned his leadership (Acts 7.24-29). Moreover, as the angel of the Lord eventually guides Philip to the "desert" (ἔρημος, 8.26), so "an angel appeared to him [Moses] in the wilderness (ἔρημος)" (7.30). And finally, as the one singled out first and foremost among those scattered in the wake of the persecution arising over Stephen, Philip may be regarded in a loose sense in Luke's story as the Moses-like leader who spearheads the "exodus" of God's people from hostile territory (cf. 7.36).

Generally, then, Philip takes his place in Luke's schema alongside Jesus and other prominent Christian ministers as a prophetic figure modelled after Moses. Given this Mosaic stamp on Philip's ministry, as Luke sees it, it is

reasonable to inquire whether Luke had in mind Moses' competition with Pharoah's magicians as an analogue to Philip's competition with Simon Magus.

3.2 *A Lucan Parallel between Philip/Simon Magus and Moses/Pharoah's Magicians?*[58]

No specific mention is made of the contest with Pharoah's magicians in the Moses-section of Stephen's speech, but the reference to Moses' "wonders and signs in Egypt" (Acts 7.36) would naturally evoke memories within anyone familiar with the OT of the classic clash with pagan wizardry. For from the very outset of Moses' miraculous demonstrations before Pharoah, as recorded in the book of Exodus, Egypt's court magicians are summoned to pit their skills against the wonder-worker from Israel who insists that his people be freed from slavery. The Lord predicts that Pharoah will demand proof of Moses' and Aaron's authority in the form of "a sign or wonder" (σημεῖον ἢ τέρας, Exod 7.9). Indeed, at the first meeting with Pharoah, Aaron enacts a show of power by turning his rod into a serpent (7.10). Then "the magicians of Egypt by their secret arts" (οἱ ἐπαοιδοὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ταῖς φαρμαρκείαις) prove themselves able to perform the same feat, only to find, however, that Aaron's serpent-rod swallows up their own (7.11-12). Still, the competition ensues with Pharoah's magicians successfully keeping pace with Moses' signs of polluting the Nile and bringing frogs upon the land of Egypt (7.22; 8.3 [LXX]). But with the infliction of the third miraculous plague, when Aaron's staff is employed to multiply gnats throughout the country, the Egyptian magicians are stymied and forced to admit that a superior force--"the finger of God"--is at work through Moses

and Aaron (8.14-15 [LXX]). To add insult to injury, the magicians are personally afflicted by the boils which break out upon all the Egyptians (sixth plague), to such an extent that they "[can]not stand before Moses" (9.11). Obviously, in the Exodus story, Moses' (and Aaron's) overwhelming of Egypt's finest sorcerers is a significant step toward the vindication of his divine calling and authority.

Surprisingly, however, in other parts of the OT which rehearse the events of the Exodus and make reference to Moses' mighty exploits, there is no explicit recollection of the contest with Pharoah's magicians. Yet it is important to note that immediately preceding the announcement in Deuteronomy 18 that a "prophet like Moses" will be raised up within Israel is a stern warning directed to God's people against having anything to do with pagan magical practices characteristic of those nations inhabiting the promised land.

> When you come into the land which the Lord your God gives you, you shall not learn to follow the abominable practices of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one who. . . practices divination, a soothsayer or an augur, or a sorcerer (φαρμάκός), or a charmer (ἐπαείδων ἐπαοιδήν), or a medium, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For whoever does these things is an abomination to the Lord; and because of these abominable practices the Lord your God is driving them out before you. . . . For these nations, which you are about to dispossess, give heed to soothsayers and to diviners; but as for you, the Lord your God has not allowed you so to do (Deut 18.9-14).

In effect, the promised "prophet like Moses," destined to be God's true spokesman whom the children of Israel must hear and obey (Deut 18.15, 18-19), is set forth in direct opposition to the Canaanites' reputed prophets, namely, their soothsayers and diviners.[69] A certain parallel is thus established with the contrast between Moses and Egypt's magicians in the

Exodus story.[70] As Moses proved himself to be the divinely appointed leader of Israel's exodus by besting Egypt's professional wizards, so in the conquest of Canaan Moses' prophetic successor will prove himself more worthy to be followed than the local heathen sorcerers.[71] Admittedly, the focus in Exodus is on Moses' superiority over the magicians in miracle-working, whereas in Deuteronomy 18 the emphasis falls on the "prophet like Moses'" greater authority in proclaiming God's word. But in both Exodus and Deuteronomy Moses is esteemed as a prophet mighty in both word and deed, such that either dimension of his vocation virtually presupposes the other (e.g. Exod 4.1-23; 7.1-7; Deut 29.1-9; 34.9-12).

Although the Exodus account of Moses' encounter with Pharoah's magicians is not directly alluded to or reflected upon in later strata of the biblical record, within extra-biblical traditions--both Jewish and pagan--surrounding the NT period, interest in these magicians and their deeds is revived. For example, as part of its elaborative commentary on the biblical material in Exodus 7-12, *The Book of Jubilees* states:

> And Prince Mastema stood up before you and desired to make you fall into the hand of Pharoah. And he aided the magicians of the Epyptians, and they stood up and acted before you. . . . And the Lord smote them with evil wounds and they were unable to stand because we destroyed (their ability) to do any single signs (*Jub.* 48.9-11).[72]

In a number of places the names of Jannes and/or Jambres (Mambres) came to be associated with the Egyptian magicians, as in the following statement from the Damascus Document: "For in ancient times Moses and Aaron arose by the Prince of Lights, and Belial raised Jannes and his brother by his evil device, when Israel was delivered for the first time" (CD 5.17-19).[73] Even

the second century pagan author, Numenius, was familiar with the Jannes and Jambres tradition, though, not surprisingly perhaps, he depicted the two Egyptian figures in a more favorable light than one would have found in similar Jewish reports.

> And next in order came Jannes and Jambres, Egyptian sacred scribes, men judged to have no superiors in the practice of magic, at the time when the Jews were being driven out of Egypt. So then these were the men chosen by the people of Egypt as fit to stand beside Musaeus [Moses], who led forth the Jews, a man who was most powerful in prayer to God; and of the plagues which Musaeus brought upon Egypt, these men showed themselves able to disperse the most violent (*apud.* Eus. *Praep. Evang.* 9.8).[74]

Josephus includes in his rendition of biblical history an important version of the encounter between Moses and the magicians of Egypt (*Ant.* 2.284-87). According to this account, when Moses performed his miraculous signs (σημεῖα) in the presence of Pharoah, the king reacted indignantly and accused Moses of being an escaped convict who was now trying to pass himself off "by juggleries and magic (μαγείαις)" as a divinely-ordained deliverer of his people (2.284). To expose Moses' fraud, Pharoah commissions his magician-priests to emulate Moses' spectacular displays, whereupon they successfully transform their staves into snake-like objects on the ground (2.285). Moses then delivers a forceful defence of his vocation, unparalleled in the canonical story, which accentuates the great gulf between his God-wrought miracles and the spurious tricks of Pharoah's wizards.

> Indeed, O King, I too disdain not the cunning (σοφίας) of the Egyptians, but I assert that the deeds wrought by me so far surpass their magic (μαγείας) and their art as things divine are remote from what is human. And I will show that it is from no witchcraft (γοητείαν) or deception of true judgement, but from God's providence and power (θεοῦ πρόνοιαν καὶ δύναμιν) that my miracles proceed (2.286).

After this, Moses himself (not Aaron acting on his behalf) casts down his rod and orders it to become a serpent; it obeys and proceeds to devour its competitors (2.287).[75]

Strikingly similar language to that used in this account of Moses' contest with Pharoah's magicians is picked up in Josephus' report of Jewish "sign prophets"[76] or "popular/action prophets"[77] who organized eschatological renewal movements in Josephus' own day.

> Moreover, impostors (γόητες) and deceivers called upon the mob to follow them into the desert (τὴν ἐρημίαν). For they said that they would show them unmistakeable marvels and signs (τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα) that would be wrought in harmony with God's design (τοῦ θεοῦ πρόνοιαν γινόμενα). Many were, in fact, persuaded and paid the penalty for their folly (*Ant.* 20.167-68; cf. *J.W.* 2.258-60).

Clearly, in Josephus' view, these leaders of popular movements purported to be the promised eschatological "prophet like Moses." They were intent on leading a new exodus "into the desert" and sought to establish their authority, like Moses before them, by performing "signs and wonders" which they claimed to be in accordance with τοῦ θεοῦ πρόνοιαν.[78] However, while these prophets alleged to be carrying on Moses' vocation in the same terms set forth in his defence before Pharoah, in fact Josephus regards them as γόητες (impostors, charlatans) doomed to failure, thus linking them with Egypt's practicioners of γοητεία and μαγεία who ineffectually aped the works of Israel's great leader.[79] In short, as P. W. Barnett has asserted, "the Sign Prophets are identified with the Egyptian Court magicians who in the Exodus account of Josephus are contrasted with God's true prophet Moses."[80]

Two examples which Josephus gives of these false "prophets like Moses"

who should be judged as mere magicians, like those in Pharoah's employ, are the cases of Theudas and an unnamed "Egyptian."[81] Theudas was a noted γόης, according to Josephus, who incited "the majority of the masses" to gather their possessions and follow him to the Jordan River. He pronounced himself a prophet and contended that the Jordan would part at his behest, allowing his people to cross without difficulty. Envisaging a new exodus across miraculously divided waters, Theudas apparently assumed a Moses-type role.[82] However, his movement came to a disastrous end, proving the "folly" of his claims and schemes (*Ant.* 20.97-98).

The anonymous "Egyptian" (a possible symbolic designation for one who claimed to be a deliverer, like Moses, raised up in Egypt) was a ψευδοπροφήτης and γόης, as Josephus calls him in *The Jewish War*, who attracted a large company of Judean peasants and led them on a meandering journey from the desert to the Mount of Olives. His ultimate goal was to conquer the city of Jerusalem after miraculously flattening its walls with but a word of command. While images of Joshua and the Conquest spring most readily to mind, the picture of a Moses-led people wandering through the wilderness in preparation for entrance into the promised land should also be considered as background to the "Egyptian's" campaign.[83] Once again, despite his pretensions to be a Moses/Joshua-styled leader, the "Egyptian" was (deservedly in Josephus' thinking) put to flight by Roman armies and the movement surrounding him crushed (*Ant.* 20.169-70; *J.W.* 2.261-62).[84]

With this widespread currency in Luke's day of retellings and even contemporary applications (in Josephus' case) of the biblical traditions concerning Moses' rivalry with Pharoah's magicians, the likelihood is

increased that Luke himself would have been knowledgeable of this tradition and conscious of its value as an apt illustration of the competition between Philip and Simon Magus. Such likelihood moves closer to the point of certainty when the saying of Jesus reported in Luke 11.20 is taken into account.

> But if it is by the finger of God (δακτύλῳ θεοῦ) that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you.

Scholarly debate on this verse has focused typically on whether Luke has retained the reading "finger of God" from his "Q" source or whether he has altered the original "Spirit of God" found in the Matt 12.28 parallel. The balance of opinion still favors the originality of the Lucan reference, in part because of the unlikelihood that Luke would pass up an opportunity to bolster his emphasis on the Spirit's activity.[85] However, the matter is complicated by the fact that on one occasion Luke omits a reference to the Spirit which Mark and Matthew include (Mark 12.36//Matt 22.43//Luke 20.42)[86] and by the observation that the anthropomorphism "finger of God" is closely related to "hand of God/the Lord," which appears several times in Luke-Acts (Luke 1.66; Acts 4.28, 30; 11.21; 13.11) and can be equated with "Spirit of God" in OT usage (Ezek 3.14; 8.1-3; 1 Chron 28.12, 19).[87] The "finger of God" reference, then, even if borrowed rather than created by Luke, fits in well with Lucan tendencies and interests.[88]

At any rate, what is most relevant to our present concerns is the consensus view that "finger of God" in Luke 11.20 represents an allusion to the pronouncement of Pharoah's magicians in Exod 8.15 (LXX) regarding the divine authority of Moses' works.[89] The comparison with the Exodus story

becomes especially clear when we consider the context of the saying of Jesus in Luke 11.20. Jesus is embroiled in a debate regarding the source of power for his exorcising ministry, with some in the crowd hurling the calumny, "He casts out demons by Beelzebul, the prince of demons" (11.15). This is tantamount to a charge that Jesus was acting in the capacity of a pagan sorcerer. Jesus, however, after pointing out the absurdity of the notion that Satan would conspire to defeat his own minions (11.17-19), remonstrates that his exorcisms are in fact demonstrations of the "finger of God"; that is, they are just like Moses' signs of deliverance in Egypt, wrought by the "finger of God" and sharply distinguished from the conjuring tricks of Pharoah's Satan-inspired magicians (cf. references to the magicians' alliance with Belial/Prince Mastema [= Beelzebul] in *Jub.* 48.9-11 and CD 5.17-10 cited above).[90] To illustrate further his liberation of Satan's captives, Jesus speaks next of the plundering of the strong man's palace by one who is stronger (11.21-22),[91] a picture which may well be related to Israel's despoiling of Pharoah's household and kingdom in connection with the emancipation of the children of Israel (Exod 3.19-22; 11.2-3; 12.35-36).[92]

Looking beyond Luke 11 to the wider context of Luke's two-volume work, we notice that in Acts 4 there emerges a similar allusion to the miraculous activity of God's <u>hand</u> which effected Israel's freedom from Egyptian slavery (though not explicitly tied to the discomfiture of Pharoah's magicians). Under the threat of persecution from the local authorities, the community of Christians at Jerusalem gather to beseech the Lord for assistance: ". . . grant to thy servants to speak thy word with all boldness, while thou <u>stretchest out thy hand</u> (τὴν χεῖρά [σου] ἐκτείνεν σε) to heal and

signs and wonders (σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα) are performed through the name of thy holy servant Jesus" (Acts 4.29-30; cf. Exod 3.19-20; 7.3-5; 9.3, 15; ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, 3.20; 7.5; σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, 7.3).[93]

Given Luke's typological interest in the work of God's mighty finger/hand through Moses in Egypt, prompting in particular a clear comparison of Jesus' victory over Satan with Moses' subduing of Pharoah's magicians, we can surmise with some confidence that Luke envisaged an analogous backdrop to the competition between Philip and Simon Magus presented in Acts 8. That is, he regarded Philip as a "prophet like both Moses and Jesus" who, through a superior display of signs and outstanding miracles, overwhelmed Simon, the "magician like Pharoah's wizards," and gave evidence of being the instrument of the "finger of God." Interestingly, "finger of God" (like "hand of God") could easily be interpreted as a symbolic reference to the "power of God."[94] This becomes significant in light of Simon's notoriety in the Acts account as the "Great Power (of God)." While Simon had given every impression in Samaria of being divinely empowered, in fact, like his magician counterparts in Pharoah's Egypt, he is ultimately forced to acknowledge that the Moses-styled prophet--Philip--is a channel of a Higher Power. One might even talk of Philip's role, from Luke's perspective, as the "more powerful/stronger one" who strips the "powerful/strong man" Simon of his authority and restores the nation of Samaria which had long been held spellbound to Simon's charms.[95]

Beyond this probable correspondence between Philip's greater wonder-working than Simon Magus and Moses' outdoing of Egypt's magicians, Philip's "prophet-like-Moses" status *vis-à-vis* Simon may also be more specifically

rooted, in Luke's view, in the Deuteronomy 18 tradition referred to above, with its primary accent on the prophet's spoken ministry and authority to be heard. For as the Samaritans in Acts 8 "hear" (ἀκούω) and "give heed" (προσέχω) to Philip's message where formerly they had "given heed" (προσέχω) to the amazing Simon Magus (8.6, 10-11), so the children of Israel were commanded in Deuteronomy 18 not to "give heed" (ἀκούω) to sorcerers in the land of Canaan but rather to "heed" (ἀκούω) the words of the divinely appointed "prophet like Moses" (18.14, 15, 18-19).

Having explored the possible parallel between Philip/Simon Magus and Moses/Pharoah's magicians against the background of OT and contemporary extra-biblical accounts of the Exodus story, we now turn finally to consider the relevance of a "prophet-like-Moses" pattern for understanding the Philip-Simon encounter in Acts 8 in light of extra-Lucan traditions concerning Simon Magus.

3.3 *Simon Magus and the "Prophet like Moses"*

While one strand of patristic testimony regarding Simon Magus focuses upon his alleged identity as a Gnostic Redeemer-figure and thus bears little relation to the Acts 8 report (see above), another strand, while clearly elaborating or even embellishing Luke's account, nonetheless builds more directly on the Acts presentation of Simon as a popular Samaritan magician. And upon examining the traditions of this latter type, it is interesting to discover possible associations of Simon with the "prophet-like-Moses" model.

In reporting Celsus' critique of Jesus and the Christian movement, Origen refers to the objection that "some thousands will refute Jesus by

asserting that the prophecies which were applied to him were spoken of them" (*Con. Cel.* 1.57). Origen scarcely agrees that there were so many "messianic"-pretenders around the time of Jesus, but he does place in this category (1) Theudas, "who said that he was some great one;" (2) Judas of Galilee, who purported to be "some wise man and an introducer of new doctrines;" (3) Dositheus the Samaritan, who presented himself as "the Christ prophesied by Moses and. . . appeared to have won over some folk to his teaching;" and (4) Simon "the Samaritan magician," who endeavored "to draw away some folk by magic and. . . succeeded in his deception at the time." However, Simon, like the other figures mentioned, proved to be a fraud, and the movement around him collapsed (1.57). Later in *Contra Celsum* Origen once again links Simon, "the so-called Great Power of God," with Dositheus, Theudas and Judas as fellow contemporaries of Jesus whose claims to divine authority had proven utterly false (6.11).[96]

While it is true that Origen does not indicate in so many words that Simon made himself out to be the eschatological "prophet like Moses," Simon's appearance in *Contra Celsum* as one who rivalled Jesus' claims to fulfill OT prophecy and his association with one whom Josephus cast as a false "prophet like Moses" (Theudas, see above) and with a fellow Samaritan alleged to be "the Christ prophesied by Moses" (Dositheus)[97] suggest that Origen conceived of Simon's self-perception in terms related to a popular Moses-type leader.

A similar, though much more developed, account of Simon's early career emerges in the Pseudo-Clementine literature:

> By nationality he [Simon] is a Samaritan and comes from the village of Gittha, which is six miles distant from the capital. During his stay in Egypt he acquired a large measure of Greek culture and attained to an extensive knowledge of magic and

> ability in it. He then came forward claiming to be accepted as a mighty power of the very God who has created the world. On occasion he sets himself up for the Messiah and describes himself as the Standing One. He uses this title since he is to exist for ever and his body cannot possibly fall a victim to the germs of corruption (*Hom.* 2.22; cf. *Rec.* 2.7).[98]

The report goes on to describe an intense conflict between Simon and Dositheus within an elite circle of thirty disciples of John the Baptist over who had the right to be called the "Standing One" and to assume leadership of the group after John's death. Dositheus initally staked his claim to the top position while Simon was away in Egypt studying magic. When Simon returned to the community he feigned support for Dositheus at first, but eventually plotted to undermine Dositheus' authority as the "Standing One." Matters came to a head when Dositheus, upon discovering his rival's scheme, struck out at Simon with his rod. Amazingly, the rod "seemed to go through Simon's body as if it were smoke," and Simon was thus vindicated as the true "Standing One." The humiliated Dositheus was forced to acknowledge Simon's superior status and then died in disgrace a few days later (*Hom.* 2.23-24; cf. *Rec.* 2.8-11).

The focus on Simon's clash with Dositheus as a contest over the ability to wield a miraculous staff suggests the portrayal of these reputed "Standing Ones" as rival "prophets like Moses." This idea may be strengthened by the familiar OT witness that Moses was uniquely called to <u>stand</u> in close communion with God (cf. Exod 3.4-6; 33.18-23; Deut 5.31).[99]

Granting the plausibility that certain patristic presentations of Simon Magus viewed him as well as Dositheus as first century Samaritan magicians pretending to fulfill the role of the promised eschatological "prophet like

Moses," we must inquire whether there is any evidence that such a conception is historically reliable and would have been extant in Luke's day. Recent critical analyses of the relevant Dosithean and Simonian traditions, notably by S. J. Isser and J. E. Fossum,[100] have indeed tended to regard Dositheus and Simon as historical Samaritan figures around the middle of the first century who worked wonders and purported to be the long-awaited Mosaic prophet of Deuteronomy 18, though admittedly the precise relationship between the two men remains speculative,[101] not to mention their supposed alliance with John the Baptist.[102]

In support of this primitive connection between Simon/Dositheus and the "prophet-like-Moses" expectation, two points may be advanced:

(1) As noted in our previous chapter, a compilation of citations from the book of Deuteronomy forms part of the SP expansion to the Exodus Decalogue. Included among these inserted texts are Deut 18.18-22, pertaining to the promised "prophet like Moses," together with Deut 5.31, which reports the divine exhortation to Moses, "But you, stand here *by* Me, and I will tell you the commandments. . ." Interestingly, the Qumran fragments which provide the only ancient parallels to a cluster of *testimonia* from Exodus 20, Deuteronomy 5 and Deuteronomy 18 (4QTestim 175; 4QBibPar 158) do not refer specifically to Deut 5.31 in conjunction with the "prophet-like-Moses" promise.[103] Thus the expected "prophet-like-Moses" figure may have been uniquely affiliated in early Samaritan thought with one who, like Moses, would claim to stand in the presence of God.[104] It would not be surprising, then, to find in the first century charismatic miracle-workers, such as Simon and Dositheus, who sought to win over a segment of the Samaritan population

by putting themselves forward as the anticipated "prophet like Moses"/"Standing One."

(2) In addition to his reports concerning various Jewish "sign prophets" in the first century, Josephus records an incident from 36 C.E. in which Pontius Pilate brutally put down a popular uprising among the Samaritans led by an unnamed prophetic figure. This figure had mustered his following by claiming to be the restorer of the sacred vessels of the tabernacle which Moses had supposedly hidden on Mt. Gerizim (*Ant.* 18.85-89). While the precise nature of his mission remains vague, it would appear that he assumed the role of an eschatological Moses *redivivus* or "prophet like Moses" who had come to reinstate true worship on the Samaritans' sacred site.[105] Though tapping a somewhat esoteric Mosaic tradition and appearing more as a rabble-rouser than a teacher and miracle-worker, this anonymous leader still exemplifies a general Samaritan interest in Moses-styled figures within the first century which others, like Simon and Dositheus, could have exploited in their own ways.[106]

In the likely event that the related conceptions of Simon Magus as the self-proclaimed "prophet like Moses" and "Standing One" go back in some form to Luke's time, we are encouraged to probe the possible influence of such ideas on the Acts 8 portrayal of Simon's competition with Philip the evangelist.

(1) We have already contended that Luke has cast Philip in the role of a "prophet like Moses" and modelled Philip's encounter with Simon after Moses' contest with Pharoah's magicians. Within this scenario it would have fit most aptly for Luke to regard Simon as a <u>counterfeit "prophet like</u>

Moses", in much the same way as Josephus characterized Theudas and the "Egyptian" as inept, Moses-mimicking prophets following in the train of Egypt's magicians of old (see above). In fact, Luke mentions both Theudas and the "Egyptian" in the book of Acts (5.36; 21.38) and, like Origen (no doubt dependent on the Acts account), especially links Theudas and Simon Magus as popular pretenders to greatness (see above). Moreover, the μάγος Bar-Jesus in Acts 13.6 is labelled a ψευδοπροφήτης, matching Josephus' designation of the "Egyptian" in *J. W.* 2.261, so it would not be surprising if Luke conceived of Simon Magus in similar terms.

(2) While the Pseudo-Clementine tradition that Simon staked his claim to be the "prophet like Moses" and "Standing One" probably has its roots in the first century, the information that Simon trained for his vocation under Egypt's magicians is likely an apocryphal elaboration. But the basic connection of Simon's Mosaic aspirations with some kind of attachment to Egyptian magic represents a Christian interpretation of Simon's career which may possibly be inspired by the story in Exodus 7-9 and thus provide an interesting parallel to Luke's characterization of Simon in the book of Acts.

(3) The "Standing-One" concept in conjunction with the idea of the "prophet like Moses" and with the claims of Simon Magus has seldom been explored as a possible feature of Luke's presentation. But we should not overlook the climactic scene in the Stephen-narrative in which the Christian martyr beholds Jesus/Son of Man "standing at the right hand of God" (Acts 7.55-56). Special attention is in fact drawn to the figure of the standing Christ by the repetition of ἑστῶτα in 7.55-56[107] and by the well-known variation from the customary depiction of Christ as seated at God's right

hand (cf. Luke 22.69). While a wide range of opinions have been offered regarding the significance of Stephen's vision,[108] insufficient attention has been paid to the possible links between the "Standing" Christ and Moses and the Mosaic prophet in the Stephen speech.

In Acts 7.33 Moses receives his appointment to the role of Israel's deliverer in an awesome encounter with the divine presence while "standing" (ἕστηκας) on holy ground, and in 7.37 reference is made to the "prophet like Moses" from Deuteronomy 18 (= Christ, cf. 3.18-22) whom "God will raise up" (ἀναστήσει). While this "raising up" of the Mosaic prophet may only refer to bringing him on the scene, a more sublime exaltation may be in view. At the close of the speech, Stephen reminds his audience that their fathers had always killed the prophets as they had now even murdered the Righteous One (= Christ = "prophet like Moses") of whom the prophets spoke (7.52). Thus, the formal Stephen discourse ends with the violent death of God's appointed messenger, a shocking destiny for the promised "prophet like Moses." But Stephen's subsequent vision of this same figure <u>standing</u> at God's right hand would seem to underscore that the Mosaic prophet (= Son of Man/Jesus) had been <u>raised up</u> (i.e. resurrected and ascended) in a new way to everlasting glory.[109] In short, Jesus the "Standing One" who appears to Stephen emerges in the context of Acts 7 as <u>the vindicated "prophet like Moses."</u>[110]

If we accept that Simon boasted of himself in Samaritan circles as the "Standing One" and "prophet like Moses" and if we take note that the Lucan treatment of Simon at the beginning of Acts 8 closely follows the account of Stephen's Christophany at the end of Acts 7 in which Jesus is revealed as

the "Standing One" and "prophet like Moses," it becomes very tempting to conclude that Luke intended a direct comparison between Jesus and Simon as rival claimants to divine authority. Of course, in Luke's estimation, Jesus alone had proven himself--to Simon's great embarrassment--to be the true "Standing One," the authorized eschatological "prophet like Moses," the select instrument of God's right hand of power.

(4) As for Philip's role in this connection, he comes to Samaria as the messenger of the "Standing" Christ''' and a powerful "prophet like Moses and Jesus" (and Stephen) in his own right (see above). He thoroughly overwhelms and exposes as a sham the self-acclaimed "prophet like Moses" and "Standing One," Simon Magus. And so Philip demonstrates the greatness of his own prophetic ministry and the preeminence of the Christ whom he preaches and serves.

§4. PHILIP AND SIMON THE "APOSTATE"

Thus far our analysis of Philip's juxtaposition with Simon Magus in Acts 8 has tended only to disclose a high evaluation of Philip's ministry on Luke's part. Philip appears dramatically as a greater power and a greater Mosaic prophet than one who purported to be (and for a time persuaded a group of Samaritans that he was) the nonpareil "Great Power (of God)" and "prophet like Moses"/"Standing One." Philip's exceptional achievement with respect to Simon even extends to winning him as a convert to the Christian faith. Simon believes Philip's message, is baptized and attaches himself like a disciple to Philip (8.13)--all typical marks of personal Christian response and identification with the Christian community.

However, when the material in Acts 8.18-24 is taken into account, an apparent blight on Philip's record emerges. For when the Jerusalem apostles arrive in Samaria, Simon reverts to his old wicked ways and incurs from Peter what amounts to a pronouncement of excommunication[112]: "Your silver perish with you. . . . before God. Repent therefore of this wickedness of yours. . ." (8.20-22). Does this "apostasy"[113] on Simon's part not somehow reflect badly on the quality of Philip's evangelism? Should not Philip have exercised better judgment in Simon's case, either by refusing to baptize him in the first place or by instructing him more fully in the demands of Christian discipleship--or at least by personally censuring his wayward convert rather than leaving the matter to a visiting missionary? These, of course, are all questions which arise from a certain ecclesiology which advocates the close scrutiny and strict discipline of candidates for church membership, and it may be that Luke did not share this perspective.

If we want to know Luke's view of how Simon's "apostasy" colors the appraisal of Philip's ministry, we must compare this instance of losing a supposed convert with similar situations in Luke's two-volume work, especially connected with the ministries of Jesus and Peter. Also, it should prove illuminating to consult Luke's version of the parable of the Sower, which delineates different levels of response to the proclamation of the gospel.

(1) The Synoptic interpretations of Jesus' parable of the Sower tend to provide important insight into each Gospel writer's theology of mission.[114] In Luke's case, the evaluation of the fruitful receiver of the word is particularly revealing: "And as for that in the good soil, they are

those who, hearing the word, hold it fast in an honest and good heart, and bring forth fruit with patience" (Luke 8.15). Unique to Luke is the emphasis upon holding fast (κατέχουσιν) to the word and bearing fruit in perseverance (ἐν ὑπομονῇ) from a sincere heart (ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ). The idea of persisting in one's commitment to the word[115] is clearly contrasted with an initial reception of joy (χαρά) and belief "for a while" (πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν), followed by a falling away in the time of temptation (8.13).[116] A mature hearing of the word is also inconsistent with an superficial devotion eventually choked by preoccupation with material pleasures (8.14).

The parallels with Simon's experience in Acts 8 are noteworthy. Simon believes Philip's word (8.13) and is probably to be viewed as caught up in Samaria's joy (χαρά, 8.8) over Philip's ministry. As the narrative ensues, however, we find Simon snared by a craving for money and power as a result of his wicked heart (καρδία, 8.21, 22). Simon has received the word of God (8.14), but by failing to persevere in faith and obedience he has fallen away and forfeited his share "in this word" (ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ, 8.21).[117]

(2) The classic apostate in Luke-Acts is, of course, Judas, who through treachery loses his place as one of Jesus' twelve disciples. The scene in Acts 1.15-26 describing the replacement of Judas in the apostolic band manifests a number of contact points with the Simon-episode in Acts 8.18-24.[118] Peter announces that, while Judas had formerly enjoyed "a share in this ministry" (τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης, 1.17), judgment had befallen him in fulfillment of Scripture, and his office was to be occupied by another (1.20). Luke adds parenthetically the financial

motivation behind Judas' betrayal: "This man bought (ἐκτήσατο) a field with the reward of his wickedness (ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας)" (1.18; cf. Luke 22.3-6). After praying to the Lord "who knowest the hearts of all men" (1.24), the deciding lot (ὁ κλῆρος) falls on Matthias, and he is inducted into the apostolic circle (1.26).

Simon Magus endeavors to obtain the signs of apostolic authority by seeking to purchase (κτάομαι, 8.20) the ability to impart the Spirit, evidently for his own economic profit. As proclaimed by Peter, however, Simon's entanglement in the bonds of wickedness (ἀδικίας, 8.23)[119] insures that he receives no portion (κλῆρος, 8.21) in the apostles' ministry of the word and Spirit[120] and sets him on the road to destruction.[121]

(3) According to events related in Acts 5.1-11, Ananias and Sapphira, apparently members in good standing within the young Jerusalem church, sin egregiously against the Holy Spirit over a matter involving the disposal of money. The problem is judged to be one of an evil <u>heart</u> (καρδία, 5.3, 4). Peter exposes the offence, and the couple are amazingly struck dead for their wrongdoing.

Again the correspondence with the report of Simon's impiety is transparent. The professing Christian, Simon, also errs because of a corrupt heart in matters pertaining to the Spirit and the use of money, and while he is not smitten dead on the spot for his iniquity, he effectively receives a death sentence which frightens him terribly and, as far as he knows, has every likelihood of being carried out in the future (8.20-24).[122]

The fundamental point to be established from these parallels is that Luke did not regard Simon's "apostasy" as an isolated phenomenon in the

history of the Jesus movement and the early church and, consequently, would scarcely have held Philip responsible for its occurrence. In Luke-Acts, if even among Jesus' most intimate disciples one becomes a traitor and among the Spirit-filled Jerusalem congregation headed by Peter two are "filled with Satan," then nothing derogatory toward Philip could be meant by reporting his failure with Simon Magus. Indeed, it is the way of the kingdom of God, as Luke sees it, that the ministry of the word will periodically evoke insincere and transitory responses.

Of course, if the end result of an evangelistic campaign described by Luke had been widespread "apostasy" on the part of professing believers, then there would be room for suspecting the competency of the missionary-in-charge. But in the case of Philip's Samaritan mission presented in Acts 8, Simon stands out among the multitude of joyful respondents to the gospel as the lone example of an apparent convert who fails to persevere in the faith, even as Judas and Ananias and Sapphira feature as exceptional cases among Jesus' disciples and the Jerusalem church. Philip surely should not be blamed for the odd delinquent Samaritan when he has proven successful with the vast majority.

We are still left with the potentially embarrassing situation for Philip in Acts 8 that it is not he but Peter who uncovers the chicanery of Simon and pronounces judgment upon him. But the same circumstance applies to Jesus' treatment of Judas. The betrayed Master actually rebukes his followers for retaliating against Judas and his arrest party (Luke 22.47-53), leaving Peter to assess Judas' true condition in Acts 1. It may in fact be a Lucan *Tendenz* to highlight Peter as the staunch defender of Christian

integrity and the opponent of pretenders to the faith. This pattern would be consistent with Luke's unique saying of Jesus when predicting Peter's denial: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan demanded to have you, that he might sift you like wheat, but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren" (Luke 22.31). The book of Acts demonstrates that Jesus' prayer was answered, as a renewed Simon Peter, now strong and confident, exposes others whom Satan has claimed and whose faith has failed. When it comes, then, to disciplining Simon Magus in Acts 8, the assignment of the leading role to Peter would seem to reflect Luke's desire more to reinforce a particular portrayal of Peter than to denigrate Philip in any way.

§5. SUMMARY

The principal features of the Lucan *Philippusbild* discernible from the portrayal in Acts 8 of Philip's encounter with Simon Magus include an emphasis on (1) Philip's greatness and on (2) Philip's continuity with renowned OT prophets and (3) other key figures in Luke-Acts.

(1) That Luke regards Philip the evangelist as one of the truly great figures within the early church is clearly manifest in the presentation of Philip's superiority, both in terms of miraculous power and moral character, over the likes of Simon Magus who had established an extensive reputation as the "Great Power (of God)." The climax of Philip's notable achievement emerges in Acts 8.13, where Simon himself appears awe-struck over Philip's mighty works and submits to Philip's ministry of proclamation and baptism. Though later on in the story Simon fails to live up to his discipleship-

commitment, this should not be viewed from a Lucan standpoint as in any way disparaging Philip's reputation, any more than Judas' "apostasy" reflects badly on the calibre of Jesus' ministry. Admittedly, however, there is still the thorny problem of why Philip does not impart the Spirit to his Samaritan converts, which we shall discuss in detail in chap. 5.

(2) Reinforcing Luke's presentation of Philip's greatness in relation to Simon Magus is the patterning of Philip's exploits after those of a "prophet like Moses" (and possibly a "prophet like Elisha" as well). In particular, Philip's subduing of the Samaritan magician proves analogous to Moses' victory over Pharoah's magicians in the well-known Exodus story. Also, Luke may have intended to counterpoint Philip's vocation as an honorable Mosaic prophet and minister of Jesus Christ--the preeminent "Prophet like Moses"--and Simon's false pretensions to be the "prophet like Moses" and "Standing One."

(3) Philip's triumphant contest with Simon Magus closely associates his work with the ministries of both Jesus and Paul in Luke-Acts. Like Jesus, Philip stands out as a Moses-styled instrument of the "finger of God" (cf. Luke 11.20), wielding his authority to deliver others from the clutches of a formidable evil "Power." And like Paul, Philip successfully eliminates the threat of magical religion as an impediment to the world-wide advance of the gospel.

CHAPTER 4: PHILIP AND THE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH

§1. INTRODUCTION

As we have already established, by virtue of his groundbreaking outreach in Acts 8.4-13 to the nation of Samaria, Philip the evangelist takes his place within Luke's narrative as one of the key trailblazers of the early church's universal mission. He then yields the spotlight temporarily to the Jerusalem apostles (8.14-25) but subsequently re-emerges as the protagonist of Luke's mission-history in the incident which features the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch (8.26-40). In the present chapter we aim to examine in depth this second Philip-story in Acts 8 in order to determine its significance within Luke's unfolding drama of the gospel's initial advance to the ends of the earth. In particular we shall seek to understand how Luke correlates Philip's evangelization of the Ethiopian eunuch with his prior mission to the Samaritans and with subsequent missionary milestones in Acts 9-11 associated with Peter, Paul and the community at Antioch.

In comparing Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch and his previous interaction with the Samaritans, we notice that both are concerned principally with Philip's ministry of gospel-proclamation (εὐαγγελίζομαι, 8.4, 12, 35, 40) and baptism (8.12-13, 36-39) beyond the borders of Jerusalem (Samaria/road to Gaza). But despite this fundamental correspondence, the incidents are far from identical. In the first place, while the account of the Samaritan mission is a brief, generalized summary of events exclusively in third person, the eunuch-story is recounted in much greater detail, focusing upon an extended dialogue between Philip and his inquirer.[1]

Secondly, there are differences in the setting and scope of Philip's evangelistic undertakings in Acts 8. On the one hand, Philip journeys to "the city of Samaria" and ministers to a "multitude" of its inhabitants (8.4-8); on the other hand, he goes down to "a desert road" south of Jerusalem to witness solely to an isolated traveller (8.26-29). Thirdly, different impulses trigger the launching of Philip's two missionary enterprises. The evangelist is constrained to venture to Samaria on account of hostile forces in Jerusalem (8.1, 3-5), whereas he is guided to his rendezvous with the Ethiopian eunuch by direct mandate from the angel/Spirit of the Lord (8.26, 29). Finally, and most significantly, the respondents to Philip's preaching in Acts 8 vary in terms of their ethnico-religious status. We have already discussed the somewhat ambiguous identity of the Samaritans in Luke's presentation as "foreigners" (ἀλλογενεῖς) opposed to Jerusalem-based Judaism who yet maintain some traditional links with the Jewish race and religion so as not to be classified properly as Gentiles. In the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, as a native of an African country he is clearly a Gentile and thus ethnically distinguishable from the Samaritans. To be sure, he is portrayed as a Gentile interested in Jewish worship and scripture, but one of the specific expressions of this attraction to Judaism--namely, his pilgrimage to Jerusalem (8.27)--again sets him apart from the Samaritans who looked to Gerizim as their cultic center.

Because of these noteworthy differences between Philip's respective missions to the Samaritans and Ethiopian eunuch as reported in Acts 8, we should not simply lump these missions together as alternative stages within a single, essentially uniform, evangelistic campaign conducted by Philip

outside Jerusalem. Indeed we must press in the course of this chapter to clarify what Luke regards as Philip's distinctive and innovative achievement in converting the Ethiopian eunuch *vis-à-vis* his former breakthrough to the Samaritans.

Turning to consider the relationship of the Philip-eunuch encounter to the events which immediately follow in Acts 9-11, the critical issue concerns Luke's presentation of the opening of the church's doors to the Gentiles. In Acts 9 Paul is dramatically converted and commissioned by the Lord himself to be "a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles" (v. 15), thus setting the stage for his monumental mission throughout the Mediterranean world in the latter half of Acts. In Acts 10.1-11.18 Peter's witness to the Roman centurion, Cornelius, receives extended treatment. This event is normally interpreted as the official inauguration of the Gentile mission in the book of Acts, and in any case, it has a poignant impact upon the church's developing mission policy (11.1-18; cf. 15.7-9). In Acts 11.19-21 we learn about the founding of the Christian community at Antioch by some of those expelled from Jerusalem after Stephen's death. Notable among these missionaries are "men of Cyprus and Cyrene" who proclaim the message of the Lord Jesus "to the Greeks also" (11.20).

How then does the report of the Ethiopian eunuch's baptism at the hands of the Philip fit in with this emphasis in Acts 9-11 on the beginnings of the Gentile mission?[2] Some scholars in fact deny that the eunuch-incident has any substantial bearing on Luke's portrayal of the church's outreach to Gentiles, since they regard Philip's convert as a full proselyte to Judaism.[3] Others, however, envisage the Ethiopian official as more marginally attached

to Judaism and view his conversion as marking a "stepping-stone" between the Samaritan and Gentile missions, that is, an intermediate stage in the church's expansion beyond the acceptance of "semi-Jewish" Samaritans but falling short of embracing full-fledged Gentiles.[4] Yet another approach seems to perceive of Philip's evangelization of the eunuch as more closely related to the birth of the Gentile mission. In this case Philip's achievement is classified as a *Vorspiel*,[5] *Präludium*,[6] or *Auftakt*[7] (German synonyms roughly equivalent to "prelude") to the fuller work of Peter and Paul among the Gentiles.

The difficulty with these perspectives on Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch as "stepping-stone" or "prelude" to the Gentile mission lies in both cases with their imprecision and, consequently, the questions they leave unanswered. For example, if the winning of the eunuch slots somewhere in the middle of the Samaritan and Gentile missions, to which of the two is it really closer? Is it more a tentative inching forward beyond Samaritan boundaries, a bold new advance just this side of a breakthrough to the Gentiles, or something in between? Likewise, if Philip's witness to the eunuch functions as a "prelude" to the flowering of the Gentile mission, are we to imagine that Luke depicts Philip as the progenitor of the Gentile mission who in fact sets the missionary agenda which Peter and Paul (and certain preachers in Antioch) simply take up and bring to fruition? Or should we think in more modest terms of Philip's contribution that he just happens to recruit the odd foreigner as an exceptional case before the serious seeking after Gentiles commences in Acts 9-11?

In short, we need to sharpen our understanding of exactly how Philip's

outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch at the end of Acts 8 acts as a bridge in Luke's narrative from the Samaritan mission in the first half of Acts 8 to the unfolding of the Gentile mission in Acts 9-11. In pursuing this objective we shall analyze the eunuch-incident from a variety of angles, starting with a literary focus on the story's structure and style and on its parallels with narratives in the OT and Luke's Gospel and then proceeding to concentrate on a number of key issues raised by the episode--including matters pertaining to geography, divine intervention, the eunuch's status and Philip's ministry of proclamation and baptism--all of which have a bearing on defining Philip's strategic role, as Luke sees it, in advancing the world-wide extension of the gospel.

§2. STRUCTURE AND STYLE OF ACTS 8.25-40

Before delineating various structural and stylistic features of the report of Philip's interaction with the Ethiopian eunuch, a word of explanation must be offered which accounts for opening the story at v. 25. Μὲν οὖν characteristically signals the start of a new section in the book of Acts (cf. above on 8.4), and the circumstances of v. 25 dovetail nicely with those presented in v. 26 to form a natural introduction to the ensuing narrative.[8] Together, vv. 25-26 chart the courses of the principal missionaries to Samaria after the encounter with Simon Magus. The first verse informs the reader of Peter and John's movement back to Jerusalem, while the second, by way of contrast ("But [δὲ] an angel of the Lord said to Philip. . ."), relates Philip's separate journey toward the coastal region of Palestine where the stage is set for the following events. But how do we

square this analysis with the fact, previously observed in our study, that v. 25 also constitutes a fitting conclusion to the Samaritan episode? The best solution interprets v. 25 as a carefully constructed transitional "hinge" which functions as a link to both the preceding and succeeding stories. The marking off of v. 25 as a self-contained paragraph in most modern texts and translations would seem to reflect this dual purpose.

A helpful approach to structuring the whole of Acts 8.25-40 maps out an intricate chiastic pattern. Scholars have detected the use of chiasm throughout Luke-Acts,[9] so it would not be surprising to find it employed in this particular case. Drawing on the work of D. Mínguez and R. O'Toole, the following schema may be sketched, focusing on the repetition of identical or similar terminology.[10]

v. 25 A. ὑπέστρεφον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα

B. πολλάς τε κώμας τῶν Σαμαριτῶν

C. εὐηγγελίζοντο

v. 26 D. ἐλάλησεν πρὸς Φίλοππον

E. πορεύου. . . ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν

v. 27 F. καὶ ἰδοὺ. . . εὐνοῦχος

v. 29 G. εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ Φιλίππῳ

v. 31 H. ἀναβάντα καθίσθαι σὺν αὐτῷ

v. 32 I. ἡ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς

vv. 32-35 J. ISAIAH 53.7-8: CITATION AND DISCUSSION

v. 35 I.' ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης

v. 39 H.' ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος

G.' πνεῦμα κυρίου ἥρπασεν τὸν Φίλιππον

F.' καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὸν οὐκέτι ὁ εὐνοῦχος

E.' ἐπορεύετο γὰρ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ

v. 40 D.' Φίλιππος δὲ εὑρέθη εἰς Ἄζωτον

C.' εὐηγγελίζετο

B.' τὰς πόλεις πάσας

A.' τοῦ ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς Καισάρειαν

The interpretive value of discerning a chiastic arrangement of a text lies in the resulting disclosure of both the narrative's main focus highlighted at the chiasm's center and important subsidiary ideas flagged through repetition on either side of the mid-point. The hub of the story of Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch may thus be pinpointed at the citation and probing of Isa 53.7-8 in Acts 8.32-35, indicated by letter (J) in the outline above.[11] This emphasis on exploring the Isaianic text is reinforced by the closely associated repetition of γραφή (I/I'). Such a direct appeal to OT Scripture, especially prophetic passages, in Christian proclamation represents a favorite Lucan tendency at large, but interestingly, in Acts 8-11--the primary narrative context surrounding the eunuch-incident--this tendency is manifest again only in the report of Peter's instruction to Cornelius (10.43), and even here only in a general fashion ("To him all the prophets bear witness. . ."). Certainly, grasping the significance of the Isaiah quotation is particularly vital to interpreting the eunuch-episode as a whole and must merit our careful attention below.

Auxiliary concerns reflected in the chiastic structure of Acts 8.25-40,

along with their echoes in the surrounding scenes in Acts 8-11, may be enumerated as follows:

(1) The gospel permeates a region especially through its proclamation in the area's cities (B/B'). This urban context of missionary expansion is characteristic of Luke's perspective, with a particular accent on certain principal cities as bases of operation.[12] In the account of the eunuch's conversion, while the main action takes place on "a desert road," the overall movement of the narrative progesses toward the great centers of Jerusalem and Caesarea (A/A'; cf. Jerusalem in vv. 26-27). The Jerusalem connection appears in all the stories of Acts 8-11, but the additional association with Caesarea only emerges in the Cornelius-incident.

(2) The preaching of the gospel is denoted by the verb εὐαγγελίζω. Not only does this term occur at the beginning and end of the pericope (C/C'); it also appears very near the heart of the story (v. 35) and, as noted above, characterizes the Philip-material in general (8.4, 12; cf. 21.8). It recurs in Peter's sermon to Cornelius--in connection with God's announcement of peace through Jesus Christ (10.36)--and in the record of the witness of the first missionaries to Antioch (11.20).

(3) It is not surprising that references to Philip and the eunuch, the protagonists of the story, fit the chiastic model (D/D'; F/F') and are repeated throughout the passage (vv. 30, 34, 35, 38). The use of εὐνοῦχος as the predominant appellation for Philip's convert, overshadowing ἀνὴρ Αἰθίοψ and δυνάστης (v. 27), identifies the critical component of his character and places a special burden on correctly understanding its significance within the narrative. The emphasis upon a one-to-one evangelistic encounter

is typical of Acts 8-11, evidenced in the interactions between Philip/Peter and Simon Magus, Ananias and Saul, and Peter and Cornelius.[13]

(4) The repeated usage of πορεύομαι (E/E'; cf. also vv. 27, 36) and ὁδός (E/E'; cf. also v. 36; ὁδηγέω, v. 31) coincides with the familiar journey motif which pervades Luke's two-volume work.[14] In the immediate context of Acts 8-11 the two terms cluster again noticeably in the account of Saul's conversion and commission in chap. 9 (vv. 3, 11, 15, 17, 21).[15] Bauernfeind has made the interesting suggestion that in the eunuch-narrative the notion of πορεύεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν applies especially to directing the gospel <u>on the way to the Gentiles</u>, in contradistinction to the mission imperatives in Matt 10.5-6.[16]

(5) The focus on the Spirit as the agent of divine guidance (G/G') illustrates the theme of providential initiative which runs throughout the eunuch-incident and also permeates the stories involving Paul and Peter in Acts 9-11 (cf. full treatment below).

(6) Ἀναβαίνω portrays action within the story where the two main characters are closely linked together (H/H'). Philip "comes up" to sit with the eunuch in his chariot, enabling the pair to discuss the Isaiah passage with each other (v. 31). Later, just before Philip is whisked away from the scene, he and the eunuch "come up" out of the water together, picturing their common faith and baptism. These indications of fellowship between evangelist and inquirer may intimate the egalitarian nature of the church's universal mission, as Luke understands it, whereby new converts are accepted as full partners in the Christian community.[17]

Apart from those terms which strictly conform to a chiastic pattern in

Acts 8.25-40, we observe additional repeated words which also reflect important ideas in the passage.

(1) The multiple use of both προφήτης (vv. 28, 30, 34) and ἀναγινώσκω (vv. 28, 30, 32) in reference to the text from Isaiah 53 confirms the pivotal place which this portion of Scripture holds in the narrative.

(2) The recurrence of ὕδωρ (vv. 36 [twice], 38, 39) and βαπτίζω (vv. 36, 38) in the section directly following the proclamation based on Isaiah 53 emphasizes the baptismal act as a necessary response of commitment to the preached word. Likewise, baptism demonstrates the faith of Saul and Cornelius' household in Acts 9-10.

(3) The double-mention of ἰδού (vv. 27, 36) highlights the occurrence of unexpected phenomena in the story--the presence of a traveller and water in the desert--which serves to reinforce the larger theme concerning the supernatural ordering of events. The ejaculatory term surfaces frequently in the stories surrounding the eunuch-episode, especially calling attention to the unusual proceedings which prompt Peter's visit to Cornelius (10.17, 19, 21, 30; 11.11; cf. 7.56; 9.10-11).

Completing our brief literary analysis of Acts 8.35-40, we mention in passing two further stylistic features.

(1) *Word-plays.* Cleverly the author describes the Ethiopian who is met on the road from Jerusalem to Gaza (v. 26) as an official in charge of all the queen's γάζης (v. 27); later, Philip's terse question to the eunuch evinces a similar literary flair: ἆρα γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις; (v. 30).[18]

(2) *Optative + ἄν.* The eunuch responds to Philip's query using a construction alien to *koine* Greek and found nowhere else in the NT outside of Luke's writings: πῶς γὰρ ἄν δυναίμην. . .; (v. 31a).[19]

No great semantic significance should be read into these two characteristics, but in each case they do represent samples of literary sophistication, suggesting a particular narrative slant toward an educated audience.

In conclusion, this investigation of the internal structure and style of Acts 8.25-40 has brought to light the high degree of Lucan artistry which shapes the presentation of Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch. This is not to deny the use of source material, but, as so often in Luke's work, it makes the task of distinguishing between tradition and redaction an exceedingly difficult one. Also emerging in our study thus far is an indication of the leading ideas conveyed within the eunuch-incident, which must be examined more fully, and a charting of specific lines of continuity among the mission-stories in Acts 8-11, the preponderance of which conjoin the Philip-narrative in Acts 8.25-40 with the account of Peter's outreach to Cornelius in 10.1-11.18.

§3. LITERARY ANALOGUES TO ACTS 8.25-40

In addition to and ultimately informing our investigation of the correlation between the story of Philip's meeting with the Ethiopian eunuch and the companion mission-narratives in Acts 8-11, we must take due note of certain suggested parallels between Acts 8.25-40 and selected incidents within the OT and Luke's Gospel and inquire into the significance of these

parallels for understanding Luke's presentation of Philip's role in the church's universal mission. In particular we shall probe the possible literary background of the Elijah/Elisha material in Kings and the Emmaus-road-episode in the closing chapter of Luke's Gospel.

3.1 *The Elijah/Elisha-Narrative*

The dynamic prophetic figures of Elijah and Elisha and the lively incidents surrounding them in 1 Kings 17-2 Kings 9 clearly captured the attention of Luke, who utilized them both explicitly (Luke 1.17; 4.25-27; 9.8, 19, 30-33) and in more allusive fashion.[20] We have already intimated the particular influence which this OT material exerted on the casting of both Philip-narratives in Acts 8.[21] The eunuch-story especially reflects such influence, extending to a number of details associated with the accounts of both Elijah's and Elisha's prophetic careers.

E. Trocmé has noted a number of striking affinities between the Philip-story in Acts 8.25-40 and the Elijah-episode in 1 Kings 18[22]: (1) events set in motion by the command of God (1 Kgs 18.1//Acts 8.26); (2) desert setting (1 Kgs 18.2, 5//Acts 8.26); (3) prophet encounters pious, royal official (Obadiah, I Kgs 18.3-4, 7//Ethiopian eunuch, Acts 8.27-28); (4) prophet outruns chariot (1 Kgs 18.46//Acts 8.30); (5) prophet engages official in conversation (1 Kgs 18.7-15//Acts 8.30-35); (6) act of sacrifice forms core of the narrative (1 Kgs 18.20-40//Acts 8.32-35); (7) provision of necessary water (1 Kgs 18.41-45//Acts 8.36); (8) exit of prophet from the scene through divine intervention (1 Kgs 18.46, 12//Acts 8.39).

We may add to this list of common elements between the Philip- and

Elijah-stories:

(9) In 1 Kings 18 the miraculous movements of Elijah from one place to another are specifically attributed to the vehicle of the "Spirit of the Lord" (v. 12), just as in the case of Philip (Acts 8.39). A similar reference emerges in 2 Kgs 2.16 in an attempt to account for Elijah's whereabouts after he had been "taken up into heaven" (2 Kgs 2.11).[23]

(10) The royal official Obadiah, whom Elijah meets, notably demonstrates his great piety through his commitment to the Lord's prophets (1 Kgs 18.4, 13), a devotion which is mirrored in the eunuch's interest in the prophet Isaiah.

(11) Both Elijah's ordeal on Mt. Carmel and Philip's adventure in the desert focus on noon-time (μεσημβρία) as the hour of testing for divine activity (1 Kgs 18.26-29; Acts 8.26 [see more below]).

Admittedly these parallels are not equally compelling, but together they appear sufficiently strong to confirm some coloring of Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch, as reported in Acts 8, with Elijah-like characteristics. As Trocmé contends, this depiction of Philip as an Elijah-styled prophet should probably be linked in Luke's presentation to Philip's role in the Samaritan mission, marked by the performance of miracles and the conquest of the "false prophet" Simon Magus, and to Philip's association with a circle of prophets, among whom are included Philip's own daughters (Acts 21.8-11).[24]

T. L. Brodie has recently drawn attention to the correspondence between the eunuch-incident in Acts 8 and the story of Elisha's dealings with Naaman in 2 Kings 5. As previously noted, Brodie's study sets forth 2 Kings 5 as a major source underlying the whole of the Philip-cycle in Acts 8.9-40.[25] The

bulk of the influence, however, of this OT tradition upon Luke's description of Philip's ministry concentrates in the final episode.

In light of the innovative importance of Brodie's contribution to Lucan studies, a brief analysis of his methods and conclusions seems appropriate.[26] Brodie starts from the two-fold premise that Luke was a Greco-Roman author employing rhetorical conventions popular in his day and that he was also a Christian theologian seeking to interpret the Jewish Scriptures for his post-resurrection community. Along the first line Brodie concludes that Luke was particularly indebted to the ancient literary practice of *imitatio*, which involved the technique of "internalization," that is, "taking an existing text, especially a text that was old, and reworking it in a way which emphasized values that were internal" (in other words: inward, spiritual values).[27] Additional means of adaptation included the processes of "abbreviation, elaboration, division and fusion (or synthesis)--including dividing and fusing of diverse characters" and "modernization."[28] One ancient text from which Luke frequently "has distilled the essence. . . and has used that essence as a basic component, a skeletal framework, around which he has grafted other material"[29] is the Elijah/Elisha narrative block in the LXX. In addition to the Philip-stories in Acts 8, Brodie has effectively applied his theory to two pericopae in Luke 7[30] and to the Stephen-incident in Acts 6-8,[31] the latter representing a most suggestive case in view of its proximity to the Philip-material.[32]

As Brodie himself admits, his approach to Lucan composition needs some refinement in terms of unravelling the precise operations which Luke is performing on his OT model, and, we would add, occasionally the parallels

which Brodie draws between incidents in the LXX and Luke-Acts seem excessively tenuous and far-fetched (see n. 35 below). Nevertheless, on the whole, Brodie's working hypothesis is an illuminating one based on sound principles and careful examination. He has correctly recognized the Greco-Roman and Jewish literary backgrounds which, as most scholars agree, inform Luke's writing, but he advances the discussion by positing a satisfying integration, functional in a broad number of cases, which few have attempted, much less achieved.

Turning to consider the specific case of Acts 8.25-40, we focus on the possible influence of 2 Kings 5 on three principal themes within the eunuch-incident which we will examine more fully in due course.

(1) The status and condition of the inquirers in the two stories are demonstrably parallel. Naaman and the Ethiopian eunuch are both prominent, chariot-riding foreigners who serve their respective monarchs as royal officials. True, Naaman is a military officer and the eunuch a treasurer, but the OT figure also superintends large amounts of his master's money (2 Kgs 5.5)--a function which plays a much greater role in the story than his service in the army (2 Kgs 5.15-27). The conditions of the two men are not identical, but neither are they dissimilar. Both need cleansing--one outwardly, the other internally--effected through immersion in water (καὶ κατέβη. . . καὶ ἐβαπτίσατο [2 Kgs 5.14]/καὶ κατέβησαν. . . ἐβάπτισεν αὐτόν [Acts 8.38]).[33] Also, assuming one interpretation of εὐνοῦχος (see more below), we may add to Brodie's observations that both Naaman and the Ethiopian suffer from physical afflictions (leprosy/castration) which legally exclude them from Israel's assembly

(Leviticus 13-14/Deut 23.1).

(2) A similar emphasis on providential guidance emerges in both narratives. At just the point when Naaman appears stymied in his quest for healing, two directional instructions come from Elisha, the "man of God," which set the leprous official on the road to recovery (2 Kgs 5.8-10). The first beckons Naaman to come to Elisha's house, "that he may know that there is a prophet in Israel;" the second comes *via* a messenger (ἄγγελος) of Elisha, enjoining Naaman to wash in the Jordan seven times. The prophet's message to Naaman is not readily appreciated, but after a period of dialogue with his servants (2 Kgs 5.11-13), the Syrian proceeds to the river to perform the requisite ritual and is cured--"according to the word of the man of God" (v. 14). Likewise, the Ethiopian eunuch's need for salvation is miraculously answered by a double-command (angel [ἄγγελος] of the Lord [Acts 8.26]/Spirit of the Lord [8.29]) which brings Philip to provide the necessary counsel. The discussion turns on the significance of the prophetic word, in this case the message of Isaiah 53; it, like Elisha's prescription to Naaman, is not immediately understood, but in due course the eunuch is enlightened by Philip's explanation and responds to the word by submitting himself to baptism (8.30-38).[34]

(3) An additional point of contact (in terms of both comparison and contrast) between the Naaman-incident in Kings and the eunuch-incident in Acts--which Brodie fails to recognize--relates to a common pattern of resisting or obstructing God's purpose. As is well known, Naaman at first indignantly refuses to comply with the prophet's prescription to go and wash in the Jordan; he must eventually be persuaded to perform the required deed

(2 Kgs 5.11-13). At this point Naaman appears as quite the opposite, indeed an antitype, of the Ethiopian eunuch. The latter figure is positively eager to be baptized, even taking the initiative with Philip the evangelist: "See here is water! What is to prevent my being baptized?" (Acts 8.36). Implied in this query, however, is the notion that something may still be obstructing (preventing) the eunuch's baptism--if not his own obedience (as in Naaman's case), then something else (such as restrictive Jewish legislation barring eunuchs from becoming proselytes; cf. full discussion below). In any event, certain barriers hindering washing/baptism must be broken down in both the Naaman- and eunuch-incidents.

Whether or not we accept Brodie's view that Acts 8.25-40 (along with 8.9-24) represents a conscious, extensive and sophisticated rewriting of 2 Kings 5,[36] the evidence at least seems to indicate that Luke would have taken some notice of the account of Elisha's dealings with Naaman as an apt OT analogue to the story of Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch. That Luke had reflected on the contemporary relevance of the Naaman episode is explicitly certified by Luke 4.27, and as noted in a previous chapter, the story of the Samaritan leper's healing in Luke 17 seems also to have been partially influenced by the account of Naaman's cleansing.

A curious feature of these studies which detect the influence of either an Elijah- or Elisha-story upon the composition of Acts 8.25-40 is their apparent oversight of the other possibility. However, since the traditions surrounding the two great OT prophets are so closely related in the Kings narrative and since Luke evinces a tendency in his Gospel to juxtapose references or allusions to the two figures (Luke 4.25-27; 9.51-57), it seems

reasonable to conclude that materials connected with both Elijah and Elisha contributed to the shaping of the eunuch-incident. At certain points, items from each half of the Elijah/Elisha-cycle even appear to coalesce in their parallels to the Acts account. For example, both Elijah and Elisha function as literary models for the Lucan Philip, as do Obadiah and Naaman for the Ethiopian eunuch, and there are additional common elements such as the prophetic word, divine guidance and the significance of water.

Given this literary background to the report of Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch, an instructive link can be made with Luke's Gospel in relation to the Gentile mission. As we have already discussed, Jesus' appeal to the experiences of Elijah and Elisha in Luke 4.25-27 patently serves to foreshadow (and legitimate) the church's eventual turn toward the Gentiles. As a counter-response to being rejected "in his own country," Jesus reminds his audience that during rebellious days in Israel's history two of her most revered prophets had bypassed opportunities for domestic service to minister instead to selected Gentiles, namely, a Sidonian widow and the Syrian officer, Naaman. At this stage Jesus himself does not actively turn to the Gentiles, but the implication is clear: Jewish repudiation of his ministry will in time precipitate a move to the more receptive Gentiles. Within the Lucan schema this move is normally judged to have begun officially with Peter's outreach to Cornelius,[36] but if the Elijah/Elisha paradigm from Luke 4.25-27 is taken seriously, then Philip's evangelization of the eunuch would also appear to mark an important missionary breakthrough to the Gentiles in its own right. For in the account of Acts 8.25-40, Philip functions as both an Elijah- and Elisha-styled prophet. In the latter case he specifically affiliates with the

Naaman-incident, thus providing a direct link to Luke 4.27. While the Elijah-association has nothing distinctively to do with the story alluded to in Luke 4.25-26 (miraculous feeding of the widow at Zarephath), it is interesting to observe that one facet of Philip's presentation in Acts portrays him assisting Grecian (though also Jewish) widows in a crisis over food supply (Acts 6.1-6).[37] If alongside these parallels between Philip's work and Luke 4.25-27 we recall an earlier observation that the outcome of Jesus' pronouncements in Nazareth--his violent expulsion from the city (4.28-30)--is matched by Philip's forced flight from Jerusalem which sparks his itinerant preaching (Acts 8.4-40), then it seems most probable that Luke intends Philip to be regarded as one of the fulfilling agents of Jesus' envisaged mission to the Gentiles.[38]

3.2 *The Emmaus-Road-Incident (Luke 24.13-35)*

Further promoting the narrative unity of Luke-Acts has been the observation of several scholars regarding the striking parallelism between the story of Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch and the scene on the Emmaus road in Luke's Gospel.[39] There are a variety of linguistic correspondences,[40] but the most impressive feature correlating the two episodes concerns a common sequence of similar events.

(1) Two disciples on the road from Jerusalem to Emmaus are joined by Jesus (Luke 24.13-16; ὁδός, v. 32); the eunuch travelling from Jerusalem to his homeland is joined by Philip (Acts 8.29-30; ὁδός, vv. 26, 36).

(2) Jesus and Philip both employ engaging questions to initiate conversations with their fellow-wayfarers (Luke 24.17//Acts 8.30).

(3) Discussion ensues in the Emmaus-road-incident over the significance of Jesus of Nazareth (Luke 24.18-27), particularly related to the mystery of his recent death and alleged resurrection (24.20-24) which Jesus himself illuminates through the exposition of Scripture (especially the prophets, 24.25-27). This is paralleled by Philip's preaching of Jesus, starting[41] from the Isaianic text which alludes to both the Servant's suffering and his exaltation (Acts 8.32-35).

(4) Both encounters culminate in "Sacred Acts"[42] which signify the travellers' new-found fellowship with Jesus. In the story from Luke's Gospel, Cleopas and his companion break bread with Jesus (24.28-30); in the Acts story, the eunuch submits to baptism (8.36-39).

(5) Jesus suddenly vanishes from the scene (Luke 24.31), to appear again in another place where he continues his revelatory ministry (24.36-43); likewise, Philip abruptly disappears from the eunuch's sight and rematerializes in another location along the coastal plain where he resumes his preaching activity (Acts 8.39-40).

(6) The travellers are deeply affected emotionally by their experiences. The two disciples of Jesus find their "hearts burning within them" (Luke 24.32), and the eunuch proceeds on his way with great joy (Acts 8.39).

By so modelling the Emmaus-road- and Ethiopian-eunuch-incidents after a common pattern, Luke no doubt betrays his customary concern to correlate the experiences of the early church with the life and ministry of Jesus. But which experiences are particularly in view? One suggestion focuses upon the church's sensing of the living Christ's presence mediated through the study

of the OT Scriptures and through the celebration of common meals and baptismal ceremonies.[43] Another approach fixes on the importance of wandering evangelists (like Philip) in early Christian missions and the need for communities to show them hospitality, as if receiving Christ himself (like the Emmaus disciples).[44] While we can accept these matters as reflective of Luke's broad pastoral interests, they do not really address the critical issue underlying Luke's presentation of the Philip-eunuch encounter, namely, its place in the unfolding of the church's universal mission.

In a general sense, the fact that the account of Philip's ministry to the Ethiopian eunuch corresponds so closely to an episode from the life of Jesus certainly serves christologically to illustrate and legitimate the former incident, in much the same way as Philip's Samaritan mission is foreshadowed and validated by material associated with Jesus' great journey in Luke 9-17. But what might the parallel with the Emmaus-story reveal concerning the nature of Philip's Ethiopian outreach? In itself, Jesus' encounter with the two travellers *en route* to Emmaus appears to have nothing to do with extending the boundaries of the gospel's witness beyond Judaism. Cleopas and his partner[45] are obviously loyal Jews, evidenced in their preoccupation with the redemption of Israel (Luke 24.31). But the resurrected Christ who manifests himself to the Emmaus disciples does, in the course of Luke 24, look ahead to the proclamation of salvation to the Gentile nations. After his sudden departure from the dinner table in Emmaus, Jesus reappears in the company of the eleven apostles in Jerusalem (24.36). He then probes their confusion with a question (v. 38), shares a meal with them (vv. 41-43) and opens their hearts to understand the christological

thrust of the Scriptures (vv. 44-45)--all events very similar to those which had just occurred on the Emmaus road.[46] Moreover, the bond with the previous story is further cemented by the fact that the eleven have been joined by the two wayfarers from Emmaus, who excitedly recount their recent adventure (vv. 33-35) and remain on hand for a second, almost duplicate, encounter with Jesus (vv. 36-43).[47] Toward the end of this particular manifestation of the resurrected Christ, he announces his vision for the preaching of salvation to the Gentiles:

> Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name <u>to all nations</u>, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but stay in the city until you are clothed with power from on high (Luke 24.46-49).

Now it is obvious that these words have a primary application to the eleven apostles. They receive virtually identical instruction in Acts 1.4-8, and Peter in particular fulfills the vocation to proclaim repentance and forgiveness of sins to the nations (10.34-43).[48] But we must remember that the recipients of Jesus' missionary mandate at the end of Luke's Gospel include members outside the circle of the Twelve[49] and that from a narrative perspective the incident on the Emmaus road is still very much in view. This may warrant the recognition of an oblique, secondary allusion to the forthcoming mission of Philip--one of the seven servants chosen to assist the Twelve and the principal emulator of Jesus' Emmaus road activity--who, utilizing the testimony of OT Scripture, bears witness of Christ's suffering and resurrection to the Ethiopian eunuch.

In conclusion, as the parallels between the Elijah/Elisha-cycle and Acts

8.25-40 serve to direct our attention to the beginning of Jesus' public ministry in Nazareth (Luke 4.25-27) as part of the literary background informing Luke's portrayal of Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch, so the correspondence between this Philip-story and the Emmaus-road-incident in Luke 24 establishes a bond in Luke's narrative between Philip's mission and the climax of Jesus' earthly activity. The significance of these links between the characterizations of Philip and Jesus appears related to the development of the church's universal mission. For in both his inaugural work in Nazareth and his parting ministry in Jerusalem (still in the company of the Emmaus disciples), the Lucan Jesus forecasts the eventual dissemination of the gospel to the Gentiles. Accordingly, Philip's evangelization of the Ethiopian eunuch would seem to represent part of the fulfillment of this missionary vision.

§4. GEOGRAPHICAL ELEMENTS IN ACTS 8.25-40

Several items of geographical interest emerge in Acts 8.25-40 and color the events reported therein. The significance of the brief travel notes, κατὰ μεσημβρίαν and αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος (8.26) will be considered in a later section, but now we examine three larger matters pertaining to locale: (1) the references to Jerusalem; (2) the feature of the eunuch's Ethiopian homeland; and (3) the setting of the Philip-eunuch encounter in the coastal plain region of Palestine.

4.1 *Jerusalem*

The importance of Jerusalem for Luke as the focal center of God's

redemptive work and starting point of the church's missionary outreach is well known, and, consequently, any references to the Holy City in the Philip-material in Acts should not be passed over lightly. We have already emphasized the connection between Jerusalem and Philip's first evangelistic undertaking in Acts 8. Philip is spurred to take the gospel to Samaria because of the tragic obstinancy of Jerusalem's Jewish authorities (8.1, 4-5), and two of Jerusalem's Jewish-Christian apostles eventually journey to Samaria to "inspect" and complement Philip's work (8.14-17). In the second Philip-story in Acts 8 with which we are presently concerned, the Jerusalem link continues. The opening three verses of the eunuch incident each mention the Jewish capital in association with the movements of different characters: (1) the apostles return to Jerusalem following their preaching tour of Samaritan villages (v. 25); (2) Philip is instructed to make his way to the road which runs from Jerusalem to Gaza (v. 26); and (3) the Ethiopian eunuch is identified as one who had worshiped in Jerusalem (v. 27).

An interesting feature of these three Jerusalem-references is the use of two distinct lexical forms, Ἱεροσόλυμα in v. 25 and Ἰερουσαλήμ in vv. 26 and 27. This variation in the terms for Jerusalem is manifest throughout Luke's two-volume work and has given rise to no end of ingenious theories accounting for the phenomenon. The supposition of older literary analyses was that different sources lay behind the variant terminology, but such an explanation has carried little weight in recent years when answers have been sought primarily on the level of Lucan composition. For example, J. K. Elliott contends that Luke consciously utilizes the more Hebraic form, Ἰερουσαλήμ, in clearly Jewish contexts, that is, when a Jewish audience is

being addressed by a Jewish speaker or when a story takes place in Jewish territory. In Elliott's opinion, in Acts 7.8-9.31 "the church is still on Jewish soil"--hence the preponderant use of Ἰερουσαλήμ in this section.[50] I. de la Potterie takes a different tack by distinguishing between the more "religious" or "sacred" term, Ἰερουσαλήμ, and the more "profane," hellenized term, Ἱεροσόλυμα. According to this view, the former name emerges in contexts which memorialize Jerusalem as the Holy City of Israel where Jesus accomplished his work of salvation and the apostles based their ministry. When the perspective shifts to the apostles' mission outside of Jerusalem or to the church's work in the Diaspora, if mention is made of Jerusalem, the "profane" designation is employed. Following this schema, Ἱεροσόλυμα alone is used in Acts 8.1-25, where the focus is on the dispersion from the Holy City, while the "religous" Ἰερουσαλήμ re-emerges as the dominant name in 8.26-11.26, where the missionary interest is no longer central and Jerusalem stands out as the sacred center of Israel.[51]

Despite the effort expended to detect some consistent pattern governing Luke's use of two names for Jerusalem, it is doubtful whether either of the two schemes just presented adequately accounts for all the evidence, especially the material in Acts 8. In response to Elliott's proposal, we would certainly question whether the Samaritan mission (see study of Samaria/Samaritans in Luke-Acts in §3, chap. 2), much less Philip's witness to the Ethiopian eunuch, should be regarded as situated wholly within a Jewish environment, and furthermore, Elliott's case is undermined by his accepting as original the poorly attested reading of Ἰερουσαλήμ in both 8.14 and 8.25 in order to fit his theory.[52] De la Potterie likewise seems weak in his

handling of Acts 8. In the first place, his insistence on the fact that Ἱεροσόλυμα is suited to contexts of apostolic mission beyond Jerusalem is scarcely supported by the news in 8.25 of Peter and John's <u>return to</u> Ἱεροσόλυμα. And secondly, in the eunuch-incident and subsequent stories in Acts 9-11 where Ἰερουσαλήμ predominates, the church's preoccupation with missionary matters outside of Jerusalem is hardly diminished and, if anything, is heightened. We may learn that the Ethiopian official ventured to Ἰερουσαλήμ to worship (8.27), but the keynote of this man's story in Acts 8, namely, his reception of the Christian message and baptism, takes place on the return trip to his homeland--<u>away from</u> the Holy City.

While we must admit that the string of eleven consecutive occurrences of the more Semitic, "biblical" Ἰερουσαλήμ,[53] in Acts 1-6 may have been consciously designed by Luke to fit this portion of his narrative which stresses the early church's continuity with its Jewish heritage,[54] it seems that the more random use of two names for Jerusalem as the church breaks out of its Jewish shell in Acts 8ff. follows no prescribed pattern and reflects simply a desire for stylistic variation.[55] In the case of Acts 8.25-27, the important distinction among the three Jerusalem-references has to do not so much with terminology, but rather concerns the movement of personnel in relation to the Holy City. As noted above, Peter and John <u>head back to</u> Jerusalem after their brief preaching stint in Samaria (v. 25), whereas Philip the evangelist and the Ethiopian eunuch meet one another while travelling <u>away from Jerusalem</u> toward the Mediterranean coast (vv. 25-30). It may be thought that the angel's ordering of Philip to follow the Jerusalem-Gaza road implies that Philip must first go back to Jerusalem

from Samaria--a puzzling itinerary in light of Philip's recent forced exit from Jerusalem--and then proceed from there toward Gaza.[56] In fact, however, the angel simply directs Philip to "go toward. . . the road" (πορεύου. . . ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν) which runs from Jerusalem to Gaza. This can easily be taken to mean that Philip should proceed directly from Samaria to some point of intersection along the Jerusalem-Gaza road, thereby bypassing Jerusalem altogether.[57] At any rate, Philip's final destination and sphere of mission activity is once more outside of Jerusalem, while the apostles remain stationed in the Holy City, as in 8.1. Philip thus emerges again as the vanguard of the early church's centrifugal missionary thrust beyond Jerusalem.

In Acts 9-11 other preachers of the Christian gospel follow Philip's lead in venturing outside of Jerusalem. Saul, newly converted and commissioned to carry the gospel to the Gentiles, proclaims Christ (to Jews) in Damascus. Peter ministers in Lydda and Joppa and eventually evangelizes Cornelius' household in Caesarea. And some of those scattered because of persecution find a welcome reception for their testimony in Antioch. But in the case of both Paul and Peter, at this stage in Luke's narrative there is still a strong counter-pull back to Jerusalem (9.26-29; 11.2). Only Philip and the founders of the Antiochene community seem to have set their sights exclusively on opportunities for mission outside the Holy City.

4.2 *Ethiopia*

In the ancient world Ethiopia referred to the land of Nubia (OT Cush) located in the area due south of Egypt between the first and sixth cataracts

of the Nile. Its principal cities were Napata and Meroe. The Ethiopian kingdom was typically ruled in the period around the first century by queens who assumed the dynastic title of Candace (like Pharoah in Egypt), one of whom is mentioned in Acts 8.27.[58] Luke's story of Philip's encounter with the eunuch contains the only references to Αἰθίοψ in the NT, but the region of Ethiopia and its inhabitants were more frequently featured in both the OT and Greco-Roman literature.[59]

In the biblical tradition we find an interest in Ethiopia as a remote and distant land (Ezek 29.10; Esth 1.1; 8.9; cf. Jdt 1.10) renowned for its wealth (Job 28.19; Isa 45.14), military prowess (2 Kgs 19.9; 2 Chron 14.9-13; Isa 37.9; Jer 46.9) and dark-complexioned people (Jer 13.23). The prophets repeatedly class Ethiopia with other wicked nations of the world, such as Egypt and Sheba, who have opposed God's people and merited his judgment (Isa 20.3-5; 43.3; Ezek 30.1-9; Nah 3.9; Zeph 2.11-12). However, a more positive note is also sounded in the OT regarding the Ethiopians, in that they are reckoned among those foreign peoples who will eventually be converted and acknowledge the true God of Israel.

> Let bronze be brought from Egypt;
> let Ethiopian hasten to stretch out her hands to God.
> Sing to God, O kingdoms of the earth;
> sing praises to the Lord (Psa 68 [67 LXX]. 31-32).
>
> Thus says the Lord:
> "The wealth of Egypt and the merchandise of Ethiopia,
> and the Sabeans [from Sheba], men of stature,
> shall come over to you and be yours,
> they shall follow you;
> they shall come over in chains and bow down to you.
> They will make supplication to you, saying:
> 'God is with you only, and there is no other,
> no god beside him'" (Isa 45.14).

> Yea, at that time I will change the
> speech of the people to a pure speech,
> that all of them may call on the name of Lord
> and serve him with one accord.
> From beyond the rivers of Ethiopia my suppliants,
> the daughter of my dispersed one shall bring my offering
> (Zeph 3.9-10).

In classical writings, the Ethiopians were idealized as people of great piety and beauty. Homer spoke of "blameless Ethiopians" (*Iliad* 1.423-24); Herodotus extolled the "burnt-skinned" Ethiopians as the tallest and most handsome of all men in the world (3.20); and Diodorus Siculus commented that "it is generally held that the sacrifices practiced among the Ethiopians are those which are most pleasing to heaven" (3.3.1).[60] Adding to the mystique of the Ethiopians in Greco-Roman society was the common perception that these people lived "at the end of the habitable earth,"[61] on the very edge of civilization. Homer, for example, regarded the Ethiopians as "the farthermost of men (ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν)" (*Odyssey* 1.22-24), and the geographer Strabo, placed Ethiopia at the "extreme limits" of the Roman Empire (τὰ ἄκρα τῆς οἰκουμένης, *Geog.* 17.2.1).[62] Further arousing the curiosity of the educated classes in the exotic country of Ethiopia were reports of two Roman expeditions into the region, one military (under Gaius Petronius, 23 B.C.E.) and the other scientific (to discover the source of the Nile, 62 C.E.).[63]

As an educated and sophisticated author in his own right, how might Luke have exploited this literary tradition concerning Ethiopia in his presentation of Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8.25-40?

(1) Assuming that part of Luke's overall purpose in writing his two-volume work was to press the claims of Christianity before a cultured Hellenistic audience (represented by Theophilus, Luke 1.3; Acts 1.1), he would

have been concerned not only with presenting a convincing and accurate narrative (Luke 1.1-4) but a compelling and interesting one as well, one which would capture the imagination as well as the logical mind. Undoubtedly one reason for relating the conversion-story of a prominent official from the mysterious land of Ethiopia was precisely because of its guaranteed dramatic appeal.[64]

(2) We have already called attention to the well-known observation that in Acts 1.8 Luke discloses his plan in the book of Acts to plot the trajectory of the church's mission from Jerusalem and Judea to Samaria and ultimately out "to the end of the earth" (ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς), that is, to the farthest reaches of the Gentile nations.[65] Given the fact that Luke reports the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8 immediately after the account of the gospel's extension to Samaria, it is reasonable to assume that Luke has capitalized on the fame of Ethiopia as a country on the distant borders of the known world and thus regarded the evangelization of the eunuch as a first step in the church's outreach "to the end of the earth."[66]

On this reading of the Acts narrative, it would appear that Philip the evangelist emerges as an important pioneer of both the Samaritan and Gentile missions. However, the extent of this latter breakthrough should not be overestimated. For in spite of the understandable deduction of patristic writers that the Ethiopian eunuch went on to bear witness to his new-found faith in his native land,[67] Luke does not say this and in fact restricts the scope of Philip's outreach to the single Ethiopian on Palestinian soil. In Luke's view, Philip certainly propels the gospel <u>on its way toward</u> the earth's

outer limits, but he can hardly be credited on the basis of the eunuch's Ethiopian nationality alone with bringing the church's global mission to full flower. This only comes in Acts 13ff. with the missionary journeys of Paul, through which he fulfills his commission "to be a light for the Gentiles" and herald of salvation "to the end of the earth" (ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς, 13.47; cf. Isa 49.6).

(3) Given Luke's tendency to interpret the missions of Jesus and the early church as fulfilling OT prophecy, it is conceivable that he envisages the Ethiopian eunuch's adherence to the gospel of Christ as a first-fruit of the conversion of the Ethiopian nation forecast in the Jewish Scriptures cited above.[68] Significantly, however, Luke adjusts the OT scenario by associating the Ethiopian's incorporation into the people of God not so much with his pilgrimage to Jerusalem but with his experience of being proselytized by Philip the evangelist on the return journey from Jerusalem. Further insight into Luke's understanding of the Ethiopian's conversion in relation to OT expectation will follow from our discussion below of the Ethiopian's peculiar status as a eunuch.

4.3 *The Coastal Plain*

After baptizing the Ethiopian eunuch at a spot near the Jerusalem-Gaza highway, Philip is miraculously whisked away by the Spirit and eventually reappears at Azotus (Acts 8.39-40). In the first century Azotus was a city located due west of Jerusalem and north of Gaza on the coastal plain of Palestine. Thus, in Luke's account, Philip remains in the general vicinity of the site where he ministered to the Ethiopian eunuch. A final note in Acts

8.40 discloses that from Azotus Philip moved north along the coastal plain to Caesarea, "preach[ing] the gospel to all the towns" *en route*. Apparently, then, Luke has summarized the events of an extended missionary campaign conducted by Philip in the coastal region of Palestine and chosen to focus on Philip's outreach to the eunuch as a representative incident in this campaign.

How does this larger coastal setting of the eunuch-episode affect our understanding of Philip's missionary role in the book of Acts? The particular cities along the coastal plain which Luke mentions in conjunction with Philip's ministry--Gaza and Azotus, both former Philistine strongholds, and Caesarea, the seat of Roman government in Palestine--were all Hellenistic centers with substantial Gentile populations in the period of the early church.[69] That Luke would have been aware of these demographic facts is highly probable, given the evidence throughout his work of a first-hand acquaintance with the coastal region.[70] Accordingly, it would seem that Luke has implicitly associated Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch with a larger mission in Gentile territory, though he does not spell out in so many words that Philip actually converted any Gentiles other than the lone traveller from Africa.

Another important feature from a narrative perspective of Philip's preaching tour along the Mediterranean coast is its parallel to Peter's itinerary in Acts 9.32-10.48. Once again Peter leaves Jerusalem, and on this occasion he proceeds to Lydda (9.32-35), Joppa (9.36-10.23) and Caesarea (10.24-48). The first two stops on this journey are at the most prominent <u>Jewish</u> centers along the coastal plain,[71] located between Gaza and Azotus to

the south and Caesarea to the north. While Luke reports a great harvest of converts as a result of Peter's spectacular ministry in these two cities (9.35, 42), it is noteworthy that in each case Peter's initial work is among a community of saints which has already been established (9.32, 36, 38, 41). Indeed we are left with the impression that Peter is making an "inspection" tour of local churches outside Jerusalem.[72] Who then does Luke regard as the founding missionary(ies) of these communities? He does not explicitly tell us, but the earlier announcement that Philip proclaimed the gospel to all the towns between Azotus and Caesarea (8.40) certainly implies that, in addition to his work in the Hellenistic centers of the coastal plain, Philip also played a part in the growth of the Jewish-Christian communities at Lydda and Joppa prior to Peter's arrival at these places. We have then a similar situation to that in Samaria where Philip establishes a beachhead for the gospel in a certain area and Peter comes along later to nurture the young converts and increase their number.[73]

Likewise, Peter comes to Caesarea in Acts 10.24 only after Philip has been stationed there (8.40; cf. 21.8). In this place, however, Luke does not indicate that Peter meets with or ministers to a local congregation of believers. Rather the Jerusalem apostle journeys to Caesarea solely to witness to the Gentile inquirer, Cornelius, and his family. Therefore, Peter is now portrayed not as a pastor complementing Philip's former work in Samaritan or Jewish centers but as an evangelist matching Philip's previous activity in Hellenistic areas along the coastal plain of Palestine. More specifically, Peter's witness to Cornelius, a foreign official with Jewish sympathies, may be obviously compared to Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian

eunuch. As we shall argue below in more detail, such a comparison plausibly extends to regarding the eunuch's conversion, like the centurion's, as a missionary breakthrough to the Gentiles.

§5. THE THEME OF SUPERNATURAL GUIDANCE IN ACTS 8.25-40

Though no miracles are performed by Philip in his encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch such as characterize his Samaritan mission (healings and exorcisms), the manifestestion of supernatural activity still features prominently in the eunuch-incident--in the form of extraordinary spiritual guidance.[74] From start to finish the course of events in the story of Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch appear to follow a spectacularly-ordered divine agenda. The evangelist's mission is set in motion by an unusual directive from an angel of the Lord. The heavenly being instructs Philip merely to proceed toward the Jerusalem-Gaza road without giving any details concerning what Philip should expect along the way (Acts 8.26). Philip simply obeys without hesitation, and "behold" (ἰδού) he comes upon the travelling Ethiopian who just happens to be reading an Isaiah scroll (8.27-28). Another heavenly mandate, this time from the Spirit, leads Philip to confront the foreign official personally (8.29-30). What then ensues is a beautifully orchestrated exchange of questions and answers centering around Isa 53.7-8--which happens to be the particular Isaianic text which the eunuch is reading at precisely the moment when Philip arrives--thus affording Philip the perfect opportunity to proclaim the good news of Jesus (8.30-35). Upon hearing the message, the eunuch immediately desires baptism, and "behold" (ἰδού) the journeying pair suddenly find themselves at a

suitable site with water (8.36). The baptism is administered, and no sooner is it completed than the Spirit of the Lord dramatically orders Philip's movements once more, this time by miraculously transporting the missionary to another preaching station (8.39-40).[75]

The marked emphasis on the leadership of the Spirit in particular once again links Philip's work to that of the foremost characters in Luke-Acts: Jesus, Peter and Paul.[76] Just before Jesus' public ministry officially commences in Galilee, he is "led by the Spirit" into the wilderness for a season of testing (Luke 4.1-2). After proving his faithfulness to God, Jesus "return[s] in the power of the Spirit into Galilee" and begins to teach in the synagogues there (4.14-15). In the synagogue at Nazareth he announces his personal fulfillment of the prophecy in Isa 61.1-2 and, in so doing, places his entire ministry under the banner of the Spirit's guiding authority: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach. . . . He has sent me to proclaim. . ." (4.18). Likewise, at a critical point of transition in Peter's career culminating in his fellowship with and witness to the Gentile Cornelius, it is the Spirit who provides the decisive impulse (Acts 10.19-20; 11.12). And the pattern continues with Paul's missionary activity later in the book of Acts. The sovereign will of the Spirit is the determinative factor in both his initial venture into Asia Minor from Antioch and his subsequent trek further west into Greece (13.2, 4; 16.6-10).[77]

While the basic notion of the Spirit's authorization of important breakthroughs in mission appears to be standard operating procedure in Luke-Acts, the "transportational" dimension of the Spirit's work is more

distinctively restricted to Philip's coastal campaign. As we have already seen, there is a likely parallel to the miraculous movements of the resurrected Jesus in Luke 24.31, 36-37 (though not explicitly related to the Spirit), but no comparable phenomenon is reported in conjunction with the travels of Peter or Paul or any other missionary in the book of Acts. Apart from the connection to the Lucan Jesus, Philip's relocation by the Spirit recalls most readily the similar experiences of biblical prophets, such as Elijah (1 Kgs 18.12; 2 Kgs 2.16, see above), Ezekiel (Ezek 3.12, 14; 8.3; 11.1, 24) and Habakkuk (Bel 36-39).[78] As for the significance of Philip's being snatched away by the Spirit immediately after baptizing the Ethiopian eunuch, R. Pesch surmises that it serves to vindicate Philip's determination to allow nothing to hinder the full incorporation of a Gentile convert into the Christian community (cf. Acts 8.36).[79] Also, we should think, it illustrates more generally the spontaneous nature of Philip's ministry as well as his remarkable availability as an instrument of the Spirit.

Apart from focusing on the Spirit's superintendence of Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch, we must also probe more fully the significance of the angel's opening command to Philip in Acts 8.26. While not providing an elaborate itinerary, the angel does tell Philip to "rise and go" (ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου) to the Jerusalem-Gaza road κατὰ μεσημβρίαν, to an area described as ἔρημος.[80] The meaning of both of these travel notes is disputed, but W. C. van Unnik has supplied a satisfying interpretation which coordinates well with the overall theme of supernatural guidance.[81]

On purely lexical and grammatical grounds κατὰ μεσημβρίαν can

either denote "toward the south" or "about noon."[82] Either rendering would make sense in the present context, but the case for the temporal meaning appears stronger. In its only other NT usage, which also comes in the book of Acts (22.6), μεσημβρία clearly refers to "midday," again in the context of travel. Likewise, most of the LXX instances refer to "noon-time."[83] Still, it is most unusual for Philip's journey to be deliberately scheduled at the noon hour. This was the least comfortable time of day to travel and thus the least favorable time to encounter anyone else.[84] Why should an evangelist be out and about when there is likely to be no one around to evangelize? As strange as it seems, however, the description of the road which Philip must join as ἔρημος confirms the picture of loneliness. Ἔρημος can represent a desert or wilderness region, but since the route in question did not traverse such terrain *per se*, it is best to take the term as an adjective meaning "deserted, vacated" (menschenleer), that is, without people.[85]

Why then would the angel issue this "absurd command" (*widersinnige Befehl*) directing the missionary Philip to an isolated location? This peculiarity can best be explained as a dramatic means of enhancing the miraculous dimension of Philip's encounter with the eunuch. In a setting most unsuited to finding any human ear for the gospel, Philip in fact meets a receptive Ethiopian! That Luke intends for his readers to register this element of surprise is signalled in the καὶ ἰδοὺ--a frequent interjection in Luke's writing attending some extraordinary occurrence[86]--which immediately precedes the eunuch's appearance on the scene (Acts 8.27, cf. v. 36).

A similar emphasis on carrying out shocking orders from heaven may be discerned in relation to the accounts of Saul's conversion/call and Peter's witness to Cornelius in Acts 9-11.[87] Saul, on his way to Damascus to arrest followers of Jesus, suddenly finds himself arrested by a heavenly vision and commanded by the very Jesus he opposes to "rise and enter" (ἀνάστηθι καὶ εἴσελθε) the city" where he would receive further instructions (9.3-6). Subsequently, one of the disciples in Damascus, Ananias, is also confronted by the exalted Jesus and given perplexing orders. He is to "rise and go" (ἀναστὰς πορεύθητι) to Judas' home to find the villainous Saul, who now, lo and "behold" (ἰδοὺ), "is praying" and expecting Ananias to restore his sight (9.11-12). Moreover, after Ananias' protestations, the Lord repeats the command to "go" (πορεύου) and reveals to Ananias the astonishing new destiny mapped out for Saul as missionary to the Gentiles and martyr for the name of Christ (9.15-16).

While praying on a housetop in Joppa around midday ("the sixth hour," Acts 10.9),[88] Peter receives a bewildering vision of unclean animals accompanied by the unthinkable mandate to "rise. . . kill and eat" (10.10-13). As he ponders the meaning of this experience, the Spirit intervenes (as noted above) and informs Peter that--"behold" (ἰδοὺ, 10.19, cf. v. 17)--at his doorstep even now are three men with whom he is to "rise and go" (ἀναστὰς κατάβηθι καὶ πορεύου σὺν αὐτοῖς) without delay (10.20). He learns from these men that their master, a "God-fearing" Gentile named Cornelius, had himself been directed by "a holy angel" to seek out Peter's counsel (10.22, cf. 10.3-8).

Given their parallelism around the theme of supernatural guidance, the

conversion stories of the Ethiopian eunuch, Saul and Cornelius appear bound together in Luke's presentation as miraculously engineered events vital to the beginnings of the Gentile mission. We would assume that in each instance such a demonstrable emphasis upon God's controlling activity serves Luke's intention to legitimate the controversial breakthrough of the gospel beyond Jewish boundaries. While the missions of Philip, Paul and Peter in Acts 8-11 are thus once more interconnected in Luke's narrative framework, there is still, however, an important sense in which Philip's response to a puzzling commission from on high should be distinguished from that of both Paul and Peter. Simply put, Philip promptly obeys the strange command of the angel without a fuss. Notice the repetition of verbs in 8.26-27a: he who had been instructed to "rise and go" (ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου) in fact "rose and went" (ἀναστὰς ἐπορεύθη), pure and simple.[89] In a similar vein, when the Spirit directs Philip to intercept the eunuch's chariot, the evangelist <u>runs</u> to fulfill his appointed task (8.30). What a contrast this eager reaction poses to the utter hostility of Saul toward anything having to do with the Christian mission and to the impulsive indignation of Peter at the thought of mingling with Gentiles and eating their unclean food (note also the contrast to Ananias' misgivings over ministering to Saul). These resistant attitudes of Peter and Paul must be forcefully overcome before the Gentile mission can move forward. Philip, on the other hand, enthusiastically accepts the opportunity to evangelize a foreigner. If we were to draw on prophetic models, Peter and Paul would be cast as Jonah-type figures requiring considerable heavenly persuasion before accepting God's missionary

call;[30] Philip, however, appears more like Isaiah in his notable willingness to do the Lord's bidding ("Here am I! Send me").

§6. THE SOCIAL STATUS OF THE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH

The nature and significance, in Luke's eyes, of Philip's accomplishment in converting the Ethiopian eunuch is understandably closely related to the social profile which characterizes the eunuch in the Acts account. We have already focused to some extent on the eunuch's ethnic status as a native of Ethiopia. We now turn to consider briefly his economic and occupational position and, more fully, his religious status *vis-à-vis* Judaism. The critical factor in our analysis will concern the socio-religious import of the key term, εὐνοῦχος.

6.1 *Finance Minister*

In Acts 8.27 the Ethiopian eunuch is described as δυνάστης Κανδάκης βασιλίσσης Αἰθιόπων, ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γάζης αὐτῆς. In short, he is a leading official in Candace's court, specifically, the head of the treasury. As a result he may be regarded as a man of high social standing and great wealth. Other details in the story confirm this appraisal. The Ethiopian dignitary obviously has the means to travel in style ("in his chariot") a long distance and to obtain an expensive Greek scroll of Isaiah for personal study.[31] Morever, the fact that he has the leisure to read and converse with Philip while in transit implies the presence of attending servants (8.28-31).

The report of Philip's evangelization of such a figure fits in with

Luke's general interest in the attractiveness of the Christian message to foreign officials and other prominent citizens within ancient society.[92] Jesus and Peter both reach out to Roman centurions who demonstrate exemplary faith and humility (Luke 7.1-10; Acts 10-11; cf. Luke 23.47). Jesus receives support for his ministry from the wife of Herod's steward (Luke 8.3), and a member of Herod's court stands out as one of the leading prophets and teachers in the church at Antioch (Acts 13.1). Paul preaches at Cyprus to the inquiring proconsul, Sergius Paulus (Acts 13.7), and at Berea to "not a few Greek women of high standing as well as men" (17.12; cf. 17.4). He also numbers among his friends some of the Asiarchs of Ephesus (19.31) and is graciously entertained by "the chief man of the island" of Malta, named Publius (28.7).

As is well known, however, Luke also takes pains to demonstrate the great reversal of social patterns attending the coming of Christ, that is, the humbling of the powerful and the lifting up of the underprivileged and downtrodden. Indeed the only other occurrence of δυνάστης in Luke-Acts outside the eunuch-incident appears in the famous statement from the Magnificat: "he has put down the mighty (δυνάστας) from their thrones, and exalted those of low degree (ταπεινούς)" (Luke 1.52). Repeatedly in Luke's Gospel the rich are warned of their precarious position in the kingdom of God, while the poor are assured of their acceptance (4.18-19; 6.20; 7.22; 12.13-34; 14.7-24; 16.19-31; 18.18-30). Consequently, in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch it is important to note that, while he enjoys a lofty social status and has a considerable fortune at his disposal, he does not depend upon these means for his security before God. He concentrates on Isaiah's

portrayal of the faithful servant "in his humiliation" (ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει, 8.32-3//Isa 53.7-8) and gladly submits to Philip's christocentric interpretation of the prophetic passage (8.30-38, see next section below). No money from the queen's treasury is offered in exchange for God's favor. Implicitly, then, a contrast is drawn between this genuine disciple and the frivolous Simon Magus featured in the previous Philip-narrative.[93]

6.2 *The Proselyte/"God-fearer" Question*

Determining Luke's perspective on the socio-religious status of the Ethiopian eunuch inevitably involves one in a discussion of the two principal categories--proselyte and "God-fearer"--in which scholars typically classify Gentiles in the ancient world who became attached to the Jewish faith in one degree or another. While in the LXX προσήλυτος consistently refers to the "resident alien" (Heb. גר) within Israel's borders, during the NT period the term already seems to have acquired a more technical sense of a Gentile who converts fully to Judaism.[94] Philo, for example, speaks of "'proselytes,' or newly-joined (προσηλύτους ἀπὸ τοῦ προσεληλυθέναι καινῇ)" who "have joined the new and godly commonwealth" and merit the respect of native-born Jews because they have forsaken "their country, their kinsfolk and their friends for the sake of virtue and religion" (*Spec. Laws* 1.51-52).[95] In another place Philo adds that these "incomers" have abandoned "the ancestral customs in which they were bred" and "have crossed over to piety in whole-hearted love of simplicity and truth," leading to the worship and service of the one true God (*Spec. Laws* 1.308-09). No doubt for Philo this "cross-over" of proselytes to the Jewish community entailed submission to the rite of

circumcision and the laws of Moses (cf. *Migr. Abr.* 89-94).[96] In Rabbinic tradition, some of which surely reflects conditions in NT times, proselytes (גרים) were regarded as Gentile converts to Judaism who not only became circumcised and accepted the demands of the Torah but also underwent a purificatory baptism (cf. *m. Pesah.* 8.8.; *m. Ed.* 5.2).[97] While, generally speaking, proselytes were accepted as full-fledged members of the Jewish community and no longer classed as Gentiles, the impression is given from continuing debates over their precise legal and religious status within Jewish society that they remained marked off in some respects from native born Jews (cf. *Mek. Mishpatim* 18; *m. Qidd.* 4.1; *m. Nid.* 7.3). Jeremias associates proselytes with other groups of Israelites set apart by "a slight blemish."[98]

"God-fearers" (φοβούμενοι/σεβομένοι τὸν θεόν), by contrast, are typically taken to represent a group of Gentiles more marginally attached to Judaism. They supported the local synagogue and even attended its services and voluntarily complied with certain Jewish customs, such as Sabbath observance and food laws, but for one reason or another they stopped short of becoming circumcised and fully incorporated into the Jewish community. Legally they remained Gentiles in the eyes of Jewish society. To call them "half-" or "semi-proselytes" is a misnomer.[99] On the basis primarily of limited archaeological evidence to back up the "God-fearer" hypothesis, A. T. Kraabel has recently questioned the historical existence of such a group.[100] But ancient literary testimony as well as certain inscriptional data still make an impressive case in favor of the scholarly consensus.[101]

The satirist Juvenal (60-130 C.E.) ridicules the (apparently common)

phenomenon in Rome whereby a father, who "reveres the Sabbath" (*metuentem sabbata*), worships one God ("the divinity of the heavens") and adheres to certain dietary regulations, raises children who adopt his faith and indeed go a step further: they accept circumcision and "revere the Jewish law (*Iudaicum. . . metuunt ius*) and all that Moses handed down in his secret tome" (*Sat.* 14.96-106). The father clearly represents a class of "God-fearing" pagans devoted to various Jewish beliefs and practices who should be distinguished from other Gentiles, in this case his own offspring, who undergo circumcision and become proselytes.[102]

Josephus speaks generally of "those Gentiles who revere our practices" (*Ant.* 3.217) and of "the masses" from every city and nation throughout the Roman empire who manifest "a keen desire to adopt our religious observances," especially those pertaining to the Sabbath and dietary habits (*Ag. Ap.* 2.282). Moreover, when discussing the financial support for the temple coming from the Diaspora, Josephus distinguishes two groups among the contributors: "[1] all the Jews throughout the habitable world and [2] those who worshipped God (σεβομένων τὸν θεόν)" (*Ant.* 14.110). Though their precise identity is disputed, these "God-worshippers" would seem to be Gentiles who were sympathetic to the Jewish religion but who maintained a separate identity from the Jews.[103]

Josephus' story of Izates' interaction with Jewish missionaries provides a more elaborate illustration of the varying levels of commitment to Judaism which were open to Gentiles in the first century.[104] As a Jewish-sympathizing foreigner of high rank, namely, the king of Adiabene, Izates represents a useful test case for comparison with the Ethiopian eunuch.

Izates' mother and wives had been instructed by a Jewish merchant named Ananias "to worship God (τὸν θεὸν σέβειν) after the manner of the Jewish tradition." Izates himself became interested in the Jewish faith and wanted to become a full convert by circumcision, "since he considered he would not be genuinely a Jew unless he was circumcised." Fearing, however, that such a decision might not be appreciated by Izates' subjects, Ananias advised the king against becoming a proselyte, assuring the king he could "worship God even without being circumcised (καὶ χωρὶς τῆς περιτομῆς τὸ θεῖον σέβειν) if indeed he had fully decided to be a devoted adherent to Judaism, for it was this that counted more than circumcision." At this stage Izates would appear to be a "God-fearing" Gentile still on the periphery of Jewish society. Subsequently, however, a more Pharisaically-minded teacher from Galilee passed through Adiabene. Upon encountering Izates reading the law of Moses, this strict teacher, named Eleazar, exhorted the king to go beyond the mere reading of Torah and actually obey its stipulations, particularly the requirement of circumcision. Despite his earlier misgivings, Izates now consented to being circumcised and, in so doing, accepted the badge of the Jewish covenant and became a *bona fide* proselyte (*Ant.* 20.34-48).

A recently discovered inscription from the ancient synagogue at Aphrodisias in Asia Minor confirms the dichotomy between proselytes and "God-fearers."[105] Listed on one side of the stele are the names of a synagogue committee who organized and financed a building project. Among these are thirteen native Jews, three members identified as προσήλυτοι and two designated as θεοσεβεῖς. On the reverse side of the slab are two longer lists of (apparently) lesser contributors. The upper list contains a

large group of Jewish names, and the lower list features over fifty names, predominantly of Gentile derivation, under the heading: καὶ ὅσοι θεοσεβεῖς. While on purely linguistic grounds θεοσεβής can characterize anyone, Jewish or Gentile, known to be pious and God-honoring, in this context the term seems to be a technical one denoting "God-fearing" Gentiles (cf. Greek and Roman names) who participated in the life of the Jewish synagogue but were clearly separated from and subordinate to (because listed below) Jews by birth and proselytes.

In addition to observing certain Sabbath and food laws and being involved in some way in the worship and deliberations of the local Diaspora synagogues, "God-fearers" might also, despite their marginal attachment to Judaism, make pilgrimages to Jerusalem to celebrate the great religious festivals and worship in the temple precincts--a fact which proves interesting in comparison with the activities of the Ethiopian eunuch reported in Acts 8.27.[105] Josephus writes of a group of foreigners who make the arduous trek to the temple to pay homage but are unable to participate fully in the cultic ceremonies because of their abiding alienation from the traditions of the Jewish people.

> . . . certain persons from beyond the Euphrates, after a journey of four months, undertaken from veneration of our temple and involving great perils and expense, having offered sacrifices, could not partake of the victims, because Moses had forbidden this to any of those not governed by our laws nor affiliated by the customs of their fathers to ourselves (*Ant.* 3.318-19).

Similarly, in the *Jewish War*, we learn that numbered among the pilgrims to Jerusalem at Passover, as recorded in a census by Cestius Gallus during the reign of Nero, were a large contingent of "foreigners (ἀλλόφυλοι) present

for worship," who alongside lepers and other defiled persons "were not permitted to partake of this sacrifice" (*J.W.* 6.426-27).[107]

Given this social profile of proselytes and "God-fearers" in the Greco-Roman period, we are prepared to turn now to the material in Luke-Acts and to the case of the Ethiopian eunuch in particular. A major problem which complicates the identification of the socio-religious status of Philip's convert in the Acts 8 report is the absence of either προσήλυτος or φοβούμενος/σεβομένος τὸν θεόν terminology which Luke uses elsewhere to characterize Gentiles in relation to Judaism. This phenomenon has prompted Haenchen and a number of other scholars to conclude that Luke has purposefully blurred the socio-religious character of the eunuch.[108] According to this view, the traditional story of Philip's evangelization of the Ethiopian eunuch was the account stemming from Hellenist-Christian circles of the first missionary breakthrough to the Gentiles (i.e. "God-fearers"). Luke, however, regarded Peter's outreach to Cornelius as the church's pioneering step to the Gentiles and so was compelled to reformulate the eunuch-incident in a way which left the Gentile status of the eunuch ambiguous. Luke probably conceived of the Ethiopian eunuch as closer to the category of Gentile than the Samaritans, but by refraining from using "God-fearer" language Luke still distanced Philip's convert from Cornelius and other Gentile believers.

The lack of customary labels in the Acts 8 account to designate the Ethiopian eunuch may well be grounds for concluding that Luke did not regard the foreign official as a proselyte. Luke appears to use προσήλυτος consistently to identify Gentile converts to Judaism (2.10; 6.5; 13.43),[109] and

there is no obvious case where Luke refers to a proselyte without using the appropriate designation. Moreover, prior to Acts 8 Luke has been happy to report the presence of proselytes, such as Nicolaus of Antioch (6.5), within the Christian community, thus making it difficult to account for Luke's failure to identify the Ethiopian eunuch as a proselyte if such was Luke's conception of the man.

Concerning the "God-fearer" question, however, the linguistic argument from silence is not so convincing. Luke describes Cornelius as φοβούμενος τὸν θεὸν (Acts 10.2, 22) and patently conceives of him as an uncircumcised Gentile devoted to certain Jewish beliefs and practices, that is, a "God-fearer" in line with the description given above. Generally speaking, however, Luke does not employ φοβούμενος/σεβομένος τὸν θεόν as a clear-cut *terminus technicus* for a class of Gentile sympathizers on the margin of Judaism.[110] Lydia and Titius Justus are both characterized as σεβομένοι τὸν θεόν (16.14; 18.7) and <u>may</u> fit the "God-fearer" category, but in actuality Luke does not supply sufficient information about them (such as whether Justus had been circumcised) for us to ascertain their precise relationship to Judaism. Elsewhere in Luke-Acts we find φοβέομαι and σέβομαι applied broadly to the reverent worship of God on the part of unlimited subjects (Luke 1.50; Acts 10.35; 18.13)[111] as well as in connection with the Jew Jesus (Luke 23.40) and proselytes (τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων, 13.43).[112]

Moreover, Luke does not universally utilize the "God-fearer" tag when referring to Gentile devotees of Judaism who apparently fall short of being full converts. In other words, we might say that one does not have to be

called a "God-fearer" in Luke-Acts to be a "God-fearer" in the more technical sense. On two occasions Gentile worshippers at Diaspora synagogues are simply identified as "Greeks" (Ἕλληνες, Acts 14.1; 18.4). The Roman centurion in Luke 7 is assigned no "God-fearer" label, but, nonetheless, as a respected lover of the Jewish nation and patron of the Capernaum synagogue (7.5), he appears to be a parallel figure to his fellow-officer, Cornelius, in the book of Acts.[113] Finally, P. F. Esler has suggested that Luke would have also envisaged Naaman as a prototypical "God-fearer"--though no such terminology emerges in Luke 4.27--since the 2 Kings account portrays the Syrian general as acknowledging the one true God of Israel (5.15) yet intimates no experience of circumcision or wholesale identification with the people of Israel.[114] This example is particularly instructive in view of the parallel drawn above between Naaman and the Ethiopian eunuch in Luke's narrative.

In view of this flexibility in terminology, Luke's conceptualization of the Ethiopian eunuch's religious status should not be made to hinge on the presence or absence of φοβούμενος/σεβομένος τὸν θεόν. If such language had been employed we could not necessarily classify the foreign official in Luke's mind as a "God-fearer" according to the technical sense of the term; by the same token, the lack of a "God-fearer" designation does not mean that Luke did not associate the eunuch with Jewish-sympathizing Gentiles like Cornelius. Other criteria than that depending on strict word choice must come into play. The fact that, according to Luke's report, the Ethiopian eunuch made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem to worship Yahweh demonstrates in principle that he "feared" God (though προσκυνέω is used

instead of φοβέομαι/σέβομαι) and corresponds to the practice of "God-fearers" discussed above (cf. *Ant.* 3.318-19; *J.W.* 6.426-27; John 12.20). Also, the eunuch's high social standing as a court official and his serious interest in studying the Jewish Scriptures both recall the example of the "God-fearer" Izates (before he was circumcised). Thus, the possibility that Luke regarded the Ethiopian eunuch as a "God-fearing" Gentile--on a par with Cornelius--should not be dismissed. Still, at this stage in our discussion, neither can we conclusively rule out the possibility that Luke viewed the eunuch as a proselyte (though we have suggested it is unlikely). A final decision on the matter can only be reached after grappling with the meaning and significance of the key term in Acts 8 characterizing Philip's convert, namely, εὐνοῦχος.

6.3 *The Meaning and Social Significance of Εὐνοῦχος*

The term εὐνοῦχος can refer either to a castrated man or to a public official or to both, since in the ancient world important court attendants would often be eunuchs in the more literal sense pertaining to their physical condition.[115] In the LXX εὐνοῦχος uniformly renders the Hebrew סָרִיס, which can also be taken in the various senses just enumerated. Applied to the married Potiphar (Gen 39.1) εὐνοῦχος obviously denotes only a military officer; other references are plainly limited to those who have been castrated (Isa 56.3-4; Sir 30.20). Most instances, however, refer in a general way to military and political officials, especially those serving as palace courtiers; in these contexts, both physical and vocational notions could easily apply.[116]

As we have already noted, in Acts 8 the Ethiopian εὐνοῦχος is also characterized as a δυνάστης Κανδάκης, with particular responsibilities over the queen's finances. Accordingly, some have thought that the εὐνοῦχος designation merely reinforces the chamberlain's official status and does not suggest any physical handicap.[117] Δυνάστης, like εὐνοῦχος, does translate סָרִיס in the LXX on one occasion (Jer 41 [34].19), so it is possible that Luke understood the two terms as virtual synonyms. Nevertheless, a stronger case can be made for the view that Luke did have in mind the physical connotation of εὐνοῦχος in Acts 8. In the first place, Luke periodically features public figures as beset by some bodily "defect." Naaman, the Syrian general afflicted with leprosy, is the most obvious example (Luke 4.27), but there are also the cases of the centurion in Capernaum, the synagogue ruler, Jairus, and Publius of Malta--all of whom, though not personally debilitated, are deeply distressed over the infirmities of a close friend or relative which they appear helpless to remedy (Luke 7.2-3; 8.41-42; Acts 28.7-8). Secondly, the deployment of εὐνοῦχος and δυνάστης Κανδάκης in immediate succession in Acts 8.27 most naturally suggests the communication of two discrete characteristics; otherwise, if the designations were identical, one would seem to be semantically superfluous.[118] Thirdly, if Luke had intended only to stress the Ethiopian's courtly position and not to raise the question of his sexual identity as well, it is difficult to see why he chose to utilize the ambiguous εὐνοῦχος as his principal designation for Philip's convert and why he allowed εὐνοῦχος to stand alone in four of its five occurrences in Acts 8 without a modifying term like δυνάστης to remind the reader of the Ethiopian's

official status. Finally, the fact that the Ethiopian was reported to be in the service of an oriental queen makes it most probable that Luke regarded him as a physically-impaired eunuch as well. For obvious reasons, the male attendants of a female royal figure were often those who had been castrated.[119]

Having established that from Luke's perspective the Ethiopian εὐνοῦχος was in fact a eunuch in the more literal sense, we must now inquire into the prevailing attitudes within ancient society toward such an individual. In short, as G. Petzke states, eunuchs in antiquity typically "gehörten. . . zu den am meisten verachteten und verspotteten Menschengruppen."[120] Generally speaking, they were slaves who had been brutalized by other men as a form of punishment or subjugation.[121] Even those eunuchs who were fortunate enough to rise to positions of power and responsibility could not wholly escape the stigma associated with their peculiar condition. Herodotus tells of a eunuch in Xerxes' court, named Hermotimus, who enjoyed the special favor of the king. However, when opportunity presented itself, Hermotimus exacted vicious revenge on a man called Panionius who had forcibly castrated him and sold him into slavery, that is, made him "to be no man. . . a thing of nought." Exercising his acquired authority, Hermotimus eventually sought out Panionius and forced him to castrate his four sons and they in turn their father (8.104-06). Lucian narrates the tale of a (supposed) eunuch who was in the running for one of the chairs of philosophy at Athens. Despite his intellectual qualifications for the post, the eunuch's physical condition proved to be a serious liability. Witness the scornful remarks of his chief competitor in

Lucian's story: ". . . such people [eunuchs] ought to be excluded. . . not simply from all that [philosophy] but even from temples and holy-water bowls and all the places of public assembly" (*The Eunuch* 6).[122]

Our chief concern, of course, in relation to Luke's portrayal of the Ethiopian eunuch is with the place of eunuchs within ancient Jewish society. On this matter the legislation in Deut 23.1 (23.2 LXX) was fundamental: "He whose testicles are crushed or whose male member is cut off shall not enter the assembly of the Lord." The rationale for this unmistakeable exclusion of eunuchs from the people of God presumably had to do with a eunuch's incapacity for procreation and (in the case of complete emasculation) circumcision, both of which were sacred acts vital to the identity of every Jewish male.[123] Also, a castrated man would likely have been regarded as physically blemished or deformed and thus in a permanent state of ritual impurity (cf. Lev 21.20; 22.24).[124]

That this ban on accepting eunuchs within the Jewish community was current during the NT period is plainly manifest in comments from Josephus and Philo. The former writer vigorously enjoined total separation from eunuchs, principally because of their perceived opposition to the created order.

> Shun eunuchs and flee all dealings with those who have deprived themselves of their virility and of those fruits of generation, which God has given to men for the increase of our race; expel them even as infanticides who withal have destroyed the means of procreation. For plainly it is by reason of the effeminacy of their soul that they have changed the sex of their body also. And so with all that would be deemed a monstrosity by the beholders. Ye shall castrate neither man nor beast (*Ant.* 4.290-91).

Similarly, in the category of "all the unworthy" barred from entering the sacred congregation, Philo placed

> the men who belie their sex and are affected with effemination, who debase the currency of nature and violate it by assuming the passions and the outward form of licentious women. For it [the law] expels those whose generative organs are fractured or mutilated (θλαδίας γὰρ καὶ ἀποκεκομμένους τὰ γεννητὰ ἐλαύνει, cf. Deut 23.2 LXX) (*Spec. Laws* 1.324-25).

In addition to this harsh exclusionary policy with respect to eunuchs which we find rooted in the Torah and enforced in the first century,[125] we must also note two traditions within the later strata of Jewish Scripture which strike a more positive, inclusive chord. In the opening section of Trito-Isaiah, dating from the post-exilic period and presenting a more universal perspective on the people of God in the framework of an apocalyptic eschatology (cp. Zechariah 14),[126] we encounter the prophecy that devout eunuchs, along with God-honoring foreigners, will finally be granted access to the Lord's house at the end of the age.

> Thus says the Lord: "Keep justice, and do righteousness,
> for soon my salvation will come, and my deliverance be
> revealed."
> Let not the foreigner who has joined himself to the Lord say,
> "The Lord will surely separate me from his people";
> and let not the eunuch say, "Behold, I am a dry tree."
> For thus says the Lord: "To the eunuchs who keep my sabbaths,
> who choose the things that please me and hold fast my covenant,
> I will give in my house and within my walls a monument and a
> name better than sons and daughters;
> I will give them an everlasting name which shall not be cut off.
> "These I will bring to my holy mountain,
> and make them joyful in my house of prayer;
> their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be accepted on my
> altar;
> for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples."
> (Isa 56.1, 3-5, 7)

Closer to the time of the NT (first century B.C.E.), the author of the Wisdom of Solomon offers a similar hope that pious eunuchs will be welcomed into God's temple.

> Blessed also is the eunuch whose hands have done no lawless deed,
> and who has not devised wicked things against the Lord;
> for special favor will be shown him for his faithfulness,
> and a place of great delight in the temple of the Lord.
> (Wis 3.14)

Against this background of divergent opinion on the socio-religious status of eunuchs within the Jewish community, how do we assess Luke's attitude toward the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8? Clearly, by presenting a scenario in which no impediment is allowed to stand in the way of the eunuch's baptism and incorporation into the people of God (8.36-38), Luke demonstrates his sympathy with the sentiments expressed in the book of Isaiah and the Wisdom of Solomon. Indeed, as many have supposed, it is likely that Luke consciously conceived of Philip's evangelization of the Ethiopian eunuch as a fulfillment of the prophecy in Isaiah 56.[127] Though he does not cite this passage directly, Luke's general familiarity with the latter chapters of Isaiah is well known, including an explicit focus on Isaiah 53 within the eunuch narrative. The God-worshipping, Scripture-reading eunuch in Acts 8 certainly meets the requirements for piety delineated in Isaiah 56, and his identity as an Ethiopian matches him with the <u>foreigners</u> (αλλογενεῖς) whom Isaiah features alongside the eunuchs as those outcasts destined eventually to find acceptance in God's house (Isa 56.3, 6).[128] It seems, therefore, that in Luke's estimation Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch marks the realization (at least in part) of the predicted opening of God's kingdom to "all nations" (πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Isa 56.7).

If we accept this correlation between the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8 and the foreigners and eunuchs in Isaiah 56, it scarcely follows that Luke identifies Philip's convert as a former proselyte to Judaism.[129] For we must

also appreciate one important point at which Luke's episode deviates from Isaiah 56, namely, the place where the Gentile eunuch is assured of acceptance among the people of God. In the OT prophecy, the expectation is that foreigners and eunuchs will receive welcome in the temple at Zion, the focal institution of Judaism (cf. Wis 3.14). In Luke's story, however, the Ethiopian eunuch makes his way to worship in the Holy City but in fact only gains full entrance into God's community through baptism while travelling along a desert road away from Jerusalem (cf. earlier discussion). The implication is clear. From Luke's perspective the Ethiopian eunuch, despite his demonstrations of piety, was "hindered" (κωλύω, Acts 8.36) from finding total acceptance within established Jewish religion and society.[130] The Judaism which we encounter in Luke-Acts is of the scrupulous, Pharasaic variety, greatly concerned with maintaining standards of cultic purity. It would certainly have concurred with Josephus and Philo in upholding the legal restrictions of Deut 23.1, no more sanctioning covenant fellowship with defiled and disfigured eunuchs than with lepers, harlots, tax collectors and other such "sinners" (cf. Luke 7.36-50; 10.25-37; 14.1-24; 15.1-32; 17.11-19; 18.9-14).[131] The inability of many eunuchs to be circumcised would have particularly certified their outsider status from the Pharasaic point of view (cf. Acts 15.1, 5). And since such a separatist attitude would have applied to Jewish eunuchs, how much more to a Gentile eunuch like the Ethiopian in Acts 8![132] Consequently, in relation to the Judaism with which Luke was familiar, the foreign official whom Philip encounters could not have become a proselyte even if he wanted to. He must have remained a "God-fearer," barred from access to the inner courts of the temple and the inner circles

of Jewish society.[133] It is only in the newly constituted Messianic community established with the coming of Jesus Christ (whom Philip proclaims) that the Ethiopian eunuch at last finds a home among the people of God.

6.4 *Conclusion*

This extended investigation into the social status of the Ethiopian eunuch has uncovered a multi-dimensional character eminently suited to Luke's presentation of the universal mission of the early church.[134] This figure is a well-to-do public official of some prominence, and yet at the same time, on account of his affliction as a castrated man, he bears a certain ignominy reserved only for lowest classes in the ancient world. What is more, he is a foreigner--a Gentile--who, whatever his devotion to the God of Israel, is doomed as a eunuch to remain forever on the margin of Jewish society. There is no intention on Luke's part to blur the Ethiopian eunuch's status *vis-à-vis* Judaism. He fits the same basic category of "God-fearer" (the absence of the term notwithstanding) as the Roman centurion, Cornelius. If anything, the Ethiopian is more alienated from Judaism than Cornelius, because Cornelius could presumably become a proselyte if he so desired, whereas this option is closed to the eunuch.

Our ultimate goal in sketching this social profile of the Ethiopian eunuch has been to gain further insight into Luke's portrayal of Philip's missionary vocation. By reaching out in proclamation and baptism to such a distinctive individual, Philip the evangelist stands out once again in Luke's narrative as a pioneering minister of the gospel to "all flesh." In

particular, we should underscore Philip's achievement in winning a *bona fide* Gentile convert to the Christian movement. Accordingly, Philip should be allowed his fair share of the credit, normally reserved exclusively for Peter, for sparking the church's inaugural mission to the Gentiles in the book of Acts.

§7. PHILIP'S MINISTRY TO THE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH

After examining a variety of literary, theological, geographical and social elements related to the overall narrative in Acts 8.25-40, we come finally to focus more directly on the heart of the eunuch-episode in 8.30-38, where the details of Philip's evangelistic encounter with the Ethiopian official are unfolded. In particular we are interested in probing the nature and significance, from Luke's point of view, of the two main components of Philip's ministry to the eunuch: proclamation and baptism.

7.1 *Proclamation*

As with Luke's report of Philip's earlier mission in Samaria, so in the presentation of Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch there is no recorded speech placed in the mouth of the evangelist disclosing the content of his preaching. The narrator, however, does generally describe Philip's proclamation once again as the heralding of good news concerning Jesus (Acts 8.35; cf. 8.5, 12) and more specifically lays stress on the linkage of this message to a passage from Isaiah 53 which had captured the eunuch's attention. As indicated above in our outline of the chiastic structure of Acts 8.25-40, the citation and discussion of Isa 53.7-8 forms the pivot of

the entire narrative. We may also observe that the exchange between Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch revolves around the eunuch's need--which Philip meets--for someone to expound the meaning of the prophetic text to him, especially in terms of revealing the identity of the depicted character. Philip first makes contact with the eunuch while the latter is reading aloud from the book of Isaiah. This prompts Philip's query as to whether the traveller comprehends what he is reading, which in turn triggers the reply: "How can I unless someone guides me?" (8.30-31). As Philip then climbs into the chariot at the eunuch's behest, he clearly assumes the role of the interpretive guide which the eunuch seeks (8.31). Directly, we learn of the specific expositional operation which Philip is expected to perform. It concerns a selected Isaianic text--53.7-8--and a pointed question regarding its referent: "About whom. . . does the prophet say this, about himself or some one else?" When Philip then "open[s] his mouth, and <u>beginning with this scripture</u>" proceeds to proclaim the gospel of Jesus (8.35), there can be little doubt as to the basic core of Philip's message, even though Luke does not spell it out in so many words. We should understand that Philip informs the Ethiopian eunuch that <u>Jesus</u> is the mysterious figure referred to by Isaiah, or put another way, that Jesus fulfills that which was spoken by the prophet (cf. Luke 4.21; 24.27).[135]

To deepen our understanding of Luke's perspective on Isa 53.7-8 as the foundation of Philip's proclamation of Jesus to the Ethiopian eunuch, we must examine the major emphases of this scriptural text in light of the larger literary context of Luke's two-volume work and the immediate social context of missionary outreach to one who is both a foreigner and a eunuch. These

matters have rarely been given sufficient attention in scholarly discussion. Investigations into the use of Isaiah 53 within the NT have tended to serve predominantly historical and dogmatic interests, such as whether Jesus himself and/or the the earliest Palestinian wing of the church conceived of Jesus' mission in terms of a Servant-Messiah whose vicarious suffering and death effected atonement for sin.[136] Increasingly, however, doubts have been raised concerning the primitive origins of a Servant-Christology,[137] and greater consideration has been given to Luke's contribution to the subject.[138] Even so, little has been done to demonstrate how the particular text (not the full-blown Servant image) from Isaiah 53 cited in Acts 8 coordinates with Luke's overall thematic emphases and with the peculiar social situation reflected in the eunuch-incident.[139]

That Acts 8.32-33 follows the LXX version of Isaiah 53 virtually verbatim[140] suggests a careful attention to the biblical text on Luke's part and a conscious appropriation of only that material which suits his purpose. Accordingly, what Luke has chosen not to cite from Isaiah 53 should not be assumed without further ado to form an implicit background to Luke's presentation. As a number of scholars have pointed out, Luke seems to have studiously avoided any reference in Isaiah 53 to the atoning efficacy of the servant's death.[141] Instead, he accentuates the humiliating (that is, oppressive and shameful, ταπείνωσις)[142] side of the servant's suffering, likening it to the experience of a helpless sheep facing the slaughter (8.32-33a).

But such is not the whole story. The servant's humiliation, while not leading directly to the expiation of others' sins, does give way to something

positive in Luke's Isaianic citation, namely, the servant's personal exaltation. This reversal of the servant's bad fortune may be seen already in a phrase from the first line in Acts 8.33--ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη--which can be rendered, "his judgment/condemnation was taken away."[143] However, κρίσις can also connote the idea of "justice" (cf. Luke 11.42), in which case the phrase in question simply reinforces the servant's debasement ("In his humiliation justice was denied him" [RSV]). At any rate, whatever our exegesis of 8.33a, the final statement in v. 33 certainly sounds a hopeful note regarding the servant's ultimate destiny: "For his life is taken up from the earth" (8.33c). In the Lucan schema, this declaration most naturally calls to mind the ascension of Jesus into heaven (cf. Acts 1.2, 9-11). It is significant that Luke opts to end his quotation of Isa 53.8 where he does, rather than continuing on to the next line in the LXX which returns to the theme of the servant's atoning death (ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον).[144] Obviously Luke wants to highlight the crowning transformation of the servant-Jesus' humiliation (death) into glory (ascension). A similar emphasis emerges in the parallel Emmaus-road-incident (see above), where the Lucan Jesus expounds the prophetic scriptures to demonstrate how necessary it was "that the Christ suffer. . . and enter into his glory" (Luke 24.25-27).

The humiliation-exaltation pattern is one which recurs in Luke's writing.[145] In the Magnificat Mary exults over the Lord's thoughtful consideration of her "low estate" (ταπεινώσις) and concomitant blessing of her in an extraordinary way, destined to be remembered by all future generations (Luke 1.48). Moreover, Mary regards her experience as typical of

the Lord's dealings with humankind: "he has put down the mighty (δυνάστας) from their thrones, and exalted those of low degree (ταπεινώσις)" (1.52). This inversion of traditional societal positions is also a key part of Jesus' agenda in Luke's Gospel, as we learn from John the Baptist's poetic forecast of the effects of Jesus' work (drawn from Isaiah and cited only by Luke): "Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain shall be brought low (ταπεινωθήσεται). . . ; and all flesh shall see the salvation of God" (Luke 3.5-6//Isa 40.4-5). Such a pattern of ministry is fulfilled in both Jesus' action and teaching. He restores the ill to health (e.g. Luke 5.12-26), accords love and dignity to notorious "sinners" (e.g. 7.36-50) and enables hopeless outcasts to re-enter the mainstream of society (e.g. 8.26-39). And especially in parables addressed to Pharisees, Jesus drives home the thrust of his social program: "For everyone who exalts himself will be humbled (ταπεινωθήσεται) and he who humbles himself (ὁ ταπεινῶν) will be exalted" (14.11; 18.14). That is, those in the lowest places at the wedding banquet will be promoted (14.6-10), and those alienated from worship in the temple will be accepted (18.9-14). Not only, however, does Jesus act and speak on behalf of the oppressed in order to elevate their social status; he also personally identifies with their plight in a dramatic way. "He [is] reckoned with transgressors" (Luke 22.37/Isa 53.12) in his death, literally crucified between two convicted criminals. Yet he rises again to new life and even secures a place in paradise for one of the felon's who died with him (Luke 23.43). And so we are brought back to the portrait of Jesus in Acts 8. He himself underwent ταπεινώσις in death, yet ultimately was "taken up" (ἦρθη) in renewed life to an exalted state.

Another important line cited from Isaiah 53 in the eunuch-narrative, whose meaning must be ascertained in relation to the literary context of Luke-Acts, is the enigmatic query in Acts 8.33b: τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγήσεται; The interpretive crux is the sense of γενεά in this setting. The term can be a temporal one, denoting an "age" or "era"--past, present or future--roughly equivalent to a life-span, or it can refer to the existing population ("the men of this generation," Luke 7.31) within any given age.[146] Neither of these options, however, seems to fit the case in Acts 8. Here γενεά appears to take on more of a strictly *genea*-logical meaning, such as "descendants," "lineage" or "family." But the question is then raised once again of whether a negative or positive connotation is intended in the context of Acts 8.33. Should we read, "Who shall describe his descendants?" as a lamentation, bemoaning the fact that because of the servant's untimely death he will leave behind no legacy or progeny? Or should we think in completely different terms of an exultation which marvels at the "indescribable" (incalculable) number and scope of "spiritual offspring" who will be generated as a result of the servant's humiliation and subsequent glorification? The latter interpretation seems more in line with Lucan interests.[147] Luke is scarcely preoccupied with Jesus' earthly ties or physical family (cf. Luke 8.19-21) and certainly does not regard Jesus' death as the tragic end of his influence on the human race. Quite the contrary, from the Pentecost-event onward, the book of Acts makes plain that Jesus' death, resurrection and ascension touched off a great accession of dedicated followers or "spiritual descendants" (cf. also Luke 24.44-48; Acts 1.8-11). Indeed, in Luke's estimation, the Christ who had suffered and been "the first

to rise from the dead" was himself still actively at work in reaching out and gathering his people (Acts 26.23). Thus the notion of Jesus' γενεά in Acts 8.33b is not far in meaning from the Pauline conception of the resurrected Christ as the "first-fruits" or "first-born among many brethren" (cf. Rom 8.29; 1 Cor 15.20, 23; Col 1.15, 18).

This focus on the outreaching effects of the climactic events of Jesus' life, inspired by material from one of Isaiah's "servant songs," coincides with Luke's overall employment of Isaianic language to depict the mission of Jesus and the early church. We notice in particular that Luke utilizes the book of Isaiah to justify the proclamation of God's salvation to the end of the earth, with special emphasis on the inclusion of oppressed people and Gentiles within this program.[148] Simeon's first oracle comprises a pastiche of allusions to Isaiah, whereby the new-born Jesus is identified as the long-awaited agent of God's salvation, "prepared in the presence of all peoples [Isa 40.5 LXX; 52.9-10], a light for revelation to the Gentiles [Isa 42.6; 49.6 LXX], and for glory to thy people Israel [Isa 46.13]" (Luke 2.30-32).[149] We have already noted another Lucan reference to Isa 40.5 (LXX), this time placed on the lips of John the Baptist, which again anticipates Jesus' extension of divine redemption to "all flesh" (Luke 3.6). The critical disclosure of the nature of Jesus' vocation in the Nazareth-pericope features the citation of Isa 61.1-2 (LXX), with its stress on liberating ministry to the poor, the enslaved, the blind and the oppressed (Luke 4.17-19). The Lucan Jesus not only claims to fulfill this passage in himself (4.21); he also "exegetes" this text (by appealing to other scriptural material, from Kings) in a way which effectively regards the favored unfortunates of whom Isaiah

speaks as those needy people outside the social and geographical boundaries of Israel (i.e. Gentiles, 4.25-27).[150]

In the book of Acts we find incorporated into the Stephen speech a passage from the closing chapter of Isaiah which speaks eloquently of the universal presence of God, unrestricted to any one people or locale (Acts 7.49-50//Isa 66.1-2). Emerging as it does at the end of Stephen's discourse in close connection with his scathing rebuke against the Jews for rejecting Jesus (Acts 7.51-53), this Isaianic citation helps to signal in the Lucan schema the beginning of the gospel's radiation beyond the confines of Judaism which occurs with Philip's mission in Acts 8. Finally, the Gentile mission of Paul, not surprisingly, is also characterized by Luke as fulfilling Isaianic expectation. After being rejected by a Jewish audience in Antioch of Pisidia, the Lucan Paul announces his decision to "turn to the Gentiles" (13.46), citing Isa 49.6 as his divine commission: "I have set you to be a light for the Gentiles, that you may bring salvation to the uttermost parts of the earth" (13.47). Similarly, in his defense before Agrippa, Paul portrays his evangelistic work in Isaianic fashion as a light- and sight-giving mission among the nations, authorized by Jesus himself (26.16-18; cf. Isa 42.6-7, 16). Moreover, in the same speech we encounter the reference alluded to above to Christ's continuing missionary activity, and significantly, this activity is depicted as matching the prophetic forecast "that the Christ must suffer, and that, by being the first to rise from the dead, he would proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles" (26.23). Such a description recalls yet again the universal light-bearing vocation of Isaiah's servant of the Lord.[151]

Having examined the leading ideas in the citation of Isa 53.7-8 in Acts 8.32-33 against the larger backdrop of Luke's two-volume work, we must not lose sight of the immediate context of the incident involving Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch. Why is the eunuch reading precisely this Isaianic text when Philip overtakes him? And how should we understand Philip's use of this scriptural passage as the basis of his persuasive proclamation of Jesus to the eunuch, leading directly to the eunuch's request for Christian baptism? Though Luke is not explicit at this point, we must surely assume that Isa 53.7-8 appears as the focus of Philip's evangelization of the eunuch <u>because of its special relevance to the eunuch's particular situation</u>. Recalling the two themes discussed above, this relevance is not hard to find. As we have seen, in Luke's view the eunuch represents an individual well-acquainted with humiliation and ostracism from the people of God on account of his physical deformity. No wonder, then, that Philip's presentation of Jesus as the model servant prophesied by Isaiah strikes the eunuch as "good news." For this servant-Jesus himself had been despised and rejected by the Jewish nation, yet this was not his final fate. He was ultimately transfigured in glory and, in so doing, paved the way for the "adoption" of a vast host of "spiritual descendants"--including Gentiles--into the "family of God." As not only a eunuch but a foreigner as well, Philip's convert on the Jerusalem-Gaza road emerges as an exemplary recruit into Jesus' "indescribable" γενεά.

Accordingly, Philip the evangelist appears to be cast in the role of "midwife," facilitating the incorporation of the eunuch into the family of Jesus' descendants. In more traditional terms, Philip functions as the

messenger of the servant-Jesus. He "open[s] his mouth" (Acts 8.35)[152] on behalf of the humiliated/exalted Jesus to proclaim to the eunuch the message of God's universal salvation. Therefore, like Paul, Philip may be regarded in Luke's presentation as a missionary-servant in his own right, a "light for the Gentiles [the eunuch]" who "brings salvation to the uttermost parts of the earth [Ethiopia]" (cf. Acts 13.47).

7.2 *Baptism*

As in the case of Philip's evangelization of the Samaritans, so in his outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch baptism is ultimately administered as a sign of both the candidate's acceptance of Philip's message and his entrance into the Christian community. It is true that the eunuch's faith in Christ is not explicitly featured in Luke's account (except according to later "Western" readings, Acts 8.37), but such faith must surely be presupposed in the eunuch's forthright initiation of his own baptism (8.36, 38a).

In seeking to uncover any special significance which attaches to Philip's baptism of the eunuch in Luke's presentation, we seem best advised to concentrate on the eunuch's critical query: "What is to prevent (κωλύει) my being baptized?" (Acts 8.36). The fact that the eunuch poses his request for baptism in these terms implies an abiding element of doubt in the minds of some regarding his fitness to become a member of the people of God. Indeed, as suggested above, Luke would have us understand that up to this point the eunuch had been prevented from being baptized as a Jewish proselyte on account of his despicable physical blemish. However, now that Philip has arrived and announced the good news of God's universal salvation

proffered in Jesus Christ, nothing is permitted to obstruct the eunuch's baptism. The requisite water is amazingly ready-to-hand at the opportune moment (ἰδοὺ ὕδωρ, cf. above); Philip goes down into the water with the new convert; the ceremony is duly performed; and the eunuch goes on his way rejoicing (8.36-39).

A look at related uses of κωλύω'[153] in Luke-Acts will confirm and illuminate further this emphasis on Philip's breaking down of social and religious barriers in baptizing the Ethiopian eunuch. The term appears twice on the lips of Jesus in Luke's Gospel as a negative imperative (μὴ κωλύετε) addressed to his disciples in the context of their resisting certain parties who seek to identify or associate with the Master. In the first instance, Jesus rebukes his disciples for forbidding an outsider to exorcise demons in Jesus' name (Luke 9.49-50). In the second example, Jesus chides his followers for hindering the approach of little children who serve as models for all who would enter the kingdom of God (18.15-17). On yet another occasion, the Lucan Jesus denounces a company of hypocritical lawyers who, despite their pretensions to wisdom, remain ignorant of God's ways and impede the progress of those seeking entrance into God's kingdom (τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε, Luke 11.52; cf. Matt 23.13). In Luke's Gospel, therefore, Jesus sets the example--which Philip follows with respect to the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8--of clearing the path into the fellowship of God's people for those whose access has been blocked in some way by insiders' prejudice.

This pattern of ministry is also reflected in the dealings of Peter with Cornelius in Acts 10-11. In this case, of course, Peter represents not

only an apostle who ultimately spearheads the dissolution of obstacles hindering the salvation of an uncircumcised Gentile, but also one who himself must initially be convinced of the legitimacy of such a progressive agenda. And so it is only when the Holy Spirit spontaneously falls on Cornelius and his household that Peter is compelled to inquire--"Can anyone forbid (δύναται κωλῦσαι) water for baptizing these people. . .?"--leading straightaway to the command that baptismal proceedings be carried out (10.47-48). Later, when Peter is placed in the position of defending his actions before the "circumcision party" in Jerusalem, he rehearses the miraculous events in Cornelius' home and frankly confesses, "Who was I that I could withstand (δυνατὸς κωλῦσαι) God?" (11.17). To persist in hindering uncircumcised Gentiles from entering the community of God's people was now tantamount in Peter's estimation to hindering the realization of God's sovereign purpose.

This common stress on removing traditional impediments to baptism once more closely connects the missions of Philip to the Ethiopian and Peter to Cornelius in Luke's narrative.[154] Such a parallel supports our earlier conclusion that in both cases we have to do with the evangelization and incorporation into God's household of "God-fearing" foreigners apart from the customary requirements of Jewish law, especially circumcision.

Finally we should note that the very last word in the book of Acts is ἀκωλύτως (28.31, "unhindered"), an adverbial form of κωλύω and a NT *hapax*. While some regard this as an abrupt and awkward ending to Luke's two-volume work, F. Stagg wisely perceives that the term provides an apt conclusion to Paul's boundary-breaking mission to the Gentiles (cf. 28.23-31) and indeed

"epitomizes" the fundamental message of the gospel's extension to all peoples which permeates Luke-Acts.

> Throughout his two volumes, Luke never lost sight of his purpose, and he planned well the conclusion to it all, achieving the final effort by the last stroke of the pen. "Unhinderedly," Luke wrote, describing the hard-won liberty of the gospel. This liberty came only after many barriers had been crossed, and it was won because its first home was in the mind and intention of Jesus himself.[155]

By reaching out "unhinderedly" to the marginalized Ethiopian eunuch, Philip the evangelist once more emerges in Luke's presentation as a notable proponent of the liberating gospel of Jesus Christ and a worthy partner with Paul in advancing the early church's universal mission.[156]

§8. CONCLUSION

Having examined the account of Philip's evangelization of the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8.25-40 from a number of perspectives, we are now in a position to make a final assessment of the significance of this incident within Luke's overall presentation of the early church's mission history. The balance of evidence points in the direction that Luke regarded Philip's winning of the eunuch to Christian faith and baptism as a pioneering missionary breakthrough to the Gentiles. Literarily, the episode seems to fulfill Jesus' predictions in Luke 4.25-27 and 24.47 of a missionary turn to the Gentiles; geographically, the gospel finds a welcome reception among a representative from "the end of the earth"; thematically, the eunuch-story features emphases on supernatural guidance and humiliation/exaltation, which are linked elsewhere in Luke-Acts to a focus on the extension of God's salvation to "all flesh"; and socially, the Ethiopian eunuch is cast into the

role of a "God-fearing" foreigner who at last finds acceptance among the people of God through Jesus Christ--an acceptance formerly denied him within the Jewish community on account of his incorrigible physical disability and the stigma of ritual impurity attached to it.

In terms of relating the report of Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch to the other stories in Acts 8-11 associated with the unfolding of the church's universal mission, our investigation has disclosed time and again a special affinity with the succeeding narratives in chaps. 9-11 dealing with the beginnings of Christian proclamation among the Gentiles. This connection is in fact stronger than the link to the preceding account in Acts 8, which treats Philip's mission to Samaria. With his witness to the eunuch, Philip takes a definitive step beyond his own earlier ministry to the Samaritans in advancing the gospel to the whole of humankind. From a people (Samaritans) classed ambiguously on the margin between Jewish and Gentile realms, the Christian message now reaches a man (Ethiopian eunuch) who, despite his attraction to Judaism, is no Jew at all but rather a full-fledged Gentile.

The parallels drawn between the reports of Philip's mission to Candace's treasurer and Peter's outreach to the Roman centurion Cornelius (Acts 10-11) are especially striking. For example, we have noted that both missions are part of evangelistic campaigns along the coastal plain of Palestine; both are marked by the Spirit's miraculous superintendence of events; both involve the conversion and baptism of uncircumcised, Jewish-sympathizing foreign officials; and both break down traditional socio-religious barriers preventing (κωλύω) the full incorporation of "God-fearers" into the fellowship of God's

household. We regard these links between the eunuch- and Cornelius-incidents as notably transparent--not blurred or downplayed--in Luke's presentation. Accordingly, we conclude that Luke has deliberately set up a dramatic correspondence between the missionary achievements of Philip and Peter. The glory is not all Peter's in inaugurating the early church's Gentile mission. Philip the evangelist must also be given his due.

Indeed, because Philip's encounter with the eunuch is recounted first in the Acts narrative, it might be thought that pride of place should go to him, not Peter, for launching the Gentile breakthrough. However, such a perspective is too simplistic. Though we have challenged the common perception that Luke gives Peter exclusive credit for opening the church's doors to the Gentiles, we do not wish to deny that Peter's experience with Cornelius marks a watershed event in Luke's narrative, even in relation to Philip's conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch. The entire Peter/Cornelius-episode (10.1-11.18) is four times as long as the Philip/eunuch-story, and the effects of the former incident are much farther reaching. Philip in fact evangelizes the first Gentile in the book of Acts, but this is an isolated incident, referred to no more after chap. 8. It is Peter who spearheads the first Gentile conversion which attracts others' attention and eventually undergirds the church's landmark decision at the Jerusalem Conference endorsing the wider mission of Paul and Barnabas among the Gentiles (Acts 15.7-11). Philip's pioneering outreach to a Gentile should not be overlooked or minimized, but it must be kept in perspective. Philip, so to speak, blazes a trail into Gentile territory which Peter then follows and develops into a public road (and Paul eventually expands into a highway). In other words,

Philip appears to function in Luke's schema as Peter's forerunner (see also the Samaria-incident in 8.4-25). His witness to the Ethiopian eunuch sets the stage for (or serves as a "prelude" to) Peter's climactic breakthrough to the Gentiles in the person of Cornelius (and household). This forerunner role which Luke establishes for Philip in relation to Peter will be further explored and clarified in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5: PHILIP AND PETER

§1. INTRODUCTION

In the course of our investigation thus far, we have noted a number of points of contact between Luke's portrayals of Philip and Peter. They are both preachers of the same gospel of Jesus Christ and workers of similar miracles; they both feature prominently among the first wave of Christian missionaries outside the boundaries of Jerusalem-based Judaism, first to the Samaritans and then to "God-fearing" Gentiles; they are both "men of the Spirit" supernaturally empowered and guided in the execution of their ministries; and as true prophets of the Lord they both experience persecution as well as divine blessing for their efforts.

While Luke thus establishes a certain parity between the activities of Philip and Peter in the book of Acts, the presentation of Peter as the dominant figure in chaps. 1-12 can scarcely be overlooked, and a case can even be made that, whatever the resemblances between the two characters, Luke still consciously subordinates Philip to Peter and consequently undervalues the former's contribution to the early church's mission history. We have already taken up the matter of Peter's disciplining one of Philip's apparent converts, Simon Magus, and demonstrated that in fact this incident necessarily casts no shadows of doubt on the integrity or importance of Philip's ministry in Luke's eyes. We have also argued that Peter's witness to Cornelius, far from totally eclipsing Philip's outreach to the Ethiopian eunuch in the Acts narrative, actually complements this Philip-incident which itself represents a significant breakthrough to the Gentiles in Luke's view.

But there remain two additional elements within Luke's depiction of Philip and Peter which might suggest at first glance a downplaying, if not degrading, of the former's ministry in relation to the latter.

In the first place, Philip emerges in Acts 6 as one of the seven table-servants appointed to assist the twelve apostles, including Peter their leader, in the pastoral care of the Jerusalem community. Does the "ordination" of the Seven (6.6) to a menial task enabling the apostles to continue their priority work of proclamation and prayer (6.2-4) not imply a clear-cut "subordination" of the Seven to the Twelve within the congregation? And are Philip's achievements as an evangelist in Acts 8 not deliberately toned down by first associating him with the "lesser" vocation of caterer in Acts 6?

Secondly, while Philip proclaims the gospel, works wonders and baptizes with water, his prowess as a missionary apparently fails to match that of Peter at the crucial point of imparting the Spirit to his converts. We see this especially in connection with the Samaritan mission. Peter (along with John) comes to Samaria and finds that the believers baptized by Philip have not yet received the Spirit. So he prays and lays hands on the Samaritans to rectify this deficiency (Acts 8.14-17). Similarly, in the case of the Gentile mission, Peter is on the scene when the Spirit falls on Cornelius and his household, whereas acording the best text (see below) no mention is made of any outpouring of the Spirit upon the Ethiopian eunuch during Philip's encounter with him. Is it not an odd feature in Luke's account that a charismatic missionary so evidently filled with and controlled by the Spirit as Philip (cf. 6.3; 8.29, 39) does not himself administer the Spirit to those

he wins to Christian faith? Does this phenomenon perhaps suggest some inadequacy on Philip's part as a channel of the Spirit? And does it not point to Philip's dependency on Peter, the more authoritative and gifted minister?

While it may seem transparent in these instances that Luke subordinates Philip to Peter and even stigmatizes the former's work, a closer analysis of the relevant material discloses a quite different picture. In this chapter we aim to clarify Philip's role both as Peter's "diaconal" assistant and as precursor to Peter's Spirit-imparting mission, showing in the process that Philip stands out in Luke's story as more of Peter's co-laborer than his underling and as a generally more exemplary figure than is often assumed. Moreover, by focusing sympathetically on Philip in his relation to Peter, we may hope to shed new light on the Lucan *Petrusbild* and on other traditional issues of Lucan scholarship, such as the function of the Twelve and the relationship between water- and Spirit-baptism.

§2. PHILIP, PETER AND THE PASTORAL CARE OF THE JERUSALEM COMMUNITY (ACTS 6.1-7)

Philip the evangelist first appears in the book of Acts as part of a list of seven men chosen to assist the Twelve in the pastoral oversight of the expanding Christian community at Jerusalem (6.5). Philip occupies the second position in the list after Stephen. The fact that extended narratives pertaining successively to Stephen and Philip immediately follow Acts 6.1-7 suggests that this snippet serves to introduce these characters into Luke's story.[1] In effect, the initial casting of Stephen and Philip as members of

the circle of seven table-servants establishes a social identity for these individuals which inevitably colors their portrayal in the balance of Luke's narrative. In Philip's case a relationship with the twelve apostles is set up which must certainly inform our interpretation of the interplay between Philip and Peter in Acts 8-11. Moreover, the juxtaposition of Philip's roles as table-servant and missionary is reinforced by a terse description later in Acts: ". . . Philip the evangelist, who was one of the seven" (21.8).

Investigations of Acts 6.1-7 have traditionally had as their aim the reconstruction of historical conditions within the primitive Jerusalem church. Accordingly, the text has typically been viewed as a window into the earliest periods of Christian history which, however, only becomes visible when the curtains of Lucan redaction are fully drawn back. A common interpretation avers that the reliable tradition underlying Luke's account reported the existence of two conflicting factions within the developing Jerusalem community, the one group led by Peter and his fellow eleven apostles and the other headed by a body of seven men, including Stephen and Philip (6.1, 5). Regarded as almost wholly redactional is the material in 6.2-4, 6-7, wherein, following his theological agenda, Luke peacefully brings the opposing parties together in an artificial scenario which reduces the Seven to mere table-waiters under the authority of the Twelve and results in a dramatic increase in the church's membership (6.7).[2]

Our concern in this section is to test this common perception of Luke's intention in Acts 6.1-7, utilizing different methods of analysis in the process. Rarely in discussions of this passage--focused as they are on quests for historical information--is sufficient attention paid to the place

of the text within Luke's overall literary presentation and to the possible influence of OT models on its composition.[3] Hopefully, by balancing the standard redaction-critical approaches with these additional perspectives, we can obtain a clearer idea of what Luke is trying to get across in the Acts 6 account in relation to his larger portrayal of the relationship between Philip and Peter in Acts 8-11.

2.1 *The Twelve and the Seven*

Does Luke in fact betray an awareness of the Seven as leaders of the "Hellenist" wing of the early Jerusalem community at odds with the "Hebrew" wing governed by the Twelve? And, if so, is his concern to depict an effective reconciliation between these two ruling bodies along clearly marked hierarchical lines, that is, by casting the Seven as submissive servants under the sovereign jurisdiction of the Twelve? While Luke transparently refers to a particular altercation between "Hellenist" and "Hebrew" contingents within the Jerusalem church (Acts 6.1), he nowhere identifies the leaders of these respective parties nor does he make it clear that such leaders were directly involved in promoting the crisis at hand. Thus it must be admitted that interpretations which link the Seven and the murmuring "Hellenists" and drive a wedge between the Seven and the twelve "Hebrews" are based at best on <u>inferences</u> from the data in Luke's account, not on explicit statements.

(1) The fact that Stephen, Philip and all the others listed in Acts 6.5 have Greek names may point, as many have supposed, to the homogeneous character of the seven-member committee and to its connection with the

"Hellenists." But this evidence is not conclusive by itself. Two members of the Twelve--Andrew and Philip (Luke 6.14; Acts 1.13)--also bear Greek appellations, and historically speaking, given the widespread influence of the Greek language among the various peoples--including the Jews--within the ancient Roman empire, the use of Greek names was common practice and not necessarily indicative of any distinctive "Hellenistic" orientation.[4]

(2) The description of the Stephen-Philip group as "seven men of good repute, full of the Spirit and of wisdom" (Acts 6.3) seems to suggest a recognition on Luke's part that this company already constituted an acknowledged leadership body within the young Jerusalem community distinct from, though not necessarily in competition with, the Twelve. Town councils comprising seven men were common entities of executive administration among the Jews of first century Palestine,[5] and the particular qualities which are said to characterize the Seven in the Acts account are appropriate not only to table-service, but also to the exercise of more extensive charismatic authority within the congregation.[6] Moreover, it is assumed that such qualities had been manifest by the group long enough to gain community respect.

(3) It is commonly thought that hints of an underlying rift between the Seven and the Twelve may be detected in Luke's report of the persecution which breaks out against the Jerusalem church.[7] It all begins with the stoning of Stephen, the leading representative of the Seven. This tragic event then precipitates a general attack on the wider Christian community, resulting in the dispersion of "all" (πάντες) members of the church, "except the apostles" (πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων, Acts 8.1). While at this point the

story clearly distinguishes the Twelve from the entire scattered community, not strictly from the Seven or the "Hellenists," it is important to note that in succeeding chapters the Twelve are not portrayed as the last remnant of a ravaged church. Assisted by a body of elders and such notable ministers as James, Barnabas and Agabus (9.26-30; 11.27-30; 15.2-29), they still preside over a company of disciples, such as the prayer group based in Mary's home (12.12-17). Moreover, the only specific people portrayed in Luke's account who flee Jerusalem in the wake of Stephen's martyrdom are Philip, Stephen's partner in the circle of the Seven (8.4-5), and the founders of the church at Antioch, among whom number Greek-speaking Cypriots and Cyrenians who could easily be classed as "Hellenists" (11.19-20). Taken together, this data may indeed suggest an awareness on Luke's part of a polarization between the Twelve and their followers (the "Hebrews"?), on the one hand, who withstand or remain untouched by the pressures of persecution, and the Seven and their affiliates (the "Hellenists"?), on the other hand, who are forced to escape the mounting hostilities against them in the Holy City.

J. D. G. Dunn also sees a possible trace of this community division in the note that "devout men (εὐλαβεῖς) buried Stephen, and made great lamentation over him" (Acts 8.2). Εὐλαβής is not a distinctively Christian term in Luke-Acts (cf. Luke 2.25; Acts 2.5) and could apply in this instance to pious Jews (not Jewish-Christians) committed to upholding Mosaic burial laws. Why is there no mention of "disciples" or the apostles themselves lending a helping hand, and why do we not hear specifically that "the church" lamented Stephen's death? "Is Luke perhaps trying to cloak the fact that the Hebrew Christians had virtually abandoned Stephen?"[8] This is a provocative

idea, but of course care must be taken not to build too much on presumed silences in the text.

(4) Understanding Luke's conception of the identities of the "Hebrews" and "Hellenists" may provide additional clues tacitly linking the two groups to the Twelve and Seven respectively. As is well known, determining the meaning of Ἑβραῖος and Ἑλληνιστής is a long-standing and complex problem in *Actaforschung*.[9] In recent years, however, a certain view, most often associated with the work of M. Hengel, has emerged as the dominant, if not consensus, interpretation.[10] The "Hebrews" in Acts 6.1 are taken to be Aramaic-speaking Jewish-Christians[11] of Palestinian origin (they may also have spoken Greek) whose worship remained centered in the Jerusalem temple, while their "Hellenist" counterparts are regarded as native Greek-speaking[12] Jewish-Christians who had migrated to Jerusalem from the Diaspora (before their conversion to Christianity) and naturally became attached to local Greek-speaking synagogues. The social differences, therefore, between the two groups are judged to be principally linguistic and liturgical, though many would feel that matters of distinctive culture and theology also entered the picture.[13] In terms of this basic profile, the Twelve appear to be aligned with the "Hebrews" in Luke's presentation. Their roots are in Galilee according to Luke's Gospel, and in Acts 2-5 their Jerusalem ministry is based in the temple (2.46; 3.1-11; 5.12-16, 42). The Seven are more difficult to categorize, but Stephen's interaction with members of the Diaspora synagogues in Acts 6.9-10, though ultimately a hostile encounter, implies a certain socio-cultural common ground for debate between him and these "Hellenist" Jews (cf. 9.29).[14] And we are told that another

representative of the Seven, Nicolaus, was a proselyte from Antioch (6.5), making him a Greek-speaking Jew (who became a Christian) with origins outside of Palestine or, in other words, a "Hellenist" according to the description given above.[15]

On the whole then, the evidence, though more allusive and sketchy than scholars tend to concede, does point to an apparent consciousness on Luke's part of a historic division between the Twelve and the Seven in the primitive Jerusalem church, connected in some way with the reported tension between the "Hebrews" and "Hellenists." But ultimately Luke has sought to downplay this division and to paint a picture of emerging harmony between the two groups and their leaders. This leads us to explore the question of exactly how Luke brings the Seven and Twelve together in Acts 6.1-7. N. Walter speaks for many scholars on the issue when he propounds in one place: "it is generally recognized that Luke endeavors not only to relate (*zuordnen*) but also to subordinate (*unterzuordnen*) the Seven to the twelve apostles, in that he allows them to be appointed by the apostles. . .;"[16] and in another place: "everything in 6.1-7 which amounts so to speak to an 'official' subordination (*'dienstliche' Unterordnung*) of the Seven under the Twelve and which seems to force down (*herabdrücken*) the function of the Seven to that of social-helpers, springs from the efforts of Luke. . ."[17] Walter also admits, however, that in the ensuing material in Acts 6-8 Luke virtually sabotages the picture he has created in 6.1-7 by allowing Stephen and Philip to function more like dynamic ministers of the word, *à la* the twelve apostles, than menial table-servants.[18]

Does Luke in fact establish a unity between the Twelve and Seven in

Acts 6.1-7 according to a strict hierarchical model which then appears in conflict with the more developed portrayals of Stephen and Philip which follow? It is true that the Twelve take charge and play a leading part in healing the breach between "Hellenists" and "Hebrews" in the Jerusalem community. They initiate the reconciliation process by calling the congregation together and proposing a plan of action which entails the apostolic appointment (καταστήσομεν)[19] of a committee of seven to oversee the care of widows (6.2-3). Elsewhere in Luke-Acts καθίστημι occasionally appears in the context of a ruler's appointment of one his subjects to a particular task--for example, a householder's charging of a steward with responsibility for managing the estate (Luke 12.42, 44) or a king's installation of a governor to administrate the realm (Acts 7.10)--and such notions of a formal chain of command may possibly be in view in the Twelve's proposed appointment of seven servants to a specific pastoral duty.

However, we must not lose sight of the important contribution which the congregational body also makes to the proceedings in Acts 6. Luke has framed his account in vv. 1 and 7 with a similar focus on the burgeoning company of disciples comprising the young Christian community at Jerusalem (πληθυνόντων τῶν μαθητῶν//ἐπληθύνετο ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν μαθητῶν). And this larger assembly is very much involved in solving the crisis which threatens their fellowship. It is the "entire multitude" of believers, "Hellenists" and "Hebrews" together,[20] who both ratify the apostles' recommendation (καὶ ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους, 6.5)[21] and effect its implementation. They select (ἐξελέξαντο) the seven candidates of their choice, set them (ἔστησαν) before the apostles, and

then, according to Luke's report: προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας (6.6). It is often assumed that these climactic acts of prayer and the laying on of hands should be understood as ecclesiastical rites performed by the apostles. But the grammar of the sentence by no means requires this interpretation. Indeed the most natural reading of Acts 6.6 would take the subjects of ἔστησαν, προσευξάμενοι and ἐπέθηκαν to be the same, namely, the congregation.[22] Accordingly, we may understand that the same assembly who brings forward the seven nominees also prays collectively for God's blessing upon them; likewise, the laying on of hands can also be viewed as a collective gesture by the congregation, symbolizing their solidarity with and support of the seven representatives they have chosen.[23] The apostles must still be regarded as approving and overseeing the church's action, but not in a domineering way. As it turns out, their appointment of the Seven appears to be more of a collaborative venture with the congregation than an expression of independent authority.

Given this cooperative interplay between apostles and assembly in commissioning the Seven to their new duty, the relationship which is established between the Twelve and Seven would appear to be more fraternally based than officially structured.[24] That is, Luke depicts the two groups of leaders as colleagues, fellow-laborers united in the service of the entire congregation. Certainly within Luke's overall perspective the Twelve maintain a special position of respect within the community by virtue of their unique witness to the earthly ministry and resurrection of Jesus (cf. Acts 1.21-23). But this does not entitle them to absolute control over church business nor to some superior ecclesiastical status with reference to

other groups of ministers, such as the Seven. A brief look at three other incidents in Acts having to do with decision-making in the church will further confirm the point.

(1) The appointment of a successor for Judas within the circle of the Twelve occurs not behind closed apostolic doors but "in the midst of the brethren" numbering about 120 persons (Acts 1.15). Peter, to be sure, takes the lead and stipulates the qualifications for inclusion among the Twelve, but ultimately "they put forward (ἔστησαν)"[25] two candidates (1.23; cf. 6.6), "they pray (προσευξάμενοι)" for divine guidance (1.24), and "they cast lots (ἔδωκαν)" to determine which one should be enrolled among the apostles (1.26). "They" in each case would seem to refer to the entire company of disciples who participate in selecting Matthias, thereby matching the congregation in Acts 6 who choose and set apart the Seven.[26] As to who has supreme authority in Acts 1 to appoint Judas' replacement, the focus is on the Lord himself (σὺ κύριε. . . ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω, 1.24) rather than on a particular cadre of ecclesiastical officials, apostolic or otherwise.[27]

(2) The commissioning of Barnabas and Saul for missionary service takes place in the context of the local church at Antioch, without any contribution from the Twelve (Acts 13.1-3). As the Antioch community together with its recognized prophets and teachers are gathered for worship,[28] the Holy Spirit instructs the body of believers to "set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them" (13.2). Once again the emphasis falls on the Lord's sovereign authority to appoint his ministers. The church, of course, has an important part to play in carrying

out the divine mandate, and it seems to be the entire worshipping congregation, not merely a small group of leaders, who take the appropriate action: "after fasting and praying they laid their hands on them and sent them off" (13.3).[29] Such a procedure (prayer/laying on of hands) obviously echoes the Jerusalem community's dealings with the Seven in Acts 6.

(3) The so-called "Apostolic Council" in Acts 15 is in fact not exclusively an apostolic affair. When Paul and Barnabas come to Jerusalem, they report their missionary experiences to "the church and the apostles and the elders" (15.4). As debate ensues, Peter and James emerge as the principal spokesmen for the Jerusalem church, but "all the assembly" (πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος) remain attentively on the scene (15.12). When a verdict is finally reached, it represents the collective will of "the apostles and the elders, with the whole church (σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ)" (15.22). This entire company chooses (ἐκλεξαμένους) two representatives from their midst and dispatches them with a letter to the Pauline communities in Syria and Cilicia (15.22-23).

In short, throughout the book of Acts a non-hierarchical, democratic process characterizes church government in general and the appointment of Christian ministers in particular. Peter and the apostles play a leading role but do not lord their authority over the congregation. Representatives who are chosen and commissioned to specific tasks--such as Philip and fellow-members of the committee of Seven--are not so much placed under the Twelve as alongside the Twelve and the larger community of believers, all of whom work together as partners in the service of the church's one Lord Jesus Christ.

Having concluded that from the standpoint of church order Luke does not assign a subordinate status to the Seven with respect to the Twelve, we must still address the issue of whether or not the particular division of labor in Acts 6 into the ministry of the word and table-service implies a subordinate function for the Seven.

2.2 *The Ministry of the Word*[30] *and Table-Service*

In order to assess the value which Luke places on the work assigned to the Seven in Acts 6 in relation to the ministry of the Twelve, we must isolate particular dimensions of the Seven's prescribed *diakonia* and then set these in the context of Luke's overall perspective on Christian service. In the first place, we must appreciate that neglected widows emerge from the outset of Luke's report as the special targets of the ministry entrusted to the Seven (6.1). No writer in the New Testament reflects a greater concern for the activity and plight of widows than Luke. Outside the material in Luke 20.45-21.4, which is shared with Mark, the several passages in Luke-Acts focusing on widows are unique to this two-volume work. Anna, an elderly widow and prophetess, appears as a model of spiritual devotion and a key witness to the new age of God's salvation inaugurated by the birth of Jesus (Luke 2.36-38). In the critical scene set in Nazareth where Jesus launches his public ministry and defines its character, he refers particularly to Elijah's outreach to a destitute widow during a season of famine as a model for his own mission (4.25-27). Later Jesus encounters a bereaved widow who has just lost her only son and, motivated by compassion, he resuscitates the dead child and returns him to his mother (7.11-17).[31] In his teaching the

Lucan Jesus features the pleadings of a mistreated widow in a lesson about importunate prayer and God's vindication of the oppressed (18.1-8) and warns the scribes of the condemnation which awaits them for ravaging widows' houses at the same time they feign piety with their lengthy prayers (20.47). Finally in Luke's Gospel (as in Mark), Jesus commends a poverty-stricken widow for her remarkable generosity (21.1-4).

Obviously Luke manifests a deep sensitivity to the vulnerable position of many widows in ancient society[32] and regards honoring widows, providing for their needs and ameliorating injustices against them as top priority concerns reflected in the ministry of Jesus. Especially relevant to our interests is the fact that Jesus' care of widows in Luke's Gospel is part and parcel of his general commitment to promote the physical and social welfare of downtrodden people--a commitment which is perfectly complementary to and even wrapped up with his determination to preach the word of God. The Jesus who restores life to the widow's beloved son is the same Jesus who reaches out to lepers and other excluded persons and preaches the good news to the poor (Luke 7.21-22).[33] Thus, authentic gospel ministry for Luke includes the performance of merciful deeds of relief on behalf of the needy.

If in the ministry of Jesus Luke makes no essential value distinction between the proclamation of the word and the pastoral support of widows, then surely he intends for no such distinction to be read into the situation of the Jerusalem church in Acts 6.[34] Though for pragmatic reasons (such as the expanding size of the community) the Twelve and Seven divide the labor between them, there is no notion of the Seven taking up the inferior duty (watching over widows) while the Twelve get on with the really important

work (preaching and teaching). As for the relationship between the ministerial assignments in Acts 6 and in subsequent chapters, the tension is not so great as sometimes assumed. Philip's prophetic ministry of word and deed to the outcast Samaritans and eunuch is entirely of a piece with his attention to the special needs of widows, another marginalized group in the ancient world. And in Acts 9 Peter appears less as a minister of the word than an agent of healing and pastoral care to a company of disciples which includes grieving widows (9.32-43, esp. vv 39-41).[35] The point is: in the course of Acts both Philip and Peter, following the example set by Jesus, participate in the equally significant and related tasks of preaching the word and ministering to widows.

A second feature of Luke's characterization of the Seven's ministry in Acts 6 is the use of two phrases with a form of διακονία: ἡ διακονία ἡ καθημερινή (6.1) and διακονεῖν τραπέζαις (6.2). Before examining the specific type of service implied in such phrases, we must call attention to the fact that the designation of the Seven's work as διακονία corresponds to the notation of the apostles' duty as <u>ἡ διακονία</u> τοῦ λόγου (6.4). In a sense, then, whatever may distinguish the two ministries, they are both perceived as "diaconal" functions in Luke's view. Ecclesiastical notions of the Seven as holders of a formal office of "deacon" over against a ruling episcopacy comprised of the Twelve appear to be alien to Luke's presentation.[36]

In more particular terms, how should we understand the ministry of "serving tables" entrusted to the Seven? A τράπεζα can refer to a money-changer's table (Mark 11.15; Matt 21.12; John 2.15) or more generally to a

bank where money can be deposited to gain interest (Luke 19.23). More commonly, however, in Luke-Acts the term denotes a dinner or banqueting table (Luke 16.21; 22.21, 30) or, by extension, the meal which is placed on the table (Acts 16.34). Since διακονία/διακονέω also frequently occur in Luke's writing in the context of meal-service and general hospitality (Luke 4.39; 8.3; 10.40; 12.37; 17.8; 22.26, 27),[37] it seems most likely that διακονεῖν τραπέζαις in Acts 6.4 identifies the Seven's responsibility as that of superintending the provision of food to the congregation, especially to those in need such as widows. As a "daily" (καθημερινή) chore, this ministry may somehow be linked to the "day by day" (καθ' ἡμέραν) fellowship meals characteristic of community practice in the primitive Jerusalem church (Acts 2.46). Perhaps the Seven are to make sure that widows and other poor members of the congregation are invited to these home gatherings and receive their fair share.[38] The system of Jewish poor-relief outlined in early rabbinic materials, whereby indigent vagrants were supplied with a daily ration of food, may also provide relevant background to Luke's understanding of the early church's "daily distribution" in Acts 6.1.[39]

According to conventional social standards, ancient and modern, the task of doling out food or waiting on tables is a lowly one, scarcely comparable in importance to the duties of public-speaking and policy-making performed by community leaders. Even in the church the influential ministry of the word--largely the province of ordained officials--has tended to be prized above the admittedly necessary, but menial, work of Christian charity which may be carried out by laypeople, including women. But Luke must be allowed his own perspective on the matter.

On the basis of three accounts in Luke's Gospel, two of which are part of his special material, it might possibly be construed that Luke thinks of table-service as suitable "women's work," inferior to the preaching and healing ministry of Jesus and his disciples. In reporting the healing of Simon's mother-in-law, Luke follows his fellow-Synoptists in indicating that, once her fever miraculously broke, the woman immediately "rose and served (διηκόνει)" those who had gathered in her home (Luke 4.39//Mark 1.31//Matt 8.15). In a unique Lucan summary statement of Jesus' activities, we read that Jesus was preaching the gospel throughout the cities of Galilee, accompanied along the way by the Twelve and a company of women (whom Jesus had healed) who "served" (διηκόνουν) the travelling party (Luke 8.1-3).[40] And in an incident which E. S. Fiorenza especially regards as a parallel to Acts 6 in its emphasis on subordinating table-service to the ministry of the word, Luke portrays Jesus as chiding Martha for her excessive preoccupation with "much serving" (πολλὴν διακονίαν) at the same time he commends Mary for her attention to the "good portion" of Jesus' teaching (10.38-42).[41]

On closer examination, however, these examples do not necessarily emphasize women's table-service as a distinct and subordinate function *vis-à-vis* the preaching ministry of Jesus and the Twelve. In the cases of Simon's mother-in-law and the women in Luke 8, their διακονία is presented not so much as a separate activity in contrast to the work of Jesus and the apostles, but rather as a complementary ministry revealing the women's gratitude for Jesus' blessing of their lives as well as their ongoing commitment to support his mission. Moreover, B. Witherington has argued convincingly that in Luke's eyes Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna and company

"were more than just a hospitality or catering service for the men and Jesus."[42] These women are introduced as part of Jesus' band of disciples in Luke 8.1-3 in order to set them up as models of fruitful receptors of the word (8.4-15) and prepare for Luke's later presentation of certain women--including Mary Magdalene and Joanna--as the first witnesses (= ministers of the word) to Jesus' resurrection (24.8-11).[43]

The snippet set in Mary and Martha's home does establish a contrast between Martha's absorption in table-service and Mary's devotion to Jesus' word. But this is not a contrast between two ministries--table-service and preaching and teaching the word (corresponding to Acts 6)--but rather a contrast between two expressions of love for Jesus--serving him dinner and listening to his word. Jesus rebukes Martha for becoming so distracted with serving (he does not fault the basic task of table-service, if kept in perspective) that she ignores the priority responsibility of all disciples: to attend to Jesus' instruction. In addition, a logical corollary of Jesus' commendation of Mary's choice is an invitation to Martha to leave the kitchen and join her sister in the fellowship of Jesus' teaching. Certainly in Luke 10.38-42 Jesus does not advocate the relegation of women to catering duties nor dissociate them from contact with the proclamation of the word.[44]

There are four other important blocks of material in Luke's Gospel dealing with table-service or food-provision[45] which must inform our understanding of Acts 6.1-7, especially as these accounts have to do more directly with the ministry of the twelve apostles.

(1) Luke's version of the miraculous feeding of the five thousand focuses more emphatically on the role of the Twelve than the other Gospels.

Only Luke actually identifies the apostles as οἱ δώδεκα (9.12) and calls attention to the number once again by making it the very last word in the account (the twelve apostles take up the twelve leftover baskets: κλασμάτων κόφινοι δωδεκα, 9.17). Repeated use of emphatic pronouns with reference to the Twelve in 9.13 (ὑμεῖς, ἡμῖν, ἡμεῖς) also highlights the apostles' function in the narrative.[46] What this function amounts to is that of resisting Jesus' intentions to feed the multitude before they depart. Jesus has been preaching to and working miracles among the crowd all day long (9.11-12a) and now regards it as a fitting conclusion to his ministry to feed his audience (9.13a). The Twelve, however, who themselves have just returned from a preaching and healing campaign (9.1-6, 10),[47] balk at Jesus' idea because of what appears to be a serious lack of available resources (9.12-13). As is well known, they fail to reckon with the immensity of Jesus' power coupled with the depth of his concern to supply the multitude's physical needs (9.14-17). One lesson which clearly emerges from the story is Jesus' determined blending of gospel-proclamation and food-provision in his ministry.[48] The two tasks stand side-to-side as important expressions of his compassion for needy people. The Twelve's slowness to appreciate this double-barrelled approach to service provides an interesting prelude to their activity in Acts 6 (see below).

(2) In Luke's presentation of the parable of the watchful servants, Jesus tells of an estate owner who, if he finds his servants alert to their duties, will himself "sit at table. . . and serve (διακονήσει) them" (Luke 12.37). Peter then asks if the Lord is relating this parable "for us [= disciples, including the Twelve] or for all [= the crowd]" (12.41),[49]

whereupon Jesus responds by clarifying the responsibilities of the faithful steward, with obvious application to the leaders of his people.[50] They are to superintend the members of his household, "to give them <u>their portion of food</u> at the proper time" (12.42). Obviously Jesus once again extols table-service/food-provision as exemplary employment for himself and his ministers.[51]

(3) In a short parable unique to Luke, Jesus features a servant who returns to his master's home after a hard day's work in the field. The master, Jesus suggests, will hardly invite his hired hand to dine with him but rather will say, "Prepare supper for me. . . serve (διακόνει) me, till I eat and drink." Such is the accepted duty of faithful servants (Luke 17.7-10). The parable seems to be addressed especially to Jesus' apostles (cf. 17.5), exhorting them to fulfill a servant-role which includes the performance of domestic table-waiting duties. More specifically, P. S. Minear thinks that the story drives home to the apostles, against their natural inclinations, the necessity and importance of participation in diaconal work in addition to their involvement in preaching the gospel on the "mission field."

> The parable distinguishes the duties in the field from those in the house. This distinction agrees with the line drawn between the duties of traveling evangelists (cultivating the field, searching for lost sheep, inviting people to the banquet table, 14:21-23) and the duties of the more sedentary deacons. The parable presupposes that the apostolic evangelists have a penchant for claiming that their work is finished when they come from the field into the house; they also have a tendency to assign priority and superiority to their "field work". The parable counters this tendency with the insistence that the same servants must fulfill both extramural and intramural duties to the lord.[52]

(4) Luke's account of the apostles' dispute over greatness, in contradistinction to the other Synoptics, is set in the context of table-fellowship at the Last Supper (Luke 22.14-23) and utilizes as the basis of Jesus' response the model of a table-servant (22.26-27) as opposed to a servant/slave who ransoms his life (Mark 10.43-45//Matt 20.26-28).[53] Contrary to the apostles' apparently hierarchical and power-oriented line of thinking, Jesus sets up ὁ διακονῶν as the pattern of true greatness for those who are called to lead his followers (22.26). Jesus himself represents the supreme example of ὁ διακονῶν (22.27) by his recent service of bread and wine to his apostles (22.17-20).[54]

These selected materials from Luke's Gospel are sufficient to demonstrate the narrator's presentation of the ministry of the word and table-service as equally significant components of the outreaching mission of Jesus. Moreover, we have noticed how the Lucan Jesus repeatedly endeavors to overcome the one-sided perspective of the Twelve and to inculcate within them his high regard for diaconal as well as kerygmatic ministry. As we move into the book of Acts, we get a glimpse that in some respects the apostles have learned their lesson. While they certainly take the lead in preaching the word of the Lord, especially testifying to Jesus' resurrection (Acts 4.33), they also assume responsibility for the material welfare of the young Jerusalem church, distributing funds to any one in need (χρεία) (4.34-35; cf. 2.43-45). In Acts 6 they maintain their personal commitment to proclaiming the word but also manifest a concern for the work of food-distribution by initiating the appointment of the Seven to handle this "need" (χρεία, 6.3).[55] This division of labor perhaps betrays traces of an abiding

reluctance on the part of the Twelve to become personally engaged in table-service (as we find in Luke's Gospel), but at least they now recognize the importance of such ministry within the church and take action to insure its efficient performance.

Certainly from Luke's (i.e. the implied author's) perspective--which coincides with the perspective of Jesus (the supreme authoritative character) within the narrative and may, as we have seen, critically challenge the perspective of the fallible apostles--the preaching and serving functions of the Twelve and Seven respectively should be viewed as two balanced and interrelated parts of a unified community ministry. More particularly, in the framework of Luke's presentation, the fact that Philip waits on tables in Acts 6 while Peter preaches the word does not subordinate the former to the latter, and the fact that Philip moves on in Acts 8 to conduct a successful preaching campaign is not at all incompatible with his former vocation. In short, Philip "the evangelist who was one of the Seven" emerges in Luke's story as a prime model of the dutiful servant in Jesus' parable who both sows the word in the field and waits on tables in the house.[56]

2.3 *Pentateuchal Parallels*

Thus far in our investigation of the relationship which Luke envisages between Philip (the Seven) and Peter (the Twelve) in Acts 6.1-7, we have focused principally on the place of this pericope within the narrative framework of Luke's two-volume work. In this section we aim to illumine Luke's purpose in Acts 6 by another means, namely, by exploring the possible influence of biblical models on its composition. In particular, we intend to

examine parallels between the Acts 6 account and certain passages in the Pentateuch related to the career of Moses. Such an analysis follows on from our study in chap. 3, where we highlighted Luke's employment of a Mosaic pattern to characterize Jesus and the main figures in the early church, including Peter and Philip (in his interaction with Simon Magus).

A number of scholars note the apparent link between the installment of the Seven and the appointment of Joshua as Moses' successor in Num 27.15-23.[57] The verb ἐπισκέπτομαι is used in both accounts to refer to the act of selection (Acts 6.3//Num 27.16); the Seven and Joshua are similarly reported to be qualified men of the Spirit (Acts 6.3//Num 27.18); and they are similarly commissioned to their assignments in a congregational ceremony involving a formal presentation (ἵστημι, Acts 6.6//Num 27.22) and the laying on of hands (Acts 6.6//Num 27.23). While granting the striking nature of these parallels, we must press the matter further than scholars typically do and underscore the equally striking <u>differences</u> between the two cases, especially in terms of the respective functions of the congregation and leaders in the proceedings.

In the Numbers incident, Moses, in direct consultation with the Lord, assumes total control of the situation. He asks the Lord to appoint a successor, and the Lord promptly singles out Joshua and details the ordination process (27.15-21). The assembly is gathered but plays a strictly passive role. Moses is the one who takes Joshua, sets him before the congregation (and Eleazar the priest) and lays hands upon him (27.22-23). In so doing Moses invests Joshua with his personal, God-given authority (cf. 27.20). By marked contrast, the congregation is much more actively involved

in Acts 6. As we have seen, the entire body of believers selects the Seven, presents them before the Twelve and lays hands upon them. The Twelve have their part to play, but in this case they should not be facilely identified with Moses as exclusive agents of God's authority. The Seven in Acts 6 do not appear like Joshua in relation to Moses as official successors to the twelve apostles, but rather as representatives of the larger Christian community which collectively fulfills the Mosaic pattern. If Luke did compose Acts 6.1-7 with an eye to Num 27.15-23 (which seems likely), the significant thing is that he adapted his biblical model to feature a more egalitarian, cooperative relationship between God's people and their leaders.

In an important article which makes a fresh contribution to the interpretation of Acts 6.1-7, D. Daube probes the correspondence between Luke's account and three episodes from the ministry of Moses pertaining to the appointment of administrative assistants.[58] In Exodus 18 Moses' father-in-law, Jethro, observes a typical day of work in the life of the great leader of Israel. Jethro concludes that what Moses is doing--namely, settling disputes from morning till evening--"is not good," since it will eventually dissipate his energies (18.17-18). Jethro then devises a plan to alleviate Moses' burden, whereby "able men from all the people" are to be chosen (σκέπτομαι, cf. ἐπισκέπτομαι, Acts 6.3) and placed (καθίστημι, cf. Acts 6.3) over segments of the population to judge their petty conflicts. Only matters of great import are to be brought to Moses (18.19-23). The proposal pleases Moses, and he proceeds to select personally his assistants (18.24-27).

In a related but not identical passage from Deuteronomy 1, Moses

rehearses the process of appointing his administrative aides. Here Jethro is not mentioned. Moses simply refers to the awareness which had dawned upon him that he needed some assistance in governing the great throng (πλῆθος, cf. Acts 6.2, 5) of Israelites whom God had steadily multiplied (πληθύνω, cf. Acts 6.1, 7) (1.10). So, according to this review, he instructed the people to choose "wise [σοφία, cf. Acts 6.3], understanding, and experienced men" whom he would appoint (καθίστημι, cf. Acts 6.3) as tribal judges (1.13). The crowd approved the proposal (1.14), and Moses installed the various subordinate officers to adjudicate impartially the disputes of all people ("great and small alike"), except for the hard cases which Moses would still decide (1.15-17).

It is clear that a number of linguistic and thematic elements link these two Pentateuchal incidents and Acts 6.1-7. But once again we must stress that there are important divergences. Daube recognizes the greater participation of the congregation in Acts 6, but he fails to appreciate an additional distinction in the types of service entrusted to the assistants. Daube thinks that Moses' delegation of more negligible responsibilities to his underlings so he can give himself to the weightier matters of government corresponds well with the Twelve's relinquishing[59] of "the smaller, controversial business" of table-service to the Seven in order that they might devote themselves to the vital duties of preaching and prayer.[60] In fact, despite the general parallel that Moses' helpers and the Seven are both appointed to solve an administrative crisis threatening the peace of an expanding community, their specific tasks are quite different. Israel's tribal officials are instituted as judges to oversee small units of people

within an elaborate corporate structure topped by Moses, the chief executive, legislator and judge. Stephen, Philip and company, however, are commissioned as a service organization (not a judicial body) with responsibility for ministering to the entire congregation (not merely a sub-group). Moreover, the Acts account leaves the impression that the "business" of table-service has been transferred wholly and exclusively to the Seven. No stipulation is introduced suggesting or requiring the Seven to bring difficult matters to the Twelve for final settlement. As we argued above, the charity work of the Seven in Acts is esteemed by Luke as a complementary ministry to the preaching activity of the Twelve. Once again we must say that, if Luke did depend on Mosaic models from Exodus and Deuteronomy, he felt free to adjust the hierarchical structures which they endorse.

The third OT incident which Daube discusses as a model for Acts 6.1-7 comes once again from the book of Numbers. The parallel here is especially noteworthy, in that it involves a common setting of congregational grumbling (γογγύζω, Num 11.1//γογγυσμός, Acts 6.1) over food supply. In the Numbers account the people of Israel plead for meat in addition to the manna with which they had been provided (11.1-9). This murmuring prompts Moses to lament before the Lord the heavy burden of caring for the nation alone, whereupon the Lord instructs him to share the leadership load with seventy of Israel's elders (11.16-17). When Moses assembles these elders in the "tent of meeting," the Lord "comes down" and takes some of the Spirit which he had placed on Moses and imparts it to the seventy, causing them to <u>prophesy</u> (11.24-25). Interestingly, we read nothing about the seventy actively assisting in solving the immediate problem at hand regarding the

provision of meat. This the Lord handles himself with a mighty gust of wind which drives an abundant supply of quail into the camp (11.31-32; cf. 11.18-23).

Yet again the evidence is suggestive of a broad correspondence but not a perfect match between the narrative in Acts 6 and an episode from Numbers. A notable difference (which Daube does not point out) is manifest in the outcomes of the two incidents. In Numbers the people are struck with a plague "while the meat [is] yet between their teeth" as a token of God's displeasure with their constant complaining (11.33-35; cf. 11.10-15, 18-23), whereas in Acts the congregation prospers (6.7), and the widows' murmuring is treated sympathetically as an expression of legitimate hardship. An essentially negative OT account finds a positive counterpart in Luke's presentation.

For our purposes the most provocative connection emerges between the functions of the Seventy in Numbers and the Seven in Acts. The fact that the Seventy, chosen to assist Moses during a time of crisis over food provision, are portrayed as Spirit-endued prophets provides an interesting biblical precedent for Stephen and Philip, who carry out Spirit-empowered prophetic ministries after their appointment as table-servants. Moreover, we should not ignore the special focus in Numbers 11 on two prophesying elders, Eldad and Medad, whom Moses commends in the face of Joshua's protestations.

> And Joshua the son of Nun, the minister of Moses, one of his chosen men, said, "My lord Moses, forbid them (κώλυσον αὐτούς)." But Moses said to him, "Are you jealous for my sake? Would that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!" (11.28-29).

There is evidence that Eldad and Medad (Modad) were the objects of some interest in the early church, even to the point that a book (no longer extant) was in circulation allegedly reporting the content of their prophecies (cf. Hermas, *Vis.* 2.3.4.).[61] At any rate, Luke seems to have the Eldad/Medad case in mind when relating--in close proximity to the mention of the seventy (-two) missionaries in Luke 10.1[62]--Jesus' chastisement of the apostle John ("one of his chosen men," cf. 6.13-14) for forbidding (κωλύω) a man outside the apostolic circle to exercise a public ministry in Jesus' name (Luke 9.49-50).[63] Is it possible that Luke also has in view the example of Eldad and Medad in his portrayal in Acts 6-8 of Stephen and Philip--two men outside the circle of the Twelve who, though appointed as table-waiters, also function as dynamic prophets on par with the Twelve? Daube specifically compares Joshua's resistance to the two elders' inspired proclamation, for Moses' sake, with the synagogue members' attack on Stephen for blaspheming against Moses and God (Acts 6.11).[64] In any event, it appears certain that Luke would not have regarded Stephen's and Philip's prophetic activities as in any sense improper or inconsistent with their vocation as caterers or their status as individuals outside the apostolic band. Speaking through the voice of Peter (the leader of the Twelve) in Acts 2, Luke announces the fulfillment of Joel's expectation in words which clearly echo the desire of Moses expressed in Num 11.29 (cited above):

> And in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy. . . ; yea, and on my menservants and my maidservants in those days I will pour out my Spirit; and they shall prophesy (2.17-18).[65]

2.4 *Conclusion*

Our analysis of Acts 6.1-7 in the context of Luke's two-volume work and against the backdrop of OT models has led us to accept the consensus opinion that Luke has framed his account to depict a fundamental unity between the Twelve and the Seven within the primitive Jerusalem church which overrides traces of an underlying tension between the two leadership groups. However, we have run against the majority view in our interpretation of how Luke brings about this match. He does not, we have argued, erect a clear-cut hierarchical structure in which the Twelve are placed at the summit and assigned the top priority duties, while the Seven are placed under the Twelve as support staff responsible for the more mundane tasks of community care. Luke's overall perspective on ministry is much more egalitarian than that. He highlights the executive authority of the entire body of believers which its leaders--including the twelve apostles!--acknowledge and submit to, and he portrays the proclamation of the word and table-service as tandem tasks of comparable importance in the vocations of Jesus and his emissaries.[66]

Accordingly, as key representatives of the Seven and Twelve respectively, Philip and Peter in Acts 6 emerge as partners in ministry, complementary servants of a thriving community of disciples. Such a relationship must be kept in mind when evaluating Luke's portrayals of the overlapping missionary careers of Philip and Peter in Acts 8-11. Within this material, however, there is an important additional factor--related to the Spirit's outpouring on Samaritan and Gentile converts--which complicates our

understanding of how Luke perceives the connection between Philip's and Peter's ministries. It is to this issue that we now turn.

§3. PHILIP, PETER AND THE SPIRIT'S OUTPOURING ON SAMARITAN AND GENTILE CONVERTS (ACTS 8-11)

3.1 *Statement of the Problem*

In the introduction to this chapter we adumbrated the difficulties in Luke's presentation surrounding the apparent fact that Philip's otherwise successful evangelistic efforts do not include the crowning achievement of imparting the Spirit to his converts. We must now expose the problem in more detail. The case of the Samaritan mission poses a particularly perplexing "riddle"[67] to the minds of most interpreters. In the first place, it appears anomalous within the NT in its temporal dissociation of a believer's reception of the Spirit from the moment of faith and conversion (typically linked closely to water-baptism). Paul and John certainly regard possession of the Spirit as an automatic concomitant of Christian faith (e.g. Gal 3.2, 5; Rom 8.9; John 3.5-8; 7.38-39), but evidently so does Luke, according to the programmatic statement in Acts 2.38: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." How then do we explain the lapse of time (of unspecified duration) between the Samaritans' faith and baptism in 8.12-13 and their reception of the Spirit in 8.14-17?

There have been attempts to diminish the problem by proposing some kind of two-stage manifestation of the Spirit among the Samaritan Christians.

In these cases, the Spirit is viewed as coming in some measure upon the Samaritans following their response of faith and baptism, only to be subsequently poured out in some degree of greater fullness. Particular theological constructions undergirding this process include: (1) the classical Pentecostal understanding of Spirit-baptism (usually accompanied by tongues-speaking) as a "second blessing" experienced by some Christians, indicating a higher level of Spirit-filling and -empowering than that attained at conversion;[68] (2) the classical Catholic position regarding confirmation, whereby the post-baptismal rite of the laying on of official hands "completes" the new convert's relationship to the Spirit begun in baptism;[69] and (3) the view that Acts 8.14-17 merely recounts the added experience of external Pentecostal phenomena to authenticate the Spirit's already full presence within the Samaritan believers and legitimate a new missionary advance into Samaritan territory.[70]

However distinct from one another these theories may be and whatever their individual difficulties, a common and insuperable problem plaguing all of them is the plain reading of Luke's text. One simply cannot get around the unambiguous statement in Acts 8.16 concerning the Holy Spirit:

> οὐδέπω γὰρ ἦν ἐπ' οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιπεπτωκός, μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.

The words οὐδέπω, οὐδενὶ and μόνον all drive home the absoluteness of the Spirit's absence among the believing and baptized Samaritans. The first term, very rare in the NT, is also combined with οὐδείς in a version of Luke 23.53[71] to describe the tomb of Jesus "where no one had ever yet been laid" (cf. John 19.41). Clearly in Acts 8.16 Luke intends to communicate in

exclusive terms that no one converted in Philip's Samaritan mission had ever yet been blessed with the gift of the Spirit. It may well be that Simon's visual perception of the Spirit's activity in 8.18 signals the manifestation of external *charismata*,[72] but as with similar displays attending the Spirit's outpouring in Acts (2.1-4; 10.44-48; 19.1-7), the outward signs are not to be divorced from the initial coming of the Spirit himself.

A more feasible attempt to downplay the supposed oddity of the so-called "Samaritan Pentecost" starts by questioning whether Luke is in fact greatly bothered with matters of chronological precision when describing the operations of the Spirit. We only have to compare the Samaritans' situation with that of Cornelius' household in Acts 10, which features the Spirit's spontaneous effusion before baptism, to detect a certain flexibility on Luke's part regarding the schedule of the Spirit's activities in relation to new believers. The important thing for Luke seems to be the total experience of respondents to the gospel, which typically includes components such as repentance, faith, water-baptism and forgiveness of sins, along with possession of the Spirit, but not ordered according to any rigidly determined pattern. Accordingly, the fact that the Samaritan believers eventually receive the promised gift of the Spirit may be viewed as adequate fulfillment of Acts 2.38 from Luke's perspective.[73]

Whatever the merits of such an analysis in addressing certain soteriological (*ordo salutis*) questions raised by the time lag between the Samaritans' faith/baptism and their reception of the Spirit, there remains a critical ministerial problem having to do with the function of human agents in channelling the Spirit to others. Here is where doubts may be introduced

regarding Philip's competency as a missionary. For Luke delineates a course of events in which the Samaritans not only receive the Spirit at a different time than their baptism, but also receive the Spirit at the hands of different ministers, namely, Peter and John, than the one who baptized them, namely, Philip. Indeed, a possible inference from Luke's story is that the Samaritans have to wait for the Spirit precisely because they have to wait for the arrival of qualified ministers--among whom Philip does not rank--authorized to impart the Spirit to them. Philip's lack of participation in transmitting the Spirit to the Samaritans becomes all the more puzzling in Luke's presentation when we realize both that Philip otherwise appears in Acts 8 as an exemplary charismatic figure, working wonders and being guided by the Spirit in dramatic ways (8.6-7, 13, 29, 39),[74] and that Ananias, a devoted but scarcely dynamic disciple of the Lord,[75] emerges in the next chapter as the instrument through which no one less that Paul himself is filled with the Spirit (9.17).[76] Why does Philip the mighty evangelist fail where a lesser light like Ananias succeeds? Are we pressed to adopt Käsemann's conclusion that Luke has "stigmatized" Philip's ministry as "defective?"[77]

Whatever his peculiar role in the Samaritan episode, Philip's reputation as a channel of the Spirit has been thought by some to be vindicated in the incident involving the Ethiopian eunuch. First of all, consideration is given to the possible authenticity of the longer "Western" reading in Acts 8.39. This text does not identify the Spirit's action as snatching Philip away, but rather as <u>falling upon the eunuch</u> immediately following his baptism, after which <u>an angel of the Lord</u> removes Philip from the scene.[78] Arguments which

have been marshalled in favor of the originality of this version include its consistency with a Lucan tendency to feature outpourings of the Spirit in Acts 1-10 and its avoidance of a rather idiosyncratic view of the Spirit as a vehicle of relocation. Moreover, the omission of the "Western" reading in other texts can be explained as an embarrassment over the lack of apostolic participation in the Spirit's bestowal or simply as a transcriptional error on the part of a copyist who inadvertently jumped from πνεῦμα to κυρίου.[79]

Nevertheless, most commentators and all modern texts and translations opt for the priority of the shorter version of Acts 8.39. Its external attestation is considerably stronger, and it stakes a claim to being the *lectio difficilior*. The presentation of the Spirit's peculiar transportational activity should be regarded as authentic precisely because of its uniqueness in the NT,[80] and the absence of an explicit account of the Spirit's outpouring upon a new believer in the first half of Acts is actually so surprising an omission as to argue for its original, rather than secondary, status.[81] The lack of apostolic agency in conferring the Spirit manifest in the "Western" text is not altogether without parallel in Acts 1-10, as Ananias' ministry to Saul attests; therefore, relating the eunuch's reception of the Spirit through the ministry of Philip could be accounted for as conforming to Saul's experience in chap. 9. Finally, the "Western" attribution of Philip's disappearance to "an angel of the Lord" appears to be harmonized too neatly to Acts 8.26.[82]

On the whole, then, the shorter, standard text of Acts 8.39 is to be preferred. This is not to deny, however, that the competing "Western" tradition might go back to a very early period.[83] E. J. Epp views the longer

reading of the text as part of a general "Western" theological tendency to insert references to the Spirit especially at key points in the story of the church's outreach beyond strictly Jewish boundaries. In these instances, the Spirit serves to legitimate the Gentile mission and, increasingly, to define the Christian movement over against Judaism.[84] Such social factors affecting Christian-Jewish interaction were certainly in play by the end of the first century. Moreover, it is not difficult to imagine that some early Christian circles (such as the Hellenists?) who venerated Philip would have enthusiasically endorsed and even promulgated a "Western"-type tradition directly associating the Spirit's descent with the great evangelist's activity of preaching and baptism.[85] At any rate, if the "Western" version was current in Luke's day and known to him in any form, he apparently chose against it in favor of limiting the Spirit's action to directing Philip's itinerary.

The text-critical issue aside, some scholars see, irrespective of the accepted reading in Acts 8.39, an allusion to the eunuch's immediate reception of the Spirit upon baptism in the concluding note that the new convert "went on his way rejoicing."[86] Certainly in Luke's understanding joy flows as a natural response to being filled with the Spirit (cf. Acts 13.52), but rejoicing is no automatic guarantee of the Spirit's presence. Indeed, the most important parallel in this regard is the previous Philip-narrative where the Samaritans experience <u>great joy</u> (8.8), believe and are baptized, and yet <u>none of them are thereby judged to possess the Spirit</u> (8.16) when the Jerusalem apostles come and inspect. The Ethiopian eunuch seems to be in a similar state when he and Philip part company.

Though we learn nothing of the eunuch's subsequent reception of the Spirit (as in the case of the Samaritans), we do encounter the report of the Spirit's outpouring upon a Gentile convert in the parallel incident involving Cornelius. And, of course, the "minister-in-charge" in this case is the apostle Peter. Philip the evangelist, though presumably on the scene in the city of Caesarea (Acts 8.40; cf. 21.8), is not assigned so much as a "bit part" in the proceedings related to the Spirit's bestowal upon Cornelius and his household. As with the Samaritans, so with the Gentiles, Philip lays the groundwork with his mission of gospel-preaching and water-baptism, but he gives way to Peter when it comes to facilitating the climactic experience of the Spirit's outpouring. Despite our analysis of Acts 6.1-7 offered above, in which we sketched a more egalitarian picture of relations between Philip and Peter, are we perhaps driven to conclude that Acts 8-11 in fact features Philip's subordination to Peter? In any event, we are faced with the interpretive conundrum of accounting for Philip's strange lack of participation, in comparison with Peter, in administering the Spirit to Samaritan and Gentile converts.

A common approach to this dilemma focuses on the status of Philip as an independent, itinerant missionary in relation to the leading apostle, Peter, headquartered in the Jerusalem church. In the following section we will evaluate this approach and set the stage for presenting subsequently a more distinctive perspective on Luke's portrayal of the interplay between Philip and Peter in Acts 8-11.

3.2 *Philip the Independent Missionary and Peter the Jerusalem Apostle*

The opinion of Käsemann averted to above that Luke has in some measure downgraded Philip's evangelistic achievements springs from a particular understanding of Lucan ecclesiology. According to this view, Luke conceives of the church as the *Una sancta catholica* built on the foundation of the twelve apostles and rigidly exclusive of all divergent expressions of Christian faith, such as those emanating from Gnostic circles. More specifically, Luke makes his point by reconstructing primitive Christian history to magnify the Jerusalem apostles' centralized authority over the expanding church, including their unique prerogative to impart the Spirit to new believers. In the process, "free-lance" missionaries like Philip and Apollos (Acts 18.24-28), who strike out on their own initiative with alarming success, are deliberately diminished and brought under the official ecclesiastical umbrella by making their converts dependent solely upon the apostles (including Paul in Apollos' case) for the provision of the Spirit.[87] In a similar vein, Haenchen contends that Luke's account of Peter's (and John's) administration of the Spirit in Acts 8.14-17 is designed to emphasize that "the mission to the Samaritans was not completed by any <u>subordinate outsider</u> [= Philip]. but was carried out in due form by the <u>legal heads of the Church</u> [= members of the Twelve]" (emphasis added).[88]

The connection between Philip and Apollos as independent, trail-blazing evangelists is an interesting one and will be pursued further below, but the insistence on the apostles as a Spirit-dispensing "supervisory authority" (*Aufsichtsbehörde*)[89] which sanctions the work of maverick missionaries and guarantees the unity of the early church cannot be supported as a consistent

Lucan platform. Ananias' healing and Spirit-bestowing ministry to Saul in Act 9.17, carried out without any apostolic aid, proves to be a notable exception; and as for the work of Barnabas, an emissary of Jerusalem (but not one of the Twelve!), on behalf of the new Christian community at Antioch founded by unnamed missionaries, it includes instruction and encouragement but not the transmission of the Spirit (11.22-25).[90] (The activity of the Spirit within the church at Antioch is assumed in 13.2 without any formal account of the Spirit's descent.) Moreover, the repeated underscoring of Spirit-reception as a "gift of God" (δωρεά; Acts 2.38; 8.20; 10.45; 11.17; 15.8 [δίδωμι]; cf. Luke 11.13) suggests that the impartation of the Spirit is no human being's prerogative, be he or she apostle or otherwise. This point is in fact driven home with special force in the larger Samaritan-episode. Simon Magus desires the authority to confer the Spirit and is willing to pay for it. He is sternly rebuffed, however, since anything to do with the Spirit as δωρεά τοῦ θεοῦ (8.20) is, by definition, not for sale, or, more broadly speaking, not disposable by human means.[91] Only God can bestow his Spirit. Any attempt to control or manipulate the Spirit for personal ends, as is Simon's intention, is judged to be a perverse usurpation of divine privilege (8.21-24).[92]

Along the same line, even the Lord's apostles must recognize the sovereignty of God in matters concerning the Spirit. Hence their primary activity when facing a need for the Spirit's presence is <u>prayer</u> (Acts 8.15),[93] beseeching God for what he alone can give.[94] The Spirit is <u>given</u> (δίδωμι) and <u>received</u> (λαμβάνω),[95] not strictly administered and obtained. He is perceived as <u>falling</u> (ἐπιπίπτω) freely from heaven rather than being

forcibly brought down. With all of these emphases on the Spirit's freedom within the Samaritan incident and throughout the book of Acts,[96] it is inconceivable that Luke expounds an "early Catholic" position regarding the Spirit's management by apostolic executives.[97]

W, Dietrich realizes that on the whole Luke does not advocate restricting the privilege of transmitting the Spirit to apostolic office, but he does argue that the events recorded in Acts 8.14-17 reflect a tradition taken over by Luke from the early period of the Jerusalem church which did credit the apostles with exclusive authority to impart the Spirit.[98] As for Philip's contribution to the Samaritan mission reported in Acts 8, Dietrich suggests that it betrays a "limitation of competence" (*Kompetenzbegrenzung*) in relation to the "competence" of the Jerusalem apostles to confer the Spirit, but he also claims that Philip's ministry is thereby "in no way discredited" (*in keiner Weise diskreditierten*).[99] Apparently Dietrich means that, just because Philip and Peter (and John) are commissioned to perform different missionary tasks, this does not necessarily imply any attending judgment as to the relative value of their ministries.[100]

Concerning the claim that the Samaritan-story in Acts 8 stems from a primitive Jerusalem source which marked out the apostles as indispensable agents of the Spirit, the problem of anachronism rears its head. Solid evidence for the rigid institutionalization of ministerial function only surfaces toward the end of the first century and into the second. Certainly the undisputed letters of Paul bear witness to a rather fluid church structure marked by charismatic instead of institutional authority.[101] The Spirit is sovereignly bestowed by the Lord himself, not channelled through

any ecclesiastical hierarchy (cf. Gal 3.5; Rom 8.14-17; 12.3-8; 1 Cor 2.10-14; 12.1-31). Another difficulty with Dietrich's analysis is the assumption that in Acts 8 Luke has incorporated without alteration an early tradition regarding the Spirit's transmission which stands in opposition to his overall presentation. Our own analysis of the Samaritan episode in 8.4-25 has demonstrated that, whatever the sources at his disposal, Luke has thoroughly shaped the material to create a unified narrative with numerous literary links to the rest of his two-volume work. In 8.14-17 elements such as the word of God, prayer, baptism in Jesus' name and the laying on of hands, not to mention the outpouring of the Spirit, are echoed repeatedly in Luke's account of the early church's mission history. On a matter of such seminal importance to Luke as the coming of the Spirit upon Christian disciples, we would expect more coherence of presentation than Dietrich seems to allow.[102] With these criticisms aside, Dietrich's point that the distinctive roles assigned to Philip and the Jerusalem apostles need not be differentiated in importance is a useful insight worth bearing in mind. We made a similar point above in relation to the division of labor between the Twelve's ministry of the word and the Seven's table-service in Acts 6.

While Acts 8.14-17 does not appear in any sense to portray Peter and John as <u>sacramental officials</u> monopolizing the administration of the Spirit, it is quite possible that the passage does reflect a Lucan interest in the role of the apostolic pair as <u>representatives of the Jerusalem community</u> left behind after the dispersion arising from Stephen's persecution. If we are correct in assuming that Luke was conscious of an underlying tension between the resident "Hebrew" faction of the Jerusalem church led by the

Twelve and the scattered "Hellenist" wing led by Philip and other members of the Seven, then, true to his passion for Christian harmony, Luke may have intended the Samaritan-episode to illustrate an abiding unity between the pioneering "Hellenist" missionary and the visiting "Hebrew" apostles.[103] The activities of prayer and the laying on of hands on the part of the apostles in Acts 8.15, 17 may once again be interpreted as gestures of solidarity (cf. 6.6) in addition to their connection with the Spirit's descent. The two representatives of the Twelve proffer the hand of fellowship to the outcast Samaritans[104] and by extension also to the architect of the Samaritan mission, Philip, who himself had been recently estranged from Jerusalem. Notions of Philip's subordination to Peter and John need not enter the picture. The apostles may simply be viewed as acknowledging the evangelist as a partner in mission.

The acceptance of Philip's Samaritan enterprise by leaders of the Jerusalem church may also reflect what many scholars have perceived as a "salvation-historical" interest on Luke's part in demonstrating the continuity of every new phase of missionary outreach with the earthly ministry of Jesus--which climaxed in Jerusalem--and with the first community established by Jesus' closest followers--which was localized in Jerusalem.[105] To be sure, we must not go so far as to envisage Jerusalem in the book of Acts as some kind of ecclesiastical see formally sanctioning all missionary projects and essentially ruling the Christian world. For instance, the give-and-take negotiations between the Jerusalem community leaders and Paul over the Gentile mission manifest a relationship of mutual respect and cooperation (see chaps. 15, 21). It likewise follows, as we have already suggested, that

the Jerusalem apostles do not function in Acts as episcopal officers for the whole church who roam about Christendom imposing their will.[106] They simply represent the interests of the Palestinian Jewish-Christian community based in Jerusalem, and then not exclusively. Ambassadors from Jerusalem also include ministers outside the circle of the Twelve, like Barnabas, Agabus, Judas and Silas, all dispatched to Antioch (11.22, 28; 15.27, 32). So Luke still allows for a measure of independence and diversity within primitive Christianity. But for all this, we must not lose sight of the persistent Lucan intention to demonstrate that a cooperative tie between the various mission congregations (and their leaders) and the mother church (and her leaders) in Jerusalem was never broken.

Granting that Luke's account of the Samaritan mission depicts in more mutual (cooperative) than hierarchical (divisive/partitive) terms both a unity between Philip and Peter and a continuity between Philip's work and the course of salvation history originating in Jerusalem, there still remains the question: why does Luke focus the issue as he does on the Samaritans' reception of the Spirit? He could have easily related a visit of the Jerusalem apostles to Samaria exhibiting friendly relations with Philip and the integration of his mission into God's redemptive plan without bringing in the controversial matter of the Samaritans' lack of the Spirit. For example, links are established between Jerusalem and the Pauline mission without recourse to any dependence of the latter upon the former for the gift of the Spirit. In fact, Paul himself receives the Spirit through the ministry of a Damascene disciple unconnected to Jerusalem and later conveys the Spirit to a group of Ephesian disciples without any outside intervention. What then is

the significance of Luke's portrayal of the bond between Philip and Peter specifically in terms related to the Spirit's outpouring? We turn now to offer a possible answer to this question based on a particular literary pattern detected within Luke-Acts.

3.3 *Philip the Baptist-Style Forerunner to Peter's Spirit-Imparting Mission*

In the previous chapter we characterized the role of Philip in Acts 8-11 as that of missionary forerunner to the apostle Peter in Samaria and the coastal plain of Palestine, culminating in Caesarea. In the present chapter, we have focused upon the distinction in the same section of Acts between Philip's initial ministry of gospel-preaching and water-baptism and Peter's follow-up work in the same territory, which climaxes in the Spirit's outpouring on Samaritan and Gentile converts. When we put these elements together and consider the emerging pattern of <u>the kerygmatic, water-baptizing forerunner (Philip) to one who comes after and "baptizes" in the Spirit</u> (Peter), the Lucan parallel which most readily springs to mind is the relational structure involving John the Baptist and Jesus. In Luke 3 John comes on the scene "preaching a baptism of repentance" and fulfilling a mission of "prepar[ing] the way of the Lord," prophesied by Isaiah (3.3-4). As it turns out, Jesus is the coming Christ for whom John is blazing a trail, and the distinctive relationship between John and Jesus is delineated in the well-known formula placed on the lips of John: "I baptize with water; but he who is mightier than I is coming. . .; he will baptize with the Holy Spirit. . ." (3.16). All the Gospel writers in some fashion set forth John's forerunner function in relation to Jesus and, in the process, make the basic

distinction between John's water-baptism and Jesus' Spirit-baptism (Matt 3.3, 11; Mark 1.2-4, 7-8; John 1.6-8, 15, 23, 26-34). But Luke is unique in the extent to which he emphasizes this pattern in his two-volume work. We see this especially at key points in the book of Acts.

Among the critical, final words which the resurrected Jesus communicates to his apostles before ascending to heaven is the instruction for them to tarry in Jerusalem and "wait for the promise of the Father" which he had previously announced (Acts 1.4; cf. Luke 24.49). Jesus then explicitly defines this anticipated divine gift as the Holy Spirit and contrasts its outpouring to John's administration of water-baptism in terms clearly reminiscent of John's own earlier prediction: "for John baptized with water, but before many days you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 1.5; cp. Luke 3.16). The antithesis in this passage is once again strictly between one who baptizes with water and one who baptizes with the Spirit.[107] No discrimination is introduced at this stage between a "baptism of repentance" and "baptism in the name of Jesus."

As Luke's story of the early church unfolds, the Pentecost-event represents the fulfillment of Jesus' announcement of the Spirit's coming upon his apostles. They had formerly experienced the water-baptism of John (Acts 1.22), but without an accompanying baptism in the Spirit. Now as they are gathered together on the day of Pentecost, they receive--through Jesus--the Father's promised Holy Spirit (2.33; cp. 1.4). Later Peter refers back to this "beginning" of his personal encounter with the Spirit and specifically links it to "the word of the Lord" concerning the demarcation between John's water-baptism and the expected baptism with the Holy Spirit (11.15-16).

Significantly, the particular context for these statements is Peter's report to the Jerusalem church about his recent mission to Caesarea, in which he compares his own Pentecostal experience to the Spirit's surprising descent upon Cornelius and his Gentile household before the issue of water-baptism even came up for discussion.

> As I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them just as on us at the beginning. And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, 'John baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit' (11.15-16; cf. 10.44-48).

We also learn earlier in the Cornelius-story that reference to John's baptism formed part of Peter's proclamation about Jesus to the Roman centurion (10.37). Similarly, in the course of Paul's ministry throughout the Mediterranean world, as charted by Luke, the renowned missionary on two occasions reiterates the preparatory character of John's baptismal vocation in relation to Jesus (13.24-25; 19.4) and in the latter instance goes on to impart the Spirit to a group of Ephesian disciples who, though recipients of John's baptism, had not yet received the Spirit when Paul encounters them (19.1-7).

Given this evidence that (i) Luke continues to feature John's role as Jesus' forerunner in the book of Acts and that (ii) he depicts the Spirit's outpouring at three significant stages in the church's expanding mission (Jerusalem, Caesarea and Ephesus)--including one connected with Peter's breakthrough to the Gentiles--with the contrast between John's water-baptism and Jesus' Spirit-baptism clearly in view, it seems plausible that this "Baptist-factor" also implicitly colors Luke's presentation of the "Samaritan Pentecost," where Philip baptizes in water and prepares the way for Peter's

imparting of the Spirit.'[108] More specifically, we would suggest that a vital clue to Luke's appraisal of the value of Philip's achievement in relation to Peter in Acts 8-11 may be found in his assessment of John the Baptist's contribution *vis-à-vis* Jesus. In order to test this hypothesis further and unpack its particular implications for the Lucan *Philippusbild*, we must look more closely at certain aspects of the John/Jesus model in Luke's Gospel.

(1) Among the Gospel writers, only Luke gives special consideration to the relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus in an extended infancy narrative covering the first two chapters of his work (Luke 1.5-2.52), immediately following the prologue. A transparent parallelism is set up between the two figures.[109] Both experience miraculous births (1.57-66; 2.1-20) announced by angels (1.5-25; 1.26-56); both are circumcised (1.59-63; 2.21), and both inspire prophetic oracles regarding their unique missions in the service of the Most High (1.57-80; 2.25-35). Like Jesus, John is destined for <u>greatness</u> (μέγας, 1.15, 32) and is <u>filled with the Spirit</u> from birth (1.15, 35). And finally, their nativities are both occasions for jubilant rejoicing (1.14, 58; 2.10-14).

But within this framework revealing only the highest admiration for John the Baptist as well as Jesus, a pattern of distinction also emerges.[110] Both children are great, but one is greater; both participate significantly in God's work of salvation, but only Jesus is the "Savior, who is Christ the Lord" (2.11). John is dramatically born to a barren woman advanced in years (1.17); Jesus, however, is miraculously born of a virgin (1.26-38). John's birth is attended by the joy of friends and neighbors (1.58); the whole host of heaven exults over Jesus' advent (2.13-14). John the Baptist is appointed

to prepare the way for the Lord as the prophet of the Most High (1.76; cf. 1.17); Jesus is no one less than the Lord himself (1.43; 2.11), the Son of the Most High (1.32, 34). And most critically for our interests, John is without doubt a man imbued with the Spirit even from birth (1.15), and his work will be performed "in the spirit and power of Elijah" (1.17); but Jesus is actually conceived by the Holy Spirit and brought to life through "the power of the Most High" (1.34).

How should we evaluate this parallel-yet-distinct portrayal of John the Baptist and Jesus in Luke's infancy narrative? Some scholars have envisaged an underlying Baptist source promulgated in circles devoted to John as their master, if not their Messiah. Luke's redaction of this tradition and placement of it within a birth narrative designed to bring out Jesus' preeminence supposedly represents a polemical intention to offset rival Baptist claims and promote Christian ones.[111] Apart from the difficulties, however, of detecting the existence, much less the precise Messianic convictions, of Baptist sects before the second century,[112] the text of Luke 1-2 simply does not evince a tone of harsh invective. As we have seen, John is genuinely praised even while he is carefully categorized as Jesus' precursor. In addition, there is little in the description of John the Baptist's nativity and future ministry which cannot be accounted for by OT models of miraculous births and by the Baptist traditions shared with Mark and "Q."[113]

Conzelmann recognizes that the opening chapters of Luke's Gospel reflect a clearly established "typological correspondence" or "analogy" between John the Baptist and Jesus, but he also regards this presentation as

standing in "direct contradiction" to the balance of Luke's work, where the two figures in question are consistently and sharply segregated from one another as representatives of distinct epochs of salvation history (John = period of Israel; Jesus = "the Middle of Time" [*Die Mitte der Zeit*]).[114] H. H. Oliver and W. B. Tatum have both challenged Conzelmann's disjunction of Luke 1-2 from the rest of Luke-Acts, while at the same affirming his basic conception of Luke's salvation-historical schema. These two scholars regard the infancy stories as in fact reinforcing the relegation of John to a separate and implicitly inferior sphere of activity than that enjoyed by Jesus in the realm of God's kingdom. Oliver speaks of "a conscious suppression of the relationship between Jesus and John" on Luke's part which "had <u>already been well established</u> in the birth stories" (his emphasis).[115] For example, the description of John in Luke 1.76 as the "<u>prophet</u> of the Most High" (*versus* Jesus, the "<u>Son</u> of the Most High," 1.32) who "will go before the Lord to prepare his ways" is taken to represent Luke's intention "to establish the subordinate and preliminary role of John to that of Jesus and the Middle of Time."[116] Tatum, focusing primarily on the Spirit-motif in Luke 1-2, likewise refers to "the subordination of John to Jesus" in these chapters and contends that any correspondence envisaged here between the two characters is "superficial."[117]

Obviously Oliver and Tatum have concentrated on the distinctions between John and Jesus in Luke's infancy narrative at the expense of the parallels. But in so doing they have failed to appreciate the fine balance of Luke's literary artistry. The comparisons drawn above between John and Jesus as great, Spirit-endowed servants of God are clearly manifest in Luke's

presentation and should not be ignored or watered down. Moreover, the equally evident distinctions, while truly distinctions, are hardly of the black-and-white variety designed to drive a piercing wedge between the two characters. They are merely differences in degree of greatness. As we have seen, Jesus outshines John in Luke 1-2 at a number of points, but these are always points at which John is exalted in his own right. To repeat but one example, Jesus may be the more remarkable figure by virtue of his being conceived by the Holy Spirit (1.35), but John certainly runs a close second with his pedigree of being filled with the Spirit from his mother's womb (1.15). The two pre-natal experiences are more alike than dissimilar in their dramatic marking out of John and Jesus as special instruments of the Spirit.[118] Thus, it seems best to view John and Jesus in Luke 1-2 not so much as opposed to and set apart from one another, but rather as fitting into an arrangement of climactic parallelism,[119] in which one figure (Jesus) surpasses the other (John) in various respects, while at the same time the two mirror one another to a great extent and are brought together in a common enterprise.

A similar stance is taken by P. S. Minear, who persuasively argues for the coherence of Luke 1-2 with the rest of Luke-Acts (against Conzelmann) in addition to insisting that within the birth stories the John/Jesus relationship should be viewed in essentially positive, integrated terms (against Oliver and Tatum).

> Although the prologue [Luke 1-2] preserves a distinction between the tasks of the two figures, at no point does it make an invidious or apologetic effort to downgrade or to deny the eschatological significance of John. . . . The work of both men is seen as essential to the fulfillment of the promise, as ground for the joy of redemption. Both are included within the same

> consolation of Israel. In fact, the mood, resonance, and thrust of the birth narratives are such as to discourage the neat assignment of John and Jesus to separate epochs.[120]

Having sketched the main contours of the Jesus/John model established at the outset of Luke's Gospel, we may now compare this configuration with Luke's depiction of the Philip/Peter relationship in the book of Acts. Throughout our investigation we have noted a number of contact points between the portrayals of Philip and Peter, including their similar miraculous ministries anointed by the Spirit. But coming after Philip, Peter emerges as the more spectacular figure, though not in such a way as to depreciate the value of Philip's achievements. Peter may make an especially shattering impression on Simon Magus, but we must not overlook the amazement which Philip elicits from the same figure (see §2, chap. 3). Peter may have sparked the greater interest with his witness to a Gentile household, but Philip's prior outreach to a prominent Gentile individual marks an important missionary breakthrough in its own right (see chap. 4). Thus, we seem to encounter in the correlation of Philip and Peter a similar pattern of climactic parallelism to that which structures the interplay between John and Jesus. In both cases, the forerunner is neither widely distanced from nor cynically belittled in relation to the one who comes after.

(2) Focusing more directly on the distinction between John's water-baptism and Jesus' Spirit-baptism, we must carefully consider Luke 3.16 in its immediate literary setting of 3.1-22, where John's public ministry--climaxing in the baptism of Jesus--is most fully detailed. In the opening paragraph of chap. 3 Luke sets the work of the Baptist in a broader context

than the other Synoptic authors. The political situation for the whole of Palestine is noted (3.1-2), and John's baptismal mission, instigated by a word from God in the wilderness (ἔρημος, 3.2b; cf. 3.4b), is carried out in itinerant fashion throughout "all (πᾶσαν) the region about the Jordan" (3.3a).[121] Again, through the expanded quotation from Isaiah 40 unique to Luke's Gospel, the effects of John's preparation for the Lord's coming are conceived in the widest possible terms: "Every (πᾶσα) valley shall be filled. . . every (πᾶν) mountain and hill shall be brought low. . . ; and all (πᾶσα) flesh shall see the salvation of God" (3.4-6). This universal impact of the Baptist's ministry is characteristic of Luke's larger presentation (cf. πᾶς: Luke 3.15, 16a; 7.29; 20.6; Acts 13.24)[122] and further demonstrates that the scope of John's vocation should not be too narrowly defined.

The ascetical garb and diet of John the Baptist receive no mention in Luke's account (≠ Matt 3.4//Mark 1.6), as the narrative moves directly to feature John's proclamation of repentance. As in Matthew, Luke generally describes John's message as one which stresses the importance of righteous conduct over ethnic heritage, implying in the process that repentant Gentiles as well as Jews may find a place within God's covenant community ("God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham," 3.8; cf. 3.7-9). Only Luke, however, goes on to spell out some of John's more specific exhortations and to single out certain groups within John's audience. Sharing one's possessions--including food--with the needy is requisite behavior befitting repentance, according to John, and tax collectors and soldiers in particular are expected to be just in their financial dealings with others (3.10-14).

Coming to John's pronouncements about Jesus--including his forecast of Jesus' Spirit-baptizing ministry--related most closely to the immediately surrounding material in Luke 3.15-18, we may enumerate several characteristic elements of Luke's presentation in comparison with Matthew and Mark.

(i) Only Luke among the Synoptics stages John's evaluation of Jesus against a background of pervasive speculation concerning his own Messianic status (3.15).[123] Thus, as in the infancy narrative, no attempt is made to cover up the attractiveness of John even while establishing his contrast with the Stronger One who is to come.

(ii) In John's self-reference to his baptizing mission, only Luke places ὕδατι in a more prominent syntactical position than we find in Matthew or Mark (ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς, 3.16; cp. βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι, Matt 3.11; ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, Mark 1.8)[124]; thereby, Luke possibly accentuates the distinction between the <u>watery</u> substance of John's baptism and the <u>Spirit</u>-element in which Jesus will baptize.

(iii) Luke omits ὀπίσω μου found in the other Synoptics (Matt 3.11//Mark 1.7). This may represent a desire to downplay the notion of Jesus as John's disciple, if ὀπίσω is thought to be related (as it frequently is in the NT) to the act of "following after" someone (cf. Matt 4.19; 10.38; Mark 1.17, 20; 8.34; Luke 9.23; 14.23; 21.8; Acts 20.30).[125] But if, as is more likely, a more temporal distinction is in view (cf. Acts 5.37)--that is, John's work historically precedes and prepares for Jesus' ministry which comes "after" (later)--then probably little importance should be assigned to Luke's omission. For elsewhere Luke certainly supports the forerunner idea for John

and regards his mission as largely completed before Jesus' emergence on the public scene (cf. Luke 3.18-23; Acts 13.25 [μετ' ἐμὲ]; 19.4 [μετ' αὐτὸν]).

(iv) Luke follows Mark by referring to John's unworthiness to untie (λυω) rather than to carry (βαστάζω, Matt 3.11) the Coming One's sandals. However, Luke omits Mark's κύψας (1.7), apparently wishing to soften an undue emphasis on John's subordination to Jesus.

(v) In 3.16 Luke follows the "Q" tradition against Mark in announcing Jesus' future baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire. The latter element may be understood as symbolizing the judgmental character of the Stronger One's ministry, as elaborated in 3.17: "the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire."[126] Thus, an important continuity is maintained between the vocations of Jesus and John (cf. 3.7-9, esp. v. 9: "every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire") amid the discontinuity declared over the matter of the Spirit's bestowal.

(vi) Only Luke, after reporting John's appraisal of Jesus, appends the summary statement in 3.18 regarding John's ministry of proclamation: "So, with many other exhortations, he preached good news to the people (εὐηγγελίζετο τὸν λαόν)." There is no warrant for bracketing off εὐαγγελίζομαι in this instance as a unique case within Luke-Acts, merely denoting the activity of preaching without any implied reference to its content.[127] Throughout Luke's writings, the term is virtually a technical designation for the preaching of the gospel of Christ and the kingdom of God. Thus, as W. Wink expresses it, "by deliberately applying the word to John's preaching Luke makes him the first preacher of the Gospel, the prototype of the Christian evangelist" (my emphasis).[128]

In short, it is unmistakeable in 3.15-18 that Luke concurs with the general Gospel witness that Jesus, for whom John clears the way, is notably "mightier" than the Baptist--principally in his function as Spirit-baptizer in contrast to John's role as water-baptizer. But within this clear-cut relational structure Luke still seems to resist a tendency to denigrate John or to deny his essential harmony with Jesus' gospel mission.

In the incident of Jesus' baptism reported in Luke 3.21-22, the relationship between John and Jesus, connected with the operation of the Spirit, is clarified still further. It is most striking here that Jesus' own baptism in water and the attendant phenomenon of the Spirit's descent upon him are set apart from the influence of John the Baptist to a degree unparalleled in the other Gospels. According to Luke, John has already completed his preaching ministry (3.18) and been imprisoned by Herod (3.19-20).[129] The setting of Jesus' baptism is then described in very impersonal and imprecise terms: "Now when all the people were baptized and when Jesus also had been baptized. . ." (3.21). There is no mention of the Jordan and no reference to the agency of John or any other human minister of baptism.[130] As regards the outpouring of the Spirit, it occurs <u>after</u> Jesus has been baptized (βαπτισθέντος, aor. ptc.) and <u>while</u> he is engaged in <u>prayer</u> (προσευχομένου, pres. ptc.),[131] again with no mention of any human assistants. In a sense, then, Jesus precipitates (through prayer) his own baptism in the Spirit as a distinct experience from his baptism in water. Accordingly, John's prediction concerning Jesus in 3.16 already receives its initial fulfillment, and Jesus' personal experience of Spirit-baptism provides a model for that of the first Christians in the book of Acts.[132]

Though Luke 3.1-22 culminates in a scene which poignantly stresses the gulf between John's mission of water-baptism and Jesus' vocation of Spirit-baptism, it should still not be thought that Luke adopts a negative stance toward John or rigidly compartmentalizes him within the dispensation of OT prophecy. While John's task as the Messiah's forerunner is essentially completed, Luke does not hesitate later in his Gospel to remind his readers of Jesus' continuing appreciation of John's greatness: "I tell you, among those born of women none is greater than John" (7.28a). The ensuing statement--"yet he who is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he" (7.28b)--should not be taken as minimizing the force of the former declaration or denying John's involvement in the kingdom. Jesus' promotion of the status of the "least" echoes his familiar position within Luke that the kingdom of God is no respecter of persons and gladly welcomes those typically outcast by the religious establishment. One such group whom Jesus incorporates into the fellowship of God's kingdom are the despised tax collectors (Luke 5.27-32; 19.1-10). Far from marking a point of contrast with John's ministry, this inclusion of tax collectors as well as "all the people" represents an extension of John's outreach, as Luke's following parenthetical note in 7.29-30 makes plain.[133]

With this extended analysis of Luke 3.1-22 before us, we are now in a better position to ascertain to what extent the presentation of John the Baptist in this passage serves as an apt model for the portrayal of Philip in the book of Acts. A number of interesting points of comparison may be observed. Philip's initial occupation as a table-waiter reveals his sympathy with John's concern for feeding the needy (Acts 6.1-6; Luke 3.11).

Subsequently, Philip parallels John by carrying out an itinerant preaching and baptizing mission throughout Palestine, specifically including a desert area (ἔρημος, Acts 8.26; Luke 3.2, 4). In his outreach to Samaritans and an Ethiopian eunuch and financial official, Philip matches John's openness to outcasts within Jewish society (e.g. tax collectors) as well as his implicit transcendence of traditional ethnico-religious boundaries (cf. Luke 3.7-14). And the particular characterization of Philip's witness as "preaching the gospel" (εὐαγγελίζω, Acts 8.4, 12, 35, 40) marks yet another link with the ministry of John (Luke 3.18). The most striking feature, however, of Philip's correspondence to John the Baptist remains his mission of water-baptism which prepares the way for another's (in this case, Peter's) ministry of Spirit-baptism. We have already noted that Luke explicitly associates the Spirit's initial outpouring on Gentiles--namely, those Gentiles converted by Peter, not the Ethiopian eunuch earlier baptized in water by Philip but lacking an accompanying effusion of the Spirit--with the announced distinction between John's baptism in water and Jesus' promised baptism in the Spirit (Acts 11.15-16; cf. Luke 3.16; Acts 1.5). But the "Samaritan Pentecost" may also find an echo in the John/Jesus pattern in Luke 3. As Jesus, so to speak, participates <u>through prayer</u> in his own anointing with the Spirit at a distinct point in time <u>after</u> his baptism with water and <u>after</u> John the Baptist has completed his work and exited the scene (Luke 3.18-22), so the Samaritans receive the Spirit in response to Peter's <u>praying</u> on a separate occasion following their water-baptism at the hands of Philip, who has since faded into the background (Acts 8.14-17).

In short, it appears that if John the Baptist functions as a "prototype

of the Christian evangelist" for anyone in Luke's presentation, it would be Philip the "baptist" evangelist to the Samaritans and Gentiles. Moreover, it seems to be confirmed that the John/Jesus interaction provides a suitable pattern for the Philip/Peter relationship in Acts 8-11. If this is the case, then following the John/Jesus model outlined above, the distinction between Philip's preparatory work of water-baptism and Peter's succeeding Spirit-imparting mission need not be regarded as undercutting Philip's accomplishments in any sense or as nullifying the numerous points of contact which unite the two missionaries in Luke's narrative. Though they are assigned different roles in relation to the Spirit's outpouring and though one's role is in fact greater (more climactic) than the other's, Philip and Peter, like John and Jesus, still maintain a vital cooperative bond as fellow-servants within the kingdom of God.

(3) The theory being advanced regarding Luke's utilization of John's forerunner role in relation to Jesus as a literary pattern for Philip's vocation in relation to Peter would doubtless be strengthened and further developed if we could uncover another case within the book of Acts where the same pattern appears to be employed. The most promising analogue in this respect would seem to involve the juxtaposed Ephesian ministries of Apollos and Paul in Acts 18.19-19.7, especially since this material features the motifs both of Johannine baptism and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

In Acts 18.19-23 Paul makes his way to Ephesus and, as usual, proceeds to the synagogue to debate with the Jews. However, on this occasion, he stays only for a brief time, despite the Jews' pleadings that he remain for a "longer period." Promising to return "if God wills," he sails away from

Ephesus to Caesarea, leaving behind his two colleagues, Priscilla and Aquila. Paul's hasty entrance and exit in this opening scene of Luke's Ephesian narrative establishes an incipient Pauline influence within the Asian capital and foreshadows the extended ministry which Paul eventually will have in this city (19.1-40; cf. 20.17-38). At this stage, however, no conversions are reported, and no Christian community appears to be established.

After Paul's departure, an Alexandrian Jewish preacher named Apollos comes on the scene in Ephesus (18.24). The historical status of this missionary has been a matter of considerable debate: was he simply a Jew or a Jewish-Christian upon his arrival in Ephesus?[134] However one settles this issue with respect to pre-Lucan tradition, there is little doubt as to Apollos' characterization on the level of Lucan redaction. Though his rhetorical skill and biblical expertise may be claimed by any devout Jew, Apollos' knowledge of the "way of the Lord" (τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου),[135] his fervency in the Spirit (ζέων τῷ πνεύματι, cf. Rom 12.11) and his accurate teaching of "the things concerning Jesus" (ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) (18.25) could only characterize a *bona fide* Christian missionary in Lucan terms. The last item echoes in particular the description of Paul's ministry in the final verse of the book of Acts (διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 28.31).[136]

As a Jewish-Christian evangelist, Apollos not suprisingly begins his work of proclamation in the local synagogue (18.26), just as Paul had previously done. Though again no specific conversions are reported, it is clear from the mention of "brethren"[137] in 18.27 that a Christian community has now sprung to life in Ephesus. These new believers obviously think

highly of Apollos, since they encourage him and recommend his services to others (18.27), and we could plausibly deduce from this evidence that some of these disciples owed their Christian faith to Apollos' ministry. In any event, the overall presentation in 18.24-28 leaves the impression that Luke favorably regards Apollos as a key foundational missionary within the Ephesian church.

Nevertheless, three items within Luke's report seem to intimate certain shortcomings with respect to Apollos and his ministry:

(i) "He knew only the baptism of John" (18.25c).

(ii) He requires a "more accurate" explanation of the way of God by Aquila and Priscilla (18.26).

(iii) A letter of recommendation is deemed necessary to open the door for Apollos' work in Corinth (18.27).

Working in reverse order through this list, the letter of recommendation (unique in Acts), while revealing the support of the Ephesian community, may at the same time suggest a degree of skepticism about how the Corinthian Christians would receive Apollos. However, Luke in fact discloses that Apollos proves to be a glowing success in Achaia (18.27-28), and the mention of an introductory letter may simply reflect traditional policy within the Corinthian church regarding the reception of itinerant missionaries (cf. 2 Cor 3.1-3). It is more difficult to account for the need for one already teaching "accurately" (ἀκριβῶς, 18.25) the things of Christ to be instructed "more accurately" (ἀκριβέστερον, 18.26) in the way of God by Aquila and Priscilla. How can any information be "more accurate" than "accurate"? One senses that Luke is caught up in a delicate situation of

not wanting to demean Apollos' perception of the Christian message but yet desiring at the same time to supplement his understanding with insights from Paul's colleagues. Finally, when Luke indicates that Apollos "knew only the baptism of John," the μόνον hints at a measure of incompleteness associated with John's baptism. Most likely, the emphasis here falls not simply on the fact that Apollos had experienced the rite of John's baptism, but also on the fact that he had known (understood, ἐπιστάμενος) only the message of baptism which John preached.[138] In short, the evangelistic ministries of John and Apollos are viewed in comparable terms, eliciting the same high regard from Luke but also subject to similar limitations.

In this connection with John the Baptist may be found a key to Luke's portrayal of Apollos.[139] As John prepared "the way of the Lord" (Luke 3.4), that is, served as forerunner for the mission of Jesus, so Apollos, instructed in "the way of the Lord," breaks ground for the gospel at Ephesus which Paul will cultivate and bring to full harvest.[139] As John and Jesus are both extolled in similar ways in Luke's presentation, but with Jesus manifesting the greater glory, so Apollos is commended for his proclamation ("accurate") while also being cast as dependent upon Pauline representatives for deeper insight ("more accurate"). A pattern of "climactic parallelism" seems to be emerging once again.

What about the role of the Holy Spirit in the Apollos/Paul relationship which plays such a significant part in Luke's distinction between John the Baptist and Jesus? Interestingly, like John the Baptist, Apollos himself is a man of the Spirit (Acts 18.25); but what of his involvement in administering the Spirit to others? Here the strange incident surrounding the encounter

between Paul and the Ephesian disciples must be considered. Scholars disagree over the precise connection between the episodes featuring Apollos at the end of Acts 18 and the Ephesian disciples at the beginning of Acts 19, with some going so far to discount any essential relationship other than geographical.[140] But the common mention of two important elements--John's baptism and the operation of the Spirit--in the two scenes suggest some thematic linkage beyond the shared Ephesian locale.[141]

When Paul comes (back) to Ephesus, Apollos has already moved on to Corinth (Acts 19.1), thus completely eliminating the latter's direct participation in the events which follow. Paul initially encounters τινας μαθητάς. In Luke-Acts a "disciple" is consistently a true believer in Jesus, and we should no doubt follow this interpretation here.[142] Just a few lines earlier Luke refers to the Achaian "disciples" (τοῖς μαθηταῖς, 18.27) who happen to be identical with "those who through grace had believed" (τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν διὰ τῆς χάριτος, 18.27). So, too, the Ephesian μαθῆται are addressed by Paul as believers (πιστεύσαντες, 19.2).[143]

But no sooner has their "Christian" identity been suggested than these Ephesians prove themselves to be peculiar disciples indeed. They respond to Paul's query with the astonishing admission that they had never heard of the Holy Spirit (Acts 19.2). The sense of this declaration is commonly interpreted as ignorance not of the Holy Spirit's existence but of his having been poured out upon all flesh.[144] In any case, it is clear that the Ephesian disciples had not yet personally received the Spirit. Upon learning of this Spirit-deficiency, Paul immediately turns the discussion to the issue

of the Ephesians' baptism and discovers that they had been initiated into the baptism of John (19.3).

Why this concern with baptism? In the present context it must have something to do with the connection between the Ephesian disciples' baptism and their experience of the Spirit. We of course are aware from Luke's teaching elsewhere that John's baptism--whatever else it accomplished--did not result in the Spirit's transmission. Could this be the point of emphasis in the case being considered? Paul proceeds to spell out the significance of John's baptism in Acts 19.4: "John baptized with the baptism of repentance, telling the people to believe in the one who was to come after him, that is, Jesus." This stress on repentance and faith in Jesus connected with John's baptism should probably not be understood as a disclosure of new information to the Ephesians, which they then embrace. The record of their response to Paul's message in 19.5 says nothing about repentance or believing in Jesus, only that they are re-baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Indeed, Paul assumes in 19.2 that they had already believed.

It would seem, then, that Paul's brief explanation of the import of John's baptism functions simply as a reminder to the Ephesian disciples of what they already knew and were convinced of. At the same time, however, it implies the limits of John's ministry. As the "prototype Christian evangelist" (see above), John had adequately called the people to repentance and faith in Jesus evidenced in water-baptism, but this baptism, effective though it was, did not precipitate the Spirit's outpouring. Hence the Ephesian disciples must acknowledge their need to be baptized in the name of the One who alone baptizes with the Spirit.[145] After this new baptism and

the imposition of Paul's hands, the Spirit comes upon them in a dramatic way (19.5-6).

How does Apollos fit into this scenario? Though the story in Acts 19.1-7 is vague concerning who had evangelized the twelve Ephesian disciples, the previous narrative in 18.24-28 sets forth Apollos as the prime candidate. He represents the principal witness to Jesus in Ephesus up to this point,[146] and his background is connected in an exclusive sense ("only") with the baptism of John. Regarding his own experience, Apollos possesses the Spirit without any (recorded) baptism in the name of Jesus to supplement his Johannine baptism.[147] In this respect he occupies a similar position to John himself, enjoying the Spirit's power as a specially anointed prophet of God. Already possessing Spirit, there is no need for re-baptism; but as a John-the-Baptist-type preacher, Apollos cannot participate in the conveying of the Spirit to others. He can effectively bring his hearers to believe in Jesus as the Christ, but in terms of their reception of the Spirit, he can only pave the way for the greater minister of Christ, in this case, Paul. Thus, the motif of the Spirit's outpouring supports the overall framework which categorizes Apollos' function as that of forerunner to Paul, modelled after the relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus.

We are obviously sympathetic with Käsemann's opinion that the peculiar events involving Paul and the Ephesian disciples in Acts 19.1-7 are designed by Luke to reflect back on the portrait of Apollos in 18.24-28, and we can also see that such a presentation promotes Luke's interest in Christian unity. Apollos and Paul are effectively brought together as co-laborers within the developing Ephesian community. But we need not follow Käsemann's

additional conclusion that Luke intended to create a strict hierarchical unity between the two missionaries by placing the maverick Apollos (as well as "heretical" Baptist sects) under the aegis of Paul's apostolic authority (thus safeguarding the *Una sancta apostolica*).[148] If Luke had really wanted officially to bring Apollos under Paul's ecclesiastical wing, he surely would have had the apostle himself deliver any advanced teaching to the "free-lance" missionary rather than leaving this task to a couple of Paul's travelling companions.[149] Moreover, Apollos is still allowed independent movement ("when he wished to go to Achaia," 18.27a) and journeys to Corinth, where he in fact supplements Paul's earlier ministry there (Apollos "greatly help[s]" the Achaian believers, 18.27b). A more mutual and cooperative bond seems to be maintained between Apollos and Paul in Luke's account than Käsemann allows. As we have seen, the two celebrated ministers appear as fellow, Spirit-inspired preachers of "the things concerning Jesus" and partners in the work of evangelizing Ephesian Jews within the synagogue, though admittedly Paul's activity of transmitting the Spirit is more climactic.

In a more recent study, M. Wolter likewise underplays the more egalitarian dimensions of Luke's depiction of the Apollos/Paul relationship. While Wolter does not wholly accept Käsemann's sweeping "early Catholic" interpretation, he still contends that the principal Lucan redactional concern in 18.24-19.7 is "die paulinische Dominanz über Apollos zum Ausdruck zu bringen."[150] In particular, Wolter thinks that Luke has in mind the historical situation behind 1 Corinthians 1-4, in which supposedly an Apollos faction had created conflict within the Corinthian community by claiming

themselves to be inspired pneumatics while denying this status to Paul. Luke, in Wolter's estimation, aimed to turn the tables on this situation by cleverly and subtly devaluing Apollos' pneumatic abilities and by setting forth Paul as the exclusively authorized conveyor of the Spirit to others.[151]

However, apart from the difficulties connected with reconstructing the history of the early Corinthian church from Paul's letters and with determining Luke's knowledge of that history, it is difficult to see how an account which so clearly extols Apollos' virtues can at the same time serve (even tacitly) a polemical, anti-Apollos intention. It is true that Paul surpasses Apollos in the matter of participating in the Spirit's outpouring, but not in a way which effaces Apollos' own personal gifts and his missionary achievements in Ephesus and Corinth. If Luke was aware of Paul's Corinthian correspondence and the presence of underlying tensions between rival parties associated with Apollos and Paul in the Corinthian church, then his attitude would appear to be more in line with Paul's own expressed democratic stance in 1 Corinthians 3 than with Wolter's hierarchical reading.

> What then is Apollos? What is Paul? Servants through whom you believed, as the Lord assigned to each. I planted, Apollos watered [or in the case of the Ephesus-incident in Acts, the roles would be reversed: Apollos planted, Paul watered], but God gave the growth. So neither he who plants nor he who waters is anything, but only God gives the growth. He who plants and he who waters <u>are equal</u>, and each shall receive his wages according to his labor. For <u>we are God's fellow workers</u> (1 Cor 3.5-9).

Granting the fundamental literary link between Luke's presentation of John/Jesus in his Gospel and Apollos/Paul in Acts 18-19, what can be said of a similar connection between the latter component and the Philip/Peter portrait in Acts 8? There are some obvious differences between Philip and

Apollos, notably that Philip receives no supplemental instruction from anyone and is not reported to have submitted personally to John's baptism. But such distinctions should not obscure the prevailing parallels between the two missionaries and the Samaritan and Ephesian "Pentecosts."

(i) Philip and Apollos both possess the Spirit and impress their audiences with dynamic preaching.

(ii) Their converts (assuming the Ephesian disciples' evangelization by Apollos) are baptized in water but have to wait for another ministerial encounter before receiving the Spirit.

(iii) The incompleteness of Apollos' Johannine water-baptism and the Samaritans' water-baptism at the hands of Philip are both suggested by the use of μόνον (Acts 8.16; 18.25).[152]

(iv) For both the Samaritans and Ephesians, the imposition of hands (by Peter and Paul respectively) accompanies the Spirit's outpouring.[153]

(v) Both Philip and Apollos stand as Baptist-style forerunners in a partnership relation of "climactic parallelism" to the great missionaries, Peter and Paul, who come after them.

(vi) The fact that in the case of the Ephesian disciples it is <u>John's baptism</u> which is inadequate to prompt the Spirit's outpouring and with the Samaritans it is <u>baptism in the name of Jesus</u> which lacks the same efficacy is no great obstacle to seeing a correspondence between the two situations. In general, the book of Acts expounds no necessary causal connection between water-baptism in any form--be it John's or in the name of Jesus--and Spirit-reception.[154] The Cornelius-episode most clearly reveals the freedom of the Spirit's work apart from water-baptism, with respect both to John's baptism

(with which Peter draws a contrast, 11.16) and to baptism in Jesus' name (which follows the effusion of the Spirit, 10.47-48). The Ephesian-incident may seem on the surface to link causally baptism in the name of Jesus with the coming of the Spirit (19.5-6), but, as discussed above, the main thrust of Paul's baptismal instruction actually reinforces the limited potential of John's baptism as a catalyst for the Spirit's outpouring. From a Lucan perspective, Paul's intention could hardly have been to turn around then and promote the indispensability of baptism in the name of Jesus for possession of the Spirit, especially when the immediately preceding narrative in 18.24-28 allows Apollos to stand as a man of the Spirit knowing only the baptism of John.'[55]

In a sense, then, whatever may distinguish them on other grounds, there is little substantial difference in Luke's view between John's baptism and baptism in the name of Jesus in terms of their influence on the outpouring of the Spirit upon believers. Both represent acts of water-baptism which, though important as outward testimonies of repentance and faith, do not automatically result in the Spirit's bestowal. Hence, the antithesis, "John baptized with water [not specified any further, e.g., 'unto repentance'], but you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit," equally illustrates the distinction between being baptized with water in the name of Jesus and being baptized with the Spirit. With this outlook on the limitation of water-baptism, there is no real conflict between the basic frameworks structuring the Samaritan- and Ephesian-episodes.

3.4 *Conclusion*

The circumscribing of Philip's ministry in Acts 8-11 to include the activities of gospel-preaching and water-baptism--but not the climactic impartation of the Spirit to Samaritan and Gentile converts, which first occurs as part of the subsequent mission of the apostle Peter--need not suggest a tendency on Luke's part to smear Philip's reputation as a successful evangelist or to cast Philip in a starkly subordinate role to the superior missionary, Peter. As a proponent of a pneumatology which conceives of the Spirit as a gift of God freely poured out upon and dynamically at work within all believers ("all flesh"), Luke has little interest in creating an ecclesiastical caste system whereby any group or individual within the church--apostolic or otherwise--appears to have monopolizing control over the Spirit's activity. Philip, as surely as Peter, is a man filled with and empowered by the Spirit in Luke's presentation. His lack of participation in transmitting the Spirit to new believers does not reflect a deficiency or abnormality in either his ministry or his own experience of the Spirit; rather it fits into a literary schema which Luke employs to demonstrate a prevailing compatibility and continuity between pairs of prominent ministers.

The primary model integrates the careers of John the Baptist and Jesus. The two characters share much in common as genuinely great and Spirit-endowed foundational figures within the kingdom of God. But they also fulfill distinctive roles in relation to each other. John functions as the forerunner who baptizes in water, preparing the way for Jesus' climactic mission of Spirit-baptism. Such a distinction, however, while pointing to Jesus' supremacy, does not minimize John's own eminence in Luke's narrative

nor impair the essential unity established between John and Jesus. Indeed, it may be viewed as supporting this unity by showing how the two ministries complement one another within a cooperative enterprise of ushering in God's kingdom.

In a similar fashion, Philip functions as a Baptist-style forerunner to Peter's Spirit-imparting mission in Acts 8-11 (as does Apollos in relation to Paul in Acts 18-19) and thereby displays another facet of his mutual rather than subordinate relationship to Peter. As within the Jerusalem community Philip's ministry of table-service is regarded by Luke as an equally significant and complementary vocation to Peter's ministry of the word, so on the mission field in Samaria and the coastal plain, Philip's trail-blazing labor of proclamation and baptism--which sets the stage for Peter's climactic work related to the Spirit's bestowal--represents for Luke an important contribution in its own right to the global advance of the gospel and also maintains a vital connecting link to Peter's mission and the Jerusalem mother church he represents. In short, Philip plants and Peter waters, but ultimately God gives the increase--even in the matter of the Spirit's outpouring! Philip and Peter are co-laborers, fellow-workers in God's field.

EXCURSUS: *THE LETTER OF PETER TO PHILIP*

The Letter of Peter to Philip designates a Christian-Gnostic tractate originally written in Greek toward the end of the second century C.E. or into the early part of the third. This document was eventually translated into Coptic and incorporated into Codex VIII of the Nag Hammadi library.[1] Though *The Letter of Peter to Philip* post-dates Luke's writings by a century or so, its focus on the Christian figures of Peter and Philip, together with its several other similarities to the early chapters of the canonical Acts (see below), make it an interesting text with which to compare and contrast Luke's depiction of Philip-Peter relations.

The tractate opens with the full, superscribed title: "The letter of Peter Which He Sent to Philip."[2] What immediately ensues is a standard epistolary greeting from (psuedo-) author (Peter) to (pseudo-) recipient (Philip) and a cordial plea on Peter's part that Philip "our beloved brother and fellow apostle" assemble together with the apostolic company from which he had been recently dissociated.

> Now I [Peter] want you [Philip] to know, our brother [that] we received orders from our Lord and the Savior of the whole world that [we] should come [together] to give instruction and preach in the salvation which was promised us by our Lord Jesus Christ. But as for you, you were separate from us, and you did not desire us to come together and to know how we should organize ourselves in order that we might tell the good news. Therefore, would it be agreeable to you, our brother, to come according to the orders of our God Jesus? (132,16-133,8)

At this juncture, the epistolary form is abandoned in favor of a third person narrative which runs to the end of the document. Philip is described as receiving and reading the correspondence and duly responding to Peter's wishes of reunion. We then learn that Peter convenes Philip and the other

apostles on the Mt. of Olives to await Christ's instructions (132,9-133,9). Throughout the remainder of the document Peter clearly dominates the apostolic group as its chief spokesman and leader. After the opening two paragraphs, neither Philip nor any apostle other than Peter is singled out or mentioned by name again.

As the apostles are assembled in prayer on the Mt. of Olives, the resurrected Christ appears and speaks to them. The apostles respond by asking a series of questions related to typically Gnostic concerns, such as "the deficiency of the aeons and their pleroma" and "why do the powers fight against us?" (134,19-135,2). One by one the resurrected Christ--"our illuminator, Jesus"--addresses the apostles' queries, following the basic form of a standard Gnostic "dialogue" (135,3-138,3).[3]

When the discussion concludes, Christ is "taken up to heaven," and the apostles return to Jerusalem. Along the way they confer with one another concerning the revelation they had just received, focusing in particular on the suffering of Christ and the prospects for their own persecution as his disciples. And once again an illuminating "voice" breaks in to instruct the confused apostles (138,4-139,4).

With great joy the apostles arrive in Jerusalem. They proceed to the temple where they offer "instruction in salvation in the name of [the] Lord Jesus Christ" and administer healing to a multitude of people (139,4-9). Peter, then, "filled with a holy spirit," addresses his fellow disciples, proclaiming the crucified and risen "Lord Jesus, the Son of the immeasurable glory of the Father. . . the author of our life" and petitioning Christ "to give us a spirit of understanding in order that we also may perform wonders"

(139,9-140,7). As a result the other apostles, together with Peter, are "filled with a holy spirit" and empowered to work miraculous healings and preach the message of Jesus (140,7-13).

At the close of the narrative in *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, Jesus appears yet again to his apostles, imparting a special blessing of peace and assuring them of his abiding presence. The apostles then scatter "to preach. . . by a power of Jesus, in peace" (140,15-27).

Several elements within *The Letter of Peter to Philip* manifest an obvious resemblance to certain features of the narrative in Luke 24 and the first half of Acts (e.g. the discussion concerning Jesus' death on the Emmaus road, the disciples' joyous return to Jerusalem, Peter's Spirit-filled leadership and Pentecost sermon, the apostles' Spirit-empowered ministry in the temple--including the performance of healing miracles, and the apostles' commission to preach the gospel). These affinities have prompted the consensus view that the author of *The Letter of Peter to Philip* was directly dependent upon segments of Luke-Acts, or at least closely related early Christian traditions, in composing his work.[4] Of particular interest to us is the apparent connection between the Peter and Philip referred to in the Gnostic tractate and the same two characters featured in Acts 8. To be sure, the former Philip is clearly designated an apostle (unlike Philip the evangelist in Acts 8), but we know from other sources that by the end of the second century there was a definite tendency in certain Christian circles to blur the historical distinction between Philip the apostle and evangelist (cf. Eus. *Eccl. Hist.* 3.31, 39; Clem. of Alex. *Strom.* 3.6).[5]

If indeed the writer of *The Letter of Peter to Philip* drew upon Luke's

presentations of Peter and Philip the evangelist, then he also certainly adapted these presentations to suit his own purposees. M. W. Meyer contends that, by accentuating Philip's initial separation from Peter and the apostolic circle, *The Letter of Peter to Philip* "indicates more clearly than Luke the independence of Philip and his mission," even though it also eventually aligns with Luke's overall emphasis by bringing Philip back into the apostolic fold under Peter's supreme authority. (Meyer accepts without question a thoroughgoing "early catholic" interpretation of Lucan aims, à la Haenchen).[6] Our view, however, expounded throughout the present chapter, is that Luke, while interested in portraying the unity and complementarity of Peter's and Philip's respective ministries, had no desire in the process to denigrate or cover up Philip's independent missionary vocation. And, we would aver, *The Letter of Peter to Philip* only acknowledges Philip's dissociation from the apostles in order to criticize it (as a violation of "the orders of our God Jesus") and correct it (by reuniting Philip with the apostles and subordinating him to Peter). If anything, by not referring to Philip again after his return to the apostolic company, *The Letter of Peter to Philip* effectively effaces Philip's independent status to a degree unparalleled in Luke-Acts.

Moreover, as T. V. Smith points out, Peter actually emerges in the Gnostic "letter" as a figure of much greater authority and importance than we find in Acts, especially in relation to the Spirit. Unlike the account in Acts 2, *The Letter of Peter to Philip* portrays Peter as being uniquely filled with the Spirit, delivering his Pentecost-type sermon and praying for his fellow apostles <u>before</u> they are similarly endowed with the Spirit's power.

Accordingly, the author would no doubt have regarded Peter's Spirit-imparting mission to the Samaritans in Acts 8 as a further example of the apostles'--in this case Philip's--dependence upon Peter's superior ability and subordination to Peter's preeminent authority.[7]

The Letter of Peter to Philip is first and foremost a Petrine document designed to promote Peter's primacy in the early church.[8] As such it has moved far beyond its more egalitarian Lucan *Vorlage*. The opening scenes, where Philip is featured as joyfully returning to Peter and the other apostles, may, as Ménard suggests, intimate an attempted "rapprochement" between contemporary Petrine and Philippine circles,[9] but scarcely in a way which accords comparable, much less equal, status to the Philip-group.

CHAPTER 6: PHILIP AND PAUL

§1. INTRODUCTION

A large measure of Philip's significance in the book of Acts derives not only from his correlation with the Jerusalem apostle Peter, but also from his association with that other eminent hero of Luke's narrative, Paul, the chief missionary to the Gentiles. We have already noted certain parallels between the missions of Philip and Paul in Luke's presentation, such as their similar confrontations with misguided magicians and their common ministries of miracle-working and proclaiming the good news of Jesus Christ and God's kingdom. In addition, however, to establishing these patterns of corresponding activity, Luke also coordinates the work of Philip the evangelist and Paul the missionary by bringing the two characters into direct contact with one another in Acts 21.8-9.

This short scene portraying the sojourn of Paul and his travelling companions at Philip's house in Caesarea has excited little scholarly discussion. For the most part it is regarded simply as an incidental segment within a travelogue recording a number of resting-places for the Pauline entourage *en route* to Jerusalem from Greece (cf. Acts 20.4-21.16).[1] Nevertheless, we would contend that the report of Philip's hospitality toward Paul, disclosing as it does the final image of Philip the evangelist which Luke elects to impress upon the minds of his readers, merits closer attention as a vital part of Luke's overall *Philippusbild*.

It may of course be objected that Acts 21.8-9 has little impact upon or connection with Luke's earlier (and much fuller) characterization of Philip in

chap. 8 because of the wide distance which separates the two passages. In fact, however, Luke has supplied a number of literary clues which point to an intentional link between the earlier and later Philip-scenes and suggest a unified portrayal of Philip in the Acts narrative.

(1) The designation of Philip as εὐαγγελιστής in Acts 21.8 recalls his evangelizing (εὐαγγελίζω) exploits featured in chap. 8. (The description ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ likewise recalls Philip's role in 6.5.)

(2) The Caesarean residence of Philip in Acts 21 matches the last-mentioned site of Philip's preaching ministry (8.40).

(3) A similar proximity to Jerusalem characterizes the earlier and later Philip-material in Acts. In the first instance, Philip's mission to Samaria marks the early church's <u>first step beyond Jerusalem</u> in the Acts account. Ties with the Jerusalem community are still maintained, however, through the follow-up work of the Jerusalem apostles Peter and John in Philip's territory (cf. Acts 8.4-25). In the second case, Philip's later ministry of hospitality in Caesarea represents the <u>last stage before</u> the action in Luke's narrative moves back to Jerusalem for the final time.[2] And here in Philip's home the outreaching presence of the Jerusalem church is manifest once again, this time in the person of the prophet Agabus (cf. 21.8-16).

(4) The intersection of the careers of Philip and Paul in Acts 21 also has an interesting counterpart in the first half of the Acts story. The large Philip-cycle in 8.4-40 is framed most immediately by references to Saul's (i.e. Paul's) former campaign of violence against the early church (8.1-3; 9.1-2). Though Philip does not encounter Paul directly in chap. 8,

the whole of his evangelistic ministry in Samaria and along the coastal plain may be viewed from the perspective of Luke's narrative as falling under the threat of Paul's persecution.[3]

In spite of these indicators of a purposeful literary connection between the earlier and later portraits of Philip in the book of Acts, it may still be argued that the Philip-reference in 21.8 is more reflective of Luke's source or personal reminiscence than his redactional artistry. Such a conclusion is related in part to the inclusion of this last Philip-segment within a so-called "we"-section.

In Acts 20.5 the first-person plural pronoun re-emerges in Luke's narrative after its last previous occurrence in 16.17. The "we"-group now designates a Pauline travel party moving east from Macedonia (cf. 20.6). The "we"-style continues to be used in the ensuing description of the Pauline journey to Asia Minor (20.5-15). It is then replaced by third-person narration in the Miletus-episode (20.16-38), only to surface again in 21.1-18. Because of the rather lengthy hiatus marked by the Miletus-incident, some scholars envisage two discrete "we"-sections in Acts 20-21.[4] But a better case can be made for a single continuous "we"-narrative.[5] According to 20.15 the "we"-party came with Paul to Miletus, and 21.1 reports that "we. . . parted from them [i.e. the Ephesian elders assembled at Miletus] and set sail." Obviously, then, Paul's companions ("we") remain with him throughout his reunion with the Ephesian elders. The fact that they recede into the background for a while, so that the focus may be placed on Paul and his contacts, is not untypical of Luke's "we"-passages.[6]

Given the setting of Acts 21.8-9 within Luke's second "we"-section

running from 20.5-21.18, what can be said regarding the literary character of this closing Philip-scene? Does the use of "we" reveal the historical participation of the author in the events being reported?[7] Does it betray an underlying source for Luke's account, say, a travel diary kept by one of Paul's companions (not the author of Acts)? Or is the employment of "we" merely a narrative device, designed to give the impression (illusion) of eyewitness testimony,[8] to conform to a recognized "sea voyage genre"[9] or to present the author as an experienced traveller (seaman) and therefore a reliable historian?[10]

The sporadic deployment of "we" by Luke certainly argues in favor of his membership in the "we"-group or his takeover of an eyewitness source.[11] All purely redactional theories founder on having to explain why Luke did not utilize his "we"-device more often, particularly if it was intended to serve a purpose as important as authenticating his entire work. The suggestion that the context of sea voyages limited the appearance of "we" ignores the absence of such language during the sailing segments of Paul's first missionary journey (Acts 13.4, 13; 14.26) and the dominant focus of the first "we"-passage on movements <u>within</u> the city of Philippi (16.12-17). Also hampering the evaluation of "we" as a complete Lucan invention is the nature of the parallels cited from Hellenistic authors. Ancient accounts of sea voyages may manifest at times a comparable propensity for first-person narration, but such a phenomenon hardly establishes *ipso facto* that the author was not personally on hand to experience the events being recorded.[12]

While granting as plausible that the "we"-material in Acts derives from eyewitness testimony, we should not ignore another important feature of this

material, namely, its stylistic affinity with the larger Lucan narrative.[13] In the case of Acts 20.5-21.18, we encounter not only typical Lucan vocabulary but also prominent Lucan themes (such as Spirit-inspired guidance [20.22-23; 21.4, 11-14])[14] as well as an overarching structural pattern paralleling the presentation of Jesus' life in Luke's Gospel (cp. Paul's "passion" with that of Jesus).[15] Luke does not merely chronicle Paul's final journey to Jerusalem, but shapes it to fit his entire two-volume work. The "we"-narrative is clearly his narrative; likewise, the "we"-references are his references.

In all likelihood, therefore, what we have in the "we" sections of Acts are reflective recollections of Luke's own experiences of missionary travel with Paul, that is, examples of eyewitness testimony reported not in wooden, journalistic fashion, but rather adapted in creative fashion to coordinate with the author's overall literary and theological interests. Regarding the Philip-episode in Acts 21.8-9, it is reasonable to number Luke among the "we" who "came to Caesarea and entered the house of Philip the evangelist." Thus we may assume with Harnack and others that Luke met Philip personally, visited with him for several days (cf. 21.10a) and obtained valuable information about Philip's missionary activity (and possibly other material pertaining to the "Hellenists").[16] However, the mention of Philip in Acts 21 should not be regarded merely as Luke's identification of an informant. As part of a "we"-passage, the closing Philip-scene is also part of a carefully designed narrative presentation. Accordingly, Philip the evangelist is not merely a historical source of data for Luke. He is also a literary character in Luke's unfolding drama of the early church's world-wide mission, whose

final depiction here in chap. 21 merits careful examination as part of a coherent Philip-profile sketched by Luke within the book of Acts.[17]

In probing the specific portrayal of Philip the evangelist in Acts 21, including its relationship to earlier characterizations, one may be struck initially with an impression of Philip's rather lowly status. In comparison with his more glamorous and "spiritual" pursuits on the mission field detailed in Acts 8, Philip's vocation as a settled family man and homeowner who provides lodging for Paul and his companions may appear prosaic and insignificant. Are we now to envisage Philip sitting on the sidelines, so to speak, retired from front-line missionary duty? Is not Paul so much the focus of attention at this stage in Luke's story that Philip must be viewed as nothing more than a subordinate "bit player," just another member of the gallery cheering Paul onward in his final march to Jerusalem? Is our final encounter, then, with the Lucan Philip an essentially unmemorable one, even functioning retrospectively to diminish in some measure Philip's previously reported successes?

Thus far in this study, we have investigated other facets of Luke's presentation which some have perceived as attempts to demean Philip's reputation. In each case, however, we have contended that the role which Philip plays is in fact a vital and venerated one, especially when viewed in the context of Luke-Acts as a whole. The possibility thus remains open that, when carefully analyzed in the light of Luke's two-volume work, Philip's stint as Paul's host will likewise be evaluated in more positive terms than a surface reading might suggest.

§2. PHILIP'S ROLE AS PAUL'S HOST

In order to assess properly the Lucan presentation of Philip's domestic vocation in Acts 21, it will be necessary to uncover the basic attitude(s) toward the ministry of hospitality held by the early church in general and the author of Luke-Acts in particular. Whatever our modern appraisals of the importance of hospitality in comparison with other ministerial tasks such as preaching, counseling or administration, these must not be allowed to inhibit or distort a candid investigation of Luke's perspective on hospitality in relation to the outlook of the wider first-century Christian community.

2.1 *The Practice of Hospitality in the Early Church*

The great system of roads and highways throughout the Roman empire together with the preservation of peace and order made for a very mobile society in the ancient world, and, naturally, the proliferation of travellers created a high demand for accommodation. Inns were available along the routes at regular intervals, but given their notoriety as brothels, they were normally not frequented by the upper classes or by any morally-sensitive parties, such as the primitive Christians. The way around this dilemma was to secure lodging in the homes of personal friends or trusted members of some fraternity with a reliable reputation as gracious hosts.[18]

Ever on the move, the apostle Paul often availed himself of the hospitality of Christian acquaintances. He told Philemon to prepare a guest room for his expected visit (Phlm 22). He anticipated wintering with the Corinthians so they might "speed him on his journey" (1 Cor 16.5-7; cf. 2 Cor 1.15-16). On the occasion of writing the first letter to the Corinthians,

Paul apparently was living in Ephesus with Aquila and Priscilla (1 Cor 16.9), and his correspondence to the Romans was drafted while staying with Gaius in Corinth (Rom 16.23). The privilege of receiving hospitality was certainly not uniquely accorded to Paul, however. As a rule, any itinerant Christian preacher could count on being accommodated by those to whom he ministered (Matt 10.5-14; Mark 6.7-13; Luke 10.1-12; 2-3 John; *Did.* 11-13). Moreover, provision of room and board was not restricted to travelling ministers. The caring Christian was even expected to open his home to wayfaring strangers, never knowing when one might be treated to the company of an angel in disguise (Heb 13.2).

In addition to hosting sojourners from outside the community, the early Christians were known for their consistent hospitality toward one another. Without church buildings, community life centered in individuals' homes (Rom 16.5, 23; 1 Cor 26.29; Col 4.15; Phlm 2).[19] Although only the owners of the most spacious dwellings could serve as hosts for the larger congregational assemblies, every believer could use his or her residence, however humble, as a place of fellowship with other believers and a means of sheltering the local poor and needy. The virtue of hospitality was a serious obligation incumbent upon every Christian seeking to fulfill the law of love (Rom 12.9-13; 1 Pet 4.8-9; Heb 13.12).[20] It was particularly associated with the responsibility to care for destitute widows and prisoners awaiting trial (Herm. Mand. 8, 10; *Sim.* 9.27.2; Just. *Apol.* 67.6)--an interesting observation in light of Philip's former assignment as one of the Seven table-servants and his current duty as host to Paul whose imminent arrest is dramatically enacted before Philip's eyes (Acts 21.11-14).[21]

Obviously the ministry of hospitality was widely practiced in the early church and highly prized as a necessary and noble expression of Christian charity. Nevertheless, certain problems involving hospitality did arise within early Christian communities. Conflicts among various house churches in a given locale could create a situation in which members of one faction would refuse to welcome into their homes any representative from another group. Witness the obstinancy of Diotrophes within the Johannine community (3 John 9-10).[22] Another difficulty was the tendency for certain unstable people to abuse the privilege of hospitality, such as idle young widows prone to "gadding about from house to house. . . gossips and busybodies, saying what they should not" (1 Tim 5.13).

The most acute dilemma, however, involving troublesome guests pertained to the accommodation of roving prophets and missionaries. These itinerant preachers exercised considerable influence over their hosts which could be used for salutary or ignoble purposes. On the negative side, they could gain an entrance into gullible households and successfully peddle some new and dangerous teaching. And so the writer of 2 John warns: "If anyone come to you and does not bring this doctrine [i.e. the "orthodox" faith that Christ came in the flesh, v. 7], do not receive him into the house or give him any greeting; for he who greets him shares his wicked work" (vv. 10-11; cf. 2 Tim 3.6-9; *Did.* 11.1-2). While hosts were being swept off their feet by deceptive, smooth-talking preachers, they were often being parted from their money as well. Exploitation by bogus travelling ministers was an all too common phenomenon in ancient society (see e.g. Sir 11.29, 34; Lucian, *Pas. of Pereg.* 11-13; *Alex. the False Proph.* 22-24). This is why the *Didache*

stipulated that a wandering prophet should be entertained for only two or three days at the most and then sent on his way with nothing but bread. If he solicited additional compensation, he was judged to be a "false prophet" (*Did.* 11.3-6; 12.1-5).[23] The fraudulent tendencies of many interant ministers also accounts in part for Paul's frequent practice of self-support as a means of legitimating his own apostleship (cf. 1 Thess 2.1-12; 2 Thess 3.7-9; 1 Cor 9.1-18; 2 Cor 11.7-15).[24]

2.2 *The Theme of Hospitality in Luke-Acts*

The widespread practice and appreciation of hospitality in the early church as well as some of the problems connected with this form of Christian service receive ample attestation in Luke's writing.[25] Both the Gospel of Luke and the book of Acts manifest a pervasive interest in the hospitality motif, especially in the material related to Luke's two principal characters, Jesus and Paul. Moreover, the theme is shown to be particularly prominent by its emergence at both the beginning and end of Luke's two-volume work (Luke 1.40 and esp. 2.1-7; Acts 28.23, 30-31).[26] As we might expect, while sharing the general enthusiasm for hospitality within early Christianity, Luke places his peculiar stamp on the subject. By uncovering this perspective we should be in a better position to evaluate the portrayal of Philip as Paul's host.

(1) Hospitality in the Gospel of Luke. More so than in the other Gospels, Jesus is presented in the Gospel of Luke as an itinerant prophet without family ties and a home base,[27] ever dependent on others' hospitality. Even his birth takes place in the context of a journey and features the

problems of finding suitable lodging (Luke 2.1-7). The unfolding description of Jesus' ministry repeatedly confirms that "the Son of man has nowhere [permanent] to lay his head" (9.58). He subsists predominantly by being entertained in the homes of his followers, for example, tax collectors like Levi and Zacchaeus (5.27-32; 19.1-10) and women like Mary and Martha (10.38-42). On three occasions--which Luke alone reports--Jesus even dines in a Pharisee's home (7.36-50; 11.37-52; 14.1-24). After his resurrection, Jesus continues to appear in the role of a guest, hosted by Cleopas (and partner) and the eleven disciples in the climactic scenes of Luke's Gospel (24.28-30, 36-43).

Not only does the Lucan Jesus personally adopt the lifestyle of a nomadic preacher sustained by the hospitality of grateful respondents, he also exhorts his emissaries, both the Twelve and Seventy, to follow the same pattern (9.1-6; 10.1-12). However, while maintaining that "the laborer deserves his wages," Jesus appears concerned that his disciples not abuse the privilege of support. They are not to roam from house to house in search of benefits, but rather they are instructed to abide in one place within a receptive village, content to eat and drink whatever is set before them (10.7-8). The main order of business is not the minister's sustenance but his obligation to proclaim the kingdom of God and heal the sick (9.1-2, 6; 10.9). A similar point is driven home in Jesus' gentle rebuke of Martha's preoccupation with dinner arrangements and his obvious priority commitment to the ministry of the word, recognized by Mary (10.38-42).[28]

While according to Luke's Gospel Jesus clearly plays the part of a <u>guest</u> preacher reliant upon his hearers' hospitality and encourages his

ambassadors to pursue the same vocation, he also functions as a gracious host attendant to the needs of others. He is notorious among the Pharisees and scribes as a man who "receives (προσδέχεται) sinners and eats with them" (15.1-2).[29] In the company of his disciples he takes on the character of "one who serves" (22.27; cf. 12.35-37). When the Twelve recommend that the crowd which had flocked to hear the Master be sent away at the end of the day to find food and lodging,[30] Jesus intervenes and miraculously caters a feast for the lot (9.10-17).[31] Several of the special Lucan (SL) parables found on the lips of Jesus feature scenes of table-fellowship focusing on the responsibilities of servants and hosts as well as the privileges of masters and guests (11.5-8; 15.11-32; 16.19-31; 17.7-10). The clearest example is the Parable of the Great Banquet (14.7-24)--uttered during a dinner party held in the home of prominent Pharisee (14.1, 12)--in which humility on the part of the guests and magnanimity on the part of the host are both forcefully commended.

(2) Hospitality in the book of Acts. At the beginning of Acts the small band of early Christians huddle together in a common dwelling (upper room, Acts 1.13-14). As the believing community grows in number, the custom of regular fellowship in each others' homes starts to develop (2.46; 5.42; 12.12). When the missionary movement finally gets underway, propelled by the dispersion of the primitive Jerusalem community, it is carried forward principally by itinerant evangelists who sojourn in the homes of receptive converts and seekers. During Peter's coastal preaching tour, for example, the apostle lodges in the seaside home of Simon the tanner (10.5-6, 32) and is invited to Cornelius' residence to proclaim the gospel to the household

assembled there (10.22-48). Above all, however, it is Paul in the book of Acts who epitomizes the travelling missionary who avails himself of others' hospitality. Following his dramatic conversion on the Damascus road, he is welcomed into Judas' home on Straight Street where he receives further instruction from Ananias (9.10-19). Throughout his missionary journeys across the Mediterranean world, we learn of people like Lydia (16.14-15, 40), the Philippian jailer (16.27-34), Jason (17.5-9), Aquila and Priscilla (18.2-3), Titius Justus (18.7), Mnason (21.16) and Publius (28.7-10)--all of whose main claim to fame is the opening of their home to accommodate Paul. While Philip's reputation is more broadly based, he nonetheless assumes a place of honor alongside these several hosts of the great missionary to the Gentiles.

The picture of Paul as a wandering preacher, without roots and personal means of support, does not, however, reflect the whole story in Acts. To an even greater extent than we found with respect to Jesus in Luke's Gospel, Paul in the book of Acts also takes on a more "residential" profile.[32] Though travelling extensively, he works from a stable home base at Antioch. And far from always flitting from one place to another, he settles down for relatively prolonged ministries in three places: Corinth (18 mos., 18.11), Ephesus (3 yrs., cf. 20.31) and Rome (2 yrs., 28.30). Interestingly, in each of these settings Paul's self-sufficiency is accentuated. At Corinth, though staying with Aquila and Priscilla, he works alongside this couple in their tent-making trade (18.3). In his final encounter with the Ephesian elders he takes great pains to remind them that, while he faithfully ministered "from house to house" in the Asian capital, he also labored hard throughout his stay to provide for his own material needs and at no time did he covet

anyone's possessions (20.33-35). At Rome, even though a prisoner and thus patently entitled to the support of the local Christian community, Paul lives at his own expense in rented quarters and welcomes (ἀποδέχομαι) all inquirers after his gospel (28.30-31; cf. v. 23). Thus, the Paul of Acts steers well clear of any charges of abusing his missionary position financially and proves himself to be a generous host in his own right as well as a grateful guest from time to time. The situation is remarkably similar to that revealed in the Pauline letters.

(3) Conclusion. In short, both Jesus in Luke's Gospel and Paul in the book of Acts combine within themselves the roles of itinerant guest and residential host. From such a presentation, set predominantly within a missionary context, we may reasonably conclude that part of Luke's purpose in treating the theme of hospitality was to sort out the often problematic relationship between itinerant prophets and resident ministers within the early church, as evidenced, for example, in the Corinthian and Johannine letters and the *Didache*.[33]

Clearly, the wandering preachers dependent upon the hospitality of their hearers receive favorable treatment in Luke's story. Much of his version of "Q" as well as his *Sondergut* reflect the special concerns of a radical itinerant mission, including not only the need for accommodation, but also the requirement of rigorous integrity in all financial dealings. Dillon may be right that these two blocks of material (Q and SL) are related to one another and can be traced back to a common pool of tradition transmitted in wandering-charismatic circles.[34] In any event, if Luke has received rather than created the bulk of his Gospel material regarding the roving prophetic

ministry of Jesus and his followers, he has nonetheless made this tradition his own and in the process fully endorsed its missionary perspective.

Theissen's contention that Luke actually sets out to attack the leaders of the primitive wandering charismatic movement as "false prophets" cannot be sustained by a balanced reading of Luke's text. Theissen bases his opinion on (i) an overly extreme periodization of Lucan history in which the circumstances surrounding the life of Jesus are sharply demarcated from conditions in Luke's own time; (ii) an excessively restrictive view of Luke's exaltation of the twelve apostles as the only legitimate missionaries of the church; and (iii) a misinterpretation of Luke 22.35-36 as a contemporary reversal of the earlier missionary model.[35] Concerning this last matter, Jesus' charge to his disciples suddenly to take along purse and bag is not a blanket repudiation of their former mendicant practice (cf. 10.4), but merely a policy appropriate to more drastic times. Among the provisions now required is also a sword (22.36), surely an indication that the threat of persecution is in the air. During more peaceful days the original missionary pattern of unencumbered travel would still commend itself.[36]

Granting that Luke does not discount the ongoing validity of an itinerant charismatic mission, it must still be admitted that much of his material focuses on concerns appropriate to a relatively stable residential community of some means,[37] even to the extent (as noted above) of showing a markedly domestic side to the great wandering evangelists of Christian history. In the final analysis, then, is there perhaps something to be said for Theissen's position that Luke tips the scales, if only slightly, to favor the resident minister and underplay the vocation of the travelling prophet?

Such a stance might be warranted if we could detect any trace of a polemical cast to the material which deals with itinerant missionaries or any sign of resistance on the part of resident hosts to accommodate wayfaring preachers. Neither element, however, is transparent anywhere in Luke-Acts.[38] A better evaluation of the evidence appreciates that Luke gives due weight and authorization in balanced proportions to both itinerant and resident ministers and typically portrays their interaction as a positive experience. No doubt aware of the potential for tension between the two very different types of ministers, Luke strongly advocates, as always, the need for cooperation and unity.

A similar interpretation of Luke's intention has been put forward in much greater detail by J. Koenig, and his conclusions merit an extended hearing:

> But why should we call such a mission "cooperative"? We do so because Luke, in managing his material, clearly makes special efforts to promote harmonious relationships between itinerants and residents for the sake of their common work. While his main interest is in supporting and encouraging the prophetic ministry of residential believers. . . , he does not simply forget about the contributions of the itinerants or declare their missionary efforts obsolete. Nor does he deny them an important share in the ongoing leadership of the church. Rather, what we find in Luke's two-volume work, particularly in Acts, is an attempt on his part to provide models for flexibility with regard to ministerial roles. Neither itinerants nor residents can define themselves too exclusively in terms of the activities they have come to regard as specific to their manner of life (guest, host, leader, servant, giver, receiver, minister of the word, minister of tables, etc.). It is the nature of God's Spirit always to challenge the self-images of believers so that the gospel may advance.[39]

2.3 *Philip's Hospitality to Paul in Acts 21*

In view of Luke's fundamental appraisal of hospitality as a charitable act of prime importance within the Christian community, we should not regard Philip's opening of his home to accommodate Paul and his companions in Acts 21 as a trifling courtesy of little consequence to Luke's theology. The role of host is an honorable and indispensable one in Luke's narrative, numbering among its players both Jesus and Paul in addition to Philip and several other characters. By the same token, the juxtaposition of Philip's settled domestic vocation in Caesarea with his erstwhile evangelistic endeavors throughout Samaria and Judea should not be interpreted as belittling Philip or undercutting his missionary achievements in any way. As a notable migratory preacher who becomes a local host for another travelling missionary, Philip strikingly exemplifies that "flexibility with regard to ministerial roles" so integral to Lucan ecclesiology. This flexibility is very similar to that which is manifest in Philip's dual function as table servant and minister of the word in Acts 6-8, discussed fully in the previous chapter. Moreover, the specific encounter in Acts 21 between Philip the gracious host (and sometime wandering charismatic) and Paul the guest preacher (and sometime host)--far from subordinating the former to the latter or endorsing any division between them--serves in the larger context of Luke-Acts to illustrate a basic compatibility between the two respective individuals and the itinerant and residential ministerial types which they both represent.

The significance of this cooperative bond established between Philip and Paul in Acts 21 may be further apprehended against the backdrop of earlier depictions of the relationship between Paul and the Stephen-Philip

circle in the Acts account. As noted above, the first encounter between these parties in Luke's story appears as a violent clash. Paul (Saul) emerges as a conspicuous collaborator in Stephen's lynching (Acts 7.58; 8.1a) and the chief instigator of the ensuing persecution which breaks out against Stephen's associates, including Philip (8.1-5; 9.1-2). However, once Paul's former identity as persecutor is disclosed (in references framing the account of Philip's ministry), we immediately learn of his extraordinary conversion on the Damascus road which paves the way for a dramatic reversal in relations with the Stephen-Philip group. The church at Antioch, founded by missionaries driven from Jerusalem because of Saul's assault on Stephen's sympathizers, now benefits from Paul's teaching ministry and becomes his missionary headquarters (11.19-26; 13.1-3). While questions arise within the Jewish-Christian community at Jerusalem concerning the validity of Paul's Gentile mission, congregations in Samaria and Phoenicia--established by Philip and others associated with the dispersion after Stephen's death (cf. 11.19)--warmly embrace Paul and wholeheartedly approve of his outreach beyond Jewish boundaries (15.3).

This pattern of reconciliation between Paul and the Stephen-Philip circle continues and climaxes in Acts 21-22. As chap. 22 opens Paul finds himself in a defensive situation before hostile Jerusalem Jews similar to that faced earlier by Stephen, and in v. 20 he even makes a commendatory reference to "Stephen thy [the Lord's] witness" whom he had formerly persecuted. The previous chapter in Luke's account discloses that Paul's troubles in the Holy City on this occasion had been fomented in particular by Asian Jews distressed over his fraternization with the Ephesian Gentile,

Trophimus (21.27-35), one of the members of Paul's retinue on the journey from Greece to Jerusalem (20.4). In contrast, however, to this display of Jewish antagonism toward Paul and associates, we find earlier in chap. 21 that certain Christian assemblies and individuals with ties to the original circle surrounding Stephen welcome the Pauline entourage with open arms.[40] The community of disciples at Tyre in the province of Phoenicia (cf. 11.19; 15.3 for connection with the Stephen-Philip circle)[41] host the Pauline travel party for a week and send them on their way to Jerusalem assured of the congregation's compassion and prayer support (21.3-6). Philip himself then receives Paul and company into his home for several days. Along with Philip's four daughters, various additional members of the Caesarean Christian community apparently gather at Philip's residence and express their concern for Paul's safety in Jerusalem (21.12).[42] A contingent of these Caesarean believers even accompany Paul to Jerusalem, directing him to the home of Mnason where another joyous reception awaits (21.15-17). As an "early disciple" (ἀρχαίῳ μαθητῇ) and native of Cyprus, Mnason may be linked in Luke's presentation both with Barnabas and with those "Hellenists" who first proclaimed the gospel to Greeks in Antioch (cf. 4.36; 11.20).[43]

In summary, Philip's hospitality to Paul in Acts 21 represents part of a cluster of events demonstrating the prevailing unity between the renowned missionary to the Gentiles and those Christians he had formerly persecuted. Harmony has replaced hostility. Paul, who had previously ravaged the church by

> (a) "entering house after house, . . .
> (b) drag[ging] off men and women and
> (c) commit[ting] them to prison" (8.3),

is now

(a) gladly received in house after house (21.1-17),
(b) accommodated by men and women like Philip and his four daughters (21.8-9)
(c) and himself branded as a lawbreaker facing imprisonment (21.11-14).

In the course of Luke's narrative, a thorough reversal has occurred in Paul's personal experience and in his relations with Philip and other friends of Stephen the faithful witness.

As Philip's gracious welcome of Paul in Caesarea clearly stands in contrast to the Asian Jews' harsh treatment of Paul in Jerusalem, M. Hengel suggests that Luke has set up in Acts 21 a similar opposition between the respective receptions of Paul by Philip and James.

> . . . the friendly reception of Paul and his companions when they arrive in Caesarea on the last journey, described in the 'we report' (21.8ff.). . . is clearly contrasted with the more reserved account of the reception by James and the elders in James's 'residence', where the advice, or rather command of James leads to the subsequent conflict in the temple (21.18ff.). . . . Luke wants to use this background account to demonstrate that in contrast to the threatening situation in Jerusalem, his hero was *persona grata* to Philip and the Christians in Caesarea who accompanied him on his difficult journey to Jerusalem (21.16).[44]

While it is true that Paul's interaction with James and the elders of the Jerusalem church appears somewhat more official and less intimate than his encounter with Philip and the Caesarean community, nevertheless, the antithesis between Philip and James at this point is not as sharply drawn in Luke's narrative as Hengel avers. We should not suppose that Luke has suddenly abandoned altogether his interest in portraying the early church as unified. Despite the presentation of a "more reserved" response to Paul on the part of James and his followers, there are clear signs in the account

that, from Luke's perspective, no serious break in relations had occurred.

(1) James and the elders still "glorify God" when Paul reports his ministry among the Gentiles (21.19-20a).

(2) The "Apostolic Decree" is mentioned again (21.25), and though awkwardly cited as if Paul is hearing it for the first time, in the Lucan schema it surely recalls the momentous council of Acts 15 and the unity which prevailed there between Paul and the Jerusalem mother church.

(3) The Jacobean party may show its suspicion of Paul by insisting on a public demonstration of his loyalty, but the fact remains that Paul complies with their wishes, thereby eliminating the grounds of dissension.

(4) The trouble which erupts in the temple stems from the machinations of the Jews from Asia, not the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem,[45] and though the lack of James' intervention on Paul's behalf raises historical questions about how fully James had embraced Paul, Luke would scarcely have intended his account to intimate that James actually plotted with the Asians to entrap Paul.[46]

(5) Agabus, the prophet from Judea who comes to Philip's home and warns Paul of "the Jews'" impending hostility against him (21.10-11), represents a bridge figure in the book of Acts (similar to Barnabas) uniting the settled Jerusalem Christian community, the disciples scattered in the wake of Stephen's persecution and Paul (cf. 11.27-30).

In short, the juxtaposed receptions of Paul in Acts 21.8-26 by Philip and the Caesarean Christians, one the one hand, and James and the Jerusalem Christians, on the other hand, are more alike than dissimilar in their basic demonstration of sympathy and support for Paul and his ministry.

§3. PHILIP THE "EVANGELIST" AND PAUL

In the title and throughout the course of this study, we have referred to the Lucan character under investigation as "Philip the evangelist," following the conventional nomenclature of modern scholarship in distinguishing this Philip from "Philip the apostle," one of Jesus' original twelve disciples. The term εὐαγγελιστής, by virtue of its close connection to εὐαγγελίζομαι and εὐαγγέλιον, is obviously an appropriate designation for one like Philip, known for his proclamation of the gospel to the Samaritans and Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8. Of course, other missionaries in Luke-Acts also participate in "evangelizing" activities, but Philip is the only individual specifically labelled ὁ εὐαγγελιστής in Luke's narrative, and that on only one occasion--in Acts 21.8. On the basis of this restricted usage, should we perhaps infer that εὐαγγελιστής has a more specialized meaning in relation to Philip than simply "one who preaches the gospel?"

This possibility of a more technical nuance to εὐαγγελιστής becomes more intriguing when we take into account the wider distribution of the term in the NT. Apart from the lone Lucan reference in Acts 21.8, εὐαγγελιστής appears in only two other NT texts: Eph 4.11 and 2 Tim 4.5. Interestingly, both of these non-Lucan references emerge in writings widely accepted today as "deutero-Pauline," due in part to their emphasis on more developed structures of ministry. Since Luke-Acts may also be classified as "post-Pauline" literature, and since Philip is uniquely called "the evangelist" in the specific context of a meeting with Paul, we should remain alert to the prospect of a peculiar understanding of εὐαγγελιστής associated with

established Pauline circles. At any rate, a comparative analysis of the rare cases of εὐαγγελιστής in the NT (together with a look at selected patristic references) promises to shed important light on Philip's singular role in Luke's account as "the evangelist" of the early church.

3.1 *Ephesians 4.11*

> "And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers."

Here "evangelists" are listed between two related pairs of gifted ministers in the church. The "apostles and prophets," though distinguished from each other by μὲν. . . δέ and the use of the definite article with each term, are clearly linked together in the book of Ephesians (2.20; 3.5), and "pastors and teachers," governed by a single article, can be taken to denote two aspects of one "office" (pastor-teacher).[47] The gift of "evangelist," then, standing by itself in the middle of the series in Eph. 4.11, would seem to be defined to some extent in opposition to and in comparison with the two flanking ministerial pairs.

Apostles and prophets are distinguished in Ephesians by their function as foundational builders of the church (2.20) and recipients of direct revelation from the Spirit of divine mysteries hitherto concealed (3.3-5). They are clearly servants of the church at large, the "one body" of Christ which Ephesians conceives in universal terms. The precise identity of these apostles and prophets is never disclosed, though one would assume that Jesus' original twelve disciples were among those in the author's mind. Whatever the total representation of the group, there is no doubt that Paul

should be ranked as an apostle and prophet *par excellence* (3.1-12). Of particular interest for our purposes is the fact that the mystery of Christ revealed to the apostles and prophets concerns the promises of the gospel (εὐαγγέλιον, 3.6), a gospel which once known must be preached (εὐαγγελίζομαι, 3.8; cf. 3.7-10). Thus the apostles and prophets engage in "evangelistic" functions but are still set apart from those ministers explicitly characterized as "evangelists" in Eph 4.11.

What can be inferred from this parallel-yet-distinct relationship between apostles/prophets and evangelists in the book of Ephesians? The most cogent hypothesis envisages evangelists as missionaries who proclaimed the gospel just like the apostles and prophets but who could not, with Paul and the Twelve, lay claim to a direct commission from Christ and to immediate revelation (of the gospel) by the Spirit. They were second-generation Christian preachers, from the perspective of Ephesians, who differed from the apostles and prophets not in their essential function but only in the relative originality of their message. The apostles and prophets laid the gospel foundation; the evangelists built upon it.[48]

There is no need in this arrangement to posit a strict idea of apostolic succession or a clear-cut hierarchy subordinating evangelist to apostle.[49] These are notions tied to narrow conceptions of ecclesiastical office which go beyond the primarily functional understanding of an evangelist's ministry. In the case of the Pauline circle, evangelists likely represented the many co-laborers of Paul who were indebted to the apostle for their initiation into the gospel ministry, but who often conducted independent (though not competitive) missions.[50] Harnack's theory may well

be right that evangelists were mentioned in Ephesians precisely because the community(ies) addressed in this letter was "founded by non-apostolic missionaries [=evangelists], and not by Paul himself."[51]

Relating the role of the evangelist to that of the pastor-teacher is more difficult, since Ephesians provides no elaboration on the latter's significance. Nevertheless, it is probably safe to assume that pastor-teachers in Ephesians, as elsewhere in the NT, represent the local community leaders responsible for the ongoing spiritual care and instruction of the believers. By their strictly residential ministry within established congregations, they would naturally have been distinguished from the more itinerant, church-planting evangelists. This does not eliminate, however, the possibility of a continuing ministry for evangelists within the local community, since the need consistently to add new converts remained a pressing concern for young congregations and since preaching the gospel was critical not only for generating community life, but for sustaining it as well.

3.2 *2 Timothy 4.5*

". . . do the work of an evangelist. . ."

It is unmistakeable in this instance that "evangelist" points chiefly to the <u>act</u> (ἔργον) of preaching the gospel which Timothy must perform rather than to any official position in the church. However, while we might assume that a wide variety of ministers would be expected to carry out such a duty, it is interesting to note that, in fact, throughout the Pastorals no other local community leader--bishop, deacon or elder--is exhorted to function as

an evangelist nor is their ministry associated directly with any εὐαγγελίζομαι/εὐαγγέλιον terminology (cf. 1 Tim 3.1-12; 5.17-22; Tit 1.5-9). In addition to Timothy, only the apostle Paul emerges explicitly as one "entrusted with the gospel" (1 Tim 1.11; cf. 2 Tim 1.8-11). A rather exclusive Pauline claim upon the gospel may even be detected in the reference to "my gospel" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου) in 2 Tim 2.8. Yet, however unique Paul appears in the Pastorals as the supreme "preacher (κῆρυξ) and apostle and teacher" (2 Tim 1.11; cf. 1 Tim 2.7), these letters also disclose that Paul has personally transmitted his gospel message and ministry to his beloved son in the faith, Timothy (1 Tim 1.2, 18-20; 4.11-16; 6.20; 2 Tim 1.2, 6-14; 2.1-26; 3.10-4.5). Given this special relationship between Paul and Timothy depicted in the Pastorals, it would seem that we are faced with a similar conception of "evangelist" as that found in Ephesians, namely, an apostle-like preacher of the gospel. Only in the present case the connecting link between apostle and evangelist appears stronger and more sharply defined,[52] and the principal scope of evangelistic work assigned to Timothy strikes one as more local or regional than universal.

In short, from the scanty NT evidence outside of Acts regarding the identity of a εὐαγγελιστής, the most balanced description we can offer is that of a minister of the gospel (i) who exhibited a close continuity in function with the foundational apostles--especially Paul (but probably also the Twelve)--but not necessarily in terms of fixed, "official" lines of authority, and (ii) who both planted new churches through itinerant missionary preaching and strengthened local communities by expounding the depths of the gospel to believers and by seeking to win additional

converts.[53] Along similar lines, L. Goppelt provides a succinct definition of εὐαγγελιστής: "The name referred to a circle of men who, partly independent of the apostles and partly as their companions and fellow workers, had carried out the mission and the pastoral care of the churches."[54]

3.3 *Patristic Sources*

Before dealing specifically with the "evangelist" tag applied to Philip in Acts, can we fill in the rough sketch drawn thus far of εὐαγγελιστής in the NT by appealing to extra-biblical materials? Unfortunately, secular sources supply no really illuminating parallels. In fact, the paucity of references to εὐαγγελιστής in ancient pagan literature has sparked the suggestion that the term was originally coined in Christian circles.[55] After the NT period, εὐαγγελιστής surfaces in the writings of the church fathers around the beginning of the third century as a technical title for the authors of the Gospels (τά εὐαγγέλια, Hipp. *De Antichr.* 56; Tert. *Adv. Prax.* 21.23). Such a usage could only arise at a time when the gospel began to be closely identified with certain authoritative books about Jesus' life and teaching. Thus it would be anachronistic to impose this later notion of "Evangelist" on the NT material, where the gospel is still conceived principally within the framework of oral preaching.[56]

Coming to Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, however, a work composed in the fourth century but recounting events from an earlier period, we encounter uses of εὐαγγελιστής more in tune with the "deutero-Pauline" conception. In discussing the "shining lights" of the first half of the

second century, Eusebius mentions the many evangelists, those "pious disciples of great men" who "built in every place upon the foundations of the churches laid by the apostles." They were travelling missionaries who, like their apostolic predecessors, engaged in founding new communities and appointing local pastors before moving on to spread the gospel to other unreached areas throughout the world. Of particular interest in comparison with Philip is Eusebius' specific profile of evangelists as those who displayed miraculous signs through the power of the Spirit and inspired entire crowds upon their first hearing of the gospel to turn from other gods to the worship of the one true God (*Eccl. Hist.* 3.37).[57]

Passing on to Eusebius' report concerning prominent Christian figures in the closing decades of the second century, we learn of one Pantaenus, an esteemed philosopher of the Alexandrian school, who "was appointed as a herald for the gospel of Christ" to regions in the East, notably, India. In this missionary capacity Pantaneus functioned as an evangelist, furthering the work in India begun by the apostle Bartholomew who had left behind a copy of Matthew's Gospel. After completing his tour of duty, Pantaenus returned to Africa to take up the post of principal of the Alexandrian academy (*Eccl. Hist.* 5.10).[58]

3.4 *Acts 21.8*

It might be thought that the designation of Philip as "evangelist" simply reflects a traditional ("Hellenist"?) title taken over by Luke[59] or a natural label utilized by Luke to acknowledge Philip's reputation as a preacher of the gospel and to distinguish him from his apostolic namesake

(cf. Luke 6.14; Acts 1.13).[60] While either of these explanations is possible, as far as they go, they do not take into account the specialized understanding of εὐαγγελιστής in post-Pauline circles which may have influenced Luke's usage. As a matter of fact, the overall presentation of Philip's ministry in Acts conforms remarkably to the conception of an evangelist gleaned from Ephesians and the Pastorals and illustrated later in Eusebius. Philip functions in Luke's story as a gospel-proclaiming, miracle-working missionary in much the same way as the apostles Peter and Paul, though not being a direct recipient of Christ's personal revelation and commission, he himself is not called an apostle.[61] Philip's mission in Samaria and the coastal plain is initially conducted independent of the apostles, but, as we have seen, soon Peter comes along in the same territory to complement Philip's labor. A strong continuity (though not a strict hierarchy) is established between Philip and the Twelve, precisely the relationship between evangelist and apostle which underlies the "deutero-Pauline" writings.

A similar arrangement between Philip and Paul seems to be in view, centered in the city of Caesarea. Philip pioneers the preaching of the gospel in this place (Acts 8.40) and eventually settles down here and raises a family (21.8-9). It is Peter, of course, who first ministers in Caesarea after Philip (10.24-48), but later Paul also arrives on the scene, lodging in Philip's home and making contact with the Caesarean disciples (21.8-16). By calling Philip--"the evangelist"--in this setting of Paul's visit, Luke may be subtly casting Philip in a role parallel to the evangelists of Eph 4.11 and Timothy in the Pastorals. Philip may have laid the groundwork for the

Caesarean church instead of Paul, but his vocation as an evangelist insures both his and the Caesarean community's linkage to apostolic and Pauline foundations (cp. Ephesians). At the time of Paul's arrival in Caesarea in Acts 21, Philip may appear more as a resident minister than a wandering missionary (see above). but, like Timothy, he may continue to "do the work of an evangelist," that is, carry on exactly that type of gospel preaching ministry which Paul himself had modelled and could fully endorse. In short, by dubbing Philip "evangelist," Luke not only characterizes the nature of Philip's activity, but in effect also incorporates the independent missionary into the ranks of Paul's co-laborers. A unity is thus established between Philip and Paul in the common cause of heralding the gospel. In this regard, Philip's unique identification as evangelist serves roughly the same purpose as Stephen's designation as witness in Acts 22.20, a title which otherwise Luke exclusively reserves for the Twelve and Paul.[62]

This opinion that Luke's single reference to εὐαγγελιστής should be coordinated with "deutero-Pauline" usage receives further confirmation from the larger literary context surrounding Acts 21.8. In particular it is interesting to note the other ministries which receive mention in Luke's account of Paul's final journey to Jerusalem in 20.5-21.17. In Paul's Miletus speech the leaders of the Ephesian community are characterized as elders (πρεσβύτεροι, 20.17), bishops (overseers, ἐπίσκοποι, 20.28) and pastors (ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, 20.28), and in the episode in Philip's house, Agabus the prophet (προφήτης, 21.10) is featured (cf. also Philip's daughters "who prophesied" [προφητεύουσαι], 21.9). Such a grouping of ministerial titles is unique in Acts. Elders and prophets are

mentioned elsewhere (11.27, 30; 13.1; 14.23; 15.2, 4, 6, 22; 16.4; 21.18), but there is no internal parallel for the reference in 20.28 to bishops who exercise pastoral care over their flock. Significantly, however, this particular cluster of ministries does find a close match in Ephesians (prophet/pastor) and the Pastorals (bishops/elders), precisely those parts of the NT which contain the only other occurrence of εὐαγγελιστής outside of Acts 21.8. Therefore, the supposition presents itself that, in his report of Paul's final trek to Jerusalem, Luke reflects the ecclesiastical concerns of a post-Pauline community.[63] This being the case, it is reasonable to interpret his use of εὐαγγελιστής as consistent with the "deutero-Pauline" conception.

§4. CONCLUSION

The final Philip-scene in Acts 21.8-9, though brief, makes an integral and memorable contribution to Luke's overall *Philippusbild*. Philip's principal role in this scene is that of host to Paul and his companions on their way to Jerusalem. We have found no reason to doubt the historical basis of this encounter between Philip and Paul and have even concluded that the author of Luke-Acts, as part of the "we"-group attending Paul, also met Philip personally. Our main interest, however, has been in Luke's portrayal of this incident of hospitality against the backdrop of his larger narrative presentation.

Few expressions of Christian service are as highly prized in Luke-Acts as the practice of hospitality, and Philip's participation in this duty may be regarded as an unmitigated Lucan commendation of his ministry. Moreover,

far from being inconsistent with or inferior to his earlier activities of wonder-working and gospel-preaching, Philip's hospitality represents a complementary labor of love (similar to table-service) within Luke's overall conception of Christian ministry, repeatedly practiced and promoted by Jesus himself in Luke's Gospel.

The dominant Lucan purpose behind Acts 21.8-9 which has come to light in this chapter has been the concern to establish a bond of unity and cooperation between Philip and Paul. This purpose can be detected from three angles:

(1) Philip is depicted as a resident minister who extends hospitality to the itinerant Paul. The friction which often characterized relations between resident and itinerant ministers in early Christian communities plays no part in the interaction between Philip and Paul in the book of Acts.

(2) Philip's gracious reception of Paul in Acts 21 represents the crowning example of the reversal of hostilities between Paul and the Stephen-Philip circle since the former's conversion.

(3) Philip is uniquely designated "the evangelist" as a means of incorporating him into the Pauline network of missionaries, thus matching the pattern of the "deutero-Pauline" letters.

Generally speaking, the hospitality motif and the "evangelist" label serve to illustrate the unity between Philip and Paul in much the same way as the forerunner model brings together Philip and Peter in the Lucan schema.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

In this investigation we have explored in detail the person and work of Philip the evangelist as disclosed in the book of Acts. Numerous components of the Lucan *Philippusbild* have been identified, and no attempt will be made here to reiterate all of them. But we shall endeavor to take a panoramic look at our findings and highlight the most salient features of Philip's role within Luke's narrative. Also we will suggest possible lines of further inquiry stimulated by this study.

On the whole we have found Philip to be a genuinely prominent and positive figure within Luke's presentation. He does not, of course, enjoy the full stature of the members of Luke's heroic triumvirate--Jesus, Peter and Paul--but neither is Philip so eclipsed by these three characters as to be scarcely noticeable as a character of substance and distinction in his own right. Still less should Philip be viewed as a figure whom Luke has consciously set out to belittle or "put in his place." We have consistently maintained that alleged failures (the "apostasy" of Simon Magus), deficiencies (the lack of ability to impart the Spirit to his converts) and inconsistencies (table service/hospitality *versus* proclamation of the word) in Philip's ministry, as portrayed in the book of Acts, are in fact either commendable elements of Philip's vocation or at least in no way damaging to Philip's reputation when viewed in the overall literary context of Luke's two-volume work.

In more specific terms, Luke's favorable depiction of Philip the

evangelist may be conveniently ordered around three critical roles which Philip plays within Luke's account of primitive mission.

§1. PHILIP THE PIONEERING MISSIONARY

It is commonplace to observe that the structure of the book of Acts reflects Luke's overarching purpose to chart the extension of the gospel beyond the borders of Jerusalem-based Judaism out to the ends of the earth (cf. Acts 1.8). It is also customary to credit Peter and Paul with the strategic advances in this missionary program. This study, however, while not denying Luke's focus on the outreaching accomplishments of Peter and Paul, has argued that Luke also features Philip the evangelist as a notable, pioneering missionary in his own right, one who deserves more credit as a catalyst of the early church's universal mission than modern *Actaforschung* tends to allow. In our estimation, Philip's evangelistic achievements, recounted in Acts 8, represent for Luke genuinely trail-blazing and barrier-breaking--not merely transitional and bridge-building--steps in forwarding the global dissemination of the Christian message.

In Acts 1-7 the earliest Christian community is localized exclusively in Jerusalem and, from all indications, directs its ministry exclusively to resident or immigrant (cf. 2.5-11) Jewish-Christians within the Holy City. It is only in Acts 8, in conjunction with the forced dispersion of some members of the Jerusalem church following Stephen's execution, that a Christian witness begins to be carried to outlying regions and outcast peoples (from the perspective of strict Jerusalem-centered Judaism). And Philip the evangelist, Stephen's associate (cf. 6.5), is the pioneering itinerant

missionary whom Luke features first in his narrative.

In Acts 8.5-13 Philip preaches to and baptizes a throng of Samaritans in the city of Samaria. In terms of ethnic-religious status, Samaritans in Luke-Acts occupy something of a middle position between Jews and Gentiles, difficult to pin down precisely. But, at any rate, within his two-volume work Luke clearly exposes prevailing animosities between Samaritans and Jews, thus creating a situation in which compassionate outreach to Samaritans on the part of Jews or Jewish-Christians stands out as a radical social gesture. The Lucan Jesus, in his actions (Luke 9.51-56; 17.11-19), teachings (Luke 10.25-37) and commands (Acts 1.8), sets the stage for such a groundbreaking mission to the Samaritans, but it is Philip in Acts 8 who brings this work to fruition. To be sure, Peter and John later complement this ministry, but we must not forget that Philip initiates the Samaritan "crusade" by himself, while the apostles remain cloistered in Jerusalem (Acts 8.1). Moreover, we are told that certain of the apostles originally mirrored the standard Jewish antipathy toward Samaritans, contrary to the spirit of Jesus' vocation (Luke 9.54-56). Obviously, these hostilities had to be overcome before the apostles could sincerely invite and accept Samaritans into the Christian community. Philip, however, requires no such attitude adjustment in Luke's account. Apart from the list of seven servants in Acts 6.5, the first reference to Philip in Luke's narrative relates in matter-of-fact terms the evangelist's commitment to taking the gospel outside of Jerusalem to the despised (by the Jews) Samaritans: "Philip went down to [the] city of Samaria, and proclaimed to them the Christ" (8.5).

The last episode in Acts 8 describes Philip's evangelistic encounter

with an Ethiopian eunuch on a "desert" road leading away from Jerusalem to the coastal plain (8.25-40). Once again the apostles are stationed at their home base in Jerusalem (8.25), while Philip embarks on a solitary mission outside the city's limits. On this occasion, Philip directs his witness to a "God-fearing" Gentile from the "ends of the earth" (Ethiopia) barred ("hindered", κωλύω) from full incorporation into the people of God (as defined by the Judaism known to Luke) on account of his physical condition as a eunuch. In our opinion, Luke regards this Ethiopian eunuch as a *bona fide* Gentile, standing in a similar relation to Judaism as the Roman centurion Cornelius. Hence, the eunuch's conversion to faith in Christ and baptism at the hands of Philip marks the first breakthrough in the early church's Gentile mission reported in the Acts narrative. Peter's outreach to Cornelius (10.1-11.18) has a greater overall impact on Luke's unfolding drama of the gospel's proclamation to the nations, but Philip's evangelization of the Ethiopian eunuch is still distinguished as the inaugural venture into Gentile territory. What is more, Philip takes this innovative step decisively and without complaint, despite the peculiar circumstances associated with it, whereas such a willing heart scarcely characterizes Peter's initial response to the challenge of the Gentile mission.

In short, Philip the evangelist must be accorded his due share of the spotlight, alongside the apostle Peter, as one who spearheads the initial thrust of the early church's universal mission in the book of Acts. (Paul, of course, emerges later in Acts as the one who brings the Gentile mission to full flower.) In both Samaria and the coastal plain, Peter comes along to build upon and supplement Philip's work, particularly in the area of

imparting the Spirit to new believers. But in the process we have discerned the contours of a more cooperative/mutual rather than competitive/hierarchical relationship between Philip and Peter in Luke's presentation. We have also suggested that in this relationship Philip functions in many respects as Peter's forerunner, modelled in part on the role characterizing John the Baptist in relation to Jesus in Luke's narrative.

§2. PHILIP THE DYNAMIC PROPHET

Building on the work of a number of scholars who detect Luke's regular employment of biblical-prophetic models to portray his principal characters, we have explored various ways in which Luke's casting of Philip the evangelist fits this prophetic pattern. Generally speaking, Philip's vocation as a Spirit-endowed preacher and miracle-worker, mighty in word and deed, recalls the dynamic ministry of many venerated prophets from Israel's history. More particularly, however, the Lucan Philip especially reflects the images of Moses and Elijah/Elisha.

The demonstration of Philip's superior greatness as an authentic channel of divine power in direct contrast to Simon the magician, the self-styled "Great Power of God" who had mesmerized the Samaritan nation, manifests Philip's role as a prophet like Moses who, according to the Exodus account, overwhelmed Egypt's finest magicians as a token of his God-given authority to liberate the people of Israel. Moreover, Philip's emergence in the book of Acts as a Moses-type instrument of "the finger of God" matches his ministry with that of Jesus, the ultimate "prophet like Moses," in Luke's

Gospel (cf. Luke 11.20; Exod 8.15 LXX).

A further link between Philip and Moses in Luke's presentation may be observed in conjunction with the "rejected prophet" motif. As Moses was initially spurned by his own Israelite kinsmen and forced to flee into a foreign land where he found God's presence and the people's acceptance (cf. Acts 7.23-35), so Philip launches his evangelistic mission in alien territory (Samaria, cf. Shechem-reference, Acts 7.16) as a fugitive from the Jewish establishment in Jerusalem. Of course, this "rejected prophet-like-Moses" pattern also associates Philip with other principal characters in Luke-Acts, namely, Jesus, Stephen, Peter and Paul.

We uncovered Philip's reflection of the Elijah/Elisha model especially in the context of the reported encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch. To rehearse only selected parallels with the prophetic pair from Kings, we noted that Philip is supernaturally guided and even transported in his ministerial pursuits by the Spirit of God (like Elijah) and that through his labor of proclamation and baptism Philip incorporates a physically "defective" foreign official into the people of God (cf. Elisha's ministry to the leprous Syrian general, Naaman). Given this correspondence between Philip and both Elijah and Elisha in a missionary setting outside the margins of a hostile Jewish public, we suggested further that Philip's ministry in Acts 8 echoes in some measure Jesus' stark portrayal of the prophetic vocation in Luke 4.24-27.

§3. PHILIP THE AGENT OF UNITY

Repeatedly we have discovered that Luke's well-known interest in portraying the unity and cooperative spirit of the early church has been

clearly manifest in his characterization of Philip the evangelist. Others, of course, have acknowledged this fundamental role which Philip plays in Luke's presentation of a harmonious Christian community, but our study has flowed against the tide of certain scholarly perspectives (esp. "early catholic" interpretations) in terms of precisely how we envisage Philip's function as a unifying figure within Luke's narrative. Our approach may be conveniently summarized in relation to two general aspects of Philip's profile: (1) his various relations with other Lucan characters and (2) his various acts of Christian service.

Regarding the first matter, Philip emerges as one of the few characters who interacts on some level with both of the leading lights in Luke's history of the early church: Peter and Paul. Early in the Acts account there are hints of underlying tension and even hostility between Philip and the two respective Lucan heroes. As a leading member of the segment of the Jerusalem church surrounding Stephen (the "Hellenists"), Philip is, on the one hand, implicitly involved in some conflict with Peter and the eleven apostles over the proper administration of the congregation and, on the other hand, eventually driven from the Jewish capital under the threat of Paul's persecution (cf. 6.1-7; 8.1-5; 9.1-2). As the story in Acts ensues, however, these signs of discord between Philip, Peter and Paul disappear and are replaced by vivid pictures of unity. Philip's missionary exploits (e.g. kingdom- and gospel-preaching, working signs and wonders, confronting and overwhelming magicians) match the activities of Peter and Paul at a number of points (we also noted important contacts between Philip's ministry and those of Jesus and Stephen), and his work in various locales serves to

complement the endeavors of Peter and Paul, either by preparing the way for the gospel (Peter's forerunner in Samaria and the coastal plain) or by providing practical support (Paul's host in Caesarea). We concluded that in each case Luke regards Philip more as an independent yet cooperative partner in ministry (co-laborer) than an inferior subordinate or underling.

Secondly, the variety of duties which Philip performs in the book of Acts evinces a versatility with respect to ministerial roles which breaks down barriers between potentially competitive occupations. For example, Philip appears as both table-servant and minister of the word (as does the Lucan Jesus)--not as a means of undercutting Philip's evangelistic accomplishments by underscoring his more menial pursuits--but rather as a means of displaying the comparable value and compatible relation of diaconal and kerygmatic tasks in Luke's concept of ministry. Philip also appears as both an itinerant-charismatic missionary and a residential-domestic host (as do Jesus and Paul in Luke-Acts), thus combining within himself two distinct and sometimes conflicting styles of leadership within earliest Christianity.

§4. FUTURE RESEARCH

Our investigation of Philip the evangelist in Lucan perspective compelled us to probe a number of Lucan themes and patterns associated with the Philip-material--such as the role of Samaria/Samaritans, the church's conflict with magic, the concept of true greatness, outreach to marginalized persons (e.g. widows and the physically impaired), the link between humility and exaltation, the sovereignty of the Spirit, the function of forerunners, the ministry of table-service and hospitality--all of which could be

fruitfully examined in greater detail to gain deeper insight into Luke's overarching literary and theological purpose.

More specifically related to the person of Philip, our analysis of the role of Philip the evangelist within Luke's two-volume work could serve as a foundational step toward tracing developing conceptions of the Philip-figure within early Christian history. How, if at all, does the Lucan Philip (the "Hellenist" evangelist) relate to the roughly contemporary Johannine Philip (the disciple of Jesus) featured four times in the Fourth Gospel (John 1.43-48; 6.5; 12.21-22; 14.8-9)? And how, then, do these two presentations of a Christian figure named Philip within the NT affect the later hagiographical reports of Philip the apostle in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, certain Nag Hammadi documents (*The Letter of Peter to Philip* [cf. excursus in chap. 5]; *The Gospel of Philip*) and *The Acts of Philip*? At what point in the history of the early church do Philip "the evangelist" and Philip "the apostle" begin to be identified with other another, and to what extent (if any) do we find the roots of this blurring already in the NT?

Finally, since focusing upon a Lucan character other than Jesus, Peter or Paul afforded us a fresh perspective on a variety of Lucan issues and even allowed us to view the three Lucan protagonists in a new light, we are encouraged to examine in detail Luke's treatment of other key supporting figures. Stephen represents a case in point, but, as we noted in chap. 1, he in fact has received ample attention from Lucan scholars in recent years.[1] Luke's perception of James (the emerging leader of the Jerusalem church), however, while the object of some study,[2] merits further investigation, and

the significant role of Barnabas "the encourager" in Acts has been almost as neglected or superficially treated as that of Philip the evangelist.[3]

NOTES

NOTE: An abbreviated form of citation is employed. Full titles and publication data may be found in the bibliography.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

[1] E.g. E. Haenchen, "Simon;" G. Lüdemann, "Acts;" R. Bergmeier, "Gestalt."

[2] E.g. O. C. Edwards Jr., "Exegesis;" M. Gourgues, "Esprit."

[3] Generally see E. Richard, "Luke," 7; F. Bovon, *Luke*, 344-59. Special recent studies related to the respective Lucan heroes include: Peter: W. Dietrich, *Petrusbild*; R. E. Brown *et. al.*, eds., *Peter*, 39-56, 109-28; Paul: J. Jervell, *Unknown Paul*; J. Roloff, "Paulus-Darstellung;" V. Stolle, *Zeuge*; Stephen: Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*; G. Stanton, "Stephen;" J. Kilgallen, *Stephen*.

[4] É. Trocmé, *Formation*, 253-59.

[5] B. Reicke, *Roots*, 169-73, 187-88.

[6] A. M. Johnson, Jr., "Philip."

[7] W. M. Ramsay, *Luke*, 303-05.

[8] Stanton, "Stephen," 345; cf. 345-46.

[9] Stanton, "Stephen," 346-47, particularly laments the common disjointing of the Stephen-speech and -narrative in scholarly investigation.

[10] The full title of Stanton's study is "Stephen in Lucan Perspective."

[11] H. Conzelmann, *Theology*, 18-94.

[12] Our approach is similar to that followed recently in R. C. Tannehill's *Narrative Unity*, a major literary analysis of the Gospel of Luke.

> I have chosen to focus on major roles in the narrative, understood in the context of the comprehensive purpose which is being realized throughout the narrative. I will be standing on the borderline between character and plot, understanding characters in terms of role, which is character in action and interaction within the unfolding plot (p. 1).
>
> The central chapters of this work are organized by narrative roles. They concern Jesus as he interacts with groups which appear repeatedly in the narrative (p. 5).

. . . the selection of material for discussion. . . is determined by the appearance of the characters that are the subject of the chapter. Within the chapters I am often following the order of relevant material in Luke, and I hope to preserve a sense of the forward movement of the story in doing so. However, it is sometimes important to point out connections with other material which may occur considerably earlier or later (p. 5).

[13] See H. Conzelmann, *Theology*; *Apg.*; "Luke's Place;" and E. Haenchen, *Acts*; "Book of Acts."

[14] See the useful survey of German commentaries on Acts from 1980 to 1985 in F. Hahn, "Gegenwärtige Stand." A. Weiser, *Apg.* (2 vols.) and Lüdemann, *Frühe Christentum*, give particular attention throughout their commentaries to detailed identification of traditional and redactional elements within each unit of the Acts narrative. For a recent special study of Acts 8.5-25 following standard redaction-critical methods, see D. -A. Koch, "Geistbesitz."

[15] E.g. I. H. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*; J. Dupont, *Nouvelles Études*; J. A. Fitzmyer, *Luke* (2 vols.).

[16] C. H. Talbert, review of *Gospel*, 337, marks 1974 as a watershed in American Lucan studies because in that year the ground-breaking lectures of P. S. Minear were given (later published as *To Heal and To Reveal*) and the Luke-Acts Seminar of the SBL began (see findings in Talbert, ed., *Perspectives* [1978] and *Luke-Acts. New Perspectives* [1984]).

[17] See Talbert, "Shifting Sands," 392-95.

[18] Marshall, *Luke: Historian*, 19-20, 218; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 6; F. S. Spencer, review of *Narrative Unity*, 354.

[19] See e.g. M. D. Goulder, "House," 1-24.

[20] Regarding the ongoing attempt by commentators on Acts to distinguish tradition and redaction, Hahn, "Gegenwärtige Stand," 190, comments: "Hier wird weiterzuarbeiten sein; vor allem ist eine brauchbare Kriteriologie immer noch ein Desiderat" (see also cols. 180-81).

[21] C.f. J. T. Carroll, *Response*, 32: "In Acts (as also in Luke 1-2), the absence of any reliably reconstructed sources requires that tradition-redaction analysis take a back seat to the literary analysis of the finished product."

[22] Cf. Talbert, review of *Gospel*, 337; M. C. Parsons, *Departure*, 18-19.

[23] However, Parsons, *Departure*, represents a recent, creative combination of diachronic and synchronic approaches in analyzing the ascension-narratives in Luke-Acts.

[24] P. S. Minear, *To Heal*, 83.

[25] J. B. Tyson, *Death*, 4.

[26] Tannehill, "Israel," 69.

[27] M. D. Hamm, "Freeing," 23.

[28] D. E. Smith, "Table Fellowship," 617.

[29] E.g. C. A. Evans, "Luke's Use," and the several articles by D. P. Moessner and T. L. Brodie cited in the bibliography.

[30] Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 3.

CHAPTER 2: PHILIP AND THE SAMARITANS

[1] See Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 54, 111, 147, 185, 188, 226, for examples of the technique of "inclusion," as he calls it in Luke's Gospel.

[2] See e.g. Acts 1.6; 2.41; 5.41; 9.31; 11.19; 12.5; 13.4; 15.3, 30; 16.5; 23.31. In these passages μὲν οὖν may mark either the beginning of a new section, the close of a previous section or both (functioning as a hinge). Acts 8.4 may be viewed as the conclusion to the Stephen-story as well as the introduction to the report of Philip's mission. Cf. Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 227; K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury, *Beginnings*, 4:7, 94-95; S. H. Levinsohn, *Textual Connections*, 141-50.

[3] *Contra* Lake and Cadbury, *Beginnings*, 4:95; F. F. Bruce, *Acts* (1962), 184; J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism*, 61; Marshall, *Acts*, 160.

[4] While Peter, as the apostolic spokesman, clearly overshadows John, John has not been totally eclipsed from the scene. The plural verbs in vv. 19 and 24 (δότε; δεήθητε ὑμεῖς) show that Simon addresses both Peter and John.

[5] Δύναμις and ἐξουσία are closely related throughout Luke-Acts: cf. Luke 4.36; 5.17, 24; 9.1; 10.13, 19; Acts 1.7, 8.

[6] Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 229, notes a similar "salient alternating pattern" with respect to Stephen and Saul structuring Acts 7.53-8.3: Stephen (7.57), Saul (7.58b), Stephen (7.59), Saul (8.1), Stephen (8.2), Saul (8.3).

[7] Koch, "Geistbesitz," 68. In the same article Koch later avers that "eine mündliche Erzählung," corresponding to the events in Luke's account, "hat weder eingeschlossenes Handlungsgerüst, noch kann für sie ein die ganze Erzählung bestimmendes Erzählziel angegeben" (pp. 72-73).

[8] See the older treatment by H. Waitz, "Quelle," 340-47, 352-55; and more recently the contributions by K. Löning, "Lukas," 205-09; E. Grässer, "Acta-Forschung," 25-34; Hahn, *Mission*, 48-49 n. 8; C. K. Barrett, "Light," 282-85; Trocmé, *"Livre"*, 181-83; Lüdemann, "Acts," 422-23; Koch, "Geistbesitz," 64-82; J. Roloff, *Apg.*, 131-33; Weiser, *Apg. 1-12*, 199-201; Haenchen, *Acts*, 305-08.

[9] O. Bauernfeind, *Apg.*, 124-25; Trocmé, *"Livre", 181-83; Hahn, Mission*, 48-49 n. 8.

[10] For the view that only the interaction between Philip and Simon derives from a traditional report, see Haenchen, *Gott*, 293-98; *idem*, *Acts*, 305-08; Roloff, *Apg.*, 131-33. The theory in this case is that behind Acts 8.18-24 was an earlier story about Simon's desire to purchase Philip's miraculous powers, not Peter's ability to impart the Spirit. Among those who judge only the Peter-Simon altercation to be pre-Lucan, see Löning, "Lukas," 205-09; Weiser, *Apg. 1-12*, 199-201; Koch, "Geistbesitz," 72ff.

[11] Barrett, "Light," 283. Cf. also the remarks of G. Stählin, *Apg.*, 116: "Mit Sicherheit läßt sich aber auch hier nicht behaupten, daß er [Lukas] überhaupt schriftliche Quellen benützt hat, und wenn es zutrifft, so hat er jedenfalls seine Quellen trotz gewissen stehengebliebenen Unausgeglichenheiten so gründlich verarbeitet, daß sie nicht mehr mit Sicherheit entfluchten werden können."

[12] R. Pesch, *Apg.*, 1:271.

[13] After a thorough assessment of scholarly opinion (see *Apg.*, 1:269-72), Pesch concludes: "Angesichts der unlösbaren Aporien literarkritischer (und darauf gestützter traditionsgeschichtlicher) Hypothesen ist also der Versuch geboten, 8,4-25 als einheitlichen, von Lukas bearbeiteten Erzählzusammenhang zu verstehen. Dieser Erzählzusammenhang wird durch die Themen Samaria-Mission und Auseinandersetzung mit dem in Samaria wirken den Magier Simon zusammengehalten" (p. 272).

[14] Though we will not always concur with W. Schmithal's conclusions about Luke's intention in Acts 8.4-25, his basic approach to the issue is similar to that being advocated here: "Die vorliegende Episode sperrt sich, wie zahlreiche unterchiedliche Erklärungen der Ausleger zeigen, gegen eine einfache Analyse. Es empfiehlt sich, in 8,5-25 zünachst die in dem bisherigen Gang durch die Apg. bereits als solche identifizierten eigenen Gedanken des Schriftstellers Lukas aufzusuchen, um auf dieser Grundlage als Besonderheiten der Perikope zu bedenken, die sich dabei als einheitliche lukanische Komposition erweisen wird" (*Apg.*, 79; cf. also 81).

[15] Barrett, "Light," 285, comments: ". . . when the actions ascribed to Philip are examined they appear to be confined to the purest generalities." Cf. Weiser, *Apg. 1-12*, 198-200; Trocmé, *"Livre"*, 183; M. Dibelius, *Studies*, 17 n. 34.

[16] From a source-critical standpoint we would surmise that either Luke knew very little about Philip's activities in Samaria or he chose to distill only the barest essential elements from a much fuller report.

[17] A. Harnack, *Acts*, 131-88, grouped together Acts 6.1-8.4; 11.19-30; 12.25; 13-15, as traditions of Antiochene provenance and associated the Philip material in 8.5-40 with the narratives in 3.1-5.16; 9.29-11.18; 12.1-24, which featured the apostle Peter and a Jerusalem-Caesarea setting. Harnack thought it probable that Philip himself, possibly along with his daughters, were Luke's source for this Philip-Peter unit (cf. Harnack, *Luke*, 153ff.) For similar, though not identical, constructions of the "Antioch" source and the isolation of Acts 8.5-40 from it, see J. Jeremias, "Untersuchungen," 247-53; R. Bultmann, "Zur Frage," 74-78; W. L. Knox, *Acts*, 23-26. Note the general discussion in Dupont, *Sources*, 35-39, 62-72.

[18] On Luke's penchant for holding his story together by repetitive phrases, sometimes at wide intervals, see Cadbury, "Four Features," 88-97. On

rejecting the linkage between Acts 8.4 and 11.19 as a necessary pointer to an underlying "Antioch" source, see G. Schille, *Apg.*, 200.

[19] Tannehill, *Narrative Unity* 30.

[20] In Acts 7.58-8.3 Luke highlights Saul's prominent role in the persecution by means of a progressive, three-fold reference: first Saul passively observes Stephen's stoning (7.58b); then he approvingly consents (8.1a); and ultimately he becomes the church's chief menace (8.3). Cf. G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:480.

[21] *Contra* E. F. F. Bishop, "Which Philip?" 154-59.

[22] In Acts 15.3 the Christian community in Samaria is paired with that in Phoenicia (cf. 11.19) as sympathetic to Paul's Gentile mission.

[23] Εὐαγγελίζομαι is dealt with later in this chapter, §2.2

[24] The three references in Acts represent the only NT uses of the verb διασπειρω; the noun διασπορα occurs only in John 7.35; James 1.1; 1 Pet 1.1.

[25] K. L. Schmidt, "διασπορά," 99, regards διασπορά in the LXX as a technical term for "the dispersion of the Jews among the Gentiles." For the opinion that this LXX usage lies behind Luke's thought, see G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:479 n. 65.

[26] On this "centripetal" movement, "the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to the Mountain of God," see Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise*, 55-61. Isa 66.18-20 does suggest an active outreach <u>to</u> the Gentiles, but one which will be accomplished by <u>Gentile</u> witnesses; cf. Hahn, *Mission*, 18-20; E. P. Sanders, *Jesus*, 214, 393 n. 18; E. Franklin, *Christ*, 122, 210 n. 16. In Isa 49.6, part of which Luke applies to Paul's mission in Acts 13.47, there is an emphasis upon Israel's being "a light to the nations" so that God's salvation might reach "to the end of the earth," but in the LXX this is conjoined with the return of Israel from the dispersion (καὶ τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ Ισραηλ ἐπιστρέψαι).

[27] Of course, these were <u>Jews</u> who had gathered from the end of the earth in Jerusalem (Acts 2.5), thus symbolizing the restoration of the Jewish Diaspora. But included among these pilgrims were proselytes as well (2.10), and the larger Pentecostal scene certainly portends the ingathering of the Gentile nations in its emphasis upon "<u>every</u> nation under heaven" (2.5), the Spirit's outpouring "upon all flesh" (2.17; cf. v. 39) and the opportunity for salvation for "<u>whoever</u> calls on the name of the Lord" (2.21).

[28] Hahn, *Mission*, 21-25, and D. Georgi, *Gegner*, 83 ff., suggest that, while Palestinian Jews generally did not aggressively seek after proselytes, Hellenistic Jews in the Diaspora were more mission-minded (like Luke). However, this supposed distinction of Diaspora Judaism has been convincingly

challenged in studies such as A. T. Kraabel, "Six Questionable Assumptions," 449-60, and J. Nolland, "Proselytism," 347-55. Thus, Luke's emphasis on active evangelization outside Jerusalem seems truly to have set him apart from the prevailing Judaism(s) of his day.

[29] The fact that Stephen debates in the synagogues belonging to Diaspora Jews (Acts 6.9) and that Stephen, Philip and other members of their circle of seven servants have Greek names may suggest that, in Luke's view, Stephen and his followers were themselves Hellenistic Jews who had migrated to Jerusalem from the Diaspora. For a fuller discussion of Stephen, Philip and "the Hellenists," see chap. 5.

[30] 31 of 42 occurrences in the NT appear in Luke-Acts.

[31] Lake and Cadbury, *Beginnings*, 4:108, note this frequent occurence of διέρχομαι in contexts pertaining to proclaiming the gospel, but warn against treating it as a technical missionary term in Luke's writings. Occasionally it is employed in connection with visits to previously evangelized areas (Acts 9.32; 16.6).

[32] Related terms include: ἀναγγέλλω, διδάσκω, διαγγέλλω, λαλέω, καταγγέλλω, πείθω; cf. Conzelmann, *Theology*, 218-25; Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 145-49.

[33] Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 78; Conzelmann, *Theology*, 222; Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 147-48.

[34] It is also used in connection with the annunciations of the angels (Luke 1.19; 2.10) and the preaching of the first missionaries in Antioch (Acts 11.20).

[35] The next greatest concentration of the term is in a section pertaining to Paul's first missionary journey (Acts 13.32-14.21), where it appears four times.

[36] A similar use of εὐαγγελίζομαι + accusative (denoting content of message) may be found in Acts 5.42; 11.20; 15.35; 17.18. Ἐυαγγελίζομαι + accusative (denoting audience) emerges in Luke 3.18; Acts 13.32; 14.21; 16.10. Cf. Marshall, *Luke: Historian*, 160. The use of περὶ τῆς βασιλείας with εὐαγγελίζομαι in Acts 8.12 is unique in Luke-Acts, but the same phrase occurs with related verbs in Luke 9.11 (λαλέω); Acts 1.3 (λέγω); Acts 19.8 (πείθω).

[37] See Cadbury, "Titles," 357-59; Harnack, *Date*, 104-06; J. C. O'Neill, *Theology* (1961), 119-29; S. S. Smalley, "Christology of Acts," 362; *idem*, "Christology of Acts Again," 79-93; C. F. D. Moule, "Christology," 174-75; D. L. Jones, "Title," 69-76.

[38] The typical Jewish mocking of the idea of a crucified Christ is reflected in Luke 23.35, 39. On Luke's distinctive emphasis on the suffering

Christ and its relationship to other NT passages (chiefly from 1 Peter), see Moule, "Christology," 168; Smalley, "Christology of Acts Again," 88-92; Jones, "Title," 73; J. A. T. Robinson, *Twelve*, 145-46.

[39] Cf. O'Neill's remark regarding Luke's usage of Χριστός: "it is always used when Jews, or men familiar with Jewish customs, are being addressed; and it is often used where the identification of the Messiah is the point of argument" (*Theology* [1961]), 120).

[40] O. Merk, "Reich," 204-06, observes that about one fourth of all references to βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke-Acts occur in a context of proclamation and that as a rule they are unique to Luke. Cf. also M. Völkel, "Deutung," 62-70.

[41] On the relationship between Luke 4.43-44 and the Nazareth-pericope in 4.16-30, see Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 77-79, 81-83; Völkel, "Deutung," 63-67; R. Maddox, *Purpose*, 133.

[42] Merk, "Reich," 205; Maddox, *Purpose*, 133.

[43] Stanton, *Jesus*, 17, remarks that with their emphasis on proclaiming the kingdom of God "the closing verses of Acts. . . are almost as important for Luke's theology as the closing verses of Matthew for Matthean theology."

[44] Merk, "Reich," 205-06; R. Schnackenburg, *God's Rule*, 261.

[45] Stanton, *Jesus*, 17-18. There seems to be no basis for the view of Lake and Cadbury, *Beginnings*, 4:4, that the kingdom of God in Acts refers to "the Christian Church."

[46] Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 154.

[47] Cf. Merk, "Reich," 219: "Der Verkünder im Evangelium des Lukas aber ist in den kerygmatischen Texten der Apg zum Verkündigten geworden."

[48] For a development of the view that "we should take seriously the possibility that Luke seriously meant to say, the kingdom of God is a present reality for the disciples, which they seek to share with whoever will listen," see Maddox, *Purpose*, 132-37.

[49] *Contra* Haenchen, *Acts*, 723, who erroneously thinks that "the kingdom of God proclaimed in Acts 8.12; 28.23, 31 has the same futuristic sense as in 14.22, simply because in these places "it is mentioned along with the events of Jesus." Cf. Stanton, *Jesus*, 18. Maddox, *Purpose*, 136-37, contends that even in Acts 14.22 Luke intended a present, non-eschatological understanding of "entering the kingdom of God."

[50] See the discussion in H. Kee, *Miracle*, 200-02.

[51] Cf. F. Pereira, *Ephesus*, 118-26.

[52] H. Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 243; Dunn, *Jesus*, 164.

[53] Marshall, *Luke: Historian*, 179.

[54] Cf. Conzelmann, *Theology*, 177-78.

[55] On this point of Luke's connection of Jesus' name with gospel-preaching, see especially J. Ziesler, "Name," 28-41, though we do not follow Ziesler in concluding that this emphasis is wholly exclusive of any tendency to associate Jesus' name with "a presently active Jesus" (see above). In particular, the references to Jesus' name in conjunction with the healing incident at the temple seem to incorporate both the idea of Jesus' powerful presence and the message of salvation in Jesus which the apostles proclaimed (Acts 3.6, 16; 4.10, 12, 17, 18).

[56] See P. J. Achtemeier, "Lukan Perspective," 156-57; J. Jervell, *Unknown Paul*, 86-87; G. Lampe, "Miracles in the Acts," 168.

[57] As is well-known Luke's Nazareth-episode is greatly expanded over its Synoptic parallels (Mark 6.1-6//Matt 13.53-58). Matthew and Mark both mention Jesus' teaching and performance of mighty works in a general way, but only Luke gives an extended discussion of the nature and significance of this dual ministry.

[58] J. A. Hardon, "Miracle Narratives," 311; cf. Achtemeier, "Lukan Perspective," 159; and the similar assessment of Kee, *Miracle*, 220: "For Luke miracle functions, not only to heighten the drama of the narrative, but also to show that at every significant point in the transitions of Christianity from its Jewish origins in Jerusalem to its Gentile outreaching to Rome itself the hand of God is evident in the form of public miraculous confirmation."

[59] Luke shows a certain affinity for public demonstrations in a "loud voice" in a variety of contexts (e.g. Luke 8.28; 17.15; 23.23, 46; Acts 14.10; 16.28). Of particular note because of their close proximity to the account of Philip's exorcisms are the examples from the closing verses of Acts 7, where Stephen's opponents cry out against him with a φωνῇ μεγάλῃ (7.57), and then Stephen himself utters a prayer for his executioners in a φωνῇ μεγάλῃ (7.60).

[60] Also there is the emphasis on the experience of "much joy" (πολλὴ χαρὰ) as a result of Philip's ministry (Acts 8.8).

[61] Cf. Lampe, "Miracles in the Acts," 173.

[62] Dunn, *Jesus*, notes this parallel between Acts 8.13 and 19.11 and views the emphasis on <u>great</u> miraculous works as evidence of Luke's general attitude that "the more eye-catching the miracle the greater the propaganda value."

[63] Cf. Exod 4.8, 9, 17, 28, 30; 7.3, 9; 10.1-2; 11.9-10; 12.13; Deut 29.2-3; 34.10-12; Bar 2.11.

[64] The function of Moses' signs and wonders to authenticate his prophetic vocation is clearly brought out in Exod 4.1-9; Deut 34.10-12; and Jos. *Ant.* 2.274-87. Cf. G. Macrae, "Miracle," 296-98.

[65] On the Lucan characterization of Jesus and the ministers of the early church as rejected prophets-like-Moses, see §3.1 in chap. 3.

[66] Cf. K. Rengstorf, "σημεῖον," 241; Dunn, *Jesus*, 163; Lampe, "Miracles in the Acts," 170-71.

[67] See §3.2 in chap. 3 for a working out of this Philip-Moses connection.

[68] Cf. Moule, "Excursus," 235.

[69] Cf. Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 246. Again, this matter will be pursued in more detail in chap. 3.

[70] The "they" in Acts 8.12 relates back to "the multitudes" and "many" of 8.6-7.

[71] Cf. Roloff, *Kerygma*, 193-94 n. 306.

[72] Jervell, *Unknown Paul*, 81, is mistaken when he states that "Philip's mission to Samaria. . . begins [my emphasis] with a miraculous event."

[73] D. Georgi, *Opponents*, 168, ignores this fundamental distinction between the Samaritans' respective responses to Philip and Simon and, consequently, is led to the erroneous judgment, unsupported by the text of Acts 8.5-13, that in Philip's ministry "miracle activity takes the spotlight from proclamation."

[74] Jervell, *Unknown Paul*, 86-87, concludes in relation to word and miracle in the Acts account of Paul's ministry that there is "no doubt that for Luke the primacy is given the proclamation." "By way of summary we can say that for Luke Paul's miracles comprise a secondary part of his preaching and teaching, for the miracles demonstrate the irresistible nature of God's word." Cf. Dunn, *Jesus*, 168: "In the Acts of Luke the miraculous is subordinated to the theological purpose of demonstrating the wonderful progress of the 'Word of God'."

[75] Roloff, *Kerygma*, 192-96; cf. the discussion in F. Neirynck, "Miracle Stories," 203-04.

[76] Notice in Acts 4.20 and 22.14-15, where "seeing and hearing" are mentioned in the same order as in Luke 7.22, that the emphasis is still clearly on the apostles' and Paul's speaking/bearing witness to what they have already "seen and heard" of Jesus.

[77] Dunn, *Baptism*, 64-65.

[78] In Dunn's view (*Baptism*, 55-68), it is this deficiency in the Samaritans' faith that accounts for their failure to receive the Spirit under Philip's ministry. See our discussion of the problem of the Samaritans' reception of Spirit in §3., chap. 5.

[79] *Contra* Georgi, *Opponents*, 168-69, who denies this distinction in his exclusive emphasis on the correspondences between Philip's and Simon's respective ministries among the Samaritans.

[80] I fail to see why Dunn, *Baptism*, 64, dismisses the Lydia example as "hardly to be compared" with the Samaritans' case. Both Acts 8.6 and 16.14 stress "giving heed to what what was said by" Christian missionaries, the only difference being the utilization of variant terms for "what was said" (λεγομένοις/λαλουμένοις). There is of course no doubt about the genuineness of Lydia's response.

[81] Dunn, *Baptism*, 65; *idem*, "'They believed'," 181-82.

[82] Cf. E. A. Russell, "'They believed'," 169-76; Marshall, *Acts*, 156.

[83] §3., chap. 5.

[84] Acts 8.8 functions as a summary statement of the reaction to the total ministry of Philip described in 8.5-7.

[85] M. Miyoshi, *Anfang*, 8-9, regards ἀνάληψις as referring primarily to Jesus' ascension but also inclusive of the events of Jesus' passion and resurrection leading up to his ascension.

[86] Cf. J. Jervell, *Luke*, 113-17.

[87] Cf. Miyoshi, *Anfang*, 13; Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 830; E. E. Ellis, *Luke*, 151; C. A. Evans, "Luke's Use," 80. The ἀνάληψις-reference in Luke 9.51 is likely also an allusion to Elijah's "assumption" into heaven (cf. 4 Kgdms 2.9, 10, 11; Sir 48.9; 1 Macc 2.58; Miyoshi, *Anfang* 8-9; C. A. Evans, "Luke's Use," 81-82).

[88] J. M. Ross, "Rejected Words," 85-88: (1) It is easier to explain the omission of the disputed words than their inclusion by later versions; (2) other stories of Jesus following a similar literary form usually ended with a saying of Jesus; (3) the content of the disputed words fits the general tenor of the genuine sayings of Jesus.

[89] On the comparison between Luke 9.51-56 and the Gema incident, see J. M. Ford, *My Enemy*, 84-91; *idem*, "Reconciliation," 90-92; D. Flusser, "Lukas 9:51-56," 166-67.

[90] See e.g. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 230; M. S. Enslin, "Luke and the Samaritans," 284-85; *idem*, "Samaritan Ministry," 30-33; Miyoshi, *Anfang*, 16-18; D. Tiede, *Prophecy*, 55.

[91] J. T. Sanders, *Jews*, 144; cf. 180-81.

[92] Cf. Jervell, *Luke*, 123-24.

[93] E.g. C. C. McCown, "Geography of Luke's Central Section," 56-66; *idem*, "Gospel Geography," 14-18; E. Lohse, "Missionarisches Handeln," 1-13; Enslin, "Samaritan Ministry," 29-38.

[94] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 165-66, 824-26.

[95] The precise significance of the geographical note in Luke 17.11 has been a matter of considerable discussion. See e.g. Lohse, Missionarisches Handeln," 7-9; J. Blinzler, "Literarische Eigenart," 46-50; G. Sellin, "Komposition," 16-17; Sanders, *Jews*, 144-45; Conzelmann, *Theology*, 68-73. M. Hengel, "Luke," 100, cuts across the debate with a sober conclusion: "In Luke 17.11, the geographical information over which scholars have argued so much and which tends to be over-interpreted remains utterly obscure. We do not know what the author had in mind here. For 'Luke's only concern is to explain the presence of a Samaritan among the Jews' (17.16)."

[96] Sellin, "Komposition," 115-16.

[97] On the question of whether we should read "seventy" or "seventy-two" in Luke 10.1, see B. M. Metzger, "Seventy," 299-306; *idem*, *Textual Commentary*, 150-51. Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 115, see the basis for the variant manuscript evidence in the MT of Genesis 10, which enumerates seventy nations of the world, and the LXX version of the same chapter, which lists seventy-two nations. He goes on to conclude: "Whatever the original reading, then, the point is the same. The number seventy or seventy-two symbolizes all the nations of the world: the mission is a universal one." Cf. W. Manson, *Luke*, 123.

[98] Note how Luke 9.52 and 10.1 are linked together by a common emphasis on Jesus' sending (ἀποστέλλω) messengers ahead of him. On the general connection between Luke 9.51-56 and 10.1-24, see Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 232-35; Miyoshi, *Anfang*, 25-27.

[99] See Tannehill, "Mission," 62-63.

[100] Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 230, notes that in Luke "the Elijah stories are being used critically. Elijah is not only prototype but also antitype, and the contrast receives strong accent in Luke 9." A similar critical treatment is to be seen with respect to Elisha in the next scene (Luke 9.61-62; cp. 1 Kgs 19.19-21).

[101] L. C. Crockett, "Luke 4.25-27," 183, goes too far in his conclusion that Luke 4.25-27 foreshadows "Jewish-gentile reconciliation [his emphasis]," but he is correct in his observation that this passage is "certainly not" designed to disclose God's final rejection of Israel.

[102] Miyoshi, *Anfang*, 25-26. The comparison between Luke 9.52 and 7.27 is especially strong:

καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ (9.52)
ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου (7.27)

[103] The report in Luke 9.54 that James and John "saw" the Samaritans' rejection of Jesus may suggest that they had been present in the village and experienced the Samaritans' rebuff first-hand.

[104] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 827, 664.

[105] By focusing so exclusively on Luke 9.51-56 as the beginning of a new section, the contacts of this passage with the preceding material in Luke 9 are often ignored. Among those, however, who perceive these contacts are Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 400-02; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 230; J. Kodell, "Luke," 419-23.

[106] The "surprise" element in the Samaritan's ministry is noted by R. W. Funk, "Good Samaritan," 80; J. D. M. Derrett, *Law*, 220-21.

[107] Cf. Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 354-55 n. 8; B. van Elderen, "Another Look," 115-16.

[108] Cf. R. J. Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 94, and further discussion of Samaritan-Jewish relations below.

[109] Cf. Ford, *My Enemy*, 92.

[110] I have discussed this in detail in F. S. Spencer, "2 Chronicles 28:5-15," 317-49. Cf. Derrett, *Law*, 210, though he feels other OT passages, especially Hosea 6, were equally influential on the story's composition; F. H. Wilkinson, "Oded," 94; M. Black, "Parables," 285-86.

[111] Van Elderen, "Another Look," 117-18, notes in particular how Jesus' activity in Luke 18.35-43 corresponds with the Good Samaritan's behavior. Near Jericho Jesus heals a blind beggar who is crying out for mercy and in the process stands out as a model of compassion over against an insensitive crowd who attempts to silence the afflicted man.

[112] D. Gewalt, "'Barmherzige Samariter'," 408.

[113] On the significance of the ἐπιστάτα-title in this context, see O. Glombitza, "Dankbare Samariter," 241-43, 245.

[114] On the "Christian" status of the grateful Samaritan, see Glombitza, "Dankbare Samariter," 243-46; H. D. Betz, "Cleansing," 315-16, 318-21.

[115] The disclosure of the Samaritan identity of the one thankful leper is held back until this point of the story for dramatic emphasis.

[116] J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *Vocabulary*, 23; cf. Coggins, "Samaritans and Acts," 431.

[117] The reference in Jdt 9.2 to the Shechemite "strangers" who defiled Dinah (cf. Genesis 34) may be a polemical allusion to the Samaritans (see more below).

[118] J. Bowman, *Samaritan Problem*, 69-70. Also associating the Samaritans with Gentiles in Luke's perspective are Jeremias, "Σαμάρεια," 91-93, and Enslin, "Samaritan Mission," 29-30.

[119] Jervell, *Luke*, 117; cf. 113-32.

[120] Jervell, *Luke*, 117, 131 n. 41; cf. J. A. Montgomery, *Samaritans*, 160 n. 20.

[121] In *J.W.* 5.193, when referring to the temple inscription prohibiting entry to foreigners, Josephus uses ἀλλόφυλος in place of ἀλλογενής; cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, 23.

[122] On the influence of the Naaman-incident on Luke 17.11-19 see W. Bruners, *Reinigung*, 287-306; Enslin, "Luke and the Samaritans," 295-96; *idem*, "Samaritan Mission," 33.

[123] Cf. G. B. Caird, *Saint Luke*, 195: "For Luke the most attractive part of the story was that the Samaritan, by his eager appreciation, showed up his Jewish fellow-sufferers, and gave a foretaste of the opening of the kingdom to the Gentiles."

[124] Even though we should probably envisage the Samaritan as heading off to his own temple and priest while the nine Jews go to Jerusalem (Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 651, thinks the plural ἱερεῖς indicates that "each man would go to the appropriate priest"), all ten lepers share a common respect for Pentateuchal legislation.

[125] Cf. Hengel, "Luke," 122; Coggins, "Samaritans and Acts," 431-32; G. Bouwman, "Samaria," 119.

[126] J. T. Sanders, *Jews*, 132-53, chap. 5.

[127] ". . . it matters not a whit whether the person who anoints Jesus or the leper who is healed or the one who prays for redemption in the Temple is an outcast, a Samaritan, or a proselyte or God-fearer. Their response to

Jesus or their exemplary piety is of one piece, and the differences exist only for verisimilitude and for narrative interest" (J. T. Sanders, *Jews*, 147).

[128] Recent historical studies have tended to view the relationship between Samaritans and Jews in the ancient world as a complex and ambiguous one. While recognizing the tensions which prevailed between these two religious groups, there is a growing reluctance among scholars to speak of any hard-and-fast schism that allowed for no congenial interaction. Along the same lines, rather than viewing Samaritanism as a strictly sectarian movement, there is a tendency now to probe its identity "as a variety of Judaism." See the useful survey in J. D. Purvis, "Samaritans and Judaism," 81-98; also F. Dexinger, "Limits," 88-114.

[129] On Josephus' sentiment toward the Samaritans, see Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 93-99; R. Pummer, "Genesis 34," 183-86.

[130] Cf. the summary of the Mishnah's treatment of the Samaritans in E. Schürer, *History*, 2:19: "The Samaritans are never treated purely and simply as foreigners, but as a race of uncertain derivation. Their Israelite extraction cannot be taken as proven, but neither can it be a priori excluded." On the variegated portrayal of the Samaritans in the larger corpus of rabbinic literature, see Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 354-58; Montgomery, *Samaritans*, 165-203; G. Alon, *Jews, Judaism*, 354-73; L. Schiffmann, "Samaritans," 323-50.

[131] See the ET of *Masseket Kutim* in Montgomery, *Samaritans*, 197-203; the citation is from p. 197.

[132] In the first century a mixed population of Jews, Gentiles and Samaritans actually inhabited the region of Samaria, but Luke is not interested in such demographic particulars. As Hengel, "Luke," 122, states: "basically so far as Luke's terminology goes, we can say that he always uses the word Σαμάρεια to refer to the territory of the Samaritans, that ethnic religious group whose members are not proper Jews but even less can be counted among the Gentiles."

[133] "Judea" can refer in Luke-Acts to the whole of Palestine (Luke 1.5; 7.17; 23.5; Acts 10.37), but for the most part, as in the present case, designates that part of Palestine inhabited by the Jews. Cf. Pesch, *Apg.*, 1:70; G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:203; Hengel, "Luke," 99.

[134] There is some debate as to how many stages in in the church's world-wide mission are predicted in Acts 1.8 and illustrated in the course of the book of Acts. C. Burchard, "Fußnoten," 161, sees only two stages: Jews (Jerusalem, Judea and Samaria) and Gentiles (end of the earth); Hahn, *Mission*, 132-33, delineates three stages: (1) Jerusalem, (2) Judea and Samaria and (3) the end of the earth; but we prefer G. Schneider's conclusion that in the Acts account Luke distinguishes <u>four</u> separate stages of missionary outreach--Jerusalem/Judea/Samaria/end of the earth--though the two middle stages are closely related (*Apg.*, 1:203-04).

[135] Though suggested by E. H. Plumptre, "Samaritan Element," 34-39, as early as 1878, the real impetus for investigating Samaritan traditions within the Stephen speech came with the published summary of A. Spiro's work as an appendix to J. Munck's commentary on Acts ("Stephen's Samaritan Background," 285-300).

[136] Spiro, "Stephen's Samaritan Background," 285-300. Among those who follow Spiro in assuming Stephen's Samaritan identity are Purvis, "Fourth Gospel," 176-77; A. M. Johnson, Jr., "Philip," 51-57; Bouwman, "Samaria," 133-39.

[137] M. H. Scharlemann, *Stephen*, 53.

[138] C. H. H. Scobie, "Origins," 398-99; R. Scroggs, "Earliest Hellenistic Christianity," 200-201.

[139] O. Cullmann, *Johannine Circle*, 39-53; *idem*, "Von Jesus," 44-56.

[140] L. Gaston, *No Stone*, 154-61.

[141] Our treatment of the Stephen speech from a Lucan perspective follows the basic supposition expressed by Barrett, "Old Testament History ," 57 n. 1: ". . . whether or not Stephen. . . uttered the words attributed to [him] we may be confident that Luke approved of the opinions he ascribed. . . to [this] noted Christian [leader]." Among those studies which have confirmed the integral place of the Stephen speech within Luke's overall presentation, see J. Bihler, *Stephanusgeschichte*; Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*; Stanton, "Stephen," 345-60; J. Via, "Interpretation," 190-207.

[142] Cf. R. Bergmeier, "Frühdatierung," 121-53; Pummer, "New Evidence?" 100-01; *idem*, *Samaritans*, 6-8; Stanton, "Samaritan Incarnational Christology?" 243.

[143] The relevant passages are Acts 7.4 compared with Gen 11.32; 7.5 with Deut 2.5; 7.32 with Exod 3.6; and 7.37 with Deut 18.15. See M. Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 27-30, 33-34; Spiro, "Stephen's Samaritan Background," 285; Scobie, "Origins," 391-94.

[144] Cf. Barrett, "Old Testament History," 61, 63-64; Richard, "Acts 7," 196-97, 202-06; G. Schneider, "Stephanus," 226-27.

[145] Cf. Purvis, *Samaritan Pentateuch*, 69-87; Pummer, "Samaritan Pentateuch," 441-43; *idem*, "Present State: I," 42-47.

[146] Several scholars admit to being impressed and ultimately persuaded by this "cumulative" effect of the Samaritan evidence relative to the Stephen speech: Scharlemann, *Stephen*, 50-51 (lists 15 possible points of contact between the Stephen speech and Samaritanism); Scroggs, "Earliest Hellenistic Christianity," 192-93; Scobie, "Origins," 396. Richard, "Acts 7," 194, rightly criticizes this stance on the grounds that "weak arguments, no matter how numerous, prove very little."

[147] Cf. Purvis, *Samaritan Pentateuch*, 105-09; G. E. Wright, "Samaritans," 357-66.

[148] Cf. H. Koester, *History*, 1:247-48.

[149] Citation from Bowman, *Samaritan Documents*, 23-24; on the Samaritan Decalogue, see pp. 9-25; M. Gaster, *Samaritans*, 185-90.

[150] Cf. Pummer, *Samaritans*, 6; Scobie, "Use," 406.

[151] Scobie, "Use," 409. The criticisms which have been directed against Scobie's work predominantly focus on his earlier investigation, "Origins" (1972/73). But this more recent treatment, "Use" (1978/79), marks a considerable advance, taking into account objections which had been raised against the previous article and offering a more nuanced, sophisticated analysis. Curiously, little attention has been paid to this update of Scobie's position.

[152] Scobie, "Use," 406-07.

[153] G. Stemberger, "Stephanusrede," 159.

[154] K. Haacker, "Samaritan," 464; G. Schneider, "Stephanus," 228.

[155] Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 49-54; N. A. Dahl, "Story," 143.

[156] Scobie, "Use," 408-09, building in part on traditions in *Samaritan Chronicle II*.

[157] Gilgal was the site where the twelve stones from the dried up Jordan River bed were erected and where the celebration of the first passover after entering the promised land took place (Joshua 4-5). As such it would seem more entitled than Shechem to be called the first worship center set up by Joshua in Canaan (*contra* Scobie, "Use," 408).

[158] Scobie, "Use," 407-08.

[159] Scobie, "Use," 407; *contra* Barrett, "Old Testament History," 62, and Jeremias, *Heiligengräber*, 37, who regard only οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν in 7.15 as the subject of the verbs in 7.16.

[160] As attempted by W. H. Mare, "Acts 7," 10, 19-20.

[161] S. Lowy, *Principles*, 53.

[162] Stemberger, "Stephanusrede," 164.

[163] Scobie, "Use," 407-08; Jeremias, *Heiligengräber*, 36-38; H. G. Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 111-12. Interestingly, a critic such as G. Stemberger, who generally opposes a Samaritan backdrop for the Stephen speech,

recognizes the utilization of Samaritan tradition in this case ("Stephanusrede," 162-65, 173). Dahl, "Story," 143, comments that "an unparalleled confusion is found in Acts 7.16," but on p. 155 n. 24 he admits that "possibly a Samaritan local tradition, that all the (twelve?) patriarchs were buried at Shechem, has been reinterpreted. . ." Richard stops short of tracing Acts 7.16 to a specifically Samaritan tradition, but he does assert that the author of the Stephen speech is deviating at this point from his customary OT source and "is in fact emphasizing an old tradition which presented Shechem as the burial place of the patriarchs" (*Acts 6:1-8:4*, 323-24 n. 184), knowing full well the polemical effect of Shechem's association with Samaritan territory ("Polemical Character," 259-60).

[164] The patristic witnesses include Julius Africanus, Jerome and George Syncellus. See Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 111-12; Jeremias, *Heiligengräber*, 36-38; Barrett, "Old Testament History," 62-63.

[165] Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 82-86; cf. Purvis, *Samaritan Pentateuch*, 119-29; Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 353-53.

[166] Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 90, regards the story in Genesis 34 as the "Magna Charta jüdischer Gewalttätigkeit gegen die Sichemiter;" cf. pp. 87-90 for a larger discussion of anti-Samaritan polemic behind Jewish treatments of Genesis 34. Also see Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 88-94; J. J. Collins, "Epic," 91-104. For a position which raises doubts about the alleged anti-Samaritan bias in early Jewish literature, see Pummer, "Antisamaritanische Polemik," 224-42; *idem*, "Genesis 34," 177-88.

[167] Cadbury, *Book of Acts*, 105-06.

[168] This foundational function of Acts 7.2-8 in relation to the larger discourse in Acts 7 has been explored by Dahl, "Story," 42-48, though he regards "promise and fulfillment" as the leading theme which unifies the speech.

[169] W. D. Davies, *Gospel*, 270, notes that the reference to "before he lived in Haran" "adds force to the extra-territorial nature of the revelation."

[170] See Stemberger, "Stephanusrede," 164-65, 173; Davies, *Gospel*, 267-74; Kilgallen, *Stephen Speech*, 17-21; A. Ehrhardt, *Acts*, 34.

[171] The rejection theme in the Stephen speech is particularly stressed by Stanton, "Stephen," 353-57 (he calls it "the major theme of the whole speech," p. 354); Kilgallen, *Stephen Speech*, 108-13; Via, "Interpretation," 191-96; L. T. Johnson, *Literary Function*, 76; Tannehill, "Israel," 79-81. For a tradition-historical viewpoint that envisions one of the underlying layers of the Stephen speech as a "deuteronomistic" strain highlighting the parallel between the Jews' rejection of Jesus and their perennial rejection of the prophets, see O. Steck, *Israel*, 265-67; G. Schneider, "Stephanus," 230-37.

[172] For the specific connection between Acts 7.16 and the motif of God's involvement with his people on foreign soil, see Davies, *Gospel*, 270; Stemberger, "Stephanusrede," 164-65, 173; Richard, "Polemical Character," 259-60; Dahl, "Story," 143, 155 n. 24.

[173] Cadbury's contention that in the Shechem-reference in Acts 7.16 the author of Acts engages in "the most biting form of anti-Jewish polemic" (*Book of Acts*, 105) appears exaggerated in light of the note of forgiveness toward the hostile Jews sounded at the close of the Stephen episode ("Lord, do not hold this sin against them" [Acts 7.60; cf. Luke 23.34]).

[174] Cf. Scroggs, "Earliest Hellenistic Christianity," 197; Bouwman, "Samaria," 137-38.

[175] The viewpoint that in the ancient world the Samaritans were particularly susceptible to compromising their religious beliefs and practices under the pressures of Hellenization (largely on the basis of an incident in the reign of Antiochus IV recorded in Jos. *Ant.* 12.257-64) has been proven unfounded in recent studies. See Pummer, *Samaritans*, 4; *idem*, "Genesis 34," 184-86; Hengel, *Judaism*, 1:293-94.

[176] Cf. R. F. O'Toole, *Unity*, 62-94; *idem*, "Parallels," 195-212.

[177] The inclusion of the definite article follows the best manuscript evidence: p^{74}, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and Vaticanus.

[178] Cp. especially the Parable of the Lost Son, Luke 15.11-32.

[179] More specifically, the greedy and self-absorbed Simon stands out as a manifest exception to the "Good Samaritan," who sacrifices his money and possessions while fulfilling the law of love, and to the "Grateful Samaritan," whose worshipful interest in Jesus extends beyond the miraculous and self-centered.

[180] Hengel, "Luke," 126.

[181] Historically, Shechem was also not in existence as such in Luke's day, having been rebuilt in 72 C.E. as Flavius Neapolis. But the narrative link between the references to a major Samaritan city in Acts 8.5 and to the ancient biblical city of Shechem would still have been obvious to Luke's readers.

[182] Cf. Richard, "Polemical Character," 259-60: "Shechem here [Acts 7.16] prepares for the Samaria episode of 8:5-6." Acts 7.16 "is. . . structurally. . . significant. It prepares for the spread of the good news outside of Jerusalem to Samaria. . ."

[183] Cf. O. Bauernfeind, *Apg.*, 122; Hengel, *Acts*, 78.

CHAPTER 3: PHILIP AND SIMON MAGUS

[1] For helpful surveys of recent scholarship on the Simon Magus question, see W. A. Meeks, "Simon," 137-42; Grässer, "Acta-Forschung," 25-34; K. Rudolph, "Simon," 279-359.

[2] This Philip-Simon parallelism is observed in K. Beyschlag, *Simon*, 100-01; Roloff, *Apg.*, 131-32.

[3] Bauernfeind, *Apg.*, 125, suggests that the mention of "both men and women" responding to Philip's ministry in 8.12 is an indication of the breadth of Philip's influence comparable to Simon's attraction of "the least to the greatest."

[4] For a citation and general discussion of the various Simonian traditions, see R. P. Casey, "Simon," 151-63; E. Meyer, *Ursprung*, 3:277-302; Beyschlag, *Simon*, 7-78.

[5] Justin, *Apol.* 1.26; Iren. A. H. 1.23; Hipp. *Ref.* 6.9-20; cf. also Epiph. *Haer.* 21.

[6] Haenchen, *Acts*, 307; *idem*, *Gott*, 297; Lüdemann, *Untersuchungen*, 42; *idem*, "Acts," 423.

[7] Bergmeier, "Gestalt," 270.

[8] For a more extended critique of Haenchen's and Lüdemann's theories, see Beyschlag, *Simon*, 106, 122-24; *idem*, "Simon-Magus-Frage," 395-415; Bergmeier, "Quellen?" 200-20; *idem*, "Gestalt," 267-75; R. McL. Wilson, "Simon," 485-91; E. Yamauchi, *Pre-Christian Gnosticism*, 58-65.

[9] Talbert, *Luke and the Gnostics*, 83.

[10] *Ibid.*, 83-97.

[11] J. Drane, "Simon," 131-37, also pursues the questionable line of reasoning that Luke was aware of traditions which linked Simon to Gnosticism but elected not to report them in the interest of promoting Christian unity. Only, in Drane's view, Luke's concern for unity stemmed not from "early catholic" ideas, as Talbert avers, but from a "salvation historical" agenda which emphasized in Acts 8 the "reunification of Jews and Samaritans in Christ." Supporting our view that Luke does <u>not</u> regard the apostolic age as wholly free from heresy and schism, see van Unnik, "Apostelgeschichte," 402-09.

[12] Barrett, *Luke* (1961), 62, leaves open the possibility that Luke "pillories gnostic leaders in the person of Simon Magus," but hastens to add "a more important observation," namely, "that Luke studiously avoids gnostic thought and language." Later, in "Light" (1979), 286, Barrett flatly states,

"there is nothing in Acts 8 to suggest that Simon was a gnostic," and "for Luke Simon was not a gnostic but a μάγος."

[13] See primarily §3.3. Regarding the Pseudo-Clementine treatment of Simon Magus, we should take note that, while it may offer some potentially useful points of contacts with the account in Acts 8, it also supplies many legendary embellishments which appear unrelated to our concerns: e.g. the apparent polemical identification of Simon Magus with Paul (Enslin's suggestion ["Once Again," 270] that for Luke Simon Magus' activity in Acts 8 symbolizes Paul's abortive attempt to buy his way into the apostolic community in Jerusalem seems far-fetched and inconsistent with Luke's generally favorable portrait of the great missionary to the Gentiles).

[14] Among those who find the θεῖος ἀνήρ category suitable for Simon, see Stählin, *Apg.*, 120; Roloff, *Apg.*, 134, 137-38; Beyschlag, *Simon*, 102-06, 122-24; Barrett, "Light," 291.

[15] Cf. Bergmeier, "Frühdatierung," 148.

[16] E.g. Bergmeier, "Frühdatierung," 148; Beyschlag, *Simon*, 104-05; Conzelmann, *Apg*, 60-61; G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:489-90; Weiser, *Apg. 1-12*, 200.

[17] Cf. also Luke 6.15 ("Simon called Zelotes"; 8.21 ("Mary. . . Magdalene"); Acts 1.23 ("Joseph. . . Barsabbas"); 15.37 ("John. . . Mark").

[18] For a survey of the various relevant religious-historical contexts, see Beyschlag, *Simon*, 106-20; Lüdemann, *Untersuchungen*, 42-49; Rudolph, "Simon," 320-28.

[19] Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 329-48; cf. *idem*, "Gebetbuch," 76-103.

[20] Fossum, *Name*, 171-72; cf. Coggins, "Samaritans and Acts," 430-31. Kippenberg and Fossum both go on to theorize from their perception of the Samaritan background to the "Great Power" concept that Samaritanism must have been the *Mutterboden* from which Simonian gnosis sprang. Such an assessment of Gnostic origins, however, remains highly speculative and goes beyond our simple concern to demonstrate a possible point of contact between Luke's presentation of Simon Magus and external Samaritan traditions.

[21] G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:490 n. 60, observes that while Simon's popularity had been acquired over an extended period, Philip "sehr schnell zum Erfolg kam." The direct and compact description of Philip's ministry certainly creates the picture of a fast-paced, unterrupted success: "Philip went down . . . proclaimed to the them the Christ. And the multitudes with one accord gave heed. . ." (Acts 8.5-6).

[22] Cf. F. Mussner's comment on Acts 8.13: "He [Simon] is 'amazed' over the miracles of Philip, wherewith Luke wants to say that the 'sorceries' of Simon were nothing in comparison with the miracles of Philip. . ." (my trans., *Apg.*, 50).

[23] Προσκαρτερέω is used several times in the book of Acts in connection with the early Christians' devotion to various aspects of worship and fellowship (Acts 1.14; 2.42, 46; 6.4). Most comparable, however, to the usage in 8.13, which denotes Simon's attachment to a person (Philip), is the instance in 10.7 referring to Peter's servants who "waited on him."

[24] Ἐξουσία is used in Acts 8.19 in connection with Simon's request for the power to impart the Spirit and seems to be a stylistic variant of δύναμις (as elsewhere in Luke-Acts), thus forming a lexical link with 8.10.

[25] Here we demarcate the particular conflict with magic and magicians from that with demonic forces in general. Observing this distinction which he considers of historical importance, Kee, *Miracle*, 211-18, points out that the book of Acts is unique in the NT in featuring miracles which are associated in some degree with magical technique (see esp. pp. 211-12 n. 69, where Kee interacts with the studies of J. Hull and M. Smith).

[26] For the observation and discussion of some or all of the following parallel incidents from the Pauline mission in relation to the Simon-Magus-story, see Kee, *Miracle*, 216-18; Georgi, *Opponents*, 167-70; Barrett, "Light," 289-91; G. Klein, "Synkretismus," 50-77; E. S. Fiorenza, "Miracles," 8-20.

[27] Cf. G. Delling, "μάγος," 359. Except for the reference to the "magi" in Matthew's Gospel, the occurrences of μάγος and cognates in the NT are restricted to the Simon- and Elymas-episodes in the book of Acts.

[28] The analogy between Peter's and Paul's respective confrontations with magicians is commonly recognized as part of a larger scheme of parallelism involving the two great Christian heroes in the first and second halves of the book of Acts: e.g. Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 23-26.

[29] A. D. Nock, "Paul," 185-86.

[30] For the designation of πύθων as a pretension to divine ventriloquism, see Plutarch, *Def. Orac.* 9.414 E; W. Foerster, "πύθων," 918-20; Haenchen, *Acts*, 495 n. 4.

[31] 1 Kgdms 28.8: καὶ [Σαουλ] εἶπεν αὐτῇ Μάντευσαι δή μοι ἐν τῷ ἐγγαστριμύθῳ. Cf. F. F. Bruce, *Acts* (1952), 315; Foerster, "πύθων," 919.

[32] Especially emphasized by Kee, *Miracle*, 211-18.

[33] Especially emphasized by Barrett, "Light," 288-91.

[34] Especially in the second to fourth centuries C.E., among both Christians and pagans, do we find this tendency to scrutinize closely the claims of miracle workers and magicians. Kee, *Miracle*, 273, tersely sums up the situation: "In this epoch, both champions and critics of miracle-workers are agreed as to what the basic issues are: are miracles evidence of divine

wisdom and power, of demonic power and wizardry, or of fraud and chicanery?" Among the most useful surveys and appraisals of the various approaches to these problems in the ancient world are Kee, *Miracle*, 252-89; *idem*, *Medicine*, 12-25; S. Benko, *Pagan Rome*, 103-39; H. Remus, *Pagan-Christian Conflict*, *passim*, see esp. 52-72; G. W. H. Lampe, "Miracles and Early Christian Apologetic," 205-18.

[35] Citations of Philostratus' *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana* are from the LCL.

[36] Citations of *The Treatise of Eusebius* are from the LCL (incorporated into Philostratus' works, 2:485-605).

[37] *Alexander the False Prophet.*

[38] Citations of *The Passing of Peregrinus* are from the LCL.

[39] Summing up Origen's polemic, Lampe, "Miracles and Early Christian Apologetic," 212-13, remarks:

> In every case, Origen goes on to say, the criterion is the moral character of the people concerned and the effects of the miracle. The works of Moses and Jesus are divine. They can be recognized as such because the former created a nation and the latter introduced the life which is in accordance with the gospel. The proof of the miracle of the Resurrection is ultimately the behaviour of Christ's disciples.

[40] Citations of *Contra Celsum* are from H. Chadwick, *Origen*.

[41] Citation from Hennecke-Scheemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2.

[42] Among those who note the correspondence between Theudas and Simon in Luke's account are Bauernfeind, *Apg.*, 125; Stählin, *Apg.*, 120; Beyschlag, *Simon*, 102.

[43] An exception may be noted in Acts 28.6 where the Maltans call Paul a god, and no rebuke is forthcoming from the Christian missionary. However, neither does Paul affirm the acclamation (in fact, no responsive comment of Paul is recorded). At any rate, in the overall account of Paul's voyage to Rome as a bound prisoner, Luke repeatedly brings out Paul's attitude of humble dependence on God (27.21-26, 35; 28.15).

[44] Throughout his two-volume work, Luke manifests a special concern for the desperate plight of widows (Luke 2.36-38; 7.11-17; 18.1-8; 20.45-21.4; Acts 6.1-6; 9.36-43).

[45] Here is an indication that the lowly status of table-servant assigned to Philip and the Seven in Acts 6.1-6 should not be viewed in such negative terms as sometimes suggested in discussions of the Seven's "subordination"

to the Twelve. The significance of Philip's role as table-waiter will be taken up more fully in §2, chap. 5.

[46] Cf. Kee, *Miracle*, 201.

[47] T. L. Brodie, "2 Kgs 5," 41-67.

[48] Brodie takes pains to allow for the use of other source material in Acts 8, including historical tradition, though he seems to view 2 Kings 5 as Luke's primary literary model (see *Ibid.*, 41, 50).

[49] *Ibid.*, 46.

[50] Brodie's paraphrase of the LXX of 2 Kings 5 (*Ibid.*, 49).

[51] *Ibid.*, 49.

[52] Brodie does make the Philip-Elisha connection with reference to the Ethiopian-eunuch-incident (*Ibid.*, 55-58).

[53] We have already noted (chap. 2) a correspondence between Jesus' identification with Elijah/Elisha in Luke 4 and Philip's Samaritan mission in Acts 8. Jesus calls upon the picture of Elisha's ministry to Naaman to illustrate his rejection by the Nazarenes and the prospects for welcome by non-Jews; similarly, Philip retreats from the hostile environment of Jerusalem to the more receptive Samaritan mission field.

[54] Klein, "Synkretismus."

[55] Cf. Barrett, "Light," 291.

[56] The suggestion offered in the previous section that Philip appears in Luke's presentation as a "prophet like Elisha" does not preclude the possibility that Philip is cast in the role of a "prophet like Moses" as well. An author may draw on more than one literary model in depicting a character, and in Luke's case, given his familiarity with and a respect for OT traditions, it would not be surprising to discover that he combines features of two of the OT's most prominent prophets in his portrayal of Jesus and key figures in the early church. On the use of multiple literary patterns in the ancient world, see Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 13-14 n. 68; 64 n. 10. More specifically related to Luke's widespread use and adaptation of <u>both</u> Moses- and Elijah/Elisha-traditions, see C. A. Evans, "Luke's Use," 75-83.

[57] E.g. Cullmann, *Christology*, 37; J. A. T. Robinson, *Twelve NT Studies* 150-51; Dunn, *Christology*, 138; Jeremias, "Μωϋσῆς," 868-69.

[58] Minear, *To Heal*, 105.

[59] *Ibid.*, 109.

[60] *Ibid.*, 116.

[61] *Ibid.*, 105-11, 117-21.

[62] D. P. Moessner, "Jesus and the 'Wilderness Generation'" (1982), 319-40; *idem*, "Luke 9:1-50" (1983), 575-605; *idem*, "Paul and the Pattern" (1983), 203-12; *idem*, "'Christ Must Suffer'" (1986), 220-56.

[63] Moessner, "Luke 9:1-50," 582; cf. 575-605; *idem*, "'Christ Must Suffer'," 238-43. The theory that the "Central Section" of Luke's Gospel is patterned after the Moses-material in Deuteronomy 1-26 was earlier set forth in brief by C. F. Evans, "Central Section" (1955), 37-53. In addition to Moessner, a number of other scholars have recently taken up and developed Evans' thesis in various ways. See e.g. J. Drury, *Tradition*, 138-64; M. D. Goulder, *Evangelists' Calendar*, 95-101; J. A. Sanders, "Ethic," 255, 264-66; Tiede, *Prophecy*, 39-63.

[64] Moessner, "Luke 9:1-50," 588-600; *idem*, "'Christ Must Suffer'," 235-38.

[65] Moessner, "Paul and the Pattern;" *idem*, "'Christ Must Suffer'."

[66] Moessner, "'Christ Must Suffer'," 227-34, 247-48, 255-56. On Stephen as a Moses-like prophet, see also Minear, *To Heal*, 140; L. T. Johnson, *Literary Function*, 50-52.

[67] Cf. Minear, *To Heal*, 140-41; L. T. Johnson, *Literary Function*, 52-53.

[68] In his commentary on Acts 8.12-13, F. F. Bruce, *Acts* (1962), 179, briefly suggests the parallel between Simon and Pharoah's magicians: "But Simon Magus himself was influenced by the actions and words of Philip. Like the magicians of Egypt, he recognized that the messenger of the true God had access to a source of power that outstripped his own." Bruce, however, does not elaborate on this parallel, and most commentators ignore it altogether.

[69] Though the Canaanites "give heed" (ἀκούσονται) to wizards, the children of Israel are "not allowed. . . so to do" (Deut 18.14); rather they must "give heed" (ἀκούσεσθε) to the "prophet like Moses" who will be raised up (18.15).

[70] There is a linguistic parallel between ἐποίησαν καὶ οἱ ἐπαοιδοὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ταῖς φαρμακείαις αὐτῶν in Exod 7.11 and φαρμακός, ἐπαείδων ἐπαοιδήν in Deut 18.10-11.

[71] Whatever speculations developed later regarding the advent of an eschatological "prophet like Moses," the most immediate fulfiller of the "prophet-like-Moses" expectation, according to the OT, was Joshua, who successfully led the children of Israel into the promised land and indeed worthily commanded the respect and obedience of the people (cf. Josh 1.1-18; 24.14-28).

[72] Citation from J. H. Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2.

[73] Citation from G. Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*. On the Jannes and Jambres tradition, see *Tg. Ps.-J.* Exod 1.15 and 7.11; *The Book of Jannes and Jambres*; 2 Tim 3.8; L. Grabbe, "Jannes/Jambres," 394-96; Schürer, *History*, 3.2:781-83; A. Pietersma and R. T. Lutz, "Jannes," 427-36.

[74] Citation from E. H. Gifford's translation of *The Gospel of Preparation*. In *Con. Cel.* 4.51 Origen mentions a book by Numenius entitled "Concerning the Good" in which the pagan author "quotes the story about Jannes and Jambres." On Numenius and other pagan writers who refer to Moses' conflict with Jannes and Jambres, see J. Gager, *Moses*, 137-40.

[75] Cf. G. Delling, "Josephus," 297-98; Macrae, "Miracle," 135-36.

[76] So called in P. W. Barnett, "Jewish Sign Prophets," 679-97.

[77] So called in R. A. Horsley and J. S. Hanson, *Bandits*, 160-72, 186-87; R. A. Horsley, "'Like One'," 435-63. Horsley contrasts the "popular/action" prophets with the "oracular" prophets modelled after the classical biblical tradition.

[78] Note also that the mention in *J. W.* 2.259 of "tokens of deliverance" (σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας) performed by first century popular prophets corresponds to the reference in *Ant.* 2.327 to Moses' "miracles. . . in token of their [the Hebrews'] liberation" (πρὸς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς σημείων) from Egyptian bondage.

[79] According to BAGD, 164, the term γόης was used in classical literature to denote a "sorcerer, juggler" and in the NT period took on more the connotation of a "swindler, cheat." In the NT itself the word appears only in 2 Tim 3.13, where the warning is sounded that "evil men and impostors (γόητες) will go on from bad to worse, deceivers and deceived." Interestingly, a few verses earlier these "evil men and impostors" are described as "men of corrupt mind and counterfeit faith" whose "folly will be plain to all"--<u>just like Jannes and Jambres who opposed Moses</u> (2 Tim 3.8-9).

In an example from Philo, γόης is used (as in Josephus) to characterize false prophets:

> If anyone cloaking himself under the name and guise of a prophet and claiming to be possessed by inspiration lead us on to the worship of the gods recognized in the different cities, we ought not to listen to him and be deceived by the name of a prophet. For such a one is no prophet, but an impostor (γόης), since his oracles and pronouncements are falsehoods invented by himself" (*Spec. Leg.* 1.315; citation from the LCL). Cf. L. H. Feldman, ed., Josephus, LCL, 9:40 n. [b].

[80] Barnett, "Jewish Sign Prophets," 683; cf. 681-83. In "'Like One'," 455, and "Popular Prophetic Movements," 4, Horsley flatly rejects Barnett's interpretation, arguing that Josephus' use of Mosaic language to characterize

the contemporary popular prophets was designed merely to cast them as alleged "prophets like Moses," not as magicians like those in Pharoah's service. But Horsley seems to ignore the apparent association of the γόητες-prophets with Egyptian γοητεία and fails to appreciate that as false and failed imitators of Moses, the contemporary prophets are cast in precisely the same light as Pharoah's court magicians.

[81] W. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 163, refers to "Theudas and the other 'magicians' [my emphasis] (like Theudas, they doubtless called themselves 'prophets') who promised or actively attempted to perform miracles in the wilderness." Similarly, D. E. Aune, "Magic," 1528, speaks of "demonstrations of magical power" as "a central feature" of the movements launched by these prophetic figures.

[82] In addition to a Moses typology, the pattern of Joshua's parting the Jordan *en route* to the promised land may also be relevant to Theudas' aspirations, as Josephus conceived them. Cf. Horsley, "'Like One'," 457-58.

[83] Cf. Horsley, "'Like One'," 458-59: "The round-about route by which they came to the Mount of Olives may have been either a symbolic march around the city or perhaps the symbolically purifying and preparatory 'way through the wilderness,' prior to entry into the city--in either case, patterned after God's great historical acts of deliverance through Moses or Joshua."

[84] In addition to the reports about Theudas and the "Egyptian," note the similar account concerning another anonymous γόης: "Festus also sent a force of cavalry and infantry against the dupes of a certain impostor (γόητος) who had promised them salvation and rest from troubles, if they chose to follow him into the wilderness (τῆς ἐρημίας). The force which Festus dispatched destroyed both the deceiver himself and those who had followed him" (*Ant.* 20.188).

[85] T. W. Manson, *Teaching*, 82-83; Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 918.

[86] Cf. C. S. Rodd, "Spirit," 157-58.

[87] Cf. R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, "Note," 167-68. Dunn, *Jesus*, 44-46, thinks that the evidence may tilt slightly in favor of the originality of Matthew's "Spirit" reading but admits that "the point may be largely academic, since in fact the two concepts ["Spirit" and "finger"] are synonymous." Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 475-76, and G. R. Beasley-Murray, "Jesus," 469, 474 n. 2, both incline toward the view that Luke has preserved the traditional reading, but they also accept the essential semantic equivalence of Matthew's and Luke's versions and recognize the difficulties of making a conclusive decision about which reading is original.

[88] Cf. A. George, *Études*," 127-32.

[89] E.g. Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 922; Ellis, *Luke*, 167; Beasley-Murray, "Jesus," 469 n. 1; Dunn, *Jesus*, 45; A. R. C. Leaney, *Commentary*, 189. R. W.

Wall, "'Finger'," 144-50, has recently argued that in fact the reference in Deut 9.10 to the "finger of God" which wrote the ten commandments delivered to Moses should be regarded as the primary OT source behind Luke 11.20. Part of Wall's case depends on the supposed architechtonic parallel between Luke's "Central Section" and Deuteronomy 1-26. While we would accept that the Moses-related reference in Deut 9.10 (cf. Exod 31.1) may well comprise part of the background to Luke's concept of the "finger of God," the larger context of Luke 11.14-23--with its focus on the legitimacy of Jesus' authority to work miracles of deliverance--still seems to recall most directly the controversy between Moses and Pharoah's magicians (see below).

[90] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 922: "The OT image ["finger of God"] recalls God's intervention on behalf of his people at the time of the hardening of Pharoah's heart against them. In Jesus, God's power now intervenes again to release humans from evil, this time from psychic evil."

[91] We follow here the usual interpretation (e.g. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 476-78) that the story of the "strong man" is meant to illustrate Jesus' victory over Satan. *Contra* Wall, "'Finger'," 147 (following F. W. Danker, *Jesus*, 138-40), who sees the story as typifying Satan's threatening of Israel.

[92] Only Luke among the Synoptics depicts the discomfited "strong man" as an armed warrior guarding his own palace, i.e. a king-like figure, not unlike Pharoah.

[93] The παῖς-identity of Jesus is linked with the "prophet-like-Moses" expectation in Acts 3.22, 26:

"Moses said, 'The Lord your God will <u>raise up</u> (ἀναστήσει) for you a <u>prophet</u> from your brethren as he <u>raised me up</u>" (3.22).

"God, having <u>raised up his servant</u> (ἀναστήσας. . . τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ). . . (3.26).

[94] Cf. K. Grayston, "Significance," 479-81. For the equation, "finger of God = power of God = Spirit of God," see Dunn, *Jesus*, 46; Beasley-Murray, "Jesus," 469. The Psalmist's description of creation as "the work of thy fingers" (Psa 8.3) establishes a clear symbolic relation between God's "finger" and his demonstrations of power.

[95] Philip's role in Samaria as an exorciser of demons and preacher of the kingdom of God (Acts 8.7, 12) also corresponds with Jesus' statement regarding his own ministry in Luke 11.20.

[96] Cf. also Origen, *Hom. on Luke* 25; *Com. on Matt., ser. 33* [on Matt 24.4ff.]; *Com. on John 13.27* [On John 4.25].

[97] Cf. Eusebius, *Theophany* 4.35, cited in S. J. Isser, *Dositheans*, 29: ". . . For example, the Samaritans were persuaded that Dositheus, who arose after the times of the savior, was <u>the very prophet whom Moses predicted</u> [my emphasis]. Others at the time of the Apostles called Simon the magician the Great Power of God, thinking he was the Christ. . ." Isser, *Dositheans*, 32-33,

regards Origen's characterization of Dositheus as "the Christ prophesied by Moses" as "a Christianized distortion of the eschatological 'predicted prophet'"--probably the "prophet like Moses" promised in Deuteronomy 18.

[98] Citation from Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2.

[99] Isser, *Dositheans*, 184; *idem*, "Dositheus," 175-77; Fossum, *Name*, 117-20.

[100] Isser, *Dositheans*, *passim* (see summary of conclusions, 163-64); *idem*, "Dositheus," 167-89; Fossum, *Name*, 112-29 (section on "Simon the Eschatological Prophet Like Moses"). Cf. H. Teeple, *Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, 64-65; Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 122-36.

[101] Cf. Isser, *Dositheans*, 22-23.

[102] The anti-Baptist polemic of the Pseudo-Clementine literature makes one suspect the authenticity of associating the Baptist movement with "heretics" like Simon and Dositheus. Some scholars, however, assume that such a connection is historically valid: e.g. M. Smith, "Account," 739-41; cf. discussion in Fossum, *Name*, 115-17.

[103] Cf. Isser, *Dositheans*, 139; Fossum, *Name*, 122; R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism*, 91-92; Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 319 n. 72.

[104] This emphasis on the "Standing One" is consistent with the use of ܩܝܡܐ in later Samaritan traditions to represent God himself as the One who "stands" (lives and reigns) eternally and to designate those "standing" before God, such as angelic intermediaries and, of course, the great prophet Moses, Israel's great revealer of divine truth. Cf. Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 347-49 n. 136; Isser, *Dositheans*, 138-40; Fossum, *Name*, 55-62, 120-24.

[105] Cf. M. F. Collins, "Hidden Vessels," 97-116.

[106] The eschatological figure most commonly associated with the Samaritans is the *Taheb*, who assumes an apocalyptic role in Samaritan traditions, demanding repentance against the day of final judgment and ushering in the age of divine favor which will include resurrection from the dead. Since there is no explicit reference to the *Taheb*-concept prior to the *Memar Marqah* in the fourth century C.E., we cannot be certain that it was a part of Samaritan theology in the first century. However, it is noteworthy that when the idea is introduced it coincides with the reports about Dositheus, Simon and the Samaritan restorer of the hidden vessels by reflecting the use of Mosaic imagery. For example, the poem in the *Memar Marqah* which petitions the *Taheb's* coming is matched by a similar prayer for the advent of the great prophet Moses (citations from Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 248-49).

> May the Taheb come in peace
> and expose the darkness that has become powerful in the world.

May the Taheb come in peace
and destroy the opponents who provoke God (1.9).

May the great prophet Moses come in peace,
who revealed truth and abolished falsehood,
May the great prophet Moses come in peace,
who glorified righteousness and destroyed the wicked ones (2.8).

The most thorough recent examinations of the Samaritan *Taheb*-figure may be found in two lengthy articles by F. Dexinger: "Frühesten samaritanischen Belege," 224-52; "Taheb," 1-172. Interestingly, Dexinger views the Samaritan belief in the *Taheb* as a direct development of the earlier attested hope in an eschatological "prophet like Moses," based on Deut 18.15, 18. See also Dexinger, "'Prophet' ," 97-110.

[107] On Luke's penchant for repetition of key words and phrases, see Cadbury, "Four Features," 88-97.

[108] See the useful summary of six explanations in D. L. Bock, *Proclamation*, 222-24.

[109] The fact that according to Acts 7.55 the vision of the "Standing" Jesus includes the vision of the glory of God as well recalls the transfiguration scene in Luke's Gospel where, in the company of Moses and in Moses-like fashion, Jesus appears in blazing glory on the mountain-top. Moreover, it is noteworthy that only Luke reports that when the disciples awakened "they saw his glory and the two men who stood with him (τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ)" (9.32).

[110] Isser, *Dositheans*, 140, poses the query--"Could it be that Stephen applied the Standing One tradition. . . to Jesus, whom he saw as the prophet like Moses?"--but leaves the matter unelaborated and unresolved. Cf. Coggins, "Samaritans and Acts," 425-26. P. Doble, "Son," 74-76, interprets Stephen's vision of the "Standing" Son of Man as symbolizing the vindication of Christ's authority, but he does not link this idea with the presentation of the rejected "prophet like Moses" in Stephen's speech.

[111] R. Pesch, *Vision*, 47-48, notes that a central feature of the exalted Christ's revelation to Paul in Acts 9 is a commission to preach the gospel to the Gentiles (9.15; cf. 22.21; 26.16-18) and suggests that, similarly in Luke's presentation, the appearance of the exalted Christ to Stephen serves to sanction the gospel's ensuing progress away from the Jews and Jerusalem to all the peoples of the earth. Indirectly, then, the "Standing" Christ of Acts 7.55-56 may be regarded as authorizing Philip's Samaritan mission in Acts 8.

[112] Haenchen, *Acts*, 305; J. D. M. Derrett, "Simon," 63-65.

[113] S. Brown, *Apostasy*, 110, comments that "the story of Simon Magus is not strictly an instance of apostasy, since the excommunication formula in v. 20 is not actually carried out." In view of the prospects for repentance

and forgiveness preached in 8.22, it is true that Simon is not expelled once for all from the Christian community. However, Simon still experiences a marked lapse in his behavior as a Christian requiring drastic discipline, and it is in this general sense that we refer to Simon as an "apostate." Moreover, we must appreciate that the story ends on an ominous note, with Simon expressing a desire to avoid the dire consequences of his wickedness but falling short of true repentance. In short, Simon remains the villain of the piece.

[114] Cf. B. Chilton, *Beginning*, 36-39.

[115] There is no reason to deny Conzelmann's evaluation of the preseverance envisaged by Luke as essentially ethical, involving obedience and good works, the fruits of a godly character to be lived out during the age of the Church prior to Jesus' return (*Theology*, 103-04, 231-34). S. Brown's more formal ecclesiological interpretation of perseverance to denote Christians who "remain [in the church] while others leave" is based principally on a forced linguistic understanding of ὑπομονή (*Apostasy*, 48-50). See the criticisms of Brown's work in Bovon, *Luc*, 407-10.

[116] S. Brown, *Apostasy*, 50; G. Baumbach, *Verständnis*, 177.

[117] In light of the multiple λόγος-references in Acts 8.4-25 denoting the gospel word preached to and received by the Samaritans (vv. 4, 14, 25), we should no doubt interpret the same term in v. 21 along similar lines. Cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 305: "The λόγος in which Simon is refused a share is Christianity." Stählin, *Apg.*, 124, thinks "this word" may refer to a sermon by the apostles which Simon is supposed to have heard. However, a secondary application to "this matter" of the authority to impart the Spirit should not be ruled out.

[118] For the general connection, see Weiser, *Apg.*, 1:205; S. Brown, *Apostasy*, 82-98.

[119] Cf. Deut 29.17 and Isa 58.6.

[120] L. T. Johnson, *Literary Function*, 215-17, especially highlights the feature of Simon's desire to buy his way into the apostolic circle and notes the parallel with Judas in Acts 1.

[121] Κλῆρος, κτάομαι and ἀδικία seldom appear in Luke's writing outside of Acts 1.15-26 and 8.18-24.

[122] S. Brown, *Apostasy*, 111-13, contends that Luke distinguishes between Simon and Ananias and Sapphira by denying that the Samaritan magician ever received the Spirit which would have made him a "full Christian." But in fact Luke is vague about whether Simon received the Spirit, and it might even be argued that the focus of Simon's preoccupation in Acts 8 with imparting the Spirit to others implies some prior personal experience of the Spirit (why would he seek to transmit what he did not possess?). At any

rate, as we have already remarked, Simon's responses to the gospel in Acts 8.13 are characteristic of "full Christians;" indeed they are identical to the other Samaritans who all receive the Spirit through the apostles' hands. Cf. Marshall, *Kept*, 87: "It is to be presumed that Simon was among those who had hands laid upon him. Thereafter he sought to obtain by bribery the gift of being able to confer the Spirit on others. The indicators are thus that Simon became a believer, at least outwardly, and would be treated as such."

[1] This phenomenon may suggest that the latter Philip-narrative has a firmer basis in tradition than the former. But, as we shall see below, whatever its tradition-history, the material in Acts 8.25-40--like that in 8.4-24--has been thoroughly shaped by Luke in accordance with his literary and theological interests (*contra* Schille, *Apg.*, 194-95).

[2] Among those who appreciate this link between the eunuch-incident and the stories in Acts 9-11, see Stählin, *Apg.*, 116; O'Toole, "Philip," 29-31; B. Gaventa, *Darkness*, 123-25.

[3] S. G. Wilson, *Gentiles*, 171-72; J. T. Sanders, *Jews*, 151-53. Dupont, *Salvation*, 11-33, leaves the eunuch-narrative out of his discussion altogether.

[4] Haenchen, *Acts*, 314; Roloff, *Apg.*, 139; Schmithals, *Apg.*, 86; Weiser, *Apg. 1-12*, 212; M. Dömer, *Heil*, 167.

[5] Bauernfeind, *Apg.*, 123; G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:498.

[6] Conzelmann, *Apg.*, 63.

[7] E. Plümacher, *Lukas*, 90, regards the eunuch's conversion as at least "eine Auftakt," if not the "eigentliche Heidenbekehrung im lukanischen Sinn."

[8] Cf. W. C. van Unnik, "Befehl," 332-34.

[9] C. H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 51-58; K. E. Bailey, *Poet*, 79-85; C. L. Blomberg, "Midrash," 233-48.

[10] D. Mínguez, "Hechos 8,25-40," 168-91; O'Toole, "Philip," 25-29. The two analyses are not identical, and O'Toole's is to be viewed as the more helpful (it is actually a refinement of Mínguez). See also P. de Meester, "'Philippe'," 366-67, whose chiastic schema is simpler and focuses more on thematic rather than linguistic connections.

[11] In addition to O'Toole and Mínguez, on the story's center see G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:498; C. H. Lindijer, "Two Creative Encounters," 80-81.

[12] Cf. Conzelmann, *Apg.*, 61.

[13] Of course, others are present with Cornelius as part of his "household," and there are witnesses from Jerusalem with Peter. But the focus is clearly on the encounter between the two principal figures, Peter and Cornelius. Likewise, in the report of the Samaritan mission, an unspecified number of Samaritans are on the scene, but Simon Magus is singled out for special treatment.

[14] Cf. O'Toole, "Philip," 30-31.

[15] Elsewhere in Acts 8-11 either term is used only at 10.20.

[16] εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθητε. . . . πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ (Matt 10.5-6). Bauernfeind's view is tied in with the fact (noted in chap. 2) that the Matthean reference also prohibits preaching to the Samaritans, which the Philip-narrative controverts as well (*Apg.*, 122) Cf. Hengel, *Acts*, 78; *idem*, "Luke," 111-12.

[17] Outside the eunuch-episode, in Acts 8-11 ἀναβαίνω appears only in the Cornelius-incident (10.4, 9; 11.2), but with no apparent significance.

[18] Cf. Stählin, *Apg.*, 127-28.

[19] Cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 311; J. H. Moulton, *Grammar*, 1:197-99.

[20] See generally R. E. Brown, "Jesus," 90-93; J.-D. Dubois, "Figure," 155-76; C. A. Evans, "Luke's Use," 75-83.

[21] See §2, chap. 3, and note the comment of R. B. Rackham, *Acts*, 112: "[Philip] the evangelist acts exactly like one of the prophets of old: we could imagine that we are reading of a second Elijah or Elisha."

[22] Trocmè, *"Livre"*, 180.

[23] A number of commentators cite this Elijah-incident as a parallel to Philip's experience, e.g. Roloff, *Apg.*, 142; Pesch, *Apg.*, 1:294; Marshall, *Acts*, 165; Krodel, *Acts*, 171.

[24] Trocmè, *"Livre"*, 180.

[25] Brodie, "2 Kgs 5," 41-67.

[26] Brodie's work is based on his 1981 dissertation, *Luke the Literary Interpreter: Luke-Acts as a Systematic Rewriting and Updating of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative*. Several recent articles in addition to the one directly related to Acts 8 set forth his basis thesis: "Accusing" (1983); "Luke 7,36-50" (1984); "Greco-Roman Imitation" (1984); "Luke 7:11-17" (1986).

[27] "2 Kgs 5," 44. In "Luke 7,36-50," 457, Brodie suggests that Luke has taken "external" elements pertaining to "financial debt" and "physical life" from the story in 1 Kgs 17.17-24 and "internalized" them to correspond to matters related to "moral debt" and "spiritual life." On the use of this rhetorical technique in ancient literature, see Brodie, "Greco-Roman Imitation," 17-32.

[28] "2 Kgs 5," 44, 53.

[29] *Ibid.*, 41.

[30] "Luke 7:11-17" and "Luke 7,36-50."

[31] "Accusing."

[32] In "2 Kgs 5," 66, Brodie himself makes the connection between the Stephen- and Philip-stories.

[33] Brodie, "2 Kgs 5," 51-54. On the connection between baptism and cleansing in Luke's understanding, see Acts 22.16; cf. 2.38.

[34] Brodie, "2 Kgs 5," 54-58.

[35] A point where we feel that Brodie may be pressing his case too far relates to Luke's alleged adaptation of βιβλίον from the Kings story. Naaman brings money and a βιβλίον to court the favor of the king of Israel (2 Kgs 5.6-7). This βιβλίον is a letter of recommendation from Naaman's own king. In Brodie's opinion, the reading of this letter "has been fused [by Luke] to become the single complex idea of reading (a *biblion*) of the prophet Isaiah" in the Acts account of the Ethiopian eunuch's conversion ("2 Kgs 5," 54). However, the connection between a royal letter and a book of prophetic Scripture seems tenuous at best and is all the more difficult to accept in view of the fact that the term βιβλίον does not appear anywhere in the eunuch-incident

[36] Cf. Crockett, "Luke 4.25-27," 177-83.

[37] It is also interesting to note that the reports of both Elijah's encounter with the widow at Zarephath and Philip's witness to the Ethiopian eunuch are introduced by a divine command to the respective "prophets" to "rise and go," followed by an explicit indication of obedience: "he rose and went" (1 Kgs 17.8-10//Acts 8.26-27); cf. van Unnik, "Befehl," 335-36.

[38] O'Toole, "Philip," 31, 33, makes a broad comparison between Luke 4.16-30 and Acts 8.25-40 on the matter of Christ's fulfillment of OT Scripture.

[39] See J. Dupont, "Pèlerins," 361-64, 370-73; *idem*, "Meal," 116-21; J. Grassi, "Emmaus," 463-67; J. Kremer, *Osterevangelien*, 129-30; X. Leon-Dufour, *Resurrection*, 160-63; J. Wanke, "'Brotbrechen'," 102; O'Toole, "Philip," 31-32; Lindijer, "Two Creative Encounters," 77-85; R. J. Dillon, *Eye-witnesses*, 111-12.

[40] See Lindijer, "Two Creative Encounters," 77-79.

[41] Cp. ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν (Luke 24.27) and ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης. . . (Acts 8.35).

[42] Lindijer, "Two Creative Encounters," 79.

[42] Dupont, "Meal," 119-21; Lindijer, "Two Creative Encounters," 82.

[44] Grassi, "Emmaus," 465-67.

[45] P. Benoit, *Passion*, 275, posits that the unnamed partner was in fact Philip the deacon, who then served as Luke's source for the details of the Emmaus-road-incident. This is pure conjecture, however (as even Benoit admits). If Luke knew that Cleopas' companion was Philip, why would Luke have allowed him to remain anonymous in this instance?

[46] On the parallel design of Luke 24.13-35 and 36-53, see Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 1572-73.

[47] V. 36--"As they [i.e. Cleopas and companion] were saying this, Jesus himself stood among them. . ." There is no indication then of their exit after Jesus' arrival, so we must assume their continuing presence on the scene.

[48] Acts 10.41 offers a specific allusion to Peter's experience in Luke 24.

[49] In addition to Cleopas and his partner, there are present an unspecified number of "friends" of the apostles (Luke 24.33); cf. Dillon, *Eye-witnesses*, 218.

[50] J. K. Elliott, "Jerusalem," 462-65.

[51] I. de la Potterie, "Deux noms," 153-65.

[52] Neither the Nestle-Aland nor United Bible Societies text even cites Ιερουσαλημ as a variant in these cases.

[53] This is the only form for "Jerusalem" found in the LXX.

[54] Acts 1.8, 12 (twice), 19; 2.5, 14; 4.5, 16; 5.16, 28; 6.7. (The first reference to "Jerusalem" in Acts [1.4], however, utilizes the more "hellenized" form, Ἱεροσόλυμα). Cf. G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:199-200; Jeremias, "ΙΕΡΟΥΣΑΛΗΜ," 273-76.

[55] Cf. Cadbury, "Four Features," 91: ". . . probably the two forms owe their adoption to the changing fancy of the writer in each several instance." E. Lohse, "Σιών," 327-28; Harnack, *Acts*, 81. For other views and discussion of the problem of Jerusalem-terminology in Luke-Acts, see M. Bachmann, *Jerusalem*, 13-66; D. D. Sylva, "Ierousalem," 207-21; J. T. Sanders, *Jews*, 35-36.

[56] Cf. Schmithals, *Apg.*, 84, and discussion in Barrett, "Light," 284-85.

[57] Though Luke charts no specific course for Philip, one might imagine a journey from Samaria which ran southwest to Antipatris and then due south through Lydda and along the edge of the Shephelah to Eluetheropolis

(Betogabris), which marked an intersection with the Jerusalem-Gaza road at approximately its mid-point.

[58] Strabo *Geog.* 17.2.1-3; Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 6.35; Dio Cassius *Hist.* 54.5. Cf. Bruce, *Acts* (1962), 186; Dinkler, "Philippus," 89-94; P. T. Crocker, "City of Meroe," 53-66; de Meester, "Philippe," 362-63; S. Lösch, "Kämmerer," 477-519; Cadbury, *Book of Acts*, 16-17.

[59] See especially F. M. Snowden, Jr., "Ethiopians," 11-36; *idem*, "Blacks," 111-14.

[60] Translation by C. H. Oldfather in the LCL.

[61] Hengel, "Luke," 111.

[62] See also Herodotus 3.114; Strabo *Geog.* 17.1.13; Philostr. *Apollon.* 6.1; cf. Hengel, "Luke," 200 n. 85; T. C. G. Thornton, "To the end," 374-75; Snowden, "Ethiopians," 22.

[63] Dio Cassius *Hist.* 54.5; Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 6.35; Seneca *Nat. Quest.* 6.8.3; Strabo *Geog.* 17.1.54; cf. Dinkler, "Philippus," 91-92; Plümacher, *Lukas*, 12-13.

[64] Dinkler, "Philippus," 90-94; Plümacher, *Lukas*, 12-13; Cadbury, *Book of Acts*, 15-18; R. I. Pervo, *Profit*, 70-71.

[65] D. R. Schwartz, "End," 669-76, has recently advanced the view that Acts 1.8 presents as the goal of apostolic witness "the end of the <u>land</u>," that is, the <u>land of Israel</u>. However, among other things, this thesis founders on Luke's own commentary on Acts 1.8 in 13.47, where the gospel's extension to the end of the earth is unmistakeably linked to the church's light-bearing mission to the <u>Gentiles</u>. Cf. Davies, *Gospel*, 279-80; Dupont, *Salvation*, 18-19.

[66] Thornton, "To the end," 374-75; Dinkler, "Philippus," 85-87; Hengel, *Acts*, 80; Cadbury, *Book of Acts*, 15-16; Gaventa, *Darkness*, 106. We might also suggest a link to a reference in Luke's Gospel at this point. As "the queen of the South [= Sheba]. . . came from <u>the ends of the earth</u> (ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς) to hear the wisdom of Solomon" (Luke 11.31), so a confidant of the queen of Ethiopia (a region proximate to Sheba) comes from the world's farthest reaches to hear the proclamation of Philip the evangelist concerning One "greater than Solomon." In early Abyssinian Christian tradition there was in fact a tendency to fuse the figures of Candace and the queen of Sheba (cf. E. Ullendorff, "Candace," 53-56).

[67] Iren. *A. H.* 3.12.8; 4.23.2; Eus. *E. H.* 2.1.13.

[68] On the linguistic links between Acts 8.26-40 and Zephaniah 2-3, see W. K. L. Clarke, "Use," 102. On the eunuch-incident as the fulfillment of Psa 68 (67).31-32, see Eus. *E. H.* 2.1.13; Dinkler, "Philippus," 85.

[69] On these ancient cities see Hengel, "Luke," 110-16; Schürer, *History*, 2:98-103, 108-09, 115-18.

[70] Though in *Theology* Conzelmann stresses Luke's generally vague acquaintance with Palestinian geography and his "straightforward symbolical use of localities" (p. 20), he still admits that "Luke is familiar with the coastal region of Phoenicia and in Acts with the connection of Judea with the coast" (p. 70). This marking out of the coastal plain as the area where Luke's information appears to be the most accurate has recently been confirmed in much greater detail in M. Hengel's fresh study of the geography of Palestine in the book of Acts ("Luke," 111-28).

[71] Hengel, "Luke," 116-17.

[72] Peter's visits to the communities of believers at Lydda and Joppa are representative of a much larger mission to established churches outside of Jerusalem. Acts 9.31 presents the summary statement regarding the growth and stability of "the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria." The very next verse, before introducing Peter's work at Lydda, first discloses that "Peter went here and there among them all"--that is (presumably), among all the congregations included in the report of 9.31.

[73] Cf. Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 258.

[74] Among those who discuss the unfolding of this theme with the eunuch-episode, see Haenchen, *Acts*, 314-15; Stählin, *Apg.*, 127-28; Plümacher, *Lukas*, 90-91; Dinkler, "Philippus," 88-89; O'Toole, "Philip," 29-30.

[75] The text-critical problem surrounding Acts 8.39 will be taken up in §3.1, chap. 5.

[76] See also the possible reference to the Spirit's directing of Simeon's way into the temple (ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, Luke 2.27).

[77] See also the emphasis on the Spirit's prompting of Paul's final journey to Jerusalem (Acts 19.21; 20.22-23; cf. 21.4, 11-14).

[78] G. Friedrich, "Gegner," 200-01, thinks that Philip's being "caught up" (ἁρπάζω) by the Spirit should be understood as some kind of visionary or ecstatic experience, along the lines of Paul's being "caught up" (ἁρπάζω, 2 Cor 12,2, 4) to the "third heaven." However, apart from the common use of ἁρπάζω, the experiences of Philip and Paul are quite distinct. Philip is physically moved by the Spirit from one earthly place to another; there is no mention of his "seeing" or "hearing" anything special in the process. Paul, on the other hand, is transported to Paradise--"whether in the body or out of the body" he does not know--and brought into contact with "unutterable" revelations.

[79] "Zweifellos soll das Motiv der wunderbaren Entrückung des Philippus durch den Geist des Herrn noch einmal unterstreichen, dass er recht daran

tat, sich durch nichts--vermutlich insbesondere die Tatsache, dass der Eunuch Heide war,--hindern zu lassen und den Kämmerer zu taufen" (Pesch, *Apg.*, 1:294).

[80] The ἔρημος-reference can be taken either as part of the angel's command or as a parenthetical note by the narrator elaborating the nature of the angel's command. Van Unnik, "Befehl," 332, argues for the former option; cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 310 n. 4.

[81] Van Unnik, "Befehl," 328-39; cf. Gaventa, *Darkness*, 101-03.

[82] BAGD, 506.

[83] E.g. Gen 18.1; 43.16, 25; Deut 28.29; 2 Kgdms 4.5; 3 Kgdms 18.26, 27; Psa 36 (37).6; Amos 8.9; Isa 18.4; 58.10; Jer 15.8; Sir 43.4.

[84] Objectors to the "noon-time" rendering of μεσημβρία in Acts 8.26 often cite this fact: e.g. Bauernfeind, *Apg.*, 128.

[85] Van Unnik, "Befehl," 328-34. We are assuming with van Unnik and most recent commentators (e.g. Pesch, *Apg.*, 1:290; G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:501; Stählin, *Apg.*, 127) that αὕτη in the phrase αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος refers back to ὁδὸν and not to Γάζαν (*contra* C. S. C. Williams, *Commentary*, 119; Lake and Cadbury, *Beginnings*, 4:95). We are explicitly told that the ensuing encounter between Philip and the eunuch takes place "along the road" (κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν, 8.36), and no further mention is made of the city of Gaza.

[86] Cf. numerous references in Luke 1-2; Luke 24.4, 49; Acts 1.10; 2.7; 5.9; 9.10, 11; 10.17, 19, 21, 30; 11.11; 12.7; 13.11.

[87] Cf. O'Toole, "Philip," 29-30; Plümacher, *Lukas*, 90-91; K. Haacker, "Dibelius," 246-47.

[88] According to Acts 22.6, Paul's Damascus-road vision occurred around noon-time (περὶ μεσημβρίαν) as well.

[89] Van Unnik, "Befehl," 335-37; Stählin, *Apg.*, 128.

[90] R. W. Wall, "Peter," 79-90, in fact argues for a strong typological connection in Luke's mind between the Jonah-story and Peter's outreach to Cornelius. Cf. C. S. C. Williams, *Acts*, 152-53; Goulder, *Type*, 176-77.

[91] K. Bornhäuser, *Studien*, 96.

[92] Cf. P. F. Esler, *Community*, 183-85.

[93] Cf. Rackham, *Acts*, 120: "There is a contrast between Simon Magus and the Ethiopian treasurer which recalls the contrast between Gehazi and the stranger Naaman who was baptized in the Jordan."

[94] See K. G. Kuhn, "προσήλυτος," 730-42; Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 320-34; Dunn, "Incident," 19-21.

[95] Texts and translations of Philo in this chapter are from the LCL.

[96] See P. Borgen, *Paul*, 16-18; T. M. Finn, "God-fearers," 82-83; J. L. Nolland, "Uncircumcised Proselytes?" 173-79. (All discuss the difficult text related to Philo's view of circumcision in *Quest. Exod.* 2.2 [on Exod 22.21 LXX].)

[97] Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 320-21. On the necessity of circumcision for proselytes, see J. J. Collins, "Symbol," 170-71; Nolland, "Uncircumcised Proselytes?" 173-79. On the requirement of proselyte baptism, see Epict. *Diss.* 2.9.20 and comment on this text in M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 1:543-44.

[98] Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 323, remarks that the rabbinic consideration of a converted Gentile "in all things as an Israelite" (*b. Yebam.* 47b) does not imply a parity of status between proselyte and native-born Israelite, but merely underscores the proselyte's duty to keep the whole law.

[99] F. Siegert, "Gottesfürchtige," 163: "Die Gottesfürchtigen waren keine Teilproselyten. Das jüdische Volk hatte nur einen Grad der Zugehörigkeit zu vergeben, die volle Zugehörigkeit. Die Gottesfürchtigen waren Heiden, und es liegt in der Sache, dass ihre Unterscheidung von der übrigen Heidenwelt, wie sie von den Quellen nahegelegt wird, in keiner Weise scharf zu ziehen ist." Cf. K. Lake, "Proselytes," 76; Kuhn, "προσήλυτος," 731.

[100] A. T. Kraabel, "Disappearance," 113-26; *idem*, "Greeks," 150-57; R. S. MacLennan and A. T. Kraabel, "God-Fearers," 46-53, 64.

[101] Kraabel's thesis is clearly not winning the day in contemporary scholarship. Among the best recent treatments of the "God-fearer" question supporting the traditional perspective, see Finn, "God-fearers," 75-84; P. R. Trebilco, "Studies," 154-77; Siegert, "Gottesfürchtige," 109-64; Gager, "Jews," 91-99; J. J. Collins, *Athens*, 163-68.

[102] See text, translation and discussion in Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2:102-07.

[103] Trebilco, "Studies," 158-59; cf. Siegert, "Gottesfürchtige," 126-28.

[104] See the brief but helpful discussion of this story in J. J. Collins, *Athens*, 164.

[105] See the definitive study by J. M. Reynolds and R. Tannenbaum, *Jews and God-Fearers at Aphrodisias*, and the helpful summary of their findings in Trebilco, "Studies," 161-64; Gager, "Jews," 97-99.

[106] See S. Safrai, *Wallfahrt*, 108-09; *idem*, "Relations," 199-200.

[107] On the matter of the restricted worship of "God-fearers" at the temple, see Esler, *Community*, 145-67.

[108] Haenchen, *Acts*, 314; Conzelmann, *Apg.*, 63; G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:498-500; Weiser, *Apg. 1-12.*, 208-09; J.-W. Taeger, *Mensch*, 208-10; Dömer, *Heil*, 167.

[109] M. Wilcox, "'God-Fearers'," 108; Kuhn, "προσήλυτος," 742-43. J. A. Overman, "God-Fearers," 20, contends that Luke in fact does not employ προσήλυτος in the technical sense of a Gentile convert to Judaism because he clearly distinguishes the term from Ἰουδαῖος in Acts 2.11 and 13.43. However, Overman fails to appreciate the social status of proselytes discussed above: while they were fully accepted into the Jewish community, at the same time they continued to be classed in a distinct, slightly inferior, category from native-born Jews.

[110] See Wilcox, "'God-Fearers'," 102-22; Lake, "Proselytes," 85-88.

[111] Note even the context of pagan worship in Acts 19.27: ". . . the great goddess Artemis. . ., she whom all Asia and the world worship (σέβεται)."

[112] Realizing the generalized, non-technical meaning of σέβομαι in Luke-Acts, there is no need to follow those scholars (e.g. Kuhn, "προσήλυτος," 743) who regard the προσήλυτος-reference in Acts 13.43 as an inaccurate Lucan slip or later textual gloss; cf. Wilcox, "'God-Fearers'," 108-09.

[113] The commendation of Jewish elders regarding the centurion in Luke 7 that "he loves our nation" (7.4-5) parallels the report about Cornelius that he "is well spoken of by the whole Jewish nation" (Acts 10.22). Cf. G. Muhlack, *Parallelen*, 39-71, for an extended treatment of the parallel between the centurion-incidents in Luke 7 and Acts 10-11; also J. T. Sanders, *Jews*, 140-41, 173-74.

[114] Esler, *Community*, 35.

[115] Especially in oriental societies (e.g. Persia). On εὐνοῦχος in the ancient world, see J. Schneider, "εὐνοῦχος," 765-68; G. Petzke, "εὐνοῦχος," 202-04; L. H. Gray, "Eunuch," 579-84; Pauly-Wissowa, "Eunuchen," 449-55.

[116] This pattern is especially on display in the book of Esther (1.1, 10, 12, 15, 21; 2.3, 14, 15, 21, 23; 4.4, 5; 6.2, 14; 7.9). See also 4 Kgdms 8.6; 9.32; 20.18; 2 Chron 18.8; Jer 36 (29).2.

[117] S. G. Wilson, *Gentiles*, 171; Hahn, *Mission*, 62 n. 2; de Meester, "Philippe," 363.

[118] Petzke, "εὐνοῦχος," 204; Dinkler, "Philippus," 92.

[119] As in the book of Esther. Among those who regard the status of the Ethiopian official in Acts 8 as a literal eunuch, see (in addition to those

mentioned in previous note) Bornhaüser, *Studien*, 95-99; Löning, "Stephanuskreis," 88; Bachmann, *Jerusalem*, 290-91; Conzelmann, *Apg.*, 63; Roloff, *Apg.*, 140; Taeger, *Mensch*, 209 n. 867; Krodel, *Acts*, 168.

[120] Petzke, "εὐνοῦχος," 202; cf. Gray, "Eunuch," 582: "The social status of the eunuch has always been of the lowest."

[121] Petzke, "εὐνοῦχος," 202; Pauly-Wissowa, "Eunuchen," 449. There was also a select group of men who voluntarily underwent castration for religious reasons, such as priests in the fertility cults of Asia Minor (e.g. Cybele).

[122] Translations of these accounts from Herodotus and Lucian are taken from the LCL.

[123] J. Schneider, "εὐνοῦχος," 766.

[124] Cf. G. Stählin, "ἀποκόπτω," 854, who also points out the probable association in Jewish legal thought between emasculation and other forbidden "cutting" operations characteristic of pagan practice (cf. Lev 19.28; Deut 14.1).

[125] The Mishnah also enforces the Pentateuchal ban on receiving eunuchs as full members in the Jewish community (*m. Yebam.* 8.1-2), although there was some tendency to distinguish the status of those who were eunuchs "by nature," that is, from birth, and those who had been mutilated by men (*m. Yeb.* 8.4-6; cf. Matt 19.12, no Lucan parallel). Cf. Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 343-44, who classes eunuchs alongside bastards in rabbinic tradition as "Israelites with grave racial blemish."

[126] Cf. P. D. Hanson, *Dawn*, 384-85, 388-89; D. Senior and C. Stuhlmueller, *Biblical Foundations*, 28-31, 92.

[127] E.g. Esler, *Community*, 160-62; J. T. Sanders, *Jews*, 152; J. Schneider, "ευνουχος," 768; G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:498; Bornhaüser, *Studien*, 96-97; P. Stuhlmacher, "Gesetz," 269.

[128] Esler, *Community*, 160, and G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:498, note that, in light of his designation of the Samaritan in Luke 17.18 as ἀλλογενής, Luke would have also regarded Philip's mission to the Samaritans as fulfilling the promise of Isaiah 56.

[129] As certain scholars contend: S. G. Wilson, *Gentiles*, 171-72; J. T. Sanders, *Jews*, 152-53; Senior and Stuhlmueller, *Biblical Foundations*, 270 (though cf. 272).

[130] In his account of the temple-cleansing, Luke cites Jesus' appeal to Isa 56.7--"My house shall be a house of prayer" (Luke 19.46)--but, significantly, omits the final phrase--"for all nations"--included in the Marcan parallel (11.17). In Marshall's opinion (*Gospel of Luke*, 721) this

omission has to do with Luke's awareness that the Jerusalem temple in fact never became a gathering center of worship for all the peoples of the world. This accords with our view that Luke especially regards the "multi-national" perspective of Isaiah's prophecy as fulfilled in the Ethiopian eunuch's acceptance of the Christian gospel--apart from the temple!

[131] J. A. Ziesler, "Luke," 146-57, has correctly demonstrated that Luke's portrayal of the Pharisees is by no means a wholly negative one. Particularly in Acts Luke positions certain Pharisees, such as Gamaliel, on the side of the Christian movement (Acts 5.33-39; 23.6-10). However, alongside this more positive presentation, one must not overlook Luke's recurrent and poignant critique of certain Pharisees and scribes for their self-righteous and exclusivist demeanor in relation to impure "sinners" (cf. J. T. Sanders, *Jews*, 84-131).

[132] Note the Jews' staunch commitment to uphold the prohibition against Gentiles entering the inner courts of the temple in the Trophimus-case in Acts 21.

[133] *Contra* Cadbury, "Hellenists," 66: "Whether in point of fact a eunuch could have become a proselyte or been admitted to the service of the Temple is a query which probably did not interest Luke." Supporting our basic viewpoint, see Esler, *Community*, 154-63; Bachmann, *Jerusalem*, 291-97; Löning, "Stephanuskreis," 87-88; Bornhaüser, *Studien*, 94-99.

[134] Cf. Gaventa, *Darkness*, 106: ". . . the Ethiopian eunuch is . . . a <u>symbolic</u> convert. . . . as one who comes from the limits of Luke's geographical world (an Ethiopian) and beyond Luke's [*sic*!] religious community (a eunuch), he symbolizes all those whose inclusion has been announced in Acts 1:8."

[135] Cf. Bock, *Proclamation*, 229-30.

[136] E.g. O. Cullmann, *Christology*, 51-82; Jeremias, "παῖς θεοῦ," 700-717; R. N. Longenecker, *Christology*, 104-09.

[137] M. D. Hooker, *Jesus*, *passim*. Cf. O'Neill, *Theology* (1961), 133-39, and the discussion of the debate in Bovon, *Luc*, 195-97.

[138] D. L. Jones, "Title," 148-65; Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 211-13; Tiede, *Prophecy*, 43-46; Franklin, *Christ*, 60-64.

[139] P. B. Decock, "Understanding," 111-33, does carefully examine the citation's overarching Lucan context, but he remains weak in his analysis of the function of the Isaianic text in its immediate setting of the eunuch-story.

[140] Luke alters the LXX at only two points, and these are both minor (adds αὐτοῦ and changes χειροντος to χείραντος). Cf. Bock, *Proclamation*, 228-29; T. Holtz, *Untersuchungen*, 31-32.

[141] E. Kränkl, *Jesus*, 115; M. Rese, *Alttestamentlich Motive*, 98-100; Cadbury, *Making*, 280-81 n. 2; Hooker, *Jesus*, 113-14; D. L. Jones, "Title," 153.

[142] R. Leivestad, "Ταπεινός," 36-47, stresses that in biblical usage ταπεινος (and cognates ταπεινόω and ταπείνωσις) retains its negative "secular" connotation of "humiliated" (*niedrig*), "debased," etc. and has not become colored by more noble "theological" notions of "humility" (*Demut*) or "meekness," as in the case of ταπεινόφρων/ταπεινοφροσύνη.

[143] So most commentators, e.g. Haenchen, *Acts*, 312; G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:504-05; Roloff, *Apg.*, 141.

[144] Cf. Kränkl, *Jesus*, 114-15; Conzelmann, *Apg.*, 63.

[145] See Decock, "Understanding," 115-22.

[146] BAGD, 153-54.

[147] Commentators favoring this interpretation include: Roloff, *Apg.*, 141, and G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:505. Haenchen, *Acts*, 312, and Kränkl, *Jesus*, 115, admit to its plausibility.

[148] On Luke's use of Isaiah generally, see J. A. Sanders, "Isaiah," 144-55; D. Seccombe, "Luke," 252-59; J. Dupont, *Salvation*, 141-46. On Luke's use of Scripture (including Isaiah) to legitimate the church's universal mission, see J. B. Tyson, "Gentile Mission," 619-31. Noting in particular Luke's use of Isaiah's "servant songs" to justify the gospel's extension to the nations is Franklin, *Christ*, 63.

[149] Cf. R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 458-60, and Tiede, *Prophecy*, 31, who suggests that this Isaiah-laden oracle "might well be regarded as a thematic statement of Luke's entire narrative: the call of the servant (*pais*) to restore the diaspora of Israel and to be a light to the Gentiles to the end of the earth."

[150] See J. A. Sanders, "Isaiah 61," 92-104.

[151] Note that at the end of Acts Paul also appeals to Isa 6.9-10 as part of his justification for turning to the Gentiles (Acts 28.25-28).

[152] Note the play on words: Philip "open[s] his mouth" (ἀνοίξας δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ) to proclaim the good news of the Servant-Jesus who, in his humiliation, had kept his mouth shut, like the sheep or lamb facing slaughter or shearing (οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, Acts 8.32). In this connection Luke may be stressing Philip's function as Jesus' mouthpiece, that is, one who speaks <u>for</u> Jesus as well as <u>about</u> him. Cf. Pesch, *Apg.*, 1:292: ". . . diejenigen, die von 'seinem Geschlecht' (= seinem Nachkommen) erzählen, sind seine Nachfolger wie Philippus selbst, die dem 'mundtot' gemachten Knecht nun bei der Verkündigung des Evangeliums ihren Mund leihen, die Diener des erhöhten Herrn."

[153] Κωλύω is a favorite term of Luke, appearing 12 times in his writings (about half of all NT occurrences) in a variety of contexts: e.g. forbidding taxes (Luke 23.2), preventing assistance (Acts 24.23), thwarting an intent to kill (Acts 27.43). Our concern, of course, is with those instances which closely parallel the situation reflected in the eunuch-story.

[154] O. Cullmann, *Baptism*, 71-80, has theorized that the use of κωλύω in connection with the baptisms of the Ethiopian eunuch and Cornelius reflects the language of a primitive baptismal liturgy designed to test the fitness of candidates for entry into the Christian community. A. W. Argyle, "Cullmann's Theory," 17, has properly challenged this view, however, pointing to the varied usage of κωλύω in Luke-Acts and Greek literature generally in a wide range of contexts having nothing to do with baptism. He regards the LXX as a more likely source of inspiration for Luke's treatment of κωλύω than early Christian liturgical tradition. Without elaboration he notes an interesting possible parallel between the κωλύω-reference in the eunuch-incident and Isa 43.6: "I will say to the north, Give up, and to the south, Do not withhold (Μὴ κώλυε); bring my sons from afar and my daughters from the end of the earth" (cf. references to "passing through the waters" and "Ethiopia" in Isa 43.2-3).

[155] F. Stagg, *Book of Acts*, 1; cf. 1-4, 263-66.

[156] See the section entitled "Unhindered: The Ethiopian Eunuch, a God-fearing Greek" in Stagg, *Book of Acts*, 106-09.

CHAPTER 5: PHILIP AND PETER

[1] J. T. Lienhard, "Acts 6:1-6," 228-30; S. G. Wilson, *Gentiles*, 130.

[2] See e.g. Lienhard, "Acts 6:1-6," 228-36; Weiser, *Apg. 1-12*, 162-69; G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:490-92; M. Hengel, "Between Jesus and Paul," 12-13; M. Simon, *Stephen*, 4-9; E. S. Fiorenza, *Memory*, 162-66.

[3] Notable exceptions include J. B. Tyson, "Acts 6:1-7," 145-61 (literary analysis) and D. Daube, "Reform," 151-63 (use of OT models).

[4] J. Munck, *Acts*, 57, calls attention to inscriptional evidence from ancient Jewish tombs in Jerusalem which testifies to the widespread use of both Greek and Semitic names within individual Jewish families. He then suggests that the Seven should be viewed as a mixed "Hebrew"-"Hellenist" committee, best designed to mollify tensions between the two factions. This is a possible interpretation of the data in Acts 6, but not a necessary one. It is equally plausible that Luke wants to demonstrate the particularly magnanimous good-will of the "Hebrews" and the Twelve toward the neglected "Hellenists" by noting their willingness to turn over the business of table-service to a group comprised exclusively of "Hellenist" representatives.

[5] Cf. Jos. *Ant.* 4.214, 287; *J.W.* 2.569-71; G. Alon, *Jews in their Land*, 1:176-79. For rabbinic references to the "Seven of a City," see Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, 2:641.

[6] Cf. Dunn, *Jesus*, 181. The "wisdom" characteristic of the Seven should not be reduced to the notion of "worldly prudence" (so Haenchen, *Acts*, 262), appropriate to the exercise of practical duties such as table-service. As we see especially in Stephen's case, σοφία is also a dynamic quality inspiring persuasive proclamation (Acts 6.10; cf. Luke 2.15; O. Glombitza, "Charakterisierung," 238-44).

[7] See e.g. the discussion in S. G. Wilson, *Gentiles*, 142-53; Hengel, "Between Jesus and Paul," 13; Dunn, *Unity*, 273-75.

[8] Dunn, *Unity*, 273.

[9] See surveys of the debate in H. -W. Neudorfer, *Stephanuskreis*, 329ff.; Grässer, "Acta-Forschung," 17-25; E. Ferguson, "Hellenists," 159-80.

[10] Hengel, "Between Jesus and Paul," 1-29. Regarding the widespread acceptance of Hengel's basic thesis, E. Larsson, "Hellenisten," 207, wittily remarks: "Es sieht aus, als ob sich die Forscher-Kollegen in einer ähnlichen Situation befanden wie die Gegner des Stephanus in Jerusalem: Sie können der Weisheit und dem Geist, der heraus spricht, nicht widerstehen." Larsson goes on to express his own opinion that he regards Hengel's "begriffsmässige Untersuchung als ganz entscheidend." Among those who either anticipated Hengel's conclusions or have since built upon them, see: Moule, "Once More," 100-02; J. N. Sevenster, *Do You Know Greek?* 28-38; Marshall, "Palestinian and

Hellenistic Christianity," 277-79; R. Pesch, E. Gerhardt, and F. Schilling, "'Hellenisten'," 87-92; G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:406-10; Löning, "Stephanuskreis," 81.

[11] N. Walter, "Apostelgeschichte 6.1," 370-93, has recently argued that the "Hebrew"-"Hellenist" controversy should be viewed not as an inner-Christian conflict but as a problem within the larger Jewish community outside the church. However, from Luke's point of view at least, the situation appears restricted from the start to the context of a growing company of "disciples" (= Christian believers, 6.1a; cf. 6.2a: "the body of the disciples"). For a critique of Walter's thesis and the related stance of N. Hyldahl, see Larsson, "Hellenisten," 208-11.

[12] The term Ἑλληνιστής does not occur in extant Greek literature of antiquity prior to the book of Acts. It appears, however, to be coined from the verb ἑλληνίζω, whose primary meaning was "to speak Greek." Hence the rendering of Ἑλληνιστής as a (Jewish) Greek-speaker. Cf. Sevenster, *Do You Speak Greek?* 28-29; W. Jaeger, *Early Christianity*, 107-09; BAGD, 252.

[13] That is, some would regard the "Hellenists" as more open to practicing Greek customs and more critical of venerated Jewish institutions, such as Torah and Temple. See e.g. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 118-23; Schmithals, *Paul*, 16-37; S. G. Wilson, *Gentiles*, 138-152; Fitzmyer, "Jewish Christianity," 237-38; Ferguson, "Hellenists," 176-80; C. S. Mann, "'Hellenists'," 301-04; Simon, *Stephen*, 9-19. It should be noted, however, that in the book of Acts some Diaspora Jews who had settled in Jerusalem are portrayed as tenaciously loyal to the temple and the laws of Moses (cf. Acts 6.8-15; 21.27-29).

[14] In Acts 9.29 we read that the recently converted Saul "spoke and disputed against the Hellenists" (ἐλάλει τε καὶ συνεζήτει πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνιστάς) who were seeking to kill him. These "Hellenists" seem to be closely related in Luke's presentation to the Greek-speaking Jews from the Diaspora who "disputed (συζητοῦντες, 6.9) with Stephen" in Jerusalem and resisted the way in which "he spoke" (ἐλάλει, 6.10), even to the point of arresting and finally executing him. The socio-religious heritage of the "Hellenists" in 9.29 is evidently the same as that of Stephen and the "Hellenists" of Acts 6.1, except at the volatile point of the latter group's devotion to Jesus of Nazareth. Cf. Simon, *Stephen*, 15: ". . . the term Hellenists, as used by Luke, includes all Greek-speaking Jews, whether already converted, as is in the case of the Seven, or still opposing the Christian message. It must be conceded that to the author of Acts, the word apparently has no other meaning." Pesch, Gerhardt and Schilling, "'Hellenisten'," 87-89; Haenchen, *Acts*, 267.

Cadbury, "Hellenists," 59-74, and more recently Tyson, "Acts 6:1-7," 155-61, have focused principally on Luke's only other use of Ἑλληνιστής--in Acts 11.20--where the term seems to denote "Greeks" (i.e. Gentiles) in opposition to "Jews" (Ἰουδαῖοι) in 11.19, and then argued that the same meaning underlies Luke's reference to "Hellenists" in 6.1 and 9.29. However, there is reasonable doubt concerning the authenticity of the Ἑλληνιστής reading in 11.20 (the variant is Ἕλληνας), and Luke has provided no other

clear indicators that he envisaged Gentiles as comprising part of either the earliest Jerusalem Christian community or the Jewish synagogue within the Holy City. For an alternative socio-historical analysis of the "Hellenists" in 6.1 which supports Hengel's basic position but goes further to posit that the group included God-fearing Gentiles as well as Greek-speaking Jews from the Diaspora, see Esler, *Community*, 136-39, 154-63.

[15] E. C. Blackman, "Hellenists," 524-25, and B. Reicke, *Glaube*, 115-17, suggest that all the Seven and their fellow-Hellenists should be regarded as proselytes. However, as a proselyte (i.e. specifically a Gentile convert to Judaism as well as a Greek-speaking Jew from the Diaspora), Nicolaus appears to be singled out by Luke as an exception among the Seven, rather than the rule.

[16] Walter, "Apostelgeschichte 6.1," 370.

[17] *Ibid.*, 372-73.

[18] *Ibid.*, 370.

[19] Daube, "Reform," 157, suggests that the first person plural "may be explained by taking the 'we' as inclusive, 'we and you together.' The apostles, that is, may have represented the step as one to be taken jointly by them and their followers whom, it should be observed, the apostles were addressing as 'brethren'." Such a view would in fact strengthen our emphasis below on the congregation's key role in the appointment of the Seven. But in light of the ἡμεῖς which begins 6.4 and undoubtedly refers exclusively to the apostles, it seems best also to regard the apostles as the primary subject of καταστήσομεν at the end of 6.3.

[20] *Contra* P. Gaechter, *Petrus*, 128-30, who argues unconvincingly that only the "Hellenists" are assembled by the apostles and take part in selecting the Seven.

[21] What "pleases" (ἀρεστόν, Acts 6.2) the apostles must also "please" (ἀρέσκω, 6.5) the congregation.

[22] Dunn, *Jesus*, 181; Daube, *New Testament*, 237-39; *idem*, "Reform," 157-58; Barrett, *Church*, 50. The "Western" text makes it clear that only the apostles imposed their hands upon the Seven, but this seems to reflect a later tendency in the church toward a more rigid institutionalization of authority.

[23] Daube, *New Testament*, 236-39, understands the congregation's laying on of hands in terms of the Jewish *samakh* ("leaning" on of hands), which symbolizes identification and representation. The people "'leaned their hands on them', thus making them into their representatives. . . . The distribution of charity was now in the hands of the community--the community living in its deputies" (p. 237).

[24] Cf. K. Giles, "'Early Protestantism'? (Part 2)," 16-17: "That the seven are placed in subordination to the apostles is nowhere implied. Luke does not explicitly say that hands were laid upon them solely by the twelve nor does he make them agents of the twelve."

[25] The "Western" variant, ἔστησεν, places the focus on Peter's leading role in the proceedings. Once again the "Western" reading reflects later ecclesiastical practice, in this case the tendency to exalt Peter as the chief monarchical bishop of the church. Cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 288.

[26] Pesch, *Apg.*, 1:90.

[27] On the parallel between the appointment of Matthias in Acts 1 and the Seven in Acts 6, see generally B. Domagalski, "'Sieben'," 26-29.

[28] There is some ambiguity regarding the subject of Λειτουργούντων in 13.2. Is it the entire "church at Antioch" (13.1) or strictly the five prophets and teachers gathered in a closed session? We are following the judgment of Marshall, *Acts*, 215, on this matter: "Since the list of names in verse 1 is primarily meant to show who was available for missionary service, and since changes of subject are not uncommon in Greek, it is preferable to assume that Luke is thinking of an activity involving the members of the church generally." Cf. also Krodel, *Acts*, 228.

[29] The same group who <u>worships and fasts</u> in 13.2--namely, the congregation together with its leaders--would appear to be the same body who <u>fasts and prays</u> in 13.3 and by the laying on of hands commissions Barnabas and Saul for missionary service.

[30] In Acts 6.4 the commitment of the Twelve to the ministry of the word is conjoined with their devotion to <u>prayer</u>. However, in 6.2 the Twelve only refer to "preaching the word of God" over against the ministry of table-service, and it is this fundamental contrast which shall occupy our attention in this section.

[31] This incident also seems related in Luke's mind to Elijah's encounter with the Sidonian widow in 1 Kings 17 (1 Kgs 17.8-16 [miraculous feeding of widow]//Luke 4.25-27; 1 Kgs 17.17-24 [miraculous raising of widow's son]//Luke 7.11-17). Cf. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 72, 87-88.

[32] On the plight of widows in the ancient world, see G. Stählin, "Bild der Witwe," 5-20.

[33] Cf. also the Nazareth-pericope where Jesus implicitly related Elijah's ministry to the widow (with which he identifies, Luke 4.25-26) to his vocation of preaching good news to the poor and liberating the oppressed (4.18).

[34] For a discussion relating Luke's overall presentation of widows to the situation in Acts 6, see Tyson, "Acts 6:1-7," 158-59.

[35] Though Peter does not directly engage in charitable work on behalf of widows, he certainly does so in a significant, indirect way by raising up Dorcas, who herself had been "full of good works and acts of charity" (9.36) toward needy widows. As Haenchen, *Acts*, 340, puts it: "for them [widows] the restoration to life of their benefactress is especially important."

[36] Cf. Larsson, "Hellenisten," 211: "Die alte Frage, ob Apg 6 die Gründung des Diakonats schildert, sollte heute nicht mehr aktuell sein." Barrett, *Church*, 49-51. Domagalski, "'Sieben'," 33, agrees that in Acts 6.1-7 Luke does not intend to portray the institution of the diaconate, but he goes on needlessly to qualify this judgment, almost to the point of negating it altogether, by suggesting that Luke does intend "die Möglichkeit zur Weitergabe von kirchlichen Ämtern schildern" and that "Lukas hier auf einen vorliegendenden Bericht zurückgreift, der aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach schon in enger Verbindung mit dem Amt der Diakoknen stand."

[37] H. Beyer, "διακονέω," 81-93, has demonstrated that throughout the range of ancient Greek literature, including Luke-Acts, the διακονέω word group maintains a primary association with food-service or table-waiting.

[38] Fiorenza, *Memory*, 165-66, thinks that the problem in Acts 6 concerned a specifically eucharistic meal in which "Hellenist" widows were either not properly served themselves or excluded from participating in serving others. However, from the standpoint of Luke's presentation, it is by no means certain that formal eucharistic connotations lie behind every reference to "breaking of bread" or meal-time observances (see Barrett, *Church*, 60-63; Dunn, *Unity*, 163).

[39] There was also a weekly distribution in which the local poor received requisite food and clothing. See the discussion in Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 130-32; A. Strobel, "Armenpfleger," 271-76.

[40] M. Hengel, "Maria Magdalena," 247-48, suggests that in Luke's presentation this account parallels the report in Acts 6.1-7 as "eine paradigmatische Vorstufe des späteren Diakonenamtes." As the diaconal ministry of the Seven in Acts 6 is designed to free the Twelve to pursue their ministry of the word without encumbrance, so the service of the women in Luke 8 enables Jesus and the apostles to carry out their task of proclaiming the kingdom of God.

[41] Fiorenza, *Memory*, 165; cf. G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:426 n. 48.

[42] B. Witherington III, "On the Road," 244 n. 6.

[43] *Ibid.*, 243-48. Note that in Luke 24.8-11 the women are portrayed as witnesses of Jesus' resurrection <u>to the eleven apostles</u>, who initially respond to the valid testimony with incredulity.

[44] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 893: "Luke in this scene does not hesitate to depict a woman as a disciple sitting at Jesus' feet. . . . the episode is

scarcely introduced to instruct women about the proper entertainment of traveling preachers. Jesus rather encourages a woman to learn from him."

[45] The themes of food and table-fellowship are pervasive in Luke's Gospel and relate to a wide range of issues. Cf. R. Karris, *Luke*, 47: "The extent. . . of Luke's use of the theme of food is appreciated only when the reader realizes that the aroma of food issues from each and every chapter of Luke's Gospel" (see pp. 47-78 for an extended treatment of the motif). D. E. Smith, "Table Fellowship," 613-38, divides his analysis of table-fellowship into five distinct categories. We have chosen to limit our discussion to only one of these areas--"Table Service as a Symbol for Community Service" (pp. 629-33)--which is most directly relevant to the situation in Acts 6.

[46] Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 216-17.

[47] The opening statement of the feeding pericope in Luke 9.10a--"On their return the apostles told him what they had done"--clearly links this story back to the report of the Twelve's preaching mission in 9.1-6. And Luke's connection between these preaching and feeding episodes is much closer than in Mark because of the greatly abbreviated intervening account of Herod's problems over John the Baptist (Luke 9.7-9; cp. Mark 6.14-29).

[48] Note that Jesus' food service is also juxtaposed with his ministry of <u>prayer</u> in Luke 9.18, 28. Compare Acts 6.4, where the Twelve emphasize their duty to <u>pray</u> as well as minister the word over against the Seven's responsibility to wait on tables.

[49] Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 989.

[50] Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 217.

[51] The picture of table-service in the parable no doubt has a figurative application to all forms of ministry within the community, but this does not preclude an application to literal table-service as well. Cf. D. E. Smith, "Table Fellowship," 630: "This text surely correlates with the reference in Acts 6:1-6 to actual table service in the early church. In addition, however, it can be interpreted as a symbol of servanthood as a whole."

[52] P. S. Minear, "Note on Luke 17:7-10," 85; cf. pp. 82-87 and esp. p. 86, where a connection is made between this text and Acts 6.1-6.

[53] Luke's image of a table-servant as the model of greatness also differs slightly from that of a foot-washing, household servant in John 13.12-16.

[54] On the connection between the Last Supper scene and Jesus' statement in Luke 22.27, see D. J. Lull, "Servant-Benefactor," 297-99.

[55] Though χρεία in Acts 6.3 is usually translated "duty" or "office", following customary Hellenistic Greek usage (cf. Bruce, *Acts* [1952], 152; BAGD, 885), the idea of appointing the Seven "over this need" (that is, to

meet the need of widows for food) appears to fit adequately the context of Acts 6.1-7 and matches the consistent sense of χρεια as "need, necessity" elsewhere in Luke-Acts (Luke 5.31; 9.11; 10.42; 15.7; 19.31, 34; 22.71; Acts 2.45; 4.35; 20.34; 28.10).

[56] Note also that after his presentation in Acts 8 as a dynamic evangelist, Philip returns in Acts 21.8 to a domestic role as provider of hospitality. For a fuller discussion of this role, see chap. 6.

[57] E.g. Haenchen, *Acts*, 262; Marshall, *Acts*, 126-27; Daube, *New Testament*, 238-39; Roloff, *Apg.*, 119; Pesch, *Apg.*, 1:230.

[58] Daube, "Reform," 151-63. This article (published in 1976) updates and expands the author's earlier discussion of Acts 6.1-7 in *New Testament* (1956), 237-39. Daube's insights have been incorporated into two recent German commentaries: G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:422-30; Pesch, *Apg.* 1:225-26. (These two works also discuss Pharoah's appointment of Joseph to oversee the distribution of grain in Gen 41.29-43 as a possible literary background to Acts 6.1-7.)

[59] Daube, "Reform," 155, thinks that Acts 6.2 should be taken to mean that the apostles had themselves assumed responsibility for community table-service up to this point ("it is no good that, having abandoned preaching, we are engaged in the distribution of supplies"). But the majority of scholars would follow Haenchen's interpretation: "These words do not mean that the Apostles gave up this service because they were overworked; καταλείψαντας does not express past action: the Apostles are not reproaching themselves with having taken over the serving of tables (with unhappy results, at that) and therefore neglected their preaching. Luke is rather explaining to the reader why the Apostles did not themselves assume this responsibility" (*Acts*, 262).

[60] Daube, "Reform." 154-55.

[61] See E. G. Martin, "Eldad and Modad," 463-65.

[62] For a discussion of Luke's typological method which correlates the seventy elders (seventy-two with Eldad and Medad?) in Numbers 11 with the seventy (-two) messengers in Luke 10 and the seven servants in Acts 6, see A. M. Farrer, "Ministry," 133-50.

[63] Cf. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 398: "The background of the story lies. . . in the appointment of the Twelve to mission, and their incredulity that one who had not been authorised in the same way should be doing the same work. It is thus a NT parallel to the situation in Nu. 11:24-30."

[64] Daube, "Reform," 158-59.

[65] Daube, "Reform," 158, notes that in comparison with the elders in Numbers 11 not only Philip becomes an inspired preacher, but also his daughters are introduced later in Acts as those "who prophesied" (21.9).

[66] Cf. J. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 107-110, 122 n. 36.

[67] Cf. chap. 5, "The Riddle of Samaria," in Dunn, *Baptism*, 55-68.

[68] E.g. H. D. Hunter, *Spirit-Baptism*, 83-84; H. M. Ervin, *Conversion-Initiation*, 25-40.

[69] E.g. N. Adler, *Taufe*, 109-117; J. Coppens, "L'imposition," 423-32; L. Dewar, *Holy Spirit*, 51-57; cf. discussion in Bovon, *Luc*, 244-52.

[70] E.g. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 119-20; J. E. L. Oulton, "Holy Spirit," 236-40; Bruce *Acts* (1962), 182-83; and most recently Gourges, "Esprit," 376: "The Samaritans had only received individually the gift of the 'quiet Spirit' linked with baptism. The laying on of hands performed by Peter and Paul [*sic*] coincides with a 'Pentecost' or manifestation of the 'shattering Spirit' which indicates that the time has come to move into the second stage of mission."

[71] οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδείς οὐδέπω κείμενος: attested in Sinaiticus, C, K, P, W, and incorporated in the Westcott-Hort text.

[72] Oulton, "Holy Spirit," 238.

[73] Cf. S. New, "Name," 136-37.

[74] Cf. Schmithals, *Apg.*, 81: ". . . das Manko der Samaritaner unbegreiflich bleibt, da ja Philippus 'voll von Geist'. . . wirkt und tauft."

[75] In the book of Acts we learn that Ananias was "a disciple" (9.10) and "a devout man according to the law, well spoken of by all the Jews" (22.12)--but nowhere is there any specific mention of his being Spirit-empowered or performing miraculous, charismatic deeds.

[76] Some view the laying on of Ananias' hands as directly leading only to the recovery of Saul's sight and not to his reception of the Spirit, but the text suggests both effects. Cf. Koch, "Geistbesitz," 69 n. 15; Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 251 n. 160.

[77] So E. Käsemann, *Essays*, 146.

[78] πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον, ἄγγελος δέ κυρίου ἥρπασεν τὸν Φίλιππον.

[79] E. Schweizer, "πνεῦμα," 409; Marshall, *Acts*, 165-66; cf. discussion in Coppens, "L'imposition," 410-11.

[80] The "rapture" idea associated with ἁρπάζω does appear in 2 Cor 12.2, 4; 1 Thess 4.17 and Rev 12.5--but not in conjunction with the Spirit. Cf. Coppens, "L'imposition," 411.

[81] Lake and Cadbury, *Beginnings*, 4:98, suggest that the "Western" text might be the more difficult since it clashes with Acts 8.14-17. It does conflict with the Samaritan-story in its association of Philip with the Spirit's coming. But at least 8.14-17 and the "Western" reading of 8.39 agree that the Spirit is poured out upon believers, whereas the shorter reading of 8.39 actually diverges from 8.14-17 in that the Spirit, as far as we are told, does not come at all--immediately or later--upon the eunuch.

[82] See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 360-61; Coppens, "L'imposition," 410-11.

[83] Cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 221-27.

[84] See Acts 1.2, 5; 6.10; 8.35; 11.17; 15.29, 32; 19.1; E. J. Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 116-18.

[85] Schweizer, "πνεῦμα," 409, suggests the possibility that the "Western" text in Acts 8.39 represents "the remnant of a pre-Lukan tradition."

[86] Marshall, *Acts*, 165-66; Bruce, *Acts* (1962), 190; Lampe, *Seal*, 65-67; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 118-19.

[87] Käsemann, *Essays*, 90, 136-48.

[88] Haenchen, *Acts*, 306; cf. also Conzelmann, *Apg.*, 61-62; Koch, "Geistbesitz," 69-82; Schmithals, *Apg.*, 80-81; Weiser, *Apg. 1-12*, 200, 203.

[89] Conzelmann, *Apg.*, 61.

[90] Cf. Dunn, *Baptism*, 58-59; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 114-15; H. von Baer, *Heilige Geist*, 172-73; M. Quesnel, *Baptisés*, 60-61.

[91] Cf. Barrett, "Light," 292-95; Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 253-56.

[92] Concerning whether the "gift" which Simon desires is the Spirit himself or the ability to impart the Spirit, see Koch, "Geistbesitz," 76-77; Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 254.

[93] Luke might even be taken to stress that the primary action on the part of the apostles catalyzing the descent of the Spirit was prayer: "they prayed for them so that (ὅπως) they might receive the Holy Spirit" (Acts 8.15). The laying on of hands follows immediately as an accompanying activity, but it appears to be distinguished from the actual transmission of the Spirit: "then they laid their hands on them and (καὶ) they received the Holy Spirit" (8.17). Of course, Simon Magus interprets the Spirit as coming

through the laying on of hands. But this may be viewed as part of his skewed perspective on the whole event.

[94] On the connection between prayer and the activity of the Spirit in Luke-Acts see e.g. Luke 11.13; Acts 1.14 and 2.1-4; 4.31; 13.1-3; and S. Smalley, "Spirit," 59-71.

[95] Note the repetition of λαμβάνω in our text: vv. 15, 17, 19; cf. Acts 2.38.

[96] The Cornelius-incident especially reveals the "sovereign" dimension of the Spirit's activity.

[97] Cf. Barrett, "Light," 292-95; *idem*, *Church*, 58-59, 78-80; Dunn, *Unity*, 356-58.

[98] Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 248-51. He notes in particular the divergence of the supposed traditional remnant in Acts 8.14-17 from what he regards as Luke's own view in 9.17, for example, which allows for someone who was not an apostle (Ananias) to transmit the Spirit (p. 251 n. 160). Cf. Lake, "Holy Spirit," 108-110.

[99] Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 249-51.

[100] Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 249, speaks of the "Ausbleiben jeglicher abträglichen Bewertung oder positiven Beurteilung" connected with the characterization of Philip's ministry in Acts 8--including his lack of involvement in imparting the Spirit. Moreover, "hat Philippus das Vorrecht der Apostel respektiert und seine Tätigkeit auf Verkündigung und Taufe beschränkt, ohne dass diese Kompetenzbegrenzung für ihn zu einem offenen oder latenten Problem geworden wäre" (my emphasis, pp. 249-50).

[101] Cf. Dunn, *Unity*, 109-114; cf. 106-09.

[102] Cf. Oulton, "Holy Spirit," 236; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 104-12. Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 251 n. 160, recognizes the problem and wants to get out of it by regarding Luke's overall view as one which magnifies the freedom of the Spirit but also tolerates a more institutional perspective as having "provisional/temporary significance (*vorläufige Bedeutung*)." This analysis, however, fails to take seriously enough the fundamental opposition between hierarchical and democratic models of the Spirit's transmission and operation.

[103] Stählin, *Apg.*, 122-24; Barrett, "Light," 281-82.

[104] For the emphasis on fellowship in this encounter, see Lampe, *Seal*, 69-72; Bruce, "Holy Spirit," 174.

[105] See Schweizer, "πνευμα," 411-13; Roloff, *Apg.*, 135-36; G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:491-92; Löning, "Lukas," 205-10, 228; S. Brown, "'Water-Baptism'," 149; W. Wilkens, "Wassertaufe," 26-27.

[106] Cf. Roloff, *Apg.*, 135-36; Dunn, *Baptism*, 59; Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 114-15; S. G. Wilson, *Gentiles*, 240: "Luke himself has left hints which show that Jerusalem did not enjoy such a ubiquitous role as overseer of all missionary development as his overall scheme implies."

[107] The precise identity of the one who baptizes with the Spirit remains unclear in Acts 1.5, but 2.32-33 clearly ascribes this ministry to the risen and exalted Christ.

[108] S. Brown, "'Water-Baptism'," 135-51, and Wilkens, "Wassertaufe," 26-44, both discuss Luke's emphasis on the distinction between water-baptism and Spirit-baptism and the foundation of this distinction in the respective ministries of John the Baptist and Jesus. However, while these scholars acknowledge the basic fit of the Samaritan-episode within this schema, they do not exlore the possible connection between the vocations of Philip and John the Baptist.

[109] See R. Laurentin, *Structure*, 36-42; R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 246-53; A. George, "Parallele," 147-71.

[110] See Benoit, "Enfance," 191-93; Dömer, *Heil*, 18-25; H. H. Oliver, "Lucan Birth Stories," 215-26; W. B. Tatum, "Epoch," 184-95.

[111] Cf. E. Bammel, "Baptist," 105-09, and survey of research in Oliver, "Lucan Birth Stories," 205-15.

[112] Solid evidence for the existence of Baptist sects who claimed John as the Messiah emerges first in the Pseudo-Clementine and Mandean literature. On Baptist movements in ancient history, see generally J. Thomas, *Mouvement*; C. H. Kraeling, *John*, 158-87 (chap. 6); Scobie, *John*, 187-202 (chap. 12); Bammel, "Baptist," 95-128.

[113] Cf. R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 245-50; W. Wink, *John*, 58-72.

[114] Conzelmann, *Theology*, 24, 172.

[115] Oliver, "Lucan Birth Stories," 217.

[116] *Ibid.*; cf. overall discussion, pp. 216-26.

[117] Tatum, "Epoch," 189; cf. overall discussion, pp. 184-95.

[118] Tatum, "Epoch," 187, goes too far when he concludes that "the role played by the Spirit here in relation to Jesus [Luke 1.35] is to be <u>sharply distinguished</u> [emphasis added] from the role it plays in relation to John [in Luke 1.15]." More specifically, he sets up an unnecessary dichotomy between the <u>Spirit of prophecy</u>, which engulfs John in his mother's womb, and the Spirit as <u>divine creative power</u>, operative in Jesus' conception. Passages like Luke 4.14-19; Acts 1.8; 2.17; and 4.31, taken together, demonstrate how

closely the Spirit of prophecy and power are associated in Luke's presentation.

[119] Among those who note the technique of "climactic parallelism" in Luke-Acts, see Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 216; K. E. Bailey, *Poet*; H. Flender, *St. Luke*, 20-27. However, when assessing the "climactic parallelism" structuring Luke's characterization of John and Jesus in Luke 1-2, Flender exaggerates the distinctive dimension: "Obviously, Luke is very interested in showing that the Baptist stands shoulder to shoulder with Jesus, but at the same time they are poles apart [emphasis added]" (p. 22). In our view, the transparent "shoulder to shoulder" comparison of John and Jesus at a number of points precludes a starkly gaping polarization between the two figures. Distinction, yes; polarization, no.

[120] Minear, "Luke's Use," 122-23; cf. overall discussion, pp. 118-30. See more recently, Minear, *To Heal*, 97: "Certainly Luke did not encourage his readers to promote Jesus by demoting John. To him the association of the two prophets did not demean either." Note also the conclusion of Wink, *John*, 71: "This parallelism [between John and Jesus in the traditions utilized in Luke 1] is the artistic expression of the theological conviction. . . that through both men God has worked the redemption of Israel."

[121] Matt 3.5-6 and Mark 1.5 depict a more stationary mission of John in which people come to him at the Jordan. The larger Palestinian setting for John's ministry in Luke's Gospel (cp. John 1,28; 3.26) argues against the strict geographical limitation of the Baptist's activity to the Jordan locale (*contra* Conzelmann, *Theology*, 20). Cf. Wink, *John*, 49-51; Reicke, "Verkündigung," 52.

[122] Cf. Dömer, *Heil*, 31.

[123] At this point Luke is closer to the presentation in the Fourth Gospel (cf. John 1.19-28).

[124] Cf. H. Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 172, 186. In Acts 1.5 ἐν πνεύματι occupies a similar prominent position in the sentence, featuring Jesus' forecast of the apostles' Spirit-baptism as an experience distinct from John's baptism in water.

[125] Cf. W. Grundmann, *Evangelium*, 105, and Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 146: "the phrase ὀπίσω μου is omitted, possibly as conveying a sense of inferiority."

[126] Scobie, *John*, 67-73; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 174-75. This judgmental dimension of the predicted Spirit-and-fire baptism does not preclude an accompanying salvific (purifying/refining) dimension as well in Luke's presentation (note esp. the manifestation of Spirit and "fire" in the Pentecost-scene in Acts 2.1-4, 17-21). See the analyses of Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 144-48; Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 473-75; Dunn "Spirit-and-Fire Baptism," 85-92 (though much of the discussion focuses on determining what the

"historical" John might have meant by announcing a future baptism of Spirit and fire).

[127] As does Conzelmann, *Theology*, 23 n. 1, 221.

[128] Wink, *John*, 53; cf. Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 27-30; G. Friedrich, "εὐαγγελίζομαι," 719.

[129] As is well known, Matthew and Mark treat the imprisonment (and eventual beheading) of John the Baptist much more extensively than Luke and at a much later point in their Gospel narratives (Matt 14.3-12//Mark 6.17-29).

[130] Wink, *John*, 83 n. 1, suggests that "βαπτισθέντος [in Luke 3.21] is intended as middle ([Jesus] 'baptized himself') since no one else is there to baptize him."

[131] Cf. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 152; Wilkens, "Wassertaufe," 29.

[132] On Luke's understanding of Jesus' reception of the Spirit at the Jordan as a "Spirit-baptism" paradigmatic of the early Christians' experience at Pentecost, see Dunn, *Baptism*, 23-54. For an alternative view, see M. M. B. Turner, "Jesus," 10, 28-29, 40, who stresses more the uniqueness of Jesus' anointing by the Spirit in Luke's Gospel *vis-à-vis* the church's baptism in the Spirit in Acts.

[133] A still later reference to John the Baptist in Luke's Gospel is found in 16.16, a verse which Conzelmann depends upon heavily to make his case for a rigid separation of John's epoch (Israel) from that of Jesus and the kingdom of God (the center-point of time) (*Theology*, 21-27, 112, 160-62). Linguistically, however, Luke 16.16 is far from clear and can even be used to support the very opposite of what Conzelmann contends! "The law and the prophets were until John (μέχρι Ἰωάννου; up to but <u>not</u> including John?); since then (ἀπὸ τότε; from John onwards?) the good news of the kingdom is preached" (cf. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 628-29). In any event Minear's cutting criticism of Conzelmann's handling of Luke 16.16 must be born in mind: "It must be said that rarely has a scholar placed so much weight on so dubious an interpretation of so difficult a logion" ("Luke's Use," 122; cf. Wink, *John*, 51-57).

[134] Schweizer, "Bekehrung," 75-79, emphasizes the introduction of Apollos as a "Jew" and attempts to demonstrate how ζέων τῷ πνεύματι and ἡ ὁδός τοῦ κυρίου (Acts 18.25) could have originally been interpreted in a strictly Jewish sense. However, Barrett, "Apollos," 29-39; Dunn, *Baptism*, 88-89; H. Preisker, "Apollos," 301-04; and most other commentators accept Apollos' "Christian" status from the start.

[135] "The Way" for Luke is something of a technical term designating the Christian movement; cf. Acts 9.2; 19.9, 23; 22.4; 24.14, 22.

[136] Note also the common element of "boldness" in the proclamation of Apollos (Acts 18.26) and Paul (28.31). Cf. Barrett, "Apollos," 30.

[137] Cadbury, "Names," 378-79.

[138] On baptism as the object of John's preaching as well as practice, see Luke 3.3; Acts 10.37; 13.24.

[139] For a similar recognition of the John/Apollos parallel, see Pereira, *Ephesus*, 61-65.

[140] E.g. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 108-111; Roloff, *Apg.*, 181.

[141] Barrett, "Apollos," 36-37; M. Wolter, "Apollos," 61-62.

[142] Cadbury, "Names," 375-78.

[143] Dunn, *Baptism*, 84, suggests that "Luke's description of the twelve as τινες μαθῆται. . . probably implies that the twelve did not belong to 'the disciples' in Ephesus. . . " However, in this context the use of τινες (even without an accompanying definite article) most naturally means that Paul simply met "some"--that is, not all, only a portion, a particular group--of members within the larger Ephesian community. Most commentators on Acts 19.1-7 support the reading of "disciples" as true believers.

[144] Cf. the clarification of the "Western" reviser: "We have not even heard whether people are receiving [λαμβάνουσίν τινες] the Holy Spirit."

[145] M. Barth, *Taufe*, 169, contends that Acts 19.5 continues Paul's explanation of the significance of John's baptism, thus equating John's "baptism of repentance" with baptism "in the name of Jesus." However, Luke nowhere else intimates a complete blurring of distinctions between John's baptism and "Christian" baptism, and as Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 111 n. 4, remarks, Barth's view implausibly "implies that in receiving John's baptism Jesus was baptized unto Himself!" Accordingly, we are best advised to take Acts 19.5 as part of Luke's narrative, describing the baptism of the Ephesian disciples in the name of Jesus which took place following Paul's comments concerning their former Johannine baptism.

[146] Paul only had a brief stay in Ephesus up to this point, and the only recorded ministry of Aquila and Priscilla was directed to Apollos himself. Certainly neither Paul nor his companions would have converted the twelve disciples and left them in the state in which Paul later finds them in the Acts story.

[147] In the Acts narrative, the twelve apostles of Jesus apparently also receive the Spirit with no subssequent baptism in the name of Jesus to supplement their Johannine baptism (cf. Acts 1.21, 22; 2.1-4).

[148] Käsemann, *Essays*, 136-48.

[149] Barrett, "Apollos," 38-39; Schweizer, "Bekehrung," 75.

[150] Wolter, "Apollos," 68; cf. 67-71.

[151] *Ibid.*, 72-73.

[152] Cf. Käsemann, *Essays*, 144-45.

[153] The only other occurrence in Acts of the imposition of hands in connection with receiving the Spirit comes in the case involving Ananias and Saul (Acts 9.17).

[154] Cf. Schweizer, "πνεῦμα," 414-15, and the fuller discussions in S. Brown, "'Water-Baptism'," and Wilkens, "Wassertaufe."

[155] Even the one verse in Acts 2.38 which appears most to lead in the direction of a water-baptism/Spirit unity proves otherwise by its own context. Those who hear Peter's Pentecost sermon, repent and are baptized in the name of Jesus are not explicitly reported to have received the Spirit immediately. The first mention of their being filled with the Spirit comes later when the young Jerusalem congregation gathers for prayer (4.31). This accent on prayer, coupled with the stress on the Spirit as the gift of God, undergirds Luke's dominant theological motif related to the reception of the Spirit: the Spirit is bestowed according to the sovereign will of the Father and the Son apart from the performance of any human rite--such as baptism.

EXCURSUS: *THE LETTER OF PETER TO PHILIP*

[1] M. W. Meyer and F. Wisse, "Letter," 433.

[2] All citations from *The Letter of Peter to Philip* are taken from the translation by F. Wisse in Meyer and Wisse, "Letter," 434-37 (*Nag Hammadi Library in English*). For other modern translations, see Meyer, *Letter*, 17-33; J. É. Ménard, *Lettre*, 10-29; H. -G. Bethge, "Sogennante 'Brief'," 166-68.

[3] Meyer, *Letter*, 92.

[4] See the discussion in G. P. Luttikhuizen, "Letter," 96-102; K. Koschorke, "Gnostische Pfingstpredigt," 325-332; T. V. Smith, *Petrine Controversies*, 122-26; Meyer, *Letter*, 94-98; Meyer and Wisse, "Letter," 431-32. *The Letter of Peter to Philip* also shows signs of adapting other NT materials besides Luke-Acts, such as the Johannine prologue.

[5] For a summary of references to the two Philips in early Christian literature, see P. W. Schmiedel, "Philip," 3697-3701; Bovon, "Actes de Philippe," 4456-60; H. H. Platz, "Philip," 784-85.

[6] Meyer, *Letter*, 95-97.

[7] T. V. Smith, *Petrine Controversies*, 124-25; cf. Koschorke, "Gnostische Pfingstpredigt," 328.

[8] Other ancient Petrine or pseudo-Petrine documents would include 1-2 Peter, *Apocalypse of Peter*, *The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles*, and the *Epistula Petri* (at the beginning of the Pseudo-Clementine literature).

[9] Ménard, *Lettre*, 7.

CHAPTER 6: PHILIP AND PAUL

[1] The most immediate context is the report of a series of stops from Miletus to Jerusalem in 21.1-16; cf. the title for this section in Lüdemann's commentary on Acts, *Frühe Christentum*, 238: "Reise von Milet nach Jerusalem."

[2] The later and expanded "Western" version of Acts 21.16-17 discloses that in fact Mnason's home was the final resting-place for Paul's travel party before entering Jerusalem: "And these [the Caesarean disciples] brought us to those with whom we were to lodge; and when we arrived at a certain village, we stayed with Mnason of Cyprus, an early disciple. And when we had departed thence we came to Jerusalem." (See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 483.) Roloff, *Apg.*, 313-14, thinks that this reading accurately interprets Luke's report of the Pauline itinerary. Though some ambiguities do exist in the original text of Acts 21.15-17 regarding the exact location of Mnason's residence, we agree with Lake and Cadbury that "a linguistically more natural exegesis would place Mnason's house in Jerusalem" (*Beginnings*, 4:270). The mention in 21.17 of the travellers' advent to Jerusalem and warm welcome by "the brethren" most logically does not begin a new section in a new setting but rather describes what happened when the Pauline party reached Mnason's dwelling (cf. 21.15-16). The shift in setting does not occur until 21.18, where we learn that "on the following day" an audience is sought with James and the elders of the Jerusalem community (cf. discussion in Stählin, *Apg.*, 275-76).

[3] On the basic link which Luke establishes between Paul and Philip in conjunction with Stephen's death, see R. L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts*, 44; Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 312.

[4] 20.5-15 and 21.1-18. These together with 16.10-17 and 27.1-28.16 comprise the four "we"-passages in Acts of which scholars most often speak. See e.g. V. Robbins, "By Land," 216; Lüdemann, *Paul*, 25-26; E. Plümacher, "Wirklichkeitserfahrung," 2.

[5] H. Cadbury, "'We'," 130 n. 1.

[6] This happens also at Troas on the present journey (20.9-12); cf. also 27.9-12, 21-26, 30-36; 28.3-6.

[7] See general discussion of the "we"-problem in Dupont, *Sources*, 75-165; Aune, *New Testament*, 122-24; R. Jewett, *Chronology*, 13-17; G. Schneider, *Apg.*, 1:89-95.

[8] Haenchen, *Acts*, 85.

[9] Robbins, "By Land," 215-42.

[10] Plümacher, "Wirklichkeitserfahrung," 16-22.

[11] Jewett, *Chronology*, 13.

[12] See the useful critique of Robbins' "we"-theory (related to ancient reports of sea voyages) in C. K. Barrett, "Paul Shipwrecked." Cf. also Marshall, *Acts*, 38-39, and W. S. Kurz, "Narrative Approaches," 210:

> All literary critics whose treatment of the Acts "We" passages I have discovered interpret them as a claim of the implied author's presence in those Acts events. Whether or not this claim is verified historically for the real author as distinct from the implied author, literary criticism clearly establishes the fact that the implied author is making such a claim and not automatically using a sea voyage convention forced on him by his environment.

[13] See the extensive linguistic investigation in Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, 26-120.

[14] Evidence of literary design in the Lucan report of Paul's final journey to Jerusalem may also be detected in the repeated emphasis upon (1) Paul's determined intention to go to Jerusalem (20.16, 22; 21.13); (2) the Holy Spirit's particular revelation of the trials which await Paul in the city (29.22-23; 21.11); and (3) the grief of Paul's friends over his departure and future destiny (20.36-38; 21.5, 12-13). Cf. Weiser, *Apg. 13-28*, 588.

[15] See A. J. Mattill, Jr., "Jesus-Paul Parallels," 30-37; W. Radl, *Paulus*, 133-68; J. Neyrey, *Passion*, 98-107; O'Toole, *Unity*, 67-72. Bovon, "Saint-Esprit," 339-51, also suggests Luke's dependence in Acts 20.36-21.16 on conventional rhetorical patterns from classical Greek literature.

[16] Harnack, *Acts*, 186-94; *idem*, *Luke the Physician*, 152-65; Bruce, *Acts* (1962), 424; A. T. Robertson, *Luke*, 84; cf. W. W. Gasque, *History*, 152. However, in supporting the view that the author of Luke-Acts personally encountered Philip the evangelist, we are not necessarily bound to follow Harnack in identifying "Luke" with Luke the physician.

[17] On the literary nature of Luke's work as <u>both</u> creatively artistic and historically factual, note Aune's assessment of the book of Acts in the context of ancient historiography: "Acts <u>is</u> entertaining and edifying. That Acts should be categorized as a <u>historical novel</u> with closer links to fiction than history, however, is doubtful. . . . Though ancient historians wrote to entertain, they did not think truth and usefulness had to be sacrificed" (*New Testament*, 80).

[18] See A. J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects*, 62-66; J. Stambaugh and D. Balch, *Social World*, 37-38; L. T. Johnson, *Writings*, 27.

[19] Stambaugh and Balch, *Social World*, 138-40; G. Stählin, "ξένος," 23; R. Banks, *Paul's Idea*.

[20] Bishops and widows were singled out as having particular responsibilities for hospitality (1 Tim 3.2; 5.10), but all believers were

expected to participate in this duty as well. Cf. D. W. Riddle, "Early Christian Hospitality," 141-54.

[21] Cf. Riddle, "Early Christian Hospitality," 142-44, and the parallel experiences of Paul and Ignatius as venerated Christian ministers who, on the road to martyrdom, receive hospitality from loyal and loving disciples.

[22] Malherbe, "Inhospitality," 222-32.

[23] Stählin, "ξένος," 23 n. 165, suggests that the early church's custom of requiring letters of introduction (cf. 2 Cor 3.1; Rom 16.1-2; Acts 18.27) arose because of the exploitative practices of unscrupulous travelling ministers.

[24] Cf. G. Theissen, *Social Setting*, 40-54; B. Holmberg, *Paul*, 86-93.

[25] I am indebted in this section especially to the chapter on Luke-Acts in J. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 85-123. Cf. also D. Juel, *Luke-Acts*, 88-90; H. Cadbury, "Lexical Notes," 305-22; *idem*, *Making of Luke-Acts*, 251-53.

[26] Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 86-88.

[27] Cf. Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 86-87: "In contrast to Mark and Matthew, Luke allows Jesus no regular headquarters in Peter's house at Capernaum."

[28] The contrast drawn here is between the minister's right to be served and his responsibility to minister the word, not between the relative values of the ministries of table-service and proclamation in general (cf. discussion in §2.2, chap. 5).

[29] Δέχομαι and various related compound terms are frequently used in Luke-Acts in connection with hospitality: e.g. Luke 9.5, 53; 10.8, 10, 38; 16.4, 9; 19.6; Acts 17.7; 21.17; 28.7, 30.

[30] Only here and in Luke 19.7 in the NT is καταλυω used intransitively in the sense of "find lodging"/"be (someone's) guest".

[31] Note the contextual connection with 9.1-6 where the disciples are sent out and promised lodging. Here they are slow to provide for others what Jesus had authorized for them.

[32] Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 99, speaks of the "residentialization" of Paul in Acts.

[33] On the conflicts in leadership styles between wandering charismatics and community organizers in earliest Christianity, see G. Theissen, *Sociology*, 8-23; *idem*, *Social Setting*, 22-67.

[34] Dillon, *Eye-witnesses*, 227-49.

[35] Theissen, "Wanderradikalismus," 104.

[36] Cf. Karris, "Poor," 115, 118-19.

[37] See Esler, *Community*, 183-87; Karris, "Poor," 116-25.

[38] In Luke 7.36-50 Simon proves to be a reluctant and less than gracious host to both Jesus and the sinful woman, but Simon of course appears in Luke's story not as a typical disciple of Jesus but rather as a Pharasaic critic of Jesus' social habits.

[39] Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality*, 107.

[40] Bruce, *Pauline Circle*, 98, thinks that the seven companions of Paul listed in Acts 20.4 should be regarded as a mixed Jewish- and Gentile-Christian group. In addition to Trophimus, the Gentiles are represented by Secundus and Gaius.

[41] Pesch, *Apg.*, 1:210; Roloff, *Apg.*, 309.

[42] Οἱ ἐντόποι in Acts 21.12 is a NT *hapax* meaning "the local residents" (BAGD, 269) or "the local people" (Louw *et. al.*, 1:131) and seems to refer to a wider group of Caesarean disciples than Philip's immediate family.

[43] Cf. Bruce, *Pauline Circle*, 99; Dunn, *Unity*, 256; Lüdemann, *Paulus*, 2:91.

[44] Hengel, "Luke," 115.

[45] J. T. Sanders, *Jews*, 284, greatly exaggerates the evidence of Acts 21 by claiming that the Jewish-Christians in Jerusalem "are involved in a 'scheme' to get rid of Paul" and are "little to be distinguished from non-Christian Jews. Both are hostile to Gentile Christianity. . ." To be sure, the Jewish-Christians within James' community are concerned about Paul's commitment to uphold the Mosaic law (21.20-22), but there is no indication that this concern leads them to participate with "the Jews from Asia" in fomenting the violent uprising against Paul in the temple (21.27-29).

[46] On James as "the defender of Paul" in Acts, see Jervell, *Luke*, 185-207.

[47] J. Gnilka, *Epheserbrief*, 211; R. Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 182-85; H. Merklein, *Kirchliche Amt*, 332-35, 345-47.

[48] Commentators generally agree on this assessment. See e.g. M. Barth, *Ephesians 4-6*, 430; Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 182-85; Gnilka, *Epheserbrief*, 211-12; H. Schlier, *Epheser*, 196; U. Becker, "Gospel," 114. Compare 1 Cor 12.28 where a similar list of gifted ministers is provided <u>minus</u> "evangelist." In 1 Corinthians a less restrictive concept of apostles and prophets seems to be in force (cf. 4.9-13; 9.1-12; 14.1-5, 22-40). In the "post-apostolic" period, however, apostles and prophets become more narrowly defined, creating

a need for a category of apostle-like ministers distinguished from the apostles. Hence Eph 4.11 adds "evangelists" to the list in 1 Cor 12.28.

[49] As suggested, for example, in Merklein, *Kirchliche Amt*, 345-47.

[50] Though not calling them "evangelists" *per se*, Ellis, *Prophecy*, 5, acknowledges the presence within the wider Pauline circle of a number of ministers "who, though in friendly association with the Apostle, for the most part work in relative independence of him."

[51] Harnack, *Mission*, 1:321 n. 4; cf. M. Barth, *Ephesians 4-6*, 438; Schlier, *Epheser*, 196.

[52] The Pastorals seem to reflect an ecclesiastical situation further on the road toward an increasingly rigid institutionalization of ministry (as in Ignatius) than we find in Ephesians (cf. Dunn, *Unity*, 114-16. 351-52). Timothy, for example, is clearly subordinated to Paul; even so, Timothy's particular role as "evangelist" is still conceived primarily in functional rather than "official" terms.

[53] Roloff, *Apg.*, 310, and G. Strecker, "εὐαγγελίζω," 176, stress the local dimension of an evangelist's ministry, and others focus chiefly on the missionary dimension. But it seems best not to demarcate these functions too sharply. Cf. Friedrich, "εὐαγγελίζομαι," 737.

[54] Goppelt, *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, 191.

[55] Merklein, *Kirchliche Amt*, 347.

[56] Cf. Friedrich, "εὐαγγελίζομαι," 735-36; *contra* D. Hadidian, "*tous de euangelistas*," 317-19.

[57] Eusebius refers to the evangelists as distributors of inspired written Gospels to their audiences, but not as the actual authors of those Gospels. Eusebius citations are from the LCL edition.

[58] Like Philip in the book of Acts, Pantaenus returned to a more settle ministry after his missionary tour.

[59] Schmithals, *Apg.*, 192, suggests that the title "evangelist" in Acts 21.8 "kennzeichnet Philippus vermutlich als Missionar einer hellenistisch-jüdischen Gemeinde."

[60] Giles, "'Early Protestantism'?," Part 2:15; Marshall, *Acts*, 339.

[61] As is well known, it is questionable whether even Paul enjoys full "apostolic" status alongside the Twelve in Luke's presentation, although in Acts 14.4, 14, the ἀπόστολος label is applied to him (and Barnabas). Nevertheless, by virtue of his Damascus road encounter with the risen Christ,

Paul does share with the Twelve one vital qualification of apostleship (cf. Acts 1.22) which Philip could not claim.

[62] N. Brox, *Zeuge*, 64-66, parallels Philip's and Stephen's designations as evangelist and witness respectively. He further suggests that Luke regards Philip as a witness as well, not in the technical sense reserved for eyewitnesses of the resurrection, but in the broader sense connected with the function of preaching.

[63] We are not claiming that all of Luke-Acts reflects this more developed ecclesiastical situation. Lucan ecclesiology is quite complex and cannot as a whole be simply equated with Ephesians and the Pastorals, which themselves are not identical. Parts of Luke-Acts strike one as more primitive and supportive of charismatic authority (e.g. Acts 6-8 discussed in previous chapters); others, like Acts 20-21. seem to reflect a later period. Schweizer, *Church Order*, 72, wisely speaks of "very diverse forms [of church order] standing side by side" in Luke's writing. Cf. also Dunn, *Unity*, 106-09, 352-58.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

[1] For representative works on Stephen see n. 3 in chap. 1.

[2] E.g. Jervell, *Luke*, 185-207.

[3] A very brief treatment may be found in H. Evans, "Barnabas," 248-50.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: Abbreviations follow the format in "Instructions for Contributors," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988) 579-596.

Achtemeier, P. J. "The Lukan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch." In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, pp. 153-67. Edited by C. H. Talbert. Danville, Va.: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Adler, N. *Taufe und Handauflegung. Eine exegetisch-theologische Untersuchung von Apg. 8,14-17.* Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 19/3. Münster: Aschendorffsche, 1951.

Alon, G. *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World. Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud.* ET. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1977.

Alon, G. *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age (70-640 C.E.).* Vol. 1. Translated and Edited by G. Levi. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1980.

Argyle, A. W. "O. Cullmann's Theory Concerning κωλύειν." *ExpTim* 67 (1955/56) 17.

Aune, D. E. "Magic in Early Christianity." *ANRW* II.23.2, pp. 1507-57.

Aune, D. E. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment.* Libary of Early Christianity 8. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.

Bachmann, M. *Jerusalem und der Tempel. Die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums.* BWANT 109. Stuttgart: Kolhammer, 1980.

Baer, H. von. *Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften.* BWANT 39. Stuttgart, 1926.

Bailey, J. A. *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John.* NovTSup 7. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Bailey, K. E. *Poet and Peasant. A Literary Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

Bammel, E. "The Baptist in Early Christian Tradition." *NTS* 18 (1971/72) 95-128.

Banks, R. *Paul's Idea of Community. The Early House Churches in their Historical Setting.* Exeter: Paternoster, 1980.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnett, P. W. "The Jewish Sign Prophets--A.D. 40-70. Their Intentions and Origin." *NTS* 27 (1980/81) 679-97.

Barrett, C. K. "Apollos and the Twelve Disciples of Ephesus." In *The New Testament Age. Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*, vol. 1, pp. 29-39. Edited by W. C. Weinrich. Macon, Ga.: Mercer Univ., 1984.

Barrett, C. K. *Church, Ministry, and Sacraments in the New Testament.* 1983 Didsbury Lectures. Exeter: Paternoster, 1985.

Barrett, C. K. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition.* London: SPCK, 1958.

Barrett, C. K. "Light on the Holy Spirit from Simon Magus (Acts 8,4-25)." In *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, pp. 281-95. Edited by J. Kremer. BETL 48. Paris-Gembloux: Duculot/ Louvain: Louvain Univ., 1979.

Barrett, C. K. *Luke the Historian in Recent Study.* London: Epworth, 1961.

Barrett, C. K. *New Testament Essays.* London: SPCK, 1972.

Barrett, C. K. "Old Testament History According to Stephen and Paul." In *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments. Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Heinrich Greeven*, pp. 57-69. Edited by W. Schrage. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1986.

Barrett, C. K. "Paul Shipwrecked." In *Scripture: Meaning and Method. Essays Presented to Anthony Tyrrell Hanson for his Seventieth Birthday.* Edited by B. P. Thompson. Hull: Hull Univ., 1987.

Barth, M. *Ephesians. Translation and Commentary on Chapters 4-6.* AB 34A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974.

Barth, M. *Die Taufe--ein Sakrament? Ein exegetischer Beitrag zum Gespräch über die kirchliche Taufe.* Zollikon/Zürich: Evangelischer, 1951.

Bauer, W., Arndt, W. F., Gingrich, F. W. and Danker, F. W. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 2nd ed. Chicago/London: Univ. of Chicago, 1979.

Bauernfeind, O. *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte.* WUNT 22. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck) 1980.

Baumbach, G. *Das Verständnis des Bösen in den synoptischen Evangelien.* Theologische Arbeiten 19. Berlin: Evangelische, 1963.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. *Baptism in the New Testament.* Exeter: Paternoster, 1972 (reprint of 1962 edition).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beasley-Murray, G. R. "Jesus and the Spirit." In *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux*, pp. 463-78. Edited by A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.

Becker, U. "Gospel, Evangelize, Evangelist." In *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 2, pp. 107-115. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.

Benko, S. *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians*. London: Batsford, 1985.

Benoit, P. "L'enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc 1." *NTS* 3 (1956/57) 169-94.

Benoit, P. *The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ*. ET. London: DLT, 1969.

Bergmeier, R. "Zur Frühdatierung samaritanischer Theologumena." *JSJ* 5 (1974) 121-53.

Bergmeier, R. "Die Gestalt des Simon Magus in Act 8 und in der simonianischen Gnosis--Aporien einer Gesamtdeutung." *ZNW* 77 (1986) 267-75.

Bergmeier, R. "Quellen vorchristlicher Gnosis?" In *Tradition und Glaube. Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt*, pp. 200-220. Edited by G. Jeremias, H. -W. Kuhn, H. Stegemann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.

Best, E. "Spirit-Baptism." *NovT* 4 (1960) 236-43.

Betz, H. D. "The Cleansing of the Ten Lepers (Luke 17:11-19)." *JBL* 90 (1971) 314-28.

Bethge, H. -G. "Die sogennante 'Brief des Petrus an Philippus'." *TLZ* 103 (1978) 161-70.

Beyer, H. "διακονέω, διακονία, διάκονος." *TDNT* 2:81-93.

Beyschlag, K. *Simon Magus und die christliche Gnosis*. WUNT 16. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1974.

Beyschlag, K. "Zur Simon-Magus-Frage." *ZTK* 68 (1971) 395-426.

Bietenhard, H. "ὄνομα, ὀνομάζω, κτλ." *TDNT* 5:242-83.

Bihler, J. *Die Stephanusgeschichte im Zusammenhang der Apostelgeschichte*. Munich: Hueber, 1963.

Bishop, E. F. F. "Which Philip?" *ATR* 28 (1946) 154-59.

Black, M. "The Parables as Allegory." *BJRL* 42 (1959/60) 273-87.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blackman, E. C. "The Hellenists of Acts vi.1." *ExpTim* 48 (1936/37) 524-25.

Blinzler, J. "Die literarische Eigenart des sogenannten Reiseberichts im Lukas-Evangelium." In *Synoptische Studien*, pp. 20-52. Edited by J. Schmid and A. Vögtle. Munich: Zink, 1953.

Blomberg, C. L. "The Law in Luke-Acts." *JSNT* 22 (1984) 53-80.

Blomberg, C. L. "Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke's Central Section." In *Gospel Perspectives*. Vol. 3: *Studies in Midrash and Historiography*, pp. 217-62. Edited by R. T. France and D. Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.

Bock, D. L. *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern. Lucan Old Testament Christology*. JSNTSup 12. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.

Borgen, P. *Paul Preaches Circumcision and Pleases Men and Other Essays on Christian Origins*. Trondheim: TAPIR, 1983.

Bornhäuser, K. *Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1934.

Bouwman, G. "Samaria im lukanischen Doppelwerk." In *Theologe aus dem Norden*, pp. 118-41. Edited by A. Fuchs. Studien zum NT und Seiner Umwelt A/2. Linz, 1976.

Bovon, F. "Les Actes de Philippe." *ANRW* II.25.6, pp. 4431-4527.

Bovon, F. *Luc le théologien. Vinqt-cinq ans de recherches (1950-1975)*. Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1978.

Bovon, F. *Luke the Theologian. Thirty-Three Years of Research (1950-83)*. ET. PTMS 12. Allison Park, Pa.: Pickwick, 1987.

Bovon, F. "Le Saint-Esprit, l'Église et les relations humaines selon Actes 20,36-21,16." In *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, pp. 339-58. Edited by J. Kremer. BETL 48. Paris-Gembloux: Duculot/Louvain: Louvain Univ., 1979.

Bowman, J. *Samaritan Documents Relating to their History, Religion and Life*. Pittsburgh Original Texts and Translation 2. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1977.

Bowman, J. *The Samaritan Problem. Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism, and Early Christianity*. ET. PTMS 4. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1975.

Brawley, R. L. *Luke-Acts and the Jews. Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. SBLMS 33. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brodie, T. L. "The Accusing and Stoning of Naboth (1 Kgs 21:8-13) as One Component of the Stephen Text (Acts 6:9-14; 7:58a)." *CBQ* 45 (1983) 417-32.

Brodie, T. L. "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources." In *Luke-Acts. New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, pp. 17-46. Edited by C. H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

Brodie, T. L. "Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37: A Study of Luke's Rhetorical Imitation." *Bib* 64 (1983) 457-85.

Brodie, T. L. "Towards Unraveling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7:11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17:17-24." *NTS* 32 (1986) 247-67.

Brodie, T. L. "Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Imitation of Sources in Acts: 2 Kgs 5 as One Component of Acts 8,9-40." *Bib* 67 (1986) 41-67.

Brown, R. E. *The Birth of the Messiah.* London: Chapman, 1977.

Brown, R. E. "Jesus and Elisha." *Perspective* 12 (1971) 85-104.

Brown, R. E., Donfried, K. P., and Reumann, J., eds. *Peter in the New Testament. A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars.* London: Chapman, 1974.

Brown, S. *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke.* AnBib 36. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.

Brown, S. "'Water-Baptism' and 'Spirit-Baptism' in Luke-Acts." *ATR* 59 (1977) 135-51.

Brox, N. *Zeuge und Märtyrer. Untersuchungen zur frühchristlichen Zeugnis-Terminologie.* SANT 5. Munich: Kösel, 1961.

Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles. The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary. Chicago/Toronto: Inter-Varsity, 1952.

Bruce, F. F. *Commentary on the Book of the Acts.* New London Commentary on the NT. 3rd. ed. London/Edinburgh: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1962.

Bruce, F. F. "The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles." *Int* 27 (1973) 166-83.

Bruce, F. F. *New Testament History.* London/Glasgow: Pickering & Inglis, 1982.

Bruce, F. F. *The Pauline Circle.* Exeter: Paternoster/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bruners, W. *Die Reinigung der zehn Aussätzigen und die Heilung des Samariters Lk 17,11-19. Ein Beitrag zur lukanischen Interpretation der Reinigung von Aussätzigen.* FB 23. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977.

Bultmann, R. "Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apostelgeschichte." In *New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, pp. 68-80. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester Univ., 1959.

Burchard, C. "Fußnoten zum neutestamentlichen Griechisch." *ZNW* 61 (1970) 157-71.

Cadbury, H. J. *The Book of Acts in History.* London: Black, 1955.

Cadbury, H. J. "Four Features of Lucan Style." In *Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, pp. 87-102. Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966; reprint ed., London: SPCK, 1976.

Cadbury, H. J. "The Hellenists." In *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake. Vol. 5: *Additional Notes to the Commentary*, pp. 59-74. Edited by K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Cadbury, H. J. "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts. III. Luke's Interest in Lodging." *JBL* 45 (1926) 305-22.

Cadbury, H. J. *The Making of Luke-Acts.* London: Macmillan, 1927.

Cadbury, H. J. "Names for Christians and Christianity in Acts." In *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake. Vol. 5: *Additional Notes to the Commentary*, pp. 375-92. Edited by K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Cadbury, H. J. "The Titles of Jesus in Acts." In *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake. Vol. 5: *Additional Notes to the Commentary*, pp. 354-75. Edited by K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Cadbury, H. J. "'We' and 'I' Passages in Luke-Acts." *NTS* 3 (1956/57) 128-32.

Caird, G. B. *The Gospel of St. Luke.* Pelican NT Commentaries. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.

Carroll, J. T. *Response to the End of History. Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts.* SBLDS 92. Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Casey, R. P. "Simon Magus." In *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake. Vol. 5: *Additional Notes to the Commentary*, pp. 151-63. Edited by K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Charlesworth, J. H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* 2 vols. London: DLT, 1985.

Chilton, B. *Beginning New Testament Study.* London: SPCK, 1986.

Clarke, W. K. L. "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts." In *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake. Vol. 2: *Prolegomena II. Criticism*, pp. 66-105. London: Macmillan, 1922.

Coggins, R. J. "The Samaritans and Acts." *NTS* 28 (1982) 423-34.

Coggins, R. J. *Samaritans and Jews. The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered.* Growing Points in Theology. Oxford: Blackwell, 1975.

Collins, J. J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora.* New York: Crossroad, 1983.

Collins, J. J. "The Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans." *HTR* 73 (1980) 91-104.

Collins, J. J. "A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century." In *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us." Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*, pp. 163-86. Edited by J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1985.

Collins, M. F. "The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions." *JSJ* 3 (1972) 97-116.

Conzelmann, H. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* HNT 7. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1972.

Conzelmann, H. "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity." In *Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, pp. 298-316. Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966; reprint ed., London: SPCK, 1976.

Conzelmann, H. *The Theology of Luke.* ET. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1982.

Coppens, J. "L'imposition des mains dans les Actes des Apôtres." In *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, pp. 405-38. Edited by J. Kremer. BETL 48. Paris-Gembloux: Duculot/Louvain: Louvain Univ., 1979.

Crocker, P. T. "The City of Meroe." *BurH* 22 (1986) 53-72.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Crockett, L. C. "Luke 4.25-27 and Jewish-Gentile Relations in Luke-Acts." *JBL* 88 (1969) 177-83.

Cross, F. M., Jr. "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Later Persian and Hellenistic Times." *HTR* 59 (1966) 201-11.

Cullmann, O. *Baptism in the New Testament.* ET. SBT. London: SCM, 1950.

Cullmann, O. *The Christology of the New Testament.* 2d ed. ET. London: SCM, 1963.

Cullmann, O. *The Johannine Circle.* ET. London: SCM, 1976.

Cullmann, O. "Von Jesus zum Stephanuskreis und zum Johannesevangelium." In *Jesus und Paulus. Festschrift für Werner Gerog Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag*, pp. 44-56. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Dahl, N. A. "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts." In *Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, pp. 139-58. Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1968.

Danby, H. *The Mishnah.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1933.

Danker, F. W. *Jesus and the New Age according to St. Luke. A Commentary on the Third Gospel.* St. Louis: Clayton, 1972.

Daube, D. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism.* Jordan Lectures, 1952. London: Athlone, 1956.

Daube, D. "A Reform in Acts and its Models." In *Jews, Greeks and Christians. Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honor of William David Davies*, pp. 151-63. Edited by R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Davies, W. D. *The Gospel and the Land. Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine.* Berkely/Los Angeles/London: Univ. of California, 1974.

Decock, P. B. "The Understanding of Isaiah 53:7-8 in Acts 8:32-35." *Neot* 14 (1981) 111-33.

Delling, G. "Josephus und das Wunderbare." *NovT* 2 (1957/58) 291-309.

Delling, G. "μάγος, μαγεία, μαγεύω." *TDNT* 4:356-59.

Derrett, J. D. M. *Law in the New Testament.* London: DLT, 1970.

Derrett, J. D. M. "Simon Magus (Acts 8.9-24)." *ZNW* 73 (1982) 52-68.

Dewar, L. *The Holy Spirit and Modern Thought.* New York: Harper, 1959.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dexinger, F. "Die frühesten samaritanischen Belege der Taheb-Vorstellung." *Kairos* NF 26 (1984) 224-52.

Dexinger, F. "Limits of Tolerance in Judaism: The Samaritan Example." In *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition.* Edited by E. P. Sanders, A. I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson. Vol. 2: *Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*, pp. 88-114. London: SCM, 1981.

Dexinger, F. "Der 'Prophet wie Mose' in Qumran und bei den Samaritanern." In *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor.* Edited by A. Caquot, S. Légasse, M. Tardieu. AOAT 215. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1985.

Dexinger, F. "Der Taheb. Ein 'messianischer' Heilsbringer der Samaritaner." *Kairos* NF 27 (1985) 1-172.

Dibelius, M. *Studies in the Acts of the Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by H. Greeven. ET. London: SCM, 1956.

Dietrich, W. *Das Petrusbild der lukanischen Schriften.* Stuttgart: Kolhammer, 1972.

Dillon, R. J. *From Eye-witnesses to Ministers of the Word. Tradition and Composition in Luke 24.* AnBib 82. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1978.

Dinkler, E. "Philippus und der ANHP AIΘOΨ (Apg 8,26-40). Historische und geographische Bemerkungen zum Missionsablauf nach Lukas." In *Jesus und Paulus. Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag*, pp. 85-95. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Diodorus of Sicily. LCL. 12 vols. Edited by C. H. Oldfather, C. L. Sherman, C. B. Welles, F. R. Walton, and R. M. Geer. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ./London: Heinemann, 1933-67.

Doble, P. "The Son of Man Saying in Stephen's Witnessing: Acts 6.8-8.2." *NTS* 31 (1985) 68-84.

Domagalski, B. "Waren die 'Sieben' (Apg 6,1-7) Diakone?" *BZ* 26 (1982) 21-34.

Dömer, M. *Das Heil Gottes. Studien zur Theologie des lukanischen Doppelwerkes.* BBB 51. Köln/Bonn: Hanstein, 1978.

Drane, J. W. "Simon the Samaritan and the Lucan Concept of Salvation History." *EvQ* 47 (1975) 131-37.

Drury, J. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel. A Study in Early Christian Historiography.* London: DLT, 1976.

Dubois, J. -D. "La figure d'Elie dans la perspective lucanienne." *RHPR* 53 (1973) 155-76.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dunn, J. D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit. A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in relation to Pentecostalism Today.* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.

Dunn, J. D. G. *Christology in the Making. An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation.* London: SCM, 1980.

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

Dunn, J. D. G. *Jesus and the Spirit. A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament.* London: SCM, 1975.

Dunn, J. D. G. "Spirit-and-Fire-Baptism." *NovT* 14 (1972) 81-92.

Dunn, J. D. G. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament. An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity.* London: SCM, 1977.

Dunn, J. D. G. "'They believed Philip preaching' (Acts 8.12): A Reply." *IBS* 1 (1979) 177-83.

Dupont, J. "The Meal at Emmaus." In *The Eucharist in the New Testament. A Symposium*, pp. 105-21. Edited by J. Delorme, *et. al.* ET. London: Chapman, 1964.

Dupont, J. *Nouvelles Études sur les Actes des Apôtres.* LD 118. Paris: Cerf, 1984.

Dupont, J. "Les pèlerins d'Emmaüs (Luc, xxiv, 13-15)." In *Miscellanea Biblica B. Ubach*, pp. 349-74. Scripta et Documenta 1. Montisserrati, 1953.

Dupont, J. *The Salvation of the Gentiles. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles.* ET. New York/Ramsey/Toronto: Paulist, 1979.

Dupont, J. *The Sources of Acts. The Present Position.* ET. London: DLT, 1964.

Edwards, O. C., Jr. "The Exegesis of Acts 8:4-25 and its Implications for Confirmation and Glossolalia: A Review Article of Haenchen's Acts Commentary." *ATR* (Sup. Ser) 2 (1973) 100-12.

Ehrhardt, A. *The Acts of the Apostles.* Manchester: Manchester Univ., 1969.

Elderen, B. van. "Another Look at the Parable of the Good Samaritan." In *Saved By Hope. Essays in Honor of Richard C. Oudersluys*, pp. 109-19. Edited by J. I. Cook. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Elliott, J. K. "Jerusalem in Acts and the Gospels." *NTS* 23 (1976/77) 462-69.

Ellis E. E. *The Gospel of Luke.* NCB. London: Nelson, 1966.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ellis, E. E. *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity. New Testament Essays.* WUNT 18. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1978.

Enslin, M. S. "Luke and the Samaritans." *HTR* 36 (1943) 277-97.

Enslin, M. S. "Once Again, Luke and Paul." *ZNW* 61 (1970) 253-71.

Enslin, M. S. "The Samaritan Ministry and Mission." *HUCA* 51 (1980) 29-38.

Epp, E. J. *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts.* SNTSMS 3. Cambridge: CUP, 1966.

Esler, P. F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts. The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology.* SNTSMS 57. Cambridge: CUP, 1987.

Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History.* LCL. 2 vols. Edited and translated by K. Lake. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ./London: Heinemann, 1926-32.

Eusebius. *Preparation for the Gospel.* Translated by E. H. Gifford. Oxford: Clarendon, 1903; reprint ed. (2 vols.), Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.

Evans, C. A. "Luke's Use of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethic of Election." *JBL* 106 (1987) 75-83.

Evans, C. F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." In *Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, pp. 37-53. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955.

Evans, H. "Barnabas the Bridge-Builder." *ExpTim* 89 (1977) 248-50.

Farrer, A. M. "The Ministry in the New Testament." In *The Apostolic Ministry. Essays on the History and the Doctrine of Episcopacy*, pp. 113-82. Edited by K. E. Kirk. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946; new ed., 1957.

Ferguson, E. "The Hellenists in the Book of Acts." *ResQ* 12 (1969) 159-80.

Finn, T. M. "The God-fearers Reconsidered." *CBQ* 47 (1985) 75-84.

Fiorenza, E. S. *In Memory of Her. A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins.* London: SCM, 1983.

Fiorenza, E. S. "Miracles, Mission, and Apologetics: An Introduction." In *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, pp. 1-25. Edited by E. S. Fiorenza. London/Notre Dame: Univ. of Notre Dame, 1976.

Fitzmyer, J. A. *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX).* AB 28. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fitzmyer, J. A. *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV).* AB 28a. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.

Fitzmyer, J. A. "Jewish Christianity in Acts in Light of the Qumran Scrolls." In *Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, pp. 233-57. Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966; reprint ed., London: SPCK, 1976.

Flender, H. *St. Luke. Theologian of Redemptive History.* ET. London: SCM, 1967.

Flusser, D. "Lukas 9:51-56--ein hebräisches Fragment." In *The New Testament Age. Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*, vol. 1, pp. 165-79. Edited by W. C. Weinrich. Macon, Ga.: Mercer Univ., 1984.

Foerster, W. "πύθων." *TDNT* 6:917-20.

Ford, J. M. *My Enemy is My Guest. Jesus and Violence in Luke.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1984.

Ford, J. M. "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Luke's Gospel." In *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*, pp. 80-98. Edited by R. J. Cassidy and P. J. Scharper. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1983.

Fossum, J. E. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism.* WUNT 36. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1985.

Franklin, E. *Christ the Lord. A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts.* London: SPCK, 1975.

Friedrich, G. "εὐαγγελίζομαι, εὐαγγέλιον, κτλ." *TDNT* 2:707-37.

Friedrich, G. "Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief." In *Abraham unser Vater. Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel*, pp. 181-215. Edited by O. Betz, M. Hengel, and P. Schmidt. AGJU 5. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Funk, R. "The Good Samaritan as Metaphor." *Semeia* 2 (1974) 74-81.

Gaechter, P. *Petrus und seine Zeit. Neutestamentliche Studien.* Innsbruck/Vienna/Munich: Tyrolia, 1958.

Gager, J. "Jews, Gentiles, and Synagogues in the Book of Acts." *HTR* 79 (1986) 91-99.

Gager, J. *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism.* SBLMS 16. Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1972.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gasque, W. W. *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975

Gaster, M. *The Samaritans. Their History, Doctrines and Literature.* Schweich Lectures (1923). London: Oxford Univ., 1925.

Gaston, L. *No Stone on Another. Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels.* NovTSup 23. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Gaventa, B. R. *From Darkness to Light. Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament.* OBT 20. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

George, A. *Études sur L'Ouvre de Luc.* Paris: Gabalda & Cie, 1978.

George, A. "Le parallèle entre Jean-Baptiste et Jésus en Luc 1-2." In *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux*, pp. 147-71. Edited by A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.

Georgi, D. *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief. Studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike.* WMANT 11. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1964.

Georgi, D. *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians.* ET. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Gewalt, D. "Der 'Barmherzige Samariter' zu Lukas 10,25-37." *EvT* 38 (1978) 403-17.

Giles, K. "Is Luke an Exponent of 'Early Protestantism'? Church Order in the Lukan Writings." Part 1: *EvQ* 54 (1982) 193-205; Part 2: *EvQ* 55 (1983) 3-20.

Glombitza, O. "Zur Charakterisierung des Stephanus in Act 6 und 7." *ZNW* 53 (1962) 238-44.

Glombitza, O. "Der dankbare Samariter. Luk. xvii 11-19." *NovT* 11 (1969) 241-46.

Gnilka, J. *Der Epheserbrief.* HTKNT 10/2. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1971.

Goppelt, L. *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times.* ET. London: Black, 1970.

Goulder, M. *The Evangelists' Calendar. A Lectionary Explanation of the Developoment of Scripture.* London: SPCK, 1978.

Goulder, M. "A House Built on Sand." In *Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study*, pp. 1-24. Edited by A. E. Harvey. London: SPCK, 1985.

Goulder, M. *Type and History in Acts.* London: Black, 1964.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gourgues, M. "Esprit des commencements et Esprit des prolongements dans les *Actes*. Note sur la 'Pentecôste des Samaritains' (*Act.* VIII,5-25)." *RB* 93 (1986) 376-85.

Grabbe, L. L. "The Jannes/Jambres Tradition in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and its Date." *JBL* 98 (1979) 393-401.

Grant, F. C. *The Gospels. Their Origin and Growth.* London: Faber, 1957.

Grant, R. M. *Gnosticism and Early Christianity.* New York: Columbia Univ., 1959.

Grässer, E. "Acta-Forschung seit 1960 (Fortsetzung)." *ThRu* 42 (1977) 1-68.

Grassi, J. "Emmaus Revisited (Luke 24,13-35 and Acts 8,26-40)." *CBQ* 26 (1964) 463-67.

Gray, L. H. "Eunuch." In *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 5, pp. 579-84. Edited by J. Hastings. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1910-27.

Grayston, K. "The Significance of the Word *Hand* in the New Testament." In *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux*, pp. 479-87. Edited by A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.

Grundmann, W. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas.* THKNT 3. Berlin: Evangelische, 1971.

Haacker, K. "Dibelius und Cornelius. Ein Beispiel formgeschichtlicher Überlieferungskritik." *BZ* 24 (1980 234-51.

Haacker, K. "Samaritan, Samaria." In *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 3, pp. 449-67.

Hadidian, D. Y. "*tous de evanglistas* in Eph 4,11." *CBQ* 28 (1966) 317-19.

Haenchen, E. *The Acts of the Apostles. A Commentary.* ET. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

Haenchen, E. "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity." In *Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, pp. 258-78. Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966; reprint ed., London: SPCK, 1976.

Haenchen, E. *Gott und Mensch. Gesammelte Aufsätze.* Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1965.

Haenchen, E. "Simon Magus in der Apostelgeschichte." In *Gnosis und Neues Testament*, pp. 267-79. Edited by K. -W. Tröger. Studien aus Religionswissenschaft und Theologie. Berlin: Evangelische, 1973

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hahn, F. "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der Apostelgeschichte. Kommentare und Aufsatzbände 1980-1985." *TRev* 82 (1986) 177-90.

Hahn, F. *Mission in the New Testament.* ET. SBT 7. London: SCM, 1965.

Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. "A Note on Matthew XII.28 par. Luke XI.20." *NTS* 11 (1964/65) 167-69.

Hamm, M. D. "The Freeing of the Bent Woman and the Restoration of Israel: Luke 13.10-17 as Narrative Theology." *JSNT* 31 (1987) 23-49.

Hanson, P. D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic. The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology.* Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Hanson, R. P. C. *The Acts in the Revised Standard Version.* New Clarendon Bible. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

Hardon, J. A. "The Miracle Narratives in the Acts of the Apostles." *CBQ* 16 (1954) 303-18.

Harnack, A. *The Acts of the Apostles.* Crown Theological Library 27. ET. London/Williams & Norgate/New York: Putnam's Sons, 1909.

Harnack, A. *The Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels.* Crown Theological Library 33. ET. London: Williams & Norgate/New York: Putnam's Sons, 1911.

Harnack, A. *Luke the Physician. The Author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles.* Crown Theological Library 20. ET. London: Williams & Norgate/New York: Putnam's Sons, 1911.

Harnack, A. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.* 2 vols. 2nd rev. ed. London: Williams & Norgate/New York: Putnam's, 1908.

Hengel, M. *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity.* ET. London: SCM, 1979; reprint ed. in M. Hengel, *Earliest Christianity*, pp. 1-146; London: SCM, 1986.

Hengel, M. "Between Jesus and Paul. The 'Hellenists', the 'Seven' and Stephen (Acts 6.1-15; 7.54-8.3)." In *Between Jesus and Paul. Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*, pp. 1-29. ET. London: SCM, 1983.

Hengel, M. *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period.* 2 vols. ET. London: SCM, 1974.

Hengel, M. "Luke the Historian and the Geography of Palestine in the Acts of the Apostles." In *Between Jesus and Paul. Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*, pp. 97-128. ET. London: SCM, 1983.

Hengel, M. "Maria Magdalena und die Frauen als Zeugen." In *Abraham unser Vater. Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel*, pp. 241-56. Edited by O. Betz, M. Hengel and P. Schmidt. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Hennecke, E. and Schneemelcher, W., eds. *New Testament Apocrypha*. 2 vols. ET edited by R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963-66.

Herodotus. LCL. 4 vols. Edited and translated by A. D. Godley. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ./London: Heinemann, 1920-26.

Holmberg, B. *Paul and Power. The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Holtz, T. *Untersuchungen über die altestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*. TU 104. Berlin: Akademie, 1968.

Hooker, M. D. *Jesus and the Servant. The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*. London: SPCK, 1959.

Horsley, R. A. "'Like One of the Prophets of Old'. Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus." *CBQ* 47 (1985) 435-63.

Horsley, R. A. "Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus. Their Principal Features and Social Origins." *JSNT* 26 (1986) 3-27.

Horsley, R. A. and Hanson, S. *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs. Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus*. New Voices in Biblical Studies. Minneapolis/Chicago/New York: Winson, 1985.

Hull, J. M. *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition*. SBT 28. London: SCM, 1974.

Hunter, H. D. *Spirit-Baptism. A Pentecostal Alternative*. Lanham/New York/London: Univ. Press of America, 1983.

Isser, S. J. *The Dositheans. A Samaritan Sect in Late Antiquity*. SJLA 17. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Isser, S. J. "Dositheus, Jesus, and a Moses Aretalogy." In *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*. Part 4: *Other Greco-Roman Cults*, pp. 167-90. Edited by J. Neusner. SJLA 12. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Jaeger, W. *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 1961.

Jeremias, J. *Heiligengräber in Jesu Umwelt (Mt. 23,29; Lk 11,47). Eine Untersuchung zur Volksreligion der Zeit Jesu*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jeremias, J. "ΙΕΡΟΥΣΑΛΗΜ/ΙΕΡΟΥΣΟΛΥΜΑ." *ZNW* 65 (1974) 273-76.

Jeremias, J. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. An Investigtaion into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period.* ET. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.

Jeremias, J. *Jesus' Promise to the Nations.* ET. London: SCM, 1958; reprint ed., Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Jeremias, J. "Μωϋσῆς." *TDNT* 4:848-73.

Jeremias, J. "Σαμάρεια, Σαμαρίτης, Σαμαρῖτις." *TDNT* 7:88-94.

Jeremias, J. (and W. Zimmerli). "παῖς θεοῦ." *TDNT* 5:654-717.

Jeremias, J. "Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte." In *Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 238-55. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

Jervell, J. *Luke and the People of God. A New Look at Luke-Acts.* Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.

Jervell, J. *The Unknown Paul. Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History.* Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.

Jewett, R. *A Chronology of Paul's Life.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Johnson, A. M. Jr. "Philip the Evangelist and the Gospel of John." *AbrN* 16 (1975/76) 49-72.

Johnson, L. T. "On Finding the Lukan Community. A Cautious Cautionary Essay." In SBLSP 1979, vol. 1, pp. 87-100. Missoula, Mon.: Scholars, 1979.

Johnson, L. T. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts.* SBLDS 39. Missoula: Scholars, 1977.

Johnson, L. T. *The Writings of the New Testament. An Interpretation.* London: SCM, 1986.

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

Jones, D. L. "The Title 'Servant' in Luke-Acts." In *Luke-Acts. New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, pp. 148-65. Edited by C. H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

Josephus. LCL. 9 vols. Edited and translated by H. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, A. Wikgren and L. H. Feldman. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ./London: Heinemann, 1926-65.

Juel, D. *Luke-Acts.* London: SCM, 1984.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Karris, R. J. *Luke: Artist and Theologian. Luke's Passion Account as Literature.* New York/Toronto: Paulist, 1985.

Karris, R. J. "Missionary Communities: A New Paradigm for the Study of Luke-Acts." *CBQ* 41 (1979) 80-97.

Karris, R. J. "Poor and Rich: The Lucan *Sitz im Leben.*" In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, pp. 112-25. Edited by C. H. Talbert. Danville, Va.: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion/Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Käsemann, E. *Essays on New Testament Themes.* ET. London: SCM, 1964; reprint ed., Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Kee, H. C. *Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times.* SNTSMS 55. Cambridge: CUP, 1986.

Kee, H. C. *Miracle in the Early Christian World. A Study in Sociohistorical Method.* New Haven/London: Yale, 1983.

Kilgallen, J. *The Stephen Speech. A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7,2-53.* AnBib 67. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976.

Kippenberg, H. G. *Garizim und Synagoge. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäische Periode.* Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 30. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1971.

Kippenberg, H. G. "Ein Gebetbuch für den samaritanischen Synagogengottesdienst aus dem 2. Jh. n. Chr." *ZDPV* 85 (1969) 76-103.

Klein, G. "Der Synkretismus als theologisches Problem in der ältesten christlichen Apologetik." *ZTK* 64 (1967) 40-82.

Knox, W. L. *The Acts of the Apostles.* Cambridge: CUP, 1948.

Koch, D. -A. "Geistbesitz, Geistverleihung und Wundermacht. Erwägungen zur Tradition und zur lukanischen Redaktion in Act 8.5-25." *ZNW* 77 (1986) 64-82.

Kodell, J. "Luke and the Children: The Beginning and End of the Great Interpolation (Luke 9:46-56; 18:9-23)." *CBQ* 49 (1987) 415-29.

Koenig, J. *New Testament Hospitality. Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission.* OBT 17. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Koester, H. *History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age.* Vol. 1: *Introduction to the New Testament.* ET. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Koschorke, K. "Eine gnostische Pfingstpredigt. Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen gnostischem und kirchlichem Christentum am Beispiel der 'Epistula Petri ad Philippum' (NHC VIII,2)." *ZTK* 74 (1977) 323-43.

Kraabel, A. T. "The Disappearance of the 'God-fearers'." *Numen* 28 (1981) 113-26.

Kraabel, A. T. "Greeks, Jews, and Lutherans in the Middle Half of Acts." *HTR* 79 (1986) 147-57.

Kraabel, A. T. "Six Questionable Assumptions." *JJS* 33 (1982) 445-64.

Kraeling, C. H. *John the Baptist.* New York/London: Scribner's, 1951.

Kränkl, E. *Jesus der Knecht Gottes. Die heilsgeschichtliche Stellung Jesu in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte.* Biblische Untersuchungen 8. Regensburg: Pustet, 1972.

Kremer, J. *Die Osterevangelien. Geschichten um Geschichte.* Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977.

Krodel, G. A. *Acts.* Augsburg Commentary on the NT. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.

Kuhn, K. G. "προσήλυτος." *TDNT* 6:727-44.

Kurz, W. S. "Narrative Approaches to Luke-Acts." *Bib* 68 (1987) 195-220.

Lake, K. "The Holy Spirit." In *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by F. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake. Vol. 5: *Additional Notes to the Commentary*, pp. 96-111. Edited by K. Lake and H, J, Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Lake, K. "Proselytes and God-fearers." In *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake. Vol. 5: *Additional Notes to the Commentary*, pp. 74-96. Edited by K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Lake, K. and Cadbury, H. J. *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake. Vol. 4: *English Translation and Commentary.* London: Macmillan, 1933.

Lampe, G. W. H. "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of Luke." In *Studies in the Gospels*, pp. 159-200. Memorial R. H. Lightfoot. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford, 1955.

Lampe, G. W. H. "Miracles and Early Christian Apologetic." In *Miracles. Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History*, pp. 203-18. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. London: Mowbray, 1965.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lampe, G. W. H. "Miracles in the Acts of the Apostles." In *Miracles. Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History*, pp. 163-78. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. London: Mowbray, 1965.

Lampe, G. W. H. *The Seal of the Spirit. A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers.* 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1967.

Larsson, E. "Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde." *NTS* 33 (1987) 205-25.

Laurentin, R. *Structure et Théologie de Luc I-II.* Ebib. Paris: Gabalda et Cie, 1957.

Leaney, A. R. C. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke.* Black's NT Commentaries. London: Black, 1958.

Leivestad, R. "Ταπεινός-ταπεινόφρων." *NovT* 8 (1966) 36-47.

Léon-Dufour, X. *Resurrection and the Message of Easter.* ET. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1975.

Levinsohn, S. H. *Textual Connection in Acts.* SBLMS 31. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.

Lienhard, J. T. "Acts 6:1-6: A Redactional View." *CBQ* 37 (1975) 228-36.

Lindijer, C. H. "Two Creative Encounters in the Work of Luke. Luke xxiv 13-35 and Acts viii 26-40." In *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*, pp. 77-85. Edited by T. Baarda, A. F. J. Klijn and W. C. van Unnik. NovTSup 48. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Lohse, E. "Missionarisches Handeln Jesu nach dem Evangelium des Lukas." *TZ* 10 (1954) 1-13.

Lohse, E. "Σιών, κτλ." *TDNT* 7:292-338.

Longenecker, R. N. *The Christology of Early Jewish Chritianity.* London: SCM, 1970; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.

Löning, K. "Lukas--Theologe der von Gott geführten Heilsgeschichte." In *Gestalt und Anspruch des Neuen Testaments*, pp. 200-228. Edited by J. Schreiner and G. Dautzenberg. Würzburg: Echter, 1969.

Löning, K. "Der Stephanuskreis und seine Mission." In *Die Anfänge des Christentums: alte Welt und neue Hoffnung*, pp. 80-101. Edited by J. Becker *et. al.* Stuttgart: Kolhammer, 1987.

Lösch, S. "Der Kämmerer der Königin Kandake (Apg. 8,27)." *TQ* 111 (1930) 477-519.

Louw, J. P., Nida, E. A., Smith, R. B., and Munson, K. A. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains.* 2 vols. New York: UBS, 1988.

Lowy, S. *The Principles of Samaritan Bible Exegesis.* SPB 28. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Lüdemann, G. "The Acts of the Apostles and the Beginnings of Simonian Gnosis." *NTS* 33 (1987) 420-26.

Lüdemann, G. *Das frühe Christentum nach den Traditionen der Apostelgeschichte. Ein Kommentar.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

Lüdemann, G. *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles. Studies in Chronology.* ET. London: SCM, 1984.

Lüdemann, G. *Paulus, der Heidenapostel II. Antipaulinismus im frühen Christentum.* FRLANT 130. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.

Lüdemann, G. *Untersuchungen zur simonianischen Gnosis.* GTA 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Lull, D. J. "The Servant-Benefactor as a Model of Greatness (Luke 22:24-30)." *NovT* 28 (1986) 289-305.

Luttikhuizen, G. P. "The Letter of Peter to Philip and the New Testament." In *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis. Papers read at the First International Congress of Coptology*, pp. 96-102. Edited by R. McL. Wilson. Nag Hammadi Studies 14. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

McCown, C. C. "The Geography of Luke's Central Section." *JBL* 57 (1938) 51-66.

McCown, C. C. "Gospel Geography: Fiction, Fact, and Truth." *JBL* 60 (1941) 1-25.

Macdonald, J. *Memar Marqah. The Teaching of Marqah.* 2 vols. BZAW 84. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963.

Macdonald, J. *The Theology of the Samaritans.* NTL. London: SCM, 1964.

McEleney, N. J. "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law." *NTS* 20 (1973/74) 319-41.

MacLennan, R. S. and Kraabel, A. T. "The God-Fearers--A Literary and Theological Invention." *BARev* 12 (1986) 46-53, 64.

MacRae, G. "Miracle in *The Antiquities* of Josephus." In *Miracles. Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History*, pp. 163-78. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. London: Mowbray, 1965.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Maddox, R. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts.* FRLANT 126. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

Malherbe, A. J. "The Inhospitality of Diotrophes." In *God's Christ and His People. Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl*, pp. 222-32. Edited by J. Jervell and W. A. Meeks. Oslo/Bergen/Tromsö: Universitetsforlaget, 1977.

Malherbe, A. J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity.* 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Mann, C. S. "'Hellenists' and 'Hebrews' in Acts VI 1." In J. Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 301-04. Revised by W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann. AB 31. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967.

Manson, T. W. *The Teaching of Jesus. Studies of its Formand Content.* Cambridge: CUP, 1939.

Manson, W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews. An Historical and Theological Reconsideration.* The Baird Lecture. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1951.

Manson, W. *The Gospel of Luke.* MNTC. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930.

Mare, W. H. "Acts 7: Jewish or Samaritan in Character?" *WTJ* 34 (1971/72) 1-21

Marshall, I. H. *The Acts of the Apostles.* Tyndale NT Commentaries. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1980.

Marshall, I. H. *The Gospel of Luke. A Commentary on the Greek Text.* NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.

Marshall, I. H. *Kept By the Power of God. A Study of Perseverance and Falling Away.* London: Epworth, 1969.

Marshall, I. H. *Luke: Historian and Theologian.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970.

Marshall, I. H. "Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity: Some Critical Comments." *NTS* 19 (1972/73) 271-87.

Martin, E. G. "Eldad and Modad." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2, pp. 463-65. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. London: DLT, 1985.

Mattill, A. J., Jr. "The Jesus-Paul Parallels and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: H. H. Evans Reconsidered." *NovT* 17 (1975) 15-46.

Meeks, W. A. *The Prophet-King. Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology.* NovTSup 14. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

Meeks, W. A. "Simon Magus in Recent Research." *RelSRev* 3 (1977) 137-42.

Meester, P. de. "'Philippe et l'eunuque éthiopien' ou 'Le baptême d'un pèlerin de Nubie'?" *NRT* 103 (1981) 360-74.

Ménard, J. É. *La Lettre de Pierre à Philippe. Texte établi et présente.* Bibliothéque Copte de Nag Hammadi. Section "Textes" 1. Quebec: Laval Univ., 1977.

Merk, O. "Das Reich Gottes in den lukanischen Schriften." In *Jesus und Paulus. Festschrift für Werner Georg Kummel zum 70. Geburtstag*, pp. 201-220. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Merklein, *Das kirchliche Amt nach dem Epheserbrief.* SANT 33. München: Kösel, 1973.

Metzger, B. M. "Seventy or Seventy-two Disciples?" *NTS* 5 (1958/59) 299-306.

Metzger, B. M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament.* London/New York: UBS, 1975.

Meyer, E. *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums.* 3 vols. Stuttgart/Berlin: Cotta'sche, 1924.

Meyer, M. W. *The Letter of Peter to Philip. Text, Translation, and Commentary.* SBLDS 53. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1981.

Meyer, M. W. and Wisse, F. "The Letter of Peter to Philip (VIII,2)." In *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, pp. 431-37. General editor, J. M. Robinson. 3rd ed. with afterword by R. Smith, managing editor. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.

Minear, P. S. *To Heal and To Reveal. The Prophetic Vocation According to Luke.* New York: Seabury, 1976.

Minear, P. S. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories." In *Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays Presented in Honor or Paul Schubert*, pp. 111-30. Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966; reprint ed., London: SPCK, 1976.

Minear, P. S. "A Note on Luke 17:7-10." *JBL* 93 (1974) 82-87.

Mínguez, D. "Hechos 8,25-40. Análisis estructural del relato." *Bib* 57 (1976) 168-91.

Miyoshi, M. *Der Anfang des Reiseberichts Lk 9,51-10,24. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung.* AnBib 60. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1974.

Moessner, D. P. "'The Christ Must Suffer': New Light on the Jesus-Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts." *NovT* 28 (1986) 220-56.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Moessner, D. P. "Jesus and the 'Wilderness Generation': The Death of the Prophet Like Moses according to Luke." In SBLSP 1982, pp. 319-40. Edited by K. H. Richards. Chico: Calif., 1982.

Moessner, D. P. "Luke 9:1-50: Luke's Preview of the Journey of the Prophet Like Moses of Deuteronomy." *JBL* 102 (1983) 575-605.

Moessner, D. P. "Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet like Moses in Acts." In SBLSP 1983, pp. 203-212. Edited by K. H. Richards. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1983.

Montgomery, J. A. *The Samaritans. The Earliest Jewish Sect. Their History, Theology and Literature.* New York: Ktav, 1968; reprint ed., 1907.

Moule, C. F. D. "The Christology of Acts." In *Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, pp. 159-85. Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville, Abingdon, 1966; reprint ed., London: SPCK, 1976.

Moule, C. F. D. "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?" *ExpTim* 70 (1958/59) 100-02.

Moule, C. F. D. "The Vocabulary of Miracle." Excursus 1 in *Miracles. Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History*, pp. 235-38. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. London: Mowbray, 1965.

Moulton, J. H. and Milligan, G. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament.* London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930.

Muhlack, G. *Die Parallelen von Lukas-Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte.* Theologie und Wirklichkeit 8. Frankfurt/Bern/Las Vegas: Lang, 1979.

Munck, J. *The Acts of the Apostles.* Revised by W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann. AB 31. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967.

Mussner, F. *Apostelgeschichte.* Neue Echter Bibel 5. Würzburg: Echter, 1984.

Neil, W. *The Acts of the Apostles.* NCB. London: Oliphants, 1973.

Neirynck, F. "The Miracle Stories in the Acts of the Apostles. An Introduction." In *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, pp. 169-213. Edited by J. Kremer. BETL 48. Paris/Gembloux: Duculot/ Louvain: Louvain Univ., 1979.

Neudorfer, H. -W. *Der Stephanuskreis in der Forschungsgeschichte seit F. C. Baur.* Giessen/Basel: Brunner, 1983.

New, S. "The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands." In *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake. Vol. 5: *Additional Notes to the Commentary,*

pp. 121-40. Edited by K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Neyrey, J. *The Passion According to Luke. A Redaction Study of Luke's Soteriology.* New York: Paulist, 1985.

Nock, A. D. "Paul and the Magus." In *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake. Vol. 5: *Additional Notes to the Commentary*, pp. 164-88. Edited by K. Lake and H. . Cadbury. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Nolland, J. "Proselytism or Politics in Horace *Satires* I,4,138-43?" *VigChr* 33 (1979) 347-55.

Nolland, J. "Uncircumcised Proselytes?" *JSJ* 12 (1981) 173-94.

Oliver, H. H. "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts." *NTS* 10 (1963/64) 202-26.

O'Neill, J. C. *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting.* London: SPCK, 1961. 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1970.

Origen. *Contra Celsum.* Edited and translated by H. Chadwick. Cambridge: CUP, 1953,

O'Toole, R. F. "Parallels Between Jesus and His Disciples in Luke-Acts." *BZ* 27 (1983) 195-212.

O'Toole, R. F. "Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts VIII 25-40)." *JSNT* 17 (1983) 23-34.

O'Toole, R. F. *The Unity of Luke's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts.* GNS 9. Wilmington, Del.: Glazier, 1984.

Oulton, J. E. L. "The Holy Spirit, Baptism, and Laying on of Hands in Acts." *ExpTim* 66 (1954/55) 236-40.

Overman, J. A. "The God-Fearers: Some Neglected Factors." *JSNT* 32 (1988) 17-26.

Owen, H. P. "Stephen's Vision in Acts VII.55-56." *NTS* 1 (1955) 224-26.

Parratt, J. K. "The Rebaptism of the Ephesian Disciples." *ExpTim* 79 (1967/68) 182-83.

Parson, M. C. *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts. The Ascension Narratives in Context.* JSNTSup 21. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.

Pauly-Wissowa. "Eunuchen." In *Real-Encylcopädie der classischen Altertumwissenschaft.* Supp. vol. 3, cols. 449-55.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Pereira, F. *Ephesus: Climax of Universalism in Luke-Acts. A Redaction-Critical Study of Paul's Ephesian Ministry (Acts 18:23-20:1).* Jesuit Theological Forum Studies 1. Anand, India: Gujarat Sahitya Prakash, 1983.

Pervo, R. I. *Profit with Delight. The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Pesch, R. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* 2 vols. EKKNT 5/1, 2. Zurich: Benziger/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1986.

Pesch, R. *Die Vision des Stephanus. Apg 7,55-56 im Rahmen der Apostelgeschichte.* SBS 12. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966.

Pesch, R., Gerhardt, E. and Schilling F. "'Hellenisten' und 'Hebräer'. Zu Apg 9,29 und 6,1." *BZ* 23 (1979) 87-92.

Petzke, G. "εὐνοῦχος." *EWNT* 2:202-204.

Pietersma, A. and Lutz, R. T. "Jannes and Jambres." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,* vol. 2, pp. 427-42. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. London: DLT, 1985.

Platz, H. H. "Philip." *IDB* 3:784-85.

Plümacher, E. "Acta-Forschung 1974-1982 (Fortsetzung und Scluss)." *TRu* 49 (19840 105-69.

Plümacher, E. *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller. Studien zur Apostelgeschichte.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

Plümacher, E. "Wirklichkeitserfahrung und Geschichtsschreibung bei Lukas. Erwägungen zu den Wir-Stücken der Apostlegeschichte." *ZNW* 68 (1977) 2-22.

Plumptre, E. H. "The Samaritan Element in the Gospels and Acts." *The Expositor* 7 (1878) 22-40.

Potterie, I. de la. "Les deux noms de Jérusalem dans les Actes des Apôtres." *Bib* 63 (1982) 153-87.

Preisker, H. "Apollos und die Johannesjünger in Act 18.24-19.6." *ZNW* 30 (1931) 301-04.

Pummer, R. "Antisamaritanischer Polemik in jüdischen Schriften aus der intertestamentarischen Zeit." *BZ* 26 (1982) 224-42.

Pummer, R. "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods." *HTR* 75 (1982) 177-88.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Pummer, R. "New Evidence for Samaritan Christianity?" *CBQ* 41 (1979) 98-117.

Pummer, R. "The Present State of Samaritan Studies: I." *JSS* 21 (1976) 39-61.

Pummer, R. "The Present State of Samaritan Studies: II." *JSS* 22 (1977) 27-47.

Pummer, R. "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the New Testament." *NTS* 22 (1975/76) 441-43.

Pummer, R. *The Samaritans.* Iconography of Religions XXIII.5 Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Purvis, J. D. "The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans." *NovT* 17 (1975) 161-98.

Purvis, J. D. *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect.* HSM 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ., 1968.

Purvis, J. D. "The Samaritans and Judaism." In *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*, pp. 81-98. Edited by R. A. Kraft and G. W. E. Nickelsburg. Philadelphia: Fortress/Atlanta: Scholars, 1986.

Quesnel, M. *Baptisés dans l'Esprit. Baptême et Esprit Saint dans les Actes des Apôtres.* LD 120. Paris: Cerf, 1985.

Rackham, R. B. *The Acts of the Apostles.* London: Methuen, 1901.

Radl, W. *Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk. Untersuchungen zu Parallelmotiven im Lukasevangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte.* Europäische Hochschulschriften, ser. 23, vol. 49. Franfurt/Bern: Lang, 1975.

Ramsay, W. M. *Luke the Physician and Other Studies in the History of Religion.* London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1908; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1956.

Reicke, B. "Der barmherzige Samariter." In *Verborum Veritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag*, pp. 103-09. Edited by O. Böcher and K. Haacker. Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1970.

Reicke, B. *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde. Bemerkungen zu Apg. 1-7.* ATANT 32. Zürich: Zwingli, 1957.

Reicke, B. *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Reicke, B. "Die Verkündigung des Täufers nach Lukas." In *Jesus in der Verkündigung der Kirche*, pp. 50-61. Edited by A. Fuchs. Studien zum NT und seiner Umwelt A/1. Linz, 1976.

Remus, H. *Pagan-Christian Conflict over Miracle in the Second Century.* Patristic Monograph Series 10. Cambridge, Mass.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1983.

Rengstorf, K. "σημεῖον, σημαίνω, κτλ." *TDNT* 7:200-269.

Rese, M. *Altestamentlich Motive in der Christologie des Lukas.* SNT 1. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969.

Reynolds, J. and Tannenbaum, R. *Jews and God-Fearers at Aphrodisias. Greek Inscriptions with Commentary.* Cambridge Philological Society Sup. Vol. 12. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1987.

Richard, E. *Acts 6:1-8:4. The Author's Method of Composition.* SBLDS 41. Missoula: Scholars, 1978.

Richard, E. "Acts 7: An Investigation of the Samaritan Evidence." *CBQ* 39 (1977) 190-208.

Richard, E. "Luke--Writer, Theologian, Historian: Research and Orientation of the 1970's." *BTB* 13 (1983) 3-15.

Richard, E. "The Polemical Character of the Joseph Episode in Acts 7." *JBL* 98 (1979) 255-67.

Riddle, D. W. "Early Christian Hospitality: A Factor in the Gospel Transmission." *JBL* 57 (1938) 141-54.

Robbins, V. K. "By Land and By Sea: The We-Passages and Ancient Sea Voyages." In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, pp. 215-42. Edited by C. H. Talbert. Danville, Va.: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion/Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Robertson, A. T. *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research.* New York: Scribner's, 1920.

Robinson, J. A. T. *Twelve New Testament Studies.* SBT 34. London: SCM, 1962.

Rodd, C. S. "Spirit or Finger." *ExpTim* 72 (1960/61) 157-58.

Roloff, J. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* NTD 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

Roloff, J. *Apostolat-Verkündigung-Kirche. Ursprung, Inhalt und Funktion des kirchlichen Apostelamtes nach Paulus, Lukas und den Pastoralbriefen.* Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965.

Roloff, J. *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus. Historische Motive in den Jesus-Erzählungen der Evangelien.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

Roloff, J. "Die Paulus-Darstellung des Lukas, Ihre geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen und ihr theologisches Ziel." *EvT* 39 (1979) 310-31.

Ross, J. M. "The Rejected Words in Luke 9.54-56." *ExpTim* 84 (1972/73) 85-88.

Rowland, C. *The Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity.* London: SPCK, 1982.

Rudolph, K. "Simon--Magus oder Gnosticus? Zur Stand der Debatte." *TRu* 42 (1977) 279-359.

Russell, E. A. "'They believed Philip preaching' (Acts 8.12)." *IBS* 1 (1979) 169-76.

Safrai, S. "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the End of the Second Temple Period." In *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*, pp. 12-21. Edited by O. Michel, *et. al.*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969.

Safrai, S. "Relations between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel." In *The Jewish People in the First Century*, vol. 1, pp. 184-215. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. Assen: Van Gorcum. 1974.

Safrai, S. *Die Wallfahrt im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels.* Forschungen zum jüdisch-christlichen Dialog 3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1981.

Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism.* London: SCM, 1985.

Sanders, J. A. "The Ethic of Election in Luke's Great Banquet Parable." In *Essays in Old Testament Ethics (J. Philip Hyatt, In Memoriam)*, pp. 245-71. Edited by J. L. Crenshaw and J. T. Willis. New York: Ktav, 1974.

Sanders, J. A. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4." In *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty.* Part 1: *New Testament*, pp. 75-106. Edited by J. Neusner. SJLA 12. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Sanders, J. A. "Isaiah in Luke." *Int* 36 (1982) 144-55.

Sanders, J. T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts.* London: SCM, 1987.

Scharlemann, M. H. *Stephen: A Singular Saint.* AnBib 34. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968.

Schiffman, L. "The Samaritans in Tannaitic Halakhah." *JQR* 75 (1985) 323-50.

Schille, G. *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas.* THKNT 5. Berlin: Evangelisch, 1983.

Schlier, H. *Der Brief an die Epheser. Ein Kommentar.* 6th ed. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968.

Schmidt, K. L. "διασπορά." *TDNT* 2:98-104.

Schmiedel, P. W. "Philip, the Apostle, and Philip, the Evangelist." In *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. 3, cols. 3697-3701. Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black. London: Black, 1902.

Schmithals, W. *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas.* Zürcher Bibelkommentare. Zürich: Theologischer, 1982.

Schmithals, W. *The office of Apostle in the Early Church.* ET. Nashville: Abingdon, 1969; reprint ed., London: SPCK, 1971.

Schmithals, W. *Paul and James.* ET. SBT 46. London: SCM, 1965.

Schnackenburg, R. *Der Brief an die Epheser.* EKKNT 10. Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1982.

Schnackenburg, R. *God's Rule and Kingdom.* ET. Freiburg: Herder; Edinburgh/London: Nelson, 1963.

Schneider, G. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* 2 vols. HTKNT 5/1,2. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1980-82.

Schneider, G. "Stephanus, die Hellenisten und Samaria." In *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, theologie*, pp. 215-40. Edited by J. Kremer. BETL 48. Paris: Duculot/Louvain: Louvain Univ., 1979

Schürmann, H. *Das Lukasevangelium. Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-9,50.* HTKNT 3/1. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1969.

Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135).* 3 vols. ET. Revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973-87.

Schneider, J. "εὔνοῦχος, εὐνουχίζω." *TDNT* 2:765-68.

Schwartz, D. R. "The End of the ΓΗ (Acts 1:8): Beginning or End of the Christian Vision?" *JBL* 105 (1986) 669-76.

Schweizer, E. "Die Bekehrung des Apollos, Apg 18,24-26." In *Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Neutestamentliche Aufsätze (1955-70)*, pp. 71-79. Zurich: Zwingli, 1970.

Schweizer, E. *Church Order in the New Testament.* ET. SBT 32. London: SCM, 1961.

Schweizer, E. "πνεῦμα, πνευματικός." *TDNT* 6:332-451.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Scobie, C. H. H. *John the Baptist.* London: SCM, 1964.

Scobie, C. H. H. "The Origins and Development of Samaritan Christianity." *NTS* 19 (1972/73) 390-414.

Scobie, C. H. H. "The Use of Material in the Speeches of Acts III and VII." *NTS* 25 (1978/79) 399-421.

Scroggs, R. "The Earliest Hellenistic Christianity." In *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough,* pp. 176-206. Edited by J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1968.

Seccombe, D. "Luke and Isaiah." *NTS* 27 (1980-81) 252-59.

Sellin, G. "Komposition, Quellen und Funktion des lukanischen Reiseberichts (Lk. ix 51-xix 28)." *NovT* 20 (1978) 100-35.

Senior, D. and Stuhlmueller, C. *The Biblical Foundations for Mission.* London: SCM, 1983.

Sevenster, J. N. *Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known?* NovTSup 19. Leiden: Brill, 1968.

Siegert, F. "Gottesfürchtige und Sympathisanten." *JSJ* 4 (1973) 109-164.

Simon, M. *St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church.* Haskell Lectures, Oberlin College, 1952. London/New York/Toronto: Longmans, Green, 1958.

Skehan, P. W. "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran." *JBL* 74 (1955) 182-87.

Sloan, R. B., Jr. *The Favorable Year of the Lord. A Study of Jubilary Theology in the Gospel of Luke.* Austin, Tex.: Schola, 1977.

Smalley, S. S. "The Christology of Acts." *ExpTim* 73 (1961/62) 358-62.

Smalley, S. S. "The Christology of Acts Again." In *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament. In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule,* pp. 79-93. Edited by B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley. Cambridge: CUP, 1973.

Smalley, S. S. "Spirit, Kingdom and Prayer in Luke-Acts." *NovT* 15 (1973) 59-71.

Smith, D. E. "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke." *JBL* 106 (1987) 613-38.

Smith, M. "The Account of Simon Magus in Acts 8." In *H. A. Wolfson Jubilee Volume,* pp. 735-49. Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1965.

Smith, T. V. *Petrine Controversies in Early Christianity. Attitudes towards Peter in Christian Writings of the First Two Centuries.* WUNT 15. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1985.

Snowden, F. M., Jr. "Blacks, Early Christianity and." *IDBSup*, pp. 111-114.

Snowden, F. M., Jr. "Ethiopians and the Graeco-Roman World." In *The African Diaspora*, pp. 11-36. Edited by M. L. Kilson and R. I. Rotberg. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard Univ., 1976.

Spencer, F. S. "2 Chronicles 28:5-15 and the Parable of the Good Samaritan." *WTJ* 46 (1984) 317-49.

Spencer, F. S. Review of *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts. A Literary Interpretation.* Vol. 1: *The Gospel according to Luke*, by R. C. Tannehill. *WTJ* 50 (1988) 352-55.

Spiro, A. "Stephen's Samaritan Background." In J. Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 285-300. Revised by W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann. AB 31. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967

Stagg, F. *The Book of Acts. The Early Struggle for an Unhindered Gospel.* Nashville: Broadman, 1955.

Stählin, G. "ἀποκόπτω." *TDNT* 3:852-55.

Stählin, G. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* NTD 5. 11th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

Stählin, G. "Das Bild der Witwe. Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der Bibel und zum Phänomen der Personifikation in der Antike." JAC 17 (1974) 5-20.

Stählin, G. "ξένος, κτλ." *TDNT* 5:1-36.

Stambaugh, J. and Balch, D. *The Social World of the First Christians.* London: SPCK, 1986.

Stanton, G. *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching.* SNTSMS 27. Cambridge: CUP, 1974.

Stanton, G. "Samaritan Incarnational Christology?" In *Incarnation and Myth. The Debate Continued*, pp. 243-46. Edited by M. Goulder. London: SCM, 1979.

Stanton, G. "Stephen in Lucan Perspective." In *Studia Biblica 1978.* Vol. 3: *Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors*, pp. 345-60. JSNTSup 3. Sheffield: JSOT, 1980.

Steck, O. H. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistichen*

Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum. WMANT 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1967.

Stemberger, G. "Die Stephanusrede (Apg 7) und die jüdische Tradition." In *Jesus in der Verkündigung der Kirche*, pp. 154-76. Edited by A. Fuchs. Studien zum NT und seiner Umwelt A/1. Linz, 1976.

Stern, M. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism.* 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976-84.

Stolle, V. *Der Zeuge als Angeklagter. Untersuchungen zum Paulusbild des Lukas.* BWANT 102. Stuttgart: Kolhammer, 1973.

Strack, H. L. and Billerbeck, P. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* Vol. 2. Munich: Becksche, 1924.

Strecker, G. "εὐαγγελίζω." *EWNT* 2:173-76.

Strobel, A. "Armenpfleger 'um des Freidens willen' (Zum Verständnis von Act 6.1-6)." *ZNW* 63 (1972) 271-76.

Stronstad, R. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke.* Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1984.

Stuhlmacher, P. "Das Gesetz als Thema biblischer Theologie." *ZTK* 75 (1978) 251-80.

Sylva, D. D. "Ierousalem and Hierosoluma in Luke-Acts." *ZNW* 74 (1983) 207-221

Taeger, J. -W. *Der Mensch und sein Heil. Studien zum Bild des Menschen und zur Sicht der Bekehrung bei Lukas.* SNT 14. Gütersloh: Gutersloher/Mohn, 1982.

Talbert, C. H. *Acts.* Knox Preaching Guides. Atlanta: Knox, 1984.

Talbert, C. H. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts.* SBLMS 20. Missoula: Scholars, 1974.

Talbert, C. H. *Luke and the Gnostics. An Examination of the Lucan Purpose.* Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1966.

Talbert, C. H., ed. *Luke-Acts. New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar.* New York: Crossroad, 1984.

Talbert, C. H., ed. *Perspectives on Luke-Acts.* Danville, Va.: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Talbert, C. H. *Reading Luke. A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel.* New York: Crossroad, 1984.

Talbert, C. H. Review of *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)*, by J. A. Fitzmyer. *CBQ* 48 (1986) 336-38.

Talbert, C. H. "Shifting Sands: The Recent Study of the Gospel of Luke." *Int* 30 (1976) 381-95).

Tannehill, R. C. "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story." *JBL* 104 (1985) 69-85.

Tannehill, R. C. "The Mission of Jesus according to Luke IV 16-30." In *Jesus in Nazareth*, pp. 51-75. Edited by W. Eltester. BZNW 40. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972.

Tannehill, R. C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts. A Literary Interpretation.* Vol. 1: *The Gospel According to Luke.* Foundations and Facets. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Tatum, W. B. "The Epoch of Israel: Luke I-II and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts." *NTS* 13 (1966/67) 184-95.

Teeple, H. M. *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet.* SBLMS 10. Philadelphia: SBL, 1957.

Theissen, G. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity. Essays on Corinth.* Edited and translated and with an introduction by J. H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Theissen, G. *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity.* ET. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

Theissen, G. "Wanderradikalismus. Literatursoziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum." In *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums*, pp. 79-105. WUNT 19. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1979.

Thomas, J. *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie (150 AV. J.-C.-300 AD. J.-C).* Gembloux: Duculot, 1935.

Thornton, T. C. G. "To the end of the earth: Acts 1.8." *ExpTim* 89 (1977/78) 374-75

Tiede, D. L. *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Trebilco, P. R. "Studies on Jewish Communities in Asia Minor." Durham University Ph.D. Dissertation, 1987.

Trocmé, É. *The Formation of the Gospel According to Mark.* ET. London: SPCK, 1975.

Trocmé, É. *Le "Livre des Actes" et L'Histoire.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957.

Turner, M. M. B. "Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective." *TynBul* 32 (1981) 3-42.

Tyson, J. B. "Acts 6:1-7 and Dietary Regulations in Early Christianity." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 10 (1983) 145-61.

Tyson, J. B. *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts.* Columbia, S.C.: Univ. of South Carolina, 1986.

Tyson, J. B. "The Gentile Mission and the Authority of Scripture in Acts." *NTS* 33 (1987) 619-31.

Via, J. "An Interpretation of Acts 7.35-37 from the Perspective of Major Themes in Luke-Acts." *Perspective in Religious Studies* 6 (1979) 190-207.

Ullendorff, E. "Candace (Acts VIII.27) and the Queen of Sheba." *NTS* 2 (1955/56) 53-56.

Unnik, W. C. van. "Die Apostelgeschichte und die Häresien." In *Sparsa Collecta. The Collected Essays of W. C. van Unnik*, part 1, pp. 402-09. NovTSup 29. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Unnik, W. C. van. "Der Befehl an Philippus." In *Sparsa Collecta. The Collected Essays of W. C. van Unnik*, part 1, pp. 328-39. NovTSup 29. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Vermes, G. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English.* 3rd ed. London: Penguin, 1987.

Völkel, M. "Zur Deutung des 'Reiches Gottes' bei Lukas." *ZNW* 65 (1974) 57-70.

Waitz, H. "Die Quelle der Philippusgeschichten in der Apostelgeschichte 8,5-40." *ZNW* 7 (1906) 340-55.

Wall, R. W. "'The Finger of God': Deuteronomy 9.10 and Luke 11.20." *NTS* 33 (1987) 144-50.

Wall, R. W. "Peter, 'Son' of Jonah: The Conversion of Cornelius in the Context of Canon." *JSNT* 29 (1987) 79-90.

Walter, N. "Apostelgeschichte 6.1 und die Anfänge der Urgemeinde in Jerusalem." *NTS* 29 (1983) 370-93.

Wanke, J. "'. . . wie sie ihn beim Brotbrechen erkannten.' Zur Auslegung der Emmauserzählung Lk 24,13-35." *BZ* 18 (1974) 180-92.

Weiser, A. *Die Apostelgeschichte. Kapitel 1-12.* Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum NT 5/1. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn/Würzburg: Echter, 1981.

Weiser, A. *Die Apostelgeschichte. Kapitel 13-28.* Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum NT 5/2. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn/Würzburg: Echter, 1985.

Wilcox, M. "The 'God-Fearers' in Acts--A Reconsideration." *JSNT* 13 (1981) 102-22.

Wilcox, M. *The Semitisms of Acts.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

Wilkens, W. "Wassertaufe und Geistempfang bei Lukas." *TZ* 23 (1967) 26-47.

Wilkinson, F. H. "Oded: Proto-Type of the Good Samaritan." *ExpTim* 69 (1957/58) 94.

Williams, C. S. C. *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles.* Black's NT Commentaries. London: Black, 1957.

Wilson, R. McL. "Simon and Gnostic Origins." In *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, pp. 485-91. Edited by J. Kremer. BETL 48. Paris-Gembloux: Duculot/Louvain: Louvain Univ., 1979.

Wilson, S. G. *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts.* SNTSMS 23. Cambridge: CUP, 1973.

Wilson, S. G. *Luke and the Law.* SNTSMS 50. Cambridge: CUP, 1983.

Wink, W. *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition.* SNTSMS 7. Cambridge: CUP, 1968.

Witherington, B., III. "On the Road with Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and Other Disciples--Luke 8.1-3." *ZNW* 70 (1979) 243-48.

Wolter, M. "Apollos und die ephesinischen Johannesjünger (Act 18.24-19.7)." *ZNW* 78 (1987) 49-73.

Wright, G. E. "The Samaritans at Shechem." *HTR* 55 (1962) 357-66.

Yamauchi, E. M. *Pre-Christian Gnosticism. A Survey of the Proposed Evidences.* London: Tyndale, 1973.

Ziesler, J. A. "Luke and the Pharisees." *NTS* 25 (1978/79)

Ziesler, J. A. "The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles." *JSNT* 4 (1979) 28-41.

Additions:

Lucian. LCL. 8 vols. Edited and translated by A. M. Harmon, K. Kilburn, and M. D. Macleod. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ./London: Heinemann, 1913-67.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philo. LCL. 10 vols. Edited and translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ./London: Heinemann, 1929-43.

Philostratus. *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. LCL. 2 vols. Edited and translated by F. C. Conybeare. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ./London: Heinemann, 1912.